

Near-critical dimers and massive SLE

Nathanaël Berestycki, Levi Haunschmid-Sibitz

March 30, 2022

We consider the dimer model on the square and hexagonal lattices with doubly periodic weights. Although in the near-critical regime the Kasteleyn matrix is related to a massive Laplacian, Chhita [Chh12] proved that on the whole plane square lattice, the corresponding height function has a scaling limit which surprisingly is not even Gaussian.

The purpose of this paper is threefold: (a) we establish a rigorous connection with the massive SLE_2 constructed by Makarov and Smirnov [MS10] (and recently revisited by Chelkak and Wan [CW19]); (b) we show that the convergence takes place in *arbitrary* (bounded) domains subject to Temperleyan boundary conditions, and that the scaling limit is universal; and (c) we prove conformal covariance of the scaling limit. This requires allowing the drift to be a smoothly varying vector field; along the way we prove that the corresponding loop-erased random walk has a universal scaling limit. Our techniques rely on the imaginary geometry approach developed in [BLR20] and some exact discrete Girsanov identities which are of independent interest.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Off-critical dimer model.	3
1.2	Temperleyan boundary conditions.	4
1.3	Temperley’s bijection.	4
1.4	Massive SLE_2	5
1.5	Main results	6
1.6	Conformal covariance	7
1.7	Comments and open problems	9
2	Connection between massive and drifted LERW; proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2	11
2.1	Temperley’s bijection on the hexagonal lattice	11
2.2	Statement of the theorem about LERW	12
2.3	Discrete Girsanov lemma on the triangular lattice	13
2.4	Discrete Girsanov on the square lattice	18
3	Convergence of massive LERW on the triangular lattice	22
3.1	Convergence of domains and curves	23
3.2	Absolute continuity with respect to classical SLE_2	23

3.3	Convergence of the Green function	25
3.4	Convergence of discrete massive Poisson kernel	33
3.5	Proof of the main statement	35
4	Convergence of massive LERW on general planar graphs	36
4.1	Continuum hitting probabilities	39
4.2	Discrete crossing and Beurling estimates	43
5	Convergence of height function, proof of Theorem 1.4	44
	References	48

1 Introduction

Makarov and Smirnov initiated in [MS10] a programme to describe near-critical scaling limits of planar statistical mechanics models in terms of massive SLE and/or Gaussian free field. To quote from their paper:

The key property of SLE is its conformal invariance, which is expected in 2D lattice models only at criticality, and the question naturally arises: Can SLE success be replicated for off-critical models? In most off-critical cases to obtain a non-trivial scaling limit one has to adjust some parameter [...], sending it at an appropriate speed to the critical value. Such limits lead to massive field theories, so the question can be reformulated as whether one can use SLEs to describe those. Massive CFTs are no longer conformally invariant, but are still covariant when mass is considered as a variable covariant density [...].

As part of this programme, Makarov and Smirnov introduced a massive version of SLE_2 , which will be defined more precisely in Section 1.4. As established rigorously recently by Chelkak and Wan [CW19], this can be seen as the scaling limit of the loop-erasure of a massive random walk, i.e., a random walk which has a fixed probability of being killed at every step, and which is conditioned to leave the domain before being killed. Makarov and Smirnov also listed a number of fascinating questions, many of which remain open today.

In this paper we carry out part of this programme for the near-critical dimer model. The dimer model is one of the most classical models of statistical mechanics, and is equivalent to random matchings on a planar bipartite graph. That is, given such a (finite) graph G , we associate to every dimer covering (or perfect matching) \mathbf{m} (a subset of the edges such that every vertex is covered exactly once) the Gibbs weight

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{e \in \mathbf{m}} w_e,$$

where $w_e > 0$ are given edge weights and Z is a normalisation constant (partition function). The model is also equivalent to tilings (in particular to lozenge tilings if the underlying graph is the hexagonal lattice; see [Gor21] for a recent superb introduction). The study of the dimer model goes back to the pioneering work of Temperley and Fisher [TF61] and Kasteleyn [Kas61], who computed its partition function, and noted that it is equal (up to a sign or more generally a complex number of modulus one) to the determinant of a matrix now called the Kasteleyn matrix, which is a suitably weighted adjacency matrix. This identity is the starting point of a far-reaching theory which eventually led Kenyon to prove convergence (subject to so-called Temperleyan boundary conditions) of the associated height function to a Gaussian free field in




Figure 1: Doubly periodic weights on the square lattice. Only black vertices are indicated, their size distinguishes between the two types of black vertices. The weights s_1, \dots, s_4 are periodically repeated around every black vertex of type 1. Every other edge weight is equal to 1.

a sequence of two landmark papers [Ken00], [Ken01] when all edge weights are equal. This was the first proof of conformal invariance for a planar model of statistical mechanics.

1.1 Off-critical dimer model.

In this paper we are concerned with an off-critical model, which can be defined either on the square lattice or on the hexagonal lattice when the edge weights are assumed to be doubly periodic, in the following sense. We start with the square lattice. Let $s_1, \dots, s_4 > 0$. We divide the square lattice into the usual black and white vertices in checkboard fashion, and the black vertices are themselves divided into two alternating classes B_1 and B_2 (as in [Ken00]). We declare that around every B_1 vertex, the edge weights are respectively s_1, \dots, s_4 as we move in clockwise direction starting from the east. All other edge weights are set to 1. See Figure 1 for an illustration. We will further specify the weights s_i so as to be in the near-critical regime in (1.1).

A similar construction can be applied to the hexagonal lattice. Consider the usual black and white colouring of the vertices of the hexagonal lattice \mathbb{H} . Black vertices at distance two apart in \mathbb{H} form a triangular lattice, which is a tripartite graph. So all black vertices in \mathbb{H} belong one of three possible classes, B_1, B_2, B_3 , say. We declare that the edge weights around a B_1 vertex are respectively a, b and c going counter-clockwise starting from the east direction See Figure 1.

This model was first considered in the work of Chhita [Chh12] in the case of the square lattice, and called it the “drifted” dimer model, for reasons that will become clear later. Suppose $s_i = 1 + c_i \delta$, where δ tends to zero (we will later identify δ with the mesh size). When applying the treatment of Kenyon [Ken00] to this model, if K denote the associated Kasteleyn matrix then one can easily check that $L = K^* K$, viewed as an operator on the black vertices, is approximately the negative of a massive Laplacian: indeed, on the B_1 vertices, the diagonal entry is of the form $s_1^2 + \dots + s_4^2$, while the sum of the off-diagonal entries is $-2s_2s_4 - 2s_1s_3$. (The reason why this is only an approximation is because terms of the form $L(b_1, b_2)$ are not all exactly zero when $b_1 \in B_1, b_2 \in B_2$; they are simply lower order than $L(b_1, b'_1)$ for $b_1, b'_1 \in B_1$). (In fact, after a suitable transformation, the inverse Kasteleyn matrix can be related to a modified Kasteleyn matrix which corresponds exactly to the Green function of a massive random walk,

see Section 3 of [Chh12]).

From this it is perhaps natural to conjecture that the height function, suitably rescaled, converges to the **massive Gaussian free field**, which is (informally) the Gaussian field whose covariance matrix is the massive Green function. Surprisingly, however, [Chh12] showed that while there is a scaling limit for the height function as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the full plane, the limit cannot be the massive Gaussian free field since its moments do not even satisfy the Wick relation, hence it is not even Gaussian.

The purpose of this paper is threefold:

- First, we extend the results of [Chh12] in several different ways: we consider not only the square lattice but also the hexagonal lattice; furthermore our results are not only valid in the whole plane but in arbitrary simply connected domains subject to Temperleyan boundary conditions (these are perhaps the nicest boundary conditions from the combinatorial point of view and are defined immediately below in Section 1.2).
- Second, we show for the first time a connection to massive models and more specifically to the massive SLE₂, constructed by Makarov and Smirnov [MS10] and revisited recently by Chelkak and Wan [CW19].
- Finally, we show that the scaling limit of the height function obey a certain conformal covariance rule. This is reminiscent of other near-critical scaling limits previously obtained e.g. for percolation [GPS18]. Interestingly however, the covariance rule involves not only the modulus of the derivative of the conformal map but also its argument.

1.2 Temperleyan boundary conditions.

To make this connection and state our results, we will now define precisely the type of boundary conditions we impose on the model, which in the case of the square grid are known as Temperleyan. We recall the definition in this case first. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded simply connected domain of the complex plane. Let $\Gamma_\delta = (v(\Gamma_\delta), E(\Gamma_\delta))$ be a sequence of graphs in $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ approximating Ω : that is, Γ_δ is a planar graph with vertex set $v(\Gamma_\delta) \subset \Omega \cap (\delta\mathbb{Z}^2)$ and edge set $E(\Gamma_\delta)$ such that if $x, y \in v(\Gamma_\delta)$ and $x \sim y$ in $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$, then $(x, y) \in E(\Gamma_\delta)$ if and only if $[x, y] \subset \Omega$. We assume that the *vertex boundary* of Γ_δ , i.e. the vertices $v \in v(\Gamma_\delta)$ which have at least one neighbour w of the full plane square lattice not in $v(\Gamma_\delta)$, is within $O(\delta)$ of $\partial\Omega$. We also assume that Γ_δ is Temperleyan: namely, all corners (be them convex or concave) are of type B_2 , and one further such corner has been removed. See e.g. Figure 2. Equivalently, along the vertex boundary, all black vertices are of type B_2 , i.e. the boundary alternates between B_2 and white vertices (except at the removed corner).

We make a similar definition in the hexagonal case. We say that the domain Γ_δ whose vertices are in $\delta\mathbb{H}$ is Temperleyan if the boundary does not contain any B_1 vertices (i.e., consists only of B_2 and B_3 and white vertices), and a vertex of type B_2 or B_3 has been removed. Figure 2 shows examples of a Temperleyan domain on both the square and hexagonal lattices.

1.3 Temperley's bijection.

Temperley's bijection is a powerful tool which relates the dimer model on the Temperleyan graph Γ_δ to a pair of spanning trees on a different graph. As it turns out, the Temperleyan boundary conditions described above are such that both dimer models (i.e., on the square and hexagonal lattices respectively) are equivalent to a certain spanning tree on a (possibly directed) graph




Figure 2: A Temperleyan domain on the square lattice and a Temperleyan domain on the hexagonal lattice. In both the black vertices of type B_1 have been highlighted and a (non- B_1) black vertex on the lower left boundary has been removed.

Ω^δ whose vertices are the B_1 vertices of Γ_δ (or, equivalently, to a pair of dual spanning trees on Ω^δ and its planar dual). In the square lattice (and for rectangles) this goes back to the original paper of Temperley and Fisher [TF61]. This was considerably generalised and strengthened in many subsequent works, in particular [KPW00]. That paper included the perhaps lesser well known case of the hexagonal lattice, which we will use in this paper and will be recalled in more detail in Section 2.1; in that case the corresponding graph Ω^δ of the spanning tree is the directed triangular lattice with mesh size δ .

As developed in the sequence of papers [BLR20, BLR19, BLR22], Temperley's bijection can be used to describe the scaling limit of the height function fluctuations via a random geometric approach. Essentially these papers reduce the problem of finding the scaling limit of the dimer height function to the (easier) problem of finding a scaling limit for the associated Temperleyan tree in the Schramm topology: in other words, to the question of the scaling limit of a single branch of that tree. In turn, by Wilson's algorithm, this boils down to the scaling limit of the loop-erasure of the random walk on the (possibly directed) graph Ω^δ .

1.4 Massive SLE₂.

As already mentioned, the construction of massive SLE₂ was sketched by Makarov and Smirnov in [MS10] and recently revisited by Chelkak and Wan [CW19] (see also [BBK08] for a mathematical physics perspective). A massive random walk is a walk which has a chance of order δ^2 to be killed at every time step (the constant of proportionality is by definition m^2 , where $m \geq 0$ is the mass), and otherwise moves like ordinary walk. Massive (chordal, resp. radial) SLE₂ describes the scaling limit of the loop-erasure of a massive random walk from a to b (where b is on the boundary of a simply connected domain Ω , and a is on the boundary of Ω or in Ω respectively), conditioned on not getting killed before reaching b . In fact, it is more convenient to define massive SLE₂ by its associated Loewner flow, which in the radial case is defined by Loewner's equation (parametrised by capacity)

$$\frac{dg_t(z)}{dt} = -\varphi'(z)g_t(z)\frac{g_t(z) + \zeta_t}{g_t(z) - \zeta_t}; z \in \Omega_t$$

where φ is a fixed conformal map sending Ω to \mathbb{D} and a to 0, Ω_t denotes the slit domain $\Omega \setminus \gamma([0, t])$ (since $\kappa = 2$ we do not need to remove more than that), g_t is the Loewner map from

Ω_t to \mathbb{D} , and if we write the driving function in the form $\zeta_t = e^{i\xi_t}$, then ξ solves the Stochastic Differential Equation:

$$d\xi_t = \sqrt{2}dB_t + 2\lambda_t dt; \lambda_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial g_t(a_t)} \log \frac{P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(a_t, z)}{P_{\Omega_t}(a_t, z)} \Big|_{z=b}.$$

Here $a_t = \gamma(t)$, and $P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}$ and P_{Ω_t} are the Poisson kernels for the Brownian motion with mass m , and regular Brownian motion respectively, in Ω_t .

The description above is then a theorem proved in the chordal case and on the square lattice by [CW19] (the radial case is briefly discussed as being analogue to, and in fact a little simpler than, the chordal case). We will obtain here a different proof of this fact in the radial case as a byproduct of our method and extend it to the case of the triangular lattice (and in fact the result could even be stated more generally, but we do not attempt this here). See Theorem 1.1 in [CW19] for a precise statement, and see [Law08] as well as [BN14] for general references on SLE.

1.5 Main results

Our first result below concerns the branches of the Temperleyan tree for an off-critical dimer model on a graph (defined more precisely below, which may be a piece either of the square lattice or of the hexagonal lattice, scaled by δ) with Temperleyan boundary conditions, as explained above. The result shows that the scaling limit exists, and furthermore gives a connection to massive models. On the square lattice, suppose that the weights s_1, \dots, s_4 satisfy

$$s_i = 1 + c_i \delta \tag{1.1}$$

counterclockwise from the east direction, while on the hexagonal lattice we assume that the weights a_1, a_2, a_3 satisfy

$$a_i = 1 + c_i \delta \tag{1.2}$$

also counterclockwise from the east direction. We consider the associated rescaled drift vector Δ defined respectively by

$$\Delta = \frac{c_1 + c_2 i + c_3 i^2 + c_4 i^3}{4}; \Delta = \frac{c_1 + c_2 \tau + c_3 \tau^2}{3}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and $\tau = e^{2i\pi/3}$ the fourth and third roots of unity, respectively. We also assume

$$c_1 + c_3 = c_2 + c_4 \tag{1.4}$$

in the square lattice case. See Remark 2.13 for a discussion of this condition; heuristic arguments suggest this condition is in fact necessary for the result below to hold.

We suppose we are given a Temperleyan lattice domain Γ_δ as in Section 1.2 and a dimer model on Γ_δ . Applying the Temperleyan bijection leads to a pair of dual trees respectively on Ω^δ and its dual, where Ω^δ is a subgraph of either $\delta\mathbb{T}$ or $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. Note that there is natural edge boundary $\partial\Omega^\delta$ on Ω^δ , corresponding to pair of vertices (y_1, y_2) of the lattice such that y_1 and y_2 are neighbours in the lattice, at least one of y_1 or y_2 is a vertex of Ω^δ but not both. With a slight abuse of notation we will still refer to y_δ as a point on the boundary, identify it in calculations with y_2 and say that $y_\delta \rightarrow y$ if y_2 converges to y as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ (or equivalently y_1). Likewise, we will

often consider the random walk $(X_n, \geq 0)$ on Ω^δ . With an abuse of notation we will refer to the first time τ that the walk leaves Ω^δ as the smallest $n \geq 1$ such that (X_{n-1}, X_n) is a boundary edge. We will also identify, with an abuse of notation, the position X_τ with the boundary edge $(X_{\tau-1}, X_\tau)$, and denote it by Y_δ in the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Consider a near-critical dimer model as above in a domain Γ_δ with Temperleyan boundary conditions. Let z be a vertex on the primal lattice and let γ^δ be the path starting from z in the associated Temperleyan tree on Ω^δ . Let $Y_\delta \in \partial\Omega^\delta$ denote the endpoint of this path. Then conditional on $Y_\delta = y_\delta$, if $y_\delta \rightarrow y \in \partial\Omega$, then also the path γ^δ converges to radial massive SLE₂ with mass $m = |\Delta|$, with $|\Delta|$ the Euclidean norm of the drift vector Δ .*

In fact, the distribution of Y_δ converges weakly to a distribution $\sigma^{(\Delta)}$ on $\partial\Omega$, which is the exit law from Ω of Brownian motion with unit covariance matrix and drift vector Δ . We therefore obtain the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{T}_δ denote the Temperleyan tree associated with the dimer configuration in Γ_δ (either in the hexagonal or square lattice case). Then as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the tree \mathcal{T}_δ converges in the Schramm sense to a continuum limit tree \mathcal{T} . Each branch of this tree from a point $z \in \Omega$ has the law described in Theorem 1.1: that is, sample y according to $\sigma^{(\Delta)}$; given y , the branch of \mathcal{T} from z to y has the law of massive radial SLE₂ with mass $m = |\Delta|$.*

A key result from [BLR20] (see also [BLR19]) is that the convergence of the Temperleyan tree implies the convergence of the dimer height function. This requires only a uniform crossing estimate and some basic estimates such as polynomial decay on the probability for the loop-erasure to visit a small ball, and control on the moments of winding close to a point (these estimates are a fairly simple consequence of our work, and are written explicitly in Section 5 in a more general context). We obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 1.3. *In the setup of Theorem 1.1 or 1.2, the centered height function $h^\delta - \mathbb{E}(h^\delta)$ converges to a limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.*

To establish these results, we observe that the law of a branch in the Temperleyan tree may be described via Wilson's algorithm as the loop-erasure of a random walk on Ω^δ with near-critical weights defined by (1.1) on the square lattice and (1.2) on the directed triangular lattice respectively. The random walk corresponding to these weights is one which has a drift: as the mesh size $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the random walk converges to a Brownian motion with drift vector Δ defined in (1.3). Furthermore, using a discrete Girsanov transform, we relate the corresponding random walks to massive ones on the same lattices; the result then intuitively follows by the known convergence of the massive LERW to the massive SLE₂ of Makarov and Smirnov (proved rigourously by Chelkak and Wan recently in [CW19]). The Girsanov identity is stated as Lemma 2.3 on the triangular lattice and Lemma 2.9 on the square lattice. Although both are exact formulas, the connection between massive and drifted walk is only exact on the triangular case (Corollary 2.4) whereas it is approximate in the case of the square lattice (Corollary 2.11). On the other hand, the application of the results of Chelkak and Wan [CW19] in the directed triangular case needs additional arguments because of the lack of reversibility.

1.6 Conformal covariance

A fundamental feature of critical models in two-dimensional models of statistical mechanics is that they display conformal invariance. In the near-critical regimes that are under consideration in this paper, we cannot of course expect conformal invariance but rather a change of conformal

coordinates rule known as **conformal covariance** which, roughly speaking, says that the transformation needs to be corrected by suitable powers of the derivative of the conformal map. This has been established in particular in the case of near-critical percolation in the paper [GPS18] (where this follows from analogous covariance rules for the limit of the uniform measure on pivotal points proved earlier in the remarkable work [GPS13]). To state such a result we need to extend the setup slightly, by allowing the drift vector Δ to depend continuously on the point $z \in \Omega$.

Thus, let us fix $\Delta(z) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a continuous, bounded vector field (identified with a complex-valued function) on Ω . (The boundedness is a technical restriction which makes some arguments easier). Given such a bounded, continuous vector field, we associate to it biperiodic weights on Γ_δ defined by the converse of (1.1) and (1.2) respectively. That is, in the case of the square lattice, the weights s_i are defined by

$$s_i = 1 + c_i \delta; \quad \Delta = \frac{c_1 + c_2 i}{2}; \quad c_1 + c_3 = 0; c_2 + c_4 = 0; \quad (1.5)$$

(note that this is a slight refinement but is in fact asymptotically equivalent to the assumption (1.4)). In the case of the hexagonal lattice we assume instead:

$$a_i = 1 + c_i \delta; \quad \Delta = \frac{c_1 + c_2 \tau + c_3 \tau^2}{3}; \quad c_1 + c_2 + c_3 = 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Thus the weights are defined by the vector Δ computed locally at each point $z \in \Gamma_\delta$ in a biperiodic way similar to Figure 1, except that the actual values of these weights change from point to point. We assume without loss of generality that the mesh size δ is small enough that all these weights are strictly positive.

We will show that Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 can be generalised to this more general setup both for the case of a general drift vector field or a continuously varying mass; the existence of a scaling limit for the loop-erased random walk will be shown in Theorem 4.1 for the case of random walk with drift asymptotically Δ and Theorem 4.2 for the corresponding statements in the massive case. Note however that in general there is no reason for the scaling limits to agree even when we condition on the endpoint. The next theorem, which we obtain as a consequence of Theorem 4.1, Temperley's bijection and results from [BLR20], shows that the height function $h_\delta^{(\Delta)}$ of the corresponding biperiodic dimer model with weights (1.5) and (1.6) have an identical scaling limit; this generalises Corollary 1.3 to the variable drift setting. Furthermore, under the technical restriction that the conformal map has bounded derivative, the limit is conformally covariant.

Theorem 1.4. *Fix Δ and Ω as above. The height function $h_\delta^{(\Delta)}$ of the corresponding biperiodic dimer model with weights (1.5) on the square lattice, or (1.6) on the hexagonal lattice, have an identical scaling limit which we denote by $h^{(\Delta); \Omega}$. Furthermore, let $\phi : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \Omega$ denote a conformal map between two bounded simply connected domains, and suppose that ϕ' is bounded on $\tilde{\Omega}$. Let $\tilde{\Delta}$ denote a continuous vector field in $\tilde{\Omega}$. Then in law,*

$$h^{(\Delta); \Omega} \circ \phi = h^{(\tilde{\Delta}); \tilde{\Omega}}$$

where at a point $w \in \tilde{\Omega}$,

$$\tilde{\Delta}(w) = \overline{\phi'(w)} \cdot \Delta(\phi(w)) \quad (1.7)$$

and the product above refers to the multiplication of complex numbers.

To explain the theorem, we point out that the new drift vector field $\tilde{\Delta}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ has an amplitude which, compared to that of Δ in Ω , has been scaled by 1 over the modulus of the derivative of the conformal map going from Ω to Ω' , and the vector has been rotated (in the positive direction) by the argument of its derivative. This is the desired conformal covariance rule. The formula may be simply understood in terms of conformal covariance of Brownian motion with unit covariance matrix and drift vector Δ : simply put, the above rule describes (by Itô's formula and the Cauchy–Riemann equations) the change of coordinates for a Brownian motion with drift Δ .

1.7 Comments and open problems

- (i). The height function $h^{(\Delta)}$ is determined implicitly from the scaling limit of the associated Temperleyan tree. A natural question would be to identify its law explicitly. Given the Coleman correspondence (see [BW20]), which relates massive free fermions and the Sine-Gordon model, one may speculate that the limiting height function is related to the Sine-Gordon field. Alternatively, can an axiomatic characterisation of this field be given in the manner of [BPR20, BPR21, AP21]? (This last question is due to Christophe Garban who asked it in a slightly different form.) It is natural to guess that this is indeed possible, provided that the conformal invariance is replaced by the covariance of Theorem 1.4, and the notion of harmonic function in the domain Markov property corresponds to Brownian motion with drift instead of the usual Laplacian.
- (ii). We also do not know much either about the corresponding tree, except for the fact that (in the case where the drift vector field Δ is constant) the branches are given by massive SLE₂, conditioned on their endpoints. We note that the endpoint has a law which is given by the exit distribution from Ω by a Brownian motion with drift Δ and so is absolutely continuous with respect to the same exit distribution without drift. Therefore, a branch of the tree, call it $\mathcal{T}^{(\Delta)}$, is absolutely continuous with respect to massive SLE₂. Let $\mathcal{T}^{(m)}$ denote the tree constructed recursively from massive SLE₂ and Wilson's algorithm. It is tempting to believe that massive SLE₂ is related in some way to the massive Gaussian free field via a version of Imaginary Geometry, as in [BLR20]. The exact relation may not be completely clear, because massive SLE involves conditioning on surviving, and no such conditioning takes place in Wilson's algorithm. Thus the massive GFF may be more naturally associated to the forest obtained from Wilson's algorithm without any conditioning.

On the other hand, the scaling limit of the latter, the continuous massive spanning forest, is a.s. a forest rather than a tree (related to [BDW20]), whereas the massive GFF $h^{(m)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to ordinary GFF, as we now discuss: indeed, the Radon–Nikodym derivative is given by

$$\frac{1}{Z} \exp(-m^2 \int_{\Omega} :h^2(z): dz)$$

where the partition function Z is chosen so that the right hand side integrates to 1. (Here $:h^2:$ denotes the Wick renormalised square of the GFF, which is a generalised function that is not necessarily positive, so the existence of negative exponential moments of $\int_{\Omega} :h^2(z): dz$ is not entirely obvious, see Lemma 3.5 in [LRV17] for a proof).

Question. Is $h^{(\Delta);\Omega}$ absolutely continuous with respect to $h^{(m)}$ (or, equivalently, a massless GFF)? Is the Temperleyan tree $\mathcal{T}^{(\Delta)}$ associated to off-critical dimer model absolutely

continuous with respect to a continuous Uniform Spanning Tree? And what can be said about the imaginary geometry flow lines of a massive GFF?

By Schramm’s lemma [Sch99] (see also [BLR20]), a continuous Uniform Spanning Tree is almost entirely determined by a fixed finite number of branches, and each branch of the Temperleyan tree of the off-critical dimer model is known by Theorem 1.1 to be absolutely continuous with respect to radial SLE_2 (that is to say, with respect to a branch of the continuous UST). This might suggest that the answer to the above question of absolute continuity is yes.

On the other hand, a back of the envelope calculation suggests the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the Temperleyan tree with respect to the UST picks up a factor of order 1 at each scale and so is not absolutely continuous in the limit. This would be similar to the situation of the scaling limit of the massive UST, where the limit is not a tree and so cannot be absolutely continuous with respect to a continuum UST. (Likewise, the scaling limit of near-critical percolation interfaces is known to be singular with respect to SLE_6 , even locally; see [NW09]). This suggests that in fact the limiting height function $h^{(\Delta)}$ is singular with respect to a GFF, and equivalently the associated limiting Temperleyan tree is singular with respect to a continuum UST.

- (iii). A separate line of enquiry concerns the possible implications of our results to the study of the Ising model. By bosonization, it is known that the critical Ising model is related to the critical dimer model ([Dub11]). This correspondence remains at least partly valid in the near-critical regime studied here, but we do not know whether the corresponding Ising model is near-critical in the sense of commonly studied perturbations of the critical Ising model (see in particular, [DCGP14], [CIM21], [Par18], [CJN20] and references therein).
- (iv). Finally we have developed a near-critical dimer theory on the square and hexagonal lattices using the symmetries of these lattices, but it would be of considerable interest to have a theory in some more general setting, e.g., for double isoradial graphs (i.e., superposition of an isoradial graph and its dual) since we know for instance that the Temperleyan bijection extends to this setting ([KPW00]).

While it is not the purpose of this paper to give an extensive overview of recent works on near-critical models, we feel it is appropriate to conclude this introduction by mentioning some which are at least in spirit motivated by similar questions albeit for different models. These include, beyond the already mentioned works on near-critical percolation [GPS18] and the near-critical Ising model [CIM21], [Par18], [CJN20] and [DCGP14], the work of Duminil-Copin and Manolescu on scaling relations in the random cluster model [DCM20]), the work of Benoist, Dumaz and Werner [BDW20] on near-critical spanning forests, and Camia’s work on off-critical Brownian loop soup [Cam13].

Organisation of the paper. In Section 2 we state and prove the discrete Girsanov identities and explain the implication for the connection between drifted and massive walks which lies at the heart of this paper. In Section 3 we extend Chelkak and Wan’s result about the convergence of the massive LERW to massive SLE_2 to the directed triangular case; the additional difficulty compared to their setup is the lack of reversibility. At this stage Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are proved.

In Section 4 we show how to get the existence of a scaling limit for loop-erased random walk on graphs where the drift is a variable function of the vertices (in particular, the scaling limit of

random walk is allowed to be Brownian motion with variable drift). The final Section 5 contains the arguments in order to transfer results about convergence of trees to convergence of height function (which implies in particular the conformal covariance of Theorem 1.4).

Acknowledgements. Both authors thank Dima Chelkak and Marcin Lis for a number of illuminating conversations, as well as Christophe Garban for some comments on a draft. Research of the first author is supported by FWF grant P33083, “Scaling limits in random conformal geometry”. The paper was finished while the first author was in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Spring 2022 semester on *Analysis and Geometry of Random Spaces*, which was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1928930.

2 Connection between massive and drifted LERW; proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

In this section we start with a proof of Theorem 1.1, which we prove separately in the case of the square and hexagonal lattices. As mentioned the result will follow from applying a form of Temperley’s bijection and studying the scaling limit of the corresponding loop-erased random walk (which describe branches in the spanning tree by Wilson’s algorithm). Since Temperley’s bijection is not so well known in the case where Γ_δ is a subgraph of the hexagonal lattice, we start by explaining the bijection in this case, which can also be found (albeit somewhat informally) in Section 2 of [KPW00]; see in particular their Figure 2.

2.1 Temperley’s bijection on the hexagonal lattice

As mentioned before, Temperley’s bijection relates rooted spanning trees on a graph Ω^δ which we now define to dimers on the graph Γ_δ , a Temperleyan subgraph of the hexagonal lattice. We start by describing how Ω^δ and Γ_δ are related to one another. The bijection itself will be stated in Theorem 2.1 and is illustrated in Figure 3.

Consider the triangular lattice, that is the graph whose vertices are given by $a + b\tau$, where $a, b \in \delta\mathbb{Z}$ are integers (times δ) and $\tau = e^{2i\pi/3}$ is the third root of unity, and where each pair of vertices at distance δ is connected by an edge. We will give each edge an orientation, such that it is oriented in direction $1, \tau$ or τ^2 and a weight, which is a_1, a_2 or a_3 accordingly. This gives a directed graph in which each vertex has three outgoing and three incoming edges. We will call this graph the directed triangular lattice and denote it by \mathbb{T} throughout this article.

Let us now choose a simply connected set of vertices of \mathbb{T} and identify all other vertices as a single **outer vertex**. We call the resulting graph Ω^δ . A **spanning tree of Ω^δ rooted at the outer vertex** is a set of edges, such that for every vertex in Ω^δ there is a unique path of such edges to the outer vertex, which respects the orientation of the edges. (Sometimes such a tree is called an arborescence). By definition we assign a weight to a rooted spanning tree given by the product of the weights of the edges in the tree.

Now consider the superposition graph H^* obtained in the following way. The vertices of H^* are the vertices, edges and faces of Ω^δ . To avoid terminological confusion, call the vertices of H^* nodes and call them vertex-nodes, edge-nodes and face-nodes depending on their counterpart in Ω^δ . The edges of H^* are called links and are defined as follows: connect a vertex-node v and an edge-node e if e is an outgoing edge of v in Ω^δ and give this link the same weight as e in Ω^δ . Also connect an edge-node e and a face-node f if e is adjacent to f in Ω^δ , and assign weight




Figure 3: A dimer configuration on the hexagonal lattice, and its associated pair of dual spanning trees from Temperley’s bijection. The outer (i.e., boundary) vertex is represented as a black hexagon for convenience. The unique path connecting a vertex v (at the centre of the hexagon) to the boundary has been highlighted on the tree; the corresponding path on the dimer graph appears as a dotted line. Each dimer on this path can be viewed as the first half of the corresponding tree edge. Conversely, we obtain the tree by multiplying by two each dimer emanating from a B_1 vertex, in the direction from black to white.

1 to such links. Finally obtain Γ_δ from H^* by deleting the vertex-node corresponding to the outer vertex and one face-node for a face adjacent to the the outer vertex. Note that the vertex nodes of H^* are the B_1 vertices of the hexagonal lattice, while edge-nodes are white. (The face nodes of H^* are either of type B_2 or B_3 .) For an illustration of this procedure see Figure 3.

The graph Γ_δ obtained this way is exactly a Temperleyan domain of the hexagonal lattice as defined in Section 1.2, and by choosing Ω^δ as the directed triangular lattice formed by the B_1 vertices in such a domain, it is also clear that each Temperleyan subgraph of the hexagonal lattice can be obtained in this way. The weights on this graph are as in Figure 1.

The relevant version of Temperley’s bijection is then the following:

Theorem 2.1 ([KPW00]). *There is a weight preserving bijection between spanning trees of Ω^δ rooted at the outer vertex and dimer configuration on Γ_δ .*

The bijection is easier to describe in the direction “dimers” to “trees”: given a dimer configuration \mathbf{m} on Γ_δ , define a collection \mathcal{T} of oriented edges in Ω^δ as follows: for every dimer occupying a link between a vertex-node $v \in v(\Omega^\delta)$ and an edge node $e \in E(\Omega^\delta)$, include the outgoing edge e from v to \mathcal{T} . One can check that the resulting collection of edges \mathcal{T} is a spanning tree in the sense above. (Essentially, to every vertex $v \in v(\Omega^\delta)$ there is a unique outgoing edge containing v in \mathcal{T} by definition of the dimer model and of \mathcal{T} ; following the outgoing edges from a given vertex $v \in v(\Omega^\delta)$ may not result in a cycle by duality considerations, and thus necessarily ends at the outer vertex – this is the unique path to the outer vertex in the definition). Once again, we refer to Figure 3 for illustration.

2.2 Statement of the theorem about LERW

We may now state the theorem needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let Γ_δ be as in Theorem 1.1 and let Ω^δ denote the embedded graph on which the tree obtained from the Temperleyan




Figure 4: Two samples of loop-erased random walks on the triangular lattice in a hexagon of side-length 500. The first sample has no drift, the second one has a small drift to the right.

bijection lives; thus Ω^δ is either a portion of the scaled square lattice or of the (directed) triangular lattice, and is embedded within the domain Ω . With an abuse of notation, we often identify the vertex set $v(\Omega^\delta)$ of Ω^δ with Ω^δ itself.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose Ω is bounded. Let $z \in \Omega$ and let z_δ denote a lattice point on Ω^δ which converges to z as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Let $(\gamma_0^\delta, \dots, \gamma_T^\delta)$ denote the loop-erasure of a random walk starting from z_δ killed when leaving Ω^δ , and identify γ^δ with its linear interpolation to get a continuous path on $[0, T]$. Then as $\delta \rightarrow 0$,*

$$\gamma^\delta \rightarrow \gamma^0,$$

where γ^0 has the following law: first, its endpoint y has the law σ which is the hitting distribution of $\partial\Omega$ by a Brownian motion with drift Δ ; furthermore, conditionally given y , γ^0 is a massive radial SLE₂ from y to z in Ω . Here the convergence is in the sense of uniform convergence up to reparametrisation.

The rest of Section 2 will be devoted to a proof of Theorem 2.2. We will separate the case of the square and triangular lattices as the proofs are a little different in both cases. We first outline the main ideas. Essentially, we are able to relate at the discrete level the loop-erasure of random walk on Ω^δ with that of a massive random walk. The relation is exact in the case of the triangular lattice and approximate in the case of the square lattice. On the square lattice, we know by the results of Makarov and Smirnov [MS10] (as clarified by the more recent work of Chelkak and Wan [CW19]) that the massive LERW converges to massive SLE₂. Combined with the above-mentioned approximate relation on the square lattice, this gives a proof of Theorem 2.2 in this case. The theorem of Chelkak and Wan is however only stated for the square lattice and we will verify that their approach can be extended to cover the directed triangular lattice as well. The lack of reversibility is a difficulty in that case.

2.3 Discrete Girsanov lemma on the triangular lattice

Consider first the case of the triangular lattice $\delta\mathbb{T}$. To prepare for later developments, it is already useful at this point to allow the jump probabilities of the random walk to depend on the position of the vertex $v \in \Omega^\delta$. That is, suppose that if the walk is at the vertex v , then the

jump probabilities of the random walk are given by

$$P^{(\Delta)}(v, v + \delta\tau^{k-1}) = \frac{a_k(v)}{a(v)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, 3, \quad \text{with } a(v) = a_1(v) + \dots + a_3(v).$$

Let $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$ denote the law of this random walk. Let also Y^δ denote the position of the random walk when it hits $\partial\Omega^\delta$ and let $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\cdot|Y_\delta = y_\delta)$ denote the conditional law given the exit point is y_δ . We also let $\mathbb{P}^{(0)}$ denote the law of the usual simple random on the directed triangular lattice $\delta\mathbb{T}$.

Fix $\gamma^\delta = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ a given path on the triangular lattice, starting from some point $x_0 = z_\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ of some length $n = N(\gamma^\delta)$. Let $dx_s = x_{s+1} - x_s \in \mathbb{R}^2$, for $s = 0, \dots, n-1$ denote the discrete derivative of γ_s at time s . Define $\alpha_k(v) \in \mathbb{R}$ ($k = 1, \dots, 3$) by

$$\exp(\delta\alpha_k) = (1 + c_k\delta) \tag{2.1}$$

and define also $\beta(v) > 0$ by

$$\exp(-\delta^2\beta(v)^2) = (a/3)^{-3} \prod_{i=1}^3 (1 + c_i\delta),$$

which is well-defined by the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality. Let $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2\tau + \alpha_3\tau^2$, which is a vector in \mathbb{R}^2 associated to every vertex v of Ω^δ . The following gives us an exact value for the global Radon–Nikodym derivative of the law $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$ compared to $\mathbb{P}^{(0)}$.

Lemma 2.3.

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_x^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}_x^{(0)}(\gamma^\delta)} = \exp(M_n - \frac{1}{2}V_n), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$M_n = \frac{2}{3} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \langle \alpha(x_s), dx_s \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad V_n = \frac{2}{3} \delta^2 \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \beta^2(x_s). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Let $n_1 = n_1(v)$, $n_2 = n_2(v)$ and $n_3 = n_3(v)$ be the number of steps taken by γ^δ from v in the directions $1, \tau$ and τ^2 respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta) &= \prod_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} \prod_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{1 + c_i\delta}{a} \right)^{n_i} \\ &= 3^{-n} \prod_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} \left[\left((a/3)^{-3} \prod_{i=1}^3 (1 + c_i\delta) \right)^{\frac{n_1+n_2+n_3}{3}} \prod_{i=1}^3 (1 + c_i\delta)^{n_i - \frac{n_1+n_2+n_3}{3}} \right] \\ &= 3^{-n} \prod_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} e^{-\delta^2\beta(v)^2 \frac{n_1+n_2+n_3}{3}} \exp \left(\delta \sum_{k=1}^3 \alpha_k \left(n_k - \frac{n_1+n_2+n_3}{3} \right) \right) \\ &= 3^{-n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}V_n} \exp \left(\delta \sum_v \alpha_1 \left(\frac{2n_1-n_2-n_3}{3} \right) + \alpha_2 \left(\frac{2n_2-n_1-n_3}{3} \right) + \alpha_3 \left(\frac{2n_3-n_1-n_2}{3} \right) \right) \\ &= 3^{-n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}V_n} \exp \left(\frac{2}{3} \delta \sum_v \langle \alpha_1 + \alpha_2\tau + \alpha_3\tau^2, n_1 + n_2\tau + n_3\tau^2 \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used in the last line that $\langle 1, \tau \rangle = \langle 1, \tau^2 \rangle = \langle \tau, \tau^2 \rangle = -1/2$. To conclude simply observe that each dx_s contributes exactly 1, τ or τ^2 exactly n_1 times, n_2 or n_3 times respectively, up to a factor δ . Therefore,

$$\frac{2}{3}\delta \sum_v \langle \alpha_1 + \alpha_2\tau + \alpha_3\tau^2, n_1 + n_2\tau + n_3\tau^2 \rangle = \frac{2}{3} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \langle \alpha(x_s), dx_s \rangle = M_n,$$

so that

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_x^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}_x^{(0)}(\gamma^\delta)} = \exp(M_n - \frac{1}{2}V_n),$$

as desired. \square

We will want to compare our walk $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$ with an appropriate massive walk. Let $m = m(v) > 0$ be defined by

$$\frac{1}{3}(1 - m^2\delta^2) = \frac{\sqrt[3]{a_1 a_2 a_3}}{a}. \quad (2.4)$$

(Note that m is well defined by the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality.) The mass m can also be related to the factor β^2 previously introduced in Lemma 2.3:

$$1 - m^2\delta^2 = \exp(-\beta^2\delta^2/3).$$

Let $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$ denote the law of massive random walk, which has jump probabilities

$$Q^{(m)}(v, \delta\tau^k v) = \frac{1 - m^2\delta^2}{3} = \frac{\sqrt[3]{a_1 a_2 a_3}}{a}; \quad k = 1, \dots, 3$$

and which jumps to an additional ghost or cemetery vertex with probability $m(v)^2\delta^2$ (in which case say that the path has died). Let $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\cdot | Y_\delta = y^\delta)$ denote the conditional law of massive random walk, given that the walk does not die before leaving Ω^δ and that the exit point is y_δ .

To get a correspondence we will assume that the jump probabilities are constant (i.e., do not depend on v), in which case the mass m is also constant. We deduce from Lemma 2.3 the following corollary:

Corollary 2.4. *For each Δ and $\delta > 0$, for each $z_\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ and $y_\delta \in \partial\Omega^\delta$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\cdot | Y_\delta = y_\delta) = \mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\cdot | Y_\delta = y_\delta).$$

Proof. Since a_i does not depend on the point v , then neither does the vector α and hence the discrete stochastic integral

$$M_n = \frac{2}{3} \langle \alpha(x_s), dx_s \rangle = \frac{2}{3} \langle \alpha, y_\delta - z_\delta \rangle$$

and so does not depend on the path γ^δ subject to the condition $Y_\delta = y_\delta$. Furthermore the quadratic variation part also cancels with the massive part: that is,

$$\exp(-\frac{1}{2}V_n) = (1 - m^2\delta^2)^n.$$

Hence the ratio of the left hand side to the right hand side is a constant, independent of the path γ^δ , therefore this constant is one since both probability measures sum up to one when we sum over all paths. \square

It is useful to rewrite α and β in terms of the drift vector Δ defined by

$$\Delta = \frac{c_1 + c_2\tau + c_3\tau^2}{3}.$$

With these notations, observe that

$$\alpha = 3\Delta + o(\delta),$$

which follows directly from the definition of α_k and the vector α . It is possible to also relate β to the norm of Δ (see Lemma 2.7).

Corollary 2.5. *Let c_1, c_2, c_3 be as above and consider the associated drift Δ and mass m as in (2.4). Suppose $z^\delta \rightarrow z \in \Omega, y^\delta \rightarrow y \in \partial\Omega$,*

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}}{\mathbb{P}^{(m)}}(\gamma^\delta) \rightarrow \exp(2 \langle y - z, \Delta \rangle).$$

Proof. This follows from our exact expression for $(\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}/\mathbb{P}^{(0)})(\gamma^\delta)$, the already observed fact that the quadratic variation part cancels exactly with the mass, and the limiting expression for α . \square

Note that this is stated without conditioning the massive walk to hit the boundary before dying. (This conditioning would simply add a term to the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the previous lemma, corresponding to the probability to hit the boundary before dying.)

From Corollary 2.5, in particular we see that when γ^δ is a loop then $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta) = \mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\gamma^\delta)$. Although we do not need this here, this implies that the loop measures associated with the drifted walk $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$ are identical. Since these loop measures can be used to identify the law of loop-erased random walk (see, e.g., [LL10, Chapter 9.5]), we can use this observation to deduce that the expression obtained in Lemma 2.5 can be transferred at the level of the loop-erasure. In fact this can be proved directly as follows. To phrase this, it is convenient to identify $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$ as probability measures on the canonical path space rather than their respective law on lattice paths, which we have implicitly done so far. Thus we identify $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)$ with $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(X[0, n] = \gamma^\delta)$ when γ^δ is a path of length n , and similarly with $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$. If X is a lattice path, let $\text{LE}(X)$ denote the chronological loop-erasure of X considered up until its hitting time of $\partial\Omega^\delta$ (if the path never reaches $\partial\Omega^\delta$ – for instance if it dies before reaching the boundary – then $\text{LE}(X)$ is by convention the empty path).

Lemma 2.6. *Let γ^δ denote a fixed (sequence of) **simple** lattice paths from $x^\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ to $y^\delta \in \partial\Omega^\delta$, with $x^\delta \rightarrow x \in \Omega, y^\delta \rightarrow y \in \partial\Omega$. Then*

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\text{LE}(X) = \gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\text{LE}(X) = \gamma^\delta)} \rightarrow \exp(2 \langle y - x, \Delta \rangle).$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. This follows directly from Corollary 2.5 by summing over all ways to obtain γ^δ as a loop-erasure, and noting that the expression for the Radon-Nikodym derivative in Lemma 2.5 depends only on the endpoints of the path, and not the rest of the path itself. \square

We now show that the mass is non degenerate in the limit, and in fact simply equals the norm of the drift vector Δ .

Lemma 2.7. *Let c_1, \dots, c_3 be as above. Then the corresponding mass m converges as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ to $|\Delta|$.*

Proof. Let $s = \sum_{i=1}^3 c_i$, so that $a = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_i = 3 + s\delta$. Then starting from the identity

$$\frac{\sqrt[3]{(1+c_1\delta)(1+c_2\delta)(1+c_3\delta)}}{3+s\delta} = \frac{1}{3}(1-m^2\delta^2),$$

and expanding the product before doing a Taylor expansion of the left hand side as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we find

$$\frac{1 + \frac{s\delta}{3} + \left(\frac{c_1c_2+c_2c_3+c_3c_1}{3} - \frac{1}{9}s^2\right)\delta^2 + o(\delta^2)}{3+s\delta} = \frac{1}{3}(1-m^2\delta^2)$$

in other words, writing $k = \frac{c_1c_2+c_2c_3+c_3c_1}{3} - \frac{1}{9}s^2$,

$$\frac{1}{3} + \frac{k}{3}\delta^2 + o(\delta^2) = \frac{1}{3}(1-m^2\delta^2)$$

from which it follows that

$$m^2 = -k + o(1).$$

Let us call $p = c_1c_2 + c_2c_3 + c_3c_1$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} k &= p/3 - s^2/9 \\ &= p/3 - \left(\sum_i c_i^2 + 2p\right)/9 \\ &= p/9 - \sum_i c_i^2/9 \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that since $\langle 1, \tau \rangle = \langle \tau, \tau^2 \rangle = \langle 1, \tau^2 \rangle = -1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta|^2 &= \frac{1}{9} \langle c_1 + c_2\tau + c_3\tau^2, c_1 + c_2\tau + c_3\tau^2 \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{9}p + \frac{1}{9} \sum_i c_i^2 = -k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$m^2 = |\Delta|^2 + o(1).$$

□

As was mentioned in the introduction, the scaling limit of massive LERW is rather well understood. Although the existing proofs of convergence to massive SLE₂ do not cover the case of the triangular lattice, it is possible with some effort to extend these methods to cover this case. We state the result here, but defer its proof until later, and see how this can be used to deduce Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\Omega^\delta \subset \delta\mathbb{T}$ approximate Ω with $z_\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ such that $z_\delta \rightarrow z$, and let a^δ be a boundary point of Ω^δ such that $a^\delta \rightarrow a \in \partial\Omega$. Then the massive loop-erased random walk started at x^δ conditioned to hit the boundary at y^δ before dying, with mass m defined by (2.4), converges in law to radial massive SLE₂ from y to x with mass $|\Delta|$.*

Since the exit distribution of massive LERW from Ω^δ , conditional on exiting this domain before dying, has a limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ (the “massive harmonic measure” on $\partial\Omega$), and since the law

of radial massive SLE₂ from $y \in \partial\Omega$ to $x \in \Omega$ is continuous with respect to y , we deduce from this theorem that the scaling limit holds even if we do not condition on the exit point y^δ of the random walk, and simply condition on not dying before reaching the boundary.

The proof of Theorem 2.8 is deferred to Section 3. For now, we see how this immediately implies Theorem 2.2 for the triangular lattice.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. This will follow rather simply from Lemma 2.6, the fact that the expression for the Radon-Nikodym derivative is well-behaved, and the fact that the extinction probability for the massive walk converges to some nontrivial probability bounded away from zero and one as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, since Ω is bounded, the function $\exp(2\langle\Delta, y - x\rangle)$, viewed as a function of the endpoint $y \in \partial\Omega$, is a bounded continuous functional on path space. Therefore, if F is another arbitrary such functional, then letting τ be the hitting time of $\partial\Omega^\delta$ by X ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x^{(\Delta)}[F(\mathbf{LE}(X))] &= \mathbb{E}_x^{(m)} [F(\mathbf{LE}(X)) \exp(2\langle\Delta + o(\delta), Y_\delta - x\rangle) | \tau < \infty] \mathbb{P}_x^{(m)}(\tau < \infty) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{E}_x^{\text{mSLE}_2} [F(\gamma) \exp(2\langle\Delta, Y - x\rangle)] p(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_x^{\text{mSLE}_2}$ denote the law of a massive radial SLE₂ started from massive harmonic measure on $\partial\Omega$ (a point which we denote by Y), towards x , and $p(x)$ is the survival probability for massive Brownian motion in Ω starting from x , i.e., $p(x) = \mathbb{E}_x^{\text{BM}}(\exp(-m^2\tau_\Omega))$ with τ_Ω the exit time from Ω . The rest of the result follows immediately by specifying F to be a continuous function of the endpoint Y_δ . \square

2.4 Discrete Girsanov on the square lattice

On the square lattice $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ we again start by allowing the jump probabilities to depend on the current position $v \in \Omega^\delta$ of the random walk. To this end let $\Delta: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded function. That is the jump probabilities at v are given by

$$\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(v, v + \delta i^{k-1}) = \frac{a_k(v)}{a(v)} \quad k = 1, \dots, 4.$$

Here

$$a(v) = \sum_{k=1}^4 a_k(v) \text{ and } a_k = 1 + c_i \delta$$

Further assume that:

$$\Delta(v) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^4 c_k i^{k-1}}{4} \text{ and } c_1 + c_3 = c_2 + c_4.$$

Together these assumptions guarantee that this random walk converges to a Brownian motion with drift Δ .

Again fix $\gamma^\delta = (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ a given path, this time on the square lattice, starting from some point $x_0 = z_\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ of some length $n = N(\gamma^\delta)$. Define $\alpha_k(v) \in \mathbb{R}, k = 1, \dots, 4$ by

$$\exp(\delta\alpha_k) = a_k = 1 + c_k \delta. \tag{2.5}$$

Define the vector (or complex number) α by setting $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 i + \alpha_3 i^2 + \alpha_4 i^4$. Define also (for $k = 1, 2$), $\beta_k = \beta_k(v) \geq 0$ by

$$\exp(-\delta^2 \beta_k^2) = \frac{a_k a_{k+2}}{(a/4)^2}.$$

Note that β_k is well defined by the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality since

$$\frac{a}{4} = 1 + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 c_i \delta = 1 + \frac{1}{2} (c_k \delta + c_{k+2} \delta) = \frac{a_k + a_{k+2}}{2},$$

where we used the assumption that $c_1 + c_3 = c_2 + c_4$.

Lemma 2.9. *On the square lattice, we have*

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_z^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}_z^{(0)}(\gamma^\delta)} = \exp(M_n - \frac{1}{2}V_n), \quad (2.6)$$

where M_n and V_n can be written as

$$M_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \langle \alpha(x_s) dx_s \rangle \text{ and } V_n = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} |\beta(x_s) \odot dx_s|^2$$

where $a \odot b$ is the Hadamard product of the vectors a and b , whose coordinate are $a_i b_i$ ($i = 1, 2$). Explicitly, $V_n = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \beta_1^2(x_s) |dx_s^1|^2 + \beta_2^2(x_s) |dx_s^2|^2$.

Proof. Denote for a given path γ^δ of length n whose starting point is z , by $n_1(v), \dots, n_4(v)$ the number of steps of the walk from v and going in the direct $1, i, -1, -i$ respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_z^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta) &= \prod_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} a_1^{n_1(v)} a_2^{n_2(v)} a_3^{n_3(v)} a_4^{n_4(v)} a^{-n} \\ &= 4^{-n} \prod_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} \left(\frac{a_1}{a_3} \right)^{\frac{n_1 - n_3}{2}} \left(\frac{a_2}{a_4} \right)^{\frac{n_2 - n_4}{2}} \left(\frac{a_1 a_3}{(a/4)^2} \right)^{\frac{n_1 + n_3}{2}} \left(\frac{a_2 a_4}{(a/4)^2} \right)^{\frac{n_2 + n_4}{2}} \\ &= 4^{-n} \exp \left(\sum_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} (\alpha_1 - \alpha_3) \delta \frac{n_1 - n_3}{2} + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_4) \delta \frac{n_2 - n_4}{2} - \beta_1^2 \delta^2 \frac{n_1 + n_3}{2} - \beta_2^2 \delta^2 \frac{n_2 + n_4}{2} \right) \\ &= 4^{-n} \exp(M_n - \frac{1}{2}V_n), \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where in the last step we used that for each step of the walk in direction $1, i, -1$ or $-i$ the left two summands contribute $\delta/2$ times $\alpha_1 - \alpha_3, \alpha_2 - \alpha_4, \alpha_3 - \alpha_1$ or $\alpha_4 - \alpha_2$ respectively, whereas the right two summands contribute $\delta^2/2$ times β_1^2 or β_2^2 depending on whether the displacement is horizontal or vertical. This leads to the expressions for M_n and V_n respectively. \square

We can again compare $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$ with an appropriate massive random walk. Let $m = m(v) > 0$ be defined by:

$$\frac{1}{4}(1 - m^2 \delta^2) = \frac{\sqrt[4]{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4}}{a}$$

Note that this choice of m also satisfies:

$$(1 - m^2 \delta^2) = \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_1^2 \delta^2 + \beta_2^2 \delta^2}{4}\right).$$

Let $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$ be the law of the massive random walk, which has jump probabilities

$$Q^m(v, v + \delta i^{k-1}) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - m^2 \delta^2)$$

and which jumps to an additional ghost or cemetery vertex with probability $m^2\delta^2$ (in which case say that the path has died). Let $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\cdot|Y_\delta = y_\delta)$ denote the conditional law of the massive random walk, given that the walk does not die before leaving Ω^δ and that the exit point is y_δ .

While an exact connection between massive random walk and the random walk with drift conditioned on the exit point holds only for the triangular lattice, a similar statement holds asymptotically also for the square lattice. To establish the connection between the two random walks we first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\tau = \tau_\delta$ be the first time the random walk leaves the domain Ω^δ and $\alpha < 1$. Then:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}(|V_\tau - \tau\delta^2\frac{\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2}{2}| > \delta^\alpha) \rightarrow 0,$$

where \mathbb{P}_{z_δ} is either $\mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}^{(\Delta)}$ or $\mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}^{(0)}$.

Proof. For both walks, by Donsker's invariance principle, $\tau = \tau_\delta$ is of order δ^{-2} and fluctuates on that scale, i.e. the distribution of $\delta^2\tau_{\Omega^\delta}$ has a nontrivial weak limit T , which simply is the law of the exit time T of Ω by a Brownian motion with drift Δ or by a standard Brownian motion.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Choose K large enough that $\mathbb{P}_z(T > K) < \epsilon$. For δ small enough it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}(\tau > K\delta^{-2}) < 2\epsilon.$$

For both walks at each step the walk takes a horizontal or a vertical step, both with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ (since $c_1 + c_3 = c_2 + c_4$). Therefore $M_n = V_n - n\delta^2\frac{\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2}{2}$ is a martingale with increment jumps uniformly bounded by $O(\delta^2)$. Indeed, note that since

$$\frac{a_k a_{k+2} + 2}{(a/4)^2} = \frac{(1 + c_k\delta)(1 + c_{k+2}\delta)}{(1 + \frac{c_k + c_{k+2}}{2}\delta)^2} = 1 - \frac{1}{4}(c_k - c_{k+2})^2\delta^2 + o(\delta^2),$$

both β_1 and β_2 are bounded as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ (they even converge). Hence $\delta^{-2}M_n$ is a martingale with bounded increments, and we are interested in its terminal value at the stopping time $\tau = \tau_\delta$. Using Freedman's martingale inequality (Proposition (2.1) in [Fre75]), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}(|V_\tau - \tau\delta^2\frac{\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2}{2}| > \delta^\alpha) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}(\tau > K\delta^{-2}) + \mathbb{P}_{z_\delta}(|\delta^{-2}M_\tau| > \delta^{\alpha-2}; \tau \leq K\delta^{-2}) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon + \exp(-\frac{\delta^{4-2\alpha}}{2(C\delta^{\alpha-2} + K\delta^{-2})}) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon + \exp(-c\delta^{2\alpha-2}), \end{aligned}$$

where c depends only on K and α (and hence only on ϵ and α) but not on δ . The lemma follows since $\alpha < 1$. \square

This allows us to prove the analogue of Corollary 2.5:

Corollary 2.11. *Let γ^δ be a fixed lattice path in Ω^δ from $x_\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ to $y_\delta \in \Omega^\delta \cup \partial\Omega^\delta$. Then*

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\gamma^\delta)} \rightarrow \exp(2\langle (y-x), \Delta \rangle),$$

in probability as δ goes to 0 with respect to both the law of the massive walk $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$ (conditioned on survival up to hitting the boundary) and of the drifted walk $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$.

Proof. By 2.9 we have that the ratio satisfies:

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\gamma^\delta)} = \exp(M_n - \frac{1}{2}V_n + n\delta^2 \frac{|\beta|^2}{4}) = \exp(M_n) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}(n\delta^2 \frac{|\beta|^2}{2} - V_n)\right).$$

Since we are only considering paths that do not die before reaching their endpoint, Lemma 2.10 applies and the second term converges in probability to 1 (with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{(0)}$ or $\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}$), since the term in the exponential converges to 0 in probability. Since surviving until hitting the boundary has positive probability, this second term also converges to 1 in probability with respect to the massive walk conditioned to survive before hitting the boundary.

As in the triangular case, since α is constant, $M_n = \frac{1}{2}\langle \alpha, y_\delta - z_\delta \rangle$, which converges to the desired function since:

$$\alpha_k = c_k + o(1)$$

and therefore $\alpha = 4\Delta + o(1)$. □

Remark 2.12. Note in particular that if G_δ is the good event

$$G_\delta := \{|V_\tau - \tau\delta^2 \frac{|\beta|^2}{2}| \leq \delta^\alpha\},$$

then we have learnt that on G_δ we may write

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(\gamma^\delta)} = (1 + o(1)) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\langle (y-x), \Delta \rangle\right),$$

where the $o(1)$ term is nonrandom. Note that since $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}(G_\delta) \rightarrow 1$ this implies that Lemma 2.6 also holds on the square lattice.

With this proposition we can now conclude to the proof of Theorem 2.2 in the case of the square lattice.

Proof of Theorem 2.2, square lattice case. Let F be a bounded continuous functional on curves in D (for the topology of uniform convergence of paths up to reparametrisation). Let x, y and x_δ, y_δ be as in Proposition 2.11. Let γ^δ denote random walk with jump probabilities p_1, \dots, p_4 and let T denote the first time γ^δ leaves Ω^δ . Let $\mathbf{LE}(\gamma^\delta)$ denote the chronological loop-erasure of γ^δ . We want to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{(\Delta)}[F(\mathbf{LE}(\gamma^\delta))] \rightarrow \int_{y \in \partial\Omega} \mathbb{E}_{x;y}^{\text{mSLE}_2}[F(\gamma)]\sigma^{(\Delta)}(dy) \quad (2.8)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{x;y}^{\text{mSLE}_2}$ is the law of massive radial SLE_2 between x and y in Ω , and $\sigma^{(\Delta)}(dy)$ denote the hitting distribution of Brownian motion with drift Δ of $\partial\Omega$. Then since $\gamma^\delta(T)$ is a bounded continuous functional of γ^δ (when Ω is bounded),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x^{(\Delta)}[F(\mathbf{LE}(\gamma^\delta))] &= \mathbb{E}_x^{(\Delta)}[F(\mathbf{LE}(\gamma^\delta))1_{G_\delta}] + o(1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x^{(m)}[F(\mathbf{LE}(\gamma^\delta))1_{G_\delta}(1 + o(1)) \exp(2\langle \Delta, \gamma_T^\delta - x \rangle)] + o(1) \\ &= (1 + o(1))\mathbb{E}_x^{(m)}[F(\mathbf{LE}(\gamma^\delta)) \exp(2\langle \Delta, \gamma_T^\delta - x \rangle)] + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

by Remark 2.12. Now, by [CW19, Theorem 1.1], since γ_T^δ is a bounded continuous functional

of γ^δ (when Ω is bounded), we find

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{(\Delta)}[F(\text{LE}(\gamma^\delta))] \rightarrow \int_{y \in \partial\Omega} \mathbb{E}_{x;y}^{\text{mSLE}_2}[F(\gamma) \exp(2\langle \Delta, y - x \rangle)] \sigma^{(m)}(dy).$$

Taking F to be a function of γ_T^δ only, we see that

$$\int_{y \in \partial\Omega} F(y) \sigma^{(\Delta)}(dy) = \int_{y \in \partial\Omega} F(y) \exp(2\langle \Delta, y - x \rangle) \sigma^{(m)}(dy).$$

so that

$$\sigma^{(\Delta)}(dy) = \exp(2\langle \Delta, y - x \rangle) \sigma^{(m)}(dy)$$

almost everywhere with respect to $\sigma^{(m)}$. This proves (2.8) and hence Theorem 2.2 in the case of the square lattice. \square

To finish the proof of Theorem 1.1 it remains to compute the mass in terms of the limiting drift vector Δ in the case of the square lattice (we already did it in the case of the triangular lattice in Lemma 2.7). Note that by definition, one has

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - m^2 \delta^2 &= \frac{4}{a} (a_1 \dots a_4)^{1/4} \\ &= (1 - c_1^2 \delta^2)^{1/4} (1 - c_2^2 \delta^2)^{1/4} \\ &= 1 - \frac{c_1^2 + c_2^2}{4} \delta^2 + o(\delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

However, $\Delta = \frac{c_1 + c_2 i}{2}$ so that $|\Delta|^2 = \frac{c_1^2 + c_2^2}{4}$. We deduce that $m^2 \rightarrow |\Delta|^2$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, as desired. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1 (modulo the proof of Theorem 2.8 in the case of the triangular lattice, deferred to next section). The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows from Wilson's algorithm and induction.

Remark 2.13. If we had not assumed $c_1 + c_3 = c_2 + c_4$ we could not write the ‘‘quadratic variation term’’ V_n in the form V_n of the sum along the path of positive terms of type β_k^2 , $k = 1, 2$. Even if we don't insist on the positivity of these terms and try to analyse the limiting behaviour, we find that V_n is the sum of terms of order δ rather than δ^2 . The first order contribution however cancels out on the large scale and we do get a term of order 1 when n is of order δ^{-2} , but it does not seem that this term can easily be interpreted as a massive term; in particular it seems it is not concentrated at a fixed time $n \approx t\delta^{-2}$. In other words, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the random walk with drift with respect to the massive random walk picks up a non-trivial contribution due to the walk taking more horizontal or vertical steps, even though the proportion of those steps behaves like $\frac{1}{2} + c\delta$. While the corresponding loop-erased random walk still has a scaling limit by the arguments of Section 4 (the crossing assumption still holds in particular), its scaling limit might be different from massive SLE₂.

3 Convergence of massive LERW on the triangular lattice

In [LSW01] Lawler, Schramm and Werner proved that the scaling limit of the loop-erased random walk in a simply connected domain on the square lattice converges to radial SLE₂. While the proof is written for the LERW on the square grid, in the last chapter it is mentioned that the proof can be adapted to more general setups; the random walk on the directed triangular lattice is explicitly mentioned as an example of an *irreversible* random walk to which the proof

applies. In [MS10] Makarov and Smirnov proposed a strategy for proving convergence of the massive LERW to massive SLE₂ building in part on ideas coming from Conformal Field Theory (see [BBC09, BBK08]). This strategy was then successfully followed by Chelkak and Wan in [CW19], using a framework for convergence to SLE developed by Kemppainen and Smirnov in [KS17] and a recent addition [Kar18] by Karilla. We show in this section that the arguments of Chelkak and Wan in [CW19] can be adapted to the directed triangular lattice which will imply a proof of Theorem 2.8. The key difficulty is the lack of reversibility, which is used in several important places in [CW19]; see in particular Proposition 3.11 which is the heart of the proof. A more general (but somewhat less explicit) proof, based instead on the Yadin–Yehudayoff approach [YY11] to universality of the scaling limit of loop-erased random walk, will be given in Section 4.

3.1 Convergence of domains and curves

For each discrete domain $\Omega^\delta \subset \delta\mathbb{T}$ we associate a polygonal domain $\hat{\Omega}^\delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ which is the union of open hexagons with side length δ centered at vertices of Ω^δ . Notice that vertices of $\delta\mathbb{T}$ on the boundary of $\hat{\Omega}^\delta$ are exactly vertices on the outer vertex boundary of Ω^δ .

We will assume that $\hat{\Omega}^\delta$ converges to Ω in the *Carathéodory* topology and if this is the case write, that Ω^δ approximates Ω . This means that each inner point of Ω belongs to $\hat{\Omega}^\delta$ for small enough δ and each boundary point of Ω can be approximated by boundary points of Ω^δ , see, e.g., [Pom92]. Further, we assume that $0 \in \Omega^\delta$ for each δ and we have a point $a^\delta \in \partial\Omega^\delta$ which converges to $a \in \partial\Omega$. Let $\psi_{\hat{\Omega}^\delta}: \hat{\Omega}^\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ be the unique conformal map such that $\psi_{\hat{\Omega}^\delta}(0) = 0$ and $\psi_{\hat{\Omega}^\delta}(a^\delta) = 1$. Then it can be seen (see, e.g., [Pom92]) that Carathéodory convergence is equivalent to the uniform convergence on compacts of $\psi_{\hat{\Omega}^\delta}$ and $\psi_{\hat{\Omega}^\delta}^{-1}$ to ψ_Ω and ψ_Ω^{-1} respectively.

The main theorem of [KS17] states that if a family Σ of measures of random curves satisfies a certain annulus crossing condition, then the family is tight and furthermore, if $\mathbb{P}_n \in \Sigma$ is a weakly converging subsequence then its limit is a random Loewner chain. Moreover if $(W^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are the driving processes of the random curves $(\gamma^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that satisfy the annulus crossing condition which are parametrized by capacity then:

- $(W^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space of continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets.
- $(\gamma^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space of curves up to reparametrization with the supremum norm.

If the sequence converges in either of the topologies it also converges in the other one and the limit of the driving processes is the driving process of the limiting random curve.

That the annulus crossing condition is satisfied is checked for a chordal loop-erased random walk in [KS17, Section 4.5] with a remark that the radial case is equivalent to calculations in [LSW01].

3.2 Absolute continuity with respect to classical SLE₂

Let $0 < \delta < m^{-1} \leq \infty$. Here, m is the mass, which we allow to be zero and δ is the scale. We consider subgraphs Ω^δ of the scaled triangular lattice $\delta\mathbb{T}$, which approximate some domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}$. Given such δ, m, Ω^δ as well as two vertices w^δ, z^δ we define the partition function of the

massive random walk:

$$Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(w^\delta, z^\delta) := \sum_{\pi^\delta \in S(w^\delta, z^\delta)} \left(\frac{1}{3}(1 - m^2\delta^2) \right)^{\#\pi^\delta}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the sum is over all possible paths π^δ from w^δ to z^δ remaining in Ω^δ . If $m = 0$ this corresponds to the classical random walk and we drop the superscript (m) ; thus

$$Z_{\Omega^\delta}(w^\delta, z^\delta) = Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(0)}(w^\delta, z^\delta).$$

If w^δ is an interior vertex and z^δ is a vertex on the boundary, this is the probability that a random walk with killing rate $m^2\delta^2$ started at w^δ leaves the boundary at z^δ without any conditioning. More generally, $Z_{\Omega^\delta}(w^\delta, z^\delta)$ is the **discrete massive Green function**, i.e. the expected number of visits to z^δ starting from w^δ before hitting the boundary or being killed. Note that, because of the directed edges in general $Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(w^\delta, z^\delta) \neq Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(z^\delta, w^\delta)$. In the limit however, we will see (in section 3.3) that equality holds.

To apply the tightness results to the massive case we first need some estimates on this partition function, which are similar (but easier in some respects) as Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.5 in [CW19].

Proposition 3.1. *For each domain Ω^δ with $\Omega^\delta \subset B(0, 1)$, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $c > 0$ (depending only on $\varepsilon > 0$) such that the following holds. For each interior point v^δ at distance at least $\varepsilon > 0$, and for each boundary point b^δ , $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}m^{-1}$, one has*

$$\frac{Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(v^\delta, b^\delta)}{Z_{\Omega^\delta}(v^\delta, b^\delta)} \geq \exp(-cm^2).$$

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of Proposition 2.5 in [CW19]. By Jensen's inequality (since $1 - m^2\delta^2 \geq 0$):

$$\frac{Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(v^\delta, b^\delta)}{Z_{\Omega^\delta}(v^\delta, b^\delta)} = \mathbb{E} \left((1 - m^2\delta^2)^{\#\pi^\delta} \right) \geq (1 - m^2\delta^2)^{\mathbb{E}(\#\pi^\delta)},$$

where the expectation is for a classical random walk π started at v^δ conditioned to leave at b^δ . Therefore it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{E}(\#\pi^\delta) \leq \text{const} \cdot \delta^{-2}. \quad (3.2)$$

In the chordal context of [CW19], where this needs to be proved for a random walk excursion from the boundary point a^δ to the boundary point b^δ , this is the content of Lemma 2.4 in [CW19] (in fact that Lemma is even more precise, since it bounds the expected time spent at any given point by a constant). This is done by referencing [Che16], which also works in the directed triangular lattice, as this random walk also satisfies conditions (S) and (T) in [Che16]. Rather than adapting the arguments of [Che16] to our radial context, let us give a brief argument which shows how the chordal estimate (Lemma 2.4 in [CW19]) implies the desired radial estimate (3.2). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that v^δ is at distance at least $\varepsilon > 0$ from the boundary. Let u^δ be another interior point, also at distance at least $\varepsilon > 0$ from the boundary. Let $\mathbb{P}_{u^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}$ denote the law of simple random walk, conditioned to leave Ω^δ through b^δ . Our first observation is that

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{u^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}}{d\mathbb{P}_{v^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}} \leq C \quad (3.3)$$

for a constant C depending only on $\varepsilon > 0$. Indeed, by first computing the Radon–Nikodym derivative with respect to simple random walk as a Doob h -transform, we see that the left hand side is simply $\mathbb{P}_{u^\delta}(X_{\tau_\Omega^\delta} = b^\delta)/\mathbb{P}_{v^\delta}(X_{\tau_\Omega^\delta} = b^\delta)$, where τ_Ω^δ is the hitting time of the boundary. This ratio is easily seen to be bounded by a constant depending only on ε (but otherwise independent of u^δ, v^δ). Indeed, it suffices to show that the walks beginning at v^δ and at u^δ can be coupled by requiring the walk from u^δ to make a loop around v^δ without leaving Ω^δ (an event of positive probability even when we condition on $X_{\tau_\Omega^\delta} = b^\delta$, see e.g. Corollary 4.5 in [BLR20] – here we use the fact that Ω^δ is assumed to be contained in the unit ball). This immediately implies (3.3).

Let us now see how (3.3) and Lemma 2.4 in [CW19] imply (3.2). Fix a boundary point a^δ at distance at least $\varepsilon > 0$ from b^δ . Let τ_ε denote the first time that a given trajectory (we will use the random walk excursion Y from a^δ to b^δ) is at distance ε from the boundary, and note that $\mathbb{P}_{a^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\varepsilon < \infty) \geq c$ uniformly (which also follows from Lemma 2.4 in [CW19], where it is noted explicitly that the expected amount of time spent at a point is comparable to the probability to visit a macroscopic ball). Furthermore, given $\tau_\varepsilon < \infty$, and given $Y_{\tau_\varepsilon} = u^\delta$, the Markov property (for the excursion Y) implies that the remainder of the trajectory of Y is distributed according to $\mathbb{P}_{u^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}$. We deduce (by neglecting the amount of time spent by Y until τ_ε):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{a^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\Omega^\delta) &\geq \mathbb{E}_{a^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\Omega^\delta; \tau_\varepsilon < \infty) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{a^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}[1_{\tau_\varepsilon < \infty} \mathbb{E}_{u^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\Omega^\delta) |_{u^\delta = Y_{\tau_\varepsilon}}] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{a^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\varepsilon < \infty) C^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{v^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\Omega^\delta) \\ &\geq c \mathbb{E}_{v^\delta \rightarrow b^\delta}(\tau_\Omega^\delta) \end{aligned}$$

where C is as in (3.3) and the value of c changes from line to line, but always depends only on ε . Since the left hand side is bounded above by $c^{-1}\delta^{-2}$, (3.2) follows. \square

From this (just as in [CW19, Section 2.5]) it follows that the densities of massive LERW with respect to classical LERW are uniformly bounded from above by $\exp(cm^2 R^2)$ and thus the tightness of the law of massive LERW follows. Also, (as in [CW19, Section 2.6]) it follows that each subsequential limit of $P_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the SLE₂ on Ω . Thus we can use Girsanov’s theorem to find the driving term of ξ_t of the Loewner evolution under $P_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}$.

3.3 Convergence of the Green function

In this section we prove the convergence of $Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(u, v)$ to a multiple of the massive Green function $G^{(m)}(u, v)$. To do so we will show that $G^{(m)}(u, \cdot)$ is precompact in a suitable space of functions, and we will show that any subsequential limit must satisfy the following three properties:

$$G^{(m)}(u, \cdot) = 0 \text{ on the boundary of } \Omega, \tag{3.4}$$

$$(-\Delta + m^2)G^{(m)}(u, \cdot) = 0 \text{ away from } u, \text{ and} \tag{3.5}$$

$$G^{(m)}(u, v) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log(|u - v|^{-1}) + O(1) \text{ as } v \rightarrow u. \tag{3.6}$$

As we will see, these three properties uniquely characterise the (continuous) **massive Green function**; from this the desired convergence will follow immediately. The second condition is that $G(u, \cdot)$ is a massive harmonic function. It will be useful to appeal to the discrete notion of

massive harmonicity: given $m \geq 0$ we call a function H massive discrete harmonic at $v \in \delta\mathbb{T}$ if

$$H(v) = \frac{1 - m^2\delta^2}{3} \sum_{w \in \delta\mathbb{T}: w \sim v} H(w). \quad (3.7)$$

Obviously, H being a discrete massive harmonic function is equivalent to being discrete harmonic on the augmented graph where every vertex is connected to an additional cemetery point where the transition probability to the cemetery is $m^2\delta^2$ from every point; and the value of H at the cemetery point being 0. We immediately deduce:

Lemma 3.2. *Let Ω^δ be a bounded domain in $\delta\mathbb{T}$ and $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a massive random walk with mass $m^2\delta^2$. Let H be a bounded real valued function defined on $\Omega^\delta \cup \partial\Omega^\delta$ and massive discrete harmonic at every point of Ω^δ . Denote by $\mathbb{P}_v^{(m)}$ the law of this walk started at v and by $\mathbb{E}_v^{(m)}$ the corresponding expectation. Let τ_{Ω^δ} be the hitting time of the boundary and let τ^* denote the killing time, or hitting time of the cemetery state. Then*

$$H(v) = \mathbb{E}_v^{(m)}\left(H(X_{\tau_{\partial\Omega^\delta}})1_{\{\tau^* > \tau_{\Omega^\delta}\}}\right).$$

The above statement needs to be interpreted carefully as we defined the boundary $\partial\Omega^\delta$ to be the edge boundary, that is, pairs (y_1, y_2) of vertices such that exactly one of these vertices (say y_1) lies in Ω^δ . In the above statement, we abusively identify $\partial\Omega^\delta$ with the outer vertex boundary (i.e., the vertices of the form y_2 where (y_1, y_2) is a boundary edge such that $y_1 \in \Omega^\delta$ but $y_2 \notin \Omega^\delta$). Now we can prove the uniqueness of the Green function:

Lemma 3.3. *For each $u \in \Omega$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ there is exactly one function $G(u, \cdot): \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is massive harmonic away from u , 0 on the boundary, and satisfies*

$$G(u, \cdot) = k \log(|u - v|^{-1}) + o(\log|u - v|) \text{ as } v \rightarrow u.$$

Proof. Let h and g be two such functions. Then $f := h - g$ is a massive harmonic function that is massive harmonic away from u , 0 on the boundary, and

$$f(v) = o(\log(|u - v|))$$

as $v \rightarrow u$. Fix $x \neq u \in \Omega$ and let $\mathbb{P}_x^{(m)}$ be the law of massive Brownian motion with mass m started at x : thus if τ^* denote an exponential random variable with rate m^2 then by definition

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{(m)}(f(B_t)) = \mathbb{E}_x(f(B_t)1_{\{\tau^* > t\}}).$$

Since f is massive harmonic, $M_t = f(B_t)1_{\{\tau^* > t\}}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_x^{(m)}$ -local martingale. Let $r > 0$, $B(u, r)$ be the disk of radius r , τ_r the hitting time of $B(u, r)$ and τ_Ω the hitting time of $\partial\Omega$. It is a well known fact about Brownian motion that the probability that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_r < \tau_{\partial\Omega}) \lesssim 1/\log(1/r),$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$. (This can be seen by applying the optional stopping theorem to the \mathbb{P}_x -local martingale $\log|B_t - u|$, see for example [LG16]). By applying the optional stopping theorem to M under $\mathbb{P}_x^{(m)}$ (which is justified since f is smooth and hence bounded away from u , as Ω is

bounded) we obtain:

$$f(x) = \mathbb{E}^{(m)}(M_{\tau_r \wedge \tau_\Omega}).$$

The only contribution comes from the event $\tau_r < \min(\tau^*, \tau_\Omega)$ since if either of these two stopping times occur before τ_r , then the martingale is equal to zero. Hence

$$f(x) = \mathbb{E}_x(f(B_{\tau_r})1_{\tau_r < \min(\tau^*, \tau_\Omega)})$$

But $f(B_{\tau_r}) = o(\log(r))$ by assumption on f , and

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_r < \min(\tau^*, \tau_\Omega)) \leq \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_r < \tau_\Omega) \lesssim 1/\log(1/r).$$

Hence letting $r \rightarrow 0$ we see that $f(x) = 0$. Since x was arbitrary, we deduce $f = 0$ and hence $g = h$, as desired. \square

(The existence of a function satisfying (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) follows from the result in [CW19], or the convergence result below.) In order to prove convergence of the discrete Green function $Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(u, v)$ to $G^{(m)}(u, v)$ we will show precompactness and identify the limit ultimately via Lemma 3.3. The following lemma will be useful for the existence of subsequential limits:

Lemma 3.4. *There are constants C and β depending on m such that for all positive massive harmonic functions H defined in $B(v_0, 2r) \cap \delta\mathbb{T}$ with $r \leq m^{-1}$ and for all $v_1, v_2 \in B(v_0, r) \cap \delta\mathbb{T}$ one has:*

$$|H(v_1) - H(v_2)| \leq C(|v_2 - v_1|/r)^\beta \max(H(v)).$$

Proof. Essentially, one can follow the argument of [CW19, Lemma 3.10]. Its proof relies on the following estimate: for any annulus $A = A(v_0, r, 2r)$, let $E(A)$ be the event that X_n makes a non-trivial loop around in the annulus before leaving it and before dying, i.e. there are $0 < s < t < \tau_A$ such that $X[s, t]$ disconnects v_0 from ∞ ; and $\tau^* > \tau_A$. Then there exists a positive constant $c > 0$ independent of δ, r, v_0 , and v such that:

$$\mathbb{P}_v^{(m)}(E(A(v_0, r, 2r))) \geq c, \tag{3.8}$$

for all $8\delta < r \leq m^{-1}$ and all $v \in \delta\mathbb{T}$ such that $\frac{3}{2}r - \delta \leq |v_0 - v| \leq \frac{3}{2}r + \delta$. This needs to be established in our directed context, which is not covered explicitly by [CW19]. To see this, simply observe that we can in fact also require $\tau_A \leq Mr^2\delta^{-2}$ for some large M . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_v^{(m)}(E(A)) &\geq \mathbb{P}_v^{(m)}(E(A); \tau_A \leq M\delta^{-2}r^2) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_v^{(0)}(E(A); \tau_A \leq M\delta^{-2}r^2)(1 - m^2\delta^2)^{M\delta^{-2}r^2} \\ &\geq \exp(-(M/2)r^2)[\mathbb{P}^{(0)}(E(A)) - \mathbb{P}^{(0)}(\tau_A > M\delta^{-2}r^2)] \end{aligned}$$

It is well known and easy to see that $\mathbb{P}^{(0)}(E(A))$ is bounded away from 0 (by convergence to Brownian motion) and the second term can be made arbitrarily small by choosing M sufficiently large. The result follows. \square

Finally, for the estimate we also need the following lemma about convergence of the conditioned (non-massive) random walk to a Brownian bridge:

Lemma 3.5. *Let $t > 0$. Let X_n^δ be the simple random walk on $\delta\mathbb{T}$ started at x^δ converging to x . Let $y^\delta \in \delta\mathbb{T}$ approximate y in such a way that for any $\delta > 0$ it is always possible to go from*

x^δ to y^δ in $\lfloor \delta^{-2}t \rfloor$ steps with positive probability. Then the law of $(X_{\lfloor \delta^{-2}s \rfloor}^\delta)_{s \in [0,t]}$ conditioned on $X_{\lfloor \delta^{-2}t \rfloor}^\delta = y^\delta$ converges to the law of the Brownian bridge $(b_s)_{s \in [0,t]}$ from x to y of duration $t > 0$.

Proof. We interpolate linearly between vertices to consider $(X_{\lfloor \delta^{-2}s \rfloor}^\delta)_{s \in [0,t]}$ as a continuous function on $[0,t]$. Let $(S_s^\delta)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ be this interpolation. Fix $u = 2t/3$, and let us first show that $(S_s^\delta)_{0 \leq s \leq u}$ converges to $(b_s)_{0 \leq s \leq u}$. Fix $F: C([0,u]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous functional. Then the conditioning $S_t^\delta = y^\delta$ weights every path $(S_s^\delta)_{s \in [0,u]}$ by how likely it is to go to y^δ from S_u^δ . Thus the conditional expectation of the functional can be rewritten as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x^\delta}(F((S_s^\delta)_{s \in [0,u]} | S_t^\delta = y^\delta)) = \mathbb{E}_{x^\delta} \left(F((S_s^\delta)_{s \in [0,u]}) \frac{\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}(S_t^\delta = y^\delta | S_u^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}(S_t^\delta = y^\delta)} \right). \quad (3.9)$$

The probability in the numerator can be written as $\mathbb{P}_{z^\delta}(S_{t/3}^\delta = y^\delta)$, with $z^\delta = S_u^\delta$. The ratio of probabilities therefore converges and the limit is

$$\mathbb{E}(F((B_s)_{s \in [0,u]}) \frac{\varphi(\frac{y-B_u}{t-u})}{\varphi(\frac{y}{t})}) = \mathbb{E}(F((b_s)_{0 \leq s \leq u})),$$

where φ is the density of a two-dimensional standard normal random variable. Applying the same argument but in the other direction of time (from t to $t-u = t/3$), the time-reversed random walk \hat{S} is distinct but the same argument applies to it. We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x^\delta}(F((S_{t-s}^\delta)_{s \in [0,u]} | S_t^\delta = y^\delta)) &= \mathbb{E}_{y^\delta}[F(\hat{S}_s^\delta)_{0 \leq s \leq u} | \hat{S}_t^\delta = x^\delta] \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{E}[F((\hat{b}_s)_{0 \leq s \leq u})] = \mathbb{E}[F((b_{t-s})_{0 \leq s \leq u})] \end{aligned}$$

where \hat{b} is a Brownian bridge of duration t from y to x , and we used the reversibility of Brownian bridge. Altogether this proves the lemma. \square

We will use this to approximate the probability that a random walk conditioned on the point at time n leaves a domain by the corresponding probability for the Brownian motion.

Corollary 3.6. *Let Ω^δ approximate a domain $\Omega \in \mathbb{C}$ and x^δ, y^δ approximate x, y in Ω . Let $\mathbb{P}_{x \rightarrow y; t}$ denote the law of a Brownian bridge of duration t from x to y . For any $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^\delta(\tau_{\partial\Omega^\delta} > t\delta^{-2} | X_{\lfloor t\delta^{-2} \rfloor}^\delta = y^\delta) \rightarrow P_{x,y}(t) := \mathbb{P}_{x \rightarrow y; t}(\tau_{\partial\Omega} > t)$$

Suppose x, y are fixed. When t is small the Brownian bridge of duration t is close to a straight line segment $[x, y]$. If the latter is contained in D then it is very likely that the bridge did not leave D by time t . This can be made rigorous through the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $P_{x,y}(t)$ be as above. Assume that the line between x and y is in Ω . Then:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} P_{x,y}(t) = 1.$$

Furthermore, $P_{x,y}$ is a continuous function of t .

Proof. Let $(b_s)_{s \in [0,t]}$ be the Brownian bridge from x to y of duration t . A well known representation of the Brownian bridge is $b_s = x + (y-x)\frac{s}{t} + W_s - \frac{s}{t}W_t$, where $(W_s)_{s \in [0,t]}$ is a standard

two dimensional Brownian motion started at 0. By rescaling the time to the interval $[0, 1]$ we get $\hat{b}_t = b_{tc}$ for t in $[0, 1]$, which satisfies:

$$\hat{b}_s = x + (y - x)s + W_{st} - sW_t.$$

As $t \rightarrow 0$ the second term $W_{st} - sW_t$ converges to 0 in probability uniformly in t . Since Ω is an open set and hence also contains an open set around the line from x to y this implies that $P_{x,y}(t)$ converges to 1. \square

It is also useful to recall the following elementary estimate which can be obtained e.g. by Stirling's approximation (or from computing the Fourier transform):

Lemma 3.8. *Let x^δ and $y^\delta \in \delta\mathbb{T}$ be sequences of lattice points. Then there exists a constant $C < \infty$ independent of $x^\delta, y^\delta, \delta$ and n such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}(X_n = y^\delta) \leq \frac{C}{n} \quad (3.10)$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x^\delta, y^\delta = x^\delta + a\delta + b\delta\tau \in \Omega^\delta$ such that $x^\delta \rightarrow x$ and $y^\delta \rightarrow y$ and that $n - a - b$ is divisible by 3. Then*

$$\binom{n}{n-a-b, n-a+2b, n+2a-b} = \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi n} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{\delta^2 n}\right) (1 + O(\delta)). \quad (3.11)$$

where the error is uniform in x^δ, y^δ and δ, n such that $|x-y|^2\delta^{-2} < n < M\delta^{-2}$ for some constant M .

Proof. Since $y^\delta - x^\delta \rightarrow y - x$ we have that a and b are of order δ^{-1} . Because the domains are bounded they are uniformly of this order. Therefore all entries in the multinomial coefficient are uniformly of order δ^{-2} and we can apply Stirling's approximation to all appearing factorials to obtain that the multinomial coefficient equals:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^n \sqrt{2\pi n}}{\left(\frac{n-a-b}{3}\right)^{\frac{n-a-b}{3}} \left(\frac{n+2a-b}{3}\right)^{\frac{n+2a-b}{3}} \left(\frac{n-a+2b}{3}\right)^{\frac{n-a+2b}{3}} (\sqrt{2\pi n/3})^3 3^n} (1 + O(\delta^2)) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi n} \left(\left(1 + \frac{-a-b}{n}\right) \left(1 + \frac{2a-b}{n}\right) \left(1 + \frac{-a+2b}{n}\right) \right)^{-\frac{n}{3}} \times \\ & \quad \left(1 + \frac{-a-b}{n}\right)^{-\frac{-a-b}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{2a-b}{n}\right)^{-\frac{2a-b}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{-a+2b}{n}\right)^{-\frac{-a+2b}{3}} (1 + O(\delta^2)) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi n} \left(1 + \frac{-3(a^2 - ab + b^2)}{n^2} + O(\delta^3) \right)^{-\frac{n}{3}} \times \\ & \quad \left(1 + \frac{-a-b}{n}\right)^{-\frac{-a-b}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{2a-b}{n}\right)^{-\frac{2a-b}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{-a+2b}{n}\right)^{-\frac{-a+2b}{3}} (1 + O(\delta^2)) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi n} \exp\left(\frac{a^2 - ab + b^2}{n}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(-a-b)^2 + (2a-b)^2 + (2b-a)^2}{3n}\right) (1 + O(\delta)) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi n} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{\delta^2 n}\right) (1 + O(\delta)). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used that $\delta^2(a^2 - ab + b^2) = |a\delta + b\delta\tau|^2 = |x - y|^2 + o(\delta)$. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\Omega^\delta \subset \delta\mathbb{T}$ be a sequence of lattice domains satisfying $\Omega^\delta \subset B(0, R)$ for some $R > 0$ independent of δ . Let x^δ and $y^\delta \in \Omega^\delta$ be a sequences of lattice points. Then there exists a constants $c > 0$ depending on R , but not on δ, n, x^δ or y^δ such that for all $n \geq 1$:*

$$\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(\tau_{\Omega^\delta} > n | X_n^\delta = y^\delta) < \exp(-cn\delta^2). \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. This can easily be deduced from the fact that the Radon–Nikodym derivative of the conditioned random walk compared to an unconditional random walk, restricted to $[0, n/2]$, is bounded (see, e.g., (3.9)), and the analogous (and straightforward) bound for unconditional random walk. Details are left to the reader. \square

Now we state the main result of this section:

Proposition 3.11. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded simply connected domain and $x, y \in \Omega$ be two distinct points of Ω . Assume that discrete domains $\Omega^\delta \subset \delta\mathbb{T}$ approximate Ω . Then*

$$Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(x^\delta, y^\delta) \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} G_\Omega^{(m)}(x, y).$$

Proof. Fix $r > 0$ and assume that $|x - y| \geq r$. We will need to obtain estimates that do not depend on $r > 0$. To begin we rewrite the Green function as

$$Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(x^\delta, y^\delta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta) (1 - m^2\delta^2)^n \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(\tau_{\partial\Omega} > n | X_n = y^\delta). \quad (3.13)$$

We split this sum into three parts: First the sum from $n = 0$ to $\lfloor |x - y|^2\delta^{-2} \rfloor$, then from $n = \lfloor |x - y|^2\delta^{-2} \rfloor + 1$ to $\lfloor M\delta^{-2} \rfloor$ (where M is a large constant chosen suitably later), then larger values of n . We will call these sums *I*, *II* and *III* and estimate them separately.

Bounding I. To estimate the first part of the sum we compare $\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta)$ with the same probability for points that are closer to x , as follows. Depending on the residue of n modulo 3 a different set of vertices is reachable from x^δ . Assuming that a point is reachable and is at least twice as close to x than y^δ in the Euclidean sense, then it is easier to reach that point than y^δ :

Lemma 3.12. *Fix $n \geq 0$. For any vertex z such that $\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = z) > 0$ and satisfies $|z - x^\delta| < \frac{1}{2}|y^\delta - x^\delta|$, we claim that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = z) \geq \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta).$$

Proof. Since the number of steps n is fixed this is just about comparing multinomial coefficients. It is easy to check that for any n and any a_1, a_2, a_3 such that $n = a_1 + a_2 + a_3$ and $a_1 > a_2$ it holds that:

$$\binom{n}{a_1, a_2, a_3} \leq \binom{n}{a_1 - 1, a_2 + 1, a_3}.$$

Assume without loss of generality that $y^\delta - x^\delta = a_1 + a_2\tau + a_3\tau^2$, such that $a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = n$ and $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3$. The above inequality implies that for any z reachable from y by repeatedly reducing one of the a_i and increasing another a_j subject to $a_i > a_j$ satisfies: $\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = z) \geq \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta)$. It is clear that in this way only points z can be obtained that are also reachable in n steps from x^δ .




Figure 5: Situation of Lemma 3.12, the bold line marks the relevant quadrilateral, the marked points are the points reachable with n steps from x and the orange arrows are the three steps possible from y^δ .

Claim All z reachable from x^δ in n steps, which are in the quadrilateral described by the lines through x^δ in the directions 1 and τ and through y^δ in the directions orthogonal to 1 and τ are reachable through these operations. See figure 3.3.

Proof of the claim:

By applying the step of reducing a_1 and increasing a_2 we see that all such points on the line through y^δ orthogonal to 1 are reachable and the same by reducing a_2 and increasing a_3 for the line orthogonal to τ . By choosing the correct starting point on these lines any other point in the quadrilateral is reachable by applying the step of reducing a_1 and increasing a_3 . This proves the claim.

By mirroring this quadrilateral on the lines in directions 1, τ and τ^2 through x^δ we obtain that also all z in the resulting hexagon satisfy $\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = z) \geq \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta)$. The vertices of this hexagon are the reflections of y^δ along those lines. The points on the boundary of this hexagon which are closest to x^δ are the projections of y^δ onto the lines through x in directions 1 and τ (and their respective reflections). Since the angle between those lines is $\frac{1}{3}\pi$ both of those points have distance from x^δ of at least $\frac{1}{2}|x^\delta - y^\delta|$, therefore the disk of radius $\frac{1}{2}|x^\delta - y^\delta|$ is contained in the hexagon. This proves the Lemma. Note that the extreme case of this being the largest disk that fits inside the hexagon is obtained exactly when $y^\delta - x^\delta$ is a multiple of 1, τ or τ^2 . \square

There are approximately $C|x - y|^2\delta^{-2}$ points verifying the conditions of Lemma 3.12, where $C = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{3}}\pi$. Consequently we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor |x - y|^2\delta^{-2} \rfloor &= \sum_z \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor |x-y|^2\delta^{-2} \rfloor} \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = z) \\ &\geq (C + o(1))|x - y|^2\delta^{-2}I \end{aligned}$$

Which implies that $I < 1/C + o(1)$ and thus I is bounded independently of r .

Bounding III. From Lemma 3.10, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(\tau_{\partial\Omega} > n | X_n = y^\delta) \leq \exp(-cn\delta^2).$$

By Lemma 3.12, $\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta) \leq \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = x^\delta) \leq C/n$ by Lemma 3.8. Hence, crudely bounding $(1 - m^2\delta^2)^n$ by 1 in the sum III we get

$$\begin{aligned} III &\leq \sum_{n \geq M\delta^{-2}} \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta) \mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(\tau_{\partial\Omega} > n | X_n = y^\delta) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq M\delta^{-2}} \frac{C}{n} \exp(-cn\delta^2) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{n=2^k M\delta^{-2}}^{2^{k+1}M\delta^{-2}-1} \frac{C}{n} \exp(-cM2^k) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} C \exp(-cM2^k), \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded independently of r , as desired.

Estimating II. For II we estimate the number of lattice paths using Stirling's formula. Assume without loss of generality that $y^\delta = x^\delta + a + be^{2\pi i/3} = a + b\tau$ with $a = a^\delta, b = b^\delta \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ (other cases are similar), then the number of paths from x^δ to y^δ is 0 if $n - a - b$ is not divisible by 3. If $n - a - b$ is divisible by 3, the number of paths is given by the multinomial coefficient:

$$\binom{n}{\frac{n-a-b}{3}, \frac{n+2a-b}{3}, \frac{n-a+2b}{3}}.$$

Now, in the regime II, Applying Lemma 3.9 we find

$$\mathbb{P}_{x^\delta}^{(0)}(X_n = y^\delta) = \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi n} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{\delta^2 n}\right) (1 + O(\delta)) \quad (3.14)$$

Recall that $P_{x,y}(t) = \mathbb{P}_{x \rightarrow y; t}(\tau_{\partial\Omega} > t)$. By Corollary 3.6 we get:

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_{\partial\Omega} > n | X_n^\delta = y) = P_{x,y}(n\delta^2)(1 + o_\delta(1)),$$

where $o_\delta(1) \rightarrow 0$ when $\delta \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in n such that $|x-y|^2\delta^{-2} \leq n \leq M\delta^{-2}$. Using this we get:

$$II = \frac{\sqrt{27}}{2\pi} \times \frac{1}{3} \times \sum_{n=\lfloor |x-y|^2\delta^{-2} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor M\delta^{-2} \rfloor} \frac{1}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{\delta^2 n}\right) P_{x,y}(n\delta^2) (1 - m^2\delta^2)^n (1 + O(\delta))(1 + o_\delta(1)) \quad (3.15)$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} (1 + o_\delta(1)) \sum_{n=\lfloor |x-y|^2\delta^{-2} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor c\delta^{-2} \rfloor} \frac{1}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{\delta^2 n}\right) (1 - m^2\delta^2)^n P_{x,y}(n\delta^2), \quad (3.16)$$

where the fact 1/3 in the first line comes from the fact that only one in three terms contribute to the sum (owing to periodicity).

This can be transformed into a Riemann sum, from which we deduce:

$$II = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} (1 + o_\delta(1)) \int_{|x-y|^2}^M \frac{P_{x,y}(s) \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{s}\right) \exp(-m^2 s)}{s} ds \quad (3.17)$$

The convergence of the Riemann sum is guaranteed by the fact that the continuity of the integrand over the relevant interval.

From (3.17) and our bounds on I and III note that $Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(x^\delta, \cdot)$ is uniformly bounded in δ on compacts of $D \setminus \{x\}$. Using Lemma 3.4 we deduce that $Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(x^\delta, \cdot)$ has subsequential limits in every compact of $D \setminus \{x\}$. By considering a countable number of such compacts (e.g. $D_n = \{y \in D : d(y, x) \wedge d(y, \partial D) \geq 1/n\}$) and a standard diagonalisation argument we may assume that there are subsequential limits in all of these compact domains simultaneously, which are necessarily consistent with one another. Let $h(x, \cdot)$ denote any such limit. We aim to identify h uniquely.

As we are interested in the behaviour when y is close to x we can assume that the straight line from x to y is in Ω and therefore lemma 3.7 applies and $P_{x,y}(s)$ approaches 1 as s goes to 0. Elementary computations give the asymptotic behaviour of this integral as $-2 \log(|x - y|) + O(1)$ when $|x - y| \rightarrow 0$.

It is elementary to check that $Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(x^\delta, \cdot)$ is a discrete massive harmonic function in the sense of Lemma 3.2. Since the convergence to the limit in the chosen subsequence is uniform, it is not hard to see that we can pass to the limit in the solution of the massive Dirichlet problem of Lemma 3.2, and deduce that $h(x, \cdot)$ is harmonic away from x . Furthermore, from our estimates above it follows that

$$h(x, y) = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \log(|x - y|) + O(1). \quad (3.18)$$

Thus h is the unique function satisfying the desired properties. Therefore all subsequential limits are the same which proves the desired convergence of the discrete massive Green functions. \square

Remark 3.13. The factor $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ can be explained as follows: Just as in the discrete case, the expected time spent by Brownian motion in a disk D is given by the integral of the Green's function. Thus, the expected amount of time spent in D of the discrete walk on the scaled lattice should satisfy:

$$\delta^2 \mathbb{E}(|\{n : X_n \in D\}|) = \delta^2 \sum_{y^\delta \in A \cap \delta\mathbb{T}} Z(x^\delta, y^\delta) \rightarrow \int_D G(x, y) dy.$$

For any disk D the number of points in $D \cap \delta\mathbb{T}$ behaves like $\delta^2 |A| \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ as this is the density of vertices of the triangular lattice. Therefore as $Z(x, y) \rightarrow h(x, y)$ the left-hand side converges to:

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \int_A h(x, y) dy = \int_D G(x, y) dy.$$

Therefore the constant is to be expected. It is however not harmful: the continuous objects considered below are all either identical to their counterparts on the square lattice or also just scaled by this factor.

3.4 Convergence of discrete massive Poisson kernel

Given a domain Ω , an interior point $z \in \Omega$ and a boundary point $a \in \partial\Omega$ (thought of as a prime end of Ω), we define the **continuous massive Poisson kernel** as:

$$P_\Omega^{(m)}(z, a) := P_\Omega(z, a) - m^2 \int_{\Omega_t} G_\Omega^{(m)}(z, w) P_\Omega(w, a) dA(w). \quad (3.19)$$

where $P_\Omega(w, a)$ is the (non-massive) continuous Poisson kernel.

This definition is motivated by the following crucial (and somewhat mysterious, in our opinion) identity for the discrete massive Green function:

Lemma 3.14.

$$(1 - m^2\delta^2)Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(w^\delta, z^\delta) = Z_{\Omega^\delta}(w^\delta, z^\delta) - m^2\delta^2 \sum_{v^\delta \in \text{Int } \Omega^\delta} Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(w^\delta, v^\delta)Z_{\Omega^\delta}(v^\delta, z^\delta), \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. We prove this by splitting each trajectory in the definition of Z_Ω into two parts, and summing over all possible ways to do so:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v^\delta \in \text{Int } \Omega^\delta} Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(w^\delta, v^\delta)Z_{\Omega^\delta}(v^\delta, z^\delta) &= \sum_{v^\delta \in \text{Int } \Omega^\delta} \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{\substack{\pi: w \rightarrow z, \\ \pi_k = v}}, \left(\frac{1}{3}(1 - m^2\delta^2)\right)^k \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{(\#\pi) - k} \\ &= \sum_{\pi: w \rightarrow z} \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{\#\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\#\pi} (1 - m^2\delta^2)^k \\ &= \sum_{\pi: w \rightarrow z} \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{\#\pi} \frac{1 - (1 - m^2\delta^2)^{(\#\pi) + 1}}{m^2\delta^2} \\ &= \frac{Z_{\Omega^\delta}(w^\delta, z^\delta) - (1 - m^2\delta^2)Z_{\Omega^\delta}^{(m)}(w^\delta, z^\delta)}{m^2\delta^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the terms gives the desired result. \square

The importance of the Poisson kernel stems from the well known martingale observable of Lawler, Schramm and Werner [LSW01]. Namely, let γ^δ be a massive LERW between b^δ in Ω^δ and $a^\delta \in \partial\Omega^\delta$. We parametrise γ^δ from b^δ to a^δ . For a vertex $v^\delta \in \Omega^\delta$, define the **massive martingale observable** as:

$$M_n^{(m)}(v^\delta) := \frac{Z_{\Omega^\delta \setminus \gamma^\delta[0, n]}^{(m)}(v^\delta, \gamma^\delta(n))}{Z_{\Omega^\delta \setminus \gamma^\delta[0, n]}^{(m)}(b^\delta, \gamma^\delta(n))}. \quad (3.21)$$

Since $\gamma^\delta(n)$ is on the boundary of $\Omega^\delta \setminus \gamma^\delta[0, n]$, this is also simply equal to the ratio of hitting probabilities of $\gamma^\delta(n)$ from v^δ vs. b^δ . Proceeding exactly as in [LSW01, Remark 3.6], one can check that for every $\delta > 0$ and every fixed vertex v^δ , the sequence $(M_n^{(m)}(v^\delta))_{0 \leq n \leq T(b^\delta)}$ gives a martingale (see also [Law, Lemma 7.2.1]).

The strategy of the proof of convergence of this martingale observable to its continuum limit in Chelkak and Wan [CW19] is to:

- first, prove the convergence of the non-massive martingale observable in the non-massive case (something which was in fact already proved in the radial case by Lawler, Schramm and Werner [LSW01] and generalised by Yadin and Yehudayoff [YY11], but in the chordal context of [CW19] requires some additional justifications); this was proved in Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 in [CW19] (and put in the correct chordal framework in Proposition 3.14)
- second, prove that the ratio of massive Green function to non-massive Green function converges to its continuum limit, which is Proposition 3.15 in [CW19].

The first step follows directly from the work of Yadin and Yehudayoff [YY11], which holds for arbitrary planar graphs subject to convergence of random walk to Brownian motion (which we know is true on the directed triangular lattice). Therefore only the second step needs to be justified, this is the content of the next lemma (which is the analogue of Proposition 3.15 in [CW19]).

Lemma 3.15. *In the setup above for any $z \in \Omega_t$ and $z^\delta \rightarrow z$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, one has:*

$$\frac{Z_{\Omega_t^\delta}^{(m)}(z^\delta, a_t^\delta)}{Z_{\Omega_t^\delta}(z^\delta, a_t^\delta)} \rightarrow \frac{P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(z, a_t)}{P_{\Omega_t}(z, a_t)} = 1 - m^2 \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{P_{\Omega_t}(w, a_t)}{P_{\Omega_t}(z, a_t)} G_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(z, w) dA(w).$$

Proof. The proof in [CW19] works also for the directed triangular lattice, as besides the convergence results of the last section it only requires the identity above, and estimates on the massive Green function, which follow from convergence to Brownian motion. One might at first be worried as the right-hand side of (3.20) is not linear in Z , whereas the limit of the discrete Green function for the triangular lattice is $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ times the limit on the square grid. However, the additional factor of $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ is actually needed for the sum to converge to a Lebesgue integral, see the remark after Proposition 3.11. Therefore $P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(z, a_t)$ is $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ times the massive Poisson kernel in [CW19]. \square

As a corollary we obtain the following convergence of martingale observables. Fix a subsequential limit $(\gamma_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of massive LERW on the directed triangular lattice, which a priori we know to be a simple curve (by absolute continuity with standard LERW), and parametrise it by capacity. Let $\Omega_t = \Omega \setminus \gamma([0, t])$. Let $a_t = \gamma(t)$ denote the tip of the curve at time t , which is on the boundary of Ω_t .

Corollary 3.16. *Fix $r > 0$. Suppose $v^\delta \in B(b^\delta, r/2)$. For $t \leq \log(1/r)$, let n_t denote the first n such that the capacity of $\gamma^\delta([0, n])$ viewed from b^δ exceeds t (equivalently, the conformal radius of b^δ in $\Omega \setminus \gamma([0, n])$ is less than e^{-t}).*

$$M_{n_t}^{(m)}(v^\delta) \rightarrow \frac{P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(v, a_t)}{P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(b, a_t)} =: M_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(v),$$

almost surely along the underlying subsequential limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

3.5 Proof of the main statement

We are now ready to prove convergence to massive SLE₂, as stated in Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. As discussed in Section 3.2 the laws of the massive loop-erased random walks are tight and all subsequential limits are absolutely continuous with respect to classical SLE₂. This justifies the application of Girsanov's theorem which in particular implies that the driving function ξ_t is a semi-martingale under $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$.

Moreover, the discrete martingales of (3.21) have continuous limits as shown in Proposition 3.16. Writing the martingale in the form

$$M_n^{(m)}(v^\delta) = \frac{Z_{\Omega_n^\delta}^{(m)}(v^\delta, a_n^\delta)}{Z_{\Omega_n^\delta}(v^\delta, a_n^\delta)} \left(\frac{Z_{\Omega_n^\delta}^{(m)}(b^\delta, a_n^\delta)}{Z_{\Omega_n^\delta}(b^\delta, a_n^\delta)} \right)^{-1} \frac{Z_{\Omega_n^\delta}(v^\delta, a_n^\delta)}{Z_{\Omega_n^\delta}(b^\delta, a_n^\delta)}$$

with $a_n^\delta = \gamma^\delta(n)$ and $\Omega_n = \Omega \setminus \gamma^\delta([0, n])$, we see that $M^{(m)}(v^\delta)$ is uniformly bounded: the first term is trivially bounded by 1, the second is bounded by Proposition 3.1 (and Koebe's one-quarter theorem), and the third one is bounded for $n \leq n_t$ by (uniform) convergence to the continuous Poisson kernel (here we use the strength of the result of Yadin and Yehudayoff [YY11]) and conformal invariance of the latter. Hence the limit in Corollary 3.16 must also be a martingale (see Remark 2.3 and (2.14) in [CW19] for the argument).

Standard Itô calculations (as outlined in [MS10] and written out in [CW19], see Section 4.3 and more specifically Lemma 4.9) for this family of martingales imply that the law of the driving function ξ_t under $\mathbb{P}^{(m)}$ is uniquely determined. \square

4 Convergence of massive LERW on general planar graphs

In the previous section it was proven that on a triangular and on a quadratic lattice the loop erasure of a random walk with certain weights converges to SLE₂ with drift given by a reweighting of massive SLE₂. This also extended a result from [CW19] which proved that the loop erasure of a massive random walk on the square lattice converges to massive SLE₂ as conjectured in [MS10].

We now want to use the strategy employed in the critical case by [YY11] to extend this result to more general lattices and weights, thus establishing both universality and a new family of off-critical versions of SLE.

Fix a domain Ω and a bounded continuous vector field $\Delta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. Let Ω^δ be a sequence of planar graphs embedded in the complex plane with edge weights w^δ ; and suppose that there is no accumulation point in the sense that for every compact set K , the number of vertices of Ω^δ inside K is finite. We will assume that the random walk on Ω^δ satisfies the following **uniform crossing** assumption:

Let \mathcal{R} be the horizontal rectangle $[0, 3] \times [0, 1]$ and \mathcal{R}' be the vertical rectangle $[0, 1] \times [0, 3]$. Let $B_1 := B((1/2, 1/2), 1/4)$ be the *starting ball* and $B_2 := B((5/2, 1/2), 1/4)$ be the *target ball*. Let $\mathcal{R}_r = r\mathcal{R} + z$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}'_r = r\mathcal{R}' + z$) for some $r > 0$ and $z \in D$, and suppose that \mathcal{R}_r (resp. \mathcal{R}'_r) $\subset D \subset R\mathbb{D}$. Let B_1^r, B_2^r be the corresponding scaled starting and target balls. Let Cross_r denote the event that the walk hits B_2^r before leaving the rectangle \mathcal{R}_r (respectively \mathcal{R}'_r) or getting killed, in case this possibility exists. We will say that the graphs (Ω^δ) satisfying the uniform crossing estimate if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that, uniformly over $z \in B_1^r$, uniformly over $r \leq R$,

$$\mathbb{P}_z^\delta(\text{Cross}_r) \geq c. \quad (4.1)$$

The main theorems of this section are:

Theorem 4.1. *Let Ω and Δ be as above, and let Ω^δ be as above, in particular (4.1) holds. Let $(X_t^\delta, t = 0, 1, \dots)$ be the random walk on Ω^δ , started at a specified vertex $o^\delta \rightarrow o$ of Ω^δ , with transition probabilities proportional to the directed weights w^δ . Suppose that $(X_{\delta^{-2}t}^\delta, t \geq 0)$ converges in law, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, to a Brownian motion with drift, that is to the solution of the stochastic differential equation*

$$dX_t = \Delta(X_t)dt + dW_t, \quad (4.2)$$

where $(W_t, t \geq 0)$ is a standard planar Brownian motion. Let τ_δ denote the first time at which X^δ leaves Ω and consider the the loop erasure $\text{LE}(X^\delta)$ of the walk up until this time. Then conditionally on $X_{\tau_\delta}^\delta = a^\delta$, $\text{LE}(X^\delta)$ converges weakly to a radial Loewner evolution γ , whose driving function $\zeta_t = e^{i\xi_t}$ (when parametrised by capacity) satisfies the stochastic differential

equation

$$d\xi_t = \sqrt{2}dB_t + \lambda_t dt, \quad \lambda_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial g_t(a_t)} \log \left(\frac{P_{\Omega_t}^{(\Delta)}(o, a_t)}{P_{\Omega_t}(o, a_t)} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where $a_t = \gamma(t)$, $\Omega_t = \Omega \setminus \gamma([0, t])$ is the slitted domain at time t , g_t is the Loewner map from Ω_t to \mathbb{D} and $P_{\Omega_t}^{(\Delta)}$ and P_{Ω_t} are the Poisson kernels for the Brownian motion with drift Δ , and regular Brownian motion respectively, in Ω_t .

We have a similar theorem in the case (which turns out to be slightly easier) where the mass is given by a continuously varying function of the point.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Ω^δ be as described above, in particular (4.1) holds. Fix a function $m : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a bounded nonnegative continuous function on Ω . Let $X_t^{(m), \delta}$ be the massive random walk, which at each step, if in position v^δ , gets killed with probability $m(v^\delta)^2 \delta^2$, and otherwise moves like simple random walk (we assume that δ is small enough so that this is smaller than one), and starts from o_δ with $o_\delta \rightarrow o \in \Omega$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.*

Suppose that $(X_{\delta^{-2}t}^{(m), \delta}, t \geq 0)$ converges in law as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ to a massive Brownian motion with killing profile m starting from o , i.e. a process $X_t^{(m)}$ that behaves like a Brownian motion X until a stopping time τ_ that satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_* > t | \mathcal{F}_t) = \exp \left(- \int_0^t m^2(X_s) ds \right), \quad (4.4)$$

after which it also goes to the cemetery and stays there. (Equivalently, suppose that the ordinary random walk $(X_{\delta^{-2}t}^{(0), \delta}, t \geq 0)$, starting from o_δ , converges to planar Brownian motion from o). Then the loop erasure $\text{LE}(X^{(m), \delta})$ of $X^{(m), \delta}$, conditioned to leave Ω before killing, and conditioned on $X_{\tau_\delta}^{(m), \delta} = a^\delta$, converges to a radial Loewner Evolution with driving function $\zeta_t = e^{i\xi_t}$ satisfying

$$d\xi_t = \sqrt{2}dB_t + \lambda_t dt, \quad \lambda_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial g_t(a_t)} \log \left(\frac{P_{\Omega_t}^{(m)}(o, a_t)}{P_{\Omega_t}(o, a_t)} \right), \quad (4.5)$$

with notations similar to Theorem 4.1.

For the proof of this theorem it is more natural to use the approach of Yadin and Yehudayoff [YY11] than of Chelkak and Wan [CW19], since it would be for instance difficult to obtain analogues of Proposition 3.11 in this general context. As before, the theorem essentially reduces to proving uniform convergence of the Poisson kernel. We switch to the notations of [YY11] for convenience. The following is Proposition 5.1 in [YY11], from which the main lemma (Lemma 1.2) follows by a compactness argument which carries over to our setting without any changes.

Lemma 4.3. *For all $\epsilon, \alpha > 0$ there is a δ_0 such that for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ the following holds. Fix a domain Ω such that $0 \in \Omega$ and let $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be the unique conformal map sending 0 to 0 and $\phi'(0) > 0$, and $a \in \Omega \cap \Omega^\delta$ be such that $|\phi(a)| < 1 - \epsilon$ (and a is in the connected component of that graph containing the origin) and let $b \in \partial\Omega \cap \Omega^\delta$ (again in the main component). Then,*

$$\left| \frac{H^\delta(a, b; \Omega)}{H^\delta(0, b; \Omega)} - \lambda(a, b; \Omega) \right| < \alpha,$$

where $H^\delta(x, b; \Omega)$ is the probability that a walk started at x leaves the domain through b and

$$\lambda(a, b; \Omega) = \frac{1 - |\phi(a)|^2}{|\phi(a) - \phi(b)|^2}$$

is the continuous Poisson kernel for Brownian motion.

Most of the arguments in [YY11] go through and we will therefore content ourselves with describing the instances where changes are needed. Because of this, we feel it is useful to first give a simplified overview of the arguments in [YY11], as it may otherwise prove difficult to see why the instances below are indeed the only arguments that need to be changed. The first observation of Yadin and Yehudayoff is that “the exit probabilities are correct”: given a small macroscopic arc on $\partial\Omega$ (i.e., the image under the inverse conformal map of a small macroscopic arc I on the boundary of the unit circle), the ratio of the probabilities $\mathbb{P}_a^\delta(X_{\tau^\delta} \in J)/\mathbb{P}_0^\delta(X_{\tau^\delta} \in J)$ converges to what one would expect, namely $\mathbb{P}_a(B_\tau \in J)/\mathbb{P}_0(B_\tau \in J)$. This is the content of their Lemma 4.8 and is a more or less obvious consequence of the assumption that random walk converges to Brownian motion together with planarity. When the arc J is small, this ratio is itself close to the continuum Poisson kernel $\lambda(a, b; \Omega)$ (essentially by definition of the latter).

Next for a boundary point b and an interior point a , they fix a small arc J centered around b and write

$$H^\delta(a, b, \Omega) = \mathbb{P}_a^\delta(X_{\tau^\delta} = b | X_{\tau^\delta} \in J) \mathbb{P}_a^\delta(X_{\tau^\delta} \in J),$$

so that it suffices to prove that the ratio

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_a^\delta(X_{\tau^\delta} = b | X_{\tau^\delta} \in J)}{\mathbb{P}_0^\delta(X_{\tau^\delta} = b | X_{\tau^\delta} \in J)} \approx 1 \tag{4.6}$$

is close to 1. It is easier to map everything to the unit disc, and take \tilde{b} an approximation of $\phi(b)$ on the unit circle. The key argument for this is a multiscale coupling, which is implicitly described in Propositions 5.4 – 5.6. The idea is to consider exponentially growing scales $R_j, j = 1, \dots, N$ and points ξ_j in the unit disc at distance of order R_j from both \tilde{b} and the unit circle, with $R_j \approx e^j r$, and r being the width of the arc $I = \phi(J)$. At the smallest scale $j = 1$, ξ_j is thus at a distance of order r from \tilde{b} itself, while at the largest scale $j = N$, ξ_j is at macroscopic distance from \tilde{b} . They condition both walks starting from a and 0 respectively to leave Ω through J . At each successive scale, there is a positive chance that when the walks get to that scale, they will go and visit the *same* predetermined small ball, chosen to be centered around ξ_j and to have a radius proportional to R_j times a very small constant. Once that is the case, the conditional chances of exiting through b specifically rather than anywhere else in J are necessarily essentially the same for both walks, which proves (4.6). Essentially, Proposition 5.4 shows that the coupling succeeds with positive probability at each scale independently of previous attempts. Proposition 5.5 shows that the ratio in (4.6) is bounded even in the unlikely event that the coupling never succeeded, and Proposition 5.6 quantifies how close to 1 the ratio in (4.6) once there is a success.

At the discrete level, the only properties of the walks that are needed are planarity (which of course always holds for the random walks considered in this paper) as well as crossing estimates (i.e., (4.1)) and simple consequences of it, such as Beurling estimates. These will be discussed briefly in Section 4.2. At the continuum level the required estimates are described (without proof) in Section 3 of [YY11], mostly Proposition 3.3 to Lemma 3.10. One can see that with very few exceptions, these estimates are properties of Brownian motion which are concerned with typical events of Brownian motion that can additionally be required to hold in a short time

scale. In such cases the change of measure between massive (or drifted) and ordinary Brownian motion is harmless, hence these properties also obviously hold true in our situation. The lone exception is Proposition 3.3 (recalled below as Lemma 4.4, which concerns the probability to hit a very small ball); since this is not a typical event for Brownian motion, one needs to consider the effect of the change of measure and more specifically one needs to check that conditioning on the atypical event does not cause the change of measure to degenerate. This will be carried out in Section 4.1.

4.1 Continuum hitting probabilities

The following well-known proposition is recalled as Proposition 3.3 of [YY11] and can be proved using the fact that for two dimensional Brownian motion $\log(|B_t|)$ is a local martingale and the inequality $\log(1-r) \leq -r$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let \mathbb{D} be the unit disc and let $x \in \mathbb{D}$ be different from 0. Let $0 < \epsilon < |x|$. Let τ be the exit time of X_t from the unit disc \mathbb{D} . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\exists t \in [0, \tau] : |X_t| < \epsilon) \geq \frac{1 - |x|}{\log(1/\epsilon)}, \quad (4.7)$$

We need to replace this with a suitable analogue either for the drift case (Theorem 4.1) or the massive case (Theorem 4.2). It is easier to consider first the massive case.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$ is the unit disc. There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $x \in \Omega$ be different from 0 and $0 < \epsilon < |x|$. Let τ be the exit time of X_t from the disc. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_x^{(m)}(\exists t \in [0, \tau \wedge \tau_*] : |X_t| < \epsilon) \geq c \frac{1 - |x|}{\log(1/\epsilon)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. Suppose without loss of generality that $\epsilon = e^{-N}$ for some $N \geq 1$. Writing down the Radon–Nikodym derivative with respect to ordinary Brownian motion, and letting τ_ϵ being the first time the trajectory enters $B(0, \epsilon)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x^{(m)}(\tau_\epsilon < \tau) &= \mathbb{E}_x \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\epsilon < \tau\}} \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} m^2(X_s) ds\right) \right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_x \left(\exp(-\tau_\epsilon \|m^2\|_\infty) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\epsilon < \tau\}} \right) \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_\epsilon < \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Thus it remains to show

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left(\exp(-M^2 \tau_\epsilon) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_\epsilon < \tau\}} \right) \geq c, \quad (4.9)$$

for some constant c , where $M^2 = \|m^2\|_\infty$. A priori, the difficulty is that conditioning the Brownian motion to hit a very small ball might cause the process to waste a lot of time and thus make it highly likely to be killed (or equivalently make the exponential term very small). We will see this is not the case; essentially, when we condition planar Brownian motion to hit zero before leaving the unit disc, it does so in an a.s. finite time.

Let $\tau_0 = \inf\{t > 0 : |B_t| = e^k \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, and define inductively a sequence of stopping times τ_n by setting

$$\tau_{n+1} = \inf\{t > \tau_n : |B_t| = e^k \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } |B_t| \neq |B_{\tau_n}|\}.$$

In words, the sequence τ_n corresponds to the sequence of times at which $|B_t|$ is of the form e^k for some distinct k .

Let $M_n = \log_r(|B_{\tau_n}|)$. Because $\log|x|$ is a harmonic function on \mathbb{R}^2 and rotational invariance of Brownian motion, it is easy to see that M_n is nothing but simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} with a possibly random initial value M_0 which however differs from $\log|x|$ by at most 1. Let σ_ϵ denote the first n such that $M_n \leq -N$ (recall that we have assumed $\epsilon = e^{-N}$, so σ_ϵ corresponds to Brownian motion entering $B(0, \epsilon)$). Let σ be the smallest n such that $M_n \geq 0$ (which corresponds to Brownian motion leaving the unit disc).

Now let us describe the effect of conditioning on $\tau_\epsilon < \tau$ (or equivalently $\sigma_\epsilon < \sigma$). The conditional transition probabilities are well known and easy to compute (this can be viewed as an elementary version of Doob's h-transform). Writing $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ for the conditional probability measure given $\sigma_\epsilon < \sigma$, we obtain for $-N + 1 \leq k \leq -1$,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(M_{n+1} = k \pm 1 | M_n = k) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \mp \frac{1}{|k|} \right). \quad (4.10)$$

Note that this description is actually independent of N (or equivalently ϵ). The formalism of electrical networks is useful to describe the conditional walk defined by (4.10) (which, up to the sign, is essentially a discrete version of a three-dimensional Bessel process, and is in particular transient). To put it in this framework, note that 4.10 coincides with the walk on the network with conductances $c(k, k-1) = \binom{|k|+1}{2}$. Indeed in that case the corresponding stationary measure is then

$$\pi(k) = \binom{|k|+1}{2} + \binom{|k|}{2} = k^2$$

after simplification, so that $c(k, k-1)/\pi(k)$ coincides with (4.10) as desired. The corresponding unit current voltage $v(k) = \frac{2}{|k|}$ (if we set zero voltage at $-\infty$ and unit voltage at 1), which means that the expected number of visits to k is exactly $2|k|$ if we let the conditioned walk (4.10) live forever. We deduce that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\#\{n \leq \sigma : M_n = k\}) \leq 2|k|. \quad (4.11)$$

(This can also be computed directly using elementary computations based on the gambler's ruin probability, and considering the probability from k that the conditioned walk ever returns to k).

Now let us decompose

$$\tau_\epsilon - \tau_0 = \sum_{n=0}^{\sigma_\epsilon-1} (\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 1_{\{N_j^m < \sigma_\epsilon\}} (\tau_{N_j^m+1} - \tau_{N_j^m}) \quad (4.12)$$

where for $1 \leq j \leq N-1$ and $m \geq 1$, $n = N_j^m$ is the time of the m th visit to level $-j$ by the martingale M_n . We will check that the conditional expectation of the left hand side, given $\sigma_\epsilon < \sigma$, remains finite as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Let \mathcal{F} denote the σ -algebra generated by all the random variables of the form X_{τ_n} , $0 \leq n \neq N$. Note that the event $\sigma_\epsilon < \sigma$ is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F} , and that given \mathcal{F} , the trajectory of $(X_t, 0 \leq t \leq \tau_\epsilon)$ may be split in pieces of the form $X[\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}]$, which are *independent* of one another, and where each piece may be described as a Brownian motion starting from X_{τ_n} conditioned to exit a certain annulus $A_n = B(0, e^{M_n+1}) \setminus B(0, e^{M_n-1})$ through $X_{\tau_{n+1}}$. Now, if A is any annulus of the form $B(0, e^{k+1}) \setminus B(0, e^{k-1})$ and $y \in A$ is any interior point, $z \in \partial A$ is any point on the

boundary of the annulus A , then it is not hard to see for some constant $C > 0$, by Brownian scaling,

$$\mathbb{E}_y(\tau_A | X_{\tau_A} = z) \leq Ce^{2k} \quad (4.13)$$

where τ_A is the time at which X leaves A , and this estimate is uniform in $y \in A, z \in \partial A$, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}(\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n | \mathcal{F}) \leq Ce^{2M_n}. \quad (4.14)$$

This implies that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tau_0) \leq C < \infty$. Furthermore, using (4.12)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tau_\varepsilon - \tau_0) &= \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{N_j^m < \sigma_\varepsilon\}} (\tau_{N_j^{m+1}} - \tau_{N_j^m}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{N_j^m < \sigma_\varepsilon\}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[(\tau_{N_j^{m+1}} - \tau_{N_j^m}) | \mathcal{F}] \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{N_j^m < \sigma_\varepsilon\}} Ce^{-2j} \right] \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} e^{-2j} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\#\{n \leq \sigma : M_n = j\}) \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^2 e^{-2j}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used (4.14) in the third line, and (4.11) in the last line. The right hand side is uniformly bounded in N (or equivalently ε). We deduce that $\mathbb{E}(\tau_\varepsilon | \tau_\varepsilon < \tau) \leq C$ for some constant C independent of x . Therefore, using Jensen's inequality and convexity of $x \mapsto e^{-x}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left(\exp(-M^2 \tau_\varepsilon) \middle| \tau_\varepsilon < \tau \right) \geq \exp(-M^2 \mathbb{E}_x(\tau_\varepsilon | \tau_\varepsilon < \tau)) \geq \exp(-M^2 C),$$

which proves (4.9). This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

A slightly more elaborate version of this argument allows us to prove the same result in the case of drift.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$ is the unit disc. Let Δ be a drift vector field as in Theorem 4.1. There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $x \in \Omega$ be different from 0 and $0 < \varepsilon < |x|$. Let τ be the exit time of X_t from the disc. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_x^{(\Delta)}(\exists t \in [0, \tau] : |X_t| < \varepsilon) \geq c \frac{1 - |x|}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}. \quad (4.15)$$

Proof. Compared to Lemma 4.5, the complication arises from the fact that the change of measure is not monotone; it is instead the stochastic exponential of a local martingale (hence the exponential includes not only a monotone decreasing term but also a stochastic integral which needs additional control). By Girsanov's theorem, we can write

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{(\Delta)}}{d\mathbb{P}^{(0)}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_\varepsilon}} =: Z_\varepsilon = \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau_\varepsilon} \Delta(X_s) \cdot dX_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau_\varepsilon} |\Delta(X_s)|^2 ds \right). \quad (4.16)$$

where the \cdot in the stochastic integral is an inner product. As in (4.9), our goal is to prove

$$\mathbb{E}_x(Z_\varepsilon | \tau_\varepsilon < \tau) \geq c \quad (4.17)$$

for some constant $c > 0$, where we recall that \mathbb{E}_x denotes the massless or driftless expectation $\mathbb{E}_x^{(0)}$. Here it is convenient to write down an SDE for X under the conditional law $\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot | \tau_\varepsilon < \tau)$ analogous to the description (4.10). Namely, observe that $\mathbb{P}_x^\varepsilon := \mathbb{P}_x(\cdot | \tau_\varepsilon < \tau)$ can be described as a Doob h -transform of X where the harmonic function h is simply given by $h(y) = \mathbb{P}_y(\tau_\varepsilon < \tau)$. Hence, under \mathbb{P}_x^ε , we have

$$dX_t = dW_t + \frac{\nabla h(X_t)}{h(X_t)} dt, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \tau_\varepsilon$$

where W is an ordinary planar Brownian motion. Now, observe that $h(y) = \log(|y|)/\log \varepsilon$, so that $\nabla h(y) = 1/(|y| \log \varepsilon) \vec{u}$, where \vec{u} is the unit radial vector at y (i.e., $\vec{u} = y/|y|$) and $\nabla h(y)/h(y) = 1/(|y| \log |y|) \vec{u}$. We deduce

$$dX_t = dW_t + \frac{1}{|X_t|^2 \log(|X_t|)} X_t dt; \quad 0 \leq t \leq \tau_\varepsilon. \quad (4.18)$$

(Recall that since $|X_t| \leq 1$, the drift points inwards, as it should). Observe the remarkable fact that this SDE does not depend on ε beyond its range; this is analogous to the observation that (4.10) does not depend on N or ε . We will let $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x$ denote the law of the solution to the SDE (4.18) run until the hitting time T of 0 or τ , whichever comes first. (In fact, under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_x$, the process will always hit zero first). Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_x(Z_\varepsilon | \tau_\varepsilon < \tau) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(Z_\varepsilon)$$

and by Fatou's lemma,

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(Z_\varepsilon) \geq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(Z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} \Delta(X_s) \cdot dX_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau \wedge T} |\Delta(X_s)|^2 ds \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} \Delta(X_s) \cdot dW_s + \int_0^{\tau \wedge T} \frac{\Delta(X_s) \cdot X_s}{|X_s|^2 \log(|X_s|)} ds - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau \wedge T} |\Delta(X_s)|^2 ds \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence to show (4.17), it suffices to show that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau \wedge T} |\Delta(X_s)|^2 ds \right) < \infty; \quad (4.19)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x \left[\left(\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} \Delta(X_s) \cdot dW_s \right)^2 \right] < \infty; \quad (4.20)$$

and (after applying the triangle inequality and Cauchy–Schwarz)

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x \left(\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} \frac{|\Delta(X_s)|}{|X_s| \log(1/|X_s|)} ds \right) < \infty. \quad (4.21)$$

Now, since Δ is bounded, (4.19) follows directly from Lemma 4.5. By Itô's isometry, we further note that the left hand side of (4.20) equals twice that of (4.19), and is hence finite too. The final term (4.21) is of a similar nature to (4.19), but one cannot directly appeal to Lemma 4.5 because of the divergence in $1/(x \log(1/x))$ in the integrand, which might make the integral blow up. We use an argument similar to (4.13). If A is any annulus of the form $B(0, e^{k+1}) \setminus B(0, e^{k-1})$ and $y \in A$ is any interior point, $z \in \partial A$ is any point on the boundary of the annulus A , then it is not hard to see for some constant $C > 0$, by Brownian scaling, if W is a standard Brownian motion,

$$\mathbb{E}_y \left(\int_0^{\tau_A} \frac{|\Delta(W_s)|}{|W_s| \log(1/|W_s|)} ds \middle| W_{\tau_A} = z \right) \leq C|k|e^k$$

where τ_A is the time at which W leaves A , and this estimate is uniform in $y \in A, z \in \partial A$, and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, arguing as in Lemma 4.5, we get

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x \left(\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} \frac{|\Delta(X_s)|}{|X_s| \log(1/|X_s|)} ds \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} Cj^3 e^{-j} < \infty$$

which proves (4.21). This completes the proof of Lemma 4.6. \square

4.2 Discrete crossing and Beurling estimates

To end this section we conclude with the remaining missing discrete estimates required for the proof of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. The first one concerns disconnection events: for $z \in D$, and $r > 0$ such that $B(z, 10r) \subset \Omega$, let us write $x[0, t] \circlearrowleft^{(r)} z$ for the event that the path $x[0, t]$ disconnects $B(z, r)$ from $B(z, 5r)^c$ (or, equivalently, makes a noncontractible loop in the corresponding annulus); this is the notation from [YY11]. The next lemma corresponds to Proposition 3.4 in [YY11] although there it is only stated for Brownian motion, although we will need its random walk version.

Lemma 4.7. *For every R there exists a z such that the following holds: Let $0 < r \leq R$ and let $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Let T be the exit time of $X(\cdot)$ from $B(z, r)$. Then for every $x \in B(z, r/2)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(X(0, T) \circlearrowleft^{(r)} z) \geq c.$$

Proof. Encircling a point at scale r contains the intersection of ten box-crossing events (see Figure 4.2). We conclude using (4.1). \square

The last missing piece is a Beurling estimate (corresponding to Proposition 4.1. in [YY11]), which shows that a walk starting close to the boundary of a domain is very likely to leave this domain in a short time, without going far from its starting point. Actually what is needed is the version of this estimate in which we want to ensure the random walk will hit a given curve which is close to its starting point; of course, this makes no difference. Such an estimate is well known in the critical case where the walk converges to Brownian motion. This remains true in the off-critical regime thanks to the following observation: while of course the off-critical Brownian motions are not scale invariant, this effect disappears at small scales. In fact, making loops at any scale above that separating the curve from the starting point guarantees an intersection, and so we can get a uniform bound using the previous observations. Also, since we assume that the original domain Ω is bounded, we do not need to consider arbitrarily large scales and can therefore obtain uniform bounds for all domains which have diameter less than some constant R .

Proposition 5.1. *Consider the square lattice with weights (1.5) and the directed triangular lattices with weights (1.6). Then both corresponding sequences of graph Ω^δ satisfy the assumption of Theorem 4.1 with the same limiting drift vector field Δ . In particular, loop-erased random walk converges to the radial off-critical SLE described in (4.3).*

Proof. It is a simple consequence of the Stroock–Varadhan theorem that random walk on Ω^δ with the specified weights converge to Brownian motion with drift Δ . We therefore need to check the crossing estimate (4.1). By Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.9 we have on both lattices that:

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_x^{(\Delta)}(\gamma^\delta)}{\mathbb{P}_x^{(0)}(\gamma^\delta)} = \exp(M_n - \frac{1}{2}V_n), \quad (5.1)$$

Let Q_n be the quadratic variation process of M , i.e. $Q_n = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \text{Var}(dM_s | \mathcal{F}_s)$. This equals $\frac{\delta^2}{8} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} |\alpha(x_s)|^2$ on the square lattice and $\frac{2\delta^2}{9} \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} |\alpha(x_s)|^2$ in the triangular case.

Let $C = \max_{v \in v(\Omega^\delta)} |\beta(x)| + |\alpha(x)|$ (which is bounded by the above remark and since the vector field Δ is fixed and bounded). Then we get,

$$V_n \leq C\delta^2 n; \quad Q_n \leq C\delta^2 n. \quad (5.2)$$

In order to prove that $\mathbb{P}_m^{(\Delta)}(\text{Cross}_r) \geq c$ for some uniform constant $c > 0$ we will in fact consider the restricted event $G = \text{Cross}_r \cap \{T \leq \delta^{-2}\}$, where T is the time required to make the desired crossing, or the exit time of \mathcal{R}_r , whichever is smaller. Then on G , $T \leq \delta^{-2}$ so $V_T \leq C$ and $Q_T \leq C$ as well, so that if K is a number large enough (chosen suitably below)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_z^{(\Delta)}(\text{Cross}) &\geq \mathbb{P}_z^{(\Delta)}(G) = \mathbb{E}_z^{(0)}(1_G e^{M_T - \frac{1}{2}V_T}) \\ &\geq e^{-C/2} \mathbb{E}_z^{(0)}(1_G e^{M_T}) \\ &\geq e^{-C/2} \mathbb{E}_z^{(0)}(1_{G \cap \{M_T \geq -K\}} e^{M_T}) \\ &\geq e^{-C/2-K} \mathbb{P}_z^{(0)}(G, M_T \geq -K) \\ &\geq e^{-C/2-K} (\mathbb{P}_z^{(0)}(G) - \mathbb{P}_z^{(0)}(G, M_T \leq -K)) \end{aligned}$$

Now, under $\mathbb{P}_z^{(0)}$ it is clear that the crossing probability is uniformly bounded below and furthermore G itself has positive probability. Let $c > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}_z^{(0)}(G) \geq c$. On G , $Q_T \leq C$ so (since G is T -measurable and T is a stopping time), by the optional stopping theorem and monotone convergence to apply it at time T , $\mathbb{E}(M_T^2 1_G) = \mathbb{E}(Q_T 1_G) \leq C$ and we can choose by Chebyshev's inequality K large enough so that $\mathbb{P}(|M_T| \geq K; G) \leq c/2$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}_z^{(\Delta)}(G) \geq e^{-C/2-K} c/2, \quad (5.3)$$

which proves (4.1). This concludes the proof. \square

Let us now see how Proposition 5.1 implies convergence of the dimer height function when the weights are given by (1.5) and (1.6).

Proposition 5.2. *Consider the square lattice with weights (1.5) and the directed triangular lattices with weights (1.6). Let $h^{(\Delta),\delta}$ denote the height function of the biperiodic dimer on the dimer graph G^δ (either the square lattice with half the mesh size, or the hexagonal lattice respectively). Then $h^{(\Delta),\delta}$ converges to the same limit, in the sense that if f is a test function,*

then

$$(h^{(\Delta),\delta}, f) \rightarrow (h^{(\Delta)}, f)$$

converges in law and in the sense of moments. Here $h^{(\Delta),\delta}$ is identified with a function defined on all Ω which is constant on each face of G^δ , and the inner product above is simply the L^2 inner product of square integrable functions.

Proof. Again, we only write the argument in the case of the square lattice, and leave the triangular case (which is entirely similar) to the reader. The convergence of the loop-erased random walk, applied iteratively using Wilson's algorithm, implies the convergence of the uniform spanning tree \mathcal{T} with weights (1.5) and (1.6) in the Schramm topology ([Sch99]). Recall that this tree is identical to the tree one obtains from applying the Temperley bijection to the biperiodic dimer model with weights (1.5) and (1.6). We apply a general theorem (Theorem 8.1 in [BLR19]) in order to deduce convergence of the height function. The theorem, which follows the approach originating in [BLR20], is particularly simple to apply on simply connected domains, which is our situation. The assumptions of that theorem in this simplified situations are as follows:

- There exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds. For any vertex $v \in v(\Omega^\delta)$, for any interior point $z \in \Omega$, if $r = |v - z| \wedge \text{dist}(v, \partial\Omega) \wedge \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$ and if γ is the loop-erasure of the random walk starting from v and killed when it leaves Ω , then for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}_v^{(\Delta)}(\gamma \cap B(z, r\epsilon) \neq \emptyset) \leq \epsilon^c, \quad (5.4)$$

in other words γ is polynomially unlikely to enter a small ball near z .

- There exists $C, c > 0$ and for every $k \geq 1$ there is a constant M_k such that the following holds. For any $v \in v(\Omega^\delta)$, let γ denote the loop-erasure of the random walk starting from v and killed when it leaves Ω , parameterised from v to $\partial\Omega$. For all $r > 0$, let σ_r denote the first time it leaves $B(v, r)$ and τ_r the last time it is in $B(v, er)$. For $s < t$, let $W(\gamma[s, t])$ denote the intrinsic winding of the path $\gamma([s, t])$ (that is, on a graph where all edges are straight, the sum of the turning angles of γ during that interval of time). Then for every $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_v^{(\Delta)}\left[\sup_{\sigma_r \leq s \leq t \leq \tau_r} |W(\gamma[s, t])|^k\right] \leq M_k, \quad (5.5)$$

in other words the winding of the path γ at any scale r is of order one.

The proofs in [BLR20] of both these facts for the random walk on Ω^δ relies on nothing but the uniform crossing estimate of (4.1); in fact Proposition 4.4 of [BLR20] and Proposition 4.12 of [BLR20] are stated for general random walks on embedded planar graphs subject to the uniform crossing estimate (convergence to Brownian motion is also assumed throughout that section, but plainly that assumption is only used to identify the law of the limit of loop-erased random walk). Hence Proposition 4.4 of [BLR20] applies and yields (5.4); and Proposition 4.12 of [BLR20] also applies and yields uniform stretched exponential tails hence (5.5). This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2.

It is also possible to deduce (5.4) and (5.5) from the Proposition 4.4 of [BLR20] and Proposition 4.12 of [BLR20] (applied to the usual driftless random walk on the square lattice) and the following result, which gives a control on the Radon–Nikodym derivative and may be of independent interest:

Lemma 5.3. *There exist $q > 1$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that for all δ small enough, $\mathbb{E}_v^{(0)}(e^{q(M_\tau - \frac{1}{2}V_\tau)}) \leq C$. In other words, the Radon–Nikodym derivative is uniformly bounded in L^q for some $q > 1$.*

Let us first see how Lemma 5.3 may be used to finish the proof of (5.4) and (5.5). Consider for instance (5.4). Fix $q > 1$ as in Lemma 5.3. Let $p > 1$ such that $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Using Hölder’s inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_v^{(\Delta)}(\gamma \cap B(z, r\epsilon) \neq \emptyset) &= \mathbb{E}_v^{(0)}[1_{\{\gamma \cap B(z, r\epsilon) \neq \emptyset\}} e^{M_\tau - \frac{1}{2}V_\tau}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_v^{(0)}[\gamma \cap B(z, r\epsilon) \neq \emptyset]^{1/p} \cdot \mathbb{E}_v^{(0)}[e^{qM_\tau - \frac{q}{2}V_\tau}]^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

so using Proposition 4.4 of [BLR20] we obtain (5.4). The same argument also implies (5.5). It remains to give the proof of Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Fix $q > 1$ and consider qM_τ . This is the martingale associated to a new set of weights $c_1^{(q)}, \dots, c_4^{(q)}$ implicitly defined by the equation (cf. (2.1) and (2.5)):

$$1 + \delta c_i^{(q)} = (1 + \delta c_i)^q; \quad i = 1, \dots, 3 \text{ or } 4.$$

Note that $c_i^{(q)} = qc_i + o(1)$ when $\delta \rightarrow 0$; let us write the corresponding drift vector field by $\Delta^{(q)}$. This has an associated quadratic variation process defined in Lemma 2.9 which we will denote by $V^{(q)}$. Note that asymptotically as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $V_\tau^{(q)} = (1 + o(1))q^2V_\tau$ (where the $o(1)$ term is not random and uniform). We can thus write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_v^{(0)}[e^{q(M_\tau - \frac{1}{2}V_\tau)}] &= \mathbb{E}_v^{(\Delta^{(q)})}[e^{(1+o(1))(q^2 - q)\frac{1}{2}V_\tau}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_v^{(\Delta^{(q)})}[e^{(q^2 - q)C\delta^2\tau}]. \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to check that $\delta^2\tau$ has exponential moments of small order that are uniformly bounded. This is easily checked: indeed, using the argument in (5.3), since Ω is bounded, we obtain that in every δ^{-2} units of time there is a positive probability of leaving Ω , uniformly over the starting position (and uniformly over $q > 1$ close to 1). Iterating this over many intervals of time we get independent trials to leave Ω which succeed with some fixed positive probability. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_v^{(\Delta^{(q)})}[e^{(q^2 - q)C\delta^2\tau}] \leq C < \infty$$

by choosing q sufficiently close to 1, as desired. □

This concludes the proof of Proposition 5.2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 1.4. All that remains to prove is the conformal covariance of the limiting height function $h^{(\Delta); \Omega}$ (here we write explicitly the dependence on the domain Ω in order to avoid confusions). Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be another bounded simply connected domain and let $\tilde{\phi} : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \Omega$ be a conformal map with bounded derivative. Recall that we wish to show

$$h^{(\Delta); \Omega} \circ \tilde{\phi} = h^{(\tilde{\Delta}); \tilde{\Omega}}$$

where at a point $w \in \tilde{\Omega}$,

$$\tilde{\Delta}(w) = \overline{\phi'(w)} \cdot \Delta(\phi(w)). \tag{5.6}$$

Let $\tilde{\Omega}^\delta$ denote the square lattice with mesh size δ intersected with $\tilde{\Omega}$. The idea is simply to apply the same chain of arguments as in Proposition 5.1 and 5.2 but with the graphs $\phi(\tilde{\Omega}^\delta)$ in Ω . Indeed the structure of the square lattice was only used in Proposition 5.1 to prove the crossing estimate via an absolute continuity argument. Since ϕ has bounded derivative, it is clear that the crossing estimate is valid also in $\phi(\tilde{\Omega}^\delta)$. The scaling limit of the corresponding random walk is necessarily the image by ϕ of a Brownian motion with drift $\tilde{\Delta}$ in Ω . Applying Itô's formula and the Cauchy–Riemann equations, one checks that Δ and $\tilde{\Delta}$ are related via (5.6).

Likewise (5.4) and (5.5) are trivially verified in $\phi(\tilde{\Omega}^\delta)$ because they are verified in $\tilde{\Omega}^\delta$ and ϕ has bounded derivative. The dimer model associated to $\phi(\tilde{G}^\delta)$ is the image by ϕ of the dimer model on \tilde{G}^δ and has a height function which necessarily converges to $h^{(\tilde{\Delta});\tilde{\Omega}} \circ \phi^{-1}$ in Ω . On the other hand, the law of the limiting Temperleyan tree is uniquely determined by the law of its branches, which by Theorem 4.1 are off-critical radial SLE₂ with limiting drift vector field Δ , as described in (4.3). We conclude that, in law,

$$h^{(\tilde{\Delta});\tilde{\Omega}} \circ \phi^{-1} = h^{(\Delta),\Omega},$$

as desired. □

References

- [AP21] Juhan Aru and Ellen Powell. A characterisation of the continuum Gaussian free field in $d \geq 2$ dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07273*, 2021.
- [BBC09] Michel Bauer, Denis Bernard, and Luigi Cantini. Off-critical SLE(2) and SLE(4): A field theory approach. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2009(7), 2009.
- [BBK08] Michel Bauer, Denis Bernard, and Kalle Kytölä. LERW as an example of off-critical SLEs. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 132(4):721–754, 6 2008.
- [BDW20] Stéphane Benoist, Laure Dumaz, and Wendelin Werner. Near-critical spanning forests and renormalization. *The Annals of Probability*, 48(4):1980–2013, 2020.
- [BLR19] Nathanaël Berestycki, Benoit Laslier, and Gourab Ray. The dimer model on Riemann surfaces, I. *Preprint*, 8 2019.
- [BLR20] Nathanaël Berestycki, Benoît Laslier, and Gourab Ray. Dimers and imaginary geometry. *The Annals of Probability*, 48(1):1–52, 3 2020.
- [BLR22] Nathanaël Berestycki, Benoit Laslier, and Gourab Ray. The dimer model on Riemann surfaces, II. *In preparation*, 2022.
- [BN14] Nathanaël Berestycki and James Norris. Lectures on Schramm-Loewner Evolution. 2014.
- [BPR20] Nathanaël Berestycki, Ellen Powell, and Gourab Ray. A characterisation of the Gaussian free field. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 176(3):1259–1301, 2020.
- [BPR21] Nathanaël Berestycki, Ellen Powell, and Gourab Ray. $1 + \varepsilon$ moments suffice to characterise the GFF. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 26:1–25, 2021.

- [BW20] Roland Bauerschmidt and Christian Webb. The Coleman correspondence at the free Fermion point. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07096*, 2020.
- [Cam13] Federico Camia. Off-criticality and the massive Brownian loop soup. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.6068*, 2013.
- [Che16] Dmitry Chelkak. Robust discrete complex analysis: A toolbox. *The Annals of Probability*, 44(1):628–683, 1 2016.
- [Chh12] Sunil Chhita. The Height Fluctuations of an Off-Critical Dimer Model on the Square Grid. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 148(1):67–88, 2012.
- [CIM21] Dmitry Chelkak, Konstantin Izyurov, and Rémy Mahfouf. Universality of spin correlations in the Ising model on isoradial graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.12858*, 2021.
- [CJN20] Federico Camia, Jianping Jiang, and Charles M Newman. Conformal measure ensembles and planar Ising magnetization: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08129*, 2020.
- [CW19] Dmitry Chelkak and Yijun Wan. On the convergence of massive loop-erased random walks to massive SLE(2) curves. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08045>, 2019.
- [DCGP14] Hugo Duminil-Copin, Christophe Garban, and Gábor Pete. The near-critical planar FK-Ising model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 326(1):1–35, 2014.
- [DCM20] Hugo Duminil-Copin and Ioan Manolescu. Planar random-cluster model: scaling relations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.15090*, 2020.
- [Dub11] Julien Dubédat. Exact bosonization of the Ising model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1112.4399*, 2011.
- [Fre75] David A Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *Annals of Probability*, 3:100–118, 1975.
- [Gor21] Vadim Gorin. *Lectures on random lozenge tilings*, volume 193. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [GPS13] Christophe Garban, Gábor Pete, and Oded Schramm. Pivotal, cluster, and interface measures for critical planar percolation. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 26(4):939–1024, 2013.
- [GPS18] Christophe Garban, Gábor Pete, and Oded Schramm. The scaling limits of near-critical and dynamical percolation. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 20(5):1195–1268, 2018.
- [Kar18] Alex Karrila. Limits of conformal images and conformal images of limits for planar random curves. *arXiv:1810.05608*, 2018.
- [Kas61] P. W. Kasteleyn. The statistics of dimers on a lattice. I. The number of dimer arrangements on a quadratic lattice. *Physica*, 27(12):1209–1225, 12 1961.
- [Ken00] Richard Kenyon. Conformal invariance of domino tiling. *Annals of probability*, 28:759–795, 2000.

- [Ken01] Richard Kenyon. Dominos and the Gaussian free field. *Annals of Probability*, 29:1128–1137, 2001.
- [KPW00] Richard W. Kenyon, James G. Propp, and David B. Wilson. Trees and matchings. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 7(1 R):1–34, 2000.
- [KS17] Antti Kemppainen and Stanislav Smirnov. Random curves, scaling limits and Loewner evolutions. *Annals of Probability*, 45(2):698–779, 3 2017.
- [Law] Gregory F Lawler. *Intersections of Random Walks*. Springer New York.
- [Law08] Gregory F. Lawler. *Conformally Invariant Processes in the Plane*. American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [LG16] Jean-François Le Gall. *Brownian Motion, Martingales, and Stochastic Calculus*, volume 274 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.
- [LL10] Gregory F Lawler and Vlada Limic. *Random walk: a modern introduction*, volume 123. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [LRV17] Hubert Lacoïn, Rémi Rhodes, and Vincent Vargas. Semiclassical limit of Liouville field theory. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 273(3):875–916, 2017.
- [LSW01] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm, and Wendelin Werner. Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Annals of Probability*, 32(1 B):939–995, 12 2001.
- [MS10] Nikolai Makarov and Stanislav Smirnov. Off-critical lattice models and massive SLEs. *XVIIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics*, pages 362–371, 2010.
- [NW09] Pierre Nolin and Wendelin Werner. Asymmetry of near-critical percolation interfaces. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 22(3):797–819, 2009.
- [Par18] SC Park. Massive scaling limit of the Ising model: subcritical analysis and isomonodromy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.06636*, 2018.
- [Pom92] Christian Pommerenke. *Boundary Behaviour of Conformal Maps*, volume 299. 1992.
- [Sch99] Oded Schramm. Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 118(1):221–288, 4 1999.
- [TF61] H. N. V. Temperley and Michael E. Fisher. Dimer problem in statistical mechanics—an exact result. *The Philosophical Magazine: A Journal of Theoretical Experimental and Applied Physics*, 6(68):1061–1063, 1961.
- [YY11] Ariel Yadin and Amir Yehudayoff. Loop-erased random walk and Poisson kernel on planar graphs. *Annals of Probability*, 39(4):1243–1285, 7 2011.