

The supercritical phase of the φ^4 model is well behaved

Trishen S. Gunaratnam*, Christoforos Panagiotis†,
Romain Panis‡, Franco Severo‡

January 10, 2025

Abstract

In this article, we analyse the φ^4 model on \mathbb{Z}^d in the supercritical regime $\beta > \beta_c$. We consider a random cluster representation of the φ^4 model, which corresponds to an Ising random cluster model on a random environment. We prove that the supercritical phase of this percolation model on \mathbb{Z}^d ($d \geq 2$) is well behaved in the sense that for every $\beta > \beta_c$, local uniqueness of macroscopic clusters happens with high probability, uniformly in boundary conditions. This result provides the basis for renormalisation techniques used to study several fine properties of the supercritical phase. As an application, we obtain surface order large deviation bounds for the empirical magnetisation of the φ^4 model in the entire supercritical regime.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Surface order large deviations	4
1.2	Random cluster for φ^4 and supercritical sharpness	5
1.3	Outline of the proof	6
2	Preliminaries	8
2.1	The φ^4 model on \mathbb{Z}^d	8
2.2	Correlation inequalities	9
2.3	Quartic tail bounds	10
2.4	The random tangled current representation	12
2.4.1	Tangled currents	12
2.4.2	Switching principle for tangled currents	14
3	Bulk and boundary magnetisation	17
3.1	Bulk magnetisation	17
3.2	Boundary magnetisation	20
4	Random cluster for the φ^4 model	26
4.1	Definition of the φ^4 random cluster model	26
4.2	Coupling to the spin model	27
4.3	Correlation inequalities and monotonicity	30
4.4	Uniqueness of infinite volume measures	33

*TIFR, Mumbai and ICTS-TIFR, Bengaluru, trishen@math.tifr.res.in

†University of Bath, cp2324@bath.ac.uk

‡Institut Camille Jordan (Lyon 1), panis@math.univ-lyon1.fr, severo@math.univ-lyon1.fr

5	Surface order bound on disconnections	34
5.1	Definition of the surface tension	35
5.2	Strict positivity of the surface tension	37
5.3	Comparison with the free φ^4 random cluster model	40
6	Local uniqueness and renormalisation	45
6.1	Local uniqueness with sprinkling	45
6.2	Slab percolation	46
6.3	Local uniqueness without sprinkling	48
6.3.1	Proof of Theorem 1.3 in $d = 2$	48
6.3.2	Proof of Theorem 1.3 when $d \geq 3$	49
6.4	Coupling with a sprinkled measure	50
7	Surface order large deviations	54
A	Toolbox	61
A.1	Large degree deviations	61
A.2	Tanglings estimates	62
A.3	Large deviation for highly supercritical percolation	63
B	The weak plus measure	64

1 Introduction

The φ^4 model is a natural generalisation of the Ising model to a lattice spin model with unbounded spins. On a finite graph $G = (V, E)$, it is given by a probability measure on configurations $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^V$ defined by its expectation values on bounded measurable functions $F : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle F(\varphi) \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}^V} F(\varphi) \exp \left(\beta \sum_{\{x,y\} \in E} \varphi_x \varphi_y - \sum_{x \in V} (g\varphi_x^4 + a\varphi_x^2) \right) \prod_{x \in V} d\varphi_x,$$

where Z is a normalisation constant, $\beta \geq 0$ is the inverse temperature, and $g > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$ are coupling constants. It is well-known that this model interpolates between the Ising model and the Gaussian free field. Furthermore, it arises in Euclidean quantum field theory, where it is used to construct (or destruct) the continuum φ^4 model [Nel66, GJ73, Sok82, Aiz82, Frö82, AD21].

The φ^4 model is a rich statistical physics model in its own right. On the hypercubic lattice \mathbb{Z}^d , it undergoes a *phase transition* as β is varied, provided the dimension satisfies $d \geq 2$. Namely, there is a *critical point* β_c separating a *subcritical/disordered* phase ($\beta < \beta_c$), in which two-point correlations tend to 0 when the system size is large, and a *supercritical/ordered* phase ($\beta > \beta_c$), in which two-point correlations stay bounded away from 0. The model's *critical phase* is of significant interest since it is expected to be in the same *universality class* as the Ising model in all dimensions, meaning that the two model's *critical exponents* are expected to coincide. We refer to the introduction of [GPPS22] (see also [Aiz21, Pan24]) for a more complete discussion. On the mathematical side, *subcritical sharpness* results [ABF87] imply an exponential decay of correlations for all $\beta < \beta_c$. In the critical phase, continuity of the phase transition in dimensions $d \geq 3$ [GPPS22], trivality of the critical and near-critical scaling limits in $d \geq 4$ [Aiz82, Frö82, AD21, Pan23], and bounds on the (near-)critical two-point function in dimensions

$d \geq 3$ [FSS76, FILS78, Sak15, DP24] have been established. Furthermore, the so-called *weakly-coupled* φ^4 model (which corresponds to choosing g small enough in (1.1)) has been extensively studied in the literature through the *renormalization group* approach [GK85, Har87, FMRS87, BBS14, ST16, BBS19]. The model’s critical behaviour in dimension $d = 2$, weakly-coupled or not, remains a fascinating challenge.

In this paper, we prove that the supercritical phase of the φ^4 model is well behaved in the sense that properties which are typical of a robust supercritical behaviour are valid in the entire supercritical regime. In our Theorem 1.1, we establish an important example of such a property: a surface order large deviation bound for the empirical magnetisation of the φ^4 model for all $\beta > \beta_c$. The main tool to prove this result is a *random cluster*— or Fortuin–Kasteleyn (FK)— representation for the φ^4 model, which we define as an Ising random cluster model on a random environment. Although this object has been studied in the physics literature [BT89], in this article we give (to the best of our knowledge) the first mathematical treatment of this representation. Our main result is Theorem 1.3, where we prove a *supercritical sharpness* result for this percolation model in all dimensions $d \geq 2$. The corresponding result for the Ising random cluster model was first obtained by Bodineau [Bod05]. In words, this result says that, for every $\beta > \beta_c$, there exists a *unique* macroscopic cluster in a large box with high probability, uniformly in boundary conditions. Supercritical sharpness is the essential input allowing to use non-perturbative renormalisation techniques to obtain a detailed description of the supercritical phase of statistical physics models. Indeed, we use a coarse graining argument, inspired by that of Pizstora [Pis96], to deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.3.

Proving supercritical sharpness results for general models remains a significant challenge in percolation theory. In dimension $d = 2$, one can often rely on duality and crossing probabilities to prove such a result by relating the supercritical behaviour of the model with the subcritical behaviour of its dual model. In particular, supercritical sharpness is known for many percolation models in 2D, such as the random cluster model with $q \geq 1$ [BD12] (previously known for $q = 1, 2$ due to [Kes80, CCS87]), Voronoi percolation [BR06] and Boolean percolation [ATT18]. However, in dimensions $d \geq 3$ there is no dual (percolation) model available in general, so a much more sophisticated approach is required. For instance, the random cluster model in dimensions $d \geq 3$ has only been proved to satisfy supercritical sharpness in the special cases $q = 1$ (corresponding to Bernoulli percolation) and $q = 2$ (corresponding to the Ising model) in the celebrated works of Grimmett and Marstrand [GM90] and Bodineau [Bod05], respectively— see also [CMT24] and [Sev24] for new proofs. Although the problem remains open for the random cluster model with $q \neq 1, 2$, several other percolation models were proved to satisfy supercritical sharpness in the last few years, such as level-set percolation for the (discrete) Gaussian free field [DGRS23] and some continuous Gaussian fields [Sev22], the vacant set of random interacements [DGRST23b, DGRST23a, DGRST24], the occupied set of Boolean percolation [DT22], and Voronoi percolation [DS23].

Our proof coarsely follows the strategy of [Sev24]. However, this approach requires handling boundary conditions for both the spin model and the associated random cluster measure. To address this, we develop new techniques, building on the random tangled current representation of the φ^4 model introduced in [GPPS22]. We stress that our result is new even in the two-dimensional case, where the random cluster representation does not seem to have a treatable dual model or any integrable feature. This is also one of the reasons why continuity of the phase transition remains open for $d = 2$, despite being known for $d \geq 3$ [GPPS22].

We expect that our results will find further applications in the analysis of the super-

critical φ^4 model. Indeed, for the Ising model, local uniqueness for the random cluster representation has been a crucial ingredient in deriving several results for $\beta > \beta_c$, such as the construction of the so-called Wulff shape [DKS92, Iof95, CP00, BIV00], bounds of the spectral gap for the associated dynamics [CGMS96], and the decay of truncated correlations [DGR20]. Therefore, our work paves the way for obtaining corresponding results on the entire supercritical phase of the φ^4 model.

1.1 Surface order large deviations

We begin by introducing the model and relevant quantities to state the theorem. We fix once and for all constants $g > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\rho_{g,a}$ be the so-called single-site measure on \mathbb{R} defined by

$$d\rho_{g,a}(t) = \frac{1}{z_{g,a}} e^{-gt^4 - at^2} dt, \quad (1.1)$$

where $z_{g,a} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-gt^4 - at^2} dt$. Let Λ be a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^d . Define $E(\Lambda) := \{\{x, y\} \subset \Lambda : x \sim y\}$ where $x \sim y$ means that x and y are neighbours in \mathbb{Z}^d . We often denote the elements of $E(\Lambda)$ as $xy = \{x, y\}$. Given an external magnetic field $h \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\Lambda,h}(\varphi) := - \sum_{xy \in E(\Lambda)} \varphi_x \varphi_y - h \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \varphi_x, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^V.$$

The φ^4 model on Λ with external magnetic field h and at inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$ is the probability measure $\nu_{\Lambda,\beta,h}$ (also denoted $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,h}$) given by

$$d\nu_{\Lambda,\beta,h}(\varphi) \propto e^{-\beta H_{\Lambda,h}(\varphi)} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g,a}(\varphi_x).$$

We may omit h from the notation when $h = 0$. We consider the infinite volume measures

$$\nu_{\beta,h} = \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d} \nu_{\Lambda,\beta,h}.$$

It is classical that this limit exists and is monotonic increasing in h , see e.g. [Gri67]. We can then define the so-called *plus measure* ν_{β}^+ via the following monotonic weak limit:

$$\nu_{\beta}^+ = \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \nu_{\beta,h}. \quad (1.2)$$

The measure ν_{β}^+ is translation invariant, ergodic and extremal. In fact, every translation invariant Gibbs measure for the φ^4 model is a linear combination of the two extremal measures ν_{β}^+ and $\nu_{\beta}^-(d\varphi) := \nu_{\beta}^+(-d\varphi)$, see [GPPS22].

The *spontaneous magnetisation* at inverse temperature β is defined as

$$m^*(\beta) := \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\beta}^+,$$

where $\langle f \rangle_{\beta}^+$ denotes the expectation of f with respect to ν_{β}^+ . We can now define the *critical point*

$$\beta_c = \beta_c(g, a) := \inf\{\beta \geq 0 : m^*(\beta) > 0\}.$$

It is known that $\beta_c \in (0, \infty)$ for every $d \geq 2$ and all $(g, a) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ [GJS75, Wel77] (alternatively, this can be proven by directly using the random cluster representation of Section 4). Another quantity of interest is the *empirical magnetisation* on Λ given by

$$m_{\Lambda} := \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \varphi_x.$$

We will mostly be interested in the empirical magnetisation on boxes $\Lambda_n := \{-n, \dots, n\}^d$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Our first theorem is the following surface order large deviation estimate for the empirical magnetisation in the entire supercritical regime.

Theorem 1.1. *For every $d \geq 2$, $\beta > \beta_c$ and $\delta \in (0, m^*(\beta))$, there exist constants $c, C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every n large enough,*

$$e^{-Cn^{d-1}} \leq \nu_{\Lambda_n, \beta} \left[|m_{\Lambda_n}| \leq m^*(\beta) - \delta \right] \leq e^{-cn^{d-1}}. \quad (1.3)$$

Remark 1.2. *The lower large deviation of (1.3) differs from the upper large deviation, which is always of volume order. Indeed, it is not hard to prove (see Section 7) that for every $\beta \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there exist $c, C > 0$ such that for every n large enough*

$$e^{-Cn^d} \leq \nu_{\Lambda_n, \beta} \left[|m_{\Lambda_n}| \geq m^*(\beta) + \delta \right] \leq e^{-cn^d}. \quad (1.4)$$

Both large deviation estimates of (1.3) and (1.4) can be extended to the infinite volume measure.

1.2 Random cluster for φ^4 and supercritical sharpness

The main tool used in this work is a percolation representation of the φ^4 model, which plays a role analogous to that of the random cluster representation of the Ising model. In Section 4, we define the model in detail and derive some of its basic properties, such as a coupling with the spin system, monotonicity in boundary conditions and correlation inequalities. We only give a rough description of the model here and defer the reader to Section 4 for details. First, observe that, conditionally on the absolute value field $|\varphi|$, the sign field $\text{sign}(\varphi)$ can be seen as an Ising model with random coupling constants $J(|\varphi|)_{x,y} = \beta |\varphi_x| |\varphi_y|$. Therefore, we can consider the corresponding random cluster representation in a random environment. For every $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}$ be the probability measure on configurations $(\omega, \mathbf{a}) \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, where \mathbf{a} is distributed as $|\varphi|$ (under $\nu_{\Lambda, \beta}$), and ω —conditionally on \mathbf{a} —is distributed as an Ising random cluster model with coupling constants $J_{x,y} = \beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y$. Certain correlation functions of φ can then be expressed in terms of connectivity properties for $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}$. For example, we have

$$\langle \varphi_x \varphi_y \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta} = \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}[\mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y \mathbb{1}\{x \overset{\omega}{\longleftrightarrow} y\}].$$

We can also construct random cluster measures $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{\#}$ with general *boundary conditions* $\#$, see Section 4 for details.

Similarly to the case of the Ising model, the crucial step to establish Theorem 1.1 is to prove that the percolation model $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}$ is “well behaved” for every $\beta > \beta_c$. In other words, we establish a *supercritical sharpness* result for $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}$. There are several ways of defining supercritical sharpness. In dimensions $d \geq 3$, a classical way is to consider the notion of *slab percolation*, as done in [GM90] for Bernoulli percolation and in [Bod05] for the Ising model. However, this notion becomes meaningless in 2D, where classically the crossing of long rectangles is used instead. In order to state our result for all dimensions $d \geq 2$ in a unified way, we choose to consider the notion of *local uniqueness*. Furthermore, this notion is more handy when performing renormalisation arguments to prove non-perturbative results.

For every scale $L \geq 1$, consider the *local uniqueness event* $U(L)$ of percolation configurations $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda_{8L})}$ such that there exists at least one cluster of ω crossing the annulus $\Lambda_{8L} \setminus \Lambda_L$, and any two paths in ω crossing the annulus $\Lambda_{4L} \setminus \Lambda_{2L}$ are connected in $\omega \cap (\Lambda_{8L} \setminus \Lambda_L)$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.3. *For every $d \geq 2$ and $\beta > \beta_c$,*

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_{10L}, \beta}^\# [U(L)] = 1.$$

Theorem 1.3 implies that the percolation model $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^\#$ is “well behaved” for every $\beta > \beta_c$. Indeed, it allows to compare the model with a highly supercritical Bernoulli percolation via standard renormalisation arguments. For instance, one can prove that the unique giant component is robust and ubiquitous, while the other components are tiny (namely logarithmically small). This is the key feature underlying the proof Theorem 1.1, which combines Theorem 1.3 and a coarse graining argument. Another consequence of Theorem 1.3 is that the infinite volume plus measure ν_β^+ can be obtained as the limit of φ^4 measures on Λ_n with boundary condition $\eta_n \gg 1/n^{d-1}$, see Proposition B.2. As mentioned above, we expect Theorem 1.3 to find several other applications concerning the supercritical behaviour of the φ^4 model.

1.3 Outline of the proof

We will now give a more detailed description of the proofs of our theorems, starting with Theorem 1.3. At a global level, the strategy of proof is similar to that of [Bod05, Sev24]. However, several new ideas are necessary in our context in order to deal with extra difficulties, especially coming from the unboundedness of the spins. The main novelty is the use of the random tangled current representation of [GPPS22] in order to deal with some of these challenges.

The first step is to prove that a certain notion of surface tension for the φ^4 model is positive for every $\beta > \beta_c$. We adapt the corresponding argument of Lebowitz and Pfister [LP81] for the Ising model. Roughly speaking, the surface tension measures the energetic cost of imposing a surface of disagreeing spins separating two halves of a box. For the Ising model, the surface tension can be rigorously defined as simply

$$\tau_\beta := - \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \log \frac{Z_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^{+, -}}{Z_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^+},$$

where $Z_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^{+, -}$ and $Z_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^+$ denote, respectively, the Ising partition functions with Dobrushin (i.e. +1 on the top and -1 on the bottom) and plus (i.e. +1 everywhere) boundary conditions. For the φ^4 model, while we could in principle define the surface tension in the same way, the proof of positivity from [LP81] would only adapt if we knew that the φ^4 measure with boundary conditions +1 converges to the plus measure ν_β^+ defined in (1.2). This last fact is not easy to prove due to the unboundedness of the spins (however, this does follow, a posteriori, from our results, as proved in Proposition B.2). Even though one can obtain ν_β^+ as the limit of finite volume measures with *growing* boundary conditions (see (2.6)), these measures are not “regular” (in the sense of Proposition 2.6) up to the boundary, which would cause us problems in the next step, where we compare the corresponding random cluster measure with its free counterpart. In order to solve this issue, we prove in Proposition 3.1 that the φ^4 measures with magnetic field equal to +1 on a *thick boundary* of thickness $\log L$ (namely $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$) converge to ν_β^+ as L tends to infinity. This result allows us to approximate ν_β^+ by a sequence of measures that are “regular” up to the boundary since the magnetic field is bounded. The proof is based on a comparison between boundary conditions, which is derived through the use of the random tangled currents representation constructed in [GPPS22]. We then use these “thick-plus” measures (and their Dobrushin counterpart) to define the surface tension τ_β

of the φ^4 model, and to prove in Proposition 5.5 that indeed $\tau_\beta > 0$ for every $\beta > \beta_c$. We stress that this proof, adapted from [LP81], crucially relies on the Ginibre inequality (see Proposition 2.4), which is specific to the Ising and φ^4 models.

The second step is to transfer the information that $\tau_\beta > 0$ to the φ^4 random cluster model. It follows rather easily from the Edwards–Sokal coupling that the probability that the top and bottom of a box are disconnected from each other in the corresponding random cluster representation decays exponentially in the surface order (see Lemma 5.3). However, we need to prove that the same happens for the random cluster measure with *free* boundary condition, which is in fact the minimal one. We therefore perform a comparison argument to go from the “thick plus” random cluster measure to the “free” one. In order to do so, we adapt an argument originally used by Bodineau [Bod05] for the Ising model. However, this argument relies on the fact that there exists a unique random cluster measure on the half-space with any positive magnetic field on the boundary. For the Ising model, this follows from a work of Fröhlich and Pfister on the wetting transition [FP87], together with the Lee–Yang theorem. Instead of extending the results of [FP87] to the φ^4 model (which remains an open problem), we give a completely different proof—relying again on the random tangled currents—of the uniqueness of half-space measures with positive boundary field (see Proposition 3.6). We remark that our proof can be easily adapted to give a new proof of this uniqueness result for the Ising model.

The two steps described above imply that for every $\beta > \beta_c$, the probability that a box is not crossed by a cluster decays exponentially in the surface order for the φ^4 random cluster model with minimal (i.e. free) boundary conditions at a macroscopic distance from the box. Finally, we prove that this implies that local uniqueness happens with high probability. We use two different approaches, depending on the dimension. In dimension $d = 2$, we use the Russo–Seymour–Welsh theorem for FKG measures recently obtained by Köhler-Schindler and Tassion [KST23] to deduce that a macroscopic annulus is surrounded by a circuit with high probability, which easily implies the local uniqueness event $U(L)$. In dimensions $d \geq 3$, a different argument is required and we follow the approach of [Sev24], which is inspired by the work of Benjamini and Tassion [BT17]. We first prove that the surface order exponential bound on disconnection implies local uniqueness with the help of an independent *Bernoulli sprinkling*. By a standard static renormalisation, this implies that this Bernoulli-sprinkled random cluster model (with free boundary conditions) percolates on sufficiently thick slabs. Then, we prove in Proposition 6.4 that the Bernoulli-sprinkled random cluster measure is stochastically dominated by the original random cluster measure at a slightly higher β , thus implying slab percolation for the latter. We stress that, although such a domination is trivial for the Ising random cluster model (see e.g. [Sev24, Lemma 2.5]), this is not the case in our context since the absolute value field $|\varphi|$ can take arbitrarily small values. Once percolation on slabs is proved for the free random cluster measure for all $\beta > \beta_c$, we conclude that local uniqueness holds by a classical “onion argument”, thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.3.

As mentioned above, the surface order large deviation of Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.3 via a coarse graining argument, very similar to the one that Pisztor [Pis96] developed for the Ising model. Another essential ingredient in the coarse graining argument is the uniqueness of the infinite volume measure for the φ^4 random cluster model (see Lemma 7.2). This is proved in Proposition 4.13 as a consequence of the characterization of translation invariant Gibbs measures for the φ^4 model obtained in [GPPS22]. Since the spins are continuous and unbounded, some extra care is required when running the coarse graining argument in our context, but this is dealt with in a rather simple way by relying on regularity estimates.

Organisation of the paper. In Section 2 we recall the main properties of the φ^4 model, including some correlation inequalities, a regularity theorem and the switching principle for the random tangled current representation. In Section 3 we prove the aforementioned Propositions 3.1 and 3.6 on the convergence of the thick-plus measures to ν_β^+ and the uniqueness of half-space measure with positive magnetic field. This section is the only one that uses the random tangled currents. In Section 4 we properly define the random cluster representation for the φ^4 model and prove its main basic properties. Section 5 is devoted to the first two steps in the proof of Theorem 1.3 described above, while Section 6 is concerned with the final step. Finally, in Section 7 we deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgements. We thank the University of Geneva, where the project was initiated, for its hospitality. RP acknowledges the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation through a Postdoc.Mobility grant, the NCCR SwissMAP, and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 757296). FS was supported by the ERC grants CriSP (No. 851565) and Vortex (No. 101043450).

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some classical definitions and properties related to the φ^4 model. For further details and generalisations, see [GPPS22].

2.1 The φ^4 model on \mathbb{Z}^d

Let Λ be a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^d . Recall that $E(\Lambda) = \{\{x, y\} \subset \Lambda : x \sim y\}$ and that we write the elements of $E(\Lambda)$ as xy . Let $g > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Since g, a will be fixed for the entire article, we drop them from notation. The ferromagnetic φ^4 model on Λ (with parameters (g, a)) at inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$ and coupling strengths $J = (J_e)_{e \in E(\Lambda)} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{E(\Lambda)}$, and with external magnetic field $\mathbf{h} = (\mathbf{h}_x)_{x \in \Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$ is the finite volume probability measure $\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J}$ whose expectation values are defined for $F : \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded and measurable by

$$\langle F(\varphi) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J} := \frac{1}{Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J}^{\varphi^4}} \int F(\varphi) \exp(-\beta H_{\Lambda, \mathbf{h}, J}(\varphi)) \prod_{x \in V} d\rho_{g, a}(\varphi_x),$$

where $Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J}^{\varphi^4}$ is the partition function which guarantees that $\langle 1 \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J} = 1$, the Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{\Lambda, \mathbf{h}, J}(\varphi) := - \sum_{xy \in E(\Lambda)} J_{xy} \varphi_x \varphi_y - \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \mathbf{h}_x \varphi_x,$$

and $\rho_{g, a}$ is the *single-site* measure defined in (1.1). We let $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ be the expectation with respect to the measure $\rho_{g, a}$. Unless specified otherwise, we will consider the homogeneous case $J \equiv 1$ (i.e. $J_e = 1$ for every $e \in E(\Lambda)$) and drop J from notation.

The above definition includes the possibility of having *boundary conditions*. Let us first introduce a useful notation. The (inner) vertex boundary of Λ is the set $\partial\Lambda := \{x \in \Lambda : \exists y \in \Lambda^c, x \sim y\}$. Boundary conditions are interpreted (and synonymous in this paper with) as inhomogeneous external magnetic fields \mathbf{h} that satisfy $\mathbf{h}_x = 0$ for $x \in \text{Int}(\Lambda) := \Lambda \setminus \partial\Lambda$.

Let us now discuss an important property satisfied by these measures: the domain Markov property. We begin by introducing some useful notation. Let $\Delta \subset \Lambda$ be finite

subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d . If $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$, we define a magnetic field $\mathbf{h}_\varphi^{\Lambda, \Delta}$ on Δ (or, the boundary condition on $\partial\Delta$ induced by φ) as follows: for all $x \in \Delta$,

$$\mathbf{h}_\varphi^{\Lambda, \Delta}(x) := \mathbb{1}_{x \in \partial\Delta} \sum_{\substack{y \in \Lambda \setminus \Delta \\ xy \in E(\Lambda)}} \varphi_y. \quad (2.1)$$

If $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$ and $\beta \geq 0$, the measure $\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}$ introduced above satisfies, for every $f : \mathbb{R}^\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}[f] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^\Lambda} \nu_{\Delta, \beta, \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{h}_\varphi^{\Lambda, \Delta}}[f] d\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}(\varphi). \quad (2.2)$$

2.2 Correlation inequalities

We now present various classical correlation inequalities that will be used in this paper (see [GPPS22] and references therein for proofs and background). We begin with correlations of increasing functions.

Proposition 2.1 (FKG inequalities, [GPPS22, Propositions A.1–A.2] and [LO24, Corollary 6.4]). *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite, $\beta \geq 0$, $J \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{E(\Lambda)}$, and $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$. Then, for any increasing and bounded functions $F, G : \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\langle F(\varphi)G(\varphi) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J} \geq \langle F(\varphi) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J} \langle G(\varphi) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J}.$$

The same holds for the absolute value field if $\mathbf{h}_x \geq 0$ for every $x \in \Lambda$, namely

$$\langle F(|\varphi|)G(|\varphi|) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J} \geq \langle F(|\varphi|) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J} \langle G(|\varphi|) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J}.$$

As a consequence of the FKG inequalities above, we obtain the following monotonicity properties of correlations: the first inequality is standard, and the second inequality follows from a straightforward adaptation of the proof of [GPPS22, Lemma 2.13].

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite, and $\beta \geq 0$. Let also $J_1, J_2 \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{E(\Lambda)}$ be such that $J_1 \leq J_2$, and $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$ be such that $\mathbf{h}_1 \leq \mathbf{h}_2$. Then, for any increasing function $F : \mathbb{R}^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$\langle F(\varphi) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1, J_1} \leq \langle F(\varphi) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2, J_2}.$$

The same holds for the absolute value field if $|\mathbf{h}_1| \leq \mathbf{h}_2$, namely for any increasing function $F : (\mathbb{R}^+)^\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\langle F(|\varphi|) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1, J_1} \leq \langle F(|\varphi|) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2, J_2}.$$

We now turn to spin correlations. In what follows, given $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite and $A : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we write $\varphi_A := \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \varphi_x^{A_x}$.

Proposition 2.3 (Monotonicity in coupling strength, [GPPS22, Proposition 3.18 and Remark 3.19]). *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite, $\beta \geq 0$, $J \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{E(\Lambda)}$, $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^\Lambda$, and $A : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then, for every $e \in E(\Lambda)$, the function $J_e \mapsto \langle \varphi_A \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, J}$ is increasing.*

Proposition 2.4 (Ginibre inequality, [GPPS22, Proposition 2.11]). *Let $A, B : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^\Lambda$ such that $|\mathbf{h}_1| \leq \mathbf{h}_2$,*

$$\langle \varphi_A \varphi_B \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2, J} - \langle \varphi_A \varphi_B \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1, J} \geq |\langle \varphi_A \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2, J} \langle \varphi_B \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1, J} - \langle \varphi_A \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1, J} \langle \varphi_B \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2, J}|. \quad (2.3)$$

Remark 2.5. *In [GPPS22], we only proved Proposition 2.4 when $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \equiv 0$ in $\Lambda \setminus \partial\Lambda$, i.e. when $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2$ can be seen as boundary conditions, but the proof adapts mutatis mutandis.*

2.3 Quartic tail bounds

For the φ^4 model, since spins are unbounded, there is a priori no notion of a maximal or minimal boundary condition. However, it is natural to expect that, similarly to the single site measure $\rho_{g,a}$, the finite volume measures $\nu_{\Lambda,\beta,h,J}$ also have tails of the type $e^{-c\varphi^4}$. In this case, one can deduce that, with high probability, every spin in a domain Λ is smaller than $C(\log|\Lambda|)^{1/4}$ in absolute value, for C large enough. This suggests that $\pm C(\log|\Lambda|)^{1/4}$ are good candidates for the maximal and minimal boundary condition. This is indeed the case and follows from a regularity property encapsulated in Proposition 2.6 below. If $\Delta \subset \Lambda$, we denote by $\nu_{\Lambda,\beta,h}^{(\Delta)}$ the push-forward of $\nu_{\Lambda,\beta,h}$ under the restriction map $(\varphi_x)_{x \in \Lambda} \mapsto (\varphi_x)_{x \in \Delta}$. Additionally, we let $d\varphi_\Delta := \prod_{x \in \Delta} d\varphi_x$. The following proposition states that the measures $\nu_{\Lambda_L,\beta,h}$ have (uniform) tails of the form $e^{-c\varphi^4}$ at vertices that are sufficiently far away from locations where \mathbf{h} takes large values. Following the terminology used in [GPSS22], we will refer to this result as a *regularity* estimate. See Figure 1 for an illustration.

Recall that $|\cdot|$ denotes the infinite norm on \mathbb{R}^d , and that for every $L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\Lambda_L = \{-L, \dots, L\}^d = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : |x| \leq L\}$, and for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\Lambda_L(z) = z + \Lambda_L$. Furthermore, for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $\text{dist}^\infty(z, A) = \inf\{|z - a| : a \in A\}$ with the convention that $\text{dist}^\infty(z, \emptyset) = \infty$.

Proposition 2.6. *For every $\beta, h \geq 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(\beta, h) \in (0, \infty)$, depending continuously on the parameters, such that the following holds. Let $L \geq 1$, and $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_L}$ be such that $|\mathbf{h}_x| \leq h$ for every $x \in \Lambda_L \setminus \partial\Lambda_L$ and $|\mathbf{h}_x| \leq \sqrt{\log L}$ for every $x \in \partial\Lambda_L$. Then, for every $z \in \Lambda_L$ such that $M(z) := \text{dist}^\infty(z, \{x \in \partial\Lambda_L : |\mathbf{h}_x| > h\}) \geq L$,*

$$\nu_{\Lambda_L,\beta,h}^{(\Delta)}(|\cdot|) \preceq \rho_{\Delta,g/2,0}(C + |\cdot|), \quad (2.4)$$

where \preceq refers to stochastic domination of measures, $\Delta \subset \Lambda_{m-\sqrt{m}}(z) \cap \Lambda_L$ for $m := \min\{M(z), 2L\}$, and $\mu(f(\cdot))$ denotes the push-forward of the measure μ with respect to the function f . Moreover, $\langle \varphi_x^2 \rangle_{\Lambda_L,\beta,h} \leq C\sqrt{\log L}$ for every $x \in \Lambda_L$.




Figure 1: An illustration of two applications of Proposition 2.6. On both sides, the magnetic field \mathbf{h} is equal to 0 in $\Lambda_L \setminus \partial\Lambda_L$. On the left: the part of $\partial\Lambda_L$ in red carries a “large” magnetic field $\mathbf{h}_x = \sqrt{\log L}$, while the blue part carries a constant magnetic field $\mathbf{h}_x = h$. With the notations of Proposition 2.6, the point z satisfies $M(z) \geq L$. The restriction of $\nu_{\Lambda_L,\beta,h}$ to the shaded grey region Δ has quartic tails. On the right: $\mathbf{h}_x = \sqrt{\log L}$ for $x \in \partial\Lambda_L$. Here, $M(0) \geq L$ and the restriction of $\nu_{\Lambda_L,\beta,h}$ to the shaded grey region Δ has quartic tails.

Proof. Let z and $\Delta \subset \Lambda_{m-\sqrt{m}}(z) \cap \Lambda_L$ be as in the statement, and define $\Lambda = \Lambda_L \cup \Lambda_m(z)$. By Proposition 2.2,

$$\nu_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\Delta)}(|\cdot|) \preceq \nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}}^{(\Delta)}(|\cdot|),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_x = \max\{\mathbf{h}_x, h\}$ for $x \in \Lambda_L$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_x = h$ for $x \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_L$. Note that the only vertices where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} > h$ lie at $\partial\Lambda$, and $|\mathbf{h}_x| \leq \sqrt{\log(\text{dist}^\infty(z, \partial\Lambda))}$ for every $x \in \partial\Lambda$. We can thus apply [GPPS22, Corollary D.12] (for the translation of Λ by $-z$) to deduce that the density of $\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}}^{(\Delta)}$ is upper bounded by $e^{-\sum_{x \in \Delta} (\frac{g}{2}\varphi_x^4 - A)}$ for some constant $A > 0$. Note that there exists $C > 0$ large enough such that for every $u = (u_x)_{x \in \Delta} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Delta}$, letting $I(u) = \prod_{x \in \Delta} [C + u_x, \infty)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I(u)} e^{-\sum_{x \in \Delta} (\frac{g}{2}\varphi_x^4 - A)} \prod_{x \in \Delta} d\varphi_x &\leq \rho_{\Delta, g/2, 0}(C + |\varphi_x| \geq C + u_x, \forall x \in \Delta) \\ &= \rho_{\Delta, g/2, 0}(|\varphi_x| \geq u_x, \forall x \in \Delta). \end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired stochastic domination (2.4). The second part of the statement follows from [GPPS22, Remark D.13]. \square

Remark 2.7. *Let us remark that the argument of Lemma 6.8 can be adapted to give an alternative proof of the statement in the case where Δ consists of a single vertex.*

Remark 2.8. *Proposition 2.6 implies that regularity estimates hold far away from the boundary, and even at boundary vertices that are sufficiently far away from vertices where \mathbf{h} is large. In the particular case where $|\mathbf{h}_x| \leq h$ for every $x \in \Lambda_L$, the regularity estimates hold everywhere in Λ_L .*

Remark 2.9. *Proposition 2.6 implies that the family of measures considered is tight. We will use this several times (together with monotonicity arguments) to prove that certain sequences of measures converge to an infinite volume measure. Moreover, it will follow immediately that in these cases the corresponding infinite volume measure inherits the bound (2.4).*

As mentioned above, a consequence of Proposition 2.6 is that we can make sense of maximal (and minimal) boundary condition as follows. Let us write $\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda := \{x \in \Lambda^c : \exists y \in \Lambda, x \sim y\}$ to denote the exterior boundary of Λ and $\bar{\Lambda} := \Lambda \sqcup \partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda$. It follows from a union bound that there exists a large enough constant $C_0 = C_0(h) \in (0, \infty)$ such that, setting $\mathfrak{M}_\Delta := C_0(1 \vee \log |\Delta|)^{1/4}$, one has

$$\nu_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}} \left(\max_{x \in \Delta} |\varphi_x| \leq \mathfrak{M}_\Delta \right) = 1 - o(1), \quad (2.5)$$

where $o(1)$ tends to 0 uniformly in Δ of the form $\bar{\Delta} \subset \Lambda_{m-\sqrt{m}}(z) \cap \Lambda_L$ as $|\Delta| \rightarrow \infty$, with $m = \min\{M(z), 2L\}$ and z satisfying $M(z) = \text{dist}^\infty(z, \{x \in \partial\Lambda_L : |\mathbf{h}(x)| > h\}) \geq L$. Having the Markov property (2.2) in mind, we can therefore think of \mathfrak{M}_Δ as the effectively maximal boundary condition in Δ . It follows from (2.2), (2.5) and monotonicity in \mathbf{h} (see Proposition 2.2), that for every increasing event E ,

$$\nu_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}}(E) \leq \nu_{\Delta, \beta, \mathbf{p}_\Delta}(E) + o(1),$$

where, again, $o(1)$ tends to 0 uniformly in Δ chosen as above as $|\Delta| \rightarrow \infty$, and where

$$\mathbf{p}_\Delta(x) := \mathbf{h}_{\bar{\Delta}, \Delta}^{\mathfrak{M}_\Delta}(x),$$

with $\bar{h}_\varphi^{\Delta, \Delta}$ defined in (2.1). When clear from context, we omit the subscript Δ in the notation \mathfrak{p}_Δ . Then, as shown in [Rue70, LP76] (see also [GPPS22] in the context of general graphs of polynomial growth), one has

$$\nu_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathfrak{p}_{\Lambda_L}} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} \nu_\beta^+, \quad (2.6)$$

where ν_β^+ is the translation-invariant, extremal probability measure ν_β^+ introduced in Section 1.1. Analogously, we have $\nu_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathfrak{m}_{\Lambda_L}} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} \nu_\beta^-$, where for a finite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathfrak{m}_\Lambda := -\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda$.

In [GPPS22], we additionally proved that for every $\beta \geq 0$, the set of translation invariant Gibbs measures at β (see [GPPS22, Definition 1.1]) consists of convex combinations of the extremal measures ν_β^+ and ν_β^- . In particular, one has

$$\nu_\beta = \nu_{\beta, 0} = \frac{1}{2} (\nu_\beta^+ + \nu_\beta^-). \quad (2.7)$$

Remark 2.10. *A question that arises naturally is the following: how big or small can a boundary field \mathfrak{h}_L be so that $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathfrak{h}_L} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$? As a consequence of our results, for $\beta > \beta_c$, the convergence holds for boundary fields satisfying $\mathfrak{h}_L \leq \mathfrak{p}_L$ and $L^{d-1} \mathfrak{h}_L \rightarrow \infty$. This is established in Proposition B.2. However, the convergence may also hold for boundary fields that grow faster than \mathfrak{p}_L , provided the regularity estimates of Proposition 2.6 remain valid deep in the bulk. Based on the argument in Lemma 6.8, we expect that regularity estimates hold even for exponentially growing boundary fields.*

2.4 The random tangled current representation

We recall the random tangled current representation of the φ^4 model introduced in [GPPS22]. We begin by defining what a tangled current is and then state our main combinatorial tool: the *switching principle*. This object will only be used in Section 3 in order to compare measures with different boundary conditions.

2.4.1 Tangled currents

We begin by recalling the definition of a current. Below, \mathfrak{g} refers to a ghost vertex and we let $\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}} \equiv 1$. Let $(\Lambda, E(\Lambda))$ be a finite graph. If $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$, we let $\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]$ be the graph with vertex set $\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} := \Lambda \cup \{\mathfrak{g}\}$, and edge set $E(\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]) := E(\Lambda) \cup \{\{x, \mathfrak{g}\} : x \in \Lambda, \mathfrak{h}_x \neq 0\}$. We will sometimes make a slight abuse of notation and additionally view $\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]$ as a weighted graph. This means that the notation $\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]$ also carries the information of the value of \mathfrak{h} . When $\mathfrak{h} \equiv 0$, the graph $\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]$ is equal to $(\Lambda, E(\Lambda))$.

Single currents. Let $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$. A *current* \mathbf{n} on $\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]$ is a function $\mathbf{n} : E(\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We let $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]}$ be the set of currents on $\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]$. We write $\mathbf{n}_{x,y} = \mathbf{n}_{xy} = \mathbf{n}(x,y)$ for the value of \mathbf{n} on $xy \in E(\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}])$. Given $\mathbf{n} \in \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]}$, let $\Delta \mathbf{n}(x) := \sum_{e \in E(\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]), e \ni x} \mathbf{n}_e$ be the \mathbf{n} -degree of x . The set of *sources* of \mathbf{n} is defined by

$$\partial \mathbf{n} := \{x \in \Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} : \Delta \mathbf{n}(x) \text{ is odd}\}.$$

Additionally, we define

$$\mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) := \left\{ A \in \mathbb{N}^{\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}} : A_{\mathfrak{g}} \leq 1, \sum_{x \in \Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}} A_x \text{ is even} \right\}$$

to be the set of *admissible moments* or *source functions* on $\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}$, and write $\partial A := \{x \in \Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}} : A_x \text{ is odd}\}$. We write $A = \emptyset$ if $A_x = 0$ for all $x \in \Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Additionally, if $A = \mathbf{1}_x + \mathbf{1}_y$, we write $A = xy$. Given $A, B \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$, define $A + B \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$ by:

$$(A + B)_x := A_x + B_x$$

for all $x \in \Lambda$, and

$$(A + B)_{\mathfrak{g}} := A_{\mathfrak{g}} + B_{\mathfrak{g}} \bmod 2.$$

Finally, for $\mathbf{n} \in \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]}$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$, we introduce the weight

$$w_{\beta, \mathfrak{h}}^A(\mathbf{n}) := \prod_{xy \in E(\Lambda)} \frac{\beta^{\mathbf{n}_{xy}}}{\mathbf{n}_{xy}!} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \frac{(\beta \mathfrak{h}_x)^{\mathbf{n}_{x\mathfrak{g}}}}{\mathbf{n}_{x\mathfrak{g}}!} \langle \varphi^{A_x + \Delta \mathbf{n}(x)} \rangle_0.$$

Since $\rho_{g,a}$ is an even measure, the above weight is equal to zero unless $\partial \mathbf{n} = \partial A$.

It is possible to expand the correlation functions of the φ^A model to relate them to currents. Recall that, for $A \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$, $\varphi_A = \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \varphi_x^{A_x}$.

Lemma 2.11 ([GPSS22, Proposition 3.1]). *Let $\beta > 0$ and $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda}$. Then, for all $A \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$,*

$$\langle \varphi_A \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathfrak{h}} = \frac{\sum_{\partial \mathbf{n} = \partial A} w_{\beta, \mathfrak{h}}^A(\mathbf{n})}{\sum_{\partial \mathbf{n} = \emptyset} w_{\beta, \mathfrak{h}}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n})}.$$

We now turn to the definition of *tangled currents*. We will introduce two useful notions: the *single* tangled current, and the *double* tangled current. The latter will be useful to state the switching principle below. We fix $\mathfrak{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$.

Single tangled current. We fix $A \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$, and let $\mathbf{n} \in \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}]}$ be such that $\partial \mathbf{n} = \partial A$. For each $z \in \Lambda$, we define the block $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n})$ as follows: for each $y \in \Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}$ such that $zy \in E(\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}])$, it contains \mathbf{n}_{zy} points labelled $(zy(k))_{1 \leq k \leq \mathbf{n}_{zy}}$, and A_z points labelled $(za(k))_{1 \leq k \leq A_z}$. Note that $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n})$ has cardinality $\Delta \mathbf{n}(z) + A_z$, which is an even number by definition. We also write $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{g}}^A(\mathbf{n}) = \{\mathfrak{g}\}$, and when $A_{\mathfrak{g}} = 1$ we may also write $\mathfrak{g}a(1) = \mathfrak{g}$. For each $z \in \Lambda$, let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A(z)$ be the set of *even partitions* of the block $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n})$, i.e. for every $P = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A(z)$, each $|P_i|$ is even. Define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A = \bigotimes_{z \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A(z).$$

An element $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A$ is called a *tangling*. We sometimes refer to an element \mathfrak{t}_z of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A(z)$ as a tangling (of $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n})$), this will be clear from the context. We call the pair $(\mathbf{n}, \mathfrak{t})$ a *tangled current*.

Let $\mathcal{H}^A(\mathbf{n})$ be the graph consisting of vertex set

$$\bigcup_{z \in \Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}} \mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n}),$$

and edge set

$$\left(\bigcup_{\{x,y\} \subset \Lambda} \{\{xy(k), yx(k)\} : 1 \leq k \leq \mathbf{n}_{xy}\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{x \in \Lambda : \mathfrak{h}_x \neq 0} \{\{x\mathfrak{g}(k), \mathfrak{g}\} : 1 \leq k \leq \mathbf{n}_{x\mathfrak{g}}\} \right).$$

Given any tangling $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A$, the graph $\mathcal{H}^A(\mathbf{n})$ naturally induces a graph $\mathcal{H}^A(\mathbf{n}, \mathfrak{t})$ defined as follows. For each block $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n})$, if $\mathfrak{t}_z = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}^A(z)$, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, we

add $\binom{|P_i|}{2}$ edges connecting pairwise the vertices lying in P_i . In words, we add to $\mathcal{H}^A(\mathbf{n})$ the complete graph on the elements of each partition induced by \mathbf{t} . This gives a canonical notion of connectivity in a tangled current (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{t}) . In the case where $A = \emptyset$, we may drop the superscript A from the notation.

We now move to the definition of double tangled currents. We will need the following terminology.

Definition 2.12. Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d . If $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}') \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda'}$, we say that \mathbf{h}' is a restriction of \mathbf{h} if

$$\{x \in \Lambda' : \mathbf{h}'_x \neq \mathbf{h}_x\} \subset \{x \in \Lambda' : \mathbf{h}'_x = 0\}.$$

Note that by definition, $\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']$ is a subgraph of $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$.

Double tangled current. Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ and $\mathbf{h}' \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda'}$ be a restriction of \mathbf{h} . Fix $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$. Let $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]}$ and $\mathbf{n}_2 \in \Omega_{\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}]}$ satisfy $\partial \mathbf{n}_1 = \partial A$ and $\partial \mathbf{n}_2 = \partial B$. We trivially view \mathbf{n}_2 as an element of $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]}$ by setting $\mathbf{n}_2(x, y) = 0$ for all edges $xy \in E(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) \setminus E(\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}'])$. We define $\mathcal{B}_z^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ as the disjoint union of $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n}_1)$ and $\mathcal{B}_z^B(\mathbf{n}_2)$. We write $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}(z)$ for the set of even partitions of the set $\mathcal{B}_z^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ whose restriction to $\mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n}_1)$ and $\mathcal{B}_z^B(\mathbf{n}_2)$ is also an even partition, i.e. for every $P = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}(z)$, both $|P_i \cap \mathcal{B}_z^A(\mathbf{n}_1)|$ and $|P_i \cap \mathcal{B}_z^B(\mathbf{n}_2)|$ are even numbers. The elements of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}(z)$ are called *admissible* partitions. As above, we define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B} = \bigotimes_{z \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}(z).$$

As above, for any \mathbf{t} in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}$, we can define a graph $\mathcal{H}^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$ by the following procedure: for each block $\mathcal{B}_z^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$, if $\mathbf{t}_z = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}(z)$, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, we add $\binom{|P_i|}{2}$ edges connecting pairwise the vertices lying in P_i . This provides a natural notion of connectivity in $\mathcal{H}^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$. If $G = (V(G), E(G))$ is a subgraph of $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$, we let $\mathcal{H}_G^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$ be the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{H}^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$, where we restrict to blocks labelled by $V(G)$ and edges which projects to elements of $E(G)$.

2.4.2 Switching principle for tangled currents

We now state the version of the switching principle which will be used in this paper. A more general statement can be found in [GPPS22].

Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be two finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d and $\beta > 0$. Let $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}') \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda'}$ with \mathbf{h}' a restriction of \mathbf{h} . For $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$, we define $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}, A, B}$ to be the set of double tangled currents on $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$ with source functions A, B , i.e the set of triples $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$ where: $(\partial \mathbf{n}_1, \partial \mathbf{n}_2) = (\partial A, \partial B)$, and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}$. We sometimes identify such a triple with its associated graph $\mathcal{H}^{A, B}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$. We set

$$\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}} := \bigcup_{(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})} \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}, A, B}.$$

Before stating the switching principle, we need a definition.

Pairing events. Let $(C, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$. Assume that $B \leq C$, i.e. $B_x \leq C_x$ for every $x \in (\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Define $\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^C(B)$ to be the subset of $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}, C, \emptyset}$ consisting of all double tangled currents $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$ satisfying the following condition: each connected component of $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{C, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$ intersects $\{zc(k) : z \in (\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}}, C_z - B_z + 1 \leq k \leq C_z\}$ an even number of times.

Theorem 2.13 ([GPPS22, Theorem 3.11]). *Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d . Let $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}') \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda'}$ with \mathbf{h}' a restriction of \mathbf{h} . For every $z \in \Lambda$, every $(C, D) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$, every $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) \in \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]} \times \Omega_{\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}$ with $(\partial \mathbf{n}_1, \partial \mathbf{n}_2) = (\partial C, \partial D)$, there exists a probability measure $\rho_{z, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{C, D}$ on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{C, D}(z)$ such that the following holds. For every $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{\partial \mathbf{n}_1 = \partial A \\ \partial \mathbf{n}_2 = \partial B}} w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\mathbf{n}_1) w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}'}^B(\mathbf{n}_2) = \sum_{\substack{\partial \mathbf{n}_1 = \partial(A+B) \\ \partial \mathbf{n}_2 = \emptyset}} w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^{A+B}(\mathbf{n}_1) w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}'}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_2) \rho_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A+B, \emptyset} [\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{A+B, \emptyset}(B)],$$

where

$$\rho_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A+B, \emptyset} := \bigotimes_{z \in \Lambda} \rho_{z, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A+B, \emptyset},$$

is a probability measure on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A+B, \emptyset}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{A+B, \emptyset}(B)$ is the event defined above.

Remark 2.14. *As it turns out (see the construction in [GPPS22]), for any z , the measures $\rho_{z, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}$ depend only on $(g, a, \Delta \mathbf{n}_1(z) + A_z, \Delta \mathbf{n}_2(z) + B_z)$, but they do not depend on $\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}$ or the rest of $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2$. Sometimes, for $\Delta \mathbf{n}_1(z) + A_z = 2k$ and $\Delta \mathbf{n}_2(z) + B_z = 2k'$ ($k, k' \geq 0$), we will denote the tangling measure by $\rho^{2k, 2k'} := \rho_{z, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}$.*

We can also state the switching lemma in a probabilistic way. We start by introducing the random tangled current measures of interest. We define $\rho_{z, \mathbf{n}}^A := \rho_{z, \mathbf{n}, 0}^{A, \emptyset}$ and

$$\rho_{\mathbf{n}}^A := \bigotimes_{z \in \Lambda} \rho_{z, \mathbf{n}}^A.$$

We view $\rho_{\mathbf{n}}^A$ as a measure on single currents. In view of Remark 2.14, we may sometimes write $\rho^{2k} := \rho_{z, \mathbf{n}}^A$, for $\Delta \mathbf{n}(z) + A_z = 2k$. With a small abuse of notation, we view the set of single tangled currents on $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$ as a subset of $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}}$ that we denote by $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]}^{\mathcal{T}}$. Similarly, we define for $A \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$ the set $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]}^{\mathcal{T}, A} \subset \Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}, A, \emptyset}$.

Tangled current measures. Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d and $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$. Let $(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}') \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda'}$ with \mathbf{h}' a restriction of \mathbf{h} . We define a measure $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^A$ on $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]}^{\mathcal{T}, A}$ by

$$\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^A[(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{t})] = \frac{w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\mathbf{n}) \rho_{\mathbf{n}}^A(\mathbf{t})}{\sum_{\partial \mathbf{m} = \partial A} w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\mathbf{m})}.$$

We also define a measure $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}$ on $\Omega_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}']}^{\mathcal{T}, A, B}$ by

$$\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}[(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})] = \frac{w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\mathbf{n}_1) w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}'}^B(\mathbf{n}_2) \rho_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{A, B}(\mathbf{t})}{\sum_{\substack{\partial \mathbf{n}_1 = \partial A \\ \partial \mathbf{n}_2 = \partial B}} w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\mathbf{n}_1) w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}'}^B(\mathbf{n}_2)}.$$

We write $\mathbf{E}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^A$ (resp. $\mathbf{E}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}$) for the expectation with respect to the measure $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^A$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \Lambda'[\mathbf{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}$). The measures introduced above also depend on \mathbf{h} (resp. \mathbf{h}'). However, as explained in the beginning of the section, this information is contained in the notation $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$ (resp. $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}']$). Using these definitions, we can reformulate the switching lemma in a more probabilistic way.

Corollary 2.15 (Probabilistic version of the switching lemma). *For every $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}) \times \mathcal{M}((\Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}})$,*

$$\frac{\langle \varphi_A \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathfrak{h}} \langle \varphi_B \rangle_{\Lambda', \beta, \mathfrak{h}'}}{\langle \varphi_{A+B} \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathfrak{h}}} = \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}], \Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}'], \beta}^{A+B, \emptyset}[\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}']}^{A+B}(B)].$$

In what follows, β is often fixed and to lighten the notations we omit it in the notation of the tangled current measures.

Coupling between double and single tangled currents measures. Note that by definition, the marginal of \mathbf{n}_1 and \mathbf{n}_2 in $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}], \Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}$ are independent and distributed according to the marginals of \mathbf{n} in $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}], \beta}^A$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}'], \beta}^B$ respectively. However, the relation between \mathfrak{t} and its marginals in these measures is less clear. In the following proposition, we establish a natural stochastic domination.

If P, Q are two partitions of a set S , we say that P is coarser than Q , and write $P \succ Q$, if any element of P can be written as a union of elements of Q . Recall the shorthand notation for the tangling measures introduced in Remark 2.14.

Proposition 2.16 ([GPPS22, Proposition 3.36]). *Let $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a coupling of $\rho^{2k, 2k'}$, ρ^{2k} and $\rho^{2k'}$ such that if $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}_1, \mathfrak{t}_2) \sim (\rho^{2k, 2k'}, \rho^{2k}, \rho^{2k'})$ and if $\mathfrak{t}_1 \sqcup \mathfrak{t}_2$ is the partition whose partition classes are the partition classes of \mathfrak{t}_1 and \mathfrak{t}_2 ,*

$$\mathfrak{t} \succ \mathfrak{t}_1 \sqcup \mathfrak{t}_2, \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

We write,

$$\rho^{2k, 2k'} \succ \rho^{2k} \sqcup \rho^{2k'}.$$

We may abuse the notation and write $\rho^{2k, 2k'}$ for the associated (extended) measure on triplets $(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}_1, \mathfrak{t}_2)$.

Remark 2.17. *Since the tangling measures on each block are independent (conditionally on the currents \mathbf{n}_1 and \mathbf{n}_2), we can apply Proposition 2.16 to each block to construct a random quintuple $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}_1, \mathfrak{t}_2)$ such that*

- (a) $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1) \sim \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}], \beta}^A$,
- (b) $(\mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t}_2) \sim \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}'], \beta}^B$,
- (c) $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t}) \sim \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}], \Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}$,
- (d) $\mathfrak{t}(z) \succ \mathfrak{t}_1(z) \sqcup \mathfrak{t}_2(z)$ for every $z \in \Lambda$ almost surely.

When clear from context, we abuse notation and write $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathfrak{h}], \Lambda'[\mathfrak{h}'], \beta}^{A, B}$ for this (extended) measure on quintuples.

In fact, the above stochastic domination is strict in the sense of the following proposition, which is proved in Appendix A.2.

Proposition 2.18. *For any $k_1 > 0$, $k_2 > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(k_1, k_2) > 0$ such that for every even partition P_1 of $\{1, 2, \dots, 2k_1\}$ and every even partition P_2 of $\{1, 2, \dots, 2k_2\}$ we have*

$$\rho^{2k_1, 2k_2}[\mathfrak{t} = \text{ECT} \mid \mathfrak{t}_1 = P_1, \mathfrak{t}_2 = P_2] \geq \varepsilon,$$

where ECT is the partition consisting of one element, i.e. the partition in which ‘‘Everybody is Connected Together’’.

3 Bulk and boundary magnetisation

In this section, we prove two fundamental results about the magnetisation in the full-space and the half-space settings. The first result shows that one may replace the + boundary condition \mathfrak{p} by a sufficiently thick layer of external magnetic field at the boundary taking the value +1. The second result says that there is a unique infinite volume Gibbs measure on the half space with positive field on the boundary. The corresponding result for the Ising model was obtained by Bodineau [Bod05] and relied on a work of Fröhlich and Pfister on the wetting transition [FP87], and a consequence of the Lee–Yang theorem obtained in [MMSP84]. Our proof for the φ^4 model has a more probabilistic flavour and can easily be adapted to the Ising model. For both statements, we strongly rely on the switching principle for tangled currents stated in Theorem 2.13.

3.1 Bulk magnetisation

Let $L \in \mathbb{N}$. We define \mathfrak{h}_L to be the external magnetic field taking value +1 on $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$ and 0 elsewhere.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $d \geq 2$. For all $\beta > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathfrak{h}_L} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\beta}^+.$$

Proof. We fix $\beta > 0$ and drop it from the notations. We will compare $\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \mathfrak{h}_L}$ to a finite-volume approximation of $\langle \varphi_0 \rangle^+$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_k := \mathfrak{p}_{\Lambda_k}$ for $k \geq 1$. We first claim that the following convergence result holds:

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle^+. \quad (3.1)$$

Indeed, by monotonicity (see Proposition 2.4) one has $\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathfrak{p}_{2L}} \leq \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}}$. Then, using (2.2), Proposition 2.2, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and Proposition 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}} &\leq \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{L/2}, \beta, \mathfrak{p}_{L/2}} + \sqrt{\langle \varphi_0^2 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \beta, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}}} \sqrt{\nu_{\Lambda_{2L}, \beta, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}} \left[\max_{x \in \partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda_{L/2}} \varphi_x > \mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda_{L/2}} \right]} \\ &\leq \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{L/2}, \beta, \mathfrak{p}_{L/2}} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $o(1)$ tends to 0 as L tends to infinity, and where \mathfrak{M} was defined above (2.5). These two inequalities together with (2.6) readily imply (3.1).

Since \mathfrak{h}_L is a restriction of $\mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}$, the switching principle of Theorem 2.13 gives

$$\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}} - \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \mathfrak{h}_L} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}} \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_{2L}[\mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}], \Lambda_L[\mathfrak{h}_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \tilde{0}} [\tilde{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\mathfrak{h}_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \tilde{0}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t})], \quad (3.2)$$

where we recall that $\tilde{0} = 0a(1)$ denotes the extra vertex in \mathcal{B}_0 given by the source constraint. For the rest of the proof, we will use the extended measure on quintuples $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}_1, \mathfrak{t}_2)$ introduced in the end of Section 2.4 and write $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_{2L}[\mathfrak{h}_L + \mathfrak{p}_{2L}], \Lambda_L[\mathfrak{h}_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \tilde{0}}$ for short.

Under \mathbf{P} , there exists a path in $\mathcal{H}^{0\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ that connects $\tilde{0}$ to \mathfrak{g} because of the source constraints. When $\tilde{0}$ is not connected to \mathfrak{g} in $\Lambda_L[\mathfrak{h}_L]$, there must exist a path in $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ that crosses the annulus $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$. Our aim is to show that any path that crosses the annulus $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$ connects with high probability to \mathfrak{g} before reaching $\partial\Lambda_L$, which implies that the right-hand side of (3.2) goes to 0 as L goes to infinity. See Figure 2 for an illustration.




Figure 2: An illustration of the proof of Proposition 3.1. The magnetic field \mathbf{h}_L is supported on the red region, while \mathbf{p}_{2L} is supported on $\partial\Lambda_{2L}$. A path γ connects $\tilde{0}$ to \mathbf{g} in $\mathcal{H}^{0\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{t}_1)$. Red vertices correspond to blocks \mathcal{B}_x along γ in which the tangling is $\text{ECT}(\mathcal{B}_x)$ and the degree $\Delta_{\mathbf{n}_1}(x)$ is not too large. There are typically order $\log L$ many such vertices. Each red dotted edge represents a chance for $\tilde{0}$ to connect to the ghost within $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\mathbf{h}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{t}_1)$. The thickness of the red region is chosen in such a way that (at least) one of these edges is open with high probability.

Given a constant $M \geq 1$ to be specified later, consider the set of “good vertices”

$$\mathcal{V} := \{x \in \Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L} : \Delta_{\mathbf{n}_1}(x) + \Delta_{\Lambda_L} \mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq M \text{ and } \Delta_{\mathbf{n}_1}(x) + \Delta_{\mathbf{n}_2}(x) \leq M + 2\},$$

where $\Delta_{\Lambda_L} \mathbf{n}_2(x) := \sum_{y \in \Lambda_L} \mathbf{n}_2(x, y)$. Let γ be a path in $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$ that crosses the annulus $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$, and notice that by definition $\sum_{e: e \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset} \mathbf{n}_1(e) + \mathbf{n}_2(e) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \gamma} \Delta_{\mathbf{n}_1}(x) + \Delta_{\mathbf{n}_2}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} |\gamma \cap \mathcal{V}^c| M$. Therefore, by Markov’s inequality for $2^{\sum_{e: e \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset} \mathbf{n}_1(e) + \mathbf{n}_2(e)}$, Lemma A.1 and Proposition 2.6,

$$\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \mathbf{h}_L + \mathbf{p}_{2L}} \mathbf{P}[|\gamma \cap \mathcal{V}^c| > |\gamma|/2] \leq e^{2(2d+1)C'|\gamma|} \cdot 2^{-M|\gamma|/4}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $C' > 0$ is the constant in Lemma A.1 (which in turn depends on the constant $C > 0$ of Proposition 2.6). Consider the following event (which only depends on \mathcal{V})

$$\mathcal{A} := \{|\gamma \cap \mathcal{V}| \geq |\gamma|/2, \quad \forall \gamma \text{ crossing } \Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}\}.$$

Note that the number of paths of length k in \mathbb{Z}^d crossing the annulus $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L-\log L}$ is at most $|\partial\Lambda_L|(2d)^k \leq C_1 L^{d-1} (2d)^k$. Choosing M large enough so that $a := 2de^{2(2d+1)C'} 2^{-M/4} < e^{-d}$, a union bound and (3.3) gives (note that $a^{\log L} < L^{-d}$)

$$\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \mathbf{h}_L + \mathbf{p}_{2L}} \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}^c] \leq C_1 L^{d-1} \sum_{k \geq \log L} a^k \leq \frac{C_2}{L}. \quad (3.4)$$

We will show that (the block of) each vertex $x \in \mathcal{V}$ has a uniformly positive probability (independently from each other) of being fully tangled and connected to \mathbf{g} , thus implying that the event $\{\tilde{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\mathbf{h}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})\}$ occurs with high probability conditionally on \mathcal{A} . Indeed, consider a configuration $(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2)$ (with $\partial\mathbf{m}_1 = \{0, \mathbf{g}\}$ and $\partial\mathbf{m}_2 = \emptyset$) and let $x \in \Lambda_L$ be a vertex satisfying $\Delta_{\mathbf{m}_1}(x) + \Delta_{\Lambda_L} \mathbf{m}_2(x) \leq M$ and $\mathbf{m}_2(x\mathbf{g}) = 0$. Define the

current $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2 = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2^x$ as $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2(x\mathbf{g}) = 2$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2(e) = \mathbf{m}_2(e)$ otherwise. Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2$ has no sources, $\Delta \mathbf{m}_1(x) + \Delta_{\Lambda_L} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2(x) \leq M$, $\Delta \mathbf{m}_1(x) + \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2(x) \leq M + 2$ and that

$$Cw_{\beta, h_L}^{\emptyset}(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_2) \geq w_{\beta, h_L}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{m}_2),$$

where $C := 2\beta^{-2} \max \left\{ \frac{\langle \varphi^{2k} \rangle_0}{\langle \varphi^{2k+2} \rangle_0} : 0 \leq k \leq M/2 \right\}$. This implies that, for $(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2)$ and x as above,

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathbf{n}_2(x\mathbf{g}) = 0 \mid \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, x)] \leq C\mathbf{P}[\mathbf{n}_2(x\mathbf{g}) > 0 \mid \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, x)], \quad (3.5)$$

where,

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, x) := \left\{ (\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) : \mathbf{n}_1 = \mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{n}_2|_{E(\Lambda_L[h_L]) \setminus \{x\mathbf{g}\}} = \mathbf{m}_2|_{E(\Lambda_L[h_L]) \setminus \{x\mathbf{g}\}}, \right. \\ \left. \Delta \mathbf{n}_1(x) + \Delta \mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq M + 2 \right\}.$$

Hence, from (3.5) we find

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathbf{n}_2(x\mathbf{g}) > 0 \mid \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{m}_2, x)] \geq \frac{1}{1 + C}.$$

Furthermore, using Proposition 2.18, there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(M)$ such that, for $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ satisfying $\Delta \mathbf{n}_1(x) + \Delta \mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq M + 2$ and any tangling configuration \mathfrak{s}_1 ,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \emptyset}[\mathfrak{t}_x = \text{ECT} \mid \mathfrak{t}_1 = \mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{t}|_{\Lambda_L \setminus \{x\}}] \geq \varepsilon.$$

The last two displayed equations easily imply that, conditionally on $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ and \mathcal{V} , the sequence of random variables $(\omega_x)_{x \in \mathcal{V}}$, where $\omega_x := \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_2(x\mathbf{g}) > 0, \mathfrak{t}_x = \text{ECT}\}}$, stochastically dominates a sequence of independent Bernoulli random variables $(Z_x)_{x \in \mathcal{V}}$ with $\mathbb{P}[Z_x = 1] = \varepsilon/(1 + C)$.

Now, notice that on the event $\{\tilde{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[h_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t})\}$, the cluster of $\tilde{0}$ in $\mathcal{H}^{0\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ induces a path γ in \mathbb{Z}^d crossing the annulus $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L - \log L}$, for which $\omega_x = 0$ for every $x \in \gamma$. Furthermore, by definition, on the event \mathcal{A} , the set $\gamma' = \gamma \cap \mathcal{V}$ satisfies $|\gamma'| \geq |\gamma|/2 \geq (\log L)/2$. Therefore

$$\mathbf{P}[\tilde{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[h_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t}) \mid \mathcal{A}] \leq \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}[\omega_x = 0 \forall x \in \gamma' \mid (\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1), \mathcal{V}] \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}] \leq L^{-c'} \quad (3.6)$$

for some $c' > 0$, where in the last inequality we used the stochastic domination proved in the previous paragraph. Combining (3.6) with (3.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, h_L + p_{2L}} \mathbf{P}[\tilde{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[h_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t})] \\ \leq \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, h_L + p_{2L}} \mathbf{P}[\tilde{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[h_L]}^{0\mathfrak{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathfrak{t}), \mathcal{A}] + \frac{C_2}{L} \\ \leq \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, h_L + p_{2L}} L^{-c'} + \frac{C_2}{L}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Combining (3.7), (3.2), and (3.1), we deduce that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, h_L} = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, h_L + p_{2L}} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle^+.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.2. *It is straightforward to extend Proposition 3.1 to any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Since the sequence $(\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L})_{L \geq 1}$ is tight and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L}$ is stochastically dominated by $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_{2L}, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L + \mathbf{p}_{2L}}$, it follows that any weak limit $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta$ of $(\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L})_{L \geq 1}$ is stochastically dominated by $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$. In particular, there exists a monotone coupling (φ, φ^+) , $\varphi \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_\beta$, $\varphi^+ \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$, where $\varphi_x \leq \varphi_x^+$ almost surely for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ by Strassen's theorem [Str65]. Thus, by Proposition 3.1 and its aforementioned extension, this implies that $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta = \langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$, hence the full measure converges, namely $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L} = \langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$.*

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L$ be the external magnetic field which takes the value $+1$ for all $x \in \{-L, \dots, -L + \log L - 1\} \times \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}$ and 0 elsewhere.

Proposition 3.3 (One side is enough). *Let $d \geq 2$ and $\beta > 0$. Then,*

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L} \geq \frac{1}{2d} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_\beta^+.$$

Proof. Observe that $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L$ is a restriction of \mathbf{h}_L . By the switching principle,

$$\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L} - \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L} \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L[\mathbf{h}_L], \Lambda_L[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}, \emptyset}[\tilde{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})]. \quad (3.8)$$

However, using the $\pi/2$ rotational symmetries of $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L[\mathbf{h}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}}$, together with the fact that the event $\{\tilde{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{t}_1)\}$ happens by the source constraints, and the stochastic domination of Proposition 2.16, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L[\mathbf{h}_L], \Lambda_L[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}, \emptyset}[\tilde{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}, \emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})] \geq \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L[\mathbf{h}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}}[\tilde{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L]}^{0\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{t}_1)] \geq \frac{1}{2d}. \quad (3.9)$$

Combining (3.9) with (3.8) implies that

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_L} \geq \frac{1}{2d} \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L} = \frac{1}{2d} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_\beta^+,$$

where we used Proposition 3.1 in the equality. \square

3.2 Boundary magnetisation

Let $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{N}$, and write $\Lambda_L^+ = \Lambda_L(L\mathbf{e}_d)$, where \mathbf{e}_d is the unit vector of last coordinate equal to 1. Given $h > 0$, we define the measures

$$\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta}^{0, h} := \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta, \mathbf{h}} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta}^{\mathbf{p}, h} := \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta, \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{h}}, \quad (3.10)$$

where \mathbf{p} denotes the magnetic field which is equal to $\mathbf{p}_{\Lambda_L^+}$ on $\partial\Lambda_L^+ \setminus \partial\mathbb{H}$ and 0 elsewhere, and \mathbf{h} denotes the magnetic field which is equal to h on $\Lambda_L^+ \cap \partial\mathbb{H}$ and 0 elsewhere. (Although both \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{h} depend on L and $h > 0$, we choose not to stress this dependency in the notation throughout this section as it will be clear in the context.)

Lemma 3.4. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $\beta, h > 0$. Then, as L tends to infinity, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta}^{\mathbf{p}, h}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta}^{0, h}$ converge weakly to probability measures $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{+, h}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, h}$. Furthermore, both $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{+, h}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, h}$ are regular and invariant under the isometries of \mathbb{H} .*

Proof. We fix $h > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ and drop the latter from the notations. We begin with the study of $(\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{0,h})_{L \geq 1}$. Proposition 2.2 implies the following (stochastic) monotonicity: for every $L \geq 1$, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{0,h} \preceq \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_{L+1}^+}^{0,h}$. Combined with Proposition 2.6, this implies that $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{0,h}$ converges weakly. We now turn to $(\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h})_{L \geq 1}$. We follow the argument used in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Consider a bounded local increasing function f . Fix some $m \geq 1$ such that $\text{supp}(f) \subset \Lambda_m^+$, and consider L large enough such that $L \geq 3m$. Then, by Proposition 2.6, the measures $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h}$ (with $L \geq 3m$) are (uniformly) regular in Λ_m^+ . Combining this observation with the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives

$$\langle f \mathbb{1}_{\exists x \in \partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda_m^+ \cap \mathbb{H}: \varphi_x > \mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda_m^+}} \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h} \leq \sqrt{\langle f^2 \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h}} \sqrt{\langle \mathbb{1}_{\exists x \in \partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda_m^+ \cap \mathbb{H}: \varphi_x > \mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda_m^+}} \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h}} = o(1),$$

where $o(1)$ tends to 0 as m tends to infinity. By the monotonicity in the boundary conditions (see Proposition 2.2),

$$\langle f \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h} = \langle f \mathbb{1}_{\varphi_x \leq \mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda_m}, \forall x \in \partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda_m^+ \cap \mathbb{H}} \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h} + \langle f \mathbb{1}_{\exists x \in \partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda_m^+ \cap \mathbb{H}: \varphi_x > \mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda_m}} \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h} \leq \langle f \rangle_{\Lambda_m^+}^{p,h} + o(1).$$

Sending first n to infinity and then m to infinity we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h},$$

which implies that the limit $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle f \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h}$ exists. Since this holds for all increasing functions, by the inclusion-exclusion principle it holds for all bounded local functions. Thus, the sequence $(\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{p,h})_{L \geq 1}$ converges weakly. \square

Combined with the methods of [GPPS22, Section 5.1], Lemma 3.4 allows to construct the associated infinite volume (double) tangled current measures. Therefore, we obtain the following (the proof is omitted).

Corollary 3.5. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $\beta, h > 0$. Then, as L tends to infinity, the measures $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathfrak{p}+h],\beta}^\emptyset$, $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L^+[h],\beta}^\emptyset$, and $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathfrak{p}+h],\Lambda_L^+[h],\beta}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}$ converge weakly to probability measures that we denote by $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{H}(+,h),\beta}^\emptyset$, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{H}(0,h),\beta}^\emptyset$, and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{H}(+,h),\mathbb{H}(0,h),\beta}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}$ respectively.*

In fact, the two measures constructed in Lemma 3.4 coincide for every $\beta, h > 0$. Such a result was already derived for the Ising model in the work of Bodineau (see Step 2 in [Bod05, Lemma 3.1]). The argument used there relies on both the Lee–Yang theorem and a result of Fröhlich and Pfister on the wetting transition [FP87]. Although the Lee–Yang property still holds in our setup, extending the results of Fröhlich and Pfister to the φ^4 model remains an open problem and is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, we take a different approach and use the switching principle to obtain a more probabilistic proof of the desired equality. Let us mention that the switching principle was also used to analyse half-space measures in the context of the Book-Ising model, see [DGT23].

Proposition 3.6. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $\beta, h > 0$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{H}$,*

$$\langle \varphi_x \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\beta}^{+,h} = \langle \varphi_x \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\beta}^{0,h}. \quad (3.11)$$

In particular, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\beta}^{+,h} = \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\beta}^{0,h}$.

Proof. Fix $h > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, and drop the latter from the notations. Note that the second part of the proposition follows from (3.11) by a similar argument to the one described in Remark 3.2. We thus focus our attention on (3.11) and we do the case $x = 0$. The same argument can be adapted to the general case.

Recall the definitions of \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{h} below (3.10). Notice that \mathbf{h} is a restriction of $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{h}$. Hence, the switching principle of Theorem 2.13 gives

$$\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{\mathbf{p},h} - \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{0,h} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_n^+}^{\mathbf{p},h} \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{h}], \Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset} [\bar{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})] \quad (3.12)$$

for every $L \geq 1$. It is more convenient to work with a sourceless measure. To turn the measure in (3.12) into a sourceless one, we will add an edge between $\bar{0}$ and \mathbf{g} in \mathbf{n}_1 . This is performed rigorously in the next paragraph.

To each triplet $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})$ with $\partial \mathbf{n}_1 = 0\mathbf{g}$ and $\partial \mathbf{n}_2 = \emptyset$, we associate a new triplet $(\mathbf{n}'_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t}')$ with $\partial \mathbf{n}'_1 = \partial \mathbf{n}_2 = \emptyset$ defined as follows. First, let $\mathbf{n}'_1(e) = \mathbf{n}_1(e) + \mathbb{1}_{e=0\mathbf{g}}$ and $\mathbf{t}'_x = \mathbf{t}_x$ for every $x \neq 0$. It remains to define \mathbf{t}'_0 , which is basically set to be the same as \mathbf{t}_0 , except for the different labelling of $\mathcal{B}_0^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ and $\mathcal{B}_0^{\emptyset,\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}'_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$. In order to formally define \mathbf{t} , recall from Section 2.4 the convention for labelling the blocks and that $\bar{0} = 0a(1)$ stands for the extra point in $\mathcal{B}_0^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ due to the source constraint. Additionally, we denote $\bar{0} := 0\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{n}'_1(0\mathbf{g}))$ the “last point” in $\mathcal{B}_0^{\emptyset,\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}'_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ associated to the edges from 0 to \mathbf{g} in \mathbf{n}'_1 . This way, we can write $\mathcal{B}_0^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) \setminus \{\bar{0}\} = \mathcal{B}_0^{\emptyset,\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}'_1, \mathbf{n}_2) \setminus \{\bar{0}\}$. Now, if $\mathbf{t} = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$ and P_k is the subset of the partition containing $\bar{0}$, we let $\mathbf{t}' := \{P_1, \dots, P_{k-1}, P'_k\}$ where $P'_k := P_k \cup \{\bar{0}\} \setminus \{\bar{0}\}$. Note that the map $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto (\mathbf{n}'_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t}')$ is one-to-one and that $\rho_{\mathbf{n}'_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}(\mathbf{t}') = \rho_{\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2}^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset}(\mathbf{t})$. Additionally, observe that

$$w_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{h}}^{0\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{n}_1) w_{\mathbf{h}}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_2) = (\beta h)^{-1} \mathbf{n}'_1(0, \mathbf{g}) w_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{h}}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}'_1) w_{\mathbf{h}}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_2).$$

Recall the extended measure on quintuples $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2)$ introduced in the end of Section 2.4. Using the above,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L^+}^{\mathbf{p},h} \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{h}], \Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset} [\bar{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{0\mathbf{g},\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t})] \\ & \leq (\beta h)^{-1} \mathbf{E}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{h}], \Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{\emptyset,\emptyset} \left[\mathbf{n}_1(0, \mathbf{g}) \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bar{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{p}]}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{t}_1), \bar{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{\setminus \{\bar{0}\mathbf{g}\}} \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{\setminus \{\bar{0}\mathbf{g}\}} := \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t}) \setminus \{\{\bar{0}, \mathbf{g}\}\}$. See Figure 3 for an illustration of the event appearing on the right-hand side of (3.13).

Due to Lemma A.1 and Proposition 2.6, $\mathbf{n}_1(0, \mathbf{g})$ is uniformly integrable under the sequence $\mathbf{P}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{h}], \Lambda_L^+[\mathbf{h}]}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}$, which in turn converges weakly to $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{H}(+,h), \mathbb{H}(0,h)}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}$ (by Corollary 3.5). Thus, plugging (3.13) in (3.12) and taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\beta}^{+,h} - \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\beta}^{0,h} \leq (\beta h)^{-1} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbb{H}(+,h), \mathbb{H}(0,h)}^{\emptyset,\emptyset} \left[\mathbf{n}_1(0, \mathbf{g}) \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bar{0} \longleftrightarrow \infty \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_1, \bar{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^{\setminus \{\bar{0}\mathbf{g}\}} \right\} \right],$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{\setminus \{\bar{0}\mathbf{g}\}} := \mathcal{H}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{t}) \setminus \{\{\bar{0}, \mathbf{g}\}\}$, and $\mathcal{H}_1 := \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{H}}^{\emptyset}(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{t}_1)$. As a conclusion, it is sufficient to show that

$$\mathbf{P}[\bar{0} \longleftrightarrow \infty \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_1, \bar{0} \not\leftrightarrow \mathbf{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^{\setminus \{\bar{0}\mathbf{g}\}}] = 0, \quad (3.14)$$

where we write $\mathbf{P} := \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{H}(+,h), \mathbb{H}(0,h)}^{\emptyset,\emptyset}$ to shorten the notation.

We now proceed to prove (3.14). This follows from the following lemma, which says that when the cluster of $\bar{0}$ in \mathcal{H}_1 is infinite, it necessarily touches $\partial \mathbb{H}$ at infinitely many “good sites”, i.e. sites with bounded \mathbf{n}_1 degree, see Figure 4 for an illustration.




Figure 3: An illustration of the event appearing on the right-hand side of (3.13). The red path is a subgraph of $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda_L^+[\mathfrak{p}]}^\theta(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ which connects $\bar{0}$ to \mathfrak{g} . Red (resp. black) bubbles correspond to elements of the tanglings of \mathfrak{t}_1 (resp. \mathfrak{t}). Note that by the increasing coupling described in Remark 2.17, every partition class of \mathfrak{t}_1 is included in a partition class of \mathfrak{t} . The dotted line represents an open edge that we do not consider in the connection events. Note that in this picture, $\bar{0}$ does not connect to \mathfrak{g} in $\Lambda_L^+[\mathfrak{h}]$ when the dotted edge is removed.

Lemma 3.7. *For every $M \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{G}_M := \{x \in \partial\mathbb{H} : \Delta\mathbf{n}_1(x) \leq M\}$. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}[|\mathcal{C}_1(0)| = \infty, |\pi(\mathcal{C}_1(0)) \cap \mathcal{G}_M| < \infty \quad \forall M \geq 1] = 0, \quad (3.15)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1(0)$ denotes cluster of $\bar{0}$ in \mathcal{H}_1 and $\pi : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is the natural projection.

Before proving the Lemma 3.7, let us conclude the proof of Proposition 3.6. The idea is that at the “good sites” in \mathcal{G}_M , there is a uniformly positive conditional probability of connecting to the ghost \mathfrak{g} in the double tangled current $\mathcal{H}^{\setminus\{\bar{0}\mathfrak{g}\}}$. The argument is similar to the one used in the proof of Proposition 3.1.

For each $M \geq 1$, let $A_M := \{|\pi(\mathcal{C}_1(0)) \cap \mathcal{G}_M| = \infty\}$. We will prove that

$$\mathbf{P}[\bar{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^{\setminus\{\bar{0}\mathfrak{g}\}} \mid A_M] = 1 \quad \forall M \geq 1,$$

which readily implies (3.14) by Lemma 3.7. We condition on the $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ -measurable set $\mathcal{U}_M := \pi(\mathcal{C}_1(0)) \cap \mathcal{G}_M$, which is infinite on the event A_M . Since $D = \mathbf{E}[\Delta\mathbf{n}_2(0)] = \mathbf{E}[\Delta\mathbf{n}_2(x)] < \infty$ for every $x \in \partial\mathbb{H}$ by translation invariance and Lemma A.1 and Proposition 2.6, we deduce from independence that

$$\mathbf{P}[|\mathcal{V}_M| = \infty \mid A_M] = 1,$$

where $\mathcal{V}_M := \{x \in \mathcal{U}_M : \Delta_{\mathbb{H}}\mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq D + 1, \Delta\mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq D + 3\}$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{H}}\mathbf{n}_2(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{H}} \mathbf{n}_2(x, y)$. Note that $\Delta\mathbf{n}_1(x) + \Delta_{\mathbb{H}}\mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq M'$ and $\Delta\mathbf{n}_1(x) + \Delta\mathbf{n}_2(x) \leq M' + 2$ for every $x \in \mathcal{V}_M$, where $M' := M + D + 1$. Following the same lines as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, one can prove that the random variables $\omega_x := \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_2(x\mathfrak{g}) > 0, \mathfrak{t}_x = \text{ECT}(\mathcal{B}_x)\}}$ (for $x \in \mathcal{V}_M$) stochastically dominate a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables of some parameter $\delta = \delta(M) > 0$. However, the event $\{\bar{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^{\setminus\{\bar{0}\mathfrak{g}\}}\}$ happens as long as $\omega_x = 1$ for some $x \in \mathcal{V}_M$. Thus,

$$\mathbf{P}[\bar{0} \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \text{ in } \mathcal{H}^{\setminus\{\bar{0}\mathfrak{g}\}} \mid |\mathcal{V}_M| = \infty] = 1,$$

which concludes the proof. \square




Figure 4: An illustration of the strategy used in the proof of (3.14). The infinite cluster lying in \mathcal{H}_1 has to touch the boundary infinitely many times. Even better, as shown in Lemma 3.7, it has to touch infinitely many “good” blocks where the total degree is uniformly bounded. These blocks are pictured in red. In each of them, there is a positive probability of connecting to the ghost. It is hence a zero probability event to observe an infinite cluster which manages to avoid \mathbf{g} .

Proof of Lemma 3.7. For every $L \geq 1$, let \mathcal{N}_L be the number of distinct infinite clusters of \mathcal{H}^1 intersecting Λ_L^+ . We will prove that,

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_L] = o(L^{d-1}). \quad (3.16)$$

The lemma is a direct consequence of (3.16). Indeed, assume by contradiction that (3.15) does not hold. Since $\mathcal{G}_M \uparrow \partial\mathbb{H}$ almost surely as $M \rightarrow \infty$, there exist $1 \leq M, K < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}[|\mathcal{C}_1(0)| = \infty, 0 \in \mathcal{G}_M, |\mathcal{C}_1(0) \cap \mathcal{G}_M| \leq K] \geq \delta.$$

Consider $\mathcal{U} := \{x \in \partial\mathbb{H} : |\mathcal{C}_1(x)| = \infty, x \in \mathcal{G}_M, |\mathcal{C}_1(x) \cap \mathcal{G}_M| \leq K\}$, where $\mathcal{C}_1(x)$ is the cluster of $\bar{x} := x\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{n}_1(x\mathbf{g}))$ in \mathcal{H}_1 . Notice that by definition, each infinite cluster \mathcal{C} coincides with at most K -many $\mathcal{C}(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{U}$. Therefore, by translation invariance one obtains

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_L] \geq \frac{1}{K} \mathbf{E}[|\mathcal{U} \cap \Lambda_L^+|] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{x \in \partial\mathbb{H} \cap \Lambda_L^+} \mathbf{P}[x \in \mathcal{U}] \geq \frac{\delta}{K} |\partial\mathbb{H} \cap \Lambda_L^+| \geq c(\delta, K)L^{d-1},$$

which is in contradiction with (3.16).

It remains to prove (3.16), which we do now. We first show that infinite clusters are unlikely to be close to each other deep in the bulk. More precisely, let $\mathcal{N}_m(x)$ be the number of infinite clusters intersecting the box $\Lambda_m^+(x) := x + \Lambda_m^+$ and consider

$$p_m(k) := \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{N}_m(k\mathbf{e}_d) \geq 3],$$

where we recall that $\mathbf{e}_d = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. We claim that for every $m \geq 0$,

$$p_m(k) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.17)$$

The proof of (3.17) follows a Burton–Keane type argument (see [BK89]). First, fix $m \geq 0$, $\delta > 0$ and let $K \subset \mathbb{N}$ be the set of $k \geq 0$ such that $p_m(k) \geq \delta$. We will prove that K is finite, thus implying (3.17). We say that an m -box $\Lambda_m^+(z)$ is a *coarse-trifurcation* if every vertex in $\Lambda_m^+(z)$ belongs to the same infinite cluster \mathcal{C}_z , which in turn breaks into at least 3 distinct infinite clusters if all vertices of $\Lambda_m^+(z)$ are removed. Notice that if

$\mathcal{N}_m(z) \geq 3$, $\mathbf{n}_1(x, y) \geq 1$ for all neighbours $x, y \in \Lambda_m^+(z) \cap \mathbb{H}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_x = \text{ECT}$ for all vertices $x \in \Lambda_m^+(z) \cap \mathbb{H}$, then $\Lambda_m^+(z)$ is a coarse-trifurcation. By a simple insertion-tolerance property, as in¹ [GPPS22, Proposition 5.12], we deduce that there exists $\delta' = \delta'(m, \delta) > 0$ such that for every $k \in K$,

$$q_m(k) := \mathbf{P}[\Lambda_m^+(k\mathbf{e}_d) \text{ is a coarse-trifurcation}] \geq \delta'.$$

For $L \geq 8m$, let $\mathcal{T}_n := |\{z \in 8m\mathbb{H} \cap \Lambda_{L-8m}^+ : \Lambda_m^+(z) \text{ is a coarse-trifurcation}\}|$ be the number of well-spaced coarse-trifurcations of size m deep inside Λ_L^+ . By a classical deterministic argument— see e.g. the proof of [GPPS22, Proposition 5.13]— we have $\mathcal{T}_L \leq \mathcal{N}_L$. On the one hand, by translation invariance we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{T}_L] = \sum_{x \in (8m\mathbb{H}) \cap \Lambda_{L-8m}^+} \mathbf{P}[\Lambda_m^+(x) \text{ is a coarse-trifurcation}] \geq c\delta' |K \cap [0, L-8m]| L^{d-1}.$$

On the other hand, \mathcal{N}_L is smaller than the sum of all the degrees over $\partial\Lambda_L^+$, hence $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_L] \leq CL^{d-1}$ by Lemma A.1 and Proposition 2.6. We conclude that $|K \cap [0, L-8m]| \leq C/c\delta'$ for every $L \geq 8m$, thus K is finite and (3.17) follows.

Finally, we show how to deduce (3.16) from (3.17). First, by applying Lemma A.1 and Proposition 2.6 again, we have $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_m(x)^2] \leq C(m^{d-1})^2$. Therefore, for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \times \{k\}$, $k \geq 0$, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_m(x)] &\leq 2 + \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_m(x) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_m(x) \geq 3}] \\ &\leq 2 + \sqrt{p_m(k) \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_m(x)^2]} \leq 2 + C_1 \sqrt{p_m(k)} m^{d-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Let $I := \lceil \frac{L}{m} \rceil$ and, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, I\}$, cover $\partial\Lambda_L^+ \cap (\mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \times [(i-1)m, im])$ with boxes $\Lambda_m^+(x_j^i)$, $1 \leq j \leq J_i$, where $x_j^i \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \times \{im\}$. Notice that we can take $J_i \leq C_2(L/m)^{d-2}$ for every $i \leq I-1$, and $J_I \leq C_2(L/m)^{d-1}$. Now, for every L large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_L] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^I \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{N}_m(x_j^i)] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^I |J_i| \left(2 + C_1 \sqrt{p_m(im)} m^{d-1} \right) \\ &\leq 4C_2 \left(\frac{L}{m} \right)^{d-1} + C_1 C_2 \left(\frac{L}{m} \right)^{d-2} m^{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \sqrt{p_m(im)} + C_1 C_2 L^{d-1} \sqrt{p_m(Im)} \\ &= C_2 L^{d-1} \left(\frac{4}{m^{d-1}} + \frac{C_1}{I-1} \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \sqrt{p_m(im)} + C_1 \sqrt{p_m(Im)} \right) \\ &\leq C_3 \left(\frac{L}{m} \right)^{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.18) in the second line, and that due to (3.17), one has $\sqrt{p_m(Im)} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{1}{I-1} \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \sqrt{p_m(im)} \rightarrow 0$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Since m is arbitrary, (3.16) follows. \square

¹For full disclosure, here we use the following statement: for every $m \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$ there exists $\delta' = \delta'(m, \delta) > 0$ such that if an event \mathcal{A} satisfies $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}] \geq \delta$, then for any m -box $\Lambda_m^+(z)$ lying in \mathbb{H} , one has $\mathbf{P}[\Phi_{\Lambda_m^+(z)}^{\mathcal{A}}] \geq \delta'$, where $\Phi_{\Lambda_m^+(z)}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is as in [GPPS22, Definition 5.11]. Although this is not exactly the same statement as [GPPS22, Proposition 5.12], the proof is precisely the same.

4 Random cluster for the φ^4 model

In this section, we introduce the random cluster representation of the φ^4 model. This representation arises by viewing φ^4 as an Ising model with random coupling constants coming from the absolute value field, and considering the random cluster representation of the resulting (random) Ising model. After we define the model, we derive some basic properties and correlation inequalities. We stress from the outset that the definitions and properties are true in greater generality: we could replace the product of φ^4 single-site measures by any product of single-site even measures μ on \mathbb{R} having super-Gaussian tails, i.e. $\int e^{cx^2} d\mu(x) < \infty$ for every $c > 0$, so that the corresponding spin model is well-defined for all value values of $\beta \geq 0$.

4.1 Definition of the φ^4 random cluster model

Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite. Define $\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda := \{x \notin \Lambda : \exists y \in \Lambda, y \sim x\}$ and set $\bar{\Lambda} := \Lambda \sqcup \partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda$. Also, recall that $E(\Lambda) = \{xy \in E(\mathbb{Z}^d) : x, y \in \Lambda\}$, and define $\bar{E}(\Lambda) = \{xy \in E(\mathbb{Z}^d) : x \text{ or } y \in \Lambda\}$. Given an external magnetic field $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, recall the definition of the (weighted) graph $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}] = (\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}}, E(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]))$ from Section 2.4, and also define $\bar{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) := E(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) \cup \bar{E}(\Lambda)$. A boundary condition on $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$ is a pair (ξ, \mathbf{b}) , where $\xi = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{|\xi|}\}$ is a partition of $\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda$, and $\mathbf{b} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda}$. Given a percolation configuration $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\bar{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}])}$, we denote by $k^{\xi}(\omega)$ the number of connected components in the graph obtained from $(\bar{\Lambda}^{\mathfrak{g}}, \{e \in \bar{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) : \omega_e = 1\})$ by identifying the vertices in the elements of the partition ξ . In what follows, we abuse the notation and write $d\rho_{g,a}(\mathbf{a}_x)$ to denote the pushforward $d\rho_{g,a}(\varphi_x)$ under the map $\varphi_x \mapsto |\varphi_x| = \mathbf{a}_x$.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite, (ξ, \mathbf{b}) be a boundary condition, and $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$ be an external field. The φ^4 random cluster measure $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ on Λ with boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) , at inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$, and with external magnetic field \mathbf{h} is the probability measure on pairs $(\omega, \mathbf{a}) \in \{0, 1\}^{\bar{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}])} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda}}$ satisfying $\mathbf{a}_x = \mathbf{b}_x$ for all $x \in \partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda$ defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} d\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[(\omega, \mathbf{a})] &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}|_{\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda} = \mathbf{b}}}{Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}} \prod_{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda)} \sqrt{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy}} \\ &\times \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \sqrt{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \right)^{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}} 2^{k^{\xi}(\omega)} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g,a}(\mathbf{a}_x), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy} := 1 - e^{-2\beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y}$, $p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}} := 1 - e^{-2\beta \mathbf{h}_x \mathbf{a}_x}$, and $Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ is a normalisation constant. We write $\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ for the marginal on ω and $\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ for the marginal on \mathbf{a} .

If $\xi = \{\{x\} : x \in \partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda\}$, i.e. each partition class consists of a single vertex, and $\mathbf{b} \equiv 0$, we call it the free boundary condition, and simply write $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$, $\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$, and $\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$. If $\xi = \{\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda\}$, i.e. all vertices are in the same partition, and $\mathbf{b} \equiv \mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda}$, we call it the wired plus boundary condition, and we simply write $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(w, \mathfrak{p})}$, $\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(w, \mathfrak{p})}$, and $\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(w, \mathfrak{p})}$. When $\mathbf{h} = 0$, we may drop it from the notation.

Remark 4.2. *Unlike in the definition of the φ^4 measure from Section 2, here we consider both boundary conditions and a magnetic field. We chose to define the random cluster measure in this way so that we can state its domain Markov property more easily. This makes it possible to define the same random cluster measure in different ways, by considering either a wired (i.e. $\xi = \{\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda\}$) boundary condition (with $\mathbf{h} = 0$) or a magnetic field*

supported on the boundary. For instance, the measures $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathfrak{p}}^0$ can be obtained from $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta}^{(w,\mathfrak{p})}$ by identifying all vertices of $\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda$ as a single vertex that we call \mathfrak{g} .

Remark 4.3. In (4.1), we could replace $\rho_{g,a}$ with any even single-site measure μ with super-Gaussian tails. In particular, choosing μ to be an even measure which is a mixture of δ_0 and $\delta_{\pm 1}$ we recover the dilute random cluster measure considered in [GKP24] in the context of the Blume-Capel model.

It is straightforward to check from (4.1) that a *domain Markov property* holds for φ^4 random cluster measures, as stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4 (Domain Markov property). *Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d , and $\beta \geq 0$. Consider a boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) on Λ and let $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$. For every $\theta \in \{0, 1\}^{\overline{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) \setminus \overline{E}(\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}])}$ and every $\mathbf{s} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda'}$, we have*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[(\omega, \mathbf{a}) \mid (\omega|_{\overline{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) \setminus \overline{E}(\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}])}, \mathbf{a}|_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda'}) = (\theta, \mathbf{s})] = \Psi_{\Lambda',\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi^\theta,\mathbf{s})}[(\omega, \mathbf{a})],$$

where ξ^θ is the partition of $\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda'$ where x, y are in the same partition if and only if they are in the same connected component in the graph obtained from $(\overline{\Lambda} \setminus \Lambda')^{\mathfrak{g}}, \{e \in \overline{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]) \setminus \overline{E}(\Lambda'[\mathbf{h}]) : \theta_e = 1\}$ by identifying the vertices in the elements of the partition ξ .

Remark 4.5. In words, the domain Markov property holds whenever we condition on the value of ω on a set of edges E , and the value of \mathbf{a} on the endpoints of the edges in E . The reason why we define the configuration ω on $\overline{E}(\Lambda)$ in the first place is so that the domain Markov property holds.

4.2 Coupling to the spin model

We now couple the φ^4 model with its random cluster measure introduced above in the same spirit as the Edwards–Sokal coupling between the Ising model and the random cluster model with cluster weight $q = 2$ (see [Gri06, Chapter 1]). We will prove that the marginal \mathbf{a} under $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^0$ is distributed according to the absolute value field under $\nu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}$, and that the percolation marginal ω —conditionally on \mathbf{a} —has the law of a FK-Ising model in a random environment coming from \mathbf{a} .

We begin by introducing the FK-Ising random cluster model with inhomogeneous coupling constants. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\overline{\Lambda}}$, $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, and ξ be a partition of $\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda$. Recall that, given $\beta \geq 0$, $p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy} = 1 - e^{-2\beta\mathbf{a}_x\mathbf{a}_y}$ for every edge $xy \in \overline{E}(\Lambda)$ and $p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}} = 1 - e^{-2\beta\mathbf{h}_x\mathbf{a}_x}$ for every $x \in \Lambda$. Denote by $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^\xi$ the probability measure on $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\overline{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}])}$ defined by

$$\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^\xi[\omega] = \frac{1}{\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^\xi} \prod_{xy \in \overline{E}(\Lambda)} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy}} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \right)^{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}} 2^{k^\xi(\omega)}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^\xi$ is a normalisation constant.

We now turn to definition of the Ising model (with inhomogeneous coupling constants) that arises in the Edwards–Sokal coupling of $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^\xi$. For this definition, we may also consider $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^\Lambda$. We say that a configuration $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\overline{\Lambda}}$ is ξ -admissible, and write $\sigma \sim_{\text{ext}} \xi$, if σ_x is constant for every x in the same element of the partition ξ . Let $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising},\xi}$ to

the probability measure on $\{\pm 1\}^{\bar{\Lambda}}$ which assigns the following weight to every configuration σ :

$$\langle \sigma \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi} = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\sigma \sim_{\text{ext}} \xi}}{Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi}} \exp \left(\beta \sum_{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda)} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y \sigma_x \sigma_y + \beta \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \mathbf{h}_x \mathbf{a}_x \sigma_x \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where $Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi}$ is a normalisation constant. If $\xi = \{\{x\} : x \in \partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda\}$, we let $Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi} = Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, 0}$, and if $\xi = \{\partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda\}$, we let $Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi} = Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, w}$. Note the following fundamental relation,

$$Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{\varphi^4} = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}} Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, 0} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g, \mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_x). \quad (4.4)$$

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite. For every boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) on Λ , every external magnetic field $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, and every inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$ we have*

$$d\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[(\omega, \mathbf{a})] = \phi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[\omega] d\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}(\mathbf{a}), \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$d\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}(\mathbf{a}) = 2 \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}|_{\partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda} = \mathbf{b}} \frac{Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi}}{Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g, \mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_x). \quad (4.6)$$

Moreover, $\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$ is the law of the absolute value field of the φ^4 spin measure $\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}$.

Proof. Observe that (4.5) holds with

$$d\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}|_{\partial^{\text{ext}} \Lambda} = \mathbf{b}} \frac{\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi}}{Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}} \prod_{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda)} \sqrt{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \sqrt{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{xg}} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g, \mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_x). \quad (4.7)$$

The equality (4.5) then follows if we can establish

$$Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi} \prod_{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda)} \sqrt{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \sqrt{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{xg}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Here, the factor 1/2 comes from the fact that we have (implicitly) fixed $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}} = 1$.

Let us now show (4.8). We say that a configuration $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\bar{\Lambda}}$ is *compatible* with some $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\bar{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}])}$ and write $\omega \sim \sigma$ if $\omega_{xy} = 0$ for every $xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}])$ such that $\sigma_x \neq \sigma_y$. Note that, if additionally $\sigma \sim_{\text{ext}} \xi$, each ω is compatible with $2^{k^{\xi}(\omega) - 1}$ configurations σ , since σ needs to be constant on each cluster of ω and there are 2 possibilities for the sign of each cluster of ω other than the cluster of \mathbf{g} , where we implicitly extend σ by setting $\sigma_{\mathbf{g}} = 1$. Thus,

$$\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi} = 2 \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\bar{\Lambda}}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma \sim_{\text{ext}} \xi} \sum_{\omega \sim \sigma} \prod_{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda)} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy}} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{xg}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{xg}} \right)^{\omega_{xg}}.$$

Furthermore, since ω_{xy} needs to be 0 whenever $\sigma_x \neq \sigma_y$, and both values 0 and 1 are allowed whenever $\sigma_x = \sigma_y$, we get that $\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\bar{\Lambda}}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma \sim_{\text{ext}} \xi} \prod_{\substack{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda) \\ \sigma_x = \sigma_y}} \sum_{\omega_{xy} \in \{0, 1\}} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy}} \prod_{\substack{x \in \Lambda \\ \sigma_x = 1}} \sum_{\omega_{xg} \in \{0, 1\}} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{xg}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a})_{xg}} \right)^{\omega_{xg}} \\ & = 2 \sum_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\bar{\Lambda}}} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma \sim_{\text{ext}} \xi} \prod_{\substack{xy \in \bar{E}(\Lambda) \\ \sigma_x = \sigma_y}} e^{2\beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y} \prod_{\substack{x \in \Lambda \\ \sigma_x = 1}} e^{2\beta \mathbf{h}_x \mathbf{a}_x}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma_x \sigma_y = 1$ when $\sigma_x = \sigma_y$ and $\sigma_x \sigma_y = -1$ when $\sigma_x \neq \sigma_y$, we can rewrite the latter to obtain (4.8).

It follows from (4.6) that

$$Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0 = 2 \int Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, 0} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g, \mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_x).$$

The latter is equal to $2Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{\varphi^4}$ thanks to (4.4), hence

$$Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0 = 2Z_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{\varphi^4}. \quad (4.9)$$

We can now combine equations (4.4), (4.6) and (4.9) to deduce that $\mu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$ is the law of the absolute value field of $\nu_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}$. \square

Proposition 4.6 together with the Edwards–Sokal coupling for the Ising model— see [Gri06, Chapter 1]— implies the following.

The Edwards–Sokal coupling for φ^4 .

From percolation to spin model. Given a pair $(\omega, \mathbf{a}) \sim \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$, we can sample a field $\varphi \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}$ as follows.

- (i) Consider a sequence of independent random variables $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}} \in \{\pm 1\}$, indexed by the connected components \mathcal{C} of ω , such that $\mathbb{P}[\sigma_{\mathcal{C}} = 1] = 1$ if \mathcal{C} is the cluster of \mathbf{g} , and $\mathbb{P}[\sigma_{\mathcal{C}} = 1] = 1/2$ otherwise.
- (ii) For every cluster \mathcal{C} and $x \in \mathcal{C}$, set $\varphi_x = \mathbf{a}_x \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$.

From spin model to percolation. Conversely, given a field $\varphi \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}$, we can sample a pair $(\omega, \mathbf{a}) \sim \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$ as follows. (Recall that $\varphi_{\mathbf{g}} = 1$, and note that almost surely we have $\varphi_x \neq 0$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, so that $\text{sgn}(\varphi_x) := \varphi_x / |\varphi_x| \in \{\pm 1\}$ exists almost surely.)

- (i) For each $x \in \Lambda$, set $\mathbf{a}_x = |\varphi_x|$.
- (ii) For each edge $xy \in E(\Lambda[\mathbf{h}])$ such that $\text{sgn}(\varphi_x) \neq \text{sgn}(\varphi_y)$, set $\omega_{xy} = 0$.
- (iii) For each edge $xy \in E(\Lambda)$ such that $\text{sgn}(\varphi_x) = \text{sgn}(\varphi_y)$, let $\omega_{xy} = 1$ with probability equal to $p(\mathbf{a}, \beta)_{xy}$, independently of the other edges.
- (iv) For each vertex $x \in \Lambda$ such that $\text{sgn}(\varphi_x) = 1$, let $\omega_{x\mathbf{g}} = 1$ with probability equal to $p(\mathbf{a}, \beta, \mathbf{h})_{x\mathbf{g}}$, independently of the other edges.

As a direct consequence of this coupling (see [Gri06, Theorem 1.16]) we obtain the following result for $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0$. We note that this result also holds for $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(w, \mathbf{p})}$, since $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(w, \mathbf{p})} = \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{p}_{\Lambda}}^0$. Below, if $x, y \in \Lambda^{\mathbf{g}}$, we write $\{x \leftrightarrow y\}$ to denote the event that x and y lie in the same connected component of ω .

Corollary 4.7. *Let $\beta \geq 0$ and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite. For every $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, and every $x, y \in \Lambda$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_x \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}} &= \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0[\mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{x \leftrightarrow \mathbf{g}}], \\ \langle \text{sgn}(\varphi_x) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}} &= \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0[x \leftrightarrow \mathbf{g}], \\ \langle \varphi_x \varphi_y \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}} &= \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0[\mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y \mathbb{1}_{x \leftrightarrow y}], \\ \langle \text{sgn}(\varphi_x) \text{sgn}(\varphi_y) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}} &= \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0[x \leftrightarrow y]. \end{aligned}$$

4.3 Correlation inequalities and monotonicity

In this section, we derive some basic correlation inequalities and monotonicity properties for $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}$. We start by proving that $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}$ satisfies the absolute value FKG property, which is equivalent to saying that the marginals $\mu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}$ satisfy the FKG inequality. We will in fact state a stronger inequality that holds for conditional probabilities. The proof is a modification of the classical argument in [GJ12, Theorem 4.4.1].

Proposition 4.8 (Absolute value FKG, conditional version). *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite, let (ξ, \mathbf{b}) be a boundary condition on Λ , and let $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$. For every $A \subset \Lambda$, $\eta \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$, and increasing, square integrable functions $F, G : (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[F \cdot G \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] \geq \mu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[F \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] \mu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[G \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta]. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. For ease of notation, let us write for every $A \subset \Lambda$ and $\eta \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$

$$\mu^{A,\eta}[\cdot] := \mu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[\cdot \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta].$$

Let us first observe that, sampling two independent fields $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}' \sim \mu^{A,\eta}$, for every square integrable $F, G : (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mu^{A,\eta} \otimes \mu^{A,\eta} [(F(\mathbf{a}) - F(\mathbf{a}'))(G(\mathbf{a}) - G(\mathbf{a}'))] = 2 \left(\mu^{A,\eta}[FG] - \mu^{A,\eta}[F] \mu^{A,\eta}[G] \right) \quad (4.11)$$

We will prove that $\mu^{A,\eta}$ satisfies (4.10), or equivalently that the left-hand side of (4.11) is positive, by induction on the number of sites n we do *not* condition on, i.e. $n = |\Lambda \setminus A|$. Notice when $n = 1$, the desired FKG inequality follows (from (4.11)) since $F(\mathbf{a}) - F(\mathbf{a}')$ and $G(\mathbf{a}) - G(\mathbf{a}')$ have the same sign if they are both increasing. Assume now that for some $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\mu^{A,\eta}[FG] \geq \mu^{A,\eta}[F] \mu^{A,\eta}[G]$$

for every $A \subset \Lambda$ such that $|\Lambda \setminus A| \leq n$ and any $\eta \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$. Fix any such A and η . We claim that for every $x \in A$, every $s, s' \geq 0$, and every increasing square integrable functions $F, G : (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mu^{A \setminus \{x\}, \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}}} \otimes \mu^{A \setminus \{x\}, \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}}} [(F(\mathbf{a}) - F(\mathbf{a}'))(G(\mathbf{a}) - G(\mathbf{a}')) \mid \mathbf{a}_x = s, \mathbf{a}'_x = s'] \geq 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Upon taking expectation of the left-hand side of (4.12) with respect to $\mu^{A \setminus \{x\}, \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}}} \otimes \mu^{A \setminus \{x\}, \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}}}$, using (4.11), and using the fact that A, η, x were arbitrary, we obtain the desired induction hypothesis in the case $n + 1$, thus completing the proof.

It remains to prove the claim (4.12). For shorthand, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ let us write

$$\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[\cdot] := \mu^{A \setminus \{x\}, \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}}}[\cdot \mid \mathbf{a}_x = s].$$

Observe that $\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s} = \mu^{A,\tilde{\eta}}$, where $\tilde{\eta} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$ is such that $\tilde{\eta}|_{A \setminus \{x\}} = \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}}$ and $\tilde{\eta}_x = s$, and hence $\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}$ satisfies the induction hypothesis. Let now $F, G : (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus (A \setminus \{x\})} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be increasing square integrable functions. Since the restrictions of F, G to any subset are also increasing, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (4.12)} &= \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[FG] + \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[FG] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[F] \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[G] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[F] \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[G] \\ &= \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[FG] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[F] \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[G] + \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[FG] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[F] \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[G] \\ &\quad + \left(\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[F] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[F] \right) \left(\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[G] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[G] \right) \\ &\geq \left(\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[F] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[F] \right) \left(\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[G] - \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[G] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where we used the induction hypothesis in the last inequality.

Assume, without loss of generality, that $s \geq s'$. We will now show that $\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[F] \geq \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[F]$ for every increasing function F as above (i.e. including if F is swapped for G). This establishes that the last line of (4.13) is positive, thereby completing the proof of the claim. On the event $\{\mathbf{a}|_A = \tilde{\eta}\}$, where $\tilde{\eta}|_{A \setminus \{x\}} = \eta$ and $\tilde{\eta}_x = s'$, define the random variable

$$Z(\mathbf{a}) := \frac{Z_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}^{\text{Ising},\xi}}{Z_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising},\xi}},$$

where, $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}|_{\Lambda \setminus A} = \mathbf{a}|_{\Lambda \setminus A}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}|_{A \setminus \{x\}} = \mathbf{a}|_{A \setminus \{x\}} (= \eta|_{A \setminus \{x\}})$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_x := s \geq s' = \mathbf{a}_x$. The logarithmic derivative of Z with respect to \mathbf{a}_y for $y \in \Lambda \setminus A$, is given by

$$\beta \sum_{z \sim y} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_z \langle \sigma_y \sigma_z \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}^{\text{Ising},\xi} - \mathbf{a}_z \langle \sigma_y \sigma_z \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising},\xi} \right) + \beta \mathbf{h}_y \left(\langle \sigma_y \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}^{\text{Ising},\xi} - \langle \sigma_y \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising},\xi} \right). \quad (4.14)$$

By Griffiths' inequality, it is positive and hence Z is an increasing function on $(\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus A}$. Therefore, by a direct computation and using that $F(\tilde{\mathbf{a}}) \geq F(\mathbf{a})$, followed by the induction hypothesis,

$$\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s}[F] \geq \frac{\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[ZF]}{\mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[Z]} \geq \mu^{A,\eta\Delta s'}[F],$$

as desired. \square

We can now deduce that $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}$ satisfies the full FKG property. We again state a stronger property that holds for conditional measures.

Proposition 4.9 (FKG). *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite, let (ξ, \mathbf{b}) be a boundary condition on Λ , and let $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$. For every $A \subset \Lambda$, $\eta \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, and every increasing, square-integrable functions $F, G : \{0, 1\}^{\bar{E}(\Lambda)} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[F \cdot G \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] \geq \Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[F \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] \Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[G \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta].$$

Proof. For every $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda}}$, let $F^{\mathbf{a}}(\omega) = F(\omega, \mathbf{a})$ and $G^{\mathbf{a}}(\omega) = G(\omega, \mathbf{a})$. Clearly these are increasing as functions of ω . By the FKG property of the random cluster model (see [Gri06, Theorem 3.8]), for every $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda}}$ we have

$$\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[F^{\mathbf{a}} \cdot G^{\mathbf{a}}] \geq \phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[F^{\mathbf{a}}] \phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[G^{\mathbf{a}}].$$

The mapping $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[F^{\mathbf{a}}]$ is increasing due to the monotonicity of $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}$ in \mathbf{a} (see [Gri06, Theorem 3.21]), and the fact that for $\mathbf{a}_1 \leq \mathbf{a}_2$, we have $F^{\mathbf{a}_1}(\omega) \leq F^{\mathbf{a}_2}(\omega)$ for every ω . Hence, by the conditional absolute value FKG property (4.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[F \cdot G \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] &\geq \mu_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[F^{\mathbf{a}}] \phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h},\mathbf{a}}^{\xi}[G^{\mathbf{a}}] \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] \\ &\geq \Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[F \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta] \Psi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{h}}^{(\xi,\mathbf{b})}[G \mid \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta]. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

As a consequence of the FKG property, we obtain the following monotonicity in boundary conditions, inverse temperature, and external magnetic field. Before stating it, let us introduce a useful notation. For boundary conditions $(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1), (\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)$ on a common set Λ , we write $(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1) \leq (\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)$ if every partition class of ξ_1 is contained in a partition class of ξ_2 , and $\mathbf{b}_1 \leq \mathbf{b}_2$. Also, recall that for two measures μ_1 and μ_2 , we write $\mu_1 \preceq \mu_2$ if $\mu_1(F) \leq \mu_2(F)$ for every increasing function F .

Proposition 4.10 (Monotonicity properties of the random cluster measure). *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite and $A \subset \Lambda$. For every boundary conditions $(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1) \leq (\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)$ on Λ , every $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$ such that $\eta_1 \leq \eta_2$, every external magnetic fields $\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$ with $\mathbf{h}_1 \leq \mathbf{h}_2$, and every $0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$ we have*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[\cdot | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1] \preceq \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2}^{(\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)}[\cdot | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_2].$$

In particular,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0 \preceq \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \preceq \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^{(w, \mathbf{p})}$$

for every boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) on Λ such that $\mathbf{b} \leq \mathfrak{M}_\Lambda$, and every $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^A$.

Proof. We first claim that

$$\mu_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[\cdot | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1] \preceq \mu_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2}^{(\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)}[\cdot | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_2].$$

Indeed, for any bounded increasing function $F : (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mu_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2}^{(\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)}[F | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_2] = \frac{\mu_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[Z \cdot F | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1]}{\mu_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[Z | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1]}$$

where

$$Z(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{Z_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \bar{\mathbf{a}}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi_2}}{Z_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising}, \xi_1}},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{a}}|_A = \eta_2$, and is otherwise equal to \mathbf{a} . By taking the logarithmic derivative and using Griffiths' inequality (as in (4.14)), we see that Z is an increasing function of \mathbf{a} . Using the absolute value FKG (4.10), we deduce that

$$\mu_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[F | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1] \leq \mu_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2}^{(\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)}[F | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_2],$$

which implies the claim.

We now proceed to the proof of the full monotonicity. Let $G : \{0, 1\}^{\bar{E}(\Lambda)} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda} \setminus A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an increasing function. For any $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda}}$, we have by the monotonicity properties of the random cluster model that

$$\phi_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi_1}[G^{\mathbf{a}}] \leq \phi_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi_2}[G^{\mathbf{a}}],$$

where we recall that $G^{\mathbf{a}}(\omega) = G(\omega, \mathbf{a})$, and that the mapping $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \phi_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi_2}[G^{\mathbf{a}}]$ is increasing. By the monotonicity of the absolute value field we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[G | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1] &\leq \mu_{\Lambda, \beta_1, \mathbf{h}_1}^{(\xi_1, \mathbf{b}_1)}[\phi_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2, \mathbf{a}}^{\xi_2}[G^{\mathbf{a}}] | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_1] \\ &\leq \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta_2, \mathbf{h}_2}^{(\xi_2, \mathbf{b}_2)}[G | \mathbf{a}|_A = \eta_2]. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

As a corollary, we obtain the following monotonicity property for the free measure.

Corollary 4.11. *Let $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be finite and $\mathbf{h}_1 \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda_1}, \mathbf{h}_2 \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda_2}$ such that $\mathbf{h}_1(x) \leq \mathbf{h}_2(x)$ for all $x \in \Lambda_1$. For every $\beta \geq 0$, we have*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_1, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1}^0 \preceq \Psi_{\Lambda_2, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2}^0,$$

in the sense that for every increasing, integrable function $F : (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\bar{\Lambda}_2}$ that is Λ_1 -measurable,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_1, \beta, \mathbf{h}_1}^0[F|_{\Lambda_1}] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_2, \beta, \mathbf{h}_2}^0[F].$$

Proof. First note that by Proposition 4.10,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_2, \beta, \tilde{h}_1}^0 \preceq \Psi_{\Lambda_2, \beta, h_2}^0,$$

where \tilde{h}_1 coincides with h_1 on Λ_1 and is equal to 0 on $\Lambda_2 \setminus \Lambda_1$. The desired inequality then follows by applying Proposition 4.4 followed by Proposition 4.10 (applied to the random boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) on Λ_1 induced from the domain Markov property) to yield that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_1, \beta, h_1}^0 \preceq \Psi_{\Lambda_2, \beta, \tilde{h}_1}^0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4.4 Uniqueness of infinite volume measures

In this section, we show uniqueness of full space and half-space infinite volume measures. First, we consider the infinite volume limits arising from the measures $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ and $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(w, \mathbf{p})}$ as $\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, and show that they coincide for any $\beta \geq 0$.

Proposition 4.12. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. Then, $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ and $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(w, \mathbf{p})}$ converge weakly as $\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ to infinite volume measures denoted Ψ_β^0 and Ψ_β^1 , respectively.*

Proof. Note that $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(w, \mathbf{p})} = \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{p}_\Lambda}^0$. The desired result then follows from the weak convergence of the corresponding spin measures $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{p}_\Lambda}$ and the Edwards–Sokal coupling. \square

Recall from (2.7) that $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^0 = \frac{1}{2}(\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+ + \langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^-)$. Using this result, we will now deduce that Ψ_β^0 and Ψ_β^1 coincide.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. One has that $\Psi_\beta^0 = \Psi_\beta^1$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.10, we have $\Psi_\beta^0 \preceq \Psi_\beta^1$. Hence, by Strassen’s theorem [Str65], there exists a coupling $(\mathbb{Q}, (\mathbf{a}^0, \omega^0), (\mathbf{a}^1, \omega^1))$ such that $(\mathbf{a}^0, \omega^0) \sim \Psi_\beta^0$, $(\mathbf{a}^1, \omega^1) \sim \Psi_\beta^1$, and $\mathbf{a}^0 \leq \mathbf{a}^1$, $\omega^0 \leq \omega^1$ almost surely under \mathbb{Q} . Since $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta$ is a convex combination of $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^-$, and $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^-$ coincides with the pushforward of $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta^+$ under the mapping $(\varphi_x) \mapsto -(\varphi_x)$, we can deduce that

$$\langle |\varphi_x| \rangle_\beta^0 = \langle |\varphi_x| \rangle_\beta^+, \quad (4.15)$$

and

$$\langle \varphi_x \varphi_y \rangle_\beta^0 = \langle \varphi_x \varphi_y \rangle_\beta^+. \quad (4.16)$$

It follows from (4.15) that $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{a}_x^0] = \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{a}_x^1]$, which, combined with the almost sure monotonicity, implies that

$$\mathbf{a}^0 = \mathbf{a}^1 \quad \mathbb{Q}\text{-almost surely.} \quad (4.17)$$

We now use (4.16) and (4.17) to deduce that $\omega_{xy}^0 = \omega_{xy}^1$ \mathbb{Q} -almost surely, from which it follows that $\Psi_\beta^0 = \Psi_\beta^1$, as desired. We first observe that by combining Corollary 4.7, (4.16), and (4.17),

$$\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{a}_x^0 \mathbf{a}_y^0 \mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^0} y\}] = \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{a}_x^1 \mathbf{a}_y^1 \mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^1} y\}] = \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{a}_x^0 \mathbf{a}_y^0 \mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^1} y\}].$$

Since $\mathbf{a}_x^0 \mathbf{a}_y^0 > 0$ almost surely, using again the almost sure monotonicity we obtain that

$$\mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^0} y\} = \mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^1} y\} \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (4.18)$$

By the Edwards–Sokal coupling we have

$$\mathbb{Q}[\omega_{xy}^0] = \langle p(\beta, |\varphi|)_{xy} \mathbb{1}\{\text{sgn}(\varphi_x) = \text{sgn}(\varphi_y)\} \rangle_{\beta}^0. \quad (4.19)$$

Note that $\mathbb{1}\{\text{sgn}(\varphi_x) = \text{sgn}(\varphi_y)\} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{sgn}(\varphi_x)\text{sgn}(\varphi_y) + 1)$, and by the Edwards–Sokal coupling between the Ising and random cluster models, we have $\langle \text{sgn}(\varphi_x)\text{sgn}(\varphi_y) \mid |\varphi| \rangle_{\beta}^0 = \mathbb{Q}[x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^0} y \mid \mathbf{a}^0]$. Combining the two previous equations with (4.19) yields

$$\mathbb{Q}[\omega_{xy}^0] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Q}[p(\beta, \mathbf{a}^0)_{xy} (\mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^0} y\} + 1)], \quad (4.20)$$

and similarly,

$$\mathbb{Q}[\omega_{xy}^1] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Q}[p(\beta, \mathbf{a}^1)_{xy} (\mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^1} y\} + 1)].$$

However, (4.17) and (4.18) imply that

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Q}[p(\beta, \mathbf{a}^0)_{xy} (\mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^0} y\} + 1)] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Q}[p(\beta, \mathbf{a}^1)_{xy} (\mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega^1} y\} + 1)].$$

Thus, $\mathbb{Q}[\omega_{xy}^0] = \mathbb{Q}[\omega_{xy}^1]$, and by the almost sure monotonicity this implies that $\omega_{xy}^0 = \omega_{xy}^1$ almost surely. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.14. *Note that Corollary 4.7 and Proposition 4.13 imply that for any $\beta \geq 0$, one has*

$$m^*(\beta) = \Psi_{\beta}^1[\mathbf{a}_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \leftrightarrow \infty\}}] = \Psi_{\beta}^0[\mathbf{a}_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \leftrightarrow \infty\}}].$$

We conclude this section by considering infinite volume limits arising in the half-space setting. Following the setup of Proposition 3.6, we let $h > 0$ and define $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\mathbb{H}}$ as $h_x := h \mathbb{1}_{x \in \partial \mathbb{H}}$. Define two measures $\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, h}$ and $\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{1, h}$ on $\{0, 1\}^{E(\mathbb{H}[\mathbf{h}])} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\mathbb{H}}$ as follows,

$$\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, h} := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta, \mathbf{h}}^0, \quad \Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{1, h} := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_L^+, \beta, \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{p}_{\Lambda_L^+ \setminus \partial \mathbb{H}}}^0$$

Note that these limits exist thanks to Lemma 3.4 and the Edwards–Sokal coupling.

Proposition 4.15. *Let $d \geq 2$, $\beta \geq 0$ and $h > 0$. Then,*

$$\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, h} = \Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{1, h}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.6, we have that $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{+, h} = \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, h}$. The desired result follows readily from the Edwards–Sokal coupling. \square

5 Surface order bound on disconnections

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 5.1 below, which states that disconnection probabilities for the the φ^4 random cluster model with *free* (and therefore any!) boundary condition decays exponentially in the surface order.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $\beta > \beta_c$. There exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for every $L \geq 1$ we have*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^0[\Lambda_{\ell} \longleftrightarrow \partial \Lambda_{c_1 L}] \geq 1 - e^{-c_1 \ell^{d-1}}, \quad \forall 1 \leq \ell \leq c_1 L.$$

Theorem 5.1 is proved in two steps. First, we prove that the surface tension of the φ^4 model is positive for every $\beta > \beta_c$ by adapting the argument of Lebowitz and Pfister [LP81]. We then perform a delicate comparison argument to deduce a corresponding statement for the *free* φ^4 random cluster model.

5.1 Definition of the surface tension

Here we define a notion of surface tension for the φ^4 model and relate it to disconnection probabilities for the corresponding random cluster representation. As mentioned in the introduction, we consider a magnetic field of intensity 1 on a thick boundary. The thick boundary will be important in Section 5.2 in order to prove positivity of the surface tension with the help of Proposition 3.1. The boundedness of the magnetic field will be important in Section 5.3, where we will rely on regularity up to the boundary (recall Proposition 2.6) in order to recover the *free* φ^4 random cluster measure.

First, let us introduce some necessary definitions and notation. For $L, M \geq 1$, define the rectangle $\mathcal{R}(L, M) = \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{-M, \dots, M\}$, and the infinite strip $\mathcal{R}(L) := \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Let also $\partial^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M) := \mathcal{R}(L, M) \setminus \{-L + \log L + 1, \dots, L - \log L - 1\}^{d-1} \times \{-M, \dots, M\}$ and $\partial^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L) := \mathcal{R}(L) \setminus \{-L + \log L + 1, \dots, L - \log L - 1\}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{Z}$ denote their thickened boundaries. We also define the top and bottom of the thick boundary $\partial_+^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M) := \partial^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M) \cap \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $\partial_-^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M) := \partial^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M) \cap \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{-M, \dots, 0\}$. Let

$$\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,-}(x) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{for } x \in \partial_+^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M), \\ -1, & \text{for } x \in \partial_-^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We also let $\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,+}$ be the external magnetic field taking value +1 on $\partial^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M)$ and 0 otherwise. See Figure 5 for an illustration. For ease of notation, we write the partition functions of the associated φ^4 models as follows:

$$Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} = Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,+}}^{\varphi^4} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} = Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,-}}^{\varphi^4}.$$

We also let $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} = \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,+}}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} = \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,-}}$.




Figure 5: An illustration of the rectangle $\mathcal{R}(L, M)$. The support of the magnetic field $\mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,-}$ is the coloured region.

Definition 5.2. *The surface tension of the φ^4 model on $\mathcal{R}(L, M)$ is defined as*

$$\tau_\beta^{L,M} := \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \log \frac{Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}}{Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-}}.$$

We also define

$$\tau_\beta^L := \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \tau_\beta^{L,M} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_\beta := \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \tau_\beta^L.$$

The surface tension can be expressed naturally in terms of a disconnection event under the measure $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0$. In order to facilitate the comparison external magnetic fields $h_{L,M}^{+,+}$ and $h_{L,M}^{+,-}$, it is convenient to view $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0$ as a probability measure on a graph with *two* ghost vertices $\{\mathfrak{g}^+, \mathfrak{g}^-\}$. We write $\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L, M)$ for the graph with vertex set $\mathcal{R}(L, M) \cup \{\mathfrak{g}^+, \mathfrak{g}^-\}$ and edge set $E(\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L, M))$ given by the union of $\{xy \in E(\mathbb{Z}^d) : x, y \in \mathcal{R}(L, M)\}$ and

$$\{x\mathfrak{g}^- : x \in \partial_-^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M)\} \sqcup \{x\mathfrak{g}^+ : x \in \partial_+^{\text{thick}}\mathcal{R}(L, M)\}.$$

We can now (re)define $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0$ on $\{0, 1\}^{E(\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L,M))} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\mathcal{R}(L,M)}$ as in Definition 4.1 with straightforward modifications to the edge weights and where in $k^0(\omega)$, the clusters are counted in the graph obtained by identifying \mathfrak{g}^- and \mathfrak{g}^+ . Under the pushforward with respect to the bijection identifying the two ghosts, we have that $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0$ coincides with the definition of Section 4. Below, we will use that the partition functions are the same.

Lemma 5.3. *For every $\beta > 0$, and every $L, M \geq 1$ we have*

$$\frac{Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-}}{Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}} = \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+]. \quad (5.1)$$

In particular, $\tau_\beta \geq 0$ for every $\beta > 0$.

Proof. Recall (4.9), and note that in our case it implies that

$$Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} = \frac{1}{2} Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0. \quad (5.2)$$

We claim that

$$Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} = \frac{1}{2} Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+], \quad (5.3)$$

where $Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+]$ denotes the partition function obtained by restricting the sum to configurations ω in which \mathfrak{g}^- and \mathfrak{g}^+ lie in different clusters. Note that (5.1) follows readily from (5.2) and (5.3).

Recall from (4.4) that

$$Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h}^{+,-} = \int Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,-},a}^{\text{Ising},0} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M)} d\rho_{g,a}(\mathbf{a}_x),$$

where $Z_{\Lambda,\beta,h,a}^{\text{Ising},0}$ is defined² in (4.3). Furthermore, let $Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+},a}^0$ denote the partition function of the FK-Ising random cluster measure which is, as for the φ^4 random cluster measure above, viewed on the graph $\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L, M)$, i.e. with two ghost vertices. By adapting the proof of (4.8), we will show:

$$Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,-},a}^{\text{Ising},0} = \frac{1}{2} Z_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+},a}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \prod_{xy \in E(\mathcal{R}(L,M))} e^{-\beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M)} e^{-\beta (h_{L,M}^{+,+})_x \mathbf{a}_x}. \quad (5.4)$$

²There, we only considered $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$ but the definition extends to general $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda}$

Upon integrating, this yields (5.3).

Let us now show (5.4). Recall that we say that a spin configuration $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L,M)}$ is compatible with $\omega \in \{0,1\}^{E(\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L,M))}$ if σ is constant in the clusters of ω . We write $\omega \sim_{\mathfrak{g}} \sigma$ if in addition, $\sigma_{\mathfrak{g}^+} = 1$ and $\sigma_{\mathfrak{g}^-} = -1$. Note that, given a configuration ω such that $\{\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+\}$, the number of configurations σ such that $\omega \sim_{\mathfrak{g}} \sigma$ is $2^{k^0(\omega)-1}$, where we emphasise that $k^0(\omega)$ is the number of components in ω after identifying \mathfrak{g}^+ and \mathfrak{g}^- . Conversely, if $\omega \sim_{\mathfrak{g}} \sigma$, then $\omega \in \{\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+\}$. Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{Z}_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+},\mathbf{a}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \\ &= 2 \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{E(\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L,M))} \\ \mathfrak{g}^+ \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^-}} 2^{\tilde{k}(\omega)-1} \prod_{xy \in E(\mathcal{R}(L,M))} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy}} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M)} \left(\frac{p(\beta, h_{L,M}^{+,+}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{1 - p(\beta, h_{L,M}^{+,+}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \right)^{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{\mathcal{R}^{+,-}(L,M)} \\ \sigma_{\mathfrak{g}^+} = 1 \\ \sigma_{\mathfrak{g}^-} = -1}} \sum_{\omega \sim_{\mathfrak{g}} \sigma} \prod_{xy \in E(\mathcal{R}(L,M))} \left(\frac{p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy}} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M)} \left(\frac{p(\beta, h_{L,M}^{+,+}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{1 - p(\beta, h_{L,M}^{+,+}, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \right)^{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}}. \end{aligned}$$

From there, the end of the computation is exactly the same as in the proof of (4.8). \square

5.2 Strict positivity of the surface tension

Our aim now is to show that the strict inequality $\tau_\beta > 0$ holds in the entire supercritical regime— see Proposition 5.5. This follows from an adaptation of the argument of [LP81], which crucially relies on the Ginibre inequality (Proposition 2.4).

We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\beta > 0$ and $L \geq 1$. Then, both $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-}$ converge weakly as $M \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. The convergence of $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}$ follows from the Edwards–Sokal coupling and the stochastic monotonicity of $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0$ in M by Corollary 4.11. For $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-}$, note that by flipping the sign of all spins φ_x for $x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{-M, \dots, 0\}$, and denoting the resulting configuration $\tilde{\varphi}$, we obtain

$$\langle F(\varphi) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} = \frac{\langle F(\tilde{\varphi}) \prod_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}} \exp(-2\beta \varphi_{(x,1)} \varphi_{(x,0)}) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}}{\langle \prod_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}} \exp(-2\beta \varphi_{(x,1)} \varphi_{(x,0)}) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}}$$

for every bounded measurable function F . The convergence of $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-}$ then follows from the convergence and regularity of $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+}$. \square

In what follows, we write

$$\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,+} := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,-} := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-}.$$

Proposition 5.5. *We have $\tau_\beta > 0$ for every $\beta > \beta_c$.*

Proof. Our main tool will be the Ginibre inequality stated in Proposition 2.4. We first differentiate $\tau_\beta^{L,M}$ with respect to β to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\beta} \tau_\beta^{L,M} &= \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{xy \in E(\mathcal{R}(L,M))} \left(\langle \varphi_x \varphi_y \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} - \langle \varphi_x \varphi_y \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M)} \left(\langle \mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,+}(x) \varphi_x \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta} - \langle \mathbf{h}_{L,M}^{+,-}(x) \varphi_x \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.3), each term in the sums is non-negative. Let us fix some $N \geq 1$. By disregarding the horizontal edges and the edges in the complement of $E(\mathcal{R}(L,N))$, and applying Proposition 2.4, we obtain, for every $M \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\beta} \tau_\beta^{L,M} &\geq \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{\substack{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \\ j \in \{-N, \dots, N-1\}}} \left(\langle \varphi_{(x,j)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} \langle \varphi_{(x,j+1)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \langle \varphi_{(x,j+1)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,+} \langle \varphi_{(x,j)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{+,-} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$, and using translation invariance in the \mathbf{e}_d direction we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\beta} \tau_\beta^{L,M} &\geq \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{\substack{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \\ j \in \{-N, \dots, N-1\}}} \langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,+} \left(\langle \varphi_{(x,j+1)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,-} - \langle \varphi_{(x,j)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,-} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}} \langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,+} \left(\langle \varphi_{(x,N)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,-} - \langle \varphi_{(x,-N)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,-} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can use Lemma 5.6 below to obtain that

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\beta} \tau_\beta^{L,M} \geq \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}} 2 \left(\langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta}^{+,+} \right)^2.$$

Applying Fatou's lemma we can now deduce that

$$\tau_\beta^L \geq \tau_{\beta_c}^L + \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \sum_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}} 2 \int_{\beta_c}^\beta \left(\langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),u}^{+,+} \right)^2 du.$$

Without loss of generality, we only handle $\langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),u}^{+,+}$ for $x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}$ satisfying $x_1 = |x| \in \{0, \dots, L\}$. Using Proposition 2.3, for $u \in (\beta_c, \beta)$ and $x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}$ satisfying $x_1 = |x| \in \{0, \dots, L\}$, one has

$$\langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L),u}^{+,+} \geq \langle \varphi_{(x,0)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L,L-x_1),u}^{+,+} \geq \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{L-x_1}(x),u, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{L-x_1}(x)},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{L-x_1}(x)$ was defined above Proposition 3.3. The latter proposition gives that

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_{L-x_1}(x),u, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{L-x_1}(x)} \geq \frac{1}{2d} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_u^+.$$

It follows that

$$\tau_\beta \geq \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{dL^{d-1}} \sum_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}} \int_{\beta_c}^\beta \left(\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_u^+ \right)^2 du = \frac{1}{d} \int_{\beta_c}^\beta \left(\langle \varphi_0 \rangle_u^+ \right)^2 du > 0,$$

as desired. \square

We now prove the lemma mentioned in the proof of Proposition 5.5.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\beta > 0$. For every $L \geq 1$ we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi(x, N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} = \langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi(x, -N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} = -\langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +}$$

for every $x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}$.

Proof. We will only obtain the limit of $\langle \varphi(x, N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -}$. The limit of $\langle \varphi(x, -N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -}$ can be obtained similarly, once one observes that $-\langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +} = \langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{-, -}$.

Recall that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}^+} = 1$ and $\varphi_{\mathfrak{g}^-} = -1$, and let \mathcal{S}^+ (resp. \mathcal{S}^-) denote the connected component of \mathfrak{g}^+ (resp. \mathfrak{g}^-) consisting of vertices x such that $\varphi_x > 0$ (resp. $\varphi_x < 0$). Let \mathcal{I} be the *interface* separating \mathcal{S}^+ and \mathcal{S}^- , i.e. the set of edges in $E(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ with one endpoint in \mathcal{S}^+ and the other in \mathcal{S}^- . Since $\mathcal{R}(L)$ is “one-dimensional”, it is not hard to see that \mathcal{I} is almost surely a finite set. Indeed, by Proposition 2.6, there exists $M > 0$ such that $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -}$ -almost surely, there are infinitely many $i > 0$ such that the event $A_{M, i} := \{|\varphi(x, \ell)| \leq M, \forall x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}, \forall \ell \in \{-i-1, -i+1, i-1, i+1\}\}$ happens. Moreover, conditioning on $\eta = (\varphi(x, \ell))_{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}, \ell \in \{-i-1, -i+1, i-1, i+1\}}$ and using the domain Markov property, we see that both

$$\nu_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \left[\left\{ \varphi(x, i) > 0, \varphi(x, -i) > 0, \forall x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \mid \eta \right\} \right]$$

and

$$\nu_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \left[\left\{ \varphi(x, i) < 0, \varphi(x, -i) < 0, \forall x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \mid \eta \right\} \right]$$

remain bounded away from 0, uniformly over $\eta \in A_{M, i}$ and (x, i) . Thus, almost surely, there are (infinitely many) indices $i, j > 0$ such that $\varphi(x, i) > 0, \varphi(x, -i) > 0, \varphi(x, j) < 0$ and $\varphi(x, -j) < 0$ for every $x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1}$. When this happens, \mathcal{I} is a finite set.

Let us now condition on the event $\{\mathcal{I} = I\}$ for some finite realisation I . Note that I splits $\mathcal{R}(L)$ into two connected components \mathcal{R}^+ and \mathcal{R}^- such that $\mathfrak{g}^+ \in \mathcal{R}^+$ and $\mathfrak{g}^- \in \mathcal{R}^-$. Since $\varphi_x > 0$ for every $x \in \mathcal{R}^+$ which has a neighbour $y \in \mathcal{R}^-$, and $(x, N) \in \mathcal{R}^+$ for every N large enough depending only on I , we can use the monotonicity in boundary conditions to deduce that

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi(x, N) \mid \mathcal{I} = I \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \geq \langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +}.$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Proposition 2.6, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $k \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi(x, N) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I} \not\subset \Lambda_k} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -}| &\leq \sqrt{\langle \varphi(x, N)^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I} \not\subset E(\Lambda_k)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -}} \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I} \not\subset E(\Lambda_k)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -}} =: \varepsilon_k. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by decomposing we see that for every $k \geq 1$ we have

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi(x, N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \geq \langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +} \langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I} \subset E(\Lambda_k)} \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} - \varepsilon_k.$$

Since ε_k tends to 0 as k tends to infinity, we can deduce that

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi(x, N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \geq \langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +}.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 2.4 (with $A = \{(x, N)\}$ and $B = \emptyset$), for every N ,

$$\langle \varphi(x, N) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, -} \leq \langle \varphi(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}(L), \beta}^{+, +}.$$

The proof follows readily from the two last displayed equations. \square

5.3 Comparison with the free φ^4 random cluster model

In this section we prove Theorem 5.1. Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 5.3 readily imply a surface order bound on disconnection for the φ^4 random cluster measure $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta,h_L^{+,+}}^0 := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta,h_{L,M}^{+,+}}^0$ — see Lemma 5.7. Theorem 5.1 then follows from a comparison to the free measure $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L),\beta}^0$ (for $\delta > 0$ well-chosen). This comparison is established in two steps in Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9. The uniqueness of the φ^4 random cluster measure on the half space with positive magnetic field (recall Propositions 3.6 and 4.15) will be crucial in the later step.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. There exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for every $L \geq 1$,*

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta,h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \geq 1 - e^{-c_2 L^{d-1}}.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 5.5 that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta,h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] < 0.$$

Since $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta,h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] > 0$ for every $L \geq 1$, there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{L^{d-1}} \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),\beta,h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \leq -c_2$$

for every $L \geq 1$. This concludes the proof. \square

We now obtain a finite volume analogue of Lemma 5.7 for a φ^4 random cluster measure defined on a rectangle with sufficiently large external magnetic field on the top and bottom faces, and external magnetic field on the lateral faces. More precisely, for $h > 0$, let $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,M),\beta}^{0,h}$ denote the φ^4 random cluster measure on $\mathcal{R}(L,M)$ with external magnetic field equal to h on $\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L,M) \cup \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L,M)$ and 0 otherwise, where

$$\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L,M) := \{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M) : x_d = -M\}, \quad \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L,M) := \{x \in \mathcal{R}(L,M) : x_d = M\}.$$

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. For every $h > 0$ sufficiently large, there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c_3 = c_3(h) > 0$ such that for every $L \geq 1$,*

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L),\beta}^{0,h}[\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L) \longleftrightarrow \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L)] \geq 1 - e^{-c_3 L^{d-1}}.$$

Proof. We fix $\beta > \beta_c$ and drop it from notation. Let $\delta > 0$ be a constant to be determined. Recall Lemma 5.7. Our aim is to first compare $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),h_L^{+,+}}^0$ to $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L)}^{0,h}$ up to a cost that we can make smaller than $e^{(c_2/2)L^{d-1}}$ by tuning the value of h , and then forcing a particular set of edges to be closed, which in turn forces any path from \mathfrak{g}^- to \mathfrak{g}^+ to connect $\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L)$ to $\partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L)$. To achieve the latter at a small cost we need to choose δ sufficiently small. This naturally splits the proof into two steps.

Step 1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant to be determined. Introduce $A := A^{\text{top}} \cup A^{\text{bot}}$, where $A^{\text{top}} = \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L + 1)$ and $A^{\text{bot}} = \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L,\delta L + 1)$. By the FKG inequality and regularity, we can now choose $H > 0$ to be large enough so that

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L),h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{a}_x \leq H, \forall x \in A] \geq e^{-c_2/2L^{d-1}},$$

where c_2 is the constant of Lemma 5.7. Thus,

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \geq \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+ \mid \mathfrak{a}_x \leq H, \forall x \in A] e^{-c_2/2L^{d-1}}. \quad (5.5)$$

By Proposition 4.10 and the FKG inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+ \mid \mathfrak{a}_x \leq H, \forall x \in A] &\geq \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+ \mid \mathfrak{a}|_A = H] \\ &\geq \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_L^{+,+}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+ \mid \mathfrak{a}|_A = H, \mathcal{A}], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\omega_e = 1, \forall e \in E(A)\} \cap \{\exists(x, y) \in A^{\text{top}} \times y \in A^{\text{bot}} : \omega_{x\mathfrak{g}^+} = 1, \omega_{y\mathfrak{g}^-} = 1\}.$$

Let us denote \mathbf{H} the external magnetic field which is equal to H on $\partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L) \cup \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$. Since on the event \mathcal{A} , A^{top} is connected to \mathfrak{g}^+ , and A^{bot} is connected to \mathfrak{g}^- , the domain Markov property of Proposition 4.4 gives

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_L^{+,+}}^0[\cdot \mid \mathfrak{a}|_A = H, \mathcal{A}] = \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), h_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathbf{H}}^0. \quad (5.6)$$

Combining (5.5) and (5.6), and applying Lemma 5.7, we obtain

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), h_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathbf{H}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \leq e^{-c_2/2L^{d-1}}. \quad (5.7)$$




Figure 6: An illustration of (5.8). The magnetic field $h_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathbf{H}$ is supported on the coloured regions: in the red region it is equal to 1, in the green region it is equal to H , and in the overlap of the two regions—in orange—it is equal to $H + 1$. This provides three different ways to connect to either of the two ghost vertices. If there exists an open path in ω connecting \mathfrak{g}^+ to \mathfrak{g}^- and additionally the graph T —depicted by the dotted red line—is fully closed in ω , then there must exist an open path from $\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$ to $\partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$.

Step 2. We now move to the second part of the proof. We begin by defining the graph $T = (V(T), E(T))$ defined as follows:

$$V(T) := \{x \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{0, 1\} : L - \log L \leq |x| \leq L\} \cup \{x \in \partial\Lambda_{L - \log L} : |x_d| \leq \delta L\},$$

and $E(T) := \{xy \in E(\mathbb{Z}^d) : x, y \in V(T)\}$. Observe that

$$\mathcal{E} \cap \{\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in E(T)\} \subset \{\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+\} \cap \{\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in E(T)\}, \quad (5.8)$$

where $\mathcal{E} := \{\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L) \not\leftrightarrow \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)\}$, see Figure 6 for an illustration. To estimate the cost of $\{\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in E(T)\}$, we first bound the absolute value field on $V(T)$. By Proposition 2.6, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\mathcal{B}] \geq \frac{1}{2}$, where

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \sum_{xy \in E(T)} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y \leq M|E(T)| \right\}.$$

Since $\phi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, \mathbf{a}}^{0, H}$ is stochastically dominated by Bernoulli percolation of parameter $p(\beta, \mathbf{a})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in E(T) \mid \mathcal{B}] &\geq \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0 \left[\exp\left(-2\beta \sum_{xy \in E(T)} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y\right) \mid \mathcal{B} \right] \\ &\geq e^{-2\beta M|E(T)|}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] &\geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\beta M|E(T)|} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \not\leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+ \mid \mathcal{B} \cap \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\beta M|E(T)|} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\mathcal{E} \mid \mathcal{B} \cap \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

We now compare the latter probability with $\Psi_{R(L - \log L, \delta L)}^{0, H}[\mathcal{E}]$. Using that $e^{\beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y} \geq 1$ and the definition of the event \mathcal{B} we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\mathcal{E} \mid \mathcal{B} \cap \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}] &\geq e^{-\beta M|E(T)|} \frac{\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\exp(\sum_{xy \in E(T)} \beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \mid \mathcal{B} \cap \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}]}{\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\exp(\sum_{xy \in E(T)} \beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y) \mid \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}]} \\ &\geq e^{-\beta M|E(T)|} \frac{\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\exp(\sum_{xy \in E(T)} \beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \mid \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}]}{\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}}^0[\exp(\sum_{xy \in E(T)} \beta \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y) \mid \{\omega|_{E(T)} = 0\}]} \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

By the expression (4.1) for the density, the ratio in the last line of (5.10) is equal to $\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{B}]$, where $J_e = 0$ for every $e \in E(T)$, and $J_e = 1$ otherwise. Applying Proposition 2.6 for $\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0$, we can increase the value of M , if necessary, so that $\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{B}] \geq 1 - e^{-L^{d-1}}$. At this point, we take cases. Either

$$\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{E}] \leq 2\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), J}^{0, H}[\mathcal{B}^c] \quad \text{or} \quad \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{E}] > 2\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), J}^{0, H}[\mathcal{B}^c].$$

In the first case, the desired result follows directly, since we have $\Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{E}] = \Psi_{R(L - \log L, \delta L)}^{0, H}[\mathcal{E}]$. In the second case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{B}] &\geq \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), J}^{0, H}[\mathcal{E}] - \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{B}^c] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{R(L, \delta L), \mathfrak{h}_{L, \delta L}^{+,+} + \mathfrak{H}, J}^0[\mathcal{E}] = \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{R(L - \log L, \delta L)}^{0, H}[\mathcal{E}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Combining inequalities (5.7), (5.9), (5.10) and (5.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L-\log L, \delta L)}^{0,H}[\mathcal{E}] &\leq 4e^{3\beta M|E(T)|} \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L), h_{L, \delta L}^+, +\mathbf{H}}^0[\mathfrak{g}^- \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^+] \\ &\leq 4e^{3\beta M|E(T)|} e^{-c_2/2L^{d-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Recall that $|E(T)| \leq C\delta^{d-1}L^{d-1}$, and choose δ, ε small enough such that, for L large enough

$$4e^{3\beta M|E(T)|} \leq e^{(c_2/4)L^{d-1}}. \quad (5.13)$$

Plugging (5.13) in (5.12), and choosing c_3 small enough to accommodate the small values of L concludes the proof. \square

Finally, we show that we can reduce the probability to free boundary conditions.

Lemma 5.9. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. There exist $\delta, c_4 > 0$ such that for every $L \geq 1$,*

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^0[\partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2) \longleftrightarrow \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2)] \geq 1 - e^{-c_4L^{d-1}}. \quad (5.14)$$

Proof. Let $h, \delta, c_3 > 0$ be the constants of Lemma 5.8. Write $\mathcal{D} = \{\partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2) \leftrightarrow \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2)\}$. By inclusion of events, we have

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,h}[\mathcal{D}] \leq e^{-c_3L^{d-1}}.$$

We now gradually decrease the value of the external magnetic field from $s = h$ to $s = 0$ in order to interpolate between $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,h}[\mathcal{D}]$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^0[\mathcal{D}]$. To this end, consider the derivative with respect to s and note that by Russo's formula (see [Gri06, Theorem (2.43)])

$$\frac{\partial \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,s}[\mathcal{D}]}{\partial s} = \sum_{x \in \partial^\pm \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)} \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,s} [F_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega) \mid \mathcal{D}] - \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,s} [F_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)],$$

where $\partial^\pm \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L) = \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L) \cup \partial^{\text{top}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$, and

$$F_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega) = -\beta \mathbf{a}_x + \frac{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}(1 - p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}})} \frac{\partial p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{\partial s} = -\beta \mathbf{a}_x \left(1 + 2 \frac{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}}{p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}}} \right).$$

Here the term $-\beta \mathbf{a}_x$ arises from differentiating $e^{-\beta \mathbf{a}_x s}$, while the other term arises from differentiating $\left(\frac{p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})}{1 - p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})} \right)^{\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}}$. Arguing as in the proof of (4.20) we see that we can replace $2\omega_{x\mathfrak{g}}$ by $p(\beta, s, \mathbf{a})_{x\mathfrak{g}} (\mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega} \mathfrak{g}\} + 1)$ to get that

$$\frac{\partial \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,s}[\mathcal{D}]}{\partial s} = \sum_{x \in \partial^\pm \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)} \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,s} [G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega) \mid \mathcal{D}] - \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0,s} [G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)], \quad (5.15)$$

where

$$G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega) = -\beta \mathbf{a}_x \left(2 + \mathbb{1}\{x \xleftrightarrow{\omega} \mathfrak{g}\} \right).$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $x \in \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$. Note that G_x is a decreasing function, and that the event \mathcal{D} is supported on $\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2)$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta/2)$ to be fixed below. Define $\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x) := \Lambda_{\varepsilon L}^+(x)$, and for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\partial \mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x)}$,

$$h(x; s, \mathbf{b})_y := \begin{cases} s & \text{for } y \in \partial \mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x) \cap \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : y_d = -\delta L\}, \\ \mathbf{b}_y & \text{for } y \in \partial \mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x) \cap \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d : y_d > -\delta L\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

See Figure 7 for an illustration. By Propositions 2.6, 4.4, and 4.10, we get that (recall that G_x is a decreasing function) if $x \in \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$ with $|x| \leq L - \varepsilon L$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0, s}[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)] &\geq \Psi_{\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x), \beta, \mathbf{h}(x; s, \mathfrak{p})}^0[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)] - o(1), \\ \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0, s}[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega) \mid \mathcal{D}] &\leq \Psi_{\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x), \beta, \mathbf{h}(x; s, 0)}^0[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)].\end{aligned}\quad (5.16)$$

where the $o(1)$ term tends to 0 as $L \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly over $s \in [0, h]$ and x as above. Using Proposition 4.15, one has that $\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, s} = \Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{1, s}$ for every $s \in (0, h]$. As a result,

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x), \beta, \mathbf{h}(x; s, 0)}^0[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)] - \Psi_{\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x), \beta, \mathbf{h}(x; s, \mathfrak{p})}^0[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)] = o(1),$$

where $o(1)$ tends to 0 as L tends to infinity, for any $s \in (0, h]$, uniformly over $x \in \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$ such that $|x| \leq L - \varepsilon L$. Additionally, note that by Proposition 2.6, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for every $x \in \partial^{\text{bot}}\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0, s}[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)] \right| &\leq C, \\ \left| \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0, s}[G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega) \mid \mathcal{D}] \right| &\leq C,\end{aligned}\quad (5.17)$$

where we used the FKG inequality in the second line.




Figure 7: An illustration of the proof of Lemma 5.9. The blue region is the box $\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x) = \Lambda_{\varepsilon L}^+(x)$. We put an external magnetic field on the bold blue boundary of $\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x)$ which is either 0 or \mathfrak{p} . The top and bottom boundaries of $\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)$ (in red) carry a magnetic field s . The law of $G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)$ within $\mathcal{B}(L, \varepsilon, x)$ approximates that of $G_x(\mathbf{a}, \omega)$ under the half-space measures $\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{0, s}$ or $\Psi_{\mathbb{H}, \beta}^{1, s}$. Thanks to Proposition 4.15, these measures coincide.

Combining equations (5.15) and (5.16)–(5.17), for every $s \in (0, h]$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0, s}[\mathcal{D}]}{\partial s} \right| \leq \sum_{x \in \partial^{\pm} \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)} \left(2C \mathbb{1}_{\text{dist}^{\infty}(x, \partial \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L) \setminus \partial^{\pm} \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)) < \varepsilon L} + o(1) \right). \quad (5.18)$$

Integrating (5.18) and using the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for L large enough,

$$\left| \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^{0, h}[\mathcal{D}] - \log \Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L), \beta}^0[\mathcal{D}] \right| \leq C_1 \varepsilon L^{d-1}.$$

The proof follows from choosing ε small enough in such a way that $C_1 \varepsilon \leq c_3/2$, and from fixing c_4 small enough to accommodate the small values of L . \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Lemma 5.9 implies that there exist some $\delta, c_4 > 0$ such that for every $L \geq 1$,

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{R}(L, \delta L)}^0[\partial \mathcal{R}^{\text{bot}}(L, \delta L/2) \not\leftrightarrow \partial \mathcal{R}^{\text{top}}(L, \delta L/2)] \leq e^{-c_4 L^{d-1}}. \quad (5.19)$$

Let $\ell \leq \delta L/2$. Note that we can cover the hyperplane $\{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ by $m \leq C(L/\ell)^{d-1}$ boxes $\Lambda_\ell(x_1), \dots, \Lambda_\ell(x_m)$ with $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. With such a choice in hands, we have

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^m \{\Lambda_\ell(x_i) \not\leftrightarrow \partial \Lambda_{\delta L/2}(x_i)\} \subset \{\partial^{\text{bot}} \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2) \not\leftrightarrow \partial^{\text{top}} \mathcal{R}(L, \delta L/2)\}.$$

Therefore, by the FKG inequality together with (5.19), we can find an $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^0[\Lambda_\ell(x_{i_0}) \not\leftrightarrow \partial \Lambda_{\delta L/2}(x_{i_0})] \leq e^{-c_4 \ell^{d-1}/C}.$$

By the monotonicity in the volume we obtain

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_{2L}(x_{i_0}), \beta}^0[\Lambda_\ell(x_{i_0}) \not\leftrightarrow \partial \Lambda_{\delta L/2}(x_{i_0})] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^0[\Lambda_\ell(x_{i_0}) \not\leftrightarrow \partial \Lambda_{\delta L/2}(x_{i_0})] \leq e^{-c_4 \ell^{d-1}/C}.$$

This implies the desired result with $c_1 = \min\{\delta/2, c_4/C\}$. \square

6 Local uniqueness and renormalisation

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. We handle the dimensions $d \geq 3$ and $d = 2$ separately. In dimension $d = 2$, we combine the general Russo–Seymour–Welsh theory developed in [KST23] with Theorem 5.1 to deduce that open circuits lying in dyadic annuli exist with high probability. This is enough to obtain the desired local uniqueness. In dimensions $d \geq 3$, we follow the approach of [Sev24]. First, we use Theorem 5.1 to first show that all macroscopic clusters merge into a unique cluster after sprinkling $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ by an independent Bernoulli bond percolation. We then show that increasing the value of β has a stronger effect than this independent Bernoulli sprinkling of $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$. This allows us to deduce that the slab percolation threshold (as for the Ising model [Bod05]) coincides with β_c . Finally, we use the slab technology to obtain local uniqueness without sprinkling.

6.1 Local uniqueness with sprinkling

We consider a measure obtained from $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ by sprinkling an independent Bernoulli bond percolation. We will show that in $d \geq 3$, all macroscopic clusters of $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ merge into one cluster after sprinkling.

Let us first introduce some notation. Given $\beta > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, a finite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and boundary conditions (ξ, \mathbf{b}) on Λ , let $(\omega, \mathbf{a}) \sim_d \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ and $\gamma \sim_d \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda, \varepsilon}^{\text{Ber}}$ be independent random variables, where $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda, \varepsilon}^{\text{Ber}} = \otimes_{e \in \overline{E}(\Lambda)} \text{Ber}(\varepsilon)$ denotes the law of independent identically distributed Bernoulli random variables of parameter ε . Denote $\omega \cup \gamma$ the configuration on $\overline{E}(\Lambda)$ where $(\omega \cup \gamma)_e = 1$ if and only if $\omega_e = 1$ or $\gamma_e = 1$. Define $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} := \Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda, \varepsilon}^{\text{Ber}}$ and let $\Gamma_{\Lambda, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ be the pushforward of $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$ under the mapping $(\omega, \eta) \mapsto \omega \cup \eta$.

Let $\text{Unique}(L)$ be the event that there is a cluster in $\omega \cap \Lambda_L$ crossing $\Lambda_L \setminus \Lambda_{L/8}$ and that every cluster of $\omega \cap \Lambda_L$ crossing $\Lambda_{L/2} \setminus \Lambda_{L/4}$ are connected to each other in $(\omega \cup \gamma) \cap \Lambda_{L/2}$.

Our aim is to show that $\text{Unique}(L)$ happens with probability tending to 1 as L tends to infinity, uniformly over all possible boundary conditions (ξ, \mathbf{b}) at a macroscopic distance from Λ_L . The proof adapts the work of Benjamini & Tassion [BT17], which concerns the connectedness of “everywhere percolating subsets” of \mathbb{Z}^d after an ε -Bernoulli sprinkling, to the setting of very dense subgraphs. This extension appears in [Sev24].

To this end, we first introduce the following notation. Let $c_1 > 0$ be the constant of Theorem 5.1, and set $\delta := c_1/4$, $C_0 := (dc_1)^{-\frac{1}{d-1}}$, and

$$\ell = \ell(L, \beta) := C_0(\log L)^{\frac{1}{d-1}}.$$

Define the event

$$\mathcal{A}_L := \bigcap_{x \in \ell\mathbb{Z}^d \cap \Lambda_{\delta L}} \{\Lambda_\ell(x) \xleftrightarrow{\omega} \partial\Lambda_{\delta L}\}.$$

Proposition 6.1. *For every $\beta > \beta_c$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{A}_L} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[\text{Unique}(\delta L) \mid \omega = \theta] = 1.$$

Proof. The proof of this result is given in [Sev24, Proposition 2.2]. There the result is shown for the standard random cluster measure sprinkled by Bernoulli percolation, but as the desired result is a statement purely about γ , the same proof applies mutatis mutandis. \square

With this result in hands we can now deduce that $\text{Unique}(\delta L)$ happens with probability tending to 1 under $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}$.

Proposition 6.2. *For every $\beta > \beta_c$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[\text{Unique}(\delta L)] = 1,$$

where $\delta = c_1/4$ and c_1 is given by Theorem 5.1.

Proof. Let $L' \geq 1$ and set $L = 2L'$. By the monotonicity on boundary conditions and Theorem 5.1, we obtain

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[\Lambda_\ell(x) \xleftrightarrow{\omega} \partial\Lambda_{\delta L}] \geq \Psi_{\Lambda_{L'}}^0[\Lambda_\ell \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{c_1 L'}] \geq 1 - L^{-d}$$

for all $x \in \Lambda_{\delta L}$ and all (ξ, \mathbf{b}) . By the union bound, we conclude that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[\mathcal{A}_L] = 1.$$

The desired result follows now from Proposition 6.1. \square

6.2 Slab percolation

In this section, we work in dimensions $d \geq 3$. Consider the “slab box” of size N and thickness L given by

$$\mathcal{S}(L, N) := \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-2} \times \{-N, \dots, N\}^2,$$

and the corresponding “slab” of thickness L given by

$$\mathcal{S}(L) := \{-L, \dots, L\}^{d-2} \times \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

We will show that for every $\beta > \beta_c$, there exists a sufficiently large L such that $\Psi_{\mathcal{S}(L),\beta}^0$ percolates. We will first show that this is indeed the case once we sprinkle $\Psi_{\mathcal{S}(L),\beta}^0$ with a Bernoulli percolation of an arbitrarily small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, we will show that the edge marginal of the latter sprinkled measure is stochastically dominated by the edge marginal $\Phi_{\mathcal{S}(L),\beta'}^0$ of the measure $\Psi_{\mathcal{S}(L),\beta'}^0$ with a slightly higher inverse temperature β' , and deduce that $\Psi_{\mathcal{S}(L),\beta'}^0$ percolates. It is important for the next section to state our results in terms of finite-volume measures defined on the slab box $\mathcal{S}(L, N)$. In what follows, given a vertex x , we write $\text{Unique}_x(L)$ for the translation of the event $\text{Unique}(L)$ by x . We now implement the aforementioned strategy. We first prove the following result.

Proposition 6.3. *Let $d \geq 3$. For every $\beta > \beta_c$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $L \geq 1$ such that*

$$\inf_{N \geq 0} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{S}(L, N)} \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}(L, N), \beta, \varepsilon}^0 [0 \xleftrightarrow{\omega \cup \gamma} x] > 0.$$

Proof. Since we always have $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}(L, N), \beta, \varepsilon}^0 [0 \xleftrightarrow{\omega \cup \gamma} x] > 0$, it suffices to show that the infimum over $N \geq L$ is strictly positive. Let $c_1 > 0$ be the constant of Theorem 5.1, and recall that Proposition 6.2 holds with $\delta = c_1/4$. Write $n := \lfloor \frac{8(N-L)}{\delta L} \rfloor$, and consider the vertices of the form $x(u) = (0, \dots, 0, \frac{\delta}{8}Lu)$ for $u \in B_n := \{-n, \dots, n\}^2$. Note that with this choice, we have $\Lambda_L(x(u)) \subset \mathcal{S}(L, N)$ for all $u \in B_n$, and if $|u-v| > 16/\delta$, then $\Lambda_L(x(u)) \cap \Lambda_L(x(v)) = \emptyset$. We now define a site percolation configuration η on B_n by setting $\eta_u = 1$ if and only if the event $\text{Unique}_{x(u)}(\delta L)$ happens. First, notice that, by the definition of the event $\text{Unique}(\delta L)$, any path in η starting at some vertex u and ending at some vertex v induces a path in $\omega \cup \gamma$ from $\Lambda_{\delta L/8}(x(u))$ to $\Lambda_{\delta L/8}(x(v))$. Second, by the Markov property, we have

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}(L, N), \beta, \varepsilon}^0 [\eta_u = 1 \mid (\eta_v : |u-v| > 16/\delta)] \geq \alpha(L) \quad \text{a.s. } \forall u \in B_n,$$

where $\alpha(L) := \inf_{(\xi, b)} \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}(L, L), \beta, \varepsilon}^{(\xi, b)} [\text{Unique}(\delta L)]$, and the infimum is taken over boundary conditions on $\mathcal{S}(L, L) = \Lambda_L$. Since $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(L) = 1$ by Proposition 6.2, the main result of [LSS97] implies that there exists an $L \geq 1$ such that η stochastically dominates a Bernoulli site percolation $\mathbb{P}_s^{\text{site}}$ on B_n with parameter $s > p_c^{\text{site}}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$. Let us fix such an L . Since there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}_s^{\text{site}}[u \longleftrightarrow v] \geq c$ for all $u, v \in B_n$ and all N , it follows that

$$\inf_{N \geq L} \inf_{u, v \in B_n} \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}(L, N), \beta, \varepsilon}^0 [u \xleftrightarrow{\eta} v] \geq c$$

Now, given any point $x \in \mathcal{S}(L, N)$, there exists $u \in B_n$ such that $x \in \Lambda_{2L}(x(u))$, so that the event $\{0 \xrightarrow{\eta} u\} \cap \{\Lambda_L \text{ fully open in } \gamma\} \cap \{\Lambda_{2L}(x(u)) \cap \mathcal{S}(L, N) \text{ fully open in } \gamma\}$ is contained in $\{0 \xleftrightarrow{\omega \cup \gamma} x\}$. As a conclusion, conditioning on ω and using the FKG inequality for γ (note that η is increasing in γ) we obtain the desired uniform lower bound $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}(L, N), \beta, \varepsilon}^0 [0 \xleftrightarrow{\omega \cup \gamma} x] \geq c' := c\varepsilon^{CL^d} > 0$ for every $x \in \mathcal{S}(L, N)$ and every $N \geq L$. \square

Recall from Definition 4.1 that, for $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\beta > 0$, the probability measure $\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ on $E(\Lambda)$ is the edge-marginal of the free φ^4 random cluster measure $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$. Let $\beta > 0$ and $\beta' \in (0, \beta)$. The main technical result of this section is the proof that $\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0$ stochastically dominates the superposition of $\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta'}^0$ and an independent Bernoulli bond percolation $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda, \varepsilon}^{\text{Ber}}$ of parameter $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\beta', \beta) > 0$ uniformly in Λ . This is formalised in the upcoming proposition.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $0 < \beta' < \beta$. There exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\beta', \beta) > 0$ such that for every $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite,*

$$\Phi_{\Lambda, \beta}^0 \succcurlyeq \Gamma_{\Lambda, \beta', \varepsilon}^0.$$

The proof of Proposition 6.4 is rather technical and we defer it to Section 6.4. We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Corollary 6.5. *Let $d \geq 3$. For every $\beta > \beta_c$, there exists $L \geq 1$ such that*

$$\inf_N \inf_{x \in \mathcal{S}(L, N)} \Psi_{\mathcal{S}(L, N), \beta}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow x] > 0. \quad (6.1)$$

Proof. This follows from applying Proposition 6.3 for some $\beta' \in (\beta_c, \beta)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small so that the stochastic domination of Proposition 6.4 holds. \square

6.3 Local uniqueness without sprinkling

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. We treat dimensions $d = 2$ and $d \geq 3$ separately in the following subsections.

6.3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.3 in $d = 2$

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3 in dimension $d = 2$. Our proof in this dimension relies on the positivity of the surface tension, combined with the general Russo–Seymour–Welsh (RSW) theory for positively associated measures that was recently developed by Köhler-Schindler and Tassion in [KST23].

In order to state the result of [KST23] in our context, we first introduce some definitions and notation. For $m, n \geq 1$, define the crossing event

$$\mathcal{C}(m, n) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists a path crossing from left to right in} \\ [-m, m] \times [-n, n] \text{ made of open edges} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Theorem 6.6. *Let $d = 2$. There exists a continuous and increasing bijection $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for every $\beta > 0$ and every $k \geq 2$ we have*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_{(k+4)n}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(2n, n)] \geq f(\Psi_{\Lambda_{kn}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(n, 2n)]).$$

for every $n \geq 1$.

Proof. The result follows from applying [KST23, Theorem 2] to the measures $\Psi_{\Lambda_{kn}, \beta}^0$, $\Psi_{\Lambda_{(k+2)n}, \beta}^0$, and $\Psi_{\Lambda_{(k+4)n}, \beta}^0$, which satisfy the assumptions of the theorem by the monotonicity of the free measure in the volume. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3 in dimension $d = 2$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 when $d = 2$. Consider the event

$$\mathcal{C}(L) = \{\exists \text{ a circuit of open edges in } \Lambda_{2L} \setminus \Lambda_L \text{ that surrounds } \Lambda_L\}.$$

We claim that it suffices to show that for some $C > 0$ large enough we have

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_{CL}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(L)] = 1. \quad (6.2)$$

Indeed, if (6.2) holds, then by the monotonicity in boundary conditions, it holds uniformly over all boundary conditions. Moreover, when the annuli of the form $\Lambda_{2\lfloor L/C \rfloor}(x) \setminus \Lambda_{\lfloor L/C \rfloor}(x)$ for $x = (\lfloor kL/C \rfloor, 0, \dots, 0)$, $k = 1, \dots, 8C$, contain an open circuit, then the event $\{\Lambda_L \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{8L}\}$ happens. A union bound then gives

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_{10L}, \beta}^0[\Lambda_L \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{8L}] = 1.$$

We can similarly combine circuits to show that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_{10L}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(2L)] = 1.$$

Since $\mathcal{C}(2L) \cap \{\Lambda_L \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{8L}\} \subset U(L)$, the desired result follows directly.

We now turn to the proof of (6.2). First, we construct horizontal crossings of rectangles of aspect ratio 2 and 4, as follows. Recall Lemma 5.9 and let $\delta, c_4 > 0$ be the constants of (5.14). Notice that when the event $\{\partial\mathcal{R}^{\text{bot}}(L, \delta L/2) \longleftrightarrow \partial\mathcal{R}^{\text{top}}(L, \delta L/2)\}$ happens, either one of the rectangles of the form $[-L + k\delta L, -L + (k+2)\delta L] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$ for $0 \leq k \leq 2/\delta - 2$ is crossed horizontally or one of the squares of the form $[-L + k\delta L, -L + (k+1)\delta L] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$ for $0 \leq k \leq 2/\delta - 1$ is crossed vertically. By the FKG inequality for the complementary events, monotonicity in volume, inclusion of events and the $\pi/2$ rotational symmetry

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_{2L}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(\delta L/2, \delta L)] \geq 1 - \Psi_{\Lambda_{2L}, \beta}^0[\partial\mathcal{R}^{\text{bot}}(L, \delta L/2) \not\longleftrightarrow \partial\mathcal{R}^{\text{top}}(L, \delta L/2)]^{\delta/4}.$$

Since the latter tends to 1, we can apply Theorem 6.6 to deduce that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_{6L}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(\delta L, \delta L/2)] = 1.$$

Note that when the rectangles $[-2\delta L, 0] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$, $[-\delta L, \delta L] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$ and $[0, 2\delta L] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$ are crossed horizontally, and the squares $[-\delta L, 0] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$ and $[0, \delta L/2] \times [-\delta L/2, \delta L/2]$ are crossed vertically, the event $\mathcal{C}(2\delta L, \delta L/2)$ happens, hence by the FKG inequality and monotonicity in the volume, we can further obtain that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_{12L}, \beta}^0[\mathcal{C}(2\delta L, \delta L/2)] = 1.$$

Now, note that when the rectangles $[-2\delta L, 2\delta L] \times [\delta L, 2\delta L]$ and $[-2\delta L, 2\delta L] \times [-\delta L, -2\delta L]$ are crossed horizontally, and the rectangles $[\delta L, 2\delta L] \times [-2\delta L, 2\delta L]$ and $[-\delta L, -2\delta L] \times [-2\delta L, 2\delta L]$ are crossed vertically, the event $\mathcal{C}(\delta L)$ happens. The FKG inequality now shows that (6.2) holds (up to redefining L). \square

6.3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3 when $d \geq 3$

We will now show that in $d \geq 3$, the event $U(L)$ happens with probability tending to 1, uniformly over the boundary conditions. Our proof is based on the onion/orange peeling argument [Gri99, Lemma 7.89], and the slab percolation result of Corollary 6.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 in $d \geq 3$. Let $\beta > \beta_c$. It follows from Propositions 6.2 and 6.4, and a gluing argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 in $d = 2$ that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \Psi_{\Lambda_{10n}, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[\Lambda_n \longleftrightarrow \Lambda_{8n}] = 1.$$

It remains to show that with high probability, there is at most one cluster crossing $\Lambda_{4n} \setminus \Lambda_{2n}$. Consider an $L' \geq 1$ large enough so that (6.1) holds, and let $L = 2L' + 1$. First, we partition $\Lambda_{4n} \setminus \Lambda_{2n}$ into disjoint annuli of the form $A(k, L) := \Lambda_{(k+1)L-1} \setminus \Lambda_{kL-1}$ for $\lfloor \frac{2n}{L} \rfloor \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{4n-L}{L} \rceil$. By the domain Markov property, the FKG inequality and the monotonicity in boundary conditions, for any $x, y \in \partial\Lambda_{2n}$ and $\lfloor \frac{2n}{L} \rfloor \leq k \leq \lceil \frac{4n-L}{L} \rceil$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{\Lambda_{10n}, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})}[x \longleftrightarrow y \text{ in } \Lambda_{(k+1)L-1} \mid x \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{kL}, y \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{kL}, x \not\longleftrightarrow y \text{ in } \Lambda_{kL-1}] \\ & \geq \inf_{u', v' \in \partial\Lambda_{kL-1}} \inf_{(\xi', \mathbf{b}')} \Psi_{A(k, L), \beta}^{(\xi', \mathbf{b}')} [u' \longleftrightarrow v' \text{ in } \Lambda_{(k+1)L-1} \mid u' \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{kL}, v' \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{kL}] \\ & \geq \inf_{u, v \in A(k, L)} \Psi_{A(k, L), \beta}^0 [u \longleftrightarrow v]. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 6.5 and the FKG inequality, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\Psi_{A(k,L),\beta}^0[u \longleftrightarrow v] \geq \delta$ for any $u, v \in A(k, L)$. Iterating this bound we see that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_{10n},\beta}^{(\xi,b)}[x \not\leftrightarrow y \mid x \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{4n}, y \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{4n}] \leq (1 - \delta)^{2n/L}.$$

The desired result follows from the union bound over all $x, y \in \partial\Lambda_{2n}$. \square

6.4 Coupling with a sprinkled measure

As a first step towards establishing Proposition 6.4, we show that $\Phi_{\Lambda,\beta}^0$ stochastically dominates the superposition of $\Phi_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0$ and a Bernoulli bond percolation with inhomogeneous *random* edge parameter. Heuristically, conditioning $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta}^0$ on \mathbf{a} gives the usual random cluster measure, but with inhomogeneous edge-weights $p(\mathbf{a}, \beta)$ defined in (4.2). For these measures, an analogous stochastic domination holds, allowing for the (inhomogeneous) parameter of the independent sprinkling to depend on \mathbf{a} by direct calculation. A disintegration argument will then yield the result. Let us now define the latter measure. For every $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$ and $xy \in E(\Lambda)$, write

$$r(\beta, \mathbf{a})_{xy} = \frac{1 - e^{-2\beta\mathbf{a}_x\mathbf{a}_y}}{1 + e^{-2\beta\mathbf{a}_x\mathbf{a}_y}}.$$

Denote $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta}^0$ the measure on $\{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)} \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$ defined by

$$d\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta}^0[(\omega, \mathbf{a})] = \gamma_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0[\omega] d\mu_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0(\mathbf{a}),$$

where $\gamma_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0$ is the superposition of $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0$ and an independent Bernoulli bond percolation on $E(\Lambda)$ with law $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ber}}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ber}}[\omega] = \prod_{xy \in E(\Lambda)} r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}^{\omega_{xy}} (1 - r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy})^{1 - \omega_{xy}}.$$

Finally, write $\Gamma_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta}^0$ for the projection of $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta}^0$ on to $\{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)}$.

In order to state the intermediate stochastic domination result, we will need the following notation. Given $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $G = (\Lambda, E^{1,2})$ be the graph with vertex set Λ , where for each edge $xy \in E(\Lambda)$, G contains two parallel edges $xy(1)$ and $xy(2)$. We write $E^i = \{xy(i) : xy \in E(\Lambda)\}$.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $0 < \beta' < \beta$. For every $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite, $\Phi_{\Lambda,\beta}^0 \succcurlyeq \Gamma_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta}^0$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{a} \sim \mu_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0$. We write $\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0$ for the random cluster measure on G defined by

$$\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0[\omega] = \frac{1}{Z_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0} \prod_{xy \in E(\Lambda)} \left(\frac{p(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy(1)}} \left(\frac{p(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}}{1 - p(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}} \right)^{\omega_{xy(2)}} 2^{k^0(\omega)}.$$

Consider also the product measure $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0 \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ber}}$, which we view as a measure on $\{0, 1\}^{E^{1,2}}$ in the natural way.

We first show that $\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0$ stochastically dominates $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0 \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ber}}$. Consider configurations $\theta, \theta' \in \{0, 1\}^{E^{1,2}}$ such that $\theta \geq \theta'$. A direct calculation gives

$$\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0[\omega_{xy(1)} = 1 \mid \omega|_{E^{1,2} \setminus \{xy(1)\}} = \theta|_{E^{1,2} \setminus \{xy(1)\}}] = \begin{cases} p(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy} & \text{if } x \stackrel{\theta|_{E^{1,2} \setminus \{xy(1)\}}}{\longleftrightarrow} y, \\ r(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0[\omega_{xy(2)} = 1 \mid \omega|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(2)\}} = \theta|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(2)\}}] = \begin{cases} p(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy} & \text{if } x \overset{\theta|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(2)\}}}{\longleftrightarrow} y, \\ r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A similar calculation combined with the fact that $p(t, \mathbf{a}) \geq r(t, \mathbf{a})$ for $t \geq 0$ shows that $\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0[\omega_{xy(1)} = 1 \mid \omega|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(1)\}} = \theta|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(1)\}}]$ is at least $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0 \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ber}}[\omega_{xy(1)} = 1 \mid \omega|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(1)\}} = \theta'|_{E^{1,2}\setminus\{xy(1)\}}]$. A standard Markov chain argument then implies that $\phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0$ stochastically dominates $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0 \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}$. See e.g. [Dum19, Lemma 1.5].

Let $\omega^{\max} \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)}$ be the configuration defined by $\omega_{xy}^{\max} = \max\{\omega_{xy(1)}, \omega_{xy(2)}\}$. Notice that if $\omega \sim \phi_{G,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0$, then ω^{\max} is distributed according to $\phi_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathbf{a}}^0$. The desired result now follows from the fact that $\mu_{\Lambda,\beta}^0$ stochastically dominates $\mu_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0$ and the monotonicity of the random cluster and Bernoulli percolation measures in the edge parameter. \square

Note that the parameter $r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}$ is close to 0 when $\mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y$ is close to 0. Thanks to Lemma 6.7, in order to prove Proposition 6.4 it will suffice to show that $\mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y$ remains bounded away from 0 with good $\mu_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0$ -probability when we condition on the state of all edges. We will begin by showing that, conditionally on the state of all edges, \mathbf{a}_x remains bounded with good probability for every vertex x . For technical reasons that will become clear later, we will work with a slightly more general family of measures, where we ignore the contribution coming from certain closed edges.

As above, let us fix $0 < \beta' < \beta$ and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite. Let $A, B \subset E(\Lambda)$, and $\omega^1, \omega^2 \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)}$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\Lambda, \beta', \beta, A, B, \omega^1, \omega^2)$ the probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$ defined by the Radon–Nikodym derivative

$$d\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{Z}} \phi_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0[\omega^1] \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ber}}[\omega^2|_{E(\Lambda)\setminus B}] \prod_{xy \in A} e^{\beta' \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y} d\mu_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0(\mathbf{a}),$$

where \mathbf{Z} is a normalisation constant and we recall from (4.7) that

$$d\mu_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda,\beta',\mathbf{a}}^0}{\mathbf{Z}_{\Lambda,\beta'}^0} \prod_{xy \in E(\Lambda)} e^{-\beta' \mathbf{a}_x \mathbf{a}_y} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g,\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_x).$$

Note that when $A = B = \emptyset$, then $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the projection of the conditional measure $\Psi_{G,\beta',\beta}^0[\cdot \mid \omega|_{E^1} = \omega^1, \omega|_{E^2} = \omega^2]$ to $(\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$, where $G = (\Lambda, E^{1,2})$ is as above and by abuse of notation we write $\Psi_{\Lambda,\beta',\beta}^0$ to denote its natural lift to the multigraph G .

Lemma 6.8. *Let $0 < \beta' < \beta$. There exists a constant $C = C(\beta', \beta, d) > 1$ such that for every $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ finite, every $A, B \subset E(\Lambda)$, every pair of configurations $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)}$, and every $x \in \Lambda$ we have*

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}[\mathbf{a}_x \geq s] \leq C \int_s^\infty e^{-\frac{q}{2}t^4 - at^2} dt, \quad \forall s \geq C.$$

Proof. Fix a vertex $x \in \Lambda$ and let $C > 1$ be a sufficiently large constant to be determined. For $s \geq C^3$, let $E_s = E_s(x)$ be the event that $\mathbf{a}_y \leq \max\{s^{d(x,y)+1}, C \max_{z \sim y} \{\mathbf{a}_z^{1/3}\}\}$ for every $y \in \Lambda$. We claim that on the event E_s , $\mathbf{a}_x \leq s$. Indeed, consider a configuration $\mathbf{a} \in E_s$, and let $y \in \Lambda$ be such that $\mathbf{a}_y/s^{d(x,y)+1}$ is maximal. Then by definition of the

event E_s ,

$$\begin{aligned}
M &:= \frac{\mathbf{a}_y}{s^{d(x,y)+1}} \leq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{C}{s^{2(d(x,y)+1)/3}} \max_{z \sim y} \left\{ \left(\frac{\mathbf{a}_z}{s^{d(x,y)+1}} \right)^{1/3} \right\} \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{Cs^{1/3}}{s^{2(d(x,y)+1)/3}} \max_{z \sim y} \left\{ \left(\frac{\mathbf{a}_z}{s^{d(x,z)+1}} \right)^{1/3} \right\} \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{Cs^{1/3}}{s^{2(d(x,y)+1)/3}} M^{1/3} \right\} \\
&\leq \max\{1, M^{1/3}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now either $M \leq 1$ or $M \leq M^{1/3}$. In both cases, $M \leq 1$. This implies in particular that $\mathbf{a}_x \leq s$, as claimed.

Thus, it suffices to estimate the probability of E_s happening for some constant $C > 1$ large enough. We will prove this by comparing the value of the density $d\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{a})$ of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ for different values of \mathbf{a} . To this end, for each edge $uv \in E(\Lambda)$, let

$$a_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) = \begin{cases} e^{-\beta' \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v} \left(\frac{p(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{uv}}{1 - p(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{uv}} \right)^{\omega_{uv}^1}, & uv \notin A \\ 1, & uv \in A \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

and

$$b_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) = \begin{cases} r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{uv}^{\omega_{uv}^2} (1 - r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{uv})^{1 - \omega_{uv}^2}, & uv \notin B \\ 1, & uv \in B, \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

where $r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})$ is as above. We first compare the values of $a_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v)$ and $b_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v)$ when the first argument $\mathbf{a}_u \in [1, 2]$ and when \mathbf{a}_u is large, where in both instances we consider \mathbf{a}_v fixed. Let $f(t) = \log(1 - e^{-t})$ and note that $f(2\beta' \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v) = \log p(\mathbf{a}, \beta')_{uv}$.

For $t > 0$,

$$f'(t) = \frac{e^{-t}}{1 - e^{-t}} = \frac{1}{e^t - 1} \leq \frac{1}{t},$$

since $e^t \geq 1 + t$. By integrating we obtain that for $\mathbf{a}_u \geq 2$ and $t \in [1, 2]$

$$f(2\beta' \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v) - f(2\beta' t \mathbf{a}_v) \leq \log(2\beta' \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v) - \log(2\beta' t \mathbf{a}_v) \leq \log(\mathbf{a}_u).$$

Hence $p(\beta', \mathbf{a})_{uv} \leq \mathbf{a}_u (1 - e^{-2\beta' t \mathbf{a}_v})$. By taking cases according to whether $uv \in A$ or not, and whether $\omega_{uv}^1 = 1$ or not, we see that in any case have

$$a_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) \leq e^{\beta' \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v} \mathbf{a}_u a_{uv}(t, \mathbf{a}_v) \quad (6.5)$$

for every $\mathbf{a}_u \geq 2$ and $t \in [1, 2]$.

We now turn to $b_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v)$. Let $g(t) = \log(1 + e^{-t})$ and note that $\log r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a}) = f(2(\beta - \beta') \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v) - g(2(\beta - \beta') \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v)$. For $t > 0$ we have

$$g'(t) = -\frac{e^{-t}}{1 + e^{-t}} = -\frac{1}{e^t + 1} \geq -\frac{1}{t}.$$

Hence for every $\mathbf{a}_u \geq 2$ and $t \in [1, 2]$ we have $\exp g(2(\beta - \beta') \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v) \geq \mathbf{a}_u^{-1} \exp g(2(\beta - \beta') t \mathbf{a}_v)$, and hence $r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a}) \leq \mathbf{a}_u^2 \frac{1 - e^{-2\beta' t \mathbf{a}_v}}{1 + e^{-2\beta' t \mathbf{a}_v}}$. Thus, by examining each case separately, we have

$$b_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) \leq \mathbf{a}_u^2 b_{uv}(t, \mathbf{a}_v). \quad (6.6)$$

Now if $\mathbf{a}_u \geq C\mathbf{a}_v^{1/3}$ for $C = \sqrt[3]{\frac{8\beta'd}{g}}$, then

$$e^{\beta'\mathbf{a}_u\mathbf{a}_v} \leq e^{\frac{g}{8d}\mathbf{a}_u^4}. \quad (6.7)$$

By increasing the value of C if necessary, we can further ensure that

$$\mathbf{a}_u^3 e^{-\frac{g}{8d}\mathbf{a}_u^4} \leq \min\{1, e^{-gt^4-at^2}\} \quad (6.8)$$

for every $\mathbf{a}_u \geq C$ and every $t \in [1, 2]$. Since u has degree at most $2d$, combining inequalities (6.5), (6.6), (6.7) and (6.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{v \sim u} a_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) b_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) e^{-g\mathbf{a}_u^4 - a\mathbf{a}_u^2} &\leq e^{-\frac{g}{2}\mathbf{a}_u^4 - a\mathbf{a}_u^2} \min_{t \in [1, 2]} \left\{ \prod_{v \sim u} a_{uv}(t, \mathbf{a}_v) b_{uv}(t, \mathbf{a}_v) e^{-gt^4 - at^2} \right\} \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{g}{2}\mathbf{a}_u^4 - a\mathbf{a}_u^2} \int_0^\infty \prod_{v \sim u} a_{uv}(t, \mathbf{a}_v) b_{uv}(t, \mathbf{a}_v) e^{-gt^4 - at^2} dt \end{aligned}$$

for every $\mathbf{a}_u \geq C \max\{1, \max_{v \sim u}\{\mathbf{a}_v^{1/3}\}\}$. By integrating and letting $E_{u,s} = \{\mathbf{a}_u \leq \max\{s^{d(x,u)+1}, C \max_{v \sim u}\{\mathbf{a}_v^{1/3}\}\}\}$ for $s \geq C$, we obtain that

$$\mu[E_{u,s}^c] \leq \int_{s^{d(x,u)+1}}^\infty e^{-\frac{g}{2}t^4 - at^2} dt. \quad (6.9)$$

It is not hard to see that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for $C > 1$ large enough and every $s \geq C$ and $k \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s^k}^\infty e^{-\frac{g}{2}t^4 - at^2} dt &\leq \int_{s^k}^\infty e^{-\frac{g}{4}t^4 - \frac{a}{2}t^2} e^{-\frac{g}{2}t^{4/k} - at^{2/k}} dt \\ &= \int_s^\infty kt^{\frac{k-1}{k}} e^{-\frac{g}{4}t^{4k} - \frac{a}{2}t^{2k}} e^{-\frac{g}{2}t^4 - at^2} dt \\ &\leq e^{-c(k-1)} \int_s^\infty e^{-\frac{g}{2}t^4 - at^2} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

The desired result now follows (up to a redefinition of C as necessary) from (6.9) and (6.10) and a union bound over all vertices u in Λ . \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 6.4.

Proof of Proposition 6.4. Consider two neighbouring vertices $x, y \in \Lambda$, and let $\omega_1 \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda)}$, $\omega_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{E(\Lambda) \setminus \{xy\}}$. Our aim is to show that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta', \beta}^0[\omega_{xy(2)} = 1 \mid \omega|_{E^1} = \omega_1, \omega|_{E^2 \setminus xy(2)} = \omega_2] \geq \varepsilon \quad (6.11)$$

for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$ that depends only on β' and β . Assuming that (6.11) holds, we can deduce that the projection of $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta', \beta}^0$ on E^2 stochastically dominates a Bernoulli bond percolation on $E(\Lambda)$ which is independent from the projection of $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta', \beta}^0$ on E^1 . The desired result then follows from Lemma 6.7.

It remains to prove (6.11). Let S_i be the set of edges uv with $u \in \{x, y\}$ such that $\omega_{uv}^i = 0$, and let $A = S_1$ and $B = S_2 \cup \{xy\}$. It is not hard to see that for $\mu = \mu(\Lambda, \beta', \beta, A, B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$, the Radon–Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\mu(\mathbf{a})}{\prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\rho_{g, a}(\mathbf{a}_x)} = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{uv \in E(\Lambda)} a_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) b_{uv}(\mathbf{a}_u, \mathbf{a}_v) =: f(\mathbf{a})$$

is an increasing function of \mathbf{a}_x and \mathbf{a}_y , where a_{uv} and b_{uv} are defined in (6.3) and (6.4), and where $Z = Z(\Lambda, \beta', \beta, A, B, \omega_1, \omega_2)$ is a normalisation constant. Indeed, this follows from the fact that the functions a_{uv} and b_{uv} are increasing for all edges uv such that $u \in \{x, y\}$. Let $C > 1$ a large enough constant to be determined. Define

$$F(\mathbf{a}_x, \mathbf{a}_y) := \int_{(\mathbb{R})^\Lambda \setminus \{x, y\}} \mathbb{1}_{G_{x,y}} f(\mathbf{a}) \prod_{x \in \Lambda \setminus \{x, y\}} d\rho_{g,a}(\mathbf{a}_x),$$

where $G_{x,y}$ is the event that $\mathbf{a}_u \leq C$ for every u which either lies in $\{x, y\}$ or has a neighbour in $\{x, y\}$. Note that since $f(\mathbf{a})$ is increasing in \mathbf{a}_x and \mathbf{a}_y , the function F is increasing.

Using the absolute value FKG for the product measure $\rho^{\otimes 2, \leq C} := \rho_{g,a}[\cdot \mid \mathbf{a}_x \leq C] \otimes \rho_{g,a}[\cdot \mid \mathbf{a}_y \leq C]$, which is a special case of Proposition 4.8 for $\beta = 0$, we obtain that

$$\mu[\mathbf{a}_x \geq 1, \mathbf{a}_y \geq 1 \mid G_{x,y}] = \frac{\rho^{\otimes 2, \leq C}[F(\mathbf{a}_x, \mathbf{a}_y) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \geq 1, \mathbf{a}_y \geq 1}]}{\rho^{\otimes 2, \leq C}[F(\mathbf{a}_x, \mathbf{a}_y)]} \geq (\rho_{g,a}[\mathbf{a} \geq 1 \mid \mathbf{a} \leq C])^2,$$

On the event $G_{x,y}$ we have that $1 - r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{uv}$ and $e^{-\beta' \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v}$ are bounded away from 0 for every edge uv with $u \in \{x, y\}$, while on the event $\{\mathbf{a}_x \geq 1, \mathbf{a}_y \geq 1\}$ we have $r(\beta - \beta', \mathbf{a})_{xy}$ is bounded away from 0. Writing $S(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \{\omega|_{E^1} = \omega_1, \omega|_{E^2 \setminus xy(2)} = \omega_2\}$, we can now deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta', \beta}^0[\omega_{xy(2)} = 1 \mid S(\omega_1, \omega_2)]}{\mu[G_{x,y}]} &\geq \frac{\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta', \beta}^0[\omega_{xy(2)} = 1, \mathbf{a}_x \geq 1, \mathbf{a}_y \geq 1, G_{x,y} \mid S(\omega_1, \omega_2)]}{\mu[G_{x,y}]} \\ &\geq \delta \mu[\mathbf{a}_x \geq 1, \mathbf{a}_y \geq 1 \mid G_{x,y}] \\ &\geq \delta (\rho_{g,a}[\mathbf{a} \geq 1 \mid \mathbf{a} \leq C])^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\delta > 0$ depending only on β' and β , where we used that once the contribution of the closed edges in S_1 and S_2 is removed from $\Psi_{\Lambda, \beta', \beta}^0[\cdot \mid S(\omega_1, \omega_2)]$, we obtain a measure whose projection on \mathbf{a} coincides with μ . By Lemma 6.8 and a union bound, there exists $C > 1$ large enough so that $\mu[G_{x,y}] \geq 1/2$. The desired inequality (6.11) follows readily. \square

7 Surface order large deviations

In this section, we prove the surface order (lower) large deviations of Theorem 1.1, which will follow rather easily from Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2 and the key Proposition 7.4 below. The latter is proved by combining Theorem 1.3 and a Pisztora's coarse graining. We also show the volume order (upper) large deviations mentioned in Remark 1.2, which follows from Lemma 7.3.

The following simple lemma allows us to disregard large absolute values of the field.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\beta \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$. There exists $M_0 = M_0(\delta)$ such that, for every $M \geq M_0$ and every n large enough,*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \geq M} \geq \delta \right] \leq e^{-n^d}. \quad (7.1)$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.6, the field $(\mathbf{a}_x)_{x \in \Lambda_n}$ is stochastically dominated by a field $\mathbf{a}' = (\mathbf{a}'_x)_{x \in \Lambda_n}$ with independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) marginals with quartic exponential tails and, in particular, finite exponential moments. Since the event in (7.1) is increasing, it is enough to prove the bound for the i.i.d. field \mathbf{a}' . This follows from classical large deviations results, see e.g. [Dur19, Theorem 2.7.7]. \square

The next lemma allows us to control the lower large deviations for vertices belonging to large clusters.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. For every $\delta > 0$ and $K \geq 1$, there exists $c = c(K, \delta) > 0$ such that, for every boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) , and for every n large enough,*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{|\mathcal{C}_x| \geq K} \leq m^*(\beta) - \delta \right] \leq e^{-cn^d}. \quad (7.2)$$

Proof. We can always assume that $m^*(\beta) > \delta$ (in particular $\beta > \beta_c$). We fix $K \geq 0$. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we let $Y_x^K := \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{|\mathcal{C}_x| \geq K}$. First of all, notice that, since the event in (7.2) is increasing, it is sufficient to prove the above statement for the measure $\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0$. Using Remark 4.14, one has that, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\Psi_{\beta}^0[\mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{0 \leftrightarrow \infty}] = \Psi_{\beta}^1[\mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{0 \leftrightarrow \infty}] = m^*(\beta).$$

As a result, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\Psi_{\beta}^0[Y_x^K] \geq m^*(\beta).$$

Moreover, since Y_x^K is a local increasing function measurable with respect to $\Lambda_K(x)$, there exists $L = L(K, \delta) > K$ such that, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_L(x), \beta}^0[Y_x^K] \geq m^*(\beta) - \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Note that by Proposition 2.6, the random variable Y_0^K has exponential tails (under the measure $\Psi_{\Lambda_L}^0$). Choose $n \geq 10L$. Let \mathbb{P} be the law of a collection of i.i.d. random variables $(\tilde{Y}_x^K)_{x \in \Lambda_{n-2L}}$ of law given by the law of Y_0^K under $\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta}^0$. Let $m := \lfloor \frac{n-2L}{4L} \rfloor$. As a consequence of monotonicity in boundary conditions, we find that, for any $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$, the collection of random variables $(Y_x^K)_{x \in (y+4L\Lambda_m)}$ under the measure $\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0$ stochastically dominates $(\tilde{Y}_x^K)_{x \in (y+4L\Lambda_m)}$. For $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$, introduce the (decreasing) event

$$\mathcal{E}_y(Y^K) := \left\{ \frac{1}{|y+4L\Lambda_m|} \sum_{x \in (y+4L\Lambda_m)} Y_x^K \leq m^*(\beta) - \frac{3\delta}{4} \right\}.$$

Similarly, one may define $\mathcal{E}_w(\tilde{Y}^K)$. Classical large deviations estimates for independent random variables with exponential tails (see [Dur19, Theorem 2.7.7]) imply the existence of $c_1 = c_1(K, \delta) > 0$ such that, for every n large enough,

$$\sup_{y \in \Lambda_{4L}} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_y(\tilde{Y}^K)] \leq e^{-c_1 n^d}. \quad (7.3)$$

Now, letting n be large enough so that $\frac{|\Lambda_n|}{|\Lambda_{n-2L}|} \leq 1 + \frac{\delta/4}{m^*(\beta) - \delta}$, there exists $c_2 = c_2(K, \delta) > 0$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} Y_x^K \leq m^* - \delta \right] &\leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_{n-2L}|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_{n-2L}} Y_x^K \leq m^* - \frac{3\delta}{4} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{w \in \Lambda_{4L}} \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0[\mathcal{E}_w(Y^K)] \\ &\leq \sum_{w \in \Lambda_{4L}} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_w(\tilde{Y}^K)] \leq e^{-c_2 n^d}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the stochastic domination in the third line, and (7.3) in the last line. This concludes the proof. \square

The next lemma is the upper deviation counterpart of Lemma 7.2. It will only be used to prove the upper large deviations stated in Remark 1.2.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. For every $\delta > 0$, there exist $K_1 = K_1(\delta) \geq 1$ and $c = c(\delta) > 0$ such that for every $K \geq K_1$, and for every n large enough,*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{|c_x| \geq K} \geq m^*(\beta) + \delta \right] \leq e^{-cn^d}.$$

Proof. We will argue as in the proof of the previous lemma, with certain additional complexities arising from the presence of large absolute values. Again, for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we let $Y_x^K = \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{|c_x| \geq K}$. We first consider Ψ_β^1 and we note that there exists $K > 0$ such that, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\Psi_\beta^1[Y_x^K] \leq m^*(\beta) + \frac{\delta}{8}.$$

Since Y_x^K is a local function (around x), there exists $L > K$ large enough such that, for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_L(x), \beta}^{(w, \mathbf{p})}[Y_x^K] \leq m^*(\beta) + \frac{\delta}{4}. \quad (7.4)$$

We now consider $n \geq 10L$, and let $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$. We consider the collection of boxes of the form $\Lambda_L(y + 4Lz)$ for $z \in \Lambda_m$, where $m = \lfloor \frac{n-2L}{4L} \rfloor$. Note that the union of all these boxes over $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$ and $z \in \Lambda_m$ covers Λ_{n-5L} . Recall the definition of \mathbf{p} . For each $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$ and $z \in \Lambda_m$, let B_z denote the event $\{\exists z \in \partial\Lambda_L(y + 4Lz) \text{ such that } \mathbf{a}_z \geq C_M(1 \vee \log |\Lambda_L|)^{1/4}\}$. With this definition in hand, we write

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} Y_x^K \geq m^*(\beta) + \delta \right] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda_{n-5L}} Y_x^K \geq \frac{\delta}{3} \right] \quad (7.5)$$

$$+ \sum_{y \in \Lambda_{4L}} \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_m|} \sum_{z \in \Lambda_m} Y_{y+4Lz}^K \mathbb{1}_{B_z} \geq \frac{\delta}{3} \right] \quad (7.6)$$

$$+ \sum_{y \in \Lambda_{4L}} \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_m|} \sum_{z \in \Lambda_m} Y_{y+4Lz}^K \mathbb{1}_{B_z^c} \geq m^*(\beta) + \frac{\delta}{3} \right], \quad (7.7)$$

and we bound each probability separately.

We begin with the term on the right-hand side of (7.5). Let $M_0 = M_0(\delta/3)$ be given by Lemma 7.1. If n is large enough so that $\frac{|\Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda_{n-5L}|}{|\Lambda_n|} M_0 < \frac{\delta}{3}$, it follows from Lemma 7.1 that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda_{n-5L}} Y_x^K \geq \frac{\delta}{3} \right] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \geq M_0} \geq \frac{\delta}{3} \right] \leq e^{-n^d}. \quad (7.8)$$

To estimate the term in (7.6), recall that $\mathbf{a} \sim \Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0$ is stochastically dominated by a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\mathbf{a}' = (\mathbf{a}'_x)_{x \in \Lambda_n}$ that have quartic tails. Writing \mathbb{P} for the law of these random variables, we see that—to the cost of potentially increasing the value of L —we can assume that $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{a}'_{y+4Lz} \mathbb{1}_{B_z}] \leq \frac{\delta}{4}$ for every $z \in \Lambda_m$. Since for fixed y , the random variables $\mathbf{a}'_{y+4Lz} \mathbb{1}_{B_z}$ are independent under \mathbb{P} , it follows again from classical large deviations estimates that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that, for every n large enough and every $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_m|} \sum_{z \in \Lambda_m} Y_{y+4Lz}^K \mathbb{1}_{B_z} \geq \frac{\delta}{3} \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_m|} \sum_{z \in \Lambda_m} \mathbf{a}'_{y+4Lz} \mathbb{1}_{B_z} \geq \frac{\delta}{3} \right] \leq e^{-c_1 n^d}.$$

Finally, we estimate the term in (7.7). We use the monotonicity in the boundary conditions to deduce that for each $y \in \Lambda_{4L}$, the collection of random variables $(Y_{y+4Lz}^K)_{z \in \Lambda_m}$ is stochastically dominated by a sequence of independent random variables $(\tilde{Y}_{y+4Lz}^K)_{z \in \Lambda_m}$ where each marginal is distributed according to the law of Y_y^K under $\Psi_{\Lambda_L(y), \beta}^{(w, \mathfrak{p})}$, and in particular have exponential tails by Proposition 2.6. By (7.4), the latter have mean at most $m^*(\beta) + \frac{\delta}{4}$. Hence, we can use again the large deviation estimates for independent random variables with exponential tails (see [Dur19]) to obtain that for some $c_2 > 0$ and for every n large enough,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_m|} \sum_{z \in \Lambda_m} Y_{y+4Lz}^K \mathbb{1}_{B_{\varepsilon}} \geq m^*(\beta) + \delta/3 \right] \leq e^{-c_2 n^d}. \quad (7.9)$$

Plugging (7.8)–(7.9) in (7.5)–(7.7) concludes the proof. \square

Let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(\Lambda_n)$ be the set of all clusters in Λ_n . Define \mathcal{C}_{\max} to be the element of \mathfrak{C} of largest cardinality (with an arbitrary rule to break ties). We can now state the main crucial ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1.1. This proposition allows us to deal with the contributions of large clusters which are not the (unique) giant one. The proof uses Theorem 1.3 and a coarse graining argument in order to reduce the problem to a highly supercritical Bernoulli percolation.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. For every $\delta > 0$, there exist $N_0 = N_0(\delta) \geq 1$ and $c = c(\delta) > 0$ such that, for every boundary condition (ξ, \mathfrak{b}) , for every $N \geq N_0$, and for every n large enough,*

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathfrak{b})} \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_{\max}\} \\ |\mathcal{C}| \geq N}} |\mathcal{C}| \geq \delta \right] \leq e^{-c n^{d-1}}. \quad (7.10)$$

We will use the following result about the largest cluster in highly supercritical Bernoulli percolation. Given a set of vertices $A \subset \Lambda_n$, denote by $\mathfrak{S}(A)$ the set of connected components (not to be confused with percolation clusters!) of A . Below we denote by $\mathbb{P}_p^{\text{site}}$ the law of Bernoulli site percolation of parameter p on \mathbb{Z}^d .

Lemma 7.5. *There exists $p_0 < 1$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\ell = \ell(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{p_0}^{\text{site}} \left[\exists \mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}(\Lambda_m) : |\mathcal{C}| \geq \frac{3}{4} |\Lambda_m| \text{ and } \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{S}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{C}) \\ |\mathcal{S}| \geq M}} |\mathcal{S}| \leq \varepsilon |\Lambda_m| \right] \geq 1 - e^{-c m^{d-1}} \quad (7.11)$$

for every $m \geq 1$.

Lemma 7.5 is a slight modification of the main result of [DP96]. The proof, very similar to that of [DP96], is presented in the Appendix A.3.

Proof of Proposition 7.4. Fix $\beta > \beta_c$ and $\delta > 0$. We will prove the desired result by a renormalisation argument. Take $p_0 < 1$ given by Lemma 7.5. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $L \geq 1$, let $U_x(L)$ denote the translation of the event $U(L)$ from Theorem 1.3 by x . Consider the renormalised percolation model $\eta \in \{0, 1\}^{\Lambda_m}$, where $m = \lfloor \frac{n-10L}{L} \rfloor$, given by

$$\eta_x := \mathbb{1}_{U_{Lx}(L)}.$$

Since $\inf_{\#} \Psi_{\Lambda_{10L}, \beta}^{\#}[U(L)] \rightarrow 1$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from the main result of [LSS97] that there exists an $L = L(p_0) \geq 1$ sufficiently large such that, no matter the boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) , η stochastically dominates Bernoulli percolation with parameter p_0 . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant to be chosen later. By Lemma 7.5, there exists $M = M(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n, \beta}^{(\xi, \mathbf{b})} \left[\exists \mathcal{S}_{\max} \in \mathfrak{C}(\eta) : |\mathcal{S}_{\max}| \geq \frac{3}{4}|\Lambda_m| \text{ and } \frac{1}{|\Lambda_m|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{G}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\max}) \\ |\mathcal{S}| \geq M}} |\mathcal{S}| \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - e^{-cm^{d-1}}, \quad (7.12)$$

for every boundary condition (ξ, \mathbf{b}) and for every n large enough.

We call \mathcal{G} the event in (7.12). We claim that \mathcal{G} is contained in the complement of the event in (7.10) for $\varepsilon := \frac{\min\{\delta, 1\}}{2|\Lambda_{16L}|}$. This fact, combined with (7.12), implies the desired result. Let us prove this claim. The proof goes in two steps.

Because of the way the event $U(L)$ is defined, the cluster \mathcal{S}_{\max} as in (7.12) induces an ω cluster \mathcal{C}_0 which intersects all boxes $\Lambda_L(Lx)$ for $x \in \mathcal{S}_{\max}$. In particular if \mathcal{G} occurs, \mathcal{C}_0 has size $|\mathcal{C}_0| \geq \frac{3}{4}|\Lambda_m|$. We first prove that \mathcal{C}_0 is the largest ω cluster, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{C}_{\max}$. To see this, let $N' := M|\Lambda_{16L}|$. Consider any other ω -cluster \mathcal{C} such that $|\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \geq N'$, and let \mathcal{S} be the set of vertices $x \in \Lambda_m$ such that the annulus $\Lambda_{4L}(Lx) \setminus \Lambda_{2L}(Lx)$ is crossed by \mathcal{C} . Note that

$$|\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \leq |\Lambda_{16L}| |\mathcal{S}|, \quad (7.13)$$

hence $|\mathcal{S}| \geq M$. Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{S} \subset \Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\max}. \quad (7.14)$$

Thus, \mathcal{S} lies in a connected component of $\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\max}$, and in particular, $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \varepsilon |\Lambda_m|$. Hence, by our choice of ε , $|\mathcal{C}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|\Lambda_m| + |\Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda_{n-11L}| < |\mathcal{C}_0|$ for every n large enough. This implies that $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{C}_{\max}$.

Now, if \mathcal{G} occurs, we can use (7.13) and (7.14) to deduce that

$$\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_{\max}\} \\ |\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \geq N'}} |\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \leq \frac{|\Lambda_{16L}|}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{G}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\max}) \\ |\mathcal{S}| \geq M}} |\mathcal{S}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon |\Lambda_{16L}| |\Lambda_m|}{|\Lambda_n|}.$$

Hence, for $N = 2N'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_{\max}\} \\ |\mathcal{C}| \geq N}} |\mathcal{C}| &\leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_{\max}\} \\ |\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \leq N' \\ |\mathcal{C}| \geq N}} |\mathcal{C}| + \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_{\max}\} \\ |\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \geq N'}} |\mathcal{C} \setminus \Lambda_{n-11L}| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_{\max}\} \\ |\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \geq N'}} |\mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda_{n-11L}| \\ &\leq \frac{|\Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda_{n-11L-N'}|}{|\Lambda_n|} + \frac{\varepsilon |\Lambda_{16L}| |\Lambda_m|}{|\Lambda_n|} \leq \frac{\delta}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon |\Lambda_{16L}| |\Lambda_m|}{|\Lambda_n|} < \delta \end{aligned}$$

for every n large enough. This proves the claim that the event in (7.12) is contained in the complement of the event in (7.10). The desired result follows. \square

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We fix $\beta > \beta_c$ and drop it from the notations. Let $\delta > 0$.

Proof of the upper bound in (1.3). Let $M := M_0(\delta/8)$ be given by Lemma 7.1. Let $N := N_0(\delta/(8M))$ be given by Proposition 7.4. Applying these two results, and also Lemma 7.2 to $K = N$ and $\frac{\delta}{4}$, we obtain $c_1 > 0$ such that, for every n large enough,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_1 \cup B_2] \leq e^{-c_1 n^d}, \quad \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_3] \leq e^{-c_1 n^{d-1}}, \quad (7.15)$$

where $B_1 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \geq M} \geq \frac{\delta}{8} \right\}$, $B_2 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{|C_x| \geq N} \leq m^* - \frac{\delta}{4} \right\}$, and $B_3 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{C \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{C_{\max}\}: |C| \geq N} |C| \geq \frac{\delta}{8M} \right\}$. First, we remark that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_4] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_1 \cup B_3],$$

where $B_4 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{C \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{C_{\max}\}: |C| \geq N} \sum_{x \in C} \mathbf{a}_x \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \right\}$. Combined with (7.15), this implies that for every n large enough,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_4] \leq 2e^{-c_1 n^{d-1}}. \quad (7.16)$$

Now, remark that,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \notin C_{\max}} \varphi_x \notin \left(-\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \right] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_1 \cup B_4] + 2\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[C_1], \quad (7.17)$$

where

$$C_1 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{C \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{C_{\max}\} \\ |C| \leq N}} \operatorname{sgn}(C) \sum_{x \in C} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \leq M} \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \right\}.$$

Using the Edwards–Sokal coupling, we get that the random variables

$$\mathbb{1}_{|C| \leq N} \operatorname{sgn}(C) \sum_{x \in C} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \leq M_0}, \quad C \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{C_{\max}\}$$

are centred, independent, and bounded (by $N \cdot M$). Classical large deviations estimates (see [Dur19]) then imply the existence of $c_2 > 0$ such that for every n large enough,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[C_1] \leq e^{-c_2 n^d}. \quad (7.18)$$

Combining (7.15), (7.16), (7.17), and (7.18), we obtain $c_3 > 0$ such that for all n large enough,

$$\nu_{\Lambda_n} \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \varphi_x \in [-m^* + \delta, m^* - \delta] \right] \leq e^{-c_3 n^{d-1}} + \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{x \in C_{\max}} \leq m^* - \frac{\delta}{2} \right]. \quad (7.19)$$

Now, writing $\mathbb{1}_{x \in C_{\max}} = \mathbb{1}_{|C_x| \geq N} - \mathbb{1}_{|C_x| \geq N, C_x \neq C_{\max}}$, observe that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0 \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{x \in C_{\max}} \leq m^* - \frac{\delta}{2} \right] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_2 \cup B_4]. \quad (7.20)$$

Combining (7.19) and (7.20), and using again (7.15) and (7.16), we obtain $c_4 > 0$ such that for all n large enough

$$\nu_{\Lambda_n} \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \varphi_x \in [-m^* + \delta, m^* - \delta] \right] \leq e^{-c_4 n^{d-1}}.$$

Proof of the lower bound in (1.3). Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta) > 0$ be a small constant to be defined. We partition Λ_n into boxes of the form $\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}((\varepsilon n + 1)x) \cap \Lambda_n$, where $x \in \Lambda_m$, $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{\varepsilon n + 1} \rfloor$. Let S be the set of all the edges in Λ_n that connect neighbouring boxes $\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}((\varepsilon n + 1)y)$ and $\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}((\varepsilon n + 1)x)$. Since $|S| \leq m^d \cdot 2d(2\varepsilon n)^{d-1}$, by the FKG inequality,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in S] \geq e^{-Cn^{d-1}}$$

for some constant $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$. Furthermore, by Proposition 2.6, there exists a constant $R > 0$, independent of ε , such that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0 \left[\sum_{y \in \Lambda_{\varepsilon n}((\varepsilon n + 1)x)} \mathbf{a}_y \leq R|\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}|, \forall x \in \Lambda_m \right] \geq 1 - |\Lambda_m|e^{-|\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}|}.$$

A union bound gives that for every n large enough

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0 \left[\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in S, \sum_{y \in \Lambda_{\varepsilon n}((\varepsilon n + 1)x)} \mathbf{a}_y \leq R|\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}|, \forall x \in \Lambda_m \right] \geq e^{-2Cn^{d-1}}.$$

On the latter event, we use the Edwards–Sokal coupling to assign to each cluster independent ± 1 spins. Conditionally on such a pair (ω, \mathbf{a}) , the expectation of $\sum_{z \in \Lambda_n} \varphi_z$ is equal to 0. Furthermore, since on the event $\{\omega_e = 0, \forall e \in S\}$ spins in different εn -boxes are independent, the (conditional) variance of $\sum_{z \in \Lambda_n} \varphi_z$ is at most

$$\sum_{x \in \Lambda_m} \sum_{u, v \in \Lambda_{(\varepsilon n + 1)x}} \mathbf{a}_u \mathbf{a}_v \leq m^d R^2 |\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}|^2.$$

This implies that conditionally on such a pair (ω, \mathbf{a}) , with probability $1/2$ we have $|\sum_{z \in \Lambda_n} \varphi_z| \leq \sqrt{2m^d R^2 |\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}|^2}$. Now, we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ to be small enough so that $2m^d R^2 |\Lambda_{\varepsilon n}|^2 \leq (m^*(\beta) - \delta)^2 |\Lambda_n|^2$. The desired result follows by combining the above inequalities. \square

We now prove the volume order large deviations mentioned in Remark 1.2.

Proof of (1.4). We keep the notations of the preceding proof. For the lower bound, we note that for each $x \in \Lambda_n$, the probability that $\varphi_x \leq m^*(\beta) + \delta$ stays bounded away from 0. The FKG inequality then gives the desired lower bound.

For the upper bound, let $K_1 = K_1(\delta/2)$ be given by Lemma 7.3. Using this result, there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for every n large enough,

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_5] \leq e^{-c_1 n^d}, \quad (7.21)$$

where $B_5 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \Lambda_n} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{|c_x| \geq K_1} \geq m^* + \frac{\delta}{2} \right\}$. Notice that

$$\nu_{\Lambda_n} \left[m_{\Lambda_n} \notin [-m^* - \delta, m^* + \delta] \right] \leq \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[B_1 \cup B_5] + \Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[C_2], \quad (7.22)$$

where

$$C_2 := \left\{ \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{C \in \mathfrak{C}: |C| \leq K_1} \text{sgn}(C) \sum_{x \in C} \mathbf{a}_x \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_x \leq M} \geq \frac{\delta}{4} \right\}.$$

Using again a classical large deviations estimate, we argue the existence of $c_2 > 0$ such that for every n large enough

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_n}^0[C_2] \leq e^{-c_2 n^d}. \quad (7.23)$$

Plugging (7.21), (7.23), and (7.15) in (7.22) yields the existence of $c_3 > 0$ such that for every n large enough,

$$\nu_{\Lambda_n} \left[m_{\Lambda_n} \notin [-m^* - \delta, m^* + \delta] \right] \leq e^{-c_3 n^d}.$$

\square

A Toolbox

A.1 Large degree deviations

In this section, we obtain a large deviations estimate for the degrees $\Delta \mathbf{n}(x)$ of a random current \mathbf{n} .

Lemma A.1. *For every $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $o \in \Lambda$, $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}$ and every set of edges \mathcal{E} in $\Lambda[\mathbf{h}]$, we have³*

$$\langle \varphi_o \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}} \mathbf{E}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^{\text{og}} \left[2^{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbf{n}_e} \right] = \langle \varphi_o \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(J_e \varphi_e) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^{\emptyset} \left[2^{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbf{n}_e} \right] = \langle \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(J_e \varphi_e) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $J_e := \beta \mathbb{1}_{e \in E(\Lambda)} + \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \beta \mathbf{h}_x \mathbb{1}_{e=x\mathbf{g}}$. In particular, if the endpoints of \mathcal{E} are all contained in $\Delta \cup \{\mathbf{g}\}$, for a set $\Delta \subset \Lambda$ satisfying the stochastic domination (2.4) from Proposition 2.6 with some $C \in (0, \infty)$, then the right hand sides of both (A.1) and (A.2) are smaller than $e^{C'|\mathcal{E}|}$ for some constant $C' \in (0, \infty)$ depending only on C .

Proof. We only prove (A.1). The proof of (A.2) is similar and simpler. For ease of notation, we write $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda[\mathbf{h}], \beta}^{\text{og}}$. We use the binomial theorem to write

$$\mathbf{E} \left[2^{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbf{n}_e} \right] = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{k_e \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \binom{\mathbf{n}_e}{k_e} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{n}_e \geq k_e} \right]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

To express the latter, given a current \mathbf{n} that satisfies $\mathbf{n}_e \geq k_e$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ be the current defined by $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_f := \mathbf{n}_f - k_f \mathbb{1}\{f \in \mathcal{E}\}$. With this definition in hands, we can write

$$w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^{\text{og}}(\mathbf{n}) \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \binom{\mathbf{n}_e}{k_e} = w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}}) \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E} \cap E(\Lambda)} \frac{\beta^{k_e}}{k_e!} \prod_{\substack{x \in \Lambda \\ e=x\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{E}}} \frac{(\beta \mathbf{h}_x)^{k_e}}{k_e!},$$

where $A \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda^{\mathfrak{g}})$ is defined by

$$A_x := \sum_{\substack{e \in \mathcal{E} \\ e \ni x}} k_e + \mathbb{1}_{x=o}, \quad x \in \Lambda,$$

$$A_{\mathbf{g}} := \sum_{\substack{e \in \mathcal{E} \\ e \ni \mathbf{g}}} k_e + 1 \pmod{2}.$$

Moreover, $\partial \tilde{\mathbf{n}} = \partial A$. Using Lemma 2.11 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \binom{\mathbf{n}_e}{k_e} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{n}_e \geq k_e} \right] &= \frac{1}{\langle \varphi_o \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}} \frac{\sum_{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{n}} = \partial A} w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}^A(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})}{\sum_{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{n}} = \emptyset} w_{\beta, \mathbf{h}}(\tilde{\mathbf{n}})} \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E} \cap E(\Lambda)} \frac{\beta^{k_e}}{k_e!} \prod_{\substack{x \in \Lambda \\ e=x\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{E}}} \frac{(\beta \mathbf{h}_x)^{k_e}}{k_e!} \\ &= \frac{\langle \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \varphi_x^{A_x} \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}}{\langle \varphi_o \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}} \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E} \cap E(\Lambda)} \frac{\beta^{k_e}}{k_e!} \prod_{\substack{x \in \Lambda \\ e=x\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{E}}} \frac{(\beta \mathbf{h}_x)^{k_e}}{k_e!} \\ &= \frac{\langle \varphi_o \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E} \cap E(\Lambda)} (\beta \varphi_e)^{k_e} \prod_{\substack{x \in \Lambda \\ e=x\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{E}}} (\beta \mathbf{h}_x \varphi_x)^{k_e} \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}}{\langle \varphi_o \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}} \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{1}{k_e!}. \end{aligned}$$

³Recall that for $e = uv$, φ_e denotes the product $\varphi_u \varphi_v$, and by convention $\varphi_{\mathbf{g}} \equiv 1$.

We can now use (A.3) to deduce that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[2^{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbf{n}_e} \right] = \frac{\langle \varphi_o \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(J_e \varphi_e) \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}}{\langle \varphi_o \rangle_{\Lambda, \beta, \mathbf{h}}}.$$

□

A.2 Tanglings estimates

In this section we prove Proposition 2.18. We recall from [GPPS22] that the measure ρ^{2k} (resp. $\rho^{2k_1, 2k_2}$) is constructed from taking a weak limit of the single (resp. double) random current measure associated with a near-critical Ising model on the complete graph K_n . We refer to [GPPS22, KPP24] for more details. In order to prove the desired result, we will use some properties of this random current expansion established in [KPP24]. We denote the random current measure on K_n with source set S by $P_{K_n}^S$.

Proof of Proposition 2.18. Let $S_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, 2k_1\}$ and $S_2 = \{2k_1 + 1, 2k_1 + 2, \dots, 2k_1 + 2k_2\}$. Let \mathbf{n}_1 and \mathbf{n}_2 be random currents on K_n with source sets S_1 and S_2 , respectively. Let $\Pi_i(\mathbf{n}_i)$ be the random partition of S_i induced by the current \mathbf{n}_i , where x, y are in the same partition class if and only if $x \longleftrightarrow y$ in \mathbf{n}_i . Define similarly $\Pi(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$ to be the random partition of $S_1 \cup S_2$ induced by the current $\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{n}_2$. We will show that for every even partition P_1 of S_1 and every even partition P_2 of S_2 , there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$P_{K_n}^{S_1, S_2}[\Pi(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2) = \{S_1 \cup S_2\} \mid \Pi_1(\mathbf{n}_1) = P_1, \Pi_2(\mathbf{n}_2) = P_2] \geq \varepsilon$$

for every n large enough. The desired result will then follow by taking the limit as n tends to infinity.

Indeed, by the main result of [KPP24], there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$P_{K_n}^{S_1}[\Pi_1(\mathbf{n}_1) = P_1, |C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(i)| \geq c\sqrt{n} \forall i \in S_1] \geq \delta$$

and

$$P_{K_n}^{S_2}[\Pi_2(\mathbf{n}_2) = P_2, \sqrt{n}/c \geq |C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(i)| \geq c\sqrt{n} \forall i \in S_2] \geq \delta$$

for every n large enough, where $C_{\mathbf{n}_i}(x)$ denotes the connected component of x induced by the current \mathbf{n}_i , and $|C_{\mathbf{n}_i}(x)|$ denotes its cardinality (number of vertices). Our aim is to show that conditionally on the above events, there is positive probability that each cluster $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(i)$ with $i \in S_2$ intersects all clusters $C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(j)$ with $j \in S_1$. The desired result then follows readily.

To this end, it suffices to show that for every $i \in S_2$, conditionally on the clusters $C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(1), \dots, C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(2k_1)$ and $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1), \dots, C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(i - 1)$, the cluster $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(i)$ has positive probability to intersect all clusters $C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(1), \dots, C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(2k_1)$. Note that under this conditioning, $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(i) \setminus S_2$ is sampled uniformly at random from K_n without $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1), \dots, C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(i - 1)$ and S_2 . For ease of notation we prove the above only for $i = 2k_1 + 1$, and the general case follows similarly, up to changing the value of n .

Let $P_1 = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_j\}$ be an even partition of S_1 , and on the event $\{\Pi(\mathbf{n}_1) = P_1\}$, write $C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(Q_l)$ for the cluster of Q_l in \mathbf{n}_1 . Denote $A = A(B_1, \dots, B_j, r)$ the event $\{C_{\mathbf{n}_1}(Q_l) = B_l \forall l \in \{1, 2, \dots, j\}, |C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1)| = r\}$, where the sets B_l are possible realisations satisfying $|B_l| \geq c\sqrt{n}$, and where $\sqrt{n}/c \geq r \geq c\sqrt{n}$. Note that under $P_{K_n}^{S_2}[\cdot \mid |C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1)| = r]$, the vertices lying in $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1) \setminus \{2k_1 + 1, \dots, 2k_1 + 2k_2\}$ are distributed uniformly at random among subsets of cardinality $r - 2k_2$ chosen from a set of cardinality $n - 2k_2$. Furthermore, the probability that the set of these $r - 2k_2$ points intersects each

B_l is increasing as a function of r and the size of each B_l . Thus we may assume that each B_l has size $r_0 := \lfloor c\sqrt{n} \rfloor$, and $|C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1)| = r_0$. By asking $C_{\mathbf{n}_2}(2k_1 + 1)$ to contain exactly one point from each B_l we obtain the lower bound

$$P_{K_n}^{S_1, S_2}[2k_1 + 1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{n}_2} Q_l \ \forall l = 1, 2, \dots, j \mid A] \geq \frac{(r_0 - 2k_1 - 2k_2)^j \binom{n-m-2k_2}{r_0-j-2k_2}}{\binom{n-2k_2}{r_0-2k_2}},$$

where $m := j(r_0 - 2k_1 - 2k_2)$. Here the term $(r_0 - 2k_1 - 2k_2)^j$ is a lower bound for the number of ways to choose exactly one vertex from each B_l , and $\binom{n-m-2k_2}{r_0-j-2k_2}$ is a lower bound for the number of ways to choose the remaining $r_0 - j - 2k_2$ vertices.

For every n large enough we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{n-m-2k_2}{r_0-j-2k_2}}{\binom{n-2k_2}{r_0-2k_2}} &= \frac{(n-m-2k_2)!(n-r_0+j)!}{(n-2k_2)!(n-m-r_0+j)!} = \prod_{p=0}^{m-1} \frac{n-r_0+j-p}{n-2k_2-p} \\ &= \prod_{p=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \frac{r_0-j-2k_2}{n-2k_2-p}\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{2r_0}{n}\right)^m = (1+o(1))e^{-2jc^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for some constant $c' > 0$ we have

$$\frac{\binom{n-2k_2}{r_0-j-2k_2}}{\binom{n-2k_2}{r_0-2k_2}} = \frac{(r_0-2k_2)!(n-r_0)!}{(r_0-j-2k_2)!(n-r_0+j)!} = (1+o(1))\frac{r_0^j}{n^j} \geq \frac{c'}{(r_0-2k_1-2k_2)^j}.$$

This implies that

$$P_{K_n}^{S_1, S_2}[2k_1 + 1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{n}_2} Q_l, \ \forall l = 1, 2, \dots, j \mid A] \geq (1+o(1))c'e^{-2jc^2}.$$

The desired result follows. \square

A.3 Large deviation for highly supercritical percolation

Here we prove Lemma 7.5 by adapting [DP96]. We start by introducing some notations and recalling basic facts. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a subset $S \subset V$, we define the inner and outer boundaries $\partial_G^{\text{in}} S := \{x \in S : \exists y \in V \setminus S, \{x, y\} \in E\}$ and $\partial_G^{\text{out}} S := \{y \in V \setminus S : \exists x \in S, \{x, y\} \in E\}$. We define the notion of $*$ -connectivity in \mathbb{Z}^d , where every pair of vertices x, y satisfying $|x - y|_\infty = 1$ are connected by an edge. We will use the fact, proved in [DP96, Lemma 2.1 (ii)], that for every connected set $C \subset \Lambda_m$ and every $S \in \mathfrak{S}(\Lambda_m \setminus C)$, both $\partial_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{in}} S$ and $\partial_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{out}} S$ are $*$ -connected.

Our main tool will be a local isoperimetric inequality for boxes of \mathbb{Z}^d , $d \geq 2$, proved in [DP96, Proposition 2.2]: for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for every $m \geq 1$ and every connected set $S \subset \Lambda_m$ satisfying $|S| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)|\Lambda_m|$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |\Delta_i S|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \geq c|S|, \tag{A.4}$$

where ΔS can be either $\partial_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{in}} S$ or $\partial_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{out}} S$ and $(\Delta_i S)_{i=1}^{\ell}$ are the $*$ -connected components of ΔS .

Proof of Lemma 7.5. Fix $m \geq 1$. Recall that $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(\Lambda_m)$ denotes the set of open clusters. We also denote by $\mathfrak{C}^* = \mathfrak{C}^*(\Lambda_m)$ to be the set of closed $*$ -connected clusters.

Assume that $|\mathcal{C}| < \frac{3}{4}|\Lambda_m|$ for every $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$. For convenience, we extend \mathfrak{C} to $\bar{\mathfrak{C}}$ by including each closed vertex as a singleton. For every $\mathcal{C} \in \bar{\mathfrak{C}}$, let $\Delta\mathcal{C} = \partial_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{out}}\mathcal{C}$ if $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$, and $\Delta\mathcal{C} = \{x\}$ if $\mathcal{C} = \{x\}$ is a closed singleton. In particular, the $*$ -connected components $(\Delta_i\mathcal{C})_{i=1}^{\ell(\mathcal{C})}$ of $\Delta\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C} \in \bar{\mathfrak{C}}$, are all fully closed and, by our assumption, satisfy the local isoperimetric inequality (A.4) with $c = c(1/4)$. Since each vertex can only appear in at most $2d + 1$ many components $\Delta_i\mathcal{C}$, one has $(2d + 1)|\mathcal{C}^*| \geq \sum_{\Delta_i\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}^*} |\Delta_i\mathcal{C}|$. Taking both sides to the power $d/(d - 1)$ and using (A.4), we conclude that

$$|\Lambda_m| = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \bar{\mathfrak{C}}} |\mathcal{C}| \leq \frac{1}{c} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \bar{\mathfrak{C}}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\mathcal{C})} |\Delta_i\mathcal{C}|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \frac{1}{c'} \sum_{\mathcal{C}^* \in \mathfrak{C}^*} |\mathcal{C}^*|^{\frac{d}{d-1}},$$

where $c' = c/(2d + 1)^{\frac{d}{d-1}}$.

Let us now assume that there exists a component $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that $|\mathcal{C}| \geq \frac{3}{4}|\Lambda_m|$, but that $\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{S}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{C}) \\ |\mathcal{S}| \geq M}} |\mathcal{S}| > \varepsilon|\Lambda_m|$. For each $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{S}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{C})$, let $\Delta\mathcal{S} := \partial_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{in}}\mathcal{S}$ and notice that $\Delta\mathcal{S}$ is closed, $*$ -connected and satisfies the local isoperimetric inequality (A.4). Using again that each vertex appears in at most $2d + 1$ many $\Delta\mathcal{S}$, we conclude that

$$\varepsilon|\Lambda_m| < \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{S}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{C}) \\ |\mathcal{S}| \geq M}} |\mathcal{S}| \leq \frac{1}{c} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{S}(\Lambda_m \setminus \mathcal{C}) \\ |\Delta\mathcal{S}| \geq (cM)^{(d-1)/d}}} |\Delta\mathcal{S}|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \leq \frac{1}{c'} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C}^* \in \mathfrak{C}^* \\ |\mathcal{C}^*| \geq (cM)^{(d-1)/d}}} |\mathcal{C}^*|^{\frac{d}{d-1}}.$$

Combining the two last paragraphs, we have

$$1 - \mathbb{P}_{p_0}^{\text{site}}[\mathcal{E}] \leq \mathbb{P}_{p_0}^{\text{site}} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{C}^* \in \mathfrak{C}^*} |\mathcal{C}^*|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \geq c'|\Lambda_m| \right] + \mathbb{P}_{p_0}^{\text{site}} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C}^* \in \mathfrak{C}^* \\ |\mathcal{C}^*| \geq (cM)^{(d-1)/d}}} |\mathcal{C}^*|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \geq c'\varepsilon|\Lambda_m| \right],$$

where \mathcal{E} is the event in (7.11). Under a certain probability measure \mathbb{P} , let $(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*)_{x \in \Lambda_m}$ be independent random variables, each distributed as the closed $*$ -connected cluster of x under $\mathbb{P}_{p_0}^{\text{site}}$. As proved in [DP96, Lemma 2.3], for every increasing function $\rho : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, we have that $\sum_{\mathcal{C}^* \in \mathfrak{C}(\Lambda_m)} \rho(|\mathcal{C}^*|)$ is stochastically dominated by $\sum_{x \in \Lambda_m} \rho(|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*|)$. Therefore,

$$1 - \mathbb{P}_{p_0}^{\text{site}}[\mathcal{E}] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{x \in \Lambda_m} |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \geq c'|\Lambda_m| \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{x \in \Lambda_m} |\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*|^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \mathbb{1}\{|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*| \geq (cM)^{\frac{d-1}{d}}\} \geq c'\varepsilon|\Lambda_m| \right]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It is standard (see e.g. [DP96, Equation (3.8)]) to prove that for $p_0 < 1$ sufficiently close to 1, the tail $\mathbb{P}[|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*| \geq k]$ of the random variable $|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*|$ decays exponentially fast to 0 in k . We can further choose $p_0 < 1$ such that $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*|] \leq c'/2$, and then choose $M = M(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ large enough such that $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*| \mathbb{1}\{|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_x^*| \geq (cM)^{\frac{d-1}{d}}\}] \leq c'\varepsilon/2$. It then follows from standard large deviation estimates for i.i.d. random variables (see e.g. [Dur19]) that both probabilities in the right hand side of (A.5) are decay exponentially in $|\Lambda_m|^{\frac{d-1}{d}} \asymp m^{d-1}$, as we wanted to prove. \square

B The weak plus measure

In this section, we consider the question of how small can a boundary field \mathbf{h}_L be so that $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathbf{h}_L} \xrightarrow{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \cdot \rangle_{\beta}^+$. We show that the convergence holds for boundary fields satisfying $\mathbf{h}_L \leq \mathbf{p}_{\Lambda_L}$ and $L^{d-1}\mathbf{h}_L \rightarrow \infty$, which was claimed in Remark 2.10. We first need the following lemma.

Lemma B.1. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a finite set and let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{\partial\Lambda}$ such that $|\eta| \leq \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda$. There exists a coupling $(\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta}, \varphi^{\mathfrak{p}}, \varphi^\eta)$, $\varphi^{\mathfrak{p}} \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathfrak{p}}$, $\varphi^\eta \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\eta}$ and a non-decreasing function $g : (0, \infty)^2 \mapsto (0, \infty)$, such that $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta}$ -almost surely, $|\varphi_x^{\mathfrak{p}}| \geq |\varphi_x^\eta|$ and*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [\text{sgn}(\varphi_x^{\mathfrak{p}}) - \text{sgn}(\varphi_x^\eta) \mid |\varphi^{\mathfrak{p}}|, |\varphi^\eta|] \geq 0$$

for every $x \in \Lambda$.

Proof. Using Lemma 2.13 in [GPPS22] and Strassen's theorem [Str65], we obtain a coupling $(\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta}, \psi^{\mathfrak{p}}, \psi^\eta)$, where $\psi^{\mathfrak{p}} \sim \langle |\cdot| \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\psi^\eta \sim \langle |\cdot| \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\eta}$, such that $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta}$ -almost surely,

$$\psi_x^{\mathfrak{p}} \geq \psi_x^\eta \quad \text{for every } x \in \Lambda.$$

Enlarging our probability space, we can assume that in the same probability space, there is a family $I = \{\sigma^{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathbf{a}) \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathfrak{p},\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising},0}, \sigma^\eta(\mathbf{a}) \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\eta,\mathbf{a}}^{\text{Ising},0} \mid \mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\Lambda}\}$ of independent Ising models that are also independent from $\psi^{\mathfrak{p}}$ and ψ^η . Now let $\varphi^{\mathfrak{p}} := \psi^{\mathfrak{p}} \cdot \sigma^{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi^{\mathfrak{p}})$ and $\varphi^\eta := \psi^\eta \cdot \sigma^\eta(\psi^\eta)$. It follows that $\varphi^{\mathfrak{p}} \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathfrak{p}}$, $\varphi^\eta \sim \langle \cdot \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\eta}$, and $|\varphi_x^{\mathfrak{p}}| \geq |\varphi_x^\eta|$ for every $x \in \Lambda$. Moreover, by the Ginibre inequality for the Ising model,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [\text{sgn}(\varphi_x^{\mathfrak{p}}) - \text{sgn}(\varphi_x^\eta) \mid |\varphi^{\mathfrak{p}}|, |\varphi^\eta|] = \langle \sigma_x \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\mathfrak{p},\psi^{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\text{Ising},0} - \langle \sigma_x \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\eta,\psi^\eta}^{\text{Ising},0} \geq 0.$$

□

We now prove the main result of this section.

Proposition B.2. *Let $\beta > \beta_c$. Let $\eta_L \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^{\partial\Lambda_L}$ be an external magnetic field such that $\eta_L \leq \mathfrak{p}_{\Lambda_L}$ and $L^{d-1} \inf_{x \in \partial\Lambda} \eta_L(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\beta}^+.$$

Proof. We claim that it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \text{sgn}(\varphi_0) \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L} = \langle \text{sgn}(\varphi_0) \rangle_{\beta}^+. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Indeed, assume that (B.1) holds and recall the monotone coupling $(\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda,\beta}, \varphi^{\mathfrak{p}}, \varphi^{\eta_L})$. Let $Y = \text{sgn}(\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{p}}) - \text{sgn}(\varphi_0^\eta)$. Using the defining properties of the monotone coupling, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $0 \leq Y \leq 2$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \mathfrak{p}_L} - \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L} &= \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [(|\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{p}}| - |\varphi_0^{\eta_L}|) \text{sgn}(\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{p}})] + \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [|\varphi_0^{\eta_L}| Y] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [|\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{p}}| - |\varphi_0^{\eta_L}|] + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [(\varphi_0^{\eta_L})^2] \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [Y^2]} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [|\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{p}}| - |\varphi_0^{\eta_L}|] + \sqrt{2 \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [(\varphi_0^{\eta_L})^2] \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [Y]}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle |\varphi_0| \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta,\eta_L} \geq \langle |\varphi_0| \rangle_{\Lambda,\beta}^0$, and $\Psi^0 = \Psi^1$ by Proposition 4.13, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [|\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{p}}| - |\varphi_0^{\eta_L}|]$ tends to 0. Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda,\beta} [Y]$ tends to 0 by our assumption. We can thus conclude that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L} = \langle \varphi_0 \rangle_{\beta}^+,$$

as desired.

We now proceed with the proof of (B.1). By the Edwards-Sokal coupling and Proposition 4.13, it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0 [0 \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}] = \Psi_{\beta}^0 [0 \longleftrightarrow \infty]. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

We will prove this by using a renormalisation argument. To this end, recall Theorem 1.3. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider some $p \in (0, 1)$ and $k \geq 1$ to be chosen in terms of ε . Let $L \geq 1$ be much larger than k , and consider boxes of the form $\Lambda_k(kx)$ for $x \in \Lambda_m$, where $m = \lfloor \frac{L-10k}{k} \rfloor$. We define a site percolation configuration η on Λ_m by letting $\eta_x = 1$ if $U(k, kx)$ happens. As in the proof of Proposition 6.3, for some L large enough, which we now fix, η dominates a supercritical Bernoulli site percolation $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda_m, s}$.

Let P_m denote the projection of $\Lambda_{m/2}$ to $\partial\Lambda_m$. Let also \mathcal{E} denote the event that at least cm vertices $x \in \partial P_m$ are connected to Λ_m . For $x \in \partial\Lambda_m$, let \mathcal{C}_x denote the connected component of x in A_m consisting of open vertices, and define $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{x \in \partial\Lambda_m} \mathcal{C}_x$. For $x \in P_m$, let K_x denote the column that contains x and intersects $\Lambda_{m/2}$. Note that when there is no path of open vertices connecting a vertex $x \in P_m$ to $\Lambda_{m/2}$, there exists a vertex $y \in \partial^{\text{ext}}\mathcal{C}$ that lies in K_x . Indeed, let z be the last vertex of K_x that lies in \mathcal{C}_x , and let y be the vertex in K_x after z . Then y lies in $\partial^{\text{ext}}\mathcal{C}$, as claimed. Since there are at most $2d$ vertices x that can give rise to the same vertex y , we can deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}_{A_m, s}[\mathcal{E}^c] \leq \mathbb{P}_{A_m, s} \left[|\partial^{\text{ext}}\mathcal{C}| \geq cm/2d \right].$$

To bound the latter probability, let $\Delta\mathcal{C} = \partial^{\text{ext}}\mathcal{C} \cup \partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda_m$. Note that $\Delta\mathcal{C}$ is $*$ -connected, since each $\partial^{\text{ext}}\mathcal{C}_x$ is $*$ -connected. Since the number of $*$ -connected subgraphs of \mathbb{Z}^d with k vertices that contain 0 is at most e^{Ck} for some constant $C > 0$, we can use a union bound to obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda_m, s} \left[|\partial^{\text{ext}}\mathcal{C}| \geq \frac{cm}{2d} \right] \leq \sum_{i \geq \frac{cm}{2d}} \exp \left(C|\partial^{\text{ext}}\Lambda_m| + Ci \right) (1-s)^i.$$

By choosing s to be close enough to 1, we can ensure that the latter is at most ε , which implies that

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0[\eta \in \mathcal{E}^c] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Now note that when the events \mathcal{E} and $\{0 \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_m\}$ happen under η , and additionally, $\{0 \longleftrightarrow \partial L_k\}$ and $U(L)$ happen under ω , then the event $\mathcal{B} = \{0 \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_{L-10k}, |\mathcal{C}_0 \cap \partial\Lambda_{L-10k}| \geq cL^{d-1}\}$ happens under ω . By further increasing the value of s , we can assume that $\mathbb{P}_{\Lambda_m, s}[0 \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_m] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Choosing L to be large enough so that $\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0[U(L)] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_k] \geq \Psi_{\beta}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_k] - \varepsilon$, we obtain that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0[\mathcal{B}] \geq \Psi_{\beta}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow \partial\Lambda_k] - 4\varepsilon \geq \Psi_{\beta}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow \infty] - 4\varepsilon.$$

It remains to show that conditionally on \mathcal{B} , 0 is connected to \mathfrak{g} with high probability. Indeed, if some $x \in \Lambda_{L-10k}$ is connected to 0, when we fully open $E(\Lambda_{10L}(x))$ and we also open an edge of the form $u\mathfrak{g}$ for some $u \in \Lambda_{10L}(x)$, 0 is connected to \mathfrak{g} . Now note that

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_{10k}(x), \beta, \eta_L}^0[\omega|_{E(\Lambda_{10k}(x)) \cup \{u\mathfrak{g}\}} = 1] \geq \Psi_{\Lambda_{10k}(x), \beta}^0[\omega|_{E(\Lambda_{10k}(x))} = 1] \Psi_{\{u\}, \beta, \eta_L}^0[\omega_{u\mathfrak{g}} = 1] \geq r\eta_L$$

for some $r > 0$ by the FKG inequality and monotonicity in the volume. It follows that the family of events $\{\omega|_{E(\Lambda_{10k}(x)) \cup \{u\mathfrak{g}\}} = 1\}$ for $x \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cap \partial\Lambda_{L-10k}$ at distance at least $20k$ apart from each other stochastically dominate a sequence of Bernoulli random variables of parameter $r\eta_L > 0$. Hence conditionally on \mathcal{B} , $\bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cap \partial\Lambda_{L-10k}} \{\omega|_{E(\Lambda_{10k}(x)) \cup \{u\mathfrak{g}\}} = 1\}$ happens with high probability, where here used that $L^{d-1}\eta_L \rightarrow \infty$. Thus for every L large enough we have

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow \mathfrak{g} \mid \mathcal{B}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

It follows that

$$\liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{\Lambda_L, \beta, \eta_L}^0[\mathcal{B}] \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(\Psi_{\beta}^0[0 \longleftrightarrow \infty] - 4\varepsilon).$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we can conclude that (B.2) holds, as desired. \square

References

- [ABF87] M. AIZENMAN, D.J. BARSKY and R. FERNÁNDEZ : The phase transition in a general class of Ising-type models is sharp. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **47**:343–374, 1987.
- [AD21] M. AIZENMAN and H. DUMINIL-COPIN : Marginal triviality of the scaling limits of critical 4D Ising and φ_4^4 models. *Annals of Mathematics*, **194**(1): 163–235, 2021.
- [Aiz82] M. AIZENMAN : Geometric analysis of φ^4 fields and Ising models. Parts I and II. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **86**(1):1–48, 1982.
- [Aiz21] M. AIZENMAN : A geometric perspective on the scaling limits of critical Ising and ϕ_d^4 models. *Preprint*, available at arXiv:2112.04248, 2021.
- [ATT18] D. AHLBERG, V. TASSION and A. TEIXEIRA : Sharpness of the phase transition for continuum percolation in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 172:525–581, 2018.
- [BBS14] R. BAUERSCHMIDT, D.C. BRYDGES and G. SLADE : Scaling limits and critical behaviour of the 4-dimensional n -component $|\varphi|^4$ spin model. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **157**:692–742, 2014.
- [BBS19] R. BAUERSCHMIDT, D.C. BRYDGES and G. SLADE : *Introduction to a Renormalisation Group Method*, volume **2242**. Springer Nature, 2019.
- [BD12] V. BEFFARA and H. DUMINIL-COPIN : The self-dual point of the two-dimensional random-cluster model is critical for $q \geq 1$. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **153**(3-4):511–542, 2012.
- [BIV00] T. BODINEAU, D. IOFFE and Y. VELENIK : Rigorous probabilistic analysis of equilibrium crystal shapes. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **41**(3):1033–1098, 2000.
- [BK89] R.M. BURTON and M. KEANE : Density and uniqueness in percolation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **121**:501–505, 1989.
- [Bod05] T. BODINEAU : Slab percolation for the Ising model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **132**:83–118, 2005.
- [BR06] B. BOLLOBÁS and O. RIORDAN : The critical probability for random Voronoi percolation in the plane is $1/2$. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 136(3):417–468, 2006.
- [BT89] R.C. BROWER and P. TAMAYO : Embedded dynamics for φ^4 theory. *Physical Review Letters*, **62**(10):1087, 1989.
- [BT17] I. BENJAMINI and V. TASSION : Homogenization via sprinkling. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré-Probabilités and Statistiques*, **53**(2):997–1005, 2017.
- [CCS87] J.T. CHAYES, L. CHAYES and R.H. SCHONMANN : Exponential decay of connectivities in the two-dimensional Ising model. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 49:433–445, 1987.

- [CGMS96] F. CESI, G. GUADAGNI, F. MARTINELLI and R.H. SCHONMANN : On the two-dimensional stochastic Ising model in the phase coexistence region near the critical point. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **85**:55–102, 1996.
- [CMT24] D. CONTRERAS, S. MARTINEAU and V. TASSION : Supercritical percolation on graphs of polynomial growth. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 173(4):745–806, 2024.
- [CP00] R. CERF and Á. PISZTORA : On the wulff crystal in the Ising model. *The Annals of Probability*, **23**(3):947–1017, 2000.
- [Dum19] H. DUMINIL-COPIN : Lectures on the Ising and Potts models on the hypercubic lattice. In *Random Graphs, Phase Transitions, and the Gaussian Free Field: PIMS-CRM Summer School in Probability, Vancouver, Canada, June 5–30, 2017*, pages 35–161. Springer, 2019.
- [DGR20] H. DUMINIL-COPIN, S. GOSWAMI and A. RAOUFI : Exponential decay of truncated correlations for the Ising model in any dimension for all but the critical temperature. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **374**(2): 891–921, 2020.
- [DGRST23a] H. DUMINIL-COPIN, S. GOSWAMI, P.-F. RODRIGUEZ, F. SEVERO and A. TEIXEIRA : Finite-range interlacements and couplings. *To appear in The Annals of Probability*, available at arXiv:2308.07303, 2023.
- [DGRST23b] H. DUMINIL-COPIN, S. GOSWAMI, P.-F. RODRIGUEZ, F. SEVERO and A. TEIXEIRA : Phase transition for the vacant set of random walks and random interlacements. *Preprint*, available at arXiv:2308.07919, 2023.
- [DGRST24] H. DUMINIL-COPIN, S. GOSWAMI, P.-F. RODRIGUEZ, F. SEVERO and A. TEIXEIRA : A characterization of strong percolation via disconnection. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 129(2):e12622, 2024.
- [DGRS23] H. DUMINIL-COPIN, S. GOSWAMI, P.-F. RODRIGUEZ and F. SEVERO : Equality of critical parameters for percolation of Gaussian free field level sets. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 172(5):839 – 913, 2023.
- [DGT23] H. DUMINIL-COPIN, C. GARBAN and V. TASSION : Long-range order for critical Book-Ising and Book-percolation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **404**(3):1309–1339, 2023.
- [DP24] H. DUMINIL-COPIN and R. PANIS : New lower bounds for the (near) critical Ising and φ^4 models’ two-point functions. *Preprint*, available at arXiv:2404.05700, 2024.
- [DKS92] R.L. DOBRUSHIN, R. KOTECKÝ and S. SHLOSMAN : *Wulff construction: a global shape from local interaction*, volume **104**. American Mathematical Society Providence, 1992.
- [DP96] J.-D. DEUSCHEL and A. PISZTORA : Surface order large deviations for high-density percolation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **104**:467–482, 1996.

- [DS23] B. DEMBIN and F. SEVERO : Supercritical sharpness for Voronoi percolation. *To appear in Probability Theory and Related Fields*, available at arXiv:2311.00555, 2023.
- [DT22] B. DEMBIN and V. TASSION : Almost sharp sharpness for Poisson Boolean percolation. *Preprint*, available at arXiv:2209.00999, 2022.
- [Dur19] R. DURRETT : *Probability: theory and examples*, Volume **49**. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [FILS78] J. FRÖHLICH, R. ISRAEL, E.H. LIEB and B. SIMON : Phase transitions and reflection positivity. I. General theory and long-range lattice models. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **62**(1):1–34, 1978.
- [FMRS87] J. FELDMAN, J. MAGNEN, V. RIVASSEAU and R. SÉNÉOR : Construction and Borel summability of infrared φ_4^4 by a phase space expansion. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **109**:437–480, 1987.
- [FP87] J. FRÖHLICH and C.-E. PFISTER : Semi-infinite Ising model: II. The wetting and layering transitions. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **112**:51–74, 1987.
- [Frö82] J. FRÖHLICH : On the triviality of $\lambda\phi_d^4$ theories and the approach to the critical point in $d > 4$ dimensions. *Nuclear Physics B*, **200**(2):281–296, 1982.
- [FSS76] J. FRÖHLICH, B. SIMON and T. SPENCER : Infrared bounds, phase transitions and continuous symmetry breaking. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **50**(1):79–95, 1976.
- [GJ73] J. GLIMM and A. JAFFE : Positivity of the φ_3^4 hamiltonian. *Fortschritte der Physik*, **21**(7):327–376, 1973.
- [GJ12] J. GLIMM and A. JAFFE : *Quantum Physics: A Functional Integral Point of View*. Springer New York, NY, 2012.
- [GJS75] James GLIMM, Arthur JAFFE and Thomas SPENCER : Phase transitions for φ_2^4 quantum fields. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **45**:203–216, 1975.
- [GK85] K. GAWEDZKI and A. KUPIAINEN : Massless lattice φ_4^4 theory: rigorous control of a renormalizable asymptotically free model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **99**:197–252, 1985.
- [GKP24] T.S. GUNARATNAM, D. KRACHUN and C. PANAGIOTIS : Existence of a tricritical point for the Blume–Capel model on \mathbb{Z}^d . *Probability and Mathematical Physics*, **5**(3):785–845, 2024.
- [GM90] G. GRIMMETT and J.M. MARSTRAND : The supercritical phase of percolation is well behaved. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, **430**(1879):439–457, 1990.
- [GPPS22] T.S. GUNARATNAM, C. PANAGIOTIS, R. PANIS and F. SEVERO : Random tangled currents for φ^4 : translation invariant Gibbs measures and continuity of the phase transition. *Preprint*, available at arXiv:2211.00319, 2022.

- [Gri67] R.B. GRIFFITHS : Correlations in Ising ferromagnets. I. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **8**(3):478–483, 1967.
- [Gri99] G. GRIMMETT : *Percolation*, Volume **321**. Springer, 1999.
- [Gri06] G. GRIMMETT : *The random-cluster model*, Volume **333**. Springer, 2006.
- [Har87] T. HARA : A rigorous control of logarithmic corrections in four-dimensional ϕ^4 spin systems: I. Trajectory of effective Hamiltonians. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **47**:57–98, 1987.
- [Iof95] D. IOFFE : Exact large deviation bounds up to T_c for the Ising model in two dimensions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **102**:313–330, 1995.
- [Kes80] H. KESTEN : The critical probability of bond percolation on the square lattice equals $1/2$. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **74**(1):41–59, 1980.
- [KPP24] D. KRACHUN, C. PANAGIOTIS and R. PANIS : Scaling limit of the cluster size distribution for the random current measure on the complete graph. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, **29**:1–24, 2024.
- [KST23] L. KÖHLER-SCHINDLER and V. TASSION : Crossing probabilities for planar percolation. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, **172**(4):809–838, 2023.
- [Leb77] J.L. LEBOWITZ : Coexistence of phases in Ising ferromagnets. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **16**(6):463–476, 1977.
- [LO24] P. LAMMERS and S. OTT : Delocalisation and absolute-value-FKG in the solid-on-solid model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **188**:63–87, 2024.
- [LP76] J.L. LEBOWITZ and E. PRESUTTI : Statistical mechanics of systems of unbounded spins. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **50**(3):195–218, 1976.
- [LP81] J. L. LEBOWITZ and C.-E. PFISTER : Surface tension and phase coexistence. *Physical Review Letters*, **46**(15):1031, 1981.
- [LSS97] T.M. LIGGETT, R.H. SCHONMANN and A.M. STACEY : Domination by product measures. *The Annals of Probability*, **25**(1):71–95, 1997.
- [MMSP84] A. MESSENGER, S. MIRACLE-SOLÉ and C.-E. PFISTER : On classical ferromagnets with a complex external field. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **34**:279–286, 1984.
- [Nel66] E. NELSON : A quartic interaction in two dimensions. *In Mathematical Theory of Elementary Particles, (Dedham, Mass., 1965)*, pages 69–73, 1966.
- [Pan23] R. PANIS : Triviality of the scaling limits of critical Ising and φ^4 models with effective dimension at least four. *Preprint*, available at arXiv:2309.05797, 2023.
- [Pan24] R. PANIS : *Applications of Paths Expansions to Statistical Mechanics*. PhD thesis, Université de Genève, 2024.

- [Pis96] A. PISZTORA : Surface order large deviations for Ising, Potts and percolation models. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 104:427–466, 1996.
- [Rue70] D. RUELLE : Superstable interactions in classical statistical mechanics. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **18**(2):127–159, 1970.
- [Sak15] A. SAKAI : Application of the lace expansion to the φ^4 model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **336**:619–648, 2015.
- [Sev22] F. SEVERO : Sharp phase transition for Gaussian percolation in all dimensions. *Annales Henri Lebesgue*, 5:987–1008, 2022.
- [Sev24] F. SEVERO : Slab percolation for the Ising model revisited. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 29:1–11, 2024.
- [Sok82] A.D. SOKAL : An alternate constructive approach to the φ_3^4 quantum field theory, and a possible destructive approach to φ_4^4 . *Annales de l’IHP Physique Théorique*, **37**(4):317–398, 1982.
- [ST16] G. SLADE and A. TOMBERG : Critical correlation functions for the 4-dimensional weakly self-avoiding walk and n -component $|\varphi|^4$ model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **342**:675–737, 2016.
- [Str65] V. STRASSEN : The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **36**(2):423–439, 1965.
- [Wel77] D.R. WELLS : *Some moment inequalities and a result on multivariate unimodality*. Indiana University, 1977.