



HAL
open science

Large deviations of the extreme eigenvalues of random deformations of matrices

Florent Benaych-Georges, Alice Guionnet, Mylène Maïda

► **To cite this version:**

Florent Benaych-Georges, Alice Guionnet, Mylène Maïda. Large deviations of the extreme eigenvalues of random deformations of matrices. 2010. hal-00505502v1

HAL Id: hal-00505502

<https://hal.science/hal-00505502v1>

Preprint submitted on 23 Jul 2010 (v1), last revised 18 Jun 2011 (v4)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

LARGE DEVIATIONS OF THE EXTREME EIGENVALUES OF RANDOM DEFORMATIONS OF MATRICES

F. BENAYCH-GEORGES*, A. GUIONNET†, M. MAIDA‡.

ABSTRACT. Consider a real diagonal deterministic matrix X_n of size n with spectral measure converging to a compactly supported probability measure. We perturb this matrix by adding a random finite rank matrix of a certain form, with delocalized eigenvectors. We show that the joint law of the extreme eigenvalues of the perturbed model satisfies a large deviation principle, in the scale n with a good rate function for which we give a variational expression.

We tackle both cases when the extreme eigenvalues of X_n converge to the edges of the support of the limiting measure and when we allow some eigenvalues of X_n , that we call outliers, to converge out of the bulk.

We can also generalize our results to the case when X_n is random, with law proportional to $e^{-\text{Tr } V(X)} dX$, for V growing fast enough at infinity and any perturbation of finite rank with orthonormal eigenvectors.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The models	3
1.2. The assumptions	4
1.3. The results in the case without outliers	4
1.4. The results in the case with outliers	5
2. LDP for the largest eigenvalues of a perturbation of matrix models	6
3. Scheme of the proofs of the large deviations principles, organization of the paper	7
4. Characterisation of the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n , proof of Proposition 3.1	9
4.1. The Gram-Schmidt orthonormalisation procedure	9
4.2. Characterisation of the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n : proof of Proposition 3.1	10

Date: July 23, 2010.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 15A52,60F10.

Key words and phrases. Random matrices, large deviations.

* UPMC Univ Paris 6, LPMA, Case courrier 188, 4, Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France, florent.benaych@upmc.fr,

† UMPA, ENS Lyon, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France, aguionne@umpa.ens-lyon.fr,

‡ Université Paris-Sud, Laboratoire de Mathématiques, Bâtiment 425, Faculté des Sciences, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France, mylene.maida@math.u-psud.fr.

This work was supported by the *Agence Nationale de la Recherche* grant ANR-08-BLAN-0311-03.

5.	Large deviation principle for the law of H^n in the case without outliers	11
5.1.	Statement of the result	11
5.2.	Proof of Theorem 5.1.	12
5.3.	Identification and properties of the rate function	15
5.4.	Study of the minimizers of \mathbf{I}	18
6.	Large deviation principle for the largest eigenvalues: the case without outliers	19
6.1.	Statement of the main result	19
6.2.	Preliminary remarks and strategy of the proof	20
6.3.	The structure of H^n	21
6.4.	Core of the proof	23
6.5.	Proof of Lemma 6.9	26
6.6.	Identification of the minimizers	27
7.	Large deviations for H^n in the presence of outliers	27
8.	Statement on the main result in the case with outliers	30
8.1.	Proof of Theorem 8.1	32
9.	Proofs of the results related to classical matrix models	36
9.1.	Proof of Theorem 2.2	36
9.2.	Proof of Theorem 2.5	37
10.	Appendix	38
10.1.	An auxiliary large deviations result	38
10.2.	Proof of a technical lemma	40
10.3.	On the eigenvalues of the deformed matrix	41
	References	43

1. INTRODUCTION

The understanding of the large deviations of the spectrum of large random matrices is still very scarce. Concerning the global asymptotics of the spectrum, a large deviation principle was proved in [4], based on the explicit joint law of the eigenvalues, which is described by a Coulomb Gas interaction, for the law of the spectral measure of random matrices distributed according to a Gibbs measure, including the case of Gaussian Wigner random matrices. This result was extended to the eigenvalues of the sum of a self-adjoint Gaussian Wigner random matrix and a deterministic self-adjoint matrix in [12], using stochastic analysis. The large deviations for the law of the extreme eigenvalues are understood in a slightly more general context. Again relying on the explicit joint law of the eigenvalues, a large deviation principle was derived in [3] for the same models. The large

deviation of extreme eigenvalues of Gaussian Wishart matrices was studied in [16]. In the case where the Wishart matrix is of the form XX^* with X a rectangular matrix so that the ratio of its dimensions goes to zero, large deviations of the extreme eigenvalues could be studied under rather general assumptions on the entries [10]. Similar large deviation results hold in discrete situations, see [9]. In this article, we shall be concerned by the effect of finite rank deformations on the deviations of the extreme eigenvalues of random matrices. In [8], a large deviation principle for the largest eigenvalue of matrices of the GOE and GUE deformed by a rank-one matrix was obtained by using fine asymptotics of the Itzykson-Zuber-Harich-Chandra (or spherical) integrals. The large deviations of the extreme eigenvalues of a Wigner matrix perturbed by a matrix with finite rank greater than one happened to be much more complicated. One of the goal of this paper is to prove such a large deviation result when the Wigner matrix is Gaussian. In fact, our result will include the more general case where the non-perturbed matrices are taken in some classical matrix ensembles, namely the ones with distribution $\propto e^{-n \operatorname{tr}(V(X))} dX$, for which the deviations are well known. We first tackle a closely related question, namely the large deviation properties of the largest eigenvalues of a deterministic matrix X_n perturbed by a finite rank random matrix. We show that the law of these eigenvalues satisfy a large deviation principle for a fairly general class of random finite rank perturbations. We can then consider random matrices X_n , independent of the perturbation, by studying the deviations of the perturbed matrix conditionnally to the non-perturbed matrices.

Let us now present more precisely the kind of models we will be dealing with.

1.1. The models. Let X_n be a real diagonal matrix of size $n \times n$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1^n \geq \lambda_2^n \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n^n$.

We perturb X_n by a random matrix whose rank does not depend on n . More precisely, let m, r be fixed positive integers and $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \dots \geq \theta_m > 0 > \theta_{m+1} \geq \dots \geq \theta_r$ be fixed, let $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ be a random vector whose law does not charge any hyperplane and $(G(k) = (g_1(k), \dots, g_r(k)))_{k \geq 1}$ be independent copies of G . Then, for $n > r$, the r vectors with dimension n

$$G_1^n := (g_1(1), \dots, g_1(n))^T, \dots, G_r^n := (g_r(1), \dots, g_r(n))^T$$

are almost surely linearly independent and we denote by $(U_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ the vectors obtained from $(G_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ by a Gram-Schmidt orthonormalisation procedure with respect to the usual scalar product on \mathbb{C}^n .

We shall consider the eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_1^n \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\lambda}_n^n$ of \tilde{X}_n , which is either defined by

$$\tilde{X}_n = X_n + \sum_{i=1}^r \theta_i U_i^n U_i^{n*} \tag{1}$$

or by

$$\tilde{X}_n = X_n + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^r \theta_i G_i^n G_i^{n*}. \tag{2}$$

We refer to the model (1) as the *orthonormalized case* and to the model (2) as the *i.i.d. case*.

If g_1, \dots, g_r are r independent standard (real or complex) Gaussian variables, it is well known that the law of $(U_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ is the uniform measure on the set of r orthonormal vectors. The model (1) coincides then with the one introduced in [5].

Our goal will be to examine the large deviations for the m largest eigenvalues of the deformed matrix \widetilde{X}_n , with m the number of positive eigenvalues of the random deformation.

1.2. The assumptions. Concerning the spectral measure of the full rank deterministic matrix X_n , we assume the following

Assumption 1.1. *The empirical distribution $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i^n}$ of X_n converges weakly as n goes to infinity to a compactly supported probability μ .*

Concerning the random vector G , we assume the following:

Assumption 1.2. *$G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ is a random vector with entries in $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} such that*

- *for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}^r \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i g_i = 0) = 0$*
- *there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(e^{\alpha \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i|^2}) < \infty$.*

We consider two distinct kind of assumptions on the extreme eigenvalues of X_n . We will be first interested in the case when these extreme eigenvalues **stick to the bulk** (see Assumption 1.3), and then to the case **with outliers**, when we allow some eigenvalues of X_n to take their limit outside the support of the limiting measure μ (see Assumption 1.5).

1.3. The results in the case without outliers. We first consider the case where the extreme eigenvalues of X_n stick to the bulk.

Assumption 1.3. *The largest and smallest eigenvalues of X_n tend respectively to the upper bound (denoted by b) and the lower bound (denoted by a) of the support of μ .*

Our main theorem is the following (see Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.4 for precise statements).

Theorem 1.4. *Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, the law of the m largest eigenvalues $(\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \widetilde{\lambda}_m^n) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ of \widetilde{X}_n satisfies a large deviation principle (LDP) in the scale n with a good rate function L . In other words, for any closed set F of \mathbb{R}^m ,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left((\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \widetilde{\lambda}_m^n) \in F \right) \leq - \inf_F L$$

and for any open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left((\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \widetilde{\lambda}_m^n) \in O \right) \geq - \inf_O L.$$

Moreover, this rate function achieves its minimum value at a unique m -tuple $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_m^*)$ towards which $(\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \widetilde{\lambda}_m^n)$ converges almost surely.

Theorem 1.4 is true for both the orthonormalized model and the i.i.d. model, but the rate function L is not the same for both models. As could be expected, the minimum $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_m^*)$ only depends on the θ_i 's, on the limiting spectral distribution μ of X_n , and on the covariance matrix of the vector G .

1.4. The results in the case with outliers. We now consider the case where some eigenvalues of X_n escape from the bulk, so that Assumption 1.3 is not fulfilled. We assume that these eigenvalues, that we call *outliers*, converge:

Assumption 1.5. *There exist some non negative integers p^+, p^- such that for any $i \leq p^+$, $\lambda_i^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \ell_i^+$, for any $j \leq p^-$, $\lambda_{n-j+1}^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} \ell_j^-$, $\lambda_{p^++1}^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} b$ and $\lambda_{n-p^-}^n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} a$ with $-\infty < \ell_1^- \leq \dots \leq \ell_{p^-}^- < a \leq b < \ell_{p^+}^+ \leq \dots \leq \ell_1^+ < \infty$, where a and b denote respectively the lower and upper bounds of the limiting measure μ .*

To simplify the notations in the sequel we will use the following conventions : $\ell_{p^-+1}^- := a$ and $\ell_{p^++1}^+ := b$.

In this framework, we will need to make on G the additional assumption

Assumption 1.6.

- *The law of the random vector $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^r or on \mathbb{C}^r .*
- *The law of the vector $\frac{G}{\sqrt{n}}$ satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n with a good rate function that we denote by I .*

Theorem 1.7. *If Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 and 1.6 hold, the law of the $m + p^+$ largest eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n satisfies a large deviation principle with a good rate function L° .*

Again, Theorem 1.7 is true for both the orthonormalized model and the i.i.d. model, but the rate function is not the same for both models. See Theorem 8.1 for a precise definition of L° .

Before going any further, let us discuss Assumption 1.6.

Lemma 1.8. (1) *If $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ are i.i.d standard Gaussian variables, Assumption 1.6 holds with $I(v) = \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_2^2$ and $I^{(Z)}(M) = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(M)$ if $M = xx^*$ for some vector x , and $+\infty$ otherwise.*

- (2) *If G is such that for any $\alpha > 0$, $\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i|^2}] < \infty$, then the second point of Assumption 1.6 holds with I infinite except at 0, where it takes value 0.*

Proof. The first result is a direct consequence of Schilder's theorem. For the second, it is enough to notice by Tchebychev's inequality that for all $L, \delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} |g_i|^2 \geq \delta n\right) \leq r e^{-L\delta n} \mathbb{E}(e^{L \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i|^2})$$

so that taking the large n limit and then L going to infinity yields

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} |g_i/\sqrt{n}|^2 \geq \delta\right) = -\infty$$

thus proving the claim. \square

2. LDP FOR THE LARGEST EIGENVALUES OF A PERTURBATION OF MATRIX MODELS

In this section, we apply our results to study the large deviations of the law of the extreme eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n , in the orthonormalized case but where X_n is now randomly chosen, independently of the G_i^n 's. We suppose that X_n is distributed according to the Gibbs measure

$$d\mu_\beta^n(X) = \frac{1}{Z_n} e^{-n \operatorname{tr}(V(X))} dX$$

with dX the Lebesgue measure on the set of $n \times n$ Hermitian ($\beta = 2$ and G is \mathbb{C}^r -valued) or symmetric matrices ($\beta = 1$ and G is \mathbb{R}^r -valued)). Let us first recall a few facts about this non-perturbed model. It is well known that the law of the eigenvalues of X_n is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n(d\lambda_1, \dots, d\lambda_n) = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_n}}{Z_{V,\beta}^n} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} |\lambda_i - \lambda_j|^\beta e^{-n \sum_{i=1}^n V(\lambda_i)} \prod_{i=1}^n d\lambda_i.$$

A large deviation principle in the scale n^2 for the law of the spectral measure $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i}$ under $\mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n$ was obtained in [4], resulting in particular with the almost sure convergence of the latter to a probability measure μ_V . The large deviations for the extreme eigenvalues of X_n were derived in [3], see also [1, Section 2.6.2]. We give below a slightly more general statement to consider the deviations of the p th largest eigenvalues (note that the p th smallest can be considered similarly).

This will be obtained under the following assumption

Assumption 2.1. • V is continuous and $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V(x)}{\beta \log|x|} = +\infty$.

- For all integer numbers p , the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{Z_{nV/n-p,\beta}^{n-p}}{Z_{V,\beta}^n}$$

exists and is denoted by $\alpha_{V,\beta}^p$.

- Under $\mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n$ the largest eigenvalue λ_1^n converges almost surely to the upper boundary b_V of the support of μ_V .

These assumptions hold in a wide generality. It is verified for the law of the GUE ($\beta = 2$, $V(x) = x^2$) and the GOE ($\beta = 1$, $V(x) = x^2/2$) as the second point is verified by Selberg formula whereas the last is well known, see Kőmlos-Füredi [1, Section 2.1.6]. It is as well verified for Wishart matrices (case $\beta = 1, 2$ and $V(x) = \frac{\beta}{2}x^2 - \alpha \log(x)$) with the slight extension of taking the integration on the positive real line.

Theorem 2.2. Under Assumption 2.1 the law of the p th largest eigenvalues ($\lambda_1^n > \dots > \lambda_p^n$) of X_n satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n and with good rate function given by

$$J^p(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^p J_V(x_i) + \alpha_{V,\beta}^p, & \text{if } x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_p, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

with $J_V(x) = V(x) - \beta \int \log|x-y| d\mu_V(y)$.

Remark 2.3. Note that in the case of the GOE and the GUE, see [3],

$$J_V(x) = \beta \int_2^x \sqrt{(y/2)^2 - 1} dy - \alpha_{V,\beta}^1, \quad \alpha_{V,\beta}^p = p\alpha_{V,\beta}^1.$$

We now go to the perturbed model and consider the orthonormalized case. In this case, due to the rotational invariance of the law of X_n , one can consider perturbation of a more general form namely

Assumption 2.4. (U_1^n, \dots, U_r^n) is a family of orthonormal vectors in $(\mathbb{R}^n)^r$ (resp. $(\mathbb{C}^n)^r$) if $\beta = 1$ (resp. $\beta = 2$), either deterministic or independent of X_n .

Under these assumptions, we know that \widetilde{X}_n has in law the same eigenvalues as $D_n + \sum_{i=1}^r \theta_i (O_n U_i^n)(O_n U_i^n)^*$, with D_n a real diagonal matrix with eigenvalues of law $\mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n$ and O_n Haar distributed on the orthogonal (resp. unitary) group of size n if $\beta = 1$ (resp. $\beta = 2$). Now, from the well know properties of the Haar measure, if the U_i^n 's satisfy Assumption 2.4, then the $O_n U_i^n$'s are column vectors of a Haar distributed matrix. It means in particular that they can be obtained by the orthonormalisation procedure described in the introduction, with $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ i.i.d. Gaussian standard variables (which satisfies in particular Assumption 1.6).

With these considerations in mind, we can state the large deviation principle for the extreme eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n . We denote b_V the rightmost point of the support of μ_V .

Theorem 2.5. Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4, for any integer k , the law of the k th largest eigenvalues $(\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_k^n)$ of \widetilde{X}_n satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n and with good rate function given by, by

$$\tilde{J}^k(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \inf_{p \geq 0} \inf_{\ell_1 > \dots > \ell_p > b_V} \{L_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p}^0(x_1, \dots, x_k) + J^p(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p)\},$$

if $x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_k$, the function being infinite otherwise.

Here, $L_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p}^0$ is the rate function defined in Theorem 8.1 for the orthonormalized model built on $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ iid standard Gaussian variables and X_n with limiting spectral measure μ_V and outliers ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_p .

3. SCHEME OF THE PROOFS OF THE LARGE DEVIATIONS PRINCIPLES, ORGANIZATION OF THE PAPER

The strategy of the proof will be quite similar in both cases (with or without outliers), so, for the sake of simplicity, we will outline it in the present section only in the case without outliers (both models, the orthonormalized one and the i.i.d. one, will be treated in the same time).

The cornerstone is a nice representation, already crucially used in many papers on finite rank deformations, see e.g. [5, 2], of the eigenvalues $(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_m^n)$ as roots of a fixed polynomial of matrices of fixed size, depending only on $\Theta = \text{diag}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ the $r \times r$ diagonal matrix of the non-null eigenvalues of the perturbation.

Indeed, if V is the $n \times r$ matrix equal to $[U_1^n \cdots U_r^n]$ in the orthonormalized model and to $[G_1^n \cdots G_r^n]$ in the i.i.d. model, and I_n the identity in $n \times n$ matrices, the characteristic polynomial of \widetilde{X}_n reads

$$\det(zI_n - \widetilde{X}_n) = \det(zI_n - X_n - V\Theta V^*) = \det(zI_n - X_n) \det(I_r - V^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}V\Theta) \quad (3)$$

It means that the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n that are not¹ eigenvalues of X_n are the zeroes of $\det(I_r - V^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}V\Theta)$, which is the determinant of a matrix whose size is independent of n .

Because of the relation between V and the random vectors G_1^n, \dots, G_r^n , it is not hard to check that, if we let, for $z \notin \{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$, $K^n(z)$ and C^n be the elements of the set \mathbf{H}_r of $r \times r$ Hermitian matrices given, for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq r$, by

$$K^n(z)_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k)}{z - \lambda_k^n} \quad (4)$$

and

$$C^n_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k), \quad (5)$$

we have:

Proposition 3.1. *In both i.i.d and orthonormalized situations, there exists a function $P_{\Theta,r}$ defined on $\mathbf{H}_r \times \mathbf{H}_r$ which is polynomial in the entries of its arguments and depends only on the matrix Θ , such that any $z \notin \{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$ is an eigenvalue of \widetilde{X}_n if and only if*

$$H^n(z) := P_{\Theta,r}(K^n(z), C^n) = 0.$$

Of course, the polynomial $P_{\Theta,r}$ is different in the i.i.d. and the orthonormalized case. In the i.i.d. model, $P_{\Theta,r}$ is simpler and does not depend on C . This proposition characterizes the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n as the zeroes of the random function H^n , which depends continuously (as a polynomial function) on the random pair $(K^n(\cdot), C^n)$. The large deviations of these eigenvalues are therefore inherited from the large deviations of $(K^n(\cdot), C^n)$, which we thus study in detail before getting into the deviations of the eigenvalues themselves. Because $K^n(z)$ blows up when z approaches λ_1^n , which itself converges to b , we study the large deviations of $(K^n(z), C^n)$ for z away from b . We shall let \mathcal{K} be a compact interval in (b, ∞) , $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r)$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$ be the space of continuous functions on \mathcal{K} taking values respectively in \mathbf{H}_r and in \mathbb{R} . We endow the latter set with the uniform topology. We will then prove that (see Theorem 5.1 for a precise statement and a definition of the rate function \mathbf{I} involved)

Proposition 3.2. *The law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ equipped with the uniform topology, satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n and with good rate function \mathbf{I} .*

By the contraction principle, we therefore deduce

¹ We show in section 10.3 that the spectrum of X_n and \widetilde{X}_n is distinct in generic situation .

Corollary 3.3. *The law of $(H^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$ equipped with the uniform topology, satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n and with rate function given, for a continuous function $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$, by*

$$J_{\mathcal{K}}(f) = \inf\{\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C); (K(\cdot), C) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r, P_{\Theta, r}(K(z), C) = f(z) \forall z \in \mathcal{K}\}$$

with $P_{\Theta, r}$ the polynomial function of Proposition 3.1.

Theorem 1.4 is then a consequence of this corollary with, heuristically, $L(\alpha)$ the infimum of $J_{[b, +\infty)}$ on the set of functions which vanish exactly at $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Of course, the problem is again to deal with deviations to b . An important technical issue will come from the fact that the set of functions which vanish exactly at α has an empty interior, which requires extra care for the large deviation lower bound.

The organization of the paper will follow the scheme we have just described: in the next section, we detail the orthonormalisation procedure and prove Proposition 3.1. Section 5 and Section 6 will then deal more specifically with the case without outliers. In Section 5, we establish the functional large deviation principles for $(K^n(\cdot), C^n)$ and H^n and in Section 6 our main results in this case, namely the large deviation principle for the largest eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n and the almost sure convergence to the minimizers of the rate function. We then turn to the case with outliers in Sections 7 and 8. Therein, the proofs will be less detailed, but we will insist on the points that differ from the previous case. The extension to random matrices X_n given by classical matrix models is presented in Section 9. To make the core of the paper easier to read, we gather some technical results in Section 10.

4. CHARACTERISATION OF THE EIGENVALUES OF \widetilde{X}_n , PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

As will be seen further, the proof of this proposition is straightforward in the i.i.d. case but more involved in the orthonormalized case and we first detail the orthonormalisation procedure.

4.1. The Gram-Schmidt orthonormalisation procedure.

We start this section by detailing the construction of $(U_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ from $(G_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq r}$ in the orthonormalized model. The canonical scalar product in \mathbb{C}^n will be denoted by $\langle v, w \rangle = v^* w = \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{v_k} w_k$, and the associated norm by $\|\cdot\|_2$. We also recall that \mathbf{H}_r is the space of $r \times r$ either symmetric or Hermitian matrices, according to whether G is a real or complex random vector.

Fix $1 \leq r \leq n$ and consider a linearly independent family G_1, \dots, G_r of vectors in \mathbb{C}^n . Define their Gram matrix (up to a factor n)

$$C = [C_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^r, \quad \text{with } C_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \langle G_i, G_j \rangle.$$

We then define

$$q_1 = 1 \text{ and for } i = 2, \dots, r, \quad q_i := \det[C_{kl}]_{k,l=1}^{i-1}. \quad (6)$$

and the lower triangular matrix $A = [A_{ij}]_{1 \leq j \leq i \leq r}$ as follows : for all $1 \leq j < i \leq r$,

$$A_{ij} = \frac{\det[\gamma_{k,l}^j]_{k,l=1}^{i-1}}{q_i} \text{ with } \gamma_{kl}^j = \begin{cases} C_{kl}, & \text{si } l \neq j \\ -C_{ki}, & \text{si } l = j. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Note that by linear independence of the G_i 's, none of the q_i 's is zero so that the matrix A is well defined.

Then the vectors W_1, \dots, W_r defined, for $i = 1, \dots, r$, by

$$W_i = \sum_{l=1}^i A_{il} \frac{G_l}{\sqrt{n}}$$

are orthogonal and the U_i 's, defined, for $i = 1, \dots, r$, by

$$U_i = \frac{W_i}{\|W_i\|_2}$$

are orthonormal. They are said to be the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalized vectors from (G_1, \dots, G_r) . The following proposition, which can be easily deduced from the definitions we have just introduced, will be useful in the sequel.

Property 4.1. *For each $i_0 = 1, \dots, r$, there is a real function P_{i_0} , defined on \mathbf{H}_r , polynomial in the entries of the matrix, not depending on n and nor on the G_i 's, such that*

$$\|q_{i_0} W_{i_0}\|_2^2 = P_{i_0}(C).$$

Moreover, the polynomial function P_{i_0} is positive on the set of positive definite matrices.

The last assertion of the proposition comes from the fact that any positive definite $r \times r$ Hermitian matrix is the Gram matrix of a linearly independent family of r vectors of \mathbb{C}^r (namely the columns of its square root).

Let G be a random vector satisfying Assumption 1.2 and $(G^n(k), k \geq 1)$ be i.i.d copies of G . Let $G_i^n = (G^n(k)_i)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. One can easily check that if $n > r$, these vectors are almost surely linearly independent, so that we can apply Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization to this family of random vectors. We define the $r \times r$ matrices C^n, A^n , the real number q_i^n and the vectors $W_1^n, \dots, W_r^n, U_1^n, \dots, U_r^n$ of \mathbb{C}^n as above. As announced in Section 1, these U_i^n 's are the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalized of the G_i^n 's we used to define our model in the introduction.

4.2. Characterisation of the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n : proof of Proposition 3.1.

As explained in Section 3, a crucial observation (see [5, Proposition 5.1]) is that the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n can be characterized as the zeroes of a polynomial function of matrices of size $r \times r$. This was stated in Proposition 3.1 which we prove below.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. We have, from (3),

$$\begin{aligned} \det(zI_n - \widetilde{X}_n) &= \det(zI_n - X_n - V\Theta V^*) \\ &= \det(zI_n - X_n) \det(\Theta) \det(\Theta^{-1} - V^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}V) \end{aligned}$$

Hence any $z \notin \{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$ is an eigenvalue of \widetilde{X}_n if and only if

$$D_n(z) := \det(\Theta^{-1} - V^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}V) = 0.$$

In the i.i.d. model, since $V^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}V = K^n(z)$,

$$H^n(z) := \det(\Theta^{-1} - V^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}V)$$

is actually a polynomial, depending on Θ , in the entries of $K^n(z)$.

Let us now treat the orthonormalized model, where the Gram-Schmidt procedure makes things a bit more involved. If we denote by \mathbf{G} the $n \times r$ matrix with column vectors $(G_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq r}$, D the $r \times r$ diagonal matrix given by $D = \text{diag}(\|W_1^n\|_2, \dots, \|W_r^n\|_2)$ and $\Sigma = (A^n)^T$, V is equal to $n^{-1/2}\mathbf{G}\Sigma D^{-1}$. As $K^n(z) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{G}^*(zI_n - X_n)^{-1}\mathbf{G}$, we deduce that

$$D_n(z) = \det(\Theta^{-1} - D^{-1}\Sigma^*K_n(z)\Sigma D^{-1}).$$

Now, if we define $Q = \text{diag}(q_1^n, \dots, q_r^n)$ (recall (6)), $E = DQ$, $F = \Sigma Q$ and $H^n(z) := \det(E^*\Theta^{-1}E - F^*K_n(z)F)$ then on one hand, one can check that

$$D_n(z) = (\det E^*E)^{-1}H^n(z),$$

so that any $z \notin \{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$ is an eigenvalue of \widetilde{X}_n if and only if it is a zero of H^n . On the other hand, $H^n(z)$ is obviously a polynomial (depending only on the matrix Θ) of the entries of $K^n(z)$, $E^*\Theta^{-1}E$ and F . Furthermore, $E^*\Theta^{-1}E$ is a diagonal matrix whose i -th entry is given by $(E^*\Theta^{-1}E)_i = \theta_i^{-1}\|q_i^n W_i^n\|_2^2 = \theta_i^{-1}P_i(C^n)$ (by Property 4.1) and $F_{ij} = \det[\gamma_{k,l}^j]_{k,l=1}^{i-1}$ with $\gamma_{k,l}^j$ defined in (7). This concludes the proof. \square

5. LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR THE LAW OF H^n IN THE CASE WITHOUT OUTLIERS

We assume throughout this section that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 hold.

5.1. Statement of the result.

In the sequel, \mathcal{K} will denote any compact interval included in (b, ∞) , and we denote by z^* its upper bound. We equip $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ with the uniform topology which is given by the distance d defined, for $(K_1, C_1), (K_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ by

$$d((K_1, C_1), (K_2, C_2)) = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}} \|K_1(z) - K_2(z)\|_2 + \|C_1 - C_2\|_2,$$

where $\|M\|_2 = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(M^2)}$ for all $M \in \mathbf{H}_r$.

With $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ satisfying Assumption 1.2, we define Z a matrix in \mathbf{H}_r such that, for $i \leq j$, $Z_{ij} = \overline{g_i}g_j$ and Λ given, for any $H \in \mathbf{H}_r$ by

$$\Lambda(H) = \log \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\text{Tr}(HZ)} \right). \quad (8)$$

The goal of this section is to show the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. (1) *The law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$, viewed as an element of the space $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ equipped with the uniform topology, satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n and with good rate function \mathbf{I} defined, for $K \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r)$ and*

$C \in \mathbf{H}_r$ by $\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C) = \infty$ if $z \mapsto K(z)$ is not Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{K} . Otherwise, K' exists Lebesgue-almost everywhere and

$$\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C) = \sup_{P, X, Y} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\int K'(z)P(z)dz + K(z^*)X + CY \right) - \Gamma(P, Y, X) \right\}$$

where $\Gamma(P, Y, X)$ is given by the formula

$$\Gamma(P, Y, X) = \int \Lambda \left(- \int \frac{1}{(z-x)^2} P(z)dz + \frac{1}{z^* - x} X + Y \right) d\mu(x)$$

and the supremum is taken over piecewise constant functions P with values in \mathbf{H}_r and X, Y in \mathbf{H}_r .

- (2) The law of $(H^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$ equipped with the uniform topology, satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n and with rate function given, for a continuous function $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$, by

$$J_{\mathcal{K}}(f) = \inf \{ \mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C) ; (K(\cdot), C) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r, P_{\Theta, r}(K(z), C) = f(z) \forall z \in \mathcal{K} \}$$

with $P_{\Theta, r}$ the polynomial function of Proposition 3.1.

Since the map $(K(\cdot), C) \mapsto (P_{\Theta, r}(K(z), C))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}$ from $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ to $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R})$, both equipped with their uniform topology, is continuous and \mathbf{I} is a good rate function, the second part of the theorem is a direct consequence of its first part and the contraction principle [7, Theorem 4.2.1].

The remainder of the section will be devoted to the proof of the first part of the theorem and the study of the properties of the rate function \mathbf{I} , in particular its minimizers.

5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.1.

The strategy will be to establish a LDP for finite dimensional marginals of the process $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ based on [14, Theorem 3.2] that we remind in Theorem 10.1 of the Appendix. From that, we will establish a LDP in the topology of pointwise convergence via the Dawson-Gärtner theorem. As $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ will be shown to be exponentially tight for the uniform topology, the LDP will also hold in this latter topology.

5.2.1. *Exponential tightness.* We start with the exponential tightness, stated in the following lemma. As \mathcal{K} is a compact subset of (b, ∞) and the largest eigenvalue λ_1^n tends to b , there exists $1 > \varepsilon > 0$ (depending only on \mathcal{K}) such that for n large enough, for any $z \in \mathcal{K}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, $z - \lambda_i^n > \varepsilon$. We fix hereafter such an ε .

For any $L > 0$, we set, for any $p \geq 1$, $\delta(p) = \frac{2\varepsilon}{pL}$ and define

$$\mathcal{K}_L := \bigcap_{p \geq 1} \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}} \|K(z)\|_2 + \|C\|_2 \leq L, \quad \sup_{z, z' \in \mathcal{K}, |z-z'| \leq \delta(p)} \|K(z) - K(z')\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{p} \right\}.$$

We have

Lemma 5.2.

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n) \in \mathcal{K}_L^c \right) = -\infty.$$

In particular, the law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ is exponentially tight for the uniform topology on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$.

Proof. We claim that

$$\left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} C_{ii}^n \leq \frac{\varepsilon L}{2r} \right\} \subset \{((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n) \in \mathcal{K}_L\}.$$

Indeed, for n large enough,

$$|K^n(z)_{ij} - K^n(z')_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{C_{ii}^n C_{jj}^n} \frac{|z - z'|}{\varepsilon^2}$$

so that, for $|z - z'| \leq \delta(p)$,

$$\|K^n(z) - K^n(z')\|_2 \leq r \frac{\delta(p)}{\varepsilon^2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} C_{ii}^n.$$

Therefore, if $\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} C_{ii}^n \leq \frac{\varepsilon L}{2r}$, then $\|K^n(z) - K^n(z')\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{p}$ whereas $\|C^n\|_2 \leq r \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} C_{ii}^n \leq \frac{\varepsilon L}{2} \leq \frac{L}{2}$ and $\|K^n(z)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} r \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} C_{ii}^n \leq \frac{L}{2}$.

Now, by Assumption 1.2, let $\alpha > 0$ be such that $C := \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\alpha |g_1|^2} \right) < \infty$.

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} C_{ii}^n > \frac{\varepsilon L}{2r} \right) \leq r \mathbb{P} \left(C_{11}^n > \frac{\varepsilon L}{2r} \right) \quad (9)$$

$$\leq r \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\alpha \sum_k |G_1^n(k)|^2} \right) e^{-n\alpha \frac{\varepsilon L}{2r}} \leq r C^n e^{-n\alpha \frac{\varepsilon L}{2r}} \leq e^{-n\alpha \frac{\varepsilon L}{4r}}, \quad (10)$$

where the last inequality holds for n and L large enough. This gives

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n) \in \mathcal{K}_L^c \right) = -\infty.$$

By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, \mathcal{K}_L is a compact subset of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ for any $L > 0$, from which we get immediately the second part of the lemma. \square

5.2.2. Large deviation principle for finite dimensional marginals. We now study the finite dimensional marginals of our process. More precisely, we intend to show the following:

Proposition 5.3. *Let $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $b < z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_M$.*

The law of $((K^n(z_i))_{1 \leq i \leq M}, C^n)$ viewed as an element of \mathbf{H}_r^{M+1} satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n with good rate function $I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}$ defined, for $K_1, \dots, K_M, C \in \mathbf{H}_r$ by

$$I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(K_1, \dots, K_M, C) = \sup_{\Xi_1, \dots, \Xi_M, Y \in \mathbf{H}_r} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{l=1}^M \Xi_l K_l + Y C \right) - \Gamma_M(\Xi_1, \dots, \Xi_M, Y) \right\},$$

with $\Gamma_M(\Xi_1, \dots, \Xi_M, Y)$ defined by the formula

$$\Gamma_M(\Xi_1, \dots, \Xi_M, Y) = \int \Lambda \left(\sum_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{z_l - x} \Xi_l + Y \right) d\mu(x),$$

with Λ given by (8).

Proof. The proof of the proposition is a direct consequence of Theorem 10.1.1. Indeed, let Z_1 be the \mathbf{H}_r -valued random variable such that for all $1 \leq i, j \leq r$,

$$(Z_1)_{ij} = \overline{g_i(1)}g_j(1)$$

and we define f the matrix-valued continuous function with values in $\mathbb{R}^{[(M+1)r] \times r}$ such that, if we denote by I_r the identity matrix in \mathbf{H}_r ,

$$f(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{z_1-x} I_r \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{z_M-x} I_r \\ I_r \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, if $(Z_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}$ are iid copies of Z_1 and if we denote by

$$L_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(\lambda_k^n) \cdot Z_k = \begin{pmatrix} K^n(z_1) \\ \vdots \\ K^n(z_M) \\ C^n \end{pmatrix},$$

from Theorem 10.1.1, we get that L_n satisfies an LDP in the scale n with good rate function $I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}$. \square

5.2.3. Large deviation principle for the law of $((K_n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$. The next step is to establish a LDP for the law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ associated to the topology of pointwise convergence. The following proposition will be a straightforward application of the Dawson-Gärtner theorem on projective limits.

Proposition 5.4. *The law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ as an element of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence satisfies a LDP in the scale n with good rate function \mathbf{J} defined as follows : for $K \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r)$ and $C \in \mathbf{H}_r$,*

$$\mathbf{J}(K, C) = \sup_M \sup_{z_1 < \dots < z_M, z_i \in \mathcal{K}} I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(K(z_1), \dots, K(z_M), C).$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{J} be the collection of all finite subsets of \mathcal{K} ordered by inclusion. For $j = \{z_1, \dots, z_{|j|}\} \in \mathcal{J}$ and f a measurable function from \mathcal{K} to \mathbf{H}_r , $p_j(f) = (f(z_1), \dots, f(z_{|j|})) \in \mathbf{H}_r^{|j|}$.

We know from Proposition 5.3 that the law of $(p_j(K^n), C^n)$ satisfies a LDP with good rate function $I_{|j|}^{z_1, \dots, z_{|j|}}$. Moreover, one can check that the projective limit of the family $\mathbf{H}_r^{|j|} \times \mathbf{H}_r$ is $\mathbf{H}_r^{\mathcal{K}} \times \mathbf{H}_r$ equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence.

Therefore, the Dawson-Gärtner theorem [7, Theorem 4.6.1] gives us Proposition 5.4. \square

The next step is the following : from Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.2, and as the topology of uniform convergence is finer than the topology of pointwise convergence, we can apply [7, Corollary 4.2.6] and get that the law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}}, C^n)$ as an element of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ equipped with the uniform topology satisfies a LDP in the scale n with good rate function \mathbf{J} .

5.3. Identification and properties of the rate function.

Now, to complete the proof of Theorem 5.1, the last step is to identify the rate function, that is, show that $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{J}$.

We will consider the operator norm, given, for $H \in \mathbf{H}_r$, by $\|H\|_\infty = \sup\langle u, Hu \rangle$, where the supremum is taken over vectors $u \in \mathbb{C}^r$ with norm one. We also use the usual order on Hermitian matrices, i.e. $H_1 \leq H_2$ if and only if $H_2 - H_1$ is positive semi-definite (respectively $H_1 < H_2$ if $H_2 - H_1$ is positive definite).

We first want to check that $\mathbf{J}(K(\cdot), C) = \infty$ whenever K is not Lipschitz continuous. We prove the following more complete lemma, which also proves that \mathbf{I} is a good rate function². Moreover, some of the items will be useful in the sequel. We recall that Λ was defined in (8).

Lemma 5.5. (1) $H \mapsto \Lambda(H)$ is increasing, $\Lambda(-H) \leq 0$ if $H \geq 0$ and for all non null positive semi-definite $H \in \mathbf{H}_r$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda(-tH) = -\infty. \quad (11)$$

(2) If we denote by $(C^*)_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[\overline{g_i}g_j]$. Then, for any $H \in \mathbf{H}_r$,

$$\Lambda(H) \geq \text{Tr}(HC^*).$$

(3) There exists $\gamma > 0$ so that

$$B := \sup_{H: \|H\|_\infty \leq \gamma} \Lambda(H) < \infty.$$

(4) If $\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C)$ or $\mathbf{J}(K(\cdot), C)$ are finite, then $C > 0$ and $K(z) > 0$ for any $z \in \mathcal{K}$.

(5) For all L , there exists a finite constant M_L so that on $\{\mathbf{I} \leq L\}$ or $\{\mathbf{J} \leq L\}$, we have

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}} \|K(z)\|_\infty \leq M_L, \quad \|C\|_\infty \leq M_L$$

$$\text{and for all } z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{K}, \|K(z_2) - K(z_1)\|_\infty \leq M_L |z_1 - z_2|.$$

In particular, K' exists almost surely and is bounded by M_L .

(6) If $\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C)$ or $\mathbf{J}(K(\cdot), C)$ are finite, then $K'(z) \leq 0$ for almost any $z \in \mathcal{K}$ and for any non zero vector e , there is no non empty interval where $\langle e, K'(z)e \rangle$ is null everywhere.

(7) \mathbf{I} is a good rate function.

Proof.

(1) The two first assertions of the first point are just based on the fact that almost surely, $\text{Tr}(HZ) \geq 0$ if $H \geq 0$. Let us now prove the last assertion. Consider $\eta > 0$ and a non vanishing orthogonal projector $p \in \mathbf{H}_r$ such that $H \geq \eta p$. For all $t > 0$, we have

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-t \text{Tr}(HZ)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-t\eta \text{Tr}(pZ)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-t\eta \text{Tr}(pGG^*)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-t\eta G^* p G}].$$

²Note that this latter fact could also be deduced from the fact that \mathbf{J} is a good rate function because of exponential tightness and the identification $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{J}$.

Since, by dominated convergence,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-t\eta G^* p G}] = \mathbb{P}\{G^* p G = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{G \in \ker p\} = 0$$

(where we used Assumption 1.2 in the last equality), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda(-tH) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-t \operatorname{Tr}(HZ)}] = -\infty.$$

- (2) The second point follows from Jensen's inequality.
(3) The third point is due to the fact that $\operatorname{Tr}(HZ) \leq \|H\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i|^2$ so that by Hölder's inequality,

$$\Lambda(H) \leq \log \mathbb{E}[e^{\|H\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i|^2}] \leq \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \log \mathbb{E}[e^{\|H\|_\infty r |g_i|^2}]$$

which is finite by Assumption 1.2 if $\|H\|_\infty r \leq \alpha$.

To prove (4), (5) and (6), we shall consider \mathbf{I} rather than \mathbf{J} but proofs are similar for \mathbf{J} (even slightly simpler).

- (4) Assume $\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C) \leq L < \infty$. We first prove that C is positive. We take $P, X \equiv 0$ to get

$$\sup_{Y \in \mathbf{H}_r} \{\operatorname{Tr}(CY) - \Lambda(Y)\} \leq \mathbf{I}(K, C) \leq L.$$

Suppose now that there exists some vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^r$ such that $\langle u, Cu \rangle \leq 0$, and define, for any $t > 0$, $Y_t = -tuu^*$. Then $\operatorname{Tr}(CY_t) \geq 0$ so that for all $t > 0$,

$$-\Lambda(Y_t) \leq \operatorname{Tr}(CY_t) - \Lambda(Y_t) \leq L,$$

which contradicts Equation (11).

Let $z_0 \in \mathcal{K}$. Suppose now that there exists some vector $u \in \mathbb{C}^r$ such that

$$\langle u, K(z_0)u \rangle \leq 0,$$

and take $Y = 0$ and $P(z) = -\mathbb{1}_{z \geq z_0} X$ so that for all $X \in \mathbf{H}_r$, $K(z^*)X + \int K'(z)P(z)dz = K(z_0)X$. Now, for $t > 0$, choose $X_t = -tuu^*$. To exhibit a contradiction, we can then proceed as above, using that, for x in the support of μ , $\frac{1}{z_0-x}$ is bounded below by some positive constant.

- (5) Assume $\mathbf{I}(K(\cdot), C) \leq L$. With γ and B introduced in the third point, we define $Y = \pm\gamma uu^*$ and take $P, X \equiv 0$. We get

$$\gamma |\langle u, Cu \rangle| \leq B + L$$

for all vector u with norm one, that is $\|C\|_\infty \leq \gamma^{-1}(L+B)$. Similar considerations hold for the bound over $\|K(z)\|_\infty$.

We next show that K is Lipschitz. Let u, v be two vectors of norm 1. For $z_1 \leq z_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, if we take P_{z_1, z_2} equals to $(z_1 - z_2)^{-1}(uv^* + vu^*)$ on $[z_1, z_2]$ and equal to zero outside this interval, one then checks that there exists a constant κ which does not depend on z_1 and z_2 nor on u such that for μ -almost all x , the operator norm of the matrix $\int \frac{P_{z_1, z_2}(z)}{(z-x)^2} dz$ can be bounded by κ . Let η_0 be such that $\eta_0 \kappa \leq \gamma$ (with γ satisfying the third point). Then, for any $z_1 \leq z_2 \in \mathcal{K}$,

$$\operatorname{Tr} \left(\int \eta_0 P_{z_1, z_2}(z) K'(z) dz \right) \leq B + L$$

that is

$$(z_2 - z_1)^{-1} 2\Re\langle u, (K(z_2) - K(z_1))v \rangle \leq \frac{L + B}{\eta_0}$$

which gives the desired control after optimization over u, v .

- (6) Let us prove that for any $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $z_1 < z_2$, $K(z_2) \leq K(z_1)$ (dividing by $z_2 - z_1$ will then give the fact that K' is negative semi-definite where it is defined). So let us fix $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $z_1 < z_2$. Let us fix $u \in \mathbb{C}^r \setminus \{0\}$. For all real number $t \geq 0$, we have, for $P_t(z) := t \mathbb{1}_{[z_1, z_2]}(z)uu^*$ and $X = Y = 0$,

$$I(K(\cdot), C) \geq tu^*(K(z_2) - K(z_1))u - \Gamma(P_t, 0, 0).$$

Note that

$$\Gamma(P_t, 0, 0) = \int \Lambda \left(-t \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \frac{dz}{(z-x)^2} u^*u \right) d\mu(x) \leq 0$$

by (1) of this lemma. Thus for all $t > 0$,

$$I(K(\cdot), C) \geq tu^*(K(z_2) - K(z_1))u.$$

It follows that $u^*(K(z_2) - K(z_1))u$ is non positive by letting t going to infinity, which completes the proof of this point. Similarly, if u is a fixed vector and $\langle u, K'(\cdot)u \rangle$ vanishes on an interval $[z_1, z_2]$ with $z_1 < z_2$, $P_t = t \mathbb{1}_{[z_1, z_2]}(z)uu^*$, and $X = Y = 0$,

$$I(K(\cdot), C) \geq - \int \Lambda \left(-t \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \frac{dz}{(z-x)^2} uu^* \right) d\mu(x)$$

which goes to infinity as t goes to infinity by the first point.

- (7) Finally, let us show that \mathbf{I} is a good rate function, namely that $\{\mathbf{I} \leq L\}$ is compact as a subset of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ and that \mathbf{I} is lower semi-continuous. Note here that clearly $\mathbf{I} \geq 0$ (by taking $P, Y, X = 0$). Note first that on this set, by the fifth point K is uniformly Lipschitz with constant M_L and is also uniformly bounded by the fourth point (recall \mathcal{K} is compact), hence it belongs to a compact set by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem. Similarly, C being uniformly bounded, we conclude that $\{\mathbf{I} \leq L\}$ is included into a compact set of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$. Moreover, for any piecewise constant function P, X and Y in \mathbf{H}_r ,

$$L_{P,X,Y}(K, C) := \text{Tr} \left(\int P(z)K'(z)dz + CY + K(z^*)X \right)$$

is a nice linear function of K, C and therefore is continuous. Hence, \mathbf{I} is lower semi-continuous as the supremum of such functions, that is $\{\mathbf{I} \leq L\}$ is closed. \square

We can now identify the rate function itself. Let $z \mapsto K(z)$ be Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{K} taking values in \mathbf{H}_r and $C \in \mathbf{H}_r$.

For any M , the map $(X_1, \dots, X_M, Y) \mapsto (-X_1, -(X_1 + X_2), \dots, -(X_1 + \dots + X_M), Y)$

being bijective on \mathbf{H}_r^{M+1} , one can rewrite, for any $b < z_1 < \dots < z_M$,

$$\begin{aligned} & I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(K(z_1), \dots, K(z_M), C) \\ &= \sup_{\Xi_1, \dots, \Xi_{M-1}, X, Y} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} (K(z_{k+1}) - K(z_k)) \Xi_k + K(z_M) X + CY \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int \Lambda \left(\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left(\frac{1}{z_{k+1} - x} - \frac{1}{z_k - x} \right) \Xi_k + \frac{1}{z_M - x} X + Y \right) d\mu(x) \right\}. \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

Now, if we define the piecewise constant function equal to 0 on $(-\infty, z_1)$, Ξ_k on $[z_k, z_{k+1})$ for $1 \leq k \leq M-1$ and X on $[z_M, z^*]$, the functional inside the supremum above is equal to

$$\text{Tr} \left(\int K'(z) P(z) dz + K(z^*) X + CY \right) - \int \Lambda \left(- \int \frac{1}{(z-x)^2} P(z) dz + \frac{1}{z^* - x} X + Y \right) d\mu(x).$$

Hence the equality $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{J}$ is straightforward.

5.4. Study of the minimizers of \mathbf{I} .

We characterize the minima of \mathbf{I} as follows :

Lemma 5.6. *For any compact set \mathcal{K} of (b, ∞) , the unique minimizer of \mathbf{I} on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ is the pair (K^*, C^*) given, for $1 \leq i, j \leq r$, by*

$$(K^*(z))_{ij} = \int \frac{(C^*)_{ij}}{z - \lambda} d\mu(\lambda), \quad \text{for } z \in \mathcal{K} \quad \text{and} \quad (C^*)_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[\overline{g_i} g_j].$$

Proof. \mathbf{I} vanishes at its minimizers (as a good rate function) and therefore a minimizer (K, C) satisfies

$$\text{Tr} \left(\int K'(z) P(z) dz + K(z^*) X + CY \right) \leq \Gamma(P, X, Y) \quad (13)$$

for all P, X, Y .

Now, for any fixed (P, X, Y) , there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any for any $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, for any x in the support of μ we have

$$\varepsilon \left\| - \int \frac{1}{(z-x)^2} P(z) dz + \frac{1}{z^* - x} X + Y \right\|_{\infty} < \alpha,$$

with α given by Assumption 1.2. Therefore, there exists a constant L such that for any x in the support of μ

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\varepsilon \text{Tr} \left(- \int \frac{1}{(z-x)^2} P(z) dz + \frac{1}{z^* - x} X + Y \right) Z} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left(1 + \varepsilon \text{Tr} \left(\left(- \int \frac{1}{(z-x)^2} P(z) dz + \frac{1}{z^* - x} X + Y \right) C^* \right) \right) \right| \leq \varepsilon^2 L, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\Gamma(\varepsilon P, \varepsilon X, \varepsilon Y) = \varepsilon \text{Tr} \left(\int (K^*)'(z) P(z) dz + K^*(z^*) X + C^* Y \right) + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

Therefore for any minimizer (K, C) , we find after replacing (P, X, Y) by $\varepsilon(P, X, Y)$, using (13) and letting ε going to zero,

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left(\int K'(z)P(z)dz + K(z^*)X + CY \right) \leq \mathrm{Tr} \left(\int (K^*)'(z)P(z)dz + K^*(z^*)X + C^*Y \right).$$

Changing (P, X, Y) in $-(P, X, Y)$ gives the equality. This implies that

$$C = C^*, \quad K' = (K^*)' \quad \text{a.s. and} \quad K(z^*) = K^*(z^*)$$

and therefore $(K, C) = (K^*, C^*)$. \square

6. LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR THE LARGEST EIGENVALUES: THE CASE WITHOUT OUTLIERS

We again assume throughout this section that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 hold.

6.1. Statement of the main result.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we define the compact set $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon := [b + \varepsilon, \varepsilon^{-1}]$. Let $s := \mathrm{sign}(\prod_{i=1}^r \theta_i) = (-1)^{r-m}$.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we set $\mathbb{R}_\downarrow^p(x) = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p / \alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_p \geq x\}$.

We also denote by $\omega(g) := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|}{|x - y|} \in [0, \infty]$ the modulus of continuity of a function g .

For any $\varepsilon, \gamma > 0$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_\downarrow^p(b + \varepsilon)$, we put

$$S_{\alpha, \gamma}^\varepsilon := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}) : \exists g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \gamma \leq g \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}, \omega(g) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } f(z) = s.g(z) \prod_{i=1}^p (z - \alpha_i) \right\}$$

Note that in the latter product, the α_i 's appear with multiplicity. We also denote by

$$C_{k, \gamma}^\varepsilon := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}) : \exists p \text{ polynomial of degree } m - k \text{ with } m - k \text{ roots in } \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon \right. \\ \left. \text{and dominant coefficient } 1, g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \gamma \leq g \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}, \omega(g) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \text{ and } f(z) = s.g(z)p(z) \right\}$$

and

$$C_\gamma^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{0 \leq k \leq m} C_{k, \gamma}^\varepsilon.$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, the law of the m largest eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_m^n$ of \tilde{X}_n satisfies a large deviation principle in \mathbb{R}^m in the scale n and with good rate function L , defined as follows. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we take $\alpha_{m+1} = b$ and*

$$L(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{\cup_{\gamma > 0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_\downarrow^m(b), \alpha_{m-k+1} = b \text{ and } \alpha_{m-k} > b \\ & \text{for a } k \in \{0, \dots, m\}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 6.2. *The function L is well defined. Indeed, one can easily notice that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\downarrow}^m(b)$ such that for some $k \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, $\alpha_{m-k+1} = b$ and $\alpha_{m-k} > b$, the map*

$$\varepsilon \longmapsto \inf\{J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(f); f \in \cup_{\gamma>0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}, \gamma)}^\varepsilon\}$$

is increasing, so that its limits as ε decreases to zero exists.

Remark 6.3. *Note that $J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(f)$ is infinite if f has more than r zeroes greater than b . Indeed, by definition, if $J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(f)$ is finite,*

$$f(z) = P_{\Theta, r}(K(z), C) = a \det(A - K(z))$$

with a non-vanishing constant a and a self-adjoint matrix A with eigenvalues $(\theta_1^{-1}, \dots, \theta_r^{-1})$ and a function K with values in $r \times r$ positive self-adjoint matrices so that $K' \leq 0$ by Lemma 5.5. We may assume without loss of generality that f vanishes at a point $x > b$, since otherwise we are done, so that there exists a non zero $e \in \mathbb{C}^r$ so that $K(x)e = Ae$. There is at most one x at which $K(x)e = Ae$; otherwise, $\langle e, K'(\cdot)e \rangle$ would vanish on a non trivial interval which is impossible by Lemma 5.5.6. Moreover, if we let P be the orthogonal projection onto the orthocomplement of e , $H(z) = \det((1 - P)(A - K(z))(1 - P)) \det(PAP - PK(z)P)$ so that H vanishes at x and at the zeroes of $\det(PAP - PK(z)P)$. But PAP and $PK(z)P$ have the same properties as A and $K(z)$ except they have one dimension less. Thus, we can proceed by induction and see that f can vanish at at most r points.

The minimizers are described by the following result.

Theorem 6.4. *If we define on (b, ∞)*

$$H(z) = P_{\Theta, r}(K^*(z), C^*)$$

where (K^, C^*) are given in Lemma 5.6 and $P_{\Theta, r}$ is defined in Proposition 3.1, there exists $k \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ such that H has $m - k$ zeroes $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_{m-k}^*)$ (counted with multiplicity). The unique point of \mathbb{R}^m on which L vanishes is $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_{m-k}^*, b, \dots, b)$ and consequently $(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_m^n)$ converges almost surely to this point as n grows to infinity.*

Remark 6.5. *In the case when (g_1, \dots, g_r) are independent centered variables with variance one, one can check that $C^* = I_r$, $K^*(z) = \int \frac{1}{z-x} d\mu(x) \cdot I_r$ and*

$$H(z) = \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{1}{\theta_i} - \int \frac{1}{z-x} d\mu(x) \right)$$

so that we recover [5, Theorem 2.1].

6.2. Preliminary remarks and strategy of the proof.

Let us first notice that at most m eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n can deviate from the bulk since by Weyl's interlacing inequalities

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{m+1}^n \leq \lambda_1^n,$$

which converges to b as n goes to infinity.

Secondly, let us state the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *The law of the sequence $(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_m^n)$ of the m largest eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n is exponentially tight in the scale n .*

Proof. Let us define $R_n := \widetilde{X}_n - X_n$ and let us denote by $\|R_n\|_\infty$ the operator norm of the perturbation matrix R_n . Note that for all k ,

$$\lambda_k^n - \|R_n\|_\infty \leq \widetilde{\lambda}_k^n \leq \lambda_k^n + \|R_n\|_\infty.$$

Since for any fixed k , the non random sequence λ_k^n tends to b as n tends to infinity, it suffices to prove that

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\|R_n\|_\infty \geq L) = -\infty. \quad (14)$$

For the orthonormalized model, since $\|R\|_\infty = \max\{\theta_1, -\theta_r\}$, (14) is clear. In the i.i.d. model, we have, for $\theta := \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} |\theta_i|$,

$$\|R_n\|_\infty = \sup_{\|v\|_2=1} |\langle v, R_n v \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^r \theta \|G_i^n\|^2 = \frac{\theta}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i(k)|^2.$$

It implies, by Tchebychev's inequality, that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|R_n\|_\infty \geq L) \leq e^{-\frac{n\alpha L}{\theta}} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\alpha \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i(k)|^2 \right) \right] = e^{-\frac{n\alpha L}{\theta}} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\alpha \sum_{i=1}^r |g_i(1)|^2 \right) \right]^n$$

which allows to conclude by the second point of Assumption 1.2. \square

As the law of $(\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \widetilde{\lambda}_m^n)$ is exponentially tight, the proof of Theorem 6.1 reduces in establishing a weak LDP. In virtue of [7, Theorem 4.1.11] (see also [1, Corollary D.6]), this weak LDP (and the fact that L is a rate function) will be a direct consequence of Equation (18) and Lemma 6.8 below. The fact that L is a good rate function is then implied by exponential tightness [7, Lemma 1.2.18].

Before getting into the proof itself in Section 6.4, we first need to know more about H^n .

6.3. The structure of H^n .

From Proposition 3.1, we know that the $\widetilde{\lambda}_i^n$'s are essentially the zeroes of H^n . However, H^n could a priori have other zeroes than these eigenvalues or take very small values. To control this point, we need to understand better the structure of H^n and more precisely, we intend to show the following fact

Lemma 6.7. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists a positive integer $n_0(\varepsilon)$, $L(\varepsilon) > 0$ and a deterministic function g_n such that for any $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ and $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$,*

$$H^n(z) = \begin{cases} s \prod_{i=1}^r \|q_i^n W_i^n\|_2^2 g_n(z) \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \widetilde{\lambda}_i^n) & \text{in the orthonormalized model,} \\ s g_n(z) \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \widetilde{\lambda}_i^n) & \text{in the i.i.d. model,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

$$\text{with } s = (-1)^{r-m}, L(\varepsilon) \leq g_n \leq \frac{1}{L(\varepsilon)} \text{ and } \omega(g_n) \leq \frac{1}{L(\varepsilon)}. \quad (16)$$

In particular, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left((H^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} \in (C_\gamma^\varepsilon)^c \right) = -\infty. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Note that once (16) will be established, (17) is then a direct consequence of Lemma 10.3. Let us define the random sequence

$$c_n := \begin{cases} s \prod_{i=1}^r \|q_i^n W_i^n\|_2^2 & \text{in the orthonormalized model,} \\ s & \text{in the i.i.d. model.} \end{cases}$$

Going back to the proof of Proposition 3.1, one can easily see that, for any $z \notin \{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$,

$$H^n(z) = c_n \prod_{i=1}^r \theta_i^{-1} \det(zI_n - X_n)^{-1} \det \left(zI_n - X_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \theta_i U_i^n (U_i^n)^* \right).$$

We can rewrite the above as

$$H^n(z) = c_n g_n(z) \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n)$$

with

$$g_n(z) := \prod_{i=1}^r |\theta_i|^{-1} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^m (z - \lambda_i^n)} \prod_{i=m+1}^n \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_i^n - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n}{z - \lambda_i^n} \right)$$

Now, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed.

As \mathcal{K}_ε is compact and the λ_i^n belong to a fixed compact, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, for any i and $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ we have $z - \lambda_i^n \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$ and $|\lambda_i^n| \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$ so that

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=m+1}^n (\lambda_{i-m}^n - \lambda_i^n) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^n - \sum_{i=n-m}^n \lambda_i^n \leq 2m \frac{2}{\varepsilon}.$$

We choose $n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$ and any i and $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ we have $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq z - \lambda_i^n$ and

$$0 \leq \frac{\lambda_{i-m}^n - \lambda_i^n}{z - \lambda_i^n} = 1 - \frac{z - \lambda_{i-m}^n}{z - \lambda_i^n} \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}.$$

Now, using Weyl's interlacing properties, we have for any $i \geq m+1$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq \lambda_{i-m}^n,$$

so that

$$\lambda_i^n - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n \geq -(\lambda_{i-m}^n - \lambda_i^n).$$

For $0 \leq x \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}$, $\log(1-x) \geq -\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}x$, so that we finally get

$$g_n(z) \geq \prod_{i=1}^r |\theta_i|^{-1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^m e^{-\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\right)^2}.$$

By very similar arguments (using $\log(1+x) \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$), one can also check that for any $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$,

$$g_n(z) \leq \prod_{i=1}^r |\theta_i|^{-1} \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right)^m e^{\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}}$$

To finish the proof, we have to verify the uniform equicontinuity of g_n on \mathcal{K}_ε . For any i , we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{z - \lambda_i^n} - \frac{1}{z' - \lambda_i^n} \right| \leq \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 |z - z'|$$

Moreover, for any f, g continuous on \mathcal{K}_ε , $\omega(fg) \leq \|f\|_\infty \omega(g) + \|g\|_\infty \omega(f)$ so that

$$\omega(g_n) \leq \prod_{i=1}^r |\theta_i|^{-1} \left(m \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)^{m+1} e^{\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}} + \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)^{m+2} e^{\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}} \sum_{i=m+1}^n |\lambda_i^n - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n| \right)$$

Now, by Weyl's interlacing inequalities, we have

$$\lambda_{i+r-m}^n \leq \tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq \lambda_{i-m}^n$$

so that $|\lambda_i^n - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n| \leq \lambda_{i-m}^n - \lambda_{i+r-m}^n$ and $\sum_{i=m+1}^n |\lambda_i^n - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n| \leq r \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$. \square

6.4. Core of the proof.

First, from what we said in the preliminary remarks and the fact that the $\tilde{\lambda}_i^n$ are ordered in decreasing order, we obviously have that if $\alpha \notin \mathbb{R}_\downarrow^m(b)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \right) \\ = \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| < \delta\} \right) = -\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The weak LDP will then be a direct consequence of the following lemma, with k the numbers of eigenvalues going to b ,

Lemma 6.8. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_\downarrow^m$ and k between 0 and m such that $\alpha_{m-k+1} = \dots = \alpha_m = b$ and $\alpha_{m-k} > b$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} \right) \\ = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} \right) = -L(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

with the obvious convention that $\bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} = \Omega$ if $k = 0$.

Proof. Let δ and ε positive small enough so that $\alpha_{m-k} - \delta \geq b + 2\varepsilon$. In particular, $\bigcap_{i=1}^{m-k} [\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta] \subset \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$. On the set $\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\}$, for all $i \leq m-k$, $\tilde{\lambda}_i^n$ is in \mathcal{K}_ε . On the other hand, for n large enough, $\{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\} \cap \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon = \emptyset$. Therefore, $\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \notin \{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and, by Proposition 3.1, is a zero of H^n .

If we define

$$B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}) : \exists g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \frac{1}{\gamma} \leq g \leq \gamma, \omega(g) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } f(z) = s.g(z) \prod_{i=1}^{m-k} (z - \beta_i) \text{ with } \forall i \leq m-k, \beta_i \in [\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta] \right\} \quad (19)$$

we then have

$$\{H^n \in C_\gamma^\varepsilon\} \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \cap \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} \subset \{H^n \in B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon\}.$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \cap \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(H^n \in B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(H^n \in (C_\gamma^\varepsilon)^c).$$

As a consequence, for all $\gamma > 0$, by [7, Lemma 1.2.15],

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \cap \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} \right) \\ \leq \max \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(H^n \in B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon); \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(H^n \in (C_\gamma^\varepsilon)^c) \right\},$$

Moreover, $B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon$ is a closed subset of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R})$. Indeed, if we take a converging sequence $f_n(z) = s g_n(z) \prod_{i=1}^{m-k} (z - \beta_i^n)$, since the $\beta_i^n, n \geq 0$ belongs to compacts and the $g_n, n \geq 0$ are tight by Ascoli-Arzelà's theorem, we can always assume up to extraction that g_n and $\beta_i^n, 1 \leq i \leq m-k$ converge so that the limit of f_n belongs to $B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon$.

Since $J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$ is a good rate function and $\bigcap_{\delta>0} B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon = S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon$, Theorem 5.1 gives with [7, Lemma 4.1.6] that for all $\gamma > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(H^n \in B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^\varepsilon) \leq - \inf_{S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}. \quad (20)$$

Taking γ small enough, (17) gives

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta\} \cap \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} \right) \\ \leq - \inf_{\bigcup_{\gamma>0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}.$$

We can then let ε go to zero as the left hand side obviously decreases as ε decreases to 0 and, as we already mentioned it in Remark 6.2, the right handside increases as ε decreases to 0.

We turn to the lower bound, which is a bit more delicate. Let us again consider δ and ε small enough so that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{m-k} [\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta] \subset \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$. As $J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$ is a good rate function, for all

$\gamma > 0$, the infimum $\inf_{S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}$ is achieved, say at $f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}$. To complete the proof, we need the following lemma,

Lemma 6.9. *Let ε, γ be fixed and small enough. There exists δ_0 such that for any $\delta \leq \delta_0$, there exists δ' such that for any n ,*

$$\left\{ \tilde{\lambda}_1^n \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \right\} \cap \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |H^n(x) - f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}(x)| < \delta' \right\} \subset \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{ |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta \} \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{ \tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b+2\varepsilon \}.$$

We postpone its proof to the next subsection but it is easy to convince oneself that this lemma holds in the particular case when $k = 0$ and all the multiplicities of the α_i 's are one.

To prove the lower bound in Theorem 5.1, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$J := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{\cup_{\gamma > 0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} < \infty.$$

Let $\eta > 0$ be fixed. As

$$\inf_{\cup_{\gamma > 0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} = \inf_{\gamma > 0} \inf_{S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} = \inf_{\gamma > 0} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}),$$

we can choose ε, γ small enough so that $J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}) \leq J + \eta$. By Lemma 6.6, there exists $L(\varepsilon)$ going to infinity as ε goes to zero so that for n large enough,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n \geq \varepsilon^{-1} \right) \leq e^{-nL(\varepsilon)}.$$

We choose ε small enough so that $L(\varepsilon) > J + 2\eta$.

The above lemma implies, that for $\delta \leq \delta_0$, for δ' small enough, for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{ |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta \} \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{ \tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + 2\varepsilon \} \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |H^n(z) - f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}(z)| < \delta' \right) - \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n \geq \varepsilon^{-1} \right) \\ & e^{-n(J+2\eta)} - e^{-nL(\varepsilon)} \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-n(J+2\eta)} \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality following from Theorem 5.1.2. As η can be chosen as small as we want, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq m-k} \{ |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta \} \bigcap_{m-k+1 \leq i \leq m} \{ \tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + 2\varepsilon \} \right) \\ \geq - \inf_{\cup_{\gamma > 0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon} J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

and one concludes by the monotonicity of the right hand side with respect to ε . \square

6.5. Proof of Lemma 6.9. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed and $n_0(\varepsilon)$ as in Lemma 6.7. By definition of $S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^\varepsilon$, we know that for any $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$,

$$f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}(z) = s \cdot g(z)P(z), \quad \text{with } P(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{m-k} (z - \alpha_i),$$

with $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$ and $g \geq \gamma > 0$.

On the other hand, we know, by Lemma 6.7, that for $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$, there exists a (random) positive number c_n such that for any $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$,

$$H^n(z) = s \cdot c_n g_n(z) P_n(z), \quad \text{with } P_n(z) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n), \quad (21)$$

where g_n is uniformly bounded above and below. Without loss of generality, one can assume that $s = 1$ and $g_n \geq \gamma$ and we choose $M > 1$ such that $g_n \leq M$, $g \leq M$ and $\varepsilon^{-1} - b \leq M$. We also restrict ourselves to the case where the eigenvalues are smaller than ε^{-1} so that if they do not belong to \mathcal{K}_ε , they are smaller than $b + \varepsilon$.

We also denote by

$$\ell := \min \left(1, \frac{1}{3} \min_{\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j} |\alpha_i - \alpha_j|, \frac{1}{3} |\alpha_{m-k} - b| \right)$$

and $\eta := \frac{\varepsilon^{-1} - (b + \varepsilon)}{2(m+1)} \wedge 1$.

We fix hereafter $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta < \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \left(\frac{\eta \ell}{2} \right)^m \frac{1}{M^{2m+1}}.$$

Obviously, as g is bounded below by γ , one can choose δ'_1 such that for any $\delta' < \delta'_1$, any f satisfying that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |f(x) - f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}(x)| < \delta'$ vanishes only on $\cup_{i=1}^{m-k} [\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$.

Let δ'_2 be such that

$$0 < \delta'_2 \leq \delta^m \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \frac{(\eta \ell)^m}{M^{m+1}} - \delta (2M)^m \right)$$

Let now δ' be strictly smaller than $\min(\delta'_1, \delta'_2, \frac{\gamma \eta^m}{2})$ and H^n be a function satisfying (21) and $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |H^n(x) - f_\gamma^{k, \varepsilon}(x)| < \delta'$.

We first claim that c_n is bounded below uniformly on this set. Indeed, if we cut \mathcal{K}_ε into $m + 1$ intervals of size 2η , at least one of them does not contain any zero of P . We call x_0 the center of this interval. Then $|g(x_0)P(x_0)| \geq \gamma \eta^m$. Therefore $|c_n g_n(x_0) P_n(x_0)| \geq \gamma \eta^m - \delta' > \frac{\gamma \eta^m}{2}$ so that $c_n > \frac{\gamma \eta^m}{2M^{m+1}}$.

Let α_i be a zero of P of multiplicity $p \geq 1$. Assume that P_n has strictly less than p zeroes on the interval $[\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$. In this case,

$$|g(\alpha_i + 2\delta)P(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \leq M(2\delta)^p M^{m-p} \leq \delta^p (2M)^m,$$

and on the other hand

$$|c_n g_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta) P_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \geq \frac{\gamma^2 \eta^m}{2M^{m+1}} \delta^{p-1} \ell^{m-k-p} \geq \frac{\gamma^2 (\eta \ell)^m}{2M^{m+1}} \delta^{p-1},$$

where we used the fact that all the roots of P_n are in $\cup_{j=1}^{m-k} [\alpha_j - \delta, \alpha_j + \delta]$ so that the roots that are not $[\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$ are at distance at least ℓ of $\alpha_i + 2\delta$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |H^n(x) - f_\gamma^{k,\varepsilon}(x)| &> \left| |c_n g_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta) P_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| - |g(\alpha_i + 2\delta) P(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \right| \\ &> \delta^{p-1} \left(\frac{\gamma^2 (\eta \ell)^m}{2M^{m+1}} - \delta (2M)^m \right) > \delta', \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which is a contradiction. A similar argument holds if we suppose that P_n has strictly more than p zeroes on the interval $[\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$. This finishes the proof since we have proved that inside \mathcal{K}_ε , H^n vanishes iff $f_\gamma^{k,\varepsilon}$ vanishes at in a very small neighborhood and with the same multiplicity, and its other zeroes must be smaller than $b + 2\varepsilon$ on $\{\tilde{\lambda}_1^n \leq \varepsilon^{-1}\}$.

6.6. Identification of the minimizers.

We give a proof of Theorem 6.4 which is straightforward. Since L is a good rate function, it vanishes at its minimizers $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_m^*) \in \mathbb{R}_\downarrow^m(b)$. We know that there exists $0 \leq k \leq m$ such that $\lambda_{m-k}^* > b$ and $\lambda_{m-k+1}^* = b$. From the definition of L , for any n large enough such that $b + \frac{1}{n} < \lambda_{m-k}^*$, we can find a function f_n defined on $\mathcal{K}_{\frac{1}{n}}$ vanishing at $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_{m-k}^*)$ such that $J_{\mathcal{K}_{\frac{1}{n}}}(f_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. From the definition of $J_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the fifth point of Lemma 5.5, all the functions f_n are in a compact set of $\mathcal{C}((b, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ so that we can find a function f vanishing at $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_{m-k}^*)$ so that $J_{\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon}(f) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. But the latter also implies that $f(z) = P_{\Theta,r}(K(z), C)$ with (K, C) minimizing \mathbf{I} , that is $(K, C) = (K^*, C^*)$ by Lemma 5.6.

7. LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR H^n IN THE PRESENCE OF OUTLIERS

Let $\mathcal{K}^\circ := \cup_{i=1}^{p^0} [a_i, b_i]$ a compact subset of $(b, \infty) \setminus \{\ell_1^+, \dots, \ell_{p^+}^+\}$. We equip again $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^\circ, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ with the uniform topology. Hereafter, we denote by $\ell_i = \ell_i^+$ for $1 \leq i \leq p^+$ and $\ell_i = \ell_{p^+p^- - i + 1}^-$ for $p^+ + 1 \leq i \leq p^+ + p^-$.

We recall that $K^n(z)$ and C^n were defined in (4) and (5) respectively.

Theorem 7.1. *We assume that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 and 1.6 hold.*

- (1) *The law of $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}^\circ}, C^n)$, viewed as an element of the space $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^\circ, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r$ endowed with the uniform topology, satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n with rate function \mathbf{I}° defined, for $K \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^\circ, \mathbf{H}_r)$ and $C \in \mathbf{H}_r$ by $\mathbf{I}^\circ(K(\cdot), C) = +\infty$ if $z \rightarrow K(z)$ is not uniformly Lipschitz on \mathcal{K}° . Otherwise, and we set*

$$\mathbf{I}^\circ(K(\cdot), C) = \inf \left\{ \Gamma^*(K_0(\cdot), C_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} I^{(Z)}(L_i) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over the families $K_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^\circ, \mathbf{H}_r)$, $C_0, L_1, \dots, L_{p^+ + p^-} \in \mathbf{H}_r$ satisfying the condition

$$K_0(\cdot) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} \frac{1}{\cdot - \ell_i} L_i = K(\cdot) \text{ and } C_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} L_i = C \quad (23)$$

and with

$$\Gamma^*(K(\cdot), C) = \sup_{P, X, Y} \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\int K'(z) P(z) dz + \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} K(b_i) X_i + CY \right) - \int \Lambda \left(- \int \frac{1}{(z-x)^2} P(z) dz + \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} \frac{1}{b_i - x} X_i + Y \right) d\mu(x) \right\},$$

the supremum being taken over piecewise constant P with values in \mathbf{H}_r , $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{p_0}) \in (\mathbf{H}_r)^{p_0}$ and $Y \in \mathbf{H}_r$.

- (2) The law of $(H^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}^o}$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^o, \mathbb{R})$ equipped with the uniform topology, satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n with rate function given, for a function $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^o, \mathbb{R})$, by

$$J_{\mathcal{K}^o}^o(f) = \inf \{ \mathbf{I}^o(K(\cdot), C); (K(\cdot), C) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}^o, \mathbf{H}_r) \times \mathbf{H}_r, P_{\Theta, r}(K(z), C) = f(z) \forall z \in \mathcal{K}^o \}.$$

Note that the function Γ^* is well defined because if K is uniformly Lipschitz on \mathcal{K}^o , then so is any K_0 satisfying the compatibility condition (23), so that K_0' almost surely exists.

Note firstly that under the second assertion of Assumption 1.6, we have the following straightforward application of the contraction principle.

Lemma 7.2. *Let Z_1 be the \mathbf{H}_r -valued random variable such that for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq r$, $(Z_1)_{ij} = \overline{g_i(1)} g_j(1)$. Under Assumption 1.6, $\frac{Z_1}{n}$ also satisfies a large deviation principle in the scale n with a good rate function $I^{(Z)}(M) = \inf \{ I(v) : \overline{v_i} v_j = M_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq r \}$.*

The proof of Theorem 7.1 follows the same lines as that of Theorem 5.1. The LDP for finite dimensional marginals for our process is described by the second part of Theorem 10.1. It is based on the large deviations for K^n and C^n that can be, up to a reindexation, shown to be exponentially equivalent to

$$K^n(z)_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=p^++p^-+1}^n \frac{1}{z - \lambda_k^n} \overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k) + \sum_{k=1}^{p^++p^-} \frac{1}{z - \ell_k} \frac{\overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k)}{n}$$

which satisfy a LDP by independence of the $g_i(k)$, and large deviations of each parts. The corresponding rate function will be denoted by $(I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M})^o$. To define this new rate function, we first extend in an obvious way the definition of $I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}$ for z_i 's in \mathcal{K}^o . Then one can define, for $K_1, \dots, K_M, C \in \mathbf{H}_r$, and $z_1, \dots, z_M \in \mathcal{K}^o$,

$$(I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M})^o(K_1, \dots, K_M, C) = \inf \left\{ I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(K_{0,1}, \dots, K_{0,M}, C) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^++p^-} I^{(Z)}(L_i) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over families

$$(C, K_{0,1}, \dots, K_{0,M}, L_1, \dots, L_{p^++p^-}) \in (\mathbf{H}_r)^{1+M+p^++p^-}$$

under the condition that for all $1 \leq j \leq M$,

$$K_{0,j} + \sum_{i=1}^{p^++p^-} \frac{1}{z_j - \ell_i} L_i = K_j \quad \text{and} \quad C_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p^++p^-} L_i = C.$$

By Dawson-Gärtner Theorem, we deduce that $((K^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}^o}, C^n)$ satisfies a LDP for the topology of pointwise convergence with good rate function

$$\mathbf{J}^o(K, C) = \sup_M \sup_{z_1 < \dots < z_M, z_j \in \mathcal{K}^o} (I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M})^o(K(z_1), \dots, K(z_M), C).$$

Since exponential tightness is clear, this LDP can be reinforce into the uniform topology. We then have to check that $\mathbf{I}^o = \mathbf{J}^o$.

From the definition of \mathbf{I}^o , the first thing to check is that $\mathbf{J}^o(K(\cdot), C) = \infty$ if K is not Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{K}^o . Assume the latter and choose any $L > 0$. We know that there exists η such that for any $z \in \mathcal{K}^o$ and $i \leq p^+ + p^-$, $z - \ell_i > \eta$. As $I^{(Z)}$ is a good rate function, its level sets are compact and there exists $R > 0$ such that $\{I^{(Z)} \leq L\}$ is included in the ball of radius $\frac{R\eta^2}{(p^+ + p^-)}$ for the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ in \mathbf{H}_r . Let γ and B be given by Lemma 5.5.(3). As K is not Lipschitz continuous, there exists $z_1 < z_2 \in \mathcal{K}^o$ such that

$$\|K(z_1) - K(z_2)\|_2 \geq \left(\frac{L+B}{\gamma\eta^2} + R \right) |z_1 - z_2|.$$

We will show that $(I_2^{z_1, z_2})^o(K(z_1), K(z_2), C) \geq L$. Let K_0, L_i be such that

$$K_0(z_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} \frac{1}{z_1 - \ell_i} L_i = K(z_1) \quad \text{and} \quad K_0(z_2) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} \frac{1}{z_2 - \ell_i} L_i = K(z_2).$$

Then

$$K_0(z_1) - K_0(z_2) = (z_1 - z_2) \left(\frac{K(z_1) - K(z_2)}{z_1 - z_2} + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} \frac{1}{(z_1 - \ell_i)(z_2 - \ell_i)} L_i \right)$$

Therefore, there exists i_0 such that $L_{i_0} > \frac{R\eta^2}{(p^+ + p^-)}$ or $\|K_0(z_1) - K_0(z_2)\|_2 \geq \frac{L+B}{\gamma\eta^2} |z_1 - z_2|$. In the first case, $I^{(Z)}(L_{i_0}) > L$. In the second case, we have, from the rewriting (12), that,

$$I_2^{z_1, z_2}(K_0(z_1), K_0(z_2), C) \geq \text{Tr} \left(\pm \gamma \eta^2 \frac{K_0(z_1) - K_0(z_2)}{z_1 - z_2} \right) - \int \Lambda \left(\frac{\pm \gamma \eta^2 I_r}{(z_1 - x)(z_2 - x)} \right) d\mu \geq L,$$

if we choose the right sign.

This gives $(I_2^{z_1, z_2})^o(K(z_1), K(z_2), C) \geq L$ so that $\mathbf{J}^o(K(\cdot), C) = \infty$ after optimization.

We now suppose that K is Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{K}^o and we want to identify the two rate functions. By mimicking³ the proof at the end of Section 5.3, one can easily show that for K is Lipschitz continuous on \mathcal{K}^o ,

$$\sup_M \sup_{z_1, \dots, z_M} I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(K(z_1), \dots, K(z_M)) = \Gamma^*(K, C). \quad (24)$$

Now, in order to achieve this identification, we have to check that we can switch the supremum over M and the z_i 's and the infimum over the admissible simultaneous decompositions of K and C . It is clear that,

$$\mathbf{J}^o(K, C) \leq \Gamma^*(K_0(\cdot), C_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} I^{(Z)}(L_i)$$

³We just have to be careful in the rewriting to put one border term for each interval involved in \mathcal{K}^o .

for any admissible choice of L_i , and therefore $\mathbf{J}^o \leq \mathbf{I}^o$ after optimization. We now need the converse inequality. By definition of \mathbf{J}^o , if it is finite, then for any positive integer p , there exists $M(p)$ and $z_1, \dots, z_{M(p)}$ such that

$$\mathbf{J}^o(K, C) \geq (I_{M(p)}^{z_1, \dots, z_{M(p)}})^o(K(z_1), \dots, K(z_{M(p)}), C) - \frac{1}{p}.$$

Now for each $z_1, \dots, z_{M(p)}$ we choose an admissible decomposition (according to (23)) of K so that

$$\mathbf{J}^o(K, C) \geq I_{M(p)}^{z_1, \dots, z_{M(p)}}(K_0^{M(p)}(z_1), \dots, K_0^{M(p)}(z_{M(p)}), C) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} I^{(Z)}(L_i^{M(p)}) - \frac{1}{p}.$$

Moreover, for each M and choices of $z_1 < \dots < z_M$,

$$I_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(K(z_1), \dots, K(z_M)) = \Gamma^*(K_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}, C)$$

with $K_M^{z_1, \dots, z_M}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^M 1_{[z_i, z_{i+1}]} K(z)$.

By definition, since $I^{(Z)}$ and Γ^* are good rate functions and as for all i , $I^{(Z)}(L_i^{M(p)})$ and $\Gamma^*(K_0^{M(p)}(z_1), \dots, K_0^{M(p)}(z_{M(p)}), C)$ are uniformly bounded, it implies that the arguments are tight and we can take a converging subsequence. Let K_0 and L_i be limits along a subsequence, we get

$$\mathbf{J}^o(K, C) \geq \Gamma^*(K_0(\cdot), C) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^+ + p^-} I^{(Z)}(L_i) - \frac{1}{p}$$

which insures that $\mathbf{J}^o(K, C) \geq \mathbf{I}^o(K, C)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 7.1.

8. STATEMENT ON THE MAIN RESULT IN THE CASE WITH OUTLIERS

We now state the main Theorem of this section, namely an analog of Theorem 6.1. For any ε, ρ small enough, we define the compact sets

$$\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o := [b + \varepsilon, \varepsilon^{-1}] \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{p^+} (\ell_i^+ - \rho, \ell_i^+ + \rho)$$

and $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^o := [b + \varepsilon, \varepsilon^{-1}]$. The reason why we distinguish the two parameters ε and ρ will become apparent in the statement and the proof of Lemma 8.7 below. We also define the set $\{\ell\} := \{\ell_1^+, \dots, \ell_{p^+}^+, b\}$, and for $z \notin \{\ell\}$, $R(z) := \prod_{i=1}^{p^+} \frac{1}{z - \ell_i^+}$. We recall that s is the sign of the product $\prod_{i=1}^r \theta_i$.

For any $\varepsilon, \rho, \gamma > 0$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\downarrow}^p(b + \varepsilon)$, we put

$$S_{\alpha, \gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o} := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o, \mathbb{R}) : \exists g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \gamma \leq g \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}, \omega(g) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } f(z) = s.R(z).g(z) \prod_{i=1}^p (z - \alpha_i) \right\}$$

We also denote by

$$C_{k, \gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o} := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o, \mathbb{R}) : \exists p \text{ polynomial of degree } m + p^+ - k \text{ with } m + p^+ - k \text{ roots in } \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon}^o \right. \\ \left. \text{and dominant coefficient } 1, g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \gamma \leq g \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}, \omega(g) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } f(z) = s.g(z).R(z).p(z) \right\}$$

and

$$C_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o} = \bigcup_{0 \leq k \leq m + p^+} C_{k, \gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}.$$

Then the main statement of this section is the following.

Theorem 8.1. *Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 and 1.6, the law of the $m + p^+$ largest eigenvalues $(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+p^+}^n)$ of \tilde{X}_n satisfies a large deviation principle in \mathbb{R}^{m+p^+} with good rate function L^o . For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+p^+}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+p^+}$, we take $\alpha_{m+p^++1} = b$ and L^o is defined as follows :*

$$L^o(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \inf_{\cup_{\gamma > 0} S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+p^+-k})}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}, \gamma} J_{\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o}^o & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\downarrow}^{m+p^+}(b), \alpha_{m+p^+-k+1} = b, \\ & \alpha_{m+p^+-k} > b \text{ for a } k \in \{0, \dots, m\}, \\ & \text{otherwise.} \\ \infty & \end{cases}$$

The statement of this theorem is quite involved so before going into the proof, let us make a few remarks to help understanding its meaning.

Remark 8.2. *Recall that the eigenvalues $(\tilde{\lambda}_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ of the sum of two Hermitian matrices with eigenvalues $(\lambda_i^n)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and $\theta := (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r, 0, \dots, 0)$ satisfy Horn's inequalities and are characterized by the fact that they satisfy such inequalities (see [15] for details). Assume that $\tilde{\lambda} := (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+p^+})$ is at distance of the bulk and of the outliers which is bounded below. We claim that the rate function $L^o(\tilde{\lambda})$ is infinite if $(\tilde{\lambda}, \ell, \theta)$ do not satisfy the Horn inequalities. Indeed, if $L^o(\tilde{\lambda})$ is finite, $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+p^+})$ are zeroes of a function f which can be written*

$$f(z) = P_{\Theta, r}(K(z), C).$$

with $\mathbf{I}^o(K(\cdot), C)$ is finite. It implies that there exists sequences $\lambda^n \in \mathbb{R}^n, g_j(\cdot) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ so that λ^n satisfies Assumptions 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6 and

$$K^n(z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k)}{z - \lambda_k^n}, \quad C^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k)$$

converge to $K(z)$ (uniformly away from the bulk and the outliers) and C respectively. By definition, there exists a constant c such that

$$P_{\Theta,r}(K^n(z), C^n) \prod_{i=1}^n (z - \lambda_i^n) = c \det \left(z - \text{diag}(\lambda^n) - \sum_{i=1}^r \theta_i u_i u_i^* \right)$$

with $u_i = g_i$ in the i.i.d. model and u_i the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization of the vectors g_i in the orthonormalized model. Hence, the function $f_n(z) = P_{\Theta,r}(K^n(z), C^n)$ vanishes at the eigenvalues $(\tilde{\lambda}^n)$ of the sum of the two Hermitian matrices $\text{diag}(\lambda^n)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^r \theta_i u_i u_i^*$ (note that we can assume without loss of generality that its zeroes are different from λ^n by Lemma 10.4). Therefore, $(\lambda^n, \tilde{\lambda}^n, \theta)$ satisfy Horn's inequalities by [15]. Since the $(\tilde{\lambda}^n)$ are bounded, they are relatively compact and we see that the limit points $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+p^+})$ of $(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+p^+}^n)$ which stay away from the bulk and the outliers are the zeroes of f . By passing to the limit in Horn's inequalities, we thus deduce that if the vector $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{m+p^+})$ has finite L^0 -entropy, and is away from the bulk and the outliers, $(\tilde{\lambda}, \ell, \theta)$ satisfies Horn's inequalities. It would be interesting to have a direct proof of this fact at the asymptotic level.

8.1. Proof of Theorem 8.1.

We now prove Theorem 8.1, following roughly the same lines as for Theorem 6.1.

As in the proof of Theorem 6.1, the crucial point is to use Proposition 3.1. In the sticking case, if $z \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon$, for n large enough, the condition that z should not belong to the set of eigenvalues of X_n was very easy to check. Here, we need to show the following

Lemma 8.3. *Assume that the eigenvalues $\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n$ of X_n are pairwise distinct and that Assumptions 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6 hold, then X_n and \tilde{X}_n have no eigenvalue in common.*

The proof of this lemma is postponed to Appendix 10.3. We shall therefore give the proof of the Theorem when the eigenvalues of X_n are distinct. This is however sufficient to get the large deviation principle without this hypothesis due to the following Lemma.

Lemma 8.4. *Let X_n satisfy Assumptions 1.1 and 1.5 and G Assumption 1.6. Then, there exists a sequence \tilde{X}_n of matrices satisfying Assumptions 1.1 and 1.5 such that moreover,*

- the eigenvalues of \tilde{X}_n are pairwise distinct,
- almost surely for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, the i th largest eigenvalue of \tilde{X}_n and the i th largest eigenvalue of \tilde{X}_n are within n^{-1} .

Therefore, the random variables $(\tilde{\lambda}_i^n)_{i \leq m}$ and $(\tilde{\lambda}_i^n)_{i \leq m}$ are exponentially equivalent and [7, Theorem 4.2.13] asserts that a large deviations principle for $(\tilde{\lambda}_i^n)_{i \leq m}$ entails the large deviations principle for the law of $(\tilde{\lambda}_i^n)_{i \leq m}$.

The proof of Lemma 8.4 follows by taking \tilde{X}_n to be the matrix with the same eigenvectors as X_n and the same eigenvalues except for those which are stucked together which we separate by an arbitrary small weight $w_n \leq 1/n$, much smaller than the minimal distance between two distinct eigenvalues of X_n , so that the eigenvalues of \tilde{X}_n are distinct and

the operator norm of $X_n - \bar{X}_n$ is bounded above by w_n . But then also the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n and \bar{X}_n differ only at most by w_n almost surely. It is straightforward to verify Assumptions 1.1 and 1.5 for \bar{X}_n .

Thus, we shall restrict ourselves in the sequel to the case where X_n has distinct eigenvalues. By Lemma 8.3, the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n are then the zeroes of H^n and we can proceed as in the case without outliers.

We first focus our attention to the function H^n restricted to $\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o$ and show the counterpart of Lemma 6.7, that is

Lemma 8.5. *Let ε, ρ be fixed. There exists a positive integer $n_0(\varepsilon, \rho)$ and $L(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon, \rho)$, for any $z \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o$,*

$$H^n(z) = \begin{cases} s \prod_{i=1}^r \|q_i^n W_i^n\|_2^2 g_n(z) R(z) \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n) & \text{in the orthonormalized model,} \\ s g_n(z) R(z) \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n) & \text{in the i.i.d. model,} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

with $L(\varepsilon) \leq g_n \leq \frac{1}{L(\varepsilon)}$ and $\omega(g_n) \leq \frac{1}{L(\varepsilon)}$.

In particular, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ small enough,

$$\limsup_{\gamma \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left((H^n(z))_{z \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o} \in (C_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o})^c \right) = -\infty. \quad (26)$$

Proof. In this case,

$$g_n(z) := \prod_{i=1}^r |\theta_i|^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^{p^+} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_i^n - \ell_i^+}{z - \lambda_i^n} \right) \prod_{i=p^++1}^{m+p^+} \frac{1}{z - \lambda_i^n} \prod_{i=m+p^++1}^n \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_i^n - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n}{z - \lambda_i^n} \right).$$

The proof is exactly the same as in the sticking case once we have noticed that, from Assumption 1.5, there exists $n_0(\varepsilon, \rho)$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon, \rho)$, $\prod_{i=1}^{p^+} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_i^n - \ell_i^+}{\lambda_i^n - z} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2^{p^+}}$, so that

$$g_n(z) \geq \prod_{i=1}^r |\theta_i|^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{p^+} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)^m e^{-\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}\right)^2}.$$

Note that we could similarly show that for $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon, \rho)$,

$$g_n(z) \leq L(\varepsilon) := \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^{p^+} \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \right)^m e^{\frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}}. \quad (27)$$

The uniform equicontinuity is also shown very similarly. \square

As in the sticking case, we have the analog of Lemma 6.8, with L^o instead of L . To state more precisely the lemma, we introduce the following notation: we denote by $G_k(\alpha, \delta, \varepsilon, \rho)$ the set of n -tuples $(\tilde{\lambda}_1^n \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\lambda}_n^n)$ such that for all $i \leq m + p^+ - k$,

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \delta \text{ if } \alpha_i \notin \{\ell\} \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - \alpha_i| \leq \rho \text{ if } \alpha_i \in \{\ell\}$$

and for all $m + p^+ - k + 1 \leq i \leq m + p^+$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon.$$

We shall show the following

Lemma 8.6. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_\downarrow^m$ and k between 0 and m such that $\alpha_{m+p^+-k+1} = \dots = \alpha_{m+p^++1} = b$ and $\alpha_{m+p^+-k} > b$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left((\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n^n) \in G_k(\alpha, \delta, \varepsilon, \rho) \right) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left((\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n^n) \in G_k(\alpha, \delta, \varepsilon, \rho) \right) = -L^\circ(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

with the obvious convention that $\bigcap_{m+p^+-k+1 \leq i \leq m+p^+} \{\tilde{\lambda}_i^n \leq b + \varepsilon\} = \Omega$ if $k = 0$.

The only point that differs substantially is the proof of the analog of Lemma 6.9. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\alpha_{m-k} > b + \varepsilon$. Let $L(\varepsilon)$ be as in (27) (and denote it by L for simplicity). We assume that $L > 1$. We denote by $\eta := \frac{\varepsilon^{-1} - (b + \varepsilon)}{2(p^+ + m + 1)}$ and

$$t := \min \left(1, \frac{1}{3} \min_{\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j} |\alpha_i - \alpha_j|, \frac{1}{3} |\alpha_{m-k} - b|, \frac{1}{3} \min_{i,j; \alpha_i \notin \{\ell\}} |\alpha_i - \ell_j| \right).$$

Let j be such that $\alpha_i = \ell_j$ and denote by q the multiplicity of ℓ_j as an outlier. From the definition of R , one can check that there exists two constants c_i and C_i (depending only on ε) such that, for any $\rho > 0$, $c_i \rho^{-q} \leq |R(\alpha_i + 2\rho)| \leq C_i \rho^{-q}$. Let $c := \max_i c_i$ and $C := \max_i C_i$.

Let now fix ρ small enough such that for any i such that $\alpha_i \notin \{\ell\}$, $\min_j |\alpha_i - \ell_j| > 3\rho$ and $\rho < \frac{c\gamma(\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{C \cdot 2^{m+p^++1} L^{2m+1+3p^+}}$

Let $f_\gamma^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}$ be a minimizer of $J_{\mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o}^\circ$ over $S_{\alpha, \gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}$, then we have

Lemma 8.7. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for $\delta \leq \delta_0$ there exists δ' such that for any $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon, \rho)$,*

$$\left\{ \tilde{\lambda}_1^n \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \right\} \cap \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o} |H^n(z) - f_\gamma^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}(z)| < \delta' \right\} \subset \left\{ (\tilde{\lambda}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_n^n) \in G_k(\alpha, \delta, \varepsilon, \rho) \right\}$$

The remaining of this section will be devoted to the proof of this lemma and this will complete the study of the case with outliers.

By definition of $S_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-k}), \gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}$, we know that for any $z \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o$,

$$f_\gamma^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}(z) = s \cdot R(z) \cdot g(z) \cdot P(z) \text{ with } P(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{m-k} (z - \alpha_i),$$

with $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^o$ and $g \geq \gamma > 0$.

On the other hand, from the study of the structure of H^n , we know that there exists a (possibly random) positive number c_n such that for any $z \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o$,

$$H^n(z) = s \cdot c_n R(z) g_n(z) P_n(z) \text{ with } P_n(z) := \prod_{i=1}^m (z - \tilde{\lambda}_i^n).$$

With no loss of generality, one can assume that $s = 1$, $g_n \geq \gamma$ and we know that, for n large enough, $g_n \leq L(\varepsilon)$, with $L(\varepsilon)$ as defined in (27). One can also assume that $g \leq L(\varepsilon)$

and $b^* - b \leq L$.

We fix hereafter $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\delta < \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \left(\frac{\eta}{2} \right)^{m+p^+} \frac{t^{m+p^+}}{L^{2m+1+4p^+}} \right) \wedge t.$$

As g is bounded below by γ , one can choose δ'_1 such that for any $\delta' < \delta'_1$, any f satisfying that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o} |f(x) - f_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}(x)| < \delta'$ vanishes only in

$$\cup_{j, \alpha_j \in \{\ell\}} [\alpha_j - \rho, \alpha_j + \rho] \cup \cup_{j, \alpha_j \notin \{\ell\}} [\alpha_j - \delta, \alpha_j + \delta].$$

Let δ'_2 be such that

$$0 < \delta'_2 \leq \delta^m \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \frac{(\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{L^{m+1+3p^+}} - \delta \frac{(2L)^{m+p^+}}{t^{p^+}} \right)$$

and

$$0 < \delta'_2 \leq \rho^m \left(c \frac{\gamma^2 (\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{2L^{m+1+2p^+}} - \rho C (2L)^{m+p^+} \right)$$

(it exists thanks to our choices of δ and ρ).

Let now δ' be such that $\delta' < \min \left(\delta'_1, \delta'_2, \frac{\gamma \eta^m}{2L^{p^+}} \right)$ and H^n such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o} |H^n(x) - f_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}(x)| < \delta'.$$

We first claim that c_n is bounded below uniformly on this set. Indeed, if we cut $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^o$ into $p^+ + m + 1$ intervals of size 2η , at least one of them do not contain any zero of α_i nor any ℓ_i^+ . We call x_0 the center of this interval. Then $|g(x_0)R(x_0)P(x_0)| \geq \gamma \eta^m \frac{1}{L^{p^+}}$. Therefore $|c_n g_n(x_0)R(x_0)P_n(x_0)| \geq \gamma \eta^m \frac{1}{L^{p^+}} - \delta' > \frac{\gamma \eta^m}{2L^{p^+}}$ so that $c_n > \frac{\gamma \eta^{m+p^+}}{2L^{m+1+2p^+}}$.

Let $\alpha_i \notin \{\ell\}$ be of multiplicity $p \geq 1$. Assume that P_n has strictly less than p zeroes on the interval $[\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$. We recall that $\min_j |\alpha_i - \ell_j^+| > \rho$. In this case,

$$|g(\alpha_i + 2\delta)R(\alpha_i + 2\delta)P(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \leq L(2\delta)^p \frac{(b^* - b)^{m+p^+-p}}{t^{p^+}} \leq \delta^p \frac{(2L)^{m+p^+}}{t^{p^+}},$$

and on the other hand

$$|c_n R(\alpha_i + 2\delta)g_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)P_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \geq \frac{\gamma^2 \eta^{m+p^+}}{2L^{m+1+2p^+}} \delta^{p-1} \frac{t^{m+p^+-k-p}}{L^{p^+}} \geq \frac{\gamma^2 (\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{2L^{m+1+3p^+}} \delta^{p-1}.$$

where we used the fact that all the roots of P_n that are not $[\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$ are at distance at least t of $\alpha_i + 2\delta$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o} |H^n(x) - f_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}(x)| &\geq \left| |c_n g_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)P_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| - |g(\alpha_i + 2\delta)P(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \right| \\ &\geq \delta^{p-1} \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \frac{(\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{L^{m+1+3p^+}} - \delta \frac{(2L)^{m+p^+}}{t^{p^+}} \right) > \delta', \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which is a contradiction. Symmetrically, one can do the same kind of reasoning when we suppose that P_n has strictly more than p zeroes on the interval $[\alpha_i - \delta, \alpha_i + \delta]$.

We now consider the case, specific to the framework with outliers, of an $\alpha_i \in \{\ell\}$ of multiplicity $p \geq 1$. Assume that P_n has strictly less than p zeroes on the interval $[\alpha_i - \rho, \alpha_i + \rho]$. In this case, $\alpha_i + 2\rho \in \mathcal{K}_{\varepsilon, \rho}^o$. We have

$$|g(\alpha_i + 2\rho)R(\alpha_i + 2\rho)P(\alpha_i + 2\rho)| \leq LC\rho^{-q}(2\rho)^p L^{m+p^+ - k - p} \leq C(2L)^m \rho^{p-q}.$$

On the other hand,

$$|c_n R(\alpha_i + 2\delta)g_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)P_n(\alpha_i + 2\delta)| \geq c \frac{\gamma^2(\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{2L^{m+1+2p^+}} \rho^{p-1-q},$$

so that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{K}_\varepsilon} |H^n(x) - f_\gamma^{\varepsilon, \rho, o}(x)| \geq \rho^{p-1-s} \left(c \frac{\gamma^2(\eta t)^{m+p^+}}{2L^{m+1+2p^+}} - \rho C(2L)^{m+p^+} \right) > \delta'.$$

This completes the proof.

9. PROOFS OF THE RESULTS RELATED TO CLASSICAL MATRIX MODELS

9.1. Proof of Theorem 2.2.

The proof is a slight extension of the proof of [1, Theorem 2.6.6]. We introduce the notations $\phi(\mu, x) = -V(x) + \beta \int \log|x-y|d\mu(y)$, and $\hat{\mu}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=p+1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i^n}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{V, \beta}^n(d\lambda_1, \dots, d\lambda_n) = \frac{Z_{nV/(n-p), \beta}^{n-p}}{Z_{V, \beta}^n} e^{n \sum_{i=1}^p \phi(\hat{\mu}^n, \lambda_i) + \beta \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \log|\lambda_i - \lambda_j|} dP_{nV/(n-p), \beta}^{n-p}(\lambda_{p+1}, \dots, \lambda_n) d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_p.$$

By [1, Lemma 2.6.7], the law $\mathbb{P}_{V, \beta}^n$ is exponentially tight so that it is enough to estimate the probability of a small ball around $\mathbf{x} = (x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_p)$, namely events of the form $B(x, \delta) := \{\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i - x_i| \leq \delta, \max |\lambda_i| \leq M\}$.

We proceed as in [3], using the fact that $\hat{\mu}_n$ converges to μ_V much faster than exponentially under $P_{nV/(n-p), \beta}^{n-p}$ (indeed, its LDP is in the scale n^2), we can replace $\phi(\hat{\mu}^n, \lambda_i)$ by $\phi(\mu_V, x_i)$, whereas the ratio of partition functions converges by hypothesis.

To be more precise, let us sketch the proof of the upper bound. Note that there exists a constant Φ_M such that on $B(x, \delta)$, $\phi(\mu, x)$ is bounded above by Φ_M so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{V, \beta}^n(B(x, \delta)) &\leq \frac{Z_{nV/(n-p), \beta}^{n-p}}{Z_{V, \beta}^n} e^{\beta p(p-1)/2 \log(x_1-2)} (e^{np\Phi_M} \mathbb{P}_{nV/(n-p), \beta}^{n-p}(\hat{\mu}^n \in B_\varepsilon(\mu_V)^c) \\ &\quad + (2M)^p e^{n \sum_{i=1}^p \max_{|y-x_i| \leq \delta} \max_{\mu \in B_\varepsilon(\mu_V)} \phi(\mu, y)}) \end{aligned}$$

with $B_\varepsilon(\mu_V)$ a small ball with radius ε around μ_V for a distance compatible with the weak topology. As $n^{-2} \log \mathbb{P}_{nV/(n-p), \beta}^{n-p}(\hat{\mu}^n \in B_\varepsilon(\mu_V)^c)$ is bounded above by a negative real number for all $\delta > 0$ by the LDP for the law of $\hat{\mu}^n$, the first term is negligible as n goes to infinity. Using the fact that $(x, \mu) \rightarrow \phi(\mu, x)$ is upper continuous, we obtain the upper bound.

The lower bound is similar to the proof in [1, p. 84]. For the lower bound, note that we may assume the x_p 's away from the boundary of the support of μ_V since otherwise we

may and shall consider only the deviations of the first $p - 1$ th eigenvalues (and proceed by induction till $p = 1$ which is already known). There exists $x_i^\delta, 1 \leq i \leq p$, whose small neighborhood are included in the δ neighborhood of $x_i, 1 \leq i \leq p$, and which are distinct, so that for ϵ small enough

$$\mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i - x_i| < \delta) \geq \mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i - x_i^\delta| < \epsilon)$$

When the x_i 's are distinct and away from b_V , we refer the reader to [1, p. 84] as the proof is very similar. We get

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i - x_i| < \delta) \geq - \sum_{i=1}^p J_V(x_i^\delta) - \alpha_{V,\beta}^p$$

Now, J_V is continuous away from the support of μ_V so that we can conclude by letting δ going to zero. \square

9.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5.

As explained in Section 2, we have to study \widetilde{X}_n , when X_n is diagonal with eigenvalues having $\mathbb{P}_{V,\beta}^n$ as their joint law and the U_i 's obtained by orthonormalization procedure from $G = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ iid standard Gaussian.

It is clear that since the largest eigenvalues of X_n are exponentially tight, so are the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n , and therefore it is enough to prove a weak large deviation principle. We let $K(L)$ be such that the probability that λ_1^n or $\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n$ is greater than $K(L)$ is smaller than e^{-nL} . We first consider the deviations of $(\widetilde{\lambda}_1^n > \dots > \widetilde{\lambda}_k^n)$ towards $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots > x_k > b_V$ with b_V the rightmost point of the support of μ_V . Let $\epsilon > 0$ so that $x_k \geq b_V + \epsilon$. The proof will consist in first fixing the possible deviations of the extreme eigenvalues of X_n (hence providing outliers) and then, being given these outliers, computing the deviations of the eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n . The main point of course is that with exponentially large probability, only a finite number of eigenvalues of X_n can deviate. For B an event B with positive probability, we denote in the sequel by $\mathbb{P}(A|B)$ the probability of an event A conditionally to B .

- We first claim that for any $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) \in (b_V, +\infty)$ and any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon(\eta, \ell), \delta(\eta, \ell) > 0$ so that for n large enough, for $\epsilon < \epsilon(\eta, \ell), \delta < \delta(\eta, \ell)$,

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p}^0(x_1, \dots, x_k) - \eta &\leq \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\widetilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq \delta \left| \begin{array}{l} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i^n - \ell_i| \leq \epsilon, \\ \lambda_{p+1}^n \leq b_V + \epsilon \end{array} \right. \right) \quad (29) \\ &\leq -L_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p}^0(x_1, \dots, x_k) + \eta \end{aligned}$$

These inequalities were proven for ϵ going to zero a priori with n in Theorem 8.1. Let X_n be a matrix such that the event $\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\widetilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq \delta\}$ is realized. Let X_n' be a real diagonal matrix with same eigenvalues of X_n except its k largest eigenvalues are equal to the outliers (ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_p) . Then we have $\|X_n - X_n'\|_\infty \leq \delta$, so that, with obvious notations, $\|\widetilde{X}_n - \widetilde{X}_n'\|_\infty \leq 2\delta$, so that the ordered eigenvalues of \widetilde{X}_n and \widetilde{X}_n' differ at most by 2δ . Thus, up to change δ into $\delta + \epsilon$, Theorem 8.1 gives the inequalities for X_n' for $\eta/2$, from which we deduce (29).

• By Theorem 2.2, we have

$$-J^p(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) - \eta \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i^n - \ell_i| \leq \varepsilon, \lambda_{p+1}^n \leq b_V + \varepsilon \right) \leq -J^p(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) + \eta. \quad (30)$$

For all (ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_p) , we define the set

$$V(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) = \{(\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n; \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\lambda_i - \ell_i| < \varepsilon(\eta, \ell), \lambda_{p+1} < b_V + \varepsilon(\eta, \ell)\}.$$

• We observe, again by Theorem 2.2 that for all $\kappa > 0$, the probability that λ_p^n is greater than $b_V + \delta$ goes to zero as $e^{-np\varepsilon(\delta)}$ for some $\varepsilon(\delta) = \inf_{(b_V + \delta, +\infty)} J_V > 0$.

• To prove the upper bound we can write

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq \delta \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq \delta, \lambda_{p+1}^n \leq b_V + \delta \right) + e^{-np\varepsilon(\delta)} \quad (31)$$

We next consider the infinite covering $\cup V(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p)$ of $[b_V, K(L)]^p$. We can always extract a finite covering $\cup_{1 \leq s \leq M(\delta)} V(\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s)$ as the latter is compact. We then take $\delta = \min \delta(\eta, \ell^s) > 0$. Thus, we get by the LDP estimate (30)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq 2\delta \right) &\leq e^{-nL} + \sum_{s=1}^{M(\delta)} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq 2\delta \cap V(\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s) \right) \\ &\leq e^{-nL} + \sum_{s=1}^{M(\delta)} e^{-nL_{\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s}(x_1, \dots, x_k) - nJ^p(\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s) + n\eta} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq 2\delta \right) &\leq M(\delta) e^{-n \min_{1 \leq s \leq M(\delta)} (L_{\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s}(x_1, \dots, x_k) + J^p(\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s) - \eta)} + e^{-nL} + e^{-np\varepsilon(\delta)} \\ &\leq 3M(\delta) e^{-n \min\{L, p\varepsilon(\delta), \bar{J}^k(x_1, \dots, x_k)\}} \end{aligned}$$

which gives the announced bound by taking first the limit as n goes to infinity, then δ to zero and L to infinity.

• The lower bound is easier as we simply write

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq 2\delta \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\tilde{\lambda}_i^n - x_i| \leq 2\delta \cap V(\ell_1^s, \dots, \ell_p^s) \right)$$

and use the large deviation theorems. \square

10. APPENDIX

10.1. An auxiliary large deviations result.

For sake of completeness, we recall the following result, following from [14, Theorem 3.2] (see also [3] and [6]).

Theorem 10.1. *Let, for each n , $\lambda_1^n \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n^n$ be a family of deterministic real numbers such that there exists a compactly supported probability measure μ on \mathbb{R} such that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i^n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mu \quad \text{weakly,} \quad (32)$$

Let $(Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of \mathbb{R}^d -valued i.i.d. random variables such that Z_1 has some exponential moments. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ be a continuous matrix-valued function and consider the sequence of \mathbb{R}^m -valued random variables

$$L_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i^n) \cdot Z_i.$$

(1) *If we assume moreover that*

$$\lambda_1^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \max(\text{supp}(\mu)), \quad \lambda_n^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \min(\text{supp}(\mu)). \quad (33)$$

then L_n satisfies a LDP with good rate function

$$\Gamma^*(y) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{ \langle \lambda, y \rangle - \Gamma(\lambda) \},$$

where $\Gamma(\lambda)$ is defined by the formula

$$\Gamma(\lambda) = \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_k \cdot k\text{-th row of } f(x) \right) d\mu(x)$$

and Λ is defined by the formula $\Lambda(\theta) = \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\langle \theta, Z_1 \rangle})$.

(2) *If there exists $p^+, p^- \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $i \leq p^+$, $\lambda_i^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \ell_i^+$, for any $j \leq p^-$, $\lambda_{n-j+1}^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \ell_j^-$, $\lambda_{p^++1}^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \max(\mathcal{S})$ and $\lambda_{n-p^-}^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \min(\mathcal{S})$ with*

$$-\infty < \ell_1^- \leq \dots \leq \ell_{p^-}^- < \min(\mathcal{S}) \leq \max(\mathcal{S}) < \ell_{p^+}^+ \leq \dots \leq \ell_1^+ < \infty$$

and if $\frac{Z_1}{n}$ satisfies the LDP with a good rate function denoted by $I^{(Z)}$, then L_n satisfies a LDP with good rate function

$$I_f(y) = \inf \left\{ \Gamma^*(y_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{p^++p^-} I^{(Z)}(y_i) \middle/ y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m, y_1, \dots, y_{p^++p^-} \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p^++p^-} f(m_i) \cdot y_i = y \right\},$$

with $m_i = \ell_i^+$ if $1 \leq i \leq p^+$ and $m_i = \ell_i^-$ if $p^+ + 1 \leq i \leq p^+ + p^-$ and where Γ^* and Λ are defined as above.

Remark 10.2. *Note that in [14, Theorem 3.2], the assumption that $\frac{Z_1}{n}$ satisfies the LDP with a good rate function is required in both case but a careful reading of the proof shows that in the case when (33) is fulfilled, this is not a necessary condition.*

10.2. Proof of a technical lemma.

With the notations of Section 4.1, we have the following result

Lemma 10.3. *Under Assumption 1.2, for any $1 \leq i_0 \leq r$, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\|q_{i_0}^n W_{i_0}^n\|_2^2 \notin [\delta, \frac{1}{\delta}]) = -\infty.$$

Proof. To simplify the notations, we shall assume that $i_0 = r$.

Recall that the G_i^n 's were constructed from a family $(G(k) = (g_1(k), \dots, g_r(k)))_{k \geq 1}$ of independent copies of G , via the formula $G_i^n := (g_i(1), \dots, g_i(n))^T$. For $1 \leq k$, we consider the random $r \times r$ Hermitian matrix

$$Z_k = G(k)^* G(k) = [\overline{g_i(k)} g_j(k)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} \quad \text{and} \quad L^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n Z_k.$$

By Theorem 10.1, we have that the law of L^n satisfies a LDP with convex good rate function

$$I^{(L)}(y) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{H}_r} \{\langle \lambda, y \rangle - \Lambda(\lambda)\},$$

where $\Lambda(\lambda) = \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\langle \lambda, Z_1 \rangle})$ is exactly the function defined in Equation (8).

Note that since for all n , L^n is almost surely a positive-semidefinite matrix, by closedness of the set of such matrices, the domain of I is contained in the set of positive-semidefinite matrices.

Let P_r be the real polynomial function on \mathbb{H}_r introduced in Proposition 4.1: we have $\|q_r^n W_r^n\|_2^2 = P_r(L^n)$. Therefore, if, for any $\delta > 0$, we introduce the closed set $\mathcal{E}_\delta := \{y \in \mathbb{H}_r; P_r(y) \leq \delta\}$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\|q_r^n W_r^n\|_2^2 \leq \delta) \leq - \inf_{y \in \mathcal{E}_\delta} I^{(L)}(y).$$

Let us assume that

$$M := \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \inf_{y \in \mathcal{E}_\delta} I^{(L)}(y) < \infty.$$

Since $I^{(L)}$ is a good rate function, there exists a compact set K such that $\inf_{y \in K^c} I^{(L)}(y) > M$, so that for all $\delta > 0$, $\inf_{y \in \mathcal{E}_\delta} I^{(L)}(y) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{E}_\delta \cap K} I^{(L)}(y)$. Moreover the infimum on \mathcal{E}_δ is reached : let, for all $n \geq 0$, y_n be an element of K such that $I^{(L)}(y_n) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{E}_{\frac{1}{n}}} I^{(L)}(y)$. There exists a subsequence $\varphi(n)$ such that $y_{\varphi(n)}$ converges, as n goes to infinity to some y_0 . By continuity of P_r , $P_r(y_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_r(y_{\varphi(n)}) = 0$. It follows, by the last part of Proposition 4.1, that y_0 is not positive definite. However, since $I^{(L)}$ is lower semicontinuous, we have $I^{(L)}(y_0) \leq M < \infty$, which implies that y_0 is a positive semi-definite matrix. Let p

be the orthogonal projection onto $\ker y_0$. Note that $p \neq 0$ and that $\langle p, y_0 \rangle = \text{Tr}(y_0 p) = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(L)}(y_0) &= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{H}_r} \{ \langle \lambda, y_0 \rangle - \Lambda(\lambda) \} \\ &\geq \sup_{t > 0} \{ \langle -tp, y_0 \rangle - \Lambda(-tp) \} \\ &= \sup_{t > 0} -\Lambda(-tp) \\ &= +\infty \quad \text{by (11),} \end{aligned}$$

which yields a contradiction (as we already proved that $I^{(L)}(y_0) \leq M$).

Similarly, as $I^{(L)}$ is a good rate function, it has compact level sets and therefore has to be large on the set $\{y : P_r(y) \geq 1/\delta\}$. Hence,

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\|q_r^n W_r^n\|_2^2 \geq \delta^{-1}) = -\infty$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

10.3. On the eigenvalues of the deformed matrix.

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma 8.3. In fact, we will prove the slightly more general

Lemma 10.4. *Let \mathbb{K} be either \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} . Let us fix some positive integers n, r such that $n > r$, a self adjoint $n \times n$ real matrix X with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ and some non null real numbers $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r$. We make the following hypothesis:*

(H) $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are pairwise distinct and there are pairwise distinct indices $i_1, \dots, i_{r-1} \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\{\lambda_{i_1} + \theta_1, \dots, \lambda_{i_{r-1}} + \theta_{r-1}\} \cap \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} = \emptyset$.

Let us define, for $g = [g_1, \dots, g_r] \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times r}$,

$$\tilde{X}_g := X + \theta_1 u_1 u_1^* + \dots + \theta_r u_r u_r^*,$$

where (u_1, \dots, u_r) is the orthonormalized family deduced from the columns of g by the Gram-Schmidt process (we recall that the u_i 's exist for Lebesgue-almost all g 's). Then the Lebesgue measure of the set of the g 's such that \tilde{X}_g and X have at least an eigenvalue in common is null.

Now, Lemma 8.3 will be easy to deduce from the above. Indeed, one can check that for n large enough, X_n satisfies hypothesis (H). We know that its eigenvalues $\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n$ are distinct. Moreover, let η be such that $\eta < \frac{1}{2} \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} |\theta_i|$ and $\eta < \frac{1}{3} \min_{i \neq j} |\ell_i - \ell_j|$. From Assumption 1.5, there exists n large enough so that X_n has at most p^+ eigenvalues greater than $b + \eta$, at most p^- eigenvalues smaller than $a - \eta$, more than $2r(p^+ + 1)$ eigenvalues in the interval $(b - \eta, b + \eta)$ and more than $2r(p^- + 1)$ eigenvalues in $(a - \eta, a + \eta)$.

Let us assume that $\theta_1 > 0$. Then one can find an eigenvalue λ_{i_1} among the $p^+ + 1$ greater ones in $(b - \eta, b + \eta)$ such that $\lambda_{i_1} + \theta_1$ do not belong to $\{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$. We then forget the $p^+ + 1$ greater eigenvalues and look at the $p^+ + 1$ following. Among them, one can find an eigenvalue λ_{i_2} such that $\lambda_{i_2} + \theta_2$ do not belong to $\{\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n\}$. and so on. For the negative θ_i 's, we consider the $p^- + 1$ smallest eigenvalues in $(a - \eta, a + \eta)$.

From Assumption 1.6, the law of G is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure and Lemma 8.3 follows.

We now prove Lemma 10.4.

Proof. Let β be either 1 or 2 according to whether \mathbb{K} is \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} .

• Note that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there are two universal polynomials $D_k, N_{k,i,j}$ of βrn real variables with coefficients in \mathbb{K} such that the i, j -th entry of $u_k u_k^*$ is $\frac{N_{k,i,j}(g)}{D_k(g)}$ and D_k is Lebesgue-almost everywhere positive. Let us define the universal real polynomial of βrn real variables

$$D = \prod_{k=1}^r D_k.$$

Our statement is equivalent to the fact that for almost all g , $D(g)X$ and $D(g)\tilde{X}_g$ have no eigenvalue in common, i.e. that for almost all g , the resultant of the characteristic polynomials of $D(g)X$ and $D(g)\tilde{X}_g$ is non zero. Note that there is a universal polynomial P in $n+r+\beta rn$ real variables such that this resultant is equal to $P(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r, g)$.

It can easily be proved, by induction on the number of variables, that any non null polynomial in several real variables does not vanish on any set of positive Lebesgue measure. Hence it suffices to prove that the polynomial in βrn real variables $Q(g) := P(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r, g)$ is non null, i.e. that for certain $g \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times r}$ which columns are linearly independent, \tilde{X}_g and X have no eigenvalue in common.

• So let us prove that there exists $g = [g_1, \dots, g_r] \in \mathbb{K}^{n \times r}$ such that \tilde{X}_g and X have no eigenvalue in common. Up to a reindexing of the λ_i 's, one can suppose that $i_1 = 1, \dots, i_{r-1} = r-1$ and that $\lambda_r < \dots < \lambda_n$. As X is a self adjoint matrix with distinct eigenvalues, one can find an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors and express the matrices in this basis. We shall choose the $r-1$ first columns g_1, \dots, g_{r-1} of g to be the $r-1$ first columns of the identity matrix and g_r with null $r-1$ first coordinates and unit norm, so that for all $k = 1, \dots, r$, $u_k = g_k$. With such a choice of g , we have

$$\tilde{X}_g = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_n \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \theta_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \theta_{r-1} & \\ & & & \theta_r g_r g_r^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us suppose that $\theta_r > 0$ (the case $\theta_r < 0$ can be treated in the same way). It was shown in [11, Section 3.2] that as g_r runs through the set of unit norm vectors of $\mathbb{K}^{n \times 1}$ with null $r-1$ first coordinates, the ordered eigenvalues of the $n - (r-1) \times n - (r-1)$ lower right block of \tilde{X}_g describes the set of families μ_r, \dots, μ_n of real numbers which sum up to $\lambda_r + \dots + \lambda_n + \theta_r$ and such that

$$\lambda_r \leq \mu_r \leq \lambda_{r+1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n \leq \mu_n.$$

One can easily find such a family μ_r, \dots, μ_n such that

$$\{\mu_r, \dots, \mu_n\} \cap \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} = \emptyset,$$

which concludes the proof, by hypothesis (H). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Anderson, A. Guionnet, O. Zeitouni *An Introduction to Random Matrices* Cambridge University Press (2009).
- [2] Z. Bai and J-F Yao *Central limit theorems for eigenvalues in a spiked population model* Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **44**(2008) 447–474
- [3] G. Ben Arous, A. Dembo, A. and A. Guionnet, *Aging of spherical spin glasses*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, **120**, (2001)1, 1–67.
- [4] G. Ben Arous, A. Guionnet. *Large deviations for Wigner’s law and Voiculescu ’s non commutative entropy*. Probability theory and related fields , **108**, 517-542 (1997).
- [5] F. Benaych-Georges, R. N. Rao. *The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices*. Preprint.
- [6] B. Bercu and F. Gamboa and A. Rouault, *Large deviations for quadratic forms of stationary Gaussian processes*, Stochastic Process. Appl., **71**(1997)75–90
- [7] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviation Techniques and Applications*. Springer.
- [8] M. Maïda. *Large deviations for the largest eigenvalue of rank one deformations of Gaussian ensembles* Elec. J. Probab.
- [9] D. Féral *On large deviations for the spectral measure of discrete Coulomb gas* Séminaire de probabilités XLI, Lecture Notes in Math. 1934 (2008) 19–49
- [10] A. Fey, R. van der Hofstad, Remco and M. Klok *Large deviations for eigenvalues of sample covariance matrices, with applications to mobile communication systems* Adv. in Appl. Probab. **40** (2008) 1048–1071
- [11] P. J. Forrester, T. Nagao *Determinantal Correlations for Classical Projection Processes* Arxiv.
- [12] A. Guionnet and O. Zeitouni, *Large deviations asymptotics for spherical integrals* J. Funct. Anal. **188** (2002)461–515
- [13] R. Horn and C. R. Johnson *Matrix Analysis* Cambridge University Press (1990)
- [14] M. Maïda, J. Najim, S. Péché *Large deviations for weighted empirical mean with outliers*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **117**1373–1403 (2007)
- [15] T. Tao and A. Knutson *Honeycombs and sums of Hermitian matrices* Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **48** (2001) 175–186
- [16] P. Vivo, S. Majumdar and O. Bohigas *Large deviations of the maximum eigenvalue in Wishart random matrices* J. Phys. A **40** (2007) 4317–4337