

SLE Loop Measure and Liouville Quantum Gravity

Morris Ang
UC San Diego

Gefei Cai
Peking University

Xin Sun
Peking University

Baojun Wu
Peking University

Abstract

As recently shown by Holden and two of the authors, the conformal welding of two Liouville quantum gravity (LQG) disks produces a canonical variant of SLE curve whose law is called the SLE loop measure. In this paper, we demonstrate how LQG can be used to study the SLE loop measure. Firstly, we show that for $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$, the loop intensity measure of the conformal loop ensemble agrees with the SLE loop measure as defined by Zhan (2021). The former was initially considered by Kemppainen and Werner (2016) for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$, and the latter was constructed for $\kappa \in (0, 8)$. Secondly, we establish a duality for the SLE loop measure between κ and $16/\kappa$. Thirdly, we obtain the exact formula for the moment of the electrical thickness for the shape (probability) measure of the SLE loop, which in the regime $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$ was conjectured by Kenyon and Wilson (2004). This relies on the exact formulae for the reflection coefficient and the one-point disk correlation function in Liouville conformal field theory. Finally, we compute several multiplicative constants associated with the SLE loop measure, which are not only of intrinsic interest but also used in our companion paper relating the conformal loop ensemble to the imaginary DOZZ formulae.

1 Introduction

Schramm-Loewner evolution (SLE) is a one-parameter family of planar curves, which are of fundamental importance in two-dimensional random geometry and statistical physics. There are several variants of the SLE curves, such as the chordal and radial versions considered originally by [Sch00]. For $\kappa \in (0, 8)$, Zhan [Zha21] constructed a variant called the SLE_κ loop measure, an infinite measure on the space of non-crossing loops that locally look like SLE_κ . In particular, the loop is simple for $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ and non-simple for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, with Hausdorff dimension $1 + \frac{\kappa}{8}$. Zhan [Zha21] shows that for $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, the SLE loop measure satisfies the conformal restriction property proposed by Kontsevich and Sukov [KS07]. Recently, Baverez and Jego [BJ24] proved that this conformal restriction property uniquely characterizes the SLE loop measure for $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ modulo multiplicative constants. Before [Zha21, BJ24], the existence and uniqueness for $\kappa = 8/3$ was established by Werner [Wer08]. A construction for the SLE_2 loop measure was given by Benoist and Dubedat [BD16] and Kassel and Kenyon [KK17]. For $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$ a construction was given by Kemppainen and Werner [KW16] based on the conformal loop ensemble (CLE); their construction in fact produces a SLE type loop measure for all $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$.

With Holden, the first and third authors showed the conformal welding of two Liouville quantum gravity (LQG) disks produces Zhan's SLE loop measure with $\kappa \in (0, 4)$ [AHS23b]. In this paper, we first extend this result to $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ using the natural LQG disk with non-simple boundaries from [DMS21, AHSY23, HL22, MSW21]. We then clarify the equivalence between Zhan's construction of the SLE loop measure and the construction of Kemppainen and Werner [KW16] based on CLE for $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$. See Section 1.1.

After completing these two foundational tasks, the bulk of our paper is to use LQG techniques to study the properties of the SLE loop measure. First, we establish a duality for the SLE loop

measure between κ and $16/\kappa$. The case when $\kappa = 8/3$ had previously been treated by Werner in [Wer08]. Second, we obtain the exact formula for the moment of the electrical thickness for the shape (probability) measure of the SLE loop, which in the regime $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$ had been conjectured by Kenyon and Wilson (2004). This relies on the exact formulae for the structure constants in Liouville conformal field theory obtained in [KRV20, RZ22, ARS23]. See Sections 1.2 and 1.3 for the precise statements.

Although the equivalence and duality results for the SLE loop may be derived without LQG, as discussed below Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, one of the main purposes of our paper is to demonstrate the methodology. Several LQG objects and techniques from this paper are useful for our further study of SLE and CLE. For example, we introduce and study a natural LQG surface of annular topology, which we call the quantum annulus. We also determine several constants related to the SLE loop measure that are interesting in their own right and useful in our companion paper relating CLE to the imaginary DOZZ formulae. We give an overview of our techniques in Section 1.4 and outline some further applications in Section 1.5.

1.1 On the definitions of the SLE loop measure

The conformal loop ensemble (CLE) is a countable collection of non-crossing random loops in a simply connected domain defined for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$ [She09, SW12]. CLE has been proved or conjectured to be the scaling limit of many important loop models in two-dimensional statistical physics, such as percolation, the Ising model, the $O(n)$ -loop model, and the random cluster model, see [BH19, CN08, KS16]. There is also a sphere version of CLE, called *full-plane* CLE, which is constructed and proved to satisfy conformal invariance by Kemppainen-Werner [KW16] for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$ and Gwynne-Miller-Qian [GMQ18] for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$.

Let Γ be a full-plane CLE_κ with $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$. The *loop intensity measure* $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ for CLE_κ is defined to be the distribution of a loop chosen from the counting measure over the set of loops in Γ . This is an infinite measure on the space of non-crossing loops on the plane. By the conformal invariance of CLE_κ , the measure $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ is conformally invariant. For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, the measure $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ was first considered by Kemppainen and Werner [KW16], who showed it satisfies inversion symmetry.

Recently, Zhan [Zha21] constructed what he called the SLE loop measure for all $\kappa \in (0, 8)$, which we denote by $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. The construction is based on the Minkowski content of SLE and an un-rooting procedure. We will recall this in Section 3. In this paper, we show that for $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$, Zhan's SLE_κ loop measure agrees with the loop intensity measure $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ modulo a multiplicative constant.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$, there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$.*

For $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$, it might be possible to show that the CLE loop intensity measure satisfies the conformal restriction property in [KS07, BJ24] based on the Brownian loop soup construction of CLE from [SW12]. Then Theorem 1.1 for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$ follows from the uniqueness result in [BJ24]. Alternatively, the equivalence in this range is also implicit from [KW16], as explained to us by Werner. See Theorem 2.18 of the second arXiv version of [AS21] for more explanation. That argument might extend to $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ as well. Despite these alternative approaches, we believe that our LQG proof is interesting on its own and contains several useful technical intermediate results.

1.2 Duality for the SLE loop measure

Our next theorem is an instance of SLE duality, which says that for $\kappa < 4$, the outer boundary of an $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}$ curve is an SLE_κ curve. The duality of chordal SLE was established by Zhan [Zha08, Zha10] and Dubédat [Dub09] from martingale method. The chordal/radial/whole-plane SLE duality was systematically studied by Miller and Sheffield in the imaginary geometry framework in [MS16a, MS16b, MS16c, MS17]. The duality for the SLE bubble measure was proved in [NQSZ23] via a limiting argument from chordal duality. Our Theorem 1.2 concerns duality for the SLE loop measure. The case $\kappa = \frac{8}{3}$ was proved by Werner in [Wer08], i.e. the shape of the scaling limit of percolation cluster outer perimeters is Brownian loops.

Theorem 1.2. *For $\kappa \in (2, 4)$, sample a loop η from $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ on $\hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Let \mathcal{C}_η^+ be the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$ and let η^{out} be the boundary of \mathcal{C}_η^+ . Then the law of η^{out} equals $C \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ for some constant C .*

Duality for loops in CLE has been extensively studied in the context of CLE percolation [MSW17], where the boundary of non-simple loops is described by the so-called boundary CLE for $\kappa \in (2, 4)$. We were informed by Werner that Theorem 1.2 can be derived from this result and the imaginary geometry method [MS16b]. We were also informed by Baverez and Jego that Theorem 1.2 can be derived from conformal restriction arguments based on [BJ24]. Again, we stress that we prove Theorem 1.2 using the LQG method, which we believe is interesting in its own right.

1.3 Electrical thickness for the SLE loop measure

Suppose η is sampled from $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η separates 0 and ∞ ; we denote the law of η under this restriction by $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$. Here we say η separates z and ∞ if $z \notin \eta$ and, for an arbitrarily chosen orientation of η , its winding number around z is nonzero. Note that this definition does not depend on the choice of orientation of η . When η is simple, this is equivalent to z lying in the bounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$, but in general, the statements “ η separates z and ∞ ” and “ z lies in a bounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$ ” are not equivalent. Let $R_\eta = \inf\{|z| : z \in \eta\}$ and $\hat{\eta} = \{z : R_\eta z \in \eta\}$. By the conformal invariance of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, the law of $\log R_\eta$ is translation invariant on \mathbb{R} , hence a constant multiple of the Lebesgue measure. Also by conformal invariance, the conditional law of $\hat{\eta}$ given R_η does not depend on the value of R_η . We denote this conditional law by \mathcal{L}_κ , and call it the *shape measure* of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. It is a probability measure on the space of loops that surround \mathbb{D} (separates \mathbb{D} and ∞) and touch $\partial\mathbb{D}$.

Let D_η be the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$ containing 0. Let \mathbb{D} be the unit disk and $\psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow D_\eta$ be a conformal map such that $\psi(0) = 0$. Let $\text{CR}(\eta, 0) := |\psi'(0)|$ be the *conformal radius* of D_η viewed from 0. Let $\bar{\eta}$ be the image of η under the inversion map $z \mapsto z^{-1}$. Let $\vartheta(\eta) := -\log \text{CR}(\eta, 0) - \log \text{CR}(\bar{\eta}, 0)$ be the *electrical thickness* of η . It is clear that $\vartheta(\eta)$ only depends on η through its shape $\hat{\eta}$. Our next result is an exact formula for the law of $\vartheta(\eta)$ under \mathcal{L}_κ .

Theorem 1.3. *For $\kappa \in (0, 8)$, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] < \infty$ if and only if $\lambda < 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}$. Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = \frac{\sin(\pi(1 - \kappa/4))}{\pi(1 - \kappa/4)} \frac{\pi\sqrt{(1 - \kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2}}{\sin(\pi\sqrt{(1 - \kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2})} \quad \text{for } \lambda < 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}. \quad (1.1)$$

This concept of electrical thickness was introduced by Kenyon and Wilson [KW04] and was also recorded in [SSW09, Eq (14)] as a way to describe how much the shape of a loop differs from a circle. It is nonnegative and equals 0 if and only if the loop is a circle centered at the origin.

When viewing the plane as a homogeneous electrical material, the electrical thickness measures the net change in effective resistance between 0 and ∞ when the loop η becomes a perfect conductor. Recently, Baverez and Jego [BJ24] initiated the study of the conformal field theory for the SLE loop measure, where they used the SLE loop measure to construct representations of the Virasoro algebra with a bilinear form called the Shapovalov form. As they point out, our Theorem 1.3 gives the explicit formula for the partition function of the Shapovalov form.

Theorem 1.3 settles a conjecture of Kenyon and Wilson on the electrical thickness of CLE loops for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$. Consider the shape measure $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ of $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ defined in the same way as \mathcal{L}_κ . Then Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}_\kappa = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$. Let $(\eta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the sequence of loops of a CLE_κ on the unit disk which separate 0 and ∞ , ordered such that η_n surrounds η_{n+1} . For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, it is proved in [KW16] that the law of the rescaled loop $\hat{\eta}_n$ converges weakly to $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$, and for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, we prove the analogous result in Lemma 6.14. Since $\vartheta(\eta_n) = \vartheta(\hat{\eta}_n)$, we see that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda \vartheta(\eta_n)}]$ equals $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda \vartheta(\eta)}]$ in Theorem 1.3. Kenyon and Wilson [KW04] conjectured a formula for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda \vartheta(\eta_n)}]$, as recorded in [SSW09, Eq (14)]. Their formula agrees with the right-hand of (1.1) after κ is replaced by $16/\kappa$. Thus our Theorem 1.3 shows that the conjectural formula is false but only off by this flip¹. In the next subsection we give an overview of the proof of Theorem 1.3.

1.4 SLE loop measure coupled with Liouville quantum gravity

We now explain our strategy for proving Theorem 1.3 to illustrate how LQG can be used to study the SLE loop. LQG is the two-dimensional random geometry corresponding to the formal Riemannian metric tensor $e^{\gamma h}(dx^2 + dy)$, where $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ is a parameter and h is a variant of the Gaussian free field (GFF). See [DS11, DDDF20, GM21] for its construction. LQG describes the scaling limits of discrete random surfaces, namely random planar maps under conformal embeddings; see e.g. [HS23, GMS21]. We refer to the survey articles [Gwy20, GHS23, She23] for more background on LQG and its relation to random planar maps. For natural LQG surfaces related to random planar maps, the GFF variant is produced by a quantum field theory called Liouville conformal field theory (CFT). This field theory was recently constructed and solved in [DKRV16, KRV20, GKRV20, ARS23, ARSZ23].

A cornerstone in LQG is that when a pair of independent LQG surfaces are glued together along their boundaries in a conformal manner (i.e. conformal welding), the resulting interface is an SLE-type curve. The starting point of our arguments is the following way of producing the SLE loop measure via conformal welding of LQG surfaces. The most canonical random surface in LQG with the sphere (resp., disk) topology is the so-called γ -LQG sphere (resp., disk). In [AHS23b], Holden and the first and third authors proved that when two independent γ -LQG disks are glued together, the resulting surface is the γ -LQG sphere and the interface is an independent $\text{SLE}_{\gamma, 2}$ loop. In order to treat the $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ regime where SLE_κ loops are non-simple, we first extend this basic conformal welding result, replacing the ordinary γ -LQG disks with γ -LQG disks having non-simple boundary considered in [MSW21, HL22, AHSY23]. (These are also called generalized quantum disks.) This is our Theorem 3.3. Here we focus on explaining the $\kappa \in (0, 4)$ case for simplicity, although dealing with non-simple boundary causes various technical difficulties here and there. The case of $\kappa = 4$ can be treated by a limiting argument.

If we conformally weld a pair of γ -LQG disks, each having an interior marked point sampled from the quantum area measure, then the resulting surface is a γ -LQG sphere with two marked points, and the law of the interface becomes the SLE loop measure restricted to the event that

¹As a sanity check, the formula should blow up as $\kappa \rightarrow 8$, but [SSW09, Eq (14)] gives a finite limit and therefore cannot be correct.

these two points are separated. This is exactly $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ with $\kappa = \gamma^2$. We will work with a variant of this result where the loop is a weighted variant of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$. Liouville CFT allows us to define natural LQG surfaces with interior marked points that are not chosen from the quantum area measure. In particular, one can define a one-parameter family of γ -LQG surfaces of disk topology with one interior marked point, where the parameter α indexes the log-singularity of the field at the marked point. Similarly, Liouville CFT can define a one-parameter family of γ -LQG surfaces of sphere topology, with two interior marked points of equal log singularity. Based on the previous conformal welding result and a method from [AHS24], we show in Proposition 7.4 that once a pair of such LQG disks are conformal welded together, the resulting two-pointed sphere are those defined by Liouville CFT, and the law of interface is $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ weighted by $e^{(2\Delta_\alpha - 2)\theta(\eta)}$ where $\theta(\eta)$ is the electrical thickness and $\Delta_\alpha = \frac{\alpha}{2}(Q - \frac{\alpha}{2})$.

This new conformal welding result will ultimately allow us to express the moment-generating function of the electrical thickness in terms of the two-point sphere and one-point disk correlation functions of the Liouville CFT. The exact results needed are the formula for the reflection coefficient proved in [KRV20], and the FZZ formula proved in [ARS23]. However, there is an important difficulty, namely, the measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ is infinite while we need to identify suitable observables to extract exact information. Overcoming this is the technical bulk of our proof of Theorem 1.3 in Section 7.

1.5 Outlook and perspectives

1. So far we have not paid much attention to various multiplicative constants concerning the SLE loop measure. For example, when we decompose the loop measure into its shape measure and the dilation, the law of the dilation is encoded by a multiple of the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . There is also a multiplicative constant in the conformal welding result for the SLE loop measure. For the loop intensity measure $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, the value of these constants turns out to play an important role in our study of the integrability of CLE in [ACSW24]. We compute them explicitly in Propositions 8.1, 8.3 and 8.6. We do not know how to compute the corresponding constants for Zhan's loop measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. It would be interesting to compute the corresponding constants for the law of outer boundary of $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ in Theorem 1.2; we expect that they would also be useful for the quantitative study of CLE.
2. In order to prove the equivalence loop measures in Theorem 1.1, we introduce in Section 5 an LQG surface with annular topology, which we call the quantum annulus. This surface also plays an important role in our study of the integrability of CLE in [ACSW24]. Moreover, Remy and two of the authors [ARS22] developed a method to derive the law of random moduli for LQG surfaces of annular topology, which can be applied to the quantum annulus defined here. Combined with ideas from bosonic string theory, the laws of such random moduli encode important information about CLE on the annulus; see the introduction of [ARS22] for more discussion. In Section 5 we derive the joint length distribution of the two boundary components for the quantum annulus, which is interesting in its own right and useful for these further applications.
3. The conformal restriction property satisfied by the SLE loop measure when $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ considered in [KS07, Wer08, BJ24] is similar in spirit to the Weyl anomaly in Liouville conformal field theory; see [DKRV16, Theorem 3.5]. It would be interesting to see if the conformal restriction property can be directly seen from the conformal welding picture. By the recent uniqueness result of Baverez and Jego [BJ24], this would give an alternative proof for the conformal welding result for the SLE loop measure on the sphere when $\kappa \in (0, 4]$. In [Zha21],

Zhan constructed the SLE loop measure on Riemann surfaces via the conformal restriction. It would be interesting to establish the corresponding conformal welding results using LQG surfaces of non-trivial topology.

Organization of the paper. In Section 2, we provide background on LQG, Liouville CFT, and conformal welding. In Section 3, we recall the conformal welding result for the SLE loop measure in the simple case and extend it to the non-simple case. In Section 4, we provide background on the coupling between CLE and LQG. In Section 5, we introduce and study the quantum annulus. In Section 6, we prove Theorems 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. In Section 7 we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 8 we evaluate the welding constant in the conformal welding result for the loop intensity measure.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Wendelin Werner for explaining to us how Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 can be proved without LQG. We thank Nicolas Curien, Rick Kenyon, Scott Sheffield, Pu Yu and Dapeng Zhan for helpful discussions. M.A. was supported by the Simons Foundation as a Junior Fellow at the Simons Society of Fellows and partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1712862. G.C., X.S. and B.W. were supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2023YFA1010700). X.S. was also partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2027986, the NSF Career grant DMS-2046514, and a start-up grant from the University of Pennsylvania.

2 Backgrounds and preliminary results on LQG

In this section, we review the precise definition of some γ -LQG surfaces and Liouville fields. For more background, we refer to [GHS23, Var17] and references therein, as well as the preliminary sections in [AHS24, ARS23]. We first provide some measure theoretic background that will be used throughout the paper.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.1 Liouville field and Liouville quantum gravity

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

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

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

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

We now review the Liouville fields on \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{H} following [AHS24, Section 2.2].

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

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

We also need Liouville fields on \mathbb{C} with several insertions as the following.

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

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

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

The measure $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i, z_i)_i}$ formally equals $\prod_{i=1}^m e^{\alpha_i \phi(z_i)} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$. In fact, after a regularization and limiting procedure, we will arrive at Definition 2.4; see [AHS24, Lemma 2.6].

Similarly, we define Liouville field with one bulk and several boundary insertions as the following:

Definition 2.5. Let $(\alpha, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ and $(\beta_i, s_i) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathbb{H} \cup \{\infty\})$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ where $m \geq 0$ and all s_i 's are distinct. We also assume that $s_i \neq \infty$ for $i \geq 2$. Let the constant

$$C_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, u), (\beta_i, s_i)_i} := \begin{cases} (2\text{Im}u)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} |u|_+^{-2\alpha(Q-\alpha)} \prod_{i=1}^m |s_i|_+^{-\beta_i(Q-\frac{\beta_i}{2})} \times e^{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \frac{\beta_i \beta_j}{4} G_{\mathbb{H}}(s_i, s_j) + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\alpha \beta_i}{2} G_{\mathbb{H}}(u, s_i)} & \text{if } s_1 \neq \infty \\ (2\text{Im}u)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} |u|_+^{-2\alpha(Q-\alpha)} \prod_{i=2}^m |s_i|_+^{-\beta_i(Q-\frac{\beta_i}{2}-\frac{\beta_1}{2})} \times e^{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \frac{\beta_i \beta_j}{4} G_{\mathbb{H}}(s_i, s_j) + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\alpha \beta_i}{2} G_{\mathbb{H}}(u, s_i)} & \text{if } s_1 = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Here, we use the convention that $G_{\mathbb{H}}(z, \infty) := \lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} G_{\mathbb{H}}(z, w) = 2 \log |z|_+$.

Sample (h, \mathbf{c}) from $C_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, u), (\beta_i, s_i)_i} P_{\mathbb{H}} \times [e^{(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i + \alpha - Q)c} dc]$, and let $\phi(z) = h(z) - 2Q \log |z|_+ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i G_{\mathbb{H}}(z, s_i) + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(z, u) + \mathbf{c}$. Then we define $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, u), (\beta_i, s_i)_i}$ as the law of ϕ . When $\alpha = 0$, we simply write it as $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\beta_i, s_i)_i}$.

The Liouville field $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, u), (\beta_i, s_i)_i}$ can also be identified with $e^{\alpha\phi(u)} \prod_{i=1}^m e^{\frac{\beta_i}{2} \phi(s_i)} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}$, see [SY23, Lemma 2.8] for the precise statement and proof.

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

$$\tilde{h} = h \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'|. \quad (2.2)$$

We write $(D, h)/\sim_{\gamma}$ as the quantum surface corresponding to (D, h) . An *embedding* of a quantum surface is a choice of its representative. Both quantum area and quantum length measures are intrinsic to the quantum surface thanks to (2.2) as shown in [DS11, SW16].

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

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

if there is a conformal map $\psi : \tilde{D} \rightarrow D$ such that (2.2) holds, $\psi(\tilde{z}_i) = z_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $\psi \circ \tilde{\eta}_i = \eta_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We call an equivalence class defined through \sim_{γ} a *decorated quantum surface*, and likewise an embedding of a decorated quantum surface is a choice of its representative.

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

2.2 Quantum sphere and Liouville reflection coefficient

We now recall the two-pointed quantum sphere defined in [DMS21] following the presentation of [AHS23a, AHS24]. Consider the horizontal cylinder \mathcal{C} obtained from $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi]$ by identifying $(x, 0) \sim (x, 2\pi)$. Let $h_{\mathcal{C}}(z) = h_{\mathbb{C}}(e^z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{C}$ where $h_{\mathbb{C}}$ be sampled from $P_{\mathbb{C}}$. We call $h_{\mathcal{C}}$ the GFF on \mathcal{C} normalized to have mean zero on the circle $\{\text{Re } z = 0\} \cap \mathcal{C}$. The field $h_{\mathcal{C}}$ can be written as $h_{\mathcal{C}} = h_{\mathcal{C}}^1 + h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$, where $h_{\mathcal{C}}^1$ is constant on vertical circles $\{\text{Re } z = u\} \cap \mathcal{C}$ for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ has mean zero on all such circles. We call $h_{\mathcal{C}}^2$ the *lateral component* of the GFF on \mathcal{C} .

Definition 2.6. For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, $W > 0$ and $\alpha = Q - \frac{W}{2\gamma}$, let $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be a standard Brownian motion conditioned on $B_s - (Q - \alpha)s < 0$ for all $s > 0$, and $(\tilde{B}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ an independent copy of $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$. Let

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

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

The un-pointed quantum sphere and n -pointed quantum sphere are defined from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{spH}}(4 - \gamma^2)$ as follows:

Definition 2.7. Let $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ be a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{spH}}(4 - \gamma^2)$. We let QS be the law of the quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ under the reweighted measure $\mu_h(\mathcal{C})^{-2} \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{spH}}(4 - \gamma^2)$. For $n \geq 0$, let (\mathcal{C}, h) be a sample from $\mu_h(\mathcal{C})^n \text{QS}$, and then independently sample z_1, \dots, z_n according to $\mu_h(\mathcal{C})^\#$. Let QS_n be the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, z_1, \dots, z_n)/\sim_\gamma$.

It is proved in [DMS21] that $\text{QS}_2 = \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{spH}}(4 - \gamma^2)$. Namely QS_2 is invariant under re-sampling of its two marked points according to the quantum area.

Recall the unit-volume reflection coefficient for LCFT on the sphere [KRV20, RV19]

$$\bar{R}(\alpha) := - \left(\frac{\pi \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)} \frac{1}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha))}{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q - \alpha)) \Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))}. \quad (2.3)$$

Lemma 2.8. The law of the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{spH}}(W)$ is

$$\frac{1}{2} \bar{R}(\alpha) a^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha - Q) - 1} da \quad \text{where } \alpha = Q - \frac{W}{2\gamma}.$$

Proof. For $0 < a < a'$ with \hat{h} as in Definition 2.6, we have

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

where we have used the change of variables $y = e^{\gamma c} \mu_{\hat{h}}(\mathcal{C})$. By [KRV20, Theorem 3.5] and [RV19, (1.10)–(1.12)], for $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ we have $\mathbb{E}[\mu_{\hat{h}}(\mathcal{C})^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)}] = \bar{R}(\alpha)$. Interchanging the expectation and integral gives the result. \square

It is shown in [AHS17, AHS24] that the embedding of QS_3 in \mathbb{C} gives a Liouville field on \mathbb{C} with three γ -insertions modulo an explicit multiplicative constant.

Theorem 2.9 ([AHS24, Proposition 2.26]). Let ϕ be sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, u_1), (\gamma, u_2), (\gamma, u_3)}$ where $(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (0, 1, e^{i\pi/3})$. Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, u_1, u_2, u_3)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\frac{2(Q - \gamma)^2}{\pi\gamma} \text{QS}_3$.

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

Definition 2.10. Let $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the law of the GFF on the cylinder \mathcal{C} defined above Definition 2.6. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Sample (h, \mathbf{c}) from $P_{\mathcal{C}} \times [e^{(2\alpha - 2Q)c} dc]$ and let $\phi(z) = h(z) - (Q - \alpha)|\operatorname{Re} z| + \mathbf{c}$. We write $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}$ as the law of ϕ .

Theorem 2.11 ([AHS24, Theorem B.5]). *Let h be as in Def. 2.6 so that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is QS_2 . Let $T \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} independently of h . Let $\phi(z) = h(z + T)$. Then the law of ϕ is given by $\frac{\gamma}{4(Q-\gamma)^2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$.*

One can also use the *uniform embedding* of quantum surfaces; which is defined as follows. Denote $\text{Conf}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$ for the conformal automorphism group on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Then according to the definition of quantum surface, one can view QS as an (infinite) measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})/\text{Conf}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$. Let $\mathfrak{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}}$ be the left and right invariant Haar measure on $\text{Conf}(\hat{\mathbb{C}})$. We first recall a basic property for $\mathfrak{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}}$, which we will use frequently in the following sections.

Lemma 2.12 ([AHS24, Lemma 2.28]). *Suppose \mathfrak{f} is a conformal automorphism sampled from the Haar measure $\mathfrak{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}}$. Then for any three fixed points $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, the law of $(\mathfrak{f}(z_1), \mathfrak{f}(z_2), \mathfrak{f}(z_3))$ equals $C|(p-q)(q-r)(r-p)|^{-2} d^2p d^2q d^2r$ for some constant $C \in (0, \infty)$.*

In the following, we will always choose $\mathfrak{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}}$ is such that the constant C in Lemma 2.12 equals 1. The following theorem says the uniform embedding of QS gives the Liouville field $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Theorem 2.13 ([AHS24, Theorem 1.2, Proposition 2.32]). *We have $\mathfrak{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \text{QS} = \frac{\pi\gamma}{2(Q-\gamma)^2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$.*

2.3 Quantum disk and the FZZ formula

First, we follow [AHS23a] and introduce the thick quantum disk with two boundary insertions. Consider the horizontal strip $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R} \times (0, \pi)$. Let $h_{\mathcal{S}}(z) = h_{\mathbb{H}}(e^z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{S}$ where $h_{\mathbb{H}}$ be sampled from $P_{\mathbb{H}}$. We call $h_{\mathcal{S}}$ the GFF on \mathcal{S} normalized to have mean zero on the vertical segment $\{\text{Re } z = 0\} \cap \mathcal{S}$. The field $h_{\mathcal{S}}$ can be written as $h_{\mathcal{S}} = h_{\mathcal{S}}^1 + h_{\mathcal{S}}^2$, where $h_{\mathcal{S}}^1$ is constant on vertical lines $\{\text{Re } z = u\} \cap \mathcal{S}$ for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $h_{\mathcal{S}}^2$ has mean zero on all such circles. We call $h_{\mathcal{S}}^2$ the *lateral component* of the GFF on \mathcal{S} .

Definition 2.14. *For $\gamma \in (0, 2)$, $W \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$ and $\beta = Q + \frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{W}{\gamma}$, let $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be a standard Brownian motion conditioned on $B_s - (Q - \beta)s < 0$ for all $s > 0$, and let $(\tilde{B}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be an independent copy of $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$. Let*

$$Y_t = \begin{cases} B_{2t} - (Q - \beta)t & \text{if } t \geq 0 \\ \tilde{B}_{-2t} + (Q - \beta)t & \text{if } t < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Let $h^1(z) = Y_{\text{Re } z}$ for each $z \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $h_{\mathcal{S}}^2$ be independent of h^1 and have the law of the lateral component of the GFF on \mathcal{S} . Let $\hat{h} = h^1 + h_{\mathcal{S}}^2$. Let $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from $\frac{\gamma}{2} e^{2(\beta-Q)c} dc$ independently of \hat{h} and set $h = \hat{h} + \mathbf{c}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(W)$ be the infinite measure describing the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathcal{S}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$. We call a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(W)$ a two-pointed quantum disk of weight W .

Definition 2.15. *Let $(\mathcal{S}, h, -\infty, +\infty)$ be the embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(2)$ as in the above definition. We write QD for the law of $(\mathcal{S}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ under the reweighted measure $\nu_h(\partial\mathcal{S})^{-2} \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(2)$. For $m, n \geq 0$, let (\mathcal{S}, h) be a sample from $\mu_h(\mathcal{S})^m \nu_h(\partial\mathcal{S})^n \text{QD}$, and independently sample z_1, \dots, z_m and s_1, \dots, s_n according to $\mu_h^\#$ and $\nu_h^\#$ respectively. Let $\text{QD}_{m,n}$ be the law of $(\mathcal{S}, h, z_1, \dots, z_m, s_1, \dots, s_n)/\sim_\gamma$. We call a sample from $\text{QD}_{m,n}$ a quantum disk with m bulk points and n boundary points.*

By [DMS21], $\text{QD}_{0,2} = \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(2)$, which means the marked points on $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}$ is quantum typical.

Proposition 2.16 ([ARS23, Lemma 3.2]). *The quantum boundary length law of QD is $R_\gamma \ell^{-\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-2} d\ell$, where*

$$R_\gamma := \frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-1}}{\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}}}$$

When $0 < W < \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$, we define the thin quantum disk as the concatenation of weight $\gamma^2 - W$ thick disks with two marked points as in [AHS23a, Section 2].

Definition 2.17. *For $W \in \left(0, \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right)$, we can define the infinite measure $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(W)$ on the space of two-pointed beaded surfaces as follows. First, sample a random variable $T \sim \left(1 - \frac{2}{\gamma^2}W\right)^{-2} \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{R}_+}$; then sample a Poisson point process $\{(u, \mathcal{D}_u)\}$ from the intensity measure $\text{Leb}_{[0,T]} \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - W)$; and finally consider the ordered (according to the order induced by u) collection of doubly-marked thick quantum disks $\{\mathcal{D}_u\}$, called a thin quantum disk of weight W .*

Before discussing quantum disk with bulk insertions. We first recall the law of the quantum boundary length under $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}$ obtained in [Rem20] following the presentation of [ARS23, Proposition 2.8].

Proposition 2.18 ([Rem20]). *For $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$, the law of the quantum length $\nu_\phi(\mathbb{R})$ under $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}$ is*

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

where

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

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

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

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

Lemma 2.19 ([ARS23, Lemma 4.3]). *Let h be a sample from $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ and $\hat{h}(\cdot) = h(\cdot) - 2Q \log|\cdot|_+ + \alpha G_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot, z)$. The law of $\hat{h} + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \frac{\ell}{\nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})}$ under the reweighted measure $2^{-\alpha^2/2} \frac{2}{\gamma} \ell^{-1} \left(\frac{\ell}{\nu_{\hat{h}}(\mathbb{R})}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)} P_{\mathbb{H}}$ is a version of the disintegration $\{\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell) : \ell > 0\}$.*

We now recall the quantum disk with one generic bulk insertion.

Definition 2.20 ([ARS23]). *Fix $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\ell > 0$. We let $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$ be the law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi, i)/\sim_\gamma$ where ϕ is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell)$. We let $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$ be the law of $(\mathbb{H}, \phi, i, s)/\sim_\gamma$ where ϕ is sampled from $\ell \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha,i)}(\ell)$ and s is sampled from probability measure proportional to quantum length measure. Finally, write $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) d\ell$ and $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) d\ell$.*

One can fix the embedding of $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$ as the following:

Proposition 2.21. *For $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\ell > 0$, let (D, h, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. Given (D, h, z) , let p be a point sampled from the harmonic measure on ∂D viewed from z , then the law of $(D, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$ equals that of $(\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0)/\sim_\gamma$ where X is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$.*

Proof. We assume that $(D, h, z) = (\mathbb{H}, h, i)$ where h is a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$. Let $\psi_p : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ be the conformal map with $\psi_p(i) = i$ and $\psi_p(p) = 0$ and set $X = h \circ \psi_p^{-1} + Q \log |(\psi_p^{-1})'|$. Then by the coordinate change for Liouville fields on \mathbb{H} (see e.g. [ARS23, Lemma 2.4]), the law of X is also $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell)$. Since $(D, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma = (\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0)/\sim_\gamma$ we are done. \square

Theorem 2.22 ([ARS23, Theorem 3.4]). *Fix $\ell > 0$. Let $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)$ be the law of the quantum disk with boundary length ℓ and with one interior marked point defined in 2.15. Then*

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

The FZZ formula is the analog of the DOZZ formula for $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, z)}$ proposed in [FZZ00] and proved in [ARS23]. We record the most convenient form for our purpose, which uses the modified Bessel function of the second kind $K_\nu(x)$ [DLMF, Section 10.25]. One concrete representation of $K_\nu(x)$ in the range of our interest is the following [DLMF, (10.32.9)]:

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

Theorem 2.23 ([ARS23, Theorem 1.2, Proposition 4.19]). *For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and $\ell > 0$, let A be the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. The law of A under $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\#$ (i.e. the probability measure proportional to $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)$) is the inverse gamma distribution with density*

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

Moreover, recall $\bar{U}(\alpha)$ from in Proposition 2.18. Then for $\mu > 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)[e^{-\mu A}] = \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \ell^{-1} \frac{2}{\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha))} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}\right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)} K_{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q-\alpha)}\left(\ell \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\sin(\pi\gamma^2/4)}}\right).$$

2.4 Forested quantum surfaces and generalized quantum disks

In this section, we review the notion of forested quantum surfaces, and introduce a particularly important example called the generalized quantum disk. Our presentation mainly follows [AHSY23], and we refer to [DMS21, MSW21, HL22, AHSY23] for more backgrounds.

We first give a generalization of the notion of quantum surface defined in (2.2). Consider pairs (D, h) where $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is now a closed set (not necessarily homeomorphic to a closed disk) such that each component of its interior together with its prime-end boundary is homeomorphic to the closed disk, and h is only defined as a distribution on each of these components. We define the equivalence relation \sim_γ such that $(D, h) \sim_\gamma (D', h')$ iff there is a homeomorphism $g : D \rightarrow D'$ that is conformal on each component of the interior of D , and $h' = h \circ g^{-1} + Q \log |(g^{-1})'|$. A *beaded quantum surface* S is then defined to be an equivalence class of pairs (D, h) under the above \sim_γ , and we say (D, h)

is an embedding of S if $S = (D, h)/\sim_\gamma$. Generalized quantum surfaces with marked points and curve-decorated generalized quantum surfaces can be defined analogously. Later, in Section 4.2, we give a precise definition of the generalized surface with annulus topology (in some component), called the generalized quantum annulus.

Definition 2.24 (Forested line). *For $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$, let $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be a stable Lévy process of index $\frac{4}{\gamma^2}$ with only positive jumps satisfying $X_0 = 0$. For $t > 0$, let $Y_t = \inf\{s > 0 : X_s \leq -t\}$. Fix the root $o = (0, 0)$, and define the forested line as follows: First, construct the looptree corresponding to X_t . Then, for each loop of length L , we independently sample a quantum disk from $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L)^\#$ and topologically identify its boundary with the loop, identifying its marked point with the root of the loop.*

The closure of the collection of the points on the boundaries of quantum disks is referred as the forested boundary arc, while the set of the points corresponding to the running infimum of X_t is called the line boundary arc. For a point p_t on the line boundary arc corresponding to the point at which X first takes the value $-t$, the quantum length between o and p_t is defined to be t . The generalized boundary length between two points on the forested boundary arc is defined to be the length of the corresponding time interval for $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$. We denote the forested line by \mathcal{L}^o .

Define the truncation of \mathcal{L}^o at quantum length t to be the union of the line boundary arc and the quantum disks on the forested boundary arc between o and p_t .

Definition 2.25. *Fix $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$. Define $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}$ as the law of the surface obtained by first sampling $\mathbf{t} \sim \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{R}^+}$ and truncating an independent forested line at quantum length \mathbf{t} . We define the disintegration of the measure $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}$:*

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \ell) dt d\ell$$

where $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \ell)$ is the measure on the forested line segments with quantum length t for the line boundary arc and generalized boundary length ℓ for the forested boundary arc. We also define $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \cdot) := \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \ell) d\ell$.

Note that since the $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}$ -law of \mathbf{t} is Lebesgue measure, and the disintegration above was with respect to Lebesgue measure, we have $|\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \cdot)| = 1$, i.e., the law of the forested line segment with quantum length t is a probability measure.

Definition 2.26. *Let $W > 0$. Consider a sample*

$$(\mathcal{L}^1, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}^2) \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t_1, \cdot) \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(W; t_1, t_2) \times \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t_2, \cdot) dt_1 dt_2.$$

Glue the line boundary arcs of \mathcal{L}^1 and \mathcal{L}^2 to the left and right boundary arcs of \mathcal{D} according to quantum length. We call the resulting forested quantum surface a forested two-pointed quantum disk of weight W , and denote its law by $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(W)$.

The special weight $W = \gamma^2 - 2$ exhibits the following remarkable symmetry. A sample from $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ is a generalized quantum surface with two marked boundary points. Given the surface, forget the two marked points and sample two new marked points independently from the generalized boundary length measure. Then the law of the resulting marked generalized quantum surface is still $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ [AHSY23, Proposition 3.16]. This motivates the following analog of the quantum disk (Definition 2.15).

Definition 2.27. Let $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$. Let $\text{GQD}_{0,2} := \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$. Denoting the quantum area and generalized boundary length of a generalized quantum surface by A and L , a generalized quantum disk is a sample from the weighted measure $L^{-2}\text{GQD}_{0,2}$ with boundary points forgotten; denote its law by GQD . For $m, n \geq 0$, sample a generalized quantum surface from $A^m L^n \text{GQD}$, and given this surface sample m bulk points and n boundary points independently from the probability measures proportional to the quantum area and generalized boundary length measures. The result is a generalized quantum disk with m bulk points and n boundary points. Denote its law by $\text{GQD}_{m,n}$.

We define $\text{GQD}_{m,n}(\ell)$ to be the disintegration of $\text{GQD}_{m,n}$ over the generalized boundary length. That is, $\text{GQD}(\ell) = \int_0^\infty \text{GQD}_{m,n}(\ell) d\ell$ where each measure $\text{GQD}_{m,n}(\ell)$ is supported on the space of generalized quantum surfaces with generalized boundary length ℓ .

Lemma 2.28. *There exists a constant $R'_\gamma > 0$ such that the law of the generalized boundary length of a sample from GQD is $R'_\gamma 1_{\ell > 0} \ell^{-2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}} d\ell$.*

Proof. By Definition 2.27 and [AHSY23, Lemma 3.8] the generalized boundary length law of a sample from $\text{GQD}_{0,2}$ is a multiple of $1_{\ell > 0} \ell^{-2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}} d\ell$. Applying Definition 2.27 again gives the result for GQD . \square

As explained in [AHSY23, Remark 3.12], the definition of generalized quantum disk here agrees with that of [HL22, Definition 5.8], in the sense that $\text{GQD}(\ell)^\#$ is what they call the law of the length ℓ generalized quantum disk. We now state some area statistics of $\text{GQD}(\ell)^\#$, which are derived from [HL22, Theorem 1.8]. We write $\kappa' = \frac{16}{\gamma^2}$ and define the constant $M' := 2 \left(\frac{\mu}{4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \right)^{\frac{\kappa'}{8}}$ for simplicity.

Proposition 2.29. [HL22, Theorem 1.8] *The quantum area A of a sample from $\text{GQD}(\ell)^\#$ satisfies*

$$\text{GQD}(\ell)^\#[e^{-\mu A}] = \bar{K}_{4/\kappa'}(\ell M'), \quad \text{GQD}^\#(\ell)[Ae^{-\mu A}] = 2 \frac{\kappa'}{4\mu\Gamma(\frac{4}{\kappa'})} \left(\frac{M'\ell}{2} \right)^{4/\kappa'+1} K_{1-\frac{4}{\kappa'}}(M'\ell)$$

where here $\bar{K}_\nu(x) := \frac{2^{1-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} x^\nu K_\nu(x)$ is the normalization of the modified second Bessel function such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \bar{K}_\nu(x) = 1$. In particular, we have $\text{GQD}(\ell)^\#[A] = \frac{\kappa'}{16 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \frac{\Gamma(1-\frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\kappa'})} \ell^{\frac{8}{\kappa'}}$.

Lemma 2.30. *The generalized boundary length law of $\text{GQD}_{1,0}$ is $R'_\gamma \frac{\kappa'}{16 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \frac{\Gamma(1-\frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\kappa'})} \ell^{\frac{4}{\kappa'}-2} d\ell$, where R'_γ is the constant in Lemma 2.28.*

Proof. Denoting quantum area by A and generalized boundary length by L ,

$$\text{GQD}_{1,0}[1_{L \in (\ell_1, \ell_2)}] = \text{GQD}[A 1_{L \in (\ell_1, \ell_2)}] = \int_{\ell_1}^{\ell_2} |\text{GQD}(\ell)| \text{GQD}(\ell)^\#[A] d\ell$$

hence $|\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)| = |\text{GQD}(\ell)| \text{GQD}(\ell)^\#[A]$, and the result follows from Proposition 2.29. \square

In the remainder of this section, we will describe decompositions of forested quantum surfaces in terms of GQD ; informally, these are statements about self-similarity of fractals at different scales.

The forested line can be described as a Poisson point process of generalized quantum disks.

Proposition 2.31 ([AHSY23, Proposition 3.11]). *Sample a forested line, and consider the collection of pairs (u, \mathcal{D}_u^f) such that \mathcal{D}_u^f is a generalized quantum surface attached to the line boundary arc (with the root of \mathcal{D}_u^f defined to be the attachment point) and u is the quantum length from o to the root of \mathcal{D}_u^f . Then the law of this collection is a Poisson point process with intensity measure $c1_{u>0} du \times \text{GQD}_{0,1}$ for some constant c .*

Thus, a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(W)$ can be obtained from a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(W)$ by adding a Poisson point process of generalized quantum disks to its boundary according to quantum length measure. More generally, given a quantum surface with boundary, one can *forest its boundary* by adding a Poisson point process of generalized quantum disks to its boundary according to quantum length measure as in Proposition 2.31.

We now define some forested quantum surfaces obtained by foresting the boundary of a quantum disk with generic bulk point (Definition 2.20).

Definition 2.32. *Let $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$. Sample $\mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha)$ and let \mathcal{D}^f be the generalized quantum surface obtained by foresting the boundary of \mathcal{D} . We denote the law of \mathcal{D}^f by $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha)$. Letting L be the generalized boundary length of a random surface, consider a sample from $L\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha)$, and conditioned on this generalized quantum surface sample a boundary point from the probability measure proportionate to generalized quantum length. Denote the law of the resulting two-pointed surface by $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha)$. Finally, let $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha)$ be the law of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha)$ with forested boundary.*

The three subscripts of $\mathcal{M}_{i,j,k}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha)$ indicate the quantities of various kinds of marked points: a sample has i marked bulk points, j marked points on the boundaries of connected components of the generalized quantum surface, and k marked points on the forested boundary.

Proposition 2.33. *Let $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$. Sample a pair of beaded quantum surfaces $(\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2) \sim \mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha) \times \text{GQD}_{0,2}$, identify the marked boundary point of \mathcal{D}_1 with the first marked boundary point of \mathcal{D}_2 , then unmark this point. This gives a beaded quantum surface with one marked bulk point and one marked boundary point, whose law is $C\mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha)$ for some constant C .*

Proof. Recall in Proposition 2.31 that the forested line is a Poisson point process with intensity measure $c1_{u>0} du \times \text{GQD}_{0,1}$. Let \mathcal{L} be a loop with length L , and $\text{Leb}_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{L} . Then, by Palm's formula [HL22, Lemma 3.5], the following two procedures yield the same law:

1. Sample a Poisson point process with intensity $c\text{Leb}_{\mathcal{L}} \times \text{GQD}_{0,1}$, then sample one point according to the generalized quantum length (this induces a weighting by the total generalized quantum length);
2. Sample $x \sim c\text{Leb}_{\mathcal{L}}$, and independently sample $\text{GQD}_{0,1}$, identifying its marked point with x , and sample one point according to the generalized quantum length (i.e. we sample $\text{GQD}_{0,2}$ and identifying one marked point with x). Then independently sample a forested line on $[0, L]$, with its two ends identified with x .

Since $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma) = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell) d\ell$, the result follows by Definition 2.32. □

Proposition 2.34. *We have $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma) = C^{\text{f.d.}} \text{GQD}_{1,1}$ for some constant $C^{\text{f.d.}} = C^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$.*

Proof. By Definition 2.17 and the fact that $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(2) = \text{QD}_{0,2}$ (Definition 2.15), a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ can be obtained by first sampling $T \sim (\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)^{-2} \text{Leb}_{\mathbb{R}_+}$, then sampling a Poisson

point process $\{(u, \mathcal{D}_u)\}$ from the intensity measure $\text{Leb}_{[0,T]} \times \text{QD}_{0,2}$ and finally concatenating the collection $\{\mathcal{D}_u\}$ according to the ordering induced by u .

Now, writing A to denote the quantum area of a quantum surface, let $\mathcal{M}_{1,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ be the law of a sample from the (area-weighted) measure $A\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ with a marked bulk point sampled according to the probability measure proportional to the quantum area measure. Using the Poissonian description of $\mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ stated above, a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ can be obtained as follows: sample $(\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}^\bullet, \mathcal{D}_2) \sim (\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)^2 \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2) \times \text{QD}_{1,2} \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$, identify the first marked points of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 with the boundary marked points of \mathcal{D}^\bullet , and forget these marked points. See [AHS23a, Proposition 4.4] for details; there, they add a boundary rather than a bulk point, but the argument is identical.

Next, for a sample from $\text{GQD}_{1,2}$, let E be the event that the bulk point lies on the chain of disks connecting the two boundary points. By Definition 2.27, the law of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,2}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2)$ with boundary forested is $1_E \text{GQD}_{1,2}$. Thus, a sample from $1_E \text{GQD}_{1,2}$ can be obtained as follows: sample $(\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}^\bullet, \mathcal{D}_2) \sim \frac{2}{\pi\gamma^2} \text{GQD}_{0,2} \times \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell) \ell^2 d\ell \times \text{GQD}_{0,2}$, forest the boundary of \mathcal{D}^\bullet , and identify the first marked points of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 with points on $\partial\mathcal{D}^\bullet$ sampled independently from the probability measure proportional to boundary length measure. Here, we identified the foresting of $\text{QD}_{1,0}$ with $\frac{\gamma}{2\pi(Q-\gamma)^2} \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$ via Theorem 2.22. The forested boundary of \mathcal{D}^\bullet is a Poisson point process of generalized quantum disks (Proposition 2.31), so using Palm's theorem for Poisson point processes, we can pass from our description of $1_E \text{GQD}_{1,2}$ to the desired description of $\text{GQD}_{1,1}$, with $C^{\text{f.d.}} = \frac{c\pi\gamma^2}{2}$ where c is the constant in Proposition 2.31. \square

2.5 Conformal welding of quantum surfaces

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

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

Suppose that \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are a pair of independent γ -LQG quantum surfaces, each having a distinguished boundary arc having the same boundary length; for example, they might be sampled from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_1; \ell) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha_2; \ell)$ for some fixed ℓ . Viewed as oriented Riemann surfaces with the quantum length measure, there is almost surely a unique conformal welding of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 identifying their marked boundary points. The existence is due to Sheffield's work [She16] which gives a conformal welding whose welding interface is locally absolutely continuous with respect to SLE_{γ^2} , and the uniqueness follows from the conformal removability of SLE_κ for $\kappa \leq 4$ (see [JS00] for $\kappa < 4$ and [KMS22] for $\kappa = 4$). In the same manner, the uniform conformal welding of independent quantum surfaces with the same quantum boundary length almost surely exists and is unique. In many cases, the law of the resulting curve-decorated quantum surface is exactly identified, see e.g. Theorem 3.2.

Now consider $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$ and $\kappa' = 16/\gamma^2$ (so $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ is non-simple but not space-filling). The situation is similar for independent *forested* quantum surfaces $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ which have distinguished boundary arcs of the same generalized boundary length. By [DMS21], there exists a conformal welding measurable with respect to $(\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2)$ where the welding interface is locally absolutely continuous with respect to $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$. In this paper, we will always consider this conformal welding for forested quantum surfaces.

At the present moment, the uniqueness of conformal welding of forested quantum surfaces is known for $\gamma \geq 1.688$ (via conformal removability for $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ for $\kappa' \in (4, 5.6158\dots]$ [KMS23]), but for the restricted subset of conformal weldings such that the welding interface is locally absolutely continuous with respect to $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$, uniqueness is known for all values of $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$ [MMQ21].

3 The SLE loop via conformal welding of quantum disks

In this section, we recall from [AHS23b] that the conformal welding of quantum disks gives a quantum sphere decorated by an SLE_{κ} loop (Theorem 3.2), and prove an analogous result for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ (Theorem 3.3) where we weld the generalized quantum disks. This is the starting point of our study of the SLE loop measure via LQG.

We first recall the definition of Zhan's loop measure $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ for $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ as in [Zha21, Theorem 4.2]. Given two distinct points $p, q \in \mathbb{C}$, *two-sided whole plane* SLE_{κ} from p to q is a pair of curves (η_1, η_2) sampled as follows. Let η_1 be a whole-plane $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}(2)$ from p to q . When $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ the region $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta_1$ is simply connected; conditioned on η_1 let η_2 be chordal SLE_{κ} in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta_1$ from q to p . When $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ there are countably many connected components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta_1$, which come in three types: those surrounded by η_1 on its left, those surrounded by η_1 on its right, and the remaining regions. For each region D of the third type, independently sample chordal SLE_{κ} from the last point of ∂D hit by η_1 to the first point of ∂D hit by η_1 , and let η_2 be the concatenation of these curves. We denote the law of (η_1, η_2) by $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{p=q}$.

By concatenating the curves and forgetting the marked points, $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{p=q}$ can be viewed as a measure on the space of loops in \mathbb{C} . Given a loop η sampled from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{p=q}$, let

$$\text{Cont}(\eta) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa}{8}-1} \text{Area}(\{z : \text{dist}(z, \eta) < \varepsilon\})$$

be the $(1 + \frac{\kappa}{8})$ -dimensional Minkowski content of η . By [LR15], $\text{Cont}(\eta)$ exists almost surely.

Definition 3.1. For $\kappa \in (0, 8)$, the SLE loop measure $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ is given by

$$\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}} = \text{Cont}(\eta)^{-2} \iint_{\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}} |p - q|^{-2(1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})} \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{p=q}(d\eta) d^2p d^2q. \quad (3.1)$$

We now review the conformal welding result established in [AHS23b, Theorem 1.1] for $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ with $\kappa \in (0, 4)$. Let $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa} \in (0, 2)$. Recall the measures QS and QD(ℓ) for $\ell > 0$ from Section 2 that correspond to variants of the quantum sphere and disk in γ -LQG. Let \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 be quantum surfaces sampled from $\text{QD}(\ell) \times \text{QD}(\ell)$. We write $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell), \text{QD}(\ell))$ as the law of the loop-decorated quantum surface obtained from the uniform conformal welding of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 (as described in Section 2.5).

Theorem 3.2 ([AHS23b, Theorem 1.1]). *Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is QS if h is sampled from \mathbb{F} . Let $\text{QS} \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ be the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, h, \eta)/\sim_{\gamma}$ when (h, η) is sampled from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$. Then there exists a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

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

Our next theorem extends Theorem 3.2 to the non-simple case. An analogous conformal welding can be defined for generalized quantum disks. Recall $\text{GQD}(\ell)$ in Definition 2.27. Let $\text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \text{GQD}(\ell))$ denote the law of the (non-simple) loop-decorated quantum surface obtained from the uniform conformal welding of a sample from $\text{GQD}(\ell) \times \text{GQD}(\ell)$.

Theorem 3.3. *For $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\kappa'}}$, there is a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

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

Here, the measure $\text{QS} \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$ on the space of loop-decorated quantum surfaces is defined in the same way as in Theorem 3.2.

3.1 Conformal welding results for two-pointed (forested) quantum disks

The proof of Theorem 3.3 follows the strategy of [AHS23b]. First, we recall some basic conformal welding results for quantum disks and forested quantum disks. In the following, we write $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W; \ell, \ell') \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ to denote the law of the curve-decorated quantum surface obtained by taking an arbitrary embedding (D, h, x, y) of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W; \ell, \ell')$, sampling η independently of h to be $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ on (D, x, y) , and outputting $(D, h, x, y, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$.

Proposition 3.4 ([AHS23a, Theorem 2.2]). *For $\kappa \in (0, 4)$, $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ and $W_1, W_2 > 0$, there exists a constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\ell, \ell' > 0$*

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1 + W_2; \ell, \ell') \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa(W_1 - 2, W_2 - 2) = c \int_0^\infty \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1; \ell, \ell_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_2; \ell_1, \ell')) d\ell_1.$$

Here, $\text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1; \ell, \ell_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_2; \ell_1, \ell'))$ denotes the law of the conformal welding of a pair sampled from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1; \ell, \ell_1) \times \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_2; \ell_1, \ell')$ according to quantum length.

One can also weld quantum disks to get a quantum sphere. Define $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sph}}(W_1, W_2)$ to be the law of the pair (η_0, η_1) obtained as follows: sample η_0 as a whole-plane $\text{SLE}_\kappa(W_1 + W_2 - 2)$, and let η_1 be the concatenation of independent samples from chordal $\text{SLE}_\kappa(W_1 - 2, W_2 - 2)$ in each connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_0$ from the first to the last boundary point hit by η_0 . In the same way that we defined $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W; \ell, \ell') \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1, \rho_2)$, we define measures $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{whole-plane SLE}_\kappa$ and $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \mathcal{P}^{\text{sph}}(W_1, W_2)$ on the space of curve-decorated quantum surfaces.

Proposition 3.5 ([AHS23a, Theorem 2.4]). *Let $\kappa \in (0, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. For $W \geq 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$, there is a constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{whole-plane SLE}_\kappa(W - 2) = c \int_0^\infty \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W; \ell, \ell)) d\ell.$$

Here, $\text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W; \ell, \ell))$ denotes the law of the curve-decorated quantum surface with the sphere topology obtained by conformal welding of the left and right boundary arcs of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W; \ell, \ell)$ according to quantum length.

For $W_1, W_2 > 0$, there is a constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W_1 + W_2) \otimes \mathcal{P}^{\text{sph}}(W_1, W_2) = c \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1; \ell_0, \ell_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_2; \ell_1, \ell_0)) d\ell_0 d\ell_1.$$

Here, $\text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1; \ell_0, \ell_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_2; \ell_1, \ell_0))$ denotes the law of the curve-decorated quantum surface with the sphere topology obtained by conformal welding of a pair sampled from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_1; \ell_0, \ell_1) \times \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W_2; \ell_1, \ell_0)$ according to quantum length.

We now state Propositions 3.6 and 3.7, which are the forested counterparts of Propositions 3.4 and 3.5 respectively. The $\text{Weld}(-, -)$ notations are the same except that generalized boundary length is used rather than quantum length.

Proposition 3.6 ([AHSY23, Theorem 1.4]). *For $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\kappa'}}$, let $W_{\pm} > 0$ and $\rho_{\pm} = \frac{4}{\gamma^2}(2 - \gamma^2 + W_{\pm})$. Let $W = W_+ + W_- + 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$. Then for some constant $c \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\rho_-; \rho_+) = c \int_0^{\infty} \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_-; \ell), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_+, \ell)) d\ell. \quad (3.2)$$

Similarly,

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}\left(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4; \frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4\right) = c \int_0^{\infty} \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(\ell), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(\ell)) d\ell.$$

Note that the second claim above for forested line segments can be interpreted as a special case of the first claim with $W_- = W_+ = 0$.

To state Proposition 3.7, we first need to define the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ variant of $\mathcal{P}^{\text{sph}}(W_+, W_-)$. First sample η_0 as a whole-plane $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{4(W_+ + W_- + 4 - \gamma^2)}{\gamma^2} - 2\right)$. There are countably many connected components of $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta_0$, which come in three types: those surrounded by η_0 on its left, those surrounded by η_0 on its right, and the remaining regions. For each region D of the third type, independently sample chordal $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ from the last point of ∂D hit by η to the first point of ∂D hit by η , and let η_1 be the concatenation of these curves. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{sph}}(W_+, W_-)$ be the law of (η_0, η_1) . Note that for $W_+ = W_- = \gamma^2 - 2$, we have $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{sph}}(W_+, W_-) = \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{p=q}$ for $(p, q) = (0, \infty)$.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma = 4/\sqrt{\kappa'}$. For $W \geq 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$, there is some constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{whole-plane SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{4W}{\gamma^2} - 2\right) = c \int_0^{\infty} \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W - (2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}); \ell, \ell)) d\ell. \quad (3.3)$$

For $W = W_1 + W_2 + 4 - \gamma^2$ and $W_1, W_2 > 0$, there is some constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{sph}}(W_1, W_2) = c \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_1; \ell_1, \ell_2), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_2, \ell_1, \ell_2)) d\ell_1 d\ell_2. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. We first prove (3.3). According to Proposition 3.6, the conformal welding of two independent forested lines gives a thin quantum disk with weight $2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$ decorated with an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4; \frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4\right)$. Therefore, the RHS of (3.3) is equal to (up to a multiplicative constant)

$$\int_0^{\infty} \text{Weld}\left(\left(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(W - (2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}); \ell_1, \ell_2), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}\left(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; \ell_1, \ell_2\right) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4; \frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4\right)\right)\right) d\ell_1 d\ell_2.$$

Therefore (3.3) follows from Proposition 3.5 and [DMS21, Theorem 1.17], which we recall:

Theorem ([DMS21, Theorem 1.17]). *Let $\kappa = 16/\kappa' \in (2, 4)$. Sample η_0 according to whole-plane $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}(W - 2)$ on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, and conditioned on η_0 let η_1 be chordal $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}(W - 4 + \frac{\kappa}{2}, -\frac{\kappa}{2})$ on $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta_0$. Then (η_0, η_1) is a pair of GFF flow lines with an angle gap of π . Conditioned on (η_0, η_1) , in each connected component of $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (\eta_0 \cap \eta_1)$ lying to the right of η_0 and left of η_1 sample an independent chordal $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4; \frac{\kappa'}{2} - 4\right)$ between the two boundary points hit by both η_0 and η_1 , and let η be the concatenation of these curves. Then the marginal law of η is whole-plane $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}\left(\frac{4W}{\gamma^2} - 2\right)$.*

Now we prove (3.4). By Proposition 3.6, for a sample from $\int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_1; \ell_1, \ell_2) \times \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_2, \ell_1, \ell_2) d\ell_1$, conformally welding the boundary arcs having length ℓ_1 gives a curve-decorated quantum surface whose law is (up-to-constant) $\int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(W_1 + W_2 + 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; \ell_2, \ell_2) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\rho_-; \rho_+) d\ell_2$ with $\rho_\pm = \frac{4}{\gamma^2}(2 - \gamma^2 + W_\pm)$. We then conformally weld the left and right boundary arcs and integrate over ℓ_2 . By (3.3) and the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{sph}}(W_1, W_2)$, the resulting curve-decorated quantum surface has law (up-to-constant) $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{sph}}(W_1, W_2)$, so (3.4) holds. \square

From Proposition 3.7 we can obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *Fix distinct $p, q \in \mathbb{C}$. Let (\mathbb{C}, h, p, q) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\gamma^2)$ and independently sample η from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{p=q}$. Then the law of (\mathbb{C}, h, η) , viewed as a loop-decorated quantum surface, equals $C \int_0^\infty \ell^3 \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \text{GQD}(\ell)) d\ell$ for some constant $C \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.7 and the fact that $\text{GQD}_{0,2}(\ell_1, \ell_2) = \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma^2 - 2; \ell_1, \ell_2)$ (see Definition 2.27), the law of $(D, h, \eta, p, q) / \sim_\gamma$ equals $C \iint_0^\infty \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}_{0,2}(\ell_1, \ell_2), \text{GQD}_{0,2}(\ell_1, \ell_2)) d\ell_1 d\ell_2$. Now the result follows by taking the pushforward $(\ell_1, \ell_2) \mapsto \ell = \ell_1 + \ell_2$ (i.e. forgetting the two marked points), similarly in the proof of [AHS23b, Lemma 3.2]. \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

The proof follows the argument of [AHS23b], where the inputs are instead conformal welding results for forested quantum surfaces (developed in Section 3.2). We first need the following area-weighted variant of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W)$ in Definition 2.7.

Definition 3.9. *Fix $W > 0$ and let $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, -\infty, +\infty)$ be an embedding of a sample from the quantum-area-weighted measure $\mu_\phi(\mathbb{C}) \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W)$. Given ϕ , sample z from the probability measure proportional to μ_ϕ . We write $\mathcal{M}_{2,\bullet}^{\text{sph}}(W)$ for the law of the marked quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, \phi, -\infty, +\infty, z) / \sim_\gamma$.*

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let $M = \text{QS} \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$. For a sample from M weighted by the quantum area times the square of the generalized quantum length, pick an arbitrary embedding (\mathbb{C}, h, η) . Given (h, η) , we independently sample p, q from the probability measure proportional to the generalized quantum length and r from the probability measure proportional to the quantum area. Let M_3 be the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, \eta, p, q, r) / \sim_\gamma$.

Next, for fixed distinct points p, q, r in \mathbb{C} , let (\mathbb{C}, h, p, q, r) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{2,\bullet}^{\text{sph}}(\gamma^2)$ and let η be independently sampled from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{p=q}$. Let \tilde{M}_3 be the law of the decorated quantum surface $(\mathbb{C}, h, \eta, p, q, r) / \sim_\gamma$. Let $\tilde{M}_3^{p,q,r}$ be the law of the field-curve pair (h, η) , i.e., $\tilde{M}_3^{p,q,r}$ is the law of an embedding of a sample from \tilde{M}_3 with marked points sent to p, q, r .

To show Theorem 3.3, it suffices to show $M_3 = C \tilde{M}_3$ for some constant $C > 0$. Indeed, by Corollary 3.8, if we deweight the total quantum area from \tilde{M}_3 and then forget its marked points, the resulting law is $C \int_0^\infty \ell^3 \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \text{GQD}(\ell)) d\ell$. Further reweighting by ℓ^{-2} we get $C \int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \text{GQD}(\ell)) d\ell$. On the other hand, applying the same weightings to M_3 and forgetting the marked points yields M by definition. This gives $M = C \int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \text{GQD}(\ell)) d\ell$, concluding the proof of Theorem 3.3.

We will now show $M_3 = C \tilde{M}_3$. Theorem 2.13 states that $\mathbf{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \text{QS} = \text{CLF}_{\mathbb{C}}$, and hence $\mathbf{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}} \times M = \text{CLF}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$ by the conformal invariance of $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$. Building on this, we have the following counterpart of [AHS23b, Lemma 3.5] (which considers $\kappa \in (0, 4)$) via exactly the same argument:

$$\mathbf{m}_{\hat{\mathbb{C}}} \times M_3 = C |p - q|^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\frac{2}{\gamma}, p), (\frac{2}{\gamma}, q), (\gamma, r)}(d\phi) \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{p=q}(d\eta) d^2 p d^2 q d^2 r. \quad (3.5)$$

Instead of repeating the argument, we just point out the two minor modifications needed. The right hand side of [AHS23b, Lemma 3.5] is $C|p-q|^{\frac{\gamma^2}{4}-2}\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\frac{\gamma}{2},p),(\frac{\gamma}{2},q),(\gamma,r)}(d\phi)\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{p=q}(d\eta)d^2pd^2qd^2r$. Since the generalized quantum length of $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ is a $\frac{2}{\gamma}$ -GMC (the quantum length of SLE_{κ} is a $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ -GMC), the insertions of the Liouville field in (3.5) are $\frac{2}{\gamma}$ rather than $\frac{\gamma}{2}$. Further, the polynomial term in (3.5) is $|p-q|^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-2}$ rather than $|p-q|^{\frac{\gamma^2}{4}-2}$; this corresponds to having $|p-q|^{-2(1-\frac{\kappa'}{8})}$ rather than $|p-q|^{-2(1-\frac{\kappa}{8})}$ in (3.1). Other than these, the proof of (3.5) is identical to that of [AHS23b, Lemma 3.5].

On the other hand, following the proof of [AHS23b, Lemma 3.8], we have

$$\widetilde{M}_3^{p,q,r} = C|p-q|^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-2}|(p-q)(q-r)(p-r)|^2\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\frac{2}{\gamma},p),(\frac{2}{\gamma},q),(\gamma,r)}(d\phi)\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{p=q}(d\eta). \quad (3.6)$$

Indeed, from the definition of $\widetilde{M}_3^{p,q,r}$ one can first find that $\widetilde{M}_3^{0,1,-1} = C\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\frac{2}{\gamma},0),(\frac{2}{\gamma},1),(\gamma,r)}(d\phi)\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{0=1}(d\eta)$. Then let $f \in \text{conf}(\widehat{\mathbb{C}})$ be that $(0,1,-1) \mapsto (p,q,r)$ and use the transformation law $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i,f(z_i))_i} = \prod_{i=1}^m |f'(z_i)|^{-2\Delta_{\alpha_i}} f_* \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha_i,z_i)_i}$ with $\Delta_{\alpha} := \frac{\alpha}{2}(Q - \frac{\alpha}{2})$ (see e.g. [AHS23b, Proposition 2.9] for more details), one obtains (3.6).

Finally recall that $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \widetilde{M}_3 = C\widetilde{M}_3^{p,q,r}|(p-q)(q-r)(r-p)|^{-2}d^2pd^2qd^2r$. Hence combining (3.5) and (3.6) we conclude $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times M_3 = C\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \widetilde{M}_3$ for some constant C ; and then we deduce $M_3 = C\widetilde{M}_3$ by disintegration (see [AHS23b, Section 3.1] for more details). \square

4 Backgrounds and preliminary results on CLE coupled with LQG

In this section, we review existing results on CLE coupled with independent quantum disks or generalized quantum disks, where the CLE and LQG parameters are related by $\kappa \in \{\gamma^2, 16/\gamma^2\}$. Some of these results were implicitly obtained and others were sketched in prior literature; we will give details or alternative derivations.

4.1 The independent coupling of LQG and simple CLE

Let $\gamma \in (\sqrt{8/3}, 2)$ and $\kappa = \gamma^2$. Suppose that (D, h) is an embedding of a sample from QD, where D is a bounded domain. Let Γ be a (non-nested) CLE_{κ} on D that is independent of h . Then we call the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \Gamma)/\sim_{\gamma}$ a CLE_{κ} decorated quantum disk and denote its law by $\text{QD} \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa}$. By the conformal invariance of CLE_{κ} , the measure $\text{QD} \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa}$ does not depend on the choice of embedding of $(D, h)/\sim_{\gamma}$.

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

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

Proposition 4.1 ([MSW20, BBCK18, CCM20]). *Set $\beta := \frac{4}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a β -stable Lévy process whose Lévy measure is $1_{x>0}x^{-\beta-1}dx$, so that it has no downward jumps. We denote*

its law by \mathbb{P}^β . Let $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$. Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the sequence of the sizes of the upward jumps of ζ on $[0, \tau_{-a}]$ sorted in decreasing order. Then the law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined right above equals that of $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ under the reweighted probability $\frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]}$.

It was pointed out at the end of [CCM20, Section 1] that Proposition 4.1 can be extracted from [MSW20, BBCK18, CCM20]. The reason is that $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ are two ways of describing the scaling limit of the outermost loop lengths of an $O(n)$ -loop-decorated planar map model. The former follows from [BBCK18, MSW20] and the latter follows from [CCM20]. We explain this in more detail in Section 4.3.

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

Proposition 4.2. *For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Let D_η and A_η be the two connected components of $D \setminus \eta$ where $z \in D_\eta$. Let ℓ_h be the quantum boundary length measure on η . Conditioning on (h, Γ, η, z) , let w be a point on η sampled from the probability measure proportional to ℓ_h . Now consider the joint distribution of (D, h, η, z, w) . Then conditioning on $\ell_h(\eta)$, the decorated quantum surfaces $(D_\eta, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ and $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta}, w)/\sim_\gamma$ are conditionally independent, and the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))^\#$.*

Proposition 4.2 is implicitly proved in [MSW20], see Section 4.4 for more details.

4.2 The independent coupling of LQG and non-simple CLE

Let $\gamma \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$ and $\kappa = 16/\gamma^2$. Suppose that (D, h) is an embedding of a sample from GQD , where D is a bounded domain. Let Γ be the union of independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$'s in each connected component of $\text{int}(D)$. Then we call the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \Gamma)/\sim_\gamma$ a $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated quantum disk and denote its law by $\text{GQD} \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$.

As the loops in Γ are non-simple, we need to give the following definitions. We say a loop η *surrounds* a point z if $z \notin \eta$ and η has a nonzero winding number with respect to z . We call a loop $\eta \in \Gamma$ *outermost* if no point of η is surrounded by any loop in Γ . Let $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the collection of the quantum natural time of the outermost loops of Γ listed in non-increasing order.

We first state the $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ analog of Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.3 ([MSW21, BBCK18, CCM20]). *Set $\beta := \frac{4}{\kappa'} + \frac{1}{2} \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a β -stable Lévy process whose Lévy measure is $1_{x>0} x^{-\beta-1} dx$, so that it has no downward jumps. We denote its law by \mathbb{P}^β . Let $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$. Let $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the sequence of the sizes of the upward jumps of ζ on $[0, \tau_{-a}]$ sorted in decreasing order. Then the law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ defined right above equals that of $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ under the reweighted probability $\frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^\beta}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]}$.*

In Section 4.3 we will explain how Proposition 4.3 follows from [MSW21, BBCK18, CCM20]. The argument is the same as that of Proposition 4.1.

Now, we state the $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ analog of Proposition 4.2. The statement is more complicated due to the nontrivial topologies of the random surfaces involved. Let Ann denote the set of quantum surfaces with the annulus topology having distinguished inner and outer boundaries and decorated by a countable collection of loops. Concretely, Ann is the set of equivalence classes

$(A, h, \Gamma, \partial_{\text{out}}A, \partial_{\text{in}}A)/\sim_\gamma$ where $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ has the annulus topology, $\partial_{\text{out}}A$ and $\partial_{\text{in}}A$ are the boundary components of A , h is a distribution on A , Γ is a collection of loops on A , and \sim_γ identifies pairs of tuples if there exists a conformal map identifying the domains, boundaries and loops, which also relates the fields via the LQG coordinate change (2.2). Similarly, let Ann' denote the set of beaded quantum surfaces arising from a countable collection of loop-ensemble-decorated two-pointed disk-topology quantum surfaces endowed with a cyclic ordering, and say its inner (resp. outer) boundary is the union of the left (resp. right) boundary arcs of the two-pointed quantum surfaces. The definition of Ann' is analogous to that of a thin quantum disk, except the ordering is cyclic. See Figure 1.




Figure 1: **Left:** An element of Ann . **Middle:** An element of Ann' . **Right:** A sample from $\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b)^\#$. Note that both configurations are possible.

As explained below Proposition 2.31, forested quantum surfaces arise from adding a Poisson point process of generalized quantum disks to the boundary of a quantum surface. If we further sample in each connected component of the added generalized quantum disks an independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, we call it $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting.

Proposition 4.4. *There exists a measure $\text{GA}^{\text{u.f.}}$ on $\text{Ann} \cup \text{Ann}'$ such that, if $\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b)^\#$ denotes the law of a sample from $\text{GA}^{\text{u.f.}}$ with $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting conditioned on having outer (resp. inner) generalized boundary length a (resp. b), then the following holds:*

For $a, b > 0$, the law of a sample from $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ conditioned on the length of the outermost loop surrounding the marked bulk point being b is $\text{Weld}(\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b)^\#, \text{GQD}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$.

Remark 4.5. *In Proposition 4.4, because $\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b)^\#$ is defined in terms of $\text{GA}^{\text{u.f.}}$, by definition $\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b)^\#$ is the law of a forested quantum surface (i.e., the generalized quantum disks added to the boundary arise from a Poisson point process according to quantum length). Thus, the following is an informal way of rephrasing Proposition 4.4:*

For a sample from $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, condition on the length of the outermost loop η around the bulk point being b . Then, cutting by η gives a pair of conditionally independent forested quantum surfaces $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ corresponding to the regions outside and inside η respectively; the conditional law of \mathcal{D} is $\text{GQD}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, and we denote the conditional law of \mathcal{A} by $\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b)^\#$. Furthermore, if we condition on $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$, the initial surface agrees in law with the uniform conformal welding of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} .

We also note that the proof of Proposition 4.4 yields an explicit description of $\text{GA}^{\text{u.f.}}$ via conformal weldings of forested quantum triangles.

Proposition 4.4 is implicitly proved in [MSW21] (in the same way that Proposition 4.2 is implicitly proved in [MSW20]). The explanation would be more complicated than that of Proposition 4.2,

so we will instead give an alternative proof in Section 4.5 based on [AHSY23].

4.3 Scaling limit of $O(n)$ -loop-decorated planar maps: Proofs of Propositions 4.1 and 4.3

In this section we explain why Propositions 4.1 and 4.3 hold; since both have the same proof we focus on the former, and briefly discuss the latter at the end. The claim that $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ agree in law holds because they give two descriptions of the scaling limit of the same discrete model: loop lengths in the $O(n)$ -loop-decorated quadrangulation. This was pointed out at the end of Section 1 of [CCM20]. We give a more detailed justification by assembling results in [CCM20, BBCK18, MSW20].

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

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

Proposition 4.6 ([CCM20, Proposition 3]). *There exists (g, h) such that as $p \rightarrow \infty$, the sequence $(\frac{a}{2p} L_i^p)_{i \geq 1}$ converges in law to $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$, where $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ and $a > 0$ are as in Proposition 4.1.*

We refer to [CCM20, Definition 1] for a description of (g, h) such that Proposition 4.6 holds. In the rest of the section we explain why the following proposition follows from [BBCK18, MSW20].

Proposition 4.7. *For (g, h) satisfying Proposition 4.6, $(\frac{a}{2p} L_i^p)_{i \geq 1}$ converges in law to $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ as defined in Proposition 4.1.*

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

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

$$\nu_\theta(dx) = \frac{\Gamma(\theta + 1)}{\pi} \left(\frac{1_{1/2 < x < 1}}{(x(1-x))^{\theta+1}} + \sin(\pi(\theta - \frac{1}{2})) \frac{1_{x > 1}}{(x(x-1))^{\theta+1}} \right) dx. \quad (4.1)$$

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

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

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

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

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

We now relate $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$ to the CPI on quantum disks reviewed in Section 4.4. Suppose (D, h, Γ, x, y) are as in Proposition 4.10 such that the law of $(D, h, \Gamma, x)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. The chordal CPI from x to y can be viewed as an exploration of the carpet of Γ such that at any splitting time it goes into the domain with the target y on its boundary. Namely, it enters D_t instead of B_t to continue. We can also alter the exploration rule at these splitting times, each of which defines a variant of CPI and corresponds to a branch in the so-called CPI branching exploration tree rooted at x . One particular variant of CPI is such that at any splitting time it enters the domain with the largest quantum boundary length. In the terminology of [MSW20], this is called the CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism.

Let \tilde{Y}_t^a be the boundary length of the to-be-explored region at time t CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism. Then by [MSW20, Theorem 1.2], for some constant $c > 0$ not depending on a , we have $(\tilde{Y}_{ct}^a)_{t \geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$. Moreover, the upward jumps in \tilde{Y}_t correspond to times when the CPI discovers a loop, and downward jumps in \tilde{Y}_t correspond to times when the CPI splits the to-be-explored region into two. Iteratively applying this fact we get the following description the outermost loop lengths is as in Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.8 ([MSW20]). *The lengths $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ agree in law with $(L_i)_{i \geq 1}$ sampled as follows. First sample $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$, and let U_1 and D_1 be the sets of the sizes of upward and downward jumps of $(Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$. Given D_1 , sample a collection of independent processes $S_2 = \{(Y_t^x)_{t \geq 0} : x \in D_1\}$, and let U_2 and D_2 be the sets of the sizes of all upward and downward jumps of processes in S_2 . Iteratively define S_i, U_i, D_i for all i , and finally set $U = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} U_i$. Finally, rank the elements of U as $L_1 \geq L_2 \geq \dots$.*

Proof. The quantum lengths of loops discovered by CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism correspond to the sizes of the upward jumps in \tilde{Y}_t^a , which has the same law as the upward jumps in Y_t^a . The analogous Markov properties in Propositions 4.10 and 4.11 still hold for this CPI. Now we continue this exploration mechanism to explore the rest of CLE carpet. Iteratively applying this relation the quantum length of the discovered loops and the upward jumps, we get Proposition 4.8. \square

We now explain how Proposition 4.7 follows from the scaling limit results for \mathfrak{M}_p proved in [BBCK18, Section 6].

Proof of Proposition 4.7. Let \mathfrak{M}'_p be the planar map obtained from \mathfrak{M}_p by removing all the regions surrounded by outermost loops on \mathfrak{M}_p . For (g, h) satisfying Proposition 4.6, \mathfrak{M}'_p is the so-called critical non-generic Boltzmann planar map considered in [BBCK18, Section 6]. The map \mathfrak{M}'_p is the discrete analog of the CLE carpet on the LQG background. The discrete analog of CPI exploration for CLE carpet is considered in [BBCK18, Section 6.3] which is called the branching

peeling exploration. The exact analog of the CPI with $(q = \infty)$ -exploration mechanism is considered in [BBCK18, Section 6.4], where the exploration is always towards the component with the largest perimeter when there is splitting. It was shown in [BBCK18, Proposition 6.6] that the rescaled lengths of the loops discovered by this peeling process converge in law to the sizes of the upward jumps in Y_t^a . Iterating the exploration in both discrete and continuum, we get the desired convergence. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Combining Propositions 4.6 and 4.7, we conclude the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.3. The argument is exactly the same as that of Proposition 4.1. All results taken from [CCM20] and [BBCK18] still hold for $\beta = \frac{4}{\kappa'} + \frac{1}{2} \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$ and $\theta = \frac{4}{\kappa'} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. The results from [MSW20] each have non-simple CLE counterparts in [MSW21]; in particular, to see $(\tilde{Y}_{ct}^a)_{t \geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$, [MSW21, Theorem 5.1] gives $(\tilde{Y}_{ct}^a)_{t \geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_t^a)_{t \geq 0}$ when $\sin(\pi(\theta - \frac{1}{2}))$ in (4.1) is replaced by a quantity they call $A_+(p)/A_-(p)$, and [MSW21, Remark 5.2] identifies this quantity as $-\cos(\pi\theta)$ ($= \sin(\pi(\theta - \frac{1}{2}))$). \square

4.4 Proof of Proposition 4.2

We now explain how Proposition 4.2 follows from [MSW20]. It reduces to the following:

Proposition 4.9. *In the setting of Proposition 4.2, we can find a random point $p \in \eta$ such that, conditioning on $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta, p})/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))^\#$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.2 given Proposition 4.9. Suppose (h, Γ, p, z) satisfies Proposition 4.9. Conditioning on (h, Γ, p, z) , let U be a uniform random variable on $(0, 1)$. Let w be the point of η such that the counterclockwise arc on η from p to w is of ℓ_h -length $U\ell_h(\eta)$. By definition, w is sampled from the probability measure proportional to $\ell_h(\eta)$. By Proposition 4.9 and the re-rooting invariance of $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))$, conditioning on $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta, p})/\sim_\gamma$ and U , the conditional law of $(D_\eta, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta))$. Since $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta, w})/\sim_\gamma$ is determined by $(A_\eta, h, \Gamma|_{A_\eta, p})/\sim_\gamma$ and U , we are done. \square

To find the desired p in Proposition 4.9, we use the *conformal percolation interface* (CPI) within a CLE carpet introduced by Miller, Sheffield and Werner [MSW17]. Suppose Γ is a CLE_κ on a Jordan domain D (i.e. ∂D is a simple curve) for some $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$. Given two boundary points x, y , a (chordal) CPI for Γ from x to y is a random curve from x to y coupled with Γ that does not enter the interior of any region surrounded by a loop of Γ (but it can touch the loops). We also need to specify how a CPI proceeds upon hitting a loop of Γ on its way from x to y . We require that it always leaves the loop to its right. In the terminology of [MSW17], this corresponds to CPI with $\beta = 1$. The marginal law of a CPI is $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ on D from x to y where $\kappa' = 16/\kappa$ [MSW17, Theorem 7.7 (ii)] and the force point is on the right of x . In particular, a CPI is a non-simple curve. Intuitively, the chordal CPI describes the chordal interface of a percolation on a CLE carpet. It is characterized by certain conformal invariance and Markov properties which are consistent with this intuition; see [MSW17, Definition 2.1]. We will not review the full details but will rely on an analogous Markov property that CPI satisfies on a quantum disk background. This was established in [MSW20], which we review now.

Fix $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. For $L_0, R_0 > 0$, suppose (D, h, Γ, x) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(L_0 + R_0) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let y be the point on ∂D such that the quantum length of the counterclockwise arc from x to y is R_0 . Conditioning on (h, Γ, x, y) , sample a CPI η' within the carpet of Γ from x to y . Since the law of η' is a $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$, there is a quantum natural time

parametrization for η' with respect to h [DMS21, Section 6], which we use throughout. Under this parametrization, η' has a finite duration T . For a fixed time $t > 0$, on the event that $t \leq T$, let $\tilde{\eta}'_t$ be the union of $\eta'[0, t]$ and all the loops of Γ touched by $\eta'[0, t]$. If $t < T$, let D_t be the simply connected component of $D \setminus \tilde{\eta}'_t$ which contains y on its boundary. For a fixed t , both D_t and the interior of $D \setminus D_t$ are Jordan domains a.s. We write the interior $D \setminus D_t$ as U_t . The interface between D_t and U_t are SLE $_{\kappa}$ types curves, on which there is a well-defined quantum length measure.




Figure 2: We color D_t blue and U_t green. **(a)**: At all but countably many times t , we have $D_t = D_{t-}$. To simplify (b)–(d) we omit their loops. **(b)**: A loop discovery time. **(c)**, **(d)**: A splitting time. At times when the left boundary length L_t has a downward jump, there are two possible topologies; we do not illustrate the similar cases when the split is to the right.

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

Proposition 4.10 ([MSW20]). *For a fixed $t > 0$, on the event that $t < T$, let L_t and R_t be the quantum lengths of the clockwise and counterclockwise arcs from $\eta'(t)$ to y of ∂D_t . Conditioning on the decorated quantum surface $(U_t, h, \Gamma|_{U_t}, \eta'|_{[0, t]}) / \sim_{\gamma}$ and (L_t, R_t) , the conditional law of $(D_t, h, \Gamma|_{D_t}, y) / \sim_{\gamma}$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_t + R_t)^{\#} \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa}$.*

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

The point p in Proposition 4.9 that we will find is a point where a CPI hits a loop. Therefore we need a stronger variant of the Markov property in Proposition 4.10 at certain random times which we now define. For each $t \in (0, T)$, let D_{t-} be the interior of $\cap_{s < t} D_s$. According to [MSW20], for each fixed time t , on the event that $t < T$, almost surely $D_{t-} = D_t$; see Figure 2 (a). But there exist countably many times where $D_{t-} \neq D_t$. In this case, there are two scenarios:

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

In both cases, we let \mathcal{B}_t be the interior of $D_{t-} \setminus D_t$ and U_{t-} be the interior of $D \setminus D_{t-}$. Then $\partial \mathcal{B}_t \setminus \partial D$ is an SLE $_{\kappa}$ type curve. By definition, $\partial \mathcal{B}_t$ is a loop in Γ if and only if t is a loop discovery time. Recall (L_t, R_t) from Proposition 4.10. If t is a loop discovery time, then R_t has an upward

jump. If t is a splitting time, then either L_t or R_t has a downward jump. In both cases, the size of the jump equals the quantum length of $\partial\mathcal{B}_t$, which we denote by X_t . We now state the stronger version of Proposition 4.10.

Proposition 4.11. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a positive integer n . Let τ be the n -th time such that $D_{t-} \neq D_t$ and the quantum length X_t of $\partial\mathcal{B}_t$ is larger than ε . If this time never occurs, set $\tau = \infty$. Conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, the decorated quantum surface $(U_{\tau-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, the indicator $1_{\{\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}$, and the quantum lengths X_τ of $\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau$ and L_τ, R_τ of the two arcs on D_τ , the conditional law of $(D_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{D_\tau}, y)/\sim_\gamma$ and $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is given by independent samples from $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_\tau + R_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ and $\text{QD}_{0,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, respectively.*

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

We claim that conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, $(U_{\tau-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, $1_{\{\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}$, and X_τ, L_τ, R_τ , the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Fix a large $k > 0$. Let s_k be the largest integer multiple of 2^{-k} smaller than τ . Let $\mathcal{U}_t = (U_t, h, \Gamma|_{U_t}, \eta'|_{[0, t]})/\sim_\gamma$ and $\mathcal{D}_t = (D_t, h, \Gamma|_{D_t}, y)/\sim_\gamma$. For a fixed j , by Proposition 4.10, conditioning on $\mathcal{U}_{j2^{-k}}$ and $(L_{j2^{-k}}, R_{j2^{-k}})$, the conditional law of $\mathcal{D}_{j2^{-k}}$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_{j2^{-k}} + R_{j2^{-k}})^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Note that $\{s_k = j2^{-k}\}$ is determined by $\mathcal{U}_{j2^{-k}}$ and the quantum lengths of the boundaries of elements in $\{(\mathcal{B}_s, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_s}, \eta'(s))/\sim_\gamma : j2^{-k} \leq s \leq (j+1)2^{-k} \text{ and } D_{s-} \neq D_s\}$. Applying the assertion of the first paragraph to $\mathcal{D}_{j2^{-k}}$ with $T = 2^{-k}$, we see that conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, $\mathcal{U}_{s_k}, \{s_k = j2^{-k}\}, 1_{\{\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}, X_\tau, L_{s_k+2^{-k}}$ and $R_{s_k+2^{-k}}$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Varying j , we can remove the condition $\{s_k = j2^{-k}\}$. Since almost surely $\mathcal{U}_{s_k} \rightarrow (U_{\tau-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$ and $(L_{s_k+2^{-k}}, R_{s_k+2^{-k}}) \rightarrow (L_\tau, R_\tau)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have proved the desired claim.

It remains to show that conditioning on $\tau < \infty$, $(U_{\tau-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, $1_{\{\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}, X_\tau, L_\tau, R_\tau$ and $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(D_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{D_\tau}, y)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{0,1}(L_\tau + R_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. This follows from a similar but easier argument: we consider the smallest multiple of 2^{-k} larger than τ and use the Markov property in Proposition 4.10 at this time. We omit the details. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.9. For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, x) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{0,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Now we reweight $\text{QD}_{0,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ by $\mu_h(D)$ and sample a point z according to the probability measure proportional to μ_h . This way, the law of (D, h, Γ, z, x) is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ as in Propositions 4.2 and 4.9. Let y be the point on ∂D such that both the two arcs between x to y have quantum length $a/2$, and sample a CPI η' from x to y , parametrized by quantum natural time. Let t_0 be the time such $z \in \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$ and set $p_0 = \eta'(t_0)$.

Consider τ and \mathcal{B}_τ as defined in Proposition 4.11 with this choice of (D, h, Γ, x, y) . Then on the event that $t_0 = \tau$, namely $z \in \mathcal{B}_\tau$, conditioning on $(U_{\tau-}, h, \Gamma|_{U_{\tau-}}, \eta'|_{[0, \tau]})/\sim_\gamma$, $1_{\{\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau \text{ is a loop}\}}$, the quantum length X_τ of $\partial\mathcal{B}_\tau$ and $(D_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{D_\tau}, y)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, z, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(X_\tau)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, where we have $\text{QD}_{1,1}$ instead of $\text{QD}_{0,1}$ because of area weighting. This means that conditioning on the quantum intrinsic information on $D \setminus \mathcal{B}_\tau$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, z, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ is a CLE decorated marked quantum disk with given boundary length. By

varying ε and n in Proposition 4.11, the same holds with $(\mathcal{B}_\tau, h|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_\tau}, z, \eta'(\tau))/\sim_\gamma$ replaced by $(\mathcal{B}_{t_0}, h, \Gamma|_{\mathcal{B}_{t_0}}, z, \eta'(t_0))/\sim_\gamma$.

If t_0 is a loop discovery time, then $\partial\mathcal{B}_{t_0}$ is the loop η surrounding z and $p_0 = \eta'(t_0)$ is the desired point we need for Proposition 4.9. Otherwise, we set $D_1 = \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$ and construct t_1 , \mathcal{B}_{t_1} and p_1 as above with (D, h, Γ, x) replaced by $(D_1, h, \Gamma|_{D_1}, p_0)$. If $p_1 \in \eta$ then we are done by setting $p = p_1$. Otherwise, we iterate this procedure and construct p_2, p_3, \dots . We claim that there must be a finite k such that $p_k \in \eta$, hence we can set $p = p_k$ and conclude the proof.

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

4.5 Proof of Proposition 4.4

Our proof will depend on conformal welding results from [ASYZ24]. We first give a decomposition of CLE via the *continuum exploration tree*. See Figure 3.

Lemma 4.12. *Let D be a Jordan domain and let $z \in D$, $x \in \partial D$. Let $\tilde{\eta}$ be a radial $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\rho)$ curve in D from x to z , with $\rho = \kappa' - 6$ and force point located infinitesimally clockwise from x . Let σ be the time that the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \tilde{\eta}([0, \sigma])$ containing z is bounded; this is the first time $\tilde{\eta}$ completes a loop around z . Consider each connected component U of $D \setminus \tilde{\eta}([0, \sigma])$ such that ∂U intersects both ∂D and $\tilde{\eta}([0, \sigma])$, and $\tilde{\eta}$ fills some boundary segment of $\partial U \cap \tilde{\eta}([0, \sigma])$ in the counterclockwise direction. Let $s(U) < t(U)$ be the first and last times that $\tilde{\eta}$ hits ∂U , and let η_U be the concatenation of $\tilde{\eta}|_{[s(U), t(U)]}$ with an independent $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ curve in D from $\tilde{\eta}(t(U))$ to $\tilde{\eta}(s(U))$, so η_U is a loop with counterclockwise orientation. Let Γ_0 be the collection of all such η_U . In each connected component of $D \setminus \bigcup_{\eta_U \in \Gamma_0} \eta_U$ sample an independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, and let Γ be the union of Γ_0 and these $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ s. Then Γ has the law of $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ in D .*

Proof. This follows immediately from the continuum exploration tree construction of $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ of Sheffield [She09]. \square

In Lemmas 4.13 and 4.15, we give decompositions of $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$ decorated by $(\tilde{\eta}, \Gamma)$ (from Lemma 4.12) depending on whether $\tilde{\eta}$ first closes a counterclockwise or clockwise loop around z . Combining these will yield Proposition 4.4.

Recall the space Ann' and the notion of $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting defined immediately above Proposition 4.4. Let Ann'_1 denote the space of quantum surfaces in Ann' with an additional marked point on the outer boundary.

Lemma 4.13. *There exists a measure M_{ccw} on Ann'_1 such that if $M_{\text{ccw}}^{\text{f}}$ denotes the law of a sample from M_{ccw} with $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting, and $M_{\text{ccw}}^{\text{f}}(b)^\#$ denotes the law of a sample from $M_{\text{ccw}}^{\text{f}}$ conditioned on having inner generalized boundary length b , then the following holds:*

Let $b > 0$. Let (D, h, z, x) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$, let D be the connected component of $\text{int}(\tilde{D})$ containing w , and independently sample $\tilde{\eta}$ and Γ in D as in Lemma 4.12.




Figure 3: Figure for Lemma 4.12. The curve $\tilde{\eta}$ (black) is radial $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ stopped at the first time it closes a loop around the target point z . Some connected components of $D \setminus \tilde{\eta}([0, \sigma])$ have a boundary arc lying in ∂D and a boundary arc traced in the counterclockwise direction by $\tilde{\eta}$; these are shown in color. In each such region, draw an independent SLE_κ curve (dashed) from the last point hit by $\tilde{\eta}$ to the first point hit by $\tilde{\eta}$. Concatenating these curves with segments of $\tilde{\eta}$ gives a collection of loops Γ_0 . This, together with independent CLE_κ in each connected component of D in the complement of Γ_0 , gives CLE_κ in D . **Left:** If $\tilde{\eta}$ closes a counterclockwise loop around z , then z is surrounded by a loop in Γ_0 (shown in blue). **Right:** If $\tilde{\eta}$ closes a clockwise loop around z , then z is not surrounded by a loop in Γ_0 . (Note that the drawing is only schematic; in both cases, due to the fractal nature of SLE, there is a.s. no loop touching x .)

Condition on the event that $\tilde{\eta}$ closes a counterclockwise loop around z at time σ , and on the loop of Γ surrounding z having quantum length b . Then the conditional law of $(\tilde{D}, h, \Gamma, \tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \sigma]}, z, w) / \sim_\gamma$ is $\text{Weld}(M_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)^\#, \text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$.

The Weld notation in Lemma 4.13 refers to the law of a sample from $M_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)^\# \times (\text{GQD}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$ after the inner boundary of the first surface is uniformly conformally welded to the boundary of the second surface. Similarly to Remark 4.5, Lemma 4.13 can be informally stated as follows. In the setup and conditioning of Lemma 4.13, cutting by the loop of Γ surrounding z gives a pair of conditionally independent decorated forested quantum surfaces $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ corresponding to the regions outside and inside η respectively; the conditional law of \mathcal{D} is $\text{GQD}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, and we denote the conditional law of \mathcal{A} by $M_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)^\#$. Furthermore, if we condition on $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$, the initial surface agrees in law with the uniform conformal welding of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} .

Proof. See Figure 4. Cut $(\tilde{D}, h, \tilde{\eta}, z, x) / \sim_\gamma$ by $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \sigma]}$ to obtain a pair of forested quantum surfaces $(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ where \mathcal{D}_1 contains the bulk marked point. The first claim of [ASYZ24, Proposition 4.3] (with parameter $\alpha = \gamma$) states that the law of $(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{D}_1)$ is

$$C \iint_0^\infty \text{QT}^f\left(\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}, \gamma^2 - 2; t, a + t\right) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; a) da dt \quad (4.2)$$

for some constant C . Here, $\text{QT}^f(W_1, W_2, W_3)$ is the law of the *forested quantum triangle with weights* W_1, W_2, W_3 , and $\text{QT}^f(W_1, W_2, W_3; t, a + t)$ is the law of the quantum triangle whose boundary arc between the vertices of weights W_1 and W_2 (resp. W_3) has generalized boundary length t (resp. $a + t$). Since the vertex with weight $2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$ is thin (since $2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2} < \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$), by [ASY22, Definition 2.18] \mathcal{T}_1 decomposes into a pair $(\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{D}_2)$ where \mathcal{T}_2 is a forested quantum triangle with weights

$(\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}, \gamma^2 - 2)$ and \mathcal{D}_2 is a forested quantum disk of weight $2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}$. Precisely, the joint law of $(\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_1)$ is

$$(2 - \frac{4}{\gamma^2})C \iiint_0^\infty \text{QT}^f(\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, \frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, \gamma^2 - 2; b, a + b + c) \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; c) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; a) da db dc. \quad (4.3)$$

Now, consider the connected component U_0 of $D \setminus \tilde{\eta}([0, \sigma])$ such that ∂U_0 intersects ∂D and contains $\tilde{\eta}(\sigma)$, so $\eta_{U_0} \in \Gamma$ is the loop surrounding z . Let p be the first point on ∂U_0 hit by $\tilde{\eta}$, i.e., $p = \tilde{\eta}(s(U_0))$. Recall that η_{U_0} is the concatenation of a segment of $\tilde{\eta}$ and an SLE_κ curve in U_0 from $\tilde{\eta}(\sigma)$ to p ; this latter curve corresponds to an SLE_κ curve in \mathcal{T}_2 between the two vertices of weight $\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2$. By [AHSY23, Lemma 4.1] and [AHSY23, Theorem 1.4], cutting by this curve gives a pair $(\mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{D}_3)$ where \mathcal{T}_3 is a forested quantum triangle with weights $(\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, \frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, \gamma^2 - 2)$ and \mathcal{D}_3 is a forested quantum disk with weight $\gamma^2 - 2$. Precisely, the joint law of $(\mathcal{T}_3, \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_1)$ is

$$C' \iiint_0^\infty \text{QT}^f(\gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2; e, a + b + c) \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma^2 - 2; e, b) \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; c) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; a) da db dc de \quad (4.4)$$

where C' is a constant.

Now, let \mathcal{T}_4 be \mathcal{T}_3 with its first marked point shifted counterclockwise by $(a + b)$ units of generalized boundary length, so its boundary arcs counterclockwise and clockwise from the first vertex have generalized boundary lengths c and $a + b + e$ respectively. Since a sample from $\text{QT}^f(\gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2)$ is invariant in law under the operation of forgetting a boundary marked point and resampling it according to generalized boundary length measure [ASYZ24, Lemma 4.1], we conclude that \mathcal{T}_4 is also a quantum triangle with all three weights $\gamma^2 - 2$. Let \mathcal{D}_4 be the concatenation of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_3 where the boundary marked point of \mathcal{D}_1 is identified with the first marked point of \mathcal{D}_3 , and this point is then unmarked. By definition \mathcal{D}_3 is a generalized quantum disk with two boundary points, so by Propositions 2.33 and 2.34 \mathcal{D}_4 is a generalized quantum disk with one bulk and one boundary point. In summary, the joint law of $(\mathcal{T}_4, \mathcal{D}_4, \mathcal{D}_2)$ is

$$C'' \int_0^\infty \text{QT}^f(\gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2; f, c) \times \text{GQD}_{1,1}(f) \times \mathcal{M}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; c) dc df \quad (4.5)$$

where C'' is a constant.

For $c > 0$, let $\widehat{\text{QT}}^f(\gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2; -, c)$ be the law of a sample from $\text{QT}(\gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2)$ with forested boundary between the first and third vertices, disintegrating on this forested boundary arc having generalized boundary length c , and similarly define $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; c)$. Let \widehat{M}_{ccw} be the law of the (non-forested) quantum surface obtained from a sample from $C'' \int_0^\infty \widehat{\text{QT}}^f(\gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2, \gamma^2 - 2; -, c) \times \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2}^{\text{f.d.}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; c) dc$ by conformally welding the pair of boundary arcs with generalized boundary length c , and identifying the first and second vertices of the quantum triangle. A sample from \widehat{M}_{ccw} has two marked points; its first (resp. second) marked point corresponds to the third (resp. first) marked point of the quantum triangle. Its inner boundary corresponds to the boundary arc of the quantum triangle between its first and second vertices. Let $\widehat{M}_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)^\#$ be the law of a sample from \widehat{M}_{ccw} with CLE_κ -decorated foresting and conditioned on having inner generalized boundary length b . By (4.5), $(\bar{D}, h, \eta|_{[0, \sigma]}, \eta_{U_0}, z, w, p) / \sim_\gamma$ conditioned on the quantum length of η_{U_0} being b agrees in law with the conformal welding of a pair of quantum surfaces $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) \sim \widehat{M}_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)^\# \times \text{GQD}_{1,1}(b)^\#$ in which the second marked point of \mathcal{A} is identified with the boundary marked point of \mathcal{D} . Since forgetting the boundary marked point of \mathcal{D} and resampling it according to generalized boundary length leaves \mathcal{D} invariant in law, the conditional

law of $(\widehat{D}, h, \eta|_{[0, \sigma]}, \eta_{U_0}, z, w) / \sim_\gamma$ is $\text{Weld}(\widehat{M}_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)^\#, \text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)^\#)$ (where the second marked point of \mathcal{A} is forgotten).

Finally, the desired M_{ccw} can be obtained from \widehat{M}_{ccw} by sampling independent chordal $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ curves via the process described in Lemma 4.12. By Lemma 4.12 the claim holds. \square

Remark 4.14. Equation (4.5) gives a stronger result than Lemma 4.13, which we will not need in the present work. We state it here:

Let M_{ccw} be defined as in the above proof of Lemma 4.13, let M_{ccw}^f be the law of a sample from M_{ccw} with $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting, and let $\{M_{\text{ccw}}^f(b)\}_{b>0}$ be the disintegration of M_{ccw}^f with respect to inner generalized boundary length. For a sample $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ from $\int_0^\infty M_{\text{ccw}}^f(b) \times (\text{GQD}_{1,1}(b) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}) db$, forget the marked boundary point of \mathcal{D} , and let \mathcal{D}' be the uniform conformal welding of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} . There is a constant C such that the law of \mathcal{D}' is $C\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ restricted to the event that the outermost loop around the marked bulk point touches the boundary.




Figure 4: Diagram for Lemma 4.13. **(i)** A sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma, \gamma)$ decorated by an independent pair $(\tilde{\eta}, \Gamma)$ and restricted to the event $\{\tilde{\eta} \text{ closes counterclockwise loop around } z\}$. The loop closure time is called σ , and the curve $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \sigma]}$ is shown in black and red. The SLE curve in U_0 is colored in blue; concatenating it with a segment of $\tilde{\eta}$ gives the loop of Γ surrounding z . **(ii)** Cutting by $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \sigma]}$ gives the surfaces $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{T}_1$ whose joint law is described in (4.2). **(iii)** The surfaces $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{T}_2$ from (4.3). **(iv)** Cutting by the blue curve gives $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{T}_3$ whose joint law is described in (4.4). **(v)** Concatenating \mathcal{D}_1 with \mathcal{D}_3 gives \mathcal{D}_4 , and shifting the first marked point of \mathcal{T}_3 counterclockwise by $(a+b)$ units of generalized boundary length gives \mathcal{T}_4 . The law of $\mathcal{D}_4, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{T}_4$ is described by (4.5). **(vi)** Definition of \widehat{M}_{ccw} via conformal welding of forested quantum surfaces. Only the pair of boundary arcs being welded are forested boundary arcs, so the resulting quantum surface is not forested.

Let Ann'_2 denote the space of quantum surfaces in Ann' with two additional marked points, one

on each boundary component.

Lemma 4.15. *There exists a measure M_{cw} on Ann'_2 such that if M_{cw}^f denotes the law of a sample from M_{cw} with $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting, and $M_{\text{cw}}^f(b)^\#$ denotes the law of a sample from M_{cw}^f conditioned on having inner generalized boundary length b , then the following holds:*

Let $b > 0$. Let (\tilde{D}, h, z, x) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma, \gamma)$, let D be the connected component of $\text{int}(\tilde{D})$ containing w , and independently sample $\tilde{\eta}$ and Γ in D as in Lemma 4.12. Condition on the event that $\tilde{\eta}$ closes a clockwise loop around z at time σ . Let τ be the first time that $\tilde{\eta}$ hits $\tilde{\eta}(\sigma)$, and condition on the loop $\tilde{\eta}|_{[\tau, \sigma]}$ having quantum length b . Then the conditional law of $(\tilde{D}, h, \Gamma, \tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \sigma]}, z, \tilde{\eta}(\sigma), w)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{Weld}(M_{\text{cw}}^f(b)^\#, \mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$.

As with Remark 4.5, Lemma 4.15 can be informally rephrased as follows. In the setup and conditioning of Lemma 4.15, cutting by $\tilde{\eta}|_{[\tau, \sigma]}$ gives a pair of conditionally independent decorated forested quantum surfaces $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ corresponding to the regions outside and inside η respectively; the conditional law of \mathcal{D} is $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, and we denote the conditional law of \mathcal{A} by $M_{\text{cw}}^f(b)^\#$. Furthermore, if we condition on $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$, the initial surface agrees in law with the uniform conformal welding of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} .

Proof. As explained in the second claim of [ASYZ24, Proposition 4.3] (with their parameter α set to γ), the curve $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \sigma]}$ cuts the forested quantum surface into a pair whose joint law is

$$\left(\int \text{QT}^f\left(\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}, \gamma^2 - 2; \ell + b, \ell\right) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; b) d\ell \right)^\#.$$

Here, $\text{QT}^f(W_1, W_2, W_3)$ is the law of the forested quantum triangle with weights W_1, W_2, W_3 , and $\text{QT}^f(W_1, W_2, W_3; \ell + b, \ell)$ is the law of the quantum triangle whose boundary arc between the vertices of weights W_1 and W_2 (resp. W_3) has generalized boundary length $\ell + b$ (resp. ℓ).

Thus, we can choose M_{cw}^f to be the law of a sample from $\int_0^\infty \text{QT}^f\left(\frac{3\gamma^2}{2} - 2, 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}, \gamma^2 - 2; \ell + a, \ell\right) d\ell da$ conformally welded to itself (and M_{cw} to be the law after forgetting the foresting). \square

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let (\tilde{D}, h, z, w) be an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$, let D be the connected component of $\text{int}(\tilde{D})$ containing z , and independently sample $\tilde{\eta}$ and Γ in D as in Lemma 4.12. We first prove the analogous statement in this setting. On the event that $\tilde{\eta}$ closes a counterclockwise loop at time σ , the desired independence holds by Lemma 4.13. If instead $\tilde{\eta}$ closes a clockwise loop at time σ , by Lemma 4.13, conditioned on the length of the loop ℓ , the decorated quantum surface is obtained by conformally welding samples $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) \sim M_{\text{cw}}^f(\ell)^\# \times (\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$. We may then decompose \mathcal{D} in exactly the same way by coupling radial $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ with its $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$, and checking if the first loop closed is clockwise or counterclockwise, iterating until a loop is closed in the counterclockwise direction. The conclusion is that if $n \geq 0$ clockwise loops are closed before the first counterclockwise loop, then conditioned on n , the generalized boundary length ℓ_0 of (\tilde{D}, h, z, w) , and on the lengths ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n of these clockwise loops, the conditional law of $(\tilde{D}, h, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ agrees with that of the conformal welding of a sample from

$$\int_0^\infty \cdots \int_0^\infty \left(\prod_{i=1}^n M_{\text{cw}}^f(\ell_{i-1}, \ell_i)^\# \times M_{\text{ccw}}^f(\ell_n, b)^\# \right) \prod_{i=0}^n d\ell_i db.$$

Here, $M_{\text{cw}}^f(\ell_{i-1}, \ell_i)^\#$ denotes the law of a sample from M_{cw}^f conditioned to have inner and outer generalized boundary lengths (ℓ_{i-1}, ℓ_i) , and similarly for $M_{\text{ccw}}^f(\ell_n, b)^\#$. We conclude that there

exists a measure $\widetilde{\text{GA}}^{\text{u.f.}}$ on $\text{Ann}_1 \cup \text{Ann}'_1$ such that, if $\widetilde{\text{GA}}^{\text{d}}(b)^\#$ denotes the law of a sample from $\widetilde{\text{GA}}^{\text{u.f.}}$ with $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ -decorated foresting conditioned on having inner generalized boundary length b , then the law of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ conditioned on the length of the loop surrounding the marked bulk point being b is $\text{Weld}(\widetilde{\text{GA}}^{\text{d}}(b)^\#, \text{GQD}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$.

Next, using Propositions 2.33 and 2.34, an analogous result holds when $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$ is replaced by $\text{GQD}_{1,1}$ (since we can concatenate an independent sample from $\text{GQD}_{0,2}$ to the marked boundary point of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_{1,1,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma)$). The desired claim then follows by forgetting the boundary point of $\text{GQD}_{1,1}$ and weighting by L^{-1} where L is the generalized boundary length. \square

5 Quantum annulus

In this section, we introduce the *quantum annulus* and its generalized variant, which will be crucial to our proof of Theorem 1.1. Throughout this section, we assume $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$.

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

Lemma 5.1. *For a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ with zero Lebesgue measure, $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[\mathfrak{l}_\eta \in E] = 0$.*

Proof. Let $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the quantum lengths of the outermost loops in a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$, ordered such that $\ell_1 > \ell_2 > \dots$. By the explicit law of $(\ell_i)_{i \geq 1}$ from Proposition 4.1, for each $i > 0$ we have $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa[\ell_i \in E] = 0$. Since $\{\mathfrak{l}_\eta \in E\} \subset \cup_i \{\ell_i \in E\}$, we conclude the proof. \square

Given Lemma 5.1, we can define the disintegration of $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ over \mathfrak{l}_η , which we denote by $\{\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(\ell) : \ell \in (0, \infty)\}$. We now define the quantum annulus.

Definition 5.2 (Quantum annulus). *Given (D, h, Γ, η, z) defined right above, let A_η be the non-simply-connected component of $D \setminus \eta$. For $a, b > 0$, let $\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b)$ be the law of the quantum surface $(A, h)/\sim_\gamma$ under the measure $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(b)$. Let $\text{QA}(a, b)$ be such that*

$$b|\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)|\text{QA}(a, b) = \widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b) \quad (5.1)$$

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

Remark 5.3 (No need to say “for almost every b ”). *Using the general theory of regular conditional probability, for each $a > 0$ the measure $\text{QA}(a, b)$ is only well defined for almost every $b > 0$. The ambiguity does not affect any application of this concept in this paper because we will take integrations over b ; see e.g., Proposition 5.4 below. On the other hand, one can give an equivalent definition of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ for all $a, b > 0$ in terms of the Liouville field on the annulus [ARS22, Theorem 1.4]² For these reasons, we omit the phrase “for almost every b ” in statements concerning $\text{QA}(a, b)$.*

Given a pair of independent samples from $\text{QA}(a, b)$ and $\text{QD}_{1,0}(b)$, we can uniformly conformally weld them along the boundary component with length b to get a loop-decorated quantum surface with one marked point. We write $\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b))$ for the law of the resulting decorated quantum surface. Then Proposition 4.2 can be reformulated as follows.

²[ARS22] builds on the present work but does not use the existence of a canonical definition of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ for all $b > 0$, so there is no circular dependence between the works.

Proposition 5.4. *For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$. Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ equals $\int_0^\infty b\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)) db$.*

Proof. From Proposition 4.2 and the definitions of $\widetilde{\text{QA}}$ and uniform welding, the law of $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ under $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa(b)$ is $\text{Weld}(\widetilde{\text{QA}}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)^\#)$. By (5.1), this measure equals

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

The reason we consider QA instead of $\widetilde{\text{QA}}$ in Definition 5.2 is that it is in some sense more canonical. In particular, its total measure has the following simple and symmetric form.

Proposition 5.5. *The total mass of $\text{QA}(a, b)$ is*

$$|\text{QA}(a, b)| = \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1))}{\pi\sqrt{ab}(a+b)}.$$

In fact, we will see that $\text{QA}(a, b) = \text{QA}(b, a)$ from the proof of Theorem 1.1, see Remark 6.10.

When defining the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ variant of the quantum annulus, which we denote by $\text{GA}(a, b)$, there are some subtleties if one follows the same fashion as in Definition 5.2, as we will explain in Section 5.3. We use an alternative treatment. Recalling that Proposition 4.4 already fixes the definition of the probability measure $\text{GA}(a, b)^\#$, we simply define $\text{GA}(a, b)$ by specifying its total mass. Then we obtain the counterpart of Definition 5.2 as a property of $\text{GA}(a, b)$.

The rest of the section is organized as follows, we first prove Proposition 5.5 in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. In Section 5.3, we treat $\text{GA}(a, b)$ in detail.

5.1 Reduction of Proposition 5.5 to the setting of Proposition 4.1

In this section, we reduce Proposition 5.5 to the setting of Proposition 4.1 to use the Levy process defined there. Recall that the setting where (D, h, Γ) is an embedding of a sample of $\text{QD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ for some $a > 0$. Sample a loop η from the counting measure on Γ , and let \mathbb{M}_a be the law of the decorated quantum surface (D, h, Γ, η) . In other words, consider $((D, h, \Gamma)/\sim_\gamma, \mathbf{n})$ sampled from the product measure $(\text{QD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa) \times \text{Count}_\mathbb{N}$ where $\text{Count}_\mathbb{N}$ is the counting measure on \mathbb{N} . Let $\eta \in \Gamma$ be the outermost loop with the \mathbf{n} th largest quantum length. Then \mathbb{M}_a is the law of $(D, h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$. The following proposition is the analog of Proposition 5.4 for \mathbb{M}_a .

Proposition 5.6. *Under \mathbb{M}_a , the law of $(D, h, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is*

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

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

$$(1_E \text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta)) \mu_h(d^2z) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma) = \mu_h|_{D_\eta}(d^2z) \text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta) \mathbb{F}(dh) \text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma), \quad (5.2)$$

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

If (h, Γ, η, z) is sampled according to the left hand side of (5.2), then the law of $(\mathbb{D}, h, \Gamma, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_\kappa$ and η is the outermost loop around z . Therefore we are in the setting of Proposition 5.4 hence the law of $(\mathbb{D}, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\int_0^\infty b\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)) db$.

If $(h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is sampled from $\text{Count}_{\Gamma^\circ}(d\eta)\mathbb{F}(dh)\text{CLE}_\kappa(d\Gamma)$, then the law of $(D, h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is $|\text{QD}(a)| \cdot \mathbb{M}_a$ by the definition of \mathbb{M}_a . If we then weight by $\mu_h(D_\eta)$ and sample a point z from $(\mu_h|_{D_\eta})^\#$, then the law of (h, Γ, η, z) is given by the right hand side of (5.2), so the law of $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\int_0^\infty b\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}_{1,0}(b)) db$. Unweighting by $\mu_h(D_\eta)$ and forgetting z , we see that the law of $(D, h, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ under $|\text{QD}(a)| \cdot \mathbb{M}_a$ is $\int_0^\infty b\text{Weld}(\text{QA}(a, b), \text{QD}(b)) db$. Dividing by $|\text{QD}(a)|$, we conclude the proof. \square

Proposition 5.5 immediately follows from its counterpart under \mathbb{M}_a .

Proposition 5.7. *The law of the quantum length of η under \mathbb{M}_a is*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C} \mathbf{1}_{b>0} b |\text{QD}(b)| db}{\sqrt{ab(a+b)} |\text{QD}(a)|} \quad \text{for constant } \mathfrak{C} = \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1))}{\pi}. \quad (5.3)$$

We now explain how Proposition 5.7 yields Proposition 5.5 and then prove it in Section 5.2

Proof of Proposition 5.5 assuming Proposition 5.7. By Proposition 5.6, the law of $\ell_h(\eta)$ under \mathbb{M}_a is $\frac{1}{|\text{QD}(a)|} b |\text{QA}(a, b)| |\text{QD}(b)| db$. Comparing this to Proposition 5.7 yields $|\text{QA}(a, b)| = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{\sqrt{ab(a+b)}}.$ \square

5.2 Distribution of the loop length: proof of Proposition 5.7

We first reduce Proposition 5.7 to a problem on the Levy process in Proposition 4.1. Let

$$\beta = \frac{4}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{4}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.4)$$

Let \mathbb{P}^β be the probability measure on càdlàg processes on $[0, \infty)$ describing the law of a β -stable Lévy process with Lévy measure $1_{x>0} x^{-\beta-1} dx$. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a sample from \mathbb{P}^β . Let $J := \{(x, t) : t \geq 0 \text{ and } \zeta_t - \zeta_{t-} = x > 0\}$ be the set of jumps of ζ . Given J , let $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) \in J$ be sampled from the counting measure on J . Namely (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is chosen uniformly randomly from J similarly as η from the outermost loops of Γ . Let M^β be the law of $(\zeta, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t})$, which is an infinite measure. For each $a > 0$, let $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$ and $J_a = \{(x, t) \in J : t \leq \tau_{-a}\}$. Let M_a^β be the restriction of the measure M^β to the event $\{\mathbf{t} \leq \tau_{-a}\}$. Let $\widetilde{M}_a^\beta = \frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M_a^\beta$, where \mathbb{E}^β is the expectation with respect to \mathbb{P}^β . Then by Proposition 4.1 we have the following.

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose (D, h, Γ, η) and \mathbb{M}_a are as in Proposition 5.6. Let $\ell_1 > \ell_2 > \dots$ be the quantum lengths of the outermost loops in Γ and $\ell_h(\eta)$ be the quantum length of the distinguished loop η . Then the joint law of $\{\ell_i : i \geq 1\}$ and $\ell_h(\eta)$ under \mathbb{M}_a equals the joint law of $\{x : (x, t) \in J\}$ and \mathbf{b} under the measure \widetilde{M}_a^β defined right above.*

Proof. Under the measure \widetilde{M}_a^β , the jump (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is chosen uniformly from J_a . Now Lemma 5.8 follows from Proposition 4.1 and the fact that η is chosen uniformly among all outermost loops of Γ . \square

Given Lemma 5.8, Proposition 5.7 immediately follows from the proposition below.

Proposition 5.9. *The law of \mathbf{b} under \widetilde{M}_a^β is*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C} \mathbf{1}_{b>0}}{(a+b)} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{\beta+1} db \quad \text{for constant } \mathfrak{C} = \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1))}{\pi} \quad (5.5)$$

Proof of Proposition 5.7 given Proposition 5.9. By Proposition 2.16, we have

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

By Lemma 5.8 and Proposition 5.9, the \mathbb{M}_a -law of the quantum length of η is

$$\frac{\mathfrak{C}}{(a+b)} \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{\beta+1} db = \frac{\mathfrak{C} b |\text{QD}(b)| db}{\sqrt{ab}(a+b)|\text{QD}(a)|} \quad \text{with } \mathfrak{C} \text{ in (5.5).} \quad \square$$




Figure 5: Illustration of Lemma 5.10 and 5.11. The measure M^β is \mathbb{P}^β with a uniformly chosen jump (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) . Conditioned on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) , removing (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and concatenating the two pieces of (ζ_t) before and after \mathbf{t} gives a sample $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of \mathbb{P}^β . The event $\{\mathbf{t} < \tau_{-a}\}$ for ζ becomes $\{\mathbf{t} < \tilde{\tau}_{-a}\}$ for $\tilde{\zeta}$.

We now prove Proposition 5.9. We first use Palm's Theorem for Poisson point process to give an alternative description of the measure M^β . See Figure 5 for an illustration.

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\tilde{\zeta}_t = \zeta_t - \mathbf{1}_{t \geq \mathbf{t}} \mathbf{b}$. Then the M^β -law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is $\mathbf{1}_{b>0, t>0} b^{-\beta-1} db dt$. Conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) , the conditional law of $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ under M^β is \mathbb{P}^β . Equivalently, the joint law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the product measure $(\mathbf{1}_{b>0, t>0} b^{-\beta-1} db dt) \times \mathbb{P}^\beta$.*

Proof. By the definition of Levy measure, the jump set J of ζ is a Poisson point process on $(0, \infty)^2$ with intensity measure $\mathbf{1}_{x>0, t>0} x^{-\beta-1} dx dt$. Since (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is chosen from the counting measure on J , by Palm's theorem (see e.g. [Kal17, Page 5]), the M^β -law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is the same as the intensity measure of J , which is $\mathbf{1}_{b>0, t>0} b^{-\beta-1} db dt$. Moreover, conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) , the conditional law of $J \setminus \{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t})\}$ is given by the original Poisson point process, which is the \mathbb{P}^β -law of J . Note that $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}} = (\zeta_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$ is measurable with respect to the jump set $\{(x, t) \in J : t < \mathbf{t}\}$. Therefore, the conditional law of $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$ conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) is the \mathbb{P}^β -law of $(\zeta_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$. Similarly, conditioning on (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$, the conditional law of $(\tilde{\zeta}_{t+\mathbf{t}} - \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathbf{t}})_{t \geq 0}$ under M^β is \mathbb{P}^β . Concatenating $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{0 \leq t < \mathbf{t}}$ and $(\tilde{\zeta}_{t+\mathbf{t}} - \tilde{\zeta}_{\mathbf{t}})_{t \geq 0}$ we see that the conditional law of $\tilde{\zeta}_t$ under M^β is \mathbb{P}^β . \square

Proposition 5.9 is an immediate consequence of the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.11. *Recall the expectation \mathbb{E}^β for \mathbb{P}^β . The law of \mathbf{b} under \widetilde{M}_a^β in Proposition 5.9 is*

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

Proof. We start from $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) under M^β . Let $\tilde{\zeta}_t = \zeta_t - 1_{t \geq \mathbf{t}} \mathbf{b}$ as in Lemma 5.10. Let $\tilde{\tau}_{-\ell} = \inf\{t : \tilde{\zeta}_t = -\ell\}$ for each $\ell > 0$. Then $\tau_{-a} = \tilde{\tau}_{-a+\mathbf{b}}$. Moreover, both the events $\{\mathbf{t} \leq \tau_{-a}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{t} < \tilde{\tau}_{-a}\}$ are the same as $\inf\{\zeta_t : t \in (0, \mathbf{t})\} > -a$, hence are equal. Now the measure \widetilde{M}_a^β can be described as

$$\frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M_a^\beta = \frac{\tau_{-a}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{t} < \tau_{-a}}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M^\beta = \frac{\tilde{\tau}_{-a-\mathbf{b}}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{t} < \tilde{\tau}_{-a}}}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} M^\beta. \quad (5.6)$$

Integrating out \mathbf{t} and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the right side of (5.6) and using the joint law of (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}) and $(\tilde{\zeta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ from Lemma 5.10, we see that the \widetilde{M}_a^β -law of \mathbf{b} is $\frac{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-a-b}]}{\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}]} b^{-\beta-1} \mathbf{1}_{b > 0} db$ as desired. \square

Lemma 5.12. *Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be sampled from \mathbb{P}^β and $\tau_{-a} = \inf\{t : \zeta_t = -a\}$ for each $a > 0$. Then*

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

Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-1}^{-1}] = \frac{\pi}{\sin(-\pi\beta)}$.

Proof. The process $(\tau_{-s})_{s \geq 0}$ is a stable subordinator of index $1/\beta$. Since (τ_{-a}, τ_{-2a}) has the distribution as $(\tau_{-2a} - \tau_{-a}, \tau_{-2a})$, we have $\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-2a}] = \frac{1}{2}$. Similary, we have $\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}/\tau_{-b}] = \frac{a}{a+b}$ if $\frac{a}{b}$ is rational. By continuity we can extend this to all $a, b > 0$. For the second equality, let $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the Levy process with Levy measure $\Pi(dx) = \Gamma(-\beta)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{x > 0} x^{-\beta-1} dx$ so that $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda Y_t}] = e^{t\lambda^\beta}$. Let $\sigma_{-s} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t = -s\}$ for $s > 0$. Then $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \sigma_{-s}}] = e^{s\lambda^{1/\beta}}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_{-1}^{-1}] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \sigma_{-1}}] d\lambda = \Gamma(1 + \beta)$. By scaling, we have $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{-1}^{-1}] = \Gamma(-\beta) \mathbb{E}[\sigma_{-1}^{-1}] = \Gamma(-\beta) \Gamma(1 + \beta) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(-\pi\beta)}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.9. With respect to \mathbb{P}^β , we have $\tau_{-a} \stackrel{d}{=} a^\beta \tau_{-1}$ by the scaling property of β -stable Lévy processes. Therefore $\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-a}^{-1}] = \mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-1}^{-1}] a^{-\beta}$. Combined with Lemmas 5.11 and 5.12 we get (5.5) with $\mathfrak{C} = 1/\mathbb{E}^\beta[\tau_{-1}^{-1}] = \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-1))}{\pi}$. \square

5.3 Generalized quantum annulus

In this section, we introduce the *generalized quantum annulus*. It is a quantum surface with annulus topology³. We assume $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\kappa'}} \in (\sqrt{2}, 2)$ in this subsection.

Let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ where D is a bounded domain. Recall that a loop *surrounds* a point if they are disjoint and the loop has nonzero winding number with respect to the point, and a loop $\eta \in \Gamma$ is *outermost* if no point in η is surrounded by a loop in Γ . Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z and \mathfrak{l}_η be the generalized quantum length of η . To ensure the existence of disintegration of $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ over \mathfrak{l}_η , we need similar argument as Lemma 5.1. This is directly from Proposition 4.3, which describes the joint law of generalized quantum length as the jump size of Lévy process. So the disintegration of $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ over \mathfrak{l}_η exists, which we denoted by $\{\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}(\ell); \ell \in (0, \infty)\}$.

We first try to define the generalized quantum annulus $\text{GA}(a, b)$ following the same approach as $\text{QA}(a, b)$ in Definition 5.2, then explain that this “definition” requires more care to be correct.

“Definition” 5.13. *Given $a > 0$ and (D, h, Γ, z) defined right above, let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Let D_η be the region surrounded by η and $A_\eta = D \setminus D_\eta$. For $b > 0$, let $\widetilde{\text{GA}}(a, b)$ be the law of the quantum surface parametrized by A_η under the measure $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}(b)$. Let $\text{GA}(a, b)$ be such that*

$$b|\text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)|\text{GA}(a, b) = \widetilde{\text{GA}}(a, b) \quad (5.7)$$

³We allow the random annulus to possibly have pinch points.

Under this “definition” one can obtain the analog of Proposition 5.4 via exactly the same method in Sections 5.1 and 5.2:

$$|\text{GA}(a, b)| = \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1))}{\pi\sqrt{ab}(a+b)}. \quad (5.8)$$

The reason we will not actually use “Definition” 5.13 is that the quantum surface $(A_\eta, h)/\sim_\gamma$ has too many self-intersection points. Indeed, in the conformal welding of a generalized quantum annulus and a generalized quantum disk (Proposition 5.15 below), each double point of the interface η will correspond to a local cut point of exactly one of the generalized quantum surfaces. “Definition” 5.13 can be fixed by removing the self-intersection points of $(A_\eta, h)/\sim_\gamma$ which correspond to local cut points of the generalized quantum surface surrounded by η . This could be done similarly as in [MSW21]. However, we instead give an alternative treatment which is simpler to present and follow. What is important for us is that (5.8) and Proposition 5.15 (the analog of Proposition 5.4) both hold for this definition.

Definition 5.14 (Generalized quantum annulus). *For $a, b > 0$, define*

$$\text{GA}(a, b) := \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1))}{\pi\sqrt{ab}(a+b)} \text{GA}(a, b)^\#$$

where $\text{GA}(a, b)^\#$ is the probability measure from Proposition 4.4. We call a sample from $\text{GA}(a, b)$ a generalized quantum annulus.

Proposition 5.15. *For $a > 0$, let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$. Let η be the outermost loop of Γ surrounding z . Then the law of the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ equals $\int_0^\infty b \text{Weld}(\text{GA}(a, b), \text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)) db$, as well as the law of the decorated quantum surface $(D, h, \Gamma, \eta, z)/\sim_\gamma$ equals $\int_0^\infty b \text{Weld}(\text{GA}^d(a, b), \text{GQD}_{1,0}(b) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}) db$.*

Proof. We only prove the second claim since the first claim will then follow by just forgetting the loop configuration. By Proposition 4.4, conditioned on the length of η being b , the conditional law of $(D, h, \eta, \Gamma, z)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{Weld}(\text{GA}^d(a, b)^\#, \text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$. It thus suffices to show that the law of the length of η is $b \frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1))}{\pi\sqrt{ab}(a+b)} |\text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)| db$. Exactly as in Section 5.1, this reduces to showing that for a sample from $\text{GQD}(a)^\# \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ and an outermost loop chosen from counting measure, the law of the loop length is $\frac{\cos(\pi(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1))}{\pi\sqrt{ab}(a+b)} \frac{b|\text{GQD}(b)|}{|\text{GQD}(a)|} db$ (the analog of Proposition 5.7), and by Lemma 2.28 this latter measure can be written as $\frac{\cos(\pi(\beta' - \frac{3}{2}))}{\pi(a+b)} (\frac{a}{b})^{\beta'+1} db$ where $\beta' = \frac{4}{\kappa'} + \frac{1}{2}$.

Thus, by Proposition 4.3, it suffices to prove Proposition 5.9 when the Lévy measure is $1_{x>0}x^{-\beta'-1} dx$ with $\beta' = \frac{4}{\kappa'} + \frac{1}{2} \in (1, \frac{3}{2})$ rather than $1_{x>0}x^{-\beta-1} dx$ with $\beta = \frac{4}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$. The proof of Proposition 5.9 directly carries over to the parameter range $(1, \frac{3}{2})$ so we are done. \square

Finally, we give a corrected version of “Definition” 5.13, where instead of attempting to define the forested boundary by removing the extra self-intersection points of $(A_\eta, h)/\sim_\gamma$, we simply forget and resample the forested boundary using the notion of a forested line segment (Definition 2.25). We will not use this description in the present work.

Proposition 5.16. *Let (D, h, Γ, z) be an embedding of a sample from $\text{GQD}_{1,0} \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ and let $\eta \in \Gamma$ be the outermost loop around z . Let η^{out} be the boundary of the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta$, and let $D(\eta^{\text{out}})$ be the bounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta^{\text{out}}$. Choose $p \in \eta^{\text{out}}$ such that $(D \setminus D(\eta^{\text{out}}), \Gamma, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$ is measurable with respect to $(D \setminus D(\eta^{\text{out}}), \Gamma, z)/\sim_\gamma$. Conditioned on $(D \setminus D(\eta^{\text{out}}), \Gamma, z, p)/\sim_\gamma$, sample a forested line segment \mathcal{L} conditioned on having quantum length*

(resp. generalized boundary length) equal to that of η^{out} (resp. η), and in each connected component of \mathcal{L} sample an independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$. Glue \mathcal{L} to the boundary loop η^{out} of $(D \setminus D(\eta^{\text{out}}), \Gamma, z, p) / \sim_{\gamma}$, identifying the endpoints of \mathcal{L} with p . Let $\widehat{\text{GA}}^{\text{d}}$ be the law of the resulting generalized quantum surface, and let $\widehat{\text{GA}}^{\text{d}}(a, b)$ be the disintegration of $\widehat{\text{GA}}^{\text{d}}$ according to the outer and inner generalized boundary lengths. Then $\text{GA}^{\text{d}}(a, b) = (\text{bGQD}_{1,0}(b))^{-1} \widehat{\text{GA}}^{\text{d}}(a, b)$.

Proof. This is immediate from Proposition 5.15 and the fact that for a forested quantum surface (such as a sample from GA^{d}), conditioned on the unforested quantum surface, the foresting is described by a forested line segment with specified quantum length. \square

6 Equivalence of two definitions of the SLE loop

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1, namely for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$, $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ for some $C \in (0, \infty)$, where $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ is Zhan's loop measure (Definition 3.1), and $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ is the loop measure obtained from choosing a loop in a full-plane $\text{CLE}_{\kappa}^{\mathbb{C}}$ from the counting measure. For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, this was already implicitly shown in [KW16]; see [AS21, Theorem 2.18] for details. Combining Theorem 1.1 with the conformal welding results for the SLE loop (Theorems 3.2 and 3.3) gives conformal welding results for CLE which we state in Section 6.7; these will be used in our subsequent work [ACSW24].

Recall from Section 1.3 the probability measures \mathcal{L}_{κ} and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}$ that describe the shapes of $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ and $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$, respectively. Namely, given a loop η on \mathbb{C} surrounding 0, we have $R_{\eta} = \inf\{|z| : z \in \eta\}$ and $\hat{\eta} = \{z : R_{\eta} z \in \eta\}$. Suppose η is a sample from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0. Then the law of $(\hat{\eta}, \log R_{\eta})$ is a constant multiple of the product measure $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa} \times dt$, where dt is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . The same holds for $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}$ when $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 8)$. By definition, Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa} = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}$.

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

Definition 6.1. Fix $\kappa \in (0, 8)$. Let η be a sample from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0, hence $\psi^{-1}(\eta)$ is a loop on \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$. Let $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ be the law of $\psi^{-1}(\eta)$. We also write $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}) := (\psi^{-1})_{*} \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}) := (\psi^{-1})_{*} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}$.

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

Lemma 6.2. Let η be a sample from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then η can be uniquely written as $\eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$ where $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. The law of (η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $C \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}) \times dt$ for a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$, where dt is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} .

Proof. If η is a sample from $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to the event that η surrounds 0, the law of $(\hat{\eta}, \log R_{\eta})$ is a constant multiple of $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa} \times dt$. Therefore Lemma 6.2 follows from mapping \mathbb{C} to \mathcal{C} . \square

6.1 The case $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$

In this section, we first treat the $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and deal with $\kappa = 4$ case via a limiting argument. We prove the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ case later in Section 6.5.

Proposition 6.3. *For each $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$, there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$.*

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

Recall that the total variational distance between two measures μ and ν on a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) is $d_{\text{tv}}(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|$.

Lemma 6.4. *Fix $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and let $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the Markov chain starting from η^0 . Then the law of η^n tends to $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ in total variational distance. In particular, $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the unique stationary probability measure of the Markov chain.*

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

The start point of our proof of $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the following conformal welding result for $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Fix $a > 0$. A pair of quantum surfaces sampled from $\text{QD}_{1,0}(a) \times \text{QD}_{1,0}(a)$ can be uniformly conformally welded to get a loop-decorated quantum surface with two marked points (corresponding to the interior marked points of each surface). We write $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(a))$ for the law of this loop-decorated quantum surface with two marked points.

Proposition 6.5. *Fix $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$. Let \mathbb{F} be the law of h as in Definition 2.6, so that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is the two-pointed quantum sphere QS_2 . Now sample (h, η) from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ and write $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ as the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, \eta, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$. Then*

$$\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}} = C \int_0^\infty a \cdot \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(a)) da \quad \text{for some } C > 0. \quad (6.1)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 5.6. Let \mathbb{F}_0 be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is the unmarked quantum sphere QS if h is a sample from \mathbb{F}_0 . Let (h, η, z, w) be sampled from $\mu_h(d^2z) \mu_h(d^2w) \mathbb{F}_0(dh) \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}(d\eta)$. Let E_{sep} be the event that η separates z, w . Then the law of (h, η, z, w) restricted to E_{sep} can be obtained in two ways:

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

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

Recall Theorem 3.2 and the definitions of QS_2 and $\text{QD}_{1,0}$ from Section 2.2. The law of $(h, \eta, z, w)/\sim_\gamma$ restricted to E_{sep} , from the first sampling, equals $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$. From the second sampling, the same law equals $C \int_0^\infty a \cdot \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}(a), \text{QD}_{1,0}(a)) da$ for some $C \in (0, \infty)$. \square

In the rest of this section we consider the setting where Lemma 6.2 and Proposition 6.5 apply. For $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$, let (h, η) be a sample from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then η can be uniquely written as $\eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$ where $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 6.2, the law of (η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $C\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) \times dt$. Conditioning on (h, η) , sample a $\text{CLE}_\kappa \Gamma^+$ in \mathcal{C}_η^+ , where \mathcal{C}_η^+ is the component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $+\infty$. Let $(\eta_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the set of loops in Γ^+ separating $\pm\infty$ ordered from left to right. We write $\eta_i = \eta^i + t_i$ where $\eta^i \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$. See Figure 6 for an illustration.




Figure 6: **Left:** Illustration of η_i and t_i . **Right:** Illustration of η^i .

To prove $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, consider the decorated quantum surface $S_0 = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ and $S_i = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta_i, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ for $i \geq 1$. If $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ holds, then the stationarity of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ gives the stationarity of $(S_i)_{i \geq 0}$. Although we cannot show this directly before proving $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, we will prove using Proposition 5.4 that the law of the subsurface of S_i on the right side of η_i indeed does not depend on i . This is the content of Section 6.2. In Section 6.3 we use Lemma 6.4 to show that as $i \rightarrow \infty$ the law of S_i converges to $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ in a suitable sense, where $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ is defined as $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ in Proposition 6.5 with $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ in place of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$. This convergence would be immediate in the total variational sense if the law of S_i were a probability measure instead of being *infinite*. To handle this subtlety we will prove some intermediate results that will also be useful in Section 7.

Once the two steps in the previous paragraph are achieved, we will have that the right subsurface of $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ has the same law as that of $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$. Then by left/right symmetry we can conclude that $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}} = \text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$, hence $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. We carry out these final steps and complete the proof of Theorem 6.3 in Section 6.3. In Section 6.4 we supply a technical ingredient in the proof coming from the fact that $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ is an infinite measure.

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

Consider (h, η) and $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 0}$ as defined in and below Proposition 6.5. Let $S_0 = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ and $S_i = (\mathcal{C}, h, \eta_i, \pm\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ for $i \geq 1$ as discussed right above Section 6.2. For $i \geq 0$, let $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ be the quantum length of η_i .

Lemma 6.6. *The law of $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ is the same as that of $\ell_h(\eta)$ in Proposition 6.5 for all $i \geq 0$.*

Proof. By definition the law of $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ is the same as that of $\ell_h(\eta)$ in Proposition 6.5. It remains to show that the law of $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ does not depend on $i \geq 0$. By Propositions 5.4 and 6.5, the joint law of $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1)$ is given by

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

Since $|\text{QA}(a, b)| = |\text{QA}(b, a)|$ by Proposition 5.5, the laws of $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1)$ are the same. By Proposition 5.4, and the fact that Γ^+ restricted to $\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^+$ is still a CLE_κ , the conditional law of $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ given $\ell_h(\eta_{i-1})$ does not depend on i . Since $\ell_h(\eta_0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1)$ have the same law, so do $\ell_h(\eta_i)$ and $\ell_h(\eta_{i+1})$ for all $i \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 6.7. For $i \geq 0$, conditioning on (h, η_i) , let z_i be a point on η_i sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length measure. Let $S_i^+ = (\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^+, h, +\infty, z_i)/\sim_\gamma$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^-$ be the component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta_i$ containing $-\infty$ and $S_i^- = (\mathcal{C}_{\eta_i}^-, h, -\infty, z_i)/\sim_\gamma$. Then the conditional law of S_i^+ given S_i^- is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta_i))^\#$ for all $i \geq 0$.

Proof. When $i = 0$, this follows from Theorem 3.2. The $i \geq 1$ case follows iteratively using Proposition 5.4. \square

From Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7, we see that the law of S_i^+ is a quantum disk whose law does not depend on i . Moreover, conditional on $\ell_h(\eta_i)$, S_i^+ and S_i^- are conditionally independent and S is obtained from the conformal welding of S_i^+ and S_i^- .

6.3 Convergence of S_i and the proof of Theorem 6.3

We retain the setting in Section 6.2. For $z \in \mathcal{C}$, let $\phi^0(z) = h(z + \mathbf{t})$ and $\phi^i(z) = h(z + t_i)$ for $i \geq 1$. By definition, $(\mathcal{C}, \phi^i, \eta^i)/\sim_\gamma$ is an embedding of the decorated quantum surface S_i for $i \geq 0$. By Theorem 2.11, we immediately have the following description of the law of (ϕ^i, η^i) .

Lemma 6.8. Recall the Markov chain in Lemma 6.4 and the Liouville field $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ from Definition 2.10. Let $P_0 = \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. For $i \geq 1$, let P_i be the distribution of the i -th step of this Markov chain on $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ with the initial distribution P_0 . Then the law of (ϕ^i, η^i) is $\text{CLF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)} \times P_i$ for all $i \geq 0$, where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is a constant that does not depend on i .

Proof. By definition, the law of (h, η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $\mathbb{F} \times P_0 \times [C dt]$, where \mathbb{F} is the law of h in Definition 2.6. By the definition of P_i and the translation invariance of $[C dt]$, the law of (h, η^i, t_i) is $\mathbb{F} \times P_i \times [C dt]$. Finally, Theorem 2.11 yields the result. \square

From now on we write the measure $\text{CLF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ in Lemma 6.8 as $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ for simplicity so that the law of (ϕ^i, η^i) is $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i$.

From Lemma 6.4 we know that $d_{\text{tv}}(P_i, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})) \rightarrow 0$. We would like to say that $d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa) \rightarrow 0$ as well, but since $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is an infinite measure we need a truncation. Recall that the quantum length $\ell_h(\eta)$ is a measurable function of (ϕ^0, η^0) [She16]. We write this as $\ell_h(\eta) = \ell(\phi^0, \eta^0)$. Then $\ell_h(\eta_i) = \ell(\phi^i, \eta^i)$ a.s. for each $i \geq 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the event $E_\varepsilon = \{\ell(\phi, \eta) > \varepsilon\}$. Then by Lemma 6.6 we have

$$\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i(E_\varepsilon) = \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_0(E_\varepsilon) \quad \text{for each } i \geq 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (6.2)$$

We claim that the total variational convergence holds after restriction to E_ε .

Lemma 6.9. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i|_{E_\varepsilon}, \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})|_{E_\varepsilon}) = 0$.

The proof of Lemma 6.9 is not hard but technical so we postpone it to Section 6.4. We proceed to finish the proof of Theorem 6.3.

Proof of Theorem 6.3 given Lemma 6.9. Let $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ be a sample from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. Conditioning on $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$, let $z \in \tilde{\eta}$ be sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length measure of $\tilde{\eta}$. Recall the decorated quantum surfaces S_i^+ and S_i^- from Lemma 6.7. We similarly define $\tilde{S}^+ = (\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^+, \phi, +\infty, z)/\sim_\gamma$ and $\tilde{S}^- = (\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^-, \phi, -\infty, z)/\sim_\gamma$, where $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^+$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\eta}}^-$) is the component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \tilde{\eta}$ to the right (resp., left) of $\tilde{\eta}$. By Lemma 6.9, restricted to the event E_ε , the law of (S_i^+, S_i^-) converge in total variational distance to that of $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$. Since ε can be arbitrary, by Lemmas 6.6 and 6.7 and Equation (6.2), the joint law of $\ell(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ and \tilde{S}^+ under $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the same as that

of $\ell(\phi, \eta)$ and S_0^+ in Lemma 6.7. Moreover, conditioning on $\ell(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$, the decorated quantum surfaces \tilde{S}^+ and \tilde{S}^- are conditionally independent.

Now we use the additional observation that both $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ are invariant under the mapping $z \mapsto -z$ from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C} (in the case of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}$ we also translate the reflected loop so it lies in $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$). Therefore $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$ must agree in law with $(\tilde{S}^-, \tilde{S}^+)$. Hence $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$ agrees in law with (S_0^+, S_0^-) in Lemma 6.7. Namely, if we uniformly conformal weld \tilde{S}^+ and \tilde{S}^- , the resulting decorated quantum surface is $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}}$ from Proposition 6.5.

The conditional law of $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ given $(\tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^-)$ is obtained by conformally welding \tilde{S}^+, \tilde{S}^- then embedding the decorated quantum surface in $(\mathcal{C}, -\infty, +\infty)$ in a rotationally invariant way around the axis of the cylinder. The same holds for (ϕ^0, η^0) and (S_0^+, S_0^-) . Consequently $(\phi, \tilde{\eta})$ and (ϕ^0, η^0) agree in distribution, i.e. $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ where $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C})$ is the law of (ϕ^0, η^0) by Lemma 6.8. Therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa} = \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}$ as desired, hence $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ for some constant C . This proves Theorem 6.3 for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$. For $\kappa = 4$, we can take the $\kappa \uparrow 4$ limit as explained in Lemmas A.5 and A.6 to get $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4 = \mathcal{L}_4$ and conclude the proof. \square

Remark 6.10 (Symmetry of the quantum annulus). *As a byproduct of our proof, we can upgrade Proposition 5.5 to $\text{QA}(a, b) = \text{QA}(b, a)$. Indeed, let A_{η_0, η_1} be the annulus bounded by η_0 and η_1 . Then the probability measure $\text{QA}(a, b)^{\#}$ is the conditional law of the quantum surface $(A_{\eta_0, \eta_1}, h) / \sim_{\gamma}$ given $\ell_h(\eta_0) = a$ and $\ell_h(\eta_1) = b$. Given Theorem 6.3, we see that the law of (h, η_0, η_1) is invariant under the mapping $z \mapsto -z$ of the cylinder. Therefore $\text{QA}(a, b)^{\#} = \text{QA}(b, a)^{\#}$ hence $\text{QA}(a, b) = \text{QA}(b, a)$.*

6.4 Convergence in total variation: proof of Lemma 6.9

We first make a simple observation.

Lemma 6.11. *For $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}))[E_{\varepsilon}] \leq (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}))[E_{\varepsilon}] < \infty$.*

Proof. We consider a coupling $\{\eta^i : i \geq 0\}$ of $(P_i)_{i \geq 0}$ such that for each $i \geq 1$, $\mathbb{P}[\eta^i \neq \eta^0]$ achieves the minimum among all couplings of P_i and P_0 . Then in this coupling we can find a subsequence i_k such that $\mathbb{P}[\eta^{i_k} \neq \eta^0] \leq 1/k^2$ hence by Borel-Cantelli lemma $\eta^{i_k} = \eta^0$ a.s. for large enough k . Now we take the product measure of $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and this coupling. Then by Fatou's lemma we have $(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}))[E_{\varepsilon}] \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_{i_k})[E_{\varepsilon}]$. On the other hand, by Lemma 6.6, $(\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_i)[E_{\varepsilon}] = (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times P_0)[E_{\varepsilon}] = (\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{C}))[E_{\varepsilon}]$ for all $i \geq 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

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

Lemma 6.12. *Suppose $\eta \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and ϕ is such that the law of $(\mathcal{C}_{\eta}^+, \phi, +\infty) / \sim_{\gamma}$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^{\#}$ for some $\ell > 0$. Suppose g is a deterministic smooth function on \mathcal{C} supported on $\{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z \in [C_0, C_0 + 1]\}$ such that $\int g(z) d^2 z = 1$. Then*

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

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

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

$$\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow \infty \quad (6.3)$$

where the convergence rate only depends on g .

To prove (6.3), let $f : \mathcal{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\eta^+$ be a conformal map such that $f(+\infty) = +\infty$ and set $\phi_0 = \phi \circ f + Q \log |f'|$. Then $(\mathcal{C}_+, \phi_0, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma = (\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$, hence its law is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(1)^\#$. Let S be the collection of smooth functions ξ that are supported on $\{\text{Re } z \in [\frac{2}{3}C_0, \frac{4}{3}C_0 + 1]\} \subset \mathcal{C}_+$ and satisfy $\|\xi\|_\infty \leq 4\|g\|_\infty$ and $\|\nabla \xi\|_\infty \leq 8(\|g\|_\infty + \|\nabla g\|_\infty)$. By the definitions of C_0 and f , we see that $|f'|^2 g \circ f \in S$. Let $Y = \sup_{\xi \in S} |(\phi_0, \xi)|$. Since ϕ_0 is almost surely in the local Sobolev space of index -1 , we have $Y < \infty$ a.s. Note that $\|f'(z)1_{\text{Re } z \in [C_0, C_0+1]}\|_\infty \leq 2$ so

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

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

Proof of Lemma 6.9. Let g be a smooth function on \mathcal{C} as in Lemma 6.12. For $K > 0$, define

$$S_K = E_\varepsilon \cap \{(\phi, \eta) \in H^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) \times \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C}) : (\phi, g) \in (-K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell(\phi, \eta), K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \ell(\phi, \eta))\}. \quad (6.4)$$

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

$$d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_i|_{S_K}, \text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa|_{S_K}) + (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] + (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K]. \quad (6.5)$$

Since $(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa)[E_\varepsilon] < \infty$ by Lemma 6.11 and $\cap_{K>\infty}(E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K) = \emptyset$, we see that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] = 0. \quad (6.6)$$

On the other hand, conditioning on the boundary length being ℓ , the conditional law of $(\mathcal{C}_{\eta^i}^+, \phi^i, \infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$. Since $\eta^i \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$, by Lemma 6.12, we have

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

where $o_K(1)$ is a function converging to 0 as $K \rightarrow 0$ uniform in $i \geq 0$. Since $(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon]$ does not depend on i by (6.2), we have

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \geq 0} (\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_i)[E_\varepsilon \setminus S_K] = 0. \quad (6.7)$$

It remains to handle the first term in (6.5). Let $F_K = \{\phi \in H^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) : (\phi, g) > -K + \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \varepsilon\}$. Then $S_K \subset F_{\varepsilon, K} \times \text{Loop}_0$. We claim that $\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}[F_{\varepsilon, K}] < \infty$. Assuming this, since $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(P_i, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa) = 0$, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}|_{F_{\varepsilon, K}} \times P_i, \text{LF}_\mathcal{C}|_{F_{\varepsilon, K}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa) = 0$ hence $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times P_i|_{S_K}, \text{LF}_\mathcal{C} \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa|_{S_K}) = 0$. Thus the quantity (6.5) tends to 0 as $i \rightarrow \infty$ then $K \rightarrow \infty$, as desired.

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

6.5 The $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ case

In this section, we prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 6.13. *For each $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$, there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}} = C \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$.*

The proof here follows the framework of previous sections line by line, where the equivalence of SLE_{κ} loop measure for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ is proved. Therefore, we just list the main steps for the case $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and briefly mention the differences with the arguments in the proof of Proposition 6.3.

Similar to the simple case, we let $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ be the set of non-crossing loops on the cylinder \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ with $\max\{\text{Re } z : z \in \eta\} = 0$. Define $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})$ to be the shape measure of Zhan's $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ loop measure $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$ (see Definition 3.1), and define $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})$ to be the shape measure of $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$ (the counting measures of the full-plane $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$). Finally, we say a loop η in \mathcal{C} *surrounds* $+\infty$ if the loop $\exp(-\eta)$ in \mathbb{C} surrounds 0 (has nonzero winding number around 0).

Let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta^0$ that contains $+\infty$. As the simple case, if one samples $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ configuration on $\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$, and translates its outermost loop surrounding $+\infty$ to be an element $\eta^1 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$, then we define a Markov transition kernel $\eta^0 \rightarrow \eta^1$ on $\text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$. The following lemma gives the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ counterpart of Lemma 6.4 (also extends the result of Proposition 4 in [KW16] to the nonsimple case).

Lemma 6.14. *Let $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the Markov chain starting from η^0 . Then η^n converges in the total variation distance to $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})$. Moreover, $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})$ is the unique stationary measure of the Markov chain.*

Lemma 6.15. *Suppose $0 \in D \subset \widehat{D}$ are two Jordan domains in \mathbb{C} . Let Γ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ be $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ configurations in D and \widehat{D} respectively. Then there is a coupling of Γ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ such that with a positive probability $c > 0$, their loops surrounding the origin coincide.*

Proof. Let \widehat{D} be a domain such that $D \subset \widehat{D} \subset \widetilde{D}$ and both of $\partial D \cap \partial \widehat{D}$ and $\partial \widetilde{D} \cap \partial \widehat{D}$ have connected subsets α, β more than one point. Let $0 \in A \subset D$ be such that $\alpha \subset \partial A$ and ∂A does not intersect $\partial D \Delta \partial \widehat{D}$. Similarly, let $0 \in B \subset \widehat{D}$ be such that $\beta \subset \partial B$ and ∂B does not intersect $\partial \widehat{D} \Delta \partial \widetilde{D}$. Fix $a \in \alpha$, $b \in \partial D \setminus \partial A$, $c \in \beta$ and $d \in \partial \widetilde{D} \setminus \partial B$. Let $\eta, \widehat{\eta}^{ac}, \widehat{\eta}^{ca}, \widetilde{\eta}$ be the chordal $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ from a to b in D , from a to c and from c to a in \widehat{D} , and from c to d in \widetilde{D} (with the force points being $a+$, $a+$, $c-$, $c-$ respectively, where $+$ stands for the counterclockwise direction).

In the following we will couple η and $\widetilde{\eta}$ such that with a positive probability 0 is *disconnected*, i.e. not encircled by η (resp. $\widetilde{\eta}$) and clockwise boundary arc \overline{ba} (resp. \overline{cd}) in D (resp. \widetilde{D}), and the connected components of $D \setminus \eta$ and $\widetilde{D} \setminus \widetilde{\eta}$ containing 0 are the same. Once this coupling succeeds, according to the construction of $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ by $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ exploration trees in Lemma 4.12 (which is based on [She09]), when 0 is disconnected in the above sense, the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ loops surrounding 0 are from the conditionally independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ in the remaining connected component containing 0.

We will establish the coupling by using $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ and $\widehat{\eta}^{ca}$ as intermediaries. Note that η and $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ can be viewed as the counterflow line of GFFs in D and \widehat{D} with some boundary data, which coincide on $\partial D \cap \partial \widehat{D} \subset A$. By the absolute continuity of GFF (see e.g. [MS16a, Proposition 3.4]), the law of restriction $h|_A$ and $\widehat{h}|_A$ are mutually absolutely continuous. Since the counterflow line is determined by the field [MS16a, Proposition 5.13], we find that the laws of η and $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ before exiting A are mutually absolutely continuous. For a non self-touching curve γ from a and disconnecting 0, let τ be its first time of that 0 is disconnected, and $\sigma < \tau$ be such that $\gamma(\sigma) = \gamma(\tau)$. We call $\gamma[\sigma, \tau]$ to be the *disconnecting loop* of 0. Now define the event E to be that 0 is disconnected before exiting A , and the disconnecting loop of 0 is in $A \cap B$. Since E is measurable w.r.t. the curve before

exiting A , once $\mathbb{P}[E] > 0$, we can deduce that conditioned on the event E , the laws of the connected components of $D \setminus \eta$ and $\widehat{D} \setminus \widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ containing 0 are mutually absolutely continuous. Similarly, we can define the disconnecting loop of 0 for curves from c in parallel, and define the event \widetilde{E} to be that 0 is disconnected before exiting B , and the disconnecting loop of 0 is in $A \cap B$. For the same reason, once $\mathbb{P}[\widetilde{E}] > 0$, we find conditioned on \widetilde{E} , the laws of the connected components of $\widehat{D} \setminus \widehat{\eta}^{ca}$ and $\widetilde{D} \setminus \widetilde{\eta}$ containing 0 are mutually absolutely continuous.

By the reversibility of the chordal $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ [MS16c, Theorem 1.2], $\widehat{\eta}^{ca}$ and the time-reversal of $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ are equal in law, hence in the following we set $\widehat{\eta}^{ca}$ to be the time-reversal of $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$. Define the event $\widehat{E} := \{\widehat{\eta}^{ac} \text{ is in } E\} \cap \{\text{the time-reversal } \widehat{\eta}^{ca} \text{ of } \widehat{\eta}^{ac} \text{ is in } \widetilde{E}\}$. Once $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{E}] > 0$, by the domain Markov property, we find that the laws of $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}[0, \tau]$ (τ is the time that $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ disconnects 0), conditioned on E and \widehat{E} respectively, are mutually absolutely continuous. Indeed, if $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}[0, \tau]$ satisfies the event E , then with a positive probability the remaining part of $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ will stay in B , which achieves the event \widehat{E} . Hence we deduce that conditioned on E and \widehat{E} , the laws of the connected components containing 0 of $\widehat{D} \setminus \widehat{\eta}^{ac}$ are mutually absolutely continuous. For the same reason, conditioned on \widetilde{E} and \widehat{E} respectively, the laws of the connected components containing 0 of $\widetilde{D} \setminus \widetilde{\eta}^{ca}$ are mutually absolutely continuous. Since we have set $\widehat{\eta}^{ca}$ to be the time-reversal of $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}$, we have $\widehat{D} \setminus \widehat{\eta}^{ca} = \widehat{D} \setminus \widehat{\eta}^{ac}$. Combining with the previous paragraph, we conclude that the laws of the connected components containing 0 of $D \setminus \eta$ and $\widetilde{D} \setminus \widetilde{\eta}$, conditioned on E and \widetilde{E} respectively, are mutually absolute continuous. Since then, by the maximal coupling, one can couple η (restricted on E) and $\widetilde{\eta}$ (restricted on \widetilde{E}) such that the connected components of $D \setminus \eta$ and $\widetilde{D} \setminus \widetilde{\eta}$ containing 0 coincide with a positive probability.

It remains to show that the probabilities for events $E, \widetilde{E}, \widehat{E}$ are all positive. In the following we show $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{E}] > 0$; the cases for other two events can be done similarly. Fix three tubes T_1, T_2, T_3 as the figure below. According to [GMQ18, Lemma A.1], the following three (conditional) probabilities are all positive: the event E_1 that η hits the marked boundary of T_2 before exiting T_1 ; conditioned on E_1 , the event E_2 that η disconnects 0 and then hits T_3 before exiting T_2 ; and conditioned on E_1 and E_2 , the event E_3 that η ends at c without leaving T_3 . Thus $\mathbb{P}[E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3] > 0$. Since $E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3 \subset \widehat{E}$, we have $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{E}] > 0$. □

Proof of Lemma 6.14. Let $0 \in D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a Jordan domain and consider a full-plane $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ configuration Γ . Denote γ to be the inner-most loop in Γ surrounding D , and let G be the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \gamma$ containing 0 (and also D). Conditionally on Γ , independently take $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ configurations (Γ_D, Γ_G) on D and G from the coupling in Lemma 6.15, and denote its the success probability to be $c(G)$. Note that the resampling property for full-plane $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ gives that the collection of loops $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma|_{\mathbb{C} \setminus G} \cup \{\gamma\} \cup \Gamma_G$ also has the law of full-plane $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$. Hence we obtain the desired coupling $(\Gamma_D, \widetilde{\Gamma})$ for $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ on D and \mathbb{C} such that with probability $\mathbb{E}c(G)$ their loops surrounding 0 in D coincide ($\mathbb{E}c(G) > 0$ since $c(G) > 0$ a.s.). □

The following proposition is the counterpart of Proposition 6.5. Its proof is just by the same argument as in the proof of 6.5, with the input Theorem 3.3.

Proposition 6.16. *Fix $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$. For some $C > 0$, we have*

$$\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep}} = C \int_0^\infty a \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a), \text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)) da.$$

For $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$, let (h, η) be a sample from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$. Then η can be uniquely written as $\eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$ where $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. The law of (η^0, \mathbf{t}) is $C \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C}) \times dt$. Conditioning on (h, η) ,




Figure 7: **Left:** The configuration that the event E occurs, where the orange loop corresponds to the segment $\widehat{\eta}^{ac}[\sigma, \tau]$. A and B are the yellow and pink regions. **Right:** Three tubes T_1, T_2, T_3 are colored grey light to dark, such that $T_1 \subset A$, $T_2 \subset A \cap B$ and $T_3 \subset B$. The marked boundary of T_2 is colored black.

sample a $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'} \Gamma^+$ in C_{η}^+ . Let $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the set of loops in Γ^+ separating $\pm\infty$ ordered from left to right (note that $(\eta^i)_{i \geq 1}$ is just the Markov chain with the transition kernel defined above). Let $\ell_h(\eta^i)$ be the quantum length of η^i . The following is the counterpart of Lemma 6.6.

Lemma 6.17. *The law of $\ell_h(\eta^i)$ is the same as the law of $\ell_h(\eta^0)$.*

Proof. By Propositions 5.15 and 6.16 the joint law of $\ell_h(\eta^0)$ and $\ell_h(\eta^1)$ is

$$Cab|\text{GQD}_{1,0}(a)||\text{GA}(a,b)||\text{GQD}_{1,0}(b)| da db,$$

and by Definition 5.14 $|\text{GA}(a,b)| = |\text{GA}(b,a)|$ so this expression is symmetric in a and b . Thus the lemma holds for $i = 1$, and inductively for general i . \square

We now state Lemma 6.18, which is the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ analog of Lemma 6.7. In Lemma 6.7 we defined quantum surfaces S_i^+ and S_i^- parametrized by the regions $C_{\eta_i}^+$ and $C_{\eta_i}^-$ to the right and left of the (simple) loop η_i . In the present setting η_i is nonsimple, so to state Lemma 6.18, we will define the analogous *forested* quantum surfaces \mathfrak{S}_i^+ and \mathfrak{S}_i^- parametrized by regions $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta_i}^+$ and $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta_i}^-$; these regions have to be defined via *index* with respect to the loop, rather than “right” and “left”.

For $\eta^0 \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$, we define $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ as follows. Let $f(z) = e^{-z}$ be the conformal map from \mathcal{C} to \mathbb{C} , and let D_{η^0} be the set of points on \mathbb{C} whose index w.r.t. $f \circ \eta^0$ is non-zero (in particular, $0 \in D_{\eta^0}$). We then set $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta^0}^+ = f^{-1}(D_{\eta^0})$ (so $+\infty \in \mathfrak{C}_{\eta^0}^+$). One can similarly define $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta^0}^-$. By Proposition 6.16 the quantum surfaces parametrized by $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta_i}^+$ and $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta_i}^-$ are forested quantum surfaces when $i = 0$, and inductively by Proposition 5.15 they are forested quantum surfaces when $i > 0$.

Lemma 6.18. *For $i \geq 0$, conditioning on (h, η_i) , let z_i be a point on η_i sampled from the probability measure proportional to the generalized quantum length measure. Let \mathfrak{S}_i^+ (resp. \mathfrak{S}_i^-) be the forested quantum surface parametrized by $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta_i}^+$ (resp. $\mathfrak{C}_{\eta_i}^-$) having marked points z_i and $+\infty$ (resp. $-\infty$). Then the conditional law of \mathfrak{S}_i^+ given \mathfrak{S}_i^- is $\text{GQD}_{1,1}(\ell_h(\eta_i))^\#$ for all $i \geq 0$.*

Proof. When $i = 0$, this follows from Theorem 3.3. The $i \geq 1$ case follows iteratively using Proposition 5.15. \square

Let E_ε be the event that the generalized quantum length of η is larger than ε . The following is the counterpart of Lemma 6.9.

Lemma 6.19. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_{\text{tv}}(\text{LF}_C \times P_i|_{E_\varepsilon}, \text{LF}_C \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})|_{E_\varepsilon}) = 0$.*

Proof of Proposition 6.13 given Lemma 6.19. According to [GMQ18, Theorem 1.1], the inversion invariance also holds for $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}^{\mathbb{C}}$, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})$ is invariant under the mapping $z \mapsto -z$ from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C} . Then the result just follows line by line in the proof of Proposition 6.3, with the $\kappa < 4$ inputs replaced by Lemmas 6.14 and 6.18 and Proposition 6.16. \square

Now it remains to prove Lemma 6.19. To this end, we repeat the argument in Section 6.4. The key input is the following counterpart of Lemma 6.12. Recall the universal constant C_0 defined above Lemma 6.12.

Lemma 6.20. *Suppose $\eta \in \text{Loop}_0(\mathcal{C})$ and ϕ are such that the law of $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$. Suppose g is a deterministic smooth function on $[C_0, C_0 + 1] \times [0, 2\pi]$ with $\int g(z) d^2z = 1$. Then*

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

where the convergence rate only depends on g .

Proof. Similarly as in Lemma 6.12, if the law of $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^+, \phi, \infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\#$, then the law of $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^+, \phi - \frac{\gamma}{2} \log \ell, \infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\#$. Thus it suffices to show that if the law of $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^+, \phi, \infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\#$, then

$$\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K)] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow \infty, \tag{6.8}$$

where again the convergence rate depends only on g . Let \mathcal{C}_η^+ be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $+\infty$. Sample a point z on $\eta^{\text{in}} = \partial \mathcal{C}_\eta^+$ from the probability measure proportional to quantum length, and let $S^+ = (\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty, z)/\sim_\gamma$. Since the law of $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^+, \phi, \infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\#$, the conditional law of S^+ given the quantum length $\ell_\phi(\eta^{\text{in}})$ is $\text{QD}_{1,1}(\ell_\phi(\eta^{\text{in}}))^\#$. Since $C_0 > 0$, we have $\mathfrak{C}_\eta^+ \cap [C_0, C_0 + 1] = \mathcal{C}_\eta^+ \cap [C_0, C_0 + 1]$. Thus, by Lemma 6.12 applied to η^{in} ,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K) | \ell_\phi(\eta^{\text{in}})] = 0. \tag{6.9}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}[(\phi, g) \notin (-K, K) | \ell_\phi(\eta^{\text{in}})]]$, the dominated convergence theorem and (6.9) imply (6.8). \square

Proof of Lemma 6.19. Recall E_ε is the event that the generalized quantum length of η is larger than ε . Following line by line as in Lemma 6.11, one can first show that $(\text{LF}_C \times \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}))|_{E_\varepsilon} \leq (\text{LF}_C \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C}))|_{E_\varepsilon} < \infty$. Then the proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 6.9, except that we need to replace S_K in (6.4) with

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

and use Lemma 6.20 in the place of Lemma 6.12. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Propositions 6.3 and 6.13 prove the claim for $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ and $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. \square

6.6 Duality of the SLE loop measure

Let $\kappa \in (2, 4)$. Fix a point z_0 on the sphere $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$, and sample $\eta \sim \text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$. Let η^{in} be the boundary of the connected component of $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta$ containing z_0 .

Proposition 6.21. *For $\kappa \in (2, 4)$, the law of η^{in} is $C \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$ for some $C \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. In this proof we let C be a constant depending only on γ that may change from line to line.

Let $(\hat{\mathbb{C}}, h, \eta, z_0)$ be an embedding of a sample from $\text{QS}_1 \otimes \text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$, and let η^{in} be the boundary of the connected component of $\hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta$ containing z_0 . Let M_1 be the law of $(\hat{\mathbb{C}}, h, \eta^{\text{in}}, z_0) / \sim_{\gamma}$. Let p, q be independently sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum length measure on η^{in} , and let M_3 be the law of $(\hat{\mathbb{C}}, h, \eta^{\text{in}}, p, q, z_0) / \sim_{\gamma}$ weighted by the square of the quantum length of η^{in} . We will show that

$$M_3 = C \int_0^{\infty} \text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{0,2}(b, a), \text{QD}_{1,2}(a, b)) da db. \quad (6.10)$$

Given (6.10), by forgetting the points on η^{in} and deweighting, we get $M_1 = C \int_0^{\infty} \ell \text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell), \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)) d\ell$, so Theorem 3.2 tells us that $M_1 = C \text{QS}_1 \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{loop}}$. The desired result follows. The rest of the proof is devoted to showing (6.10).

By Theorem 3.3 η cuts $(\hat{\mathbb{C}}, h, \eta, p, q, z_0) / \sim_{\gamma}$ into a pair of forested quantum surfaces; let \mathfrak{S}^+ be the forested quantum surface containing marked points (p, q, z_0) , and let \mathfrak{S}^- be the other forested quantum surface (having marked points (p, q)). Similarly, η^{in} cuts $(\hat{\mathbb{C}}, h, \eta^{\text{in}}, p, q, z_0) / \sim_{\gamma}$ into a pair of quantum surfaces S^+ and S^- , where S^+ has marked points (p, q, z_0) and S^- has marked points (p, q) . See Figure 8.

By Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 2.34, we have $\text{QS}_1 \otimes \text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}^{\text{loop}} = C \int_0^{\infty} \ell \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell)) d\ell$. Thus, writing $\mathcal{M}_{2,\bullet}^{\text{f.d.}}(2; \ell_1, \ell_2)$ to denote the law of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(2; \ell_1, \ell_2)$ with a bulk point sampled from the probability measure proportional to the quantum area measure on the thick quantum disk (without foresting) and with law weighted by the quantum area of the thick quantum disk (without foresting), by Definition 2.15, the law of $(\mathfrak{S}^-, \mathfrak{S}^+)$ is $\int_0^{\infty} \text{GQD}_{0,2}(\ell_2, \ell_1) \times \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(2; \ell_1, \ell_2) d\ell_1 d\ell_2$. Recall from Definition 2.27 that $\text{GQD}_{0,2}(\ell_2, \ell_1) = \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma^2 - 2; \ell_2, \ell_1)$, and that two-pointed forested quantum disks arise from welding forested line segments to two-pointed quantum disks (Definition 2.26). Thus, the joint law of (S^-, S^+) is

$$C \int \text{Weld}\left(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(b, \ell_2), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t_2, \ell_2), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2; t_2, t_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t_1, \ell_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(\ell_1, a)\right) \times \mathcal{M}_{2,\bullet}^{\text{disk}}(2; a, b)$$

with integral taken over $a, b, \ell_1, \ell_2, t_1, t_2 > 0$ and welding interfaces forgotten. By Proposition 3.6, the first term in the integrand integrated over $\ell_1, \ell_2 > 0$ simplifies to $C \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; b, t_2), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(\gamma^2 - 2; t_2, t_1), \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}; t_1, a))$, and by Proposition 3.4 integrating this term over $t_1, t_2 > 0$ gives $C \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(2; b, a)$. We conclude that the joint law of (S^-, S^+) is $C \int_0^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{disk}}(2; b, a) \times \mathcal{M}_{2,\bullet}^{\text{disk}}(2; a, b) da db$, so by Definition 2.15 we obtain (6.10). \square

6.7 Full-plane CLE via conformal welding

Theorem 1.1 yields the following variant of Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 6.22. *Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h) / \sim_{\gamma}$ is QS if h is sampled from \mathbb{F} . For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$, we sample (h, Γ, η) from $\mathbb{F}(dh) \text{Count}_{\Gamma}(d\eta) \text{CLE}_{\kappa}^{\mathbb{C}}(d\Gamma)$, where $\text{CLE}_{\kappa}^{\mathbb{C}}(d\Gamma)$*




Figure 8: **Left:** Forested quantum surfaces \mathfrak{S}^- and \mathfrak{S}^+ . **Right:** By Proposition 2.34, S^+ is a sample from $\text{QD}_{1,2}$. On the other hand, splitting the forested line segments off of \mathfrak{S}^\pm and welding them together (Proposition 3.6), we can express S^- in terms of the conformal welding of two-pointed quantum disks with weights $(2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}, \gamma^2 - 2, 2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2})$, hence it is a two-pointed quantum disk with weight 2 (Proposition 3.4). Thus we can identify the joint law of S^- and S^+ .

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

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

Proof of Theorem 6.22. This immediately follows from Theorems 1.1 and 3.2, combined with the following property of full-plane $\text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}$ from [KW16].

Proposition 6.23 ([KW16]). *Sample (Γ, η) from $\text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta) \text{CLE}_\kappa^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$. Conditioning on η , the conditional law of $\Gamma \setminus \{\eta\}$ is given by two independent CLE_κ 's on the two components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta$. \square*

The analog of Proposition 6.23 holds for $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ as well.

Proposition 6.24. *Sample (Γ, η) from $\text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta) \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$. Conditioning on η , the conditional law of $\Gamma \setminus \{\eta\}$ is given by sampling independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$'s on the each connected components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \eta$.*

Proof. From [GMQ18, Lemma 2.9], let η_n be the sequence of loops of Γ surrounding 0. For each n , γ_n splits \mathbb{C} into countably many connected components. If we condition on η_n and the set of loops in Γ which are contained in the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_n$, then the conditional law of the rest of Γ is that of an independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ in each bounded connected $\mathbb{C} \setminus \gamma_n$. By conformal invariance of full-plane CLE ([GMQ18, Theorem 1.1]), we can swap the roles of the connected component containing 0 and the unbounded component, hence the result follows. \square

We have the following analog of Theorem 6.22 for $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$.

Theorem 6.25. *Let \mathbb{F} be a measure on $H^{-1}(\mathbb{C})$ such that the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h)/\sim_\gamma$ is QS if h is sampled from \mathbb{F} . For $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$, we sample (h, Γ, η) from $\mathbb{F}(dh) \text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta) \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$, where $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$ is the law of a full-plane $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ and $\text{Count}_\Gamma(d\eta)$ is the counting measure on a sample Γ from $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}^\mathbb{C}(d\Gamma)$. For $\ell > 0$, let $\text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}, \text{GQD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'})$ be the generalized quantum surface decorated by a loop ensemble and a distinct loop obtained from uniformly welding*

a pair of CLE-decorated quantum disks sampled from $[\text{GQD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}] \times [\text{GQD}(\ell) \otimes \text{CLE}_{\kappa'}]$. Then the law of $(\mathbb{C}, h, \Gamma, \eta)/\sim_\gamma$ is

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

Proof. Combine Proposition 6.24 and Theorem 1.1. \square

7 Electrical thickness of the SLE loop via conformal welding

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3. Recall from Section 6 the cylinder $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi]$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ identified with $x + 2\pi i$, and that $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the pullback of the loop shape measure \mathcal{L}_κ under the map $z \mapsto e^{-z}$. Thus $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is a probability measure on loops η in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ and satisfying $\max_{z \in \eta} \text{Re } z = 0$. For a loop η sampled from $\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, we write $\vartheta(\eta)$ for the electrical thickness of $\exp(\eta)$. Then Theorem 1.3 is equivalent to: For $\kappa \in (0, 8)$

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = \begin{cases} \frac{\sin(\pi(1-\kappa/4))}{\pi(1-\kappa/4)} \frac{\pi\sqrt{(1-\kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2}}{\sin(\pi\sqrt{(1-\kappa/4)^2 + \lambda\kappa/2})} & \text{if } \lambda < 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}. \\ \infty & \text{if } \lambda \geq 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8}. \end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

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

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha}{d\mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})}(\eta) = \left(\frac{1}{4}\text{CR}(\exp(\eta), 0)\text{CR}(\exp(-\eta), 0)\right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} = 2^{2\lambda} e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)} \quad (7.2)$$

Thus proving Theorem 1.3 amounts to computing the total mass $|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|$. We will obtain the following two results by conformal welding of quantum surfaces and forested quantum surfaces:

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\kappa \in (0, 4)$, $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$ and $Q = \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$. For some constant $C = C(\kappa)$ and all $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ we have*

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

Proposition 7.2. *Let $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$, $\gamma = 16/\sqrt{\kappa'}$ and $Q = \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{2}{\gamma}$. For some constant $C = C(\kappa')$ and all $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$, we have*

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

Given these, we complete the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We break the proof of (7.1) (hence Theorem 1.3) into several cases.

Case I: $\kappa < 4$ and $\lambda \in (1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$. Let $\alpha = Q - \sqrt{Q^2 - 4 + 2\lambda} \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$, so $\lambda = \frac{\alpha^2}{2} - Q\alpha + 2$. By (7.2) and Proposition 7.1 we have

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

for some constant $C = C(\gamma)$. Since $\kappa \in (0, 4)$, we have $0 \in (1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$. Thus we can obtain the value of C by considering $1 = \mathbb{E}[e^0] = \frac{C(1-\kappa/4)}{\sin(\pi(1-\kappa/4))}$. This yields (7.1) in this case.

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

Case III: $\kappa = 4$. For $\lambda < \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain the result by taking $\kappa \uparrow 4$ as follows. Let η_κ be sampled from \mathcal{L}_κ , then $\vartheta(\eta_\kappa) \rightarrow \vartheta(\eta_4)$ in law as $\kappa \uparrow 4$ by Lemma A.6. Fix $\lambda < \lambda' < 1 - \frac{4}{8}$. For κ sufficiently close to 4 the family $\{e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_\kappa)}\}$ is uniformly integrable, since Theorem 1.3 gives a uniform bound on $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda'\vartheta(\eta_\kappa)}]$ for κ close to 4. Therefore $\lim_{\kappa \uparrow 4} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_\kappa)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta_4)}]$. Now, for $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the monotonicity argument of Case II gives $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)}] = \infty$.

Case IV: $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. For $\lambda \in (1 - \frac{\kappa}{8} - \frac{2}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{\kappa}{8})$ the argument is identical to that of Case I, using Proposition 7.2 instead of Proposition 7.1. The extension to general $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ follows the same monotonicity argument of Case II. \square

We now introduce the key objects in our proofs of Propositions 7.1 and 7.2. Let $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ and $\kappa \in \{\gamma^2, 16/\gamma^2\} \cap (0, 8)$ (in subsequent sections we will specialize to a fixed value of κ).

Sample a pair (η, \mathbf{t}) from $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha \times dt$ (where dt is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}), and let $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ be the law of the translated loop $\eta + \mathbf{t}$. Then $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ is an infinite measure on loops on \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$. Note that $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\gamma = \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. According to Lemma 6.2, $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \gamma}$ is a constant multiple of the measure $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}(\mathcal{C})$ from Section 6.

Let $\alpha < Q$ and $W = 2\gamma(Q - \alpha)$. Let \mathbb{F} be the law of h as in Definition 2.6, so that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W)$. Now sample (h, η) from $\mathbb{F} \times \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ and write $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ for the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, \eta, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$.

This object is related to $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$ as follows. Recall $\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}$ on \mathcal{C} from Definition 2.10.

Proposition 7.3. *If (ϕ, η) is sampled from $\text{LF}_\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is*

$$C(Q - \alpha)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha} \quad \text{for some constant } C = C(\kappa) \in (0, \infty). \quad (7.3)$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ and [AHS24, Theorem 1.2], which says the following: let h be the field in Definition 2.6, so the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W)$. Let $T \in \mathbb{R}$ be sampled from Lebesgue measure independently of h , and set $\phi := h(\cdot + T)$. Then ϕ has law $\frac{\gamma}{4(Q - \alpha)^2} \text{LF}_\mathcal{C}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)}$. \square

In Section 7.1 we will prove Proposition 7.1 ($\kappa < 4$). The proof uses a conformal welding result for $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ (Proposition 7.4) shown in Section 7.2; the conformal welding gives two different descriptions of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$, allowing us to compute the size of an event in two different ways, and a computation deferred to Section 7.3. Next, for $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$, we review the area statistics of generalized quantum disks with an α -insertion in Section 7.4, and in Section 7.5 we carry out an argument parallel to that of Section 7.1 to prove Proposition 7.2.

7.1 The case $\kappa \in (0, 4)$

We now present the conformal welding result needed for the proof of Proposition 7.1.

Proposition 7.4. *For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and for some constant $C = C(\gamma)$ we have*

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

We postpone the proof of Proposition 7.4 to Section 7.2 and proceed to the proof of Proposition 7.1. We would like to compare the area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ using Propositions 7.3 and 7.4 to obtain $|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|$ and hence prove Theorem 1.3, but $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}[e^{-A}] = \infty$. We will find a different computable observable that is finite. Note that $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ is a measure on quantum surfaces decorated by two marked points and a loop separating them. The loop separates the quantum surface into two connected components. For $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$, let $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ be the event that the connected component containing the first marked point has quantum area at least 1 and the loop has quantum length in (ε, δ) . The size of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ is easy to compute using Proposition 7.4:

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. With C from Proposition 7.4, $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$ equals*

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

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

Proof. Let A be the quantum area of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. By Proposition 7.4, to prove Lemma 7.5, it suffices to prove

$$\int_\varepsilon^\delta \ell \cdot |\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)| \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)[A > 1] d\ell = \frac{(1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha))} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \right)^2 \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4} \right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)}. \quad (7.4)$$

since the left side of (7.4) is the mass of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ under $\int_0^\infty \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)) d\ell$. By the scaling of quantum area and boundary length, we have $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)^\# [A > 1] = \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\# [A > \ell^{-2}]$. By Theorem 2.23 the quantum area law of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\#$ is inverse gamma with shape $a = \frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \alpha)$ and scale $b = (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-1}$. Let $\underline{\Gamma}$ be the lower incomplete gamma function; this satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\underline{\Gamma}(a; y)}{y^a} = \frac{1}{a}$. By the tail asymptotic property of the inverse gamma distribution, as $\ell \rightarrow 0$,

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

By Proposition 2.18 we have $|\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)| = \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}} \bar{U}(\alpha) \ell^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha - Q) - 1}$. Therefore

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

We can also compute the size of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ using Proposition 7.3 in terms of $|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|$ and $\bar{R}(\alpha)$.

Proposition 7.6. *For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$, with the error term in the same sense as in Lemma 7.5,*

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

We postpone the proof of Proposition 7.6 to Section 7.3 and proceed to the proof of Proposition 7.1 using Lemma 7.5 and Proposition 7.6.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. In this proof, we write C for a κ -dependent constant that may change from line to line. By Lemma 7.5 and Proposition 7.6 we get

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

Using the definitions of $\bar{R}(\alpha)$ and $\bar{U}(\alpha)$ in (2.3) and (2.4) and cancelling equal terms gives

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

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

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

□

We now proceed to prove Propositions 7.4 and 7.6 in Sections 7.2 and 7.3, respectively.

7.2 Conformal welding of two quantum disks with generic insertions

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 7.4. We start from the γ -insertion case.

Lemma 7.7. *If (ϕ, η) is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, then the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $C \int_0^\infty \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell), \mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell)) d\ell$.*

Proof. Recall $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ from Proposition 6.5, which is $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ restricted to loops separating 0 and ∞ . By the definition of \mathcal{L}_κ , for some γ -dependent constant $C' \in (0, \infty)$, the pull back of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ via the map $z \mapsto e^{-z}$ is $C' \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \gamma}$. Therefore, $\text{QS}_2 \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}} = C' \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\gamma) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \gamma}$. Now Propositions 7.3 and 6.5 yield Lemma 7.7. □

By the definition of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$, if we sample a field X from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(\ell)$, then the law of $(\mathbb{H}, X, i)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)$. We now recall a fact from [ARS23] about the reweighting of $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell)$ by “ $e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X}$ ”.

Lemma 7.8 ([ARS23, Lemma 4.6]). *For any $\ell > 0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for any nonnegative measurable function f of X that depends only on $X|_{\mathbb{H} \setminus B_\varepsilon(i)}$, we have*

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

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

We now state a version for the sphere; the proof is very similar to that of Lemma 7.8 but we include it here for completeness.

Lemma 7.9. *Let η_1 be a simple loop in \mathbb{C} separating 0 and 1. Let D_{η_1} be the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \eta_1$ containing 0. Let p be a point on η_1 and let $\psi : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow D_{\eta_1}$ be the conformal map with $\psi(i) = 0$ and $\psi(0) = p$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, let $\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon} = \mathbb{C} \setminus \psi(B_\varepsilon(i))$. For ϕ sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, 1)}$, let $X = \phi \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'|$ so that $(\mathbb{H}, X, i, 0) / \sim_\gamma = (D_{\eta_1}, \phi, 0, p) / \sim_\gamma$. Then for a fixed $\alpha \in (Q - \frac{\gamma}{4}, Q)$ and for any nonnegative measurable function f of ϕ that depends only on $\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}}$ we have*

$$\int f(\phi) \times \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_\varepsilon(i)} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, 1)} = \int f(\phi) \left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, 0), (\gamma, 1)}.$$

Proof. Let θ_ε be the uniform probability measure on $\partial B_\varepsilon(i)$ and $\widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon := \psi_* \theta_\varepsilon$. Recall notations in Section 2.1, where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the probability measure for the GFF on \mathbb{C} . Let \mathbb{E} be the expectation for $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}$, then $\widetilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}(z, w) = \mathbb{E}[h(x)h(y)] = -\log |z - w| + \log |z|_+ + \log |w|_+$. For a sample h from $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}$, we set $\widetilde{h} := h - 2Q \log |\cdot|_+ + \sum_{j=1}^2 \gamma G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, z_j)$. Lemma 7.9 will follow from three identities.

$$e^{(\alpha - \gamma)X_\varepsilon(i)} = \left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{(\alpha - \gamma)Q} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(\phi, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)}. \quad (7.5)$$

$$\int f(\phi) \times e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(\phi, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, 1)} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-(\alpha - \gamma)\gamma} \int \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} f(\widetilde{h} + c)] e^{(\alpha + \gamma - 2Q)c} dc. \quad (7.6)$$

$$\int \mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)} f(\widetilde{h} + c)] e^{(\alpha + \gamma - 2Q)c} dc = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha - \gamma)^2} \int f(\phi) \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, 0), (\gamma, 1)}. \quad (7.7)$$

To prove (7.5), note that $X_\varepsilon(i) = (X, \theta_\varepsilon) = (\phi \circ \psi + Q \log |\psi'|, \theta_\varepsilon)$. Since ψ' is holomorphic and $\log |\psi'|$ is harmonic, we have $(\log |\psi'|, \theta_\varepsilon) = \log |\psi'(i)|$ hence $(X, \theta_\varepsilon) = (\phi, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) + Q \log |\psi'(i)|$. Since $|\psi'(i)| = \frac{1}{2} \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)$, we get (7.5).

To prove (7.6), let $\eta^\varepsilon := \psi(\partial B_\varepsilon(i))$. Since $\widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon$ is the harmonic measure on η^ε viewed from 0, we have $(\log |\cdot|, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = \log \text{CR}(\eta^\varepsilon, 0) = \log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2}$. Since $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$, the curve η^ε is contained in the unit disk hence $(\log |\cdot|_+, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = 0$. Let $G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(0, z) := (G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, z), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)$. Then $G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(0, z) = G_{\mathbb{C}}(0, z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}$ and $G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(0, 0) = -\log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2}$. Thus, $(-2Q \log |\cdot|_+ + \gamma G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, 0) + \gamma G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, 1), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = -\gamma \log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2}$. Therefore $(\widetilde{h} + c, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = (h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) - \gamma \log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} + c$. Recall from Definition 2.4 that $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, 1)}$ is the law of $\widetilde{h} + c$ under $e^{(2\gamma - 2Q)c} dc \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}(dh)$. This gives (7.6).

To prove (7.7), note that $\mathbb{E}[h(z)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)] = (G_{\mathbb{C}}(\cdot, z), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(0, z)$, which equals $G_{\mathbb{C}}(z, 0)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}$. By Girsanov's theorem and the fact that $f(\phi)$ depends only on $\phi|_{\mathbb{C}_{\eta_1, p, \varepsilon}}$, we have

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

Since $\text{Var}((h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)) = (G_{\mathbb{C}}^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0), \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon) = -\log \frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(h, \widehat{\theta}_\varepsilon)}] = \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha - \gamma)^2}$.

Since the law of $\widetilde{h} + c$ under $e^{(\alpha + \gamma - 2Q)c} dc \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}(dh)$ is $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, 0), (\gamma, 1)}$, we get (7.7).

Combining (7.5), (7.6) and (7.7), and collecting the prefactors via

$$\left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{(\alpha - \gamma)Q} \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-(\alpha - \gamma)\gamma} \left(\frac{\varepsilon \text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha - \gamma)^2} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^2 - \gamma^2)} \left(\frac{\text{CR}(\eta_1, 0)}{2} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2},$$

we conclude the proof of Lemma 7.9. \square

Suppose η is a simple curve in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ with two marked points $p^-, p^+ \in \eta$. Let D_η^\pm be the connected components of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $\pm\infty$, and let $\psi_\eta^\pm : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow D_\eta^\pm$ be the conformal maps sending $(i, 0)$ to $(\pm\infty, p^\pm)$. We need the following lemma, which is essentially the variant of Lemma 7.9 on \mathcal{C} where γ -insertions at $\pm\infty$ are changed to α -insertions.

Lemma 7.10. *Let η be a simple curve in \mathcal{C} that separates $\pm\infty$ with two marked points $p^-, p^+ \in \eta$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon} = \mathcal{C} \setminus (\psi_\eta^-(B_\varepsilon(i)) \cup \psi_\eta^+(B_\varepsilon(i)))$. For ϕ sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$, let $X^\pm = \phi \circ \psi_\eta^\pm + Q \log |(\psi_\eta^\pm)'|$. Then for a fixed $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and any nonnegative measurable function f of $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon}}$ we have*

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

Proof. Let $g : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by $g(z) = \frac{z}{z-1}$ and let $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by $G = g \circ \exp$. By [AHS24, Lemma 2.13], if ϕ is sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$ then $\hat{\phi} := \phi \circ G^{-1} + Q \log |(G^{-1})'|$ has law $\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, +1)}$, and the same is true when γ is replaced by α . Let $(\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^-, \hat{p}^+) = (G(\eta), G(p^-), G(p^+))$. Since $g'(0) = -1$ and $\frac{d}{dz}(g(\frac{1}{z}))|_{z=0} = 1$, we see that $\text{CR}(\exp(\eta), 0) = \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, 0)$ and $\text{CR}(\exp(-\eta), 0) = \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, +1)$. Let $\mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^\pm, \varepsilon} := \mathbb{C} \setminus (G(\psi_\eta^-(B_\varepsilon(i))) \cup G(\psi_\eta^+(B_\varepsilon(i))))$. Then Lemma 7.10 is equivalent to the following: for any nonnegative measurable function \hat{f} of $\hat{\phi}$ that depends only on $\hat{\phi}|_{\mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}, \hat{p}^\pm, \varepsilon}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \hat{f}(\hat{\phi}) \times \varepsilon^{\alpha^2 - \gamma^2} e^{(\alpha - \gamma)(X_\varepsilon^-(i) + X_\varepsilon^+(i))} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\gamma, 0), (\gamma, +1)} \\ &= \int \hat{f}(\hat{\phi}) \left(\frac{1}{4} \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, 0) \text{CR}(\hat{\eta}, +1) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{2} + Q\alpha - 2} d\text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}^{(\alpha, 0), (\alpha, +1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

Now we apply Lemma 7.9, we get

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

Applying the argument of Lemma 7.9 again to change the insertion at $+1$, we get (7.8). \square

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

Lemma 7.11. *There is a constant $C = C(\gamma)$ such that the following holds. Suppose $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. Sample (ϕ, η, p^-, p^+) from the measure*

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

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

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

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

$$C \cdot \text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}(d\phi) \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}(d\eta) \text{Harm}_{-\infty, \eta}(dp^-) \text{Harm}_{+\infty, \eta}(dp^+) = \int_0^{\infty} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\gamma, i)}(\ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} d\tau] d\ell, \quad (7.9)$$

where with abuse of notation we view the left-hand side as a measure on triples $(X^-, X^+, \tau) \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) \times H^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) \times [0, \infty)$. Indeed, (7.9) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 6.5 and Lemma 2.21.

Now, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon} := \mathbb{H} \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(i)$. Let f be a nonnegative measurable function of $(X^-|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, X^+|_{\mathbb{H}_{\varepsilon}}, \tau)$, then reweighting (7.9) gives

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

By Lemma 7.10, the left hand side equals

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

By Lemma 7.8, the right hand side equals

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

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

Proof of Proposition 7.4. In Lemma 7.11, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $C(Q - \alpha)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ by (7.3), and the joint law of $((\mathbb{H}, X^-, i)/\sim_{\gamma}, (\mathbb{H}, X^+, i)/\sim_{\gamma}, \tau)$ is $\int_0^{\infty} \ell \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) \times \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell) \times [1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} \ell^{-1} d\tau] d\ell$. Since $[1_{\tau \in (0, \ell)} \ell^{-1} d\tau]$ corresponds to uniform conformal welding, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, \pm\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $\int_0^{\infty} \ell \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \ell)) d\ell$. \square

7.3 The appearance of $\bar{R}(\alpha)$ and $|\mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}|$: proof of Proposition 7.6

We will prove Proposition 7.6 via a particular embedding of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W)$. Let h be the field $\hat{h} + \mathbf{c}$ in Definition 2.6 so that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, h, -\infty, +\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W)$. Now we restrict to the event $\{\mu_h(\mathcal{C}) > 1\}$ and set $\phi := h(\cdot - a)$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\mu_h((-\infty, a) \times [0, 2\pi]) = 1$. Namely, we shift h horizontally such that $\mu_{\phi}(\{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z \leq 0\}) = 1$. Let M be the law of ϕ under this restriction. Then we can represent $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$ in Proposition 7.6 as follows.

Lemma 7.12. *Given a simple closed curve η on \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$, let \mathcal{C}_{η}^+ (resp. \mathcal{C}_{η}^-) be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta$ containing $+\infty$ (resp. $-\infty$). For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\eta + t$ be the curve on \mathcal{C} obtained by shifting η by t . Now sample $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha}$ and set $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$. Let*

$$E'_{\delta, \varepsilon} := \{(\phi, \eta) : \varepsilon < \ell_{\phi}(\eta) < \delta \text{ and } \mu_{\phi}(\mathcal{C}_{\eta}^-) > 1\} \quad (7.10)$$

where $\ell_{\phi}(\eta)$ is the quantum length of η . Then $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}[E_{\delta, \varepsilon}] = (M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa}^{\alpha})[E'_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$.

Proof. Since the measure $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ is invariant under translations along the cylinder, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_{\gamma}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ to the event that the total quantum area is larger than 1. Now Lemma 7.12 follows from the definition of $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$. \square

The next lemma explains how the reflection coefficient $\bar{R}(\alpha)$ shows up in Proposition 7.6.

Lemma 7.13. $|M| = \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{2} \bar{R}(\alpha) a^{\frac{2}{\gamma}(\alpha-Q)-1} da = \frac{\gamma \bar{R}(\alpha)}{4(Q-\alpha)}$.

Proof. This simply comes from Lemma 2.8. □

By Lemmas 7.10 and 7.13, Proposition 7.6 is reduced to the following proposition.

Proposition 7.14. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. With an error term $o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)$ satisfying $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)| = 0$, we have*

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) |M| |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha| \frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)}. \quad (7.11)$$

Proof of Proposition 7.6 given Proposition 7.14. By Lemma 7.12 and 7.13, we have

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




Figure 9: Illustration of the proof of Proposition 7.14. On the left $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ is sampled from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$ and $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$. The curve η^0 satisfies $\sup_{z \in \eta^0} \text{Re } z = 0$ and the field ϕ satisfies $\mu_\phi(\{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z \leq 0\}) = 1$. The domain D_η^- is colored grey. The event $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is $\{\ell_\phi(\eta) \in (\varepsilon, \delta) \text{ and } \mu_\phi(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-) > 1\}$. If $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ occurs, we have $\ell_\phi(\eta) \approx e^{\frac{\gamma}{2} X_{\mathbf{t}}}$. Therefore \mathbf{t} is in an interval close to the red one on the right figure, which is approximately $(\frac{2}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \delta^{-1}, \frac{2}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$. The proofs of Lemmas 7.18 and 7.20 are done by quantifying this statement in two directions.

The high level idea for proving Proposition 7.14 is the following. Suppose $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ is sampled from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$. For $s \geq 0$, let X_s be the average of ϕ on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$. For most realizations of (ϕ, η^0) , the occurrence of $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is equivalent to the event that \mathbf{t} lies in some interval of length $(1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)}$ determined by X . (See Figure 9.) Hence the mass of $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is this length times $|M| |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|$. In the rest of this section, we first prove a few properties for X in Section 7.3.1 and then prove Proposition 7.14 in Section 7.3.2.

7.3.1 The field average process

We need the following description of the law of $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_+}$ and $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$, where $\mathcal{C}_+ := \{z \in \mathcal{C} : \text{Re } z > 0\}$ is the right half cylinder.

Lemma 7.15. *Let ϕ be a sample from M . Conditioned on $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_-}$, the conditional law of $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_+}$ is the law of $\phi_0 + \hat{h} - (Q - \alpha) \operatorname{Re}(\cdot)$, where ϕ_0 is a zero boundary GFF on \mathcal{C}_+ , and \hat{h} is a harmonic function determined by $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_-}$ whose average on the circle $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$ does not depend on s . Moreover, let X_s be the average of ϕ on $[s, s + 2\pi i]/\sim$. Conditioned on X_0 , the conditional law of $(X_s - X_0)_{s \geq 0}$ is the law of $(B_s - (Q - \alpha)s)_{s \geq 0}$ where B_s is a Brownian motion.*

Proof. The first statement is the sphere analog of [AG21, Lemmas 2.10 and 2.11] based on the domain Markov property of Gaussian free field. The proof is identical so we omit it. The second statement on $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$ follows from the first statement. \square

Proposition 7.14 essentially follows from the fact that the field average process $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$ looks like a line of slope $-(Q - \alpha)$. We now introduce two random times to quantify this. For $y > 0$, let

$$\sigma_y = \inf\{s > 0 : X_s < \frac{2}{\gamma} \log y\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_y = \sup\{s > 0 : X_s > \frac{2}{\gamma} \log y\}. \quad (7.12)$$

Lemma 7.16. *M -a.e. the field ϕ satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sigma_y}{\log y^{-1}} = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tau_y}{\log y^{-1}} = \frac{2}{\gamma(Q - \alpha)}$.*

Proof. Given Lemma 7.15, this is a straightforward fact about drifted Brownian motion. \square

The proof of the upper bound in Proposition 7.14 will rely on the following lemma.

Lemma 7.17. *Sample $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$ and set $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$. Let $\mathfrak{l} = \ell_\phi(\eta)$, which is the boundary length of the quantum surface $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-, \phi)/\sim_\gamma$. Fix $\zeta \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ and a function $\operatorname{err}(\ell)$ such that $\lim_{\ell \downarrow 0} \operatorname{err}(\ell) = 0$, and conditioned on $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-, \phi)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional probability of $\{\mathbf{t} \in (\sigma_{1-\zeta} - C, \tau_{1+\zeta})\}$ is at least $1 - \operatorname{err}(\mathfrak{l})$.*

Proof. We first introduce C and err , and then show that they satisfy Lemma 7.17. Recall that η^0 is a loop in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ and with $\sup_{z \in \eta^0} \operatorname{Re} z = 0$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ be the connected component of $\mathcal{C} \setminus \eta^0$ containing $+\infty$. Let $f : \mathcal{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\eta^0}^+$ be the unique conformal map such that $f(+\infty) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} (f(z) - z) \in \mathbb{R}$. By standard conformal distortion estimates (e.g. [MS19, Lemma 2.4]), for $C = e^{10}$ we have

$$|f(z) - z| < \frac{C}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad |f''(z)| < \frac{1}{2} < |f'(z)| < 2 \quad \text{for } \operatorname{Re} z > \frac{C}{3}. \quad (7.13)$$

Let g be a fixed smooth function on \mathcal{C} supported on $\{\operatorname{Re} z \in (C - 1, C)\}$ such that $\int g(z) dz = 1$ and g is invariant under rotations against the axis of \mathcal{C} . Let S be the collection of smooth functions ξ that are supported on $\{\operatorname{Re} z \in [\frac{2}{3}C - 1, \frac{4}{3}C]\} \subset \mathcal{C}_+$ and satisfy $\|\xi\|_\infty \leq 4\|g\|_\infty$ and $\|\nabla \xi\|_\infty \leq 8(\|g\|_\infty + \|\nabla g\|_\infty)$. Let

$$\operatorname{err}(\ell) := \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\# \left[\sup_{\xi \in S} |(h, \xi)| + Q \log 2 \geq -\frac{2\zeta}{\gamma} \log \ell \right] \quad (7.14)$$

where $(\mathcal{C}_+, h, +\infty)$ is an embedding of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\#$, the probability measure proportional to $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)$. Since the space S is invariant under rotations against the axis of \mathcal{C} , the probability in (7.14) does not depend on the choice of the embedding. Moreover, since h is a.s. in the Sobolev space of index -1 , we see that $\sup_{\xi \in S} |(h, \xi)| < \infty$ a.s. hence $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{err}(\ell) = 0$.

We now show that C and err satisfy Lemma 7.17. Set $\phi^0(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot + \mathbf{t})$ and $\hat{\phi} = \phi^0 \circ f + Q \log |f'| - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}$. Then $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma = (D_{\eta^0}^+, \phi^0, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ hence $(\mathcal{C}_+, \hat{\phi}, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma = (\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$. Moreover,

$$(\phi^0, g) - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l} = (\hat{\phi} \circ f^{-1} + Q \log |(f^{-1})'|, g) = (\hat{\phi}, |f'|^2 g \circ f) + (Q \log |(f^{-1})'|, g). \quad (7.15)$$

By (7.13) and the definition of S , we have $|f'|^2 g \circ f \in S$. Then by (7.13) and (7.15), we have

$$|(\phi^0, g) - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}| \leq |(\hat{\phi}, |f'|^2 g \circ f)| + |(Q \log |(f^{-1})'|, g)| \leq \sup_{\xi \in S} |(\hat{\phi}, \xi)| + Q \log 2.$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 7.12 that the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, +\infty, -\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ to the event that the total quantum area is larger than 1. By Proposition 7.4, conditioning on $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-, \phi)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional law of $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^+, \phi, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \mathfrak{l})^\#$, hence the conditional law of $(\mathcal{C}_+, \hat{\phi}, +\infty)/\sim_\gamma$ is $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; 1)^\#$. Therefore, by (7.14) and (7.15), conditioning on $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-, \phi)/\sim_\gamma$, the conditional probability of the event $\left|(\phi^0, g) - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}\right| < -\frac{2\zeta}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}$ is at least $1 - \text{err}(\mathfrak{l})$. Since g is supported on $\{\text{Re } z \in (C-1, C)\}$, if $\left|(\phi^0, g) - \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}\right| < -\frac{2\zeta}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}$, then there exists $s \in [C-1, C]$ such that the average of ϕ^0 on $[s, s+2\pi i]$ lies in $((1+\zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}, (1-\zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l})$. This gives $X_{\mathfrak{t}+s} \in ((1+\zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l}, (1-\zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma} \log \mathfrak{l})$ hence $\mathfrak{t} + s \in (\sigma_{1-\zeta}, \tau_{1+\zeta})$ for some $s \in [C-1, C]$. Therefore $\mathfrak{t} \in (\sigma_{1-\zeta} - C, \tau_{1+\zeta})$, which gives Lemma 7.17 with our choice of C and err . \square

7.3.2 Proof of Proposition 7.14

We refer to Figure 9 and the paragraph above Section 7.3.1 for an illustration of our proof ideas. We will write $o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$ as an error term satisfying $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)| = 0$ which can change from place to place. We first prove the lower bound for $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta, \varepsilon}]$.

Lemma 7.18. *We have $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta, \varepsilon}] \geq (1 + o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) |M| |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|^{\frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)}}$.*

We will prove Lemma 7.18 by a coupling of the probability measure $M^\# = M/|M|$ and cylindrical GFF measure P_C . Recall that for a sample h from P_C , it can be written as $h = h_1 + h_2$, where h_1 is constant on vertical circles and h_2 is the lateral component that has mean zero on all such circles.

Lemma 7.19. *There exists a coupling of h sampled from P_C and ϕ sampled from $M^\#$ such that h_2 is independent of $(X_s)_{s \geq 0}$, and moreover, $\sup_{\text{Re } z > 1} |\mathfrak{h}(z)| < \infty$ where $\mathfrak{h}(z) = \phi(z) - h_2(z) - X_{\text{Re } z}$.*

Proof. By [MS17, Proposition 2.8], on \mathcal{C}_+ the field h can be written as $h_0 + \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ where h_0 is a zero boundary GFF on \mathcal{C}_+ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ is an independent harmonic function on \mathcal{C}_+ such that $\sup_{\text{Re } z > 1} |\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}(z)| < \infty$. Similarly, by Lemma 7.15, $\phi(z) + (Q-\alpha)\text{Re } z$ on \mathcal{C}_+ can be written as $\phi_0 + \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ with the same properties. Coupling h and ϕ such that $h_0 = \phi_0$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}$ is independent of ϕ , we are done. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.18. Let \mathbb{P} be the probability measure corresponding to the law of (ϕ, h) as coupled in Lemma 7.19. Let $(\phi, h, \mathfrak{t}, \eta^0)$ be a sample from $\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$. Then the law of $(\phi, \mathfrak{t}, \eta^0)$ is $M^\# \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$, where $M^\# = M/|M|$. Let h_2 and \mathfrak{h} be defined as in Lemma 7.19 so that $\phi = h_2 + X_{\text{Re}} + \mathfrak{h}$. Fix $\zeta \in (0, 0.1)$ which will be sent to zero later. Let $I_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ be the interval $((1+3\zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \delta^{-1} + \delta^{-1}, (1-3\zeta)\frac{2}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$. Let

$$G_{\delta, \varepsilon} := \{I_{\delta, \varepsilon} \subset (\tau_{\delta^{1+2\zeta}} + \delta^{-1}, \sigma_{\varepsilon^{1-2\zeta}}) \text{ and } \sup_{\text{Re } z > 1} |\mathfrak{h}(z)| < \zeta \cdot \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \delta^{-1}\},$$

where the random times σ_y, τ_y are as in (7.12). By Lemma 7.16 we have $\mathbb{P}[I_{\delta, \varepsilon} \subset (\tau_{\delta^{1+2\zeta}} + \delta^{-1}, \sigma_{\varepsilon^{1-2\zeta}})] = 1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$. Since $\sup_{\text{Re } z > 1} |\mathfrak{h}(z)| < \infty$ almost surely, we have $\mathbb{P}[G_{\delta, \varepsilon}] = 1 - o_{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)$.

Fix $n > 0$. Let $A_n = \{\inf_{z \in \eta^0} \text{Re } z > -n\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n] < \infty$. Let $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathfrak{t}$ and $\ell_{h_2}(\eta)$ be the quantum length of η with respect to h_2 . Define the event

$$E'_{\delta, \varepsilon}(n) := \{A_n \text{ occurs, } \mathfrak{t} \in I_{\delta, \varepsilon}, \text{ and } \ell_{h_2}(\eta) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})\}.$$

Suppose $n < \delta^{-1} < \frac{2\zeta}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} \log \varepsilon^{-1}$ and the event $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n) \cap G_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ occurs. Since $\mathbf{t} \in I_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ and $G_{\delta,\varepsilon} \cap A_n$ occurs, we have $\operatorname{Re} z \in (\tau_{\delta^{1+2\zeta}}, \sigma_{\varepsilon^{1-2\zeta}})$ for each $z \in \eta$, hence $\mathcal{C}_- := \{z \in \mathcal{C} : \operatorname{Re} z \leq 0\} \subset D_\eta^-$. By the definition of ϕ we have

$$\mu_\phi(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-) \geq \mu_\phi(\mathcal{C}_-) \geq 1 \quad (7.16)$$

Moreover, from the bound on $\sup_{\operatorname{Re} z > 1} |\mathfrak{h}(z)|$ we have $\frac{\gamma}{2}(X_{\operatorname{Re} z} + \mathfrak{h}(z)) \in ((1-\zeta) \log \varepsilon, (1+\zeta) \log \delta)$ for each $z \in \eta$. Now $\ell_{h_2}(\eta) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})$ yields $\ell_\phi(\eta) \in (\varepsilon, \delta)$. This gives

$$E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n) \cap G_{\delta,\varepsilon} \subset E'_{\delta,\varepsilon} = \{\mu_\phi(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-) \geq 1, \ell_\phi(\eta) \in (\varepsilon, \delta)\} \quad (7.17)$$

Therefore

$$(\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \geq (\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n)] - (\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n) \setminus G_{\delta,\varepsilon}]. \quad (7.18)$$

We claim that

$$(\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n)] = (1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n] \text{ and } (\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n) \setminus G_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)|I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|. \quad (7.19)$$

Since the law of h_2 is translation invariant, namely $h_2 \stackrel{d}{=} h_2(\cdot - t)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n)] &= |I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|(\mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[\ell_{h_2}(\eta^0) \in (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta}), A_n] \\ &= |I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|(\mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[A_n] - |I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|(\mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[\ell_{h_2}(\eta^0) \notin (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta}), A_n] = (1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n]. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we used $(\mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[A_n] = \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n] < \infty$ and $(\mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[\ell_{h_2}(\eta^0) \notin (\varepsilon^\zeta, \delta^{-\zeta})|A_n] = o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)$, the latter of which holds because $\ell_{h_2}(\eta^0) < \infty$ a.e. in $\mathbb{P} \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$. This gives the first identity in (7.19).

The second identity in (7.19) is proved by as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(n) \setminus G_{\delta,\varepsilon}] &\leq (\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[A_n \setminus G_{\delta,\varepsilon} \text{ and } \mathbf{t} \in I_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[G_{\delta,\varepsilon} \text{ does not occur}] \times |I_{\delta,\varepsilon}| \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n] = o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)|I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n]. \end{aligned}$$

By (7.18) and (7.19), for a fixed n , we have $(\mathbb{P} \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \geq (1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|I_{\delta,\varepsilon}|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n]$ hence

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

Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\delta \rightarrow 0$, and $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ in order, we see that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \times \gamma(Q-\alpha)}{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}} \geq |M|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n].$$

Since $\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha[A_n] \rightarrow |\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha|$, sending $n \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude the proof. \square

It remains to prove the upper bound for $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}]$.

Lemma 7.20. *We have $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \leq (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))|M|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha \frac{2 \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)}$.*

Proof. Recall σ and τ defined in (7.12). For $C > 0$, consider the event

$$F_{x,y,C} = \{(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0) : \mathbf{t} \in (\sigma_x - C, \tau_y)\}. \quad (7.20)$$

We will prove Lemma 7.20 by first bounding $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[F_{x,y,C}]$ and then comparing $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ to $F_{\delta^{1-\zeta},\varepsilon^{1+\zeta},C}$. More precisely, we will prove two estimates. First, for each $x > 0$, we have

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[F_{x,y,C}] \leq (1 + o_y(1))|M|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha\left(\frac{2 \log y^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)} + C\right) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow 0, \quad (7.21)$$

where $o_y(1) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in C . Moreover, for a fixed $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ there exists some $C > 0$ such that

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[F_{\delta^{1-\zeta},\varepsilon^{1+\zeta},C} | E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = 1 - o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1). \quad (7.22)$$

Given (7.21) and (7.22), we see that for any fixed $\zeta > 0$ there exists some $C > 0$ such that

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

Sending $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ we will get Lemma 7.20.

We first prove (7.21). Note that $(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha)[F_{x,y,C}] = M^\#[\tau_y - \sigma_x + C]|M|\mathcal{L}_\kappa^\alpha$ from the definition of $F_{x,y,C}$. Hence (7.21) is equivalent to $M^\#[\tau_y - \sigma_x] \leq (1 + o_y(1))\frac{2 \log y^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)}$. By Lemma 7.15, the process X_s evolves as Brownian motion with drift $-(Q-\alpha)$. Let $T = \inf\{s \geq 0 : B_s^x - (Q-\alpha)s = \frac{2}{\gamma} \log y\}$ where $(B_s^x)_{s \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion starting from $\frac{2}{\gamma} \log x$. Then $M^\#[\tau_y - \sigma_x] \leq \mathbb{E}[T]$. Since $\mathbb{E}[T] = (1 + o_y(1))\frac{2 \log y^{-1}}{\gamma(Q-\alpha)}$, we get (7.21).

Since the event $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is determined by $(\mathcal{C}_\eta^-, \phi)/\sim_\gamma$, and $\ell_\phi(\eta) \in (\varepsilon, \delta)$ on $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$, Lemma 7.17 yields (7.22) with the constant C from Lemma 7.17. This concludes the proof. \square

7.4 Area statistics of generalized quantum disks

We now transition from the $\kappa < 4$ regime to the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ setting, with the goal of proving Proposition 7.2 in Section 7.5. We review several results on the law of forested disks, mainly from [HL22]. In order to use the results there, we first need to clarify the equivalence between our $\mathcal{M}^{\text{f.d.}}$ as in Definition 2.32 and the definitions of generalized quantum disks in [HL22].

We first recall the notion of looptree, which is originally defined in [DMS21]. Suppose $\nu \in (1, 2)$. Let $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a stable Lévy process with exponent ν with no negative jumps started at $\zeta_0 = 0$. This only specifies the process up to a multiplicative constant, which we fix by requiring $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \zeta_t}] = e^{-t \lambda^\nu}$ for $\lambda, t > 0$. Equivalently, $(\zeta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the ν -stable Lévy process whose jump measure is $\frac{1}{\Gamma(-\nu)} h^{-1-\nu} 1_{h>0} dh$. One can make sense of the *Lévy excursion conditioned to have duration ℓ* by conditioning on the event that ζ_t first hits $-\varepsilon$ at time ℓ , then sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. See e.g. [DLG02, Section 1] for further discussion.

Definition 7.21 ([MSW21]). *Let $e : [0, \ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sample from the ν -stable Lévy excursion with no negative jumps conditioned on having duration ℓ . On the graph $\{(t, e(t)) : t \in [0, \ell]\}$ we define an equivalence relation $s \sim t$ iff $e(s) = e(t)$ and the horizontal segment connecting $(s, e(s))$ and $(t, e(t))$ is below the graph of $e|_{s,t}$. We also set $(t, e(t))$ and $(t, e(t-))$ to be equivalent if t is a jump time of e ; this naturally identifies a root for each loop. We call the quotient \mathcal{T}_ℓ of the graph $\{(t, e(t)) : t \in [0, \ell]\}$ under the above equivalence relation the ν -stable looptree with length ℓ .*

Note that the looptree \mathcal{T}_ℓ defined above is naturally rooted at the equivalence class of the origin $(0, 0)$. We define the *generalized boundary length measure* on the looptree to be the pushforward of the Lebesgue measure on $[0, \ell]$.




Figure 10: From a Lévy excursion to a looptree. The root of \mathcal{T}_ℓ is marked as the dot.

Now we review the definitions of generalized quantum disks in [HL22]. According to [HL22, (1.8)], the authors define the generalized quantum disk with one α -bulk marked point and one boundary marked point as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell) = \sum_{t: \Delta e_t \neq 0} \frac{1}{|\text{QD}_{0,1}(|\Delta e_t|)|} \mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; |\Delta e_t|) \prod_{s \neq t: \Delta e_s \neq 0} \text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(|\Delta e_s|) d\mathcal{T}_\ell, \quad (7.23)$$

where $d\mathcal{T}_\ell$ denotes for the probability measure of $\frac{\kappa'}{4}$ -stable loop tree with length ℓ . Here, the summation is over the set of jumps of the Lévy excursion e defining \mathcal{T}_ℓ . A sample from the RHS is a looptree \mathcal{T}_ℓ , a quantum disk with a α -bulk insertion and a marked boundary point, and a collection of quantum disks each with a marked boundary point. Identifying the boundaries of the quantum surfaces with the corresponding loops according to boundary length gives a generalized quantum surface with a marked bulk point and a marked boundary point (given by the root of \mathcal{T}_ℓ); we denote its law by $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$. We denote the law of a sample from $\ell^{-1} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$ with boundary point forgotten by $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$.

Lemma 7.22. *We have $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell) \ell^{-1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} = R'_\gamma \ell^{-1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} \frac{2\pi(Q-\gamma)^2}{\gamma} \text{GQD}_{1,1}(\ell)$.*

Proof. As explained above Proposition 2.29, our $\text{GQD}_{0,1}(\ell)^\#$ is same as in [HL22], i.e. the probability measure $\prod_{s: \Delta e_s \neq 0} \text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(|\Delta e_s|) d\mathcal{T}_\ell$. Take the total mass into consideration, by Lemma 2.28 we deduce $\text{GQD}_{0,1}(\ell) = R'_\gamma \ell^{-1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} \cdot \prod_{s: \Delta e_s \neq 0} \text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(|\Delta e_s|) d\mathcal{T}_\ell$. Then on both sides we weigh the total quantum area and sample one point according to the probability measure proportional to the quantum area measure; the LHS is just $\text{GQD}_{1,1}(\ell)$ and the RHS gives

$$R'_\gamma \ell^{-1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} \sum_{t: \Delta e_t \neq 0} \frac{1}{|\text{QD}_{0,1}(|\Delta e_t|)|} \text{QD}_{1,0}(|\Delta e_t|) \prod_{s \neq t: \Delta e_s \neq 0} \text{QD}_{0,1}^\#(|\Delta e_s|) d\mathcal{T}_\ell. \quad (7.24)$$

Since by Theorem 2.22 one has $\text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell) = \frac{\gamma}{2\pi(Q-\gamma)^2} \mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell)$, according to (7.23), (7.24) above is just equal to $R'_\gamma \ell^{-1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} \frac{\gamma}{2\pi(Q-\gamma)^2} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell)$. \square

According to the above lemma, we can conclude

Proposition 7.23. *The definitions of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$ above are consistent with $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$ in Definition 2.32, namely, we have*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell) \ell^{-1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} = C \mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell), \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell) \ell^{-2 - \frac{4}{\kappa'}} = C \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell), \quad (7.25)$$

where C only depends on γ .

Proof. The proof is by using a reweighting argument on Lemma 7.22. That is, according to Lemma 7.22 and Proposition 2.34, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell) \ell^{-1-\frac{4}{\kappa'}} = C \mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell) \quad (7.26)$$

with a γ -dependent constant C . On both sides of (7.26), if we reweight the bulk marked point of weight γ to be of weight α , then the LHS turns out to be $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell) \ell^{-1-\frac{4}{\kappa'}}$, while the RHS to be exactly $C \mathcal{M}_{1,0,1}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$. Then the first claim follows; by reweighting ℓ^{-1} and forgetting the boundary marked point the second claim follows straightforwardly. \square

According to the equivalence in Proposition 7.23, we can compute the total mass of $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)$ based on [HL22].

Proposition 7.24. *For $\alpha > \frac{\gamma}{2}$, we have $|\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)| = D(\alpha) |\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; 1)| \ell^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(\alpha-Q)-1}$, where*

$$D(\alpha) := \frac{|\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)|}{|\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; 1)|} = (2\pi)^{2-2\alpha/\gamma} 2^{2-\alpha Q+\alpha^2/2} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma} - \frac{4}{\gamma^2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(2 - \frac{4}{\gamma^2}\right)} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right)^{2\alpha/\gamma-2}.$$

Proof. According to Proposition 7.23, our definition of $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)$ only differs from [HL22] by a γ -dependent constant, i.e. we have $\frac{|\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)|}{|\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; 1)|} = \frac{|\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)|}{|\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; 1)|}$. In the following we will prove

$$|\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)| = \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\alpha^2/2} \bar{U}(\alpha) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma} - \frac{4}{\gamma^2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(-\frac{4}{\gamma^2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma\alpha}{2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right)} \frac{1}{\bar{R}(\gamma; 1, 1)}. \quad (7.27)$$

Given this and the formulas for $\bar{U}(\alpha)$ in Proposition 2.18 and $\bar{R}(\gamma; 1, 1)$ in Proposition 2.16, the result follows. According to (7.23), the total mass of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)$ equals

$$|\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)| = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{(t, \Delta e_t)} \frac{1}{|\text{QD}_{0,1}(\Delta e_t)|} |\mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \Delta e_t)| \right]$$

where \mathbb{E} denotes expectation with respect to the probability measure of the $\frac{4}{\kappa}$ -stable Lévy excursion with living time 1. According to the expressions of $|\text{QD}_{0,1}(\Delta e_t)|$ and $|\mathcal{M}_{1,1}^{\text{disk}}(\alpha; \Delta e_t)|$ in Propositions 2.16 and 2.18, we deduce

$$|\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)| = \frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\alpha^2/2} \bar{U}(\alpha) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_t |\Delta e_t|^{2\alpha/\gamma} \right] \frac{1}{\bar{R}(\gamma; 1, 1)} \quad (7.28)$$

The expectation $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_t |\Delta e_t|^{2\alpha/\gamma} \right]$ can be computed by applying [HL22, Lemma 4.2]. Namely, choose $G(x) = 0$ in Proposition [HL22, Lemma 4.2], then for $\lambda > 0$ and $F : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ twice continuously differentiable with $F(0) = F'(0) = 0$, [HL22, Formula (4.3)] gives

$$-\frac{d}{d\lambda} (e^{-\rho(\lambda)}) \frac{1}{\Gamma(-\nu)} \int_0^\infty \frac{dh}{h^{1+\nu}} e^{-\rho(\lambda)h} F(h) = \frac{e^{-\rho(\lambda)}}{\nu \Gamma(1-1/\nu)} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\ell}{\ell^{1+1/\nu}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{t \leq 1} F(\ell^{1/\nu} \Delta e_t) e^{-\lambda \ell} \right) \quad (7.29)$$

where $\rho(\lambda) = \lambda^{1/\nu}$. Setting $F(x) = x^{2\alpha/\gamma}$ in (7.29) and simplifying gives

$$e^{-\rho(\lambda)} \frac{1}{\nu} \lambda^{1/\nu-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma(-\nu)} \Gamma\left(-\nu + \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}\right) \rho(\lambda)^{\nu - \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}} = \frac{e^{-\rho(\lambda)}}{\nu \Gamma(1-1/\nu)} \lambda^{-\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma\nu} + \frac{1}{\nu}} \Gamma\left(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma\nu} - \frac{1}{\nu}\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_t |\Delta e_t|^{2\alpha/\gamma}\right],$$

i.e. we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_t |\Delta e_t|^{2\alpha/\gamma}\right] = \frac{\Gamma(1-1/\nu) \Gamma\left(-\nu + \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}\right)}{\Gamma(-\nu) \Gamma\left(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma\nu} - \frac{1}{\nu}\right)} = \frac{\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma} - \frac{4}{\gamma^2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(-\frac{4}{\gamma^2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma\alpha}{2} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}\right)}. \quad (7.30)$$

Plugging (7.30) into (7.28) gives (7.27), which gives the result. \square

Finally, we record the Laplace transform of the quantum area of $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)^\#$ in [HL22].

Proposition 7.25 ([HL22, Theorem 1.8]). *Let $M' := 2\left(\frac{\mu}{4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}}\right)^{\frac{\kappa'}{8}}$. For $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)^\# [e^{-\mu A}] = \frac{2}{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha))} \left(\frac{M'\ell}{2}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha)} K_{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha)}(M'\ell) \quad (7.31)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)^\# [Ae^{-\mu A}] = \frac{\kappa'}{2\mu \Gamma(\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha))} \left(\frac{M'\ell}{2}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha)+1} K_{1-\frac{\gamma}{2}(Q-\alpha)}(M'\ell) \quad (7.32)$$

In particular,

$$\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\# [e^{-\mu A}] = \bar{K}_{1-4/\kappa'} \left(2l \left(\frac{\mu}{4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \right)^{\kappa'/8} \right).$$

7.5 The $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ case

In this section, we prove Proposition 7.2. The proof of Proposition 7.1 in Section 7.1 used Proposition 7.4, Lemma 7.5 and Proposition 7.6. The analogous inputs in our setting are Proposition 7.26, Lemma 7.28 and Proposition 7.29 below, and given these, the proof of Proposition 7.2 is identical to that of Proposition 7.1. As usual, we assume $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma = 16/\sqrt{\kappa'}$.

Sample η from $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}$, we define the connected component that contains $+\infty$ as \mathcal{D}_{η^+} , with η^+ as its boundary and we also define the connected component contains $-\infty$ as \mathcal{D}_{η^-} , with η^- as its boundary. Let $-\eta$ be the image of η under reflection $z \mapsto -z$. Under these conventions, we have

$$\vartheta(\eta) = -\log \text{CR}(\exp(\eta^+), 0) - \log \text{CR}(\exp(-\eta^-), 0)$$

$$d\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha(\mathcal{C})(\eta) = 2^{2\lambda} e^{\lambda\vartheta(\eta)} d\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})(\eta)$$

Then the goal of this section is to compute $|\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha(\mathcal{C})|$ for $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$.

Recall for a sample (η, \mathbf{t}) from $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha \times dt$. $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep}, \alpha}$ is the law of the translated loop $\eta + \mathbf{t}$. We have the following conformal welding result, we prove it in Section 7.6 later.

Proposition 7.26. *There is a constant $C = C(\gamma)$ such that for all $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ we have*

$$C(Q-\alpha)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sp}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep}, \alpha} = \int_0^\infty \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)) d\ell. \quad (7.33)$$

For $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$, let $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ be the event that the generalized quantum surface containing the first marked point has quantum area at least 1 and the loop has generalized quantum length in (ε, δ) . As in the simple case, we will evaluate event $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ on both sides of (7.33) to deduce a formula for $|\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha|$. To evaluate $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ on the right hand side of 7.33, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7.27. *Writing A to denote quantum area, we have the following tail asymptotics*

$$\text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\# [A > x] = \frac{\Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\Gamma(2 - 4/\kappa')\Gamma(2 - \kappa'/4)} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} x^{-\kappa'/4+1} (1 + o(1)) \quad (7.34)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)^\# [A > x] = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} - \frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(2 - \frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} + \frac{4}{\kappa'})\Gamma(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma} - \frac{\kappa'}{4})} \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}\right)^{-1 - \frac{\kappa'}{4} + \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}} x^{-1 - \frac{\kappa'}{4} + \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}} (1 + o(1)). \quad (7.35)$$

where $o(1)$ satisfies $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} o(1) = 0$.

Proof. We only prove the first equation, since the argument for the second one is identical. According to Proposition 2.29, we have $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\# [e^{-\mu A}] = \bar{K}_{1-4/\kappa'}(M')$ for $M' = 2 \left(\frac{\mu}{4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \right)^{\frac{\kappa'}{8}}$. Now we need to estimate its inverse Laplace transform. According to Post's inversion formula [Pos30], for a bounded continuous function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its Laplace transform $F(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} f(t) dt$ exists and is smooth for $s > 0$, and we can uniquely recover f as

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1}\{F\}(t) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \left(\frac{k}{t}\right)^{k+1} F^{(k)}\left(\frac{k}{t}\right). \quad (7.36)$$

Now we use (7.36) to obtain the leading term of inverse Laplace transform of $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\# [e^{-\mu A}] = \bar{K}_{1-4/\kappa'}(M')$. Note that we have the absolutely convergent expansion (see e.g. [AS48, (9.6.2), (9.6.10)])

$$\bar{K}_\nu(z) = \Gamma(1 - \nu) \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! \Gamma(n - \nu + 1)} \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^{2n} - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! \Gamma(n + \nu + 1)} \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^{2n+2\nu} \right],$$

hence we have

$$\text{GQD}(1)^\# [e^{-\mu A}] = \Gamma\left(\frac{4}{\kappa'}\right) \left[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n! \Gamma(n + \frac{4}{\kappa'})} \left(\frac{\mu}{4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}}\right)^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4}} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-1)! \Gamma(n - \frac{4}{\kappa'} + 1)} \left(\frac{\mu}{4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}}\right)^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4} - 1} \right], \quad (7.37)$$

and we can evaluate its k -th derivative as (one can easily check the condition of term by term differentiation holds)

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{4}{\kappa'}\right) \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(n \frac{\kappa'}{4} + 1)}{n! \Gamma(n + \frac{4}{\kappa'}) \Gamma(n \frac{\kappa'}{4} - k + 1)} \frac{\mu^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4} - k}}{(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4}}} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(n \frac{\kappa'}{4})}{(n-1)! \Gamma(n - \frac{4}{\kappa'} + 1) \Gamma(n \frac{\kappa'}{4} - k)} \frac{\mu^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4} - 1 - k}}{(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4} - 1}} \right]. \quad (7.38)$$

We now take (7.38) into the formula (7.36). Using the fact $\Gamma(z - n) \sim (-)^n \frac{\pi}{\sin \pi z} \frac{n^{z-1}}{\Gamma(n)}$ (see e.g. [AS48, (6.1.46), (6.1.17)]), we find the limit in (7.36) is given by

$$-\Gamma\left(\frac{4}{\kappa'}\right) \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(n \frac{\kappa'}{4} + 1)}{n! \Gamma(n + \frac{4}{\kappa'})} \frac{\sin(\pi \frac{n \kappa'}{4})}{\pi} \frac{t^{-n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4} - 1}}{(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4}}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(n \frac{\kappa'}{4})}{(n-1)! \Gamma(n - \frac{4}{\kappa'} + 1)} \frac{\sin(\pi \frac{n \kappa'}{4})}{\pi} \frac{t^{-n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4}}}{(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{n \cdot \frac{\kappa'}{4} - 1}} \right]. \quad (7.39)$$

Note that the $n = 1$ term in the second summation above gives the leading order of (7.39) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore the inversion of $\text{GQD}_{0,1}(1)^\# [e^{-\mu A}]$ has the asymptotic:

$$-\frac{\Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\pi\Gamma(2-4/\kappa')} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} \sin \frac{\pi\kappa'}{4} \Gamma(\kappa'/4) t^{-\kappa'/4} + O(t^{-1-\kappa'/4}). \quad (7.40)$$

Finally, the tail probability follows just by the integration of (7.40) on $[x, \infty)$, which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GQD}_{1,0}(1)^\# [A > x] &= \frac{\Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\pi\Gamma(2-4/\kappa')} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} \Gamma(\kappa'/4) \frac{1}{-\kappa'/4+1} \sin \frac{\pi\kappa'}{4} x^{-\kappa'/4+1} + O(x^{-\kappa'/4}) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\Gamma(2-4/\kappa')\Gamma(2-\kappa'/4)} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} x^{-\kappa'/4+1} + O(x^{-\kappa'/4}), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the result. \square

We now evaluate the measure of the event $E_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ with respect to the right hand side of (7.33):

Lemma 7.28. *With $D(\alpha)$ the constant in Proposition 7.24, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\alpha) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep},\alpha})[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] \\ &= C' \times \frac{D(\alpha)^2}{(Q-\alpha)^2} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} - \frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(2 - \frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} + \frac{4}{\kappa'})\Gamma(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma} - \frac{\kappa'}{4})} \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}\right)^{-1 - \frac{\kappa'}{4} + \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}} (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where C' is a constant only depending on γ .

Proof. Similar to the computation in Lemma 7.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep},\alpha})[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = \frac{1}{C(Q-\alpha)^2} \int_\delta^\varepsilon \ell |\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)|^2 \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)^\# [A > \ell^{-8/\kappa'}] d\ell \\ &= C' \times \frac{D(\alpha)^2}{(Q-\alpha)^2} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} - \frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(2 - \frac{\alpha\gamma}{2} + \frac{4}{\kappa'})\Gamma(\frac{2\alpha}{\gamma} - \frac{\kappa'}{4})} \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}\right)^{-1 - \frac{\kappa'}{4} + \frac{2\alpha}{\gamma}} (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 7.27 to obtain the last expression. \square

Next, we evaluate the measure of $E_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ with respect to the left hand side of (7.33):

Proposition 7.29. *Let $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. We have*

$$(\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(W) \otimes \text{SLE}_{\kappa'}^{\text{sep},\alpha})[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{R}(\alpha)}{8(Q-\alpha)^2} |\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha| \log \varepsilon^{-1}$$

where the reflection coefficient $\bar{R}(\alpha)$ is as in Lemma 2.8,

Proof. As we explain, the argument is a minor modification of that of Section 7.3. Keeping the notation in that section, we sample $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha$ and set $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$, let \mathbf{C}_η^- be the region surrounded by η that contains $-\infty$, as defined in the paragraph above Lemma 6.18. Define the event

$$E'_{\delta,\varepsilon} = \{(\phi, \eta) : \varepsilon < \ell_\phi(\eta) < \delta \text{ and } \mu_\phi(\mathbf{C}_\eta^-) > 1\}$$

where $\ell_\phi(\eta)$ is the generalized quantum length of η . Then it suffices to prove

$$(M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha)[E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) |M| |\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha| \frac{\gamma \log \varepsilon^{-1}}{2(Q - \alpha)}. \quad (7.41)$$

Equation (7.41) is the $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ analog of Proposition 7.14; indeed, the only difference in the right hand sides is that the factor $\frac{2}{\gamma}$ in Proposition 7.14 becomes $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ in (7.41). The reason for the change $\frac{2}{\gamma} \rightarrow \frac{\gamma}{2}$ is that under $E'_{\delta,\varepsilon}$, the generalized quantum length $\ell_\phi(\eta^0 + \mathbf{t}) \approx e^{\frac{2}{\gamma} X \mathbf{t}}$.

The proof of the upper bound in (7.41) is identical to the proof of Lemma 7.20 (upper bound of Proposition 7.14), except that each factor $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ or $\frac{2}{\gamma}$ is replaced by its reciprocal, and the input Lemma 7.17 is replaced with the following:

Lemma 7.30. *Sample $(\phi, \mathbf{t}, \eta^0)$ from $M \times dt \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha$ and set $\eta = \eta^0 + \mathbf{t}$. Let $\mathfrak{l} = \ell_\phi(\eta)$, which is the boundary length of the beaded quantum surface $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^-, \phi) / \sim_\gamma$. Fix $\zeta \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ and a function $\text{err}(\ell)$ such that $\lim_{\ell \downarrow 0} \text{err}(\ell) = 0$, and conditioned on $(\mathfrak{C}_\eta^-, \phi) / \sim_\gamma$, the conditional probability of $\{\mathbf{t} \in (\sigma_{1-\zeta} - C, \tau_{1+\zeta})\}$ is at least $1 - \text{err}(\mathfrak{l})$. Where*

$$\sigma_y = \inf\{s > 0 : X_s < \frac{\gamma}{2} \log y\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_y = \sup\{s > 0 : X_s > \frac{\gamma}{2} \log y\}. \quad (7.42)$$

and $\text{err}(\mathfrak{l}) := \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; 1)^\# \left[\sup_{\xi \in S} |(h, \xi)| + Q \log 2 \geq -\frac{\gamma \zeta}{2} \log \ell \right]$.

Proof. The argument is identical to Lemma 7.17, except we use Lemma 6.20 in place of Lemma 6.12. \square

The proof of the lower bound of (7.41) is identical to the proof of Lemma 7.18 (lower bound of Proposition 7.14); the only changes needed are that each factor of $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ or $\frac{2}{\gamma}$ should be replaced by its reciprocal, and in (7.16) and (7.17) \mathcal{C}_η^- should be replaced by \mathfrak{C}_η^- . This concludes the proof of (7.41), so Proposition 7.29 holds. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.2. The result quickly follows by evaluating $E_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ on both sides of (7.33), and plugging in the expressions in Lemma 7.28 and Proposition 7.29. \square

7.6 Proof of Proposition 7.26

We start with the γ insertion case. The following lemma is the counterpart of Lemma 7.7.

Lemma 7.31. *For (ϕ, η) sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)} \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}(\mathcal{C})$, the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, -\infty, +\infty) / \sim_\gamma$ is $C \int_0^\infty \ell \cdot \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell), \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell)) d\ell$ for some γ -dependent constant $C \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 7.7, the result is immediate from Propositions 6.16 and 7.3. \square

Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and let η be a non-self-crossing loop separating $\pm\infty$. As at the beginning of Section 7.5, we can define η^+ and η^- . We mark a point p^+ on η^+ and p^- on η^- and let $\psi_{\eta^\pm} : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\eta^\pm}$, $\psi_{\eta^\pm}(i) = \pm\infty$ and $\psi_{\eta^\pm}(0) = p^\pm$. For ϕ sampled from $\text{LF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\gamma, \pm\infty)}$, let $X^\pm = \phi \circ \psi_{\eta^\pm} + Q \log |(\psi_{\eta^\pm})'|$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon} = \mathcal{C} \setminus (\psi_{\eta^-}(B_\varepsilon(i)) \cup \psi_{\eta^+}(B_\varepsilon(i)))$.

Lemma 7.32. For a fixed $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$ and for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ and any nonnegative measurable function f of $\phi|_{\mathcal{C}_{\eta, p^\pm, \varepsilon}}$ we have

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

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Lemma 7.10. \square

Now, we give the analog of Lemma 7.11. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \ell)$ denote the law of a sample from $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t, \ell)$ with a marked point sampled from the probability measure proportional to generalized boundary length.

Lemma 7.33. There is a constant $C = C(\gamma)$ such that the following holds. Suppose $\alpha \in (\frac{\gamma}{2}, Q)$. Sample (ϕ, η, p^-, p^+) from the measure

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

and further sample a point $q \in \eta$ from the probability measure proportional to generalized quantum length. Then the curve η cuts $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, -\infty, +\infty, p^-, p^+, q) / \sim_\gamma$ into a pair of forested quantum surfaces \mathcal{D}^- and \mathcal{D}^+ (respectively containing marked points $(-\infty, p^-, q)$ and $(+\infty, p^+, q)$) with the following description.

Embed the connected component of \mathcal{D}^\pm containing the bulk marked point as $(\mathbb{H}, X^\pm, i, 0)$ (so $X^\pm = \phi \circ \psi_\eta^\pm + Q \log |(\psi_\eta^\pm)'|$), and let \mathcal{L}_\bullet^\pm be the forested line segment corresponding to the foresting of the boundary $\partial\mathbb{H}$ in counterclockwise direction starting from 0, so \mathcal{L}_\bullet^\pm has a marked point on its forested boundary arc. Then the law of $(X^-, \mathcal{L}_\bullet^-, \mathcal{L}_\bullet^+, X^+)$ is

$$\iint \int_0^\infty \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(t^-) \times \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t^-, \ell) \times \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t^+, \ell) \times \text{LF}_{\mathbb{H}}^{(\alpha, i)}(t^+) dt^- \cdot \ell d\ell \cdot dt^+. \quad (7.43)$$

Proof. We first establish the $\alpha = \gamma$ case. Writing $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^\pm$ for \mathcal{D}^\pm without the marked point q , Lemma 7.31 identifies the law of $(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^-, \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^+)$ as $C \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell) \ell d\ell$. Thus, if we let \mathcal{L}_\bullet^\pm be \mathcal{L}_\bullet^\pm with marked point forgotten, by Lemma 2.21 and the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\gamma; \ell)$ (Definition 2.32) the law of $(X^-, \mathcal{L}_\bullet^-, \mathcal{L}_\bullet^+, X^+)$ is (7.43) with the measures $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t^\pm, \ell)$ replaced by $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{f.l.}}(t^\pm, \ell)$. The desired $\alpha = \gamma$ result then holds by the uniform conformal welding claim in Lemma 7.31.

The extension to the general α case is identical to that in the proof of Lemma 7.11, using Lemma 7.32 (in place of Lemma 7.10) and Lemma 7.8. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.26. In Lemma 7.33, by Definition 2.32 the pair $(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^-, \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^+)$ agree in law with a sample from $\int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell) \times \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell) \ell d\ell$ after a boundary point is sampled from the probability measure proportional to generalized boundary length for each surface. Thus, for $(\phi, \eta) \sim \text{CLF}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(\alpha, \pm\infty)} \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}^\alpha$ the law of $(\mathcal{C}, \phi, \eta, -\infty, +\infty) / \sim_\gamma$ is $\int_0^\infty \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell), \mathcal{M}_{1,0,0}^{\text{f.d.}}(\alpha; \ell)) \ell d\ell$. The desired result then follows from Proposition 7.3. \square

8 Evaluation of constants for the loop intensity measure

In this section, we evaluate the constants mentioned in Section 1.5 for the loop intensity measure.

8.1 The dilation constant

The first constant concerns the decomposition of the loop measure into its shape measure and a dilation. For convenience, we map the measure to the infinite cylinder \mathcal{C} so that dilation becomes translation. Let $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ be the measure on the space of loops in \mathcal{C} separating $\pm\infty$ which is obtained by sampling a loop from $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, mapping it to \mathcal{C} via \log , and restricting to $\{\text{loop separates } \pm\infty\}$. For a loop $\eta \sim \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ we define a pair (η_0, \mathbf{t}) , where $\mathbf{t} = \sup_{z \in \eta} \text{Re } z$ and $\eta_0 = \eta - \mathbf{t}$ is the translation of η such that $\sup_{z \in \eta_0} \text{Re } z = 0$. On the other hand, given a pair (η_0, \mathbf{t}) , we can recover $\eta = \eta_0 + \mathbf{t}$. Thus we may view $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$ as the law of the pair (η_0, \mathbf{t}) .

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$. There is a probability measure \mathcal{L}_κ such that*

$$\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\kappa}{4} - 1 \right) \cot\left(\pi \left(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)\right) \mathcal{L}_\kappa(d\eta_0) dt.$$

To prove Proposition 8.1, we need the following asymptotic result.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\kappa \in (8/3, 8)$ and $C > 0$. Sample a full-plane CLE_κ and let $N_C \geq 0$ be the number of loops η which separate 0 and ∞ satisfying $e^{-C} \leq \text{dist}(\eta, 0) \leq 1$. Then*

$$\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{C} \mathbb{E}[N_C] = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\kappa}{4} - 1 \right) \cot\left(\pi \left(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)\right). \quad (8.1)$$

Proof. Let $\dots, \eta_{-1}, \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots$ be the doubly-infinite sequence of loops separating 0 and ∞ such that each successive loop is nested in the previous loop, and η_0 is the first loop which intersects \mathbb{D} . Let $B_n := \log \text{CR}(\eta_{n-1}, 0) - \log \text{CR}(\eta_n, 0)$, so the sequence B_1, B_2, \dots is i.i.d., and [SSW09, Proposition 1, Equation (2)] gives

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[B_1]} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{\kappa}{4} - 1 \right) \cot\left(\pi \left(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}\right)\right).$$

For $n \geq 0$ let $S_n := B_1 + \dots + B_n$ and let $R := \text{CR}(\eta_0, 0)$, so $\text{CR}(\eta_n, 0) = e^{-S_n} R$. Let $\tau_C \geq 0$ be the first index such that $S_{\tau_C} > C - \log 4 + \log R$, and let $\sigma_C \geq 0$ be the first index such that $S_{\sigma_C} > C + \log R$. Then by the Koebe quarter theorem

$$\text{dist}(\eta_{\tau_C-1}, 0) \geq \frac{1}{4} \text{CR}(\eta_{\tau_C-1}, 0) \geq e^{-C}, \quad \text{dist}(\eta_{\sigma_C}, 0) \leq \text{CR}(\eta_{\sigma_C}, 0) \leq e^{-C},$$

hence

$$\tau_C \leq N_C \leq \sigma_C + 1. \quad (8.2)$$

We will show that $\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tau_C]/C = \lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_C]/C = 1/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$. This and (8.2) imply the desired (8.1).

First, the explicit density for B_1 computed in [SSW09, (4)] implies that for some constants $a, b > 0$ we have $\mathbb{P}[B_1 \in dx] = (1 + o_x(1))ae^{-bx}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, so there is a constant K such that for any $x > 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}[B_1 \mid B_1 > x] < x + K$. We conclude that $\mathbb{E}[S_{\sigma_C} \mid R] \leq C + \log R + K$. By Wald's identity, we have $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_C \mid R] = \mathbb{E}[S_{\sigma_C} \mid R]/\mathbb{E}[B_1] \leq (C + \log R + K)/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$. Since $R = \text{CR}(\eta_0, 0) \leq 4$ by the Koebe quarter theorem, we conclude $\limsup_{C \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[S_{\sigma_C}]/C \leq 1/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$.

Next, by Wald's identity $\mathbb{E}[\tau_C \mid R] = \mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_C} \mid R]/\mathbb{E}[B_1] \geq (C - \log 4 + \log R)/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$. Thus for any constant $x > 0$ we have $\mathbb{E}[\tau_C] \geq \mathbb{E}[\tau_C 1_{R > x}] \geq \mathbb{P}[R > x](C - \log 4 + \log x)/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$, and $\liminf_{C \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tau_C]/C \geq \mathbb{P}[R > x]/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$. Since x is arbitrary we have $\liminf_{C \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\tau_C]/C \geq 1/\mathbb{E}[B_1]$. Combining with the previous paragraph gives the desired result. \square

Proof of Proposition 8.1. By (8.1) we have $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}[0 \leq \mathbf{t} \leq C] = (1 + o(1))\frac{1}{\pi}(\frac{\kappa}{4} - 1) \cot(\pi(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}))C$, so the conformal invariance of $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ implies the marginal law of \mathbf{t} is $\frac{1}{\pi}(\frac{\kappa}{4} - 1) \cot(\pi(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa})) dt$. Conformal invariance also implies the conditional law of η_0 given \mathbf{t} does not depend on \mathbf{t} ; this conditional law is \mathcal{L}_κ . \square

8.2 The welding constant for $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$

For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$, Theorems 3.2 and 1.1 imply that

$$\text{Weld}(\text{QD}, \text{QD}) = C_\gamma \text{QS} \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} \quad (8.3)$$

For some constant C_γ . We now evaluate this constant.

Proposition 8.3. *For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$, we have*

$$C_\gamma = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{(Q - \gamma)^2} \tan(\pi(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)), \quad (8.4)$$

As same in the proof of Proposition 6.5, we sample two points from quantum area measure and restrict to the event that the loop separates the two points. Then it suffices to prove (we incur a factor of 2 since there are two choices for which quantum disk the first point lies on)

$$2\text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}, \text{QD}_{1,0}) = C_\gamma \cdot \text{QS}_2 \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{sep}}$$

with the same C_γ as (8.4). This can be done by the following lemma.

Lemma 8.4. *We have $\text{Weld}(\text{QD}_{1,0}, \text{QD}_{1,0}) = \tilde{K}_\gamma \text{QS}_2 \otimes (\mathcal{L}_\kappa \times dt)$, with the welding constant*

$$\tilde{K}_\gamma = \frac{\gamma}{16\pi^2(Q - \gamma)} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}).$$

Proof. By Proposition 7.4, there exists a constant C such that

$$\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell), \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell)) d\ell = C(Q - \gamma)^2 \mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\gamma) \otimes (\mathcal{L} \times dt).$$

We evaluate the event $E_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ (i.e. the total quantum area is larger than 1 and the quantum length of the SLE_κ loop is in (δ, ε) ; see the paragraph before Lemma 7.5 on both sides of the above welding equation). By Lemma 7.5 and Proposition 7.6, we have

$$\frac{1}{C(Q - \gamma)^2} \frac{1}{\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \gamma)\Gamma(\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \gamma))} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} 2^{-\gamma^2/2} \bar{U}(\gamma) \right)^2 \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4} \right)^{-\frac{2}{\gamma}(Q - \gamma)} = \frac{\bar{R}(\gamma)}{2(Q - \gamma)^2},$$

hence

$$C = \frac{2^{3-\gamma^2}}{\gamma^2 \Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2})} \left(4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4} \right)^{1 - \frac{4}{\gamma^2}} \frac{\bar{U}(\gamma)^2}{\bar{R}(\gamma)} = \frac{Q - \gamma}{4\gamma} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4}).$$

Here, we are using the following computation which uses $\Gamma(x)\Gamma(1-x) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi x)}$ and $\Gamma(x+1) = x\Gamma(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{U}(\gamma)^2}{\bar{R}(\gamma)} &= \left(\frac{2^{2-\gamma^2}\pi^2}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-1} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})^2 \left/ \left(\left(\frac{\pi\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})^2} \right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-1} \frac{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1)}{(Q - \gamma)\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)} \right) \right. \\ &= 2^{\gamma^2-4} \left(\frac{4\pi}{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})} \right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-1} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})^2}{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1)} (Q - \gamma)\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1) \\ &= 2^{\gamma^2-5}\gamma \left(4 \sin(\frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}) \right)^{\frac{4}{\gamma^2}-1} \Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})(Q - \gamma)\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2}) \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Theorem 2.22, we have $\mathcal{M}_{1,0}^{\text{disk}}(\gamma; \ell) = \frac{2\pi}{\gamma}(Q - \gamma)^2 \text{QD}_{1,0}(\ell)$. And by definition we have $\mathcal{M}_2^{\text{sph}}(\gamma) = \text{QS}_2$. This gives $\tilde{K}_\gamma = C(Q - \gamma)^2 / (\frac{2\pi}{\gamma}(Q - \gamma)^2)^2$ as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 8.3. Combining Lemma 8.4 and Proposition 8.1, the result follows. \square

Another natural formulation of conformal welding result for the SLE loop measure is under the uniform embedding $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}}$. For the loop intensity measure, we have

$$\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \left(\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell), \text{QD}(\ell)) d\ell \right) = K_\gamma \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} \quad (8.5)$$

where K_γ is a constant depends on γ . We now evaluate this constant as a corollary of Proposition 8.3.

Corollary 8.5. *For $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4)$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{\kappa}$, we have*

$$K_\gamma = \frac{\gamma}{8} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\gamma^2}{4})\Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})}{(Q - \gamma)^4} \tan(\pi(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)).$$

Proof. Applying the uniform embedding $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}}$ in Proposition 8.3 gives

$$\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \left(\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{QD}(\ell), \text{QD}(\ell)) d\ell \right) = C_\gamma \mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \left(\text{QS} \times \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}} \right).$$

Since $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \text{QS} = \frac{\pi\gamma}{2(Q-\gamma)^2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$ (Proposition 2.13), we conclude that $K_\gamma = C_\gamma \frac{\pi\gamma}{2(Q-\gamma)^2}$. Plugging (8.4) yields the result. \square

8.3 The welding constant for $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$

We first prove the counterpart of Proposition 8.3.

Proposition 8.6. *For $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\gamma = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\kappa'}}$, we have $\text{Weld}(\text{GQD}, \text{GQD}) = C'_\gamma \text{QS} \otimes \widetilde{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$ (by Theorems 3.3 and 1.1) with*

$$C'_\gamma = R'_\gamma{}^2 \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} \right)^5 \pi^{-\frac{8}{\gamma^2}+2} 2^{-\frac{8}{\gamma^2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)}{\Gamma(2 - \frac{4}{\gamma^2})} \Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})^{\frac{8}{\gamma^2}+2} \tan \pi \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1 \right) \frac{2(Q - \gamma)^2}{\pi\gamma}, \quad (8.6)$$

where R'_γ is specified by $|\text{GQD}(\ell)| = R'_\gamma \cdot \ell^{-\frac{\gamma^2}{4}-2}$ as in Lemma 2.28.

Similary as in the proof of Proposition 8.6 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 8.7. *The constant \widetilde{K}'_γ in the welding equation $\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell), \text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)) d\ell = \widetilde{K}'_\gamma \text{QS}_2 \times \mathcal{L}_{\kappa'}(d\eta_0) dt$ satisfies*

$$\widetilde{K}'_\gamma \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{R}(\gamma)}{8(Q - \gamma)^2} = \frac{R'_\gamma{}^2 \Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\Gamma(2 - 4/\kappa') \Gamma(2 - \kappa'/4)} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} \left(\frac{\kappa'}{16 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \frac{\Gamma(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\kappa'})} \right)^2$$

Proof. Recall $E_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is the event that the generalized quantum disk containing the first marked point has quantum area t least 1 and the loop has boundary length in (ε, δ) . We evaluate $E_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ on both sides of the welding equation. By Proposition 7.29 and taking $\alpha = \gamma$, we have

$$(\text{QS}_2 \otimes (\mathcal{L}_{\kappa'} \times dt))[E_{\delta,\varepsilon}] = (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{R}(\gamma)}{8(Q - \gamma)^2} \log \varepsilon^{-1}, \quad (8.7)$$

while evaluating $E_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ on the measure $\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell), \text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)) d\ell$ gives

$$\int_\delta^\varepsilon \ell |\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)|^2 \text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\# [A > 1] d\ell. \quad (8.8)$$

Note that $\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\# [A > 1] = \text{GQD}_1(1)^\# [A > \ell^{-8/\kappa'}]$. According to Lemma 7.27, we see

$$\text{GQD}_1(1)^\# [A > \ell^{-8/\kappa'}] = \frac{\Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\Gamma(2 - 4/\kappa')\Gamma(2 - \kappa'/4)} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} \ell^{2-8/\kappa'} + O(\ell^2).$$

Then (8.8) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\varepsilon^\delta \ell |\text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)|^2 \text{GQD}_{1,0}(\ell)^\# [A > 1] d\ell \\ &= \int_\varepsilon^\delta \left[\frac{\Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\Gamma(2 - 4/\kappa')\Gamma(2 - \kappa'/4)} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} \ell^{2-8/\kappa'} + O(\ell^2) \right] \ell \left(R'_\gamma \frac{\kappa'}{16 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \frac{\Gamma(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\kappa'})} \ell^{\frac{4}{\kappa'}-2} \right)^2 d\ell \\ &= \frac{R'_\gamma{}^2 \Gamma(4/\kappa')}{\Gamma(2 - 4/\kappa')\Gamma(2 - \kappa'/4)} (4 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4})^{-\kappa'/4+1} \left(\frac{\kappa'}{16 \sin \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{4}} \frac{\Gamma(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa'})}{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\kappa'})} \right)^2 (1 + o_{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \log \varepsilon^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.9)$$

Let (8.7) equal the last line of (8.9), the result then follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 8.6. Combining Lemma 8.7 and Proposition 8.1, we get the result. \square

As in Corollary 8.5, in the the uniform embedding setting we have:

Corollary 8.8. *We have*

$$\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \left(\int_0^\infty \ell \text{Weld}(\text{GQD}(\ell), \text{GQD}(\ell)) d\ell \right) = K'_\gamma \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}} \times \widehat{\text{SLE}}_{\kappa'}^{\text{loop}}$$

where the constant K'_γ is given by

$$\frac{K'_\gamma}{R'_\gamma{}^2} = - \left(\frac{2}{\gamma} \right)^5 \pi^{-\frac{8}{\gamma^2}+2} 2^{-\frac{8}{\gamma^2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{4}{\gamma^2} - 1)}{\Gamma(2 - \frac{4}{\gamma^2})} \Gamma(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4})^{\frac{8}{\gamma^2}+2} \tan \pi \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{4} - 1 \right) \quad (8.10)$$

Proof. We apply the uniform embedding $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}}$ to Proposition 8.6 and use $\mathbf{m}_{\widehat{\mathbb{C}}} \times \text{QS} = \frac{\pi\gamma}{2(Q-\gamma)^2} \text{LF}_{\mathbb{C}}$ (Proposition 2.13). Then we conclude $K'_\gamma = C'_\gamma \frac{\pi\gamma}{2(Q-\gamma)^2}$ for C'_γ in (8.6); and the result follows by plugging into the expression of the reflection coefficient $\bar{R}(\gamma)$ in Lemma 2.8. \square

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

In this section we supply the continuity in κ needed to extend Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 from $\kappa < 4$ to $\kappa = 4$. We start with a monotonicity statement for CLE_κ proved in [SW12].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recall the loop measures $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, $\widetilde{\text{SLE}}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$, \mathcal{L}_κ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa$ from Section 6. We first give a quantitative version of Lemma 6.4 and then prove the continuity in κ for these measures.

Proposition A.4. *Lemma 6.4 holds. Moreover, the convergence is exponential with a uniform rate near $\kappa = 4$. That is, there exists a constant $a(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$ depending on κ such that the total variation distance between the law of η^n and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is at most $a(\kappa)^n$, and in addition, $\sup\{a(\kappa) : \kappa \in [\kappa_0, 4]\} < 1$ for $\kappa_0 \in (8/3, 4]$.*

Proof. Fix $\kappa \in (\frac{8}{3}, 4]$. [KW16, Section 3.1, Fact 4] shows that there exists $a(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$ such that regardless of the initial states, the Markov chain in Lemma 6.4 couples in one step with probability $1 - a(\kappa)$. Moreover, inspecting that argument, we see that $\sup\{a(\kappa) : \kappa \in [\kappa_0, 4]\} < 1$ for $\kappa_0 \in (8/3, 4]$. This gives Proposition A.4. \square

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

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

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

Proof. We only explain that under the natural parameterization, chordal SLE_κ converges to SLE_4 as $\kappa \uparrow 4$. Once this is done, the same convergence holds for $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{p \rightleftharpoons q}$. Note that the whole-plane SLE_κ from p to q is continuous as $\kappa \uparrow 4$ with Hausdorff topology. Conditioned on this, the law of the other is a chordal SLE_κ from p to q in the complementary domain, which is continuous as $\kappa \uparrow 4$ under natural parametrization. By symmetry, we get two-sided whole plane SLE_κ curve

$\text{SLE}_\kappa^{p=q}$ converges to $\text{SLE}_4^{p=q}$ under natural parametrization as well. From this and the definition of $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{\text{loop}}$ (Definition 3.1), we get the convergence of \mathcal{L}_κ .

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

References

- [ACSW24] Morris Ang, Geifei Cai, Xin Sun, and Baojun Wu. Integrability of Conformal Loop Ensemble: Imaginary DOZZ and Beyond. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2024.
- [AG21] Morris Ang and Ewain Gwynne. Liouville quantum gravity surfaces with boundary as matings of trees. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(1):1 – 53, 2021.
- [AHS17] Juhan Aru, Yichao Huang, and Xin Sun. Two perspectives of the 2D unit area quantum sphere and their equivalence. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 356(1):261–283, 2017.
- [AHS23a] Morris Ang, Nina Holden, and Xin Sun. Conformal welding of quantum disks. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 28:Paper No. 52, 50, 2023.
- [AHS23b] Morris Ang, Nina Holden, and Xin Sun. The SLE loop via conformal welding of quantum disks. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 28:Paper No. 30, 20, 2023.
- [AHS24] Morris Ang, Nina Holden, and Xin Sun. Integrability of SLE via conformal welding of random surfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 77(5):2651–2707, 2024.
- [AHSY23] Morris Ang, Nina Holden, Xin Sun, and Pu Yu. Conformal welding of quantum disks and multiple SLE: the non-simple case. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2310.20583*, October 2023.
- [ARS22] Morris Ang, Guillaume Remy, and Xin Sun. The moduli of annuli in random conformal geometry. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2203.12398, March 2022.
- [ARS23] Morris Ang, Guillaume Remy, and Xin Sun. Fzz formula of boundary liouville cft via conformal welding. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, pages 1–58, 2023.
- [ARSZ23] Morris Ang, Guillaume Remy, Xin Sun, and Tunan Zhu. Derivation of all structure constants for boundary Liouville CFT. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2305.18266*, May 2023.
- [AS48] Milton Abramowitz and Irene A Stegun. *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*, volume 55. US Government printing office, 1948.
- [AS21] Morris Ang and Xin Sun. Integrability of the conformal loop ensemble. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2107.01788*, July 2021.
- [ASY22] Morris Ang, Xin Sun, and Pu Yu. Quantum triangles and imaginary geometry flow lines. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2211.04580*, November 2022.

- [ASYZ24] Morris Ang, Xin Sun, Pu Yu, and Zijie Zhuang. Boundary touching probability and nested-path exponent for non-simple CLE. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15904*, Jan 2024.
- [BBCK18] Jean Bertoin, Timothy Budd, Nicolas Curien, and Igor Kortchemski. Martingales in self-similar growth-fragmentations and their connections with random planar maps. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 172(3-4):663–724, 2018.
- [BD16] Stéphane Benoist and Julien Dubédat. An SLE_2 loop measure. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 52(3), August 2016.
- [BH19] Stéphane Benoist and Clément Hongler. The scaling limit of critical Ising interfaces is CLE_3 . *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):2049–2086, 2019.
- [BJ24] Guillaume Baverez and Antoine Jego. The CFT of SLE loop measures and the Kontsevich–Suhov conjecture. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2407.09080*, July 2024.
- [CCM20] Linxiao Chen, Nicolas Curien, and Pascal Maillard. The perimeter cascade in critical Boltzmann quadrangulations decorated by an $O(n)$ loop model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D*, 7(4):535–584, 2020.
- [CN08] Federico Camia and Charles M. Newman. SLE_6 and CLE_6 from critical percolation. In *Probability, geometry and integrable systems*, volume 55 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 103–130. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [DDDF20] Jian Ding, Julien Dubédat, Alexander Dunlap, and Hugo Falconet. Tightness of Liouville first passage percolation for $\gamma \in (0, 2)$. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 132:353–403, 2020.
- [DKRV16] François David, Antti Kupiainen, Rémi Rhodes, and Vincent Vargas. Liouville quantum gravity on the Riemann sphere. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 342(3):869–907, 2016.
- [DLG02] Thomas Duquesne and Jean-François Le Gall. Random trees, Lévy processes and spatial branching processes. *Astérisque*, (281):vi+147, 2002.
- [DLMF] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.1.0 of 2020-12-15. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.
- [DMS21] Bertrand Duplantier, Jason Miller, and Scott Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity as a mating of trees. *Astérisque*, (427):viii+257, 2021.
- [DS11] Bertrand Duplantier and Scott Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity and KPZ. *Invent. Math.*, 185(2):333–393, 2011.
- [Dub09] Julien Dubédat. Duality of Schramm-Loewner evolutions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 42(5):697–724, 2009.
- [FZZ00] V. Fateev, A. Zamolodchikov, and Al. Zamolodchikov. Boundary Liouville Field Theory I. Boundary State and Boundary Two-point Function. *arXiv e-prints hep-th/0001012*, January 2000.

- [GHS23] Ewain Gwynne, Nina Holden, and Xin Sun. Mating of trees for random planar maps and Liouville quantum gravity: a survey. In *Topics in statistical mechanics*, volume 59 of *Panor. Synthèses*, pages 41–120. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2023.
- [GKRV20] Colin Guillarmou, Antti Kupiainen, Rémi Rhodes, and Vincent Vargas. Conformal bootstrap in Liouville Theory. *Acta to appear, arXiv:2005.11530*, May 2020.
- [GM21] Ewain Gwynne and Jason Miller. Existence and uniqueness of the Liouville quantum gravity metric for $\gamma \in (0, 2)$. *Invent. Math.*, 223(1):213–333, 2021.
- [GMQ18] E. Gwynne, J. Miller, and W. Qian. Conformal invariance of CLE_κ on the Riemann sphere for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. *International Math Research Notices*, to appear, 2018.
- [GMS21] E. Gwynne, J. Miller, and S. Sheffield. The Tutte embedding of the mated-CRT map converges to Liouville quantum gravity. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(4):1677–1717, 2021.
- [Gwy20] Ewain Gwynne. Random surfaces and Liouville quantum gravity. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 67(4):484–491, 2020.
- [HL22] Nina Holden and Matthias Lehmkuehler. Liouville quantum gravity weighted by conformal loop ensemble nesting statistics. *Probability and Mathematical Physics*, 2022.
- [HS23] Nina Holden and Xin Sun. Convergence of uniform triangulations under the Cardy embedding. *Acta Math.*, 230(1):93–203, 2023.
- [JS00] Peter W. Jones and Stanislav K. Smirnov. Removability theorems for Sobolev functions and quasiconformal maps. *Ark. Mat.*, 38(2):263–279, 2000.
- [Kal17] Olav Kallenberg. *Random measures, theory and applications*, volume 77 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [KK17] Adrien Kassel and Richard Kenyon. Random curves on surfaces induced from the laplacian determinant. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(2), March 2017.
- [KMS22] Konstantinos Kavvadias, Jason Miller, and Lukas Schoug. Conformal removability of SLE_4 . *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2209.10532*, September 2022.
- [KMS23] Konstantinos Kavvadias, Jason Miller, and Lukas Schoug. Conformal removability of non-simple Schramm-Loewner evolutions. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2302.10857*, February 2023.
- [KRV20] Antti Kupiainen, Rémi Rhodes, and Vincent Vargas. Integrability of Liouville theory: proof of the DOZZ formula. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 191(1):81–166, 2020.
- [KS07] M. Kontsevich and Y. Suhov. On Malliavin measures, SLE, and CFT. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 258(Anal. i Osob. Ch. 1):107–153, 2007.
- [KS16] Antti Kemppainen and Stanislav Smirnov. Conformal invariance in random cluster models. II. Full scaling limit as a branching SLE. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:1609.08527*, September 2016.
- [KW04] Richard Kenyon and David B. Wilson. Conformal radii of loop models. 2004. Manuscript.

- [KW16] Antti Kemppainen and Wendelin Werner. The nested simple conformal loop ensembles in the Riemann sphere. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 165(3-4):835–866, 2016.
- [LR15] Gregory F. Lawler and Mohammad A. Rezaei. Minkowski content and natural parameterization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(3):1082–1120, 2015.
- [LS11] Gregory F. Lawler and Scott Sheffield. A natural parametrization for the Schramm-Loewner evolution. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(5):1896–1937, 2011.
- [MMQ21] Oliver McEntegart, Jason Miller, and Wei Qian. Uniqueness of the welding problem for SLE and Liouville quantum gravity. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 20(3):757–783, 2021.
- [MS16a] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry I: interacting SLEs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 164(3-4):553–705, 2016.
- [MS16b] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry II: Reversibility of $SLE_\kappa(\rho_1; \rho_2)$ for $\kappa \in (0, 4)$. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):1647–1722, 2016.
- [MS16c] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry III: reversibility of SLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 184(2):455–486, 2016.
- [MS17] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry IV: interior rays, whole-plane reversibility, and space-filling trees. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 169(3-4):729–869, 2017.
- [MS19] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity spheres as matings of finite-diameter trees. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 55(3):1712–1750, 2019.
- [MSW17] Jason Miller, Scott Sheffield, and Wendelin Werner. CLE percolations. *Forum Math. Pi*, 5:e4, 102, 2017.
- [MSW20] Jason Miller, Scott Sheffield, and Wendelin Werner. Simple Conformal Loop Ensembles on Liouville Quantum Gravity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05698*, 2020.
- [MSW21] Jason Miller, Scott Sheffield, and Wendelin Werner. Non-simple conformal loop ensembles on Liouville quantum gravity and the law of CLE percolation interfaces. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–42, 2021.
- [NQSZ23] Pierre Nolin, Wei Qian, Xin Sun, and Zijie Zhuang. Backbone exponent for two-dimensional percolation. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2309.05050*, September 2023.
- [Pos30] Emil L Post. Generalized differentiation. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 32(4):723–781, 1930.
- [Rem20] Guillaume Remy. The Fyodorov-Bouchaud formula and Liouville conformal field theory. *Duke Math. J.*, 169(1):177–211, 2020.
- [RV19] Rémi Rhodes and Vincent Vargas. The tail expansion of Gaussian multiplicative chaos and the Liouville reflection coefficient. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(5):3082–3107, 2019.
- [RZ22] Guillaume Remy and Tunan Zhu. Integrability of boundary Liouville conformal field theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 395(1):179–268, 2022.

- [Sch00] Oded Schramm. Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Isr. J. Math.*, 118:221–288, 2000.
- [She09] Scott Sheffield. Exploration trees and conformal loop ensembles. *Duke Math. J.*, 147(1):79–129, 2009.
- [She16] Scott Sheffield. Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(5):3474–3545, 2016.
- [She23] Scott Sheffield. What is a random surface? In *International Congress of Mathematicians 2022 July 6–14. Vol. II. Plenary lectures*, pages 1202–1258. EMS Press, 2023.
- [SSW09] Oded Schramm, Scott Sheffield, and David B. Wilson. Conformal radii for conformal loop ensembles. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 288(1):43–53, 2009.
- [SW12] Scott Sheffield and Wendelin Werner. Conformal loop ensembles: the Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(3):1827–1917, 2012.
- [SW16] Scott Sheffield and Menglu Wang. Field-measure correspondence in Liouville quantum gravity almost surely commutes with all conformal maps simultaneously. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1605.06171, May 2016.
- [SY23] Xin Sun and Pu Yu. SLE partition functions via conformal welding of random surfaces. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:2309.05177*, September 2023.
- [Var17] Vincent Vargas. Lecture notes on Liouville theory and the DOZZ formula. *arXiv e-prints arXiv:1712.00829*, December 2017.
- [Wer08] Wendelin Werner. The conformally invariant measure on self-avoiding loops. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(1):137–169, 2008.
- [Zha08] Dapeng Zhan. Duality of chordal SLE. *Invent. Math.*, 174(2):309–353, 2008.
- [Zha10] Dapeng Zhan. Duality of chordal SLE, II. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 46(3):740–759, 2010.
- [Zha19] Dapeng Zhan. Optimal Hölder continuity and dimension properties for SLE with Minkowski content parametrization. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 175(1-2):447–466, 2019.
- [Zha21] Dapeng Zhan. SLE loop measures. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 179(1-2):345–406, 2021.