

# Zeros and Critical Points of Gaussian Fields: Cumulants Asymptotics and Limit Theorems

Michele Ancona\*    Louis Gass†    Thomas Letendre‡    Michele Stecconi§

January 20, 2025

## Abstract

Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a smooth centered stationary Gaussian field and  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact set. In this paper, we determine the asymptotics as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  of all the cumulants of the  $(d-k)$ -dimensional volume of  $f^{-1}(0) \cap nK$ . When  $k = 1$ , we obtain similar asymptotics for the number of critical points of  $f$  in  $nK$ . Our main hypotheses are some regularity and non-degeneracy of the field, as well as mild integrability conditions on the first derivatives of its covariance kernel. As corollaries of these cumulants estimates, we deduce a strong Law of Large Numbers and a Central Limit Theorem for the nodal volume (resp. the number of critical points) of a smooth non-degenerate field whose covariance kernel admits square integrable derivatives at any order. Our results hold more generally for a one-parameter family  $(f_n)$  of Gaussian fields admitting a stationary local scaling limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for example Kostlan polynomials in the large degree limit.

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Overview and motivations . . . . .	2
1.2	Main results for the nodal volume of stationary Gaussian fields . . . . .	3
1.3	General statement of the main results . . . . .	6
1.4	Structure of the proofs . . . . .	8
<b>2</b>	<b>The combinatorics of cumulants</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Möebius inversion on a lattice . . . . .	9
2.2	The lattice of partitions of a finite set . . . . .	11
2.3	Cumulants of a random variable . . . . .	14
<b>3</b>	<b>Basics and notations</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	Diagonal set and diagonal inclusion . . . . .	17
3.2	Matrix notations . . . . .	19
3.3	Space notations . . . . .	21
3.4	Invariance by translation . . . . .	21
<b>4</b>	<b>Multivariate interpolation and divided differences</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1	Kergin interpolation . . . . .	22
4.2	Abstract divided differences . . . . .	22
4.3	Divided differences of a Gaussian process . . . . .	27

\*Université Côte d'Azur, michele.ancona(at)unice.fr ;

†University of Luxembourg, louis.gass(at)uni.lu ;

‡Université Paris-Saclay, letendre(at)math.cnrs.fr ;

§University of Luxembourg, michele.stecconi(at)uni.lu .

**Acknowledgments:** This work was supported by the Luxembourg National Research Fund (Grant: 021/16236290/HDSA).

<b>5</b>	<b>Kac–Rice formula for Gaussian processes</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1	Kac density and cumulants of the zeros counting measure . . . . .	30
5.2	Matrix representation of the Kac density and factorization property . . . . .	33
5.3	Decay of the cumulant Kac density . . . . .	38
<b>6</b>	<b>Asymptotics of the cumulants of the zeros counting measure</b>	<b>43</b>
6.1	Asymptotics of the cumulants . . . . .	43

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview and motivations

The study of the zeros, or nodal sets, of Gaussian processes and random fields has a long and rich history, rooted in the pioneering works of Kac and Rice [36, 53], and has since grown into a significant area of probability theory, see [10, 1, 59, 60]. Classical problems in this field focus on understanding the distribution and asymptotics of the number of zeros and critical points, nodal volume, and other nodal-related observables, often leveraging the celebrated Kac–Rice formula (see [36, 53, 57, 15, 46]) for integral expressions of moments. We mention for instance the papers [61, 38, 20, 44, 33, 51, 54, 21, 26, 41] for asymptotics related to the nodal measure of random waves, [48, 45, 13, 12] for asymptotics of excursion sets, [55, 19, 30, 32, 31, 23, 42, 6, 2, 3, 40] for the random real algebraic geometry setting.

Previous works, such as those employing Wiener chaos expansions, have successfully addressed variance asymptotics and CLTs for zeros in specific models, e.g. [9, 22, 6], but general methods for studying higher moments are still a work in progress, often constrained by strong decay assumptions on the covariance functions, or by the dimensionality of the problem. Particularly, in dimension one, several results prove the convergence of central moments or cumulants under the assumption of a sufficiently fast polynomial decay of the covariance kernel, see for instance the [49] for zeros of analytic functions, extended by Ancona and Letendre in [2, 3, 4] in a real smooth setting, and for a broader class of geometric statistics in [17]. These results have been refined by Gass [27] to  $L^2$  decaying kernels, thus matching the classical framework of Breuer–Major theorem [18] for non-singular local functionals of Gaussian processes. This framework in particular encompasses slowly decaying kernels, such as the sinc kernel that appear as the scaling limit of various models of random polynomials [34, 50, 28].

In the higher dimensional setting, even showing the finiteness of the  $p$ -moments of the nodal volume of a random field is a delicate problem that have been the object of extensive research over the past years, see for instance [43, 11, 12, 8, 39, 7]. In particular, the recent papers [29, 5] prove that under mild nondegeneracy and smoothness assumptions, the volume of the zero set and the number of critical points of a Gaussian random field have finite moments of all orders, in arbitrary dimension. Exploiting the relation between the topology of excursion sets and the number of critical points, these moments bounds have been used to prove CLT for of various topological quantities related to excursion sets of stationary Gaussian fields, see [12, 35].

In this paper, we combine the strategy developed in [4, 27] for proving the cumulant asymptotics in the one dimensional case, and the strategy developed in [29, 5] to prove the aforementioned finiteness of moments in the higher dimensional case, in order to study the moments of the nodal volume and critical points of smooth Gaussian fields, in arbitrary dimensions. Specifically, we derive the exact asymptotics for the moments and cumulants of the nodal volume and critical points and the associated linear statistics, under regularity, integrability, and non-degeneracy conditions. These results lead to a strong law of large numbers (SLLN) for both the

nodal volume and the number of critical points, polynomial concentration around the mean to any order, and a central limit theorem (CLT) by the method of cumulants.

## 1.2 Main results for the nodal volume of stationary Gaussian fields

In the following, all the random variables considered are defined on a common abstract probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and  $\mathbb{E}, \text{Var}$  will denote the associated expectation and variance.

Let  $d \geq k, q \geq 1$  be positive integer. We call the set of zeros of a function  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  the *nodal set* of  $f$  and we denote it as follows:

$$Z(f) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

Assuming that  $f$  is of class  $\mathcal{C}^q(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k)$  and that 0 is a regular value for  $f$ , meaning that there is no  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $f(x) = \partial_1 f(x) = \dots = \partial_d f(x) = 0$ , then by the implicit function theorem,  $Z(f)$  is a  $\mathcal{C}^q$  submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of dimension  $d - k$ . We denote by

$$\nu_f(K) = \text{Vol}_{d-k}(Z(f) \cap K) \tag{1.1}$$

the  $(d - k)$ -dimensional volume, i.e., Hausdorff measure, of  $Z(f) \cap K$ , for any Borel subset  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . For instance, when  $d = k$ , then  $\nu_f(K)$  is the cardinality of  $Z(f) \cap K$ . Such  $\nu_f$  is a Borel measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , that is finite on every compact subset.

In this paper we are concerned with the random variable  $\nu_f(K)$  defined from a stochastic process  $f$  and a compact subset  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . More generally, we also consider *linear statistics*, namely the random variables obtained by integrating a test function  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with respect to the measure  $\nu_f$ , for which we introduce the following bracket notation:

$$\langle \nu_f, \phi \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) \nu_f(dx),$$

whenever the latter expression is defined. In particular,  $\langle \nu_f, \mathbf{1}_K \rangle = \nu_f(K)$ , if  $\mathbf{1}_K$  is the indicator function of  $K$ . For now we will stick to  $\nu_f(K)$ , deferring the discussion of the linear statistics  $\langle \nu_f, \phi \rangle$  to Section 1.3, which contains a more general analogue of all the four main theorems reported in this section. An important example that we want to consider is that of a gradient field  $f = \nabla h$ , case in which

$$\nu_{\nabla h}(K) = \#(\text{Crit}(h) \cap K) \tag{1.2}$$

denotes the number of critical points of  $h$  in  $K$ . We work under sets of assumptions that in particular ensure (as a consequence of Bulinskaya Lemma) that 0 is a regular value for  $f$  with probability one, thus we can think of  $Z(f)$  as a random submanifold and  $\nu_f$  as a random measure. Our main assumption is the following.

**Definition 1.1.** We say that a Gaussian field  $f$  is *q-nondegenerate* if it is of class  $\mathcal{C}^{q+1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k)$  and, for any  $\ell \leq q+1$ , any set of distinct points  $x_1, \dots, x_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $m_1, \dots, m_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $m_1 + \dots + m_\ell = q + 1$ , the family of Gaussian variables

$$\left\{ \partial^\alpha f^j(x_i) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d, |\alpha| < m_i \right\}$$

forms a non-degenerate Gaussian vector.

In particular, if  $f$  is  $(q - 1)$ -nondegenerate, then the Gaussian vector  $(\partial^\alpha f(x))_{|\alpha| \leq q-1}$  is non-degenerate for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Note that this is never the case for a gradient field  $f = \nabla h$ , in which case we shall assume that  $h$  is  $q$ -nondegenerate. Either assumption ensures that  $\nu_f(K)$  is in  $L^q$ , in virtue of [29, Theorem 1 and 2].

To illustrate our results, valid for sequences of random variables  $\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle$  (see Section 1.3), we will first consider a particular case. Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a stationary and centered Gaussian process of class  $\mathcal{C}^q(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k)$ . Such an object is completely characterized by its covariance function, that is a matrix valued even function  $r \in \mathcal{C}^{2q}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{k \times k})$  defined by the identity:

$$r(x - y) = \mathbb{E} \left[ f(x) f(y)^T \right],$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We will treat  $r$  as a function with values in  $\mathbb{R}^{k^2}$ . In particular, we will use the standard multi-index notations  $\partial^\alpha = \partial_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_d^{\alpha_d}$  to denote the derivative operator, for any multi-index  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ , of order  $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_d$ ; for a matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ , we will write  $|\Sigma|$  for the standard norm in  $\mathbb{R}^{k^2}$ , i.e.  $|\Sigma|^2 = \text{tr}(\Sigma^T \Sigma)$ .

The main results of this paper are a strong law of large numbers and a central limit theorem for the sequence of random variables  $\nu_f(nK)$ , with  $n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , deduced from the convergence of its *cumulants*. A fundamental tool in our analysis is the celebrated Kac-Rice formula, which allows to express the expected volume as the integral of a function with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For a stationary field such function is constant, thus, under the aforementioned regularity assumptions,

$$\mathbb{E}(\nu_f(nK)) = \int_{nK} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\det(f'(x) f'(x)^T)} \mid F(x) = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k \det r(0)}} dx = \gamma_1(r) \text{Vol}_d(nK), \quad (1.3)$$

for some constant  $\gamma_1(r) \in \mathbb{R}$  depending on  $r$  in an explicit way, see Remark 1.7 below. The natural next step is to estimate the variance. This has been done in several instances in the literature, see for instance [11, 8, 39, 24]. Using again the Kac-Rice formula one can see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{Var}(\nu_f(nK))}{n^d} = \gamma_2(r) \cdot \text{Vol}_d(K), \quad (1.4)$$

for some  $\gamma_2(r) \geq 0$ .

**Remark 1.2.** The condition  $\gamma_2(r) > 0$  is an important hypothesis in the statement of Theorem 1.3 below, and it is the object of the recent paper [24] in which the author establishes a setting under which (1.4) holds with  $\gamma_2(r) > 0$ . Such setting includes the case where the components of  $f$  are independent scalar fields and the case where  $f = \nabla h$  is gradient field (i.e.  $\nu_f(K)$  is the number of critical points of  $h$  in  $K$ , see (1.2)).

The analogous Kac-Rice formula for higher moments is our starting point for all the results of this paper. It allows to express  $\mathbb{E}[\nu_f(nK)^p]$  as the integral of a function over  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^p$ . Although such function is rather explicit, its analysis presents a major difficulty: it is singular (explodes) on the diagonal, to the point that even proving its integrability is a hard problem. In fact, this has been the object of a long-standing conjecture, recently solved by the authors of this paper, in the two independent articles [29] and [5], see also [43, 11, 12, 8, 39, 7] for previous partial results in this direction. Both papers prove, with different methods and perspectives, that under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3, the quantity  $\mathbb{E}[\nu_f(nK)^p]$  is finite. This of course is a necessary standing ground to approach the question of the asymptotic behavior of such random variables.

The following theorem extends to arbitrary dimension  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , the results of [4, 27], proved in dimension  $d = 1$ .

**Theorem 1.3** (Moments asymptotics). *Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a stationary centered Gaussian process, with covariance function  $r$  and let  $\nu_f$  be defined as above. Let  $p$  be a positive integer. Assume that*

- $|\partial^\alpha r| \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for every multi-index  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$  with  $|\alpha| \leq 2p$
- either  $f$  is  $(2p - 1)$ -nondegenerate, or  $f = \nabla h$  for a  $2p$ -nondegenerate scalar field  $h$
- $\gamma_2(r) > 0$

Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\nu_f(nK) - \mathbb{E}[\nu_f(nK)]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\nu_f(nK))}} \right)^p \right] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}(0, 1)^p].$$

Theorem 1.3 implies a strong law of large numbers and a central limit theorem.

**Corollary 1.4** (Strong Law of Large Numbers). *Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied for all  $p \geq 2$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_f(nK)}{n^d} = \gamma_1(r) \text{Vol}_d(K) \quad a.s.$$

Such a statement shows that the zeros of  $f(n \cdot)$  tend to be equidistributed. Corollary 1.4 is deduced from Theorem 1.3 by an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma, similar to [4, Proof of Theorem 1.16].

**Corollary 1.5** (Central Limit Theorem). *Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied for all  $p \geq 2$ . Then, we have the following convergence in distribution*

$$\frac{n^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\sqrt{\gamma_2(r)}} \left( \frac{\nu_f(nK)}{n^d} - \gamma_1(r) \text{Vol}_d(K) \right) \Longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \text{Vol}_d(K)).$$

This theorem is a direct consequence of the moment convergence established in Theorem 1.3, by the method of moments, see [16, Chapter 30].

Our approach to prove Theorem 1.3 is to deduce the asymptotics of the moments from those of the cumulants. This method already proved effective in [27], where it is applied in the case  $d = 1$  to strengthen the results of [4], in which the authors directly estimate the (central) moments.

We recall that the  $p$ -th cumulant  $\kappa_p(Z)$  of a real random variable  $Z$  is the real number defined by the expression:

$$\kappa_p(Z) := \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_p} (-1)^{|\mathcal{I}|-1} (|\mathcal{I}| - 1)! \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}[Z^{|I|}], \quad (1.5)$$

where the sum is indexed by the set  $\mathcal{P}_p$  of all partitions of the finite set  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . We recall that a partition is a set  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, \dots, I_N\}$  of non-empty disjoint subsets  $I \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ , with union equal to  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ ; then,  $|\mathcal{I}| = N$  and  $|I|$  is the cardinality of  $I$ . We refer to [56, 52] and Section 2 below for more details on the cumulants of a random variable. The cumulants are a

(universal) linear combination of the moments  $\mathbb{E}[Z^p]$ , in particular  $\kappa_1 = \mathbb{E}$  and  $\kappa_2 = \text{Var}$ . Their interest lies in the following two facts. First,  $\kappa_p(\mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = 0$  for all  $p \geq 3$ . And second, the system of equations (1.5) can be inverted, so that Theorem 1.3 can be proved by showing the convergence of higher cumulants to zero. Indeed, we prove Theorem 1.3 by showing that

$$\kappa_p(\nu_f(nK)) = o\left(n^{\frac{pd}{2}}\right), \quad \forall p \geq 2, \quad (1.6)$$

as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  and that  $\kappa_1(\nu_f(nK)), \kappa_2$  are both of order  $n^d$ . As a byproduct of our strategy of proof of (1.6), we obtain a more precise estimate under additional integrability assumptions.

**Theorem 1.6** (Cumulants asymptotics). *Let the setting of Theorem 1.3 prevail. Assume in addition that  $|\partial^\alpha r| \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for all  $|\alpha| \leq 2p$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\kappa_p(\nu_f(nK))}{n^d} = \gamma_p(r) \cdot \text{Vol}_d(K),$$

where  $\gamma_p(r) \in \mathbb{R}$  is an explicit constant depending on  $r$ .

Note that for  $p = 2$ , this is equivalent to the variance asymptotic in Theorem 1.3.

**Remark 1.7.** The constant  $\gamma_1(r)$  in the statement of Theorem 1.3 can be computed from the formula (1.3) under the additional assumption that the field is isotropic, that is, if  $r(x) = \rho(|x|)$ . In this case

$$\gamma_1(r) = \frac{s_{d-1}}{s_d} \sqrt{\frac{\det \rho(0)}{\det -\rho''(0)}},$$

where  $s_d := 2\pi^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{d+1}{2}\right)^{-1}$  is the surface area of the  $d$ -sphere. The other constants  $\gamma_p(r)$  can be computed from the Kac-Rice formula for the higher moments, following an analogous strategy, see Theorem 6.7. The formulas are explicit, but much more involved and depend on the global behavior of  $\rho$ , rather than just its first derivatives at 0.

### 1.3 General statement of the main results

Let us define the set of assumptions under which the general theorem will be stated. We stress that Kostlan polynomials satisfy these hypotheses, the parameter going to infinity being the degree of the polynomial and the limit process being the Bargmann–Fock process.

**Definition 1.8.** Let  $\mathbf{N}$  be an unbounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}_+^*$  and  $\overline{\mathbf{N}} = \mathbf{N} \sqcup \{+\infty\}$ . For each  $n \in \overline{\mathbf{N}}$ , we consider a centered Gaussian process  $f_n$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , with values in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  and we assume that the process  $f_\infty$  is a non-zero stationary centered process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  also with values in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . For  $n \in \overline{\mathbf{N}}$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we denote the rescaled covariance function of  $f_n$  as  $r_n$ , that is,

$$r_n(x, y) = \mathbb{E} \left[ f_n \left( \frac{x}{n} \right) f_n \left( \frac{y}{n} \right)^T \right] \quad \text{and} \quad r_\infty(x - y) = r_\infty(x, y).$$

For  $q \geq 1$  we define the three following hypotheses, each of which also includes the previous part of this definition.

- $H_1(q)$  : the sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \overline{\mathbf{N}}}$  is of class  $\mathcal{C}^q(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k)$ , and for  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q$ , the following convergence holds uniformly for  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and locally uniformly for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \partial_{\alpha, \beta} r_n(nu + x, nu + y) = \partial_{\alpha, \beta} r_\infty(x, y). \quad (1.7)$$

- $H_2(q)$  : there is a even, positive, bounded function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , going to zero at infinity, such that for  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q$ ,  $n \in \overline{\mathbf{N}}$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|\partial_{\alpha, \beta} r_n(x, y)| \leq g(x - y), \quad (1.8)$$

and for some positive constant  $\omega$  the function  $g_\omega$  is in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , where

$$g_\omega : x \mapsto \sup_{|y| \leq \omega} g(x + y).$$

- $H_3(q)$  :  $f_\infty$  is  $q$ -nondegenerate or  $f_\infty = \nabla h$ , for some  $(q + 1)$ -nondegenerate scalar field  $h$ .

Observe that  $H_i(q) \implies H_i(p)$  for all  $p \leq q$ . Recall that if the process  $f_n$  is of class  $\mathcal{C}^q(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k)$  for  $q \geq 0$  then the covariance function  $r_n$  is also of class  $\mathcal{C}^q$  in each variable, and for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$  with  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q$ , one has that  $\partial_{\alpha, \beta} r_n(x, y) = \mathbb{E}[\partial_\alpha f_n(x) \partial_\beta f_n(y)]$ .

Theorem 1.3 is a specialization of the following more general statement. To see this one should consider the particular case of  $f_n(\cdot) := f(n \cdot)$  and  $f_\infty = f$  relatively to the test function  $\phi = \mathbb{1}_K$ , in which case we have that

$$\frac{\nu_f(nK)}{n^d} = \frac{\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle}{n^k}.$$

Arguing as for (1.3) and (1.4), one can deduce the analogous asymptotics of the first two moments:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle)}{n^k} = \gamma_1(r_\infty) \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) dx \right), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{Var}(\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle)}{n^k} = \gamma_2(r_\infty) \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x)^2 dx \right).$$

where  $\gamma_1(r_\infty), \gamma_2(r_\infty)$  are constants depending on  $r_\infty$  and coincide with those of Theorem 1.6, see also Remark 1.7.

The latter comparison with the case  $f_n = f(n \cdot)$  provides a useful guideline to read the next theorems, which are the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 1.9** (Moments asymptotics). *Let  $p \geq 2$  and  $q = 2p - 1$ . We assume that the sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies hypotheses  $H_1(q), H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  defined above. Then for any non-zero test function  $\phi \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle - \mathbb{E}[\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle)}} \right)^p \right] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}(0, 1)^p].$$

The measure  $\nu_{f_n}$  can be seen as a random element of the space of Radon measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We consider this space to be endowed with the *vague topology*, that is, the coarsest topology such that all the linear functionals  $\nu \mapsto \langle \nu, \phi \rangle$ , obtained by integrating a continuous compactly supported test function  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , are continuous.

Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5 extend to this more general framework.

**Corollary 1.10** (Strong Law of Large Numbers). *Assume that hypotheses  $H_1(q), H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  are satisfied for all  $q \geq 1$ , and either  $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}^*$ , or  $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{R}_+^*$  and for  $n \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ ,  $f_n = f_\infty(n \cdot)$ . Then we have the following almost-sure convergence*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\nu_{f_n}}{n^k} = \gamma_1(r_\infty) \text{Vol}_d \quad \text{a.s.},$$

*in the space of Radon measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , endowed with the vague topology.*

**Corollary 1.11** (Central Limit Theorem). *Assume that hypotheses  $H_1(q), H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  are satisfied for all  $q \geq 1$ . Then we have the following convergence in distribution*

$$\forall \phi \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(U), \quad \frac{n^{\frac{k}{2}}}{\sqrt{\gamma_2(r_\infty)}} \left\langle \left( \frac{\nu_{f_n}}{n^k} - \gamma_1(r_\infty) \text{Vol}_d \right), \phi \right\rangle \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \int_U \phi(x)^2 dx \right).$$

**Theorem 1.12** (Cumulants asymptotics). *Let the setting of Theorem 1.9 prevail. Assume in addition that  $g_\omega \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\kappa_p(\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle)}{n^k} = \gamma_p(r_\infty) \cdot \left( \int_U \phi(x)^p dx \right),$$

*where  $\gamma_p(r_\infty) \in \mathbb{R}$  is a constant depending on  $r$ , through an explicit formula.*

## 1.4 Structure of the proofs

The theorems in Section 1.2, are a special case of those stated in Section 1.3. Theorem 1.9 is a consequence of the cumulants asymptotic:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\kappa_p(\langle \nu_{f_n}, \phi \rangle)}{n^{dp/2}} = 0$$

which is proven in Theorem 6.7. The same theorem gives the leading order of the cumulants implying Theorem 1.12. We already discussed how Corollary 1.10 and Corollary 1.11 follow from Theorem 1.9.



The proof is written under the assumption that  $f_\infty$  is nondegenerate and that  $d = k$ , so that  $\nu_f$  is the counting measure of  $Z(f)$ . The proof in the case of critical points, that is when  $f_\infty = \nabla h$ , is in all point similar, with the minor adaptation explained in Remark 3.5. The proof for the case  $k < d$  is analogous, using the combinatorics of cumulants instead of the combinatorics of factorial cumulants in Lemma 5.3. The analogy is also explained in [29, 5].

## 2 The combinatorics of cumulants

The development of this section is borrowed from the thesis [25]. Let  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  be a sequence of centered random variables with unit variance, and  $N$  be a standard Gaussian random variable. There are several available methods in order to prove a central limit theorem (CLT) for the sequence  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , that is the convergence in distribution of the form

$$X_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} N.$$

We focus on one of these methods, namely the method of moments. Assume that  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  has finite moments of all orders. Then, the CLT is equivalent to the convergence of each moments of  $X_n$  towards the corresponding moments of  $N$ , see [16, Thm. 30.2]. For each integer  $p \geq 0$ , it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}[X_n^p] = \mathbb{E}[N^p].$$

The method of moments is well-advised when one has an explicit expression for the  $p$ -th moment, which in our framework is given by the Kac–Rice formula. The moments of a standard Gaussian variables are given by

$$\mathbb{E}[N^p] = \begin{cases} \frac{p!}{2^{p/2}(\frac{p}{2})!} & \text{if } p \text{ is even,} \\ 0 & \text{if } p \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

This expression has a nice combinatoric interpretation. The quantity  $\mathbb{E}[N^p]$  is the number of partition into pairs of a set with  $p$  elements. For instance,  $\mathbb{E}[N^4] = 3$ , there are 3 partitions into pair of the set  $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ :

$$\{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}\}, \quad \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}\}.$$

Proving the asymptotics of every moments often uses this combinatoric interpretation of Gaussian moments. One has to find a way to make this combinatoric explicit in the expression of  $\mathbb{E}[X_n^p]$ , this is exactly the role of the cumulants of a random variable.

The cumulants of a random variable are classically defined from the power series expansion of the logarithm of the moment generating function. In the following subsections, we give a combinatoric introduction of the cumulants based on the Möebius inversion formula on the lattice of partitions. This approach is largely inspired by the paper of T. P. Speed [56]. It has the advantage of proving usual properties of cumulants with minimal computation. Though not obviously related to the study of zeros of random functions, the use of of these combinatoric tools will appear clearer in the rest of the article. For further applications of this combinatoric-based approach of cumulants, one can also refer to the book [52].

### 2.1 Möebius inversion on a lattice

Let  $(P, \preceq)$  be a finite lattice, that is a partially ordered finite set such that two elements  $x, y$  have a greatest lower bound – a *meet* – denoted  $x \wedge y$  and a least upper bound – a *join* – denoted  $x \vee y$ . Given two elements  $x, y$  in  $P$  with  $x \preceq y$ , we define the closed interval  $[x, y]$  as

$$[x, y] = \{z \in P \mid x \preceq z \preceq y\}.$$

We define recursively the Möebius function  $\mu$  of an interval  $[x, y]$  as the quantity

$$\mu([x, y]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y, \\ - \sum_{x \preceq z \prec y} \mu([x, z]) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

By induction, the Möebius function satisfies the two following identities

$$\sum_{x \preceq z \preceq y} \mu([x, z]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{x \preceq z \preceq y} \mu([z, y]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

From these two formulas, we deduce the following first important theorem, known as *Möebius inversion*.

**Theorem 2.1** (Möebius inversion). *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two functions from  $P$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . We have the following equivalence.*

$$\left( \forall x \in P, \quad g(x) = \sum_{y \succeq x} f(y) \right) \iff \left( \forall x \in P, \quad f(x) = \sum_{y \succeq x} \mu([x, y])g(y) \right).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left( \forall x \in P, \quad g(x) = \sum_{y \preceq x} f(y) \right) \iff \left( \forall x \in P, \quad f(x) = \sum_{y \preceq x} \mu([y, x])g(y) \right).$$

*Proof.* Assume that for all  $x \in P$ ,  $g(x) = \sum_{y \succeq x} f(y)$ . Then

$$\sum_{y \succeq x} \mu([x, y])g(y) = \sum_{y \succeq x} \mu([x, y]) \left( \sum_{z \succeq y} f(z) \right) = \sum_{z \succeq x} f(z) \left( \sum_{x \preceq y \preceq z} \mu([x, y]) \right).$$

Relations (2.1) imply that the right hand term equals  $f(x)$ . The converse sense as well as the second statement can be proved in a similar fashion.  $\square$

A well-known application of Möebius inversion formula is on the ring  $\mathbb{Z}$  of integers equipped the divisibility as partial order, which is a fundamental tool in arithmetic and number theory. One can also cite the lattice of subsets of some finite set, with inclusion as partial order. In that case, Möebius inversion yields the *principle of inclusion-exclusion*.

The second important theorem for our applications is the following *principle of cancellation*.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two functions from  $P$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\forall x \in P, \quad g(x) = \sum_{y \preceq x} f(y).$$

*Let  $x, z \in P$  with  $x \not\preceq z$  such that*

$$\forall y \preceq x, \quad g(y) = g(y \wedge z).$$

*Then*

$$f(x) = 0.$$

*Proof.* One has by Möebius inversion

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= \sum_{y \preceq x} \mu([y, x])g(y) \\
&= \sum_{y \preceq x} \mu([y, x])g(y \wedge z) \\
&= \sum_{y \preceq x} \mu([y, x]) \left( \sum_{w \preceq y \wedge z} g(w) \right) \\
&= \sum_{w \preceq z} g(w) \left( \sum_{w \preceq y \preceq x} \mu([y, x]) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $x \not\preceq z$ , then for all  $w \preceq z$ , one has  $w \neq x$ . Identity (2.1) then implies that

$$\forall w \preceq z, \quad \sum_{w \preceq y \preceq x} \mu([y, x]) = 0,$$

and the conclusion follows.  $\square$

We will concentrate from now on the lattice of partitions of a finite set, which we define in the following subsection.

## 2.2 The lattice of partitions of a finite set

In the following,  $A$  is a non-empty finite set. We say that  $\mathcal{I}$  is a *partition* of  $A$  if it is a collection of disjoint and non-empty subsets of  $A$  such that their union equals to  $A$ . Elements of a partition are called *cells*. We denote the set of partitions of  $A$  by  $\mathcal{P}_A$ . For instance if  $A = \{a, b, c\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\{a,b,c\}} = \left\{ \left\{ \{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\} \right\}, \left\{ \{a\}, \{b, c\} \right\}, \left\{ \{b\}, \{a, c\} \right\}, \left\{ \{c\}, \{a, b\} \right\}, \left\{ \{a, b, c\} \right\} \right\}.$$

Let  $B$  be a subset of  $A$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ . For  $a \in A$  we denote  $[a]_{\mathcal{I}}$  the cell of  $\mathcal{I}$  in which the element  $a$  belongs, and  $\mathcal{I}_B$  the partition of  $B$  induced by the partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$ . For instance, if  $\mathcal{I} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}, \{5\}\}$ ,  $a = 1$  and  $B = \{1, 2, 3\}$  then

$$[a]_{\mathcal{I}} = \{1, 2\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_B = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3\}\}.$$

The set of partitions of  $A$  is naturally equipped with a partial order  $\preceq$ . Given  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  two partitions of  $A$ , we say that  $\mathcal{J}$  is *finer* than (or *refines*)  $\mathcal{I}$  (or that  $\mathcal{I}$  is *coarser* than  $\mathcal{J}$ ) and we denote it by  $\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}$  (or  $\mathcal{I} \succeq \mathcal{J}$ ), if

$$\forall J \in \mathcal{J}, \exists I \in \mathcal{I} \text{ such that } J \subset I.$$

Given two partitions  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$ , one can define its *meet*  $\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J}$  as the coarsest partition that refines both  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$ , and its *join*  $\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{J}$  as the finest partition that is refined both by  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$ . Explicitly, the cells of  $\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J}$  are all the non-empty intersections of a block in  $\mathcal{I}$  and a block in  $\mathcal{J}$ , i.e

$$\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J} = \{I \cap J \mid I \in \mathcal{I}, J \in \mathcal{J}\} \setminus \emptyset.$$

The cells of  $\mathcal{I} \vee \mathcal{J}$  are exactly the smallest subsets of  $A$  that are both union of blocks of  $\mathcal{I}$  and union of blocks of  $\mathcal{J}$ . These two properties turn the partially ordered set  $(\mathcal{P}_A, \preceq)$  into a finite lattice. The two following lemmas, whose proofs are straightforward, will be used throughout the article.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$  be two partitions of the set  $A$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J} = \bigsqcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{I}_J.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a partition of  $A$ . There is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of partitions of  $A$  coarser than  $\mathcal{J}$ , and the set of partitions of  $\mathcal{J}$ , given by the bijection*

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A \mid \mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}\} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{J}} \\ \mathcal{I} &\longmapsto \{\mathcal{I}_I \mid I \in \mathcal{I}\} \end{aligned}$$

We are now in position to explicit the Möebius function on the lattice of partitions  $\mathcal{P}_A$ , given by the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$  be two partitions of the set  $A$  with  $\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}$ . Then*

$$\mu([\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}]) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1} (|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1)! \quad .$$

*Proof.* Given two integers  $n$  and  $p$ , we define the factorial power

$$[n]^p = n(n-1) \dots (n-p+1).$$

We apply Möebius inversion of Theorem 2.1 to the following identity, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A$ ,

$$n^{|\mathcal{J}|} = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \succeq \mathcal{J}} n^{|\mathcal{I}|}. \quad (2.2)$$

This identity can be deduced by considering the number of  $n$ -colorings of the cells of the partitions  $\mathcal{J}$ , with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . There are naively  $n^{|\mathcal{J}|}$  such colorings. We can also count them by gathering cells of same color, leading to the formula on the right-hand side of (2.2). Möebius inversion then implies, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$n^{|\mathcal{J}|} = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \succeq \mathcal{J}} \mu([\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}]) n^{|\mathcal{I}|}.$$

Identifying the linear term in  $n$  in both sides leads to

$$\mu([\mathcal{J}, \{A\}]) = (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}| - 1} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! \quad .$$

More generally, let  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  be two partitions with  $\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}$ . The one-to-one correspondence 2.4 implies that the interval  $[\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}]$  can be formally written as the product  $\prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} [\mathcal{J}_I, \{I\}]$ . It is not hard to show that the Möebius function is multiplicative, so that

$$\mu([\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}]) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mu([\mathcal{J}_I, \{I\}]) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1} (|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1)! \quad .$$

□

Let us then describe the Möebius inversion on the lattice of partitions. To this end, we fix  $(m_{\mathcal{I}})_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$  and  $(\kappa_{\mathcal{I}})_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$  be two families of numbers.

**Proposition 2.6.** *One has the equivalence*

$$\left( \forall \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A, \quad m_{\mathcal{I}} = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}} \kappa_{\mathcal{J}} \right) \text{ iff } \left( \forall \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A, \quad \kappa_{\mathcal{I}} = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1} (|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1)! \right) m_{\mathcal{I}} \right). \quad (2.3)$$

On the lattice of partition, the particular shape of the Möebius function as a product implies a very pleasant version of the Möebius inversion in the particular case where one has the product decomposition

$$\forall \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A, \quad m_{\mathcal{I}} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} m_I \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_{\mathcal{I}} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \kappa_I.$$

For  $(m_B)_{B \subset A}$  and  $(\kappa_B)_{B \subset A}$  two families of numbers indexed by subsets of  $A$ . In that case, the Möebius inversion takes the following more standard form.

**Proposition 2.7.** *We have*

$$\left( \forall B \subset A, \quad m_B = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_B} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \kappa_J \right) \text{ iff } \left( \forall B \subset A, \quad \kappa_B = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}| - 1} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} m_J \right).$$

*Proof.* We prove the direct implication, but the converse sense is proved similarly. We define for a collection  $\mathcal{I}$  of subsets of  $A$  (not necessarily a partition of  $A$ ) the quantities

$$m_{\mathcal{I}} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} m_I \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_{\mathcal{I}} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \kappa_I.$$

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of a subset  $B$  of  $A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\mathcal{I}} &= \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \left( \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_I} \kappa_{\mathcal{J}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}} \kappa_{\mathcal{J}} \end{aligned}$$

By Möebius inversion on the lattice  $\mathcal{P}_B$ , we get

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{I}} = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1} (|\mathcal{J}_I| - 1)! m_I \right)$$

We get the conclusion by choosing  $\mathcal{I} = \{B\}$ . □

As for the cancellation principle, it takes the following two alternatives forms.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $(m_{\mathcal{I}})_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$  and  $(\kappa_{\mathcal{I}})_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$  be two families of numbers related by one of the equivalent formulas in Proposition (2.3). Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K}$  be two partition of  $A$ , with  $\mathcal{I} \not\preceq \mathcal{K}$  such that*

$$\forall \mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{K}, \quad m_{\mathcal{J}} = m_{\mathcal{J} \wedge \mathcal{K}}.$$

*Then*

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{I}} = 0.$$

*Alternatively, let  $(m_B)_{B \subset A}$  and  $(\kappa_B)_{B \subset A}$  be two families of numbers related by one of the equivalent formulas in Proposition 2.7. Let  $C$  be a subset of  $A$  and assume the existence of a partition  $\mathcal{K}$  such that  $\mathcal{K}_C \neq \{C\}$  and such that*

$$\forall B \subset C, \quad m_B = \prod_{K \in \mathcal{K}} m_{K \cap B}.$$

*Then*

$$\kappa_C = 0.$$

We readily understand the dictionary between cumulants as a collection indexed by partitions of  $A$ , and by subsets of  $A$ . In most of the articles that treats cumulant of a random variable, it is generally the latter that is used, since it is closer to the intuition we have of cumulants. We also could have used this approach in the present article, but for some technical reasons, the formal approach simplifies a bit some notations and arguments and allows for greater generality for the future. The main argument is that the former approach consider the relation between moments and cumulants as a *linear transformation*, contrary to the latter approach.

### 2.3 Cumulants of a random variable

We now apply the previous results on the Möebius inversion on the lattice of partitions to define the cumulants of a random variable and prove some useful properties. To this end, we consider  $A$  a finite set and  $X = (X_a)_{a \in A}$  be a collection of real random variables indexed by  $A$ . Assume that these random variables have finite moments up to order  $|A|$ . For a subset  $B$  of  $A$ , we define  $X_B = (X_b)_{b \in B}$ ,

$$m(X_B) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{b \in B} X_b \right] \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(X_B) = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (-1)^{|\mathcal{I}|-1} (|\mathcal{I}| - 1)! \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} m(X_I). \quad (2.4)$$

The quantity  $m(X_B)$  (resp.  $\kappa(X_B)$ ) is called the *joint moment* (resp. *joint cumulant*) of the collection of random variables  $(X_b)_{b \in B}$ . One has by Möebius inversion of Proposition 2.7, that

$$m(X_B) = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_B} \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \kappa(X_I).$$

**Proposition 2.9** (Cancellation of cumulants). *Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a partition of  $A$  different from the trivial partition  $\{A\}$ . Assume that the collection of random vectors  $((X_j)_{j \in J})_{J \in \mathcal{J}}$ , indexed by the cells of the partition  $\mathcal{J}$ , are mutually independent. Then*

$$\kappa(X) = 0.$$

*Proof.* This is a direct application of Lemma 2.8, since the independence assumption implies that

$$m(X_B) = \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} m(X_{J \cap B}).$$

□

In order to study the distribution of the collection of random variables  $X = (X_a)_{a \in A}$ , we will consider the joint cumulants of repetitions of the variables  $(X_a)_{a \in A}$ . To this end, we use the following multindex notations. For a vector  $p = (p_a)_{a \in A}$  of  $\mathbb{N}^A$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}^A$ , we define

$$p! := \prod_{a \in A} p_a!, \quad |p| := \sum_{a \in A} p_a, \quad \text{and} \quad t^p := \prod_{a \in A} t_a^{p_a}.$$

We also define

$$A^p := \{(a, i) \mid a \in A, 1 \leq i \leq p_a\}.$$

We introduce, when defined, the quantities

$$m_p(X) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} X_a^{p_a} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_p(X) := \kappa \left( \bigcup_{a \in A} \underbrace{(X_a, \dots, X_a)}_{p_a \text{ times}} \right),$$

with the convention  $m_0(X) = 1$  and  $\kappa_0(X) = 0$ . For a single variable  $X$  and  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$m_p(X) = \mathbb{E}[X^p] \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_p(X) = \kappa(\underbrace{X, \dots, X}_{p \text{ times}}).$$

Given the definition of the set  $A^p$ , we have the following equality

$$m_p(X) = m(X^{(p)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_p(X) = \kappa(X^{(p)}),$$

where  $X^{(p)}$  is the random vector indexed by  $A^p$  such that  $X_{a,i}^{(p)} = X_a$ . Assume that all the moments of the random vector  $X$  are finite. For  $t \in \mathbb{R}^A$ , we define the *moment generating function* as the formal series

$$M_X(t) := \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}^A} m_p(X) \frac{t^p}{p!}.$$

Note that this series does not necessarily converges. Since  $m_0(X) = 1$  we can define the *cumulant generating function*  $H_X(t)$  as the formal series

$$K_X(t) := \log M_X(t).$$

**Proposition 2.10.** *The formal Taylor series of the function  $K_X$  is*

$$K_X(t) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}^A} \kappa_p(X) \frac{t^p}{p!}.$$

*Proof.* It suffices to show that

$$\exp \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}^A} \kappa_p(X) \frac{t^p}{p!} \right) = M_X(t).$$

We compute the left hand term to get

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}^A} \kappa_p(X) \frac{t^p}{p!} \right) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{n!} \left( \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}^A} \kappa_p(X) \frac{t^p}{p!} \right)^n \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(n)} \in \mathbb{N}^A} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \kappa_{p^{(i)}}(X) \right) \frac{t^{p^{(1)} + \dots + p^{(n)}}}{p^{(1)}! \dots p^{(n)}!}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting the term of order  $p$  by  $c_p(X)$ , we get the identity

$$p! c_p(X) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{p^{(1)} + \dots + p^{(n)} = p} \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \kappa_{p^{(i)}}(X) \right) \frac{1}{n!} \frac{p!}{p^{(1)}! \dots p^{(n)}!}.$$

By enumerating partitions of the set  $A^p$  by the number of cells, a standard combinatoric argument shows that this sum is exactly

$$p! c_p(X) = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_{A^p}} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \kappa_I(X^{(p)}) \right).$$

Möebius inversion then implies the identity

$$c_p(X) = m_p(X).$$

□

Note that the logarithm and the exponential respect the graduation. As a consequence, the above proof remains valid if one replace the logarithm and exponential functions by their truncated definition up to some order  $p \in \mathbb{N}^A$ . That is, this formal series relation between moments and cumulants works even though moments (and thus cumulants) are defined up to some order  $p \in \mathbb{N}^A$ . We then have the following proposition, that characterizes Gaussian moments.

**Proposition 2.11.** *A random vector  $X = (X_a)_{a \in A}$  is Gaussian if and only if*

$$\forall p \in \mathbb{N}^A \text{ with } |p| \geq 3, \quad \kappa_p(X) = 0.$$

*Proof.* The random vector  $X$  is a Gaussian vector  $\mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)$ , if and only if its moment generating function is given by

$$M_X(t) = \exp \left( \langle m, t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle t, \Sigma t \rangle \right).$$

Taking the logarithm of this expression, one obtains by Proposition 2.10 the next expression for the cumulant generating function

$$K_X(t) = \langle m, t \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle t, \Sigma t \rangle,$$

and the conclusion follows. The converse sens is similar, since the cumulant generating function necessarily has the above form. □

The joint cumulant of a collection of random variables  $(X_a)_{a \in A}$  must be seen as the “pure order  $A$ ” dependence between the random variables  $(X_a)_{a \in A}$ . If the variables  $(X_a)_{a \in A}$  can be split into two independent collections of random variables, then there is no “pure order  $A$  dependence”. This explains why their joint cumulant is zero and the conclusion of Proposition 2.9. The joint moment, by the formula (2.4), is obtained by adding up all possible mutual dependencies between random variables. In that sense, cumulants are more natural than moments in order to explore the mutual dependence between random variables. If  $X$  is a random variable, then

$$\kappa_1(X) = \mathbb{E}[X] \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_2(X) = \text{Var}(X).$$

The cumulant  $\kappa_3(X)$  and  $\kappa_4(X)$  are respectively called the *skewness* and the *kurtosis* of the random variable  $X$ . They measure the asymmetry and the flatness of a given distribution, respectively.



Proposition 2.11 implies that Gaussian distributions are the only distributions such that all the interactions (i.e. cumulants) are of order at most 2 (expectation and covariance). It is a combinatoric interpretation of Gaussian distribution. In that sense, the collection of cumulants higher than 2 can be seen as a measure of non Gaussianity of a given distribution.

### 3 Basics and notations

We define a few notations that will be of use and simplify the exposition. The letter  $a, b, \dots$  denote elements of  $A$ . The letters  $B, C, \dots$  denote subsets of  $A$ . The letters  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \dots$  denote partitions of  $A$ .

#### 3.1 Diagonal set and diagonal inclusion

Let  $(E, \|\cdot\|)$  be a normed vector space. We define the large diagonal of  $E^A$  as the subset of  $E^A$  where at least two coordinates coincide.

$$\Delta := \left\{ \underline{x}_A \in E^A \mid \exists a, b \in A \text{ with } a \neq b \text{ and } x_a = x_b \right\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of the set  $A$ . We define

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I}} = \left\{ \underline{x}_A \in E^A \mid x_a = x_b \iff [a]_{\mathcal{I}} = [b]_{\mathcal{I}} \right\}.$$

From this definition, one has the following decomposition of the space  $E^A$

$$E^A = \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}, \quad \Delta = \bigsqcup_{\substack{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A \\ \mathcal{I} \neq \bar{A}}} \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}, \quad \text{and} \quad E^A \setminus \Delta = \Delta_{\bar{A}}.$$

We also define

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I}^+} := \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}} \Delta_{\mathcal{J}} = \left\{ \underline{x}_A \in E^A \mid x_a = x_b \implies [a]_{\mathcal{I}} = [b]_{\mathcal{I}} \right\}.$$

##### 3.1.1 Enlargement of the diagonal set

We fix a number  $\eta \geq 0$  and  $\underline{x}_A \in E^A$ . We define

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I}^+, \eta} = \left\{ \underline{x}_A \in E^A \mid \forall I, J \in \mathcal{I}, \text{dist}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_I), \text{Conv}(\underline{x}_J)) > \eta \right\},$$

and

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} = \Delta_{\mathcal{I}^+, \eta} \setminus \left( \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{J} \prec \mathcal{I}} \Delta_{\mathcal{J}^+, \eta} \right).$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ . An element  $\underline{x}_A$  in  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta}$  satisfies the two following properties*

- For all  $a, b \in A$  such that  $[a]_{\mathcal{I}} = [b]_{\mathcal{I}}$ , one has  $\|x_a - x_b\| \leq (|A| - 1)\eta$
- For  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $I \neq J$ , one has  $\text{dist}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_I), \text{Conv}(\underline{x}_J)) > \eta$

*Proof.* Let  $\underline{x} \in E^A$ . We define

$$\mathcal{I}_\eta^{(0)}(\underline{x}) = \overline{A}.$$

By induction, assume that for some  $k \geq 0$ , the partition  $\mathcal{I}_\eta^{(k)}(\underline{x})$  is defined, and that for every cell  $I$  of  $\mathcal{I}_\eta^{(k)}(\underline{x})$ , one has

$$\text{diam}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_I)) \leq (|I| - 1)\eta.$$

If  $I, J$  are two distinct cells of  $\mathcal{I}_\eta^{(k)}(\underline{x})$  such that  $\text{dist}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_I), \text{Conv}(\underline{x}_J)) \leq \eta$ , we define

$$\mathcal{I}_\eta^{(k+1)}(\underline{x}) = \left( \mathcal{I}_\eta^{(k)}(\underline{x}) \setminus \{I, J\} \right) \cup \{I \cup J\},$$

the partition obtained by merging the cells  $I$  and  $J$ . In that case,

$$\text{diam}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_{I \cup J})) \leq \text{diam}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_I)) + \text{diam}(\text{Conv}(\underline{x}_J)) + \eta \leq (|I \cup J| - 1)\eta,$$

and the induction hypothesis is true for  $\mathcal{I}_\eta^{(k+1)}(\underline{x})$ . This construction provides a increasing sequence of partitions in the finite set of partitions of  $A$ , that stops to a final partition denoted  $\mathcal{I}_\eta(\underline{x}_A)$ . It is straightforward to observe by double inclusion the equality

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} = \left\{ \underline{x}_A \in E^A \mid \mathcal{I}_\eta(\underline{x}_A) = \mathcal{I} \right\},$$

and the two points in the theorem. □

### 3.1.2 The factorial power measure

We define the diagonal inclusion

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{\mathcal{I}} : E^{\mathcal{I}} &\longrightarrow E^A \\ \underline{x}_{\mathcal{I}} &\longrightarrow (x_{[a]_{\mathcal{I}}})_{a \in A}. \end{aligned}$$

For instance, if  $\mathcal{I} = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2\}\}$  then  $\iota_{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) = (x, y, x)$ . A direct consequence of this definition is that the mapping  $\iota_{\mathcal{I}}$  is a bijection between  $E^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \Delta$  and  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}$ . Let  $Z$  be a locally finite subset of the space  $E$ . We set  $\nu := \sum_{x \in Z} \delta_x$  the counting measure on  $Z$ ,

$$\nu^A = \sum_{x \in Z^A} \delta_x \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^{[A]} = \sum_{x \in Z^A \setminus \Delta} \delta_x.$$

The measure  $\nu^A$  (resp.  $\nu^{[A]}$ ) is the power (resp. factorial power) measure of the measure  $\nu$ . Both measures are linked by the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *With the notations as above, one has*

$$\nu^A = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \iota_{\mathcal{I}*} \nu^{[\mathcal{I}]}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\sum_{x \in Z^A} \delta_x = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \left( \sum_{x \in Z^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}} \delta_x \right).$$

Using the fact that the mapping  $\iota_{\mathcal{I}}$  is a bijection between  $E^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \Delta$  and  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}$ , one gets

$$\sum_{x \in Z^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I}}} \delta_x = \sum_{y \in Z^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \Delta} \delta_{\iota_{\mathcal{I}}(y)} = \iota_{\mathcal{I}*} \nu^{[\mathcal{I}]}.$$

□

## 3.2 Matrix notations

The Kac density (see Section 5 and Lemma 5.3) is expressed in term of the covariance matrix of the underlying Gaussian process and its derivatives. This fact allows us to consider the Kac density as a function defined on the set of positive definite matrices, evaluated in some covariance matrix related to our underlying Gaussian process. To this end, we introduce a few useful notations

### 3.2.1 Basic matrix notations

Let  $(E, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$  be an Euclidean spaces equipped with an orthogonal base, and  $\tilde{E}$  be a linear subspace of  $E$ . We define  $\mathcal{M}(E)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(E)$  and  $\mathcal{S}^+(E)$  respectively the sets of square, symmetric, and symmetric positive definite matrices acting on the space  $E$ , and  $\mathcal{M}(E, \tilde{E})$  the space of matrices acting from  $E$  to  $\tilde{E}$ . The open subset of matrices in  $\mathcal{M}(E, \tilde{E})$  with maximal rank (i.e such that the image is the whole space  $\tilde{E}$ ) is denoted  $\mathcal{M}^*(E, \tilde{E})$ . The norm of an element in  $\mathcal{M}(E, \tilde{E})$  is the supremum norm of its coefficients.

Let  $B, C, I, J$  be subsets of  $A$ , and  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{M}(E^B, E^C)$ . We define  $\Gamma_{I, J}$  to be the induced submatrix in  $\mathcal{M}(E^{J \cap B}, E^{I \cap C})$  and  $\Gamma_I = \Gamma_{I, I}$ . For a partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$ , we define

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(E^B, E^C) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}(E^{B \cap I}, E^{C \cap I}) \subset \mathcal{M}(E^B, E^C),$$

the space of block diagonal matrices with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , and  $\Gamma_{\mathcal{I}}$  the matrix in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(E^B, E^C)$  with block  $(\Gamma_I)_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ , so that  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(E^B, E^C)$  if and only if  $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathcal{I}}$ . We define in a similar fashion  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(E^B)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}(E^B)$ ,  $\dots$

Let  $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$ , an orthogonal decomposition of  $E$ , adapted to its basis. A vector  $v \in E$  can be uniquely decomposed as  $v = v^1 + v^2$ , where  $v^1 \in E^1$  and  $v^2 \in E^2$ . This notation will be used throughout the article. Given a matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}(E^B, E^C)$ , we write

$$\Sigma = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma^{11} & \Sigma^{12} \\ \hline \Sigma^{21} & \Sigma^{22} \end{array} \right),$$

where  $\Sigma^{uv} \in \mathcal{M}((E^v)^B, (E^u)^C)$  for  $u, v \in \{1, 2\}$ . Let  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}(E^A)$  such that the matrix  $\Sigma^{11}$  is invertible. We define the matrix  $\Sigma^c \in \mathcal{M}((E^2)^A)$  to be the Schur complement of  $\Sigma^{11}$  in  $\Sigma$  :

$$\Sigma^c = \Sigma^{22} - \Sigma^{21}(\Sigma^{11})^{-1}\Sigma^{12}.$$

This matrix arises from the identity

$$\left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{Id} & 0 \\ \hline -\Sigma^{21}(\Sigma^{11})^{-1} & \text{Id} \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma^{11} & \Sigma^{12} \\ \hline \Sigma^{21} & \Sigma^{22} \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma^{11} & \Sigma^{12} \\ \hline 0 & \Sigma^c \end{array} \right).$$

In particular

$$\det(\Sigma) = \det(\Sigma^{11}) \det(\Sigma^c). \quad (3.1)$$

If  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}^+(E^A)$  then  $\Sigma^c \in \mathcal{S}^+((E^2)^A)$  and

$$(\Sigma^c)^{-1} = (\Sigma^{-1})^{22}. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that if  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^+(E^A)$ , then  $\Sigma^c \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^+((E^2)^A)$  and

$$(\Sigma^c)_{\mathcal{I}} = (\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}})^c. \quad (3.3)$$

### 3.2.2 Covariance matrix and Gaussian conditioning

Let  $E$  be an Euclidean space equipped with a basis, such that  $E = E_1 \oplus E_2$ , an orthogonal decomposition of  $E$  adapted to its basis. and  $X, Y$  two jointly real Gaussian vectors taking values respectively in  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ . We assume that the Gaussian vector  $(X, Y)$  is non-degenerate in  $E$ . We define

$$\Sigma_{11} = \text{Var}(X), \quad \Sigma_{22} = \text{Var}(Y), \quad \Sigma_{12} = \text{Cov}(X, Y),$$

and

$$\Sigma := \text{Var}(X, Y) = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \hline \Sigma_{12}^T & \Sigma_{22} \end{array} \right) \in \mathcal{S}^+(E).$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *We have*

$$\text{Law}(Y|X=0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_c).$$

*Proof.* We define the Gaussian vector

$$Y_c = Y - \Sigma_{12}^T (\Sigma_{11})^{-1} X.$$

Then

$$\text{Cov}(X, Y_c) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Cov}(Y_c) = \Sigma_c.$$

Since decorrelation implies independence for Gaussian vectors, we have the following equality of conditional distributions

$$\text{Law}(Y|X) \sim \mathcal{N}(\Sigma_{12}^T (\Sigma_{11})^{-1} X, \Sigma_c) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Law}(Y|X=0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_c).$$

□

### 3.2.3 Power product space

In section 5.2.3 we will compute cumulants of a collection of random variables indexed by a set  $A$ . To this end, we will have to deal with families of objects –matrices– indexed by subsets of  $A$ . This justifies the introduction of the following spaces. We define the sets

$$\mathcal{M}(F^{[A]}) := \prod_{B \subset A} \mathcal{M}(F^B) \times \mathcal{M}(F^A, F^B) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}^*(F^{[A]}) := \prod_{B \subset A} \mathcal{M}(F^B) \times \mathcal{M}^*(F^A, F^B). \quad (3.4)$$

The space  $\mathcal{M}^*(F^{[A]})$  is an open subset of  $\mathcal{M}(F^{[A]})$ . An element  $(M^B, Q^B)_{B \subset A}$  of  $\mathcal{M}(F^{[A]})$  will be simply denoted  $(M, Q)$ . For a partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$  we define similarly the sets

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(F^{[A]}) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}(F^{[I]}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]}) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{M}^*(F^{[I]}),$$

as subsets of  $\mathcal{M}(F^{[A]})$ . An element  $(M, Q) \in \mathcal{M}(F^{[A]})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(F^{[A]})$  if for all  $B \subset A$ , the matrices  $M^B$  and  $Q^B$  are block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , with blocks  $(M^{I \cap B})_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $(Q^{I \cap B})_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ .

Let  $R = (R^{\mathcal{J}})_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$ , a collection of real numbers indexed by partitions of  $A$ , that is an element of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_A}$ . For a partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , we define the linear subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_A}$

$$\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{P}_A} = \left\{ R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_A} \mid \forall \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A, R^{\mathcal{J}} = R^{\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J}} \right\}.$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K}$  be two partitions of  $A$  with  $\mathcal{I} \preceq \mathcal{K}$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}^*(F^{[A]}),$$

and

$$\mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{P}^A} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{K}}^{\mathcal{P}^A}.$$

*Proof.* The proofs of both facts are straightforward : if a matrix is block diagonal with respect to a partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , then it is also block diagonal with respect to a partition  $\mathcal{K}$  for  $\mathcal{K} \succeq \mathcal{I}$ . Similarly, let  $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{P}^A}$ . Then for  $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{J}$ ,

$$R^{\mathcal{K} \wedge \mathcal{J}} = R^{\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{K} \wedge \mathcal{J}} = R^{\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J}} = R^{\mathcal{J}}.$$

□

### 3.3 Space notations

This short subsection is devoted the notations that will be used throughout the article. For the rest of the article, we fix a positive integer  $p$ . In the following,  $E$  is an abstract finite dimensional vector space. We denote by  $\mathcal{P}[E]$  the space of all real valued polynomial functions on  $E$ . If  $(X_i)_i$  is a basis of  $E$  then one can see  $\mathcal{P}[E]$  as the polynomial ring with indeterminates the elements of  $(X_i)_i$ . This space is naturally endowed with a gradation corresponding to the total degree of the associated polynomial. For  $p \geq 0$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}_p[E]$  the subspace of  $\mathcal{P}[E]$  of polynomial with total degree lower than  $p$ . We define the vector spaces

$$V = (\mathcal{P}_{2p-1}(\mathbb{R}^d))^k, \quad W = \mathcal{C}^{2p-1}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k) \quad \text{and} \quad W_2 = W \otimes W = \mathcal{C}^{(2p-1, 2p-1)}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)),$$

equipped with their usual topology. Note that  $V$  can be seen as a closed subset of  $W$ . We also define

$$F = \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^k).$$

If  $f \in W$  then for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , one has that

$$(f(x), \nabla f(x)) \in F.$$

The space  $F$  is naturally decomposed as a direct sum  $F_1 \oplus F_2$ , and we will use the notations of Section 3.2.

**Remark 3.5.** When dealing with critical points of a Gaussian field, we define alternatively the spaces  $V, W, W^2$  and  $F$  as follow to take into account the symmetry of the derivatives

$$V = \nabla \mathcal{P}_{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad W = \nabla \mathcal{C}^{2p}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}), \quad W_2 = \nabla_1 \nabla_2 \mathcal{C}^{(2p, 2p)}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}), \quad F = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

### 3.4 Invariance by translation

In the rest of the article, the invariance by translation or the equivariance will play an important role. The heuristic is that a property of clustering and a property of invariance by translation implies some form of compactness that will be essential for the following. Given  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define the translation by the vector  $t$  by  $\tau_t$ . This function acts on collection of points and on functions via the relation  $\tau_t \cdot h = h \circ \tau_t$ . A function  $h$  is said to be invariant by translation if

$$\tau_t \cdot h = h.$$

A family of functions  $\underline{x} \mapsto g_{\underline{x}}$  is equivariant (by translation) if for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$g_{\underline{x}} = \tau_t \cdot g_{\tau_{-t}(\underline{x})}$$

Given a collection of points  $\underline{x}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we define  $\text{Bar}(\underline{x})$  the barycenter of  $\underline{x}$ . Note that a function  $h$  invariant by translation is completely defined by its values on the subspace  $\{\text{Bar}(\underline{x}) = 0\}$ , and a similar property can be stated for equivariant families of functions.

## 4 Multivariate interpolation and divided differences

### 4.1 Kergin interpolation

In [37], the author provides an elegant solution to the interpolation problem at  $p$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of a function in  $W$  by  $d$ -variate polynomials. We refer to [29] for more details.

**Theorem 4.1** (Kergin). *There is a family of mapping  $(\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}})_{\underline{x} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^p}$  from  $W$  to  $V$  such that*

- *if the multiplicity of  $x_i$  in  $\underline{x}$  is  $n$  then for  $f \in W$ ,*

$$\forall |\alpha| \leq 2n - 1, \quad \partial_\alpha f(x_i) = \partial_\alpha \mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f(x_i)$$

- *the family  $\underline{x} \mapsto \mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}}$  is continuous and is an equivariant family of continuous linear projectors for the usual topology on  $W$*

The projector  $\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}}$  is the usual Kergin projector at points  $(x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2, \dots, x_p, x_p)$ . In [47], the authors provide an explicit formula for the Kergin interpolant that generalizes the Hermite-Genocchi formula in the one-dimensional case. We define the standard simplex of dimension  $2p - 1$  as

$$\Sigma^{2p-1} = \left\{ (v_1, \dots, v_p) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^p \mid \sum_{i=1}^p v_i = 1 \right\},$$

and for any vector of  $p$  points  $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_p) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^p$ , we define the linear functional  $\int_{[\underline{x}]}$  such that

$$\int_{[\underline{x}]} f = \int_{\Sigma^p} f(v_1 x_1 + \dots + v_p x_p) dv_1 \dots dv_p.$$

For a positive integer  $r$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we denote by  $D_x^r f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the  $r^{\text{th}}$  the total  $r$ -th derivative of  $f$  at point  $x$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *For each  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{2p-1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\underline{x} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^p$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f)(z) &= \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \int_{[(x_1, \dots, x_r)]} D_v^r f((z - x_1), \dots, (z - x_r)) dv \quad + \\ &\quad \sum_{r=0}^{p-1} \int_{[(x_1, \dots, x_p, x_1, \dots, x_r)]} D_v^{p+r} f((z - x_1), \dots, (z - x_p), (z - x_1), \dots, (z - x_r)) dv \end{aligned}$$

*In particular, if  $K$  is a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , there is a constant  $C_K$  such that for  $\underline{x} \in K^A$*

$$\|\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f\| \leq C_K \sup_{y \in \text{Conv}(\underline{x})} \sup_{|\alpha| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_\alpha f(y)|.$$

*Proof.* See [47]. □

### 4.2 Abstract divided differences

This material is largely borrowed from the ideas developed in the paper [29].

### 4.2.1 Definition and basic properties

Let  $E$  be a finite dimensional vector space endowed with a scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . For a linear subspace  $\tilde{E} \subset E$  we define  $\text{Proj}_{\tilde{E}}$  as the orthogonal projector on the space  $\tilde{E}$ . We endow the vector space  $V$  with with a scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ . Let  $A$  be a finite set equipped with an arbitrary total order, and  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \setminus \Delta$ . We define

$$\delta_{\underline{y}} = (\delta_{y_a})_{a \in A}, \quad \nabla_{\underline{y}} = (\nabla_{y_a})_{a \in A} \quad \text{and} \quad j_{\underline{y}} = (\delta_{\underline{y}}, \nabla_{\underline{y}}),$$

the families of free linear forms on  $W$  (and thus on  $V$ ). This family can be seen as a map from  $W$  to  $F^A$ , where  $F$  is introduced in 3.3. Assume first that the barycenter of  $\underline{y}$ , denoted by  $\text{Bar}(\underline{y})$  is zero. We define  $J_{\underline{y}} = (D_{\underline{y}}, N_{\underline{y}})$  as the family of linear forms on  $W$  obtained by applying the Gram-Schmidt process to the family  $j_{\underline{y}}$ , with respect to the scalar product defined on  $V^*$ . This family can also be seen as a map from  $W$  to  $F^A$ . Let  $M(\underline{y})$  be the associated transformation matrix, that can be seen as an element of  $\mathcal{M}^*(F^A)$  so that

$$j_{\underline{y}} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{\underline{y}} \\ \nabla_{\underline{y}} \end{pmatrix} = M(\underline{y})J_{\underline{y}} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1(\underline{y}) & 0 \\ M_{21}(\underline{y}) & M_2(\underline{y}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_{\underline{y}} \\ N_{\underline{y}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now if  $\text{Bar}(\underline{y}) \neq 0$ , we define

$$J_{\underline{y}} : f \rightarrow J_{\underline{y}-\text{Bar}(\underline{y})} (f(\cdot + \text{Bar}(\underline{y}))) \quad \text{and} \quad M(\underline{y}) = M(\underline{y} - \text{Bar}(\underline{y})),$$

so that the matrix  $M(\underline{y})$  is invariant by translation, the mapping  $\underline{y} \mapsto J_{\underline{y}}$  is equivariant, and  $j_{\underline{y}} = M(\underline{y})J_{\underline{y}}$ . If  $B$  is a subset of  $A$ , we define the matrix  $Q_B(\underline{y}) \in \mathcal{M}^*(F^A, F^B)$  that relates divided differences with respect to the families of points  $\underline{y}_A$  and the subfamily of points  $\underline{y}_B$ . Using the notation introduced in 3.3,

$$Q_B(\underline{y}) := [M(\underline{y}_B)]^{-1}M_{A,B}(\underline{y}), \quad \text{so that} \quad J_{\underline{y}_B} = Q_B(\underline{y})J_{\underline{y}} \quad \text{and} \quad j_{y_a} = Q_{\{a\}}(\underline{y})J_{\underline{y}}.$$

We will abusively associate the term "orthonormal" to the family  $J_{\underline{y}}$ . It is indeed an orthogonal family up to translation of the barycenter, but not with unit norm, given the Gram-Schmidt process used. In practice, we use the orthogonalization process on the family  $j_{\underline{y}}$  only when the collection of points  $\underline{y}$  is close to the deep diagonal, so that the norm of the vectors in  $\delta_{\underline{y}}$  (after translation of the barycenter) are positively bounded below, by a compactness argument. This justifies the denomination "orthonormal".

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $B$  be a subset of  $A$ . The sets*

$$\left\{ M(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ Q_B(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}.$$

*are relatively compact subsets of  $\mathcal{M}(F^A)$  and  $\mathcal{M}^*(F^A, F^B)$ , respectively.*

*Proof.* Let  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ . Since the matrix  $M(\underline{y})$  is invariant by translation, we can assume that  $\text{Bar}(\underline{y}) = 0$ . In that case, from Lemma 3.1, one has that for  $a \in A$  the inequality  $|y_a| \leq (|A| - 1)\eta$ . It implies that the set

$$\left\{ j_{\underline{y}} \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}$$

is bounded. The matrix  $M(\underline{y})$  sends an orthonormal family (namely,  $J_{\underline{y}}$ ) to an element of this set and must be uniformly bounded by a constant that does not depend of  $\underline{y}$ . Similarly, the set

$$\left\{ J_{\underline{y}_B} \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}$$

is a relatively compact subset of the set of families of vectors of  $V^*$  of maximal rank. The matrix  $Q_B(\underline{y})$  sends an orthonormal family of  $V^*$  to an element of this set, and thus must belong to a compact subset of the matrices of maximal rank independent of  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ .  $\square$

### 4.2.2 Divided differences with respect to a partition

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ . Given a collection of points  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \setminus \Delta$ . We define the families of linear forms on  $W$  obtained by applying the Gram-Schmidt process independently on each subfamily  $j_{\underline{y}_I}$ , for  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , so that

$$J_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} = (J_{\underline{y}_I})_{I \in \mathcal{I}} = (D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}}, N_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}}).$$

Let  $M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \in \mathcal{M}^*(F^A)$  be the associated transformation matrix so that

$$j_{\underline{y}} = M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) J_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}}.$$

Note that the matrix  $M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  is block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , with blocks  $(M(\underline{y}_I))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ , so that  $M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^A)$ . Let  $B$  be a subset of  $A$ . We define

$$Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) = [M^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B)]^{-1} M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}),$$

so that

$$J_{\underline{y}_B}^{\mathcal{I}_B} = Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) J_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}}.$$

The matrix  $Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^A, F^B)$ , with blocks  $(Q_{I \cap B}(\underline{y}_B))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$  and  $B$  be a subset of  $A$ . The sets*

$$\left\{ M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}.$$

*are relatively compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}(F^A)$  and  $\mathcal{M}^*(F^A, F^B)$ , respectively.*

*Proof.* Note that if  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta}$ , then for  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , one has  $y_I \in \Delta_{\overline{I}, \eta} \subset V^I$ . The proof then follows directly from Lemma 4.3 since the matrices  $M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  and  $Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  are block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , with blocks  $(M(\underline{y}_I))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $(Q_{I \cap B}(\underline{y}_B))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ , respectively.  $\square$

At last we introduce the notation

$$M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}] = (M^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B))_{B \subset A} \quad \text{and} \quad Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}] = (Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{B \subset A}.$$

**Lemma 4.5.** *The set*

$$\left\{ (M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}], Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}$$

*is a relatively compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]})$ .*

*Proof.* Let us first check that for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ , the element  $(M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}], Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}])$  belongs to the set  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(F^{[A]})$  introduced in Section 3.2.3. This is straightforward, since for a subset  $B$  of  $A$ , the matrices  $M^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B)$  and  $Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  are block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ , with respective blocks  $(M(\underline{y}_{I \cap B}))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $(Q_{I \cap B}(\underline{y}_B))_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ . The fact that this set is a relatively compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]})$  is a direct application of the previous Lemma 4.4.  $\square$



### 4.2.3 Determinant and polynomial

Let  $B$  be a subset of  $A$ ,  $b \in B$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}^*(F_2^B)$ . The mapping

$$\begin{aligned} p_b(M) : F_2^B &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ N &\longmapsto \det \left[ (MN)_b (MN)_b^T \right] \end{aligned}$$

can be seen as a positive homogeneous polynomial of degree  $2k$  on  $F_2^A$ . On the subspace  $\text{Ker}(\delta_{\underline{y}})$  one has

$$\begin{aligned} \det[(\nabla_{y_b} f)(\nabla_{y_b} f)^T] &= p_b(M_2(\underline{y}))(N_y f). \\ \nabla_{y_b} &= \left( M_2(\underline{y}) N_{\underline{y}} \right)_b \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla_{y_b}|^2 = p_b(\underline{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Given the scalar product on  $P_{2k}[F_2^B]$  naturally inherited from the one on  $F_2$ , we consider the associated norm, with the scaling convention that  $\|p_b(Id)\| = 1$ . We then define the unit polynomial

$$P_b(M) = \frac{p_b(M)}{\|p_b(M)\|}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}^*(F_2^A)$  such that  $M = M_{\mathcal{I}}$ . Then for  $a \in I \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $N \in F_2^A$ ,

$$p_a(M)(N) = p_a(M_I)(N_I).$$

The natural choice of scalar product on  $P_{2k}[F_2^A]$  and  $P_{2k}[F_2^I]$  implies that

$$\|p_a(M)\| = \|p_a(M_I)\| \quad \text{and} \quad P_a(M)(N) = P_a(M_I)(N_I).$$

In particular, on the subspace  $\text{Ker}(\delta_{\underline{y}})$  one has

$$\det[(\nabla_{y_a} f)(\nabla_{y_a} f)^T] = p_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))(N_y^{\mathcal{I}} f) \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))\| = \|p_a(M_2(\underline{y}_I))\|.$$

### 4.2.4 Near-diagonal behavior of the divided difference

In dimension one, the above process can be compared to the classical Lagrange interpolation, where the orthogonal family are the divided differences, i.e. the coefficient of the Lagrange polynomial in a well chosen basis. When the interpolation points  $y_1, \dots, y_p \in \mathbb{R}$  collapse, we obtain the Hermite-Lagrange interpolation. This has been the path followed in [Anc, Gas] to treat the delicate problem of understanding the Kac–Rice formula near the diagonal. In higher dimension, the situation is more intricate due to the variety of possible way for a collection of points to collapse. We show that one can still recover interesting estimates for the above orthogonalization procedure, thanks to the Kergin interpolation.

**Lemma 4.6.** *For every sequence  $(\underline{y}_m)_{m \geq 0}$  of points in  $\Delta_{\overline{A}} \setminus \Delta$  that converges in  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^p$  to a limit point  $\underline{x}$ , one can extract a subsequence  $(\underline{y}_{\phi(m)})_{m \geq 0}$  such that*

- *the sequence of free families  $(J_{\underline{y}_{\phi(m)}})_{m \geq 0}$  on  $W$  converges pointwise towards a limit free family  $J$  of linear forms on  $W$ .*
- *$\forall a \in A$ , the sequence of polynomials  $(P_a(M_2(\underline{y}_{\phi(m)})))_{m \geq 0}$  converges to a limit unit positive polynomial  $P_a$  on  $F_2^A$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\underline{y}_m)_{m \geq 0}$  be a sequence of points in  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^p \setminus \Delta$  that converges in  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^p$  to a limit point  $\underline{x}$ . We can assume that the barycenter of  $\underline{y}_m$  is zero for  $m \geq 0$ . The space  $V$  is finite dimensional, as well as the unit sphere of the polynomial space  $P_{2k}[F_2^A]$ . One can then find by compactness a subsequence  $(\underline{y}_{\phi(m)})_{m \geq 0}$  such that the sequence of orthonormal families  $(J_{\underline{y}_{\phi(m)}})_{m \geq 0}$  in  $V^*$  converges towards a limit orthonormal family  $J$  in  $V^*$ , and the sequence of unit positive polynomials  $(P_a(M_2(\underline{y}_{\phi(m)})))_{m \geq 0}$  converges to a limit positive unit polynomial  $P_a$  in  $P_{2k}[F_2^A]$ . From the identity

$$J_{\underline{y}_m} = J_{\underline{y}_m} \circ \mathcal{K}_{\underline{y}_m},$$

we can extend also extend the mapping  $J$  defined on  $V$  to the whole space  $W$  via the identity

$$J = J \circ \mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}}.$$

Since the mapping  $\underline{x} \mapsto \mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}}$  is continuous, we deduce the following weak convergence

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} J_{\underline{y}_{\phi(m)}} = J \circ \mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} = J.$$

Since the family  $J$  is free as a family in  $V^*$  it is also free in  $W$ . □

**Lemma 4.7.** *There is a constant  $C$  such that for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$  and  $f \in W$ ,*

$$\|J_{\underline{y}}f\| \leq C \sup_{\underline{y} \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y})} \sup_{|\alpha| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha}f(\underline{y})|.$$

*Proof.* From the invariance by translation, it suffices to show this proposition only for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$  such that  $\text{Bar}(\underline{y}) = 0$ . Since we choose  $\eta \leq 1$  then by Lemma 3.1,

$$(\Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta) \cap \{\text{Bar}(\underline{y}) = 0\} \subset B(0, |A|).$$

Let  $P \in V$  a polynomial. By uniform continuity of the family of linear forms  $(J_{\underline{y}})_{\underline{y} \in B(0, |A|)}$ , there is a constant  $C$  independent of  $\underline{y}$  such that

$$\|J_{\underline{y}}P\| \leq C\|P\|.$$

Then from Theorem 4.2

$$\|J_{\underline{y}}f\| = \|J_{\underline{y}}K_{\underline{y}}f\| \leq C\|K_{\underline{y}}f\| \leq \tilde{C} \sup_{\underline{x} \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y})} \sup_{|\alpha| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha}f(\underline{x})|.$$

□

#### 4.2.5 Extension to bi-variate functions

In the following, we show how to extend the abstract divided difference procedure above to the bi-variate case, that is when one take a function  $r \in W \otimes W$ . To this end, we consider the natural scalar product on  $V \otimes V$  inherited from the one on  $V$ . The proofs are very similar to the ones of the previous section.

Let  $A, B$  be two finite sets. For  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \setminus \Delta$  and  $\underline{z} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^B \setminus \Delta$  we observe that  $\underline{y} \times \underline{z}$  is a collection of  $A \times B$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{J}$ ) be a partition of  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ). Then  $\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}$  forms a partition on  $A \times B$ . Using the notation of the previous paragraph, one observe the fundamental relation for families of linear forms on  $W \otimes W$

$$j_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} = j_{\underline{y}} \otimes j_{\underline{z}}.$$

Then from the mixed product formula, one has

$$J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} = J_{\underline{y}} \otimes J_{\underline{z}} \quad \text{and} \quad j_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} = M(\underline{y}) J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} M(\underline{z})^T,$$

and

$$J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}}^{\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}} := (J_{\underline{y}_I \times \underline{y}_J})_{I \in \mathcal{I}, J \in \mathcal{J}},$$

so that

$$j_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} = M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}}^{\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}} M^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{z})^T.$$

At last, if  $C$  (resp.  $D$ ) is a subset of  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ), we have

$$J_{\underline{y}_B \times \underline{z}_C}^{\mathcal{I}_C \times \mathcal{J}_D} = Q_C^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}}^{\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J}} Q_D^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{z})^T.$$

**Lemma 4.8.** *There is a constant  $C$  such that for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\overline{A}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ ,  $\underline{z} \in \Delta_{\overline{B}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$  and  $r \in W \otimes W$ ,*

$$\|J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} r\| \leq C \sup_{\underline{y} \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y})} \sup_{z \in \text{Conv}(\underline{z})} \sup_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha, \beta} r(\underline{y}, z)|.$$

*Proof.* The proof follows the same lines as Lemma 4.7, but the last line is replaced by

$$\|J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}} r\| = \|J_{\underline{y} \times \underline{z}}(K_{\underline{y}} \otimes K_{\underline{z}} r)\| \leq C \|K_{\underline{y}} \otimes K_{\underline{z}} r\| \leq \tilde{C} \sup_{\underline{y} \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y})} \sup_{z \in \text{Conv}(\underline{z})} \sup_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha, \beta} r(\underline{y}, z)|.$$

□

### 4.3 Divided differences of a Gaussian process

At last we describe the covariance matrix of the divided difference vector of a Gaussian process. In the following,  $A$  is a finite set of size  $p$ . Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  be a Gaussian process of class  $\mathcal{C}^{2p-1}$ , that is, a Gaussian element of  $W$ . Its distribution is completely characterized by its covariance function  $r$  living in  $W \otimes W$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$  be partitions of  $A$  with  $\mathcal{J} \preceq \mathcal{I}$ . For  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ , we define the non-negative matrices in  $\mathcal{S}(F^A)$

$$\Omega(\underline{y}) := \text{Var}(j_{\underline{y}} f) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) := \text{Var}(J_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f).$$

One has the relation

$$\Omega(\underline{y}) = M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})^T \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B) = Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})^T.$$

and thus

$$\Omega(\underline{y}) = j_{\underline{y}^2} r \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) = J_{\underline{y}^2}^{\mathcal{I}} r.$$

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ , and  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ . There is a constant  $C$  such that for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ ,*

$$\|(\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I, J}\| \leq C \sup_{x \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_I)} \sup_{z \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_J)} \sup_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha, \beta} r(x, z)|.$$

*Let  $\tilde{f}$  be another Gaussian process of class  $\mathcal{C}^{2p-1}$  with covariance function  $\tilde{r}$ , and  $\tilde{\Sigma}^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) = \text{Var}(J_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} \tilde{f})$ . Then*

$$\|(\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I, J} - (\tilde{\Sigma}^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I, J}\| \leq C \sup_{x \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_I)} \sup_{z \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_J)} \sup_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha, \beta} (r - \tilde{r})(x, z)|.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ , and  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ . One has the equality

$$(\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I,J} = \text{Cov}(J_{\underline{y}_I} f, J_{\underline{y}_J} f) = J_{\underline{y}_I \times \underline{y}_J} r,$$

and

$$(\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I,J} - (\tilde{\Sigma}^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I,J} = J_{\underline{y}_I \times \underline{y}_J} (r - \tilde{r}).$$

Observe that if  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ , then  $\underline{y}_I \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ . The lemma is a direct application of Lemma 4.8 to the function  $r$  for the first part, and to the function  $r - \tilde{r}$  for the second part.  $\square$

### 4.3.1 Non-degeneracy of the covariance matrix

In this section, we prove some uniform non-degeneracy of the covariance matrix. The divided difference procedure originating from Gramm-Schmidt gives a way to prove the non-degeneracy. It suffices that the Kergin projection of the Gaussian process gives a non-degenerate Gaussian polynomial when points are close to the diagonal. We begin with the following Lemma.

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $f$  be a stationary Gaussian process from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that the Gaussian vector  $(\partial^\alpha f(0))_{|\alpha| \leq 2p-1}$  is non-degenerate. Then for  $\eta$  small enough the set*

$$\left\{ \Sigma^{\bar{A}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\bar{A},\eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}$$

*is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ .*

*Proof.* Since the process  $f$  is stationary, its covariance function is invariant by translation. Then

$$\left\{ \Sigma^{\bar{A}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\bar{A},\eta} \setminus \Delta \right\} = \left\{ \Sigma^{\bar{A}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\bar{A},\eta} \setminus \Delta \text{ and } \text{Bar}(\underline{y}) = 0 \right\}.$$

The non-degeneracy hypothesis on  $f$  is completely equivalent to saying that the Taylor polynomial of  $f$  of degree  $2p - 1$  at point 0, that is, from Kergin interpolation, that  $K_{(0,\dots,0)} f$  is a non-degenerate polynomial. By continuity of the mapping  $\underline{x} \mapsto K_{\underline{x}}$ , there one can choose  $\eta$  small enough such that the Gaussian polynomial  $\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f$  is non degenerate when  $\underline{x} \in \Delta_{\bar{A},\eta}$ .

To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that for any sequence  $(\underline{y}_m)_{m \geq 0}$  of  $(\Delta_{\bar{A},\eta} \setminus \Delta) \cap (\text{Bar}(\underline{y}) = 0)$ , one can take a subsequence that is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ . By compactness, one extract a converging subsequence  $(y_{\phi(m)})_{m \geq 0}$  such as in Lemma 4.6. Let  $\underline{x}$  be the limit point in  $\Delta_{\bar{A},\eta}$ . Then

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \Sigma^{\bar{A}}(y_{\phi(m)}) = \text{Var}(Jf) = \text{Var}(J(\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f)).$$

Since  $J$  is a free family of linear form on  $V$  and the random polynomial  $\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f$  is non degenerate then  $J(\mathcal{K}_{\underline{x}} f)$  is a non-degenerate Gaussian vector, and the conclusion follows.  $\square$

For  $n \in \bar{\mathbb{N}}$ , we consider  $f_n$ , a Gaussian process defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In the following, we fix a positive small number  $\eta$  and we consider the subsequent partition  $(\Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta})_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A}$  of  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^A$ . For  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta}$ , we define  $r_n$  the covariance of  $f_n$  and

$$\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}_A) = \text{Var} \left( J_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f_n \right).$$

Let  $A$  be a finite set and  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ . We assume for now that the sequence  $(f_n)_{n \in \bar{\mathbb{N}}}$  satisfies hypotheses  $H_1(q)$ ,  $H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  defined in (1.7) and (1.8), with  $q = 2|A| - 1$ . Since the function  $g$  of hypothesis  $H_2(q)$  decreases to zero, then for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , one can find a constant  $T_\varepsilon > |A|\eta$  such that

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid g(x) \geq \varepsilon \right\} \subset [-T_\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon]. \quad (4.1)$$

The main proposition of this section is the following.

**Proposition 4.11.** *In the above setting, there is a  $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{N}$  such that the set*

$$\left\{ \Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta, n \geq n_\varepsilon \right\}$$

*is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ .*

We prove first Proposition 4.11 for the limit stationary process  $f_\infty$ .

**Lemma 4.12.** *In the above setting, the set*

$$\left\{ \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta \right\}$$

*is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ .*

*Proof.* One must show the existence of positive constants  $C_\eta$  and  $c_\eta$  such that

$$\forall \underline{y}_A \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta, \quad \|\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}_A)\| \leq C_\eta \quad \text{and} \quad \det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}_A) \geq c_\eta.$$

From Lemma 4.9, we observe that the coefficients of the matrix  $\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{x}_A)$  are bounded by a constant times  $\|g\|_\infty$ . It only remains to prove the uniform positiveness of the determinant.

We prove the uniform lower bound for  $\underline{x}_A \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$  by induction on the size of the set  $A$ . If  $|A| = 1$  it reduces to the fact that the process  $f_\infty$  is non-degenerate. Now assume that the property is true for every strict subset  $B$  of  $A$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be another partition of  $A$  such that  $\mathcal{J} \succeq \mathcal{I}$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let us consider the set  $\Delta_{\mathcal{J},T_\varepsilon}$ . Then we have the decomposition

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} = \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{J} \succeq \mathcal{I}} \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{J},T_\varepsilon}.$$

In the case  $\mathcal{J} = \{A\}$ , one can mimic the proof of Lemma 4.10 to show that the set

$$\left\{ \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \mid \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \cap \Delta_{\{A\},T_\varepsilon} \setminus \Delta \right\}$$

is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ . Now assume that  $\mathcal{J} \neq \{A\}$ . If  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{J},T_\varepsilon} \setminus \Delta$  then for  $a, b \in A$  such that  $[a]_{\mathcal{J}} \neq [b]_{\mathcal{J}}$ , and  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p - 1$ ,

$$|\partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_\infty(y_a, y_b)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

It implies by Lemma 4.9 that

$$\sup_{\substack{I, J \in \mathcal{J} \\ I \neq J}} \|\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})_{I,J}\| \leq \varepsilon,$$

and thus

$$\|\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) - (\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{\mathcal{J}}\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Since the determinant is a smooth function of the matrix coefficients and the matrix  $\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  is bounded, we deduce the existence of a constant  $C_\eta$  such that for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{J},T_\varepsilon} \setminus \Delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) - \det (\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{\mathcal{J}} \right| &= \left| \det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) - \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}_J}(\underline{y}_J) \right| \\ &\leq C_\eta \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \geq \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}_J}(\underline{y}_J) - C_\eta \varepsilon.$$

For all  $J \in \mathcal{J}$ , the set  $J$  is a strict subset of  $A$ . Moreover, if  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta}$  then  $\underline{y}_J \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}_J,\eta}$ . By induction hypothesis, one can find a positive constant  $c_\eta$  depending only on  $\eta$  such that  $\det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}_J}(\underline{y}_J) \geq c_\eta$  when  $\underline{y}_J \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}_J,\eta} \setminus \Delta$ . It implies that

$$\forall \underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{J},\varepsilon} \setminus \Delta, \quad \det \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \geq (c_\eta)^{|\mathcal{J}|} - C_\eta \varepsilon.$$

Taking  $\varepsilon$  small enough and gathering the case  $\mathcal{J} = \{A\}$  and  $\mathcal{J} \neq \{A\}$ , the conclusion follows.  $\square$

### Proof of Proposition 4.11.

*Proof.* A consequence of hypothesis  $H_1(q)$  applied to the compact set  $[-T_\varepsilon, T_\varepsilon]$  yields the existence of a  $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for  $n \geq n_\varepsilon$  and  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p - 1$

$$\sup_{\substack{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ |x-y| \leq T_\varepsilon}} |\partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_n(x, y) - \partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_\infty(x, y)| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4.2)$$

Let  $n \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ . If  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $|x - y| > T_\varepsilon$  then hypothesis  $H_2(q)$  implies that for  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p - 1$ ,

$$|\partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_n(x, y)| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

Gathering Equations (4.2) and (4.3), for  $n \geq n_\varepsilon$ ,  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p - 1$

$$|\partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_n(x, y) - \partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_\infty(x, y)| \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (4.4)$$

Let  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ . To bound the distance between the distribution of the Gaussian vector  $J_\underline{y}^{\mathcal{I}} f_n$  and  $J_\underline{y}^{\mathcal{I}} f$ , Lemma 4.9 shows that

$$\left\| \Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) - \Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \right\| \leq C_\eta \varepsilon.$$

The matrix  $\Sigma_\infty^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  leaves in a compact subset of  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$  for  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ . The inequality above implies that for  $\varepsilon$  small enough, there is an integer  $n_\varepsilon$  and a compact subset  $K_\eta$  of  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$  such that for  $n \geq n_\varepsilon$  and  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ , the matrix  $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  belongs to  $K$ .  $\square$

## 5 Kac–Rice formula for Gaussian processes

For now on,  $A$  is a finite set and  $f$  is a centered Gaussian process defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with covariance function  $r$ . We assume for this section that the process  $f$  is of class  $\mathcal{C}^{2|A|-1}$ , and satisfies the non-degeneracy hypothesis  $H_3(q)$  with  $q = 2|A| - 1$ , i.e. for any partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $\{1, \dots, q + 1\}$  and distinct points  $(x_I)_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathcal{I}|}$  the Gaussian vector

$$\left( \partial_{\alpha_I} f(x_I) \right)_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ |\alpha_I| < |I|}}$$

is non-degenerate.

### 5.1 Kac density and cumulants of the zeros counting measure

In this section we give the expression of the  $p$ -th factorial moment and cumulant of the nodal measure. The first step is to lift the degeneracy of the Kac–Rice formula near the diagonal.

### 5.1.1 Diagonal degeneracy of the Kac density

We fix for the rest of this paragraph a partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$ . We define the random set

$$Z = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f(x) = 0\}.$$

By Bulinskaya lemma (see [10, Lem. 1.20]) and the assumption on  $f$ , the subset  $Z$  is almost surely a closed discrete subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and we can define the random measure  $\nu := \nu_f$  as in (1.1). The Kac–Rice formula (see [10, Thm. 3.2] and [4, Prop. 3.6]) asserts that for a measurable function  $\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded with compact support, one has, following the notations of Section 4,

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \nu^{[A]}, \Phi \rangle] = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^A \setminus \Delta} \Phi(\underline{y}) \rho(\underline{y}) d\underline{y}, \quad (5.1)$$

with

$$\rho(\underline{y}) := \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{\det[(\nabla_{y_a} f)(\nabla_{y_a} f)^T]} \mid \forall a \in A, f(x_a) = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \text{Var}((f(y_a))_{a \in A})]}}$$

Let  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ . We define

$$\sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{P_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))(N_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)} \mid D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \text{Var}(D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)]}},$$

and the universal (i.e. independent from  $f$ ) functions  $R$  and  $R^{\mathcal{I}}$

$$R(\underline{y}) = \frac{\prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{\|p_a(M_2(\underline{y}))\|}}{|\det M_1(\underline{y})|} \quad \text{and} \quad R^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} R(\underline{y}_I).$$

Note that for a single variable  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , one has from the choice of scaling conventions that  $R(y) = 1$ , so that one has for  $\mathcal{I} = \overline{A}$  that

$$R^{\overline{A}}(y) = 1.$$

For another partition  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $A$ , observe the identity,

$$\prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} R^{I_J}(\underline{y}_J) = R^{I \wedge \mathcal{J}}(\underline{y}).$$

We then introduce for Section 6 the notations

$$R[\underline{y}] = (R^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{y}))_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \quad \text{and} \quad R^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}] = (R^{I \wedge \mathcal{J}}(\underline{y}))_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A}.$$

**Lemma 5.1.** *For  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$  one has*

$$\rho(\underline{y}) = R^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}).$$

*Proof.* Following the previous paragraph, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(\underline{y}) &= \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{\det[(\nabla_{y_a} f)(\nabla_{y_a} f)^T]} \mid \forall a \in A, f(x_a) = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \text{Var}((f(y_a))_{a \in A})]}} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{p_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))(N_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)} \mid D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \text{Var}(M_1^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)]}} \\
&= \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\prod_{i \in I} \|p_i(M_2(\underline{y}_I))\|}{|\det M_1(\underline{y}_I)|} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{P_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))(N_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)} \mid D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \text{Var}(D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)]}} \\
&= R^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}),
\end{aligned}$$

□

The function  $R^{\mathcal{I}}$  should be thought as the singular part of the function  $\rho$  near the diagonal  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}$ , as attests Lemma 4.4 about non-degeneracy of the components of the function  $\sigma^{\mathcal{I}}$  (see also [29]).

### 5.1.2 Expression of the cumulants of the zeros counting measure

We are now ready to give the expression of the cumulant of order  $|A|$  of the linear statistics associated to zeros counting measure. Let  $(\phi_a)_{a \in A}$  be a collection of bounded functions with compact support. We define

$$\kappa_A(\nu)(\underline{\phi}_A) = \kappa((\langle \nu, \phi_a \rangle)_{a \in A}),$$

the joint cumulant of the family of random variables  $(\langle \nu, \phi_a \rangle)_{a \in A}$ . We define the *cumulant Kac density* associated with the set  $A$  to be the function

$$\begin{aligned}
F_A : (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \setminus \Delta &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
\underline{y} &\longrightarrow \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}|-1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \rho(\underline{y}_J).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

The following Proposition 5.2 express the cumulant of order  $|A|$  of the linear statistics associated to zeros counting measure. It is key step in towards proof of Theorem 1.9, and reveals the elegant interplay between the factorial power counting measure and the combinatorics of cumulants.

**Proposition 5.2.** *We have*

$$\kappa_A(\nu)(\underline{\phi}_A) = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \Delta} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \prod_{i \in I} \phi_i(y_I) \right) F_{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}) d\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

*Proof.* We have, using the expression of cumulants in terms of moments given by Proposition (2.7)

$$\kappa_A(\nu)(\underline{\phi}_A) = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}|-1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle \nu^J, \underline{\phi}_J^{\otimes} \rangle \right].$$

The link between the power measure and factorial power measure given by Lemma 3.2 implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \langle \nu^J, \underline{\phi}_J^{\otimes} \rangle \right] = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_J} \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle \nu^{[\mathcal{I}]}, \underline{\phi}_J^{\otimes} \circ \iota_{\mathcal{I}} \rangle \right].$$



The bijection given by Lemma 2.4 then implies

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_A(\nu)(\underline{\phi}_A) &= \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}|-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \succeq \mathcal{J}} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nu^{[\mathcal{I}_J]}, \underline{\phi}_J^\otimes \circ \iota_{\mathcal{I}_J} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \sum_{\mathcal{J} \succeq \mathcal{I}} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}|-1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nu^{[\mathcal{I}_J]}, \underline{\phi}_J^\otimes \circ \iota_{\mathcal{I}_J} \right\rangle \right].\end{aligned}$$

The Kac–Rice formula then asserts that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\langle \nu^{[\mathcal{I}_J]}, \underline{\phi}_J^\otimes \circ \iota_{\mathcal{I}_J} \right\rangle \right] = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}_J} \setminus \Delta} \left( \prod_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ I \subset J}} \prod_{i \in I} \phi_i(y_I) \right) \rho(\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}_J}) d\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}_J},$$

from which we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_A(\nu)(\underline{\phi}_A) &= \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \Delta} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \prod_{i \in I} \phi_i(y_I) \right) \sum_{\mathcal{J} \succeq \mathcal{I}} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}|-1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \rho(\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}_J}) d\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}_J} \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus \Delta} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \prod_{i \in I} \phi_i(y_I) \right) F_{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}) d\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the bijection given by Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

## 5.2 Matrix representation of the Kac density and factorization property

In this section we prove a matrix representation for the Kac density and the cumulant Kac density. It allows us to dissociate the analysis of the covariance matrix of divided differences associated with the Gaussian process  $f$ , and of the Kac density seen as a functional of the covariance matrix.

### 5.2.1 Matrix representation of the Kac density

We define the mapping

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\sigma} : \mathcal{M}(F^A) \times \mathcal{S}^+(F^A) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (M, \Sigma) &\longmapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma)}} \int_{F_2^A} \sqrt{\prod_{a \in A} P_a(M_2)(N)} \exp\left(-\frac{\vec{N}^T (\Sigma^c)^{-1} \vec{N}}{2}\right) dN.\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma gives an alternative expression of  $\sigma(\underline{y})$  as a function of the covariance matrix  $\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$ , and the matrix of divided differences  $M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$ , when  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** For  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ ,

$$\sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) = \tilde{\sigma} \left( M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}), \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \right).$$

*Proof.* According to the Gaussian conditioning formula, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) &= \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{a \in A} \sqrt{P_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))(N_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)} \mid D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} = 0 \right]}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \text{Var}(D_{\underline{y}}^{\mathcal{I}} f)]}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det [2\pi \Sigma_1^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})] \det [2\pi (\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))^c]}} \int_{F_2^A} \sqrt{\prod_{a \in A} \tilde{P}_a(M_2^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))(N)} \exp \left( -\frac{\vec{N}^T ((\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))^c)^{-1} \vec{N}}{2} \right) dN \\ &= \tilde{\sigma} \left( M^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}), \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \right).\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ . For a subset  $B$  of  $A$ ,*

$$\sigma^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B) = \tilde{\sigma} \left( M^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B), Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})^T \right).$$

*Proof.* Note first that  $\underline{y}_B \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}_B} \setminus \Delta$ . According to the previous lemma,

$$\sigma^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B) = \tilde{\sigma} \left( M^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B), \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B) \right).$$

Since

$$\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}_B}(\underline{y}_B) = Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) Q_B^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})^T,$$

the conclusion follows. □

Given two open subsets  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  of finite dimensional vector spaces, we define the function space  $\mathcal{C}^{0, \infty}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$  to be the set of functions from  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , that are infinitely differentiable with respect to the second argument and such that the partial derivatives (with respect to the second argument) are jointly continuous. We endow this space with the usual topology of uniform convergence of second partial derivatives to any order on compact subsets of  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *The application  $\tilde{\sigma}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}^{0, \infty}(\mathcal{M}(F^A), \mathcal{S}^+(F^A))$ .*

*Proof.* Let

$$h(\Sigma, N) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma)}} \exp \left( -\frac{\vec{N}^T (\Sigma^c)^{-1} \vec{N}}{2} \right).$$

The function  $\Sigma \mapsto h(\Sigma, N)$  is infinitely differentiable on  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$  and its partial derivatives are also exponentially decreasing with respect to the variable  $N$ . By differentiability under the integral, it implies that  $\tilde{\rho}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}^{0, \infty}(\mathcal{M}(F^A), \mathcal{S}^+(F^A))$ . □

### 5.2.2 Factorization of the Kac density and error term

In this section, we show that the function  $\tilde{\rho}$  satisfies a nice factorization property. For the rest of this section,  $\mathcal{I}$  is a fixed partition of the set  $A$ .

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(F^A)$  and  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^+(F^A)$ . Then*

$$\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\sigma}(M_I, \Sigma_I).$$

*Proof.* Since the matrix  $\Sigma$  is block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ ,

$$\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma)} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_I)}.$$

Similarly, for  $N \in F_2^A$ ,

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\vec{N}^T(\Sigma^c)^{-1}\vec{N}}{2}\right) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \exp\left(-\frac{\vec{N}_I^T((\Sigma_I)^c)^{-1}\vec{N}_I}{2}\right).$$

The matrix  $M_{\mathcal{I}}$  is also block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$  and

$$\prod_{a \in A} P_a(M)(N) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \prod_{i \in I} P_i(M_I)(N_I).$$

The conclusion follows from the definition of  $\tilde{\sigma}$ .  $\square$

We now want to describe the error term in Lemma 5.6 after perturbation of the block-diagonal matrix  $\Sigma$ . We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(F^A) \times \mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ . There is a constant  $C_K$  such that for all  $(M, \Sigma) \in K$ ,*

$$|\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma) - \tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}})| \leq C_K \|\Sigma - \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}\|^2.$$

*Proof.* We set  $H = \Sigma - \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}$ . The matrix  $H$  satisfies  $H_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$ . It implies that

$$(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}H)_{\mathcal{I}} = (\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}H\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^{-1})_{\mathcal{I}} = 0 \quad \text{and thus} \quad \text{Tr}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}H) = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

This implies that the differential of the determinant at  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}$  in the direction  $H$  is zero. Moreover, one has from identity (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} [(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}} + H)^c]^{-1} &= [(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}} + H)^{-1}]^{22} \\ &= (\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^c)^{-1} - \tilde{H} + O(\|H\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{H} = [\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}H\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}]^{22}$  and the big-oh is uniform on the compact  $K$ . By (5.3), one has  $(\tilde{H})_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$ . Differentiation under the integral sign gives

$$\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}} + H) = \tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) + d\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{I}}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) \cdot H + O(\|H\|^2),$$

where

$$d\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) \cdot H = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}})}} \int_{F_2^A} \sqrt{\prod_{a \in A} P_a(M_2)(N)} (\vec{N}^T \tilde{H} \vec{N}) \exp\left(-\frac{\vec{N}^T(\Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}^c)^{-1}\vec{N}}{2}\right) d\mathbb{N}$$

Since  $(\tilde{H})_{\mathcal{I}} = 0$ , the integrand in the equation above is an odd function of the coordinates of  $\vec{N}$ , which implies that

$$d\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) \cdot H = -d\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) \cdot H = 0.$$

The conclusion follows by Taylor expansion.  $\square$

We can now state the following proposition that gives the error in Lemma 5.6 when the matrix  $\Sigma$  is not block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ .

**Corollary 5.8.** *Let  $B$  be a subset of  $A$  and  $K$  be a compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}(F_2^B) \times \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F_2^A, F_2^B) \times \mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ . Then there is a constant  $C_K$  such that, for all  $(M, Q, \Sigma) \in K$ ,*

$$\left| \tilde{\sigma}(M, Q\Sigma Q^T) - \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\sigma}(M_I, Q_I \Sigma_I Q_I^T) \right| \leq C_K \sup_{\substack{I, J \in \mathcal{I} \\ I \neq J}} \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|^2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Pi = Q\Sigma Q^T$ . The couple  $(M, \Pi)$  lives in a compact set of  $\mathcal{M}_B(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S}_{2B}^+(\mathbb{R})$ . From Lemma 5.7, one has

$$|\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Pi) - \tilde{\sigma}(M, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}})| = O(\|\Pi - \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}\|^2).$$

By Lemma 5.5, the application  $\tilde{\sigma}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}^{0, \infty}(\mathcal{M}_B(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S}_{2B}^+(\mathbb{R}))$ . Lagrange remainder formula asserts the existence of a constant  $C_K$  such that

$$|\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Pi) - \tilde{\sigma}(M, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}})| \leq C_K \|\Pi - \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}\|^2 \leq C_K \sup_{\substack{I, J \in \mathcal{I} \\ I \neq J}} \|\Pi_{I, J}\|^2.$$

Since  $Q = Q_{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\|Q\| \leq C_K$  for some constant  $C_K$ , we deduce

$$\|\Pi_{I, J}\| = \|Q_I \Sigma_{I, J} Q_J^T\| \leq C_K \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|.$$

Finally the conclusion follows from Lemma 5.6 since

$$\tilde{\sigma}(M, \Pi_{\mathcal{I}}) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\sigma}(M_I, \Pi_I) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\sigma}(M_I, Q_I \Sigma_I Q_I^T).$$

□

### 5.2.3 Matrix representation of the cumulant Kac density

Similarly to the Kac density, we can derive a matrix representation for the cumulant Kac density defined in (5.2). From notations of Paragraph 3.2.3, we introduce the function  $\tilde{F}_A$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_A : \mathcal{M}^*(F^{[A]}) \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{P}_A} \times \mathcal{S}^+(F^A) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (M, Q) \times R \times \Sigma &\longmapsto \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}| - 1} R^{\mathcal{J}} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \tilde{\sigma}(M^J, Q^J \Sigma^T Q^J). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ . The following lemma gives an alternative expression to the function  $F_A$  when  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ . Recall the definition of  $M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$ ,  $Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$ ,  $R^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$  and  $\Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$  in 4.

**Lemma 5.9.** *One has*

$$F_A(\underline{y}) = \tilde{F}_A \left( (M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}], Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]), R^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}], \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \right).$$

*Proof.* The first statement is a direct consequence of the definition of  $M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$ ,  $Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$  and  $R^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$ . Let  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta} \setminus \Delta$ . One has

$$\begin{aligned} F_A(\underline{y}) &= \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}| - 1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \rho(\underline{y}_J) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}| - 1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} R^{\mathcal{I}J}(\underline{y}_J) \sigma^{\mathcal{I}J}(\underline{y}_J) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}| - 1} R^{\mathcal{I} \wedge \mathcal{J}}(\underline{y}) \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \sigma^{\mathcal{I}J}(\underline{y}_J) \end{aligned}$$

According to lemma 5.4, for a subset  $J$  of  $A$  one has

$$\rho(\underline{x}_J) = R^{\mathcal{I}_J}(\underline{y}_J) \tilde{\sigma} \left( M^{\mathcal{I}_J}(\underline{y}_J), Q^{\mathcal{I},J}(\underline{y}) \Sigma^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})^T Q^{\mathcal{I},J}(\underline{y}) \right),$$

and the conclusion follows.  $\square$

Given the definition of the function  $\tilde{F}_A$ , one can translate the cancellation property of Lemma 2.8 to this function. It is the object of the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ , with  $\mathcal{I} \neq \{A\}$ . Let  $(M, Q) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]})$ ,  $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{P}^A}$  and  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^+(F^A)$ . Then*

$$\tilde{F}_A((M, Q, R), \Sigma) = 0.$$

*Proof.* For a subset  $B$  of  $A$ , we set

$$m_B = R^B \tilde{\sigma}(M^B, Q^B \Sigma^T Q^B).$$

Then from Lemma 5.6 one has

$$\begin{aligned} m_B &= R^B \tilde{\sigma}(M^B, Q^B \Sigma^T Q^B) \\ &= \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} R^{I \cap B} \tilde{\rho}(M^{I \cap B}, Q^{I \cap B} \Sigma_I^T Q^{I \cap B}) \\ &= \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} m_{I \cap B} \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.8, one deduce that

$$\tilde{F}_A((M, Q, R), \Sigma) = \sum_{\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{P}_A} (|\mathcal{J}| - 1)! (-1)^{|\mathcal{J}|-1} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} m_J = 0.$$

$\square$

Corollary 5.8 translates directly into the following bound for the function  $\tilde{F}_A$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$ , with  $\mathcal{I} \neq \{A\}$ . Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]}) \times \mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ . Then there is a constant  $C_K$  such that for all  $((M, Q), \Sigma) \in K$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{P}^A}$  one has*

$$\left| \tilde{F}_A((M, Q, R), \Sigma) \right| \leq C_K \|R\| \sup_{\substack{I, J \in \mathcal{I} \\ I \neq J}} \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|^2.$$

*If  $\mathcal{K}$  is another partition of  $A$  with  $\mathcal{I} \preceq \mathcal{K} \prec \{A\}$  then*

$$\left| \tilde{F}_A((M, Q, R), \Sigma) \right| \leq C_K \|R\| \sup_{\substack{I, J \in \mathcal{K} \\ I \neq J}} \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|^2.$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 5.10, one has

$$\tilde{F}_A((M, Q), R, \Sigma_{\mathcal{I}}) = 0.$$

Since the function  $\tilde{F}_A$  is a polynomial expression in the function  $\tilde{\rho}$  applied to different parameters, and is a linear function of  $R$ , the error term given by Corollary 5.8 translates directly for the function  $\tilde{F}_A$  to the desired estimate.

As for the second assertion, it follows directly from the first one applied to the partition  $\mathcal{K}$ , since one has the inclusion  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}}^*(F^{[A]})$ .  $\square$

### 5.3 Decay of the cumulant Kac density

The goal of the following section is to improve the quadratic bound given by Lemma 5.11. We will do so, thanks to a refinement of Taylor expansion for regular functions that cancel on given affine subspaces. The next key Lemma 5.19 bounds the function  $\tilde{F}_A$  by a sum over a collection of graphs. We recall first a few definitions and propositions from graph theory.

#### 5.3.1 Graph setting

A graph  $G$  is a couple  $(E(G), V(G))$ , where  $E(G)$  is the set of edges of the graph  $G$  and  $V(G)$  the collection of vertices of  $G$ . For our purposes, a graph  $G$  has no loop, but two different edges can have the same endpoints. The multiplicity of an edge  $\{a, b\}$  is the number of edges in the graph that are equal to  $\{a, b\}$ . Let  $k$  be a positive integer. We say that a graph  $G$  is *k-edge connected* if the graph  $G$  remains connected when any collection of  $k$  of its edges are removed. Alternatively, a graph  $G$  is *k-edge connected* if for any partition of its vertices into two distinct subsets, one can find at least  $k$  distinct edges connecting the two subsets.

We say that a graph  $G$  is *minimally k-edge connected* if it is  $k$ -edge connected, but the removal of any edge results in a graph which is no longer  $k$ -edge connected. We define  $\mathcal{G}_A$  to be the set of graphs with set of vertices  $A$  that are minimally 2-edge connected. Note that the set  $\mathcal{G}_A$  is finite since any edge has multiplicity at most 2.

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$  and let  $G$  be a graph with set of vertices  $A$ . We define the graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  on the set of vertices  $\mathcal{I}$  to be the quotient graph with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ . That is, the multiplicity of the edge  $\{I, J\}$  (with  $I \neq J$ ) of  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is the number of edges  $\{i, j\}$  in  $G$  (with multiplicity) such that  $\{I, J\} = \{[i]_{\mathcal{I}}, [j]_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ .

**Lemma 5.12.** *If  $G \in \mathcal{G}_A$  then  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is 2-edge connected. Conversely, let  $H \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ . There is  $G \in \mathcal{G}_A$  such that*

$$H = G_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

*Proof.* Removing one edge of  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  amounts to removing one edge of  $G$ . Since  $G$  remains connected after this operation, then so is the quotient graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ , which implies that  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is 2-edge connected. For the second assertion, for each  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , we choose a element  $a_I \in I$  of the class. We define the graph  $G$  with vertices  $A$  and set of edges so that

- if  $\{I, J\}$  is an edge of  $H$  with multiplicity  $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  then  $\{a_I, a_J\}$  is an edge of  $G$  with multiplicity  $k$
- an element  $b_I \in I \setminus a_I$  is only connected to  $a_I$  with an edge with multiplicity 2.

It is straightforward to observe that the graph  $G$  satisfies  $G_{\mathcal{I}} = H$  and is minimally 2-edge connected.  $\square$

An *ear* of a graph  $G$  is a path in  $G$ , but with possibly matching endpoints. Note that a cycle is a particular instance of an ear. An *ear decomposition* of the graph  $G$  is a decomposition  $(P_1, \dots, P_k)$  such that  $P_1$  is a cycle in  $G$ , and for  $i \geq 2$ ,  $P_i$  is an ear of  $G$  whose endpoints belong to  $\bigcup_{j < i} P_j$ . We states the following standard fact for 2-edge connected graphs (see [58, Thm. 4.2.10]). The proof is an induction on the number of ears.

**Lemma 5.13.** *A 2-edge connected graph admits an ear decomposition. The number of ears is necessary the circuit rank of the graph  $G$ . Moreover, the starting cycle can be chosen arbitrarily among the cycles of  $G$ .*

It implies the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.14.** *Let  $G$  be a 2-edge connected graph. There is a family  $(T_a)_{a \in A}$  of spanning trees of  $G$  such that for every edge  $e \in E(G)$ , one can find an element  $a_e \in A$  such that  $e$  is not an edge of the spanning tree  $T_{a_e}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P_1$  be a largest cycle in  $G$ , with vertices  $B$ , and  $(P_1, \dots, P_k)$  be an ear decomposition of  $G$ . For  $i \geq 1$ , we define  $E_i$  the set of edges of the path  $P_i$ . One has  $|B| \geq |E_i|$ , so that one can find a surjection  $\tau_i : B \rightarrow E_i$ .

For  $a \notin B$ , we define  $T_a$  to be any spanning tree of  $G$ . For  $a \in B$ , we define  $T_a$  to be the graph  $G$  where we removed, in each path  $E_i$ , the edge  $\tau_i(a)$ . The number  $k$  is the circuit rank of the graph  $G$ . By construction, the graph  $T_a$  is connected, so it must be a spanning tree of the graph  $G$ . Every edge  $e \in E_i$  is the image of some element  $a_e \in B$  by the surjection  $\tau_i$ , so that the edge  $e$  does not belong to the tree  $T_{a_e}$ .  $\square$

### 5.3.2 Crossed Taylor formula

In this paragraph we prove an enhancement of the Taylor remainder estimates for regular functions that cancel on affine subspaces. An observation of this phenomenon is the following. Assume that  $F(x, y)$  is a regular function such that in a neighborhood of zero,

$$|F(x, y)| \leq |x| \quad \text{and} \quad |F(x, y)| \leq |y|.$$

Then for some constant  $C$ , one has in a neighborhood of zero that

$$|F(x, y)| \leq C|xy|,$$

which improves by a square factor the trivial bound  $\sqrt{|xy|}$ . We wish to extend this observation to the more complicated function  $\tilde{F}_A$  that satisfies the bounds given by Lemma 5.11 for several partitions  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$ . In the following, we give a general statement for this phenomenon.

Let  $E$  be a finite set and  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^E$ . Let  $F$  be an infinitely differentiable function on  $\Omega$ , and  $\underline{y}$  be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^E$ . We fix an integer  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following lemma states equivalent conditions for a regular function  $F$  to cancel on an affine subspace with order of cancellation at least  $d$ .

**Lemma 5.15.** *Let  $B$  be a subset of  $E$ . Then the three following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *For every compact subset  $K$  of  $\Omega$ , there is a constant  $C_K$  such that,*

$$\forall \underline{x} \in K, \quad |F(\underline{x})| \leq C_K \left( \sup_{b \in B} |x_b - y_b| \right)^d.$$

2. *For every multi-index  $\underline{n}_B \in \mathbb{N}^B$  with  $|\underline{n}_B| = d$ , there exists a function  $H_{\underline{n}_B} \in C^\infty(\Omega)$  such that*

$$\forall \underline{x} \in \Omega, \quad F(\underline{x}) = \sum_{|\underline{n}_B|=d} (\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{n}_B} H_{\underline{n}_B}(\underline{x}).$$

3. *For all  $\underline{w} \in \Omega$  such that  $\underline{w}_B = \underline{y}_B$ , for every multi-index  $\underline{m} \in \mathbb{N}^E$  with  $|\underline{m}_B| < d$ ,*

$$\partial^{\underline{m}} F(\underline{w}) = 0.$$

*Proof.* We can assume that  $\Omega$  is a product of open intervals. The general case follows by a partition of unity. We denote by  $\Omega_B$  the projection of  $\Omega$  to  $\mathbb{R}^B$ .

- (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) follows from the boundedness of the functions  $H_{\underline{n}_B}$  on compact subsets  $K$  of  $\Omega$ .
- (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) is a consequence of the uniqueness of the polynomial approximation given by Taylor expansion.
- (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), we distinguish two cases. If  $\underline{y}_B \in \Omega_B$ , then the implication is a direct consequence of Taylor expansion with integral remainder of the function  $F$  on the segment between points  $\underline{x}$  and  $(\underline{x}_{E \setminus B}, \underline{y}_B)$ . If  $\underline{y}_B \notin \Omega_B$ , then there is an index  $b \in B$  such that  $y_b \notin \Omega_{\{b\}}$ . We can then define

$$H(\underline{x}) = \frac{F(\underline{x})}{(x_b - y_b)^d}, \quad \text{so that} \quad F(\underline{x}) = (x_b - y_b)^d H(\underline{x}).$$

□

For the rest of this section, we fix a collection  $\mathcal{B}$  of (not necessarily disjoint) subsets of  $E$ . We wish to extend the previous Lemma 5.15 to the collection  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{B}} = (d_B)_{B \in \mathcal{B}}$  be a collection of positive integers. The space  $\mathbb{N}^E$  is naturally equipped with a partial order induced from the natural order on  $\mathbb{N}$ , and we define

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}} = \min \left\{ \underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}^E \mid \forall B \in \mathcal{B}, |\underline{n}_B| \geq d_B \right\}. \quad (5.4)$$

For instance, if  $E = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}\}$  and  $d_B = 2$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , then

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}} = \{(2, 2, 0), (0, 2, 2), (2, 0, 2), (1, 1, 1)\}.$$

**Proposition 5.16.** *Assume that for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , the function  $F$  satisfies one of the equivalent statements of Lemma 5.15. Then there exists functions  $(H_{\underline{n}})_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega)$  such that*

$$\forall \underline{x} \in \Omega, \quad F(\underline{x}) = \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}} (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{n}} H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}).$$

*In particular, for a compact subset  $K$  of  $\Omega$ , one can find a constant  $C_K$  such that*

$$\forall \underline{x} \in K, \quad |F(\underline{x})| \leq C_K \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}} |\underline{x} - \underline{y}|^{\underline{n}}.$$

*Proof.* Once again, we can assume that the  $\Omega$  is a product of open intervals, and for a subset  $B$  of  $E$  we denote by  $\Omega_B$  the projection of  $\Omega$  to  $\mathbb{R}^B$ . The proof is an induction on the size of the set  $\mathcal{B}$ . If  $\mathcal{B} = \{B\}$ , this is exactly the hypothesis on  $F$  (second characterization in Lemma 5.15). Now let  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and suppose that the lemma is true for the family  $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}$ . We have

$$F(\underline{x}) = \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}}} (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{n}} H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}).$$

As in the proof of 5.15, we distinguish two cases. Assume first that  $\underline{y}_B \in \Omega_B$ , and let  $\underline{w} \in \Omega$  such that  $\underline{w}_B = \underline{y}_B$ . For every multi-index  $\underline{m}_B \in \mathbb{N}^B$  with  $|\underline{m}_B| < d_B$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^{\underline{m}_B} F(\underline{w}) &= \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}}} \partial^{\underline{m}_B} \left( (\cdot - \underline{y})^{\underline{n}} H_{\underline{n}}(\cdot) \right) (\underline{w}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}} \\ \underline{n}_B \leq \underline{m}_B}} (\underline{w}_{E \setminus B} - \underline{y}_{E \setminus B})^{\underline{n}_{E \setminus B}} \frac{\underline{m}_B!}{(\underline{m}_B - \underline{n}_B)!} \partial^{(\underline{m}_B - \underline{n}_B)} H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{w}) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$



according to the third characterization in Lemma 5.15. Let  $\underline{w} = (\underline{x}_{E \setminus B}, \underline{y}_B)$ . One cannot directly use Lemma 5.15 to the functions  $H_{\underline{n}}$  because it is not guaranteed that they satisfy one of the equivalent propositions, but it will be the case if we subtract to  $H_{\underline{n}}$  its Taylor expansion. For  $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}}$  and  $\underline{x} \in \Omega$  we define the quantity

$$\tilde{H}_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}) = H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}) - \sum_{|\underline{m}_B| < d_B - |\underline{n}_B|} \frac{(\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{m}_B}}{(\underline{m}_B)!} \partial^{\underline{m}_B} H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{w}).$$

If  $|\underline{n}_B| \geq d_B$ , then  $H_{\underline{n}} = \tilde{H}_{\underline{n}}$  and  $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$ . If  $|\underline{n}_B| < d_B$ , then by Taylor expansion with integral remainder (or directly by (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) of Lemma 5.15), there exists functions  $(H_{\underline{n}, \underline{p}_B})_{|\underline{p}_B| = d_B - |\underline{n}_B|}$  such that

$$\tilde{H}_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}) = \sum_{|\underline{p}_B| = d_B - |\underline{n}_B|} (\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{p}_B} H_{\underline{n}, \underline{p}_B}(\underline{x}). \quad (5.5)$$

Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned} F(\underline{x}) &= F(\underline{x}) - \sum_{|\underline{m}_B| < d_B} \frac{(\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{m}_B}}{(\underline{m}_B)!} \partial^{\underline{m}_B} F(\underline{w}) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}}} (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{n}} \left( H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}) - \sum_{\substack{|\underline{m}_B| < d_B \\ \underline{m}_B \geq \underline{n}_B}} \frac{(\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{m}_B - \underline{n}_B}}{(\underline{m}_B - \underline{n}_B)!} \partial^{(\underline{m}_B - \underline{n}_B)} H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{w}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}}} (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{n}} \tilde{H}_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{n} \in (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}})} (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{n}} \tilde{H}_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\underline{n} \in (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}} \setminus \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}})} \sum_{|\underline{p}_B| = d_B - |\underline{n}_B|} (\underline{x}_{E \setminus B} - \underline{y}_{E \setminus B})^{\underline{n}_{E \setminus B}} (\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{n}_B + \underline{p}_B} H_{\underline{n}, \underline{p}_B}(\underline{x}) \end{aligned}$$

One then have  $|\underline{n}_B + \underline{p}_B| = d_B$ . The multi-index  $\tilde{\underline{n}} = (\underline{n}_{E \setminus B}, \underline{n}_B + \underline{p}_B)$  does not necessarily belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$  because it is not necessary a minimal element as in the definition of the set  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$ , but there exists a multi-index  $\underline{m} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$  such that  $\underline{m} \leq \tilde{\underline{n}}$ . One can then write

$$(\underline{x}_{E \setminus B} - \underline{y}_{E \setminus B})^{\underline{n}_{E \setminus B}} (\underline{x}_B - \underline{y}_B)^{\underline{n}_B + \underline{p}_B} H_{\underline{n}, \underline{p}_B}(\underline{x}) = (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{m}} \left( (\underline{x} - \underline{y})^{\underline{n} - \underline{m}} H_{\underline{n}, \underline{p}_B}(\underline{x}) \right),$$

and the conclusion follows.

If  $\underline{y}_B \notin \Omega_B$ , we can argue as in the proof of (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) in Lemma 5.15 to get an expression for  $H_{\underline{n}}(\underline{x})$  similar to (5.5) and the conclusion directly follows.  $\square$

For instance, let  $E = \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Let  $F$  be an infinitely differentiable function such that for  $(x, y, z)$  in any compact subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ,

$$|F(x, y, z)| \leq x^2 + y^2, \quad |F(x, y, z)| \leq y^2 + z^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |F(x, y, z)| \leq x^2 + z^2.$$

Then the function  $F$  satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 5.16 with  $\mathcal{B} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}\}$  and  $d_B = 2$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . It implies the existence of a constant  $C_K$  such that for  $(x, y, z) \in K$ ,

$$|F(x, y, z)| \leq C_K \left( x^2 y^2 + y^2 z^2 + x^2 z^2 + |xyz| \right).$$

Now let  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  be a finite dimensional normed vector space. In the following  $\Omega$  is an open subset of the vector space  $V^E$ ,  $F$  is a function defined on  $\Omega$  and  $\underline{y} \in V^E$ . We keep the definition of the collection  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}$  introduced above.

**Corollary 5.17.** *Assume that for every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , and for all compact subset  $K$  of  $\Omega$ , there is a constant  $C_K$  such that*

$$\forall \underline{x} \in K, \quad |F(\underline{x})| \leq C_K \left( \sup_{b \in B} \|x_b - y_b\| \right)^d.$$

*Then for a compact subset  $K$  of  $\Omega$ , one can find a constant  $C_K$  such that*

$$\forall \underline{x} \in K, \quad |F(\underline{x})| \leq C_K \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}} \prod_{e \in E} \|x_e - y_e\|^{n_e}.$$

*Proof.* We identify  $V$  with  $\mathbb{R}^k$  so that  $V^E \simeq \mathbb{R}^{\{1, \dots, k\} \times E}$ . The proof is a direct consequence of the previous Proposition 5.17 applied to the family

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{B}} = \{\{1, \dots, k\} \times B \mid B \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}}\}.$$

□

**Remark 5.18.** Let  $\Omega^1$  be an open subset of a finite dimensional vector space and assume that  $F \in \mathcal{C}^{0, \infty}(\Omega^1, \Omega)$  (this function space is defined before Lemma 5.5). Then Proposition 5.16 remains true if one replace  $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\Omega)$  by  $\mathcal{C}^{0, \infty}(\Omega^1, \Omega)$  and the proof is in all points similar.

We now apply the previous Corollary 5.17 to the function  $\widetilde{F}_A$ .

**Lemma 5.19.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a partition of  $A$  and  $K$  be a compact subset of  $M_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]}) \times \mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$ . Then there is a constant  $C_K$  such that for all  $((M, Q), \Sigma) \in K$  and  $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathcal{I}}^{P^A}$ , one has*

$$\left| \widetilde{F}_A((M, Q), R, \Sigma) \right| \leq C_K \|R\| \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{\{I, J\} \in E(G)} \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|.$$

*Proof.* The proposition is trivial if  $\mathcal{I} = \{A\}$ , and we can assume that  $\mathcal{I} \neq \{A\}$ . The proof is an application of Corollary 5.17. We define  $E$  to be the collection of subsets of  $A$  of cardinal 2 :

$$E = \{\{a, b\} \subset A \mid a \neq b\}.$$

Note that we can first make the identification

$$\mathcal{S}(F^A) = \mathcal{S}(F)^A \times \mathcal{M}(F)^E.$$

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a partition of  $A$  with  $\mathcal{K} \succeq \mathcal{I}$ . We define

$$B_{\mathcal{K}} = \{\{i, j\} \in E \mid [i]_{\mathcal{K}} \neq [j]_{\mathcal{K}}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}} = \left\{ B_{\mathcal{K}} \mid \mathcal{I} \preceq \mathcal{K} \text{ and } |\mathcal{K}| = 2 \right\}.$$

The set  $B_{\mathcal{K}}$  encodes the pair of indices that belongs to two different cells of the partition  $\mathcal{K}$ . In the space  $\mathcal{S}(F^A)$ , the associated sub-vector space corresponds to the matrices that are block diagonal with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{K}$ . Let us give a more intuitive description of the set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}}} = \min \left\{ \underline{n} \in \mathbb{N}^E \mid \forall \mathcal{K} \succeq \mathcal{I} \text{ s.t. } |\mathcal{K}| = 2, \quad |\underline{n}_{B_{\mathcal{K}}}| \geq 2 \right\}.$$

For an element  $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}}}$ , we define the graph  $G^{\underline{n}}$  with set of vertices  $A$ , and where the edge  $e = \{a, b\}$  has for multiplicity  $n_e$ , for  $e \in E$ . Now consider the  $H^{\underline{n}} = G_{\mathcal{I}}^{\underline{n}}$ , obtained as the

quotient graph with respect to the partition  $\mathcal{I}$ . Since  $\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}}}$ , one can find, for any partition  $\mathcal{K} \succeq \mathcal{I}$  of the set  $\mathcal{I}$  in two disjoint subsets, at least two distinct edges connecting the two subsets. It implies that the graph  $H^{\underline{n}}$  is 2-edge connected. More over, the minimality assumption on the set  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}}}$  implies that the graph  $H^{\underline{n}}$  is minimally 2-edge-connected. Thus, one has  $H^{\underline{n}} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}$ .

According to Lemma 5.19, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \tilde{F}_A((M, Q), R, \Sigma) \right| &\leq C_K \|R\| \sup_{\substack{I, J \in \mathcal{K} \\ I \neq J}} \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|^2 \\ &\leq C_K \|R\| \sup_{e \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{K}}} \|\Sigma_e\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, according to Corollary 5.17, there is a constant  $C_K$  such that

$$\left| \tilde{F}_A((M, Q), R, \Sigma) \right| \leq C_K \|R\| \sum_{\underline{n} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}}}} \prod_{e \in E} \|\Sigma_e\|^{n_e}$$

According to the above paragraph, one readily deduce that

$$\left| \tilde{F}_A((M, Q), R, \Sigma) \right| \leq C_K \|R\| \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{\{I, J\} \in E(G)} \|\Sigma_{I, J}\|.$$

□

## 6 Asymptotics of the cumulants of the zeros counting measure

We are now in position to study the asymptotics of the cumulants of the zeros counting measure associated with a sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We first prove that the non-degeneracy condition holds uniformly for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which allows us to translate the previous Lemma 5.19 to the cumulant Kac density  $F_{A, n}$  associated with the sequence  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . As a consequence of the previous Proposition 4.11, we deduce the following corollary about convergence of the Kac density associated with the process  $f_n$ .

**Corollary 6.1.** *Assume that the sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies hypotheses  $H_1(q)$ ,  $H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  defined in (1.7) and (1.8), with  $q = 2|A| - 1$ . Then we have the following convergence, uniformly for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\underline{t}$  in compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^A$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_n(nx + \underline{t}) = \rho_{\infty}(\underline{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F_{A, n}(nx + \underline{t}) = F_{A, \infty}(\underline{t}).$$

*Proof.* The proof of Proposition 4.11 implies that for all partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$ , one has the following convergence, uniformly for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\underline{t}$  in a bounded subset of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}, \eta}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(nx + \underline{t}) = \text{Sigma}_{\infty}^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{t}).$$

The conclusion follows from the alternative expression for  $\rho_n$  given by Lemma 5.3. Note that the function  $\rho_{\infty}$  does not depends on the function  $\psi(x)$  since it cancels on the numerator and denominator. □

### 6.1 Asymptotics of the cumulants

Let  $A$  be a finite set of cardinal  $p$ . We assume that the sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies hypotheses  $H_1(q)$ ,  $H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  defined in (1.7) and (1.8), with  $q = 2p - 1$ . We then choose  $\eta = \frac{\omega}{2p}$  where  $\omega$  is the parameter of hypothesis  $H_2(q)$ , so that

$$g_{\omega}(x) = \sup_{|u| \leq 2\eta p} g(x + u).$$

### 6.1.1 Decay of the cumulant Kac density

Let us now translate Lemma 5.19 to the cumulant Kac density  $F_{A,n}$ . The previous Corollary 6.1 ensures that the matrix  $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{x})$  lives in a compact subset of  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$  when  $\underline{x} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta}$  and  $n$  is large enough.

**Lemma 6.2.** *There is a constant  $C$  depending only on  $\eta$  such that for all  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ ,*

$$|F_{A,n}(\underline{y})| \leq C \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \|R[\underline{y}_I]\| \right) \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{\{I,J\} \in E(G)} g_{\omega}(\text{Bar}(\underline{y}_I) - \text{Bar}(\underline{y}_J)).$$

*Proof.* We prove that the inequality holds for any partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $A$  and  $\underline{y} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta$ . According to Corollary 6.1 there is a compact subset  $K$  of  $\mathcal{S}^+(F^A)$  such that for  $n$  large enough,  $\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}) \in K$ . By Lemma 4.5, the element  $(M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}], Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}])$  also lives in a compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}}^*(F^{[A]})$ .

We can then apply Lemma 5.19 with  $\Sigma = \Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y})$ ,  $(M, Q) = (M^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}], Q^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}])$  and  $R = R^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]$ . Given the representation formula for  $F_A$  given by Lemma 5.9, we deduce the existence of a constant  $C$  such that for all  $\underline{y} \in \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |F_A(\underline{y})| &\leq C \|R^{\mathcal{I}}[\underline{y}]\| \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{\{I,J\} \in E(G)} \|(\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I,J}\| \\ &\leq C \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \|R[\underline{y}_I]\| \right) \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{\{I,J\} \in E(G)} \|(\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I,J}\|. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 4.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Sigma_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{y}))_{I,J}\| &\leq C \sup_{x \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_I)} \sup_{z \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_J)} \sup_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq 2p-1} |\partial_{\alpha,\beta} r_n(x, z)| \\ &\leq C \sup_{x \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_I)} \sup_{z \in \text{Conv}(\underline{y}_J)} |g(x, z)| \\ &\leq C g_{\omega}(\text{Bar}(\underline{y}_I), \text{Bar}(\underline{y}_J)), \end{aligned}$$

according to the definition of  $g$  and  $g_{\omega}$ . □

### 6.1.2 Convergence of the error term towards zero

This whole part is borrowed from [Gas21].

Let  $k = d$  and  $\nu_n = \nu_{f_n}$  be the random counting measure of the zero set of the Gaussian process  $f_n$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The previous Lemma 6.2 and the formula for the  $p$ -th cumulant given by Proposition 5.2 shows that the convergence of the cumulant reduces to the behavior of the quantity

$$H_n(G) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^A \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta} \setminus \Delta} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} r_I(\underline{y}_I) \right) \prod_{a \in A} \left| \phi_a \left( \frac{y_a}{n} \right) \right| \prod_{e=\{I,G\} \in E(G)} g_e(\text{Bar}(\underline{y}_I) - \text{Bar}(\underline{y}_J)) d\underline{y}, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{I}$  is a partition of  $A$ ,  $G$  is a 2-edge connected graph with set of vertices  $\mathcal{I}$  and set of edges  $E(G)$ ,  $(\phi_a)_{a \in A}$  are bounded functions with compact support,  $(g_e)_{e \in E(G)}$  are even functions in  $L^2 \cap L^\infty$  and the functions  $(r_B)_{B \subset A}$  are locally integrable and invariant by translation. We begin by a first lemma that give a bound on  $H_n(G)$ . For  $B \subset A$  we introduce the function

$$\phi_B^n : y \mapsto \int_{\substack{\text{Bar}(\underline{t}_B)=0 \\ |\underline{t}_B| \leq \eta p}} r(\underline{t}_B) \prod_{a \in B} \phi_a \left( y + \frac{t_a}{n} \right) d\underline{t}_B.$$

**Lemma 6.3.** For  $B \subset A$  and  $n \geq 1$ , one has

$$\|\phi_B\|_\infty \leq \left( \prod_{a \in B} \|\phi_a\|_\infty \right) \|r\mathbf{1}_{B(0,\eta p)}\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi_B\|_1 \leq \left( \prod_{a \in B} \|\phi_a\|_{|B|} \right) \|r\mathbf{1}_{B(0,\eta p)}\|_1.$$

Moreover, there is a constant  $C$  depending only on  $\eta$  such that

$$H_n(G) \leq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi_I^n \left( \frac{x_I}{n} \right) \prod_{e=\{I,G\} \in E(G)} g_e(x_I - x_J) d\underline{x}_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

*Proof.* The first assertion is straightforward from the definition of  $\phi_B^n$ . Now for  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ , we make the change of variable inside  $H_n(G)$

$$\underline{y}_I = x_I + \underline{t}_I, \quad \text{where} \quad \text{Bar}(\underline{t}_I) = 0.$$

By using the description of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{I},\eta}$  in Lemma 3.1 we get

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(G) &\leq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \left( \int_{\substack{\text{Bar}(\underline{t}_I)=0 \\ |\underline{t}_I| \leq \eta p}} \prod_{i \in I} \phi_i \left( \frac{y_I + t_i}{n} \right) d\underline{t}_I \right) g_e(x_I - x_J) d\underline{x}_{\mathcal{I}} \\ &\leq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{I}}} \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi_I^n \left( \frac{x_I}{n} \right) \prod_{e=\{I,J\} \in E(G)} g_e(x_I - x_J) d\underline{x}_{\mathcal{I}} \end{aligned}$$

□

We now introduce the quantity

$$I_n(G) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^A} \prod_{a \in A} \phi_a \left( \frac{x_a}{n} \right) \prod_{e=\{i,j\} \in E(G)} g_e(x_i - x_j) d\underline{x},$$

for some bounded function  $(\phi_a)_{a \in A}$  with compact support, and function  $(g_e)_{e \in E(G)}$ . In the previous Lemma 6.3, we have bound the quantity  $H_n(G)$  by the quantity  $I_n(G)$  for some well chose function  $\phi_a$  and graph  $G$ .

We recall the following theorem about Hölder interpolation, which is a particular instance of the Brascamp–Lieb inequality (see [14]).

**Theorem 6.4** (Hölder interpolation). Let  $m, n$  positive integers, and  $v_1, \dots, v_m$  be non-zeros vectors which span the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We denote by  $Q$  the subset of  $[0, 1]^m$  such that  $\underline{q} \in Q$  if there is a finite constant  $C_{\underline{q}}$  such that for every measurable functions  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m$  from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^n} \prod_{i=1}^m |\psi_i(\langle \underline{x}, v_i \rangle)| d\underline{x} \leq C_{\underline{q}} \prod_{i=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\psi_i(x)|^{1/q_i} dx \right)^{q_i}.$$

Then  $Q$  is convex.

The above theorem implies the following theorem about the integral quantity  $I_n(G)$ . Recall that  $p = |A|$ .

**Lemma 6.5.** *Assume that for all  $e \in E(G)$ ,  $g_e \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$ . Then for every  $e \in E(G)$ , there is a number  $p_e \geq \frac{p}{p-1}$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{n^d} I_n(G) \leq \left( \prod_{a \in A} \|\phi_a\|_p \right) \left( \prod_{e \in E(G)} \|g_e\|_{p_e} \right).$$

*Assume that  $p \geq 3$  and  $g_e \in L^2 \cap L^\infty$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^{dp/2}} I_n(G) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let  $(T_a)_{a \in A}$  be the family of spanning trees of  $G$  given by Lemma 5.14. For fixed index  $a \in A$ , the linear mapping

$$\underline{x}_A \mapsto (x_a, (x_b - x_c)_{\{b,c\} \in E(T_a)})$$

is volume preserving. For  $e \notin E(T_a)$  we bound the term  $g_e(x_i - x_j)$  in  $I_n(G)$  by  $\|g_e\|_\infty$ , and for  $b \neq a$ , the function  $\phi_b$  by  $\|\phi_b\|_\infty$ . By a change of variable, we get

$$I_n(G) \leq n^d \|\phi_a\|_1 \left( \prod_{b \neq a} \|\phi_b\|_\infty \right) \left( \prod_{e \in E(T_a)} \|g_e\|_1 \right) \left( \prod_{e \notin E(T_a)} \|g_e\|_\infty \right).$$

This inequality is true for all  $a \in A$ . By Theorem 6.4, one can interpolate this collection of Hölder inequalities indexed by the set  $A$  and convex combination  $(1/p, \dots, 1/p)$  to obtain

$$I_n(G) \leq C n^d \left( \prod_{a \in A} \|\phi_a\|_p \right) \left( \prod_{e \in E(G)} \|g_e\|_{p_e} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{1}{p_e} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{a \in A} \mathbf{1}_{E(T_a)}(e). \quad (6.2)$$

Since for all  $e \in E(G)$ , there is a tree  $T_{a_e}$  that does not contain the edge  $e$ , one must have  $p_e \geq \frac{p}{p-1}$ , and the first part of the lemma follows. For the second part, note that we also have the crude bound

$$I_n(G) \leq n^{dp} \left( \prod_{a \in A} \|\phi_a\|_1 \right) \left( \prod_{e \in E(G)} \|g_e\|_\infty \right).$$

We can once again interpolate this inequality with inequality (6.2) and convex combination  $\left(\frac{p}{2(p-1)}, \frac{p-2}{2(p-1)}\right)$  to get

$$\frac{1}{n^{dp/2}} I_n(G) \leq C \left( \prod_{a \in A} \|\phi_a\|_2 \right) \left( \prod_{e \in E(G)} \|g_e\|_{q_e} \right), \quad \text{with} \quad q_e = 2p_e \frac{p-1}{p} \geq 2. \quad (6.3)$$

It remains show that the left hand side of (6.3) converges towards zero for  $p \geq 3$ . If the functions  $(g_e)_{e \in E(G)}$  are bounded and compactly supported, then inequality (6.2) implies the convergence towards zero of the left hand side of (6.3) when  $p \geq 3$ . In the general case, one can take, for every  $e \in E(G)$ , a sequence of bounded and compactly supported functions that converge towards  $g_e$  in  $L^{q_e}$ . The Hölder bound given by (6.3) and the triangular inequality imply the desired result.  $\square$

The above Lemma 6.5 implies that the space of test functions  $(\phi_a)_{a \in A}$  can be extended to  $L^p(U)$ . The previous Lemma 6.5 and the convergence of the Kac density given by Corollary 6.1 imply the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.6.** For all  $p \geq 3$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^{dp/2}} \int_{(nU)^A} \phi_A^{\otimes} \left( \frac{\underline{x}_A}{n} \right) F_{A,n}(\underline{x}_A) d\underline{x}_A = 0.$$

For all  $p \geq 1$ , if  $g_\omega \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$  then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^A} \phi_A^{\otimes} \left( \frac{\underline{y}}{n} \right) F_{A,n}(\underline{y}) d\underline{y} = \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{a \in A} \phi_a(x) dx \right) \left( \int_{\text{Bar}(\underline{y})=0} F_{A,\infty}(\underline{y}) d\underline{y} \right).$$

*Proof.* According to Lemma 6.2, there is a constant  $C$  such that

$$\left| \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^A} \phi_A^{\otimes} \left( \frac{\underline{y}}{n} \right) F_{A,n}(\underline{y}) d\underline{y} \right| \leq C \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{I}}} I_n(G),$$

where  $I_n(G)$  is defined in (6.1) with functions  $g_e = g_\omega$ . The first part of the corollary is an immediate consequence of the second part of Lemma 6.5. Assume first that the functions  $(\phi_a)_{a \in A}$  are continuous and compactly supported. In that case, pick  $a_0 \in A$ . We define  $x_{a_0} = 0$  and we make the change of variables

$$y_{a_0} = ny \quad \text{and} \quad \forall a \in A \setminus \{a_0\}, \quad y_a = nx + x_a.$$

Then we have the following uniform convergence for  $x \in U$  and  $\underline{x}_A$  in compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^A$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_a \left( x + \frac{x_a}{n} \right) = \phi_a(x),$$

and according to Corollary 6.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F_{A,n}(nx + \underline{x}_A) = F_{A,\infty}(\underline{x}_A).$$

The conclusion then follows from the dominated convergence theorem. In the general case, we consider for all  $a \in A$  a sequence of continuous and compactly supported functions that converges towards  $\phi_a$  in  $L^p$ . The Hölder bound given by Lemma 6.5 and another application of dominated convergence theorem imply the desired result.  $\square$

Given the expression of cumulants given by Proposition 5.2 and the previous Lemma 6.6, we then deduce the following theorem concerning the convergence of cumulants associated with the linear statistics of the zeros counting measure of the sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}}$ . We define the Stirling number of the second kind

$$\left\{ \begin{matrix} p \\ k \end{matrix} \right\} := \text{Card} \{ \mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A \mid |\mathcal{I}| = k \}.$$

**Theorem 6.7.** Let  $p \geq 2$  and assume that the sequence of processes  $(f_n)_{n \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}}$  satisfies hypotheses  $H_1(q)$ ,  $H_2(q)$  and  $H_3(q)$  with  $q = 2p - 1$ . Let  $\phi \in L^1 \cap L^{p^2}$ . If  $p \geq 3$  then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^{dp/2}} \kappa_p(\langle \nu_n, \phi \rangle) = 0.$$

Moreover when  $g_\omega \in L^{\frac{p}{p-1}}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \kappa_p(\langle \nu_n, \phi \rangle) = \left( \int_U \phi^p(x) dx \right) \sum_{k=1}^p \left\{ \begin{matrix} p \\ k \end{matrix} \right\} \left( \int_{\text{Bar}(\underline{y})=0} F_{k,\infty}(\underline{y}) d\underline{y} \right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $p \geq 3$ . Recall from Proposition 5.2 that

$$\kappa_p(\langle \nu_n, \phi \rangle) = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \int_{(nU)^{\mathcal{I}}} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi \left( \frac{y_I}{n} \right)^{|I|} \right) F_{\mathcal{I},n}(\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}) d\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}.$$

Since  $\phi \in L^1 \cap L^{p^2}$ , then for every partition  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $\{1, \dots, p\}$  and  $I$  a subset of  $\mathcal{I}$  one has that the function  $\phi^{|I|}$  is in  $L^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ . According to the previous Lemma 6.6, one has

$$\frac{1}{n^{dp/2}} |\kappa_p(\langle \nu, \phi \rangle)| \leq \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \frac{1}{n^{p/2}} \left| \int_{(nU)^{\mathcal{I}}} \left( \prod_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi \left( \frac{y_I}{n} \right)^{|I|} \right) F_{\mathcal{I},n}(\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}}) d\underline{y}_{\mathcal{I}} \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

which proves the first assertion. As for the second assertion, it is again a consequence of Lemma 6.6, which implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \kappa_p(\langle \nu_n, \phi \rangle) = \left( \int_U \phi^p(x) dx \right) \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{P}_A} \left( \int_{\text{Bar}(\underline{y})=0} F_{|\mathcal{I}|}(\underline{y}) d\underline{y} \right).$$

□

The proof of the main Theorem 1.9 is a reformulation of the previous Theorem 6.7, with

$$\forall p \geq 1, \quad \gamma_p = \sum_{k=1}^p \left\{ \begin{matrix} p \\ k \end{matrix} \right\} \left( \int_{\text{Bar}(\underline{y})=0} F_{k,\infty}(\underline{y}) d\underline{y} \right).$$

## References

- [1] R. J. Adler and J. E. Taylor. *Random fields and geometry*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2007.
- [2] Michele Ancona. Random sections of line bundles over real riemann surfaces. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2021(9):7004–7059, 2021.
- [3] Michele Ancona and Thomas Letendre. Roots of Kostlan polynomials: moments, strong law of large numbers and central limit theorem. *Ann. H. Lebesgue*, 4:1659–1703, 2021.
- [4] Michele Ancona and Thomas Letendre. Zeros of smooth stationary Gaussian processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26:Paper No. 68, 81, 2021.
- [5] Michele Ancona and Thomas Letendre. Multijet bundles and application to the finiteness of moments for zeros of Gaussian fields. *Hal preprint, hal-04165218*, 2023.
- [6] D. Armentano, J.-M. Azaïs, F. Dalmao, and J. R. Leon. Central limit theorem for the number of real roots of Kostlan Shub Smale random polynomial systems. *Amer. J. Math.*, 143(4):1011–1042, 2021.
- [7] Diego Armentano, Jean Marc Azaïs, Federico Dalmao, José Rafael Leon, and Ernesto Mordecki. On the finiteness of the moments of the measure of level sets of random fields. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 37(1):219–245, 2023.
- [8] Jean-Marc Azaïs and Céline Delmas. Mean number and correlation function of critical points of isotropic gaussian fields and some results on goe random matrices. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 150:411–445, 2022.
- [9] Jean-Marc Azaïs and José León. CLT for crossings of random trigonometric polynomials. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 18(none):1 – 17, 2013.



- [10] Jean-Marc Azaïs and Mario Wschebor. *Level sets and extrema of random processes and fields*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2009.
- [11] Dmitry Beliaev, Valentina Cammarota, and Igor Wigman. Two point function for critical points of a random plane wave. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(9):2661–2689, 2019.
- [12] Dmitry Beliaev, Michael McAuley, and Stephen Muirhead. A central limit theorem for the number of excursion set components of gaussian fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09085*, 2022.
- [13] Dmitry Beliaev and Igor Wigman. Volume distribution of nodal domains of random band-limited functions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 172(1-2):453–492, 2018.
- [14] Jonathan Bennett, Anthony Carbery, Michael Christ, and Terence Tao. The brascamp–lieb inequalities: finiteness, structure and extremals. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 17(5):1343–1415, 2008.
- [15] Corinne Berzin, Alain Latour, and José León. Kac-rice formula: A contemporary overview of the main results and applications, 2022.
- [16] Patrick Billingsley. *Probability and measure*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, third edition, 1995. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [17] Bartłomiej Błaszczyszyn, Dhandapani Yogeshwaran, and Joseph E Yukich. Limit theory for geometric statistics of point processes having fast decay of correlations. *The Annals of Probability*, 47(2):835–895, 2019.
- [18] Peter Breuer and Péter Major. Central limit theorems for non-linear functionals of gaussian fields. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 13(3):425–441, 1983.
- [19] Peter Bürgisser. Average euler characteristic of random real algebraic varieties. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 345(9):507–512, 2007.
- [20] Yaiza Canzani and Boris Hanin. Local universality for zeros and critical points of monochromatic random waves. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 378(3):1677–1712, 2020.
- [21] Gauthier Dierickx, Ivan Nourdin, Giovanni Peccati, and Maurizia Rossi. Small scale clts for the nodal length of monochromatic waves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06577*, 2020.
- [22] Yen Do, Hoi Nguyen, and Oanh Nguyen. Random trigonometric polynomials: universality and non-universality of the variance for the number of real roots. 2020.
- [23] Yan V. Fyodorov, Antonio Lerario, and Erik Lundberg. On the number of connected components of random algebraic hypersurfaces. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 95:1–20, 2015.
- [24] Louis Gass. Spectral criteria for the asymptotics of local functionals of gaussian fields and application to the nodal volume. *To appear*.
- [25] Louis Gass. *On the geometry of random nodal sets*. Theses, Université de Rennes, July 2022.
- [26] Louis Gass. Almost-sure asymptotics for Riemannian random waves. *Bernoulli*, 29(1):625 – 651, 2023.
- [27] Louis Gass. Cumulants asymptotics for the zeros counting measure of real Gaussian processes. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28(none):1 – 45, 2023.

- [28] Louis Gass. Variance of the number of zeros of dependent Gaussian trigonometric polynomials. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 151(5):2225–2239, 2023.
- [29] Louis Gass and Michele Stecconi. The number of critical points of a gaussian field: finiteness of moments. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–31, 2024.
- [30] Damien Gayet and Jean-Yves Welschinger. Lower estimates for the expected Betti numbers of random real hypersurfaces. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 90(1):105–120, 2014.
- [31] Damien Gayet and Jean-Yves Welschinger. Expected topology of random real algebraic submanifolds. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 14(4):673–702, 2015.
- [32] Damien Gayet and Jean-Yves Welschinger. Betti numbers of random real hypersurfaces and determinants of random symmetric matrices. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 18(4):733–772, 2016.
- [33] Damien Gayet and Jean-Yves Welschinger. Betti numbers of random nodal sets of elliptic pseudo-differential operators. *Asian J. Math.*, 21(5):811–839, 2017.
- [34] Andrew Granville and Igor Wigman. The distribution of the zeros of random trigonometric polynomials. *Amer. J. Math.*, 133(2):295–357, 2011.
- [35] Christian Hirsch and Raphael Lachieze-Rey. Functional central limit theorem for topological functionals of gaussian critical points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11429*, 2024.
- [36] M. Kac. On the average number of real roots of a random algebraic equation. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 49:314–320, 1943.
- [37] Paul Kergin. A natural interpolation of ck functions. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 29(4):278–293, 1980.
- [38] Manjunath Krishnapur, Pär Kurlberg, and Igor Wigman. Nodal length fluctuations for arithmetic random waves. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 177(2):699–737, 2013.
- [39] Safa Ladgham and Raphaël Lachieze-Rey. Local repulsion of planar Gaussian critical points. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 166:Paper No. 104221, 25, 2023.
- [40] Antonio Lerario and Michele Stecconi. Maximal and typical topology of real polynomial singularities. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 74(2):589–626, 2024.
- [41] Thomas Letendre. Expected volume and Euler characteristic of random submanifolds. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 270(8):3047–3110, 2016.
- [42] Thomas Letendre and Martin Puchol. Variance of the volume of random real algebraic submanifolds ii. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 68(6):pp. 1649–1720, 2019.
- [43] Tat’yana L’vovna Malevich and LN Volodina. Some finiteness conditions for factorial moments of the number of zeros of gaussian field zeros. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 38(1):27–45, 1994.
- [44] Domenico Marinucci, Giovanni Peccati, Maurizia Rossi, and Igor Wigman. Non-universality of nodal length distribution for arithmetic random waves. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 26(3):926–960, 2016.
- [45] Domenico Marinucci and Igor Wigman. On the area of excursion sets of spherical gaussian eigenfunctions. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 52(9):093301, 2011.

- [46] Léo Mathis and Michele Stecconi. Expectation of a random submanifold: the zonoid section. *Annales Henri Lebesgue*, 7:903–967, 2024.
- [47] Charles A Micchelli and Pierre Milman. A formula for kergin interpolation in rk. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 29(4):294–296, 1980.
- [48] Fedor Nazarov and Mikhail Sodin. On the number of nodal domains of random spherical harmonics. *Amer. J. Math.*, 131(5):1337–1357, 2009.
- [49] Fedor Nazarov and Mikhail Sodin. Correlation functions for random complex zeroes: strong clustering and local universality. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 310(1):75–98, 2012.
- [50] Oanh Nguyen and Van Vu. Random polynomials: Central limit theorems for the real roots. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(17):3745–3813, 2021.
- [51] Ivan Nourdin, Giovanni Peccati, and Maurizia Rossi. Nodal statistics of planar random waves. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 369(1):99–151, 2019.
- [52] Giovanni Peccati and Murad S. Taqqu. *Wiener chaos: moments, cumulants and diagrams*, volume 1 of *Bocconi & Springer Series*. Springer, Milan; Bocconi University Press, Milan, 2011. A survey with computer implementation, Supplementary material available online.
- [53] S. O. Rice. Mathematical analysis of random noise. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 24:46–156, 1945.
- [54] P. Sarnak and I. Wigman. Topologies of nodal sets of random band-limited functions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(2):275–342, 2019.
- [55] Michael Shub and Steve Smale. Complexity of bezout’s theorem ii volumes and probabilities. In Frédéric Eyssette and André Galligo, editors, *Computational Algebraic Geometry*, pages 267–285, Boston, MA, 1993. Birkhäuser Boston.
- [56] T. P. Speed. Cumulants and partition lattices. *Austral. J. Statist.*, 25(2):378–388, 1983.
- [57] M. Stecconi. Kac-Rice formula for transverse intersections. *Analysis and Mathematical Physics*, 12(2):44, 2022.
- [58] Douglas Brent West et al. *Introduction to graph theory*, volume 2. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2001.
- [59] Igor Wigman. On the nodal lines of random and deterministic laplace eigenfunctions, 2011.
- [60] Igor Wigman. On the nodal structures of random fields – a decade of results, 2022.
- [61] Steve Zelditch. Real and complex zeros of Riemannian random waves. In *Spectral analysis in geometry and number theory*, volume 484 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 321–342. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.