

The Scaling Limits of Planar LERW in Finitely Connected Domains

Dapeng Zhan

February 9, 2020

Abstract

We define a family of SLE-type processes in finitely connected domains, which are called continuous LERW (loop-erased random walk). A continuous LERW describes a random curve in a finitely connected domain that starts from a prime end and ends at a certain target set, which could be an interior point, or a prime end, or a side arc. It is defined using the usual chordal Loewner equation with the driving function being $\sqrt{2}B(t)$ plus a drift term. The distributions of continuous LERW are conformally invariant. A continuous LERW preserves a family of local martingales, which are composed of generalized Poisson kernels, normalized by their behaviors near the target set. These local martingales resemble the discrete martingales preserved by the corresponding LERW on the discrete approximation of the domain. For all kinds of targets, if the domain satisfies certain boundary conditions, we use these martingales to prove that when the mesh of the discrete approximation is small enough, the continuous LERW and the corresponding discrete LERW can be coupled together, such that after a suitable parametrization, with probability close to 1, the two curves are uniformly close to each other.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Some Notations	4
2.1	Loop-erased random walk	4
2.2	Finitely Connected Domains	6
2.3	Positive harmonic functions	7
2.4	Hulls and Loewner chains	7
3	Continuous LERW	9
3.1	Chordal Loewner equation	9
3.2	Continuous LERW aiming at an interior point	10
3.3	Conformal invariance	12
3.4	Continuous LERW with other kinds of targets	15
4	Observables Generated by Martingales	17
4.1	Local martingales for continuous LERW	17
4.2	Discrete approximations	20
5	Existence and Uniqueness	22
5.1	Convergence of domains	22
5.2	Topology on the space of hulls	23
5.3	Lipschitz conditions	27
6	Convergence of the Driving Functions	36
6.1	Some estimates	36
6.2	Convergence	40
7	Convergence of the Curves	47
7.1	Local convergence	47
7.2	Global convergence	54
8	Other Kinds of Targets	61
8.1	When the target is a prime end	61
8.2	When the target is a side arc	64

1 Introduction

LERW (loop-erased random walk) (c.f. [4]) is obtained by removing loops, in the order they are created, from a simple random walk on a graph that is stopped at some hitting time. Since the loops are erased, so an LERW is a simple lattice path. In this paper, we will consider the loop-erasures of conditional random walks. They have properties that are very similar to loop-erased random walks, so we still call them LERW.

In [18], O. Schramm introduced Stochastic Loewner evolution (SLE), a family of random growth processes of closed fractal subsets in simply connected plane domains. The evolution is described by the classical Loewner equation with the driving term being $\sqrt{\kappa}$ times a standard linear Brownian motion for some $\kappa \geq 0$. SLE behaves differently for different value of κ . Schramm conjectured that SLE_2 is the scaling limit of a kind of LERW on the grid approximation of the domain. And he proved the conjecture in that paper under the assumption that the scaling limits of LERW are conformally invariant.

Schramm's processes turned out to be very useful. On the one hand, they are amenable to computations, on the other hand, they are related with some statistical physics models. In a series of papers [6]-[8], G. F. Lawler, O. Schramm and W. Werner used SLE to determine the Brownian motion intersection exponents in the plane. In [10], the conjecture in [18] is completely solved, where no additional assumption is added. In the same paper, SLE_8 is proved to be the scaling limits of UST (uniform spanning tree) Peano curve. S. Smirnov proved in [20] that chordal SLE_6 is the scaling limit of critical site percolation on the triangular lattice. And O. Schramm and S. Sheffield proved in [19] that the harmonic explorer converges to chordal SLE_4 . In [9], $\text{SLE}_{8/3}$ is proved to have the restriction property, and so is conjectured to be the scaling limits of self-avoiding walk. For the properties of SLE, see [17], [5], and [22].

At the beginning, the SLE is only defined in simply connected domains, because the definition uses Riemann mapping theorem. In [23], a kind of SLE-type process, which is called annulus SLE, is defined in doubly connected domains. The definition uses the rotation symmetry and reflection symmetry of an annulus. It is proved there that annulus SLE_2 is the scaling limit of the LERW in the grid approximation of a doubly connected domain that starts from a vertex that is close to a boundary point and stops when it hits the other boundary component.

The definitions of LERW on grid approximations of simply or doubly connected domains could be easily extended to multiply connected domains. It is interesting to study the scaling limits of the LERW in multiply connected domains. This may help us to extend the SLE to multiply connected domains.

In this paper, we will define a family of SLE-type processes, which are called continuous LERW, in finitely connected domains. They are defined using the usual chordal Loewner equation with the driving function being $\sqrt{2}B(t)+S(t)$, where $B(t)$ is a standard

linear Brownian motion, and the drift term $S(t)$ is continuously differentiable in t . The drift term is carefully chosen, so that the continuous LERW satisfy the conformal invariance, and preserve a family of local martingales generated by generalized Poisson kernels. The local martingales resemble the discrete martingales preserved by the corresponding discrete LERW on the discrete approximation of that domain. And this resemblance is used to prove the convergence of discrete LERW to continuous LERW.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define some notations that will be used in this paper. In Section 3, three kinds of continuous LERW are defined, which are continuous LERW aim at interior points, prime ends, and side arcs. And we prove that they all satisfy the conformal invariance. In Section 4, we present the continuous and discrete martingales preserved by continuous and discrete LERW, respectively, and explain the similarity between these martingales.

In Section 5, we give a rigorous proof of the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the equation that is used to define a continuous LERW. The lemmas that are used for the proof are interesting. We first use the idea of Carathéodory topology to define the convergence of plane domains. Although in our definition, a sequence of domains may have more than one limit domains, the definition is very easy to use. Then we define a metric on the space of hulls in the upper half plane, so that the set of hulls that are contained in a fixed hull is compact. This compactness property is frequently used in the remaining part of this paper. In this section, we use it to derive many uniform constants without working on concrete functions.

In Section 6, we first consider one kind of LERW, whose targets are interior points. The method given in [10] is used to get a coupling of the driving process for the discrete LERW and that for the continuous LERW such that the two driving processes are uniformly close to each other in probability. In Section 7, we first use some regular properties of the discrete LERW curve to get a local coupling of the LERW curve and the continuous LERW trace so that the two curves are close to each other, before either of them leave a hull bounded by a crosscut. Finally, we glue all local couplings to get a global coupling of the curves. In the last section, we study the convergence of the other two kinds of LERW. And we get the similar results of the convergence.

2 Some Notations

2.1 Loop-erased random walk

In general, an LERW is defined on a connected locally finite graph $G = (V, E)$. We will usually consider the graphs that are discrete approximations of some plane domains. A loop-erasure of a finite lattice path $v = (v(0), \dots, v(n))$ on G is defined as follows. Let $n_0 = \max\{m : v(m) = v(0)\}$. Define the sequence (n_j) inductively by $n_{j+1} = \max\{m :$

$v(m) = v(n_j + 1)\}$ if n_j is defined and $n_j < n$. Let χ be the first j such that $n_j = n$. Let $w(j) = v(n_j)$ for $0 \leq j \leq \chi$. Then $w = (w(0), \dots, w(\chi))$ is called the loop-erasure of $(v(0), \dots, v(n))$ (see [4]), and is denoted by $\text{LE}(v)$. It is a simple lattice path with $w(0) = v(0)$ and $w(\chi) = v(n)$.

A subset S of V is called reachable in G if for any $v \in V \setminus S$, a (simple) random walk on G started from v will hit S in finitely many steps almost surely. Suppose A and B are disjoint subsets of V such that $A \cup B$ is reachable in G . Suppose $v_0 \in V \setminus (A \cup B)$ and there is a lattice path on G connecting v_0 and A without passing through B . Then the probability that a random walk started from v_0 hits A before B is positive. We now consider this random walk stopped on hitting $A \cup B$ and conditioned to hit A . It is a random finite lattice path. The loop-erasure of this path is called the LERW on G started from x conditioned to hit A before B .

For a function f defined on V , and $v \in V$, let $\Delta_G f(v) = \sum_{w \sim v} (f(w) - f(v))$, where $w \sim v$ means that w and v are adjacent. If $\Delta_G f(v) = 0$ then we say f is discrete harmonic at v . The proof of the following lemma is easy, and can be found in [23].

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose A and B are disjoint subsets of V and $A \cup B$ is reachable in G . Let $x \in V \setminus (A \cup B)$ be such that there is a lattice path connecting x and A without passing through any vertex on B . Then there is a unique nonnegative bounded function h on V such that $h \equiv 0$ on $A \cup B$; $\Delta_G h \equiv 0$ on $V \setminus (A \cup B \cup \{x\})$; and $\sum_{v \in A} \Delta_G h(v) = 1$. Moreover, if either A or B is a finite set, then there is a unique nonnegative bounded function g on V such that $g \equiv 0$ on B ; $g \equiv 1$ on A ; $\Delta_G g \equiv 0$ on $V \setminus (A \cup B \cup \{x\})$; and $\sum_{v \in A} \Delta_G g(v) = 0$.*

Suppose E_{-1} and F are disjoint subsets of V and $E_{-1} \cup F$ is reachable in G . Let $x_0 \in N$ be such that there is a lattice path connecting x_0 and F without passing through any vertex on E_{-1} . Let $(q(0), \dots, q(\chi))$ be the LERW on G started from x_0 conditioned to hit F before E_{-1} . So $q(0) = x_0$ and $q(\chi) \in F$. For $0 \leq j < \chi$, let $E_j = E_{-1} \cup \{q(0), \dots, q(j)\}$. Then E_j and F are disjoint. Since $E_j \cup F$ is bigger than $E_{-1} \cup F$, so is also reachable. Note that for any for $0 \leq j < \chi$, $(q(j), \dots, q(\chi))$ is a lattice path connecting $q(j)$ with F without passing through E_{j-1} . Let h_j be as in Lemma 2.1 with $A = F$, $B = E_{j-1}$ and $x = q(j)$. If either E_{-1} or F is finite, then either E_j or F is finite. Let g_j be the g in Lemma 2.1 with $A = F$, $B = E_{j-1}$ and $x = q(j)$. Let \overline{F} be the union of F with the set of vertices of V that are adjacent to F . Then we have

Proposition 2.1 *Fix any $v_0 \in V$. Then $(g_k(v_0))$ (if E_{-1} or F is finite) and $(h_k(v_0))$ are discrete martingales up to the first time x_k hits \overline{F} , or E_k disconnects v_0 from F in G .*

Proof. The result for (g_k) in a special case is Proposition 3.2 in [23]. The proof of that proposition applies to general cases. The proof for (h_k) is similar. \square

2.2 Finitely Connected Domains

A finitely connected domain in this paper is an n -connected domain for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which is a connected open subset of the complex plane \mathbb{C} such that the complement of the domain in the Riemann Sphere $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a disjoint union of n contractible continua. A 1-connected domain is a simply connected plane domain other than \mathbb{C} , and so is conformally equivalent to the unit disc. A 2-connected domain is a doubly connected domain with finite modulus, and so is conformally equivalent to an annulus. The boundary of an n -connected domain D in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ has n connected components, each of which is the boundary a connected component of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$.

If f maps an n -connected domain D conformally onto another plane domain D' , then D' is also an n -connected domain. And f induces a one-to-one correspondence \tilde{f} from the set of components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$ to the set of components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D'$ such that for any component A of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$, $z \in D$ and $z \rightarrow A$ in the spherical metric iff $f(z) \rightarrow \tilde{f}(A)$ in the spherical metric. There exists some f that maps D conformally onto a plane domain that is bounded by n mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves. Let's call such f a boundary smoothing map of D . Suppose f_1 and f_2 are two boundary smoothing maps of D , and $E_j = f_j(D)$, $j = 1, 2$. Then $f_2 \circ f_1^{-1}$ maps E_1 conformally onto E_2 , and $f_2 \circ f_1^{-1}$ induces a one-to-one correspondence J from the set of Jordan curves that bound E_1 to the set of Jordan curves that bound E_2 such that for any Jordan curve σ that bound E_1 , $z \in E_1$ and $z \rightarrow \sigma$ iff $f_2 \circ f_1^{-1}(z) \rightarrow J(\sigma)$. Since σ and $J(\sigma)$ are both analytic, from Schwarz reflection principle, $f_2 \circ f_1^{-1}$ can be extended conformally across σ , and maps σ onto $J(\sigma)$.

Now consider the set of all pairs (f, z) such that f is a boundary smoothing map of D , and $z \in \overline{f(D)}$. Two pairs (f_1, z_1) and (f_2, z_2) are equivalent if the extension of $f_2 \circ f_1^{-1}$ maps z_1 to z_2 . Let \widehat{D} be the set of all equivalent classes. There is a unique conformal structure on \widehat{D} such that $z \mapsto [(f, z)]$ maps $\overline{f(D)}$ conformally onto \widehat{D} for any boundary smoothing map f . Then $z \rightarrow [(f, f(z))]$ is a conformal map from D into \widehat{D} independent of the choice of f . So we may view D as a subset of \widehat{D} , and call \widehat{D} the conformal closure of D . It is clear that a conformal map between two n -connected domain extends uniquely to a conformal map between their conformal closures.

We call $\partial D := \widehat{D} \setminus D$ the conformal boundary of D . Then ∂D is a union of n disjoint analytic Jordan curves, each of which is called a side of D . Each side σ corresponds to a component A of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$ such that for $z \in D$, $z \rightarrow \sigma$ in \widehat{D} iff $z \rightarrow A$ in the spherical metric. Each point on σ is called a prime end of D on σ . This is equivalent to the prime ends defined in [1] and [15]. In fact, the definition in [1] describes the property of a sequence of points in D that converges to a point on ∂D , and the definition in [14] describes a neighborhood basis bounded by crosscuts of a point on $\partial \widehat{D}$. A connected subset of a side that contains more than one point is called a side arc.

If $z_0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ and a prime end w_0 of D satisfy that $z \in D$ and $z \rightarrow z_0$ in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ iff $z \rightarrow w_0$ in \widehat{D} .

and $z \rightarrow w_0$ in \widehat{D} , then we say the point z_0 and the prime end w_0 correspond to each other. And we do not distinguish the point z_0 from the prime end w_0 . For example, if a boundary component of D is a Jordan curve, then each point on this curve corresponds to a prime end. If $z_0 \in \partial D$ and for some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| < \varepsilon\} \setminus D$ is a simple curve γ connecting z_0 with $\{|z - z_0| = \varepsilon\}$, then z_0 corresponds to a prime end of D . But every other point on γ corresponds to two prime ends of D .

If $\alpha : (a, b) \rightarrow D$ is a curve in D , and for some $z_0 \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ that lies on the boundary of D in $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$, and $\alpha(t) \rightarrow z_0$ in the spherical metric as $t \rightarrow a$, then there is some prime end w_0 of D such that $\alpha(t) \rightarrow w_0$ in \widehat{D} as $t \rightarrow a$. Such w_0 is called the prime end determined by α at one end. In general, z_0 and w_0 do not correspond to each other. And there may exist another curve $\beta : (c, d) \rightarrow D$ such that $\beta(t) \rightarrow z_0$ in the spherical metric as $t \rightarrow c$, but $\beta(t) \rightarrow w_1$ in \widehat{D} as $t \rightarrow c$, where w_1 is a prime end of D other than w_0 . And not every prime end of D can be determined by a curve in D in this way.

2.3 Positive harmonic functions

Suppose D is a finitely connected domain, and $z_0 \in D$. The Green function $G(D, z_0; \cdot)$ in D with the pole at z_0 is the continuous function defined on $\widehat{D} \setminus \{z_0\}$ which vanishes on ∂D , is positive and harmonic in $D \setminus \{z_0\}$, and the limit as $z \rightarrow z_0$ of $G(D, z_0; z) + \ln |z - z_0| / (2\pi)$ exists. Such Green function is unique.

Suppose w_0 is a prime end of D . There is a continuous function P defined on $\widehat{D} \setminus \{w_0\}$ which vanishes on $\widehat{D} \setminus \{w_0\}$, and is harmonic and positive in D . It is called a generalized Poisson kernel in D with the pole at w_0 . Such P is not unique. But any two generalized Poisson kernels in D with the pole at w_0 differ by a positive multiple constant. Suppose $z_0 \in \partial D$, and ∂D is analytic near z_0 , then z_0 corresponds to a prime end of D , and the Poisson kernel in D with the pole at z_0 is well defined, and is an example of a generalized Poisson kernel in D with the pole at z_0 .

Suppose I is side arc of D . The harmonic measure function $H(D, I; \cdot)$ is a bounded continuous function defined on \widehat{D} taking away the end points of I , which is harmonic in D , vanishes on $\partial D \setminus \overline{I}$, and takes constant value 1 on I except the end points. For any $z \in D$, $H(D, I; z)$ is equal to the probability that the plane Brownian motion started from z first hits ∂D at I .

2.4 Hulls and Loewner chains

Suppose D is an n -connected domain, and σ is a side of D . Let $A(\sigma)$ be the connected component of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$ that corresponds to σ . A closed subset H is called a hull of D on σ if $A(\sigma) \cup H$ is a connected compact contractible subset of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$. Then $D \setminus H$ is also an

n -connected domain, $A(\sigma) \cup H$ is a component of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus (D \setminus H)$, and other components of $D \setminus H$ are the components of $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$ other than $A(\sigma)$.

In this paper, we define a crosscut to be an open simple curve α in D , whose two ends approach to two points on ∂D , in the Lebesgue metric, such that $D \setminus \alpha$ has two components, one of which is simply connected. If U is a simply connected component of $D \setminus \alpha$, then $U \cup \alpha$ is a hull in D . If $n > 1$, i.e., D is not simply connected, then U is determined by α , and let $H(\alpha) := U \cup \alpha$ be the hull bounded by α . If $n = 1$, then the two components of $D \setminus \alpha$ are both simply connected, so we need some other restrictions to determine $H(\alpha)$. For example, if we say that $H(\alpha)$ is a neighborhood of some prime end w_0 in D , then there is no ambiguity.

Suppose σ is a side of D . A Loewner chain in D on σ is a function L from $[0, T)$ for some $T \in (0, +\infty]$ into the set of hulls in D on σ such that $L(0) = \emptyset$, $L(t_1) \subsetneq L(t_2)$ if $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < T$, and for any fixed $b \in [0, T)$ and any compact subset F of $D \setminus L(b)$, the extremal length (see [1]) of the family of curves in $D \setminus L(t + \varepsilon)$ that separates F from $L(t + \varepsilon) \setminus L(t)$ tends to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, uniformly w.r.t. $t \in [0, b]$. Suppose $L(t)$, $0 \leq t < T$, is a Loewner chain in D on σ . For each $t \in [0, T)$, let d_t be any metric on $\widehat{D \setminus L(t)}$. From the definition, the d_t -diameter of $L(t + \varepsilon) \setminus L(t)$ tends to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. Thus there is a unique prime end $w(t)$ of $D \setminus L(t)$ that lies on the closure of $L(t + \varepsilon) \setminus L(t)$ in $\widehat{D \setminus L(t)}$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. We call $w(t)$ the prime end determined by L at time t . Especially, $w(0)$ is a prime end on σ . We say L is a Loewner chain started from $w(0)$. It is clear that for any $b \in [0, T)$, $t \mapsto L(b + t)$, $0 \leq t < T - b$, is a Loewner chain in $D \setminus L(b)$ started from $w(b)$.

Suppose $L(t)$, $0 \leq t < T$, is a Loewner chain in D . Suppose u is a continuous (strictly) increasing function defined on $[0, T)$ with $u(0) = 0$. Let $u(T) := \sup u([0, T))$. Then $L'(t) := L(u^{-1}(t))$, $0 \leq t < u(T)$, is also a Loewner chain in D . Such L' is called a time-change of L through u . Moreover, the prime end determined by L' at time $u(t)$ is the same as the prime end determined by L at time t .

One example of a Loewner chain is constructed by a simple curve. Suppose $\gamma : [0, T) \rightarrow \widehat{D}$ is a simple curve that satisfies $\gamma(0) \in \partial D$ and $\gamma(t) \in D$ for $0 \leq t < T$. Let $L(t) = \gamma([0, t])$, $0 \leq t < T$. Then L is a Loewner chain in D started from $\gamma(0)$, and $\gamma(t)$ corresponds to the prime end determined by L at time t . We say that L is the Loewner chain generated by γ .

3 Continuous LERW

3.1 Chordal Loewner equation

Let $\mathbb{H} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } z > 0\}$. Then \mathbb{H} is a 1-connected domain whose side is $\widehat{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. We say H is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ if H is a hull in \mathbb{H} and H is bounded (i.e., bounded away from ∞). A Loewner chain L in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ is a Loewner chain in \mathbb{H} such that each $L(t)$ is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ . For each hull H in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , there is a unique function φ_H that maps $\mathbb{H} \setminus H$ conformally onto \mathbb{H} such that for some $c \geq 0$,

$$\varphi_H(z) = z + \frac{c}{z} + O\left(\frac{1}{z^2}\right),$$

as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Such c is called the capacity of H in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , denoted by $\text{hcap}(H)$. Empty set is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , and $\varphi_\emptyset = \text{id}$, so $\text{hcap}(\emptyset) = 0$.

Proposition 3.1 *Suppose Ω is an open neighborhood of $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ in \mathbb{H} . Suppose W maps Ω conformally into \mathbb{H} such that for some $r > 0$, as $z \in \Omega$ and $z \rightarrow (x_0 - r, x_0 + r)$, we have $W(z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. So W extends conformally across $(x_0 - r, x_0 + r)$ by Schwarz reflection principle. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some $\delta > 0$ such that if a hull H in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ is contained in $\{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z - x_0| < \delta\}$, then $W(H)$ is also a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , and*

$$|\text{hcap}(W(H)) - W'(x_0)^2 \text{hcap}(H)| < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. This is Lemma 2.8 in [6]. \square

For $T \in (0, +\infty]$, let $C([0, T])$ denote the space of real valued continuous function on $[0, T]$. Suppose $\xi \in C([0, T])$. We solve the chordal Loewner equation:

$$\partial_t \varphi_t(z) = \frac{2}{\varphi_t(z) - \xi(t)}, \quad \varphi_0(z) = z,$$

for $0 \leq t < T$. For each $t \in [0, T)$, let K_t be the set of $z \in \mathbb{H}$ such that the solution $\varphi_s(z)$ blows up before or at time t . We say that φ_t and K_t , $0 \leq t < T$, are chordal Loewner maps and hulls, respectively, driven by ξ .

For $0 \leq t < T$, K_t is a bounded closed subset of \mathbb{H} , φ_t maps $\mathbb{H} \setminus K_t$ conformally onto \mathbb{H} , and satisfies

$$\varphi_t(z) = z + \frac{2t}{z} + O\left(\frac{1}{z^2}\right)$$

as $z \rightarrow \infty$. So K_t is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , $\text{hcap}(K_t) = 2t$, and $\varphi_{K_t} = \varphi_t$.

Proposition 3.2 (i) Suppose φ_t and K_t , $0 \leq t < T$, are chordal Loewner maps and hulls, respectively, driven by ξ . Then $t \mapsto K_t$, $0 \leq t < T$, is a Loewner chain in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ started from $\xi(0)$. And for each $t \in [0, T)$, $hcap(K_t) = 2t$, $\varphi_t = \varphi_{K_t}$, and

$$\{\xi(t)\} = \cap_{\varepsilon > 0} \overline{\varphi_t(K_{t+\varepsilon} \setminus K_t)}.$$

So $\varphi_t^{-1}(\xi(t))$ is the prime end determined by $(K_t, 0 \leq t < T)$ at time t .

(ii) Suppose $L(t)$, $0 \leq t < T$, is a Loewner chain in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ . Let $v(t) = hcap(L(t))/2$, $0 \leq t < T$. Then v is a continuous increasing function with $v(0) = 0$. And $K_t := L(v^{-1}(t))$, $0 \leq t < u(T)$, are chordal Loewner hulls driven by some $\xi \in C([0, v(T)))$.

Proof. This is almost the same as Theorem 2.6 in [6]. \square

Fix $b \in [0, T)$. Let $\varphi_{b,t} = \varphi_t \circ \varphi_b^{-1}$ and $K_{b,t} = \varphi_b(K_t \setminus K_b)$ for $b \leq t < T$. Then it is easy to check that $K_{b,b+t}$ and $\varphi_{b,b+t}$, $0 \leq t < T - b$, are chordal Loewner hulls and maps driven by $t \mapsto \xi(b+t)$, $0 \leq t < T - b$. Thus for any $s < t \in [0, T)$, $\varphi_s(K_t \setminus K_s)$ is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , and its capacity in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ is $2(t-s)$.

3.2 Continuous LERW aiming at an interior point

For $a \geq 0$, let $C([0, a])$ be the space of all real valued continuous functions defined on $[0, a]$ with the norm $\|\xi\|_a := \sup\{|\xi(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq a\}$. For $\xi \in C([0, a])$, let K_t^ξ and φ_t^ξ , $0 \leq t \leq a$, be chordal Loewner hulls and maps, respectively, driven by ξ . Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ is a finitely connected domain bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves in \mathbb{H} , and $p \in \Omega$. For $t \in [0, a]$, if $K_t^\xi \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$, then $\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$ is a finitely connected domain, and contains p . Recall that $G(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p; \cdot)$ is the Green function in $\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$ with the pole at p . Let

$$J_t^\xi(z) = G(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(z). \quad (3.1)$$

We begin with a theorem. The proof is postponed to Section 5 in this paper.

Theorem 3.1 For any $A \in C([0, \infty))$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $T_A \in (0, +\infty]$ such that the equation

$$\xi(t) = A(t) + \lambda \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^\xi(\xi(s)) ds \quad (3.2)$$

has a unique solution $\xi(t) = \xi_A(t)$ on $[0, T_A)$, and can not be extended. And for any $a \in (0, \infty)$, the set $\{A \in C([0, \infty)) : T_A > a\}$ is open w.r.t. the metric $\|\cdot\|_a$, and $A \mapsto \xi_A$ is $(\|\cdot\|_a, \|\cdot\|_a)$ continuous on $\{A \in C([0, \infty)) : T_A > a\}$. Moreover, suppose α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. Then $\cup_{0 \leq t < T} K_t^\xi \not\subset H(\alpha)$.

Let $B(t)$ be a Brownian motion. Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ be the filtration generated by $B(t)$. Apply the above theorem to $A(t) = \sqrt{2}B(t)$ and $\lambda = 2$. Then we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1 (i) *There is an \mathcal{F}_t -stopping time $T \in (0, +\infty]$ such that the equation*

$$\xi(t) = \sqrt{2}B(t) + 2 \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^\xi(\xi(s)) ds \quad (3.3)$$

has a unique \mathcal{F}_t -adapted solution on $[0, T)$, and the solution can not be extended.

(ii) *There does not exist a crosscut α in \mathbb{H} such that $\cup_{0 \leq t < T} K_t^\xi \subset H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$.*

Suppose D is a finitely connected domain, w_0 is a prime ends of D , and $z_e \in D$. There is f that maps D conformally onto $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$, which is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves, and $f(w_0) = 0$. Let $p = f(z_e)$, $B(t)$ be a Brownian motion, and $\xi(t)$ be the solution to equation (3.3) and $[0, T)$ be the maximal interval on which the solution exists. For $0 \leq t < T$, let

$$u(t) = \int_0^t (\partial_y J_s^\xi(\xi(s)))^2 ds. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $S = u(T)$, and $F(t) = f^{-1}(K_{u^{-1}(t)}^\xi)$, $0 \leq t < S$. Then we call $(F(t), 0 \leq t < S)$ a continuous LERW in D from w_0 to z_e , and let it be denoted by $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e)$.

From the property of chordal SLE_2 (c.f. [17]), and Girsanov's theorem, almost surely there is a simple curve $\gamma(t) : [0, S) \rightarrow \widehat{D}$ such that $\gamma(0) = w_0$, $\gamma(t) \in D$ for $0 < t < S$, and $F(t) = \gamma([0, t])$ for $0 \leq t < S$, i.e., F is the Loewner chain generated by γ . We call such γ an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e)$ trace.

Since f maps D conformally onto Ω and $p = f(z_e)$, so we have

$$J_t^\xi(z) = G(D \setminus f^{-1}(K_t^\xi), z_e; \cdot) \circ f^{-1} \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(z).$$

Thus equations (3.3) and (3.4) become

$$\xi(t) = \sqrt{2}B(t) + 2 \int_0^t \frac{\partial_x \partial_y (G(D \setminus f^{-1}(K_s^\xi), z_e; \cdot) \circ f^{-1} \circ (\varphi_s^\xi)^{-1})(\xi(s))}{\partial_y (G(D \setminus f^{-1}(K_s^\xi), z_e; \cdot) \circ f^{-1} \circ (\varphi_s^\xi)^{-1})(\xi(s))} ds; \quad (3.5)$$

$$u(t) = \int_0^t (\partial_y (G(D \setminus f^{-1}(K_s^\xi), z_e; \cdot) \circ f^{-1} \circ (\varphi_s^\xi)^{-1})(\xi(s)))^2 ds. \quad (3.6)$$

Remark: If D is a 1-connected domain, w_0 is a prime end of D and $z_e \in D$, then an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e)$ has the same distribution as a radial $\text{SLE}_2(D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e)$ up to a linear time-change.

3.3 Conformal invariance

Theorem 3.2 *For $j = 1, 2$, let $(F_j(t), 0 \leq t < S_j)$ be an $LERW(D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e)$. Then $(F_1(t), 0 \leq t < S_1)$ and $(F_2(t), 0 \leq t < S_2)$ have the same distribution.*

Proof. From the definition, we have $F_j(t) = f_j^{-1}(K_{u_j^{-1}(t)}^{\xi_j})$, $0 \leq t < S_j$, where f_j maps D conformally onto $\Omega_j \subset \mathbb{H}$, which is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves, and $f_j(w_0) = 0$; and $\xi_j(t)$, $0 \leq t < T_j = u_j^{-1}(S_j)$, is the solution to

$$\xi_j(t) = \sqrt{2}B_j(t) + 2 \int_0^t \frac{\partial_x \partial_y (G(\Omega_j \setminus K_t^{\xi_j}, p_j; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^{\xi_j})^{-1})(\xi_j(s))}{\partial_y (G(\Omega_j \setminus K_t^{\xi_j}, p_j(z_e); \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^{\xi_j})^{-1})(\xi_j(s))} ds, \quad (3.7)$$

and can not be extended, where $B_j(t)$ is a Brownian motion and $p_j = f_j(z_e)$; and $u_j(t)$, $0 \leq t < T_j$, is defined by

$$u_j(t) = \int_0^t \partial_y (G(\Omega_j \setminus K_s^{\xi_j}, p_j; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_s^{\xi_j})^{-1})(\xi_j(s))^2 ds.$$

Let $v_j = u_j^{-1}$ and $L_j(t) = K_{u_j^{-1}(t)}^{\xi_j}$. Then $F_j(t) = f_j^{-1}(L_j(t))$, $0 \leq t < S_j$.

Let $W = f_2 \circ f_1^{-1}$. Then W maps Ω_1 conformally onto Ω_2 , $W(0) = 0$ and $W(p_1) = p_2$. Let $L_{2'}(t) = W(L_1(t))$, $0 \leq t < S_1$. It suffices to show that $(L_{2'}(t), 0 \leq t < S_1)$ has the same distribution as $(L_2(t), 0 \leq t < S_2)$. Let $\beta_1(t)$ be the random simple curve that generates $L_1(t)$, i.e., $\beta_1(0) = 0$, $\beta_1(t) \in \Omega_1$, $0 < t < S_1$, and almost surely $L_1(t) = \beta_1((0, t])$, $0 \leq t < S_1$. Let $\beta_{2'}(t) = W(\beta_1(t))$, $0 \leq t < S_1$. Then $\beta_{2'}$ is a simple curve, $\beta_{2'}(0) = 0$, $\beta_{2'}(t) \in \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{H}$, $0 < t < S_1$, and almost surely $L_{2'}(t) = \beta_{2'}((0, t])$, $0 \leq t < S_1$. Thus $L_{2'}$ is a Loewner chain in \mathbb{H} w.r.t ∞ . Let $v_{2'}(t) = \text{hcap}(L_{2'}(t))/2$, $0 \leq t < S_1$. Let $T_{2'} = v_{2'}(S_1)$ and $u_{2'} = v_{2'}^{-1}$. Then from Proposition 3.2, $L_{2'}(u_{2'}(t)) = K_t^{\xi_{2'}}$, $0 \leq t < T_{2'}$, for some $\xi_{2'} \in C([0, T_{2'}])$.

Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t^1\}$ be the filtration generated by $B_1(t)$. Let

$$R_1(t, x) = \partial_y (G(\Omega_j \setminus K_t^{\xi_j}, p_j; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^{\xi_j})^{-1})(x).$$

Then $(\xi_t(t))$ and $R_1(t, x)$ are \mathcal{F}_t^1 -adapted, and T_1 is an \mathcal{F}_t^1 -stopping time. And we have

$$d\xi_1(t) = \sqrt{2}dB_1(t) + 2 \frac{\partial_x R_1(t, \xi_1(t))}{R_1(t, \xi_1(t))} dt, \quad \text{and } u_1'(t) = R_1(t, \xi_1(t))^2,$$

for $0 \leq t < T_1$. So there is another Brownian motion $\widetilde{B}_1(t)$ such that for $0 \leq t < S_1$,

$$d\xi_1(v_1(t)) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))} d\widetilde{B}_1(t) + \frac{2\partial_x R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^3} dt. \quad (3.8)$$

Note that W maps $\Omega_1 \setminus L_1(t)$ conformally onto $\Omega_2 \setminus L_{2'}(t)$. Let $\Omega_1(t) = \varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(\Omega_1 \setminus L_1(t))$, $\Omega_{2'}(t) = \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(\Omega_2 \setminus L_{2'}(t))$, and $W_t = \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}} \circ W \circ (\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1})^{-1}$. Then both $\Omega_1(t)$ and $\Omega_{2'}(t)$ are finitely connected subdomain of \mathbb{H} that are bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves, and W_t maps $\Omega_1(t)$ conformally onto $\Omega_{2'}(t)$. Moreover, W_t extends analytically to $\Omega_1(t) \cup \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$, and maps $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ onto itself.

For $t \in [0, S_1)$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, S_1 - t)$, define

$$L_1(t, \varepsilon) = \varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(L_1(t + \varepsilon) \setminus L_1(t)) = \varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(K_{v_1(t+\varepsilon)}^{\xi_1} \setminus K_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1});$$

$$L_{2'}(t, \varepsilon) = \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(L_{2'}(t + \varepsilon) \setminus L_{2'}(t)) = \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(K_{v_{2'}(t+\varepsilon)}^{\xi_{2'}} \setminus K_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}).$$

Then $\text{hcap}(L_1(t, \varepsilon)) = 2(v_1(t + \varepsilon) - v_1(t))$, $\text{hcap}(L_{2'}(t, \varepsilon)) = 2(v_{2'}(t + \varepsilon) - v_{2'}(t))$, and $W_t(L_1(t, \varepsilon)) = L_{2'}(t, \varepsilon)$. From Proposition 3.2, we have $\{\xi_1(v_1(t))\} = \cap_{\varepsilon > 0} \overline{L_1(t, \varepsilon)}$ and $\{\xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t))\} = \cap_{\varepsilon > 0} \overline{L_{2'}(t, \varepsilon)}$. Thus $\xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)) = W_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))$. From Proposition 3.1, we have $v_{2'}'(t) = W_t'(\xi_1(v_1(t)))^2 v_1'(t)$.

Differentiate the inequality $W_t \circ \varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1} = \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}} \circ W$ w.r.t. t . We get

$$\partial_t W_t(\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(z)) + \frac{2W_t'(\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(z))v_1'(t)}{\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(z) - \xi_1(v_1(t))} = \frac{2v_{2'}'(t)}{\varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}} \circ W(z) - \xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t))}$$

for any $z \in \Omega_1 \setminus L_1(t)$. Since $\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}$ maps $\Omega_1 \setminus L_1(t)$ conformally onto $\Omega_1(t)$, so for any $w \in \Omega_1(t)$, we have

$$\partial_t W_t(w) = \frac{2W_t'(\xi_1(v_1(t)))^2 v_1'(t)}{W_t(w) - W_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))} - \frac{2W_t'(w)v_1'(t)}{w - \xi_1(v_1(t))}.$$

Let $w \in \Omega_1(t)$ and $w \rightarrow \xi_1(v_1(t))$, from Taylor expansion of W_t at $\xi_1(v_1(t))$, we get

$$\partial_t W_t(\xi_1(v_1(t))) = -3W_t''(\xi_1(v_1(t)))v_1'(t) = -3W_t''(\xi_1(v_1(t)))/R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^2.$$

Since $\xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)) = W_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))$, so from equation (3.8) and Ito's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)) &= \partial_t W_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))dt + W_t'(\xi_1(v_1(t)))d\xi_1(v_1(t)) + W_t''(\xi_1(v_1(t)))/2d\langle \xi_1(v_1(t)) \rangle \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}W_t'(\xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))} d\tilde{B}_1(t) + 2 \frac{W_t'(\xi_1(v_1(t)))\partial_x R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^3} dt \\ &\quad + \partial_t W_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))dt + \frac{W_t''(\xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^2} dt. \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}W_t'(\xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))} d\tilde{B}_1(t) + \end{aligned}$$

$$+2 \left(\frac{W'_t(\xi_1(v_1(t))) \partial_x R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^3} - \frac{W''_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^2} \right) dt. \quad (3.9)$$

Since $\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}$ maps $\Omega_1 \setminus L_1(t)$ conformally onto $\Omega_1(t)$, so

$$R_1(v_1(t), x) = \partial_y(G(\Omega_1 \setminus K_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}, p_1; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1})^{-1})(x) = \partial_y G(\Omega_1(t), \varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(p_1); \cdot)(x).$$

Since W_t maps $\Omega_1(t)$ conformally onto $\Omega_{2'}(t)$, and $W_t(\varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(p_1)) = \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2)$, so

$$G(\Omega_1(t), \varphi_{v_1(t)}^{\xi_1}(p_1); \cdot) = G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); \cdot) \circ W_t.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(v_1(t), x) &= \partial_y G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); W_t(x)) W'_t(x); \\ \partial_x R_1(v_1(t), x) &= \partial_x \partial_y G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); W_t(x)) (W'_t(x))^2 \\ &\quad + \partial_y G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); W_t(x)) W''_t(x). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging these equalities into (3.9) and letting $x = \xi_1(v_1(t))$, we get

$$d\xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)) = \frac{\sqrt{2} W'_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))} d\tilde{B}_1(t) + 2 \frac{\partial_x \partial_y G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); \xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)))}{\partial_y G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); \xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)))^3} dt.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} v'_{2'}(t) &= W'_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))^2 v'_1(t) = \frac{W'_t(\xi_1(v_1(t)))^2}{R_1(v_1(t), \xi_1(v_1(t)))^2} \\ &= \partial_y G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); \xi_{2'}(v_{2'}(t)))^{-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and $G(\Omega_{2'}(t), \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}(p_2); \cdot) = G(\Omega_2 \setminus K_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}, p_2; \cdot) \circ \varphi_{v_{2'}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}$, so for $0 \leq t < T_{2'}$,

$$d\xi_{2'}(t) = \sqrt{2} dB_{2'}(t) + 2 \frac{\partial_x \partial_y (G(\Omega_2 \setminus K_t^{\xi_{2'}}, p_2; \cdot) \circ \varphi_t^{\xi_{2'}})(\xi_{2'}(t))}{\partial_y (G(\Omega_2 \setminus K_t^{\xi_{2'}}, p_2; \cdot) \circ \varphi_t^{\xi_{2'}})(\xi_{2'}(t))} dt$$

for another Brownian motion $B_{2'}(t)$. Since $\xi_{2'}(0) = W_0(\xi_1(0)) = W(0) = 0$, so for $0 \leq t < T_{2'}$,

$$\xi_{2'}(t) = \sqrt{2} B_{2'}(t) + 2 \int_0^t \frac{\partial_x \partial_y (G(\Omega_2 \setminus K_s^{\xi_{2'}}, p_2; \cdot) \circ \varphi_s^{\xi_{2'}})(\xi_{2'}(s))}{\partial_y (G(\Omega_2 \setminus K_s^{\xi_{2'}}, p_2; \cdot) \circ \varphi_s^{\xi_{2'}})(\xi_{2'}(s))} ds. \quad (3.11)$$

We claim that $[0, T_{2'})$ is the maximal interval on which the solution $\xi_{2'}$ to (3.11) exists. Suppose the claim is not true. Then then at some ω , the solution $\xi_{2'}$ exists on $[0, T_{2'}]$. Note that $W(\infty)$ is a prime end on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ other than $W(0) = 0$. We may find a crosscut α in \mathbb{H} such that $K_{T_{2'}}^{\xi_{2'}} \subset H(\alpha)$, and $W(\infty) \notin \overline{H(\alpha)}$. Then $W^{-1}(\alpha)$ is also a crosscut in \mathbb{H} , and $H(W^{-1}(\alpha)) = W^{-1}(H(\alpha))$. So $W^{-1}(K_t^{\xi_{2'}}) \subset H(W^{-1}(\alpha))$ for $0 \leq t < T_{2'}$, which implies that $K_t^{\xi_1} \subset H(W^{-1}(\alpha))$ for $0 \leq t < T_1$. This contradicts part (ii) of Corollary 3.1. So the claim is justified.

Compare equation (3.11) with equation (3.7) when $j = 2$. Since $[0, T_{2'})$ ($[0, T_2)$, resp.) is the maximal interval on which the solutions $\xi_{2'}(t)$ ($\xi_2(t)$, resp.) to equation (3.11) (equation (3.7) when $j = 2$, resp.) exists, and $B_{2'}(t)$ has the same distribution as $B_2(t)$, so from the uniqueness in Theorem 3.1 we conclude that $(\xi_{2'}(t), 0 \leq t < T_{2'})$ has the same distribution as $(\xi_2(t), 0 \leq t < T_2)$. From (3.10), $u_{2'} = v_{2'}^{-1}$, and that $u_{2'}(0) = 0$, we get that for $0 \leq t < T_{2'}$,

$$u_{2'}(t) = \int_0^t \partial_y(G(\Omega_2 \setminus K_s^{\xi_{2'}}, p_2; \cdot) \circ \varphi_s^{\xi_{2'}})(\xi_{2'}(s))^2 ds.$$

Thus $((\xi_{2'}(t), u_{2'}(t)), 0 \leq t < T_{2'})$ has the same distribution as $((\xi_2(t), u_2(t)), 0 \leq t < T_2)$. Since $L_{2'}(t) = K_{u_{2'}^{-1}(t)}^{\xi_{2'}}$ for $0 \leq t < S_1 = u_{2'}(T_{2'})$, and $L_2(t) = K_{u_2^{-1}(t)}^{\xi_2}$ for $0 \leq t < S_2 = u_2(T_2)$, so $(L_{2'}(t), 0 \leq t < S_1)$ has the same distribution as $(L_2(t), 0 \leq t < S_2)$. \square

From the definition and the above theorem, we immediately have the conformal invariance of continuous LERW aiming at interior points. Suppose D is a finitely connected domain, w_0 is a prime end of D , and $z_e \in D$, and $(\gamma(t), 0 \leq t < S)$ is an LERW($D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e$) trace. Suppose f maps D conformally onto D' . Then $(f(\gamma(t)), 0 \leq t < S)$ is an LERW($D'; f(w_0) \rightarrow f(z_e)$) trace.

3.4 Continuous LERW with other kinds of targets

Suppose D is a finitely connected domain, w_0 is a prime end of D , and I_e is a side arc of D that is bounded away from w_0 . Here I_e may or may not lie on the same arc as w_0 . Suppose $w_\infty \neq w_0$ is a prime end of D that lies on the same side of D as w_0 . Then there is f that maps D conformally onto a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ that is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves such that $f(w_0) = 0$ and $f(w_\infty) = \infty$. If a hull K in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ is bounded away from $f(I_e)$, and $K \subset \Omega$, then $f(I_e)$ is a side arc of $\Omega \setminus K$. We have the harmonic measure function $H(\Omega \setminus K, f(I_e); \cdot)$.

Now we change the definition of J_t^ξ by replacing $G(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p; \cdot)$ by $H(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, f(I_e); \cdot)$ in equation (3.1). Let everything else in Section 3.2 be unchanged. Then Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 still hold if the condition on α is replaced by that α is a crosscut in

\mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$, and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(I_e)$. Let $u(t)$ be defined by (3.4). Then $(F(t) = f^{-1}(K_{u^{-1}(t)}^\xi), 0 \leq t < S = u(T))$ is called a continuous LERW in D from w_0 to I_e , and is denoted by $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$. It is almost surely generated by a random simple curve, which is called an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ trace. Theorem 3.2 still holds for $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$. Thus any two $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ have the same distribution, and continuous LERW aiming at side arcs satisfy the conformal invariance.

Suppose D is a finitely connected domain, w_0 and w_e are two different prime ends of D . Here w_0 and w_e may or may not lie on the same side as w_0 . There is f that maps D conformally onto a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ that is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves such that $f(w_0) = 0$. Then $p := f(w_e)$ is a prime end of Ω other than 0. If a hull K in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ is bounded away from p , and $K \subset \Omega$, then p is a prime end of $\Omega \setminus K$. Then we have a generalized Poisson kernel $P(z)$ in $\Omega \setminus K$ with the pole at p . Such $P(z)$ is not unique.

Suppose h maps a neighborhood U of p in $\widehat{\Omega}$ conformally onto a neighborhood V of 0 in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ such that $h(p) = 0$ and $h(U \cap \widehat{\partial}D) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $P_h(z) = P \circ h^{-1}(z)$ for $z \in V$. Then there is $c > 0$ such that $P_h(z) + \text{Im}(\frac{c}{z}) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \in V$ and $z \rightarrow 0$. So there is a unique generalized Poisson kernel $P(z)$ in $\Omega \setminus K$ with the pole at p such that the constant c for P_h equals 1. We call such $P(z)$ the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega \setminus K$ with the pole at p normalized by h , and let $P(\Omega \setminus K, p, h; z)$ denote this function. The function h is called a normalizing function. It is easy to check that if h_1 and h_2 are two normalizing functions, then

$$P(\Omega \setminus K, p, h_1; z) = (h_2 \circ h_1^{-1})'(0)P(\Omega \setminus K, p, h_2; z).$$

Now fix a normalizing function h . Change the definition of J_t^ξ by replacing $G(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p; \cdot)$ by $P(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p, h; \cdot)$ in equation (3.1). Let everything else in Section 3.2 be unchanged. Then Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 still hold if the condition on α is replaced by that α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$, and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $p = f(w_e)$. Let $u(t)$ be defined by (3.4). Then $(F(t) = f^{-1}(K_{u^{-1}(t)}^\xi), 0 \leq t < S = u(T))$ is called a continuous LERW in D from w_0 to w_e , normalized by h , and is denoted by $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow w_e)$. It is almost surely generated by a random simple curve, which is called an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow w_e)$ trace normalized by h . And we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3 *For $j = 1, 2$, let $(F_j(t), 0 \leq t < S_j)$ be an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow w_e)$ normalized by h_j . Then $(F_1(t), 0 \leq t < S_1)$ and $(F_2(t)/(h_2 \circ h_1^{-1})'(0)^2), 0 \leq t < (h_2 \circ h_1^{-1})'(0)^2 S_2)$ have the same distribution.*

Thus any two $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow w_e)$ have the same distribution up to a linear time-change that is determined by the normalizing functions. And continuous LERW aiming at prime ends satisfy the conformal invariance up to a linear time-change.

Remark (i) If D is a 1-connected domain, and $w_0 \neq w_e$ are two prime ends of D , then an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow w_e)$ has the same distribution as a chordal $\text{SLE}_2(D; w_0 \rightarrow w_e)$ up to a linear time-change.

(ii) If D is a 1-connected domain, w_0 is a prime end of D , and I_e is a side arc of D that is bounded away from w_0 , then an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ has the same distribution as a strip $\text{SLE}_2(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ (c.f. [24] up to a linear time-change. Strip SLE is called dipolar SLE in [2].

(iii) If D is a 2-connected domain, w_0 is a prime end of D , and I_e is a side of D that does not contain w_0 , then an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ has the same distribution as an annulus $\text{SLE}_2(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ (c.f. [23]) up to a deterministic time-change.

4 Observables Generated by Martingales

4.1 Local martingales for continuous LERW

Suppose D is a finitely connected domain, $z_e \in D$, and w_0 is a prime end of D . Let $\gamma(t)$, $0 \leq t < S$, be an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow z_e)$ trace. So γ is a simple curve in \widehat{D} with $\gamma(0) = w_0$ and $\gamma(t) \in D$ for $0 < t < S$. For $0 \leq t < S$, let P_t be the generalized Poisson kernel in $D \setminus \gamma((0, t])$ with the pole at $\gamma(t)$, normalized by $P_t(z_e) = 1$.

Theorem 4.1 *For any fixed $z \in D$, $(P_t(z))$ is a local martingale.*

Proof. Suppose f maps D conformally onto $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ that is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and analytic Jordan curves σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, such that $f(w_0) = 0$ and $f(z_e) = p$. Let $v(t) = \text{hcap}(f(\gamma((0, t]))/2$, $0 \leq t < S$. Let $T = v(S)$, and u on $[0, T)$ be the reversal of v . Then $f(\gamma((0, u(t)])) = K_t^\xi$, $0 \leq t < T$, for some $\xi \in C([0, T])$ that solves equation (3.3). And $u(t)$ satisfies equation (3.4).

Since a time-change preserves a local martingale, so we suffice to show that $(Q_t(z) := P_{u(t)} \circ f^{-1}(z))$ is a local martingale for any fixed $z \in \Omega$. Note that $Q_t(z)$ is the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$ with the pole at $w_\xi(t) = (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(\xi(t))$, normalized by $Q_t(p) = 1$.

Let $P(t, x, \cdot)$ be the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega_t^\xi := \varphi_t^\xi(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi)$ with the pole at x , normalized by $P(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(p)) = 1$. Since φ_t^ξ maps $\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$ conformally onto Ω_t^ξ , so $Q_t(z) = P(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z))$. Since Ω_t^ξ is the domain bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, it is standard to check that $P(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is $C^{1,2,h}$ differentiable, where the superscript h means harmonic. From Ito's formula, $(Q_t(z), 0 \leq t < T)$ is a semi-martingale. So we may write

$$dQ_t(z) = \mathcal{S}_t(z)dB(t) + \mathcal{D}_t(z)dt.$$

Since Q_t is harmonic in $\mathbb{H} \setminus K_t^\xi$, and vanishes on σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, so \mathcal{D}_t is also harmonic in $\mathbb{H} \setminus K_t^\xi$, and vanishes on σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$. Since $Q_t(z) = P(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z))$, so from Ito's

formula, for any $t \in [0, T)$ and $z \in \mathbb{H} \setminus K_t^\xi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_t(z) &= \partial_1 P(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) + \partial_2 P(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) 2\partial_x R_t(\xi(t))/R_t(\xi(t)) \\ &\quad + \partial_2^2 P(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) + 2\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{3,z} P(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) \cdot \frac{2}{\varphi_t^\xi(z) - \xi(t)}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where ∂_1 and ∂_2 are partial derivatives of P w.r.t. the first two (real) variables, $\partial_{3,z} = (\partial_{3,x} - i\partial_{3,y})/2$ is the partial derivative of P w.r.t. the third (complex) variable, and $R_t(x) := \partial_y J_t^\xi(x)$. Thus for any $t \in [0, T)$, and $w \in \Omega_t^\xi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(w) &= \partial_1 P(t, \xi(t), w) + 2\partial_2 P(t, \xi(t), w) \partial_x R_t(\xi(t))/R_t(\xi(t)) \\ &\quad + \partial_2^2 P(t, \xi(t), w) + 2\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{3,z} P(t, \xi(t), w) \cdot \frac{2}{w - \xi(t)}). \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{D}_t vanishes on σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, so $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$ vanishes on $\varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Since $P(t, \xi(t), \cdot)$ vanishes on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{\xi(t)\}$, and $\frac{2}{w - \xi(t)}$ is real on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{\xi(t)\}$, so $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$ vanishes on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{\xi(t)\}$. As $w \in \mathbb{H}$ and $w \rightarrow \infty$, ∂_1 , ∂_2 , ∂_2^2 and $\partial_{3,z}$ of P at $(t, \xi(t), w)$ all tend to 0, and $\frac{2}{w - \xi(t)}$ tends to 0 as well. Thus $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$ vanishes on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{\xi(t)\}$.

There is some $c(t, x) > 0$ such that $P(t, x, w) + c(t, x) \operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{w - x}$ vanishes on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$. So there is some analytic function $F(t, x, \cdot)$ defined in some neighborhood of x such that in that neighborhood, $P(t, x, w) = \operatorname{Im}(F(t, x, w) - \frac{c(t, x)}{w - x})$. Then we have

$$\partial_1 P(t, \xi(t), w) = \operatorname{Im}(\partial_1 F(t, \xi(t), w) - \frac{\partial_1 c(t, \xi(t))}{w - \xi(t)}).$$

$$\partial_2 P(t, \xi(t), w) = \operatorname{Im}(\partial_2 F(t, \xi(t), w) - \frac{\partial_2 c(t, \xi(t))}{w - \xi(t)} - \frac{c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^2}).$$

$$\partial_2^2 P(t, \xi(t), w) = \operatorname{Im}(\partial_2^2 F(t, \xi(t), w) - \frac{\partial_2^2 c(t, \xi(t))}{w - \xi(t)} - \frac{2\partial_2 c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^2} - \frac{2c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^3}).$$

$$2\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{3,z} P(t, \xi(t), w) \cdot \frac{2}{w - \xi(t)}) = \operatorname{Im}(\frac{2F'(t, \xi(t), w)}{w - \xi(t)} + \frac{2c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^3}).$$

Thus $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(w)$ equals the imaginary part of

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_1 F(t, \xi(t), w) - \frac{\partial_1 c(t, \xi(t))}{w - \xi(t)} + 2(\partial_2 F(t, \xi(t), w) - \frac{\partial_2 c(t, \xi(t))}{w - \xi(t)} - \frac{c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^2}) \frac{\partial_x R_t(\xi(t))}{R_t(\xi(t))} \\ &+ \partial_2^2 F(t, \xi(t), w) - \frac{\partial_2^2 c(t, \xi(t))}{w - \xi(t)} - \frac{2\partial_2 c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^2} - \frac{2c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^3} + \frac{2F'(t, \xi(t), w)}{w - \xi(t)} + \frac{2c(t, \xi(t))}{(w - \xi(t))^3} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \partial_1 F(t, \xi(t), w) + \partial_2 F(t, \xi(t), w) \frac{\partial_x R_t(\xi(t))}{R_t(\xi(t))} + \partial_2^2 F(t, \xi(t), w) + \frac{A_1(t)}{w - \xi(t)} + \frac{A_2(t)}{(w - \xi(t))^2}$$

for some functions $A_1(t)$ and $A_2(t)$, where

$$A_2(t) = -2c(t, \xi(t))\partial_x R_t(\xi(t))/R_t(\xi(t)) - 2\partial_x c(t, \xi(t)).$$

We want to show $A_2(t) = 0$ for $0 \leq t < T$. It suffices to show $c(t, x)R_t(x)$ is a constant on \mathbb{R} . Since $J_t^\xi = G(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$ is the Green function in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at $\varphi_t^\xi(p)$, so $R_t(x) = \partial_y J_t^\xi(x)$ equals the Poisson kernel (in the usual sense) in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at x , valued at $\varphi_t^\xi(p)$. Recall that $P(t, x, \cdot)$ equals some constant times the usual Poisson kernel in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at x . Since the principle part of the Poisson kernel in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at x is $\text{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{w-x}$, so we have

$$R_t(x)/(-1/\pi) = P(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(p))/c(t, x) = 1/c(t, x).$$

Thus $c(t, x)\partial_y R_t(x) = -1/\pi$ is a constant, which implies that $A_2(t) = 0$. So $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(w)$ equals the imaginary part of some analytic function plus $\frac{A_1(t)}{w-\xi(t)}$ near $\xi(t)$. Since $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$ is harmonic in Ω_t^ξ , and vanishes at every prime end of Ω_t^ξ other than $\xi(t)$, so $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$ equals some real constant $C(t)$ times the Poisson kernel in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at $\xi(t)$. Finally, since $Q_t(p) = 1$ for $0 \leq t < T$, so $\mathcal{D}_t(p) = 0$ for $0 \leq t < T$. Thus $\mathcal{D}_t \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(\varphi_t^\xi(p)) = 0$. So we have $C(t) = 0$. Thus $\mathcal{D}_t \equiv 0$, $0 \leq t < T$. Therefore $dQ_t(z) = \mathcal{S}_t(z)dB(t)$. So $(Q_t(z))$ is a local martingale for any $z \in D$. \square

Second, we consider an LERW($D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e$) trace: $\gamma(t)$, $0 \leq t < S$, where w_0 is a prime end of D , and I_e is a side arc of D . Consider a generalized Poisson kernel $P_t(z)$ in $D \setminus \gamma((0, t])$ with the pole at $\gamma(t)$. Such P_t is not unique. Suppose there is g that maps a neighborhood U of I_e in \widehat{D} conformally into \mathbb{C} such that I_e is mapped to an analytic curve. Then the value of

$$\int_{g(I_e)} \partial_{\mathbf{n}}(P_t \circ g^{-1})(z) ds(z)$$

is a positive number, where \mathbf{n} is the unit normal vector pointing inwards, and ds is the length of the curve. In fact, this value does not depend on the choice of g . So we define $\int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_t(z) ds(z)$ to be equal to this value. We may choose the generalized Poisson kernel $P_t(z)$ such that $\int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_t(z) ds(z) = 1$. Such P_t exists uniquely. Then Theorem 4.1 holds in this setting, and the proof is similar.

Third, we consider an LERW($D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e$) trace: $\gamma(t)$, $0 \leq t < S$, where $w_0 \neq w_e$ are prime ends of D . Consider a generalized Poisson kernel $P_t(z)$ in $D \setminus \gamma((0, t])$ with the pole at $\gamma(t)$. Such P_t is not unique. Now we normalize P_t by its behavior at w_e . Suppose g maps a neighborhood U of w_e in \widehat{D} to a neighborhood V of 0 in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ such that $g(w_e) = 0$

and $g(U \cap \widehat{\partial}D) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then $\partial_y(P_t \circ g^{-1})(0)$ is a positive number. We may choose P_t such that $\partial_y(P_t \circ g^{-1})(0) = 1$. With these notations, we have Theorem 4.1 again, and the proof is similar.

4.2 Discrete approximations

Let D be a finitely connected domain. Suppose $0 \in \partial D$, and there is some $\delta_D > 0$ such that the half open line segment $[\delta_D, 0)$ is contained in D . As $z \in D$ and $z \rightarrow 0$ along $[\delta_D, 0)$, z tends to a prime end of D . We use 0_+ to denote this prime end.

For $\delta > 0$, let $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2 = \{(j + ik)\delta : j, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset \mathbb{C}$. We also view $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ as a graph whose vertices are $(j + ik)\delta$, $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and two vertices are adjacent iff the distance between them is δ . We define a graph \widetilde{D}^δ that approximates D in $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ as follows. The vertex set $V(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ is the union of interior vertex set $V_I(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ and boundary vertex set $V_\partial(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$, where $V_I(\widetilde{D}^\delta) := \delta\mathbb{Z}^2 \cap D$, and $V_\partial(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ is the set of ordered pairs $\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle$ such that $z_1 \in V_I(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$, $z_2 \in \partial D$, and there is $z_3 \in \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ that is adjacent to z_1 in $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$, such that $[z_1, z_2] \subset [z_1, z_3] \cap D$. Two vertices w_1 and w_2 in $V(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ are adjacent iff either $w_1, w_2 \in V_I(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$, and $[w_1, w_2] \subset D$, or for some $j = 1$ or 2 , $w_j \in V_I(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ and $w_{3-j} = \langle w_j, z_3 \rangle \in V_\partial(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ for some $z_3 \in \partial D$.

Every interior vertex of \widetilde{D}^δ has exactly 4 adjacent vertices, and every boundary vertex $w = \langle z_1, z_2 \rangle$ has exactly one adjacent vertex, which is the interior vertex z_1 . So \widetilde{D}^δ is locally finite. If $\langle z_1, z_2 \rangle$ is a boundary vertex, then it determines a boundary point, which is z_2 , and a prime end of D , which is the limit in \widehat{D} as $z \rightarrow z_2$ along $[z_1, z_2]$. If there is no ambiguity, we do not distinguish a boundary vertex from the boundary point or prime end it determines. Suppose $\delta \in (0, \delta_D]$. Then δ is an interior vertex of \widetilde{D}^δ , and $\langle \delta, 0 \rangle$ is a boundary vertex of \widetilde{D}^δ . A (simple) random walk on \widetilde{D}^δ started from an interior vertex w_0 up to the first time it leaves D agrees with a (simple) random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ started from w_0 up to the first time it uses an edge that intersects ∂D . Let D^δ be the connected component of \widetilde{D}^δ that contains δ . Let $V_I(D^\delta) := V(D^\delta) \cap V_I(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ and $V_\partial(D^\delta) := V(D^\delta) \cap V_\partial(\widetilde{D}^\delta)$ be the set of interior and boundary vertices, respectively, of D^δ .

Fix $z_e \in D$. Let w_e^δ be the vertex in $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ that is closest to z_e . If such vertex is not unique, we choose the one that maximize $\operatorname{Re} z + \pi \operatorname{Im} z$ to break the tie. Suppose $\delta \in (0, \delta_D]$ is small enough. Then there is a lattice path on \widetilde{D}^δ that connects δ with w_e^δ , which does not pass through any boundary vertex. So w_e^δ is an interior vertex of D^δ . Let $F = \{w_e^\delta\}$ and $E_{-1} = V_\partial(D^\delta)$. From the recurrence of the random walks on \mathbb{Z}^2 , we know that $E \cup F$ is reachable in D^δ . Let $(q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(\chi_\delta))$ be the LERW on D^δ started from δ conditioned to hit F before E_{-1} . So $q_\delta(0) = \delta$ and $q_\delta(\chi_\delta) = w_e^\delta$. Let $q_\delta(-1) = 0$.

Extend q_δ to $[-1, \chi_\delta]$ such that q_δ is linear on $[k-1, k]$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, \chi_\delta]}$. Then q_δ is a simple curve in $D \cup \{0\}$ that connects 0 and w_e^δ .

Since F contains only one point, we may define g_k as in Proposition 2.1. Then for any fixed vertex v_0 on D^δ , $(g_k(v_0))$ is a martingale up to the time $q_\delta(k)$ is next to w_e^δ or $E_k := E_{-1} \cup \{q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(k)\}$ disconnects v_0 from z_e . Note that g_k vanishes on $E_k \setminus \{q_\delta(k)\}$, is discrete harmonic at every interior vertices of D^δ except $q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(k)$, and $g_k(w_e^\delta) = 1$. For $0 \leq k \leq \chi_\delta - 1$, let $D_k = D \setminus q_\delta([-1, k])$. Then $q_\delta(k)$ corresponds to a prime end of D_k . When δ is small, the function g_k approximates the generalized Poisson kernel P_k in D_k with the pole at $q_\delta(k)$, normalized by $P_k(z_e) = 1$. Note the resemblance of the discrete martingales preserved by (discrete) LERW and the local martingales preserved by continuous LERW. Suppose $\gamma_0(t)$, $0 \leq t < S_0$, is an LERW($D; 0_+ \rightarrow z_e$) trace. In the last several sections, we will prove the following theorem. Note that we do not require that the boundary of D is good.

Theorem 4.2 (i) Suppose U is a neighborhood of 0_+ in D . Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, then there are a coupling of q_δ and γ_0 , and a continuous increasing function \tilde{u} that maps $(-1, \chi_\delta)$ onto $(0, S_0)$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|q_\delta(\tilde{u}^{-1}(t)) - \gamma_0(t)| : T_U(\gamma_0) \leq t < S_0\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

where $T_U(\gamma_0)$ is the first time that γ_0 leaves U .

(ii) If the prime end 0_+ is degenerate (see [15]), then the above displayed inequality holds with “ $T_U(\gamma_0) \leq t < S_0$ ” replaced by “ $0 < t < S_0$ ”.

Now we still assume $0 \in \partial D$ and $(0, \delta_D] \subset D$ for some $\delta_D > 0$. Suppose w_e is a boundary point of D other than 0 such that $w_e \in \delta_e \mathbb{Z}^2$ for some $\delta_e > 0$, and ∂D is flat near w_e , which means that there is $r > 0$ such that $D \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - w_e| < r\} = a\mathbb{H} \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - w_e| < r\}$ for some $a \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. For $\delta > 0$, let $w_e^\delta = w_e + ia\delta$.

Let \mathcal{M} be the set of $\delta > 0$ such that $w_e \in \delta \mathbb{Z}^2$. If $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ is small enough, then $\langle w_e^\delta, w_e \rangle$ is a boundary vertex of \widetilde{D}^δ , which determines the boundary point and prime end w_e , and there is a lattice path on D^δ that connects δ with w_e without passing through any other boundary vertex. Here we do not distinguish w_e from the boundary vertex $\langle w_e^\delta, w_e \rangle$. Let $F = \{w_e\}$ and $E_{-1} = V_\partial(D^\delta) \setminus F$. Then $E \cup F = V_\partial(D^\delta)$ is reachable in D^δ . Let $(q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(\chi_\delta))$ be the LERW on D^δ started from δ conditioned to hit F before E_{-1} . So $q_\delta(0) = \delta$ and $q_\delta(\chi_\delta) = w_e$. Let $q_\delta(-1) = 0$. Extend q_δ to be defined on $[-1, \chi_\delta]$ such that q_δ is linear on $[k-1, k]$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, \chi_\delta]}$. Then q_δ is a simple curve in $D \cup \{0, w_e\}$ that connects 0 and w_e .

Let h_k be as in Proposition 2.1. Then for any fixed vertex v_0 on D^δ , $(h_k(v_0))$ is a martingale up to the time when $q_\delta(k) = w_e^\delta$ or $E_k = E_{-1} \cup \{q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(k)\}$ disconnects v_0 from w_e . Let $D_k = D \setminus q_\delta([-1, k])$. Then $q_\delta(k)$ is a prime end of D_k . Note that h_k

vanishes on $q_\delta(-1), \dots, q_\delta(k-1)$ and all boundary vertices of D^δ , is discrete harmonic at all interior vertices of D^δ except $q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(k)$, and $h_k(w_e^\delta) = 1$. So when δ is small, $\delta \cdot h_k$ is close to the generalized Poisson kernel P_k in D_k with the pole at $q_\delta(k)$ normalized by $\partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_k(w_e) = 1$. Suppose $\gamma_0(t), 0 \leq t < S$, is an LERW($D; 0_+ \rightarrow w_e$) trace. Then Theorem 4.2 still holds for q_δ and γ_0 defined here if we replace “ $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ ” by “ $\delta \in (0, \delta_0) \cap \mathcal{M}$ ”.

Now suppose I_e is a side arc of D that is bounded away from 0_+ . Let I_e^δ be the set of boundary vertices of D^δ which determine prime ends that lie on I_e . If δ is small enough, I_e^δ is nonempty, and there is a lattice path on D^δ that connecting δ with I_e^δ without passing through any boundary vertex of not in I_e^δ . Then we let $F = I_e^\delta$ and $E_{-1} = V_\partial(D^\delta) \setminus F$. Let $(q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(\chi_\delta))$ be the LERW on D^δ started from δ conditioned to hit F before E_{-1} . So $q_\delta(0) = \delta$ and $q_\delta(\chi_\delta) \in I_e$.

Let h_k be as in Proposition 2.1. Then for any fixed vertex v_0 on D^δ , $(h_k(v_0))$ is a martingale up to the time $q_\delta(k)$ is close to I_e or $E_k := E_{-1} \cup \{q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(k)\}$ disconnects v_0 from I_e . Note that h_k vanishes on $q_\delta(-1), \dots, q_\delta(k-1)$ and all boundary vertices of D^δ , h_k is discrete harmonic at every interior vertex of D^δ except $q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(k)$, and $\sum_{v \in I_e^\delta} \Delta h_k(v) = 1$. So when δ is small, the function h_k seems to be close to the generalized Poisson kernel P_k in D_k with the pole at $q_\delta(k)$ normalized by $\int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_k(z) ds(z) = 1$.

If I_e is a whole side of D , then Theorem 4.2 still holds for q_δ and γ_0 defined here. If I_e is not a whole side, for the purpose of convergence, we may need some additional boundary conditions. Suppose the two ends of I_e correspond to two boundary points w_e^1 and w_e^2 of D , ∂D is flat near w_e^1 and w_e^2 , and $w_e^1, w_e^2 \in \delta_e \mathbb{Z}^2$ for some $\delta_e > 0$. Let \mathcal{M} be the set of $\delta > 0$ such that $w_e^1, w_e^2 \in \delta \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then Theorem 4.2 still holds for q_δ and γ_0 defined here if we replace “ $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ ” by “ $\delta \in (0, \delta_0) \cap \mathcal{M}$ ”.

5 Existence and Uniqueness

In this section we will prove Theorem 3.1. The proof is somehow similar to that of the existence and uniqueness of the solution of an ordinary differential equation.

5.1 Convergence of domains

A domain in this paper is a nonempty connected open subset of the complex plane \mathbb{C} .

Definition 5.1 *Suppose D_n is a sequence of domains and D is a domain. We say that (D_n) converges to D , denoted by $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D$, if for every $z \in D$, $\text{dist}(z, \partial D_n) \rightarrow \text{dist}(z, \partial D)$. This is equivalent to the followings:*

- (i) *every compact subset of D is contained in all but finitely many D_n 's;*
- (ii) *for every point $z_0 \in \partial D$, the distance from z_0 to ∂D_n tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

A sequence of domains may converge to two different domains. For example, let $D_n = \mathbb{C} \setminus ((-\infty, n])$. Then $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H}$, and $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} -\mathbb{H}$ as well. But two different limit domains of the same domain sequence must be disjoint from each other, because if they have nonempty intersection, then one contains some boundary point of the other, which implies a contradiction.

If only condition (i) in the definition is satisfied, then for any $z \in D$, $\text{dist}(z, \partial D) \leq \liminf \text{dist}(z, \partial D_n)$. Thus $D_n \cap D \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D$. If $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D$, $E_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} E$, and $z_0 \in D \cap E$. Let F_n (F , resp.) be the connected component of $D_n \cap E_n$ ($D \cap E$, resp.) that contains z_0 . Then for any $z \in F$, $\text{dist}(z, \partial F_n) = \text{dist}(z, \partial D_n) \wedge \text{dist}(z, \partial E_n)$ for each n , and $\text{dist}(z, \partial F) = \text{dist}(z, \partial D) \wedge \text{dist}(z, \partial E)$, which implies $F_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} F$. Thus if $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D$, $E_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} E$, $D_n \subset E_n$ for each n , and $D \cap E \neq \emptyset$, then we have $D \subset E$.

Suppose $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D$, and for each n , f_n is a function on D_n , and f is a function on D . We say that f_n converges to f locally uniformly in D , or $f_n \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} f$ in D , if for each compact subset F of D , f_n converges to f uniformly on F . If every f_n is analytic (harmonic, resp.), then f is also analytic (harmonic, resp.).

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D$, f_n is a conformal map of D_n for each n , and $f_n \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} f$ in D . Then either f is constant on D , or f is a conformal map of D . And in the latter case, $f(D_n) \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} f(D)$ and $f_n^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} f^{-1}$ in $f(D)$.*

This lemma is similar to Theorem 1.8, the Carathéodory kernel theorem, in [15], and the proof is also similar. When applying this lemma, we will usually first exclude the possibility that f is constant, and then obtain the convergence of the image domains and the inverse functions.

5.2 Topology on the space of hulls

If H is a nonempty hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , then $\overline{H} \cap \mathbb{R}$ is nonempty. Let $a_H = \inf(\overline{H} \cap \mathbb{R})$ and $b_H = \sup(\overline{H} \cap \mathbb{R})$. Let

$$\Sigma_H = \mathbb{C} \setminus (H \cup \{\bar{z} : z \in H\} \cup [a_H, b_H]).$$

By reflection principle, φ_H extends to Σ_H , and maps Σ_H conformally onto $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$ for some $c_H < d_H \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, φ_H is increasing on $(-\infty, a_H)$ and $(b_H, +\infty)$, and maps them onto $(-\infty, c_H)$ and $(d_H, +\infty)$, respectively. So φ_H^{-1} extends conformally to $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. And $[c_H, d_H]$ is the smallest in the sense that if φ_H^{-1} extends conformally to $\mathbb{C} \setminus I$ for some closed interval I , then $[c_H, d_H] \subset I$. If $H = \emptyset$, we do not define a_H, b_H, c_H, d_H , but still use the notations $[a_\emptyset, b_\emptyset]$ and $[c_\emptyset, d_\emptyset]$ to denote empty sets. Then $\Sigma_\emptyset = \mathbb{C}$, so it is true that φ_\emptyset maps Σ_\emptyset conformally onto $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_\emptyset, d_\emptyset]$.

If γ is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} , we define $H(\gamma)$ to be γ unions the bounded component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \gamma$. Then $H(\gamma)$ is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ . We call it the hull bounded by γ . If $A \subset \overline{H(\gamma)}$, then we say γ encloses A . If $A \subset \overline{H(\gamma)}$ and $\overline{A} \cap \overline{\gamma} = \emptyset$, then we say γ strictly encloses A . For simplicity, we write x_γ instead of $x_{H(\gamma)}$ when x is one of the following symbols: $a, b, c, d, \Sigma, \varphi$.

Since $\widehat{\partial}(\mathbb{H} \setminus H(\gamma)) = (\widehat{\mathbb{R}} \setminus (a_\gamma, b_\gamma)) \cup \gamma$ is a simple curve, so φ_γ extends to a homeomorphism of $\mathbb{H} \setminus H(\gamma)$, and maps γ onto $[c_\gamma, d_\gamma]$. So $\varphi_{H(\gamma)}^{-1}$ has a continuous extension to $\mathbb{H} \cup \mathbb{R}$, and maps (c_γ, d_γ) onto γ . From the results about Poisson kernel, we have

$$\varphi_\gamma^{-1}(z) - z = \int_{c_\gamma}^{d_\gamma} \frac{-1}{z - x} \frac{\operatorname{Im} \varphi_\gamma^{-1}(x)}{\pi} dx,$$

for any $z \in \Sigma_\gamma$. From the behavior of φ_γ near ∞ , we have $\int_{c_\gamma}^{d_\gamma} \operatorname{Im} \varphi_\gamma^{-1}(x)/\pi dx = \operatorname{hcap}(H(\gamma))$. If H is a general nonempty hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , then φ_H^{-1} may not have continuous extension to $[c_H, d_H]$. We may use a sequence of hulls bounded by crosscuts to approximate H . Then we conclude that there is a positive measure μ_H supported by $[c_H, d_H]$ with total mass $|\mu_H| = \operatorname{hcap}(H)$ such that for any $z \in \Sigma_H$,

$$\varphi_H^{-1}(z) - z = \int_{c_H}^{d_H} \frac{-1}{z - x} d\mu_H(x). \quad (5.1)$$

Example: Suppose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r_0 > 0$. Let $\alpha = \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z - x_0| = r_0\}$. Then α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} , $H(\alpha) = \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z - x_0| \leq r_0\}$, and $[a_\alpha, b_\alpha] = [x_0 - r_0, x_0 + r_0]$. It is clear that $\varphi_\alpha(z) = z + \frac{r_0^2}{z - x_0}$. Thus $\operatorname{hcap}(H(\alpha)) = r_0^2$, and $[c_\alpha, d_\alpha] = [x_0 - 2r_0, x_0 + 2r_0]$.

Lemma 5.2 *If H is a nonempty hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , then $\varphi_H^{-1}(x) > x$ for any $x \in (-\infty, c_H)$; $\varphi_H^{-1}(x) < x$ for any $x \in (d_H, +\infty)$; $\varphi_H(x) < x$ for any $x \in (-\infty, a_H)$; $\varphi_H(x) > x$ for any $x \in (b_H, +\infty)$. So if H is any hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , then $[a_H, b_H] \subset [c_H, d_H]$.*

Proof. This follows from (5.1) and that φ_H maps $(-\infty, a_H)$ and $(b_H, +\infty)$ onto $(-\infty, c_H)$ and $(d_H, +\infty)$, respectively. \square

If $H_1 \subset H_2$ are two hulls in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , we call H_1 a sub-hull of H_2 . Then $H_2/H_1 := \varphi_{H_1}(H_2 \setminus H_1)$ is also a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ . We call H_2/H_1 a quotient-hull of H_2 . It is clear that $\varphi_{H_2} = \varphi_{H_2/H_1} \circ \varphi_{H_1}$. Thus $\operatorname{hcap}(H_2) = \operatorname{hcap}(H_2/H_1) + \operatorname{hcap}(H_1)$, and so $\operatorname{hcap}(H_1), \operatorname{hcap}(H_2/H_1) \leq \operatorname{hcap}(H_2)$.

Lemma 5.3 *If $H_1 \subset H_2$ are two hulls in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , then $[c_{H_1}, d_{H_1}] \subset [c_{H_2}, d_{H_2}]$ and $[c_{H_2/H_1}, d_{H_2/H_1}] \subset [c_{H_2}, d_{H_2}]$.*

Proof. If $H_1 = \emptyset$ or $H_1 = H_2$, then $H_2/H_1 = H_2$ or $H_2/H_1 = \emptyset$, so it is trivial. Now suppose $\emptyset \subsetneq H_1 \subsetneq H_2$. Then $H_2/H_1 \neq \emptyset$. Since $\varphi_{H_2/H_1}^{-1}(z) = \varphi_{H_1} \circ \varphi_{H_2}^{-1}(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{H}$, $\varphi_{H_2}^{-1}$ maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_{H_2}, d_{H_2}]$ onto Σ_{H_2} , and φ_{H_1} extends conformally to $\Sigma_{H_1} \supset \Sigma_{H_2}$, so φ_{H_2/H_1}^{-1} extends conformally to $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_{H_2}, d_{H_2}]$. From the minimum property of $[c_{H_2/H_1}, d_{H_2/H_1}]$, we have $[c_{H_2/H_1}, d_{H_2/H_1}] \subset [c_{H_2}, d_{H_2}]$.

If $x \in (-\infty, a_{H_2})$, then $\varphi_{H_2}(x) \in (-\infty, c_{H_2}) \subset (-\infty, c_{H_2/H_1})$. Since $\varphi_{H_2/H_1}^{-1}(x) > x$ on $(-\infty, c_{H_2/H_1})$, so $\varphi_{H_1}(x) = \varphi_{H_2/H_1}^{-1} \circ \varphi_{H_2}(x) > \varphi_{H_2}(x)$. Thus

$$c_{H_1} = \sup \varphi_{H_1}((-\infty, a_{H_1})) \geq \sup \varphi_{H_1}((-\infty, a_{H_2})) \geq \sup \varphi_{H_2}((-\infty, a_{H_2})) = c_{H_2}.$$

Similarly, we have $d_{H_1} \leq d_{H_2}$. Thus $[c_{H_1}, d_{H_1}] \subset [c_{H_2}, d_{H_2}]$. \square

Corollary 5.1 *If $H_1 \subset H_2 \subset H_3$ are hulls in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ , then $\text{hcap}(H_2/H_1) \leq \text{hcap}(H_3)$ and $[c_{H_2/H_1}, d_{H_2/H_1}] \subset [c_{H_3}, d_{H_3}]$. We call H_2/H_1 a sub-quotient-hull of H_3 .*

Let H be a nonempty hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ . Let $\mathcal{H}(H)$ denote the set of all sub-hulls of H . Let $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$ denote the set of all sub-quotient-hulls of H . If α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} , we write $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$ for $\mathcal{H}(H(\alpha))$, and $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(\alpha)$ for $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(H(\alpha))$. Choose $d > 0$. Let $\alpha = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - (c_H + d_H)/2| = |d_H - c_H|/2 + d\}$. Then α is a Jordan curve that encloses $[c_H, d_H]$, and d is the distance between α and $[c_H, d_H]$. Suppose $K \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$. Then $[c_K, d_K] \subset [c_H, d_H]$. If z lies on or outside α , from equation (5.1),

$$|\varphi_K^{-1}(z) - z| \leq |\mu_K|/d = \text{hcap}(K)/d \leq \text{hcap}(H)/d.$$

If $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_K, d_K]$ lies inside α , then $\varphi_K^{-1}(z)$ lies inside $\varphi_K^{-1}(\alpha)$. Choose $w \in \alpha$, then

$$|\varphi_K^{-1}(z) - z| \leq |z - w| + |w - \varphi_K^{-1}(w)| + |\varphi_K^{-1}(w) - \varphi_K^{-1}(z)|$$

$$\leq \text{diam}(\alpha) + \text{hcap}(H)/d + \text{diam}(\varphi_K^{-1}(\alpha)) \leq 2|d_H - c_H| + 4d + 3\text{hcap}(H)/d.$$

Let $d = \sqrt{\text{hcap}(H)}$ and $M_H = 2|d_H - c_H| + 7\sqrt{\text{hcap}(H)}$. Then for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_K, d_K]$, $|\varphi_K^{-1}(z) - z| \leq M_H$. Since φ_K^{-1} maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_K, d_K]$ onto Σ_K , so for any $z \in \Sigma_K$, $|\varphi_K(z) - z| \leq M_H$. Since $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_K, d_K] \supset \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, so $\{\varphi_K^{-1}(z) - z : K \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$ by M_H , and so is a normal family.

Let \mathcal{H} denote the set of all hulls in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ . Choose a sequence of compact subsets (F_n) of \mathbb{H} such that $F_n \subset \text{int} F_{n+1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\cup_n F_n = \mathbb{H}$. We may define a distant function $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ on \mathcal{H} such that

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(H_1, H_2) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} (1 \wedge \sup_{z \in F_n} \{|\varphi_{H_1}^{-1}(z) - \varphi_{H_2}^{-1}(z)|\}).$$

It is clear that $H_n \rightarrow H$ w.r.t. $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ iff $\varphi_{H_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_H^{-1}$ in \mathbb{H} . So the topology does not depend on the choice of (F_n) . We use $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}}$ to denote the convergence w.r.t. $d_{\mathcal{H}}$.

From Lemma 5.1, if $H_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} H$, then $\mathbb{H} \setminus H_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus H$ and $\varphi_{H_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_H$ in $\mathbb{H} \setminus H$. However, $\mathbb{H} \setminus H_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus H$ does not imply $H_n \setminus H$. For example, let $H_n = \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z - 2n| \leq n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathbb{H} \setminus H_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H} \setminus \emptyset$, but $\varphi_{H_n}(z) = z + n^2/(z - 2n) \not\rightarrow z = \varphi_{\emptyset}(z)$. And $H_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} H$ does not imply $\Sigma_{H_n} \rightarrow \Sigma_H$. For example, let $H_n = \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |\operatorname{Re} z| \leq 1, \operatorname{Im} z \leq 1/n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $H_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} \emptyset$, but $\Sigma_{H_n} \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1] \neq \mathbb{C} = \Sigma_{\emptyset}$.

Suppose $H_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} H$, $K_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} K$, and $K_n \subset H_n$ for each n . Then $\mathbb{H} \setminus H_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus H$, $\mathbb{H} \setminus K_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus K$, and $\mathbb{H} \setminus H_n \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus K_n$ for each n . Since $(\mathbb{H} \setminus H) \cap (\mathbb{H} \setminus K) = \mathbb{H} \setminus (H \cup K) \neq \emptyset$, so $\mathbb{H} \setminus H \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus K$. Thus $K \subset H$. Let $L_n = H_n/K_n$ for each n and $L = K/H$. Then $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} = \varphi_{K_n} \circ \varphi_{H_n}^{-1}$ and $\varphi_L^{-1} = \varphi_K \circ \varphi_H^{-1}$. Since $\varphi_{H_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_H^{-1}$ in \mathbb{H} , and $\varphi_{K_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K$ in $\mathbb{H} \setminus K \supset \mathbb{H} \setminus H = \varphi_H(\mathbb{H})$, so $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_L^{-1}$ in \mathbb{H} . Thus $L_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} L$, i.e., $H_n/K_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} H/K$.

Lemma 5.4 (Compactness) $\mathcal{H}(H)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$ are compact. Moreover, we have
(i) Suppose (K_n) is a sequence in $\mathcal{H}(H)$, then it has a subsequence (L_n) that converges to some $K \in \mathcal{H}(H)$ w.r.t. $d_{\mathcal{H}}$, and $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, $\Sigma_{L_n} \setminus [a_H, b_H] \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \Sigma_K \setminus [a_H, b_H]$, and $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K$ in $\Sigma_K \setminus [a_H, b_H]$.
(ii) Suppose (K_n) is a sequence in $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$, then it has a subsequence (L_n) that converges to some $K \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$, w.r.t. $d_{\mathcal{H}}$, and $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, $\Sigma_{L_n} \setminus [c_H, d_H] \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \Sigma_K \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, and $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K$ in $\Sigma_K \setminus [c_H, d_H]$.

Proof. (i) Since $\{\varphi_{K_n}^{-1}(z) - z : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, so (K_n) has a subsequence (L_n) such that $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1}(z) - z$ converges to some function f locally uniformly in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Then $|f(z)| \leq M$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Let $g(z) = f(z) + z$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Then $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} g$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. There are $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$ with $|z_1 - z_2| > 2M$. Then $|g(z_1) - g(z_2)| \geq |z_1 - z_2| - |g(z_1) - z_1| - |g(z_2) - z_2| > 2M - M - M = 0$. So g is not constant. From Lemma 5.1, g is a conformal map. Since for each n , $\mathbb{H} \supset \varphi_{L_n}^{-1}(\mathbb{H}) = \mathbb{H} \setminus L_n \supset \mathbb{H} \setminus H$, so $\mathbb{H} \supset g(\mathbb{H}) \supset \mathbb{H} \setminus H$. Let $K = \mathbb{H} \setminus g(\mathbb{H})$. Then $K \in \mathcal{H}(H)$, and g maps \mathbb{H} conformally onto $\mathbb{H} \setminus K$. Since $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1}(z) - z = O(1/z)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$, so $g(z) - z = O(1/z)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $g(z) = \varphi_K^{-1}(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. So $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Especially, $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K^{-1}$ in \mathbb{H} . So K is a subsequential limit of (K_n) . Thus $\mathcal{H}(H)$ is compact.

For $L \in \mathcal{H}(H)$, let $\Sigma_L^1 := \Sigma_L \setminus [a_H, b_H]$, $\Sigma_L^2 := \Sigma_L \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Then $\Sigma_L^2 \subset \Sigma_L^1$, and

$$\Sigma_L^1 = (\mathbb{H} \setminus L) \cup \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \bar{z} \in \mathbb{H} \setminus L\} \cup (-\infty, a_H) \cup (b_H, +\infty), \quad (5.2)$$

$$\Sigma_L^2 = (\mathbb{H} \setminus L) \cup \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \bar{z} \in \mathbb{H} \setminus L\} \cup (-\infty, c_H) \cup (d_H, +\infty), \quad (5.3)$$

because $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_L) \cap \mathbb{R} \subset [a_L, b_L] \subset [a_H, b_H] \subset [c_H, d_H]$. So from $\mathbb{H} \setminus L_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus K$, we have $\Sigma_{L_n}^j \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \Sigma_K^j$ for $j = 1, 2$. From Lemma 5.1, $\varphi_{L_n}^{-1}(\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]) \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \varphi_K^{-1}(\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H])$ and $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K$ in $\varphi_K^{-1}(\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H])$. Note that $\varphi_K^{-1}(\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]) \supset \Sigma_K^2$, where the inclusion follows from Lemma 5.2. Thus $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \phi_K$ in Σ_K^2 .

Since $|\varphi_{L_n}(z) - z| \leq M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \Sigma_{L_n}$, and $\Sigma_{L_n}^1 \subset \Sigma_{L_n}$, so every subsequence of (φ_{L_n}) has a subsequence that converges to some analytic function h locally uniformly in Σ_K^1 . Since $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \phi_K$ in $\Sigma_K^2 \subset \Sigma_K^1$, so h agrees with φ_K on Σ_K^2 . Since they are both analytic, so h agrees with φ_K on Σ_K^1 . Since all subsequential limits of φ_{L_n} in Σ_K^1 are the same function φ_K , so $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K$ in $\Sigma_K^1 = \Sigma_K \setminus [a_H, b_H]$.

(ii) Suppose $K_n = K_n^2/K_n^1$ with $K_n^1 \subset K_n^2 \subset H$. From (i), (K_n) has a subsequence $(L_n = L_n^2/L_n^1)$ such that $L_n^j \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} K^j$ for some $K^j \in \mathcal{H}(H)$, $j = 1, 2$. Since $L_n^1 \subset L_n^2$ for each n , so $K^1 \subset K^2$. Let $K = K_2/K_1$. Then $K \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$, and $L_n = L_n^2/L_n^1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} K^2/K_1 = K$. So K is a subsequential limit of (K_n) . Thus $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$ is compact.

Since $\{\varphi_{L_n}^{-1}(z) - z : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, so every subsequence of $(\varphi_{L_n}^{-1})$ has a subsequence which converges to some h locally uniformly in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Then h agrees with φ_K^{-1} on \mathbb{H} . Since they are both analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$, so h agrees with φ_K^{-1} on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. Thus $(\varphi_{L_n}^{-1}) \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [c_H, d_H]$.

For $L \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(H)$, we define Σ_L^j , $j = 1, 2$, as in (i). Then equation (5.3) still holds but (5.2) does not because $[a_L, b_L] \subset [c_L, d_L] \subset [c_H, d_H]$, but $[a_L, b_L] \subset [a_H, b_H]$ may not hold. A similar argument gives that $\varphi_{L_n} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} \varphi_K$ in $\Sigma_K^2 = \Sigma_K \setminus [c_H, d_H]$. \square

5.3 Lipschitz conditions

Suppose $\xi \in C([0, a])$ for some $a > 0$, and $K_a^\xi \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha)$. Then for each $t \in [0, a]$, $\varphi_t^\xi = \varphi_{K_t^\xi}$, and $K_t^\xi \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha)$. For $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq a$, let $K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi = K_{t_2}^\xi / K_{t_1}^\xi$. Then $K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(\alpha)$, and $\varphi_{K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi} = \varphi_{t_2}^\xi \circ (\varphi_{t_1}^\xi)^{-1}$, $\varphi_{K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi}^{-1} = \varphi_{t_1}^\xi \circ (\varphi_{t_2}^\xi)^{-1}$. Since $\xi(t_1) \in K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi$, so

$$\xi(t_1) \in [a_{K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi}, b_{K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi}] \subset [c_{K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi}, d_{K_{t_1, t_2}^\xi}] \subset [c_\alpha, d_\alpha].$$

This holds for any $t_1 \in [0, a)$. Since ξ is continuous, so we also have $\xi(a) \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$.

Lemma 5.5 *Suppose α_0 and α_1 are crosscuts in \mathbb{H} , and α_0 is strictly enclosed by α_1 . Then there are $\delta, C > 0$ depending only on α_0 and α_1 such that if $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$, $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$, and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha_0)$, then $K_a^\eta \subset H(\alpha_1)$, and for any $z \in \overline{\mathbb{H} \setminus H(\alpha_1)}$,*

$$|\varphi_a^\zeta(z) - \varphi_a^\eta(z)| \leq Ca\|\zeta - \eta\|_a.$$

Proof. Suppose $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$ and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha_0)$. Choose a crosscut $\alpha_{0.5}$ in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses α_0 , and is strictly enclosed by α_1 . Then $\overline{\alpha_{0.5}}$ and $\overline{\alpha_1}$ are disjoint compact subsets of Σ_{α_0} , which contains $\Sigma_K \setminus [a_{\alpha_0}, b_{\alpha_0}]$ for any $K \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_0)$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_0)$, there is $d > 0$, such that the distance between $\varphi_K(\alpha_{0.5})$ and $\varphi_K(\alpha_1)$ is at least d for any $K \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_0)$. For $t \in [0, a]$, since $K_t^\zeta \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_0)$, so the distance between $\varphi_t^\zeta(\alpha_{0.5})$ and $\varphi_t^\zeta(\alpha_1)$ is at least d . Since K_a^ζ is enclosed by $\alpha_{0.5}$, so $K_{t,a}^\zeta = \varphi_t^\zeta(K_a^\zeta \setminus K_t^\zeta)$ is enclosed by $\varphi_t^\zeta(\alpha_{0.5})$, which implies that $\zeta(t) \in \overline{K_{t,a}^\zeta}$ is enclosed by $\varphi_t^\zeta(\alpha_{0.5})$. Thus the distance between $\zeta(t)$ and $\varphi_t^\zeta(z)$ is at least d for any $z \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \overline{H(\alpha_1)}$ and $t \in [0, a]$. Fix $z \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \overline{H(\alpha_1)}$ and $\delta \in (0, d/3]$. Then $|\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \zeta(t)| \geq d$ for any $t \in [0, a]$. Suppose $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$. Note that $\varphi_0^\zeta(z) = z = \varphi_0^\eta(z)$. Let $[0, b)$ be the maximal subinterval of $[0, a)$ on which $\varphi_t^\eta(z)$ is defined and $|\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \varphi_t^\eta(z)| \leq d/3$. Then for any $t \in [0, b)$,

$$|\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \eta(t)| \geq |\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \zeta(t)| - |\zeta(t) - \eta(t)| \geq 2d/3;$$

$$|\varphi_t^\eta(z) - \eta(t)| \geq |\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \eta(t)| - |\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \varphi_t^\eta(z)| \geq d/3.$$

Thus $\varphi_b^\eta(z)$ is also defined. From chordal Loewner equation, for $t \in [0, b]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_t^\zeta(z) - \varphi_t^\eta(z)| &\leq \int_0^t \left| \frac{2}{\varphi_s^\zeta(z) - \zeta(s)} - \frac{2}{\varphi_s^\eta(z) - \eta(s)} \right| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \left| \frac{2(\zeta(s) - \eta(s))}{(\varphi_s^\zeta(z) - \zeta(s))(\varphi_s^\zeta(z) - \eta(s))} \right| ds + \int_0^t \left| \frac{2(\varphi_s^\eta(z) - \varphi_s^\zeta(z))}{(\varphi_s^\zeta(z) - \eta(s))(\varphi_s^\eta(z) - \eta(s))} \right| ds. \\ &\leq \frac{3t}{d^2} \|\zeta - \eta\|_a + \frac{9}{d^2} \int_0^t |\varphi_s^\zeta(z) - \varphi_s^\eta(z)| ds \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\leq \frac{3\delta t}{d^2} + \frac{9}{d^2} \int_0^t |\varphi_s^\zeta(z) - \varphi_s^\eta(z)| ds. \quad (5.5)$$

Solving inequality (5.5), we get

$$|\varphi_b^\zeta(z) - \varphi_b^\eta(z)| \leq \delta/3(e^{\frac{9b}{d^2}} - 1) \leq \delta/3(e^{\frac{9a}{d^2}} - 1).$$

Let $h = \text{hcap}(H(\alpha_0))$. Then $a = \text{hcap}(K_a^\zeta)/2 \leq h/2$. Now we choose

$$\delta = \min\{d/3, \frac{d/2}{e^{9h/2d^2} - 1}\}.$$

Then $|\varphi_b^\zeta(z) - \varphi_b^\eta(z)| \leq d/6$. So we have $b = a$, which implies that $\varphi_t^\eta(z)$ is defined on $[0, a]$, i.e., $z \notin K_a^\eta$. Since this is true for any $z \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \overline{H(\alpha_1)}$, so $K_a^\eta \subset H(\alpha_1)$. Finally, let $C = (\exp(\frac{9h}{2d^2}) - 1)/(3h/2)$. Solving inequality (5.4) for $t \in [0, a]$, we get

$$|\varphi_a^\zeta(z) - \varphi_a^\eta(z)| \leq (e^{\frac{9a}{d^2}} - 1)/3 \|\zeta - \eta\|_a \leq Ca \|\zeta - \eta\|_a$$

for any $z \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \overline{H(\alpha_1)}$, where the second “ \leq ” holds because $a \leq h/2$. \square

Lemma 5.6 Suppose α and ρ are crosscuts in \mathbb{H} , and $[c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$ is strictly enclosed by ρ . Then there are $\delta, C > 0$ depending only on α and ρ , such that if $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$, $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$, and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$, then K_a^η is enclosed by $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho)$, and for any $w \in \mathbb{H} \setminus H(\rho)$,

$$|w - \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(w)| \leq Ca\|\zeta - \eta\|_a.$$

Proof. Suppose $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$ and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$. Choose ρ_0 that strictly encloses $[c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, and is strictly enclosed by ρ . Then for any $t \in [0, a]$, $\zeta(t) \in \overline{K_{t,a}^\zeta}$ is enclosed by $\varphi_{K_{t,a}^\zeta}^{-1}(\rho_0)$. Note that $K_{t,a}^\zeta \in \mathcal{H}_{sq}(\alpha)$ and $\varphi_{K_{t,a}^\zeta}^{-1} = \varphi_t^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}_{sq}(\alpha)$ and an argument that is similar to the first paragraph of the last proof, we see that there is $d > 0$ depending only on α and ρ such that $|\varphi_t^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(w) - \zeta(t)| \geq d$ for any $t \in [0, a]$ and $w \in \mathbb{H} \setminus H(\rho)$. Fix $w \in \mathbb{H} \setminus H(\rho)$. Apply the argument of the second paragraph in the last proof to $z = (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(w)$. Then we have $\delta, C > 0$ depending only on α and ρ such that if $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$, then $\varphi_a^\eta(z)$ is well defined, and

$$|w - \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(w)| = |\varphi_a^\zeta(z) - \varphi_a^\eta(z)| \leq Ca\|\zeta - \eta\|_a.$$

That $\varphi_a^\eta(z)$ is well defined implies that $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(w) = z \notin K_a^\eta$. Since this holds for any $w \in \mathbb{H} \setminus H(\rho)$, so K_a^η is enclosed by $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho)$. \square

Now suppose Ω is a finitely connected subdomain of \mathbb{H} that is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $p \in \Omega$. If K is a hull in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ that is contained in $\Omega \setminus \{p\}$, let $\Omega_K = \varphi_K(\Omega \setminus K)$, $G_K = G(\Omega \setminus K, p; \cdot)$, and $J_K = G_K \circ \varphi_K^{-1} = G(\Omega_K, \varphi_K(p); \cdot)$. If $\xi \in C([0, a])$, $a > 0$, and $K_a^\xi \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$, then we write Ω_a^ξ for $\Omega_{K_a^\xi}$, and G_a^ξ for $G_{K_a^\xi}$. So $J_a^\xi = J_{K_a^\xi} = G_a^\xi \circ (\varphi_a^\xi)^{-1} = G(\Omega_a^\xi, \varphi_a^\xi(p); \cdot)$.

Suppose α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, there is $\mathbf{h} > 0$ depending only on Ω, p, α , such that if $K \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, then $\text{dist}(\varphi_K(\cup_{j=1}^m \sigma_j \cup \{p\}), \mathbb{R}) \geq \mathbf{h}$. Let ρ be a crosscut in \mathbb{H} with height smaller than $\mathbf{h}/2$ that strictly encloses $[c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$. Then for any $K \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, $H(\varphi_K(\rho)) \subset \Omega_K \setminus \{\varphi_K(p)\}$.

Lemma 5.7 Let Ω, p, α, ρ be as above. Then there are $\delta, C > 0$ depending only on Ω, p, α, ρ , such that if $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$, $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$, and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $z \in \rho$,

$$|J_a^\zeta(z) - J_a^\eta(z)| \leq Ca\|\zeta - \eta\|_a. \quad (5.6)$$

Proof. Suppose $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$ and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$. Choose a crosscut α_1 in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses α such that $H(\alpha_1) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. From Lemma 5.5, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending only on α and α_1 such that if $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta_0$, then $K_a^\eta \subset H(\alpha_1)$.

Choose a crosscut ρ_1 in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses $[c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, and is strictly enclosed by ρ . From Lemma 5.6, there are $\delta_1, C_1 > 0$ depending only on α, ρ, ρ_1 , such that if $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta_1$, then K_a^η is enclosed by $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1)$, and for any $z \in \rho \cup \rho_1$,

$$|z - \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi^\zeta)^{-1}(z)| \leq C_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a. \quad (5.7)$$

Let $F = \{z \in \overline{\mathbb{H}} : \text{dist}(z, H(\rho)) \leq \mathbf{h}/4\}$. Since Ω_K is the domain bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\varphi_K(\sigma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $J_k = G(\Omega_K, \varphi_K(p); \cdot)$, so from the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$, there is $D > 0$ depending only on Ω, p, α_1, F , such that for any $K \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$ and $z \in F$,

$$|\nabla J_K(z)| \leq D. \quad (5.8)$$

Let $h_0 = \text{hcap}(H(\alpha))$. Then $a = \text{hcap}(K_a^\zeta)/2 \leq h_0/2$. Let $\delta = \min\{\delta_0, \delta_1, \mathbf{h}/(2C_1 h_0)\}$. Suppose $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$. Then for any $z \in \rho \cup \rho_1$,

$$|z - \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi^\zeta)^{-1}(z)| \leq C_1 a \delta \leq C_1 h_0 \delta / 2 \leq \mathbf{h}/4,$$

which implies that $[z, \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi^\zeta)^{-1}(z)] \subset F$.

Let

$$M = \sup_{z \in \rho} \{|G_a^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z) - G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\eta)^{-1}(z)|\};$$

$$M_1 = \sup_{z \in \rho_1} \{|G_a^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z) - G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\eta)^{-1}(z)|\};$$

$$N = \sup_{z \in \rho} \{|G_a^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z) - G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z)|\};$$

$$N_1 = \sup_{z \in \rho_1} \{|G_a^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z) - G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z)|\}.$$

There is $q \in (0, 1)$ depending only on ρ and ρ_1 such that for any $z \in \rho_1$, the probability that a plane Brownian motion started from z hits ρ before \mathbb{R} is less than q . Since both $G_a^\zeta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1} = J_a^\zeta$ and $G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\eta)^{-1} = J_a^\eta$ are harmonic in $H(\rho)$, have continuations to $H(\rho)$, and vanish on \mathbb{R} , so $J_a^\zeta - J_a^\eta$ also has these properties. Since $\rho_1 \subset H(\rho)$, so

$$M_1 = \sup_{z \in \rho_1} \{|J_a^\zeta(z) - J_a^\eta(z)|\} \leq q \sup_{z \in \rho} \{|J_a^\zeta(z) - J_a^\eta(z)|\} = qM.$$

Since K_a^ζ and K_a^η are enclosed by $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1)$, so G_a^ζ and G_a^η are harmonic in $\Omega \setminus \{p\} \setminus H((\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1))$. Since they both behave as $-\ln(z-p)/(2\pi) + O(1)$ as $z \rightarrow p$, so $G_a^\zeta - G_a^\eta$ is harmonic in $\Omega \setminus H((\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1))$. Since $G_a^\zeta - G_a^\eta$ vanishes at every boundary point of $\Omega \setminus H((\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1))$ including ∞ , except on $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1)$, and $(\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho) \subset \Omega \setminus H((\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1))$, so from the maximum principle for harmonic functions,

$$N = \sup_{z \in (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho)} \{|G_a^\zeta(z) - G_a^\eta(z)|\} \leq \sup_{z \in (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(\rho_1)} \{|G_a^\zeta(z) - G_a^\eta(z)|\} = N_1.$$

From $[z, \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi^\zeta)^{-1}(z)] \subset F$ for $z \in \rho$, $K_a^\eta \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$, and (5.7) and (5.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |M - N| &\leq \sup_{z \in \rho} \{|G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\eta)^{-1}(z) - G_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z)|\} \\ &= \sup_{z \in \rho} \{|J_a^\eta(z) - J_a^\eta(\varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z))|\} \\ &\leq \sup_{w \in F} |\nabla J_a^\eta(w)| \sup_{z \in \rho} \{|z - \varphi_a^\eta \circ (\varphi_a^\zeta)^{-1}(z)|\} \leq DC_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $|M_1 - N_1| \leq DC_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} M &\leq N + DC_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a \leq N_1 + DC_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a \\ &\leq M_1 + 2DC_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a \leq qM + 2DC_1 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $M \leq Ca \|\zeta - \eta\|_a$, where $C = 2DC_1/(1-q)$. So we get (5.6). From the proof, we see that δ and C depend only on $\Omega, p, \alpha, \alpha_1, \rho, \rho_1$. Since we have the freedom to choose α_1 and ρ_1 , so δ and C may depend only on Ω, p, α, ρ . \square

Lemma 5.8 *There are $\delta, C > 0$ depending only on Ω, p, α , such that if $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$, $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$, and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$, then*

$$|(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(\zeta(a)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\eta(\eta(a))| \leq C \|\zeta - \eta\|_a. \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. Suppose $\zeta, \eta \in C([0, a])$ and $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$. Choose a crosscut α_1 in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses α such that $H(\alpha_1) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. Let ρ be a crosscut in \mathbb{H} with height smaller than $\mathbf{h}/2$ that strictly encloses $[c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$. From Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.7, there are $\delta_0, C_0 > 0$ depending only on $\Omega, p, \alpha, \alpha_1, \rho$, such that if $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta_0$, then $K_a^\eta \subset H(\alpha_1)$ and for any $z \in \rho$, $|J_a^\zeta(z) - J_a^\eta(z)| \leq C_0 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a$. Let $d_0 = \text{dist}([c_\alpha, d_\alpha], \rho)/2 > 0$, and $\delta = \delta_0 \wedge d_0$.

Suppose $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta$. Then $K_a^\zeta, K_a^\eta \subset H(\alpha_1)$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$, there are $m, M_1, M_2, M_3 > 0$ depending only on $\Omega, p, \alpha, \alpha_1, \rho$, such that for any $x \in [c_\alpha - d_0, d_\alpha + d_0]$,

$$m \leq \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x), \partial_y J_a^\eta(x) \leq M_1; \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_x^{j-1} \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x)|, |\partial_x^{j-1} \partial_y J_a^\eta(x)| \leq M_j,$$

for $j = 2, 3$. Let $C_1 = M_3/m + M_2^2/m^2$. So for any $x \in [c_\alpha - d_0, d_\alpha + d_0]$,

$$|\partial_x(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(x)| = |(\partial_x^2 \partial_y / \partial_y - ((\partial_x \partial_y \cdot \partial_x \partial_y) / (\partial_y \cdot \partial_y))) J_a^\zeta(x)| \leq C_1. \quad (5.10)$$

Since $\text{dist}([c_\alpha - d_0, d_\alpha + d_0], \rho) \geq d_0$, so for any $x \in [c_\alpha - d_0, d_\alpha + d_0]$,

$$|\partial_x^{j-1} \partial_y (J_a^\zeta - J_a^\eta)(x)| \leq \frac{2j!}{d_0^j} \sup_{z \in \rho} |J_a^\zeta(z) - J_a^\eta(z)| \leq \frac{2j!}{d_0^j} C_0 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a,$$

for $j = 1, 2$, from which follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(x) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\eta(x)| \\
&= |\partial_x \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x) \partial_y J_a^\eta(x) - \partial_x \partial_y J_a^\eta(x) \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x)| / |\partial_y J_a^\zeta(x) \partial_y J_a^\eta(x)| \\
&\leq |\partial_x \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x) \partial_y J_a^\eta(x) - \partial_x \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x) \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x)| / m^2 \\
&\quad + |\partial_x \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x) \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x) - \partial_x \partial_y J_a^\eta(x) \partial_y J_a^\zeta(x)| / m^2 \\
&\leq M_2 |\partial_y (J_a^\zeta - J_a^\eta)(x)| / m^2 + M_1 |\partial_x \partial_y (J_a^\zeta - J_a^\eta)(x)| / m^2 \\
&\leq (2M_2/d_0 + 4M_1/d_0^2) C_0 a \|\zeta - \eta\|_a / m^2 \leq C_2 \|\zeta - \eta\|_a, \tag{5.11}
\end{aligned}$$

if we let $C_2 = (M_2/d_0 + 2M_1/d_0^2) C_0 \text{hcap}(H(\alpha)) / m^2$.

Since $K_a^\zeta \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, so $\zeta(a) \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$. From $|\eta(a) - \zeta(a)| \leq \delta \leq d_0$, we have $\eta(a) \in [c_\alpha - d_0, d_\alpha + d_0]$. Thus from (5.10) and (5.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(\zeta(a)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\eta(\eta(a))| \\
&\leq |(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(\zeta(a)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(\eta(a))| \\
&\quad + |(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\zeta(\eta(a)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_a^\eta(\eta(a))| \\
&\leq C_1 |\zeta(a) - \eta(a)| + C_2 \|\zeta - \eta\|_a \leq (C_1 + C_2) \|\zeta - \eta\|_a.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $C = C_1 + C_2$. Then we have inequality (5.9). Finally, since we have the freedom to choose α_1 and ρ , so δ and C may depend only on Ω, p, α . \square

Corollary 5.2 *Suppose $K_{a_0}^\xi \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$ for some $\xi \in C([0, a_0])$, $a_0 > 0$. Then there are $\delta, C > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, a_0]$, if $\zeta_j \in C([0, t])$, $\|\zeta_j - \xi\|_t < \delta$, $j = 1, 2$, then*

$$|(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\zeta_1}(\zeta_1(t)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\zeta_2}(\zeta_2(t))| \leq C \|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|_t. \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. Choose crosscuts α_0 and α_1 in \mathbb{H} such that $K_{a_0}^\xi$ is enclosed by α_0 , α_0 is strictly enclosed by α_1 , and $H(\alpha_1) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. For any $t \in (0, a_0]$, since $K_t^\xi \subset K_{a_0}^\xi \subset H(\alpha_0)$, so from Lemma 5.5, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that if $\zeta_j \in C([0, t])$ satisfies $\|\zeta_j - \xi\|_t < \delta_1$, then $K_t^{\zeta_j} \subset H(\alpha_1)$. Let $\delta_2, C > 0$ be the constants given by Lemma 5.8 with $\alpha = \alpha_1$. Let $\delta = \delta_1 \wedge (\delta_2/2)$. If for some $t \in (0, a_0]$, $\zeta_j \in C([0, t])$ and $\|\zeta_j - \xi\|_t < \delta$, $j = 1, 2$, then $K_t^{\zeta_1} \subset K_{a_0}^{\zeta_1} \subset H(\alpha_1)$, and $\|\zeta_2 - \zeta_1\|_t < 2\delta \leq \delta_2$. Then (5.12) follows from Lemma 5.8 with $\alpha = \alpha_1$, $a = t$, $\zeta = \zeta_1$, and $\eta = \zeta_2$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $\xi_0(t) = A(0)$, $t \in [0, \infty)$. We may have $a_0 > 0$ such that $K_{a_0}^{\xi_0} \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. From Corollary 5.2, there are $\delta, C > 0$ such that for any $a \in (0, a_0]$, if $\zeta_j \in C([0, a])$ and $\|\zeta_j - \xi_0\|_a < \delta$ for $j = 1, 2$, then for any $t \in [0, a]$,

$$|(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\zeta_1}(\zeta_1(t)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\zeta_2}(\zeta_2(t))| \leq C \|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|_a. \quad (5.13)$$

Define a sequence of functions $(\xi_n(t))$ by induction. Let

$$\xi_{n+1}(t) = A(t) + \lambda \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_n}(\xi_n(s)) ds, \quad (5.14)$$

as long as $\xi_n(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq t$, are defined, and $K_t^{\xi_n} \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. We may choose $a \in (0, a_0]$ such that $|\lambda|Ca < 1/2$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, a]} |A(t) - A(0)| + |\lambda| \int_0^a |(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_0}(\xi_0(s))| ds < \delta/2.$$

Then we have $\|\xi_1 - \xi_0\|_a < \delta/2$. For $n = 1$, we have $\|\xi_n - \xi_0\|_a < (1 - 1/2^n)\delta$ and $\|\xi_n - \xi_{n-1}\|_a < \delta/2^n$. Suppose this is true for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then from (5.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_{n+1}(t) - \xi_n(t)| &\leq |\lambda| \int_0^t |(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_n}(\xi_n(s)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_{n-1}}(\xi_{n-1}(s))| ds \\ &\leq |\lambda| \int_0^t C \|\xi_n - \xi_{n-1}\|_a ds \leq |\lambda| Ca \|\xi_n - \xi_{n-1}\|_a < \|\xi_n - \xi_{n-1}\|_a / 2 < \delta/2^{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, a]$. Thus $\|\xi_{n+1} - \xi_n\|_a < \delta/2^{n+1}$, and $\|\xi_{n+1} - \xi_0\|_b < \delta/2^{n+1} + \|\xi_n - \xi_0\|_b < (1 - 1/2^{n+1})\delta$. From induction, we have $\|\xi_{n+1} - \xi_n\|_a < \delta/2^{n+1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus (ξ_n) restricted to $[0, a]$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C([0, a])$. Let $\xi_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n|_{[0, a]} \in C([0, a])$. Let $n \rightarrow \infty$ in equation (5.14), we see that ξ_∞ solves (3.2) for $t \in [0, a]$.

Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all couples (ξ, T) such that $T > 0$ and ξ solves equation (5.14) for $t \in [0, T]$. We have proved that \mathcal{S} is nonempty. We claim that if $(\xi, T) \in \mathcal{S}$ then there is $(\xi_e, T_e) \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $T_e > T$ and $\xi_e(t) = \xi(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. To prove this claim, let $\tilde{\Omega} = \varphi_T^\xi(\Omega \setminus K_T^\xi)$ and $\tilde{p} = \varphi_T^\xi(p)$. If $K_t^\xi \subset \tilde{\Omega} \setminus \{\tilde{p}\}$, let $\tilde{J}_t^\xi = G(\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K_t^\xi, \tilde{p}; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$. From the first part of the proof, the solution to

$$\tilde{\xi}(t) = \xi(T) + A(T+t) - A(T) + \lambda \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) \tilde{J}_s^\xi(\tilde{\xi}(s)) ds \quad (5.15)$$

exists on $[0, \tilde{a}]$ for some $\tilde{a} > 0$. Let $T_e = T + \tilde{a} > T$. Define $\xi_e(t) = \xi(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ and $\xi_e(t) = \tilde{\xi}(t - T)$ for $t \in [T, T_e]$. It is clear that $\xi_e \in C([0, T_e])$. Since ξ_e agrees with ξ on

$[0, T]$, so ξ_e solves (3.2) for $t \in [0, T]$. For $t \in [0, T_e - T]$, we have $\varphi_{T+t}^{\xi_e} = \varphi_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \circ \varphi_T^{\xi}$ and $K_{T+t}^{\xi_e} = K_T^{\xi} \cup (\varphi_T^{\xi})^{-1}(K_t^{\tilde{\xi}})$. Since φ_T^{ξ} maps p to \tilde{p} , and $\Omega \setminus K_{T+t}^{\xi_e}$ onto $\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K_t^{\tilde{\xi}}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} J_t^{\tilde{\xi}} &= G(\tilde{\Omega} \setminus K_t^{\tilde{\xi}}, \tilde{p}; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^{\tilde{\xi}})^{-1} = G(\Omega \setminus K_{T+t}^{\xi_e}, p; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_T^{\xi})^{-1} \circ (\varphi_t^{\tilde{\xi}})^{-1} \\ &= G(\Omega \setminus K_{T+t}^{\xi_e}, p; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_{T+t}^{\xi_e})^{-1} = J_{T+t}^{\xi_e}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $t \in [0, T_e - T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_e(T+t) &= \tilde{\xi}(t) = \xi(T) + A(T+t) - A(T) + \lambda \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) \tilde{J}_s^{\tilde{\xi}}(\tilde{\xi}(s)) ds \\ &= A(T+t) + \lambda \int_0^T (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi}(\xi(s)) ds + \lambda \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_{T+s}^{\xi_e}(\xi_e(T+s)) ds \\ &= A(T+t) + \lambda \int_0^{T+t} (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_e}(\xi_e(s)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

So ξ_e solves (3.2) for $t \in [T, T_e]$. Thus $(\xi_e, T_e) \in \mathcal{S}$. So the claim is justified.

Suppose $(\xi_1, T_1), (\xi_2, T_2) \in \mathcal{S}$. For $j = 1, 2$, since $\xi_j(0) = A(0) = \xi_0(0)$, so there is $S_j \in (0, T_j \wedge a_0]$ such that $\|\xi_j - \xi_0\|_{S_j} < \delta$. Choose $S_3 \in (0, S_1 \wedge S_2]$ such that $C|\lambda|S_3 < 1$. From (3.2) and (5.13), we have $\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|_{S_3} \leq |\lambda|CS_3\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|_{S_3}$, so $\|\xi_1 - \xi_2\|_{S_3} = 0$, which means that $\xi_1(t) = \xi_2(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq S_3$.

Let $T_0 = T_1 \wedge T_2$. We claim that $\xi_1(t) = \xi_2(t)$ for $t \in [0, T_0]$. Let $T \in [0, T_0]$ be the maximum such that $\xi_1(t) = \xi_2(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Suppose $T < T_0$. Let $\tilde{\xi}_1(t) = \xi_1(T+t)$, $\tilde{\xi}_2(t) = \xi_2(T+t)$ for $t \in [0, T_0 - T]$. Then $\tilde{\xi}_1$ and $\tilde{\xi}_2$ both solve equation (5.15) for $t \in [0, T_0 - T]$. From the last paragraph, there is $S_3 \in (0, T_0 - T]$ such that $\tilde{\xi}_1(t) = \tilde{\xi}_2(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq S_3$, which implies that $\xi_1(t) = \xi_2(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T + S_3$. This contradicts the maximum property of T . So $T = T_0$, and $\xi_1(t) = \xi_2(t)$ for $t \in [0, T_0]$.

Let $T_A = \sup\{T : (\xi, T) \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Define ξ_A on $[0, T_A]$ as follows. For any $t \in [0, T_A]$, choose $(\xi, T) \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $t \leq T$, and let $\xi_A(t) = \xi(t)$. From the last paragraph, ξ_A is well defined, and solves (3.2) for $t \in [0, T_A]$. The uniqueness of ξ_A also follows from the last paragraph. There is no solution to (3.2) defined on $[0, T_A]$. Otherwise, there exists some solution on $[0, T_A + \varepsilon]$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, which contradicts the definition of T_A .

Suppose $A_0 \in C([0, \infty))$, $a \in (0, \infty)$, and $T_{A_0} > a$. Let ξ_{A_0} be the solution to (3.2) with A replaced by A_0 . Then $K_a^{\xi_{A_0}} \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. From Corollary 5.2, there are $\delta_0, C_0 > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, a]$, if $\zeta_j \in C([0, t])$ and $\|\zeta_j - \xi_0\|_t < \delta_0$ for $j = 1, 2$, then

$$|(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\zeta_1}(\zeta_1(t)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\zeta_2}(\zeta_2(t))| \leq C_0 \|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|_t. \quad (5.16)$$

Let $\delta = \delta_0 \exp(-C_0|\lambda|a)$. Suppose $A \in C([0, \infty))$ and $\|A - A_0\|_a < \delta$. Define a sequence of functions (ξ_n^A) in $C([0, a])$ inductively. Let $\xi_0^A(t) = \xi_{A_0}(t)$ for $t \in [0, a]$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, a]$, let

$$\xi_n^A(t) = A(t) + \lambda \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_{n-1}^A}(\xi_{n-1}^A(s)) ds.$$

Then for any $t \in [0, a]$, $|\xi_1^A(t) - \xi_0^A(t)| = |A(t) - A_0(t)| \leq \|A - A_0\|_a < \delta \leq \delta_0$. We claim that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|\xi_n^A - \xi_0^A\|_a < \delta_0$, and for any $t \in [0, a]$, $|\xi_n^A(t) - \xi_{n-1}^A(t)| \leq \|A - A_0\|_a (C_0|\lambda|t)^{n-1}/(n-1)!$. We have seen that this statement is true for $n = 1$. Suppose this is true for $n \leq k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $t \in [0, a]$, from (5.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_{k+1}^A(t) - \xi_k^A(t)| &\leq |\lambda| \int_0^t |(\partial_x \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_k^A}(\xi_k^A(s)) - (\partial_x \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_{k-1}^A}(\xi_{k-1}^A(s))| ds \\ &\leq |\lambda| \int_0^t C_0 \|\xi_k^A - \xi_{k-1}^A\|_s ds \leq C_0 |\lambda| \int_0^t \|A - A_0\|_a (C_0|\lambda|s)^{k-1}/(k-1)! ds \\ &\leq \|A - A_0\|_a (C_0|\lambda|t)^k/k!. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for every $t \in [0, a]$,

$$|\xi_{k+1}^A(t) - \xi_0^A(t)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} |\xi_j^A(t) - \xi_{j-1}^A(t)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \|A - A_0\|_a \frac{(C_0|\lambda|t)^j}{j!} < \delta \exp(C_0|\lambda|a) = \delta_0.$$

So we have $\|\xi_{k+1}^A - \xi_0^A\|_a < \delta_0$. So the statement is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\|\xi_{n+1}^A - \xi_n^A\|_a \leq \|A - A_0\|_a (C_0|\lambda|a)^n/n!$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|A - A_0\|_a (C_0|\lambda|a)^n/n! = \|A - A_0\|_a \exp(C_0|\lambda|a)$, so (ξ_n^A) is a Cauchy sequence w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_a$. Let $\xi_\infty^A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n^A \in C([0, a])$. Then ξ_∞^A solves (3.2) for $t \in [0, a]$, and $\|\xi_\infty^A - \xi_0^A\|_a \leq \|A - A_0\|_a \exp(C_0|\lambda|a)$. Thus $T_A > a$ and $\xi_A(t) = \xi_\infty^A(t)$ for $t \in [0, a]$. So we conclude that if $\|A - A_0\|_a < \delta$, then $T_A > a$ and $\|\xi_A - \xi_{A_0}\|_a \leq \exp(C_0|\lambda|a) \|A - A_0\|_a$. So $\{A \in C([0, \infty)) : T_A > a\}$ is open w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_a$, and $A \mapsto \xi_A$ is $(\|\cdot\|_a, \|\cdot\|_a)$ continuous on $\{A \in C([0, \infty)) : T_A > a\}$.

Finally, let α be a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. Suppose $K_t^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$ for $0 \leq t < T$. Then $T \leq \text{hcap}(H(\alpha))/2 < +\infty$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, $|(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^\xi(\xi(t))|$ are uniformly bounded. So from (3.2), $\xi(t) \rightarrow x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ as $t \rightarrow T$. Define $\xi(T) = x$. Then $\xi \in C([0, T])$, $K_T^\xi \subset H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$, and so J_t^ξ is defined for $t \in [0, T]$. Then $\xi(t)$ solves (3.2) for $0 \leq t \leq T$, which is a contradiction. \square

6 Convergence of the Driving Functions

From now on, we begin proving Theorem 4.2 and its variations. We first study the case that the target is an interior point. In this section, we will show that the driving functions for the (discrete) LERW converge to that for the continuous LERW.

6.1 Some estimates

Suppose Ω is a finitely connected subdomain of \mathbb{H} that is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves σ_j , $1 \leq j \leq m$; $p \in \Omega$; α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$; F is a compact subset of $\Omega \setminus H(\alpha)$. For $\xi \in C([0, T])$, let K_t^ξ and φ_t^ξ , $0 \leq t < T$, be chordal Loewner hulls and maps generated by ξ . If $K_t^\xi \subset \Omega$, then $\Omega_t^\xi := \varphi_t^\xi(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi)$ is the domain bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. If $K_t^\xi \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$, let $J^\xi(t, z) := G(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, p; \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}(z) = G(\Omega_t^\xi, \varphi_t^\xi(p); z)$; let $P^\xi(t, x, \cdot)$ be the generalized Poisson kernel in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at $x \in \mathbb{R}$, normalized by $P^\xi(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(p)) = 1$; and let $\widetilde{R}^\xi(t, z) = (\partial_{2,z}^2 / \partial_{2,z}) J^\xi(t, z)$, where $\partial_{2,z} = (\partial_{2,x} - i\partial_{2,y})/2$ is the partial derivative w.r.t. the second variables, which is complex, of J^ξ . Since $J^\xi(t, \cdot)$ vanishes on \mathbb{R} , so for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\partial_{2,z}^j J^\xi(t, z) = \partial_{2,x}^{j-1} \partial_{2,y} J^\xi(t, z)$. Thus $\widetilde{R}^\xi(t, z) = (\partial_{2,x} \partial_{2,y} / \partial_{2,y}) J^\xi(t, z)$ if $z \in \mathbb{R}$. From (4.1) and the fact that the drift term \mathcal{D}_t vanishes, for $z \in \Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_1 P^\xi(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) + 2\partial_2 P^\xi(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) \widetilde{R}^\xi(t, \xi(t)) \\ & + \partial_2^2 P^\xi(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) + 2(\operatorname{Re} \partial_{3,z} P^\xi(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) \frac{2}{\varphi_t^\xi(z) - \xi(t)}) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

In the lemmas in this subsection, a uniform constant is a number that only depends on Ω, p, α, F , and some other variable(s) that we will specify. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$ (Lemma 5.4), there is a uniform constant $\mathbf{h} > 0$ such that if $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $t \in [0, a]$, $\operatorname{dist}(\cup_{j=1}^m \varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j) \cup \varphi_t^\xi(F), \mathbb{R}) \wedge \operatorname{dist}(\varphi_t^\xi(F), \cup_{j=1}^m \varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)) \geq \mathbf{h}$.

Lemma 6.1 *There are uniform constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that if $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $t_1 \leq t_2 \in [0, a]$ and $z \in F$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & |\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)| \leq C_1 |t_2 - t_1|; \\ & |\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \frac{2(t_2 - t_1)}{\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_1)}| \leq C_2 |t_2 - t_1| (|t_2 - t_1| + \sup_{t \in [t_1, t_2]} \{|\xi(t) - \xi(t_1)|\}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Suppose $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$. Then $|\varphi_t^\xi(z) - \xi(t)| \geq \mathbf{h}$ for any $t \in [0, a]$ and $z \in F$. Since $\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{2}{\varphi_t^\xi(z) - \xi(t)} dt$, so $|\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)| \leq C_1|t_2 - t_1|$ for and $t_1 \leq t_2 \in [0, a]$ and $z \in F$, where $C_1 = 2/\mathbf{h} > 0$ is a uniform constant. Thus for $t_1 \leq t_2 \in [0, a]$ and $z \in F$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{2}{\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_2)} - \frac{2}{\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_1)} \right| &\leq \frac{2}{\mathbf{h}^2} (|\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)| + |\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1)|) \\ &\leq 2C_1/\mathbf{h}^2 |t_2 - t_1| + 2/\mathbf{h}^2 |\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1)|. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $t_1 \leq t_2 \in [0, a]$ and $z \in F$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \frac{2(t_2 - t_1)}{\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_1)} \right| &= \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left(\frac{2}{\varphi_t^\xi(z) - \xi(t)} - \frac{2}{\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_1)} \right) dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left| \frac{2}{\varphi_t^\xi(z) - \xi(t)} - \frac{2}{\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_1)} \right| dt \leq C_2|t_2 - t_1| (|t_2 - t_1| + \sup_{t \in [t_1, t_2]} \{|\xi(t) - \xi(t_1)|\}), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 := (2C_1/\mathbf{h}^2) \vee (2/\mathbf{h}^2) > 0$ is a uniform constant. \square

Lemma 6.2 *For each $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there is a uniform constant $C_0 > 0$ depending on n_1, n_2, n_3 , such that if $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $t \in [0, a]$, $x \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, and $z \in F$, we have*

$$|\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_2^{n_2} \partial_{3,z}^{n_3} P^\xi(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(z))| \leq C_0.$$

Proof. Suppose $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$. Let $H^\xi(t, x, \cdot)$ be the continuous function defined on $\widehat{\Omega_t^\xi}$ that satisfies $H^\xi(t, x, z) = 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $H^\xi(t, x, z) = \text{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{z-x}$ for $z \in \varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $H^\xi(t, x, \cdot)$ is harmonic in Ω_t^ξ . Let $Q^\xi(t, x, z) = \text{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{z-x} - H^\xi(t, x, z)$. Then $Q^\xi(t, x, \cdot)$ is the Poisson kernel in Ω_t^ξ with the pole at x . Thus $P^\xi(t, x, z) = Q^\xi(t, x, z)/Q^\xi(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(p))$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, $Q^\xi(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(p))$, $t \in [0, a]$, $x \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, is bounded from below by some positive uniform constant. For any $n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there is some uniform constant $C_0(n_2, n_3) > 0$ depending on n_2 and n_3 such that $\partial_x^{n_2} \partial_z^{n_3} \text{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{z-x} = C_0(n_2, n_3)(z-x)^{-1-n_2-n_3}$, whose absolute value is bounded by $C_0(n_2, n_3)\mathbf{h}^{-1-n_2-n_3}$, if $z \in \varphi_t^\xi(F)$ and $x \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$. So we suffice to show that for each $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there is some uniform constant $C_1(n_1, n_2, n_3) > 0$ depending on n_1, n_2, n_3 , such that for any $t \in [0, a]$, $x \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, and $z \in F$, $|\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_2^{n_2} \partial_{3,z}^{n_3} H^\xi(t, x, \varphi_t^\xi(z))| \leq C_1(n_1, n_2, n_3)$.

Now fix $t_0 \in [0, a]$ and $x_0 \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$. We claim that for each $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there is some uniform constant $C_2(n_1, n_2) > 0$ depending on n_1 and n_2 , such that

$$|\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_2^{n_2} H^\xi(t_0, x_0, z)| \leq C_2(n_1, n_2), \quad (6.2)$$

for any $z \in \Omega_{t_0}^\xi$. From the definition of H^ξ and the property of \mathbf{h} , we have

$$0 < H^\xi(t_0, x_0, z) = \operatorname{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{z - x_0} \leq \frac{1/\pi}{|z - x_0|} \leq \frac{1/\pi}{\mathbf{h}}$$

for any $z \in \cup_{j=1}^m \varphi_{t_0}^\xi(\sigma_j)$. Since $H^\xi(t_0, x_0, \cdot)$ is harmonic in $\Omega_{t_0}^\xi$, and vanishes on $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$, so from the maximum principle for harmonic functions, we have $|H^\xi(t_0, x_0, z)| \leq 1/(\pi\mathbf{h})$ for any $z \in \Omega_{t_0}^\xi$. Let $C_2(0, 0) = 1/(\pi\mathbf{h})$. Then we proved (6.2) in the case $n_1 = n_2 = 0$.

Since $\varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, are analytic Jordan curves, so $H^\xi(t, x, \cdot)$ can be extended harmonically across them. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, there is a uniform constant $C_3 > 0$ such that $|\partial_{3,z} H^\xi(t_0, x_0, z)| \leq C_3$ for any $z \in \cup_{j=1}^m \varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$. For any $t \in [0, a]$ and $z \in \cup_{j=1}^m \sigma_j$, we have $H^\xi(t, x_0, \varphi_t^\xi(z)) = \operatorname{Im} \frac{-1/\pi}{\varphi_t^\xi(z) - x_0}$. Differentiate this equality w.r.t. t , and evaluate it at t_0 . Then for any $z \in \cup_{j=1}^m \sigma_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_1 H^\xi(t_0, x_0, \varphi_{t_0}^\xi(z)) + 2\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{3,z} H^\xi(t_0, x_0, \varphi_{t_0}^\xi(z)) \frac{2}{\varphi_{t_0}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_0)}) \\ &= \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{1/\pi}{(\varphi_{t_0}^\xi(z) - x_0)^2} \frac{2}{\varphi_{t_0}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_0)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $|\partial_1 H^\xi(t_0, x_0, z)| \leq 4C_3/\mathbf{h} + 2/(\pi\mathbf{h}^3) =: C_2(1, 0)$ for any $z \in \cup_{j=1}^m \varphi_{t_0}^\xi(\sigma_j)$. From the maximum principle, we have $|\partial_1 H^\xi(t, x, z)| \leq C_2(1, 0)$ for any $z \in \Omega_{t_0}^\xi$. So (6.2) is proved the case $n_1 = 1$ and $n_2 = 0$.

Suppose $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then $\partial_2^{n_2} H^\xi(t_0, x_0, \cdot)$ is harmonic in Ω_t^ξ , has continuation to the boundary, and satisfies $\partial_2^{n_2} H^\xi(t, x, z) = 0$ for $z \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$, and $\partial_2^{n_2} H^\xi(t, x, z) = \operatorname{Im} \frac{(-1)^{n_2+1}/\pi}{(z-x)^{n_2+1}}$ for $z \in \cup_{j=1}^m \varphi_t^\xi(\sigma_j)$. Then (6.2) can be proved in these cases in a similar way as the previous two cases. So (6.2) holds in all cases.

Since $\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_2^{n_2} H^\xi(t, x, \cdot)$ is harmonic in $\Omega_{t_0}^\xi$, $\varphi_t^\xi(F) \subset \Omega_t^\xi$, and $\operatorname{dist}(\varphi_t^\xi(F), \partial\Omega_t^\xi) \geq \mathbf{h}$, so from (6.2), for any $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$, $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $z \in F$, and $n_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$|\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_2^{n_2} \partial_{3,z}^{n_3} H^\xi(t_0, x_0, \varphi_{t_0}^\xi(z))| \leq 2n_3! C_2(n_1, n_2)/\mathbf{h}^{n_3} =: C_1(n_1, n_2, n_3).$$

And $C_1(n_1, n_2, n_3) > 0$ is a uniform constant. So the proof is finished. \square

Lemma 6.3 *For each $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there is a uniform constant $C_0 > 0$ depending on n_1, n_2 such that if $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $t \in [0, a]$, $x \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, we have*

$$|\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_{2,x}^{n_2} \widetilde{R}^\xi(t, x)| \leq C_0.$$

Proof. Suppose $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$. It suffices to prove that for any $t \in [0, a]$ and $x \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$, $|\partial_{2,z} J^\xi(t, x)|$ is bounded from below by a positive uniform constant, and $|\partial_1^{n_1} \partial_{2,z}^{n_2} J^\xi(t, x)|$ is bounded from above by a positive uniform constant depending on $n_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. They all follow from the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$. \square

Lemma 6.4 *There is a uniform constant $C_0 > 0$ such that if $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $t_1 \leq t_2 \in [0, a]$ and $z \in F$, we have*

$$|\partial_1 P^\xi(t_2, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)) - \partial_1 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))| \leq C_0(|t_2 - t_1| + |\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1)|).$$

Proof. This follows from (6.1) and the above several lemmas. \square

Lemma 6.5 *There is a uniform constant $d_1 > 0$ such that if $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$, then for any $t_1 < t_2 \in [0, a]$ that satisfy $|t_2 - t_1| \leq d_1$, and for any $z \in F$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & P^\xi(t_2, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)) - P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)) \\ &= \partial_2 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))((\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1)) - \tilde{R}^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1))(t_2 - t_1)) \\ & \quad + 1/2 \partial_2^2 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))((\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1))^2 - 2(t_2 - t_1)) \\ & \quad + O(A^2) + O(AB) + O(AB^2) + O(B^3), \end{aligned}$$

where $A := |t_2 - t_1|$, $B := \sup_{s, t \in [t_1, t_2]} \{|\xi(s) - \xi(t)|\}$, and $O(X)$ is some number whose absolute value is bounded by $C|X|$ for some uniform constant $C > 0$.

Proof. Suppose $K_a^\xi \subset H(\alpha)$. Let $d_0 = \text{dist}(F, \partial\Omega) > 0$. Let $F' = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{dist}(z, F) \leq d_0/2\}$. Then F' is a compact subset of Ω and F is contained in the interior of F' . From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$, there is a uniform constant $d'_0 > 0$ such that for any $t \in [0, a]$, $\text{dist}(\varphi_t^\xi(F), \partial\varphi_t^\xi(F')) \geq d'_0$. So from Lemma 6.1, there is a uniform constant $d_1 > 0$ such that if $s, t \in [0, a]$ satisfy $|s - t| \leq d_1$ then for any $z \in F$, $[\varphi_s^\xi(z), \varphi_t^\xi(z)] \subset \varphi_s^\xi(F')$.

Fix $z \in F$ and $t_1 < t_2 \in [0, a]$ with $|t_2 - t_1| \leq d_1$. Let $P_1 = P^\xi(t_2, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z))$, $P_2 = P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z))$, $P_3 = P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z))$, $P_4 = P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))$. Then

$$P^\xi(t_2, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)) - P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)) = (P_1 - P_2) + (P_2 - P_3) + (P_3 - P_4).$$

Now $P_1 - P_2 = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \partial_1 P^\xi(t, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)) dt$. Fix any $t \in [t_1, t_2]$. Applying Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 to F' , since $\xi(t), \xi(t_2) \in [c_\alpha, d_\alpha]$ and $[\varphi_t^\xi(z), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)] \subset \varphi_t^\xi(F')$, so we have

$$\partial_1 P^\xi(t, \xi(t_2), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)) - \partial_1 P^\xi(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) = O(A) + O(B).$$

Applying Lemma 6.4 to F , we have

$$\partial_1 P^\xi(t, \xi(t), \varphi_t^\xi(z)) - \partial_1 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)) = O(A) + O(B).$$

So we get

$$P_1 - P_2 = \partial_1 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))(t_2 - t_1) + O(A^2) + O(AB).$$

Applying Lemma 6.2 to F' , since $\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) \in \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(F')$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 - P_3 &= \partial_2 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z))(\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1)) \\ &\quad + 1/2 \partial_2^2 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z))(\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1))^2 + O(B^3). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 to F' , since $[\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)] \subset \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(F')$, so we have

$$\partial_2^j P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)) - \partial_2^j P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)) = O(A),$$

for $j = 1, 2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 - P_3 &= \partial_2 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))(\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1)) \\ &\quad + 1/2 \partial_2^2 P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))(\xi(t_2) - \xi(t_1))^2 + O(AB) + O(AB^2) + O(B^3). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 to F' , since $[\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z), \varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z)] \subset \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(F')$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_3 - P_4 &= 2\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{3,z} P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))(\varphi_{t_2}^\xi(z) - \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z))) + O(A^2) \\ &= 2\operatorname{Re}(\partial_{3,z} P^\xi(t_1, \xi(t_1), \varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z)) \frac{2(t_2 - t_1)}{\varphi_{t_1}^\xi(z) - \xi(t_1)}) + O(AB) + O(A^2). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from the equalities for $P_j - P_{j+1}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, and (6.1). \square

6.2 Convergence

We use the notations in Section 4.2 and 6.1. Suppose f maps D conformally onto Ω such that $f(0_+) = 0$ and $p = f(z_e)$. From now on till the end of Section 7.2, we fix D , z_e , f , Ω , and p . Suppose ρ_0 and ρ_1 are crosscuts in D such that $H(\rho_0) \subset H(\rho_1)$ are neighborhoods of 0_+ in D ; $z_e \notin H(\rho_1)$; and $\overline{\rho_0} \cap \overline{\rho_1} = \emptyset$. Let $\alpha_j = f(\rho_j)$, $j = 0, 1$. Then α_0 and α_1 are crosscuts in \mathbb{H} ; $H(\alpha_0)$ is a neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{H} , α_0 is strictly enclosed by α_1 , and $H(\alpha_1) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$.

Let L^δ denote the set of finite simple lattice paths $X = (X(0), \dots, X(s))$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, on D^δ , such that $X(0) = \delta$, $X(k) \in D$ for $0 \leq k \leq s$, and $\cup_{k=0}^s (X(k-1), X(k)] \subset H(\rho_1)$, where we set $X(-1) := 0$. Here s is called the length of X , and is denoted by $s = l(X)$;

and $\text{Tip}(X) := X(l(X))$ is called the tip point of X . For $X \in L^\delta$, let $D_X = D \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{l(X)} (X(k-1), X(k)]$; let P_X be the generalized Poisson kernel in D_X with the pole at $\text{Tip}(X)$, normalized by $P_X(z_e) = 1$; let g_X be defined on $V(D^\delta)$ that satisfies $g_X \equiv 0$ on $V_\partial(D^\delta) \cup \{X(k) : 0 \leq k \leq l(X) - 1\}$, $\Delta_{D^\delta} g_X \equiv 0$ on $V_I(D^\delta) \setminus \{X_k : 0 \leq k \leq l(X)\}$, and $g_X(w_e^\delta) = 1$. Let ρ_2 be a crosscut in D such that $H(\rho_1) \subset H(\rho_2)$ and $\overline{\rho_1} \cap \overline{\rho_2} = \emptyset$.

Proposition 6.1 *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, then for any $X \in L^\delta$, and any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap (D \setminus H(\rho_2))$, we have $|g_X(w) - P_X(w)| < \varepsilon$.*

Sketch of the proof. Suppose the proposition is not true. Then we can find $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, a sequence of lattice paths $X_n \in L^{\delta_n}$ with $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, and a sequence of points $w_n \in V^{\delta_n} \cap (D \setminus H(\rho_2))$, such that $|g_{X_n}(w_n) - P_{X_n}(w_n)| > \varepsilon_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For simplicity of notations, we write g_n for g_{X_n} , P_n for P_{X_n} , and D_n for D_{X_n} . Let $K_n = f(\bigcup_{j=0}^{l(X_n)} (X_n(j-1), X_n(j)]$). Then $K_n \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$. Write φ_n for φ_{K_n} . Let $x_n = \varphi_n \circ f(\text{Tip}(X_n))$. Then $x_n \in [c_{\alpha_1}, d_{\alpha_1}]$. Let $\Omega_n = \varphi_n(\Omega \setminus K_n)$ and $Q_n = P_n \circ f^{-1} \circ \varphi_n^{-1}$. Then Q_n is the generalized Poisson kernel in Ω_n with the pole at x_n , normalized by $Q_n(\varphi_n(p)) = 1$. From the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$, by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $K_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}} K_0 \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$ and $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in [c_{\alpha_1}, d_{\alpha_1}]$. Let $\Omega_0 = \varphi_{K_0}(\Omega \setminus K)$ and Q_0 be the generalized Poisson kernel in Ω_0 with the pole at x_0 , normalized by $Q_0(\varphi_{K_0}(p)) = 1$. Let $D_0 = f^{-1}(\Omega \setminus K_0)$ and $P_0 = Q_0 \circ \varphi_{K_0} \circ f$. Then P_0 is the generalized Poisson kernel in D_0 with the pole at $f^{-1} \circ \varphi_{K_0}^{-1}(x_0)$, normalized by $P_0(z_e) = 1$. Moreover, $D_n \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} D_0$, and $P_n \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} P_0$ in D_0 .

We extend g_n to $\text{CE}^n g_n$ that is defined on the union of lattice squares of $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ at whose four vertices g_n is defined. Applying Harnack's Inequality to the positive discrete harmonic function g_n , we find that $(\text{CE}^n g_n)$ is locally uniformly continuous in D_0 . By Arzela-Ascoli Theorem, there is a subsequence of $(\text{CE}^n g_n)$, which converges locally uniformly to some g_0 in D_0 . We may assume that the subsequence is $(\text{CE}^n g_n)$ itself. By applying Harnack's Inequality to the discrete partial derivatives of g_n , we may assume that the continuation of all discrete partial derivatives of g_n also converge to the corresponding partial derivatives of g_0 . Then we conclude that g_0 is a positive harmonic function in D_0 .

We may find a sequence of crosscuts (γ^k) in D_0 such that $(H(\gamma^k))$ is a nesting neighborhood basis of the prime end $f^{-1} \circ \varphi_{K_0}^{-1}(x_0)$ in D_0 , which is the pole of P_0 . Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we find a crosscut γ_n^k in D_n that bound a neighborhood $H(\gamma_n^k)$ of $\text{Tip}(X_n)$, such that γ_n^k converge to γ^k in some sense as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each $k \geq 2$, we may construct some "hook" in the area of D_0 between γ^{k-1} and γ^{k+1} that holds the boundary of D_0 and disconnects γ^{k+1} from γ^{k-1} . We use these hooks to prove that the values of g_n outside $H(\gamma^{k+1})$ are uniformly bounded, and $g_n(w) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $w \in V(D^{\delta_n}) \cap (D_n \setminus H(\gamma_n^{k+1}))$ and $w \rightarrow \partial D_n$ in the spherical metric. Thus $g_0(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \in D_0 \setminus H(\gamma^{k+1})$ and $w \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D_0$ in the spherical metric. Since $(H(\gamma^k))$ is a neighborhood

basis of $f^{-1} \circ \varphi_K^{-1}(x_0)$ in D_0 , so g_0 must be a generalized Poisson kernel in D_0 with the pole at $f^{-1} \circ \varphi_K^{-1}(x_0)$. Since $g_0(z_e) = \lim_n \text{CE}^n g_n(w_e^\delta) = \lim g_n(w_e^\delta) = 1 = P_0(z_e)$, so $g_0 \equiv P_0$ in D_0 . The sequence (w_n) has a subsequence (w_{n_k}) that converges to some $w_0 \in D$ or tends to $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus D$ in the spherical metric. In both cases, we can get a contradiction.

Please see Section 5 in [23] for the detailed proof of a similar proposition. \square

Let $K = \overline{\mathbf{B}(z_e; r_0)}$, where $r_0 > 0$ is such that $K \subset D \setminus H(\rho_1)$. And we may choose a crosscut ρ_2 in D such that $H(\rho_1) \subset H(\rho_2)$, $\overline{\rho_1} \cap \overline{\rho_2} = \emptyset$, and $K \subset D \setminus H(\rho_2)$. Let $d_0 = \min\{r_0/2, \text{dist}(\rho_0, \rho_1), \text{dist}(0, \rho_0)\}$. Suppose $\delta < d_0$. Then $w_e^\delta \in K$, $(0, \delta] \subset H(\rho_0)$, and any edge of D^δ can not intersect both ρ_0 and ρ_1 .

In this subsection, a uniform constant is a number that depends only on $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, r_0, K, d_0$, and some other variable we will specify. We use $O(X)$ to denote a number whose absolute value is bounded by $C|X|$ for some positive uniform constant C . We use $o_\delta(X)$ to denote a number whose absolute value is bounded by $C(\delta)|X|$ for some positive uniform constant $C(\delta)$ depending on δ , such that $C(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Let the LERW curve q_δ on $[-1, \chi_\delta]$ be defined as in Section 4.2. For $-1 \leq t \leq \chi_\delta$, let $v_\delta(t) = \text{hcap}(f \circ q_\delta((0, t]))/2$. Let $T_\delta = v_\delta(\chi_\delta)$, and $u_\delta = v_\delta^{-1}$. Let $\beta_\delta(t) = f(q_\delta(u_\delta(t)))$, $0 < t \leq T_\delta$. Since $f(0_+) = 0$, so β_δ extends continuously to $[0, T_\delta)$ such that $\beta_\delta(0) = 0$. From Proposition 3.2, there is some $\xi_\delta \in C([0, T_\delta])$ such that $\beta_\delta((0, t]) = K_t^{\xi_\delta}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_\delta$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let \mathcal{F}_n be the σ -algebra generated by $\{n \leq \chi_\delta\}$ and $q_\delta(j)$, $0 \leq j \leq n$. Let n_∞ be the first n such that $(q_\delta(n-1), q_\delta(n)]$ intersects ρ_0 . Then n_∞ is an \mathcal{F}_n -stopping time, and $\cup_{k=0}^{n_\infty} (q_\delta(k-1), q_\delta(k_j)]$ is contained in $H(\rho_1)$ because $\delta < \text{dist}(\rho_0, \rho_1)$. Let $T_{\alpha_0}^\delta = v_\delta(n_\infty)$. Then $\beta_\delta((0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta])$ intersects α_0 , and is strictly enclosed by α_1 . So $K_{T_{\alpha_0}^\delta}^{\xi_\delta} \subset H(\alpha_1)$. Let $h_1 = \text{hcap}(H(\alpha_1)) > 0$. Then h_1 is a uniform constant, and $T_{\alpha_0}^\delta \leq h_1/2$, so $T_{\alpha_0}^\delta = O(1)$.

Fix any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{[-1, n_\infty-1]}$. Then $(q_\delta(n), q_\delta(n+1)]$ can be disconnected from ρ_1 by an annulus $A = \{\delta < |z - q_\delta(n)| < d_0\}$. Let Γ be the set of all crosscuts γ in $D \setminus \cup_{k=0}^n [q_\delta(k-1), q_\delta(k)]$ that is contained in A , and disconnects $\{|z - q_\delta(n-1)| = \delta\}$ from $\{|z - q_\delta(n-1)| = d_0\}$ in $D \setminus \cup_{k=0}^n [q_\delta(k-1), q_\delta(k)]$. Then the extremal length of Γ is at most $2\pi/\ln(d_0/\delta)$. If $\gamma \in \Gamma$, then γ disconnects $(q_\delta(n), q_\delta(n+1)]$ from ρ_1 in D . Thus $\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta} \circ f(\gamma)$ is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} , which disconnects $\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta} \circ f((q_\delta(n), q_\delta(n+1))) = \varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(K_{v_\delta(n+1)}^{\xi_\delta} \setminus K_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta})$ from $\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(\alpha_1)$ in \mathbb{H} . Since $K_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta} \subset H(\alpha_0)$, and α_0 is strictly enclosed by α_1 , so from the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_0)$, the area of $H(\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(\alpha_1))$ is bounded from above by a uniform constant $C_0 > 0$. By the conformal invariance, the extremal length of $f(\Gamma)$ is at most $2\pi/\ln(d_0/\delta)$. So there is $\gamma \in f(\Gamma)$ whose length is smaller than $l(\delta) := 2(C_0\pi/\ln(d_0/\delta))^{1/2}$. Then $l(\delta) = o_\delta(1)$. Since $\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(K_{v_\delta(n+1)}^{\xi_\delta} \setminus K_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta})$ is enclosed by γ , so its diameter is not bigger than $l(\delta)$. Thus there is $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(K_{v_\delta(n+1)}^{\xi_\delta} \setminus K_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}) \subset \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z - x_0| \leq l(\delta)\}$. Since $\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(K_{v_\delta(n)+t}^{\xi_\delta} \setminus K_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta})$,

$0 \leq t \leq v_\delta(n+1) - v_\delta(n)$, are chordal Loewner hulls driven by $\xi_\delta(v_\delta(n) + t)$, so we have $v_\delta(n+1) - v_\delta(n) \leq \text{hcap}(\{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z - x_0| \leq l(\delta)\})/2 = l(\delta)^2/2$ and $\xi_\delta(t) \in [x_0 - 2l(\delta), x_0 + 2l(\delta)]$ for any $t \in [v_\delta(n), v_\delta(n+1)]$, which implies that $|\xi_\delta(s) - \xi_\delta(t)| \leq 4l(\delta)$ for any $s, t \in [v_\delta(n), v_\delta(n+1)]$. This is true for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{[-1, n_\infty - 1]}$.

Now fix a small $d > 0$. Define a non-decreasing sequence $(n_j)_{j \geq 0}$ inductively. Let $n_0 = 0$. Let n_{j+1} be the first $n \geq n_j$ such that $n = n_\infty$, or $v_\delta(n) - v_\delta(n_j) \geq d^2$, or $|\xi_\delta(n) - \xi_\delta(n_j)| \geq d$, whichever comes first. Then n_j 's are stopping times w.r.t. $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$, and are all bounded by n_∞ . From the result of the last paragraph, we may let $\delta > 0$ be smaller than some positive uniform constant depending on d , such that $v_\delta(n_{j+1}) - v_\delta(n_j) \leq 2d^2$ and $|\xi_\delta(v_\delta(s)) - \xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_j))| \leq 2d^2$ for any $s \in [n_j, n_{j+1}]$, $0 \leq j < \infty$. Let $\mathcal{F}'_j = \mathcal{F}_{n_j}$, $0 \leq j < \infty$. For $0 \leq n \leq n_\infty$, let $q_\delta^n = (q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(n))$ be a sub-path of q_δ . Then $q_\delta^n \in L^\delta$. Let (g_n) be the (g_n) in Proposition 2.1 for the LERW q_δ . Then $g_n = g_{q_\delta^n}$, where $g_{q_\delta^n}$ is as in Proposition 6.1. For simplicity, we write P_n for $P_{q_\delta^n}$.

From Proposition 2.1, for any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap F$, $(g_{n_j}(w))_{j \geq 0}$ is a martingale w.r.t. $\{\mathcal{F}'_j\}$, so $\mathbf{E}[g_{n_{j+1}}(w)|\mathcal{F}'_j] = g_{n_j}(w)$ for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. From Proposition 6.1, we have $\mathbf{E}[P_{n_{j+1}}(w)|\mathcal{F}'_j] = P_{n_j}(w) + o_\delta(1)$. Since P_{n_j} is positive harmonic in $\{|z - z_e| < r_0 + \varepsilon\}$ for some uniform constant $\varepsilon > 0$, and $P_{n_j}(z_e) = 1$ for all j , so from Harnack's inequality, the absolute value of the gradients of P_{n_j} on $K = \{|z - z_e| \leq r_0\}$ are bounded by a positive uniform constant. Since for any $z \in K$, there is $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap K$ with $|z - w| \leq 4\delta$, so for any $z \in K$, $\mathbf{E}[P_{n_{j+1}}(z)|\mathcal{F}'_j] = P_{n_j}(z) + o_\delta(1)$. Thus for any $z \in f(K)$,

$$\mathbf{E}[P_{n_{j+1}} \circ f^{-1}(z)|\mathcal{F}'_j] = P_{n_j} \circ f^{-1}(z) + o_\delta(1).$$

Note that $P_n \circ f^{-1} \circ (\varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta})^{-1}$ is the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}$ with the pole at $\xi_\delta(v_\delta(n))$, normalized by $P_n \circ f^{-1}(p) = 1$. Let $F = f(K)$. Then for any $z \in F$, $P_n \circ f^{-1}(z) = P^{\xi_\delta}(v_\delta(n), \xi_\delta(v_\delta(n)), \varphi_{v_\delta(n)}^{\xi_\delta}(z))$, so

$$\mathbf{E}[P^{\xi_\delta}(v_\delta(n_{j+1}), \xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_{j+1})), \varphi_{v_\delta(n_{j+1})}^{\xi_\delta}(z))|\mathcal{F}'_j] = P^{\xi_\delta}(v_\delta(n_j), \xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_j)), \varphi_{v_\delta(n_j)}^{\xi_\delta}(z)) + o_\delta(1). \quad (6.3)$$

Proposition 6.2 *There are a uniform constant $\delta(d) > 0$ depending only on d , and a uniform constant $d_2 > 0$ such that if $d < d_2$ and $\delta < \delta(d)$, then for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,*

$$\mathbf{E}[(\xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_{j+1})) - \xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_j))) - \int_{v_\delta(n_j)}^{v_\delta(n_{j+1})} \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(t, \xi_\delta(t)) dt |\mathcal{F}'_j] = O(d^3);$$

$$\mathbf{E}[(\xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_{j+1})) - \xi_\delta(v_\delta(n_j)))^2 - 2(v_\delta(n_{j+1}) - v_\delta(n_j))|\mathcal{F}'_j] = O(d^3).$$

Proof. Note that $K_{T_{\alpha_0}^\delta}^\xi \subset H(\alpha_1)$. Let $d_1 > 0$ be the uniform constant given by Lemma 6.5 with $\alpha = \alpha_1$ and $a = T_{\alpha_0}^\delta$. Let $d_2 = (d_1/2)^{1/2}$. Suppose $d < d_2$. Fix $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let $a = v_\delta(n_j)$, $b = v_\delta(n_{j+1})$. Then $0 \leq b - a \leq 2d^2 \leq 2d_2^2 = d_1$, and $|\xi_\delta(s) - \xi_\delta(t)| \leq 4d$ for any $s, t \in [a, b]$. Fix $z \in F$. From Lemma 6.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P^{\xi_\delta}(b, \xi_\delta(b), \varphi_b^{\xi_\delta}(z)) - P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z)) \\ &= \partial_2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z))((\xi_\delta(b) - \xi_\delta(a)) - \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a))(b - a)) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \partial_2^2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z))((\xi_\delta(b) - \xi_\delta(a))^2 - 2(b - a)) + O(d^3). \end{aligned}$$

Take the conditional expectation of this equality with respect to \mathcal{F}'_j . From (6.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z)) \mathbf{E}[(\xi_\delta(b) - \xi_\delta(a)) - \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a))(b - a) | \mathcal{F}'_j] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \partial_2^2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z)) \mathbf{E}[(\xi_\delta(b) - \xi_\delta(a))^2 - 2(b - a) | \mathcal{F}'_j] = O(d^3) + o_\delta(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $o_\delta(1) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, so there is a positive uniform function $\delta(d)$ depending only on d such that if $\delta < \delta(d)$, then $|o_\delta(1)| \leq d^3$. From Lemma 6.3, we have $\tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(t, \xi_\delta(t)) - \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a)) = O(d)$ for any $t \in [a, b]$. Thus for $\delta < \delta(d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z)) \mathbf{E}[(\xi_\delta(b) - \xi_\delta(a)) - \int_a^b \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(t, \xi_\delta(t)) dt | \mathcal{F}'_j] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \partial_2^2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z)) \mathbf{E}[(\xi_\delta(b) - \xi_\delta(a))^2 - 2(b - a) | \mathcal{F}'_j] = O(d^3). \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is true for any $z \in F$. We may choose $z_1 \neq z_2 \in F$ and solve the linear equations to get the estimates of the two conditional expectations. We already know that $\partial_2^j P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z)) = O(1)$ for $j = 1, 2$. So the proof will be completed if we prove that there is a uniform positive constant C_0 such that there are $z_1, z_2 \in K$ that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & |\partial_2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z_1)) \cdot \partial_2^2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z_2)) \\ & - \partial_2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z_2)) \cdot \partial_2^2 P^{\xi_\delta}(a, \xi_\delta(a), \varphi_a^{\xi_\delta}(z_1))| \geq C_0. \end{aligned}$$

This follows from the compactness of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$, and the fact that for every $H \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$ and $x \in [c_{\alpha_1}, d_{\alpha_1}]$, there are $z_1, z_2 \in F$ such that

$$\partial_2 P(H, x, \varphi_H(z_1)) \partial_2^2 P(H, x, \varphi_H(z_2)) - \partial_2 P(H, x, \varphi_H(z_2)) \partial_2^2 P(H, x, \varphi_H(z_1)) \neq 0, \quad (6.4)$$

where $P(H, x, \cdot)$ is the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega_H = \varphi_H(\Omega \setminus H)$ with the pole at x , normalized by $P(H, x, \varphi_H(p)) = 1$. Here if (6.4) does not hold for some $H \in \mathcal{H}(\alpha_1)$

and $x \in [c_{\alpha_1}, d_{\alpha_1}]$, then there is $C = C(H, x, F)$ such that $\partial_2^2 P(H, x, z) = C \partial_2 P(H, x, z)$ for $z \in \varphi_H(F)$. Since $\varphi_H(F)$ contains an interior point, and $\partial_1^j P(H, x, \cdot)$, $j = 1, 2$, are harmonic in Ω_H , so $\partial_2^2 P(H, x, z) = C \partial_2 P(H, x, z)$ for $z \in \Omega_H$, which can not be true because x is a pole of $\partial_2^j P(H, x, \cdot)$ of order $j + 1$ for $j = 1, 2$. \square

Let $\eta_\delta(t) = \xi_\delta(t) - 2 \int_0^t \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(s, \xi_\delta(s)) ds$, $0 \leq t \leq T_{\alpha_0}^\delta = v_\delta(n_\infty)$. From Lemma 6.3, we have $\int_{v_\delta(n_j)}^{v_\delta(n_{j+1})} \tilde{R}^{\xi_\delta}(s, \xi_\delta(s)) ds = O(d^2)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{\alpha_0}^\delta$. Thus

$$\mathbf{E}[(\eta_\delta(v_\delta(n_{j+1})) - \eta_\delta(v_\delta(n_j))) | \mathcal{F}'_j] = O(d^3);$$

$$\mathbf{E}[(\eta_\delta(v_\delta(n_{j+1})) - \eta_\delta(v_\delta(n_j)))^2 - 2(v_\delta(n_{j+1}) - v_\delta(n_j)) | \mathcal{F}'_j] = O(d^3).$$

The following theorem can be deduced by using the Skorokhod Embedding Theorem. It is very similar to Theorem 3.7 in [10]. So we omit the proof.

Theorem 6.1 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a uniform constant $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on ε such that if $\delta < \delta_0$ then there is a coupling of the processes $\eta_\delta(t)$ and a Brownian motion $B(t)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\eta_\delta(t) - \sqrt{2}B(t)| : t \in [0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta]\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Note that for $t \in [0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta]$, $\xi_\delta(t)$ solves the equation

$$\xi_\delta(t) = \eta_\delta(t) + 2 \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_\delta}(\xi_\delta(s)) ds. \quad (6.5)$$

Suppose $B(t)$ is a Brownian motion, and $\xi_0(t)$, $0 \leq t < T_0$, is the maximal solution to

$$\xi_0(t) = \sqrt{2}B(t) + 2 \int_0^t (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_s^{\xi_0}(\xi_0(s)) ds, \quad (6.6)$$

Then there is a.s. a simple curve β_0 such that $\beta_0(0) = 0$, $\beta_0(t) \in \mathbb{H}$ for $0 < t < T_0$, and $K_t^{\xi_0} = \beta_0((0, t])$ for $0 \leq t < T$. Then there is a continuous increasing function u_0 such that $\gamma_0(t) := f^{-1}(\beta_0(u_0^{-1}(t)))$, $0 \leq t < S_0 = u_0(T_0)$, is an $\text{LERW}(D; 0_+ \rightarrow z_e)$ trace.

If α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} , and β define on $[0, T)$ is a curve in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$, let $T_\alpha(\beta)$ be the first t such that $\beta(t) \in \alpha$, if such t exists; otherwise let $T_\alpha(\beta) = T$. Then we have $T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta) \leq T_{\alpha_0}^\delta$. If $\beta(0)$ is enclosed by α and $\beta(t) \notin \mathbb{R}$ for $t > 0$, then $\beta([0, T_\alpha(\beta)))$ is enclosed by α .

Theorem 6.2 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a uniform constant $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on ε such that if $\delta < \delta_0$ then there is a coupling of the processes $\xi_\delta(t)$ and $\xi_0(t)$, such that*

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\xi_\delta(t) - \xi_0(t)| : t \in [0, T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)]\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (6.7)$$

Here if β_0 is not defined on $[0, T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)]$, then the value of \sup is set to be $+\infty$.

Proof. Let $\alpha_2 = f(\rho_2)$. Then α_2 is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses α_1 , and such that $H(\alpha_2) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. Since $K_{T_{\alpha_0}^\delta}^{\xi_\delta} \subset H(\alpha_1)$, so from Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.8, there are uniform constants $\varepsilon_1, C_1 > 0$ such that for any $t \in [0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta]$, if $\|\xi_0 - \xi_\delta\|_t < \varepsilon_1$, then $K_t^{\xi_0} \subset H(\alpha_2)$, and

$$|(\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\xi_0}(\xi_0(t)) - (\partial_x \partial_y / \partial_y) J_t^{\xi_\delta}(\xi_\delta(t))| \leq C_1 \|\xi_0 - \xi_\delta\|_t. \quad (6.8)$$

Let $C_2 = e^{C_1 h_1} / (2C_1)$, where $h_1 = \text{hcap}(H(\alpha_1))$. From Theorem 6.1, there is a uniform constant $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, C_2$ such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then there is a coupling of η_δ with $\sqrt{2}B$ such that the probability that $|\eta_\delta(t) - \sqrt{2}B(t)| < (\varepsilon \wedge \varepsilon_1) / C_2$ for $t \in [0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta]$ is greater than $1 - \varepsilon$. Let \mathcal{E}^δ denote this event. Assume \mathcal{E}^δ occurs. Since ε_1 and C_2 are uniform constants, so δ_0 is a uniform constant depending on ε .

Now $\xi_0(0) = 0 = \xi_\delta(0)$. Let $[0, b)$ be maximal subinterval of $[0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta) \cap [0, T_0)$, on which $|\xi_0(t) - \xi_\delta(t)| < \varepsilon_1$. Then from equations (6.5), (6.6), and (6.8), we have

$$\|\xi_0 - \xi_\delta\|_t \leq \|\eta_\delta - \sqrt{2}B\|_{T_{\alpha_0}^\delta} + 2C_1 \int_0^t \|\xi_0 - \xi_\delta\|_s ds,$$

for any $t \in [0, b]$. Solving this inequality, since $b \leq T_{\alpha_0}^\delta \leq h_1/2$ and \mathcal{E}^δ occurs, so

$$\|\xi_0 - \xi_\delta\|_b \leq (e^{2C_1 b} - 1) / (2C_1) \|\eta_\delta - \sqrt{2}B\|_{T_{\alpha_0}^\delta} \leq C_2 \|\eta_\delta - \sqrt{2}B\|_{T_{\alpha_0}^\delta} < \varepsilon \wedge \varepsilon_1.$$

Thus $K_t^{\xi_0} \subset H(\alpha_2)$ for $0 \leq t < b$. From part (ii) of Corollary 3.1, we have $b < T_0$. Since $\|\xi_0 - \xi_\delta\|_b < \varepsilon_1$, so $b = T_{\alpha_0}^\delta$. Thus $\xi_0(t)$ is defined on $[0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta]$, and $|\xi_\delta(t) - \xi_0(t)| < \varepsilon$ for $t \in [0, T_{\alpha_0}^\delta]$. Since $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^\delta] > 1 - \varepsilon$, and $T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta) \leq T_{\alpha_0}^\delta$, so we have (6.7). \square

Theorem 6.3 *Suppose α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses 0, and $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on α and ε , such that if $\delta < \delta_0$ then there is a coupling of the processes $\xi_\delta(t)$ and $\xi_0(t)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\xi_\delta(t) - \xi_0(t)| : t \in [0, T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)]\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (6.9)$$

If ξ_δ or ξ_0 is not defined on $[0, T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)]$, then the value of sup is set to be $+\infty$.

Proof. We may choose ρ_0, ρ_1 that satisfy the properties at the beginning of this subsection, such that α is strictly enclosed by $\alpha_0 = f(\rho_0)$. Then we choose r_0, K, ρ_2 , and define d_0 , as in the paragraph right after the proof of Proposition 6.1. From Lemma 5.5, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ depending on α and α_0 such that if $K_a^\zeta \subset H(\alpha)$ and $\|\zeta - \eta\|_a < \delta_1$, then K_a^η is strictly enclosed by α_0 . For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon \wedge \delta_1$. From Theorem 6.2 and the meaning of a uniform constant, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, r_0, K, d_0$, and

ε_0 , such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then there is a coupling of ξ_δ and ξ_0 such that (6.7) holds with ε replaced by ε_0 . Assume this coupling. Let \mathcal{E}^δ denote the event that $|\xi_\delta(t) - \xi_0(t)| < \varepsilon_0$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^\delta] > 1 - \varepsilon_0 \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Assume \mathcal{E}^δ occurs. From part (ii) of Corollary 3.1, ξ_0 is defined on $[0, T_\alpha(\beta_0)]$. We claim that $T_\alpha(\beta_0) < T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)$. If the claim is not true, then $K_{T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)}^{\xi_0} \subset H(\alpha)$, which implies that $K_{T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)}^{\xi_\delta}$ does not intersect $\overline{\alpha_0}$ because $\|\xi_\delta - \xi_0\|_{T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)} < \varepsilon_0 \leq \delta_1$. This contradicts the definition of T_{α_0} . So the claim is justified. This means that $T_\alpha(\beta_0) < T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)$ on \mathcal{E}^δ under the coupling. It is always true that $T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \leq T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)$ because α is enclosed by α_0 . Thus on the event \mathcal{E}^δ , we have $T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \wedge T_\alpha(\beta_0) \leq T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta)$, and so $|\xi_\delta(t) - \xi_0(t)| < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)$. So we have (6.9). Finally, since we have the freedom to choose $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, r_0, K, d_0$, so δ_0 depends only on α and ε . \square

7 Convergence of the Curves

7.1 Local convergence

We first introduce a well-known lemma about random walks on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. We use the superscript $\#$ to denote the spherical metric, and let $\mathbf{B}(w; R) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - w| < R\}$ and $\mathbf{B}^\#(w; R) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{dist}^\#(z, w) < R\}$.

Lemma 7.1 *Suppose $w \in \delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ and K is a connected set on the plane that has Euclidean (spherical, resp.) diameter at least R . Then the probability that a random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ started from w will exit $\mathbf{B}(w; R)$ ($\mathbf{B}^\#(w; R)$, resp.) before using an edge of $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ that intersects K is at most $C_0((\delta + \text{dist}(w, K))/R)^{C_1}$ ($C_0((\delta + \text{dist}^\#(w, K))/R)^{C_1}$, resp.) for some absolute constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$.*

For $w \in V(D^\delta)$, let X_w (X_w^r , resp.) be a random walk on D^δ started from w , stopped when it hits $V_\partial(D^\delta) \cup \{w_e^\delta\}$ (hits $V_\partial(D^\delta)$, resp.). Let Y_w be X_w conditioned to hit w_e^δ . Let Y_w^r be X_w^r conditioned to hit the boundary vertex $\langle \delta, 0 \rangle$. By definition, $q_\delta = \text{LE}(Y_\delta)$. Let $q_\delta^r = \text{LE}(Y_{w_e^\delta}^r)$. From the relationship between LERW and UST (uniform spanning tree), if we forget about the direction, then q_δ and q_δ^r have the same distribution as the curve connecting 0 and w_e^δ in the UST on D^δ with wired boundary condition, conditioned on the event that the only path on the UST connecting w_e^δ with ∂D passing through the edge $[0, \delta]$. So the reversal of q_δ has the same distribution as q_δ^r .

Define Q and Q^r on $V(D^\delta)$. For $w \in V(D^\delta)$, let $Q(w)$ be the probability that X_w hits w_e^δ ; let $Q^r(w)$ be the probability that X_w^r hits $\langle \delta, 0 \rangle$. Then Q and Q^r take values in $[0, 1]$. Q vanishes on $V_\partial(D^\delta)$, and is discrete harmonic on $V_I(D^\delta) \setminus \{w_e^\delta\}$. Q^r vanishes on $V_\partial(D^\delta) \setminus \{\langle \delta, 0 \rangle\}$, and is discrete harmonic on $V_I(D^\delta)$.

Lemma 7.1 will be applied because if $w \in D$, X_w (X_w^r , resp.) is not different from a random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ started from w stopped when it uses an edge that intersects ∂D or hits w_e^δ (stopped when it uses an edge that intersects ∂D , resp.). And Y_w (Y_w^r , resp.) can be related with X_w (X_w^r , resp.) by the function $Q(w)$ ($Q^r(w)$, resp.).

Definition 7.1 Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $r, \varepsilon > 0$. A (z, r, ε) -quasi-loop in a path ω is a pair $a, b \in \omega$ such that $a, b \in \mathbf{B}(z; r)$, $|a - b| \leq \varepsilon$, and the subarc of ω with endpoints a and b is not contained in $\mathbf{B}(z; 2r)$. Let $\mathcal{L}_\delta(z, r, \varepsilon)$ denote the event that q_δ has a (z, r, ε) -quasi-loop.

Lemma 7.2 Suppose $r > 0$ and $\mathbf{B}(z_0; 5r) \subset D$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{L}_\delta(z_0, r, \varepsilon)] \rightarrow 0$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in δ .

Proof. We will use the idea of the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [18]. However, that proof does not apply here immediately, because we are dealing with the loop-erasure of a *conditional* random walk, and Wilson's algorithm does not apply to a *conditional* UST.

Let $\mathcal{L}_\delta^r(z_0, r, \varepsilon)$ denote the event that q_δ^r has a (z_0, r, ε) -quasi-loop. Since the reversal of q_δ has the same distribution as q_δ^r , so $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{L}_\delta^r(z_0, r, \varepsilon)] = \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{L}_\delta(z_0, r, \varepsilon)]$. It suffices to show that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{L}_\delta^r(z_0, r, \varepsilon)] = 0$, uniformly in $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$ for some absolute constant $\delta_1 > 0$ because if $\delta > \delta_1$, then $\mathcal{L}_\delta^r(z_0, r, \varepsilon)$ does not happen when $\varepsilon < \delta_1$.

Let $\mathbf{B}_k = \mathbf{B}(z_0; kr)$, $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. Let s_1 be the first s such that $Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(s) \in \mathbf{B}_1$, if such s exists; otherwise, we do not define s_1 , let $M = 0$ and stop here. If s_1 is defined, let t_1 be the first $t > s_1$, such that $Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(t) \notin \mathbf{B}_2$. Inductively, if t_j is defined, then define s_{j+1} to be the first time $s > t_j$ such that $Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(s) \in \mathbf{B}_1$, if such s exists; otherwise, let $M = j$ and stop here. If s_{j+1} is defined, then define t_{j+1} to be the first time $t > s_{j+1}$ such that $Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(t) \notin \mathbf{B}_2$. Then we get a sequence $s_1 < t_1 < \dots < s_M < t_M$. Such M is a random number. Finally, for each $s \geq 0$, let $(Y_{w_e^\delta}^r)^s$ be the restriction of $Y_{w_e^\delta}^r$ to $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$.

For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{Y}_j be the event that $j \leq M$ and $\text{LE}((Y_{w_e^\delta}^r)^{t_j})$ has a (z_0, r, ε) -quasi-loop. Then \mathcal{Y}_1 is empty, and it is clear that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_\delta^r(z_0, r, \varepsilon) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{Y}_j \subset \{M \geq m+1\} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m \mathcal{Y}_j. \quad (7.1)$$

We first estimate $\mathbf{P}[M \geq j+1 | (Y_{w_e^\delta}^r)^{t_j}]$. For $w \in V(D^\delta) \setminus \mathbf{B}_1$, let $Q_1^r(w)$ be the probability that X_w^r hits ∂D before \mathbf{B}_1 , and leaves D through $[\delta, 0]$. Then the probability that Y_w^r does not hit \mathbf{B}_1 is equal to $Q_1^r(w)/Q^r(w)$. From the Markov property of Y , we have

$$\mathbf{P}[M \geq j+1 | (Y_{w_e^\delta}^r)^{t_j}] = Q_1^r(Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(t_j))/Q^r(Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(t_j)).$$

It is clear that $Q_1^r(w) \leq Q^r(w)$ for any $w \in V(D^\delta) \setminus \mathbf{B}_1$. Let $F = \{2r \leq |z - z_0| \leq 3r\}$. Then F is a compact subset of $D \setminus \overline{\mathbf{B}_1}$, and if $\delta < r$, then $Y_{w_e^\delta}^r(t_j) \in F$. We claim that

there are absolute constants $\delta_0 \in (0, r)$ and $1 > C_2 > 0$ such that $Q_1^r(w)/Q^r(w) < C_2$ for any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap F$, if $\delta < \delta_0$. If the claim is not true, then we can find $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $w_n \in V(D^{\delta_n}) \cap F$, and $w_n \rightarrow w_0 \in F$, such that $Q_1^{\delta_n}(w_n)/Q^{\delta_n}(w_n) \rightarrow 1$. Let $I^{\delta_n}(w) = Q^{\delta_n}(w)/Q^{\delta_n}(w_n)$ and $I_1^{\delta_n}(w) = Q_1^{\delta_n}(w)/Q^{\delta_n}(w_n)$. Then $I_1^{\delta_n} \leq I^{\delta_n}$. Let P and P_1 be the generalized Poisson kernels in D and $D \setminus \overline{\mathbf{B}_1}$, respectively, with the pole at 0_+ , normalized by $P(w_0) = P_1(w_0) = 1$. Then I^{δ_n} and $I_1^{\delta_n}$ converge to P and P_1 , respectively, in $D \setminus \overline{\mathbf{B}_1}$. Thus $P_1 \leq P$ in $D \setminus \overline{\mathbf{B}_1}$. From $P_1(w_0) = P(w_0)$, we must have $P_1 \equiv P$ in $D \setminus \overline{\mathbf{B}_1}$, which is a contradiction because P does not vanish on $\partial \mathbf{B}_1$. So the claim is justified, and we have $\mathbf{P}[M \geq j+1 | (Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r)^{t_j}] \leq C_2$. By induction, we therefore find that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then

$$\mathbf{P}[M \geq m+1] \leq C_2^m. \quad (7.2)$$

We now estimate $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{Y}_{j+1} | \neg \mathcal{Y}_j, (Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r)^{t_j}]$. Let \mathcal{Q}_j be the set of components of intersection of \mathbf{B}_2 with $\text{LE}((Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r)^{s_{j+1}})$ that do not contain $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r(s_{j+1})$. Observe that if \mathcal{Y}_j does not occur, then for \mathcal{Y}_{j+1} to occur, there must be a $K \in \mathcal{Q}_j$ such that $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r$ comes at some time $t \in [s_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]$ within distance ε of $K \cap \mathbf{B}_1$ but $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r(t) \notin K$ for all $t \in [s_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]$. But if $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r(t)$ is close to K for some $t \in [s_{j+1}, t_{j+1}]$, then Lemma 7.1 can be applied, to estimate the probability that $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r(t)$ will not hit K before time t_{j+1} .

Suppose $\delta < \delta_1 := \delta_0 \wedge \text{dist}(0, \mathbf{B}_5)$, then $\delta \notin \mathbf{B}_5$, so Q^r is discrete harmonic inside \mathbf{B}_5 , and $Q^r(w) > 0$ for any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap \mathbf{B}_5$. Applying Harnack's inequality to Q^r , we get an absolute constant $C_1 \geq 1$ such that $Q^r(w_1) \leq C_1 Q^r(w_2)$ for any $w_1, w_2 \in V(D^\delta) \cap \mathbf{B}_4$. Let T_3 be the first time that a path leaves \mathbf{B}_3 or hits K . Then for any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap \mathbf{B}_3$, $X_w^r(t)$ and $Y_w^r(t)$, $t = 0, 1, \dots, T_3$, are contained in \mathbf{B}_4 because $\delta < \delta_0 < r$. Note that for any path (w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n) on D^δ that is contained in \mathbf{B}_4 ,

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_{w_0}^r(j) = w_j, 1 \leq j \leq n] / \mathbf{P}[X_{w_0}^r(j) = w_j, 1 \leq j \leq n] = Q^r(w_n)/Q^r(w_0) \leq C_1.$$

Therefore, conditioned on $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r(s_{j+1})$, for each given $K \in \mathcal{Q}_j$, the probability that $Y_{w_\varepsilon}^r([s_{j+1}, t_{j+1}])$ gets to within distance ε of K but does not hit K is at most $C_3((\delta + \varepsilon)/r)^{C_4}$ for some absolute constant $C_3, C_4 > 0$. Note that if $\delta > \varepsilon$, then the above event can not happen, so the probability is at most $C_3(2\varepsilon/r)^{C_4}$. Observe that $|\mathcal{Q}_j|$, the cardinality of \mathcal{Q}_j , is at most j . Let $C_5 = C_3(2/r)^{C_4}$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{Y}_{j+1} | \neg \mathcal{Y}_j] \leq j C_5 \varepsilon^{C_4}.$$

This gives

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\bigcup_{j=1}^m \mathcal{Y}_j\right] = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{Y}_{j+1} \cap \neg \mathcal{Y}_j] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{Y}_{j+1} | \neg \mathcal{Y}_j] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} j C_5 \varepsilon^{C_4} \leq m^2 C_5 \varepsilon^{C_4}.$$

Combining this with (7.1) and (7.2), we find that

$$\mathbf{P} [\mathcal{L}_\delta^r(z_0, r, \varepsilon)] \leq C_2^m + m^2 C_5 \varepsilon^{C_4}.$$

Since $C_2 \in (0, 1)$, the lemma follows by taking $m = \lfloor \varepsilon^{-C_4/3} \rfloor$, say. \square

Definition 7.2 *Let $F \subset \mathbb{C}$, and $r, \varepsilon > 0$. An (F, r, ε) -quasi-loop in a path ω is a pair $a, b \in \omega$ such that $a \in F$, $|a - b| < \varepsilon$, and the subarc of ω with endpoints a and b is not contained in $\mathbf{B}(a; r)$. One should note that a $(\{z_0\}, r, \varepsilon)$ -quasi-loop is different from a (z_0, r, ε) -quasi-loop.*

Corollary 7.1 *Suppose F is a compact subset of D , and $r > 0$. Then the probability that q_δ contains an (F, r, ε) -quasi-loop tends to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in δ .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}_\delta(F, r, \varepsilon)$ denote this event. We may find $r_0 \in (0, r/3)$ and finitely many points $z_1, \dots, z_n \in F$, such that $\mathbf{B}(z_j; 5r_0) \subset D$ for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n]}$, and $F \subset \cup_{j=1}^n \mathbf{B}(z_j; r_0/2)$. It is easy to check that if $\varepsilon < r_0/2$, then $\mathcal{L}_\delta(F, r, \varepsilon) \subset \cup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{L}_\delta(z_j, r_0, \varepsilon)$. The conclusion follows from Lemma 7.2. \square

Corollary 7.2 *Suppose F is a compact subset of Ω , and $r > 0$. Then the probability that β_δ contains an (F, r, ε) -quasi-loop tends to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in δ .*

Proof. This follows from the last corollary, and the facts that f maps D conformally onto Ω , f (f^{-1} , resp.) is uniformly continuous on each compact subset of D (Ω , resp.), and that β_δ is a time-change of $f \circ q_\delta$. \square

For a domain E and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\partial_\varepsilon^\# E := \{z \in E : \text{dist}^\#(z, \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E) < \varepsilon\}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $f(\partial_{\varepsilon_1}^\# D) \subset \partial_\varepsilon^\# \Omega$ and $f^{-1}(\partial_{\varepsilon_2}^\# \Omega) \subset \partial_\varepsilon^\# D$.

Lemma 7.3 *Suppose U_0 is a neighborhood of 0_+ in D . Then the probability that q_δ visits $\partial_\varepsilon^\# D$ after leaving U_0 tends to 0 as $\varepsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. Choose a crosscut ρ such that $H(\rho)$ is a neighborhood of 0_+ in D , and $H(\rho) \subset U_0$. We suffice to prove that the probability that Y_δ visits $\partial_\varepsilon^\# D$ after leaving $H(\rho)$ tends to 0 as $\varepsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$. Let $r_0 = \text{dist}(z_e, \partial D) > 0$. Let $d_1 = \text{dist}^\#(\mathbf{B}(z_e; r_0/2), \partial D) > 0$. Choose $d_2 \in (0, d_1)$, and define $K = D \setminus (\partial_{d_2}^\# D) \setminus \mathbf{B}(z_e; r_0/4)$ and $F = K \cap H(\rho)$. We may assume that d_2 is small enough that F has nonempty interior. Applying Harnack's inequality to Q on K , we find a constant $C_0 \geq 1$ such that $Q(w_1) \leq C_0 Q(w_2)$ for any $w_1, w_2 \in V(D^\delta) \cap K$, if δ is small enough.

Let Y_δ^ρ be X_δ conditioned to leave $H(\rho)$ through an edge that intersects ρ . Then Y_δ^ρ approximates the Brownian excursion in $H(\rho)$ started from 0_+ conditioned to hit ρ .

Since the interior of F is a nonempty subset of $H(\rho)$, so there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that if δ is small enough, then $\mathbf{P}[Y_\delta^\rho \text{ hits } F] \geq C_1$, which implies that

$$\mathbf{P}[X_\delta \text{ visits } F \text{ before } \partial D] \geq C_1 \mathbf{P}[X_\delta \text{ leaves } H(\rho) \text{ through an edge that intersects } \rho]. \quad (7.3)$$

Suppose $\delta < r_0/4$, then $w_e^\delta \in \mathbf{B}(z_e; r_0/4)$, and any lattice path on D^δ that connects w_e^δ with some vertex in $\partial_{d_2}^\# D$ must use some vertex in the annulus $\{r_0/4 \leq |z - z_e| \leq r_0/2\}$, which is a subset of K . Let $d_0 > 0$ be the smallest spherical diameter of the components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$. Then from Lemma 7.1, there are absolute constants $C_2, C_3 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon < d_2/2$, and $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap \partial_\varepsilon^\# D$,

$$\mathbf{P}[X_w \text{ visits } K \text{ before } \partial D] \leq C_2((\varepsilon + \delta)/((d_2/2) \wedge d_0))^{C_3}. \quad (7.4)$$

From the definition of X_δ , Y_δ , and the Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}[Y_\delta \text{ visits } \partial_\varepsilon^\# D \text{ after leaving } H(\rho)] \\ &= \mathbf{P}[X_\delta \text{ first leaves } H(\rho) \text{ through an edge that intersects } \rho, \text{ then visits } \partial_\varepsilon^\# D, \\ & \quad \text{and then visits } K \text{ before } \partial D, \text{ and finally visits } w_e^\delta \text{ before } \partial D]/Q(\delta) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}[X_\delta \text{ leaves } H(\rho) \text{ through an edge that intersects } \rho] \cdot \\ & \quad \cdot \sup\{\mathbf{P}[X_w \text{ visits } K \text{ before } \partial D] : w \in V(D^\delta) \cap \partial_\varepsilon^\# D\} \\ & \quad \cdot \sup\{Q(w) : w \in V(D^\delta) \cap K\}/Q(\delta). \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\delta) &= \mathbf{P}[X_\delta \text{ visits } w_e^\delta \text{ before leaving } H(\rho)] \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}[X_\delta \text{ visits } F \text{ before } \partial D] \cdot \inf\{Q(w) : w \in V(D^\delta) \cap F\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

From (7.3), (7.4), (7.5), (7.6), and the facts that $F \subset K$, and $Q(w_1) \leq C_0 Q(w_2)$ for any $w_1, w_2 \in V(D^\delta) \cap K$, we conclude that if δ is small enough, then

$$\mathbf{P}[Y_\delta \text{ visits } \partial_\varepsilon^\# D \text{ after leaving } H(\rho)] \leq C_0 C_2 / C_1 ((\varepsilon + \delta)/((d_2/2) \wedge d_0))^{C_3}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 7.3 *Suppose U_0 is a neighborhood of 0 in Ω . Then the probability that β_δ visits $\partial_\varepsilon^\# \Omega$ after leaving U_0 tends to 0 as $\varepsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$.*

Proposition 7.1 *Let $a, \varepsilon > 0$. There are $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for $\delta < \delta_0$, with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, β_δ satisfies that if $|\beta_\delta(t_1) - \beta_\delta(t_2)| < \varepsilon_0$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq a$, then the diameter of $\beta_\delta([t_1, t_2])$ is less than ε .*

Proof. Choose a hull H in \mathbb{H} w.r.t. ∞ such that H is a neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{H} , and $\text{hcap}(H)/2 < a$. Then β_δ leaves H before time a (if β_δ is defined on $[0, a]$). From Corollary 7.3, there are $\delta_0, \varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/2$, $\beta_\delta(t) \in F := \Omega \setminus \partial_{\varepsilon_1}^\# \Omega$ for $t \geq a$. Let \mathcal{E}_1^δ denote this event. Since F is a compact subset of Ω , so from Corollary 7.2, there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/2$, β_δ does not contain an $(F, \varepsilon/3, \varepsilon_0)$ -quasi-loop. Let \mathcal{E}_2^δ denote this event. Let $\mathcal{E}^\delta = \mathcal{E}_1^\delta \cap \mathcal{E}_2^\delta$. Suppose $\delta < \delta_0$ and \mathcal{E}^δ occurs. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^\delta] > 1 - \varepsilon$. If $t_1, t_2 \geq a$ and $|\beta_\delta(t_1) - \beta_\delta(t_2)| < \varepsilon_0$, since $\beta_\delta(t_1) \in F$, and β_δ does not contain an $(F, \varepsilon/3, \varepsilon_0)$ -quasi-loop, so $\beta_\delta([t_1, t_2]) \subset \mathbf{B}(\beta_\delta(t_1); \varepsilon/3)$, whose diameter is less than ε . \square

Theorem 7.1 *Suppose α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses 0, and $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on α and ε , such that if $\delta < \delta_0$ then there is a coupling of the processes $\beta_\delta(t)$ and $\beta_0(t)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : t \in [0, T_\alpha(\beta_0)]\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (7.7)$$

Proof. This is similar to Theorem 1.2 in [23]. Choose a crosscut α_1 in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses α , such that $H(\alpha_1) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. Suppose the theorem is false, then there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, such that for each δ_n , there is no coupling of β_{δ_n} with β_0 such that (7.7) holds with δ replaced by δ_n . From Theorem 6.3, and by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that for each n , there is a coupling of ξ_{δ_n} and ξ_0 such that

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\xi_{\delta_n}(t) - \xi_0(t)| : t \in [0, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]\} \geq 1/2^n] < 1/2^n, \quad (7.8)$$

We may assume that all ξ_{δ_n} and ξ_0 are defined in the same probability space, and (7.8) is satisfied. Then almost surely $\|\xi_{\delta_n} - \xi_0(t)\|_{T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)} \rightarrow 0$.

Fix any $t \in [0, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]$. Suppose F is any compact subset of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t])$. From $\|\xi_{\delta_n} - \xi_0(t)\|_t \rightarrow 0$, we see that $\varphi_t^{\xi_{\delta_n}} \rightarrow \varphi_t^{\xi_0}$ uniformly on F , and $F \subset \mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t])$ for all but finitely many n . Thus $(\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t]) \cap (\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t])) \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t])$. From Lemma 5.1, $(\varphi_t^{\xi_{\delta_n}})^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{l.u.}} (\varphi_t^{\xi_0})^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{H} = \varphi_t^{\xi_0}(\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t]))$. Thus we have $\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t]) \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t])$.

Since β_0 is a continuous curve started from 0, so there is $b > 0$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0/6$, $\beta_0([0, b]) \subset \{|z| < \varepsilon_0/4\}$. From Lemma 5.5 and the uniform convergence of ξ_{δ_n} to ξ_0 on $[0, b]$, there is $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $n \geq N_1$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0/3$, we have $\beta_0([0, b]) \subset \{|z| < \varepsilon_0/4\}$ and $\beta_{\delta_n}([0, b]) \subset \{|z| < \varepsilon_0/3\}$. Let \mathcal{E}_1^n denote this event.

Let $a = b/2$. From Theorem 6.3 and Proposition 7.1, there are $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $n > N_2$, then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_0/3$, ξ_{δ_n} is defined on $[0, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]$, and if $|\beta_{\delta_n}(t_2) - \beta_{\delta_n}(t_1)| < \varepsilon_1$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq a$, then the diameter of $\beta_{\delta_n}([t_1, t_2])$ is less than $\varepsilon_0/3$. Let \mathcal{E}_2^n denote this event.

Since β_0 is continuous on $[a, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]$, $\beta_0([a, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]) \cap \mathbb{R} = \emptyset$, and $T_\alpha(\beta_0) < T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)$, so there is $\Delta, h > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_0/3$, the followings hold: $T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0) - T_\alpha(\beta_0) > \Delta$, $\text{Im } \beta_0(t) \geq h$ for any $t \in [a, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]$, and if $t_1, t_2 \in [a, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]$ and $|t_1 - t_2| \leq \Delta$, then $|\beta_0(t_1) - \beta_0(t_2)| < \varepsilon_1/3$. Let \mathcal{E}_3 denote this event.

Let $A = \text{hcap}(H(\alpha_1))/2$. Then $T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0) \leq A$. Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A/N < (\Delta \wedge b)/2$, and define $t_k = a + (T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0) - a)k/N$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$. Then $t_0 = a$, $t_N = T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)$, and $t_1 \leq b$, $t_{N-1} \geq T_\alpha(\beta_0)$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, N]}$. Since $\beta_0(t_k) \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t_{k-1}])$ and $\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t_{k-1}]) \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t_{k-1}])$, so there is $M_k^1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\beta_0(t_k) \notin \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t_{k-1}])$ when $n > M_k^1$. Since $\beta_0(t_k)$ is a boundary point of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t_k])$ and $\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t_k]) \xrightarrow{\text{Cara}} \mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_0((0, t_k])$, so there is $M_k^2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that when $n > M_k^2$, there is $z_n \in \partial(\mathbb{H} \setminus \beta_{\delta_n}((0, t_k]))$ with $|z_n - \beta_0(t_k)| < (\varepsilon_1/3) \wedge h$. If event \mathcal{E}_3 occurs, and $n > M_k^1 \vee M_k^2$, then $z_n \notin \mathbb{R}$ and $z_n \notin \beta((0, t_{k-1}])$, which implies that $z_n = \beta_{\delta_n}(s_k)$ for some $s_k \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$. Thus if \mathcal{E}_3 occurs and $n > M := \bigvee_{k=1}^N (M_k^1 \vee M_k^2)$, then we have $s_k \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$, such that $|\beta_{\delta_n}(s_k) - \beta_0(t_k)| < \varepsilon_1/3$.

Let $L = N_1 \vee N_2 \vee M$. Let $\mathcal{E}^n = \mathcal{E}_1^n \cap \mathcal{E}_2^n \cap \mathcal{E}_3$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^n] > 1 - \varepsilon_0$. Assume that $n > L$ and \mathcal{E}^n occurs. Fix $t \in [0, T_\alpha(\beta_0)]$. If $t \leq b$, then $\beta_{\delta_n}(t), \beta_0(t) \in \{|z| < \varepsilon_0/3\}$ because \mathcal{E}_1^n occurs and $n > N_1$, so $|\beta_{\delta_n}(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \varepsilon_0$. Now suppose $t \geq b$. Then $t \in [b, T_\alpha(\beta_0)] \subset [t_1, t_{N-1}] \subset [s_1, s_N]$. Thus $t \in [s_k, s_{k+1}]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, N-1]}$. Since $n > M$, $t_k, t_{k+1} \in [a, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_0)]$, $|t_k - t_{k+1}| < \Delta$, and \mathcal{E}_3 occurs, so

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_{\delta_n}(s_k) - \beta_{\delta_n}(s_{k+1})| &\leq |\beta_{\delta_n}(s_k) - \beta_0(t_k)| + |\beta_0(t_k) - \beta_0(t_{k+1})| \\ &\quad + |\beta_0(t_{k+1}) - \beta_{\delta_n}(s_{k+1})| < \varepsilon_1/3 + \varepsilon_1/3 + \varepsilon_1/3 = \varepsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n > N_2$, $t \in [s_{k-1}, s_k]$, and \mathcal{E}_2^n occurs, so $|\beta_{\delta_n}(t) - \beta_{\delta_n}(s_k)| < \varepsilon_0/3$. Since $t \in [s_k, s_{k+1}] \subset [t_{k-1}, t_{k+1}]$, so $|t - t_k| < \Delta$. Since \mathcal{E}_3 occurs, so $|\beta_0(t) - \beta_0(t_k)| < \varepsilon_1/3$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_{\delta_n}(t) - \beta_0(t)| &\leq |\beta_{\delta_n}(t) - \beta_{\delta_n}(s_k)| + |\beta_{\delta_n}(s_k) - \beta_0(t_k)| \\ &\quad + |\beta_0(t) - \beta_0(t_k)| \leq \varepsilon_0/3 + \varepsilon_1/3 + \varepsilon_1/3 < \varepsilon_0/3 + \varepsilon_0/3 + \varepsilon_0/3 = \varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0$, $|\beta_{\delta_n}(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \varepsilon_0$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_\alpha(\beta_0)$, which contradicts the choice of (δ_n) . \square

We may also derive a coupling with symmetric inequality. The idea similar to the development of Theorem 6.3 from Theorem 6.2.

Theorem 7.2 *Let α be as in Theorem 7.1. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on α and ε , such that if $\delta < \delta_0$ then there is a coupling of the processes $\beta_\delta(t)$ and $\beta_0(t)$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : t \in [0, T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)]\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (7.9)$$

7.2 Global convergence

We restrict β_δ to $[0, T_\delta)$. Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_\delta} \beta_\delta(t) = f(w_e^\delta)$. Recall that β_0 is defined on $[0, T_0)$, where $[0, T_0)$ is the maximal interval on which the solution to equation (6.6) exists. Let \mathcal{B} denote the set of continuous curves $\beta : [0, T(\beta)) \rightarrow \Omega \cup \mathbb{R}$, for some $T(\beta) \in (0, \infty]$, with $\beta(0) = 0$ and $\beta(t) \in \Omega$ for $t \in (0, T(\beta))$. So T is a function taking values in $(0, \infty]$ on \mathcal{B} that describes the length of lifetime. Then β_0 and β_δ are \mathcal{B} valued random variables, and $T(\beta_\delta) = T_\delta$, $T(\beta_0) = T_0$.

Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of crosscuts α in \mathbb{H} that strictly enclose 0, and such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega \setminus \{p\}$. For $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, we write $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_2 \succ \alpha_1$ if α_1 is strictly enclosed by α_2 . For any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, let $T_\alpha(\beta)$ be the biggest $T \in (0, T(\beta)]$ such that $\beta(t) \notin \alpha$ for $0 \leq t < T$. It is clear that $T_{\alpha_1} \leq T_{\alpha_2}$ if $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_2$. Define $T_\alpha^+ = \bigwedge_{\alpha' \succ \alpha} T_{\alpha'}$.

Suppose $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. For $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\Delta(\beta_1, \beta)$ be 0 if $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ and 1 otherwise, where $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ means that $T(\beta_1) = T(\beta_2)$ and $\beta_1(t) = \beta_2(t)$ for $0 \leq t < T(\beta_1)$, and define

$$d_\alpha^\vee(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \Delta(\beta_1, \beta_2) \wedge \sup\{|\beta_1(t) - \beta_2(t)| : t \in [0, T_\alpha(\beta_1) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_2)]\},$$

where the value of the sup is set to be ∞ if either $\beta_1(t)$ or $\beta_2(t)$ is not defined at some t in the interval of the formula. Then $0 \leq d_\alpha^\vee \leq 1$. Now define

$$d_\alpha(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \inf\left\{\sum_{k=1}^n d_\alpha^\vee(\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma_k) : \gamma_0 = \beta_1, \gamma_n = \beta_2, \gamma_k \in \mathcal{B}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n-1]}, n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}.$$

Then d_α is a pseudo-metric on \mathcal{B} , and $d_\alpha \leq d_\alpha^\vee$. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $r > 0$, let $\mathbf{B}_\alpha(\beta_1; r) = \{\beta \in \mathcal{B} : d_\alpha(\beta, \beta_1) < r\}$. Let \mathcal{T}_α denote the topology generated by d_α . It is clear that if $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_2$, then $d_{\alpha_1}^\vee \leq d_{\alpha_2}^\vee$, so $d_{\alpha_1} \leq d_{\alpha_2}$, from which follows that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1} \subset \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_2}$. Let $\mathcal{T}_\alpha^+ = \bigcap_{\alpha' \succ \alpha} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha'}$.

Lemma 7.4 *Suppose $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $d_0 = 1 \wedge \text{dist}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) > 0$. Suppose $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, and $d_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1, \beta_2) < d_0$. Then $d_{\alpha_1}^\vee(\beta_1, \beta_2) \leq d_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1, \beta_2)$.*

Proof. Choose $d_1 \in (d_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1, \beta_2), d_0)$. Then there are $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\gamma_0 = \beta_1$, $\gamma_n = \beta_2$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n d_{\alpha_2}^\vee(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j) < d_1$. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n]}$, since $d^\vee(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j) < d_1 < 1$, so

$$d_{\alpha_2}^\vee(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j) = \sup\{|\gamma_{j-1}(t) - \gamma_j(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_{j-1}) \vee T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_j)\}.$$

Let $t_0 = T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_1) \vee T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_2)$. Assume, for example, that $t_0 = T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_1) = T_{\alpha_1}(\gamma_0)$.

We claim that $t_0 \leq T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_j)$ for any $0 \leq j \leq n$. Since $t_0 = T_{\alpha_1}(\gamma_0) < T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_0)$, if the claim is not true, then there is $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n]}$ such that $t_0 > T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_k)$ and $t_0 \leq T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_j)$ for $0 \leq j \leq k-1$. Let $t_1 = T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_k)$. So $t_1 \in [0, T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_j)]$, $0 \leq j \leq k$. Then we have

$$d_0 > d_1 > \sum_{j=1}^k d_{\alpha_2}^\vee(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j) \geq \sum_{j=1}^k 1 \wedge |\gamma_{j-1}(t_1) - \gamma_j(t_1)| \geq 1 \wedge |\gamma_0(t_1) - \gamma_k(t_1)|.$$

Since t_0 is the first t such that $\beta_1(t) \in \alpha_1$, and $t_1 < t_0$, so $\gamma_0(t_1) = \beta_1(t_1)$ is enclosed by α_1 . Since $\gamma_k(t_1) \in \alpha_2$, and $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_2$, so $|\gamma_0(t_1) - \gamma_k(t_1)| \geq \text{dist}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. This implies that $1 \wedge |\gamma_0(t_1) - \gamma_k(t_1)| \geq d_0$, which is a contradiction. So the claim is justified.

Thus for any $t \in [0, t_0]$, we have $t \in [0, T_{\alpha_2}(\gamma_j)]$ for any $0 \leq j \leq n$. Thus

$$|\beta_1(t) - \beta_2(t)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |\gamma_{j-1}(t) - \gamma_j(t)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n d_{\alpha_2}^{\vee}(\gamma_{j-1}, \gamma_j) < d_1.$$

Since this is true for any $t \in [0, t_0] = [0, T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_1) \vee T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_2)]$ and $d_1 \in (d_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1, \beta_2), d_0)$, so $d_{\alpha_1}^{\vee}(\beta_1, \beta_2) \leq d_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1, \beta_2)$. \square

Lemma 7.5 $\{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1}^+$ for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Fix any $\alpha_1'' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\alpha_1'' \succ \alpha_1$. There is $\alpha_1' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\alpha_1'' \succ \alpha_1' \succ \alpha_1$. Suppose $\beta_1 \in \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\}$. Then there is $a > 0$ such that $a < T_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1) \wedge T_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1)$ and $\beta_1(a) \notin H(\alpha_1)$. Let $d_0 = 1 \wedge \text{dist}(\beta_1(a), H(\alpha_1)) \wedge \text{dist}(\alpha_1', \alpha_1'') \wedge \text{dist}(\beta_1([0, a]), \alpha_2) > 0$. Suppose $\beta_2 \in \mathbf{B}_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1; d_0)$. From Lemma 7.4, $d_{\alpha_1'}^{\vee}(\beta_2, \beta_1) < d_0$. Since $d_0 \leq 1$, so $|\beta_2(t) - \beta_1(t)| < d_0$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1)$. Since $a < T_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1)$, so $|\beta_2(t) - \beta_1(t)| < d_0$ for any $t \in [0, a]$. Since $\beta_1([0, a])$ is strictly enclosed by α_2 , and $d_0 \leq \text{dist}(\beta_1([0, a]), \alpha_2)$, so $\beta_2([0, a])$ is also strictly enclosed by α_2 , which implies that $a < T_{\alpha_2}(\beta_2)$. Since $|\beta_2(a) - \beta_1(a)| < d_0$, and $d_0 \leq \text{dist}(\beta_1(a), H(\alpha_1))$, so $\beta_2(a) \notin H(\alpha_1)$, which implies that $T_{\alpha_1}^+(\beta_2) < a$. Thus $T_{\alpha_1}^+(\beta_2) < T_{\alpha_2}(\beta_2)$, i.e., $\beta_2 \in \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\}$. So $\mathbf{B}_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1; d_0) \subset \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\}$. Thus $\{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1'}$. Since $\alpha_1'' \succ \alpha_1$ is chosen arbitrarily, so $\{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1}^+$. \square

Lemma 7.6 Suppose $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, and $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1}^+$. Then $B \cap \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_2}$.

Proof. Fix $\beta_1 \in B \cap \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\}$. Then there is $a > 0$ such that $a < T_{\alpha_2}(\beta_1)$ and $\beta_1(a) \notin H(\alpha_1)$. We may choose $\alpha_1' \succ \alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2' \prec \alpha_2$ such that $\beta_1(a) \notin H(\alpha_1')$ and $\beta_1([0, a])$ is strictly enclosed by α_2' . Since $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1}^+ \subset \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_1'}$, so there is $d_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{B}_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1; d_0) \subset B$. Let $d_1 = 1 \wedge d_0 \wedge \text{dist}(\beta_1(a), H(\alpha_1')) \wedge \text{dist}(\alpha_2', \alpha_2)$. Suppose $\beta_2 \in \mathbf{B}_{\alpha_2'}(\beta_1; d_1)$. From Lemma 7.4, $d_{\alpha_2'}^{\vee}(\beta_2, \beta_1) < d_1$. Since $d_1 \leq 1$, so $|\beta_2(t) - \beta_1(t)| < d_1$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{\alpha_2'}(\beta_1)$. Since $a < T_{\alpha_2'}(\beta_1)$, so $|\beta_2(t) - \beta_1(t)| < d_1$ for $0 \leq t \leq a$. Since $d_1 \leq \text{dist}(\beta_1(a), H(\alpha_1'))$, so $\beta_2(a) \notin H(\alpha_1')$. Thus $T_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_2) \vee T_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1) < a$. So we have

$$d_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_2, \beta_1) \leq d_{\alpha_1'}^{\vee}(\beta_2, \beta_1) \leq \sup\{|\beta_2(t) - \beta_1(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq a\} < d_1 \leq d_0.$$

Thus $\beta_2 \in \mathbf{B}_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_1; d_0) \subset B$. Since $\beta_1([0, a])$ is strictly enclosed by α_2' , $\alpha_2' \prec \alpha_2$, and $|\beta_2(t) - \beta_1(t)| < d_1 \leq \text{dist}(\alpha_2', \alpha_2)$ for $0 \leq t \leq a$, so $\beta_2([0, a])$ is strictly enclosed by α_2 . Thus $T_{\alpha_1}^+(\beta_2) \leq T_{\alpha_1'}(\beta_2) < a < T_{\alpha_2}(\beta_2)$, i.e., $\beta_2 \in \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\}$. So $\mathbf{B}_{\alpha_2'}(\beta_1; d_1) \subset B \cap \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\}$. Thus $B \cap \{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_2}$. \square

Corollary 7.4 $\{T_{\alpha_1}^+ < T_{\alpha_2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_2}$ for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let μ_δ and μ_0 be the distribution of β_δ and β_0 , respectively. From Theorem 7.2, for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mu_\delta \rightarrow \mu_0$ weakly w.r.t. d_α , as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Suppose A is a nonempty finite subset of \mathcal{A} . Let $d_A = \vee_{\alpha \in A} d_\alpha$, and \mathcal{T}_A be the topology generated by d_A . So $\mathcal{T}_A = \vee_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. For $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $r > 0$, let $\mathbf{B}_A(\beta_1; r) := \{\beta \in \mathcal{B} : d_A(\beta, \beta_1) < r\} = \cap_{\alpha \in A} \mathbf{B}(\beta_1; r)$. Let $\mathcal{B}_A^+ := \{\vee_{\alpha \in A} T_\alpha^+ < T\}$, i.e., the set of $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ that are not contained in $\cup_{\alpha \in A} H(\alpha)$.

Theorem 7.3 $\mu_\delta \rightarrow \mu_0$ weakly w.r.t. d_A , as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Suppose $A = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$. The case $n = 1$ follows from Theorem 7.2. Now suppose $n \geq 2$. We suffice to show that for any $G \in \mathcal{T}_A$, $\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\delta(G) \geq \mu_0(G)$.

We may find polygonal paths $\alpha_j^0 \in \mathcal{A}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, such that $\alpha_j^0 \succ \alpha_j$ for each j , and such that for $j \neq k$, any line segment on α_j^0 is not parallel to any line segment on α_k^0 . Fix $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]}$. List the vertices on $\overline{\alpha_j^0}$ in order as $z_0^0, z_1^0, \dots, z_m^0$, such that $z_0^0 > 0 > z_m^0$, and $z_k^0 \in \Omega$ for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$. We may find $z_0^1, z_m^1 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $z_k^1 \in \Omega$, $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, and let $\alpha_j^1 = \cup_{k=1}^{m-1} (z_{k-1}^1, z_k^1] \cup (z_{m-1}^1, z_m^1)$, such that $\mathcal{A} \ni \alpha_j^1 \succ \alpha_j^0$, $[z_{k-1}^1, z_k^1]$ is parallel to $[z_{k-1}^0, z_k^0]$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$, and $[z_l^0, z_l^1] \cap [z_k^0, z_k^1] = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq l < k \leq m$. For $r \in [0, 1]$, let $z_k(r) = z_k^0 + r(z_k^1 - z_k^0)$, $0 \leq k \leq m$, and let $\alpha_j(r) = \cup_{k=1}^{m-1} (z_{k-1}(r), z_k(r)] \cup (z_{m-1}(r), z_m(r))$. Then $\alpha_j(r) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$, and $\alpha_j(s) \prec \alpha_j(r)$ if $1 \leq s < r \leq 1$. And for any $s \in [0, 1]$, if $\alpha_j(s) \prec \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ then there is $r \in (s, 1)$ such that $\alpha_j(r) \prec \alpha$. Thus for any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, we have that $r \mapsto T_{\alpha_j(r)}(\beta)$ is increasing on $[0, 1]$, and for any $s \in [0, 1]$, $T_{\alpha_j(s)}^+ = \lim_{r \downarrow s} T_{\alpha_j(r)}$, so there are at most countably many $r \in [0, 1]$ such that $T_{\alpha_j(r)}^+(\beta) > T_{\alpha_j(r)}(\beta)$. So there is $r_j \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mu_0(\{T_{\alpha_j(r_j)}^+ > T_{\alpha_j(r_j)}\}) = 0$. For $j = 1, \dots, k$, let $\alpha_j^2 = \alpha_j(r_j)$, then $\alpha_j \prec \alpha_j^2$, and $\mu_0(\{T_{\alpha_j^2}^+ > T_{\alpha_j^2}\}) = 0$.

Suppose $j \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]}$. Since any line segment on α_j^2 is not parallel to any line segment on α_k^2 , so $S_{j,k} := \alpha_j^2 \cap \alpha_k^2$ is a finite set. If for some $j \neq k$, and $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, $T_{\alpha_j^2}(\beta) = T_{\alpha_k^2}(\beta) < T(\beta)$, then β must pass through $S_{j,k}$. From part (ii) of Corollary 3.1, we have $T_{\alpha_j^2}(\beta_0), T_{\alpha_k^2}(\beta_0) < T(\beta_0)$. Thus $\{T_{\alpha_j^2}(\beta_0) = T_{\alpha_k^2}(\beta_0)\} \subset \{\beta_0 \text{ passes through } S_{j,k}\}$. From the property of chordal SLE₂, for any $z_0 \in \Omega$, the probability that β_0 passes through z_0 is 0, which implies $\mathbf{P}[\beta_0 \text{ passes through } S_{j,k}] = 0$, so $\mu_0(\{T_{\alpha_j^2} = T_{\alpha_k^2}\}) = 0$.

For $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]}$, let $I_j = \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]} \setminus \{j\}$, and $B_j = \{\vee_{k \in I_j} T_{\alpha_k^2}^+ < T_{\alpha_j^2}\} = \cap_{k \in I_j} \{T_{\alpha_k^2}^+ < T_{\alpha_j^2}\}$, which belongs to $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$ from Corollary 7.4. Then B_1, \dots, B_n are mutually disjoint. Let $N = \mathcal{B} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_j$. Then

$$N \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq n} \{T_{\alpha_j^2}^+ > T_{\alpha_j^2}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} \{T_{\alpha_j^2} = T_{\alpha_k^2}\}.$$

Thus $\mu_0(N) = 0$. Fix $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]}$. If $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j}$, then $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$, so $B \cap B_j \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$. If $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_k}$ for some $k \in I_j$, then $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_k^+}$. From Lemma 7.6, we have $B \cap \{T_{\alpha_k^2}^+ < T_{\alpha_j^2}\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$. Thus $B \cap B_j = B \cap \{T_{\alpha_k^2}^+ < T_{\alpha_j^2}\} \cap B_j \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$. Let \mathcal{T}_j denote the collection of sets $B \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that $B \cap B_j \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$. Then \mathcal{T}_j is a topology. We have proved that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_k} \subset \mathcal{T}_j$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]}$. Thus $\mathcal{T}_A = \bigvee_{k=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_k} \subset \mathcal{T}_j$.

Suppose $G \in \mathcal{T}_A$. Let $G_j = G \cap B_j$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n]}$, since $G \in \mathcal{T}_A \subset \mathcal{T}_j$, so $G_j = G \cap B_j \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_j^2}$. Since $\mu_\delta \rightarrow \mu_0$ w.r.t. $d_{\alpha_j^2}$, so $\liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \mu_\delta(G_j) \geq \mu_0(G_j)$. Since G is the disjoint union of G_j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, and $\mu_0(G \cap N) = 0$, so

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\delta(G) \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\delta(G_j) \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_0(G_j) = \mu_0(G).$$

Since this is true for any $G \in \mathcal{T}_A$, so we have $\mu_\delta \rightarrow \mu_0$ weakly w.r.t. d_A , as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. \square

Lemma 7.7 (\mathcal{B}_A^+, d_A) is separable.

Proof. For $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, let \mathcal{C}_r denote the set of continuous curves $\gamma : [0, r] \rightarrow \Omega \cup \mathbb{R}$ with $\gamma(0) = 0$ and $\gamma(t) \in \Omega$ for $t \in (0, r]$. Then \mathcal{C}_r is a subset of $C([0, r], \mathbb{C})$. Let d_r be the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_r$ to \mathcal{C}_r , i.e., $d_r(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \sup\{|\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq r\}$. Then (\mathcal{C}_r, d_r) is a subspace of $(C([0, r], \mathbb{C}), \|\cdot\|_r)$, so is separable. Let $\{\gamma_{r,n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be dense in (\mathcal{C}_r, d_r) . For each $r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we choose $\beta_{r,n} \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $T(\beta_{r,n}) > r$ and $\beta_{r,n}(t) = \gamma_{r,n}(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq r$. Then $\{\beta_{r,n} : r \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is countable.

Suppose $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{B}_A^+$, and $d_0 > 0$. There is $r_0 \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} T_\alpha^+(\beta_1) < r_0 < T(\beta_1)$. For each $\alpha \in A$, there is $t_\alpha \in (0, r_0)$ such that $\beta_1(t_\alpha) \notin H(\alpha)$. Let $d_1 = \bigwedge_{\alpha \in A} \text{dist}(\beta_1(t_\alpha), H(\alpha)) \wedge d_0 > 0$. From the denseness of $\{\gamma_{r_0,n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $(\mathcal{C}_{r_0}, d_{r_0})$, we have $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\beta_{r_0,n_0}(t) - \beta_1(t)| = |\gamma_{r_0,n_0}(t) - \beta_1(t)| < d_1$ for $0 \leq t \leq r_0$. Fix $\alpha \in A$. Since $|\beta_{r_0,n_0}(t_\alpha) - \beta_1(t_\alpha)| < d_1 \leq \text{dist}(\beta_1(t_\alpha), H(\alpha))$, so $\beta_{r_0,n_0}(t_\alpha) \notin H(\alpha)$. Thus $T_\alpha(\beta_{r_0,n_0}) < r_0 < T(\beta_{r_0,n_0})$. Since this is true for any $\alpha \in A$, so $\beta_{r_0,n_0} \in \mathcal{B}_A^+$. Since

$$d_\alpha(\beta_{r_0,n_0}, \beta_1) \leq d_\alpha^\vee(\beta_{r_0,n_0}, \beta_1) \leq \sup\{|\beta_{r_0,n_0}(t) - \beta_1(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq r_0\} < d_1 \leq d_0$$

for any $\alpha \in A$, so $d_A(\beta_{r_0,n_0}, \beta_1) < d_0$. Thus $\{\beta_{r,n}\} \cap \mathcal{B}_A^+$ is dense in (\mathcal{B}_A^+, d_A) . \square

Theorem 7.4 For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on A and ε , such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 such that

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} (T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0))\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Suppose $A = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$. For each $1 \leq j \leq n$, choose $\alpha'_j \succ \alpha_j$. Let $A' = \{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_n\}$. From part (ii) of Corollary 3.1, we have $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{A'}^+$. As $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $w_e^\delta \rightarrow z_e$, so $f(w_e^\delta) \rightarrow p \notin \cup_{\alpha \in A'} H(\alpha)$. There is $\delta_1 > 0$, such that if $\delta < \delta_1$, then $f(w_e^\delta) \notin \cup_{\alpha \in A'} H(\alpha)$, so $\beta_\delta \in \mathcal{B}_{A'}^+$. Thus μ_0 and μ_δ are supported by $\mathcal{B}_{A'}^+$, when $\delta < \delta_1$. From Theorem 7.3, $\mu_\delta \rightarrow \mu_0$ weakly as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, w.r.t. $d_{A'}$. From Lemma 7.7, $(\mathcal{B}_{A'}^+, d_{A'})$ is separable. So from the coupling theorem in [3], there is $\delta_0 \in (0, \delta_1)$ such that for $\delta < \delta_0$, there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 such that

$$\mathbf{P} [d_{A'}(\beta_\delta, \beta_0) < \wedge_{j=1}^n \text{dist}(\alpha'_j, \alpha_j) \wedge 1 \wedge \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (7.10)$$

Assume $d_{A'}(\beta_\delta, \beta_0) < \wedge_{j=1}^n \text{dist}(\alpha'_j, \alpha_j) \wedge 1 \wedge \varepsilon$. Then from Lemma 7.4, we have $\vee_{\alpha \in A} d_\alpha^\vee(\beta_\delta, \beta_0) < 1 \wedge \varepsilon$. For each $\alpha \in A$, since $d_\alpha^\vee(\beta_\delta, \beta_0) < 1 \wedge \varepsilon$, so

$$\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)\} < \varepsilon.$$

This implies that

$$\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq \vee_{\alpha \in A} T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)\} < \varepsilon.$$

So we have proved that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{d_{A'}(\beta_\delta, \beta_0) < \wedge_{j=1}^n \text{dist}(\alpha'_j, \alpha_j) \wedge 1 \wedge \varepsilon\} \subset \\ & \{\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq \vee_{\alpha \in A} T_\alpha(\beta_\delta) \vee T_\alpha(\beta_0)\} < \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (7.10) finishes the proof. \square

Let $\{\tilde{\alpha}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be the set of polygonal curves $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that all vertices on α have rational coordinates. Then for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_n \succ \alpha$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $T_n = \vee_{j=1}^n T_{\tilde{\alpha}_j}$. Then for any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, $\vee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta) = \vee_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T_\alpha(\beta)$. And $\vee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0) = T(\beta_0) = T_0$.

Theorem 7.5 $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} \beta_0(t) = p$ almost surely.

Proof. Let L be the set of spherical subsequential limits of $\beta_0(t)$ as $t \rightarrow T_0$. Our goal is to show $\mathbf{P} [L = \{p\}] = 1$. We first claim that $\mathbf{P} [L \cap \partial^\# \Omega \neq \emptyset] = 0$, where $\partial^\# \Omega$ is the spherical boundary of Ω in $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. If the claim is not true, then there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P} [L \cap \partial^\# \Omega \neq \emptyset] > \varepsilon_0$. Choose $\alpha \prec \tilde{\alpha}_1$. From Corollary 7.3, there are $\varepsilon_1, \delta_1 > 0$ such that if $\delta < \delta_1$, then the probability that β_δ visits $\partial_{\varepsilon_1}^\# \Omega$ after leaving $H(\alpha)$ is smaller than $\varepsilon_0/2$. Since $\mathbf{P} [\beta_0([T_1(\beta_0), T_0)) \cap \partial_{\varepsilon_1/2}^\# \Omega \neq \emptyset] > \varepsilon_0$, and $T_0 = \vee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0)$, so there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{P} [\mathcal{E}_1] > \varepsilon_0$, where $\mathcal{E}_1 := \{\beta_0([T_1(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]) \cap \partial_{\varepsilon_1/2}^\# \Omega \neq \emptyset\}$. From Theorem 7.4, there is $\delta_2 < \delta_1$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0/2$,

there is a coupling of β_{δ_2} with β_0 that satisfies $|\beta_{\delta_2}(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \text{dist}(\tilde{\alpha}_1, \alpha) \wedge (\varepsilon_1/4)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{n_0}(\beta_0)$. Let \mathcal{E}_2 denote this event. Since $\delta_2 < \delta_1$, so the probability that β_{δ_2} does not visit $\partial_{\varepsilon_1}^\# \Omega$ after leaving $H(\alpha)$ is greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0/2$. Let \mathcal{E}_3 denote this event. Let $\mathcal{E} = \cap_{j=1}^3 \mathcal{E}_j$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}] > 0$. So \mathcal{E} is nonempty. Assume that \mathcal{E} occurs. Since \mathcal{E}_1 occurs, there is $t_0 \in [T_1(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]$ such that $\beta_0(t_0) \in \partial_{\varepsilon_1/2}^\# \Omega$. Since \mathcal{E}_2 occurs, so $\text{dist}^\#(\beta_{\delta_2}(t_0), \beta_0(t_0)) < 2|\beta_{\delta_2}(t_0) - \beta_0(t_0)| < \varepsilon_1/2$, which implies that $\beta_{\delta_2}(t_0) \in \partial_{\varepsilon_1}^\# \Omega$. Since $\beta_0(T_1(\beta_0)) \in \tilde{\alpha}_1$, $|\beta_{\delta_2}(T_1(\beta_0)) - \beta_0(T_1(\beta_0))| < \text{dist}(\tilde{\alpha}_1, \alpha)$, and $\alpha \prec \tilde{\alpha}_1$, so $\beta_{\delta_2}(T_1(\beta_0)) \notin H(\alpha)$. Since $T_1(\beta_0) \leq t_0$, so β_{δ_2} visits $\partial_{\varepsilon_1}^\# \Omega$ after leaving $H(\alpha)$, which means that \mathcal{E}_3 can not occur. So we get a contradiction. Thus $\mathbf{P}[L \cap \partial^\# \Omega \neq \emptyset] = 0$.

Second, we claim that $\mathbf{P}[\text{diam}(L) > 0] = 0$. If $F \subset \Omega$ and $\text{diam}(F) > 0$, then there are $z_0 = x_0 + iy_0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $x_0, y_0, r_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\overline{\mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0)} \subset \Omega$, $F \cap \mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0/2) \neq \emptyset$ and $F \setminus \mathbf{B}(z_0; 4r_0) \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $\mathbf{P}[\text{diam}(L) > 0] > 0$. Then from the last paragraph, we have $\mathbf{P}[\text{diam}(L) > 0, L \subset \Omega] > 0$. Since $\{(x_0 + iy_0, r_0) : x_0, y_0, r_0 \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ is countable, so there are $z_0 \in \Omega$ and $r_0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that the probability that $\overline{\mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0)} \subset \Omega$, $L \cap \mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0/2) \neq \emptyset$ and $L \setminus \mathbf{B}(z_0; 4r_0) \neq \emptyset$ is greater than ε_0 . Let \mathcal{E}_0 denote this event. From Corollary 7.2, there is $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0/2$, β_δ does not contain a $(\overline{\mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0)}, r_0, \varepsilon_1)$ -quasi-loop. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{E}_0^n denote the event that there are $t_1 < t_0 < t_2 < T_n(\beta_0)$ with $\beta_0(t_1), \beta_0(t_2) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0/2)$, $|\beta_0(t_1) - \beta_0(t_2)| < \varepsilon_1/3$, and $\beta_0(t_0) \notin \mathbf{B}(z_0; 3r_0)$. If \mathcal{E}_0 occurs, then since $T_0 = \vee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0)$, and $\beta_0(t)$ has subsequential limits, as $t \rightarrow T_0$, inside $\mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0/2)$ and outside $\mathbf{B}(z_0; 4r_0)$, so some \mathcal{E}_0^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, must occur. Thus $\mathcal{E}_0 \subset \cup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{E}_0^n$. Since $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_0] > \varepsilon_0$, and (\mathcal{E}_0^n) is increasing, so there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_0^{n_0}] > \varepsilon_0$. From Theorem 7.4, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ and a coupling of β_{δ_0} and β_0 such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon_0/2$, $|\beta_{\delta_0}(t) - \beta_0(t)| < (r_0/2) \wedge (\varepsilon_1/3)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{n_0}(\beta_0)$. Let \mathcal{E}_1 denote this event. Let \mathcal{E}_2 denote the event that β_{δ_0} does not contain a $(\overline{\mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0)}, r_0, \varepsilon_1)$ -quasi-loop. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}_2] > 1 - \varepsilon_0/2$ from the choice of ε_1 . Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0^{n_0} \cap \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}] > 0$. So \mathcal{E} is nonempty. Assume that \mathcal{E} occurs. Since $\mathcal{E}_0^{n_0}$ occurs, so there are $t_1 < t_0 < t_2 < T_{n_0}(\beta_0)$ with $\beta_0(t_1), \beta_0(t_2) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0/2)$, $|\beta_0(t_1) - \beta_0(t_2)| < \varepsilon_1/3$, and $\beta_0(t_0) \notin \mathbf{B}(z_0; 3r_0)$. Since \mathcal{E}_1 occurs, so $|\beta_{\delta_0}(t_j) - \beta_0(t_j)| < (r_0/2) \wedge (\varepsilon_1/3)$, $j = 1, 2$, and $|\beta_{\delta_0}(t_0) - \beta_0(t_0)| < r_0$, which implies that $\beta_{\delta_0}(t_1) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0)$, $|\beta_{\delta_0}(t_1) - \beta_{\delta_0}(t_2)| < \varepsilon_1$, and $\beta_{\delta_0}(t_0) \notin \mathbf{B}(z_0; 2r_0)$, so $|\beta_{\delta_0}(t_0) - \beta_{\delta_0}(t_1)| \geq r_0$, which means that \mathcal{E}_2 does not occur. This is a contradiction. So $\mathbf{P}[\text{diam}(L) > 0] = 0$.

Thus almost surely L is a single point in Ω , which means that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} \beta_0(t)$ exists and lies in Ω . Now we claim that $\mathbf{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} \beta_0(t) \in \beta_0([0, T_0])] = 0$. If the claim is not true, then there exist $z_0 = x_0 + iy_0$ and $r_0 > 0$ with $x_0, y_0, r_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that with a positive probability, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} \beta_0(t) \in \beta_0([0, T_0]) \cap \mathbf{B}(z_0; r_0/2)$ and $\beta_0([0, T_0]) \not\subset \mathbf{B}(z_0; 4r_0)$. Then we can use an argument that is similar to the last paragraph to find a contradiction. Thus almost surely, we may extend β_0 to be a simple continuous curve defined on $[0, T_0]$ such that $\beta_0(T_0) \in \Omega$. If $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ extends continuously to $[0, T(\beta)]$ such that $\beta(T(\beta)) \in \Omega$, and $p \notin \beta([0, T(\beta)])$, then there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ encloses $\beta([0, T(\beta)])$. We

already know that $p \notin \beta_0([0, T(\beta)))$. If $\mathbf{P}[\beta_0(T_0) \neq p] > 0$, then there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the probability that $\beta_0([0, T_0])$ is enclosed by $\tilde{\alpha}_{n_0}$ is positive, which contradicts part (ii) of Corollary 3.1. Thus $\mathbf{P}[\beta_0(T_0) = p] = 1$. \square

Corollary 7.5 $\lim_{t \rightarrow S_0} \gamma_0(t) = z_e$ almost surely.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 7.5 and that γ_0 is a time-change of $f^{-1}(\beta_0)$. \square

Theorem 7.6 For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ depending on ε such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, there is $S \in (0, T_\delta \wedge T_0)$ that satisfies $|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \varepsilon/3$ for $0 \leq t \leq S$; and the diameters of $\beta_\delta([S, T_\delta])$ and $\beta_0([S, T_0])$ are both smaller than $\varepsilon/3$. If this event occurs, and if u is any increasing function that maps $[0, T_\delta)$ onto $[0, T_0)$ such that $u(t) = t$ for $0 \leq t \leq S$, then $|\beta_\delta \circ u^{-1}(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \varepsilon$ for $0 \leq t < T_0$. So we have

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\beta_\delta(u^{-1}(t)) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t < T_0\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Choose $r > 0$ such that $\mathbf{B} := \overline{\mathbf{B}(p; r)} \subset \Omega$. From Corollary 7.2, there is $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that the probability that β_δ does not contain an $(\mathbf{B}, \varepsilon/6, \varepsilon_0)$ -quasi-loop is greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$. Let \mathcal{E}_0^δ denote this event. There is δ_1 such that if $\delta < \delta_1$, then $|f(w_e^\delta) - p| < r \wedge (\varepsilon_0/3)$. Since almost surely $\beta_0(t) \rightarrow p$ as $t \rightarrow T_0$, and $T_0 = \vee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0)$, so there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, the diameter of $\beta_0([T_{n_0}(\beta_0), T_0])$ is less than $\varepsilon_0/3$. Let \mathcal{E}_1 denote this event. From Theorem 7.4, there is $\delta_0 < \delta_1$ such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, then there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, $|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \varepsilon_0/3$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{n_0}(\beta_0)$. Let \mathcal{E}_2 denote this event. Let $\mathcal{E}^\delta = \mathcal{E}_0^\delta \cap \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^\delta] > 1 - \varepsilon$ if $\delta < \delta_0$. Assume $\delta < \delta_0$ and \mathcal{E}^δ occurs. Let $S = T_{n_0}(\beta_0)$. Then $|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| < \varepsilon_0/3 < \varepsilon/3$ for $0 \leq t \leq S$. And $|\beta_\delta(S) - f(w_e^\delta)| \leq |\beta_\delta(S) - \beta_0(S)| + |\beta_0(S) - p| + |p - f(w_e^\delta)| < \varepsilon_0/3 + \varepsilon_0/3 + \varepsilon_0/3 = \varepsilon_0$. Since $\beta_\delta(T_\delta) = f(w_e^\delta) \in \mathbf{B}$, and β_δ does not contain an $(\mathbf{B}, \varepsilon/6, \varepsilon_0)$ -quasi-loop, so the diameter of $\beta_\delta([S, T_\delta])$ is less than $\varepsilon/3$. The remaining statement is clear. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. (i) Let $V = f(U)$ and $T_V(\beta_0)$ be the first time that β_0 leaves V . Since $\beta_0([T_V(\beta_0), T_0])$ is a compact subset of Ω , in which f^{-1} is continuous, so there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $z_1 \in \beta_0([T_V(\beta_0), T_0])$, $z_2 \in \Omega$, and $|z_2 - z_1| < \varepsilon_0$, then the probability that $|f^{-1}(z_2) - f^{-1}(z_1)| < \varepsilon$ is greater than $1 - \varepsilon/2$. From Theorem 7.6, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta < \delta_0$, there are a coupling of β_δ and β_0 , and a continuous increasing function u that maps $[0, T_\delta)$ onto $[0, T_0)$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}[\sup\{|\beta_\delta(u^{-1}(t)) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t < T_0\} < \varepsilon_0] > 1 - \varepsilon/2.$$

From the property of ε_0 , we have

$$\mathbf{P} [\sup\{|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(u^{-1}(t))) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| : T_V(\beta_0) \leq t < T_0\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{P} [\sup\{|q_\delta(u_\delta \circ u^{-1}(t)) - \gamma_0(u_0(t))| : T_V(\beta_0) \leq t < T_0\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Let $\tilde{u} = u_0 \circ u \circ u_\delta^{-1}$. Since $T_U(\gamma_0) = u_0(T_V(\beta_0))$, so we have

$$\mathbf{P} [\sup\{|q_\delta(\tilde{u}^{-1}(t)) - \gamma_0(t)| : T_U(\gamma_0) \leq t < S_0\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

(ii) From [15], if the prime end 0_+ is degenerate, i.e., the impression of 0_+ is a single point, then f^{-1} extends continuously to $\Omega \cup \{0\}$. Since $\beta_0([0, T_0])$ is a compact subset of $\Omega \cup \{0\}$, so the argument in part (i) also works here, if we replace both “ $T_V(\beta_0) \leq t$ ” and “ $T_U(\gamma_0) \leq t$ ” by “ $0 < t$ ”, and replace “ $[T_V(\beta_0), \cdot]$ ” by “ $(0, \cdot]$ ” \square

8 Other Kinds of Targets

8.1 When the target is a prime end

Now we consider the cases that the target is a prime end. We use the notations and boundary conditions given in Section 4.2 for the discrete LERW aimed at a prime end w_e . Recall that we require that w_e corresponds to a boundary point of D , $w_e \in \delta_e \mathbb{Z}^2$ for some $\delta_e > 0$, and ∂D is flat near w_e , i.e., there is some $r_e > 0$ and $a_e \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$ such that $\mathbf{B}(w_e; r_e) \cap D = \mathbf{B}(w_e; r_e) \cap a_e \mathbb{H}$. Let \mathcal{M} be the set of $\delta > 0$ such that $w_e \in \delta \mathbb{Z}^2$. For $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, let $w_e^\delta = w_e + ia_e \delta$. If $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ is small enough, then $\langle w_e^\delta, w_e \rangle$ is a boundary vertex of D^δ . We do not distinguish it from w_e . Suppose f maps D conformally onto $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ that is bounded by $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ and mutually disjoint analytic Jordan curves such that $f(0_+) = 0$ and $f(w_e) \neq \infty$.

For $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, let $(q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(\chi_\delta))$ be a LERW on D^δ started from δ conditioned to hit w_e before other boundary vertices. Let $q_\delta(-1) = 0$ and extend q_δ to be piecewisely linear on $[-1, \chi_\delta]$. We will go through the propositions in Section 6 and Section 7, and explain how they can be modified to prove the convergence of q_δ defined here. We only consider D^δ for $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, so the words “ $\delta < *$ ” should all be replaced by “ $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < *$ ”, and the words “ $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ” should all be replaced by “ $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ”. The proofs in this subsection are only sketches.

First we change the definition of $J^\xi(t, z)$ and $P^\xi(t, x, z)$ in Section 6.1. If $K_t^\xi \subset \Omega$ and is bounded away from $f(w_e)$, then let $J^\xi(t, \cdot) = P(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, f(w_e); \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$, where $P(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, f(w_e))$ is the Poisson kernel in $\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$ with the pole at $f(w_e)$; and let $P^\xi(t, x, z)$

be the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega_t^\xi = \varphi_t^\xi(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi)$ with the pole at x , normalized by $\partial_{\mathbf{n}}(P^\xi(t, x, \cdot) \circ \varphi_t^\xi \circ f)(w_e) = 1$. Since $\partial(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi)$ is smooth near $f(w_e)$, so the Poisson kernel with the pole at $f(w_e)$ exists. We still define $\tilde{R}^\xi(t, z) = (\partial_{2,z}^2 / \partial_{2,z})P^\xi(t, z)$. Since the meaning of $P^\xi(t, z)$ has been changed, so does $\tilde{R}^\xi(t, z)$. Let α be a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$ and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(w_e)$. Let everything else in Section 6.1 be unchanged. Then it is not hard to check that all lemmas in Section 6.1 still hold under these these settings, and we only need to make some simple modifications on the proofs.

In Section 6.2, we require that $H(\rho_1)$ is bounded away from w_e . We do not change the definition of L^δ , and those of $l(X)$, $Tip(X)$ and D_X for each $X \in L^\delta$. For $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $X \in L^\delta$, we now define P_X to be the generalized Poisson kernel in D_X with the pole at $Tip(X)$, normalized by $\partial_{\mathbf{n}}P_X(w_e) = 1$; let h_X be defined on $V(D^\delta)$ that satisfies $h_X \equiv 0$ on $V_\partial(D^\delta) \cup \{X(k) : 0 \leq k \leq l(X) - 1\}$, $\Delta_{D^\delta}h_X \equiv 0$ on $V_I(D^\delta) \setminus \{X_k : 0 \leq k \leq l(X)\}$, and $\Delta_{D^\delta}h_X(w_e) = 1$. Let ρ_2 be any crosscut in D such that $H(\rho_1) \subset H(\rho_2)$ and $\overline{\rho_1} \cap \overline{\rho_2} = \emptyset$. Then Proposition 6.1 should be restated as follows.

Proposition 8.1 *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in (0, \delta_0) \cap \mathcal{M}$, then for any $X \in L^\delta$, and any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap (D \setminus H(\rho_2))$, we have $|\delta \cdot h_X(w) - P_X(w)| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Fix $z_0 \in D \setminus H(\rho_2)$ and let w_0^δ be a vertex on D^δ that is closest to z_0 . For $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $X \in L^\delta$, let $g_X^0(w) = h_X(w)/h_X(w_0^\delta)$. Then from Proposition 6.1, g_X^0 converges to the generalized Poisson kernel P_X^0 in D_X with the pole at $Tip(X)$, normalized by $P_X^0(z_0) = 1$, uniformly on $D \setminus H(\rho_3)$ for any crosscut ρ_3 in D such that $H(\rho_1) \subset H(\rho_3)$ and $\overline{\rho_1} \cap \overline{\rho_3} = \emptyset$. Since ∂D is flat near w_e , and g_X^0 vanishes on ∂D near w_e , so g_X^0 can be naturally extended to be a discrete harmonic function on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2 \cap \mathbf{B}(w_e; r_0)$ for some $r_0 > 0$. We may also extend P_X^0 to be a harmonic function defined in $\mathbf{B}(w_e; r_0)$ by Schwarz reflection principle. Then we can prove that the discrete partial derivatives of g_X^0 approximates the corresponding partial derivatives of P_X^0 locally uniformly in $\mathbf{B}(w_e; r_0)$. Especially, we have $(g_X^0(w_e^\delta) - g_X^0(w_e))/\delta \rightarrow \partial_{\mathbf{n}}P_X^0(w_e)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, because w_e^δ is the unique adjacent vertex of w_e in D^δ . Note that $\Delta_{D^\delta}g_X^0(w_e) = g_X^0(w_e^\delta) - g_X^0(w_e)$. From the definition of g_X^0 , we have $\Delta_{D^\delta}h_X(w_e)/(\delta \cdot h_X(w_0^\delta)) \rightarrow \partial_{\mathbf{n}}P_X^0(w_e)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Since $\Delta_{D^\delta}h_X(w_e) = 1$, so $\delta \cdot h_X(w_0^\delta) \rightarrow 1/P_X^0(w_e)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Thus $\delta \cdot h_X(w) = g_X(w) \cdot \delta \cdot h_X(w_0^\delta)$ converges to $P_X^0(w)/P_X^0(w_e) = P_X(w)$ uniformly on $D \setminus H(\rho_2)$. \square

We now consider the martingales (h_n) in Proposition 2.1 for the q_δ we are studying here. Define n_∞ , n_j and \mathcal{F}'_j , $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, as in Section 6.2. Then for $n \leq n_\infty$, the sub-path q_δ^n belongs to L^δ , and $h_{q_\delta^n} = h_n$. Using Proposition 2.1 and 8.1, we obtain Proposition 6.2, from which follows Theorem 6.1. Let ξ_0 and $\beta_0(t)$, $0 \leq t < T_0$, and $\gamma_0(t)$, $0 \leq t < S_0$, be as defined after Theorem 6.1. Since we have changed the meaning of $J_t^\xi(z)$, so now γ_0

is an LERW($D; 0_+ \rightarrow w_e$) trace. The statements and proofs of the remaining theorems in Section 6.2 need not be changed.

In Section 7.1, Lemma 7.1 is always true. Lemma 7.2 still holds for the q_δ here. For the proof, let X_w be a random walk on D^δ started from w stopped when it hits a boundary vertex, and let Y_w be X_w conditioned to hit w_e . Then q_δ is the loop-erasure of Y_δ . We may argue directly on X_w and Y_w instead of the reversed curve. The proof is very similar. Then Corollary 7.1 and Corollary 7.2 immediately follow from this lemma. The statement of Lemma 7.3, Corollary 7.3 and Proposition 7.1 should be restated as follows.

Lemma 8.1 *Suppose U_0 and U_e are neighborhoods of 0_+ and w_e , respectively, in D . Then the probability that q_δ visits $(D \setminus U_e) \cap \partial_\varepsilon^\# D$ after leaving U_0 tends to 0 as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Corollary 8.1 *Suppose U_0 and U_e are neighborhoods of 0 and $f(w_e)$, respectively, in Ω . Then the probability that β_δ visits $(\Omega \setminus U_e) \cap \partial_\varepsilon^\# \Omega$ after leaving U_0 tends to 0 as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Proposition 8.2 *Suppose U_e is a neighborhood of $f(w_e)$ in Ω . Let $T_e(\beta_\delta)$ be the first time that β_δ hits $\overline{U_e}$. Let $a, \varepsilon > 0$. There are $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for $\delta < \delta_0$, with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, β_δ satisfies that if $|\beta_\delta(t_1) - \beta_\delta(t_2)| < \varepsilon_0$ for some $t_1, t_2 \in [a, T_e(\beta_\delta)]$, then the diameter of $\beta_\delta([t_1, t_2])$ is less than ε .*

The proofs are very similar as the proofs of Lemma 7.3, Corollary 7.3 and Proposition 7.1. Then Theorem 7.1 and Theorem 7.2 still hold if α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses 0, $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$, and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(w_e)$. The proofs need not be changed.

In Section 7.2, we define \mathcal{B} in the same way, but define \mathcal{A} to be the set of crosscuts α in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses 0, $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$, and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(w_e)$. Then we have Theorem 7.3 and Theorem 7.4. The proofs need not be changed. Then we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} \beta_0(t) = f(w_e)$. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 7.5. Let L be the set of subsequential limits of $\beta_0(t)$ as $t \rightarrow T_0$, in the spherical metric. Using Corollary 8.1 and Theorem 7.4, we can prove that almost surely $L \cap \partial^\# D \subset \{f(w_e)\}$. If $\mathbf{P}[f(w_e) \notin L] > 0$, then there is $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathbf{P}[\beta_0((0, T_0)) \subset H(\alpha)] > 0$, which contradicts part (ii) of Corollary 3.1 for continuous LERW aiming at a prime end. Thus $f(w_e) \in L$ almost surely. Finally if $\mathbf{P}[L \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset] > 0$, then we can obtain a contradiction from Lemma 7.2 and Theorem 7.4. So the proof is finished. As a corollary, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow S_0} \gamma(t) = w_e$ almost surely.

For the global coupling, we need an additional lemma about the behavior of q_δ near w_e . Recall the definition of an (F, r, ε) -quasi-loop for a set F in Definition 7.2.

Lemma 8.2 *For $r > 0$, the probability that q_δ contains a $(\{w_e\}, r, \varepsilon)$ -quasi-loop tends to 0 as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. Note that q_δ contains a $(\{w_e\}, r, \varepsilon)$ -quasi-loop iff the reversal of q_δ visits $\mathbf{B}(w_e; \varepsilon)$ after leaving $\mathbf{B}(w_e; r)$. The reversal of q_δ has the same distribution as q_δ^r : the LERW on D^δ started from w_e^δ conditioned to hit $\langle \delta, 0 \rangle$ before other boundary vertices of D^δ . Then Lemma 8.1 holds for q_δ^r if we interchange the roles of U_0 and U_e . So the probability that q_δ^r visits $\mathbf{B}(w_e; \varepsilon)$ after leaving $\mathbf{B}(w_e; r)$ tends to 0 as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Since f extends conformally across ∂D near w_e , so we have

Corollary 8.2 *For $r > 0$, the probability that β_δ contains an $(\{f(w_e)\}, r, \varepsilon)$ -quasi-loop tends to 0 as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Using Theorem 7.4, Corollary 8.2, and the fact that $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} \beta_\delta(t) = f(w_e)$, we can derive Theorem 7.6 and Theorem 4.2 without changing the proofs.

In the proof of Lemma 8.2, we define the LERW q_δ^r , which has the same distribution as the reversal of q_δ . If ∂D is flat near 0, then we can prove the convergence of q_δ^r to an $\text{LERW}(D; w_e \rightarrow 0_+)$ trace. From the conformal invariance of continuous LERW, we have the following corollary about the reversal property of continuous LERW.

Corollary 8.3 *Suppose $w_1 \neq w_2$ are two prime ends of D . For $j = 1, 2$, suppose $\gamma_j(t)$, $0 < t < S_j$, is an $\text{LERW}(D; w_j \rightarrow w_{3-j})$ trace. Then there is a random continuous decreasing function u_r that maps $(0, S_1)$ onto $(0, S_2)$ such that $(\gamma_1 \circ u_r^{-1}(t), 0 < t < S_2)$ has the same distribution as $(\gamma_2(t), 0 < t < S_2)$.*

8.2 When the target is a side arc

Now we study the cases that the target is a side arc I_e , that is bounded away from 0_+ . Let $(q_\delta(0), \dots, q_\delta(\chi_\delta))$ be a LERW on D^δ started from δ conditioned to hit I_e^δ before other boundary vertices, where I_e^δ is the set of all boundary vertices of D^δ that determine some prime ends that lie on I_e . Let $q_\delta(-1) = 0$ and extend q_δ to be piecewisely linear on $[-1, \chi_\delta]$. Let f map D conformally onto $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ such that $f(0_+) = 0$ and $f(I_e)$ is a bounded boundary arc of Ω .

Recall that if I_e is not a whole arc, we require that ∂D is flat near the two ends of I_e : w_e^1 and w_e^2 , and there is some $\delta_e > 0$ such that $w_e^1, w_e^2 \in \delta_e \mathbb{Z}^2$. Let \mathcal{M} be the set of $\delta > 0$ such that $w_e^1, w_e^2 \in \delta \mathbb{Z}^2$. We will only consider those D^δ with $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$. If I_e is a whole side, we do not need additional boundary conditions, and we may consider D^δ for any small enough positive number δ . For consistency, set $\mathcal{M} = (0, \infty)$ in this case.

We will go through the propositions from in Section 6 and Section 7, and explain how they can be modified to prove the convergence of q_δ defined here. All conditions “ $\delta < *$ ” should be replaced by “ $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < *$ ”, and “ $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ” should be replaced by “ $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ”.

First we change the definition of $J^\xi(t, z)$ and $P^\xi(t, x, z)$ in Section 6.1. If $K_t^\xi \subset \Omega$ and is bounded away from $f(I_e)$, then let $J^\xi(t, \cdot) = H(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, f(I_e); \cdot) \circ (\varphi_t^\xi)^{-1}$, where $H(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi, f(I_e); \cdot)$ is the harmonic measure function of $f(I_e)$ in $\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi$; and let $P^\xi(t, x, z)$ be the generalized Poisson kernel in $\Omega_t^\xi = \varphi_t^\xi(\Omega \setminus K_t^\xi)$ with the pole at x , normalized by $\int_{f(I_e)} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P^\xi(t, x, z) ds(z) = 1$. Let α be a crosscut in \mathbb{H} such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$ and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(I_e)$. Let everything else in Section 6.1 be unchanged. Then it is not hard to check that all lemmas in Section 6.1 still hold under these settings, and we only need to make some simple modifications on the proofs.

In Section 6.2, we require that $H(\rho_1)$ is bounded away from I_e . We do not change the definition of L^δ , and those of $l(X)$, $Tip(X)$ and D_X for each $X \in L^\delta$. For $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $X \in L^\delta$, we now define P_X to be the generalized Poisson kernel in D_X with the pole at $Tip(X)$, normalized by $\int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X(z) ds(z) = 1$; let h_X be defined on $V(D^\delta)$ that satisfies $h_X \equiv 0$ on $V_\partial(D^\delta) \cup \{X(k) : 0 \leq k \leq l(X) - 1\}$, $\Delta_{D^\delta} h_X \equiv 0$ on $V_I(D^\delta) \setminus \{X_k : 0 \leq k \leq l(X)\}$, and $\sum_{w \in I_e^\delta} \Delta_{D^\delta} h_X(w) = 1$. Let ρ_2 be any crosscut in D such that $H(\rho_1) \subset H(\rho_2)$ and $\overline{\rho_1} \cap \overline{\rho_2} = \emptyset$. Then Proposition 6.1 should be restated as Proposition 8.3. We first need a simple lemma.

Lemma 8.3 *Suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a connected locally finite graph. Suppose $A, B \subset V$ are such that B is finite and $A \cup B$ is reachable. Suppose h is a nonnegative bounded function on G such that h vanishes on A , and is discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. Then we have $\sum_{w \in A} \Delta_G h(w) = -\sum_{w \in B} \Delta_G h(w)$.*

Proof. If V is finite, then this lemma follows from the equality $\sum_{w \in V} \Delta_G h(w) = 0$. But here we allow V to be infinite. Suppose Z_w is a random walk on G started from $w \in V$. Let τ be the hitting time of Z_w on $A \cup B$. Since h is discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$, is bounded on V , and vanishes on A , so for any $w \in V$,

$$h(w) = \mathbf{E}[h(Z_w(\tau))] = \sum_{w_0 \in B} h(w_0) \mathbf{P}[Z_w(\tau) = w_0] = \sum_{w_0 \in B} h(w_0) H_{w_0}(w), \quad (8.1)$$

where $H_{w_0}(w) := \mathbf{P}[Z_w(\tau) = w_0]$. Then H_{w_0} is bounded, discrete harmonic in $V \setminus (A \cup B)$, vanishes on $A \cup B \setminus \{w_0\}$, and $H_{w_0}(w_0) = 1$. From Lemma 3.2 in [23], we have $\sum_{w \in (A \cup B) \setminus \{w_0\}} \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = -\Delta_G H_{w_0}(w_0)$. Since B is finite, so $\sum_{w \in A} \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = -\sum_{w \in B} \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w)$. Thus

$$\sum_{w_0 \in B} \sum_{w \in A} h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = - \sum_{w_0 \in B} \sum_{w \in B} h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w).$$

Since B is finite, so we may interchange $\sum_{w_0 \in B}$ and $\sum_{w \in B}$, and use (8.1) to obtain

$$\sum_{w_0 \in B} \sum_{w \in B} h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = \sum_{w \in B} \sum_{w_0 \in B} h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = \sum_{w \in B} \Delta_G h(w).$$

On the other hand, since $h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) \geq 0$ for $w_0 \in B$ and $w \in A$, so we may interchange $\sum_{w_0 \in B}$ and $\sum_{w \in A}$, and use (8.1) to obtain

$$\sum_{w_0 \in B} \sum_{w \in A} h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = \sum_{w \in A} \sum_{w_0 \in B} h(w_0) \Delta_G H_{w_0}(w) = \sum_{w \in A} \Delta_G h(w).$$

So the proof is finished. \square

Proposition 8.3 *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in (0, \delta_0) \cap \mathcal{M}$, then for any $X \in L^\delta$, and any $w \in V(D^\delta) \cap (D \setminus H(\rho_2))$, we have $|h_X(w) - P_X(w)| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 8.1. Let z_0 , w_0^δ , h_X^0 , and P_X^0 be as in that proof. Then we have the convergence of h_X^0 to P_X^0 . We claim that $\sum_{w \in I_e^\delta} \Delta_{D^\delta} h_X^0(w) \rightarrow \int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z)$ as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$. If the claim is proved, then from the conditions on h_X at I_e^δ , we have $h_X(w_0^\delta) \rightarrow 1 / \int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z)$. Thus $h_X = h_X^0 h_X(w_0^\delta)$ converges to $P_X^0 / \int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z) = P_X$.

To prove the claim, we consider two cases. The first case is that I_e is a whole side. Then we may choose a polygonal Jordan curve ρ in D that disconnect I_e from other sides of D , such that ρ is disjoint from ρ_2 , and every line segment on ρ is parallel to either x or y axis. Let $D(\rho)$ denote the doubly connected domain bounded by I_e and ρ . Let $V_\rho^\delta = V_I(D^\delta) \cap D(\rho)$. Suppose that δ is small enough such that the adjacent vertex of every $w \in I_e^\delta$ belongs to V_ρ^δ , and any vertex in V_ρ^δ is not adjacent to any boundary vertex that is not belong to I_e^δ .

Since P_X^0 is bounded and harmonic in $D(\rho)$, so we have

$$\int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z) = - \int_{\rho} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z),$$

where \mathbf{n} is the unit normal vector on $\partial D(\rho)$ pointing towards $D(\rho)$. Let \mathcal{P} denote the pairs (w, w') such that $w \in V_\rho^\delta$, $w' \in V_I(D^\delta) \setminus V_\rho^\delta$ and $w' \sim w$. Then for every $(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}$, $[w, w']$ intersects ρ , and is orthogonal to ρ at the intersection point. Since the discrete partial derivatives of h_X^0 converge to the corresponding partial derivatives of P_X^0 uniformly on ρ , so we have

$$\sum_{(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}} (h_X^0(w) - h_X^0(w')) \rightarrow \int_{\rho} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z)$$

as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. So now we suffice to show

$$\sum_{w \in I_e^\delta} \Delta_{D^\delta} h_X^0(w) = - \sum_{(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}} (h_X^0(w) - h_X^0(w')).$$

Define the graph $G = (V, E)$ as follows. Let $V = V_\rho^\delta \cup I_e^\delta \cup \{w' : (w, w') \in \mathcal{P}\}$, and E be the set of edges in D^δ that are incident with some vertex in V_ρ^δ . Let $A = I_e^\delta$ and $B = \{w' : (w, w') \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Then h_X^0 vanishes on A , $\Delta_G h_X^0(w) = \Delta_{D^\delta} h_X^0(w)$ for each $w \in V_\rho^\delta \cup I_e^\delta$, and $\Delta_G h_X^0(w') = \sum_{w: (w, w') \in \mathcal{P}} (h_X^0(w) - h_X^0(w'))$ for each $w' \in B$. Thus h_X^0 is discrete harmonic on $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. From Proposition 2.1, h_X^0 is bounded. From the recurrence of random walk on $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$, $A \cup B$ is reachable in G . Since for each $(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}$, $[w, w']$ intersects ρ , so \mathcal{P} is finite, which implies B is finite. So we can apply Lemma 8.1 to obtain

$$\sum_{w \in I_e^\delta} \Delta_{D^\delta} h_X^0(w) = \sum_{w \in A} \Delta_G h_X^0(w) = - \sum_{w \in B} \Delta_G h_X^0(w) = - \sum_{(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}} (h_X^0(w) - h_X^0(w')).$$

So the case that I_e is a whole side is done.

The second case is that I_e is not a whole side. We suppose that ∂D is flat near the two ends z_e^1 and z_e^2 of I . We may choose a polygonal open simple curve ρ in D composed of line segments parallel to x or y axis, such that its two ends approach to z_e^1 and z_e^2 , respectively, and ρ together with I_e bounds a simply connected subdomain $D(\rho)$ of D . Then $H(\rho) = \rho \cup D(\rho)$. Let $V_\rho^\delta = V_I(D^\delta) \cap H(\rho)$. Let \mathcal{P} denote the pairs (w, w') such that $w \in V_\rho^\delta$, $w' \in V_I(D^\delta) \setminus V_\rho^\delta$ and $w' \sim w$. Then an argument that is similar to the last paragraph gives $\sum_{w \in I_e^\delta} \Delta_{D^\delta} h_X^0(w) = - \sum_{(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}} (h_X^0(w) - h_X^0(w'))$. Since P_X^0 is bounded and harmonic in $D(\rho)$, so $\int_{I_e} \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z) = - \int_\rho \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z)$, where \mathbf{n} is the unit normal vector on $\partial D(\rho)$ pointing towards $D(\rho)$. So we suffice to show that

$$\sum_{(w, w') \in \mathcal{P}} (h_X^0(w) - h_X^0(w')) \rightarrow \int_\rho \partial_{\mathbf{n}} P_X^0(z) ds(z) \quad (8.2)$$

as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$. To prove this, we use the flat boundary conditions at w_e^1 and w_e^2 to extend h_X^0 and P_X^0 harmonically across ∂D near w_e^1 and w_e^2 . Since $\bar{\rho}$ is compact in the extended domain: D unions two balls centered at w_e^1 and w_e^2 , respectively, so we get the uniform convergence of the discrete partial derivatives of h_X^0 to the corresponding partial derivatives of P_X^0 on ρ . Then (8.2) can be easily proved. \square

We now consider the martingales (h_n) in Proposition 2.1 for the q_δ we are studying here. Define n_∞ , n_j and \mathcal{F}'_j , $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, as in Section 6.2. Then for $n \leq n_\infty$, the sub-path q_δ^n belongs to L^δ , and $h_{q_\delta^n} = h_n$. Using Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 8.3, we obtain Proposition 6.2, from which follows Theorem 6.1. Let ξ_0 and $\beta_0(t)$, $0 \leq t < T_0$, and

$\gamma_0(t)$, $0 \leq t < S_0$, be as defined after Theorem 6.1. Now γ_0 is an $\text{LERW}(D; 0_+ \rightarrow I_e)$ trace. The statements and proofs of the remaining theorems in Section 6.2 need not be changed.

In Section 7.1, Lemma 7.2 still holds for the q_δ here. For the proof, let X_w be a random walk on D^δ started from w stopped when it hits a boundary vertex, and let Y_w be X_w conditioned to hit I_e^δ . Then q_δ is the loop-erasure of Y_δ . We may argue on X_w and Y_w directly instead of the reverse curve. The proof is very similar. Then Corollary 7.1 and Corollary 7.2 immediately follow from this lemma. The statement of Lemma 7.3, Corollary 7.3 and Proposition 7.1 should be restated as Lemma 8.1, Corollary 8.1, and Proposition 8.2 except that now U_e is a neighborhood of I_e in D or a neighborhood of $f(I_e)$ in Ω . Since $f(\beta_\delta)$ is a time-change of q_δ , so we have

Lemma 8.4 *Suppose U_0 and U_e are neighborhoods of 0_+ and I_e , respectively, in D . Then the probability that q_δ and $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta)$ visits $(D \setminus U_e) \cap \partial_\varepsilon^\# D$ after leaving U_0 tends to 0 as $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Then we can obtain Theorem 7.1 and Theorem 7.2 if α is a crosscut in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses 0, such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$ and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(I_e)$. The proof needs not be changed.

In Section 7.2, we define \mathcal{B} in the same way, but define \mathcal{A} to be the set of crosscuts α in \mathbb{H} that strictly encloses 0, such that $H(\alpha) \subset \Omega$ and $H(\alpha)$ is bounded away from $f(I_e)$. Then we have Theorem 7.3 and Theorem 7.4.

We may choose a sequence $(\tilde{\alpha}_n)$ in \mathcal{A} such that for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_n \succ \alpha$. Let $T_n = \vee_{j=1}^n T_{\tilde{\alpha}_j}$. Then $T_0 = \vee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0)$. From Theorem 7.4 and the proof of Theorem 4.2, we have

Theorem 8.1 *(i) Suppose $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_0$, then there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 such that*

$$\mathbf{P} [\sup\{|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)| : 0 \leq t \leq T_{n_0}(\beta_0)\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon; \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{P} [\sup\{|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| : T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0) \leq t \leq T_{n_0}(\beta_0)\} < \varepsilon] > 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (8.3)$$

(ii) If 0_+ is degenerate, then “ $T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0) \leq t$ ” in (8.3) could be replaced by “ $0 < t$ ”.

Recall that $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta)$ is a time-change of q_δ , and $f^{-1}(\beta_0)$ is a time-change of γ_0 . Now we need a lemma about the behavior of q_δ when it gets close to ∂D after leaving a neighborhood of 0_+ in D .

Lemma 8.5 *Suppose $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $t_{\alpha_0}^\delta$ be the first time $q_\delta(t)$ hits $f^{-1}(\alpha_0)$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_0$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, the following holds: if $\text{dist}(q_\delta(t_0), \partial D) < \varepsilon_0$ for some $t_0 \in [t_{\alpha_0}^\delta, \chi_\delta)$, then the diameter of $q_\delta([t_0, \chi_\delta])$ is less than ε .*

Proof. Let X_w^δ be a random walk on D^δ started from w stopped when it hits $V_\partial(D^\delta)$. Let Y_w^δ be X_w^δ conditioned to hit I_e^δ . Then q_δ is the loop-erasure of Y_w^δ .

We first consider the case that I_e is not a whole side. Since Y_w^δ approximates the Brownian excursion in D started from 0_+ conditioned to hit I_e , so there are $\delta_1, r_e > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_1$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, q_δ never visits $\overline{\mathbf{B}(w_e^1; r_e)} \cup \overline{\mathbf{B}(w_e^2; r_e)}$. Suppose r_e is small enough such that $D \cap \mathbf{B}(w_e^j, 3r_e) = a^j \mathbb{H} \cap \mathbf{B}(w_e^j, 3r_e)$ for $j = 1, 2$, where $a^1, a^2 \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$, and $\mathbf{B}(w_e^1; 3r_e)$ is disjoint from $\mathbf{B}(w_e^2; 3r_e)$. Let \mathcal{E}_1^δ denote this event. For $j = 1, 2$, every point on $[w_e^j - 2a^j r_e, w_e^j + 2a^j r_e]$ corresponds to a prime end of D . Since w_e^1 and w_e^2 are end points of I_e , so $I_e \cap [w_e^j - 2a^j r_e, w_e^j + 2a^j r_e] = [w_e^j, w_e^j + 2c^j a^j r_e]$ for some $c^j \in \{\pm 1\}$, $j = 1, 2$. For $j = 1, 2$, let $z^j = w_e^j - c^j a^j r_e$ and $R^j = \{z - w_e^j = r_e\} \cap D$. Then R^j is an open half circle, and z^j is the end point of R^j that does not lie on I_e . For $j = 1, 2$, choose $\theta_1^j \neq \theta_2^j \in R^j$ such that θ_1^j is closer to z^j than θ_2^j , and let ρ_k^j denote the open arc on R^j bounded by z^j and θ_k^j , $k = 1, 2$. We may find two closed simple curves ρ_1^0 and ρ_2^0 in D such that for $k = 1, 2$, θ_k^1 and θ_k^2 are end points of ρ_k^0 , $\rho_k^0 \cap R^j = \{\theta_k^j\}$, $j = 1, 2$; $\rho_1^0 \cap \rho_2^0 = \emptyset$; and $\rho_1 := \rho_1^0 \cup \rho_1^1 \cup \rho_1^2$ disconnects I_e from any side of D that does not contain I_e , and so ρ_1 is a crosscut in D , and $H(\rho_1)$ is a neighborhood of I_e . Let $\rho_2 = \rho_2^0 \cup \rho_2^1 \cup \rho_2^2$. Then ρ_2 is also a crosscut in D , and $H(\rho_2) \subset H(\rho_1)$.

Let $U_e = H(\rho_2) \setminus \rho_2$. Then U_e is a neighborhood of I_e in D , and $\mathbf{B}(w_e^j; r_e) \cap D \subset U_e$ for $j = 1, 2$. Let $U_0 = f^{-1}(H(\alpha_0) \setminus \alpha_0)$. Then U_0 is a neighborhood of 0_+ in D bounded by $f^{-1}(\alpha_0)$. From Lemma 8.4, there are $\delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_2$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, q_δ satisfies that if $\text{dist}(q_\delta(t_0), \partial D) < \varepsilon_2$ for some $t_0 \in [t_{\alpha_0}^\delta, \chi_\delta)$, then $q_\delta(t_0) \in U_e$. Let \mathcal{E}_2^δ denote this event.

For $j = 1, 2$, let $\rho_3^j = R^j \setminus \rho_2^j$. Let $\rho_3 = \rho_2^0 \cup \rho_3^1 \cup \rho_3^2$ and $\rho_{1.5} = \rho_1^0 \cup (w_e^1, \theta_1^1] \cup (w_e^2, \theta_1^2]$. Then ρ_3 and $\rho_{1.5}$ are also crosscuts in D , $H(\rho_3) \subset H(\rho_{1.5})$ and $\overline{\rho_3} \cap \overline{\rho_{1.5}} = \emptyset$. Let $d_1 = \text{dist}(\rho_3, \rho_{1.5}) > 0$. Let $d_0 > 0$ be the minimal diameter of the connected component of $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$. Let $Q^\delta(w)$ be the probability that X_w^δ hits I_e^δ . Suppose $w \in H(\rho_3)$, and X_w^δ hits $V_\partial(D^\delta) \setminus I_e^\delta$. Then X_w^δ must intersect both ρ_3 and $\rho_{1.5}$. So the diameter of X_w^δ is at least d_1 . Thus X_w^δ must leave $\mathbf{B}(w; d_1/2)$ before it hits ∂D . From Lemma 7.1, there are $C_0, C_1 > 0$ such that

$$Q^\delta(w) \geq 1 - C_0((\delta + \text{dist}(w, \partial D))/((d_1/2) \wedge d_0))^{C_1}. \quad (8.4)$$

So there are $\delta_3, \varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_3$, and $w \in H(\rho_3)$ and $\text{dist}(w, \partial D) < \varepsilon_3$, then $Q^\delta(w) \geq 1/2$. If $Q^\delta(w) \geq 1/2$, then the probability that Y_w^δ leaves $\mathbf{B}(w; \varepsilon/3)$

before it hits ∂D is at most 2 times the probability that X_w^δ leaves $\mathbf{B}(w; \varepsilon/3)$ before it hits ∂D , which is less than

$$p_w^\delta := 2C_0((\delta + \text{dist}(w, \partial D))/((\varepsilon/3) \wedge d_0))^{C_1}. \quad (8.5)$$

There are $\delta_4, \varepsilon_4 > 0$ such that if $\delta < \delta_4$ and $\text{dist}(w, \partial D) < \varepsilon_4$, then $p_w^\delta < \varepsilon/3$. From the Markov property of Y^δ , if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_3 \wedge \delta_4$, and $Y_\delta^\delta(t_1) \in H(\rho_3) \cap \partial_{\varepsilon_3 \wedge \varepsilon_4} D$, where $\partial_a D := \{z \in D : \text{dist}(z, \partial D) < a\}$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, $Y_\delta^\delta(t) \in \overline{\mathbf{B}(Y_\delta^\delta(t_1); \varepsilon/3)}$ for $t \geq t_1$. Let \mathcal{E}_3^δ denote this event.

Let $\delta_0 = \bigwedge_{j=1}^4 \delta_j$, $\varepsilon_0 = \bigwedge_{j=2}^4 \varepsilon_j$, and $\mathcal{E}^\delta = \bigcap_{j=1}^3 \mathcal{E}_j^\delta$. Suppose $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_0$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^\delta] > 1 - \varepsilon$. Assume \mathcal{E}^δ occurs. Suppose $\text{dist}(q_\delta(t_0), \partial D) < \varepsilon_0$ for some $t_0 \in [t_{\alpha_0}^\delta, \chi_\delta]$. Since $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_2$, and \mathcal{E}_2^δ occurs, so $q_\delta(t_0) \in U_e = H(\rho_2) \setminus \rho_2$. Since $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_1$, and \mathcal{E}_1^δ occurs, so $q_\delta(t_0) \notin \mathbf{B}(w_e^j; r_e)$, $j = 1, 2$. Thus

$$q_\delta(t_0) \in H(\rho_2) \setminus (\overline{\mathbf{B}(w_e^1; r_e)} \cup \overline{\mathbf{B}(w_e^2; r_e)}) \subset H(\rho_3).$$

Since q_δ is the loop-erasure of Y_δ^δ , so there is some t_1 such that $Y_\delta^\delta(t_1) = q_\delta(t_0)$. Since $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_3 \wedge \delta_4$, \mathcal{E}_3^δ occurs, and $Y_\delta^\delta(t_1) \in H(\rho_3) \cap \partial_{\varepsilon_3 \wedge \varepsilon_4} D$ because $\varepsilon_0 < \varepsilon_3 \wedge \varepsilon_4$, so $Y_\delta^\delta(t) \in \overline{\mathbf{B}(Y_\delta^\delta(t_1); \varepsilon/3)}$ for $t \geq t_1$. Since q_δ is the loop-erasure of Y_δ^δ , so $q_\delta(t) \in \overline{\mathbf{B}(Y_\delta^\delta(t_1); \varepsilon/3)}$ for $t \in [t_0, \chi_\delta]$, which implies that the diameter of $q_\delta([t_0, \chi_\delta])$ is at most $2\varepsilon/3$.

The case that I_e is a whole side is easier. We may choose two Jordan curves ρ_3 and $\rho_{1.5}$ in D such that $\rho_{1.5}$ disconnects I_e from other sides of D , ρ_3 disconnects I_e from $\rho_{1.5}$, and $\overline{\rho_3} \cap \overline{\rho_{1.5}} = \emptyset$. Let $d_1 = \text{dist}(\rho_3, \rho_{1.5}) > 0$, and $d_0 > 0$ be the minimal diameter of the components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$. Let $D(\rho_3)$ denote the domain bounded by I_e and ρ_3 . Then for $w \in D(\rho_3)$, (8.4) holds for some constants $C_0, C_1 > 0$. So there are $\delta_3, \varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_3$, and $w \in D(\rho_3)$ and $\text{dist}(w, \partial D) < \varepsilon_3$, then $Q^\delta(w) \geq 1/2$. Then the probability that Y_w^δ leaves $\mathbf{B}(w; \varepsilon/3)$ before it hits ∂D is at most 2 times the probability that X_w^δ leaves $\mathbf{B}(w; \varepsilon/3)$ before it hits ∂D , which is less than p_w^δ given by (8.5). There are $\delta_4, \varepsilon_4 > 0$ such that if $\delta < \delta_4$ and $\text{dist}(w, \partial D) < \varepsilon_4$, then $p_w^\delta < \varepsilon/3$. From the Markov property of Y^δ , if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_3 \wedge \delta_4$, and $Y_\delta^\delta(t_1) \in H(\rho_3) \cap \partial_{\varepsilon_3 \wedge \varepsilon_4} D$, where $\partial_a D := \{z \in D : \text{dist}(z, \partial D) < a\}$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, $Y_\delta^\delta(t) \in \overline{\mathbf{B}(Y_\delta^\delta(t_1); \varepsilon/3)}$ for $t \geq t_1$, so the image of Y_δ^δ after t_1 has diameter less than ε . Since q_δ is the loop-erasure of Y_δ^δ , so the conclusion holds. \square

Corollary 8.4 *Suppose $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_0$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, the following holds: if $\text{dist}(f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t_0)), \partial D) < \varepsilon_0$ for some $t_0 \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_\delta), T_\delta]$, then the diameter of $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta([t_0, T_\delta]))$ is less than ε .*

Lemma 8.6 *Suppose $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $M, \delta_0 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_0$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, q_δ stays in $\mathbf{B}(0; M)$ after it first hits $f^{-1}(\alpha_0)$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 7.1 and the ideas in the proof of Lemma 7.3. \square

Lemma 8.7 *Suppose $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Then almost surely $f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_0]))$ is bounded.*

Proof. We may choose $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_0$. Let $d_0 = \text{dist}(\alpha_1, \alpha_0) > 0$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From Theorem 8.1, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_1$, then with probability greater than $1 - 2\varepsilon$, there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 , such that $|\beta_\delta(t) - \beta_0(t)|, |f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < d_0$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)]$. Let \mathcal{E}_1^δ denote this event. Since $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta)$ is a time-change of q_δ , so from Lemma 8.6, there are $\delta_2, M > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_2$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) \in \mathbf{B}(0; M)$ if $t \geq T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_\delta)$. Let \mathcal{E}_2^δ denote this event. Let $\mathcal{E}^\delta = \mathcal{E}_1^\delta \cap \mathcal{E}_2^\delta$. We may choose $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\delta_0 < \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^{\delta_0}] > 1 - 3\varepsilon$. Assume \mathcal{E}^{δ_0} occurs. Since $\delta_0 < \delta_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_1^{\delta_0}$ occurs, so $|f^{-1}(\beta_{\delta_0}(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < d_0$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)]$, and $|\beta_{\delta_0}(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)) - \beta_0(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0))| < d_0$. Since $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_0$ and $d_0 = \text{dist}(\alpha_1, \alpha_0)$, so $\beta_{\delta_0}(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)) \notin H(\alpha_1)$. Thus $T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_{\delta_0}) < T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)$. Since $\delta_0 < \delta_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_2^{\delta_0}$ occurs, so

$$f^{-1}(\beta_{\delta_0}([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)])) \subset f^{-1}(\beta_{\delta_0}([T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_{\delta_0}), T_n(\beta_0)])) \subset \mathbf{B}(0; M).$$

Since $|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < d_0$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)]$, so

$$f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)])) \subset \mathbf{B}(0; M + d_0).$$

Thus $\mathbf{P}[f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)])) \subset \mathbf{B}(0; M + d_0)] > 1 - 3\varepsilon$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}[f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_0])) \subset \mathbf{B}(0; M + d_0)] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_n(\beta_0)])) \subset \mathbf{B}(0; M + d_0)] \geq 1 - 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So with probability at least $1 - 3\varepsilon$, $f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_0]))$ is bounded. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is chosen arbitrarily, so the proof is finished. \square

Theorem 8.2 *Almost surely $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))$ exists and lies on ∂D .*

Proof. Let L be the set of subsequential limits of $f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))$ as $t \rightarrow T_0$, in the Lebesgue metric. From Lemma 8.7, L is almost surely nonempty. If $L \cap \partial D = \emptyset$, then there is $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\beta_0([0, T_0)) \subset H(\alpha_0)$. Since there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_{n_0} \succ \alpha_0$, so $\beta_0([0, T_0)) \subset H(\tilde{\alpha}_{n_0})$. Thus if $\mathbf{P}[L \cap D = \emptyset] > 0$, then there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{P}[\beta_0([0, T_0)) \subset H(\tilde{\alpha}_{n_0})] > 0$, which contradicts part (ii) of Corollary 3.1 for β_0 here. So

$L \cap \partial D \neq \emptyset$ almost surely. Choose $z_0 \in L \cap \partial D$. We now suffice to show that $L = \{z_0\}$ almost surely.

Choose $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $d_0 = \text{dist}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) > 0$. Suppose $\mathbf{P}[L \neq \{z_0\}] > 0$. Then there are $a, r > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}[L \not\subset \mathbf{B}(z_0; r)] > a$. From Corollary 8.4, there are $\varepsilon_1, \delta_1 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_1$, then with probability greater than $1 - a/2$, β_δ satisfies that if $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t_0)) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; \varepsilon_1)$ for some $t_0 \geq T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_\delta)$, then $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; r/2)$ for $t \in [t_0, T_\delta]$. Let \mathcal{E}_1^δ denote this event. Since $\mathbf{P}[L \not\subset \mathbf{B}(z_0; r)] > a$ and $T_0 = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0)$, so there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability greater than a , there are $t_1, t_2 \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]$ such that $t_1 < t_2$, $f^{-1}(\beta_0(t_1)) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; \varepsilon_1/2)$ and $f^{-1}(\beta_0(t_2)) \notin B(z_0; 2r/3)$. Let \mathcal{E}_0 denote this event.

From Theorem 8.1, there is $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\delta_0 < \delta_1$ such that with probability greater than $1 - 2a/2$, there is a coupling of β_{δ_0} and β_0 such that $|\beta_{\delta_0}(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)) - \beta_0(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0))| < d_0$, and $|f^{-1}(\beta_{\delta_0}(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < (\varepsilon_1/2) \wedge (r/6)$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]$. Let $\mathcal{E}_2^{\delta_0}$ denote this event. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \cap \mathcal{E}_1^{\delta_0} \cap \mathcal{E}_2^{\delta_0}$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}] > 0$. So \mathcal{E} is not empty. Assume \mathcal{E} occurs. Since $\mathcal{E}_2^{\delta_0}$ occurs, $d_0 = \text{dist}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1)$, and $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_0$, so $T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_{\delta_0}) < T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)$. Since \mathcal{E}_0 occurs, so there are $t_1 < t_2 \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]$ such that $f^{-1}(\beta_0(t_1)) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; \varepsilon_1/2)$ and $f^{-1}(\beta_0(t_2)) \notin B(z_0; 2r/3)$. Since $\mathcal{E}_2^{\delta_0}$ occurs, so we have $f^{-1}(\beta_{\delta_0}(t_1)) \in \mathbf{B}(z_0; \varepsilon_1)$ and $f^{-1}(\beta_{\delta_0}(t_2)) \notin B(z_0; r/2)$. Since $t_2 > t_1 \geq T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0) > T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_{\delta_0})$, so $\mathcal{E}_1^{\delta_0}$ can not occur, which is a contradiction. Thus $\mathbf{P}[L \neq \{z_0\}] = 0$. \square

Corollary 8.5 *Almost surely $\lim_{t \rightarrow S_0} \gamma_0(t)$ exists and lies on ∂D .*

Proof of the variation of Theorem 4.2. (i) We may choose $\alpha_1 \prec \alpha_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f(H(\alpha_0)) \subset U$. Let $d_0 = \text{dist}(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) > 0$. From Corollary 8.4, there are $\delta_1, \varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_1$, then with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$ the following holds: if $\text{dist}(f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t_0)), \partial D) < \varepsilon_1$ for some $t_0 \in [T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_\delta), T_\delta]$, then $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta([t_0, T_\delta]))$ has diameter less than $\varepsilon/3$. Let \mathcal{E}_1^δ denote this event. Since almost surely $\lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))$ exists and lies on ∂D , and $T_0 = \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty T_n(\beta_0)$, so there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, $T_{n_0}(\beta_0) > T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)$, $\text{diam}(f^{-1}(\beta_0([T_{n_0}(\beta_0), T_0]))) < \varepsilon/3$, and $\text{dist}(f^{-1}(\beta_0(T_{n_0}(\beta_0))), \partial D) < \varepsilon_1/3$. Let \mathcal{E}_0 denote this event. From Theorem 8.1, there is $\delta_2 > 0$ such that if $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_2$, there is a coupling of β_δ and β_0 such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon/3$, we have $|\beta_\delta(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)) - \beta_0(T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0))| < d_0$ and $|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < (\varepsilon \wedge \varepsilon_1)/3$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]$. Let \mathcal{E}_2^δ denote this event. Let $\delta_0 = \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2$ and $\mathcal{E}^\delta = \mathcal{E}_0 \cap \mathcal{E}_1^\delta \cap \mathcal{E}_2^\delta$. Suppose $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta < \delta_0$. Then $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{E}^\delta] > 1 - \varepsilon$. Assume \mathcal{E}^δ occurs.

Since $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_2$, and \mathcal{E}_2^δ occurs, so $T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_\delta) < T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0)$, and $|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(T_{n_0}(\beta_0))) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(T_{n_0}(\beta_0)))| < \varepsilon_1/3$. Since \mathcal{E}_0 occurs, so $\text{dist}(f^{-1}(\beta_0(T_{n_0}(\beta_0))), \partial D) < \varepsilon_1/3$ and $T_{n_0}(\beta_0) > T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0) > T_{\alpha_1}(\beta_\delta)$. Thus $\text{dist}(f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(T_{n_0}(\beta_0))), \partial D) < \varepsilon_1$. Since $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_1$, and \mathcal{E}_1^δ occurs, so $\text{diam}(\beta_\delta([T_{n_0}(\beta_0), T_\delta])) < \varepsilon/3$. Since $\delta \in \mathcal{M}$, $\delta < \delta_2$, and \mathcal{E}_2^δ occurs, so $|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(t)) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < \varepsilon/3$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_{n_0}(\beta_0)]$. Since \mathcal{E}_0 holds, so

$\text{diam}(\beta_0([T_{n_0}(\beta_0), T_0])) < \varepsilon/3$. Thus if \widehat{u} is a continuous increasing function on $[0, T_\delta)$, and maps $[0, T_\delta)$ onto $[0, T_0)$, such that $\widehat{u}(t) = t$ for $0 \leq t \leq T_{n_0}(\beta_0)$, then we have $|f^{-1}(\beta_\delta(\widehat{u}^{-1}(t))) - f^{-1}(\beta_0(t))| < \varepsilon$ for $t \in [T_{\alpha_0}(\beta_0), T_0)$. Since $f^{-1}(\beta_\delta)$ and $f^{-1}(\beta_0)$ are time-changes of q_δ and γ_0 , respectively, so there is a continuous increasing function \widetilde{u} on $[-1, \chi_\delta)$, which maps $[-1, \chi_\delta)$ onto $[0, S_0)$, and satisfies $|q_\delta(\widetilde{u}^{-1}(t)) - \gamma_0(t)| < \varepsilon$ for $t \in [S_{\alpha_0}(\gamma_0), S_0)$, where $S_{\alpha_0}(\gamma_0)$ is the first time $\gamma_0(t)$ hits $f^{-1}(\alpha_0)$. Since $f(H(\alpha_0)) \subset U$, so $S_{\alpha_0}(\gamma_0) \leq T_U(\gamma_0)$, and (i) is proved.

(ii) Suppose 0_+ is degenerate. Then part (ii) in Theorem 8.1 can be applied. The proof can be done by using an argument that is similar to that in part (i) of this proof. \square

Corollary 8.6 *Suppose $\gamma(t)$, $0 \leq t < S$, is an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow I_e)$ trace, then almost surely $\widehat{\lim_{t \rightarrow S} \gamma(t)}$, the limit of $\gamma(t)$ in \widehat{D} , as $t \rightarrow S$, exists and lies on I_e , and the distribution of $\widehat{\lim_{t \rightarrow S} \gamma(t)}$ is the same as the distribution of the limit point in \widehat{D} of the Brownian excursion in D started from w_0 conditioned to hit I_e . And if J_e is a sub-arc of I_e , then after a time-change, $\gamma(t)$ conditioned on the event that $\widehat{\lim_{t \rightarrow S} \gamma(t)} \in J_e$ has the same distribution as an $\text{LERW}(D; w_0 \rightarrow J_e)$ trace.*

Question: Can we prove Corollary 7.5, Corollary 8.3, and Corollary 8.6 directly from the definition of continuous LERW?

Acknowledgment. I would like to thank Professor Nikolai Makarov, who introduced me to this subject, and gave me many valuable suggestions. I also thank Professor Yuvel Peres for his interesting courses and talks given in U. C. Berkeley.

References

- [1] Lars V. Ahlfors. *Conformal invariants: topics in geometric function theory*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1973.
- [2] M. Bauer, D. Bernard and J. Houdayer. Dipolar stochastic Loewner evolutions. J. Stat. Mech, P03001, 2005.
- [3] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, 1968.
- [4] Gregory F. Lawler. *Intersection of random walks*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1991.
- [5] Gregory F. Lawler. *Conformally Invariant Processes in the Plane*. American Mathematical Society, 2005.
- [6] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm and Wendelin Werner. Values of Brownian intersection exponents I: Half-plane exponents. *Acta Mathematica*, 187:237-273, 2001.

- [7] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm and Wendelin Werner. Values of Brownian intersection exponents II: Plane exponents. *Acta Mathematica*, 187:275-308, 2001.
- [8] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm and Wendelin Werner. Values of Brownian intersection exponents III: two-sided exponents. *Ann. Int. Henri Poincaré*, 38:109-123, 2002.
- [9] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm and Wendelin Werner. Conformal restriction: the chordal case, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(4): 917-955, 2003.
- [10] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm and Wendelin Werner. Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1B):939-995, 2004.
- [11] Paul R. Garabedian. *Partial Differential Equations*. Wiley, New York, 1964.
- [12] Bernt Oksendal. *Stochastic Differential Equations: an introduction with applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1995.
- [13] Christian Pommerenke. On the Löwner differential equation. *Michigan Math. J.*, 13:435-443, 1968.
- [14] Christian Pommerenke. *Univalent functions*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1975.
- [15] Christian Pommerenke. *Boundary behaviour of conformal maps*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1991.
- [16] Daniel Revuz and Marc Yor. *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [17] Steffen Rohde and Oded Schramm. Basic properties of SLE. *Ann. Math.*, 161(2):879-920, 2005.
- [18] Oded Schramm. Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Israel J. Math.*, 118:221-288, 2000.
- [19] Oded Schramm and Scott Sheffield. The harmonic explorer and its convergence to SLE(4). *Ann. Probab.*, 33(6):2127-2148, 2005.
- [20] Stanislav Smirnov. Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance, Cardy's formula, scaling limits. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 333(3):239-244, 2001.

- [21] D. B. Wilson. Generating random spanning trees more quickly than the cover time. In Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing. Philadelphia, PA, 1996, pages 296C303, New York, 1996. ACM.
- [22] Wendelin Werner. Random planar curves and Schramm-Loewner evolutions, arXiv: math.PR/0303354.
- [23] Dapeng Zhan. Stochastic Loewner evolution in doubly connected domains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 129:340-380, 2004.
- [24] Dapeng Zhan. Random Loewner Chains in Riemann Surfaces. Caltech Thesis.