

Global fluctuations for Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles

Maurice Duits* Benjamin Fahs[†] Rostyslav Kozhan[‡]

Abstract

We study the fluctuations of linear statistics with polynomial test functions for Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles. Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles form an important class of determinantal point processes that include random matrix models such as the GUE with external source, complex Wishart matrices, multi-matrix models and others.

Our analysis is based on the recurrence matrix for the multiple orthogonal polynomials, that is constructed out of the nearest neighbor recurrences. If the coefficients for the nearest neighbor recurrences have limits, then we show that the right-limit of this recurrence matrix is a matrix that can be viewed as representation of a Toeplitz operator with respect to a non-standard basis. This will allow us to prove Central Limit Theorems for linear statistics of Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles. A particular novelty is the use of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula to prove that the higher cumulants of the linear statistics converge to zero.

We illustrate the main results by discussing Central Limit Theorems for the Gaussian Unitary Ensembles with external source, complex Wishart matrices and specializations of the Schur measure related to multiple Charlier, multiple Krawtchouk and multiple Meixner polynomials.

*Department of Mathematics, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden. Email: duits@kth.se. Supported by the Swedish Research Council grant (VR) Grant no. 2016-05450 and the Göran Gustafsson Foundation.

[†]Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, UK. Email: bf308@ic.ac.uk. Supported by the Göran Gustafsson Foundation (UU/KTH) and by the Leverhulme Trust research programme grant RPG-2018-260.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden. Email: kozhan@math.uu.se.

1 Introduction

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a system of Borel measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^m$ on \mathbb{R} be given. For each vector $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, the type II multiple orthogonal polynomial of multi-index \vec{k} is defined as the monic polynomial $p_{\vec{k}}$ of smallest possible degree such that

$$\int p_{\vec{k}}(x) x^\ell d\mu_j(x) = 0, \quad \ell = 0, \dots, k_j - 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

We say that the multi-index \vec{k} is *normal* if the degree of $p_{\vec{k}}$ is $|\vec{k}| = k_1 + \dots + k_m$. A system of measures $\{\mu_j(x)\}_{j=1}^m$ is called a *perfect system* if each $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ is normal. Note that if $m = 1$ then this definition reduces to that of standard orthogonal polynomials on the real line.

Multiple orthogonal polynomials arise naturally in several different contexts. Originally they were introduced in analytic number theory (for proving irrationality and transcendence). They also play an important role in approximation theory (Hermite-Padé approximations). We refer to [39, 45] for surveys on these topics. More recently, they have appeared in random matrix theory and integrable probability, as they integrate the Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles [31]. This is an interesting class of point processes that generalize the more classical Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles [35] and includes many interesting models such as Unitary Ensembles with external source, complex Wishart matrices, products of random matrices, the two matrix model and certain specializations of the Schur processes.

1.1 Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles

Let us take

$$d\mu_j(x) = w_j(x) d\mu(x), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \quad (1.1)$$

for some Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} and non-negative weight functions w_j . Fix a vector of non-negative integers $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$ and set $n = k_1 + \dots + k_m = |\vec{k}|$. Then a probability measure of the form

$$\frac{1}{Z_{\vec{k}}} \det (x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^n \det (g_j(x_i))_{i,j=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n d\mu(x_j), \quad (1.2)$$

where $g_j(x)$ are the functions

$$w_1(x), xw_1(x), \dots, x^{k_1-1}w_1(x), \dots, w_m(x), xw_m(x), \dots, x^{k_m-1}w_m(x), \quad (1.3)$$

and Z_k is a normalizing constant is called a *Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensemble (MOPE)*. It should be noted that we assume here that (1.2) is non-negative, which is an implicit assumption on the weight functions w_j . In the language of [10] we see that (1.2) defines a biorthogonal ensemble, where one of the family of functions consists of polynomials. It is therefore clear that (1.2) is a determinantal point process [27]. The name, MOPE, for these processes was proposed in [31] and is explained by the fact that the correlation kernel can be expressed in terms of multiple orthogonal polynomials. The correlation kernel will however not play a role in the present paper.

A classical example of a MOPE is the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble with external source. This well-studied model was introduced in [17]. In the model, we equip the space of $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices with distribution proportional to

$$\sim e^{-n \operatorname{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2} M^2 - H M \right)} dM, \quad (1.4)$$

where H is a diagonal matrix and dM is the Lebesgue measure on the entries. It turns out [7, 8] that the eigenvalues of M form a Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensemble where m is the number of distinct values along the diagonal with multiplicities k_j so that $k_1 + \dots + k_m = n$. The weight functions are the Gaussian

$$w_j(x) = e^{-n \left(\frac{1}{2} x^2 - h_j x \right)},$$

and μ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . The polynomials in this case are called multiple Hermite polynomials.

Another example is the complex Wishart Ensemble. Given a diagonal matrix $\Sigma = \operatorname{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ with $\sigma_j > 0$, one studies the eigenvalues of an $n \times n$ matrix M chosen randomly from

$$\sim (\det M)^\alpha e^{-n \operatorname{Tr} M \Sigma} dM,$$

on the space of positive definite hermitian matrices (for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ the eigenvalues of M are the square of the singular values of a $n \times (n + \alpha)$ where the columns are independent and identically distributed as a complex multivariate normal distribution with covariance matrix Σ^{-1}). Similarly to the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble with external source, the eigenvalues of M form a MOPE, where m is the number of distinct values along the diagonal of Σ and the k_j 's are their multiplicities. The multiple polynomials that arise here are called the multiple Laguerre polynomials of the second kind [7, 31].

There are many other examples, some of which we address in Section 5. For now, we only briefly mention some important ones and refer to [31] for

an extensive survey and a long list of references. In the Hermitian two matrix model, the biorthogonal polynomials can be characterized as multiple orthogonal polynomials [23, 32]. MOPE's also appear in the recent activity around the singular values of products of random matrices [34]. The Borodin–Muttalib Ensembles [10, 33] with an integer (or, by duality, the reciprocal of an integer) parameter θ lead to multiple orthogonal polynomials with the number of weights θ .

Lesser known examples are several discrete multiple orthogonal polynomial ensembles that are particular specializations of the Schur measure and arise in the discrete integrable probability models, such as last passage percolation, discrete interacting particles systems and random tilings of planar domains. Here we briefly mention how the multiple Meixner ensemble arises as a specialization of the Schur measure [40]. Later in Section 5 we will also discuss Markov chains that lead to the multiple Charlier, multiple Krawtchouk and multiple Meixner polynomials and are specializations of the Schur process [41]. These are also specializations and marginals of a more general Markov chain introduced in [11]. In fact, the multiple Charlier model with two weights was already studied in [20] as an example of the model in [11], but the connection to multiple Charlier polynomials was not mentioned there. For completeness, we will include a short discussion on Schur polynomials and the Schur process in Section 5.3.7.

We recall that for $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ and a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ with $\lambda_j \geq \lambda_k$ for $j \leq k$, the Schur polynomial [37, I.3] is defined as

$$s_\lambda(a) = \frac{\det(a_k^{\lambda_j+n-j})_{j,k=1}^n}{\det(a_k^{n-j})_{j,k=1}^n}. \quad (1.5)$$

Note that this is a symmetric multivariate polynomial in the a_k 's. Given $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, we can then define the Schur measure as the probability measure on $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ with $\lambda_j \geq \lambda_k$ for $j \leq k$, by

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda) = s_\lambda(a)s_\lambda(b) \prod_{j,k=1}^n (1 - a_j b_k). \quad (1.6)$$

By taking the limits $a_k \rightarrow 1$, $b_k \rightarrow q \in (0, 1)$ and using l'Hôpital's rule, we see that $s_\lambda(a)s_\lambda(b)$ converges to a product of two Vandermonde determinants in the variables $x_j = \lambda_j - j$ and a factor $q^{x_1+\dots+x_n}$ (up to a constant). This is called the Meixner ensemble in the literature since the corresponding orthogonal polynomials that integrate this model are the Meixner polynomials. If, instead, one takes the limits $a_k \rightarrow 1$ and $b_k \rightarrow q_j$ such that there

are precisely m different values q_1, \dots, q_m for these limits with multiplicities k_1, \dots, k_m such that $k_1 + \dots + k_m = n$, then $s_\lambda(a)$ converges again to a Vandermonde determinant but $s_\lambda(b)$ converges, up to a constant, to $\det g_j(x_i)$ where g_j are as in (1.3) with $w_j(x) = q_j^x$ and multiplicities k_j (cf. Lemma 5.2). Thus, the limiting Schur measure is an MOPE of the form (1.2). The corresponding multiple orthogonal polynomials are called multiple Meixner polynomials of the first kind [25], see also Section 5.3.5 below.

1.2 Universality of global fluctuations

The prime interest of the current paper is to investigate the global behavior of Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles. A natural way to study a point process is via its linear statistics. Given a random configuration of points $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and a smooth function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the linear statistic $X_n(f)$ is defined as

$$X_n(f) = \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j).$$

The first natural question is whether there is a limiting distribution for the random points x_j . In other words, does there exist a $\rho(x)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[X_n(f)] \rightarrow \int f(x) \rho(x) dx,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$? In many determinantal point processes in random matrix theory and integrable probability this is indeed the case and identifying $\rho(x)$ is an important problem. Naturally, ρ depends on the parameters of the model at hand (in the case of MOPE, these parameters are the weights w_j , measure μ , and the indices k_j). It was proved by Hardy in [26] that for MOPE's, $\rho(x)$ is the limiting zero distribution for the multiple orthogonal polynomials p_n , and that convergence even holds almost surely (under certain conditions on the recurrence coefficients for the multiple orthogonal polynomials). The characterization of the limiting zero distribution of p_n is a classical problem for multiple orthogonal polynomials. This limiting distribution can often be given in terms of the solution of a vector equilibrium problem, which is a good starting point for an asymptotic analysis of the multiple orthogonal polynomials via Riemann-Hilbert techniques in special cases. We refer to [31, 42] for general discussions.

In this paper, we will address the phenomenon that the global fluctuations $X_n(f) - \mathbb{E}X_n(f)$ are universal. One of the remarkable facts, is that for many random processes in random matrix theory the variance of the linear

statistic $X_n(f)$ does not grow with n for functions f that are sufficiently smooth (jump discontinuities are known to contribute with terms that grow logarithmically in n). In fact, it has been proved in a variety of models that for sufficiently smooth f there is limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var } X_n(f) = \sigma_f^2,$$

for some $\sigma_f^2 > 0$. The models in which this limit holds have the property that the random points accumulate on a single interval. If they accumulate on multiple disjoint intervals, then the variance may have quasi-periodic behavior (see [14] for a discussion and further references). Note that if the points x_j were to be independent, then the variance would grow linearly in n . That the variance does not grow is a result of the repulsion between the points that causes rigidity in the location of the points. Moreover, the limiting variance σ_f^2 is universal and only depends on a few general properties of the model. Even more is true: for many models, in which the points accumulate on a single interval, it has been established that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$X_n(f) - \mathbb{E}X_n(f) \rightarrow N(0, \sigma_f^2), \quad (1.7)$$

in distribution. This Central Limit Theorem (CLT) together with the universality of σ_f , is sometimes referred to as global universality and has been proved in a long list of important models. We will not attempt to give a full list of references, but only mention some. One of the first CLT's in random matrix theory is by Jonsson who proved a CLT for Wishart Matrices [30]. In a seminal work [28], Johansson proved (1.7) for general (continuous) β -ensembles on \mathbb{R} with polynomial potentials and certain smoothness conditions on f . The case of discrete β -ensembles was dealt with by Borodin, Gorin and Guionnet [13]. For the special value $\beta = 2$, the continuous and discrete log-gases are special cases of Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles and, consequently, of MOPE's. In [14] a general CLT for polynomial test functions was proved for a class of biorthogonal ensembles, including Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles as important examples. The goal of the present paper is to prove a general CLT in (1.7) for MOPE's, inspired by the approach introduced in [14]. An alternative approach to CLT's for MOPE's would be to use the Schur-generating function approach recently developed by Bufetov and Gorin [18]. It would be interesting to see how the techniques and results of the present paper would fit into their framework.

1.3 Nearest neighbor recurrences

The main tool that we will use is the nearest neighbor recurrence relations for multiple orthogonal polynomials. Similarly to the case of standard orthogonal polynomials on the real line, for each family of multiple orthogonal polynomials (from a perfect system) there exist coefficients $\{a_{\vec{k},j}\}_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m}$ and $\{b_{\vec{k},j}\}_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m}$ such that

$$xp_{\vec{k}}(x) = p_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}(x) + b_{\vec{k},\ell}p_{\vec{k}}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m a_{\vec{k},j}p_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}(x) \quad (1.8)$$

holds for every $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, where $\{\vec{e}_j\}_{j=1}^m$ denotes the standard canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^m . Equations (1.8) are called the *nearest neighbor recurrence relations*, see [45, 43]. If we subtract two of these relations with $\ell = r$ and $\ell = s$, we arrive at the equality

$$p_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_r}(x) = p_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_s}(x) + (b_{\vec{k},s} - b_{\vec{k},r})p_{\vec{k}}(x), \quad (1.9)$$

for $1 \leq r, s \leq m$. Note that for $m = 1$ these relations are obsolete, so they are a particular feature for multiple orthogonal polynomials.

In concrete examples, the coefficients may be explicitly computed. There are families of multiple orthogonal polynomials corresponding to all of the classical orthogonal polynomials (Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, Charlier, Krawtchouk, Meixner, Hahn), and for these, there are explicit expressions in the literature [5, 7, 25, 39, 38, 45, 43].

In general, the map from the system of measures $\{\mu_j(x)\}_{j=1}^m$ to its nearest neighbor recurrence coefficients is highly non-trivial. There is an important class of measures though for which the coefficients are known to have a simple limiting behavior.

Definition 1.1. We say that a perfect system $\{\mu_j(x)\}_{j=1}^m$ is in the *multiple Nevai class* if, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and every $\vec{\nu} = [0, 1]^m$ with $|\vec{\nu}| = 1$, there exist $a_j(\vec{\nu})$ and $b_j(\vec{\nu})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} a_{\vec{k},j} \rightarrow a_j(\vec{\nu}), \\ b_{\vec{k},j} \rightarrow b_j(\vec{\nu}), \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

if $\vec{k}/|\vec{k}| \rightarrow \vec{\nu}$ as $|\vec{k}| \rightarrow \infty$.

As was shown in [2, Thm 4.6], multiple Nevai class in particular includes systems for which $\text{supp } \mu_j$ are pairwise disjoint intervals (Angelesco systems)

with μ_j absolutely-continuous whose a.c. densities $\frac{d\mu_j}{dx}$ are non-vanishing and analytic in a neighborhood of $\text{supp } \mu_j$. This class is conjectured to be much wider, allegedly containing Angelesco systems with the mere conditions $\frac{d\mu_j}{dx} > 0$ a.e. on $\text{supp } \mu_j$. The computation of the constants $\{a_j(\vec{\nu})\}_{j=1}^m$ and $\{b_j(\vec{\nu})\}_{j=1}^m$ in (1.10) was addressed in [2] and [4].

It should be noted that the behavior (1.10) will typically not hold for measures that have unbounded support. Instead, an alternative formulation of (1.10) is expected to be true for a wide class of measures with unbounded support. Just as in the case of orthogonal polynomials (e.g., the Hermite polynomials), to get reasonable limiting expressions for the multiple orthogonal polynomials and their features, we need an appropriate rescaling. For example, for the Multiple Hermite Polynomials related to the random matrix model (1.4) we have rescaled the Gaussians to be $e^{-n(x-h_j)^2/2}$. This has the consequence that the eigenvalues accumulate on a union of bounded intervals. By formula (2.2) in [7],

$$xp_{\vec{k}}(x) = p_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}(x) + h_\ell p_{\vec{k}}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{k_j}{n} p_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}(x), \quad (1.11)$$

for $|\vec{k}| \geq 0$. We see that (1.10) does not hold directly, but we do obtain a limit if we let $|\vec{k}| \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$ simultaneously.

To accommodate this type of rescaling, we allow the measures to depend on a parameter n and write $p_{\vec{k}}^{(n)}$, $a_{\vec{k},j}^{(n)}$ and $b_{\vec{k},\ell}^{(n)}$ to indicate the dependence on n . In the orthogonal polynomial literature one often speaks of *varying measures*. Then for a wide class of measures it is expected that the following limits hold

$$\begin{cases} a_{\vec{k},j}^{(n)} \rightarrow a_j(\vec{\nu}), \\ b_{\vec{k},\ell}^{(n)} \rightarrow b_\ell(\vec{\nu}), \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

if $\vec{k}/|\vec{k}| \rightarrow \vec{\nu}$ and $|\vec{k}|/n \rightarrow 1$ as $|\vec{k}|, n \rightarrow \infty$. The limits (1.10) or (1.12) are easily verified for the generalizations of the classical orthogonal polynomials. We discuss some examples in Section 5.

1.4 Main results

Our goal is to show that one can formulate a general CLT for MOPE's. In discussing the limiting behavior $X_n(f)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have to clarify how precisely we want to take the limit. Indeed, for each n we need to choose a corresponding vector \vec{k} . The choice we make is the following: for each




Figure 1: An example of an up-right path $\{\vec{k}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ for $m = 2$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$ the path will grow to infinity at an angle determined by $\vec{\nu} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$.

$n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we take a vector $\vec{k}_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ such that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} |\vec{k}_n| &= n; \\ \vec{k}_{n+1} &= \vec{k}_n + \vec{e}_{j_n} \text{ for some } j_n \in \{1, \dots, m\}; \\ \text{there exists a } \vec{\nu} \in [0, 1]^m, |\vec{\nu}| &= 1 \text{ with } \vec{k}_n/n \rightarrow \vec{\nu} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1.13)$$

One can think of $\{\vec{k}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ as a path on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, that connects $(0, \dots, 0)$ to infinity in the direction of $\vec{\nu}$, see Fig. 1 for an example.

The following two theorems are the main results of the paper. The first one deals with the fixed choice of orthogonality measures and the second allows the measures to vary.

Theorem 1.2 (Non-varying systems). *Let μ have compact support and assume that the system (1.1) belongs to the multiple Nevai class. Take a path $\{\vec{k}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ satisfying (1.13). Consider x_1, \dots, x_n taken randomly from (1.2) with m weights w_1, \dots, w_m and multiplicities \vec{k}_n . Let $a_j = a_j(\vec{\nu})$ and $b_j = b_j(\vec{\nu})$ be the limits in (1.10). Then, for any polynomial f with real coefficients, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \right] \rightarrow N \left(0, \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell f_{\ell} f_{-\ell} \right),$$

in distribution, where

$$f_{\ell} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} f \left(z + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{z - b_j} \right) \frac{dz}{z^{\ell+1}}$$

and γ is a contour around the poles b_j with counter-clockwise orientation.

Note that the theorem is essentially a result on the universality of the Central Limit Theorem. This result also presents an additional motivation from integrable probability to study which systems of measures are in the multiple Nevai class. However, to have a wide scope of applications, the restriction on the compactness of the support of μ is too severe. Fortunately, it is not necessary.

Let us now allow the weights $w_j^{(n)}$ and the measure $\mu^{(n)}$ in (1.1) to be n -dependent (where n is the number of points in the process). Then the recurrence coefficients $\{a_{\vec{k},j}^{(n)}\}$ and $\{b_{\vec{k},j}^{(n)}\}$ are also n -dependent. Instead of the Nevai condition (1.10) we now only require that for a path (1.13) and for any $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$\begin{cases} a_{\vec{k}_{n+s,j}}^{(n)} \rightarrow a_j(\vec{v}), & \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ b_{\vec{k}_{n+s,j}}^{(n)} \rightarrow b_j(\vec{v}), & \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that these right-limit-type conditions are slightly weaker than (1.12).

Theorem 1.3 (Varying systems). *Assume that an n -dependent family of perfect systems satisfies (1.14) along a path with (1.13). Then, for any polynomial f with real coefficients, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \right] \rightarrow N \left(0, \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell f_{\ell} f_{-\ell} \right),$$

in distribution, where

$$f_{\ell} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} f \left(z + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{z - b_j} \right) \frac{dz}{z^{\ell+1}}$$

and γ is a contour around the poles b_j with counter-clockwise orientation.

Note that Theorem 1.2 is a special case of Theorem 1.3, so it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.3 which will be the topic of the remainder of this paper.

Note that if all $|b_j| < 1$ then f_ℓ are the Fourier coefficients of the function $f\left(z + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{z-b_j}\right)$. Moreover, $f_{-\ell} = \overline{f_\ell}$ and thus the limiting variance is the $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -norm of that function. Such $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -noise in the fluctuations is typical in random matrix theory. It should also be noted such $H_{\frac{1}{2}}$ -noise can often be seen as a one-dimensional section of a Gaussian Free Field with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Indeed, for certain Markov chains related to orthogonal polynomials, the Gaussian Free Field fluctuations were established in [21]. We believe that it is possible to use similar techniques to prove Gaussian Free Field fluctuations for similar Markov chains involving multiple orthogonal polynomials (for instance, for Dyson's Brownian motion started from several starting points and the Markov chains discussed in Section 5). We intend to come back to this problem in future work.

Our approach for proving Theorem 1.3 is inspired by [14]. In that paper, the authors considered biorthogonal ensembles where the biorthogonal functions satisfy certain recurrence relations. In case that the recurrence coefficients have limits (more precisely, when the recurrence matrix has a right limit along the diagonal that is a banded Toeplitz matrix) then Corollary 2.2 in [14] says that there is a CLT of the type (1.7). The special case $m = 1$ in Theorem 1.3 is (the varying version of) Theorem 2.5 in [14]. The approach of [14] can also be performed on the unit circle [22]. In further works, it has been extended to prove universality of the fluctuations on the mesoscopic scale for orthogonal polynomial ensembles on the real line [15] and, very recently, on the circle [16]. In [21] a multi-time extension was constructed to prove the global fluctuations for a class of non-colliding processes (such as stationary Dyson's Brownian motion) are governed by the Gaussian Free Field. See also [36] where the results of [14] were revisited and related to several combinatorial identities.

Although the results of [14] also hold for some special MOPE's (in fact, [14] contains examples including the 2-matrix model and also [36] discusses the example of singular values of products of Ginibre matrices), it fails to cover important examples such as the ones mentioned previously and which we discuss later in Section 5. The results of [14] assume that there are finite term recurrence relations for the family of polynomials $\{p_{k_n}^-\}_{n=0}^\infty$. By using the nearest neighbor recurrences (1.8) together with (1.9), we can find the recurrence relations for the family $\{p_{k_n}^-\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (cf. Proposition 2.1), but the coefficients in these recurrences depend on the nearest neighbor recurrence coefficients in a complicated way. In general, they will *not* have limits which

is required in order for the main results of [14] to apply. Moreover, the number of terms in this recurrence is not bounded and the recurrence matrix is therefore not banded (nor essentially banded as in [15]). These are the two reasons that our setting falls outside of the scope of [14] and we have to come up with new ideas to deal with them.

1.5 Overview of the paper

In Section 2 we construct the recurrence matrix for the family $\{p_{\vec{k}_n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ out of the nearest neighbor recurrences. Moreover, we show that if (1.10) or (1.14) hold, then one can construct a Toeplitz *operator* with a rational symbol out of the limiting values. The recurrence matrix for the family $\{p_{\vec{k}_n}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and the matrix representation of the Toeplitz operator in a particularly chosen basis share the same asymptotic behavior, as shown in Theorem 2.2. It is important to note that this basis is not the canonical basis and the matrix is therefore not a Toeplitz *matrix*.

In Section 3 we discuss certain general determinants involving exponentials of one-sided banded matrices. We show that the asymptotic behavior (except for the leading term) of these determinants depend only on a small part of the one-sided banded matrix. We then prove that under certain conditions, the determinant converges to a Gaussian based on the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula. This last part is an important novelty and replaces the use of Ehrhardt’s version of the Helton–Howe–Pincus formula in [14, 15, 21, 22]. The latter is hard to use in our setting since our matrix representation of the Toeplitz operator is not necessarily bounded, leading to non-trivial questions on convergences. By using the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula we avoid such questions and obtain a more direct proof.

In Section 4 we start by recalling that the moment-generating function for the linear statistic is a determinant of the type considered in Section 3. After verifying that the condition of the results in Section 3 are satisfied we then arrive at the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Finally, in Section 5 we present some important applications of Theorem 1.3. We show that Theorem 1.3 gives CLT’s for the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble with external source, complex Wishart matrices and certain Markov processes on non-intersecting paths related to multiple Charlier, multiple Krawtchouk and multiple Meixner polynomials.

2 Recurrence matrices

2.1 Orthogonal polynomials

Let us remind the reader the basics of orthogonal polynomials on the real line and of Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles. Let μ be a compactly supported Borel measure on \mathbb{R} with infinitely many points in its support. The (monic) orthogonal polynomial p_n is the unique monic polynomial of degree n such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} p_n(x) x^j d\mu(x) = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

One of the important features of orthogonal polynomials on the real line is that they satisfy a three term recurrence. Indeed, there exist $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \subset (0, \infty)$ and $\{b_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$xp_k(x) = p_{k+1}(x) + b_k p_k(x) + a_{k-1} p_{k-1}(x).$$

Here we have set $a_{-1} = 0$. We can organize this recurrence into a matrix form

$$x \begin{pmatrix} p_0(x) \\ p_1(x) \\ p_2(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_0 & 1 & & \\ a_0 & b_1 & 1 & \\ & a_1 & b_2 & 1 \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p_0(x) \\ p_1(x) \\ p_2(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

The tridiagonal infinite matrix on the right-hand side of (2.1) is called the Jacobi matrix of μ , which we denote by \mathcal{J} . A significant part of the literature on orthogonal polynomials is devoted to studying the relationship between (properties of) μ and (properties of) \mathcal{J} and the coefficients a_n 's and b_n 's.

An important special class of measures are those that are in the *Nevai class*. This class is defined as all the measures for which there exists a and b such that

$$a_n \rightarrow a, \quad b_n \rightarrow b, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

The Nevai class of measures is rather large, but it is not easy to explicitly characterize in terms of properties of μ . A famous result of Denisov–Rakhmanov says that if a measure μ has essential support $[b - 2\sqrt{a}, b + 2\sqrt{a}]$ and the absolutely continuous part $\frac{d\mu}{dx} > 0$ almost everywhere on this interval, then μ is in the Nevai class (2.2).

We recall that for $a(z) = \sum_j a_j z^j$ the Toeplitz matrix \mathcal{T}_a with symbol a is defined as

$$(\mathcal{T}_a)_{jk} = a_{k-j}, \quad j, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Note that the Toeplitz matrix has two standard definitions in the literature, namely the one we have given or its transpose. In our definition we are motivated by (2.12) below.

Observe that if the measure μ is in the Nevai class (2.2), then the matrix \mathcal{J} is a compact perturbation of the Toeplitz matrix \mathcal{T}_s with symbol $s(z) = z + b + a/z$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{J}_{n+j,n+k} - (\mathcal{T}_s)_{n+j,n+k} \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.3)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It is important to note that the orthogonality measures for various classical orthogonal polynomials, such as Hermite and Laguerre polynomials, are not in the Nevai class. Indeed, the measures have unbounded support and the recurrence coefficients are unbounded. This is hardly surprising, since it is known that the asymptotic behavior of the Hermite and Laguerre polynomials is best described using a rescaling (so that their zeros accumulate on compact intervals), in other words, varying orthogonality. That is, while taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ as in (2.3), we introduce the n -dependence in the measure $\mu^{(n)}$, the recurrence coefficients $a_k^{(n)}$, $b_k^{(n)}$, monic orthogonal polynomials $p_n^{(n)}$, and the Jacobi matrix $\mathcal{J}^{(n)}$. If done appropriately, the following generalization for (2.3) is expected to be universal:

$$\mathcal{J}_{n+j,n+k}^{(n)} - (\mathcal{T}_s)_{n+j,n+k} \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.4)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for $s(a) = z + b + a/z$ and some $a > 0$.

Very roughly speaking, the limit (2.4) can be expected to hold if the zeros of $p_n^{(n)}$ accumulate on a single interval $[b - 2\sqrt{a}, b + 2\sqrt{a}]$. If they accumulate on several intervals, the limit is not true. This has been proved for varying measures of the type $e^{-nV(x)}dx$ where V is real analytic function with sufficient growth at infinity [19].

2.2 Recurrence matrices for multiple orthogonal polynomials

We now return to multiple orthogonal polynomials: let $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be a perfect system of measures. Then the type II multiple orthogonal polynomials satisfy the nearest neighbor recurrence relations (1.8) and the relations (1.9).

Now let us choose any path with (1.13). Note that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we have that $x p_{\vec{k}_n}^-(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $n + 1$. Therefore there exist

coefficients $J_{n,j}$ such that

$$xp_{\vec{k}_n}(x) = p_{\vec{k}_{n+1}}(x) + \sum_{j=0}^n J_{n,j} p_{\vec{k}_j}(x).$$

These coefficients can be organized into a matrix $J = (J_{n,j})_{n,j=0}^\infty$ (we take $J_{n,n+1} = 1$ for all n and $J_{n,j} = 0$ if $j \geq n+2$), and the above relation can be written as

$$x \begin{pmatrix} p_{\vec{k}_0}(x) \\ p_{\vec{k}_1}(x) \\ p_{\vec{k}_2}(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = J \begin{pmatrix} p_{\vec{k}_0}(x) \\ p_{\vec{k}_1}(x) \\ p_{\vec{k}_2}(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.5)$$

The matrix J with $J_{n,j} = 0$ for $j \geq n+2$ is said to be in (lower) Hessenberg form. The lower triangular part of J can be computed from the nearest neighbor recurrence (1.8) and (1.9), as we show in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $j_n \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be as in (1.13). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} xp_{\vec{k}_n}(x) &= p_{\vec{k}_{n+1}}(x) + b_{\vec{k}_n, j_n} p_{\vec{k}_n}(x) + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} \right) p_{\vec{k}_{n-1}}(x) \\ &+ \sum_{r=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} B_{n, \ell} B_{n-1, \ell} \cdots B_{n-r+1, \ell} \right) p_{\vec{k}_{n-r-1}}(x), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$B_{n, \ell} = b_{\vec{k}_{n-1} - \vec{e}_\ell, \ell} - b_{\vec{k}_{n-1} - \vec{e}_\ell, j_{n-1}}.$$

Proof. From (1.9) we find

$$p_{\vec{k}_n - \vec{e}_\ell} = p_{\vec{k}_{n-1}} + B_{n, \ell} p_{\vec{k}_{n-1} - \vec{e}_\ell},$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
xp_{\vec{k}_n}(x) &= p_{\vec{k}_{n+1}}(x) + b_{\vec{k}_n, j_n} p_{\vec{k}_n}(x) + \sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} p_{\vec{k}_n - \vec{e}_\ell} \\
&= p_{\vec{k}_{n+1}}(x) + b_{\vec{k}_n, j_n} p_{\vec{k}_n}(x) + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} \right) p_{\vec{k}_{n-1}}(x) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} B_{n, \ell} p_{\vec{k}_{n-1} - \vec{e}_\ell}(x) \\
&= p_{\vec{k}_{n+1}}(x) + b_{\vec{k}_n, j_n} p_{\vec{k}_n}(x) + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} \right) p_{\vec{k}_{n-1}}(x) \\
&\quad + \sum_{r=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_n, \ell} B_{n, \ell} B_{n-1, \ell} \cdots B_{n-r+1, \ell} \right) p_{\vec{k}_{n-r-1}}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the statement. \square

We see that J is more complicated than the Jacobi matrix \mathcal{J} for orthogonal polynomials. It is natural to ask whether (1.12) implies that there exists a Laurent polynomial $s(z) = \sum_{j=-q}^p s_j z^j$ such that

$$J_{n+j, n+k}^{(n)} - (\mathcal{T}_s)_{n+j, n+k} \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.7)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, similarly to (2.4). If (2.7) holds, then Theorem 1.3 follows from the results in [14] and we are done. Although it is true for some special cases (and we refer to [14] for examples), in general it is too much to ask for.

First of all, note that J depends on the specific path $\{k_{\vec{n}}\}$ and, in general, J will not be a banded matrix but only one-sided banded (Hessenberg). The matrix J will happen to be banded in very special cases such as the step-line path $\vec{k}_n = \vec{k}_{n-1} + \vec{e}_{n \bmod m}$ (here $n \bmod m$ is the remainder of the Euclidean division of n by m), which results in the so-called *step-line recurrence relation*.

Secondly, J depends on the nearest neighbor recurrences in a complicated fashion and there is no reason to expect that the entries of J behave in a simple way, even if (1.14) holds. In the examples in Section 5 we will see cases where one can obtain perturbations of block Toeplitz matrices, which is likely as good as it gets.

Our first main result of this paper is that (2.7) does hold if \mathcal{T}_s is replaced by the matrix representation of a Toeplitz operator in a *non-standard basis*, which we discuss in the next subsection.

2.3 Limiting behavior of recurrence matrices

Denote the space of rational functions on \mathbb{C} by \mathcal{R} and the (sub-)space of all polynomials by \mathcal{P} . We denote the operator that projects any rational function to its polynomial part by $P : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ and denote the embedding of \mathcal{P} into \mathcal{R} by $P^* : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. Note that

$$Pg(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} \frac{g(w)dw}{w-z}$$

where γ is a simple counter-clockwise oriented contour that goes around all poles of g and around the pole at z , and that with this integral representation it is easily verified that $Pp = p$ for any polynomial p and that $P(1/p) = 0$ if the degree of p is 1 or greater. Then for any rational function r we define the multiplication operator $M_r : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ by $M_r g = rg$ for all $g \in \mathcal{R}$. The Toeplitz operator $\tau_r : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, with symbol $r \in \mathcal{R}$, is now defined as the operator

$$\tau_r = PM_r P^*.$$

We will be specifically interested in the Toeplitz operator τ_c with the symbol

$$c(z) = z + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{z - b_j}. \quad (2.8)$$

with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, for any polynomial p ,

$$(\tau_c p)(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|w|=\alpha} p(w) \left(w + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{w - b_j} \right) \frac{dw}{w - z},$$

where $\alpha > \max\{|b_1|, \dots, |b_m|, |z|\}$.

For each $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ we define

$$\pi_{\vec{k}}(z) = \prod_{j=1}^m (z - b_j)^{k_j}.$$

Note that τ_c acts on such functions in a rather simple way. In fact, we have the following relation

$$\tau_c \pi_{\vec{k}} = \pi_{\vec{k} + \vec{e}_\ell} + b_\ell \pi_{\vec{k}} + \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \pi_{\vec{k} - \vec{e}_j}, \quad (2.9)$$

for $\ell = 1, \dots, m$ and $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$. By subtracting any pair of equations we also find

$$\pi_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_j} = \pi_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell} + (b_\ell - b_j)\pi_{\vec{k}} \quad (2.10)$$

for $\ell, j = 1, \dots, m$. It is illuminating to compare these two identities with (1.8) and (1.9) for multiple orthogonal polynomials.

The collection of all functions $\pi_{\vec{k}}$ can not be a basis since it has too many elements. We need to choose one polynomial of degree n for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, to obtain a basis. We do this using the path $\{\vec{k}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ with (1.13).

In analogy with (2.5), we define $T_c = (T_c)_{j,k=0}^\infty$ as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} (\tau_c \pi_{\vec{k}_0})(x) \\ (\tau_c \pi_{\vec{k}_1})(x) \\ (\tau_c \pi_{\vec{k}_2})(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = T_c \begin{pmatrix} \pi_{\vec{k}_0}(x) \\ \pi_{\vec{k}_1}(x) \\ \pi_{\vec{k}_2}(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.11)$$

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that an n -dependent family of perfect systems satisfies (1.14) along a path with (1.13). Let T_c be as in (2.11) and $J^{(n)}$ be the lower Hessenberg matrix corresponding to multiplication by x in the basis $\{p_{\vec{k}_n}^{(n)}(x)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ (see (2.5)). Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(J^{(n)})_{n+s,n+r} - (T_c)_{n+s,n+r} \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall s, r \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where c is (2.8) with $a_\ell = a_\ell(\vec{\nu})$ and $b_\ell = b_\ell(\vec{\nu})$.

Proof. Repeating the proof of Proposition 2.1 with (2.9)/(2.10) instead of (1.8)/(1.9), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_c \pi_{\vec{k}_n} &= \pi_{\vec{k}_{n+1}} + b_{j_n} \pi_{\vec{k}_n} + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_\ell \right) \pi_{\vec{k}_{n-1}}(x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_\ell \tilde{B}_{n,\ell} \tilde{B}_{n-1,\ell} \cdots \tilde{B}_{n-r+1,\ell} \right) \pi_{\vec{k}_{n-r-1}}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{B}_{n,\ell} = b_\ell - b_{j_{n-1}}.$$

Using this and (2.6) (with n -dependence), for $s \geq r + 2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (J^{(n)})_{n+s,n+r} - (T_c)_{n+s,n+r} &= \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_{\vec{k}_{n+s},\ell}^{(n)} B_{n+s,\ell}^{(n)} B_{n+s-1,\ell}^{(n)} \cdots B_{n+r+2,\ell}^{(n)} \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^m a_\ell \tilde{B}_{n+s,\ell} \tilde{B}_{n+s-1,\ell} \cdots \tilde{B}_{n+r+2,\ell} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now the condition (1.14) implies that the last expression goes to 0. For $s = r$ and $s = r + 1$ the proof is similar, while for $s < r$ there is nothing to prove due to the Hessenberg structure of $J^{(n)}$ and T_c . \square

Note that the operator τ_c is a Toeplitz *operator*, but T_c is *not* a Toeplitz *matrix*. To get a Toeplitz matrix, we change the basis $\{\pi_j(z)\}_{j=0}^\infty$ to $\{z^j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ in the equality (2.11). We obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau_c(1) \\ \tau_c(z) \\ \tau_c(z^2) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{T}_c \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ z \\ z^2 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.12)$$

where the matrix \mathcal{T}_c is the Toeplitz matrix (see (2.1)) with the symbol $c(z)$ (2.8). The matrices \mathcal{T}_c and T_c are related as indicated in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *For any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have*

$$T_r = S \mathcal{T}_r S^{-1},$$

where S is the triangular matrix

$$S_{j,k} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} \pi_{\vec{k}_j}(z) \frac{dz}{z^{k+1}}, \quad j, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where γ_0 is simple counter-clockwise oriented contour that goes around the origin.

Proof. By the Cauchy residue theorem,

$$S \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ z \\ z^2 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \pi_0(z) \\ \pi_1(z) \\ \pi_2(z) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The lemma follows from the fact that τ_r is linear on the space of polynomials \mathcal{P} . \square

3 One-sided band matrices

In this section, we recall and extend parts of [14] that are necessary for our proofs. The main results are Theorems 3.2 and 3.3. The most important differences are: (i) the analysis of [14] is restricted to band matrices, where as here we only require the matrices to be banded from one side; (ii) we will use the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula to establish that the fluctuations are Gaussian in a more direct way than in [14].

3.1 Determinants and traces of one-sided banded matrices

Consider the space \mathcal{B} of one-sided banded matrices $B = (B_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^\infty$. More precisely, $B \in \mathcal{B}$ if and only if there exists $b > 0$ (depending on B) such that $B_{ij} = 0$ for $j > i + b$. It is not hard to see that the space of such one-sided band matrices is closed under addition and matrix multiplication. Therefore, if $B \in \mathcal{B}$ then for any polynomial p the matrix $p(B)$ is well-defined and belongs to \mathcal{B} . In particular,

$$\exp_r(B) := \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{B^j}{j!}$$

is well defined.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we will be interested in

$$\det(P_n \exp_r(tB)P_n + Q_n),$$

where Q_n and P_n are the complementary projection matrices: P_n is the projection $(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)^T \mapsto (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0, 0, \dots)^T$, and $Q_n = I - P_n$.

Lemma 3.1. *For $B \in \mathcal{B}$, define*

$$C_m^{(n)}(B) = m! \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{l_1 + \dots + l_j = m \\ l_i \geq 1}} \frac{\text{Tr} P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n}{l_1! \dots l_j!},$$

Then

$$\log \det(P_n \exp_r(tB)P_n + Q_n) = \sum_{m=1}^r \frac{t^m}{m!} C_m^{(n)}(B) + \mathcal{O}(t^{r+1}),$$

as $t \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. This is a standard identity that can be proved by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\log \det (P_n \exp_r(tB)P_n + Q_n) &= \log \det(I + P_n(\exp_r(tB) - I)P_n) \\ &= \text{Tr} \log(I + P_n(\exp_r(tB) - I)P_n).\end{aligned}$$

Expanding the logarithm and then the exponential near $t = 0$, we get the statement. See, for example, [21, Lemma 4.1] (with $N = 1$). \square

The following theorem is an extension of the results from [14] for (two-sided) banded matrices.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $B^{(1)}, B^{(2)} \in \mathcal{B}$ and suppose that*

$$\left| B_{n+i,n+j}^{(1)} - B_{n+i,n+j}^{(2)} \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for any fixed $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| C_m^{(n)}(B^{(1)}) - C_m^{(n)}(B^{(2)}) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.2)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for any fixed $m = 2, 3, \dots$.

Proof. We first recall the statement of Lemma 4.1 in [14]. In equality $t = \log(1 + (e^t - 1))$ we expand the logarithm first and then the exponential, and then observing that all coefficients of t^m in the expansion vanish, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_j = m \\ \ell_i \geq 1}} \frac{1}{\ell_1! \dots \ell_j!} = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

for $m \geq 2$. As a consequence, it follows that for any infinite matrix $B = (B_{ij})_{i,j=1}^\infty$, and $m \geq 2$,

$$C_m^{(n)}(B) = m! \sum_{j=2}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{l_1 + \dots + l_j = m \\ l_i \geq 1}} \frac{\text{Tr} P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n - \text{Tr} P_n B^m P_n}{l_1! \dots l_j!}, \quad (3.4)$$

which is Lemma 4.1 in [14].

Let us now fix $m \geq 2$. For $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $B_{ij} = 0$ if $j > i + b$, we define

$$\widehat{B}_{ij}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} B_{ij} & \text{for } |i - n| \text{ and } |j - n| < 2m^2b, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

If we can show that

$$C_m^{(n)}(B) = C_m^{(n)}\left(\widehat{B}^{(n)}\right), \quad (3.5)$$

for n sufficiently large, then, by (3.1) and (3.5), we obtain (3.2) and this finishes the proof.

To prove (3.5), we use the representation (3.4), and analyze each summand on the right hand side. By definition of the trace, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n - \text{Tr} P_n B^m P_n \\ &= - \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{(r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}) \in I_{j,n}} \left(B^{l_1}\right)_{sr_1} \left(B^{l_2}\right)_{r_1 r_2} \dots \left(B^{l_j}\right)_{r_{j-1} s}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$I_{j,n} = \{(r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}) : r_i > n \text{ for some } i = 1, \dots, j-1\}.$$

Since B is one-sided banded, it follows that

$$\left(B^{l_i}\right)_{r_{i-1} r_i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, j, \quad (3.7)$$

if $r_i > r_{i-1} + l_i b$, with $r_0 = r_j = s$. Since $l_i \leq m$, it follows that (3.7) is 0 if $r_i > r_{i-1} + bm$. Combined with the fact that $s = r_0 \leq n$ and that there is an i such that $r_i > n$, it follows that the only possible contributions in (3.6) can come from the summands where $|r_i - n| < jmb \leq m^2 b$ for all i (including $r_0 = r_j = s$). Finally, for a chosen $i = 0, \dots, j$, let us write

$$\left(B^{l_i}\right)_{r_{i-1} r_i} = \sum_{(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{l_i-1})} B_{r_{i-1} t_1} B_{t_1 t_2} \dots B_{t_{l_i-1} r_i}.$$

Note that each of these summands is zero unless $t_k \leq t_{k-1} + b$ (we adopt $t_0 = r_{i-1}$ and $t_{l_i} = r_i$). Combining it with $|r_i - n| < m^2 b$, this leads to $|t_k - n| \leq m^2 b + l_i b < 2m^2 b$.

Therefore $C_m^{(n)}(B)$ only depends on the entries B_{ik} of B for which $|i - n|, |k - n| < 2m^2 b$. This proves (3.5). \square

The following is an important improvement over [14, 22].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and decompose $B = B_- + B_+$ such that*

1. B_- is strictly lower triangular;

2. B_+ is upper triangular and banded, that is, there exists $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(B_+)_{j,j+\ell} = 0$ for $\ell < 0$ and $\ell > b$;
3. $[B_-, B_+]Q_s = (B_-B_+ - B_+B_-)Q_s = 0$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then, for $m \geq 3$, $C_m^{(n)}(B) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof will make use of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula. We postpone the proof for a moment and proceed with an intermezzo on several well-known identities around the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula and some of their consequences.

3.2 Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula

The Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula gives an expression of Z in $\exp Z = \exp X \exp Y$ in terms of nested commutators of X and Y .

Before we state the form that we will need, we start with a more straightforward expansion stated in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, then*

$$\log e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} t^m \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \frac{A_1^{u_1} A_2^{v_1} \dots A_1^{u_j} A_2^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!}. \quad (3.8)$$

Remark 3.5. The series on the right-hand side (3.8) should be considered as formal series. As noted in the previous subsection, the space \mathcal{B} forms an algebra, so each of the coefficients on the right-hand side of (3.8) is well defined. Therefore the statement is to be interpreted in the following standard way: if, on the left-hand side, the exponential is replaced by its truncated series \exp_r and similarly for the logarithm, then each coefficient on the left-hand side matches the corresponding coefficient on the right-hand side for sufficiently large r .

Proof. This follows by expanding first the logarithm and then the exponentials in the following sequence of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \log e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} (e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2} - I)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1, v_1, \dots, u_j, v_j=0 \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}}^{\infty} t^{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j} \frac{A_1^{u_1} A_2^{v_1} \dots A_1^{u_j} A_2^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \end{aligned}$$

The sum can be further reorganized to

$$\begin{aligned} \log e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{m=j}^{\infty} t^m \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \frac{A_1^{u_1} A_2^{v_1} \dots A_1^{u_j} A_2^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} t^m \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \frac{A_1^{u_1} A_2^{v_1} \dots A_1^{u_j} A_2^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the statement. \square

This immediately implies the following.

Corollary 3.6. *Let A_1 and A_2 be infinite matrices with only finitely many non-zero entries. Then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \text{Tr} \frac{A_1^{u_1} A_2^{v_1} \dots A_1^{u_j} A_2^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} = 0,$$

for $m \geq 2$.

Proof. Since A_1 and A_2 have only finitely many entries, we can think of them as finite matrix. This means that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \log e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2} &= \log \det (e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2}) = \log \det (e^{tA_1}) \det (e^{tA_2}) \\ &= \log (e^{t \text{Tr } A_1} e^{t \text{Tr } A_2}) = t \text{Tr } A_1 + t \text{Tr } A_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the trace of the left-hand side of (3.8) is linear in t for finite matrices. Therefore the trace of the coefficients of t^m for $m \geq 2$ on the right-hand side must vanish and this proves the statement. \square

Remark 3.7. By taking $A_2 = 0$, the equality reduces to (3.3).

Remark 3.8. It is important to note that Corollary 3.6 does not hold for general infinite matrices A_1 and A_2 . Indeed, if A_1 or A_2 is not of trace class the traces in the summand are not necessarily well-defined and the statement does not make sense.

The Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula now states the far from obvious results that each coefficient of t^m on the right-hand side of (3.8) can be written as a nested commutator as stated in the next proposition. The form that we have chosen here is due to Dynkin [24].

Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_j be in \mathcal{B} . We define the nested commutator by

$$[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_j] = [X_1, [X_2, [\dots, [X_{j-2}, [X_{j-1}, X_j]] \dots]].$$

For example,

$$[X_1, X_2, X_3] = [X_1, [X_2, X_3]].$$

We can also take “powers” within nested commutator:

$$[X_1^{(\ell_1)}, X_2^{(\ell_2)}, \dots, X_j^{(\ell_j)}] = [\underbrace{X_1, X_1, \dots, X_1}_{\ell_1}, \underbrace{X_2, X_2, \dots, X_2}_{\ell_2}, \dots, \underbrace{X_j, X_j, \dots, X_j}_{\ell_j}].$$

For example,

$$[X_1^{(2)}, X_2^{(1)}] = [X_1, [X_1, X_2]].$$

Proposition 3.9 (Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula, Dynkin’s version).

$$\log e^{tA_1} e^{tA_2} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^m}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \frac{[A_1^{(u_1)}, A_2^{(v_1)}, \dots, A_1^{(u_j)}, A_2^{(v_j)}]}{u_1!v_1! \dots u_j!v_j!}. \quad (3.9)$$

As before, we point out that the series on the right-hand side of (3.9) is in general not convergent and has to be interpreted as a formal series. The point here is that the coefficients on the right-hand side of (3.9) match the ones on the right-hand side of (3.8). The proof of this fact is purely algebraic, see, for example, [9, 24].

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Now we return to the proof of Theorem 3.3.

We will need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.10. *Let B_{\pm} be as in Theorem 3.3. Then, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$B^{\ell} = (B_- + B_+)^{\ell} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \binom{\ell}{k} B_-^k B_+^{\ell-k} + A,$$

where A is a matrix such that $AQ_s = 0$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$ that depends on B and ℓ only.

Proof. Choose any $\sigma \in \{+, -\}^\ell$ and let ℓ_+ and ℓ_- be the number of $+$ and $-$ entries in σ , respectively. By successively changing the order of B_- 's and B_+ 's, it is not hard to see that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} B_{\sigma(j)} = B_-^{\ell_+} B_+^{\ell_-} + A_\sigma,$$

where A_σ is a linear combination of terms with each term being a product of B_- 's, B_+ 's and $[B_-, B_+]$ in a certain order. By assumption we have that $[B_-, B_+]$ has only finitely many non-trivial columns. Clearly, this structure is preserved if we multiply this commutator by an arbitrary matrix from the left. This also holds true if we multiply the commutator from the right by a lower triangular matrix. Finally, if we multiply from the right by an upper triangular matrix that is *banded*, then the number of non-trivial columns increases with the bandwidth b . Still, there are only finitely many non-trivial columns. Then there exists s_σ such that $AQ_{s_\sigma} = 0$. Hence the statement follows by taking $s = \max_{\sigma \in \{+, -\}^\ell} s_\sigma$. \square

Lemma 3.11. *Let B_\pm be as in Theorem 3.3. Then*

$$\text{Tr } P_n[B_+, A]P_n = \text{Tr } P_n[B_-, A]P_n = 0.$$

for any matrix A such that $AQ_s = 0$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and for n sufficiently large.

Proof. Let us start with $\text{Tr } P_n[B_+, A]P_n = 0$. Then for n sufficiently large,

$$\text{Tr } P_n B_+ A P_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (B_+)_{jk} A_{kj} = \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (B_+)_{jk} A_{kj} = \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{k=1}^{s+b} (B_+)_{jk} A_{kj}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\text{Tr } P_n A B_+ P_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_{kj} (B_+)_{jk} = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^s A_{kj} (B_+)_{jk} = \sum_{k=1}^{s+b} \sum_{j=1}^s A_{kj} (B_+)_{jk}.$$

Therefore, $\text{Tr } P_n[B_+, A]P_n = 0$ for n sufficiently large.

The proof of $\text{Tr } P_n[B_-, A]P_n = 0$ is even easier. Since $A = AP_n$ for $n \geq s$ and $P_n B_- = P_n B_- P_n$ we have $P_n[B_-, A]P_n = P_n B_- P_n A P_n - P_n A P_n B_- P_n$. Each term is a product of two finite square matrices, and for such products the trace is cyclic. \square

Corollary 3.12. *Let B_{\pm} be as in Theorem 3.3. Let $m \geq 3$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $u_1 + v_1 + \dots + u_j + v_j = m$ where $u_i + v_i \geq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, j$. Then*

$$\text{Tr } P_n [B_-^{(u_1)}, B_+^{(v_1)}, \dots, B_-^{(u_j)}, B_+^{(v_j)}] P_n = 0,$$

for n sufficiently large.

Proof. If $v_j > 1$, the nested commutator is trivially zero. If $v_j = 1$, then

$$[B_-^{(u_1)}, B_+^{(v_1)}, \dots, B_-^{(u_j)}, B_+^{(v_j)}] = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r],$$

where $r = u_1 + v_1 + \dots + u_j + v_j$, and where each $X_i = B_-$ or B_+ , and $X_{r-1} = B_-$ and $X_r = B_+$. Let

$$Y_i = [X_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_r], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, r-1.$$

Then $Y_{r-1} = [B_-, B_+]$, and by assumption it has a finite number of non-trivial columns. We assume that this property holds true for Y_i , and prove the same for Y_{i-1} . By definition, $Y_{i-1} = [X_{i-1}, Y_i]$. Since Y_i has only a finite number of non-trivial columns by assumption, and X_{i-1} is either lower triangular or upper triangular with finite bandwidth, it follows that both $X_{i-1}Y_i$ and Y_iX_{i-1} have only a finite number of non-trivial columns. The same property therefore holds true for Y_{i-1} and by induction for Y_2 . By Lemma 3.11 we obtain $\text{Tr } P_n Y_1 P_n = 0$, which proves the corollary for $v_j = 1$.

If $v_j = 0$ and $u_j > 1$, then the nested commutator is trivially zero. If $v_j = 0$ and $u_j = 1$, the arguments above apply, with the right-most part of the nested commutator being equal to $[B_+, B_-]$ instead of $[B_-, B_+]$. \square

Now we are ready for the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Our starting point is the following expression from the proof of Theorem 3.2:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr } P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n - \text{Tr } P_n B^m P_n \\ &= - \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_{j-1} \in I_{j,n}} \left(B^{l_1} \right)_{sr_1} \left(B^{l_2} \right)_{r_1 r_2} \dots \left(B^{l_j} \right)_{r_{j-1} s}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_{j,n} = \{r_1, \dots, r_{j-1} : r_i > n \text{ for some } i = 1, \dots, j-1\}.$$

As argued in the proof of Theorem 3.2, the one-side banded structure shows that this only depends on s and r_j that are within a certain distance of n .

In particular, one has $s > n - m^2b$ and $r_i > n - m^2b$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, j-1$, and thus by Lemma 3.10, it follows that, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n - \text{Tr} P_n B^m P_n \\ &= - \sum_{u_1=0}^{l_1} \dots \sum_{u_j=0}^{l_j} \binom{l_1}{u_1} \dots \binom{l_j}{u_j} \\ & \quad \text{Tr} \sum_{s=1}^n \sum_{r_1, \dots, r_{j-1} \in I_{j,n}} (B_-^{u_1} B_+^{v_1})_{sr_1} (B_-^{u_2} B_+^{v_2})_{r_1 r_2} \dots (B_-^{u_j} B_+^{v_j})_{r_{j-1} s}, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_j = l_j - u_j$. Note that we used that contributions from various matrices A (see lemma 3.10) disappear since $s > n - m^2b$ and $r_i > n - m^2b$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left(\frac{P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n - P_n B^m P_n}{l_1! \dots l_j!} \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \sum_{u_1=0}^{l_1} \dots \sum_{u_j=0}^{l_j} \frac{P_n B_-^{u_1} B_+^{v_1} P_n \dots P_n B_-^{u_j} B_+^{v_j} P_n - P_n B_-^{u_1} B_+^{v_1} \dots B_-^{u_j} B_+^{v_j} P_n}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \end{aligned}$$

By the triangular structure, we have $P_n B_- = P_n B_- P_n$ and $B_+ P_n = P_n B_+ P_n$, and hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr} \left(\frac{P_n B^{l_1} P_n \dots B^{l_j} P_n - P_n B^m P_n}{l_1! \dots l_j!} \right) = \\ & \text{Tr} \sum_{u_1=0}^{l_1} \dots \sum_{u_j=0}^{l_j} \frac{(P_n B_- P_n)^{u_1} (P_n B_+ P_n)^{v_1} \dots (P_n B_- P_n)^{u_j} (P_n B_+ P_n)^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \\ & \quad - \text{Tr} \sum_{u_1=0}^{l_1} \dots \sum_{u_j=0}^{l_j} \frac{P_n B_-^{u_1} B_+^{v_1} \dots B_-^{u_j} B_+^{v_j} P_n}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \end{aligned}$$

for n sufficiently large. Now, by Corollary 3.6 we can ignore the contribution

of the first term to $C_m^{(n)}(B)$ and write

$$\begin{aligned}
C_m^{(n)}(B) &= \\
& - m! \operatorname{Tr} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \frac{P_n B_-^{u_1} B_+^{v_1} \dots B_-^{u_j} B_+^{v_j} P_n}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \\
& = -m! \operatorname{Tr} P_n \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{u_1+v_1+\dots+u_j+v_j=m \\ u_i+v_i \geq 1}} \frac{B_-^{u_1} B_+^{v_1} \dots B_-^{u_j} B_+^{v_j}}{u_1! v_1! \dots u_j! v_j!} \right) P_n,
\end{aligned}$$

for $m \geq 2$. By (3.8) and the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff theorem we can rewrite this as nested commutators. Then by applying Corollary 3.12 we see that $C_m^{(n)}(B) = 0$ for $m \geq 3$ as claimed. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section we prove our main result, Theorem 1.3. The starting point is that the moment-generating function for the linear statistic can be written as a determinant involving the exponential of a one-sided banded matrix. We then employ the results from the previous section to prove Theorem 1.3.

4.1 Cumulants

We start by recalling the definition of the cumulants for $X_n(f) = \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j)$. For $r = 1, 2, \dots$, consider

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp_r(\lambda X_n(f))] = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{\lambda^j M_j^{(n)}(f)}{j!},$$

where $M_j^{(n)}(f) = \mathbb{E}[(X_n(f))^j]$ are the moments (we chose to work with \exp_r since the moment-generating function is not necessarily well-defined. An alternative is to work with formal expressions). The cumulants $C_m(X_n(f))$ are defined by

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp_r(\lambda X_n(f))] = \sum_{m=1}^r C_m(X_n(f)) \frac{\lambda^m}{m!} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{r+1}),$$

for λ in a neighbourhood of 0. It is easily verified that $C_m(X_n(f))$ defined in such a manner is indeed independent of $r > m$.

The first step is to give a formula for the cumulants $C_m(X_n(f))$ in terms of $f(J)$. We start with the following observation.

Lemma 4.1. *Let \vec{k}_i be a path satisfying (1.13), and let x_j for $j = 1, \dots, n$ be points randomly taken from (1.2) with $\vec{k} = \vec{k}_n$. Assume that $\{\mu_j(x)\}_{j=1}^m$ defined in (1.1) is a perfect system. Then for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and polynomial f , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp_r \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \right) \right] = \det(Q_n + P_n \exp_r(\lambda f(J)) P_n) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{r+1}),$$

for λ in a neighbourhood of 0, with J as defined in (2.5).

Remark 4.2. We will allow J, μ and w to depend on n . To avoid cumbersome notation we will suppress the n -dependence and just write J, μ and w from now on.

Proof. This lemma can be found in [21, Lemma 4.1] in a more general setup. For clarity and completeness we include a proof here.

We start with a standard biorthogonalization procedure. Let G be the $n \times n$ matrix given by

$$G_{i,j} = \int g_i(x) p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x) d\mu(x), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then, by Andreief's identity, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n!} \int \cdots \int \det \left(p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x_i) \right)_{i,j=1}^n \det \left(g_j(x_i) \right)_{i,j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^n d\mu(x_i) \\ = \det \left(\int p_{\vec{k}_{i-1}}(x) g_j(x) d\mu(x) \right)_{i,j=1}^n = \det G, \end{aligned}$$

and thus the normalizing constant for (1.2) equals $Z_{\vec{k}} = n! \det G$. Since (1.2) is assumed to be a probability measure, this determinant does not vanish and thus G is invertible. If we further define

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{g}_1(x) \\ \tilde{g}_2(x) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{g}_n(x) \end{pmatrix} = G^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} g_1(x) \\ g_2(x) \\ \vdots \\ g_n(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \int \tilde{g}_i(x) p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x) d\mu(x) &= \sum_{l=1}^n (G^{-1})_{i,l} \int g_l(x) p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^n (G^{-1})_{i,l} G_{l,j} = \delta_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

showing that $\{p_{\vec{k}_j}\}_{j=0}^{n-1}$ and $\{\tilde{g}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are biorthogonal. From the biorthogonality we find that

$$\int x^\nu p_{\vec{k}_i}(x) \tilde{g}_j(x) d\mu(x) = \int \sum_{s=0}^{i+\nu} (J^\nu)_{i,s} p_{\vec{k}_s}(x) \tilde{g}_j(x) d\mu(x) = (J^\nu)_{i,j}, \quad (4.1)$$

for $\nu = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Also, by standard row and column operations, the measure (1.2) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{n!} \det(p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x_i))_{i,j=1}^n \det(\tilde{g}_j(x_i))_{i,j=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n d\mu(x_j),$$

where the normalization constant is simply $n!$ by Andreiéf's identity and biorthogonality.

Now that we have finished the biorthogonalization procedure, let us return to the claim of the lemma. We start by noting that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp_r \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n \exp_r(\lambda f(x_j)) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{r+1}),$$

for λ in a neighbourhood of 0. Then it is easily verified, using Andreiéf's identity, that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=1}^n \exp_r(\lambda f(x_j)) \right] = \det \left(\int \exp_r(\lambda f(x)) p_{\vec{k}_{i-1}}(x) \tilde{g}_j(x) d\mu(x) \right)_{i,j=1}^n.$$

and since $\exp_r(\lambda f(x))$ is a sum of monomials (in x), the lemma follows from (4.1). \square

Together with Lemma 3.1 we thus find the following expression for the cumulants.

Corollary 4.3. For $m, n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$C_m(X_n(f)) = C_m^{(n)}(f(J)),$$

where

$$C_m^{(n)}(f(J)) = m! \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{j} \sum_{\substack{l_1 + \dots + l_j = m \\ l_i \geq 1}} \frac{\text{Tr} P_n f(J)^{l_1} P_n \dots f(J)^{l_j} P_n}{l_1! \dots l_j!},$$

and P_n is the projection onto the first n dimensions of $\ell_2(\mathbb{N})$.

4.2 Comparison with the right limit

Our next step is to show that the results of Section 3 imply the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. Under the conditions of Theorem 1.3 we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_m^{(n)}(f(J)) - C_m^{(n)}(T_{f \circ c}) = 0,$$

for any polynomial f , with

$$(f \circ c)(z) = f \left(z + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{a_j}{z - b_j} \right),$$

and $T_{f \circ c}$ is given by the matrix defined in (2.11) but with τ_c replaced by $\tau_{f \circ c}$.

Before we come to the proof of this lemma, we first mention an easier consequence of Theorem 3.2.

Corollary 4.5. Under the conditions of Theorem 1.3 we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_m^{(n)}(f(J)) - C_m^{(n)}(f(T_c)) = 0,$$

for any polynomial f .

Proof. Since J is banded from one-side and f is a polynomial, Theorem 2.2 implies

$$(f(J))_{n+\ell, n+m} - (f(T_c))_{n+\ell, n+m} \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.2)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The statement now follows from Theorem 3.2. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let f be a polynomial. Then, for any polynomial p ,*

$$\tau_{f \circ c} p - f(\tau_c) p$$

is a polynomial of degree less than or equal to $\deg f - 1$.

Proof. We recall that M_c is the multiplication operator on \mathcal{R} with multiplier $c(z) = z + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_j}{z-b_j}$. By definition, we have

$$\tau_{f \circ c} - f(\tau_c) = P f(M_c) P^* - f(P M_c P^*)$$

and since f is a polynomial, it suffices to show that

$$(P M_c^j P^*) p - (P M_c P^*)^j p,$$

is a polynomial of degree less than or equal to $j - 1$, for any polynomial p . It is clear that this holds for $j = 1$. We assume that it is true for $j - 1$ ($j \geq 2$), and prove it for j . We rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} (P M_c^j P^* - (P M_c P^*)^j) p &= P M_c (M_c^{j-1} P^* - P^* (P M_c P^*)^{j-1}) p \\ &= P M_c (M_c^{j-1} - P^* P M_c^{j-1}) p - P M_c q_{j-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where on the last step we use the induction hypothesis to replace $(P M_c P^*)^{j-1} p$ with $P M_c^{j-1} P^* p + q_{j-2}$, where q_{j-2} is some polynomial of degree less than or equal to $j - 2$. The first term $P M_c (M_c^{j-1} - P^* P M_c^{j-1}) p$ is a constant (indeed, for any rational function g we have that $P M_c (g - P^* P g)$ is a constant) and $P M_c q_{j-2}$ has degree less than or equal to $j - 1$, and thus we have proven the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.4. By Lemma 4.6 we see that the matrices $T_{f \circ c}$ and $f(T_c)$ only differ possibly in the first $\deg f - 1$ columns. Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(T_{f \circ c})_{n+\ell, n+m} - f(T_c)_{n+\ell, n+m} \rightarrow 0,$$

for any fixed ℓ, m . Thus, the statement follows from Theorem 3.2 and (4.2). \square

4.3 Computing the cumulants for the right-limit

We now compute the limiting behavior of $C_m^{(n)}(T_{f \circ c})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For the rest of the section let us put

$$r = f \circ c$$

for some given polynomial f .

We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *Split $r = r_+ + r_-$ where r_+ is the polynomial part of r , i.e. $r_+ = Pr$. Then*

1. $T_r = T_{r_+} + T_{r_-}$.
2. T_{r_+} is upper triangular and banded (more precisely, $(T_{r_+})_{j,j+k} = 0$ for $k < 0$ or $k > \deg r_+$),
3. T_{r_-} is strictly lower triangular,
4. $[T_{r_-}, T_{r_+}]Q_s = 0$ for $s \geq \deg r_+ - 1$.

Proof. 1. This is trivial.

2. By construction of the basis it follows that $r_+(z)\pi_{\vec{k}_n}$ can be expressed in term of $\pi_{\vec{k}_m}$ with only $n \leq m \leq n + \deg r_+$. Therefore, T_{r_+} is upper triangular and banded.

3. The polynomial part of r_-p for any polynomial p is a polynomial of strictly lower degree.

4. Note that

$$(\tau_{r_-}\tau_{r_+} - \tau_{r_+}\tau_{r_-})p(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} \frac{r_+(w) - r_+(z)}{w - z} r_-(w)p(w)dw,$$

where γ is a simple counter-clockwise oriented contour that goes around all poles of r_-p . Now, $\frac{r_+(w) - r_+(z)}{w - z}$ is a polynomial of degree $\deg r_+ - 1$ in z . After going to the basis $\{\pi_{\vec{k}_n}\}_n$ we see therefore that only the first $\deg r_+ - 1$ columns of $[T_{r_-}, T_{r_+}]$ contain non-zero entries. This proves the statement with $s \geq \deg r_+ - 1$. \square

By Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 4.7 we readily find the following corollary.

Corollary 4.8. *Let f be a polynomial. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_m^{(n)}(T_r) = 0,$$

for $m \geq 3$.

It remains to compute the limiting behavior of $C_2^{(n)}(T_r)$. For this, we will change basis and work with $C_2^{(n)}(\mathcal{T}_r)$ instead. This change of basis is surprisingly delicate.

Lemma 4.9. *Let f be a polynomial. Then*

$$C_2^{(n)}(T_r) = C_2^{(n)}(\mathcal{T}_r),$$

for n large enough.

Proof. We will use the decomposition $r = r_+ + r_-$ with $r_+ = Pr$. We wish to rely on the connection between T_r and \mathcal{T}_r from Lemma 2.3. First observe that

$$C_2^{(n)}(T_r) = -\text{Tr } P_n T_r P_n T_r P_n + \text{Tr } P_n (T_r^2) P_n = \text{Tr } P_n T_r Q_n T_r P_n.$$

Because of the triangular structure,

$$P_n T_{r_-} Q_n = 0, \quad Q_n T_{r_+} P_n = 0,$$

and thus we can write

$$C_2^{(n)}(T_r) = \text{Tr } P_n T_{r_+} Q_n T_{r_-} P_n.$$

Now, recalling Lemma 2.3, we change basis from $\{\pi_{\vec{k}_n}\}_n$ to the canonical basis $\{z^n\}_n$. This change of basis shows that T_{r_\pm} and \mathcal{T}_{r_\pm} are related by conjugation with a lower triangular matrix S ,

$$T_{r_\pm} = S \mathcal{T}_{r_\pm} S^{-1}.$$

Thus, we can write

$$C_2^{(n)}(T_r) = \text{Tr } P_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_+} S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} S^{-1} P_n. \quad (4.3)$$

It remains to argue that we can drop the $S^{\pm 1}$ everywhere on the right-hand side. This is in fact not obvious since P_n and $S^{\pm 1}$ do not commute.

By the lower-triangular structure of S , we have

$$P_n S^{\pm 1} = P_n S^{\pm 1} P_n \quad \text{and} \quad S^{\pm 1} Q_n = Q_n S^{\pm 1} Q_n.$$

This implies that

$$P_n S P_n S^{-1} P_n = P_n \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n S Q_n S^{-1} Q_n = Q_n. \quad (4.4)$$

This allows us to rewrite (4.3) to

$$C_2^{(n)}(T_r) = \text{Tr } P_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} S^{-1} P_n.$$

Now insert $I = P_n + Q_n$ after the \mathcal{T}_{r_-} at the right-hand side to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(n)}(T_r) &= \text{Tr } P_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n S^{-1} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n S^{-1} P_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Tr } AB = \text{Tr } BA$ if A, B are of finite rank and by (4.4), we can simplify the first term at the right-hand side to

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(n)}(T_r) &= \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n S^{-1} P_n. \end{aligned}$$

By inserting $I = P_n + Q_n$ before \mathcal{T}_{r_-} in the first term at the right-hand side we find

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(n)}(T_r) &= \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n S^{-1} P_n. \end{aligned}$$

In the first term at the right-hand side we use (4.4). For the third term, we note that since \mathcal{T}_{r_-} is lower triangular we have $\mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n = Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n$ and combining this with (4.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(n)}(T_r) &= \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n S P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n S^{-1} P_n. \end{aligned}$$

Using the cyclicity of the trace in the second and third term we find

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(n)}(T_r) &= \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n S^{-1} P_n S P_n. \end{aligned}$$

By the triangular structure we have $P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n = P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-}$ and $Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n = \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n$, so we can drop the Q_n and P_n between the matrices $\mathcal{T}_{r_{\pm}}$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(n)}(T_r) &= \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S P_n \\ &\quad + \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} \mathcal{T}_{r_-} Q_n S^{-1} P_n S P_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q_n P_n = O$ we have $Q_n S^{-1} Q_n S P_n = -Q_n S^{-1} P_n S P_n$ and thus

$$C_2^{(n)}(T_r) = \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n + \text{Tr } P_n [\mathcal{T}_{r_+}, \mathcal{T}_{r_-}] Q_n S^{-1} P_n S P_n.$$

Now, by the same argumentation as in Lemma 4.7, we have $[\mathcal{T}_{r_+}, \mathcal{T}_{r_-}]Q_n = O$ for n large enough, and thus,

$$C_2^{(n)}(\mathcal{T}_r) = \text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n = C_2^{(n)}(\mathcal{T}_r) \quad (4.5)$$

which proves the statement. \square

The benefit of working with $C_2^{(n)}(\mathcal{T}_r)$ over $C_2^{(n)}(T_r)$ is that it is much easier to compute.

Lemma 4.10. *Let f be a polynomial. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_2^{(n)}(\mathcal{T}_r) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j r_j r_{-j}.$$

Proof. This follows directly by rewriting (4.5)

$$\text{Tr } P_n \mathcal{T}_{r_+} Q_n \mathcal{T}_{r_-} P_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\ell=k}^{\infty} r_{\ell} r_{-\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \min(j, n) r_j r_{-j},$$

and then taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

4.4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Proof. To prove that $X_n(f) - \mathbb{E}X_n(f)$ converge to a Gaussian in distribution, it is sufficient (1) to show that $C_m(X_n(f)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for $m \geq 3$ and (2) to compute $C_2(X_n(f))$. Corollary 4.3 shows that these cumulants are given by $C_m^{(n)}(f(J))$. By Lemma 4.4 it suffices to consider the limiting behavior of $C_m^{(n)}(T_{f \circ c})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Corollary 4.8 tells us that the higher cumulants indeed tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The second cumulant is computed using Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10. \square

5 Applications

In this section we will illustrate the main results with some applications. We will prove CLT's for the MOPE's related to the multiple Hermite, Laguerre, Charlier, Krawtchouk, and Meixner polynomials and also discuss them in the context of random matrix theory and integrable probability.

5.1 GUE with external source and Multiple Hermite polynomials

Let us give more details here on the example from the Introduction. So consider (1.4) where H is a diagonal matrix with m distinct values h_1, \dots, h_m on the diagonal with multiplicities k_1, \dots, k_m . Then the eigenvalues of a matrix M chosen randomly from (1.4) form a MOPE with weights

$$w_\ell(x) = e^{-n\left(\frac{1}{2}x^2 - h_\ell x\right)}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, m.$$

The recurrence coefficients of the multiple Hermite polynomials of type II, denoted by $p_{\vec{k}}$ for $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$ are then given by (1.11). We readily verify that the conditions of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied which gives us the following result.

Corollary 5.1. *Let $\{\vec{k}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a path satisfying (1.13). Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be the eigenvalues of a random matrix from GUE with external source as defined in Section 1.1, where the eigenvalues h_1, \dots, h_m of H have multiplicities \vec{k}_n (h_1, \dots, h_m are fixed and independent of n while the sum of their multiplicities varies and is equal to n). Then for any polynomial f with real coefficients, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j) \right] \rightarrow N \left(0, \sum_{\ell=1}^\infty \ell f_\ell f_{-\ell} \right),$$

in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$f_\ell = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma f \left(z + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\nu_j}{z - h_j} \right) \frac{dz}{z^{\ell+1}}$$

and γ is a contour around the poles h_j with counter-clockwise orientation, where ν_j is the limit in (1.13).

Proof. We have nearest neighbour recurrence relations (1.11) which has the form of (1.8) with $a_{\vec{k},j}^{(n)} = \frac{k_j}{n}$ and $b_{\vec{k},j}^{(n)} = h_j$. We readily verify condition (1.14). Namely, for any path \vec{k}_n satisfying (1.13) and any fixed $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $a_{\vec{k}_{n+s},j}^{(n)} \rightarrow \nu_j$ and $b_{\vec{k}_{n+s},j}^{(n)} \rightarrow h_j$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then Theorem 1.3 proves our statement. \square

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first CLT for this model. Although one may argue that the point process is determinantal and that there are explicit double integral formulas for the kernel [7], which means that proving a CLT using steepest descent techniques on these integrals should be possible, we emphasize that the many technical details in that approach increase with m . Our approach makes a very direct verification possible, without all the cumbersome technical details.

We end this example with a comment on the fact that the results of [14] are not sufficient for proving the above CLT. As mentioned before, the main assumption for the CLT in [14] was that the right limit of the recurrence matrix J in (2.5) is constant along the diagonals. We claim that this is only possible for the multiple Hermite polynomials in case $m = 1$. This is most easily understood by an example: Consider the external source model with $m = 2$, the values $h_1 \neq h_2$ on the diagonal and multiplicities $(n/2, n/2)$ with n even. Then take the family of polynomials $\{p_{\vec{k}_j}\}_{j=0}^n$ where $\vec{k}_j = (\lfloor (j+1)/2 \rfloor, \lfloor j/2 \rfloor)$ and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ stands for the largest integer less than or equal x . From the recurrences (1.11) and (1.9), we then see that

$$xp_{\vec{k}_j}(x) = \begin{cases} p_{\vec{k}_{j+1}}(x) + h_1 p_{\vec{k}_j}(x) + \frac{k_{1,j} + k_{2,j}}{n} p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x) - \frac{k_{1,j}(h_2 - h_1)}{n} p_{\vec{k}_{j-2}}(x), & j \text{ even} \\ p_{\vec{k}_{j+1}}(x) + h_2 p_{\vec{k}_j}(x) + \frac{k_{1,j} + k_{2,j}}{n} p_{\vec{k}_{j-1}}(x) + \frac{k_{2,j}(h_2 - h_1)}{n} p_{\vec{k}_{j-2}}(x), & j \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore there is a 2-periodic structure along the diagonals in the recurrence matrix J , and every right limit will have this 2-periodicity. In fact, the right limit is a particular block Toeplitz matrix. The proof of the CLT in [14] only apply to cases where the right limit is a scalar Toeplitz matrix and the extension to block Toeplitz is in general false. For instance, in the multi-cut case for unitary ensembles the right-limit can be a block Toeplitz matrix, but we know that there is no CLT in the multi-cut case. See, for example, [14] for a discussion. The point is that the block Toeplitz matrix in this example with multiple Hermite polynomials is of a very special type.

5.2 Wishart ensembles and Multiple Laguerre polynomials

In the next example, we consider the measure

$$(\det M)^\alpha e^{-n \operatorname{Tr} M \Sigma} dM,$$

on the space of positive definite matrices, where $\alpha > 0$ and Σ is a diagonal matrix with strictly positive entries. We will study the case where Σ has precisely m different values $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ on the diagonal with multiplicities

k_1, \dots, k_m . It is known that the eigenvalues of M form a multiple orthogonal polynomial ensemble, with weights now given by

$$w_j(x) = x^\alpha e^{-n\sigma_j x}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

The multiple orthogonal polynomials are called multiple Laguerre polynomials *of the second kind* [44] and are denoted by $L_{\vec{k}}^{\alpha, \vec{\sigma}}$ where $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$. The nearest neighbor recurrences now are given by

$$xL_{\vec{k}}^{\alpha, \vec{\sigma}}(x) = L_{\vec{k} + \vec{e}_\ell}^{\alpha, \vec{\sigma}}(x) + b_{\vec{k}, \ell} L_{\vec{k}}^{\alpha, \vec{\sigma}}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m a_{\vec{k}, j} L_{\vec{k} - \vec{e}_j}^{\alpha, \vec{\sigma}}(x)$$

and [44, § 3.6.2]

$$a_{\vec{k}, j} = \frac{k_j(|\vec{k}| + \alpha)}{n^2 \sigma_j^2}, \quad b_{\vec{k}, j} = \frac{|\vec{k}| + \alpha + 1}{n \sigma_j} + \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{k_r}{n \sigma_r}.$$

We see directly that also here the conditions of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied, so we obtain the CLT of Theorem 1.3 with $a_j = \frac{\nu_j}{\sigma_j^2}$ and $b_j = \frac{1}{\sigma_j} + \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{\nu_r}{\sigma_r}$. Note that we can even let α depend linearly on n which will change the parameters in the CLT in an obvious way. To the best of our knowledge, the CLT for Wishart ensembles has not appeared in the literature before.

5.3 Discrete multiple orthogonal polynomials

The examples above are well-known in the literature. It is lesser known that discrete multiple orthogonal polynomials also appear in integrable probability. We will discuss three families of examples related to multiple Charlier, multiple Krawtchouk, and multiple Meixner polynomials, based on Markov processes for non-colliding particles. It is interesting to note that these Markov processes are special cases of the more general Schur process and the Multiple Orthogonal Polynomial Ensembles are particular specializations of the Schur measure. This connection is not needed to understand the examples, but we will include a detailed explanation of these claims in the last paragraph for completeness. We refer to [12, 29] for excellent lecture notes containing more background on the general constructions of this paragraph, including a more detailed discussion about Schur processes and how they appear in integrable probability.

5.3.1 Markov processes on Weyl chambers

Let $P_t(x - \xi)$ be the transition kernel (for the probability to jump from ξ to x after time t) for a single particle Markov process (time may be discrete or continuous) on \mathbb{Z} . We will mainly be interested in the cases of the Poisson process

$$P_t(x) = \begin{cases} e^{-t} \frac{t^x}{x!}, & x = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, \\ 0, & x < 0, \end{cases} \quad t > 0, \quad (5.1)$$

the simple random walk with binomial transition function

$$P_t(x) = \begin{cases} p^x (1-p)^{t-x} \binom{t}{x}, & x = 0, 1, \dots, t, \\ 0, & x < 0 \text{ or } x > t, \end{cases} \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (5.2)$$

and the random walk where each jump is geometrically distributed with parameter $a \in (0, 1)$ (and the parameter is constant in time), having the negative binomial distribution as transition function

$$P_t(x) = \begin{cases} (1-a)^t \binom{t-1+x}{t-1} a^x, & x = 0, 1, \dots, \\ 0, & x < 0, \end{cases} \quad t = 1, 2, \dots \quad (5.3)$$

There is a standard construction for defining non-colliding processes with n particles, starting from these Markov processes, using Doob's h -transform [35]. The key to this construction is the fact that $k \mapsto \alpha^k$ is a harmonic function for the transition kernel $P_t(x - \xi)$. That is,

$$\sum_x P_t(x - \xi) \alpha^x = c_{t,\alpha} \alpha^\xi,$$

for some constant $c_{t,\alpha}$. On the Weyl Chamber

$$W_n = \{x_1 < \dots < x_n \mid x_j \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

we can then, using the Cauchy–Binet identity, define a Markov process by taking the transition function

$$\frac{1}{n! \prod_i c_{t,\alpha_i}} \det (P_t(x_i - \xi_j))_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\det (\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\det (\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n} \quad (5.4)$$

For now the coefficients α_j are arbitrary, but all with distinct values, in $(0, 1]$. Since the states space is n -dimensional and ordered, we can think of the full process as a collection of n processes. Each of these processes is driven by P_t but they can never leave the Weyl chamber. We say that the processes are *non-colliding*.

5.3.2 Choosing special parameters

We will start Markov process with transition functions (5.4) from consecutive integers $\xi_j = j - 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. This special initial condition is important for the connection to multiple orthogonal polynomials. Indeed, with this choice the determinant $\det P_t(x_i - \xi_j)$ reduces to the following product containing the Vandermonde determinant

$$\det (P_t(x_i - j + 1))_{i,j=1}^n = \det (x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_t(x_j).$$

The weight function μ_t depends on the choice of the transition function (5.1), (5.2), or (5.3), and we will do this step case by case in the discussion below.

Apart from fixing the initial positions we also specify the values of α_j 's. While (5.4) was defined with distinct α_j 's, we would like to consider the case where some or all are allowed to be equal, and for this purpose we give the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Consider*

$$\frac{\det (\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\det (\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n} \tag{5.5}$$

as a function of $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^n$, with distinct α_j 's different from zero. The function (5.5) extends to a continuous function for $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^n \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^n$. When several values of α_j are the same, denote $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^n = \{\gamma_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^m$ with γ_ℓ 's, and let $k_\ell = \#\{j : \alpha_j = \gamma_\ell \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n\}$. Then

$$\frac{\det (\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\det (\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n} = \frac{\det (g_j(x_i))_{i,j=1}^n}{\det (g_j(\xi_i))_{i,j=1}^n},$$

where the g_j 's are given by (1.3) with $w_j(x) = \gamma_j^x$.

Proof. The proof that we will give here is based on a standard procedure using l'Hôpital's rule. The point here is that determinants in (5.5) are both zero when $\alpha_j = \alpha_k$ for some $j \neq k$. We therefore have to consider limits $\alpha_j \rightarrow \alpha_k$.

First note that the ratio in (5.5) is a symmetric function of α_j 's (in fact, by (1.5) it is a ratio of Schur polynomials and therefore a well-defined continuous function of $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^n \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})^n$ for distinct x_j and distinct ξ_j). If all α_j 's are distinct we may therefore assume that they are ordered by growth $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n$. Also assume that γ_ℓ 's are ordered by growth $\gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_m$.

Now set $\alpha_1 = \gamma_1$ and consider the limit $\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1$. As function of α_2 the numerator and denominator have a simple zero at α_1 . Thus, by l'Hôpital's rule we find

$$\lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \frac{\det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\det(\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n} = \lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \det(\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n} = \lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \frac{\alpha_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\alpha_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \det(\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n}$$

Now the numerator and denominator can be computed using the rule

$$\lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \left(\alpha_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \right) \det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n = \det \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots \\ \alpha_1^{x_i} & x_i \alpha_1^{x_i} & \alpha_3^{x_i} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix}$$

When we next take $\alpha_3 \rightarrow \alpha_1$ then it is important to note that α_1 is a double zero of the determinant as a function of α_3 . We thus have to apply l'Hôpital's rule with the second derivative:

$$\lim_{\alpha_3 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \frac{\det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\det(\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n} = \lim_{\alpha_3 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \frac{\left(\alpha_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_3} \right)^2 \alpha_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n}{\left(\alpha_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_3} \right)^2 \alpha_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \det(\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n}.$$

And now

$$\lim_{\alpha_3 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \lim_{\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1} \left(\alpha_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_3} \right)^2 \left(\alpha_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_2} \right) \det(\alpha_j^{x_i})_{i,j=1}^n = \det \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots \\ \alpha_1^{x_i} & x_j \alpha_1^{x_i} & x_j^2 \alpha_1^{x_i} & \alpha_4^{x_i} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

By iterating this procedure the statement follows. For α_j for $j = 1, \dots, k_1$ we apply l'Hôpital's rule with using higher derivatives $(\alpha_j \partial / \partial \alpha_j)^{j-1}$ and

this changes the j -th column into $x_i^{j-1} \alpha_1^{x_i}$. Then we start over by setting $\alpha_{k_1+1} = \gamma_2$ and continue applying l'Hôpital's rule for $\alpha_{k_2+2} \rightarrow \alpha_{k_1+1}$ and so on. \square

By the lemma, we thus see that in all three cases of (5.1), (5.2), and (5.3) the positions x_j at time t have the joint probability function proportional to

$$\det(x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^n \det(g_j(x_i))_{i,j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_t(x_j), \quad (5.6)$$

where the g_j 's are given by (1.3) with $w_j(x) = \gamma_j^x$ and corresponding multiplicity k_j , and thus form multiple orthogonal polynomial ensembles.

Our purpose is now to show that the CLT in Theorem 1.3 applies when both $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, Theorem 1.3 can be used to provide information on the long time behavior for large collections of non-colliding processes.

5.3.3 Multiple Charlier Ensemble

Consider $P_t(u)$ as in (5.1) and let us start the process at consecutive integers $\xi_j = j - 1$, for $j = 1, \dots, n$. The heart of the matter is the fact that

$$P_t(x + 1 - j) = (-1)^{j+1} t^{-j+1} e^{-t} \frac{t^x}{x!} (-x)_{j-1}, \quad x \geq 0,$$

where $(a)_j$ stands for the Pochhammer symbol $(a)_j = a(a+1)(a+2) \cdots (a+j-1)$. Thus, up to the factor $t^x/x!$, we see that $P_t(x + 1 - j)$ is a polynomial of degree $j - 1$ in x . Therefore (after using some standard rules for determinants), we see that

$$\det(P_t(x_i - j + 1))_{i,j=1}^n = c_n(t) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{t^{x_i}}{x_i!} \det(x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^n,$$

for some $c_n(t)$ independent of the x_i 's.

Concluding, we find that the joint density (5.6) at time t indeed defines a MOPE on the non-negative integers, with $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$, where $|\vec{k}| = n$, and

$$w_j(x) = \gamma_j^x, \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad \mu_t(x) = \frac{t^x}{x!}.$$

The multiple orthogonal polynomials are called the Multiple Charlier polynomials, denoted by $C_{\vec{k}}(x)$. Observe that in the case $m = 1$, these are indeed

the classical Charlier polynomials. The nearest neighbor recurrence coefficients for $C_{\vec{k}}$ have been computed explicitly in [43]. By taking the parameter a_j in [43] to be $a_j = t\gamma_j$ we find

$$xC_{\vec{k}}(x) = C_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}(x) + b_{\vec{k},\ell}C_{\vec{k}}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m a_{\vec{k},j}C_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}(x).$$

where

$$a_{\vec{k},j} = k_j t \gamma_j, \quad b_{\vec{k},\ell} = t\gamma_\ell + |\vec{k}|.$$

To get a reasonable limit theorem, we need to rescale the time parameter and space parameters. The explanation of this is that after long time the particles will spread out over a large interval and the CLT applies after an appropriate rescaling of time and space. It turns out the correct rescaling is $t = n\tau$ and $x = n\xi$. By setting $\tilde{C}_{\vec{k}}(\xi) = n^{-|\vec{k}|}C_{\vec{k}}(n\xi)$ we obtain

$$\xi\tilde{C}_{\vec{k}}(\xi) = \tilde{C}_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}(\xi) + \tilde{b}_{\vec{k},\ell}\tilde{C}_{\vec{k}}(\xi) + \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{a}_{\vec{k},j}\tilde{C}_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}(\xi).$$

where

$$\tilde{a}_{\vec{k},j} = k_j \tau \gamma_j / n \quad \tilde{b}_{\vec{k},\ell} = \tau \gamma_\ell + \frac{|\vec{k}|}{n}.$$

Now one readily verifies that the conditions of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied. We get the CLT theorem 1.3 with $a_j = \nu_j \tau \gamma_j$ and $b_j = \tau \gamma_j + 1$.

The multiple Charlier ensemble with $m = 2$ has appeared before (although not explicitly mentioned). Indeed, in [20], the dynamics on interlacing particles systems of [11] with two speeds was studied. By taking the marginal density at the horizontal level with n particles, we obtain exactly the process described here. The different coefficients γ_1 and γ_2 represent two different speeds in the evolution of the particle system. The main result of [20] was the computation of the long time behavior of global fluctuation for the two dimensional system, which turns out to be described by the Gaussian Free Field. Observe that the proof of the fluctuations of the present paper avoids many of the technical details that one needs to overcome in the approach of [20]. In fact, in an effort to keep the number of technical details to a minimum, [20] deals with only two possible speeds, whereas here we can allow m different values without much extra effort.

5.3.4 Multiple Krawtchouk Ensemble

Let us now consider the case (5.2). Now note that

$$\frac{\chi_{i-1 \leq x \leq t+i-1}(x)}{(x-i+1)!(t-x+i-1)!} = (-1)^{n-1} \frac{(-x)_{i-1}(-t-n+1+x)_{n-i}}{x!(t+n-1-x)!},$$

for $x = 0, \dots, t+n-1$. This implies that

$$P_t(x_i + 1 - j) = (p/(1-p))^{x_i} \frac{q_j(x_i)}{x_i!(t+n-1-x_i)!},$$

for $x_i = 0, \dots, t+n-1$, where q_j is a polynomial of degree $n-1$. In fact, all q_1, \dots, q_n can be shown to be linearly independent and thus, after some standard rules for determinants, we find

$$\det (P_t(x_i + 1 - j))_{i,j=1}^n = c_n(p, t) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(p/(1-p))^{x_i}}{x_i!(t+n-1-x_i)!} \det (x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^n,$$

where $c_n(p, t)$ is a constant independent of the x_i 's.

Concluding, we find that the process (5.4) at time t is indeed a MOPE on $\{0, 1, \dots, t+n-1\}$, with $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$ where $|\vec{k}| = n$, and

$$w_j(x) = \gamma_j^x, \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad \mu_t(x) = \frac{(p/(1-p))^x}{x!(t+n-1-x)!}.$$

These are the weights for the Multiple Krawtchouk Polynomials $K_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p}, t+n-1}$ that were studied in [5, 25, 45]. Here $\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ where $p_j \in (0, 1)$ is the unique solution to $\gamma_j p/(1-p) = p_j/(1-p_j)$. Naturally, when $m = 1$, these reduce to the standard Krawtchouk polynomials. The nearest neighbor recurrence relation reads (see [25, Section 3.4])

$$x K_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p}, t+n-1}(x) = K_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}^{\vec{p}, t+n-1}(x) + b_{\vec{k}, \ell} K_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p}, t+n-1}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m a_{\vec{k}, j} K_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}^{\vec{p}, t+n-1}(x). \quad (5.7)$$

where

$$a_{\vec{k}, j} = p_j(1-p_j)k_j(t+n-|\vec{k}|),$$

and

$$b_{\vec{k}, j} = (t+n-1-|\vec{k}|)p_j + \sum_{\ell=1}^m k_\ell(1-p_\ell).$$

After a rescaling $t = \lfloor n\tau \rfloor$ (with $\lfloor q \rfloor$ denoting the integer part of q), $x = yn$, and $\tilde{K}_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p},\tau}(y) = n^{-|\vec{k}|} K_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p},[n\tau]+n-1}(x)$, (5.9) becomes

$$y\tilde{K}_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p},\tau}(y) = \tilde{K}_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}^{\vec{p},\tau}(y) + \frac{b_{\vec{k},\ell}}{n}\tilde{K}_{\vec{k}}^{\vec{p},\tau}(y) + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_{\vec{k},j}}{n^2}\tilde{K}_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}^{\vec{p},\tau}(y).$$

Now it is easy to see that the conditions (1.14) are satisfied and Theorem 1.3 applies with $a_j = p_j(1-p_j)\nu_j\tau$ and $b_j = \tau p_j + \sum_{r=1}^m \nu_r(1-p_r)$.

5.3.5 Multiple Meixner ensemble

The last example that we will consider is that of the multiple Meixner polynomials where consider the Markov chain with P_t as in (5.3). We will only consider times $t \geq n$ and comment on $1 \leq t < n$ in the end of this paragraph.

First note that, for $t \geq n$, we have

$$\binom{t+x-i}{t-1} = \frac{(t-n)!}{(t-1)!} \frac{(t-n+1)_x}{x!} (t-n+x+1)_{n-i} (x-i+2)_{i-1}$$

Hence

$$P_t(x+1-j) = \frac{(t-n+1)_x a^x}{x!} q_j(x),$$

where q_j is a polynomial of degree $n-1$. And therefore (again after matrix manipulations) we find

$$\det(P_t(x_i+1-j))_{i,j=1}^n = c_n(a,t) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{(t-n+1)_{x_i} a^{x_i}}{x_i!} \det(x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1}^n,$$

for some $c_n(a,t)$ independent of the x_i 's.

Concluding, we find that the process (5.4) at time t is indeed a MOPE on $\{0, 1, \dots\}$, with $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$, and

$$w_j(x) = \gamma_j^x, \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad \mu_t(x) = \frac{(t-n+1)_x a^x}{x!}.$$

These are precisely the weights for the multiple Meixner polynomials $M_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(x)$ of the first kind (there are two families of multiple Meixner polynomials). They satisfy the recurrence relations ([25, Section 3.3])

$$xM_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(x) = M_{\vec{k}+\vec{e}_\ell}^{(1)}(x) + b_{\vec{k},\ell}M_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^m a_{\vec{k},j}M_{\vec{k}-\vec{e}_j}^{(1)}(x). \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$a_{\vec{k},j} = (t - n + |\vec{k}|) \frac{k_j a \gamma_j}{(1 - a \gamma_j)^2},$$

and

$$b_{\vec{k},j} = (t - n + 1 + |\vec{k}|) \frac{a \gamma_j}{1 - a \gamma_j} + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{k_i}{1 - a \gamma_i}.$$

To get a reasonable limit we set $t = n\tau$ and scale $x = n\xi$. After setting $\tilde{M}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(\xi) = n^{-|\vec{k}|} M_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(n\xi)$ we obtain the recurrence

$$\xi \tilde{M}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(\xi) = \tilde{M}_{\vec{k} + \vec{e}_\ell}^{(1)}(\xi) + \frac{b_{\vec{k},\ell}}{n} \tilde{M}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}(\xi) + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{a_{\vec{k},j}}{n^2} \tilde{M}_{\vec{k} - \vec{e}_j}^{(1)}(\xi). \quad (5.9)$$

Now it is easy to see that the conditions (1.14) are satisfied and Theorem 1.3 applies with

$$a_j = \frac{\tau \nu_j a \gamma_j}{(1 - a \gamma_j)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad b_j = \frac{\tau a \gamma_j}{1 - a \gamma_j} + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\nu_i}{1 - a \gamma_i}.$$

We end this example by commenting on the condition that $t \geq n$. Note that this condition does not enter in the previous examples on multiple Charlier and multiple Krawtchouk polynomials. The reason is not merely technical but has an interpretation. Recall that our state space is the Weyl chamber and we have n processes that are non-colliding. One can verify by evaluating the determinant in (5.4) with (5.3) explicitly, that if at time t the j -th process (counted from below) has location x and the $(j+1)$ -th process has location $x+1$, then the j -th process will be blocked by the $(j+1)$ -th process, i.e., will not be able to jump at time $t+1$. Therefore it will remain at location x at time $t+1$. Since the processes start at n consecutive initial points at $t=0$, the lowest process will only be able to move starting from $t=n$. At time $t \leq n$ only the top t processes have been able to move. This phenomenon does not occur in the previous two examples where each process is able to move at all times $t > 0$.

Finally, note that for $t=n$, we have $\mu(x) = a^x$ and the MOPE is exactly the last example from the Introduction.

5.3.6 Multi-time fluctuations

In the three examples, we have only considered the distribution of the positions at a fixed time. It is also possible to look at the joint distribution at several times.

Let $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_N$ and set $\Delta_r = t_r - t_{r-1}$ for $r = 1, \dots, N$. Denote the positions of the processes at time t_r by x_j^r for $r = 1, \dots, N$ and order them according to $x_1^r < \dots < x_n^r$. Then the probability of having the processes go through the points $\{x_j^r\}_{j,r=1}^{n,N}$ at times t_1, \dots, t_m is proportional to

$$\det(P_{\Delta_1}(x_i^1 - \xi_j))_{i,j=1}^n \left(\prod_{r=2}^N \det(P_{\Delta_r}(x_i^r - x_j^{r-1}))_{i,j=1}^n \right) \frac{\det(\alpha_j^{x_i^N})_{i,j=1}^n}{\det(\alpha_j^{\xi_i})_{i,j=1}^n}, \quad (5.10)$$

giving a product of $N+1$ terms. This raises the interesting question whether we can describe the multi-time fluctuations using multiple orthogonal polynomials. In [21] this was done for regular orthogonal polynomials (that is, $m = 1$). In that paper it was proved that the multi-time fluctuations are governed by the two-dimensional Gaussian Free Field with Dirichlet boundary conditions using properties of the orthogonal polynomials and the two-dimensional extension of the methods introduced in [14]. We expect a similar statement to be true in our setting, perhaps by a similar argument as in [21]. We will not address this very interesting question in this paper, but do intend to return to this topic in future work.

5.3.7 Schur measure and process

For completeness we describe how the dynamics of above is a special example of the Schur process and the MOPE are special examples of the Schur measure.

Let $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\infty$, $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\infty$ and $c \geq 0$. Assume that $0 \leq a_j < 1$ and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (a_j + b_j) < \infty.$$

Then, for $|z| < 1$, define

$$H(z; a, b, c) = e^{cz} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 + b_j z}{1 - a_j z} \quad (5.11)$$

and set

$$H(z; a, b, c) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} h_k(a, b, c) z^k$$

We also set $h_k = 0$ for $k \leq 0$. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ be a partition. That is, $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_j$ whenever $i \leq j$. Denote the length of the partition by $\ell(\lambda) = \max\{k \mid \lambda_k > 0\}$ (we will always assume $\ell(\lambda) < \infty$). Then the Schur function is defined by

$$s_\lambda(a, b, c) = \det \left(h_{\lambda_j - j + i}(a, b, c) \right)_{i,j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \quad (5.12)$$

This is the Jacobi-Trudi formula for Schur functions. If $b = 0, c = 0$ and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n, 0, 0, \dots)$ then it can be shown that this equals the Schur polynomial defined in (1.5) for $\ell(\lambda) \leq n$ and 0 for $\ell(\lambda) > n$.

For two partitions λ and μ we say that $\lambda \geq \mu$ if and only if $\lambda_j \geq \mu_j$. The skew Schur function is defined as

$$s_{\lambda/\mu}(a, b, c) = \det \left(h_{\lambda_j - j - \mu_i + i}(a, b, c) \right)_{i,j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)}, \quad (5.13)$$

for $\lambda \geq \mu$ and $s_{\lambda/\mu}(a, b, c) = 0$ otherwise. Note that if μ is the trivial partition (i.e. $\mu_j = 0$) then $s_{\lambda/\mu} = s_\lambda$. Also, $s_{\lambda/\mu}(0, 0, 0) = 1$ if $\lambda = \mu$ and $s_{\lambda/\mu}(0, 0, 0) = 0$ otherwise.

To be precise, our definitions (5.12) and (5.13) are specializations of (skew) Schur functions. The (skew) Schur functions are elements of the algebra Λ of symmetric functions in infinitely many variables (for a proper definition of this algebra see [12]). The definitions above are the result of applying different specializations to that algebra (a specialization is an algebra homomorphism between Λ and \mathbb{C}). In fact, these are known as the Schur positive specializations since these are precisely all specializations such that $s_\lambda \geq 0$ for any λ .

The Schur measure, introduced by Okounkov in [40], is the probability measure on partitions λ given by

$$\mathcal{P}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{Z} s_\lambda(\rho_+) s_\lambda(\rho_-),$$

where Z_n is a normalizing constant and ρ_\pm are of the form $\rho_\pm = (a_\pm, b_\pm, c_\pm) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\infty \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\infty \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Note that (1.6) is a special case for an appropriate choice of ρ_+ and ρ_- . The Schur process, introduced by Okounkov and Reshitikhin in [41], is the probability measure on a pair of sequences of partitions $\{\lambda^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^N$ and $\{\mu^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{N-1}$ such that $\lambda^{(j)} \geq \mu^{(j)}$ and $\lambda^{(j+1)} \geq \mu^{(j)}$ for $j = 1, \dots, N-1$ proportional to

$$s_{\lambda^{(1)}}(\rho_+^{(1)}) \left(\prod_{j=2}^N s_{\lambda^{(j-1)}/\mu^{(j-1)}}(\rho_-^{(j-1)}) s_{\lambda^{(j)}/\mu^{(j-1)}}(\rho_+^{(j)}) \right) s_{\lambda^{(N)}}(\rho_-^{(N)}) \quad (5.14)$$

where $\rho_{\pm}^{(j)} = (a_{\pm}^{(j)}, b_{\pm}^{(j)}, c_{\pm}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$. It follows from the Cauchy-Binet identity that the marginal densities for each $\lambda^{(j)}$ or $\mu^{(j)}$ in the Schur process are Schur measures. For future reference, we recall that if $\rho_{-}^{(j)} = (0, 0, 0)$ then $\mu^{(j)} = \lambda^{(j)}$, for $j = 1, \dots, N-1$ (with probability one).

Coming back to the Markov chain, we show first that the transition probabilities can be rewritten using Schur function where the parameters depend on the choice (5.1), (5.2) or (5.3).

Lemma 5.3. *Set $\lambda_j = x_{n-j+1} - n + j$ and $\mu_j = y_{n-j+1} - n + j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$.*

Then, with P_t as in (5.1), we have

$$\det (P_t(x_i - y_j))_{i,j=1}^n = d_t s_{\lambda/\mu}(0, 0, t),$$

and d_t is some constant.

With P_t as in (5.2), we have

$$\det (P_t(x_i - y_j))_{i,j=1}^n = d_t s_{\lambda/\mu}(0, b^t, 0)$$

$$\text{where } b^t = \left(\underbrace{\frac{p}{1-p}, \dots, \frac{p}{1-p}}_t, 0, 0, \dots \right) \text{ and } d_t \text{ is some constant.}$$

With P_t as in (5.3), we have

$$\det (P_t(x_i - y_j))_{i,j=1}^n = d_t s_{\lambda/\mu}(a^t, 0, 0)$$

where $a^t = (\underbrace{a, \dots, a}_t, 0, 0, \dots)$ and d_t is some constant.

Proof. First note that in the new variables (after flipping the order of the rows of columns)

$$\det (P_t(x_i - y_j))_{i,j=1}^n = \det (P_t(\lambda_i - i - \mu_j + j))_{i,j=1}^n$$

By the Jacobi-Trudi formula (5.13), we thus need to show that

$$P_t(k) = c_{t,a,b,c} h_k(a, b, c),$$

where a, b and c are as indicated in the lemma for the three different situations and $c_{t,a,b,c}$ is a constant independent of k . That means we need to verify that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_t(k) z^k = c_{t,a,b,c} H(z; a, b, c).$$

In each of the three cases these are some elementary Taylor series leading to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_t(k) z^k = \begin{cases} e^{t(z-1)}, & \text{for (5.1)} \\ (1-p+pz)^t, & \text{for (5.2)} \\ \left(\frac{1-a}{1-az}\right)^t, & \text{for (5.3).} \end{cases}$$

Comparing this with (5.11) gives the statement. \square

Using this lemma we see that probability measure (5.10) can be written as a product of Schur functions (with properly chosen parameters). Now note that in the change of variables the initial condition $\xi_i = i - 1$ is mapped to the empty partition. Thus, by Lemma 5.3 and (1.5) we see that we can write the multi-time probability function (5.10) as a probability density function on sequences of partitions $\lambda^{(1)} \leq \lambda^{(2)} \leq \dots \leq \lambda^{(N)}$, where $\lambda_j^{(r)} = x_{n-j+1}^r - n + j$, proportional to

$$s_{\lambda^{(1)}}(\rho_{\Delta_1}) \left(\prod_{r=2}^N s_{\lambda^{(r)}/\lambda^{(r-1)}}(\rho_{\Delta_r}) \right) s_{\lambda^{(N)}}(\alpha, 0, 0).$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_N, 0, \dots)$ and ρ_{Δ_r} are the parameters indicated in Lemma 5.3. By comparing this to (5.14) we see that this is a special case of the Schur process where $\rho_+^{(j)} = \rho_{\Delta_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$, $\rho_-^{(j)} = (0, 0, 0)$ (and hence $\mu^{(j)} = \lambda^{(j)}$) for $j = 1, \dots, N - 1$, and $\rho_-^{(N)} = (\alpha, 0, 0)$. For $N = 1$ the marginal distribution of $\lambda^{(1)}$ is proportional to

$$s_{\lambda^{(1)}}(\rho_{\Delta_1}) s_{\lambda^{(1)}}(\alpha, 0, 0),$$

and is a special case of Schur measure [40]. We recall that the three classical discrete MOPE's discussed above arise as the fixed time marginal distribution when setting $\alpha_j \rightarrow q_k$ for q_1, \dots, q_m with corresponding multiplicities k_1, \dots, k_m , which shows that these MOPE's are particular specializations of the Schur measure.

References

- [1] A.I. Aptekarev, *Multiple orthogonal polynomials*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 99 (1998), no. 1–2, 423–447.
- [2] A. I. Aptekarev, S. A. Denisov, M. L. Yatsselev, *Self-adjoint Jacobi matrices on trees and multiple orthogonal polynomials*, to appear in Transactions of the AMS, arXiv:1806.10531v1.

- [3] A.I. Aptekarev, M. Derevyagin, W. Van Assche, *Discrete integrable systems generated by Hermite-Padé*, Nonlinearity 29 (2016), 1487–1506.
- [4] A. I. Aptekarev, R. Kozhan, *Differential equations for the recurrence coefficients limits for multiple orthogonal polynomials from a Nevai class*, preprint.
- [5] J. Arvesu, J. Coussement, and W. Van Assche, *Some discrete multiple orthogonal polynomials*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 153 (2003), no 1–2, 19–45.
- [6] J. Baik, G. Ben Arous, and S. Péché, *Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for non-null complex sample covariance matrices*, Ann. Probab. 33, (2005) no. 5, 1643–1697.
- [7] P.M. Bleher, A.B.J. Kuijlaars, *Integral representations for multiple Hermite and multiple Laguerre polynomials*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 55 (2005), no. 6, 2001–2014.
- [8] P.M. Bleher and A.B.J. Kuijlaars, *Random matrices with external source and multiple orthogonal polynomials*, Internat. Math. Research Notices 2004 (2004), 109–129.
- [9] A. Bonfiglioli and R. Fulci, *Topics in noncommutative algebra. The theorem of Campbell, Baker, Hausdorff and Dynkin*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2034. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [10] A. Borodin, *Biorthogonal Ensembles*, Nuclear Phys. B 536 (1998), no. 3, 704–732.
- [11] A. Borodin and P. Ferrari, *Anisotropic growth of random surfaces in $2+1$ dimensions*, Comm. Math. Phys. 325 (2014), no. 2, 603–684.
- [12] A. Borodin and V. Gorin, *Lectures on integrable probability*, arXiv:1212.3351
- [13] A. Borodin, V. Gorin, A. Guionnet, *Gaussian asymptotics of discrete β -ensembles*, Publications mathématiques de l’IHÉS 125, no. 1 (2017), 1–78.
- [14] J. Breuer and M. Duits, *Central Limit Theorems for biorthogonal ensembles and asymptotics of recurrence coefficients*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 30 (2017) No. 1, 27–66.

- [15] J. Breuer and M. Duits, *Universality of mesoscopic fluctuations in orthogonal polynomial ensembles*, Comm. Math. Phys. 342 (2016), no. 2, 491–531.
- [16] J. Breuer and D. Ofner, *Mesoscopic universality for orthogonal polynomial ensembles on the unit circle*, in preparation.
- [17] E. Brézin and S. Hikami, *Correlations of nearby levels induced by a random potential*, Nucl. Phys., B 479 (1996), 697–706.
- [18] A. Bufetov and V. Gorin, *Fluctuations of particle systems determined by Schur generating functions*, Adv. Math 338 (2018), 702–781.
- [19] P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, K.T.-R. McLaughlin, S. Venakides, and X. Zhou, *Uniform asymptotics for polynomials orthogonal with respect to varying exponential weights and applications to universality questions in random matrix theory*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 52 (1999), 1335–1425.
- [20] M. Duits, *The Gaussian free field in an interacting particle system with two jump rates*, Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. 66 (2013), no. 4, 600–643.
- [21] M. Duits, *On global fluctuations for non-colliding processes*, Ann. of Prob. 2018, Vol. 46, No. 3, 1279–1350.
- [22] M. Duits and R. Kozhan, *Relative Szegő Asymptotics for Toeplitz determinants*, accepted for publication in International Mathematics Research Notices
- [23] M. Duits, A.B.J. Kuijlaars and M. Mo, *The Hermitian two matrix model with an even quartic potential*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 217 (2012), no. 1022, 105 pp.
- [24] E. Dynkin, *Calculation of the coefficients in the Campbell–Hausdorff formula* (in Russian), Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR 57 (1947), pp. 323–326.
- [25] M. Haneczok and W. Van Assche, *Interlacing properties of zeros of multiple orthogonal polynomials*, J. of Math. Analysis and Appl., Volume 389, Issue 1, 1 May 2012, Pages 429–438
- [26] A. Hardy, *Average characteristic polynomials of determinantal point processes*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 51, no. 1 (2015), 283–303.

- [27] K. Johansson, *Random matrices and determinantal processes*, Mathematical Statistical Physics, Elsevier B.V. Amsterdam (2006) 1–55.
- [28] K. Johansson, *On fluctuations of eigenvalues of random Hermitian matrices*, Duke Math. J. 91 (1998), no. 1, 151–204.
- [29] K. Johansson, *Edge fluctuations of limit shapes*. In: Current Developments in Mathematics 2016, D. Jerison et al. (eds.), Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 47–110 (2018)
- [30] D. Jonsson, *Some limit theorems for the eigenvalues of a sample covariance matrix*, J. Multivariate Anal. 12 (1982), no.1, 1–38.
- [31] A.B.J. Kuijlaars, *Multiple orthogonal polynomial ensembles*, in ‘Recent trends in orthogonal polynomials and approximation theory’, Contemp. Math. 507, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 155–176.
- [32] A.B.J. Kuijlaars and K. McLaughlin, *A Riemann-Hilbert problem for biorthogonal polynomials*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 178 (2005), 313–320.
- [33] A.B.J. Kuijlaars and L. Molag, *The local universality of Muttalib-Borodin biorthogonal ensembles with parameter $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$* , Nonlinearity 32 (2019), no. 8.
- [34] A.B.J. Kuijlaars and L. Zhang, *Singular Values of Products of Ginibre Random Matrices, Multiple Orthogonal Polynomials and Hard Edge Scaling Limits*, Comm. Math. Phys., 332 (2014), no. 2, 759–781.
- [35] W. König, *Orthogonal polynomial ensembles in probability theory*, Probab. Surveys 2 (2005), 385–447.
- [36] G. Lambert, *CLT for biorthogonal ensembles and related combinatorial identities*, Adv. in Math. 329 (2018) 590–648.
- [37] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Second edition. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995. x+475 pp.
- [38] F. Ndayiragije and W. Van Assche, *Multiple Meixner polynomials and non-Hermitian oscillator Hamiltonians*, J. Phys. A, 46(50):505201, 17, 2013.

- [39] E.M. Nikishin, V.N. Sorokin, Rational Approximations and Orthogonality, in: Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 92, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991.
- [40] A. Okounkov, *Infinite wedge and random partitions*, Selecta Math. 7 (2001), pp. 57–81.
- [41] A. Okounkov, N. Reshetikhin, *Correlation functions of Schur process with application to local geometry of a random 3-dimensional Young diagram*. Journal of American Mathematical Society, 16 (2003), 581–603.
- [42] W. Van Assche, J. Geronimo and A.B.J. Kuijlaars, *Riemann-Hilbert problems for multiple orthogonal polynomials*. In: Bustoz J., Ismail M.E.H., Suslov S.K. (eds) Special Functions 2000: Current Perspective and Future Directions. NATO Science Series (Series II: Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry), vol 30. Springer, Dordrecht
- [43] W. Van Assche, *Nearest neighbor recurrence relations for multiple orthogonal polynomials*, J. of Approx. Theory 163 (2011), 1427–1448.
- [44] W. Van Assche, *Orthogonal and multiple orthogonal polynomials, random matrices, and Painlevé equations*, arXiv:1904.07518
- [45] W. Van Assche, Chapter 23, in Classical and Quantum Orthogonal Polynomials in One Variable (by M.E.H. Ismail), Volume 98 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2005.