

TRIDIAGONAL RANDOM MATRICES, AN ANALYTIC APPROACH

LUCAS BABET AND IONEL POPESCU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the limiting distribution of the eigenvalues for random tridiagonal matrix models. In the paper [Pop09], the limiting distribution is well described by its moments. Here, an analytical approach allows us, as in the case of Wigner matrices, to relax the assumptions on the random variables. With this method, we proved the convergence of the spectral distribution under an assumption on the second moment. We discuss also about an algebraic approach for the tridiagonal models, which are more complicated than the classic freeness.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Stieltjes Transform	4
1.2. The Wasserstein space	4
1.3. Main result	5
2. The simple tridiagonal model	6
3. A more general tridiagonal model	11
3.1. Compact case	11
3.2. The general tridiagonal model	14
4. Examples	17
5. A joint distribution result	19
6. An algebraic structure	21
Remarks and open questions	23
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION

In the area of random matrices, the full models and the reduced models are very rich. For example the history started with the work of Wigner in [Wig58b] and [Wig58a] which led to an almost independent area of study which is documented in the book by Mehta [Meh04]. The full matrix models is an area in itself. In an interesting paper Trotter [Tro84] proved the Wigner semicircular law using a tridiagonalization procedure. In a subsequent work [DE02] Dumitriu and Edelman introduced a general tridiagonal model which is now known as the β -ensemble as [DE02] is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{N}(0, 2) & \chi_{(n-1)\beta} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \chi_{(n-1)\beta} & \mathcal{N}(0, 2) & \chi_{(n-2)\beta} & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \chi_{(n-2)\beta} & \mathcal{N}(0, 2) & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \chi_{2\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \chi_{2\beta} & \mathcal{N}(0, 2) & \chi_{\beta} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \chi_{\beta} & \mathcal{N}(0, 2) \end{bmatrix}$$

1

and the exact distribution of the eigenvalues is

$$\frac{1}{Z_{n,\beta}} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} |x_i - x_j|^\beta e^{-\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}.$$

Some exact and fine details can be studied from this form.

The main property of the β -ensemble is that the distribution of the eigenvalues is computable and puts a matrix model being the distribution of eigenvalues which extend the distribution of eigenvalues of the G(O/U/S)E corresponding to $\beta = 1, 2, 4$ to any $\beta > 0$. This spurred a large body of work which can be seen in the comprehensive monograph by Forrester [For10], which unifies the study of random matrices with log-gas systems in statistical mechanics. A significant breakthrough following the tridiagonal models was the characterization of the continuum limits. Ramírez, Rider, and Virág [RRV11] proved that the "soft edge" of the spectrum converges to the eigenvalues of the Stochastic Airy Operator, a random differential operator, thereby defining the Tracy-Widom laws for general β . Further extensions to unitary ensembles were developed by Killip and Stoiciu [KS09] using CMV matrices, providing a complete picture of the universality classes for β -ensembles. These developments have established that the tridiagonal models are not merely computational tools, but discrete approximations of fundamental stochastic operators [KRV16].

The tridiagonal models a general class that includes β -ensembles that have been studied using combinatorial tools in [Pop09]. Later on some extensions to these models were considered in [ABZ23, LSW10, Tri19, BS22, BB11, BHS10, BSS21, Cha09, LS15, BS13].

The tridiagonalization of a Wigner ensemble produces a random tridiagonal matrix. However, a major challenge arises: the entries of this resulting matrix are no longer i.i.d., making their analysis considerably more difficult. To address this, we study models where the entries remain i.i.d., hoping that insights gained in this setting will illuminate the more complex case.

Finally, these models connect to the broader problem of band matrices with widths growing as a function of matrix size. Tridiagonalizing such an ensemble yields a matrix with strong entry dependencies, yet understanding the band matrices may reveal new and interesting phenomena related to eigenvalues and eigenvectors.

The tridiagonal model considered in [Pop09] is

$$(1.1) \quad A_N^\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} a_N & b_{N-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \bar{b}_{N-1} & a_{N-1} & b_{N-2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \bar{b}_{N-2} & a_{N-2} & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & b_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \bar{b}_1 & a_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where the parameter $\alpha > 0$ is related to the non-degenerate convergence of the moments

$$(1.2) \quad \forall k : \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{b_n}{n^\alpha} \right)^k \right) = m_k < +\infty.$$

We also assume that all entries are real (the complex case can be studied similarly). The variables $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are bounded in L^2 and i.i.d.

The rescaled matrix $X_N^\alpha = \frac{1}{N^\alpha} A_N^\alpha$ provides a suitable framework for investigating the convergence of the spectral distribution. Using the method of moments, we study the quantities $L_k = \text{tr}((X_N^\alpha)^k)$, where tr denotes the normalized trace. Under these assumptions, the main

theorem of [Pop09] establishes the almost sure convergence of all moments of the spectral distribution. Let us recall it.

Theorem 1.3 (I. Popescu). *Let $\alpha > 0$. Assume that all random variables a_n and b_n are independent and there exists a sequence $\{m_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ with $m_0 = 1$ such that*

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{b_n}{n^\alpha} \right)^k = m_k \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0.$$

Moreover, assume

$$(2.8) \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} |a_n|^k < \infty \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0.$$

Denoting $X_n = \frac{1}{n^\alpha} A_n$, we have

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}_n(X_n^k) = L_k \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0,$$

and almost surely,

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{tr}_n(X_n^k) = L_k \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0.$$

Moreover, L_k is given by

$$(2.11) \quad L_k = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{1}{\alpha k + 1} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_k} \prod_{i < 0} m_{l_i(\gamma)} & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where Γ_k is the set of one-step paths of length k linking 0 to 0, i.e.,

$$\Gamma_k = \{\gamma : \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \forall i < k : |\gamma(i) - \gamma(i+1)| = 1 \text{ and } \gamma(1) = \gamma(k) = 0\}$$

and for any path γ ,

$$c_i = \#\{j \in \operatorname{Im}(\gamma) : i \in [\gamma(j), \gamma(j+1)]\}.$$

Notably, $L_k = 0$ for all odd k .

As highlighted in [AZ06], this result ensures the almost sure convergence of the spectral distribution towards a measure uniquely characterized by its moments, provided that (m_k) corresponds to the moment sequence of such a measure. The same observation holds for measures with compact support.

By leveraging similar combinatorial techniques, we can also establish the convergence of joint distributions for tridiagonal matrices. Specifically, the joint distribution of k tridiagonal matrices is determined by the limiting moments of the matrix entries (including odd moments) and the structure of k -colored one-step paths.

The goal of this work is to present a natural extension of Theorem (1.3) through the Stieltjes transform, which allows us to obtain spectral convergence results beyond moment methods which, for instance, relaxes the integrability condition on the entries. We explore a broader results that do not require the existence of all moments.

Our goal is to analyze the spectral distribution under optimal conditions, and the Stieltjes transform emerges as the natural analytical tool in this setting.

1.1. Stieltjes Transform. We give a quick recap of the Stieltjes transform.

Definition 1.4 (Stieltjes Transform). *Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R} . We define its Stieltjes transform by*

$$S_\mu(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{z - x} \right) d\mu(x) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

The Stieltjes transform is a useful object to study measures on \mathbb{R} . An important remark, although immediate, is that S_μ maps \mathbb{C}^+ to $-\mathbb{C}^+$. In particular (see [AGZ10] for more details), it characterizes the convergence of measures and random measures. To illustrate this, we state the following result.

Proposition 1.5. *Let (μ_n) be a sequence of random probability measures. Then (μ_n) converges weakly almost surely to μ if and only if for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{\mu_n}(z) = S_\mu(z)$ almost surely.*

The assumption $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ can be reduced to $z \in K \subset \mathbb{C}^+$ where K has a non-isolated point, thanks to Montel's theorem. We now present two important examples of Stieltjes transforms.

We consider the determination of the square root on \mathbb{C}^+ given by $\sqrt{\rho e^{i\theta}} = \sqrt{\rho} e^{i\frac{\theta}{2}}$.

Example 1.6. *We denote by σ_r the semicircular law on $[-r, r]$, i.e., the distribution with density $\mathbb{1}_{[-r, r]}(x) \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{r^2 - x^2}$. Its Stieltjes transform is*

$$S_{\sigma_r}(z) = \frac{2(z - \sqrt{z^2 - r^2})}{r^2}$$

and it satisfies the algebraic equation

$$S_{\sigma_r}(z) = \frac{1}{z - \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^2 S_{\sigma_r}(z)}.$$

Example 1.7. *We denote by γ_r the arcsine law on $[-r, r]$, i.e., the distribution with density $\mathbb{1}_{[-r, r]}(x) \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 - x^2}}$. Its Stieltjes transform is*

$$S_{\gamma_r}(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{z^2 - r^2}}.$$

Throughout this paper, for every matrix M , we denote by $S_M(z)$ the Stieltjes transform of its empirical spectral distribution, i.e.,

$$S_M(z) = \text{tr}((zI_N - M)^{-1}).$$

To relax the moment assumptions, we need to consider a specific space where we have convergence of the off-diagonal coefficients.

1.2. The Wasserstein space. We will suppose that (b_n^2) converges in the Wasserstein space.

Definition 1.8. *Let μ, ν be two probability measures on (\mathcal{X}, d) , a separable complete metric space. We define the Wasserstein distance between μ and ν by*

$$W(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{X \sim \mu, Y \sim \nu} \mathbb{E}(d(X, Y)).$$

In this setting, this is equivalent to

$$W(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{\|f\|_{\text{Lip}}=1} \left(\mathbb{E}_\mu(f(X)) - \mathbb{E}_\nu(f(X)) \right).$$

Recall the following important lemma; the proof can be found in [Vil09].

Lemma 1.9. *If (\mathcal{X}, d) is a separable complete metric space, then $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), W)$ is also a separable complete metric space.*

With these two notions, we will prove in Sections 2 and 3 the following main theorem.

1.3. Main result. For the main context we extend the definition of X_N^α . For a given sequence $(\sigma_{k,N})_{k \leq N, N \in \mathbb{N}}$, we define

$$(1.10) \quad X_N^\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} a_{N,N} & \sigma_{N-1,N} b_{N-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \sigma_{N-1,N} \bar{b}_{N-1} & a_{N-1,N} & \sigma_{N-2,N} b_{N-2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \sigma_{N-2,N} \bar{b}_{N-2} & a_{N-2,N} & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \sigma_{1,N} b_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \sigma_{1,N} \bar{b}_1 & a_{1,N} \end{bmatrix}$$

The case X_N^α is recovered by the sequence $\left(\frac{k^\alpha}{N^\alpha}\right)_{k \leq N, N \in \mathbb{N}}$.

We also write X_N when σ is constantly equal to 1, and call it the simple tridiagonal model (see Section 2 for details).

Theorem. *Let (X_N^σ) be the tridiagonal model (1.10) and (X_N) the associated simple model. If*

- $((b_i)^2)$ is a sequence of independent variables that converges in $(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}), W)$ to a variable b ;
- $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}(a_{k,N}^2) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$;
- $\sup_{2 \leq k \leq N-1} |\sigma_{k,N} - \sigma_{k-1,N}| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$;
- the measure $\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \delta_{\sigma_{k,N}}$ converges to a measure μ_T and satisfies the uniform integrability condition in L^2 ,

then the empirical spectral distribution of X_N^σ converges almost surely to μ_b^T , defined in terms of its Stieltjes transform by

$$S_{\mu_b^T}(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{z - xt} d\mu_b(x) d\mu_T(t),$$

where

$$S_{\mu_b}(z) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_1^2 S_1(z) - b_2^2 S_2(z)} \right),$$

and where $S_1(z)$ and $S_2(z)$ are two i.i.d. copies characterized in law by

$$S_{1,2}(z) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \frac{1}{z - b^2 S_{1,2}(z)}$$

and independent of b_1 and b_2 , which are two i.i.d. copies of b .

In addition to this theorem, in Section 6, we also discuss the analog of Voiculescu's theory of free probability. This is less clear in this tridiagonal context. We prove that in general there is convergence of mixed moments for several tridiagonal random matrices, but the algebraic underlying structure similar to the free probability is not clear. We leave a number of open question in the last section some related to this particular question.

Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we prove the convergence for the simple case, which requires some technical steps.

In Section 3 we extend the result to the general case. In particular, we highlight the importance of the assumptions on the sequence $(\sigma_{k,N})_{k \leq N, N}$ and how they modify the empirical distribution.

In Section 4 we give some exotic examples of limiting distributions, illustrating the diversity of laws obtained with the tridiagonal model.

In Section 5 we extend the convergence theorem to the joint distribution of the diagonal matrix and the tridiagonal one.

In Section 6 we discuss some underlying algebraic structure, partially described in [Pop09], and leave some open questions.

2. THE SIMPLE TRIDIAGONAL MODEL

In this section we first study a simple model with independent entries and without any growth factor. The growth factor will consequently be dealt with later in Lemma (3.4).

We call the *simple tridiagonal model* the tridiagonal model with $\sigma = 1$ (or $\alpha = 0$ in the less general context) and with zero diagonal entries, i.e.

$$(2.1) \quad X_N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b_{N-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \bar{b}_{N-1} & 0 & b_{N-2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \bar{b}_{N-2} & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & b_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \bar{b}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $(b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are complex i.i.d. random variables in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$.

We recall a useful lemma for the rest of the paper, which reduces the study to this case.

Lemma 2.2 (Hoffman–Wielandt). *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{H}_N(\mathbb{C})$, and let $\lambda_1^A \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_N^A$ and $\lambda_1^B \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_N^B$ be their eigenvalues. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N |\lambda_i^A - \lambda_i^B|^2 \leq \|A - B\|_2^2.$$

To delve deeper, we need to precisely describe the resolvent entries. Throughout this section, write

$$S_N(z) = (zI_N - X_N)^{-1}$$

for the resolvent (not to be confused with its normalized trace $\text{tr}_N S_N(z)$, i.e., the Stieltjes transform). The starting point is the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A \in \mathcal{H}_N(\mathbb{C})$. For each i , let a_i denote the i th column of A with the i th entry removed, and let $A^{(i)}$ be the matrix obtained by deleting the i th row and column. Then, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,*

$$(zI_N - A)^{-1}(i, i) = \frac{1}{z - A(i, i) - a_i^*(zI_{N-1} - A^{(i)})^{-1}a_i}.$$

With this description, we can express $\text{tr}_N S_N(z)$ in terms of the matrices obtained by removing the (i, i) th rows and columns:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_N S_N(z) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z - X_N(i, i) - x_i^*(zI_{N-1} - X_N^{(i)})^{-1}x_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z - x_i^*(zI_{N-1} - X_N^{(i)})^{-1}x_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The term $x_i^*(zI_{N-1} - X_N^{(i)})^{-1}x_i$ is now easier to manipulate. Indeed,

$$X_N^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X}_{i-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{X}_{N-i} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \tilde{X}_{i-1} and \tilde{X}_{N-i} have the same distribution as X_{i-1} and X_{N-i} . Thus

$$(zI_{N-1} - X_N^{(i)})^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{S}_{i-1}(z) & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{S}_{N-i}(z) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\tilde{S}_{i-1}(z)$ and $\tilde{S}_{N-i}(z)$ are independent copies of $S_{i-1}(z)$ and $S_{N-i}(z)$. Consequently,

$$(2.4) \quad x_i^*(zI_{N-1} - X_N^{(i)})^{-1}x_i = b_i^2 \tilde{S}_{i-1}(z)(i-1, i-1) + b_{i+1}^2 \tilde{S}_{N-i}(z)(1, 1).$$

Therefore, the first issue is the behavior of $S_N(z)(1, 1)$ and $S_N(z)(N, N)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, we prove the following.

Proposition 2.5. *For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $S_i(z)(i, i)$ and $S_i(z)(1, 1)$ have the same distribution.*

Proof. First, consider the distribution of $S_i(z)(1, 1)$. Denote by P_i the characteristic polynomial of X_i . By a classical computation,

$$P_{i+1}(z) = zP_i(z) - b_i^2 P_{i-1}(z).$$

Using the classical formula for the inverse of a matrix,

$$(z - X_i)^{-1}(1, 1) = \frac{\det(z - X_{i-1})}{\det(z - X_i)} = \frac{P_{i-1}(z)}{P_i(z)}.$$

If we denote $s_i = S_i(z)(1, 1)$, we deduce the recursion

$$s_{i+1} = \frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_i}, \quad s_0 = 0.$$

For the second term (see [CdF01]), $u_i = S_i(z)(i, i) = \frac{1}{\delta_i^i}$, where, fixing i , the sequence $(\delta_k^i)_{k \leq i}$ is defined by

$$\delta_k^i = z - \frac{b_{n-i+1}^2}{\delta_{k-1}^i}.$$

Hence

$$u_i = \frac{1}{z - b_1^2 \tilde{u}_{i-1}}$$

where \tilde{u}_{i-1} is a copy of u_{i-1} , independent of b_1 . Moreover $u_1 = \frac{1}{z}$, so u_i and s_i have the same distribution. \square

Thanks to these considerations we have, in distribution,

$$(2.6) \quad \mathrm{tr}_N S_N(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_{i+1}^2 u_{N-i}}.$$

The convergence in distribution of s_i is the next step.

Working in \mathbb{C} , this holds; we can easily show the convergence.

Lemma 2.7. *Let (b_i) be a sequence of i.i.d. real variables and define $s_1 = \frac{1}{z}$, and for all $i > 1$:*

$$s_i = \frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1}}.$$

If $\mathbb{E}(b_1^2) < +\infty$, then for $\Im z > \mathbb{E}(b_1^2)$, (s_i) converges in distribution to a random variable S that satisfies, in distribution,

$$S \sim \frac{1}{z - b^2 S}$$

where b is a copy of b_1 independent of S .

Proof. Let $\Im z > \mathbb{E}(b^2)$. Note that $s_i \in -\mathbb{C}^+$ for all i and $|s_i| \leq \frac{1}{\Im z}$. Denote by \mathbb{P}_n the law of s_n . Let f be a 1-Lipschitz function on \mathbb{C} .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(f(s_{n+1})) - \mathbb{E}(f(s_n)) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\mathbb{E}\left(f\left(\frac{1}{z - x^2 s_n}\right)\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(f\left(\frac{1}{z - x^2 s_{n-1}}\right)\right) \right] dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\mathbb{E}(f \circ g_x(s_n)) - \mathbb{E}(f \circ g_x(s_{n-1})) \right] dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $g_x(w) = 1/(z - x^2 w)$. For each x , $f \circ g_x$ is $\frac{x^2}{(\Im z)^2}$ -Lipschitz, so by the definition of the Wasserstein distance,

$$\mathbb{E}(f \circ g_x(s_n)) - \mathbb{E}(f \circ g_x(s_{n-1})) \leq \frac{x^2}{(\Im z)^2} W(\mathbb{P}_n, \mathbb{P}_{n-1}).$$

Integrating and using $\mathbb{E}(b^2) = \int x^2 d\mathbb{P}_b(x)$ yields

$$W(\mathbb{P}_{n+1}, \mathbb{P}_n) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2} W(\mathbb{P}_n, \mathbb{P}_{n-1}).$$

Thus (\mathbb{P}_n) is Cauchy for $\Im z$ large enough, hence convergent. The characterization of S follows by the same argument. \square

We also recall the Burkholder inequality, which allows us to manipulate expectations directly.

Lemma 2.8 (Burkholder inequality). *Let $Y \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ and (\mathcal{F}_k) be a filtration. Set $Y_k = \mathbb{E}(Y \mid \mathcal{F}_k) - \mathbb{E}(Y \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1})$. Then for all $p > 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{k=1}^n Y_k\right|^p\right) \leq C_p \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n |Y_k|^2\right)^{p/2}$$

where C_p is a constant depending only on p .

We add a classical bound between resolvents of minors.

Proposition 2.9. *Let M be an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix. For each k , let M_k be the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix obtained from M by erasing the k th row and column. Then for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,*

$$\left| \mathrm{tr}_n((zI_n - M)^{-1}) - \mathrm{tr}_{n-1}((zI_{n-1} - M_k)^{-1}) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\Im z}.$$

See a proof of this proposition in Lemma 1.5.6 of [Cap13].

Combined with this proposition and a classical martingale argument as in [AGZ10, Section 2.4], the Burkholder inequality allows us to consider only expectations. More precisely:

Proposition 2.10. *Let $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. If $\mathbb{E}(\text{tr}_N S_N(z))$ converges, then $\text{tr}_N S_N(z)$ converges almost surely.*

Theorem 2.11. *Let (X_N) be the simple tridiagonal model defined above. If (b_i) is a sequence of i.i.d. variables with a finite second moment, then the empirical spectral distribution of X_N converges almost surely to μ_b , defined in terms of its Stieltjes transform by*

$$S_{\mu_b}(z) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_1^2 S_1(z) - b_2^2 S_2(z)} \right),$$

where $S_1(z)$ and $S_2(z)$ are i.i.d. as in Lemma 2.7 and independent of b_1 and b_2 .

Proof. Fix z with $\Im z > \mathbb{E}(b^2)$. Start from the expression of $\text{tr}_N S_N(z)$ in (2.6):

$$\text{tr}_N S_N(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_{i+1}^2 u_{N-i}}.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $W(\mathbb{P}_n, \mathbb{P}_S) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq \delta$, with the notation of Lemma 2.7. For $N > \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\text{tr}_N S_N(z)) - S_{\mu_b}(z)| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_{i+1}^2 u_{N-i}} - \frac{1}{z - b_1^2 S_1 - b_2^2 S_2} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{4\delta}{N(\Im z)^2} + \varepsilon_N, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_N &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=\delta}^{N-\delta} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_{i+1}^2 u_{N-i}} - \frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_2^2 S_2} \right) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=\delta}^{N-\delta} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_2^2 S_2} - \frac{1}{z - b_1^2 S_1 - b_2^2 S_2} \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\delta \leq i \leq N - \delta$ and control

$$\alpha_{i,1} = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_{i+1}^2 u_{N-i}} - \frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_2^2 S_2} \right).$$

As above,

$$\begin{aligned} \pm \Re \alpha_{i,1} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(\pm \Re \left[\frac{1}{z - x^2 s_{i-1} - y^2 u_{N-i}} - \frac{1}{z - x^2 s_{i-1} - y^2 S_2} \right] \right) d\mathbb{P}_b(y) d\mathbb{P}_b(x) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{y^2}{(\Im z)^2} W(\mathbb{P}_{N-i}, \mathbb{P}_S) d\mathbb{P}_b(y) d\mathbb{P}_b(x) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2} W(\mathbb{P}_{N-i}, \mathbb{P}_S) \leq \varepsilon \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The same computation yields the bound for the imaginary part, and using $\sqrt{a^2 + b^2} \leq |a| + |b|$ we obtain

$$|\alpha_{i,1}| \leq 2\varepsilon \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2}.$$

Similarly,

$$|\alpha_{i,2}| = \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{z - b_i^2 s_{i-1} - b_2^2 S_2} - \frac{1}{z - b_1^2 S_1 - b_2^2 S_2} \right) \right| \leq 2\varepsilon \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\varepsilon_N \leq 4\varepsilon \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2}.$$

For N large enough,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(\mathrm{tr}_N S_N(z)) - S_{\mu_b}(z) \right| \leq 4 \left(\frac{\delta}{N (\Im z)^2} + \varepsilon \frac{\mathbb{E}(b^2)}{(\Im z)^2} \right) \leq \varepsilon \frac{4 \mathbb{E}(b^2) + 1}{(\Im z)^2}.$$

Hence $\mathbb{E}(\mathrm{tr}_N S_N(z))$ converges to $S_{\mu_b}(z)$ on $\{\Im z > \mathbb{E}(b^2)\}$, and by analyticity on all of \mathbb{C}^+ . By the Burkholder inequality, $\mathrm{tr}_N S_N(z)$ converges almost surely to $S_{\mu_b}(z)$. \square

This generalization of Theorem (1.3) ensures convergence for a large family of tridiagonal models not studied until now.

A corollary of this result concerns more general tridiagonal models.

Corollary 2.12. *Let (X_N) be a tridiagonal model (1.10). If (b_i) is a sequence of independent variables that satisfies*

- $\forall i : b_i = \beta_i + \epsilon_i,$
- β_i are i.i.d. variables in $L^2,$
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(|\epsilon_i|^2) = 0,$

then the limiting spectral distribution of X_N is the same as that of the tridiagonal model with entries (β_i) .

Proof. We notice that

$$\mathbb{E}(\|X_N - Y_N\|_2^2) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|\epsilon_i|^2) = o(N),$$

where (Y_N) is the tridiagonal model with entries (β_i) . By Theorem (2.11), the limiting spectral distribution of Y_N exists, and by Proposition (2.2) and the Burkholder inequality, it is the same as that of X_N . \square




FIGURE 1. Spectral distribution when b_i follows a Pareto(1, 4) law for $N = 10^4$.

We have seen the behavior in a simple case, without the diagonal and without a growth coefficient for (b_i) . However, the growth behavior of b_i is an important component in the tridiagonal model and will be addressed next.

3. A MORE GENERAL TRIDIAGONAL MODEL

We proceed in two steps via a classical truncation argument for the main result. First, we treat compactly supported measures, and then we address the general case.

3.1. Compact case. For the compact case, the method of moments is directly effective.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X_N be the simple tridiagonal model*

$$X_N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b_{N-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \bar{b}_{N-1} & 0 & b_{N-2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \bar{b}_{N-2} & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & b_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \bar{b}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

with $\{b_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ independent (real or complex) and satisfying the hypotheses of [Pop09] that ensure the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) of X_N converges (in expectation and almost surely) to a compactly supported symmetric law μ_X (odd moments 0; even moments given by Dyck-path counts). For each N , let $(\sigma_{k,N})_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ be positive numbers and define the σ -deformation

$$X_N^\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} a_{N,N} & \sigma_{N-1,N} b_{N-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \sigma_{N-1,N} \bar{b}_{N-1} & a_{N-1,N} & \sigma_{N-2,N} b_{N-2} & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \sigma_{N-2,N} \bar{b}_{N-2} & a_{N-2,N} & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \sigma_{1,N} b_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \sigma_{1,N} \bar{b}_1 & a_{1,N} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the moment bounds in [Pop09, Sec. 2] become

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_k \mathbb{E}[|a_{k,N}|^l] = 0 \quad \text{for any } l \geq 0.$$

Assume now

(SV) **Slow variation:** $\sup_{2 \leq k \leq N-1} |\sigma_{k,N} - \sigma_{k-1,N}| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.$

(EM) **Empirical measure:** $(\sigma_{k,N})$ is a bounded sequence and $\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \delta_{\sigma_{k,N}} \Rightarrow \mu_T$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

where T is a random variable with law μ_T .

(B) **Boundedness:** $\sup_{N \geq 2} \sup_{1 \leq k \leq N-1} |\sigma_{k,N}| < \infty.$

Then the ESD $\mu_{X_N^\sigma}$ converges weakly (in expectation, and almost surely) to the scale mixture μ , which is the law of $T \cdot X$ for T and X independent.

Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$m_{2k}(\mu) = m_{2k}(\mu_X) m_{2k}(\mu_T) \quad \text{and} \quad m_{2k+1}(\mu) = 0.$$

Equivalently, writing μ_b for the limit law in the simple model and μ_b^T for the limit of the σ -deformation, we have

$$m_{2k}(\mu_b^T) = m_{2k}(\mu_b) m_{2k}(\mu_T), \quad m_{2k+1}(\mu_b^T) = 0.$$

Proof. First, since $(\sigma_{k,N})$ is bounded, T is compactly supported, and the convergence $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_{\sigma_{k,N}} \Rightarrow \mu_T$ entails convergence of all moments as well. We now examine the path expansion of the ESD.

Fix M with $-M \leq \sigma_{k,N} \leq M$. Expand $\text{tr}_N((X_N^\sigma)^k)$ via paths as in [Pop09, Sec. 2, eq. (2.6)]. For tridiagonal matrices with zero diagonal, only Dyck paths contribute; with diagonals, the same bookkeeping includes flats, still governed by [Pop09, (2.6)] and the shift partitions [Pop09, (2.5)]. For a fixed admissible path of length k whose top index is p , only indices $p+i$ with $|i| \leq k/2$ appear. By slow variation (SV),

$$\max_{|i| \leq k/2} |\sigma_{p+i,N} - \sigma_{p,N}| = o_N(1) \quad \text{uniformly in } p,$$

so the product of the σ 's contributed by the path equals $\sigma_{p,N}^k$ up to a $(1 + o_N(1))$ factor (with nonzero diagonals the exponent is k minus the number of flat steps, but this only changes the inner Dyck sum, not the argument). After taking expectation over the b 's and summing over paths as in [Pop09, Thm. 1; (2.12)–(2.15)], we obtain for even k

$$\mathbb{E} \text{tr}_N[(X_N^\sigma)^k] = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N-1} \sigma_{p,N}^k \right) m_k(\mu_X) + o(1),$$

with odd moments equal to 0. By the classical Weierstrass approximation on compact sets of continuous functions with polynomials, this yields the desired weak convergence.

The almost sure convergence follows by the same variance summability used in [Pop09, (2.17)], since the extra bounded deterministic factor $\sigma_{p,N}^k$ does not affect summability. \square

The astute reader may ask whether the variables X appearing in Theorem 3.1 have any special structure. We end this section with a general result showing that any distribution can be realized as in Theorem 3.1 with an appropriate double sequence $(\sigma_{k,N})_{1 \leq k \leq N}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let T be a real random variable with distribution function F_T . Then there exists a double sequence $(\sigma_{k,N})_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ such that:*

(1) **Vanishing mesh:**

$$\max_{2 \leq k \leq N} |\sigma_{k,N} - \sigma_{k-1,N}| \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

(2) **Empirical convergence:** *The empirical measures $\nu_N = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \delta_{\sigma_{k,N}}$ converge weakly to the law of T .*

Proof. Let $F := F_T$ and let $Q : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the (left-continuous) quantile function

$$Q(u) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq u\}.$$

It is classical that if $U \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ then $Q(U)$ has distribution F .

Step 1: choose a central window and a target mesh. For $N \geq 2$, define

$$R(\varepsilon) := Q(1 - \varepsilon) - Q(\varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}].$$

Note $R(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$ and $\varepsilon \mapsto R(\varepsilon)$ is nonincreasing. Set

$$\varepsilon_N := \inf\left\{\varepsilon \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}] : R(\varepsilon) \leq \sqrt{N}\right\}.$$

This is well-defined and $\varepsilon_N \downarrow 0$: indeed, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $R(\varepsilon) < \infty$, hence $R(\varepsilon) \leq \sqrt{N}$ for all large N , so eventually $\varepsilon_N \leq \varepsilon$. Put

$$L_N := Q(\varepsilon_N), \quad U_N := Q(1 - \varepsilon_N), \quad W_N := U_N - L_N \leq \sqrt{N}.$$

Choose a target step

$$\delta_N := \frac{1}{\log(N+1)} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Let

$$B_N := \left\lceil \frac{W_N}{\delta_N} \right\rceil + 2 \leq \sqrt{N} \log(N+1) + 2 = o(N), \quad m_N := N - B_N.$$

Step 2: core quantile points. Define equally spaced probabilities on $[\varepsilon_N, 1 - \varepsilon_N]$ by

$$u_{k,N} := \varepsilon_N + \frac{k}{m_N + 1} (1 - 2\varepsilon_N), \quad k = 1, \dots, m_N,$$

and set the core points $x_{k,N} := Q(u_{k,N}) \in [L_N, U_N]$. List the multiset $\{x_{k,N}\}_{k=1}^{m_N}$ in nondecreasing order, and between any two *distinct* consecutive values $s < t$ insert

$$\ell(s, t) := \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil (t - s)/\delta_N \right\rceil - 1 \right\}$$

additional “bridge” points on the arithmetic progression from s to t , so that every consecutive step along the progression is $\leq \delta_N$. The total number of bridge points used is at most

$$\sum \ell(s, t) \leq \left\lceil \frac{U_N - L_N}{\delta_N} \right\rceil \leq B_N - 2.$$

If fewer than B_N slots have been used so far, fill the remaining slots with duplicates of L_N (these do not affect the mesh). Concatenate the resulting list to obtain $\sigma_{1,N}, \dots, \sigma_{N,N}$.

By construction,

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq N-1} |\sigma_{k+1,N} - \sigma_{k,N}| \leq \delta_N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which proves item (1).

Step 3: weak convergence. Fix $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$ and set $f := \varphi \circ Q : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since Q is nondecreasing, it has at most countably many discontinuities; hence f is Riemann integrable on $[0, 1]$.

Let $J_N := [\varepsilon_N, 1 - \varepsilon_N]$, $L_N := |J_N| = 1 - 2\varepsilon_N$, and $h_N := L_N/(m_N + 1)$. Define the grid $t_{j,N} := \varepsilon_N + jh_N$ ($j = 0, \dots, m_N + 1$) and tags $u_{k,N} := t_{k,N}$ ($k = 1, \dots, m_N$). Then

$$\frac{1}{m_N} \sum_{k=1}^{m_N} f(u_{k,N}) = \frac{m_N + 1}{m_N} \cdot \frac{1}{L_N} \underbrace{\left(h_N \sum_{k=1}^{m_N} f(u_{k,N}) \right)}_{=: S_N(f)}.$$

By Riemann integrability of f on $[0, 1]$, for any $\eta > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every partition of any subinterval of $[0, 1]$ with mesh $< \delta$, its Darboux gap is $< \eta$. Since $\text{mesh}(t_{\bullet,N}) = h_N \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\left| S_N(f) - \int_{J_N} f(u) du \right| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Because $(m_N + 1)/m_N \rightarrow 1$ and $L_N \rightarrow 1$, it follows that

$$\left| \frac{1}{m_N} \sum_{k=1}^{m_N} \varphi(Q(u_{k,N})) - \frac{1}{L_N} \int_{J_N} \varphi(Q(u)) du \right| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

i.e.

$$\left| \frac{1}{m_N} \sum_{k=1}^{m_N} \varphi(x_{k,N}) - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(Q(U_{\varepsilon_N}))] \right| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

where $U_{\varepsilon_N} \sim \text{Unif}[\varepsilon_N, 1 - \varepsilon_N]$.

Next, since $U_{\varepsilon_N} \Rightarrow U$ with $U \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ and $f(u) = \varphi(Q(u))$ is bounded and continuous Lebesgue-a.e. (discontinuities are countable), the Portmanteau theorem yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(Q(U_{\varepsilon_N}))] \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[\varphi(Q(U))] = \int \varphi dF.$$

Combining the last two displays gives

$$\frac{1}{m_N} \sum_{k=1}^{m_N} \varphi(x_{k,N}) \longrightarrow \int \varphi dF.$$

Let $\mu_N^{(x)} := \frac{1}{m_N} \sum_{k=1}^{m_N} \delta_{x_{k,N}}$. Since $\|\nu_N - \mu_N^{(x)}\|_{BL} \leq 2 B_N/N \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\int \varphi d\nu_N \rightarrow \int \varphi dF$, i.e. $\nu_N \Rightarrow F$. \square

Remark 3.3. If F is continuous (no atoms), one may simply take $\sigma_{k,N} = Q\left(\frac{k-\frac{1}{2}}{N}\right)$ in increasing order; then the mesh already vanishes without inserting bridges. The bridge trick above is only needed to handle atoms and heavy tails uniformly.

3.2. The general tridiagonal model. As in the compact case above, the diagonal does not affect the limiting distribution.

Lemma 3.4. Let X_N^σ be the tridiagonal model (1.1) and assume that $(a_{k,N})$ is a family of independent variables satisfying

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_k \mathbb{E}[|a_{k,N}|^2] = 0.$$

Then the limiting distribution of X_N^σ exists if and only if the limiting distribution of \tilde{X}_N^σ exists; in that case the two limits coincide, where \tilde{X}_N^σ is obtained from X_N^σ by setting the diagonal to zero.

Proof. We have

$$\mathbb{E}(\|X_N^\sigma - \tilde{X}_N^\sigma\|_2^2) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[|a_{i,N}|^2] = o(N).$$

By Proposition (2.2),

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(S_{X_N^\sigma}(z)) - \mathbb{E}(S_{\tilde{X}_N^\sigma}(z)) \right| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

where $S_M(z)$ denotes the Stieltjes transform (normalized trace of the resolvent) of the ESD of M . By Theorem (1.3) and moment determinacy, $\mathbb{E}(S_{\tilde{X}_N^\sigma}(z))$ converges; by Burkholder's inequality, $S_{X_N^\sigma}(z)$ converges almost surely to the same limit. \square

Hence we may (and will) study X_N^σ directly in the case where $(a_{i,N})_{i,N}$ is the zero family.

We also note how the parameter α appears in the limiting distribution as a deformation in Theorem (1.3). The case $\sigma \equiv 1$ contains all the information needed to describe the limiting spectral distribution of X_N^σ , together with the limiting distribution of σ .

The natural next step is to determine whether the result in Theorem 3.1 also holds under more relaxed conditions.

Before stating the main result, we record a technical lemma, which is likely well known, but we include a full proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.5. Suppose $(\sigma_{i,N})_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ satisfies:

(EM) **Empirical convergence:**

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\sigma_{i,N}} \Rightarrow \mu_T,$$

where T is a random variable with law μ_T .

(SM) **Second moment:** $\mathbb{E}[T^2] < \infty$.

Then for any $M > 0$,

$$(3.6) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > M\}} \leq \mathbb{E}[T^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|T| > M\}}],$$

and

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,N}^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[T^2] \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let F_N denote the empirical measure

$$F_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\sigma_{i,N}},$$

so that $F_N \Rightarrow \mu_T$.

For $M > 0$, define $\varphi_M(x) = x^2 \wedge M$. Then φ_M is bounded and continuous, hence by weak convergence,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_M(\sigma_{i,N}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}[\varphi_M(T)].$$

For tail control, note that for $A > 0$,

$$x^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| > A\}} = \int_A^\infty 2u \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| > u\}} du.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > A\}} = \int_A^\infty 2u F_N(\{|x| > u\}) du.$$

By the Portmanteau theorem,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N(\{|x| > u\}) \leq \mathbb{P}(|T| > u),$$

so

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > A\}} \leq \int_A^\infty 2u \mathbb{P}(|T| > u) du = \mathbb{E}[T^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|T| > A\}}].$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[T^2] < \infty$, the right-hand side tends to 0 as $A \rightarrow \infty$. This proves (3.6) and uniform integrability.

To remove the truncation, write with $A = \sqrt{M}$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,N}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_M(\sigma_{i,N}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{i,N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > \sqrt{M}\}},$$

and similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}[T^2] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_M(T)] + \mathbb{E}[T^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|T| > \sqrt{M}\}}].$$

Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, the first terms converge by weak convergence; the second terms are bounded above by $\mathbb{E}[T^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|T| > \sqrt{M}\}}]$ by the previous step. Then sending $M \rightarrow \infty$ kills the tails, yielding (3.7). \square

As is common in random matrix theory, the main work is truncation; we now prove the main result.

Theorem 3.8. *Let (X_N^σ) be a general tridiagonal model (1.1). Suppose $\{b_i\}$ are i.i.d. in L^2 , and that $(\sigma_{k,N})_{0 \leq k \leq N, N \geq 1}$ satisfies:*

(SV) **Slow variation:** $\sup_k |\sigma_{k,N} - \sigma_{k+1,N}| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$.

(EM) **Empirical measure:** $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_{\sigma_{k,N}} \Rightarrow \mu_T$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where T has law μ_T .

(SM) **Second moment:** $\mathbb{E}[T^2] < \infty$.

Then the empirical spectral distribution of X_N^σ converges almost surely to $\mu_X^\sigma = \mathcal{L}(T \cdot X)$, where T and X are independent and X has the limiting spectral distribution of the simple tridiagonal model with entries $\{b_i\}$.

Proof. Fix $C > 0$, $M > 0$, and $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Define

$$\beta_i := |b_i| \mathbf{1}_{\{|b_i| \leq C\}}, \quad \sigma_{i,N}^M := \sigma_{i,N} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| \leq M\}}.$$

Compare X_N^σ with $X_{N,C}^{\sigma^M}$, the tridiagonal model whose off-diagonal entries are $\{\sigma_{i,N}^M \beta_i\}$. By moment convergence,

$$\mu_{X_{N,C}^{\sigma^M}} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(T \mathbf{1}_{\{|T| \leq M\}} \cdot X \mathbf{1}_{\{|X| \leq C\}}), \quad \mu_{X_C^{\sigma^M}} \xrightarrow{M, C \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(TX).$$

Moreover,

$$\|X_N^\sigma - X_{N,C}^{\sigma^M}\|_2^2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |\sigma_{i,N}|^2 |b_i|^2 (\mathbf{1}_{\{|b_i| > C\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > M\}}).$$

Taking expectations,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|X_N^\sigma - X_{N,C}^{\sigma^M}\|_2^2) &\leq 2 \mathbb{E}[|b_1|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|b_1| > C\}}] \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |\sigma_{i,N}|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}[|b_1|^2] \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |\sigma_{i,N}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > M\}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Burkholder's inequality, it suffices to control $\mathbb{E}(S_{X_N^\sigma}(z))$. Using Proposition (2.2) together with (3.6) and (3.7) from Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}(S_{X_N^\sigma}(z)) - \mathbb{E}(S_{X_{N,C}^{\sigma^M}}(z)) \right| &\leq \frac{2}{(\Im z)^2} \mathbb{E}[|b_1|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|b_1| > C\}}] \mathbb{E}[T^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{(\Im z)^2} \mathbb{E}[|b_1|^2] \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sigma_{i,N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma_{i,N}| > M\}} + o_N(1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where $o_N(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ and using Lemma 3.5 yields

$$|S_{\mu_{X^\sigma}}(z) - S_{\mu_{X_{M,C}^\sigma}}(z)| \leq \frac{2}{(\Im z)^2} \mathbb{E}[|b_1|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|b_1| > C\}}] \mathbb{E}[T^2] + \frac{2}{(\Im z)^2} \mathbb{E}[|b_1|^2] \mathbb{E}[T^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|T| > M\}}].$$

Finally, sending $M, C \rightarrow \infty$ gives, for z in any fixed subset of \mathbb{C}^+ ,

$$S_{\mu_{X^\sigma}}(z) = S_{\mathcal{L}(TX)}(z),$$

which proves the claim. In particular,

$$S_{\mu_{X^\sigma}}(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{z - xt} d\mu_X(x) d\mu_T(t).$$

□

4. EXAMPLES

We now present a few simple yet somewhat exotic examples that appear to be less commonly discussed in the literature.
Constant and classical laws.

Proposition 4.1 (Limiting distribution for constant coefficients). *If all the coefficients satisfy $\frac{b_i}{i^\alpha} = 1$, then the limiting distribution of X_N is Ullmann's law, that is, the distribution of $T^\alpha X$ where T is uniform on $[0, 1]$ and X follows the arcsine law on $[-2, 2]$, with T and X independent.*

Proof. We provide two proofs.

First approach (Toeplitz). We recognize a tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix. The well-known eigenvalues of X_N are

$$\left\{ \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{N+1}\right) \mid k = 1, \dots, N \right\}.$$

A simple change of variables shows convergence to the arcsine law.

Second approach (Stieltjes transform). Applying Theorem (2.11), we must solve

$$s(z) = \frac{1}{z - s(z)}.$$

This is precisely the equation satisfied by the Stieltjes transform of the semicircular distribution (cf. (1.6)). The Stieltjes transform of the limiting spectral distribution is then

$$S(z) = \frac{1}{z - 2s(z)} = \frac{1}{z - z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{z^2 - 4}},$$

which corresponds to the Stieltjes transform of the arcsine law.

Finally, convergence to Ullmann's law for each $\alpha > 0$ follows from Theorem (3.8). \square




FIGURE 2. Simulation of Ullmann's law for $\alpha = 0$, $\alpha = 0.2$, and $\alpha = 0.8$ with $N = 2000$.

Bernoulli case. We now study X_N without any growth factor.

Proposition 4.2 (Limiting distribution for Bernoulli entries). *Let $b_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ with parameter $p \in (0, 1)$, independently, and set $q = 1 - p$. Then the limiting distribution of X_N is*

$$\mu_{B_p} = q^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k p^{k-1},$$

where μ_k denotes the spectral distribution of the $k \times k$ tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix with 1 on the sub- and super-diagonals and 0 on the diagonal.

Heuristic approach. We observe that

$$\frac{1}{N}S_N = \frac{n_N}{N} \cdot \frac{1}{n_N} \sum_{i=1}^{n_N} \frac{P'_{\Delta_i}}{P_{\Delta_i}} + \frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{P'_{N-\tau_{n_N}}}{P_{N-\tau_{n_N}}},$$

where n_N denotes the number of indices i such that $b_i = 0$. The last term is negligible. It is known that $n_N \sim \text{Binomial}(N, q)$. Moreover, the Δ_i are i.i.d. and follow a geometric distribution $\mathcal{G}(q)$ on \mathbb{N}^* . We therefore expect that

$$\frac{1}{N}S_N \implies \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_N}{N} \right) \cdot \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_N} \sum_{i=1}^{n_N} \frac{P'_{\Delta_i}}{P_{\Delta_i}} \right) = q \cdot \left(q \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{\mu_k} p^{k-1} \right).$$

Proof. We describe the decomposition. The characteristic polynomial χ_{X_N} of X_N can be written as

$$\chi_{X_N} = P_{N-\tau_k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k P_{\Delta_i},$$

where we define τ_i , Δ_i , and P_i by:

- $\tau_0 = 0$, and for $i > 0$, $\tau_i = \min\{m > \tau_{i-1} : b_m = 0\}$;
- for all $i \geq 1$, $\Delta_i = \tau_i - \tau_{i-1}$;
- for $i \geq 1$, P_i denotes the characteristic polynomial of the $i \times i$ tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix with 1 on the off-diagonals.

Here k is such that $\tau_k \leq N < \tau_{k+1}$. The Cauchy–Stieltjes transform is then

$$S_{L_N} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{\chi'_{X_N}}{\chi_{X_N}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n \leq N < \tau_{n+1}\}} \left(\frac{P'_{N-\tau_n}}{P_{N-\tau_n}} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{P'_{\Delta_i}}{P_{\Delta_i}} \right).$$

A computation shows that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_i = k, \tau_n \leq N < \tau_{n+1}) = q^n p^{N-n} \binom{N-k}{n-1}.$$

Using standard manipulations for negative-binomial expectations, we obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}(S_{L_N}) = q^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} S_{\mu_k} p^{k-1}.$$


□

We can attempt to apply Theorem (2.11). The problem reduces to solving, for b a Bernoulli variable,

$$s \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{z - b s}.$$

This yields the expression

$$S(z) = \frac{q^2}{z} + \frac{2qp}{z-s} + \frac{p^2}{z-2s}.$$

FIGURE 3. Limiting distribution with parameters $p = 0.5$ (left) and $p = 0.9$ (right).

5. A JOINT DISTRIBUTION RESULT

We now upgrade Theorem 3.1 to a joint convergence result for the pair (Σ_N, X_N) .

Theorem 5.1 (Joint convergence of (Σ_N, X_N)). *Let X_N and $\sigma_{k,N}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, and define*

$$\Sigma_N = \text{diag}(\sigma_{1,N}, \dots, \sigma_{N,N}).$$

Let T be a bounded random variable with law μ_T (the weak limit of the empirical measure of $(\sigma_{k,N})$), and let X be the limit operator associated with the tridiagonal model (so that the ESD of X_N converges to μ_X). Consider the noncommutative probability space

$$(\mathcal{A}, \varphi) = (L^\infty(\Omega_T) \bar{\otimes} \mathcal{A}_X, \mathbb{E} \otimes \varphi_X),$$

where T lives in the first tensor factor and X in the second. Then, for any noncommutative polynomial P in two variables,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \text{Tr} P(\Sigma_N, X_N) = (\mathbb{E} \otimes \varphi_X)(P(T, X)),$$

and the convergence also holds almost surely.

In particular, for all integers $k, \ell \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell) = m_k(\mu_T) m_\ell(\mu_X),$$

with $m_{2r+1}(\mu_X) = 0$ and $m_{2r}(\mu_X)$ given by Dyck-path counts as in [Pop09]. Thus the joint noncommutative distribution of (Σ_N, X_N) converges to that of the commuting pair (T, X) , with T and X independent in the classical sense.

Proof. We proceed in two steps.

1. *Asymptotic commutativity of Σ_N and X_N .* Recall that X_N is tridiagonal, and Σ_N is diagonal with entries $(\sigma_{k,N})_{1 \leq k \leq N}$. A direct computation shows that the commutator $[\Sigma_N, X_N]$ is again tridiagonal, with off-diagonal entries

$$([\Sigma_N, X_N])_{k,k+1} = (\sigma_{k,N} - \sigma_{k+1,N}) b_k, \quad ([\Sigma_N, X_N])_{k+1,k} = (\sigma_{k+1,N} - \sigma_{k,N}) \bar{b}_k.$$

Introduce the normalized Hilbert–Schmidt norm

$$\|A\|_{2,N}^2 := \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(A^* A).$$

Then

$$\|[\Sigma_N, X_N]\|_{2,N}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} 2 |\sigma_{k+1,N} - \sigma_{k,N}|^2 |b_k|^2 \leq 2 \delta_N^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} |b_k|^2,$$

where

$$\delta_N := \sup_{2 \leq k \leq N-1} |\sigma_{k,N} - \sigma_{k-1,N}|.$$

By (SV), $\delta_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and by the assumptions on the b_k (in particular the boundedness of second moments implied by [Pop09]), the sequence

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} |b_k|^2$$

has bounded expectation and converges to $m_2(\mu_X)$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E} \|\Sigma_N, X_N\|_{2,N}^2 \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

and the same holds almost surely along a subsequence by standard arguments. Thus $[\Sigma_N, X_N]$ is asymptotically negligible in normalized Hilbert–Schmidt norm.

Now let $W(\Sigma_N, X_N)$ be any monomial (word) of total degree d in Σ_N and X_N . By repeated use of the identity

$$AB = BA + [A, B],$$

we can reorder the factors so that all Σ_N 's stand to the left of all X_N 's:

$$W(\Sigma_N, X_N) = \Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell + \sum_r C_{r,N},$$

where each remainder term $C_{r,N}$ contains at least one factor $[\Sigma_N, X_N]$, and $k + \ell = d$.

Using the traciality of $\text{tr}_N = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}$ and Hölder's inequality for $\|\cdot\|_{2,N}$, we obtain

$$|\text{tr}_N(C_{r,N})| \leq \|[\Sigma_N, X_N]\|_{2,N} \prod_j \|A_{j,N}\|_{2,N},$$

where the $A_{j,N}$ are products of Σ_N and X_N of degree at most $d - 1$. By (B) and the moment bounds on X_N , these $A_{j,N}$ have uniformly bounded operator and Hilbert–Schmidt norms in N . Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E} |\text{tr}_N(W(\Sigma_N, X_N)) - \text{tr}_N(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell)| \rightarrow 0.$$

The same holds almost surely along a subsequence by Borel–Cantelli, and hence along the full sequence by a diagonal argument over a countable family of monomials.

Thus, to determine the limiting joint moments, it suffices to compute the limits of

$$\text{tr}_N(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell)$$

for all $k, \ell \geq 0$.

2. *Limit of mixed moments* $\text{tr}_N(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell)$. Fix $k, \ell \geq 0$. Expand X_N^ℓ via the path method as in [Pop09, Sec. 2]. Each contributing path uses only indices within a bounded window (of size $O(\ell)$) around some “base point” p , and the weight of a path involves a product of off-diagonal coefficients b_j (and possibly diagonal entries $a_{j,N}$, which are negligible by the assumption on their moments) and, in our deformed setting, products of the $\sigma_{j,N}$ along the path.

In the proof of Theorem 3.1, the slow variation assumption (SV) is used to replace all $\sigma_{j,N}$ along the path by a single representative $\sigma_{p,N}$, up to a multiplicative $(1 + o_N(1))$ error, uniformly in p . Exactly the same argument applies here, with the only difference that we now have an additional factor $\sigma_{p,N}^k$ from the left multiplication by Σ_N^k :

$$\text{tr}_N(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N-1} \sigma_{p,N}^k \cdot \left(\text{Dyck/path contribution at level } p \right) + o(1).$$

As in [Pop09] and Theorem 3.1, the path contribution does not depend on p in the limit and equals $m_\ell(\mu_X)$ for even ℓ and 0 for odd ℓ . Hence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}_N(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell) = m_\ell(\mu_X) \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N-1} \sigma_{p,N}^k.$$

By (EM) and boundedness (B), the empirical measure of the $\sigma_{p,N}$ converges weakly to μ_T , and boundedness implies convergence of all moments, so

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N-1} \sigma_{p,N}^k = m_k(\mu_T).$$

Thus

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}_N(\Sigma_N^k X_N^\ell) = m_k(\mu_T) m_\ell(\mu_X),$$

with $m_\ell(\mu_X) = 0$ for odd ℓ .

The almost sure convergence of these mixed moments follows by the same variance estimates as in [Pop09, (2.17)], noting that the extra bounded deterministic factor $\sigma_{p,N}^k$ does not affect summability.

Finally, for a general noncommutative polynomial P , write it as a finite linear combination of monomials and combine Steps 1 and 2. We obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{Tr} P(\Sigma_N, X_N) = \sum_{k,\ell} c_{k,\ell} m_k(\mu_T) m_\ell(\mu_X) = (\mathbb{E} \otimes \varphi_X)(P(T, X)),$$

which is precisely the joint moment convergence of (Σ_N, X_N) to (T, X) . The almost sure statement is obtained similarly.

This proves the theorem. \square

6. AN ALGEBRAIC STRUCTURE

In the Wigner case, the limiting distribution of the sum or product of two Gaussian ensembles is well defined thanks to rotational invariance. In contrast, significant differences arise here—especially when describing sums.

Throughout this section, we focus on the case $\alpha = 0$ and work within the standard framework of noncommutative probability spaces used for Gaussian ensembles, namely the family $(\mathcal{M}_N(\mathbb{R}), \Phi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Recall that we defined the set of cyclic paths of size n by

$$\Gamma_n = \left\{ \gamma : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} : \forall i < n, |\gamma(i) - \gamma(i+1)| = 1, \gamma(1) = \gamma(n) = 0 \right\}.$$

As seen previously, the empirical measure of a tridiagonal model depends only on the distribution of its coefficients. The idea behind introducing paths is to view, in the limit, a tridiagonal model (X_N) as

$$X = U + U^T,$$

where U acts on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ as

$$(6.1) \quad U = \begin{bmatrix} \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & & \\ \cdots & \boxed{0} & b_{-1} & 0 & \cdots & \\ \cdots & 0 & \boxed{0} & b_0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & 0 & \boxed{0} & b_1 & \cdots \\ & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \longleftarrow 0$$

6.0.1. *The addition.* In noncommutative probability, a central question is which notion should replace classical independence. For our models, we seek an appropriate analogue of independence and a corresponding algebraic formulation.

Definition 6.5. Let a be a random limit of a tridiagonal model as in (6.1). Denote by $\mu_{(a,a^*)}$ the law of (a, a^*) and by $\mu_{(T,a)}$ the law of (T, a) . Define

$$\mathcal{NC}_2 = \{ \mu(a, a^*) : a \text{ as in (6.1)} \}, \quad \mathcal{NC}_T = \{ \mu(T, a) : a \text{ as in (6.1)} \}.$$

Remark 6.6. We have $\mu(T, a) = \mu(T, a^*)$ and $\mu(a, a^*) = \mu(a^*, a)$, even though in general $a^*a \neq aa^*$ and $Ta \neq aT$.

The construction of [Pop09] provides a map $N : \mathcal{NC}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{NC}_2$ such that

$$N(\mu(T, a)) = \mu(a, a^*),$$

where N is defined via 1-colored paths. Thus, the essential structure is \mathcal{NC}_T , with \mathcal{NC}_2 recoverable through N .

Proposition 6.7. There exists a unique map $N_n : \mathcal{NC}_T^n \rightarrow \mathcal{NC}_T$ such that for all a_1, \dots, a_n ,

$$N_n(\mu(T, a_1), \dots, \mu(T, a_n)) = \mu(T, a_1 + \dots + a_n),$$

and N_n is defined using n -colored paths as in Theorem 6.4.

We can now define an addition map

$$(+): \mathcal{NC}_T \times \mathcal{NC}_T \longrightarrow \mathcal{NC}_T$$

such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A^2 & \xrightarrow{+} & A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & \mathcal{NC}_T \\ & \searrow \mu & & & \downarrow (+) \\ & & \mathcal{NC}_T^2 & \xrightarrow{N_2} & \mathcal{NC}_T \end{array}$$

REMARKS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

We conclude with several remarks and open questions that emerged during our discussions.

Remark 6.8 (Finite band matrices). Combinatorial tools based on paths of more than one step can also be used to describe the moments of the limiting spectral distribution of band matrices [BB12]. As in the tridiagonal case, one might attempt to adapt these methods to the band-matrix setting. However, the specific tridiagonal structure cannot be directly exploited to establish convergence in the band case.

Nevertheless, an analogous algebraic structure can still be defined for finite-band matrices.

Question 1 (Band matrices). For growing band matrices, similar phenomena arise. In particular, for certain regimes—such as when the bandwidth is of order \sqrt{N} , a “thinning-band” perspective might provide a new analytical framework or key simplification.

Question 2 (Algebraic structure). A satisfactory algebraic framework likely depends on a deeper understanding of the shift operator.

An initial approach based on freeness with amalgamation (or B -type freeness) over the shift does not seem to capture the situation. A more refined structure may therefore be required in this specific context.

Also in this context it is good to have a clean and clear structure of the joint distribution of constant matrices and tridiagonal matrices in the spirit of free probability à la Voiculescu. This would unify and extend the results in Section 5 with the results presented in this section.

Question 3 (Groups and matrices). *To further clarify the algebraic interpretation of tridiagonal models, one might investigate the structure of the orthogonal matrix appearing in their diagonalization.*

In the literature, three main types of ESD (empirical spectral distribution) compositions are well characterized. Let A_N, B_N be diagonal random matrices with ESDs converging to μ_A and μ_B , respectively. Then:

- Freeness. *If U_N is Haar-distributed on $\mathcal{O}_N(\mathbb{R})$, then*

$$\text{ESD}(A_N U_N B_N U_N^T) \implies \mu_A \boxtimes \mu_B.$$

- Traffic independence. *If U_N is uniformly distributed on the permutation group, then $\text{ESD}(A_N U_N B_N U_N^T)$ can be expressed in terms of μ_A and μ_B via traffic independence.*
- Classical independence. *If $U_N = I$, then*

$$\text{ESD}(A_N U_N B_N U_N^T) \implies \mu_A \otimes \mu_B.$$

It is straightforward to move from the model X_N^σ to $\Sigma_N X_N$, where Σ_N is diagonal with entries $(\sigma_{k,N})_{k \leq N}$. Writing μ_σ for μ_T , we have

$$\mu_{\Sigma_N X_N} \implies \mu_\sigma \otimes \mu_X,$$

which corresponds to classical independence.

An intriguing open problem is how “small” the group associated with the orthogonal matrix from the diagonalization of a tridiagonal matrix can be. One may speculate that this matrix behaves almost like a random N -cycle, though much remains to be explored. A related question concerns the transition from the GOE to the $G\beta E$ via products of Householder transformations: perhaps such a product becomes asymptotically Haar-distributed.

Question 4 (Gaussian field). *To better understand the Stieltjes transform of certain tridiagonal models, one could aim to establish a central limit theorem on the entire upper half-plane, yielding a Gaussian field under suitable assumptions. For the $G\beta E$, this has been shown in [LP25]. Building on the Gaussian CLT results in [Pop09, Theorems 6–7], one might hope to extend this to a Gaussian field through a Gaussian analytic function framework.*

REFERENCES

- [ABZ23] Fanny Augeri, Raphael Butez, and Ofer Zeitouni. A clt for the characteristic polynomial of random jacobi matrices, and the $g\beta e$. *Probability theory and related fields*, 186(1):1–89, 2023.
- [AGZ10] Greg W. Anderson, Alice Guionnet, and Ofer Zeitouni. *An Introduction to Random Matrices*, volume 118 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [Akh65] N. I. Akhiezer. *The Classical Moment Problem and Some Related Questions in Analysis*. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1965. Translated by N. Kemmer. Reprinted by Dover (1990) and by Hafner (1965).
- [Arv76] William Arveson. *An Invitation to C^* -Algebras*, volume 39 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 1976.
- [AZ06] Greg W. Anderson and Ofer Zeitouni. A CLT for a band matrix model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 134(2):283–338, 2006.
- [Bai99] Zhidong D Bai. Methodologies in spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices, a review. *Advances in statistics*, pages 174–240, 1999.
- [BB11] Anirban Basak and Arup Bose. Limiting spectral distributions of some band matrices. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 63(1):113–150, 2011.
- [BB12] Anirban Basak and Arup Bose. Limiting spectral distributions of some band matrices. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 65(2):257–265, 2012.
- [Bel11] Serban Teodor Belinschi. Complex analysis methods in noncommutative probability. In Petter Brändén, Mikael Passare, and Mihai Putinar, editors, *Notions of Positivity and the Geometry of Polynomials*, Trends in Mathematics, pages 153–190. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2011.

- [BHS10] Arup Bose, Rajat Subhra Hazra, and Koushik Saha. Patterned random matrices and method of moments. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians 2010 (ICM 2010) (In 4 Volumes) Vol. I: Plenary Lectures and Ceremonies Vols. II–IV: Invited Lectures*, pages 2203–2231. World Scientific, 2010.
- [BS13] Arup Bose and Sanchayan Sen. Finite diagonal random matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 26(3):819–835, 2013.
- [BS22] Arup Bose and Priyanka Sen. xx^t matrices with independent entries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10811*, 2022.
- [BSS21] Arup Bose, Koushik Saha, and Priyanka Sen. Some patterned matrices with independent entries. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 10(03):2150030, 2021.
- [Cap13] Mireille Capitain. Introduction aux grandes matrices aléatoires. In *Cours M2*. none, 2012-2013.
- [CdF01] J.Petronilho C.M. da Fonseca. Explicit inverses of some tridiagonal matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 325(1–3):7–21, 2001.
- [Cha09] Djalil Chafai. Aspects of large random markov kernels. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastics Processes*, 81(3-4):415–429, 2009.
- [DE02] Ioana Dumitriu and Alan Edelman. Matrix models for beta ensembles. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 43(11):5830–5847, 2002.
- [FGZ23] Quentin François and David García-Zelada. Asymptotic analysis of the characteristic polynomial for the elliptic ginibre ensemble. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16720*, 2023.
- [For10] Peter J. Forrester. *Log-gases and random matrices*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [KRV16] Manjunath Krishnapur, Brian Rider, and Bálint Virág. Universality of the stochastic airy operator. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 69(1):145–199, 2016.
- [KS09] Rowan Killip and Mihai Stoiciu. Eigenvalue statistics for cmv matrices: from poisson to clock via random matrix ensembles. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 146(3):361–399, 2009.
- [LP25] Gaultier Lambert and Elliot Paquette. Bulk asymptotics of the gaussian beta-ensemble characteristic polynomial. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.01458*, 2025.
- [LS15] Yiting Li and Xin Sun. On fluctuations for random band toeplitz matrices. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 4(03):1550012, 2015.
- [LSW10] Dang-Zheng Liu, Xin Sun, and Zheng-Dong Wang. Fluctuation of eigenvalues for random toeplitz and related matrices, 2010.
- [Meh04] Madan Lal Mehta. *Random matrices*, volume 142. Elsevier, 2004.
- [Pop09] Ionel Popescu. General tridiagonal random matrix models, limiting distributions and fluctuations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 144(1–2):179–220, 2009.
- [RRV11] José A. Ramírez, Brian Rider, and Bálint Virág. Beta ensembles, stochastic airy spectrum, and a diffusion. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 24(4):919–944, 2011.
- [Spe97] Roland Speicher. Free calculus. In Dan-Virgil Voiculescu, editor, *Free Probability Theory*, volume 12 of *Fields Institute Communications*, pages 94–114. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [Spe09] Roland Speicher. *Free probability theory*, 2009.
- [Tri19] Khanh Duy Trinh. Global spectrum fluctuations for gaussian beta ensembles: a martingale approach. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 32(3):1420–1437, 2019.
- [Tro84] Hale F. Trotter. Eigenvalue distributions of large hermitian matrices; wigner’s semi-circle law and a theorem of kac, murdock, and szego. *Advances in Mathematics*, 54:67–82, 1984.
- [VDN92] Dan-Virgil Voiculescu, Kenneth J. Dykema, and Alexandru Nica. *Free Random Variables*, volume 1 of *CRM Monograph Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [VV07] Benedek Valkó and Bálint Virág. Continuum limits of random matrices and the brownian carousel. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 177:463–508, 2007.
- [Wig58a] E. P. Wigner. On the distribution of the roots of certain symmetric matrices. *Annals of Mathematics*, 67(2):325–327, 1958.
- [Wig58b] Eugene Paul Wigner. On the distribution of the roots of certain symmetric matrices. *Annals of Mathematics*, 67:325, 1958.
- [Zha17] Deng Zhang. Tridiagonal random matrix: Gaussian fluctuations and deviations. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 30(3):1076–1103, 2017.
- [Zhu19] Yizhe Zhu. A graphon approach to limiting spectral distributions of wigner-type matrices. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 56(1):251–279, October 2019.

ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE

Email address: `lucas.babet@ens.psl.eu`

UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE; INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS “SIMION STOILOW” OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY

Email address: `ionel.popescu@fmi.unibuc.ro`

Email address: `ionel.popescu@imar.ro`