A MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR THE COULOMB GAS: MICROSCOPIC DENSITY BOUNDS, CONFINEMENT ESTIMATES, AND HIGH TEMPERATURE LIMITS

ERIC THOMA

ABSTRACT. We introduce and prove a maximum principle for a natural quantity related to the k-point correlation function of the classical one-component Coulomb gas. As an application, we show that the gas is confined to the droplet by a well-known effective potential in dimensions two and higher. We also prove new upper bounds for the particle density in the droplet that apply at any temperature. In particular, we give the first controls on the microscopic point process for high temperature Coulomb gases beyond the mean-field regime, proving that their laws are uniformly tight in the particle number N for any inverse temperatures β_N. Furthermore, we prove that limit points are homogeneous mixed Poisson point processes if $\beta_N \to 0$.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study the classical one-component Coulomb gas at inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ and particle number N in dimension $\mathsf{d} \geq 2$, which is specified by the Gibbs measure

$$\mathbb{P}_{N,\beta}^V(dX_N) = \frac{1}{\mathsf{Z}_{N,\beta}^V} e^{-\beta \mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N)} dX_N, \quad X_N = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in (\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})^N, \tag{1.1}$$

where the Coulomb energy is given by

$$\mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \mathsf{g}(x_i - x_j) + \sum_{i=1}^N V(x_i) \tag{1.2}$$

for a confining potential $V(x) = V_N(x) := N^{2/\mathsf{d}} V_1(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}} x)$ for fixed V_1. The partition function $\mathsf{Z}_{N,\beta}^V$ is a normalizing factor, and g is the Coulomb potential given by $x \mapsto -\log|x|$ if $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and $x \mapsto |x|^{-d+2}$ if $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. The scaling of the energy (1.2) is such the distance between neighboring particles x_i, x_j is typically order $O(1)$.

We are interested in estimates for the *k-point correlation function* $\rho_k = \rho_{k,N,\beta,V}$, a measure defined through the relation

$$\int_{A_1 \times \cdots \times A_k} \rho_k(dy_1, \ldots, dy_k) = k! \binom{N}{k} \mathbb{P}_{N,\beta}^V \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \{x_i \in A_i\} \right) \tag{1.3}$$

for measurable sets $A_1, \ldots, A_k \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$. The quantity above is the expectation of the number of ordered k-tuples of particles that can be formed with the ith particle in A_i. We will always work in the case that ρ_k has a Lebesgue density, which we will also denote by ρ_k.

It is expected that ρ_1 should decay to 0 rapidly outside the *droplet* $\Sigma_N = \Sigma_{N,V} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$, which is a closed set solving a potential-theoretic obstacle problem associated to V. Moreover, there is a natural confining potential ζ_N associated to the obstacle problem, and the growth of ζ_N outside Σ_N is expected to describe the corresponding decay of ρ_1, at least over large enough scales. The first purpose of the present article is to prove $\rho_1(x) \leq Ce^{-\beta\zeta_N(x)}$. We call such an estimate a *confinement estimate* or a *localization estimate*, since it shows that most particles lie in close proximity to Σ_N.

The limit points (in a topology to be defined) of ρ_k, possibly recentered, as $N \to \infty$ are also of great interest. These limits describe infinite volume Coulomb gases, which in two dimensions generalize the Ginibre point process ($\beta = 2$, $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$) to general β and potential. We prove that subsequential limits of ρ_k exist for a wide range of temperatures, and furthermore in $\mathsf{d} = 2$ that the resulting infinite volume Coulomb gases are homogeneous mixed Poisson point processes if $\beta_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. The existence of $N \to \infty$ limit points of ρ_k are new in the high temperature regime, and it will be a corollary of improved *microscopic control* of point counts.

Our results will apply for a wide range of β, which we take to depend on N under the restriction that $\theta_* := \inf_{N \geq 1} \beta_N N^{2/\mathsf{d}} > 2$. The potential V_1 will likewise be allowed to be very general; see our assumptions (A1)-(A7) below.

Despite their varied nature, the results all follow from new maximum principles and mean value inequalities for quantities related to the 1-point (and k-point) functions. These principles result from an improvement of the isotropic averaging method, which was introduced informally in [Leb23] and then made into a systematic technique in [Tho24]. They also bear some resemblance to an argument of Lieb (published with permission in [NS14, RS16]). The isotropic averaging inequalities used here are tighter (i.e. have less loss from Jensen's inequality) than previous works.

1.1. **Definitions and assumptions.** We begin with some basic definitions and assumptions.

The parameters N, β, and V_1 will be used throughout the paper. Accordingly, we will generally drop these parameters from notation except where needed to avoid confusion. For example, we let $V = V_N$. We warn the reader that our conventions and spatial scaling of the Coulomb gas differs from some of the literature.

All implicit constants will be independent of N and β when not specified, but we allow constants to depend on certain norms and potential theoretic objects associated to V_1. We will only examine this dependence in certain simple cases in which it can be expressed through

$$\mathcal{M}_{x,N} := \|\max(\Delta V_1, 0)\|_{L^\infty\left(B_1(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x)\right)} = \|\max(\Delta V_N, 0)\|_{L^\infty(B_{N^{1/\mathsf{d}}}(x))}, \qquad (1.4)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$ is the point at which we are estimating quantities of interest and $B_R(x)$ is the open ball of radius R centered at x. In [Tho24], it was shown that $\mathcal{M}_{x,N} \leq C_1$ is sufficient to show strong bounds on the probability of a point count in $B_R(x)$ larger than $C_2 R^{\mathsf{d}}$ with $R = \max(1, \beta^{-1/2})$ and $C_2 \gg \max(C_1, 1)$. It is actually assumed $\sup_x \mathcal{M}_{x,N} < \infty$ in [Tho24], but it is easy to see that the proofs only use boundedness of $\mathcal{M}_{x,N}$ at relevant points x. See Theorem 5 for a precise statement.

We assume throughout that

$$\theta_* := \inf_{N \geq 1} \beta_N N^{2/\mathsf{d}} > 2. \qquad (A1)$$

Many results (i.e. all that do not involve an $N \to \infty$ limit) work at fixed N again under the restriction that $\theta_N := \beta_N N^{-2/\mathsf{d}} > 2$. When θ_N is small, the gas is not expected to be localized

to a ball of volume $O(N)$, so (A1) covers essentially all interesting temperature regimes for localization.

We assume that the potential V_1 in (1.2) is in $C^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})$ with some basic growth assumptions:

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} V_1(x) + \mathsf{g}(x) = +\infty \tag{A2}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\{|x|\geq 1\}} e^{-\frac{\theta_*}{2}(V_1(x)-\log|x|)}dx + \int_{\{|x|\geq 1\}} e^{-\theta_*(V_1(x)-\log|x|)}|x|\log^2|x|dx < \infty & \text{if } \mathsf{d}=2, \\ \int_{\{|x|\geq 1\}} e^{-\frac{\theta_*}{2}V_1(x)}dx < \infty & \text{if } \mathsf{d}\geq 3. \end{cases} \tag{A3}$$

Under (A2) and (A3), the partition function $\mathsf{Z}^V_{N,\beta}$ is finite.

For low enough temperature, the *empirical measure* $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x_i}$ is well-approximated by the *equilibrium measure* $\mu_{\infty,1}$, which is characterized within probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$ through the existence of a constant $c_{\infty,1}$ such that

$$\zeta_1(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_{\infty,1}(dy) + V_1 - c_{\infty,1} \tag{1.5}$$

satisfies $\zeta_1 \geq 0$ and $\zeta_1 = 0$ on supp $\mu_{\infty,1}$ except on a set of capacity 0 (i.e. quasi-everywhere). We will almost exclusively work with a rescaling $\mu_\infty = \mu_{\infty,N}$ defined by

$$\mu_{\infty,N}(A) = N\mu_{\infty,1}(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}A) \tag{1.6}$$

for measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$. Note that μ_∞ has total mass N. The *droplet* $\Sigma = \Sigma_N$ is defined as the support of μ_∞. It is compact under (A2) and (A3), and clearly $\Sigma_N = N^{1/\mathsf{d}}\Sigma_1$.

We define the *effective confining potential* $\zeta = \zeta_N$ via

$$\zeta_N(x) = N^{2/\mathsf{d}}\zeta_1(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x) \tag{1.7}$$

where ζ_1 was introduced in (1.5). Note that $\zeta \geq 0$ and $\zeta = 0$ on Σ q.e., and

$$\zeta(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_\infty(dy) + V - c_{\infty,N} \tag{1.8}$$

for a constant $c_{\infty,N} = N^{2/\mathsf{d}}c_{\infty,1} + \frac{1}{2}\log N \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{d}=2}$.

For our confinement estimates, we will also assume the existence of a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\partial\Sigma_1 \in C^{1,1}, \tag{A4}$$

$$\Delta V_1(x) \geq \alpha > 0 \quad \forall x \text{ in a neighborhood of } \Sigma_1, \tag{A5}$$

$$\zeta_1(x) \geq \alpha\min(\text{dist}(x,\Sigma_1)^2, 1) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}. \tag{A6}$$

We also assume

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{V_1(x)}{\mathcal{M}_{x,1}} = +\infty \quad \text{if } \mathsf{d}\geq 3. \tag{A7}$$

With the exception of (A7), these assumptions are needed to use results of [AS19] on the *thermal equilibrium measure* in the proof of Proposition 4.1. We note that (A4) and (A5) imply (A6) for x in a neighborhood of Σ_1 by the regularity theory for the related obstacle problem [Caf98]. So in effect (A6) is an assumption that outside of any fixed neighborhood of Σ_1, the potential ζ_1 stays some distance away from 0. Up to changing α, it is sufficient for (A6) that (A4) and (A5) holds and V_1 is strictly convex.

We define a dimensional constant $\mathsf{c_d}$ through the relation

$$-\Delta \mathsf{g} = \mathsf{c_d}\delta_0, \tag{1.9}$$

so that $\frac{1}{\mathsf{c_d}}\mathsf{g}$ is the fundamental solution of $-\Delta$. Applying the Laplacian operator to (1.8) within the interior of Σ formally shows $\mu_\infty = \mathsf{c_d}^{-1}\Delta V \mathbf{1}_\Sigma$. We also will use the electric potential generated by a measure ν, defined by

$$\mathsf{h}^\nu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} \mathsf{g}(y - x)\nu(dy) \tag{1.10}$$

whenever ν has bounded negative part in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ or bounded negative part and sufficient decay at ∞ in $\mathsf{d} = 2$.

We define the microscopic point process

$$\mathbf{X}_N = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{x_i} \tag{1.11}$$

associated to X_N, as well as its translates $\tau_{x^*}\mathbf{X}_N = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{x_i - x^*}$ for $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}$. We consider $\mathbf{X}_N$ as a random variable taking values in the set of locally finite, integer valued Radon measures endowed with the weak topology induced via integration against compactly supported, continuous functions. See [DVJ08, Chapters 9 and 11] for relevant background material on point processes. Uniform tightness of the laws of point processes $\mathbf{X}_N$ in this space is equivalent to uniform tightness of $\mathbf{X}_N(A)$ for any bounded Borel set A [DVJ08, Theorem 11.1.VI].

1.2. **Main results and comparisons to literature.** Our main results are consequences of the following inequality and its generalizations.

Theorem 1. *One has*

$$-\Delta(e^{\beta\zeta}\rho_1) \leq \beta\mathsf{c_d}e^{\beta\zeta}\rho_1\mu_\infty \tag{1.12}$$

in an integral sense. In particular, the quantity $e^{\beta\zeta}\rho_1$ is subharmonic on the complement of $\Sigma = \operatorname{supp} \mu_\infty$.

This theorem is proved in Proposition 2.6 (in an equivalent integral formulation alongside a closely related inequality) through a short isotropic averaging argument. Crucially, it also holds with $x \mapsto \rho_1(x)$ replaced by the conditional 1-point function $x \mapsto \rho_1(x|y_2, \ldots, y_k)$ satisfying $\rho_k(y_1, \ldots, y_k) = \rho_{k-1}(y_2, \ldots, y_k)\rho_1(y_1|y_2, \ldots, y_k)$ a.e. with respect to the k-point marginal of the Coulomb gas.

We emphasize that (1.12) is valid at fixed N, i.e. there is no error term and it is not an asymptotic inequality. It can be compared to the maximum principle for weighted polynomials; see Remark 2.7 for a discussion. Unlike its weighted polynomial analog, Theorem 1 is fundamentally stochastic, works in dimensions $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ in addition to $\mathsf{d} = 2$, and can be applied in a mean value inequality form.

In [Tho24, proof of Theorem 2], it is proved (though never explicitly stated) that

$$-\Delta\rho_1 \leq \beta\rho_1\Delta V,$$

which coincides with (1.12) on the interior of Σ where $\zeta = 0$ and $\mu_\infty = \mathsf{c_d}^{-1}\Delta V$. The improved form of Theorem 1, which comes from a refinement of the isotropic averaging technique, gives much more useful information on the complement of Σ.

Indeed, the maximum principle for $e^{\beta\zeta}\rho_1$ on $\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d} \setminus \Sigma$ allows us to prove global upper bounds for $e^{\beta\zeta}\rho_1$ once we bound the quantity within Σ and at ∞. The following result takes care of the bound within Σ.

Theorem 2. *We have for any $r > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$ that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma \mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right] \leq e^{C^{1+\beta}\gamma r^{\mathsf{d}}} \tag{1.13}$$

for a constant C uniformly bounded for bounded $\mathcal{M}_x$ and γ (and independent of N, r, β).

Theorem 2 in particular implies that $\|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})} \leq C^{1+\beta}$. It is the first uniform control of high temperature, microscopic ($\beta \ll 1$, $r = O(1)$) particle densities. Previous best controls of point counts in [AS19, Ser20, Tho24] only show bounded particle densities at length scales $r = \beta^{-1/2}$ (or sometimes $\beta^{-1/2}\max(\log \beta^{-1}, 1)^{1/2}$ in $\mathsf{d} = 2$), where they show subgaussian probability tails at large density. It is expected that below this length scale $\mathbf{X}_N$ is governed by Poissonian statistics. The weaker exponential tails given by Theorem 2 is consistent with this expectation.

In Proposition 4.1, we prove bounds on the one-point function near ∞, and as a result we deduce from Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 the following confinement estimate.

Theorem 3. *If $\mathsf{d} = 2$, one has*

$$\rho_1 \leq C^{1+\beta}e^{-\beta\zeta}, \tag{1.14}$$

for a constant C dependent only on $\sup_{x\in\Sigma}\mathcal{M}_x$. If $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$, there are V_1 dependent constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $N \geq C$ we have

$$\rho_1(x) \leq C^{1+\beta}\left(1 + \max(-\log\beta, 1)e^{-c\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}p(x, \Sigma)\right)e^{-\beta\zeta(x)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}} \tag{1.15}$$

where $p(x, \Sigma)$ is the probability that Brownian motion started at x never hits Σ.

By applying a union bound to Theorem 3, we can give a result on the onset of the vacuum from the droplet edge.

Corollary 1.1. *We consider any $\mathsf{d} \geq 2$, but if $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ we also assume that $\theta_N = \beta_N N^{2/\mathsf{d}} \geq c_1^{-1}\log\log N$ for a small enough $c_1 > 0$ and N is large enough. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,N\}}\zeta(x_i) \geq \gamma\right) \leq C^{1+\beta}\int_{\{\zeta\geq\gamma\}}e^{-\beta\zeta(x)}dx \quad \forall\gamma \geq 0. \tag{1.16}$$

If we further assume that (A3) holds with 4 in place of θ_*, then there exists $c_V > 0$ such that, uniformly in N and for all $0 \leq \gamma \leq N^{1/\mathsf{d}}\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\log N}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,N\}}\mathrm{dist}(x_i, \Sigma) \geq \gamma\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{\beta}}\right) \leq C^{1+\beta}N^{1-c_V\gamma^2}. \tag{1.17}$$

Remark 1.2. For an easier comparison with the literature, we now write Theorem 3 and Corollary 1.1 in the macroscopic coordinates $Y_N = N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}X_N$. The first corresponding bound is

$$\overline{\rho}_1(y) \leq C^{1+\beta}N\left(1 + \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{d}\geq 3}\max(-\log\beta, 1)e^{-c\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}p(y, \Sigma_1)\right)e^{-\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}\zeta_1(y)}$$

for $\overline{\rho}_1(y) = N\rho_1(N^{1/\mathsf{d}}y)$ the 1-point function density of Y_N, i.e. N times the marginal probability density of y_1. The effective confining potential ζ_1 is written in macroscopic coordinates as in (1.5). Corresponding to Corollary 1.1, we have for all N large enough and $\beta \leq \beta_0$ fixed that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,N\}}\mathrm{dist}(y_i, \Sigma_1) \geq \frac{c_V^{-1/2}}{N^{1/\mathsf{d}}}\sqrt{C + \frac{\log N + t}{\beta}}\right) \leq e^{-t} \quad \forall t \leq \log N \tag{1.18}$$

so long as $\beta_N \gg N^{-2/\mathsf{d}} \log N$ as $N \to \infty$, where c_V is the constant from (1.17) and $C > 0$ depends on V.

Our Theorem 3 and Corollary 1.1 have a direct precedent in the literature. In [Ame21, Theorem 1], Ameur works in $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and proves (under a similarly general but not identical set of assumptions)

$$\rho_1 \leq C^\beta N e^{-\beta\zeta} \tag{1.19}$$

for any $\beta > 0$ and for a V_1 dependent constant C. Actually, Ameur presents a modified version of (1.19) by applying growth estimates for ζ near the droplet boundary. Theorem 3 strengthens (1.19) by removing the factor of N and extending the result to $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. [Ame21, Theorem 2] also proves a version of Corollary 1.1 in $\mathsf{d} = 2$ which effectively matches (1.18), so our contribution is mainly the $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ extension. Finally, [AT24] examines the case in which V_1 is a Hele-Shaw potential and $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and combines isotropic averaging and weighted polynomial techniques to give a result similar to (1.19) but with constants with explicit potential dependence. It also proves an interesting Lipschitz estimate for ρ_1.

Working in all $\mathsf{d} \geq 2$, the bounds of [CHM18, Theorem 1.12], which work with the inverse temperature parameter $\widetilde{\beta} = N^{1-2/\mathsf{d}}\beta$, give that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is contained within a ball of radius $RN^{1\mathsf{d}}$ with probability $e^{-cNV_1(R)}$ for all $R \geq R_0$ with V_1 and $\widetilde{\beta}$ dependent constants c and R_0, though we expect their proof can be used to achieve a similar bound as we give in Lemma 4.4, as both follow similar ideas. In the proof of Theorem 3, we will need a similar bound in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ except with the (expected) optimal constant c for large R, which takes new techniques. This is the only explicit previous result on confinement for $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ beyond classical estimates. Some previous estimates on linear statistics give that $N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x_i}$ is close to $\mu_{\infty,1}$ in certain senses, but none are sensitive enough to single particles to effectively estimate $\max_i \mathrm{dist}(x_i, \Sigma)$ and none apply on microscopic scales near $\partial\Sigma$.

In the case of quadratic $V_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, $\mathsf{d} = 2$, and $\beta = 2$, the Coulomb gas corresponds to the Ginibre ensemble from random matrix theory, and much more is known about the gas confinement due to determinantal structure. In particular, [Rid03] proves that we have a precise approximation in law:

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,N} |x_i| \approx \sqrt{N} + \frac{\sqrt{\log N - 2\log\log N - \log 2\pi}}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log N - 2\log\log N - \log 2\pi}} G$$

as $N \to \infty$ for a standard Gumbel random variable G. Since $\Sigma = \overline{B_{\sqrt{N}}(0)}$, this estimate also gives the approximate law of the maximal distance from the droplet. Similarly detailed results are given with a certain class of radially symmetric potentials, but still with $\mathsf{d} = \beta = 2$, in [CP14].

Our result allows us to obtain a less detailed upper bound for $V_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, $\mathsf{d} = 2$, and general β by working directly from (1.16) with the explicit form of $\zeta_1(x) = V_1(x) - \log|x| - 1/2$. We omit the proof as it is simply bounding (1.16) using a first order Taylor approximation to $\zeta(x)$ just outside Σ. The result below gives the expected order of $\max_i |x_i|$ at $\beta = 2$ up to the submicroscopic length scale $\sqrt{\frac{\log\log N}{\log N}}$, and similar calculations can easily give results for $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ or small β.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and $V_1(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, and let $\beta > 0$ be fixed with N. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i=1,\ldots,N} |x_i| \geq \sqrt{N} + \sqrt{\frac{\log N - \log\log N + 2t}{2\beta}}\right) \leq C e^{-t} \tag{1.20}$$

for all N large enough and $t \leq \log N$. Here C depends on β.

Remark 1.4. To obtain the correct coefficient for the $\sqrt{\log \log N}$ term in (1.20), the inequality (1.16) is insufficient. One possible explanation is that actually ρ_1 satisfies a slightly stronger inequality than (1.14) in this case, which heuristic arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 4.4 suggest.

Theorem 2 implies the law of (recentered versions of) $\mathbf{X}_N$, $N \geq 1$, are uniformly tight in N. Such a result was previously only known for β uniformly bounded away from 0 [AS21, Tho24]. Theorem 1 (and its conditional one-point function version) implies that the k-point function of any limit point $\mathbf{X}$ is subharmonic in each variable if $\beta \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. Since the limiting k-point function is bounded, it is therefore constant if $\mathsf{d} = 2$. Some further arguments allow us to prove the following.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathsf{d} = 2$, and let $\mathbf{X}$ be a weak limit point of the recentered point process*

$$\tau_{x_N^*} \mathbf{X}_N = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{x_i - x_N^*}$$

under $\mathbb{P}_{N,\beta}^V$, $N \geq 1$, for a sequence x_N^* with $\sup_N N^{-1/2}|x_N^*| < \infty$ and $\beta_N \to 0$. Then the law of $M_R := (\pi R^2)^{-1}\mathbf{X}(B_R(0))$ has a weak limit μ as $R \to \infty$, and $\mathbf{X}$ is a mixed Poisson point process of homogeneous intensity m with $m \sim \mu$. In particular, if there is a sequence $R_n \to \infty$ with

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbf{X}(B_{R_n}(0))}{\pi R_n^2} = m_0 \tag{1.21}$$

in probability, for some constant $m_0 \geq 0$, then $\mathbf{X}$ is a homogeneous Poisson point process of intensity m_0.

There are several previous results for limit points of microscopic point processes or related objects of (general) Coulomb gases. The first category of results involves "averaging" the point process $\mathbf{X}_N$ over centering points x_N^* in a cube much larger than ρ_β in length, where $\rho_\beta \geq \beta^{-1/2}$ is a certain rigidity length scale, forming the "(tagged) empirical process." These empirical processes satisfy a large deviation principle with a rate function of the form

$$\mathbf{X} \mapsto \text{RelEnt}(\mathbf{X}) + \frac{\beta}{2}\text{W}_{\text{Coul}}(\mathbf{X}) - \text{constant} \tag{1.22}$$

where RelEnt is the entropy relative to a homogeneous Poisson process of an explicit intensity and W_{Coul} is a jellium renormalized Coulomb energy. This result was proved for fixed β (and including certain Riesz gases) in [LS17], and extended to include $\beta_N \to 0$ in [AS21] (see also an intermediate work [Leb17]). In particular, it is known that the empirical process becomes Poissonian in the high temperature limit, which is not sufficient to conclude that the microscopic point process is asymptotically Poissonian for any specific centering points. It is also known that if one takes a $\beta \to 0$ limit of minimizers of (1.22), then one obtains a Poisson process [Leb16]. See also [PG23] for a similar result in the high temperature (mean field) regime with more general interactions g.

In two recent breakthroughs [Leb23, Leb24], Leblé proved that if $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and $\beta > 0$ is fixed, then limit points of the microscopic point processes $\mathbf{X}_N$ are hyperuniform, satisfy canonical DLR equations, and are translation invariant. It is still an open question whether limit points are unique up to their average particle density, though of course Theorem 4 answers this question in the infinite temperature case, as well as proving translation invariance and

DLR formalism (which are trivial for mixed Poisson processes). By comparison to the infinite temperature case, limit points with $\inf_N \beta_N > 0$ are rich in structure and require delicate techniques to study.

A unique feature of Theorem 4 is that applies to $\beta_N \to 0$ at arbitrarily slow speeds and without averaging over centering points. Furthermore, the powerful estimates of [Ser20], critical for the analysis in [Leb23, Leb24], are unavailable on microscopic scales in this regime. Remarkably, the proof of Theorem 4 is quite short and almost entirely avoids delicate computations, instead relying on the classical Liouville's theorem to do the heavy lifting (which also restricts it to $\mathsf{d} = 2$, though we can give significant information in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ as well).

If we instead demand that $\beta_N \to 0$ at a fast enough rate, specifically the "mean-field" regime $N\beta_N^{2/\mathsf{d}} \to \gamma$ for some $\gamma \geq 0$, then Lambert proves that $\mathbf{X}_N$ converges as $N \to \infty$ to a Poisson process of explicit intensity for a wide range of interactions g and any $\mathsf{d} \geq 1$, including the Coulomb kernel in $\mathsf{d} \geq 2$ [Lam21]. The author also analyzes the edge behavior of the Coulomb gas (and others) in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ for certain radial potentials, proving convergence to inhomegeneous Poisson processes when the centering point is on the boundary of Σ, which in particular provides very precise versions of Corollary 1.1 in this high temperature case.

The fast decay of β_N allows the proofs of [Lam21] to treat interaction terms that appear in computations of ρ_k as their macroscopic space averages. Following a related proof structure, [PGPT24] is able to prove converges to a Poisson processe for the wider range of temperatures $N^{-1} \ll \beta_N \ll N^{-1/2}$, e.g. beyond the mean field regime, but with a restricted class of g that does not include the Coulomb kernel. When $\beta_N \to 0$ at a very slow speed, we are in a tricky spot where β_N is not small enough to use techniques from [Lam21], for which factors of β mollify error terms, nor large enough to use estimates from [Ser20], which apply above a rigidity length scale $\geq \beta^{-1/2}$.

Finally, for the two-component Coulomb gas, in which $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and there are two species of oppositely charged particles, there has been progress on the empirical and microscopic point processes, which exhibit interesting phenomenon such as dipole formation. In particular, [LSZ17] proves an LDP for the empirical fields after averaging over the macroscopic domain when $\beta < 2$ (bounded away from 0), and recently [BS24] examined the interesting process of dipole formation for general β.

1.3. **Paper organization and future directions.** The technical core of the paper is in Section 2, where we prove several quite general inequalities using the isotropic averaging method, including Theorem 1. In Section 3, we apply these methods to prove the particle density upper bound Theorem 2 and the high temperature result Theorem 4. Section 4 proves our confinement estimates Theorem 3 and Corollary 1.1. As mentioned previously, with the maximum principle from Theorem 1 and the density bound within Σ from Theorem 2, the main task of Section 4 becomes proving an estimate for $\limsup_{|x|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta} \rho_1(x)$, which is done in Proposition 4.1. The proof of that proposition is relatively straightforward in $\mathsf{d} = 2$, but takes a novel "squeezing" argument in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ which relies on delicate isotropic averaging estimates for particle repulsion; see Subsection 4.5 for this new technique.

Isotropic averaging techniques, and their consequences, have now found a handful of applications, for which they are flexible and lead to relatively short proofs. We expect results of this paper to be useful in future research, particularly we believe the extension of particle density bounds and k-point function bounds to the high temperature regime will be useful technical tools in future works.

We highlight the potential usefulness of the "squeezing" argument in Subsection 4.5, which is somewhat reminiscent of the "mimicry" technique used in [Tho24, Tho23]. A key advantage is that this new argument leads to transport costs that recombine with the Coulomb energy (1.2). These costs can therefore be estimated by ratios of partition functions with varying temperature, for which results in the literature are readily available. We expect one could go further with this technique by for instance estimating the distribution of electric potential energy of individual particles in the gas. The maximum of the electric potential energy has recently received attention in [LLZ24, Pei24].

Lastly, our results leave many interesting related open problems. For our confinement estimate, the microscopic behavior of ρ_1 near the boundary of the gas is very interesting, as it is expected to exhibit oscillations and a squeezing effect; see [CSA20, CSA24]. Our results fall short of describing these phenomena besides for establishing decay of ρ_1 at microscopic distances from the droplet edge; this strong confinement effect at the edge is expected to result in a boundary layer of frozen particles. It would also be interesting to have corresponding lower bounds for Corollary 1.1.

For Theorem 4, we expect that all infinite temperature limit points of $\tau_{x_N^*} \mathbf{X}_N$ are Poisson processes of constant intensity $\mu_{\theta_\infty,1}(x_\infty^*)$ when $N^{2/\mathsf{d}}\beta_N \to \theta_\infty \in (2,\infty]$ and $x_\infty^* = \lim_{N\to\infty} N^{-1/\mathsf{d}} x_N^*$ (see Subsection 4.3 for the definition of $\mu_{\theta,1}$), and we expect a similar result to also hold in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. In $\mathsf{d} = 2$, the remaining task is to estimate $\mathbf{X}_N(B_R)/R^2$ for R a fixed large number as $N \to \infty$ and $\beta_N \to 0$. This task is accomplished at $R = R_N = \beta_N^{-1/2}|\log \beta_N|^{1/2}$ in [AS21], and if similar results were known at any sequence $R_N \ll \beta_N^{-1/2}$, then a quantitative form of Liouville's theorem and Theorem 1 would be sufficient to conclude.

2. A MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR THE COULOMB GAS

We begin with the *electric splitting formula*, which is a rewriting of $\mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N)$ which brings the equilibrium measure to the forefront. It uses the jellium energy F which we first define.

Definition 2.1. The jellium energy F of points X_N on a background measure μ of bounded Lebesgue density is defined by

$$\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu) = \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d} \times \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d} \setminus \Delta} \mathsf{g}(x - y) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i} - \mu \right)^{\otimes 2} (dx, dy), \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Delta = \{(x,x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}\}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Recall the (scaled) equilibrium measure $\mu_\infty = \mu_{\infty,N}$ and effective confining potential ζ. We have*

$$\mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) = \mathsf{E}(\mu_\infty, V) + \mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty) + \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta(x_i) \tag{2.2}$$

where $\mathsf{E}(\mu, V) = \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d} \times \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu^{\otimes 2}(dx, dy) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)\mu(dx)$ is the electrostatic self-energy of μ. In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(dX_N) \propto e^{-\beta \mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty) - \beta \sum_{i=1}^N \zeta(x_i)} dX_N.$$

Proof. The proof is standard (e.g. [Ser24, Lemma 5.1]), but we repeat it in our notation. By expanding $(\sum_i \delta_{x_i} - \mu_\infty)^{\otimes 2}$, one has

$$\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty) = \mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) + \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_\infty^{\otimes 2}(dx, dy) - \sum_{i=1}^N V(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathsf{g}(x_i - y)\mu_\infty(dy)$$

(2.3)

$$= \mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) - \mathsf{E}(\mu_\infty, V)$$
$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i} - \mu_\infty\right)(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i} - \mu_\infty\right)(dx)\mu_\infty(dy).$$

By (1.8), there is a constant c such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathsf{g}(x_i - y)\mu_\infty(dy) + V - c = \zeta(x_i).$$

It follows that the two terms in the last line of (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\zeta(x) + c)\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i} - \mu_\infty\right)(dx) = -\sum_{i=1}^N \zeta(x_i),$$

where the last equality used that $\zeta = 0$ q.e. within $\Sigma = \operatorname{supp}\mu_\infty$ and $\mu_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) = N$. Rearranging terms completes the proof. $\qquad\square$

We now define *isotropic averaging* operators and examine their effect on the energy $\mathsf{F}(\cdot, \mu_\infty)$.

Definition 2.3. For an open, bounded set $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $\mathrm{Iso}_\omega : C^0(\partial\omega) \to C^0(\overline{\omega})$ be the solution of the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta(\mathrm{Iso}_\omega f)(x) = 0 & x \in \omega \\ \mathrm{Iso}_\omega f(x) = f(x) & x \in \partial\omega. \end{cases}$$

(2.4)

We assume that ω is regular enough that the solution to the above problem is unique. We extend Iso_ω to measurable functions with continuous negative parts by monotonicity.

We furthermore assume that ω has a harmonic measure $\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, \cdot)$, $x \in \omega$, that is absolutely continuous with respect to $(d-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathsf{Haus}_{\partial\omega}$ restricted to $\partial\omega$, and we denote its density also by $\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, \cdot)$. We can then write

$$(\mathrm{Iso}_\omega f)(x) = \int_{\partial\omega} f(y)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, dy).$$

By convention, we take $\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, \cdot)$ to be the Dirac mass at x if $x \notin \omega$. In this way, we consider Iso_ω to act on functions of X_N that have continuous negative parts by specifying the index of the variable on which it operates, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,i} f(X_N) = \int_{\partial\omega} f(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_N)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x_i, dy).$$

Note that $\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,i} f(X_N) = f(X_N)$ for $x_i \notin \omega$ by our convention. For index sets $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we let $\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,\mathcal{I}} = \otimes_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,i}$, which is also, by the above notation convention, the functional composition of each $\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,i}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, in any order.

Proposition 2.4. *For any (nonnegative) bounded measure μ, one has*

$$\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu) = \mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu) - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\sum_{j\neq i}\delta_{x_j}-\mu}(x_i), \tag{2.5}$$

where we define the Dirichlet electrostatic potential in ω generated by a signed measure ν with either bounded negative part or bounded positive part by

$$\mathsf{h}_\omega^\nu(x) := \int_\omega \mathsf{g}_\omega(x,y)\nu(dy), \tag{2.6}$$

and $\frac{1}{\mathsf{c_d}}\mathsf{g}_\omega$ is the Dirichlet Green's function of $-\Delta$ in ω. In particular, since g_ω is nonnegative, we have

$$\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu) \leq \mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{h}_\omega^\mu(x_i). \tag{2.7}$$

Finally, one has

$$\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) = \mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\sum_{j\neq i}\delta_{x_j}-\mathsf{c_d}^{-1}\Delta V}(x_i) \leq \mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mathsf{c_d}^{-1}\Delta V}(x_i). \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. It is enough to consider $\mathcal{I} = \{1\}$ and $x_1 \in \omega$. The energy $\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu)$ can be written as a function of $(x_i)_{i\neq 1}$ plus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathsf{g}(x_1 - y)\left(\sum_{i=2}^N \delta_{x_i} - \mu_\infty\right)(dy).$$

It is clear then that the RHS of (2.5) solves (2.4) for $f(x_1) = \mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu)$. Similarly, one can check that the middle term of (2.8) solves (2.4) for $f(x_1) = \mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N)$. $\qquad\square$

Next, we compute the adjoint of Iso_ω.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $F:\omega\to\mathbb{R}$ and $G:\partial\omega\to\mathbb{R}$ be nonnegative and measurable. Then*

$$\int_\omega F(x)(\mathrm{Iso}_\omega G)(x)dx = \int_{\partial\omega}(\mathrm{Iso}_\omega^* F)(x)G(x)\mathsf{Haus}_{\partial\omega}(dx)$$

where

$$\mathrm{Iso}_\omega^* F(x) = \int_\omega F(y)\mathsf{p}_\omega(y,x)dy.$$

Proof. This is a direct application of Tonelli's theorem using the characterization of Iso_ω in terms of harmonic measure. $\qquad\square$

We are now ready for the central technical result of the paper. For this, define the conditional 1-point function $\rho_1(y|y_2,\ldots,y_k)$ as a properly rescaled Lebesgue density of the regular conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(x_1\in dy|x_2=y_2,\ldots,x_k=y_k)$, i.e. this solves

$$\rho_k(y,y_2,\ldots,y_k) = \rho_{k-1}(y_2,\ldots,y_k)\rho_1(y|y_2,\ldots,y_k) \quad y\text{-a.e.} \tag{2.9}$$

almost surely with $(y_2,\ldots,y_k)$ drawn from the $(k-1)$-particle marginal of the Coulomb gas.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\widetilde{\rho}_1(x) = \rho_1(x|y_2,\ldots,y_k)$, and recall the Dirichlet electrostatic potential $\mathsf{h}_\omega^\cdot$ from (2.6). Then a.s. with $(y_2,\ldots,y_k)$ drawn from the $(k-1)$-particle marginal of the Coulomb gas, we have for $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ a.e. that*

$$\widetilde{\rho}_1(x) \leq \exp\left(\beta\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mathsf{c_d}^{-1}\Delta V-\sum_{i=2}^k\delta_{y_k}}(x)\right)\int_{\partial\omega}\widetilde{\rho}_1(z)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,dz), \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\widetilde{\rho}_1(x) \le \exp\left(\beta\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mu_\infty-\sum_{i=2}^k \delta_{y_k}}(x)\right)\int_{\partial\omega} e^{\beta\zeta(z)}\widetilde{\rho}_1(z)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,dz). \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. First we prove (2.11). The $x \notin \omega$ case is trivial, so we assume $x \in \omega$. Let $r > 0$ be small enough that $B_{2r}(x) \subset \omega$, and let $M_r = \sup_{y\in B_r(x)} \mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mu_\infty-\sum_{i=2}^k \delta_{y_i}}(y)$. For any $(x_2,\ldots,x_N)$ we have by (2.5) that

$$\int_{B_r(x)} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)-\beta\zeta(x_1)}dx_1 \le e^{\beta M_r}\int_{B_r(x)} e^{-\beta(\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,1}\mathsf{F})(X_N,\mu_\infty)-\beta\zeta(x_1)}dx_1 \tag{2.12}$$

$$\le e^{\beta M_r}\int_{B_r(x)}\left(\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,1}e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(\cdot,x_2,\ldots,x_N,\mu_\infty)}\right)(x_1)e^{-\beta\zeta(x_1)}dx_1$$

$$= e^{\beta M_r}\int_{\partial\omega} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)}\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,1}^*\left(e^{-\beta\zeta}\mathbf{1}_{B_r(x)}\right)(x_1)\mathsf{Haus}_{\partial\omega}(dx_1),$$

where we applied Jensen's inequality in the second to last line, using that $\mathsf{p}_\omega(x_1,\cdot)$ is a probability measure for each $x_1 \in \omega$.

Using Proposition 2.5 we compute

$$\mathrm{Iso}_{\omega,1}^*\left(e^{-\beta\zeta}\mathbf{1}_{B_r(x)}\right)(x_1) = \int_{B_r(x)} \mathsf{p}_\omega(y,x_1)e^{-\beta\zeta(y)}dy =: J_r(x_1)e^{-\beta\zeta(x)}\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,x_1),$$

defining $J_r(x_1)$ accordingly. We have proved

$$\int_{B_r(x)} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)-\beta\zeta(x_1)}dx_1 \tag{2.13}$$

$$\le e^{\beta M_r-\beta\zeta(x)}\int_{\partial\omega} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)}J_r(x_1)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,dx_1).$$

We can then integrate against $e^{-\beta\sum_{i=2}^N \zeta(x_i)}dx_{k+1}\cdots dx_N$, set $(x_2,\ldots,x_k) = (y_2,\ldots,y_k)$, and divide by a normalizing factor to see (note the normalization $\int\widetilde{\rho}_1 = N-k+1$):

$$\mathbb{P}\left(x_1 \in B_r(x)|y_2,\ldots,y_k\right) \le \frac{e^{\beta M_r-\beta\zeta(x)}}{N-k+1}\int_{\partial\omega} J_r(z)e^{\beta\zeta(z)}\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,z)\widetilde{\rho}_1(z)dz. \tag{2.14}$$

We will now take $r \to 0$. Clearly M_r decreases to $\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mu_\infty-\sum_{i=2}^k \delta_{y_i}}(x)$ as $r \to 0$, and we have

$$\frac{J_r(z)}{|B_r(z)|} = \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|}\int_{B_r(x)} \frac{\mathsf{p}_\omega(y,z)e^{-\beta\zeta(y)}}{\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,z)e^{-\beta\zeta(x)}}dy. \tag{2.15}$$

The integrand on the RHS converges uniformly to 1 as $y \to x$ by continuity of ζ and of $\mathsf{p}_\omega(\cdot,z)$. Indeed, ζ inherits the regularity of V and $\mathsf{p}_\omega(\cdot,z)$ satisfies a Harnack inequality, uniformly in $z \in \partial\omega$, on $B_{R/2}(x)$ for $R = \mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\omega)$. We thus see that $J_r(z)/|B_r(z)| \to 1$ as $r \to 0$, and also that the quantity in (2.15) is uniformly bounded for $r \to 0$ and $z \in \partial\omega$. We may then conclude that

$$\widetilde{\rho}_1(x) \le \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{(N-k+1)\mathbb{P}\left(x_1 \in B_r(x)|y_2,\ldots,y_k\right)}{|B_r(x)|} \tag{2.16}$$

$$\le e^{\beta\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mu_\infty-\sum_{i=2}^k \delta_{y_i}}(x)-\beta\zeta(x)}\int_{\partial\omega} e^{\beta N\zeta(z)}\widetilde{\rho}_1(z)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x,dz),$$

finishing the proof of (2.11).

The justification of (2.10) is similar, except we instead use (2.8) in place of (2.5). The proof otherwise corresponds directly with $\mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N)$ taking the role of $\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty)$ and 0 taking the role of ζ. $\square$

Remark 2.7. It is interesting to compare our method to that of the previous best localization estimate of Ameur [Ame21]. For Ameur, a key fact is that in $\mathsf{d} = 2$ there are random weighted polynomials $P = P_{X_N}$ on $\mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\mathbb{E}P(z) = \rho_1(z)$, roughly speaking. These polynomials are of the form $qe^{-\beta N V_1}$ for a holomorphic polynomial q of degree $N-1$, and they satisfy a maximum principle for each fixed configuration X_N. This naturally leads to the need to control the quantity $\mathbb{E}\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_1)}$, since the L^∞ norm appears in each configuration-wise application of the maximum principle.

Proposition 2.6 can be viewed as a stochastic version of the well-known maximum principle for weighted polynomials (written in a mean value inequality form). That is, the maximum principle comes after the expectation, and we are lead to control quantities like $\|\mathbb{E}P\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_1)}$ rather than $\mathbb{E}\|P\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma_1)}$. This form will allow us to save a factor of N in our ρ_1 estimate and extend results to $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. We also obtain more information due to the precise spatial dependencies detailed within Proposition 2.6 as compared to a maximum principle.

Remark 2.8. The error $\omega \mapsto \mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mu_\infty}$ and its dependence on ω in Proposition 2.4 has interesting properties due to its connection with Brownian motion and its strong Markov property. For instance, one can show that the order of $\mathsf{h}_\omega^{\mu_\infty}$ is $O(r^2)$ whenever ω is a set with "thickness" of order r, formalized as: Brownian motion, regardless of starting point, exits ω within time r^2 with probability at least some uniform $\delta > 0$. This raises the possibility of applying Proposition 2.4 to sets ω with large aspect ratios. One can also let ω be random and $\{x_i : i \notin \mathcal{I}\}$ measurable.

3. Microscopic point process

In this section, we prove that weak limit points of (translates of) $\mathbf{X}_N = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$ under the Coulomb gas exist as $N \to \infty$. To do so, it is sufficient to prove that the law of $\mathbf{X}_N(B_R(x))$ is tight uniformly in N (by the compactness criterion [DVJ08, Theorem 11.1.VI]) for all $R > 0$. Such a result is known if $\inf_N \beta_N > 0$ by [AS21, Theorem 1] or [Tho24, Theorem 1]. In the high temperature regime, it is known from these results that if $R = R_N \geq \beta_N^{-1/2}$ then the law of $R^{-\mathsf{d}}\mathbf{X}_N(B_R(x))$ is uniformly tight in N, so the task is to extend this result down to smaller scales. This is done by Theorem 2, proved in Subsection 3.1 where we also conclude an upper bound on the k-point function that shows particle repulsion effects even in the high temperature regime.

In Subsection 3.2, we study limits of $\mathbf{X}_N$ when $\beta_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, proving Theorem 4.

3.1. **Density upper bounds.** We will now seek to bound pointwise ρ_1 (and ρ_k). Our main focus will be bounds within Σ, where the bounds will be of the correct order, but the structure of V_1 will come into the argument solely through the quantity
$$\mathcal{M}_x = \|\max(\Delta V_1, 0)\|_{L^\infty(B_1(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x))}.$$
It is also helpful to define the smaller quantity
$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_x = \|\max(\Delta V_1, 0)\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{1}{100}}(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x))}. \tag{3.1}$$

The following result shows that the particle density is controlled on balls of radius $\max(\beta^{-1/2}, 1)$.

Theorem 5 ([Tho24], Theorem 1)**.** *For any $R \geq 1$, integer $\lambda \geq 100$, and integer Q satisfying*

$$Q \geq \begin{cases} \frac{C\lambda^2 R^2 + C\beta^{-1}}{\log(\frac{1}{4}\lambda)} & \text{if } \mathsf{d} = 2, \\ CR^{\mathsf{d}} + C\beta^{-1}R^{\mathsf{d}-2} & \text{if } \mathsf{d} \geq 3, \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}^V_{N,\beta}(\mathbf{X}_N(B_R(x)) \geq Q) \leq \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta \log(\frac{1}{4}\lambda)Q^2 + C(1+\beta\lambda^2 R^2)Q} & \text{if } \mathsf{d} = 2, \\ e^{-2^{-\mathsf{d}}\beta R^{-\mathsf{d}+2}Q(Q-1)} & \text{if } \mathsf{d} \geq 3. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

The constant C depends only on $\mathcal{M}_x$ and d. The same result holds (with the same constant) if we add an arbitrary perturbation to V which is superharmonic in each x_i; see [Tho24] for details.

We also have the isotropic averaging result which follows directly from Proposition 2.6. It allows estimates for the k-point function to be proved by appeal to estimates at a larger scale r, with a bounded associated cost if $r = O(\beta^{-1/2})$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $r > 0$. Define*

$$\mathcal{F}(y_1, \ldots, y_k; r) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \max(0, \mathsf{g}(y_i - y_j) - \mathsf{g}(r/2)).$$

One has

$$\rho_k(y_1, \ldots, y_k) \tag{3.4}$$
$$\leq C^k r^{-\mathsf{d}k} e^{-\beta\mathcal{F}(y_1,\ldots,y_k;r) + C\beta r^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{y_i}} \int_{B_r(y_1) \times B_r(y_2) \times \cdots \times B_r(y_k)} \rho_k(z_1, \ldots, z_k) dz_1 \cdots dz_k$$

for a dimensional constant C. In particular, for $4s \leq r \leq N^{1/\mathsf{d}}/200$ one has

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\binom{\mathbf{X}_N(B_s(y))}{k}\right] \leq C^k e^{-\beta\binom{k}{2}(\mathsf{g}(2s) - \mathsf{g}(r/2)) + C\beta kr^2 \mathcal{M}_y} \left(\frac{s}{r}\right)^{\mathsf{d}k} \mathbb{E}\left[\binom{\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(y))}{k}\right]. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By iteration, to prove (3.4) it will be enough to prove

$$\widetilde{\rho}_1(y_1) \leq Cr^{-\mathsf{d}} e^A \int_{B_r(y_1)} \widetilde{\rho}_1(z) dz \tag{3.6}$$

for $A := C\beta r^2 \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{y_1} - \beta \sum_{j=2}^k \max(0, \mathsf{g}(y_1 - y_j) - \mathsf{g}(r/2))$ and where $\widetilde{\rho}_1$ is the one-point function of the Coulomb gas conditioned on $y_2, \ldots, y_k$ (as in Proposition 2.6).

This estimate follows from Proposition 2.6 with $\omega_s = B_s(y_1)$, $\frac{r}{2} \leq s \leq r$. Indeed, using the well-known explicit formula for $\mathsf{g}_{\omega_s}(y_1, \cdot)$, one can estimate

$$\mathsf{h}_{\omega_s}^{\mathsf{c}_{\mathsf{d}}^{-1}\Delta V}(y_1) \leq C\|\max(\Delta V, 0)\|_{L^\infty(B_s(y_1))} s^2 \leq C\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{y_1} r^2,$$

and

$$\mathsf{h}_{\omega_s}^{\delta_{y_j}}(y_1) = \mathsf{g}_{\omega_s}(y_1, y_j) \geq \max(\mathsf{g}(y_1 - y_j) - \mathsf{g}(r/2), 0).$$

It follows from (2.10) that

$$\widetilde{\rho}_1(y_1) \leq Cs^{-\mathsf{d}+1} e^A \int_{\partial B_s(y_1)} \widetilde{\rho}_1(z) \mathsf{Haus}_{\partial B_s(y_1)}(dz).$$

Integrating against $s^{\mathsf{d}-1}ds$ for $s \in [r/2, r]$ shows

$$\widetilde{\rho}_1(y) \leq Cr^{-\mathsf{d}}e^A \int_{B_r(y_1)\backslash B_{r/2}(y_1)} \widetilde{\rho}_1(z)dz$$

which implies (3.6).

Equation (3.5) follows from integration of (3.4) (with r replaced by $r-s$) over $(B_s(y))^k$. The expectations of the binomial terms in (3.5) is what the k-fold integration of the k-point function computes, up to a combinatorial factor, and one estimates

$$\int_{B_s(y)^k} \int_{B_{r-s}(y_1)\times\cdots\times B_{r-s}(y_k)} \rho_k(z_1,\ldots,z_k)dz_1\cdots dz_k dy_1\cdots dy_k$$

$$\leq C^k s^{\mathsf{d}k} \int_{B_r(y)^k} \rho_k(z_1,\ldots,z_k)dz_1\cdots dz_k.$$

Furthermore, we clearly have for all $(y_1,\ldots,y_k) \in (B_s(y))^k$ that $\sum_{i=1}^k \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{y_i} \leq k\mathcal{M}_y$, and

$$\mathcal{F}(y_1,\ldots,y_k;r) \geq \binom{k}{2}(\mathsf{g}(2s) - \mathsf{g}(r/2))$$

since $|y_i - y_j| \leq 2s$. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 2. We will bound the exponential moments of $\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))$. Let $R = \max(\beta^{-1/2}, 3)$. We allow implicit constants C to depend continuously on γ and $\mathcal{M}_x$ below, but they are independent of β.

We first work in the case that $r \geq R/3 \geq 1$. By Theorem 5 and some routine estimates, there exists $\lambda > 0$ (uniform in r) such that for any integer Q with $\frac{Q}{r^{\mathsf{d}}} \geq C$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x)) \geq Q) \leq e^{-9\lambda\beta r^{-d+2}Q^2} \leq e^{-\lambda\frac{Q^2}{r^{\mathsf{d}}}}. \tag{3.7}$$

By summation by parts, we compute for any $\gamma > 0$ that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right] = 1 + (1 - e^{-\gamma})\sum_{Q=1}^{\infty} e^{\gamma Q}\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x)) \geq Q)$$

$$\leq 1 + Cr^{\mathsf{d}}e^{C\gamma r^{\mathsf{d}}} + \sum_{Q=\lceil Cr^{\mathsf{d}}\rceil}^{\infty} e^{\gamma Q - \lambda\frac{Q^2}{r^{\mathsf{d}}}}.$$

If we choose C large enough based on $\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}$, one can bound the rightmost sum above by

$$\sum_{Q=\lceil Cr^{\mathsf{d}}\rceil}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda Q} \leq C.$$

If $\gamma \geq 1$ (and since $r \geq 1$), we conclude $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right] \leq e^{C\gamma r^{\mathsf{d}}}$. If $\gamma < 1$, we use Jensen's inequality to see

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right]^{\gamma} \leq e^{C\gamma r^{\mathsf{d}}}.$$

We now handle the case $r < R/3$. By (3.5) and the formula $e^{\gamma n} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(e^{\gamma} - 1)^k \binom{n}{k}$ for any nonnegative integer n, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma \mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(e^{\gamma} - 1)^k \mathbb{E}\left[\binom{\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}{k}\right] \tag{3.8}$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(C(e^{\gamma} - 1)e^{C\beta R^2 \mathcal{M}_x}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\mathsf{d}}\right)^k \mathbb{E}\left[\binom{\mathbf{X}_N(B_R(x))}{k}\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{m_{\gamma,r,R}\mathbf{X}_N(B_R(x))}\right],$$

for

$$m_{\gamma,r,R} = \log\left(1 + C(e^{\gamma} - 1)e^{C\beta R^2 \mathcal{M}_x}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\mathsf{d}}\right) \leq C^{1+\beta}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\mathsf{d}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Using the $r \geq R/3$ case, we can bound

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma \mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{C^{1+\beta}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\mathsf{d}}\mathbf{X}_N(B_R(x))}\right] \leq e^{C^{1+\beta}r^{\mathsf{d}}},$$

which gives the desired upper bound for $\gamma \geq 1$. For $\gamma < 1$, we can use Jensen's inequality as earlier in the proof. $\square$

An easy consequence of Theorem 2 is a bound on the one point function.

Corollary 3.2. *One has $\rho_1(x) \leq C^{1+\beta}$ where C depends only on $\mathcal{M}_x$.*

Proof. Theorem 2 shows the existence of C, dependent only on $\mathcal{M}_x$ such that

$$\limsup_{r \to 0^+} r^{-\mathsf{d}}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))\right] \leq \limsup_{r \to 0^+} r^{-\mathsf{d}}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))) - 1\right] \leq C^{1+\beta}.$$

$\square$

Remark 3.3. A variety of results from [Tho24], including bounds for ρ_k, particle clusters, and minimal interparticle distances, can be extended to high temperature regimes by using Theorem 2 (typically with $r = 1$) in place of Theorem 5 in various places within the proofs.

3.2. **High temperature limit points.** With Theorem 2 in hand, we can prove that limit points of the law of $\mathbf{X}_N$ exist in a certain sense even if $\beta_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. These high temperature limit points inherit versions of Proposition 2.6 obtained by formally setting $\beta = 0$. In $\mathsf{d} = 2$, we can exploit the structure of bounded subharmonic functions (i.e. constants) to give a rigid structure to the possible limit points.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\beta_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, and let $x_N^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$, $N \geq 1$, be a sequence with $N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x_N^*$ bounded. Then the laws of $\tau_{x_N^*}\mathbf{X}_N$ under $\mathbb{P}_{N,\beta_N}^V$, $N \geq 1$, are tight under the weak topology on point processes. Limit points $\mathbf{X}$ are such that $\mathbf{X}(B_r(y))$ has a finite moment generating function with*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma \mathbf{X}(B_r(y))}\right] \leq e^{C\gamma r^{\mathsf{d}}}. \tag{3.10}$$

uniformly over $r > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$, and γ in a compact interval. The k-point correlation function ρ_k of $\mathbf{X}$ is in $L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})$ and is subharmonic in each variable, in the sense that

$$x \mapsto \int_{A_1 \times \cdots \times A_k} \rho_k(y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}, y_i + x, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_k)dy_1 \cdots dy_k \tag{3.11}$$

is a continuous subharmonic function for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$ *and any bounded open sets* $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ *with Lebesgue measure* 0 *boundaries.*

Proof. We note that boundedness of $N^{-1/\mathsf{d}} x_N^*$ (and thus $\mathcal{M}_{x_n^*, N}$) allows us to apply Theorem 2 to show that

$$\limsup_{N \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\gamma \tau_{x_N^*} \mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))} \right] \le e^{C\gamma r^{\mathsf{d}}}$$

for a constant C uniform in $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $r > 0$ and bounded γ. Tightness of the law of $\tau_{x_N^*} \mathbf{X}_N$ then follows from the tightness criterion from [DVJ08, Theorem 11.1.VI]. In particular, along appropriate subsequences the law of $\tau_{x_N^*} \mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x))$ converges, and so (3.10) holds for any limit point. The L^∞ bound for ρ_k for limit points follows from this argument as well in a way similar to Corollary 3.2.

We now prove the subharmonicity property (3.11), where it will be sufficient to consider $i = 1$. Let q be the function in (3.11), and let q_N be defined by

$$q_N(x) = \int_{A_1 \times \cdots \times A_k} \tau_{x_N^*}^{\otimes k} \rho_{k,N}(x + y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_k) dy_1 \cdots dy_k.$$

Here $\tau_{x_N^*}^{\otimes k} \rho_{k,N}$ is the k-point correlation function of $\tau_{x_N^*} \mathbf{X}_N$. By (2.10) (applied to the 1-point function for the translated gas conditioned on $x_j = y_i$, $j = 2, \ldots, k$) and switching the order of integration, we have for any $r > 0$ that

$$q_N(x) \le \sup_{y \in A_1} e^{\beta_N \mathsf{h}_{B_r(x+y-x_N^*)}^{\mathsf{c}_{\mathsf{d}}^{-1} \Delta V_N}(x+y-x_N^*)} \frac{1}{\mathsf{Haus}(\partial B_r(x))} \int_{\partial B_r(x)} q_N(z) \mathsf{Haus}_{\partial B_r(x)}(dz).$$

Since $N^{-1/\mathsf{d}} x_N^*$ and A_1 is bounded, the quantity $\beta_N \Delta V_N(z) = \beta_N (\Delta V_1)(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}} z)$ converges to 0 as $N \to \infty$ for z in the relevant sets above uniformly over $N^{-1/\mathsf{d}} x$ and r in a compact set. Furthermore, $q_N \to q$ pointwise as $N \to \infty$ (subsequentially) since $\mathbf{X}$ has bounded correlation functions and the A_i have measure 0 boundaries, and q_N is bounded on compact sets uniformly in N. By weak convergence, we conclude that

$$q(x) \le \frac{1}{\mathsf{Haus}(\partial B_r(x))} \int_{\partial B_r(x)} q(z) \mathsf{Haus}_{\partial B_r(x)}(dz) \quad \forall r > 0,$$

which means that q is subharmonic. That q is continuous follows from our L^∞ bound on ρ_k and the fact that the symmetric difference of $A_1 + x$ and A_1 has vanishing measure as $|x| \to 0$. $\square$

Corollary 3.5. *Let* $\mathsf{d} = 2$ *and let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a limit point as in Proposition 3.4. Then the* k-point *correlation functions of* $\mathbf{X}$ *are constant.*

Proof. The function defined in (3.11) for $i = 1$ is subharmonic and uniformly bounded above. It is a classical fact that all such functions are constant in two dimensions. Since the A_i, $1 \le i \le k$, can be any bounded open sets, we must have $\rho_k(y_1, \ldots, y_k) = \rho_k^{(1)}(y_2, \ldots, y_k)$ for some L^∞ function $\rho_k^{(1)}$. The subharmonicity of (3.11) for $i = 2$ then implies that $x \mapsto \rho_k^{(1)}(x + y_2, \ldots, y_k)$ is subharmonic, in a similar integral sense, and we can iterate the argument to eliminate the dependence on y_2, and so on. $\square$

We are ready to prove our main theorem on high temperature limit points in $\mathsf{d} = 2$. Indeed, all that is left is to verify that point processes with constant correlation functions are mixed Poisson processes.

Proof of Theorem 4. By Corollary 3.5 and (3.10), the k-point correlation functions of $\mathbf{X}$ are constant and the moment generating function of $M_R = (\pi R^2)^{-1}\mathbf{X}(B_R(0))$ is locally bounded uniformly in $R \in (1, \infty)$. Let μ be any subsequential limit of the law of M_R, say along a sequence $R_n \to \infty$.

For any $k \geq 1$, the uniform exponential tails of M_R imply

$$\mathbb{E}\left[M_R^k\right] = \int_0^\infty m^k \mu(dm) + o(1)$$

as $R = R_n \to \infty$. Letting $P_k(x) = x(x-1)\cdots(x-k+1)$, we see

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P_k(\mathbf{X}(B_R(0)))\right] = \int_0^\infty P_k\left(\pi R^2 m\right)\mu(dm) + o(R^{2k}) = (\pi R^2)^k \int_0^\infty m^k \mu(dm) + o(R^{2k}), \tag{3.12}$$

and we also have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P_k(\mathbf{X}(B_R(0)))\right] = \rho_k(B_R(0)^k) = \rho_k \cdot (\pi R^2)^k, \tag{3.13}$$

where ρ_k also denotes the (constant) Lebesgue density of ρ_k. Comparing (3.12) and (3.13), we see that ρ_k is the kth moment of μ, which matches that of a mixed Poisson process with constant intensity drawn independently from μ. In particular, M_R converges in law to μ as $R \to \infty$, and in the case that μ is supported on a singleton $\{m_0\}$, the process $\mathbf{X}$ is Poissonian of constant intensity m_0. □

4. Confinement of the Coulomb gas

In this section, we prove quantitative results showing that the particles in the Coulomb gas are typically confined to a small neighborhood of the droplet Σ. In Subsection 4.1, we prove our main result on ρ_1 assuming that ρ_1 has strong decay at ∞. In Subsection 4.2, we apply the main result and a union bound to bound the distance of furthest particle from the vacuum. In Subsection 4.4 and Subsection 4.5, we complete the results by examining the behavior of ρ_1 at ∞. In particular, the $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ results use an interesting technique of transporting a particle from ∞ by "squeezing" it into the space between other particles, and will require the particle repulsion bounds we proved in Proposition 3.1 to bound the transport cost.

4.1. **Proof of the main result.** The following proposition's proof will appear in Subsection 4.4 and Subsection 4.5.

Proposition 4.1. *If $\mathsf{d} = 2$, we have*

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) = 0.$$

(The convergence is not necessarily uniform in N or β.) If $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$, we have V dependent constants $C < \infty$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{|x|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) \leq C^{1+\beta}\max(\log\beta^{-1}, 1)e^{-c\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}$$

for all $N \geq C$.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem Theorem 3. Let $x \notin \Sigma$, and let $\omega_R = B_R(0) \setminus \Sigma$ with R large enough that $x \in \omega_R$. Note $\mathsf{h}_{\omega_R}^{\mu_\infty}(x) = 0$ since $\mu_\infty = 0$ in ω_R. Then by Proposition 2.6 we may estimate

$$e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) \le \int_{\partial B_R(0)} e^{\beta\zeta(z)}\rho_1(z)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, dz) + \int_{\partial\Sigma} \rho_1(z)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, dz). \tag{4.1}$$

Here we used that $\zeta(z) = 0$ q.e. on $\partial\Sigma$ (which is stronger than $\mathsf{Haus}_{\partial\Sigma}$-a.e.). By Corollary 3.2, we have $\rho_1(z) \le C^{1+\beta}$ on $\partial\Sigma$, and so taking $R \to \infty$ shows

$$e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) \le C^{1+\beta} + \limsup_{|z|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta(z)}\rho_1(z)\mathsf{p}_\omega(x, \partial B_{|z|}(0)). \tag{4.2}$$

Applying Proposition 4.1 finishes the proof. $\qquad\square$

4.2. **The distance to vacuum.** We now prove Corollary 1.1 as a consequence of Theorem 3. Recall from (A6) that there exists some $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\zeta_1(x) \ge \alpha \min(\mathrm{dist}(x, \Sigma_1)^2, 1) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}, \tag{4.3}$$

which we can rescale to see

$$\zeta(x) \ge \alpha \min(\mathrm{dist}(x, \Sigma)^2, N^{2/\mathsf{d}}) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,N\}} \zeta(x_i) \ge \gamma\right) \le N\mathbb{P}\left(\zeta(x_1) \ge \gamma\right) = \int_{\{\zeta\ge\gamma\}} \rho_1(x)dx. \tag{4.5}$$

Equation (1.16) follows by plugging in (1.14) or (1.15). In $\mathsf{d} \ge 3$ we assume that $\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}} \ge c_1^{-1}\log\log N$ for a small enough $c_1 > 0$, so (1.15) is controlled by $C^{1+\beta}e^{-\beta\zeta(x)}$.

Turning to (1.17), we may bound for any $\gamma \ge 0$:

$$\int_{\{\zeta\ge\gamma\}} e^{-\beta\zeta(x)}dx \le e^{-\beta\gamma+2N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}\gamma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} e^{-2N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}\zeta(x)}dx.$$

Since we are assuming here that (A3) holds with $\theta_* = 4$, it is a simple calculation to see

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} e^{-2N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}\zeta(x)}dx = N \int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} e^{-2\zeta_1(x)}dx \le CN.$$

We conclude that $\mathbb{P}(\max_i \zeta(x_i) \ge \gamma) \le CNe^{-\beta\gamma+2N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}\gamma}$. The growth estimate (4.4) implies

$$\left\{\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,N\}} \mathrm{dist}(x_i, \Sigma) \ge \sqrt{c^{-1}\gamma}\right\} \subset \left\{\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,N\}} \zeta(x_i) \ge \gamma\right\} \quad \forall\gamma \in [0, cN^{2/\mathsf{d}}].$$

for a small enough $c > 0$. The corollary follows from the change of variables $\gamma'\sqrt{\beta^{-1}\log N} = \sqrt{c^{-1}\gamma}$. $\qquad\square$

4.3. **The thermal equilibrium measure.** It will be convenient, in the proof of Proposition 4.1 and related results, to work with the *thermal equilibrium measure* $\mu_{\theta,N}$ for $\theta > 0$. Recalling the electric potential generated by a measure (1.10), this measure with total mass N is defined through the relation

$$\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta,N}} + V_N + \frac{N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}{\theta}\log\mu_{\theta,N} = c_{\theta,N} \tag{4.6}$$

for some constant $c_{\theta,N}$, from which one can check that $\mu_{\theta,N}(A) = N\mu_{\theta,1}(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}A)$ for measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}$ and fixed $\theta > 0$. As usual, we will let $\mu_\theta = \mu_{\theta,N}$ and use μ_θ for both the

measure and its Lebesgue density, e.g. $\mu_{\theta,N}(x) = \mu_{\theta,1}(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x)$. Unless otherwise stated, we set $\theta = \beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}$ implicitly for now on. The choice to include θ, rather than β, in the notation is so that $\mu_{\theta,N}$ approximates $\mu_{\infty,N}$ on the macroscopic length scale $N^{1/\mathsf{d}}$ as $N \to \infty$ so long as θ grows to ∞.

The following proposition establishes the electric splitting formula with respect to μ_θ.

Proposition 4.2. *One has*

$$\exp\left(-\beta\mathsf{H}_N^V(X_N)\right) = \exp\left(-\beta\mathsf{E}(\mu_\theta, V) - \beta\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\theta)\right) \prod_{i=1}^N \mu_\theta(x_i). \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 2.2. Indeed, (2.3) with μ_θ in place of μ_∞ holds, and using the equation

$$\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta} + V + \frac{1}{\beta}\log\mu_\theta = c_{\theta,N}$$

finishes the proof. $\square$

The following proposition, based on [AS19, Theorem 1] with some routine calculations, establishes a few useful properties of the (thermal) equilibrium measure. By convention, we allow μ_θ with $\theta = \infty$ to be the equilibrium measure μ_∞ as in (1.6).

Proposition 4.3. *Letting θ_* be as in (A1), the following holds for uniformly for $\theta \geq \theta_* > 2$. First one has for $\theta < \infty$ that*

$$\|\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta} - c_\theta - \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty} + c_\infty\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})} \leq \frac{CN^{2/\mathsf{d}}}{\theta}. \tag{4.8}$$

We also have

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu_\theta(x)}{e^{-N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}\theta\zeta(x)}} \leq C. \tag{4.9}$$

For $\theta_* \leq \theta \leq \infty$, we have

$$\|\mu_\theta\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})} \leq C. \tag{4.10}$$

If $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$

$$0 \leq \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta} \leq CN^{2/\mathsf{d}}, \tag{4.11}$$

and if $\mathsf{d} = 2$

$$\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta} \leq -\frac{1}{2}N\log N + CN \quad and \quad \exists C_\delta \quad \sup_{|x| \geq \delta} |\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta,1}}(x) + \log|x|| \leq C_\delta \quad \forall \delta > 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Finally, one has

$$\int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}\mu_\theta = -\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{d}=2}\frac{1}{2}N^2\log N + O(N^{1+2/\mathsf{d}}). \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. We begin by noting the scaling identity (valid for $\theta = \infty$)

$$\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta,N}}(x) = N^{\frac{2}{\mathsf{d}}}\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta,1}}(N^{-1/\mathsf{d}}x) - \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{d}=2}\frac{1}{2}N\log N. \tag{4.14}$$

from which it follows, using (4.6), that

$$c_{\theta,N} = N^{2/\mathsf{d}}\mathsf{c}_{\theta,1} - \mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{d}=2}\frac{1}{2}N\log N.$$

Included in [AS19, Theorem 1] is the result (the β in [AS19] is equivalent to our θ)

$$\|\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},1} - c_{\theta,1} - \mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\infty},1} + c_{\infty,1}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})} \leq \frac{C}{\theta}.$$

Equation (4.8) follows.

Substituting into (4.8) with (4.6) and (1.8) shows

$$\|\frac{N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}{\theta} \log \mu_{\theta,N} + \zeta_N\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})} \leq \frac{CN^{2/\mathsf{d}}}{\theta},$$

which becomes (4.9) after exponentiation.

The bound (4.10) for $\theta < \infty$ follows from (4.9) and $\zeta \geq 0$ q.e.. At $\theta = \infty$, it follows from $\mu_{\theta,N} = \mathsf{c}_{\mathsf{d}}^{-1} \Delta V_N$ in the droplet and $\mu_{\theta,N} = 0$ outside. The upper bound for the positive part of $\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},N}$ in (4.11) and (4.12) for $N = 1$ follows from Young's inequality:

$$\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},1}(x) \leq \max(\mathsf{g},0) * \mu_{\theta,1}(x) \leq \|\max(\mathsf{g},0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})} \|\mu_{\theta,1}\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}})} \leq C.$$

For $N > 1$, the result follows from the scaling identity (4.14). Since $\mathsf{g} \geq 0$ in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$, the lower bound for $\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},N}$ is trivial.

Considering now $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and the second bound in (4.12), we can compute for $A_x = \{y : |y| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x|\}$ that

$$\left| \mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},1}(x) - \mu_{\theta,1}(A_x)\mathsf{g}(x) - \int_{A_x^c} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) \right| = \left| \int_{A_x} (\mathsf{g}(x-y) - \mathsf{g}(x))\,\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) \right| \leq \log 2.$$

$$(4.15)$$

The last bound follows from $|\log|x-y| - \log|x|| \leq \log 2$ on A_x. One may compute as $|x| \to \infty$

$$(1 - \mu_{\theta,1}(A_x))|\mathsf{g}(x)| = \int_{A_x^c} |\mathsf{g}(x)|\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) \leq \int_{A_x^c} \log|y|\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) + \log 2,$$

and (since $\mathsf{g}(z) \leq 0$ for $|z| \geq 1$)

$$\int_{\{|x-y|\leq 1\}} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) \geq \int_{A_x^c} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) \geq -\int_{A_x^c} \log|y|\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) - C.$$

By (A3), (4.9), and the relation between ζ_1 and V_1 near ∞ from (1.5), we see from the above that

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \int_{A_x^c} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_{\theta,1}(dy) = 0.$$

By combining the above with (4.15), we find $\mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},1}(x) = \mathsf{g}(x) + O(1)$ as $|x| \to \infty$.

Finally, it is easy to see using (4.12), (4.9), and (A3) that

$$\left| \int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_{\theta},1}\mu_{\theta,1} \right| \leq C,$$

uniformly in $\theta > \theta_*$, and (4.13) follows from scaling. $\qquad\square$

4.4. **Proof of Proposition 4.1 in dimension two.** Our proof of Proposition 4.1 will be based on the following lemma. We emphasize that we are conditioning on all particles except x_1 below. The general structure of the proof, namely the use of Jensen's inequality, seems to be well-known, used for instance in [Ame21] for a similar purpose or in [CHM18], but we could not find a version that uses the thermal equilibrium measure or which gives exactly our conclusion.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $X_{N,1} = (x_2, \ldots, x_N)$ and $\delta > 0$. There is a constant $C = C_{V,\delta}$ such that for any measurable set U with $\mathrm{dist}(U, 0) \geq \delta N^{1/2}$, we have in $\mathsf{d} = 2$ that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\{x_1 \in U\} \cap \{|x_1| \geq \delta \max(|x_2|, \ldots, |x_N|)\} \big| X_{N,1}\right) \leq N^{-1} e^{C\beta N} \int_U e^{-\beta \log|y| - \beta \zeta(y)} dy \quad (4.16)$$

almost surely. In $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$, we have a.s. that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(x_1 \in U \big| X_{N,1}\right) \leq N^{-1} e^{C\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}} \int_U e^{-\beta \zeta(y)} dy \quad (4.17)$$

for any measurable set U.

Proof. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $X_{N,1} = (x_2, \ldots, x_N)$ be fixed. By expanding $\mathsf{F}(\cdot, \mu_\theta)$, one has

$$\frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{F}((z, X_{N,1}), \mu_\theta) \mu_\theta(dz) \quad (4.18)$$

$$= \mathsf{F}(X_{N,1}, \mu_\theta) + \frac{1}{N} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{g}(z - z') \left(\sum_{i=2}^{N} \delta_{x_i}(dz') - \mu_\theta(dz')\right) \mu_\theta(dz)$$

$$= \mathsf{F}((y, X_{N,1}), \mu_\theta) + \frac{1}{N} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{g}(z - z') \left(\sum_{i=2}^{N} \delta_{x_i}(dz') - \mu_\theta(dz')\right) \mu_\theta(dz)$$

$$- \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{g}(y - z') \left(\sum_{i=2}^{N} \delta_{x_i}(dz') - \mu_\theta(dz')\right)$$

$$=: \mathsf{F}((y, X_{N,1}), \mu_\theta) + N^{-1} \mathrm{Fluct}'[\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}] - \mathsf{g} * \mathrm{fluct}'(y),$$

where we defined $\mathrm{fluct}' = \sum_{i=2}^{N} \delta_{x_i}(dz') - \mu_\theta(dz')$ and $\mathrm{Fluct}'[\cdot] = \int[\cdot]\mathrm{fluct}'$. Applying Jensen's inequality, with the convex function $\gamma \mapsto e^{-\beta\gamma}$, shows

$$e^{-\beta \mathsf{F}((y, X_{N,1}), \mu_\theta)} \leq e^{\frac{\beta}{N} \mathrm{Fluct}'[\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}] - \beta \mathsf{g} * \mathrm{fluct}'(y)} \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} e^{-\beta \mathsf{F}((z, X_{N,1}), \mu_\theta)} \mu_\theta(dz). \quad (4.19)$$

Upon multiplying the above by $\mu_\theta(dy)$ and dividing by the integral in the RHS (when nonzero), the LHS becomes the density of the conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in \cdot | X_{N,1})$ evaluated at y; see Proposition 4.2. We find

$$\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in dy | X_{N,1}) \leq N^{-1} e^{\frac{\beta}{N} \mathrm{Fluct}'[\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}] - \beta \mathsf{g} * \mathrm{fluct}'(y)} \mu_\theta(dy) \quad (4.20)$$

$$\leq C N^{-1} e^{\frac{\beta}{N} \mathrm{Fluct}'[\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}] - \beta \mathsf{g} * \mathrm{fluct}'(y)} e^{-\beta \zeta(y)} dy,$$

where we changed μ_θ to $e^{-\beta\zeta}$ using (4.9). From (4.12) or (4.11) and (4.13), we can bound

$$\mathrm{Fluct}'[\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}] \leq (N-1) \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta} \mu_\theta \leq C N^{1+2/\mathsf{d}}.$$

If $\mathsf{d} = 2$ and $|y| \geq \delta \max(|x_2|, \ldots, |x_N|)$, then since $|y - x_i| \leq (1 + \delta^{-1})|y|$ and (4.12) holds, we have

$$-\mathsf{g} * \mathrm{fluct}'(y) \leq (N-1) \log(1 + \delta^{-1}) + (N-1) \log|y| + \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}(y) \leq -\log|y| + CN$$

as $N^{-1/2}|y| \to \infty$. If $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$, we simply bound $-\mathsf{g} * \mathrm{fluct}'(y) \leq \mathsf{g} * \mu_\theta(y) \leq C N^{2/\mathsf{d}}$.

For $\mathsf{d} = 2$, inserting these bounds into (4.20) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in dy | X_{N,1}) \leq C N^{-1} e^{C\beta N} e^{-\beta \zeta(y) - \beta \log|y|},$$

and integrating this over the relevant set yields (4.16). Similarly, we can prove (4.17) by combining the above. $\qquad\square$

Remark 4.5. The bound (4.16) is already sufficient to prove Proposition 4.1 if $\mathsf{d} = 2$. The $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ bound (4.17) does not give sufficient bounds for the 1-point function function at ∞, but some more care allows us to prove

$$\limsup_{|y| \to \infty} e^{\beta \zeta(y)} \rho_1(y) \leq C \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\frac{\beta}{N} \text{Fluct}[\mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}]}\right]. \tag{4.21}$$

for $\text{Fluct}[\cdot] = \int [\cdot] \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i} - \mu_\theta\right)$. This would allow us to prove a result sufficient for Theorem 3 if we could show that the linear statistic $\text{Fluct}[\phi]$ is typically not larger than order $\beta^{-1} N^{1-2/\mathsf{d}}$ with $\phi = N^{-2/\mathsf{d}} \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\theta}$. Unfortunately such a bound is only known when ϕ is supported within the droplet, whereas the support of h^{μ_θ} extends past the droplet boundary; see [Ser20, Corollary 2.2]. We instead use a different approach for the $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ result in Subsection 4.5.

Proof of Proposition 4.1 in dimension two. We will bound the probability that $x_1 \in B_r(y)$ and then send $r \to 0$. We split into two cases:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(x_1 \in B_r(y)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\{x_1 \in B_r(y)\} \cap \{|x_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \max(|x_2|, \ldots, |x_N|)\}\right) \tag{4.22}$$
$$+ \mathbb{P}\left(\{x_1 \in B_r(y)\} \cap \{|x_1| < \frac{1}{2} \max(|x_2|, \ldots, |x_N|)\}\right).$$

For the first term in the RHS above, by Lemma 4.4 we have

$$\limsup_{r \to 0} \frac{1}{\pi r^2} \mathbb{P}\left(\{x_1 \in B_r(y)\} \cap \{|x_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \max(|x_2|, \ldots, |x_N|)\}\right) \leq N^{-1} e^{C\beta N} e^{-\beta \log|y| - \beta \zeta(y)}.$$

For the second term in the RHS of (4.22), we bound (using particle exchangeability and Lemma 4.4)

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\{x_1 \in B_r(y)\} \cap \{|x_1| < \frac{1}{2} \max(|x_2|, \ldots, |x_N|)\}\right)$$
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\{x_1 \in B_r(y)\}\right)$$
$$\times N \mathbb{P}\left(\{|x_2| \geq 2|y| - 2r\} \cap \{|x_2| \geq \max(|x_1|, |x_3|, \ldots, |x_N|)\} \big| \{x_1 \in B_r(y)\}\right)$$
$$\leq e^{C\beta N} \mathbb{P}\left(x_1 \in B_r(y)\right) \int_{\{|z| \geq 2|y| - 2r\}} e^{-\beta \log|z| - \beta \zeta(z)} dz$$

for all r small enough. Letting $Q_y = e^{\beta \zeta(y)} \limsup_{r \to 0} \pi^{-1} r^{-2} \mathbb{P}(x_1 \in B_r(y))$, we have shown

$$Q_y \leq N^{-1} e^{C\beta N} e^{-\beta \log|y|} + e^{C\beta N} Q_y \int_{\{|z| \geq 2|y|\}} e^{-\beta \log|z| - \beta \zeta(z)} dz.$$

Since the integral on the RHS converges to 0 as $|y| \to \infty$, we have $Q_y \leq 2 N^{-1} e^{C\beta N - \beta \log|y|}$ for all $|y|$ large enough (dependent on N). This establishes Proposition 4.1. $\qquad\square$

4.5. **Proof of Proposition 4.1 in dimension three and higher.** Our goal in this section is to prove an upper bound for $\rho_1(x)$ in the limit $|x| \to \infty$ in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. Our method involves a new technique involving "squeezing" a particle into the interstitial space between the other particles. We assume $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$ implicitly throughout, though many techniques should carry over to the $\mathsf{d} = 2$ case.

To be precise, let $\nu_{x,\eta}$ be the uniform probability measure on $B_\eta(x) \setminus B_{\eta/2}(x)$. Define $\nu = \nu_{X_{N,1}} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=2}^N \nu_{x_i,\widetilde{\eta}_i}$ where

$$\widetilde{\eta}_i = \frac{1}{4} \min\left(1, \min_{j \neq i,1} |x_i - x_j|\right)$$

is one fourth the truncated distance between x_i and the nearest distinct particle within $X_{N,1} = (x_2, \ldots, x_N)$. We also define $\eta_i = \frac{1}{4} \min(1, \min_{j \neq i} |x_i - x_j|)$.

The next proposition, roughly speaking, shows that "replacing" x_1 by a unit charge shaped like ν changes the energy of the configuration by a small multiplicative factor plus some error. This operation will be used to compare probabilities of configurations in which x_1 is very far from $X_{N,1}$ to configurations in which x_1 is in interstitial spaces within $X_{N,1}$. Such a comparison allows us to find an upper bound for $\rho_1(x)$ for large $|x|$. As to why the more obvious technique of "replacing" a particle by a μ_θ-shaped charge is (currently) infeasible, see Remark 4.5.

Proposition 4.6. *One has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\mathsf{F}((y, X_{N,1}), \mu_\infty) + \zeta(y) + \sum_{i=2}^N \zeta(x_i) \right) \nu(dy) \tag{4.23}$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{N-1}\right) \left(\mathsf{F}(X_{N,1}, \mu_\infty) + \sum_{i=2}^N \zeta(x_i) \right) - \frac{1}{2(N-1)} \int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty} \mu_\infty + \mathrm{Err}$$

where $\mathrm{Err} \leq C + \frac{C}{N-1} \sum_{i=2}^N (\mathsf{g}(\widetilde{\eta}_i) + \mathcal{M}_{x_i})$.

Proof. First, note that for $i \neq j$ in $\{2, \ldots, N\}$, we have

$$\int \mathsf{g}(y - x_j) \nu_{x_i,\widetilde{\eta}_i}(dy) = \mathsf{g}(x_i - x_j)$$

by the definition of $\widetilde{\eta}_i$ and harmonicity of g away from 0, and

$$\int \mathsf{g}(y - x_i) \nu_{x_i,\widetilde{\eta}_i}(dy) \leq \mathsf{g}(\widetilde{\eta}_i/2) \leq C\mathsf{g}(\widetilde{\eta}_i).$$

We also have

$$\int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}(y) \nu_{x_i,\widetilde{\eta}_i}(dy) = \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}(x_i) + O(\widetilde{\eta}_i^2) \geq \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}(x_i) - C. \tag{4.24}$$

since h^{μ_∞} has bounded Laplacian. We are then able to deduce the inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathsf{F}((y, X_{N,1}), \mu_\infty) \nu(dy) - \mathsf{F}(X_{N,1}, \mu_\infty) \tag{4.25}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2(N-1)} \sum_{i,j=2}^N \int \mathsf{g}(y - x_j) \nu_{x_i,\widetilde{\eta}_i}(dy) - \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=2}^N \int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}(y) \nu_{x_i,\widetilde{\eta}_i}(dy)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2(N-1)} \sum_{i \neq j=2}^N \mathsf{g}(x_i - x_j) - \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=2}^N \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}(x_i) + \mathrm{Err}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N-1} \left(\mathsf{F}(X_{N,1}, \mu_\infty) - \frac{1}{2} \int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty} \mu_\infty \right) + \mathrm{Err}.$$

To handle the ζ term within (4.23), a similar procedure as in (4.24) works, using that the Laplacian of ζ is bounded by $\mathcal{M}_{x_i}$ near x_i. $\square$

Applying the squeezing transformation, and using Proposition 4.6 and Jensen's inequality as usual, yields the following bound on ρ_1.

Proposition 4.7. *We have*

$$\limsup_{|x|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\beta}{2N}\int h^{\mu\infty}\mu_\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1+\beta\mathrm{Err}+\frac{\beta}{N}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)+\sum_{i=1}^N\zeta(x_i)\right)}\right] \quad (4.26)$$

for $\mathrm{Err} \leq \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(\mathsf{g}(\eta_i) + \mathcal{M}_{x_i})$.

Proof. For a measurable set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}$, by Proposition 2.2 and $\mathsf{g} \downarrow 0$ at ∞, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in U) \leq \frac{e^{o(1)}}{\mathsf{K}_\beta}\left(\int_U e^{-\beta\zeta(y)}dy\right)\int_{(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})^{N-1}} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_{N,1},\mu_\infty)-\beta\sum_{i=2}^N\zeta(x_i)}dX_{N,1} \quad (4.27)$$

as $\mathrm{dist}(U,0) \to \infty$, where the $o(1)$ term is not necessarily uniform in β or N, and

$$\mathsf{K}_\beta = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})^N} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)-\beta\sum_{i=1}^N\zeta(x_i)}dX_N. \quad (4.28)$$

Applying Proposition 4.6, we compute

$$e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_{N,1},\mu_\infty)-\beta\sum_{i=2}^N\zeta(x_i)}$$

$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{-\beta(N-1)}{N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}}\left(\mathsf{F}((y,X_{N,1}),\mu_\infty)+\zeta(y)+\sum_{i=2}^N\zeta(x_i)\right)\nu(dy)\right)$$

$$\times \exp\left(\frac{-\beta}{2N}\int h^{\mu\infty}\mu_\infty+\beta\mathrm{Err}(X_{N,1})\right),$$

where Err is as in Proposition 4.6. We will integrate the above against $dX_{N,1}$ and apply Jensen's inequality to move the $\nu(dy)$ integral outside the exponential. After renaming y to x_1, we have proved

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})^{N-1}} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_{N,1},\mu_\infty)-\beta\sum_{i=2}^N\zeta(x_i)}dX_{N,1} \quad (4.29)$$

$$\leq e^{-\frac{\beta}{2N}\int h^{\mu\infty}\mu_\infty}\int_{(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})^N} e^{\log\nu(x_1)+\beta\mathrm{Err}(X_{N,1})}e^{-\beta\frac{N-1}{N}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)+\sum_{i=1}^N\zeta(x_i)\right)}dX_N \quad (4.30)$$

where $\nu(x_1)$ denotes the density of ν at x_1. Note that if $\nu(x_1) > 0$, then there is a unique $i \in \{2,\dots,N\}$ such that x_1 and x_i are mutual nearest neighbors, and

$$\nu(x_1) \leq CN^{-1}|x_1-x_i|^{-\mathsf{d}} \leq CN^{-1}\eta_1^{-\mathsf{d}}.$$

Inserting this inequality into (4.29) and (4.27) shows

$$\mathbb{P}(x_1 \in U) \leq CN^{-1}e^{-\frac{\beta}{2N}\int h^{\mu\infty}\mu_\infty+o(1)}\left(\int_U e^{-\beta\zeta(y)}dy\right)$$

$$\times \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1+\beta\mathrm{Err}(X_{N,1})+\frac{\beta}{N}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)+\sum_{i=1}^N\zeta(x_i)\right)}\right].$$

The proposition follows by letting $U = B_r(x)$ and sending $r \to 0$ and $|x| \to \infty$. $\qquad\square$

We now seek to bound the terms in the RHS of (4.26). The first observation is that the quantity $\sum_{i=2}^n \mathsf{g}(\widetilde\eta_i)$ is well controlled by the energy $\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty)$.

Proposition 4.8. *We have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathsf{g}(\eta_i) \leq 2\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty) + CN$$

for a $\|\mu_\infty\|_{L^\infty}$ *and* d *dependent constant* C.

Proof. This is proved in more generality in [AS21, Lemma B.2].   □

Unfortunately Proposition 4.8 is not strong enough to sufficiently control the $-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1$ term appearing in (4.26), nor is any estimate not including particle repulsion since the term is infinite for a Poisson point process. We use particular repulsion bounds from the 2-point function bound in (3.4) (more precisely, we use (3.6)).

Proposition 4.9. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1}\right] \leq C_\beta(1 + \max(\log\beta^{-1}, 0)).$$

for a β-*dependent constant* C_β *(depending continuously on* $\beta \geq \theta_* N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}$*).*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ denote the Coulomb gas $\mathbb{P}$ conditioned on x_1, and let $\widetilde{\rho}_1$ be the corresponding conditional one-point function (as in Proposition 2.6). Then one has for any $r \leq 1$ that

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_1 \leq r/4) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{X}_N(B_r(x_1)) - 1 \mid x_1\right] = \int_{B_r(x_1)} \widetilde{\rho}_1(x)dx.$$

By (3.6) and some routine estimates, for any $r \leq R/4 \leq \frac{1}{8}N^{1/\mathsf{d}}$, we can bound

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_1 \leq r/4) \leq CR^{-\mathsf{d}}e^{\beta(\mathsf{g}(2r)-\mathsf{g}(R/2))}\int_{B_r(x_1)} e^{C\beta R^2 \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_x}\int_{B_R(x)} \widetilde{\rho}_1(z)dzdx \qquad (4.31)$$

$$\leq C\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\mathsf{d}} e^{C\beta R^2 \mathcal{M}_{x_1} - \beta(\mathsf{g}(2r)-\mathsf{g}(R/2))}\int_{B_{2R}(x_1)} \widetilde{\rho}_1(x)dx.$$

Choosing now $R = \max(1, \beta^{-1/2})$, we find

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_1 \leq r/4) \leq C\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{\mathsf{d}} e^{-\beta\mathsf{g}(2r)}e^{C(1+\beta)\mathcal{M}_{x_1}}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{X}_N(B_{2R}(x_1)) \mid x_1\right]. \qquad (4.32)$$

The conditional expectation on the RHS above can be bounded by Theorem 5. Indeed, the conditional distribution is equivalent to an $N-1$ particle Coulomb gas with a superharmonic perturbation to the potential, so the result still applies. Moreover we can extract a dependence on large $\mathcal{M}_{x_1}$ by globally scaling space by a factor of $\mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{1/\mathsf{d}}$ to see

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{X}_N(B_{2R}(x_1)) \mid x_1\right] \leq C\max(1, \mathcal{M}_{x_1})R^{\mathsf{d}} \leq Ce^{C\mathcal{M}_{x_1}}R^{\mathsf{d}}, \qquad (4.33)$$

for a dimensional constant C. We now justify this claim in more detail.

Consider $X_{N,1} = (x_2, \ldots, x_N)$ distributed by $\mathbb{P}$ with conditioned on x_1 with $\mathcal{M}_{x_1} \geq 1$, and $Y_N = \mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{1/\mathsf{d}}X_N$. Then for fixed y_1, the gas $Y_{N,1} = (y_2, \ldots, y_N)$ has the law of a $N-1$ particle Coulomb gas with new parameters (denoted with bars)

$$\overline{\beta} = \beta\mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{1-\frac{2}{\mathsf{d}}}, \quad \overline{V}_{N-1}(y) = \mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{\frac{2}{\mathsf{d}}-1}V_N(\mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{-1/\mathsf{d}}y)$$

with a superharmonic perturbation $\overline{\beta}\sum_{i=2}^{N}\mathsf{g}(y_i - y_1)$ to the energy. This implies $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{y,N-1} = (\mathcal{M}_{x_1,N})^{-1}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{-1/\mathsf{d}}y,N}$. At $y = y_1$, this is $\overline{M}_{y_1,N-1} = 1$, and so Theorem 5 applied to $Y_{N,1}$

conditional on y_1 applies with a constant dependent only on d. Looking at the condition (3.2) with the new parameters $\overline{R} = \mathcal{M}_{x_1}^{1/\mathsf{d}} R$ and $\overline{Q} = Q$, we find that

$$\overline{Q} \geq C\overline{R}^{\mathsf{d}} + C\overline{\beta}^{-1}\overline{R}^{\mathsf{d}-2} \iff Q \geq C\mathcal{M}_{x_1}R^{\mathsf{d}} + C\beta^{-1}R^{\mathsf{d}-2}, \tag{4.34}$$

where now the constant C is dimensional. Substituting $R = \max(1, \beta^{-1/2})$, one can easily verify

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_N(B_{2R}(x_1)) \geq Q + 1 \mid x_1) \leq e^{-C^{-1}\beta R^{-\mathsf{d}+2}Q^2} \leq e^{-\mathcal{M}_{x_1}Q}$$

for all $Q \geq C\mathcal{M}_{x_1}R^d$, which justifies (4.33).

Combining (4.32), (4.33), and taking expectation yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta_1 \leq r/4) \leq Cr^{\mathsf{d}}e^{\beta\mathsf{g}(2r)}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{C(1+\beta)\mathcal{M}_{x_1}}\right] \leq C_\beta r^{\mathsf{d}}e^{\beta\mathsf{g}(2r)},$$

where the last bound follows from Lemma 4.10 below. Taking $C = C_\beta$ below, we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1}\right] = 4^{\mathsf{d}} + \mathsf{d}\int_0^{\frac{1}{4}} r^{-\mathsf{d}-1}\mathbb{P}(\eta_1 \leq r)dr \tag{4.35}$$

$$\leq 4^{\mathsf{d}} + C\int_0^{\frac{1}{4}} r^{-1}e^{\frac{-\beta}{8^{\mathsf{d}-2}}r^{-\mathsf{d}+2}}dr \leq 4^{\mathsf{d}} + C\int_0^{\frac{1}{32}} r^{-1}e^{-\beta r^{-\mathsf{d}+2}}dr.$$

One can estimate

$$\int_0^{\beta^{1/(d-2)}} \frac{e^{-\beta r^{-(d-2)}}}{r}dr \leq \beta\int_0^{\beta^{1/(d-2)}} \frac{e^{-\beta r^{-(d-2)}}}{r^{\mathsf{d}-1}}dr \leq C,$$

where the last inequality follows from the change of variables $u = r^{-(\mathsf{d}-2)}$, and if $\beta^{1/(d-2)} < 1/32$, one estimates the remainder of the integral by

$$\int_{\beta^{1/(d-2)}}^{\frac{1}{32}} \frac{e^{-\beta r^{-(d-2)}}}{r}dr \leq \int_{\beta^{1/(d-2)}}^{\frac{1}{32}} \frac{dr}{r} \leq C + C\log\beta^{-1}.$$

Inserting these bounds into (4.35) finishes the proof. $\qquad\square$

Finally, we fill in the needed bound for Proposition 4.9. The result is a relatively straightforward consequence of (4.17) and our assumptions on V. The argument in Lemma 4.10 is similar to the argument in [CHM18, Theorem 1.12].

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. For any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{t\mathcal{M}_{x_1}}\right] \leq C_t$$

for a V_1, t dependent constant C_t.

Proof. Note that

$$\zeta(x) = \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}(x) + V(x) + O(N^{2/\mathsf{d}}) \geq V(x) + O(N^{2/\mathsf{d}}). \tag{4.36}$$

By (4.17), and the bound on the density of the x_1 marginal it implies, we have for any measurable set U that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{t\mathcal{M}_{x_1}}\mathbf{1}_{x_1 \in U}\right] \leq N^{-1}e^{C\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}\int_U e^{-\beta\zeta(y)+t\mathcal{M}_y}dy \tag{4.37}$$

$$\leq N^{-1}e^{C\beta N^{2/\mathsf{d}}}\sup_{z \in U} e^{-(\beta-N^{2/\mathsf{d}}\theta_*/2)V(z)+t\mathcal{M}_z}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{\mathsf{d}}} e^{-\frac{N^{-2/\mathsf{d}}\theta_*}{2}V(y)}dy.$$

The integral on the RHS is bounded by $Ne^{C\beta N^{2/d}}$ by (A3). Indicating the N-dependence in what follows and denoting $z' = N^{-1/d}z$, note that

$$-\left(\beta_N - \frac{N^{-2/d}\theta_*}{2}\right)V_N(z) + t\mathcal{M}_{z,N} = -\left(N^{2/d}\beta_N - \frac{\theta_*}{2}\right)V_1(z') + t\mathcal{M}_{z',1}.$$

For any $K > 0$, we have for all $|z'|$ large enough by (A7) that

$$\left(N^{2/d}\beta_N - \frac{\theta_*}{2}\right)V_1(z') \geq t\mathcal{M}_{z',1} + K\theta_*$$

Indeed, this follows from $\frac{\theta_*}{2}V_1(z') \geq 2t\mathcal{M}_{z',1}$ and $V_1(z') \to \infty$ as $|z'| \to \infty$. Choosing K large enough then shows that, for $U = (B_{N^{1/d}R}(0))^c$ for a large enough R, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{t\mathcal{M}_{x_1,N}}\mathbf{1}_{x_1 \in U}\right] \leq 1.$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_{x,N}$ is bounded for $x \in U^c$, we achieve the desired result. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.1 in $\mathsf{d} \geq 3$. Consider the error term

$$\mathrm{Err}(X_{N,1}) = \frac{C}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathsf{g}(\eta_i) + \mathcal{M}_{x_i}$$

from Proposition 4.7. By (4.36) and (A7) (and the N scaling), we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{x,N} \leq CV_1(N^{-1/d}x) + C = CN^{-2/d}V(x) + C \leq C\zeta(x) + C,$$

and so Proposition 4.8 implies

$$\mathrm{Err}(X_{N,1}) \leq \frac{C}{N}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty) + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\zeta(x_i)\right) + C.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 4.7 there exists $C_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\limsup_{|x|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\beta}{2N}\int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}\mu_\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1 + \frac{C_0\beta}{N}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty) + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\zeta(x_i)\right)}\right]. \qquad (4.38)$$

The expectation in the RHS of (4.38) can be written and bounded as

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[e^{-\mathsf{d}\log\eta_1}\right]\frac{\mathsf{K}_{\widetilde\beta}}{\mathsf{K}_\beta} \leq C\max(\log\beta^{-1}, 1)\frac{\mathsf{K}_{\widetilde\beta}}{\mathsf{K}_\beta} \qquad (4.39)$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ denotes expectation with respect to the gas $\mathbb{P}_{N,\widetilde\beta}^V$ with $\widetilde\beta = (1 - \frac{C_0}{N})\beta$ and K_β is as in (4.28). We used Proposition 4.9 to bound the $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ expectation term.

Jensen's inequality implies that for all N large enough, we have

$$\frac{\mathsf{K}_{\widetilde\beta}}{\mathsf{K}_\beta} = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\frac{C_0\beta}{N}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty) + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\zeta(x_i)\right)}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\frac{\beta}{2}\left(\mathsf{F}(X_N,\mu_\infty) + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\zeta(x_i)\right)}\right]^{\frac{2C_0}{N}} = \left(\frac{\mathsf{K}_{\beta/2}}{\mathsf{K}_\beta}\right)^{\frac{2C_0}{N}}.$$
$$(4.40)$$

We claim that

$$\log\mathsf{K}_\beta = N\log N + O(N(1+\beta)).$$

We could not find a reference inclusive of small β and our exact form of K_β, so we sketch an essentially well-known argument here. First, the inequalities

$$\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty) \geq -CN, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} e^{-\beta\zeta(x)} dx \leq CN,$$

the first coming from a standard truncation argument, as in [Ser24, Corollary 4.14] or [AS21, Lemma 3.7], and the second coming from $e^{-\beta\zeta(x)} dx \leq C\mu_\theta(dx)$, immediately imply that

$$\log \mathsf{K}_\beta \leq CN\beta + N\log N.$$

For the reverse inequality, beginning with the inequality

$$dX_N \geq \frac{1}{\|\mu_\infty\|_{L^\infty}^N} \mu_\infty^{\otimes N}(dX_N) \geq e^{-CN} \mu_\infty^{\otimes N}(dX_N),$$

we find via Jensen's inequality and a short computation that

$$\mathsf{K}_\beta \geq e^{-CN} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})^N} e^{-\beta\mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty)} \mu_\infty^{\otimes N}(dX_N)$$

$$\geq e^{N\log N - CN} \exp\left(-\beta N^{-N} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d})^N} \mathsf{F}(X_N, \mu_\infty)\mu_\infty^{\otimes N}(dX_N)\right)$$

$$= e^{N\log N - CN} \exp\left(\frac{\beta}{2N} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d} \times \mathbb{R}^\mathsf{d}} \mathsf{g}(x-y)\mu_\infty(dx)\mu_\infty(dy)\right) \geq e^{N\log N - CN}.$$

Using our K_β estimate, (4.40), (4.39), and (4.38), we find

$$\limsup_{|x|\to\infty} e^{\beta\zeta(x)}\rho_1(x) \leq C^{1+\beta} \max(\log\beta^{-1}, 1)e^{-\frac{\beta}{2N}\int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}\mu_\infty}.$$

We conclude by noting the scaling inequality

$$\frac{\beta}{2N} \int \mathsf{h}^{\mu_\infty}\mu_\infty \geq \beta c_{V_1} N^{2/\mathsf{d}}$$

for some $c_{V_1} > 0$. $\qquad\square$

References

[Ame21] Yacin Ameur. A localization theorem for the planar Coulomb gas in an external field. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 26(none):1 – 21, 2021.

[AS19] Scott Armstrong and Sylvia Serfaty. Thermal approximation of the equilibrium measure and obstacle problem, 2019.

[AS21] Scott Armstrong and Sylvia Serfaty. Local laws and rigidity for Coulomb gases at any temperature. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(1):46 – 121, 2021.

[AT24] Yacin Ameur and Erik Troedsson. Remarks on the one-point density of Hele-Shaw β-ensembles. 2024.

[BS24] Jeanne Boursier and Sylvia Serfaty. Dipole formation in the two-component plasma. 2024.

[Caf98] L.A. Caffarelli. The obstacle problem revisited. *The journal of Fourier analysis and applications*, 4(4-5):383–402, 1998.

[CHM18] Djalil Chafaï, Adrien Hardy, and Mylène Maïda. Concentration for Coulomb gases and Coulomb transport inequalities. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 275(6):1447–1483, 2018.

[CP14] Djalil Chafaï and Sandrine Péché. A note on the second order universality at the edge of Coulomb gases on the plane. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 156(2):368–383, May 2014.

[CSA20] Gabriel Cardoso, Jean-Marie Stéphan, and Alexander G Abanov. The boundary density profile of a coulomb droplet. freezing at the edge. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 54(1):015002, dec 2020.

[CSA24]   Gabriel Cardoso, Jean-Marie Stéphan, and Alexander G. Abanov. The density profile of a Coulomb plasma on a cylinder: boundary oscillations, 2024.

[DVJ08]   D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones. *Convergence Concepts and Limit Theorems*, pages 131–175. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2008.

[Lam21]   Gaultier Lambert. Poisson statistics for Gibbs measures at high temperature. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 57(1):326 – 350, 2021.

[Leb16]   Thomas Leblé. Logarithmic, Coulomb and Riesz energy of point processes. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 162(4):887–923, 2016.

[Leb17]   Thomas Leblé. Local microscopic behavior for 2d Coulomb gases. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 169(3):931–976, 2017.

[Leb23]   Thomas Leblé. The two-dimensional one-component plasma is hyperuniform. 2023.

[Leb24]   Thomas Leblé. DLR equations, number-rigidity and translation-invariance for infinite-volume limit points of the 2DOCP. 2024.

[LLZ24]   Gaultier Lambert, Thomas Leblé, and Ofer Zeitouni. Law of large numbers for the maximum of the two-dimensional Coulomb gas potential. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 29(none):1 – 36, 2024.

[LS17]   Thomas Leblé and Sylvia Serfaty. Large deviation principle for empirical fields of Log and Riesz gases. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 210(3):645–757, 2017.

[LSZ17]   Thomas Leblé, Sylvia Serfaty, and Ofer Zeitouni. Large deviations for the two-dimensional two-component plasma. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 350(1):301–360, 2017.

[NS14]   Simona Rota Nodari and Sylvia Serfaty. Renormalized energy equidistribution and local charge balance in 2d Coulomb systems. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015(11):3035–3093, 03 2014.

[Pei24]   Luke Peilen. On the maximum of the potential of a general two-dimensional Coulomb gas, 2024.

[PG23]   David Padilla-Garza. Large deviations principle for the tagged empirical field of a general interacting gas. 2023.

[PGPT24]   David Padilla-Garza, Luke Peilen, and Eric Thoma. Emergence of a Poisson process in weakly interacting particle systems. 2024.

[Rid03]   B Rider. A limit theorem at the edge of a non-Hermitian random matrix ensemble. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 36(12):3401, mar 2003.

[RS16]   Nicolas Rougerie and Sylvia Serfaty. Higher-dimensional Coulomb gases and renormalized energy functionals. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 69(3):519–605, 2016.

[Ser20]   Sylvia Serfaty. Gaussian Fluctuations and Free Energy Expansion for Coulomb Gases at Any Temperature, 2020.

[Ser24]   Sylvia Serfaty. Lectures on Coulomb and Riesz gases. 2024.

[Tho23]   Eric Thoma. Non-rigidity properties of the Coulomb gas, 2023.

[Tho24]   Eric Thoma. Overcrowding and separation estimates for the Coulomb gas. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 77(7):3227–3276, 2024.

ERIC THOMA
Department of Mathematics, Stanford University.
Email: thoma@stanford.edu.