

Noise sensitivity of second-top eigenvectors of Erdős-Rényi graphs and sparse matrices

Jaehun Lee *

January 10, 2020

Abstract

We consider eigenvectors of adjacency matrices of Erdős-Rényi graphs and study the variation of their directions by resampling the entries randomly. Let \mathbf{v} be the eigenvector associated with the second-largest eigenvalue of the Erdős-Rényi graphs. After choosing k entries of the given matrix randomly and resampling them, we obtain another eigenvector \mathbf{w} corresponding to the second-largest eigenvalue of the matrix obtained from the resampling procedure. We prove that, in a certain sparsity regime, \mathbf{w} is “almost” orthogonal to \mathbf{v} with high probability if $k \gg N^{5/3}$. On the other hand, if $k \ll q^2 N^{2/3}$, where q is the sparsity parameter, we observe that \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} are “almost” collinear. This extends the recent work of Bordenave, Lugosi and Zivotovskiy to the Erdős-Rényi model.

1 Introduction

Let $X = (x_{ij})$ be a symmetric $N \times N$ matrix with positive integer N . The matrix X is said to be a *Wigner random matrix* if it satisfies the following properties:

- (i) For $i \leq j$, the x_{ij} are independent random variables and centered. The other entries are automatically defined by symmetry.
- (ii) For some $\sigma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}x_{ij}^2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i < j, \\ \sigma^2 & \text{for } i = j. \end{cases}$$

The class of Wigner matrices is one of the most important classes in random matrix theory. The spectrum of a Wigner matrix has been deeply analyzed and many remarkable results have been proved thus far. Eigenvectors of Wigner matrices have also attracted much attention. The joint distribution of the coordinates, the size of the largest (or smallest) coordinate and the ℓ^p -norm are the main properties of interest.

Very recently, Bordenave, Lugosi and Zivotovskiy investigated another aspect of eigenvectors, especially the *top eigenvector*, the unit eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue [BLZ19]. They studied how the direction of the top-eigenvector varies by *resampling* some entries of a given Wigner matrix. In other words, their main interest is the *noise sensitivity* of the top eigenvector. For the notion of

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST, ljhiverson@kaist.ac.kr

noise sensitivity, we refer to the seminal work of Benamini, Kalai, and Schramm [BKS99].

The resampling procedure introduced in [BLZ19] is as follows. For a positive integer $k \leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2}$, let $S_k = \{(i_1 j_1), \dots, (i_k j_k)\}$ be a random set of k distinct pairs of positive integers (with $i_m \leq j_m$) which is chosen uniformly from the family of all sets of k distinct pairs. In the resampling procedure, a pair $(i_m j_m)$ is used to denote an index of a matrix entry.

Definition 1.1 (Resampling procedure). *Let $X' = (x'_{ij})$ be an independent copy of X . Write the new random matrix $X^{[k]} = (x^{[k]}_{ij})$ generated from the given Wigner matrix X , by resampling entries. For $i \leq j$, we define $x^{[k]}_{ij}$ according to*

$$x^{[k]}_{ij} = \begin{cases} x'_{ij} & (ij) \in S_k, \\ x_{ij} & (ij) \notin S_k. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The remaining entries of $X^{[k]}$ are determined by symmetry.

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_N$ be the ordered eigenvalues of X and, let \mathbf{v}_1 be the top eigenvector of X . Similarly, we use the notation $\lambda_1^{[k]} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_N^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ for the ordered eigenvalues and the top eigenvectors of $X^{[k]}$.

Here we assume one additional property for the distribution of x_{ij} :

(iii) There exists some constant $\vartheta > 0$ such that, for all $i \leq j$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(|x_{ij}|^\vartheta)] \leq \vartheta^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

Theorem 1.2 ([BLZ19, Theorem 1]). *Let X be a Wigner matrix and assume (1). Let $X^{[k]}$ be the matrix obtained by the resampling procedure in Definition 1.1. If $k \gg N^{5/3}$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]} \right\rangle \right| = o(1) \quad (3)$$

According to Theorem 1.2, we can say, roughly, that \mathbf{v}_1 is almost orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ when more than $O(N^{5/3})$ entries are resampled. On the other hand, if k is much smaller than $N^{5/3}$ (precise description below), the behavior of $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ is completely different. In such a case, it can be shown that \mathbf{v}_1 and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ lie almost on the same line, i.e.,

$$\left| \left\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]} \right\rangle \right| \sim 1. \quad (4)$$

Let us assume that \mathbf{v}_1 and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ has almost the same direction, and consider

$$\|\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}\|_\infty. \quad (5)$$

It is well known that unit eigenvectors of Wigner matrices *delocalize*, i.e. the ∞ -norm is bounded above by $(\log N)^C N^{-1/2}$ for some $C > 0$. Due to this delocalization result, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\log N^C}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (6)$$

We need a sharper bound than (6) in order to describe (4). This sharper bound is given in the next theorem.




Figure 1: An illustration for Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. On the left, the number k of resampled entries is much larger than $N^{5/3}$. Then, according to Theorem 1.2, \mathbf{v}_1 are almost orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$. Contrarily, on the right, it is observed that \mathbf{v}_1 and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ are almost on the same line when k is far less than $N^{5/3}$. In that case, \mathbf{v}_1 and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ have almost the same direction or almost opposite directions. The latter is illustrated in this figure.

Theorem 1.3 ([BLZ19, Theorem 2]). *Let X and $X^{[k]}$ be as in Theorem 1.2. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\max_{k \leq N^{5/3} L^{-C}} \min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \sqrt{N} \|\mathbf{v}_1 - s \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}\|_\infty$$

converges to 0 in probability where L is a logarithmic control parameter defined by

$$L \equiv L_N := (\log N)^{\log \log N}, \quad N \geq 3. \quad (7)$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq k \leq N^{5/3} L^{-C}} \min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \|\mathbf{v}_1 - s \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}\|_2 \right] = o(1). \quad (8)$$

where for $N \geq 3$

$$L \equiv L_N := (\log N)^{\log \log N}. \quad (9)$$

Combining Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, we can see a phase transition of $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ around $k \sim N^{5/3}$. Now we raise the following question.

- Can we get an analogous result for the class of *sparse random matrices*?

There are a lot of interesting classes of random matrices besides Wigner matrices. One of the most important is the class of *sparse random matrices*. Roughly speaking, a given random matrix is said to be sparse if it has many zero entries (see Remark 2.5 for more detailed description). The adjacency matrix of a *sparse Erdős-Rényi graph* is one of the typical examples. The Erdős-Rényi graph is a random graph connecting any two distinct nodes by an edge, independently, with probability p . Thus, the adjacency matrix of an Erdős-Rényi graph is a symmetric random matrix and its entries have the Bernoulli distribution with parameter p .

Let $A \equiv A_N$ be the adjacency matrix of the Erdős-Rényi graph on N vertices with edge density p . The matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is an $N \times N$ symmetric matrix and all entries are independent up to symmetry.




Figure 2: Simulation for the Wigner random matrices. On the left (a), $k = \lfloor N^{11/6} \rfloor \gg N^{5/3}$ so we observed the realizations of inner product $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]} \rangle$ gather around 0 as expected in Theorem 1.2. On the right (b), the contrary case, $k = \lfloor N^{4/3} \rfloor \ll N^{5/3}$, is described. The absolute value of $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]} \rangle$ tends to be close to 1, which is consistent with Theorem 1.3.

The edge density p is replaced by a *sparsity parameter* $q \equiv q(N)$ by setting $q = \sqrt{pN}$. We assume the sparsity parameter q satisfies

$$(\log N)^{\log \log N} \ll q \ll \sqrt{N}. \quad (10)$$

Under a normalization, each entry of the matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}$ is distributed as follows. If $i \leq j$,

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} \zeta/q & \text{with probability } q^2/N, \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - q^2/N, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\zeta := (1 - q^2/N)^{-1/2}. \quad (11)$$

From the matrix A , we generate the new $N \times N$ matrix $H = (h_{ij})$ by extracting the mean. Each entry h_{ij} is defined according to

$$h_{ij} = a_{ij} - \mathbb{E}a_{ij}, \quad (12)$$

and satisfies the moment conditions

$$\mathbb{E}|h_{ij}|^m \leq \frac{1}{Nq^{m-2}} \quad (m \geq 2). \quad (13)$$

Many outstanding results have been achieved for the Erdős-Rényi graph [BGBK19, BHY17, EKYY12, EKYY13, HKM18]. Especially, it is well-known that the unit eigenvectors of the adjacency matrices of the Erdős-Rényi graph delocalize under some general conditions. Furthermore, the top eigenvector converges to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(1, \dots, 1) \quad (14)$$

$N^{-1/2}(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ in the ℓ^2 -sense with very high probability (see Lemma 3.7). This implies that the direction of the top eigenvector is almost deterministic. Therefore the naive answer to the question raised above would be “No” for sparse random matrices with nonzero mean.

However, it should be noted that the largest eigenvalue of sparse Erdős-Rényi graphs behaves differently when compared to that of Wigner matrices. In both of these classes of random matrices the eigenvalue distribution converges to the *semicircle distribution* (see (33)), but in the case of Wigner matrices, the largest eigenvalue sticks to the edge of the semicircle distribution. In contrast, the largest eigenvalue of the sparse Erdős-Rényi model stays far away from the support of the semicircle distribution [EKYY13, KS03]. In the sparse Erdős-Rényi model, the second largest eigenvalue is the largest eigenvalue converging to the edge of the semicircle distribution [BGBK17, EKYY13]. Thus, one might expect that the *second top eigenvector*, a unit eigenvector associated with the second largest eigenvalue, shows the desired phase transition behavior.

When we consider an eigenvector not associated with the largest eigenvalue, there is one technical difficulty. In [BLZ19], the authors explicitly use the fact that the top-eigenvector maximizes a quadratic form to prove Theorem 1.2, in the following way. Let X and Y be a Wigner random matrix and the one obtained from X by resampling a single entry. Let us say \mathbf{v} is the top-eigenvector of X and \mathbf{w} is that of Y . Then, by definition, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{w}, (X - Y)\mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{v}, X\mathbf{v} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{w}, Y\mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \langle \mathbf{v}, (X - Y)\mathbf{v} \rangle \quad (15)$$

because \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} maximize $\langle \mathbf{v}, X\mathbf{v} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{w}, Y\mathbf{w} \rangle$ respectively. Consequently, we need to develop some way to circumvent this issue when considering the second top eigenvector. Actually, it can be done using the fact that the largest eigenvalue is far from the second largest eigenvalue in the sparse Erdős-Rényi model.

Indeed, we prove that the second top eigenvector of sparse Erdős-Rényi graphs behaves exactly like the top eigenvector of Wigner matrices under the resampling procedure, when we assume a certain condition on the *sparsity parameter*. For the adjacency matrix of an Erdős-Rényi graph, the sparsity parameter is associated with the expected degree of each node. We shall specify why a certain condition on the sparsity parameter is needed. Interestingly, this is related with the tail bound of the gap between adjacent eigenvalues.

It should be noted that research on sparse random matrices have real-world applications. The Erdős-Rényi graph is a standard model for a random network. In terms of this random graph, resampling an entry corresponds to creating or removing an edge with some probability. Thus, resampling in sparse random matrices can be regarded as a perturbation of a random network. Moreover, when we analyze data in matrix form, eigenvectors tend to have more information than their associated eigenvalues. Thus, we hope that the above-described phase transition of second-top eigenvectors will find relevance in network theory and the other information sciences.

2 Results

Consider the adjacency matrix A of an Erdős-Rényi graph on N vertices with edge density $p = q^2/N$. We consistently assume

$$L \ll q \ll \sqrt{N} \quad (16)$$

where L is the logarithmic control parameter in (7). Let $A' = (a'_{ij})$ be an independent copy of A . We obtain $A^{[k]} = (a^{[k]}_{ij})$ from the adjacency matrix A by following Definition 1.1, the resampling procedure.

Note that, for $i \leq j$, the entry $a_{ij}^{[k]}$ is defined according to

$$a_{ij}^{[k]} = \begin{cases} a'_{ij} & (ij) \in S_k, \\ a_{ij} & (ij) \notin S_k. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_N$ be the ordered eigenvalues of A and, let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N$ be associated unit eigenvectors of A . Similarly, we use the notation $\lambda_1^{[k]} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_N^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N^{[k]}$ for the ordered eigenvalues and the associated unit eigenvectors of $A^{[k]}$. Note that Luh and Vu recently showed that sparse random matrices have simple spectrum [LV18]. This implies $\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_N$ a.s. for large N . As we already discussed in the introduction, due to Lemma 3.7, \mathbf{v}_1 and $\mathbf{v}_1^{[k]}$ are almost collinear for any k and large N . Thus, we deal with the second top eigenvector.

Theorem 2.1 (Excessive resampling). *If $q = N^b$ with $b \in (\frac{4}{9}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $k = N^\tau$ with $\tau \in (\frac{5}{3}, 2)$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} \right\rangle \right| = o(1).$$

Remark 2.2. *The condition $b \in (\frac{4}{9}, \frac{1}{2})$ comes from the tail bound for gaps between the adjacent eigenvalues. It can be improved if we can obtain a sharper estimate for the spacing between two adjacent eigenvalues converging to the edge.*

Theorem 2.3 (Small resampling). *Suppose $q = N^b$ with $b \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\tau > 0$. Assume*

$$\tau < 2b + 2/3. \quad (18)$$

Then,

$$\max_{k \leq N^\tau} \min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \sqrt{N} \|\mathbf{v}_2 - s \mathbf{v}_2^{[k]}\|_\infty$$

converges to 0 in probability. As a result,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left| \left\langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} \right\rangle \right| = 1. \quad (19)$$

Remark 2.4. *The available sparsity regime is determined by $\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}$. This is due to Lemma 7.1, an estimate on the variation of resolvents according to the resampling.*

Remark 2.5 (Sparse random matrices). *Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3 may be extended to the more general class of sparse random matrices. Here we present the model studied in [EKYY12, EKYY13]. Let $\tilde{H} = (\tilde{h}_{ij})$ be $N \times N$ symmetric random matrices whose entries are real and independent up to the symmetry. We assume that the elements of \tilde{H} satisfy the moment condition (13) for all $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ and $3 \leq m \leq L$. We define*

$$\tilde{A} := \tilde{H} + f|\mathbf{e}\rangle\langle\mathbf{e}|, \quad (20)$$

where $f \equiv f(N)$ is a deterministic number satisfying

$$L^{-1}q \leq f \leq Lq, \quad (21)$$

and

$$\mathbf{e} \equiv \mathbf{e}_N := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(1, \dots, 1)^T. \quad (22)$$

We call this \tilde{A} a sparse random matrix (with nonzero mean).




Figure 3: Phase diagram for the Erdős-Rényi model. Note that the line $b = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to the Wigner matrix case. The rectangular domain in the upper right corner is for Theorem 2.1. The left quadrangle is the domain for Theorem 2.3. Note that the boundary between the “almost collinear” domain and the unknown one is the line $\tau = 2b + 2/3$ according to the condition (18).




Figure 4: Simulation for the adjacency matrices of Erdős-Rényi-graphs. On the left (a), the condition $N = 5000, k = \lfloor N^{11/6} \rfloor$ and $q = N^{17/36}$ satisfies the assumption in Theorem 2.1 and it is observed that $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]} \rangle$ is close to 0. On the right (b), we also choose N, k and q to satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 2.3 and it is observed that $|\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_1^{[k]} \rangle|$ is close to 1.

2.1 Outline

In the next section, we shall cover some necessary tools used in the proof of the main results. In Section 4, we describe the top-level proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3. In Section 5, we prove the monotonicity lemma which is an ingredient to the proof of Theorem 2.1. The remaining sections, Section 6 and Section 7, are devoted to the details, for Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3, respectively.

2.2 Notation and convention

We use $C > 0$, $D > 0$ and $c > 0$ as universal constants whose values may change between occurrences. In this paper, C and D are used to denote some constants large enough whereas $c > 0$ means a sufficiently small constant. Sometimes we use subscript indices such as $C_1, \dots, D_1, \dots, c_1, \dots$, whenever we need to denote some fixed large or small constant specifically. Asymptotic notation is used under the assumption $N \rightarrow \infty$. For function f and g of parameter N , we use the following notation as $N \rightarrow \infty$: $f \gtrsim g$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $C \cdot f \geq g$; $f = O(g)$ if $|f|/|g|$ is bounded from above; $f = o(g)$ if $|f|/|g| \rightarrow 0$; $f = \Theta(g)$ if $f = O(g)$ and $g = O(f)$. Hilbert-Schmidt norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{HS}$.

3 Preliminaries

In this section, we collect some necessary tools for the proof of main results. For any positive integer i , denote $[i] = \{1, \dots, i\}$. Let $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables taking values in \mathbb{R} and let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function. Consider the random vector $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n)$ (we shall replace n with $N(N+1)/2$ later). Let $\mathcal{X}' = (\mathcal{X}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}'_n)$ be an independent copy of \mathcal{X} . We shall use the following notation,

$$\mathcal{X}^{(i)} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i-1}, \mathcal{X}'_i, \mathcal{X}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}^{[i]} = (\mathcal{X}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}'_i, \mathcal{X}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n), \quad (23)$$

in particular, $\mathcal{X}^{[0]} = \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{X}^{[n]} = \mathcal{X}'$. More generally, for $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{N}_+$, we define $\mathcal{X}^{\mathcal{I}} = (\mathcal{X}_1^{\mathcal{I}}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n^{\mathcal{I}})$ by setting

$$\mathcal{X}_i^{\mathcal{I}} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{X}_i & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{I}, \\ \mathcal{X}'_i & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Let $\sigma = (\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n))$ be a random permutation sampled uniformly from the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n and let $\sigma([i])$ denote $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(i)\}$. We assume σ is independent of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' . Let j be a random variable uniformly distributed on $[n]$ and independent of \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{X}' and σ . Let \mathcal{X}'' be an independent copy of \mathcal{X} and be independent of other random variables. Let $\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}$ be the vector obtained from $\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}$ by replacing j -th component of $\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}$ with \mathcal{X}''_j , in particular,

$$\mathcal{X}^{(j)} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{j-1}, \mathcal{X}''_j, \mathcal{X}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n). \quad (25)$$

For example, suppose $n = 5$, and a realization of random elements σ and j is given by

$$\sigma = (2, 3, 1, 5, 4) \quad \text{and} \quad j = 3. \quad (26)$$

If $i = 3$, we have $\sigma([i-1]) = \{2, 3\}$ and

$$\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}'_2, \mathcal{X}'_3, \mathcal{X}_4, \mathcal{X}_5) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}'_2, \mathcal{X}''_3, \mathcal{X}_4, \mathcal{X}_5). \quad (27)$$

Lemma 3.1 (Variance and noise sensitivity [BLZ19, Lemma 3]). *For any $i \in [n]$, define I_i by*

$$I_i := \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right]. \quad (28)$$

Then, we have for $i \in [n]$

$$I_k \leq \left(\frac{n+1}{n} \right) \left(\frac{2\text{Var}(f(\mathcal{X}))}{k} \right). \quad (29)$$

Lemma 3.2 (Monotonicity lemma). *For any $i \in [n]$, define I_i as in (28). Then, we have for $i \in [n-1]$*

$$I_i \geq I_{i+1}. \quad (30)$$

Lemma 3.1 is shown in [BLZ19]. For the reader's convenience, we provide its proof in the appendix, with adding some additional details. In Section 5, we establish Lemma (3.2), the monotonicity of $\{I_i\}$. This monotonicity lemma is required to prove Lemma 4.4 later. Next, we summarize some random matrix results.

Definition 3.3 (Overwhelming probability). *Let $\{E_N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ be a sequence of events. We say E_N holds with **overwhelming probability** if for any $C > 0$, there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$*

$$\mathbb{P}((E_N)^c) \leq DN^{-C}. \quad (31)$$

Let γ_i be the classical location of i -th eigenvalue which is defined by

$$\mu_{\text{sc}}(\gamma_i, \infty) = \frac{i}{N} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\mu_{\text{sc}} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{(4-x^2)_+} \quad (33)$$

is the semicircle distribution.

Lemma 3.4 (Eigenvalue location [EKYY13, Theorem 2.13]). *If $q = N^b$ with $b \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that we have with overwhelming probability for $i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$*

$$|\lambda_i - \gamma_i| \leq L^C \left(N^{-2/3} (\min(i, N-i))^{-1/3} + q^{-2} \right). \quad (34)$$

Remark 3.5. *Using Lemma 3.4, we obtain for some $C > 0$*

$$\text{Var}(\lambda_2) \leq O\left(L^C N^{-4/3}\right). \quad (35)$$

Lemma 3.6 (Location of the largest eigenvalue [EKYY13, Theorem 6.2]). *We have with overwhelming probability*

$$\lambda_1 = \zeta q + \frac{1}{\zeta q} + o(1). \quad (36)$$

Lemma 3.7 (Delocalization of eigenvectors [EKYY13, Theorem 2.16]). *Assume $q = N^b$ and $b \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty \leq \frac{(\log N)^C}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (37)$$

holds with overwhelming probability. In particular, for the top eigenvector \mathbf{v}_1 , we have with overwhelming probability

$$\|\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{e}\|_2 \leq O(q^{-1}) \quad (38)$$

where

$$\mathbf{e} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(1, \dots, 1)^T. \quad (39)$$

Lemma 3.8 (Tail bounds for the gaps between eigenvalues [LL19, Theorem 2.6]). *Assume $q = N^b$ and $b \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. There exists $c > 0$ such that we have for any $\rho > 0$*

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \leq cN^{-1-\rho}) = O(N^{-\rho} \log N). \quad (40)$$

4 Top-level proof of the results

We adapt the method of proof in [BLZ19] by applying recent results for the sparse Erdős-Rényi graph model, in order to establish Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3.

4.1 Top-level proof of Theorem 2.1

For any $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, denote by $B_{(ij)}$ the symmetric matrix obtained from A by replacing the entry a_{ij} and a_{ji} with a''_{ij} and a''_{ji} respectively. We obtain $B_{(ij)}^{[k]}$ from $A^{[k]}$ by the same operation. Denote by (st) a random pair of indices chosen uniformly from $\{(ij) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N\}$. Note that

$$|\{(ij) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq N\}| = N(N+1)/2 \quad (41)$$

Let $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_N$ be the ordered eigenvalues of $B_{(st)}$ and, let $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N$ be the associated unit eigenvectors of $B_{(st)}$. Similarly, we define $\mu_1^{[k]} \geq \dots \geq \mu_N^{[k]}$ and $\mathbf{u}_1^{[k]}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N^{[k]}$ for $B_{(st)}^{[k]}$. According to Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \right] \leq \frac{2\text{Var}(\lambda_2)}{k} \cdot \frac{N(N+1)+2}{N(N+1)}. \quad (42)$$

Using the next lemma, we can control $\lambda_2 - \mu_2$ and $\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let us write $\mathbf{v}_2 = (v_1, \dots, v_N)$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 = (u_1, \dots, u_N)$. There exists $C > 0$ and $D > 0$ such that with overwhelming probability*

$$Z_{st}u_su_t - \frac{CL^D}{q^3N^2} \leq \lambda_2 - \mu_2 \leq Z_{st}v_sv_t + \frac{CL^D}{q^3N^2} \quad (43)$$

where

$$Z_{st} := (a_{st} - a''_{st})(1 + \mathbb{1}(s \neq t)). \quad (44)$$

Similarly, with overwhelming probability,

$$Z_{st}^{[k]}u_s^{[k]}u_t^{[k]} - \frac{CL^D}{q^3N^2} \leq \lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]} \leq Z_{st}^{[k]}v_s^{[k]}v_t^{[k]} + \frac{CL^D}{q^3N^2}, \quad (45)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} = (v_1^{[k]}, \dots, v_N^{[k]})$, $\mathbf{u}_2^{[k]} = (u_1^{[k]}, \dots, u_N^{[k]})$ and

$$Z_{st}^{[k]} := \begin{cases} (a_{st} - a''_{st})(1 + \mathbb{1}(s \neq t)) & \text{if } (st) \notin S_k, \\ (a'_{st} - a''_{st})(1 + \mathbb{1}(s \neq t)) & \text{if } (st) \in S_k. \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

We write

$$T_1 := (Z_{st}v_sv_t + \epsilon_0)(Z_{st}^{[k]}v_s^{[k]}v_t^{[k]} + \epsilon_0), \quad (47)$$

$$T_2 := (Z_{st}v_sv_t + \epsilon_0)(Z_{st}^{[k]}u_s^{[k]}u_t^{[k]} - \epsilon_0), \quad (48)$$

$$T_3 := (Z_{st}u_su_t - \epsilon_0)(Z_{st}^{[k]}v_s^{[k]}v_t^{[k]} + \epsilon_0), \quad (49)$$

$$T_4 := (Z_{st}u_su_t - \epsilon_0)(Z_{st}^{[k]}u_s^{[k]}u_t^{[k]} - \epsilon_0). \quad (50)$$

where

$$\epsilon_0 := \frac{CL^D}{q^3N^2}. \quad (51)$$

Let us define the event \mathcal{E}_1 : for some $D > 0$

$$|x - \gamma_2| \leq L^D N^{-2/3} \text{ for all } x \in \{\lambda_2, \mu_2, \lambda_2^{[k]}, \mu_2^{[k]}\}, \quad (52)$$

$$y = \zeta q + \frac{1}{\zeta q} + o(1) \text{ for all } y \in \{\lambda_1, \mu_1, \lambda_1^{[k]}, \mu_1^{[k]}\}, \quad (53)$$

$$\max_{1 \leq i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 \leq N} (\|\mathbf{v}_{i_1}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{u}_{i_2}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{v}_{i_3}^{[k]}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{u}_{i_4}^{[k]}\|_\infty) \leq \frac{L^D}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (54)$$

Recall γ_2 is the second classical location defined by (32) and $\zeta = (1 - q^2/N)^{-1/2}$. It follows from Lemma 4.1 that on the event \mathcal{E}_1

$$\min(T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4) \leq (\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \leq \max(T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4). \quad (55)$$

Lemma 4.2. Assume $q = N^b$ and $b \in (\frac{4}{9}, \frac{1}{2})$. Let $\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}$ be the second top eigenvector of $B_{(ij)}$. Then, there exist $\rho > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \inf_{s \in \{-1, 1\}} \|s \mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}\|_\infty > N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta} \right) = O(N^{-\rho} \log N) \quad (56)$$

and

$$2b + \rho > 1. \quad (57)$$

Remark 4.3. Lemma 4.2 provides us with the available sparsity regime: $b \in (\frac{4}{9}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Next, let $\mathbf{u}_{(ij)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{(ij)}^{[k]}$ be the second top eigenvectors of $B^{(ij)}$ and $B_{(ij)}^{[k]}$. We define the event \mathcal{E}_2 :

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \|\mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{u}_{(ij)}\|_\infty \leq N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta} \text{ and } \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \|\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} - \mathbf{u}_{(ij)}^{[k]}\|_\infty \leq N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta}. \quad (58)$$

According to Lemma 4.2 (choosing the \pm -phase properly for $\mathbf{u}_{(ij)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{(ij)}^{[k]}$), for some $\delta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2^c) = O(N^{-\rho} \log N)$ and also $q^2 N^\rho \gg L^D N$ for any $D > 0$. Set the event $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$. On the event \mathcal{E} , we observe that $v_s v_t u_s^{[k]} u_t^{[k]}$, $u_s u_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]}$ and $u_s u_t u_s^{[k]} u_t^{[k]}$ can be replaced with

$$v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} + O \left(\frac{L^D}{N^{2+\delta}} \right). \quad (59)$$

Thus, on the event \mathcal{E} , it follows that from Lemma 4.1

$$(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \geq Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} + |Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]}| O \left(\frac{L^D}{N^{2+\delta}} \right) + O \left(\frac{L^D}{q^4 N^3} \right). \quad (60)$$

We shall see

Lemma 4.4.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \right] \gtrsim \frac{1}{N^3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \right] + o(N^{-3}) \quad (61)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \right] = o(N^{-3}). \quad (62)$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[|Z_{st}Z_{st}^{[k]}|] = O(N^{-1})$, the main estimate

$$\mathbb{E}[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]})] \gtrsim \frac{1}{N^3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \right] + o(N^{-3}) \quad (63)$$

follows from (61) and (62). Now we are ready to prove the main statement. From (35), (42) and (63), it is derived that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \right] \leq \frac{L^D N^{5/3}}{k} + o(1) \quad (64)$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \right] \geq \left(\mathbb{E} |\langle \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} \rangle| \right)^2. \quad (65)$$

Since $k \gg N^{5/3} L^D$, the desired conclusion follows. Lemmas 4.2, 4.1 and 4.4 are proved in Section 6.

4.2 Top-level proof of Theorem 2.3

For $z = E + i\eta$ with $\eta > 0$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce the resolvent matrices

$$R(z) = (A - zI)^{-1}, \quad (66)$$

where I denotes the identity matrix. We denote by $R^{[k]}(z)$ the resolvent of $A^{[k]}$. Theorem 2.3 is proved by showing the lemma below. We write $\mathbf{v}_2 = (v_{2,1}, \dots, v_{2,N})$ and $\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} = (v_{2,1}^{[k]}, \dots, v_{2,N}^{[k]})$.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose $q = N^b$ with $b \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $k = N^\tau$ with $\tau \in (0, 2)$. Assume $\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$*

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} N |v_{2,i} v_{2,j} - v_{2,i}^{[k]} v_{2,j}^{[k]}| = O(L^{-2}). \quad (67)$$

This lemma is proved in Section 7. Let us fix $\epsilon > 0$. From now on, we shall work on the event such that the conclusions of Lemma 4.5 hold and we have for some $C_1 > 0$

$$\max \left(\|\mathbf{v}_2\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]}\|_\infty \right) \leq \frac{(\log N)^{C_1}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (68)$$

According to Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 4.5, this event is of probability at least $1 - 2\epsilon$ for large N . For each i , choose $s_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ so that $\text{sgn}(s_i v_{2,i}) = \text{sgn}(v_{2,i}^{[k]})$. Using Lemma 4.5 with $i = j$, we have

$$\sqrt{N} |s_i v_{2,i} - v_{2,i}^{[k]}| = O(L^{-1}). \quad (69)$$

We want to choose a single $s \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that we have for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$

$$\sqrt{N} |s v_{2,i} - v_{2,i}^{[k]}| = o(1). \quad (70)$$

If $\sqrt{N} |v_{2,i}| \leq L^{-1/3}$, then regardless of the choice of s , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{N} |s v_{2,i} - v_{2,i}^{[k]}| &\leq \sqrt{N} (|v_{2,i}| + |v_{2,i}^{[k]}|) \\ &\leq L^{-1/3} + \sqrt{N} (|v_{2,i}^{[k]} - s_i v_{2,i}| + |v_{2,i}|) \\ &= O(L^{-1/3}). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Next, consider the other case $\sqrt{N}|v_{2,i}| > L^{-1/3}$. For all $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, we claim

$$(1 - s_i s_j)N|v_{2,i}v_{2,j}| = O(L^{-1}(\log N)^{C_1}). \quad (72)$$

If $s_i = s_j$, it is trivial so we assume $s_i \neq s_j$. For brevity, we only consider the case $s_i = 1$ and $s_j = -1$. Furthermore, it is enough to check the case

$$v_{2,i} > 0, \quad v_{2,i}^{[k]} > 0, \quad v_{2,j} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{2,j}^{[k]} < 0. \quad (73)$$

The other cases can be dealt with similarly. Note that

$$\sqrt{N}|v_{2,i} - v_{2,i}^{[k]}| = O(L^{-1}), \quad \sqrt{N}|v_{2,j} + v_{2,j}^{[k]}| = O(L^{-1}), \quad (74)$$

and

$$\max \left(|v_{2,i}|, |v_{2,j}|, |v_{2,i}^{[k]}|, |v_{2,j}^{[k]}| \right) \leq \frac{(\log N)^{C_1}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (75)$$

As a result, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - s_i s_j)N|v_{2,i}v_{2,j}| &= 2Nv_{2,i}v_{2,j} \\ &\leq N \left| v_{2,i}v_{2,j} - v_{2,i}^{[k]}v_{2,j}^{[k]} \right| + Nv_{2,i}^{[k]}v_{2,j}^{[k]} + Nv_{2,i}v_{2,j} \\ &\leq O(L^{-2}) + Nv_{2,i}^{[k]}v_{2,j}^{[k]} + Nv_{2,i}v_{2,j} \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 4.5. Since

$$v_{2,i}v_{2,j} = \left(v_{2,i} - v_{2,i}^{[k]} \right) v_{2,j} + v_{2,i}^{[k]} \left(v_{2,j} + v_{2,j}^{[k]} \right) - v_{2,i}^{[k]}v_{2,j}^{[k]}, \quad (77)$$

we establish the claim (72).

Let us define a set $J := \{1 \leq i \leq N : \sqrt{N}|v_{2,i}| > L^{-1/3}\}$. If $J = \emptyset$, there is nothing to prove so we suppose $J \neq \emptyset$. Assuming this, we find that $s_i = s_j$ for any $i, j \in J$. Otherwise, we have

$$(1 - s_i s_j)N|v_{2,i}v_{2,j}| = 2N|v_{2,i}v_{2,j}| \geq 2L^{-2/3}, \quad (78)$$

which contradicts (72). Thus, we obtain (70) by choosing $s = s_i$ for some $i \in J$ (such a choice is well-defined because s_i is the same for all $i \in J$).

5 Proof of the monotonicity lemma

First of all, we split I_i into two parts.

$$\begin{aligned} I_i &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \notin \sigma([i-1]) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Let $\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j}(\cdot)$ be the conditional expectation with respect to σ and j . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \notin \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_N \\ j \notin \sigma([i-1])}} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right] \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right] \left(\frac{n - (i-1)}{n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

According to [BLZ19, Lemma 2], we have for all $i \in [n-1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i+1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i+1])}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Thus, it is enough to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i]) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Fix σ and take $j \in \sigma([i-1])$. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i])}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

For brevity, we assume σ is the identity, i.e., $\sigma(k) = k$ for all $k \in [n]$, and $j = 1$. We want to show

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{[i-1]}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1) \circ [i-1]}) \right) \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{[i]}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1) \circ [i]}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Note that $\mathcal{X}^{(1)} = (\mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n)$. Let us use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} J &:= (\mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i-1}), \\ J' &:= (\mathcal{X}_2', \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i-1}'), \\ K &:= (\mathcal{X}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Since (\mathcal{X}_1, J) and (\mathcal{X}_1', J') are i.i.d., we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) (f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J', \mathcal{X}_i, K)) | \mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_i, K] \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) | \mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_i, K])^2. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Similarly, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) (f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i', K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J', \mathcal{X}_i', K)) | \mathcal{X}_1'', K] \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) | \mathcal{X}_1'', K])^2 \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) | \mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_i, K] | \mathcal{X}_1'', K])^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} [(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) | \mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_i, K])^2 | \mathcal{X}_1'', K \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{[i]}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1) \circ [i]}) \right) \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) \right) | \mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_i, K \right]^2 | \mathcal{X}_1'', K \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma,j} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.1. When we prove Lemma 4.4 later, this monotonicity lemma, the inequality (30), is used to deal with the case $k \geq N^2 L^{-D}$. In other words, due to the monotonicity, it is enough to consider the case $k < N^2 L^{-D}$

6 Excessive resampling

6.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

By spectral theorem, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_2, A \mathbf{u}_2 \rangle = \lambda_1 |\langle \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle|^2 + \sum_{i=2}^N \lambda_i |\langle \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle|^2 \leq (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) |\langle \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle|^2 + \langle \mathbf{v}_2, A \mathbf{v}_2 \rangle. \quad (88)$$

Recall the event \mathcal{E}_1 defined by (52), (53) and (54). Note that \mathcal{E}_1 holds with overwhelming probability due to Lemma 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7. We write

$$\mathbf{v}_1 = \alpha \mathbf{u}_2 + \beta \mathbf{x} \quad (89)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_3, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N)$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$. Since

$$B \mathbf{v}_1 = A \mathbf{v}_1 + (B - A) \mathbf{v}_1 = \lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + (B - A) \mathbf{v}_1 \quad (90)$$

and also

$$B \mathbf{v}_1 = \alpha \mu_2 \mathbf{u}_2 + \beta B \mathbf{x}, \quad (91)$$

it follows that

$$\lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 = \alpha \mu_2 \mathbf{u}_2 + \beta B \mathbf{x} + (A - B) \mathbf{v}_1. \quad (92)$$

Then,

$$\lambda_1 \alpha = \lambda_1 \langle \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_2, \lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle = \mu_2 \alpha + \langle \mathbf{u}_2, (A - B) \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle. \quad (93)$$

Consequently, on the event \mathcal{E}_1 , it follows that

$$|(\lambda_1 - \mu_2) \alpha| = |\langle \mathbf{u}_2, (A - B) \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle| \leq \frac{CL^D}{qN}. \quad (94)$$

Note that $\lambda_1 \sim \zeta q + (\zeta q)^{-1}$ and $\mu_2 \leq C$ on the event \mathcal{E}_1 . Finally, on the event \mathcal{E}_1 , we obtain

$$|\alpha| \leq \frac{CL^D}{q^2 N}, \quad (95)$$

which implies

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_2, A\mathbf{u}_2 \rangle \leq \frac{CL^D}{q^3 N^2} + \langle \mathbf{v}_2, A\mathbf{v}_2 \rangle. \quad (96)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_2, B\mathbf{v}_2 \rangle \leq \frac{CL^D}{q^3 N^2} + \langle \mathbf{u}_2, B\mathbf{u}_2 \rangle. \quad (97)$$

As a result, it follows that on the event \mathcal{E}_1

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_2, (A - B)\mathbf{u}_2 \rangle - \frac{CL^D}{q^3 N^2} \leq \lambda_2 - \mu_2 \leq \langle \mathbf{v}_2, (A - B)\mathbf{v}_2 \rangle + \frac{CL^D}{q^3 N^2}. \quad (98)$$

Using the same argument, we observe that on the event \mathcal{E}_1

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_2^{[k]}, (A^{[k]} - B^{[k]})\mathbf{u}_2^{[k]} \rangle - \frac{CL^D}{q^3 N^2} \leq \lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]} \leq \langle \mathbf{v}_2^{[k]}, (A^{[k]} - B^{[k]})\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} \rangle + \frac{CL^D}{q^3 N^2}. \quad (99)$$

6.2 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Let $\mu_1^{(ij)} \geq \dots \geq \mu_N^{(ij)}$ be the ordered eigenvalues of $B_{(ij)}$ and, let $\mathbf{u}_1^{(ij)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N^{(ij)}$ be the associated unit eigenvectors of $B_{(ij)}$. According to (96) and Lemma 3.7, we have with overwhelming probability

$$\lambda_2 \geq \langle \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}, A\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle - \frac{L^D}{q^3 N^2} \quad (100)$$

$$= \mu_2^{(ij)} + \langle \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}, (A - B_{(ij)})\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle - \frac{L^D}{q^3 N^2} \quad (101)$$

$$\geq \mu_2^{(ij)} - 2(|a_{ij}| + |a_{ij}''|)\|\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}\|_\infty^2 - \frac{L^D}{q^3 N^2} \quad (102)$$

$$\geq \mu_2^{(ij)} - \frac{L^D}{qN} \quad (103)$$

Reversing the role of A and $B^{(ij)}$, we also have with overwhelming probability

$$\mu_2^{(ij)} \geq \lambda_2 - \frac{L^D}{qN} \quad (104)$$

Thus, it follows that with overwhelming probability

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} |\lambda_2 - \mu_2^{(ij)}| \leq \frac{L^D}{qN}. \quad (105)$$

Applying Lemma 3.8, we have for any $\rho > 0$

$$\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 > cN^{-1-\rho} \quad (106)$$

with probability $1 - O(N^{-\rho} \log N)$. Let $N' := \lfloor N^\theta \rfloor$ with $0 < \theta < 1$. We write

$$\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} = \alpha \mathbf{v}_1 + \beta \mathbf{v}_2 + \gamma_x \mathbf{x} + \gamma_y \mathbf{y} \quad (107)$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{v}_3, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N'})$, $\mathbf{y} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{v}_{N'+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N)$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \|\mathbf{y}\| = 1$. Since

$$A\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} = \alpha \lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \beta \lambda_2 \mathbf{v}_2 + \gamma_x A\mathbf{x} + \gamma_y A\mathbf{y} \quad (108)$$

and

$$A\mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} = \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} + (\mu_2^{(ij)} - \lambda_2) \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} + (A - B) \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}, \quad (109)$$

we can observe

$$\lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} = \alpha \lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \beta \lambda_2 \mathbf{v}_2 + \gamma_x A \mathbf{x} + \gamma_y A \mathbf{y} + (\lambda_2 - \mu_2^{(ij)}) \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} + (B - A) \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}. \quad (110)$$

Next, it follows that with probability $1 - O(N^{-\rho} \log N)$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2 \gamma_x &= \lambda_2 \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{x}, \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle \\ &= \gamma_x \langle \mathbf{x}, A \mathbf{x} \rangle + (\lambda_2 - \mu_2^{(ij)}) \gamma_x + \langle \mathbf{x}, (B - A) \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle \\ &< (\lambda_2 - cN^{-1-\rho}) \gamma_x + \frac{L^D}{qN} + \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \cdot \frac{C}{q} \cdot \frac{L^D}{\sqrt{N}} \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

where we use (105), (106) and Lemma 3.7. Note that

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \sum_{m=3}^{N'} |c_m| \|\mathbf{v}_m\|_\infty \leq \frac{L^D}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{m=3}^{N'} |c_m| \leq \frac{L^D \sqrt{N'}}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (112)$$

Then, we get with probability $1 - O(N^{-\rho} \log N)$

$$|\gamma_x| \leq \frac{L^D N^\rho \sqrt{N'}}{q} \leq \frac{L^D N^{\rho+\theta/2}}{q}. \quad (113)$$

According to Lemma 3.4, the following inequality holds with overwhelming probability.

$$\lambda_2 - c(N')^{2/3} N^{-2/3} \geq \lambda_{N'} \quad (114)$$

With overwhelming probability, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2 \gamma_y &= \lambda_2 \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{y}, \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle \\ &= \gamma_y \langle \mathbf{y}, A \mathbf{y} \rangle + (\lambda_2 - \mu_2^{(ij)}) \gamma_y + \langle \mathbf{y}, (B - A) \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)} \rangle \\ &\leq (\lambda_2 - c(N')^{2/3} N^{-2/3}) \gamma_y + \frac{L^D}{qN} + \frac{L^D}{q\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

The above inequality implies that

$$|\gamma_y| \leq \frac{L^D (N')^{-2/3} N^{1/6}}{q} \leq \frac{L^D N^{1/6-2\theta/3}}{q}. \quad (116)$$

Recall $|\alpha| \leq \frac{CL^D}{q^2 N}$ (see (95) in the proof of Lemma 4.1). Since $|\beta| = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 - \gamma_x^2 - \gamma_y^2} \geq 1 - |\alpha| - |\gamma_x| - |\gamma_y|$ and $\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 \leq 1$, by setting $s := \beta/|\beta|$, we obtain with probability $1 - O(N^{-\rho} \log N)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|s \mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2^{(ij)}\|_\infty &\leq |\alpha| \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_\infty + (1 - |\beta|) \|\mathbf{v}_2\|_\infty + |\gamma_x| \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty + |\gamma_y| \\ &\leq |\alpha| \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_\infty + (|\alpha| + |\gamma_x| + |\gamma_y|) \|\mathbf{v}_2\|_\infty + |\gamma_x| \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty + |\gamma_y| \\ &\leq \frac{L^D}{q^2 N^{3/2}} + \left(\frac{L^D}{q^2 N} + \frac{L^D N^{\rho+\theta/2}}{q} + \frac{L^D N^{1/6-2\theta/3}}{q} \right) \cdot \frac{L^D}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &\quad + \frac{L^D N^{\rho+\theta/2}}{q} \cdot \frac{L^D \sqrt{N'}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{L^D N^{1/6-2\theta/3}}{q}. \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

To get the desired result, it is enough to show that for some $\delta > 0$

$$\max \left(\frac{L^D N^{\rho+\theta-1/2}}{q}, \frac{L^D N^{1/6-2\theta/3}}{q} \right) \leq N^{-1/2-\delta}. \quad (118)$$

with $q^2 N^\rho \gg N$. Recall $q = N^b$. We should find appropriate ranges of q , ρ and θ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \rho + \theta < b, \\ \frac{1}{6} - \frac{2}{3}\theta - b < -\frac{1}{2}, \\ 2b + \rho > 1. \end{cases} \quad (119)$$

If $b > \frac{4}{9}$, then we can find $\rho > 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ satisfying the above condition (119).

6.3 Proof of Lemma 4.4

We split the expectation into two parts.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \right] \quad (120)$$

We consider the upper bound of the second part.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \right] \quad (121)$$

On the event \mathcal{E}_1 , we bound $v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]}$ using the delocalization. Since $|Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]}| = O(q^{-2})$, and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2^c) = O(N^{-\rho} \log N)$ with $q^2 N^\rho \gg N$ by Lemma 4.2, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]}| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \right] \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} \leq \frac{L^D}{q^2 N^{2+\rho}} = o(N^{-3}). \quad (122)$$

Since \mathbf{v}_2 and $\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]}$ are unit vectors,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \right] = o(N^{-3}). \quad (123)$$

It turns out that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \right] + o(N^{-3}). \quad (124)$$

To get (61), it is enough to show the following lemma. From now on, we assume $k = N^\tau$ with $\tau < 2$, so that $kL^D \ll N^2$ for any $D > 0$. We emphasize that this additional assumption on k does not harm the generality due to (30) in Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $k = N^\tau$ with $\tau < 2$.*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \right] = \frac{8}{N^2(N+1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \right] + o(N^{-3}) \quad (125)$$

We postpone the proof of Lemma 6.1 to the appendix. What remains is to show (62).

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}^c} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \right] \quad (126)$$

To control the first term, we recall (55) and (122). It follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]})| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]}| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \right] \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} + O \left(\frac{L^D}{q^4 N^3} \right) = o(N^{-3}). \quad (127)$$

For the second term, it is enough to consider the Hilbert-Schmidt norm,

$$|(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]})| \leq (\|A\|_{HS} + \|B\|_{HS})(\|A^{[k]}\|_{HS} + \|B^{[k]}\|_{HS}), \quad (128)$$

and the moment condition (13) because $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c)$ decays very fast.

By the Cauchy-Schwarz, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\lambda_2 - \mu_2)(\lambda_2^{[k]} - \mu_2^{[k]}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} \right] = o(N^{-3}), \quad (129)$$

and we obtain (62).

7 Small resampling

7.1 Proof of Lemma 4.5

Lemma 4.5 is a consequence of the following two lemmas.

Lemma 7.1. *Assume $q = N^b$ with $b > \frac{1}{3}$ and $k = N^\tau$ with $\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}$. For $C_0 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$, the following event holds with overwhelming probability: for all $z = E + i\eta$ such that $|E - 2| \leq N^{-2/3} L^{C_0}$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3} L^{-C_1}$,*

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} N\eta |R^{[k]}(z)_{ij} - R(z)_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{L^2} \quad (130)$$

Lemma 7.2. *Let $q = N^b$ with $b > \frac{1}{3}$ and $\tau > 0$. Assume $\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}$. For $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C_1 > 0$ such that the following event holds for all N large enough with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$: for all $k \leq N^\tau$, we have, with $z = \lambda_2 + i\eta$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3} L^{-C_1}$,*

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} N|\eta \text{Im} R(z)_{ij} - v_{2,i} v_{2,j}| \leq L^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} N|\eta \text{Im} R^{[k]}(z)_{ij} - v_{2,i}^{[k]} v_{2,j}^{[k]}| \leq L^{-2}. \quad (131)$$

First of all, Choose C_1 and C_2 as in Lemma 7.1 and 7.2. Note that if q and k satisfies the assumption of Lemma 7.1, we have $k \leq N^{5/3} L^{-D}$ for all $D > 0$. According to Lemma 3.4, there exist C_0 such that $|\lambda_2 - 2| \leq N^{-2/3} L^{C_0}$ for large N with overwhelming probability. Thus, we can apply Lemma 7.1 with $z = \lambda_2 + i\eta$ and $\eta = N^{-2/3} L^{-C_1}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{2,i} v_{2,j} - v_{2,i}^{[k]} v_{2,j}^{[k]}| &\leq |v_{2,i} v_{2,j} - \eta \text{Im} R(z)_{ij}| + |\eta \text{Im} R(z)_{ij} - \text{Im} R^{[k]}(z)_{ij}| \\ &\quad + |\eta \text{Im} R^{[k]}(z)_{ij} - v_{2,i}^{[k]} v_{2,j}^{[k]}|, \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

the desired result follows from Lemma 7.1 and 7.2. The proof of these two lemmas is in the appendix.

In order to show Lemma 7.2, we need to estimate the effect of the resampling to λ_2 . The following proposition provide us the upper bound of the difference between λ_2 and $\lambda_2^{[k]}$.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $q = N^b$ with $b > \frac{1}{3}$ and $\tau > 0$. Assume $\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}$. For $C_3 > 0$, the following holds with overwhelming probability: for all N large enough,*

$$\max_{k \leq N^\tau} |\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^{[k]}| \leq N^{-2/3} L^{-C_3}. \quad (133)$$

Proof. If $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2^{[k]}$, we are done. Thus, suppose $\lambda_2^{[k]} < \lambda_2$. Choose $C_0 > 0$ as in Lemma A.1 and set

$$\eta := N^{-2/3} L^{-\frac{C_0}{2} - C_3}. \quad (134)$$

According to Lemma A.1, we can find $1 \leq i \leq N$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2\eta^2} \leq N\eta^{-1} \text{Im}R(\lambda_2 + i\eta)_{ii} \quad (135)$$

By Lemma A.1, with over whelming probability, we have $|\lambda_2 - 2| \leq L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}$ and

$$N\eta^{-1} \text{Im}R^{[k]}(\lambda_2 + i\eta)_{ii} \leq L^{C_0} \left(\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} |\lambda_2 - \lambda_j^{[k]}| \right)^{-2}. \quad (136)$$

Note that $\lambda_1^{[k]}$ is close to $f + \frac{1}{f}$ with overwhelming probability, which implies

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} |\lambda_2 - \lambda_j^{[k]}| = |\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^{[k]}|. \quad (137)$$

Since $k \leq N^\tau$ with $\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}$, we can apply Lemma 7.1. Then, with overwhelming probability,

$$N\eta^{-1} \text{Im}R^{[k]}(\lambda_2 + i\eta)_{ii} \geq N\eta^{-1} \left(\text{Im}R(\lambda_2 + i\eta)_{ii} - \left| \text{Im}R^{[k]}(\lambda_2 + i\eta)_{ii} - \text{Im}R(\lambda_2 + i\eta)_{ii} \right| \right) \quad (138)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2\eta^2} - \frac{1}{L^2\eta^2} \geq \frac{1}{4\eta^2}. \quad (139)$$

As a result, we obtain with overwhelming probability

$$\frac{1}{4\eta^2} \leq L^{C_0} |\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^{[k]}|^{-2}. \quad (140)$$

In other words, with overwhelming probability,

$$|\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^{[k]}| \leq 2N^{-2/3} L^{-C_3}. \quad (141)$$

□

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the research grants NRF-2017R1A2B2001952 and NRF-2019R1A5A1028324. We would also like to show our gratitude to Paul Jung, an associate professor at KAIST, for providing insight and expertise.

Appendix A Proof of some lemmas

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

According to [Cha05], we have

$$\text{Var}(f(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{[i-1]}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{[i]}) \right) \right]. \quad (142)$$

Moreover, for a random permutation σ which is uniformly distributed on S_n , it follows that

$$\text{Var}(f(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right]. \quad (143)$$

In [BLZ19], it is also shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right] \\ \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i+1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i+1])}) \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(n)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([n-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([n])}) \right) \right] \geq 0. \quad (145)$$

Consequently, we have for each $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} 2\text{Var}(f(x)) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right] \\ &\geq k \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(k)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([k-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([k])}) \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(k)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([k-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([k])}) \right) \right] \leq \frac{2\text{Var}(f(x))}{k}. \quad (147)$$

We split I_i into two parts.

$$\begin{aligned} I_i &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \notin \sigma([i-1]) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

By recalling (80), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \notin \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right] \left(\frac{n-(i-1)}{n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Also, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1]) \setminus \{j\}}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j) \circ \sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1]) \setminus \{j\}}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i-1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-2])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right] \left(\frac{i-1}{n} \right) \\ - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1]) \setminus \{j\}}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) \right) ; j \in \sigma([i-1]) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

To finish the proof, we claim that for a fixed $\sigma \in S_n$ and any $j \in \sigma([i-1])$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(j)})) (f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1]) \setminus \{j\}}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])})) \right] \geq 0, \quad i \in [n+1]. \quad (150)$$

If the claim holds, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_i &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i])}) \right) \right] \left(\frac{n - (i-1)}{n} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma(i-1)}) \right) \left(f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-2])}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{\sigma([i-1])}) \right) \right] \left(\frac{i-1}{n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

By (147), it follows that

$$I_i \leq \frac{2\text{Var}(f(\mathcal{X}))}{n} \left(1 + \frac{n-i+1}{i} \right) = \frac{2\text{Var}(f(\mathcal{X}))}{i} \left(\frac{n+1}{n} \right). \quad (152)$$

What remains is to show the claim (150). For simplicity, we assume σ is the identity, i.e., $\sigma(k) = k$ for all $k \in [n]$, and $j = 1$. In this case,

$$I'_i := \mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)})) (f(\mathcal{X}^{[i-1] \setminus \{1\}}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{[i-1]})) \right] \quad (153)$$

Note that $\mathcal{X}^{(1)} = (\mathcal{X}_1'', \mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n)$. It is enough to show that $I'_i \geq I'_{i+1}$ and $I'_{n+1} \geq 0$. We shall use the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} J &:= (\mathcal{X}_2, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i-1}), \\ J' &:= (\mathcal{X}_2', \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i-1}'), \\ K &:= (\mathcal{X}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

We have

$$I'_i = \mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) (f(\mathcal{X}_1, J', \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i, K)) \right], \quad (155)$$

$$I'_{i+1} = \mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) (f(\mathcal{X}_1, J', \mathcal{X}_i', K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i', K)) \right]. \quad (156)$$

Next, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) (f(\mathcal{X}_1, J', \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i, K)) \middle| \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K \right] \quad (157)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) | \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K]^2, \quad (158)$$

where we use (\mathcal{X}_1'', J) and (\mathcal{X}_1', J') i.i.d. in the last equality. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K)) (f(\mathcal{X}_1, J', \mathcal{X}_i', K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i', K)) \middle| \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{X}_i', K \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) | \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K] \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}_1, J', \mathcal{X}_i', K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1', J', \mathcal{X}_i', K) | \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i', K] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i, K) | \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K] \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}_1, J, \mathcal{X}_i', K) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, \mathcal{X}_i', K) | \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i', K]. \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

Let us define $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ by setting for any independent random variables x, y, z

$$h(x, y, z) = \mathbb{E} [f(x, J, y, z) - f(\mathcal{X}_1'', J, y, z) | x, y, z]. \quad (160)$$

Then, we observe $I'_{i+1} \leq I'_i$ because

$$\begin{aligned}
I'_{i+1} &= \mathbb{E} [h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K)h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}'_i, K)] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K)h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}'_i, K) | \mathcal{X}_1, K] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K) | \mathcal{X}_1, K]^2] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K)^2 | \mathcal{X}_1, K]] = \mathbb{E} [h(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_i, K)^2] = I'_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{161}$$

Next, we will deal with I'_{n+1} .

$$I'_{n+1} = \mathbb{E} \left[(f(\mathcal{X}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)})) (f(\mathcal{X}^{[n] \setminus \{1\}}) - f(\mathcal{X}^{[n]})) \right] \tag{162}$$

We observe

$$\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X})f(\mathcal{X}^{[n] \setminus \{1\}})] = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X})f(\mathcal{X}^{[n] \setminus \{1\}}) | \mathcal{X}_1]] = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}) | \mathcal{X}_1]^2]. \tag{163}$$

Let us denote the independence between random variables by the notation $\perp\!\!\!\perp$. Since

$$\mathcal{X}^{(1)} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{X}^{[n] \setminus \{1\}}, \quad \mathcal{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{X}^{[n]} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}^{(1)} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{X}^{[n]}, \tag{164}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)})f(\mathcal{X}^{[n] \setminus \{1\}})] = \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X})f(\mathcal{X}^{[n]})] = \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}^{(1)})f(\mathcal{X}^{[n]})] = \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X})]^2. \tag{165}$$

Therefore, by Jensen's inequality, we obtain

$$I'_{n+1} = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}) | \mathcal{X}_1]^2] - \mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X})]^2 = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}) | \mathcal{X}_1]^2] - \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [f(\mathcal{X}) | \mathcal{X}_1]]^2 \geq 0. \tag{166}$$

A.2 Proof of Lemma 6.1

Let \mathbb{E}_{st} be the conditional expectation given (A, A', A'', S_k) . Under \mathbb{E}_{st} , the random pair (st) is integrated out.

$$\mathbb{E}_{st} \left[Z_{st} Z_{st}^{[k]} v_s v_t v_s^{[k]} v_t^{[k]} \right] = \frac{2}{N(N+1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \tag{167}$$

Set $Z'_{ij} := (a'_{ij} - a''_{ij})(1 + \mathbb{1}(i \neq j))$. Then, the sum in the right-hand side of (167) is split up into two parts,

$$\sum_{(ij) \in S_k} Z_{ij} Z'_{ij} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} + \sum_{(ij) \notin S_k} Z_{ij}^2 v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]}, \tag{168}$$

where $1 \leq i \leq j \leq N$ in the both sums. Note that

$$\mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z'_{ij}] = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{N} & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \frac{1}{N} & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij}^2] = \begin{cases} \frac{8}{N} & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \frac{2}{N} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \tag{169}$$

Next, we shall calculate

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]}] v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]}. \tag{170}$$

We deal with two cases, $(ij) \in S_k$ and $(ij) \notin S_k$, separately.

$$\sum_{(ij) \in S_k} \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z'_{ij}] v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} = \frac{4}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \in S_k \\ i < j}} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \in S_k \\ i=j}} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \quad (171)$$

$$\sum_{(ij) \notin S_k} \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij}^2] v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} = \frac{8}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \notin S_k \\ i < j}} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \notin S_k \\ i=j}} v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]} \quad (172)$$

For brevity, we denote $v_i v_j v_i^{[k]} v_j^{[k]}$ by $V_{i,j,k}$. Combining above two equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]}] V_{i,j,k} = \\ \frac{8}{N} \sum_{i < j} V_{i,j,k} + \frac{4}{N} \sum_{i=j} V_{i,j,k} - \frac{4}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \in S_k \\ i < j}} V_{i,j,k} - \frac{3}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \in S_k \\ i=j}} V_{i,j,k} - \frac{2}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \notin S_k \\ i=j}} V_{i,j,k} \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

In fact, the last three sums of the above equation is negligible after taking expectation. The delocalization result (Lemma 3.7) and the Cauchy–Schwarz is used. Recall the event \mathcal{E}_1 defined previously. The delocalization occurs on \mathcal{E}_1 and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c) \leq N^{-K}$ for an arbitrary $K > 0$. Since we assume $|S_k| = k = N^\tau$ with $\tau < 2$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \in S_k \\ i < j}} V_{i,j,k} (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1} + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c}) \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \cdot k \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N} \cdot k \cdot \frac{1}{N^{K/2}} = o(N^{-1}). \quad (174)$$

Using the similar argument, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \in S_k \\ i=j}} V_{i,j,k} \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \cdot N \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N} \cdot N \cdot \frac{1}{N^{K/2}} = o(N^{-1}) \quad (175)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{(ij) \notin S_k \\ i=j}} V_{i,j,k} \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \cdot N \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} + \frac{1}{N} \cdot N \cdot \frac{1}{N^{K/2}} = o(N^{-1}). \quad (176)$$

Since $2 \sum_{i < j} V_{i,j,k} = \sum_{i \neq j} V_{i,j,k}$ by symmetry, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]}] V_{i,j,k} \right] = \frac{4}{N} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} V_{i,j,k} \right] + o(N^{-1}). \quad (177)$$

What remains is to show

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} \left(Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]} - \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]}] \right) V_{i,j,k} \right] = o(N^{-1}). \quad (178)$$

Let $A''' = (a_{ij}''')$ be a independent copy of A which is also independent of A' and A'' . As we set $B_{(ij)}$ and $B_{(ij)}^{[k]}$, analogously define $\tilde{B}_{(ij)}$ and $\tilde{B}_{(ij)}^{[k]}$ by using a_{ij}''' and a_{ji}''' instead of a_{ij}'' and a_{ji}'' . Denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}^{[k]}$ be the second top eigenvector of $\tilde{B}_{(ij)}$ and $\tilde{B}_{(ij)}^{[k]}$ respectively. To ease the notation, we define

$$\tilde{U}_{i,j,k} := (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)})_i (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)})_j (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}^{[k]})_i (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}^{[k]})_j \quad (179)$$

and

$$W_{ij} := Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]} - \mathbb{E} [Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]}]. \quad (180)$$

We can find that

$$\mathbb{E} [W_{ij} \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}] = \mathbb{E} [W_{ij}] \cdot \mathbb{E} [\tilde{U}_{i,j,k}] = 0 \quad (181)$$

because Z_{ij} and $Z_{ij}^{[k]}$ only depend on X_{ij} , X'_{ij} and X''_{ij} while $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}^{[k]}$ is independent of X_{ij} , X'_{ij} and X''_{ij} . Thus, it is enough to show

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} W_{ij} (V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}) \right] = o(N^{-1}). \quad (182)$$

Let us define the event \mathcal{E}'_1 : for some $D > 0$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} (\|\mathbf{v}_2\|_\infty, \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]}\|_\infty, \|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{(ij)}^{[k]}\|_\infty) \leq \frac{L^D}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (183)$$

We also define the event \mathcal{E}'_2 :

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \|\mathbf{v}_2 - \mathbf{u}_{(ij)}\|_\infty \leq N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \|\mathbf{v}_2^{[k]} - \mathbf{u}_{(ij)}^{[k]}\|_\infty \leq N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\delta}. \quad (184)$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}' := \mathcal{E}'_1 \cap \mathcal{E}'_2$, we can use the bound

$$|V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}| \leq \frac{L^D}{N^{2+\alpha}}. \quad (185)$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}'_1 \cap (\mathcal{E}'_2)^c$, it follows that from the delocalization

$$|V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}| \leq \frac{L^D}{N^2}. \quad (186)$$

We shall compute the expectation on \mathcal{E}' . Since $\mathbb{E}[Z_{ij} Z_{ij}^{[k]}] = O(N^{-1})$, we observe

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} W_{ij} (V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'} \right] = O \left(N^2 \cdot \frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^{2+\alpha}} \right). \quad (187)$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}'_1 \cap (\mathcal{E}'_2)^c$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} W_{ij} (V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_1 \cap (\mathcal{E}'_2)^c} \right] \leq N^2 \cdot \frac{C}{q^2} \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} \cdot \frac{1}{N^{\kappa'}} + N^2 \cdot \frac{C}{N} \cdot \frac{L^D}{N^2} \cdot \frac{1}{N^{\kappa'}} \quad (188)$$

for some $\kappa' > 0$ given by Lemma 4.2. We can verify that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} W_{ij} \left(V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_1 \cap (\mathcal{E}'_2)^c} \right] = o(N^{-1}). \quad (189)$$

Since $|V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k}| \leq 2$, on the event $(\mathcal{E}'_1)^c$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} W_{ij} \left(V_{i,j,k} - \tilde{U}_{i,j,k} \right) \mathbb{1}_{(\mathcal{E}'_2)^c} \right] \leq N^2 \cdot \frac{C}{q^2} \cdot \frac{1}{N^{K'}} = o(N^{-1}) \quad (190)$$

by choosing $K' > 0$ large enough. Therefore, we have the desired result.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 7.1

Lemma A.1. *For any $1 \leq k \leq N$, there exists an integer $1 \leq i \leq N$ such that for all E and $\eta > 0$*

$$\frac{1}{2(\max(\eta, |\lambda_k - E|))^2} \leq N\eta^{-1} \text{Im}R(E + i\eta)_{ii}. \quad (191)$$

Moreover, let $1 \leq k \leq L$. There exists $C_0 > 0$ such that with overwhelming probability, we have

$$|\lambda_k - 2| < L^{C_0} N^{-2/3} \quad (192)$$

and for all integers $1 \leq i \leq N$ and all E satisfying $|E - 2| < L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}$,

$$N\eta^{-1} \text{Im}R(E + i\eta)_{ii} \leq L^{C_0} \left(\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} |\lambda_j - E| \right)^{-2} \quad (193)$$

Proof.

$$\text{Im}R_{ii} = \sum_{p=1}^N \frac{\eta(\mathbf{v}_p(i))^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta^2} \quad (194)$$

Note that $\mathbf{v}_k(i) \geq N^{-1/2}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq N$. Since

$$N\eta^{-1} \text{Im}R_{ii} \geq \frac{N(\mathbf{v}_k(i))^2}{(\lambda_k - E)^2 + \eta^2} \geq \frac{1}{2(\max(\eta, |\lambda_k - E|))^2}, \quad (195)$$

the first one follows.

Now we choose an integer $1 \leq k \leq L$. By Lemma 3.4, with overwhelming probability, we have for some constant $C_0 > 0$

$$|\lambda_k - 2| \leq |\lambda_k - \gamma_k| + |\gamma_k - 2| \leq L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}, \quad (196)$$

which is the second result.

Next, we consider E satisfying $|E - 2| < L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}$. By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.7, for some constants $c > 0$, the following event \mathcal{E} holds with overwhelming probability: we have $E - \lambda_p \geq cp^{2/3} N^{-2/3}$ for all integer $p > N' := \lfloor L^{3C_0} \rfloor$, and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty^2 \leq L/N$. On the event \mathcal{E} , we have for some $C > 0$

$$\sum_{p=N'+1}^N \frac{N(\mathbf{v}_p(i))^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta^2} \leq \sum_{p=N'+1}^N \frac{L}{(\lambda_p - E)^2} \leq CL(N')^{-1/3} N^{4/3} \quad (197)$$

and

$$\sum_{p=1}^{N'} \frac{N(\mathbf{v}_p(i))^2}{(\lambda_p - E)^2 + \eta^2} \leq \frac{LN'}{(\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} |\lambda_j - E|)^2}. \quad (198)$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have $CL(N')^{-1/3}N^{4/3} \leq LN'(\min_{1 \leq j \leq N} |\lambda_j - E|)^{-2}$ with overwhelming probability, which implies the third result by adjusting the value of C_0 . \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $C_0, C_1 > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that, with overwhelming probability, the following event holds: for all $z = E + i\eta$ such that $|E - 2| \leq L^{C_0}N^{-2/3}$ and $\eta = L^{-C_1}N^{-2/3}$, we have for $i \neq j$*

$$|R(z)_{ij}| \leq L^C N^{-1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad |R(z)_{ii}| \leq C. \quad (199)$$

Proof. We shall use the local law [EKYY13, Theorem 2.9]. Then, for $i \neq j$, the following holds with overwhelming probability:

$$|R(z)_{ij}| \leq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad |R(z)_{ii} - m_{\text{sc}}(z)| \leq \delta \quad (200)$$

where for some constant $C' > 0$

$$\delta := L^{C'} \left(\frac{1}{q} + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z)}{N\eta}} + \frac{1}{N\eta} \right) \quad (201)$$

and $m_{\text{sc}}(z)$ is the Cauchy-Stieltjes transform of the semicircle distribution. According to [KY13, Lemma 3.2],

$$|m_{\text{sc}}(z)| \asymp 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z) \asymp \begin{cases} \sqrt{|E - 2| + \eta} & \text{if } |E| \leq 2, \\ \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{|E - 2| + \eta}} & \text{if } |E| \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (202)$$

Thus, for $|E - 2| \leq L^{C_0}N^{-2/3}$ and $\eta = L^{-C_1}N^{-2/3}$, it follows for some $C > 0$

$$\text{Im } m_{\text{sc}}(z) \leq L^C N^{-1/3}. \quad (203)$$

Recall that we consider the regime $q = N^b$ with $b > \frac{1}{3}$. Therefore, for some $C > 0$, we obtain

$$\delta \leq L^C N^{-1/3}. \quad (204)$$

The desired result follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.1. For $0 \leq t \leq k$, let \mathcal{F}_t be the σ -algebra generated by the random variable A , S_k and $(a'_{i_s j_s})_{1 \leq s \leq t}$. For $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, we set

$$T_{ij} = \{1 \leq t \leq k : \{i_t, j_t\} \cap \{i, j\} \neq \emptyset\} \quad (205)$$

Since \mathcal{F}_0 contains $\sigma(S_k)$, the cardinality $|T_{ij}|$ is \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable. We write

$$\begin{aligned} |T_{ij}| &= \sum_{l=i}^N \mathbb{1}[(il) \in S_k] + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{1}[(li) \in S_k] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}(i \neq j) \left(\sum_{l=j}^N \mathbb{1}[(jl) \in S_k] + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{1}[(lj) \in S_k] - 1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (206)$$

Since S_k is uniformly chosen at random, we have for any $1 \leq i' \leq j' \leq N$

$$\mathbb{P}((i'j') \in S_k) = \frac{\binom{\frac{N(N+1)}{2} - 1}{k-1}}{\binom{\frac{N(N+1)}{2}}{k}} = \frac{2k}{N(N+1)}. \quad (207)$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}|T_{ij}| = \begin{cases} \frac{2k(2N-1)}{N(N+1)} & \text{if } i < j, \\ \frac{2k}{(N+1)} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (208)$$

In other words,

$$\mathbb{E}|T_{ij}| = \Theta\left(\frac{k}{N}\right) \quad (209)$$

Next, we apply [Cha07, Proposition 1.1]. Then, for any $u > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|T_{ij}| \geq \mathbb{E}|T_{ij}| + u) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{4\mathbb{E}|T_{ij}| + 2u}\right), \quad (210)$$

which implies, with overwhelming probability,

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} |T_{ij}| \leq \frac{5k'}{N} \quad (211)$$

where $k' = \max(k, N(\log N)^2)$ (put $u = k'/N$). Let \mathcal{T} be the event that (211) holds. Denote by $\mathcal{E}_t \in \mathcal{F}_t$ the event that \mathcal{T} occurs and the conclusion of Lemma A.2 holds for $R^{[t]}$ (with the convention $A^{[0]} = A$). If \mathcal{E}_t holds, then for all $z = E + i\eta$ with $|E - 2| \leq L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}$ and $\eta = L^{-C_1} N^{-2/3}$, we have for some $C > 0$,

$$\max_{i \neq j} |R_{ij}^{[t]}(z)| \leq L^C N^{-1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_i |R_{ii}^{[t]}(z)| \leq C \quad (212)$$

We define $A_0^{[t]}$ as the symmetric matrix obtained from $A^{[t]}$ by setting to 0 the $(i_t j_t)$ -entry and $(j_t i_t)$ -entry. By construction, $A_0^{[t+1]}$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable. We denote by $R_0^{[t]}$ the resolvent of $A_0^{[t]}$. Recall the following resolvent identity.

$$(X - zI)^{-1} = (Y - zI)^{-1} + (Y - zI)^{-1}(Y - X)(X - zI)^{-1} \quad (213)$$

Using the resolvent identity (213), we get

$$R_0^{[t+1]} = \sum_{l=0}^2 \left(R^{[t]}(A^{[t]} - A_0^{[t+1]}) \right)^l R^{[t]} + \left(R^{[t]}(A^{[t]} - A_0^{[t+1]}) \right)^3 R_0^{[t+1]}. \quad (214)$$

We set for $i \leq j$, $E_{ij} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^T + \mathbf{e}_j \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbb{1}(i \neq j)$ where \mathbf{e}_i denotes the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n such that the i -th entry is equal to 1 and the other entries are equal to 0. We have

$$A^{[t]} - A_0^{[t+1]} = a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} E_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad A^{[t+1]} - A_0^{[t+1]} = a'_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} E_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} \quad (215)$$

Recall the fact that $|a_{ij}| \leq Cq^{-1}$ and $\|R_0^{[t+1]}\| \leq \eta^{-1}$. From now on, we work on the event \mathcal{E}_t with fixing $z = E + i\eta$ satisfying $|E - 2| \leq L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}$ and $\eta = L^{-C_1} N^{-2/3}$. For $i \neq j$, even if we assume the worst case $t+1 \in T_{ij}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(R_0^{[t+1]})_{ij}| &\leq L^C N^{-1/3} + Cq^{-1} + Cq^{-2} + Cq^{-3}\eta^{-1} \\ &= L^C N^{-1/3} + Cq^{-1} + Cq^{-2} + CL^{C_1} q^{-3} N^{2/3} \\ &\lesssim L^C N^{-1/3} \end{aligned} \quad (216)$$

where we use $q \gg N^{1/3}$ in the last inequality. For $i = j$, it is enough to consider

$$R_0^{[t+1]} = R^{[t]} + R^{[t]}(A^{[t]} - A_0^{[t+1]})R^{[t]} + \left(R^{[t]}(A^{[t]} - A_0^{[t+1]})\right)^2 R_0^{[t+1]}. \quad (217)$$

Then, it follows that

$$|(R_0^{[t+1]})_{ii}| \leq C + Cq^{-1} + Cq^{-2}\eta^{-1} \lesssim C. \quad (218)$$

In sum,

$$\max_{i \neq j} |(R_0^{[t+1]})_{ij}^{[t+1]}(z)| \leq L^C N^{-1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_i |(R_0^{[t+1]})_{ii}^{[t+1]}(z)| \leq C \quad (219)$$

Similarly, by the resolvent identity with $R^{[t+1]}$ and $R_0^{[t+1]}$,

$$R^{[t+1]} = R_0^{[t+1]} + R_0^{[t+1]}(A_0^{[t+1]} - A^{[t+1]})R_0^{[t+1]} + \left(R_0^{[t+1]}(A_0^{[t+1]} - A^{[t+1]})\right)^2 R^{[t+1]} \quad (220)$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^2 \left(R_0^{[t+1]}(A_0^{[t+1]} - A^{[t+1]})\right)^l R_0^{[t+1]} + \left(R_0^{[t+1]}(A_0^{[t+1]} - A^{[t+1]})\right)^3 R^{[t+1]}, \quad (221)$$

we observe

$$\max_{i \neq j} |R_{ij}^{[t]}(z)| \leq L^C N^{-1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_i |R_{ii}^{[t]}(z)| \leq C. \quad (222)$$

Since $R_0^{[t+1]} \in \mathcal{F}_t$, it follows from (221) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] &= (R_0^{[t+1]})_{ij} - r_{ij}^{[t+1]} \mathbb{E}[a'_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}}] + s_{ij}^{[t+1]} \mathbb{E}[(a'_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^2] \\ &\quad - ((R_0^{[t+1]} E_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3 R^{[t+1]})_{ij} \mathbb{E}[(a'_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3] \end{aligned} \quad (223)$$

where $r_{ij}^{[t]} := (R_0^{[t]} E_{i_t j_t} R_0^{[t]})_{ij}$ and $s_{ij}^{[t]} := ((R_0^{[t]} E_{i_t j_t})^2 R_0^{[t]})_{ij}$. We observe

$$\left| ((R_0^{[t+1]} E_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3 R^{[t+1]})_{ij} \mathbb{E}[(a'_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3] \right| \leq \alpha_{t+1} \quad (224)$$

where

$$\alpha_t := L^C N^{-2/3} q^{-3} \mathbb{1}(t \notin T_{ij}) + L^C N^{-1/3} q^{-3} \mathbb{1}(t \in T_{ij}) + Cq^{-3} \mathbb{1}(\{i, j\} = \{i_t, j_t\}) \quad (225)$$

We write the resolvent identity with $R^{[t]}$ and $R_0^{[t+1]}$,

$$R^{[t]} = \sum_{l=0}^2 \left(R_0^{[t+1]}(A_0^{[t+1]} - A^{[t]})\right)^l R_0^{[t+1]} + \left(R_0^{[t+1]}(A^{[t]} - A_0^{[t+1]})\right)^3 R^{[t]}, \quad (226)$$

and we get

$$R_{ij}^{[t]} = (R_0^{[t+1]})_{ij} - r_{ij}^{[t+1]} a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} + s_{ij}^{[t+1]} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^2 - ((R_0^{[t]} E_{i_t j_t})^3 R^{[t]})_{ij} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3. \quad (227)$$

In other words,

$$(R_0^{[t+1]})_{ij} = R_{ij}^{[t]} + r_{ij}^{[t+1]} a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} - s_{ij}^{[t+1]} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^2 + ((R_0^{[t]} E_{i_t j_t})^3 R^{[t]})_{ij} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3. \quad (228)$$

Note that, as we show in (224), we can find

$$\left| ((R_0^{[t+1]} E_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3 R^{[t+1]})_{ij} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3 \right| \leq \alpha_{t+1}. \quad (229)$$

It follows from (223) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] - R_{ij}^{[t]} &= r_{ij}^{[t+1]} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}} - \mathbb{E}[a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}}]) - s_{ij}^{[t+1]} ((a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^2 - \mathbb{E}[(a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^2]) \\ &\quad + ((R_0^{[t]} E_{i_t j_t})^3 R^{[t]})_{ij} (a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3 - ((R_0^{[t]} E_{i_t j_t})^3 R^{[t+1]})_{ij} \mathbb{E}[(a_{i_{t+1}j_{t+1}})^3] \end{aligned} \quad (230)$$

Now we are ready to make the desired bound.

$$R_{ij}^{[k]} - R_{ij} = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} (R_{ij}^{[t+1]} - R_{ij}^{[t]}) = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} (R_{ij}^{[t+1]} - \mathbb{E} [R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t]) + r_{ij} - s_{ij} + \alpha_{ij} \quad (231)$$

where

$$r_{ij} := \sum_{t=1}^k r_{ij}^{[t]} (a_{i_t j_t} - \mathbb{E}[a_{i_t j_t}]), \quad s_{ij} := \sum_{t=1}^k s_{ij}^{[t]} ((a_{i_t j_t})^2 - \mathbb{E}[(a_{i_t j_t})^2]), \quad |\alpha_{ij}| \leq 2 \sum_{t=1}^k \alpha_t. \quad (232)$$

We define

$$Z_{t+1} := (R_{ij}^{[t+1]} - \mathbb{E} [R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t]) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E}_t). \quad (233)$$

For any $u \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} (R_{ij}^{[t+1]} - \mathbb{E} [R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t]) \right| \geq u \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{t=1}^k Z_t \right| \geq u ; \bigcap_{t=0}^k \mathcal{E}_t \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{t=0}^k (\mathcal{E}_t)^c \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{t=1}^k Z_t \right| \geq u \right) + \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{E}_t)^c). \end{aligned} \quad (234)$$

Since the event \mathcal{T} and the conclusion of Lemma A.2 hold with overwhelming probability, it is verified that for any $C > 0$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{E}_t)^c) = O(N^{-C}). \quad (235)$$

Observe that $Z_s \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for all $s \leq t$,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E}_t) \mathbb{E} \left[(R_{ij}^{[t+1]} - \mathbb{E} [R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t]) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = 0, \quad (236)$$

and, by the resolvent identity,

$$|Z_t| \leq \beta_t \quad (237)$$

where

$$\beta_t := L^C N^{-\frac{2}{3}} q^{-1} \mathbb{1}(t \notin T_{ij}) + L^C N^{-\frac{1}{3}} q^{-1} \mathbb{1}(t \in T_{ij}) + C q^{-1} \mathbb{1}(\{i, j\} = \{i_t, j_t\}). \quad (238)$$

Next, we apply Azuma-Hoeffding inequality to bound $\sum_{t=1}^k Z_t$ because each Z_t has zero conditional expectation and is bounded by β_t . It follows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{t=1}^k Z_t \right| \geq u \cdot (\sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t^2)^{1/2} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{u^2}{2} \right). \quad (239)$$

By choosing $u = \log N$, we obtain that with overwhelming probability

$$\left| \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \left(R_{ij}^{[t+1]} - \mathbb{E} \left[R_{ij}^{[t+1]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \right) \right| \leq (\log N) \cdot (\sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t^2)^{1/2}. \quad (240)$$

Now it is enough to show $(\sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t^2)^{1/2} \leq L^{-C} N^{-1/3}$. Note that

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq L^C N^{-2/3} q^{-1} \sqrt{k} + L^C N^{-\frac{1}{3}} q^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{k'}{N}} + C q^{-1}. \quad (241)$$

Let $q = N^b$ with $b > 1/3$ and $k = N^\tau$. Then, it is required that

$$\max \left(-\frac{2}{3} - b + \frac{\tau}{2}, -\frac{5}{6} - b + \frac{\tau}{2}, -\frac{1}{3} - b, -b \right) < -\frac{1}{3} \quad (242)$$

and it boils down to the relation

$$\tau < 2b + \frac{2}{3}, \quad (243)$$

which is the given assumption. From this relation, we can realize that $\tau < \frac{5}{3}$ due to the assumption $b < \frac{1}{2}$.

In order to bound r_{ij} and s_{ij} , we introduce a backward filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t'\}$. Define \mathcal{F}_t' as the σ -algebra generated by A', S_k and $\{a_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} \setminus \{a_{i_s j_s}\}_{1 \leq s \leq t}$. Since $A^{[t]} \in \mathcal{F}_t'$, the event $\mathcal{E}_t \in \mathcal{F}_t'$ so the bounds of the resolvents we found above, (212), (219) and (222), is still valid with overwhelming probability. Thus, on the event \mathcal{E}_t , we have

$$\left| r_{ij}^{[t]}(a_{i_t j_t} - \mathbb{E}[a_{i_t j_t}]) \right| \leq \beta_t. \quad (244)$$

Define $Z_t' := r_{ij}^{[t]}(a_{i_t j_t} - \mathbb{E}[a_{i_t j_t}]) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{E}_t)$. Note that $Z_s' \in \mathcal{F}_t'$ for $s > t$. Since $A_0^{[t]} \in \mathcal{F}_t'$, we observe $r_{ij}^{[t]} \in \mathcal{F}_t'$, $\mathbb{E}[Z_t' | \mathcal{F}_t'] = 0$ and $|Z_t'| \leq \beta_t$. According to the same argument we used in (234), it is enough to bound

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{t=1}^k Z_t' \right| \geq u \cdot (\sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t^2)^{1/2} \right) \quad (245)$$

By applying Azuma-Hoeffding inequality with $u = \log N$, with overwhelming probability, it follows that

$$|r_{ij}| \leq (\log N) \cdot (\sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t^2)^{1/2} \leq L^{-C} N^{-1/3}. \quad (246)$$

Similarly, we can bound $|s_{ij}|$ using the backward filtration and Azuma-Hoeffding inequality. Since we have

$$\left| s_{ij}^{[t]} \left((a_{i_t j_t})^2 - \mathbb{E}[(a_{i_t j_t})^2] \right) \right| \leq q^{-1} \beta_t, \quad (247)$$

it follows that

$$|s_{ij}| \leq L^{-C} N^{-1/3}. \quad (248)$$

Moreover, we can check

$$\alpha_t \leq q^{-2} \beta_t, \quad (249)$$

which implies, under the relation (243),

$$\alpha_{ij} \leq 2 \sum_{t=1}^k \alpha_t \leq 2q^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^k \beta_t \leq L^{-C} N^{-1/3}. \quad (250)$$

As a final step, the desired result follows by a continuity argument. Since

$$|R_{ij}(E + i\eta) - R_{ij}(E' + i\eta)| \leq \frac{|E - E'|}{\eta^2}, \quad (251)$$

we split the interval $\{E : |E - 2| \leq L^{C_0} N^{-2/3}\}$ into many subintervals of length less than $\eta^{\frac{5}{2}}$. We have, with overwhelming probability, for every end point w of the subintervals,

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} N\eta |R^{[k]}(w)_{ij} - R(w)_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{L^2}. \quad (252)$$

By the continuity, the desired result also hold for all points inside every subintervals.. \square

A.4 Proof of Lemma 7.2

We write $\mathbf{v}_m = (v_{m,1}, \dots, v_{m,N})$ and $\mathbf{v}_m^{[k]} = (v_{m,1}^{[k]}, \dots, v_{m,N}^{[k]})$ for $m = 1, \dots, N$. By the spectral theorem, we have

$$N\eta \text{Im} R(z)_{ij} = \sum_{m=1}^N \frac{N\eta^2 v_{m,i} v_{m,j}}{(\lambda_m - E)^2 + \eta^2}. \quad (253)$$

According to Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.7, for some $c_0 > 0$, it follows that with overwhelming probability

$$|\lambda_2 - 2| \leq L^{c_0} N^{-2/3}, \quad \|\mathbf{v}_m\|_\infty^2 \leq L^D N^{-1} \quad (254)$$

and, for $m > N' := \lfloor L^{3c_0} \rfloor$ and E satisfying $|E - 2| \leq L^{c_0} N^{-2/3}$,

$$E - \lambda_m \geq cm^{2/3} N^{-2/3}. \quad (255)$$

Thus, we obtain with overwhelming probability that

$$\left| \sum_{m=N'+1}^N \frac{N v_{m,i} v_{m,j}}{(\lambda_m - E)^2 + \eta^2} \right| \leq L^D (N')^{-1/3} N^{4/3} \quad (256)$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Applying [EKYY12, Theorem 2.7], we can find $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 > \delta N^{-2/3}) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad (257)$$

As a result, if $|\lambda_2 - E| \leq (\delta/4)N^{-2/3}$, the following event

$$\left| \sum_{m=3}^{N'} \frac{N v_{m,i} v_{m,j}}{(\lambda_m - E)^2 + \eta^2} \right| \leq \frac{4L^D N' N^{4/3}}{\delta^2} \quad (258)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. If $|\lambda_2 - E| \leq \eta L^{-C_1}$, Lemma 3.7 implies that

$$\left| \frac{N \eta^2 v_{2,i} v_{2,j}}{(\lambda_2 - E)^2 + \eta^2} - N v_{2,i} v_{2,j} \right| \leq L^{D-2C_1} \quad (259)$$

holds with overwhelming probability. Also, since $\lambda_1 \sim \zeta q + 1/\zeta q$ with overwhelming probability by Lemma 3.6, we can verify that

$$\left| \frac{N \eta^2 v_{2,i} v_{2,j}}{(\lambda_1 - E)^2 + \eta^2} \right| \leq \frac{L^{D-2C_1} N^{-4/3}}{q^2} \quad (260)$$

holds with overwhelming probability (Lemma 3.7 is also used). Combining all of the above estimates and choosing $C_1 > 0$ large enough, we conclude that for all E satisfying $|\lambda_2 - E| \leq \eta L^{-C_1}$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} |N \eta \operatorname{Im} R(E + i\eta)_{ij} - N v_{2,i} v_{2,j}| \leq L^{-2} \quad (261)$$

with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Now we repeat the above all argument with replacing R with $R^{[k]}$, which provides us that for all E satisfying $|\lambda_2^{[k]} - E| \leq \eta L^{-C_1}$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq N} |N \eta \operatorname{Im} R^{[k]}(E + i\eta)_{ij} - N v_{2,i}^{[k]} v_{2,j}^{[k]}| \leq L^{-2} \quad (262)$$

with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. According to Lemma 7.3, we have $|\lambda_2 - \lambda_2^{[k]}| \leq \eta L^{-C_1}$ with overwhelming probability. Therefore (131) holds with probability at least $1 - 3\epsilon$.

References

- [BGBK17] Florent Benaych-Georges, Charles Bordenave, and Antti Knowles. Spectral radii of sparse random matrices. *arXiv preprint*, 2017.
- [BGBK19] Florent Benaych-Georges, Charles Bordenave, and Antti Knowles. Largest eigenvalues of sparse inhomogeneous Erdős–Rényi graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(3):1653–1676, 2019.
- [BHY17] Paul Bourgade, Jiaoyang Huang, and Horng-Tzer Yau. Eigenvector statistics of sparse random matrices. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 22:Paper No. 64, 38, 2017.
- [BKS99] Itai Benjamini, Gil Kalai, and Oded Schramm. Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and applications to percolation. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (90):5–43 (2001), 1999.
- [BLZ19] Charles Bordenave, Gábor Lugosi, and Nikita Zhivotovskiy. Noise sensitivity of the top eigenvector of a Wigner matrix. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1903.04869, 2019.
- [Cha05] Sourav Chatterjee. Concentration inequalities with exchangeable pairs. *PhD thesis, Stanford University*, 2005.

- [Cha07] Sourav Chatterjee. Stein’s method for concentration inequalities. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 138(1-2):305–321, 2007.
- [EKYY12] László Erdős, Antti Knowles, Horng-Tzer Yau, and Jun Yin. Spectral statistics of Erdős–Rényi Graphs II: Eigenvalue spacing and the extreme eigenvalues. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 314(3):587–640, 2012.
- [EKYY13] László Erdős, Antti Knowles, Horng-Tzer Yau, and Jun Yin. Spectral statistics of Erdős–Rényi graphs I: Local semicircle law. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(3B):2279–2375, 2013.
- [HKM18] Yukun He, Antti Knowles, and Matteo Marozzi. Local law and complete eigenvector delocalization for supercritical Erdős–Rényi graphs. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1808.09437, 2018.
- [KS03] Michael Krivelevich and Benny Sudakov. The largest eigenvalue of sparse random graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 12(1):61–72, 2003.
- [KY13] Antti Knowles and Jun Yin. The isotropic semicircle law and deformation of Wigner matrices. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(11):1663–1750, 2013.
- [LL19] Patrick Lopatto and Kyle Luh. Tail bounds for gaps between eigenvalues of sparse random matrices. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1901.05948, 2019.
- [LV18] Kyle Luh and Van Vu. Sparse random matrices have simple spectrum. *arXiv preprint*, 2018.