

LIMIT THEOREMS FOR THE NON-CONVEX MULTISPECIES CURIE-WEISS MODEL

FRANCESCO CAMILLI¹, EMANUELE MINGIONE², AND GODWIN OSABUTEY²

¹QUANTITATIVE LIFE SCIENCES, INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS, TRIESTE, ITALY
²DEPARTMENT OF MATEMATICS, ALMA MATER STUDIORUM - UNIVERSITY OF BOLOGNA, BOLOGNA ITALY

ABSTRACT. We study the thermodynamic properties of the generalized non-convex multispecies Curie-Weiss model, where interactions among different types of particles (forming the species) are encoded in a generic matrix. For spins with a generic prior distribution, we compute the pressure in the thermodynamic limit using simple interpolation techniques. For Ising spins, we further analyze the fluctuations of the magnetization in the thermodynamic limit under the Boltzmann-Gibbs measure. It is shown that a central limit theorem holds for a rescaled and centered vector of species magnetizations, which converges to either a centered or non-centered multivariate normal distribution, depending on the rate of convergence of the relative sizes of the species.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Curie-Weiss model, also known as the mean-field Ising model, is one of the simplest models of magnetism that exhibits phase transitions [36]. In this model, the spins assume discrete binary values (± 1) and interact uniformly with one another. Due to its simplicity and analytical tractability, it has been applied in a variety of fields, including voting dynamics [39, 38, 32] and social collective behavior [12, 11, 32, 44]. The multispecies extension of the Curie-Weiss model [17, 13, 49, 18] has been proposed to capture the large-scale behavior of interacting systems involving multiple types of interacting particles, whose strength depends on which species each belong to. These extensions were originally introduced in statistical physics as approximations of lattice models [26, 10] and meta-magnets [37, 27], which exhibit both ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions. From the mathematical physics perspective the free energy of a two-species ferromagnet was rigorously derived in [28] and further investigated in [29, 9, 30] with the Hamilton-Jacobi formalism. Beyond the computation of the free energy, the fluctuations of the order parameter of the multispecies Curie-Weiss model were initially discussed in [24], under a convexity assumption on the Hamiltonian and using the same approach of [23]. More recently stronger results have been proved using different approaches. Notably [43, 42] have shown validity of central limit theorems (CLTs) and provided their convergence rate via Stein's method, while in [40, 25, 41] a moment generating functional approach has been used. We stress that in all the aforementioned literature the convexity assumption on the interaction matrix always plays a crucial role. An analogous convexity condition also appears in the context of disordered multispecies models where a formula for the free energy is known only in the convex case [8, 50], for spherical models [7, 52] and on the Nishimori line [1, 2, 3]. The non-convex case remains an open problem (see [4, 45, 35] for partial results on the subject). Concerning models with random interactions, few fluctuation theorems for the order parameter are known: for the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model the validity of CLTs is limited to high-temperature regions [33, 34, 53], unless the model is on the Nishimori line [14], while the multispecies case is studied here [21].

Date: February 28, 2025.

Key words and phrases. Non-convex Curie-Weiss model, Central limit theorem, Ising model.

The aim of this work is to study the multispecies Curie Weiss model in full generality, in particular without any convexity assumption on the interaction matrix. The work is divided into two main parts. The first part examines the limiting free energy of the model for arbitrary spin distributions supported on $[-1, 1]$. Using a combination of interpolation methods and decoupling techniques, we derive a variational formula for the free energy. The second part focuses on the asymptotic behavior of the vector of species magnetization in the case of Ising spins. The methods used in the latter are inspired by [47, 19]. By generalizing these methods we demonstrate that the rescaled vector of species magnetization follows a standard CLT in the region of phase space where the order parameter concentrates on a single value. On the other hand, when concentration may occur at multiple points, a conditional CLT still applies.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 gives a description for the generalized multispecies Curie-Weiss model with a generic coupling matrix. The main results are presented in Section 3, followed by detailed proofs in Section 4. Section 5 concludes the paper and discusses future directions. The Appendix contains some technical results used in the proofs.

2. MODEL DESCRIPTION AND DEFINITIONS

Let ρ be a probability measure supported on $[-1, 1]$, and K an integer representing the number of different species. Consider now a Hamiltonian system made of N interacting spins, each labeled by an integer, σ_i , that lies in the set of indices $\Lambda = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. To create a multispecies structure we divide the set of indices Λ into K disjoint subsets Λ_p of cardinality N_p for $p = 1, \dots, K$, namely

$$\Lambda_p \cap \Lambda_l = \emptyset \quad \forall p \neq l, \quad \sum_{p=1}^K |\Lambda_p| = N_1 + \dots + N_K = N. \quad (2.1)$$

For future convenience we also introduce the *form factors*, or relative sizes ratios $(\alpha_p)_{p \leq K} = (N_p/N)_{p \leq K}$, that shall be collected into a diagonal $K \times K$ matrix $\alpha = \text{diag}(\alpha_p)_{p \leq K}$. Naturally, one has $\sum_{p \leq K} \alpha_p = 1$. In the following we also allow these ratios to depend on N , $\alpha_{N,p}$, and we shall call their limit α_p :

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{N,p} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_p}{N} = \alpha_p, \quad p \leq K. \quad (2.2)$$

However, with a little abuse of notation we keep writing only α_p instead of $\alpha_{N,p}$.

Let us turn back to our Hamiltonian system. The configuration space is $[-1, 1]^N = \Omega_N$. Now that the multispecies structure has been introduced, let the interaction be tuned by the symmetric matrix $\mathbf{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ and the species specific external field $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^K$. A schematic representation of the interaction network is displayed in Figure 1.

The model under study is thus defined as follows. Let $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in \Lambda} \in \Omega_N$, then for a given $(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ the multispecies model is defined by the Hamiltonian:

$$H_N(\sigma) = -\frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{i=1}^N h_i \sigma_i = -\frac{N}{2} \sum_{p,l=1}^K m_p \alpha_p J_{pl} \alpha_l m_l - N \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_p h_p m_p \quad (2.3)$$

where for each species p the magnetization density is:

$$m_p(\sigma) = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{i \in \Lambda_p} \sigma_i \quad (2.4)$$




FIGURE 1. Interaction scheme for the multispecies model.

and we denote by $\mathbf{m}_N = (m_p)_{p \leq K} \in [-1, 1]^K$ the magnetization vector. The Hamiltonian (2.3) can now be rewritten as:

$$H_N = -\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta \mathbf{m}_N) - N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{m}_N) \quad (2.5)$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) denote scalar product in \mathbb{R}^K and

$$\Delta = \alpha \mathbf{J} \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \alpha \mathbf{h}. \quad (2.6)$$

The joint distribution of σ is governed by a Boltzmann-Gibbs measure

$$\mathcal{G}_N(\sigma) := \frac{e^{-H_N(\sigma)}}{Z_N} \prod_{i=1}^N d\rho(\sigma_i), \quad (2.7)$$

where $Z_N = \int_{[-1, 1]^N} e^{-H_N(\sigma)} \prod_{i=1}^N d\rho(\sigma_i)$ is the partition function. Averages w.r.t. \mathcal{G}_N will be denoted with $\omega_N(\cdot)$. The thermodynamic pressure of the system is given by:

$$p_N = \frac{1}{N} \log Z_N. \quad (2.8)$$

3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we provide the variational formula for the large N limit of the thermodynamic pressure of the generalized multispecies Curie-Weiss model (2.5). In addition, in the case of Ising spins, we give central limit theorems for the magnetization vector \mathbf{m}_N . We stress again that the coupling matrix \mathbf{J} used throughout the work is an arbitrary symmetric real matrix.

3.1. Thermodynamic limit of the pressure per particle. Our first result is a representation of the large N limit of, p_N , (2.8) in terms of a variational problem in \mathbb{R}^K . Let us define the following variational function:

$$p_{var}(\Delta, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{x}) \equiv p_{var}(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_p \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\rho(\sigma) \exp \left[\sigma \left(\sum_{l=1}^K J_{pl} \alpha_l x_l + h_p \right) \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Now, let O be the orthogonal matrix diagonalizing Δ . Then the following theorem holds:

Theorem 3.1. For any $(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ one has

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p_N = \inf_{z_1, \dots, z_a} \sup_{z_{a+1}, \dots, z_K} p_{var}(O\mathbf{z}). \quad (3.2)$$

It is worth mentioning that the large N limit of p_N can be obtained through large deviations methods [22, 20, 48], while in this work we employ interpolation bounds. We refer interested readers to [22], where the phase diagram of the Curie-Weiss model with ferromagnetic interaction and generic compact spin distribution is analyzed.

3.2. Fluctuations of the magnetization. Here we state the fluctuations results of the species magnetization for the model with binary spins, i.e., $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \leq N} \in \{-1, 1\}^N$. Let us define

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta \mathbf{x}) + (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{x}) - (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, I(\mathbf{x})), \quad \mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^K \quad (3.3)$$

where $I(\mathbf{x}) = (I(x_p))_{p \leq K} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ with

$$I(x) = \frac{1-x}{2} \log \left(\frac{1-x}{2} \right) + \frac{1+x}{2} \log \left(\frac{1+x}{2} \right), \quad x \in [-1, 1] \quad (3.4)$$

and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is the vector associated to the diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. In the following, we assume the convergence in (2.2) is fast enough. More precisely setting $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N = \text{diag}(\alpha_{N,p})_{p \leq K}$ we assume that

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + N^{-\theta} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad (3.5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_p)_{p \leq K}$ for some $0 < \beta_p < \infty$ and $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$. The fluctuations of the magnetization vector \mathbf{m}_N depend on the global maximum point(s) of the function f in (3.3). A detailed analysis of the critical points and the maximizers can be found in [15, 28, 43] for $K = 2$. We mention that for general K and zero external fields, there is a high temperature condition [42, 41] that implies that the zero vector is the unique global maximum of f and then the system has no spontaneous magnetization. The following statements contain central limit theorems for the vector of global species magnetization $\mathbf{m}_N = (m_1, \dots, m_K)$ with respect to the measure \mathcal{G}_N (2.7). Let us start with the case of a unique non-degenerate global maximum.

Theorem 3.2. Assume that $(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ are such that f in (3.3) has a unique global maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_r)_{r \leq K}$ with Hessian $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \prec 0$. Then we have the following convergence in law under the measure \mathcal{G}_N :

$$\left(\sqrt{N} \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} (\mathbf{m}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\nu}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) & \text{if } \theta = \frac{1}{2} \\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) & \text{if } \theta > \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu} = -\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \boldsymbol{\beta}$.

When instead multiple global maxima coexists, a proper condition is sufficient to restore Gaussianity:

Theorem 3.3. Assume that $(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ are such that f in (3.3) has n global maximizers $\boldsymbol{\mu}^1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}^n$ with Hessian $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \prec 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. For any collection $(A_i)_{i \leq n}$ subsets of $[-1, 1]^K$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^i \in \text{int}(A_i)$ and $f(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) > f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{cl}(A_i) \setminus \{\boldsymbol{\mu}^i\}$ then

$$\left(\sqrt{N} \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} (\mathbf{m}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \right) | \{ \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i \} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\nu}^i, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) & \text{if } \theta = \frac{1}{2} \\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) & \text{if } \theta > \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\nu}^i = -\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \boldsymbol{\beta}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

4. PROOFS

4.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let us start by observing that any indefinite matrix can be decomposed into the sum of two semi-definite matrices:

$$\Delta = \Delta_+ + \Delta_- \quad \text{where } \Delta_+ \geq 0, \Delta_- \leq 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Thus, the scalar products seen so far split into two parts of definite signs, for example:

$$(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta \mathbf{m}_N) = (\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + (\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_- \mathbf{m}_N). \quad (4.2)$$

Also, we assume to order the species and eigenvectors so that the diagonal parts are as follows:

$$\Delta^D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_a, \lambda_{a+1}, \dots, \lambda_K) \quad \text{with } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_a \leq 0, \lambda_{a+1}, \dots, \lambda_K \geq 0 \quad (4.3)$$

$$\Delta^D = \Delta_+^D + \Delta_-^D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_a, 0, \dots, 0) + \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, \lambda_{a+1}, \dots, \lambda_K). \quad (4.4)$$

Here, the superscript D indicates a diagonal matrix. Observe also that the orthogonal matrix O diagonalizes simultaneously Δ , Δ_+ , and Δ_- . We are now in position to prove the following Sum Rule:

Proposition 4.1 (Hybrid Sum Rule). *For every N , and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ the following holds true:*

$$p_N = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta_- \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} d\rho(\sigma) e^{\frac{\beta N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + \beta N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dt \omega_{N,t} \left[(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{x}, \Delta_- (\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{x})) \right]. \quad (4.5)$$

where $\omega_{N,t}$ is the Gibbs state induced by a suitable interpolating Hamiltonian.

Proof. Let's introduce the following interpolating Hamiltonian:

$$H_N(t) = -\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) - \frac{Nt}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_- \mathbf{m}_N) - (1-t)(\Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N) - N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{m}_N). \quad (4.6)$$

The corresponding Boltzmann-Gibbs average is precisely $\omega_{N,t}$, and the interpolating pressure $p_N(t)$ has the following properties:

$$p_N(1) = p_N \quad (4.7)$$

$$p_N(0) = \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} d\rho(\sigma) e^{\frac{\beta N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + \beta N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)}. \quad (4.8)$$

Completing the square easily proves that:

$$p'_N(t) = -\frac{1}{N} \omega_{N,t}(H_N(t)) = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta_- \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \omega_{N,t} \left[(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{x}, \Delta_- (\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{x})) \right].$$

The result follows from an application of the fundamental theorem of calculus. \square

Lemma 4.1. Assume the eigenvalue ordering in (4.4). Then for any $(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ one has

$$p_N(\Delta, \mathbf{h}) \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right) + \inf_{z_1 \dots z_a} \sup_{z_{a+1} \dots z_K} p_{var}(\Delta, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{Oz}). \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. We define the grid of hypercubes $A_k^p = \left[y_k^p, y_k^p + \frac{2}{N_p} \right]$ where $y_k^p = -1 + 2(k-1)/N$ for $k \in \Lambda$, and p is the species label. The vertices of this grid are identified by a multi-index $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K) \in \Lambda^K$, and denoted y_γ in the following.

Furthermore, observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) e^{\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)} = \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) \prod_{p=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^{N_p} \mathbb{1}(m_p \in A_k^p) e^{\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)} \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \log \sum_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K=1}^{N_1, \dots, N_K} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) \prod_{p=1}^K \mathbb{1}(m_p \in A_{\gamma_p}^p) e^{\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)}. \quad (4.10)
\end{aligned}$$

While the constraint $\prod_{p=1}^K \mathbb{1}(m_p \in A_{\gamma_p}^p)$ is enforced, we have

$$0 \leq (\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{y}_\gamma, \Delta_+(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{y}_\gamma)) \leq \frac{C}{N^2} \quad (4.11)$$

where $C > 0$, and the multi-index $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)$. Using the bound above, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) e^{\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{m}_N) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)} \leq \frac{C}{N^2} + \\
& + \frac{1}{N} \log \sum_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K=1}^{N_1, \dots, N_K} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) \prod_{p=1}^K \mathbb{1}(m_p \in A_{\gamma_p}^p) e^{-\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{y}_\gamma, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y}_\gamma) + N(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y}_\gamma) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)} \\
& \leq \frac{C}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N} \log \sum_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K=1}^{N_1, \dots, N_K} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) e^{-\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{y}_\gamma, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y}_\gamma) + N(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y}_\gamma) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}_N)} \\
& = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right) + \frac{1}{N} \log \sup_{\mathbf{y}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) e^{-\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{y}, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y}) + N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x} + \Delta_+ \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{m}_N)} \\
& = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right) + \frac{1}{N} \log \sup_{\mathbf{y}} e^{-\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{y}, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d\rho(\sigma) e^{N \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_p \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{i \in \Lambda_p} \sigma_i (h_p + \hat{\alpha}^{-1}(\Delta_- \mathbf{x} + \Delta_+ \mathbf{y})_p)} \\
& = \sup_{\mathbf{y}} \left\{ -\frac{(\mathbf{y}, \Delta_+ \mathbf{y})}{2} + \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_p \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\rho(\sigma) \exp\{\sigma [\mathbf{h} + \hat{\alpha}^{-1}(\Delta_- \mathbf{x} + \Delta_+ \mathbf{y})]_p\} \right\} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right). \quad (4.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, thanks to the decomposition of Δ , there are some combinations of components of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} that will never appear, i.e., those corresponding to the zero eigenvalues of Δ_+ and Δ_- . Therefore, we have that:

$$\Delta_+ \mathbf{y} + \Delta_- \mathbf{x} = O\Delta_+^D \mathbf{y}^D + O\Delta_-^D \mathbf{x}^D = O\Delta^D \mathbf{z}^D = \Delta \mathbf{z} \quad (4.13)$$

$$\text{and } \mathbf{z}^D = (x_1^D, \dots, x_a^D, y_{a+1}^D, \dots, y_K^D) \quad (4.14)$$

where D , when accompanying vectors, indicates vectors read in the basis of the eigenvectors of Δ . Hence, the real degrees of freedom are only K . Now, by equation (4.8), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_N(0) & \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right) + \sup_{y_{a+1}^D, \dots, y_K^D} p_{var}(\Delta_+, \hat{\alpha}^{-1} \Delta_- \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{h}; O\mathbf{y}^D) \\
& = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right) + \sup_{y_{a+1}^D, \dots, y_K^D} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (O\mathbf{y}^D, \Delta_+ O\mathbf{y}^D) + \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_p \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\rho(\sigma) e^{\sigma (\hat{\alpha}^{-1} \Delta O\mathbf{z}^D + \mathbf{h})_p} \right\}. \quad (4.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that this holds for any x_1^D, \dots, x_a^D corresponding to the negative definite matrix. If we add the missing quadratic term from the derivative, which contains only Δ_- , and optimize over the remaining degrees of freedom, we get:

$$p_N \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right) + \inf_{z_1, \dots, z_a} \sup_{z_{a+1}, \dots, z_K} p_{var}(O\mathbf{z}).$$

We removed D because now \mathbf{z} is a dummy variable. \square

Now we need to find the other bound.

Lemma 4.2. For any $(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K} \times \mathbb{R}^K$ one has

$$p_N \geq \inf_{z_1, \dots, z_a} \sup_{z_{a+1}, \dots, z_K} p_{var}(O\mathbf{z}) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (4.16)$$

Proof. For any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ consider the interpolating Hamiltonian:

$$H_N(t) = -\frac{N}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N, \Delta \mathbf{m}_N) + \frac{Nt}{2}(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{z}, \Delta(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{z})) - N(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{m}_N). \quad (4.17)$$

The corresponding pressure $p_N(t)$ has the following properties:

$$p_N(0) = p_N \quad (4.18)$$

$$p_N(1) = p_{var}(\Delta, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{z}) \quad (4.19)$$

$$p'_N(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_{N,t}[(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{z}, \Delta(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{z}))]. \quad (4.20)$$

Using the convexity of the interpolating pressure $p_N(t)$, one has $p_N(1) \leq p_N(0) + p'_N(0)$ and then for every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^K$, we obtain:

$$p_N \geq \frac{1}{2}\omega_{N,0}[(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{z}, \Delta(\mathbf{m}_N - \mathbf{z}))] + p_{var}(\Delta, \mathbf{h}; \mathbf{z}). \quad (4.21)$$

Now suppose that \mathbf{z} equal to a critical point $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^D = O^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ of p_{var} , then:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{z}^D} p_{var}(O\bar{\mathbf{z}}^D) = O \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{z}} p_{var}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) = O \left[-\Delta \bar{\mathbf{z}} + \frac{\Delta \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma \exp \sigma(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1} \Delta \bar{\mathbf{z}} + \mathbf{h}) d\rho(\sigma)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \tau(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1} \Delta \bar{\mathbf{z}} + \mathbf{h}) d\rho(\tau)} \right] = 0 \quad (4.22)$$

where the above exponentials are applied component-wise, and division is also component-wise. Criticality then implies from (4.22) that

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} - \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma \exp \sigma(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1} \Delta \bar{\mathbf{z}} + \mathbf{h}) d\rho(\sigma)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \tau(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1} \Delta \bar{\mathbf{z}} + \mathbf{h}) d\rho(\tau)} \in \text{Ker}(\Delta). \quad (4.23)$$

Observe that the above can also be recast as

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} - \omega_{N,0}(\mathbf{m}_N) \in \text{Ker}(\Delta).$$

Let us now expand the quadratic form and separate the diagonal terms from the off-diagonal ones:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{N,0}[(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \Delta(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}}))] &= \sum_{p \neq l, 1}^K \Delta_{pl} \omega_{N,0}[(m_p - \bar{z}_p)] \omega_{N,0}[(m_{N_l} - \bar{z}_l)] + \\ &\quad + \sum_{p=1}^K \Delta_{pp} \omega_{N,0}[(m_p - \bar{z}_p)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Now, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_{N,0}[(m_p - \bar{z}_p)^2] &= \omega_{N,0}[(m_p)^2] - 2\omega_{N,0}[m_p]\bar{z}_p + (\bar{z}_p)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N_p^2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_p} \omega_{N,0}[\sigma_i^2] + \sum_{i \neq j} \omega_{N,0}[\sigma_i \sigma_j] \right) - 2\omega_{N,0}[m_p]\bar{z}_p + (\bar{z}_p)^2.\end{aligned}\quad (4.25)$$

For $i \neq j$ the measure $\omega_{N,0}$ factorizes, and naturally $\sum_{i \in \Lambda_p} \sigma_i^2 \leq N_p$. Therefore

$$\omega_{N,0}[(m_p - \bar{z}_p)^2] = \omega_{N,0}^2[(m_p - \bar{z}_p)] + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}).\quad (4.26)$$

The previous finally implies

$$\omega_{N,0}[(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \Delta(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}}))] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + (\omega_{N,0}(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}}), \Delta\omega_{N,0}(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}})).\quad (4.27)$$

The last term is zero because $\omega_{N,0}(\mathbf{m}_N - \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ lies in the kernel of Δ . \square

The proof of Theorem 3.1 thus follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2.

4.2. Proof of Theorem 3.2. The proof of the CLT in the case of Ising spins, namely $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{-1} + \delta_{+1})$ is based on a careful control of the asymptotic expansion of a partition function Z_N using the methods of [19, 47]. For any integer N and $x \in [-1, 1]$ we define the quantity

$$A_N(x) = \text{card}\left\{\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^N : \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i = x\right\} = \binom{N}{\frac{N(1+x)}{2}}.\quad (4.28)$$

Let's state some useful bounds on A_N , the proof is standard and can be found in [53].

Lemma 4.3. For any $x \in [-1, 1]$ the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{1}{C\sqrt{N}} e^{-NI(x)} \leq A_N(x) \leq e^{-NI(x)}\quad (4.29)$$

where C is a universal constant and,

$$I(x) = \frac{1-x}{2} \log\left(\frac{1-x}{2}\right) + \frac{1+x}{2} \log\left(\frac{1+x}{2}\right).\quad (4.30)$$

Moreover for any $x \in (-1, 1)$ one has

$$A_N(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi N(1-x^2)}} \exp(-NI(x)) \cdot (1 + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1})).\quad (4.31)$$

Let us start by dividing the configuration space $\{-1, 1\}^N$ into microstates of equal local magnetization. For a given species $l \leq K$ with spins configuration $\sigma^{(l)}$, the local magnetization m_l takes values in $S_l = \{-1 + \frac{2n}{N_l}, n = 0, \dots, N_l\}$, with $|S_l| = (N_l + 1)$. The possible values of the magnetization vector $\mathbf{m}_N = (m_l)_{l \leq K} \in S_N = \times_{l=1}^K S_l$. Hence the partition function rewrites as:

$$Z_N = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N} \prod_{l=1}^K A_{N_l}(x_l) \exp(-H_N(\mathbf{x})).\quad (4.32)$$

Here, $A_{N_l}(x_l)$ counts the number of all possible configurations of $\sigma^{(l)} \in \{-1, 1\}^{N_l}$ that share the same magnetization x_l . From Lemma 4.3 one can obtain the following bound for the pressure, by substituting (4.29) into (4.32):

$$-\frac{1}{N} \left(\log C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^K \log N_l \right) + \max_{\mathbf{x}} f_N(\mathbf{x}) \leq p_N \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^K \log(N_l + 1) + \max_{\mathbf{x}} f_N(\mathbf{x}) \quad (4.33)$$

where

$$f_N(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,l=1}^K \alpha_{N,l} J_{pl} \alpha_{N,p} x_p x_l + \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_{N,p} h_p x_p - \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_{N,p} I(x_p). \quad (4.34)$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p_N = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^K} f(\mathbf{x}) \quad (4.35)$$

where

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta \mathbf{x}) + (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{x}) - (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, I(\mathbf{x})) \quad (4.36)$$

and $I(\mathbf{x}) = (I(x_l))_{l \leq K}$ is defined in (4.30). The stationarity conditions are:

$$x_l = \tanh \left(h_l + \sum_{p=1}^K \alpha_p J_{lp} x_p \right) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, K. \quad (4.37)$$

The solutions of the fixed point equation (4.37) identify the stationary points of f among which we are interested in the ones that reach the supremum. There can be more than one global maximizer depending on the parameters (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) of the model. Here we assume that (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) are such that there exists a unique maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu^{(l)})_{l \leq K}$ of f with negative definite Hessian, i.e., $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \prec 0$. We also stress that f is smooth around $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ since the latter belongs to the interior of $[-1, 1]^K$ for any choice of (\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{h}) (see Lemma (A.1)).

The main idea is to derive the asymptotic of the partition function for a perturbed system, where a small external field is added. For any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ we define:

$$H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{m}_N) = H_N(\mathbf{m}_N) - \sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{m}_N) \quad (4.38)$$

where $\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{N_p/N})_{p \leq K}$, and $H_N(\mathbf{m}_N)$ is the unperturbed Hamiltonian defined in (2.5) with $Z_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ as the associated partition function. We also define the function:

$$f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) = f_N(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{x}). \quad (4.39)$$

Let us notice from equation (4.39) that $f_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ and all its partial derivatives with respect to \mathbf{x} at any order converge uniformly to the one of f for any \mathbf{x} in the interior of $[-1, 1]^K$. Therefore by Lemma A.2, for N large enough $f_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ has a unique maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} = (\mu_{N,\mathbf{t}}^{(l)})_{l \leq K} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ that converge to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,\mathbf{t}}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \prec 0$.

Next we will show that the magnetization vector concentrates around $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ with overwhelming probability with respect to the Boltzmann-Gibbs measure induced by $H_{N,\mathbf{t}}$, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$. For $\delta > 0$ we denote by $B_{N,\delta}$ a poly-interval centered at $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ with each coordinate $\mu_{N,\mathbf{t}}^{(l)}$ as the center and $N_l^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}$ as the length of the interval along the l th dimension, namely:

$$B_{N,\delta} = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^K : \left| x_l - \mu_{N,\mathbf{t}}^{(l)} \right| < N_l^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}, \forall l \in \{1, \dots, K\} \right\}. \quad (4.40)$$

Lemma 4.4. Assume that $f(\mathbf{x})$ has a unique global maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ with $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \prec 0$. Then for N large enough $f_{N,t}$ has a unique maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) \prec 0$. Moreover for $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2K+4})$ we have that

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}^c(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})) \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N^{2\delta} \lambda_{N,t} \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right). \quad (4.41)$$

where $\lambda_{N,t} < 0$ and the partition function (4.32) can be expanded as:

$$Z_{N,t} = \frac{e^{Nf_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})}}{\sqrt{\det(-\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})) \prod_{l=1}^K (1 - (\mu_{N,t}^{(l)})^2)}} \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{-\frac{1}{2} + (K+2)\delta} \right) \right). \quad (4.42)$$

Proof. The fact that for N large enough $f_{N,t}$ has a unique non degenerate global maximizers follows easily by Lemma A.2. For the second part of the statement one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}^c) &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N \cap B_{N,\delta}^c} \prod_{l=1}^K A_{N_l}(x_l) \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N} \prod_{l=1}^K A_{N_l}(x_l) \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}))} \\ &\leq \frac{C \prod_{l=1}^K \sqrt{N_l} (N_l + 1) \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}^c} e^{Nf_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})}}{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-1,1]^K} e^{Nf_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})}} \\ &= \exp \left\{ N \left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}^c} f_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) - f_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) \right) \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

The sup in the denominator of the inequality appearing in the second line has been extended over $[-1, 1]^K$ instead of S_N due to the fact that $f_{N,t}$ is Lipschitz continuous away from the boundaries of $[-1, 1]^K$. The difference between $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N} f_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-1,1]^K} f_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})$ is small due to the Lipschitz property of $f_{N,t}$ and bounded by a constant due to the mesh size of S_N . Let us consider the simplest case where $K = 1$. Then the set $S_N = S_1$ and $S_1 = \left\{ -1 + \frac{2n}{N_1}, n = 0, \dots, N_1 \right\}$ with mesh size $\frac{2}{N_1}$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^K = t$. Now, the Lipschitz continuity of $f_{N,t}$ means there exists a constant L such that: $|f_{N,t}(x) - f_{N,t}(y)| \leq L|x - y|$ for all x, y away from ± 1 . Given that the maximum distance between any point $x \in S_N$ and the nearest point in $(-1, 1)$ is at most $\frac{2}{N_1}$, the difference between the supremum of $f_{N,t}$ over S_N and over $(-1, 1)$ can be bounded by: $\left| \sup_{x \in S_N} f_{N,t}(x) - \sup_{x \in (-1,1)} f_{N,t}(x) \right| \leq \frac{2L}{N_1}$. Thus, the difference is small and goes to zero as $N_1 \rightarrow \infty$. This justifies substituting the sum over the discrete set S_N with the supremum over $[-1, 1]$, with the error being controlled by the mesh size and the Lipschitz constant L .

We claim that in the last equality of (4.43), the supremum of $f_{N,t}$ restricted to $B_{N,\delta}^c$ is attained at some $\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta}$, lying on the boundary of $B_{N,\delta}$. A formal proof can be obtained through a straightforward generalization of Lemma B.11 in [46]. In fact, if $\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}^c$ then at least one of the coordinates x_l is outside $\left(\mu_{N,t}^{(l)} - N_l^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}, \mu_{N,t}^{(l)} + N_l^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \right)$. The function $f_{N,t}$ decreases outside $B_{N,\delta}$, and hence the supremum must be on the boundary. Bearing this in mind we have:

$$|\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}|^2 \leq \sum_{l \leq K} N_l^{-1+2\delta} = \sum_{l \leq K} (N \alpha_{N,l})^{-1+2\delta} = N^{-1+2\delta} \sum_{l \leq K} (\alpha_{N,l})^{-1+2\delta} = N^{-1+2\delta} c_{\alpha_N, \delta} \quad (4.44)$$

and, hence, using a Taylor expansion up to third order with Lagrange type remainder:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{N,t}(\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta}) &= f_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) + \frac{1}{2} ((\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) \mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}), (\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})) + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{l,p,s=1}^K \frac{\partial^3 f_{N,t}}{\partial x_l \partial x_p \partial x_s} (\vartheta_{N,t}) (\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})_l (\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})_p (\mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})_s \\
&\leq f_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) + \frac{1}{2} N^{-1+2\delta} \underbrace{c_{\alpha_N,\delta}}_{>1} \lambda_{N,t} + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{l,p,s=1}^K \left| \frac{\partial^3 f_{N,t}}{\partial x_l \partial x_p \partial x_s} (\vartheta_{N,t}) \right| \cdot N^{-3/2+3\delta} (c_{\alpha_N,\delta})^{3/2} \\
&\leq f_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) + \frac{1}{2} N^{-1+2\delta} \lambda_{N,t} + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-3/2+3\delta}\right) \quad (4.45)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\vartheta_{N,t}$ is an intermediate point of the segment $[\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}, \mathbf{y}_{N,t,\delta}]$, $\lambda_{N,t} < 0$ is the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}$ and in the third term of the last inequality of (4.45) we have used that $\alpha_{N,l} \rightarrow \alpha_l$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, (4.41) follows from (4.43) and (4.45).

Let's now begin with the proof of the asymptotic expansion of the partition function $Z_{N,t}$ (4.42). Observe that the concentration results, equation (4.41), implies that almost all the contribution to $Z_{N,t}$ comes from spin configurations having magnetization in a vanishing neighbourhood of the maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}$, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}) = 1 - \mathcal{O}(e^{-cN^{2\delta}})$ for some $c > 0$. Hence,

$$Z_{N,t} = \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-cN^{2\delta}}\right)\right) \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N \cap B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) := \prod_{l=1}^K \left(\frac{N_l}{N_l(1+x_l)}\right) \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})). \quad (4.46)$$

Following the same argument of [19, 47], we approximate the sum in (4.46) by an integral using Lemma B.1 over the set $B_{N,\delta}$ with shrinking interval containing the unique vector of global maximizer of $f_{N,t}$ which are elements of S_N :

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{2^K}{\prod_{l=1}^K N_l} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N \cap B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) \right| &\leq N^{(\frac{1}{2}+\delta)(K-1)} \cdot N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \cdot N^{-K} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} |\nabla \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})| \\
&= \mathcal{O}\left(N^{(-\frac{1}{2}+\delta)(K+1)}\right) \zeta_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) \quad (4.47)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} |\nabla \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})|$ is bounded in Lemma A.3. Now, following from (4.47) and applying the results of Lemma B.2 to approximate the integral, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N \cap B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\prod_{l=1}^K N_l}{2^K} \int_{B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{(-\frac{1}{2}+\delta)(K+1)+K}\right) \zeta_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) \\
&= \frac{\prod_{l=1}^K N_l}{2^K} \sqrt{\frac{2^K}{\pi^K \prod_{l=1}^K N_l (1 - (\mu_{N,t}^{(l)})^2)}} \sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^K}{\prod_{l=1}^K N_l \det(-\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}))}} e^{Nf_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-1/2+(K+2)\delta}\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{e^{Nf_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})}}{\sqrt{\det(-\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t})) \prod_{l=1}^K (1 - (\mu_{N,t}^{(l)})^2)}} \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-\frac{1}{2}+(K+2)\delta}\right)\right) \quad (4.48)
\end{aligned}$$

for $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2K+4})$. Hence, the partition function becomes:

$$Z_{N,\mathbf{t}} = \frac{e^{Nf_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}})}}{\sqrt{\det(-\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,\mathbf{t}}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}})) \prod_{l=1}^K (1 - (\mu_{N,\mathbf{t}}^{(l)})^2)}} \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-\frac{1}{2} + (K+2)\delta}\right)\right). \quad (4.49)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to proof Theorem 3.2. In order to approximate the distribution of the scaled difference between the vector of global species magnetization and the limiting global maximizers, we will compute the limiting moment generating function of $\mathbf{m}_N = (m_l)_{l \leq K}$ for some $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ using the expanded form of the partition function in (4.49):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N}(\mathbf{m}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}))} \right] &= e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{m}_N)} \mathcal{G}_N(\mathbf{m}_N) d\mathbf{m}_N \\ &= e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu})} \frac{Z_{N,\mathbf{t}}}{Z_N}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

From the last equality on the right of (4.50) and using (4.49):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Z_{N,\mathbf{t}}}{Z_N} &\sim \frac{\exp(N \max_{\mathbf{x}} f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}))}{\exp(N \max_{\mathbf{x}} f_N(\mathbf{x}))} \\ &= \exp\left(N[f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) - f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)] + \sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}})\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

where \sim means equality up to $(1 + o(1))$. In the last equality above, we used that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$ are unique global maximizers of $f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})$ and $f_N(\mathbf{x})$ respectively. Now, following from Lemma A.4, equation (4.51) becomes:

$$\frac{Z_{N,\mathbf{t}}}{Z_N} \sim \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{t}) + \sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N)\right). \quad (4.52)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N}(\mathbf{m}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}))} \right] &\sim e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu})} \cdot e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N)} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{t})} \\ &= e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}))} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{t})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.53)$$

Now, from (4.34) we have that

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_N = \tanh(\mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \boldsymbol{\mu}_N + \mathbf{h}). \quad (4.54)$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_p)_{p \leq K}$ with $|\beta_p| < \infty$, and $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$. Assume that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \equiv \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + N^{-\theta} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$. If we set $\mathbf{b}_N = \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \boldsymbol{\mu}_N + \mathbf{h}$, then

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \mathbf{b}_N} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \quad (4.55)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \mathbf{b}_N} = \text{diag}(1 - \mu_{N,l}^2)_{l \leq K} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N + \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}. \quad (4.56)$$

Let, $\mathbf{M} = \text{diag}(1 - \mu_{N,l}^2)_{l \leq K}$ then

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{M} \left[\mathbf{J} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N + \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right] \quad (4.57)$$

which entails

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \left[\mathbf{M}^{-1} - \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \right] = N^{-\theta} \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N). \quad (4.58)$$

Since $\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) = - \left[\mathbf{M}^{-1} - \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \right] \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N$, hence, (4.57) yields:

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_N}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \left[\mathbf{M}^{-1} - \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \right]^{-1} N^{-\theta} \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) = -N^{-\theta} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N). \quad (4.59)$$

Finally, a Taylor's expansion of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$ around $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ gives:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu} = -N^{-\theta} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{-2\theta} \right). \quad (4.60)$$

Therefore, Theorem 3.2 follows from (4.60) and taking the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ of (4.53).

4.3. Proof of Theorem 3.3. We will now address the case where f reaches its maximum in more than one point.

Lemma 4.5. Suppose $f(\mathbf{x})$ has n global maximizers $\boldsymbol{\mu}^i$ for $i \leq n$ such that $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \prec 0$. For each $i \leq n$ let $A_i \subset [-1, 1]^K$ be a poly-interval such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^i \in \text{int}(A_i)$ is the unique maximizer of f on $\text{cl}(A_i)$. Then, for each $i \leq n$ and for N large enough, $f_{N,t}$ has a unique global maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}$ on A_i with $\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) \prec 0$. Moreover for $\delta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2K+4} \right)$ one has

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}^c(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) | \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N^{2\delta} \lambda_{N,t}^i \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right) \quad (4.61)$$

where $\lambda_{N,t}^i < 0$ is the largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i)$ for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i \in \text{int}(A_i)$ and

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta,n}^c) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N^{2\delta} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_{N,t}^i \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right) \quad (4.62)$$

where $B_{N,\delta,n}^c = \bigcup_{i \leq n} B_{N,\delta}^c(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i)$. The partition function restricted to the interval A_i , can be expanded as:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{N,t}|_{A_i} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_N \cap A_i} \prod_{l=1}^K A_{N_l}(x_l) \exp N(f_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &= \frac{e^{N f_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i)}}{\sqrt{\det \left(-\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) \right) \prod_{l=1}^K (1 - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^{i,(l)})^2)}} \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{-1/2+(K+2)\delta} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.63)$$

Proof. For N large enough, $B_{N,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) \subset A_i$ for all $i \leq n$ and equation (4.61) is obtained following a step-by-step argument used to prove equation (4.41). Hence, it follows that,

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}^c(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) | \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N^{2\delta} \lambda_{N,t}^i \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right). \quad (4.64)$$

Now, let's observe that, for N large enough, $A_i \setminus B_{N,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) = A_i \setminus B_{N,\delta,n}$ for $i \leq n$. Hence, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and N large, it follows that

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}^c(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) | \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) = \mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta,n}^c | \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i). \quad (4.65)$$

Therefore, we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta,n}^c) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta,n}^c | \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) \mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) \\
&\leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N^{2\delta} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_{N,t}^i \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) \\
&= \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N^{2\delta} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_{N,t}^i \right\} \mathcal{O} \left(N^{\frac{3K}{2}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.66}$$

This complete the result in (4.62) following from (4.66).

The proof for the asymptotic expansion of the partition function when there are multiple vectors of global maximizers of $f_{N,t}$ follows exactly the same argument for the case with a unique vector of global maximizer when conditioned on an interval containing only one of the global maximizers. Notice that for fixed $i \leq n$ and N large, \mathbf{m}_N concentrates around $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i \in A_i$ as it is stated in equation (4.61). Hence,

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,t}(\mathbf{m}_N \in B_{N,\delta}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) | \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i) = \frac{1}{Z_{N,t}|_{A_i}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_N \cap B_{N,\delta}} \prod_{l=1}^K \left(\frac{N_l}{N_l(1+x_l)} \right) \exp \{ -H_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) \}. \tag{4.67}$$

Now, following the exact computation and argument in the uniqueness case, the restricted partition function for each of the global maximizers x_i can be expanded as

$$Z_{N,t}|_{A_i} = \frac{e^{Nf_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i)}}{\sqrt{\det \left(-\mathcal{H}_{f_{N,t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) \right) \prod_{l=1}^K (1 - ((\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i)^l)^2)}} \cdot \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{-1/2+(K+2)\delta} \right) \right). \tag{4.68}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

The conditional moment generating function for some parameter $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ can be computed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N}(\mathbf{m}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}^i))} \middle| \{ \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i \} \right] &= e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}^i)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^K} e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{m}_N)} \mathcal{G}_N(\mathbf{m}_N) \big|_{\{ \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i \}} d\mathbf{m}_N \\
&= e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}^i)} \frac{Z_{N,t}|_{A_i}}{Z_{N|A_i}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.69}$$

Using the asymptotic expansion of the perturbed partition function in (4.68), the proof follows the same arguments as in Theorem 3.2. Hence,

$$\frac{Z_{N,t}|_{A_i}}{Z_{N|A_1}} \sim \exp \left(N[f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) - f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i)] + \sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i) \right) \tag{4.70}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}^i \in \text{int}(A_i)$ is the unique maximizer of $f_{N,t}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i \in \text{int}(A_i)$ is the unique maximizer of f_N . Now following the argument of Lemma A.4 and the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N}(\mathbf{m}_N - \boldsymbol{\mu}^i))} \middle| \{ \mathbf{m}_N \in A_i \} \right] &\sim e^{-\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}^i)} \cdot e^{\sqrt{N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i)} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i) \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{t})} \\
&= e^{\sqrt{N} \left[\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i - \boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \right]} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i) \sqrt{\alpha_N} \mathbf{t})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.71}$$

Similarly, if we set $\alpha_N \equiv \alpha(\beta) = \alpha + N^{-\theta} \text{diag}(\beta)$, it follows from (4.60) that:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_N^i - \boldsymbol{\mu}^i = -N^{-\theta} \mathcal{H}_f^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \alpha \mathbf{J} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}^i) \beta + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{-2\theta} \right) \tag{4.72}$$

for $\beta = (\beta_p)_{p \leq K}$ where $0 < \beta_p < \infty$ and $\theta \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$. Hence, Theorem 3.3 follows from (4.72) by taking the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ of (4.71). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.3.

5. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced a generalized version of the multispecies Curie-Weiss model featuring arbitrary spins and a non-definite interaction matrix. Specifically, we computed the pressure per-particle and established the validity of CLT for a suitably rescaled vector of global magnetization. Our results demonstrated that the rescaled vector of global magnetization follows either a centered or non-centered multivariate normal distribution, depending on the speed of convergence of the relative densities of particles to their limiting values as the system size approaches infinity.

This generalized framework holds significant promise for applications in systems where spin particles or units can exhibit arbitrary states, moving beyond traditional binary or discrete-valued models. Such flexibility is particularly relevant in fields like statistical physics, network theory, and social dynamics, where elements often have a continuum of possible states or operate under complex interactions. Furthermore, the inclusion of an indefinite interaction matrix enables the modeling of systems with both cooperative and antagonistic interactions, broadening the scope of potential applications to include meta-magnets, financial systems, and multi-agent interactions.

Future work could explore extending these results to models with more complex topologies or additional constraints, such as time-varying interaction matrices or non-equilibrium dynamics [5, 6, 31]. Additionally, investigating the robustness of the CLT under perturbations in the interaction matrix or in the distribution of spin states could yield further insights into the stability and universality of the model's behavior and broaden its applicability [16].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Pierluigi Contucci for inspiring this collaboration. E. M. was supported by the EU H2020 ICT48 project Humane AI Net contract number 952026; by the Italian Extended Partnership PE01 - FAIR Future Artificial Intelligence Research - Proposal code PE00000013 under the MUR National Recovery and Resilience Plan. E. M. and G. O. were supported by the grant for the project PRIN22CONTUCCI, 2022B5LF52 “Boltzmann Machines beyond the “Independent Identically Distributed” Paradigm: a Mathematical Physics Approach”, CUP J53D23003690006, under the MUR National Recovery and Resilience Plan.

APPENDIX A. TECHNICAL TOOLS

Lemma A.1. The maximizer μ of $f(\mathbf{x})$ belongs to the interior of $[-1, 1]^K$.

Proof. Observe that the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l} = \sum_{p=1}^K \Delta_{l,p} x_p + \tilde{h}_l - \alpha_l \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1+x_l}{1-x_l} \right) \right) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, K. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Suppose that by contradiction $\mu_l^2 = 1$ for some $l \leq K$. Then if we consider the function $f(x_l) = f(\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{x_j = \mu_j, j \neq l}$, it follows that $f(x_l)$ attains its maximum in at least one point $x_l \in (-1, 1)$ which satisfy (4.37). Indeed, from (A.1), $\lim_{x_l \rightarrow -1^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} f(x_l) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{x_l \rightarrow 1^-} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} f(x_l) = -\infty$. Therefore, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f(x_l)$ is strictly increasing on $[-1, -1 + \epsilon]$ and strictly decreasing on $[1 - \epsilon, 1]$. Since this is true for all $l = 1, \dots, K$, then the thesis follows. \square

Lemma A.2. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ be a point on the interior of $[-1, 1]^K$ and let A be an open neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Let $f : cl(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and assume that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the unique global maximum point of f and the Hessian $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is negative definite. Let (f_N) be a sequence of functions with bounded partial derivatives up to order 2 converging uniformly to those of f . Then for N large enough, f_N has a unique maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \prec 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $\{\mathbf{x}_N\}$ is a sequence of any maximizer of f_N which exists since $cl(A)$ is compact. Then there exists a subsequence $\{N_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $\{\mathbf{x}_{N_n}\}$ converges to some \mathbf{y} . Clearly $f_{N_n}(\mathbf{x}_{N_n}) \geq f_{N_n}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in cl(A)$. Therefore by uniform convergence and taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that $f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in cl(A)$. This implies that $\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ by uniqueness of the global maximizers of f and therefore, $\mathcal{H}_f(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \prec 0$. Now since f_N converges uniformly to f one has that for N large enough the maximizer $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$ of f_N is unique and $\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \prec 0$. □

Lemma A.3. For $\delta \in (0, 1/6]$, the following bound holds:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} |\nabla \zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \zeta_{N,t}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,t}) \mathcal{O}(N^{1/2+\delta}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. The proof is carried in two steps, the first is to compute $\nabla \zeta_N(\mathbf{x})$ and the second finds the supremum.

Step 1: Let's recall from (4.46) that,

$$\zeta_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{l=1}^K \left(\frac{N_l}{\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2}} \right) \exp \{ -H_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}) \}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Suppose that $\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2}$ is any real number, then the binomial coefficient becomes a continuous binomial coefficient and can be expanded using the arguments of [47, 51]. Now, using gamma functions, we have that for each $l = 1, \dots, K$:

$$A_{N_l}(x_l) = \binom{N_l}{\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2}} = \frac{\Gamma(N_l + 1)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{N_l(1-x_l)}{2} + 1\right)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

For a given component l , differentiating with respect to x_l gives:

$$\frac{\partial A_{N_l}(x_l)}{\partial x_l} = A_{N_l}(x_l) \left(-\psi\left(\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2} + 1\right) \cdot \frac{N_l}{2} + \psi\left(\frac{N_l(1-x_l)}{2} + 1\right) \cdot \frac{N_l}{2} \right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Here, $\psi(z)$ is the digamma function, the derivative of $\log \Gamma(z)$. Now, using the asymptotic expansion of ψ and the properties of Γ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi\left(\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2} + 1\right) &= \log\left(\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{N_l(1+x_l)} + \mathcal{O}(N_l^{-2}) \quad \text{and} \\ \psi\left(\frac{N_l(1-x_l)}{2} + 1\right) &= \log\left(\frac{N_l(1-x_l)}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{N_l(1-x_l)} + \mathcal{O}(N_l^{-2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Now, by the product and chain rule, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} &= \frac{\partial A_{N_l}(x_l)}{\partial x_l} \prod_{p \neq l} A_{N_p}(x_p) \cdot \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})) + A_{N_l}(x_l) \cdot \prod_{p \neq l} A_{N_p}(x_p) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})) \\
&= \prod_{p \leq K} A_{N_p}(x_p) \frac{N_l}{2} \left(\log \left(\frac{N_l(1-x_l)}{2} \right) - \log \left(\frac{N_l(1+x_l)}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{N_l(1-x_l)} - \frac{1}{N_l(1+x_l)} + \mathcal{O}(N_l^{-2}) \right) \times \\
&\quad \times \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})) + \prod_{p \leq K} A_{N_p}(x_p) A_{N_l}(x_l) \cdot N \left\{ \sum_{p=1}^K \Delta_{l,p} x_p + \tilde{h}_l + \frac{t_l \sqrt{N_l}}{N} \right\} \cdot \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})) \\
&= \prod_{p \leq K} A_{N_p}(x_p) \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})) \left(-N_l \operatorname{arctanh}(x_l) + \frac{x_l}{(1-x_l^2)} + \mathcal{O}(N_l^{-1}) \right) + \\
&\quad + \prod_{p \leq K} A_{N_p}(x_p) \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot N \left\{ \sum_{p=1}^K \Delta_{l,p} x_p + \tilde{h}_l + \frac{t_l \sqrt{N_l}}{N} \right\} \\
&= \underbrace{\prod_{p \leq K} A_{N_p}(x_p) \exp(-H_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}))}_{=\zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})} \times \\
&\quad \times \left[N \underbrace{\left\{ \sum_{p=1}^K \Delta_{l,p} x_p + \tilde{h}_l - \alpha_{N,l} \operatorname{arctanh}(x_l) + \frac{t_l \sqrt{N_l}}{N} \right\}}_{=\frac{\partial f_{N,\mathbf{t}}}{\partial x_l}} + \frac{x_l}{(1-x_l^2)} + \mathcal{O}(N_l^{-1}) \right] \\
&= \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) \left(N \frac{\partial f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} + \frac{x_l}{(1-x_l^2)} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) \right). \quad (\text{A.7})
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2: Observe from the last equality in (A.7) that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} |\nabla \zeta_N(\mathbf{x})| = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} \left\{ \left| \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) \left(N \frac{\partial f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} + \frac{x_l}{(1-x_l^2)} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}) \right) \right| \right\}_{l \leq K}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Now, for each $l \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, by the Mean Value Theorem, there exists a point \mathbf{c} in the line segment connecting $[\mathbf{x}, \mu_{N,\mathbf{t}}]$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} &= \frac{\partial f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mu_{N,\mathbf{t}})}{\partial x_l} + \sum_{p=1}^K \frac{\partial^2 f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{c})}{\partial x_l \partial x_p} (x_p - \mu_{N,\mathbf{t},p}) \\
&= \sum_{p=1}^K \frac{\partial^2 f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{c})}{\partial x_l \partial x_p} (x_p - \mu_{N,\mathbf{t},p}).
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} \left| \frac{\partial f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} \right| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{c} \in B_{N,\delta}} \sum_{p=1}^K \left| \frac{\partial^2 f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{c})}{\partial x_l \partial x_p} \right| N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} |\nabla f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})| = \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2+\delta}) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and using (4.31) we have that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) \leq (1 + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1})) \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} \sqrt{\frac{1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}^2}{1 - \mathbf{x}^2}} = \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

This implies that,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} \left| \frac{\partial \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} \right| \leq \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \mathcal{O}(N^{1/2+\delta}). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} |\nabla \zeta_N(\mathbf{x})| &\leq \max_{l \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_{N,\delta}} \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot N \cdot \sup_{\mathbf{c} \in B_{N,\delta}} \sum_{p=1}^K \left| \frac{\partial^2 f_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{c})}{\partial x_l \partial x_p} \right| N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta} \right\} \\ &= \zeta_{N,\mathbf{t}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \mathcal{O}(N^{1/2+\delta}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

□

Lemma A.4. Let Ω be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^K . Let $f_N : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of functions such that for N large enough it has a unique global maximum point $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N \in \Omega$ and $\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \prec 0$ with bounded partial derivatives up to order 3. For any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^K$, consider the function

$$g_N(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x}) = f_N(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Then for sufficiently large N , the function $g_N(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x})$ also has a unique global maximizer with $\mathcal{H}_{g_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \prec 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the following expansion holds:

$$g_N(\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) - f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) = -\frac{1}{2N}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Proof. In order to prove (A.16) let's start with

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} g_N(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_N(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Now, since $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ is a maximizer of $g_N(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x})$ then

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} g_N(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}} = \mathbf{0} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Now, we take the gradient on both sides obtaining:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{t}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Let's notice from equation (A.15), and using the fact that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$ are the global maximizers of $g_N(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x})$ and $f_N(\mathbf{x})$ respectively, we have that:

$$g_N(\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) - f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) = \underbrace{f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) - f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)}_{=\Phi_N} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

By an application of Taylor's expansion of $f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}})$ around $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$:

$$\Phi_N = \frac{1}{2} \left((\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_N), \mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}). \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Now to compute Φ_N , we need $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_N$. To begin with, let's first observe from equation (A.15) that, when $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}$: $g_N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = f_N(\mathbf{x})$ and hence $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,0} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_N$. Therefore taking Taylor's expansion of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}$ around $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}$ and using (A.19):

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,0} &= \nabla_{\mathbf{t}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,0} \mathbf{t} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{A.22}$$

It now follows from (A.21) that,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_N &= \frac{1}{2N} \left(\mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t}, \mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2})\end{aligned}\tag{A.23}$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}g_N(\mathbf{t}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N,\mathbf{t}}) - f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) &= \frac{1}{2N} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2N} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathcal{H}_{f_N}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \mathbf{t} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\mathbf{t}, \sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_N \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}).\end{aligned}\tag{A.24}$$

This completes the proof. □

APPENDIX B. APPROXIMATION LEMMAS

In this section, standard mathematical approximations which played a crucial role in the asymptotic expansion of the partition function is given.

Lemma B.1 (Multidimensional Riemann Approximation). Let $Q = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times \dots \times [a_K, b_K]$ be a rectangular domain in \mathbb{R}^K , and let $P = \{(x_{1,0}, \dots, x_{K,0}), (x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{K,1}), \dots, (x_{1,n}, \dots, x_{K,n})\}$ be any partition of Q , where $a_i = x_{i,0} < x_{i,1} < \dots < x_{i,n} = b_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Assume that g has continuous partial derivatives $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}$ on Q for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Let $\epsilon_i = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} (x_{i,j} - x_{i,j-1})$ denote the mesh size of the partition along the i -th variable. Then:

$$\left| \int_Q g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K=1}^n g(\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^K (x_{i, j_i} - x_{i, j_i-1}) \right| \leq K n^{K-1} \max_{i \leq K} (b^{(i)} - a^{(i)}) \max_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in Q} \|\nabla g(\boldsymbol{\xi})\| \prod_{i=1}^K \epsilon_i \tag{B.1}$$

where $\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r}$ is any point in the j_1 -th subinterval along the first variable, j_2 -th subinterval along the second variable, and so on, up to the j_K -th subinterval along the K -th variable.

Proof. To begin with, we can decompose the integral into summation of integrals over all the poly-intervals Q_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K} constituting the mesh grid:

$$\int_Q g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K=1}^n \int_{Q_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Using the fact the g is continuous and that each poly-interval is compact, we can use the integral mean value theorem. Therefore for any j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K there exists a $\tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}$ such that

$$\int_{Q_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = g(\tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}) \prod_{i=1}^K (x_{i, j_i} - x_{i, j_i-1}). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

This allows us to rewrite the l.h.s. of (B.1) as a unique summation:

$$\sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K=1}^n (g(\tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}) - g(\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K})) \prod_{i=1}^K (x_{i, j_i} - x_{i, j_i-1}). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

In order to bound its absolute value we use the triangular inequality, Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the multivariate version of Lagrange's mean value theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K=1}^n (g(\tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}) - g(\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K})) \prod_{i=1}^K (x_{i, j_i} - x_{i, j_i-1}) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K=1}^n \max_{\xi \in Q_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}} \|\nabla g(\xi)\| \|\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K} - \tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}\| \prod_{i=1}^K |x_{i, j_i} - x_{i, j_i-1}| \\ & \leq \max_{\xi \in Q} \|\nabla g(\xi)\| \prod_{i=1}^K \epsilon_i \sum_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K=1}^n \|\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K} - \tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Let us briefly focus on the last factor, and let us consider only the summation w.r.t., say, j_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j_1=1}^n \|\mathbf{c}_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K} - \tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}\| & \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j_1=1}^n \left| c_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}^{(i)} - \tau_{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K}^{(i)} \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j_1=1}^n \left| x_{j_1}^{(i)} - x_{j_1-1}^{(i)} \right| = \sum_{i=1}^K (b^{(i)} - a^{(i)}) \leq K \max_{i \leq K} (b^{(i)} - a^{(i)}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where we used the standard $L^2 - L^1$ norm inequality and (i) denotes the i -th component. Hence difference between the Riemann sum and the integral is controlled by

$$K n^{K-1} \max_{i \leq K} (b^{(i)} - a^{(i)}) \max_{\xi \in Q} \|\nabla g(\xi)\| \prod_{i=1}^K \epsilon_i. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

□

Remark B.1. Notice that if all $\epsilon_i = \frac{b^{(i)} - a^{(i)}}{n}$ then the above is still of order

$$N n^{K-1} \max_{i \leq K} (b^{(i)} - a^{(i)})^{K+1} \frac{1}{n^K} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

which means it still vanishes when the decomposition is fine enough ($n \rightarrow \infty$), and if the dimension K is not diverging.

Lemma B.2 (Multivariate Laplace Approximation). Let $f_N : Q \subset \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable sequence of function bounded away from the boundary of $Q = \times_{l=1}^K [\mu_{N,l} + N_l^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta}, \mu_{N,l} + N_l^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}]$, satisfying $\nabla f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \prec 0$, such that $f_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) > f_N(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in Q$. Let $g(\mathbf{x})$ be analytic function in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$, then for $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{6})$ the following hold:

$$\int_Q g(\mathbf{x}) e^{Nf_N(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x} = \sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^K}{\prod_{l=1}^K N_l \det(-\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N))}} g(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) e^{Nf_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)} (1 + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta})). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Here, ∇f_N is the gradient vector.

Proof. Observe from the left hand side of equation (B.9) that:

$$\mathcal{L} = \int_Q g(\mathbf{x}) e^{Nf_N(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mu_{N,1}-N_1^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}}^{\mu_{N,1}+N_1^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} \cdots \int_{\mu_{N,K}-N_K^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}}^{\mu_{N,K}+N_K^{-\frac{1}{2}+\delta}} g(x_1, \dots, x_K) e^{Nf_N(x_1, \dots, x_K)} dx_1 \cdots dx_K. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Let's consider the following change of variables $t_l = \sqrt{N_l}(x_l - \mu_{N,l})$ for $l = 1, \dots, K$. Then it follows that: $x_l = \frac{t_l}{\sqrt{N_l}} + \mu_{N,l}$ and $dx_l = \frac{dt_l}{\sqrt{N_l}}$. Now, the bounds on $\mathbf{x} \in Q$ becomes $t_l \in [-N_l^\delta, N_l^\delta]$ and the integral transforms into:

$$\mathcal{L} = \int_{-N_1^\delta}^{N_1^\delta} \cdots \int_{-N_K^\delta}^{N_K^\delta} g\left(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} + \mu_{N,1}, \dots, \frac{t_K}{\sqrt{N_K}} + \mu_{N,K}\right) e^{Nf_N\left(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} + \mu_{N,1}, \dots, \frac{t_K}{\sqrt{N_K}} + \mu_{N,K}\right)} \prod_{l=1}^K \frac{dt_l}{\sqrt{N_l}}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

By an application of Taylor expansion of f_N and g around the vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_N$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{Nf_N\left(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} + \mu_{N,1}, \dots, \frac{t_K}{\sqrt{N_K}} + \mu_{N,K}\right)} &= e^{Nf_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)\mathbf{t})} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N\left(\frac{N^\delta}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^3\right)\right) \quad \text{and} \\ g\left(\frac{t_1}{\sqrt{N_1}} + \mu_{N,1}, \dots, \frac{t_K}{\sqrt{N_K}} + \mu_{N,K}\right) &= g(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) + \nabla g(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \left(\frac{N^\delta}{\sqrt{N}}\right) = \\ &= g(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{\delta-1/2}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Now, following from (B.12), the right side of (B.11) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \prod_{l=1}^K \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_l}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{\delta-1/2}\right)\right) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{3\delta-1/2}\right)\right) g(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) e^{Nf_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{-N_1^\delta}^{N_1^\delta} \cdots \int_{-N_K^\delta}^{N_K^\delta} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{t}\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)\mathbf{t})} d\mathbf{t} \\ &= \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(N^{3\delta-1/2}\right)\right) \sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^K}{\prod_{l=1}^K N_l \det(-\mathcal{H}_{f_N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N))}} g(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N) e^{Nf_N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_N)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Notice that we have bounded t_l by its limit N_l^δ . This completes the proof of Lemma B.2. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Alberici, F. Camilli, P. Contucci, and E. Mingione. The multi-species mean-field spin-glass on the nishimori line. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 182, 01 2021.
- [2] D. Alberici, F. Camilli, P. Contucci, and E. Mingione. The solution of the deep boltzmann machine on the nishimori line. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 387, 10 2021.
- [3] D. Alberici, F. Camilli, P. Contucci, and E. Mingione. A statistical physics approach to a multi-channel wigner spiked model. *Europhysics Letters*, 136(4):48001, 2022.
- [4] D. Alberici, P. Contucci, and E. Mingione. Deep Boltzmann Machines: rigorous results at arbitrary depth. *Annales Institut Henri Poincaré (to appear)*, 2021.
- [5] L. Andreis and D. Tovazzi. Coexistence of stable limit cycles in a generalized Curie–Weiss model with dissipation. *Journal of statistical physics*, 173(1):163–181, 2018.
- [6] N. Ayi and N. Pouradier Duteil. Mean-field and graph limits for collective dynamics models with time-varying weights. *Journal of differential equations*, 299:65–110, 2021.
- [7] J. Baik and J. O. Lee. Free energy of bipartite spherical sherrington–kirkpatrick model. *Annales Institut Henri Poincaré*, 56, 2020.
- [8] A. Barra, P. Contucci, E. Mingione, and D. Tantari. Multi-species mean field spin glasses. rigorous results. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 16, pages 691–708. Springer, 2015.
- [9] A. Barra, G. Genovese, and F. Guerra. Equilibrium statistical mechanics of bipartite spin systems. *Journal of physics. A, Mathematical and theoretical*, 44(24):245002, 2011.
- [10] R. Bidaux, N. Boccara, and G. Forgàcs. Three-spin interaction Ising model with a nondegenerate ground state at zero applied field. *Journal of statistical physics*, 45:113–134, 1986.
- [11] L. Blume and S. Durlauf. Equilibrium concepts for social interaction models. *International game theory review*, 05(03):193–209, 2003.
- [12] W. A. Brock and S. N. Durlauf. Discrete choice with social interactions. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 68(2):235–260, 2001.
- [13] R. Burioni, P. Contucci, M. Fedele, C. Vernia, and A. Vezzani. Enhancing participation to health screening campaigns by group interactions. *Scientific reports*, 5(1):9904, 2015.
- [14] F. Camilli, P. Contucci, and E. Mingione. Central limit theorem for the overlaps on the nishimori line. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19943*, 2023.
- [15] F. Collet. Macroscopic limit of a bipartite Curie–Weiss model: A dynamical approach. *Journal of statistical physics*, 157(6):1301–1319, 2014.
- [16] F. Collet, M. Formentin, and D. Tovazzi. Rhythmic behavior in a two-population mean-field Ising model. *Physical review. E*, 94(4–1):042139, 2016.
- [17] P. Contucci and S. Ghirlanda. Modelling society with statistical mechanics: an application to cultural contact and immigration. *Quality and Quantity*, 41:569–578, 2007.
- [18] P. Contucci, J. Kertész, and G. Osabutey. Human-AI ecosystem with abrupt changes as a function of the composition. *PloS one*, 17(5):e0267310, 2022.
- [19] P. Contucci, E. Mingione, and G. Osabutey. Limit theorems for the cubic mean-field Ising model. *Annales Henri Poincaré. A Journal of Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 25(11):5019–5044, 2024.
- [20] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2010.
- [21] P. Dey and Q. Wu. Fluctuation results for multi-species sherrington-kirkpatrick model in the replica symmetric regime. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 185, 12 2021.
- [22] T. Eisele and R. S. Ellis. Multiple phase transitions in the generalized Curie-Weiss model. *Journal of statistical physics*, 52(1–2):161–202, 1988.
- [23] R. S. Ellis and C. M. Newman. The statistics of Curie-Weiss models. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 19(2):149–161, 1978.
- [24] M. Fedele and P. Contucci. Scaling limits for multi-species statistical mechanics mean-field models. *Journal of statistical physics*, 144(6):1186–1205, 2011.
- [25] M. Fleermann, W. Kirsch, and G. Toth. Local central limit theorem for multi-group Curie–Weiss models. *Journal of theoretical probability*, 35(3):2009–2019, 2022.
- [26] S. Frøyen, A. S. Sudbø, and P. Hemmer. Ising models with two- and three-spin interactions: mean field equation of state. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 85(2):399–408, 1976.

- [27] S. Galam, C. S. O. Yokoi, and S. R. Salinas. Metamagnets in uniform and random fields. *Phys. Rev. B*, 57:8370–8374, Apr 1998.
- [28] I. Gallo and P. Contucci. Bipartite mean field spin systems. existence and solution. *Mathematical Physics Electronic Journal [electronic only]*, 14:Paper No. 1, 21 p.–Paper No. 1, 21 p., 2008.
- [29] G. Genovese and A. Barra. A certain class of Curie-Weiss models. 2009.
- [30] G. Genovese and D. Tantari. Non-convex multipartite ferromagnets. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 163(3):492–513, 2016.
- [31] G. Giacomin and C. Poquet. Noise, interaction, nonlinear dynamics and the origin of rhythmic behaviors. *brazilian journal of probab. Stat*, 29(2):460–493, 2015.
- [32] M. Gsänger, V. Hösel, C. Mohamad-Klotzbach, and J. Müller. Opinion models, election data, and political theory. *Entropy (Basel, Switzerland)*, 26(3):212, 2024.
- [33] F. Guerra and F. Lucio Toninelli. Central limit theorem for fluctuations in the high temperature region of the sherrington–kirkpatrick spin glass model. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 43(12):6224–6237, 2002.
- [34] F. Guerra and F. L. Toninelli. Quadratic replica coupling in the sherrington–kirkpatrick mean field spin glass model. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 43(7):3704–3716, 2002.
- [35] J.-C. M. Hong-Bin Chen. On the free energy of vector spin glasses with non-convex interactions. *Preprint arXiv:2311.08980*, 2023.
- [36] M. Kac. Mathematical mechanisms of phase transitions. pp 241-305 of *Statistical Physics, Phase Transitions, and Superfluidity. Vol. I. Chretien, M. Gross, E. P. Deser, S. (eds.). New York, Gordon and Breach, Science Publishers, 1968.*, 10 1969.
- [37] J. M. Kincaid and E. G. D. Cohen. Phase diagrams of liquid helium mixtures and metamagnets: experiment and mean field theory. *Physics Reports*, 22(2):57–143, 1975.
- [38] W. Kirsch. *A mathematical view on voting and power*, page 251–279. EMS Press, Zuerich, Switzerland, 2016.
- [39] W. Kirsch and J. Langner. *The fate of the square root law for correlated voting*, page 147–158. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014.
- [40] W. Kirsch and G. Toth. Two groups in a Curie-Weiss model. *Mathematical Physics Analysis and Geometry*, 23(2), 2020.
- [41] W. Kirsch and G. Toth. Limit theorems for multi-group Curie–Weiss models via the method of moments. *Mathematical Physics Analysis and Geometry*, 25(4), 2022.
- [42] H. Knöpfel, M. Löwe, K. Schubert, and A. Sinulis. Fluctuation results for general block spin Ising models. *Journal of statistical physics*, 178(5):1175–1200, 2020.
- [43] M. Löwe and K. Schubert. Fluctuations for block spin Ising models. *Electronic communications in probability*, 23, 2018.
- [44] M. Marsman, C. C. Tanis, T. M. Bechger, and L. J. Waldorp. *Network psychometrics in educational practice: Maximum likelihood estimation of the Curie-Weiss model*, page 93–120. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019.
- [45] J.-C. Mourrat. Nonconvex interactions in mean-field spin glasses. *arXiv e-prints*, 2020.
- [46] S. Mukherjee and S. Sen. Variational inference in high-dimensional linear regression, 2021. [arXiv:2104.12232](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.12232).
- [47] S. Mukherjee, J. Son, and B. B. Bhattacharya. Fluctuations of the magnetization in the p -spin Curie-Weiss model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 387(2):681–728, 2021.
- [48] A. A. Opoku and G. Osabutey. Multipopulation spin models: A view from large deviations theoretic window. *Journal of mathematics*, 2018:1–13, 2018.
- [49] A. A. Opoku, G. Osabutey, and C. Kwofie. Parameter evaluation for a statistical mechanical model for binary choice with social interaction. *Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 2019, 2019.
- [50] D. Panchenko. The free energy in a multi-species Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model. *The Annals of Probability*, 43(6):3494 – 3513, 2015.
- [51] D. Salwinski. The continuous binomial coefficient: An elementary approach. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 125(3), 2018.
- [52] E. Subag. TAP approach for multispecies spherical spin glasses II: The free energy of the pure models. *The Annals of Probability*, 51(3):1004 – 1024, 2023.
- [53] M. Talagrand. *Spin glasses: a challenge for mathematicians: cavity and mean field models*, volume 46. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.

FRANCESCO CAMILLI

Email address: fcamilli@ictp.it

EMANUELE MINGIONE

Email address: emanuele.mingione2@unibo.it

GODWIN OSABUTEY

Current address: Department of Physics, Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia,
Modena, Italy

Email address: gosabutey@unimore.it