

# Extended regime of nematic order in an interacting monomer-dimer model of Heilmann and Lieb

Qidong He

## Abstract

We revisit a two-dimensional model of liquid crystals introduced by Heilmann and Lieb (1979), which consists of a system of dimers on the square lattice at chemical potential  $\lambda$ , interacting via a hard-core repulsion and an attractive interaction of strength  $-a < 0$  between adjacent, colinear dimers. The model is conjectured to exhibit nematic order at low temperatures, in the sense of orientational symmetry breaking coupled with the absence of translational order, provided that  $\lambda + a > 0$ . In this paper, we prove this conjecture under the additional condition that  $a > \lambda/3$ , significantly extending the parameter regime under which the conjecture is known to hold. Our proof adapts the strategy of Hadas and Peled (2025) for proving the existence of a columnar phase in the hard-square model, combining a mesoscopic characterization of orientational order with the disagreement percolation method of van den Berg (1993) to prove the absence of translational order. To deal with the non-nearest neighbor interactions in the model, we also introduce an extension of the chessboard estimate applicable to finite products of periodic Gibbs measures.

## 1 Introduction

Liquid crystal is a state of matter characterized microscopically by the presence of orientational order with partial or no positional order, resulting in properties intermediate between those of a liquid and a solid crystal [4]. Mathematical models of liquid crystals generally fall into one of two complementary categories: macroscopic theories based on continuum mechanics, and molecular theories rooted in statistical mechanics [24]. While macroscopic theories [16, 7] often treat the origin of liquid crystalline phases phenomenologically, molecular theories aim to derive these phases directly from microscopic interactions. Central to the latter approach are various toy models of hard-core particles which, following Onsager’s seminal work on three-dimensional hard rods [15], demonstrate that entropic effects alone can drive the transition from a disordered, isotropic phase to a liquid crystalline phase that favors global geometric alignment.

Recent simulations of lattice systems of hard-core particles have revealed a rich landscape of liquid crystalline phases dictated strictly by particle geometry. In two dimensions, systems of  $1 \times k$  hard rods on the square lattice with discrete (horizontal or vertical) orientations are found [13] to exhibit a *nematic* phase at intermediate densities for  $k \geq 7$  and proven so [5] in the limit  $k \gg 1$ . Systems of  $2 \times 2$  hard squares on the square lattice have been shown [6, 14] and very recently proven [10] to exhibit a *columnar* phase at high densities. In three dimensions, systems of  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  hard cubes on the cubic lattice have been found via Monte Carlo simulations [23] to exhibit four distinct phases, including a *layered* phase at intermediate densities and a columnar phase at high densities. Similar findings for other hard-core shapes and on different lattices have also been reported [18]; see [10, Section 10] for a recent survey. Despite the evident phenomenological richness, rigorous results in this area remain sparse compared to standard lattice spin models, largely due

to difficulties in implementing rigorous perturbation methods such as Pirogov–Sinai theory [25, 3] for these systems, of which [5] is a singular exception.

In this paper, we study a two-dimensional lattice model for liquid crystals introduced by Heilmann and Lieb in 1979 [11, Model I]. In this model, particles are represented by dimers (edges) on the square lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , and the interactions between particles consist of a hard-core repulsion and an attractive interaction between adjacent, colinear dimers. With  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  denoting the dimer chemical potential and  $-a < 0$  denoting the strength of the attractive interaction, Heilmann and Lieb proved, using reflection positivity arguments, that the model exhibits orientational symmetry breaking, in the sense of the existence of two Gibbs measures that respectively favor vertical and horizontal dimers, at low temperatures provided that  $\lambda + a > 0$ . However, in view of the two defining qualities of a liquid crystal, they stopped short of proving the absence of translational symmetry breaking within each phase. Regarding this omission, Jauslin and Lieb [12] wrote decades later that “*The main difficulty with extending [Heilmann and Lieb’s] method to prove the lack of translational order is that the correlation length of the system is very large. . . and the lack of order is only visible on that scale, and seems difficult to see using only reflection positivity.*”

Over the years, there have been two main mathematical works aimed specifically at completing the proof of liquid crystalline order in this model. The first attempt is due to Alberici in 2016 [1], who used Pirogov–Sinai theory to complete the proof of the absence of translational symmetry breaking under the assumption of unequal horizontal and vertical dimer activities. Shortly afterwards, in 2018, Jauslin and Lieb [12], again using Pirogov–Sinai theory but with a more sophisticated contour representation of the model, resolved the problem in the original setting of equal horizontal and vertical dimer activities and established the existence of a nematic liquid crystalline phase. Notwithstanding their success, the fly in the ointment is the *extreme* parameter regime in which they worked: whereas it is natural to compare  $\lambda$  and  $a$  *directly* from a physical point of view as in the original work of Heilmann and Lieb, their computation required an exceptionally strong attractive interaction in the sense that  $\beta a \gg e^{\beta \lambda} \gg 1$ . It has remained an open problem to bridge the vast gap between the regime considered by Heilmann and Lieb and that by Jauslin and Lieb.

This paper takes a step towards closing this gap. Specifically, we prove using reflection positivity methods that the model exhibits nematic order at low temperatures in the parameter regime  $\lambda + a > 0, a > \lambda/3$  (recall that  $a > 0$  is built into the model). As in [11], the condition  $\lambda + a > 0$  ensures that vacancies are suppressed at low temperatures, leading to densely packed dimer configurations from which any orientational order is easily visible from the orientations of the dimers themselves. On the other hand, the constraint  $a > \lambda/3$  arises as a necessity in the computation (see the proofs of Proposition 3.8 and Proposition 4.11). Whether low-temperature nematic order persists over the entire regime  $\lambda + a > 0$ , as Heilmann and Lieb conjectured, remains an open question.

In order to *see the lack of translational order using reflection positivity*, as Jauslin and Lieb put it, we use a novel, *mesoscopic* characterization of orientational order adapted from a recent work of Hadas and Peled [10] on the existence of a *columnar* phase in the hard-square model. The characterization is based on the existence of *long sticks* which, to avoid going into details, correspond to uninterrupted sequences of colinear dimers spanning distances on the same order of magnitude as the correlation length of the (one-dimensional) system. Hence, whereas the proof of orientational symmetry breaking by reflection positivity in [11] was based on enumerating the *local* arrangements of dimers on a  $2 \times 2$  square, ours is qualitatively more sophisticated, requiring control over the collective behavior of dimers on a mesoscopic scale. This turns out to be well worth the effort, as it opens the door to proving the absence of translational symmetry breaking using a version of the *disagreement percolation* method due to van den Berg [21]. The latter is based on bounding, intuitively, the extent of disagreement between independent samples of two Gibbs measures exhibiting the same kind of orientational order. Once again, the mesoscopic

characterization of orientational order comes in handy by allowing to explicitly construct and prove the prevalence of *sealing patterns* that greatly constrain the propagation of disagreement components across mesoscopic distances. From there, by showing that disagreement components do not percolate, we deduce the absence of translational symmetry breaking within the horizontal and vertical phases, completing the proof of nematic order.

Without further ado, let us describe the model and our main results more precisely.

## 1.1 Model and main results

Let  $\mathbb{V}$  be the edge set of the square lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . We identify each element of  $\mathbb{V}$  with its midpoint in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , so that  $\mathbb{V} \equiv [(1/2 + \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}] \cup [\mathbb{Z} \times (1/2 + \mathbb{Z})]$ . A **dimer configuration** is a function  $\sigma : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\sigma(e)\sigma(e') = 0$  whenever  $e, e' \in \mathbb{V}$  are distinct and incident to the same vertex of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . We identify each dimer configuration  $\sigma$  with the set  $\sigma^{-1}(\{1\})$  of non-adjacent edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Let  $\Omega$  be the set of all dimer configurations on  $\mathbb{V}$ .

Let  $\beta > 0$  be the inverse temperature,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  be the chemical potential, and  $-a < 0$  be the interaction strength. The formal Hamiltonian of the monomer-dimer model, as Heilmann and Lieb introduced it in [11], is

$$H(\sigma) = -\lambda|\sigma| - a \sum_{\{e, e'\} \subset \sigma} \mathbf{1}_{e \sim e'}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the cardinality, and  $e \sim e'$  means that  $e, e' \in \mathbb{V}$  are colinear and separated by exactly one other edge of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . The formal Hamiltonian (1.1) is adapted to finite volumes in the usual way and gives rise to the usual finite-volume Gibbs measures as well as infinite-volume ones via the standard Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle formalism. A detailed review of the definitions and constructions referenced above is given in Section 2.2.

Our main result is as follows.

**Theorem 1.1** (Nematic order). *Fix  $\lambda + a > 0, a > \lambda/3$ . There exist constants  $\beta_0, C, c > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , the monomer-dimer model admits a unique Gibbs measure  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  such that*

1.  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  is  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -invariant and extremal.
2. For all  $e \in \mathbb{V}$ ,

$$\mu_{\text{ver}}(\sigma(e) = 1) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{O}(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}) & \text{if } e \text{ is vertical} \\ \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta a}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (1.2)$$

3. Let  $A, B \subset \mathbb{V}$  and  $f, g : \Omega \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  be such that  $f$  depends only on the restriction of  $\sigma$  to  $A$  and  $g$  only on the restriction of  $\sigma$  to  $B$ . Then,

$$\text{Cov}_{\mu_{\text{ver}}}(f, g) \leq \sum_{u \in A} \sup_{v \in B} \alpha_1(u, v), \quad (1.3)$$

where, defining  $\ell_0 := e^{\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)}$ ,

$$\alpha_1((x_u, y_u), (x_v, y_v)) := Ce^{-c|x_v - x_u| - c\ell_0^{-1}|y_v - y_u|}. \quad (1.4)$$

Let  $\tau : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be the reflection  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ . The push-forward of  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  under  $\tau$ , denoted by  $\mu_{\text{hor}}$ , is another Gibbs measure of the monomer-dimer model that satisfies analogous properties to the above. Furthermore, every periodic Gibbs measure of the model is a convex combination of  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  and  $\mu_{\text{hor}}$ .

## 1.2 Proof overview and comparison with Hadas–Peled

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 closely follows the strategy of Hadas and Peled in [10]. In fact, the monomer-dimer model and the hard-square model are similar enough that many elements of their argument find direct analogues in our setting. Indeed, the monomer-dimer model coincides with the so-called *oriented monomer model*, which they studied as a toy model before tackling the hard-square model itself, *when a specific relation between the dimer activity and dimer interaction energy is imposed* [10, Section 10.3]. At the same time, the two models are different enough that adapting their methods to our setting is not trivial but requires many model-specific modifications and, in some cases, technical innovations (see Section 2.4.2 for instance), as we explain below. The reader is invited to compare our overview with that given in [10, Section 1.4].

The first step is to prove a qualitatively stronger form of orientational symmetry breaking in the model at low temperatures. To this end, we cover the square lattice with a grid of *overlapping* squares of large side length  $\ell_0^{1/4} \ll \ell \ll \ell_0^{1/2}$ , where  $\ell_0 \gg 1$  is the correlation length of a one-dimensional monomer-dimer system. Our goal is to show that, with high probability, each square contains either (a) two adjacent columns fully packed with vertical dimers or (b) two adjacent rows fully packed with horizontal dimers that cut through its *bulk*. Following Hadas and Peled, we refer to such squares as being **vertically** or **horizontally properly divided**. Importantly, these characterizations are mutually exclusive: a square cannot be both vertically and horizontally properly divided as one easily checks. As a side note, this mutual exclusivity depends critically on the topology of two dimensions: the same is categorically false in higher dimensions. Hence, by jointly choosing the definition of the bulk and the overlap between adjacent squares in the grid, we ensure that connected components of horizontally and vertically properly divided squares are separated by *interfaces* of squares that are not properly divided in either direction. The probability of such interfaces is controlled by a chessboard-Peierls argument and combinatorial estimates for dimer configurations not properly dividing *any* large square *anywhere*, thanks to reflection positivity. In turn, this implies that properly divided squares percolate, which yields two Gibbs measures, respectively characterized by the percolation of horizontally and vertically properly divided squares, by abstract arguments.

Concerning the characterization of orientational order, the main difference between ours and that of Hadas and Peled originates from a simple geometric fact: a dimer has an intrinsic orientation (i.e., horizontal or vertical), but a square does not. This makes characterizing orientational order in the hard-square model as tricky as it is ambiguous: for instance, should one say that the squares in the sublattice close-packing  $2\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z}$  are horizontally or vertically arranged? The way out, as proposed by Hadas and Peled, is to treat orientational order as a *collective property* and inspect the *offset* between adjacent squares: if two adjacent squares have a horizontal offset by one unit, then the separation between them can be *unambiguously* characterized as horizontal, and vice versa. Hence, their notion of properly divided squares is based on whether such offsets propagate through the bulk of a square, which they show occurs with high probability at high activities. Returning to the monomer-dimer model, the inherent orientation of dimers allows us to bypass the consideration of offsets altogether and define properly divided squares directly in terms of the orientations of the dimers contained therein. This requires major modifications to the combinatorics of everywhere non-properly dividing dimer configurations, but the high-level structure of the argument remains the same.

The second step is to refine the above characterization of orientational order with respect to the shape of the regions being properly divided, from squares to rectangles. Specifically, we show that under each ergodic Gibbs measure (with respect to a very sparse sublattice of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ ), either (a) most long, horizontal rectangles are horizontally properly divided or (b) most long, vertical rectangles

are vertically properly divided. The proof of this fact relies on a decreasing induction argument, using the characterization proven above as the base case, and closely follows [10, Section 7]. The main difference here is of a simplifying nature, due to the fact that exactly two pure phases (i.e., horizontal or vertical) are expected in the monomer-dimer model, whereas theirs has four.

In the third step, we use a version of the disagreement percolation method due to van den Berg [21] to deduce the uniqueness of Gibbs measures exhibiting each type of orientational order, as was refined in the previous step, and derive decay of correlations estimates for each phase. The overall strategy is very similar to that in [10, Section 8], namely to use the refined characterization of orientational order to prove, in a strong sense, the prevalence of mesoscopic *patterns*, termed **sealed rectangles** following [10], that significantly constrain the propagation of disagreement components across mesoscopic distances. However, the presence of non-nearest neighbor interactions in the monomer-dimer model, which are not found in the hard-square model, requires a more refined characterization of sealed rectangles based on the *joint* properties of two independently sampled dimer configurations. In contrast, in the hard-square model, it suffices to treat each sample without regard to the other and then take the intersection of the resulting characterizations to define a sealed rectangle. In order to show that the joint property prevails, and as the main technical innovation of this paper that may be of broader use, we extend the **infinite-volume chessboard estimate** due to Hadas and Peled [10, Proposition 3.8] to apply to *finite products* of periodic Gibbs measures. This extension, combined with the formalism of strongly percolating sets in [10, Section 6], allows to verify the uniqueness criterion of disagreement percolation and yields the desired decay of correlations estimates in terms of the probability of various disagreement paths.

In the fourth and final step, we characterize each phase *microscopically* by estimating the density of dimers of each orientation. Following a similar strategy to that in [10, Section 9], we show that the vertical phase, in the sense of the prevalence of vertically properly divided mesoscopic rectangles, is dominated by randomly distributed vertical dimers on a microscopic level. However, to simplify computation, we only bound the next-to-leading-order corrections to the densities, as opposed to deriving exact asymptotics as in [10, Theorem 1.1(2)].

Due to the structural similarities between our work and that of Hadas and Peled [10], we have chosen to adopt, to the extent possible, the notation, terminology, and formulation of statements therein to facilitate comparison between the two works. For intermediate results whose proofs are sufficiently general and apply to both models with no or minimal modifications, we will generally refer the reader to the corresponding sections in [10] instead of duplicating them here.

**Organization of the paper** In Section 2, we introduce the necessary notation and definitions for the monomer-dimer model, review the reflection positivity property, and import the formalism of strongly percolating sets from [10]. In particular, the extension of the chessboard estimate to finite products of periodic Gibbs measures is done in Section 2.4.2. In Section 3, we formally introduce the notion of properly divided squares and prove that it leads to a mesoscopic kind of orientational symmetry breaking at low temperatures. Section 4 is devoted to proving the absence of translational symmetry breaking and consists of two subsections. In Section 4.1, we refine the characterization of orientational order in terms of properly divided rectangles, and in Section 4.2, we implement the disagreement percolation method to accomplish the main goal of the section. Finally, in Section 5, we characterize each phase microscopically by estimating the density of vertical and horizontal dimers, respectively.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Basic definitions

**Graphical constructions** In this paper, we will consider three graphical constructions based on the square lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ :

1. The **dual square lattice**, denoted by  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$ , has vertices corresponding to the faces of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  (with respect to its standard embedding in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ), and two vertices are connected by an edge if and only if their corresponding faces share an edge. We will identify  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  with the shifted square lattice  $(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{Z}^2$ .
2. The **line graph** of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , denoted by  $L(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ , has vertices corresponding to the edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , and two vertices are connected by an edge if and only if their corresponding edges in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  share a vertex. We will identify the vertices of  $L(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  with the midpoints of the edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ ; thus,  $L(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  has vertex set  $\mathbb{V} \equiv [(1/2 + \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}] \cup [\mathbb{Z} \times (1/2 + \mathbb{Z})]$ .
3. An *augmentation* of the line graph of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , denoted by  $L^\ddagger(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ , is obtained from  $L(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  by adding an edge between each pair of vertices of  $L(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  corresponding to colinear edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that are separated by exactly one other edge. We will continue to identify the vertices of  $L^\ddagger(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  with the midpoints of the edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  as before, and use the symbol  $\ddagger$  to denote the connectivity on  $L^\ddagger(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ .

Our motivation for introducing the *augmented line graph*  $L^\ddagger(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  is that the monomer-dimer model is a Markov random field [22, (1.6)] on  $\mathbb{V}$  with respect to  $\ddagger$ -connectivity—due to the presence of second-nearest neighbor interactions in the model (see (2.8)), the same is not true with respect to the usual connectivity on  $L(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ .

Furthermore, we will consider two distinct connectivities on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  itself. The first, denoted by the symbol  $\square$ , is the standard connectivity on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  induced by the 1-norm on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  that makes  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  into the square lattice graph. The second, denoted by the symbol  $\boxtimes$ , is induced by the sup-norm on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and is particularly useful for characterizing the connectivity of boundaries of  $\square$ -connected subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  [19].

**Rectangles** We use the word **rectangle** to refer to a closed, axis-parallel rectangle in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with corners on the dual square lattice: for  $x, y \in 1/2 + \mathbb{Z}$  and  $K, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , denote

$$R_{K \times L, (x, y)} := [x, x + K] \times [y, y + L] \subset \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (2.1)$$

We also introduce the shorthand  $R_{K \times L} := R_{K \times L, (-1/2, -1/2)}$ . We say that a rectangle is even if both its width and height are even.

**Dimer configurations** Recall that we have identified  $\mathbb{V} = [(1/2 + \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}] \cup [\mathbb{Z} \times (1/2 + \mathbb{Z})]$  with the edge set of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . A **dimer** is a vertex  $e \in \mathbb{V}$ . A **dimer configuration** on  $\mathbb{V}$  is a function  $\sigma : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  with the property that no two vertices in  $\sigma^{-1}(\{1\})$ , as edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , are incident to the same vertex of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . Intuitively, a dimer configuration is a set of non-adjacent edges (dimers) of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . In line with this intuition, we identify the function  $\sigma$  with the set  $\sigma^{-1}(\{1\})$  of dimers present in the configuration. Denote the set of all dimer configurations on  $\mathbb{V}$  by  $\Omega$ . Let  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be a rectangle. We introduce several restricted sets of dimer configurations corresponding to various boundary conditions on  $R$ :

1. *Periodic boundary conditions.* Define the set of  $\Lambda$ -periodic dimer configurations as

$$\Omega_{\Lambda}^{\text{per}} := \{\sigma \in \Omega \mid \text{for all } e \in \mathbb{V}, \sigma(e) = \sigma(e + (\text{Width}(\Lambda), 0)) = \sigma(e + (0, \text{Height}(\Lambda)))\}. \quad (2.2)$$

2. *Prescribed boundary conditions.* Let  $\rho \in \Omega$ . Define the set of dimer configurations in  $\Lambda$  (more precisely, in  $\mathbb{V} \cap \Lambda$ ) with  $\rho$ -boundary conditions as

$$\Omega_{\Lambda}^{\rho} := \{\sigma \in \Omega \mid \text{for all } e \in \mathbb{V} \setminus \Lambda, \sigma(e) = \rho(e)\}. \quad (2.3)$$

3. *Vacant boundary conditions.* Define the set of dimer configurations in  $\Lambda$  with vacant boundary conditions as

$$\Omega_{\Lambda}^0 := \{\sigma \in \Omega \mid \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Lambda, v \text{ is a vacancy in } \sigma\}. \quad (2.4)$$

*Remark 2.1.* As a cautionary note, the way that the monomer-dimer model is defined on the edge set of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is a possible source of confusion to readers accustomed to lattice spin models where configurations are specified directly on the vertices. Our notation  $\mathbb{V}$  for the edge set of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is intended to mitigate this confusion.

## 2.2 The Hamiltonian and Gibbs measures

Let  $\sigma \in \Omega$ . Recall that we have identified  $\sigma \equiv \sigma^{-1}(\{1\})$ . We say that two dimers  $e, e' \in \sigma$  are **linked** if, as edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , they are colinear and separated by exactly one other edge called their **link**; in that case, we write  $e \sim e'$ . Let  $\beta > 0$  be the inverse temperature,  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  be the dimer chemical potential, and  $-a < 0$  be the strength of attraction between linked dimers. In the remainder of the paper, we will consider  $\lambda$  and  $a$  to be fixed and suppress them from the notation. The formal Hamiltonian of the monomer-dimer model, as introduced by Heilmann and Lieb in [11, Model I], is

$$H(\sigma) := -\lambda|\sigma| - a \sum_{\{e, e'\} \subset \sigma} \mathbb{1}_{e \sim e'}, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $|\sigma|$  is the number of dimers in the dimer configuration  $\sigma$ .

In this paper, we will study their model in the perturbative regime  $\beta \gg 1$ . To exploit the largeness of  $\beta$ , it is advantageous to shift the Hamiltonian by a constant multiple of the volume, as exemplified in the following formal rewriting, whose adaptation to finite volumes is straightforward (though it may lead to an inconsequential boundary term):

$$\frac{1}{2}(\lambda + a)|\mathbb{Z}^2| + H(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + a)(|\mathbb{Z}^2| - 2|\sigma|) + \frac{1}{2}a \sum_{e \in \sigma} \left( 2 - \sum_{e' \in \sigma} \mathbb{1}_{e' \sim e} \right), \quad (2.6)$$

where the terms on the RHS have the following intuitive interpretations:

1.  $|\mathbb{Z}^2| - 2|\sigma|$  is the number of vacant vertices, or **vacancies** for short, which are vertices of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  not incident to any dimer in  $\sigma$ .
2. For each  $e \in \sigma$ ,  $2 - \sum_{e' \in \sigma} \mathbb{1}_{e' \sim e}$  is the number of ends of  $e$  not linked to another dimer in  $\sigma$ . Formally, we define a **broken link** as a vertex in  $\mathbb{V}$  whose corresponding edge in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is incident to exactly one dimer in  $\sigma$  with which it is colinear. Hence,  $\sum_{e \in \sigma} (2 - \sum_{e' \in \sigma} \mathbb{1}_{e' \sim e})$  is the total number of broken links in  $\sigma$ .

For clarity, we recast (2.6) systematically using the standard notion of potentials (see [8, Section 6.3.2] or [9, (2.2)]). Let  $B \subset \mathbb{V}$  be bounded (or  $B \Subset \mathbb{V}$  for short).

1. If  $B$  has the form  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$  where all the  $e_i$  share a common vertex of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , define the four-body, vacancy potential

$$\Phi_B(\sigma) := \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + a)\mathbb{1}_{\sum_{i=1}^4 \sigma(e_i)=0}, \quad (2.7)$$

which outputs  $(\lambda + a)/2$  if and only if the shared vertex is a vacancy in  $\sigma$ .

2. If  $B$  has the form  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$  where the  $e_i$  (ordered from bottom left to top right) are adjacent and colinear, define the three-body, broken-link potential

$$\Phi_B(\sigma) := \frac{1}{2}a\mathbb{1}_{\sigma(e_1)+\sigma(e_3)=1}, \quad (2.8)$$

which outputs  $a/2$  if and only if the middle edge  $e_2$  is a broken link of the dimer  $e_1$  or  $e_3$  in  $\sigma$ .

3. Otherwise, set  $\Phi_B(\sigma) := 0$ .

Thus, the shifted formal Hamiltonian can be expressed as

$$\sum_{B \in \mathbb{V}} \Phi_B(\sigma), \quad (2.9)$$

whose adaptation to finite volumes is standard (see [8, (6.24)] or [9, (2.3)]): if  $\Lambda$  is a rectangle and  $\#$  denotes a boundary condition for  $\Lambda$ , then the finite-volume Hamiltonian for dimer configurations in  $\Lambda$  with  $\#$ -boundary conditions is

$$H_\Lambda^\#(\sigma) := \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathbb{V} \\ B \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset}} \Phi_B(\sigma). \quad (2.10)$$

As a special case, we note that if  $\#$  denotes the periodic boundary conditions, then the sum over  $B \in \mathbb{V}$  is instead restricted to a complete set of representatives of the equivalence classes of all  $B \in \mathbb{V}$  under translations generated by  $(\text{Width}(\Lambda), 0)$  and  $(0, \text{Height}(\Lambda))$ .

**Gibbs measures** Let  $\Lambda$  be a rectangle and  $\#$  denote a boundary condition for  $\Lambda$ . The weight of a dimer configuration  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^\#$  is defined as

$$w_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#(\sigma) := e^{-\beta H_\Lambda^\#(\sigma)}. \quad (2.11)$$

Hence, penalty factors of  $e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}$  and  $e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}$  are assigned to each vacancy and broken link, respectively. The finite-volume Gibbs measure on  $\Lambda$  with  $\#$ -boundary conditions is given by

$$\mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#(\sigma) := \frac{w_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#(\sigma)}{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^\#, \quad (2.12)$$

where  $Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^\# := \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^\#} w_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#(\sigma)$  is the partition function. Furthermore, given  $E \subset \Omega$ , we define the  $E$ -constrained partition function as

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#(E) := \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^\# \cap E} w_{\Lambda;\beta}^\#(\sigma). \quad (2.13)$$

Lastly, we define infinite-volume Gibbs measures in the standard Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle formalism; see [8, Section 6.2.1] or [9, (2.9)] for details.



## 2.3 Comparison of boundary conditions

In this subsection, we quote from [10] two results comparing constrained partition functions and expectations under different boundary conditions. While the models in question are different, their proofs carry over to our setting with little modification.

**Proposition 2.2** ([10, Proposition 2.1]). *There exists a constant  $C(\beta) \geq 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $\Lambda$  be a rectangle and  $\rho \in \Omega$ . Define a mapping  $m^{\rho, \Lambda} : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_{\Lambda}^{\rho}$  by taking any  $\sigma \in \Omega$ , setting  $m^{\rho, \Lambda}(\sigma) \equiv \rho$  on  $\mathbb{V} \setminus \text{int}(\Lambda)$ , and deleting all dimers in  $\mathbb{V} \cap \text{int}(\Lambda)$  that intersect another dimer. If  $E \subset \Omega$ , then, for any boundary condition  $\#$  for  $\Lambda$ ,*

$$Z_{\Lambda, \beta}^{\#}(E) \leq C(\beta)^{\text{Perimeter}(\Lambda)} Z_{\Lambda, \beta}^{\rho}(m^{\rho, \Lambda}(E)). \quad (2.14)$$

**Proposition 2.3** ([10, Proposition 2.2]). *There exists a constant  $C(\beta) \geq 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda \subset \Lambda_1$  be rectangles such that the Euclidean distance from  $\Lambda_0$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Lambda$  is at least 2. Let  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be  $\Lambda_0$ -local. Then, for any Gibbs measure  $\mu$ ,*

$$\mu(f) \leq C(\beta)^{\text{Perimeter}(\Lambda)} \mu_{\Lambda_1, \beta}^{\text{per}}(f). \quad (2.15)$$

## 2.4 Reflection positivity and the chessboard estimate

In this subsection, we formulate the reflection positivity of the monomer-dimer model and use it to set up the chessboard estimate and an infinite-volume extension thereof due to Hadas and Peled [10, Proposition 3.8]. While much of the material here is either standard or directly imported from [10], we will give a further extension of the chessboard estimate applicable to *finite products* of periodic Gibbs measures that will be useful in Section 4.2.

### 2.4.1 Standard results

We begin with some notation. Let  $R = R_{K \times L, (x_0, y_0)}$  be a rectangle. Define the **grid** of  $R$  as  $G^R := (x_0 + K\mathbb{Z}) \times (y_0 + L\mathbb{Z})$ , and denote its origin-shifted version by  $\mathcal{L}^R := K\mathbb{Z} \times L\mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $T^R$  be the group generated by the reflections of  $R$  across the vertical and horizontal lines that pass through points in  $G^R$ . Thus, for each  $v \in G^R$ , there exists a unique isometry in  $T^R$  that maps  $R$  to  $R_{K \times L, v}$ ; we denote this isometry by  $\tau_{R, v}$ . Given  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\tau \in T^R$ , define  $(\tau f)(\sigma) := f(\sigma \circ \tau)$ . Given a Gibbs measure  $\mu$  and an isometry  $\tau : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , denote by  $\tau\mu$  the push-forward of  $\mu$  under  $\tau$ . Given  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ , let  $\eta_{(x, y)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the translation  $v \mapsto v + (x, y)$ .

First, we show that the monomer-dimer model is *reflection positive* with respect to reflections across the vertices in  $\mathbb{V}$ .

**Lemma 2.4** (Reflection positivity). *Let  $R = R_{K \times L, (x_0, y_0)}$  be a rectangle and  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $R$ -local. Then,*

$$\mu_{\Lambda, \beta}^{\text{per}}(f \cdot \tau f) \geq 0 \quad (2.16)$$

*if  $(\Lambda, \tau)$  is either  $(R_{2K \times L, (-1/2, -1/2)}, \tau_{R, (x_0 + K, y_0)})$  or  $(R_{K \times 2L, (-1/2, -1/2)}, \tau_{R, (x_0, y_0 + L)})$ .*

*Proof.* We treat the case that  $(\Lambda, \tau) = (R_{2K \times L, (-1/2, -1/2)}, \tau_{R, (x_0 + K, y_0)})$ ; the other case is similar. Let

$$\mathfrak{A}^+ := \{\vartheta v \mid \vartheta \in T^{\Lambda}, v \in R\}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\mathfrak{A}^- := \{\vartheta v \mid \vartheta \in T^{\Lambda}, v \in R_{K \times L, (x_0 + K, y_0)}\}. \quad (2.18)$$

By a standard criterion for reflection positivity (see [2, Corollary 5.4] or [8, Lemma 10.8]), it suffices to write

$$-H_{\Lambda}^{\text{per}} = A + \tau A + \sum_{\alpha} C_{\alpha} \cdot \tau C_{\alpha}, \quad (2.19)$$

where  $A, C_{\alpha}$  are  $\mathfrak{A}^+$ -local functions. Recall the potential representation of the Hamiltonian (2.10). We let each  $\Phi_B$  as in (2.7) contribute to  $-(A + \tau A)$ . For each  $\Phi_B$  as in (2.8), if  $B \subset \mathfrak{A}^+$  or  $B \subset \mathfrak{A}^-$ , we let it contribute to  $-(A + \tau A)$ . Otherwise,  $B$  crosses a horizontal or vertical line passing through points in  $G^R$ . In this case, writing

$$\Phi_B(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}a - \frac{1}{2}a \left[ \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(e_1)=\sigma(e_2)} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(e_3)=\sigma(e_2)} + \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(e_1) \neq \sigma(e_2)} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(e_3) \neq \sigma(e_2)} \right], \quad (2.20)$$

we let the first term contribute to  $-(A + \tau A)$  and the second term to  $-\sum_{\alpha} C_{\alpha} \cdot \tau C_{\alpha}$ , using that  $a > 0$ . The proof is now complete.  $\square$

If  $\Lambda$  is a rectangle such that  $2\text{Width}(R) \mid \text{Width}(\Lambda)$  and  $2\text{Height}(R) \mid \text{Height}(\Lambda)$ , we say that  $R$  is a **block** of  $\Lambda$ . In that case, set  $T_{\Lambda}^R := T^R / \mathcal{L}^{\Lambda}$ . Given an  $R$ -local function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define its  $(R, \Lambda)$ -**chessboard seminorm** by

$$\|f\|_{R|\Lambda} := \mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} \left( \prod_{\tau \in T_{\Lambda}^R} \tau f \right)^{1/|T_{\Lambda}^R|}; \quad (2.21)$$

the name “seminorm” is justified by the fact that  $\|\cdot\|_{R|\Lambda}$  indeed satisfies the standard properties of a seminorm [10, Proposition 3.3]. A standard consequence of reflection positivity is the *chessboard estimate*, which asserts that the expectation of a product of local functions of a particular form under  $\mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}}$  factorizes as an upper bound into the product of their chessboard seminorms. We do not prove the chessboard estimate here but refer the reader to [2] and [8] for pedagogical references.

**Proposition 2.5** (Chessboard estimate). *Let  $R$  be a block of  $\Lambda$ . Let  $A \subset T_{\Lambda}^R$  and  $(f_{\tau})_{\tau \in A}$  be  $R$ -local functions. Then,*

$$\mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} \left( \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_{\tau} \right) \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|f_{\tau}\|_{R|\Lambda}. \quad (2.22)$$

We also quote a recursive version of the chessboard estimate from Hadas and Peled, which applies to the monomer-dimer model as well with the same proof.

**Lemma 2.6** (Recursive chessboard estimate, [10, Lemma 3.4]). *Let  $R$  and  $S$  be blocks of  $\Lambda$ , and suppose that the corners of  $S$  are in  $G^R$ . Let  $A \subset T^R$  be such that  $\cup_{\tau \in A} \tau R \subset S$  and  $(f_{\tau})_{\tau \in A}$  be  $R$ -local functions. Then,*

$$\left\| \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_{\tau} \right\|_{S|\Lambda} \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|f_{\tau}\|_{R|\Lambda}. \quad (2.23)$$

## 2.4.2 Finite products of reflection positive measures

The goal of this sub-subsection is to prove an extension of the **infinite-volume chessboard estimate** of Hadas and Peled [10, Proposition 3.8] applicable to finite products of periodic Gibbs measures. We first recall their result, noting that there is a slight difference in the definition of rectangles between [10] and ours but which is immaterial for the statement below.

**Proposition 2.7** ([10, Proposition 3.8]). *The following holds for the hard-square model. For any rectangle  $R = R_{K \times L, (x_0, y_0)}$  and  $R$ -local function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define*

$$\|f\|_R := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f\|_{R|_{\mathbb{R}_{n!} \times n!}}. \quad (2.24)$$

*Let  $R$  be a rectangle,  $A \subset T^R$  be finite, and  $(f_\tau)_{\tau \in A}$  be  $R$ -local functions. Then, for all periodic Gibbs measures  $\mu$ ,*

$$\mu \left( \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_\tau \right) \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|f_\tau\|_R. \quad (2.25)$$

A direct analogue of their result for the monomer-dimer model will follow as a special case of a more general statement which we now formulate. Let  $k \geq 1$ . An element  $(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^k \in \Omega^k$  may be thought of as a joint configuration that naturally specifies a mapping  $\mathbb{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^k$  via  $e \mapsto (\sigma_i(e))_{i=1}^k$ . Thus, given a rectangle  $R$ , the notion of  $R$ -locality and transformation under each reflection  $\tau \in T^R$  extend naturally to functions  $\Omega^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We equip  $\Omega^k$  with the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}^{\otimes k}$ , and use the symbol  $\otimes$  to denote the product of probability measures on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ .

Let  $\Lambda$  be rectangle,  $R$  be a block of  $\Lambda$ , and  $f : \Omega^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $R$ -local. Define

$$\|f\|_{R|\Lambda} := (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda; \beta}^{\text{per}}) \left( \prod_{\tau \in T_\Lambda^R} \tau f \right)^{1/|T_\Lambda^R|}. \quad (2.26)$$

We note that the product measure  $\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda; \beta}^{\text{per}}$  remains reflection positive with respect to reflections across the vertices in  $\mathbb{V}$ , so the quantity above satisfies the same seminorm properties as before and the usual chessboard estimate holds. Next, define

$$\|f\|_R := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f\|_{R|_{\mathbb{R}_{n!} \times n!}}. \quad (2.27)$$

The main result of this sub-subsection is the following extension of [10, Proposition 3.8] in the context of the monomer-dimer model.

**Proposition 2.8** (Infinite-volume chessboard estimate for product measures). *Let  $R$  be a rectangle. Let  $A \subset T^R$  be finite and  $(f_\tau)_{\tau \in A}$  be  $R$ -local functions from  $\Omega^k$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then, given periodic Gibbs measures  $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$ ,*

$$(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_\tau \right) \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|f_\tau\|_R. \quad (2.28)$$

We follow the same proof strategy as in [10], with suitable modifications to accommodate the product measures, starting with the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $R$  be a rectangle and  $f : \Omega^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $R$ -local. Then, given periodic Gibbs measures  $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$ ,*

$$(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i)(f) \leq \|f\|_R. \quad (2.29)$$

The proof of Lemma 2.9 relies on the following claims.

*Claim 2.10.* Let  $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda \subset \Lambda_1$  be rectangles such that the Euclidean distance from  $\Lambda_0$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Lambda$  is at least 2. Let  $f : \Omega^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be  $\Lambda_0$ -local. Let  $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$  be periodic Gibbs measures. Then, with the same constant  $C(\beta) \geq 1$  as in Proposition 2.3,

$$(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i)(f) \leq C(\beta)^{k \text{Perimeter}(\Lambda)} (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda_1; \beta}^{\text{per}})(f). \quad (2.30)$$

*Proof.* If  $f$  is the indicator function of a measurable rectangle, the product measure factorize into a product of measures, and the inequality follows from Proposition 2.3 for all  $m > m_0$ : note that the Euclidean distance between  $\Lambda_{m_0}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Lambda_m$  is indeed at least 2 when  $m > m_0 \geq 2$ . Next, if  $f$  is the indicator function of a measurable subset  $B \subset \Omega^k$ , the inequality follows from the construction of product measures via Carathéodory's extension theorem, i.e., the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i)(B) \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i)(B_j) \mid B_j \text{ is a finite union of measurable rectangles, } B \subset \cup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

and an analogue for  $(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda_m}^{\text{per}})(B)$ . By linearity, the inequality extends to non-negative simple functions, and finally to all non-negative measurable functions by the monotone convergence theorem.  $\square$

*Claim 2.11.* Let  $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$  be periodic Gibbs measures,  $R$  be a rectangle, and  $g : \Omega^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be  $R$ -local. Let  $(A_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be non-empty, finite subsets of  $T^R$ . Suppose that  $|A_n| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and, denoting by  $R_n$  the smallest rectangle containing  $\cup_{\tau \in A_n} \tau R$ , that  $\text{Perimeter}(R_n)/|A_n| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{|A_n|} \left( \otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i \right) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right) \leq \|g\|_R. \quad (2.32)$$

*Proof.* Fix  $n \geq 1$ . For  $m \geq 2$ , define  $\Lambda_m := R_{m! \times m!, -(m!+1)/2, -(m!+1)/2}$ . Let  $R'_n \supset R_n$  be the smallest rectangle such that the Euclidean distance from  $R_n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus R'_n$  is at least 2, and  $m(n) \geq 2$  be such that  $R'_n \subset \Lambda_{m(n)}$ . Suppose that  $m \geq m(n)$ . Since  $\prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g$  is  $R_n$ -local, using Claim 2.10, we get that

$$\left( \otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i \right) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right) \leq C(\beta)^{k \text{Perimeter}(R'_n)} (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda_m; \beta}^{\text{per}}) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right). \quad (2.33)$$

When  $m \geq m(n)$  is so large that  $R$  is a block of  $\Lambda_m$ , by the usual chessboard estimate applied to  $\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda_m; \beta}^{\text{per}}$ , we have that

$$(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_{\Lambda_m; \beta}^{\text{per}}) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right) \leq \|g\|_{R|\Lambda_m}^{|A_n|}. \quad (2.34)$$

Hence,

$$\sqrt{|A_n|} \left( \otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i \right) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right) \leq C(\beta)^{k \text{Perimeter}(R'_n)/|A_n|} \|g\|_{R|\Lambda_m}. \quad (2.35)$$

Using that  $\text{Perimeter}(R'_n) = \text{Perimeter}(R_n) + 16$ , taking limits superior of both sides as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  completes the proof.  $\square$

*Claim 2.12.* Let  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ ,  $S_n \subset M\mathbb{Z}^2$  be finite, and  $A_n := \{\eta_s \mid s \in S_n\}$  where  $\eta_s : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is the translation  $u \mapsto u + s$ . Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$  and  $g : \Omega^k \rightarrow [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$  be measurable. If  $\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i$  is  $M\mathbb{Z}^2$ -invariant, then

$$(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i) \left( \sqrt{|A_n|} \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right) = (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i)(g) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (2.36)$$

The proof of Claim 2.12 is by a direct application of the Taylor expansion and does not depend on the specifics of the model or the measure, so we omit it here and refer the reader to [10, Proof of Claim 3.11] for details. We are now ready to prove Lemma 2.9.

*Proof of Lemma 2.9.* Let  $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$  be periodic Gibbs measures. By taking the intersection of full-rank sublattices with respect to which each  $\mu_i$  is invariant, we find a full-rank sublattice  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that  $\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -invariant. Let  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be such that  $M\mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \mathcal{L} \cap 2\mathcal{L}^R$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , let  $S_n := \{M, \dots, nM\}^2$  and  $A_n$  be as in Claim 2.12. For  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2\max|f|}$ , let  $g := 1 + \epsilon f$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \epsilon \|f\|_R &\geq \|g\|_R \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n^2]{(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g \right)} \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i) \left( \sqrt[n^2]{\prod_{\tau \in A_n} \tau g} \right) \\ &\geq 1 + \epsilon (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i)(f) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

where we used Claim 2.11 in the second, Jensen's inequality in the third inequality, and Claim 2.12 in the last. Taking  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  completes the proof.  $\square$

To prove Proposition 2.8, we will also need the following extension of Lemma 2.6, which follows directly by applying the definition (2.27).

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $R$  and  $S$  be blocks of  $\Lambda$ , and suppose that the corners of  $S$  are in  $G^R$ . Let  $A \subset T^R$  be such that  $\cup_{\tau \in A} \tau R \subset S$  and  $(f_\tau)_{\tau \in A}$  be  $R$ -local functions. Then,*

$$\left\| \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_\tau \right\|_S \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|f_\tau\|_R. \quad (2.38)$$

We now deduce Proposition 2.8.

*Proof of Proposition 2.8.* Let  $S$  be a rectangle whose corners lie on  $G^R$  and which contains  $\cup_{\tau \in A} \tau R$ . Combining Lemmas 2.9 and 2.13, we get that

$$(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mu_i) \left( \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_\tau \right) \leq \left\| \prod_{\tau \in A} \tau f_\tau \right\|_S \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|f_\tau\|_R, \quad (2.39)$$

as required.  $\square$

### 2.4.3 Recursive chessboard estimates for off-grid events

We conclude this section by proving the following extension of Lemma 2.6 applicable in cases where the corners of  $S$  do not lie on  $G^R$  but the events in question enjoy additional symmetries. It will only be used in the proof of Lemma 4.8.

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $R$  and  $S$  be blocks of  $\Lambda$ . Suppose that  $G^R$  is invariant under  $T_\Lambda^S$ . Let  $A \subset T^R$  be such that  $\cup_{\tau \in A} \tau R \subset S$  and  $(E_\tau)_{\tau \in A}$  be  $R$ -local events that are invariant under reflections through the horizontal and vertical lines passing through the center of  $R$ . Then,*

$$\left\| \bigcap_{\tau \in A} \tau E_\tau \right\|_{S|\Lambda} \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|E_\tau\|_{R|\Lambda}. \quad (2.40)$$

Consequently,

$$\left\| \bigcap_{\tau \in A} \tau E_\tau \right\|_S \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|E_\tau\|_R. \quad (2.41)$$

*Proof.* We have that

$$\left\| \bigcap_{\tau \in A} \tau E_\tau \right\|_{S|\Lambda}^{|T_\Lambda^S|} = \mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} \left( \bigcap_{\kappa \in T_\Lambda^S} \bigcap_{\tau \in A} \kappa \tau E_\tau \right). \quad (2.42)$$

Since  $G^R$  is invariant under  $T_\Lambda^S$ , for each  $\kappa \in T_\Lambda^S$  and  $\tau \in A$ , there exists  $t_{\kappa,\tau} \in T_\Lambda^R$  such that  $\kappa \tau R = t_{\kappa,\tau} R$ . Moreover, by the invariance assumption on  $E_\tau$ , we have that  $\kappa \tau E_\tau = t_{\kappa,\tau} E_\tau$ . Finally, since  $\bigcup_{\tau \in A} \tau R \subset S$ , the mapping  $(\kappa, \tau) \mapsto t_{\kappa,\tau}$  is injective. Therefore, by Proposition 2.5

$$\mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} \left( \bigcap_{\kappa \in T_\Lambda^S} \bigcap_{\tau \in A} \kappa \tau E_\tau \right) = \mu_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} \left( \bigcap_{\kappa \in T_\Lambda^S} \bigcap_{\tau \in A} t_{\kappa,\tau} E_\tau \right) \leq \prod_{\tau \in A} \|E_\tau\|_{R|\Lambda}^{|T_\Lambda^S|}. \quad (2.43)$$

Combining (2.42) and (2.43) proves the first claim. The second claim follows directly by taking limits superior as in the definition (2.27).  $\square$

## 2.5 Strongly percolating sets

A recurrent theme in our analysis is to take a local property of dimer configurations—the existence of long dimer chains through the bulk of a fixed-size rectangle, for instance—and quantify its prevalence in typical dimer configurations via percolation-type arguments. In this section, we import the notion of strongly percolating sets and their properties from [10, Section 6], which are well-suited for this purpose.

We start with some notation. Let  $E \subset \Omega$  be an event, which should be thought of as a local property of dimer configurations. Define the random set  $\overline{E} : \Omega \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$  by

$$\overline{E}(\sigma) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid \sigma \in \eta_{(x,y)} E\}, \quad (2.44)$$

where we recall that  $\eta_{(x,y)}$  denotes the translation by  $(x, y)$ . Thus,  $\overline{E}$  is the random set of locations at which the local property  $E$  holds. Given  $K, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , define the random set

$$X_{K \times L} \overline{E} := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid (Kx, Ly) \in \overline{E}\}, \quad (2.45)$$

which tracks the manifestation of the local property  $E$  on the scale of the rectangular grid  $K\mathbb{Z} \times L\mathbb{Z}$ . The above definitions generalize naturally to *joint* properties of multiple, independently sampled dimer configurations, i.e., events  $E \subset \Omega^k$ ,  $k \geq 2$ .

We now define strongly percolating sets. Fix  $\epsilon_0 := 1/21$  throughout the paper. Let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . A random set  $B \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is  $\epsilon$ -**rare** if, for all finite  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(A \subset B) \leq \epsilon^{|A|}$ . A random set  $\Psi \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is  $\epsilon$ -**strongly percolating** if either  $\epsilon \geq \epsilon_0$  or there exists an  $\epsilon$ -rare set  $B$  such that  $\Psi$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely contains an infinite  $\square$ -component of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus B$ . Define

$$\mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Psi) := \inf \{\epsilon \geq 0 \mid \Psi \text{ is } \epsilon\text{-strongly percolating}\}. \quad (2.46)$$

We mention here that the quantity  $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Psi)$  may be thought of as a measure of the size of  $\Psi$ , with smaller values indicating larger random sets; see [10, Section 6.1] for further discussion.

The following results are direct imports from [10, Section 6].

**Lemma 2.15** ([10, Lemma 6.4]). *Let  $u \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,  $d \geq 0$ , and  $\Psi \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  be a random set on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Let  $E$  be the event that there exists a  $\boxtimes$ -path in  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Psi$  starting at  $u$  and ending at some point in  $\{v \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid \|v - u\|_\infty \geq d\}$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(E) \leq \left( \frac{\mathbf{p}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Psi)}{\epsilon_0} \right)^{d+1}. \quad (2.47)$$

**Lemma 2.16** ([10, Lemma 6.6]). *For all  $k \geq 1$  and random sets  $\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_k \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^k \Psi_i) \leq k \sqrt[k]{\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \mathbb{P}(\Psi_i)} \quad (2.48)$$

**Lemma 2.17** ([10, Lemma 6.7]). *Let  $E \subset \Omega$  be an event. Let  $k, K, l, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be such that  $k \mid K$  and  $l \mid L$ . Denote  $H := \{\eta_{(x,y)} \mid (x,y) \in (k\mathbb{Z} \times l\mathbb{Z}) \cap ([0, K) \cap [0, L))\}$  and  $r := |H| = \frac{KL}{kl}$ . Denote  $\Psi := X_{k \times l} \overline{E}$ ,  $\Psi'_\eta := X_{K \times L} \overline{\eta E}$  for each  $\eta \in H$ , and  $\Psi' := \cap_{\eta \in H} \Psi'_\eta$ . Then,*

1.  $\mathbb{P}(\Psi') \leq r \mathbb{P}(\Psi)$ .
2.  $\mathbb{P}(\Psi) \leq \sqrt[r]{\mathbb{P}(\Psi')}$ .
3.  $\mathbb{P}(\Psi) \leq \sqrt[r]{r \sqrt[r]{\max_{\eta \in H} \mathbb{P}(\Psi'_\eta)}}$ .
4. *If  $E \subset \Omega$  is  $R$ -local for  $R = R_{K \times L, (x,y)}$  and is invariant under reflections through the vertical and horizontal lines passing through the center of  $R$ , then, for all periodic Gibbs measures  $\mu$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\Psi) \leq \sqrt[r]{\|\Omega \setminus E\|_R}. \quad (2.49)$$

**Lemma 2.18** ([10, Proposition 6.8]). *Let  $\mathbb{P}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -ergodic probability measure on  $\Omega$  for some lattice  $\mathcal{L} \subset K\mathbb{Z} \times L\mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $E, F \subset \Omega$  be events. If*

$$E \cap \eta_{(K,0)} F = E \cap \eta_{(0,L)} F = \eta_{(K,0)} E \cap F = \eta_{(0,L)} E \cap F = \emptyset, \quad (2.50)$$

*then*

$$\min \{\mathbb{P}(X_{K \times L} \overline{E}), \mathbb{P}(X_{K \times L} \overline{F})\} \leq \mathbb{P}(X_{K \times L} \overline{E \cup F}) \quad (2.51)$$

We will also need the following new lemma on strongly percolating sets under independent couplings.

**Lemma 2.19.** *Let  $\mu, \mu'$  be probability measures on a common measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . Let  $\Psi \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  be a random set on the product probability space  $(\Omega \times \Omega, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \mu \otimes \mu')$ . Suppose that there exists a random set  $\tilde{\Psi} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  such that*

$$\Psi(\sigma, \sigma') = \tilde{\Psi}(\sigma) \text{ for } (\mu \otimes \mu')\text{-almost all } (\sigma, \sigma') \in \Omega \times \Omega. \quad (2.52)$$

*Then,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(\Psi) \leq \mathbb{P}_\mu(\tilde{\Psi})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\tilde{\Psi}$  is  $\epsilon$ -strongly percolating. Suppose in addition that  $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ . Then, there exists an  $\epsilon$ -rare set  $\tilde{B} \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that  $\tilde{\Psi}$   $\mu$ -almost surely contains an infinite  $\square$ -component of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \tilde{B}$ . Define a random set  $B(\sigma, \sigma') := \tilde{B}(\sigma)$ . It is easy to check that  $B$  is  $\epsilon$ -rare and is such that  $\Psi$   $(\mu \otimes \mu')$ -almost surely contains an infinite  $\square$ -component of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus B$ . The proof is complete by taking the infimum over all such  $\epsilon \geq 0$ .  $\square$

### 3 Mesoscopic orientational symmetry breaking

In this section, we establish orientational symmetry breaking in the monomer-dimer model at low temperatures. Our characterization of orientational order is different from that used by Heilmann and Lieb in [11] in that ours is mesoscopic rather than microscopic, and instead draws inspiration

from the characterization of Hadas and Peled [10] for the hard-square model. However, we will introduce major modifications to the latter characterization to account for the geometric distinction between dimers and squares as well as the extra attractive interaction in the monomer-dimer model. Hence, while the overall strategy of our proof is similar to that of [10], many technical components here are new.

**Sticks** Let  $\sigma \in \Omega$ . A **stick edge** of  $\sigma$  is an edge  $e$  of the dual square lattice  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  such that both endpoints of the edge of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  it bisects are incident to dimers in  $\sigma$  having the same orientation as  $e$ . We note that, unlike Hadas and Peled, we do not require that the latter two dimers be offset by one unit, since the orientations of these dimers are already evident. We define a **stick** as a maximal contiguous run of stick edges of  $\sigma$ . It is easy to check that horizontal and vertical stick edges cannot intersect. By extension, horizontal and vertical sticks cannot intersect either.

**Rectangles divided by sticks** Following Hadas and Peled, we introduce the notion of *division* of rectangles by sticks. Let  $R = R_{K \times L, (x, y)}$  be a rectangle; recall that this assumes that  $x, y \in 1/2 + \mathbb{Z}$  and  $K, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . Consider a vertical segment with endpoints  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_1, y_2)$ , where  $x_1 \in 1/2 + \mathbb{Z}$  and  $-\infty \leq y_1 < y_2 \leq \infty$ . We say that this segment **vertically divides**  $R$  if  $x < x_1 < x + K$  (note the exclusion at the endpoints) and  $y_1 \leq y < y + L \leq y_2$ . That a horizontal segment horizontally divides  $R$  is defined analogously. If we do not wish to specify the orientation of the segment, we will simply say that it **divides**  $R$ .

Using that rectangles are defined to be closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with corners on  $(1/2 + \mathbb{Z})^2$  and recalling the identification  $\mathbb{V} \equiv [(1/2 + \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}] \cup [\mathbb{Z} \times (1/2 + \mathbb{Z})]$ , it is straightforward to see that the event that a rectangle  $R$  is divided by a stick is  $R$ -local.

**Main results** A mesoscopic rectangle is a rectangle  $R$  such that  $\text{Width}(R), \text{Height}(R) \ll \ell_0$  but  $\text{Area}(R) \gg \ell_0$ , where  $\ell_0 := e^{\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)}$  is a mesoscopic length scale defined computationally in Section 3.1.2. The first main result of this section is an upper bound on the chessboard seminorm of the event that a mesoscopic rectangle  $R$  is not divided by a stick through its “bulk” in the sense made precise below.

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exist constants  $\beta_0, c > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$  and rectangles  $S \subset R$  satisfying*

$$c^{-1} \leq \text{Width}(R), \text{Height}(R) \leq c\ell_0, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{Width}(S) \geq (1 - c)\text{Width}(R), \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Height}(S) \geq (1 - c)\text{Height}(R), \quad (3.2)$$

*it holds that*

$$\| \text{no stick divides both } R \text{ and } S \|_R \leq e^{-c\ell_0^{-1} \text{Area}(R)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Fix an integer  $N > 2$  such that  $\frac{2}{N} \leq c_{3.3}$  for the rest of the paper. For a rectangle  $R$  with width and height divisible by  $N$ , denote by  $R^-$  the rectangle concentric to  $R$  with dimensions equal to  $1 - 2/N$  times those of  $R$ . Thus,  $R$  and  $R^-$  satisfy the assumption (3.2) of Theorem 3.1. We say that a stick **properly divides**  $R$  if it divides both  $R$  and  $R^-$ . Following [10], we define a mesoscopic grid to track which rectangles are properly divided by a stick of either orientation. Given  $K, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $\sigma \in \Omega$ , define

$$\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{K \times L}(\sigma) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid \text{a vertical stick of } \sigma \text{ properly divides } R_{KN \times LN, (xK-1/2, yL-1/2)}\}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{K \times L}(\sigma) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid \text{a horizontal stick of } \sigma \text{ properly divides } R_{KN \times LN, (xK-1/2, yL-1/2)}\}. \quad (3.5)$$



Vertices in  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{K \times L}(\sigma)$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{K \times L}(\sigma)$  cannot be adjacent in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , otherwise the overlap between their corresponding rectangles and the definition of proper division would imply the intersection of sticks of different orientations, which is impossible. Hence,  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{K \times L}(\sigma)$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{K \times L}(\sigma)$  are separated by interfaces corresponding to rectangles which are not properly divided by sticks. Combining Theorem 3.1 with a chessboard-Peierls argument, we obtain the following.

**Theorem 3.2.** *There exist constants  $\beta_0, C, c > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ ,  $C\ell_0^{1/2} < b < c\ell_0$ , and periodic Gibbs measures  $\mu$ , it holds that*

$$\mu(\text{exactly one of } \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{b \times b} \text{ and } \Psi_{\text{hor}}^{b \times b} \text{ has an infinite component}) = 1. \quad (3.6)$$

By abstract arguments, Theorem 3.2 implies the existence of two Gibbs measures related by the reflection  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ , characterized respectively by the percolation of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{b \times b}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{b \times b}$ . Hence, we accomplish the goal of establishing orientational symmetry breaking on a mesoscopic scale, in the sense of the prevalence of mesoscopic squares properly divided by sticks of one orientation over the other.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Under the setting of Theorem 3.2, let  $\tau$  be the reflection  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ , and  $E_{\text{ver}}$  and  $E_{\text{hor}}$  be the events that  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{b \times b}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{b \times b}$  have an infinite  $\square$ -component, respectively. The monomer-dimer model admits at least two  $b\mathbb{Z}^2$ -invariant Gibbs measures  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  and  $\mu_{\text{hor}} = \tau\mu_{\text{ver}}$  such that  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(E_{\text{ver}}) = 1$  and  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(E_{\text{hor}}) = 0$ , and vice versa for  $\mu_{\text{hor}}$ .*

We will not prove Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 in this paper, as their proofs are identical to those of [10, Theorem 5.2] and [10, Corollary 5.3] once Theorem 3.1 is proven. The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1, which is special to the monomer-dimer model.

### 3.1 One-dimensional systems

In this subsection, we compute several quantities derived from the partition function of one-dimensional monomer-dimer systems under various boundary conditions, using the transfer matrix method.

We define one-dimensional monomer-dimer systems analogously to their two-dimensional counterparts. Specifically, we consider  $\mathbb{Z}$  in its usual graphical representation as an infinite path, and identify its edge set  $\mathbb{V}^{1D}$  with the set of midpoints of its edges, i.e.,  $1/2 + \mathbb{Z}$ . Given  $L \geq 1$ , define the one-dimensional rectangle  $R_L := [-1/2, L - 1/2] \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Dimer configurations on  $\mathbb{V}^{1D}$ , boundary conditions on a one-dimensional rectangle  $R$ , and their associated finite-volume Hamiltonian and Gibbs measure are defined analogously to those in two dimensions and denoted using the same notation with the superscript 1D added. In particular, the vacancy potential (2.7) becomes a two-body interaction in one dimension, while the broken link potential (2.8) remains three-body.

To construct the transfer matrix, we picture a sliding window spanning a width of two vertices in  $\mathbb{V}^{1D}$  moving from left to right. There are exactly three possible states within the window: the left vertex is occupied by a dimer, the right vertex is occupied, or neither one is. Denote these states by  $|l\rangle$ ,  $|r\rangle$ , and  $|0\rangle$ , respectively. In the  $(|0\rangle, |l\rangle, |r\rangle)$ -basis, the transfer matrix is

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} & 0 & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)} \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}a} & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

### 3.1.1 Expansions for the eigenvalues of $T$

The eigenvalues of  $T$  are the roots of the cubic polynomial

$$p(x) := \det(xI - T) = x^3 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}x^2 - x + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)}. \quad (3.8)$$

To obtain usable expressions for the eigenvalues, we treat the last term of  $p(x)$  as a small perturbation and introduce the auxiliary polynomial

$$p_\epsilon(x) := x^3 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}x^2 - x + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} + \epsilon, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\epsilon \in [-e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)}, 0]$ . When  $\epsilon = 0$ ,  $p_\epsilon(x) = (x-1)(x - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})(x+1)$  has roots  $x_1(0) = 1$ ,  $x_2(0) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}$ , and  $x_3(0) = -1$ . By the implicit function theorem, each root  $x_i(0)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , extends to an analytic function  $x_i(\epsilon)$  satisfying  $p_\epsilon(x_i(\epsilon)) \equiv 0$  for small  $|\epsilon|$ , which admits the expansion

$$x_i(\epsilon) = x_i(0) + x'_i(0)\epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (3.10)$$

Setting  $p_\epsilon(x_i(\epsilon))' = 0$  and solving for  $x'_i(0)$  yield

$$x'_1(0) = -\frac{1}{2(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})}, \quad x'_2(0) = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\beta(\lambda+a)}}, \quad x'_3(0) = -\frac{1}{2(1 + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})}. \quad (3.11)$$

Hence, there exists a constant  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , the eigenvalues of  $T$  admit the expansions

$$x_1 = 1 + \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}), \quad (3.12)$$

$$x_2 = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}), \quad (3.13)$$

$$x_3 = -1 + \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}). \quad (3.14)$$

### 3.1.2 The partition function of one-dimensional systems

Using the eigenvalue expansions derived in Section 3.1.1, we now fulfill the goal of this subsection. We start by defining a length scale that will play a recurrent role in this paper. Recall that the **correlation length** [17, Section 15.1] of the one-dimensional monomer-dimer system is defined as

$$\xi := \frac{1}{\log |x_1/x_3|} = \frac{1}{\log \left( 1 + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \right)}. \quad (3.15)$$

We use the leading-order term of  $\xi$  to define the length scale

$$\ell_0 := e^{\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)}. \quad (3.16)$$

The first quantity we compute is, up to a factor of  $e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}$ , the partition function on a rectangle of even length with vacant boundary conditions. We prove that the unique configuration in which the rectangle is fully packed with dimers dominates the partition function, provided that the length of the rectangle is small compared to  $\ell_0$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *There exists a constant  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ ,  $0 < c < 1/2$ , and even  $2 \leq L \leq c\ell_0 - 1$ , it holds that*

$$\langle 0 | T^{L+1} | 0 \rangle = [1 + \mathcal{O}(c^2)] e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}). \quad (3.17)$$

*Proof.* It is straightforward to compute a set of eigenvectors of  $T$ , which allows us to diagonalize  $T = PDP^{-1}$ , where  $D = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ , and

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)} & e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)} \\ x_1(x_1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}) & x_2(x_2 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}) & x_3(x_3 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}) \\ x_1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} & x_2 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} & x_3 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that  $P^{-1}|0\rangle$  is precisely the first column of  $P^{-1}$ , which we now compute using the adjoint method. By an elementary computation, we find that

$$\det(P) = -e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)}(x_1 - x_2)(x_2 - x_3)(x_3 - x_1), \quad (3.19)$$

and that the first column of  $P^{-1}$  is given by

$$-\frac{1}{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(x_2 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})(x_3 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})}{(x_3 - x_1)(x_1 - x_2)} \\ \frac{(x_3 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})(x_1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})}{(x_1 - x_2)(x_2 - x_3)} \\ \frac{(x_1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})(x_2 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})}{(x_2 - x_3)(x_3 - x_1)} \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{1}{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)}} \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \\ -1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \\ \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.20)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0|T^{L+1}|0\rangle &= \left[ \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \right] x_1^{L+1} + \left[ 1 + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \right] x_2^{L+1} \\ &\quad + \left[ -\frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta(\lambda+2a)}) \right] x_3^{L+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Finally, we use the binomial approximation to expand  $x_1^{L+1}$  and  $x_3^{L+1}$  (using the assumption that  $L \leq c\ell_0 - 1$  is even) and obtain

$$x_1^{L+1} = 1 + \frac{L+1}{2\ell_0} + \mathcal{O}(((L+1)/\ell_0)^2), \quad x_3^{L+1} = -1 + \frac{L+1}{2\ell_0} + \mathcal{O}(((L+1)/\ell_0)^2). \quad (3.22)$$

Combining (3.21) and (3.22) yields the proposition.  $\square$

The second quantity we derive is a lower bound on the partition function on a rectangle of even length with fully packed boundary conditions, the boundary conditions on  $R_L$  prescribed by the dimer configuration  $\rho(e) := \mathbb{1}_{e-1/2 \text{ is even}}$  and denoted by the superscript 1.

**Proposition 3.5.** *For all  $\beta > 0$  and even  $L \geq 4$ ,*

$$Z_{R_L; \beta}^{1, \text{ID}} \geq 1 + \frac{L^2}{16\ell_0^2}. \quad (3.23)$$

*Proof.* The fully packed configuration has weight 1. Moreover, there are exactly  $\frac{L(L-2)}{8}$  configurations with two non-adjacent vacancies, each having weight  $\ell_0^{-2}$ . Thus,  $Z_{R_L; \beta}^{1, \text{ID}} \geq 1 + \frac{L(L-2)}{8\ell_0^2}$ , which implies the proposition.  $\square$

The remaining results concern the two-dimensional monomer-dimer model, which follow from the one-dimensional results above.

**Proposition 3.6.** *For all  $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$ , there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$  and rectangles  $\Lambda$  with either even width or even height,*

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} \geq e^{c\ell_0^{-1}\text{Area}(\Lambda)}. \quad (3.24)$$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$ . By the expansion (3.12), there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that  $x_1 \geq e^{c\ell_0^{-1}}$  for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ . Assuming without loss of generality that  $\text{Width}(\Lambda)$  is even, we have that

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}} = (\text{tr}(T^{\text{Width}(\Lambda)}))^{\text{Height}(\Lambda)} \geq x_1^{\text{Area}(\Lambda)} \geq e^{c\ell_0^{-1}\text{Area}(\Lambda)}, \quad (3.25)$$

as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $v$  be a vertex and  $e$  be an edge of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , and denote by  $R_v$  and  $R_e$  the  $1 \times 1$  and  $2 \times 1$  rectangles containing  $v$  and  $e$ , respectively. Under the setting of Proposition 3.6,*

1.  $\|v \text{ is a vacancy}\|_{R_v} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)},$
2.  $\|e \text{ is a broken link}\|_{R_e} \leq 6e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}.$

*Proof.* Item 1 follows immediately from the definition of the chessboard seminorm and Proposition 3.6, which we use to lower bound the partition function with periodic boundary conditions by 1. To prove Item 2, we assume without loss of generality that  $e$  is horizontal. There are six possible dimer configurations on  $R_e$  that make  $e$  into a broken link, each having  $R_e$ -chessboard seminorm no greater than  $e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}$ . Item 2 then follows by the subadditivity of the chessboard seminorm.  $\square$

### 3.2 Configurations without long sticks

Recall that the main goal of this section is to prove Theorem 3.1, which requires bounding the chessboard seminorm of the event that a mesoscopic rectangle  $R$  is not divided by a stick through its bulk  $S$ . The chessboard seminorm is defined as the limit superior of finite-volume chessboard seminorms, with respect to which the event in question is *disseminated* globally via the transformations in  $T_{R_n! \times n!}^R$ . A remarkable property of this disseminated event is as follows. For  $M \geq 1$ , let  $E_M \subset \Omega$  consist of all dimer configurations  $\sigma$  such that every stick of  $\sigma$  has length at most  $M$ . It turns out the disseminated event is, up to boundary effects that will be handled separately, contained in  $E_M$  for all  $M \geq 2 \max\{\text{Width}(R), \text{Height}(R)\}$ . The constraint on the lengths of sticks is much easier to work with than the original one that no rectangle is properly divided by sticks. Indeed, in this subsection, we prove the following bound on the  $E_M$ -constrained partition function under vacant boundary conditions.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Suppose that  $a > \lambda/3$ . There exist constants  $\beta_0, c, C > 0$  such that for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ ,  $c^{-1} \leq M \leq c\ell_0$ , and even rectangles  $\Lambda$ , it holds that*

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_M) \leq e^{2\beta(\lambda+a)} e^{-C \frac{\text{Area}(\Lambda')}{M}}, \quad (3.26)$$

where  $\Lambda' := R_{(\text{Width}(\Lambda)+2) \times (\text{Height}(\Lambda)+2), (x_0-1, y_0-1)}$ .




Figure 1: The configuration graph associated to a dimer configuration in  $\Omega_{R_{8 \times 8}}^0$ . The correspondence between edge labels and edge styles is as follows: solid green edges correspond to the label  $s$ , dotted blue edges to  $v$ , dashed light green edges to  $b$ , and dash-dotted light green edges to  $bv$  (color online)

### 3.2.1 Configuration graphs

Let  $\Lambda = R_{\text{Width}(\Lambda) \times \text{Height}(\Lambda), (x_0, y_0)}$  be an even rectangle. We encode each dimer configuration  $\sigma \in \Omega_{\Lambda}^0$  in its **configuration graph**  $G_{\sigma}$ , which is a subgraph of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  whose edges are each assigned a label from the set  $\{s, b, v, bv\}$ . Specifically, the vertex set of  $G_{\sigma}$  is the set  $V_{\sigma}$  of vertices of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  that intersect the rectangle  $\Lambda'$ . The edge set of  $G_{\sigma}$  is the set  $E_{\sigma}$  of edges of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  connecting vertices in  $V_{\sigma}$  which are not crossed by a dimer or the link between two dimers in  $\sigma$ . We assign labels to the edges in  $E_{\sigma}$  as follows:

1. every edge that is adjacent to a vacancy in  $\sigma$  is assigned the label  $v$ ;
2. every edge that is crossed by a broken link of  $\sigma$  is assigned the label  $b$ , or  $bv$  if it has already been assigned the label  $v$ ;
3. the remaining edges are assigned the label  $s$ —these are precisely the stick edges.

See Figure 1 for an example of the configuration graph associated to a dimer configuration.

We say that a vacancy of  $\sigma$  belongs to  $G_{\sigma}$  if all four edges of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  surrounding the vacancy belong to  $E_{\sigma}$ , and that a broken link of  $\sigma$  belongs to  $G_{\sigma}$  if the edge of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  crossing the broken link belongs to  $E_{\sigma}$ . Denote the number of vacancies and broken links belonging to  $G_{\sigma}$  by  $v(G_{\sigma})$  and  $b(G_{\sigma})$ , respectively. Define the **weight** of  $G_{\sigma}$  as

$$w_{\Lambda; \beta}^0(G_{\sigma}) := (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^{v(G_{\sigma})} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^{b(G_{\sigma})}. \quad (3.27)$$

We note the identity

$$w_{\Lambda; \beta}^0(G_{\sigma}) = (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^4 w_{\Lambda; \beta}^0(\sigma), \quad (3.28)$$

where the exponent of 4 reflects the fact that the vacancies at the four corners of  $\Lambda'$  do not contribute to weight of  $\sigma$ .

### 3.2.2 Properties of configuration graphs

Here, we establish several basic properties of configuration graphs.

**Proposition 3.9.** *For all  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ , the configuration graph  $G_\sigma$  is connected.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that every pair of vertices in  $V_\sigma$  that are adjacent in  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  are connected in  $G_\sigma$ . Suppose that the pair are not already connected by an edge in  $E_\sigma$ . Then, the edge of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  connecting the pair is crossed by either a dimer  $e$  or the link between two dimers  $e, e'$  in  $\sigma$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $e$  is horizontal. Consider the  $\ddagger$ -component  $\gamma$  of horizontal dimers in  $\sigma$  that contains  $e$ . The boundary of the smallest rectangle with corners on  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  that encloses  $\gamma$  contains a path in  $G_\sigma$  joining the pair.  $\square$

Let  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ . Define  $G_{\sigma, \text{ver}}$  as the graph obtained from  $G_\sigma$  by removing all of its horizontal stick edges. Each nontrivial connected component of  $G_{\sigma, \text{ver}}$  is called a **vertical sub-component** of  $G_\sigma$ . Let  $k_{\text{ver}}(G_\sigma)$  denote the number of vertical sub-components of  $G_\sigma$ . Define  $G_{\sigma, \text{hor}}$ , horizontal sub-components of  $G_\sigma$ , and  $k_{\text{hor}}(G_\sigma)$  analogously. Note that we may continue to say that a vacancy or a broken link of  $\sigma$  **belongs** to a vertical (or horizontal) sub-component of  $G_\sigma$  without ambiguity—in the case of a vacancy, this follows from the fact that all four edges of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  bounding a vacancy necessarily belong to the same vertical (or horizontal) sub-component. Finally, we set  $k(G_\sigma) := k_{\text{ver}}(G_\sigma) + k_{\text{hor}}(G_\sigma)$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** *Suppose that  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$  contains at least one dimer. Let  $A$  be a vertical sub-component and  $B$  be a horizontal sub-component of  $G_\sigma$ . If  $A$  and  $B$  intersect, then either (a) two broken links and one vacancy or (b) six broken links belong to both  $A$  and  $B$ .*

*Proof.* We split into two cases.

Suppose first that  $A$  and  $B$  share a vacancy  $v$ . Consider the  $\boxtimes$ -component  $\gamma$  of the vacancies of  $\sigma$  that contains  $v$ . Note that  $A$  and  $B$  share all the vacancies of  $\gamma$ . If  $\gamma$  is bounded, the leftmost vacancy in the top row of  $\gamma$  and the rightmost vacancy in its bottom row are each incident or adjacent to a broken link. Otherwise,  $\gamma$  is unbounded, and the dimers occupying the leftmost vertex in the top row and the rightmost vertex in the bottom row of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \gamma$  (which exist because we have assumed that  $|\sigma| \geq 1$ ) are each incident to a broken link. To summarize,  $A$  and  $B$  share at least two broken links in addition.

Otherwise,  $A$  and  $B$  do not share a vacancy, so they must share a broken link. The endpoints of this broken link are each occupied by a horizontal and a vertical dimer. Consider the union  $\gamma$  of the  $2 \times 1$  rectangles containing each horizontal dimer in  $\sigma$ . The boundary of  $\gamma$ , viewed as a subgraph of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  in the natural way, has all even degrees. Thus, the edge of  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  crossing the broken link may be extended to a simple cycle in the boundary of  $\gamma$ . A priori, every edge in this cycle has label  $b$ ,  $v$ , or  $bv$ , but the latter two possibilities are ruled out since  $A$  and  $B$  do not share a vacancy. Since the cycle has a length of at least six, the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.11.** *If  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ , then*

$$k(G_\sigma) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}b(G_\sigma) + 1 & b(G_\sigma) < 2v(G_\sigma) \\ \frac{2}{3}v(G_\sigma) + \frac{1}{6}b(G_\sigma) + 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (3.29)$$

*Proof.* The case that  $\sigma$  contains no dimers is clear, so we assume otherwise. Consider an auxiliary bipartite graph  $G'_\sigma$  whose vertices are the horizontal and vertical sub-components of  $H$ , wherein a horizontal and a vertical sub-component are connected by an edge if and only if they intersect. Then,  $G'_\sigma$  has  $k(G_\sigma)$  vertices by definition and at least  $k(G_\sigma) - 1$  edges since  $G_\sigma$  is connected by Proposition 3.9. Among the edges of  $G'_\sigma$ , suppose that exactly  $s$  connect sub-components sharing at least two broken links and one vacancy. By Proposition 3.10, the remaining edges of  $G'_\sigma$  connect sub-components sharing at least six broken links; denote the number of these edges by  $t$ . Thus,  $s + t \geq k(G_\sigma) - 1$ . By counting the number of vacancies and broken links associated to the horizontal (or vertical) sub-components of  $H$ , we deduce that

$$v(G_\sigma) \geq s, \quad b(G_\sigma) \geq 2s + 6t. \quad (3.30)$$

Since  $k(G_\sigma) \leq s + t + 1$ , maximizing  $s + t + 1$  under the constraints of (3.30) (and that  $s, t \geq 0$ ) yields the corollary.  $\square$

Lastly, we show that upper bounds on the lengths of sticks induce lower bounds on the number of vacancies and broken links in the corresponding configurations.

**Proposition 3.12.** *Let  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ . If  $G_\sigma$  does not contain any stick of length greater than  $M$ , then  $(2M + 1)b(G_\sigma) + (8M + 5)v(G_\sigma) \geq \text{Area}(\Lambda')$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$  and denote the number of dimers in  $\sigma$  by  $d = \frac{1}{2}[\text{Area}(\Lambda') - v(G_\sigma)]$ .

First, we estimate the number of stick edges in  $G_\sigma$ . We say that a dual edge is a *candidate* if it runs adjacent and parallel to a dimer in  $\sigma$ . Each dimer in  $\sigma$  contributes exactly four candidates, and each candidate is shared by (or runs adjacent and parallel to) at most two dimers, so there are at least  $2d$  candidates. Since every broken link and vacancy in  $\sigma$  prevents at most one or four distinct candidates from becoming stick edges, the total number of stick edges in  $G_\sigma$  is at least  $2d - 4v(G_\sigma) - b(G_\sigma)$  (which is trivial if the quantity is negative).

By the assumption that no stick in  $G_\sigma$  has length greater than  $M$ , the number of sticks in  $G_\sigma$  is at least  $\frac{2d - 4v(G_\sigma) - b(G_\sigma)}{M}$ . Next, observe that each endpoint of a stick must belong to a dual edge labeled  $b$ ,  $v$ , or  $bv$ . Moreover, by the non-intersecting property of sticks, every such dual edge can contribute an endpoint to at most two sticks; otherwise, two sticks would intersect at the same endpoint of the dual edge, which is a contradiction. Since the number of dual edges labeled one of  $b$ ,  $v$ , and  $bv$  is at most  $b(G_\sigma) + 4v(G_\sigma)$ , the number of distinct stick endpoints that they contribute is at most  $2b(G_\sigma) + 8v(G_\sigma)$ . We conclude, again using the non-intersecting property of sticks, that

$$2b(G_\sigma) + 8v(G_\sigma) \geq \frac{2d - 4v(G_\sigma) - b(G_\sigma)}{M}, \quad (3.31)$$

which yields the proposition after rearranging the terms.  $\square$

### 3.2.3 Compressed configuration graphs

For  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ , define the **compressed** version of its configuration graph, denoted by  $\text{comp}(G_\sigma)$ , as the graph obtained from  $G_\sigma$  by replacing every stick with a single edge labeled  $s$  connecting the same endpoints. Vertical and horizontal sub-components, as well as the associated numbers  $k_{\text{ver}}(\cdot)$ ,  $k_{\text{hor}}(\cdot)$ , and  $k(\cdot)$ , are defined for compressed configuration graphs in the same way as for configuration graphs. We quote two results about compressed configuration graphs from [10], whose proofs carry over to our setting thanks to Proposition 3.9.

**Proposition 3.13** ([10, Proposition 4.13]). *Let  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ . There are exactly  $k_{\text{ver}}(G_\sigma)$  and  $k_{\text{hor}}(G_\sigma)$  connected components in  $\text{comp}(G_\sigma)_{\text{ver}}$  and  $\text{comp}(G_\sigma)_{\text{hor}}$ , respectively, all of which are nontrivial. Thus,  $k(G_\sigma) = k(\text{comp}(G_\sigma))$ .*

For  $M \geq 1$ , define  $\mathcal{G}_{\Lambda;M}^0$  as the set of configuration graphs associated to dimer configurations in  $\Omega_\Lambda^0 \cap E_M$ .

**Proposition 3.14** ([10, Lemma 4.14]). *Let  $M \geq 1$  and  $\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0$ . Then,*

$$|\{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\Lambda;M}^0 \mid \text{comp}(G) = \text{comp}(G_\sigma)\}| \leq M^{k(G_\sigma)-2}. \quad (3.32)$$

### 3.2.4 Proof of Proposition 3.8

We are now ready to prove Proposition 3.8. In view of (3.28), our goal is to bound

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_M) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega_\Lambda^0 \cap E_M} w_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(\sigma) = e^{2\beta(\lambda+a)} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\Lambda;M}^0} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^{v(G)} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^{b(G)}. \quad (3.33)$$

We introduce the following shorthand: for  $v, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , write

$$\mathcal{H}_{v,b} := \{\text{comp}(G) \mid G \in \mathcal{G}_{\Lambda;M}^0, v(G) = v, \text{ and } b(G) = b\}. \quad (3.34)$$

Combining Propositions 3.13 and 3.14, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\Lambda;M}^0} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^{v(G)} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^{b(G)} &\leq \sum_{v,b} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{v,b}} \sum_{\substack{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\Lambda;M}^0 \\ \text{comp}(G)=H}} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^v (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^b \\ &\leq \sum_{v,b} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{v,b}} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^v (e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^b M^{k(H)-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

*Claim 3.15.* There exists a constant  $C > 1$  such that, for all  $v, b \geq 0$ ,  $M \geq 1$ , and even rectangles  $\Lambda$ ,  $|\mathcal{H}_{v,b}| \leq C^{v+b}$ .

*Proof.* It is a fact that the number of planar graphs on  $n$  vertices grows at most exponentially with  $n$  [20]. Moreover, the number of edges in a planar graph on  $n$  vertices cannot exceed a constant multiple of  $n$ . Finally, the number of vertices in a compressed configuration graph  $\text{comp}(G)$  cannot exceed a constant multiple of  $v(G) + b(G)$  since each vertex in  $\text{comp}(G)$  is incident to at least one edge labeled  $v$ ,  $b$ , or  $bv$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

We will use Claim 3.15, Corollary 3.11, and Proposition 3.12 to bound the last sum in (3.35), which requires us to split into cases depending on whether  $b < 2v$ . To treat these cases uniformly, we rely on the following elementary claim.

*Claim 3.16.* Let  $c_1, c_2, A > 0$ . For all  $0 < x, y < 1$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ c_1 m + c_2 n \geq A}} x^m y^n \leq \frac{x^{\frac{A}{2c_1}} + y^{\frac{A}{2c_2}}}{(1-x)(1-y)}. \quad (3.36)$$



*Proof.* We split the domain of summation and bound

$$\sum_{\substack{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ c_1 m + c_2 n \geq A}} x^m y^n \leq \sum_{m \geq \frac{A}{2c_1}} x^m \sum_{n \geq 0} y^n + \sum_{m \geq 0} x^m \sum_{n \geq \frac{A}{2c_2}} y^n \leq \frac{x^{\frac{A}{2c_1}} + y^{\frac{A}{2c_2}}}{(1-x)(1-y)}, \quad (3.37)$$

as required.  $\square$

Suppose first that  $b \leq 2v$ . After using Claim 3.15 and Corollary 3.11 and making the change of variables  $m = 2v - b, n = b$ , we need to bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{v,b \text{ admissible} \\ b \leq 2v}} (Ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^v (Ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^b M^{\frac{1}{2}b-1} \\ &= M^{-1} \sum_{\substack{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ m,n \text{ admissible}}} (C^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\beta(\lambda+a)})^m (C^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\beta(\lambda+3a)} M^{\frac{1}{2}})^n, \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

where the word “admissible” means that  $v, b$  (or  $m, n$ ) satisfy the bound given in Proposition 3.12. By taking  $\beta$  large and  $c$  small (where  $M \leq c\ell_0$ ), we may ensure that both  $C^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\beta(\lambda+a)}$  and  $C^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\beta(\lambda+3a)} M^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C^{\frac{3}{2}} c^{\frac{1}{2}}$  are less than  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Now, Proposition 3.12 implies that, under the current change of variables,

$$(4M + 5/2)m + (2M + 7/2)n \geq \text{Area}(\Lambda'), \quad (3.39)$$

so Claim 3.16 applies.

Otherwise, using Claim 3.15 and Corollary 3.11 and making the change of variables  $m = v, n = b - 2v$ , we need to bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{v,b \text{ admissible} \\ b \geq 2v}} (Ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)})^v (Ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a})^b M^{\frac{2}{3}v + \frac{1}{6}b-1} \\ &= M^{-1} \sum_{\substack{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \\ m,n \text{ admissible}}} (C^3 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} M)^m (Ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a} M^{\frac{1}{6}})^n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

By taking  $\beta$  large and  $c$  small (where  $M \leq c\ell_0$ ) and using that  $a > \mu/3$  (we note that this is the only place in the current proof where we use this assumption), we may ensure that both  $C^3 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+3a)} M$  and  $Ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a} M^{\frac{1}{6}} \leq Cc^{\frac{1}{6}} e^{-\frac{1}{12}\beta(3a-\lambda)}$  are less than  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Again, Proposition 3.12 yields a similar linear constraint on  $m$  and  $n$  to (3.39), so Claim 3.16 applies.

The proposition follows by combining the two cases and absorbing constant factors with  $M^{-1} \leq c$ , after decreasing  $c$  as needed.

### 3.3 Configurations mostly without long sticks

In this subsection, we address the boundary effects mentioned in the introduction to Section 3.2. Let  $A$  be a set of horizontal and vertical segments with endpoints on  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$ . Let  $E_{M,A} \subset \Omega$  consist of all dimer configurations  $\sigma$  such that every stick of  $\sigma$  that is of length greater than  $M$  is fully contained in a segment in  $A$ .

**Proposition 3.17.** *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta > 0$ ,  $M \geq C$ , even rectangles  $\Lambda$ , and sets of segments  $A$  as above,*

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_{M,A}) \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{Ce^{\beta(\lambda+3a)}}{M^3} \text{len}(A) \right\} Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_M). \quad (3.41)$$

*Proof.* To set up the proof, we follow the presentation of [10, Proof of Proposition 4.15]. Let  $M$ ,  $A$ , and  $\Lambda$  be as in the statement of the proposition. We say that a stick or segment is *long* if its length is greater than  $M$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that every segment in  $A$  is long and fully contained in  $\Lambda$  but does not lie on its boundary. We fix horizontal and vertical segments  $I_1, \dots, I_N$  of length  $\lceil \frac{M}{2} \rceil$  with endpoints on  $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$  such that

$$N \leq \frac{3\text{len}(A)}{M} \quad (3.42)$$

and the union of these segments coincides with the union of the segments in  $A$ . Thus, a long stick contained in a segment in  $A$  must fully contain one of  $I_1, \dots, I_N$ . We refer the reader to [10] for justification of the above assumptions and claims.

For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let  $D_i$  be the event that  $I_i$  is not contained in a long stick. For  $0 \leq k \leq N$ , define  $F_k := E_{M,A} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k D_i$ . Our goal is to show that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(F_{i-1})}{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(F_i)} \leq 1 + \frac{C\ell_0^2}{M^2} \quad \text{for all } M > C. \quad (3.43)$$

Once this is proven, combining the telescoping product

$$\frac{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_{M,A})}{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_M)} = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(F_{i-1})}{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(F_i)} \quad (3.44)$$

with (3.42) and (3.43) yields the proposition.

To prove (3.43), we follow the same strategy as in [10] by constructing, for each  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , a mapping  $m : F_{i-1} \setminus F_i \rightarrow 2^{F_{i-1}}$  satisfying the following properties:

1. if  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in F_{i-1} \setminus F_i$  are distinct, then  $m(\sigma_1) \cap m(\sigma_2) = \emptyset$ ;
2. for all  $M \geq C$  and  $\sigma \in (F_{i-1} \setminus F_i) \cap \Omega_\Lambda^0$ ,

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(m(\sigma)) \geq \left(1 + \frac{M^2}{C\ell_0^2}\right) w_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(\sigma). \quad (3.45)$$

Once this is done, summing over  $\sigma \in (F_{i-1} \setminus F_i) \cap \Omega_\Lambda^0$  in (3.45) for each  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and using that  $F_i \subset F_{i-1}$  yields (3.43).

In constructing the mapping  $m$ , we deviate from [10]. Fix  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , and assume without loss of generality that  $I_i$  is vertical. Let  $J$  be the  $1 \times \text{len}(I_i)$  rectangle whose right side coincides with  $I_i$ . Let  $\sigma \in F_{i-1} \setminus F_i$ . Since  $\sigma \notin D_i$ , the maximal vertical path in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  consisting of edges that intersect  $J$  is fully packed with vertical dimers in  $\sigma$ . Let  $J_\sigma \subset J$  be the set of vertical edges fully contained in  $J$  and which are disjoint from the top and bottom dimers in  $\sigma$  that intersect  $J$ . Define  $m(\sigma) := \Omega_{J_\sigma}^\sigma$ . We verify that the mapping  $m$  satisfies the required properties in a series of claims.

*Claim 3.18.* For all  $\sigma \in F_{i-1} \setminus F_i$ ,  $m(\sigma) \subset F_{i-1}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma \in F_{i-1} \setminus F_i$  and  $\sigma' \in m(\sigma)$ . It suffices to prove that every stick edge in  $G_{\sigma'}$  is a stick edge in  $G_\sigma$ . Let  $e$  be a stick edge in  $G_{\sigma'}$ . If  $e$  is horizontal, then it is also a stick edge in  $G_\sigma$  because the surgery on  $J_\sigma$  does not affect the classification of dual edges adjacent and parallel to horizontal dimers. Otherwise,  $e$  is vertical, so it bounds two vertical dimers in  $\sigma'$  on opposite sides. If neither of these dimers intersects  $J_\sigma$ , then they both belong to  $\sigma$ , so  $e$  is a stick edge in  $G_\sigma$ . Otherwise, exactly one of these dimer, say  $e$ , intersects  $J_\sigma$ , while the other dimer belongs to  $\sigma$ . Since  $J_\sigma$  is fully packed with vertical dimers in  $\sigma$ ,  $e$  must again bound a (possibly different) vertical dimer in  $\sigma$  on the same side as  $e$ . Therefore,  $e$  bounds vertical dimers in  $\sigma$  on both sides, hence a stick edge in  $G_\sigma$ .  $\square$

*Claim 3.19.* The mapping  $m$  satisfies Property 1.

*Proof.* By contraposition, suppose that  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in F_{i-1} \setminus F_i$  are such that  $m(\sigma_1) \cap m(\sigma_2) \neq \emptyset$ . Then,  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  coincide on  $\mathbb{V} \setminus (J_{\sigma_1} \cap J_{\sigma_2})$ . To see that they must also coincide on  $J_{\sigma_1} \cap J_{\sigma_2}$ , we first observe that, by construction, both  $\mathbb{V} \setminus J_{\sigma_1}$  and  $\mathbb{V} \setminus J_{\sigma_2}$  contain the top vertical edge  $e$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  that is fully contained in  $J$ . Thus,  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  agree on  $e$ . Now, since  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \notin D_i$ , the maximal vertical path in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  consisting of edges fully contained in  $J$  is fully packed with vertical dimers in both  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ . In particular, whether  $e$  is occupied by a vertical dimer in  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  fully determines the restriction of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  to  $J_{\sigma_1} \cup J_{\sigma_2}$ , on which they therefore must agree. This completes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

*Claim 3.20.* The mapping  $m$  satisfies Property 2.

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma \in (F_{i-1} \setminus F_i) \cap \Omega_\Lambda^0$ . Define  $\sigma_0$  as the configuration obtained from  $\sigma$  by removing all dimers intersecting  $J_\sigma$ . We have the identity

$$w_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(\sigma_0 + \tilde{\sigma}) = w_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(\sigma) w_{J_\sigma;\beta}^{1,1D}(\tilde{\sigma}) \quad \text{for all } \tilde{\sigma} \in \Omega_{J_\sigma}^{1,1D}. \quad (3.46)$$

Indeed, referring to the potentials defined in Section 1.1, we have that

$$H_\Lambda^0(\sigma_0 + \tilde{\sigma}) = \sum_{\substack{\Delta \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset \\ \Delta \cap J_\sigma = \emptyset}} \Phi_\Delta(\sigma_0 + \tilde{\sigma}) + \sum_{\Delta \cap J_\sigma \neq \emptyset} \Phi_\Delta(\sigma_0 + \tilde{\sigma}) = \sum_{\substack{\Delta \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset \\ \Delta \cap J_\sigma = \emptyset}} \Phi_\Delta(\sigma_0) + H_{J_\sigma}^{1,1D}(\tilde{\sigma}), \quad (3.47)$$

where we further rewrite

$$\sum_{\substack{\Delta \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset \\ \Delta \cap J_\sigma = \emptyset}} \Phi_\Delta(\sigma_0) = \sum_{\substack{\Delta \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset \\ \Delta \cap J_\sigma = \emptyset}} \Phi_\Delta(\sigma) + \sum_{\Delta \cap J_\sigma \neq \emptyset} \Phi_\Delta(\sigma) = H_\Lambda^0(\sigma). \quad (3.48)$$

using that  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_0$  coincide on  $\mathbb{V} \setminus J_\sigma$  and noting that the last sum is identically zero. Thus, summing over  $\tilde{\sigma} \in \Omega_{J_\sigma}^{1,1D}$  in (3.46) yields that

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(m(\sigma)) = w_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(\sigma) Z_{J_\sigma;\beta}^1 \geq w_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(\sigma) \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{16} \left( \frac{\text{len}(J_\sigma)}{\ell_0} \right)^2 \right] \quad (3.49)$$

where we used Proposition 3.5 in the last inequality. Recalling that  $\text{len}(J_\sigma) \geq \lceil \frac{M}{2} \rceil - 4$  completes the proof.  $\square$

The proof of the proposition is now complete.  $\square$

### 3.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

In this subsection, we deduce Theorem 3.1 from Propositions 3.8 and 3.17.

Let  $c > 0$  be a constant to be determined later. Let  $S \subset R$  be rectangles as in the statement of Theorem 3.1, and  $\Lambda$  be any even rectangle of which  $R$  is a block. Let  $E_{R,S}$  be the event that for all  $T^R$ , no stick divides both  $\tau R$  and  $\tau S$ . Thus, denoting by  $f$  the indicator function that no stick divides both  $R$  and  $S$ , the indicator function of  $E_{R,S}$  on  $\Omega_\Lambda^{\text{per}}$  is precisely  $\prod_{\tau \in T_\Lambda^R} \tau f$ .

By Proposition 2.2, there exists a constant  $C(\beta) > 0$  such that

$$Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}}(E_{R,S}) \leq C(\beta)^{\text{Perimeter}(\Lambda)} Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(m^{0,\Lambda}(E_{R,S})). \quad (3.50)$$

Provided that

$$M \geq 2 \max \{ \text{Width}(R), \text{Height}(R) \}, \quad (3.51)$$

choosing  $A$  to be the set of integer translates of the sides of  $\Lambda$  which are contained in  $\Lambda$  and disjoint from  $\cup_{\tau \in T_\Lambda^R} \text{int}(\tau S)$  ensures that

$$m^{0,\Lambda}(E_{R,S}) \subset E_{M,A}; \quad (3.52)$$

the same argument in [10, Proof of Lemma 4.1] applies here. We note that the assumptions (3.1) and (3.2) and the choice of  $A$  imply that

$$\text{len}(A) \leq 6c \text{Area}(\Lambda); \quad (3.53)$$

see [10, Proof of Lemma 4.1] for details.

Combining Propositions 3.6 (bounding the partition function with periodic boundary conditions by 1), 3.8, and 3.17, we get that

$$\frac{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^0(E_{M,A})}{Z_{\Lambda;\beta}^{\text{per}}} \leq \exp \left\{ 2\beta(\lambda + a) + \frac{C_{3.41}\ell_0^2}{M^3} \text{len}(A) - \frac{C_{3.26}}{M} \text{Area}(\Lambda') \right\}. \quad (3.54)$$

Next, combining (3.50), (3.52), and (3.54), we get that

$$\|f\|_R = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{R_{n! \times n!}; \beta}^{\text{per}}(E_{R,S})^{\frac{\text{Area}(R)}{(n!)^2}} \leq \exp \left\{ \left( \frac{6cC_{3.41}\ell_0^3}{M^3} - \frac{C_{3.26}\ell_0}{M} \right) \ell_0^{-1} \text{Area}(R) \right\}. \quad (3.55)$$

Fixing  $M = c_{3.8}\ell_0$ , the proof is complete by taking  $c > 0$  sufficiently small.

## 4 Absence of translational symmetry breaking

In this section, we establish the absence of translational order within each of the two phases identified in Corollary 3.3, thus completing the proof of the Heilmann–Lieb conjecture in our setting. Our argument builds on the mesoscopic characterization of orientational symmetry breaking established in Section 3 and consists of two main steps, each carried out in a separate subsection. In Section 4.1, we refine our characterization of these phases by showing that, in a phase where mesoscopic *squares* are predominantly divided by vertical sticks, mesoscopic *rectangles* with dimensions  $\mathcal{O}(1) \times \mathcal{O}(\ell_0)$  are also likely to be divided by vertical sticks, while those with dimensions  $\mathcal{O}(\ell_0) \times \mathcal{O}(1)$  are unlikely to be divided by horizontal sticks, and vice versa. In Section 4.2, we combine the refined characterization of the horizontal and vertical phases with disagreement percolation to prove decay of correlations estimates within each phase, thereby ruling out translational symmetry breaking.

The proofs in Section 4.1 are a simplified version of those in [10, Section 7] due to the fact that only two phases are present in our setting, whereas the hard-square model has four. The proofs in Section 4.2 pertaining to the implementation of disagreement percolation are substantially more unique to the monomer-dimer model, where we introduce new ideas to control the propagation of disagreement paths in the presence of second-nearest neighbor interactions in the model.

## 4.1 Two phases

In this subsection, we refine our mesoscopic characterization of the horizontal and vertical phases identified in Corollary 3.3. We will rely heavily on the notion of strongly percolating sets and their properties and interplay with Peierls-type estimates as imported in Section 2.5.

**Main results** Recall the integer  $N$  fixed after the statement of Theorem 3.1 and the random sets  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{K \times L}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{K \times L}$  defined there. Let  $\mathfrak{b} := \left\lceil \frac{c_{3.3\ell_0}}{N} \right\rceil$ . The first main result of this subsection is the following refinement on the shape of rectangles that are likely to be divided by sticks in each phase.

**Theorem 4.1.** *There exist universal constants  $c, \mathfrak{a}_0 > 0$  such that, for each integer  $\mathfrak{a} \geq \mathfrak{a}_0$ , there exists  $\beta_0 > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$  and  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measure, exactly one of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{a}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathfrak{a}}$ -strongly percolating, while the other almost surely has only finite  $\square$ -components.*

Let  $\mathcal{P} := \{\text{ver}, \text{hor}\}$ . For each  $\mathfrak{b}!$ -ergodic Gibbs measure  $\mu$ , write  $\text{Phase}(\mu) := \pi$  for the unique  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$  corresponding to the superscript of the strongly percolating set identified in Theorem 4.1. In the second main result of this subsection, using the refined characterization of the vertical and horizontal phases, we clarify how these phases transform under translations and reflections of the square lattice.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $\mu$  be a  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measure. Then,*

1.  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{Phase}(\eta_{(1,0)}\mu) = \text{Phase}(\eta_{(0,1)}\mu)$ ;
2. Let  $\tau$  be the reflection  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ . Then,  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{hor}$  if and only if  $\text{Phase}(\tau\mu) = \text{ver}$ .

The rest of this subsection is dedicated to the proofs of Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.2.

### 4.1.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Theorem 4.1 will follow from Item 3 of the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.3.** *There exist universal constants  $c, \mathfrak{a}_0 > 0$  such that, for each  $\beta > 0$ , integer  $\mathfrak{a}_0 \leq \mathfrak{a} \leq \mathfrak{b}$ , and  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measure  $\mu$ , all of the following hold:*

1. One of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathfrak{a}}$ -strongly percolating.
2. One of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{a}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathfrak{a}}$ -strongly percolating.
3. There exists a constant  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\mathfrak{a})$  such that for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , exactly one of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathfrak{b} \times \mathfrak{a}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathfrak{a}}$ -strongly percolating, while the other almost surely has only finite  $\square$ -components.

*Proof.* Define the events

$$D_{\pi}^{K \times L} := \{\sigma \in \Sigma \mid (0, 0) \in \Psi_{\pi}^{K \times L}(\sigma)\} \quad \text{for } \pi \in \mathcal{P}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$D^{K \times L} := \{\sigma \in \Sigma \mid (0, 0) \in \Psi^{K \times L}(\sigma)\}. \quad (4.2)$$

By Item 4 of Lemma 2.17, with  $R = R_{\mathfrak{a}N \times \mathfrak{b}N, (-1/2, -1/2)}$ ,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mu}(\Psi^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\mu}(X_{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}} \overline{D^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}}) \leq \left\| \Omega \setminus D^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}} \right\|_R^{1/N^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

By Theorem 3.1,

$$\left\| \Omega \setminus D^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}} \right\|_R \leq e^{-c_{3.3} \ell_0^{-1} \text{Area}(R)} = e^{-c_{3.3} \ell_0^{-1} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} N^2}. \quad (4.4)$$

Using that  $\mathbf{b} \geq \frac{c_{3.3} \ell_0}{N}$ , we obtain

$$\mathbf{p}_\mu(\Psi^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}) \leq e^{-c_{3.3}^2 \mathbf{a} / N}. \quad (4.5)$$

Hence, provided that  $c < \frac{c_{3.3}^2}{N}$ , and applying Lemma 2.18 with  $K = \mathbf{a}$ ,  $L = \mathbf{b}$ ,  $E = D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$ , and  $F = D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$ , we deduce that

$$\min \left\{ \mathbf{p}_\mu(\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}), \mathbf{p}_\mu(\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}) \right\} \leq \mathbf{p}_\mu(\Psi^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}) < e^{-c\mathbf{a}}, \quad (4.6)$$

so at least one of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating.

For Item 2, let  $\epsilon = e^{-c\mathbf{a}_0} / \epsilon_0$ . Suppose, using Item 1, that  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathbf{b}}$ -strongly percolating; the other case is analogous. We will use descending induction on  $\mathbf{a}$  to show that  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating for all  $\mathbf{a}_0 \leq \mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{b}$  (note that the argument in [10] requires a step size of  $-2$ , but here we use a step size of  $-1$ ). Thus, suppose that  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{(\mathbf{a}+1) \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c(\mathbf{a}+1)}$ -strongly percolating for some  $\mathbf{a}_0 \leq \mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b}$ . By Item 1, at least one of  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating. Suppose by contradiction that  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is. Then, by Lemma 2.15,

$$\max \left\{ \mu(\Omega \setminus D_{\text{ver}}^{(\mathbf{a}+1) \times \mathbf{b}}), \mu(\Omega \setminus D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}), \mu(\Omega \setminus \eta_{(\mathbf{a},0)} D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}) \right\} \leq \frac{e^{-c\mathbf{a}_0}}{\epsilon_0} \leq \epsilon. \quad (4.7)$$

Thus, provided that  $\mathbf{a}_0 \geq N$  and  $\epsilon < \frac{1}{3}$ , this implies that the event  $D_{\text{ver}}^{(\mathbf{a}+1) \times \mathbf{b}} \cap D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}} \cap \eta_{(\mathbf{a},0)} D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is non-empty, contradicting the non-intersecting property of sticks. Therefore,  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating, completing the induction step and the proof of Item 2.

Lastly, for Item 3, suppose, using Item 2, that  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  is  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating; the other case is analogous. Suppose by contradiction that  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}$  is also  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating. Then, by Lemma 2.15,

$$\max \left\{ \mu(\Omega \setminus D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}), \mu(\Omega \setminus D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}) \right\} \leq \epsilon < 1/3. \quad (4.8)$$

However, this implies that the event  $D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}} \cap D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}$  is non-empty, contradicting the non-intersecting property of sticks. Hence,  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}$  is not  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating. Recognizing that  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}} \leq \epsilon \epsilon_0 < \epsilon_0$ , negating the definition of  $e^{-c\mathbf{a}}$ -strongly percolating sets with the deterministic set  $B = \emptyset$ , we get that

$$\mu(\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}} \text{ contains an infinite } \square\text{-component}) < 1. \quad (4.9)$$

Since  $\mu$  is  $\mathbf{b}! \mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic, we conclude that  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}$  almost surely has finite  $\square$ -components.  $\square$

#### 4.1.2 Proof of Proposition 4.2

Item 2 follows from the definition of the random sets  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}$  and  $\Psi_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}$ . For Item 1, we will only prove the identity  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{Phase}(\eta_{(1,0)} \mu)$  in the case that  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{ver}$ , as the remaining cases are analogous. It suffices to rule out that  $\text{Phase}(\eta_{(1,0)} \mu) = \text{hor}$ . Suppose by contradiction that this is the case. Then, by Lemma 2.15,

$$\max \left\{ \mu(\Omega \setminus D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}}), \mu(\Omega \setminus \eta_{(1,0)} D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}) \right\} < \epsilon. \quad (4.10)$$

However, recalling that  $\epsilon < 1/3$ , this implies that the event  $D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}} \cap \eta_{(1,0)} D_{\text{hor}}^{\mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{a}}$  is non-empty, contradicting the non-intersecting property of sticks. This completes the proof of the proposition.

## 4.2 Disagreement percolation

In this subsection, we prove the uniqueness of Gibbs measures exhibiting each phase identified in Section 4.1. As a consequence, we rule out translational symmetry breaking and obtain decay of correlations estimates within each phase, completing the proof of Items 1 and 3 of Theorem 1.1. The main result of this subsection is as follows.

**Lemma 4.4.** *For each  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$ , there exists a unique  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measure  $\mu_\pi$  such that  $\text{Phase}(\mu_\pi) = \pi$ . Moreover,*

1. *for each  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mu_\pi$  is extremal;*
2. *for each  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mu_\pi$  is  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -invariant;*
3.  *$\mu_{\text{hor}}$  is obtained from  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  by applying the reflection  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ ;*
4. *every periodic Gibbs measure is a convex combination of  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  and  $\mu_{\text{hor}}$ .*

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is by implementing the disagreement percolation method introduced by van den Berg in [21]. We quote the following formulation of the method from [10].

**Theorem 4.5** (Disagreement percolation, [10, Theorem 8.2]). *Let  $\mu, \mu'$  be Gibbs measures of a Markov random field. Let  $\sigma, \sigma'$  be independent samples from  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ , respectively. If*

$$(\mu \otimes \mu')(\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'} \text{ has an infinite connected component}) = 0, \quad (4.11)$$

*then the following hold:*

1.  *$\mu = \mu'$  and  $\mu$  is extremal;*
2. *Let  $f, g : \Omega \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  be local functions with support on  $A, B \subset \mathbb{V}$ , respectively. Then,*

$$\text{Cov}_\mu(f, g) \leq 2(\mu \otimes \mu')(A \text{ and } B \text{ are connected by a path in } \Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}). \quad (4.12)$$

Recall from Section 2.1 that the monomer-dimer model is a Markov random field under the  $\ddagger$ -connectivity on  $\mathbb{V}$  introduced there. To verify the criterion (4.11) of Theorem 4.5, we will prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.6.** *There exist universal constants  $C, c > 0$  such that, if  $\mu, \mu'$  are  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measures with  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{Phase}(\mu') = \text{ver}$  and  $\sigma, \sigma'$  are independent samples from  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ , respectively, then, for each  $A, B \subset \mathbb{V}$ ,*

$$(\mu \otimes \mu')(A \text{ and } B \text{ are connected by a } \ddagger\text{-path in } \Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}) \leq \sum_{u \in A} \sup_{v \in B} \alpha_1(u, v), \quad (4.13)$$

*where*

$$\alpha_1(u, v) := C \exp\{-c|x_u - x_v| - c\ell_0^{-1}|y_u - y_v|\}. \quad (4.14)$$

Once Lemma 4.6 is established, Lemma 4.4 readily follows.

*Proof of Lemma 4.4.* We first prove the existence of a unique  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measure  $\mu$  with  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{ver}$ . Suppose that  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  are two such measures, and let  $\sigma, \sigma'$  be independent samples from  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$ , respectively. By Lemma 4.6, the condition (4.11) of Theorem 4.5 is satisfied, so  $\mu = \mu'$  and  $\mu$  is extremal.

Now, suppose that  $\mu$  is a  $\mathfrak{b}!\mathbb{Z}^2$ -ergodic Gibbs measure with  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{hor.}$  By Item 2 of Proposition 4.2, with  $\tau$  being the reflection  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ ,  $\text{Phase}(\tau\mu) = \text{ver.}$  By the uniqueness and extremality of  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  proven above,  $\mu = \tau\mu_{\text{ver}}$  is also unique and extremal.

So far, we have proven Items 1 and 3. Item 2 follows from Item 1 of Proposition 4.2 and the uniqueness of  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  and  $\mu_{\text{hor}}$  proven above.

Finally, Item 4 follows by abstract arguments; see [10, Proof of Lemma 8.1] for details.  $\square$

The rest of the subsection is dedicated to the proof of Lemma 4.6.

#### 4.2.1 Sealed rectangles

Following the strategy in [10, Section 8.3], we leverage the strong percolation characterization of a vertical phase to construct **sealed rectangles**, which are rectangles in which a joint configuration  $(\sigma, \sigma')$  sampled from  $\mu \otimes \mu'$ , where  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{Phase}(\mu') = \text{ver.}$ , exhibits desirable properties that rule out the presence of large disagreement  $\ddagger$ -components nearby. Due to the presence of non-nearest neighbor interactions in the monomer-dimer model, our definition of sealed rectangles differs from that in [10] in that ours genuinely requires *joint* properties of the pair  $(\sigma, \sigma')$ .

Define the events  $\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1 \subset \Omega$  and  $\Sigma_2 \subset \Omega \times \Omega$  as follows:

1.  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$  if and only if every  $N\mathfrak{a} \times 1$  rectangle contained in

$$R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-N\mathfrak{a}-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)} \cup R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (N\mathfrak{a}-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)} \quad (4.15)$$

intersects a vertical dimer in  $\sigma$ .

2.  $\sigma \in \Sigma_1$  if and only if every dimer in  $\sigma$  that intersects  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$  is vertical.
3.  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in \Sigma_2$  if and only if every  $1 \times N\mathfrak{c}$  rectangle contained in

$$R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)} \cup R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)} \quad (4.16)$$

contains a *coincident* vacancy or vertical dimer in  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , as illustrated in Figure 2.

By an abuse of notation, for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we write

$$\Sigma_i(\sigma) := \{(\sigma, \sigma') \in \Omega \times \Omega \mid \sigma \in \Sigma_i\} \text{ and } \Sigma_i(\sigma') := \{(\sigma, \sigma') \in \Omega \times \Omega \mid \sigma' \in \Sigma_i\}. \quad (4.17)$$

We say that  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}}$  is **sealed** in  $(\sigma, \sigma')$  if the event

$$\Sigma := \Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma') \cap \Sigma_2 \quad (4.18)$$

holds. We note that while the event  $\Sigma_0$  does not enter the definition of a sealed rectangle, it will serve as *the* entry point for the strong percolation characterization of the vertical phase and constitute the very basis for proving the prevalence of sealed rectangles in the vertical phase. Indeed, the definition of  $\Sigma_0$  appears much weaker than that of proper division by a vertical stick; a good intuitive way to think about  $\Sigma_0$  is that it merely sets up a *favorable environment* for the prevalence of vertical dimers in  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ .

We will prove the prevalence of sealed rectangles in the vertical phase by synthesizing the following three lemmas, respectively establishing the prevalence of  $\Sigma_0$  in the vertical phase, that of  $\Sigma_1$  “given  $\Sigma_0$ ,” and finally that of  $\Sigma_2$  “given  $\Sigma_1$  for both configurations.”






Figure 2: Provided that a  $1 \times N\mathfrak{c}$  rectangle intersects only vertical dimers in both  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , no disagreement  $\ddagger$ -path in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$  can cross a coincident vacancy or vertical dimer in that rectangle

**Lemma 4.7.** *There exist constants  $\beta_0, c > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$  and  $\mathfrak{b}!$ -ergodic Gibbs measures  $\mu$  with  $\text{Phase}(\mu) = \text{ver}$ ,*

$$\mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{3N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0}) \leq \frac{9N^2\mathfrak{c}}{\mathfrak{b}} e^{-c\mathfrak{a}}. \quad (4.19)$$

*Proof.* By Item 1 of Lemma 2.17,

$$\mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{3N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\cap_{\eta \in H\eta} D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}}) \leq \frac{9N^2\mathfrak{c}}{\mathfrak{b}} \mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}} \overline{D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}}) = \frac{9N^2\mathfrak{c}}{\mathfrak{b}} \mathfrak{p}_\mu(\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}}) \leq \frac{9N^2\mathfrak{c}}{\mathfrak{b}} e^{-c_{4.1}\mathfrak{a}}. \quad (4.20)$$

Noting that  $\cap_{\eta \in H\eta} D_{\text{ver}}^{\mathfrak{a} \times \mathfrak{b}} \subset \Sigma_0$  completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.8.** *There exists constant  $\beta_0, C > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$  and periodic Gibbs measures  $\mu$ ,*

$$\mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{3N\mathfrak{a} \times 5N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0^c}) \leq C(N\mathfrak{a})^3 \left[ e^{-\beta\mathfrak{a}} + N\mathfrak{c} \max \left\{ e^{-\beta(\lambda+2\mathfrak{a})}, e^{-3\beta\mathfrak{a}} \right\} \right]. \quad (4.21)$$

*Proof.* Denote  $S = R_{3N\mathfrak{a} \times 5N\mathfrak{c}, (-N\mathfrak{a}-1/2, -2N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ . By Item 4 of Lemma 2.17,

$$\mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{3N\mathfrak{a} \times 5N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0^c}) \leq \|\Sigma_0 \setminus \Sigma_1\|_S, \quad (4.22)$$

so it suffices to bound  $\|\Sigma_0 \setminus \Sigma_1\|_S$ . Since every  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0 \setminus \Sigma_1$  contains a horizontal dimer intersecting  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ , we will apply a union bound over the possible locations of such a horizontal dimer and estimate the  $R$ -chessboard seminorm of each resulting event by locating broken links and vacancies that it forces to exist in  $\sigma$ . While our strategy for locating these defects is similar to that in Proposition 3.10, a technicality prevents us from directly applying Lemma 2.13 and Corollary 3.7 to bound the resulting chessboard seminorms. Namely, we need to ensure that the existence of the defects that we find can be framed as the intersection of transformations of  $R$ -local events under  $T^R$  for a common rectangle  $R$ . It turns out that the assumptions of Lemma 2.13 are too stringent for this purpose, and we will instead resort to Lemma 2.14.

For each horizontal  $e \in \mathbb{V}$  intersecting  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ , define the event

$$E_e := \{\sigma \in \Sigma_0 \setminus \Sigma_1 \mid \sigma(e) = 1\}. \quad (4.23)$$

Our goal is to use Lemma 2.14 to bound  $\|E_e\|_S$ .

First, suppose that  $y_e \in \{-N\mathfrak{c}, 2N\mathfrak{c}-1\}$ , i.e.,  $e$  is located at the top or bottom side of  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ . Consider the  $\ddagger$ -component  $\gamma$  of horizontal dimers in  $\sigma$  that contains  $e$ .

The horizontal edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  immediately to the left and right of  $\gamma$  must be broken links of  $\sigma$ . Moreover, by the assumption that  $\sigma \in \Sigma_0$ , both broken links are located in  $R_{3N\mathfrak{a} \times 1, (-N\mathfrak{a}-1/2, y_e-1/2)}$ . Observing that (a) the  $2 \times 1$  rectangles containing these broken links share a grid that is invariant under  $T^R$  and that (b) the event that the horizontal edge at the center of a  $2 \times 1$  rectangle is a broken link is local to that rectangle and reflection-invariant, we deduce from Lemma 2.14 and Corollary 3.7 that

$$\|E_e\|_S \leq 36(3N\mathfrak{a} + 1)^2 e^{-\beta a}. \quad (4.24)$$

Next, suppose that  $e$  is not at the top or bottom of  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ . Let  $R \subset S$  be the unique  $2 \times 4$  rectangle with corners in  $[(-1/2 + 2\mathbb{Z}) \times (-1/2 + 4\mathbb{Z})] \cup [(1/2 + 2\mathbb{Z}) \times (3/2 + 4\mathbb{Z})]$  that intersects the horizontal edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  immediately above and below  $e$  on its right side. The requirement on the corners of  $R$  ensures that  $G^R$  is invariant under  $T^S$ . Consider again the  $\ddagger$ -component  $\gamma$  of horizontal dimers in  $\sigma$  that contains  $e$ . As before, the horizontal edges of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  immediately to the left and right of  $\gamma$  are broken links of  $\sigma$ . Denote by  $u$  and  $v$  the other endpoints of the left and right broken links. We split into three cases.

1. Both  $u$  and  $v$  are vacancies. Thus, there are two  $2 \times 4$  rectangles contained in  $S$  and sharing a grid with  $R$ , each containing at least one vacancy and one broken link. Noting as in Corollary 3.7 that there exists a universal constant  $C_1 > 0$  such that

$$\|R \text{ contains at least one vacancy and one broken link}\|_R \leq C_1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)}, \quad (4.25)$$

we conclude this case using Lemma 2.14 by summing over the  $\mathcal{O}((N\mathfrak{a})^2)$  possible locations of the two rectangles.

2. One of  $u$  and  $v$  is a vacancy, while the other is incident to a vertical dimer. Suppose that  $u$  is the vacancy; the other case is analogous. Consider the  $2 \times 4$  rectangle contained in  $S$  and sharing a grid with  $R$  that contains  $v$ . By a case analysis, this rectangle contains at least one other broken link or vacancy. Again, we find as in Corollary 3.7 that there exists a universal constant  $C_2 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|R \text{ contains at least two vacancies and one broken link or at least} \\ &\text{one vacancy and two broken links}\|_R \leq C_2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+2a)} \max \left\{ e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}, e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

and conclude the case as before using Lemma 2.14.

3. Both  $u$  and  $v$  are incident to vertical dimers. By a case analysis, each  $2 \times 4$  rectangle in question contains, in addition to the broken link already identified, at least two other defects (vacancies or broken links). Again, we find as in Corollary 3.7 that there exists a universal constant  $C_3 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|R \text{ contains at least one broken link and two other defects}\|_R \\ &\leq C_3 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a} \max \left\{ e^{-\beta a}, e^{-\beta(\lambda+a)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

and conclude the case as before using Lemma 2.14.

We deduce the lemma by a union bound, as described at the beginning of the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *There exist constants  $\beta_0, c > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$  and periodic Gibbs measures  $\mu, \mu'$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_2 \cup (\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma'))^c}) &\leq 2N\mathfrak{a} \left[ e^{-c\ell_0^{-1}N\mathfrak{c}} \right. \\ &\left. + 4e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(2\lambda+3a)} + 2(N\mathfrak{c} - 3)e^{-2\beta(\lambda+2a)} + 8e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(2\lambda+5a)} + 4(N\mathfrak{c} - 3)e^{-\beta(\lambda+3a)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$




Figure 3: Provided that a  $1 \times N\mathfrak{c}$  rectangle (a) intersects only vertical dimers in both  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , (b) is not fully packed with dimers in either  $\sigma$  or  $\sigma'$ , and (c) does not contain two adjacent vacancies in  $\sigma$ , the only way to rule out the existence of coincident vacancies and vertical dimers in the rectangle is to have a vacancy of  $\sigma$  adjacent to a vacancy of  $\sigma'$

*Proof.* Denote  $S = R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)}$ . By Item 4 of Lemma 2.17,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times 3N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_2} \cup (\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma'))^c) \leq \|(\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma')) \setminus \Sigma_2\|_S. \quad (4.29)$$

With the goal of applying a union bound to the RHS, we fix a  $1 \times N\mathfrak{c}$  rectangle

$$R \subset R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, -N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)} \cup R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (-1/2, N\mathfrak{c}-1/2)} \quad (4.30)$$

and study the event  $E \subset \Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma')$  that  $R$  does not contain any sealing pattern. We will write  $E \subset E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E'_2 \cup E_3 \cup E'_3$  and then estimate  $\|E\|_R$  by a separate union bound; in the definition of the events below, we will always assume implicitly that  $R$  intersects only vertical dimers in both  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ .

Define  $E_1$  as the event that  $R$  is fully packed (by vertical dimers) in both  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ . Otherwise, without loss of generality, suppose that  $\sigma$  contains a vacancy. Define  $E_2$  as the event that  $\sigma$  has two adjacent vacancies in  $R$ . Otherwise,  $\sigma$  has only isolated vacancies in  $R$ . By a case analysis, we conclude that, to rule out the existence of coincident vacancies and vertical dimers, there must exist a vacancy of  $\sigma'$  that is adjacent to an isolated vacancy of  $\sigma$ , as illustrated in Figure 3. We define  $E_3$  as the event that there exists a vacancy of  $\sigma$  in  $R$  that is adjacent to another of  $\sigma'$  in  $R$ . Similarly, we define  $E'_2$  and  $E'_3$  by swapping the roles of  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ .

*Claim 4.10.* There exist constants  $\beta_0, c > 0$  such that, for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ ,

1.  $\|E_1\|_R \leq e^{-c\ell_0^{-1}N\mathfrak{c}},$
2.  $\|E_2\|_R \leq 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(2\lambda+3a)} + (N\mathfrak{c}-3)e^{-2\beta(\lambda+2a)},$
3.  $\|E_3\|_R \leq 4e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(2\lambda+5a)} + 2(N\mathfrak{c}-3)e^{-\beta(\lambda+3a)}.$

By symmetry, the same bounds hold for  $E'_2$  and  $E'_3$ .

*Proof.* Item 1 follows from Proposition 3.6 and the fact that there exist exactly  $2^{n!}$  configurations fully packed with vertical dimers in an  $n! \times n!$  rectangle with periodic boundary conditions, all having weight 1:

$$\|E_1\|_R \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{2^{2n!}}{(1 + \frac{1}{4}\ell_0^{-1})^{2(n!)^2}} \right]^{\frac{N\mathfrak{c}}{(n!)^2}} = (1 + \ell_0^{-1}/4)^{-2N\mathfrak{c}}. \quad (4.31)$$

For Item 2, we define, for  $1 \leq i \leq N\mathfrak{c} - 1$ , the event  $E_{2,i}$  that  $\sigma$  has vacancies at the  $i$ -th and  $(i+1)$ -th sites of  $R$ . Then,

$$\|E_{2,i}\|_R \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(\langle 0|T|0\rangle)^2 \langle 0|T^{2i-1}|0\rangle \langle 0|T^{2N\mathfrak{c}-2i-1}|0\rangle]^{\frac{n!}{2N\mathfrak{c}} \frac{N\mathfrak{c}}{n!}}. \quad (4.32)$$

Using Proposition 3.4, we have that

$$\|E_{2,i}\|_R \leq \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(2\lambda+3a)} & i = 1, N\mathfrak{c} - 1 \\ e^{-2\beta(\lambda+2a)} & 2 \leq i \leq N\mathfrak{c} - 2 \end{cases}. \quad (4.33)$$

We conclude the proof by a union bound over  $i$ .

The proof of Item 3 is very similar. Define, for  $1 \leq i \leq N\mathfrak{c} - 1$ , the event  $E_{3,i+}$  that  $\sigma$  has a vacancy at the  $i$ -th site of  $R$  and  $\sigma'$  has a vacancy at the  $(i+1)$ -th site of  $R$ , and similarly the event  $E_{3,i-}$  for  $2 \leq i \leq N\mathfrak{c}$ . Then,

$$\|E_{3,i+}\|_R \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\langle 0|T^{2i-1}|0\rangle \langle 0|T^{2N\mathfrak{c}-2i+1}|0\rangle \langle 0|T^{2i+1}|0\rangle \langle 0|T^{2N\mathfrak{c}-2i-1}|0\rangle]^{\frac{n!}{2N\mathfrak{c}} \frac{N\mathfrak{c}}{n!}} \quad (4.34)$$

Again, using Proposition 3.4, we have that

$$\|E_{3,i+}\|_R \leq \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(2\lambda+5a)} & i = 1, N\mathfrak{c} - 1 \\ e^{-\beta(\lambda+3a)} & 2 \leq i \leq N\mathfrak{c} - 2 \end{cases}. \quad (4.35)$$

Analogous bounds hold for  $\|E_{3,i-}\|_R$ . We conclude the proof by a union bound.  $\square$

The proof of the lemma is complete after applying Lemma 2.13 (noting that the corners of  $S$  are on  $G^R$ ) and a union bound over the events  $E_1, E_2, E'_2, E_3, E'_3$  and the  $2N\mathfrak{a}$  choices of  $R$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the prevalence of sealed rectangles in the vertical phase.

**Proposition 4.11.** *Suppose that  $a > \mu/3$ . For all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist constants  $\mathfrak{a}_0, \beta_0 = \beta_0(\mathfrak{a}_0)$  such that, for all  $\mathfrak{a} \geq \mathfrak{a}_0$  and  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , the random set  $X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \bar{\Sigma}$  is  $\epsilon$ -strongly percolating.*

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . By intersecting  $\Sigma$  with  $\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma')$  and inserting trivial identities, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma') \cap \Sigma_2 \supset [\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma')] \\ &\cap [(\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma')) \cup (\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma'))^c] \cap [\Sigma_2 \cup (\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma'))^c]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.16,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \bar{\Sigma}) &\leq 3 \max \left\{ \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma')}), \right. \\ &\quad \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{(\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma')) \cup (\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma'))^c}), \\ &\quad \left. \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_2 \cup (\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma'))^c}) \right\}^{1/3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

Using Lemmas 2.16 and 2.19, we further bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma')}) &= \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0(\sigma)} \cap X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0(\sigma')}) \\ &\leq 2 \max \left\{ \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0(\sigma)}), \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0(\sigma')}) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2 \max \left\{ \mathfrak{p}_{\mu}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0}), \mathfrak{p}_{\mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0}) \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

$$(\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma')) \cup (\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma'))^c \supset [\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cup \Sigma_0(\sigma)^c] \cap [\Sigma_1(\sigma') \cup \Sigma_0(\sigma')^c] \quad (4.39)$$

we bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{(\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma')) \cup (\Sigma_0(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_0(\sigma'))^c}) \\ & \leq 2 \max \{ \mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0}), \mathfrak{p}_{\mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0}) \}^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

Let  $\delta > 0$ . For all large  $\mathfrak{a}$ , there exists  $\beta_0$  such that for all  $\beta \geq \beta_0$ , the bounds of Lemmas 4.7, 4.8, and 4.9 are all less than  $\delta$ ; in the second case, we use the assumption that  $a > \mu/3$ . By Item 3 of Lemma 2.17, we get that

$$\max \{ \mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0}), \mathfrak{p}_{\mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_0}) \} \leq \sqrt[9]{9^9 \delta}, \quad (4.41)$$

$$\max \{ \mathfrak{p}_\mu(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0}), \mathfrak{p}_{\mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_0}) \} \leq \sqrt[15]{15^{15} \delta}, \quad (4.42)$$

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mu \otimes \mu'}(X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma_2 \cup (\Sigma_1(\sigma) \cap \Sigma_1(\sigma'))^c}) \leq \sqrt[3]{3^3 \delta}. \quad (4.43)$$

The proof is complete by taking  $\delta$  sufficiently small.  $\square$

#### 4.2.2 Bounding the disagreement components

We are almost ready to prove Lemma 4.6. The final ingredient is the following deterministic statement that clarifies the sense in which sealed rectangles rule out the presence of large disagreement  $\ddagger$ -components nearby.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in \Omega \times \Omega$ . Suppose that  $S = R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (N\mathfrak{a}x_0 - 1/2, N\mathfrak{c}y_0 - 1/2)}$  is sealed in  $(\sigma, \sigma')$ . Let  $e = (x_e, y_e) \in \mathbb{V} \cap S$ . If  $e \in \Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$ , then the  $\ddagger$ -component of  $e$  in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$  is contained in  $\{x_e\} \times (N\mathfrak{c}(y_0 - 1) - 1/2, N\mathfrak{c}(y_0 + 2) - 1/2)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\sigma, \sigma' \in \eta_{(N\mathfrak{a}x_0, N\mathfrak{c}y_0)} \Sigma_1$ , the  $\ddagger$ -component of  $e$  in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$  is a vertical  $\ddagger$ -path. This  $\ddagger$ -path terminates at the first instance of a coincident vacancy or vertical dimer in  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , one of which exists in both  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (N\mathfrak{a}x_0 - 1/2, N\mathfrak{c}(y_0 - 1) - 1/2)}$  and  $R_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}, (N\mathfrak{a}x_0 - 1/2, N\mathfrak{c}(y_0 + 1) - 1/2)}$  as  $(\sigma, \sigma') \in \eta_{(N\mathfrak{a}x_0, N\mathfrak{c}y_0)} \Sigma_2$ .  $\square$

We now deduce Lemma 4.6 from Propositions 4.11 and 4.12.

*Proof of Lemma 4.6.* Let  $C, c > 0$  be constants to be determined at the end of the proof. Recall the identification  $\mathbb{V} \equiv [(1/2 + \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}] \cup [\mathbb{Z} \times (1/2 + \mathbb{Z})]$ . Define  $f : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$  by  $f(x, y) := (\lfloor \frac{x}{N\mathfrak{a}} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{y}{N\mathfrak{c}} \rfloor)$ . Let  $\sigma, \sigma'$  be as in the statement of the lemma. Define  $\Pi := X_{N\mathfrak{a} \times N\mathfrak{c}} \overline{\Sigma}$ ; note that this random set depends on  $(\sigma, \sigma')$  but we omit this from the notation for brevity. We will rely on the following claim that long disagreement paths in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$  induce long sequences of non-sealed rectangles.

*Claim 4.13.* Let  $u, v \in \mathbb{V}$ . Suppose that  $u - v \notin \{0\} \times [-4N\mathfrak{c}, 4N\mathfrak{c}]$  and that  $u, v$  are connected by a  $\ddagger$ -path in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$ . Then,  $f(u), f(v)$  are connected by a  $\boxtimes$ -path in  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Pi$ .

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a  $\ddagger$ -path in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$  connecting  $u$  and  $v$ . It suffices to show that  $f(w) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Pi$  for all  $w \in P$ . Indeed,  $\{f(w) \mid w \in P\}$  will then contain the desired  $\boxtimes$ -path, since  $f$  maps  $\ddagger$ -adjacent vertices of  $\mathbb{V}$  to either the same or  $\boxtimes$ -adjacent vertices of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ . By contradiction, suppose that there exists  $w = (x_w, y_w) \in P$  such that  $f(w) \in \Pi$ . Then, by Proposition 4.12, the  $\ddagger$ -component of  $w$  in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$ , which includes  $u$  and  $v$ , is contained in  $\{x_w\} \times [y_w - 2N\mathfrak{c}, y_w + 2N\mathfrak{c}]$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $u - v \notin \{0\} \times [-4N\mathfrak{c}, 4N\mathfrak{c}]$ .  $\square$

Let  $u = (x_u, y_u) \in A$ . By a union bound, it suffices to show that

$$(\mu \otimes \mu')(\{u\} \text{ and } B \text{ are connected by a } \ddagger\text{-path in } \Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}) \leq \sup_{v \in B} \alpha_1(u, v), \quad (4.44)$$

Suppose that  $u$  is connected by a  $\ddagger$ -path in  $\Delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$  to some  $v = (x_v, y_v) \in B$ . If there exists such a  $v$  with  $u - v \in \{0\} \times [-4N\mathfrak{c}, 4N\mathfrak{c}]$ , then

$$\alpha_1(u, v) \geq C \exp\{-4c\ell_0^{-1}N\mathfrak{c}\}. \quad (4.45)$$

Otherwise, by Claim 4.13,  $f(u)$  is connected to  $f(v)$  by a  $\boxtimes$ -path in  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \Pi$ . By Proposition 4.11 and Lemma 2.15, the probability of this event is bounded above by

$$(\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{1+\inf_{v \in B} \|f(v)-f(u)\|_\infty} \leq (\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{2} \inf_{v \in B} \left( \frac{|x_u-x_v|}{Na} + \frac{|y_u-y_v|}{N\mathfrak{c}} \right)} = \sup_{v \in B} (\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{|x_u-x_v|}{Na} + \frac{|y_u-y_v|}{N\mathfrak{c}} \right)}. \quad (4.46)$$

Choosing  $C \geq 1, c > 0$  such that

$$C \exp\{-4c\ell_0^{-1}N\mathfrak{c}\} \geq 1, \quad (\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{2Na}} \leq e^{-c}, \quad \text{and} \quad (\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{2N\mathfrak{c}}} \leq e^{-c\ell_0^{-1}} \quad (4.47)$$

completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Microscopic characterization of nematic order

In this section, following the strategy in [10, Section 9], we derive a microscopic characterization of nematic order in terms of the probability of observing a vertical dimer versus a horizontal one within the vertical phase, thus establishing Item 2 of Theorem 1.1.

First, we estimate the probability of observing a horizontal dimer in the vertical phase. Much of the work involved is due to bridging the gap between the *microscopic* event that a horizontal dimer is present at a given position and the *mesoscopic* characterization of the vertical phase that vertically properly divided rectangles strongly percolate.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Suppose that  $\beta > \beta_0$ . If  $e \in \mathbb{V}$  is horizontal, then*

$$\mu_{\text{ver}}(\sigma(e) = 1) = \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\beta a}\right). \quad (5.1)$$

*Proof.* Let  $e = (x_e, y_e) \in \mathbb{V}$  be horizontal. Define the random variables

$$X_-(\sigma) := \max \{x \in 1/2 + \mathbb{Z} \mid x < x_e \text{ and } (x, y) \text{ is a broken link of } \sigma\}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$X_+(\sigma) := \min \{x \in 1/2 + \mathbb{Z} \mid x > x_e \text{ and } (x, y) \text{ is a broken link of } \sigma\}. \quad (5.3)$$

We will prove that there exist universal constants  $C, c > 0$  such that the following holds: for all  $x_-, x_+ \in (x_e + 1) + 2\mathbb{Z}$  with  $x_- < x_e < x_+$ , the event

$$J := \{\sigma \in \Omega \mid \sigma(e) = 1, X_-(\sigma) = x_-, X_+(\sigma) = x_+\} \quad (5.4)$$

satisfies

$$\mu_{\text{ver}}(J) \leq C e^{-\beta a} e^{-c(x_+ - x_-)}. \quad (5.5)$$

Once this is proven, the theorem follows by summing over all  $x_-, x_+$ .

Fix  $x_-, x_+ \in (x_e + 1) + 2\mathbb{Z}$  with  $x_- < x_e < x_+$ . Define the segment  $s := [x_-, x_+] \times \{y_e\}$ . Note that no vertical stick intersects with  $s$ . Define

$$A_0 := \{(x, \lfloor y_e/b \rfloor) \mid x \in \mathbb{Z}, x_- \leq ax - 1/2 < ax + Na - 1/2 \leq x_+\}. \quad (5.6)$$

For all  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , if the rectangle  $R_{aN \times bN, (ax-1/2, by-1/2)}$  is divided by  $s$ , then  $(x, y) \notin \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}$ . Thus,  $A_0 \cap \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}(\sigma) = \emptyset$  for all  $\sigma \in J$ . Note that

$$|A_0| \geq \frac{x_+ - x_-}{a} - N - 1. \quad (5.7)$$

By Item 2 of Corollary 3.7, Lemma 2.13 (noting that the  $2 \times 1$  rectangles bounding the broken links  $(x_-, y_e)$  and  $(x_+, y_e)$  share a grid) and Proposition 2.8,  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(J) \leq 36e^{-\beta a}$ . Let  $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_0$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  be an event such that  $J \subset \tilde{\Omega}$  and  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(\tilde{\Omega}) = 36e^{-\beta a}\epsilon_1^{-2}$ . Define  $\tilde{\mu}(\cdot) := \mu_{\text{ver}}(\cdot \mid \tilde{\Omega})$ . Define the random set

$$\Theta(\sigma) := \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \sigma \in J \\ \mathbb{Z}^2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (5.8)$$

We will prove that

$$\mathbf{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\Theta \cup \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}) \leq \epsilon_1. \quad (5.9)$$

Once this is done, by Lemma 2.15, we have that

$$\tilde{\mu}(J) \leq \tilde{\mu}(A_0 \cap (\Theta \cup \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}) = \emptyset) \leq \left( \frac{\mathbf{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\Theta \cup \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b})}{\epsilon_0} \right)^{|A_0|} \leq (\epsilon_1/\epsilon_0)^{|A_0|}, \quad (5.10)$$

from which (5.5) follows after recalling (5.7):

$$\mu_{\text{ver}}(J) = \mu_{\text{ver}}(\tilde{\Omega})\tilde{\mu}(J) \leq 36e^{-\beta a}\epsilon_1^{-4}(\epsilon_1/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{x_+ - x_-}{a} - N - 1}. \quad (5.11)$$

To prove (5.9), we use the following conditional version of Item 4 of Lemma 2.17:

**Lemma 5.2** ([10, (9.3)]). *Under the setting of Item 4 of Lemma 2.17,*

$$\mathbf{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\Theta \cup X_{k \times l} \overline{E}) \leq \sqrt[r]{\max \left\{ 6e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}, \|\Omega \setminus E\|_R \right\}}. \quad (5.12)$$

By Lemma 5.2, recalling (4.4) in the proof of Item 1 of Lemma 4.3,

$$\mathbf{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\Theta \cup \Psi^{a \times b}) = \mathbf{p}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\Theta \cup X_{a \times b} \overline{D^{a \times b}}) \leq \sqrt[N^2]{\max \left\{ 6e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}, \|\Omega \setminus D^{a \times b}\|_R \right\}} \leq \epsilon_1, \quad (5.13)$$

after taking  $\beta_0$  and  $a$  sufficiently large. Thus, under  $\tilde{\mu}$ , there exists an  $\epsilon_1$ -rare random set  $B \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that, almost surely,  $\Theta \cup \Psi^{a \times b}$  contains the unique, infinite  $\square$ -component of  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus B$ , which we denote by  $I$ . Hence, under  $\tilde{\mu}$ ,  $I \subset \Theta \cup \Psi^{a \times b}$  is almost surely defined and  $\epsilon_1$ -strongly percolating.

We conclude the proof of (5.9) by showing that,  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely,  $I \subset \Theta \cup \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}$ . Let  $\sigma \in I$ , and recall from (5.8) the definition of  $\Theta$ . If  $\sigma \in I \setminus J$ , then  $\Theta(\sigma) = \mathbb{Z}^2 \supset I(\sigma)$  as long as  $I(\sigma)$  is defined, which occurs  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely. Otherwise,  $\sigma \in J$ , and  $I(\sigma)$  is  $\square$ -connected and contained in  $\Psi^{a \times b}(\sigma)$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely. Since  $\Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}$  is  $\epsilon_1$ -strongly percolating under  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$ , so is it under  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Thus,  $I \cap \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b} \neq \emptyset$   $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost surely. However, in the case that  $I(\sigma) \subset \Psi^{a \times b}(\sigma)$ , the non-intersecting property of sticks forces  $I(\sigma) \subset \Psi_{\text{ver}}^{a \times b}(\sigma)$  for  $\tilde{\mu}$ -almost all  $\sigma \in J$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Second, we estimate the probability of observing a vertical dimer in the vertical phase.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Suppose that  $\beta > \beta_0$ . If  $e \in \mathbb{V}$  is vertical, then*

$$\mu_{\text{ver}}(\sigma(e) = 1) = \frac{1}{2} - \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}\right). \quad (5.14)$$

*Proof.* Let  $e \equiv (x, y) \in \mathbb{V}$  be vertical. Consider the events

$$E_1 := \{\sigma(x, y) + \sigma(x, y + 1) = 1\}, \quad (5.15)$$

$$E_2 := \{\sigma(x - 1/2, y + 1/2) + \sigma(x + 1/2, y + 1/2) = 1\}, \quad (5.16)$$

$$E_3 := \{(x, y + 1/2) \text{ is a vacancy of } \sigma\}. \quad (5.17)$$

Note that these events partition  $\Omega$ . By Theorem 5.1,  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(E_2) \leq 2C_{5.1}e^{-\beta a}$ . By Proposition 2.8 and Item 1 of Corollary 3.7,  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(E_3) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta(\lambda+a)}$ . Hence,

$$\mu_{\text{ver}}(E_1) = 1 - \mu_{\text{ver}}(E_2) - \mu_{\text{ver}}(E_3) = 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta a}\right). \quad (5.18)$$

Since  $\mu_{\text{ver}}$  is  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -invariant,  $\mu_{\text{ver}}(E_1) = 2\mu_{\text{ver}}(\sigma(e) = 1)$ , which implies the theorem.  $\square$

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks Ian Jauslin and Ron Peled for suggesting the problem and the latter for enlightening discussions, including pointing out that the chessboard estimate applies to independent couplings of reflection-positive measures. The author also thanks Minhao Bai and Anupam Nayak for helpful discussions. The author is supported by an SAS Fellowship at Rutgers University.

## References

- [1] Diego Alberici. A cluster expansion approach to the Heilmann–Lieb liquid crystal model. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 162(3):761–791, 2016.
- [2] Marek Biskup. Reflection positivity and phase transitions in lattice spin models. In *Methods of Contemporary Mathematical Statistical Physics*, pages 1–86. Springer, 2009.
- [3] Sarah Cannon, Tyler Helmuth, and Will Perkins. Pirogov–Sinai theory beyond lattices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07809*, 2024.
- [4] Pierre-Gilles De Gennes and Jacques Prost. *The physics of liquid crystals*. Oxford University Press, 1993.
- [5] Margherita Disertori and Alessandro Giuliani. The nematic phase of a system of long hard rods. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 323(1):143–175, 2013.
- [6] Heitor C Marques Fernandes, Jeferson J Arenzon, and Yan Levin. Monte carlo simulations of two-dimensional hard core lattice gases. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 126(11), 2007.
- [7] Frederick C Frank. I. liquid crystals. on the theory of liquid crystals. *Discussions of the Faraday Society*, 25:19–28, 1958.
- [8] Sacha Friedli and Yvan Velenik. *Statistical mechanics of lattice systems: a concrete mathematical introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.



- [9] Hans-Otto Georgii. *Gibbs measures and phase transitions*, volume 9. Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- [10] Daniel Hadas and Ron Peled. Columnar order in random packings of  $2 \times 2$  squares on the square lattice. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 2025.
- [11] Ole J Heilmann and Elliott H Lieb. Lattice models for liquid crystals. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 20(6):679–693, 1979.
- [12] Ian Jauslin and Elliott H Lieb. Nematic liquid crystal phase in a system of interacting dimers and monomers. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 363(3):955–1002, 2018.
- [13] Joyjit Kundu, R Rajesh, Deepak Dhar, and Jürgen F Stilck. Nematic-disordered phase transition in systems of long rigid rods on two-dimensional lattices. *Physical Review E*, 87(3):032103, 2013.
- [14] Trisha Nath and R Rajesh. Multiple phase transitions in extended hard-core lattice gas models in two dimensions. *Physical Review E*, 90(1):012120, 2014.
- [15] Lars Onsager. The effects of shape on the interaction of colloidal particles. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 51(4):627–659, 1949.
- [16] CW Oseen. The theory of liquid crystals. *Transactions of the Faraday Society*, 29(140):883–899, 1933.
- [17] Minoru Takahashi. *Thermodynamics of one-dimensional solvable models*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [18] Filipe C Thewes and Heitor CM Fernandes. Phase transitions in hard-core lattice gases on the honeycomb lattice. *Physical Review E*, 101(6):062138, 2020.
- [19] Ádám Timár. Boundary-connectivity via graph theory. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 141(2):475–480, 2013.
- [20] György Turán. On the succinct representation of graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 8(3):289–294, 1984.
- [21] Jacob van den Berg. A uniqueness condition for Gibbs measures, with application to the 2-dimensional Ising antiferromagnet. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 152(1):161–166, 1993.
- [22] Jacob van den Berg and Christian Maes. Disagreement percolation in the study of Markov fields. *The Annals of Probability*, 22(2):749–763, 1994.
- [23] N Vigneshwar, Dipanjan Mandal, Kedar Damle, Deepak Dhar, and R Rajesh. Phase diagram of a system of hard cubes on the cubic lattice. *Physical Review E*, 99(5):052129, 2019.
- [24] Wei Wang, Lei Zhang, and Pingwen Zhang. Modelling and computation of liquid crystals. *Acta Numerica*, 30:765–851, 2021.
- [25] Miloš Zahradník. An alternate version of Pirogov-Sinai theory. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 93(4):559–581, 1984.