

BBP PHENOMENA FOR DEFORMED RANDOM BAND MATRICES

BENSON AU

ABSTRACT. We study additive finite-rank perturbations of random periodic band matrices under the assumption that the nontrivial eigenvalues of the perturbation do not depend on the dimension. We establish the eigenvalue/eigenvector BBP transition in this model for band widths $b_N \gg N^\varepsilon$. Our analysis relies on moment method calculations for general vector states.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Background	5
3. Proofs of the main results	8
3.1. The isotropic global law	8
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3	19
References	23

1. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the spectral statistics of random matrices is a fundamental problem at the interface of mathematics, physics, and statistics. This confluence can already be observed in the classical Wigner ensemble, a mean-field model originally proposed by Wigner as a tractable proxy for the Hamiltonian of a large quantum system. In the intervening years, the definition of a Wigner matrix has become increasingly general. For concreteness, we state our working definition below.

Definition 1.1 (Wigner matrix). Let $(\mathbf{X}_N(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N \in \mathbb{N})$ be a family of independent random variables such that

- (i) the off-diagonal entries ($i < j$) are complex-valued, centered, and of variance σ^2 ;
- (ii) the diagonal entries ($i = j$) are real-valued and of finite variance;
- (iii) we have a strong uniform control on the moments: for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1) \quad \sup_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{X}_N(i, j)|^m] < \infty.$$

We call the random Hermitian matrix defined by $\mathbf{W}_N(i, j) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{X}_N(i, j)$ a *normalized Wigner matrix of variance σ^2* and use the notation $\mathbf{W}_N \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Wigner}(N, \sigma^2)$. When the context is clear, we simply refer to a Wigner matrix. Hereafter, when we refer to a Wigner matrix \mathbf{W}_N , we implicitly refer to a sequence of Wigner matrices $(\mathbf{W}_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Being Hermitian, we can order the eigenvalues of a Wigner matrix $\lambda_1(\mathbf{W}_N) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N(\mathbf{W}_N)$. The natural question of the limiting distribution of these eigenvalues was settled by Wigner under some simplifying assumptions on the distributions of the entries [Wig55, Wig58] and by Pastur in the general case with the moment assumption (iii) replaced by the much weaker Lindeberg

Date: April 27, 2023.

Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, bensonau@berkeley.edu.

condition [Pas72] (see also [BS10, Theorem 2.9]): if $\mathbf{W}_N \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Wigner}(N, \sigma^2)$, then the empirical spectral distribution $\mu_{\mathbf{W}_N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k \in [N]} \delta_{\lambda_k(\mathbf{W}_N)}$ converges weakly almost surely to the semicircle distribution $\mu_{\text{SC}, \sigma^2}(dx) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{|x| \leq 2\sigma\}}}{2\pi\sigma^2} \sqrt{4\sigma^2 - x^2} dx$.

The semicircle law governs the *global* behavior of the eigenvalues; however, the physical interpretation primarily concerns the *local* eigenvalue statistics of the matrix, in particular their conjectured universality [Wig67]. Eigenvector statistics, as pioneered by Anderson [And58], are a related line of inquiry. In particular, the Anderson tight binding model exhibits localized eigenfunctions [FS83, FMSS85, AM93, Aiz94] and Poisson local eigenvalue statistics [Min96]. Following a long line of work, the universality phenomenon for Wigner matrices is now well-understood [BGK17, EY17]: some highlights include GOE/GUE universality for the local eigenvalue statistics and complete delocalization of the eigenvectors. Random band matrices emerge as a natural interpolative model to study the transition between these two phases [Bou18].

Definition 1.2 (Random band matrix). Let $(\mathbf{X}_N(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N \in \mathbb{N})$ be as in Definition 1.1. For band widths $(b_N : N \in \mathbb{N}) \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, we define

$$\xi_N = \min\{2b_N + 1, N\}.$$

Similarly, we define the N -periodic distance

$$|i - j|_N = \min\{|i - j|, N - |i - j|\}.$$

A *periodic* $(0, 1)$ -band matrix of band width b_N is a real symmetric matrix \mathbf{B}_N with entries

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{B}_N(i, j) = \mathbb{1}_{\{|i - j|_N \leq b_N\}}.$$

We call the random Hermitian matrix defined by

$$(3) \quad \Xi_N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi_N}} \mathbf{B}_N \circ \mathbf{X}_N$$

a *normalized periodic random band matrix of variance σ^2 and band width b_N* and use the notation $\Xi_N \stackrel{d}{=} \text{RBM}(N, \sigma^2, b_N)$. Here, \circ denotes the entrywise product. When the context is clear, we simply refer to a random band matrix. Hereafter, when we refer to a random band matrix Ξ_N , we implicitly refer to a sequence of random band matrices $(\Xi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$.

A long-standing conjecture proposes a dichotomy for random band matrices: delocalization and Wigner local statistics for large band widths; localization and Poisson local statistics for small band widths; and a sharp transition around the critical band width rate $b_N \asymp \sqrt{N}$ [CMI90, FM91]. Recent progress has established delocalization (in fact, quantum unique ergodicity) for $b_N \gg N^{3/4}$ [BYY20] and localization for $b_N \ll N^{1/4}$ [CPSS, CS].

Wigner matrices also appear in statistics, where deformed versions are studied as a prototype of a spiked model. Here, spectral properties can be used to differentiate the spiked model from the null case [BBAP05, Péc06], a phenomenon known as the BBP transition. To explain this transition, we first review the relevant results in the null case of a Wigner matrix. We assume that the off-diagonal entries in (i) are i.i.d. and similarly for the diagonal entries in (ii), but we no longer assume the existence of moments as in (iii). Recall that

- (W1) The extremal eigenvalues are known to converge to the edge of the support of the semicircle distribution iff the off-diagonal entries have a finite fourth moment $\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{X}_N(1, 2)|^4] < \infty$ [BY88, BS10]. So, for example, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(\mathbf{W}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} -2\sigma$; however, without a finite fourth moment, $\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(\mathbf{W}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} -\infty$.
- (W2) The fluctuations of the extremal eigenvalues in the GOE/GUE were found in [TW94, TW96] and shown to be universal in [Sos99] assuming sub-Gaussianity of the entries. The optimal rate of decay for universality was found in [LY14] to be $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s^4 \mathbb{P}(|\mathbf{X}_N(1, 2)| > s) = 0$.

For example, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(N^{2/3}(\lambda_N(\mathbf{W}_N) - 2\sigma) \leq s\sigma) = F_\beta(s)$, where F_β is the CDF of the Tracy-Widom distribution of parameter β . In particular, we note the $N^{-2/3}$ scale of the fluctuations.

- (W3) As noted before, the (ℓ^2 -normalized) eigenvectors $(\mathbf{w}_N^{(k)})_{k \in [N]}$ of \mathbf{W}_N are completely delocalized. For example, if we assume finite moments as in (iii), then for any $\varepsilon, D > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(\max_{k \in [N]} \|\mathbf{w}_N^{(k)}\|_\infty \geq N^{\varepsilon-1/2}) \leq N^{-D}$ [BGK17, Theorem 1.2.10].

The spiked Wigner model introduces an additive perturbation \mathbf{A}_N to our matrix. We assume that \mathbf{A}_N is self-adjoint and of fixed rank $r_N \equiv r$. We further assume that the nontrivial eigenvalues of \mathbf{A}_N do not depend on N : we denote them by $\theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_r$. Since the perturbation is finite-rank, the empirical spectral distribution of the spiked model $\mathbf{M}_N = \mathbf{W}_N + \mathbf{A}_N$ still converges to the semicircle distribution. The presence of \mathbf{A}_N can however be detected by the extremal spectral statistics (cf. (W1)-(W3)). Recall that

- (S1) Each eigenvalue θ_s of \mathbf{A}_N such that $|\theta_s| > \sigma$ creates an outlying eigenvalue in \mathbf{M}_N . In particular, if $L_{-\sigma} = \#\{s \in [r] : \theta_s < -\sigma\}$ and $L_{+\sigma} = \#\{s \in [r] : \theta_s > \sigma\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_k + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_k} < -2\sigma, & \forall k \in [L_{-\sigma}]; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{L_{-\sigma}+1}(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} -2\sigma; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N+1-k}(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_{r+1-k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{r+1-k}} > 2\sigma, & \forall k \in [L_{+\sigma}]; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N-L_{+\sigma}}(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 2\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

- (S2) The fluctuations of the outlying eigenvalues are nonuniversal. We omit the precise statement of the result in this case and simply note the $N^{-1/2}$ scale of the fluctuations.
- (S3) The eigenspace of an outlying eigenvalue in \mathbf{M}_N has nontrivial alignment with the eigenspace of the corresponding eigenvalue in \mathbf{A}_N . In particular, let $\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}$ be a unit eigenvector associated with the eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\mathbf{M}_N)$. If $k \in [L_{-\sigma}]$, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| P_{\ker(\theta_k \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}) \right\|_2^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_k^2},$$

where $P_{\ker(\theta_k \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the eigenspace $\ker(\theta_k \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)$; however, if $\theta_{k'} \neq \theta_k$, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| P_{\ker(\theta_{k'} \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}) \right\|_2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0.$$

Similarly, if $k \in [L_{+\sigma}]$, then one replaces all instances of k in the superscripts with $N+1-k$ and all instances of k in the subscripts with $r+1-k$ in the above.

- (S4) On the other hand, if θ_k does not meet the threshold in (S1) for the creation of an outlier, then the eigenspace of the associated eigenvalue in \mathbf{M}_N is asymptotically orthogonal to $\ker(\mathbf{A}_N)^\perp$. In particular, if $\theta_k \in [-\sigma, 0)$, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| P_{\ker(\theta_{k'} \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}) \right\|_2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0, \quad \forall k' \in [r].$$

Similarly, if $\theta_{r+1-k} \in (0, \sigma]$, then one replaces $\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}$ with $\mathbf{m}_N^{(N+1-k)}$ in the above.

The outlier phenomenon in (S1) was first proven for the GUE in [Péc06], extended to Wigner matrices satisfying a Poincaré inequality in [CDMF09], and then relaxed to a fourth moment Lindeberg-type condition in [PRS13, RS13] at the cost of convergence in probability. In the complex case, we note that the assumption $\text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_N(i, j)) \perp \text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_N(i, j))$ are identically distributed is present throughout. The works [CDMF09, CDMF12, PRS13, RS13] address the fluctuations touched

on in (S2). Much finer results are known if one assumes uniform subexponential decay of the entries, in which case one can leverage the isotropic local semicircle law [KY13, KY14], but we will not discuss this further. The eigenvector alignment in (S3) was first proven for general unitarily/orthogonally invariant random matrices in [BGN11] and extended to Wigner matrices satisfying a Poincaré inequality in [Cap13]. The nonalignment in (S4) was proven for the same invariant ensembles in [BGN11] under the assumption of a rank one perturbation $r = 1$.

In this paper, we study the spiked RBM model $\mathbf{M}_N = \mathbf{\Xi}_N + \mathbf{A}_N$. Our main result proves that the eigenvalue/eigenvector BBP transition persists for band widths $b_N \gg N^\varepsilon$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$ be a RBM as in Definition 1.2. If $b_N \gg N^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then the spiked RBM model $\mathbf{M}_N = \mathbf{\Xi}_N + \mathbf{A}_N$ exhibits the eigenvalue/eigenvector BBP transition in (S1), (S3), and (S4).*

We briefly outline the proof of Theorem 1.3. In the case of a rank one perturbation $\theta \mathbf{a}_N \mathbf{a}_N^*$ of a Wigner matrix \mathbf{W}_N , Noiry computed the limiting spectral measure μ_θ of $\mathbf{W}_N + \theta \mathbf{a}_N \mathbf{a}_N^*$ with respect to the vector state $\tau_N(\cdot) = \langle \cdot, \mathbf{a}_N \rangle$ [Noi21, Proposition 2]. In particular,

$$(4) \quad \mu_\theta(dx) = \frac{\mathbb{1}\{|x| \leq 2\sigma\}}{2\pi} \frac{\sqrt{4\sigma^2 - x^2}}{\theta^2 + \sigma^2 - \theta x} dx + \mathbb{1}\{|\theta| > \sigma\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta^2}\right) \delta_{\theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta}}(dx).$$

The strong convergence (W1) of \mathbf{W}_N and Weyl's interlacing inequality [HJ13, Theorem 4.3.1] then imply (S1) and (S3) in the spiked Wigner model for $r = 1$ [Noi21, Corollary 3] (in fact, (S4) also follows from the same calculation). Noiry's proof of (4) uses the local law in [KY17, Theorem 12.2], but he mentions that simpler arguments suffice in the case of standard basis vectors (for example, the resolvent estimates in [Cap13, Proposition 6.2]).

In contrast to the usual approach to outliers via the resolvent, our analysis relies on moment method calculations for general vector states. In particular, we prove a seemingly innocuous isotropic *global* law in Proposition 3.6. In its simplest form, it states that if $b_N \gg N^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then

$$(5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \mathbf{x}_N^{(s-1)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \mathbf{\Xi}_N^{m_s} \right) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \prod_{s=1}^r \left[\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)} \rangle \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Xi}_N^{m_s})] \right],$$

where $\mathbf{x}_N^{(r)} = \mathbf{x}_N^{(0)}$. The proof of Theorem 1.3 now follows. Indeed, let $\mathbf{A}_N = \sum_{s=1}^r \theta_s \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)*}$ be the spectral decomposition of the perturbation. The formula in (5) tells us that the limiting moments of $\mathbf{\Xi}_N + \mathbf{A}_N$ with respect to the vector state $\tau_N^{(s')}(\cdot) = \langle \cdot, \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \rangle$ coincide with the limiting moments of $\mathbf{W}_N + \theta_{s'} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*}$ with respect to the same vector state for any $s' \in [r]$. Since the measure in (4) is uniquely determined by its moments (being compactly supported), this shows that the limiting spectral measure of $\mathbf{\Xi}_N + \mathbf{A}_N$ with respect to the vector state $\tau_N^{(s')}$ is again given by $\mu_{\theta_{s'}}$. To complete the proof, we use the strong convergence of $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$ [BvH, Corollary 2.18] and an inductive application of Weyl's interlacing inequality.

Remark 1.4. Naturally, one can ask for the optimal band width rate in Theorem 1.3. The strategy above proves the eigenvalue/eigenvector BBP transition for $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$ whenever we have the isotropic global law and the strong convergence of $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$. If $b_N \gg 1$, then the convergence in (5) still holds in probability. The limiting factor is then the strong convergence of $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$. Here, there is a “tradeoff between sparsity and integrability of the entries” [BvH, Remark 7.13]. For example, if one assumes the uniform bound $\|\mathbf{X}_N(i, j)\|_p \leq (Cp)^\alpha$ for some constants $C, \alpha \in [0, \infty)$ independent of p , then $\|\mathbf{\Xi}_N\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 2\sigma$ for band widths $b_N \gg [\log(N)]^{6(1+\alpha)}$ [BGP14, Theorem 1.4], where $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$ denotes convergence in probability (see also [BvH, Corollary 2.18]). In the case of Rademacher entries, the convergence $\|\mathbf{\Xi}_N\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 2\sigma$ is known for band widths $b_N \gg \log(N)$ [Sod10, Theorem 1.4]; for Gaussian entries, the rate $b_N \gg \log(N)$ is in fact optimal [BvH16, Corollary 4.4]. Thus, one also

has (S1), (S3), and (S4) *in probability* for spiked Gaussian RBMs for the optimal band width rate $b_N \gg \log(N)$.

Remark 1.5. A key input to our analysis is the calculation of the limiting spectral measure in (4). Given the moment determinacy of μ_θ , this calculation should in principle be possible purely on the basis of (5). In fact, the relationship between the matrices $(\mathbf{x}_N^{(s-1)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*})_{s=1}^r$ and $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$ in (5) is a particular instance of infinitesimal freeness, a concept introduced in [BS12]. Shlyakhtenko used the infinitesimal framework to give an interpretation for the eigenvalue BBP transition in unitarily invariant ensembles at the level of the $\frac{1}{N}$ correction [Shl18]. This was further developed by Collins, Hasebe, and Sakuma in [CHS18] using their framework of cyclic monotone independence. The recent breakthrough of Cébron, Dahlqvist, and Gabriel in [CDG] unifies these and other notions (e.g., conditional freeness [BLS96] and monotone independence [Mur01]) and provides a rigorous derivation of the BBP transition from noncommutative probabilistic methods. In particular, the calculation of (4) in the case of a rank one perturbation of the GUE can be realized as the monotone convolution $\mu_\theta = \delta_\theta \triangleright \mu_{SC, \sigma^2}$ [CDG, Section 1.4]. As we will not use this framework, we do not discuss this further.

We highlight an interesting feature of Theorem 1.3. The original proofs of (S1), (S3), and (S4) for unitarily/orthogonally invariant random matrices in [BGN11] crucially uses the fact that the eigenvectors of an invariant ensemble are Haar distributed. The authors remark that the proofs could possibly be adapted to random matrices with Haar-like eigenvectors [BGN11, Remark 2.15]. On the other hand, Theorem 1.3 still holds in the established localized regime $b_N \ll N^{1/4}$. For example, consider a rank one perturbation $\mathbf{A}_N = \theta \mathbf{a}_N \mathbf{a}_N^*$ with $\theta < -\sigma$. The alignment in (S3) amounts to the convergence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} |\langle \mathbf{a}_N, \mathbf{m}_N^{(1)} \rangle|^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta^2}.$$

For $\frac{\sigma^2}{\theta^2}$ small, this implies that the eigenvector $\mathbf{m}_N^{(1)}$ of the spiked model $\mathbf{M}_N = \mathbf{\Xi}_N + \theta \mathbf{a}_N \mathbf{a}_N^*$ takes on the shape of the eigenvector \mathbf{a}_N of the perturbation: if \mathbf{a}_N is localized, then so too is $\mathbf{m}_N^{(1)}$; if \mathbf{a}_N is delocalized, then so too is $\mathbf{m}_N^{(1)}$.

We do not address the fluctuations of the outlying eigenvalues in the spiked RBM model in this article (in particular, the analogue of (S2)). Here, the *scale* of the fluctuations depends on the shape of the perturbing eigenvectors. This will be the subject of future work. See [Au21, Section 2] for heuristics and simulations.

Remark 1.6. We have stated our results for RBMs, but the isotropic global law holds more generally for k_N -sparse Wigner matrices. Here, one replaces the $(0, 1)$ -band matrix \mathbf{B}_N (resp., the normalization term $\sqrt{\xi_N}$) in the entrywise product (3) with the adjacency matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_N$ of a k_N -regular graph on the vertex set $[N]$ (resp., the normalization term $\sqrt{k_N}$). If $k_N \gg N^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then we again have the strong convergence of this model to the semicircle law [BvH, Corollary 2.18]. Thus, Theorem 1.3 extends to k_N -sparse Wigner matrices: the minor modifications necessary for the proof are contained in Remarks 3.2 and 3.4.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Guillaume Cébron for bringing his attention to the works [Noi21, CDG]. The author also thanks Jorge Garza-Vargas and Shirshendu Ganguly for many helpful conversations.

2. BACKGROUND

Let $\text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ denote the set of complex $N \times N$ matrices. For a Hermitian matrix $\mathbf{H}_N \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$, we write $\mathbf{H}_N = \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k(\mathbf{H}_N) \mathbf{h}_N^{(k)} \mathbf{h}_N^{(k)*}$ for its spectral decomposition.

Definition 2.1 (Spectral measure with respect to a state ψ). Let $\psi : \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a state (i.e., a positive linear functional such that $\psi(\mathbf{I}_N) = 1$). We define the *spectral measure of \mathbf{H}_N with respect to ψ* as the unique probability measure $\mu_{\mathbf{H}_N}^\psi$ such that

$$\int x^m \mu_{\mathbf{H}_N}^\psi(dx) = \psi(\mathbf{H}_N^m), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Example 2.2 (Spectral measure with respect to a vector state). The empirical spectral distribution $\mu_{\mathbf{H}_N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_{\lambda_k(\mathbf{H}_N)}$ is the spectral measure with respect to the normalized trace $\mu_{\mathbf{H}_N} = \mu_{\mathbf{H}_N}^{\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}}$. In the case of a vector state $\psi(\cdot) = \langle \cdot \mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{u}_N \rangle$, we use the notation $\mu_{\mathbf{H}_N}^{\mathbf{u}_N}$. The spectral decomposition implies that

$$\mu_{\mathbf{H}_N}^{\mathbf{u}_N} = \sum_{k=1}^N |\langle \mathbf{u}_N, \mathbf{h}_N^{(k)} \rangle|^2 \delta_{\lambda_k(\mathbf{H}_N)}.$$

More generally, we will need to compute quantities of the form

$$\prod_{s=1}^r \langle p_s(\mathcal{H}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)} \rangle = \prod_{s=1}^r \text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{H}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right),$$

where $p_s(\vec{z}) \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$ is a noncommutative polynomial evaluated on a family of Hermitian matrices $\mathcal{H}_N = (\mathbf{H}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$. We write the inner product as a trace to suggest the usual graphical approach to such calculations, with a slight modification to distinguish the matrix $\mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*}$.

Definition 2.3 (Graphs of matrices). A *multidigraph* $G = (V, E, \text{src}, \text{tar})$ consists of a nonempty set of vertices V , a set of edges E , and directions $\text{src}, \text{tar} : E \rightarrow V$ indicating the source and target of each edge. A *test graph* $T = (G, \gamma)$ is a finite multidigraph G with edge labels $\gamma : E \rightarrow I$. For a partition $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)$, we construct the *quotient test graph* $T^\pi = (G^\pi, \gamma^\pi)$ by merging the vertices of G so that $V^\pi = \pi$. The underlying multidigraph $G^\pi = (V^\pi, E^\pi, \text{src}^\pi, \text{tar}^\pi)$ and the associated edge labels $\gamma^\pi : E^\pi \rightarrow I$ can then be written as

- (i) $V^\pi = V / \sim_\pi = \{[v]_\pi : v \in V\}$ and $E^\pi = E$;
- (ii) $\text{src}^\pi(e) = [\text{src}(e)]_\pi$ and $\text{tar}^\pi(e) = [\text{tar}(e)]_\pi$;
- (iii) $\gamma^\pi = \gamma$.

For convenience, we simply write $G^\pi = (V^\pi, E)$. By a slight abuse of notation, we often speak of a test graph T and its underlying multidigraph G interchangeably. For example, we also use the notation $\mathcal{V}(T)$ and $\mathcal{E}(T)$ for the vertex set and the edge set of a test graph respectively.

We can evaluate a test graph T on a family of matrices $\mathcal{M}_N = (\mathbf{M}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ using the formula

$$\chi(T, \mathcal{M}_N) := \sum_{\phi: V \rightarrow [N]} \prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{M}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)),$$

where $(\phi(e)) := (\phi(\text{tar}(e)), \phi(\text{src}(e))) \in [N]^2$. Similarly, we define

$$\chi^0(T, \mathcal{M}_N) := \sum_{\phi: V \hookrightarrow [N]} \prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{M}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)),$$

where $\phi : V \hookrightarrow [N]$ denotes an injective map. The functions χ and χ^0 are related by the Möbius formula

$$\chi(T, \mathcal{M}_N) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)} \chi^0(T^\pi, \mathcal{M}_N).$$

Example 2.4 (Moments). For a monomial $p(\vec{z}) = z_{i(1)} \cdots z_{i(d)} \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$ of degree d ,

$$(6) \quad \text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{M}_N)) = \chi(C_p, \mathcal{M}_N) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}(C_p))} \chi^0(C_p^\pi, \mathcal{M}_N),$$

where C_p is the test graph

$$(7) \quad C_p = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} i(1) \\ \bullet \\ \rightarrow \\ \bullet \\ i(2) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \rightarrow \\ \bullet \\ i(d) \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \rightarrow \\ \bullet \\ i(3) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \rightarrow \\ \bullet \\ i(d-1) \end{array} \\ \dots \end{array}$$

Example 2.5 (Random band matrices). Let $\mathcal{W}_N = (\mathbf{W}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ be a family of independent Wigner matrices $\mathbf{W}_N^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Wigner}(N, \sigma_i^2)$ as in Definition 1.1. Mixed moments in the family \mathcal{W}_N are governed by free independence in the large dimension limit [Voi91, Dyk93]: if $p(\mathcal{Z})$ is a monomial as in Example 2.4, then

$$(8) \quad \tau(p) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{W}_N)) \right] = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{NC}_2(d)} \prod_{\{j,k\} \in \pi} \sigma_{i(j)} \sigma_{i(k)} \mathbf{1} \{i(j) = i(k)\},$$

where $\mathcal{NC}_2(d)$ is the set of noncrossing pair partitions of $[d]$. We showed that the same convergence holds for a family $\mathcal{Z}_N = (\Xi_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ of independent RBMs $\Xi_N^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{RBM}(N, \sigma_i^2, b_N^{(i)})$ as in Definition 1.2 assuming $b_N^{(i)} \gg 1$ for each $i \in I$ [Au18], generalizing the result for a single RBM $\#(I) = 1$ [BMP91].

We briefly recall the strategy for proving (8) based on the graph formalism in Definition 2.3. Example 2.4 reduces the calculation to understanding the asymptotics of $\mathbb{E}[\chi^0(C_p^\pi, \mathcal{Z}_N)]$ for each $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}(C_p))$. It turns out that only a certain class of graphs survive in the limit, so-called double trees. Before giving the definition, it will be convenient to introduce some notation that will allow us to extract the relevant information from a quotient test graph T^π .

Definition 2.6 (Graph projections). Let $G = (V, E, \text{src}, \text{tar})$ be a multidigraph. For $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)$, we define an equivalence relation on the edges E according to the parallel edges of G^π :

$$e \sim_\pi e' \iff \{[\text{tar}(e)]_\pi, [\text{src}(e)]_\pi\} = \{[\text{tar}(e')]_\pi, [\text{src}(e')]_\pi\}.$$

We write $[e]_\pi = \{e' \in E : e' \sim_\pi e\}$ and $[E]_\pi = \{[e]_\pi : e \in E\}$. We separate the projection of loops $[E]_\pi^{(1)} = \{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi : [\text{tar}(e)]_\pi = [\text{src}(e)]_\pi\}$ from non-loop edges $[E]_\pi^{(2)} = \{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi : [\text{tar}(e)]_\pi \neq [\text{src}(e)]_\pi\}$. Note that $\underline{G}^\pi := (V^\pi, [E]_\pi^{(2)})$ is the underlying simple graph of G^π . If π is the partition of singletons, then $G^\pi = G$ and we omit it from the notation (e.g., $[e]$ and $[E]$).

This allows us to formalize the intuitive notion of a double tree.

Definition 2.7 (Double tree). A *double tree* is a multidigraph $G = (V, E, \text{src}, \text{tar})$ such that

- (i) there are no loops: $[E]^{(1)} = \emptyset$;
- (ii) every edge is of multiplicity two: $\#[[e]] = 2$ for each $e \in E$;
- (iii) the underlying simple graph $\underline{G} = (V, [E])$ is a tree.

The parallel edges of a double tree come in pairs, allowing us to write $[E] = \{\{e, e'\} : e \in E\}$. We say that a test graph $T = (G, \gamma)$ is a *colored double tree* if G is a double tree such that $\gamma(e) = \gamma(e')$ for every pair of parallel edges $\{e, e'\} \in [E]$.

Specializing [Au18, Lemma 4.3] to quotients of C_p , we obtain

$$(9) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \chi^0(C_p^\pi, \mathcal{Z}_N) \right] = \begin{cases} \prod_{\{e, e'\} \in [\mathcal{E}(C_p)]_\pi} \sigma_{\gamma(e)}^2 & \text{if } C_p^\pi \text{ is a colored double tree;} \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

from which (8) now follows.

Of course, one can apply the same formalism to $\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*)]$, but it will be convenient to separate the contribution from $\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*$.

Example 2.8 (Weighted moments). For a monomial $p(\vec{z}) = z_{i(1)} \cdots z_{i(d)} \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$ of degree d , we define the test graph

$$(10) \quad T_p = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \xleftarrow{i(1)} \bullet \xleftarrow{\cdots} \bullet \xleftarrow{i(d)} \bullet \\ v_0 \quad v_1 \quad \cdots \quad v_d \end{array}$$

Formally, $T_p = (L_p, \gamma_p)$, where $L_p = (V_p, E_p, \text{src}, \text{tar})$ and $\gamma_p : E_p \rightarrow I$ satisfy

- (i) $V_p = \{v_{t-1} : t \in [d+1]\}$;
- (ii) $E_p = \{e_t : t \in [d]\}$;
- (iii) $\text{src}(e_t) = v_t$ and $\text{tar}(e_t) = v_{t-1}$;
- (iv) $\gamma_p(e_t) = i(t)$.

We then have the analogue of (6):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{M}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*) &= \sum_{\phi: V_p \rightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi(v_d)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi(v_0))} \prod_{e \in E_p} \mathbf{M}_N^{(\gamma_p(e))}(\phi(e)) \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V_p)} \sum_{\phi: V_p^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi))} \prod_{e \in E_p} \mathbf{M}_N^{(\gamma_p(e))}(\phi(e)), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $E_p^\pi = E_p$.

Remark 2.9. Roughly speaking, the isotropic global law amounts to the asymptotic

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*)] &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V_p)} \sum_{\phi: V_p^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi))} \prod_{e \in E_p} \Xi_N^{(\gamma_p(e))}(\phi(e)) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V_p) \\ \text{s.t. } v_0 \overset{\pi}{\sim} v_d}} \sum_{\phi: V_p^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi))} \prod_{e \in E_p} \Xi_N^{(\gamma_p(e))}(\phi(e)) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

To see this, note that the cycle graph in (7) and the path graph in (10) satisfy $C_p = T_p^{\hat{\pi}}$ for the partition $\hat{\pi}$ whose only nonsingleton block is $\{v_0, v_d\}$. By restricting to the class of partitions $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V_p)$ such that $v_0 \overset{\pi}{\sim} v_d$, the set of possible quotients of T_p is then equal to the set of possible quotients of C_p . The identification $[v_0]_\pi = [v_d]_\pi$ also forces $\phi([v_0]_\pi) = \phi([v_d]_\pi)$, which both explains the inner product and introduces the additional normalization that is seemingly missing compared to (8).

3. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

3.1. The isotropic global law. Let $\mathcal{Z}_N = (\Xi_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ be a family of independent RBMs $\Xi_N^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{RBM}(N, \sigma_i^2, b_N^{(i)})$ as in Definition 1.2. We assume that $b_N^{(i)} \gg 1$ for each $i \in I$ to ensure the convergence in (8), which also holds almost surely [Au18, Theorem 4.12]:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{NC}_2(d)} \prod_{\{j, k\} \in \pi} \sigma_{i(j)} \sigma_{i(k)} \mathbf{1}\{i(j) = i(k)\} =: \tau(p).$$

The main technical contribution of this article is an isotropic version of this convergence. To state the precise result, we need some additional notation. For $p_1(\vec{z}), \dots, p_r(\vec{z}) \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$, we define

$$I_{p_1, \dots, p_r} := \{i \in I : z_i \text{ appears in } p_s(\vec{z}) \text{ for some } s \in [r]\}.$$

We start by proving convergence in expectation (cf. [Au21, Lemma 3.4]).

Lemma 3.1 (Isotropic global law, in expectation). *For $p(\vec{z}) \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$ and $\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{y}_N \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N \mathbf{y}_N^*)] = \langle \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{y}_N \rangle \tau(p) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\min_{i \in I_p} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(i)}}} \right).$$

In particular, the constant in the asymptotic does not depend on the unit vectors $\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{y}_N$.

Proof. By linearity, we may assume that $p(\vec{z}) = z_{i(1)} \cdots z_{i(d)}$ is a monomial. To simplify the notation, we abbreviate the test graph $T_p = (L_p, \gamma_p)$ in (10) to $T = (L, \gamma)$. The trace can then be expanded using the graph formalism in Example 2.8:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N \mathbf{y}_N^*)] &= \sum_{\phi: V \rightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi(v_d)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi(v_0))} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E} \Xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi))} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \frac{\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ (11) \quad &=: \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(12) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] = O_p(1)$$

uniformly in (π, ϕ) by our moment assumption (1) and the finiteness of $\gamma(E) \subset I$. Since $\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]$ is injective, the independence of our random variables allows us to factor the expectation over parallel edges. In particular, using the notation in Definition 2.6,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] = \prod_{l=1}^2 \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(l)}} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e'))}(\phi(e')) \right].$$

The centeredness of the off-diagonal random variables tells us that

$$(13) \quad \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e'))}(\phi(e')) \right] = 0$$

unless $\#[e]_\pi \geq 2$ for every $[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}$. So, we may restrict the outer sum in (11) to such partitions. This leads us to define

$$(14) \quad \mathcal{P}_+(V) := \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V) : \#[e]_\pi \geq 2 \text{ for every } [e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}\},$$

which allows us to rewrite (11) as

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N \mathbf{y}_N^*)] = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi).$$

We introduce some additional notation to control the inner sum. Recall that $\underline{L}^\pi = (V^\pi, [E]_\pi^{(2)})$ is the underlying simple graph of L^π . Let $(V^\pi, [F]_\pi)$ be a spanning tree of \underline{L}^π . For $e \in E$, we define

$$[e]_\pi := \arg \min_{e' \in [e]_\pi} b_N^{(\gamma(e'))} = \arg \min_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}.$$

In the event of a tie, we choose the leftmost edge in the path L for concreteness. Since the matrices $(\mathbf{B}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ are symmetric $(0, 1)$ -matrices of the form (2), we can bound the contribution from the product

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) &= \prod_{l=1}^2 \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(l)}} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e'))}(\phi(e')) \\ &= \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e'))}(\phi(e')) \\ &= \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi)) \\ &\leq \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi)), \end{aligned}$$

where the symmetry eliminates the ambiguity in the direction of the edge $[e]_\pi$ for the purposes of $\mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))$. Combining this with the bound on the expectation (12), we obtain

$$\zeta_N(\pi, \phi) = O_p \left(\left| \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi)) \right| \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right).$$

This allows us to further restrict to partitions

$$\mathcal{P}_{++}(V) := \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V) : T^\pi \text{ is a colored double tree}\} \subset \mathcal{P}_+(V)$$

at the cost of

$$(15) \quad \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{++}(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi) + O \left(\frac{1}{\min_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right).$$

Before proving this, note that if T^π is a double tree, then $[v_0]_\pi = [v_d]_\pi$. Indeed, every vertex in a double tree has even degree; however, every vertex $v \notin \{v_0, v_d\}$ in T has degree two, while $\deg_T(v_0) = \deg_T(v_d) = 1$. Since $\deg_{T^\pi}([v]_\pi) = \sum_{v' \sim_\pi v} \deg_T(v')$, the result follows.

To prove (15), assume that $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V) \setminus \mathcal{P}_{++}(V)$. We consider two cases: $[v_0]_\pi \neq [v_d]_\pi$ and $[v_0]_\pi = [v_d]_\pi$. If $[v_0]_\pi \neq [v_d]_\pi$, then there is a unique (necessarily nonempty) path from $[v_0]_\pi$ to $[v_d]_\pi$ in $(V^\pi, [F]_\pi)$. We enumerate the edges $[f_1]_\pi, \dots, [f_m]_\pi$ on this path as well as the vertices w_0, \dots, w_m . We separate the remaining edges $[F']_\pi = [F]_\pi \setminus \{[f_1]_\pi, \dots, [f_m]_\pi\}$ to bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \left| \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi)) \right| \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ &\leq \sum_{\Phi: \{w_n\}_{n=0}^m \rightarrow [N]} \left| \mathbf{x}_N(\Phi(w_m)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N(\Phi(w_0)) \right| \prod_{n=1}^m \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([f_n]_\pi))}(\Phi(w_{n-1}), \Phi(w_n)) \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{\sum_{\Psi: V^\pi \setminus \{w_n\}_{n=0}^m \rightarrow [N]} \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F']_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\Psi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ &= \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F']_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \sum_{\Phi: \{w_n\}_{n=0}^m \rightarrow [N]} \left| \mathbf{x}_N(\Phi(w_m)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N(\Phi(w_0)) \right| \prod_{n=1}^m \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([f_n]_\pi))}(\Phi(w_{n-1}), \Phi(w_n)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have again used the fact that the matrices $(\mathbf{B}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ are symmetric to ignore the directions of the edges in writing $\mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))}(\Phi(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi)) = \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))}(\Phi(w_{n-1}), \Phi(w_n))$. We recognize the remaining sum as an inner product

$$\sum_{\Phi: \{w_0\}_{n=1}^m \rightarrow [N]} |\mathbf{x}_N(\Phi(w_m))| |\mathbf{y}_N(\Phi(w_0))| \prod_{n=1}^m \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))}(\Phi(w_{n-1}), \Phi(w_n)) = \left\langle \prod_{n=1}^m \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))} |\mathbf{x}_N|, |\mathbf{y}_N| \right\rangle,$$

where $|\mathbf{x}_N|, |\mathbf{y}_N|$ are the vectors obtained from $\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{y}_N$ by applying the entrywise absolute value. In particular, it is still the case that $|\mathbf{x}_N|, |\mathbf{y}_N| \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \prod_{n=1}^m \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))} |\mathbf{x}_N|, |\mathbf{y}_N| \right\rangle &\leq \left\| \prod_{n=1}^m \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \prod_{n=1}^m \left\| \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))} \right\|_2 = \prod_{n=1}^m \xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))}, \end{aligned}$$

where the operator norm calculation follows from the observation that $\mathbf{B}_N^{(i)}$ is a real symmetric $(0, 1)$ -matrix with every row sum equal to $\xi_N^{(i)}$ (see, for example, [HJ13, Problem 5.6.P21]).

Putting everything together, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi) &= O_p \left(\frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))} \prod_{n=1}^m \xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor f_n \rfloor \pi))}}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))}}{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V) \setminus \mathcal{P}_{++}(V)$, we know that

$$(16) \quad \frac{\xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))}}{\prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} \leq 1, \quad \forall [e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}.$$

Furthermore, by definition, T^π is not a colored double tree. If T^π is a (miscolored) double tree, then we are done since the independence and centeredness of the off-diagonal entries would again imply (13). So, we may assume that T^π is not a double tree. This means that either the underlying simple graph is not a tree, in which case $[F]_\pi \subsetneq [E]_\pi$, or the underlying simple graph is a tree, but there is at least one edge $[e]_\pi$ with multiplicity $\#([e]_\pi) \geq 3$. In either case, we see that

$$(17) \quad \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))}}{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\min_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right).$$

The remaining case of $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V) \setminus \mathcal{P}_{++}(V)$ such that $[v_0]_\pi = [v_d]_\pi$ is treated much the same. Indeed, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} |\mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi))| |\mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi))| \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ &\leq \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))}}{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} \sum_{i=1}^N |\mathbf{x}_N(i)| |\mathbf{y}_N(i)| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [F]} \xi_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}}{\prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}}.$$

As before, we can assume that T^π is not a double tree, which again leads to the asymptotic (17). We conclude that

$$\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V) \setminus \mathcal{P}_{++}(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi) = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\min_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right),$$

which proves (15).

To finish the proof, consider a partition $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{++}(V)$. By definition, T^π is a colored double tree such that $[v_0]_\pi = [v_d]_\pi$. We can think of performing the identification $v_0 \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} v_d$ first and view T^π as a quotient of the directed cycle $C_p = T^{\hat{\pi}}$ in (7), where the only nonsingleton block in $\hat{\pi}$ is $\{v_0, v_d\}$. It is not hard to see that a quotient of a directed cycle is a double tree only if each of its parallel edges $\{e, e'\}$ point in opposite directions ($\text{tar}(e), \text{src}(e) = (\text{src}(e'), \text{tar}(e'))$) [Au18, Figure 5]. Thus, the expectation in $\zeta_N(\pi, \phi)$ can be computed entirely in terms of the variances:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \zeta_N(\pi, \phi) &= \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\phi([v_d]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\phi([v_0]_\pi))} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \frac{\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ &= \left[\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \sigma_{\gamma(e)}^2 \right] \sum_{\Phi: \{[v_0]_\pi\} \rightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\Phi([v_0]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\Phi([v_0]_\pi))} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{\sum_{\Psi: V^\pi \setminus \{[v_0]_\pi\} \hookrightarrow [N] \setminus \{\Phi([v_0]_\pi)\}} \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\Psi(e))}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As before, we can bound the number of maps Ψ that will produce a nonzero summand (necessarily equal to 1) by

$$\sum_{\Psi: V^\pi \setminus \{[v_0]_\pi\} \hookrightarrow [N] \setminus \{\Phi([v_0]_\pi)\}} \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\Psi(e)) \leq \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}.$$

Since $(V^\pi, [E]_\pi)$ is a tree, the only obstruction to equality is the required injectivity of Ψ . This gives the straightforward lower bound

$$\sum_{\Psi: V^\pi \setminus \{[v_0]_\pi\} \hookrightarrow [N] \setminus \{\Phi([v_0]_\pi)\}} \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\Psi(e)) \geq \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} (\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))} - d),$$

where we recall that $d \geq \#(V^\pi) - 1$ is the degree of the monomial $p(\vec{z})$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \sigma_{\gamma(e)}^2 \right] \sum_{\Phi: \{[v_0]_\pi\} \rightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N(\Phi([v_0]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N(\Phi([v_0]_\pi))} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{\sum_{\Psi: V^\pi \setminus \{[v_0]_\pi\} \hookrightarrow [N] \setminus \{\Phi([v_0]_\pi)\}} \prod_{[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\Psi(e))}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}} \right) \\ &= \langle \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{y}_N \rangle \prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \sigma_{\gamma(e)}^2 + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\min_{e \in E} \xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the usual calculation for the normalized trace (9), we are done. \square

Remark 3.2. In the case of independent $(k_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ -regular Wigner matrices

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{\Xi}}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k_N^{(i)}}} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_N^{(i)} \circ \mathbf{X}_N^{(i)} \right)_{i \in I},$$

we simply need to replace all instances of $\mathbf{B}_N^{(i)}$ (resp., $\xi_N^{(i)}$) with $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_N^{(i)}$ (resp., $k_N^{(i)}$) in the proof with one notable exception. In particular, for periodic $(0, 1)$ -band matrices $(\mathbf{B}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$, we repeatedly used the identity

$$\circ_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e'))} = \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))},$$

where we recall that \circ denotes the entrywise product. While this no longer holds in general for $(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$, it is true that $\circ_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_N^{(\gamma(e'))}$ is a symmetric $(0, 1)$ -matrix with row sums bounded by $k_N^{(\gamma(\lfloor e \rfloor \pi))} := \min_{e' \in [e]_\pi} k_N^{(\gamma(e'))}$, which is all that is needed to carry forward the same argument.

Having computed the expectation, we proceed to proving concentration. For this, we use a bound on central moments.

Lemma 3.3 (Central moments). *For $(p_s(\vec{z}))_{s=1}^r \subset \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$ and $(\mathbf{x}_N^{(s)})_{s=1}^r, (\mathbf{y}_N^{(s)})_{s=1}^r \subset \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right) - \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right) \right] \right) \right] = O_{p_1, \dots, p_r} \left(\left[\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(i)}} \right]^{-r} \right).$$

As before, the constant in the asymptotic does not depend on the unit vectors $(\mathbf{x}_N^{(s)})_{s=1}^r, (\mathbf{y}_N^{(s)})_{s=1}^r$.

Proof. By multilinearity, we may assume that each $p_s(\vec{z}) = z_{i_s(1)} \cdots z_{i_s(d_s)}$ is a monomial. To simplify the notation, we abbreviate the test graph $T_{p_s} = (L_{p_s}, \gamma_{p_s})$ in (10) to $T_s = (L_s, \gamma_s)$. We also define $T = (G, \gamma)$ to be the disjoint union $T = \sqcup_{s=1}^r T_s$ of the test graphs $(T_s)_{s=1}^r$. The analogue of (11) for central moments can then be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right) - \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right) \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\sum_{\phi_s: V_s \rightarrow [N]} \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi_s(v_{d_s}^{(s)})) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi_s(v_0^{(s)}))} \left(\prod_{e \in E_s} \Xi_N^{(\gamma_s(e))}(\phi_s(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_s} \Xi_N^{(\gamma_s(e))}(\phi_s(e)) \right] \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\phi: V \rightarrow [N]} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi(v_{d_s}^{(s)})) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi(v_0^{(s)}))} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\prod_{e \in E_s} \Xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_s} \Xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_{d_s}^{(s)}]_\pi)) \overline{\mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_0^{(s)}]_\pi))} \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \right) \right] \frac{\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ &=: \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \eta_N(\phi, \pi). \end{aligned}$$

We repeat two of the early steps in the proof of Lemma 3.1. In particular, our moment assumption (1) implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{X}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \right) \right] = O_{p_1, \dots, p_r}(1)$$

uniformly in (π, ϕ) with

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{x}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{x}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \right) \right] = 0$$

unless $\#[[e]_\pi] \geq 2$ for every $e \in [E]_\pi^{(2)}$. Since we are considering central moments, we can say even more. In particular, we say that T_s and $T_{s'}$ have an *edge overlay in T^π* if there exist edges $e_s \in E_s$ and $e_{s'} \in E_{s'}$ such that $[e_s]_\pi = [e_{s'}]_\pi$. The edge overlays define a natural equivalence relation $\sim_{E,\pi}$ on $[r]$ as follows:

$$s \sim_{E,\pi} s' \iff \exists s_0, \dots, s_n \in [r] : T_{s_{t-1}} \text{ and } T_{s_t} \text{ have an edge overlay in } T^\pi \text{ for every } t \in [n],$$

where $s_0 = s$ and $s_n = s'$. We use the notation $[s]_{E,\pi} = \{s' \in [r] : s' \sim_{E,\pi} s\} \in [r] / \sim_{E,\pi}$ to avoid confusion with $[v]_\pi \in V^\pi$ and $[e]_\pi \in [E]_\pi$. This allows us to factor

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{x}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{x}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \prod_{[s]_{E,\pi} \in [r] / \sim_{E,\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s' \in [s]_{E,\pi}} \left(\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \mathbf{x}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \mathbf{x}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e)) \right] \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to 0 by the centering unless $\#[[s]_{E,\pi}] \geq 2$ for every $s \in [r]$. In other words, the expectation vanishes unless every test graph T_s has an edge overlay in T^π with at least one other test graph $T_{s'}$. This leads us to define

$$\mathcal{P}_\times(V) := \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V) : \#[[s]_{E,\pi}] \geq 2 \text{ for every } s \in [r]\},$$

where we recall the definition of $\mathcal{P}_+(V)$ in (14). The central moment calculation then reduces to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right) - \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right) \right] \right) \right] = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\times(V)} \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \eta_N(\phi, \pi),$$

where

$$\eta_N(\phi, \pi) = O_{p_1, \dots, p_r} \left(\left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_{d_s}^{(s)}]_\pi)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_0^{(s)}]_\pi)) \right| \right] \frac{\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right).$$

The equivalence relation $\sim_{[E]_\pi}$ is not necessarily equal to the equivalence relation on $[r]$ defined by the connected components of $T^\pi = (\sqcup_{s=1}^r T_s)^\pi$. In particular, if

$$\mathcal{V}([s]_{E,\pi}) := \{[v]_\pi \in V^\pi : v \in T_{s'} \text{ for some } s' \sim_{E,\pi} s\},$$

then it could be that $\mathcal{V}([s]_{E,\pi}) \cap \mathcal{V}([s']_{E,\pi}) \neq \emptyset$ for $[s]_{E,\pi} \neq [s']_{E,\pi}$. Nevertheless, it is true that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_{d_s}^{(s)}]_\pi)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_0^{(s)}]_\pi)) \right| \right] \frac{\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \\ &= \prod_{[s]_{E,\pi} \in [r] / \sim_{E,\pi}} \left(\prod_{s' \in [s]_{E,\pi}} \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s')}(\phi([v_{d_{s'}}^{(s')}]_\pi)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s')}(\phi([v_0^{(s')}]_\pi)) \right| \frac{\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\sum_{\phi: V^\pi \hookrightarrow [N]} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r \left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_{d_s}^{(s)}]_\pi)) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_0^{(s)}]_\pi)) \right| \right] \frac{\prod_{e \in E} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}}$$

$$\leq \prod_{[s]_{E,\pi} \in [r]/\sim_{E,\pi}} \sum_{\phi: \mathcal{V}([s]_{E,\pi}) \rightarrow [N]} \prod_{s' \in [s]_{E,\pi}} \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s')}(\phi([v_{d_{s'}}]_{\pi})) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s')}(\phi([v_0]_{\pi})) \right| \frac{\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right].$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\phi: \mathcal{V}([s]_{E,\pi}) \rightarrow [N]} \prod_{s' \in [s]_{E,\pi}} \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s')}(\phi([v_{d_{s'}}]_{\pi})) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s')}(\phi([v_0]_{\pi})) \right| \frac{\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E_{s'}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right] \\ &= O_{p_1, \dots, p_r} \left(\left[\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(i)}} \right]^{-\#([s]_{E,\pi})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we may then assume that there is only one equivalence class $[s]_{E,\pi} = [r]$, which allows us to cut down on notation. In particular, we have reduced the problem to establishing

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \rightarrow [N]} \prod_{s=1}^r \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_{d_s}]_{\pi})) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_0]_{\pi})) \right| \frac{\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E_s} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right] \\ &= O_{p_1, \dots, p_r} \left(\left[\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(i)}} \right]^{-r} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, each test graph T_s is responsible for a factor of $\left[\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(i)}} \right]^{-1}$ via the unit vectors $\mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}$ or a defect in the underlying simple graph $\underline{G}^\pi = (V^\pi, [E]_\pi^{(2)})$ from an edge overlay. To formalize this, it will be convenient to introduce some additional notation to gather the relevant terms. We define

$$\begin{aligned} (w_1, \dots, w_{2r}) &:= (v_0^{(1)}, v_{d_1}^{(1)}, \dots, v_0^{(r)}, v_{d_1}^{(r)}); \\ (\mathbf{u}_N^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N^{(2r)}) &:= (|\mathbf{x}_N^{(1)}|, |\mathbf{y}_N^{(1)}|, \dots, |\mathbf{x}_N^{(r)}|, |\mathbf{y}_N^{(r)}|) \in (\mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^{N-1})^{2r}, \end{aligned}$$

in which case

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{s=1}^r \left[\left| \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_{d_s}]_{\pi})) \right| \left| \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)}(\phi([v_0]_{\pi})) \right| \frac{\prod_{e \in E_s} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma(e))}(\phi(e))}{\prod_{e \in E_s} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e))}}} \right] \\ &= \prod_{s=1}^{2r} \mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}(\phi([w_s]_{\pi})) \frac{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} \\ &\leq \prod_{s=1}^{2r} \mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}(\phi([w_s]_{\pi})) \frac{\prod_{[e] \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} \end{aligned}$$

for any spanning tree $(V^\pi, [F]_\pi)$ of \underline{G}^π . The unit vectors further reduce the numerator by virtue of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, which implies that for any $S \subset [N]$,

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}(i) \leq \sqrt{\#(S)}, \\ & \sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}(i) \mathbf{u}_N^{(s')}(i) \leq 1; \end{aligned}$$

however, in general, one cannot do better than

$$(20) \quad \sum_{i \in S} \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}(i) \leq 1$$

for $\mathcal{S} \subset [2r]$ such that $\#(\mathcal{S}) \geq 2$, where we have used the fact that $\|\mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}\|_2 = 1$.

To keep track of the unit vectors, we distinguish the vertices $V_{\text{out}} := \{w_1, \dots, w_{2r}\} \subset V$ by calling them *outer*. We refer to the remaining vertices $V_{\text{in}} := V \setminus V_{\text{out}}$ as *inner*. For a partition $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(V)$, we separate the blocks according to their inner/outer composition:

$$\pi^{(a,b)} = \{B \in \pi : \#(B \cap V_{\text{out}}) = a, \#(B \cap V_{\text{in}}) = b\}.$$

We separate the vertices in a similar manner:

$$V_\pi^{(a,b)} = \bigcup_{B \in \pi^{(a,b)}} B.$$

By a slight abuse of notation, we also write expressions such as $\pi^{(a,\geq b)}$ and $V_\pi^{(a,\geq b)}$ for the obvious analogues.

Without the unit vectors, we have the equality

$$\sum_{\phi: V^\pi \rightarrow [N]} \frac{\prod_{[e] \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} = \frac{N \prod_{[e] \in [F]_\pi} \xi_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}},$$

where $\#(\pi) = \#([F]_\pi) + 1$ since $(V^\pi, [F]_\pi)$ is a spanning tree. We know how to remove the factor of N in the numerator at the cost of either two blocks in $\#(\pi^{(1,\geq 0)})$ or one block in $\#(\pi^{(\geq 2,\geq 0)})$ from the proof of Proposition 3.6. When assigning the remaining values of ϕ , we can use (19) and (20) to reduce a term $\xi_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}$ in the numerator to either $\sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}}$ (if the block $B \in V^\pi$ belongs to $\pi^{(1,\geq 0)}$) or 1 (if the block $B \in V^\pi$ belongs to $\pi^{(\geq 2,\geq 0)}$). Since $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)$, we still have (16) to handle the blocks $B \in \pi^{(0,\geq 1)}$. Thus, reintroducing the unit vectors, we arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\phi: V^\pi \rightarrow [N]} \prod_{s=1}^{2r} \mathbf{u}_N^{(s)}(\phi([w_s]_\pi)) \frac{\prod_{[e] \in [F]_\pi} \mathbf{B}_N^{(\gamma([e]_\pi))}(\phi([e]_\pi))}{\prod_{[e] \in [E]_\pi} \prod_{e' \in [e]_\pi} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(\gamma(e'))}}} \\ & \leq \left[\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \xi_N^{(i)} \right]^{\left([\#(\pi) - 1] - \left[\frac{\#(\pi^{(1,\geq 0)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(\geq 2,\geq 0)}) - 1 \right] \right) - \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r d_s}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where d_s is the number of edges in the test graph T_s . Thus, (18) will follow if we can prove that for $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)$ such that $[s]_{E,\pi} = [r]$,

$$\left[\#(\pi) - \frac{\#(\pi^{(1,\geq 0)})}{2} - \#(\pi^{(\geq 2,\geq 0)}) \right] - \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r d_s}{2} \leq -\frac{r}{2},$$

or, equivalently,

$$(21) \quad \frac{\#(\pi^{(1,\geq 1)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(0,\geq 1)}) + \frac{r}{2} \leq \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r d_s}{2},$$

where we have used the fact that $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)$ forces $\pi^{(1,\geq 0)} = \pi^{(1,\geq 1)}$.

We prove (21) by induction on the total number of edges $D = \sum_{s=1}^r d_s$ with the base cases $D = 2, 3$ (cf. [AGV, Proposition 4.4]). Note that centrality allows us to restrict to $r \geq 2$ since otherwise the moment bound is trivially true. The case of $D = 2$ then corresponds to $r = 2$ and $d_1 = d_2 = 1$, which has no inner vertices. Thus, $\pi^{(1,\geq 1)} = \pi^{(0,\geq 1)} = \emptyset$, and (21) follows.




Figure 1. An example of the pinching off of the two edges adjacent to v_0 in T_{s_0} as necessitated by $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)$. Since $B = \{v_0\} \in \pi^{(0,1)}$, this is the only way the edges adjacent to v_0 can satisfy the condition $\#([e]_\pi) \geq 2$.

If $D = 3$, then there are two possibilities. First, it could be that $r = 3$ and $d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 1$. As before, there are no inner vertices in this case, and so we are done. If $r = 2$, then $\{d_1, d_2\} = \{1, 2\}$. Thus, there is exactly one inner vertex; however, the mandatory edge overlay between T_1 and T_2 means that this lone inner vertex will be merged with at least one outer vertex, whence $\#(\pi^{(0, \geq 1)}) = 0$ and $\#(\pi^{(1, \geq 1)}) \leq 1$. Plugging everything in, we again have (21).

Now suppose that $D \geq 4$. If $\#(\pi^{(0,1)}) \leq \#(\pi^{(1, \geq 2)})$, then we are done. Indeed, in this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\#(\pi^{(1, \geq 1)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(0, \geq 1)}) &= \frac{\#(\pi^{(1,1)}) + \#(\pi^{(1, \geq 2)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(0,1)}) + \#(\pi^{(0, \geq 2)}) \\
 &\leq \frac{\#(\pi^{(1,1)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(1, \geq 2)}) + \frac{\#(\pi^{(0,1)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(0, \geq 2)}) \\
 &\leq \frac{\#(V_\pi^{(1,1)} \cap V_{\text{in}})}{2} + \frac{\#(V_\pi^{(1, \geq 2)} \cap V_{\text{in}})}{2} + \frac{\#(V_\pi^{(0,1)} \cap V_{\text{in}})}{2} + \frac{\#(V_\pi^{(0, \geq 2)} \cap V_{\text{in}})}{2} \\
 &\leq \frac{\#(V_{\text{in}})}{2} \\
 &= \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r (d_s - 1)}{2} \\
 &= \frac{D - r}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

So, we can assume that $\#(\pi^{(0,1)}) > \#(\pi^{(1, \geq 2)})$. Let $B \in \pi^{(0,1)} \neq \emptyset$. This means that $B = \{v_0\}$ consists of a single inner vertex, say belonging to the test graph T_{s_0} . Since $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_+(V)$, it must be that the two vertices v_1, v_2 adjacent to v_0 in T_{s_0} are identified by π . This corresponds to pinching off the two edges e_1, e_2 incident to v_0 in T_{s_0} . The block B is then necessarily a leaf in T^π with exactly two incident edges in T^π . The remainder of T^π can therefore be constructed as a quotient of the disjoint union of $(T_s)_{s \in [r] \setminus \{s_0\}}$ and a shortened version of T_{s_0} by two edges. See Figure 1 for an illustration. Note that we must have $d_{s_0} \geq 3$; otherwise, $d_{s_0} = 2$ and an edge overlay between T_{s_0} and any other T_s would contradict $B \in \pi^{(0,1)}$.

To apply the induction hypothesis, let \tilde{T}_{s_0} be the test graph obtained from T_{s_0} by removing v_0 , its two incident edges, and merging v_1 and v_2 into a vertex \tilde{v}_2 . If v_2 is inner (resp., outer), then so too is \tilde{v}_2 in \tilde{T}_{s_0} . The partition π defines a natural partition $\tilde{\pi}$ of the vertices of the disjoint union $\sqcup_{s \in [r] \setminus \{s_0\}} T_s \sqcup \tilde{T}_{s_0}$ as follows. For a block $B' \in \pi \setminus \{B\}$, we define

$$(22) \quad f(B') = \begin{cases} (B' \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}) \cup \{\tilde{v}_2\} & \text{if } v_1, v_2 \in B'; \\ B' & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

These new blocks make up the partition

$$\tilde{\pi} = \{f(B') : B' \in \pi \setminus \{B\}\} \in \mathcal{P}\left((V \setminus \{v_0, v_1, v_2\}) \cup \{\tilde{v}_2\}\right).$$

Since B was a leaf in \underline{T}^π with exactly two incident edges e_1, e_2 in T^π , the partition $\tilde{\pi}$ still satisfies

$$(23) \quad \#([e]_{\tilde{\pi}}) \geq 2, \quad \forall e \in E \setminus \{e_1, e_2\},$$

meaning $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathcal{P}_+ \left((V \setminus \{v_0, v_1, v_2\}) \cup \{\tilde{v}_2\} \right)$. Furthermore, as noted earlier, neither e_1 nor e_2 can participate in an edge overlay between T_{s_0} and some other T_s due to the fact that $B \in \pi^{(1,0)}$. So, any such overlay is preserved in $(\sqcup_{s \in [r] \setminus \{s_0\}} T_s \sqcup \tilde{T}_{s_0})^{\tilde{\pi}}$, meaning there is still only one equivalence class $[s]_{E \setminus \{e_1, e_2\}, \tilde{\pi}} = [r]$. The induction hypothesis then allows us to conclude that

$$\frac{\#(\tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 1)})}{2} + \#(\tilde{\pi}^{(0, \geq 1)}) + \frac{r}{2} \leq \frac{\sum_{s \in [r] \setminus \{s_0\}} d_s + \tilde{d}_{s_0}}{2} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r d_s - 2}{2}.$$

We must now relate $\tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 1)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}^{(0, \geq 1)}$ to $\pi^{(1, \geq 1)}$ and $\pi^{(0, \geq 1)}$ respectively. By definition (22), f changes the composition of exactly one block $[v_1]_\pi = [v_2]_\pi$, decreasing the number of inner vertices in this block by one and leaving all other blocks untouched. If v_2 is outer, then $[v_2]_\pi \in \pi^{(\geq 1, \geq 1)}$ and $f([v_2]_\pi) \in \tilde{\pi}^{(\geq 1, \geq 0)}$. If v_2 is inner, then $[v_2]_\pi \in \pi^{(\geq 0, \geq 2)}$ and $f([v_2]_\pi) \in \tilde{\pi}^{(\geq 0, \geq 1)}$. In either case, the map f restricts to a bijection between $\pi^{(0, \geq 1)} \setminus \{B\}$ and $\tilde{\pi}^{(0, \geq 1)}$, whence

$$\#(\tilde{\pi}^{(0, \geq 1)}) = \#(\pi^{(0, \geq 1)}) - 1.$$

Similarly, f restricts to a bijection between $\pi^{(1, \geq 0)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 0)}$; however, as we have already seen, condition (14) (resp., (23)) forces $\pi^{(1, \geq 0)} = \pi^{(1, \geq 1)}$ (resp., $\tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 0)} = \tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 1)}$), whence

$$\#(\pi^{(1, \geq 1)}) = \#(\tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 1)}).$$

Putting everything together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\#(\pi^{(1, \geq 1)})}{2} + \#(\pi^{(0, \geq 1)}) + \frac{r}{2} &= \#(\tilde{\pi}^{(1, \geq 1)}) + \#(\tilde{\pi}^{(0, \geq 1)}) + 1 + \frac{r}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r d_s - 2}{2} + 1 \\ &= \frac{\sum_{s=1}^r d_s}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

as was to be shown. \square

Remark 3.4. In the case of independent $(k_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ -regular Wigner matrices, one needs only to carry forward the same modifications from Remark 3.2. The upper bound in Lemma 3.3 is easily seen to be sharp and can be achieved by overlaying copies of lines to obtain a forest of double trees.

Corollary 3.5 (Concentration). *For $p(\vec{z}) \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{y}_N \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*) - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*)]| \geq \varepsilon) = O_{p,r,\varepsilon} \left(\left[\min_{i \in I_p} \sqrt{\xi_N^{(i)}} \right]^{-r} \right).$$

Proof. Since $b_N^{(i)} \gg 1$ for each $i \in I$, it suffices to prove the result for $r = 2m$ even. We define a conjugate linear involution $*$: $\mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$ by its action on monomials:

$$(z_{i(1)} \cdots z_{i(d)})^* = z_{i(d)} \cdots z_{i(1)}.$$

Since the matrices $\mathcal{Z}_N = (\Xi_N^{(i)})_{i \in I}$ are Hermitian, this operation commutes with the usual matrix adjoint:

$$[p(\mathcal{Z}_N)]^* = p^*(\mathcal{Z}_N),$$

We use this to write the complex conjugate of our weighted trace as yet another weighted trace

$$\overline{\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*)} = \mathrm{Tr}([p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*]^*) = \mathrm{Tr}(p^*(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{y}_N\mathbf{x}_N^*).$$

In particular, the squared modulus can be written as a product

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*) - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*)]|^2 \\ &= \left(\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*) - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(p(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{x}_N\mathbf{y}_N^*)] \right) \left(\mathrm{Tr}(p^*(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{y}_N\mathbf{x}_N^*) - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(p^*(\mathcal{Z}_N)\mathbf{y}_N\mathbf{x}_N^*)] \right). \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows from Lemma 3.3 and Markov's inequality. \square

We can now prove the isotropic global law. We recall the notation $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$ for convergence in probability.

Proposition 3.6 (Isotropic global law). *Let $(\mathbf{x}_N^{(s)})_{s=1}^r, (\mathbf{y}_N^{(s)})_{s=1}^r \subset \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ be such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)} \rangle = c_s.$$

If $p_1(\vec{z}), \dots, p_r(\vec{z}) \in \mathbb{C}\langle z_i : i \in I \rangle$, then

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \mathbf{x}_N^{(s-1)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \prod_{s=1}^r [c_s \tau_{\mathcal{Z}}(p_s)],$$

where $\mathbf{x}_N^{(r)} = \mathbf{x}_N^{(0)}$. If $\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \xi_N^{(i)} \gg N^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then this convergence can be upgraded to the almost sure sense:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{Tr} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \mathbf{x}_N^{(s-1)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \right) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \prod_{s=1}^r [c_s \tau_{\mathcal{Z}}(p_s)].$$

Proof. We start by rewriting the trace in question into a product of traces:

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \mathbf{x}_N^{(s-1)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \right) = \prod_{s=1}^r \langle p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)} \rangle = \prod_{s=1}^r \mathrm{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right).$$

Thus, it suffices to prove the stated convergence for a single term $\mathrm{Tr} \left(p_s(\mathcal{Z}_N) \mathbf{x}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{y}_N^{(s)*} \right)$. Convergence in probability follows from Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.5. If $\min_{i \in I_{p_1, \dots, p_r}} \xi_N^{(i)} \gg N^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then we can choose a sufficiently large value of r in Corollary 3.5 to apply the Borel-Cantelli lemma and upgrade the convergence to the almost sure sense. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3. We elaborate on the outline of the proof given in the introduction. While many of the details are routine, we commit them here for completeness. Recall the notation $\mathbf{M}_N = \mathbf{\Xi}_N + \mathbf{A}_N = \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k(\mathbf{M}_N) \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)*}$ for the spectral decomposition of the spiked RBM model, and likewise for the perturbation $\mathbf{A}_N = \sum_{s=1}^r \theta_s \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)*}$. We assume that $\xi_N \gg N^\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We start with a straightforward consequence of the isotropic global law.

Lemma 3.7. *For $s' \in [r]$, the spectral measure $\mu_{\mathbf{M}_N}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}}$ converges weakly almost surely to*

$$\mu_{\theta_{s'}}(dx) = \frac{\mathbf{1}\{|x| \leq 2\sigma\}}{2\pi} \frac{\sqrt{4\sigma^2 - x^2}}{\theta_{s'}^2 + \sigma^2 - \theta_{s'}x} dx + \mathbf{1}\{|\theta_{s'}| > \sigma\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{s'}^2}\right) \delta_{\theta_{s'} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{s'}}}(dx).$$

Proof. Since the eigenvectors $(\mathbf{a}_N^{(s)})_{s \in [r]}$ are orthonormal, Proposition 3.6 tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathbf{M}_N^m \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}, \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \rangle &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{Tr} \left(\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*} \left(\mathbf{\Xi}_N + \sum_{s=1}^r \theta_s \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)*} \right)^m \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{Tr} \left(\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*} \left(\mathbf{W}_N + \theta_{s'} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*} \right)^m \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \left(\mathbf{W}_N + \theta_{s'} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*} \right)^m \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}, \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')} \right\rangle,$$

where \mathbf{W}_N is a Wigner matrix. Thus, the moments of $\mu_{\mathbf{M}_N}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}}$ and the moments of $\mu_{\mathbf{W}_N + \theta_{s'} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s') } \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*}}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}}$ converge to the same deterministic sequence $(m_1, m_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ almost surely. Noiry proved that the spectral measure $\mu_{\mathbf{W}_N + \theta_{s'} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s') } \mathbf{a}_N^{(s')*}}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}}$ converges weakly almost surely to $\mu_{\theta_{s'}}$ [Noi21, Proposition 2]: the finiteness of the limiting moments $m_i < \infty$ further implies that the moments of $\mu_{\theta_{s'}}$ are given by the same sequence (m_1, m_2, \dots) . Being compactly supported, the distribution $\mu_{\theta_{s'}}$ is uniquely determined by its moments. Consequently, the moment convergence of $\mu_{\mathbf{M}_N}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}}$ to (m_1, m_2, \dots) implies that $\mu_{\mathbf{M}_N}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s')}}$ converges weakly almost surely to $\mu_{\theta_{s'}}$. \square

To prove the eigenvalue BBP transition (S1) for \mathbf{M}_N , we use the classical Weyl interlacing inequality specialized to a rank one perturbation [HJ13, Corollary 4.3.9].

Proposition 3.8 (Weyl). *Let $\mathbf{H}_N \in \text{Mat}_N(\mathbb{C})$ be Hermitian and $\mathbf{v}_N \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. If $\theta > 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(\mathbf{H}_N) &\leq \lambda_k(\mathbf{H}_N + \theta \mathbf{v}_N \mathbf{v}_N^*) \leq \lambda_{k+1}(\mathbf{H}_N), & k = 1, \dots, N-1; \\ \lambda_N(\mathbf{H}_N) &\leq \lambda_N(\mathbf{H}_N + \theta \mathbf{v}_N \mathbf{v}_N^*). \end{aligned}$$

We can now give the

Proof of Theorem 1.3. First, assume that the $(\theta_s)_{s=1}^r$ are distinct. We prove the result by induction on r . The base case of $r = 1$ corresponds to a rank one perturbation $\mathbf{M}_N = \mathbf{\Xi}_N + \theta_1 \mathbf{a}_N^{(1)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(1)*}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\theta_1 > 0$. Applying Lemma 3.7 to the explicit form of the spectral measure in Example 2.2, we obtain the almost sure weak convergence

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\mathbf{M}_N}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(1)}} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(1)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 \delta_{\lambda_k(\mathbf{M}_N)} \\ &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \frac{\mathbb{1}\{|x| \leq 2\sigma\}}{2\pi} \frac{\sqrt{4\sigma^2 - x^2}}{\theta_1^2 + \sigma^2 - \theta_1 x} dx + \mathbb{1}\{|\theta_1| > \sigma\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_1^2}\right) \delta_{\theta_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_1}}(dx). \end{aligned}$$

The strong convergence of $\mathbf{\Xi}_N$ and the interlacing inequality imply that there is at most one outlier:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_1(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} -2\sigma; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N-1}(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 2\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\theta_1 \in (\sigma, \infty)$, then the atom located at $\theta_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_1} > 2\sigma$ in the limiting spectral measure (24) must originate from $\lambda_N(\mathbf{M}_N)$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_N(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_1}; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(1)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_1^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the interlacing inequality also implies that $\lambda_N(\mathbf{M}_N)$ is a nondecreasing function of $\theta_1 > 0$. If $\theta_1 \in (0, \sigma]$, then we can use this monotonicity to deduce that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_N(\mathbf{M}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 2\sigma.$$

The lack of an atom at 2σ in the limiting spectral measure (24) in this case then implies

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(1)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N)} \right\rangle \right|^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0.$$

Now assume the result for some $r \geq 1$ and consider a rank $r + 1$ perturbation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_N &= \mathbf{\Xi}_N + \sum_{s=1}^{r+1} \theta_s \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)*} \\ &= \left(\mathbf{\Xi}_N + \sum_{s=1}^r \theta_s \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)*} \right) + \theta_{r+1} \mathbf{a}_N^{(r+1)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(r+1)*} \\ &= \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N + \theta_{r+1} \mathbf{a}_N^{(r+1)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(r+1)*}. \end{aligned}$$

We recall the assumption $\theta_1 < \dots < \theta_{r+1}$ are nonzero and the notation

$$\begin{aligned} L_{-\sigma} &= \#\{s \in [r] : \theta_s < -\sigma\}; \\ L_{+\sigma} &= \#\{s \in [r] : \theta_s > \sigma\}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\theta_{r+1} > 0$. By the induction hypothesis, we know that $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N = \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_N^{(k)} \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_N^{(k)*}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (25) \quad & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_k + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_k} < -2\sigma, \quad \forall k \in [L_{-\sigma}]; \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{L_{-\sigma}+1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} -2\sigma; \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N+1-k}(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_{r+1-k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{r+1-k}} > 2\sigma, \quad \forall k \in [L_{+\sigma}]; \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N-L_{+\sigma}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 2\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Once again, we use Lemma 3.7 to compute the limiting spectral measure

$$\begin{aligned} (26) \quad & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\mathbf{M}_N}^{\mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 \delta_{\lambda_k(\mathbf{M}_N)} \\ & \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{|x| \leq 2\sigma\}}{2\pi} \frac{\sqrt{4\sigma^2 - x^2}}{\theta_s^2 + \sigma^2 - \theta_s x} dx + \mathbf{1}\{|\theta_s| > \sigma\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_s^2}\right) \delta_{\theta_s + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_s}}(dx) \end{aligned}$$

for any $s \in [r+1]$. Since the $(\theta_s)_{s=1}^{r+1}$ are distinct and the function $x \mapsto x + \frac{\sigma^2}{x}$ is injective for $|x| \geq \sigma$, the interlacing inequality applied to the rank one perturbation $\mathbf{M}_N = \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N + \theta_{r+1} \mathbf{a}_N^{(r+1)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(r+1)*}$ and the convergences in (25) imply that the weak convergence in (26) holds only if

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k(\mathbf{M}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_k + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_k}, \quad \forall k \in [L_{-\sigma}]; \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbf{1}\{s = k\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_k^2}\right), \quad \forall (s, k) \in [r+1] \times [L_{-\sigma}]; \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{L_{-\sigma}+1}(\mathbf{M}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} -2\sigma; \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0, \quad \forall s \in [r+1] \text{ if } \theta_k \in [-\sigma, 0); \\ & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_N(\mathbf{M}_N) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \begin{cases} \theta_{r+1} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{r+1}} & \text{if } \theta_{r+1} \in (\sigma, \infty); \\ 2\sigma & \text{if } \theta_{r+1} \in (0, \sigma]; \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N)} \right\rangle \right|^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} \{s = r + 1\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{r+1}^2} \right) & \forall s \in [r + 1] \text{ if } \theta_{r+1} \in (\sigma, \infty); \\ 0, & \forall s \in [r + 1] \text{ if } \theta_{r+1} \in (0, \sigma]. \end{cases}$$

Roughly speaking, we work our way in from the left edge of the spectrum using the trap $\lambda_1(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \leq \lambda_1(\mathbf{M}_N)$. Having established the right edge of the spectrum using the lower bound $\lambda_N(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N) \leq \lambda_N(\mathbf{M}_N)$, we can repeat the argument above and work our way in from the other direction using the trap $\lambda_{N-1}(\mathbf{M}_N) \leq \lambda_N(\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_N)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N-k}(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \theta_{r+1-k} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{r+1-k}}, \quad \forall k \in [L+\sigma]; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N-k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbf{1} \{s = r + 1 - k\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\theta_{r+1-k}^2} \right), \quad \forall (s, k) \in [r + 1] \times [L+\sigma]; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{N-1-L+\sigma}(\mathbf{M}_N) &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 2\sigma; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N-k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0, \quad \forall s \in [r + 1] \text{ if } \theta_{r+1-k} \in (0, \sigma], \end{aligned}$$

which completes the induction step.

To prove the general case, we no longer assume that the nontrivial eigenvalues $\theta_1 \leq \dots \leq \theta_r$ of the perturbation $\mathbf{A}_N = \sum_{s=1}^r \theta_s \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)} \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)*}$ are necessarily simple. So, let $\Theta_1 < \dots < \Theta_q$ be the distinct values of $(\theta_s)_{s=1}^r$ and $m_t = \dim(\ker(\Theta_t \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N))$ the multiplicity of Θ_t . A standard continuity argument using the Hoffman-Wielandt inequality [HJ13, Corollary 6.3.8] proves the eigenvalue BBP transition (S1) for \mathbf{M}_N from our earlier result in the case of distinct $(\theta_s)_{s=1}^r$ (see, for example, [BGN11, Section 6.2.3]). From there, we can once again use the convergence of the spectral measure (26) to deduce that for any $(s, t) \in [r] \times [q]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i+1}^{\sum_{i=1}^t m_i} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbf{1} \left\{ s \in \left[\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i + 1, \sum_{i=1}^t m_i \right] \right\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\Theta_t^2} \right) \text{ if } \Theta_t < -\sigma; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i+1}^{\sum_{i=1}^t m_i} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0 \text{ if } \Theta_t \in [-\sigma, 0); \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=\sum_{i=t+1}^q m_i+1}^{\sum_{i=t}^q m_i} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N+1-k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbf{1} \left\{ s \in \left[\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i + 1, \sum_{i=1}^t m_i \right] \right\} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\Theta_t^2} \right) \text{ if } \Theta_t > \sigma; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=\sum_{i=t+1}^q m_i+1}^{\sum_{i=t}^q m_i} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}, \mathbf{m}_N^{(N+1-k)} \right\rangle \right|^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0 \text{ if } \Theta_t \in (0, \sigma]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this already proves the nonalignment in the eigenvector BBP transition (S4) and the second part of (S3); however, we do not have access to the projections of the individual eigenvectors $\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)} / \mathbf{m}_N^{(N+1-k)}$ onto the $\mathbf{a}_N^{(s)}$. Summing the alignment over $s \in [r]$, we obtain the weaker statement

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i+1}^{\sum_{i=1}^t m_i} \left\| P_{\ker(\Theta_t \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}) \right\|_2^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} m_t \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\Theta_t^2} \right) \text{ if } \Theta_t < -\sigma;$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=\sum_{i=t+1}^q m_i+1}^{\sum_{i=t}^q m_i} \left\| P_{\ker(\Theta_t \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(N+1-k)}) \right\|_2^2 \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} m_t \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\Theta_t^2} \right) \text{ if } \Theta_t > \sigma.$$

Nevertheless, one can repeat the perturbation argument in [Cap13, Section 5] to once again deduce the result from the earlier case of distinct $(\theta_s)_{s=1}^r$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| P_{\ker(\Theta_t \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(k)}) \right\|_2^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\Theta_t^2}, & \forall k \in \left[\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} m_i + 1, \sum_{i=1}^t m_i \right] &\text{ if } \Theta_t < -\sigma; \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| P_{\ker(\Theta_t \mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}_N)}(\mathbf{m}_N^{(N+1-k)}) \right\|_2^2 &\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\Theta_t^2}, & \forall k \in \left[\sum_{i=t+1}^q m_i + 1, \sum_{i=t}^q m_i \right] &\text{ if } \Theta_t > \sigma, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes (S3). \square

REFERENCES

- [AGV] Benson Au and Jorge Garza-Vargas, *Spectral asymptotics for contracted tensor ensembles*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.01652v3>.
- [Aiz94] Michael Aizenman, *Localization at weak disorder: some elementary bounds*, Rev. Math. Phys. **6** (1994), no. 5A, 1163–1182. MR 1301371
- [AM93] Michael Aizenman and Stanislav Molchanov, *Localization at large disorder and at extreme energies: an elementary derivation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **157** (1993), no. 2, 245–278. MR 1244867
- [And58] P. W. Anderson, *Absence of Diffusion in Certain Random Lattices*, Phys. Rev. **109** (1958), 1492–1505.
- [Au18] Benson Au, *Traffic distributions of random band matrices*, Electron. J. Probab. **23** (2018), paper no. 77, 48 pp. MR 3858905
- [Au21] ———, *Finite-rank perturbations of random band matrices via infinitesimal free probability*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **74** (2021), no. 9, 1855–1895. MR 4287689
- [BBAP05] Jinho Baik, Gérard Ben Arous, and Sandrine Péché, *Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), no. 5, 1643–1697. MR 2165575
- [BGK17] Florent Benaych-Georges and Antti Knowles, *Local semicircle law for Wigner matrices*, Advanced topics in random matrices, Panor. Synthèses, vol. 53, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2017, pp. 1–90. MR 3792624
- [BGN11] Florent Benaych-Georges and Raj Rao Nadakuditi, *The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices*, Adv. Math. **227** (2011), no. 1, 494–521. MR 2782201
- [BGP14] Florent Benaych-Georges and Sandrine Péché, *Largest eigenvalues and eigenvectors of band or sparse random matrices*, Electron. Commun. Probab. **19** (2014), no. 4, 9. MR 3164751
- [BLS96] Marek Bożejko, Michael Leinert, and Roland Speicher, *Convolution and limit theorems for conditionally free random variables*, Pacific J. Math. **175** (1996), no. 2, 357–388. MR 1432836
- [BMP91] L. V. Bogachev, S. A. Molchanov, and L. A. Pastur, *On the density of states of random band matrices*, Mat. Zametki **50** (1991), no. 6, 31–42, 157. MR 1150631
- [Bou18] Paul Bourgade, *Random band matrices*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. IV. Invited lectures, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, pp. 2759–2784. MR 3966510
- [BS10] Zhidong Bai and Jack W. Silverstein, *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, second ed., Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York, 2010. MR 2567175
- [BS12] S. T. Belinschi and D. Shlyakhtenko, *Free probability of type B: analytic interpretation and applications*, Amer. J. Math. **134** (2012), no. 1, 193–234. MR 2876144
- [BvH] Tatiana Brailovskaya and Ramon van Handel, *Universality and sharp matrix concentration inequalities*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.05142v1>.
- [BvH16] Afonso S. Bandeira and Ramon van Handel, *Sharp nonasymptotic bounds on the norm of random matrices with independent entries*, Ann. Probab. **44** (2016), no. 4, 2479–2506. MR 3531673
- [BY88] Z. D. Bai and Y. Q. Yin, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for almost sure convergence of the largest eigenvalue of a Wigner matrix*, Ann. Probab. **16** (1988), no. 4, 1729–1741. MR 958213
- [BYY20] Paul Bourgade, Horng-Tzer Yau, and Jun Yin, *Random band matrices in the delocalized phase I: Quantum unique ergodicity and universality*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **73** (2020), no. 7, 1526–1596. MR 4156609
- [Cap13] M. Capitaine, *Additive/multiplicative free subordination property and limiting eigenvectors of spiked additive deformations of Wigner matrices and spiked sample covariance matrices*, J. Theoret. Probab. **26** (2013), no. 3, 595–648. MR 3090543

- [CDG] Guillaume Cébron, Antoine Dahlqvist, and Franck Gabriel, *Freeness of type B and conditional freeness for random matrices*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.01926v1>.
- [CDMF09] Mireille Capitaine, Catherine Donati-Martin, and Delphine Féral, *The largest eigenvalues of finite rank deformation of large Wigner matrices: convergence and nonuniversality of the fluctuations*, Ann. Probab. **37** (2009), no. 1, 1–47. MR 2489158
- [CDMF12] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, and D. Féral, *Central limit theorems for eigenvalues of deformations of Wigner matrices*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **48** (2012), no. 1, 107–133. MR 2919200
- [CHS18] Benoit Collins, Takahiro Hasebe, and Noriyoshi Sakuma, *Free probability for purely discrete eigenvalues of random matrices*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **70** (2018), no. 3, 1111–1150. MR 3830802
- [CMI90] Giulio Casati, Luca Molinari, and Felix Izrailev, *Scaling properties of band random matrices*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990), no. 16, 1851–1854. MR 1046365
- [CPSS] Giorgio Cipolloni, Ron Peled, Jeffrey Schenker, and Jacob Shapiro, *Dynamical localization for random band matrices up to $W \ll N^{1/4}$* , Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.05545v2>.
- [CS] Nixia Chen and Charles K Smart, *Random band matrix localization by scalar fluctuations*, Preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.06439v1>.
- [Dyk93] Ken Dykema, *On certain free product factors via an extended matrix model*, J. Funct. Anal. **112** (1993), no. 1, 31–60. MR 1207936
- [EY17] László Erdős and Horng-Tzer Yau, *A dynamical approach to random matrix theory*, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 28, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. MR 3699468
- [FM91] Yan V. Fyodorov and Alexander D. Mirlin, *Scaling properties of localization in random band matrices: a σ -model approach*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991), no. 18, 2405–2409. MR 1130103
- [FMSS85] J. Fröhlich, F. Martinelli, E. Scoppola, and T. Spencer, *Constructive proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model*, Comm. Math. Phys. **101** (1985), no. 1, 21–46. MR 814541
- [FS83] Jürg Fröhlich and Thomas Spencer, *Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy*, Comm. Math. Phys. **88** (1983), no. 2, 151–184. MR 696803
- [HJ13] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. MR 2978290
- [KY13] Antti Knowles and Jun Yin, *The isotropic semicircle law and deformation of Wigner matrices*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **66** (2013), no. 11, 1663–1750. MR 3103909
- [KY14] ———, *The outliers of a deformed Wigner matrix*, Ann. Probab. **42** (2014), no. 5, 1980–2031. MR 3262497
- [KY17] ———, *Anisotropic local laws for random matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **169** (2017), no. 1-2, 257–352. MR 3704770
- [LY14] Ji Oon Lee and Jun Yin, *A necessary and sufficient condition for edge universality of Wigner matrices*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), no. 1, 117–173. MR 3161313
- [Min96] Nariyuki Minami, *Local fluctuation of the spectrum of a multidimensional Anderson tight binding model*, Comm. Math. Phys. **177** (1996), no. 3, 709–725. MR 1385082
- [Mur01] Naofumi Muraki, *Monotonic independence, monotonic central limit theorem and monotonic law of small numbers*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **4** (2001), no. 1, 39–58. MR 1824472
- [Noi21] Nathan Noiry, *Spectral measures of spiked random matrices*, J. Theoret. Probab. **34** (2021), no. 2, 923–952. MR 4259454
- [Pas72] L. A. Pastur, *The spectrum of random matrices*, Teoret. Mat. Fiz. **10** (1972), no. 1, 102–112. MR 475502
- [Péc06] S. Péché, *The largest eigenvalue of small rank perturbations of Hermitian random matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **134** (2006), no. 1, 127–173. MR 2221787
- [PRS13] Alessandro Pizzo, David Renfrew, and Alexander Soshnikov, *On finite rank deformations of Wigner matrices*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **49** (2013), no. 1, 64–94. MR 3060148
- [RS13] David Renfrew and Alexander Soshnikov, *On finite rank deformations of Wigner matrices II: Delocalized perturbations*, Random Matrices Theory Appl. **2** (2013), no. 1, 1250015, 36. MR 3039820
- [Shl18] D. Shlyakhtenko, *Free probability of type-B and asymptotics of finite-rank perturbations of random matrices*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **67** (2018), no. 2, 971–991. MR 3798863
- [Sod10] Sasha Sodin, *The spectral edge of some random band matrices*, Ann. of Math. (2) **172** (2010), no. 3, 2223–2251. MR 2726110
- [Sos99] Alexander Soshnikov, *Universality at the edge of the spectrum in Wigner random matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **207** (1999), no. 3, 697–733. MR 1727234
- [TW94] Craig A. Tracy and Harold Widom, *Level-spacing distributions and the Airy kernel*, Comm. Math. Phys. **159** (1994), no. 1, 151–174. MR 1257246

- [TW96] ———, *On orthogonal and symplectic matrix ensembles*, Comm. Math. Phys. **177** (1996), no. 3, 727–754. MR 1385083
- [Voi91] Dan Voiculescu, *Limit laws for random matrices and free products*, Invent. Math. **104** (1991), no. 1, 201–220. MR 1094052
- [Wig55] Eugene P. Wigner, *Characteristic vectors of bordered matrices with infinite dimensions*, Ann. of Math. (2) **62** (1955), 548–564. MR 0077805
- [Wig58] ———, *On the distribution of the roots of certain symmetric matrices*, Ann. of Math. (2) **67** (1958), 325–327. MR 95527
- [Wig67] ———, *Random Matrices in Physics*, SIAM Review **9** (1967), no. 1, 1–23.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, 367 EVANS HALL # 3860, BERKELEY, CA 94720-3860, USA

Email address: bensonau@berkeley.edu