

OPTIMAL DELOCALIZATION FOR GENERALIZED WIGNER MATRICES

L. BENIGNI

University of Chicago
lbenigni@math.uchicago.edu

P. LOPATTO*

Harvard University
lopatto@math.harvard.edu

ABSTRACT

We study the eigenvectors of generalized Wigner matrices with subexponential entries and prove that they delocalize at the optimal rate with overwhelming probability. We also prove high probability delocalization bounds with sharp constants. Our proof uses an analysis of the eigenvector moment flow introduced by [Bourgade and Yau \(2017\)](#) to bound logarithmic moments of eigenvector entries for random matrices with small Gaussian components. We then extend this control to all generalized Wigner matrices by comparison arguments based on a framework of regularized eigenvectors, level repulsion, and the observable employed by [Landon, Lopatto, and Marcinek \(2018\)](#) to compare extremal eigenvalue statistics. Additionally, we prove level repulsion and eigenvalue overcrowding estimates for the entire spectrum, which may be of independent interest.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main results	2
1.2	Background	4
1.3	Proof strategy	5
1.4	Outline of the paper	9
2	Preliminaries	9
2.1	Dyson Brownian motion	10
2.2	Local semicircle law	10
3	Relaxation by Dyson Brownian motion	11
3.1	Eigenvector moment flow	11
3.2	Eigenvector moments of Gaussian divisible ensembles	12
4	Eigenvector regularization	16
4.1	Construction of regularized eigenvector projections	16
4.2	Estimates on regularized eigenvector projections	19
5	Proofs of main results	25
5.1	Proof of Theorem 1.2	25
5.2	Proof of Theorem 1.3	30
5.3	Proof of Theorem 1.4	33

*P.L. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1606305, NSF grant DMS-1855509, and the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant DGE-1144152.

A Eigenvalue regularization	34
B Level repulsion estimates	38
B.1 Level repulsion for Gaussian divisible ensembles	38
B.2 Level repulsion for generalized Wigner matrices	45
C Preliminary estimates	51

1. INTRODUCTION

Disordered quantum systems often exhibit one of two paradigmatic behaviors, existing in either a *localized phase*, with insulating properties, or a *delocalized phase*, with conducting properties. This work considers a fundamental example of a random Hamiltonian in the delocalized phase, the Wigner matrix, which is a real symmetric (or complex Hermitian) random matrix whose entries are independent up to the symmetry constraint. First introduced by Wigner in his pioneering investigations of heavy atomic nuclei, it represents a mean-field quantum system where transitions are possible between any two states, with uniformly comparable transition probabilities [58–60].

To illustrate the delocalization phenomenon, we consider the Gaussian Orthogonal Ensemble (GOE). We recall this ensemble is defined as the $N \times N$ real symmetric random matrix $\text{GOE}_N = \{g_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}$ whose upper triangular entries g_{ij} are mutually independent Gaussian random variables with variances $(1 + \mathbb{1}_{i=j})N^{-1}$. It is well known that the distribution of GOE_N is invariant under conjugacy by orthogonal matrices. Therefore, its ℓ^2 -normalized eigenvectors are rotationally invariant and uniformly distributed on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{N-1} . Using this observation, it is straightforward to prove (see, for instance, [50, Theorem 2.1]) that if \mathbf{u} is any eigenvector of the GOE_N , then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{2K^3 \log N}{N}} \right) \leq 2N^{1-K} + \exp \left(-\frac{(K-1)^2}{4K} N \right) \quad (1.1)$$

for any $K > 1$. The bound (1.1) shows that any eigenvector \mathbf{u} of GOE_N is strongly delocalized, meaning its mass is distributed approximately equally among its coordinates. Both the growth rate $\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}$ and the constant $\sqrt{2}$ are optimal; this can be seen by approximating entries of vectors uniformly distributed on the sphere by independent Gaussian random variables [21, 22, 42].

It was conjectured in [50] that delocalization with rate $\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}$ persists when the Gaussian entries g_{ij} are replaced with any subexponential distribution. Figure 1 illustrates the conjecture for a Bernoulli random matrix. For general distributions, it is no longer possible to appeal to rotational invariance, and an entirely different method is needed. The goal of this paper is to establish the optimal rate in this case, and additionally capture the optimal constant. We also prove isotropic versions of these results.

1.1. Main results. We first define generalized Wigner matrices with uniformly subexponential entries.

Definition 1.1. *A generalized Wigner matrix H is a real symmetric or complex Hermitian $N \times N$ matrix whose upper triangular elements $\{h_{ij}\}_{i \leq j}$ are independent random variables with mean zero and variances $\sigma_{ij}^2 = \mathbb{E}(|h_{ij}|^2)$ that satisfy*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{ij}^2 = 1 \quad \text{for all } j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\frac{c}{N} \leq \sigma_{ij}^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \quad (1.3)$$




Figure 1: The delocalization phenomenon for the first and middle eigenvectors of a symmetric 2000×2000 matrix with centered ± 1 entries.

for some constants $C, c > 0$. Further, there exists a constant $d > 0$ such that, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ and $t > 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|h_{ij}| > t\sigma_{ij}) \leq d^{-1} \exp(-t^d). \quad (1.4)$$

Our first main result shows that delocalization with the optimal rate $\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}$ holds for these matrices with an error probability that may be taken as small as any power of N . It is analogous to (1.1) with K large. We also provide an isotropic version.

Theorem 1.2. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Then for every $D > 0$, there exists $C = C(D) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\ell \in [1, N]} \|\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty \geq C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}\right) \leq CN^{-D} \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\ell \in [1, N]} |\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle| \geq C\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}\right) \leq CN^{-D}. \quad (1.6)$$

Our second main result captures the optimal delocalization constant for the ℓ^∞ norm of an eigenvector. It corresponds to (1.1) with K close to 1. We again obtain an isotropic version of this statement where we give an upper bound on any individual eigenvector projection. Since this is not an extreme statistics, we do not expect the constant to be optimal in this case.

Theorem 1.3. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{(2 + \varepsilon) \log N}{N}}\right) \leq CN^{-c} \quad (1.7)$$

and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle| \geq \sqrt{\frac{(2 + \varepsilon) \log N}{eN}}\right) \leq CN^{-c} \quad (1.8)$$

for all $\ell \in [1, N]$ when H is real symmetric. If H is complex Hermitian, the $2 + \varepsilon$ is replaced by $1 + \varepsilon$.

Finally, for generalized Wigner matrices with smoother entry distributions, we are able to give an optimal form of delocalization for the maximal entry of the whole eigenbasis. The delocalization constants in this theorem are also sharp (see [42, Proposition 1]).

Theorem 1.4. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix and $\vartheta > 0$. Assume that $\sqrt{N}H_{ij}$ has a density $e^{-V_{N,i,j}(x)} dx$ such that for any $k \geq 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$|V_{N,i,j}^{(k)}(x)| \leq CN^{k(1/6-\vartheta)}(1+|x|)^C \quad (1.9)$$

for all $i, j \in [1, N]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist constants $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\ell \in [1, N]} \|\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{(4+\varepsilon) \log N}{N}} \right) \leq CN^{-c} \quad (1.10)$$

when H is real symmetric. If H is complex Hermitian, the $4 + \varepsilon$ is replaced by $2 + \varepsilon$.

1.2. Background. The literature on eigenvector delocalization is extensive and we review here only the previous works most relevant to our results. For a broader overview, the interested reader may consult a number of recent surveys [14, 33, 50].

The first strong delocalization bounds were achieved in the seminal papers [28–30]. They showed that $\|\sqrt{N}\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty \leq (\log N)^4$ with very high probability, for matrices with independent, identically distributed entries, but required that the entries possess a density satisfying a certain smoothness assumption, and that the eigenvectors correspond to eigenvalues in the bulk of the spectrum. Their method uses resolvent estimates to prove a *local semicircle law* on small scales by a descending bootstrap argument. This law provides a quantitative rate for the convergence of the empirical spectral distribution to its limit on small intervals (shrinking in N). Refinements of this approach to establishing delocalization appear in a number of later works. The smoothness assumption was relaxed in [55], which gave an upper bound of $(\log N)^{20}$, and delocalization was extended to eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalues at the edge of the spectrum in [54] with a bound of $(\log N)^C$ for some $C > 0$. For generalized Wigner matrices with subexponential decay, as defined in Definition 1.1, delocalization was proved in [34] with rate $(\log N)^{13+6/d}$ for bulk eigenvectors. It was extended in [35] to all eigenvectors with an upper bound of roughly $(\log N)^{\log \log N}$.

The first optimal bound was proved in [57] using a different technique, which centers on the study of random weighted projections in high dimensions. Using it, the authors were able to establish the local semicircle law on scales even smaller than those previously accessible. As a consequence, for matrices with independent, identically distributed, and bounded entries, they obtained the $\sqrt{\log N}$ rate for bulk eigenvectors and a $\log N$ rate for edge eigenvectors. The boundedness hypothesis can be relaxed to requiring only that the entries are sub-Gaussian by combining their method with [51], as remarked in [50, Section 4]. For uniformly subexponential entries, as defined in (1.4), the same technique bounds $\|\sqrt{N}\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty$ by $\log^{1/2+1/d} N$ for bulk eigenvectors and $\log^{1+2/d} N$ for eigenvectors close to the spectral edges [50, Corollary 4.4]. The method of [57] was later applied in [23] to reach the optimal $\sqrt{\log N}$ delocalization rate for Wigner-type matrices with sub-Gaussian entries in the bulk.

These results concerned delocalization for the extremal coordinates of eigenvectors, as in (1.5). The first result regarding isotropic delocalization, as in (1.6), gave a bound of $(\log N)^{\log \log N}$ for Wigner matrices [44]. This result was extended in [12] to generalized Wigner matrices; they gave a bound of N^ε for any $\varepsilon > 0$, for all eigenvectors and sufficiently large N .

While all these results assume the existence of arbitrarily large moments of the entries (at least), recent works have aimed to weaken this assumption and consider distributions with heavier tails. In [1], complete delocalization in the bulk was proved with rate $(\log N)^C$ under the existence of $2 + \varepsilon$ moments for generalized Wigner matrices. In [37, 38], the optimal rate $\sqrt{\log N}$ for all eigenvectors was shown under the existence of a fourth moment, but with a weak probability bound and the requirement that the entries have identical variances.

From this overview, we see that our improvements to the state of the art are threefold:

- *Optimal delocalization rate with very high probability throughout the spectrum:* Theorem 1.2 is the first delocalization result for generalized Wigner matrices that controls *all* eigenvectors with the optimal rate $\sqrt{\log N}$ and probability $1 - N^{-D}$ for any $D > 0$. This estimate permits a union bound over all eigenvectors to control the entire eigenbasis with rate $\sqrt{\log N}$ and very high probability; such a result is inaccessible with the weaker probability bounds obtained in [37, 38]. Another difference is that we *do not* require that the entries are identically distributed or have equal variances.
- *Optimal constants:* In Theorem 1.3, we prove that the constant $\sqrt{2}$ is a universal upper bound for the (appropriately rescaled) maximal entry of eigenvectors of symmetric generalized Wigner matrices. We also obtain the analogous result with constant 1 for Hermitian matrices. With a more restrictive hypothesis on the entries, we also obtain the optimal constant for the upper bound on the entire eigenbasis in Theorem 1.4. Previously, sharp constants were available only for integrable random matrix ensembles.
- *Optimal isotropic delocalization:* We give the first isotropic delocalization estimate that achieves the optimal rate $\sqrt{\log N}$.

While our results give an upper bound on the maximal coordinates of eigenvectors, there are other ways to describe the delocalization phenomenon. For instance, the asymptotic distribution of eigenvector entries was studied in [18, 43, 47, 56], where it was proved for generalized Wigner matrices that any fixed number of eigenvector entries are asymptotically independent Gaussian random variables. The entry distribution was also studied in [2] for Lévy matrices, whose entries have infinite variance, in the delocalized phase of the spectrum. It was shown there that the asymptotic distribution of an entry arises from a one-parameter family of non-Gaussian laws, with the exact distribution determined by the location of the corresponding eigenvalue.

Quantum unique ergodicity is another form of delocalization and consists of a concentration bound for an eigenvector's ℓ^2 mass averaged over a subset of coordinates. Such a result for generalized Wigner matrices was first given in [18] and was later strengthened in [19] for Gaussian divisible ensembles, where it was used to prove universality results for random band matrices. A strong form of quantum unique ergodicity for all generalized Wigner matrices was subsequently shown in [11]. *No gaps delocalization* was proved in [53], where the authors show that any subset of coordinates with size linear in N must contain some non-negligible ℓ^2 mass. A related result establishing a lower bound on the smallest coordinate of an eigenvector can be found in [50, Theorem 4.7].

Finally, for the eigenvectors of non-symmetric matrices, [52, Theorem 1.1] proved a delocalization bound with rate $\log^{9/2} N$ for matrices with independent, mean zero entries with variances at least 1 using a novel geometric method. In particular, they do not require that the entries have identical distributions, or even the same variance, and the bound holds with error probability N^{-D} for any $D > 0$. More general models and isotropic delocalization were considered in [5, 6].

1.3. Proof strategy. The proofs of our results are based on the dynamical approach to random matrix theory, which was introduced in [31] for proving the universality of local eigenvalue statistics. The proofs all broadly consist of the following three steps; our novel contributions come in the second and third steps.

Step 1: Rigidity and isotropic local law. To begin our analysis, we require *a priori* estimates on the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of our original matrix. The *rigidity* of eigenvalues for generalized Wigner ensembles was proved in [35] and states that with very high probability, all eigenvalues are close to their typical locations (which are deterministic). The *isotropic local law* for generalized Wigner matrices, proved in [12, 44], controls the resolvent of a generalized Wigner matrix as a quadratic form, and as a consequence bounds the inner products of eigenvectors with arbitrary unit vectors. We remark that we do not require that the local law holds down to the optimal scale $\frac{\log N}{N}$, since our optimal bounds instead arise from the next step; instead, we only need it on the scale $N^{-1+\varepsilon}$ for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$.

Step 2: Relaxation by the Dyson Brownian motion. We next use the *a priori* estimates on generalized Wigner matrices from the first step to study the eigenvectors of such matrices perturbed by a small additive Gaussian noise matrix, which we write as $\sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N$ for a parameter $t \ll 1$. It was shown in [18] that if t is viewed as a time parameter, the time evolution of moments of the eigenvector entries of $H + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N$ is governed by a system of differential equations with random coefficients (more precisely a random walk in a dynamic random environment) now known as the *eigenvector moment flow*. While this flow has been used to derive numerous eigenvector statistics for different models [2, 9, 10, 17, 19, 47], we refine the previous analyses to handle growing moments for the first time; we permit moments which may grow as fast as $(\log N)^C$ for any $C > 0$. Then, through a Markov inequality, we obtain the optimal delocalization estimates from these moment bounds. We emphasize that our strong control over these growing moments is the underlying mechanism that enables us to reach the optimal delocalization rate and optimal constants in our main theorems.

Step 3: Regularization and comparison. Finally, we extend the results from the previous step to show that the optimal delocalization bounds hold for *all* generalized Wigner matrices, not just those with additive noise. This is the most technical step, to which the majority of the paper is devoted.

At this juncture, the standard approach in the literature is the four moment method, which was first applied in random matrix theory in [54, 55]. The basic insight is that if two random matrices have entries whose first four moments match, then any sufficiently regular observable takes, in expectation, the same value for both matrices. To prove this, one replaces the entries of the first matrix with the second one by one, showing at each step that the given observable changes by a negligible amount, and then sums the error terms across all $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ replacements. The replacements are accomplished by Taylor expanding the observable in the matrix entries; the four moment matching condition is exactly what is needed for the resulting error bounds to be effective. At a high level, this approach parallels exactly Lindeberg's proof of the central limit theorem.

By standard results, given a generalized Wigner matrix H , it is possible to find a generalized Wigner matrix M and a short time $t \ll 1$ such that the first four moments of the entries of $M + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N$ match those of H (at least asymptotically). Given this, one hopes that the extension from the ensembles considered in the second step to all generalized Wigner matrices may be accomplished by the four moment method. However, we arrive at a central difficulty: the eigenvectors of a random matrix are highly singular observables, and it is difficult to control their derivatives with respect to matrix entries, which blocks control of the error terms in the Taylor expansion mentioned above. The same problem afflicts the other common approach to this step, the matrix continuity estimate of [18], which compares H to $H + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N$.

To overcome this obstacle, we introduce *regularized eigenvectors*, which are smooth versions of the usual eigenvectors with the advantage that they are amenable to the four moment comparison. Our construction builds on the regularization introduced in [43], and we discuss this work below, after completing our proof sketch.

Let H be a Wigner matrix with eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$, and let \mathbf{u}_i be the normalized eigenvector corresponding to λ_i . Fix $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, and let $\eta > 0$ be a parameter smaller than the typical eigenvalue spacing around λ_ℓ . Because the Poisson kernel integrates to 1, we have

$$|u_\ell(i)|^2 = \frac{\eta}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|u_\ell(i)|^2 dE}{(E - \lambda_\ell)^2 + \eta^2} \approx \frac{\eta}{\pi} \int_I \frac{|u_\ell(i)|^2 dE}{(E - \lambda_\ell)^2 + \eta^2}, \quad (1.11)$$

where I is an interval with length slightly larger than η centered at λ_ℓ . In the approximation, we removed a negligible portion of the integral, since the Poisson kernel is concentrated on scale η around E . If $G(z) = (H - z)^{-1}$ is the resolvent for H , defined for $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then the spectral theorem gives

$$\int_I \frac{|u_\ell(i)|^2 dE}{(E - \lambda_\ell)^2 + \eta^2} \leq \int_I \sum_j \frac{|u_j(i)|^2 dE}{(E - \lambda_j)^2 + \eta^2} = \int_I \text{Im } G_{ii}(E + i\eta) dE. \quad (1.12)$$

It is therefore natural to use the last term in (1.12) to define a regularized eigenvector entry which approximates $u_\ell(i)$. However, one must be careful, since in general this term could be much larger than $u_\ell(i)$ if several

eigenvalues cluster in the small interval I around λ_ℓ (as can be seen directly from the spectral expansion). Indeed, it is only possible to exclude eigenvalues other than λ_ℓ from I with probability at most $1 - N^{-c}$ for a small constant $c > 0$; while this suffices for Theorem 1.3 in combination with the appropriate observable (described below), it is far from the high probability bounds we require for Theorem 1.2.

However, we make the following observation: it is not necessary for the proof of Theorem 1.2 that the regularized eigenvector be approximately equal to the usual one, only that it be *comparable* up to some constant factor. As noted below, we are able to show that for any $D > 0$, there exists a constant C such that there are no more than C eigenvalues in I with probability at least $1 - N^{-D}$. This enables the very high probability comparison for Theorem 1.2, which is based on comparing growing moments of regularized eigenvectors.

While the high moment comparison we use to prove Theorem 1.2 is effective for obtaining very high probability bounds, it is too crude to preserve the optimal constants. For Theorem 1.3 we use the following smoothed maximal function as the observable in the four moment method, which was introduced in [45] to study extremal statistics of eigenvalues:

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \log \left(\sum_{i \in [1, N]} \exp(\beta u_\ell^2(i)) \right) \approx \|\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty^2, \quad (1.13)$$

where the approximation holds for large β (see (5.50) below). The observable (1.13) should be thought of as a free energy functional with inverse temperature parameter β . The motivation for this choice comes from statistical mechanics, where it is well known that the free energy at low temperature is close to the ground state.

Finally, we note that the comparison method sketched for Theorem 1.3 does not quite suffice for Theorem 1.4, since in the latter case it would require excluding eigenvalues in sub-microscopic intervals centered around every eigenvalue λ_i simultaneously, which is impossible. We therefore resort to the reverse heat flow method introduced in [27], which provides a strong comparison bound, but comes at the cost of requiring that the matrix entries have densities satisfying the smoothness hypothesis appearing in the statement of Theorem 1.4.

We now note two important technical points relevant to step 3 of the above outline. First, in order to control the number of eigenvalues in the small interval I centered at λ_ℓ , we require bounds known as *level repulsion estimates*. Suppose for simplicity that λ_ℓ is in the bulk, $\lambda_\ell \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa)$ for some $\kappa \in (0, 2)$, so that the typical eigenvalue spacing is N^{-1} . To exclude eigenvalues other than λ_ℓ from I , we require that for small enough $\delta > 0$, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\{j \in [1, N], \lambda_j \in (\lambda_\ell - cN^{-1-\delta}, \lambda_\ell + cN^{-1-\delta})\} \geq 2) \leq N^{-\alpha} \quad (1.14)$$

for any constant $c > 0$ and large enough N (depending on δ and c). For the high probability bound, we must show that for all $D > 0$, there exists a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\{j \in [1, N], \lambda_j \in (\lambda_\ell - cN^{-1-\delta}, \lambda_\ell + cN^{-1-\delta})\} > k) \leq N^{-D} \quad (1.15)$$

for large enough N . In the latter case, such bounds are also known as *overcrowding estimates*.

In the bulk, (1.15) was first proved in [30, Theorem 3.5] for Hermitian matrices, and the same argument was later adapted to symmetric matrices in [16, Appendix B]. The estimate (1.14) follows from the bulk universality result in [32]. Further, both estimates, for both symmetry classes, also follow from the main results of [48], which appeared later. At the edge, [15, Theorem 2.7] showed (1.14) for eigenvalues λ_i such that $i \in [1, N^{1/4}] \cup [N - N^{1/4}, N]$, where we order the eigenvalues from least to greatest. To the best of our knowledge, level repulsion estimates for adjacent eigenvalues have not been established for the intermediate regime between the bulk and the edge eigenvalues covered by [15], and overcrowding estimates have not been established outside of the bulk.

However, to complete step 3 of the outline for all eigenvectors, we require both kinds of estimates to hold throughout the spectrum. Therefore, in Appendix B, we prove Proposition 5.7, a level repulsion estimate for adjacent eigenvalues which holds with no restriction on the location of the eigenvalues, and Proposition 5.3, an

overcrowding estimate for sub-microscopic intervals anywhere in the spectrum. Proposition 5.7 is a straightforward consequence of the result [15] mentioned above and the analysis of Dyson Brownian motion given in [13], which gives gap universality throughout the spectrum. The proof of Proposition 5.3 is somewhat more involved. It proceeds by first establishing the result for generalized Wigner matrices with small Gaussian noise, then using a moment matching argument on (moments of) a smoothed eigenvalue counting observable to extend the bound to all generalized Wigner matrices. For the ensembles with Gaussian noise, we deal with the bulk of the spectrum by proving a slight generalization of a similar result from [46]. At the edge, we first obtain the result for the GOE_N and its Hermitian counterpart using determinantal estimates, then use a dynamical result from [13] to show it holds for any ensemble with a small Gaussian component.

The level repulsion estimate Proposition 5.7 also has an interesting consequence for the distribution of the eigenvectors. The proof of the asymptotic normality of the eigenvector entries given in [18] relies on level repulsion estimates for neighboring eigenvalues. However, because of the lack of such an estimate in the intermediate regime noted above, it was only possible to establish asymptotic normality for λ_i such that $i \in \llbracket 1, N^{1/4} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket N^{1-c}, N - N^{1-c} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket N - N^{1/4}, N \rrbracket$, where $c > 0$ is a small constant. Our Proposition 5.7 thus immediately implies the result for the entire spectrum after combining it with the argument in [18]; we state this as Corollary B.18.

Second, the regularization given in the heuristic (1.12) is not actually smooth enough for our purposes. The integral there is over an interval I centered at λ_ℓ , and to differentiate this integral with respect to a matrix entry also involves differentiating λ_ℓ . However, like the eigenvectors, the eigenvalues are too singular to permit the four moment comparison argument to go through. We therefore construct in Appendix A *regularized eigenvalues*, which serve as smooth counterparts to the usual eigenvalues (at least on a set of very high probability) and are suitable substitutes for the usual eigenvalues in the comparison. Such a construction was already performed for bulk eigenvalues in [45, Lemma 3.2]. Our method, which applies to all eigenvalues, is essentially the same, but the proof now requires a more careful treatment of the error terms to accommodate the varying inter-eigenvalue distances for eigenvalues outside the bulk.

We would like to acknowledge the fundamental work [43], which inspired the comparison strategy used in step 3 of the outline above. In [43], the authors provide a moment matching scheme for eigenvector observables which also uses a resolvent-based eigenvector regularization and level repulsion estimates. Using this framework, they prove, *inter alia*, that only two matching moments are needed for the comparison of edge eigenvectors, which implies universality for the entries of edge eigenvectors for generalized Wigner matrices. However, [43] considers a comparison with error probability N^{-c} for some small $c > 0$, instead of the N^{-D} for any $D > 0$ obtained in Theorem 1.2, and only eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalues in the bulk and very near the edge ([43, Theorem 1.6] is stated for eigenvectors \mathbf{u}_i for $i \in \llbracket 1, (\log N)^{C \log \log N} \rrbracket$ for any fixed $C > 0$). Further, only observables depending on a finite number of eigenvector entries are permitted. This contrasts with our delocalization results, which control $\mathcal{O}(N)$ entries simultaneously. We also note that results similar to those in [43] were proved soon after in [56], with the hypothesis of four matching moments.

We have stated our results in the context of generalized Wigner matrices mainly for brevity. The essential inputs to the argument are the *a priori* estimates listed in step 1 of the proof outline, and it is known that these hold for a broad class of mean-field ensembles [1, 3, 4, 20, 26], so it is likely our techniques apply more widely. In particular, the argument leading to the sharp constant in (1.3) is quite general and does not require the subexponential decay hypothesis on the entries (essentially because the final comparison step uses the free energy functional, instead of controlling growing moments). We note that the constant 2 is not correct in the general case and will depend on the asymptotic law of the spectrum for random matrices with a non-stochastic variance profile. Further, our results on level repulsion and overcrowding in Appendix B, our regularization of eigenvalues throughout the spectrum in Appendix A, and the very high probability comparison scheme from Section 5 may also be of independent interest.

Finally, Theorem 1.3 provides a first step to proving the universality of the distribution of the maximal entry

of an eigenvector. For the GOE_N , [42] proved the matching lower bound $\sqrt{N/\log N} \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sqrt{2}$ and obtained

$$\mathbb{P} \left(N \sup_{\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \|\mathbf{u}_\ell\|_\infty^2 - 4 \log N + \log \log N + \log(2\pi) \leq 2x \right) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} e^{-e^{-x}}.$$

We hope to address this question in future work.

1.4. Outline of the paper. We state the preliminary estimates we need from previous works in Section 2, such as local laws, rigidity, and delocalization. In Section 3, we define the eigenvector moment flow and perform the high moment analysis of the flow described in step 2 of our outline. In Section 4, we develop our eigenvector regularization scheme, assuming the eigenvalue regularization result proved in Appendix A and the level repulsion estimates proved in Appendix B. Finally, Section 5 is dedicated to the proofs of Theorem 1.2, Theorem 1.3, and Theorem 1.4. Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C prove the preliminary results necessary to regularize the eigenvectors.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank P. Bourgade for suggesting the current problem and many helpful conversations. P.L. thanks A. Aggarwal, B. Landon, P. Sosoe, and H.-T. Yau for helpful conversations.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce some preliminary notions and results from previous works that are used throughout the rest of the paper.

We say $X \ll Y$ if there exists a small constant $c > 0$ such that $N^c |X| \leq Y$. We write $X = \mathcal{O}(Y)$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $|X| \leq CY$. Here X and Y may depend on other parameters, but C does not. We also say $X = \mathcal{O}_u(Y)$ if $|X| \leq C_u |Y|$ for some constant $C_u > 0$ depending only on a parameter u . The same notation with multiple subscripts denotes dependence on multiple parameters. The notation $\log N$ always denotes the natural logarithm.

Throughout this work, we suppress the dependence of various constants in our results on the constants in Definition 1.1. This dependence does not affect our arguments in any substantial way. Further, for concreteness we consider only real symmetric generalized Wigner matrices in what follows, except where noted, as the complex Hermitian case is entirely analogous.

Let Mat_N be the set of $N \times N$ real symmetric matrices. We label the eigenvalues of matrices in increasing order, so that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N$ for the eigenvalues of a matrix $M \in \text{Mat}_N$. We define the Stieltjes transform of M for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N\}$ by

$$m_N(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \frac{1}{\lambda_i - z}. \quad (2.1)$$

The semicircle law and corresponding Stieltjes transform are given by

$$\rho_{\text{sc}}(E) = \frac{\sqrt{(4 - E^2)_+}}{2\pi}, \quad m_{\text{sc}}(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\rho_{\text{sc}}(x) dx}{x - z}, \quad (2.2)$$

for $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, respectively.

The classical eigenvalue locations of the semicircle law are denoted by γ_i and defined for $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ by

$$\frac{i}{N} = \int_{-2}^{\gamma_i} \rho_{\text{sc}}(x) dx. \quad (2.3)$$

The resolvent of $M \in \text{Mat}_N$ is given by $G(z) = (M - z \text{Id})^{-1}$. We observe by the spectral theorem that

$$G(z) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^*}{\lambda_i - z}, \quad (2.4)$$

where \mathbf{u}_i is the L^2 -normalized eigenvector, $\|\mathbf{u}_i\|_2 = 1$, corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_i of M , and \mathbf{u}_i^* denotes its transpose.¹

2.1. Dyson Brownian motion. The $N \times N$ real symmetric Dyson Brownian motion with initial value H_0 is the stochastic process $(H_s)_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$ on the space of symmetric matrices defined by

$$H_s = H_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} B(s), \quad (2.5)$$

where $B(s) \in \text{Mat}_N$ is a symmetric matrix such that $B_{ij}(s)$ and $B_{ii}(s)/\sqrt{2}$ are mutually independent standard Brownian motions for all indices $1 \leq i < j \leq N$.

It is known that $(H_s)_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$ has the same distribution as $(\mathbf{u}^s \boldsymbol{\lambda}(s) (\mathbf{u}^s)^*)_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(s) = (\lambda_1(s), \dots, \lambda_N(s))$ is a vector in \mathbb{R}^N and $\mathbf{u}^s = (\mathbf{u}_1^s, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N^s) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ are the stochastic processes that solve the system of equations

$$d\lambda_k(s) = \frac{d\tilde{B}_{kk}(s)}{\sqrt{N}} + \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell \neq k} \frac{1}{\lambda_k(s) - \lambda_\ell(s)} \right) ds, \quad (2.6)$$

$$d\mathbf{u}_k^s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\ell \neq k} \frac{d\tilde{B}_{k\ell}(s)}{\lambda_k(s) - \lambda_\ell(s)} \mathbf{u}_\ell^s - \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{\ell \neq k} \frac{dt}{(\lambda_k(s) - \lambda_\ell(s))^2} \mathbf{u}_k^s, \quad (2.7)$$

with initial data $H_0 = \mathbf{u}^0 \boldsymbol{\lambda}(0) (\mathbf{u}^0)^*$, and \tilde{B} has the same distribution as B [18, Theorem 2.3]. We define $m_N^s(z)$ to be the Stieltjes transform of H_s , and $G^s(z)$ to be its resolvent.

2.2. Local semicircle law. Let $\mathbb{S}^{N-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be the set of vectors $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\|\mathbf{q}\|_2 = 1$. For any $\omega > 0$, we define the domain

$$\mathcal{D}_\omega = \{z = E + i\eta \in \mathbb{C} : |E| < \omega^{-1}, N^{-1+\omega} \leq \eta \leq \omega^{-1}\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Lemma 2.1 ([18, Lemma 4.2]). *Fix $\omega > 0$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. Let H be a $N \times N$ generalized Wigner matrix, and define H_s , G^s , \mathbf{u}_k^s , and $m_N^s(z)$ as above. Let μ be the measure on the space of joint eigenvalue and eigenvector trajectories $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(s), \mathbf{u}(s))_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$ induced by the Dyson Brownian Motion $(H_s)_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$. Then there exist constants $C_1(\omega), c_1(\omega) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)) \geq 1 - C_1 \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}), \quad (2.9)$$

where $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ is the set of trajectories $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}(s), \mathbf{u}(s))_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$ where all of the following statements hold.

1. For all $z = E + i\eta \in \mathcal{D}_\omega$,

$$\sup_{s \in [0, 1]} |\langle \mathbf{q}, G^s(z) \mathbf{q} \rangle - m_{\text{sc}}(z)| \leq N^\omega \left(\sqrt{\frac{\text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z)}{N\eta}} + \frac{1}{N\eta} \right). \quad (2.10)$$

2. For all $z = E + i\eta \in \mathcal{D}_\omega$,

$$\sup_{s \in [0, 1]} |m_N^s(z) - m_{\text{sc}}(z)| \leq \frac{N^\omega}{N\eta}, \quad \sup_{s \in [0, 1]} |G_{ij}^s(z) - \mathbb{1}_{i=j} m_{\text{sc}}(z)| \leq N^\omega \left(\sqrt{\frac{\text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z)}{N\eta}} + \frac{1}{N\eta} \right). \quad (2.11)$$

¹Note that \mathbf{u}_i is ambiguous up to a choice of sign, which we select arbitrarily. It is straightforward to see that all of our definitions are invariant under this choice.

3. For all $k \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$,

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} |\lambda_k(s) - \gamma_k| \leq N^{-2/3+\omega} [\min(k, N-k+1)]^{-1/3}, \quad \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_k^s \rangle^2 \leq N^{-1+\omega}. \quad (2.12)$$

Remark 2.2. This lemma was proved in [18] in the case where the matrix entry distributions have finite moments, with weaker probability bounds. The proof relies on the isotropic semicircle law stated in [12, Theorem 2.12], which is the origin of the probability bounds. However, our assumption that the entry distributions are uniformly subexponential enables the stronger probability estimates given in Lemma 2.1, as noted after [12, Theorem 4.1]. See also [44, Theorem 2.12] for the case where all entries have the same variance.

Finally, we require some estimates on the Stieltjes transform of the semicircle law.

Lemma 2.3 ([33, Lemma 6.2]). *There exists a constant $c_{\text{sc}} > 0$ such that for all $z = E + i\eta$ with $\eta \in (0, 10]$, when $E \in [-2, 2]$ we have*

$$c_{\text{sc}} \sqrt{||E| - 2| + \eta} \leq \text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z) \leq c_{\text{sc}}^{-1} \sqrt{||E| - 2| + \eta}, \quad (2.13)$$

and when $E \in [-20, 20] \setminus [-2, 2]$ we have

$$\frac{c_{\text{sc}} \eta}{\sqrt{||E| - 2| + \eta}} \leq \text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z) \leq \frac{c_{\text{sc}}^{-1} \eta}{\sqrt{||E| - 2| + \eta}}. \quad (2.14)$$

3. RELAXATION BY DYSON BROWNIAN MOTION

In this section, we control large moments of eigenvector entries for generalized Wigner matrices with small additive Gaussian perturbations. These perturbations are given by Dyson Brownian motion for times $s \ll 1$. Our main result is Proposition 3.2, which bounds the moments of the eigenvector entries when $s \gg N^{-1/3}$ for moments as large as $(\log N)^C$. Then, in Corollary 3.4, we apply Proposition 3.2 to give high-probability delocalization estimates for the perturbed ensembles.

3.1. Eigenvector moment flow. Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let H_s be Dyson Brownian motion with initial condition $H_0 = H$, as defined in Section 2.1. It was shown in [18] that moments of the eigenvector entries of H_s obey a parabolic equation with random coefficients, called the *eigenvector moment flow*, which we now describe.

To any index set $\{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_m, j_m)\}$ with distinct $i_k \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and positive $j_k \in \mathbb{N}$, we may associate the vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N) \in \mathbb{N}^N$ with $\xi_{i_k} = j_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$ and $\xi_p = 0$ for $p \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$. We think of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ as a particle configuration on the integers, with j_k particles at site i_k for all k and zero particles on the sites not in $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$. The configuration $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{ij}$ is defined as the result of moving one particle in $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ from i to j , if this is possible. That is, if $i \neq j$ and $\xi_i > 0$, then ξ_k^{ij} equals $\xi_k + 1$ if $k = j$, $\xi_k - 1$ if $k = i$, and ξ_k if $k \notin \{i, j\}$. When $\xi_i = 0$, we set $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{ij} = \boldsymbol{\xi}$.

The moment observable $f_s: \mathbb{N}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows, where we recall that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(s)$ and \mathbf{u}^s represent the eigenvalue and eigenvector processes associated to H_s by (2.6) and (2.7). Given $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ and a path $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}(s))_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$, we set

$$f_s(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}, s}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\xi})} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k=1}^N \langle \mathbf{q}, \sqrt{N} \mathbf{u}_k^s \rangle^{2\xi_k} \middle| \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right], \quad \text{where } \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \prod_{k=1}^N (2\xi_k - 1)!!. \quad (3.1)$$

The normalization factor $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is chosen because $(2\xi_k - 1)!!$ is the $2\xi_k$ -th moment of a standard Gaussian.

The time evolution of the observable $f_s(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is given by the parabolic equation in the following theorem.




Figure 2: An example configuration corresponding to the moment $\langle \mathbf{q}, u_{k_1} \rangle^2 \langle \mathbf{q}, u_{k_2} \rangle^6 \langle \mathbf{q}, u_{k_3} \rangle^4$.

Theorem 3.1 ([18, Theorem 3.1]). *Let $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ be a unit vector. For all $s \in (0, 1)$, the moment observable f_s defined in (3.1) satisfies the equation*

$$\partial_s f_s(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \sum_{k \neq \ell} 2\xi_k(1 + 2\xi_\ell) \frac{f_s(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{k,\ell}) - f_s(\boldsymbol{\xi})}{N(\lambda_k(s) - \lambda_\ell(s))^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

The equation (3.2) can be seen as a multi-particle random walk in a random environment given by the eigenvalues λ . We interpret it as saying that particles jump from site k to site ℓ with rate $\frac{2\xi_k(1+2\xi_\ell)}{N(\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell)^2}$.

3.2. Eigenvector moments of Gaussian divisible ensembles. We now use the eigenvector moment flow to obtain a bound on large moments of eigenvectors of the dynamics (2.7). For the next proposition, we recall that $f_{\lambda,s}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is a function of $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, although this is suppressed in the notation.

Proposition 3.2. *Fix $C, \delta > 0$, $\theta \in (0, 1/3)$, and a vector $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. Then there exists $N_0 = N_0(C, \delta, \theta)$ such that for $N \geq N_0$, $t \in [N^{-1/3+\theta}, 1]$, and $0 \leq n \leq \lceil (\log N)^C \rceil$, we have*

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}: |\boldsymbol{\xi}|=n} \mathbb{E}[f_{\lambda,t}(\boldsymbol{\xi})] \leq (1 + \delta)^n. \quad (3.3)$$

Remark 3.3. Proposition 3.2 can be compared with [18, Theorem 4.3]. However, in [18] the authors obtain the asymptotic limit for finite moments, while we bound moments growing in N .

Proof. Recall the notation of Lemma 2.1, and let $\omega > 0$ be a small parameter that will be determined later. Let $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ be the set of paths $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda(s))_{0 \leq s \leq 1}$ such that the statements (2.10), (2.11), and (2.12) hold with probability at least $1 - C_1^{1/2} \exp(-\frac{c_1}{2} (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N})$ with respect to the marginal distribution on paths $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ induced by the measure \mathbb{P}_μ (defined in Lemma 2.1). Then Lemma 2.1 and Fubini's theorem imply

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)) \geq 1 - C_1^{1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{c_1}{2} (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}\right). \quad (3.4)$$

We now restrict our attention to paths $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$.

We define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(n)} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(n)}(s)$ to be the maximizer among all configurations with n particles for the moment observable (3.1), so that

$$f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}: |\boldsymbol{\xi}|=n} f_s(\boldsymbol{\xi}). \quad (3.5)$$

When there are multiple maximizers, we pick one arbitrarily, subject to the constraint that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(s)$ remains piecewise constant in s . We let (k_1, \dots, k_p) be the sites where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ has at least one particle. Denoting the number of particles of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ at site i by $\tilde{\xi}_i$, these are the indices in $\llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ such that $\tilde{\xi}_{k_i} > 0$. We emphasize that the implicit constants in each occurrence of the \mathcal{O} notation in this proof will be independent of p and all parameters in the statement of the proposition, including \mathbf{q} and n .

Using (3.28), we now proceed by induction on the number of particles n . Set $\eta = N^{-2/3+\theta/2}$, and consider the set of times $t_k = t - (\lceil (\log N)^C \rceil - k) N^\omega \eta^{1/2}$ for $0 \leq k \leq \lceil (\log N)^C \rceil$. Our induction hypothesis is that for every $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$, we have

$$\sup_{s \in [t_n, 1]} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}: |\boldsymbol{\xi}|=n} f_{\lambda,t}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq (1 + \delta)^n \quad (3.6)$$

for $N > N_0$. Here $N_0 = N_0(C, \delta, \theta)$ will be chosen in the course of the following computation. For the base case $n = 0$, (3.6) is trivial, since $f_s(\xi) = 1$. Next, for the induction step, fix $n \leq \lceil (\log N)^C \rceil$ and suppose that (3.6) holds for $n - 1$.

To complete the induction, we begin by deriving a differential inequality for $f_s(\tilde{\xi}) = f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n)}(s))$.² Fix some path $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. Using the eigenvector moment flow (3.2), we see that for any $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$\partial_s f_s(\tilde{\xi}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell \neq k_i} 2\tilde{\xi}_{k_i} (1 + 2\tilde{\xi}_\ell) \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell}) - f_s(\tilde{\xi})}{N(\lambda_{k_i}(s) - \lambda_\ell(s))^2} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{N\eta} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell \neq k_i} (f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell}) - f_s(\tilde{\xi})) \frac{\eta}{(\lambda_{k_i}(s) - \lambda_\ell(s))^2 + \eta^2} \quad (3.8)$$

$$= \frac{2}{\eta} \sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_i} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} - \frac{2}{\eta} \sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_i} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})}. \quad (3.9)$$

In the last line, we defined $z_{k_i} = \lambda_{k_i} + i\eta$. In the inequality, we used the fact that $f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell}) \leq f_s(\tilde{\xi})$ by the definition of $\tilde{\xi}$, so that $f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell}) - f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \leq 0$ for all k, ℓ . We also used that $\tilde{\xi}_l \geq 0$ for all $l \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, and $\tilde{\xi}_{k_i} > 0$.

We control the second term in (3.9) by

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_i} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} = f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_N^s(z_{k_i}) - \frac{p}{N\eta} \right) \quad (3.10)$$

$$= f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{pN^\omega}{N\eta}\right) \right), \quad (3.11)$$

where we used (2.11) and $\eta \geq N^{-1+\omega}$ in the last equality. For the first term in (3.9), we use $f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \geq f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k, \ell}) \geq 0$, which holds by the definition of $f_s(\tilde{\xi})$, to see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_i} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} = \sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_1, \dots, k_p} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} + \mathcal{O}\left(f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \frac{p^2}{N\eta}\right). \quad (3.12)$$

Now, for the first term in (3.12), fix an index $i \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$, and observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_1, \dots, k_p} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\xi} \setminus \{k_i\})} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_k \langle \mathbf{q}, \sqrt{N} \mathbf{u}_k^s \rangle^{2(\xi_k - \mathbb{1}_{k=k_i})} \operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_1, \dots, k_p} \frac{\langle \mathbf{q}, \sqrt{N} \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} \Big| \lambda \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where we denote by $\tilde{\xi} \setminus \{k_i\}$ the configuration $\tilde{\xi}$ with a particle removed from the site k_i . We also used the identity $\mathcal{M}(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell}) = \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\xi} \setminus \{k_i\})$, which holds because $\ell \notin \{k_1, \dots, k_p\}$. The last sum can be related to the resolvent $G^s(z_{k_i})$ using (2.4). Using this fact in conjunction with (2.10), we find

$$\operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_1, \dots, k_p} \frac{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2}{(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} \leq \operatorname{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G^s(z_{k_i}) \mathbf{q} \rangle = \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O}\left(N^\omega \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i})}{N\eta}} + \frac{N^\omega}{N\eta}\right) \quad (3.14)$$

²At times when the maximum is obtained by two or more indices, $f_s(\tilde{\xi})$ may not be differentiable. But the following reasoning goes through with the redefinition $\partial_s f_s(\tilde{\xi}) = \limsup_{u \rightarrow s} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}) - f_u(\tilde{\xi})}{s - u}$.

holds with exponentially high probability, by our assumption that $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. We therefore obtain

$$\operatorname{Im} \sum_{\ell \neq k_1, \dots, k_p} \frac{f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{k_i, \ell})}{N(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} \leq \left(\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(N^\omega \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i})}{N\eta}} + \frac{N^\omega}{N\eta} \right) \right) f_s(\tilde{\xi} \setminus \{k_i\}) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-2}), \quad (3.15)$$

where the $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$ term comes from using the trivial bounds $\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \leq 1$ and $\operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{(\lambda_\ell(s) - z_{k_i})} \leq \eta^{-1}$ on the exceptional event where (2.10) fails. We also used the fact that the probability of this event is at most $C_1^{1/2} \exp(-\frac{c_1}{2}(\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N})$, by the definition of \mathcal{A}_1 .

Observe that $f_s(\tilde{\xi} \setminus \{k_i\}) \leq f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)})$ by the definition of $\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)}$. Then inserting (3.11), (3.12), and (3.15) in (3.7) gives

$$\partial_s f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n)}) \leq -\frac{2f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n)})}{\eta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p^2 N^\omega}{N\eta} \right) \right) \quad (3.16)$$

$$+ \frac{2f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)})}{\eta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(N^\omega \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i})}{N\eta}} + \frac{N^\omega}{N\eta} \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-2}). \quad (3.17)$$

Rearranging this yields

$$\partial_s f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n)}) \leq -\frac{2}{\eta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p^2 N^\omega}{N\eta} \right) \right) \quad (3.18)$$

$$\times \left(f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n)}) - f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)}) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(N^\omega \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i})}{N\eta}} + \frac{N^\omega}{N\eta} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p^2 N^\omega}{N\eta} \right)} \right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-2}). \quad (3.19)$$

We now restrict our attention to times $s \geq N^{-1/3+\theta}/2$, so that $s \gg \sqrt{\eta}$. Set $\omega = \theta/100$, and recall from (2.13) that $\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z) \geq c_{\text{sc}} \sqrt{\eta}$ for some $c_{\text{sc}} > 0$. Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(N^\omega \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i})}{N\eta}} + \frac{N^\omega}{N\eta} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p^2 N^\omega}{N\eta} \right)} = 1, \quad (3.20)$$

where we used our assumption that $1 \leq p \leq n \leq \lceil (\log N)^C \rceil$. By (3.20) and (3.18), there exists $N_0 = N_0(C, \delta, \theta)$ such that, for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\partial_s f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \leq -\frac{2}{\eta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z_{k_i}) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p^2 N^\omega}{N\eta} \right) \right) (f_s(\tilde{\xi}) - f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)})(1 + \delta/2)) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-2}). \quad (3.21)$$

Note that N_0 does not depend on n since we can bound the error $\frac{p^2 N^\omega}{N\eta}$ by $\frac{(\log N)^{3C} N^\omega}{N\eta}$. Using $\operatorname{Im} m_{\text{sc}}(z) \geq c_{\text{sc}} \sqrt{\eta}$ from (2.13), $p \geq 1$, and the definition of ω , we find after possibly adjusting N_0 upward that, for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\partial_s f_s(\tilde{\xi}) \leq -\frac{c}{2\sqrt{\eta}} (f_s(\tilde{\xi}) - f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)})(1 + \delta/2)) + \frac{c}{2N} \quad (3.22)$$

for $c = c_{\text{sc}}/10 > 0$.

We now consider times $s \geq t_{n-1}$ and use the induction hypothesis (3.6) to bound $f_s(\tilde{\xi}^{(n-1)})$ in (3.22). This gives

$$\partial_s (f_s(\tilde{\xi}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2)) \leq -\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}} (f_s(\tilde{\xi}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2)). \quad (3.23)$$

If $f_r(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2)$ for some r , then $f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2)$ holds for all $s > r$, since $f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}})$ is decreasing by (3.7). We therefore assume that $f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \geq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2)$ for all $s \in [t_{n-1}, t_n]$; otherwise, the induction hypothesis (3.6) holds for n , and the induction step is complete. Because $f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) \geq 0$, (3.23) implies

$$\partial_s \log \left(f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) \right) \leq -\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}. \quad (3.24)$$

Integrating (3.24) on the interval $[t_{n-1}, t_n]$ gives

$$\log \left(f_{t_n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) \right) \leq \log \left(f_{t_{n-1}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) \right) - \frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}(t_n - t_{n-1}). \quad (3.25)$$

Exponentiating yields

$$f_{t_n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) + \left(f_{t_{n-1}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) - (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) \right) \exp \left(-\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}(t_n - t_{n-1}) \right) \quad (3.26)$$

$$\leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) + f_{t_{n-1}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \exp \left(-\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}(t_n - t_{n-1}) \right). \quad (3.27)$$

Observe that because we assumed $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$, using delocalization (2.12), the definition (3.1) of $f_s^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$, and $n \leq \lceil (\log N)^C \rceil$, we have that $f_s^{(n)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \leq N^\omega f_s^{(n-1)}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) + N^{-1}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$ and $N \geq N_0$. The N^{-1} comes from the exceptional set where delocalization does not hold, as in (3.15). Therefore

$$f_{t_n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) + \left(f_{t_{n-1}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(n-1)})N^\omega + N^{-1} \right) \exp \left(-\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}(t_n - t_{n-1}) \right). \quad (3.28)$$

By putting the induction hypothesis (3.6) for $n - 1$ into (3.28), we obtain for $N > N_0$ that

$$f_{t_n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(n)}) \leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) + \left((1 + \delta)^{n-1}N^\omega + N^{-1} \right) \exp \left(-\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}(N^\omega \eta^{1/2}) \right) \quad (3.29)$$

$$\leq (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(1 + \delta/2) + (1 + \delta)^{n-1}(\delta/2) \leq (1 + \delta)^n. \quad (3.30)$$

In the last line we used that $N^\omega \exp \left(-\frac{c}{\sqrt{\eta}}(N^\omega \eta^{1/2}) \right) < \delta/3$ for $N > N_0$, where we increased N_0 if necessary. By our previous observation that $f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(n)})$ is decreasing, we deduce from (3.30) that for each $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$,

$$f_s(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(n)}) \leq (1 + \delta)^n \quad (3.31)$$

for all $s \geq t_n$. This completes the induction step.

We have shown that (3.6) holds for all $0 \leq n \leq \lceil (\log N)^C \rceil$, and therefore that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi}: |\boldsymbol{\xi}|=n} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1} f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}, t}(\boldsymbol{\xi})] \leq (1 + \delta)^n. \quad (3.32)$$

Using (3.4), we also have the trivial bound

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_1^c} f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}, t}(\boldsymbol{\xi})] \leq N^n C_1^{1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{c_1}{2} (\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N} \right) \quad (3.33)$$

$$\leq N^{(\log N)^C} C_1^{1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{c_1}{2} (\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N} \right) \leq \delta \quad (3.34)$$

for $N \geq N_0(\delta)$ after possibly increasing N_0 .

Combining (3.32) and (3.33), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}, t}(\boldsymbol{\xi})] \leq (1 + \delta)^n + \delta \leq (1 + \delta)^n + \delta(1 + \delta)^{n-1} \leq (1 + 2\delta)(1 + \delta)^{n-1} \leq (1 + 2\delta)^n. \quad (3.35)$$

The claim follows after redefining δ . \square

Using Proposition 3.2, we now show the optimal delocalization bound for eigenvectors of generalized matrices perturbed by small Gaussian noise.

Corollary 3.4. *Fix $\theta \in (0, 2/3)$. For $s \in [N^{-1/3+\theta}, 1]$ and any $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C = C(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon)$ such that*

$$\sup_{k \in [1, N]} \mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathbf{u}_k^s\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{(2+\varepsilon) \log N}{N}} \right) \leq C(\log N)^{1/2} N^{-\log\left(\frac{2+\varepsilon}{2(1+\delta)^2}\right)}, \quad (3.36)$$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{k \in [1, N]} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_k^s \rangle \geq \sqrt{\frac{(2+\varepsilon) \log N}{N}} \right) \leq C(\log N)^{1/2} N^{-\log\left(\frac{2+\varepsilon}{2(1+\delta)^2}\right)}, \quad (3.37)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{k \in [1, N]} \|\mathbf{u}_k^s\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{(4+\varepsilon) \log N}{N}} \right) \leq C(\log N)^{1/2} N^{-2 \log\left(\frac{4+\varepsilon}{4(1+\delta)^2}\right)}. \quad (3.38)$$

Proof. We only prove (3.37), since the proofs of (3.36) and (3.38) are similar. Fix $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ and set $J = \lfloor \log N \rfloor$. By Markov's inequality applied with the $2J$ -th moment and a union bound over all $k \in [1, N]$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{k \in [1, N]} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_k^s \rangle \geq \sqrt{\frac{(2+\varepsilon) \log N}{N}} \right) \leq \frac{N^{1+J}}{(2+\varepsilon)^J (\log N)^J} \mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_1^s \rangle^{2J}]. \quad (3.39)$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_1^s \rangle^{2J}] \leq \frac{(1+\delta)^{2J}}{N^J} (2J-1)!! \quad (3.40)$$

for $N \geq N_0(\delta, \theta)$. Stirling's formula shows that $(2J-1)!! \leq C(2J)^{(2J+1)/2} N^{-1}$ for some $C > 0$. Inserting this bound into (3.40), we obtain using (3.39) together with (3.39) that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{k \in [1, N]} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_k^s \rangle \geq \sqrt{\frac{(2+\varepsilon) \log N}{N}} \right) \leq C(\log N)^{1/2} N^{-\log\left(\frac{2+\varepsilon}{2(1+\delta)^2}\right)}, \quad (3.41)$$

after adjusting $C = C(\theta, \delta, \varepsilon) > 0$. Since all bounds are uniform in \mathbf{q} , we can finish by taking the supremum over all possible $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. This completes the proof. \square

4. EIGENVECTOR REGULARIZATION

We now construct regularized versions of the eigenvectors of any $M \in \text{Mat}_N$. These are used in the next section to implement our comparison arguments extending the optimal delocalization bounds derived in the previous section to all generalized Wigner matrices.

In Section 4.1, we state some preliminary results and give the definition of the regularized eigenvector projections in Definition 4.2. Then, in Section 4.2, we provide estimates relating the regularized eigenvector projections to the usual eigenvectors, and also control their derivatives with respect to any matrix entry.

4.1. Construction of regularized eigenvector projections. We begin by stating a result on the regularization of eigenvalues. For any $w \in [0, 1]$, $M = (m_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \in \text{Mat}_N$, and indices $a, b \in [1, N]$, we let $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} M \in \text{Mat}_N$ be defined as follows. Set $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} M$ to be the $N \times N$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is equal to m_{ij} if $(i, j) \notin \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$. If $(i, j) \in \{(a, b), (b, a)\}$, then set the (i, j) entry equal to $w m_{a,b} = w m_{b,a}$. Further, for $k \in [1, N]$, we denote $\widehat{k} = \min(k, N+1-k)$. We also set $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} G = (\Theta_w^{(a,b)} M - z)^{-1}$.

In the case of bulk eigenvalues, a version of the following proposition appeared as [45, Lemma 3.2]. The proof was based on an explicit construction of $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ using the Helffer–Sjöstrand formula. With additional technical effort, a version of the same construction can also be applied to the edge. We prove this proposition in Appendix A.

Proposition 4.1. Fix $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$. For all $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, there exist functions $\tilde{\lambda}_{i, \delta, \varepsilon}: \text{Mat}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following holds, where we write $\tilde{\lambda}_i = \tilde{\lambda}_{i, \delta, \varepsilon}$. For any generalized Wigner matrix H , there exists an event $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ such that for all $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and $a, b, c, d \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \left| \tilde{\lambda}_i(H) - \lambda_i(H) \right| \leq \frac{N^{\varepsilon - \delta}}{N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}}, \quad \sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j \tilde{\lambda}_i(\Theta_w^{(c,d)} H) \right| \leq \frac{N^{j(\varepsilon + \delta)}}{N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}}, \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}), \quad (4.2)$$

for some constants $C_1(\delta, \varepsilon), c_1(\delta, \varepsilon) > 0$. Further, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \left| \partial_{ab}^j \tilde{\lambda}_i(\Theta_w^{(c,d)} H) \right| \leq CN^{Cj}. \quad (4.3)$$

We now use Proposition 4.1 to construct regularized eigenvector projections. Suppose $M \in \text{Mat}_N$ has eigenvalues $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$, labeled in increasing order. Fix $\delta_1, \varepsilon_1 > 0$ and let the corresponding regularized eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_i(M) = \tilde{\lambda}_{i, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1}(M)$ be given by Proposition 4.1. For any $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and $\delta_2 > 0$, we define the intervals

$$I_{\delta_2}(x) = \left[x - \frac{N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}}, x + \frac{N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}} \right], \quad \widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(x) = \left[x - \frac{N^{-\delta_2}}{2N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}}, x + \frac{N^{-\delta_2}}{2N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}} \right], \quad (4.4)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Given an interval I , we also denote the counting function for the eigenvalues $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) = |\{i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \mid \lambda_i \in I\}|. \quad (4.5)$$

Definition 4.2. Suppose $M \in \text{Mat}_N$ and fix $\delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_i = \tilde{\lambda}_{i, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1}(M)$ denote the regularized eigenvalues of Proposition 4.1. For $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, we define the regularized eigenvector projections of M by

$$v_{\ell}(\mathbf{q}) = v_{\ell}(M, \mathbf{q}) = v_{\ell}(M, \mathbf{q}, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_{\ell})} \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(E + i\eta_{\ell}) \mathbf{q} \rangle dE, \quad \eta_{\ell} = \frac{N^{-\varepsilon_2}}{N^{2/3} \widehat{\eta}^{1/3}}. \quad (4.6)$$

Given $s \geq 0$, we let $v_{\ell}^s(\mathbf{q})$ denote the regularized eigenvector projections for the Dyson Brownian motion H_s .

Remark 4.3. In Section 5, we will choose parameters in the previous definition such that $\delta_1 > \varepsilon_1$ and $\delta_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \delta_2$. The inequality $\delta_1 > \varepsilon_1$ implies that the regularized eigenvalues approximate the standard ones at a scale smaller than the average inter-particle distance, by (4.1). Using Lemma 4.10 below, the inequalities $\delta_1 > \varepsilon_2 > \delta_2$ are necessary to make v_{ℓ} approximate the eigenvector projections $\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2$.

We also introduce an event where all the estimates we need in order to control the regularized eigenvector projections hold.

Definition 4.4. Suppose $M \in \text{Mat}_N$. For $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the events

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2) = \mathcal{B}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \cap \mathcal{B}_1(\mathbf{q}, \varepsilon_2/8) \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1), \quad (4.7)$$

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2, k, \ell) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2) \cap \mathcal{B}_3(\delta_2, k, \ell), \quad (4.8)$$

where

- $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ is the event defined in Lemma 2.1 where the isotropic local law (2.10), the local semicircle law (2.11), and rigidity and isotropic delocalization (2.12) hold for all $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} M$ uniformly in $a, b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and $w \in [0, 1]$,³

³More precisely, we demand that these equations hold with $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} G$ replacing G^s , $\lambda_k(\Theta_w^{(a,b)} M)$ replacing λ_k , the eigenvectors $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} \mathbf{u}_k$ of $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} M$ replacing \mathbf{u}_k^s , and $\sup_{a, b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \sup_{w \in [0, 1]}$ replacing $\sup_{s \in [0, 1]}$.

- $\mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)$ is the event where

$$\left| \tilde{\lambda}_i(M) - \lambda_i(M) \right| \leq \frac{N^{\varepsilon_1}}{N^{2/3 + \delta_1} \hat{\ell}^{1/3}} \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\sup_{i \in [1, N]} \sup_{a, b, c, d \in [1, N]} \sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \left| \partial_{ab}^j \tilde{\lambda}_i(\Theta_w^{(c, d)} M) \right| \leq \frac{N^{j(\delta_1 + \varepsilon_1)}}{N^{2/3} \hat{\ell}^{1/3}} \quad (4.10)$$

hold for all $j \in [1, 5]$, where the $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ are the regularized eigenvalues given by Proposition 4.1,

- $\mathcal{B}_3(\delta_2, k, \ell)$ is the event on which $\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)) \leq k$, where $I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$ is defined in (4.5) and λ is the vector of eigenvalues of M .




Figure 3: Illustration of the event $\mathcal{B}_3(\delta_2, k, \ell)$: on this event, we cannot fit more than k eigenvalues on a sub-microscopic interval (which is asymptotically smaller than the typical spacing between eigenvalues).

Remark 4.5. The presence of $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathbf{q}, \varepsilon_2/8)$ in the above definition is a technical convenience. This set is used only in the proof of Lemma 4.8, stated below.

The proofs of the following two lemmas are deferred to Appendix C. In particular, the proof of Lemma 4.7 is based on eigenvalue overcrowding estimates proved in Appendix B.

Lemma 4.6. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. For $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, there exist constants $C_1 = C_1(\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)$, $c_1 = c_1(\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}). \quad (4.11)$$

Lemma 4.7. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix and fix $\ell \in [1, N]$. For any $D > 0$ and $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2 > 0$ with $1/100 > \delta_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $k_0 = k_0(D, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $k \geq k_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2, k, \ell)) \leq N^{-D} \quad (4.12)$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ and $N \geq N_0(D, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2, k)$.

Before proceeding to our main estimates, we require the following lemma, which estimates Green's functions and their derivatives below the natural scale N^{-1} . The proof can be found in Appendix C.

Lemma 4.8. *Fix $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $\delta_1 > \varepsilon_1$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, and $\ell \in [1, N]$. Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)$ be the set from Definition 4.4. Let $\eta_\ell = \frac{N^{-\varepsilon_2}}{N^{2/3} \hat{\ell}^{1/3}}$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon_2) > 0$ such that for all $E \in I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell) \cup I_{\delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell)$,*

$$\sup_{a, b \in [1, N]} \sup_{w \in [0, 1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \operatorname{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, \Theta_w^{(a, b)} G(E + i\eta_\ell) \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq CN^{4\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{\hat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3} \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$\sup_{a, b, c, d \in [1, N]} \sup_{j \in [1, 5]} \sup_{w \in [0, 1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \partial_{cd}^j \operatorname{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, \Theta_w^{(a, b)} G(E + i\eta_\ell) \mathbf{q} \rangle \leq CN^{10j\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{\hat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (4.14)$$

We also have the following lemma, whose proof is also deferred to Appendix C.

Lemma 4.9. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, and $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. Then there exists $C = C(\omega) > 0$ such that, for all $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, we have*

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{p: |p-\ell| > N^{2\omega}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell)^2} \leq CN^{4/3+2\omega} \widehat{\ell}^{2/3}, \quad (4.15)$$

where $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)$.

4.2. Estimates on regularized eigenvector projections. In the next two lemmas, we show that the eigenvectors and their regularizations are comparable, in a certain sense, on a set of high probability. The following lemma shows that the eigenvectors can be used to bound their regularizations.

Lemma 4.10. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$, and $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. Then for all $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, we have*

$$\mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}} v_\ell(\mathbf{q}) \leq \sum_{p=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\omega, \varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{1}{N} (N^{3\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2} + N^{\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2-\delta_1}) \right) \quad (4.16)$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2, k, \ell)$.

Proof. We first give an estimate on a variant of the regularized eigenvector projections, where the resolvent is integrated on an interval centered on the actual eigenvalues instead of their regularized counterparts. Denote

$$w_\ell(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(E + i\eta_\ell) \mathbf{q} \rangle dE. \quad (4.17)$$

First, we have

$$w_\ell(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \sum_{p=1}^N \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \left(\sum_{|p-\ell| \leq N^{2\omega}} + \sum_{|p-\ell| > N^{2\omega}} \right) \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE. \quad (4.18)$$

In this decomposition, the second sum should be interpreted as an error term. We now work exclusively on the event $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and drop this from our notation. On $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, we have the isotropic delocalization estimate $\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2 \leq N^{-1+\omega}$, and thus

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{|p-\ell| > N^{2\omega}} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE \leq \sum_{|p-\ell| > N^{2\omega}} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell N^{-1+\omega}}{(\lambda_p - E)^2} dE \quad (4.19)$$

$$\leq \frac{4\eta_\ell N^{-1+\omega-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3} \widehat{\ell}^{1/3}} \sum_{|p-\ell| > N^{2\omega}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell)^2} \quad (4.20)$$

for large enough $N \geq N_0(\omega)$. In the final inequality we used the fact $|\lambda_p - E| > \frac{1}{2} |\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell|$ for $N \geq N_0(\omega)$, which holds by the following calculation. By rigidity (2.12) and the definition of $\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$,

$$|\lambda_p - E| \geq |\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell| - |E - \lambda_\ell| \geq |\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell| - N^{-2/3-\delta_2} \widehat{\ell}^{-1/3}, \quad (4.21)$$

so we just need to show that $|\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell| \gg N^{-2/3-\delta_2} \widehat{\ell}^{-1/3}$. Observe

$$|\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell| \geq |\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell| - |E - \lambda_\ell| \geq |\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell| - N^{-2/3} \widehat{p}^{-1/3} - N^{-2/3} \widehat{\ell}^{-1/3}. \quad (4.22)$$

The case $\ell \in [N/4, 3N/4]$ is trivial, so we consider $\ell \leq N/4$; the case $\ell \geq 3N/4$ will follow by symmetry. When $p > \ell$, the claim now follows by using the definition (2.3) to compute that $|\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell| \geq c(p - \ell)N^{-2/3}\widehat{p}^{-1/3}$ for some $c > 0$, which implies $|\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell| \gg N^{-2/3}\widehat{p}^{-1/3} + N^{-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3}$ when $|p - \ell| > N^{2\omega}$. The case $\ell > p$ is similar.

Now, inserting (4.15) in (4.20) and using (4.18) shows that

$$w_\ell(\mathbf{q}) \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{|p-\ell| \leq N^{2\omega}} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE + CN^{-1+3\omega-\delta_2-\varepsilon_2}. \quad (4.23)$$

We next remove the terms in the sum in (4.23) corresponding to the eigenvalues that do not lie in sub-microscopic interval $I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$. We write

$$\sum_{|p-\ell| \leq N^{2\omega}} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE = \left(\sum_{p:\lambda_p \in I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} + \sum_{\substack{p:\lambda_p \notin I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell) \\ |p-\ell| \leq N^{2\omega}}} \right) \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE. \quad (4.24)$$

Using the isotropic delocalization, $|I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)| = \eta_\ell N^{\varepsilon_2 - \delta_2}$, and $|\lambda_p - E| \geq \frac{1}{2}|I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)|$, we bound the second sum as follows:

$$\sum_{\substack{p:\lambda_p \notin I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell) \\ |p-\ell| \leq N^{2\omega}}} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE \leq N^{2\omega} \eta_\ell N^{\varepsilon_2 - \delta_2} \frac{\eta_\ell}{(\frac{1}{2}\eta_\ell N^{\varepsilon_2 - \delta_2})^2} N^{-1+\omega} = 4N^{-1+3\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2}. \quad (4.25)$$

Putting the estimate (4.25) in (4.23), we obtain that

$$w_\ell(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{p:\lambda_p \in I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} + \mathcal{O}_\omega(N^{-1+3\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2}). \quad (4.26)$$

Observe that by (4.9),

$$|\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell) \Delta \widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\widetilde{\lambda}_\ell)| \leq |\lambda_\ell - \widetilde{\lambda}_\ell| \leq \frac{N^{\varepsilon_1}}{N^{2/3+\delta_1}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}}. \quad (4.27)$$

Combining (4.27) with (4.13) and using the definitions of $v_\ell(\mathbf{q})$ and $w_\ell(\mathbf{q})$, we obtain on $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ that

$$v_\ell(\mathbf{q}) = w_\ell(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{N^{\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2-\delta_1}}{N} \right). \quad (4.28)$$

By definition, on the event $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ there are at most k eigenvalues in $I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$. Using that the Poisson kernel integrates to 1,

$$\sum_{p:\lambda_p \in I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} \leq \sum_{p:\lambda_p \in I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2 \leq \sum_{p=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2 \quad (4.29)$$

Finally, combining the estimates (4.26) and (4.28) with (4.29), we obtain (4.16). \square

The next lemma complements Lemma 4.10 and bounds the eigenvectors by their regularizations.

Lemma 4.11. *Fix $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ and $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $\varepsilon_2 > \delta_2$. Then for any $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, we have*

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \leq v_\ell(\mathbf{q}, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2) + \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{N^{\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2}}{N} + \frac{N^{\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2-\delta_1}}{N} \right) \quad (4.30)$$

where $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)$.

Proof. By directly integrating the Poisson kernel using $\int \frac{a dx}{x^2+a^2} = \arctan\left(\frac{x}{a}\right)$ for $a > 0$, and delocalization, we have on \mathcal{B} that

$$\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 = \frac{\eta_\ell}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2}{(\lambda_\ell - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\tilde{I}_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)} \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2}{(\lambda_\ell - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} dE + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{N^{\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2}}{N}\right). \quad (4.31)$$

Because

$$\frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2}{(\lambda_\ell - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} \leq \sum_{p=1}^N \frac{\eta_\ell \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p \rangle^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta_\ell^2} = \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(E + i\eta_\ell) \mathbf{q} \rangle, \quad (4.32)$$

we obtain

$$\langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \leq \tilde{v}_\ell(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon_2}\left(\frac{N^{\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2}}{N}\right), \quad (4.33)$$

where $\tilde{v}_\ell(\mathbf{q})$ was defined in (4.17). Finally, we obtain the claimed bound (4.30) by using (4.28) to replace $\tilde{v}_\ell(\mathbf{q})$ with $v_\ell(\mathbf{q})$ in (4.33). \square

Fix $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and $\delta_2 > 0$. We now regularize the indicator function for the set where a level repulsion estimate holds around the regularized eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_\ell$. Let q_{ℓ, δ_2} be a smooth function such that $q_{\ell, \delta_2}(x) = 1$ for $x \in \left[\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - \frac{3N^{-\delta_2}}{2N^{2/3}\tilde{\ell}^{1/3}}, \tilde{\lambda}_\ell + \frac{3N^{-\delta_2}}{2N^{2/3}\tilde{\ell}^{1/3}}\right]$, $q_{\ell, \delta_2}(x) = 0$ for $x \notin \left[\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - \frac{2N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\tilde{\ell}^{1/3}}, \tilde{\lambda}_\ell + \frac{2N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\tilde{\ell}^{1/3}}\right]$, and there exists $C > 0$ (independent of δ_2 and ℓ) such that both $\left|q_{\ell, \delta_2}^{(j)}(x)\right| \leq CN^{(2/3+\delta_2)j}\tilde{\ell}^{j/3}$ and $q_{\ell, \delta_2}(x) \leq 1$ hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$. We now fix $\nu > 0$ and further define

$$F(M) = F_{\ell, \delta_2, \nu}(M) = \sum_{p: |p-\ell| \leq N^\nu} q_{\ell, \delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_p(M)) \quad (4.34)$$

for any $M \in \text{Mat}_N$.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider a smooth function $r = r_k$ such that $r(x) = 1$ for $x \leq k-1$, $r(x) = 0$ for $x \geq k$, and $|r^{(j)}(k)(x)| \leq C$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$, for some $C > 0$. Given $M \in \text{Mat}_N$, we define

$$\chi_k = \chi_k(M) = r_k(F_{\ell, \delta_2, \nu}(M)). \quad (4.35)$$

The function $\chi_k(M)$ is a smooth version of the indicator function for the event that there are no more than k eigenvalues of M in the sub-microscopic interval $I_{\delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell)$.

For $M \in \text{Mat}_N$, $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$T(M) = T(M, \ell) = N\chi_k(M, \ell)v_\ell(M, \mathbf{q}), \quad T_m(M) = T(M)^m. \quad (4.36)$$

We now control high moments of the observable $T(M)$ using Lemma 4.10 and Proposition 3.2.

Lemma 4.12. *Fix $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $C_1, \theta, \nu > 0$, and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. For any generalized Wigner matrix H , $s \in [N^{-1/3+\theta}, 1]$, $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, positive integer $n \leq (\log N)^{C_1}$, and any $\delta, D > 0$, there exist constants $C = C(\delta_1) > 0$, $\sigma = \sigma(\delta_1) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[T_n(H_s)] \leq (2k(1+\delta))^n (2n)!! (1 + CN^{-\sigma}4^n) + N^{-D} \quad (4.37)$$

for $N \geq N_0(C_1, D, \delta, \theta, \delta_1)$, where $T(H_s)$ is defined as in (4.36) using $\varepsilon_2 = \delta_1/10^2$, $\delta_2 = \delta_1/10^3$, $\varepsilon_1 = \delta_1/10^4$, $\nu = \delta_1/10^5$, and any choice of $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Set $\omega = \nu$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, k, \ell)$. We write

$$\mathbb{E}[T_n(M)] = \mathbb{E}[T_n(M)(\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} + \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c})]. \quad (4.38)$$

By Lemma 4.10, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} N v_\ell(\mathbf{q}) \leq \sum_{p=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p^s \rangle^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\delta_1}(N^{-\sigma}). \quad (4.39)$$

for some $\sigma = \sigma(\delta_1) > 0$. This lemma applies because $(1 + s^2)^{-1/2} H_s$ is a generalized Wigner matrix, and its eigenvectors are invariant under rescaling. Because $0 \leq \chi_k \leq 1$ and $v_\ell \geq 0$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} [T_n(M) \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}] \leq \mathbb{E} [(N v_\ell^s(\mathbf{q}))^n \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}] . \quad (4.40)$$

Using (4.39), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [T_n(M) \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{p=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p^s \rangle^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\delta_1}(N^{-\sigma}) \right)^n \right]. \quad (4.41)$$

By applying Proposition 3.2, we have for $m \leq n \leq (\log N)^{C_1}$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{p=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p^s \rangle^2 \right)^m = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{p_1, \dots, p_m=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} \prod_{q=1}^m N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_{p_q}^s \rangle^2 \right] \leq (2k-1)^m (1+\delta)^m (2m)!! \quad (4.42)$$

for $N \geq N_0(C_1, \delta, \theta)$, since $s \in [N^{-1/3+\theta}]$. Inserting (4.42) into (4.41) gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{p=\ell-k+1}^{\ell+k-1} N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_p^s \rangle^2 + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\sigma}) \right)^n \right] \leq (2k-1)^n (1+\delta)^n (2n)!! \left(1 + CN^{-\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \binom{2n}{i} \right) \quad (4.43)$$

$$\leq (2k)^n (1+\delta)^n (2n)!! (1 + CN^{-\sigma} 2^{2n}), \quad (4.44)$$

for some $C = C(\delta_1) > 0$, where in the last inequality we used $\sum_{i=1}^{2n} \binom{2n}{i} \leq 2^{2n}$.

Let \mathcal{C} be the event where rigidity (2.12) holds for H with parameter $\omega' = \nu/10$. We now claim that there exists $N_0(\delta_1) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} F(M) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} \sum_{p: |p-\ell| \leq N^\nu} q_{\ell, \delta_2} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_p(M) \right) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} \sum_{p \in [1, N]} q_{\ell, \delta_2} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_p(M) \right). \quad (4.45)$$

for $N > N_0$. (We recall $\mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)$ was defined in (4.9).) It suffices to show that $q_{\ell, \delta_2} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_p(M) \right) = 0$ for $|p - \ell| > N^\nu$. Suppose first that $\ell < N/4$, and consider two cases: $p - \ell \geq N^\nu$ and $\ell - p \geq N^\nu$.

In the first case, for $p - \ell \geq N^\nu$, for $p \leq N/2$ we have

$$\left| \tilde{\lambda}_p - \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right| \geq |\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell| - |\gamma_\ell - \lambda_\ell| - |\lambda_\ell - \tilde{\lambda}_\ell| - |\gamma_p - \lambda_p| - |\lambda_p - \tilde{\lambda}_p| \quad (4.46)$$

$$\geq cN^{\nu-1/3-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} - N^{\nu/10-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} - N^{(\varepsilon_1-\delta_1)-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} \quad (4.47)$$

$$- N^{\nu/10-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} - N^{(\varepsilon_1-\delta_1)-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} \quad (4.48)$$

$$\geq (c/2)N^{2\nu/3-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} \quad (4.49)$$

on $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)$, for some constant $c > 0$ and $N > N_0(\delta_1)$. We used the definition (2.3) and the fact that the gaps $\gamma_{p+1} - \gamma_p$ decrease as p increases from 1 to $N/2$, so that

$$|\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell| \geq |\gamma_{\ell+N^\nu} - \gamma_\ell| \geq N^\nu(\gamma_{\ell+N^\nu+1} - \gamma_{\ell+N^\nu}) \geq cN^{\nu-2/3}(\ell + N^\nu)^{-1/3} \geq cN^{\nu-1/3-2/3}\ell^{-1/3}, \quad (4.50)$$

where we decreased the value of c in the last inequality. We also used rigidity (2.12), (4.9), $\delta_1 > \varepsilon_1$, and $N^{-2/3}\ell^{-1/3} \geq N^{-2/3}p^{-1/3}$. We therefore obtain (4.45) from (4.49) after recalling that q_{ℓ, δ_2} is supported on

$\left[\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - \frac{2N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}}, \tilde{\lambda}_\ell + \frac{2N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}} \right]$. When $p \geq N/2$, the argument is simpler, and we omit it. The second case, where $\ell - p \geq N^\nu$, is proved similarly.

We have established the claim for $\ell < N/4$. When $\ell \geq 3N/4$, the conclusion follows by symmetry, and for $N/4 \leq \ell \leq 3N/4$ the argument is both similar and easier, so we omit it. We therefore see that (4.45) holds for all choices of $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$.

Let $\mathcal{B}_3 = \mathcal{B}_3(\delta_2, k, \ell) = \{\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)) \leq k\}$ be the event where there are at most k eigenvalues in $I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$, as defined in Definition 4.4. Using (4.45) and the definition of q_{ℓ, δ_2} , we see that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} F(M) \leq k$ implies there are at most k regularized eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_p$ in $\left[\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - \frac{3N^{-\delta_2}}{2N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}}, \tilde{\lambda}_\ell + \frac{3N^{-\delta_2}}{2N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}} \right]$. This in turn implies, using (4.9), that there are most k eigenvalues λ_p in $I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$ for $N \geq N_0(\delta_1)$. Therefore, we have

$$\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} F(M) \leq k\} \subset \mathcal{B}_3 \quad (4.51)$$

for $N \geq N_0(\delta_1)$. Using the definition of χ_k , we see $\chi_k \neq 0$ implies $F(M) \leq k$, so this gives $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2 \cap \{\chi_k \neq 0\} \subset \mathcal{B}_3$. We now observe

$$\{\chi_k \neq 0\} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c \subset \{\chi_k \neq 0\} \cap \left((\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c \cup ((\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2)^c \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c) \right) \quad (4.52)$$

$$\subset \left(\{\chi_k \neq 0\} \cap (\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c \right) \cup \left((\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2)^c \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c \right) \quad (4.53)$$

$$\subset \left(\mathcal{B}_3 \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c \right) \cup \left((\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2)^c \right) \quad (4.54)$$

$$\subset \mathcal{B}^c \cup \mathcal{C}^c, \quad (4.55)$$

where in the last line we used $\mathcal{B}_3 \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c \subset \mathcal{B}^c$ and $\mathcal{B}_2^c \subset \mathcal{B}^c$, which hold by the definitions of \mathcal{B} and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ in Definition 4.4.

Using Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 2.1 to bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c)$, we find

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}^c) \leq C_2 \exp(-c_1(\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}), \quad (4.56)$$

for some constants $C_2(\delta_1), c_1(\delta_1) > 0$.

Therefore, for the second term in (4.38), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [T_n(M) \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}^c}] \leq \mathbb{E} [T_n(M) (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}^c} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}^c})] \quad (4.57)$$

$$\leq N^{5(\log N)^{c_1}} C_2 \exp(-c_1(\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}) \leq N^{-D} \quad (4.58)$$

for $N \geq N_0(D, \delta_1)$. Here we used the fact that v_ℓ^s is always bounded by $N^{3+\varepsilon_2} \leq N^4$ using the trivial bound $|G_{ij}(E + i\eta)| \leq \eta^{-1}$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ in the definition (4.6). \square

We conclude this section by bounding the derivatives of $T(M)$.

Lemma 4.13. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Fix $\varepsilon_1, \delta_1, \varepsilon_2, \delta_2, \nu \in (0, 1)$ and $n \leq 10 \log N$, and set $\omega = \nu$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2)$. Then there exists $C = C(\varepsilon_2) > 0$ such that for all $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$, we have*

$$\sup_{a, b, c, d \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j T_n(\Theta_w^{(c, d)} H) \right| \leq CN^{25j(\nu + \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + \delta_2 + \varepsilon_2)}, \quad (4.59)$$

and

$$\sup_{a, b, c, d \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \left| \partial_{ab}^j T_n(\Theta_w^{(c, d)} H) \right| \leq CN^{Cj}, \quad (4.60)$$

where we recall $T(M)$ was defined in (4.36).

Proof. We use the chain rule in the definition of $T(M)$, (4.36), to compute its derivatives. Since $T_n(M) = T(M)^n$, there are powers of n coming from the derivatives of $x \mapsto x^n$. Because $n \leq 10 \log N$ by hypothesis, these powers are logarithmic in size, and they can be absorbed into the powers of N appearing in the rest of this proof to produce the final bound (4.59). (The $20j$ from (4.79) below becomes $25j$ in the final estimate (4.59) to account for these logarithmic factors.) Then, by the product rule and $T(M) = N\chi_k(M, \ell)v_\ell(M, \mathbf{q})$, it is enough to bound the derivatives of $\chi = \chi_k(\Theta_w^{(c,d)}H)$ and $v_\ell = v_\ell(\mathbf{q}, \Theta_w^{(c,d)}H)$ separately.

We begin by bounding the derivatives of v_ℓ , starting with $\partial_{ab}v_\ell$. We claim that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j v_\ell \right| \leq CN^{-1+(j+1)(\delta_1+\varepsilon_1)+10j\varepsilon_2}, \quad \left| \partial_{ab}^j v_\ell \right| \leq CN^{Cj} \quad (4.61)$$

for $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and some $C = C(\varepsilon_2) > 0$. By the Leibniz integral rule, we have

$$\pi \partial_{ab} v_\ell = \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell + N^{-\delta_2-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3} + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle \left(\partial_{ab} \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right) \quad (4.62)$$

$$- \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - N^{-\delta_2-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3} + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle \left(\partial_{ab} \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right) \quad (4.63)$$

$$+ \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell)} \text{Im} \partial_{ab} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(E + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle dE. \quad (4.64)$$

Using the derivative estimate (4.1) and Green's function bound (4.13), we find that

$$|(4.62) + (4.63)| \leq CN^{-1+\delta_1+\varepsilon_1+4\varepsilon_2}. \quad (4.65)$$

Using $|\widehat{I}_\delta(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell)| \leq \frac{N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}}$ and (4.14), we find

$$|(4.64)| \leq CN^{10\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{\widehat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3} \frac{N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}} \leq CN^{-1+10\varepsilon_2}. \quad (4.66)$$

Together, (4.65) and (4.66) imply

$$|\partial_{ab} v_\ell| \leq CN^{-1+\delta_1+\varepsilon_1+10\varepsilon_2} \quad (4.67)$$

For the second derivative, we obtain

$$\pi \partial_{ab}^2 v_\ell = \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell + N^{-\delta_2-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3} + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle \left(\partial_{ab}^2 \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right) \quad (4.68)$$

$$+ \partial_{ab} \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell + N^{-\delta_2-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3} + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle \left(\partial_{ab} \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right) \quad (4.69)$$

$$- \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - N^{-\delta_2-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3} + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle \left(\partial_{ab}^2 \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right) \quad (4.70)$$

$$- \partial_{ab} \text{Im} \langle \mathbf{q}, G(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - N^{-\delta_2-2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{-1/3} + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle \left(\partial_{ab} \tilde{\lambda}_\ell \right) \quad (4.71)$$

$$+ \int_{\widehat{I}_{\delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell)} \text{Im} \partial_{ab}^2 \langle \mathbf{q}, G(E + i\eta_\ell)\mathbf{q} \rangle dE, \quad (4.72)$$

and we deduce using (4.1) and (4.13) that

$$|\partial_{ab}^2 v_\ell| \leq CN^{-1+2(\delta_1+\varepsilon_1)+20\varepsilon_2} \quad (4.73)$$

Continuing in this way, we obtain the first bound in (4.61). The second bound follows from the trivial estimate $|G_{ij}(E + i\eta)| \leq \eta^{-1}$.

Using (4.13) and the definition of v_ℓ , we also note the bounds

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} |v_\ell| \leq CN^{-1+4\varepsilon_2}, \quad |v_\ell| \leq N^2 \quad (4.74)$$

for some $C = C(\varepsilon_2) > 0$.

We now bound the derivatives of χ_k . Recall that $\chi_k(M) = r_k(F(M))$, and that r_k and its first five derivatives are bounded in absolute value by a constant. It therefore suffices to bound the derivatives of $F(M)$.

Using the derivative estimate (4.1) and the definition of q , we have for $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j F(M) \right| \leq \sum_{p: |p-\ell| \leq N^\nu} \left| \partial_{ab}^j q(\tilde{\lambda}_p) \right| \quad (4.75)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=1}^j CN^\nu \left(N^{(2/3+\delta_2)m} \widehat{p}^{m/3} \right) \left(N^{-m(2/3)+(j+1)(\varepsilon_1+\delta_1)} \widehat{p}^{-m/3} \right) \leq CN^{(j+1)(\nu+\delta_1+\varepsilon_1+\delta_2)}. \quad (4.76)$$

Additionally, using (4.3), for $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ we have the trivial bound

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j F(M) \right| \leq \sum_{p: |p-\ell| \leq N^\nu} \left| \partial_{ab}^j q(\tilde{\lambda}_p) \right| \leq CN^{Cj}. \quad (4.77)$$

This yields

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j \chi_k \right| \leq CN^{(j+1)(\nu+\delta_1+\varepsilon_1+\delta_2)}, \quad \left| \partial_{ab}^j \chi_k \right| \leq CN^{j(C+\nu)}. \quad (4.78)$$

Combining (4.61), (4.74), and (4.78) yields

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j (\chi_k v_\ell) \right| \leq CN^{-1+20j(\nu+\delta_1+\varepsilon_1+\delta_2+\varepsilon_2)}, \quad \left| \partial_{ab}^j (\chi_k v_\ell) \right| \leq CN^{Cj} \quad (4.79)$$

for $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and some $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$. We used above the fact that $|\chi_k| \leq 1$ by definition. This completes the proof. \square

5. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

Given the proceeding sections, we are ready to prove our main results. Section 5.1 contains the proof of Theorem 1.2, Section 5.2 contains the proof of Theorem 1.3, and Section 5.3 contains the proof of Theorem 1.4.

In this section only, given some $\delta_1 > 0$ we fix the choice of parameters

$$\varepsilon_2 = \delta_1/10^2, \quad \delta_2 = \delta_1/10^3, \quad \varepsilon_1 = \delta_1/10^4, \quad \nu = \omega = \delta_1/10^5, \quad (5.1)$$

which appeared in the statement of Lemma 4.12. With these choices, $T(H)$ has two free parameters, δ_1 and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

5.1. Proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Then there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that the following holds. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C = C(k) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[T_n(H)] \leq C^n (2n)!! \quad (5.2)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $n \leq \lceil \log N \rceil$, where the parameters in the definition of T_n are chosen as in (5.1)

Proof. We first recall the dynamics H_s defined in (2.5) for any initial matrix H_0 , and set $s_1 = N^{-1/4}$. By the moment matching lemma [33, Lemma 16.2], there exists a generalized Wigner matrix H_0 such that the matrix $R = (1 + s_1^2)^{-1/2} H_{s_1}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^k] = \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^k]$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 3 \rrbracket$ and $|\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^4] - \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^4]| \leq CN^{-2}s_1$ for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on the constants used to verify that Definition 1.1 holds for H_0 . We observe that R is also a generalized Wigner matrix according to definition Definition 1.1; in particular, it has subexponential

entry distributions, and the scaling factor $(1 + s_1^2)^{-1/2}$ is chosen so that its variance matrix satisfies condition (1.2).

Fix any bijection

$$\varphi: \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N\} \rightarrow \llbracket 1, \gamma_N \rrbracket, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\gamma_N = N(N+1)/2$, and define the matrices $H^1, H^2, \dots, H^{\gamma_N}$ by

$$h_{ij}^\gamma = \begin{cases} h_{ij} & \text{if } \varphi(i, j) \leq \gamma \\ r_{ij} & \text{if } \varphi(i, j) > \gamma \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

for $i \leq j$.

Fix some $\gamma \in \llbracket 1, \gamma_N \rrbracket$ and consider the indices (i, j) such that $\varphi(i, j) = \gamma$. For any $m \geq 1$, we may Taylor expand $T_m(H^\gamma)$ in the (i, j) entry, write $\partial = \partial_{ij}$, and find

$$T_m(H^\gamma) - T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) = \partial T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij} + \frac{1}{2!} \partial^2 T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \partial^3 T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij}^3 \quad (5.5)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4!} \partial^4 T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij}^4 + \frac{1}{5!} \partial^5 T_m(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij}^5, \quad (5.6)$$

where $w_1(\gamma) \in [0, 1]$ is a random variable depending on h_{ij} .

Subtracting the analogous expansion of $T_m(H^{\gamma-1})$ in the (i, j) entry and taking expectation, we find

$$\mathbb{E}[T_m(H^\gamma)] - \mathbb{E}[T_m(H^{\gamma-1})] = \frac{1}{4!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^4 T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij}^4] - \frac{1}{4!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^4 T_m(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) r_{ij}^4] \quad (5.7)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{5!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^5 T_m(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) h_{ij}^5] - \frac{1}{5!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^5 T_m(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma) r_{ij}^5], \quad (5.8)$$

where we used that $\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma$ is independent from h_{ij} and r_{ij} , and that $\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^k] = \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^k]$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 3 \rrbracket$. Here $w_2(\gamma) \in [0, 1]$ is a random variable depending on r_{ij} .

By Lemma 4.12 applied with the parameters $\theta = 1/100$, $\delta = 1$, $D = 1$, and $C_1 = 2$, we have for for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \leq \lceil 2 \log N \rceil$ that

$$\mathbb{E}[T_m(R)] \leq L^m (2m)!! \quad (5.9)$$

for some $L = L(k, \delta_1) > 0$ and all $N \geq N_0(\delta_1)$. We set $g(m) = L^m (2m)!!$.

We now use (5.9) and the expansion in (5.7) and (5.8) to show that $\mathbb{E}[T_m(H)] \leq 3g(m)$ for all $m \leq \lceil 2 \log N \rceil$. Our argument proceeds by induction, with the induction hypothesis at step $m \in \mathbb{N}$ being that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[T_n\left(\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H^\gamma\right)\right] \leq 3g(n) \quad (5.10)$$

holds for all $0 \leq n \leq m \leq \lceil 2 \log N \rceil$ and choices of $w \in [0, 1]$ and $(a, b) \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket^2$.

The base case $m = 0$ is trivial. Assuming the induction hypothesis holds for $m - 1$, we will show it holds for m . Using the independence of h_{ij} and r_{ij} from $\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma$, we may rewrite the first two terms on the right side of (5.7) as

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\partial^4 T_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^4\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\partial^4 T_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) r_{ij}^4\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\partial^4 T_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[h_{ij}^4 - r_{ij}^4\right]. \quad (5.11)$$

For the second factor, we recall that $|\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^4] - \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^4]| \leq CN^{-2}s_1 = CN^{-2-1/4}$. For the first, we compute

$$\partial^4 T_m = \partial^4 (T^m) = m T_{m-1} T^{(4)} + 3m(m-1) T_{m-2} (T^{(2)})^2 + m(m-1)(m-2)(m-3) T_{m-4} (T')^4 \quad (5.12)$$

$$+ 4m(m-1) T_{m-2} T^{(1)} T^{(3)} + 6m(m-1)(m-2) T_{m-3} (T')^2 T^{(2)}. \quad (5.13)$$

We write $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2)$. Using the induction hypothesis (5.10) for $n \leq m-1$, $m \leq \lceil 2 \log N \rceil$, the fact that $T_m \geq 0$, and (4.59), we find that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \partial^4 T_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| \leq C (\log N)^4 N^{100(\nu + \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + \delta_2 + \varepsilon_2)} g(m-1), \quad (5.14)$$

where $C = C(\delta_1) > 0$ is a constant.

Further, by (4.60) and Lemma 4.6, we find

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}^c} \partial^4 T_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| \leq CN^{-2} \quad (5.15)$$

for some constant $C = C(\delta_1) > 0$.⁴

It follows from (5.14) and (5.15) that if δ_1 is chosen small enough, so that⁵

$$130(\nu + \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + \delta_2 + \varepsilon_2) < 1/8, \quad (5.16)$$

then

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 T_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^4 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 T_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^4 \right] \right| \leq C (\log N)^4 N^{-2-1/8} g(m-1). \quad (5.17)$$

holds for all $m \leq \log N$, for some constant $C = C(\delta_1) > 0$; we now fix δ_1 so that it satisfies this condition. Therefore, if $N \geq N_0(\delta_1)$, then

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 T_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^4 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 T_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^4 \right] \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} N^{-2} g(m-1). \quad (5.18)$$

Let \mathcal{D} be the event where $\sup_{i,j} |r_{ij}| + |h_{ij}| \leq CN^{-1/2+\delta_1}$ holds. Since the variables r_{ij} and h_{ij} are subexponential, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}^c) \leq D_1 \exp(-d_1 (\log N)^{d_1 \log \log N}), \quad (5.19)$$

for some constants $D_1(\delta_1), d_1(\delta_1) > 0$.

For the terms in (5.8), we compute

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}} \partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}^c} \partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] \right| \quad (5.20)$$

$$\leq CN^{-5/2+5\delta_1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right| \right] + 1 \right), \quad (5.21)$$

for some $C(\delta_1) > 0$. In the last line, we used (5.19) and the inequality of (4.60).

An analogous bound holds for the second term in (5.8). Then repeating the previous argument for the fourth order term given in (5.14) and (5.15), and using (5.16), we find that there exists $C(\delta_1) > 0$ such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^5 \right] \right| \quad (5.22)$$

$$\leq C (\log N)^5 N^{-5/2+5\delta_1+125(\nu+\delta_1+\varepsilon_1+\delta_2+\varepsilon_2)} g(m-1) \quad (5.23)$$

$$\leq C (\log N)^5 N^{-2-1/8} g(m-1). \quad (5.24)$$

Therefore, if $N \geq N_0(\delta_1)$, then

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 T_m \left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^5 \right] \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} N^{-2} g(m-1) \quad (5.25)$$

⁴We note that the constants in the probability bound given by Lemma 4.6 do not depend on the choice of γ , since the H^γ verify Definition 1.1 simultaneously for the appropriate choice of constants. Therefore, the C in (5.15) is uniform in γ . Analogous remarks apply to our other uses of the four moment method in this work.

⁵This bound is slightly stronger than necessary for the fourth order term, but will be needed for the fifth order remainder term.

Combining (5.18) and (5.25) yields

$$|\mathbb{E}[T_m(H^\gamma)] - \mathbb{E}[T_m(H^{\gamma^{-1}})]| \leq N^{-2}g(m-1) \leq N^{-2}g(m), \quad (5.26)$$

and summing (5.26) over all γ_N pairs (i, j) , we find

$$|\mathbb{E}[T_m(R)] - \mathbb{E}[T_m(H^\gamma)]| \leq g(m) \quad (5.27)$$

for any γ . Using (5.9) and (5.27), we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}[T_m(H^\gamma)] \leq 2g(m). \quad (5.28)$$

This verifies the induction hypothesis (5.10) when $w = 1$.

To address other values of w , we consider the following expansion:

$$T_m(H^\gamma) - T_m(\Theta_w^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) = \partial T_m(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) h_{ij} + \frac{1}{2!} \partial^2 T_m(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) h_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \partial^3 T_m(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) h_{ij}^3 \quad (5.29)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4!} \partial^4 T_m(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) h_{ij}^4 + \frac{1}{5!} \partial^5 T_m(\Theta_{\tau(w)}^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) h_{ij}^5, \quad (5.30)$$

Here $\tau(w) \in [0, 1]$ is a random variable. The same argument that gave the bound (5.18) shows that the right side of (5.29) and the first term of (5.30) may be bounded in absolute value by $\frac{1}{2}g(m)$. The second term of (5.30) is also bounded in absolute value by $\frac{1}{2}g(m)$ by the reasoning leading to (5.22). We conclude

$$\sup_{w \in [0,1]} \sup_{a,b \in [1,n]} \mathbb{E} \left[T_m(\Theta_w^{(a,b)}H^\gamma) \right] \leq 3g(m). \quad (5.31)$$

This completes the induction and therefore concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Then there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that the following holds. For every $D > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\ell \in [1, N]$, there exists $C = C(D, k) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(T(H, \ell) \geq C \log N) \leq CN^{-D}. \quad (5.32)$$

Proof. Set $J = \lceil \log N \rceil$. By Markov's inequality applied to the J -th moment of $T(H)$ and (5.1), we have for any $K > 0$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(T(H) \geq 2K \log N) \leq \mathbb{P}(T(H) \geq KJ) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[T_J(H)]}{(KJ)^J} \leq \frac{L^J (2J-1)!!}{(KJ)^J}, \quad (5.33)$$

where $L = L(k)$ and the δ_1 defining $T(H)$ are given by Lemma 5.1. By Stirling's formula,

$$(\lceil 2 \log N - 1 \rceil)!! \leq B(2 \lceil \log N \rceil)^{(2 \lceil \log N \rceil + 1)/2} N^{-1} \quad (5.34)$$

for some constant $B > 0$. We then deduce from (5.33) that

$$\mathbb{P}(T(H) \geq KJ) \leq \frac{BL^J (2J)^{(2J+1)/2}}{(KJ)^J N} = \left(\frac{L}{K} \right)^J \frac{B\sqrt{J}}{N}. \quad (5.35)$$

The conclusion follows after taking $C = \max(2K, B)$ and $K \geq L \exp(2D)$. \square

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 1.2, we require the following level repulsion estimate, which is proved in Appendix B.

Proposition 5.3. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ be the vector of its eigenvalues. Fix $D > 0$, $\mathbf{a} > 0$, and $\delta_2 \in (0, 1/100)$. Then there exist $k = k(D, \mathbf{a}, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $C = C(D, \mathbf{a}, \delta_2) > 0$ such that for any $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I(\delta_2, \mathbf{a}, \lambda_\ell)) \geq k) \leq CN^{-D}, \quad (5.36)$$

where

$$I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, \lambda_\ell) = \left[\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - \frac{\mathbf{a}N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}}, \tilde{\lambda}_\ell + \frac{\mathbf{a}N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}} \right]. \quad (5.37)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let \mathcal{C} be the event where rigidity (2.12) holds for H with parameter $\omega' = \nu/10$. It was shown in the proof of Lemma 4.12 as (4.45) that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} F(M) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1)} \sum_{p \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} q_{\ell, \delta_2} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_p(M) \right). \quad (5.38)$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$I = \left[\tilde{\lambda}_\ell - \frac{3N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}}, \tilde{\lambda}_\ell + \frac{3N^{-\delta_2}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{\ell}^{1/3}} \right], \quad \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(k) = \{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \leq k-1\}, \quad (5.39)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the vector of eigenvalues of H . Then by the definition of χ_k , we have for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\mathcal{A}(k) \cap \mathcal{B}_2(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1) \cap \mathcal{C} \subset \{F(M) \leq k-1\} \subset \{\chi_k = 1\}. \quad (5.40)$$

Define $T(H)$ using the choice of $\delta_1 > 0$ provided by Lemma 5.2, the parameter choices (5.1), and a parameter $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which will be chosen later. We obtain using (5.40) and the definition $T(M) = N\chi_k(M)v_\ell(M, \mathbf{q})$ given in (4.36) that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}_2 \cap \mathcal{C}} Nv_\ell(\mathbf{q}) \leq T(M)$. Therefore, (5.32) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}_2 \cap \mathcal{C}} Nv_\ell(\mathbf{q}) \geq K \log N) \leq KN^{-D-2} \quad (5.41)$$

for some $K = K(D, k) > 0$. By Proposition 5.3, Proposition 4.1, and (2.12), there exists $k_0 = k_0(D, \delta_1)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}_2 \cap \mathcal{C})^c) \leq N^{-D-2} \quad (5.42)$$

for $k \geq k_0$ and $N \geq N_0(k, \delta_1)$. We conclude from (5.41) and (5.42) that

$$\mathbb{P}(Nv_\ell(\mathbf{q}) \geq K \log N) \leq (K+1)N^{-D-2} \quad (5.43)$$

for $k \geq k_0$ and $N \geq N_0$. Set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)$. By Lemma 4.11, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \leq v_\ell(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1-c}) \quad (5.44)$$

for some $c = c(\delta_1) > 0$. Then combining (5.44) with (5.43) gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \geq 2K \log N) \leq (K+1)N^{-D-2} \quad (5.45)$$

for $N \geq N_0(k, \delta_1)$, after increasing N_0 . By Lemma 4.7, there exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $k = \max(k_0, k_1)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(N \langle \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \geq 2K \log N) \leq N^{-D-1} \quad (5.46)$$

for $N \geq N_0(D)$. This proves (1.6) after taking taking $C = C(D)$ large enough. (Recall that δ_1 was fixed earlier). Finally, (1.5) follows from (5.46) after taking $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{e}_i$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and applying a union bound over all N choices of i , where the \mathbf{e}_i are the standard basis vectors, and increasing the value of C . \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3. Given a vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\beta > 0$, we introduce

$$A = A_\beta(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{\beta} \log \left(\sum_{i \in [1, N]} \exp(\beta w_i) \right). \quad (5.47)$$

The following lemma is elementary and its proof is omitted.

Lemma 5.4. *For any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$\left| \sup_{i \in [1, N]} w_i - A_\beta(\mathbf{w}) \right| < \frac{2 \log N}{\beta}. \quad (5.48)$$

We let $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ denote the standard basis vectors for \mathbb{R}^N , defined by $\mathbf{e}_a(b) = \mathbb{1}_{a=b}$. For any $M \in \text{Mat}_N$ and $\ell \in [1, N]$, we set $\mathbf{v}_\ell = (N v_\ell(\mathbf{e}_i))_{i=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where v_ℓ is the regularized eigenvector projection for M defined in Definition 4.2.

Lemma 5.5. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix and fix $\ell \in [1, N]$. Fix $\delta_1 > 0$ and make the parameter choices (5.1). Define $\beta = N^{\delta_1}$, and set*

$$\mathcal{E} = \bigcap_{i \in [1, N]} \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{e}_i, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}} = \bigcap_{i \in [1, N]} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{e}_i, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2, 1, \ell). \quad (5.49)$$

First, there exists $c = c(\delta_1) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \left| \sup_{i \in [1, N]} N \langle \mathbf{u}_\ell, \mathbf{e}_i \rangle^2 - A_\beta(\mathbf{v}_\ell(H)) \right| \leq CN^{-c}. \quad (5.50)$$

Second, for all $j \in [1, 5]$,

$$\sup_{a, b, c, d \in [1, N]} \sup_{w \in [0, 1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j A_\beta \left(\mathbf{v}_\ell(\Theta_w^{(c, d)} H) \right) \right| \leq CN^{10j(2\delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)}. \quad (5.51)$$

Third, we have for $j \in [1, 5]$ that

$$\sup_{a, b, c, d \in [1, N]} \sup_{w \in [0, 1]} \left| \partial_{ab}^j A_\beta \left(\mathbf{v}_\ell(\Theta_w^{(c, d)} H) \right) \right| \leq CN^{Cj}. \quad (5.52)$$

Here $C = C(\delta_1) > 0$ is a constant.

Remark 5.6. Note that in the definition of the event $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$, we set $k = 1$ as a parameter for $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. In other words, we consider the event where λ_ℓ is the unique eigenvalue in the sub-microscopic interval $I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)$.

Proof. By (4.16), we have for any $i \in [1, N]$ that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} v_\ell(\mathbf{e}_i) \leq \langle \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 + \mathcal{O}_{\delta_1} \left(N^{-1+3\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2} + N^{-1+\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2-\delta_1} \right). \quad (5.53)$$

By (4.30),

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \langle \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 \leq v_\ell(\mathbf{e}_i) + \mathcal{O} \left(N^{-1+\omega+\delta_2-\varepsilon_2} + N^{-1+\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2-\delta_1} \right). \quad (5.54)$$

We deduce from (5.53) and (5.54) that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \left| N \langle \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{u}_\ell \rangle^2 - N v_\ell(\mathbf{e}_i) \right| \leq c^{-1} N^{-c} \quad (5.55)$$

for some $c = c(\delta_1) > 0$. Since (5.55) is independent of i , we deduce (5.50) after taking a supremum over all $i \in [1, N]$ and using (5.48).

We now claim that the partial derivatives of $A_\beta(\mathbf{w})$ with respect to the entries of the vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfy

$$\sum_{\underline{j}} \left| \frac{\partial^d A(\mathbf{w})}{\partial_{j_1} \cdots \partial_{j_d}} \right| \leq C\beta^{d-1}, \quad (5.56)$$

for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Here the sum runs over all multi-indices $\underline{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_d)$ with values in $\llbracket 1, N \rrbracket^d$, $\partial_j = \partial_{v_j}$, and $C = C(d) > 0$ is a constant. This inequality follows by straightforward differentiation, and complete details are given in [45, Lemma 3.4]. Using the chain rule, (5.56) and the first inequality in (4.61) imply (5.51). Similarly, (5.56) and the second inequality in (4.61) imply (5.52). \square

Before proceeding, we require the following proposition, which is proved in Appendix B.

Proposition 5.7. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. Then there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, there exist constants $C = C(\delta)$ and $c = c(\delta) > 0$ such that for any $i \in \llbracket 1, N-1 \rrbracket$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i < \frac{N^{-\delta}}{N^{2/3} \hat{v}_i^{1/3}} \right) < C(\delta) N^{-\delta-c}. \quad (5.57)$$

We also introduce some notation. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we let $f = f_\varepsilon: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth, weakly increasing function such that $|f(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x) = 0$ for $x \leq (2 + \varepsilon) \log N$, $f(x) = 1$ for $x \geq (2 + 2\varepsilon) \log N$, and the derivatives of $f(x)$ satisfy $|f^{(j)}(x)| \leq C(\log N)^j$ for all $j \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and some constant $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$. For $M \in \text{Mat}_N$ and $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, we also define

$$S(M) = S_{\beta, \varepsilon}(M) = f_\varepsilon(A_\beta(\mathbf{v}_\ell(M))). \quad (5.58)$$

Lemma 5.8. *Let H_0 be a generalized Wigner matrix and fix $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$. Fix $\delta_1, \varepsilon > 0$ and $s \in [N^{-1/4}, 1]$, and choose parameters according to (5.1). Then there exist constants $C = C(\delta_1, \varepsilon) > 0$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta, \varepsilon}(H_s)] \leq CN^{-c}, \quad (5.59)$$

where $\beta = N^{\delta_1}$.

Proof. Define $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ as in Lemma 5.5 and observe that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}) \leq CN^{-c}$ for some constants $C = C(\delta) > 0$ and $c = c(\delta_1) > 0$ by (5.57) and Lemma 4.6. Then we have, using the definition of $S(H_s)$ and (5.50), that

$$\mathbb{E}[S(H_s)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} f_\varepsilon(A_\beta(\mathbf{v}_\ell(M)))] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^c} f_\varepsilon(A_\beta(\mathbf{v}_\ell(M)))] \quad (5.60)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}[f_\varepsilon(N \|\mathbf{u}_\ell^s\|_\infty^2 + C_1 N^{-c_1})] + CN^{-c} \quad (5.61)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}(N \|\mathbf{u}_\ell^s\|_\infty^2 + C_1 N^{-c_1} \geq (2 + \varepsilon) \log N) + CN^{-c} \quad (5.62)$$

for some constants $C_1 = C_1(\delta_1) > 0$ and $c_1(\delta_1) > 0$. For $N \geq N_0(\delta_1)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[S(H_s)] \leq \mathbb{P}\left(N \|\mathbf{u}_\ell^s\|_\infty^2 \geq \left(2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \log N\right) + CN^{-c} \leq C_2 (\log N)^{1/2} N^{-c_2} + CN^{-c} \quad (5.63)$$

for some constants $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c_2 = c_2(\varepsilon) > 0$, where in the last inequality we used (3.36) with $\delta = \varepsilon/10$ and $\theta = 1/10$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix and fix $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Set $\delta_1 = 10^{-4}$, $\beta = N^{\delta_1}$, and define $S_{\beta, \varepsilon}$ according to the choice of parameters (5.1). Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta, \varepsilon}(H)] \leq CN^{-c} \quad (5.64)$$

for constants $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$.

Proof. Define \mathcal{E} as in the statement of Lemma 5.5. By the definition of $f_\varepsilon(x)$ and Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\sup_{a,b,c,d \in [1,N]} \sup_{w \in [0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \left| \partial_{ab}^j S \left(\Theta_w^{(c,d)} H \right) \right| \leq C (\log N)^j N^{25j(2\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \nu)}, \quad (5.65)$$

and almost surely that

$$\sup_{a,b,c,d \in [1,N]} \sup_{w \in [0,1]} \left| \partial_{ab}^j S \left(\Theta_w^{(c,d)} H \right) \right| \leq CN^{Cj} \quad (5.66)$$

for all $j \in [1, 5]$, where $C > 0$ is a constant. We now define s_1 , φ , H^γ , and R to have the same meanings as in the proof of Lemma 5.1. For a fixed choice of $\gamma = \varphi(i, j)$, following that proof gives

$$\mathbb{E}[S(H^\gamma)] - \mathbb{E}[S(H^{\gamma^{-1}})] = \frac{1}{4!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^4 \right] - \frac{1}{4!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^4 \right] \quad (5.67)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{5!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] - \frac{1}{5!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^5 \right], \quad (5.68)$$

where $w_1(\gamma), w_2(\gamma) \in [0, 1]$ are random variables, and $\partial = \partial_{ij}$.

Using (5.65) and (5.1), we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| \leq C (\log N)^4 N^{100(2\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \nu)}. \quad (5.69)$$

By Lemma 4.6 and a union bound, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}), \quad (5.70)$$

for some constants $C_1(\delta_1), c_1(\delta_1) > 0$. Using (5.70) and (5.66), we find

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| \leq CN^{-10}, \quad (5.71)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Then (5.69), (5.71), and the choice $\delta_1 = 10^{-4}$ give

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^4 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 S \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^4 \right] \right| \leq CN^{-2-c} \quad (5.72)$$

for some constants $C, c > 0$. We also used the independence of h_{ij} and r_{ij} from $\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma$.

Let \mathcal{D} be the event where $\sup_{i,j} |r_{ij}| + |h_{ij}| \leq CN^{-1/2+\delta_1}$ holds. Since the variables r_{ij} and h_{ij} are subexponential, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}^c) \leq D_1 \exp(-d_1 (\log N)^{d_1 \log \log N}), \quad (5.73)$$

for some constants $D_1, d_1 > 0$. On \mathcal{D} , we therefore have $\sup_{i,j} |r_{ij}|^5 + |h_{ij}|^5 \leq CN^{-5/2+5\delta_1}$. Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, (5.66) and (5.73), and that $|h_{ij}|$ and $|r_{ij}|$ have finite 10th moments, we find

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}^c} \partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}^c} \partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^5 \right] \right| \leq CN^{-10} \quad (5.74)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. We also have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}} \partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^4 \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{D}} \partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^4 \right] \right| \quad (5.75)$$

$$\leq N^{-5/2+5\delta_1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \partial^5 S \left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right|^2 \right] \right) \leq CN^{-2-c} \quad (5.76)$$

for some constants $C, c > 0$, where the last inequality follows from reasoning similar to (5.69) and (5.71).

Combining (5.67), (5.68), (5.72), and (5.76), and summing over all $N(N+1)/2$ choices of γ , we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[S_{\beta,\varepsilon}(H)] - \mathbb{E}[S_{\beta,\varepsilon}(R)] \right| \leq CN^{-c}. \quad (5.77)$$

The conclusion follows after applying Lemma 5.8 to $\mathbb{E}[S_{\beta,\varepsilon}(R)]$ in (5.77). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Observe (5.64) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_\beta(\mathbf{v}(H)) \geq (2 + 2\varepsilon) \log N) \leq CN^{-c} \quad (5.78)$$

for some constants $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c = c(\varepsilon) > 0$. Together with (5.50), this implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \sup_{i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} N \langle \mathbf{u}_\ell, \mathbf{e}_i \rangle \geq (2 + 2\varepsilon) \log N + CN^{-c}\right) \leq CN^{-c} \quad (5.79)$$

after adjusting the values of C and c . For $N \geq N_0(\varepsilon)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} \sup_{i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} N \langle \mathbf{u}_\ell, \mathbf{e}_i \rangle \geq (2 + 3\varepsilon) \log N\right) \leq CN^{-c}. \quad (5.80)$$

We now observe that there exist constants $C_1, c_1 > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^c) \leq C_1 N^{-c_1}$ by (5.57) and Lemma 4.6. The claim (1.7) then follows after redefining ε . The proof of (1.8) follows by the same methods and is slightly easier. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 1.4. In this section, we begin by reviewing the reverse heat flow technique, then use it to prove Theorem 1.4. Since the argument is standard, our treatment is brisk, and we refer the reader to [13] for complete details.

First, we say that a random variable $h = h(N)$ is *smooth on the scale* $\sigma = \sigma(N)$ if it has a density $e^{-V(x)}$ that satisfies

$$\left|V^{(k)}(x)\right| \leq C\sigma^{-k}(1 + |x|)^C \quad (5.81)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \geq 0$, and some constant $C > 0$.

The key technical input is [13, Lemma 4.1], which says essentially the following. Suppose H is a generalized Wigner matrix whose entries verify definition (5.81) on scale $\sigma = N^{-a}$ with a uniform constant C . Let $t = N^{-b}$ be a time parameter, and suppose $0 < 2a < b < 1$. Then there exists a generalized Wigner matrix \tilde{H} such that

$$d_{\text{TV}}\left(H, \sqrt{1-t}\tilde{H} + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N\right) \leq N^{-D} \quad (5.82)$$

for $N \geq N_0(a, b, D)$, where d_{TV} denotes the total variation norm and GOE_N is independent from \tilde{H} .⁶ The intuition here is that one is finding initial data such that its time evolution under a certain parabolic differential equation is the same as H ; since parabolic differential equations (e.g. the heat equation) are smoothing, this is impossible unless the target data itself has some degree of smoothness.

By Corollary 3.4, we obtain strong delocalization results when $t \gg N^{-1/3}$. This corresponds to $b > 1/3$, which explains the requirement of smoothness on a scale $N^{-1/6+\vartheta}$ for some $\vartheta > 0$ in Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Use [13, Lemma 4.1] to construct \tilde{H} satisfying (5.82). From (5.82), it follows that for any $D > 0$, we have

$$d_{\text{TV}}\left(\sup_{\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \|\mathbf{u}_\ell(H)\|_\infty, \sup_{\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \left\|\mathbf{u}_\ell\left(\sqrt{1-t}\tilde{H} + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N\right)\right\|_\infty\right) \leq N^{-D} \quad (5.83)$$

for $N \geq N_0(a, b, D)$. Then by the definition of total variation distance,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \|\mathbf{u}_\ell(H)\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{(4 + \varepsilon) \log N}{N}}\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \left\|\mathbf{u}_\ell\left(\sqrt{1-t}\tilde{H} + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N\right)\right\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{\frac{(4 + \varepsilon) \log N}{N}}\right) + N^{-D}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.84)$$

⁶[13, Lemma 4.1] is actually stated in term of an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process. Reaching the given form requires a straightforward calculation which may be found, for example, as [41, (2.17)].

The conclusion follows after taking $D = 1$ and observing that the eigenvectors of $\sqrt{1-t}\tilde{H} + \sqrt{t}\text{GOE}_N$ satisfy (1.10), by (3.38). \square

Remark 5.10. The hypothesis of subexponential decay in Definition 1.1 is necessary to use [13, Lemma 4.1] as stated. However, as noted in [13, Section 1], this hypothesis could be weakened to assuming that only some large moment exists.

A. EIGENVALUE REGULARIZATION

We begin by presenting some computations to motivate the definition of the regularized eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_i$. Let $i = i(N) \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ be an eigenvalue index. For $m \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, recall that γ_m is the m -th quantile of the semicircle distribution, as defined in (2.3). For $m \leq 0$, we define γ_m such that $\gamma_m = \gamma_1 - (1 - m)N^{-2/3}$. For $m > N$, we set $\gamma_m = \gamma_N + (m - N)N^{-2/3}$.

Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be a parameter to be fixed later. Let j and k be indices such that $i - 2N^{\varepsilon_1} \leq j \leq i - N^{\varepsilon_1}$ and $i + N^{\varepsilon_1} \leq k \leq i + 2N^{\varepsilon_1}$, and define the interval $I = [\gamma_j, \gamma_k]$. We define the eigenvalue counting function for any $E \geq -10$ by

$$\mathcal{N}(E) = |\{k \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \mid \lambda_k \in [-10, E]\}| = \text{Tr} \mathbb{1}_{[-10, E]}(H). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We now suppose that rigidity (2.12) holds with $\omega = \varepsilon_1/10$. We then have that

$$\lambda_i - \gamma_j = \int_{\gamma_j}^{\lambda_i} dE = \int_I \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_i \geq E\}} dE = \int_I \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}(E) \leq i-1\}} dE. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For each $n \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, let $r_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $r_n(x) = 1$ for $x \leq n - 1$, $r_n(x) = 0$ for $x \geq n - 1/2$, and $|r'_n| + |r''_n| + |r'''_n| \leq C$ for a constant $C > 0$ independent of i . We write $r = r_i$. Then, because $\mathcal{N}(E)$ is integer valued, we have

$$\int_I \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}(E) \leq i-1\}} dE = \int_I r(\mathcal{N}(E)) dE. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Let $\delta_1 > 0$ be a parameter to be chosen later, and set $\eta_1 = N^{-2/3 - \delta_1} \hat{i}^{-1/3}$. For every $E \in I$ we define the smoothed indicator function $f_E(x)$ such that $f_E(x) = 1$ for $x \in [-10, E]$ and $f_E(x) = 0$ for $x \geq E + \eta_1$ and $x \leq -11$. We also demand that $|f_E^{(k)}(x)| \leq C\eta_1^{-k}$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ when $x \in [E, E + \eta_1]$, and $|f_E^{(k)}(x)| \leq C$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ when $x \in [-11, -10]$, where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of E and η_1 .

By rigidity, we have

$$|\mathcal{N}(E) - \text{Tr}(f_E)| \leq |\{a : \lambda_a \in [E, E + \eta_1]\}|, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and we can use rigidity again to deduce

$$\left| \int_I r(\mathcal{N}(E)) dE - \int_I r(\text{Tr}(f_E)) dE \right| \leq C \int_I |\mathcal{N}(E) - \text{Tr}(f_E)| dE \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\leq C \int_I |\{a : \lambda_a \in [E, E + \eta_1]\}| dE \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$= \sum_a \int_I \mathbb{1}_{\lambda_a \in [E, E + \eta_1]} dE \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\leq C\eta_1 |\{a : \lambda_a \in I + [0, \eta_1]\}| \leq C\eta_1 N^{\varepsilon_1} = CN^{-2/3 + \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1} \hat{i}^{-1/3}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

By the Helffer–Sjöstrand formula [8, Proposition C.1] and a short computation using integration by parts, we obtain

$$\mathrm{Tr}(f_E) = \frac{N}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (if_E(e)\chi'(\sigma) - \sigma f'_E(e)\chi'(\sigma)) m_N(e + i\sigma) \, de \, d\sigma \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$+ \frac{N}{2\pi} \int_{|\sigma| > \eta_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'_E(e) \partial_\sigma(\sigma\chi(\sigma)) \mathrm{Re}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \, de \, d\sigma \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$- \frac{N}{\pi} \int_0^{\eta_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f''_E(e) \sigma \mathrm{Im}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \, de \, d\sigma \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$+ \frac{N}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'_E(e) \eta_1 \mathrm{Re}[m_N(e + i\eta_1)] \, de. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Details may be found in [45, Section 4.1]. Here χ is a smooth, symmetric function such that $\chi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ for $|x| > 2$.

We now aim to replace $\mathrm{Tr}(f_E)$ with an approximation in order to produce the regularized eigenvalue. Set

$$F_E = \frac{N}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (if_E(e)\chi'(\sigma) - \sigma f'_E(e)\chi'(\sigma)) m_N(e + i\sigma) \, de \, d\sigma \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$+ \frac{N}{2\pi} \int_{|\sigma| > \eta_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'_E(e) \partial_\sigma(\sigma\chi(\sigma)) \mathrm{Re}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \, de \, d\sigma \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$+ \frac{N}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'_E(e) \eta_1 \mathrm{Re}[m_N(e + i\eta_1)] \, de. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Note that

$$\left| \int_I r(\mathrm{Tr} f_E) \, dE - \int_I r(F_E) \, dE \right| \leq C \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^{\eta_1} N\sigma |f''_E(e)| \mathrm{Im}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \, d\sigma \, de \, dE \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{\eta_1^2} \int_I \int_0^{\eta_1} \int_0^{\eta_1} N\sigma \mathrm{Im}[m_N(E + e + i\sigma)] \, d\sigma \, de \, dE \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$+ C \int_I \int_{-11}^{-10} \int_0^{\eta_1} N\sigma \mathrm{Im}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \, d\sigma \, de \, dE \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$$= \frac{C}{\eta_1^2} \int_0^{\eta_1} \int_0^{\eta_1} \left[\int_I N\sigma \mathrm{Im}[m_N(E + e + i\sigma)] \, dE \right] \, de \, d\sigma \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$+ C|I| \int_{-11}^{-10} \int_0^{\eta_1} N\sigma \mathrm{Im}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \, d\sigma \, de. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

We begin by bounding (A.19). Define $E' = E + e$. Since $\sigma \leq \eta_1$ in the integral above, we have

$$\int_I N\sigma \mathrm{Im}[m_N(E' + i\sigma)] \, dE \leq \sum_{a: |i-a| \leq 3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \eta_1 \int_I \frac{\sigma}{(E' - \lambda_a)^2 + \sigma^2} \, dE + \sum_{a: |i-a| > 3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \eta_1 \int_I \frac{\sigma}{(E' - \lambda_a)^2 + \sigma^2} \, dE. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

We estimate the first term by

$$\sum_{a: |i-a| \leq 3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \eta_1 \int_I \frac{\sigma}{(E' - \lambda_a)^2 + \sigma^2} \, dE \leq \sum_{a: |i-a| \leq 3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \eta_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma}{(E' - \lambda_a)^2 + \sigma^2} \, dE \leq CN^{-2/3+\varepsilon_1-\delta_1\widehat{i}^{-1/3}}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

For the second term, we consider only the case $i < N/4$ explicitly. The case $i > N - N/4$ follows by symmetry. The case $i \in \llbracket N/4, 3N/4 \rrbracket$ is similar and was already treated in [45, Section 4.1], so we do not give details here.

In the second term, we consider the sum over the terms with $i - a > 3N^{\varepsilon_1}$ and $a - i > 3N^{3\varepsilon_1}$ separately. When $i - a > 3N^{\varepsilon_1}$, we are considering eigenvalues λ_a nearer to the edge -2 than λ_i . For such a , we have $N^{-2/3}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} \leq N^{-2/3}\widehat{a}^{-1/3}$ and $N^{-2/3}\widehat{a}^{-1/3} \leq (i - a + 1)^{1/3}N^{-2/3}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}$. Then by rigidity (2.12) and the fact that $a < j < i$,

$$|\gamma_j - \eta_1 - \lambda_a| \geq |\gamma_j - \gamma_a| - |\gamma_a - \lambda_a| - \eta_1 \quad (\text{A.23})$$

$$\geq (j - a)N^{-2/3}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} - (i - a + 1)^{1/3}N^{-2/3+\varepsilon_1/2}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} - N^{-2/3}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

$$\geq (9/10)(i - a - 2N^\varepsilon)N^{-2/3}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

for $N \geq N_0(\varepsilon_1)$. We also observe that I satisfies

$$|I| \leq CN^{-2/3+\varepsilon_1}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Using (A.26), $\sigma \leq \eta_1$, and the definitions of I and E' , we find

$$\sum_{a:i-a>3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \eta_1 \int_I \frac{\sigma}{(E' - \lambda_a)^2 + \sigma^2} dE \leq C\eta_1\sigma|I| \left(N^{2/3}\widehat{i}^{1/3}\right)^2 \sum_{a:i-a>3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \frac{1}{((9/10)(i - a - 2N^{\varepsilon_1}))^2} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

$$\leq C\eta_1^2|I| \left(N^{2/3}\widehat{i}^{1/3}\right)^2 \leq C|I|N^{-2\delta_1} \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon_1-2\delta_1}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

For $a - i > 3N^{3\varepsilon_1}$, we recall the definition of I and write

$$\sum_{a:a-i>3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \eta_1 \int_I \frac{\sigma}{(E' - \lambda_a)^2 + \sigma^2} dE \leq \eta_1\sigma|I| \sum_{a:a-i>3N^{\varepsilon_1}} \frac{1}{(\lambda_a - \gamma_k - \eta_1)^2}. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

We note that, supposing rigidity (2.12) holds with $\omega = \varepsilon_1/10$, $a < N/2$, and $a - i > 3N^{\varepsilon_1}$, then

$$\lambda_a - \gamma_k - \eta_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_a - \gamma_i) \geq c \left(N^{-2/3}[a^{2/3} - i^{2/3}]\right) \quad (\text{A.30})$$

for $N \geq N_0(\varepsilon_1)$, after possibly increasing N_0 . Here we used the definition (2.3) to lower bound $\gamma_a - \gamma_i$.⁷ We also used the fact that $|\lambda_a - \gamma_a| \ll |\gamma_a - \gamma_i|$, which follows from the inequality

$$N^{-2/3} \left(a^{2/3} - i^{2/3}\right) \geq \frac{N^{\varepsilon_1/9}}{2N^{2/3}\widehat{i}^{1/3}} \gg \frac{N^{\varepsilon_1/10}}{N^{2/3}\widehat{i}^{1/3}}. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Then

$$\sum_{a:a-i>3N^{\varepsilon_1}, a<N/2} \frac{1}{(\lambda_a - \gamma_k - \eta_1)^2} \leq CN^{4/3} \sum_{a:a-i>3N^{\varepsilon_1}, a<N/2} \frac{1}{(a^{2/3} - k^{2/3})^2} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

$$\leq CN^{4/3} \int_{i+N^{\varepsilon_1}}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{(x^{2/3} - i^{2/3})^2} \leq CN^{4/3}i^{2/3}. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Here we used the substitution $x = iy$ to bound the integral in (A.33):

$$\int_{i+N^{\varepsilon_1}}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{(x^{2/3} - i^{2/3})^2} = i^{-1/3} \int_{1+\frac{N^{\varepsilon_1}}{i}}^{\infty} \frac{dy}{(y-1)^2} = i^{-1/3} \int_{\frac{N^{\varepsilon_1}}{i}}^{\infty} \frac{dy}{y^2} \leq Ci^{2/3}. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

⁷As an intermediate step, we use for $j \leq N/2$ that $\gamma_j \leq -2 + C \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^{2/3}$, which follows from (2.3). The claim follows from using (2.3) again and the mean value theorem to write

$$\frac{1}{N} \leq C((2 + \gamma_{j+1})^{3/2} - (2 + \gamma_j)^{3/2}) \leq 2C(\gamma_{j+1} - \gamma_j)\sqrt{2 + \gamma_{j+1}} \leq 4C(\gamma_{j+1} - \gamma_j)\sqrt{2 + \gamma_j} \leq C(\gamma_{j+1} - \gamma_j) \left(\frac{j}{N}\right)^{1/3}.$$

Since we assumed $i < N/4$, we have $|\gamma_m - \lambda_a| > 1/10$ for $a > N/2$ when rigidity (2.12) holds. This implies

$$\sum_{a:a-m > N^{\varepsilon_1}, a > N/2} \frac{1}{(\lambda_a - \gamma_k - \eta_1)^2} \leq CN \leq N^{4/3} \widehat{\eta}^{2/3}. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

We conclude that

$$(\text{A.29}) \leq N^{\varepsilon_1 - 2\delta_1} |I| = N^{-2/3 + 3\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1} \widehat{\eta}^{-1/3}. \quad (\text{A.36})$$

Collecting (A.22), (A.28), and (A.36), we have shown that the term (A.19) is bounded by $CN^{-2/3 + 3\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1} \widehat{\eta}^{-1/3}$ when $i \leq N/4$.

Finally, we consider (A.20). We observe that $\text{Im}[m_N(e + i\sigma)] \leq CN^{-1}$ for $\sigma \in (0, \eta_1)$ and $e \in [-11, -10]$ by the local law outside of the spectrum [8, (10.2)] and (2.14), and we obtain

$$|(\text{A.20})| \leq CN^{-2/3 + \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1} \widehat{\eta}^{-1/3}. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Therefore, F_E is a good approximation to $\text{Tr}(f_E)$, which we saw in (A.2), (A.3), and (A.5) controls the difference $\lambda_i - \gamma_j$. This leads to the following definition.

Definition A.1. Let $M \in \text{Mat}_N$ be a symmetric matrix, and fix δ, ε . We set $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon/3$, $\delta_1 = \delta$ in the previous computation and define the regularized eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i(M) = \tilde{\lambda}_i(M, \delta, \varepsilon) = \int_I r(F_E) dE + \gamma_j. \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Given $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, we define $\tilde{\lambda}_i: \text{Mat}_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by Definition A.1. We let $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$ be the set from Lemma 2.1 with $\omega = \varepsilon/100$, where in particular rigidity and delocalization (2.12) hold, following our choice before (A.2) (and actually choosing a smaller parameter ω). By Lemma 2.1, the claimed probability bound on \mathcal{A}_0 holds.

First, the remarks following (A.36) show the first equation in (4.1) when $i < N/4$ or (by symmetry) when $i > N - N/4$. The remaining case, where i is in the bulk, is similar, and the necessary bound for (A.19) is provided in the proof of [45, Lemma 3.2].

Next, we estimate the derivatives of $\tilde{\lambda}_i(H)$. We first estimate the derivatives of F_E . We recall the Green's function differentiation formula⁸

$$\frac{\partial G_{ab}(z)}{\partial H_{cd}} = -G_{ac}(z)G_{db}(z) \quad (\text{A.39})$$

for $a, b, c, d \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$. Using it, we find for $z = E + i\eta$ that

$$N |\partial_{bc} m_N(E + i\eta)| \leq C \sum_a |G_{ab}G_{ca}| \leq C \sum_a |G_{ab}|^2 + |G_{ca}|^2 \leq \frac{C}{\eta} (|G_{bb}(z)| + |G_{cc}(z)|), \quad (\text{A.40})$$

where in the last line we used the Ward identity [8, (3.16)]. In the same way, we have

$$N |\partial_{bc}^k m(z)| \leq \frac{C}{\eta} (|G_{bb}(z)| + |G_{cc}(z)| + |G_{bc}(z)|)^k. \quad (\text{A.41})$$

We now claim that that $|G_{ij}(E + i\eta_1)| \leq CN^{\varepsilon/4 + \delta}$ for $|E| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$ on the event \mathcal{A}_0 , for some $C > 0$. This follows, for example, from Lemma 2.1 and [8, Lemma 10.2] applied with $M = N^{\delta + \varepsilon/8}$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3 + \varepsilon/8} \widehat{\eta}^{-1/3}$. Therefore

$$\left| \partial_{bc}^k \left(\frac{2N}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f'_E(e) \eta_1 \text{Re}[m_N(e + i\eta_1)] de \right) \right| \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f'_E(e)| (|G_{bb}(e + i\eta_1)| + |G_{bc}(e + i\eta_1)| + |G_{cc}(e + i\eta_1)|)^k de \quad (\text{A.42})$$

$$\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f'_E(e)| N^{k(\delta + \varepsilon/4)} de \leq CN^{k(\delta + \varepsilon/4)}. \quad (\text{A.43})$$

⁸This follows from a resolvent expansion to first order. See [8, (2.3)].

The derivatives of the other terms may be bounded similarly, and we obtain $|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_0} \partial_{bc}^k F_E| \leq C(\log N) N^{k(\delta+\varepsilon/4)}$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ (with the $\log N$ factor coming from the integration in σ for the derivative of (A.14)). Since r is bounded with bounded derivatives, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_0} \left| \partial_{ab}^k \tilde{\lambda}_i(H) \right| \leq \left| \int_I \partial_{ab}^k r(F_E) dE \right| \leq C \int_I (\log N) N^{k(\delta+\varepsilon/4)} dE \quad (\text{A.44})$$

$$\leq CN^{-2/3+\varepsilon/3} \widehat{i}^{-1/3} N^{k(\delta+\varepsilon/3)} \leq CN^{-2/3+k(\delta+\varepsilon)} \widehat{i}^{-1/3} \quad (\text{A.45})$$

for all $k \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and $a, b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, and $N \geq N_0(\varepsilon)$. We used here $|I| \leq N^{-2/3+\varepsilon/3} \widehat{i}^{-1/3}$, which follows from our definition of I about (A.1) and our choice $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon/3$ in Definition A.1. This proves the second inequality in (4.1) for H . The proof of (4.3) for H is similar and uses the trivial inequality $|G_{ij}(E + i\eta)| \leq \eta^{-1}$.

We next consider the statements involving rank-one perturbations of H . By a resolvent expansion to high order it is straightforward to prove that

$$\sup_{a,b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{H-z} - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \frac{1}{\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H - z} \right| \leq \frac{CN^{\varepsilon/6}}{N\eta} \quad (\text{A.46})$$

and

$$\sup_{a,b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \sup_{i,j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \sup_{0 \leq w \leq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \left| \left(\frac{1}{H-z} \right)_{ij} - \left(\frac{1}{\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H - z} \right)_{ij} \right| \leq \frac{CN^{\varepsilon/6}}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (\text{A.47})$$

for any $z \in \mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon/100}$, where $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ and where $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 \cap (\cup_{i,j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \{|h_{ij}| \leq N^{-1/2+\varepsilon/12}\})$. For (A.46), we also used the Ward identity, as in (A.40). Hence, by standard arguments rigidity and delocalization (2.12) hold simultaneously for $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H$ for all choices of $w \in [0, 1]$ and $a, b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ on \mathcal{A} (see [8, Theorem 2.10] and [8, Section 9]). With these estimates, we may follow the previous reasoning to obtain (4.1) and (4.3) for all such $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H$, where the probability bound (4.2) holds for \mathcal{A} by the subexponential decay hypothesis (1.4), after decreasing C_1 and c_1 , if necessary. \square

B. LEVEL REPULSION ESTIMATES

In this section, we provide proofs of Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 5.7, which were necessary for the proofs of our main results in Section 5. We begin in Section B.1 by proving a level repulsion estimate for the GOE_N , and then extending it to generalized Wigner matrices with small additive Gaussian perturbations. In Section B.2, we use a comparison argument to extend these estimates to arbitrary generalized Wigner matrices.

B.1. Level repulsion for Gaussian divisible ensembles. In this section only, we consider a matrix-valued stochastic process slightly different from the one defined in (2.5). Given a generalized Wigner matrix H_0 , we define H_s for times $s > 0$ through the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck dynamics

$$dH_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} dB_s - \frac{1}{2} H_s. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We denote by $\lambda_1(s) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N(s)$ the eigenvalues of H_s .

For any energy $E \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $\kappa(E) = \max(N^{-2/3}, \min(|E+2|, |E-2|))$. Given $\delta > 0$ and $\mathfrak{a} > 0$, we define the interval

$$I = I(E) = I(\delta, \mathfrak{a}, E) = \left[E - \frac{\mathfrak{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(E)}}, E + \frac{\mathfrak{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(E)}} \right]. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix with eigenvalues $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$, labeled in increasing order. Given a choice of interval I , we denote the counting functions for the eigenvalues $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and corresponding regularized eigenvalues $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ of H , defined in Proposition 4.1, by

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) = |\{i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \mid \lambda_i \in I\}| \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}(I) = \left| \left\{ i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \mid \tilde{\lambda}_i \in I \right\} \right|. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

B.1.1. Bulk. In the following theorem, the cases $k = 1, 2$ were established for energies bounded away from the spectral edges ± 2 in [46, Theorem 5.1]. The extension to $k > 2$ and energies slowly tending to ± 2 is straightforward, and we give the details for completeness. Note that level repulsion estimates for any k were also proved in the bulk in [16] for larger times s .

Lemma B.1. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}(s)$ be the vector of eigenvalues for H_s , as defined in (B.1). For all integers $k \geq 1$, all $\mathbf{a}, \delta, \sigma > 0$, and $s \in [N^{-1/2}, 1]$, there exists $N_0 = N_0(\mathbf{a}, k, \delta, \sigma) > 0$ such that for all $E \in [-2 + N^{-\sigma/2}, 2 - N^{-\sigma/2}]$ and $N \geq N_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq k) \leq N^\sigma N^{-\delta k/2}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $I = I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, E)$.

Proof. We first consider the case $k = 1$. Let $m_N(z)$ and $G(z)$ be the Stieltjes transform and Green's function for H_s . Set $\varepsilon = \mathbf{a}N^{-\delta}$ and define η by the equality $\varepsilon = N\eta\sqrt{\kappa(E)}$. Following [46, (5.4)], we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq 1) \leq \frac{4\varepsilon^2}{\kappa(E)} \mathbb{E} [(\text{Im } m_N(E + i\eta))^2] \leq \frac{4\varepsilon^2}{N^2\kappa(E)} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} [|G_{ii}| |G_{jj}|] \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\leq \frac{4\varepsilon^2}{N^2\kappa(E)} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} [|G_{ii}|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [|G_{jj}|^2]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

These inequalities follow directly from the definition of $\text{Im } m_N$. Next, the computations leading to [46, (5.36)] show that for any $r > 0$, there exists $N_0(\mathbf{a}, \delta, \varepsilon, r)$ such that, for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\frac{\varepsilon^2}{N^2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} [|G_{ii}|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [|G_{jj}|^2]^{1/2} \leq N^{\sigma/2} N^{-\delta(1-r)}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Since $E \in [-2 + N^{-\sigma/2}, 2 - N^{-\sigma/2}]$, we therefore obtain from (B.6) and (B.7) that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq 1) \leq 4\kappa(E)^{-1} N^{\sigma/2} N^{-\delta(1-r)} \leq 4N^\sigma N^{-\delta(1-r)}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Taking $r = 1/3$, this proves the claim for $k = 1$.

We now proceed by induction and suppose the claim holds for $k - 1$. We will prove it for k . Following [46, (5.37)], we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq k) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\kappa(E)} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \geq k\}} (\text{Im } m_N(E + i\eta))^2] \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{N^2\kappa(E)} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(i)}(I) \geq k-1\}} |G_{ii}|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(j)}(I) \geq k-1\}} |G_{jj}|^2]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Here we used $\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(i)}$ to denote the eigenvalue counting function for the i -th minor of GOE_N , where the i th row and column are removed. We also used the Cauchy interlacing theorem to see that between any two eigenvalues of H lies an eigenvalue of the i -th minor. Let $r > 0$ be a parameter. It then follows from the first inequality in [46, (5.14)] and the bound [46, (5.39)] that

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(i)}(I) \geq k-1\}} |G_{ii}|^2] \leq N^{-k\delta} + ((\lambda_i(0) - E)^2 + s^2)^{-1} N^{\sigma/8} N^{\delta r} \left(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(i)}(I) \geq k-1) \right)^{1/(1+r)} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

for $N \geq N_0(\mathbf{a}, k, r, \delta, \sigma)$. We use (B.4) with the parameters $k - 1$, $\sigma/8$, and δ , and set $r = \min(1/(k - 2), 1/100)$

so that $\frac{1}{1+r} \geq \frac{k-2}{k-1}$ for $k \geq 3$. Then⁹

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{(i)}(I) \geq k-1\}} |G_{ii}|^2 \right] \leq N^{-k\delta} + ((\lambda_i(0) - E)^2 + s^2)^{-1} N^{\sigma/8} N^{\delta r} \left(N^{\sigma/8} N^{-(k-1)\delta/2} \right)^{1/(1+r)} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\leq N^{-k\delta} + ((\lambda_i(0) - E)^2 + s^2)^{-1} N^{\sigma/4} N^{-(\frac{k}{2}-2)\delta}, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

when $N \geq N_0(\mathbf{a}, \delta, \sigma, k)$, where we adjusted N_0 upward if necessary. We now recall from [46, (5.35)] that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\lambda_i(0) - E)^2 + s^2}} \leq N^{\sigma/16} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

for large enough $N \geq N_0(\sigma)$.

Putting (B.13) into (B.10) and using (B.14) together with $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I) \geq k) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\kappa(E)} N^{3\sigma/8} N^{-(\frac{k}{2}-2)\delta} \leq \mathbf{a}^2 N^{-2\delta} N^{7\sigma/8} N^{-(\frac{k}{2}-2)\delta} \leq N^\sigma N^{-\delta k/2}. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

when $N \geq N_0(\mathbf{a}, \delta, \sigma, k)$. This completes the proof. \square

B.1.2. Edge. Before proceeding the Gaussian divisible case, we state a level repulsion estimate at the edge for the GOE. Its proof is given below, after a series of preliminary results.

Proposition B.2. *Let λ be the vector of eigenvalues of GOE_N . Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} > 0$. Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\kappa(E) \leq N^{-\mathbf{b}}$. Then for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \delta)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I) \geq k) \leq C N^{-\delta k/2}, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

where $I = I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, E)$.

Our argument for the GOE is inspired by the methods of [39], and in particular, we provide an improvement on [39, Lemma 2.2]. The proof of Proposition B.2 uses the determinantal structure of the eigenvalue distribution for a related ensemble and a slight generalization of Wegner estimates in [39, 49]. Since the eigenvalue structure of the GOE is not determinantal but given in terms of a Pfaffian, we first obtain the result for the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble and then use the relationships between the Orthogonal and Unitary ensemble from [36] to obtain the final result. We first recall the definition of the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble.

Definition B.3. *A $N \times N$ Hermitian matrix H is distributed as GUE_N if for all $i, j \in [1, N]$ such that $i \leq j$,*

$$H_{ij} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N}} \mathcal{N}_{ij} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2N}} \mathcal{N}_{ij} \quad \text{if } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad H_{ii} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{N}_{ii}, \quad (\text{B.17})$$

where $(\mathcal{N}_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N}$ is a family of independent standard Gaussian random variables.

Remark B.4. All of our level repulsion results have a corresponding Hermitian equivalent. In particular, Proposition B.2 can be stated for the GUE_N defined in Definition B.3, and this result follows from equation (B.42) in the proof of Proposition B.2. Note that we actually obtain a stronger bound than the one for the GOE_N .

⁹Note that the minor in the definition of $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{(i)}(I)$ is not of the form M_s for a generalized Wigner matrix M , but $[(N-1)/N]^{1/2} M_s$. This means we must bound the probability eigenvalues of M_s fall in the interval $[N/(N-1)^{1/2}]I$. This causes no problems in our application of (B.4) if we use $2\mathbf{a}$ in place of \mathbf{a} to accommodate this scaling.

For the GUE_N , the eigenvalue distribution is exactly computable and can be expressed as the following distribution on the simplex $\Sigma = \{\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n\}$:

$$p_N(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) = \frac{1}{Z_N} \prod_{i < j} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^2\right), \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where Z_N is a constant factor that may be determined explicitly [7, Theorem 2.5.2]. It was observed by Dyson [24] that this joint eigenvalue density can be written as a determinant in terms of orthogonal polynomials:

$$p_N(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N) = \frac{1}{Z'_N} \det\left(K_N(\sqrt{N}\lambda_i, \sqrt{N}\lambda_j)\right)_{i,j=1}^N, \quad (\text{B.19})$$

where Z'_N is a constant, and

$$K_N(x, y) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \psi_k(x)\psi_k(y), \quad \psi_k(x) = \frac{H_k(x)e^{-x^2/4}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}}(k!)^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad H_k(x) = (-1)^k e^{x^2/2} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} e^{-x^2/2}, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

where H_k the k -th Hermite polynomial.

We do not use the explicit definition of the kernel $K_N(x, y)$, only that the eigenvalue process for GUE_N has a determinantal structure. We have the following theorem from [40], which says that the number of points from a determinantal process in a bounded domain is given by a sum of independent Bernoulli random variables. We state it here in the case of the GUE_N .

Theorem B.5 ([40, Theorem 7]). *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed interval and let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ be the vector of eigenvalues of a GUE_N . Then there exists $p_1, \dots, p_N > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Ber}(p_i) \quad \text{with} \quad \text{Ber}(p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } p, \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - p, \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.21})$$

and the $\text{Ber}(p_i)$ random variables are independent.

This gives as a direct corollary a level repulsion estimate for eigenvalues of a GUE_N .

Corollary B.6. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ be the vector of eigenvalues of a GUE_N and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed interval. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq k) \leq e^{-\lambda k + (e^\lambda - 1)\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I)]} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

Proof. Using Markov's inequality and Theorem B.5, we have for any $\lambda > 0$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq k) \leq e^{-\lambda k} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I)}\right] = e^{-\lambda k} \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda \text{Ber}(p_i)}\right] = e^{-\lambda k} \prod_{i=1}^N (1 + p_i(e^\lambda - 1)) \leq e^{-\lambda k + (e^\lambda - 1)\sum_{i=1}^N p_i}. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

The result is obtained by noting that $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I)] = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$. \square

From Corollary B.6, we see that we now only need to control $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I)]$ in order to bound the probability that there are more than k eigenvalues in I . For a sub-microscopic interval, the probability of seeing even one eigenvalue is small, so the expectation of the number of eigenvalues tends to zero. We make this claim precise in the following proposition.

Proposition B.7. *Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ be the vector of eigenvalues of a GUE_N . Fix $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} > 0$ and let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\kappa(E) \leq N^{-\mathbf{b}}$. Then for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, E))] \leq CN^{-\delta}, \quad (\text{B.24})$$

where $I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, E)$ is defined in (B.2) and $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \delta)$ is uniform in E with $\kappa(E) \leq N^{-\mathbf{b}}$.

Remark B.8. This result is a slight modification of [39, Lemma 2.2]. We unfortunately cannot use [39, Lemma 2.2] directly, since it gives a non-explicit error of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$, which is larger than the leading term of order $N^{-\delta}$ for sub-microscopic intervals.

Proof. To match the scaling of [39], we consider the measure $\widetilde{\text{GUE}}_N = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2}} \text{GUE}_N$, which is defined so that the largest eigenvalue of a $\widetilde{\text{GUE}}_N$ is approximately $\sqrt{2N}$. Define

$$E_R = E + \frac{\mathfrak{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(E)}}, \quad I_1 = \left[\sqrt{\frac{N}{2}}E, \sqrt{\frac{N}{2}}E_R \right]. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

We first compute the expected number of eigenvalues in the interval I_1 , which is the right half of the rescaled version of the interval $I(\delta, \mathfrak{a}, E)$. A similar argument applies to the left half. We study here the right edge of the spectrum to use the same asymptotics as in [39], but the statement at the left edge follows by symmetry.

If $\rho_N(x) = K_N(\sqrt{2N}x, \sqrt{2N}x)$ denotes the density of eigenvalues of the $\widetilde{\text{GUE}}_N$ scaled to have its (limiting) support in $[-1, 1]$, then we define

$$g(E) = \int_{E/2}^{E_R/2} N\rho_N(x) dx, \quad (\text{B.26})$$

which gives the number of eigenvalues in I_1 . Let Ai denote the Airy function. From [25, (4.4)] and [25, (4.21)] (see also the proof of [39, Lemma 2.2]), we have the following asymptotic in x in some fixed neighborhood $[0, 1+c]$ of $[0, 1]$, where $c > 0$ is a constant:

$$N\rho_N(x) = \left(\frac{\Phi'(x)}{4\Phi(x)} - \frac{\gamma'(x)}{\gamma(x)} \right) [2 \text{Ai}(\Phi(x)) \text{Ai}'(\Phi(x))] \quad (\text{B.27})$$

$$+ \Phi'(x) [(\text{Ai}'(\Phi(x)))^2 - \Phi(x)(\text{Ai}(\Phi(x)))^2] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N\sqrt{|1-x|}}\right), \quad (\text{B.28})$$

where we define

$$\gamma(x) = \left(\frac{x-1}{x+1} \right)^{1/4}, \quad \Phi(x) = \begin{cases} -\left(3N \int_x^1 \sqrt{1-y^2} dy\right)^{2/3} & \text{for } x \leq 1, \\ \left(3N \int_1^x \sqrt{y^2-1} dy\right)^{2/3} & \text{for } x > 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.29})$$

The function γ is defined by taking the limit from the upper half plane using the principal branch of the function $z \mapsto z^{1/4}$. For $x \in [1/2, 1]$, we observe that there exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$cN^{2/3}(x-1) \leq \Phi(x) \leq CN^{2/3}(x-1). \quad (\text{B.30})$$

A similar bound holds for $x \in [1, 3/2]$.

By the proof of [39, Lemma 2.2], we have

$$\left(\frac{\Phi'(x)}{4\Phi(x)} - \frac{\gamma'(x)}{\gamma(x)} \right) [2 \text{Ai}(\Phi(x)) \text{Ai}'(\Phi(x))] = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad (\text{B.31})$$

on $[0, 1+c]$. Then through integrating this bound we obtain

$$\int_{E/2}^{E_R/2} \left(\frac{\Phi'(x)}{4\Phi(x)} - \frac{\gamma'(x)}{\gamma(x)} \right) (2 \text{Ai}(\Phi(x)) \text{Ai}'(\Phi(x))) dx = \mathcal{O}(E_R - E) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\mathfrak{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(E)}}\right). \quad (\text{B.32})$$

For the second term in (B.27), we can again follow an exact computation given in the proof of [39, Lemma 2.2] and find that

$$\int_{E/2}^{E_R/2} \Phi'(x) ((\text{Ai}'(\Phi(x)))^2 - \Phi(x)(\text{Ai}(\Phi(x)))^2) dx = \frac{2}{3} (\Psi_1(E/2) - \Psi_1(E_R/2)) - \frac{1}{3} (\Psi_2(E/2) - \Psi_2(E_R/2)), \quad (\text{B.33})$$

where we defined

$$\Psi_1(x) = \Phi^2(x) \text{Ai}^2(\Phi(x)) - \Phi(x) [\text{Ai}'(\Phi(x))]^2, \quad \Psi_2(x) = \text{Ai}(\Phi(x)) \text{Ai}'(\Phi(x)). \quad (\text{B.34})$$

We observe that $\text{Ai}(x)$ and $\text{Ai}'(x)$ are smooth functions on \mathbb{R} . We may then suppose that $|1 - E| > N^{-2/3}/100$ and therefore using (B.30) that $\Phi(E) > c$ and $\Phi(E_R) > c$ for some small c . Otherwise, $\Phi(E) < c$ and $\Phi(E_R) < c$, and the proposition follows from a Taylor expansion of $\text{Ai}(x)$ and $\text{Ai}'(x)$ about 0.

In the case that $\Phi(E)$ and $\Phi(E_R)$ are distance at least c from 0, we may apply the Airy asymptotics given immediately before the proof of [39, Lemma 2.1], which give

$$cN(1-x)^{3/2} \leq |\Phi^2(x) \text{Ai}^2(\Phi(x))| \leq CN(1-x)^{3/2} \quad (\text{B.35})$$

as $x \rightarrow 1$ from below. A similar asymptotic holds as x tends to 1 from above. We obtain that

$$\frac{2}{3} |\Psi_1(E) - \Psi_1(E_R)| \leq CN(E_R - E) \sqrt{|1 - E|} \leq CN^{-\delta}. \quad (\text{B.36})$$

Next, by definition of Ψ_2 we have that

$$\frac{1}{3} |\Psi_2(E) - \Psi_2(E_R)| \leq C(E_R - E) \Phi'(E) (\text{Ai}'(\Phi(E))^2 + \text{Ai}(\Phi(E)) \text{Ai}''(\Phi(E))) \quad (\text{B.37})$$

$$= C(E_R - E) \Phi'(E) (\text{Ai}'(\Phi(E))^2 + \Phi(E) \text{Ai}^2(\Phi(E))), \quad (\text{B.38})$$

where we used the fact that $\text{Ai}(x) \text{Ai}''(x) = x \text{Ai}^2(x)$. Using the Airy asymptotics from [39], we obtain that both $\text{Ai}'(\Phi(E))^2$ and $\Phi(E) \text{Ai}^2(\Phi(E))$ are bounded in absolute value by $C\sqrt{\Phi(E)}$, which gives

$$\frac{1}{3} |\Psi_2(E) - \Psi_2(E_R)| \leq C(E_R - E) \Phi'(E) \sqrt{\Phi(E)}. \quad (\text{B.39})$$

Finally, by definition of $\Phi(E)$ in (B.29), we have that $\Phi'(E) = \frac{2N\sqrt{|1-E^2|}}{\sqrt{|\Phi(E)|}}$ and thus

$$\frac{1}{3} |\Psi_2(E) - \Psi_2(E_R)| \leq C(E_R - E) N \sqrt{|1 - E^2|} \leq C(E_R - E) N \sqrt{|1 - E|} \leq CN^{-\delta}. \quad (\text{B.40})$$

Finally, we remark that $(1-x)^{1/2}$ is integrable on intervals containing 1, so that the third term in (B.28) contributes $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$. We obtain the result by combining (B.27) with (B.32), (B.36) and (B.40). The bounds can be made uniform in E since, by assumption of the theorem, $E \in [1/2, 1+c]$ for $N > N_0(\mathbf{b})$. \square

Combining the bound on the expected number of eigenvalues on a sub-microscopic interval from Proposition B.7 and Corollary B.6 we obtain a bound like Proposition B.2 for the GUE instead of the GOE. To obtain the bound on the GOE, we use the following relationship between these two ensembles from [36]. This theorem states that to obtain the same distribution as eigenvalues of the GUE, one can take two independent matrices distributed as GOE_N and GOE_{N+1} , put the eigenvalues of these matrices on the real line to obtain a distribution of $2N + 1$ points, and extract every other eigenvalue.

Theorem B.9 ([36, (5.9)]). *We have the following relation in distribution between independent eigenvalue distributions for GUE_N , GOE_N , and GOE_{N+1} :*

$$\text{GUE}_N = \text{Even}(\text{GOE}_N \cup \text{GOE}_{N+1}). \quad (\text{B.41})$$

We are now ready to prove Proposition B.2.

Proof of Proposition B.2. Setting $\lambda = \delta \log N > 0$ in Corollary B.6 and using the conclusion of Proposition B.7, we obtain the bound

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{GUE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \leq \exp(-\delta k \log N + (N^\delta - 1)CN^{-\delta}) \leq CN^{-\delta k}, \quad (\text{B.42})$$

for some $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \delta)$. Now, by Theorem B.9, for any $k, N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{GUE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_{N+1}}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k). \quad (\text{B.43})$$

There are two cases: either $\mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_{N+1}}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k)$, or the reverse inequality holds. In the first case,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{GUE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k)^2. \quad (\text{B.44})$$

Then there exists $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \delta) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I_\delta(E)) \geq k) \leq CN^{-\delta k/2}. \quad (\text{B.45})$$

In the second case,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{GUE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_{N+1}}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k)^2, \quad (\text{B.46})$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_N}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I(E)) \geq k) \leq C(N-1)^{-\delta k/2} \leq CN^{-\delta k/2}, \quad (\text{B.47})$$

where we modified the value of C . Combining these cases completes the proof. \square

Having established the desired level repulsion estimate for the GOE, we now turn to the case of Gaussian divisible matrices. We consider another matrix dynamics which consists of the same stochastic differential equation as (B.1), but with a different initial condition and matrix Brownian motion \tilde{B}_s . Let \tilde{H}_0 be a random symmetric matrix sampled from the GOE_N , and denote by $\nu_1(s) \leq \dots \leq \nu_N(s)$ the eigenvalues of \tilde{H}_s , defined by the dynamics

$$\tilde{H}_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} d\tilde{B}_s - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{H}_s. \quad (\text{B.48})$$

We then have the following theorem from [13]. The coupling in the theorem is given by choosing the Brownian motion \tilde{B}_s so that the Brownian motions driving the eigenvalue dynamics (2.6) for \tilde{H}_s are the same as those driving the dynamics for H_s .

Theorem B.10 ([13, Theorem 2.8]). *There exists a coupling of H_s from (B.1) and \tilde{H}_s from (B.48) such that the following holds. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C_1(\varepsilon), c_1(\varepsilon), c_2(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\lambda_k(s) - \nu_k(s)| \geq \frac{N^\varepsilon}{N^s} \text{ for all } k \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket \text{ and } s \in [0, 1]\right) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1(\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N}). \quad (\text{B.49})$$

Remark B.11. This theorem was proved with a weaker probability bound in [18] for the case where the matrix entry distributions have finite moments. The proof relies on local law and rigidity estimates, for example [18, Lemma 2.3], which are the source of this probability loss. However, our assumption that the entry distributions are uniformly subexponential allows the stronger estimates given in Lemma 2.1, which in turn allow us to state [13, Theorem 2.8] with exponentially high probability bounds, as above.

Since GOE_N is invariant for the dynamics (B.1), for all times $s \in [0, 1]$, the $\nu_k(s)$ are distributed as eigenvalues of a GOE_N . We now apply Theorem B.10 to extend our level repulsion estimate at the edge from the GOE_N to Gaussian divisible ensembles.

Lemma B.12. *Let H_0 be a generalized Wigner matrix and H_s be the dynamics defined in (B.1). Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{a}, \delta > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \delta)$ and an event $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\delta)$ such that for any E satisfying $\kappa(E) \leq N^{-100\delta}$ and $s \in [N^{-40\delta}, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{N}_{\lambda(s)}(I) \geq k) \leq CN^{-\delta k/2}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1(\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N}), \quad (\text{B.50})$$

where $I = I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, E)$ and $C_1(\delta), c_1(\delta), c_2(\delta) > 0$ are constants.

Proof. For any $s \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, Theorem B.10 gives

$$|\lambda_\ell(s) - \nu_\ell(s)| \leq \frac{N^\varepsilon}{Ns} \quad (\text{B.51})$$

uniformly in ℓ on the event $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\varepsilon)$ of that theorem.

Set $s_0 = N^{3\delta/2} \sqrt{\kappa(E)}$. Then the hypotheses of the lemma imply $N^{-1} \ll s_0 \ll 1$. For $s \in [s_0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon = \delta/8$, we have that

$$\frac{N^\varepsilon}{Ns} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(E)}} \quad (\text{B.52})$$

on \mathcal{A} , for $N \geq N_0(\mathfrak{a}, \delta)$. We deduce from (B.51) and (B.52) that if $\lambda_\ell(s) \in I(\delta, \mathfrak{a}, E)$ and $s \in [s_0, 1]$, then $\nu_\ell(s) \in I(\delta, 2\mathfrak{a}, E)$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{N}_{\lambda(s)}(I(\delta, \mathfrak{a}, E)) \geq k) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\nu(s)}(I(\delta, 2\mathfrak{a}, E)) \geq k) \quad (\text{B.53})$$

when N is large enough. Since the eigenvalues ν_s are distributed as the eigenvalues of GOE_N , applying Proposition B.2 completes the proof. \square

B.1.3. Uniform estimate. Observe that the following estimate is effective only for k large.

Proposition B.13. *Let H_0 be a generalized Wigner matrix and H_s be the dynamics defined in (B.48). Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta, \mathfrak{a} > 0$. Suppose $E \in [-2 - N^{-100\delta}, 2 + N^{-100\delta}]$ and $s \in [N^{-40\delta}, 1]$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\mathfrak{a}, \delta)$ and event $\mathcal{A}(\delta)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}(I) \geq k) \leq CN^{200\delta} N^{-\delta k/2} \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1(\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N}) \quad (\text{B.54})$$

where $I = I(\delta, \mathfrak{a}, E)$ and $C_1(\delta), c_1(\delta), c_2(\delta) > 0$ are constants.

Proof. We apply Lemma B.1 with $\sigma = 200\delta$ and Lemma B.12. This yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}(I) \geq k) \leq N^{200\delta} N^{-\delta k/2} + CN^{-\delta k/2} \leq CN^{200\delta} N^{-\delta k/2}, \quad (\text{B.55})$$

from which the claim follows. \square

B.2. Level repulsion for generalized Wigner matrices. Before proceeding to the following proof, we first make some definitions and present some preliminary computations.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $E \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\delta > 0$, set $I_n = I(\delta, n\mathfrak{a}, E)$. Let $q = q_N \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a function such that $q(x) = 1$ for $x \in I_2$, $q(x) = 0$ for $x \in I_3^c$, $|q(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $|q^{(d)}(x)| \leq CN^{d(1+\delta)} \kappa(E)^{d/2}$ for $d \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and some constant $C = C(\mathfrak{a}) > 0$. Let $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a weakly increasing function such that $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 450$, $\chi(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 500$, $|\chi(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $|\chi^{(d)}(x)| \leq C$ for $d \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$ and some constant $C > 0$.

Let $\omega > 0$ be a parameter to be chosen later. We define the smoothed eigenvalue counting function $F(M)$ on $N \times N$ symmetric matrices by

$$g(M) = \sum_{j: |\gamma_j - E| \leq N^{-1+\omega} \kappa(E)^{-1/2}} q(\tilde{\mu}_j(M)), \quad F(M) = \chi(g(M)) g(M), \quad (\text{B.56})$$

where $\tilde{\mu}_j(M)$ are the regularized eigenvalues of M defined in Proposition 4.1 with parameters $\varepsilon, \delta_1 > 0$ chosen such that

$$\omega = \varepsilon = \frac{\delta_1}{2}. \quad (\text{B.57})$$

We also define $F_m(M) = F(M)^m$ for $M \in \text{Mat}_N$.

Recall $\widehat{j} = \min(j, N - j + 1)$. For any random matrix M taking values in Mat_N , with corresponding eigenvalues $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^N$, we let $\mathcal{A}_1(M)$ be the event where

$$\sup_{j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket} |\mu_j - \gamma_j| \leq N^{-2/3 + \omega/2} \widehat{j}^{-1/3}. \quad (\text{B.58})$$

We let $\mathcal{A}_2(M)$ be the event $\mathcal{A}(\delta_1, \varepsilon)$ from Proposition 4.1, and set $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(M) = \mathcal{A}_1(M) \cap \mathcal{A}_2(M)$.

Lemma B.14. *For any $M \in \text{Mat}_N$, we have*

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} |\partial_{ab}^d F(M)| \leq CN^{7(\omega + \delta + \delta_1 + \varepsilon)}, \quad |\partial_{ab}^d F(M)| \leq CN^{2\omega + C} \quad (\text{B.59})$$

for $d \in \llbracket 1, 5 \rrbracket$.

Proof. On \mathcal{A} , the $\tilde{\mu}_j$ satisfy $|\partial_{ab}^d \tilde{\mu}_j| \leq CN^{-2/3 + d(\delta_1 + \varepsilon)} \widehat{j}^{-1/3}$ for $d \leq 5$ and a constant $C(\varepsilon, \delta_1) > 0$. Therefore, for $d \leq 5$, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} |\partial_{ab}^d g(M)| \leq C \sum_{j: |\gamma_j - E| \leq N^{-1 + \omega} \kappa(E)^{-1/2}} \left| \partial_{ab}^d q(\tilde{\lambda}_j) \right| \quad (\text{B.60})$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=1}^5 CN^{2\omega + m/3 + d(\delta_1 + \varepsilon) + d\delta} \kappa(E)^{m/2} \widehat{j}^{-m/3} \leq CN^{7(\omega + \delta + \delta_1 + \varepsilon)}. \quad (\text{B.61})$$

Here, we used the fact that there are at most $2N^{2\omega}$ indices j such that $|\gamma_j - E| \leq N^{-1 + \omega} \kappa(E)^{-1/2}$ on \mathcal{A} . We also used the fact that, for these j , we have $(N/\widehat{j})^{1/3} \leq CN^\omega \kappa(E)^{-1/2}$. Additionally, we have the trivial bound

$$|\partial_{ab}^k g(M)| \leq C \sum_{j: |\gamma_j - E| \leq N^{\omega-1}} \left| \partial_{ab}^k q(\tilde{\lambda}_j) \right| \leq CN^{2\omega + Cd}. \quad (\text{B.62})$$

From (B.60) and (B.62), we deduce the conclusion from the definition of $F(M)$ and the fact that χ is bounded with bounded derivatives. \square

Finally, we note that when H is a generalized Wigner matrix,

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2) \subset \mathcal{A} \left(\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H \right) \quad (\text{B.63})$$

for any $w \in [0, 1]$ and $a, b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, where $\mathbf{q}, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2$ may be chosen arbitrarily. We conclude by Lemma 4.6 and (B.57) that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{w \in [0, 1]} \bigcap_{a, b \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \mathcal{A} \left(\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H \right) \right) \geq 1 - C_1 \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{c_1 \log \log N}) \quad (\text{B.64})$$

for some constants $c_1 = c_1(\omega) > 0$, $C_1 = C_1(\omega) > 0$.

Lemma B.15. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ be the vector of its eigenvalues. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \geq 500$, $\delta \in (0, 1/100)$ and $\mathbf{a} > 0$. Then there exist a constant $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \delta) > 0$ and an event $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\delta)$ such that for any $E \in [-2 - N^{-200\delta}, 2 + N^{-200\delta}]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{N}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(I) \geq k) \leq CN^{-\delta \log k}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}^c) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1 (\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N}), \quad (\text{B.65})$$

where $I = I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, E)$ and $C_1(\delta), c_1(\delta), c_2(\delta) > 0$ are constants.

Proof. Recall the dynamics H_s defined in (B.48) and set $s_0 = N^{-40\delta}$, in preparation for the use of Proposition B.13. By [33, Lemma 16.2] there exists a generalized Wigner matrix H_0 such that the matrix $R = H_{s_0}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^k] = \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^k]$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 3 \rrbracket$ and $|\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^4] - \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^4]| \leq CN^{-2}s_0$ for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on the constants used to verify Definition 1.1 holds for H_0 . We observe that R is also a generalized Wigner matrix, and in particular it has subexponential entries.

Let $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_N)$ denote the vector of eigenvalues of R arranged in increasing order. By the definition of $F(M)$ and (4.1),

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(R)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_\nu(I_4) \geq 450\}} \mathcal{N}_\nu(I_4) \geq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(R)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{N}_\nu(I_4) \geq 450\}} \mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\nu}}(I_3) \geq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(R)} F(R) \quad (\text{B.66})$$

where we recall that $I_n = I(\delta, n\mathbf{a}, E)$. We compute using Lemma B.12 and (B.66) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(R)} F(R)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(R)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_\nu(I_4) \geq 450} \mathcal{N}_\nu(I_4)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \right] \quad (\text{B.67})$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=450}^{\infty} k^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_\nu(I_4) \geq k) \leq C \sum_{k=450}^{\infty} k^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} CN^{200\delta} N^{-\delta k/2} \leq C_1, \quad (\text{B.68})$$

for some constant $C_1 = C_1(\delta, \mathbf{a}) > 1$. Since $\mathcal{A}(R)$ holds with exponentially high probability by (B.64), and $F(R) \leq N$, we see $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(R)} F(R)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \right] \leq C_1$ and therefore $\mathbb{E} \left[F(R)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \right] \leq C_1$, after increasing the value of C_1 .

Fix any bijection

$$\varphi: \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N\} \rightarrow \llbracket 1, \gamma_N \rrbracket, \quad (\text{B.69})$$

where $\gamma_N = N(N+1)/2$, and define the matrices $H^1, H^2, \dots, H^{\gamma_N}$ by

$$h_{ij}^\gamma = \begin{cases} h_{ij} & \text{if } \varphi(i, j) \leq \gamma \\ r_{ij} & \text{if } \varphi(i, j) > \gamma \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.70})$$

for $i \leq j$.

Fix some $\gamma \in \llbracket 1, \gamma_N \rrbracket$ and consider the indices (i, j) such that $\varphi(i, j) = \gamma$. For any $m \geq 1$, we may Taylor expand $F_m(H^\gamma)$ in the (i, j) entry, write $\partial = \partial_{ij}$, and find

$$F_m(H^\gamma) - F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) = \partial F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij} + \frac{1}{2!} \partial^2 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \partial^3 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^3 \quad (\text{B.71})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4!} \partial^4 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^4 + \frac{1}{5!} \partial^5 F_m\left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^5, \quad (\text{B.72})$$

where $w_1(\gamma) \in [0, 1]$ is a random variable depending on h_{ij} . Similarly, we can expand $F_m(H^{\gamma-1})$ in the (i, j) entry, and after subtracting this expansion from (B.71) and (B.72) and taking expectation, we find

$$\mathbb{E} [F_m(H^\gamma)] - \mathbb{E} [F_m(H^{\gamma-1})] = \frac{1}{4!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^4 \right] - \frac{1}{4!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) r_{ij}^4 \right] \quad (\text{B.73})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{5!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 F_m\left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) h_{ij}^5 \right] - \frac{1}{5!} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 F_m\left(\Theta_{w_2(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma\right) r_{ij}^5 \right]. \quad (\text{B.74})$$

Here $w_2(\gamma) \in [0, 1]$ is a random variable depending on r_{ij} , and we used that $\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}^k] = \mathbb{E}[r_{ij}^k]$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, 3 \rrbracket$.

We now use this expansion to show that $\mathbb{E} F(H)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \leq C$ for a constant C . Our argument proceeds by induction, with the induction hypothesis at step $m \in \mathbb{N}$ being that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[F_n\left(\Theta_\kappa^{(a,b)} H^\gamma\right) \right] \leq K_n \quad (\text{B.75})$$

holds for a constant K_n depending on n , for all $n \leq m \leq \lceil \delta \log N \rceil$ and choices of $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ and $(a, b) \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket^2$. We may assume, by increasing the constants K_n if necessary, that $K_n \geq 1$ and K_n is increasing in n . We will fix K_n later.

The base case $m = 0$ is trivial. Assuming the induction hypothesis holds for $m - 1$, we will derive a bound for m . Using the independence of h_{ij} and r_{ij} from $\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma$, we may rewrite the terms on the right side of (B.73) as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^4 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) r_{ij}^4 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[h_{ij}^4 - r_{ij}^4 \right]. \quad (\text{B.76})$$

For the second factor, we recall that $|\mathbb{E} [h_{ij}^4] - \mathbb{E} [r_{ij}^4]| \leq CN^{-2} s_0 = CN^{-2-40\delta}$. For the first, we compute

$$\partial^4 F_m = \partial^4 (F^m) = mF_{m-1}F^{(4)} + 3m(m-1)F_{m-2}(F^{(2)})^2 + m(m-1)(m-2)(m-3)F_{m-4}(F')^4 \quad (\text{B.77})$$

$$+ 4m(m-1)F_{m-2}F^{(1)}F^{(3)} + 6m(m-1)(m-2)F_{m-3}(F')^2F^{(2)}. \quad (\text{B.78})$$

Using the induction hypothesis (B.75) for $n \leq m - 1$, $m \leq \lceil \delta \log N \rceil$, the fact that $F_m \geq 0$, and the first inequality of (B.59), we find from (B.77) that

$$\left| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}(H^\gamma)} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| \leq CK_{m-1} (\log N)^4 N^{28(\omega + \delta + \delta_1 + \varepsilon)}. \quad (\text{B.79})$$

Further, by the second inequality in (B.59), and because $\mathcal{A}^c(H^\gamma)$ holds with exponentially high probability by (B.64), we find¹⁰

$$\left| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}^c(H^\gamma)} \mathbb{E} \left[\partial^4 F_m \left(\Theta_0^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right] \right| \leq CN^{-2-10\delta}. \quad (\text{B.80})$$

It follows from (B.57), (B.76), (B.79), and (B.80) that if ω is chosen small enough relative to δ , so that $28(\omega + \delta + \delta_1 + \varepsilon) < 29\delta$, then there exists some $C = C(\delta, \mathbf{a})$ such that the bound

$$(\text{B.73}) \leq CK_{m-1} N^{-2-10\delta}. \quad (\text{B.81})$$

holds for the fourth order terms for all $m \leq \log N$.

For the terms in (B.74), we first observe that $\sup_{i,j} |r_{ij}| + |h_{ij}| \leq CN^{-1/2+\delta}$ on a set \mathcal{C} of exponentially high probability. Therefore, we find similarly to our computation of (B.81) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\partial^5 F_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) h_{ij}^5 \right] \leq CN^{-5/2+5\delta} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \partial^5 F_m \left(\Theta_{w_1(\gamma)}^{(i,j)} H^\gamma \right) \right| \right] + 1 \right), \quad (\text{B.82})$$

and likewise for the second term in (B.74). Then we obtain, analogously to the bound for the fourth order term in (B.79), and using that $\delta < 1/100$,

$$(\text{B.74}) \leq CK_{m-1} N^{-2-10\delta}. \quad (\text{B.83})$$

Therefore

$$\left| \mathbb{E} [F_m(H^\gamma)] - \mathbb{E} [F_m(H^{\gamma-1})] \right| \leq CK_{m-1} N^{-2-10\delta}, \quad (\text{B.84})$$

and summing over all $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ pairs (i, j) , we find

$$\left| \mathbb{E} [F_m(R)] - \mathbb{E} [F_m(H^\gamma)] \right| \leq CK_{m-1} N^{-10\delta}. \quad (\text{B.85})$$

for any γ .

By (B.67), $\mathbb{E} [F_m(R)] \leq C_1$ for all $m \leq \log N$. Together with (B.85), we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E} [F_m(H^\gamma)] \leq CK_{m-1} N^{-10\delta} + C_1. \quad (\text{B.86})$$

This bounds the quantity in (B.75) when $\kappa = 1$.

¹⁰We remark that constants in the probability bound (B.64) do not depend on the choice of γ , since the H^γ verify Definition 1.1 simultaneously for the appropriate choice of constants. Therefore, the C in (B.80) is uniform in γ .

To address other values of κ , we consider the following expansion:

$$F_m(H^\gamma) - F_m\left(\Theta_\kappa^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right) = \partial F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right)h_{ij} + \frac{1}{2!}\partial^2 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right)h_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{3!}\partial^3 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right)h_{ij}^3 \quad (\text{B.87})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4!}\partial^4 F_m\left(\Theta_0^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right)h_{ij}^4 + \frac{1}{5!}\partial^5 F_m\left(\Theta_{w(\kappa)}^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right)h_{ij}^5, \quad (\text{B.88})$$

Here $w(\kappa) \in [0, 1]$ is a random variable. The same argument that gave the bound (B.81) shows that the right side of (B.87) and the first term of (B.88) may be bounded in absolute value by $CK_{m-1}N^{-2-10\delta}$. The second term of (B.88) is also bounded by $CK_{m-1}N^{-2-10\delta}$ by the reasoning leading to (B.83). We conclude

$$\sup_{\kappa \in [0,1]} \sup_{a,b \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket} \mathbb{E}\left[F_m\left(\Theta_\kappa^{(a,b)}H^\gamma\right)\right] \leq C_2K_{m-1}N^{-10\delta} + C_1, \quad (\text{B.89})$$

for some constant $C_2 = C_2(\delta, \mathbf{a})$.

We may therefore take

$$K_m = C_2K_{m-1}N^{-10\delta} + C_1, \quad K_0 = C_1 \quad (\text{B.90})$$

where we recall that we assumed $C_1 > 1$. For $N \geq N_0(\delta, \mathbf{a})$, we have

$$K_m \leq \frac{K_{m-1}}{2} + C_1, \quad (\text{B.91})$$

which implies $K_m \leq 2C_2$ for all $m \leq \lceil \delta \log N \rceil$ when $N \geq N_0(\delta, \mathbf{a})$. This implies the existence of a constant C_3 such that $K_m \leq C_3$ for all $m \leq \lceil \delta \log N \rceil$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

The conclusion of our induction argument is that $\mathbb{E}F(H)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil} \leq C$ for a constant $C = C(\delta, \mathbf{a})$ independent of N . This implies, using Markov's inequality, that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\lambda}}(I_2) \geq k) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}F(H) \geq k) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}F(H)^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil}}{k^{\lceil \delta \log N \rceil}} \leq \frac{C}{N^{\delta \log k}} \quad (\text{B.92})$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \geq 500$. Finally, using that (4.1) holds on $\mathcal{A}(H)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}N_{\lambda}(I_1) \geq k) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{N}_{\tilde{\lambda}}(I_2) \geq k) \leq \frac{C}{N^{\delta \log k}}. \quad (\text{B.93})$$

This completes the proof after setting $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{A}(H)$. \square

Given the previous lemma, the proof of the next proposition is similar to that of [46, Theorem 3.6].

Proposition B.16. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let λ be the vector of its eigenvalues. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k \geq 500$, $\mathbf{a} > 0$, and $\delta \in (0, 1/100)$. Then there exist a constant $C = C(\mathbf{a}, \delta) > 0$ and an event $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\delta)$ such that for any $i \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}N_{\lambda}(I(\lambda_i)) \geq k) \leq CN^{\delta/5+\delta(1-\log k)/2}, \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_1(\log N)^{c_2 \log \log N}), \quad (\text{B.94})$$

where $I(\lambda_i) = I(\delta, \mathbf{a}, \lambda_i)$ and $C_1(\delta), c_1(\delta), c_2(\delta) > 0$ are constants.

Proof of Proposition B.16. Let $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}_1(\delta)$ be the set from Lemma 2.1, and let $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}_2(\delta)$ be the set from Lemma B.15. From these lemmas, we know that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$ holds with exponentially high probability in the sense of (2.9).

Observe that the event $\{N(I(\lambda_i)) \geq k\}$ satisfies

$$\{\mathcal{N}(I(\lambda_i)) \geq k\} \subset \{N(I(\lambda_i)) \geq k, |\lambda_i - \gamma_i| \leq N^{-2/3+\delta/10}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}\} \cup \mathcal{A}^c. \quad (\text{B.95})$$

Set

$$I_j = \left[\gamma_i + (j-2) \frac{\mathbf{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(\gamma_i)}}, \gamma_i + (j+2) \frac{\mathbf{a}N^{-\delta}}{N\sqrt{\kappa(\gamma_i)}} \right]. \quad (\text{B.96})$$

Note that

$$\{\mathcal{N}(I(\lambda_i)) \geq k, |\lambda_i - \gamma_i| \leq N^{-2/3+\delta/10}\widehat{i}\} \subset \bigcup_{|j| < \frac{2N^{\delta/5}}{\mathfrak{a}}} \{\mathcal{N}(I_j) \geq k\}. \quad (\text{B.97})$$

We used here that $\sqrt{\kappa(\gamma_i)} \leq 2(\widehat{i}/N)^{1/3}$. By Lemma B.15,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \bigcup_{|j| < 2N^{\delta/5}/\mathfrak{a}} \{\mathcal{N}(I_j) \geq k\} \right) \leq \sum_{|j| < 2N^{\delta/5}/\mathfrak{a}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{N}(I_j) \geq k) \leq C(\mathfrak{a}, \delta) N^{\delta/5 + \delta(1 - \log k)/2}. \quad (\text{B.98})$$

In the last inequality, we used the fact that I_j may be slightly larger than $I(E)$ for $E = \gamma_i + j\mathfrak{a}N^{-\delta-1}\kappa(\gamma_i)^{-1/2}$, so Lemma B.15, must be applied with $\delta' = \delta/2$. This finishes the proof after recalling \mathcal{A} holds with exponentially high probability. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.3. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition B.16 and Proposition 4.1. \square

B.2.1. The case $k = 2$. The previous estimate control the probability of having k eigenvalues in a sub-microscopic interval for large k . For $k = 2$, we have the following more precise estimate following from gap universality.

Proposition B.17. *Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix. There exists δ_0 such that the following holds. Let $E \in [-2 - N^{-\delta_0}, 2 + N^{-\delta_0}]$. If $E < \gamma_1$ take $i = 1$; if $i > \gamma_N$, take $i = N$. Otherwise, let $i \in \llbracket 1, N-1 \rrbracket$ be such that $\gamma_i \leq E \leq \gamma_{i+1}$. For any $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, there exist $\alpha = \alpha(\delta) > 0$ and $C = C(\delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{N}(E - N^{-2/3-\delta}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}, E + N^{-2/3-\delta}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}) \geq 2 \right) \leq CN^{-\alpha-\delta}. \quad (\text{B.99})$$

Proof. First, for $i \in \llbracket \alpha N^{1-c}, N - \alpha N^{1-c} \rrbracket$, where $c > 0$ is a small constant, the proof was given in the discussion following [32, (6.32)]; it combines gap universality with the level repulsion induced by Gaudin distribution for Gaussian ensembles.¹¹ For $i \in \llbracket 1, N^{1/4} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket N - N^{1/4}, N \rrbracket$, level repulsion follows in a similar way from gap universality at the edge, which was proved in [15, Theorem 2.7].¹² It therefore remains to handle the intermediate regime $i \in \llbracket N^{1/4}, \alpha N^{1-c} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket N - \alpha N^{1-c}, N - N^{1/4} \rrbracket$. Gap universality here is a consequence of the proof of [13, Theorem 1.6], as noted after the theorem statement there. For completeness, we describe how to convert this universality result to a level repulsion estimate.

Denote $I_i(E) = [E - N^{-2/3-\delta}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}, E + N^{-2/3-\delta}\widehat{i}^{-1/3}]$. Let $\omega > 0$ be a parameter chosen later and denote $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(\omega)$ the event where rigidity (2.12) holds with parameter ω . For any $D > 0$, there exists $C = C(D) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}(I_i(E)) \geq 2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{N}(I_i(E)) \geq 2) + CN^{-D}, \quad (\text{B.100})$$

Consider any $\theta > 0$. There exist $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{N}(I_i(E)) \geq 2) \leq \sum_{j: |i-j| \leq N^{2\omega}} \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \leq N^{-2/3-\delta}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} \right) \quad (\text{B.101})$$

$$\leq C \sum_{j: |i-j| \leq N^{2\omega}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\text{GOE}_N} \left(\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \leq N^{-2/3-\delta}\widehat{i}^{-1/3} \right) + N^{-c+\delta} \right) \quad (\text{B.102})$$

$$\leq CN^{2\omega-2\delta+C\theta} + CN^{-c+\delta+2\omega}, \quad (\text{B.103})$$

where the level repulsion estimates for the Gaussian ensembles used in the last inequality can be deduced from [15, Theorem 3.2]. In second line, we used gap universality with an observable O defined as a smoothed indicator

¹¹The proof was written in the bulk $(-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa)$ corresponding to $i \in \llbracket \alpha N, (1 - \alpha)N \rrbracket$ for any $\alpha > 0$, but it directly translates to an estimate on this slightly extended bulk for $c > 0$ small enough.

¹²One must first establish level repulsion for the GOE and GUE for this argument to go through. See [43, Remark 1.5] for a sketch of the proof of this fact.

function on the scale $N^{-\delta}$ which obeys $\|O\|_\infty \leq CN^\delta$, and considered $O(\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i)$. Gap universality for this regime of i follows from the proof of [13, Theorem 1.6], as mentioned previously. We now set $\delta_0 = c/4$ and $\omega = C\theta = \delta/10$. For $\delta < \delta_0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{N}(I_i(E)) \geq 2) \leq CN^{-\delta} (N^{3\omega-\delta} + N^{-c+2\delta+2\omega}) \leq CN^{-\delta-7\delta/10}, \quad (\text{B.104})$$

and we obtain the final result by taking $\alpha = 7\delta/10$ and combining (B.104) with (B.100). \square

Proof Proposition 5.7. The proof is the same as that of Proposition B.16, after using rigidity to exclude the possibility that λ_i is far from the spectrum $[-2, 2]$. Transposing the argument exactly loses a factor of $N^{\delta/5}$ in comparison to Proposition B.17, but this may be replaced by $N^{\delta/n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so the loss can be made arbitrarily small, and in particular less than the α from Proposition B.17. \square

As discussed in the introduction and following [18, Definition 5.1], by combining Proposition B.17 with [18, Theorem 1.2], we obtain asymptotic Gaussianity of *all* eigenvectors of generalized Wigner matrices. We state this result here for completeness.

Corollary B.18. *Let H be a real symmetric generalized Wigner matrix and fix $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I \subset \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$, we have*

$$(\sqrt{N}|\langle \mathbf{q}, u_k \rangle|)_{k \in I} \rightarrow (|\mathcal{N}_i|_{i=1}^m) \quad (\text{B.105})$$

in the sense of convergence in moments, where $(\mathcal{N}_i)_{i=1}^m$ is a family of independent standard Gaussian random variables. In the complex Hermitian case, the \mathcal{N}_i are replaced by complex-valued standard Gaussians.

C. PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES

Proof of Lemma 4.6. In the proof of Proposition 4.1, in particular the lines following (A.46) and (A.47), it was shown that if rigidity (2.12), delocalization, and $\cup_{i,j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \{|h_{ij}| \leq N^{-1/2+\omega/12}\}$ hold for H with exponentially high probability in the sense of (2.9), then the local semicircle law (2.11), and rigidity and delocalization (2.12), hold uniformly for any rank-one perturbation $\Theta_w^{(a,b)}H$ also with exponentially high probability (with smaller constants $C_1, c_1 > 0$, but the same spectral domain \mathcal{D}_ω and arbitrary control parameter $\omega > 0$). It remains to show the isotropic local law (2.10) also holds for the rank-one perturbations. For this, we observe that for the first term in a resolvent expansion of $\langle \mathbf{q}, G - \Theta_w^{(a,b)}G\mathbf{q} \rangle$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{q}, G(H - \Theta_w^{(a,b)}H)G\mathbf{q} \rangle = w\langle \mathbf{q}, G\mathbf{e}_a \rangle h_{ab}\langle \mathbf{e}_b, G\mathbf{q} \rangle + w\langle \mathbf{q}, G\mathbf{e}_b \rangle h_{ba}\langle \mathbf{e}_a, G\mathbf{q} \rangle \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Here \mathbf{e}_a and \mathbf{e}_b are the standard basis vectors. Both terms can be bounded using polarization, $|h_{ab}| + |h_{ba}| \leq N^{-1/2+\omega/12}$, and (2.10) for H , and we obtain that (C.1) is bounded by $CN^{-1/2+\omega/12}$ in absolute value for some $C(\omega) > 0$. Similar reasoning can be applied to the higher order terms in the resolvent expansion, and we conclude that (2.10) holds for all $\Theta_w^{(a,b)}H$ after taking the expansion to a sufficiently high order, as in the proof of Proposition 4.1. Finally, we observe that $\cup_{i,j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket} \{|h_{ij}| \leq N^{-1/2+\omega/12}\}$ holds with exponentially high probability, since the h_{ij} were assumed to be subexponential. We therefore conclude using Lemma 2.1 for H and a union bound. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.7. By Proposition B.16, we have for all $\ell \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_\lambda(I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell)) \geq k) \leq N^{-D-2} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

when $N \geq N_0(\delta_2)$ and $k \geq k_0(\delta_2)$, where N_0 and k_0 are independent of ℓ . Applying a union bound to (4.11) and (C.2) completes the proof. \square

In preparation for the proof of Lemma 4.8, we note the following lemma, which is essentially given in the proof of [18, Corollary A.2]. We omit the routine modifications necessary to derive the form given here.

Lemma C.1 ([18, Appendix A]). *Fix $\omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. Let H be a generalized Wigner matrix, and let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{q}, \omega, \delta_1, \varepsilon_1, \delta_2, \varepsilon_2)$ be the set from Definition 4.4. For all $z = E + i\eta \in \mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_2/8}$ and $0 < y \leq \eta$,*

$$\sup_{a,b \in [1,N]} \sup_{w \in [0,1]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} |\langle \mathbf{q}, \Theta_w^{(a,b)} G(E + iy) \mathbf{q} \rangle| \leq C \log N \frac{\eta}{y} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

for some constant $C(\varepsilon_2) > 0$.

Proof of Lemma 4.8. We work on the set \mathcal{B} and omit this from the notation. For $E \in I_{\delta_2}(\lambda_\ell) \cup I_{\delta_2}(\tilde{\lambda}_\ell)$, we have

$$\text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(E + i\eta_\ell N^{2\varepsilon_2}) \leq C \sqrt{||E| - 2| + \eta_\ell N^{2\varepsilon_2}} \leq CN^{\varepsilon_2/2} \left(\left(\frac{\hat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3} + N^{\varepsilon_2/2} \sqrt{\eta_\ell} \right) \leq CN^{\varepsilon_2/2} \left(\frac{\hat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where in the first inequality we used Lemma 2.3, and in the second we used (4.1), $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$, and rigidity (2.12) with parameter $\omega' = \varepsilon_2$. Similarly, we obtain

$$\text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(E + i\eta_\ell) \leq CN^{\varepsilon_2/2} \left(\frac{\hat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

When $N^{1-(21/8)\varepsilon_2} \geq \hat{\ell}$, then $\eta_\ell \geq N^{-1+\varepsilon_2/8}$ and $z = E + i\eta_\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_2/8}$, so it is permissible to apply the isotropic local law (2.10) to $\Theta_w^{(a,b)} H$ with $\omega' = \varepsilon_2/8$, which gives

$$\left| \langle \mathbf{q}, \Theta_w^{(a,b)} G^s(z) \mathbf{q} \rangle - m_{\text{sc}}(z) \right| \leq CN^{\varepsilon_2} \left(\frac{\hat{\ell}}{N} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Together, (C.6) and (C.5) imply (4.13).

In the case that $\hat{\ell} \geq N^{1-(21/8)\varepsilon_2}$, we can again use the isotropic local law (2.10) with $z = E + i\eta_\ell N^{2\varepsilon_2}$ and $\omega' = \varepsilon_2/8$, (C.3) with $y = \eta_\ell$, and (C.4), to obtain (4.13).

Given (4.13) and (C.3), (4.14) follows by a standard argument using the Green's function differentiation formula $\partial_{ab} G_{ij} = -G_{ia} G_{bj}$ after expanding the inner product $\langle \mathbf{q}, G(E + i\eta_\ell) \mathbf{q} \rangle$ and computing the imaginary part. Full details can be found in the proof of [18, Corollary A.2]. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.9. When \mathcal{B} holds and $|p - \ell| > N^{2\omega}$, we have $|\lambda_p - \lambda_\ell| > \frac{1}{2} |\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell|$ for $N \geq N_0(\omega)$. It then suffices to show

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{p: |p-\ell| > N^{2\omega}} \frac{1}{(\gamma_p - \gamma_\ell)^2} \leq CN^{4/3+2\omega} \hat{\ell}^{2/3}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

This is a straightforward computation and can be accomplished using, for example, the technique demonstrated in (A.30) and the following lines. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aggarwal, *Bulk universality for generalized Wigner matrices with few moments*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **173** (2019), no. 1-2, 375–432.
- [2] A. Aggarwal, P. Lopatto, and J. Marcinek, *Eigenvector statistics of Lévy matrices*, Ann. Probab. **49** (2021), no. 4, 1778–1846.
- [3] A. Aggarwal, P. Lopatto, and H.-T. Yau, *GOE statistics for Lévy matrices*, arXiv preprint (2018).
- [4] O. Ajanki, L. Erdős, and T. Krüger, *Universality for general Wigner-type matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **169** (2017), no. 3-4, 667–727.

- [5] J. Alt, L. Erdos, and T. Krüger, *Spectral radius of random matrices with independent entries*, arXiv preprint (2019).
- [6] J. Alt and T. Krüger, *Inhomogeneous circular law for correlated matrices*, J. Funct. Anal. **281** (2021), no. 7, Paper No. 109120, 73.
- [7] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni, *An introduction to random matrices*, Vol. 118, Cambridge university press, 2010.
- [8] F. Benaych-Georges and A. Knowles, *Local semicircle law for Wigner matrices*, Advanced topics in random matrices, 2017, pp. 1–90.
- [9] L. Benigni, *Eigenvectors distribution and quantum unique ergodicity for deformed Wigner matrices*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **56** (2020), no. 4, 2822–2867.
- [10] ———, *Fermionic eigenvector moment flow*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **179** (2021), no. 3-4, 733–775.
- [11] L. Benigni and P. Lopatto, *Fluctuations in local quantum unique ergodicity for generalized wigner matrices*, arXiv preprint (2021).
- [12] A. Bloemendal, L. Erdős, A. Knowles, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin, *Isotropic local laws for sample covariance and generalized wigner matrices*, Electron. J. Probab. **19** (2014), 53 pp.
- [13] P. Bourgade, *Extreme gaps between eigenvalues of Wigner matrices*, arXiv preprint (2018).
- [14] ———, *Random band matrices*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. IV. Invited lectures, 2018, pp. 2759–2784.
- [15] P. Bourgade, L. Erdős, and H.-T. Yau, *Edge universality of beta ensembles*, Comm. Math. Phys. **332** (2014), no. 1, 261–353.
- [16] P. Bourgade, L. Erdős, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin, *Fixed energy universality for generalized Wigner matrices*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **69** (2016), no. 10, 1815–1881.
- [17] P. Bourgade, J. Huang, and H.-T. Yau, *Eigenvector statistics of sparse random matrices*, Electron. J. of Probab. **22** (2017).
- [18] P. Bourgade and H.-T. Yau, *The eigenvector moment flow and local quantum unique ergodicity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **350** (2017), no. 1, 231–278.
- [19] P. Bourgade, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin, *Random band matrices in the delocalized phase I: Quantum unique ergodicity and universality*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **73** (2020), no. 7, 1526–1596.
- [20] Z. Che and P. Lopatto, *Universality of the least singular value for sparse random matrices*, Electron. J. of Probab. **24** (2019).
- [21] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, *A dozen de Finetti-style results in search of a theory*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **23** (1987), no. 2, suppl., 397–423.
- [22] D. L. Donoho and X. Huo, *Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **47** (2001), no. 7, 2845–2862.
- [23] I. Dumitriu and Y. Zhu, *Sparse general Wigner-type matrices: local law and eigenvector delocalization*, J. Math. Phys. **60** (2019), no. 2, 023301, 16.
- [24] F. J. Dyson, *Correlations between eigenvalues of a random matrix*, Comm. Math. Phys. **19** (1970), 235–250.
- [25] N. M. Ercolani and K. D. T.-R. McLaughlin, *Asymptotics of the partition function for random matrices via Riemann-Hilbert techniques and applications to graphical enumeration*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **14** (2003), 755–820.
- [26] L. Erdős, A. Knowles, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin, *Spectral statistics of Erdős-Rényi graphs I: local semicircle law*, Ann. Probab. **41** (2013), no. 3B, 2279–2375.
- [27] L. Erdős, S. Péché, J. A. Ramirez, B. Schlein, and H.-T. Yau, *Bulk universality for Wigner matrices*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **63** (2010), no. 7, 895–925.
- [28] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, and H.-T. Yau, *Local semicircle law and complete delocalization for Wigner random matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **287** (2009), no. 2, 641–655.
- [29] ———, *Semicircle law on short scales and delocalization of eigenvectors for Wigner random matrices*, Ann. Probab. **37** (2009), no. 3, 815–852.
- [30] ———, *Wegner estimate and level repulsion for Wigner random matrices*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **3** (2010), 436–479.
- [31] ———, *Universality of random matrices and local relaxation flow*, Invent. Math. **185** (2011), no. 1, 75–119.
- [32] L. Erdős and H.-T. Yau, *Gap universality of generalized Wigner and β -ensembles*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **17** (2015), no. 8, 1927–2036.
- [33] ———, *A dynamical approach to random matrix theory*, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics **28** (2017).
- [34] L. Erdős, H.-T. Yau, and J. Yin, *Bulk universality for generalized Wigner matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **154** (2012), no. 1-2, 341–407.
- [35] ———, *Rigidity of eigenvalues of generalized Wigner matrices*, Adv. Math **229** (2012), no. 3, 1435–1515.

- [36] P. J. Forrester and E. M. Rains, *Interrelationships between orthogonal, unitary and symplectic matrix ensembles*, Random matrix models and their applications, 2001, pp. 171–207.
- [37] F. Götze, A. Naumov, and A. Tikhomirov, *Local semicircle law under fourth moment condition*, J. Theoret. Probab. (2019).
- [38] F. Götze, A. Naumov, A. Tikhomirov, and D. Timushev, *On the local semicircular law for Wigner ensembles*, Bernoulli **24** (2018), no. 3, 2358–2400.
- [39] J. Gustavsson, *Gaussian fluctuations of eigenvalues in the GUE*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **41** (2005), no. 2, 151–178.
- [40] J. B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virág, *Determinantal processes and independence*, Probab. Surv. **3** (2006), 206–229.
- [41] J. Huang, B. Landon, and H.-T. Yau, *Bulk universality of sparse random matrices*, J. Math. Phys. **56** (2015), no. 12, 123301.
- [42] T. Jiang, *Maxima of entries of Haar distributed matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **131** (2005), no. 1, 121–144.
- [43] A. Knowles and J. Yin, *Eigenvector distribution of Wigner matrices*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **155** (2013), no. 3–4, 543–582.
- [44] ———, *The isotropic semicircle law and deformation of Wigner matrices*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **66** (2013), no. 11, 1663–1750.
- [45] B. Landon, P. Lopatto, and J. Marcinek, *Comparison theorem for some extremal eigenvalue statistics*, Ann. Probab. **48** (2020), no. 6, 2894–2919.
- [46] B. Landon and H.-T. Yau, *Convergence of local statistics of Dyson Brownian motion*, Comm. Math. Phys. **355** (2017), no. 3, 949–1000.
- [47] J. Marcinek and H.-T. Yau, *High dimensional normality of noisy eigenvectors*, arXiv preprint (2020).
- [48] H. Nguyen, *Random matrices: Overcrowding estimates for the spectrum*, J. Funct. Anal. **275** (2018), no. 8, 2197–2224.
- [49] S. O’Rourke, *Gaussian fluctuations of eigenvalues in Wigner random matrices*, J. Stat. Phys. **138** (2010), no. 6, 1045–1066.
- [50] S. O’Rourke, V. Vu, and K. Wang, *Eigenvectors of random matrices: a survey*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **144** (2016), 361–442.
- [51] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin, *Hanson–Wright inequality and sub-Gaussian concentration*, Electron. Commun. Probab. **18** (2013), no. 82, 9.
- [52] ———, *Delocalization of eigenvectors of random matrices with independent entries*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 13, 2507–2538.
- [53] ———, *No-gaps delocalization for general random matrices*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **26** (2016), no. 6, 1716–1776.
- [54] T. Tao and V. Vu, *Random matrices: universality of local eigenvalue statistics up to the edge*, Comm. Math. Phys. **298** (2010), no. 2, 549–572.
- [55] ———, *Random matrices: universality of local eigenvalue statistics*, Acta Math. **206** (2011), no. 1, 127–204.
- [56] ———, *Random matrices: universal properties of eigenvectors*, Random Matrices Theory Appl. **1** (2012), no. 01, 1150001.
- [57] V. Vu and K. Wang, *Random weighted projections, random quadratic forms and random eigenvectors*, Random Structures Algorithms **47** (2015), no. 4, 792–821.
- [58] E. Wigner, *Characteristic vectors of bordered matrices with infinite dimensions*, Ann. of Math. (2) (1955), 548–564.
- [59] ———, *On the distribution of the roots of certain symmetric matrices*, Ann. of Math. (2) (1958), 325–327.
- [60] ———, *Random matrices in physics*, SIAM review **9** (1967), no. 1, 1–23.