

# SHARP ESTIMATES FOR LARGE $N$ WEINGARTEN FUNCTIONS

RON NISSIM

**ABSTRACT.** Weingarten functions provide a tool for computing Haar measure matrix integrals of polynomials in the matrix entries. An important property of Weingarten functions, is their particularly simple large  $N$  limits. In 2017 Benoit Collins and Sho Matsumoto studied when this limit holds for Weingarten functions associated to integrals of products of  $2n$  matrix entries, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , together with the matrix size  $N$  [CM17]. They showed that the large  $N$  limit is uniformly achieved as long as  $n = o(N^{4/7})$ , a result which already has applications to strong asymptotic freeness [BC23, BC24]. However, their result is not optimal. They conjectured that their result should actually hold up to  $n = o(N^{2/3})$  which is optimal. We prove this conjecture for the matrix groups  $G \in \{U(N), O(N), Sp(N)\}$ . The proof proceeds by introducing a Markov process on permutations (pairings) which we call the unitary (orthogonal) *Weingarten process*. We believe this process may have further applications to the theory of Weingarten functions. We also prove two new bounds regarding the large  $N$  limit of the Weingarten function in the regimes when  $n = o(N^{4/5})$ , and  $n = o(N)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

**1.1. Introduction.** For a compact matrix group  $G \in \{U(N), O(N), Sp(N)\}$ , let  $\mu_G$  denote the Haar probability measure on  $G$ , and let  $U_{i,j} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be the  $i, j$  coordinate function. Then the integral  $\int_G U_{i_1 j_1} \cdots U_{i_m j_m} \overline{U}_{i'_1 j'_1} \cdots \overline{U}_{i'_n j'_n} d\mu_G$  can be calculated in terms a class of special functions called Weingarten functions [Wei78]. For general background on Weingarten functions we refer the reader to [CMN22, Col22, Kös21].

These Haar measure integrals which can be evaluated in terms of Weingarten functions have applications in many areas of probability and mathematical physics. These applications include strong convergence results in free probability [CM14, BC23, CGL24, BC24], analysis of famous unitary group integrals arising from mathematical physics such as the Harish-Chandra-Itzykson-Zuber integral and the Bars-Green/Brezin-Gross-Witten/Wadia integrals [Col03, Nov07, CGMS09, GGPN11b, GGPN11a, Nov20, Nov22, CGL23], Yang-Mills lattice gauge theory [Nov24, CPS23], and quantum information theory [CN16]. The theory of Weingarten functions has been particularly successful for studying large  $N$  limits of matrix models in these areas due to the particularly simple form of Weingarten functions in the large  $N$  limit. For instance, the unitary Weingarten function takes in a permutation input  $\sigma \in S_n$ , and we have the following  $N$  limit formula: for  $n$  fixed,

$$\text{Wg}_N^U(\sigma) = N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Moeb}(\sigma)(1 + O(N^{-2})), \tag{1.1}$$

where for  $\sigma \in S_n$  with  $l$  cycles of length  $C_1, \dots, C_l$ ,  $|\sigma| := n - l$ , and  $\text{Moeb}(\sigma) := (-1)^{|\sigma|} \prod_{i=1}^l \text{Cat}(C_i - 1)$ , for  $\text{Cat}(m) := \frac{\binom{2m}{m}}{m+1}$  defined as the  $m$ -th Catalan number.  $\text{Moeb}(\sigma)$  is called the Moebius function of  $\sigma$ .

For many applications listed above, it is important to understand Weingarten functions in the case when both  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular, it is natural to ask under what conditions does  $\text{Wg}_N^U(\sigma) = (-1)^{|\sigma|} N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Moeb}(\sigma)(1 + o(1))$  hold uniformly for  $\sigma \in S_n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $N \rightarrow \infty$  simultaneously. This question is more delicate than the original large  $N$  limit question answered by (1.1), however, there have been results in this direction. In particular, Collins and Matsumoto [CM17], proved that for any  $N \geq \sqrt{6n}^{7/4}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{1 - \frac{n-1}{N^2}} \leq \frac{N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^U(\sigma)}{\text{Moeb}(\sigma)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{6n^{7/2}}{N^2}}, \tag{1.2}$$

for all  $\sigma \in S_n$ .

However, Collins and Matsumoto remark that the exponent in the upper bound of (1.2) is not tight. For the full cycle  $\sigma = (1\ 2\ \dots\ n) \in S_n$ ,  $\text{Wg}_N(\sigma)$  has an explicit formula which can be analyzed to deduce that

$$\frac{(-1)^{|\sigma|} N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma)}{\text{Moeb}(\sigma)} \rightarrow 1$$

as long as  $n, N \rightarrow \infty$  with  $n = o(N^{2/3})$ . This suggests a uniform bound of the form

$$\frac{N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma)}{\text{Moeb}(\sigma)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{Cn^3}{N^2}}, \quad (1.3)$$

for some constant  $C > 0$  and  $n < C^{-1}N^{2/3}$ . This is indeed the statement of our main theorem, Theorem 1.1. We also prove the analogous result for the  $\text{O}(N)$  and  $\text{SP}(N)$  case, Theorem 1.3.

The starting point to proving (1.3) is the path expansion formula for the Weingarten function proven in [CM17],

$$(-1)^{|\sigma|} N^{n+|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma) = \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| N^{-2g}, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)$  denotes the set of all directed paths of length  $n + |\sigma| + 2g$  from  $\sigma \rightarrow \emptyset$  in the Weingarten graph which will be defined in Section 2.2. Then the crux of the argument will be to introduce a Markov process which generates uniformly random paths in  $\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)$  which we call the *Weingarten Process*. The crux of the proof will then reduce to bounding certain statistics of this process. This process is a weighted version of the uniform transposition shuffle which has been extensively studied [DS81, Sch05, BD06, JS24]. The connection between matrix integrals and transposition shuffles has appeared in previous works including [Lév08, PPSY23].

In Section 4 of the paper we obtain bounds on the Weingarten function for a wider set of  $(n, N)$  values. Theorem 1.6 is a logarithmic version of the large  $N$  limit result which holds up to the  $n = o(N^{4/5})$  regime. However, Theorem 1.6, does not provide a uniform error over all permutations, and is strongest for permutations which have at least one large cycle. The proof of Theorem 1.6 follows from analyzing the loop equation satisfied by the Weingarten function. Lastly, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.6 both provide bounds which are made to handle permutations  $\sigma$ , with  $|\sigma|$  relatively large. We also study the ‘‘small permutation’’ regime in Section 4 when  $|\sigma| \leq k$  for some constant  $k$  and  $n, N \rightarrow \infty$ . For such permutations, we can prove a bound for an even larger range of  $(n, N)$  values. More precisely, if  $n, N \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $n = o(N)$  we prove that  $(-1)^{|\sigma|} N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{Moeb}(\sigma)$ . The more precise bound is stated in Theorem 1.4. The proof of this result is elementary and purely combinatorial, again using the path expansion (1.4).

**Acknowledgements:** The author would like to thank Sky Cao and Jacopo Borga for reading over an earlier draft and providing useful comments and suggestions. The author would also like to thank Jacopo Borga, Sky Cao, and Scott Sheffield for many helpful and inspiring discussions. The author is supported by the NSF GRFP-2141064.

**1.2. Main Results and Discussion.** We encourage the reader to refer to Subsection 2.3 for notation used in this section.

The main result of the paper is the following tight uniform bound on the Unitary Weingarten function conjectured by Collins and Matsumoto [CM17].

**Theorem 1.1.** *There exists  $C > 0$ , and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,*

$$\frac{N^{n+|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma)}{\text{Moeb}(\sigma)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{Cn^3}{N^2}},$$

for  $Cn^3 < N^2$  and all  $\sigma \in S_n$ .

*Remark 1.2.* For the full cycle  $\sigma_n := (1\ 2\ \dots\ n)$ ,

$$\text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma_n) = \frac{(-1)^{n-1} \text{Cat}(n-1)}{(N-n+1) \dots (N-1)N(N+1) \dots (N+n-1)} \quad (1.5)$$

[CM09, Proposition 6.1]. As a result, it can be checked that the bound from Theorem 1.1 is tight in the sense that the normalized Weingarten function is no longer approximated by the Moebius function once  $n$  is comparable to  $N^{2/3}$ .

The proof of Theorem 1.1 will be given in Section 3.

We also prove a similar bound for  $O(N)$  and  $SP(N)$  in Section 5. In these cases the Weingarten function will be defined in Section 5, Lemma 5.3 and Remark 5.1, and takes in pairings  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ . The bound for  $O(N)$  and  $SP(N)$  is stated below.

**Theorem 1.3.** *For  $G \in \{O(N), SP(N)\}$ , there is a constant  $C > 0$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,*

$$\frac{N^{-n-|\pi|} |\text{Wg}_N^G(\pi)|}{\text{Moeb}(\pi)} \leq \frac{1}{(1 - Cn^{3/2}/N)^2},$$

for  $Cn^3 < N^2$ , any  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ .

In Section 4 we will establish two large  $N$  quantitative convergence results that will work for an even larger regime of  $(n, N)$  values, but will no longer be uniform over permutations  $\sigma \in S_n$ . The following result addresses the case when  $n = o(N)$ , but  $|\sigma|$  remains bounded as  $n, N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 1.4.** *For  $N > \sqrt{48en}$ , and some constant  $C_{|\sigma|}$  depending only on  $|\sigma|$ ,*

$$|\overline{\text{Wg}}_N(\sigma) - \text{Moeb}(\sigma)| \leq \frac{C_{|\sigma|} n^2}{N^2 - 48en^2}.$$

Where  $e$  refers to Euler's constant  $e = 2.718\dots$

*Remark 1.5.* From the proof of Theorem 1.4, one can choose  $C_{|\sigma|} \leq Ce^{|\sigma|^2}$  for some constant  $C$  independent of  $|\sigma|$ , and if one is more careful, in fact  $C_{|\sigma|} \leq C|\sigma|^{|\sigma|}$  should also work.

We also obtain yet another result which studies the logarithmic version of the large  $N$  limit motivated as follows. From the formula for the full cycle (1.5), we still have the correct limiting asymptotics in a logarithmic sense as long as  $n = o(N)$ , that is,

$$\log \left( \frac{N^{n+|\sigma_n|} |\text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}(N)}(\sigma_n)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma_n)|} \right) \rightarrow 1$$

as  $N, n \rightarrow \infty$  with  $n = o(N)$ .

This leads us to the following theorem which deals with the  $n = o(N^{5/4})$  regime.

**Theorem 1.6.** *Suppose  $cn^{5/4} \leq N$  for sufficiently small  $c > 0$ . Then,*

$$\log \left( \frac{|\overline{\text{Wg}}_N(\sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{n^{5/2}}{N^2} |\sigma| + \log |\sigma| \right).$$

*Remark 1.7.* Recall that  $\text{Cat}(n) \sim \frac{4^n}{\sqrt{\pi n^{3/2}}}$ , so as long as  $N \gg n^{5/4}$ , and  $\sigma$  is permutation with at least one large cycle relative to  $|\sigma|$ , Theorem 1.6 can be interpreted as,

$$\log(\overline{\text{Wg}}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma)) = \log(\text{Moeb}(\sigma)) + \text{Lower Order Terms}.$$

At the moment it is unclear how tight the bounds of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.6. This could be a further direction of research. Another direction of interest is to study whether any result similar to the theorems of this paper hold in the unstable regime when  $n > N$ . We leave these questions open as a future research direction.

## 2. NOTATION AND BACKGROUND

**2.1. Partitions and Permutations.** A partition of  $n$ , denoted  $\lambda \vdash n$ , is a sequence of numbers  $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l)$  with  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_l \geq 1$ , and  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_l = n$ . For a partition  $\lambda \vdash n$  with  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l)$ , we define  $\ell(\lambda) = l$  to be the length of the partition. The letter  $l$  will also frequently be used to denote the number of cycles in a permutation since the cycle structure of the permutation will then be a partition  $\lambda$  with  $\ell(\lambda) = l$ .

Let  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We let  $S_n$  denote the group of permutations acting on  $[n]$  (the set of bijective functions  $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ ). A permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  is a *cycle* if there is no nontrivial subset  $X \subset [n]$  such




FIGURE 1. The figure above displays the unitary Weingarten graph  $\mathcal{W}^U$  restricted to layers 0 through 3,  $\bigsqcup_{n=0}^3 S_n$ .

that  $\sigma(X) = X$ . A permutation  $\tau \in S_n$  is a *transposition* if it fixes all but two elements of  $[n]$ . Recall the following facts about permutations.

**Fact 1.** Any permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  can be factored uniquely up to ordering into a product of disjoint cycles. The lengths of these cycles  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2, \dots \geq \lambda_l$ , uniquely determine a partition  $\lambda \vdash n$  called the cycle type of  $\sigma$ . We let  $S_\lambda \subset S_n$  denote the collection of all permutations with cycle type  $\lambda$ .

**Fact 2.** For any permutation  $\sigma \in S_\lambda$ , the conjugacy class of  $\sigma$ ,  $K_\sigma := \{\tilde{\sigma} = \eta^{-1}\sigma\eta : \eta \in S_n\}$ , is precisely equal to  $S_\lambda$ .

**Fact 3.** Any permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  can be factored into a product of transpositions  $\sigma = \tau_1 \dots \tau_m$ . The minimal number of transpositions necessary to factor  $\sigma$  this way is denoted by  $|\sigma|$ , and letting  $l$  denote the number of cycles in the disjoint cycle decomposition of  $\sigma$ ,  $|\sigma| = n - l$ .

For any  $\sigma \in S_n$ , and a permutation  $\tau = (ij)$ ,

$$|\tau\sigma| = \begin{cases} |\sigma| - 1 & \text{if } i \text{ and } j \text{ belong to the same cycle of } \sigma. \\ |\sigma| + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**2.2. The Unitary Weingarten Graph.** The unitary Weingarten graph  $\mathcal{W}^U$ , introduced in [CM17], has vertex set  $\bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} S_n$  ( $S_0 := \{0\}$ ). Each copy of  $S_n$  is referred to as the “ $n$ -th level” of the graph. In each level, there is a directed solid edge going from  $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma'$  if there is a transposition of the form  $(in)$  such that  $\sigma' = (in)\sigma$ . If a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  fixes  $n$ , then there is a dashed line connecting  $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma|_{[n-1]} \in S_{n-1}$ . See Figure 1 for a picture of the unitary Weingarten graph. Lastly,  $P(\sigma, l)$  will denote the set of paths from  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$  which take exactly  $l$  solid directed edges. Note this number is only non-zero if  $l \geq |\sigma|$ .

**2.3. The Unitary Weingarten Function.** Collins and Matsumoto proved the following large  $N$  expansion for the unitary Weingarten function, which we will simply take as our definition since it is the starting point of our analysis.

**Definition 2.1.** [CM17, Lemma 2.5] For  $n \leq N$ , the unitary Weingarten function  $\text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}(N)} : S_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  can be defined as follows,

$$\text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma) = (-1)^{|\sigma|} N^{-n-|\sigma|} \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} |P(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| N^{-2g}. \quad (2.1)$$

Moreover we define the normalized Weingarten function,

$$\overline{\text{Wg}}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma) := N^{n+|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma)$$

Next we recall the definition of the Moebius function of a permutation.

**Definition 2.2.** Suppose  $\sigma \in S_n$  has cycle decomposition  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_l$ , where each  $\sigma_i$  is a cycle of length  $C_i$ , then the *Moebius function* of  $\sigma$  is,

$$\text{Moeb}(\sigma) := (-1)^{|\sigma|} \prod_{i=1}^l \text{Cat}(C_i - 1),$$

where  $\text{Cat}(k) := \frac{(2k)!}{k!(k+1)!}$  is the  $k$ th Catalan number.

The large  $N$  limit of the normalized Weingarten function is the Moebius function in the following sense.

**Lemma 2.3.** [CM17, Lemma 3.3] We have that,

$$\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|) = (-1)^{|\sigma|} |\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|,$$

so as a result for any fixed  $n$  and  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\text{Wg}}_N^{\text{U}}(\sigma) = \text{Moeb}(\sigma).$$

The main application of the unitary Weingarten function is the following unitary Haar measure integration formula,

**Theorem 2.4.** [CMN22, Theorem 4.4] *For any indices  $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{i}' = (i'_1, \dots, i'_n)$ , and  $\mathbf{j}' = (j'_1, \dots, j'_n)$ , we have,*

$$\int_{\text{U}(N)} U_{i_1, j_1} \cdots U_{i_n, j_n} \overline{U}_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots \overline{U}_{i'_n, j'_n} dU = \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in S_n} \text{Wg}_N^{\text{U}(N)}(\sigma_1^{-1} \sigma_2) \delta_{\sigma_1(\mathbf{i})=\sigma_1(\mathbf{i}')} \delta_{\sigma_2(\mathbf{j})=\sigma_2(\mathbf{j}')}.$$

*Remark 2.5.* The large  $N$  expansion can actually be derived from the integration relation above, via iteration of a loop equation for unitary integration [CM17].

For further background on the unitary Weingarten function, we refer the reader to [CMN22, Col22, Kös21].

**2.4. Hoeffding's Inequality and the Berry-Esseen Bound.** For the convenience of the reader, we collect two inequalities from probability theory which will be used later in the proofs.

**Lemma 2.6** (Hoeffding's Inequality). Let  $(X_i)_{i \leq n}$ , be a collection of independent random variables. Assume that  $X_i \in [m_i, M_i]$  for each  $i \leq n$ . Then for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]) \geq t\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i)^2}\right).$$

For a proof, we refer the reader to [Ver18, Theorem 2.6]

**Lemma 2.7** (Berry-Esseen Theorem). Let  $(X_i)_{i \leq n}$  be a collection of centered independent random variables with  $\sigma_i^2 := \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] > 0$  and  $\rho_i := \mathbb{E}[X_i^3]$ . Moreover, take  $s_n^2 := \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$ ,  $r_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i$ . Letting  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ , and  $Y \sim N(0, s_n^2)$ , we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) - \mathbb{P}(Y \leq x)| \leq 6 \frac{r_n}{s_n^3}. \quad (2.2)$$

*Remark 2.8.* [Fel91] states the Berry-Esseen theorem as a comparison between the CDF of the unit variance r.v.  $X/s_n$  and a standard Gaussian, but this is of course equivalent to (2.2).

For a proof, we refer the reader to [Fel91, Ch. 16, Sec. 5, Thm 2].

### 3. UNITARY GROUP: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The reader is encouraged to briefly review Subsections 2.1 and 2.2, and Definition 2.1 before reading this section.

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we will need to introduce a Markovian way to sample paths uniformly from  $\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)$  and  $\bigcup_{\sigma \in S_\lambda} \text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)$ , a class of paths appearing in the path expansion formula for the Weingarten function (1.4). This is the content of Section 3.1.

**3.1. The Unitary Weingarten Process.** The following enumeration formula for  $|P(\sigma, |\sigma|)|$  will be crucial for us to define the Weingarten Process.

Before defining the Weingarten process, recall from subsection 2.1, for a partition  $\lambda \vdash n$ ,  $S_\lambda := \{\sigma \in S_n : \sigma \text{ has cycle structure } \lambda\}$ . If  $\sigma \in S_\lambda$ , we will denote  $\lambda := \text{shape}(\sigma)$ .

**Definition 3.1.** The unitary Weingarten process with initial data  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$  is a random process on  $P(\sigma, |\sigma|)$  defined by the following algorithm.

- (1) Let  $\sigma_0 = \sigma$ , and  $n_0 = n$ . Set  $k = 0$ .
- (2) If:  $\sigma_k$  does not fix  $n_k$ , move to the next step.  
Else if:  $n_k > 1$  and  $\sigma_k$  fixes  $n_k$ , set  $n_{k+1} = n_k - 1$ ,  $\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_k|_{[n_{k+1}]} \in S_{n_{k+1}}$ , and repeat this step with  $k$  now set to  $k + 1$ . Else if:  $n_k = 1$ , terminate the process.
- (3) Suppose the cycle in the disjoint cycle decomposition of  $\sigma_k$  containing  $n_k$  is  $(i_1 \dots i_\ell n_k)$ . With probability  $\frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(\ell-j)}{\text{Cat}(\ell)}$ , let  $\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_k(i_j n_k) \in S_{n_k}$ ,  $n_{k+1} = n_k$ , and now set  $k$  to  $k + 1$  and go back to step 2.

**Definition 3.2.** For a partition  $\lambda \vdash n$ , let  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$  be a process generating a random path of permutations  $(\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2n-\ell(\lambda)})$  as follows:

- (1) Take  $\sigma \sim \text{Uniform}(S_\lambda)$ .
- (2) Generate a random path  $(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2n-\ell(\lambda)}) \in P(\sigma, |\sigma|)$  according to  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$ .

Defining  $\lambda_i := \text{shape}(\sigma_i)$ , from  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ , we also obtain a random sequence of partitions,  $(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2n-\ell(\lambda)})$ .

$\text{WP}(\sigma)$  and  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$  come with the canonical filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \leq n+|\sigma|}$  where  $\mathcal{F}_k$  is the sigma algebra generated by  $\{\sigma_j\}_{j \leq k}$ . Moreover,  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$  has another natural filtration,  $(\Lambda_k)_{k \leq 2n-\ell(\lambda)}$ , where  $\Lambda_k$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \leq k}$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** For any permutation  $\sigma \in S_\lambda$ ,

$$\text{WP}(\sigma) \sim \text{Uniform}(P(\sigma, |\sigma|)),$$

and

$$\text{WP}(\lambda) \sim \text{Uniform}\left(\bigcup_{\pi \in S_\lambda} P(\pi, |\pi|)\right).$$

*Proof.* The proof is via induction on  $|\sigma|$ . The base case  $|\sigma| = 0$  is obvious.

For the inductive step, suppose first that  $\sigma$  does not fix  $n$ . Then let  $(i_1 \dots i_\ell n)$  be the cycle containing  $n$ , and the first step in  $P(\sigma, |\sigma|)$  must take  $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma(i_j n)$  for some  $i_j$ . Thus

$$P(\sigma, |\sigma|) \simeq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} P(\sigma(i_j n), |\sigma| - 1).$$

In other words, using the enumeration formula in Lemma 2.3, when sampling  $p \in P(\sigma, |\sigma|)$  uniformly, with probability

$$\frac{|P(\sigma(i_j n), |\sigma| - 1)|}{|P(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} = \frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(\ell-j)}{\text{Cat}(\ell)},$$

the first step of the path is  $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma(i_j n)$ , followed by a uniformly random path in  $P(\sigma(i_j n), |(i_j n)\sigma|)$ . But the Weingarten process obeys this recursion by construction.  $\square$

We also state the following lemma which obvious from the definitions of  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$  and  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$

**Lemma 3.4.** Both  $(\text{WP}(\sigma), (\mathcal{F}_k)_k)$ , and  $(\text{WP}(\lambda), (\mathcal{F}_k)_k)$  are homogeneous Markov processes. That is, for any  $\pi \in \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} S_n$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{k+1} = \pi | \mathcal{F}_k) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{k+1} = \pi | \sigma_k),$$

and for  $\pi_1, \pi_0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{k+1} = \pi_1 | \sigma_k = \pi_0) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma_1 = \pi_1 | \sigma_0 = \pi_0).$$

**Definition 3.5.** For the processes  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$  and  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ , we define the stopping time,  $\tau_m := \min\{k : n_k = n - m\}$ , that is  $\tau_m$  tracks when the Weingarten process has changed level in the Weingarten graph. We also let  $L_k$  denote the length of the longest cycle in  $\sigma$ .

We now state a slightly less obvious Markov property.

**Lemma 3.6.** The process  $(\text{WP}(\lambda), (\Lambda_k)_k)$  is a homogenous Markov process when restricted to the times  $(\tau_m)_{m \geq 0}$ . That is,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta | \Lambda_{\tau_m}) = \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta | \lambda_{\tau_m}),$$

and for  $\eta_1, \eta_0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta_1 | \lambda_{\tau_m} = \eta_0) = \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_1} = \eta_1 | \lambda_0 = \eta_0).$$

Additionally, for any  $\pi_0 \in S_{\eta_0}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta_1 | \sigma_{\tau_m} = \pi_0) = \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta_1 | \lambda_{\tau_m} = \eta_0). \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof.* First we claim on  $\Lambda_{\tau_m}$ . To prove the Markov property we first claim that conditioned on  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\tau_m}) = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\tau_m})$ , then  $\sigma_{\tau_m} \sim \text{Uniform}(S_{\eta_{\tau_m}})$ . To see this first observe that  $(\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{\tau_m})$  is invariant under conjugation by  $(i j)$  for  $i, j \leq n - m$ . Clearly  $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_0 = \pi_0) = \mathbb{P}((i j)\sigma_0(i j) = \pi_0)$  since cycle structure is invariant under conjugation. Moreover,  $\mathbb{P}(((i j)\sigma_0(i j), \dots, (i j)\sigma_{\tau_m}(i j)) = (\pi_0, \pi_1))$ , since for  $< n - m < n' \leq n$ ,

$$(i j)\sigma_k(i j) = \begin{cases} (i j)\sigma_k(k n')(i j) & \text{if } k \notin \{i, n - m\} \\ (i j)\sigma_k(j n')(i j) & \text{if } k = i \\ (i j)\sigma_k(i n')(i j) & \text{if } k = j \end{cases}$$

and thus there is a probability preserving map between the two paths. Now since every  $\pi \in S_{n-m}$  can be written as a product of such transpositions, we immediately have that  $(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{\tau_m})$  is invariant under conjugation by  $\pi$ . Therefore  $\sigma_{\tau_m} \sim \text{Uniform}(S_{\lambda_{\tau_m}})$ .

Finally, for any  $\pi, \tilde{\pi} \in S_{n-m-1}$ , we have from the Markov property for  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_{m+1}} = \pi | (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\tau_m}) = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\tau_m})) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}|} \sum_{\alpha \in S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_{m+1}} = \pi | \sigma_{\tau_m} = \alpha) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}|} \sum_{\alpha \in S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_{m+1}} = \tilde{\pi} \pi \tilde{\pi}^{-1} | \sigma_{\tau_m} = \tilde{\pi} \alpha \tilde{\pi}^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}|} \sum_{\alpha \in S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_{m+1}} = \tilde{\pi} \pi \tilde{\pi}^{-1} | \sigma_{\tau_m} = \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Averaging over  $\tilde{\pi} \in S_{\eta_{\tau_{m+1}}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_{m+1}} = \pi | (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\tau_m}) = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\tau_m})) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}|} \sum_{\alpha \in S_{\eta_{\tau_m}}} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta_{\tau_{m+1}} = \tilde{\pi} \pi \tilde{\pi}^{-1} | \sigma_{\tau_m} = \alpha) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta_{\tau_{m+1}} | \lambda_{\tau_m} = \eta_{\tau_m}) \end{aligned}$$

Now for the homogeneity property follows from the homogeneity for  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_{m+1}} = \eta_1 | \lambda_{\tau_m} = \eta_0) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_{\eta_0}|} \sum_{\pi_1 \in S_{\eta_1}, \pi_0 \in S_{\eta_0}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_{m+1}} = \pi_1 | \sigma_{\tau_m} = \pi_0) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_{\eta_0}|} \sum_{\pi_1 \in S_{\eta_1}, \pi_0 \in S_{\eta_0}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{\tau_1} = \pi_1 | \sigma_0 = \pi_0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\lambda_{\tau_1} = \eta_1 | \lambda_{\tau_0} = \eta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Over the course of proving the Markov property, we also proved (3.1).  $\square$

**3.2. Outline of the Proof of Theorem 1.1.** In order to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to prove that  $\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|+2g)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq (Cn^3)^g$  for some  $C > 0$ . Moreover, by a simple inductive argument we will only need to show  $\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|+2)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq Cn^3$  for some  $C > 0$ . To prove this, we observe that any path  $p \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)$  has exactly one “defect” solid edge  $\sigma_j \rightarrow \sigma_{j+1}$  where  $|\sigma_{j+1}| > |\sigma_j|$ . If we count all the paths in  $p \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)$  by counting all possible “partial paths” before the defect edge, and after the defect edge, we are led to the following bound,

$$\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq Cn \sum_{j=1}^{n+|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)}[L_j^{3/2}],$$

where  $\lambda$  is the cycle type of  $\sigma$ ,  $L_j$  denotes the length of the longest cycle of  $\sigma_j$ , the  $j$ th step of  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ . The proof of this formula and these reductions are the content of Subsection 3.3.

Next in Subsection 3.4, we bound  $\mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)}[L_j^{3/2}]$ . The first trivial observation is that  $\mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)}[L_j^{3/2}] \leq n^{3/2}$  which would lead to the bound  $\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|+2g)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq Cn^{7/2}$  obtained in [CM17]. To upgrade this bound from  $n^{7/2}$  to  $n^3$ , the key ingredient will be to show that after sufficiently many steps in the Weingarten process, the longest cycle will halve with very high probability, and thus  $\mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)}[L_j^{3/2}]$  will shrink by a constant factor. More precisely we will show that  $\mathbb{E}[L_{2^{(1+\epsilon)j/2}}^{3/2}] \leq 2^{1-3j/2}n^{3/2}$  by showing that for a permutation with largest cycle of size  $\approx n2^{-j}$ , the largest cycle will halve in size with very high probability after  $2^{(1+\epsilon)j/2}$  steps of the Weingarten process. There are two main steps to show this. First we show that with high probability a cycle of size  $\approx 2^{-j}n$  will contain the “pivotal element”  $n_r$  at some point after  $O(2^j)$  steps. The second harder step is to show that after a cycle of size  $2^{-j}n$  has contained the pivotal element  $O(2^{-j/2}n^{1/2})$  times, the cycle will half with high probability. The idea here is that every step after the pivotal element  $n_r$  contains the cycle of length  $2^{-j}n$ , it decrease in expected size by  $\approx \sqrt{2^{-j}n}$  in the following step, and  $\sqrt{2^{-j}n} \cdot 2^{-j/2}n^{1/2} = 2^{-j}n$ , the original scale of the cycle. The details of these arguments are carried out in Section 3.4.

**3.3. Estimating  $\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)$ .** Recall from [CM17], for a fixed path  $p \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, n + l)$  we can define  $j := j(p)$  such that the  $(j + 1)$ th solid arrow crossed in the path is the first transition  $\sigma_{j+n-r} \rightarrow \sigma_{j+n-r+1}$  such that  $|\sigma_{j+n-r}| + 1 = |\sigma_{j+n-r+1}|$ , and we define

$$\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, l) := \{p \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, l) : j(p) = j\}.$$

We clearly have

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma, l) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, l). \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, every path can be decomposed into the path up to this step, and the remaining part, i.e. for  $|\sigma| = k$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, l) = \bigcup_{r=2}^k \bigcup_{\rho \in S_r} \bigcup_{\rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho|+1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} \mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, \rho, \rho', l), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, \rho, \rho', l)$  denotes the set of paths  $\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, l)$ , where the first  $\sigma_{j+n-r} \rightarrow \sigma_{j+n-r+1}$  with  $|\sigma_{j+n-r}| + 1 = |\sigma_{j+n-r+1}|$  occurs at  $\sigma_{j+n-r} = \rho$  and  $\sigma_{j+n-r+1} = \rho'$ .

If we let  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)$  denotes the set of all “partial paths” from  $\sigma \rightarrow \rho$ , i.e. paths  $\sigma = \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{j+n-r} = \rho$  with no increasing norm steps. Then we have the factorization,

$$\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, \rho, \rho', 2g) \simeq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho) \times \mathbb{P}(\rho', |\rho'| + 2g - 2). \quad (3.4)$$

Next recall the following bound from [CM17],

**Lemma 3.7.** For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq k} \frac{\text{Cat}(n)}{\text{Cat}(l-1)\text{Cat}(k-l)} \leq 6k^{3/2}.$$

Finally we need one last definition before proving the main lemma of this section.



**Definition 3.8.** For a Weingarten process  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$  or  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ , we let  $L_j$  be the random variable taking as its value, the length of the longest cycle in the permutation  $\sigma_j$  (the  $j$ th permutation in the Weingarten process). In the case of  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$  ( $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ ), we set  $L_j = 0$  if  $j > n + |\sigma|$  (or  $j > n + |\lambda|$ )

Now we're ready to prove,

**Lemma 3.9.** For any  $\sigma \in S_\lambda$ ,

$$\frac{|\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)|}{|\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq Cn \sum_{j=0}^{n+|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)}[L_j^{3/2}]. \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* First using the path decomposition (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4) successively we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)| &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} |\text{P}_j(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)| \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\text{P}_j(\sigma, \rho, \rho' | \sigma| + 2)| \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\tilde{\text{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\text{P}(\rho', |\rho'|)|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let  $LC(\rho)$  denote the size of the longest cycle in a permutation  $\rho$ . Then plugging in the enumeration formula Lemma 2.3, together with the Catalan number quotient bound Lemma 3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\tilde{\text{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\text{P}(\rho, |\rho|)| \max_{\rho'' \rightarrow \rho} \frac{|\text{P}(\rho'', |\rho''|)|}{|\text{P}(\rho, |\rho|)|} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\tilde{\text{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\text{P}(\rho, |\rho|)| LC(\rho)^{3/2} \\ &\leq Cn \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\rho \in S_r} |\tilde{\text{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\text{P}(\rho, |\rho|)| LC(\rho)^{3/2} \end{aligned}$$

At this point we once again remark that for each  $j \in [n + |\sigma|]$ , there is a bijection  $\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|) \simeq \bigcup_{\rho \in \cup_{r \leq n} S_r} \text{P}_j(\sigma, \rho) \times \text{P}(\rho, |\rho|)$ , and thus we can express,

$$\begin{aligned} &Cn \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\rho \in S_r} |\tilde{\text{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\text{P}(\rho, |\rho|)| LC(\rho)^{3/2} \\ &= Cn |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{j=0}^{n+|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{Unif}(\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|))} [L_j^{3/2}] \\ &= Cn |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{j=0}^{n+|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\sigma)} [L_j^{3/2}], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality used Lemma 3.3.

Finally, from (3.1), we have  $Cn |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\sigma)} [L_j^{3/2}] = Cn |\text{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)} [L_j^{3/2}]$ .  $\square$

From now on, we assume all probabilities and expectations are taken with respect to  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$  unless explicitly stated otherwise.

So the remaining task is to bound  $\mathbb{E}[L_j^{3/2}]$ . The precise bound we will prove is the following.

**Lemma 3.10.** There exists a  $C > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[L_{Cj^3 2^{j/2} n^{1/2}}^{3/2}] \leq 2^{1-3j/2} n^{3/2}.$$

The proof of this bound will be deferred to Section 3.4.

In the remainder of the section we assume Lemma 3.10, and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Lemma 3.11.** There is a  $C > 0$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that,

$$\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq Cn^3,$$

for  $n \geq n_0$ .

*Proof.* Observe that  $\{L_j\}$  is always a decreasing sequence. So from Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} &\leq Cn \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\sigma)}[L_j^{3/2}] \\ &\leq Cn \left( cn^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[L_0] + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} cj^3 2^{j/2} n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[L_{cj^3 2^{j/2} n^{1/2}}^{3/2}] \right) \\ &\leq C_1 n^3 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} cj^3 2^{-j} n^3 \leq C_2 n^3. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 3.12.** There is a constant  $C > 0$  such that,

$$\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|} \leq (Cn^3)^g. \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof.* The case  $g = 0$  requires no proof, and the case  $g = 1$  is the statement of the previous lemma. The general case now follows by induction in a similar manner to the proof of Lemma 3.9:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} |\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^k \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} \sum_{\rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\mathbb{P}_j(\sigma, \rho, \rho' | \sigma| + 2g)| \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^k \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\mathbb{P}(\rho', |\rho'| + 2g - 2)| \\ &\leq (Cn^3)^{g-1} \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \sum_{r=2}^k \sum_{\rho \in S_r, \rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} \sum_{\rho' \in S_r, |\rho'| = |\rho| + 1, \rho \rightarrow \rho'} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\sigma, \rho)| |\mathbb{P}(\rho', |\rho'|)| \\ &\leq (Cn^3)^{g-1} |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2)| \\ &\leq (Cn^3)^g |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 1.1:*

Directly plugging in the bound (3.6) into the path expansion (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |N^{-n-|\sigma|} \text{Wg}_N^U(\sigma)| &\leq |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{g \geq 0} (Cn^3)^g N^{-2g} \\ &= \frac{|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|}{1 - Cn^3/N^2}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $Cn^3 < N^2$ . Now dividing both sides by  $|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)|$  and recalling that  $|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| = |\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|$ , we get the desired bound.

**3.4. Proof of  $\mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\sigma)}[L_j^{3/2}]$  Bound.** Recall from Definition 3.5, that  $\tau_m$  tracks the first time in  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ , when the permutation in the Weingarten process is an element of  $S_{n-m}$ . The following lemma tells us that with high probability, this occurs after a constant times  $m$  steps.

**Lemma 3.13.** For any  $\lambda$ , with respect to  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ .

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists m > \sqrt{n} \text{ such that } \tau_m > 9m) < 64e^{-\sqrt{n}/64}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $m$  and define the random variable

$$G_m = \min\{k : \sigma_{\tau_m+k} \text{ fixes } n-m\}.$$

Note that  $\tau_{m+1} - \tau_m = G_m + 1$ . Since  $\frac{\text{Cat}(k-1)\text{Cat}(0)}{\text{Cat}(k)} > \frac{1}{4}$ , we have,

$$\mathbb{P}(G_m = j + 1 | G_m > j, \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}) > 1/4. \quad (3.7)$$

Inductively applying the inequality above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(G_m = j | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}) &\leq (3/4)^{j-1} (1/4) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_m = j), \end{aligned}$$

For all  $j$  where  $\{X_m\}$  are i.i.d. with  $X_m \sim \text{Geom}(1/4)$ . So using the strong Markov property for  $\text{WP}(\sigma)$ , the relationship between sums of geometric and sums of Bernoulli random variables, and Hoeffding's inequality (Lemma 2.6), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau_m > 9m) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (G_m + 1) > 9m\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m G_m > 8m\right) \leq \sum_{s_1+\dots+s_m > 8m} \prod_{i=1}^m \|\mathbb{P}(G_i = s_i | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_i})\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{s_1+\dots+s_m > 8m} \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}(X_i = s_i) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m X_i > 8m\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Binom}(8m, 1/4) < m) \leq \exp(-m/64). \end{aligned}$$

Now applying a union bound as  $m$  ranges from  $\sqrt{n}$  to  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\exists m > \sqrt{n} \text{ such that } \tau_m > 8m) &\leq e^{-\sqrt{n}/64} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-k/64} \\ &= (1 - e^{-64})e^{-\sqrt{n}/64} \\ &\leq 64e^{-\sqrt{n}/64} \end{aligned}$$

□

During every solid edge step of the Weingarten process, a cycle is cut into two pieces. The next lemma will give us an understanding of the distribution of the lengths of the cut cycles, conditioned on the previous single cycle. Before stating the lemma, we need a definition.

**Definition 3.14.** For a Weingarten process,  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$ , let  $C_r$  denote the length of the cycle of  $\sigma_r$  containing the pivotal element  $n_r$ .

**Lemma 3.15.** With respect to any Weingarten process,  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$

$$\mathbb{P}(C_{\tau_m} - C_{\tau_{m+1}} = j | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}, C_{\tau_m} = k) = \frac{ek^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}j^{3/2}(k-j)^{3/2}} \left(1 + O(1/j + 1/(k-j))\right).$$

*Proof.* From Stirling's formula, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(C_{\tau_m} - C_{\tau_{m+1}} = j | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}, C_{\tau_m} = k) \\ &= \frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(k-j-1)}{\text{Cat}(k-1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{k!(k-1)!(2(j-1))!(2(k-j-1))!}{(2(k-1))!j!(j-1)!(k-j)!(k-j-1)!} \\
&\leq \frac{(k/e)^k \sqrt{2\pi k} ((k-1)/e)^{k-1} \sqrt{2\pi(k-1)} (2(j-1)/e)^{2(j-1)} \sqrt{4\pi(j-1)}}{(2(k-1)/e)^{2(k-1)} \sqrt{4\pi(k-1)} (j/e)^j \sqrt{2\pi j} ((j-1)/e)^{j-1} \sqrt{2\pi(j-1)}} \\
&\cdot \frac{(2(k-j-1)/e)^{2(k-j-1)} \sqrt{4\pi(k-j-1)}}{((k-j)/e)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi(k-j)} ((k-j-1)/e)^{k-j-1} \sqrt{2\pi(k-j-1)}} \left(1 + O(1/j + 1/(k-j))\right) \\
&= \frac{ek^{3/2}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}j^{3/2}(k-j)^{3/2}} \left(1 + O(1/j + 1/(k-j))\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

The next Lemma describes the distribution of sums of identical random variables distributed as in the cut cycle length distribution of the last lemma.

**Lemma 3.16.** Define  $Z_r := C_{r+1} \wedge (C_r - C_{r+1})$ . Then, fixing some  $j \geq 1$ ,  $4 \leq k \leq n$ . Letting  $\{\tilde{Z}_i\}_{i \leq jl}$  be independent with

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Z}_i = j) = \mathbb{P}(Z_1 = j | C_0 = k_i),$$

for some  $k_i \in (k/2, k]$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{jl} \tilde{Z}_i \leq lk^{1/2}\right) \leq (c_1 l^{-1/2} k^{1/4})^j$$

for some properly chosen constant  $c_1 > 0$ . In particular taking  $l > 16c_1^2 k^{1/2}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{jl} \tilde{Z}_i \leq c_1 l k^{1/2}) \leq 4^{-j}$

*Proof.* Throughout this proof, we will use the asymptotic notation  $y = \Theta(f(l, k))$  if there exist positive constants  $c_1, c_2$  independent of  $k$  and  $l$  such that  $c_1 f(l, k) \leq y \leq c_2 f(l, k)$ .

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_k &:= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(k-j-1)}{\text{Cat}(k-1)} \\
&\geq \frac{\text{Cat}(k-2)}{\text{Cat}(k-1)} \geq \frac{1}{4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_k &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{k^{3/2}}{j^{3/2}(k-j)^{3/2}} (1 + O(1/j + 1/(k-j))) \\
&\leq 2 \cdot 2^{3/2} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} j^{-3/2} = O(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 3.15, for any  $p > 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i^p] &= \mathbb{E}[Z_1^p | C_0 = k_i] = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_{k_i}} \sum_{j=1}^{k_i-1} j^p \wedge (k_i - j)^p \frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(k_i - j - 1)}{\text{Cat}(k_i - 1)} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_{k_i}} \sum_{j=1}^{k_i-1} j^p \wedge (k_i - j)^p \frac{k_i^{3/2}}{j^{3/2}(k_i - j)^{3/2}} (1 + O(1/j + 1/(k_i - j))) \\
&\leq 8 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} 2^{3/2} j^{p-3/2} \\
&\lesssim k_i^{p-1/2} \lesssim k^{p-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Through an identical argument  $Z_k \lesssim 1$ , and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i^p] &= \mathbb{E}[Z_1^p | C_0 = k_i] = \frac{1}{Z_{k_i}} \sum_{j=1}^{k_i-1} j^p \wedge (k_i - j)^p \frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(k_i - j - 1)}{\text{Cat}(k_i - 1)} \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{j=1}^{k_i-1} j^p \wedge (k_i - j)^p \frac{k_i^{3/2}}{j^{3/2}(k_i - j)^{3/2}} (1 + O(1/j + 1/(k_i - j))) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor - 1} j^{p-3/2} \gtrsim k^{p-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

In particular letting  $Z := \sum_{i=1}^l \tilde{Z}_i$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[Z_i] = \Theta(k^{1/2})$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i])^2] = \Theta(k^{3/2})$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i])^3] = \Theta(k^{5/2})$ , where the implied constants need not depend on  $i$ .

So by the Berry-Esseen bound (Lemma 2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(Z \leq c \sum_{j=1}^l k_j^{1/2}\right) \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{1}{\Theta(lk^{3/2})} \exp\left(\frac{-(y - \Theta(lk^{1/2}))^2}{\Theta(lk^{3/2})}\right) dy \\ &\quad + \Theta((lk^{3/2})^{-3/2}(lk^{5/2})) \\ &\lesssim \int_{-\infty}^{\Theta(-\sqrt{l}k^{-1/4})} e^{-x^2} dx + Cl^{-1/2}k^{1/4} \\ &\leq Cl^{-1/2}k^{1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim now follows for  $j = 1$ . The claim for  $j > 1$  follows from the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j^l} \tilde{Z}_i \leq c \sum_{j=1}^l k_j^{1/2}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j'=1}^j \left\{ \sum_{i=(j'-1)l+1}^{j'l} \tilde{Z}_i \leq c \sum_{j=1}^l k_j^{1/2} \right\}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(Z \leq c \sum_{j=1}^l k_j^{1/2}\right)^j = (c_1 l^{-1/2} k^{1/4})^j. \end{aligned}$$

□

The next lemma is the most technical of the section. Lemma 3.19 will tell us that after sufficiently many steps in the Weingarten process, the largest cycle will half in size with very high probability. Before stating the lemma, we need a few definitions.

**Definition 3.17.** Define the set  $A_{k,j}$  be the event that  $\sigma_k$  has a cycle of length in the interval  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$ . Similarly let  $I_{k,j}$  be the set of all  $i \in [n_k]$  which are part of a cycle in  $\sigma_k$  of length in  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$ .

**Definition 3.18.** At step  $k$  in the Weingarten process, if the pivotal element  $n_k$  is contained in cycle  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  of  $\sigma_k$ , we call  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  the pivotal cycle of  $\sigma_k$ .

For a particular cycle  $\mathfrak{c}_k$  of  $\sigma_k$  of length in  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$ , we can follow the cycle at every step of the Weingarten process. Either nothing happens to  $\mathfrak{c}_k$  and we set  $\mathfrak{c}_{k+1} = \mathfrak{c}_k$ , or it gets split into two cycles. If one of the cycles is still of length in the interval  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$ , we set this new cycle equal to  $\mathfrak{c}_{k+1}$ . Otherwise if neither piece is of length in the interval  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$ , we say the cycle has died and set  $\mathfrak{c}_{k'} = \emptyset$  for all  $k' > k$ .

**Lemma 3.19.** For some  $C > 0$  large enough, we have,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{k+Cj^{2j/2}n^{1/2},j} | A_{k,j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{k,j'}^c) < (3/4)^j$$

for any  $j < \log_2 n$ , and any  $k$  such that  $k + Cj2^{j/2} \leq n + |\sigma|$ .

*Proof.* Fix some  $k < n$ ,  $j < \log_2 n$ . Starting with a cycle  $\mathbf{c}_{\tau_k}$  of  $\sigma_{\tau_k}$  with length in the interval  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$  let  $\mathfrak{w}_l$  be the event that  $\mathbf{c}_l = \emptyset$ , and define the following stopping times recursively,

$$\eta_{i+1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{on the event } \mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i'=1}^i \eta_{i'}} \\ \min\{k' > 0 : \mathbf{p}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i'=1}^i \eta_{i'} + k'} = \mathbf{c}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i'=1}^i \eta_{i'} + k'}\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now note that,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_{\tau_k + k'} = \mathbf{c}_{\tau_k + k'} | \Lambda_{\tau_k + k'}) \geq 2^{-j}$  on the event  $\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + k'}^c$

Now by the strong Markov property of  $\text{WP}(\lambda)$  with respect to  $(\Lambda_k)$  at stopping times,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta_1 > m | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) &= \mathbb{P}(\cap_{m' \leq m} \mathbf{p}_{\tau_k + m'} \neq \mathbf{c}_{\tau_k + m'} | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ &\leq \prod_{m' \leq m} \sup_{\omega_{m'} \in \mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + m'}^c} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{p}_{\tau_k + m'} \neq \mathbf{c}_{\tau_k + m'} | \Lambda_{\tau_k + m'}) (\omega_{m'}) \\ &\leq (1 - 2^{-j})^m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus arguing in a similar manner using the strong Markov property,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_l > m | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(g_1 + \dots + g_l > m),$$

where  $\{g_i\}$  are i.i.d.  $g_i \sim \text{Geom}(2^{-j})$ .

So arguing as in the proof of Lemma 3.13, by Hoeffding's inequality Lemma 2.6,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_l > 2l2^j | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(g_1 + \dots + g_l > 2l2^j) \\ &\leq \exp(-2^j l). \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + 2^{j+1}l, j}^c | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + 2^{j+1}l, j}^c \cap \left\{\sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i \leq 2^{j+1}l\right\} | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c\right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_l > 2l2^j | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c\right) \\ &\exp(-2^j l) + \mathbb{P}\left(\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + 2^{j+1}l, j}^c \cap \left\{\sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i \leq 2^{j+1}l\right\} | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c\right). \end{aligned}$$

Next recall we defined the random variable  $Z_l = C_{l+1} \wedge (C_l - C_{l+1})$ , where  $C_l$  is the length of the pivotal cycle  $\mathbf{p}_l$ . Observe that the length of  $\mathbf{c}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i}$  minus the length of  $\mathbf{c}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i + 1}$  conditioned on  $\Lambda_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i}$  is distributed precisely according to  $Z_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i}$ . So once again by the Strong Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + 2^{j+1}l + 1, j}^c \cap \left\{\sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i \leq 2^{j+1}l\right\} | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i + 1, j}^c | A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ &\leq \prod_{l'=1}^l \sup_{\omega_{l'} \in \mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i}^c} \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i + 1}^c | \Lambda_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i}) (\omega_{l'}) \\ &\leq \prod_{l'=1}^l \sup_{\omega_{l'} \in \mathfrak{w}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i}^c} \mathbb{P}(C_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i} - Z_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i} > 2^{-j}n | \Lambda_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i}) (\omega_{l'}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \prod_{l'=1}^l \sup_{\omega_{l'} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i}^c} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{l'' \leq l'} Z_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l''} \eta_i} \leq 2^{-j} n \mid \Lambda_{\tau_k + \sum_{i \leq l'} \eta_i} \right)$$

$$\sup_{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_l \in (k/2, k]} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^l \tilde{Z}_i \leq 2^{-j} n \right).$$

where the  $\tilde{Z}_i$  are defined as in Lemma 3.16 with  $k = 2^{1-j}n$ . So taking  $l = C2^{-j/2}n^{1/2}$  for a sufficiently large constant  $C$ , we have  $lk^{1/2} \geq 2^{-j}n c_1 l^{-1/2} k^{1/4} < 1/4$  so applying Lemma 3.16,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \mathcal{Q}_{\tau_k + 2^{j+1}l, j}^c \cap \left\{ \sum_{i \leq l} \eta_i \leq 2^{j+1}l \right\} \mid A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c \right) \leq 1/4$$

Now replacing  $2^{j+1}l$  by  $j2^{j+1}l$  and applying Lemma 3.16 again we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_{\tau_k + j2^{j+1}l, j}^c \mid A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Q}_{\tau_k + Cj2^{j/2}n^{1/2}, j}^c \mid A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ &\leq e^{-n} + 4^{-j} \leq 3^{-j}. \end{aligned}$$

The next step is to realize that  $\sigma_{\tau_k}$  has at most  $2^j$  cycles of size in the interval  $(2^{-j}n, 2^{1-j}n]$ , so a simple union bound tells us that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_k + Cj2^{j/2}n^{1/2}, j} \mid A_{k, j}, \bigcap_{j' < j} A_{k, j'}^c) < (2/3)^j.$$

Finally, to get rid of the stopping times, applying Lemma 3.13, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_k + 9Cj2^{j/2}n^{1/2}, j} \mid A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcup_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ & \mathbb{P}(\tau_k + Cj2^{j/2}n^{1/2} - \tau_k > 9Cj2^{j/2}n^{1/2}) + \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_k + Cj2^{j/2}n^{1/2}, j} \mid A_{\tau_k, j}, \bigcup_{j' < j} A_{\tau_k, j'}^c) \\ & \leq (3/4)^j \end{aligned}$$

To match the statement of the lemma we can take  $k = 0$ , and then apply the Markov property.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.10.

*Proof of Lemma 3.10*

By Lemma 3.19, defining  $T_j$  inductively by  $T_j := \min\{t : A_{n^{1/2} \sum_{j' < j} Cj'2^{j'/2}T_{j'}, j}$  holds $\}$ , we have  $T_j$  are stochastically dominated by  $\tilde{T}_j \sim \text{Geom}(1/3)$  with the  $\tilde{T}_j$  being i.i.d. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\cup_{j' \leq j} A_{Cj'3^{2j'/2}n^{1/2}, j'}) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\sup_{j' \leq j} \tilde{T}_{j'} > 2j^2) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{T}_1 > 2j) \\ & \leq (2/3)^{2j} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[L_{Cj^3 2^{j/2}n^{1/2}}^{3/2}] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\cup_{j' \leq j} A_{Cj'3^{2j'/2}n^{1/2}, j'})n + 2^{-3j/2}n^{3/2} \\ & \leq 2^{1-3j/2}n^{3/2} \end{aligned}$$

#### 4. UNITARY GROUP: ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES

This section relies on definitions from subsections 2.2 and 2.3.

**4.1. Outline of the Proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.6.** The proof of Theorem 1.4 will be a combinatorial analysis of  $|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)|$  using elementary tools such as "stars and bars." The analysis starts by separating the solid edges of a path  $p \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)$  into "defect" and "non-defect" edges, where non-defect edges are the edges taking a step in the direction of the identity. The key insight is that once we select the ordering of the non-defect solid edges, the placement and choice of transpositions associated to the defect edges are severely restricted for permutations with  $|\sigma|$  small. The bound on the Weingarten function will follow from plugging into the path expansion formula.

The proof of Theorem 1.6 will use Theorem 1.4. The approach is based on the "loop equation" satisfied by the Weingarten function (equivalent to the  $U(N)$  lattice gauge theory master loop equation [AN23, CPS23, BCSK24]). This equation can be written in an operator theoretic way on a vector space with components indexed by permutations. Then with the correct norm on this vector space, we will obtain a "forcing" estimate similar to energy estimates coming from PDE theory (see [BCSK24] for a similar argument). Through this forcing estimate which uses the small permutation regime result, we will be able to prove Theorem 1.6.

## 4.2. Small Permutation Regime for Weingarten Function.

**Lemma 4.1.** For some constant  $C_{|\sigma|}$ ,

$$|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| \leq C_{|\sigma|} (\sqrt{48en})^{2g}$$

*Proof.* Fix any path  $p = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{n+2g}) \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)$ . We call a solid edge in the path *defective* if it takes  $\sigma_i \rightarrow \sigma_{i+1}$  with  $|\sigma_{i+1}| > |\sigma_i|$ . We can observe that  $p$  must have exactly  $g$  defective solid edges, and  $|\sigma| + g$  non-defective solid edges.

Any path  $p \in \mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)$  can then be constructed, by first abstractly, taking a sequence of  $n$  dashed edges,  $g$  defect solid edges, and  $g + |\sigma|$  non-defect solid edges some order, and assigning corresponding transpositions to each solid edge. To count the number of valid constructions as detailed above, start with a sequence of  $n$  dashed edges and then choose where in the sequence to insert the  $g$  defective solid edges, there are at most  $\binom{n+g}{g}$  choices for this placement. Next we need to choose the transposition assigned to each of these defective solid edges. Since we already chose the levels where these transpositions occur, there are at most  $n$  choices for each transposition, and therefore there are at most  $n^g$  choices for the  $g$  defective transpositions.

Now we still have to choose the placement of the non-defective solid edges. The key observation is that if  $g + |\sigma| < n/2$  with only  $g$  defect solid edges, there must be an  $n - 2g - 2|\sigma|$  element subset  $X$  of  $[n]$ , such that any permutation in  $p$  acts as the identity on  $X$ . Thus there are at most  $2g + 2|\sigma|$  levels where the non-defective solid edges can be placed, and all together these levels have at most  $g$  solid edges occurring in  $p$  at these levels. Thus, there are at most  $\binom{2g+2|\sigma|+g+(g+|\sigma|)}{g+|\sigma|}$  choices for the placement of the non-defective solid edges. Finally as all the permutations in the path act as the identity on  $X$ , there are at most  $(2g + 2|\sigma|)^g$  choices for the transpositions assigned to the non-defective solid edges. Putting it all together, if  $g + |\sigma| < n/2$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| &\leq \binom{n+g}{g} n^g \binom{4g+3|\sigma|}{g+|\sigma|} (2g+2|\sigma|)^{g+|\sigma|} \\ &\leq \frac{(3/2)^g n^g}{g!} n^g 2^{4g+3|\sigma|} 2^{g+|\sigma|} (g+|\sigma|)^{g+|\sigma|} \\ &\leq 48^g 2^{4|\sigma|} \frac{g^g}{g!} g^{|\sigma|} (1+|\sigma|/g)^{g+|\sigma|} n^{2g} \\ &\leq 48^g 2^{4|\sigma|} g^{|\sigma|} e^{g+|\sigma|} e^{|\sigma|+|\sigma|^2/g} n^{2g} \\ &\leq e^{|\sigma|^2} (16eg)^{|\sigma|} (\sqrt{48en})^{2g}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the binomial theorem to bound  $\binom{4g+3|\sigma|}{g+|\sigma|} \leq 2^{4g}$ , the Stirling bound  $g^g \leq e^g g!$ , and the bound  $1+x \leq e^x$ .

On the other hand, if  $g + |\sigma| \geq n/2$ , then there are still at most  $\binom{4g+3|\sigma|}{g+|\sigma|}$  choices for the placement of the non-defective solid edges, but the number of choices for the transpositions they are assigned can be



bounded by  $n^g(2g + 2|\sigma|)^{|\sigma|}$  instead, so we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| &\leq \binom{n+g}{g} n^g \binom{4g+3|\sigma|}{g+|\sigma|} n^g (2g + 2|\sigma|)^{|\sigma|} \\ &\leq 2^{3g/2} n^g 2^{4g+3|\sigma|} n^g (2g)^{|\sigma|} \left(1 + \frac{|\sigma|}{g}\right)^{|\sigma|} \\ &\leq 2^{11g/2} (16g)^{|\sigma|} e^{|\sigma|^2} n^{2g}. \end{aligned}$$

for  $g + |\sigma| \geq n/2$ . Finally  $g^{|\sigma|} \leq (|\sigma|)! e^g$  so  $|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|) \leq (|\sigma|)! 16^{|\sigma|} e^{|\sigma|^2} (2^{11/2} e)^g n^{2g}$  for  $g + |\sigma| \geq n/2$ . Combining the two regimes we get the desired bound.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.4* Applying the previous lemma, for  $N > \sqrt{48en}$

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\text{Wg}}_N(\sigma) - \text{Moeb}(\sigma)| &= \sum_{g \geq 1} |\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma| + 2g)| N^{-2g} \\ &\leq C_{|\sigma|} \sum_{g \geq 1} (\sqrt{48en}/N)^{2g} \\ &= \frac{C_{|\sigma|} (48en^2/n^2)}{1 - 48en^2/N^2} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{C}_{|\sigma|} n^2}{N^2 - 48en^2}. \end{aligned}$$

**4.3. Energy estimate for the Loop Equation.** For this section let  $\mathcal{W}_n$  denote the unitary Weingarten graph up to level  $n$  so that  $\mathcal{W}_n$  has vertex set  $\bigsqcup_{0 \leq k \leq n} S_k$ . Next let  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{W}_n}$  denote the  $1 + \sum_{k=1}^n k!$  dimensional vector space with the elements of  $\mathcal{W}_n$  as basis vectors. We can reformulate the orthogonality recursion for Weingarten functions derived in [CM17] as the following fixed point problem in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{W}_n}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** Suppose  $N \geq n$ . Then the vector  $w := (\text{Wg}_N(\sigma))_{\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_n}$  solves the fixed point problem,

$$w = Tw,$$

where  $T : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{W}_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{W}_n}$  is the linear operator given by  $(Tx)_\emptyset = x_\emptyset$ , and,

$$(Tx)_\sigma = N^{-1} x_{\sigma^\downarrow} \delta_{\sigma(k), k} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_{(i k)\sigma},$$

for each  $\sigma \in S_k \subset \mathcal{W}_n$  ( $k \neq 0$ ), where  $\sigma^\downarrow$  is  $\sigma$  restricted to a permutation in  $S_{k-1}$ .

Our goal will be to use the fixed point formulation above, to get quantitative bounds on  $w$ . To perform our analysis, we will need to first reformulate our fixed point problem in the space of conjugacy classes of permutations.

Recalling that the Weingarten function is a class function, we can reformulate our fixed point problem on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{P}_n}$  where  $\mathfrak{P}_n$  is the set of partitions  $\lambda \vdash r$  for  $r \leq n$ . We will sometimes abuse notation by referring to the component  $x_\lambda$  of a vector  $(x_\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{P}_n}$  by  $x_\sigma$  for some  $\sigma$  in the conjugacy class  $S_\lambda$ . Lastly for any conjugacy class of  $S_r$ ,  $S_\lambda$ , we will associate a special unique permutation  $\sigma_\lambda \in S_\lambda$  such that  $r$  is in the largest cycle of  $\sigma_\lambda$ .

**Lemma 4.3** (Reformulated Fixed point problem). Suppose  $N \geq n$ . Then the vector  $w := (\text{Wg}_N(\lambda))_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{P}_n}$  solves the fixed point problem,

$$w = \tilde{T}w,$$

where  $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{P}_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{P}_n}$  is the operator given by  $(\tilde{T}x)_\emptyset = x_\emptyset$ , and,

$$(\tilde{T}x)_\lambda = N^{-1} \text{Wg}_N(\text{id}_{r-1}) \delta_{\sigma_\lambda, \text{id}_r} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_{(i k)\sigma_\lambda},$$

for each  $\sigma \in S_k \subset \mathcal{W}_n$  ( $k \neq 0$ ), where  $\sigma^\downarrow$  is  $\sigma$  restricted to a permutation in  $S_{k-1}$ .

We now define a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{P}_n}$ .

**Definition 4.4.** For  $x = (x_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{P}_n}$ , let

$$\|x\|_\gamma := |x_\emptyset| + \sup_{r \in [n]} \sup_{\lambda \vdash r} N^{r+|\lambda|} \gamma^{|\lambda|} |\text{Moeb}(\sigma_\lambda)|^{-1} |x_\lambda|.$$

With this setup in place, we now prove the key estimate of the section.

**Lemma 4.5.** For  $n < cN$  for  $c$  sufficiently small, there exists a constant  $C = C(c) > 0$  ( $c$  independent of  $x, n, N$ ), such that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{P}_n}$ , we have the bound

$$\|Tx\|_\gamma \leq \left( \gamma + \frac{12n^{5/2}}{N^2} \right) \|x\|_\gamma + 1 + C \frac{n^2}{N^2},$$

for  $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$

*Proof.* Recall for each  $\lambda \neq \emptyset$ ,

$$(Tx)_\lambda := N^{-1} \text{Wg}_N(\text{id}_{r-1}) \delta_{\sigma_\lambda, \text{id}_r} - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} x_{(i r) \sigma_\lambda},$$

and as a result,

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{r+|\sigma|} \gamma^{|\sigma|} |\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|^{-1} |(Tx)_\sigma| \\ & \leq N^{r-1+|\sigma|} \gamma^{|\sigma|} |\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|^{-1} |\text{Wg}_N(\text{id}_{r-1})| \delta_{\sigma_\lambda, \text{id}_r} + N^{r-1+|\sigma|} \gamma^{|\sigma|} |\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} x_{(i r) \sigma_\lambda} \\ & \leq a_1 + a_2 + a_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &:= N^{r-1} |\text{Wg}_N(\text{id}_{r-1})|, \\ a_2 &:= \gamma \sum_{i \sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} N^{r+(i r) \sigma_\lambda} \gamma^{|(i r) \sigma_\lambda|} |\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|^{-1} |x_{(i r) \sigma_\lambda}|, \\ a_3 &:= N^{-2} \gamma^{-1} \sum_{i \not\sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} N^{r+(i r) \sigma_\lambda} \gamma^{|(i r) \sigma_\lambda|} |\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|^{-1} |x_{(i r) \sigma_\lambda}|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $i \sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r$  means that  $i$  and  $r$  belong to the same cycle in  $\sigma_\lambda$ . Now observe that for a sufficiently large  $C > 0$ ,

$$a_1 = N^{r-1} |\text{Wg}_N(\text{id}_{r-1})| \leq 1 + \frac{Cn^2}{N^2}$$

as long as  $n < cN$  for  $c$  sufficiently small, as a direct consequence of Theorem 1.4.

Next, for  $a_2$  we use the Catalan recursion as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 &= \gamma \sum_{i \sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} N^{r+(i r) \sigma_\lambda} \gamma^{|(i r) \sigma_\lambda|} |\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|^{-1} |x_{(i r) \sigma_\lambda}| \\ &\leq \gamma \sum_{i \sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} \|x\|_\gamma \\ &= \gamma \|x\|_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to bound  $a_3$ , we use the Catalan number quotient bound, Lemma 3.7,

$$\begin{aligned} a_3 &= N^{-2} \gamma^{-1} \sum_{i \not\sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} N^{r+(i r) \sigma_\lambda} \gamma^{|(i r) \sigma_\lambda|} |\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|^{-1} |x_{(i r) \sigma_\lambda}| \\ &\leq N^{-2} \gamma^{-1} \sum_{i \not\sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} \|x\|_\gamma \\ &\leq n N^{-2} \gamma^{-1} \sup_{i \not\sim_{\sigma_\lambda} r} \frac{|\text{Moeb}((i r) \sigma)|}{|\text{Moeb}(\sigma)|} \|x\|_\gamma \\ &\leq 6n^{5/2} N^{-2} \gamma^{-1} \|x\|_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Combining all the bounds obtained so far,

$$\|Tx\|_\gamma \leq \left( \gamma + \frac{6\gamma^{-1}n^{5/2}}{N^2} \right) \|x\|_\gamma + 1 + C \frac{n^2}{N^2},$$

and now restricting to  $\gamma \in [1/2, 1)$ , we obtain the desired bound.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of the section.

**Theorem 4.6.** *For sufficiently large constants,  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ , there exists a sufficiently small constant  $c > 0$  ( $c, C_1, C_2$  independent of  $n, N$ ), such that for any  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,*

$$\frac{\overline{\text{Wg}}_N(\sigma)}{\text{Moeb}(\sigma)} \leq C_1 |\sigma| \exp \left( C_2 |\sigma| \frac{n^{5/2}}{N^2} \right),$$

for  $n^{5/4} \leq c_1 N$ .

*Proof.* Directly applying Lemma 4.5 to the fixed point  $x = w$ , with  $n \leq cN$  and  $\gamma \in (1/2, 1)$ , we see that,

$$\|w\|_\gamma \leq \left( \gamma + \frac{12n^{5/2}}{N^2} \right) \|w\|_\gamma + 1 + \frac{Cn^2}{N^2},$$

so after setting  $\gamma = 1 - \frac{12n^{5/2}}{N^2} - |\sigma|^{-1}$  and rearranging,

$$\|w\|_{1 - \frac{12n^{5/2}}{N^2} - |\sigma|^{-1}} \leq |\sigma| \left( 1 + \frac{Cn^2}{N^2} \right).$$

Plugging in the definition of  $\|w\|_{1 - \frac{12n^{5/2}}{N^2} - |\sigma|^{-1}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N^{n+|\sigma|} \overline{\text{Wg}}_N(\sigma)}{\text{Moeb}(\sigma)} &\leq \left( 1 - \frac{12n^{5/2}}{N^2} - |\sigma|^{-1} \right)^{-|\sigma|} |\sigma| \left( 1 + \frac{Cn^2}{N^2} \right) \\ &\leq C_1 |\sigma| \exp \left( C |\sigma| \frac{n^{5/2}}{N^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$ . where the last line results from the elementary inequalities,  $1 + x \leq e^x$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $(1 - x)^{-1} \leq e^{2x}$ , for  $x \in (0, 1/2)$ .  $\square$

Theorem 1.6 now follows as a direct corollary.

## 5. ORTHOGONAL GROUPS: PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

For  $G \in \{O(N), \text{SP}(N)\}$ , the function  $\text{Wg}_N^G(\pi)$  takes in pairings  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  as inputs. The main result of this section is Theorem 1.3 which we restate here:

For  $G \in \{O(N), \text{SP}(N)\}$ , there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that,

$$\frac{N^{-n-|\pi|} |\text{Wg}_N^G(\pi)|}{\text{Moeb}(\pi)} \leq \frac{1}{(1 - Cn^{3/2}/N)^2}.$$

For any  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  and  $Cn^3 < N^2$ .

The definitions of  $|\pi|$  and  $\text{Moeb}(\pi)$  will be given in the next subsection.

*Remark 5.1.* We will restrict the remainder of this section to the Orthogonal group case as its known that  $\text{Wg}_N^{\text{SP}}(\pi) = \pm \text{Wg}_{2N}^O(\pi)$ .

### 5.1. Parings and the Weingarten Graph.

**Definition 5.2.** For a pairing  $\pi = \{(k_1, k_2), \dots, (k_{2n-1}, k_{2n})\} \in \mathcal{P}_2([2n])$ , and a permutation  $\sigma \in S_{2n}$ , we define the operation,

$$\sigma.\pi := \{(\sigma(k_1), \sigma(k_2)), \dots, (\sigma(k_{2n-1}), \sigma(k_{2n}))\}$$




FIGURE 2. The figure above displays the orthogonal Weingarten graph  $\mathcal{W}^O$  restricted to layers 0 through 2,  $\bigsqcup_{n=0}^2 \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ .

We can define the orthogonal Weingarten graph  $\mathcal{W}^O$  to be the directed graph with vertex set  $V = \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ . Moreover if  $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  and  $\pi_2 = (i \ 2n-1) \cdot \pi_1$  for some  $i < 2n-1$ , then there is a solid arrow  $\pi_1 \rightarrow \pi_2$ . And if  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  contains the pair  $\{2n-1 \ 2n\}$ , then there is a dashed arrow going from  $\pi$  to  $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n-2)$  which is  $\pi$  with the pair  $\{2n-1 \ 2n\}$  removed. See Figure 2 for an image of the orthogonal Weingarten graph

As in the unitary case, for  $\pi \in \mathcal{W}^O$  we can define the collection of paths  $P(\pi, l)$  in  $\mathcal{W}^O$  going from  $\pi \rightarrow \emptyset$  using exactly  $l$  solid edges.

We will use the following path expansion proved in [CM17] as the definition of  $\text{Wg}_N^O(\pi)$  for  $n < N$ ,

**Lemma 5.3.** For  $n \leq 2N$  and all  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ ,

$$(-1)^{|\pi|} N^{n+|\pi|} \text{Wg}_N^O(\pi) = \sum_{g \geq 0} |P(\pi, |\pi| + g)| (-N)^g.$$

Moreover the series is absolutely convergent.

*Remark 5.4.* The absolute convergence of the series in (5.3) is not mentioned in [CM17], however this can be proven via the trivial bound  $|P(\pi, |\pi| + g)| \leq (2n)^{n+|\pi|+g}$  since there are at most  $2n$  options for every edge traversed in a path  $p \in P(\pi, |\pi| + g)$ .

To each pairing  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2([2n])$  we can assign a partition as follows.

**Definition 5.5.** The partition  $\lambda \vdash n$  associated to a pairing  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2([2n])$  called the *coset type* of  $\pi$  can be constructed as follows:

- (1) Consider a graph with  $2n$  vertices labeled 1 through  $2n$ .
- (2) For each  $i \in [n]$ , connect vertex  $2i-1$  to  $2i$  with an edge.
- (3) For each pair  $\{k_1, k_2\} \in \pi$ , connect vertex  $k_1$  to  $k_2$ .
- (4) The connected components of this graph clearly have even number of vertices. If the connected components of the graph constructed have sizes  $2\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq 2\lambda_l$ . Then  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l) \vdash n$  is the corresponding partition.

We can interpret the partition defined above diagrammatically as follows. Consider an undirected (multi)graph with vertex set  $[2n]$ . For each  $i \in [n]$ , connect  $2i-1$  to  $2i$  with a blue edge. For each




FIGURE 3. Take  $n = 8$ , and consider  $\pi = (12)(37)(46)(58)$ , and  $\tau = (47)$  so that  $\tau.\pi = (12)(34)(67)(58)$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$  is depicted on the left with a Young diagram of the coset type of  $\pi$  below. Similarly,  $\mathcal{G}_{\tau.\pi}$  is depicted on the right with the Young Diagram of the coset type of  $\tau.\pi$  below.

$j \in [2n]$ , connect  $j$  and  $\pi(j)$  with a red edge. The connected components of the resulting graph  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$  correspond to the coset type of  $\pi$ . In particular the sizes of the connected components in  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$  divided by 2, is precisely the coset type partition of  $\pi$ . See examples in Figure 3.

For a pairing  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ , we can define the norm  $|\pi| := n - \ell(\lambda)$  where  $\lambda$  is the partition corresponding to  $\pi$  and  $\ell(\lambda)$  denotes the number of parts in  $\lambda$ .

Letting  $\epsilon := (12)(34) \cdots (2n-1)2n$ , and interpreting a pairing  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  as a permutation sending each  $i$  to its pair, then the coset type of  $\pi$  precisely corresponds to the cycle type of  $\pi\epsilon$ . As a consequence we have

**Lemma 5.6.** For any  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  and  $\tau = (i2n-1)$  for some  $i < 2n-1$ , then,

$$\ell(\tau.\pi) - \ell(\pi) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}.$$

Moreover suppose the connected component of  $2i-1$  in  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$  has size  $2m$ . Then there are exactly  $m-1$  choices for  $\tau$  such that the coset type of  $\tau.\pi$  is the same as  $\pi$ . And for each  $i \in [m-1]$ , there is exactly one choice for  $\tau$  such that the operation  $\pi \rightarrow \tau.\pi$  splits the connected component containing  $2n-1$  into a component of size  $2i$  containing  $2n-1$  and a disjoint component of size  $2m-2i$ .

*Proof.* The connected components of  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$  are just cycles with edges alternating between red and blue color. Let's enumerate the vertices in the cycle containing  $2n-1$ , by walking around the cycle starting at  $2n-1$ , and going in the red edge direction to obtain  $(2n-1, i_1, \dots, i_{2m-2}, i_{2m-1})$  with  $i_{2m-1} = 2n$ .

Case 1: Suppose  $\tau = (i2n-1)$  where  $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{2m-2}\}$ . Then we enumerate the vertices in the cycle containing  $i$  in the same way starting at  $i$  and walking in the red edge direction, we obtain a sequence  $(i, j_1, \dots, j_{m'})$ . Then the operation  $\pi \rightarrow \tau.\pi$  will merge the two cycles  $(2n-1, i_1, \dots, i_{2m-2}, i_{2m-1})$  and  $(i, j_1, \dots, j_{m'})$  to form the cycle  $(2n-1, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{m'}, i, i_{2m-1}, i_{2m-2}, \dots, i_1)$ . All other cycles will be left untouched. Thus  $\ell(\tau.\pi) = \ell(\pi) - 1$ .

Case 2: Suppose  $\tau = (i_1 2n-1)$ . Then  $\tau.\pi = \pi$ .

Case 3: Suppose  $\tau = (i_{2k+1} 2n-1)$  for  $k \in [m-2]$ . Then the cycle  $(2n-1, i_1, \dots, i_{2m-2}, i_{2m-1})$ , gets transformed into  $(2n-1, i_{2k}, i_{2k-1}, \dots, i_1, i_{2k+1}, i_{2k+2}, \dots, i_{2m-1})$  by the operation  $\pi \rightarrow \tau.\pi$ , and so  $\ell(\tau.\pi) = \ell(\pi)$ , and  $\tau.\pi$  and  $\pi$  have the same coset type.

Case 4: Suppose  $\tau = (i_{2k} 2n-1)$  for  $k \in [m-1]$ . Then the cycle  $(2n-1, i_1, \dots, i_{2m-2}, i_{2m-1})$ , gets split into the two cycles  $(2n-1, i_{2k+1}, i_{2k+2}, \dots, i_{2m-1})$  and  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2k})$  by the operation  $\pi \rightarrow \tau.\pi$ , and so  $\ell(\tau.\pi) = \ell(\pi) - 1$ , and the size of the connected component containing  $2n-1$  will now have size  $m-2k$ .  $\square$

As a consequence of the last lemma  $P(\pi, l) = \emptyset$  for  $l < |\pi|$ . Moreover, using the previous lemma and the Catalan number recursion, we obtain the enumeration formula.

**Lemma 5.7.** For any pairing  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  with cycle type  $\lambda$ ,

$$|P(\pi, |\pi|)| = |\text{Moeb}(\lambda)|.$$

For convenience we will now reformulate the path expansion Lemma 5.3.

**Definition 5.8.** First for a path  $(\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{n+l}) \in P(\pi, n+l)$ , we will call a solid edge step  $\pi_i \rightarrow \pi_{i+1}$  a *minor defect* (*major defect*) if  $|\pi_{i+1}| = |\pi_i|$  (if  $|\pi_{i+1}| = |\pi_i| + 1$ ). Define  $P(\pi, g_1, g_2)$  as the paths in  $P(\pi, |\pi| + g_1 + 2g_2)$  with exactly  $g_1$  minor defects and  $g_2$  major defects.

We now state a corollary of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.6,

**Corollary 5.9.** For  $n \leq 2N$  and any pairing  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ ,

$$(-1)^{|\pi|} N^{n+|\pi|} \text{Wg}_N^O(\pi) = \sum_{g_1, g_2 \geq 0} |P(\pi, g_1, g_2)| (-N)^{g_1 + 2g_2}.$$

**5.2. The Orthogonal Weingarten Process.** We are now in a position to define the orthogonal Weingarten process.

**Definition 5.10.** For a partition  $\mu \vdash n$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mu)$  be the set of pairings  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$  with coset type  $\mu$ .

**Definition 5.11.** The orthogonal Weingarten process with initial data  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ ,  $\text{WP}(\pi)$  generates a random path  $P(\pi, |\pi|)$  with the following algorithm.

- (1) Let  $\pi_0 = \pi$ , and  $n_0 = n$ . Set  $k = 0$
- (2) If:  $\pi_k$  does not contain the pair  $(2n_k - 1, 2n_k)$ , move to the next step. Else if:  $n_k > 1$  and  $\pi_k$  contains the pair  $(2n_k - 1, 2n_k)$ , set  $n_{k+1} = n_k - 1$ , and set  $\pi_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n_{k+1})$  to be the pairing  $\pi$  with  $(2n_k - 1, 2n_k)$  removed. Next repeat this step with  $k$  now set to  $k + 1$ . Else if:  $n_k = 1$ , terminate the process.
- (3) Suppose the cycle in  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$  containing  $2n - 1$ , is enumerated by a walk starting at  $2n - 1$ , followed by going in the red edge direction as  $(2n - 1, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2m-1})$ . For each  $j \in [m - 1]$ , with probability  $\frac{\text{Cat}(j-1)\text{Cat}(l-j)}{\text{Cat}(l)}$ , let  $\pi_{k+1} = (i_{2j} 2n - 1)$ , set  $n_{k+1} = n_k$ , and now set  $k$  to  $k + 1$ . Now go back to step 2.

**Definition 5.12.** For a partition  $\mu \vdash n$ , let  $\text{WP}(\mu)$  be a process generating a random path of pairings  $(\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{2n-\ell(\mu)})$  as follows:

- (1) Take  $\pi \sim \text{Uniform}(\mathcal{P}_2(\mu))$ .
- (2) Generate a random path  $(\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{2n-\ell(\mu)})$  sampled according to  $\text{WP}(\mu)$ .

Defining  $\mu_i := \text{shape}(\pi_i)$ , from  $\text{WP}(\mu)$ , we also obtain a random sequence of partitions,  $(\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{2n-\ell(\lambda)})$ .

$\text{WP}(\pi)$  and  $\text{WP}(\mu)$  come with the canonical filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \leq n+|\pi|}$  where  $\mathcal{F}_k$  is the sigma algebra generated by  $\{\pi_j\}_{j \leq k}$ . Moreover,  $\text{WP}(\mu)$  has another natural filtration,  $(\Sigma_k)_{k \leq 2n-\ell(\lambda)}$ , where  $\Sigma_k$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{\mu_j\}_{j \leq k}$ .

**Lemma 5.13.** For any permutation  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ ,

$$\text{WP}(\pi) \sim \text{Uniform}(P(\pi, |\pi|)),$$

and for any  $\mu \vdash n$ ,

$$\text{WP}(\mu) \sim \text{Uniform}\left(\bigcup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mu)} P(\pi, |\pi|)\right).$$

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by induction on  $|\pi|$  as in the case of Lemma 3.3. The base case is trivial

For the inductive step, suppose first that  $\pi$  does not contain the pair  $(2n - 1, 2n)$ . Then let  $(2n - 1, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2m-1})$  be the cycle containing  $2n - 1$  in  $\mathcal{G}_\pi$ . Then by Lemma 5.6 the first step in  $P(\pi, l + 1, 0)$  must take  $\pi \rightarrow (i_k 2n - 1).\pi$  for some  $k$ . Thus

$$P(\pi, l + 1, 0) \simeq \bigcup_{k=1}^{m-1} P((i_{2k} 2n - 1).\pi, l + 1, 0).$$

Moreover, using the enumeration formula in Lemma 5.7, sampling  $p \in P(\pi, |\pi|)$  uniformly, with probability

$$\frac{|P((i_{2k} 2n - 1).\pi, l + 1, 0)|}{|P(\pi, l + 1, 0)|} = \frac{\text{Cat}(k - 1)\text{Cat}(l - k)}{\text{Cat}(l)}$$

the first step of the path is  $\pi \rightarrow (i_{2k} 2n - 1).\pi$ , followed by a uniformly random path in  $P((i_{2k} 2n - 1).\pi, |\pi| - 1)$ . But the Weingarten process obeys this recursion by construction.  $\square$

At this point we remark that the partition  $\mu_j$  at the  $j$ th step of  $\text{WP}^O(\mu)$  has exactly the same law as  $\text{WP}^U(\mu)$  since the transition probabilities defining the processes are exactly the same!

As in Subsection 3.3, we will use  $L_j$  to denote the length of the longest part of  $\mu_j$ , the partition at the  $j$ th step in Weingarten process  $\text{WP}^O(\mu)$  at the. We once again remark that this  $L_j$  has the same distributions as in the unitary case.

**5.3. Proof of Theorem 1.3.** For a path  $p \in P(\pi, g_1, g_2)$  we can define  $j := j(p)$  such that the  $(j + 1)$ th solid arrow crossed in the path is the first transition  $\pi_{j+n-r} \rightarrow \pi_{j+n-r+1}$  such that  $|\pi_{j+n-r}| \leq |\pi_{j+n-r+1}|$ , and we define

$$P_j(\pi, g_1, g_2) := \{p \in P(\pi, g_1, g_2) : j(p) = j\}.$$

We clearly have

$$P(\pi, g_1, g_2) = \bigcup_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} (P_j(\pi, g_1 - 1, g_2) \cup P_j(\pi, g_1, g_2 - 1)). \quad (5.1)$$

Moreover, every path can be decomposed into the path up to this step, and the remaining part: i.e. for  $|\pi| = k$ ,

$$P_j(\pi, g_1, g_2) = \bigcup_{r=2}^k \bigcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \bigcup_{\substack{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r), |\eta'| = |\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta' \\ \eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r), |\eta'| = |\eta| + 1, \eta \rightarrow \eta'}} P_j(\pi, \eta, \eta', g_1, g_2), \quad (5.2)$$

where  $P_j(\pi, \eta, \eta', g_1, g_2)$  denotes the set of paths  $P_j(\pi, g_1, g_2)$ , where the first step  $\pi_{j+n-r} \rightarrow \pi_{j+n-r+1}$  with  $|\pi_{j+n-r}| \leq |\pi_{j+n-r+1}|$  occurs at  $\pi_{j+n-r} = \eta$  and  $\pi_{j+k-r+1} = \eta'$ .  
If we let

$$\tilde{P}_j(\pi, \eta),$$

denotes the set of all "partial paths" from  $\pi \rightarrow \eta$ , i.e. paths  $\pi = \pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{j+n-r} = \eta$  with no increasing norm steps. Then for  $|\eta| = |\eta'|$  we have the factorization,

$$P_j(\pi, \eta, \eta', g_1, g_2) \simeq \tilde{P}_j(\pi, \eta) \times P(\eta', g_1 - 1, g_2). \quad (5.3)$$

And for  $|\eta| = |\eta'|$ ,

$$P_j(\pi, \eta, \eta', g_1, g_2) \simeq \tilde{P}_j(\pi, \eta) \times P(\eta', g_1, g_2 - 1). \quad (5.4)$$

The next lemma is a corollary of this path decomposition.

**Lemma 5.14.** Suppose  $\pi$  has coset type  $\mu$ , then we have,

$$\frac{|P(\pi, 1, 0)|}{|P(\pi, 0, 0)|} \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{n+|\pi|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\mu)}[L_j], \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$\frac{|P(\pi, 0, 1)|}{|P(\pi, 0, 0)|} \leq Cn \sum_{j=1}^{n+|\pi|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\mu)}[L_j^{3/2}]. \quad (5.6)$$

*Proof.* We only prove (5.5), as (5.6) is proven identically to Lemma 3.9. Combining (5.2) and (5.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 1, 0)| &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} |\mathbb{P}_j(\pi, 1, 0)| \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} |\mathbb{P}_j(\pi, \eta, \eta', 1, 0)| \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta', 0, 0)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that if  $\eta \rightarrow \eta'$  with  $|\eta| = |\eta'|$ , then by Lemma 5.6,  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  have the same coset type, and hence,  $\mathbb{P}(\eta', 0, 0) = \mathbb{P}(\eta, 0, 0) = \mathbb{P}(\eta, |\eta|)$ . As a consequence, letting  $\ell(\pi)$  denoting the size of the largest part of the coset type of  $\pi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 1, 0)| &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta, |\eta|)| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta, |\eta|)| \ell(\pi_{n-r+j}) \\
&\leq |\mathbb{P}(\pi, |\pi|)| \sum_{j=0}^{n+|\pi|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\pi)}[L_j].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have  $Cn|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\sigma)}[L_j^{3/2}] = Cn|\mathbb{P}(\sigma, |\sigma|)| \sum_{j=0}^{|\sigma|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\lambda)}[L_j^{3/2}]$ .  $\square$

From the last Lemma, together with Lemma 3.10, we are ready to show the following.

**Lemma 5.15.** We have

$$\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 1, 0)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 0, 0)|} \leq (Cn)^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 0, 1)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 0, 0)|} \leq (Cn)^3.$$

*Proof.* The line of inequalities is the same as in Lemma 3.11,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^{n+|\pi|} \mathbb{E}_{\text{WP}(\mu)}[L_j] \\
&\leq n + \sum_j Cj^3 2^{j/2} n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[L_{Cj^3 2^{j/2} n^{1/2}}] \\
&\leq n^{3/2} + \sum_j Cj^3 2^{j/2} 2^{-j} n^{3/2} \\
&\leq C_1 n^{3/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Now via induction we have the following general path counting bound.

**Lemma 5.16.**

$$\frac{|\mathbb{P}(\pi, g_1, g_2)|}{|\mathbb{P}(\pi, 0, 0)|} \leq (Cn)^{3g_1/2 + 3g_2}.$$



*Proof.* The case  $g_1 + g_2 \leq 1$  is the statement of the previous lemma. The general case now follows by induction:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{P}(\pi, g_1, g_2)| &= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} |\mathbb{P}_j(\pi, g_1, g_2)| \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} |\mathbb{P}_j(\pi, \eta, \eta', g_1, g_2)| \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta', g_1 - 1, g_2)| \\
&+ \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|+1, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta', g_1, g_2 - 1)| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} (Cn)^{3(g_1-1)/2+3g_2} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta', 0, 0)| \\
&+ \sum_{j=0}^{|\pi|} \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r)} \sum_{\eta' \in \mathcal{P}_2(2r) \setminus \{\eta\}, |\eta'|=|\eta|+1, \eta \rightarrow \eta'} (Cn)^{3g_1/2+3(g_2-1)} |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_j(\pi, \eta)| |\mathbb{P}(\eta', 0, 0)| \\
&= (Cn)^{3(g_1-1)/2+3g_2} |\mathbb{P}(\pi, 1, 0)| + (Cn)^{3g_1/2+3(g_2-1)} |\mathbb{P}(\pi, 0, 1)| \\
&\leq (Cn)^{3g_1/2+3g_2} |\mathbb{P}(\pi, 0, 0)|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally Theorem 1.3 follows from the prior path counting bound.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3*

Substituting in Lemma 5.16 into the path expansion Corollary 5.9, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
N^{n+|\pi|} |\text{Wg}_N^{\text{O}}(\pi)| &\leq \sum_{g_1, g_2 \geq 0} |\mathbb{P}(\pi, g_1, g_2)| N^{-g_1-2g_2} \\
&\leq \sum_{g_1, g_2 \geq 0} (Cn^{3/2}/N)^{g_1+2g_2} |\text{Moeb}(\pi)| \\
&\leq \sum_{g \geq 0} (g+1) (Cn^{3/2}/N)^g |\text{Moeb}(\pi)| \\
&\leq \frac{|\text{Moeb}(\pi)|}{(1 - Cn^{3/2}/N)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

## REFERENCES

- [AN23] Omar Abdelghani and Ron Nissim. Geometric derivation of the finite  $n$  master loop equation, 2023.
- [BC23] Charles Bordenave and Benoit Collins. Norm of matrix-valued polynomials in random unitaries and permutations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05714*, 2023.
- [BC24] Charles Bordenave and Benoit Collins. Strong asymptotic freeness for independent uniform variables on compact groups associated to nontrivial representations. *Inventiones mathematicae*, pages 1–53, 2024.
- [BCSK24] Jacopo Borga, Sky Cao, and Jasper Shogren-Knaak. Surface sums for lattice yang-mills in the large- $n$  limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11676*, 2024.
- [BD06] Nathanaël Berestycki and Rick Durrett. A phase transition in the random transposition random walk. *Probability theory and related fields*, 136:203–233, 2006.
- [CGL23] Benoit Collins, Razvan G Gurau, and Luca Lionni. The tensor harish-chandra–itzykson–zuber integral i: Weingarten calculus and a generalization of monotone hurwitz numbers. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 2023.
- [CGL24] Benoit Collins, Razvan Gurau, and Luca Lionni. Free cumulants and freeness for unitarily invariant random tensors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00908*, 2024.
- [CGMS09] Benoit Collins, Alice Guionnet, and Edouard Maurel-Segala. Asymptotics of unitary and orthogonal matrix integrals. *Advances in Mathematics*, 222(1):172–215, 2009.

- [CM09] Benoît Collins and Sho Matsumoto. On some properties of orthogonal weingarten functions. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 50(11), 2009.
- [CM14] Benoît Collins and Camille Male. The strong asymptotic freeness of haar and deterministic matrices. In *Annales scientifiques de l'École normale supérieure*, volume 47, pages 147–163. Societe Mathematique de France, 2014.
- [CM17] Benoît Collins and Sho Matsumoto. Weingarten calculus via orthogonality relations: new applications. *Latin American Journal of Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 14, 01 2017.
- [CMN22] Benoit Collins, Sho Matsumoto, and Jonathan Novak. The weingarten calculus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14890*, 2022.
- [CN16] Benoit Collins and Ion Nechita. Random matrix techniques in quantum information theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(1), 2016.
- [Col03] Benoît Collins. Moments and cumulants of polynomial random variables on unitary groups, the Itzykson-Zuber integral, and free probability. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2003(17):953–982, 2003.
- [Col22] Benoît Collins. Moment methods on compact groups: Weingarten calculus and its applications. *ICM Vol. IV. Sections 5*, 8:3142–3164, 2022.
- [CPS23] Sky Cao, Minjae Park, and Scott Sheffield. Random surfaces and lattice Yang-Mills. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2307.06790, July 2023.
- [DS81] Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. Generating a random permutation with random transpositions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 57(2):159–179, 1981.
- [Fel91] William Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications, Volume 2*, volume 81. John Wiley & Sons, 1991.
- [GGPN11a] Ian P Goulden, Mathieu Guay-Paquet, and Jonathan Novak. Monotone hurwitz numbers and the hciz integral ii. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.1001*, 2011.
- [GGPN11b] IP GOULDEN, M GUAY-PAQUET, and J NOVAK. Monotone hurwitz numbers and the hciz integral i. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.1015*, 2011.
- [JS24] Vishesh Jain and Mehtaab Sawhney. Hitting time mixing for the random transposition walk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23944*, 2024.
- [Kös21] Georg Köstenberger. Weingarten calculus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00921*, 2021.
- [Lév08] Thierry Lévy. Schur–weyl duality and the heat kernel measure on the unitary group. *Advances in Mathematics*, 218(2):537–575, 2008.
- [Nov07] J Novak. Truncations of random unitary matrices and young tableaux. *the electronic journal of combinatorics*, 14(R21):1, 2007.
- [Nov20] Jonathan Novak. On the complex asymptotics of the hciz and bgw integrals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04304*, 2020.
- [Nov22] Jonathan Novak. Topological expansion of oscillatory bgw and hciz integrals at strong coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10746*, 2022.
- [Nov24] Jonathan Novak. On the 2d yang-mills/hurwitz correspondence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00628*, 2024.
- [PPSY23] Minjae Park, Joshua Pfeffer, Scott Sheffield, and Pu Yu. Wilson loop expectations as sums over surfaces on the plane. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02306*, 2023.
- [Sch05] Oded Schramm. Compositions of random transpositions. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 147:221–243, 2005.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [Wei78] Donald Weingarten. Asymptotic behavior of group integrals in the limit of infinite rank. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 19(5):999–1001, 1978.

Ron Nissim, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA, USA.

*E-mail address:* rnissim@mit.edu