

A Constructive Proof of the Spherical Parisi Formula

Brice Huang*

Mark Sellke†

Abstract

The Parisi formula for the free energy is among the crown jewels in the theory of spin glasses. We present a simpler proof of the lower bound in the case of the spherical mean-field model. Our method is constructive: given the minimizer in Parisi’s variational problem, we locate a pure state via an explicit optimization algorithm due to Subag on parts with full RSB, and a new truncated second moment argument on critical points for finite RSB parts. Similarly, we show that a truncated second moment suffices to analyze the free energy of a pure state, which amounts to computing the free energy in replica-symmetric models without external field. Our truncation arguments rely on interpolation upper bounds applied to conditional band models. Notably we do not use the Aizenman–Sims–Starr scheme, and require interpolation bounds only up to the 1RSB level. Whenever replica symmetry breaks, we obtain an approximately ultrametric set of exponentially many pure states, each with approximately the same free energy as the entire model, which are hierarchically arranged in accordance with the Parisi ansatz. Our methods also yield results for large deviations of the ground state, including the entire upper tail rate function for all 1RSB models without external field.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Fundamental Model Types	7
3	Strictly RS and 1RSB Models via Truncated Second Moment	14
4	Building a Model from Fundamental Types: Proof of Theorem 1.5	29
5	Large Deviations for the Ground State	37

1 Introduction

We consider the mixed p -spin Hamiltonian

$$H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \sum_{p \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_p}{N^{(p-1)/2}} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^N g_{i_1, \dots, i_p} \sigma_{i_1} \cdots \sigma_{i_p}. \quad (1.1)$$

*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, MIT. Email: bmhuang@mit.edu

†Department of Statistics, Harvard University. Email: msellke@fas.harvard.edu

Here g_{i_1, \dots, i_p} are i.i.d. standard Gaussians, and the coefficients γ_p satisfy $\sum_{p \geq 1} 2^p \gamma_p^2 < \infty$.¹ This model is described by the **mixture function** $\xi(t) = \sum_{p=1}^P \gamma_p^2 t^p$. For $\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, define the **overlap** $R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) = \langle \sigma^1, \sigma^2 \rangle / N$. Then H_N is the Gaussian process with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}H_N(\sigma^1)H_N(\sigma^2) = N\xi(R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)).$$

Since the introduction of this model by Sherrington and Kirkpatrick [SK75], a central question has been to understand the free energy, defined as follows. In this paper we consider the case of spherical spins. Let

$$\mathcal{S}_N = \left\{ \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{N} \right\}$$

be the sphere of radius \sqrt{N} . The partition function and free energy density are defined by

$$Z_N = \int_{\mathcal{S}_N} \exp H_N(\sigma) \, d\sigma, \quad (1.2)$$

$$F_N = \frac{1}{N} \log Z_N, \quad (1.3)$$

where in (1.2) the integration is with respect to the uniform probability measure on \mathcal{S}_N .

The in-probability limit of the free energy was first predicted by Parisi in [Par79], and proved in the breakthrough works of Talagrand [Tal06b, Tal06a] and Panchenko [Pan13a] following decades of progress in the probability and statistical physics communities. In the equivalent formulation due to Crisanti and Sommers [CS92], the limiting free energy is described as follows. Let $x : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a right-continuous non-decreasing function such that $x(\hat{q}) = 1$ for some $\hat{q} < 1$ (which may depend on x). Let

$$\hat{x}(q) = \int_q^1 x(q) \, dq.$$

Define the Crisanti-Sommers functional

$$\mathcal{P}(x; \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \xi'(0)\hat{x}(0) + \int_0^1 \xi''(q)\hat{x}(q) \, dq + \int_0^{\hat{q}} \frac{dq}{\hat{x}(q)} + \log(1 - \hat{q}) \right\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Note that $\hat{x}(q) = 1 - q$ for $q > \hat{q}$, so this functional is independent of \hat{q} . Finally define

$$\mathcal{P}(\xi) = \inf_x \mathcal{P}(x; \xi). \quad (1.5)$$

Theorem 1.1 ([Tal06a, Che13]). *The limiting free energy exists and equals*

$$\text{p-lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N = \mathcal{P}(\xi).$$

1.1 Main Result

The purpose of this paper is to give a new constructive proof of the (more difficult) lower bound for $\text{p-lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N$ in the Parisi formula. In fact, we will construct an ultrametric tree of pure states, each with the same free energy as the entire model, taking all overlaps in the model's overlap distribution (in fact a slight extension thereof, see (1.6) below) as predicted by Parisi's ultrametric ansatz [Par79, Par83].

¹For notational convenience, we have written the model's external field as the degree-1 term of H_N , rather than the traditional $h \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i$. In the spherical models we consider, these are of course equivalent by rotational invariance.

We will use the following characterization of the unique minimizer of (1.5). We emphasize that this description (including existence and uniqueness) is a comparatively elementary fact about the variational problem, and as yet says nothing about the free energy F_N . For given x , define

$$\begin{aligned} F(q) &= \xi'(q) - \int_0^q \frac{ds}{\hat{x}(s)^2}, \\ f(s) &= \int_0^s F(q) dq, \\ S &= \{s \leq 1 : f(s) = f_{\max}\}, \quad f_{\max} = \sup\{f(q) : q \in [0, 1]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Lemma 1.2 ([Tal06a, Proposition 2.1]). *There is a unique x attaining the infimum (1.5), which is characterized as follows. Let ν be the probability measure on $[0, 1]$ such that $x(q) = \nu([0, q])$. Then $\nu(S) = 1$.*

Remark 1.3. The measure ν is the **overlap distribution** of the model ξ . Namely in the *generic* models where $\sum_{p \text{ even}: \gamma_p > 0} 1/p = \sum_{p \text{ odd}: \gamma_p > 0} 1/p = \infty$, one has $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} G^{\otimes 2}(f(R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2))) = \int f(x) d\nu(x)$ for all continuous $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where G is the Gibbs measure of the model and σ^1, σ^2 are independent samples from G . The same holds for arbitrary ξ modulo small “generic perturbations” that do not affect the free energy; see [Pan13b, Chapter 3].

Remark 1.4. It is possible for $\text{supp}(\nu) \subseteq S$ to be a strict inclusion, and one may think of overlaps $q \in S \setminus \text{supp}(\nu)$ as “atoms of mass zero” in the overlap distribution. Indeed, [Sub18, Theorem 10] showed that (for generic models) all overlaps in S are *multi-samplable*, meaning that the Gibbs probability of sampling several points with this pairwise overlap is not exponentially small.

The following two definitions describe the geometry of the pure states that our main result will construct.

Definition 1. For $k, D \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}(k, D)$ be the tree with vertices $\{\emptyset\} \cup [k] \cup [k]^2 \cup \dots \cup [k]^D$ rooted at \emptyset , where $u \in [k]^d$ is the parent of $[v] \in [k]^{d+1}$ if u is the length- d prefix of v . For $u, v \in \mathbb{T}$, write $|u|$ for the length of u and $u \wedge v$ for the length of the least common ancestor of u, v . Let $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}(k, D) = [k]^D$ be the leaf set of \mathbb{T} .

Definition 2. Let $k, D \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq q_0 < \dots < q_D \leq 1$, $\vec{q} = (q_0, \dots, q_D)$, and $\delta > 0$. A (k, D, \vec{q}, δ) -ultrametric tree is a collection of points $(\sigma^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}}$ such that

$$|R(\sigma^u, \sigma^v) - q_{u \wedge v}| \leq \delta, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (1.7)$$

For $q \in [0, 1]$, define

$$E(q) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \xi'(0) \hat{x}(0) + \int_0^q \xi''(s) \hat{x}(s) ds + \int_0^q \frac{ds}{\hat{x}(s)} \right\}.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$, and $\|\sigma\|_2 \leq \sqrt{qN}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Band}_{k, q, \delta}(\sigma) &= \left\{ \vec{\rho} = (\rho^1, \dots, \rho^k) : \|\rho^i\|_2 = \sqrt{qN}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. |R(\rho^i - \sigma, \sigma)| \leq \delta, |R(\rho^i - \sigma, \rho^j - \sigma)| \leq \delta, \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq k \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.5. *For any $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, $D \in \mathbb{N}$ and increasing $q_0, \dots, q_D \in S$ with $q_D = \sup(S)$, there exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds for any $k \leq e^{cN}$. With probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ there is a (k, D, \vec{q}, δ) -ultrametric tree $(\sigma^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}}$ with the following properties.*

(i) *Energy of tree nodes:* for each $u \in \mathbb{T}$, $\frac{1}{N}H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u) \geq E(q_{|u|}) - \varepsilon$.

(ii) *Free energy of pure states:* for each $u \in \mathbb{L}$,

$$\frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u)} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \right) d\vec{\rho} \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - \varepsilon. \quad (1.8)$$

The free energy lower bound (1.8) holds even in a “ k -replicated” sense, where we average over k replicas $\boldsymbol{\rho}^i$ constrained to be nearly orthogonal. This of course lower bounds the free energy of a single replica, as

$$\int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u)} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \right) d\vec{\rho} \leq \left(\int_{\text{Band}_{1,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u)} \exp H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}) d\boldsymbol{\rho} \right)^k, \quad (1.9)$$

and this shows there is no free energy cost to taking k approximately orthogonal replicas. In our proof of Theorem 1.5, we derive an analogous k -replicated lower bound on the energy increment from any $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u$, where $u \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{L}$, to its children $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{u^1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{u^k}$, see Theorem 4.2(ii); this allows us to construct the ultrametric tree $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.5, we obtain the lower bound in the Parisi formula.

Corollary 1.6. *We have $\text{p-lim inf}_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi)$.*

Proof. Equations (1.8) and (1.9) imply

$$\begin{aligned} F_N &= \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{S_N} \exp H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}) d\boldsymbol{\rho} \geq \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{1,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u)} \exp H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}) d\boldsymbol{\rho} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u)} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \right) d\vec{\rho} \\ &\geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the result follows. \square

Taking the temperature to zero, we also obtain the following consequence on near-ground states.

Corollary 1.7. *Let ν_∞ be the zero-temperature overlap measure defined in (2.4), and let $q_1 < q_2 < \dots < q_D = 1$ lie in $\text{supp}(\nu_\infty)$. Then for any $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $k \leq e^{cN}$, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ there exists a (k, D, \vec{q}, δ) -ultrametric tree $\mathbb{T} \subseteq S_N$ such that:*

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathbb{L}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})/N \geq \max_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in S_N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})/N - \varepsilon. \quad (1.10)$$

In fact the same holds with $\text{supp}(\nu_\infty)$ replaced by T from (2.5), which is the zero-temperature analog of S .

Finally in Section 5, we obtain consequences for the large deviations of the ground state energy $GS_N = \max_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in S_N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})/N$. Confirming predictions of [LFD23], we determine the upper tail rate function for all 1RSB ξ with $\gamma_1 = 0$, and identify a sharp phase transition in the speed from $O(N)$ to $\Omega(N^2)$ for general ξ . The former follows by the methods of Section 3; the latter uses Corollary 1.7, and in particular the fact that k can be taken exponentially large in N .

Remark 1.8. Related ultrametric decompositions for spin glasses have appeared in several previous works, including [Jag17, Sub18, CS21]. A notable aspect of Theorem 1.5 is that it gives an ultrametric tree with exponentially large branching factor at each level. Our approach to the construction is also quite different, going one layer at a time “by hand”, which is why we can use it as a proof technique to study free energies. The aforementioned works proceed in the opposite direction, using previously established properties of Gibbs measures and/or free energies to construct their decompositions.

At zero temperature, with $\gamma_1 = 0$ so that $0 \in \text{supp}(\nu_\infty)$, the existence of many approximately orthogonal near ground states is closely related to disorder chaos; see [Cha14, DEZ15, AC18, CHL18, Eld20]. Corollary 1.7 is the first to show e^{cN} approximately orthogonal near ground states exist without additional assumptions on ξ .

Remark 1.9. Our proof of Theorem 1.5 is in our opinion easier than previous ones [Tal06b, Tal06a, Pan13a]. We take a quite direct approach, and the most technically sophisticated inputs required are arguably RS and 1RSB interpolation upper bounds (see Remark 2.6 and above). However despite being elementary, the approaches we combine are conceptually powerful and were developed relatively recently (see Subsection 1.3). We believe this work further demonstrates the strength and versatility of these ideas.

1.2 History of Mean-Field Spin Glasses and the Parisi Formula

Mean-field spin glasses were introduced in [SK75, Der81] to model disordered magnetic materials. Soon after, [TAP77, dAT78] observed that the replica-symmetric ansatz made by Sherrington and Kirkpatrick could not be correct at low temperatures. This was resolved by Parisi’s ground-breaking replica symmetry breaking solution, yielding a formula for the free energy at any temperature [Par79, Par80, Par83]. Several mysterious, fascinating features were present in this highly non-rigorous ansatz, which suggested the Gibbs measure should be viewed as being supported on a random ultrametric space, with a non-trivial distribution of overlaps at low temperature [MPS⁺84a, MPS⁺84b, MPV87]. Deeper insights into the nature of the overlaps were later obtained, such as the Ruelle cascades [Rue87] and Ghirlanda–Guerra identities [GG98]. *Spherical* spin glasses were also introduced in [CS92], where it was observed that a similar replica ansatz should apply and lead to simpler formulas. Despite this, rigorous results were for some time mainly restricted to high-temperature settings with similar behavior to classical spin systems [ALR87, CN95].

A crucial breakthrough was made in [GT02], which proved the existence of a limiting free energy at all temperatures using the Gaussian interpolation method. Then in [Gue03], Guerra gave an inspired interpolation upper bound for the free energy, which matched the conjectural Parisi ansatz. Finally, Talagrand used a difficult interpolation scheme (analyzing its intermediate-time behavior using another interpolation) to prove the Parisi formula at all temperatures for both Ising and spherical models, with the slight restriction that $\gamma_p = 0$ for all p odd [Tal06b, Tal06a].

While Talagrand’s solution was rather complicated, it was realized in [ASS03] that Guerra’s upper bound allows one to transparently deduce an extended variational formula for the free energy over a space of “random overlap structures”, relaxing the ultrametricity condition in the Parisi ansatz. Combined with asymptotic ultrametricity of the Gibbs measures shown by [Pan13a], this led to an alternate proof of the Parisi formula with no parity restriction [Pan14, Che13]. Subsequently, the intrinsic behavior of the associated variational formula was clarified via connection to stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations [AC15, JT16], and a limiting zero temperature formula was obtained for the ground state energy [AC17, CS17].

1.3 Background for Our Approach

Our approach combines several methods in spin glass theory which are seemingly quite different from each other, and which did not enter previous proofs of the Parisi formula. In short, we will decompose general

spin glasses into four types of special cases that can be understood separately and pieced back together. This decomposition corresponds to layers in the ultrametric Gibbs tree and can be read off explicitly from the minimizer to the Parisi formula (as depicted later in Figure 1). Below we discuss some key methods we use to study these special cases, focusing on their uses in previous work as well as their limitations.

(Conditional) Second Moment Method A natural avenue to study the free energy is the second moment method: if $(\mathbb{E}Z_N)^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_N^2]$ coincide to leading exponential order, then F_N converges in probability to the annealed value $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}Z_N$.² The second moment method is known to fail in any model where replica symmetry breaking occurs, as correlations within clusters of the Gibbs distribution cause the second moment to be exponentially larger than the first moment squared. However, one may hope to use this method to establish the free energy in the replica-symmetric phase, and a great deal of recent work has made progress on this question.

It is folklore that for replica-symmetric models **without external field**, the second moment method determines the free energy in a non-empty portion of the replica-symmetric phase, see (2.6) below. For models with external field, the Gibbs measure has a nonzero barycenter, and large-deviations events in its location dominate the first moment, so that the annealed value above is incorrect at all temperatures. This issue can be addressed by a *conditional* second moment argument, developed concurrently by [Bol18] (for the SK model) and [DS19] (for the Ising perceptron). The idea is that in (a suitable subset of) the replica-symmetric phase, the approximate message passing (AMP) iteration developed in [Bol14, BM11] should explicitly compute the barycenter. Because the behavior of AMP depends only on $O(N)$ linear functions of the disorder, conditioning on this behavior preserves nearly all of the randomness in H_N . In particular it makes sense to apply the second moment method conditionally on typical behavior of the AMP iteration; this effectively recenters spins around the barycenter, so the second moment now has a good chance to match the first moment. In this way, [Bol18] verified the replica-symmetric formula for the SK model with external field at sufficiently high temperature; the range of temperatures was later improved in [BY22].

Unfortunately, the second moment method often does not succeed in the entire RS phase (with or without external field); extending it to do so is mentioned as an open problem in both [Bol18, BY22]. Relatedly, [Sub23] characterized when it succeeds in more general spherical spin glasses with multiple species.

Critical Point Complexity An important line of work pioneered by [Fyo04] studies the critical point complexity of random landscapes using the Kac–Rice Formula [Ric44, Kac43, AT07]. For spherical spin glasses, [ABČ13, AB13] calculated the exponential growth rate of the expected number of critical points with given energy and index.

Although replica symmetry breaking prevents a second moment analysis of the free energy, the results of [Sub17a, BSZ20] demonstrated that in models that are 1RSB at zero temperature (a condition satisfied by all pure models and perturbations thereof, see Lemma 3.21), a second moment analysis of certain critical point counts can sometimes determine the *ground state energy*. This is because in such models, the pure states dominating the Gibbs measure degenerate at zero temperature to critical points with the ground state energy; because the model is 1RSB, pairs of such points are typically orthogonal, with no further clustering structure. In other words, studying critical points allows one to “go up one level of RSB.” This idea was also used in the celebrated proof of the satisfiability conjecture [DSS22], where a central technique was a combinatorial encoding of the *clusters* of solutions to random k -SAT. However for reasons similar to above, the second moment method applied to critical points determines the ground state energy not throughout the entire zero-temperature 1RSB regime, but only under a stronger “Condition M” identified in [BSZ20].

²Leading exponential order agreement is well-known to be sufficient thanks to a method introduced by [Fri90] which combines the Paley-Zygmund inequality with a priori concentration of F_N ; see Proposition 2.15.

A different phenomenon that is also amenable to study via the Kac–Rice formula is *topological trivialization*. This term describes the regime where H_N typically has just two critical points on the sphere, namely its global extrema, due to a strong external field. In particular, since the ground state energy must be a critical value, the Kac–Rice formula also enables its computation for topologically trivial models. Precise phase boundaries for this behavior were determined in [Fyo16, BČNS22, HS23c].

In addition to the aforementioned results, the Kac–Rice formula has also yielded a refined understanding of pure spherical spin glasses at low temperature beyond just the free energy [SZ17, Sub17b], and has also been used to analyze numerous other high-dimensional disordered landscapes [FK16, BMMN19, FMM21, McK21, BBM23b, Kiv23, CFM23, BFK21].

Optimization Algorithms Another pertinent line of work has studied optimization algorithms for mean-field spin glasses. For us, the most relevant thread is not the rich world of Langevin dynamics [SZ81, CHS93, CK93, Ben02, Gui07, BDG06, DGM07, BGJ20, Sel23], but instead starts with the remarkable paper [Sub21]. There, Subag gave an efficient algorithm to optimize spherical spin glass Hamiltonians based on Hessian ascent, aiming to construct an analog of the ultrametric Gibbs tree at zero temperature. Notably, this gave an elementary lower bound for the ground state energy, which is sharp for the *strictly full-RSB* models where $T = [0, 1]$, for T the zero-temperature analog of S defined in (2.5). It was later shown in [HS21, HS23a], based on the overlap gap property of [GS17, Gam21], that a natural class of *stable* algorithms can never outperform Subag’s algorithm, regardless of the RSB structure of the model (see also [GJ21, GJW20]). In particular it is believed that *only* under strict FRSB do efficient algorithms suffice to sharply lower bound the ground state energy. This motivated the 1RSB component of our main approach (explained in the next section), which is constructive but **not** computationally efficient. Related message-passing optimization algorithms were developed for Ising spin glasses [Mon21, AMS21, AM20, Sel21], where the close connection between efficient algorithms and strict FRSB persists, and other models including combinatorial optimization on sparse graphs [AS22, AMS23a, MS23, HS23b, CHM23].

2 Fundamental Model Types

In this subsection we define four types of models, which we term **topologically trivial**, **strictly RS**, **strictly 1RSB**, and **strictly FRSB**. We state lower bounds on the free energy of strictly RS models and the ground state energies of the other three model types. These models will serve as the basic building blocks for any overlap distribution. The proof of Theorem 1.5, carried out in Section 4, will decompose a model ξ into several sub-models of these types and apply these results.

Definition 3. The model ξ is **strictly RS** if $S = \{0\}$.

The remaining three types of models will be defined using a zero-temperature version of the Crisanti-Sommers formula introduced in [CS17], which is obtained as a limit of (1.4). For $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and $L > \int_0^1 \alpha(s) ds$, let

$$\widehat{\alpha}(q) = L - \int_0^1 \alpha(s) ds.$$

Then define

$$\mathcal{Q}(L, \alpha; \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \xi'(0)L + \int_0^1 \xi''(q)\widehat{\alpha}(q) dq + \int_0^1 \frac{dq}{\widehat{\alpha}(q)} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{Q}(\xi) = \inf_{L, \alpha} \mathcal{Q}(L, \alpha; \xi). \quad (2.2)$$

Theorem 2.1 ([CS17, Theorem 1]). *The limiting ground state energy of the model ξ is*

$$\text{p-lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} H_N(\sigma) = \mathcal{Q}(\xi).$$

The minimizer of (2.2) has a similar characterization to Lemma 1.2 above. For given L, α , define

$$\begin{aligned} G(q) &= \xi'(q) - \int_0^q \frac{dq}{\widehat{\alpha}(q)^2}, \\ g(s) &= \int_s^1 G(q) dq. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Similarly to before, we let ν_∞ be the finite Borel measure on $[0, 1]$ defined by

$$\nu_\infty([0, q]) = \alpha(q) \quad \forall q \in [0, 1] \tag{2.4}$$

and define the set

$$T = \{q \in [0, 1] : g(q) = 0\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Note that we always have $1 \in T$.

Lemma 2.2 ([CS17, Theorem 2]). *There is a unique (L, α) attaining the infimum (2.2), which is characterized by the following properties:*

$$G(1) = 0; \quad \min_{q \in [0, 1]} g(q) = 0; \quad \nu_\infty(T^c) = 0.$$


Definition 4. The model ξ is **topologically trivial** if $T = \{1\}$, **strictly 1RSB** if $T = \{0, 1\}$, and **strictly FRSB** if $T = [0, 1]$.

Remark 2.3. Note that ξ can only be strictly RS, strictly 1RSB, or strictly FRSB if $\xi'(0) = \gamma_1^2 = 0$, i.e. there is no external field. Indeed if $\xi'(0) > 0$, then $F(q), G(q) > 0$ for q in a neighborhood of 0, so we cannot have $0 \in S, T$. Conversely, by Lemma 2.11(a), ξ can only be topologically trivial if $\xi'(1) \geq \xi''(1)$, which implies $\xi'(0) > 0$ except in the simple case that ξ is quadratic.

2.1 Proof Outline for Theorem 1.5

Decomposition into Fundamental Types We will construct the ultrametric tree in Theorem 1.5 layer by layer, as follows. Let x attain the infimum in (1.5); it is known from [JT18] (see Lemma 4.1) that the associated S (1.6) is a finite union of intervals (including possibly atoms). We may assume without loss of generality that the sequence q_0, \dots, q_D contains all endpoints of these intervals, so that $q_0 = \inf S$, $q_D = \sup S$, and each interval $[q_d, q_{d+1}]$ (where we take as convention $q_{-1} = 0$, $q_{D+1} = 1$) either is contained in S or intersects S at exactly its endpoints. Recall that (modulo Remark 1.4) S is the support of the overlap distribution $\nu([0, q]) = x(q)$, so these intervals comprise the overlap support and overlap gaps of the model ξ .

We define a sub-model of ξ for each interval $[q_d, q_{d+1}]$ (see (4.1)), which represents the landscape of H_N on an orthogonal band of radius $\sqrt{(q_{d+1} - q_d)N}$ around a point of radius $\sqrt{q_d N}$. Due to the choice of q_0, \dots, q_D , the sub-model for $[0, q_0]$ will be topologically trivial, that for $[q_D, 1]$ strictly RS, and the remaining sub-models either strictly 1RSB or strictly FRSB (see Figure 1). We then prove sharp lower bounds for the free energy of each strictly RS component and the ground state energy of the remaining



Decomposition of an overlap distribution into fundamental components. Our proof of Theorem 1.5 combines lower bounds on the free or ground state energy of each piece.

components. For all but topologically trivial components, this lower bound will hold in a k -replicated sense, which allows us to combine the bounds in Section 4 and thus prove Theorem 1.5.

These lower bounds are stated in Subsection 2.2. For topologically trivial and strictly FRSB models, they are already known, using the Kac–Rice formula and an explicit optimization algorithm respectively (see Subsection 1.3). Namely [FD14, BČNS22] showed that topologically trivial models have w.h.p. two critical points, the global maximum and minimum, and characterized their energies. Meanwhile [Sub21] showed how to construct an approximate ground state of any strictly FRSB model (which can easily be made k -replicated). It is worth pointing out that locating the ground state of the topologically trivial model in the first stage is analogous to the recentering step from the conditional second moment method explained in Subsection 1.3. Indeed for replica-symmetric models with external field $\gamma_1 \neq 0$, our proof amounts to an improved implementation of the strategy outlined there.

Given this, our primary remaining tasks are the lower bounds for strictly RS and 1RSB models. We prove these bounds using a new truncated second moment argument, explained below.

Truncated Second Moment It is natural to study the free energy of strictly RS models using the second moment method. A direct calculation shows that if

$$\xi(q) + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q^2) \leq 0 \quad \forall q \in [0, 1), \quad (2.6)$$

then the second moment method succeeds and $\text{p-lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N = \frac{1}{2} \xi(1)$. However, this does not encompass the entire RS phase. Indeed, by Lemma 1.2 (with $x \equiv 1$), the model is strictly RS if (and only if)

$$\xi(q) + q + \log(1 - q) \leq 0 \quad \forall q \in [0, 1) \quad (2.7)$$

with equality only at $q = 0$. These conditions do not agree, so even in the strictly RS phase it is possible for the dominant contribution to the second moment to come from pairs with nonzero overlap.

Similarly, [BSZ20, Condition M] gives a condition under which the second moment method, applied to a suitable critical point count, identifies the ground state energy. However, this condition does not encompass the entire zero-temperature 1RSB phase, given by (3.4) below.

We overcome these difficulties by truncating the moment calculation to *typical* points, see Definitions 5 and 6. Roughly, $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ will be said to be **free energy typical** if for any q , the free energy on the band

$$\text{Band}_q(\sigma) = \{\rho \in \mathcal{S}_N : R(\rho, \sigma) = q\}$$

is at most $\mathcal{P}(\xi)$, and **ground state typical** if the ground state energy on such bands is at most $\mathcal{Q}(\xi)$. We will show that typical points dominate the respective first moments for both of the model types described above, by applying Guerra's interpolation bound to appropriate conditional models. This implies that truncation has only a slight effect on the first moment. On the other hand, truncation immediately ensures that the second moment is dominated by pairs of orthogonal points, causing the second moment method to succeed throughout the RS and 1RSB regimes.

To prove these highly non-obvious typicality properties, we rely on the following upper bounds which follow from the interpolation method of [Gue03]. In fact we require only replica-symmetric bounds at positive temperature, and 1RSB bounds at zero temperature.

Proposition 2.4. *For any x as in (1.4) of the form $x(q) = \mathbb{1}\{q \geq q_*\}$,*

$$\text{p-lim sup}_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N \leq \mathcal{P}(x; \xi).$$

Proposition 2.5. *For any (L, α) as in (2.1) of the form $\alpha(q) = u\mathbb{1}\{q \geq q_*\}$,*

$$\text{p-lim sup}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} H_N(\sigma) \leq \mathcal{Q}(L, \alpha; \xi).$$

Remark 2.6. Proposition 2.4 follows directly from [Tal06a], while Proposition 2.5 follows from the zero temperature limits taken in [CS17] or [JT17]. We note that proving them for general ξ requires Talagrand's positivity principle [Pan07, Tal11], which follows from the Ghirlanda–Guerra identities. If one wishes to avoid these to keep things elementary, one may assume throughout this paper that ξ is convex on $[-1, 1]$.

2.2 Lower Bounds for Free and Ground State Energy

The following propositions lower bound the free or ground state energies in the four fundamental model types. They are special cases of Theorem 1.5 where ξ is of these types.

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose ξ is strictly RS. For all $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c = c(\xi, \delta, \varepsilon)$ such that if $k \leq e^{cN}$, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$,*

$$\frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0})} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\sigma^i) \right) d\vec{\sigma} \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - \varepsilon.$$

Proposition 2.8. *Suppose ξ is strictly 1RSB. For all $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c = c(\xi, \delta, \varepsilon)$ such that if $k \leq e^{cN}$, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ there exists $\vec{\sigma} \in \text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0})$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma^i) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon \quad \forall i \in [k].$$

Proposition 2.9. *Suppose ξ is topologically trivial. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c = c(\xi, \varepsilon)$ such that with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, there exists $\sigma \in S_N$ such that $\frac{1}{N}H_N(\sigma) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon$.*

Proposition 2.10. *If ξ is strictly FRSB, the conclusion of Proposition 2.8 also holds.*

We will prove Propositions 2.7 and 2.8 in Section 3 by the aforementioned truncated second moment argument. Propositions 2.9 and 2.10 are known from previous work, and we outline their proofs below.

Lemma 2.11. *The following holds.*

(a) *If ξ is topologically trivial, then $\xi'(1) \geq \xi''(1)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(\xi) = \sqrt{\xi'(1)}$.*

(b) *If ξ is strictly FRSB, then $\mathcal{Q}(\xi) = \int_0^1 \xi''(q)^{1/2} dq$.*

Proof. If ξ is topologically trivial, then (recalling notation of Lemma 2.2), $\alpha \equiv 0$, and so $\hat{\alpha} \equiv L$. Thus

$$G(q) = \xi'(q) - \frac{q}{L^2}.$$

Since Lemma 2.2 gives $G(1) = 0$, we have $L^{-2} = \xi'(1)$. Because $\min g \geq 0$, we have

$$0 \leq g''(1) = -G'(1) = -\xi''(1) + L^{-2},$$

so $\xi'(1) \geq \xi''(1)$. Moreover, plugging this (L, α) into (2.1) shows $\mathcal{Q}(\xi) = \sqrt{\xi'(1)}$. This proves part (a). If ξ is strictly FRSB, then $g \equiv 0$, so

$$G'(q) = \xi''(q) - \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}(q)^2} = 0.$$

This implies $\hat{\alpha}(q) = \xi''(q)^{-1/2}$. Plugging this $\hat{\alpha}$ into (2.1) proves part (b). \square

Proof of Proposition 2.9. By Lemma 2.11(a), we have $\xi'(1) \geq \xi''(1)$. Define

$$GS_N \equiv \frac{1}{N} \max_{\sigma \in S_N} H_N(\sigma). \quad (2.8)$$

[BČNS22, Theorem 1.1] shows via the Kac–Rice formula that with high probability, $GS_N \geq \sqrt{\xi'(1)} - \varepsilon/2$. By concentration of the ground state energy (see Proposition 2.15 below), $GS_N \geq \sqrt{\xi'(1)} - \varepsilon$ with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. Lemma 2.11(a) further implies $\sqrt{\xi'(1)} = \mathcal{Q}(\xi)$, concluding the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.10. We use a randomized version of Subag’s Hessian ascent algorithm [Sub21] (see also [HS21, Section 3.7]). Starting from $\mathbf{x}_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we choose small $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, \delta) \in 1/\mathbb{N}$ and for $0 \leq j < 1/\eta$ construct \mathbf{x}_{j+1} from \mathbf{x}_j as follows. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ let $S^{(\eta)}(\mathbf{x})$ be the span of the top $N\eta$ eigenvectors of $\nabla^2 H_N(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}^\perp}$, with any measurable-in- \mathbf{x} tie-breaking procedure. (Here we view $\nabla^2 H_N(\mathbf{x})$ as a quadratic form and restrict it to the subspace $\mathbf{x}^\perp = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N : \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle = 0\}$.) Let $S_j = S^{(\eta)}(\mathbf{x}_j)$, and choose $\mathbf{v}_j \in S_j$ uniformly at random from the corresponding unit sphere, independently of all previous choices. Then let $\mathbf{x}_{j+1} = \mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{v}_j \sqrt{\eta N}$ if $\langle \mathbf{v}_j, \nabla H_N(\mathbf{x}_j) \rangle \geq 0$, else $\mathbf{x}_{j+1} = \mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{v}_j \sqrt{\eta N}$. The output of this algorithm is $\mathbf{x}_* = \mathbf{x}_{1/\eta} \in S_N$. (Note that $\langle \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle = 0$ by construction, thus $\|\mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2 = j\eta N$ almost surely.)

Let $\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}'_*$ be independent outputs of this algorithm for the same H_N . We claim that with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ over H_N and the randomness inside both runs of the algorithm:

$$|\langle \mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}'_* \rangle| \leq \delta N, \quad (2.9)$$

$$H_N(\mathbf{x}_*)/N \geq \int_0^1 \xi''(q)^{1/2} dq - \varepsilon \stackrel{\text{Lem 2.11(b)}}{=} \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon, \quad (2.10)$$

This claim implies the desired conclusion by taking $e^{cN/3}$ independent runs of the algorithm. The first part (2.9) holds conditionally on \mathbf{x}'_* : we have $\mathbb{P}[|\langle \mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{x}'_* \rangle| \leq \eta N \mid \mathbf{x}'_*, \mathbf{x}_j] \geq 1 - e^{-cN}$ since \mathbf{v}_j is uniform on a $\Omega(N)$ dimensional sphere.

The second part (2.10) is shown similarly to [Sub21] or [HS21, Section 3.7] so we give an outline. First one notes that $\nabla^2 H_N(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}^\perp}$ is a GOE matrix scaled by $(1 - \frac{1}{N})\xi''(\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2)$ for \mathbf{x} independent of H_N (see e.g. [HS23c, Lemma 2.1]). Because of the N^2 speed in the large deviation rate function for the bulk spectrum of GOE, combining a $\eta\sqrt{N}$ -net of the ball with Proposition 2.14 below implies that $\lambda_{N\eta}(\nabla^2 H_N(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}^\perp}) \geq 2\sqrt{\xi''(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/N)} - \varepsilon^2$ uniformly in $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \sqrt{N}$ with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. Using Proposition 2.14 again to control the Taylor approximation error, one finds with the same probability:

$$H_N(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) - H_N(\mathbf{x}_j) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \eta N \cdot \left(2\sqrt{\xi''(\|\mathbf{x}_j\|^2/N)} - \varepsilon^2 \right), \quad \forall 0 \leq j < 1/\eta.$$

Telescoping gives (2.10), completing the proof. \square

Remark 2.12. Proposition 2.9 can also be shown by an explicit gradient-based algorithm as shown in [HS23c, Section 6]. The idea is to first move to an appropriate multiple \mathbf{x}_1 of $\nabla H_N(\mathbf{0})$, and then aim to find the ground state of H_N restricted to $\text{Band}_{1, R(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1), 0}(\mathbf{x}_1)$ (the orthogonal band centered at \mathbf{x}_1). This restriction of H_N turns out to have the conditional law of another topologically trivial spin glass, enabling a recursion that leads to a completely elementary proof. See [Sel21, Section 5], [HS23b, Section 2.2] for essentially equivalent approximate message passing formulations that are more convenient for calculation.

Remark 2.13. Approximate message passing also suffice to prove Proposition 2.10. In particular one may specialize [HS23b, Proposition 3.6] to the single-species case with parameters $\vec{h} = (0)$, $m = 1$, $q_1 = 0$, and $\Phi(q) = q$. Then the algorithm therein constructs e^{cN} nearly orthogonal outputs, each with energy approximately $\mathbb{A}(\Phi) = \int_0^1 \xi''(q)^{1/2} dq$. This equals $\mathcal{Q}(\xi)$ by Lemma 2.11(b).

2.3 Preliminary Concentration Estimates

For a tensor $\mathbf{A} \in (\mathbb{R}^N)^{\otimes k}$, define the operator norm

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\text{op}} = \max_{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1\|_2, \dots, \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}^k\|_2 \leq 1} |\langle \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^1 \otimes \dots \otimes \boldsymbol{\sigma}^k \rangle|.$$

Proposition 2.14. *For any model ξ , there exists a constant $c = c(\xi) > 0$ and sequence of constants $(C_k)_{k \geq 0}$ independent of N such that the following holds. Defining the convex set*

$$K_N = \left\{ H_N \in \mathcal{H}_N : \left\| \nabla^k H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq C_k N^{1 - \frac{k}{2}} \quad \forall k \geq 0, \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N} \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_N,$$

(i) *For all N , we have $\mathbb{P}[H_N \in K_N/2] \geq 1 - e^{-cN}$.*

(ii) *More generally, let $\psi : \mathcal{H}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ be an almost surely finite linear map. Then $\mathbb{P}[H_N \in K_N : \psi(H_N)] \geq 1 - e^{-cN}$ whenever $\mathbb{E}[H_N : \psi(H_N)] \in K_N/2$.*

Proof. Part (i) follows from e.g. [HS21, Proposition 2.3] (modulo dilation of K_N by a factor of two). For part (ii), note that the conditional law of $H_N - \mathbb{E}[H_N \mid \psi(H_N)]$ does not depend on $\psi(H_N)$. Moreover, letting $H_N^{(\psi)} \in \mathcal{H}_N$ be a Hamiltonian with this law, there exists an independent centered Gaussian $H_N^{(-\psi)} \in$

\mathcal{H}_N such that the independent sum $H_N^{(\psi)} + H_N^{(\neg\psi)}$ has the law of H_N . Then whenever $\mathbb{E}[H_N | \psi(H_N)] \in K_N/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[H_N \in K_N | \psi(H_N)] &\geq \mathbb{P}[H_N^{(\psi)} \in K_N/2] \\ &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\geq} 2\mathbb{P}[H_N^{(\psi)} + H_N^{(\neg\psi)} \in K_N/2] - 1 \\ &= 2\mathbb{P}[H_N \in K_N/2] - 1 \\ &\geq 1 - 2e^{-cN}. \end{aligned}$$

Here (\dagger) follows from the simple observation that by symmetry in law of $H_N^{(\neg\psi)}$ and independence,

$$\mathbb{P}[H_N^{(\psi)} + H_N^{(\neg\psi)} \in K_N/2 | H_N^{(\psi)} \notin K_N/2] \leq 1/2. \quad \square$$

Proposition 2.15. *For any model ξ , there exists a constant $c = c(\xi) > 0$ such that F_N (1.3) and GS_N (2.8) satisfy the concentration inequality*

$$\mathbb{P}(|F_N - \mathbb{E}F_N| \geq t), \mathbb{P}(|GS_N - \mathbb{E}GS_N| \geq t) \leq 2\exp(-ct^2N).$$

Proof. The concentration inequality for F_N is [Pan13b, Theorem 1.2], and that for GS_N is by the Borell-TIS inequality [Bor76, CIS76]. \square

2.4 Preliminaries on the Kac–Rice Formula

For each $\sigma \in S_N$, let $\{e_1(\sigma), \dots, e_N(\sigma)\}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^N with $e_1(\sigma) = \sigma/\sqrt{N}$. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{2, \dots, N\}$. Let $\nabla_{\mathcal{T}}H_N(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{T}}$ denote the restriction of $\nabla H_N(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to the space spanned by $\{e_2(\sigma), \dots, e_N(\sigma)\}$, and $\nabla_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}^2 H_N(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}$ analogously. Define the radial and tangential derivatives

$$\partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma) = \langle e_1(\sigma), \nabla H_N(\sigma) \rangle, \quad \nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma) = \nabla_{\mathcal{T}}H_N(\sigma).$$

Further, define the Riemannian Hessian

$$\nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma) = \nabla_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}^2 H_N(\sigma) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma) I_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}. \quad (2.11)$$

The following lemma describes the joint law of these derivatives for any fixed $\sigma \in S_N$.

Lemma 2.16 ([BČNS22, Lemma 3.2]). *For any $\sigma \in S_N$, the random variables $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma))$, $\nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma)$, and $\nabla_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}^2 H_N(\sigma)$ are independent, with the following laws.*

- $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma))$ is a centered Gaussian with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma))^{\otimes 2} = \begin{bmatrix} N\xi(1) & \sqrt{N}\xi'(1) \\ \sqrt{N}\xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}.$$

- $\nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma)$ is a centered Gaussian with covariance $\xi'(1)I_{N-1}$.
- $\nabla_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}^2 H_N(\sigma)$ is a scaled GOE matrix, with

$$\mathbb{E}(\nabla_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}}^2 H_N(\sigma))_{i,j}^2 = \frac{(1 + \delta_{i,j})\xi''(1)}{N},$$

symmetry across the diagonal, and independent entries on and above the diagonal.

Say $\sigma \in S_N$ is a **critical point** of H_N if $\nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma) = \mathbf{0}$, and let Crt denote the set of such points. Further, for (σ, H_N) -measurable event \mathcal{E} , let

$$\text{Crt}(\mathcal{E}) = \{\sigma \in \text{Crt} : (\sigma, H_N) \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (2.12)$$

The Kac–Rice formula [Ric44, Kac48], applied to $\nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N$, states that

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}(\mathcal{E})| = \int_{S_N} \mathbb{E} \left[|\det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma)| \mathbb{1}\{(\sigma, H_N) \in \mathcal{E}\} \Big| \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma) = \mathbf{0} \right] \varphi_{\nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0}) \, d\sigma, \quad (2.13)$$

where φ_X denotes the probability density of the random variable X . In Section 3, we will use specific known consequences of this formula, which hold because conditional on $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma))$, the matrix $\nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma)$ appearing in the determinant is a shifted and scaled GOE matrix.

3 Strictly RS and 1RSB Models via Truncated Second Moment

In this section we prove Propositions 2.7 and 2.8. Subsection 3.1 proves Proposition 2.7, and the rest of the section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2.8.

3.1 Strictly RS models

Let ξ be strictly RS. Recall from Remark 2.3 that this implies $\xi'(0) = 0$. Using the notation of Lemma 1.2, $x \equiv 1$ and so

$$\mathcal{P}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}\xi(1).$$

Moreover,

$$f(q) = \xi(q) + q + \log(1 - q)$$

has unique maximum $q = 0$ on $[0, 1]$. Set $\eta > 0$ small depending on δ such that

$$f(q) \leq -8\eta \quad \forall q \in [\delta, 1]. \quad (3.1)$$

For $\sigma \in S_N$ and $q \in [-1, 1]$, let $\text{Band}_q(\sigma) = \{\rho : R(\sigma, \rho) = q\}$.

Definition 5. A point σ is **free energy typical** if for all $|q| \geq \delta$,

$$\Phi(q; \sigma) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\text{Band}_q(\sigma)} \exp H_N(\rho) \, d\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}\xi(1) - \eta.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{T}_N \subseteq S_N$ denote the set of free energy typical points, and

$$\tilde{Z}_N \equiv \int_{\mathcal{T}_N} \exp H_N(\sigma) \, d\sigma.$$

We will prove Proposition 2.7 by computing two moments of \tilde{Z}_N .

Proposition 3.1. *We have $\mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}_N \geq (1 - o(1)) \exp(N\xi(1)/2)$.*

Proposition 3.2. *We have $\mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}^2 \leq \exp(N(\xi(1) + O(\delta)))$.*

The following crucial lemma uses the interpolation bound Proposition 2.4 on a band. A similar estimate was observed by Alaoui, Montanari, and the second author in [AMS23b, Proposition 3.9] to study shattering.

Lemma 3.3. For fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$, $E \in \mathbb{R}$, $|q| \geq \delta$, the following holds. Conditional on $H_N(\sigma) = EN$, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$

$$\Phi(q; \sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}\xi(1) + \frac{\xi(q)}{\xi(1)}(E - \xi(1)) - 3\eta.$$

Proof. We first compute the conditional law of H_N given $H_N(\sigma) = EN$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[H_N(\rho)|H_N(\sigma)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}H_N(\sigma)H_N(\rho)}{\mathbb{E}H_N(\sigma)^2}H_N(\sigma) = \frac{\xi(R(\sigma, \rho))}{\xi(1)}H_N(\sigma),$$

and so the process $\widehat{H}_N(\rho) = H_N(\rho) - \mathbb{E}[H_N(\rho)|H_N(\sigma)]$ has covariance

$$\mathbb{E}\widehat{H}_N(\rho^1)\widehat{H}_N(\rho^2) = N \left(\xi(R(\rho^1, \rho^2)) - \frac{\xi(R(\sigma, \rho^1))\xi(R(\sigma, \rho^2))}{\xi(1)} \right).$$

We conclude that for $\rho \in \text{Band}_q(\sigma)$, conditional on $H_N(\sigma) = EN$,

$$H_N(\rho) \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\xi(q)EN}{\xi(1)} + \widehat{H}_N(\rho).$$

Moreover, on $\text{Band}_q(\sigma)$, writing $\rho = q\sigma + \sqrt{1 - q^2}\tau$ for $\tau \perp \sigma$, the process $\overline{H}_N(\tau) = \widehat{H}_N(\rho)$ has mixture

$$\widetilde{\xi}_q(t) = \xi(q^2 + (1 - q^2)t) - \frac{\xi(q)^2}{\xi(1)}. \quad (3.2)$$

Define the order parameter $\widetilde{x}(t) = \mathbb{1}\{t \geq r\}$ where $r = \frac{q}{1+q}$. By Proposition 2.4,

$$\Phi(q; \sigma) \leq \frac{\xi(q)E}{\xi(1)} + \mathcal{P}(\widetilde{x}; \widetilde{\xi}_q, 0) + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q^2) + o_P(1),$$

where $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q^2)$ accounts for the volume of $\text{Band}_q(\sigma)$ and $o_P(1)$ is a term tending to 0 in probability. Note that $\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{x}_q, 0)$ depends on $\widetilde{\xi}_q$ through $\widetilde{\xi}'_q$ and $\widetilde{\xi}''_q$ only, and these depend on q only through $|q|$. Moreover $\xi(q) \leq \xi(|q|)$. So we may assume without loss of generality that $q > 0$.

We upper bound $\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{x}; \widetilde{\xi}_q, 0)$ via:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{P}(\widetilde{x}; \widetilde{\xi}_q, 0) &\leq \widetilde{\xi}'_q(r)(1 - r) + \int_r^1 \widetilde{\xi}''_q(t)(1 - t) dt + \frac{r}{1 - r} + \int_r^1 \frac{dt}{1 - t} \\ &= \widetilde{\xi}_q(1) - \widetilde{\xi}_q(r) + \frac{r}{1 - r} + \log(1 - r) \\ &= \xi(1) - \xi(q) + q - \log(1 + q). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(q; \sigma) &\leq \frac{\xi(q)E}{\xi(1)} + \frac{1}{2}\xi(1) - \frac{1}{2}\xi(q) + \frac{1}{2}q + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q) + o_P(1) \\ &\stackrel{(3.1)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2}\xi(1) + \frac{\xi(q)}{\xi(1)}(E - \xi(1)) - 4\eta + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from Proposition 2.15, applied to the free energy $\Phi(q; \sigma)$. □

Lemma 3.4. For any $E \leq \xi(1) + \eta$, $\mathbb{P}[\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_N | H_N(\sigma) = EN] \geq 1 - e^{-cN}$.

Proof. Suppose the event in Lemma 3.3 holds for all $q \in \{\pm\delta, \pm(\delta + 1/N), \dots, \pm(\delta + M/N)\}$ for the largest M such that $\delta + M/N \leq 1$, and furthermore that $H_N \in K_N$ holds. By Proposition 2.14(ii) with $\psi(H_N) = H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$, this occurs with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ after adjusting c . Then, for all $q = \pm(\delta + m/N)$,

$$\Phi(q; \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\xi(1) - 2\eta,$$

since $E - \xi(1) \leq \eta$. For all $q \in [\delta + m/N, \delta + (m + 1)/N]$, on event K_N ,

$$\Phi(q; \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq \Phi(\delta + m/N; \boldsymbol{\sigma}) + O(N^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\xi(1) - \eta,$$

and similarly for $q \in [-\delta - (m + 1)/N, -\delta - m/N]$. This implies $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{T}_N$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. For any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_N$,

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}_N = \mathbb{E}[\exp(H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))\mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{T}_N\}] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))\mathbb{P}\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{T}_N | H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\}].$$

By Lemma 3.4

$$\mathbb{P}\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{T}_N | H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\} \geq (1 - e^{-cN})\mathbb{1}\{H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq N(\xi(1) + \eta)\}.$$

Thus, with $g \sim \mathcal{N}(N\xi(1), N\xi(1))$, by a Gaussian change of measure,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}_N &\geq (1 - e^{-cN})\mathbb{E}[\exp(H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))\mathbb{1}\{H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq N(\xi(1) + \eta)\}] \\ &= (1 - e^{-cN})\exp(N\xi(1)/2)\mathbb{P}[g \leq N(\xi(1) + \eta)] \\ &= (1 - e^{-cN})\exp(N\xi(1)/2). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Writing \tilde{Z}^2 as a double integral and recalling \mathcal{T}_N from Definition 5, we have almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}^2 &= \iint_{\mathcal{T}_N \times \mathcal{T}_N} \exp(H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1) + H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2))d\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1d\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 \\ &\leq \iint_{\mathcal{S}_N \times \mathcal{S}_N} \exp(H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1) + H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2))\mathbb{1}\{R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2) \leq \delta\}d\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1d\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 + e^{N(\xi(1)/2 - \eta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}_N} \exp(H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))d\boldsymbol{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations,

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}^2 \leq \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} e^{N(\xi(1) + \xi(q))} (1 - q^2)^{-(N-1)/2} dq + e^{N(\xi(1) - \eta)}.$$

The exponential growth rate of the integral is

$$\xi(1) + \max_{q \in [-\delta, \delta]} \left\{ \xi(q) + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q^2) \right\} = \xi(1) + O(\delta)$$

by Lipschitz continuity of the quantity inside the maximum around 0. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.7. The statement is clearly monotone in δ , so it suffices to prove it for δ suitably small in ε . By the last two propositions and Paley-Zygmund,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{Z}_N \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp(N\xi(1)/2)\right) \geq e^{-O(\delta)N}. \quad (3.3)$$

Suppose this event holds. Let G denote the Gibbs measure of \tilde{Z}_N (i.e. the Gibbs measure of Z_N conditioned on $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_N$). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0})} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\sigma^i)\right) d\vec{\sigma} &\geq \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{T}_N^k} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\sigma^i)\right) d\vec{\sigma} \\ &= \tilde{Z}_N^k G^{\otimes k} (|R(\sigma^i, \sigma^j)| \leq \delta \text{ for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq k) \\ &\geq \tilde{Z}_N^k \left(1 - \binom{k}{2} G^{\otimes 2}(|R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)| \geq \delta)\right). \end{aligned}$$

For any $\sigma^1 \in \mathcal{T}_N$, G -almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} G(|R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)| \geq \delta | \sigma^1) &= \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}_N} \int_{|q| \geq \delta} \int_{\text{Band}_q(\sigma^1)} \exp(H_N(\sigma^2)) d\sigma^2 dq \\ &\leq \frac{\exp(N(\xi(1)/2 - \eta))}{\frac{1}{2} \exp(N\xi(1)/2)} = 2 \exp(-\eta N). \end{aligned}$$

For $k \leq e^{\eta N/3}$,

$$1 - \binom{k}{2} G^{\otimes 2}(|R(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)| \geq \delta) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Combining the above and letting

$$Z^{(k)} = \frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0})} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\sigma^i)\right) d\vec{\sigma},$$

we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z^{(k)} \geq \frac{\xi(1)}{2} - o(1)\right) \geq e^{-O(\delta)N}.$$

Similarly to [Pan13b, Theorem 1.2] we can show the concentration inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}Z^{(k)}| \geq t) \leq \exp(-ct^2N).$$

(In fact a much stronger inequality is true, see Lemma 4.4 below.) The result follows from the last two inequalities for δ suitably small in ε . \square

3.2 Strictly 1RSB models

We turn to the proof of Proposition 2.8. Let ξ be strictly 1RSB, and so $\xi'(0) = 0$ by Remark 2.3. For most of the proof we will assume that ξ is **not** pure; we then appeal to continuity at the end by slightly perturbing any pure ξ (which will preserve the strict 1RSB property). This simplifies the presentation below as certain formulas degenerate in the pure case, see Remark 3.12. We note that some intermediate computations and lemmas resemble those from previous work including [ABČ13, AB13, BSZ20], which made different assumptions on ξ .

Recalling the notation of Lemma 2.2, there exists $u > 0$ such that $\alpha \equiv u$, and the order parameter (L, α) is described by the pair (L, u) . It can easily be verified that the function $v : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$v(z) = \frac{(1+z) \log(1+z)}{z^2} - \frac{1}{z}$$

is strictly decreasing with $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0^+} v(z) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} v(z) = 0$.

Lemma 3.5. Assume ξ is strictly IRSB. Let z be the unique solution to $v(z) = \frac{\xi(1)}{\xi'(1)}$ and $y = \sqrt{(1+z)\xi'(1)}$. Then

$$L = \frac{1+z}{y}, \quad u = \frac{z}{y}, \quad Q(\xi) = \frac{\xi'(1) + z\xi(1)}{y},$$

and for all $q \in [0, 1]$,

$$\xi(1) - \xi(q) \geq \xi'(1) \left(\frac{1+z}{z^2} \log(1 + (1-q)z) - \frac{1-q}{z} \right), \quad (3.4)$$

with equality at exactly $q = 0, 1$.

Proof. As $\hat{\alpha}(q) = L - uq$, we calculate that

$$G(q) = \xi'(q) - \frac{q}{L(L-uq)}, \quad g(q) = \xi(1) - \xi(q) - \frac{1}{u} \left(\frac{1}{u} \log \frac{L-uq}{L-u} - \frac{1-q}{L} \right).$$

Since $G(1) = g(0) = 0$, we get the system of equations

$$\xi'(1) = \frac{1}{L(L-u)}, \quad \xi(1) = \frac{1}{u^2} \log \frac{L}{L-u} - \frac{1}{Lu}.$$

Let $z' = \frac{u}{L-u}$, so

$$\frac{\xi(1)}{\xi'(1)} = \frac{L(L-u)}{u^2} \log \frac{L}{L-u} - \frac{L-u}{u} = v(z').$$

Thus $z' = z$ by monotonicity of v . Then

$$L = \sqrt{\frac{1+z'}{\xi'(1)}} = \frac{1+z}{y}, \quad u = L \cdot \frac{z'}{1+z'} = \frac{z}{y}.$$

These formulas and the condition $g(q) \geq 0$ for all q (with equality at precisely $q = 0, 1$) imply (3.4). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} 2Q(\xi) &= 2Q(L, \alpha; \xi) = \int_0^1 \xi''(q)(L-uq) dq + \int_0^1 \frac{dq}{L-uq} \\ &= (L-u)\xi'(1) + u\xi(1) + \frac{1}{u} \log(1+z). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(L-u)\xi'(1) = \frac{\xi'(1)}{y}$, $u\xi(1) = \frac{z\xi'(1)}{y}$, and

$$\frac{1}{u} \log(1+z) = \frac{z\xi'(1)}{y} \left(\frac{(1+z)}{z^2} \log(1+z) \right) = \frac{z\xi'(1)}{y} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{\xi(1)}{\xi'(1)} \right) = \frac{\xi'(1) + z\xi(1)}{y}.$$

This gives the formula for $Q(\xi)$. □

We also record a simple inequality in the parameters we will use later.

Lemma 3.6. We have $y^2 \geq \xi''(1)$.

Proof. Because $\min g(q) = 0$ is attained at $q = 1$,

$$0 \leq g''(1) = -G'(1) = -\xi''(1) + (L-u)^{-2} = -\xi''(1) + y^2. \quad \square$$

Let $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 > 0$ be small constants to be determined later, where each η_i will be set small in terms of δ, ξ , and $\{\eta_j : j < i\}$ (i.e. informally, $0 < \eta_3 \ll \eta_2 \ll \eta_1 \ll \delta \ll 1$). By (3.4), we may set η_3 such that

$$\xi(1) - \xi(q) \geq \xi'(1) \left(\frac{1+z}{z^2} \log(1 + (1-q)z) - \frac{1-q}{z} \right) + \frac{6y}{z} \eta_3 \quad (3.5)$$

for all $q \in [\delta, 1 - \eta_2]$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= Q(\xi) = \frac{\xi'(1) + z\xi(1)}{y}, \\ R_0 &= y + \frac{\xi''(1)}{y}, \\ B &= [E_0 - \eta_1 - \eta_3, E_0 - \eta_1 + \eta_3] \times [R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4} - \eta_3, R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4} + \eta_3]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

By slight abuse of notation, for $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, let

$$\text{Crt}(A) = \left\{ \sigma \in \text{Crt} : \left(\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) \right) \in A \right\}. \quad (3.7)$$

Definition 6. A point $\sigma \in \text{Crt}(B)$ is **ground state typical** if the following conditions hold.

(i) For all $q \in [\delta, 1 - \eta_2]$,

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sup_{\rho \in \text{Band}_q(\sigma)} H_N(\rho) \leq E_0 - \eta_1 - \eta_3.$$

(ii) H_N does not have any critical points ρ with $R(\sigma, \rho) \geq 1 - \eta_2$.

Denote the set of such points by $\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)$.

We will prove Proposition 2.8 through the following two propositions, whose proofs comprise the rest of the section.

Proposition 3.7. *We have $\mathbb{E}|\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)| \geq e^{\Omega(\eta_1)N}$.*

Proposition 3.8. *We have $\mathbb{E}|\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)|^2 \leq e^{O(\delta)N}$.*

Remark 3.9. The choice (3.6) of B looks strange at first, because when ξ is a pure model $H_N(\sigma)$ and $\partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma)$ are almost surely proportional, so there are a.s. no critical points with energy and radial derivative described by B . This is not a problem for the proof because the parameters η_1, η_2, η_3 can be taken small in ξ , and then the statement of Proposition 2.8 is continuous in ξ ; see the end of the proof of Proposition 2.8.

3.3 Ground State Typicality is With High Probability

The main result of this subsection is the following proposition. In it, we fix $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ and condition on the event $\{\sigma \in \text{Crt}(B)\}$. Here when conditioning, we refer to the standard regular conditional probability given $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma))$, which is a linear function of H_N .

Proposition 3.10. *If $(E, R) \in B$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}[\sigma \in \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B) \mid (H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0})] \geq 1 - e^{-cN}.$$

We will prove Proposition 3.10 by studying the ground state energy on bands defined by their overlap with σ , analogously to the replica-symmetric case.

Lemma 3.11. *Conditional on $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma)) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0})$, the restriction of H_N to $\text{Band}_q(\sigma)$ has law*

$$H_N(\rho) \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{N(q\xi'(q) + z\xi(q))}{y} + N \left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} E - E_0 \\ R - R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle + \widehat{H}_N(\rho), \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$v^q = \begin{bmatrix} v_E^q \\ v_R^q \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \xi(q) \\ q\xi'(q) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.9)$$

and \widehat{H}_N is a $(N-1)$ -dimensional spin glass with the following covariance. Write $\rho = q\sigma + \sqrt{1-q^2}\tau$ and let $\overline{H}_N(\tau) = \widehat{H}_N(\rho)$. Then \overline{H}_N has mixture

$$\tilde{\xi}_q(t) = \xi(q^2 + (1-q^2)t) - C - \frac{(1-q^2)\xi'(q)^2}{\xi'(1)}t. \quad (3.10)$$

for some constant C (which will be irrelevant for our purposes).

Remark 3.12. Note that the matrix in (3.9) has determinant

$$\xi(1)(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1)) - \xi'(1)^2 = \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 \right) \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p^2 \gamma_p^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p \gamma_p^2 \right)^2.$$

This is nonnegative by Cauchy-Schwarz and strictly positive when ξ is not pure, so the matrix inverse is well-defined. This is one reason we assume ξ is not pure.

Proof. By Lemma 2.16, $H_N(\sigma)$, $\partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma)$, and $\nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma)$ are jointly Gaussian with covariance matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} N\xi(1) & \sqrt{N}\xi'(1) & \mathbf{0}^\top \\ \sqrt{N}\xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) & \mathbf{0}^\top \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \xi'(1)I_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $\rho \in \text{Band}_q(\sigma)$, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}H_N(\rho)H_N(\sigma) &= N\xi(q), \\ \mathbb{E}H_N(\rho)\partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma) &= \sqrt{N}q\xi'(q), \\ \mathbb{E}H_N(\rho)\nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma) &= \xi'(q)P_\sigma^\perp \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[H_N(\rho)|H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma)] &= \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \xi(q) \\ q\xi'(q) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} H_N(\sigma) \\ \sqrt{N}\partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\sigma) \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{\xi'(q)}{\xi'(1)} \langle P_\sigma^\perp \rho, \nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\sigma) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Then $\widehat{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}) - \mathbb{E}[H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho})|H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \nabla_{\text{sp}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho})]$ has covariance

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \widehat{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^1) \widehat{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^2) &= \xi(R(\boldsymbol{\rho}^1, \boldsymbol{\rho}^2)) - \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \xi(q) \\ q\xi'(q) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \xi(q) \\ q\xi'(q) \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{\xi'(q)^2}{\xi'(1)} R(P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{\perp} \boldsymbol{\rho}^1, P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{\perp} \boldsymbol{\rho}^2). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.10). The conclusion (3.8) follows from (3.11), by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} E_0 \\ R_0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{y(\xi(1)(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1)) - \xi'(1)^2)} \begin{bmatrix} \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) & -\xi'(1) \\ -\xi'(1) & \xi(1) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z\xi(1) + \xi'(1) \\ (1+z)\xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{y} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

and thus

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \xi(q) \\ q\xi'(q) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} E_0 \\ R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle = \frac{q\xi'(q) + z\xi(q)}{y}. \quad \square$$

The next estimate will prepare us to apply Proposition 2.5. We will use the order parameters:

$$\widetilde{L} = \frac{1 + (1-q)z}{(1-q^2)y}, \quad \widetilde{\alpha}(t) = u \mathbb{1}\{t \geq r\}, \quad r = \frac{q}{1+q}. \quad (3.13)$$

Proposition 3.13. For fixed $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_N$, $E, R \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in [\delta, 1 - \eta_2]$,

$$\frac{q\xi'(q) + z\xi(q)}{y} + \mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{L}, \widetilde{\alpha}; \widetilde{\xi}_q, 0) \leq E_0 - 3\eta_3.$$

Proof. By direct computation,

$$2\mathcal{Q}(\widetilde{L}, \widetilde{\alpha}; \widetilde{\xi}_q, 0) = \widetilde{\xi}'_q(r)\widetilde{L} + \int_r^1 \widetilde{\xi}''_q(t) (\widetilde{L} - (t-r)u) dt + \frac{r}{\widetilde{L}} + \int_r^1 \frac{dt}{\widetilde{L} - (t-r)u}. \quad (3.14)$$

The first two terms on the right-hand side simplify as

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{\xi}'_q(r)\widetilde{L} + \int_r^1 \widetilde{\xi}''_q(t) (\widetilde{L} - (t-r)u) dt \\ &= \widetilde{\xi}'_q(1)\widetilde{L} + (\widetilde{\xi}_q(1) - \widetilde{\xi}_q(r) - (1-r)\widetilde{\xi}'_q(1))u \\ &= (1-q^2) \left(\xi'(1) - \frac{\xi'(q)^2}{\xi'(1)} \right) \widetilde{L} + (\xi(1) - \xi(q) - (1-q)\xi'(1)) u \\ &= \frac{1}{y\xi'(1)} \{ (\xi'(1)^2 - \xi'(q)^2)(1 + (1-q)z) + (\xi(1) - \xi(q) - (1-q)\xi'(1)) z\xi'(1) \} \\ &= \frac{1}{y\xi'(1)} \{ \xi'(1)^2 + z\xi'(1)(\xi(1) - \xi(q)) - \xi'(q)^2(1 + (1-q)z) \}. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms of (3.14) simplify as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r}{\widetilde{L}} &= \frac{q(1-q)y}{1 + (1-q)z} = \frac{q(1-q)(1+z)\xi'(1)}{y(1 + (1-q)z)}, \\ \int_r^1 \frac{dt}{\widetilde{L} - (t-r)u} &= \frac{1}{u} \log \frac{\widetilde{L}}{\widetilde{L} - (1-r)u} = \frac{1}{u} \log(1 + (1-q)z) \\ &\stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} \frac{1}{y} (z(\xi(1) - \xi(q)) + (1-q)\xi'(1)) - 6\eta_3. \end{aligned}$$

It thus suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{q\xi'(q) + z\xi(q)}{y} + \frac{1}{2y\xi'(1)} \{ \xi'(1)^2 + z\xi'(1)(\xi(1) - \xi(q)) - \xi'(q)^2(1 + (1-q)z) \} \\ & + \frac{q(1-q)(1+z)\xi'(1)}{2y(1+(1-q)z)} + \frac{1}{2y} (z(\xi(1) - \xi(q)) + (1-q)\xi'(1)) \leq \frac{\xi'(1) + z\xi(1)}{y}. \end{aligned}$$

The terms in red cancel. Also clearing a factor of y , it remains to show

$$q\xi'(q) - \frac{1+(1-q)z}{2} \cdot \frac{\xi'(q)^2}{\xi'(1)} - \frac{1}{2} \left(q - \frac{q(1-q)(1+z)}{1+(1-q)z} \right) \xi'(1) \leq 0.$$

Since $q - \frac{q(1-q)(1+z)}{1+(1-q)z} = \frac{q^2}{1+(1-q)z}$, the desired inequality reduces to the trivial

$$-\frac{1}{2\xi'(1)(1+(1-q)z)} (q\xi'(1) - (1+(1-q)z)\xi'(q))^2 \leq 0. \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.14. *For fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$, $E, R \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in [\delta, 1 - \eta_2]$, the following holds. Conditional on $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0})$, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$,*

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \leq E_0 + \left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} E - E_0 \\ R - R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle - 2\eta_3.$$

Proof. Lemma 3.11, Proposition 3.13, and Proposition 2.5 imply

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \leq E_0 + \left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} E - E_0 \\ R - R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle - 3\eta_3 + o_P(1).$$

The result follows by Proposition 2.15, applied to the ground state energy $\Psi(q; \sigma)$. □

Lemma 3.15. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on δ such that for all $q \in [\delta, 1]$,*

$$v_E^q \geq 1 - c_1(1-q)^2, \quad v_R^q \leq -c_2(1-q).$$

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - v_E^q &= \frac{(\xi(1) - \xi(q))(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1)) - (\xi'(1) - q\xi'(q))\xi'(1)}{\xi(1)(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1)) - \xi'(1)^2}, \\ -v_R^q &= \frac{q\xi'(q)\xi(1) - \xi(q)\xi'(1)}{\xi(1)(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1)) - \xi'(1)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} q\xi'(q)\xi(1) - \xi(q)\xi'(1) &= \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p\gamma_p^2 q^p \right) \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 q^p \right) \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p\gamma_p^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{p > p' \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 \gamma_{p'}^2 (p - p')(q^{p'} - q^p) \\ &= (1-q) \sum_{p > p' \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 \gamma_{p'}^2 q^{p'} (p - p')(1 + q + \dots + q^{p-p'-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The sum is positive and uniformly bounded away from 0 for $q \in [\delta, 1]$. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\xi(1) - \xi(q))(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1)) - (\xi'(1) - q\xi'(q))\xi'(1) \\
&= \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} \gamma_p^2(1 - q^p) \right) \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p^2 \gamma_p^2 \right) - \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p \gamma_p^2(1 - q^p) \right) \left(\sum_{p \geq 2} p \gamma_p^2 \right) \\
&= \sum_{p > p' \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 \gamma_{p'}^2 (p - p') \left((1 - q^{p'})p - (1 - q^p)p' \right) \\
&= (1 - q)^2 \sum_{p > p' \geq 2} \gamma_p^2 \gamma_{p'}^2 (p - p') \left(\sum_{r=0}^{p'-1} (r+1)(p-p')q^r + \sum_{r=p'}^{p-2} p'(p-1-r)q^r \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and the sum is uniformly bounded above for $q \in [\delta, 1]$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.10. Consider $\sigma \in \text{Crt}(B)$ with $H_N(\sigma) = EN$, $\partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) = R\sqrt{N}$, so $(E, R) \in B$. We will show both conditions (i) and (ii) hold with conditional probability $1 - e^{-cN}$.

We begin with condition (i), considering a fixed $q \in [\delta, 1 - \eta_2]$. Let $E = E_0 - \eta_1 + \iota_1$, $R = R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4} + \iota_2$, where $|\iota_1|, |\iota_2| \leq \eta_3$. We will show that with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$,

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \leq E_0 - \eta_1 - 2\eta_3. \quad (3.15)$$

By Proposition 3.14, it suffices to show

$$\left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} -\eta_1 \\ \eta_1^{3/4} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle + \left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} \iota_1 \\ \iota_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \leq -\eta_1. \quad (3.16)$$

By Lemma 3.15,

$$\left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} -\eta_1 \\ \eta_1^{3/4} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \leq -\eta_1 + c_1(1 - q)^2 \eta_1 - c_2(1 - q)\eta_1^{3/4}.$$

Setting η_1 small enough, we can ensure that $c_1(1 - q)^2 \eta_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}c_2(1 - q)\eta_1^{3/4}$. Since η_3 can be taken small in η_1 , this proves (3.16), and (3.15) follows.

Suppose the event (3.15) holds for $q \in \{\delta, \delta + 1/N, \dots, \delta + M/N\}$ for the largest M such that $\delta + M/N \leq 1$, and that $H_N \in K_N$. This occurs with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ by Proposition 2.14(ii). On K_N , for all $q \in [\delta + m/N, \delta + (m + 1)/N]$,

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \leq \Psi(\delta + m/N; \sigma) + O(N^{-1}) \leq E_0 - \eta_1 - 2\eta_3.$$

Thus part (i) holds.

To verify condition (ii), we will argue that with high (conditional) probability, σ is a “well” for H_N . Let $\theta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_N$ be an arbitrary unit-speed geodesic on \mathcal{S}_N with $\theta(0) = \sigma$, and consider the function $f(t) = H_N(\theta(t\sqrt{N}))/N$. We have $H_N \in K_N$ with conditional probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, and on this event the C^3 norm of f is bounded independently of N . Moreover $f'(0) = 0$ since $\partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) = 0$, while

$$f''(0) = \langle \theta'(0), \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma) \theta'(0) \rangle \leq \lambda_{\max}(\nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma)).$$

Given $(H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma))$, the conditional law of $\nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma)$ is (see e.g. [HS23c, Lemma 2.1]):

$$\sqrt{\xi''(1) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)} \cdot \text{GOE}(N - 1) - \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) \cdot I_{N-1}.$$

Hence $\lambda_{\max}(\nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \leq (2\sqrt{\xi''(1)} + \eta_3) - \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ has conditional probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. We will prove condition (ii) whenever this inequality and $H_N \in K_N$ both hold. By definition of B , we then have:

$$f''(0) \leq (2\sqrt{\xi''(1)} + \eta_3) - \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)} - R_0 - \eta_1^{3/4} + 2\eta_3 \leq -\frac{\eta_1^{3/4}}{2}.$$

The final bound follows because $R_0 = y + \frac{\xi''(1)}{y} \geq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)}$ by AM-GM, while η_3 is sufficiently small depending on η_1 . Recalling that $f'(0) = 0$ and f has bounded C^3 norm, it follows that $f'(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \leq o(\eta_1^{3/4})$. Since $\theta'(0)$ was arbitrary, we conclude that H_N has no other critical point within distance $o(\eta_1^{3/4} \sqrt{N})$ of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. In particular for small enough η_2 depending on η_1 , H_N has no critical point $\boldsymbol{\sigma}'$ with $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}') \geq 1 - \eta_2$. This completes the proof. \square

We will actually use Proposition 3.10 via the following natural corollary.

Corollary 3.16. *For any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_N$ and $(E, R) \in B$:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right| \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \notin \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)\} \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right] \\ & \leq e^{-cN/3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right| \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that the conditional law of $\nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ that of a $GOE(N-1)$ matrix scaled by $\sqrt{\frac{N-1}{N}}$ and shifted by $R \cdot I_{N-1}$. Recalling the notation (3.17), [BBM23a, Theorem A.2] implies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right| \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right] = \kappa(R) \pm o_N(1), \\ & \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right|^2 \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right] = 2\kappa(R) \pm o_N(1). \end{aligned}$$

(See the end of [HS23c, Proof of Proposition 3.1] for further details.) By conditional Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right| \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \notin \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)\} \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right|^2 \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right]^{1/2} \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{P} \left[\mathbb{1}\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \notin \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)\} \mid (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) = (EN, R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 3.10 to the last term gives the claimed estimate. \square

3.4 Truncated Moments of Critical Point Count via Kac-Rice

We will need the following critical point count formulas from [BSZ20]. Let

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_q = \begin{bmatrix} \xi(1) & \xi(q) & \xi'(1) & q\xi'(q) \\ \xi(q) & \xi(1) & q\xi'(q) & \xi'(1) \\ \xi'(1) & q\xi'(q) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) & q\xi'(q) + q^2\xi''(q) \\ q\xi'(q) & \xi'(1) & q\xi'(q) + q^2\xi''(q) & \xi'(1) + \xi''(1) \end{bmatrix}$$

be the covariances of $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))$ and $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}))$, where $R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = q$. Let

$$\rho(d\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{4 - \lambda^2} \mathbb{1}\{|\lambda| \leq 2\} d\lambda$$

be the semicircle measure, and define

$$\kappa(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \log |\lambda - x| \rho(d\lambda) \quad (3.17)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}x^2 - \frac{1}{2} - \mathbb{1}\{|x| > 2\} \left(\frac{1}{4}|x|\sqrt{x^2 - 4} - \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{x^2 - 4} + |x|}{2} \right) \right)$$

$$\Theta(E, R) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\xi''(1)}{\xi'(1)} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (E, R), \Sigma^{-1}(E, R) \rangle + \kappa \left(R/\sqrt{\xi''(1)} \right) \quad (3.18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi(q, E_1, E_2, R_1, R_2) &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{(1 - q^2)\xi''(1)^2}{\xi'(1)^2 - \xi'(q)^2} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (E_1, E_2, R_1, R_2), \Sigma_q^{-1}(E_1, E_2, R_1, R_2) \rangle \\ &\quad + \kappa \left(R_1/\sqrt{\xi''(1)} \right) + \kappa \left(R_2/\sqrt{\xi''(1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (3.7), for $A \subseteq [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^4$ let

$$\text{Crt}_2(A) = \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) \in \text{Crt}^2 : \left(R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\rho}), \frac{1}{N}H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \frac{1}{N}H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\partial_{\text{rad}}H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \right) \in A \right\}.$$

The next lemma, shown by the Kac–Rice formula and Laplace’s method, gives the first and second moments for the relevant critical point counts. We note that although only an upper bound is stated below for the second moment, it actually holds with equality as shown in [BBM23a, Appendix A].

Lemma 3.17 ([BSZ20, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2]). *For any product of intervals $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}(A)| = \sup_{(E, R) \in A} \Theta(E, R).$$

Furthermore, for any product of intervals $A \subseteq [-1, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^4$,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}_2(A)| \leq \sup_{(q, E_1, E_2, R_1, R_2) \in A} \Xi(q, E_1, E_2, R_1, R_2).$$

Lemma 3.18. *We have $\Theta(E_0, R_0) = \Xi(0, E_0, E_0, R_0, R_0) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $x_0 = R_0/\xi''(1)^{1/2}$. Then,

$$x_0 = \frac{y}{\xi''(1)^{1/2}} + \frac{\xi''(1)^{1/2}}{y} \quad (3.19)$$

so by Lemma 3.6

$$\sqrt{x_0^2 - 4} = \frac{y}{\xi''(1)^{1/2}} - \frac{\xi''(1)^{1/2}}{y}. \quad (3.20)$$

Also clearly $x_0 \geq 2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(x_0) &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{y}{\xi''(1)^{1/2}} + \frac{\xi''(1)^{1/2}}{y} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{y^2}{\xi''(1)} - \frac{\xi''(1)}{y^2} \right) - \log \frac{y}{\xi''(1)^{1/2}} \right\} \\ &= \frac{\xi''(1)}{2y^2} + \log \frac{y}{\xi''(1)^{1/2}} \\ &= \frac{\xi''(1)}{2y^2} + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + z) - \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\xi''(1)}{\xi'(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.12),

$$-\frac{1}{2} \langle (E_0, R_0), \Sigma^{-1}(E_0, R_0) \rangle = -\frac{zE_0 + R_0}{2y} = -\frac{z\xi'(1) + z^2\xi(1)}{2y^2} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\xi''(1)}{2y^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(E_0, R_0) &= \frac{1}{2} \log(1+z) - \frac{z\xi'(1) + z^2\xi(1)}{2y^2} \\ &= \frac{z^2}{2(1+z)} \left(\frac{(1+z)\log(1+z)}{z^2} - \frac{1}{z} - \frac{\xi(1)}{\xi'(1)} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $\Xi(0, E_0, E_0, R_0, R_0) = 2\Theta(E_0, R_0)$, which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3.19. Since we restrict attention to $\text{Crt}(B)$ in this section, we do not need to verify that $\Theta(E_0, \cdot)$ is actually maximized at R_0 . However this is true at least on $R \geq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)}$ (the range corresponding to local maxima of H_N) and follows from Lemma 5.2 later and concavity of Θ . Hence the ‘‘annealed complexity’’ of local maxima at energy E_0 is indeed zero. For the special case of pure models, the appearance of the ground state energy as a threshold for annealed complexity was verified in [ABC \check{C} 13].

Proof of Proposition 3.7. We will show that

$$\Theta(E_0 - \eta_1, R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4}) = \frac{z\eta_1}{y} + O(\eta_1^{9/8}). \quad (3.21)$$

Note that κ is $C^{3/2}$ on $[2, +\infty)$, with derivative

$$\kappa'(x) = \frac{1}{2}x - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{x^2 - 4} - \frac{x^2}{4\sqrt{x^2 - 4}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2 - 4}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(x - \sqrt{x^2 - 4} \right). \quad (3.22)$$

This implies in particular that $\kappa'(a + \frac{1}{a}) = 1/a$ for $a \geq 1$. Recalling (3.19), (3.20), and using Taylor’s theorem for Hölder continuous functions,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa \left(\frac{R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\xi''(1)}} \right) &= \kappa \left(\frac{R_0}{\sqrt{\xi''(1)}} \right) + \kappa' \left(\frac{R_0}{\sqrt{\xi''(1)}} \right) \frac{\eta_1^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\xi''(1)}} + O \left((\eta_1^{3/4})^{3/2} \right) \\ &= \kappa \left(\frac{R_0}{\sqrt{\xi''(1)}} \right) + \frac{\eta_1^{3/4}}{y} + O(\eta_1^{9/8}). \end{aligned}$$

The function $f(E, R) = -\frac{1}{2} \langle (E, R), \Sigma^{-1}(E, R) \rangle$ is clearly analytic, so

$$\begin{aligned} f(E_0 - \eta_1, R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4}) &= f(E_0, R_0) - \langle (-\eta_1, \eta_1^{3/4}), \Sigma^{-1}(E_0, R_0) \rangle + O(\eta_1^{3/2}) \\ &\stackrel{(3.12)}{=} f(E_0, R_0) + \frac{z\eta_1}{y} - \frac{\eta_1^{3/4}}{y} + O(\eta_1^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\Theta(E_0 - \eta_1, R_0 + \eta_1^{3/4}) = \Theta(E_0, R_0) + \frac{z\eta_1}{y} + O(\eta_1^{9/8}) \stackrel{\text{Lem. 3.18}}{=} \frac{z\eta_1}{y} + O(\eta_1^{9/8}),$$

and thus, by Lemma 3.17,

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}(B)| \geq e^{\Omega(\eta)N}.$$

Let $\mathcal{R}(H_N)$ denote the set of ground state typical $\sigma \in S_N$. We apply the Kac–Rice formula (2.13) with event

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ \sigma \in (\text{Crt}(B) \setminus \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)) \right\} = \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) \right) \in B \right\} \cap \{ \sigma \notin \mathcal{R}(H_N) \}.$$

By the law of iterated expectation, the Kac–Rice formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\text{Crt}(B) \setminus \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)| &= \int_{S_N} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [|\det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma)| \cdot \mathbb{1}\{ \sigma \notin \mathcal{R}(H_N) \} | H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)] \right. \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) \right) \in B \right\} \left. \middle| \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma) = \mathbf{0} \right] \varphi_{\nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0}) \, d\sigma \\ &\stackrel{\text{Cor. 3.16}}{\leq} e^{-cN/3} \int_{S_N} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [|\det \nabla_{\text{sp}}^2 H_N(\sigma)| | H_N(\sigma), \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)] \right. \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma), \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) \right) \in B \right\} \left. \middle| \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma) = \mathbf{0} \right] \varphi_{\nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)}(\mathbf{0}) \, d\sigma \\ &= e^{-cN/3} \mathbb{E} |\text{Crt}(B)|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} |\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)| \geq (1 - e^{-cN/3}) \mathbb{E} |\text{Crt}(B)| \geq e^{\Omega(\eta_1)N}. \quad \square$$

We defer the proofs of the following two lemmas to Subsection 3.5.

Lemma 3.20. *Let $V \subseteq S_N$ be a finite set of points with $|V| = M$.*

- (a) *There exists $V_1 \subseteq V$ such that $|V_1| = M^{\Omega(\delta)}$ and $R(\sigma, \rho) \geq -\delta$ for all $\sigma, \rho \in V_1$.*
- (b) *There exists $V_2 \subseteq V \times V$ such that $|V_2| = \Omega(M^2 \delta)$ and $R(\sigma, \rho) \geq -\delta$ for all $(\sigma, \rho) \in V_2$.*

Lemma 3.21. *If the function $q \mapsto \xi''(q)^{-1/2}$ is convex on $[0, 1]$, then ξ is strictly IRSB.*

Proof of Proposition 3.8. By definition of ground state typical, a.s. any distinct $\sigma, \rho \in \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)$ satisfy $R(\sigma, \rho) \leq \delta$. Let $V_2 \subseteq \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)^2$ be the set of (σ, ρ) which furthermore satisfy $R(\sigma, \rho) \geq -\delta$. By Lemma 3.20(b), $|\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)|^2 \leq C\delta^{-1}|V_2|$ for an absolute constant C . Also, a.s. $V_2 \subseteq \text{Crt}_2(B_2)$ where

$$B_2 = [-\delta, \delta] \times [E_0 - \eta_1 - \eta_3, E_0 - \eta_1 + \eta_3]^2 \times [R_0 + \eta_1^{2/3} - \eta_3, R_0 + \eta_1^{2/3} + \eta_3]^2.$$

Thus, by Lemma 3.17,

$$\mathbb{E} |\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)|^2 \leq C\delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} |\text{Crt}_2(B_2)| \leq C\delta^{-1} \exp \{ N \sup \Xi(B_2) + o(N) \}.$$

It is clear that Ξ is locally Lipschitz near $(0, E_0, E_0, R_0, R_0)$. By Lemma 3.18, $\Xi(0, E_0, E_0, R_0, R_0) = 0$, so $\sup \Xi(B_2) \leq O(\delta)$. The result follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.8. We first prove the proposition for non-pure ξ , as we have been assuming throughout the section. The statement is monotone in δ , so we may assume δ is small in ε . By Propositions 3.7 and 3.8 and Paley-Zygmund,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)| \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} |\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)| \right) \geq e^{-O(\delta)N}. \quad (3.23)$$

Suppose this event holds. By Lemma 3.20(a), there exists $V_1 \subseteq \widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)$ with

$$|V_1| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} |\widetilde{\text{Crt}}(B)| \right)^{O(\delta)} = e^{O(\delta \eta_1 N)}$$

such that $|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\rho})| \leq \delta$ for all $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\rho} \in V_1$. By the choice of B , all these points have energy at least

$$E_0 - \eta_1 - \eta_3 \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon/2,$$

where we recall $E_0 = \mathcal{Q}(\xi)$ and take η_1, η_3 small in ε . Let

$$X = \frac{1}{N} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0})} \inf_{i \in [k]} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i).$$

Combining the above shows that for any $k \leq e^{O(\delta \eta_1 N)}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon/2) \geq e^{-O(\delta)N}.$$

A direct calculation shows that for fixed $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, $H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is $O(N^{1/2})$ -Lipschitz in the disorder Gaussians. Since suprema and infima preserve Lipschitz constants, NX is also $O(N^{1/2})$ -Lipschitz in the disorder Gaussians. We thus have the concentration inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}X| \geq t) \leq \exp(-ct^2N).$$

Combining the last two inequalities implies that (for δ small in ε) $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon) \geq 1 - e^{-cN}$. This completes the proof for non-pure ξ .

Finally, we turn to the case where $\xi(q) = \beta^2 q^p$ is pure. Then, $H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \beta H_N^{(p)}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$, where $H_N^{(p)}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \langle \mathbf{G}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\otimes p} \rangle$. Consider a perturbation $\widehat{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \beta H_N^{(p)}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + \iota \beta H_N^{(p+1)}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$, for a fixed $\iota > 0$ chosen small in δ, ε . This has mixture $\widehat{\xi}(q) = \beta^2(q^p + \iota^2 q^{p+1})$. Note that

$$\widehat{\xi}''(q)^{-1/2} = \frac{q^{-(p-2)/2}}{\beta \sqrt{p(p-1)}} \left(1 + \frac{\iota^2(p+1)}{p-1} q \right)^{-1/2}$$

is convex on $[0, 1]$, so Lemma 3.21 implies $\widehat{\xi}$ is strictly 1RSB. By the result for non-pure ξ , there exists $c = c(\widehat{\xi}, \delta, \varepsilon/2)$ such that for all $k \leq e^{cN}$, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ there exists $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0})$ such that for all $i \in [k]$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \widehat{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\widehat{\xi}, 0) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

By Proposition 2.14, there exists a constant C such that $\frac{1}{N} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_N} H_N^{(p+1)}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq C$ with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. On the intersection of these events, for each $i \in [k]$,

$$\frac{1}{N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i) \geq \frac{1}{N} \widehat{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i) - \frac{\iota}{N} H_N^{(p+1)}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - C\iota \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi) - \varepsilon$$

for ι small in ε . □

3.5 Deferred Proofs

Proof of Lemma 3.20. Consider the graph G with vertex set V where (σ, ρ) is an edge if $R(\sigma, \rho) < -\delta$. Note that G does not contain a $r = \lceil 1/\delta \rceil$ -clique, because if such a clique $U \subseteq V$ existed, then the Gram matrix $[R(\sigma, \rho)]_{\sigma, \rho \in U}$ would not be positive semi-definite.

Let $\mathfrak{R}(s, t)$ denote the (s, t) Ramsey number. Recall the classic Ramsey upper bound

$$\mathfrak{R}(s, t) \leq \binom{s+t-2}{s-1},$$

which can be proved by applying the inequality $\mathfrak{R}(s, t) \leq \mathfrak{R}(s-1, t) + \mathfrak{R}(s, t-1)$ recursively. Thus $\mathfrak{R}(r, M^{\delta/2}) \lesssim M^{(r-1)\delta/2} \ll M$, so G contains a $M^{\delta/2}$ -independent set. This proves part (a). Since G avoids an r -clique, by Turán's theorem G avoids at least $\frac{1}{r-1} = O(\delta)$ fraction of edges, proving (b). \square

Lemma 3.22. *In any model with $\xi'(0) = 0$, we have $0 \in T$.*

Proof. Assume otherwise and let $q \in (0, 1]$ be the minimal point in T . Then $g(q) = 0$. If $q < 1$, then q is an interior local minimizer of g , so $0 = g'(q) = -G(q)$; if $q = 1$, then the characterization from Lemma 2.2 implies $G(q) = 0$. So in either case $G(q) = 0$. Also from the definition (2.3) of G we have $G(0) = 0$.

Recall that the measure ν given by $\nu([0, s]) = \alpha(s)$ is supported on T . Thus $\alpha \equiv 0$ on $[0, q)$, and so $\hat{\alpha}$ is constant on $[0, q]$. Therefore G is convex on $[0, q]$. Since $G(0) = G(q) = 0$, this implies $G \leq 0$ on $[0, q]$.

Thus $g(0) = g(q) + \int_0^q G(s) ds \leq g(q) = 0$. So $0 \in T$, contradicting minimality of q . \square

Proof of Lemma 3.21. Lemma 3.22 implies $0 \in T$, and Lemma 2.2 ensures $1 \in T$. The following argument, adapted from [Tal06a, Proposition 2.2], shows that $|T| \leq 2$, which then implies $T = \{0, 1\}$.

Consider any $q_1, q_2 \in T$ such that $q_1 < q_2$. If $q_i \in (0, 1)$, then $G(q_i) = 0$ because q_i is an interior local minimizer of g ; if $q_i = 1$ then $G(q_i) = 0$ by Lemma 2.2; and if $q_i = 0$ then $G(q_i) = 0$ by definition (2.3) of G . So $G(q_1) = G(q_2) = 0$. Moreover $g(q_1) = g(q_2) = 0$, so $\int_{q_1}^{q_2} G(s) ds = 0$. It follows that there are two points in $q_3, q_4 \in (q_1, q_2)$ such that $G'(q_3) = G'(q_4) = 0$.

We have thus shown that between any two elements of T lies two zeros of G' . However,

$$G'(q) = \xi''(q) - \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}(q)^2},$$

so at any zero of G' we have $\xi''(q)^{-1/2} = \hat{\alpha}(q)$. However $\xi''(q)^{-1/2}$ is convex by assumption, while $\hat{\alpha}(q)$ is concave by definition, so these functions intersect at most twice. It follows that $|T| \leq 2$. \square

4 Building a Model from Fundamental Types: Proof of Theorem 1.5

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 1.5. The proof proceeds in two steps:

- (1) Using the lower bounds in Propositions 2.7 through 2.10 and a uniform concentration lemma due to Subag (Lemma 4.4 below) we prove Theorem 4.2 below, which constructs an ultrametric tree with somewhat more lenient constraints than Theorem 1.5.
- (2) By pruning this ultrametric tree we arrive at the ultrametric tree in Theorem 1.5.

4.1 A Tree with Local Constraints

Lemma 4.1. *For any model ξ , the set S (recall (1.6)) is a disjoint union of finitely many closed intervals, possibly including atoms. Moreover $q_D < 1$.*

Proof. The first statement follows from [JT18, Corollary 1.3] and the ensuing observation that $\mathfrak{d} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi^n}}\right)''$ changes sign finitely many times on $[0, 1]$. Indeed, S is precisely the *coincidence set* denoted $\{\eta = \xi\}$, as can be seen from the display between (1.1.1) and (1.1.2) therein.

For the second statement, note that $\hat{x}(q) = 1 - q$ for q in some interval $[\hat{q}, 1]$, so

$$F(q) \leq C - \frac{1}{1 - q}$$

for some constant C independent of q . Hence $f(q) \leq Cq + \log(1 - q)$, so $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} f(q) = -\infty$, which implies $q_D < 1$. \square

Definition 7. A sequence q_0, \dots, q_D with $0 \leq q_0 < \dots < q_D \leq 1$ is an S -**refinement** if

$$\partial S \subseteq \{q_0, \dots, q_D\} \subseteq S,$$

where $\partial S = S \cap \overline{S^c}$ is the boundary of S in \mathbb{R} . (In particular $q_0 = \inf(S)$ and $q_D = \sup(S)$.)

In the following variant of Definition 2, the orthogonality constraints are enforced only locally. For $u, v \in \mathbb{T}$, write $u \sim v$ if $u = v$, or u, v are siblings, or one of u, v is the parent of the other.

Definition 8. Let $k, D \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq q_0 < \dots < q_D \leq 1$, $\vec{q} = (q_0, \dots, q_D)$, and $\delta > 0$. A (k, D, \vec{q}, δ) -locally ultrametric tree is a collection of points $(\sigma^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}}$ such that (1.7) holds for all $u \sim v$.

We will first prove the following variant of Theorem 1.5, where the properties required of the ultrametric tree are relaxed in two ways: ultrametricity will be enforced only locally, and we will lower bound the average energy increment from each node to its children rather than the energy of each node. We will deduce Theorem 1.5 from Theorem 4.2 in Subsection 4.3 by pruning this tree.

Theorem 4.2. *For any $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, $D \in \mathbb{N}$, and S -refinement q_0, \dots, q_D , there exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds for any $k \leq e^{cN}$. With probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, there is a (k, D, \vec{q}, δ) -locally ultrametric tree $(\sigma^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}}$ with the following properties.*

(i) *Energy of root:* $\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma^\emptyset) \geq E(q_0) - \varepsilon$.

(ii) *Parent-to-child energy increments:* for each $u \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{L}$,

$$\frac{1}{kN} \sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\sigma^{u^i}) - H_N(\sigma^u)) \geq E(q_{|u|+1}) - E(q_{|u|}) - \varepsilon.$$

(iii) *Free energy of pure states:* for each $u \in \mathbb{L}$,

$$\frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\sigma^u)} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\rho^i) - H_N(\sigma^u)) \right) d\vec{\rho} \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \varepsilon.$$

4.2 Model Decomposition into Fundamental Types

Fix parameters $\delta, \varepsilon, D, (q_0, \dots, q_D)$ as in Theorem 4.2. We take as convention $q_{-1} = 0, q_{D+1} = 1$. Define $\xi_{-1}(x) = \xi(q_0 x)$ and, for $0 \leq d \leq D$,

$$\xi_d(x) = \xi(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)x) - \xi(q_d) - \xi'(q_d)(q_{d+1} - q_d)x. \quad (4.1)$$

The following proposition is proved by routinely matching order parameters between the model ξ and the various models in the proposition. Its proof is deferred to the end of the section.

Proposition 4.3. *The following holds.*

- (a) *The model ξ_{-1} is topologically trivial and satisfies $\mathcal{Q}(\xi_{-1}) = E(q_0)$. (We treat this part as vacuous if $q_0 = 0$, in which case $\xi_{-1} \equiv 0$.)*
- (b) *For each $0 \leq d \leq D - 1$, ξ_d is either strictly IRSB or strictly FRSB, and satisfies $\mathcal{Q}(\xi_d) = E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d)$.*
- (c) *The model ξ_D is strictly RS and satisfies $\mathcal{P}(\xi_D) = \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q_D)$.*

For $0 \leq d \leq D - 1$ and $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, define

$$F_{d,k}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{kN} \max_{\vec{\rho} \in \text{Band}_{k,q_{d+1},\delta}(\sigma)} \sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\rho^i) - H_N(\sigma)),$$

and for $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_D N}$,

$$F_{D,k}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\sigma)} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\rho^i) - H_N(\sigma)) \right) d\vec{\rho}.$$

The following **uniform concentration** lemma was proved at finite temperature in [Sub18], and its proof at zero temperature (for $d \leq D - 1$) is a simple adaptation. We provide a proof at the end of the section.

Lemma 4.4. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\xi, \varepsilon)$ and $k_0 = k_0(\xi, \varepsilon)$ such that for all $\delta \leq \delta_0, k \geq k_0$ the following holds with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. For all $0 \leq d \leq D$ and all $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, $|F_{d,k}(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proposition 4.5. *There exists $c > 0$ (depending on $\delta, k, D, q_0, \dots, q_D$) such that the following holds.*

- (a) *With probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, there exists $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_0 N}$ such that $\frac{1}{N} H_N(\sigma) \geq E(q_0) - \varepsilon$.*
- (b) *For all $k \leq e^{cN}, 0 \leq d \leq D - 1$ and any fixed σ with $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$:*

$$\mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma) \geq E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d) - \varepsilon.$$

- (c) *For all $k \leq e^{cN}$ and any fixed σ with $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_D N}$:*

$$\mathbb{E}F_{D,k}(\sigma) \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. The Hamiltonian $H_N^{(-1)}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \equiv H_N(\sqrt{q_0}\boldsymbol{\rho})$ has mixture ξ_{-1} , so part (a) follows from Propositions 4.3(a) and 2.9.

Next we prove part (b). For $0 \leq d \leq D-1$, and fixed $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, the model

$$H_N^{(d,\boldsymbol{\sigma})}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = H_N(\sqrt{q_{d+1} - q_d}\boldsymbol{\rho} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}) - H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \sqrt{q_{d+1} - q_d}\langle \nabla H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \boldsymbol{\rho} \rangle,$$

restricted to the band $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp = \{\boldsymbol{\rho} \in \mathcal{S}_N : R(\boldsymbol{\rho}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 0\}$ is a $(N-1)$ -dimensional model with mixture ξ_d . By Proposition 4.3(b), this model is either strictly 1RSB or strictly FRSB. By Propositions 2.8 and 2.10, combined with concentration via Borell-TIS, we thus find:

$$\frac{1}{kN} \mathbb{E} \max_{\vec{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \in \text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0}) \cap (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp)^k} \sum_{i=1}^k H_N^{(d,\boldsymbol{\sigma})}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \geq E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d) - \varepsilon.$$

Still with $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ fixed, let $\vec{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_*$ attain the maximum in the previous display. Then we have the inequality chain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} F_{d,k}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &\geq \frac{1}{kN} \mathbb{E} \max_{\vec{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \in \text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\mathbf{0}) \cap (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp)^k} \sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\sqrt{q_{d+1} - q_d}\boldsymbol{\rho}^i + \boldsymbol{\sigma}) - H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{kN} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\sqrt{q_{d+1} - q_d}\boldsymbol{\rho}_*^i + \boldsymbol{\sigma}) - H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \frac{1}{kN} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^k H_N^{(d,\boldsymbol{\sigma})}(\boldsymbol{\rho}_*^i) \geq E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d) - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the step (*) uses that $H_N^{(d,\boldsymbol{\sigma})}$ is independent of $\nabla H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ as a process. This proves part (b).

The proof of (c) is similar. The model $H_N^{(D,\boldsymbol{\sigma})}$ restricted to $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp$ is a $(N-1)$ -dimensional model with mixture ξ_D . By Proposition 4.3(c), this model is strictly RS with respect to the normalized $N-2$ dimensional Hausdorff measure $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{N-2}$ on $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp$. By Propositions 2.7 and 4.3(c), with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$:

$$\frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta_2}(\mathbf{0}) \cap (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\perp)^k} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N^{(D,\boldsymbol{\sigma})}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \right) d\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{N-2}^k(\vec{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q_D) - \varepsilon/3.$$

Moreover since $H_N \in K_N$ with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, we easily find that with high probability, the restricted free energy with respect to the original uniform measure on \mathcal{S}_N obeys a similar bound:

$$\frac{1}{kN} \log \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) - H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right) d\vec{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \varepsilon/2.$$

Here the term $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 - q_D)$ disappeared from rescaling. By Lipschitz concentration of the left-hand side,

$$\frac{1}{kN} \mathbb{E} \int_{\text{Band}_{k,1,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^k H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) - H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right) d\vec{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - 2\varepsilon/3.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. It suffices to prove the theorem for $k = e^{cN}$ and $\delta \leq \delta_0(\xi, \varepsilon)$, as the statement is clearly monotone in k and δ . As k is growing in N , $k \geq k_0(\xi, \varepsilon)$ and Lemma 4.4 holds.

By Proposition 4.5, for $d \leq D - 1$ and any fixed $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_D N}$, respectively,

$$\mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma) \geq E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d) - \varepsilon/2, \quad \mathbb{E}F_{D,k}(\sigma) \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \varepsilon/2.$$

By Lemma 4.4, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, for **all** $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_D N}$, respectively,

$$F_{d,k}(\sigma) \geq E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d) - \varepsilon, \quad F_{D,k}(\sigma) \geq \mathcal{P}(\xi) - E(q_D) - \varepsilon. \quad (4.2)$$

By Proposition 4.5(a), with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ there exists $\|\sigma^\emptyset\|_2 = \sqrt{q_0 N}$ such that $\frac{1}{N}H_N(\sigma^\emptyset) \geq E(q_0) - \varepsilon$. Starting from this point, we can construct the remaining σ^u using (4.2). \square

4.3 Pruning the Relaxed Tree

We apply Theorem 4.2 with parameters $(\delta^2/2D^4, \varepsilon/2(D+1))$ in place of (δ, ε) . Let $c > 0$ be given by this theorem and $k = e^{cN}$. Then, with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$, there is a (k, D, \bar{q}, δ) -locally ultrametric tree $(\sigma^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}}$, where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}(k, D)$, with properties (i), (ii), (iii) (where δ, ε are replaced by $\delta^2/2D^4, \varepsilon/2(D+1)$). Throughout this subsection, assume this event holds and K_N from Proposition 2.14 holds.

Let $c_0 = c/2D$ and $k'' = e^{c_0 N}$. We will show that for a subtree $\mathbb{T}'' \cong \mathbb{T}(k'', D)$ of \mathbb{T} , $(\sigma^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}''}$ has the properties described in Theorem 1.5. We obtain \mathbb{T}'' from \mathbb{T} by two steps of pruning: we first ensure all energies are suitably large (Proposition 4.6), and then that global overlap constraints are satisfied (Proposition 4.7).

Proposition 4.6. *For an absolute constant $C = C(\xi)$ and $k' = \frac{\varepsilon}{C^2 D} e^{cN}$, there exists a subtree $\mathbb{T}' \cong \mathbb{T}(k', D)$ of \mathbb{T} such that the following holds. For each $u \in \mathbb{T}' \setminus \mathbb{L}$ and all $i \in [k']$ such that $ui \in \mathbb{T}'$,*

$$\frac{1}{N} (H_N(\sigma^{ui}) - H_N(\sigma^u)) \geq E(q_{|u|+1}) - E(q_{|u|}) - \varepsilon/(D+1). \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. We will construct \mathbb{T}' by breadth-first exploration starting from the root: at every non-leaf u we encounter, we will find k' children of it such that (4.3) holds.

Consider one such u , and abbreviate $\Delta_i = \frac{1}{N} (H_N(\sigma^{ui}) - H_N(\sigma^u))$, $\Delta E_{|u|} = E(q_{|u|+1}) - E(q_{|u|})$. By property (ii) of Theorem 4.2,

$$\frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i=1}^{k'} \Delta_i \geq \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/2(D+1).$$

On event K_N , $\sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N}} |H_N(\sigma)| \leq C_0 N$, so deterministically $|\Delta_i| \leq 2C_0$ for all $i \in [k']$. By Markov's inequality on $\text{unif}([k'])$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k'} |i \in [k'] : \Delta_i \leq \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/(D+1)| &= \frac{1}{k'} |i \in [k'] : 2C_0 - \Delta_i \geq 2C_0 - \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/(D+1)| \\ &\leq \frac{2C_0 - \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/(D+1)}{2C_0 - \Delta_i \leq 2C_0 - \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/2(D+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\frac{1}{k'} |i \in [k'] : \Delta_i \geq \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/(D+1)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon/2D}{2C_0 - \Delta_i \leq 2C_0 - \Delta E_{|u|} - \varepsilon/2(D+1)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4C_0(D+1)}.$$

Setting $C = 8C_0$, we conclude that we can find k' children of u such that (4.3) holds. \square

Proposition 4.7. *There is a subtree $\mathbb{T}'' \cong \mathbb{T}(k'', D)$ of \mathbb{T}' such that for any distinct parent-child pairs $(u, ui), (v, vj)$ in \mathbb{T}'' (where possibly $u = v$), $|R(\sigma^{ui} - \sigma^u, \sigma^{vj} - \sigma^v)| \leq \delta/D^2$.*

Proof. We will construct \mathbb{T}'' by breadth-first exploration starting from the root. We will abbreviate $\mathbf{x}^{ui} = \sigma^{ui} - \sigma^u$. We maintain a set

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{x}^{ui} : (u, ui) \text{ is a parent-child pair in } \mathbb{T}'\},$$

and will maintain the invariant that $|R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \leq \delta/D^2$ for any distinct $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}$. At every non-leaf u we encounter in the exploration, we will find k'' children of it such that, when the corresponding k'' parent-child pairs are added to \mathbb{T}'' , this invariant continues to hold. Note that at all times,

$$|\mathcal{C}| \leq k'' + (k'')^2 + \dots + (k'')^D \leq 2(k'')^D = 2e^{cN/2}.$$

Consider the step in this procedure where we choose children for node u . Let $I_u = \{i \in [k] : ui \in \mathbb{T}'\}$, so $|I_u| = k'$. For $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}$, let $I_u^+(\mathbf{y}), I_u^-(\mathbf{y})$ be the sets of $i \in [k]$ such that $R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}^{ui}) > \delta/D^2$ and $R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}^{ui}) < -\delta/D^2$. We **claim** that at any such step, $|I_u^+(\mathbf{y})| \leq 2D^4/\delta^2$ and $|I_u^-(\mathbf{y})| \leq 2D^4/\delta^2$. This claim suffices, since it implies

$$\left| I_u \setminus \bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}} (I_u^+(\mathbf{y}) \cup I_u^-(\mathbf{y})) \right| \geq k' - 2e^{cN/2} \cdot \frac{4D^4}{\delta^2} \gg k''.$$

Indeed, we may choose any k'' elements i in this set and add the corresponding ui to \mathbb{T}'' , which preserves the required invariant by definition.

It remains to prove the above claim, which we do now. We bound only $|I_u^+(\mathbf{y})|$ since the case of $|I_u^-(\mathbf{y})|$ is analogous. For all $i \in I_u^+(\mathbf{y})$, write

$$\mathbf{x}^{ui} = \frac{R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}^i)}{R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})} \mathbf{y} + \tau^{ui}$$

for $\tau^{ui} \perp \mathbf{y}$. Because \mathbb{T} is a $(k, D, \bar{q}, \delta^2/2D^4)$ -locally ultrametric tree, $|R(\mathbf{x}^{ui}, \mathbf{x}^{uj})| \leq \delta^2/2D^4$ for all $i \neq j$. Thus, for all distinct $i, j \in I_u^+(\mathbf{y})$,

$$\frac{\delta^2}{2D^4} \geq R(\mathbf{x}^{ui}, \mathbf{x}^{uj}) = \frac{R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}^i)R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}^j)}{R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})} + R(\tau^{ui}, \tau^{uj}) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{D^4} + R(\tau^{ui}, \tau^{uj}),$$

where we use that $R(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) \leq 1$. Thus $R(\tau^{ui}, \tau^{uj}) \leq -\delta^2/2D^4$. However, $R(\tau^{ui}, \tau^{ui}) \leq R(\mathbf{x}^{ui}, \mathbf{x}^{ui}) \leq 1$. Thus $|I_u^+(\mathbf{y})| \leq 2D^4/\delta^2$, as if not the Gram matrix of $(\tau^{ui})_{i \in I_u^+(\mathbf{y})}$ would not be positive semi-definite. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We will show \mathbb{T}'' satisfies the desired properties. First, for any $u, v \in \mathbb{T}''$, let $|u| = d_1, |v| = d_2$, and let $(\emptyset = u_0, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{d_1} = u), (\emptyset = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{d_2} = v)$ be the ancestor paths of u, v . Also let $\ell = u \wedge v$, so $u_\ell = v_\ell$ is the least common ancestor of u, v . Then

$$R(\sigma^u, \sigma^v) = \sum_{i=0}^{d_1-1} \sum_{j=0}^{d_2-1} R(\sigma^{u_{i+1}} - \sigma^{u_i}, \sigma^{v_{j+1}} - \sigma^{v_j}). \quad (4.4)$$

The sub-sum corresponding to $0 \leq i = j < \ell$ equals

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} R(\sigma^{u_{i+1}} - \sigma^{u_i}, \sigma^{u_{j+1}} - \sigma^{u_j}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} (q_{i+1} - q_i) = q_\ell,$$

while the remaining terms of (4.4) are bounded by δ/D^2 in absolute value by Proposition 4.7. Thus

$$|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^v) - q_{u \wedge v}| \leq D^2 \cdot \delta/D^2 = \delta,$$

so $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u)_{u \in \mathbb{T}''}$ is a $(k'', D, \vec{q}, \delta)$ -ultrametric tree. By property (i) of Theorem 4.2 and (4.3), for all $u \in \mathbb{T}''$ with $|u| = d$,

$$\frac{1}{N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^u) = \frac{1}{N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\emptyset) + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \frac{1}{N} (H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{u_{i+1}}) - H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{u_i})) \geq E(q_d) - (d+1)\varepsilon/(D+1) \geq E(q_d) - \varepsilon.$$

Thus property (i) of Theorem 1.5 holds. Property (ii) of Theorem 1.5 follows immediately from property (iii) of Theorem 4.2, as this property is monotone in k' . \square

Proof of Corollary 1.7. The proof is essentially identical to Theorem 1.5 but without the strictly RS part. Thus we just give an outline. Using [JT17, Theorem 1.13] and analyticity of ξ , it follows that Lemma 4.1 also holds for T . With the obvious definition, let $q_0, \dots, q_D = 1$ be a T -refinement. Proposition 4.3 remains true with the same proof, except that $\xi_D = 0$ is now trivial. The remainder of the proof is as before. \square

4.4 Deferred Proofs

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Throughout this proof, when the quantities x, \hat{x}, F, f, S appear without subscript, they refer to these quantities for the model ξ .

Since $f(q)$ is maximized at all $q \in S$, for all $q \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}$, we must have $f'(q) = F(q) = 0$. If $q = 0$, then $\xi'(0) = 0$ (see Remark 1.3), so we also have $F(q) = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, we never have $1 \in S$. Thus $F(q) = 0$ for all $q \in S$.

Let $0 \leq d \leq D - 1$. We will show ξ_d has order parameter

$$L_{\xi_d} = \frac{\hat{x}(q_d)}{q_{d+1} - q_d}, \quad \alpha_{\xi_d}(q) = x(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q)$$

by verifying the extremality condition in Lemma 2.2. Note that

$$\hat{\alpha}_{\xi_d}(q) = \frac{\hat{x}(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q)}{q_{d+1} - q_d}.$$

For $q \in [q_d, q_{d+1}]$,

$$0 \leq f_{\max} - f(q) = \int_q^{q_{d+1}} F(s) ds = \int_q^{q_{d+1}} (F(s) - F(q_d)) ds \quad (4.5)$$

For all $q \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\xi_d}(q) &= \xi'_d(q) - \int_0^q \frac{ds}{\hat{\alpha}_{\xi_d}(s)^2} \\ &= (q_{d+1} - q_d) \left(\xi'(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q) - \xi'(q_d) - \int_{q_d}^{q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q} \frac{ds}{\hat{x}(s)^2} \right) \\ &= (q_{d+1} - q_d) (F(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q) - F(q_d)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$g_{\xi_d}(q) = \int_q^1 G_{\xi_d}(s) ds = \int_{q_d+(q_{d+1}-q_d)q}^{q_{d+1}} F(s) ds = f_{\max} - f(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q) \geq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

verifying the extremality condition. Moreover, because \vec{q} is an S -refinement, either $S \cap [q_d, q_{d+1}] = \{q_d, q_{d+1}\}$ or $[q_d, q_{d+1}] \subseteq S$. In the former case, equality holds in (4.5) for exactly $q \in \{q_d, q_{d+1}\}$, and in (4.6) for exactly $q \in \{0, 1\}$, so ξ_d is strictly 1RSB. In the latter case, equality holds in (4.5) for all $q \in [q_d, q_{d+1}]$, and in (4.6) for all $q \in [0, 1]$, so ξ_d is strictly FRSB. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{Q}(\xi_d, 0) &= \int_0^1 \xi_d''(q) \widehat{\alpha}_{\xi_d}(q) + \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widehat{\alpha}_{\xi_d}(q)} dq \\ &= (q_{d+1} - q_d) \int_0^1 \xi_d''(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q) \widehat{x}(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q) dq \\ &\quad + (q_{d+1} - q_d) \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\widehat{x}(q_d + (q_{d+1} - q_d)q)} dq \\ &= 2(E(q_{d+1}) - E(q_d)). \end{aligned}$$

This proves part (b). The remaining two parts are verified similarly. For part (a), we show that ξ_{-1} has order parameter

$$L_{\xi_{-1}, h\sqrt{q_0}} = \widehat{x}(0)/q_0, \quad \alpha_{\xi_{-1}, h\sqrt{q_0}} \equiv 0$$

by verifying the extremality condition in Lemma 2.2. For part (c), we show that ξ_D has order parameter $x \equiv 1$ by verifying the extremality condition in Lemma 1.2. We omit the routine details. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.4. For the finite temperature case $d = D$, this follows from [Sub18, Proposition 1]. Suppose $d < D$, and let $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$. Consider the Gaussian process indexed by $\vec{\rho} \in \text{Band}_{k, q_{d+1}, \delta}(\sigma)$ with

$$X(\vec{\rho}) = \frac{1}{kN} \sum_{i=1}^k (H_N(\rho^i) - H_N(\sigma)).$$

Then,

$$\text{Var} X(\vec{\rho}) = \frac{1}{k^2 N} \sum_{i,j=1}^k (\xi(R(\rho^i, \rho^j)) - \xi(R(\rho^i, \sigma)) - \xi(R(\rho^j, \sigma)) + \xi(q_d)).$$

Note that

$$|R(\rho^i, \sigma) - q_d| = |R(\rho^i - \sigma, \sigma)| \leq \delta$$

and, for $i \neq j$,

$$|R(\rho^i, \rho^j) - q_d| = |R(\rho^i - \sigma, \rho^j - \sigma) + R(\rho^i - \sigma, \sigma) + R(\sigma, \rho^j - \sigma)| \leq 3\delta.$$

Finally, for $i = j$, $R(\rho^i, \rho^j) = q_{d+1}$. Thus, uniformly over $\vec{\rho} \in \text{Band}_{k, q_{d+1}, \delta}(\sigma)$,

$$\text{Var} X(\vec{\rho}) \leq \frac{\xi(q_{d+1}) - \xi(q_d)}{kN} + \frac{5\xi'(1)\delta}{N}. \quad (4.7)$$

By the Borell-TIS inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|F_{d,k}(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma)| \geq \varepsilon/2) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\xi(q_{d+1}) - \xi(q_d)}{kN} + \frac{5\xi'(1)\delta}{N}\right)^{-1} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-CN \min(k, \delta^{-1})\varepsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

for some $C = C(\xi)$.

On the event K_N in Proposition 2.14, the map $\sigma \mapsto F_{d,k}(\sigma)$ is C_1/\sqrt{N} -Lipschitz for some $C_1 = C_1(\xi)$. Consider a $\varepsilon\sqrt{N}/(2C_1)$ -net \mathcal{M} of the sphere $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, which has cardinality at most $e^{C_2 N}$ for some $C_2 = C_2(\xi, \varepsilon)$. By a union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(|F_{d,k}(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma)| \leq \varepsilon/2 \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{M}) \geq 1 - \exp(-CN \min(k, \delta^{-1})\varepsilon^2 + C_2 N) \geq 1 - e^{-cN},$$

where the last inequality holds for suitable k_0, δ_0 .

Suppose this event and K_N both hold, which occurs with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. Then, for any $\|\sigma\|_2 = \sqrt{q_d N}$, there exists $\sigma^* \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\|\sigma - \sigma^*\|_2 \leq \varepsilon\sqrt{N}/(2C_1)$. We now conclude via:

$$|F_{d,k}(\sigma) - \mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma)| \leq |F_{d,k}(\sigma) - F_{d,k}(\sigma^*)| + |F_{d,k}(\sigma^*) - \mathbb{E}F_{d,k}(\sigma^*)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon\sqrt{N}}{2C_1} \cdot \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

5 Large Deviations for the Ground State

Here we make a brief study of large deviations for the ground state energy $GS_N = \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} H_N(\sigma)$. [LFD23] recently investigated this problem using the replica method, obtaining very interesting but non-rigorous results. It was predicted that for 1RSB models (without external field), the upper tail has rate function given by a natural Kac–Rice upper bound, referred to as “replica-symmetric” behavior therein. We verify this prediction in Subsection 5.1 by adapting the interpolation-enhanced truncation from Section 3. In Subsection 5.2 we employ Corollary 1.7 to show the lower tail speed transitions to $\Omega(N^2)$ below $\mathcal{Q}(\xi - \gamma_1^2 t)$ for general mixtures. As mentioned in Remark 5.9, the super-linearity in the lower tail is closely connected to the Dotsenko–Franz–Mézard conjecture [DFM94] proved in [Tal07, Jag17].

5.1 Upper Tail for 1RSB Models

We assume in this subsection that $\gamma_1 = 0$ and ξ is 1RSB, i.e. the minimizer (L, α) of (2.2) satisfies $\alpha \equiv u$. Unlike Section 3, we do not assume **strict** 1RSB, but parameters such as y, z, E_0, R_0 still retain the same definitions. We will also assume throughout this subsection that ξ is not pure. Similarly to Proposition 2.8, pure ξ can be handled by adding small perturbation terms to ξ , e.g. chosen small enough so the perturbation Hamiltonian has maximum absolute value at most δN with probability $1 - e^{-N/\delta}$ (this ensures the perturbation has essentially no effect even in a large deviation sense).

The main computation is again encapsulated in controlling conditional band models as described in Lemma 3.11. Note that the only term in (3.8) that depends on (E, R) is

$$N \left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} E - E_0 \\ R - R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

for $v^q = (v_E^q, v_R^q)$ defined in (3.9).

Proposition 5.1. *For any ξ, ε with $\gamma_1 = 0$, there exists δ such that for all $q \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$,*

$$v_E^q \in [\delta, 1 - \delta], \tag{5.1}$$

$$v_R^q \leq -\delta. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. We easily compute

$$v_E^q = \frac{\xi(q)\xi'(1) + \xi(q)\xi''(1) - q\xi'(q)\xi'(1)}{\xi(1)\xi'(1) + \xi(1)\xi''(1) - \xi'(1)^2},$$

$$v_R^q = \frac{q\xi'(q)\xi(1) - \xi(q)\xi'(1)}{\xi(1)\xi'(1) + \xi(1)\xi''(1) - \xi'(1)^2}.$$

(Recall from Remark 3.12 that the denominators are strictly positive as long as ξ is not pure.) Note that

$$\frac{d}{dq} \frac{q\xi'(q)}{\xi(q)} = \frac{\xi(q)(\xi'(q) + q\xi''(q)) - q\xi'(q)^2}{\xi(q)^2} > 0 \quad (5.3)$$

by Cauchy–Schwarz (as in Remark 3.12), and so $q \mapsto \frac{q\xi'(q)}{\xi(q)}$ is strictly increasing. Thus $\frac{q\xi'(q)\xi(1)}{\xi(q)} - \xi'(1)$ is negative and bounded away from 0 on $q \in [\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Since $\xi(q)$ is also bounded away from 0 on this interval, this implies (5.2). Moreover, since $q \mapsto \frac{q\xi'(q)}{\xi(q)}$ is increasing,

$$\xi(q)\xi'(1) + \xi(q)\xi''(1) - q\xi'(q)\xi'(1) \geq \xi(q) \left(\xi'(1) + \xi''(1) - \frac{\xi'(1)^2}{\xi(1)} \right),$$

i.e. $v_E^q \geq \xi(q)/\xi(1) \geq \delta$. It now suffices to show v_E^q is strictly increasing in q . Differentiating and rearranging, it suffices to show

$$\frac{\xi''(1)}{\xi'(1)} \stackrel{?}{>} \frac{q\xi''(q)}{\xi'(q)}.$$

This holds because, by a calculation analogous to (5.3), $q \mapsto \frac{q\xi''(q)}{\xi'(q)}$ is increasing. \square

Given ξ , we let $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{R} \times [2\sqrt{\xi''(1)}, \infty)$. Critical points with $(E, R) \in \mathcal{R}$ will correspond to possible local maxima in Kac–Rice. Recalling (3.18), it is easy to see that Θ is strictly concave and continuously differentiable on \mathcal{R} . (Indeed the integral definition of κ immediately implies strict concavity outside the support of ρ .) For all $E \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$R_*(E) = \arg \max_{R \geq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)}} \Theta(E, R), \quad \Theta_*(E) = \Theta(E, R_*(E)).$$

It is easy to see that both are finite, since the matrix Σ in (3.18) is positive definite.

Lemma 5.2. *For IRSB ξ , we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial R} \Theta(E_0, R_0) = 0$.*

Proof. Recall (3.18) and (3.22). Since $R_0 = y + \frac{\xi''(1)}{y}$ and $y \geq \sqrt{\xi''(1)}$ by Lemma 3.6, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \Theta(E_0, R_0) &= -\Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} E_0 \\ R_0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \xi''(1)^{-1/2} \kappa'(R_0/\sqrt{\xi''(1)}) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= -\Sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} (\xi'(1) + z\xi(1))/y \\ y + (\xi''(1)/y) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1/y \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We would like to show the second entry in this vector vanishes, and (using Cramer’s rule) it is given by

$$\frac{\xi'(1)^2 + z\xi(1)\xi'(1) - \xi(1)y^2 - \xi(1)\xi''(1)}{y \det(\Sigma)} + \frac{1}{y}.$$

Recalling from Lemma 3.5 that $y = \sqrt{(1+z)\xi'(1)}$, the conclusion follows. \square

Lemma 5.3. *If ξ is 1RSB, then $R_*(E)$ is continuous and strictly increasing on $[E_0, \infty)$ with $R_*(E_0) = R_0$. Moreover $\Theta_*(E)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing with $\Theta_*(E_0) = 0$ and $\lim_{E \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_*(E) = -\infty$.*

Proof. Let

$$M(R) = \max_{E \in \mathbb{R}} \Theta(E, R).$$

This is easily seen to be C^1 on $[2\sqrt{\xi''}, \infty)$ and smooth on the interior, and inherits concavity from Θ . Since $\Theta(E, R)$ is a strictly concave quadratic function of (E, R) plus a strictly concave function of R , it can be written as

$$\Theta(E, R) = M(R) - K_1(E - K_2 R)^2,$$

for K_1, K_2 depending only on ξ . Further, one easily finds that $-M(R) \asymp R^2$ for large R since κ grows sublinearly. Hence $M'(R)$ is a strictly decreasing, continuous function with $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} M'(R) = -\infty$.

$R_*(E)$ is the unique solution in $[2\sqrt{\xi''}, \infty)$ to

$$M'(R_*) = 2K_1 K_2 (K_2 R_* - E), \quad (5.4)$$

assuming such a solution exists (if not, one would have the boundary solution $R_* = 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)}$.) Lemma 5.2 implies $R_0 = R_*(E_0)$. By monotonicity arguments (or inspecting a diagram), it follows that for all $E \geq E_0$, (5.4) admits a solution $R_*(E)$ which is continuous and strictly decreasing in E . It similarly follows that $\Theta_*(E)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing. Finally to show $\lim_{E \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_*(E) = -\infty$, note that since Σ is positive definite one has $\Theta(E, R) \leq -\varepsilon(|E| + |R|)^2 + \log(|R|)$ for some $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\xi) > 0$. \square

Similarly to Section 3, for $0 < \eta_4 \ll \eta_3 \ll \eta_2 \ll \eta_1 \ll 1$ small depending on some fixed $E > E_0$ let

$$\tilde{B}(E) = [E - \eta_3, E + \eta_3] \times [R_*(E) - \eta_3, R_*(E) + \eta_3].$$

Recalling (3.7), we say $\sigma \in \text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))$ is **large deviation typical** if H_N has no critical points ρ with $R(\sigma, \rho) \geq 1 - \eta_1$ and

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) = \sup_{\rho \in \text{Band}_q(\sigma)} H_N(\rho) \leq E - \eta_3, \quad \forall q \in [-\eta_4, 1 - \eta_1]. \quad (5.5)$$

Lemma 5.4. *For any $E > E_0$ and with small $0 < \eta_3 \ll \eta_2 \ll \eta_1 \ll 1$, given that $\sigma \in \text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))$, σ is large deviation typical with conditional probability at least $1 - e^{-cN}$.*

Proof. Let $E_\sigma = H_N(\sigma)/N$ and $R_\sigma = \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma)/\sqrt{N}$. For η_3 small enough we must have $E_\sigma - E_0 \geq (E - E_0)/2 > 0$ and $R_\sigma - R_0 \geq (R - R_0)/2 > 0$ since $\sigma \in \text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))$.

The former condition that H_N has no critical points ρ with $|R(\sigma, \rho)| \geq 1 - \eta_1$ follows by Proposition 2.14 applied to the conditionally random part of the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_N , exactly as in the proof of Proposition 3.10(ii). (Since $R_\sigma > R_0 = y + \frac{\xi''}{y} \geq 2\sqrt{\xi''}$, which was also the case in that proof.)

Now we show (5.5). Combining Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.3, and using (η_1, η_2) for (ε, δ) in the former, we then find

$$\left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} E_\sigma - E_0 \\ R_\sigma - R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \leq v_E^q(E_\sigma - E_0) \leq (1 - \eta_2)(E_\sigma - E_0), \quad \forall q \in [0, 1 - \eta_1]. \quad (5.6)$$

Next, note that if one replaces the $-2\eta_3$ term with $+\eta_3$, the proof of Proposition 3.13 goes through for (possibly non-strictly) 1RSB models and all $q \in [0, 1 - \eta_1]$. Moreover as usual it can be made simultaneous

for all q by using Proposition 2.14 to union bound over a finite set of q . Thus conditional on $\sigma \in \text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))$ and the values (E_σ, R_σ) , with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$ we have for all $q \in [0, 1 - \eta_1]$ simultaneously:

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \leq E_0 + \left\langle v^q, \begin{bmatrix} E_\sigma - E_0 \\ R_\sigma - R_0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle + \eta_3 \stackrel{(5.6)}{\leq} E_0 + (1 - \eta_2)(E_\sigma - E_0) + \eta_3 \leq E_\sigma - 2\eta_3.$$

Finally Proposition 2.14 implies $\Psi(q; \sigma)$ is $C(\xi, E_\sigma, R_\sigma)$ -Lipschitz on $[-\eta_4, 0]$ with probability $1 - e^{-cN}$. Thus we find, as desired, that with conditional probability $1 - e^{-cN}$,

$$\Psi(q; \sigma) \leq E_\sigma - \eta_3, \quad \forall q \in [-\eta_4, 1 - \eta_1]. \quad \square$$

Recalling (2.12), let $\text{LMAX} \subseteq \text{Crt}$ denote the set of local maxima of H_N .

Proposition 5.5. *For any ξ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for N large enough,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \text{LMAX} \cap \{ \sigma : \partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma) \leq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)} - \varepsilon \} \right| \right] \leq e^{-c(\varepsilon)N^2}.$$

Proof. Similarly to Corollary 3.16, by combining Cauchy–Schwarz and the Kac–Rice formula it suffices to show that for all $R \leq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)} - \varepsilon$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sigma \in \text{LMAX} \mid (\partial_{\text{rad}} H_N(\sigma), \nabla_{\text{sp}} H_N(\sigma)) = (R\sqrt{N}, \mathbf{0}) \right] \leq e^{-c'(\varepsilon)N^2}.$$

Recalling (2.11), this follows easily by the large deviation principle for the bulk spectrum of a GOE matrix, which has speed N^2 [BG97]. \square

We are ready to determine the rate function for the upper tail of GS_N in 1RSB models.

Theorem 5.6. *Assume ξ is 1RSB. Then $\max(GS_N, E_0)$ obeys a large deviation principle on $[E_0, \infty)$ with speed N and good rate function $-\Theta_*(E)$.*

Proof. Since $\Theta_*(E)$ decreases continuously from $\Theta_*(E_0) = 0$ to $-\infty$, and exponential tightness is clear by e.g. Borell–TIS, it suffices³ to show

$$\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}[GS_N \in [E - \eta, E + \eta]] \stackrel{?}{=} \Theta_*(E), \quad \forall E > E_0. \quad (5.7)$$

Thus, fix $E > E_0$ and let

$$\text{Crt}_{\text{typ}}(\tilde{B}(E)) \sqcup \text{Crt}_{\text{atyp}}(\tilde{B}(E)) = \text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))$$

respectively denote the large deviation typical and atypical critical points of H_N . For the large deviation upper bound, recall from Lemma 5.3 that on $[E, \infty) \times [2\sqrt{\xi''(1)}, \infty)$ the function Θ is maximized at $(E, R_*(E))$ with value $\Theta_*(E)$. We claim that the expected number of local maxima $\sigma \in \text{LMAX}$ satisfying $H_N(\sigma)/N \geq [E, \bar{E}]$ is at most $\exp(N\Theta_*(E) + o(N))$ for any $\bar{E} < \infty$ independent of N . Indeed, Proposition 5.5 shows that points $R \leq 2\sqrt{\xi''(1)} - \varepsilon$ contribute a negligible amount. Sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ slowly with N and applying Lemma 3.17 (and continuity of Θ) yields the claim. Since the global maximum of H_N is of course a local maximum, this together with exponential tightness of the ground state yields the upper bound.

For the lower bound, exactly as in Proposition 3.16 and its use in proving Proposition 3.7, we may deduce from Lemma 5.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} |\text{Crt}_{\text{atyp}}(\tilde{B}(E))| \leq e^{-cN/3} \mathbb{E} |\text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))|.$$

³Given exponential tightness, [AGZ09, Theorem D.4 and Corollary D.6] show (5.7) implies a large deviation principle on $[E_0 + \varepsilon, \infty)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. The large deviation principle easily extends to $[E_0, \infty)$ due to the aforementioned properties of Θ_* .

In particular

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}_{typ}(\tilde{B}(E))| \geq \mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}(\tilde{B}(E))|/2 \geq \exp(-N\Theta_*(E) \pm o(N))/2.$$

By definition, any two distinct large deviation typical points have overlap at most $-\eta_4$. Hence there are almost surely at most $2\eta_4^{-2}$ large deviation typical points in total, for any H_N (because their Gram matrix of overlaps must be positive semi-definite). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|\text{Crt}_{typ}(\tilde{B}(E))| \geq 1] &\geq \eta_4^2 \mathbb{E}|\text{Crt}_{typ}(\tilde{B}(E))|/2 \\ &\geq \eta_4^2 \exp(-N\Theta_*(E) \pm o(N))/4 \\ &\geq \exp(-N\Theta_*(E) \pm o(N)). \end{aligned}$$

By definition, if $|\text{Crt}_{typ}(\tilde{B}(E))| \geq 1$ then $GS_N \geq E - \eta_3$. Since η_3 was arbitrarily small, we obtain

$$\liminf_{\eta \downarrow 0} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}[GS_N \geq E - \eta] \geq \Theta_*(E), \quad \forall E > E_0.$$

Since we already established the large deviation upper bound with strictly increasing rate function $-\Theta_*$ as well as exponential tightness, the previous display implies (5.7) as desired. \square

5.2 Transition to Quadratic Speed

In this subsection, ξ is a general model, not necessarily 1RSB. We show in Theorem 5.8 that the large deviations of GS_N are of speed $O(N)$ above $\mathcal{Q}(\xi - \gamma_1^2 t)$ and $\Omega(N^2)$ below. The following exact orthogonalization lemma is crucial to show the latter result.

Lemma 5.7. *Fix small constants $c, \delta > 0$. Suppose $\sigma^1, \dots, \sigma^k \in \mathcal{S}_N$ for $k = e^{cN}$ satisfy $|R(\sigma^i, \sigma^j)| \leq \delta$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Then for $c' > 0$ depending only on c, δ and for N large enough, there exists a subset $A \subseteq [k]$ of size $|A| \geq c'N$ and points $\{\tilde{\sigma}^a\}_{a \in A}$ such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} R(\tilde{\sigma}^a, \tilde{\sigma}^{a'}) &= 0, \quad \forall a \neq a' \in A, \\ \|\tilde{\sigma}^a - \sigma^a\|_2 &\leq \delta^{0.01} \sqrt{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. Let $A \subseteq [k]$ be any maximal subset such that there exist $\{\tilde{\sigma}^a\}_{a \in A}$ obeying (5.8), and assume for sake of contradiction that $|A| < c'N$. For $i \in [k]$, let $\hat{\sigma}_i$ be the projection of σ_i onto $\text{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}^a\}_{a \in A})$. By maximality of A , we have $\|\hat{\sigma}_i\|_2 \geq \delta^{0.1} \sqrt{N}$ for all i . With $\mathcal{B}(A)$ the radius \sqrt{N} ball in $\text{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}^a\}_{a \in A})$, let $\hat{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}(A) \setminus \delta^{0.1} \mathcal{B}(A)$. Then, for a universal $C > 0$, $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ admits a covering by $\exp(C|A| \log(1/\delta))$ radius $\delta \sqrt{N}$ balls, whose centers are disjoint from $\delta^{0.1} \mathcal{B}(A)/2$. Since we assumed $|A| < c'N$, we have (for small enough c')

$$\exp(C|A| \log(1/\delta)) \leq \exp(cN/3).$$

Hence by the pigeonhole principle, there exists $J \subseteq [k] \setminus A$ with $|J| \geq \exp(cN/3)$ such that the points $\{\hat{\sigma}^j\}_{j \in J}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ are all contained in a radius $\delta \sqrt{N}$ ball centered at some $\hat{\sigma}^J \in \text{span}(\{\tilde{\sigma}^a\}_{a \in A})$ with $\|\hat{\sigma}^J\| \geq \delta^{0.1} \sqrt{N}/2$. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{j \in J} \langle \sigma^j, \hat{\sigma}^J \rangle = \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{j \in J} \langle \hat{\sigma}^j, \hat{\sigma}^J \rangle \geq \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{j \in J} (\langle \hat{\sigma}^j, \hat{\sigma}^J \rangle - \|\hat{\sigma}^j - \hat{\sigma}^J\|_2 \cdot \|\hat{\sigma}^J\|_2) \geq \delta^{0.3} N.$$

On the other hand, since we assumed $|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^j)| \leq \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{j \in J} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^j \right\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{|J|^2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \in J} \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{j_1}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{j_2} \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|J|^2} (|J| + |J|^2 \delta N) \\ &\leq 2\delta N. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^J\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N}$, Cauchy–Schwarz gives the desired contradiction. \square

Recall γ_1 is the weight of the degree-1 interactions in (1.1), and $\xi'(0) = \gamma_1^2$. For $h \geq 0$, let

$$\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow h}(t) = \xi(t) - \gamma_1^2 t + h^2 t$$

denote ξ with this interaction weight replaced by h . In particular $\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}(t) = \xi(t) - \gamma_1^2 t$.

Theorem 5.8. *For any $E > \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0})$,*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}[GS_N \in [E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon]] \leq C_1(\xi, E). \quad (5.9)$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{N^2} \log \mathbb{P}[GS_N \leq \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}) - \varepsilon] \geq C_2(\xi, \varepsilon). \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. We first prove (5.9), assuming further that $\xi'(0) > 0$. By Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.14, $\mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow h})$ is uniformly Lipschitz in h . Moreover clearly $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow h}) = \infty$. Thus $E = \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow h})$ for some $h > 0$. Let $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_N)$ be the vector of degree 1 disorder coefficients in (1.1). For small $\eta > 0$,

$$\frac{\gamma_1 \|\mathbf{g}\|_2}{\sqrt{N}} \in [h - \eta, h + \eta]$$

occurs with probability at least $e^{-C_1(\xi, E)N}$. Conditional on this event, $\mathbb{P}[GS_N \in [E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon]] \geq 1/2$. This proves (5.9) if $\xi'(0) > 0$.

Next, suppose $\xi'(0) = 0$. Assuming $\gamma_p > 0$, we consider the conditional behavior of H_N on the large deviation event $E_{N,x}$ that the order p coefficient $g_{1,1,\dots,1}$ (as in (1.1)) satisfies

$$g_{1,1,\dots,1} = x\sqrt{N}.$$

Using Proposition 2.14 to discretize S_N into bands with fixed first coordinate, and applying the zero temperature Parisi formula to each band, it easily follows that, with $\tilde{\xi}_q$ as in (3.2),

$$GS(x) \equiv \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[GS_N \mid E_{N,x}] = \sup_{0 \leq q \leq 1} \left\{ \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{\xi}_q) + q^p x \right\}.$$

Moreover this limit holds locally uniformly in x . In particular $GS(x)$ is continuous and strictly increasing, and (since $\gamma_1 = 0$) $GS(0) = \mathcal{Q}(\xi)$. Hence for some $x_*(E), \delta > 0$ we have $GS(x) \in [E - \varepsilon/2, E + \varepsilon/2]$ for all $x \in [x_*(E) - \delta, x_*(E) + \delta]$. Then by Borell-TIS, for N sufficiently large, we conclude (5.9) from:

$$\mathbb{P}[GS_N \in E - \varepsilon, E + \varepsilon] \geq \mathbb{P}[N^{-1/2} g_{1,1,\dots,1} \in [x_*(E) - \delta, x_*(E) + \delta]]/2 \geq e^{-C(\xi, E)N}.$$

We turn to the proof of (5.10). We start from Corollary 1.7, applied to

$$H_{N,\geq 2}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \gamma_1 \langle \mathbf{g}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle,$$

which is a Hamiltonian with mixture $\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}$. This implies the high-probability existence of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^k \in \mathcal{S}_N$ for $k = e^{cN}$ such that $|R(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^j)| \leq \delta \ll \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $H_{N,\geq 2}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. On this event, Lemma 5.7 ensures the existence of $A \subseteq [k]$ with $|A| \geq c'N$ and points $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^a\}_{a \in A}$ obeying (5.8). On the event of Proposition 2.14 we then have

$$\frac{1}{c'N^2} \max_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \in \text{Band}_{c'N,1,0}(\mathbf{0})} \sum_{i=1}^{c'N} H_{N,\geq 2}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \geq \min_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^a} H_{N,\geq 2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^a)/N \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

By the proof of Lemma 4.4, the left-hand side above is sub-Gaussian with bandwidth $O(N^{-2})$. (Namely we specialize (4.7) with $k = c'N$ and $\delta = 0$, and then apply Borell-TIS as there.) With $c'' = c''(\xi, c, c', \delta) > 0$ a small constant, we find that

$$\frac{1}{c'N^2} \max_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \in \text{Band}_{c'N,1,0}(\mathbf{0})} \sum_{i=1}^{c'N} H_{N,\geq 2}(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}) - \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}$$

with probability $1 - e^{-c''N^2}$. Let $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^1, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{c'N})$ attain the maximum on the left-hand side (and depend measurably on $H_{N,\geq 2}$).

Finally we add back in the external field $\gamma_1 \langle \mathbf{g}, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle$. Note that $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^a\}_{a \in A}$ can be chosen (in some measurable way) depending only on $H_{N,\geq 2}$, so we may take \mathbf{g} independent of $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq c'N}$. Then $\sum_{i \leq c'N} \gamma_1 \langle \mathbf{g}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^i \rangle$ is conditionally a centered Gaussian with variance $c'N^2$, so it has absolute value smaller than $\varepsilon c'N^2/4$ with probability $1 - e^{-c''N^2}$. On this event and that of the preceding display, we find as desired:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\sigma})/N &\geq \frac{1}{c'N^2} \max_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \in \text{Band}_{c'N,1,0}(\mathbf{0})} \sum_{i=1}^{c'N} H_N(\boldsymbol{\rho}^i) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{c'N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{c'N} H_{N,\geq 2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^i) \right) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \\ &\geq \mathcal{Q}(\xi^{\gamma_1 \leftarrow 0}) - \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark 5.9. Given a weaker version of Corollary 1.7 with $k_N \leq e^{o(N)}$, one finds $|A| \geq \Omega(\log k_N)$ in Lemma 5.7, which implies speed $\Omega(N \log k_N)$. In particular, Chatterjee’s “multiple peaks” property [Cha14] suffices to obtain super-linear speed for the lower tail. At positive temperature, the super-linearity in the lower tail was essentially predicted by Dotsenko-Franz-Mézard in [DFM94] and proved in [Tal07, Jag17] using a similar “orthogonal structures” idea; see also [Che23] which derives it from superconcentration. The main new feature of Theorem 5.8 is the quadratic rate, which is best possible when $\gamma_2 \neq 0$. It is natural to conjecture that $N^{p_{\min}}$ is the correct lower tail speed for $p_{\min} = \min\{p : \gamma_p > 0\}$.

Acknowledgement

We thank Wei-Kuo Chen and Peter Mottishaw for helpful comments. B.H. was supported by a Google PhD Fellowship, NSF awards CCF-1940205 and DMS-1940092, and NSF-Simons grant DMS-2031883.

References

- [AB13] Antonio Auffinger and Gérard Ben Arous. Complexity of random smooth functions on the high-dimensional sphere. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(6):4214–4247, 2013.
- [ABČ13] Antonio Auffinger, Gérard Ben Arous, and Jiří Černý. Random matrices and complexity of spin glasses. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(2):165–201, 2013.
- [AC15] Antonio Auffinger and Wei-Kuo Chen. The Parisi formula has a unique minimizer. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 335(3):1429–1444, 2015.
- [AC17] Antonio Auffinger and Wei-Kuo Chen. Parisi formula for the ground state energy in the mixed p -spin model. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(6b):4617–4631, 2017.
- [AC18] Antonio Auffinger and Wei-Kuo Chen. On the energy landscape of spherical spin glasses. *Advances in Mathematics*, 330:553–588, 2018.
- [AGZ09] Greg W. Anderson, Alice Guionnet, and Ofer Zeitouni. *An Introduction to Random Matrices*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [ALR87] Michael Aizenman, Joel L Lebowitz, and David Ruelle. Some rigorous results on the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick spin glass model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 112(1):3–20, 1987.
- [AM20] Ahmed El Alaoui and Andrea Montanari. Algorithmic thresholds in mean field spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11481*, 2020.
- [AMS21] Ahmed El Alaoui, Andrea Montanari, and Mark Sellke. Optimization of mean-field spin glasses. *Ann. Probab.*, 49(6):2922–2960, 2021.
- [AMS23a] Ahmed El Alaoui, Andrea Montanari, and Mark Sellke. Local algorithms for maximum cut and minimum bisection on locally treelike regular graphs of large degree. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 63(3):689–715, 2023.
- [AMS23b] Ahmed El Alaoui, Andrea Montanari, and Mark Sellke. Shattering in pure spherical spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04659*, 2023.
- [AS22] Ahmed El Alaoui and Mark Sellke. Algorithmic pure states for the negative spherical perceptron. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 189(2):27, 2022.
- [ASS03] Michael Aizenman, Robert Sims, and Shannon L Starr. Extended variational principle for the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick spin-glass model. *Physical Review B*, 68(21):214403, 2003.
- [AT07] Robert J Adler and Jonathan E Taylor. *Random fields and geometry*, volume 80. Springer, 2007.
- [BBM23a] Gérard Ben Arous, Paul Bourgade, and Benjamin McKenna. Exponential growth of random determinants beyond invariance. *Probability and Mathematical Physics*, 3(4):731–789, 2023.
- [BBM23b] Gérard Ben Arous, Paul Bourgade, and Benjamin McKenna. Landscape complexity beyond invariance and the elastic manifold. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 2023.
- [BČNS22] David Belius, Jiří Černý, Shuta Nakajima, and Marius A Schmidt. Triviality of the geometry of mixed p -spin spherical hamiltonians with external field. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 186(1):12, 2022.
- [BDG06] Gérard Ben Arous, Amir Dembo, and Alice Guionnet. Cugliandolo–Kurchan equations for dynamics of spin-glasses. *Probab. Theory and Related Fields*, 136(4):619–660, 2006.
- [Ben02] Gérard Ben Arous. Aging and spin-glass dynamics. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, pages 3–14. Higher Ed. Press, 2002.
- [BFK21] Gérard Ben Arous, Yan V Fyodorov, and Boris A Khoruzhenko. Counting equilibria of large complex systems by instability index. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(34):e2023719118, 2021.
- [BG97] Gérard Ben Arous and Alice Guionnet. Large deviations for Wigner’s law and Voiculescu’s non-commutative entropy. *Probab. Theory and Related Fields*, 108:517–542, 1997.
- [BGJ20] Gérard Ben Arous, Reza Gheissari, and Aukosh Jagannath. Bounding flows for spherical spin glass dynamics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 373:1011–1048, 2020.
- [BM11] Mohsen Bayati and Andrea Montanari. The dynamics of message passing on dense graphs, with applications to compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(2):764–785, 2011.
- [BMMN19] Gérard Ben Arous, Song Mei, Andrea Montanari, and Mihai Nica. The landscape of the spiked tensor model. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(11):2282–2330, 2019.

- [Bol14] Erwin Bolthausen. An iterative construction of solutions of the TAP equations for the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 325(1):333–366, 2014.
- [Bol18] Erwin Bolthausen. A Morita type proof of the replica-symmetric formula for SK. In *International Conference on Statistical Mechanics of Classical and Disordered Systems*, pages 63–93. Springer, 2018.
- [Bor76] C Borell. Gaussian Radon measures on locally convex spaces. *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 38(2):265–284, 1976.
- [BSZ20] Gérard Ben Arous, Eliran Subag, and Ofer Zeitouni. Geometry and temperature chaos in mixed spherical spin glasses at low temperature: the perturbative regime. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 73(8):1732–1828, 2020.
- [BY22] Christian Brennecke and Horng-Tzer Yau. The replica symmetric formula for the SK model revisited. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 63(7), 2022.
- [CFM23] Michael Celentano, Zhou Fan, and Song Mei. Local convexity of the TAP free energy and AMP convergence for \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):519–546, 2023.
- [Cha14] Sourav Chatterjee. *Superconcentration and related topics*, volume 15. Springer, 2014.
- [Che13] Wei-Kuo Chen. The Aizenman-Sims-Starr scheme and Parisi Formula for Mixed p -spin Spherical Models. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:1–14, 2013.
- [Che23] Wei-Kuo Chen. A Gaussian Convexity for Logarithmic Moment Generating Functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08351*, 2023.
- [CHL18] Wei-Kuo Chen, Madeline Handschy, and Gilad Lerman. On the Energy Landscape of the Mixed Even p -spin Model. *Probab. Theory and Related Fields*, 171(1):53–95, 2018.
- [CHM23] Antares Chen, Neng Huang, and Kunal Marwaha. Local algorithms and the failure of log-depth quantum advantage on sparse random CSPs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01563*, 2023.
- [CHS93] Andrea Crisanti, Heinz Horner, and H J Sommers. The spherical p -spin interaction spin-glass model: the dynamics. *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter*, 92:257–271, 1993.
- [CIS76] Boris S Cirel’son, Ildar A Ibragimov, and Vladimir N Sudakov. Norms of gaussian sample functions. In *Proceedings of the Third Japan–USSR Symposium on Probability Theory*, pages 20–41. Springer, 1976.
- [CK93] Leticia F Cugliandolo and Jorge Kurchan. Analytical solution of the off-equilibrium dynamics of a long-range spin-glass model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 71(1):173, 1993.
- [CN95] Francis Comets and Jacques Neveu. The Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model of spin glasses and stochastic calculus: the high temperature case. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 166(3):549–564, 1995.
- [CS92] Andrea Crisanti and H-J Sommers. The spherical p -spin interaction spin glass model: the statics. *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter*, 87(3):341–354, 1992.
- [CS17] Wei-Kuo Chen and Arnab Sen. Parisi formula, disorder chaos and fluctuation for the ground state energy in the spherical mixed p -spin models. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 350:129–173, 2017.
- [CS21] Sourav Chatterjee and Leila Sloman. Average Gromov hyperbolicity and the Parisi ansatz. *Advances in Mathematics*, 376:107417, 2021.
- [dAT78] Jairo RL de Almeida and David J Thouless. Stability of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick solution of a spin glass model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 11(5):983, 1978.
- [Der81] Bernard Derrida. Random-energy model: An exactly solvable model of disordered systems. *Physical Review B*, 24(5):2613, 1981.
- [DEZ15] Jian Ding, Ronen Eldan, and Alex Zhai. On multiple peaks and moderate deviations for supremum of a Gaussian Field. *Ann. Probab.*, pages 3468–3493, 2015.
- [DFM94] Vik Dotsenko, Silvio Franz, and Marc Mezard. Partial annealing and overfrustration in disordered systems. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 27(7):2351, 1994.
- [DGM07] Amir Dembo, Alice Guionnet, and Christian Mazza. Limiting dynamics for spherical models of spin glasses at high temperature. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 126:781–815, 2007.
- [DS19] Jian Ding and Nike Sun. Capacity lower bound for the Ising perceptron. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 816–827, 2019.
- [DSS22] Jian Ding, Allan Sly, and Nike Sun. Proof of the satisfiability conjecture for large k . *Ann. Math.*, 196(1):1–388, 2022.
- [Eld20] Ronen Eldan. A Simple Approach to Chaos for p -Spin Models. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 181(4):1266–1276, 2020.

- [FD14] Yan V Fyodorov and Pierre Le Doussal. Topology trivialization and large deviations for the minimum in the simplest random optimization. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 154(1-2):466–490, 2014.
- [FK16] Yan V Fyodorov and Boris A Khoruzhenko. Nonlinear analogue of the May–Wigner instability transition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(25):6827–6832, 2016.
- [FMM21] Zhou Fan, Song Mei, and Andrea Montanari. TAP free energy, spin glasses and variational inference. *Ann. Probab.*, 49(1), 2021.
- [Fri90] Alan M Frieze. On the independence number of random graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 81(2):171–175, 1990.
- [Fyo04] Yan V Fyodorov. Complexity of random energy landscapes, glass transition, and absolute value of the spectral determinant of random matrices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92(24):240601, 2004.
- [Fyo16] Yan V Fyodorov. Topology trivialization transition in random non-gradient autonomous ODEs on a sphere. *J. Stat. Mech: Theory and Experiment*, 2016(12):124003, 2016.
- [Gam21] David Gamarnik. The overlap gap property: A topological barrier to optimizing over random structures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(41), 2021.
- [GG98] Stefano Ghirlanda and Francesco Guerra. General properties of overlap probability distributions in disordered spin systems. towards parisi ultrametricity. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 31(46):9149, 1998.
- [GJ21] David Gamarnik and Aukosh Jagannath. The overlap gap property and approximate message passing algorithms for p -spin models. *Ann. Probab.*, 49(1):180–205, 2021.
- [GJW20] David Gamarnik, Aukosh Jagannath, and Alexander S. Wein. Low-degree hardness of random optimization problems. In *Proceedings of 61st FOCS*, pages 131–140. IEEE, 2020.
- [GS17] David Gamarnik and Madhu Sudan. Limits of local algorithms over sparse random graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(4):2353–2376, 2017.
- [GT02] Francesco Guerra and Fabio Lucio Toninelli. The thermodynamic limit in mean field spin glass models. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 230(1):71–79, 2002.
- [Gue03] Francesco Guerra. Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 233(1):1–12, 2003.
- [Gui07] Alice Guionnet. Dynamics for spherical models of spin-glass and aging. *Spin glasses*, pages 117–144, 2007.
- [HS21] Brice Huang and Mark Sellke. Tight Lipschitz Hardness for Optimizing Mean Field Spin Glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07847*, 2021.
- [HS23a] Brice Huang and Mark Sellke. Algorithmic threshold for multi-species spherical spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12172*, 2023.
- [HS23b] Brice Huang and Mark Sellke. Optimization algorithms for multi-species spherical spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09672*, 2023.
- [HS23c] Brice Huang and Mark Sellke. Strong topological trivialization of multi-species spherical spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09677*, 2023.
- [Jag17] Aukosh Jagannath. Approximate ultrametricity for random measures and applications to spin glasses. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 70(4):611–664, 2017.
- [JT16] Aukosh Jagannath and Ian Tobasco. A dynamic programming approach to the Parisi functional. *Proc. Amer. Math Soc.*, 144(7):3135–3150, 2016.
- [JT17] Aukosh Jagannath and Ian Tobasco. Low temperature asymptotics of spherical mean field spin glasses. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 352(3):979–1017, 2017.
- [JT18] Aukosh Jagannath and Ian Tobasco. Bounds on the complexity of replica symmetry breaking for spherical spin glasses. *Proc. Amer. Math Soc.*, 146(7):3127–3142, 2018.
- [Kac43] M Kac. On the average number of real roots of a random algebraic equation. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 49(4):314–320, 1943.
- [Kac48] M Kac. On the Average Number of Real Roots of a Random Algebraic Equation (II). *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):390–408, 1948.
- [Kiv23] Pax Kivimae. The Ground State Energy and Concentration of Complexity in Spherical Bipartite Models. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, pages 1–45, 2023.

- [LFD23] Bertrand Lacroix-A-Chez-Toine, Yan V Fyodorov, and Pierre Le Doussal. Replica-symmetry breaking transitions in the large deviations of the ground-state of a spherical spin-glass. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11927*, 2023.
- [McK21] Benjamin McKenna. Complexity of bipartite spherical spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.05043*, 2021.
- [Mon21] Andrea Montanari. Optimization of the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick Hamiltonian. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, (0):FOCS19–1, 2021.
- [MPS⁺84a] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, Nicolas Sourlas, G Toulouse, and Miguel Virasoro. Nature of the spin-glass phase. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 52(13):1156, 1984.
- [MPS⁺84b] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, Nicolas Sourlas, Gérard Toulouse, and Miguel Virasoro. Replica symmetry breaking and the nature of the spin glass phase. *Journal de Physique*, 45(5):843–854, 1984.
- [MPV87] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, and Miguel Angel Virasoro. *Spin glass theory and beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications*, volume 9. World Scientific Publishing Company, 1987.
- [MS23] Andrea Montanari and Eliran Subag. Solving overparametrized systems of random equations I: Model and algorithms for approximate solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13326*, 2023.
- [Pan07] Dmitriy Panchenko. A note on Talagrand’s positivity principle. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 12:401–410, 2007.
- [Pan13a] Dmitry Panchenko. The Parisi ultrametricity conjecture. *Ann. Math.*, pages 383–393, 2013.
- [Pan13b] Dmitry Panchenko. *The Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Pan14] Dmitry Panchenko. The Parisi formula for mixed p -spin models. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(3):946–958, 2014.
- [Par79] Giorgio Parisi. Infinite number of order parameters for spin-glasses. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 43(23):1754, 1979.
- [Par80] Giorgio Parisi. A sequence of approximated solutions to the SK model for spin glasses. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 13(4):L115, 1980.
- [Par83] Giorgio Parisi. Order parameter for spin-glasses. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 50(24):1946, 1983.
- [Ric44] Stephen O Rice. Mathematical analysis of random noise. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 23(3):282–332, 1944.
- [Rue87] David Ruelle. A mathematical reformulation of Derrida’s REM and GREM. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 108:225–239, 1987.
- [Sel21] Mark Sellke. Optimizing mean field spin glasses with external field. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03506*, 2021.
- [Sel23] Mark Sellke. The Threshold Energy of Low Temperature Langevin Dynamics for Pure Spherical Spin Glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07956*, 2023.
- [SK75] David Sherrington and Scott Kirkpatrick. Solvable model of a spin-glass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 35(26):1792, 1975.
- [Sub17a] Eliran Subag. The complexity of spherical p -spin models—a second moment approach. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(5):3385–3450, 2017.
- [Sub17b] Eliran Subag. The Geometry of the Gibbs Measure of Pure Spherical Spin Glasses. *Invent. Math.*, 210(1):135–209, 2017.
- [Sub18] Eliran Subag. Free Energy Landscapes in Spherical Spin Glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.10576*, 2018.
- [Sub21] Eliran Subag. Following the Ground States of Full-RSB Spherical Spin Glasses. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 74(5):1021–1044, 2021.
- [Sub23] Eliran Subag. On the second moment method and RS phase of multi-species spherical spin glasses. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 28:1–21, 2023.
- [SZ81] Haim Sompolinsky and Annette Zippelius. Dynamic theory of the spin-glass phase. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 47(5):359, 1981.
- [SZ17] Eliran Subag and Ofer Zeitouni. The extremal process of critical points of the pure p -spin spherical spin glass model. *Probab. Theory and Related Fields*, 168(3-4):773–820, 2017.
- [Tal06a] Michel Talagrand. Free energy of the spherical mean field model. *Probab. Theory and Related Fields*, 134(3):339–382, 2006.
- [Tal06b] Michel Talagrand. The Parisi formula. *Ann. Math.*, pages 221–263, 2006.
- [Tal07] Michel Talagrand. Large Deviations, Guerra’s and ASS Schemes, and the Parisi Hypothesis. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 126, 2007.
- [Tal11] Michel Talagrand. *Mean Field Models for Spin Glasses. Volume II: Advanced Replica-Symmetry and Low Temperature*, volume 55. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [TAP77] David J. Thouless, Philip W. Anderson, and Richard G. Palmer. Solution of ‘solvable model of a spin glass’. *Philosophical Magazine*, 35(3):593–601, 1977.