

OUTLIERS AND BOUNDED RANK PERTURBATION FOR NON-HERMITIAN RANDOM BAND MATRICES

YI HAN

ABSTRACT. In this work we consider general non-Hermitian square random matrices X that include a wide class of random band matrices with independent entries. Whereas the existence of limiting density is largely unknown for these inhomogeneous models, we show that spectral outliers can be determined under very general conditions when perturbed by a finite rank deterministic matrix. More precisely, we show that whenever $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[XX^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^*X] = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \rho\mathbf{1}$, and under mild conditions on sparsity and entry moments of X , then with high possibility all eigenvalues of X are confined in a neighborhood of the support of the elliptic law with parameter ρ . Also, a finite rank perturbation property holds: when X is perturbed by another deterministic matrix C_N with bounded rank, then the perturbation induces outlying eigenvalues whose limit depends only on outlying eigenvalues of C_N and ρ . This extends the result of Tao [42] on i.i.d. random matrices and O’rouke and Renfrew on elliptic matrices [36] to a family of highly sparse and inhomogeneous random matrices, including all Gaussian band matrices on regular graphs with degree at least $(\log N)^3$. A quantitative convergence rate is also derived. We also consider a class of finite rank deformations of products of at least two independent elliptic random matrices, and show it behaves just as product i.i.d. matrices.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work we consider the spectral properties of a very general class of inhomogeneous non-Hermitian random matrices, including a wide class of random band matrices.

To put our results in a proper context, we first recall what is known for a random matrix with i.i.d. entries, which has a fully homogeneous variance profile.

Theorem 1.1. *Consider $A_n := \{a_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ an n by n random matrix with i.i.d. elements a_{ij} having mean zero and finite second moment:*

$$\mathbb{E}[a_{ij}] = 0, \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[|a_{ij}|^2] = 1. \quad (1.1)$$

- (1) *(The circular law, see [43] and references therein) The empirical spectral density of $n^{-1/2}A_n$, defined as $n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_j}$ with $(\lambda_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ the eigenvalues of $n^{-1/2}A_n$, converges to the circular law, i.e. the uniform distribution in the unit disk in the complex plane.*
- (2) *(No outliers, see [6] [25]) Let $\rho(n^{-1/2}A_n)$ denote the spectral radius of $n^{-1/2}A_n$. Assuming the atom distribution a_{ij} has a finite fourth moment: $\mathbb{E}[|a_{ij}|^4] < \infty$, then $\rho(n^{-1/2}A_n)$ converges to 1 almost surely.*
- (3) *(Low rank perturbation, see [42]) Assuming the atom distribution a_{ij} has a finite fourth moment. Fix some $\epsilon > 0$ and let C_n be deterministic matrix with $O(1)$ rank and operator norm for each n , having no eigenvalues with norm in $[1+\epsilon, 1+3\epsilon]$ and j eigenvalues $\lambda_1(C_n), \dots, \lambda_j(C_n)$ for a $j = O(1)$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > 1+3\epsilon\}$. Then almost*

Supported by EPSRC grant EP/W524141/1.

surely when n is sufficiently large, there are exactly j eigenvalues $\lambda_1(n^{-1/2}A_n + C_n), \dots, \lambda_j(n^{-1/2}A_n + C_n)$ of $n^{-1/2}A_n + C_n$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > 1 + 2\epsilon\}$ and after labeling, $\lambda_i(n^{-1/2}A_n + C_n) = \lambda_i(C_n) + o(1)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq j$.

Remark 1.2. The finite fourth moment condition $\mathbb{E}[|a_{ij}|^4] < \infty$ is not necessary for the no outliers result in (2). We only need a finite variance, see [13], [14].

The corresponding problem in (3) low rank perturbation for Hermitian random matrices has been studied in more detail in [38], [18], [39], [24], [12], and see also references therein. There is a phase transition called the BBP transform: Consider a Wigner matrix W_n , a unit vector v and $\theta > 0$, then the largest eigenvalues of $n^{-1/2}W_n + \theta vv^t$ converges to $\theta + \frac{1}{\theta}$ when $\theta > 1$ and converges to 2 when $\theta < 1$. Item (3) of Theorem 1.1 shows that when we consider instead a square matrix with i.i.d. entries, then eigenvalues outside the unit circle converge to eigenvalues of the perturbation.

Inhomogeneous random matrix models have attracted much recent interest, from both the theoretical and applied perspective. Random band matrix is one of the most important inhomogeneous matrix models in modern mathematical physics [16]. In this paper we investigate a non-Hermitian version of random band matrix, which can be defined in the following general form.

Definition 1.3. (*Non-Hermitian random matrix on regular graphs*) Let N be an integer and $d_N \in [1, N]$ be an integer depending on N .

Fix any d_N -regular directed graph $G_N = ([N], E_N)$ having N vertices and a set E_N of directed edges on $[N]$. In this graph, self loops are allowed but multiple edges are excluded. We further require that either one of the following two alternatives hold

- (1) There is a self loop $(x, x) \in E_N$ for all $x \in [N]$,
- (2) There is no self loop $(x, x) \in E_N$ for any $x \in [N]$.

Consider a family of mean 0, variance 1 (real or complex) random variables g_{xy} for each $(x, y) \in E_N$. These random variables are assumed to be independent but not necessarily of the same distribution. However for the diagonal entries we require $\mathbb{E}[g_{xx}^2] = D$ for each $(x, x) \in E_N$ for some fixed constant D with $|D| \leq 1$.

Then we define an $N \times N$ random matrix X_N by setting $(X_N)_{xy} = 1_{(x,y) \in E_N} g_{xy}$.

This definition is sufficiently general as it encompasses a wide class of distinct random matrix models. They include periodically banded matrix where we set $(x, y) \in E_N$ if $\min(|x - y|, N - |x - y|) \leq d_N$ for a bandwidth d_N . They also include block matrix which is the direct sum of N/d_N blocks of i.i.d. matrix of size d_N . They further include the direct sum of block and band matrices, and many other possibilities.

Now we state the main result of this paper, applied to the matrix $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$.

Theorem 1.4. Assume that the regular digraphs G_N are increasing ($E_N \subset E_{N+1}$ for each N) and that we can embed X_N as the top-left $N \times N$ submatrix of X_{N+1} , so that all the random matrices X_N are defined on the same probability space.

Assume moreover that one of the following three conditions hold:

- (1) g_{xy} are standard (real or complex) Gaussian variables and $d_N \gg (\log N)^3$, or
- (2) g_{xy} are real or complex random variables that satisfy

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\log N)^2 \max_{(x,y) \in E} |(d_N)^{-1/2} g_{xy}| = 0 \quad a.s.,$$

- (3) g_{xy} are i.i.d. real centered variance 1 random variables such that, for some $p > 4$, we have $\mathbb{E}[|g_{xy}|^p] < \infty$ and $d_N \gg N^{\frac{2}{p-2}}(\log N)^{\frac{4p}{p-2}}$.

Then the random matrix $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$ in Definition 1.3 satisfies the following properties:

- (1) For any $\epsilon > 0$, almost surely as N is sufficiently large, $\rho((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N) \leq 1 + \epsilon$.
(2) Moreover, fix some $\epsilon > 0$, let C_N be deterministic matrix with $O(1)$ rank and operator norm for each N , having no eigenvalues with norm in $[1 + \epsilon, 1 + 3\epsilon]$ and j eigenvalues $\lambda_1(C_N), \dots, \lambda_j(C_N)$ for a $j = O(1)$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > 1 + 3\epsilon\}$.

Then almost surely as N is large, there are exactly j eigenvalues $\lambda_1((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N), \dots, \lambda_j((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N)$ of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > 1 + 2\epsilon\}$ and after labeling,

$$\lambda_i((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N) = \lambda_i(C_N) + o((\log \log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq j$.

A discussion on the quantitative estimates in this theorem are presented in Remark 1.8.

1.1. The elliptic case. In this section we state an elliptic analogue of Theorem 1.4.

Recall that an $N \times N$ complex random matrix $E_N = (e_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,N}$ is said to be elliptic if each entry e_{ij} has mean zero and variance one, that the covariance $\text{Cov}(e_{ij}, e_{ji}) = \rho \in (-1, 1)$ for each $i \neq j$, and that all entries of E_N are independent modulo symmetry constraint. This definition interpolates the i.i.d. case $\rho = 0$ and the symmetric case $\rho = 1$. Under some additional assumptions, it is proved [34] that the empirical eigenvalue density of $N^{-1/2}E_N$ converges to the elliptic law, that is, the uniform distribution on the ellipse \mathcal{E}_ρ

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \frac{\text{Re}(z)^2}{(1+\rho)^2} + \frac{\text{Im}(z)^2}{(1-\rho)^2} \leq 1\} \quad (1.2)$$

in the complex plane. Assuming further that e_{ij} has a finite fourth moment, [36] proved that a finite rank perturbation result also holds for random elliptic matrices, which in the i.i.d. case $\rho = 0$ reduces to Theorem 1.1 (3) (i.e., the result of [42]) and in the Wigner case $\rho = 1$ reduces to the result of [38] when the perturbation matrix C_n is self-adjoint.

Analogously to Theorem 1.4, we now consider random band matrices with elliptic correlations, which generalizes Hermitian random band matrices and random band matrices with independent entries in Definition 1.3. As will be explained in Section 1.4, it is presently unknown how to prove the limiting eigenvalue density exists and converges to the elliptic law for a random band matrix with elliptic correlation, at least when the bandwidth $b_N \leq N^{33/34}$. However, we show in the following theorem that outliers in the banded model can still be determined under elliptic correlation, thus generalizing [36] to a wide class of band matrices with elliptic correlation.

In contrast to previous work, we can consider any covariance $\rho \in \mathbb{C} : |\rho| \leq 1$ without assuming ρ is a real number. In this case we need to define the region \mathcal{E}_ρ slightly differently as follows, for any $\rho \in \mathbb{C}, |\rho| \leq 1$,

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z = x + \rho\bar{x}, \quad \text{for some } |x| \leq 1, \quad x \in \mathbb{C}\}. \quad (1.3)$$

We prove that the new definition of \mathcal{E}_ρ degenerates to the old one when ρ is real:

Lemma 1.5. *Assume that $\rho \in [-1, 1]\mathbb{R}$, then the set \mathcal{E}_ρ defined in (1.3) coincides with the ellipse defined in (1.2). In general, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho = e^{i \arg(\rho)/2} \mathcal{E}_{|\rho|},$$

that is, \mathcal{E}_ρ is $\mathcal{E}_{|\rho|}$ rotated by the angle $\arg(\rho)/2$ in the counterclockwise direction across the origin.

This lemma follows from routine computations, and see Section 3 for the proof.

For any $\epsilon > 0$ we denote by $\mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}$ the following region which is a neighborhood of \mathcal{E}_ρ in the complex plane:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{dist}(z, \mathcal{E}_\rho) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

We also use the notation \mathbb{D} to mean the unit disk in the complex plane $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\}$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$, $(1+\epsilon)\mathbb{D}$ denotes the set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1+\epsilon\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{E}_{0,\epsilon} = (1+\epsilon)\mathbb{D}$.

We now state the main result concerning elliptic band matrices:

Theorem 1.6. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $d_N \in [1, N]$. Consider a family of undirected d_N -regular graphs $G_N = ([N], E_N)$ such that either all self loops $(x, x), x \in [N]$ do not exist in E_N , or all such self loops $(x, x), x \in [N]$ are edges in E_N with multiplicity one.*

Fix a covariance parameter $\rho \in \mathbb{C} : |\rho| \leq 1$. Define a random matrix X_N on $[N]^2$ such that for any $x < y$, $(x, y) \in E_N$, we set $((X_N)_{(x,y)}, (X_N)_{(y,x)})$ to be a pair of mean 0, variance 1 random variables such that

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_N)_{(x,y)}(X_N)_{(y,x)}] = \rho.$$

If $(x, y) \notin E_N$ we set the pair to be $(0, 0)$. For self loops $(x, x) \in E$ we set $(X_N)_{(x,x)}$ an i.i.d copy of a mean 0, variance 1 random variable g_0 . We assume that all the random variables $((X_N)_{(x,y)}, (X_N)_{(y,x)})_{(x,y) \in E_N}$ are mutually independent over the edges $(x, y) \in E_N$.

We assume that the graphs G_N are increasing (so that $E_N \subset E_{N+1}$) and that X_N can be embedded as the $[1, N] \times [1, N]$ submatrix of X_{N+1} , so that all the $\{X_N\}$ can be realized on the same probability space.

For the entry distributions, we further assume that either one of the following three conditions hold:

- (1) *Either $d_N \gg (\log N)^3$ and the matrix X_N has jointly Gaussian entries;*
- (2) *Or $d_N \gg (\log N)^5$ and almost surely we have $|(X_N)_{(x,y)}| \leq C$ for some fixed $C > 0$ and all edges $(x, y) \in E_N$; or*
- (3) *For each $(x, y) \in E_N : x < y$, the pair $((X_N)_{(x,y)}, (X_N)_{(y,x)})$ has the same law as (g_1, g_2) , where g_1, g_2 are two real-valued symmetric random variables of mean 0, variance 1, having the same distribution: $g_1 \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} g_2$ and $\mathbb{E}[g_1 g_2] = \rho$. We require (g_0, g_1, g_2) satisfy that, for some $p > 4$ and $d_N \gg N^{\frac{2}{p-2}} (\log N)^{\frac{4p}{p-2}}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[|g_i|^p] < \infty, i = 0, 1, 2$.*

Then we have the following conclusion:

- (1) *For any $\epsilon > 0$, almost surely as N tends to infinity there is no eigenvalue of $(d_N)^{-1/2} X_N$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}\}$.*
- (2) *Moreover, fix $\epsilon > 0$ and consider C_N a family of fixed N by N matrix with $O(1)$ rank and operator norm, having no eigenvalues that satisfy*

$$\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)} \in \mathcal{E}_{\rho, 3\epsilon} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon} \text{ and } |\lambda_i(C_N)| > 1,$$

and having $j = O(1)$ eigenvalues $\lambda_1(C_N), \dots, \lambda_j(C_N)$ such that

$$\lambda_j(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_j(C_N)} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}, \text{ and } |\lambda_j(C_N)| \geq 1.$$

Then almost surely for N large enough, we can find j eigenvalues of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N$: $\lambda_i((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N)$, $i = 1, \dots, j$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, 2\epsilon}$ that satisfy, after proper relating,

$$\lambda_i((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N) = \lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)} + o((\log \log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq j$.

1.2. A master theorem. In this paper we will not prove Theorem 1.4 and 1.6 directly, but rather deduce them as special cases of the following master theorem.

A major observation here is that the regular graph structure in Theorem 1.4 and 1.6 are not the most intrinsic condition: for an N by N random matrix X with $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$, the intrinsic condition guaranteeing ellipticity should be $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \rho \mathbf{1}$ for some fixed constant ρ . The assumption that the variance profile is doubly stochastic, namely $\mathbb{E}[XX^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^*X] = \mathbf{1}$, is sufficiently general to cover both the homogeneous case of a standard i.i.d. and standard elliptic matrix, and the band matrix case considered in Theorem 1.4 and 1.6. We will show this is indeed the case: for a very general random matrix X with mean zero and satisfying some constraints, then its behavior in terms of outliers is completely determined whenever $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \rho \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbb{E}[XX^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^*X] = \mathbf{1}$ for some $|\rho| \leq 1$. This generalizes the Hermitian case where $\rho = 1$, as considered in Theorem 2.7 of [8].

Before presenting our master theorem, we introduce a few notations on very general random matrices from [9] and [17],

In the Gaussian case, consider the following random matrix model as in [9], Section 1. Consider fixed matrices $A_0, \dots, A_n \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$, where $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ denotes the set of N by N square matrices with complex entries. Let g_1, \dots, g_n be standard real Gaussian variables with mean 0 and variance 1. Consider a canonical model

$$X := A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n g_i A_i. \quad (1.4)$$

It is clear that any square Gaussian random matrix admits a decomposition as (1.4). We need to introduce a few more parameters on X .

For a Gaussian matrix X (1.4) we define its covariance profile $\text{Cov}(X) \in M_{N^2}(\mathbb{C})$ via

$$\text{Cov}(X)_{ij,kl} = \sum_{s=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} \overline{(A_s)_{kl}}$$

and we now define

$$\begin{aligned} v(X)^2 &= \|\text{Cov}(X)\| = \sup_{\text{Tr}|M|^2 \leq 1} \sum_{s=1}^n [\text{Tr}[A_s M]]^2, \\ \sigma(X)^2 &:= \|\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}X)^*(X - \mathbb{E}X)]\| \wedge \|\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}X)(X - \mathbb{E}X)^*]\|, \\ \sigma_*(X)^2 &:= \sup_{\|x\|=\|w\|=1} \mathbb{E}[|\langle v, (X - \mathbb{E}X)w \rangle|^2], \end{aligned}$$

and finally define

$$\tilde{v}(X)^2 := v(x)\sigma(X).$$

Our general theorem in the Gaussian case is as follows

Theorem 1.7. Fix $\rho \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\rho| \leq 1$. Consider X an $N \times N$ Gaussian random matrix with

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[XX^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^*X] = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbb{E}[X^2] = (\rho + D_N)\mathbf{1}, \quad (1.5)$$

where D_N are fixed complex numbers such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\log N)D_N = 0$.

Assume further that

$$\tilde{v}(X) \leq (\log N)^{-1}, \quad \sigma_*(x) \leq (\log N)^{-1.5}.$$

Then for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, we can find $C_1 > 0$ a fixed constant depending only on ρ and ϵ , such that

- (1) With probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.5}$ there is no eigenvalue of X lying in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$.
- (2) Consider deterministic N by N matrices C_N of rank $O(1)$ and operator norm $O(1)$, having no eigenvalues that satisfy

$$\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)} \in \mathcal{E}_{\rho, 3\epsilon} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon} \text{ and } |\lambda_i(C_N)| > 1,$$

and having $j = O(1)$ eigenvalues $\lambda_1(C_N), \dots, \lambda_j(C_N)$ such that

$$\lambda_j(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_j(C_N)} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}, \text{ and } |\lambda_j(C_N)| \geq 1.$$

Then with probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.4}$, there exists precisely j eigenvalues $\lambda_i(X + C_N)$, $i = 1, \dots, j$ of $X + C_N$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, 2\epsilon}$ and, after a possible relabeling of the eigenvalues, we have

$$\lambda_i(X + C_N) = \lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)} + o((\log \log N)^{-1/2})$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq j$,

Remark 1.8. We have presented our main theorem with quantified probability and convergence estimates. These estimates are not meant to be optimal and are of illustrative use only. The probability estimate $1 - C_1 N^{-1.4}$ can easily be upgraded to be $1 - C_1 N^{-p}$ for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and we use the latter as it is already sufficient for applying Borel-Cantelli lemma.

The error term $(\log \log N)^{-1/2}$ is more delicate and can be replaced by any quantity that vanishes strictly slower than $(\log N)^{-p}$ and any $p > 0$. We choose the term $(\log \log N)^{-1/2}$ for rotational simplicity only. This appears to be the first time where an explicit convergence rate is proven for elliptic random matrices.

An interesting problem is whether the error term can decay faster than $(\log N)^{-p}$: we believe this cannot hold unconditionally but instead relies strongly on the structure of the random matrix X . For a square matrix with i.i.d. entries, fluctuations of outlying eigenvalues on the scale $N^{-1/2}$ around their deterministic limit are studied in [13]. As we consider far more general non-Hermitian random matrices, we do not expect a similar pattern of fluctuations should hold for typical band matrices considered in this paper.

In the general case, consider the following random matrix model as in [17]

$$X := Z_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \quad (1.6)$$

where Z_1, \dots, Z_n are independent N by N random matrices having mean zero.

We can define $v(X)$, $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma_*(X)$ analogously as in the Gaussian model. We also define the following function for X , where $\|Z_i\|$ is the operator norm of Z_i :

$$R(X) := \left\| \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|Z_i\| \right\|_{\infty}, \quad \bar{R}(X) := \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|Z_i\|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.7)$$

Then our master theorem for non-Gaussian X is as follows:

Theorem 1.9. *Let X be an N by N random matrix in the form (1.6). Assume that*

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[XX^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^*X] = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbb{E}[X^2] = (\rho + D_N)\mathbf{1},$$

where D_N are fixed complex numbers satisfying $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\log N)D_N = 0$. Assume that

$$\tilde{v}(X) \leq (\log N)^{-1}, \quad \sigma_*(x) \leq (\log N)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \bar{R}(X) \ll (\log N)^{-2}.$$

Then all the conclusions in Theorem 1.7 continue to hold for X .

Remark 1.10. The constant $D_N \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 1.7 and 1.9 is used to take care of the diagonal entry of X , as they lead to a different computation when we compute $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$.

Remark 1.11. Theorem 1.6 weakens a number of hypotheses that are traditionally imposed in the elliptic random matrix literature. In prior works [36], [34] and [3], they consider an elliptic matrix where each pair (g_{ij}, g_{ji}) is independently distributed as a pair (g_1, g_2) , where (g_1, g_2) belongs to the so-called (μ, ρ) family ([34], Definition 1.6). This definition of (μ, ρ) family requires the real and imaginary parts of g_1, g_2 are independent and the covariance of the real and imaginary parts of g_i should have a very specific form. Our theorem 1.6 states that such restrictions are not necessary, and we do not even need (g_{ij}, g_{ji}) (g_{kl}, g_{lk}) are identically distributed: their real and imaginary parts can have a completely different covariance matrix for different edges $(i, j), (k, l) \in E$, (but we do require diagonal entries to be i.i.d.). As another weakening, we can consider any covariance $\rho \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\rho| \leq 1$ without assuming ρ is real, as in [36], [34] and [3]. In these cited works, the cases $\rho = \pm 1$ are excluded as the least singular value bound in [34] no longer holds: in the Wigner case $\rho = 1$ this still holds with a separate proof [33] whereas in the anti-symmetric case $\rho = -1$ the matrix is always singular in odd dimensions. In our paper we do not rely on least singular value estimates as in [34], so we treat $|\rho| = 1$ in a unified way as for $|\rho| < 1$, and in particular we cover the anti-symmetric case $\rho = -1$ which was largely unexplored before.

Remark 1.12. Theorem 1.4 and 1.6 also cover (homogeneous) sparse i.i.d matrices and elliptic matrices. Indeed, we may take G to be the complete graph on $[N]$ and take random variables g_{xy} to be $g_{xy} = b_{xy}h_{xy}$ where h_{xy} is a $\text{Ber}(\frac{k_N}{N})$ random variable taking value 1 with probability $\frac{k_N}{N}$ and 0 otherwise, and b_{xy} are bounded random variables having mean 0 and variance 1, independent from h_{xy} . Then clearly $(N/k_N)^{1/2}g_{xy}$ has mean 0 and variance 1, and as long as $k_N > (\log N)^5$ we have that $(N/k_N)^{1/2}g_{xy}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.4, (2) with g_{xy} replaced by $(N/k_N)^{1/2}g_{xy}$ and $d_N := N$. Indeed, the proof of Theorem 1.4 (2) allows distributions of g_{xy} to be N -dependent so long as all quantitative estimates are satisfied. This establishes finite rank perturbations for k_N -sparse (homogeneous) i.i.d. matrices whenever $k_N \gg (\log N)^5$, which also appears to be new.

We note that due to the homogeneous structure and i.i.d. nature, the same result on outliers in Theorem 1.4 continues to hold for k_N much smaller than $\log N$, and holds even when k_N is a fixed constant. Also, the assumptions (1), (2), (3) in Theorem 1.4 can be considerably weakened: for a square matrix with i.i.d. entries only assuming entries

have a finite second moment is sufficient. These claims are recently proven in [29] via the method of characteristic functions, and the proof is adapted from computations in [14] and [21]. The results in [29] are not accessible by techniques in this paper as this paper relies on a Hermitization procedure, and a Hermitian matrix with only finite second moment entries or constant average degree typically has unbounded operator norm. On the other hand, general band matrices are not accessible by techniques from [29] either, as in this case the characteristic function method from [14] and [21] breaks down. Also, in our master theorem 1.7 we can consider a very general square matrix X without assuming independence of entries, and thus covers many interesting new applications (Theorem 1.14); but the characteristic function method requires strongly that all entries are independent.

For the elliptic case, the assumptions of Theorem 1.6 cover (homogeneous) sparse elliptic random matrices, which is the entrywise product of a standard elliptic random matrix as considered in [36], together with a symmetric random matrix $B = (b_{xy})$ with $B_{xy} = B_{yx} \sim \text{Ber}(\frac{k_N}{N})$, for some $k_N \gg (\log N)^5$, and that all entries of B are independent modulo symmetry. The conclusion of Theorem 1.6 appears to be new even for such (homogeneous) sparse elliptic matrices as the fourth moment of each entry is not bounded, lying outside the assumptions in [36].

Remark 1.13. A somewhat orthogonal set of assumptions on non-Hermitian random matrices with inhomogeneous profile, is to assume an arbitrary variance profile but with a universal lower and upper bound on the variance of each entry. See [1] and [2] for local laws and sharp spectral radius bounds in this inhomogeneous case. The assumption that variance of all entries are bounded from below appears to be a crucial one and excludes random band matrices (see [19],[20] for a weakening of this hypothesis, but still for dense matrices). Whereas allowing sparsity, our approach instead relies strongly on the regularity hypothesis 1.5 (the variance matrix is doubly stochastic) to yield a simple solution to the matrix Dyson equation. To freely change the variance profile of each entry, one needs to find solutions to the matrix Dyson equation with general coefficients, but this seems currently out of reach when the underlying graph G_N is very sparse.

1.3. Applications: product of independent elliptic matrices. Random matrix products are a central topic in random matrix theory, and the study of outliers can likewise be generalized to the product setting. Suppose we consider a class of independent non-Hermitian random matrices $X_N^i, i = 1, \dots, m$ satisfying Definition 1.3, we can investigate the product matrix $(d_{N,1})^{-1/2} X_N^1 \cdots (d_{N,m})^{-1/2} X_N^m$ and its finite dimensional deformation $((d_{N,1})^{-1/2} X_N^1 + A_N^1) \cdots ((d_{N,m})^{-1/2} X_N^m + A_N^m)$, which is a multi-matrix version of Theorem 1.4.

The work [22] considered product of independent matrices with i.i.d. entries and showed a similar result as in the one matrix case, that is, the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 continues to hold for certain deformations of product i.i.d. matrices. They also mentioned a similar problem: the product of independent elliptic matrices with general $\rho_i \in (-1, 1)$. Indeed, [37] showed a remarkable universality phenomenon: the empirical spectral distribution of a product of ($m \geq 2$) independent elliptic random matrices converges to the m -fold circular law, just as in the case of a product of m independent matrices with i.i.d. entries. They also used ideas in free probability to explain why this happens: the product of two free elliptic elements is R -diagonal, and thus has an isotropic Brown measure. However the tools in [22] did not seem strong enough to study the outliers of product elliptic matrices due to strong dependence in the entries.

We show a far-reaching strengthening of the result in [22]: exactly the same result continues to hold when we consider independent product of elliptic random matrices with variables $\rho_i \in \mathbb{C} : |\rho_i| \leq 1$, and the conclusion continues to hold as we consider non-Hermitian band matrices as in Theorem 1.4 and 1.6. Previously such results were only proven for random matrices with i.i.d. entries.

The main result for product elliptic matrices is the following theorem, which can be regarded as a corollary of our master theorem, Theorem 1.7 and 1.9.

Theorem 1.14. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be a fixed integer, and let $(d_{N,1})^{-1/2}X_N^1, \dots, (d_{N,m})^{-1/2}X_N^m$ be independent $N \times N$ random matrices satisfying one of the following*

- (Independent case) *Each $(d_{N,i})^{-1/2}X_N^i$ satisfies the assumption of Theorem 1.4,*
- (Elliptic case) *Each $(d_{N,i})^{-1/2}X_N^i$ satisfies the assumption of Theorem 1.6 with some $|\rho_i| \leq 1$,*

and the entries of X_N^i should simultaneously satisfy one of the three constraints on entries in Theorem 1.4 or Theorem 1.6 (i.e., for $i = 1, \dots, m$ they are simultaneously either Gaussian, or bounded, or having bounded p -th moment). Then

- (1) *For any $\epsilon > 0$, almost surely as N tends to infinity there is no eigenvalue of*

$$D_N^m := (d_{N,1} \cdots d_{N,m})^{-1/2} X_N^1 \cdots X_N^m$$

lying outside of $(1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{D}$.

- (2) *Moreover we have the following finite rank perturbation result. Let A_N^1, \dots, A_N^m be deterministic $N \times N$ matrices with $O(1)$ rank and operator norm. Then consider*

$$D_N^{m,1} := \prod_{k=1}^m \left((d_{N,k})^{-1/2} X_N^k + A_N^k \right), \quad A_N := \prod_{k=1}^m A_N^k.$$

Fix an $\epsilon > 0$ and assume that there is no eigenvalue of A_N lying in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : 1 + \epsilon \leq |z| \leq 1 + 3\epsilon\}$ and that there are $j = O(1)$ eigenvalues $\lambda_1(A_N), \dots, \lambda_j(A_N)$ outside $(1 + 3\epsilon)\mathbb{D}$. Then almost surely as N tends to infinity, there are exactly j eigenvalues $\lambda_1(D_N^{m,1}), \dots, \lambda_j(D_N^{m,1})$ lying outside $(1 + 2\epsilon)\mathbb{D}$ and after rearrangement, we have

$$\lambda_i(D_N^{m,1}) = \lambda_i(A_N) + o(1), \quad i = 1, \dots, j.$$

The special case $m = 2$ and $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 1$ implies the eigenvalues of the product of two i.i.d. Wigner matrices are contained in $(1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{D}$ with high probability for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Remark 1.15. For any non commutative polynomial P with $m + n$ non commutative variables, one may consider the outliers of P evaluated at m independent random matrices and n deterministic matrices. One also assumes the n deterministic matrices have a strong limit in free probability. For random matrices with i.i.d. entries this was investigated in [10]. For non-Hermitian band matrices, it would be possible to generalize Theorem 1.14 to outliers of any polynomial P , but this requires considerably more effort and is left for further study.

1.4. Proof outline. Now we briefly discuss the context of the problem investigated, and illustrate the major difficulties and key proof strategies.

For random band matrices with independent entries with bandwidth d_N (a special case of Definition 1.3), a major open problem (see [19], [20], [44]) is to prove the convergence of the empirical spectral density to a deterministic limit. The limit should be the circular law as long as d_N grows with N , which has been proved for sparse i.i.d matrices in [40]. The major technical difficulty to proving the circular law (see for example [43]) is to prove an

estimate on the least singular value of $zI_N - (d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$ for a.e. $z \in \mathbb{C}$, so that Girko's Hermitization technique [26] [27] can be rigorously justified. This step is highly model specific and the proof techniques for i.i.d. sparse matrix [40] do not generalize to arbitrary band matrices which has much less homogeneity. Recently, [31] and [44] introduced new methods to prove the circular law for periodic block band matrices and periodic band matrices for bandwidth $d_N \gg N^{33/34}$. Yet the case of smaller d_N still seems to be open.

The spectral radius for inhomogeneous random matrices is much easier to study thanks to the method of moments. Via computing the trace of a sufficiently large $\ell \sim \log N$ power of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$, the spectral radius of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$ can be bounded with very high probability. In [11], Theorem 2.11 and Remark 2.13, a method is introduced to bound the spectral radius for inhomogeneous non-Hermitian random matrix that covers $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$ when $d_N \geq N^\epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. In Theorem 1.4 we illustrate the same spectral radius bound can be achieved whenever $d_N = (\log N)^5$. We note that when g_{xy} are standard (real) Gaussian variables, [7], Theorem 3.1 proved that $\|(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N\|_{op} = 2(1 + o(1))$ with high possibility whenever $d_N \gg \log N$. This result is optimal in the sparsity of d_N and implies $\rho((d_N)^{-1/2}X_N) = 2(1 + o(1))$, but the operator norm bound loses a factor 2 compared with the spectral radius bound $1 + o(1)$.

The problem of determining the spectral outliers of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N$ for some finite rank perturbation C_N , does not appear to be studied before in such an inhomogeneous setting, and is the main topic of the current work. On one hand, finding spectral outliers are more tractable than proving the empirical density convergence: We do not need to estimate the least singular value, which is a notoriously difficult problem. On the other hand, it appears that all existing methods on this topic require strong homogeneity on the variance profile of X_N . The first work for non-Hermitian matrices [42] made use of a moment comparison to the Ginibre ensemble, and later works either followed a similar line, or resorted to proving an isotropic law (see [36]) whose proof does not carry over to general inhomogeneous matrices X_N with $d_N = o(N)$. The method of moments, or some modifications of it, might be a promising route to study outliers of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N + C_N$. However, as the eigenvalues are complex, its distribution is not completely determined by the moments. The method of characteristic functions can alternatively be used to detect spectral outliers, see [14]. However, for this method to work we need to prove joint convergence of traces of $(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N$ to a family of independent Gaussian variables, which is simply not the case in the current setting of inhomogeneous random matrix on regular graphs. Indeed, the characteristic function $\det(I_N - z(d_N)^{-1/2}X_N)$ does not form a tight family of holomorphic functions for $|z| \leq 1 - \epsilon$, so that the method breaks down completely. Relevant moment computations for band matrices, also called genus expansion when the entries are Gaussian distributions, can be found in [23] for the i.i.d. case and [5] for the Hermitian case. These genus expansion formulas (asymptotic freeness up to first order) are only effective for $d_N \gg N^{1/3}$ and $d_N \gg N^{1/2}$ respectively, falling short of the smaller d_N case. Therefore, we see that genus expansion is ineffective for $d_N = o(N^{1/3})$ and the characteristic function technique is ineffective for any $d_N = o(N)$, and completely new techniques are needed here.

We will first take a standard Hermitization procedure and consider for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathcal{Y}_z := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X - zI_N \\ \bar{X} - \bar{z}I_N & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We need to show that $\sigma_{min}(\mathcal{Y}_z) > 0$ when z is away from the unit disk (or ellipse \mathcal{E}_ρ), and prove an isotropic law for \mathcal{Y}_z for z in the same region. The inhomogeneous sparse variance

pattern of X makes standard techniques ineffective, and we will make use of recent advances in free probability and universality principles for highly inhomogeneous self adjoint random matrices, which are illustrated in [9] for the Gaussian case and [17] for the general case. The idea is to consider a free probability model $\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}$ defined from \mathcal{Y}_z , and the assumptions on X in Theorem 1.7 (the variance profile being doubly stochastic and $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$ is a multiple of identity) make the spectral properties of $\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}$ remarkably transparent. Then universality principles in the cited papers enable us to transfer the estimates back to our random matrix X . Similar ideas have appeared in [41] which also partially inspires our work.

The main result of this paper can be seen as a non-Hermitian generalization of recent studies of spectral outliers for random band matrices. For periodically banded Hermitian matrices, the finite rank perturbation properties (the BBP transform introduced in [38]) are recently studied in [4]. Later [8] introduced a very general framework for solving such problems in the self-adjoint setting, and established the BBP type phenomena for many other inhomogeneous random matrices with divers patterns of variance profiles. Theorem 1.7 can be thought of as a non-Hermitian analogue of [8], Theorem 3.1. In contrast to the Hermitian case, we do not discuss the eigenvector overlaps associated to the outlying eigenvalues. While this might theoretically be possible to investigate, a closed form expression is too difficult to work out.

2. PREPARATIONS: FREE PROBABILITY AND UNIVERSALITY THEOREMS

2.1. Free probability preliminaries. We first recall some standard facts in free probability that can be found in [35]. Consider a C^* probability space $(\mathcal{A}, *, \tau, \|\cdot\|)$, where $(\mathcal{A}, *, \|\cdot\|)$ is a C^* -algebra and τ is a faithful trace. As τ is a faithful trace, the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is uniquely determined by ([35], Proposition 3.17)

$$\|a\| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\tau[(a^*a)^k])^{\frac{1}{2k}}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (2.1)$$

A family of self-adjoint elements $s_1, \dots, s_m \in \mathcal{A}$ are called a free semicircular family if for all $p \geq 1$ and $k_1, \dots, k_p \in [m]$ we have

$$\tau(s_{k_1} \cdots s_{k_p}) = \sum_{\pi \in \text{NC}_2([p])} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in \pi} \delta_{k_i, k_j},$$

where $\text{NC}_2([p])$ is the set of non-crossing partitions of $[p]$.

2.2. Universality principles. For the Gaussian case, let X be a Gaussian random matrix admitting a decomposition (1.4). Although in the statement of Theorem 1.7 the matrix X is non-Hermitian, we need to consider Hermitian matrices when stating the spectral universality theorems. This will be achieved via a standard Hermitization procedure. Thus in this section we assume the matrix (1.4) is Hermitian and $A_0, \dots, A_n \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$, where $M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ denotes the set of N by N square matrices which are complex valued and self-adjoint.

To the Gaussian model (1.4) we introduce the following free element X_{free} associated to X :

$$X_{\text{free}} := A_0 \otimes \mathbf{1} + \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \otimes s_i, \quad (2.2)$$

where $A_0, \dots, A_n \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ and s_1, \dots, s_d a free semicircular family.

For a general matrix model X as defined in (1.6), we associate X with a Gaussian model G of $N \times N$ matrix such that $\{\operatorname{Re} G_{ij}, \operatorname{Im} G_{ij} : i, j \in [N]\}$ are jointly Gaussian, that $\mathbb{E}[G] = \mathbb{E}[X]$ and that $\operatorname{Cov}(G) = \operatorname{Cov}(X)$. Then we associate to X a free model X_{free} via setting

$$X_{\text{free}} := G_{\text{free}},$$

where G_{free} is the free model associated to the Gaussian model G as defined in (2.2). We remark that for a Gaussian matrix X , there could be multiple ways to write X as a sum in the form of (1.4), so there could be multiple ways to define X_{free} . It turns out that any such X_{free} will be sufficient for our use.

For the Gaussian model, we have the following concentration and universality results:

Theorem 2.1. (*Resolvent convergence, Gaussian case, [9], Theorem 2.8*) Let $A_0, \dots, A_n \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$. The matrix valued Stieltjes transform for $Z \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$ is defined as

$$G(Z) := \mathbb{E}[(Z - X)^{-1}], \quad G_{\text{free}}(Z) := (\operatorname{id} \otimes \tau)[(Z \otimes \mathbf{1} - X_{\text{free}})^{-1}].$$

Then we have the estimate

$$\|G(Z) - G_{\text{free}}(Z)\| \leq \tilde{v}(X)^4 \|(\operatorname{Im} Z)^{-5}\|$$

which holds for any $Z \in M_d(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\operatorname{Im} Z := \frac{1}{2i}(Z - Z^*) > 0$.

For the Gaussian case we only need the following concentration estimate, which is very similar to [17], Lemma 5.5. The proof is given in Appendix A.

Theorem 2.2. (*Resolvent concentration, Gaussian case*) Fix any two unit vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Fix $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\operatorname{Im} z > 0$. For any $x > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle \right| \geq \frac{\sigma_*(X)}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^2} x \right] \leq 2e^{-x^2/2}.$$

For any self-adjoint operator X we let $\operatorname{sp}(X) \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote the spectrum of the operator X . We have

Theorem 2.3. (*Spectrum concentration, Gaussian case, [9] Theorem 2.1*) For the model (1.4) with $A_0, \dots, A_n \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$, then for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\operatorname{sp}(X) \subseteq \operatorname{sp}(X_{\text{free}}) + C \{ \tilde{v}(X)(\log N)^{3/4} + \sigma_*(X)t \} [-1, 1] \right] \geq 1 - e^{-t^2},$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$.

For the general case, we will need similar convergence and concentration results. We have the following universality principle:

Theorem 2.4. (*General entry resolvent universality, [17] Theorem 2.11*) For every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\operatorname{Im}(z) > 0$, we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}[(z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}] - \mathbb{E}[(z\mathbf{1} - G)^{-1}]\| \lesssim \frac{\sigma(X) + \bar{R}(X)^{1/10} \sigma(X)^{9/10}}{(\operatorname{Im}(z))^2}.$$

We will also need the following concentration result on resolvent entries, that will be proved in Section 4. The proof is outlined in Appendix A and is very similar to the argument in [17], Proposition 5.6.

Theorem 2.5. (General entry resolvent concentration) For every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\text{Im}(z) > 0$, and any two unit vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with $\|u\|_{L^2} = \|v\|_{L^2} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle| \geq \frac{\sigma(X)}{(\text{Im}(z))^2} \sqrt{x} + \left\{ \frac{R(X)}{\text{Im}(z)^2} + \frac{R(X)^2}{\text{Im}(z)^3} \right\} x \\ + \left\{ \frac{R(X)^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}\|X - \mathbb{E}X\|)^{1/2}}{\text{Im}(z)^2} + \frac{R(X)(\mathbb{E}\|X - \mathbb{E}X\|^2)^{1/2}}{\text{Im}(z)^3} \right\} \sqrt{x}] \leq 2e^{-Cx} \end{aligned}$$

for a universal constant $C > 0$ and for any given $x \geq 0$.

Theorem 2.6. (General entry spectrum concentration, [17] Theorem 2.6) For the model (1.6) with $Z_0, \dots, Z_n \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$, such that $\|Z_i\| \leq R$ a.s. for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then we have for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\text{sp}(X) \subseteq \text{sp}(X_{\text{free}}) + C\{\sigma_*(X)t^{\frac{1}{2}} + R^{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma(X)^{\frac{2}{3}}t^{\frac{2}{3}} + Rt\}[-1, 1]\right] \geq 1 - Ne^{-t^2},$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant.

3. PROOF OF MAIN RESULTS

We first prove the very simple lemma Lemma 1.5. We claim no novelty for its proof as can be found in (4.6)-(4.8) of [3].

Proof of Lemma 1.5. First assume that ρ is real, then taking the real and imaginary parts of $z = x + \rho\bar{x}$ implies $\text{Re } z = \text{Re } x + \rho \text{Re } x$ and $\text{Im } z = \text{Im } x - \rho \text{Im } x$. Then since $|x| \leq 1$, we have

$$\frac{\text{Re}(z)^2}{(1 + \rho)^2} + \frac{\text{Im}(z)^2}{(1 - \rho)^2} \leq 1.$$

All these relations can be reversed, hence proving equivalence.

For general $\rho \in \mathbb{C}$, we have that $z = x + \rho\bar{x}$ if and only if

$$e^{-i \arg(\rho)/2} z = e^{-i \arg(\rho)/2} x + |\rho| \overline{e^{-i \arg(\rho)/2} x}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{C} : |x| \leq 1$. This implies the equivalence. \square

Before entering the proof we introduce elliptic random variables in free probability, which generalizes the semicircular and circular variables introduced by Voiculescu [45].

We shall also use some notations on operator-valued free probability theory introduced in [46] and we also refer to [10], Section 3.2.1 for some basic notations.

Definition 3.1. In a C^* -non-commutative probability space (\mathcal{A}, τ) , an element c is called a circular element if $c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s_1 + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}s_2$ for two free semicircular variables s_1, s_2 .

In general, for any $\rho \in [-1, 1]$ we call $c_\rho := \sqrt{\frac{1+\rho}{2}}s_1 + i\sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{2}}s_2$ an elliptic element of parameter ρ where s_1, s_2 are two free semicircular variables.

3.1. No outliers in Theorem 1.7. We start with proving the master theorem in Gaussian case, Theorem 1.7.

First we need to analyze the free operator X_{free} associated to X . Fix any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and consider the Hermitization of X at z : define

$$\mathcal{Y}_z := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X - zI_N \\ \bar{X} - \bar{z}I_N & 0, \end{pmatrix}$$

and in particular when $z = 0$ we write

$$\mathcal{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ \bar{X} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The associated free model can be written as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -zI_N \\ -\bar{z}I_N & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X_{\text{free}} \\ \bar{X}_{\text{free}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Also, for any $v = E + i\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\eta > 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{Y}_z(v) = \begin{pmatrix} -vI_N & -zI_N \\ -\bar{z}I_N & -vI_N \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ \bar{X} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}(v) = \begin{pmatrix} -vI_N & -zI_N \\ -\bar{z}I_N & -vI_N \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X_{\text{free}} \\ \bar{X}_{\text{free}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To compute the Stieltjes transform we need the following computation. For a self-adjoint random matrix $A = A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n A_i g_i$ where $A_i \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ are self adjoint and g_i are independent real Gaussians of mean 0, variance 1, then for any $M \in M_N(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n A_i M A_i = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i g_i \right) M \left(\sum_{i=1}^n A_i g_i \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} [(A - \mathbb{E}A)M(A - \mathbb{E}A)]. \quad (3.1)$$

We define the Stieltjes transform of the free model $\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}$ as follows: for any $v \in \mathbb{C}_+ := \{z = E + i\eta \in \mathbb{C} : \eta > 0\}$, we define

$$G_z(v) := (\text{id} \otimes \tau)(\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}(v)^{-1}).$$

By [28], equation 1.5 and the computation (3.1), the Stieltjes transform $G_z(v)$ solves the following self consistency equation

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Y}G_z(v)\mathcal{Y}] + G_z(v)^{-1} + \begin{pmatrix} vI_N & zI_N \\ \bar{z}I_N & vI_N \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

By [30], Theorem 2.1, for any $v \in \mathbb{C}_+$ there is a unique solution $G_z(v)$ to this equation such that $G_z(v)$ has a positive imaginary part. Recall that for a square matrix M , its imaginary part is defined as $\text{Im } M = \frac{1}{2i}(M - M^*)$.

By symmetry we may assume (and will be proved later) that the unique solution to (3.2) with positive imaginary part is given by

$$G_z(v) = \begin{pmatrix} a(z, v)I_N & b(z, v)I_N \\ \bar{b}(z, v)I_N & c(z, v)I_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $a(z, v)$, $b(z, v)$ and $c(z, v)$ are scalar functions depending on z and v (as well as ρ and D_N , which are suppressed from notation).

Taking this block-diagonal form into (3.2), the equation transforms to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{c}{(\rho + D_N)b} & (\rho + D_N)\bar{b} \\ \bar{b} & a \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{ac - |b|^2} \begin{pmatrix} c & -b \\ -\bar{b} & a \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} v & z \\ \bar{z} & v \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

We now show that (3.4) has a unique solution such that $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ \bar{b} & c \end{pmatrix}$ has a positive imaginary part, and that the solution satisfies some desired properties. We do not try to solve (3.4) directly, but we show another (well-studied) object in free probability has the same Stieltjes transform.

For this we denote by $\rho_0 := \rho + D_N$ and set $\theta_0 := \arg \rho_0$. Note that by assumption we have $|\rho + D_N| \leq 1$. We consider an elliptic element $c_{|\rho_0|}$ multiplied by $e^{i\theta_0/2}$ and embed it into a two by two matrix (where s_1 and s_2 two free semicircular variables), for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathcal{C}_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta_0/2}(\sqrt{\frac{1+|\rho_0|}{2}}s_1 + i\sqrt{\frac{1-|\rho_0|}{2}}s_2) - z1_{\mathcal{A}} \\ e^{i\theta_0/2}(\sqrt{\frac{1+|\rho_0|}{2}}s_1 - i\sqrt{\frac{1-|\rho_0|}{2}}s_2) - \bar{z}1_{\mathcal{A}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We claim that the Stieltjes transform of \mathcal{C}_z , defined as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_z(v) := (\text{id} \otimes \tau)((\mathcal{C}_z - vI_2)^{-1}) := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{a}(z, v) & \tilde{b}(z, v) \\ \tilde{b}(z, v) & \tilde{c}(z, v) \end{pmatrix}$$

for $v \in \mathbb{C}_+$, satisfies that $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c})$ solves the same equation as (3.4) if we substitute $a = \tilde{a}$, $b = \tilde{b}$ and $c = \tilde{c}$ in equation (3.4). This can be verified via directly applying [28], equation 1.5, so that $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c})$ should solve the same equation as (3.4).

The matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_z(v)$ has positive imaginary part as it is the stieltjes transform of \mathcal{C}_z , so that the existence (and uniqueness) to (3.4) with positive real part is now well-established.

By Riesz representation theorem, we can find unique probability measures μ_1, μ_2 on the real line such that for any $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi d\mu_1 = (\text{tr} \otimes \tau)\varphi(\mathcal{C}_z),$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi d\mu_2 = (\text{tr} \otimes \tau)\varphi(\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}).$$

Let $g_1(v) := (\text{tr} \otimes \tau)((\mathcal{C}_z - vI_2)^{-1})$ and $g_2(v) := (\text{tr} \otimes \tau)((\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}(v))^{-1})$. Then $g_1 = g_2$ by our previous discussion, and by Stieltjes inversion formula

$$\mu_i = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}(g_i(x + iy)) dx \right),$$

we identify that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. Since τ is faithful, we may choose φ supported on a neighborhood of the complement of the spectrum of \mathcal{C}_z (or $\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}$), and deduce that

$$\text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_z) = \text{sp}(\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}). \quad (3.5)$$

Now we determine $\text{sp}(\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}})$ from $\text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_z)$ as the latter is the rotation of an elliptic element. Indeed, \mathcal{C}_0 is the self-adjoint dilation of an elliptic element $c_{|\rho_0|}$ rotated by $\theta/2$, and the spectral support of an elliptic element $c_{|\rho_0|}$ has been computed, see for example [32]. In particular [32] implies that for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{|\rho_0|, \epsilon}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, we have that $\sigma_{\min}(c_{|\rho_0|} - z1_{\mathcal{A}}) > 0$.

By definition, \mathcal{E}_{ρ_0} for complex ρ_0 is the rotation of $\mathcal{E}_{|\rho_0|}$ by $e^{i\theta_0/2}$, so that for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho_0, \epsilon}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, we have that $\sigma_{\min}(e^{i\theta_0/2}c_{|\rho_0|} - z1_{\mathcal{A}}) > 0$. Using the fact that $\sigma_{\min}(e^{i\theta_0/2}c_{|\rho_0|} - z1_{\mathcal{A}})$ is Lipschitz continuous in z and taking a finite covering over $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 10\} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho_0, \epsilon}$, we deduce that we can find constant $C_{\rho, \epsilon} > 0$ depending only on ρ, ϵ such that $\inf_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \sigma_{\min}(e^{i\theta_0/2}c_{|\rho_0|} - z1_{\mathcal{A}}) \geq C_{\rho, \epsilon} > 0$. In the last step we have used two reductions: first, using the naïve estimate $\|c_{|\rho_0|}\| \leq 6$, then for any $|z| > 10$ the nonzero lower bound on σ_{\min} is trivial; and second, as $D_N \rightarrow 0$ we may assume N is large enough such that $\text{dist}(\mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}, \mathcal{E}_{\rho_0, \epsilon}) \leq \epsilon/10$. Rearranging the value of ϵ justifies the claim.

In the last paragraph, we have justified that (whenever N is large) for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}$ we have $[-C_{\rho,\epsilon}, C_{\rho,\epsilon}] \notin \text{sp}(\mathcal{C}_z)$. By previous identification (3.5) we then have

$$[-C_{\rho,\epsilon}, C_{\rho,\epsilon}] \notin \text{sp}(\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}). \quad (3.6)$$

Now we apply universality principles to show the same holds for $\text{sp}(\mathcal{Y}_z)$ with high probability, justifying that X has no outliers:

Proof of Theorem 1.7, no outliers. Now the proof of no-outliers is a simple application of Theorem 2.3 together with estimate (3.6). We only need to consider the region $|z| \leq 10$, as the main results of [9] already imply that $\|X\|_{op} \leq 6$ with very high probability. For each fixed $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}$ we apply Theorem (2.3) to deduce that, with probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.5}$, $[-C_{\rho,\epsilon}/2, C_{\rho,\epsilon}/2] \notin \text{sp}(\mathcal{Y}_z)$, so that $\sigma_{\min}(X - zI_N) \geq C_{\rho,\epsilon}/2 > 0$ with probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.5}$. Since $\sigma_{\min}(X - zI_N)$ is Lipschitz continuous in z , we can take a finite covering of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 10\}$ and take a union bound to conclude that with probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.5}$, we have

$$\inf_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}} \sigma_{\min}(X - zI_N) \geq C_{\rho,\epsilon}/2 > 0. \quad (3.7)$$

The constant C_1 may change from line to line but it depends only on ρ and ϵ . \square

3.2. Isotropic laws. In this section we determine an isotropic law, i.e. an almost sure limit of $\langle u, (X - zI_N)^{-1}v \rangle$ for unit vectors u, v and $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}$ in the setting of Theorem 1.7.

In the following we only need to evaluate the Stieltjes transform $\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}(v)$ at $v = i\eta$ for any $\eta > 0$, and we will pass to the limit $\eta \searrow 0$ in the end.

Recall that provided $X - zI_N$ is invertible, we shall have

$$\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\bar{X} - \bar{z}I_N)^{-1} \\ (X - zI_N)^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.8)$$

For any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}$, on the event where (3.7) happens (which has possibility at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.5}$ under the assumption of Theorem 1.7), we have that

$$\|\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq 2/C_{\rho,\epsilon} < \infty$$

is uniformly bounded for fixed ϵ . Then from the resolvent identity

$$(\lambda I - A)^{-1} - (\lambda I - B)^{-1} = (\lambda I - A)^{-1}(A - B)(\lambda I - B)^{-1} \quad (3.9)$$

we can deduce that for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small one must have

$$\|(\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1})\|_{op} \leq \|(\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1})\|_{op} + \|(\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1})\|_{op}\eta\|(\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1})\|_{op},$$

so that for $\eta \in [0, C_{\rho,\epsilon}/4]$, we have that on the event where (3.7) happens,

$$\|(\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1})\|_{op} \leq 2\|(\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1})\|_{op} \leq 4/C_{\rho,\epsilon}. \quad (3.10)$$

Similarly, for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho,\epsilon}$ we already have proved in (3.6) that

$$\|\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}(0)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq 1/C_{\rho,\epsilon} < \infty.$$

In the following we will compute $\lim_{\eta \searrow 0} (\mathcal{Y}_{z,\text{free}}(i\eta))^{-1}$ and use the universality principle in Section 2.2 to compute $\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1}$.

We set $v = i\eta$ in the self-consistency equation (3.4). By symmetry, the solution should satisfy $a = c$ (this can be checked by noting that, swapping the role of a and c , the pair (c, b, a, d) is again a solution provided that (a, b, c, d) is a solution, and the new solution

still has positive definite imaginary part; then we resort to uniqueness of solutions in [30]). Then the individual coordinate equations are given by

$$a\left(1 + \frac{1}{a^2 - |b|^2}\right) + i\eta = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\bar{b}(\rho + D_N) - \frac{b}{a^2 - |b|^2} = -z. \quad (3.12)$$

Next we show that $a = c$ is purely imaginary and has a positive imaginary part. We will prove this by showing that there exists a solution to (3.4) with purely imaginary a that also satisfies the positive definite imaginary part assumption, so that by uniqueness [30] the solution must be of this form. We take

$$a(z, \eta) = iV(z, \eta), \quad V(z, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Then the equation simplifies to

$$V\left(1 - \frac{1}{|V|^2 + |b|^2}\right) + \eta = 0, \quad \bar{b}(\rho + D_N) + \frac{b}{|V|^2 + |b|^2} + z = 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\eta > 0$, any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|\rho + D_N| \leq 1$ there exists a solution $V > 0$ to (3.13).*

Proof. We may without loss of generality assume $\rho_0 := \rho + D_N$ is real (and recall $\theta_0 = \arg \rho_0$), this is because for a solution (V, b) to (3.13) with parameter (ρ_0, z) replaced by $|\rho_0|$ and $e^{-i\theta_0/2}z$, via a simple calculation we see that $(V, e^{i\theta_0/2}b)$ is a solution to (3.13) with parameter ρ_0 and z .

Then in the case where ρ_0 is real, we can follow computations as in [36], Lemma C.2 to see that V solves the following equation (we have changed notation $a \mapsto iV$ and $\eta \rightarrow i\eta$ in [36], C.2):

$$1 - \frac{1}{(V + \eta)V} = -\frac{\operatorname{Re}(z)^2}{(\eta + (1 + \rho_0)V)^2} - \frac{\operatorname{Im}(z)^2}{(\eta + (1 - \rho_0)V)^2}$$

Setting $V \rightarrow 0+$ and setting $V \rightarrow +\infty$ on both sides of the equation shows that a solution must exist. \square

Having checked a is purely imaginary, we now derive $\eta \searrow 0$ asymptotics of a . In the following we consider $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$. Suppose that $\limsup_{\eta \searrow 0} |a(z, \eta)| > 0$, then on a sequence $\eta_n \searrow 0$ we have $|V|^2 + |b|^2 \rightarrow 1$. Together with the fact that $D_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow 0$, we see that whenever N is large enough, this forces

$$b + \bar{b}\rho = -z + o(1) \quad (3.14)$$

on this sequence η_n . The asymptotic $|V|^2 + |b|^2 \rightarrow 1$ forces $|b| \leq 1 + o(1)$. Combining this with (3.14) and recalling the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$, this leads to a contradiction to the fact that $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$.

Thus for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$, whenever N is sufficiently large, we must have $\lim_{\eta \searrow 0} |V(z, \eta)| = 0$. Via a standard computation we deduce that

$$\lim_{\eta \searrow 0} \bar{b}(z, \eta) = \begin{cases} \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho_0}}{2\rho} & \rho_0 \neq 0 \\ -\frac{1}{z} & \rho_0 = 0 \end{cases}$$

where we take the square root $\sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho_0}$ with branch cut on the segment connecting $-2\sqrt{\rho_0}$ and $2\sqrt{\rho_0}$ in the complex plane and such that $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho_0} - z = 0$.

We have proved the following: for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, whenever N is large enough, we have

$$\lim_{\eta \searrow 0} a(z, \eta) = 0, \quad \lim_{\eta \searrow 0} \bar{b}(z, \eta) = \begin{cases} \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho_0}}{2\rho} & \rho_0 \neq 0, \\ -\frac{1}{z} & \rho_0 = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (3.15)$$

Now we are ready to proving the following isotropic law, which is the cornerstone to Theorem 1.7 and generalizes [36], Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 3.3. (*Isotropic law*) *In the setting of Theorem 1.7, set $\delta_N = (\log \log N)^{-1}$. Then for any unit vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N$, with probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.4}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, (X - zI_N)^{-1} v \rangle - \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho}}{2\rho} \langle u, v \rangle \right| &\leq C_2 \delta_N, \quad \rho \neq 0, \\ \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, (X - zI_N)^{-1} v \rangle + \frac{1}{z} \langle u, v \rangle \right| &\leq C_2 \delta_N, \quad \rho = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are some universal constants depending only on ρ and ϵ . Also, the same estimate holds if we replace δ_N by $(\delta_N)^p$ for any $p > 0$.

Proof. We invoke Theorem 2.1 to deduce that for any $\eta > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| (\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta))^{-1} - (\text{id} \otimes \tau) \mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}(i\eta)^{-1} \right\| \right] \leq \frac{(\log N)^{-1}}{\eta^5}. \quad (3.17)$$

We then invoke Theorem 2.2 to deduce that for any $\eta > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, for any two unit vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$, we have (taking $x = c\sqrt{\log N}$ in Theorem 2.2 for a large $c > 0$)

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \langle u, (\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta))^{-1} v \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle \right| \geq \frac{(\log N)^{-1/4}}{\eta^2} \right) \leq 2N^{-10}. \quad (3.18)$$

In the following we take

$$\eta = (\log \log N)^{-1}.$$

By our choice of η and resolvent identity (3.9), we can easily check that the function $z \mapsto \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle$ is Lipschitz continuous in $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ with a Lipschitz constant $(\log \log N)^2$. Therefore taking a covering of $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ of mesh size $10^{-2} \delta_N (\log \log N)^{-2}$ and then apply a union bound to estimate (3.18) for z ranging over these mesh points and $|z| \leq T_N := 100 \log \log N$, and then use the $(\log \log N)^2$ - Lipschitz continuity of the function $z \rightarrow \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle$ in z , we deduce that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq T_N\}} \left| \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle \right| \geq \delta_N \right) = O(N^{-9}). \quad (3.19)$$

Since $\|\mathcal{Y}_0(i\eta)\| \leq 6$ for $\eta > 0$ small with probability $1 - O(N^{-1.4})$ (this can be proven via applying [9], Corollary 2.2), we can ensure $\|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)\|^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{4} \delta_N$ for $|z| > T_N$ and therefore we remove the constraint $|z| \leq T_N$ and get,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle \right| \geq \delta_N \right) = O(N^{-1.4}). \quad (3.20)$$

Applying a similar continuity argument to (3.17) we get

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, (\text{id} \otimes \tau) \mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle \right| \leq \delta_N. \quad (3.21)$$

Combined with (3.20), we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} |\langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle - \langle u, (id \otimes \tau) \mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}(i\eta)^{-1} v \rangle| \geq 2\delta_N \right) = O(N^{-1.4}). \quad (3.22)$$

Now we set up a different estimate. Consider the following event

$$\Omega_N(z) := \{ \|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq 4/C_{\rho, \epsilon} \text{ for all } \eta \in [0, C_{\rho, \epsilon}/4] \}.$$

Since $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$, using the estimate (3.10) we have $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_N(z)) \geq 1 - O(N^{-1.5})$. Since $z \mapsto \|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1}\|_{op}$ is $(\log \log N)^2$ -Lipschitz continuous, we take a covering of $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}) \cap \{|z| \leq T\}$ of mesh size $10^{-2}/C_{\rho, \epsilon}(\log \log N)^{-2}$ to upgrade the bound to be uniform over $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ (the bound $\|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq 4/C_{\rho, \epsilon}$ for $|z| > T$ is trivial when T large), and conclude with the following: consider the event

$$\Omega_N := \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}, \eta \in [0, C_{\rho, \epsilon}/4]} \|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq 4/C_{\rho, \epsilon} \right\},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_N) \geq 1 - O(N^{-1.4}).$$

Moreover, by the resolvent identity (3.9), on the event Ω_N the mapping $\eta \mapsto \|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1}\|_{op}$ is Lipschitz continuous in $\eta > 0$ with a Lipschitz constant $(4/C_{\rho, \epsilon})^2$ uniformly in $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$. That is, we have that for N sufficiently large,

$$\|\mathcal{Y}_z(i\eta)^{-1} - \mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1}\|_{op} \leq (16/C_{\rho, \epsilon}^2)\delta_N \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon} \text{ on } \Omega_N. \quad (3.23)$$

Finally, the asymptotic in (3.15) for entries of the free operator, and the fact that the function $z \mapsto \|(id \otimes \tau) \mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}(i\eta)^{-1}\|$ is also $(4/C_{\rho, \epsilon})^2$ -Lipschitz continuous for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ (which follow from the fact that $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}})$ is bounded away from zero throughout $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$) imply via a continuity argument that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left\| (id \otimes \tau) \mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}(i\eta)^{-1} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b(z, 0+)I_N \\ \bar{b}(z, 0+)I_N & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{op} \leq (16/C_{\rho, \epsilon}^2)\delta_N, \quad (3.24)$$

where we again take the choice $\eta = (\log \log N)^{-1}$, and the expression $b(z, 0+)$ is given in (3.15).

We can now conclude the proof via combining (3.22), (3.23) and (3.24). Combining these estimates we have: for some universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending on ρ, ϵ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, \mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1} v \rangle - \langle u, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b(z, 0+)I_N \\ \bar{b}(z, 0+)I_N & 0 \end{pmatrix} v \rangle \right| \geq C_2 \delta_N \right) \leq C_1 N^{-1.4}. \quad (3.25)$$

Recall that $\mathcal{Y}_z(0)^{-1}$ has the expression (3.8). Thus, for any unit vector $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N$, setting (u, o) and $(0, v)$ to be the two unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^{2N} in the previous estimate, we derive the (final) isotropic estimate for the original non-Hermitian matrix X :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, (X - zI)^{-1} v \rangle - \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho}}{2\rho} \langle u, v \rangle \right| \geq C_2 \delta_N \right) &\leq C_1 N^{-1.4}, \text{ for } \rho \neq 0 \\ \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}} \left| \langle u, (X - zI)^{-1} v \rangle + \frac{1}{z} \langle u, v \rangle \right| \geq C_2 \delta_N \right) &\leq C_1 N^{-1.4}, \text{ for } \rho = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

In the last step we have used (3.15) and the assumption that $\rho = \rho_0 - D_N$ and that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\log N) D_N = 0$. Going through the above proof, we see that exactly the same argument works if we replace δ_N by $(\delta_N)^p$ and take $\eta = (\log \log N)^{-p}$ for any $p > 0$. \square

3.3. Determination of outliers. Finally we complete the determination of outlying eigenvalues, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.7.

For this purpose we will do the singular value decomposition for the deterministic matrix C_N :

$$C_N = A_N B_N$$

where A_N is some $N \times k$ matrix and B_N is some $k \times N$ matrix, both of which having a bounded operator norm.

Following [42], Lemma 2.1, we have the following eigenvalue criterion: a complex $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is an eigenvalue of $X + C_N$ but is not an eigenvalue of X if and only if

$$\det(1 + B_N(X - zI_N)^{-1}A_N) = 0. \quad (3.27)$$

The proof is a standard linear algebra exercise using the matrix identity

$$\det(1 + AB) = \det(1 + BA) \quad (3.28)$$

for any $n \times k$ matrix A and $k \times n$ matrix B . Now we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7, determination of outliers. Define

$$f(z) = \det(1 + B_N(X - zI_N)^{-1}A_N)$$

and

$$g(z) = \det\left(1 + B_N \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho}}{2\rho} A_N\right), \quad \rho \neq 0,$$

$$g(z) = \det\left(1 + B_N \left(-\frac{1}{z}\right) A_N\right), \quad \rho = 0.$$

By a standard exercise in complex analysis, the function $z \mapsto \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4\rho}}{2\rho}$ bijectively maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_\rho$ onto $\mathbb{D} = \mathcal{E}_0$ when $\rho \neq 0$. The same holds for $z \rightarrow -\frac{1}{z}$ when $\rho = 0$.

Then using the matrix identity (3.28) we deduce that the roots of $g(z)$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_\rho$ are precisely given by $\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}$, $1 \leq i \leq j$, where $\lambda_1(C_N), \dots, \lambda_j(C_N)$ are the eigenvalues of C_N such that $|\lambda_i(C_N)| \geq 1$ for each i , so there are only finitely many of them.

We first assume all the roots of g in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ are simple roots. From the isotropic law proved in Theorem 3.3, we claim that on an event with probability at least $1 - C_1 N^{-1.4}$, for each nonzero eigenvalue $\lambda_i(C_N)$ such that $|\lambda_i(C_N)| > 1$, $\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$,

$$|f(z) - g(z)| < |g(z)|, \quad \text{for all } z \in \partial B\left(\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}, (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right), \quad (3.29)$$

where for any $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\delta > 0$ we let $B(x, \delta)$ denotes the disk with center x and radius δ in the complex plane, and $\partial B(x, \delta)$ denotes its boundary. To see why this is true, we assume N is large enough so that g has no other roots in this disk $B\left(\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}, (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$ so that (as g has simple roots) $|g(z)| \sim (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}}$ on $\partial B\left(\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}, (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$ and implies the bound (3.29) thanks to the isotropic law in Theorem 3.3 and that $(\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}} \gg \delta_N$.

Hence by Rouché's theorem in complex analysis, $f(z)$ has a solution that is $(\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}}$ -close to $\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}$ (i.e. lies in $B(\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}, (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}})$) for each $i = 1, \dots, j$. Likewise, fix another domain $B(x, \delta) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ on which g has no zeros, we must have $|f(z) - g(z)| < g(z)$ for $z \in \partial B(x, \delta)$ when N is large, hence by Rouché's theorem f has no zeros on $B(x, \delta)$. This characterizes all roots of f in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$ and hence determines all outlying eigenvalues of $X + C_N$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\rho, \epsilon}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.7 as we have $(\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}} = o((\log \log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}})$.

When g has repeated roots, note that g has degree $d_g = O(1)$, we now claim that (3.29) continues to hold with probability $1 - C_1 N^{-1.4}$. To see this we assume N is large so g has no roots in $B(\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}, (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}})$ except at the center of this disk, which may have multiplicity d_g or less. Thus we have $(\delta_N)^{\frac{3d_g}{4}} \lesssim |g(z)|$ on $z \in \partial B\left(\lambda_i(C_N) + \frac{\rho}{\lambda_i(C_N)}, (\delta_N)^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$. Then we can apply the isotropic law in Theorem 3.3 with the version where we have $(\delta_N)^{d_g}$ on the right hand side of (3.16) and thus complete the proof. \square

3.4. The non-Gaussian case. The proof of the master theorem 1.9 in the non-Gaussian case is a simple adaptation of the proof in the Gaussian case.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. We follow exactly the steps in the proof of Theorem 1.7, where we have the same free probability object $\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}$ having the same Stieltjes transform. It suffices to use Theorem 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 combined with (or in place of) Theorem 2.1, 2.2 2.3 and all other steps are not changed: the former group of theorems determines concentration for the non-Gaussian model and compares the non-Gaussian model to the associated Gaussian model G or the free model $\mathcal{Y}_{z, \text{free}}$; whereas the latter group of theorems further compares the Gaussian model to the free model. \square

4. PROOF OF APPLICATIONS

4.1. Truncation step. We can now prove Theorem 1.4 and 1.6 via a truncation argument.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $X := (d_N)^{-1/2} X_N$ where X_N is specified in Definition 1.3. By definition we verify that

$$\mathbb{E}[X X^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^* X] = \mathbf{1}$$

and if all the self-loops $(x, x) \in E_N$ we have $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \frac{D}{d_N} \mathbf{1}$ (recall $\mathbb{E}[g_{ii}^2] = D$) where $(\log N) \frac{D}{d_N} \rightarrow 0$ by assumption of d_N . Otherwise, if none of the self-loops $(x, x) \in E_N$ then simply $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = 0$.

Therefore the claim of Theorem 1.4 for Gaussian entries (case (1)) follow from Theorem 1.7 with $\rho = 0$, and the claim of Theorem 1.4 for bounded entries (case (2)) follow from Theorem 1.9 with $\rho = 0$. As we assume the graphs G_N are increasing and X_N can be embedded as a submatrix of X_{N+1} , the almost sure statement follows from an application of Borel-Cantelli lemma.

It remains to prove Theorem 1.4 case (3), where entries are i.i.d. with finite p -th moment. We begin with a moment estimate similar to [17], Corollary 3.32:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x, y) \in E_N} |(d_N)^{-1/2} g_{xy}|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{d_N} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{(x, y) \in E_N} |g_{xy}|^p \right]^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq \frac{(N d_N)^{\frac{2}{p}}}{d_N} \mathbb{E}[|g_{xy}^p|]^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

By our assumption on d_N we have $(d_N)^{-1}(Nd_N)^{\frac{2}{p}} \ll (\log N)^{-4}$. Therefore we conclude that we can find a deterministic sequence $a_N \searrow 0$ such that with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$(\log N)^2 \sup_{(x,y) \in E_N} (d_N)^{-1/2} |g_{xy}| \leq a_N. \quad (4.1)$$

For regularity reasons we also assume that $a_N \geq (\log N)^{-\frac{4}{p-2}}$.

Now we define a truncated matrix \tilde{X}_N on G_N such that for each edge $(x, y) \in E_N$, the entry $(\tilde{X}_N)_{(x,y)}$ is $g_{xy} 1_{|g_{xy}| \leq a_N (d_N)^{1/2} (\log N)^{-2}}$. We let

$$\tilde{g}_{xy} := g_{xy} 1_{|g_{xy}| \leq a_N (d_N)^{1/2} (\log N)^{-2}},$$

since g_{xy} is symmetric we have $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_{xy}] = 0$. We also compute that $V_N := \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{g}_{xy}|^2] = 1 + O(N^{-1})$. This is because by assumption on d_N we have $a_N (d_N)^{1/2} (\log N)^{-2} \geq N^{\frac{1}{p-2}}$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}[g_{xy}^2] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_{xy}^2] = \mathbb{E}[g_{xy}^2 1_{|g_{xy}| \geq a_N (d_N)^{1/2} (\log N)^{-2}}] \leq N^{-1} \mathbb{E}[g_{xy}^p].$$

Therefore we may instead consider $Y := (d_N V_N)^{-1/2} \tilde{X}_N$ and now this matrix satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.4, case (2) (we verify that the entries are bounded and $\mathbb{E}[YY^*] = \mathbb{E}[Y^*Y] = \mathbf{1}$, $\mathbb{E}[Y^2] = \rho(1 + o((\log N)^{-1}))\mathbf{1}$), so the claim on absence of outliers (part (1)) and on convergence of outlying eigenvalues (part (2)) hold for Y . Moreover, $X_N = \tilde{X}_N$ on the event where (4.1) holds (which has probability $1 - o(1)$) and $V_N = 1 + o(N^{-1})$. Then an elementary exercise enables us to transfer the finite rank perturbation results on Y to that of X . (To be more specific, we determine outlying eigenvalues of $(d_N)^{-1/2} V_N \tilde{X}_N + V_N C_N$, but the eigenvalues of the latter matrix are eigenvalues of $(d_N)^{-1/2} \tilde{X}_N + C_N$ multiplied by V_N ; and eigenvalues of $V_N C_N$ are eigenvalues of C_N multiplied by V_N . Finally use $V_N = 1 + O(N^{-1})$.)

To upgrade to an almost sure argument, we can use [17], Lemma 9.22 and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[|g_{xy}|^p] < \infty$ to deduce that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(Nd_N)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \sup_{(x,y) \in E_N} |g_{xy}| = 0 \quad a.s.,$$

then using our assumptions on d_N and [17], Lemma 9.21, we deduce that we can find deterministic sequence $a_N \searrow 0$, such that

$$(d_N)^{-1/2} \sup_{(x,y) \in E_N} (d_N)^{-1/2} |g_{xy}| \leq (\log N)^{-2} a_N \text{ eventually } a.s..$$

Then we can upgrade the previous proofs to an almost sure statement. \square

For banded elliptic random matrices, a very similar argument can be used to prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $X := (d_N)^{-1/2} X_N$. Then by definition we have

$$\mathbb{E}[XX^*] = \mathbb{E}[X^*X] = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbb{E}[X^2] = (\rho + o((\log N)^{-1}))\mathbf{1}.$$

In case (1) when entries are Gaussian, the claim is implied by Theorem 1.7. In case (2) when entries are bounded, the claim is implied by Theorem 1.9.

It remains to consider case (3) when (g_0, g_1, g_2) have finite p -th moment. As in the previous proof, applying [17], Lemma 9.22 to the following three families of random variables $\{(X_N)_{(x,y)}, x < y, (x,y) \in E_N\}$, $\{(X_N)_{(x,y)}, y < x, (x,y) \in E_N\}$ and $\{(X_N)_{(x,x)}, (x,x) \in E_N\}$

$E_N\}$ (each group consists of i.i.d. random variables) and using the fact that $\mathbb{E}[|g_i|^p] < \infty$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(Nd_N)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \sup_{(x,y) \in E_N} \max(|(X_N)_{(x,y)}|, |(X_N)_{(y,x)}|) = 0 \quad a.s.,$$

then using our assumptions on d_N and [17], Lemma 9.21, we deduce that we can find a deterministic sequence $a_N \searrow 0$, such that

$$(d_N)^{-1/2} \sup_{(x,y) \in E_N} (d_N)^{-1/2} \max(|(X_N)_{(x,y)}|, |(X_N)_{(y,x)}|) \leq (\log N)^{-2} a_N \text{ eventually } a.s..$$

We again assume that $a_N \geq (\log N)^{-\frac{4}{p-2}}$, as this can be achieved by replacing a_N by $\max(a_N, (\log N)^{-\frac{4}{p-2}})$.

Now we define a truncated matrix \tilde{X}_N on G_N such that for each edge $(x, y) \in E_N$, the entry $(\tilde{X}_N)_{(x,y)}$ is $(X_N)_{(x,y)} 1_{|(X_N)_{(x,y)}| \leq a_N (d_N)^{1/2} (\log N)^{-2}}$. Then $\tilde{X}_N = X_N$ eventually almost surely.

From the random variables (g_0, g_1, g_2) we define the truncated version $(\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2)$ via setting $\tilde{g}_i \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} g_i 1_{|g_i| \leq a_N (d_N)^{1/2} (\log N)^{-2}}$ for each $i = 0, 1, 2$. Since g_0, g_1, g_2 are symmetric, we see $\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2$ still has mean zero. As in the previous proof, applying Markov's inequality, the fact that $g_1 \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} g_2$, and the finite p -th moment of g_i , we check that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{g}_1|^2] = \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{g}_2|^2] = 1 + O(N^{-1}), \quad \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{g}_0|^2] = 1 + O(N^{-1}),$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_1 \tilde{g}_2] = \rho + O(N^{-1}).$$

After a simple computation, we see that we can find a constant $V_N = 1 + O(N^{-1})$ such that $Y := V_N \tilde{X}_N$ satisfies all the assumptions in Theorem 1.9. Then we have proven no outlier and finite rank perturbation theorems (i.e. the first and second conclusions of Theorem 1.6) for the matrix Y . By definition of V_N , this implies the same limit of outlying eigenvalues for \tilde{X}_N . (To be more specific, we determine outlying eigenvalues of $(d_N)^{-1/2} V_N \tilde{X}_N + V_N C_N$, but the eigenvalues of the latter matrix are eigenvalues of $(d_N)^{-1/2} \tilde{X}_N + C_N$ multiplied by V_N ; and eigenvalues of $V_N C_N$ are eigenvalues of C_N multiplied by V_N . Finally use $V_N = 1 + O(N^{-1})$.) Since $X_N = \tilde{X}_N$ eventually almost surely, this completes the proof for $(d_N)^{-1/2} X_N$. \square

4.2. product elliptic matrices. Finally we give the proof of Theorem 1.14. The proof relies on a standard linearization argument.

Proof of Theorem 1.14. We consider the following two linearization matrices

$$\mathcal{X}_N := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (d_{N,1})^{-1/2} X_N^1 & & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (d_{N,2})^{-1/2} X_N^2 & 0 \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ 0 & & & 0 & (d_{N,m-1})^{-1/2} X_N^{m-1} \\ (d_{N,m})^{-1/2} X_N^m & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

and the $mN \times mN$ matrix

$$\mathcal{A}_N := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_N^1 & & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A_N^2 & 0 \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ 0 & & & 0 & A_N^{m-1} \\ A_N^m & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

From elementary linear algebra (see [22], Proposition 4.1), we readily see that if λ is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{X}_N , then λ^m is an eigenvalue of $(\mathcal{X}_N)^m$, so that λ^m is an eigenvalue of D_N^m . Similarly, if λ is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{A}_N (or $\mathcal{X}_N + \mathcal{A}_N$), then λ^m is an eigenvalue of A_N (or $D_N^{m,1}$).

Let $\zeta_m := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : z^m = 1\}$ denote the set of m -th roots of unity. Then the eigenvalues of \mathcal{A}_N are given by

$$(\{\lambda_i(A_N)\}^{\frac{1}{m}} \zeta_m, \quad i = 1, \dots, j),$$

where we use $(\{\lambda_i(A_N)\}^{\frac{1}{m}}$ to denote any m -th square root of $\lambda_i(A_N)$.

For the matrix \mathcal{X}_N , we readily check that whenever $m \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}_N(\mathcal{X}_N)^*] = \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{X}_N)^* \mathcal{X}_N] = \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{X}_N)^2] = 0.$$

Then we can apply Theorem 1.7 and 1.9 to $\mathcal{X}_N + \mathcal{A}_N$ (when all entries of \mathcal{X}_N are Gaussian in case(1) or bounded in case (2)), and conclude that for any $\epsilon > 0$ a.s. for N large there are no eigenvalues of \mathcal{X}_N outside $\mathbb{C} \setminus (1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}} \mathbb{D}$, so that there are no eigenvalues of D_N^m outside $(1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{D}$. Moreover, almost surely as N is large, there are precisely mj outlying eigenvalues of $\mathcal{X}_N + \mathcal{A}_N$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus (1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{1}{m}} \mathbb{D}$, and after relabeling they converge to $(\lambda_i(A_N))^{\frac{1}{m}} \zeta_m (1 + o(1))$ for each $i = 1, \dots, j$. This implies that almost surely for N large, there are precisely j outlying eigenvalues of $D_N^{m,1}$ in $\mathbb{C} \setminus (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{D}$, and after relabeling, these eigenvalues converge to $(\lambda_i(A_N))(1 + o(1))$ for each $i = 1, \dots, j$.

Finally, when entries of \mathcal{X}_N have a bounded p -th moment, we may use a similar truncation argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.4, 1.6. The adaptations are straightforward and hence omitted. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF CONCENTRATION INEQUALITIES

In this appendix we outline a proof of Theorem 2.2 and 2.5: the proof is essentially an adaptation of the version in [17].

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We write the Gaussian model G as

$$G := A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n g_i A_i$$

where g_1, \dots, g_n are independent mean 0, variance 1 Gaussians and $A_i \in M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ are fixed self-adjoint matrices. Define $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f(x) := \langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - A_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i A_i)^{-1} v \rangle.$$

We can verify as in [17], Lemma 6.5 that f is $\frac{\sigma_*(G)}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^2}$ Lipschitz continuous, so that $\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle$ is a $\frac{\sigma_*(G)}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^2}$ Lipschitz continuous function of n unit Gaussian variables. Then the Gaussian concentration inequality from [15] Theorem 5.6 finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We will adapt the proof of [17] and only give a sketch. Some estimates we present are suboptimal, but we will use them as we can simply quote the computations from the cited work.

Let X be of the form 1.6 and consider (Z'_1, \dots, Z'_n) to be some independent copy of (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) . Let $X^{\sim i} := Z_0 + \sum_{j \neq i} Z_j + Z'_i$. Then for any fixed unit vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v - (z\mathbf{1} - X^{\sim i})^{-1}v \rangle_+)^2 \leq W,$$

where we define W via

$$W := \frac{2}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^4} \sup_{\|v\|=\|w\|=1} \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle v, (Z_i - Z'_i)w \rangle|^2 + \frac{8}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^6} R(X)^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - Z'_i)^2 \right\|.$$

Then we can estimate as in Lemma 5.8 of [17],

$$\mathbb{E}[W] \lesssim \frac{\sigma_*(X)^2}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^4} + \frac{R(X)\mathbb{E}\|X - \mathbb{E}X\|}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^4} + \frac{R(X)^2\mathbb{E}\|X - \mathbb{E}X\|^2}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^6}.$$

W has the following self-bounding property: consider

$$W^{\sim i} := \frac{2}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^4} \sup_{\|v\|=\|w\|=1} \sum_{j \neq i} |\langle v, (Z_j - Z'_j)w \rangle|^2 + \frac{8}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^6} R(X)^2 \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} (Z_j - Z'_j)^2 \right\|,$$

then by [17], Lemma 5.9, $W^{\sim i} \leq W$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (W - W^{\sim i})^2 \leq \left\{ \frac{16R(X)^2}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^4} + \frac{64R(X)^4}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^6} \right\} W.$$

From the self-bounding property of W we get

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{W/a}] \leq \frac{2}{a} \mathbb{E}[W], \quad a = \frac{16R(X)^2}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^4} + \frac{64R(X)^4}{(\operatorname{Im} z)^6}.$$

Then for $0 \leq \lambda \leq a^{-1/2}$, by exponential Poincaré inequality and Chernoff bound, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle \geq \mathbb{E}\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle + \sqrt{8\mathbb{E}Wx} + \sqrt{ax} \right] \leq e^{-x}.$$

We can also prove via a refinement of [15] Theorem 6.16 that for any $0 \leq \lambda \leq (2a)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$\log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda \{ \langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle \}} \right] \leq \frac{4\mathbb{E}[W]\lambda^2}{1 - \lambda\sqrt{2a}}.$$

Then Chernoff's inequality imply the lower tail bound for any $x > 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle \leq \mathbb{E}\langle u, (z\mathbf{1} - X)^{-1}v \rangle - 4\sqrt{\mathbb{E}Wx} - \sqrt{2ax} \right] \leq e^{-x}.$$

This completes the proof with both upper and lower tails derived. \square

STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

The author has no financial or non-financial conflicting of interests to declare that are relevant to the contents of this article.

No dataset is generated in this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Johannes Alt, Laszlo Erdos, and Torben Kruger. “Local inhomogeneous circular law”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 28 (Dec. 2016).
- [2] Johannes Alt, Laszlo Erdos, and Torben Kruger. “Spectral radius of random matrices with independent entries”. In: *Probability and Mathematical Physics* 2.2 (2021), pp. 221–280.
- [3] Johannes Alt and Torben Krüger. “Local elliptic law”. In: *Bernoulli* 28.2 (2022), pp. 886–909.
- [4] Benson Au. “BBP phenomena for deformed random band matrices”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13047* (2023).
- [5] Benson Au. “Finite-Rank Perturbations of Random Band Matrices via Infinitesimal Free Probability”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 74.9 (2021), pp. 1855–1895.
- [6] Z. D. Bai and Y. Q. Yin. “Limiting behavior of the norm of products of random matrices and two problems of Geman-Hwang”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 73 (1986), pp. 555–569.
- [7] Afonso Bandeira and Ramon Handel. “Sharp nonasymptotic bounds on the norm of random matrices with independent entries”. In: *The Annals of Probability* 44 (Aug. 2014).
- [8] Afonso Bandeira et al. “Matrix Concentration Inequalities and Free Probability II. Two-sided Bounds and Applications”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11453* (2024).
- [9] Afonso S Bandeira, March T Boedihardjo, and Ramon van Handel. “Matrix concentration inequalities and free probability”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 234.1 (2023), pp. 419–487.
- [10] Serban Belinschi et al. “Outlier eigenvalues for non-Hermitian polynomials in independent iid matrices and deterministic matrices”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 26 (2021), pp. 1–37.
- [11] Florent Benaych-Georges, Charles Bordenave, and Antti Knowles. “Spectral radii of sparse random matrices”. In: *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist* 56.3 (2020), pp. 2141–2161.
- [12] Florent Benaych-Georges and Raj Rao Nadakuditi. “The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 227.1 (2011), pp. 494–521.
- [13] Charles Bordenave and Mireille Capitaine. “Outlier eigenvalues for deformed iid random matrices”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 69.11 (2016), pp. 2131–2194.
- [14] Charles Bordenave, Djalil Chafai, and David Garcia-Zelada. “Convergence of the spectral radius of a random matrix through its characteristic polynomial”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* (2021), pp. 1–19.

- [15] Stephane Boucheron, Gabor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. "*Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*". Oxford University Press, Feb. 2013. ISBN: 9780199535255.
- [16] Paul Bourgade. "Random band matrices". In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians: Rio de Janeiro 2018* (2018), pp. 2759–2783.
- [17] Tatiana Brailovskaya and Ramon van Handel. "Universality and sharp matrix concentration inequalities". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05142* (2022).
- [18] Mireille Capitaine, Catherine Donati-Martin, and Delphine Féral. "Central limit theorems for eigenvalues of deformations of Wigner matrices". In: *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques* 48.1 (2012), pp. 107–133.
- [19] Nicholas Cook et al. "Non-Hermitian random matrices with a variance profile (I): deterministic equivalents and limiting ESDs". In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 23 (Jan. 2018).
- [20] Nicholas Cook et al. "Non-Hermitian Random Matrices with a Variance Profile (II): Properties and Examples". In: *Journal of Theoretical Probability* 35 (Nov. 2021).
- [21] Simon Coste. "Sparse matrices: convergence of the characteristic polynomial seen from infinity". In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 28 (2023), pp. 1–40.
- [22] Natalie Coston, Sean O'Rourke, and Philip Wood. "Outliers in the spectrum for products of independent random matrices". In: *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques* 56 (Nov. 2017).
- [23] Guillaume Dubach and Yuval Peled. "On words of non-Hermitian random matrices". In: *The Annals of Probability* 49 (May 2021).
- [24] Delphine Feral and Sandrine Peche. "The largest eigenvalue of rank one deformation of large Wigner matrices". In: *Communications in mathematical physics* 272 (2007), pp. 185–228.
- [25] Stuart Geman. "The spectral radius of large random matrices". In: *Annals of Probability* 14 (1986), pp. 1318–1328.
- [26] V. Girko. "Strong Circular Law". In: *Random Operators and Stochastic Equations* 5 (Jan. 1997), pp. 173–196.
- [27] V. Girko. "The Strong Circular Law. Twenty years later. Part I". In: *Random Operators and Stochastic Equations* 12 (Sept. 2004), pp. 49–104.
- [28] Uffe Haagerup and Steen Thorbjørnsen. "A new application of Random Matrices: $\text{Ext}(C *_{\text{red}}(F_2))$ is not a group". In: *Annals of Mathematics* 162 (Jan. 2003).
- [29] Yi Han. "Finite rank perturbation of non-Hermitian random matrices: heavy tail and sparse regimes". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21543* (2024).
- [30] J William Helton, Reza Rashidi Far, and Roland Speicher. "Operator-valued semicircular elements: solving a quadratic matrix equation with positivity constraints". In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2007.9 (2007), rnm086–rnm086.
- [31] Vishesh Jain et al. "Circular law for random block band matrices with genuinely sublinear bandwidth". In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 62.8 (2021).
- [32] Franz Lehner and Philippe Biane. "Computation of some Examples of Brown's Spectral Measure in Free Probability". In: *Colloquium Mathematicum* (Jan. 2000).
- [33] Hoi H Nguyen. "On the least singular value of random symmetric matrices". In: *Electron. J. Probab* 17.53 (2012), pp. 1–19.
- [34] Hoi H Nguyen and Sean O'Rourke. "The elliptic law". In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2015.17 (2015), pp. 7620–7689.

- [35] Alexandru Nica and Roland Speicher. *Lectures on the combinatorics of free probability*. Vol. 13. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [36] Sean O’Rourke and David Renfrew. “Low rank perturbations of large elliptic random matrices”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 19 (Sept. 2013).
- [37] Sean O’Rourke et al. “Products of independent elliptic random matrices”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 160.1 (2015), pp. 89–119.
- [38] Sandrine Peche. “The largest eigenvalue of small rank perturbations of Hermitian random matrices”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 134 (2006), pp. 127–173.
- [39] Alessandro Pizzo, David Renfrew, and Alexander Soshnikov. “On finite rank deformations of Wigner matrices”. In: *Annales de l’IHP Probabilites et statistiques* 49.1 (2013), pp. 64–94.
- [40] Mark Rudelson and Konstantin Tikhomirov. “The sparse circular law under minimal assumptions”. In: *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 29 (2019), pp. 561–637.
- [41] Laura Shou and Ramon van Handel. “A Localization–Delocalization Transition for Nonhomogeneous Random Matrices”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 191.2 (2024), p. 26.
- [42] Terence Tao. “Outliers in the spectrum of iid matrices with bounded rank perturbations”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 155.1 (2013), pp. 231–263.
- [43] Terence Tao, Van Vu, and Manjunath Krishnapur. “Random matrices: universality of ESDs and the circular law”. In: *Annals of Probability* 38.5 (2010), pp. 2023–2065.
- [44] Konstantin Tikhomirov. “On pseudospectrum of inhomogeneous non-Hermitian random matrices”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08211* (2023).
- [45] Dan Voiculescu. “Limit laws for random matrices and free products”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 104.1 (1991), pp. 201–220.
- [46] Dan Voiculescu. “Operations on certain non-commutative operator-valued random variables”. In: *Asterisque* 232.1 (1995), pp. 243–275.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.
Email address: yh482@cam.ac.uk