

Random Matrices: Theory and Applications  
 © World Scientific Publishing Company

**Spectral properties of sample covariance matrices  
 arising from random matrices  
 with independent non identically distributed columns**

Cosme Louart\*

*GIPSA-lab, 11 rue des Mathématiques, 38401 St Martin d'Hères  
 cosmeloart@gmail.com*

Romain Couillet†

*LIG-lab, 700 avens Centrale, 38401 St Martin d'Hères  
 romain.couillet@gipsa-lab.grenoble-inp.fr*

Received (Day Month Year)

Revised (Day Month Year)

Given a random matrix  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  with independent columns and satisfying concentration of measure hypotheses and a parameter  $z$  whose distance to the spectrum of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  should not depend on  $p, n$ , it was previously shown that the functionals  $\text{Tr}(AR(z))$ , for  $R(z) = (\frac{1}{n}XX^T - zI_p)^{-1}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p$  deterministic, have a standard deviation of order  $O(\|A\|_*/\sqrt{n})$ . Here, we show that  $\|\mathbb{E}[R(z)] - \tilde{R}(z)\|_F \leq O(1/\sqrt{n})$ , where  $\tilde{R}(z)$  is a deterministic matrix depending only on  $z$  and on the means and covariances of the column vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  (that do not have to be identically distributed). This estimation is key to providing accurate fluctuation rates of functionals of  $X$  of interest (mostly related to its spectral properties) and is proved thanks to the introduction of a semi-metric  $d_s$  defined on the set  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  of diagonal matrices with complex entries and positive imaginary part and satisfying, for all  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ :  $d_s(D, D') = \max_{i \in [n]} |D_i - D'_i| / (\Im(D_i)\Im(D'_i))^{1/2}$ .

Possibly most importantly, the underlying concentration of measure assumption on the columns of  $X$  finds an extremely natural ground for application in modern statistical machine learning algorithms where non-linear Lipschitz mappings and high number of classes form the base ingredients.

*Keywords:* random matrix theory ; concentration of measure ; covariance matrices ; contractivity and stability of quadratic equations.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 15A52, 60B12, 62J10

**Notations**

For any integer  $d \geq 1$ , we will note for simplicity  $[d] \equiv \{1, \dots, d\}$ . Given a complex variable  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , we denote  $\bar{z} = \Re(z) - i\Im(z)$  its conjugate. We denote

\*GIPSA-lab.

†LIG-lab, GIPSA-lab.

$\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, x \geq 0\}$  and  $\mathbb{H} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \Im(z) > 0\}$ , the hyperbolic space. We denote  $\|\cdot\|$  the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{C}^p$  defined for any  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathbb{C}^p$  as  $\|x\| = (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2)^{1/2}$ . We denote  $\mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  the set of real matrices of size  $p \times n$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_p$  the set of squared matrices of size  $p$  and  $\mathcal{O}_p \subset \mathcal{M}_p$  the set of orthogonal matrices. Given a set  $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{p,n}(A)$  is the set of matrices with entries in  $A$  and  $\mathcal{D}_n(A)$  the set of diagonal matrices with entries in  $A$ . Given a diagonal matrix  $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}_n(A)$ , we denote  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$  its diagonal elements. We introduce on  $\mathcal{M}_{p,n}(\mathbb{C})$  (and on  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{C})$ ) the spectral norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and the Frobenius norm  $\|\cdot\|_F$  defined for any  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}(A)$  as

$$\|M\| = \sup_{\|x\| \leq 1} \|Mx\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|M\|_F = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(M\bar{M}^T)}.$$

Given two sets  $A, B$ , we note  $\mathcal{F}(A)$ , the set of functions from  $A$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{F}(A, B)$ , the set of functions from  $A$  to  $B$ .

## Introduction

Considering a sample covariance matrix  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ , where  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  is the data matrix, we note  $\text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$  the spectrum of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ . The spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ , denoted  $\mu \equiv \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)} \delta_\lambda$ , is classically studied through its Stieltjes transform expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} g : \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{Sp}\left(\frac{1}{n}XX^T\right) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ z &\longmapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(\lambda)}{\lambda - z}. \end{aligned}$$

The relevance of the Stieltjes transform has been extensively justified in some seminal works [MP67, Sil86] by the Cauchy integral that provides for any analytical mapping  $f$  defined on a neighborhood of a subset  $B \subset \text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$  the identity:

$$\int_B f(\lambda) d\mu(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\gamma} f(z) g(z) dz,$$

where  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$  is a closed path on which  $f$  is defined and whose interior  $I_\gamma$  satisfies  $I_\gamma \cap \text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T) = B \cap \text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$ . But we can go further and approximate linear functionals of the eigenvectors thanks to the resolvent. If we note  $E_B$  the random eigenspace associated to the eigenvalues of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  belonging to  $B$ , and  $\Pi_B$  the orthogonal projector on  $E_B$ , then for any deterministic matrix  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p$ :

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi_B A) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_{\gamma} \text{Tr}(AR(z)) dz \quad \text{with } R(z) \equiv \left(\frac{1}{n}XX^T - zI_p\right)^{-1}. \quad (0.1)$$

The matrix  $R(z)$  is commonly called the resolvent of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ . It satisfies in particular that, for all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{Sp}(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$ ,  $g(z) = \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}(R(z))$ . It thus naturally becomes the central element of the study of the spectral distribution. One of the first tasks

in random matrix theory is to devise a so called “deterministic equivalent” for  $R(z)$  ([HLN07]), that we will denote here  $\tilde{R}(z)$ . Specifically, we look for a deterministic matrix computable from the first statistics of our problem (the means and covariances of the  $x_i$ ’s) and close to  $\mathbb{E}[R]$ . Two questions then arise:

- (1) Is  $R(z)$  close to  $\mathbb{E}[R(z)]$  ?
- (2) What does this notion of closeness really mean ?

The first questions relate to concentrations properties on  $R(z)$  that arise from concentration properties on  $X$ . The study of random matrices originally studied with i.i.d. entries ([MP67], [Yin86]), mere Gaussian hypotheses ([BKV96]), or with weaker hypotheses concerning the first moments of the entries (supposed to be independent or at least independent up to an affine transformation). Some more recent works showed the concentration of the spectral distribution of Wishart or Wigner matrices with log-concave hypotheses that relax some independence assumptions ([AC15]) or very light hypotheses on the quadratic functionals of the columns ([BZ08]), improved in ([Yas16]) or on the norms of the columns and the rows ([Ada11]). In the present work, we adopt similar hypotheses (slightly more general than [AC15] and more precise than [BZ08] and [Ada11]) originating from the concentration of measure theory. The concentration hypothesis on  $X$  is described in Assumption 0.2: for simplicity of exposition in the introduction, we will just assume here that the matrix  $X$  is a  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz transformation of a Gaussian vector  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  for any given  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  but for a Lipschitz parameter  $\lambda \ll n, p$  (we will write  $\lambda \leq O(1)$ ). We also require the columns  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  of  $X$  to be independent, but the entries of the columns may have intricate dependencies, as long as they remain  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz transformations of a Gaussian vector. This represents a wide range of random vectors and, among the most commonly studied random vectors, this mainly merely excludes the heavy tailed distributions and the discrete distributions.<sup>a</sup> Some large description of the concentration of measure phenomenon can be found in [Led05] and [BLM13] and more specifically, some elementary applications to random matrices are provided in [Tao12], [Ver18] and [LC19]. We further provide in subsection “Practical implications” a series of arguments demonstrating the relevance of this approach in classical problems of statistical machine learning.

The concentration inequality on  $X$  in a sense “propagates” to the resolvent that then satisfies, for all deterministic matrices  $A$  such that  $\|A\|_F \equiv \sqrt{\text{Tr}(AA^T)} \leq 1$  and for all  $z$  not too close to the spectrum of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(|\text{Tr}(A(R(z) - \mathbb{E}[R(z)]))| \geq t) \leq Ce^{-cnt^2} + Ce^{-cn}, \quad (0.2)$$

for some numerical constants  $C, c$  independent of  $n, p$ . We see from (0.2) the important benefit gained with our concentration hypothesis on  $X$ : it provides simple

<sup>a</sup>Some of these random vectors still satisfy what is referred to as “convex concentration” hypotheses and their sample covariance matrix may still be studied but to the expense of more advanced control (see [LC19] and a coming follow-up work).

*quasi-asymptotic* results on the convergence of the resolvent, while most of the results on random matrices are classically expressed in the limiting regime where  $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ .

The condition  $\|A\|_F \leq 1$  answers our second question: a specificity of our approach is to control the convergence of the resolvent with the Frobenius norm at a speed of order  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ . The concentration inequality (0.2) means that all linear forms of  $R(z)$ , which are 1-Lipschitz<sup>b</sup> for the Frobenius norm, have a standard deviation of order  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ ; this is crucial to be able to estimate quantities expressed in (0.1). Generally, the only studied linear forms of the resolvent are the Stieltjes transform  $g(z) = -\frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}(R(z))$  (it is  $1/\sqrt{p}$ -Lipschitz so its standard deviation is of order  $O(1/\sqrt{pn})$  which is a classical result although not exactly under a concentration of measure assumption) or projections on deterministic vectors  $u^T R(z)u$ , for which only the concentration in spectral norm with a speed of order  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  is needed.

Those remarks gain a real importance when we are able to estimate the expectation of  $R(z)$  with a deterministic equivalent (that we can compute). In this article, we look for a closeness relation in Frobenius norm:

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}[R(z)] - \tilde{R}(z) \right\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

We may then replace in (0.2) the term “ $\mathbb{E}[R(z)]$ ” by  $\tilde{R}(z)$  which we are able to compute from the expectations and covariances of the columns  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

Note, and this is one of our important contributions, that we do not assume that the columns are identically distributed: in particular, the means and covariances can be all different (although they have to satisfy some boundedness properties expressed in Assumptions 0.4 and 0.5). This remark may be related to the studies made of matrices  $X$  with a variance profile: but this is here even more general because the laws of the columns are not solely defined from their means and covariances (although the spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  just depends on these quantities).

The main issue raised by this hypothesis is that the deterministic equivalent is then defined from the  $n$  diagonal entries of a diagonal matrix<sup>c</sup>  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z = \text{Diag}(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z)_{i \in [n]} \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{C})$  solution to:

$$\forall i \in [n] : \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z = z - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \equiv \left( I_p - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z} \right)^{-1}, \quad (0.3)$$

in which  $\Sigma_i = \mathbb{E}[x_i x_i^T]$ . The difficulties are then (i) to prove the existence and uniqueness of  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  and (ii) to ensure some stability properties<sup>d</sup> on this equation

<sup>b</sup>or  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz with  $\lambda \leq O(1)$

<sup>c</sup>The interest to resort to a diagonal matrix of  $\mathcal{M}_n$  rather than to a vector of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  will be clearer later – mainly to employ Proposition 1.4 in a natural formalism.

<sup>d</sup>Conceptually, it means that if we have a diagonal matrix  $L \in \mathcal{M}_n$  satisfying  $\forall i \in [n] : L_i \equiv z - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^L \right)$  then  $L$  is “close” to  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$ .

eventually allowing us to assert that  $\|\mathbb{E}[R(z)] - \tilde{R}(z)\|_F \leq O(1/\sqrt{n})$ , where  $\tilde{R}(z) \equiv \frac{1}{z} \tilde{Q} \tilde{\Lambda}^z$ . Those two difficulties disappear when most of the  $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$  are equal; in other words, when we have a finite number of distinct distributions for the  $x_i$ 's (see [LC19]). When they are all different, our solution consists in introducing a convenient semi-metric<sup>e</sup>  $d_s$  on which the fixed point equation satisfied by  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is contractive, leading (after still some work since a semi-metric is not as easy to treat as if  $d_s$  were a true metric) to existence, uniqueness and stability properties. This semi-metric, quite similar to the one already introduced in [LC20] to study robust estimators, is defined for any  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  as:

$$d_s(D, D') = \left\| \frac{D - D'}{\sqrt{\Im(D)\Im(D')}} \right\|.$$

The semi-metric appears as a central object in random matrix theory that already gained some visibility in a squared form in [AKE16], where it relates to the hyperbolic metric through the identity  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(z, z') = \cosh(d_s(z, z')^2 - 1)$ . In particular, we can show that any Stieltjes transform is 1-Lipschitz for this semi-metric (see Appendix A). Once the appropriate semi-metric is identified, contractivity properties are not sufficient to prove the existence and uniqueness to (0.3): one also needs to introduce the correct space over which the mapping is contractive ( $\mathcal{D}_{I^z} \equiv \{D \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H}), \frac{D}{z} \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})\}$ ).

Let us now present more precisely our assumptions and main results.

### Assumptions and Main Results

Let us start with the deterministic results concerning the diagonal matrices  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$ , which do not require any particularly constraining assumption.

**Theorem 1.** *Given  $n$  nonnegative symmetric matrices  $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n \in \mathcal{M}_p$ , for all  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ , the equation:*

$$\forall i \in [n], L_i = z - \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \left( I_p - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{L_i} \right)^{-1} \right) \quad (0.4)$$

*admits a unique solution  $L \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  that we denote  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$ .*

Letting  $\tilde{R} : z \mapsto \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z \Sigma_i}{L_i} - z I_p \right)^{-1}$ , we can construct with  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  a Stieltjes transform whose associated distribution converges towards the spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n} X X^T$ , where  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and for all  $i \in [n]$ ,  $\Sigma_i = \mathbb{E}[x_i x_i^T]$ .

**Theorem 2.** *The mapping  $\tilde{g} : z \rightarrow \frac{1}{p} \operatorname{Tr}(\tilde{R})$  is the Stieltjes transform of a measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  of compact support  $\tilde{S} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ .*

<sup>e</sup>A semi metric is defined as a metric that does not satisfies the triangular inequality.

Let us now set the stage for the results on  $X$ . We want to track the speed of convergence of our various quantities of interest as a function of  $n$  to provide a quasi asymptotic result that can be used for sufficiently large values of  $n$ . We will then assume that all our quantities depend on  $n$ ,  $X = X_n$  but also  $p = p_n$  that should not be too large compared to  $n$ :

**Assumption 0.1.** There exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $p \leq Kn$ .

The concentration hypothesis on  $X = X_n$  is a bit involved: it is issued from the concentration of measure theory and concerns a wide range of random vectors, in particular any random matrix  $X = \Phi(Z)$  with  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^d, \|\cdot\|) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_{p,n}, \|\cdot\|_F)$ ,  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz. For more examples, see [Led05].

**Assumption 0.2.** There exist two constants  $C, c > 0$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and for all 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : \mathcal{M}_{p,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(|f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)]| \geq t) \leq Ce^{-(t/c)^2}.$$

In the previous example where  $X = \Phi(Z)$ ,  $C = 2$  and  $c = \lambda\sqrt{2}$  which do not depend on  $d$  that can be taken as large as necessary.

A third natural and fundamental hypothesis is to assume that the  $n$  columns of  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  are independent. Again, we do not assume that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are identically distributed: we can possibly have  $n$  different distributions for the columns of  $X$ .

**Assumption 0.3.**  $X$  has independent columns  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ .

Let us note for simplicity, for any  $i \in [n]$ :

$$\mu_i \equiv \mathbb{E}[x_i] \quad \Sigma_i \equiv \mathbb{E}[x_i x_i^T] \quad \text{and} \quad C_i \equiv \Sigma_i - \mu_i \mu_i^T.$$

It is easy to deduce from Assumption 0.2 (see [LC19]) that there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\|C_i\| \leq O(1)$ . But to have the best convergence bounds, we also need to impose:<sup>f</sup>

**Assumption 0.4.**  $\exists K > 0$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\forall i \in [n] : \|\mu_i\| \leq K$ .

We conclude with a last assumption which is likely central to precisely approximate the support of the spectral distribution.<sup>g</sup> Although we are unsure of its importance, our line of arguments could not avoid it; it is nonetheless quite a weak constraint in view of the practical use of our result.

**Assumption 0.5.**  $\exists K > 0$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\forall i \in [n] : \Sigma_i \geq KI_p$ .

<sup>f</sup>In [LC19], we only supposed that  $\|\mu_i\| \leq O(\sqrt{n})$ , however, then we only had an approximation of the resolvent with the spectral norm, here we will provide a similar convergence result with the Frobenius norm.

<sup>g</sup>the values of the Stieltjes distribution  $g(z)$  can be approximated for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  sufficiently far from the real axis or for  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  sufficiently far from the support without this assumption.

Recalling that our goal is to estimate the spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ , we denote  $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p \geq 0$  the  $p$  eigenvalues of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ . We wish to estimate:

$$\mu = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \delta_{\lambda_i}.$$

Now, let us remark that the spectrum of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  is closely related to the spectrum of  $\frac{1}{n}X^T X$  via the equivalence:

$$\lambda \in \text{Sp} \left( \frac{1}{n}XX^T \right) \setminus \{0\} \iff \lambda \in \text{Sp} \left( \frac{1}{n}X^T X \right) \setminus \{0\}.$$

As a consequence, one of the two matrices has  $|n - p|$  supplementary zeros in its spectrum. Those zeros not carrying any specific information about the distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ , we will remove them from our study to avoid unnecessary complications. The  $\min(p, n)$  first entries of  $\sigma(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$  and  $\sigma(\frac{1}{n}X^T X)$  are the same (and some of them can cancel), we thus naturally introduce the sets:

$$S \equiv \{\mathbb{E}[\lambda_i], i \in [n]\} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{-0} \equiv \{\mathbb{E}[\lambda_i], i \in [\min(p, n)]\},$$

(we have the inclusion  $S \subset S_{-0} \cup \{0\}$ , but possibly,  $0 \in S_{-0}$ ). To avoid the issue on zero, instead of studying, as it is usually done, the resolvent  $R(z) = (\frac{1}{n}XX^T - zI_p)^{-1}$ , we rather look at:

$$Q^z \equiv \left( I_p - \frac{1}{zn}XX^T \right)^{-1},$$

that has the advantage of satisfying  $\|Q^z\| \leq O(1)$ , for all  $z \in S_{-0}$ .

Given a set  $T \subset \mathbb{C}$ , we note for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $T^\varepsilon = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \exists t \in T, |z - t| \leq \varepsilon\}$ . We introduce the semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|_{S_{-0}^\varepsilon}$ , defined for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{C})$  as:

$$\|f\|_{S_{-0}^\varepsilon} = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} |f(z)|.$$

**Theorem 3.** *Under Assumptions 0.1-0.5, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist two constants  $C, c > 0$ , such that for all linear mapping  $u : \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  1-Lipschitz for the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{S_{-0}^\varepsilon}$ :*

$$\mathbb{P}(|u(g - \tilde{g})| \geq t) \leq Ce^{-cnp t^2} + Ce^{-cn}.$$

In particular, following the preliminary inferences of the introduction, for any analytical mapping  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , since the integration on bounded paths of  $\mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$  is Lipschitz for the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{S_{-0}^\varepsilon}$ , we can approximate:

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int f(\lambda) d\mu(\lambda) - \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_\gamma f(z)g(z)dz \right| \geq t \right) \leq Ce^{-cnp t^2} + Ce^{-cn},$$

for any close path  $S_{-0}^\varepsilon \subset \gamma \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$  with length  $l_\gamma$  satisfying  $l_\gamma \leq O(1)$ . There exists a correspondence between a distribution and its Stieltjes transform: denoting

$\mu$  the spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ , we have indeed for any real  $a < b$ :

$$\mu([a, b]) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_a^b \Im(g(x + iy)) dx.$$

As seen on Figure 1, this measure is naturally close to  $\tilde{\mu}$  defined for any real  $a < b$  as  $\tilde{\mu}([a, b]) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_a^b \Im(\tilde{g}(x + iy)) dx$ . For computation issues, the quantities  $p$  and  $n$  are chosen relatively small; the convergence of the iteration of the fixed point equation (0.4) defining  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  is in particular very slow when the covariances  $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$  are all different from one another. Although the contractivity of (0.4) for the semi metric  $d_s$  ensures the convergence of the iterations, the Lipschitz parameter is very close to 1 when  $z = x + iy$  is close to the spectrum (that happens naturally when  $y$  is chosen close to 0 to estimate  $d\tilde{\mu}$ ).

We even have a stronger result that provides inferences on eigenvectors thanks to the approximation of the mapping  $R : z \mapsto (\frac{1}{n}XX^T - zI_p)^{-1}$ . Here  $z$  must be far from zero when  $0 \in S$  (even if  $0 \notin S_{-0}$ ). For this result, we introduce the semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|_{F, S^\varepsilon}$ , defined for every  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{C}, \mathcal{M}_p)$  as:

$$\|f\|_{F, S^\varepsilon} = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon} \|f(z)\|_F.$$

**Theorem 4.** *Under Assumptions 0.1-0.5, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist two constants  $C, c > 0$ , such that for all linear form  $u : \mathcal{M}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , 1-Lipschitz for the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{F, S^\varepsilon}$ :*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| u \left( R - \tilde{R} \right) \right| \geq t \right) \leq C e^{-c n t^2} + C e^{-c n}.$$

The projections on deterministic vectors provide us with good estimates on isolated eigenvectors, but a concentration in spectral norm would have been sufficient for this kind of result. A key consequence of Theorem 4 lies in its also providing accurate estimates of projections on high dimensional subspaces  $F \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ ; this is shown<sup>h</sup> in Figure 2 that depicts some of these projections with increasing numbers of classes. If we let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a subset of the eigenvalues of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$ ,  $E_A$  the eigenspace associated to those eigenvalues and  $\Pi_A$  and  $\Pi_F$ , respectively the orthogonal projection on  $E_A$  and  $F$ , we can bound (since  $\|\Pi_F\|_F = \sqrt{\dim(F)} \leq O(\sqrt{p})$ ):

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}(\Pi_F \Pi_A) - \frac{1}{2ip\pi} \oint_\gamma \text{Tr}(\Pi_F \tilde{R}(z)) dz \right| \geq t \right) \leq C e^{-c n p t^2} + C e^{-c n}.$$

<sup>h</sup>It must be noted that that the setting of Figure 2 does not exactly fall under the hypotheses of the paper (since here  $\|\mathbb{E}[x_i]\| \geq O(\sqrt{p})$ ), as the amplitude of the signals must be sufficiently large for the resulting eigenvalues to isolate from the bulk of the distribution when the number of classes is high ( $\sqrt{p} \approx 14$  is not so large). However, even in this extreme setting the prediction are good.






Fig. 1. Spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  and its deterministic estimate obtained from  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  for  $n = 160$  and  $p = 80$ . Introducing  $P$  an orthogonal matrix chosen randomly and  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{D}_p$  such that for  $j \in \{1, \dots, 20\}$ ,  $\Sigma_j = 1$  and for  $j \in \{21, \dots, 80\}$ ,  $\Sigma_j = 8$ , we chose **(left)**  $\forall i \in [n]$ ,  $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$  and **(right)**  $\forall i \in [n]$ ,  $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_i)$ , where  $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma$  and  $\Sigma_{i+1} = P^T \Sigma_i P$  for all  $i \in [n]$ . The histograms would have been similar for any other concentrated vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  having the same covariances and comparable observation diameter (see Definition 1.1)

## Practical implications

Results on the large dimensional behavior of sample covariance matrix models are far from a novelty and the present article may at first sight be seen as *yet another variation* stacked on the pile of previous generalizations to the seminal work of Marčenko and Pastur [MP67].

The core motivation for the present development of a *concentration of measure approach to random matrices* does not arise as a mere additional mathematical exercise but more fundamentally as a much needed new toolbox to address the modern problem of *efficient big data processing*. Specifically, the question of mastering artificial intelligence and automated data processing in the era of the data deluge comes along with two structural difficulties: (i) efficient machine learning algorithms (starting with neural networks) inherently rely on a *succession of non-linear operators* which, as it appears, guarantee algorithm stability when these operators are *Lipschitz*; (ii) while hitting several instances of the curse of dimensionality (which make modern neural networks extremely resource consuming), algorithm stability also appears to be guaranteed when large and numerous data are considered; besides, and possibly most importantly, as evidenced in recent works [SLTC20], *assuming the large dimensional data to be instances of concentrated random vectors is a satisfying model* to theoretically track the behavior of real algorithms applied on real data (precisely, it can be shown, as with the example of artificial images produced with *generative adversarial networks*, that real data of practical interest – such as images, sounds, or modern natural language embeddings – are akin to concentrated random vectors).




Fig. 2. Prediction of the alignment of the signals in the data towards the eigen space of the biggest eigen values of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  for  $p = 200$ ,  $n = kn_k$  where  $n_k = 20$  and  $k$  is the number of classes taking the values  $k = 10, 15, 20, 30, 35, 42, 50, 62, 75$ . The signals  $u_1, \dots, u_k$  are drawn randomly and independently following a law  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$ , and we let  $U = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathcal{M}_{p,k}$ . Then, for all  $j \in [k]$  and  $l \in [20]$ ,  $x_{j+ln_k} \sim \mathcal{N}(u_j, I_p)$ . **(top and bottom left)** representation of the spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  and its prediction with  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ . **(bottom right)** representation (with marks) of the quantities  $\text{Tr}(\Pi_{E_A} UU^T)$  and  $\mathbb{1}^T \Pi_{E_A} \mathbb{1}$  and their prediction (smooth line) with the integration of, respectively,  $\Im(\frac{1}{z\pi} \text{Tr}(\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z}))$  and  $\Im(\frac{1}{z\pi} \mathbb{1}^T \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \mathbb{1})$  on the path drawn in red on the other graphs. The line  $y = k$  represents instances of  $\text{Tr}(\Pi_A) = k$  that can be approximated integrating  $\frac{1}{z\pi} \text{Tr}(\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z})$ . The projection  $\text{Tr}(\Pi_{E_A} UU^T)$  is a little lower than  $k$  because the eigen vectors associated to the highest eigen values of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  are not perfectly aligned with the signal due to the randomness of  $X$ .

These two features of modern data processing forcefully call for a revision of large dimensional statistics, starting with random matrix theory, towards a generic framework of concentration of measure theory for large dimensional vectors and matrices. The present work, buttressed on our detailed contribution [LC20], provides the mathematical base ground for applying this framework to elementary (yet already quite rich) models of large dimensional “realistic sample” covariance matri-

ces. Note in particular that one important contribution of this paper is to generalize the results to unlimited number of classes (in classification tasks for instance) which is a classical question raised in machine learning problems.

Among other applications, our results are applicable to:

- track the behavior of the successive non-linear layers of neural networks applied on (concentrated random vector-modelled) real data; the main interest of our framework in this setting is that concentration of measure propagates seamlessly from layer to layer (which would not be valid if assumptions of independence between the data vector entries were made);
- evaluate the performance of most standard machine learning algorithms for classification and regression, all based on Lipschitz operators: from hyperplane-based (support vector machines) to graph-based (semi-supervised learning) classifications.

We consequently believe that the present work may serve, in the long run, as a springboard to simplify and systematize the analysis, improvement, and cost efficiency (thus reduce the carbon footprint) of modern large data processing algorithms.

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. We first provide some basic notations and results to handle concentrated random vectors (**Section 1**). Second, we explain why and how we have to place ourselves on an event of overwhelming probability where  $Q^z$  is bounded to show our convergence results (**Section 2**). Third, we prove the concentration of the resolvent (**Section 3**) and provide a first, intermediary, deterministic equivalent which at this stage will not be numerically satisfying (**Section 4**). Then we introduce the semi-metric  $d_s$  and prove Theorem 1 (the existence and uniqueness of  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ ) (**Section 5**) and devise our second deterministic equivalent  $\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}}$  that we can compute from  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  and that satisfies Theorem 4 (**Section 6**). Eventually, we show that  $\tilde{g}$  is a Stieltjes transform (Theorem 2) and that it approaches the Stieltjes transform of our spectral distribution (Theorem 3) (**Section 7**).

### 1. Concentration of Measure notations and general inferences

Concentration of measure is a phenomenon that appears for random vector in high dimensions, in our case, for  $X \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  or even for the column vectors  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . The idea is to track the concentration of real "observations" (or "functionals") of those random vectors through dimensionality (here when  $n$  gets big since  $p$  is seen as an integer sequence depending on  $n$ ). More precisely, we say that a random vector  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is concentrated if all the  $f(Z)$  for any  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  1-Lipschitz satisfies interesting concentration inequality detailed below.

In what follows, we simplify greatly the approach, for a larger coverage of these notions, we advice the reader to consult our previous works in [LC19,LC21]. To stay in the setting that interest us, we keep the index notation  $n$ , the next definition introduce the notation for concentrated vectors depending on  $n$ , the vector spaces will be in the next section either  $\mathcal{M}_{p_n,n}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^{p_n}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{p_n}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_n$  and vector spaces of functions taking value in those vector spaces. In all those cases, the associated norm (or semi-norm) must be specified, but it will generally be the euclidean norm (i.e. the Frobenius norm on matricial spaces).

To control the convergence speeds, we will extensively use the notation  $O(a_n)$  or  $o(a_n)$  in inequalities, they are defined followingly, for two given sequences  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} b_n \leq O(a_n) &\iff \exists K > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, b_n \leq K a_n \\ b_n \geq O(a_n) &\iff a_n \leq O(b_n) \\ b_n \leq o(a_n) &\iff \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, b_n \leq \varepsilon a_n \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 1.1.** Given a sequence of normed (or semi-normed) vector spaces  $(E_n, \|\cdot\|_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , a sequence of random vectors<sup>i</sup>  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0} \in \prod_{n \geq 0} E_n$ , a sequence of positive reals  $(\sigma_n)_{n \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}}$  and a parameter  $q > 0$ , we say that  $Z_n$  is *concentrated* with an *observable diameter* of order  $O(\sigma_n)$  iff there exist  $C, c > 0$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : E_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\forall t > 0 : \mathbb{P}(|f(Z_n) - \mathbb{E}[f(Z_n)]| \geq t) \leq C e^{-(t/c\sigma_n)^q} \quad (1.1)$$

We note in that case  $Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma)$ . When  $\sigma_n \leq O(1)$ , we have  $Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q(1)$ , that we note more simply  $Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q$ .

With this new notation, we can rewrite Assumption 0.2 followingly:

$$X \propto \mathcal{E}_2.$$

<sup>i</sup>A random vector  $Z$  of  $E$  is a measurable function from a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  to the normed vector space  $(E, \|\cdot\|)$  (endowed with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra); one should indeed write  $Z : \Omega \rightarrow E$ , but we abusively simply denote  $Z \in E$ .

We deduce immediately from this definition, that once he have a concentrated random vector (for instance  $Z \propto \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$ ) then we can construct an infinite number of them thanks to Lipschitz transformations as explained in next proposition.

**Proposition 1.1.** *In the setting of Definition 1.1, if we are given a second sequence of normed vector spaces  $(E'_n, \|\cdot\|'_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , a sequence of positive parameters  $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}}$  and a sequence of  $\lambda_n$ -Lipschitz transformation  $\phi_n : E_n \rightarrow E'_n$ , then we have the implication:*

$$Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma) \iff \phi(Z) \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\lambda\sigma).$$

We pursue this first definition with an important notion called the deterministic equivalent, which is basically a relevant approximation of the expectation of a concentrated vector. It is in particular important when we look at linear forms on the random vector (our main objective is to find a deterministic equivalent for  $R(z)$ ).

**Definition 1.2.** In the setting of Definition 1.1 and given a sequence of deterministic vectors  $\tilde{Z} \in E_n$ , we say that  $Z$  is *linearly concentrated* around the *deterministic equivalent*  $\tilde{Z}$  with an observable diameter of order  $\sigma$  iff there exist two constants  $C, c > 0$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and all  $u : E_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  1-Lipschitz and linear:

$$\forall t > 0 : \mathbb{P}\left(\left|u(Z_n - \tilde{Z}_n)\right| \geq t\right) \leq Ce^{-(t/c\sigma_n)^q}.$$

We note then  $Z \in \tilde{Z} \pm \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma)$ .

This notation will be extensively employed on random variables (depending on  $X$  and thus on  $n$ ) for which the notion of Lipschitz concentration and of linear concentration is equivalent. Of course,  $Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma) \implies Z \in \mathbb{E}[Z] \pm \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma)$ . We have in particular the simple but important result:

**Lemma 1 ([LC19], Lemma 2.6).** *In the setting of Definition 1.1, given two deterministic vectors  $\tilde{Z}, \tilde{Z}' \in E_n$ , if  $\|Z_n - Z'_n\|_n \leq O(\sigma_n)$ , then we have the equivalence:*

$$Z \in \tilde{Z} \pm \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma) \iff Z \in \tilde{Z}' \pm \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma).$$

This Lemma gives the global scheme of our paper, we first show that  $R(z) \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{n})$ , then we look for a deterministic matrix  $\tilde{R}(z)$  such that  $\|\mathbb{E}[R(z)] - \tilde{R}(z)\|_F \leq O(1/\sqrt{n})$ . We provide then a useful control on the norm of linearly concentrated matrices (the same bound is true for vectors of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  since they can be seen as matrices and the spectral norm then coincides with the euclidean norm). While being a stronger property, the Lipschitz concentration described in Definition 1.1 does not allow us to get a better bound.

**Proposition 1.2 ([LC19], Corollary 2.13).** *In the setting of Definition 1.2, if  $E_n = \mathcal{M}_{p_n, n}$ :*

$$Z \in \tilde{Z} \pm \mathcal{E}_2(\sigma) \implies \mathbb{E}[\|Z - \tilde{Z}\|] \leq O(\sqrt{n}\sigma)$$

The concentration  $Q^z \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{n})$  can not be rigorously stated with Proposition 1.1, because when  $\frac{1}{n_z}XX^T$  is too close to zero, then  $Q^z$  diverges and is far from a Lipschitz transformation of  $X$  (see the beginning of subsection 2 for more details on this issue). We need here to remove the highly unprobable event that some eigen values of  $\frac{1}{n_z}XX^T$  get close to 1 (this is the term  $Ce^{-cn}$  appearing in Theorem 3 and 4). This little correction is made possible thanks to next lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *In the setting of Definition 1.1, if we are given a sequence of events  $\mathcal{A}_n$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n) \geq O(1)$ , then:*

$$Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (Z \mid \mathcal{A}) \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma).$$

In particular, that implies that if a functional  $f : E_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is only  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz on a subset  $F \subset E_n$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(Z \in F) \geq O(1)$ , then the concentration  $Z \propto \mathcal{E}_q(\sigma)$  implies the existence of two constants  $C, c > 0$ , such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\forall t > 0 : \mathbb{P}(|f(Z) - \mathbb{E}[f(Z) \mid Z \in F]| \geq t \mid Z \in F) \leq Ce^{-(t/c\lambda\sigma)^q}.$$

**Proof.** We know from [LC19] that there exists an equivalent definition of Definition 1.1 where we assume for all 1-Lipschitz mapping  $f : E_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the existence of a constant  $a_f$  such that<sup>1</sup>:

$$\forall t > 0 : \mathbb{P}(|f(Z_n) - a_f| \geq t) \leq Ce^{-(t/c\sigma_n)^q}$$

(it replaces inequality (1.1) in Definition 1.1). An equivalent definition is also obtained replacing inequality (1.1) with:

$$\forall t > 0 : \mathbb{P}(|f(Z_n) - m_f| \geq t) \leq Ce^{-(t/c\sigma_n)^q},$$

where  $m_f$  is a median of  $f(Z_n)$ .

Given such a mapping  $f$ , and such a median  $m_f$ , let us note  $S \equiv \{z \in E \mid f(z) \leq m_f\}$ , since  $f$  is 1-Lipschitz, we can bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|f(Z_n) - m_f| \geq t \mid \mathcal{A}_n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(d(Z_n, S) \geq t \text{ or } d(Z_n, S^c) \geq t \mid \mathcal{A}_n) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n)} (\mathbb{P}(d(Z_n, S) \geq t) + \mathbb{P}(d(Z_n, S^c) \geq t)) \\ &\leq \frac{2C}{K} e^{-(t/c\sigma_n)^q}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $C, c > 0$ , since  $g : z \mapsto d(z, S)$  and  $g' : z \mapsto d(z, S^c)$  are 1-Lipschitz and 0 is  $\square$

We end this preliminary section with two important results of concentration of measure theory that will give us the basis for the approximation of  $\mathbb{E}[Q^z]$ .

<sup>1</sup>In other word, if the observations are concentrated around a constant, then, they are also concentrated around their means (the converse is clear). The approach with the expectation is not adapted here because the expectation depends on the event on which it is taken, so we would actually have to bound  $\mathbb{P}(|f(Z_n) - \mathbb{E}[f(Z_n) \mid \mathcal{A}_n]| \geq t \mid \mathcal{A}_n)$  to show the concentration of  $X \mid \mathcal{A}$ .

**Proposition 1.3 (Hanson-Wright, [LC21], Proposition 8).** *Given two random matrices  $X \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ , if we assume that  $X \propto \mathcal{E}_2$  and  $\|\mathbb{E}[X]\|_F \leq O(1)$ , then for all deterministic matrix  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p$ , we have the concentration<sup>k</sup>:*

$$X^T A X \in \mathbb{E}[X^T A X] \pm \mathcal{E}_2(\|A\|_F) + \mathcal{E}_1(\|A\|) \quad \text{in } (\mathcal{M}_n, \|\cdot\|_F)$$

*In particular, given any  $r \leq O(1)$  and any 1-Lipschitz and linear mapping  $u : \mathcal{M}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| u \left( X^T A X - \mathbb{E}[X^T A X] \right) \right|^r \right] \leq O(\|A\|_F^r)$$

**Proposition 1.4 ([LC21], Proposition 11).** *Given two random matrices  $D \in \mathcal{D}_n$ ,  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  and a deterministic matrix  $\tilde{D} \in \mathcal{D}_n$ , such that:*

- $D \in \tilde{D} \pm \mathcal{E}_2$  in  $(\mathcal{D}_n, \|\cdot\|_F)$ ,
- $x_i \propto \mathcal{E}_2$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^p, \|\cdot\|)$ ,
- $\sup_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbb{E}[x_i]\| \leq O(1)$ ,

*we can bound:*

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[ X(D - \tilde{D})X^T \right] \right\|_F \leq O(1)$$

## 2. Resorting to a “concentration zone” for $Q^z$

Before studying the matricial case, let us first place ourselves in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We consider  $X \in \mathbb{R}$ , a Gaussian random variable with zero mean and variance equal to  $\sigma^2$  ( $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ ). In particular, although we work with unidimensional variables, there can still be a possible dependence on  $n$ , and we can write  $X \propto \mathcal{E}_2$ . The random variable  $Q \equiv 1/(1 - X)$  is only defined if  $X \neq 1$  and its law  $f_Q$  can be computed on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{1\}$  and satisfies:

$$f_Q(q) = \frac{e^{-(1-\frac{1}{q})^2/\sigma^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma q^2}}.$$

Thus  $Q$  is clearly not exponentially concentrated (when  $q \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $f_Q(q) \sim \frac{e^{-1/\sigma^2}}{q^2}$  therefore the expectation of  $Q$  is not even defined). However, if  $\sigma$  is small enough (at least  $\sigma \leq o(1)$ ), it can be interesting to consider the event  $\mathcal{A}_Q \equiv \{X \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$  satisfying  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q^c) \leq Ce^{-\sigma^2/2}$ . The mapping  $f : z \mapsto \frac{1}{1-z}$  being 4-Lipschitz on  $(-\infty, \frac{1}{2}]$ , one sees that  $(Q \mid \mathcal{A}_Q) \in \mathcal{E}_2$ . Following this setting, in the matricial cases, we also need to place ourselves in a concentration zone  $\mathcal{A}_Q$  where the fixed point  $Q$  is defined; sufficiently small to retrieve an exponential concentration with  $Q \mid \mathcal{A}_Q$  but large enough to be highly probable.

The same resort to a *concentration zone* will take place for the resolvent matrix  $Q^z = (I_p - \frac{1}{zn} X X^T)^{-1}$ , for that purpose, we introduce in this section an event of

<sup>k</sup>The notation  $\mathcal{E}_2(\|A\|_F) + \mathcal{E}_1(\|A\|)$  means that we have the same concentration inequality as in (1.1) but with  $Ce^{-(t/c\|A\|_F)^2} + Ce^{-t/c\|A\|}$ , replacing the right-hand term

high probability,  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ , under which the eigen values of  $\frac{1}{zn}XX^T$  are far from 1, for all  $z \in S^\varepsilon$ .

Let us start with a bound on  $\|X\|$ , Assumption 0.4 leads us to:

$$\|\mathbb{E}[X]\| \leq \sqrt{n} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbb{E}[x_i]\| \leq O(\sqrt{n})$$

then, we deduce from Proposition 1.2 applied to Assumption 0.2 that  $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|] \leq \|\mathbb{E}[X]\| + O(\sqrt{n}) \leq O(\sqrt{n})$ . Now, introducing a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $O(1) \leq \varepsilon \leq O(1)$  and  $\nu > 0$  defined with:

$$\sqrt{\nu} \equiv \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|X\| \right] \leq O(1),$$

we note:

$$\mathcal{A}_\nu \equiv \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \|XX^T\| \leq \nu + \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Since  $\|X\|/\sqrt{n} \in \nu \pm \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{n})$ , we know that there exist two constants  $C, c > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q^c) \leq Ce^{-cn}$ . The mapping  $M \rightarrow \frac{1}{n}MM^T$  is  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  Lipschitz on  $X(\mathcal{A}_\nu) \subset \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  and therefore, thanks to Lemma 2:

$$\frac{1}{n}XX^T \mid \mathcal{A}_\nu \propto \mathcal{E}_2 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

Let us note  $\sigma : \mathcal{M}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ , the mapping that associates to any matrix the sequence of its eigen values in decreasing order. It has been shown in [] that  $\sigma$  is 1-Lipschitz (from  $(\mathcal{M}_p, \|\cdot\|_F)$  to  $(\mathbb{R}^p, \|\cdot\|)$ ) and therefore if we note  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p$  the eigen values of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  such that  $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ , we have the concentration:

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) \mid \mathcal{A}_\nu \in (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_1], \dots, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_p]) \pm \mathcal{E}_2 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

Considering a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$ , independent with  $n$  that will be fixed for the whole paper (we note  $O(1) \leq \varepsilon \leq O(1)$ ). We show in the next lemma that the event

$$\mathcal{A}_Q \equiv \mathcal{A}_\nu \cap \{\forall i \in [\min(p, n)] : \lambda_i \in S_{-0}^\varepsilon\}$$

has an overwhelming probability.

**Lemma 3.** *There exist  $C, c > 0$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q^c) \leq Ce^{-cn}$ .*

**Proof.** Starting from the identity  $S_{-0}^\varepsilon = \cup_{i \in [p]} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_i] - \varepsilon, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_i] + \varepsilon]$ , we see that  $S_{-0}^\varepsilon$  is a union of, say,  $d$  intervals of  $\mathbb{R}$ . There exists  $2d$  indexes  $i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_d$  and  $j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_d$  in  $[\min(p, n)]$  such that:

$$S_{-0}^\varepsilon = \bigcup_{k \in [d]} [\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{i_k}] - \varepsilon, \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{j_k}] + \varepsilon].$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{i_1}] \geq 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{j_d}] = \nu \leq O(1)$ , we can bound:

$$2\varepsilon d \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{j_d}] + 2\varepsilon \leq O(1),$$



That implies in particular that  $d \leq O(1)$  because  $\varepsilon \geq O(1)$ . We can then bound thanks to the concentration of the  $2d$  random variables  $\lambda_{i_1}, \dots, \lambda_{i_d}$  and  $\lambda_{j_1}, \dots, \lambda_{j_d}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q^c) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists k \in [d], |\lambda_{i_k} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{i_k}]| > \varepsilon \text{ or } |\lambda_{j_k} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{j_k}]| > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{P}(|\lambda_{i_k} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{i_k}]| > \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(|\lambda_{j_k} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_\nu}[\lambda_{j_k}]| > \varepsilon) \leq 2dCe^{-\frac{cn\varepsilon^2}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  and  $c$  are the two constants appearing in the concentration inequality of  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p) = \sigma(\frac{1}{n}XX^T)$ .  $\square$

At that point of the paper we know that the non zero eigen values of  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T$  are most likely lying in the union of compact intervals  $S_{-0}^\varepsilon \subset [0, \nu]$ .

### 3. Concentration of the resolvent $Q^z = (I_n - \frac{1}{nz}XX^T)^{-1}$ .

Given a matrix  $A \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}(\mathbb{C})$ , we note  $|A| = \sqrt{AA^T}$  ( $AA^T$  is a nonnegative Hermitian matrix). With a simple diagonalization procedure, one can show for any Hermitian matrix  $A$  the simple characterization of the spectrum of  $|A|$ :

$$\text{Sp}(|A|) = \{|\lambda|, \lambda \in \text{Sp}(A)\} \quad (3.1)$$

It is possible to go further than the mere bound  $|Q^z| \leq O(1)$  when  $z$  is close to 0 and  $p \leq n$ , we are then able to show that  $|Q^z| \leq O(|z|/(|z| + 1))$ . When  $p \geq n$  no such bound is true and it is then convenient to rather look at the coresolvent  $\check{Q}^z \equiv (I_p - \frac{1}{nz}X^TX)^{-1}$  that satisfies in that regime  $|\check{Q}^z| \leq O(|z|/(|z| + 1))$ .

To formalize this approach, we introduce two quantities that will appear in our convergence speeds:

$$\kappa_z \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} & \text{if } p \leq n \\ 1 & \text{if } n \leq p \end{cases} \quad \check{\kappa}_z \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \leq n \\ \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} & \text{if } n \leq p \end{cases}$$

note that both of them are bounded by 1 but they can tend to zero with  $|z|$  depending on the sign of  $p - n$ . Note than in our formalism, the parameter  $z$ , as most quantities of the paper, is varying with  $n$  (we do not assume that  $O(1) \leq |z| \leq O(1)$  like  $\varepsilon$ . It is not a "constant").

**Lemma 4.** *Under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $Q^z$  and  $\check{Q}^z$  can be defined on 0 and for any  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ :*

$$O(\kappa_z)I_p \leq |Q^z| \leq O(\kappa_z)I_p \quad \text{and} \quad O(\check{\kappa}_z)I_p \leq |\check{Q}^z| \leq O(\check{\kappa}_z)I_p$$

**Proof.** We can diagonalize the nonnegative symmetric matrix:  $\frac{1}{n}XX^T = P^TDP$ , with  $D = \text{Diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p)$  and  $P \in \mathcal{O}_p$ , an orthogonal matrix. There exists  $q \in [p]$  such that  $\lambda_{q+1} = \dots = \lambda_p = 0$ , and for all  $i \leq q$ ,  $\lambda_i \neq 0$  (possibly  $q = p$  or  $q < \min(p, n)$ ). Then, if we note  $P_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{p,d}$  the matrix composed of the  $p - q$

last columns of  $P$ ,  $P_+$  the matrix composed of the rest of the  $q$  columns, and  $D_+ = \text{Diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q)$ , we can decompose:

$$Q^z = P^T \begin{pmatrix} zI_p \\ zI_p - D \end{pmatrix} P = P_0^T P_0 + P_+^T \begin{pmatrix} zI_d \\ zI_d - D_+ \end{pmatrix} P_+.$$

Since  $P_0 P_+^T = 0$  and  $P_+ P_0^T = 0$ , we have:  $|Q^z|^2 = P_0^T P_0 + P_+^T \left( \frac{|z|^2 I_d}{|zI_d - D_+|^2} \right) P_+$ . We can bound:

$$O \left( \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} \right) \leq \frac{|z|}{|z| + \nu + \varepsilon} \leq P_+^T \left( \frac{|z| I_d}{|zI_d - D_+|} \right) P_+ \leq \frac{|z|}{d(z, S_{-0})} \leq O \left( \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} \right)$$

Therefore, in all cases ( $p \leq n$  or  $p \geq n$ )  $O(1) \leq |Q^z| \leq O(1)$ . However, when  $p \leq n$ , we can precise those bounds:

- if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\lambda_{\min(p,n)}] \geq O(1)$ , then  $P_0$  is empty,  $P_+ = P$  and we see that  $O \left( \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} \right) \leq |Q^z| \leq O \left( \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} \right)$ .
- if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\lambda_{\min(p,n)}] \leq o(1)$ , the bound  $d(z, S_{-0}) \geq \varepsilon \geq O(1)$  implies that  $|z| \geq O(1)$  and  $O(\kappa_z) = O \left( \frac{|z|}{1+|z|} \right) \leq O(1) \leq O(\kappa_z)$ , therefore:

$$O(\kappa_z) \leq O(\min(1, \kappa_z)) I_p \leq |Q^z| \leq O(1 + \kappa_z) I_p \leq O(\kappa_z).$$

The inequalities on  $\check{Q}^z$  are proven the same way.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.1.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ , we have the concentrations  $Q^z \mid \mathcal{A}_Q \propto \mathcal{E}_2(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$  in  $(\mathcal{M}_p, \|\cdot\|_F)$  and  $\check{Q}^z \mid \mathcal{A}_Q \propto \mathcal{E}_2(\check{\kappa}_z/\sqrt{n})$  in  $(\mathcal{M}_n, \|\cdot\|_F)$ .*

**Proof.** Noting  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_{p,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{C})$  and  $\check{\Phi} : \mathcal{M}_{p,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$  defined as:

$$\Phi(M) = \left( I_p - \frac{MM^T}{zn} \right)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\Phi}(M) = \left( I_n - \frac{M^T M}{zn} \right)^{-1},$$

it is sufficient to show that  $\Phi$  (resp.  $\check{\Phi}$ ) is  $O(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ -Lipschitz (resp.  $O(\check{\kappa}_z/\sqrt{n})$ -Lipschitz) on  $\mathcal{M}_{n,p}^{\mathcal{A}_Q} \equiv X(\mathcal{A}_Q)^1$ . For any  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{n,p}^{\mathcal{A}_Q}$  and any  $H \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ , we can bound  $\|M\| \leq (\nu + \varepsilon)\sqrt{n} \leq O(\sqrt{n})$  and:

$$\|d\Phi|_M \cdot H\|_F = \left\| \Phi(M) \frac{1}{nz} (MH^T + HM^T) \Phi(M) \right\|_F$$

We can now distinguish two different cases:

- if  $p \leq n$  then:

$$\|d\Phi|_M \cdot H\|_F \leq O \left( \frac{\|H\|_F |z|}{(1+|z|)^2 \sqrt{n}} \right) \leq O \left( \frac{\|H\|_F |z| / \sqrt{n}}{1+|z|} \right).$$

<sup>1</sup> $\mathcal{M}_{n,p}^{\mathcal{A}_Q} \subset \{M \in \mathcal{M}_{n,p}, \frac{1}{n} \|MM^T\| \leq 1 - \varepsilon\}$

- if  $p \geq n$ , we know that  $\|\Phi(M)\| \leq O(\kappa_z) \leq O(1)$  and  $\|\check{\Phi}(M)\| \leq O(\check{\kappa}_z) \leq O(\frac{|z|}{1+|z|})$ . We employ then the classical identity:

$$\Phi(M)M = M^T \check{\Phi}(M) \quad (3.2)$$

to be able to bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \|d\Phi|_M \cdot H\|_F &\leq \frac{2(\nu + \varepsilon)\|H\|_F}{|z|\sqrt{n}} \|\check{\Phi}(M)\| \|\Phi(M)\| O\left(\frac{\|H\|_F}{(1+|z|)\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{\|H\|_F}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in all cases, under  $X(\mathcal{A}_Q)$ ,  $Q^z$  is a  $O(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ -Lipschitz transformation of  $X \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1)$  and as such, it satisfies the concentration inequality of the proposition thanks to Lemma 2. The same holds for  $\check{Q}^z$ .  $\square$

#### 4. A first deterministic equivalent

One is often merely working with linear functionals of  $Q^z$ , and since Proposition 3.1 implies that  $Q^z | \mathcal{A}_Q \in \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} Q^z \pm \mathcal{E}_2 | e^{-n}$ , one naturally wants to estimate the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q]$ . In [LC19] is provided a deterministic equivalent  $\tilde{Q}^z \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{C})$  satisfying  $\|Q^z - \tilde{Q}^z\| \leq O(1/\sqrt{n})$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{R}^-$ , we are going to show below a stronger result,

- with a Frobenius norm replacing the spectral norm,
- for any complex  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^{\varepsilon}$ ,
- for random vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  having possibly different distributions (it was assumed in [LC19] that there was a finite number of classes)

An efficient approach, developed in particular in [Sil86], is to look for a deterministic equivalent of  $Q^z$  depending on a deterministic diagonal matrix  $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and having the form:

$$\tilde{Q}^\Delta = (I_p - \Sigma^\Delta)^{-1} \quad \text{where} \quad \Sigma^\Delta \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{\Delta_i} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[X \Delta^{-1} X^T].$$

One can then express the difference with the expectation of  $Q^z$  under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q^z]$  followingly:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^\Delta &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q^z \left( \frac{1}{n} X X^T - \Sigma^\Delta \right) \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q^z \left( \frac{x_i x_i^T}{z} - \frac{\Sigma_i}{\Delta_i} \right) \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

To pursue the estimation of the expectation, one needs to control the dependence between  $Q^z$  and  $x_i$ . For that purpose, one uses classically the Schur identities:

$$Q^z = Q_{-i}^z + \frac{1}{n} \frac{Q_{-i}^z x_i x_i^T Q_{-i}^z}{1 - \frac{1}{zn} x_i^T Q_{-i}^z x_i} \quad \text{and} \quad Q^z x_i = \frac{Q_{-i}^z x_i}{1 - \frac{1}{zn} x_i^T Q_{-i}^z x_i}, \quad (4.1)$$

for  $Q_{-i}^z = (I_n - \frac{1}{zn} X_{-i} X_{-i}^T)^{-1}$  (recall that  $X_{-i} = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 0, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ ). Then introducing the notation  $\Lambda^z \equiv \text{Diag}_{1 \leq i \leq n} (z - \frac{1}{n} x_i^T Q_{-i}^z x_i)$ , one can express thanks to the independence between  $Q_{-i}^z$  and  $x_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^\Delta &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q_{-i}^z \left( \frac{x_i x_i^T}{\Lambda_i^z} - \frac{\Sigma_i}{\Delta_i} \right) \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{zn^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\Delta_i} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q^z x_i x_i^T Q_{-i}^z \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \\ &= \varepsilon_1 + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \varepsilon_2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\text{with : } \begin{cases} \varepsilon_1 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q^z X \left( \frac{\Delta_i - \Lambda_i^z}{z \Delta_i} \right) X^T \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \\ \varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{zn^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\Delta_i} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q^z x_i x_i^T Q_{-i}^z \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \\ \delta_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q_{-i}^z \left( \frac{x_i x_i^T - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [x_i x_i^T]}{\Delta_i} \right) \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \\ \delta_2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q_{-i}^z \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [x_i x_i^T] - \Sigma_i}{\Delta_i} \right) \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right], \end{cases}$$

From this decomposition, one is enticed into choosing, in a first step  $\Delta \approx \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [\Lambda^z] \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{C})$  so that  $\varepsilon_1$  would be small. We will indeed take for  $\Delta$ , the deterministic diagonal matrix:

$$\hat{\Lambda}^z \equiv z - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z]) \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{C}).$$

**Lemma 5.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ ,  $(\Lambda^z \mid \mathcal{A}_Q) \propto \mathcal{E}_2(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$  in  $(\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{C}), \|\cdot\|_F)$  and:*

$$(\Lambda^z \mid \mathcal{A}_Q) \in \hat{\Lambda}^z \pm \mathcal{E}_2(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n}).$$

To prove this lemma, we need two preliminary results which aim is to show that  $Q_{-i}^z$  is close to  $Q^z$ .

**Lemma 6 (Independence under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ).** *Given two mappings  $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_p$  and  $g : \mathcal{M}_{p,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_p$  such that under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $\|f(x_i)\|_F \leq O(\kappa_f)$  and  $\|g(X_{-i})\| \leq O(\kappa_g)$ , we can approximate:*

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [f(x_i) g(X_{-i})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [f(x_i)] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [g(X_{-i})] \right\|_F \leq O(\kappa_f \kappa_g e^{-cn}),$$

for some constant  $c \geq O(1)$ .

**Proof.** Let us continue  $f|_{x_i(\mathcal{A}_Q)}$  and  $g|_{X_{-i}(\mathcal{A}_Q)}$  respectively on  $\mathbb{R}^p$  and on  $\mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  defining for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$ :

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in x_i(\mathcal{A}_Q) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}(M) = \begin{cases} g(M) & \text{if } M \in X_{-i}(\mathcal{A}_Q) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We can then estimate thanks to the independence between  $X_{-i}$  and  $x_i^m$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [f(X_{-i})g(x_i)] &= \frac{\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_Q} f(x_i)g(X_{-i})]}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\tilde{f}(x_i)\tilde{g}(X_{-i})] + \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q^c)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q)} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{f}(x_i)\tilde{g}(X_{-i})] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\tilde{f}(x_i)] \mathbb{E} [\tilde{g}(X_{-i})] + O_{\|\cdot\|_F}(\kappa_f \kappa_g e^{-cn}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [f(x_i)] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [g(X_{-i})] + O_{\|\cdot\|_F}(\kappa_f \kappa_g e^{-cn}) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 7.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ , for all  $i \in [n]$ ,  $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q - Q_{-i}]\|_F \leq O(\kappa_z/n)$*

**Proof.** As we saw with Lemma 6, we can consider that under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $X_{-i}$  and  $x_i$  are almost independent. Given a deterministic matrix  $A \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}$  such that  $\|A\|_F \leq 1$ , that allows us to bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\text{Tr}(A \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q - Q_{-i}])| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ \frac{x_i^T Q_{-i} A Q_{-i} x_i}{\Lambda_i} \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ \frac{1}{n|\hat{\Lambda}_i|} |x_i^T Q_{-i} A Q_{-i} x_i - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i^T Q_{-i} A Q_{-i} x_i]| \right] \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ \frac{1}{\Lambda_i} \right] \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i^T Q_{-i} A Q_{-i} x_i]) \right| + O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{n}\right) \\
&\leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to Proposition 1.3 ( $\|\mathbb{E}[x_i]\|_F \leq O(1)$  and  $\|Q_{-i} A Q_{-i}\|_F \leq O(\kappa_z)$ ).  $\square$

**Proof.** [Proof of Lemma 5] The concentration of  $\Lambda^z = z - \frac{1}{n} x_i^T Q_{-i}^z x_i$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$  is easy to treat since, under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $\|x_i/\sqrt{n}\| \leq O(1)$  and  $\|Q_{-i}^z\| \leq O(\kappa_z)$  and therefore it can be shown as in Proposition 3.1 that  $X \rightarrow \Lambda^z$  is a  $O(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ -Lipschitz transformation of  $X$ .

To show that  $\Lambda^z \in \hat{\Lambda}^z \pm \mathcal{E}_2(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ , we just have to bound thanks to Lemmas 6 and 7 and the bound  $\|\Sigma_i - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i x_i^T]\| \leq O(ne^{-cn}) \leq O(1/n)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\Lambda^z] \right\|_F &\leq \sqrt{n} \left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\Lambda^z] \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sup_{i \in [n]} |\text{Tr}((\Sigma_i - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i x_i^T]) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q])| + |\text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q - Q_{-i}])| \\
&\quad + |\text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i x_i^T] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q_{-i}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i x_i^T Q_{-i}])| \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us then try and bound  $\Lambda^z$  and  $\hat{\Lambda}^z$ .

<sup>m</sup>for  $x_p, y_p \in \mathcal{M}_p$  and  $(a_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathbb{N}}$  the notation  $x_p = y_p + O_{\|\cdot\|_F}(a_p)$  signifies that  $\|x_p - y_p\|_F \leq O(a_p)$

**Lemma 8.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ :*

$$O(|z|)I_n \leq O\left(\frac{|z|}{\tilde{\kappa}_z}\right) \leq \Lambda^z, \hat{\Lambda}^z \leq O\left(\frac{|z|}{\tilde{\kappa}_z}\right) \leq O(1+|z|)I_n$$

**Proof.** Starting with (3.2) and the identity:

$$\frac{1}{zn} \check{Q}^z X X^T = \check{Q}^z - I_n, \quad (4.3)$$

we deduce from the Schur identities (4.1) that:

$$\frac{z}{\Lambda^z} = \text{Diag}_{i \in [n]} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{zn} x_i^T Q^z x_i} \right) = I_n + \frac{1}{zn} \text{Diag}(X^T Q^z X) = \text{Diag}(\check{Q}^z)$$

Now we know from the characterization (3.1) and Lemma 4 that:

$$O(\tilde{\kappa}_z) \leq \inf_{i \in [n]} \text{Sp}(\check{Q}^z) \leq |\text{Diag}(\check{Q}^z)| = |\text{Diag}_{i \in [n]}(e_i^T \check{Q}^z e_i)| \leq \sup_{i \in [n]} \text{Sp}(\check{Q}^z) \leq O(\tilde{\kappa}_z)$$

where  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  are the  $n$  vectors of the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  ( $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is full of 0 except in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  entry where there is a 1).

That gives us the bounds on  $|\Lambda^z|$ . Taking the expectation under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$  on those bounds we obtain the control on  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\Lambda^z]$ , and we can then deduce the control on  $\hat{\Lambda}^z$  thanks to Lemma 5:

$$\left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\Lambda^z] \right\| \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{n}\right) \leq o\left(\frac{|z|}{\tilde{\kappa}_z}\right). \quad \square$$

We can now prove the main result of this subsections that allows us to set that  $\tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}$  is a deterministic equivalent of  $Q^z$  (thanks to Lemma 1).

**Proposition 4.1.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ :*

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right\| \leq O(\kappa_z) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

To prove this proposition, we will bound the different elements of the decomposition (4.2). And to bound  $\varepsilon_1$ , we will need:

**Lemma 9.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ , under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $\left\| \frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}} Q^z X \right\| \leq O(1)$  and:*

$$\frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}} Q^z X = \frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}} X^T \check{Q}^z \mid \mathcal{A}_Q \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1)$$

**Proof.** We follow the steps of the proof of Proposition 3.1. Depending on the sign of  $p - n$ , it is more convenient to work with the expression  $\frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}} Q^z X$  (when  $p \leq n$ ) or with  $\frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}} X^T \check{Q}^z$  (when  $p \geq n$ ). We just treat here the case  $p \leq n$  and therefore look at the variations of the mapping  $\Psi : \mathcal{M}_{p,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{p,n}(\mathbb{C})$  defined as:

$$\Psi(M) = \frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}} \left( I_p - \frac{MM^T}{zn} \right)^{-1} M.$$

to show the concentration of  $\frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}}Q^z X = \Psi(X)$ . For all  $H, M \in \mathcal{M}_{n,p}^{\mathcal{A}_Q} \equiv X(\mathcal{A}_Q)$  (and with the notation  $\Phi(M) = \left(I_p - \frac{MM^T}{zn}\right)^{-1}$  given in the proof of Proposition 3.1):

$$\begin{aligned} \|d\Psi|_M \cdot H\| &\leq \left\| \Psi(M) \frac{1}{nz} (MH^T + HM^T) \Psi(M) \frac{M}{z\sqrt{n}} \right\| + \left\| \Psi(M) \frac{H}{z\sqrt{n}} \right\| \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{\|H\|}{\sqrt{n}(1+|z|)^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{\|H\|}{(1+|z|)\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq O\left(\frac{\|H\|}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$   $\Psi$  is  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -Lipshitz and therefore  $\frac{1}{z\sqrt{n}}Q^z X \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{n})$ .  $\square$

**Proof.** [Proof of Proposition 4.1] Let us note for simplicity  $\kappa_{\tilde{Q}} \equiv \|\tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}\|$ . Looking at decomposition (4.2) we can start with the bound:

$$\|\varepsilon_1\|_F = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ Q^z X \left( \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z - \Lambda_i^z}{z\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right) X^T \tilde{Q}^\Delta \right] \right\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

applying Proposition 1.4 with the hypotheses:

- $X | \mathcal{A}_Q \propto \mathcal{E}_2$  given by Assumption 0.2,
- $\frac{1}{|z|}Q^z X | \mathcal{A}_Q \propto \mathcal{E}_2$  given by Lemma 9,
- $\Lambda^z \in \hat{\Lambda}^z \pm \mathcal{E}_2\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$  given by Lemma 5,

and bounding thanks to Lemma 8  $\frac{\kappa_z}{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z \kappa_z}{|z|}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{1+|z|}\right) \leq O(1)$ . Second, for any matrix  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{C})$  satisfying  $\|A\|_F \leq 1$ , let us bound thanks to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\text{Tr}(A\varepsilon_2)]| &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{z^2 n^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( A Q^z X |\hat{\Lambda}_n^z|^{-2} X^T \tilde{Q}^z \bar{A}^T \right) \right]} \\ &\quad \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \Sigma_i |Q_{-i}^z|^2 \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right) \right]} \\ &\leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\|A\|_F^2 \sup_{i \in [n]} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i^2) \kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{n}}\right) \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

thanks to the bounds provided by our assumptions, and Lemmas 4, 8 and 9.

Third, we bound easily with Lemma 6 the quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\text{Tr}(A\delta_1)]\| &\equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|\hat{\Lambda}_i^z|} \left\| \text{Tr} \left( \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} A \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q_{-i}^z x_i x_i^T] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \text{Tr} \left( \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} A \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q_{-i}^z] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [x_i x_i^T] \right) \right\| \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

And we can bound  $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\text{Tr}(A\delta_2)]\| \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{n}\right)$  since  $\|\Sigma_i - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i x_i^T]\| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$

Taking the supremum on  $A \in \mathcal{M}_{p,n}(\mathbb{C})$  and putting the bounds on  $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\varepsilon_1]\|_F$ ,  $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\varepsilon_2]\|_F$ ,  $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\delta_1]\|_F$  and  $\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\delta_2]\|_F$  together, we obtain:

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

So, in particular  $\kappa_{\tilde{Q}} \equiv \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right\| \leq \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] \right\| + O\left(\frac{\kappa_{\tilde{Q}}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ , which implies that  $\kappa_{\tilde{Q}} \leq O(\kappa_z)$  as  $\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] \right\|$  since  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} = o(1)$ . We obtain then directly the second bound of the Proposition.  $\square$

## 5. Introduction of the semi-metric $d_s$ and proof of Theorem 1

Proposition 4.1 slightly simplified the problem because while we initially had to estimate the expectation of the whole matrix  $Q^z$ , now, we just need to approach the diagonal matrix  $\hat{\Lambda}^z \equiv \text{Diag}(z - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [x_i Q^z_{-i} x_i])_{i \in [n]}$ . One is tempted to introduce from the pseudo identity:

$$\hat{\Lambda}_i^z \approx z - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \hat{Q}_{-i}^z) \approx z - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}) \quad (5.1)$$

a fixed point equation whose solution would be a natural estimate for  $\hat{\Lambda}^z$ . This equation is given in Theorem 1: we chose  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  satisfying

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z = z - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z}).$$

We are now going to prove that  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is well defined for any  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  (where we recall that  $\mathbb{H} \equiv \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \text{Im}(z) > 0\}$ ) to prove Theorem 1.

Introducing the mapping:

$$\forall L \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H}) : \mathcal{I}^z(L) \equiv z I_n - \text{Diag}\left(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^L)\right)_{1 \leq i \leq n},$$

we want to show that  $\mathcal{I}^z$  admits a unique fixed point. For that purpose, let us adapt tools already introduced in [LC20] that rely on the introduction of a semi-metric  $d_s$  defined<sup>a</sup> for any  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  as:

$$d_s(D, D') = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{|D_i - D'_i|}{\sqrt{\Im(D_i) \Im(D'_i)}}$$

(it lacks the triangular inequality to be a true metric). This semi-metric is introduced to set Banach-like fixed point theorems.

<sup>a</sup>In [LC20],  $d_s$  is only defined on  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and the denominator appearing in the definition is then  $\sqrt{D_i D'_i}$  instead of  $\sqrt{\Im(D_i) \Im(D'_i)}$ . The present adaptation does not change the fundamental properties of the semi-metric; the only objective with this new choice is to be able to set that  $\mathcal{I}^z$  is contractive for this semi-metric.



**Definition 5.1.** Given  $\lambda > 0$ , we denote  $\mathcal{C}_s^\lambda(\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H}))$  (or more simply  $\mathcal{C}_s^\lambda$  when there is no ambiguity), the class of functions  $f : \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ ,  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz for the semi-metric  $d_s$ ; i.e. satisfying for all  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ :

$$d_s(f(D), f(D')) \leq \lambda d_s(D, D').$$

when  $\lambda < 1$ , we say that  $f$  is contracting for the semi-metric  $d_s$ .

This class presents an important number of stability properties that we list in the next proposition (the stability of the class through the sum is proven in Appendix A, it was already done with a slightly different setting in [LC20]):

**Proposition 5.1.** *Given three parameters  $\alpha, \lambda, \theta > 0$  and two mappings  $f \in \mathcal{C}_s^\lambda$  and  $g \in \mathcal{C}_s^\theta$ ,*

$$\frac{-1}{f} \in \mathcal{C}_s^\lambda, \quad \alpha f \in \mathcal{C}_s^\lambda, \quad f \circ g \in \mathcal{C}_s^{\lambda\theta}, \quad \text{and} \quad f + g \in \mathcal{C}_s^{\max(\lambda, \theta)}.$$

We can now present our fixed point theorem that has been demonstrated once again in [LC20]:

**Theorem 5 ([LC20] Theorem 3.13).** *Given a subset  $\mathcal{D}_f$  of  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  and a mapping  $f : \mathcal{D}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_f$  with an imaginary part bounded from above and below (in  $\mathcal{D}_f$ ), if it is furthermore contracting for the stable semi-metric  $d_s$  on  $\mathcal{D}_f$ , then there exists a unique fixed point  $\Delta^* \in \mathcal{D}_f$  satisfying  $\Delta^* = f(\Delta^*)$ .*

We are going to employ this theorem on the mapping  $\mathcal{I}^z$  for  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ . We first restrict our study on a subset of  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ :

$$\mathcal{D}_{I^z} \equiv \{D \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H}), D/z \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})\}$$

**Lemma 10.** *For any  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $I^z(\mathcal{D}_{I^z}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ .*

**Proof.** Considering  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ , and  $L \in \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$  and  $i \in [n]$ , note that:

- $\Im(\mathcal{I}^z(L))_i = \Im(z) + \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \sum_i \tilde{Q}^L \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(L_j) \Sigma_i}{|L_j|^2} \tilde{Q}^L \right) > 0$
- $\Im(\mathcal{I}^z(L))_i / z = \frac{1}{n|z|^2} \text{Tr} \left( \sum_i \tilde{Q}^L \left( \Im(z) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(L_j/z) \Sigma_i}{|L_j/z|^2} \right) \tilde{Q}^L \right) > 0$  □

Let us now express the Lipschitz parameter of  $I^z$  for the semi metric  $d_s$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** *For any  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ , the mapping  $I^z$  is 1-Lipschitz for the semi-metric  $d_s$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{I^z}$  and satisfies for any  $L, L' \in \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ :*

$$d_s(I^z(L), I^z(L')) \leq \sqrt{(1 - \phi(z, L))(1 - \phi(z, L'))} d_s(L, L'),$$

where for any  $w \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $D \in \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ :

$$\phi(w, L) = \frac{\Im(w)}{\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \Im(\mathcal{I}^w(L))_i} \in (0, 1).$$

**Proof.**

Let us bound for any  $L, L' \in \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
I^z(L)_i - I^z(L')_i &= \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^z(L) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{L_j - L'_j}{\sqrt{\Im(L_j)\Im(L'_j)}} \frac{\sqrt{\Im(L_j)\Im(L'_j)}}{L_j L'_j} \Sigma_j \right) \tilde{Q}^z(L') \right) \\
&\leq d_s(L, L') \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^z(L) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(L_j)\Sigma_i}{|L_j|^2} \right) \bar{\tilde{Q}}^z(L) \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^z(L') \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(L'_j)\Sigma_i}{|L'_j|^2} \right) \bar{\tilde{Q}}^z(L') \right)} \\
&\leq d_s(L, L') \sqrt{(\Im(I^z(L)_i) - \Im(z)) (\Im(I^z(L')_i) - \Im(z))}, \quad (5.2)
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the identity

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^z(L) \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(L'_j)\Sigma_i}{|L'_j|^2} \right) \bar{\tilde{Q}}^z(L) \right) = \Im(I^z(L)_i) - \Im(z)$$

issued from the proof of Lemma 10.

Dividing both sides of (5.2) by  $\sqrt{\Im(I^z(L)_i)\Im(I^z(L')_i)}$ , we retrieve the wanted Lipschitz parameter.  $\square$

The contractivity of  $I^z$  is not fully stated in the previous proposition because, the Lipschitz parameter depends on the values of  $L, L'$  and we want a bound uniform on  $\mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ . This will be done thanks to next lemmas.

**Lemma 11 (Commutation between inversion and modulus of matrices).**

Given an invertible matrix  $M \in \mathcal{M}_p$ ,  $|M^{-1}|^2 = (|M|^2)^{-1}$ .

**Proof.** introducing  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $M^{-1} = A + iB$ , we have the identity:

$$|M^{-1}|^2 = A^2 + B^2 = M^{-1}\bar{M}^{-1} = M^{-1}\bar{M}^{-1} = (\bar{M}M)^{-1} = (|M|^2)^{-1}. \quad \square$$

**Lemma 12.** Given  $L \in \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ , we can bound:

$$\Im(z)I_n \leq |I^z(L)| \leq O\left(|z| + \frac{|z|}{\Im(z)}\right)I_n$$

and:

$$O\left(\frac{\Im(z)}{1 + \Im(z)}\right)I_p \leq |Q^{I^z(L)}| \leq \frac{|z|I_p}{\Im(z)}.$$

**Proof.** The lower bound of  $I^z(L)$  is immediate. If  $L \in \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ , then we know that  $L/z \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ , and therefore, noting that:

$$\Im\left((\tilde{Q}^{L/z})^{-1}\right) = \Im\left(zI_p - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{L_i/z}\right) = \Im(z)I_p + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(L_i/z)\Sigma_i}{|L_i/z|^2} \geq \Im(z)I_p,$$

we can deduce from Lemma 11 that  $\|\tilde{Q}^L\| \leq \frac{|z|}{\Im(z)}$  which gives us directly the upper bound on  $I^z(L)$  since  $|z| \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\sup_{i \in [n]} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i)}{\Im(z)}\right) \leq O\left(|z| + \frac{|z|}{\Im(z)}\right)$ .

Finally, since  $\|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i\| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \|XX^T\| \right] \leq \nu$ , we can bound:

$$\left\| I_n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{I^z(L)_i} \right\| \leq 1 + \frac{\nu}{\Im(z)},$$

which provides the lower bound on  $|\tilde{Q}^{I^z(L)}|$  since  $O\left(\frac{\Im(z)}{1+\Im(z)}\right) \leq \frac{1}{1+\frac{\nu}{\Im(z)}}$ .  $\square$

We now have all the elements to prove Theorem 1:

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 1] On the domain  $I^z(\mathcal{D}_{I^z})$ , the mapping  $I^z$  is bounded and contracting for the semimetric  $d_s$  thanks to Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 12. The hypotheses of Theorem 5 are thus satisfied, and we know that there exists a unique diagonal matrix  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z \in I^z(\mathcal{D}_{I^z})$  such that  $I^z(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) = \tilde{\Lambda}^z$ . There can not exist a second diagonal matrix  $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  such that  $\Lambda' = I^z(\Lambda')$  because then Proposition 5.2 (true on the whole domain  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ ) would imply that  $d_s(\Lambda', \tilde{\Lambda}^z) < d_s(\Lambda', \tilde{\Lambda}^z)$ .  $\square$

We end this section with an interesting result on  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  that is proven in Appendix B since it will not be of any use for our main results.

**Lemma 13.**  $\sup_{i \in [n]} |\Lambda_i^z| \leq O(1 + |z|)$ .

## 6. Convergence of $\hat{\Lambda}^z$ towards $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$ , proof of Theorem 4

To show the convergence of  $\hat{\Lambda}^z$  towards  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z = I^z(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)$ , we need an important result bounding the distance to a fixed point of a contracting mapping for the semimetric  $d_s$ . This sets what we call the stability of the equation. First allowing us to bound  $\|\hat{\Lambda}^z - \tilde{\Lambda}^z\|$ , it will then be employed to show the continuity of  $z \mapsto \tilde{\Lambda}^z$ . In the former application, the convergence parameter is  $n$ , while in the latter application it is a parameter  $t \in \mathbb{C}$  in the neighbourhood of 0. For the sake of generality, we thus introduce here a new notation  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  to track the convergence (we will then consider  $s = n$  or sequences  $(t_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$  depending on the applications).

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let us consider a family of mappings of  $\mathcal{D}_{n_s}(\mathbb{H})$ ,  $(f^s)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ , each  $f^s$  being  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz<sup>o</sup> for the semi-metric  $d_s$  with  $\lambda < 1$  and admitting the fixed point  $\tilde{\Gamma}^s = f^s(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)$  and a family of diagonal matrices  $\Gamma^s$ . If one assumes that <sup>P</sup>*

<sup>o</sup>Actually,  $f^s$  does not need to be  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz on the whole set  $\mathcal{D}_{n_s}(\mathbb{H})$ , but we need to be able to bound for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$d_s(f^s(\tilde{\Gamma}^s), f^s(\Gamma^s)) \leq \lambda d_s(\tilde{\Gamma}^s, \Gamma^s)$$

<sup>P</sup>Usually the notations  $O(1)$  and  $o(1)$  are used for quasi-asymptotic studies when  $n$  tends to infinity but in this proposition, the relevant parameter is  $s$ , thus  $d_s(f^s(\Gamma^s), \Gamma^s) \leq o_{s \rightarrow \infty}(1)$  means that for all  $K > 0$ , there exists  $S \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $s \geq S$ ,  $d_s(f^s(\Gamma^s), \Gamma^s) \leq K$ .

$d_s(\Im(\Gamma^s), \Im(f^s(\Gamma^s))) \leq o_{s \rightarrow \infty}(1)$ , then:

$$d_s(\Gamma^s, \tilde{\Gamma}^s) \leq O_{s \rightarrow \infty} \left( \left\| \frac{f^s(\Gamma^s) - \Gamma^s}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\| \right)$$

This proposition is just a mere application of the following elementary result.

**Lemma 14.** *Given three diagonal matrices  $\Gamma^1, \Gamma^2, \Gamma^3 \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ :*

$$\left\| \frac{\Gamma^3}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)}} \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{\Gamma^3}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)}} \right\| (1 + d_s(\Im(\Gamma^1), \Im(\Gamma^2))).$$

**Proof.** Let us simply bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\Gamma^3}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)}} \right\| &\leq \left\| \frac{\Gamma^3}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)} - \sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)}}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)\Im(\Gamma^1)}} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{\Gamma^3}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{\Gamma^3}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)}} \right\| \left\| \frac{\Im(\Gamma^2) - \Im(\Gamma^1)}{\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)}(\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)} + \sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)})} \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

we can then conclude with the bound  $\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)}(\sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^2)} + \sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)}) \geq \sqrt{\Im(\Gamma^1)\Im(\Gamma^2)}$ .  $\square$

**Proof.** [Proof of Proposition 6.1] Let us simply bound thanks to Lemma 14:

$$\begin{aligned} d_s(\tilde{\Gamma}^s, \Gamma^s) &\leq \left\| \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}^s - f^s(\Gamma^s)}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\| + \left\| \frac{f^s(\Gamma^s) - \Gamma^s}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\| \\ &\leq d_s(\tilde{\Gamma}^s, f^s(\Gamma^s)) (1 + d_s(\Im(\Gamma^s), \Im(f^s(\Gamma^s)))) + \left\| \frac{f^s(\Gamma^s) - \Gamma^s}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\| \\ &\leq \lambda d_s(\tilde{\Gamma}^s, \Gamma^s) (1 + d_s(\Im(\Gamma^s), \Im(f^s(\Gamma^s)))) + \left\| \frac{f^s(\Gamma^s) - \Gamma^s}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{\left\| \frac{f^s(\Gamma^s) - \Gamma^s}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\|}{1 - \lambda - \lambda d_s(\Im(\Gamma^s), \Im(f^s(\Gamma^s)))} \leq O \left( \left\| \frac{f^s(\Gamma^s) - \Gamma^s}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Gamma}^s)\Im(\Gamma^s)}} \right\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

since  $d_s(\Im(\Gamma^s), \Im(f^s(\Gamma^s))) \leq o(1) \leq \frac{1-\lambda}{2\lambda}$  for  $s$  sufficiently big.  $\square$

To be employ Proposition 6.1 on the matrices  $\tilde{\Gamma}^n = \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  and  $\Gamma^n = \hat{\Lambda}^z$  and on the mapping  $f^n = I^z$ , we first need to set:

**Proposition 6.2.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $d(z, S_\varepsilon) \geq O(1)$ :*

$$d_s(\Im(I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z)), \Im(\hat{\Lambda}^z)) \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{n}\right)$$

**Proof.** We can bound thanks to Lemmas 7 and 15:

$$\begin{aligned} d_s \left( \Im(I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z)), \Im(\hat{\Lambda}^z) \right) &= \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \Im \left( \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} - \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [Q^z] \right) \right)}{\sqrt{\Im(\hat{\Lambda}_i^z) \Im(I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z)_i)}} \right| + O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{n} \right) \\ &\leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \frac{\Im(\tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z})}{\Im(z)} - \frac{\Im(\mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [Q^z])}{\Im(z)} \right\|_F \right) + O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since  $\|\Sigma_i\|_F \leq O(\sqrt{n})$ . The identity  $\frac{1}{zn} Q^z X X^T = Q - I_n$  allows us to write  $\frac{\Im(\mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [Q^z])}{\Im(z)} = -\frac{1}{z} \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [|Q^z|^2 - Q^z] (= -\frac{1}{z} \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [|Q^z|^2 - \bar{Q}^z])$ . We already know how to estimate  $\mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [Q^z]$  thanks to Proposition 4.1, we are thus left to estimate  $\mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [|Q^z|^2]$ . We do not give the full justifications that are closely similar to those presented in the proof of Proposition 4.1 – mainly application of Proposition 1.4 and Lemma 5. To complete this estimation, we consider a deterministic matrix  $A \in \mathcal{M}_p$ , and we try and estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \bar{Q}^z \left( Q^z - \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right) \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{\bar{Q}^z Q^z \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{\bar{Q}^z Q^z_{-i} x_i x_i^T \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{\bar{Q}^z Q^z_{-i} \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right] \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{\bar{Q}^z_{-i} Q^z_{-i} x_i x_i^T \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right] \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{\bar{Q}^z x_i x_i^T |Q^z_{-i}|^2 x_i x_i^T \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}}{z \hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right] \right) + O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( A \bar{Q}^z X \Delta^z X^T \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right) \right]}{z \hat{\Lambda}_i^z} + O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with the notation  $\Delta^z \equiv \text{Diag}_{i \in [n]} \left( \frac{1}{n} x_i^T |Q^z_{-i}|^2 x_i \right) \in \hat{\Delta}^z \pm \mathcal{E}_2(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ , with the classical notation  $\hat{\Delta}^z = \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} [\Delta^z]$ . Returning to our estimation, we obtain thanks to Proposition 1.4:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \bar{Q}^z \left( Q^z - \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right) \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{\Delta}_i^z}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \frac{\bar{Q}^z_{-i} x_i x_i^T \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right] \right) + O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{\Delta}_i^z}{|\hat{\Lambda}_i^z|^2} \text{Tr} \left( A \mathbb{E}_{A_Q} \left[ \bar{Q}^z_{-i} \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right] \right) + O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the expectation on the identity:

$$\Im(\Lambda^z) = \Im(z) - \frac{1}{n} \Im(x_i^T Q^z x_i) = \Im(z) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{nz} (x_i^T |Q^z|^2 x_i - x_i^T Q^z x_i) \right) = \frac{\Im(z)}{z} (\Delta^z + \Lambda^z),$$

30

we deduce that  $\hat{\Delta}^z = \frac{z}{\Im(z)} \Im(\hat{\Lambda}^z) - \hat{\Lambda}^z$ . Therefore, with the identity  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\tilde{Q}^z \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}] = |\tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}|^2 + O_{\|\cdot\|_F}(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ , we can estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(A \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[|Q^z|^2]) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{z}{\Im(z)} \frac{\Im(\hat{\Lambda}_i^z)}{|\hat{\Lambda}_i^z|^2} - \frac{1}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z} \right) \text{Tr}(A \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[\tilde{Q}_{-i}^z \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}]) + \text{Tr}(A |\tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}|^2) + O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &= \frac{z}{\Im(z)} \Im(\text{Tr}(A \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z})) + \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(A \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z}) + O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion:

$$\left\| \frac{\Im(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q^z]) - \Im(\tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z})}{\Im(z)} \right\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{\Im(z)\kappa_z}{|z|\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

and we retrieve the result of the proposition.  $\square$

And to show that the mapping  $I^z$  is contracting, we will need:

**Lemma 15.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ :*

$$\Im(z) \leq \inf_{i \in [n]} \Im(\hat{\Lambda}_i^z) \leq \sup_{i \in [n]} \Im(\hat{\Lambda}_i^z) \leq O(\Im(z))$$

**Proof.** The lower bound is obvious since for all  $i \in [n]$ :

$$\Im(\hat{\Lambda}_i^z) = \Im(z) + \frac{\Im(z)}{|z|^2 n^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[x_i^T Q_{-i}^z X_{-i} X_{-i}^T \bar{Q}_{-i}^z x_i] \geq \Im(z).$$

The upper bound is obtained thanks to the bound, valid under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ ,  $Q_{-i}^z X_{-i} / |z|\sqrt{n} \leq O(1)$  provided by Lemma 9.  $\square$

We now have all the elements to show:

**Proposition 6.3.** *For any  $z \in \mathbb{H}$  such that  $d(z, S_{-0}) \geq O(1)$ :*

$$\|\hat{\Lambda}^z - \tilde{\Lambda}^z\| \leq O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad O\left(\frac{|z|}{\hat{\kappa}_z}\right) \leq |\tilde{\Lambda}^z| \leq O\left(\frac{|z|}{\hat{\kappa}_z}\right)$$

**Proof.**

We already know from Proposition 6.2 that  $d_s(\Im(I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z)), \Im(\hat{\Lambda}^z)) \leq o(1)$ . Besides, the Lipschitz parameter  $\lambda$  of  $I^z$  on the set  $\{\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \hat{\Lambda}^z, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is such that  $1 - \lambda \geq O(1)$ . Recall indeed from Proposition 5.2 that:

$$\lambda \leq \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{\Im(z)}{\sup_{i \in [n]} \Im(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z)}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\Im(z)}{\sup_{i \in [n]} \Im(\hat{\Lambda}_i^z)}\right)} \leq \sqrt{1 - O(1)} \leq 1 - O(1),$$

thanks to Lemma 15. Therefore, we can employ Proposition 6.1 to set that:

$$\left\| \frac{\hat{\Lambda}^z - \tilde{\Lambda}^z}{\sqrt{\hat{\Lambda}^z \tilde{\Lambda}^z}} \right\| = d_s(\hat{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^z) \leq O \left( \left\| \frac{\hat{\Lambda}^z - I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z)}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{S}(\hat{\Lambda}^z) \mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)}} \right\| \right),$$

which implies thanks to Lemma 15 that:

$$\left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - \tilde{\Lambda}^z \right\| \leq O \left( \sqrt{\frac{\sup_{i \in [n]} \mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z)}{\inf_{i \in [n]} \mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z)}} \left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z) \right\| \right).$$

We reach here the only point of the whole paper where we will employ Assumption 0.5. It is to set that:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{i \in [n]} \mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z) &= \mathfrak{S}(z) + \inf_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}_j)}{n|\tilde{\Lambda}_j|^2} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \Sigma_j \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right) \\ &\geq \mathfrak{S}(z) + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}_j)}{n|\tilde{\Lambda}_j|^2} O \left( \text{Tr} \left( \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \Sigma_j \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right) \right) \geq O \left( \sup_{i \in [n]} \mathfrak{S}(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z) \right) \end{aligned}$$

As a conclusion:

$$\left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - \tilde{\Lambda}^z \right\| \leq O \left( \left\| \hat{\Lambda}^z - I^z(\hat{\Lambda}^z) \right\| \right) \leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \hat{Q} - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\| \right) \leq O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{n} \right). \quad \square$$

We can then deduce a result on the resolvent:

**Corollary 1.** *For any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $d(z, S_\varepsilon) \geq O(1)$ ,  $\|\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z}\| \leq O(\kappa_z)$  and:*

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \leq O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

**Proof.** We already know from Proposition 4.1 that  $\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \leq O(\kappa_z/\sqrt{n})$ , thus we are left to bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F &\leq \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z - \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z} \Sigma_i \right) \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z - \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z}{\hat{\Lambda}_i^z \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z} \right| \|\Sigma_i\|_F \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right\| \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\| \\ &\leq O \left( \frac{\kappa_z^3 \tilde{\kappa}_z^2 \sqrt{p}}{|z|^2 n} \right) \leq O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We can then deduce that:

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \leq \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F + \left\| \tilde{Q}^{\hat{\Lambda}^z} \right\|_F \leq O(\kappa_z). \quad \square$$

We can now prove our second main Theorems (on the linear concentration of  $\frac{1}{z}Q^z$  around  $\frac{1}{z}\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z}$ ):

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 3 ] We saw in the proof of Proposition 3.1 that the mapping  $R \in (\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon, \mathcal{M}_p), \|\cdot\|_{F, S^\varepsilon})$  defined, under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ , for any  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon$  as  $R(z) = -\frac{1}{z}Q^z$  has a Lipschitz parameter bounded by:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon} O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{|z|\sqrt{n}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

(since when  $n \geq p$ ,  $\kappa_z = \frac{|z|}{1+|z|}$ , and when  $n < p$ ,  $\kappa_z = 1$  but  $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_p] = 0$  and therefore  $\inf_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon} 1/|z| \geq O(1)$ ). As a  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ -Lipschitz transformation of  $X \propto \mathcal{E}_2$ ,  $(R \mid \mathcal{A}_Q) \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{n})$ , we can then conclude thanks to Corollary 1 with the bound:

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[R] - \tilde{R} \right\|_{F, S^\varepsilon} \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{|z|} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right\| \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon} O\left(\frac{\kappa_z}{\sqrt{n}|z|}\right) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

Although it is not particularly needed for practical use, we are now going to show that the mapping  $\tilde{g} : z \rightarrow \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}(\tilde{R}(z))$  is a Stieltjes transform. One of the main result of next section is also to show the convergence of the Stieltjes transform  $g$  towards  $\tilde{g}$  on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$  (which is a bigger set than  $\mathbb{C} \setminus S^\varepsilon$  on which we approximated  $R(z)$ ).

## 7. Approach with the Stieltjes formalism, proofs of Theorems 2 and 3

We start with an interesting identity that gives a direct link between the Stieltjes transforms  $g$  and  $\tilde{g}$  with the diagonal matrix  $\Lambda^z$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$ . From the equality  $Q^z - \frac{1}{nz} X X^T Q^z = I_p$ , and the Schur identities (4.1) we can deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) &= -\frac{1}{pz} \text{Tr}(Q^z) = -\frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{npz^2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^T Q^z x_i \\ &= \frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{npz} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^T Q_{-i} x_i}{\Lambda_i^z} = \frac{1}{z} \left( \frac{n}{p} - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\Lambda_i^z} = g^{\Lambda^z}(z), \end{aligned}$$

with the notation  $g^{D^z}$ , defined for any mapping  $D : \mathbb{H} \ni z \mapsto D^z \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  as<sup>9</sup>:

$$g^{D^z} : z \mapsto \frac{1}{z} \left( \frac{n}{p} - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{D^z}.$$

Interestingly enough, if we note  $\tilde{g} \equiv g^{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ , then one can rapidly check that we have the equality  $\tilde{g} = -\frac{1}{pz} \text{Tr}(\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z})$ . To show that  $\tilde{g}$  is a Stieltjes transform, we will employ the following well known theorem that can be found for instance in [Bol97]:

<sup>9</sup>The Steiltjes transform of the spectral distribution of  $\frac{1}{n} X^T X$  is  $\tilde{g} = \tilde{g}^{\Lambda^z}$ , where for all  $D : \mathbb{H} \ni z \mapsto D^z \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ ,  $\tilde{g}^{D^z} : z \mapsto -\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{D^z}$



**Theorem 6.** *Given an analytic mapping  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ , if  $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} -iyf(iy) = 1$  then  $f$  is the Stieltjes transform of a probability measure  $\mu$  that satisfies the two reciprocal formulas:*

- $f(z) = \int \frac{\mu(d\lambda)}{\lambda - z}$ ,
- for any continuous point<sup>f</sup>  $a < b$ :  $\mu([a, b]) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_a^b \Im(f(x + iy)) dx$ .

If, in particular,  $\forall z \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $zf(z) \in \mathbb{H}$ , then  $\mu(\mathbb{R}^-) = 0$  and  $f$  admits an analytic continuation on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus (\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\})$ .

The first hypothesis to verify in order to employ Theorem 6 is the analyticity of  $\tilde{g}$ , that originates from the analyticity of  $z \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}^z$ . We can show with limiting arguments that  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is analytical as a limit of a sequence of analytical mappings. However, although it is slightly more laborious, we prefer here to prove the analyticity from the original definition. First let us show the continuity with Proposition 6.1.

**Proposition 7.1.** *The mapping  $z \mapsto \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{C}^+$ .*

**Proof.** Given  $z \in \mathbb{H}$ , we consider a sequence  $(t_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{w \in \mathbb{C} \mid w + z \in \mathbb{H}\}$  such that  $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} t_s = 0$ . Let us verify the assumption of Proposition 6.1 where for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f^s = I^{z+t_s}$ ,  $\tilde{\Gamma}^s = \tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t_s}$  and  $\Gamma^s = \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  (it does not depend on  $s$ ). We already know from Proposition 5.2 that  $f^s$  are all contracting for the stable semi-metric with a Lipschitz parameter  $\lambda < 1$  that can be chosen independent from  $s$  for  $s$  big enough. Let us express for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $i \in [n]$ :

$$f^s(\Gamma^s)_i - \Gamma_i^s = I^{z+t_s}(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)_i - \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z = t_s \quad (7.1)$$

Noting that for  $s$  sufficiently big,  $\Im(I^{z+t_s}(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)) = \Im(t_s) + \Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \geq \frac{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)}{4} \geq \frac{\Im(z)}{4}$ , we see that  $d_s(\Im(f^s(\Gamma^s)_i), \Im(\Gamma_i^s)) \leq \frac{4\Im(t_s)}{\Im(z)} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow \infty} 0$ . Therefore, the assumptions of Proposition 6.1 are satisfied and we can conclude that there exists  $K > 0$  such that for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\left\| \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t_s} - \tilde{\Lambda}^z}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t_s})\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)}} \right\| \leq \frac{K|t_s|}{\inf_{i \in [n]} \sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t_s})\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)}} \leq \frac{2Kt_s}{\Im(z)}.$$

Besides, we can also bound:

$$\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t_s})} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z)}}{\Im(z)} (\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) + Kt_s) \leq O(1),$$

That directly implies that  $\|\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t_s} - \tilde{\Lambda}^z\| \leq O(t_s) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow \infty} 0$ , and consequently,  $z \mapsto \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{H}$ .  $\square$

<sup>f</sup>We can add the property  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu(\{x\}) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} y\Im(f(x + iy))$ , here for  $\mu$  to be continuous in  $a, b$ , we need  $\mu(\{a\}) = \mu(\{b\}) = 0$

Let us now show that  $z \mapsto \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is differentiable. Employing again the notation  $f^t = I^{z+t}$ , we can decompose:

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t} - \tilde{\Lambda}^z) &= \left( f^t(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t}) - f^t(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) + f^t(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) - f^0(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \right) \\ &= \text{Diag}_{i \in [n]} \left( \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i R(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^{z+t} - \tilde{\Lambda}_j^z}{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^{z+t} \tilde{\Lambda}_j^z} \Sigma_j R(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \right) \right) + tI_n \end{aligned}$$

Now, if we introduce the vector  $a(t) = \left( \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z - \tilde{\Lambda}_i^{z+t} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and for any  $D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ , the matrix:

$$\Psi(D, D') = \left( \frac{1}{n} \frac{\text{Tr}(\Sigma_i R(D) \Sigma_j R(D'))}{D_j D'_j} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathcal{M}_n$$

We have the equation:

$$a(t) = \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t})a(t) + t\mathbb{1}. \quad (7.2)$$

To be able to solve this equation we need:

**Lemma 16.** *Given any  $z, z' \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $I_n - \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})$  is invertible.*

**Proof.** We are going to show the injectivity of  $I_n - \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})$ . Let us introduce a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $x = \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})x$ . We can bound thanks to Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, with similar calculus as in the proof of Proposition 5.2:

$$\begin{aligned} |x_i| &= \left| \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i R(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{x_j \Sigma_j}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})}} \frac{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})}}{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^z \tilde{\Lambda}_j^{z'}} R(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{j \in [n]} \left| \frac{x_j}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^z) \Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})}} \right| \sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z) - \Im(z)} \sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^{z'}) - \Im(z')} \end{aligned}$$

therefore, if we note  $\|x\|_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \equiv \sup_{i \in [n]} \left| \frac{x_j}{\sqrt{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}) \Im(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})}} \right|$ , we have then the bound:

$$\|x\|_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}} \leq \|x\|_{\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}} \sqrt{(1 - \phi(z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}))(1 - \phi(z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}))}$$

which directly implies that  $x = 0$  since we know that  $\phi(z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}) = \frac{\Im(w)}{\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \Im(I^w(\tilde{\Lambda}^{z'}))_i} \in (0, 1)$ .  $\square$

From the continuity of  $(z, z') \mapsto \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})$ , and the limit  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \|\Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^x, \tilde{\Lambda}^x)\| = 0$  (see the proof of Proposition 7.5 in Appendix B), we can deduce as a side result from Lemma 16:

**Lemma 17.** *Given any  $z, z' \in \mathbb{H}$ ,  $\|\Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z'})\| < 1$*

The continuity of  $z \mapsto \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  given by Proposition 7.1 and the continuity of the inverse operation on matrices (around  $I_n - \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^z)$  which is invertible), allows us to let  $t$  tend to zero in the equation

$$\frac{1}{t}a(t) = (I_n - \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^{z+t}))^{-1}\mathbb{1},$$

to obtain:

**Proposition 7.2.** *The mapping  $z \mapsto \tilde{\Lambda}^z$  is analytic on  $\mathbb{H}$ , and satisfies:*

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\Lambda}^z}{\partial z} = \text{Diag} \left( (I_n - \Psi(\tilde{\Lambda}^z, \tilde{\Lambda}^z))^{-1} \mathbb{1} \right)$$

We can then conclude first that for all  $i \in [n]$ , the mappings  $z \rightarrow \frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z}$  are Stieltjes transforms.

**Proposition 7.3.** *For all  $i \in [n]$ , there exists a distribution  $\tilde{\mu}_i$  with support on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  whose Stieltjes transform is  $z \mapsto -\frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z}$*

**Proof.** We just check the hypotheses of Theorem 6. We already know that  $z \mapsto -\frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z}$  is analytical thanks to Proposition 7.2 and the lower bound  $\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z \geq \Im(z) > 0$ . Besides,  $\forall z \in \mathbb{H}$ :

$$\Im \left( -\frac{1}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z} \right) = \frac{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z)}{|\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z|^2} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Im \left( -\frac{z}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z} \right) = \frac{\Im(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z/z)}{|\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z/z|^2} > 0,$$

since  $\tilde{\Lambda}^z \in \mathcal{D}_{I_z}$ . Finally recalling from Lemma 12 that for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\|\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^{iy}}\| \leq \frac{|iy|}{\Im(iy)} = 1$ , we directly see that for all  $j \in [n]$ :

$$\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^{iy}}{iy} = 1 + \frac{1}{iy n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_j \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^{iy}}) \xrightarrow{y \rightarrow +\infty} 1.$$

we can then conclude with Theorem 6.  $\square$

We can then deduce easily that  $\tilde{g}$  is also a Stieltjes transform (it is the Theorem 2) with an interesting characterization of its measure with the  $\tilde{\mu}_i$ .

**Proposition 7.4.** *The mapping  $\tilde{g}$  is the Stieltjes transform of the measure:*

$$\tilde{\mu} = \left( \frac{n}{p} - 1 \right) \delta_0 + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mu}_i,$$

where  $\delta_0$  is the Dirac measure on 0 (if  $p > n$ , then the measures  $\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_n$  contains Dirac weights on zero that cancel the term  $-\frac{p-n}{p}\delta_0$ ).

Recall that  $\tilde{\mu}$ , satisfies  $\tilde{g}(z) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda-z} d\tilde{\mu}(\lambda)$ , and let us note  $\tilde{S}$ , its support. This formula implies that  $\tilde{g}$  is analytic on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \tilde{S}$  and that for all  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \tilde{S}$ ,  $\tilde{g}(z) = \overline{\tilde{g}(\bar{z})}$ .

To precise the picture let us provide a result of compactness of  $\tilde{S}$  proven in the Appendix.

**Proposition 7.5.** *The measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  has a compact support  $\tilde{S} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\sup \tilde{S} \leq O(1)$ .*

We end this section with the proof of the convergence of  $g$  towards  $\tilde{g}$  that will close our paper.

**Proof.** [Proof of Theorem 3] Be careful that we want here a concentration for the infinite norm on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon$ . Two cases are under study:

- When  $p \leq n$ ,  $\kappa_z = \frac{|z|}{1+|z|}$ , and therefore we can show as in the proof of Proposition 3.1 that the mapping  $g$  defined for any  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (S_{-0}^\varepsilon \cup \{0\})$  with the identity  $g(z) = -\frac{1}{pz} \text{Tr}(Q^z)$  is, under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$  a  $O(1/\sqrt{pn})$ -Lipschitz transformation of  $X$ , thus  $(g \mid \mathcal{A}_Q) \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{pn})$  in  $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{C}), \|\cdot\|_{S_{-0}^\varepsilon})$ . We can then conclude thanks to the bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[g(z)] - \tilde{g}(z)| &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{zp} \text{Tr} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} [Q^z] - \tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z} \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} O \left( \frac{\kappa_z}{|z|\sqrt{np}} \right) \leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{np}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

- When  $p \geq n$   $\tilde{\kappa}_z = \frac{|z|}{1+|z|}$ , and we are going to employ the fact (see Lemma 8) that then  $|\Lambda^z| \geq O(1)$ . Indeed, thanks to this lower bound and the identity:

$$g(z) = \frac{1}{z} \left( \frac{n}{p} - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\Lambda_i^z},$$

we can show as in the proof of Lemma 5 that  $g$  is, under  $\mathcal{A}_Q$ , a  $O(1/\sqrt{pn})$ -Lipschitz transformation of  $X$ , and as such  $(g \mid \mathcal{A}_Q) \propto \mathcal{E}_2(1/\sqrt{pn})$  in  $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{C}), \|\cdot\|_{S_{-0}^\varepsilon})$ . And this time we conclude with the bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q}[g(z)] - \tilde{g}(z)| &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{|\Lambda_i^z - \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z|}{|\Lambda_i^z \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z|} \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus S_{-0}^\varepsilon} O \left( \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{A}_Q} \left[ \left| \Lambda_i^z - \hat{\Lambda}_i^z \right| + \left| \hat{\Lambda}_i^z - \tilde{\Lambda}_i^z \right| \right] \right) \\ &\leq O \left( \frac{1}{p} \right) \leq O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{pn}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We retrieve then the concentration inequality of the theorem thanks to the bound on  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_Q)$  given in Lemma 3.  $\square$

### Appendix A. Properties of the semi metric $d_s$ and consequences in random matrix theory

In this appendix, we will employ the semi-metric  $d_s$  indifferently on diagonal matrices  $\mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  or vectors of  $\mathbb{H}^n$  or more simply with variables of  $\mathbb{H}$  as in next proposition.

**Proposition Appendix A.1.** *All the Stieltjes transforms are 1-Lipschitz for the semi-metric  $d_s$  on  $\mathbb{H}$ .*

**Proof.** We consider a Stieltjes transform  $g : z \rightarrow \int \frac{d\mu(t)}{t-z}$  for a given measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Given  $z, z' \in \mathbb{H}$ , we can bound thanks to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |g(z) - g(z')| &\leq \left| \int \frac{z' - z}{(t-z)(t-z')} d\mu(t) \right| \leq \left| \frac{z' - z}{\sqrt{\Im(z)\Im(z')}} \right| \left| \int \frac{\sqrt{\Im(z)\Im(z')}}{(t-z)(t-z')} d\mu(t) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{z' - z}{\sqrt{\Im(z)\Im(z')}} \right| \sqrt{\int \frac{\Im(z)}{|t-z|^2} d\mu(t)} \sqrt{\int \frac{\Im(z')}{|t-z'|^2} d\mu(t)} \\ &= \sqrt{\Im(g(z))\Im(g(z'))} d_s(z, z') \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We did not find any particular use of this proposition (the idea could be to solve  $g(z) = z$ ) but the stability it introduces looks interesting.

Let us start with some preliminary lemmas before proving the fourth point of Proposition 5.1, i.e. the stability towards the sum of the class of mappings, 1-Lipschitz for the semi-metric  $d_s$ . They are mere adaptation of results of [LC20].

**Lemma 18.** *Given four positive numbers  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}_+$ :*

$$\sqrt{ab} + \sqrt{\alpha\beta} \leq \sqrt{(a+\alpha)(b+\beta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{a+\alpha}{b+\beta} \leq \max\left(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)$$

**Lemma 19.** *Given four diagonal matrices  $\Delta, \Delta', D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$ :*

$$d_s(\Delta + D, \Delta' + D') \leq \max(d_s(\Delta, \Delta'), d_s(D, D')).$$

**Proof.** [Proof of Property 19] For any  $\Delta, \Delta', D, D' \in \mathcal{D}_n^+$ , there exists  $i_0 \in [n]$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} d_s(\Delta + D, \Delta' + D') &= \frac{|\Delta_{i_0} - \Delta'_{i_0} + D_{i_0} - D'_{i_0}|}{\sqrt{\Im(\Delta_{i_0} + D_{i_0})\Im(\Delta'_{i_0} + D'_{i_0})}} \\ &\leq \frac{|\Delta_{i_0} - \Delta'_{i_0}| + |D_{i_0} - D'_{i_0}|}{\sqrt{\Im(\Delta_{i_0})\Im(\Delta'_{i_0})} + \sqrt{\Im(D_{i_0})\Im(D'_{i_0})}} \\ &\leq \max\left(\frac{|\Delta_{i_0} - \Delta'_{i_0}|}{\sqrt{\Im(\Delta_{i_0})\Im(\Delta'_{i_0})}}, \frac{|D_{i_0} - D'_{i_0}|}{\sqrt{\Im(D_{i_0})\Im(D'_{i_0})}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 18. □

We deduce directly from this lemma that if  $f, g : \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n(\mathbb{H})$  are  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz for  $d_s$  then  $f + g$  is also  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz.

This property gives a very fast proof to show the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the equations studied in [AKE16] (however their proof is not much longer). We start with a preliminary lemma:

**Proposition Appendix A.2.** *Given a matrix  $S \in \mathcal{M}_{n,p}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ ,  $z \mapsto Sz$  goes from  $\mathbb{C}_+^p$  to  $\mathbb{C}_+^n$  and it is 1-Lipschitz for the semi-metric  $d_s$ .*

**Proof.** For any  $z \in \mathbb{C}_+^p$ ,  $\Im(Sz) = S\Im(z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  since all the entries of  $S$  are positive. If we note  $s_1, \dots, s_n$ , the columns of  $S$ , we can decompose  $Sz = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i \pi_i(z)$ , where  $\pi_i(z) = z_i$ . Each mapping  $s_i \pi_i$  is 1-Lipschitz for  $d_s$ , since we have for any  $z, z' \in \mathbb{C}_+^p$ :

$$d_s(s_j \pi_j(z), s_j \pi_j(z')) = \sup_{j \in [p]} \left| \frac{[s_i]_j z_i - [s_i]_j z'_i}{\sqrt{\Im([s_i]_j z_i) \Im([s_i]_j z'_i)}} \right| = \frac{z_i - z'_i}{\sqrt{\Im(z_i) \Im(z'_i)}},$$

therefore, as a sum of 1-Lipschitz operators, we know that  $z \rightarrow Sz$  is also 1-Lipschitz for  $d_s$ .  $\square$

**Proposition Appendix A.3.** *Given any  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and any matrix<sup>s</sup>  $S \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , the equation:*

$$-\frac{1}{m} = z\mathbb{1} + a + Sm$$

*admits a unique solution  $m \in \mathbb{C}_+^n$ .*

**Proof.** Let us introduce  $I : x \rightarrow z\mathbb{1} + a - S\frac{1}{x}$ . To employ Theorem 5, let us first show that the imaginary part of  $I(x)$  is bounded from below and above for all  $x \in \mathbb{C}_+^n$ . Given  $x \in \mathbb{C}_+^n$  we see straightforwardly that  $\Im(I(x)) \geq \Im(z)$ , we can furthermore bound:

$$\Im(I(x)) \leq \Im(z)\mathbb{1} + S\frac{\Im(x)}{|x|^2} \leq \Im(z)\mathbb{1} + S\frac{\mathbb{1}}{\Im(x)} \leq \left( \Im(z)I_p + \frac{1}{\Im(z)}S \right) \mathbb{1} \equiv \kappa_I.$$

Besides, we already know from Proposition 5.1 that  $I$  is 1-Lipschitz for  $d_s$  but we need a Lipschitz parameter lower than 1. Given  $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^n$  we can bound thanks to Proposition 5.1 and Appendix A.2:

$$|I(x) - I(y)| \leq \left| S \left( \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{y} \right) \right| \leq \sqrt{\Im \left( S \left( \frac{1}{x} \right) \right) \Im \left( S \left( \frac{1}{y} \right) \right)} d_s(x, y)$$

that implies that the Lipschitz parameter of  $I$  is lower than:

$$\sqrt{\left( 1 - \frac{\Im(z)}{\Im(I(x))} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\Im(z)}{\Im(I(y))} \right)} \leq 1 - \frac{\Im(z)}{\kappa_I} < 1$$

We conclude then with Theorem 5 that there exists a unique  $x \in \mathbb{H}^n$  such that  $x = I(x)$ , from which we deduce the existence and uniqueness of  $m = \frac{1}{x}$ .  $\square$

<sup>s</sup>Note that unlike in [] we do not suppose that  $S$  is symmetric.

## Appendix B. Proofs of the non necessary results

**Proof.** [Proof of Lemma 13] If we assume that  $\forall i \in [n], |\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z| \geq 2\nu$ , then we deduce that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z|} \leq \frac{1}{2\nu}$  and  $|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z}| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , and therefore,  $|\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z}| \leq 2$ . As a consequence,  $\forall i \in [n]$ :

$$|\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z| \leq |z| + \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i |\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{\Lambda}^z}| \right) \leq |z| + \frac{2p\nu}{n}$$

We can conclude that:

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} |\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z| \leq \max \left( \frac{\nu}{2}, |z| + \frac{2p\nu}{n} \right) \leq O(1 + |z|). \quad \square$$

**Proof.** [Proof of Proposition 7.5] We are going to show that for  $x$  sufficiently big,  $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \Im(g(x + iy)) = 0$ , which will allow us to conclude thanks to the relation between  $\tilde{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  given in Theorem 6. Considering  $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ , for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and such that

$$x \geq x_0 \equiv \max \left( \frac{8}{n} \sup_{i \in [n]} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i), 4\nu \right)$$

let us show first that  $\forall i \in [n], \Re(\tilde{\Lambda}_i^z) \geq \frac{x_0}{2}$ . This is a consequence of the fact that  $\mathcal{I}^z$  is stable on  $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{D}_n(\{t \geq \frac{x}{2}\} + i\mathbb{R}_+^*) \cap \mathcal{D}_{I^z}$ . Indeed, given  $L \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\Re \left( (\tilde{Q}^L)^{-1} \right) = I_p - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Re(\Lambda_i) \Sigma_i}{|L_i|^2} \geq I_p - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Sigma_i}{\Re(L_i)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

and as we already know, since  $\mathcal{D}_{I^z}, \Im \left( (\tilde{Q}^L)^{-1} \right) \geq 0$ , therefore,  $\|\tilde{Q}^L\| \leq 2$ . We can then bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \Re(\mathcal{I}^z(L)_i) &= x - \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i \tilde{Q}^L \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\Re(L_j) \Sigma_j}{|L_j|^2} \right) \tilde{Q}^L \right) \\ &\geq x - \frac{4}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i) \geq \frac{x}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus as a limit of elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\Lambda^z \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\forall i \in [n], \Re(\Lambda_i^z) \geq \frac{x}{2}$ .

Besides, let us bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \Im(\Lambda_i^z) &= y + \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left( \Sigma_i R(\Lambda^z) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\Im(\Lambda_j^z) \Sigma_j}{|\Lambda_j^z|^2} \bar{R}(\Lambda^z) \right) \\ &\leq y + \frac{4}{n} \text{Tr}(\Sigma_i) \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \Sigma_j \right\| \sup_{j \in [n]} \frac{\Im(\Lambda_j^z)}{\Re(\Lambda_j^z)^2} \end{aligned}$$

and with the bounds  $\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \Sigma_j \right\| \leq \nu$ ,  $\Re(\Lambda_j^z)^2 \geq \frac{xx_0}{4}$ , we can eventually bound  $\sup_{j \in [n]} \Im(\Lambda_j^z) \leq y + \frac{2\nu}{x} \sup_{j \in [n]} \Im(\Lambda_j^z)$ , which implies, for  $x$  sufficiently big:

$$\sup_{j \in [n]} \Im(\Lambda_j^z) \leq \frac{y}{1 - \frac{2\nu}{x}} \xrightarrow{y \rightarrow 0^+} 0.$$

We can then conclude letting  $y$  tend to 0 in the formulation  $\tilde{g} = g^{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ :

$$\Im(\tilde{g}(x + iy)) = \frac{y}{x^2 + y^2} \left( \frac{n}{p} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Im(\Lambda_i^z)}{\Re(\Lambda_i^z)^2 + \Im(\Lambda_i^z)^2} \xrightarrow{y \rightarrow 0^+} 0 \quad \square$$

## References

- [AC15] Radosław Adamczak and Djilil Chafaï. Circular law for random matrices with unconditional log-concave distribution. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 17(4), 2015.
- [Ada11] Radosław Adamczak. On the marchenko-pastur and circular laws for some classes of random matrices with dependent entries. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:1065–1095, 2011.
- [AKE16] Oskari Ajanki, Torben Krüger, and Laszlo Eedös. Singularities of solutions to quadratic vector equations on the complex upper half-plane. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 70(9):1672–1705, 2016.
- [BKV96] A. Boutet de Monvel, A. Khorunzhy, and V. Vasilchuk. Limiting eigenvalue distribution of random matrices with correlated entries. *Markov Processes and Related Fields*, 2(4):607–636, 1996.
- [BLM13] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [Bol97] Vladimir Bolotnikov. On a general moment problem on the half axis. *Linear algebra and its application*, 255:57–112, 1997.
- [BZ08] Zhidong Bai and Wang Zhou. Large sample covariance matrices without independence structures in columns. *Statistica Sinica*, 18:425–442, 2008.
- [HLN07] W. Hachem, P. Loubaton, and J. Najim. Deterministic equivalents for certain functionals of large random matrices. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 17(3):875–930, 2007.
- [LC19] Cosme Louart and Romain Couillet. Concentration of measure and large random matrices with an application to sample covariance matrices. *submitted to Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 2019.
- [LC20] Cosme Louart and Romain Couillet. A concentration of measure and random matrix approach to large dimensional robust statistics. *submitted*, 2020.
- [LC21] Cosme Louart and Romain Couillet. Concentration of measure and generalized product of random vectors with an application to hanson-wright-like inequalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08020*, 2021.
- [Led05] Michel Ledoux. *The concentration of measure phenomenon*. Number 89. American Mathematical Soc., 2005.
- [MP67] V. A. Marčenko and L. A. Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Math USSR-Sbornik*, 1(4):457–483, 1967.
- [Sil86] J. W. Silverstein. Eigenvalues and eigenvectors of large dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Random Matrices and their Applications*, pages 153–159, 1986.



- [SLTC20] Mohamed El Amine Seddik, Cosme Louart, Mohamed Tamaazousti, and Romain Couillet. Random matrix theory proves that deep learning representations of gan-data behave as gaussian mixtures. *ICML (submitted)*, 2020.
- [Tao12] Terence Tao. *Topics in random matrix theory*, volume 132. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [Yas16] Pavel Yaskov. A short proof of the marchenko–pastur theorem. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 354, 3:319–322, 2016.
- [Yin86] Y. Yin. Limiting spectral distribution for a class of random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 20:50–68, 1986.