

# POTTS AND RANDOM CLUSTER MEASURES ON LOCALLY REGULAR-TREE-LIKE GRAPHS

ANIRBAN BASAK, AMIR DEMBO, AND ALLAN SLY

**ABSTRACT.** Fixing  $\beta \geq 0$  and an integer  $q \geq 2$ , consider the ferromagnetic  $q$ -Potts measures  $\mu_n^{\beta,B}$  on finite graphs  $\mathbf{G}_n$  on  $n$  vertices, with external field strength  $B \geq 0$  and the corresponding random cluster measures  $\varphi_n^{q,\beta,B}$ . Suppose that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  the uniformly sparse graphs  $\mathbf{G}_n$  converge locally to an infinite  $d$ -regular tree  $\mathbb{T}_d$ ,  $d \geq 3$ . We show that the convergence of the Potts free energy density to its Bethe-Peirls replica symmetric prediction (which has been proved in case  $d$  is even, or when  $B = 0$ ), yields the local weak convergence of  $\varphi_n^{q,\beta,B}$  and  $\mu_n^{\beta,B}$  to the corresponding free or wired random cluster measure, Potts measure, respectively, on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . The choice of free versus wired limit is according to which has the larger Potts Bethe functional value, with mixtures of these two appearing as limit points on the critical line  $\beta_c(q, B)$  where these two values of the Bethe functional coincide. For  $B = 0$  and  $\beta > \beta_c$ , we further establish a pure-state decomposition by showing that conditionally on the same dominant color  $1 \leq k \leq q$ , the  $q$ -Potts measures on such edge-expander graphs  $\mathbf{G}_n$  converge locally to the  $q$ -Potts measure on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  with a boundary wired at color  $k$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a finite graph  $\mathbf{G} = (V, E)$ , parameters  $\beta, B \in \mathbb{R}$  and an integer  $q \geq 2$ , the Potts measure  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}(\cdot)$  on  $\mathbf{G}$  is a probability measure on  $[q]^V$ , given by

$$\mu_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}(\underline{\sigma}) := \frac{1}{Z_{\mathbf{G}}(\beta, B)} \exp \left\{ \beta \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} + B \sum_{i \in V} \delta_{\sigma_i, 1} \right\}, \quad \underline{\sigma} \in [q]^V,$$

where  $\delta_{\sigma, \sigma'} := \mathbf{1}\{\sigma = \sigma'\}$  and  $Z_{\mathbf{G}}(\beta, B)$  is the normalizing constant (commonly known as the *partition function*). Setting  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , our goal here is to characterize the limits, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , of Potts measures in the ferromagnetic regime  $\beta, B \geq 0$ , for *uniformly sparse* graphs  $\{\mathbf{G}_n := ([n], E_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  that converge locally to the  $d$ -regular infinite tree  $\mathbb{T}_d := (\mathbb{T}_d, o)$  rooted at a distinguished vertex  $o$ , as defined next.

**Definition 1.1** (Uniform sparsity and local weak convergence of graphs). A sequence of graphs  $\mathbf{G}_n = ([n], E_n)$  (possibly random) is *uniformly sparse*, if

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n[\Delta_{I_n} \mathbf{1}\{\Delta_{I_n} \geq L\}] = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $I_n$  is uniform on  $[n]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_n$  denotes the expectation with respect to the (possible) randomness of the graph  $\mathbf{G}_n$  and the randomly chosen vertex  $I_n$ , and  $\Delta_i$  denotes the degree of a vertex  $i \in [n]$ . Given a graph  $\mathbf{G}$  (possibly infinite), and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{B}_{v, \mathbf{G}}(t)$  be the subgraph induced by  $\{v' \in V(\mathbf{G}) : \text{dist}_{\mathbf{G}}(v, v') \leq t\}$ , for the graph distance  $\text{dist}_{\mathbf{G}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  on  $\mathbf{G}$ , writing  $\mathbf{B}_v(t)$  when  $\mathbf{G}$  is clear from the context and  $\mathbb{T}_d(t) := \mathbf{B}_{o, \mathbb{T}_d}(t)$ . A sequence  $\mathbf{G}_n = ([n], E_n)$  is said to *converge locally weakly* to  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_{I_n}(t) \not\cong \mathbb{T}_d(t))] = 0, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1.2)$$

*Date:* February 21, 2025.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K35, 82B20, 82B26.

*Key words and phrases.* Potts model, random cluster measure, random sparse graphs, local weak convergence.

and by a slight abuse of notation, we write  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  when both (1.1) and (1.2) hold.

It is widely believed that statistical physics models on large locally tree-like graphs are a good proxy for models on the integer lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  for large  $d$  or for those with long interaction range, and therefore the study of such models on locally tree-like graphs is considered a test bed for *mean-field theory*. Based on the *cavity method* physicists predict that, for a wide class of ferromagnetic spin systems, the asymptotic *free energy density* is given by the *Bethe-Peirls prediction*, the maximum of the *Bethe free energy functional* (see Definition 1.3 below) over all ‘meaningful’ fixed points of the *belief propagation equations* (cf. [16, Chapter 17] and the references therein. See also [7, Chapter 3] for a mathematical treatment of this prediction, in the replica-symmetric regime, which is expected to hold for all ferromagnetic models). In the large  $n$  limit, the relative probabilities of these meaningful fixed points, commonly termed as the ‘pure states’, are further conjectured to be dictated by their respective Bethe free energies. In particular, if the Bethe free energy is maximized by a unique pure state then the ferromagnetic spin system, in the large  $n$  limit, is governed by that pure state, while if there are multiple maximizers then the system be governed in the limit by a mixture of such maximizers. While these conjectures been in the physics literature for quite some time, verifying them rigorously poses serious mathematical challenges. In this paper, we prove the latter conjecture for the ferromagnetic Potts model, with an external magnetic field, on locally tree-like graphs when the limiting tree is a regular tree.

After a series of works, the Bethe-Peirls prediction for the free energy density of Ising measures (namely, Potts measures with  $q = 2$ ), on locally tree-like graphs was rigorously established in [9] in full generality (see the references in [8] for a historical account). In the context of the limit of Ising measures on locally tree-like graphs, the first success was attained in [17], where they showed that under the assumption  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  the measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta, B}$ , for  $q = 2$ , locally weakly convergence to the free or wired/plus Ising measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  (the choice of limit depends on whether both  $B = 0$  and  $\beta > \beta_c$ , with  $\beta_c$  being the critical inverse temperature, or not). Such local weak convergence has been strengthened in [1] to show that it holds for a much larger collection of graph sequences  $\{\mathbf{G}_n\}$ , covering also sequences that converge locally to certain non-regular, possibly random trees (e.g. to a multi-type Galton-Watson tree of minimum degree  $d_{\min} \geq 3$ ).

As mentioned above, this phenomenon should extend to Potts measures with  $q \geq 3$ . However, as explained in the sequel, proving such a convergence is way more challenging, especially for the two-dimensional region of parameters  $\mathbf{R}_{\neq}$ , where a-priori two different scenarios are possible for such a limit law. The emergence of the two-dimensional region  $\mathbf{R}_{\neq}$  is due to the presence of two distinct phase transitions for the Potts measures with  $q \geq 3$  on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ : the uniqueness/non-uniqueness transition and the disordered/ordered transition, a phenomenon absent in the Ising setting. Moreover, on the critical line  $\mathbf{R}_c$  within  $\mathbf{R}_{\neq}$ , where the Bethe free energies of both meaningful belief propagation fixed points are the same, the predicted limit is a mixture of both pure states, a behavior also absent in the Ising case.

We note in passing that the phase diagram of Potts measures, and in particular the local weak convergence of  $\mu_n^{\beta, B} := \mu_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta, B}$ , is related to algorithmic questions of much current interest (see [12, Section 1.2] and the references therein, where  $B = 0$ ). Such convergence is also related to the metastability of the Glauber dynamics and of the Swendsen-Wang chain for  $\mu_n^{\beta, B}$ , as well as the non-reconstructions of the paramagnetic and ferromagnetic states when  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_{\neq}$  (for  $B = 0$ , see [5] and the references therein for a list representative works in this area).

To state our result about such convergence of Potts measures  $\mu_n^{\beta, B}$  when  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ , we proceed to define the Potts measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  that one expects to find in the limit.

**Definition 1.2** (Potts on trees, with given boundary conditions). For each  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ddagger \in [q] \cup \{f\}$  consider the following Potts measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d(t)$ :

$$\mu_{\ddagger,t}^{\beta,B}(\underline{\sigma}) = \mu_{\ddagger,\mathbb{T}_d,t}^{\beta,B}(\underline{\sigma}) \propto \exp \left\{ \beta \sum_{(i,j) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d(t))} \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} + B \sum_{i \in V(\mathbb{T}_d(t))} \delta_{\sigma_i, 1} \right\} \prod_{u \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)} \tilde{\nu}_{\ddagger}(du)$$

where  $\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t) := V(\mathbb{T}_d(t)) \setminus V(\mathbb{T}_d(t-1))$ ,  $\tilde{\nu}_f$  is the uniform measure on  $[q]$ , and  $\tilde{\nu}_{\ddagger}$  is the Dirac measure at  $\ddagger$  for  $\ddagger \in [q]$ . The Potts measure with  $\ddagger$  boundary condition  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\ddagger,\mathbb{T}_d,t}^{\beta,B}$  exists (in the sense of weak convergence over  $[q]^{V(\mathbb{T}_d)}$  with its cylindrical  $\sigma$ -algebra), for any  $\beta, B \geq 0$  and  $\ddagger \in \{f, 1\}$ , and  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,0}$  also exists for any  $\ddagger \in [q]$  and  $\beta \geq 0$  (see [13, Chapter IV, Corollary 1.30], in case  $q = 2$ , and Remark A.1 for an outline of the proof when  $q \geq 3$ ).

For  $q = 2$ , if  $B > 0$  or  $\beta \leq \beta_c(d)$  the measures  $\mu_1^{\beta,B}$  and  $\mu_f^{\beta,B}$  coincide (see [9, Section 4.1]), while for any  $\beta > \beta_c(d)$  the measures  $\mu_1^{\beta,0}$  and  $\mu_f^{\beta,0}$  differ (see [14]). As mentioned earlier, for  $q \geq 3$  the picture is more delicate and the two-dimensional non-uniqueness region  $R_{\neq}$  of  $(\beta, B)$  values where  $\mu_1^{\beta,B} \neq \mu_f^{\beta,B}$  (see [9, Theorem 1.11]), plays a significant role in describing our results. Indeed, within this region, the limit is determined by the relation between the free energy densities of  $\mu_n^{\beta,B}$

$$\Phi_n(\beta, B) := \frac{1}{n} \log Z_{\mathbb{G}_n}(\beta, B), \quad (1.3)$$

and the Bethe (free energy) functional at certain Bethe recursion fixed points, which we define next.

**Definition 1.3** (Bethe functional; Bethe recursion and its fixed points). Denoting by  $\mathcal{P}([q])$  the set of all probabilities on  $[q]$ , the Bethe functional  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}([q]) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\Phi(\nu) = \Phi^{\beta,B}(\nu) := \log \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in [q]} e^{B\delta_{\sigma,1}} \left( (e^{\beta} - 1)\nu(\sigma) + 1 \right)^d \right\} - \frac{d}{2} \log \left\{ (e^{\beta} - 1) \sum_{\sigma \in [q]} \nu(\sigma)^2 + 1 \right\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Of primary interest to us is the value of  $\Phi(\cdot)$  at  $\nu_f^{\beta,B}$  and at  $\nu_1^{\beta,B}$ . The latter are the fixed points of the Bethe recursion  $\text{BP} : \mathcal{P}([q]) \mapsto \mathcal{P}([q])$

$$(\text{BP}\nu)(\sigma) := \frac{1}{z_{\nu}} e^{B\delta_{\sigma,1}} \left( (e^{\beta} - 1)\nu(\sigma) + 1 \right)^{d-1}, \quad \sigma \in [q], \quad (1.5)$$

(with  $z_{\nu}$  denoting the corresponding normalizing constant), obtained as the limit of successive iterations of BP starting from the uniform probability measure on  $[q]$  and from the probability measure supported on spin 1, respectively (cf. [9, Page 4208, Section 4.3] for the existence of both limits, which we also denote as  $\nu_f$  and  $\nu_1$ , respectively).

Throughout this paper we make the following assumption on  $\mathbb{G}_n$  and the Potts free energy densities  $\Phi_n(\beta, B)$  on them.

**Assumption 1.4.** Fix  $\beta, B \geq 0$  and integer  $q \geq 2$ . Suppose  $\mathbb{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  for some  $d \geq 3$  and also

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(\beta, B) = \max \{ \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta,B}), \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta,B}) \}. \quad (1.6)$$

For Ising measures (namely  $q = 2$ ), the identity (1.6) holds for any  $\beta, B \geq 0$ ,  $d \geq 3$  and  $\mathbb{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  (see [9]). While widely believed to extend to all  $q, d \geq 3$ , this has been verified only for  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$  (see [9, 8]), or when  $\mathbb{G}_n$  are  $d$ -regular and  $B = 0$  (see [2], following upon [12] which required large  $q \geq d^{Cd}$  and  $d \geq 5$ ). See also the analysis in [10] of the first and second moments of  $Z_{\mathbb{G}_n}(\beta, B)$  for uniformly random  $d$ -regular  $\mathbb{G}_n$ .

In view of (1.6), we expect for  $B > 0$  to arrive at a limit law  $\mu_f^{\beta,B}, \mu_1^{\beta,B}$  or a mixture thereof, according to the partition of  $\mathbb{R}_\neq$  to  $\mathbb{R}_f, \mathbb{R}_1,$  and  $\mathbb{R}_c$  which correspond, respectively, to whether  $\Phi(\nu_f)$  is larger, smaller, or equal to  $\Phi(\nu_1)$ . Thus, prior to stating our limit theorem, we first describe the shape of this partition of  $\mathbb{R}_\neq$  (taken mostly from the literature, with a few items supplemented in Appendix A). See also Figure 1 for a pictorial representation of this description.

**Proposition 1.5** (Description of the non-uniqueness region). *Fix  $q, d \geq 3$ .*

*There exist  $0 < B_+ = B_+(q, d) < \infty$  and smooth curves  $\beta_f, \beta_c,$  and  $\beta_+$  defined on  $[0, B_+]$ , with  $0 < \beta_f(B) < \beta_c(B) < \beta_+(B)$  for  $B \in [0, B_+)$  and  $\beta_f(B_+) = \beta_c(B_+) = \beta_+(B_+)$  such that*

$$\mathbb{R}_\neq := \{(\beta', B') \in (0, \infty)^2 : 0 < B' < B_+, \beta' \in [\beta_f(B'), \beta_+(B')]\} \cup \{(\beta', 0) : \beta' \geq \beta_f(0)\}, \quad (1.7)$$

and the following holds:

(i) *If  $(\beta, B) \in [0, \infty)^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}_\neq$  then  $\nu_f = \nu_1$  and consequently, also*

$$\mu_1^{\beta,B} = \mu_f^{\beta,B}, \quad \text{whenever} \quad B > 0, \quad (1.8)$$

$$\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,0} = \mu_f^{\beta,0} \quad \text{for all } \ddagger \in [q], \quad B = 0. \quad (1.9)$$

(ii) *If  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_\neq$  then  $\nu_f(1) < \nu_1(1)$ . Further, setting*

$$\mathbb{R}_f := \{(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_\neq : \beta < \beta_c(B)\}, \mathbb{R}_1 := \{(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_\neq : \beta > \beta_c(B)\}, \mathbb{R}_c := \mathbb{R}_\neq \setminus (\mathbb{R}_f \cup \mathbb{R}_1), \quad (1.10)$$

we have that

$$\begin{cases} \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta,B}) > \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta,B}) & \text{if } (\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_f, \\ \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta,B}) = \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta,B}) & \text{if } (\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_c, \\ \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta,B}) < \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta,B}) & \text{if } (\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

Note that from Proposition 1.5, for  $B = 0$ , we have  $\mu_f^{\beta,0} \neq \mu_1^{\beta,0}$  for any  $\beta \in [\beta_f(0), \infty)$ . Thus  $\beta_f(0)$  is the so called uniqueness/non-uniqueness transition threshold. On the other hand, as will be evident from Theorems 1.12 and 1.18 below,  $\beta_c(0) (> \beta_f(0))$  is the disordered/ordered transition threshold. This is in stark contrast to the Ising setting where  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_f$  only when  $B = 0$  and  $\beta > \beta_c$ .

The resolution of the Ising case in [17, 1] crucially relies on the FKG inequality for a stochastic ordering of the edge-correlations for all plausible local marginals of  $\mu_n^{\beta,0}$  between those two extreme candidates. Lacking such monotonicity property when  $q \geq 3$ , we instead couple each Potts measure on  $\mathbb{G}_n$  with the corresponding random cluster measure (RCM), thereby allowing us to utilize the FKG property of the latter, and for doing so when  $B > 0$ , we first amend our graphs by a *ghost vertex*.

**Definition 1.6** (Amending graphs by a ghost vertex). From a finite or infinite graph  $\mathbb{G} = (V, E)$  we get  $\mathbb{G}^*$  by adding from every  $v \in V$  an edge to the additional *ghost vertex*  $v^*$ . That is,  $\mathbb{G}^* = (V^*, E^*)$  for  $V^* := V \cup \{v^*\}$  and  $E^* := E \cup \{(v, v^*), v \in V\}$ . With a slight abuse of notation, for any  $i \in V$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , we take for  $\mathbb{B}_i^*(t)$  the subgraph  $\mathbb{B}_{i,\mathbb{G}}(t)$  amended by  $v^*$  and all edges between  $v^*$  and  $\mathbb{B}_{i,\mathbb{G}}(t)$ . That is,  $V(\mathbb{B}_i^*(t)) = V(\mathbb{B}_i(t)) \cup \{v^*\}$  and  $E(\mathbb{B}_i^*(t)) = E(\mathbb{B}_i(t)) \cup \{(v, v^*) : v \in V(\mathbb{B}_i(t))\}$ . We likewise set  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(t) := \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)$  for the root  $o$  of  $\mathbb{T}_d$  (whereby  $\mathbb{T}_d^*$  is also the increasing limit of  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(t)$  as  $t \uparrow \infty$ ). Denoting by  $\mathcal{G}(t)$  the collection of all rooted graphs  $(\mathbb{G}, o)$  of depth  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  (namely, with all vertices at distance at most  $t$  from the root  $o$ ), and correspondingly setting  $\mathcal{G}^*(t) := \{\mathbb{B}_o^*(t) : (\mathbb{G}, o) \in \mathcal{G}(t)\}$ , we further see that  $\mathbb{B}_i^*(t) \in \mathcal{G}^*(t)$  for any  $i \in V(\mathbb{G})$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

As promised, we proceed with the definition of the RCM on  $\mathbb{G}^*$  that corresponds to the  $q$ -Potts measure  $\mu_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta,B}$ , for a finite graph  $\mathbb{G}$ .

**Definition 1.7** (Random cluster measure for a finite graph). Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a finite graph and  $G^*$  be as in Definition 1.6. Fixing  $q > 0$ , the RCM with external field  $B \geq 0$  and percolation parameter  $\beta \geq 0$ , is the probability measure on subgraphs of  $G^*$ , given by

$$\varphi_G^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}) \propto \left[ \prod_{e \in E^*} p_e^{\eta_e} (1 - p_e)^{1 - \eta_e} \right] q^{|\mathcal{C}(\underline{\eta})|}, \quad \underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E^*},$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(\underline{\eta}) = \mathcal{C}_{G^*}(\underline{\eta})$  denotes the collection of connected components for edge configuration  $\underline{\eta}$ ,  $|A|$  denotes the size of a finite set  $A$  and

$$p_e := \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-\beta} & \text{if } e \in E \\ 1 - e^{-B} & \text{if } e \in E^* \setminus E \end{cases}. \quad (1.12)$$

Summing  $\varphi_G^{\beta, B}(\cdot)$  over bonds configurations on  $E^* \setminus E$ , yields an alternative RCM with external field

$$\tilde{\varphi}_G^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}) \propto \prod_{e \in E} p_e^{\eta_e} (1 - p_e)^{1 - \eta_e} \prod_{C \in \mathcal{C}(\underline{\eta})} (1 + (q - 1)e^{-B|C|}), \quad \underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^E \quad (1.13)$$

(now without a ghost vertex, see also [3] for such RCM-s in the presence of several external fields).

**Remark 1.8.** For a lighter presentation, we use the notation  $\varphi_G^{\beta, B}$  and call this measure the RCM on  $G$ , even though in case  $B > 0$  it is actually a measure on  $G^*$ . We further use the shorthand  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B}$  for  $\varphi_{G_n}^{\beta, B}$ , where  $\{G_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of graphs under consideration. Anticipating our Edwards-Sokal coupling of  $\varphi_G^{\beta, B}$  with the  $q$ -Potts measure  $\mu_G^{\beta, B}$  (cf. Section 2), we have opted to index the RCM in Definition 1.7 by  $\beta$  instead of  $p$ . Indeed, for  $\varphi_G^{\beta, B}$  the Edwards-Sokal coupling yields a nicer conditional distribution of the spin (Potts) variables given the bond (RCM) variables  $\underline{\eta}$ , than what we get if using instead  $\tilde{\varphi}_G^{\beta, B}$  (compare Lemma 2.2(ii) and [8, Eqn. (17)]). However, for  $B = 0$  necessarily  $\eta_e = 0$  at any edge  $e \in E^* \setminus E$ , with  $\varphi_G^{\beta, 0}(\cdot) = \tilde{\varphi}_G^{\beta, 0}(\cdot)$  thus matching the *standard* RCM definition (see [11, Section 1.2]).

Since our proof of the local weak limits for  $\mu_n^{\beta, B}$  goes via a coupling of those measures with  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B}$ , it also requires us to identify the local weak limits of  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B}$ . Similarly to the Potts case, these involve the special choices of free and wired RCM on  $\mathbb{T}_d^*$ , which we define next.

**Definition 1.9** (The free and the wired RCM-s on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ ). Suppose first that  $B > 0$ . Fixing  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\hat{B}_i^*(t)$  be the graph  $B_i^*(t)$  amended by all edges of the star graph  $K^*(\partial B_i(t))$  for ghost  $v^*$  and the complete graph  $K(\partial B_i(t))$  on  $\partial B_i(t)$ . In case  $G = (\mathbb{T}_d, o)$ , we denote  $\hat{B}_o^*(t)$  by  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t)$ , calling hereafter the edges of  $K^*(\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t))$  as *boundary edges* of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t)$  (there are in  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t)$  two distinct copies of each edge between  $v^*$  and  $\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)$ , but only one of them is a boundary edge). Let  $f(f) = 0$  and  $f(w) = 1$ , setting for  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$  the probability measures

$$\varphi_{\dagger, t}^{\beta, B}(\cdot) := \varphi_{\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t)}^{\beta, B}(\cdot \mid \eta_e = f(\dagger), \text{ for all } e \in E(K^*(\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)))), \quad (1.14)$$

and define the wired and the free RCM on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  with parameters  $\beta$  and  $B$ , as their limits

$$\varphi_w^{\beta, B} := \lim_{t \uparrow \infty} \varphi_{w, t}^{\beta, B} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_f^{\beta, B} := \lim_{t \uparrow \infty} \varphi_{f, t}^{\beta, B} \quad (1.15)$$

(when  $B > 0$  these are actually measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d^*$ ). Similar to Definition 1.2, the limits in (1.15) are in the sense of weak convergence of probability measures over  $\{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*)}$  with its cylindrical  $\sigma$ -algebra and the existence of these limits is straightforward (see the proof of Lemma 2.5). For  $B = 0$  the ghost  $v^*$  is an isolated vertex, so proceeding without it, we consider (1.14) for  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^o(t)$

based on  $\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  and  $\mathbb{K}(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t))$ , in lieu of  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t)$ ,  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(t)$  and  $\mathbb{K}^*(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t))$ , respectively. The measures  $\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,0}$  on  $\{0,1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d)}$  which are thereby defined via (1.15), match the standard notion of free and wired RCM on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  (as defined in [11, Chapter 10]).

We note in passing the results of [4] about the asymptotic size and shape of the large connected components of the RCM for complete graphs  $\mathbb{G}_n = \mathbb{K}_n$ , at  $\beta = \lambda/n$  and  $B = 0$ .

Having defined the various parameter domains and candidate limit laws, we arrive at the final ingredient for stating our theorem, namely that of local weak convergence of probability measures, to which end we must first define the appropriate spaces of such measures.

**Definition 1.10** (Spaces of probability measures). Fixing finite sets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  (throughout this paper  $\mathcal{X} = [q]$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \{0,1\}$ ), we equip  $\mathcal{X}^{V(\mathbb{T}_d^*)} \times \mathcal{Y}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*)}$  with the product topology. We denote by  $\mathcal{P}_d^*$  the set of all Borel probability measures on  $\mathcal{X}^{V(\mathbb{T}_d^*)} \times \mathcal{Y}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*)}$ , endowed with the topology of weak convergence. Similarly, for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_d^{*,t}$  denote the set of all probability measures on the finite set  $\mathcal{X}^{V(\mathbb{T}_d^*(t))} \times \mathcal{Y}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*(t))}$ , equipping  $\mathcal{P}_d^*$  with the cylindrical  $\sigma$ -algebra that corresponds to  $\{\mathcal{P}_d^{*,t}, t \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Next, for a probability measure  $\mathfrak{m}$  on  $\mathcal{P}_d^*$  and any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote by  $\mathfrak{m}^t$  the (Borel) probability measure on  $\mathcal{P}_d^{*,t}$  obtained from  $\mathfrak{m}$  by projection, which we hereafter call the  $t$ -dimensional marginal of  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Utilizing Definition 1.10, we next define the local weak convergence of probability measures.

**Definition 1.11** (Local weak convergence of probability measures). Given graphs  $\mathbb{G}_n = ([n], E_n)$  and probability measures  $\zeta_n$  on  $\mathcal{X}^{[n] \cup \{v^*\}} \times \mathcal{Y}^{E_n^*}$ , for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \in [n]$ , let  $\mathbb{P}_{\zeta_n}^t(i)$  denote the law of the triplet  $(\mathbb{B}_i^*(t), \underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_i^*(t)}, \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_i^*(t)})$ , for  $(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}) \in \mathcal{X}^{[n] \cup \{v^*\}} \times \mathcal{Y}^{E_n^*}$  drawn according to the law  $\zeta_n$ . Combined with uniformly chosen  $I_n \in [n]$  this yields random distributions  $\mathbb{P}_{\zeta_n}^t(I_n)$ . While their first marginal can be anywhere in  $\mathcal{G}^*(t)$ , when  $\mathbb{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  it must converge to  $\delta_{\mathbb{T}_d^*(t)}$ . We then say that  $\{\zeta_n\}$  converges locally weakly to a probability measure  $\mathfrak{m}$  on  $\mathcal{P}_d^*$  if further  $\mathbb{P}_{\zeta_n}^t(I_n) \Rightarrow \delta_{\mathbb{T}_d^*(t)} \otimes \mathfrak{m}^t$  for any fixed  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where the notation  $\Rightarrow$  is used to denote the convergence in distribution in weak topology. In case  $\mathfrak{m} = \delta_\nu$  for some  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_d^*$ , we say that  $\{\zeta_n\}$  converge locally weakly in probability to  $\nu$ , denoted by  $\zeta_n \xrightarrow{lwc} \nu$ . Denoting the marginals of  $\zeta_n$  in the spin variables  $\underline{\sigma}$  and in the bond variables  $\underline{\eta}$ , by  $\zeta_{n,s}$  and  $\zeta_{n,b}$ , the local weak convergence of  $\{\zeta_{n,\ddagger}\}$  to  $\mathfrak{m}_\ddagger$  is similarly defined for  $\ddagger \in \{s, b\}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}_s$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_b$  are distributions over the set of probabilities on  $\mathcal{X}^{V(\mathbb{T}_d^*)}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*)}$ , respectively, and if  $\mathfrak{m}_\ddagger = \delta_{\nu_\ddagger}$  we say that  $\{\zeta_{n,\ddagger}\}$  converges locally weakly in probability to  $\nu_\ddagger$ , denoted by  $\zeta_{n,\ddagger} \xrightarrow{lwc} \nu_\ddagger$ . Lastly, if  $\zeta_{n,s}(\sigma_{v^*} = 1) = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\zeta_{n,s} \xrightarrow{lwc} \nu_s$ , we can and shall view  $\zeta_{n,s}$  and  $\nu_s$  as probability measures on  $\mathcal{X}^{[n]}$  and  $\mathcal{X}^{V(\mathbb{T}_d)}$ , respectively.

Introducing the notation

$$\mu_w^{\beta,B} := \begin{cases} \mu_1^{\beta,B} & \text{if } B > 0, \\ \frac{1}{q} \sum_{k=1}^q \mu_k^{\beta,0} & \text{if } B = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.16)$$

our first main result is the rigorous justification of the Bethe-Peirls replica-symmetric heuristic for our ferromagnetic Potts models. Namely, that at a non-critical  $\beta, B \geq 0$  the Potts laws  $\{\mu_n^{\beta,B}, n \gg 1\}$  are locally near  $\mu_f^{\beta,B}$  or near  $\mu_w^{\beta,B}$ , taking per  $(\beta, B)$  among these two limits the one with larger Bethe functional value.

**Theorem 1.12.** *Under Assumption 1.4, we have in terms of  $R_{\neq}$ ,  $R_f$ , and  $R_1$  of Proposition 1.5, the following limits:*

- (i) If  $(\beta, B) \in [0, \infty)^2 \setminus \mathbf{R}_\neq$  then  $\mu_n^{\beta, B} \xrightarrow{loc} \mu_f^{\beta, B} = \mu_w^{\beta, B}$  and  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B} \xrightarrow{loc} \varphi_f^{\beta, B} = \varphi_w^{\beta, B}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (ii) If  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_f$  then  $\mu_n^{\beta, B} \xrightarrow{loc} \mu_f^{\beta, B}$  and  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B} \xrightarrow{loc} \varphi_f^{\beta, B}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (iii) If  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_1$  then  $\mu_n^{\beta, B} \xrightarrow{loc} \mu_w^{\beta, B}$  and  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B} \xrightarrow{loc} \varphi_w^{\beta, B}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Further, only global mixtures of  $\mu_f^{\beta, B}$  and  $\mu_w^{\beta, B}$  may emerge as the limit points, at any parameter value on the critical line  $\mathbf{R}_c$  (where  $\Phi(\nu_f) = \Phi(\nu_w)$ ).

**Theorem 1.13.** *Let  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \geq 3$ . Then, for  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_c$ ,  $B > 0$  and any  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbf{T}_d$ , all local weak limit points of  $\{\mu_n^{\beta, B}\}$  and  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta, B}\}$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , are supported on*

$$\mathcal{M}_s^{\beta, B} := \{\alpha \mu_w^{\beta, B} + (1 - \alpha) \mu_f^{\beta, B}, \alpha \in [0, 1]\} \text{ and } \mathcal{M}_b^{\beta, B} := \{\alpha \varphi_w^{\beta, B} + (1 - \alpha) \varphi_f^{\beta, B}, \alpha \in [0, 1]\}, \quad (1.17)$$

respectively.

**Remark 1.14.** As  $\tilde{\varphi}_G^{\beta, B}$  is the marginal of  $\varphi_G^{\beta, B}$ , both Theorems 1.12 and 1.13 hold also for the former RCM-s (taking for the free and the wired RCM-s, the marginals of  $\varphi_f^{\beta, B}$  and  $\varphi_w^{\beta, B}$  on  $\{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbf{T}_d)}$ , respectively).

**Remark 1.15.** Recently [18], using results on the *sofic entropy* for a *sofic approximation* of the free group of rank  $d/2$  (for  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \geq 4$ ), has shown that for Potts measures with parameters  $(\beta, B) = (\beta_c(0), 0)$  on random  $d$ -regular graphs  $\mathbf{G}_n$  chosen according to the uniform-permutation-model, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , any local weak limit point in probability, must be supported on  $\mathcal{M}_s^{\beta_c(0), 0}$ . Although neither Theorem 1.13 nor [18, Proposition 3.4] shows that the limit point in context is a genuine measure on  $\mathcal{M}_s^{\beta, B}$  (i.e. neither Dirac at  $\mu_f^{\beta, B}$  nor at  $\mu_w^{\beta, B}$ ), this is believed to be the case for  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_c$ . Indeed, [12, Theorem 2] confirms the latter prediction when  $d \geq 5$ ,  $q \geq d^{Cd}$  ( $C < \infty$  is some absolute constant),  $(\beta, B) = (\beta_c(0), 0)$  and  $\mathbf{G}_n$  are uniformly random  $d$ -regular graphs. While their method might plausibly be adapted to all  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_c$  we do not pursue this here.

For any  $\beta > \beta_c(0)$ , the  $q$ -symmetry of the Potts model at  $B = 0$  gave rise in Theorem 1.12 to a limit  $\mu_w^{\beta, 0}$  which is a balanced mixture of the  $q$  possible pure-states Potts limit measures  $\mu_k^{\beta, 0}$  on  $\mathbf{T}_d$ . In the Ising setting ( $q = 2$ ), this has been further refined and explained in [17], by showing that for  $n \gg 1$  the choice between the two pure state limits matches with high probability the (random) dominating value  $\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma})$  at the spin configuration  $\underline{\sigma}$  on  $\mathbf{G}_n$ . Towards such a refinement for  $q$ -Potts with  $q \geq 3$ , we proceed to define the Potts measure with fixed dominating spin value.

**Definition 1.16** (Potts with a given dominating spin value). For a graph  $\mathbf{G}_n = ([n], E_n)$  with spin configuration  $\underline{\sigma} \in [q]^{[n]}$  define

$$\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}) := \arg \max_{k \in [q]} \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}(\sigma_i = k) \right\}, \quad (1.18)$$

breaking ties uniformly among the subset of  $[q]$  of all maximizer values.

For any  $\beta, B \geq 0$  and  $k \in [q]$ , we call the probability measure

$$\mu_{n, k}^{\beta, B}(\cdot) := \mu_n^{\beta, B}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{K}_n(\cdot) = k),$$

which is supported on  $\{\underline{\sigma} : \mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}) = k\}$ , the  $q$ -Potts with dominating spin  $k$ .

As demonstrated in [17], even in the Ising setting, having a pure-state decomposition according to the dominating spin value, requires a certain uniform edge-expansion property of  $\mathbf{G}_n$ . Our next definition states the relevant notion of edge expansion, followed by the statement of the promised pure-state decomposition according to the dominant spin value.




FIGURE 1. The left panel shows the non-uniqueness regime for the Potts measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  for  $q = 30$  and  $d = 3$ . The lightly shaded region is  $\mathcal{R}_f$ , while the darker region is  $\mathcal{R}_1$ . These two regions are separated by the critical curve  $\beta_c(B)$ , and the non-uniqueness regime  $\mathcal{R}_\neq$  is separated from its complement by the two curves  $\beta_f(B)$  and  $\beta_+(B)$ .

The right panel shows the non-uniqueness regime along with the local weak limits for Potts measures for  $q = 30$  and  $d = 10$ . Notice the difference in shapes and sizes of  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_f$  compared to the left panel. Note that Theorems 1.12 and 1.13 identify the local weak limit (points) except when  $(\beta, B) = (\beta_c(0), 0)$ , marked black in the right panel.

**Definition 1.17** (Uniformly edge-expander graphs). A finite graph  $\mathbf{G} = (V, E)$  is a  $(\delta_1, \delta_2, \lambda)$  edge-expander, if for any set of vertices  $S \subset V$  with  $\delta_1|V| \leq |S| \leq \delta_2|V|$  we have that  $|\partial S| \geq \lambda|S|$ , where  $\partial S = E(S, S^c)$  denotes the set of edges between  $S$  and  $S^c$ . We say that graphs  $\{\mathbf{G}_n = ([n], E_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are uniformly edge-expanders if  $\inf\{n^{-1}|E_n(S, S^c)| : S \subset [n], \varepsilon n \leq |S| \leq \frac{n}{2}\} > 0$  for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Theorem 1.18.** Recall the definition of  $\beta_c(0)$  from Proposition 1.5. Under Assumption 1.4 we have the following limits:

- (i) For  $\beta \in [0, \beta_c(0))$  and any  $k \in [q]$  we have  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta,0} \xrightarrow{w.c.} \mu_f^{\beta,0}$ .
- (ii) Additionally assume that  $\{\mathbf{G}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are uniformly edge-expanders. For  $\beta > \beta_c(0)$  and  $k \in [q]$  we have  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta,0} \xrightarrow{w.c.} \mu_k^{\beta,0}$ .

**1.1. Proof outline and organization of the paper.** A key ingredient for the proofs of the main results in [1, 17], the Ising case, is the monotonicity property of edge-correlations, which in turn enables one to argue that, for  $B = 0$ , the sums of the edge-correlations at the root for any Ising Gibbs measure on the limiting tree that is not a mixture of the plus and the minus Ising measure must be strictly smaller than that of the plus (and hence minus) Ising measure (see [17, Lemma 3.2] and [1, Lemma 3.6] for precise formulations for the regular and the general cases, respectively). This observation essentially allowed them to restrict the set of all possible local weak limit points to those that are mixtures of the plus and minus Ising measures.

In the absence of such monotonicity property for Potts measures, we had to devise an alternate route to reach such conclusion. To this end, we work with the Edwards-Sokal coupling of our  $q$ -Potts measures and their RCM counterparts. Whereas the RCM-s have the relevant monotonicity properties, this came at the cost of having non-quasi-local Hamiltonian. Thereby, much of the standard theory of Gibbs states does not apply for the RCM-s, with the definition and analysis of



random cluster Gibbs (RCG) states posing technical difficulties (cf. [3]). Indeed, instead of analyzing relevant properties of the RCG states (e.g. two point connectivity; as done for  $q = 2$  in [1, 17]), we derive in Section 2 several salient features of the  $t$ -dimensional spin and bond marginals of local weak limit points (i.e. probability measure induced by the spin and the bond configurations in a ball of radius  $t$  around the root of the limiting tree  $\mathbb{T}_d$ ) of Edward-Sokal measures on  $\mathbb{G}_n$ . In particular, it is shown in Lemma 2.9(c)-(d), that any such  $t$ -dimensional bond marginal must be a mixture of RCM on  $\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  with boundary conditions that are sandwiched, in the sense of stochastic ordering, between the marginals of the free and wired RCM-s on the infinite tree  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , and moreover any such  $t$ -dimensional spin marginal follows specific conditional distribution given the bond configurations. We believe that these results which apply for  $q$ -RCM at any  $q \in [1, \infty)$ , should admit broader usage.

Moreover, we show in Remark 2.10 and Lemma 2.11 that the  $t$ -dimensional spin marginals of any local weak limit point of Edward-Sokal measures on  $\mathbb{G}_n$ , follow specific conditional distributions given the bond configurations. Combining these facts with our results about the bond marginals and Assumption 1.4, we prove Theorem 1.12 in Section 3.

The key to the proof of Theorem 1.18(i) is a coupling of  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta,0}$  and  $\mu_{n,k'}^{\beta,0}$ ,  $k \neq k' \in [q]$ , so that the number of disagreements between the spin configurations induced by  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta,0}$  and  $\mu_{n,k'}^{\beta,0}$  is negligible. This is done by a construction of independent uniform colors for the connected components of the RCM, which may be of independent interest (cf. Lemma 4.3 and the proof of (4.1)).

Our proof, in Section 4.2, of Theorem 1.18(ii), uses the assumed edge-expansion property, to argue that  $\mathcal{X}_n$  is well approximated by the dominant color in large neighborhood of a uniformly chosen vertex in  $\mathbb{G}_n$ . By Theorem 1.12, this is in turn further approximated by the dominant color in a large neighborhood of the root in  $\mathbb{T}_d$  (under the wired Potts measure), and thereby we complete the proof upon noting that under  $\mu_k^{\beta,0}$  the latter dominant color is  $k$  (see Lemma 4.4). While at a high level the proof of Theorem 1.18(ii) has a similar outline as the proof of [17, Theorem 2.4 II], extra care is needed here, since unlike  $q = 2$ , one can no longer reduce the identity of the dominant color to the sign of a single variable.

The most delicate argument of this work is the proof of Theorem 1.13. The challenge here is that being along the critical line, for which there is no Ising analog (due to the difference in the order of phase transitions: second and first order phase transitions for  $q = 2$  and  $q \geq 3$ , respectively), the limit is no longer an extremal Potts (or RCM) measure on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . Our approach to handle such a scenario, thus proceeds via the following three key steps. First, Section 5.1 shows that any limit point outside  $\mathcal{M}_b^{\beta_c(B),B}$  yields ‘messages’ to the root (see Definition 5.1), of Bethe functional value smaller than  $\max\{\Phi(\nu_f^{\beta_c(B),B}), \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta_c(B),B})\}$ . For  $B > 0$ , if a local weak limit is not supported on  $\mathcal{M}_b^{\beta_c(B),B}$ , the same can be shown to hold when the messages on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  are replaced by their local analogs on large neighborhoods of a uniformly chosen vertex in  $\mathbb{G}_n$ . For  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ , this, together with a randomization over the choices of vertices in  $\mathbb{G}_n$  and the concentration of sample mean to the population mean, allow us in Section 5.2 to procure a sequence of subgraphs  $\{\mathbb{G}'_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  so that  $\mathbb{G}'_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  with asymptotic Potts free energy density exceeding the RHS of (1.6), in contradiction with [8, Theorem 1].

Appendix A provides several properties of the infinite volume Potts and the Bethe fixed points, on which we rely in these proofs.

## 2. EXISTENCE AND PROPERTIES OF LIMIT POINTS

Hereafter we fix  $\beta, B \geq 0$  and integer  $q \geq 2$ . For a finite graph  $\mathbb{G} = (V, E)$ , let  $\mathbb{G}^*$  be as in Definition 1.6, with  $\beta_{(i,j)}^* := \beta$  for  $(i, j) \in E$  and  $\beta_{(i,j)}^* := B$  for  $(i, j) \in E^* \setminus E$ . We consider the

Potts measure

$$\mu_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}(\underline{\sigma}) = \frac{1}{Z_{\mathbf{G}}(\beta,B)} \exp \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in E^*} \beta_{(i,j)}^* \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j} \right\} \cdot \delta_{\sigma_{v^*}, 1}, \quad \underline{\sigma} \in [q]^{V^*}, \quad (2.1)$$

proceeding to define the corresponding Edwards-Sokal measure.

**Definition 2.1** (Edwards-Sokal measure on a finite graph). Fix an integer  $q \geq 2$ . For a finite graph  $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}^*$  of Definition 1.6, and  $\beta, B \geq 0$ , set  $p_e$  as in (1.12) and  $\delta_e(\underline{\sigma}) := \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j}$  for  $e = (i, j) \in E^*$ . The Edwards-Sokal probability measure on the joint spin  $\underline{\sigma} \in [q]^{V^*}$  and bond  $\underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E^*}$  configuration, is given by

$$\varpi_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}) \propto \prod_{e \in E^*} [(1 - p_e)(1 - \eta_e) + p_e \eta_e \delta_e(\underline{\sigma})] \cdot \delta_{\sigma_{v^*}, 1}. \quad (2.2)$$

Our next lemma, whose elementary proof is omitted, states that for integer any  $q \geq 2$ , such Edwards-Sokal measure gives a useful coupling between  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}$  and the RCM of Definition 1.7.

**Lemma 2.2.** Fix an integer  $q \geq 2$ , a finite graph  $\mathbf{G} = (V, E)$ , and  $B, \beta \geq 0$ .

- (i) The marginal of  $\varpi_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}(\cdot, \cdot)$  in the spin variable  $\underline{\sigma}$  is  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}(\cdot)$ , whereas the marginal in the bond variable  $\underline{\eta}$  is the RCM  $\varphi_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}(\cdot)$ .
- (ii) For any  $\underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E^*}$ , with induced connected components  $\mathcal{C}(\underline{\eta}) = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k)$ , for some  $k \geq 1$ , the conditional distribution  $\varpi_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}(\cdot | \underline{\eta})$  is such that the same spin  $\sigma'$  is assigned to all vertices in each connected component  $C$ , independently of all other components. If  $v^* \notin C$ , then the law of  $\sigma'$  is uniform on  $[q]$ , whereas  $\sigma' = 1$  if  $v^* \in C$ .

We use throughout  $\mu(f)$  or  $\mu[f]$  for the expectation of  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued function  $f$  with respect to a probability measure  $\mu$ . Further, suppressing the dependence of our Potts, random cluster, and Edwards-Sokal measures on the fixed integer  $q \geq 2$ , we write for brevity  $\varpi_n^{\beta,B} := \varpi_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta,B}$  and  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B} := \varphi_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta,B}$ . As the marginal of  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}$  on  $[q]^V$  is  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}$ , hereafter  $\mu_n^{\beta,B}$  stands also for  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta,B}$ .

The following immediate corollary of Lemma 2.2 is crucial in our proof of Theorem 1.12.

**Corollary 2.3.** For any integer  $q \geq 2$ , finite graph  $\mathbf{G} = (V, E)$ , and  $B, \beta \geq 0$ , we have that

$$\mu_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \varphi_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}(i \leftrightarrow j) + \frac{1}{q}, \quad \forall (i, j) \in E, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\{i' \leftrightarrow j'\}$  denotes the event that  $i'$  and  $j'$  are in the same connected component of  $\mathbf{G}^*$ , or equivalently, that there is an open path in  $\mathbf{G}^*$  connecting  $i'$  and  $j'$ .

*Proof.* In view of Lemma 2.2(i), for any  $(i, j) \in E^*$ ,

$$\mu_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \varpi_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}[\mathbf{1}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j)] = \varphi_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B} \left[ \varpi_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}[\mathbf{1}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) | \underline{\eta}] \right].$$

Now (2.3) follows from Lemma 2.2(ii) (recall also that  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}$  is the  $[q]^V$ -marginal of  $\mu_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta,B}$ ).  $\square$

Hereafter, we denote by  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  the set of probability measures on a Polish space  $S$ . Further, adopting the notation of Definition 1.9, for  $\dagger \in \{o, \star\}$  let  $\mathbb{S}_t^\dagger := [q]^{V(\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t))}$  and  $\mathbb{B}_t^\dagger := \{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t))}$  denote the domains of the spins, and the bonds, respectively, in Edwards-Sokal measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t)$ . Using  $\Xi_t^\dagger := \{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{K}^\dagger(\partial\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t)))}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger := \{0, 1\}^{E(\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t))}$  for such domains of boundary edge bonds, and of the bonds on the tree with its edge boundary, respectively, we shall view each bond assignment  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t)$  as the pair  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}} = (\underline{\eta}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$  of assignments  $\underline{\eta} \in \mathbb{B}_t^\dagger$  for bonds in  $\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t)$  and  $\underline{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \Xi_t^\dagger$  for the boundary edge bonds.

We shall show that the Edwards-Sokal measures on  $\mathbb{G}_n$  (and hence also the corresponding Potts and random cluster measures), admit local weak limits along sub sequences satisfying certain key properties. To this end, we proceed to define the spaces in which such local weak limits must be (where to lighten our notation we suppress the dependence of these spaces on  $d, q$  and  $\beta, B \geq 0$ ).

**Definition 2.4** (Mixtures of Edwards-Sokal and RCM-s on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ ). Fixing  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathfrak{C}_\star := \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)$  denote the collection of all partitions  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_\star, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$  of the labeled set  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t) \cup \{v^\star\}$  where  $v^\star \in C_\star$  and  $\mathfrak{C}_o := \mathfrak{C}_o(t)$  be all such partitions for which  $C_\star = \{v^\star\}$ . Recalling Definition 1.9 of  $\mathbb{K}^\dagger(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t))$  and  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t)$ ,  $\dagger \in \{o, \star\}$ , we identify each  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger$  with the subgraph of  $\mathbb{K}^\dagger(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t))$  having edges between  $i, j \in \partial\mathbb{T}_d(t) \cup \{v^\star\}$  if and only if  $i$  and  $j$  belong to the same block of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Alternatively, each  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger$  corresponds to the boundary edge assignment  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})$  such that  $\eta_e = 1$  if and only if the edge  $e$  is within a block of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Now, let  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}$  be the Edwards-Sokal measure on  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t)$  conditioned on  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})$  (namely, on open bonds in  $\mathcal{C}$  and closed bonds in  $\mathbb{K}^\dagger(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t)) \setminus \mathcal{C}$ ). Thus, for  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger$ ,  $\underline{\sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_t^\dagger$ , and  $\underline{\eta} \in \mathbb{B}_t^\dagger$ ,

$$\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}) \propto \prod_{e \in E(\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t))} [(1 - p_e)(1 - \eta_e) + p_e \eta_e \delta_e(\underline{\sigma})] \prod_{j=1}^k \prod_{u, v \in C_j} \delta_{\sigma_u, \sigma_v} \prod_{v \in C_\star} \delta_{\sigma_v, 1}, \quad (2.4)$$

restricting for  $\dagger = o$  to  $B = 0$  and eliminating then the (trivial) product over  $C_\star$ . We further view  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta})$  of (2.4) also as the probability of  $(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta})$  for  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}} = (\underline{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C}))$ . Now define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_\dagger(t) := \left\{ \varpi : \varpi = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger} \rho(\mathcal{C}) \varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t} \text{ for some } \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_\dagger) \right\}, \quad \dagger \in \{o, \star\}. \quad (2.5)$$

That is,  $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_\dagger(t)$  denotes the collection of measures on spins and bonds of  $\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t)$  induced by mixtures of Edwards-Sokal measures on  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t)$  conditioned to have the edge boundary bonds  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})$ . Likewise, the RCM conditioned to such edge boundary, gives the measure on  $\mathbb{B}_t^\dagger$

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta}) := \varphi_{\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t)}^{\beta, B}((\underline{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \mid \boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})), \quad (2.6)$$

with the corresponding space of mixtures

$$\mathcal{R}_\dagger(t) := \left\{ \varphi : \varphi = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger} \rho(\mathcal{C}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t} \text{ for some } \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_\dagger) \right\}, \quad \dagger \in \{o, \star\}, \quad (2.7)$$

where for  $\dagger = o$  we restrict (2.5)-(2.7) to  $B = 0$  (and eliminate in this case the irrelevant  $v^\star$ ). Further viewing each  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta})$  also as the probability of  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}} = (\underline{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C}))$  makes  $\mathcal{R}_\dagger(t)$  a subset of  $\mathcal{P}(\widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger)$ , and the mixture coefficients are then uniquely determined by  $\rho(\mathcal{C}) = \varphi(\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C}))$ .

We next show that the  $t$ -marginals of both the free and wired RCM-s on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  reside in the spaces  $\mathcal{R}_\dagger(t)$  of Definition 2.4.

**Lemma 2.5.** For  $\beta, B \geq 0$  and  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$  the RCM  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}$  on  $\mathbb{T}_d^\star$  exists with marginals  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t} \in \mathcal{R}_\star(t)$  and  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, 0, t} \in \mathcal{R}_o(t)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\beta, B \geq 0$ . For the existence of  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, 0}$  on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  see [11, Theorem 10.67]. More generally, fix  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and note that, by definition,

$$\varphi_{w, t}^{\beta, B}(\cdot) = \varphi_{\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\star(t+1)}^{\beta, B}(\cdot \mid \eta_e = 1, e \in \mathbb{K}^\star(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t+1)) \cup \mathbb{K}^\star(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t)) \cup E(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t), \partial\mathbb{T}_d(t+1))), \quad (2.8)$$

where for two sets of vertices  $S$  and  $S'$  the notation  $E(S, S')$  denotes the collection of edges between  $S$  and  $S'$ . As  $\varphi_{\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t+1)}^{\beta, B}$  is a strictly positive measure satisfying FKG inequality (see [9, Proposition 4.3]), by [11, Theorem 2.24] it is monotonic. This observation together with the definition of  $\varphi_{\mathbb{w}, t+1}^{\beta, B}$  and (2.8) entails that  $\varphi_{\mathbb{w}, t}^{\beta, B}[f] \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{w}, t+1}^{\beta, B}[f]$  for any increasing function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{B}_s^*$  with  $s \leq t$ . As each  $\mathbb{B}_s^*$  is in the linear span of increasing indicator functions, the existence of  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\mathbb{w}, t}^{\beta, B}[f]$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and every increasing  $f$  on  $\mathbb{B}_s^*$  implies the existence of the limit  $\varphi_{\mathbb{w}}^{\beta, B}$  (in the sense of weak convergence). The existence of  $\varphi_{\mathbb{f}}^{\beta, B}$  follows similarly, since  $\varphi_{\mathbb{f}, t}^{\beta, B}[f] \leq \varphi_{\mathbb{f}, t+1}^{\beta, B}[f]$  for any increasing function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{B}_s^*$  with  $s \leq t$ .

Turning to prove that  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t} \in \mathcal{R}_*(t)$ , we start by showing that

$$\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_*(t+1) \quad \implies \quad \varphi^t \in \mathcal{R}_*(t), \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\varphi^t$  denotes the marginal of  $\varphi$  on bonds of  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(t)$ . Indeed, setting  $\tilde{\Xi}_t := \{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*(t+1)) \setminus E(\mathbb{T}_d^*(t))}$ , any pair  $\underline{\eta} \in \tilde{\Xi}_t$  and  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_*(t+1)$  induces a partition  $\mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C}) \in \mathfrak{C}_*(t)$  and further determines the difference between the number of connected components of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t)$  with boundary  $\mathcal{C}'$  and the number of connected components of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t+1)$  with boundary  $\mathcal{C}$ . Hence, by definition

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t+1}(\underline{\eta}^0 | \underline{\eta}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C})}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta}^0), \quad \forall \underline{\eta}^0 \in \mathbb{B}_t^*. \quad (2.10)$$

Thus, if  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_*(t+1)$ , then for some  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_*(t+1))$  and any  $\underline{\eta}^0 \in \mathbb{B}_t^*$ ,

$$\varphi(\underline{\eta}^0) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_*(t+1)} \sum_{\underline{\eta} \in \tilde{\Xi}_t} \rho(\mathcal{C}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t+1}(\underline{\eta}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C})}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta}^0) = \sum_{\mathcal{C}_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_*(t)} \rho'(\mathcal{C}_0) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}_0}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta}^0), \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\rho'(\mathcal{C}_0)$  denotes the sum of  $\rho(\mathcal{C}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t+1}(\underline{\eta})$  over all pairs  $(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C})$  for which  $\mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}_0$ . Having thus established (2.9), recall that  $\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B} \in \mathcal{R}_*(s)$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, by iteratively applying (2.9) we deduce that the  $t$ -dimensional marginal  $\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B, t}$  of  $\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B}$  is in the compact set  $\mathcal{R}_*(t)$  for any  $s \geq t$ . Since  $\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B, t} \Rightarrow \varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t}$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , we conclude that  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t} \in \mathcal{R}_*(t)$ .

For  $B = 0$  we have in (1.12) that  $p_e = 0$  for any  $e \in E^* \setminus E$  touching  $v^*$ . Thus, then  $v^*$  is an isolated vertex and in particular  $\mathfrak{C}_* = \{v^*\}$ . So, in this case we can WLOG replace  $\mathfrak{C}_*(t)$  by  $\mathfrak{C}_o(t)$  throughout the preceding proof, while also replacing our spin and bond domains  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(t)$  and  $\mathbb{K}^*(\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t))$  by  $\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  and  $\mathbb{K}(\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t))$ , respectively, to conclude that  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, 0, t} \in \mathcal{R}_o(t)$ .  $\square$

Having a lattice of partitions  $\mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t)$  induces a stochastic ordering on the RCM mixtures in  $\mathcal{R}_{\dagger}(t)$ .

**Definition 2.6** (Stochastic ordering on  $\mathcal{R}_{\dagger}(t)$ ). Fix  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\dagger \in \{o, \star\}$ . Recall from Definition 2.4 our embedding of  $\mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t)$  inside  $\Xi_t^{\dagger}$  via  $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})$  and the one-to-one mapping it induces between  $\mathcal{R}_{\dagger}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t))$ , by matching each

$$\varphi(\underline{\hat{\eta}}) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t)} \rho(\mathcal{C}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\hat{\eta}}),$$

with the distribution  $\rho(\mathcal{C}) = \varphi(\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C}))$  of a *random edge boundary*  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  supported on  $\mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t) \subset \Xi_t^{\dagger}$ . An edge boundary  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  of law  $\rho$  is stochastically dominated by  $\boldsymbol{\eta}'$  of law  $\rho'$ , denoted by  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \preceq \boldsymbol{\eta}'$  (or by  $\rho \preceq \rho'$ ), if  $\rho(f) \leq \rho'(f)$  for every function  $f$  which is non-decreasing with respect to the usual partial ordering of  $\Xi_t^{\dagger}$ . Equivalently,  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \preceq \boldsymbol{\eta}'$  if and only if there is a coupling such that  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \boldsymbol{\eta}'$  in the sense of partial ordering on  $\Xi_t^{\dagger}$ . For random edge boundaries in  $\mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t)$  this is further equivalent

to a coupling with such partial order on the induced partitions  $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \leq \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta}')$  (i.e. where  $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$  is a refinement of  $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta}')$ ). This notion extends to a stochastic ordering on  $\mathcal{R}_\dagger(t)$  by saying that  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_\dagger(t)$  is stochastically dominated by  $\varphi' \in \mathcal{R}_\dagger(t)$  (denoted by  $\varphi \preceq \varphi'$ ), if and only if  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \preceq \boldsymbol{\eta}'$  for the corresponding random edge boundaries.

The proof of Theorem 1.12 crucially relies on our next lemma, which reduces the question whether two stochastically ordered measures in  $\mathcal{R}_\dagger(s+1)$  are equal, to the evaluation of the corresponding expectations for a *single functional*  $\mathfrak{F}_s$  (defined below).

**Lemma 2.7.** *Fix  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\dagger \in \{\star, o\}$  (with  $B = 0$  if  $\dagger = o$ ).*

*Suppose  $\varphi, \tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{R}_\dagger(s+1)$  are such that  $\varphi \preceq \tilde{\varphi}$ .*

- (i) *Then,  $\varphi^s \preceq \tilde{\varphi}^s$  for the  $s$ -dimensional marginals of  $\varphi$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}$ .*
- (ii) *If also  $\varphi \neq \tilde{\varphi}$ , then  $\varphi(\mathfrak{F}_s) < \tilde{\varphi}(\mathfrak{F}_s)$  for*

$$\mathfrak{F}_s := \sum_{i \in \partial T_d(s)} \sum_{j \in \partial i} \mathbf{1}(i \leftrightarrow j), \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\partial i$  denotes the neighborhood of  $i$  in  $T_d(s+1)$  and  $\{i \leftrightarrow j\}$  denotes the event that there exists an open path in  $\hat{T}_d^\dagger(s+1)$  connecting  $i$  and  $j$ .

*Proof.* (i). Since  $\varphi \preceq \tilde{\varphi}$  there is a coupling such that  $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \leq \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$  for the partitions induced by the corresponding random edge boundaries  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_s$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_s$  denote the random vectors in  $\tilde{\Xi}_s$  distributed according to the corresponding marginal of  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta})}^{\beta, B, s+1}$  and  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})}^{\beta, B, s+1}$ , respectively. Since the RCM  $\varphi_{\hat{T}_d^\dagger(s+1)}^{\beta, B}$  is monotonic (see [9, Proposition 4.3] and [11, Theorem 2.24]), we have that

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta})}^{\beta, B, s+1}(f) \leq \varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})}^{\beta, B, s+1}(f) \quad (2.13)$$

for any increasing function  $f$  on  $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{s+1}^*$ . This implies in turn that  $\varphi(g) \leq \tilde{\varphi}(g)$  for any function  $g$  of  $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_s, \boldsymbol{\eta})$  which is increasing on  $\tilde{\Xi}_s \times \Xi_{s+1}^*$ . That is,  $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_s, \boldsymbol{\eta}) \preceq (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_s, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ . Recall that any given pair  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_s \in \tilde{\Xi}_s$  and  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in \Xi_{s+1}^*$  induces an edge boundary  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}' \in \Xi_s^*$ . Furthermore, the map  $(\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_s, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \mapsto \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'$  is increasing, hence also  $\boldsymbol{\eta}' \preceq \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'$  for the random edge boundaries  $\boldsymbol{\eta}'$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'$  induced by the pairs  $(\boldsymbol{\eta}_s, \boldsymbol{\eta})$  and  $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_s, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ , respectively. Recall (2.10) that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}'$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}'$  are precisely the edge boundaries of  $\varphi^s$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}^s$ , respectively. Thus,  $\varphi^s \preceq \tilde{\varphi}^s$  as claimed. In case  $B = 0$  and  $\dagger = o$  we can and shall follow the same argument, while eliminating throughout the isolated ghost vertex  $v^*$ .

(ii). Upon considering (2.13) for the increasing events  $\{i \leftrightarrow j\}$ , we deduce that  $\varphi(i \leftrightarrow j) \leq \tilde{\varphi}(i \leftrightarrow j)$  for any  $(i, j) \in T_d^*(s+1)$ , hence also  $\varphi(\mathfrak{F}_s) \leq \tilde{\varphi}(\mathfrak{F}_s)$ . Now since  $\varphi \neq \tilde{\varphi}$  and  $\mathfrak{C}_\star(s+1)$  is a finite set, there exist  $u, u' \in \mathfrak{K}^*(\partial T_d(s+1))$  such that under the monotone coupling  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \leq \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ , with positive probability  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{(u, u')} = 1$  while  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{(u, u')} = 0$ . In particular,  $u$  and  $u'$  are in different blocks of  $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$  and we may further assume that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{(u, v^*)} = 0$  (or else, exchange  $u$  with  $u'$ ). It thus suffices to show that any such boundary edges result with

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{\eta})}^{\beta, B, s+1}(u \leftrightarrow w) < \varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})}^{\beta, B, s+1}(u \leftrightarrow w), \quad (2.14)$$

where  $w \in \partial T_d(s)$  is the parent of  $u$ . Turning to prove (2.14), consider the event

$$\mathcal{A} := \{u \overset{\text{in}}{\leftrightarrow} v^*\} \cup \{w \overset{\text{in}}{\leftrightarrow} \partial T_d(s+1) \setminus \{u'\}\},$$

where  $\{U \overset{\text{in}}{\leftrightarrow} U'\}$  denotes the event of an *open path within*  $T_d^*(s+1)$  between some vertex of  $U$  and some vertex of  $U'$ . With  $\{u \leftrightarrow w\} \cap \mathcal{A}$  an increasing event, for which (2.13) holds, we arrive at

(2.14) upon showing that

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\eta})}^{\beta, B, s+1}(\{u \leftrightarrow w\} \cap \mathcal{A}^c) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\eta)}^{\beta, B, s+1}(\{u \leftrightarrow w\} \cap \mathcal{A}^c) = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

To this end, the event  $\mathcal{A}^c$  implies that apart from boundary edges,  $u$  is an isolated vertex and there is no open path between  $w$  and  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(s+1)$  except possibly between  $w$  and  $u'$ . Thus,

$$\{u \leftrightarrow w\} \cap \mathcal{A}^c = \left( \{u \xrightarrow{\text{ex}} u' \xrightarrow{\text{in}} w\} \cup \{u \xrightarrow{\text{ex}} v^* \xrightarrow{\text{in}} w\} \right) \cap \mathcal{A}^c,$$

where  $\{u \xrightarrow{\text{ex}} u'\}$  denotes the existence of an open path with *only boundary edges* between  $u$  and  $u'$ . The latter event amounts to having both  $u$  and  $u'$  in the same block of  $\mathcal{C}$ , so our observation that  $u$  is neither in the same block of  $\mathcal{C}(\eta)$  as  $u'$  nor in that of  $v^*$ , yields the right part of (2.15). Further, with  $\tilde{\eta}_{(u, u')} = 1$ , the left side of (2.15) holds as soon as

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\eta})}^{\beta, B, s+1}(\{w \xrightarrow{\text{in}} u'\} \cap \mathcal{A}^c) > 0. \quad (2.16)$$

For  $B > 0$  we get (2.16) by opening only the edges  $(w, v^*)$  and  $(u', v^*)$  of  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(s+1)$ . In case  $B = 0$  we follow the same reasoning in  $\mathbb{T}_d(s+1)$  (i.e. without the isolated  $v^*$ ), now satisfying the event  $\{w \xrightarrow{\text{in}} u'\} \cap \mathcal{A}^c$  by opening only the edges of  $\mathbb{T}_d(s+1)$  which lie on the unique path from  $w$  to  $u'$ , the probability of which is strictly positive whenever  $\beta > 0$ . Finally, in case of  $B = \beta = 0$  there is nothing to prove, for then  $\mathcal{R}_*(s+1)$  is a singleton (as all bonds of  $\mathbb{T}_d^*(s+1)$  are closed, regardless of the boundary edge configuration  $\mathcal{C}$ ).  $\square$

Thanks to our stochastic ordering of  $\mathcal{R}_\dagger(t)$ , all marginals of local weak limit points of  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta, B}\}$  are supported on the set of measures  $\mathcal{S}_\dagger(t)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_*(t)$  (the latter for  $B > 0$ ), as defined and shown below. Namely, such local weak limits are all sandwiched between the free and the wired RCM-s on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , and additionally for  $B > 0$  their random edge boundary at level  $t$  have edges *only* between  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  and the ghost  $v^*$ .

**Definition 2.8.** Fix  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$ , let  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t}$  be the marginal of  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}$  on  $\mathbb{B}_t^*$  and define

$$\mathcal{S}_\dagger(t) := \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{R}_\dagger(t) : \varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t} \preceq \varphi \preceq \varphi_w^{\beta, B, t} \right\},$$

where  $\dagger = \star$  if  $B > 0$  and  $\dagger = o$  if  $B = 0$ . Let  $\mathfrak{D}_* = \mathfrak{D}_*(t) \subset \mathfrak{C}_*(t)$  be the collection of all partitions  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_\star, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$  of the labeled set  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t) \cup \{v^*\}$  with  $v^* \in C_\star$  such that  $|C_i| = 1$  for all  $i \geq 1$ . Define

$$\mathcal{Q}_*(t) := \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_*(t) : \varphi = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{D}_*} \rho(\mathcal{C}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t} \text{ for some } \rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{D}_*) \right\}.$$

As promised, we now show that the finite dimensional marginals of sub-sequential local weak limits of our Edwards-Sokal measures must be supported on the spaces from Definition 2.4 and those for our RCM-s must further be supported on the spaces from Definition 2.8.

**Lemma 2.9.** Fix  $\beta, B \geq 0$ , integer  $q \geq 2$  and  $\mathbb{G}_n \xrightarrow{\text{loc}} \mathbb{T}_d$ . Set  $\dagger = \star$  if  $B > 0$  and  $\dagger = o$  if  $B = 0$ .

- (a) The sequence of measures  $\{\varpi_n^{\beta, B}\}$  admits sub-sequential local weak limits, as do its marginals  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta, B}\}$  and  $\{\mu_n^{\beta, B}\}$ , in bond and spin variables, respectively.
- (b) Any  $t$ -dimensional marginal of a local weak limit point  $\mathbf{m}_{s, b}$  of  $\{\varpi_n^{\beta, B}\}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{m}_{s, b}^t \in \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\dagger(t))$ .
- (c) Any  $t$ -dimensional marginal of a local weak limit point  $\mathbf{m}_b$  of  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta, B}\}$  satisfies  $\mathbf{m}_b^t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_\dagger(t))$ .
- (d) For  $B > 0$ , a  $t$ -dimensional marginal of such local weak limit point  $\mathbf{m}_b$  satisfies  $\mathbf{m}_b^t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Q}_*(t))$ .

*Proof.* (a). As  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ , for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $n_0(\varepsilon)$  such that

$$\inf_{n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(I_n)(\mathcal{P}_d^{\star,t}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon,$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_d^{\star,t}$  and  $\mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(\cdot)$  are as in Definitions 1.10 and 1.11, respectively. Since  $\mathcal{P}_d^{\star,t}$  is compact, from Prokhorov's theorem it follows that for fixed  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  the random probability measures  $\{\mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(I_n)\}$  admit a sub-sequential limit  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_t$  which is a Borel probability measure on  $\mathcal{P}_d^{\star,t}$ . Upon extracting successive subsequences, from the definition of  $\mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(I_n)$  it further follows that for every  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  the marginal of  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{t+1}$  on  $\mathcal{P}_d^{\star,t}$  is  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_t$ . Choosing the diagonal subsequence and using Kolmogorov's extension theorem we thus establish the existence of a sub-sequential local weak limit point  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$  of  $\{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}\}$ , with  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$  a probability measure on  $\mathcal{P}_d^{\star}$ . As both  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B}$  and  $\mu_n^{\beta,B}$  are marginals of  $\varpi_n^{\beta,B}$ , the existence of sub-sequential local weak limits of  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta,B}\}$  and  $\{\mu_n^{\beta,B}\}$  is now immediate.

(b). Fixing  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0) \in \mathbb{S}_t^{\star} \times \mathbb{B}_t^{\star}$  we have that for any  $\ell \in [n]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(\ell)(\mathbb{T}_d^{\star}(t), \underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0) \\ &= \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_\ell(t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)) q_{\ell,n}^t(\underline{\sigma}^0) \prod_{e \in E(\mathbb{B}_\ell^{\star}(t))} [(1-p_e)(1-\eta_e^0) + p_e \eta_e^0 \delta_e(\underline{\sigma}^0)] \cdot \mathbf{1}(\sigma_{v^{\star}}^0 = 1), \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$q_{\ell,n}^t(\underline{\sigma}^0) := \frac{1}{Z_n} \sum_{\underline{\eta}|_{E_n^{\star} \setminus E(\mathbb{B}_\ell^{\star}(t))}} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}|\underline{\eta}|_{V(\mathbb{B}_\ell^{\star}(t))} = \underline{\sigma}^0} \prod_{e \in E_n^{\star} \setminus E(\mathbb{B}_\ell^{\star}(t))} [(1-p_e)(1-\eta_e) + p_e \eta_e \delta_e(\underline{\sigma})], \quad (2.18)$$

depends only on  $\underline{\sigma}^0|_{\partial \mathbf{B}_\ell(t)}$  and  $Z_n$  is some normalizing constant. Now, split the outer sum over  $\underline{\eta}$  in (2.18) according to which vertices in  $\partial \mathbf{B}_\ell(t) \cup \{v^{\star}\}$  are connected among themselves via an open path induced by  $\underline{\eta}$ . Whenever  $\mathbf{B}_\ell(t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)$ , this amounts to splitting the sum over  $\underline{\eta}$  per partitions  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)$  of  $\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t) \cup \{v^{\star}\}$  with  $v^{\star} \in C_\star$ . Further,  $\sigma_{v^{\star}} = 1$  and any open path  $\gamma$  in  $\underline{\eta}$  induces the multiplicative factor  $\prod_{e \in \gamma} \delta_e(\underline{\sigma})$  in (2.18). Hence, if  $\underline{\eta}$  induces the partition  $\mathcal{C}$ , then the sum over the spins in the RHS of (2.18) be zero unless  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{C}}(\underline{\sigma}^0) := \prod_{j=1}^k \prod_{u,v \in C_j} \delta_{\sigma_u^0, \sigma_v^0} \cdot \prod_{v \in C_\star} \delta_{\sigma_v^0, 1} = 1$ . Therefore,

$$q_{\ell,n}^t(\underline{\sigma}^0) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)} \vartheta_{\ell,n}(\mathcal{C}) \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{C}}(\underline{\sigma}^0),$$

for some nonnegative constants  $\{\vartheta_{\ell,n}(\mathcal{C})\}_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)}$ . Plugging this into (2.17) results with

$$\mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(\ell)(\mathbb{T}_d^{\star}(t), \underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0) = \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_\ell(t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)) \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{\beta,B,t}(\ell)(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0), \quad (2.19)$$

where for each  $\ell \in [n]$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{\beta,B,t}(\ell)(\cdot, \cdot) := \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)} \varrho_{\ell,n}(\mathcal{C}) \varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}(\cdot, \cdot) \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\star(t), \quad (2.20)$$

namely, each  $\varrho_{\ell,n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_\star(t))$  (and when  $\mathbf{B}_\ell(t) \not\cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)$  we can choose an arbitrary  $\varrho_{\ell,n}$  of this form). Recall that the set of probability measures on the finite dimensional simplex  $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_\star(t) \times \mathbb{S}_t^{\star} \times \mathbb{B}_t^{\star})$  is compact under weak convergence. In particular, the probability measures  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{\beta,B,t}(I_n)$  on the compact subset  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\star(t)$  of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^{\star} \times \mathbb{B}_t^{\star})$  admit sub-sequential limits in the topology of weak convergence on  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\star(t)$ . As  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ , by (2.19) the sub-sequential limit points of  $\{\mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(I_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  coincide with those of

$\{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{\beta,B,t}(I_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . In particular, the  $t$ -marginal  $\mathbf{m}_{s,b}^t$  of any local weak limit point of  $\{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}\}$  must also be in  $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_\star(t))$ .

As noted at the end of the proof of Lemma 2.5, if  $B = 0$  we can omit throughout the isolated vertex  $v^\star$  and the preceding argument then yields that  $\mathbf{m}_{s,b}^t \in \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_o(t))$ .

(c). First recall that for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)$ , the bond-marginal of  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}$  is  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}$ . Thus, by (2.20), for any  $\ell \in [n]$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{n,b}^{\beta,B,t}(\ell)(\cdot) := \sum_{\sigma} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_n^{\beta,B,t}(\ell)(\sigma, \cdot) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)} \varrho_{\ell,n}(\mathcal{C}) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}_\star(t). \quad (2.21)$$

From (2.19), the bond-marginal of  $\mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^t(\ell)(\mathbb{T}_d^\star(t), \cdot, \cdot)$  is  $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_\ell(t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)) \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{n,b}^{\beta,B,t}(\ell)$ . Hence, applying the preceding reasoning for limit points of the probability measures  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{n,b}^{\beta,B,t}(I_n)$  on the compact  $\mathcal{R}_\star(t)$ , we conclude that the  $t$ -marginal  $\mathbf{m}_b^t$  of any limit point of the RCM-s  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta,B}\}$  must be in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{R}_\star(t))$ . Further, by Definitions 1.9 and 2.6 we know that

$$\mathcal{R}_\star(s) = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_\star(s) : \varphi_{f,s}^{\beta,B} \preceq \varphi \preceq \varphi_{w,s}^{\beta,B}\}, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Next, for  $s > t$  let  $\mathcal{R}_\star^t(s)$  be the collection of all  $t$ -dimensional marginals of measures from  $\mathcal{R}_\star(s)$ , noting that since  $\mathbf{m}_b^t$  is also the  $t$ -marginal of  $\mathbf{m}_s^t$  for any  $s > t$ , necessarily

$$\mathbf{m}_b^t \left( \bigcap_{s>t} \mathcal{R}_\star^t(s) \right) = 1, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.22)$$

Now, any  $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{R}_\star^t(s)$  is the  $t$ -marginal of some  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_\star(s)$  and in particular  $\varphi_{f,s}^{\beta,B} \preceq \varphi \preceq \varphi_{w,s}^{\beta,B}$ . In view of (2.9) and Lemma 2.7(i), it thus follows that

$$\mathcal{R}_\star^t(s) \subset \{\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{R}_\star(t) : \varphi_{f,s}^{\beta,B,t} \preceq \tilde{\varphi} \preceq \varphi_{w,s}^{\beta,B,t}\}.$$

Since  $\varphi_{\dagger,s}^{\beta,B,t} \Rightarrow \varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta,B,t}$  when  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , we thus deduce that

$$\bigcap_{s>t} \mathcal{R}_\star^t(s) \subset \{\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{R}_\star(t) : \varphi_f^{\beta,B,t} \preceq \tilde{\varphi} \preceq \varphi_w^{\beta,B,t}\} = \mathcal{S}_\star(t)$$

(see Definition 2.8), which together with (2.22) implies that  $\mathbf{m}_b^t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_\star(t))$ , as claimed.

As explained at the end of the proof of part (b), for  $B = 0$  we omit the isolated  $v^\star$  and re-run the same argument on the original tree  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , to arrive at  $\mathbf{m}_b^t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_o(t))$ .

(d). Fix any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u, v \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_0 \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t)$  such that  $u$  and  $v$  belong to a same block of  $\mathcal{C}_0$  *not* containing  $v^\star$ . Fix a  $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^\star)})$  such that its  $(t+s)$ -dimensional marginal  $\varphi^{t+s} \in \mathcal{R}_\star(t+s)$  for all integer  $s \geq 0$ . Recall from Definition 2.4 that  $\varphi^{t+s}$  can be viewed as a measure on the bonds of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\star(t+s)$ . For  $s \geq 0$  we let  $\Omega_{u,v}(s)$  be the event of bond configurations for which the cluster of  $u$ , induced by the open bonds in  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\star(t+s) \setminus \mathbb{T}_d^\star(t)$ , contains  $v$  but does *not* contain the ghost vertex  $v^\star$ . Due to consistency of the marginals of  $\varphi$  and that (2.9) holds we therefore have

$$\varphi^t(\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C}_0)) \leq \varphi^{t+s}(\Omega_{u,v}(s)) \text{ for all integer } s \geq 0. \quad (2.23)$$

We will show that for any  $B > 0$  and  $s \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\varphi^{t+s}(\Omega_{u,v}(s)) \leq q^2 \exp(-2Bs). \quad (2.24)$$



This together with (2.22) and (2.23) yield the desired result. Turning to prove (2.24), since  $\varphi^{t+s} \in \mathcal{R}_\star(t+s)$  there exists some probability measure  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_\star(t+s))$  such that

$$\varphi^{t+s}(\Omega_{u,v}(s)) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\star(t+s)} \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t+s}(\Omega_{u,v}(s))\rho(\mathcal{C}).$$

Hence, it suffices to prove (2.24) with  $\varphi^{t+s}$  replaced by  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t+s}$  with  $\mathcal{C} \ni C \not\ni v^\star$  such that  $u', v' \in C$  for some descendants of  $u$  and  $v$ , respectively. To this end, fix such a  $\mathcal{C}$  and split the bond configurations of  $\mathbb{T}_d^\star(t+s)$  into three pieces:  $\underline{\eta}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{B}_t^\star$ ,  $\underline{\eta}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{B}_{t+s} \setminus \mathbb{B}_t$ , and  $\underline{\eta}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{B}_{t+s}^\star \setminus (\mathbb{B}_t^\star \cup \mathbb{B}_{t+s})$ . Notice that the event  $\Omega_{u,v}(s)$  does not depend on  $\underline{\eta}^{(1)}$ . Further, upon ordering  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t+s)$  in some fixed, non-random manner observe that  $(\underline{\eta}^{(2)}, \underline{\eta}^{(3)}) \in \Omega_{u,v}(s)$  requires that the following events hold:

- (i) There exist open paths  $P_u$  and  $P_v$ , determined by  $\underline{\eta}^{(2)}$ , from  $u$  and  $v$  to  $\tilde{u}$  and  $\tilde{v} \in \partial\mathbb{T}_d(t+s)$ , respectively, where  $\tilde{u}$  and  $\tilde{v}$  are descendants of  $u$  and  $v$ , respectively. When there are multiple such  $\tilde{u}$  and  $\tilde{v}$  we fix the first of these as our  $\tilde{u}$  and  $\tilde{v}$ , respectively.
- (ii) We must have  $\underline{\eta}^{(3,1)} \equiv 0$ , where  $\underline{\eta}^{(3)} = (\underline{\eta}^{(3,1)}, \underline{\eta}^{(3,2)})$ ,  $\underline{\eta}^{(3,1)}$  is the bond configuration for the collection of edges between  $V(P_u \cup P_v)$  and  $v^\star$ , and  $\underline{\eta}^{(3,2)}$  is the rest of the bond configurations.

Set  $\widehat{\Omega}_{u,v}(s) := \{\underline{\eta}^{(2)} : (\underline{\eta}^{(2)}, \underline{\eta}^{(3)}) \in \Omega_{u,v}(s) \text{ for some } \underline{\eta}^{(3)}\}$ . Note that given any  $\underline{\eta}^{(1)}, \underline{\eta}^{(2)} \in \widehat{\Omega}_{u,v}(s)$ , and  $\underline{\eta}^{(3,2)}$  the only indeterminacy in the cluster structure through the choice of  $\underline{\eta}^{(3,1)}$  is whether the clusters of  $u$  and  $v$  contains the ghost  $v^\star$  or not. Therefore, using that  $|V(P_u \cup P_v)| = 2s$  and that  $1 - p_e = e^{-B}$  for  $e \in \mathbb{T}_d^\star(t+s) \setminus \mathbb{T}_d(t+s)$ , we have

$$\varphi^{\beta,B,t+s}(\underline{\eta}^{(3,1)} \equiv 0 | \underline{\eta}^{(1)}, \underline{\eta}^{(2)}, \underline{\eta}^{(3,2)}) \leq q^2 \exp(-2Bs). \quad (2.25)$$

Finally using observations (i) and (ii) above, and taking an average over  $(\underline{\eta}^{(1)}, \underline{\eta}^{(2)}, \underline{\eta}^{(3,2)})$  we obtain (2.24) with  $\varphi^{t+s}$  replaced by  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t+s}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$  as above. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.10.** For  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger$  let  $\mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\widehat{\underline{\eta}})$  denote the probability measure on spins of  $\mathbb{T}_d^\dagger(t)$ , with the same spin value across all vertices in each connected component and IID uniform on  $[q]$  spin values across different connected components, except for the component containing  $v^\star$  whose spin is  $\sigma_{v^\star} = 1$ . For  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger(t)$  let  $\mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t})$  denote the *random* probability measure induced by  $\mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\widehat{\underline{\eta}})$  for random  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}}$  whose law is  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}$  (restricting to  $B = 0$  when  $\dagger = o$ ), and for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_\dagger(t) \subset \mathcal{P}(\widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger)$  let

$$\theta_\dagger^t(\varphi) := \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger(t)} \varphi(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})) \mathbb{E}_b[\mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t})],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_b[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation with respect to the bond variables. Setting  $\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}(\widehat{\underline{\eta}}) = 0$  whenever  $\widehat{\underline{\eta}} = (\underline{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}')$  is such that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C}) \neq \boldsymbol{\eta}'$ , by Lemma 2.2(ii),

$$\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}(\cdot, \widehat{\underline{\eta}}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}(\widehat{\underline{\eta}}) \mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\widehat{\underline{\eta}})(\cdot), \quad \forall \mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger(t), \widehat{\underline{\eta}} \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger, \quad (2.26)$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{\widehat{\underline{\eta}}} \varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t}(\cdot, \widehat{\underline{\eta}}) = \mathbb{E}_b[\mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t})](\cdot), \quad \forall \mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_\dagger(t). \quad (2.27)$$

Thus, with  $\varpi_s$  and  $\varpi_b$  denoting the spin and bond marginals of  $\varpi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^\dagger \times \widehat{\mathbb{B}}_t^\dagger)$ ,

$$\varpi \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_\dagger(t) \implies \varpi = \varpi_b(\widehat{\underline{\eta}}) \mathbf{u}_\dagger^t(\widehat{\underline{\eta}}), \quad \varpi_s = \theta_\dagger^t(\varpi_b) \quad \text{and} \quad \varpi_b \in \mathcal{R}_\dagger(t), \quad \dagger \in \{o, \star\}. \quad (2.28)$$

Utilizing Remark 2.10, we now relate marginals of the free and wired Potts and RCM-s on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ .

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $\dagger = \star$  if  $B > 0$  and  $\dagger = o$  if  $B = 0$ . Then, for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ :*

- (a) *The  $t$ -dimensional marginal of  $\varpi = (\varpi_s, \varpi_b) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\dagger}(t+1)$  is  $\varpi^t = (\varpi_s^t, \varpi_b^t) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\dagger}(t)$ .*
- (b) *The Potts and RCM marginals are such that  $\mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t} = \theta_{\dagger}^t(\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t})$ , for  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$ .*
- (c) *For  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$  we have*

$$\mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}(i \leftrightarrow j) + \frac{1}{q}, \quad (i, j) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d). \quad (2.29)$$

*Proof.* (a). With  $\varpi^t$  denoting the marginal of  $\varpi$  to the sub-tree  $\mathbb{T}_d^{\dagger}(t)$ , clearly one may compute the marginals  $(\varpi^t)_s$  and  $(\varpi^t)_b$  on the spins and bonds of  $\mathbb{T}_d^{\dagger}(t)$ , respectively, also in the opposite order. That is, as stated,  $(\varpi^t)_s = (\varpi_s)^t$  and  $(\varpi^t)_b = (\varpi_b)^t$ . For our remaining claim, that  $\varpi^t \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\dagger}(t)$  for any  $\varpi \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\dagger}(t+1)$ , it suffices to consider only the extremal measures of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\dagger}(t+1)$ . Namely, to fix  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t+1)$  and consider the  $t$ -marginal of  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B}$  (with boundary specification  $\eta = \eta(\mathcal{C})$  on  $K^{\dagger}(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t+1))$ ). Doing this, we denote by  $(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0)$  the configuration on  $\mathbb{T}_d^{\dagger}(t)$ , so upon splitting the spins and bonds of  $\mathbb{T}_d^{\dagger}(t+1)$  as  $(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\sigma})$  and  $(\underline{\eta}^0, \underline{\eta})$ , our task is to show that for some  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t))$ ,

$$\sum_{\underline{\eta}} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}} \varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t+1}(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}^0, \underline{\eta}) = \sum_{\mathcal{C}^0 \in \mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t)} \rho(\mathcal{C}^0) \varpi_{\mathcal{C}^0}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0), \quad \forall \underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\eta}^0.$$

Applying (2.26) on both sides of this identity and then utilizing (2.10), it remains only to show that

$$\sum_{\underline{\sigma}} \mathbf{u}_{\dagger}^{t+1}(\underline{\eta}^0, \underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C})(\underline{\sigma}^0, \underline{\sigma}) = \mathbf{u}_{\dagger}^t(\underline{\eta}^0, \mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C}))(\underline{\sigma}^0), \quad \forall (\underline{\eta}^0, \underline{\eta}), \quad (2.30)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C}) \in \mathfrak{C}_{\dagger}(t)$  denotes the partition corresponding to open components of  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  induced by  $\underline{\eta}$  and the given partition  $\mathcal{C}$  of the boundary of  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^{\dagger}(t+1)$ . Next, recall that under  $\mathbf{u}_{\dagger}^{t+1}(\cdot)$  all spins in each  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$  must take the same value, if  $C_i$  has an open path to some  $v \in \partial\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  then the spin of  $C_i$  must match  $\sigma_v^0$  while otherwise the spin of  $C_i$  be chosen uniformly in  $[q]$ , independently of everything else. Further,  $(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C})$  determines the connectivity between  $(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t+1))^{\star}$  and  $(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t))^{\star}$  and  $\mathcal{C}'(\underline{\eta}, \mathcal{C})$  is the partition induced on  $(\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t))^{\star}$  by our requirement that  $\sigma_u^0 = \sigma_v^0$  whenever  $u$  and  $v$  connect, via  $\underline{\eta}$ , to the same block of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Combining these observations leads to (2.30).

(b). Fix  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$ ,  $B > 0$  and  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Lemma 2.2(i), Definition 2.4, and Definition 1.9, we have that  $\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B}$  are the bond marginals of the Edwards-Sokal measure  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B}$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^{\star}(s)$  with  $\eta(\mathcal{C}) \equiv \mathfrak{f}(\dagger)$ , where  $\mathfrak{f}(\cdot)$  is as in (1.14). We further claim that then  $\mu_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B}$  of Definition 1.2 is such that

$$\mu_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B}(\cdot) = \sum_{\underline{\eta}} \varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B}(\cdot, \underline{\eta}) = \theta_{\star}^s(\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B}). \quad (2.31)$$

Indeed, the LHS of (2.31) follows from Lemma 2.2(i) upon observing that by Lemma 2.2(ii), here  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B} = \varpi_{\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^{\star}(s)}^{\beta, B}$  with IID uniform spins at  $\partial\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  if  $\dagger = f$  and all such spins set to 1 if  $\dagger = w$  (whereas the RHS of (2.31) is merely an application of Remark 2.10). Next, in view of part (a) we further deduce from (2.31) that  $\mu_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B, t} = \theta_{\star}^t(\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B, t})$  for any  $s > t$ . Since  $\mu_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B, t} \Rightarrow \mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t}$  and  $\varphi_{\dagger, s}^{\beta, B, t} \Rightarrow \varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t}$  when  $s \rightarrow \infty$ , we arrive at  $\mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t} = \theta_{\star}^t(\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta, B, t})$ .

For  $B = 0$  we omit the isolated  $v^{\star}$  and arrive by the preceding reasoning at  $\mu_f^{\beta, 0, t} = \theta_o^t(\varphi_f^{\beta, 0, t})$ . We likewise get that  $\mu_w^{\beta, 0, t} = \theta_o^t(\varphi_w^{\beta, 0, t})$  upon verifying that the LHS of (2.31) holds in that case,

which in view of (1.16) and both parts of Lemma 2.2 amounts to checking that

$$\frac{1}{q} \sum_{k=1}^q \mu_{k,s}^{\beta,0}(\cdot) = \mu_{\mathcal{T}_d(s)}^{\beta,0}(\cdot \mid |\sigma|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_d(s)} \equiv \sigma' \in [q]).$$

By symmetry the value of  $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_d(s)}^{\beta,0}(\sigma|_{\partial \mathcal{T}_d(s)} \equiv k)$  is independent of  $k$  and as  $\mu_{k,s}^{\beta,0}$  equals  $\mu_{\mathcal{T}_d(s)}^{\beta,0}$  conditional to the latter event (see Definition 1.2), the preceding identity follows.

(c). For any  $(i, j) \in E(\mathcal{T}_d)$  there exists some  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(i, j) \in E(\mathcal{T}_d(t))$  in which case  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j)$  and  $\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(i \leftrightarrow j) = \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t}(i \leftrightarrow j)$ . Thus, by part (b) and arguing as in the proof of Corollary 2.3 (now conditionally to  $\boldsymbol{\eta} \equiv \mathfrak{f}(\ddagger)$  on  $\mathcal{K}^\dagger(\partial \mathcal{T}_d(t))$ ), results with (2.29).  $\square$

### 3. BETHE REPLICA SYMMETRY: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.12

We set as usual  $\dagger = \star$  if  $B > 0$  and  $\dagger = o$  if  $B = 0$ . Throughout this section also  $\ddagger = \mathfrak{f}$  if  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_f$  and  $\ddagger = \mathfrak{w}$  if  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_1$ . Our next lemma (the proof of which is postponed to Section 3.1), identifies the limit of the internal energy per vertex for  $\mu_n^{\beta,B}$ , which is hence the key to pinning down the local weak limits as those supported on one specific degenerate measure.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Under Assumption 1.4 (with  $\ddagger = \mathfrak{f}$  if  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_f$ ;  $\ddagger = \mathfrak{w}$  if  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_1$ ) we have,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \partial i} \mu_n^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \sum_{i \in \partial o} \mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i). \quad (3.1)$$

We proceed with the following three steps of our proof of Theorem 1.12.

**Step I.** From RCM limits to Potts limits.

Suppose  $\varphi_{n_k}^{\beta,B} \xrightarrow{w.c.} \varphi \in \mathcal{M}_b^{\beta,B}$ , where  $\varphi = \alpha \varphi_w^{\beta,B} + (1 - \alpha) \varphi_f^{\beta,B}$  for some  $[0, 1]$ -valued  $\alpha$ . The local weak limit points  $\mathfrak{m}_{s,b}$  of the Edwards-Sokal measures  $\varpi_{n_k}^{\beta,B}$  (which exist in view of Lemma 2.9(a)), must all have the same bond marginal with  $\mathfrak{m}_b(\{\varphi\}) = 1$ . Recall from Lemma 2.9(b) that each  $\mathfrak{m}_{s,b}^t$  is supported on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_\dagger(t)$ . In view of (2.28), this in turn implies that  $\mathfrak{m}_s^t(\{\theta_\ddagger^t(\varphi)\}) = 1$ . Applying Lemma 2.11(b) we deduce that  $\mathfrak{m}_s^t(\{\alpha \mu_w^{\beta,B,t} + (1 - \alpha) \mu_f^{\beta,B,t}\}) = 1$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . That is,  $\mu_{n_k}^{\beta,B} \xrightarrow{w.c.} \alpha \mu_w^{\beta,B} + (1 - \alpha) \mu_f^{\beta,B}$ . In particular, in the setting of Theorems 1.12 and 1.13 it suffices to prove only the stated local weak convergence for the RCM-s  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B}$ .

**Step II.** The uniqueness regime  $(\beta, B) \in [0, \infty)^2 \setminus \mathbf{R}_\neq$ .

Here  $\mu_w^{\beta,B} = \mu_f^{\beta,B}$  (see Proposition 1.5(i)), hence  $\varphi_w^{\beta,B}(i \leftrightarrow j) = \varphi_f^{\beta,B}(i \leftrightarrow j)$  at any edge  $(i, j)$  of  $\mathcal{T}_d$  (see Lemma 2.11(c)), and in particular  $\varphi_w^{\beta,B,s+1}(\mathfrak{F}_s) = \varphi_f^{\beta,B,s+1}(\mathfrak{F}_s)$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  (recall (2.12)). From Lemma 2.7 it then follows that  $\varphi_f^{\beta,B,t} = \varphi_w^{\beta,B,t}$  and hence  $\mathcal{S}_\dagger(t) = \{\varphi_f^{\beta,B,t}\}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  (see Definition 2.8). In view of Lemma 2.9(c), we conclude that  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B} \xrightarrow{w.c.} \varphi_f^{\beta,B}$ , as claimed.

**Step III.** Non-uniqueness, with  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_f \cup \mathbf{R}_1$ .

Consider the uniformly bounded functionals

$$\mathfrak{H}_t^s := \frac{1}{|\partial \mathbf{B}_o(t)|} \sum_{i \in \partial \mathbf{B}_o(t)} \frac{1}{\Delta_i} \sum_{j \in \partial i} \mathbf{1}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{H}_t^b := \frac{1}{|\partial \mathbf{B}_o(t)|} \sum_{i \in \partial \mathbf{B}_o(t)} \frac{1}{\Delta_i} \sum_{j \in \partial i} \mathbf{1}(i \leftrightarrow j)$$

(see Definitions 1.6 and 1.9), where the event  $\{i \leftrightarrow j\}$  denotes that there is an open path between  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_o^\dagger(t+1)$ . With  $\mathbb{T}_d$  vertex transitive,  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}$  is translation invariant, so for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \partial o} \mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_o = \sigma_j) = \frac{1}{|\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)|} \sum_{i \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)} \frac{1}{\Delta_i} \sum_{j \in \partial i} \mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{H}_t^b) + \frac{1}{q}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the right identity is due to Lemma 2.11(c). Consider the  $[0, 1]$ -valued functions on  $V(\mathbf{G}_n)$ ,

$$\mathfrak{a}_n^t(i) := \sum_{k \in \partial \mathbf{B}_i(t)} \frac{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_k(2t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2t))}{|\partial \mathbf{B}_k(t)|} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{B}_i(t) \not\cong \mathbb{T}_d(t), \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{B}_i(3t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(3t). \end{cases}$$

For  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  we have that  $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathfrak{a}_n^t(I_n)] \rightarrow 1$ , hence it follows from (3.1) and (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{H}_t^b) + \frac{1}{q} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in \partial i} \mathfrak{a}_n^t(i) \varpi_n^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_{I_n}(2t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2t)) \mathbf{P}_{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}}^{t+1}(I_n)(\mathfrak{H}_t^s) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

(in the last identity we used that  $k \in \partial \mathbf{B}_i(t)$  if and only if  $i \in \partial \mathbf{B}_k(t)$ ). From (3.3) we deduce that for any weak limit point  $\mathfrak{m}_{s,b}$  of  $\{\varpi_n^{\beta,B}\}$

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{H}_t^b) + \frac{1}{q} = \mathfrak{m}_{s,b}^{t+1}(\varpi(\mathfrak{H}_t^s)), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.4)$$

Applying Corollary 2.3 on the graph  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t+1)$  with boundary edges per  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathcal{C})$ , results with

$$\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{H}_t^s) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{H}_t^b) + \frac{1}{q}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall \mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\ddagger}.$$

Plugging the latter identity into (3.4) we arrive at

$$\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{H}_t^b) = \mathfrak{m}_{s,b}^{t+1}(\varphi(\mathfrak{H}_t^b)) = \mathfrak{m}_b^{t+1}(\varphi(\mathfrak{H}_t^b)), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N},$$

which since  $\mathfrak{H}_t^b = \frac{1}{c_t} \mathfrak{F}_t$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^\dagger(t+1)$  for any boundary edges (with  $c_t = d|\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)|$ ), implies that for any local weak limit point  $\mathfrak{m}_b$  of  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B}$ ,

$$\mathfrak{m}_b^{t+1}(\varphi(\mathfrak{F}_t)) = \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,t+1}(\mathfrak{F}_t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.5)$$

By Lemma 2.9(c) and Definition 2.8, we know that  $\varphi_f^{\beta,B,s+1} \preceq \varphi \preceq \varphi_w^{\beta,B,s+1}$  for  $\mathfrak{m}_b^{s+1}$ -a.e.  $\varphi$ . Combining Lemma 2.7 with (3.5) then yields that  $\mathfrak{m}_b^{s+1}(\{\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B,s+1}\}) = 1$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since this applies for any local weak limit point  $\mathfrak{m}_b$ , as claimed  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B} \xrightarrow{loc} \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**3.1. Proof of Lemma 3.1.** Setting hereafter  $\ddagger \in \{f, 1\}$  we shall rely on the next two lemmas about smoothness of the fixed points  $\nu_{\ddagger}$  of the BP recursion and the corresponding marginals of two adjacent spins under  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}$  (proofs of which are postponed to Appendix A).

**Lemma 3.2** (Smoothness of  $\nu_{\ddagger}$ ). *Let  $\partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq}$  denote the boundary of the non-uniqueness regime  $\mathbf{R}_{\neq}$  defined in Proposition 1.5. Define*

$$\partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq}^f := \{(\beta', \mathbf{B}') \in \partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq} : \beta' = \beta_f(\mathbf{B}')\} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq}^+ := \{(\beta', \mathbf{B}') \in \partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq} : \beta' = \beta_+(\mathbf{B}')\}.$$

- (i) *If  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbf{R}_{\neq} \setminus \partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq}^f$  then the map  $(\beta, B) \mapsto \nu_1^{\beta,B}$  is continuously differentiable at  $(\beta_0, B_0)$ .*
- (ii) *If  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbf{R}_{\neq} \setminus \partial \mathbf{R}_{\neq}^+$  then the same conclusion holds for  $\nu_f^{\beta,B}$ .*

**Lemma 3.3** (Marginals of  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}$ ). For  $\ddagger \in \{f, 1\}$  and any  $\beta, B \geq 0$ ,

$$\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) \propto e^{\beta \delta_{\sigma_i, \sigma_j}} \nu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i) \nu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_j), \quad \forall (i, j) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d), \quad \forall \sigma_i, \sigma_j \in [q], \quad (3.6)$$

$$\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i) \propto \left( (e^\beta - 1) \nu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i) + 1 \right) \nu_{\ddagger}^{\beta,B}(\sigma_i), \quad \forall i \in V(\mathbb{T}_d), \quad \forall \sigma_i \in [q]. \quad (3.7)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* First note that for  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_f$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(i,j) \in E_n} \mu_n^{\beta_0, B_0}(\sigma_i = \sigma_j) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi_n(\beta_0, B_0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta_0, B_0}). \quad (3.8)$$

Indeed, the left equality in (3.8) follows by a straightforward computation, whereas for the right equality recall that the derivatives in  $\beta$  of convex functions  $\{\Phi_n(\cdot, B)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converge to the derivative of their (convex) limit, whenever the latter exists. Now, as  $\mathbb{R}_c \subset (\mathbb{R}_f)^c$ , it follows by Proposition 1.5 and Assumption 1.4 that for any  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_f$  there exists some open neighborhood  $U_{\beta_0, B_0} \ni (\beta_0, B_0)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(\beta, B) = \max\{\Phi(\nu_f^{\beta, B}), \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta, B})\} = \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta, B}), \quad \text{for any } (\beta, B) \in U_{\beta_0, B_0}. \quad (3.9)$$

From Lemma 3.2(ii) we know that  $(\beta, B) \mapsto \nu_f^{\beta, B}$  is differentiable at  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_f \subset \mathbb{R}_{\neq} \setminus \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^+$  and with  $(\nu, \beta, B) \mapsto \Phi^{\beta, B}(\nu)$  differentiable, by the chain rule the limit in (3.9) is differentiable in  $\beta$  at  $(\beta_0, B_0)$ , yielding the right equality in (3.8). To complete the proof of (3.1) for  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_f$  note that the identity

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta_0, B_0}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \partial o} \mu_f^{\beta_0, B_0}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i), \quad (3.10)$$

is a special case of [9, Proposition 2.4]. Indeed, the positivity and finite mean conditions [9, (H1) and (H2)] apply for the Potts model and  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , respectively, their differentiability requirement (H3 $^\beta$ ) is covered for  $(\beta, B) \mapsto \nu_f^{\beta, B}$  by Lemma 3.2(ii), and comparing (3.6) with [9, Eqn. (1.22)] shows that the translation invariance (hence unimodular), measure  $\mu_f^{\beta, B}$  is in the space  $\mathcal{H}^*$  of [9].

Following the same line of reasoning we find that for  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_1$  the equality (3.1) holds with  $\mu_w^{\beta, B}$  replaced by  $\mu_1^{\beta, B}$ . Finally, by construction  $\mu_w^{\beta, 0}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i) = \mu_k^{\beta, 0}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i)$  for any  $k \in [q]$ , and  $\mu_1^{\beta, B} = \mu_w^{\beta, B}$  for  $B > 0$  (recall (1.16)).  $\square$

#### 4. DOMINATING SPIN AND PURE STATE: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.18

At  $B = 0$  the Potts measure is invariant under a global spin color permutation. Hence,  $\mu_n^{\beta, 0}(\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}) = k) = 1/q$  for all  $k \in [q]$  (see (1.18) for  $\mathcal{K}_n(\cdot)$ ), with  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta, 0}(\cdot) = q \mu_n^{\beta, 0}(\cdot, \mathcal{K}_n(\cdot) = k)$ .

In Section 4.1 we show that for  $\beta < \beta_c(0)$  and any  $k_1 \neq k_2 \in [q]$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left| \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{n,k_1}^{\beta, 0}}^t(I_n)(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}) - \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{n,k_2}^{\beta, 0}}^t(I_n)(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}) \right| = 0, \quad \forall \underline{\sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.1)$$

By Theorem 1.12(i)-(ii), as for such  $\beta$

$$\mu_n^{\beta, 0} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{k=1}^q \mu_{n,k}^{\beta, 0} \xrightarrow{law} \mu_f^{\beta, 0},$$

we deduce in view of (4.1) that the same must apply also for each  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta, 0}$ , yielding Theorem 1.18(i).

In contrast, to get  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta,0} \xrightarrow{lwc} \mu_k^{\beta,0}$  in Theorem 1.18(ii) amounts to showing that for  $\beta > \beta_c(0)$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n [\mu_n^{\beta,0}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_n(\cdot) = k)] = \frac{1}{q} \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{T}_d(t)} = \underline{\sigma}), \quad \forall \underline{\sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.2)$$

To this end, we show in Section 4.2 that for such  $\beta$ , due to the edge expansion property of  $\{\mathbb{G}_n\}$ , with high  $\mu_n^{\beta,0}$ -probability the dominating color  $\mathcal{K}_n$  coincides with that for a randomly chosen ‘large’ local neighborhood. Employing the local weak convergence from Theorem 1.12(iii), we relate the latter functional to the dominating color of  $\mathbb{T}_d(t)$  under the wired RCM and the proof is then completed upon identifying the behavior that corresponds to a dominant color in this tree setting.

**4.1. Free limit ( $\beta < \beta_c(0)$ ): Proof of Theorem 1.18(i).** We establish (4.1) by a coupling with an arbitrarily small fraction of disagreements between the spins under  $\mu_{n,k_1}^{\beta,0}$  and under  $\mu_{n,k_2}^{\beta,0}$ . To this end, we first show that the free RCM on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , does not have an infinite cluster when  $\beta < \beta_c(0)$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *For any  $d \geq 3$ ,  $q \geq 2$  and  $\beta \in [0, \beta_c(0))$ ,*

$$\varphi_f^{\beta,0}(o \leftrightarrow \infty) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_f^{\beta,0}(o \leftrightarrow \partial \mathbb{B}_o(t)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Recall [11, Theorem 10.67] that the RCM  $\varphi_f^{\beta,0}$  on  $\mathbb{T}_d$  with free boundary condition is merely the product measure on  $\{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d)}$ , where each edge is open with probability  $\pi(\beta) := \frac{p}{p+q(1-p)}$  for  $p = p_e = 1 - e^{-\beta}$ . Since the *branching number* of  $\mathbb{T}_d$  is  $(d-1)$  (see [15, Section 2] for a definition), the stated result follows from [15, Theorem 6.2], upon verifying that

$$m(\beta) := (d-1)\pi(\beta) = \frac{(d-1)(e^\beta - 1)}{e^\beta + q - 1} < 1, \quad \forall \beta \in [0, \beta_c(0)). \quad (4.3)$$

By the monotonicity of  $y \mapsto \frac{y}{y+a}$  whenever  $a > 0$ , it suffices for (4.3) to show that  $m(\beta_c(0)) \leq 1$ . To this end, note that by Jensen’s inequality,

$$h(x) := \frac{x^{1-d/2}(x^{d-1} - 1)}{(d-1)(x-1)} = \frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{j=0}^{d-2} x^{j+1-d/2} > 1, \quad \forall x > 1.$$

Now, recall from the discussion after [2, Theorem 1.1], that for any  $d, q \geq 3$ ,

$$e^{\beta_c(0)} = \frac{q-2}{(q-1)^{1-2/d} - 1}.$$

In view of (4.3), it then follows that  $m(\beta_c(0)) = 1/h((q-1)^{2/d}) < 1$ . Similarly,  $e^{\beta_c(0)} = d/(d-2)$  when  $q = 2$ , in which case  $m(\beta_c(0)) = 1$ . Thus,  $m(\beta) < m(\beta_c(0)) \leq 1$  for all  $q \geq 2$ , as claimed.  $\square$

With  $\varphi_n^{\beta,0} \xrightarrow{lwc} \varphi_f^{\beta,0}$  (see Theorem 1.12(i)-(ii)), we next show that Lemma 4.1 implies having only a small fraction of the vertices of  $\mathbb{G}_n$  in large open connected components of  $\varphi_n^{\beta,0}$  (whenever  $\beta < \beta_c(0)$ ).

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{N}_n(r) := \mathcal{N}_n(r, \underline{\eta})$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote the number of open connected components of size  $r$  in  $\mathbb{G}_n$  equipped with bond configuration  $\underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E_n}$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\beta \in [0, \beta_c(0))$ , there exists some  $\ell_\star = \ell_\star(\varepsilon, \beta) < \infty$  such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n^{\beta,0} \left( \sum_{r \geq \ell_\star} r \mathcal{N}_n(r) \geq \varepsilon n \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Fixing  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , note that the event  $\{\sum_{r \geq \ell} r \mathcal{N}_n(r) \geq \varepsilon n\}$  implies having at least  $\varepsilon n$  vertices of  $\mathbf{G}_n$  with open connected components of size at least  $\ell$ . Setting the smallest  $t_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $|\mathbb{T}_d(t_\ell)| \geq \ell$ , where for a finite graph  $\mathbf{G}$  the notation  $|\mathbf{G}|$  is used to denote the cardinality of its vertices, for any  $i \in [n]$  with open connected component of size at least  $\ell$  and  $\mathbf{B}_i(t_\ell) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t_\ell)$ , there must be an open path within  $\mathbf{B}_i(t_\ell)$  from  $i$  to  $\partial \mathbf{B}_i(t_\ell)$ . This together with Markov's inequality, Theorem 1.12(i)-(ii) for the RCM-s  $\varphi_n^{\beta,0}$ , and the fact that  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{\text{loc}} \mathbb{T}_d$ , entail that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n^{\beta,0} \left( \sum_{r \geq \ell} r \mathcal{N}_n(r) \geq \varepsilon n \right) \\ & \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \varphi_n^{\beta,0}(I_n \xrightarrow{\text{in}} \partial \mathbf{B}_{I_n}(t_\ell)) \cdot \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_{I_n}(t_\ell) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t_\ell)) \right] = \varepsilon^{-1} \varphi_1^{\beta,0}(o \leftrightarrow \partial \mathbf{B}_o(t_\ell)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $t_\ell \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , by Lemma 4.1 we can choose  $\ell$  large enough so that the RHS above is at most  $\varepsilon$ , thereby completing the proof.  $\square$

Recall that, by Lemma 2.2(ii) at  $B = 0$ , given a random cluster bond configuration, the Potts spin configuration is obtained by assigning a single color to all vertices in each connected component, uniformly at random, and independently across all components. Our next ‘complicated’ procedure of generating such independent discrete uniform random variables is the key to our promised coupling of  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta,0}$  and  $\mu_{n,k'}^{\beta,0}$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{M} := (\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_q) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Mult}_q(M, q^{-1}, q^{-1}, \dots, q^{-1})$ , follows the multinomial distribution with  $M$  trials and equal probability  $q^{-1}$  for each of the  $q$  categories. Conditioned on  $\mathcal{M}$  choose uniformly at random a labeled partition of  $[M]$  to distinguished sets  $\{B_k, \tilde{B}_k\}$  of sizes  $|B_k| = \mathcal{M}_k := \min_k \{\mathcal{M}_k\}$  and  $|\tilde{B}_k| = \mathcal{M}_k - \mathcal{M}_*$ . For a uniformly chosen permutation  $\underline{\gamma}$  of  $[q]$ , set  $Y_i = k$  whenever  $i \in B_k \cup \tilde{B}_{\gamma(k)}$ . This yields IID variables  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^M$ , each following the discrete uniform law  $\text{Unif}([q])$  on  $[q]$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for  $\mathbf{Y} := (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_M)$ , any fixed  $\mathbf{k} := (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_M) \in [q]^M$  and a fixed permutation  $\gamma^0$  of  $[q]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{k} \mid \underline{\gamma} = \gamma^0) = q^{-M}. \quad (4.4)$$

Now, given  $\underline{\gamma} = \gamma^0$ , the event  $\Omega_{\mathbf{k}} := \{\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{k}\}$  induces the partition  $\hat{B}_i := \{j \in [M] : k_j = i\}$  of  $[M]$  with  $\hat{B}_i = B_i \cup \tilde{B}_{\gamma^0(i)}$ . Setting  $|\hat{B}_i| = y_i$ , since  $|B_i| = y_* := \min_j \{y_j\}$  for all  $i \in [q]$ , we also have  $|\tilde{B}_{\gamma^0(i)}| = y_i - y_*$ . That is, given  $\underline{\gamma}$ , the event  $\Omega_{\mathbf{k}}$  determines the sizes and colors of  $\{B_i, \tilde{B}_i\}$ , with only the choices of  $B_i \subset \hat{B}_i$  indeterminate. In fact, any such choice of  $\{B_i\}$  with  $|B_i| = y_*$  produces a realization of the event  $\Omega_{\mathbf{k}}$ . There are  $\prod_{i=1}^q \binom{y_i}{y_*}$  such choices and the probability of observing each realization of  $\{B_i, \tilde{B}_i\}_{i=1}^q$  is then

$$\frac{1}{\binom{M}{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_q} \prod_{i=1}^q \binom{y_i}{y_*}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_i = y_i, i \in [q]) = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^q \binom{y_i}{y_*}} q^{-M}.$$

Hence, taking a union over the set of all possible choices of  $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^q$  we arrive at (4.4).  $\square$

In Lemma 4.3 the dominant color is completely determined by the  $\sum_k |\mathcal{M}_k - \mathcal{M}_*|$  colors involving  $\underline{\gamma}$ , and by standard concentration bounds with high probability there are only  $o(M)$  such colors. We can thus produce an identical copy  $\{Y'_i\}_{i=1}^M$  with only  $o(M)$  discrepancy from  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^M$  and two different specified dominant colors. Indeed, building on Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 we proceed this way to establish (4.1) (and thereby get Theorem 1.18(i)).

*Proof of (4.1).* Fixing  $k_1 \neq k_2 \in [q]$ , our proof hinges on producing Potts spin configurations  $\underline{\sigma}^1, \underline{\sigma}^2 \in [q]^n$  that with high probability agree up to  $o(n)$  sites, while  $\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^1) = k_1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^2) = k_2$ . To this end, equip  $\mathbb{G}_n$  with bond configuration  $\underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E_n}$  and let  $W_r \subset [n]$ ,  $r \geq 1$ , denote the vertex disjoint union of its  $\mathcal{N}_n(r) := \mathcal{N}_n(r, \underline{\eta})$  open connected components of size  $r$ . Next, fix a uniformly random permutation  $\underline{\gamma}$  of  $[q]$  and set  $\underline{\gamma}'$  such that  $\gamma'(k) = \gamma(k)$  for  $k \notin \{k_1, k_2\}$  with  $\gamma'(k_1) = \gamma(k_2)$  and  $\gamma'(k_2) = \gamma(k_1)$ . Choosing

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(r)} := (\mathcal{N}_n(r, 1), \mathcal{N}_n(r, 2), \dots, \mathcal{N}_n(r, q)) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Mult}_q(\mathcal{N}_n(r), q^{-1}, q^{-1}, \dots, q^{-1}),$$

and the corresponding partition of  $[\mathcal{N}_n(r)]$  as in Lemma 4.3, induces via  $\underline{\gamma}$  a color coding for each open connected component of size  $r$ . Thereby assigning that same color to all vertices of such a component, we obtain a spin configuration  $\underline{\sigma}_{W_r}^1$ . Following the same procedure except for replacing  $\underline{\gamma}$  by  $\underline{\gamma}'$  yields another spin configuration  $\underline{\sigma}_{W_r}^2$ . With  $\mathcal{W}_r \subset W_r$  denoting the (random) set of sites whose color is independent of the choice of  $\underline{\gamma}$ , we have by construction that  $\underline{\sigma}_{\mathcal{W}_r}^1 = \underline{\sigma}_{\mathcal{W}_r}^2$  and

$$|W_r \setminus \mathcal{W}_r| \leq qr \max_{k, k' \in [q]} |\mathcal{N}_n(r, k) - \mathcal{N}_n(r, k')|.$$

Repeating this procedure for each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , independently across different  $r$ 's yields a random set of sites  $\mathcal{W} \subset [n]$  with color independent of  $\underline{\gamma}$  and spin configurations  $\underline{\sigma}^1, \underline{\sigma}^2 \in [q]^n$  with  $\underline{\sigma}_{\mathcal{W}}^1 = \underline{\sigma}_{\mathcal{W}}^2$  and

$$|\mathcal{W}^c| \leq q \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} r \max_{k \neq k' \in [q]} |\mathcal{N}_n(r, k) - \mathcal{N}_n(r, k')|. \quad (4.5)$$

In view of Lemmas 2.2(ii) and 4.3, for  $\underline{\eta}$  drawn according the RCM  $\varphi_n^{\beta, 0}$ , the marginal laws of  $\underline{\sigma}^1$  and  $\underline{\sigma}^2$  are both given by the Potts measure  $\mu_n^{\beta, 0}$ . Further, these spin configurations are such that  $\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^1) = k_1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^2) = k_2$ . Indeed, since the number of sites in  $\mathcal{W}$  with any given color is exactly  $q^{-1}|\mathcal{W}|$  in both  $\underline{\sigma}^1$  and  $\underline{\sigma}^2$ , the event  $\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^1) = k_1$  amounts to spin configuration  $\underline{\sigma}_{\mathcal{W}^c}^1$  of dominating color  $k_1$ . The relation between  $\underline{\gamma}$  and  $\underline{\gamma}'$  dictates that this happens if and only if the same holds for  $\underline{\sigma}^2$  with  $k_1$  replaced by  $k_2$ , namely that equivalently  $\mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^2) = k_2$ .

Armed with these observations, for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\underline{\sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_t$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \mathbf{1}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_i(t)}^1 = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^1) = k_1) - \mathbf{1}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_i(t)}^2 = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_n(\underline{\sigma}^2) = k_2) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{B}_i(t) \cap \mathcal{W}^c \neq \emptyset, \mathbb{B}_i(2t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2t)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{B}_i(2t) \not\cong \mathbb{T}_d(2t)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Clearly,  $\mathbf{1}(\mathbb{B}_i(t) \cap \mathcal{W}^c \neq \emptyset) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{W}^c} \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{B}_i(t) \ni j)$  and if  $j \in \mathbb{B}_i(t)$  for  $\mathbb{B}_i(2t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2t)$  then also  $\mathbb{B}_j(t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)$ . Thus, the first term in the RHS of (4.6) is bounded above by

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{W}^c} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{B}_i(2t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2t), \mathbb{B}_i(t) \ni j) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{W}^c} |\mathbb{B}_j(t)| \mathbf{1}(\mathbb{B}_j(t) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(t)) \leq (d+1)^t \frac{|\mathcal{W}^c|}{n}. \quad (4.7)$$

Recalling that  $\mu_{n,k}^{\beta, 0}(\cdot) = q\mu_n^{\beta, 0}(\cdot, \mathcal{K}_n(\cdot) = k)$  and  $\mathbb{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ , by (4.6), (4.7) and the triangle inequality, we find that for any  $k_1 \neq k_2 \in [q]$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left| \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{n,k_1}^{\beta, 0}}^t(I_n)(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}) - \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{n,k_2}^{\beta, 0}}^t(I_n)(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}) \right| \leq q(d+1)^t \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{W}^c|],$$



where the expectation on the RHS is with respect to both the underlying RCM and our two color assignments via Lemma 4.3. Thus, to conclude with (4.1) it suffices to fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and show that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[|\mathscr{W}^c|] \leq 3q\varepsilon. \quad (4.8)$$

To this end, set for  $\ell_*(\varepsilon)$  as in Lemma 4.2 and  $0 < \varepsilon_* \leq \varepsilon \ell_*(\varepsilon)^{-2}$  the events

$$\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2(r), \quad \mathcal{C}_1 := \left\{ \sum_{r \geq \ell_*(\varepsilon)} r \mathcal{N}_n(r) \leq \varepsilon n \right\}, \quad \mathcal{C}_2(r) := \left\{ \max_{k, k' \in [q]} |\mathcal{N}_n(r, k) - \mathcal{N}_n(r, k')| \leq \varepsilon_* n \right\}.$$

Note that on the event  $\mathcal{C}$  we have from (4.5) and our choice of  $\varepsilon_*$  that

$$q^{-1} |\mathscr{W}^c| \leq \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} r \max_{k, k' \in [q]} |\mathcal{N}_n(r, k) - \mathcal{N}_n(r, k')| \leq \sum_{r \geq \ell_*(\varepsilon)} r \mathcal{N}_n(r) + \varepsilon_* n \sum_{r < \ell_*(\varepsilon)} r \leq 2\varepsilon n.$$

With  $|\mathscr{W}^c| \leq n$ , we thus arrive at (4.8) and thereby at (4.1), upon showing that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_1^c) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{r < \ell_*(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_2(r)^c) \leq q\varepsilon. \quad (4.9)$$

Next note that for some  $c = c(q) > 0$  and any  $\varepsilon_* > 0$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , by the union bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{k \neq k' \in [q]} |\mathcal{N}_n(r, k) - \mathcal{N}_n(r, k')| \geq \varepsilon_* \mathcal{N}_n(r) \mid \underline{\eta}\right) &\leq \sum_{k \in [q]} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}_n(r, k) - \mathcal{N}_n(r)|/q \geq \varepsilon_* \mathcal{N}_n(r)/2 \mid \underline{\eta}) \\ &\leq 2q \exp(-c \varepsilon_*^2 \mathcal{N}_n(r)) \end{aligned}$$

(the last step is a standard Binomial( $m, q^{-1}$ ) tail bound). Further  $\mathcal{C}_2(r)^c \subseteq \{\mathcal{N}_n(r) > \varepsilon_* n\}$ , hence

$$\sum_{r < \ell_*(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_2(r)^c) \leq 2q \ell_*(\varepsilon) e^{-c \varepsilon_*^2 n}.$$

The latter bound goes to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so by Lemma 4.2 we have that (4.9) holds, as claimed.  $\square$

**4.2. Pure states ( $\beta > \beta_c(0)$ ): Proof of Theorem 1.18(ii).** For any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  we have the following local proxy at  $u \in V$  for the dominant color  $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}}(\cdot)$  of a graph  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  (possibly infinite):

$$\mathcal{X}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}(u) := \arg \max_{k \in [q]} \left\{ \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}(u, k) \right\}, \quad \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}(u, k) := \frac{1}{|\mathbf{B}_{u, \mathcal{G}}(\ell)|} \sum_{v \in \mathbf{B}_{u, \mathcal{G}}(\ell)} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_{v, \mathcal{G}}(2\ell) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2\ell)) \delta_{\sigma_v, k},$$

and we break ties uniformly among all maximizer values (as done in Definition 1.16). Further let

$$\mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}^{(1)}(u) := \max_{k \in [q]} \{\mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}(u, k)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}^{(2)}(u) := \max_{k \neq \mathcal{X}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}(u)} \{\mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathcal{G}}(u, k)\},$$

suppressing the dependency on  $\mathcal{G}$  when it is clear from the context. Our next result identifies the behavior of the dominating color of  $\mathbb{T}_d(\ell)$ , under the Potts measures  $\{\mu_k^{\beta, 0}\}_{k \in [q]}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Fix  $\beta \geq \beta_f(0)$  and  $d \geq 3$ . Then, for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\mu_k^{\beta, 0}(\mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}(o, k')) = \begin{cases} \mu_1^{\beta, 0}(\sigma_o = 1) & \text{if } k = k', \\ \mu_1^{\beta, 0}(\sigma_o = 2) & \text{if } k \neq k'. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Further,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{\mu_k^{\beta, 0}}(\mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}(o, k')) = 0, \quad k, k' \in [q], \quad (4.11)$$

and consequently,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k^{\beta, 0}(\mathcal{X}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}(o) = k') = \delta_{k, k'}, \quad k, k' \in [q]. \quad (4.12)$$

**Remark 4.5.** As  $\mathbb{T}_d$  is a vertex transitive graph, the measures  $\{\mu_k^{\beta,0}\}_{k \in [q]}$  are translation invariant on  $V(\mathbb{T}_d)$ , so Lemma 4.4 applies even when the root  $o$  is replaced by any  $j \in V(\mathbb{T}_d)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* We first show (4.12) given (4.10)-(4.11). Indeed, fixing  $k \neq k' \in [q]$  note that

$$\mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(o) = k') \leq \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k) \leq \mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k')). \quad (4.13)$$

Applying (4.10)-(4.11) and Chebychev's inequality, we see that, for any  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k) \leq \mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_o = 1) - \delta) \leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{\mu_k^{\beta,0}}(\mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k)) = 0.$$

By a similar argument

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k') \geq \mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_o = 2) + \delta) = 0.$$

From Proposition 1.5(ii) and the definition of  $\nu_f^{\beta,0}$  it follows that  $q^{-1} = \nu_f^{\beta,0}(1) < \nu_1^{\beta,0}(1)$  for  $\beta \geq \beta_f(0)$ . The definition of  $\nu_1$  further yields that  $\nu_1^{\beta,0}(2) = (q-1)^{-1}(1 - \nu_1^{\beta,0}(1))$  and thus  $\nu_1^{\beta,0}(1) > \nu_1^{\beta,0}(2)$  for  $\beta \geq \beta_f(0)$ . As the map  $\nu \mapsto ((e^\beta - 1)\nu + 1)\nu$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, \infty)$  it follows from (3.7) that  $\mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_o = 1) > \mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_o = 2)$ , for any  $\beta \geq \beta_f(0)$ . Now setting  $\delta := \frac{1}{3}(\mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_o = 1) - \mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_o = 2))$ , we deduce that for any  $k \neq k' \in [q]$ ,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k) - \mathbf{N}_\ell(o, k') \geq \delta) = 1. \quad (4.14)$$

Comparing (4.13) with (4.14) and using that  $\sum_{k'=1}^q \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(o) = k') = 1$ , results with (4.12).

Setting  $\pi_k(1) = k$ ,  $\pi_k(k) = 1$  and  $\pi(k') = k'$  whenever  $k' \neq 1$ ,  $k' \neq k$ , the proof of (4.10) is immediate by the translation invariance of  $\{\mu_k^{\beta,0}\}_{k \in [q]}$  and having that for any finite set  $W \subset V(\mathbb{T}_d)$ ,

$$\mu_1^{\beta,0}(\sigma_i = k'_i, i \in W) = \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\sigma_i = \pi_k(k'_i), i \in W), \quad k, k'_i \in [q]. \quad (4.15)$$

Turning to establish (4.11), by (4.15) we can set  $k = 1$ , further noting that by the translation invariance of  $\mu_1^{\beta,0}$  and the vertex transitivity of  $\mathbb{T}_d$ ,

$$\text{Cov}_{\mu_1^{\beta,0}}(\delta_{\sigma_v, k'}, \delta_{\sigma_u, k'}) = c_{k'}(\text{dist}(u, v)), \quad \forall u, v \in V(\mathbb{T}_d). \quad (4.16)$$

By definition  $c_{k'}(s) \leq 1$  and thus, for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\text{Var}_{\mu_1^{\beta,0}}(\mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}(o, k')) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}_d(\ell)|^2} \sum_{u, v \in \mathbb{T}_d(\ell)} c_{k'}(\text{dist}(u, v)) \leq \frac{|\mathbb{T}_d(t)|}{|\mathbb{T}_d(\ell)|} + \max_{s \geq t} \{c_{k'}(s)\}.$$

As  $|\mathbb{T}_d(\ell)| \rightarrow \infty$ , it remains only to show that  $c_{k'}(t) \rightarrow 0$  when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This in turn follows from the fact that the marginal of  $\mu_1^{\beta,0}$  on any fixed ray in  $\mathbb{T}_d$  is a time homogeneous Markov chain of finite state space  $([q])$ , and strictly positive transition probabilities. Indeed, generalizing the proof of Lemma 3.3 along the lines of Remark A.1, shows that such marginal must be a (possibly inhomogeneous) Potts measure on  $\mathbb{N}$ , hence a Markov chain with strictly positive transition matrices, which thanks to the translation transitivity of  $\mu_1^{\beta,0}$  must also be time homogeneous.  $\square$

Setting for  $\delta, \eta > 0$  and  $i \in [n]$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\ell, n}^\delta := \{|\{(i, j) \in E_n : \mathcal{K}_\ell(i) \neq \mathcal{K}_\ell(j)\}| \geq \delta n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_{\ell, n}^\eta(i) := \Delta_i \mathbf{1} \left\{ \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{G}_n}^{(1)}(i) - \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{G}_n}^{(2)}(i) \leq \eta \right\},$$

we proceed to show that as  $n, \ell \rightarrow \infty$ , under  $\mu_n^{\beta,0}$  both  $\mathcal{A}_{\ell, n}^\delta$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{\ell, n}^\eta(i)$  become negligible. This observation together with the assumed edge expansion property of  $\mathbb{G}_n$  will ensure that  $\mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n)$  and  $\mathcal{K}_n$  are same on an event with arbitrarily large probability for all large  $n$  and  $\ell$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *For any  $\beta > \beta_c(0)$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and small  $\eta = \eta(\beta) > 0$ , under Assumption 1.4,*

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{A}_{\ell,n}^\delta) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n[\mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{B}_{\ell,n}^\eta(I_n))] = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

*Proof.* Fixing  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , by Markov's inequality, the local weak convergence of Theorem 1.12(iii) and the uniform integrability of  $\Delta_{I_n}$

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{A}_{\ell,n}^\delta) &\leq \delta^{-1} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \sum_{j \in \partial I_n} \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n) \neq \mathcal{K}_\ell(j)) \right] \\ &= (q\delta)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^q \sum_{j \in \partial o} \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(o) \neq \mathcal{K}_\ell(j)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

As  $\{\mathcal{K}_\ell(o) \neq \mathcal{K}_\ell(j)\} \subset \{\mathcal{K}_\ell(o) \neq k\} \cup \{\mathcal{K}_\ell(j) \neq k\}$ , the proof of the first assertion in (4.17) completes upon combining (4.18) and (4.12) (see also Remark 4.5).

Turning to the second assertion of (4.17), denote

$$\mathcal{B}_{\ell,n}^\eta(i) := \sum_{k=1}^q \mathcal{B}_{\ell,n}^{\eta,k}(i), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{B}_{\ell,n}^{\eta,k}(i) := \Delta_i \mathbf{1} \left\{ \mathcal{K}_{\ell, \mathbb{G}_n}(i) = k, \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{G}_n}^{(1)}(i) - \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{G}_n}^{(2)}(i) \leq \eta \right\}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 1.12(iii) and the uniform integrability of  $\Delta_{I_n}$  we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \mu_n^{\beta,0} \left( \mathcal{B}_{\ell,n}^\eta(I_n) \right) \right] = \frac{d}{q} \sum_{j,k=1}^q \mu_j^{\beta,0} \left( \mathcal{K}_\ell(o) = k, \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}^{(1)}(o) - \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}^{(2)}(o) \leq \eta \right). \quad (4.19)$$

By (4.14) and the union bound, for small enough  $\eta = \eta(\beta) > 0$  and all  $k \in [q]$

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k^{\beta,0} \left( \mathcal{K}_\ell(o) = k, \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}^{(1)}(o) - \mathbf{N}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}^{(2)}(o) \geq \eta \right) = 1,$$

which in combination with (4.19) yields the second assertion of (4.17).  $\square$

*Proof of (4.2).* Recall from Theorem 1.12(iii) that for any  $\beta > \beta_c(0)$ ,  $k \in [q]$ ,  $\ell \geq t$ , and  $\underline{\sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_t$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \mathbf{P}_{\mu_n^{\beta,0}}^\ell(I_n)(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n) = k) \right] = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{k'=1}^q \mu_{k'}^{\beta,0}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{T}_d(t)} = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}(o) = k). \quad (4.20)$$

Furthermore, for any such  $k$ ,  $\ell \geq t$ , and  $\underline{\sigma}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_n \left| \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_n = k) - \mathbf{P}_{\mu_n^{\beta,0}}^\ell(I_n)(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{B}_{I_n}(t)} = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n) = k) \right| \\ \leq \sum_{k=1}^q \sum_{k' \neq k} \mathbb{E}_n[\mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n) = k', \mathcal{K}_n = k)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

and from (4.12) of Lemma 4.4, for any  $k, k' \in [q]$ ,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{k'}^{\beta,0}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{T}_d(t)} = \underline{\sigma}, \mathcal{K}_{\ell, \mathbb{T}_d}(o) = k) = \delta_{k,k'} \cdot \mu_k^{\beta,0}(\underline{\sigma}_{\mathbb{T}_d(t)} = \underline{\sigma}). \quad (4.22)$$

In view of (4.20)-(4.22) and the triangle inequality, (4.2) is a direct consequence of

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n[\mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n) = k', \mathcal{K}_n = k)] = 0, \quad \forall k' \neq k. \quad (4.23)$$

To prove (4.23) we use the edge-expansion property to show that, outside an event of negligible probability, there exists a color  $k \in [q]$  such that up to at most  $o(n)$  vertices  $v \in \mathbb{G}_n$ , the  $\ell$ -neighborhood around  $v$  has dominating color  $k$  with a bounded away from zero difference between the fraction of vertices of that neighborhood possessing color  $k$  and the fraction of those possessing

any other color. Combining this with  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{\text{loc}} \mathbb{T}_d$ , we deduce that  $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n)$  with probability approaching one, as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , yielding (4.23). Turning to carry out the details, fix  $\eta = \eta(\beta)$  as in Lemma 4.6 and set

$$\mathcal{S}_{k,\ell} := \{i \in [n] : \mathcal{K}_\ell(i) = k, \mathbf{N}_\ell^{(1)}(i) - \mathbf{N}_\ell^{(2)}(i) > \eta\}, \quad k \in [q].$$

We next show that the assumed edge expansion property of  $\mathbf{G}_n$  allows us to restrict attention when  $\ell$  is large and  $\varepsilon < 1/(2q)$ , to the event

$$\mathcal{S}_\ell := \bigcup_{k=1}^q \mathcal{S}_{k,\ell} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{S}_{k,\ell} := \{\max_{k' \neq k} |S_{k',\ell}| < \varepsilon n, |S_{k,\ell}| \geq (1 - q\varepsilon)n\}. \quad (4.24)$$

Indeed, with  $\sum_k |S_{k,\ell}| \leq n$ , there is at most one  $k \in [q]$  with  $|S_{k,\ell}| > n/2$  and consequently,

$$\mathcal{S}_\ell^c \subset \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^q |S_{k,\ell}| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)n \right\} \bigcup_{k=1}^q \left\{ |S_{k,\ell}| \in [\varepsilon n, n/2] \right\}.$$

Now, fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{\eta}{4q})$ , let  $\lambda = \lambda_\varepsilon \wedge 2$  for  $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$  of Theorem 1.18(ii). The event  $|S_{k,\ell}| \in [\varepsilon n, n/2]$  implies by the edge expansion property of  $\mathbf{G}_n$  that  $|\partial S_{k,\ell}| \geq \lambda \varepsilon n := 2\delta n$ . Further, noting that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{N}_\ell^{(1)}(i) - \mathbf{N}_\ell^{(2)}(i) \leq \eta) + |\{(i, j) \in E_n : \mathcal{K}_\ell(i) \neq \mathcal{K}_\ell(j)\}| \geq \max_k |\partial S_{k,\ell}|,$$

it follows from the preceding that under  $\mathcal{S}_\ell^c$  either the event  $\{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{B}_{\ell,n}^\eta(i) \geq n\delta\}$  or  $\mathcal{A}_{\ell,n}^\delta$  holds. Thus, from Lemma 4.6 we deduce that, as claimed earlier,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{S}_\ell^c) = 0. \quad (4.25)$$

Having to contend only with the (disjoint) events  $\mathcal{S}_{k,\ell}$  of (4.24), we arrive at (4.23) upon showing that for any  $k \neq k' \in [q]$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_n \left[ \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{S}_{k,\ell}, \mathcal{K}_\ell(I_n) = k') \right] \leq q\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{S}_{k',\ell}, \mathcal{K}_n = k) = 0. \quad (4.26)$$

To this end, as  $|S_{k,\ell}| \geq (1 - q\varepsilon)n$  on  $\mathcal{S}_{k,\ell}$ , it is immediate that for any  $k' \neq k$ ,

$$\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{S}_{k,\ell}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{K}_\ell(i) = k') \leq q\varepsilon,$$

which upon taking the expectation gives the LHS of (4.26). Next,  $\mathbf{N}_\ell(i, k) \leq 1$ , hence on  $\mathcal{S}_{k',\ell}$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{N}}_\ell(k', k) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbf{N}_\ell(i, k') - \mathbf{N}_\ell(i, k)] \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_{k',\ell}} [\mathbf{N}_\ell^{(1)}(i) - \mathbf{N}_\ell^{(2)}(i)] - \varepsilon q \geq (1 - \varepsilon q)\eta - \varepsilon q \geq \frac{\eta}{2}$$

(due to our choice of  $\varepsilon q < \eta/4 < 1/4$ ). Thus,

$$\mu_n^{\beta,0}(\widehat{\mathbf{N}}_\ell(k', k) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}_{k',\ell}, \mathcal{K}_n = k\}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2} \mu_n^{\beta,0}(\mathcal{S}_{k',\ell}, \mathcal{K}_n = k). \quad (4.27)$$

Moreover, note that for any  $k' \neq k$ ,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{N}}_\ell(k', k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{B}_v(2\ell) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(2\ell)) [\delta_{\sigma_v, k'} - \delta_{\sigma_v, k}].$$

Hence, with  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\sigma \in [q]^n} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{N}}_\ell(k', k) - \widehat{\mathbf{N}}(k', k) \right| = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{N}}(k', k) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^n (\delta_{\sigma_v, k'} - \delta_{\sigma_v, k}). \quad (4.28)$$

Clearly,  $\widehat{\mathbf{N}}(k', k) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{K}_n = k\} \leq 0$ , hence (4.28) entails that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^{\beta, 0} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{N}}_\ell(k', k) \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}_{k', \ell}, \mathcal{K}_n = k\} \right) \leq 0. \quad (4.29)$$

From (4.27) and (4.29) we get the RHS of (4.26), thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.18(ii).  $\square$

## 5. THE CRITICAL LINE: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.13

Recall Lemma 2.9(a) on the existence of sub-sequential local weak limit points for both  $\mu_n^{\beta, B}$  and  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B}$  and that as in **Step I** of the proof of Theorem 1.12, fixing  $d, q \geq 3$ ,  $B > 0$  and  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_c$ , it suffices to show that such limit point  $\mathbf{m}_b$  of  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B}$  is supported on  $\mathcal{Q}_m := \mathcal{M}_b^{\beta, B}$ . Recalling Definition 2.8 of  $\mathcal{Q}_*(t)$  and Lemma 2.9(d) that such  $\mathbf{m}_b$  must be supported on  $\mathcal{Q}_* := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{B}_\infty^*) : \varphi^t \in \mathcal{Q}_*(t) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , we show that  $\mathbf{m}_b(\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m) > 0$  contradicts [8, Theorem 1]. Indeed, Section 5.1 identifies  $\mathcal{Q}_m$  in terms of the support of the RCM messages, whereby Section 5.2 completes this argument by combining this characterization with the symmetric form  $\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$  of the free energy density limit of the RCM in case  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ .

**5.1. Properties of the RCM messages.** We start with the definition of our RCM messages.

**Definition 5.1** (RCM messages). Let  $\mathcal{T}^*$  denote the tail  $\sigma$ -algebra of the bonds on  $\mathbb{T}_d^*$ . That is, for the subsets  $\mathbb{B}_t^* := \{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*(t))}$  of  $\mathbb{B}_\infty^* := \{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{T}_d^*)}$ ,

$$\mathcal{T}^* := \bigcap_{t \geq 1} \mathcal{T}_t^*, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{T}_t^* := \sigma\left(\bigcup_{r > t} \mathcal{T}_t^{*, r}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_t^{*, r} := \sigma(\mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*).$$

For  $(u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$ , the RCM message from  $u$  to  $v$  is then

$$s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi) := \varphi[u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u, v)} = 0, \mathcal{T}^*]. \quad (5.1)$$

**Remark 5.2.** While not needed here, one can define the infinite volume random cluster Gibbs measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , in presence of an external field, via the so called Dobrushin-Lanford-Ruelle condition, as done in [3, Section III], and show that the messages of (5.1) are indeed those that characterize such Gibbs measures.

The RCM messages are limits of the RCM pre-messages which we define next (and later relate to the local functions  $\mathbf{s}_{u \rightarrow w}^{t, r}$  on the finite graphs  $\mathbf{G}_n$ ). To this end, for finite graph  $\mathbf{G}$ ,  $w \in V(\mathbf{G})$  and  $t < r$ , we denote hereafter  $\underline{\eta}_{w, t}^{*, r} := \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_w^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_w^*(t)}$  and  $\underline{\eta}_{w, t}^r := \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_w(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_w(t)}$  with  $\underline{\eta}_t^{*, r} := \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r}$  and  $\underline{\eta}_t^r := \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^r$  the corresponding objects on the tree  $\mathbb{T}_d$  rooted at  $o$ .

**Definition 5.3** (RCM pre-messages). For  $(u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d(t))$  consider the (local) function

$$s_{u \rightarrow v}^{t, r}(\underline{y}) := \varphi_{\mathbb{T}_d^*(r)}^{\beta, B}(u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u, v)} = 0, \underline{\eta}_t^{*, r} = \underline{y}), \quad \text{of} \quad \underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*.$$

Similarly, for finite graph  $\mathbf{G}$ ,  $w \in V(\mathbf{G})$  and  $(u, v) \in \mathbb{B}_w(t)$  let

$$\mathbf{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t, r}(w, \underline{y}) := \varphi_{\mathbb{B}_w(r)}^{\beta, B}(u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u, v)} = 0, \underline{\eta}_{w, t}^{*, r} = \underline{y}), \quad \underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{B}_w^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_w^*(t)},$$

using hereafter  $s_{\partial v}(\varphi)$  for the vector  $(s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi))_{u \in \partial v}$  and similarly  $s_{\partial v}^{t, r}$  and  $\mathbf{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r} := (\mathbf{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t, r}(v, \cdot))_{u \in \partial v}$ .

Clearly  $\mathcal{T}_t^{*,r} \uparrow \mathcal{T}_t^*$  and therefore the Doob's martingale  $\{s_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r}(\eta_t^{*,r})\}_r$  converges  $\varphi$ -a.e. to  $\varphi[u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0, \mathcal{T}_t^*]$ . Further,  $\mathcal{T}_t^* \downarrow \mathcal{T}^*$  and hence the latter backward martingale converges  $\varphi$ -a.e. to  $s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi)$ . In conclusion, fixing any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$ , for  $\varphi$ -a.e. bond configuration,

$$s_{\partial v}(\varphi) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} s_{\partial v}^{t,r}(\eta_t^{*,r}), \quad \forall v \in V(\mathbb{T}_d). \quad (5.2)$$

Now, for  $\dagger \in \{f, 1\}$  and  $\nu_{\dagger}^{\beta,B}$  of Definition 1.3, let

$$b_{\dagger} = b_{\dagger}^{\beta,B} := \frac{q\nu_{\dagger}^{\beta,B}(1) - 1}{q - 1} \geq 0, \quad (5.3)$$

setting hereafter  $b_w := b_1^{\beta,B}$ ,  $\gamma := (e^{\beta} - 1)/(e^{\beta} + q - 1)$ , and

$$\widehat{\text{BP}}(s_1, \dots, s_{d-1}; x) := \frac{e^x \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (1 + (q-1)\gamma s_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (1 - \gamma s_i)}{e^x \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (1 + (q-1)\gamma s_i) + (q-1) \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (1 - \gamma s_i)}. \quad (5.4)$$

Utilizing these objects, we proceed to characterize  $\mathcal{Q}_m$  via the support of the RCM messages.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Fix  $B > 0$ ,  $\beta \geq 0$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$ .*

(a) *For  $\varphi$ -a.e. bond configurations and any  $(u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$ ,*

$$s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi) = \widehat{\text{BP}}((s_{w \rightarrow u}(\varphi))_{w \in \partial u \setminus \{v\}}; B), \quad (5.5)$$

$$b_f \leq s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi) \leq b_w. \quad (5.6)$$

(b) *For  $\dagger \in \{f, w\}$  and any  $(u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$ , we have  $s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta,B}) = b_{\dagger}$ , for  $\varphi_{\dagger}^{\beta,B}$ -a.e. configurations.*

(c) *If  $\varphi$ -a.e. the random vector  $s_{\partial o}(\varphi)$  is supported on  $\{(b_{\dagger}, b_{\dagger}, \dots, b_{\dagger})\}_{\dagger \in \{f, w\}}$ , then  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ .*

*Proof.* (a). For any  $(i, j) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$  let  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}$  be the connected component of the sub-tree of  $\mathbb{T}_d$  rooted at  $i$  after deleting the edge  $(i, j)$ . Set  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}^*$  to be the graph obtained from  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}$  by adding the edges from  $v^*$  to  $V(\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}) \setminus \{i\}$  (so there is *no* edge between  $i$  and  $v^*$  in  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}^*$ ). Denoting by  $\Omega_{i \rightarrow j}$  the event that  $i$  is connected to  $v^*$  using *only* the open bonds within  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}^*$  and by  $\mathfrak{p}(i)$  the (unique) parent of  $i \neq o$  (the root) in  $\mathbb{T}_d$ , let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_t^r := \sigma(\mathcal{T}_t^{*,r}, \{\Omega_{i \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}(i)}, i \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(r)\}).$$

By the one-to-one correspondence between the power set of  $\mathfrak{D}_*(r)$  (recall Definition 2.8) and  $\sigma(\{\Omega_{i \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}(i)}, i \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(r)\})$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_t^r$  is generated by the finite partition of  $(\mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*) \times \mathfrak{D}_*(r)$  to pairs  $(\eta_t^{*,r}, \mathcal{C}^r)$ , using the notation  $\mathcal{C}^r$  for an element from  $\mathfrak{D}_*(r)$ . Thus, for any  $B > 0$ ,  $\beta \geq 0$ ,  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$  and  $r > t$

$$\varphi(\cdot | \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_t^r)(\eta_t^{*,r} = \underline{y}, \mathcal{C}^r = \mathcal{C}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,r}(\cdot | \eta_t^{*,r} = \underline{y}), \quad \forall \underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*, \quad \forall \mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{D}_*(r). \quad (5.7)$$

In particular,

$$\varphi[u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0, \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_t^r] = \hat{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r}(\eta_t^{*,r}, \mathcal{C}^r), \quad \forall (u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d(t)),$$

where

$$\hat{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r}(\underline{y}, \mathcal{C}) := \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta,B,r}(u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0, \eta_t^{*,r} = \underline{y}). \quad (5.8)$$

As  $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^r \uparrow \mathcal{T}_t^*$ , fixing any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$ , we get similarly to (5.2), that  $\varphi$ -a.e.

$$s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \hat{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r}(\underline{\eta}_t^{*,r}, \mathcal{C}^r), \quad \forall (u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d) \quad (5.9)$$

and by the continuity of the mapping  $\widehat{\text{BP}}(\cdot; B)$  it suffices for (5.5) to show that for any  $t < r$ ,

$$\hat{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r} = \widehat{\text{BP}}((\hat{s}_{w \rightarrow u}^{t,r})_{w \in \partial u \setminus \{v\}}; B), \quad \forall (u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d(t)). \quad (5.10)$$

By Lemma 2.2, using an argument similar to the proof of Corollary 2.3 we find that

$$\hat{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r}(\underline{y}, \mathcal{C}) := \varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, r}(\sigma_u = 1 | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0, \underline{\eta}_t^{*,r} = \underline{y}) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \hat{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r}(\underline{y}, \mathcal{C}) + \frac{1}{q}, \quad (5.11)$$

for any  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*$ ,  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}_*(r)$ . Fixing such  $(u, v)$ ,  $\underline{y}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$ , the identity (5.10) thus amounts to

$$\bar{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t,r} = \overline{\text{BP}}((\bar{s}_{w \rightarrow u}^{t,r})_{w \in \partial u \setminus \{v\}}), \quad (5.12)$$

where  $\overline{\text{BP}}(\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{d-1}) := \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \widehat{\text{BP}}\left(\frac{q\bar{s}_1 - 1}{q-1}, \dots, \frac{q\bar{s}_{d-1} - 1}{q-1}; B\right) + \frac{1}{q}$ . Alternatively, in view of (5.4),

$$\overline{\text{BP}}(\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_{d-1}) = \frac{e^B \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \left(1 + (e^\beta - 1)\bar{s}_i\right)}{e^B \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \left(1 + (e^\beta - 1)\bar{s}_i\right) + (q-1) \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \left(1 + \frac{e^\beta - 1}{q-1}(1 - \bar{s}_i)\right)}. \quad (5.13)$$

The spin marginal of  $\varpi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, r}(\cdot | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0, \underline{\eta}_t^{*,r} = \underline{y})$  on the sub-tree  $\mathbb{T}_{u \rightarrow v} \cap \mathbb{T}_d(t)$  is a Potts measure. Further, with  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}_*(r)$ , the boundary condition for the spins at  $\mathbb{T}_{u \rightarrow v} \cap \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)$ , as determined by  $(\underline{y}, \mathcal{C})$ , must be a product measure, where each marginal spin is either uniform over  $[q]$  or supported on 1. Thus, restricting this Potts measure to  $u$  and  $\partial u \setminus \{v\}$ , yields a Potts measure on  $q$  spins, whose boundary marginals on  $\partial u \setminus \{v\}$  are mutually independent and uniform over  $\{2, \dots, q\}$ . Thus, upon expressing the RHS of (5.12) in terms of (5.13), the identity (5.12) follows by a direct computation.

Setting  $\tilde{b}_{\ddagger, t'}^{\beta, B}(u, v) := \varphi_{\ddagger, t'}^{\beta, B}(u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0)$  for  $\ddagger \in \{f, w\}$ ,  $(u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d(t))$  and  $\varphi_{\ddagger, t'}^{\beta, B}$  as in (1.14), we show in part (b) that  $\tilde{b}_{\ddagger, t'}^{\beta, B}(u, v) \rightarrow b_{\ddagger}$  as  $t' \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, in view of (5.8) and (5.9), it suffices for (5.6) to fix such  $(u, v)$  and show that for  $r > t' > t$ , any  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_{t'}^*$  and  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}_*(r)$ ,

$$\tilde{b}_{f, t'}^{\beta, B}(u, v) \leq \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, r}(u \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(u,v)} = 0, \underline{\eta}_{t'}^{*,r} = \underline{y}) \leq \tilde{b}_{w, t'}^{\beta, B}(u, v). \quad (5.14)$$

The conditional measure in (5.14) is merely the RCM on  $\mathbb{T}_{u \rightarrow v} \cap \widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t')$  with the induced boundary condition  $\mathcal{C}'(\underline{y}, \mathcal{C}) \in \mathcal{D}_*(t')$  at  $\mathbb{T}_{u \rightarrow v} \cap \mathbb{K}^*(\partial \mathbb{T}_d(t'))$ . Any such  $\mathcal{C}'$  stochastically dominates the free boundary condition and is stochastically dominated by the corresponding wired boundary condition (see Definition 1.9), with (5.14) thus a consequence of the monotonicity of the RCM  $\varphi_{\mathbb{T}_{u \rightarrow v} \cap \widehat{\mathbb{T}}_d^*(t')}^{\beta, B}(\cdot)$ .

(b). The RCM-s  $\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}$ , for  $\ddagger \in \{f, w\}$ , are both tail trivial (indeed, this follows as in the proof of [11, Theorem 4.19(d)]). Moreover, by definition  $\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B} \in \mathcal{Q}_*$  are invariant under automorphisms of  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . Hence,  $\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}$ -a.s. the values of  $s_{u \rightarrow v}(\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B})$  for  $(u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$ , must equal the same non-random constant  $\tilde{b}_{\ddagger} := \varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}(w \leftrightarrow v^* | \eta_{(w,o)} = 0)$ , where  $w \in \partial o$ . Recall (1.15) that  $\tilde{b}_{\ddagger, t}(w, o) \rightarrow \tilde{b}_{\ddagger}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, for any finite graph  $G$  and  $e \in E(G)$ , the conditional measure  $\varphi_G^{\beta, B}(\cdot | \eta_e = 0)$  is merely the RCM  $\varphi_{\tilde{G}}^{\beta, B}(\cdot)$ , for the subgraph  $\tilde{G}$  obtained upon deleting the edge  $e$  from  $G$ . Hence, it follows from

Lemma 2.2 that

$$\tilde{b}_{\ddagger} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{b}_{\ddagger,t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q \mu_{w \rightarrow o, \ddagger, t}^{\beta, B}(\sigma_w = 1) - 1}{q - 1}, \quad (5.15)$$

where  $\mu_{w \rightarrow o, \ddagger, t}^{\beta, B}$  denotes the Potts measure on  $\mathbb{T}_{w \rightarrow o} \cap \mathbb{T}_d(t)$  with free and 1-boundary conditions at the spins of  $\mathbb{T}_{w \rightarrow o} \cap \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)$ , for  $\ddagger = f$  and  $\ddagger = w$ , respectively. Since  $\mathbb{T}_{w \rightarrow o}$  is a  $(d-1)$ -ary tree (i.e. every vertex has  $(d-1)$  children), it thus follows from Definition 1.3 of  $\nu_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}$ , that the RHS of (5.15) is precisely  $b_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}$  of (5.3), as claimed.

(c). Setting  $\mathcal{A}_{\ddagger} := \{(s_{\partial o}(\varphi)) = (b_{\ddagger}, b_{\ddagger}, \dots, b_{\ddagger})\}$  and fixing  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_{\star}$  with  $\varphi(\mathcal{A}_f \cup \mathcal{A}_w) = 1$ , our claim that  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_m$  amounts to having for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  that  $\varphi$ -a.e.

$$\varphi(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \cdot \mid \mathcal{T}^{\star}) = \varphi_f^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \cdot) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_f} + \varphi_w^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \cdot) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_w}. \quad (5.16)$$

To this end, fixing  $t < t' < r$ , recall that by (5.7)

$$\varphi(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \underline{y} \mid \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{D}_{\star}(t)} \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \underline{y}) \rho_{\varphi}(\mathcal{C} \mid \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r), \quad \forall \underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t),$$

with  $\rho_{\varphi}(\cdot \mid \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r)$  the conditional distribution induced on  $\mathfrak{D}_{\star}(t)$  by the finitely generated  $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r$ . Recall the one-to-one correspondence between  $\mathfrak{D}_{\star}(t)$  and subgraphs  $C_{\star} \subset \{(u, v^{\star}), u \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t)\}$ , with

$$\rho_{\varphi}(\{u \in C_{\star}\} \mid \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r) = \varphi[u \leftrightarrow v^{\star} \mid \eta_{(u, p(u))} = 0, \eta_{(u, v^{\star})} = 0, \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r] =: \tilde{s}_{u \rightarrow p(u)}^{t', r}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t')}^{\star, r}, \mathcal{C}^r), \quad \forall u \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(t).$$

Using standard and backward martingale convergence theorems, it then follows that  $\varphi$ -a.e.

$$\varphi(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \cdot \mid \mathcal{T}^{\star}) = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{D}_{\star}(t)} \varphi_{\mathcal{C}}^{\beta, B, t}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^{\star}(t)} = \cdot) \rho_{\varphi}(\mathcal{C} \mid \mathcal{T}^{\star}), \quad (5.17)$$

$$\rho_{\varphi}(\{u \in C_{\star}\} \mid \mathcal{T}^{\star}) = \tilde{s}_{u \rightarrow p(u)}(\varphi) := \lim_{t' \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{s}_{u \rightarrow p(u)}^{t', r}. \quad (5.18)$$

In view of (5.17), we get (5.16) and thereby complete the proof, upon showing that  $\varphi$ -a.e.

$$\rho_{\varphi}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{T}^{\star}) = \rho_{\varphi_f^{\beta, B}}(\cdot) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_f} + \rho_{\varphi_w^{\beta, B}}(\cdot) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_w}. \quad (5.19)$$

Turning to prove (5.19), recall that  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_{\star}$  and that the RCM  $\varphi_{\mathbb{T}_d^{\star}(t')}^{\beta, B}$  is monotonic. Hence,

$$\rho_{\varphi_f^{\beta, B}}(\cdot) \preceq \rho_{\varphi}(\cdot \mid \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{t'}^r) \preceq \rho_{\varphi_w^{\beta, B}}(\cdot),$$

which upon taking first  $r \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $t' \rightarrow \infty$ , yields that  $\varphi$ -a.e.

$$\rho_{\varphi_f^{\beta, B}}(\cdot) \preceq \rho_{\varphi}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{T}^{\star}) \preceq \rho_{\varphi_w^{\beta, B}}(\cdot).$$

Given such stochastic ordering, (5.19) follows once all the corresponding one-dimensional marginals match (see [11, Proposition 4.6]). That is, in view of (5.18) and our assumption that  $\varphi(\mathcal{A}_f \cup \mathcal{A}_w) = 1$ , it remains only to show that  $\varphi$ -a.e. on the event  $\mathcal{A}_{\ddagger}$

$$\tilde{s}_{u \rightarrow p(u)}(\varphi) = \tilde{s}_{u \rightarrow p(u)}(\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}), \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{T}_d.$$

To this end, note that as in the proof of (5.5), we also have that  $\varphi$ -a.e.

$$\tilde{s}_{u \rightarrow p(u)}(\varphi) = \widehat{\text{BP}}((s_{w \rightarrow u}(\varphi))_{w \in \partial u \setminus \{p(u)\}}; 0), \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{T}_d.$$



Recalling from part (b) that  $s_{w \rightarrow u}(\varphi_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}) = b_{\ddagger}$  for all  $(w, u) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$ , it thus suffices to verify that on the event  $\mathcal{A}_{\ddagger}$ , also  $s_{w \rightarrow u}(\varphi) = b_{\ddagger}$  (outside a null set). Indeed, the latter is a direct consequence of (5.5) and the identity

$$b_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B} = \widehat{\text{BP}}(b_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}, \dots, b_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}; B),$$

which in view of (5.3), is merely the fact that  $\nu_f^{\beta, B}$  and  $\nu_1^{\beta, B}$  are both fixed points of (1.5).  $\square$

**Remark 5.5.** With  $\tilde{b}_{w, \ell}(w, o) \downarrow b_w$  and  $\tilde{b}_{f, \ell}(w, o) \uparrow b_f$  (for  $w \in \partial o$ ), we deduce from (5.14) that for some finite  $\kappa_o = \kappa_o(\varepsilon)$  and any  $r > t + \kappa_o$ ,

$$b_f - \varepsilon \leq s_{u \rightarrow v}^{t + \kappa_o, r}(\underline{y}) \leq b_w + \varepsilon, \quad \forall (u, v) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d(t)), \underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_{t + \kappa_o}^*.$$

Moreover, if  $w \in V(\mathbb{G})$  for a finite graph  $\mathbb{G}$  such that  $\mathbb{B}_w(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$  for  $r > t + \kappa_o$ , then

$$b_f - \varepsilon \leq \mathfrak{s}_{u \rightarrow v}^{t + \kappa_o, r}(w, \underline{y}) \leq b_w + \varepsilon, \quad \forall (u, v) \in \mathbb{B}_w(t), \underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{B}_w^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_w^*(t + \kappa_o)}. \quad (5.20)$$

Denoting hereafter by  $\mathbb{G}^-(w)$  the graph  $\mathbb{G}$  without  $w \in V(\mathbb{G})$  and all edges to it, we next show that for  $B > 0$ , when  $r \gg t$ , uniformly over  $\mathbb{G}$  the law induced on  $\mathbb{B}_w^*(t)$  by the RCM on  $\mathbb{G}$  does not depend *much* on the boundary conditions outside  $\mathbb{B}_w^*(r)$ .

**Lemma 5.6.** *Fix  $B > 0$ ,  $\beta \geq 0$ ,  $1 < t < r$  and  $o \in V(\mathbb{G})$  for a finite graph  $\mathbb{G}$ . Denoting by  $\mathcal{S}_{t, r}^c$  the complement of  $\mathcal{S}_{t, r}$ , namely, the set of  $\underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r}$  with an open cluster, not containing  $v^*$ , that intersects both  $\partial \mathbb{B}_o(t)$  and  $\partial \mathbb{B}_o(r)$ ,*

$$\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} = \cdot \mid \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{G}^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} = \underline{z}) = \varphi_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} = \cdot \mid \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r} = \underline{z}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)}), \quad (5.21)$$

whenever  $\underline{z}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} \in \mathcal{S}_{t, r}$ . Further, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , some  $r_0 = r_0(\varepsilon, q, B, t, |\mathbb{B}_o(t)|) < \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{r \geq r_0} \sup_{\mathbb{G}, \underline{y}} \{ \varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\mathcal{S}_{t, r}^c \mid \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)} = \underline{y}) \} \leq \varepsilon, \quad (5.22)$$

$$\sup_{r \geq r_0} \max_{\mathbb{G}, \underline{y}} \left| \frac{\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o(t)} = \cdot \mid \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)} = \underline{y})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o(t)} = \cdot \mid \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^r = \underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)})} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (5.23)$$

In addition, (5.22) holds for  $\varphi_{\mathbb{G}^-(o)}^{\beta, B}(\cdot)$ .

*Proof.* Note that (5.21) amounts to having

$$\mathcal{X}_*(\underline{y}, \widehat{\underline{y}}) := \frac{\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\underline{y}) \varphi_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta, B}(\widehat{\underline{y}}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\widehat{\underline{y}}) \varphi_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta, B}(\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)})} = 1, \quad (5.24)$$

whenever  $\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} \in \mathcal{S}_{t, r}$  and  $y_e = \widehat{y}_e$  for all  $e \notin \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)$ . Turning to prove (5.24), recall by Definition 1.7 of the RCM on a finite graph, that

$$\mathcal{X}_*(\underline{y}, \widehat{\underline{y}}) = q^{|\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}^*}(\underline{y})| - |\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}^*}(\widehat{\underline{y}})| + |\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}(\widehat{\underline{y}}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)})| - |\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}(\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)})|}. \quad (5.25)$$

The open cluster containing  $v^*$  appears once in each of these four counts. Thus, with  $y_e = \widehat{y}_e$  for all  $e \notin \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)$ , the RHS of (5.25) is one, unless some other open cluster induced by  $\underline{y}$  or by  $\widehat{\underline{y}}$  intersects both  $\partial \mathbb{B}_o(t)$  and  $\partial \mathbb{B}_o(r)$ , a scenario which is precluded for  $\widehat{\underline{y}}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} = \underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^*(t)} \in \mathcal{S}_{t, r}$ .

As for (5.22), we can assume WLOG that  $\underline{y}_{\mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)}$  induces  $L \geq 1$  disjoint open clusters  $C_i$  that intersect both  $\partial \mathbb{B}_o(t)$  and  $\partial \mathbb{B}_o(r)$ . In particular,  $L \leq |\mathbb{B}_o(t)|$  and  $|C_i| \geq r - t$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}_{t, r}^c$  implies

that all edges from  $v^*$  to some  $C_i$  must be closed, we thus deduce by a union over  $i \leq L$ , that

$$\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta,B}(\mathcal{S}_{t,r}^c \mid \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)} = \underline{y}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^L q e^{-B|C_i|} \leq q |\mathbb{B}_o(t)| e^{-B(r-t)},$$

which since  $B > 0$ , completes the proof for  $\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta,B}$ . With  $t > 1$ , the same applies for  $\varphi_{\mathbb{G}^{-(o)}}^{\beta,B}$ .

Turning to prove (5.23), we move to the marginal RCM-s  $\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta,B}(\cdot)$  of (1.13) and note that as in our proof of (5.21), it suffices to find  $\varepsilon_r = \varepsilon_r(q, B, t, |\mathbb{B}_o(t)|) \rightarrow 0$ , such that if  $y_e = \hat{y}_e$  for all  $e \notin \mathbb{B}_o(t)$ , then

$$\mathcal{X}(\underline{y}, \hat{\underline{y}}) := \frac{\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta,B}(\underline{y}) \tilde{\varphi}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta,B}(\hat{\underline{y}}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})}{\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta,B}(\hat{\underline{y}}) \tilde{\varphi}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta,B}(\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})} \leq 1 + \varepsilon_r. \quad (5.26)$$

To this end, since  $\underline{y}$  and  $\hat{\underline{y}}$  agree outside  $\mathbb{B}_o(r)$ , the four products over edges in (5.26) match and perfectly cancel each other, with  $\mathcal{X}(\underline{y}, \hat{\underline{y}})$  thereby being the ratio of product of contributions from open clusters. Further, as  $\underline{y}$  coincides with  $\hat{\underline{y}}$  outside  $\mathbb{B}_o(t)$ , the collections  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}}(\underline{y})$  and  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}}(\hat{\underline{y}})$  contain exactly the same open clusters  $C$  which do not intersect  $\mathbb{B}_o(t)$ , and this applies also for  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}(\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})$  versus  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}(\hat{\underline{y}}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})$ . Similarly, a cluster  $C \subset \mathbb{B}_o(r-1)$  appears in  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}}(\underline{y})$  if and only if it appears in  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}(\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})$  (and the same holds for  $\hat{\underline{y}}$ ). Denoting by  $\mathbb{C}_+$  those elements of  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}}(\underline{y}) \cup \mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}(\hat{\underline{y}}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})$ , counted twice if needed, which intersect both  $\partial\mathbb{B}_o(t)$  and  $\partial\mathbb{B}_o(r)$ , and by  $\mathbb{C}_-$  all such elements in  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{G}}(\hat{\underline{y}}) \cup \mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}(\underline{y}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)})$ , we thus deduce that

$$\mathcal{X}(\underline{y}, \hat{\underline{y}}) = \frac{\prod_{C \in \mathbb{C}_+} (1 + (q-1)e^{-B|C|})}{\prod_{C \in \mathbb{C}_-} (1 + (q-1)e^{-B|C|})} \leq (1 + (q-1)e^{-B(r-t)})^{2|\mathbb{B}_o(t)|} =: 1 + \varepsilon_r$$

(at most  $2|\mathbb{B}_o(t)|$  elements in  $\mathbb{C}_+$ , each of at least size  $r-t$ , and product over  $\mathbb{C}_-$  exceeding one).  $\square$

**5.2. The RCM free energy density for  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ : proof of Theorem 1.13.** Recall [8, Proposition 4.2] that for  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_c$  and  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$  the Potts free energy density limit

$$\hat{\Phi} = \hat{\Phi}(\beta, B) := \max\{\Phi(\nu_f^{\beta,B}), \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta,B})\},$$

has the symmetric RCM formulation,

$$\hat{\Phi} = \log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(b_f, \dots, b_f)) = \log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(b_w, \dots, b_w)) = \sup_{\underline{b} \in [b_f, b_w]^d} \{\log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\underline{b}))\}, \quad (5.27)$$

where for the symmetric group  $\mathbb{S}_d$  of size  $d$ ,

$$\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\underline{b}) := \frac{\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\underline{b})}{\Psi^{\text{e,sym}}(\underline{b})}, \quad \Psi^{\text{e,sym}}(\underline{b}) := \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{S}_d} \Psi^{\text{e}}(b_{\pi(1)}, \dots, b_{\pi(d)}),$$

while for any  $\underline{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d) \in [0, 1]^d$  and  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\underline{b}) := (1 - \gamma)^{-d} \left( e^B \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + (q-1)\gamma b_i) + (q-1) \prod_{i=1}^d (1 - \gamma b_i) \right), \quad \gamma := \frac{e^\beta - 1}{e^\beta + q - 1},$$

$$\Psi^{\text{e}}(\underline{b}) := (1 - \gamma)^{-d/2} \prod_{i=1}^{d/2} \left( 1 + (q-1)\gamma b_{2i-1} b_{2i} \right).$$

We prove Theorem 1.13 by passing WLOG to a locally weakly convergent sub-sequence of  $\varphi_n^{\beta, B}$  and procuring from  $\mathfrak{m}_b(\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m) > 0$  some graphs  $G'_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  of free energy densities such that  $\overline{\lim}_n \Phi'_n(\beta, B) > \widehat{\Phi}$ . To do so, we rely on our next observation, that the supremum in (5.27) over  $\underline{b}$  with at least two coordinates strictly inside  $(b_f, b_w)$ , is smaller than  $\widehat{\Phi}$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *For  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_c$  and any  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon_o \in (0, \delta)$  such that*

$$\sup_{\underline{b} \in \Lambda_\delta} \{\log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\underline{b}))\} < \widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon_o,$$

where

$$\Lambda_\delta := \left\{ \underline{b} \in [b_f, b_w]^d : |\{i : b_i \in [b_f + \delta, b_w - \delta]\}| \geq 2 \right\}. \quad (5.28)$$

*Proof.* Since  $\Lambda_\delta$  is compact and  $\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$  is continuous, the supremum over  $\Lambda_\delta$  is achieved at some  $\underline{b}' \in \Lambda_\delta$  and it suffices to show that  $\log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\underline{b}')) < \widehat{\Phi}$ . Now, suppose that  $\underline{b}^\circ \in [b_f, b_w]^d$  is such that  $\log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\underline{b}^\circ)) = \widehat{\Phi}$  and  $b_i^\circ \in (b_f, b_w)$  for some  $i \in [d]$ . Since both  $\Phi^{\text{vx}}$  and  $\Phi^{\text{e, sym}}$  are affine in each  $b_j$ ,  $j \in [d]$ , and  $\underline{b}^\circ$  is a maximizer, the function must be constant as we vary the  $i$ -th coordinate of  $\underline{b}^\circ$ . This, in particular implies that if we replace  $b_i^\circ$  with either  $b_f$  or  $b_w$  then the new vector continues to be a maximizer of  $\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$ . In particular, if  $\log(\Psi^{\text{sym}}(\underline{b}')) = \widehat{\Phi}$  for  $\underline{b}'$  with at least two coordinates  $i \neq j \in [d]$  such that  $b'_i, b'_j \in (b_f, b_w)$ , then by the preceding argument there exists  $\underline{b}'' \in \{b_f, b_w\}^d$ , still a maximizer, with the property  $2 \leq |\{i : b''_i = b_f\}| \leq d - 2$ . However, the proof of [8, Proposition 4.2] shows that such a  $\underline{b}''$  can never be a maximizer, yielding a contradiction.  $\square$

Combining Lemma 5.4(c) with Lemma 5.7, we proceed to show that if a local weak limit point of RCM-s puts a positive mass on  $\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m$  then it must also put a positive mass on those  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$  for which  $\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(s_{\partial o}^{t, r})$  is strictly smaller than  $\widehat{\Phi}$ , for large  $t < r$ , with non-negligible probability.

**Lemma 5.8.** *For  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $t < r \in \mathbb{N}$  set*

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^{t, r} := \left\{ \log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(s_{\partial o}^{t, r}) < \widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (5.29)$$

*If  $\mathfrak{m}_b(\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m) > 0$  for a local weak limit point  $\mathfrak{m}_b$  of  $\{\varphi_n^{\beta, B}\}$ , then there exist  $\xi > 0$ ,  $t' \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $r'(t) < \infty$ , such that  $\int \varphi(\mathcal{B}_\xi^{t, r}) d\mathfrak{m}_b \geq \xi$  for any  $t \geq t'$  and  $r \geq r'(t)$ .*

*Proof.* With  $\mathfrak{m}_b$  supported on the convex set  $\mathcal{Q}_*$  (see Lemma 2.9(d)), also  $\bar{\varphi}(\cdot) := \int \varphi(\cdot) d\mathfrak{m}_b \in \mathcal{Q}_*$ . Further, for any non-negative  $F \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_*$ , it follows from (5.2) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(F(s_{\partial o}^{t, r})) = \varphi(F(s_{\partial o}(\varphi))),$$

hence by definition of  $\bar{\varphi}$  and Fatou's lemma,

$$\bar{\varphi}(F(s_{\partial o}(\bar{\varphi}))) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\varphi}(F(s_{\partial o}^{t, r})) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi(F(s_{\partial o}^{t, r})) d\mathfrak{m}_b \geq \int \varphi(F(s_{\partial o}(\varphi))) d\mathfrak{m}_b. \quad (5.30)$$

Considering  $F(\underline{s}) := \sum_{i=1}^d f_\varepsilon(s_i)$  for continuous  $f_\varepsilon$  such that  $0 \leq f_\varepsilon(\cdot) \uparrow \mathbf{1}_{(b_f, b_w)}(\cdot)$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , we deduce from (5.30) by monotone convergence and Fatou's lemma, that in view of (5.6),

$$\sum_{u \in \partial o} \bar{\varphi}(s_{u \rightarrow o}(\bar{\varphi}) \neq \{b_f, b_w\}) \geq \int \sum_{u \in \partial o} \varphi(s_{u \rightarrow o}(\varphi) \neq \{b_f, b_w\}) d\mathfrak{m}_b \geq \int \varphi((\mathcal{A}_f \cup \mathcal{A}_w)^c) d\mathfrak{m}_b. \quad (5.31)$$

Recall Lemma 5.4(c) that  $\varphi((\mathcal{A}_f \cup \mathcal{A}_w)^c) > 0$  whenever  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m$ . Hence, our assumption that  $\mathfrak{m}_b(\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m) > 0$  implies the strict positivity of the RHS of (5.31) and thereby the same holds for the LHS. By definition of the local weak convergence, the law  $\mathfrak{m}_b$  must be invariant to our choice of

the root of  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . Hence, with  $\mathbb{T}_d$  a regular tree, necessarily  $\bar{\varphi}$  is invariant under any automorphism of  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . In particular, fixing  $u_1 \in \partial o$  and setting

$$H_\varepsilon := \left\{ \min_{\dagger \in \{f, w\}} |s_{u_1 \rightarrow o}(\bar{\varphi}) - b_\dagger| > \varepsilon \right\},$$

we deduce that  $\bar{\varphi}(H_0) > 0$ . This in turn allows us to fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough so that  $\bar{\varphi}(H_\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon$ . Next, fix  $\ell := \lceil 3/\varepsilon \rceil$  and a non-random path  $o =: v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{\ell+1}$  in  $\mathbb{T}_d$  such that  $v_{i+1} \in \partial \mathbb{T}_d(i)$ . Then, fixing for each  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , some  $w_i \in \partial v_i$ ,  $w_i \neq v_{i+1}$  (which as  $d \geq 3$ , is always possible), we have by the automorphism invariance of  $\bar{\varphi}$  that

$$\bar{\varphi}(A_i) = \bar{\varphi}(H_\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon \geq \frac{3}{\ell} \quad \text{for} \quad A_i := \left\{ \min_{\dagger \in \{f, w\}} |s_{w_i \rightarrow v_i}(\bar{\varphi}) - b_\dagger| > \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (5.32)$$

The smooth map  $\widehat{\mathbf{BP}}(\cdot; B) : [0, 1]^{d-1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  of (5.4) is coordinate-wise strictly increasing, having  $(b_\dagger, \dots, b_\dagger)$  as its fixed points (see (5.5) and Lemma 5.4(b)). Thus, for some  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon, \beta, B, q, d) > 0$ , it follows from (5.5) and (5.6) that  $s_{v_j \rightarrow v_{j-1}}(\bar{\varphi}) \in (b_f + \delta_0, b_w - \delta_0)$  on the event  $A_j$ . Iterating this argument, while reducing  $\delta_0$  to  $\delta = \delta(\delta_0, \ell, \beta, B, q, d) \in (0, \varepsilon)$ , it follows that on each  $A_j$ ,  $j \leq \ell$ ,

$$\{s_{v_{i+1} \rightarrow v_i}(\bar{\varphi}), 1 \leq i < j\} \subset (b_f + \delta, b_w - \delta).$$

So, if  $A_i \cap A_j$  occurs for  $i < j$ , then  $s_{v_{i+1} \rightarrow v_i}(\bar{\varphi}), s_{w_i \rightarrow v_i}(\bar{\varphi}) \in (b_f + \delta, b_w - \delta)$  and in particular  $s_{\partial v_i} \in \Lambda_\delta$  of (5.28). Namely, any pair from  $\{A_1, \dots, A_\ell\}$  results with  $s_{\partial v_i}(\bar{\varphi}) \in \Lambda_\delta$  for some  $i < \ell$ . Consequently, by the union bound and the automorphism invariance property of  $\bar{\varphi}$ ,

$$\ell \bar{\varphi}(s_{\partial o}(\bar{\varphi}) \in \Lambda_\delta) \geq \bar{\varphi}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} \{s_{\partial v_i}(\bar{\varphi}) \in \Lambda_\delta\}\right) \geq \bar{\varphi}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \geq 2\right) \geq \frac{1}{\ell} \bar{\varphi}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} - 2\right) \geq \frac{1}{\ell} \quad (5.33)$$

(where the right-most inequality is due to (5.32)). In view of Lemma 5.7 we deduce from (5.33) that for some  $\varepsilon_o > 0$ ,

$$\bar{\varphi}(\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(s_{\partial o}(\bar{\varphi})) < \widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon_o) \geq \frac{1}{\ell^2}.$$

With  $\log \Psi^{\text{sym}} \in C_b([0, 1]^d)$ , it follows from (5.2) that  $\bar{\varphi}$ -a.e.  $\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(s_{\partial o}^{t,r}) \rightarrow \log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(s_{\partial o}(\bar{\varphi}))$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, by the preceding

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\varphi}(\mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_o}^{t,r}) \geq \frac{1}{\ell^2},$$

yielding our claim for  $\xi = \varepsilon_o \wedge (2\ell^2)^{-1}$ .  $\square$

To prove Theorem 1.13 we keep removing from a finite graph  $\mathbf{G}$  some  $w \in V(\mathbf{G})$  such that  $\mathbf{B}_w(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$  (for some  $r \geq 2$ ), and all the edges to  $w$ , to get the graph  $\mathbf{G}^-(w)$ , thereby re-connecting the neighbors  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d$  of  $w$  to form for  $\pi \in \mathbf{S}_d$  the graph  $\mathbf{G}^\pi(w)$  as  $\mathbf{G}^-(w)$  with the additional edges  $(x_{\pi(2i-1)}, x_{\pi(2i)})$ ,  $i = 1 \dots, d/2$ . Key to the proof is thus to estimate the ratios of contributions to the partition functions from RCM-s on  $\mathbf{G}$  versus  $\mathbf{G}^-(w)$ , and on  $\mathbf{G}^\pi(w)$  versus  $\mathbf{G}^-(w)$ , when fixing certain bonds. To this end, recall  $\beta_e^*$  of (2.1) and  $p_e, C(\cdot)$  of Definition 1.7, where the un-normalized Edwards-Sokal probability mass

$$\widehat{\omega}_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}) := \prod_{e \in E^*} e^{\beta_e^*} [(1 - p_e)(1 - \eta_e) + p_e \eta_e \delta_e(\underline{\sigma})] \cdot \delta_{\sigma_{v^*}, 1}, \quad \underline{\sigma} \in [q]^{V^*}, \quad \underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E^*} \quad (5.34)$$

(see Definition 2.1), has total mass matching the Potts partition function of  $\mathbf{G}$ , as in (2.1). Namely,

$$\sum_{\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}} \widehat{\omega}_{\mathbf{G}^*}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}) = Z_{\mathbf{G}}(\beta, B). \quad (5.35)$$

More generally, restricting (5.34) to bond values  $\underline{y}_{W^*} \in \{0, 1\}^{E(W^*)}$  on the edges of  $W \subset \mathbb{G}$  (or, to only  $\underline{y}_W \in \{0, 1\}^{E(W)}$  on non-ghosted edges), yields the RCM-restricted partition functions

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W^*}(\underline{y}_{W^*}) := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{\eta: \eta_{W^*} = \underline{y}_{W^*}} q^{|\mathcal{C}(\eta)|} \prod_{e \in E^*} e^{\beta_e^*} p_e^{\eta_e} (1 - p_e)^{1 - \eta_e} = \sum_{\eta: \eta_{W^*} = \underline{y}_{W^*}} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}} \widehat{\omega}_{\mathbb{G}^*}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}), \quad (5.36)$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W}(\underline{y}_W) := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{\eta: \eta_W = \underline{y}_W} q^{|\mathcal{C}(\eta)|} \prod_{e \in E^*} e^{\beta_e^*} p_e^{\eta_e} (1 - p_e)^{1 - \eta_e} = \sum_{\eta: \eta_W = \underline{y}_W} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}} \widehat{\omega}_{\mathbb{G}^*}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\sigma}, \underline{\eta}). \quad (5.37)$$

For any  $v \in V(\mathbb{G})$  with  $\partial v = (u_i)_{i=1}^d$ ,  $\pi \in \mathbb{S}_d$  and  $\underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{B}_v(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_v(t)}$ ,  $t < r$ , we set the functions

$$\Psi_{t,r,\mathbb{G}}^{\text{vx}}(v, \underline{y}) := \varphi_{\mathbb{G}^-(v)}^{\beta, B} [\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t,r} \mid \eta_{v,t}^r = \underline{y})], \quad \Psi_{t,r,\mathbb{G}}^{\text{e,sym}}(v, \underline{y}) := \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{S}_d} \Psi_{t,r,\mathbb{G}}^{\text{e},\pi}(v, \underline{y}), \quad (5.38)$$

$$\Psi_{t,r,\mathbb{G}}^{\text{e},\pi}(v, \underline{y}) := \varphi_{\mathbb{G}^-(v)}^{\beta, B} [\Psi^{\text{e}}(\mathfrak{s}_{u_{\pi(1)} \rightarrow v}^{t,r}, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_{u_{\pi(d)} \rightarrow v}^{t,r} \mid \eta_{v,t}^r = \underline{y})].$$

Utilizing Lemma 5.6 and (5.34)-(5.37), we proceed to estimate the ratios of various RCM-restricted partition functions, in terms of these functions.

**Lemma 5.9.** *Fix  $B > 0$  and  $\beta \geq 0$ . Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , and a finite graph  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ . There exists some  $r'_o = r'_o(\varepsilon, t)$  such that if  $o \in V(\widehat{\mathbb{G}})$  and  $\mathbb{B}_o(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$ ,  $r \geq r'_o$ , then for any  $\mathbb{B}_o(r) \subset \mathbb{G} \subset \widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ , we get upon setting  $\widehat{W} := \mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)$  and  $W_r := \mathbb{B}_o(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)$ , that*

$$\max_{\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}}} \left\{ \left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, \widehat{W}}(\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), \widehat{W}}(\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}})} - \Psi_{t,r,\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}^{\text{vx}}(o, \underline{y}_{W_r}) \right| \right\} \leq \varepsilon, \quad (5.39)$$

$$\max_{\pi \in \mathbb{S}_d} \max_{\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}}} \left\{ \left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^\pi(o), \widehat{W}}(\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), \widehat{W}}(\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}})} - \Psi_{t,r,\widehat{\mathbb{G}}}^{\text{e},\pi}(o, \underline{y}_{W_r}) \right| \right\} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (5.40)$$

**Remark 5.10.** In view of (5.37), the bounds (5.39)-(5.40) actually hold also for any subgraph  $\widehat{W}$  of  $\mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)$  which contains  $\mathbb{B}_o(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)$ .

*Proof.* With  $\mathbb{G} \cap \mathbb{B}_o(r) = \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \cap \mathbb{B}_o(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$  and  $W_r = \widehat{W} \cap \mathbb{B}_o(r)$ , we first examine the special case  $\mathbb{G} = \widehat{\mathbb{G}} = \mathbb{B}_o(r)$ . Specifically, using  $\mathbb{B}_o^-(r) := \mathbb{G}^-(o)$  and  $\mathbb{B}_o^\pi(r) := \mathbb{G}^\pi(o)$  when  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{B}_o(r)$ , we show that for any  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*$  and  $\pi \in \mathbb{S}_d$ ,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_r(\underline{y}) := \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r), W_r^*}(\underline{y})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{B}_o^-(r), W_r^*}(\underline{y})} = \Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial o}^{t,r}(\underline{y})), \quad (5.41)$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_r^\pi(\underline{y}) := \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{B}_o^\pi(r), W_r^*}(\underline{y})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{B}_o^-(r), W_r^*}(\underline{y})} = \Psi^{\text{e}}(\mathfrak{s}_{u_{\pi(1)} \rightarrow o}^{t,r}(\underline{y}), \dots, \mathfrak{s}_{u_{\pi(d)} \rightarrow o}^{t,r}(\underline{y})). \quad (5.42)$$

Indeed, it follows from (5.36) that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{B}_o^-(r), W_r^*}(\underline{y}) = \sum_{\{\eta': \eta'_{o,t} = \underline{y}\}} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}'} \widehat{\omega}_{\mathbb{B}_o^-(r)^*}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\sigma}', \underline{\eta}').$$

Further, for any  $e \in E^*$  and  $\underline{\sigma} \in [q]^{V^*}$ ,

$$\sum_{\eta_e \in \{0,1\}} e^{\beta_e^*} [(1 - p_e)(1 - \eta_e) + p_e \eta_e \delta_e(\underline{\sigma})] = 1 + (e^{\beta_e^*} - 1) \delta_e(\underline{\sigma}).$$

Thus, with  $\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)} = (\underline{\eta}^{(1)}, \underline{\eta}')$  for  $\underline{\eta}^{(1)} := (\eta_e)_{e \in \mathbb{B}_o(1) \cup \{(o, v^*)\}}$ , we similarly get from (5.34)-(5.36) that

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{B}_o(r), W_r^*}(\underline{y}) = \sum_{\{\underline{\eta}' : \underline{\eta}'_{W_r^*} = \underline{y}\}} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}'} \sum_{\sigma_o, \underline{\eta}^{(1)}} \widehat{\varpi}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}^{\beta, B}((\sigma_o, \underline{\sigma}'), (\underline{\eta}^{(1)}, \underline{\eta}')) = \sum_{\{\underline{\eta}' : \underline{\eta}'_{o, t}^{*, r} = \underline{y}\}} \sum_{\underline{\sigma}'} f(\sigma'_{\partial o}) \widehat{\varpi}_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\sigma}', \underline{\eta}'),$$

for some function  $f(\cdot)$ , where by enumerating over the  $[q]$ -valued  $\sigma_o$ , one verifies that

$$f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) = \sum_{k=1}^q e^{B\delta_{k,1}} \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + (e^\beta - 1)\delta_{\sigma_i, k}).$$

Consequently,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_r(\underline{y}) = \varpi_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}^{\beta, B} \left[ f(\sigma_{\partial o}) \Big| \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r} = \underline{y} \right]. \quad (5.43)$$

By the same reasoning, now with  $\underline{\eta}^{(1)} := \underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{B}_o^-(1) \setminus \mathbb{B}_o^-(1)}$ , we find that, for any  $\pi \in \mathbb{S}_d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_r^\pi(\underline{y}) &= \varpi_{\mathbb{B}_o^-(r)}^{\beta, B} \left[ f^\pi(\sigma_{\partial o}) \Big| \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r} = \underline{y} \right], \\ f^\pi(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) &:= \prod_{i=1}^{d/2} (1 + (e^\beta - 1)\delta_{\sigma_{\pi(2i-1)}, \sigma_{\pi(2i)}}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.44)$$

Since  $\mathbb{B}_o(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$ , the spins  $(\sigma_u, u \in \partial o)$  are mutually independent under  $\varpi_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}^{\beta, B}(\cdot \mid \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r})$ , with each of them uniformly distributed on  $\{2, \dots, q\}$ . Thus, upon setting for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ,

$$b_i := \frac{1}{1 - 1/q} \varpi_{\mathbb{B}_o^*(r)}^{\beta, B}(\sigma_{u_i} = 1 \mid \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r} = \underline{y}) - \frac{1/q}{1 - 1/q},$$

a straightforward computation shows that the RHS of (5.43) and (5.44) are given by  $\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\underline{b})$  and  $\Psi^e(b_{\pi(1)}, \dots, b_{\pi(d)})$ , respectively. Finally, the identification  $\underline{b} = \mathfrak{s}_{\partial o}^{t, r}$  follows from Lemma 2.2, analogously to the derivation of (5.11).

Armed with (5.41), we proceed to prove (5.39). To this end, writing  $\underline{y} = \underline{y}_{W^*}$  and  $\underline{y}^o = \underline{y}_W$ , we get by following the derivation of (5.43), that for any  $\mathbb{G}$  with  $|\partial o| = d$  and  $W_r \subset W \subset \mathbb{G} \setminus \mathbb{B}_o(t)$ ,

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W^*}(\underline{y})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), W^*}(\underline{y})} = \varpi_{\mathbb{G}^-(o)}^{\beta, B} \left[ f(\sigma_{\partial o}) \Big| \underline{\eta}_{W^*} = \underline{y} \right] \text{ and } \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W}(\underline{y}^o)}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), W}(\underline{y}^o)} = \varpi_{\mathbb{G}^-(o)}^{\beta, B} \left[ f(\sigma_{\partial o}) \Big| \underline{\eta}_W = \underline{y}^o \right].$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W}(\underline{y}^o)}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), W}(\underline{y}^o)} = \sum_{\underline{y} \setminus \underline{y}^o} \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W^*}(\underline{y})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), W^*}(\underline{y})} \varphi_{\mathbb{G}^-(o)}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}_{W^*} = \underline{y} \mid \underline{\eta}_W = \underline{y}^o). \quad (5.45)$$

Further, from (5.34)-(5.36) we have that for some  $\bar{c} = \bar{c}(q, \beta, B, d) > 0$ ,

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), W^*}(\underline{y})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W^*}(\underline{y})} = \frac{1}{q} \varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}^{(1)} \equiv 0 \mid \underline{\eta}_{W^*} = \underline{y}) \geq \bar{c}. \quad (5.46)$$

Comparing (5.41) with (5.46) for  $(\mathbb{B}_o(r), W_r)$ , we deduce that

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}, W^*}(\underline{y})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{G}^-(o), W^*}(\underline{y})} = \frac{\varphi_{\mathbb{B}_o(r)}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}^{(1)} \equiv 0 \mid \underline{\eta}_{o, t}^{*, r} = \underline{y}_{W_r^*})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{G}}^{\beta, B}(\underline{\eta}^{(1)} \equiv 0 \mid \underline{\eta}_{W^*} = \underline{y})} \Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial o}^{t, r}(\underline{y}_{W_r^*})), \quad (5.47)$$

which, in view of (5.21) equals to  $\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial o}^{t,r}(\underline{y}_{W_r^*}))$  whenever  $\underline{y}_{W_r^*} \in \mathcal{S}_{t,r}$ . Utilizing this observation when plugging (5.47) into (5.45), then using the uniform lower bound of (5.46) and the triangle inequality, we find that for  $r \geq r_0(\varepsilon\bar{c}/6, t)$  of Lemma 5.6,

$$\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G},W}(\underline{y}_W)}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}^-(o),W}(\underline{y}_W)} - \varphi_{\mathbf{G}^-(o)}^{\beta,B}(\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial o}^{t,r}) \mid \underline{\eta}_W = \underline{y}_W) \right| \leq (2/\bar{c})\varphi_{\mathbf{G}^-(o)}^{\beta,B}(\mathcal{S}_{t,r}^c \mid \underline{\eta}_W = \underline{y}_W) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \quad (5.48)$$

where in the last inequality we have employed (5.22) for  $\varphi_{\mathbf{G}^-(o)}^{\beta,B}$ .

Analogously to the derivation of (5.46), except for now using (5.37), we get for any  $W_r \subset W \subset \widehat{W}$ ,

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}^-(o),W}(\underline{y}_W)}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G},W}(\underline{y}_W)} = \frac{1}{e^B + q - 1} \varphi_{\mathbf{G}}^{\beta,B}(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbf{B}_o(1)} \equiv 0 \mid \underline{\eta}_W = \underline{y}_W).$$

Hence, by (5.23), if  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}} \supset \mathbf{G}$  matches  $\mathbf{G}$  on their respective  $r$  balls around  $o$  and  $r \geq r_0(\varepsilon/9, t)$ , then

$$\max_{\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}}} \left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\widehat{\mathbf{G}},W_r}(\underline{y}_{W_r})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\widehat{\mathbf{G}}^-(o),W_r}(\underline{y}_{W_r})} \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}^-(o),\widehat{W}}(\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}})}{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G},\widehat{W}}(\underline{y}_{\widehat{W}})} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (5.49)$$

We combine (5.49) with (5.48) at  $(\widehat{\mathbf{G}}, W_r)$ , and recall (5.38) that  $\Psi_{t,r,\widehat{\mathbf{G}}}^{\text{vx}}(o, \cdot) = \varphi_{\widehat{\mathbf{G}}^-(o)}^{\beta,B}(\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial o}^{t,r}) \mid \underline{\eta}_{W_r})$ , to arrive at (5.39).

Upon changing  $f$  to  $f^\pi$  and  $\underline{\eta}^{(1)}$  to  $\underline{\eta}_{\mathbf{B}_{\bar{o}}(1) \setminus \mathbf{B}_o^-(1)}$  (as in the derivation of (5.44)), the proof of (5.40) out of (5.42) is the same, hence omitted.  $\square$

Hereafter we fix the sequence  $\{\mathbf{G}_n\}$ , using for  $v \in [n]$  the shorthand  $\varphi_n^v := \varphi_{\mathbf{G}_n(v)}^{\beta,B}$  and define

$$\Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{sym}}(v, \underline{y}) := \Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{vx}}(v, \underline{y}) / \Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{e,sym}}(v, \underline{y}), \quad (5.50)$$

for  $\Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{vx}} := \Psi_{t,r,\mathbf{G}_n}^{\text{vx}}$  and  $\Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{e,sym}} := \Psi_{t,r,\mathbf{G}_n}^{\text{e,sym}}$  of (5.38). For any  $t < r$ ,  $v \in [n]$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we further define, analogously to (5.29), the bond events

$$\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,v,n}^{t,r} := \left\{ \underline{y} : \log \Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{sym}}(v, \underline{y}_{\mathbf{B}_v(r) \setminus \mathbf{B}_v(t)}) < \widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (5.51)$$

Aiming to later utilize Lemma 5.9, we first adapt Lemma 5.8 to lower bound the average over  $v$  of  $\varphi_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta,B}(\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon,v,n}^{t,r})$ , when  $\varphi_n^{\beta,B}$  converges locally weakly to  $\mathfrak{m}_b$ . Out of this we produce vertex subsets  $\mathcal{V}_n$ , having well-spaced, tree-like neighborhoods in  $\mathbf{G}_n$ , at which with non-negligible probability a positive fraction of the events (5.51) hold.

**Lemma 5.11.** *Suppose  $\mathfrak{m}_b(\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m) > 0$ .*

*The following then holds for some  $\delta_o > 0$ ,  $t'$ , large  $r'(t) < \infty$ , and small enough  $\zeta(\delta_o, r) > 0$ .*

(a). *If  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{\text{loc}} \mathbb{T}_d$  and  $\{\varphi_n := \varphi_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta,B}\}$  converges locally weakly to  $\mathfrak{m}_b$ , then for  $t \geq t'$  and  $r \geq r'(t)$ ,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^n \varphi_n(\mathcal{A}_{\delta_o,v,n}^{t,r}) \geq 4\delta_o.$$

(b). *There exists  $n'(\zeta)$  so that for any  $n \geq n'(\zeta)$ , there exist  $\mathcal{V}_n \subset [n]$  of size  $|\mathcal{V}_n| = \zeta n$ , such that*

$$\inf_{v \neq v' \in \mathcal{V}_n} \{\text{dist}_{\mathbf{G}_n}(v, v')\} > 3r, \quad \mathbf{B}_v(3r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(3r), \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{V}_n, \quad (5.52)$$

$$\varphi_n \left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}_n|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\delta_o,v,n}^{t,r}} \geq \delta_o \right) \geq \delta_o. \quad (5.53)$$

*Proof.* (a). Note that for some finite  $C = C(q, d, \beta, B)$ , uniformly over  $n$  and  $v \in [n]$  with  $|\partial v| \leq d$ ,

$$C^{-1} \varphi_n(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{G}_n^-(v)}) \leq \varphi_n^v(\underline{\eta}_{\mathbb{G}_n^-(v)}) \leq C \varphi_n(\underline{\eta}) \quad \forall \underline{\eta} \in \{0, 1\}^{E_n^*}.$$

Then, from  $\mathbb{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  and Lemma 5.8, we have that for any  $\varepsilon \leq \xi/(2C)$ ,  $t \geq t'$  and  $r \geq r'(t)$ ,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)\}} (\varphi_n^v(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}) - \varepsilon) \geq C^{-1} \int \varphi(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon}^{t, r}) d\mathbf{m}_b - \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon, \quad (5.54)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r} := \{\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) < \widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon\}$ . Further, for some  $c = c(q, d, \beta, B) > 0$ ,

$$\Psi^{\text{vx}}(\underline{b}), \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\underline{b}) \in [1, c^{-1}], \quad \forall \underline{b} \in [0, 1]^d, \quad (5.55)$$

and we now set for any  $v \in [n]$ ,

$$Y_{v, n}(\underline{y}) := \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}} \mid \underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r = \underline{y} \right] - c\varepsilon \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{e, sym}}(v, \underline{y}). \quad (5.56)$$

Recall from (5.20) that  $\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r} \in [b_f - \varepsilon^4, b_w + \varepsilon^4]^d$  whenever  $t > \kappa_o(\varepsilon^4)$  and  $\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$ . For such  $v$  we have by (5.27) and the Lipschitz continuity of  $\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(\cdot)$ , that for some  $\varepsilon' > 0$  and all  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon'$ ,

$$\sup_{r > t > \kappa_o(\varepsilon^4)} \sup_{\underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r^* \setminus \mathbb{B}_t^*} \{\log \Psi^{\text{sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}(\underline{y}))\} \leq \widehat{\Phi} + \varepsilon^3 \quad (5.57)$$

(see Definition 5.3 for  $\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}(\cdot)$ ). In view of (5.38), we have for any  $t > \kappa_o(\varepsilon^4)$  that if  $\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$  and  $Y_{v, n}(\underline{y}) \geq 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{vx}}(v, \underline{y}) &= \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}} \mid \underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r = \underline{y} \right] + \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{vx}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r})^c} \mid \underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r = \underline{y} \right] \\ &< e^{\widehat{\Phi} - 2C\varepsilon} \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}} \mid \underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r = \underline{y} \right] + e^{\widehat{\Phi} + \varepsilon^3} \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r})^c} \mid \underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r = \underline{y} \right] \\ &= e^{\widehat{\Phi} - 2C\varepsilon} \left( \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{e, sym}}(v, \underline{y}) + (e^{2C\varepsilon + \varepsilon^3} - 1) \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r})^c} \mid \underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r = \underline{y} \right] \right) \\ &\leq e^{\widehat{\Phi} - 2C\varepsilon} (1 + (e^{2C\varepsilon + \varepsilon^3} - 1)(1 - c\varepsilon)) \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{e, sym}}(v, \underline{y}) \leq e^{\widehat{\Phi} - c\varepsilon^2} \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{e, sym}}(v, \underline{y}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses the definition of  $\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}$  and the uniform bound (5.57), the second one holds for  $Y_{v, n}(\underline{y}) \geq 0$  (see (5.56)), and the last one applies when  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon'')$ . That is, in view of (5.50), for any  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon' \wedge \varepsilon''$  if  $r > t > \kappa_o(\varepsilon^4)$  and  $\delta \leq c\varepsilon^2$ , then

$$\{\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r) \text{ and } Y_{v, n}(\underline{y}) \geq 0\} \implies \{\log \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{sym}}(v, \underline{y}) < \widehat{\Phi} - \delta\}. \quad (5.58)$$

As  $Y_{v, n} \leq 1/c$ , clearly  $\varphi_n^v(Y_{v, n} \geq 0) \geq c\varphi_n^v[Y_{v, n}]$ . Further, by (5.56), (5.38) and (5.55),

$$\varphi_n^v[Y_{v, n}(\underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r)] = \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}} \right] - c\varepsilon \varphi_n^v \left[ \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\mathfrak{s}_{\partial v}^{t, r}) \right] \geq \varphi_n^v(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}) - \varepsilon. \quad (5.59)$$

Combining (5.51), (5.58) and (5.59), we find that

$$\varphi_n(\mathcal{A}_{\delta, v, n}^{t, r}) \geq C^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)\}} \varphi_n^v(Y_{v, n}(\underline{\eta}_{v, t}^r) \geq 0) \geq \frac{c}{C} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)\}} (\varphi_n^v(\mathcal{B}_{2C\varepsilon, v, n}^{t, r}) - \varepsilon).$$

The preceding inequality, together with (5.54), completes our proof (with  $\delta_o := \delta \wedge c\varepsilon/(4C)$ ).

(b). We establish the existence of  $\mathcal{V}_n$  via a probabilistic construction based on the auxiliary IID, uniform over  $[n]$ , samples  $\{w_i, i \leq 2\zeta n\}$ . Specifically, set  $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{U}_0 \setminus \bar{\mathcal{U}}$  where

$$\mathcal{U}_0 := \{i : \mathbb{B}_{w_i}(3r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(3r)\}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{U}} := \{i \in \mathcal{U}_0 : \exists j \neq i \text{ such that } \text{dist}_{\mathbb{G}_n}(w_i, w_j) \leq 3r\}.$$



Observe that  $n^{-1}\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{W}_0| \rightarrow 2\zeta$  since  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ . Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}|\bar{\mathcal{W}}| \leq \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{P}(w_j \in \mathbb{B}_{w_i}(3r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(3r)) \leq 2\zeta |\mathbb{T}_d(3r)| \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{W}_0|.$$

Thus,  $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{W}| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\zeta})\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{W}_0|$  for any  $\zeta \leq \zeta_o(r)$ , where  $\zeta_o(r)$  is some sufficiently small constant depending only on  $r$ , in which case

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{W}| \geq 2\zeta n(1 - 3\sqrt{\zeta})) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{W}|}{2\zeta n} - (1 - 3\sqrt{\zeta}) \geq 2\sqrt{\zeta}. \quad (5.60)$$

With  $q_n(v) := \varphi_n(\mathcal{A}_{\delta_o, v, n}^{t, r})$ , recall from part (a) that the IID  $[0, 1]$ -valued  $\{q_n(w_i)\}$  satisfy

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[q_n(w_i)] = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^n q_n(v) \geq 4\delta_o.$$

Hence, by Chebychev's inequality

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2\zeta n} \sum_{i=1}^{2\zeta n} q_n(w_i) \geq 3\delta_o\right) = 1 \quad (5.61)$$

and in view of (5.60), at any  $n \geq n'(\zeta)$  we have with probability  $\sqrt{\zeta}$  that  $|\mathcal{W}| \geq 2\zeta n(1 - 3\sqrt{\zeta})$  and the event in (5.61) holds. For  $3\sqrt{\zeta} \leq \delta_o \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , it then follows that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}} q_n(w_i) \geq \frac{1}{2\zeta n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{W}} q_n(w_i) \geq \frac{1}{2\zeta n} \sum_{i=1}^{2\zeta n} q_n(w_i) - 3\sqrt{\zeta} \geq 3\delta_o - 3\sqrt{\zeta} \geq 2\delta_o.$$

Take for  $\mathcal{V}_n$  the  $[\zeta n]$  elements of largest  $q_n(\cdot)$  in  $\{w_i : i \in \mathcal{W}\}$ . Then, (5.52) holds and moreover

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}_n|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_n} \varphi_n(\mathcal{A}_{\delta_o, v, n}^{t, r}) \geq 2\delta_o,$$

from which (5.53) immediately follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.13.* Fix  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbf{R}_c$ ,  $B > 0$ ,  $d \in 2\mathbb{N}$ ,  $d \geq 3$  and  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$ , further assuming WLOG that  $\varphi_n = \varphi_{\mathbf{G}_n}^{\beta, B}$  converges locally weakly to  $\mathfrak{m}_b$ . In view of [8, Theorem 1], postulating further that  $\mathfrak{m}_b(\mathcal{Q}_* \setminus \mathcal{Q}_m) > 0$ , it suffices to produce  $\mathbf{G}'_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathbb{T}_d$  such that  $\lim_n \Phi'_n(\beta, B) > \widehat{\Phi}$ . To this end, for  $\delta_o > 0$  of Lemma 5.11 and  $c > 0$  from (5.55), set

$$\varepsilon_* := -\frac{1}{3} \log \left( 1 - (1 - e^{-\delta_o}) \frac{\delta_o c^2}{3} \right). \quad (5.62)$$

Similarly to the derivation of (5.57), with  $\log \Psi^{\text{vx}}(\cdot)$  and  $\log \Psi^{\text{e, sym}}(\cdot)$  Lipschitz on  $[0, 1]^d$ , taking  $\kappa_o = \kappa_o(\varepsilon_*^2)$  as in Remark 5.5 (and shrinking  $\delta_o$  as needed for  $\varepsilon_*$  to be small enough), guarantees by (5.27), (5.38), and (5.50) that for  $r > t > \kappa_o$  and any finite graph  $\mathbf{G}_n$ ,

$$\sup_{\underline{y} \in \mathbb{B}_r \setminus \mathbb{B}_t} \log \Psi_{t, r, n}^{\text{sym}}(v, \underline{y}) \leq \widehat{\Phi} + \varepsilon_* \quad (5.63)$$

provided  $v \in V(\mathbf{G}_n)$  is such that  $\mathbb{B}_v(r) \cong \mathbb{T}_d(r)$ . Hereafter we further take  $r > r'(t)$  and  $t > t'$  as needed in Lemma 5.11, possibly increasing  $r'(t)$  till Lemma 5.9 holds with  $\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon_*}{4}$ . Then, for  $\mathcal{V}_n$  of

Lemma 5.11(b), set the disjoint union  $W_n := \cup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_n} (\mathbb{B}_v(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_v(t))$  and for  $\mathcal{A}_v = \mathcal{A}_{\delta_o, v, n}^{t, r}$  of (5.51) let

$$\mathcal{Y}_n := \left\{ \underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{E(W_n)} : \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}_n|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_v} \geq \delta_o \right\}. \quad (5.64)$$

Our graph decomposition starts at  $\mathbf{G}_n^{(0)} = \mathbf{G}_n$  and iteratively has  $\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell)} := \mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1), \pi_\ell}(v_\ell)$  for

$$v_\ell := \operatorname{argmax}_{v \in \mathcal{V}_n \setminus \{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}\}} \left\{ \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1)}, W_n}(\underline{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_v}(\underline{y}) \right\},$$

$$\pi_\ell := \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_d} \left\{ \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1), \pi}(v_\ell), W_n}(\underline{y}) \right\}.$$

We will show in the sequel that for any  $\ell \leq \ell_n := \frac{\delta_o}{3} \zeta n$ ,

$$\Delta \mathcal{Z}_\ell := \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1)}, W_n}(\underline{y}) \right) - \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell)}, W_n}(\underline{y}) \right) \leq \widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon_\star. \quad (5.65)$$

We claim that  $\mathbf{G}'_n := \mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell_n)}$  then have too large free densities  $\Phi'_n(\beta, B)$ . Indeed, by (5.34), (5.35), (5.37) and the fact that the Potts measure is the spin marginal of the Edwards-Sokal measure,

$$Z_{\mathbf{G}'_n}(\beta, B) = \sum_{\underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{E(W_n)}} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}'_n, W_n}(\underline{y}).$$

Thus, by the LHS of (5.53), (5.64) and (5.65),

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_{\mathbf{G}'_n}(\beta, B) &\geq \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell_n)}, W_n}(\underline{y}) \right) = \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n, W_n}(\underline{y}) \right) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_n} \Delta \mathcal{Z}_\ell \\ &\geq \log Z_{\mathbf{G}_n}(\beta, B) + \log \delta_o - (\widehat{\Phi} - \varepsilon_\star) \ell_n. \end{aligned}$$

With  $\mathbf{G}_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathsf{T}_d$  we have from [8, Theorem 1] that  $\Phi_n(\beta, B) \rightarrow \widehat{\Phi}$ , so by the preceding,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Z_{\mathbf{G}'_n}(\beta, B) \geq \widehat{\Phi} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_o}{3} \zeta\right) + \frac{\delta_o}{3} \zeta \varepsilon_\star. \quad (5.66)$$

Note that  $|V(\mathbf{G}'_n)| = n - \ell_n = (1 - \frac{\delta_o}{3} \zeta)n$  and the degree in  $\mathbf{G}'_n$  of any  $w \in V(\mathbf{G}'_n)$  matches its degree in  $\mathbf{G}_n$ . Moreover, the sets  $\mathbb{B}_{v_\ell}(1)$  on which  $\mathbf{G}'_n$  and  $\mathbf{G}_n$  differ, are  $2r$ -separated on  $\mathbf{G}'_n$  and if  $(u, u') \in E(\mathbf{G}'_n)$  within such a changed set  $\mathbb{B}_v(1)$ , then  $\operatorname{dist}_{\mathbf{G}_n}(u, u') \leq 2$ . Consequently, any cycle of length  $k$  in  $\mathbf{G}'_n$  must have been obtained from a cycle of length at most  $k/(1 + (2r)^{-1})$  in  $\mathbf{G}_n$ . The last two observations together imply that  $\mathbf{G}'_n \xrightarrow{loc} \mathsf{T}_d$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, by [8, Theorem 1]

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Z_{\mathbf{G}'_n}(\beta, B) \leq \widehat{\Phi} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_o}{3} \zeta\right),$$

in contradiction to (5.66).

We thus complete the proof of Theorem 1.13 upon establishing (5.65). To this end, we shall apply Lemma 5.9 with  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}} = \mathbf{G}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1)}$ , and  $o = v_\ell \in \mathcal{V}_n$  (so  $\mathbb{B}_o(r) \cong \mathsf{T}_d(r)$  in view of (5.52)), where as  $\inf_{i < \ell} \operatorname{dist}_{\mathbf{G}_n}(v_\ell, v_i) > 3r$  (see (5.52)), indeed  $\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1)}$  coincides with  $\mathbf{G}_n$  on its  $r$ -ball around  $v_\ell$ . Further, Remark 5.10 allows us to do so for  $\widehat{W} = W_n$  (which by construction contains the relevant annuli  $\mathbb{B}_{v_\ell}(r) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{v_\ell}(t)$  while excluding  $\mathbb{B}_{v_\ell}(t)$ ). Specifically, using the shorthand

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell(\underline{y}) := \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell)}, W_n}(\underline{y}), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) := \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1), -}(v_\ell), W_n}(\underline{y}), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^\pi(\underline{y}) := \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbf{G}_n^{(\ell-1), \pi}(v_\ell), W_n}(\underline{y}),$$

and  $\Gamma_\ell := \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \Psi_{t,r,n}^{e,\text{sym}}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y})$ , we have by Lemma 5.9 and our choice of  $r$  that,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{Z}_\ell &= \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y})}{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y})} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \right) - \log \left( \max_{\pi} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^\pi(\underline{y})}{\widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y})} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_\star + \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{vx}}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \right) - \log \left( \max_{\pi} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \Psi_{t,r,n}^{e,\pi}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_\star + \log \left( \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{vx}}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \right) - \log \Gamma_\ell. \end{aligned} \quad (5.67)$$

To simplify the RHS of (5.67), note that by our choice of  $v_\ell$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{v_\ell}}(\underline{y}) &\geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}_n|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Y}_n \setminus \{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}\}} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_v}(\underline{y}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Y}_n|} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y}) \left( \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_v}(\underline{y}) - (\ell-1) \right) \geq \frac{2\delta_o}{3} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.68)$$

with the right-most inequality due to (5.64) and the size of  $\mathcal{Y}_n$ . Moreover, by Lemma 5.9 and (5.55)

$$\sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \Psi_{t,r,n}^{e,\text{sym}}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{v_\ell}}(\underline{y}) \geq \frac{3c}{4} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{v_\ell}}(\underline{y}) \geq \frac{\delta_o c}{2} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\ell-1}(\underline{y}) \geq \frac{\delta_o c^2}{3} \Gamma_\ell$$

where in the penultimate step we have used (5.68). Substituting the latter inequality in (5.67), upon recalling the definitions of  $\mathcal{A}_{v_\ell}$  and  $\Psi_{t,r,n}^{\text{sym}}(\cdot, \underline{y})$ , and using (5.63) we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\Delta \mathcal{Z}_\ell - \varepsilon_\star} &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma_\ell} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \exp(\widehat{\Phi} + \varepsilon_\star - \delta_o \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{v_\ell}}(\underline{y})) \Psi_{t,r,n}^{e,\text{sym}}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \\ &\leq e^{\widehat{\Phi} + \varepsilon_\star} \left( 1 - \frac{1 - e^{-\delta_o}}{\Gamma_\ell} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_n} \Psi_{t,r,n}^{e,\text{sym}}(v_\ell, \underline{y}) \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_\ell^-(\underline{y}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{v_\ell}}(\underline{y}) \right) \\ &\leq e^{\widehat{\Phi} + \varepsilon_\star} \left( 1 - (1 - e^{-\delta_o}) \frac{\delta_o c^2}{3} \right) = e^{\widehat{\Phi} - 2\varepsilon_\star} \end{aligned}$$

(with the last equality by our choice (5.62) of  $\varepsilon_\star$ ). This is (5.65), which thus completes our proof.  $\square$

#### APPENDIX A. INFINITE VOLUME POTTS MEASURES AND BETHE FIXED POINTS

We prove here various properties of the *phase diagram* associated to the Potts measures on  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . To this end, for any  $(i, j) \in E(\mathbb{T}_d)$  let  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}$  be the tree rooted at  $i$  obtained upon deleting  $(i, j)$  from  $E(\mathbb{T}_d)$  and with  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}(t)$  denoting for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  the ball  $B_i(t)$  in  $\mathbb{T}_{i \rightarrow j}$ , we first prove Lemma 3.3.

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Summing in (3.6) over  $\sigma_j$  results with (3.7). The proof of (3.6) in case  $q = 2$  is well known (e.g. see [6, Lemma 4.1]), and the extension for  $q \geq 3$  (which we now give), follows a similar scheme. With  $\mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}$  a translation invariant measure, it suffices to consider  $i = o$  and  $j = 1$  a specific neighbor of the root  $o$  of  $\mathbb{T}_d$ . Fixing  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , as there are no cycles in  $\mathbb{T}_d(t)$ , we have under  $\mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}$  of Definition 1.2, that for some  $\widehat{\nu}_t^1, \widehat{\nu}_t^o \in \mathcal{P}([q])$

$$\mu_{\dagger}^{\beta, B}(\sigma_o, \sigma_1) \propto e^{\beta \delta_{\sigma_o, \sigma_1}} \widehat{\nu}_t^1(\sigma_1) \widehat{\nu}_t^o(\sigma_o), \quad \forall \sigma_o, \sigma_1 \in [q].$$

Further, both  $T_{o \rightarrow 1}$  and  $T_{1 \rightarrow o}$  are infinite  $(d-1)$ -ary trees (i.e. each vertex has  $(d-1)$  children). Hence, by induction we deduce from Definitions 1.2 and 1.3, that  $\widehat{\nu}_t^o$  and  $\widehat{\nu}_t^1$  are the probability measures obtained by running the BP recursion  $t$  and  $(t-1)$  times, respectively, starting from  $\nu_{\ddagger}$  (i.e. starting at the uniform measure if  $\ddagger = f$  and at Dirac at 1 when  $\ddagger = 1$ ). By definition the limit of these recursions is  $\nu_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}$  and (3.6) follows.  $\square$

**Remark A.1.** By a similar reasoning one finds also that for any  $\beta, B \geq 0$  and  $\ddagger \in \{f, 1\}$ , all finite dimensional marginals of  $\mu_{\ddagger, t}^{\beta, B}$  converge as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, it can be checked that these marginals are consistent, thus implying the existence of  $\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}$  for  $\ddagger \in \{f, 1\}$ . The existence of  $\mu_i^{\beta, 0}$  for all  $i \in [q]$  is proved similarly (now starting the BP recursion at Dirac at  $i$ ).

Next we prove that  $\nu_f$  and  $\nu_1$ , when viewed as functions of  $\beta$  and  $B$ , are continuously differentiable except on  $\partial R_{\neq}^+$  and  $\partial R_{\neq}^f$ , respectively.

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* (i) Since  $\nu_1^{\beta, B}$  is a fixed point of the BP recursion of (1.5), starting from the probability measure on  $[q]$  that is Dirac at 1, necessarily  $\nu_1^{\beta, B}(\sigma) = \nu_1^{\beta, B}(\sigma')$  for all  $\sigma, \sigma' \in [q] \setminus \{1\}$  and as  $\nu_1^{\beta, B} \in \mathcal{P}([q])$ , it suffices to show that  $(\beta, B) \mapsto \nu_1^{\beta, B}(1)$  is continuously differentiable at any fixed  $(\beta_0, B_0) \notin \partial R_{\neq}^f$ . Further, after some algebra we deduce from (1.5) that

$$r_1(\beta, B) := \log \frac{\nu_1^{\beta, B}(1)}{\nu_1^{\beta, B}(2)} = \log \frac{(1-q)\nu_1^{\beta, B}(1)}{1 - \nu_1^{\beta, B}(1)},$$

satisfies the fixed point equation

$$F(r; \beta, B) = r, \tag{A.1}$$

where

$$F(r; \beta, B) := B + (d-1) \log \left( \frac{e^{\beta+r} + q - 1}{e^r + e^{\beta} + q - 2} \right).$$

Using this representation it suffices to show that  $(\beta, B) \mapsto r_1(\beta, B)$  is continuously differentiable, and this follows by an application of the implicit function theorem, once we have verified that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(r; \beta, B) \neq 1, \quad \text{for } (r, \beta, B) = (r_1(\beta_0, B_0), \beta_0, B_0). \tag{A.2}$$

To obtain (A.2) we borrow results from [9]. From the proof of [9, Lemma 4.6] it follows that for  $d \geq 3$  there is some  $\beta_- \in (0, \infty)$  such that for  $\beta < \beta_-$  there does not exist any solution to the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(r; \beta, B) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(r; \beta, 0) = 1. \tag{A.3}$$

In contrast, for  $\beta \geq \beta_-$  there exist solutions  $\rho_-(\beta) \leq \rho_+(\beta)$  of the equation (A.3), with equality if and only if  $\beta = \beta_-$ . Thus, to complete the proof of (A.2) we need to show that if  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in R_{\neq}^f \setminus \partial R_{\neq}^f$  (and therefore  $\beta_0 > \beta_-$ , see [9, Lemma 4.6]) then  $r_1(\beta_0, B_0) \neq \rho_{\pm}(\beta_0)$ .

If possible, let us assume that  $r_1(\beta_0, B_0) = \rho_+(\beta_0)$ . Denoting

$$B_{\pm}(\beta) := \rho_{\mp}(\beta) - F(\rho_{\mp}(\beta); \beta, 0), \tag{A.4}$$

as  $r_1(\beta, B)$  is a fixed point of the equation (A.1), we note that  $B_0 = B_-(\beta_0)$ . From the proof of [9, Theorem 1.11(a)] we have that the map  $B \mapsto \beta_f(B)$  is the inverse of the map  $\beta \mapsto B_-(\beta)$ . So,  $\beta_0 = \beta_f(B_0)$  implying that  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \partial R_{\neq}^f$ . As  $(\beta_0, B_0) \notin \partial R_{\neq}^f$  we arrive at a contradiction.

To rule out the other possibility that  $r_1(\beta_0, B_0) = \rho_-(\beta_0)$  we again proceed by contradiction. As  $\beta_0 > \beta_-$  we have that  $\rho_-(\beta_0) < \rho_+(\beta_0)$ . Now note

$$B_+(\beta) - B_-(\beta) = \int_{\rho_-(\beta)}^{\rho_+(\beta)} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(r; \beta, 0) - 1 \right] dr.$$

It can be checked that  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} F(r; \beta, 0)$  is negative for sufficiently large  $r$  and has a single change of sign. As  $\rho_{\pm}(\beta)$  are the solutions of (A.3) one therefore have that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} F(r; \beta, 0) > 1$  for  $r \in (\rho_-(\beta), \rho_+(\beta))$ . Hence, it follows from above that  $B_-(\beta_0) < B_+(\beta_0)$ . Thus

$$F(\rho_+(\beta_0); \beta_0, B_0) = \rho_+(\beta_0) + B_0 - B_-(\beta_0) = \rho_+(\beta_0) + B_+(\beta_0) - B_-(\beta_0) > \rho_+(\beta_0), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where in the penultimate step we have used the fact that the assumption  $r_1(\beta_0, B_0) = \rho_-(\beta_0)$  implies that  $B_0 = B_+(\beta_0)$ .

Noting that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} F(r; \beta_0, B_0) < \infty$ , (A.5) implies that there exists some  $r_{\star} \in (\rho_+(\beta_0), \infty)$  such that  $r_{\star} = F(r_{\star}; \beta_0, B_0)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $r_1(\beta_0, B_0)$  is the largest root of that fixed point equation (A.1).

(ii) As in part (i), it now suffices to show that  $(\beta, B) \mapsto r_f(\beta, B)$  is continuously differentiable for  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq} \setminus \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^+$ , where  $r_f(\beta, B) := \log \frac{(1-q)\nu_f^{\beta, B}(1)}{1-\nu_f^{\beta, B}(1)}$  for  $\nu_f^{\beta, B}(\cdot)$  of Definition 1.3. To this end, fixing  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq} \setminus \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^+$  we only need to show that (A.3) fails at  $(r, \beta, B) = (r_f(\beta_0, B_0), \beta_0, B_0)$  which analogously to part (i) be a direct consequence of having that  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0) \neq \rho_{\pm}(\beta_0)$ .

Proceeding to do this task, the same argument as in part (i) shows that  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0) \neq \rho_-(\beta_0)$ , but a slightly different argument is needed for ruling out the other choice. Specifically, we claim that  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0) = \rho_+(\beta_0)$  would imply  $\rho_-(\beta_0) > 0$ . To see this, from the definition of  $B_{\pm}(\beta)$  we find that  $B_0 = B_-(\beta_0)$ . From the proof of [9, Theorem 1.11] we also have that the map  $B \mapsto \beta_f(B)$  is the inverse of the map  $\beta \mapsto B_-(\beta)$ . Moreover, the assumption  $(\beta_0, B_0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq} \setminus \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^+$  implies that  $B_0 \in [0, B_+)$ . Therefore,

$$\beta_0 = \beta_f(B_0) < \beta_+(B_0) \leq \beta_+(0) =: \beta_+, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that  $\beta_f(B) < \beta_+(B)$  for  $B \in [0, B_+)$  and the second inequality follows from the fact that the map  $\beta_+(\cdot)$  is decreasing in  $B$ . Using [9, Eqn. (4.10)] we thus deduce that  $\rho_-(\beta_0) > 0$  whenever  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0) = \rho_+(\beta_0)$ . Now, similarly to part (i), if both  $\rho_-(\beta_0) > 0$  and  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0) = \rho_+(\beta_0)$ , then there exists a solution  $r_{\star} \in [0, r_f(\beta_0, B_0))$  of (A.1). From Definition 1.3 we know that  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0)$  is the smallest nonnegative solution of (A.1), so having arrived at a contradiction, the proof of the lemma is thus complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.5.* From [9, Theorem 1.11(a)] we have the existence of the smooth curves  $\beta_f(B)$  and  $\beta_+(B)$  with the desired properties. It also follows from there that for  $(\beta, B) \in [0, \infty)^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\neq}$  one has  $\nu_f^{\beta, B} = \nu_1^{\beta, B}$ . This together with Lemma 3.3 implies that all two dimensional marginals of  $\mu_f^{\beta, B}$  and  $\mu_1^{\beta, B}$  coincide. Further, as described in Remark A.1, any finite dimensional marginal of  $\mu_f^{\beta, B}$  then coincides with that of  $\mu_1^{\beta, B}$ , thereby yielding our claim (1.8) from which (1.9) also follows (since at  $B = 0$  the Potts measures are invariant with respect to permutations on  $[q]$ ). Since  $r_f^{\beta, B} < r_1^{\beta, B}$  for  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq}$  our claim that  $\nu_f^{\beta, B}(1) < \nu_1^{\beta, B}(1)$  follows from the fact that map  $r \mapsto e^r / (e^r + q - 1)$  is strictly increasing on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Now, for the existence of smooth  $B \rightarrow \beta_c(B)$  of the required properties, it suffices to verify that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta, B}) < \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta, B}), \quad \text{for all } (\beta, B) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_{\neq}), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\Phi(\nu_f^{\beta, B}) > \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta, B}), \quad \text{for } (\beta, B) \in \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^f, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\Phi(\nu_f^{\beta, B}) < \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta, B}), \quad \text{for } (\beta, B) \in \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^+. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Indeed, (A.7)-(A.9) imply that (1.11) holds for some  $B \mapsto \beta_c(B)$  such that  $\beta_f(B) < \beta_c(B) < \beta_+(B)$  for  $B \in [0, B_+)$ , with smoothness of  $\beta_c(\cdot)$  due to the implicit function theorem (where  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi(\nu_f^{\beta, B}) \neq \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi(\nu_1^{\beta, B})$ ) throughout  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_{\neq})$  thanks to (A.7).

Turning to prove (A.7), we set  $\bar{\nu} := \frac{1-\nu}{q-1}$  and note that the map

$$\nu \mapsto \frac{\bar{\nu}(1 + \nu - \bar{\nu})}{\bar{\nu}^2 + (q-1)\nu^2}$$

is strictly decreasing on  $[\frac{1}{q}, 1)$  (having positive numerator and denominator, whose derivatives are strictly negative and positive, respectively, on the interval  $(\frac{1}{q}, 1)$ ). Using Lemma 3.3 and the fact that  $\nu_{\ddagger}(i) = \nu_{\ddagger}(2)$  for  $\ddagger \in \{f, 1\}$  and all  $i \in [q] \setminus \{1\}$ , we also have at any  $i \in \partial o$ ,

$$\mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i) = \frac{e^{\beta} [\nu_{\ddagger}(1)^2 + (q-1)\nu_{\ddagger}(2)^2]}{e^{\beta} [\nu_{\ddagger}(1)^2 + (q-1)\nu_{\ddagger}(2)^2] + 2(q-1)\nu_{\ddagger}(1)\nu_{\ddagger}(2) + (q-1)(q-2)\nu_{\ddagger}(2)^2}.$$

With  $\frac{1}{q} \leq \nu_f^{\beta, B}(1) < \nu_1^{\beta, B}(1)$  at any  $(\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq}$ , combining the last two observations results with

$$\sum_{i \in \partial o} \mu_{\ddagger}^{\beta, B}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i) < \sum_{i \in \partial o} \mu_1^{\beta, B}(\sigma_o = \sigma_i), \quad \forall (\beta, B) \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq}$$

from which (A.7) follows upon using (3.10).

Moving next to the proof of (A.8), for any  $\beta \in [\beta_-, \beta_f]$  let

$$\Psi_-(\beta) := \Phi^{\beta, B_-(\beta)}(r_1(\beta, B_-(\beta))) - \Phi^{\beta, B_-(\beta)}(r_f(\beta, B_-(\beta))),$$

with the convention that  $\Phi^{\beta, B}(r) = \Phi^{\beta, B}(r(\nu)) := \Phi^{\beta, B}(\nu)$  for  $r(\nu) := \log(\nu(1)/\nu(2))$  and any  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}([q])$  such that  $\nu(2) = \dots = \nu(q)$ . Fix any  $(\beta_0, B_0) \notin \partial \mathbb{R}_{\neq}^+$ . By Lemma 3.2(ii), proceeding as in the steps leading to (3.10), and using the definition of  $r(\nu)$  we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \Phi^{\beta_0, B_0}(r_f(\beta_0, B_0)) = h_1(r_f(\beta_0, B_0); \beta_0) \text{ and } \frac{\partial}{\partial B} \Phi^{\beta_0, B_0}(r_f(\beta_0, B_0)) = h_2(r_f(\beta_0, B_0); \beta_0), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where

$$h_1(r; \beta) := \frac{d}{2} \cdot \frac{e^{\beta}(e^{2r} + q - 1)}{e^r(e^{\beta+r} + q - 1) + (q-1)(e^r + e^{\beta} + q - 2)}$$

and

$$h_2(r; \beta) := \frac{e^r(e^{\beta+r} + q - 1)}{e^r(e^{\beta+r} + q - 1) + (q-1)(e^r + e^{\beta} + q - 2)}.$$

By (A.4) we see that  $\rho_+(\beta_0)$  is a fixed point of (A.1) for  $(\beta, B) = (\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))$ . Recall that  $\rho_+(\beta)$  is the largest solution of (A.3) and since  $r_1(\beta, B)$  is the largest solution of (A.1), we deduce that  $\rho_+(\beta_0) = r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))$  for  $\beta_0 \in [\beta_-, \beta_f]$ . From (A.3) it can be further checked that  $\rho_+(\beta)$  is the log of the largest solution of a quadratic equation with coefficients smooth in  $\beta$  that does not admit a double root for  $\beta > \beta_-$ . Therefore, the map  $\beta \mapsto \rho_+(\beta)$  is differentiable on  $(\beta_-, \beta_f]$ . Hence, repeating a computation as in the steps leading to (3.10), we find that (A.10) continues to hold when  $B_0$  is replaced by  $B_-(\beta_0)$  and  $r_f(\beta_0, B_0)$  is replaced by  $r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))$ . Moreover, by (A.4)

we have that  $\partial_\beta B_-(\beta_0) = -\partial_\beta F(\rho_+(\beta_0); \beta_0, 0)$  for  $\beta_0 \in (\beta_-, \beta_f]$ . Thus, using the chain rule of differentiation, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi'_-(\beta_0) &= \Delta h_1(\beta_0) - \Delta h_2(\beta_0) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} F(\rho_+(\beta_0); \beta_0, 0) \\ &= \int_{r_f(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))}^{r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial r} h_1(r; \beta_0) - \frac{\partial}{\partial r} h_2(r, \beta_0) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} F(\rho_+(\beta_0); \beta_0, 0) \right) dr, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where

$$\Delta h_i(\beta_0) := h_i(r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0)); \beta_0) - h_i(r_f(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0)); \beta_0), \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Next denoting

$$g_{\beta_0}(r) := \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial r} h_1(r; \beta_0)}{\frac{\partial}{\partial r} h_2(r; \beta_0)} = d \cdot \frac{e^{2r} + (q-2)e^r - (q-1)}{e^{2r} + 2(e^{\beta_0} + q-2)e^r + (q-1)(1 + e^{-\beta_0}(q-2))}$$

we find that  $\text{sgn}(g'_{\beta_0}(r)) = \text{sgn}(2e^{\beta_0} + q - 2) \cdot \text{sgn}(Q_{\beta_0}(e^r))$ , where  $Q_{\beta_0}(t) := t^2 + 2(q-1)e^{-\beta_0} + (q-1)(1 + (q-2)e^{-\beta_0})$ . Since the roots of  $Q_{\beta_0}$  are either negative or complex conjugates of each other we deduce that  $g'_{\beta_0}(r) > 0$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . This entails that

$$g_{\beta_0}(r) < g_{\beta_0}(r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} F(\rho_+(\beta_0); \beta_0, 0) \text{ for } r \in [0, r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where to obtain the right most equality we use the fact that  $\rho_+(\beta_0) = r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))$  satisfies (A.3). So, noticing that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} h_2(\cdot; \beta_0)$  is strictly positive, by (A.12), we find that the integrand in the RHS of (A.11) is strictly negative for  $r \in [r_f(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0)), r_1(\beta_0, B_-(\beta_0))]$ , and consequently that  $\Psi'_-(\beta_0) < 0$  for  $\beta_0 \in (\beta_-, \beta_f]$ . By definition of the non-uniqueness regime, necessarily  $\Psi_-(\beta_-) = 0$  and (A.8) follows.

The proof of (A.9) is similar. Indeed, noting that  $r_f(\beta, B) = \rho_-(\beta)$  for any  $(\beta, B) \in \partial \mathcal{R}_{\neq}^+$ , denoting  $\Psi_+(\beta) := \Phi^{\beta, B_+(\beta)}(r_1(\beta, B_+(\beta))) - \Phi^{\beta, B_+(\beta)}(r_f(\beta, B_+(\beta)))$  for any  $\beta \in [\beta_-, \beta_+]$ , and proceeding as in the steps leading to (A.11) we find that (A.11) continues to hold for  $\Psi'_+(\beta_0)$  at any  $\beta_0 \in (\beta_-, \beta_+]$ , provided we replace there  $\rho_+(\beta_0)$  and  $B_-(\beta_0)$  by  $\rho_-(\beta_0)$  and  $B_+(\beta_0)$ , respectively. Moreover, a same reasoning as in (A.12) yields that

$$g_{\beta_0}(r) > g_{\beta_0}(r_f(\beta_0, B_+(\beta_0))) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} F(\rho_-(\beta_0); \beta_0, 0) \text{ for } r \in (r_f(\beta_0, B_+(\beta_0)), \infty).$$

Repeating now the rest of the argument in the proof of (A.8) we obtain (A.9) and thereby complete the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** We thank the anonymous referees for helpful comments that improved our presentation. Research of AB was partially supported by DAE Project no. RTI4001 via ICTS, the Infosys Foundation via the Infosys-Chandrashekhara Virtual Centre for Random Geometry, an Infosys–ICTS Excellence Grant, and a MATRICS grant (MTR/2019/001105) from Science and Engineering Research Board. Research of AD was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1954337 and DMS-2348142. Research of AS was partially supported by Simons Investigator Grant.

**Declarations.** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article. Data sharing is not applicable – no new data is generated.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Basak, A. Dembo. Ferromagnetic Ising measures on large locally tree-like graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(2), 780–823, 2017.
- [2] F. Bencs, M. Borbényi, and P. Csikvári. Random cluster model on regular graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 399, 203–248, 2023.
- [3] M. Biskup, C. Borgs, C., J. T. Chayes, and R. Kotecký. Gibbs states of graphical representations of the Potts model with external fields. *J. Math. Phys.*, 41(3), 1170–1210, 2000.
- [4] B. Bollobás, G. R. Grimmett, and S. Janson. The random-cluster model on the complete graph. *Probab. Th. Rel. Flds.*, 104, 283–317, 1996.
- [5] A. Coja-Oghlan, A. Galanis, L. A. Goldberg, J. B. Ravelomanana, D. Štefankovič, and E. Vigoda. Metastability of the Potts ferromagnet on random regular graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 401, 185–225, 2023.
- [6] A. Dembo, A. Montanari. Ising models on locally tree-like graphs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 20(2), 565–592, 2010.
- [7] A. Dembo, A. Montanari. Gibbs measures and phase transitions on sparse random graphs. *Braz. J. Prob. Stat.*, 24(2):137–211, 2010.
- [8] A. Dembo, A. Montanari, A. Sly, and N. Sun. The replica symmetric solution for Potts models on  $d$ -regular graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 327(2), 551–575, 2014.
- [9] A. Dembo, A. Montanari, and N. Sun. Factor models on locally tree-like graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(6), 4162–4213, 2013.
- [10] A. Galanis, D. Štefankovič, E. Vigoda, and L. Yang. Ferromagnetic Potts model: refined #BIS-Hardness and related results. *SIAM J. Comp.*, 45(6), 2004–2065, 2016.
- [11] G. R. Grimmett. *The random-cluster model* (Vol. 333). Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [12] T. Helmuth, M. Jenssen, and W. Perkins. Finite-size scaling, phase coexistence, and algorithms for the random cluster model on random graphs. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 59(2), 817–848, 2023.
- [13] T. M. Liggett. *Interacting particle systems*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Reprint of the 1985 original.
- [14] R. Lyons. The Ising model and percolation on trees and tree-like graphs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 125, 337–353, 1989.
- [15] R. Lyons. Random walks and percolation on trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 18(3), 931–958, 1990.
- [16] M. Mézard, A. Montanari. *Information, Physics, and Computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [17] A. Montanari, E. Mossel, and A. Sly. The weak limit of Ising models on locally tree-like graphs. *Probab. Th. Rel. Flds.*, 152, 31–51, 2012.
- [18] C. Shriver. Typical sofic entropy and local limits for free group shift systems. arXiv:2308.08041 preprint, 2023.

\*INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES  
TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH  
BANGALORE 560089, INDIA

†DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
SEQUOIA HALL, 390 SERRA MALL, STANFORD, CA 94305, USA

§DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
FINE HALL, PRINCETON, NJ 08540, USA