Large Deviations of Extreme Eigenvalues of Generalized Sample Covariance Matrices

Antoine Maillard*

Laboratoire de Physique de l'École Normale Supérieure, ENS, Université PSL, Paris, France

Very rare events in which the largest eigenvalue of a random matrix is atypically large have important consequences in statistics, e.g. in principal components analysis, and for studying the rough high-dimensional landscapes encountered in disordered systems in statistical mechanics. These problems lead to consider matrices $(1/m) \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} d_{\mu} \mathbf{z}_{\mu} \mathbf{z}_{\mu}^{\dagger}$, with $\{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}\}_{\mu=1}^{m}$ standard Gaussian vectors of size n, and (fixed) real d_{μ} . In a high-dimensional limit we leverage recent techniques to derive the probability of large deviations of the extreme eigenvalues away from the bulk. We probe our results with Monte-Carlo methods that effectively simulate events with probability as small as 10^{-100} .

Theoretical physics and random matrix theory share a long history that dates back to Wigner [1], and that powered progress in various areas ranging from statistical mechanics of disordered systems [2, 3] to quantum chaos [4], quantum chromodynamics [5], superconductivity [6] or quantitative finance [7–9]. Recent advances at the interface between statistical physics, information theory and statistics [10] further strenghtened this connection. A far-reaching statistical problem relying on random matrix theory is principal components analysis (PCA), which has wide interdisciplinary applications [11].

Consider a matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ whose columns $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. Gaussian vectors, generated with a given covariance matrix $\Gamma = \langle \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}} \rangle$. We assume a high-dimensional regime $n, m \to \infty$, with $m/n \to \alpha > 0$. PCA aims at discovering an unknown "privileged" direction in the covariance matrix Γ (i.e. the eigenvector corresponding to the largest isolated eigenvalue of Γ) by studying the largest eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrix $C_n \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^{\mathsf{T}} / n$. Denoting $\mathbf{x}_i = \sqrt{\Gamma} \mathbf{z}_i$, with \mathbf{z}_i standard Gaussian vectors, we see that $C_n = \sqrt{\Gamma} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^{\mathsf{T}} \sqrt{\Gamma} / n$ has the same eigenvalues (up to possible zeros and a scaling factor) as $H_n = \mathbf{Z}^{\mathsf{T}} \Gamma \mathbf{Z} / m$. The typical position of outliers in the spectrum of H_n (or C_n) was first studied when Γ is a finite-rank deformation of the identity matrix, both in the physics and mathematics literature [12, 13]. Further work extended this analysis to all possible Γ [14, 15]. A natural question then emerges: can an outlier appear in the absence of any privileged direction in Γ , due to an atypical realization of Z? Such events can be considered as a "null hypothesis", and have important consequences for the significance of PCA results. This is also known as *large deviations*, and it has received great attention when Γ is the identity matrix (or a finite-rank deformation of it), corresponding to weakly correlated data in PCA[16–22]. The aim of this letter is to answer this question for $H_n = \mathbf{Z}^{\mathsf{T}} \Gamma \mathbf{Z} / m$ built from an *arbitrary* Γ , i.e. for PCA with possibly heavily correlated data.

A simple example is to consider Γ being the sample covariance matrix of m standard Gaussian vectors in \mathbb{R}^m (independent of \mathbf{Z}), so that its asymptotic spectrum $\rho(t)$ is known as the Marchenko-Pastur law [23]. The large n limit of the eigenvalue density $(1/n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta(\lambda - \lambda_i)$ of



FIG. 1. The bulk $\sigma(\lambda)$, and the functions $G_{\sigma}, \overline{G}_{\sigma}$ for $\alpha = 2$ and $\rho(t)$ the Marchenko-Pastur law with ratio 1. In the box, we plot $\rho(t)$ and the right edge d_{\max} of its support. Δ is the gap between the largest eigenvalue of H_n and the bulk $\sigma(\lambda)$.

 H_n , often called "bulk", and denoted $\sigma(\lambda)$, is shown in Fig. 1. We depict by a black arrow a possible "spike", i.e. an outlier in the spectrum of H_n . $\sigma(\lambda)$ is analytically derived using the *Stieltjes transform* (or the trace of the resolvent), a central object in random matrix theory: $G_{\sigma}(x) = \text{Tr}[(H_n - x)^{-1}]/n = \int d\lambda \sigma(\lambda)/(x - \lambda)$. The main result of [23] is the expression of the inverse of $G_{\sigma}(x)$, i.e. the *Marchenko-Pastur equation*:

$$G_{\sigma}^{-1}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega} + \alpha \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \frac{t}{\alpha - t\omega}.$$
 (1)

 $\sigma(\lambda)$ is completely characterized by $G_{\sigma}(x)$ via the inversion formula $\sigma(\lambda) = -\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \text{Im}[G_{\sigma}(\lambda + i\epsilon)]/\pi$. In particular, the support of $\sigma(\lambda)$ and its right edge s_{max} can be computed (analytically or numerically) from eq. (1).

By rotation invariance of \mathbf{Z} , Γ can be considered diagonal $\Gamma = \text{Diag}(\{d_{\mu}\})$, with all $d_{\mu} \geq 0$. This leads us to extend the matrix model to generalized sample covariance matrices, defined as:

$$H_n \equiv \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mu=1}^m d_\mu \mathbf{z}_\mu \mathbf{z}_\mu^\dagger, \qquad (2)$$

in which the fixed variables d_{μ} are not necessarily positive, and the $\{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}\}$ are standard real or complex Gaussian vectors. Note that the positivity (or negativity) of the matrix H_n is equivalent to the positivity (or negativity) of all d_{μ} . We denote $\rho(t) = \lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{\mu=1}^m \delta(t - d_{\mu})/m$, and d_{\max} the right edge of the support of $\rho(t)$, that we assume to be bounded (see the inner box in Fig. 1).

In the following, we detail our main result before discussing its consequences, notably a phase transition. We then probe our findings in an extremely low probability regime, using precise numerical simulations. The remaining of the letter is devoted to the derivation of our result. SM denotes the supplementary material.

Large deviations - From now on we restrict to the study of $\lambda_{\max}(H_n)$. Since we can always consider $d'_{\mu} = -d_{\mu}$, our analysis also applies to $\lambda_{\min}(H_n)$. We emphasize that the large deviations regime corresponds to macroscopic changes in $\lambda_{\max}(H_n)$, which are exponentially rare, as opposed to the finite-size fluctuations, in the scale $n^{-2/3}$ and typically described by the Tracy-Widom distribution (for unperturbed matrices) [24, 25]. These two regimes are shown as cyan and grey regions in Fig. 1. Crucially, we assume that $\max_{1 \le \mu \le m} d_{\mu}$ approaches d_{\max} as $m \to \infty$, i.e. that there is no outlier in the list $\{d_{\mu}\}$. This ensures that $\lambda_{\max}(H_n)$ converges to the right edge s_{\max} of the bulk $\sigma(\lambda)$. In other words, the set of vectors $\{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}\}$ such that the spectrum of H_n has an outlier is very atypical under the Gaussian distribution.

We now state our main result, under the aforementioned hypotheses. Let $\beta \in \{1,2\}$ for respectively real and complex \mathbf{z}_{μ} , with the convention $\langle |z|^2 \rangle = 1$ for a Gaussian standard random variable. We denote $P_n(x)$ the PDF of $\lambda_{\max}(H_n)$ (for given $\{d_{\mu}\}$). For $x \geq s_{\max}$:

$$P_n(x) \simeq \exp\Big\{-n \underbrace{\overline{\frac{\beta}{2} \int_{s_{\max}}^{x} [\overline{G}_{\sigma}(u) - G_{\sigma}(u)] \mathrm{d}u}}_{S_{\max}}\Big\}.$$
 (3)

The function \overline{G}_{σ} is defined in the following (technical) way. By monoticity arguments, it can easily be seen that the equation $G_{\sigma}^{-1}(\omega) = x$ has a second solution $\omega = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$, sometimes referred to as the "second branch" of the Marchenko-Pastur equation (1). Examples of $(G_{\sigma}, \overline{G}_{\sigma})$ are given in Fig. 1. An important remark is that $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ can saturate if $d_{\max} > 0$ (i.e. if H_n is positive). In this case, $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) = \alpha/d_{\max}$ for $x \ge x_c(\rho)$, with

$$x_c(\rho) \equiv d_{\max}^2 G_{\rho}(d_{\max}) + (\alpha^{-1} - 1)d_{\max}.$$
 (4)

Here, $G_{\rho}(z) = \int dt \, \rho(t)/(z-t)$ is the Stieltjes transform of $\rho(t)$. Possibly, $x_c(\rho) = +\infty$ if $G_{\rho}(d_{\max}) = +\infty$. If H_n is negative, then $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ diverges to $+\infty$ as $x \uparrow 0$, and we pose $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) = +\infty$ for $x \ge 0$.

Discussion - Eq. (3) is the main result of this letter. The negative of the argument of the exponential is called the *rate function* I(x) in the large deviations language. In Fig. 2, we show analytical computations of I(x) for different α and $\rho(t)$. Importantly, we do not consider large deviations at the left of s_{max} : these events require



FIG. 2. The rate function I(x) for different values of α and two different distributions ρ , in the real case. The full dots show the right edge s_{max} of the bulk, while the empty dots (when present) correspond to the transition $x_c(\rho)$.

a macroscopic move of a number $\mathcal{O}(n)$ of eigenvalues, which has probability in the scale $\exp\{-n^2\}$, and thus very different large deviations [17, 20]. As a consistency check, one verifies easily that eq. (3) reduces to known results for Wishart matrices (i.e. $\rho(x) = \delta(x-1)$) [17, 18].

In a different context, computing the large deviations of $\lambda_{\min}(H_n)$ is also a critical step in understanding the loss landscape of statistical problems and disordered models, as it allows to count the number of local minima of the landscape: indeed, the Hessian of the Hamiltonian of such models is often close to the matrix of eq. (2) [26]. Such calculations have been shown to provide detailed insight into the landscape and the behavior of local optimization algorithms for Gaussian models (e.g. variants of the mixed *p*-spin model) [27–35], and extending them to more involved disordered models is an exciting challenge.

Phase transition in the rate function - Let us describe a first notable consequence of eq. (3). We assume that $d_{\text{max}} > 0$ and that $x_c(\rho)$ (see eq. (4)) is finite, e.g. $\rho(t)$ can be the Marchenko-Pastur law, as shown in Figs. 1,2. Recall that $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ saturates at α/d_{max} for $x \geq x_c(\rho)$. It is in general not smooth at $x = x_c(\rho)$ and this singularity induces a phase transition in the rate function I(x). The order of the transition (i.e. the order of the first discontinuous derivative of I(x) can be computed if the right tail of $\rho(t)$ behaves as $\rho(t) \sim (d_{\max} - t)^{\eta}$ for $t \to d_{\max}$, with $\eta > 0$, so that $x_c(\rho) < \infty$. When $\eta \geq 1$ and $1/2 \leq \eta < 1$ (e.g. the Marchenko-Pastur law, for which $\eta = 1/2$) we show that the transition is respectively of second and third order. The details are given in SM A, and we conjecture generically the order to be k+1 if $1/k \le \eta < 1/(k-1)$.

Monte-Carlo simulations - Although eq. (3) is a large *n* result, we investigate numerically the large deviations regime at moderately large *n*, which is the relevant regime for real data in PCA. Because we need $(1/m) \sum_{\mu} \delta(t - d_{\mu})$ to be very close to $\rho(t)$, we can not perform histograms of $\lambda_{\max}(H_n)$, as performed in [17],



FIG. 3. The function $x^*(t)$ for $\rho(t) = :$ (*i*) the sum $(\delta_1+\delta_{-1})/2$, (*ii*) Wigner's semicircle law, (*iii*) the Marchenko-Pastur law with ratio 1, (*iv*) the uniform distribution in [-2, -1]. In all cases $\alpha = 2$ except for (*ii*), in which $\alpha = 1$. Solid lines are analytical predictions. The different Monte-Carlo runs (n = 500) are shown in green with their respective noise. The mean of the green points is depicted as a red dot.

since the large deviations probability decays exponentially in n. We instead modify the law of \mathbf{z} so that it favors large deviations. Precisely we define

$$P_t(\mathbf{z}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{z} \propto \mathcal{D}\mathbf{z} \, e^{nt\lambda_{\max}(H_n)}$$

For a given $t \ge 0$, eq. (3) and the Laplace method imply that when sampling \mathbf{z} under P_t , the largest eigenvalue of H_n concentrates on $x^*(t) \equiv \operatorname{argmin}_x[tx - I(x)]$. To sample from P_t , we implement a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [36]. The physical parameters are n, m, ρ, t , and we generate i.i.d. samples $\{d_{\mu}\}_{\mu=1}^m$ from ρ . We initialize $\{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}\}_{\mu=1}^m$ as standard Gaussian vectors, and sample from the move proposal distribution $g(\mathbf{z}'|\mathbf{z})$ as follows: (*i*) Pick a random index μ with probability $P(\mu) \propto e^{\beta_d d_{\mu}}$. (*ii*) Draw a uniform $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with norm $||\mathbf{e}||^2 = n$, and draw $L \ge 0$ from a truncated Gaussian distribution centered in 1 and with variance $\Delta > 0$. Let $\mathbf{z}'_{\mu} = \sqrt{L}\mathbf{e}$. (*iii*) The new state \mathbf{z}' is given by changing $\mathbf{z}_{\mu} \to \mathbf{z}'_{\mu}$.

We impose the detailed balance condition with stationary distribution $P_t(\mathbf{z})$ and move proposal distribution $g(\mathbf{z}'|\mathbf{z})$ in the MCMC. We measure the largest eigenvalue of H_n , which we compare to $x^*(t)$. The parameters (β_d, Δ) are found to reduce greatly the equilibration time of the Markov chain, and are adapted during a warmup phase to obtain an acceptance ratio in the range [0.2, 0.3]. Physically, β_d favors the right edge of the bulk, while Δ favors large norms of \mathbf{z}_{μ} . The code is available in a public Github repository and the results of the simulations are given in Fig. 3 for four choices of $\rho(t)$. The agreement with our predictions is very good, whether H_n is negative, positive, or neither. Even though the variability of the MC results naturally increases with t, we are able to access very large values of $x^*(t)$, beyond the transition point $x_c(\rho)$. For example, in case *(iii)* of Fig. 3 we sample up to $x^*(t) \simeq 8$. Comparing with Fig. 2, this implies that our simulations reach events with probability of order $e^{-0.5n} \sim 10^{-109}$ under a naive sampling !

Derivation of the result - Let us now derive eq. (3), focusing on the real case. The factor $\beta = 2$ in the complex case arises from Zuber's 1/2-rule in spherical "HCIZ" integrals, considered hereafter [37]. Our derivation is based on a *tilting* method, developed in a series of recent mathematical works [18, 38–42]. This technique is more adaptable than a Coulomb gas analysis, as it does not require the joint probability of the eigenvalues of H_n , which is not known here. Moreover, the calculation does not rely on any heuristics, and we expect it to be adaptable into mathematically rigorous statements.

First tilt of the measure - We start with a simple use of the tilting method [43], which will prove useful when $d_{\max} \leq 0$. For any $\theta \geq 0$ we write:

$$P_n(x) = \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{z} \ \delta(\lambda_{\max}(H_n) - x), \tag{5}$$
$$\simeq e^{-nJ_1(\theta, x)} \int_{\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 = 1} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{e} \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{z} \ \delta(\lambda_{\max}(H_n) - x) e^{\frac{\theta n}{2}\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}H_n\mathbf{e}}.$$

We introduced the spherical integral $J_1(\theta, y)$, defined as the limit of $J_n(H_n, \theta) \equiv (1/n) \ln \int_{\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 = 1} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{e} \ e^{\frac{n\theta}{2}\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}H_n\mathbf{e}}$, assuming $\lambda_{\max}(H_n) \to y$ as $n \to \infty$. Adopting the language of statistical physics, we call J_1 a quenched spherical integral. Using a Lagrange multiplier to fix the norm of \mathbf{e} , we find [44]:

$$J_1(\theta, x) = \inf_{\gamma \ge \theta x} \left[\frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathrm{d}u \,\sigma(u) \ln(\gamma - \theta u) \right] - \frac{1}{2}.$$
 (6)

In the same way, we define an *annealed* integral $F_1(\theta) \equiv \lim_{n \to \infty} (1/n) \ln \int \mathcal{D} \mathbf{z} \int_{\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 = 1} d\mathbf{e} \ e^{\frac{\theta n}{2} \mathbf{e}^{\intercal} H_n \mathbf{e}}$. If $d_{\max} > 0$, we also impose $\theta \leq \alpha/d_{\max}$ so that F_1 is well-defined. We compute it by direct integration on \mathbf{z} :

$$F_1(\theta) = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \ln(1 - \alpha^{-1}\theta t).$$
 (7)

It is well-known [44, 45] that a transition occurs in the quenched integral J_1 as $\theta \to \theta_c(x) = G_{\sigma}(x)$. At this point, the multiplier γ of eq. (6) reaches its boundary value θx , and $J_1(\theta, x)$ becomes sensitive to the value of x, while for $\theta \leq \theta_c(x)$ it is only sensitive to the *bulk* $\sigma(\lambda)$ of H_n , and is equal to the annealed integral. This is summarized by:

$$J_{1}(\theta, x) =$$

$$\begin{cases} F_{1}(\theta) = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \int dt \rho(t) \ln(1 - \alpha^{-1}\theta t) & \text{if } \theta \leq G_{\sigma}(x), \\ \frac{\theta x - 1 - \ln \theta}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \int du \ \sigma(u) \ln(x - u) & \text{if } \theta \geq G_{\sigma}(x). \end{cases}$$
(8)

Let us come back to eq. (5). By integrating in a small range $[x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon]$, and bounding the integrated δ term by 1, we reach:

$$P_n(x) \le \exp\{-n \sup_{\theta} [J_1(\theta, x) - F_1(\theta)]\}.$$

The core of the method is to find θ_x such that under the *tilted* distribution

$$P_{\theta,\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{z})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{z} \propto \mathcal{D}\mathbf{z} \; e^{\frac{\theta n}{2}\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}H_{n}\mathbf{e}},$$
 (9)

 $\lambda_{\max}(H_n) \simeq x \text{ as } n \to \infty \text{ if } \theta = \theta_x.$ For such a θ_x one can remove the δ term in eq. (5), so that $P_n(x) \simeq \exp\{-n[J_1(\theta_x, x) - F_1(\theta_x)]\}$, and thus:

$$P_n(x) \simeq \exp\{-n \sup_{\theta} [J_1(\theta, x) - F_1(\theta)]\}.$$
(10)

Can we find such a θ_x ? Note that the tilted distribution $P_{\theta,\mathbf{e}}$ is equivalent to a rank-one change in the covariance of the \mathbf{z}_{μ} . Using simple algebra detailed in SM B1 we show that, under the tilted law, H_n is distributed as:

$$H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mu=1}^m d_\mu [\mathbb{1}_n + \kappa_\theta(d_\mu) \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}] \mathbf{z}_\mu \mathbf{z}_\mu^{\mathsf{T}} [\mathbb{1}_n + \kappa_\theta(d_\mu) \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}],$$

with $\kappa_{\theta}(t) \equiv (1-\alpha^{-1}\theta t)^{-1/2}-1$. Importantly, the change of the largest eigenvalue of a random matrix under a finite rank perturbation is often tractable. Intuitively, one must separate two cases according to the sign of d_{max} :

- If $d_{\max} \leq 0$, then $\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\mu}) \to -1$ as $\theta \gg 1$. We can see that $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ will thus develop a 0 eigenvalue with eigenvector **e**. On the contrary, $\lambda_{\max}(H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)})$ will converge to s_{\max} if $\theta = 0$, as there are no outliers in $\{d_{\mu}\}$. By continuously varying θ , one should thus be able to induce x to be the largest eigenvalue of $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$, for all $s_{\max} \leq x < 0$.
- If $d_{\max} > 0$, as $n \to \infty$ and $\theta \to \alpha/d_{\max}$, the dominant spiked term in $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ is proportional to $\sum_{\mu=1}^m d_\mu \kappa_\theta (d_\mu)^2/m \simeq \int dt \rho(t) t \kappa_\theta(t)^2$. However, this term will only diverge if $G_\rho(d_{\max}) = \infty$: this condition is required for the tilting to be able to induce arbitrarily large outliers ! The finiteness of $G_\rho(d_{\max})$ is exactly the existence condition of a phase transition in I(x), which prevents the tilting from capturing all the large deviations.

This intuition is backed by a detailed argument, based on self-averaging properties, and performed in SM B 2.

If $d_{\max} \leq 0$, we can deduce the existence of θ_x and thus the validity of eq. (10). For $s_{\max} \leq x < 0$, we finish the derivation by simplifying $I(x) = \sup_{\theta} [J_1(\theta, x) - F_1(\theta)]$. Using eq. (8), it is simple algebra to show $I'(x) = (1/2)[\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) - G_{\sigma}(x)]$, which gives eq. (3) and solves the problem in this case. For $x \geq 0$, $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) = +\infty$ and so eq. (3) is valid (indeed $I(x) = +\infty$ since H_n is negative). The details of this derivation are given in SM C 1.

Beyond the transition - To go beyond the phase transition when $d_{\text{max}} > 0$, we change the tilt of eq. (9) to (with $\sum_i e_i^2 = \sum_{\mu} f_{\mu}^2 = 1$):

$$P_{\theta,\mathbf{e},\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{z} \propto \mathcal{D}\mathbf{z} \,\,e^{\frac{\theta n}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{i,\mu}\sqrt{d_{\mu}}e_{i}z_{\mu i}f_{\mu}}.$$
 (11)

The corresponding annealed and quenched integrals are:

$$F_{2}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{z} \int_{\|\mathbf{e}\|^{2}=1} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{e} \int_{\|\mathbf{f}\|^{2}=1} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{f} e^{\frac{\theta n}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i,\mu} \sqrt{d_{\mu}} e_{i} z_{\mu i} f_{\mu}},$$
$$J_{2}(\theta, y) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \int_{\|\mathbf{e}\|^{2}=1} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{e} \int_{\|\mathbf{f}\|^{2}=1} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{f} e^{\frac{\theta n}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i,\mu} \sqrt{d_{\mu}} e_{i} z_{\mu i} f_{\mu}}.$$

In $J_2(\theta, y)$, we assume that $\lambda_{\max}(H_n)$ converges to y as $n \to \infty$. When $d_{\mu} \leq 0$, we define $\sqrt{d_{\mu}} \equiv i\sqrt{-d_{\mu}}$ so that the tilt is possibly complex-valued. Introducing Lagrange multipliers in the spherical integrals, we find [44–46]:

$$F_2(\theta) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \inf_{\gamma \ge d_{\max}} \left[\frac{\gamma \theta^2}{\alpha^2} - \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \ln(\gamma - t) - 1 - \ln \frac{\theta^2}{\alpha^2} \right].$$

As in J_1 , there is a transition in J_2 : for $\theta \leq \theta_c(y)$, $J_2(\theta, y) = F_2(\theta)$, while for $\theta \geq \theta_c(y)$ one reaches:

$$J_2(\theta, y) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} \ln\left[\frac{1 - \alpha + \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^2 + 4y\theta^2}}{2y}\right] - \frac{1 + \alpha}{2}$$
$$-\frac{\alpha}{2} \ln\frac{\theta^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^2 + 4y\theta^2} - \frac{1}{2}\int d\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda)\ln(y - \lambda),$$

with $\theta_c(y) \equiv \sqrt{yG_{\sigma}(y)^2 + (\alpha - 1)G_{\sigma}(y)}$. The details are given in SM B3: importantly, the very existence of this transition relies on the positivity of y, so that this tilting fails for negative matrices. This notably implies that our first simple tilt is still crucial when $d_{\max} \leq 0$. Eq. (11) corresponds to a simple additive shift of \mathbf{z}_{μ} , and the tilted law of H_n is:

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^{(\theta,\mathbf{e},\mathbf{f})} &\equiv \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mu=1}^m \left[d_\mu \mathbf{z}_\mu \mathbf{z}_\mu^\mathsf{T} + \frac{\theta^2 m}{\alpha^2} d_\mu^2 f_\mu^2 \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^\mathsf{T} \right. \\ &+ \frac{\theta \sqrt{m}}{\alpha} \mathbbm{1}_{\{d_\mu \ge 0\}} d_\mu^{3/2} f_\mu(\mathbf{e} \mathbf{z}_\mu^\mathsf{T} + \mathbf{z}_\mu \mathbf{e}^\mathsf{T}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

When $\theta = 0$ the largest eigenvalue of the unspiked matrix will naturally concentrate on s_{max} . As $\theta \gg 1$, a spike proportional to θ^2 will push the largest eigenvalue of $H_n^{(\theta, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f})}$ to $+\infty$. By continuously varying θ , this implies that the tilt can induce any outlier $x \ge s_{\text{max}}$ in the spectrum, with a corresponding θ_x . The argument is carried out in more details in SM B 4.

We deduce that $P_n(x) \sim \exp\{-n \sup_{\theta} [J_2(\theta, x) - F_2(\theta)]\}$ in the same way as before. Using eq. (1) and the explicit expressions of F_2 and J_2 we derived, one shows that for all $x \geq s_{\max}$ the supremum is attained in $\theta_x =$ $[x\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)^2 + (\alpha - 1)\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)]^{1/2}$. We compute then I'(x) = $[\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) - G_{\sigma}(x)]/2$, which, together with $I(s_{\max}) = 0$, implies eq. (3). These algebraic calculations are detailed in SM C 2.

Conclusion - We derived the large deviations of the extreme eigenvalues of generalized sample covariance matrices using a tilting technique. Our result allows for a finer analysis of rare events in PCA with heavily correlated data, and open the way for analyzing the landscape of statistical models and disordered systems. Using

Monte-Carlo simulations we are able to probe our results for high n, in a difficult regime in which the probability of existence of an outlier is extremely small.

The author is grateful to G.Biroli, F.Krzakala and S.Goldt for discussions, help and comments, and to A.Guionnet for introducing him to the tilting method used here. Funding is acknowledged from Fondation CFM pour la Recherche.

* antoine.maillard@ens.fr

- [1] E. P. Wigner, Annals of Mathematics **62**, 548 (1955).
- [2] S. F. Edwards and P. W. Anderson, Journal of Physics F: Metal Physics 5, 965 (1975).
- [3] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Physical review letters 35, 1792 (1975).
- [4] O. Bohigas, M.-J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, Physical Review Letters 52, 1 (1984).
- [5] J. Verbaarschot and T. Wettig, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science 50, 343 (2000).
- [6] S. R. Bahcall, Physical review letters 77, 5276 (1996).
- [7] L. Laloux, P. Cizeau, J.-P. Bouchaud, and M. Potters, Physical review letters 83, 1467 (1999).
- [8] L. Laloux, P. Cizeau, M. Potters, and J.-P. Bouchaud, International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance 3, 391 (2000).
- [9] J.-P. Bouchaud and M. Potters, arXiv:0910.1205 (2009).
- [10] L. Zdeborová and F. Krzakala, Advances in Physics 65, 453 (2016).
- [11] H. Abdi and L. J. Williams, Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: computational statistics 2, 433 (2010).
- [12] S. F. Edwards and R. C. Jones, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General 9, 1595 (1976).
- [13] J. Baik, G. Ben Arous, S. Péché, et al., The Annals of Probability 33, 1643 (2005).
- [14] F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi, Advances in Mathematics 227, 494 (2011).
- [15] B. Aubin, B. Loureiro, A. Maillard, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová, in Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2019) pp. 8366–8377.
- [16] D. S. Dean and S. N. Majumdar, Physical review letters 97, 160201 (2006).
- [17] S. N. Majumdar and M. Vergassola, Physical review letters 102, 060601 (2009).
- [18] G. Biroli and A. Guionnet, arXiv:1904.01820 (2019).
- [19] M. Maida *et al.*, Electronic Journal of Probability **12**, 1131 (2007).
- [20] P. Vivo, S. N. Majumdar, and O. Bohigas, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 40, 4317 (2007).
- [21] S. N. Majumdar and G. Schehr, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment 2014, P01012 (2014).
- [22] F. Benaych-Georges, A. Guionnet, and M. Maïda, Probability Theory and Related Fields 154, 703 (2012).
- [23] V. A. Marchenko and L. A. Pastur, Matematicheskii Sbornik 114, 507 (1967).
- [24] C. A. Tracy and H. Widom, Communications in Mathematical Physics 159, 151 (1994).
- [25] X. Ding and F. Yang, arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.04166 (2020).

- [26] A. Maillard, G. Ben Arous, and G. Biroli, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02143 (2019).
- [27] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics 13, L469 (1980).
- [28] J. Kurchan, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General 24, 4969 (1991).
- [29] A. Crisanti and H.-J. Sommers, Journal de Physique I 5, 805 (1995).
- [30] Y. V. Fyodorov and I. Williams, Journal of Statistical Physics 129, 1081 (2007).
- [31] A. J. Bray and D. S. Dean, Physical review letters 98, 150201 (2007).
- [32] A. Auffinger, G. Ben Arous, and J. Černý, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics 66, 165 (2013).
- [33] V. Ros, G. Ben Arous, G. Biroli, and C. Cammarota, Physical Review X 9, 011003 (2019).
- [34] S. Sarao Mannelli, G. Biroli, C. Cammarota, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová, in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2019) pp. 8679–8689.
- [35] S. Sarao Mannelli, G. Biroli, C. Cammarota, F. Krzakala, P. Urbani, and L. Zdeborová, Physical Review X 10, 011057 (2020).
- [36] W. K. Hastings, Biometrika 57, 97 (1970).
- [37] P. Zinn-Justin and J.-B. Zuber, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General 36, 3173 (2003).
- [38] F. Augeri, A. Guionnet, and J. Husson, arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.10591 (2019).
- [39] B. McKenna, arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13566 (2019).
- [40] A. Guionnet, J. Husson, *et al.*, Annals of Probability 48, 1436 (2020).
- [41] J. Husson, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.01010 (2020).
- [42] S. Belinschi, A. Guionnet, and J. Huang, arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07117 (2020).
- [43] If all $d_{\mu} \geq 0$, the analysis of [18, 42] suggests a tilt which is a function of A_n , with $H_n = A_n A_n^{\mathsf{T}}$. For arbitrary d_{μ} , A_n does not exist, which is why we begin with this simpler tilting. In the end of the manuscript we come back to this idea by allowing complex-valued A_n .
- [44] A. Maillard, L. Foini, A. L. Castellanos, F. Krzakala, M. Mézard, and L. Zdeborová, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2019**, 113301 (2019).
- [45] A. Guionnet and M. Maida, Journal of functional analysis 222, 435 (2005).
- [46] F. Benaych-Georges, Journal of Theoretical Probability 24, 969 (2011).
- [47] J. Sherman and W. J. Morrison, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics 21, 124 (1950).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Appendix A: The phase transition in the rate function

In this section, we investigate possible discontinuities in the derivatives of the rate function I(x), when $d_{\max} > 0$ and $x_c(\rho)$ is finite. In this case, the function $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ is constant and equal to α/d_{\max} for $x \ge x_c(\rho)$. Recall that if $s_{\max} \le x \le x_c(\rho)$, $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ is the second branch to the Marchenko-Pastur equation (1). This equation can be written as $F_{\sigma}(G) = x$, with

$$F_{\sigma}(G) = \frac{1}{G} + \alpha \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \frac{t}{\alpha - tG}.$$
(A1)

Moreover we know that $G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) \leq \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) \leq \alpha/d_{\max}$. By differentiating the relation $F_{\sigma}(\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)) = x$, we find

$$\overline{G}'_{\sigma}(x) = 1/F'_{\sigma}(\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x))$$

Let us assume that $\rho(t) \sim (d_{\max} - t)^{\eta}$ with $\eta > 0$ and t close to d_{\max} . If $\eta \ge 1$, we have $G'_{\rho}(d_{\max}) < \infty$, so that $F'_{\sigma}(\alpha/d_{\max}) < \infty$, and $\overline{G}'_{\sigma}(x) \to 1/F'_{\sigma}(\alpha/d_{\max}) > 0$ as $x \uparrow x_c(\rho)$. The transition in I(x) is thus of second order in this case, as $\overline{G}'_{\sigma}(x)$ is discontinuous.

If we now assume that $\eta < 1$, we have $G'_{\rho}(d_{\max}) = +\infty$. By eq. (A1), this implies that $\overline{G}'_{\sigma}(x) \to 0$ as $x \uparrow x_c(\rho)$. Thus in this case both \overline{G}_{σ} and \overline{G}'_{σ} are continuous in $x = x_c(\rho)$. We can differentiate the relation $F_{\sigma}(\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)) = x$ once more, and we find easily:

$$\overline{G}_{\sigma}^{\prime\prime}(x) = -\frac{F_{\sigma}^{\prime\prime}(\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x))}{F_{\sigma}^{\prime}(\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x))^3}.$$
(A2)

From eqs. (A1), (A2), one can show that $\overline{G}''_{\sigma}(x) \to 0$ as $x \to x_c(\rho)$ if and only if $\eta < 1/2$. In particular, for any $1/2 \le \eta < 1$, the transition in I(x) is of third order.

Differentiating three times, one can show in a similar way that the transition is of fourth order if and only if $\eta \in [1/3, 1/2)$. Generalizing this to any order, we conjecture that I(x) is smooth at any point $x \neq x_c(\rho)$, and that the first discontinuous derivative of the rate function at $x = x_c(\rho)$ is $I^{(k+1)}(x)$, with $\eta \in [1/k, 1/(k-1))$ (with the convention $1/0 = +\infty$).

Appendix B: Technical details of the derivation

1. The law of H_n under the first tilt

Recall the tilted distribution

$$P_{\theta \mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{z}) \mathrm{d} \mathbf{z} \propto \mathcal{D} \mathbf{z} \ e^{\frac{\theta n}{2} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} H_n \mathbf{e}}.$$
(B1)

Computing the normalization factor, we reach that:

$$P_{\theta,\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{z}) = \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu=1}^{m}\ln\left(1-\frac{\theta}{\alpha}d_{\mu}\right) + \frac{\theta}{2\alpha}\sum_{\mu=1}^{m}d_{\mu}(\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\mu})^{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu=1}^{m}\|\mathbf{z}_{\mu}\|^{2} - \frac{nm}{2}\ln 2\pi\right\},\$$
$$=\prod_{\mu=1}^{m}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{z}_{\mu}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbb{1}_{n} - \frac{\theta}{\alpha}d_{\mu}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}})\mathbf{z}_{\mu} - \frac{n}{2}\ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2}\ln\det\left(\mathbb{1}_{n} - \frac{\theta}{\alpha}d_{\mu}\mathbf{e}\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\right)\right\}.\tag{B2}$$

The matrix $\mathbb{1}_n - \frac{\theta}{\alpha} d_\mu \mathbf{ee^{\intercal}}$ is a rank-one modification of the identity, so we easily compute

$$\left(\mathbb{1}_n - \frac{\theta}{\alpha} d_\mu \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\right)^{-1/2} = \mathbb{1}_n + \left(\left(1 - \theta d_\mu/\alpha\right)^{-1/2} - 1\right) \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}.$$
(B3)

Changing variables $\mathbf{z}'_{\mu} = \left(\mathbb{1}_n - \theta d_{\mu} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^{\intercal} / \alpha\right)^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{\mu}$ in eq. (B2) and using eq. (B3) yields the law of $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ in the main text.

2. The existence of θ_x : first tilt of the measure

Note that $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ has the same asymptotic spectral distribution as H_n , since the two matrices only differ by a rank-2 change change. We will now look for outliers of $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$, i.e. eigenvalues which are "out of the bulk", and show that we can choose θ_x so that the largest eigenvalue is an outlier that concentrates exactly on x. Let us define:

$$\gamma^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} \equiv \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} d_{\mu} \kappa_{\theta} (d_{\mu})^{2} (\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{z}_{\mu})^{2},$$
$$\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} \equiv \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} d_{\mu} \kappa_{\theta} (d_{\mu}) (\mathbf{z}_{\mu}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{e}) \mathbf{z}_{\mu}.$$

As $m \to \infty$, by the law of large numbers $\gamma^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ self-averages on $\Gamma(\theta)$ given by:

$$\Gamma(\theta) \equiv \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) t \kappa_{\theta}(t)^2. \tag{B4}$$

Note that one can write the distribution of $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ as:

$$H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} = H_n + \left(\gamma^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\right)\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} + \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\right)^{\mathsf{T}}.$$

Thus, x is an eigenvalue of $H_n^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ without being an eigenvalue of H_n if:

$$\det\left[x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n - \left(\gamma^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\right)\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} - \mathbf{e}\left(\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\right)^{\mathsf{T}}\right] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \det[x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n] \neq 0.$$

which can be rewritten as:

$$\det \left[\mathbb{1}_n - (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2} \left\{ \left(\gamma^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\right)\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} + \mathbf{e} \left(\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}\right)^{\mathsf{T}} \right\} (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2} \right] = 0.$$

Therefore one must understand when the rank-2 matrix appearing in this last equation has an eigenvalue equal to 1. A rank-2 Hermitian matrix of the form $M = t\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}} + (\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}})$ has (n-2) zero eigenvalues, and two eigenvalues equal to:

$$\lambda_{\pm}(M) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[t \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + 2\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v} \pm \sqrt{4(\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 - (\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v})^2) + (t\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + 2\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v})^2} \Big].$$
(B5)

We will use this formula with $t = \gamma^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$, $\mathbf{u} = (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2}\mathbf{e}$, and $\mathbf{v} = (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2}\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$. In order to simplify it, we will use classical concentration (or self-averaging) properties as $n, m \to \infty$, using that \mathbf{e} is uniformly taken on the sphere with $\|\mathbf{e}\|^2 = 1$. First, we have:

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} (x \mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1} \mathbf{e} \simeq G_\sigma(x).$$
(B6)

For each $\nu = 1, \dots, m$, we denote the "truncated" matrix

$$H_{n,\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\nu'(\neq\nu)} d_{\nu'} \mathbf{z}_{\nu'} \mathbf{z}_{\nu'}^{\mathsf{T}}.$$
(B7)

Then the Sherman-Morrison formula [47] implies:

$$(x\mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu} = \frac{(x\mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n,\nu})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}}{1 - \frac{d_{\nu}}{m}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n,\nu})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}} \simeq \alpha \frac{(x\mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n,\nu})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}}{\alpha - d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x)}.$$
(B8)

Moreover, by the law of large numbers, we expect $\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\mathbb{1}_n - H_{n,\nu})^{-1}\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)}$ to "self-average" in the $n \to \infty$ limit. Since $\mathbf{z}_{\nu} - (\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\nu})\mathbf{e}$ is a Gaussian random vector in the orthogonal space to \mathbf{e} , and independent of $H_{n,\nu}$, we obtain using

self-averaging and eq. (B8):

$$\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\mathbb{1}_{n}-H_{n})^{-1}\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m}d_{\nu}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})(\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{e})\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\mathbb{1}_{n}-H_{n})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}$$

$$\simeq \frac{\alpha}{m}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m}d_{\nu}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})(\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{e})\frac{\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\mathbb{1}_{n}-H_{n,\nu})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}}{\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x)}$$

$$\simeq \frac{\alpha}{m}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m}(\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\nu})^{2}\frac{d_{\nu}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})G_{\sigma}(x)}{\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x)} \simeq \frac{\alpha G_{\sigma}(x)}{m}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m}\frac{d_{\nu}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})}{\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x)},$$

$$\simeq \alpha\int \mathrm{d}t\,\rho(t)\frac{t\,\kappa_{\theta}(t)\,G_{\sigma}(x)}{\alpha-tG_{\sigma}(x)}.$$
(B9)

In a similar fashion, we compute (using again self-averaging of the involved quantities):

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)})^{\mathsf{T}}(x\,\mathbbm{1}_{n}-H_{n})^{-1}\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} &= \frac{1}{m^{2}}\sum_{\nu,\nu'=1}^{m} d_{\nu}d_{\nu'}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'})(\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\nu})(\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{e})\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\,\mathbbm{1}_{n}-H_{n})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}, \\ &\simeq \frac{\alpha}{m^{2}}\sum_{\nu,\nu'=1}^{m} d_{\nu}d_{\nu'}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'})(\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\nu})(\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{e})\frac{\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\,\mathbbm{1}_{n}-H_{n,\nu'})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}}{\alpha-d_{\nu'}G_{\sigma}(x)}, \\ &\simeq \frac{\alpha}{m^{2}}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m} d_{\nu}^{2}(\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu}))^{2}(\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\nu})^{2}\frac{\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\,\mathbbm{1}_{n}-H_{n,\nu})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu}}{\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x)} \\ &\qquad + \frac{\alpha^{2}}{m^{2}}\sum_{\nu\neq\nu'} d_{\nu}d_{\nu'}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'})(\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{z}_{\nu})(\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{e})\frac{\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}}(x\,\mathbbm{1}_{n}-H_{n,\nu,\nu'})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}}{(\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x))(\alpha-d_{\nu'}G_{\sigma}(x))}. \end{aligned}$$

We defined the "truncated" matrix $H_{n,\nu,\nu'}$ very similarly to eq. (B7), by removing this time the two indices (ν,ν') . Taking the average of the second term over \mathbf{z} yields (again decomposing the components of $\{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}\}$ in the direction of \mathbf{e}):

$$\frac{\alpha^2}{m^2} \sum_{\nu \neq \nu'} d_{\nu} d_{\nu'} \kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu}) \kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'}) (\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{z}_{\nu}) (\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{e}) \frac{\mathbf{z}_{\nu}^{\mathsf{T}} (x \mathbb{1}_n - H_{n,\nu,\nu'})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\nu'}}{(\alpha - d_{\nu} G_{\sigma}(x)) (\alpha - d_{\nu'} G_{\sigma}(x))} \\
\approx \frac{\alpha^2}{m^2} \sum_{\nu \neq \nu'} d_{\nu} d_{\nu}' \kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu}) \kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'}') (\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{z}_{\nu})^2 (\mathbf{z}_{\nu'}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{e})^2 \frac{\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} (x \mathbb{1}_n - H_{n,\nu,\nu'})^{-1} \mathbf{e}}{(\alpha - d_{\nu} G_{\sigma}(x)) (\alpha - d_{\nu'} G_{\sigma}(x))}, \\
\approx \frac{\alpha^2}{m^2} \sum_{\nu \neq \nu'} d_{\nu} d_{\nu}' \kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu}) \kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'}') \frac{G_{\sigma}(x)}{(\alpha - d_{\nu} G_{\sigma}(x)) (\alpha - d_{\nu'} G_{\sigma}(x))}.$$

Thus in the large n limit, we reach the concentration:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)})^{\mathsf{T}}(x\mathbbm{1}_{n}-H_{n})^{-1}\mathbf{h}^{(\mathbf{e},\theta)} \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m}\frac{G_{\sigma}(x)d_{\nu}^{2}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})^{2}}{\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x)} + \frac{1}{m^{2}}\sum_{\nu,\nu'=1}^{m}\frac{\alpha^{2}G_{\sigma}(x)d_{\nu}d_{\nu'}\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu})\kappa_{\theta}(d_{\nu'})}{(\alpha-d_{\nu}G_{\sigma}(x))(\alpha-d_{\nu'}G_{\sigma}(x))} \\ &\simeq G_{\sigma}(x)\int \mathrm{d}t\rho(t)\frac{t^{2}\kappa_{\theta}(t)^{2}}{\alpha-tG_{\sigma}(x)} + \alpha^{2}G_{\sigma}(x)\Big[\int \mathrm{d}t\rho(t)\frac{t\kappa_{\theta}(t)}{\alpha-tG_{\sigma}(x)}\Big]^{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(B10)

In the end using eqs. (B5),(B6),(B9),(B10) we must show that there exists a θ_x such that $\lambda_+(\theta_x, x) = 1$ with:

$$\lambda_{+}(\theta, x) \equiv \frac{G_{\sigma}(x)}{2} \bigg\{ \Gamma(\theta) + 2 \int \frac{\mathrm{d}t\rho(t)t\kappa_{\theta}(t)}{1 - \alpha^{-1}tG_{\sigma}(x)} + \sqrt{\left(\Gamma(\theta) + 2 \int \frac{\mathrm{d}t\rho(t)t\kappa_{\theta}(t)}{1 - \alpha^{-1}tG_{\sigma}(x)}\right)^{2} + \frac{4}{\alpha} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}t\rho(t)t^{2}\kappa_{\theta}(t)^{2}}{1 - \alpha^{-1}tG_{\sigma}(x)} \bigg\},$$
(B11)

with $\Gamma(\theta) \equiv \int dt \rho(t) t \kappa_{\theta}(t)^2$. From eq. (B11), we can conclude in two cases:

- If $d_{\max} > 0$ and $G_{\rho}(d_{\max}) = +\infty$, then for all $x \ge s_{\max}$, we have $\lim_{\theta \to \alpha/d_{\max}} \lambda_{+}(\theta, x) = +\infty$. Since $\lambda_{+}(0, x) = 0$, this implies that there exists θ_x such that $\lambda_{+}(\theta, x) = 1$.
- If $d_{\max} \leq 0$ and $s_{\max} < 0$, then for all $s_{\max} \leq x < 0$:

$$\lim_{\theta \to \infty} \lambda_+(\theta, x) = 1 + \frac{G_\sigma(x)}{2} \left\{ \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) t - 2x + \sqrt{\left(\int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) t - 2x \right)^2 - \frac{4x}{G_\sigma(x)}} \right\} > 1.$$

Since $\lambda_+(0, x) = 0$, this implies that there exists θ_x such that $\lambda_+(\theta, x) = 1$.

However, as emphasized in the main text, these cases do not cover the setting in which $d_{\max} > 0$ and $G_{\rho}(d_{\max}) < \infty$. We can get an intuition on the reason why our technique fails in this case. As we will see in Section C, we indeed have $\theta_x = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ whenever θ_x exists. However when $x_c(\rho) < \infty$, we need to impose $\theta < \alpha/d_{\max}$ for the tilting to be well-defined, while $\overline{G}_{\sigma}(x) = \alpha/d_{\max}$ for all $x \ge x_c(\rho)$: this implies that we can not impose $\theta_x = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$ when $x \ge x_c(\rho)$! This argument provides an intuitive explanation for how is the phase transition in the rate function responsible of the failure of this first "naive" tilting when $d_{\max} > 0$ and $x_c(\rho) < \infty$.

3. The transition in $J_2(\theta, y)$

We start from the expression of $J_2(\theta, y)$, with $y \ge 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} & J_2(\theta, y) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\substack{\Lambda_e, \Lambda_f \ge 0\\ \text{s.t. } \alpha \Lambda_e \Lambda_f \ge \theta^2 y}} \left[\Lambda_e + \alpha \Lambda_f - (\alpha - 1) \ln \Lambda_f - \int d\lambda \, \sigma(\lambda) \ln \left(\Lambda_e \Lambda_f - \frac{\theta^2}{\alpha} \lambda \right) \right] - \frac{1 + \alpha}{2}. \end{aligned}$$
(B12)

The variational parameters Λ_e , Λ_f can saturate, which is associated to a phase transition. At this point $J_2(\theta, y)$ will become sensitive to the largest eigenvalue of H_n (assumed to be equal to y). This phase transition occurs for $\theta = \theta_c(y)$ such that the corresponding values of Λ_e , Λ_f satisfy $\alpha \Lambda_e \Lambda_f = (\theta_c(y))^2 y$. From this equation and the zero-gradient equations on Λ_e , Λ_f (valid for $\theta \le \theta_c(y)$), it is easy to obtain $\theta_c(y) = \sqrt{yG_\sigma(y)^2 + (\alpha - 1)G_\sigma(y)}$.

The case $\theta \leq \theta_c(y)$. In this case $J_2(\theta, y)$ is not sensitive to the value of y, and we can use a very useful expression derived in [26] for the log-potential of $\sigma(\lambda)$. For any $x \geq s_{\max}$:

$$\int d\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda) \ln(x-\lambda) = \inf_{0 < g < G_{\sigma}(s_{\max})} \left[-\ln g + zg + \alpha \int dt \,\rho(t) \ln(\alpha - tg) \right] - 1 - \alpha \ln \alpha.$$

Note that this infimum is attained at $g = G_{\sigma}(x)$, as this value is the unique zero of the derivative of the expression above, by eq. (1). We can write from eq. (B12):

$$J_{2}(\theta, y) = -\frac{\alpha(1 - \ln \alpha)}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \inf_{0 < g < G_{\sigma}(s_{\max})} \inf_{\substack{\Lambda_{e}, \Lambda_{f} \ge 0\\(\alpha \Lambda_{e} \Lambda_{f} \ge \theta^{2} y)}} \left[\Lambda_{e} + \alpha \Lambda_{f} \right]$$

$$- (\alpha - 1) \ln \Lambda_{f} + \ln g - \frac{\alpha \Lambda_{e} \Lambda_{f}}{\theta^{2}} g - \alpha \int dt \,\rho(t) \ln(\alpha - tg) \left].$$
(B13)

Since we are in the "no-saturation" regime, we can use the zero-gradient equations on Λ_e, Λ_f :

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda_f &= \theta^2/(\alpha g), \\ \Lambda_e &= \theta^2/g - (\alpha - 1). \end{cases}$$

Plugging this back into eq. (B13) we obtain:

$$J_2(\theta, y) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{0 < g < G_\sigma(s_{\max})} \Big[\frac{\theta^2}{g} + \alpha \ln g - \alpha \ln \frac{\theta^2}{\alpha} - \alpha \int \mathrm{d}t \,\rho(t) \ln(\alpha - tg) + \alpha (\ln \alpha - 1) \Big].$$

Changing variables $\gamma = \alpha/g$, we reach:

$$J_2(\theta, y) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \inf_{\gamma \ge \alpha/G_\sigma(s_{\max})} \left[\frac{\gamma \theta^2}{\alpha^2} - \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \ln(\gamma - t) \right] - \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(1 + \ln \frac{\theta^2}{\alpha^2} \right). \tag{B14}$$

In order to map this J_2 to $F_2(\theta)$, we must only show that the Lagrange multiplier γ in eq. (B14) does not "saturate" for $\theta \leq \theta_c(y)$. This is easily shown using eq. (1). Since $\theta \leq \theta_c(y)$, we also have $\theta \leq \theta_c(s_{\max})$, and thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^2 &\leq s_{\max} G_{\sigma}(s_{\max})^2 + (\alpha - 1) G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) \leq \alpha G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) \left[1 + G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) \left(\frac{s_{\max}}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha G_{\sigma}(s_{\max})} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \alpha G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) \left[1 + G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) \int \frac{\mathrm{d}t \,\rho(t) \, t}{\alpha - t G_{\sigma}(s_{\max})} \right] \leq \alpha^2 \int \frac{\mathrm{d}t \,\rho(t)}{\alpha / G_{\sigma}(s_{\max}) - t}. \end{aligned}$$

This precisely means that the infimum in eq. (B14) will be attained for a point γ which is a critical point of the functional inside the infimum:

$$\frac{\theta^2}{\alpha^2} = \int \mathrm{d}t \,\rho(t) \frac{1}{\gamma - t},$$

i.e. there is no saturation, and we have $J_2(\theta, y) = F_2(\theta)$.

The case $\theta \ge \theta_c(y)$. In this case, we have a "saturation" in the infimum of eq. (B12). More precisely, the Λ_e, Λ_f attaining the infimum satisfy $\alpha \Lambda_e \Lambda_f = \theta^2 y$. One can solve the infimum over Λ_e, Λ_f constrained by this equality. Introducing a Lagrange parameter ρ , we reach:

$$J_{2}(\theta, y) = -\frac{1+\alpha}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} \int d\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda) \ln(y-\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\Lambda_{e}, \Lambda_{f} \ge 0} \exp_{\rho} \left[\Lambda_{e} + \alpha \Lambda_{f} - (\alpha-1) \ln \Lambda_{f} - \rho \left(\Lambda_{e} \Lambda_{f} - \frac{\theta^{2} y}{\alpha} \right) \right].$$

The extr notation denotes solving the associated zero-gradient equation, as is standard with Lagrange multipliers. One can now solve the infimum over Λ_e, Λ_f easily, and we reach:

$$J_2(\theta, y) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{extr}_{\rho} \left[\frac{\alpha}{\rho} + (\alpha - 1) \ln \rho + \frac{\rho \theta^2 y}{\alpha} - \ln \frac{\theta^2}{\alpha} - \int d\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda) \ln(y - \lambda) \right] - \frac{1 + \alpha}{2}.$$
 (B15)

This can also be solved easily, and finally we have, for $\theta \ge \theta_c(y)$:

$$J_2(\theta, y) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[-(1+\alpha) - \alpha \ln \frac{\theta^2}{\alpha} - (\alpha - 1) \ln(2y) + \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^2 + 4y\theta^2} \\ + (\alpha - 1) \ln \Big[1 - \alpha + \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^2 + 4y\theta^2} \Big] - \int d\lambda \, \sigma(\lambda) \ln(y - \lambda) \Big].$$
(B16)

This ends the argument by justifying all the expressions given for $J_2(\theta, y)$ in the main text.

The case $d_{\max} \leq 0$. In this case (not considered in the calculation of J_2) $s_{\max} \leq 0$, and the transition we described does not take place, as $\Lambda_e, \Lambda_f \geq 0$ can not satisfy $\alpha \Lambda_e \Lambda_f = \theta^2 y < 0$. The difference between the quenched and annealed integrals in this case has, as far as we know, not been investigated before, and it remains an open question. In this setting the first "naive" tilting allows to derive the large deviations, as emphasized in the main text.

4. The existence of θ_x : beyond the transition

We now perform a very similar analysis to the one of Section B 2. We show that for all $x > s_{\text{max}}$, there exists a $\theta_x \ge 0$ such that the largest eigenvalue of $H_n^{(\theta, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f})}$ concentrates on x. This condition can be stated as:

$$\det\left[\mathbb{1}_n - (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2} \left\{\gamma(\theta, \mathbf{f}) \mathbf{e} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} + \mathbf{h}(\theta, \mathbf{f}) \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} + \mathbf{e} \mathbf{h}(\theta, \mathbf{f})^{\mathsf{T}}\right\} (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2}\right] = 0,$$
(B17)

in which we defined:

$$\begin{cases} \gamma(\theta, \mathbf{f}) &\equiv (\theta^2 / \alpha^2) \sum_{\mu=1}^m d_\mu^2 f_\mu^2, \\ \mathbf{h}(\theta, \mathbf{f}) &\equiv (\theta / (\alpha \sqrt{m})) \sum_{\mu=1}^m \mathbb{1}_{\{d_\mu \ge 0\}} d_\mu^{3/2} f_\mu \mathbf{z}_\mu. \end{cases}$$
(B18)

In the large *n* limit, $\gamma(\theta, \mathbf{f})$ concentrates on $\Gamma(\theta)$ given by $\Gamma(\theta) \equiv (\theta^2/\alpha^2) \int dt \,\rho(t)t^2$. We denote $\mathbf{u} \equiv (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2}\mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{v} \equiv (x\mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1/2}\mathbf{h}(\theta, \mathbf{f})$. Exactly as in Section B2, eq. (B17) can be rewritten as $\lambda_+(\theta, x) = 1$, with

$$\lambda_{+}(\theta, x) \equiv \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{2} \Big[\Gamma(\theta) \|\mathbf{u}\|^{2} + 2\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v} + \sqrt{4(\|\mathbf{u}\|^{2}\|\mathbf{v}\|^{2} - (\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v})^{2}) + (\Gamma(\theta)\|\mathbf{u}\|^{2} + 2\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v})^{2}} \Big].$$

We make use of the Sherman-Morisson formula [47] to compute the norms and inner products involved in this formula. We reach easily:

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} (x \mathbb{1}_n - H_n)^{-1} \mathbf{e} \simeq G_\sigma(x).$$
(B19)

Similarly, we reach:

$$\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{v} = \frac{\theta}{\alpha\sqrt{m}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\mu}\geq 0\}} d_{\mu}^{3/2} f_{\mu} \mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} (x \mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\mu},$$

$$\simeq \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\mu}\geq 0\}} d_{\mu}^{3/2} f_{\mu} \frac{\mathbf{e}^{\mathsf{T}} (x \mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n,\mu})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\mu}}{\alpha - d_{\mu} G_{\sigma}(x)} \simeq 0,$$
(B20)

by independence of the present variables (in particular \mathbf{e} and \mathbf{f}). We also reach (recall the definition of the "truncated" matrices in eq. (B7)):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}\|^{2} &= \frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha^{2}m} \sum_{\mu,\nu=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\mu} \ge 0\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\nu} \ge 0\}} d_{\mu}^{3/2} d_{\nu}^{3/2} f_{\mu} f_{\nu} \mathbf{z}_{\mu}^{\intercal} (x \mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\nu}, \\ &\simeq \frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha m} \sum_{\mu=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\mu} \ge 0\}} d_{\mu}^{3} f_{\mu}^{2} \frac{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}^{\intercal} (x \mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n,\mu})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\mu}}{\alpha - d_{\mu} G_{\sigma}(x)} \\ &+ \frac{\theta^{2}}{m} \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\mu} \ge 0\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{d_{\nu} \ge 0\}} d_{\mu}^{3/2} d_{\nu}^{3/2} f_{\mu} f_{\nu} \frac{\mathbf{z}_{\mu}^{\intercal} (x \mathbb{1}_{n} - H_{n,\mu,\nu})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{\nu}}{(\alpha - d_{\mu} G_{\sigma}(x)) (\alpha - d_{\nu} G_{\sigma}(x))}, \\ &\simeq \frac{\theta^{2} G_{\sigma}(x)}{\alpha^{2}} \int \nu(\mathrm{d}t) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \ge 0\}} \frac{t^{3}}{\alpha - t G_{\sigma}(x)}. \end{aligned}$$
(B21)

We finally reach:

$$\lambda_{+}(\theta, x) = \frac{G_{\sigma}(x)}{2} \Big[\frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} \int \mathrm{d}t\rho(t)t^{2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} \int \mathrm{d}t\rho(t)t^{2}\right)^{2} + \frac{4\theta^{2}}{\alpha^{3}} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}t\rho(t)\mathbb{1}_{\{t\geq 0\}}t^{3}}{1 - \alpha^{-1}tG_{\sigma}(x)}} \Big]. \tag{B22}$$

In particular, for any $x \ge s_{\max}$, we have $\lambda_+(0, x) = 0$ and $\lambda_+(\theta, x) \sim G_{\sigma}(x)\theta^2 \int dt \rho(t)t^2/\alpha^2 \to \infty$ as $\theta \to \infty$. Therefore there exists $\theta_x \ge 0$ s.t. $\lambda_+(\theta_x, x) = 1$, for any $x \ge s_{\max}$, regardless of the transition point $x_c(\rho)$.

Appendix C: Simplifying the rate function

1. When $d_{\max} \leq 0$

The goal of this section is to show, for all $s_{\max} \leq x < 0$:

$$\underbrace{\sup_{\theta \ge 0} [J_1(\theta, x) - F_1(\theta)]}_{I(x)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{s_{\max}}^x [\overline{G}_{\sigma}(u) - G_{\sigma}(u)] \mathrm{d}u.$$
(C1)

Recall eq. (8):

$$J_1(\theta, x) = \begin{cases} F_1(\theta) = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \ln(1 - \alpha^{-1}\theta t) & \text{if } \theta \le G_\sigma(x), \\ \frac{\theta x - 1 - \ln \theta}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathrm{d}\lambda \ \sigma(\lambda) \ln(x - \lambda) & \text{if } \theta \ge G_\sigma(x). \end{cases}$$
(C2)

Differentiating with respect to θ in this equation, we reach:

$$\partial_{\theta}[J_1(\theta, x) - F_1(\theta)] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \theta \le G_{\sigma}(x), \\ \frac{\theta x - 1}{2\theta} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \int \mathrm{d}t \,\rho(t) \frac{t}{\alpha - \theta t} & \text{if } \theta > G_{\sigma}(x). \end{cases}$$
(C3)

So the supremum $\sup_{\theta>0}[J_1(\theta, x) - F_1(\theta)]$ is attained for $\theta = \theta_x > G_{\sigma}(x)$ that satisfies:

$$x = \frac{1}{\theta} + \alpha \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \frac{t}{\alpha - \theta t}.$$

Note that this is exactly the Marchenko-Pastur equation (1), so that θ_x is the second "branch" to the Marchenko-Pastur equation, i.e. precisely $\theta_x = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$. Moreover, we know that $I(s_{\text{max}} = 0)$, and we conclude by noticing that:

$$I'(x) = \partial_x [J_1(\theta_x, x) - F_1(\theta_x)] = \frac{\theta_x}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda)}{x - \lambda} = \frac{1}{2} [\overline{G}_\sigma(x) - G_\sigma(x)].$$

2. When $d_{\max} > 0$

Our objective is to show, for all $x \ge s_{\max}$:

$$I(x) = \sup_{\theta \ge 0} [J_2(\theta, x) - F_2(\theta)] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{s_{\max}}^x [\overline{G}_\sigma(u) - G_\sigma(u)] \mathrm{d}u.$$
(C4)

Recall the functions J_2 and F_2 (with $\theta_c(x) = \sqrt{xG_\sigma(x)^2 + (\alpha - 1)G_\sigma(x)}$):

$$J_{2}(\theta, x) = \begin{cases} F_{2}(\theta) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \inf_{\gamma \ge d_{\max}} \left[\frac{\gamma \theta^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} - \int \mathrm{d}t \rho(t) \ln(\gamma - t) - 1 - \ln \frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} \right] & \text{if } \theta \le \theta_{c}(x), \\ \frac{\alpha - 1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1 - \alpha + \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^{2} + 4x\theta^{2}}}{2x} \right] - \frac{1 + \alpha}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \ln \frac{\theta^{2}}{\alpha} \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\alpha - 1)^{2} + 4x\theta^{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathrm{d}\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda) \ln(x - \lambda) & \text{if } \theta \ge \theta_{c}(x). \end{cases}$$
(C5)

We perform the change of variable $\theta(\tau, x)^2 \equiv x\tau^2 + (\alpha - 1)\tau$. At the critical value $\theta_c(x)$, we have $\tau_c(x) = G_{\sigma}(x)$. We obtain the expression of the rate function as $I(x) = \sup_{\tau \geq G_{\sigma}(x)} I(x, \tau)$, with $I(x, \tau) = J(\tau, x) - F(\tau, x)$, in which we naturally defined:

$$J(\tau, x) = = \frac{1}{2} \Big\{ -2 - \alpha \ln\left[\frac{\tau x}{\alpha} + 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right] - \ln(\tau) + 2x\tau - \int d\lambda \,\sigma(\lambda) \ln(x - \lambda) \Big\}.$$
 (C6)

Note that we have the following expression for $F(\tau, x)$:

$$F(\tau, x) = \tag{C7}$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{0}^{\theta(\tau, x)^{2}/\alpha^{2}} \left[G_{\rho}^{-1}(u) - \frac{1}{u} \right] \mathrm{d}u & \text{if } \theta(\tau, x)^{2} \leq \alpha^{2} G_{\rho}(d_{\max}), \\ \frac{\alpha}{2} \left[\frac{d_{\max}\theta(\tau, x)^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} - \int \mathrm{d}t\rho(t) \ln(d_{\max} - t) - 1 - \ln \frac{\theta(\tau, x)^{2}}{\alpha^{2}} \right] & \text{if } \theta(\tau, x)^{2} \geq \alpha^{2} G_{\rho}(d_{\max}). \end{cases}$$

We then compute $\tau_x \equiv \operatorname{argmax}_{\tau \geq G_{\sigma}(x)}[J(\tau, x) - F(\tau, x)]$ using the derivatives of eqs. (C6),(C7):

$$\partial_{\tau}[J(\tau, x) - F(\tau, x)] =$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{(2\tau x + \alpha - 1)}{2\alpha\tau} (\alpha - \tau G_{\rho}^{-1}[\theta(\tau, x)^2 / \alpha^2]) & \text{if } \theta_c(x)^2 \le \theta(\tau, x)^2 \le \alpha^2 G_{\rho}(d_{\max}), \\ \frac{(2\tau x + \alpha - 1)}{2\alpha\tau} (\alpha - \tau d_{\max}) & \text{if } \theta(\tau, x)^2 \ge \alpha^2 G_{\rho}(d_{\max}). \end{cases}$$
(C8)

For all $s_{\max} \leq x \leq x_c(\rho) \equiv d_{\max}G_{\rho}(d_{\max})^2 + (\alpha^{-1} - 1)d_{\max}$, the equation $\alpha = \tau G_{\rho}^{-1}[\theta(\tau, x)^2/\alpha^2]$ is again the Marchenko-Pastur equation (1), with $\omega = \tau$. Since $\tau_x > G_{\sigma}(x)$, it is easy to check from eq. (C8) that the supremum is attained in $\tau_x = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$. This is true even if $x > x_c(\rho)$, as the maximum is attained in $\tau = \alpha/d_{\max} = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$, again from eq. (C8). Moreover we can compute from eq. (C4):

$$I'(x) = \partial_x (J-F)(\tau_x, x) + (\partial_x \tau_x) \underbrace{\partial_\tau (J-F)(\tau_x, x)}_{=0} = \partial_x [J-F](\tau_x, x) = \frac{1}{2} [\tau_x - G_\sigma(x)]$$

Since $I(s_{\max}) = 0$ and $\tau_x = \overline{G}_{\sigma}(x)$, this last equality implies eq. (C4).