

**ANSWER TO A QUESTION BY A. MANDARINO, T. LINOWSKI
AND K. ŻYCZKOWSKI**

MIHAI POPA

ABSTRACT. A recent work by A. Mandarino, T. Linowski and K. Życzkowski left open the following question. If μ_N is a certain permutation of entries of a $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix (“mixing map”) and U_N is a $N^2 \times N^2$ Haar unitary random matrix, then is the family $U_N, U_N^{\mu_N}, (U_N^2)^{\mu_N}, \dots, (U_N^m)^{\mu_N}$ asymptotically free? (here by A^μ we understand the matrix resulted by permuting the entries of A according to the permutation μ). This paper presents some techniques for approaching such problems. In particular, one easy consequence of the main result is that the question above has an affirmative answer.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent years one can notice the emergence of a small but growing body of literature addressing questions connected to permutations of entries of various classes of matrices. For example, partial transposes (see part 5.1 for a precise definition and more details) appear in connection to Quantum Information Theory in [13], [5], [12]; furthermore, distributions of partial transposes of Wishart random matrices are described in [4], [7], also in [16], [17]; very interesting examples of entry permutations and other linear transforms on matrix entries are studied in [2], [8]. One should also mention the groundbreaking work [1] on random entry permutations on Haar unitary random matrices.

A recent paper in theoretical Physics, [14], authored by A. Mandarino, T. Linowski and K. Życzkowski, left open an interesting question regarding asymptotic free independence of certain random matrices. Briefly, the question is as follows. First, we naturally identify (quotient-remainder) each integer from 1 to N^2 to a pair of integers from 1 to N . This way, each entry (i, j) of a $N^2 \times N^2$ matrix is described by a 4-tuple (a, b, c, d) . The map μ_N is defined by permuting the entries via $(a, b, c, d) \mapsto (a, c, b, d)$. We denote by A^{μ_N} the matrix obtained by permuting as above the entries of the matrix A . With these notations, [14] asks if the family $U_{N^2}, U_{N^2}^{\mu_N}, (U_{N^2}^2)^{\mu_N}, \dots, (U_{N^2}^P)^{\mu_N}$ is asymptotically free, where U_{N^2} is a $N^2 \times N^2$ Haar unitary random variable.

The techniques employed here to answer the question above track back to [22], where general entry permutations (including the map μ_N from above) are studied in the framework of Gaussian random matrices. Ideas from [22] were further developed in [24], [23] for matrices with non-commutative entries, in the new and interesting work [3] for Wiegner matrices, in [18] for Haar unitaries. [18] gives general necessary conditions, for a sequence of permutations $(\sigma_N)_N$ such that $U_N^{\sigma_N}$ is asymptotically circular and free from $(U_N)_N$;

furthermore, Consequence ... from [18] shows that $(U_{N^2}^{\mu_N})_N$ is asymptotically circular distributed and free from $(U_{N^2})_N$, thus giving a partial answer to the question from [14]. Yet the step from $(U_{N^2}^{\mu_N})_N$ to the family $\{((U_{N^2}^k)^{\mu_N})_N : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ seems non-trivial and requires the development of its own combinatorial machinery, as shown in the next pages.

Besides the Introduction, the paper is organized in three sections, as detailed below.

Section 2, Background and Notations, gives a short review of the main results of [9] and [10] regarding integration on the Unitary Group and lists some notation that will be widely used throughout the rest of the paper. The most important is equation (4), which writes the expectation of the normalized trace of an arbitrary product of permuted Haar unitary random matrices and their adjoints as a sum over a family of pairings.

Section 3, Preliminary Results, is organized in two parts. First part gives a series of inequalities leading to Corollary 3.5 which establishes that all summands in equation (4) are asymptotically bounded and gives sufficient conditions for the asymptotic vanishing of such summands; second part further details the structure of the asymptotically non-vanishing summands.

Section 4, Main results, gives sufficient conditions for a family $(\tau_{1,N})_N, \dots, (\tau_{P,N})_N$ of sequences of entry permutations such that the family of correspondent permuted powers of Haar unitaries $\{(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}} : 1 \leq l \leq M, 1 \leq k \leq P\}$ is asymptotically free circular and free from $(U_N)_N$.

Section 5, Particular Cases, shows that the result from Section 4 can be easily applied to the entry permutation introduced in [14] (giving an affirmative answer to the question left open there), but also to partial transposes or to a mix of the two.

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

2.1. Review of the Unitary Weingarten Calculus. One of the main results in [10] is the following. If U is a $N \times N$ Haar unitary matrix, and $u_{i,j}$ is its (i,j) -entry, then

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(u_{i_1, j_1} u_{i_2, j_2} \cdots u_{i_n, j_n} \overline{u_{i'_1, j'_1}} \cdots \overline{u_{i'_n, j'_n}} \right) = \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in S_n} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \delta_{i_k, i'_{\sigma(k)}} \delta_{j_k, j'_{\tau(k)}} \right) \text{Wg}_N(\sigma^{-1}\tau),$$

where Wg_N is the unitary Weingarten function. Furthermore, for $\sigma \in S_n$ with cycle decomposition $\sigma = c_1 \cdots c_{\#\sigma}$, and Cat_r denoting the r -th Catalan number, we have that

$$\text{Wg}_N(\sigma) = N^{-2n+\#\sigma} \prod_{i=1}^{\#\sigma} (-1)^{|C_i|-1} Cat_{|C_i|-1} + O(N^{-2n+\#\sigma-2}).$$

We will re-write the equation above using notations more suitable for the computations in the next sections. For m a positive integer, we shall denote by $[m]$ the ordered set $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. and denote by $P_2(m)$ the set of pair-partitions on $[m]$. Given a map $\varepsilon : [m] \rightarrow \{1, *\}$, we shall denote by $P_2^\varepsilon(m)$ the set (possibly void) of pair-partitions on $[m]$ that connect elements with different values of ε :

$$P_2^\varepsilon(m) = \{p \in P_2(m) : \varepsilon(k) \neq \varepsilon(p(k)) \text{ for all } k \in [m]\}.$$

As showed in [18], an equivalent form of equation 1, which is more suited for the computations in the present paper, is described as below:

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E}(u_{i_1, j_1}^{\epsilon(1)} u_{i_2, j_2}^{\epsilon(2)} \cdots u_{i_m, j_m}^{\epsilon(m)}) = \sum_{p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\epsilon(m)} \left(\prod_{k=1}^m \delta_{i_k, i_{p(k)}} \delta_{j_k, j_{q(k)}} \right) \text{Wg}_N(p, q),$$

where the function $\text{Wg}_N(\cdot, \cdot)$ is obtained from the unitary Weingarten function as follows. For $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\epsilon(m)$, denote by $p \vee q$ the supremum of p and q in the lattice of the partitions of $[m]$ (see [21] for more details). More precisely, if $p \vee q$ has the block decomposition $B_1 B_2 \cdots B_{|p \vee q|}$, then each of the blocks has an even number of elements $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2s}\}$ with $a_2 = p(a_1)$, $a_3 = q(a_2)$, $a_4 = p(a_2)$, \dots , $a_1 = q(a_{2s})$. Finally, we define $\text{Wg}_N(p, q) = \text{Wg}_N(\sigma)$. In particular, equation (2) gives that

$$(3) \quad \text{Wg}_N(p, q) = N^{-m+|p \vee q|} \prod_{i=1}^{|p \vee q|} (-1)^{\frac{|B_i|}{2}-1} \text{Cat}_{\frac{|B_i|}{2}-1} + O(N^{-2n+|p \vee q|-2}).$$

2.2. Notations. If (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m) is a tuple indexed by the ordered set $[m]$ and $S \subseteq [m]$ is given by $S = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s\}$ with $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_s$, we will use the notations $(i_\nu)_{\nu \in S}$ for the s -tuple $(i_{a_1}, i_{a_2}, \dots, i_{a_s})$.

Throughout the paper, U_N will denote a $N \times N$ random Haar unitary matrix. If σ is a permutation of the set $[N]^2 = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}$, then U_N^σ will denote the matrix defined by $[U_N^\sigma]_{i, j} = [U_N]_{\sigma(i, j)}$. Furthermore, if $\vartheta \in \{1, *\}$, then we denote

$$U^{(\sigma, \vartheta)} = (U^\sigma)^\vartheta = \begin{cases} U^{\sigma_s} & \text{if } \theta_s = 1, \\ (U^{\sigma_s})^* & \text{if } \theta_s = *. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers, $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_r$ are permutations on the set $[N]^2$ and $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_r \in \{1, *\}$. The main goal of the following Section is to describe the leading term of the following expression (seen as a function in N):

$$\mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} \left([(U^{n_1})^{\sigma_1}]^{\theta_1} \cdot [(U^{n_2})^{\sigma_2}]^{\theta_2} \cdots [(U^{n_r})^{\sigma_r}]^{\theta_r} \right) = \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} \left((U^{n_1})^{(\sigma_1, \theta_1)} \cdots (U^{n_r})^{(\sigma_r, \theta_r)} \right).$$

We need to introduce more notations. First, put

$$a^{(\varepsilon)} = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1, \\ \bar{a} & \text{if } \varepsilon = * \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon(i, j) = \begin{cases} (i, j) & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1, \\ (j, i) & \text{if } \varepsilon = *. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, for π_1, π_2 the canonical projections,

$$[(U^n)^{(\sigma, 1)}]_{i, j} = [U^n]_{\sigma(i, j)} = \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} \in [N]} u_{\pi_1 \circ \sigma(i, j), \alpha_1} u_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} \cdots u_{\alpha_{n-2}, \alpha_{n-1}} u_{\alpha_{n-1}, \pi_2 \circ \sigma(i, j)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
[(U^n)^{(\sigma,*)}]_{i,j} &= \overline{[(U^n)^{(\sigma,1)}]_{j,i}} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} \in [N]} \overline{u_{\pi_1 \circ \sigma(j,i), \alpha_1} \cdot u_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} \cdots u_{\alpha_{n-2}, \alpha_{n-1}} \cdot u_{\alpha_{n-1}, \pi_2 \circ \sigma(j,i)}} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} \in [N]} \overline{u_{\alpha_{n-1}, \pi_2 \circ \sigma(j,i)} \cdot u_{\alpha_{n-2}, \alpha_{n-1}} \cdots u_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} \cdot u_{\pi_1 \circ \sigma(j,i), \alpha_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $m(0) = 0$, and, for $t = 1, \dots, r$, let $m(t) = m(t-1) + n(t)$, hence $m(r) = m$. Define $\varepsilon : [m] \rightarrow \{1, *\}$ via $\varepsilon(s) = \varepsilon_s = \theta_t$ whenever $m(t-1) + 1 \leq s \leq m(t)$. For $t \in [r]$, denote by S_t the set $\{m(t-1) + 1, m(t_1) + 2, \dots, m(t)\}$. Finally, for $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m \in [N]$ with the identification $i_{m+1} = i_1$, define $\vartheta(i_1, \dots, i_m) = (k_s, l_s)_{1 \leq s \leq m}$, where

- if $s \notin \{m(t), m(t) + 1 : 0 \leq t \leq r\}$ then $(k_s, l_s) = \varepsilon_s(i_s, i_{s+1})$
- if $s \in \{m(t) + 1 : 0 \leq t \leq r - 1\}$ then

$$(k_s, l_s) = \begin{cases} (\pi_1 \circ \sigma_t(i_{m(t)+1}, i_{m(t+1)+1}), i_{m(t)+2}) & \text{if } \varepsilon_s = 1 \\ (i_{m(t)+2}, \pi_2 \circ \sigma_t(i_{m(t)+1}, i_{m(t+1)+1})) & \text{if } \varepsilon_s = *. \end{cases}$$

- if $s \in \{m(t) : 1 \leq t \leq r\}$, then

$$(k_s, l_s) = \begin{cases} (i_{m(t)}, \pi_2 \circ \sigma_t(i_{m(t-1)+1}, i_{m(t)+1})) & \text{if } \varepsilon_s = 1 \\ (\pi_1 \circ \sigma_t(i_{m(t-1)+1}, i_{m(t)+1}), i_{m(t)}) & \text{if } \varepsilon_s = *. \end{cases}$$

In particular, the map ϑ is an injection from $[N]^m$ to $[N]^{2m}$.

With these notations, equation (2) gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4) \quad \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} & \left((U^{n_1})^{(\sigma_1, \theta_1)} \cdot (U^{n_2})^{(\sigma_2, \theta_2)} \cdots (U^{n_r})^{(\sigma_r, \theta_r)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m \in [N]} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left(u_{k_1, l_1}^{(\varepsilon_1)} \cdot u_{k_2, l_2}^{(\varepsilon_2)} \cdots u_{k_m, l_m}^{(\varepsilon_m)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\varepsilon(m)} \left[\frac{1}{N} \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m \in [N]} \prod_{s=1}^m \delta_{k_s}^{k_{p(s)}} \delta_{l_s}^{l_{q(s)}} \right] \\
&= \sum_{p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\varepsilon(m)} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p, q)}|,$$

and $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p, q)}$ denotes the set

$$\left\{ \vec{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m) \in [N]^m : k_s = k_{p(s)} \text{ and } l_s = l_{q(s)} \text{ for all } s = 1, 2, \dots, m \right\}.$$

Finally, for S a subset of $[m]$, define

$$\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S) = \{(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S} \in [N]^{2|S|} : \text{there exist } (k_t, l_t)_{t \in [m] \setminus S} \in [N]^{2(m-|S|)} \text{ and } \vec{i} \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)} \text{ such that } (k_s, l_s)_{s \in [m]} = \vartheta(\vec{i})\}.$$

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

3.1. Asymptotic boundedness of $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For $S, T \subset [m]$, denote*

$$D(S : T) = \{t \in T : \text{there exist some } a, b \in S \text{ such that } p(a) = q(b) = t\}.$$

If $k \in [r]$ and the set $S \subseteq [m]$ are such that $D(S : S_k) \neq \emptyset$, then

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(k) - |D(S : S_k)|}.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $n(k) = 1$. Then S_k has only one element, $m(k) = p(a) = q(b)$ for some $a, b \in S$, so $k_{n(k)} = k_a$ and $l_{n(k)} = l_b$, hence $(k_{m(k)}, l_{m(k)})$ is uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$, which gives $|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|$.

Suppose now that $n(k) > 1$. In this case, elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)$ are obtained by concatenated elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$ and tuples of the form $(k_t, l_t)_{m(k-1)+1 \leq t \leq m(k)}$ which are uniquely determined by the $(n(k) + 1)$ -tuple $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(k)+1})$.

If $D(S : S_k) \cap (S_k \setminus \{m(k-1) + 1, m(k)\}) = \emptyset$, then $m(k-1) + 1 \in D(S : S_k)$ or $m(k) \in D(S : S_k)$.

If both $m(k-1) + 1$ and $m(k)$ are elements of $D(S : S_k)$, then the 4-tuple $(k_{m(k-1)+1}, l_{m(k-1)+1}, k_{m(k)}, l_{m(k)})$ is uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. Since σ_k is bijective, it follows that $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)+1})$ and $i_{m(k-1)+2}$ and $i_{m(k)}$ are, in turn, uniquely determined by $(k_{m(k-1)+1}, l_{m(k-1)+1}, k_{m(k)}, l_{m(k)})$. So, for each $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$, there are at most $n(k) + 1 - 3$ possible choices (since $m(k-1) + 2$ may equal $m(k)$) for the tuple $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(k)+1})$, and the conclusion follows.

If $m(k-1) + 1 \notin D(S : S_k)$ but $m(k) \in D(S : S_k)$, then $(k_{m(k)}, l_{m(k)})$ are uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. That is $i_{m(k)}$ and one component of $\sigma_k \circ \theta_k(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)+1})$ are uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. Therefore, there are at most N possible choices for the couple $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)+1})$ and at most one choice for $i_{m(k)}$, and the conclusion follows. The case $m(k-1) + 1 \in D(S : S_k)$ and $m(k) \notin D(S : S_k)$ is similar.

Finally, if $n(k) > 1$ and $D(S : S_k) \cap (S_k \setminus \{m(k-1) + 1, m(k)\}) \neq \emptyset$, note first that whenever $t \in D(S : S_k) \cap (S_k \setminus \{m(k-1) + 1, m(k)\})$ we have that i_t and i_{t+1} are uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. Indeed, $i_t = k_t = k_a$ and $i_{t+1} = l_t = l_b$ for some $a, b \in S$ with $p(a) = q(b) = t$. Therefore, at least $|D(S : S_k) \cap (S \setminus \{m(k-1) + 1, m(k)\})| + 1$ elements of the $(n(k) - 1)$ -tuple $(i_t)_{t \in (S \setminus \{m(k-1)+1, m(k)\})}$ are uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. Furthermore, as shown above, for each $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$ for the couple $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)+1})$ there are at most N choices if only one of $m(k-1) + 1$ and $m(k)$ are in $D(S : S_k)$, respectively one choice if both are in $D(S : S_k)$. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $S \subseteq [m]$ and $k \in [r]$ are such that there exist some $a \in S$ and some $t \in S_k$ with $p(a) = t$ or $q(a) = t$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| \leq N^{n(k)-|D(S:S_k)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|.$$

Proof. If $D(S : S_k) \neq \emptyset$, then the result follows trivially from Lemma 3.1. Suppose then that $D(S : S_k) = \emptyset$.

As seen before, the elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)$ are obtained by concatenated elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$ and tuples of the form $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S_k}$, which are uniquely determined by the $(n(k) + 1)$ -tuple $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(k)+1})$.

If $p(a) = b$ for $a \in S$ and $b \in S_k$, then $k_b = k_a$ is uniquely determined by the tuple $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. But k_b is either an element of $\{i_t : m(k-1) + 1 < t < m(k) + 1\}$ or it is a component of $\sigma_k \circ \theta_k(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)})$. If $k_a = i_t$ for some t with $m(k-1) + 1 < t < m(k) + 1$, then for each $2|S|$ -tuple $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$ there are at most $N^{n(k)}$ choices for the $(n(k) + 1)$ -tuple $(i_t)_{m(k-1)+1 \leq t \leq m(k)+1}$. If k_a is a component of $\sigma_k \circ \theta_k(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)})$ then, since σ_k is bijective, for each $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$ there are at most N choices for the couple $i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)+1}$ hence at most $n(k)$ choices for the $(n(k) + 1)$ -tuple $(i_t)_{m(k-1)+1 \leq t \leq m(k)+1}$.

The case $q(a) = b$ is similar. \square

The argument from the proof of Corollary 3.2 above will further give the result below, that we will use in the next subsection.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $S \subset [m]$ and that $k \in [r]$ is such that $n(k) > 1$. For each $\nu \leq n(k) - 1$, consider the sets*

$$\begin{aligned} T_\nu &= \{m(k-1) + 1, m(k-1) + 2, \dots, m(k-1) + \nu\} \\ Q_\nu &= \{m(k) - \nu + 1, m(k) - \nu + 2, \dots, m(k)\}. \end{aligned}$$

With this notations, we have that

- (i) *If $\theta_k = 1$ and $p(a) = m(k-1) + 1$ for some $a \in S$, or if $\theta_k = *$ and $q(a) = m(k-1) + 1$ for some $a \in S$, then*

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,a)}(S \cup T_\nu)| \leq N^{\nu-|D(S:T_\nu)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|.$$

- (ii) *If $\theta_k = 1$ and $q(b) = m(k)$ for some $b \in S$, or if $\theta_k = *$ and $p(b) = m(k)$ for some $b \in S$, then*

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup Q_\nu)| \leq N^{\nu-|D(S:Q_\nu)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|$$

Proof. It suffices to show part (i); part (ii) follows then by taking adjoints.

As stated before, elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup T_\nu)$ are concatenations of $2|S|$ -tuples from $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$ and 2ν -tuples of the form $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in T_\nu}$.

If $\theta_k = 1$, then $l_t = k_{t+1}$ for all $m(k-1) + 1 \leq t \leq m(k) - 1$, so $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in T_\nu}$ is uniquely determined by $k_{m(k-1)+1}$ and the ν -tuple $(l_t)_{t \in T_\nu}$. Since $p(a) = m(k-1) + 1$, we have that $k_{m(k-1)+1} = k_a$. Furthermore, if $t \in D(S : T_\nu)$, then $l_t = l_d$ for some $d \in S$. It follows

that each tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup T_\nu}$ from $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup T_\nu)$ is uniquely determined by its components $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S}$ and $(l_t)_{t \in T_\nu \setminus D(S:T_\nu)}$, hence the conclusion.

If $\theta_k = *$, the argument is similar. Now $k_t = l_{t+1}$ for all $m(k-1)+1 \leq t \leq m(k)-1$, so $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in T_\nu}$ is now uniquely determined by $l_{m(k-1)+1}$ and the ν -tuple $(k_t)_{t \in T_\nu}$. The condition $q(a) = m(k-1)+1$ gives that $l_a = l_{m(k-1)+1}$ and, as above, if $t \in D(S:T_\nu)$, then $k_t = k_d$ for some $d \in S$. It follows that each tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup T_\nu}$ from $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup T_\nu)$ is uniquely determined by its components $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S}$ and $(k_t)_{t \in T_\nu \setminus D(S:T_\nu)}$, hence the conclusion. \square

Lemma 3.4. *For $S, T \subset [m]$, denote*

$$B(S:T) = \{B \text{ block in } p \vee q : B \subseteq S \cup T \text{ and } B \not\subseteq S\}.$$

If $S_{k-1} \subseteq S$, or if $S_{k+1} \subseteq S$ then

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(k)-|B(S:S_k)|}.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the result for the case $S_{k-1} \subseteq S$; the case $S_{k+1} \subseteq S$ will follow by taking adjoints.

Also, since $\varepsilon_t = \theta_k$ for all $t \in S_k$, it follows that p and q do not pair elements of S_k with other elements from S_k . Therefore the set $D(S:S_k)$ has more elements than $B(S:S_k)$. It suffices then to show that

$$(5) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| \leq N^{n(k)-|D(S:S_k)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|.$$

If $D(S:S_k) \neq \emptyset$ then (5) follows from Lemma 3.1 above. Therefore suffices to show that if $D(S:S_k) = \emptyset$ then

$$(6) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| \leq N^{n(k)} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|.$$

Fix $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$, i.e. all i_t are uniquely determined for $m(k-1)+1 \leq t \leq m(k)+1$. The elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)$ are obtained by concatenated elements of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$ and tuples of the form $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S_k}$, which are uniquely determined by the $(n(k)+1)$ -tuple $(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(k)+1})$. But, as stated above, $i_{m(k-1)+1}$ is uniquely determined for each $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S} \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$, so (6) follows. \square

Corollary 3.5.

- (i) $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^0) = O(1)$ for any $p, q \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$.
- (ii) With the notations from above, suppose that $S = S_{\alpha_1} \cup S_{\alpha_2} \cup \dots \cup S_{\alpha_t}$ for some $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in [r]$. If $p, q \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$ are such that

$$(7) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| = o(N^{1+|S| - |\{B \text{ block in } p \vee q : B \subseteq S\}|})$$

then $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = o(N^0) = o(1)$.

- (iii) If $p \vee q$ has a block with more than one element in some S_k , then $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$.

Proof. Any element from $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_1)$ is uniquely determined by $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m_1+1}$, hence

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_1)| \leq N^{m_1+1}.$$

Applying Lemma 3.4 $r - 1$ times, we obtain that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| \leq N^{m_1+1} \cdot \prod_{t=2}^r N^{n_t - |B(\cup_{\nu=1}^{t-1} S_\nu : S_t)|} = N^{m_1+1 - \sum_{t=2}^r |B(S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{t-1} : S_t)|}.$$

Since $p, q \in F_2^\varepsilon(m)$ no blocks of $p \vee q$ are contained in S_1 . It follows that $p \vee q$ is the disjoint union of the sets $B(S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{t-1} : S_t)$ for $2 \leq t \leq r - 1$, so

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| \leq N^{m_1+1 - |p \vee q|}.$$

Since $\text{Wg}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-m_1+|p \vee q|})$, we have that

$$\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| \leq \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot N^{m_1 - |p \vee q|} = O(1),$$

so part (i) follows.

To show part (ii), let $\beta = \min\{t \in [r] : t \neq \alpha_\nu, 1 \leq \nu \leq p\}$ and $S' = S \cup S_\beta$. Lemma 3.4 gives that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S')| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(\beta) - |B(S : S_\beta)|} = o(N^{1+|S|+n(\beta) - |\{B \in \pi_{p,q} : B \subseteq S\}| - |B(S : S_\beta)|})$$

But $|S'| = |S| + |S_\beta| = |S| + n(\beta)$ and the blocks of $p \vee q$ contained in S' are either contained in S or elements of $B(S : S_\beta)$. Hence S' satisfies equation (7). Iterating, it follows that $[m]$ satisfies (7), so $|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| = o(N^{1+m - |p \vee q|})$, therefore

$$\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot o(N^{m - |p \vee q|}) = o(N^0).$$

For part (iii), suppose that B is a block of $p \vee q$ such that S_k contains more than one element of B . Via a circular permutation of the sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r , we can suppose without loss of generality that $k = r$.

Denote $S = S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{r-1}$. As seen above, Lemma 3.4 gives that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \leq N^{|S|+1 - \sum_{t=2}^{r-1} |B(S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{t-1} : S_t)|},$$

and using again $|p \vee q| = \sum_{t=2}^r |B(S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{t-1} : S_t)|$, the equation above reads

$$(8) \quad |\mathcal{F}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \leq N^{|S|+1 - |p \vee q| + |B(S : S_r)|}.$$

On the other hand, since there is a block of $p \vee q$ with more than one element on S_r , we have that the set $D(S : S_r)$ has strictly more elements than $B(S : S_r)$, so Lemma 3.1 gives that relations

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| \leq N^{1+|S|+n(r) - |p \vee q| + |B(S : S_r)| - |D(S : S_r)|} \leq N^{m_1+1 - |p \vee q|},$$

henceforth

$$\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) \leq \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot N^{m+1-|p \vee q|-1} = O(N^{-1}).$$

□

3.2. Structure of the asymptotically non-vanishing summands.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $p, q \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$. Then either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or for each block B of $p \vee q$, with $B = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_h\}$, and $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_h$, we have that the following properties are satisfied by all $s \in [h]$, with the identification $a_{h+1} = a_1$:*

- $\varepsilon_{a_s} \neq \varepsilon_{a_{s+1}}$
- $\{p(a_s), q(a_s)\} = \{a_{s-1}, a_{s+1}\}$.

Proof. It suffices to show that either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or every $s \in [h]$ satisfies the following property (again, we identify $a_{h+1} = a_1$):

$$(9) \quad a_{s+1} \in \{p(a_s), q(a_s)\}.$$

For every $t \in [h]$, define $b(t)$ via $a_t \in S_{b(t)}$. From part (iii) of Corollary 3.5, we can suppose that $b(t_1) \neq b(t_2)$ whenever $t_1 \neq t_2$ (otherwise $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$).

Suppose that (9) is not satisfied for some $s \in [h]$. Via a circular permutation of the sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r we can further assume that $b(s+1) = r$. Moreover, using part (ii) of Corollary 3.5, we can further assume that S_r contains only one element, that is a_h , of B , so $s = h-1$.

To simplify the notions, let $b = b(h-1)$ and let $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{b-1}$. The condition $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_p$ gives that $B \setminus \{a_h\} \subseteq S$. Next, since we are under assumption that $h-1$ does not satisfy (9), we have that $p(a_{h-1}), q(a_{h-1}) \in B \setminus \{a_h\}$, that is $a_{h-1} \in D(S : S_b)$. On the other hand, $a_{h-1} \notin B(S : S_b)$, because $a_h \in B(S \cup S_b)$. Lemma 3.1 gives then

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_b)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(b)-|D(S:S_b)|} < |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(b)-|B(S:S_b)|}.$$

Finally, as in the proof of Corollary 3.5, an application of Lemma 3.4 gives

$$\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| \leq \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot N^{m-|p \vee q|-1} = O(N^{-1}).$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that $p, q \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$ are such that there exist $a, b, c, d \in [m]$ with the following properties:*

- $a < b < c < d$
- $c \in \{p(a), q(a)\}$ and $d \in \{p(b), q(b)\}$
- $a \in S_\alpha, b \in S_x, c \in S_\beta$ and $d \in S_y$ with $\alpha < x < \beta < y$.

Then $\mathcal{E}_N^{(p,q)} = O(N^{-1})$.

Proof. Let $S' = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \cdots \cup S_{x-1}$. As in the proof of part (i) of Corollary 3.5, we have that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S')| \leq N^{|S'|+1-|\{B \text{ block in } p \vee q: B \subseteq S'\}|}.$$

Henceforth, Corollary 3.2 gives that

$$(10) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S' \cup S_\beta)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S')| \cdot N^{|S_\beta|-|B(S':S_\beta)|} \leq N^{|S' \cup S_\beta|+1-|\{B \in p \vee q: B \subseteq (S' \cup S_\beta)\}|}.$$

Denote $S = S' \cup S_\beta \cup S_{\beta-1} \cup \cdots \cup S_{x+1}$. and note that $d \notin S$ from the assumption $\beta < y$. Equation (10) and Lemma 3.4 give then

$$(11) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \leq N^{|S|+1-|\{B \in p \vee q: B \subseteq S\}|}$$

If $n(x) = 1$ then S_x has a unique element $b = m(x)$ and, since b is in the same block with $d \notin S$, we have that $B(S : S_x) = \emptyset$. On the other hand, each tuple $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$, uniquely determines the pair $(i_{m(x)}, i_{m(x)+1})$, so it also uniquely determines the pair $(k_{m(x)}, l_{m(x)}) = \sigma_x \circ \theta_x(i_{m(x)}, i_{m(x)+1})$. The inequality (11) gives then

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_x)| = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \leq N^{|S \cup S_x|-|\{B \in p \vee q: B \subseteq (S \cup S_x)\}|}$$

and the conclusion follows from part (ii) of Corollary 3.5.

Next, suppose that $n(x) \geq 2$, i.e. $S_x \setminus \{b\} \neq \emptyset$.

If $b = m(x-1) + 1$, respectively if $b = m(x) + 1$ then, from the formulae describing the map ϑ , the couple (k_b, l_b) is uniquely determined by the triples $(i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x-1)+2}, i_{m(x)+1})$ respectively $(i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x)}, i_{m(x)+1})$. Also, if $m(x-1) + 2 < b < m(x) + 1$, then $(k_b, l_b) = \epsilon_b(i_b, i_{b+1})$, which is uniquely determined by (k_{b-1}, l_{b-1}) and (k_{b+1}, l_{b+1}) . Therefore (k_b, l_b) is uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S \cup S_x \setminus \{b\}}$. So

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_x)| = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_x \setminus \{b\})|.$$

On the other hand, since b is in the same block of $p \vee q$ as $d \notin S$, we have that $B(S : S_x) = B(S : S_x \setminus \{b\})$. According to Corollary 3.5(ii), it suffices to show that

$$(12) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_x \setminus \{b\})| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(x)-1-|D(S:S_x \setminus \{b\})|}.$$

As seen above, the couple $(i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x)+1})$ is uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. So the tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S_x \setminus \{b\}}$ is uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$ and by the $(n(x) - 1)$ -tuple $(i_\nu)_{m(x-1)+1 < \nu < m(x)+1}$.

If $t \in D(S : S_x \setminus \{b\})$ then $k_t = k_{t'}$ and $l_t = l_{t''}$ for some $t', t'' \in S$. Hence, if $t = m(x-1) + 1$, respectively $t = m(x) + 1$, then $i_{m(x-1)+2}$, respectively $i_{m(x)}$ are uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$. Also, if $m(x-1) + 1 < t < m(x) + 1$, then both i_t and i_{t+1} are uniquely determined by $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$, so (12) follows. \square

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in [r]$ have the property that there exist some $a, b \in S_\beta$ such that*

$$(13) \quad \theta_\alpha(m(\alpha-1) + 1, m(\alpha)) = (p(a), q(b)).$$

Then either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or $p(S_\alpha) \subseteq S_\beta$ and $q(S_\alpha) \subseteq S_\beta$.

Proof. Via a circular permutations of the sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r , we can suppose that $\beta < \alpha$.

If $n(\alpha) = 1$, then S_α has only one element, $m(\alpha) = m(\alpha - 1) + 1$, so the result is trivial.

Suppose that $n(\alpha) \geq 2$ and that there exists some $\nu \in S_\alpha$ such that $p(\nu) \notin S_\beta$ or $q(\nu) \notin S_\beta$. Let us denote by s the smallest element of S_α with this property.

First, note that, by construction, $s \notin D(S : S_\alpha)$, so $D(S : S_\alpha) = D(S : S_\alpha \setminus \{s\})$.

Next, note that

$$(14) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_\alpha)| = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup (S_\alpha \setminus \{s\}))|$$

Indeed, if $s = m(\alpha - 1) + 1$ and $\theta_\alpha = 1$, then $l_s = k_{s+1}$ while (13) gives $p(a) = s$ so $k_a = k_s$; if $s = m(\alpha - 1) + 1$ and $\theta_\alpha = *$, then $k_s = l_{s+1}$ while (13) gives $q(b) = l_s$. In both cases, it follows that any tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_\alpha}$ is uniquely determined by its components $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup (S_\alpha \setminus \{s\})}$, so (14) holds true. A similar argument works for the case $s = m(\alpha)$. Finally, if $m(\alpha - 1) + 1 < s < m(\alpha)$, then $(k_s, l_s) = (l_{s-1}, k_{s+1})$ if $\theta_\alpha = 1$, respectively $(k_s, l_s) = (l_{s+1}, k_{s-1})$ if $\theta_\alpha = *$, so (14) holds true.

Let A_1 be the possibly empty set $A_1 = \{m(\alpha - 1) + \nu : 0 \leq \nu < s - m(\alpha - 1)\}$ and denote $A_2 = S_\alpha \setminus (\{s\} \cup A_1)$. Applying Lemma 3.3 we then obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup A_1 \cup A_2)| &\leq N^{|A_2| - |D(S \cup A_1 : A_2)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup A_1)| \\ &\leq N^{|A_2| - |D(S \cup A_1 : A_2)|} \cdot N^{|A_1| - |D(S : A_1)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since A_1 and A_2 are disjoint, $D(S : A_1 \cup A_2) = D(S : A_1) \cup D(S : A_2)$. Moreover, Lemma 3.6 gives that either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or $D(S : A_1) \cap D(S : A_2) = \emptyset$ and $D(S \cup A_1 : A_2) = D(S : A_2)$. Hence, we obtain that either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup A_1 \cup A_2)| \leq N^{|A_1| + |A_2| - |D(S : A_1 \cup A_2)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|.$$

Since S_α is the disjoint union of A_1 and A_2 , the equality (14) gives that the relation above is equivalent to

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_\alpha)| \leq N^{n(\alpha) - 1 - |D(S : S_\alpha)|} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)|$$

which, from Corollary 3.2 also implies that $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in [r]$ are such that*

$$(15) \quad p(S_\alpha) = S_\beta = q(S_\alpha).$$

Then either $\mathcal{E}_N^{(p,q)} = O(N^{-1})$ or for each $\nu \in [n(\alpha)]$, we have that

$$p(m(\alpha - 1) + \nu) = q(m(\alpha - 1) + \nu) = m(\beta) + 1 - \nu.$$

Proof. First, note that condition (15) implies $\theta_\alpha \neq \theta_\beta$; without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\theta_\alpha = 1$ and $\theta_\beta = *$.

Next, note that, since p and q are injective, the condition (15) implies $n(\alpha) = n(\beta)$. Also, (15) gives that $S_\alpha \cup S_\beta$ is a union of blocks of $p \vee q$. Corollary 3.5 gives that either

$\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$, or each of these blocks have exactly two elements, one in S_α and one in S_β . The last property means that $p(t) = q(t)$ for all $t \in S_\alpha \cup S_\beta$ and that

$$|B(S_\alpha : S_\beta)| = |D(S_\alpha : S_\beta)| = n(\alpha).$$

Therefore Lemma 3.4 gives

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_\alpha \cup S_\beta)| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_\alpha)| \cdot N^{n(\beta)-n(\alpha)} = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_\alpha)|.$$

and, utilizing Corollary 3.5, we obtain that either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or $|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_\alpha)| = N^{n(\alpha)+1}$.

As seen before, each $(2n(\alpha))$ -tuple $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S_\alpha}$ is uniquely determined by the $(n(\alpha) + 1)$ -tuple $(i_{m(\alpha-1)+1}, i_{m(\alpha-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(\alpha)+1})$. Moreover, using that $\theta_\alpha = 1$, we have that the following relations are satisfied whenever $m(\alpha - 1) + 2 \leq t \leq m(\alpha)$:

$$\begin{aligned} i_t &= k_{t+1} = l_t \\ \sigma_\alpha(i_{m(\alpha-1)+1}, i_{m(\alpha)+1}) &= (k_{m(\alpha-1)+1}, l_{m(\alpha)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the $2n(\alpha)$ -tuple $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S_\alpha}$ is uniquely determined by $l_{m(\alpha)}$ and the $(n(\alpha))$ -tuple $(k_{m(\alpha-1)+1}, k_{m(\alpha-1)+2}, \dots, k_{m(\alpha)})$.

On the other hand, since $\theta_\beta = *$, we have

$$\sigma_\beta(i_{m(\beta-1)+1}, i_{m(\beta)}) = (k_{m(\beta)}, l_{m(\beta-1)+1})$$

and $i_t = k_t = l_{t+1}$ for $m(\beta - 1) + 2 \leq t \leq m(\beta)$.

Next, remark that either $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$ or $q(m(\alpha)) = m(\beta - 1) + 1$. Indeed, if $q(m(\alpha)) \neq m(\beta - 1) + 1$ then $q(m(\alpha)) - 1 \in S_\beta$. Since $l_t = l_{q(t)}$, we get $l_{m(\alpha)} = l_{q(m(\alpha))}$, and, using that $q(m(\alpha)) \in S_\beta$, it follows that $l_{q(m(\alpha))} = k_{q(m(\alpha))-1}$ which gives $l_{m(\alpha)} = k_{p(q(m(\alpha)-1))}$. This implies that $(k_s, l_s)_{s \in S}$ is uniquely determined by the $n(\alpha)$ -tuple $(k_t)_{t \in S_\alpha}$, i.e. $|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_\alpha \cup S_\beta)| \leq N^{n(\alpha)}$, therefore $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$.

For $m(\alpha - 1) + 1 \leq t \leq m(\alpha) - 1$ we have that $t + 1 \in m(\alpha)$, hence $k_{t+1} = l_t$. But $l_t = l_{q(t)} = k_{q(t)-1}$, since $q(t) \in S_\beta$. On the other hand, $k_{q(t)-1} = k_{p(q(t)-1)}$, which gives $k_{t+1} = k_{p(q(t)-1)}$ with both $t + 1$ and $p(q(t) - 1)$ elements of S_α . If $t + 1 \neq p(q(t) - 1)$, then there are at most $N^{n(\alpha)}$ possible choices for the tuple $(k_{m(\alpha-1)+1}, k_{m(\alpha-1)+2}, \dots, k_{m(\alpha)}, l_{m(\alpha)})$, therefore, according to Corollary 3.5, we have that $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = O(N^{-1})$. It follows that $t + 1 = p(q(t) - 1)$, hence, since p and q coincide on $S_\alpha \cup S_\beta$, we have that $q(t + 1) = q(t) - 1$, and an inductive argument gives the conclusion. \square

4. MAIN RESULTS

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that there exists some $k \in [r]$ such that the sequence $(\sigma_{k,N})_N$ satisfies the following property:*

$$(16) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sup_{(a,b) \in [N]^2} \sum_{\alpha=1,2} |\{\nu \in [N] : a \in \{\pi_\alpha \circ \sigma(\nu, j), \pi_\alpha \circ \sigma(j, \nu)\}\}| = 0,$$

where π_1, π_2 are the canonical projections.

If $p, q \in P_2^c(m)$ are such that $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N^{(p,q)} \neq 0$ and $a, b \in [m]$ are such that

$$(p(a), q(b)) = \theta_k(m(k-1) + 1, m(k)),$$

then a and b are both elements of the same S_α for some $\alpha \in [r]$.

Proof. First assume that $\theta_k = 1$; let us suppose that $m(s-1) + 1 = p(a)$ and $m(s) = q(b)$ for some $a \in S_\alpha$ and $b \in S_\beta$ such that $\alpha \neq \beta$. Via a circular permutation of the sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r , we can further suppose that either $\alpha < k < \beta$ or $\beta < k < \alpha$.

Denote $S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{k-1}$. Since $\alpha \neq k \neq \beta$, we have that $S \neq \emptyset$. From Corollary 3.5, it suffices to show that

$$(17) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot o(N^{n(k)-|B(S:S_k)|}).$$

Suppose first that $\alpha < k < \beta$. As proved in Lemma 3.3, we have that

$$(18) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup (S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}))| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(k)-1-|D(S:S_k \setminus \{m(k)\})|}.$$

Since $q(m(k)) = b \notin S$, we have that $m(k) \notin D(S : S_k)$, therefore $D(S : S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}) = D(S : S_k)$. So (18) gives

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup (S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}))| \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(k)-1-|D(S:S_k)|} \leq |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)| \cdot N^{n(k)-1-|B(S:S_k)|},$$

that is, to show (17), it suffices to prove that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| = o(N) \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup (S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}))|,$$

i.e. it suffices to show that for any given tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}}$ there are $o(N)$ pairs $(k_{m(k)}, l_{m(k)})$ such that their juxtaposition $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k}$ is in $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)$. By construction (see the notations from 2.2), we have that $k_{m(k)} = l_{m(k)-1}$, therefore $k_{m(k)}$ is uniquely determined by the tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}}$. Next, according to Notations 2.2, we have that

$$i_{m(k-1)+1} = \begin{cases} \pi_1 \circ \sigma_{k-1, N}(k_{m(k-2)+1}, l_{m(k-1)}) & \text{if } \theta_k = 1 \\ \pi_1 \circ \sigma_{k-1, N}(l_{m(k-2)+1}, k_{m(k-1)}) & \text{if } \theta_k = * \end{cases}$$

and

$$l_{m(k)} = \pi_2 \circ \sigma_{k, N}(i_{m(k-1)+1}, i_{m(k)+1}).$$

Therefore $i_{m(k-1)+1}$ also is uniquely determined by $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}}$, and, given the tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k \setminus \{m(k)\}}$, we have that $l_{m(k)}$ is uniquely determined by $i_{m(k)+1}$.

But, using property (16) for the second relation, we have that

$$|\{i_{m(k)+1} : (k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k} \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)\}| \leq |\{\nu : k_{m(k-1)+1} = \pi_1 \circ \sigma(i_{m(k-1)+1}, \nu)\}| = o(N),$$

and the conclusion follows.

The case $\beta < k < \alpha$ is similar: this time let $S = S_{k+1} \cup \cdots \cup S_r$ and, via Lemma 3.3, it suffices to show that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup S_k)| = o(N) \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S \cup (S_k \setminus \{m(k-1) + 1\}))|.$$

Given a tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k \setminus \{m(k-1)+1\}}$, it uniquely determines, from the constructions in Notations 2.2, both $l_{m(k-1)+1}$ and $i_{m(k)}$; also, since $p(a) = m(k-1) + 1$, that is $k_a = k_{m(k-1)+1}$, for some $a \in S_\alpha \subseteq S$, the tuple also uniquely determines $k_{m(k-1)+1}$. So the pair $(k_{m(k-1)+1}, l_{m(k-1)+1})$ is uniquely determined by the tuple $(k_t, l_t)_{t \in S \cup S_k \setminus \{m(k-1)+1\}}$ and by $i_{m(k-1)+1}$. Furthermore, the number of possible choices for $i_{m(k-1)+1}$ is bounded above by the cardinality of the set

$$\{\nu : k_a = \pi_1 \circ \sigma_{k,N}(\nu, i_{m(k)})\}$$

which, from Property (16), equals $o(N)$.

Finally, the case the case $\theta_k = *$ follow similarly, by taking adjoints, switching p and q and using Property (16) for π_2 . \square

An immediate consequence of Lemmata 4.1 and 3.8 is the following.

Corollary 4.2. *Suppose that $\alpha \in [r]$ is such that the sequence $(\sigma_{\alpha,N})_N$ satisfies property (16) and that the pairings $p, q \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$ are such that $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N^{(p,q)} \neq 0$. Then there exists some $\beta \in [r]$ such that $p(S_\alpha), q(S_\alpha) \subseteq S_\beta$.*

The main result of the paper is the theorem below.

Theorem 4.3. *Let P be a positive integer. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, P$, suppose that $(\tau_{k,N})_N$ is a family of permutations that satisfies condition (16) with each $\tau_{k,N}$ a permutation on $[N] \times [N]$. If for each distinct $a, b \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ the sequences $(\tau_{a,N})_N$ and $(\tau_{b,N})_N$ satisfy the condition*

$$(19) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} |\{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \in [N]^3 : \tau_{a,N}(i_1, i_2) \in \{\tau_{b,N}(i_1, i_3), \tau_{b,N}(i_3, i_2)\}\}| = 0$$

then, for any positive integer M , the family $\{(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}} : 1 \leq l \leq M, 1 \leq k \leq P\}$ is asymptotically (as $N \rightarrow \infty$) free circular of variance 1 and free from U_N .

As in Section 2.2, let n_1, \dots, n_r be positive integers, for $k = 1, \dots, r$ let $(\sigma_{k,N})_N$ be sequences of permutations either equal to $(\text{Id}_N)_N$ or from the set $\{(\tau_{k,N})_N : 1 \leq P\}$ and let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_r \in \{1, *\}$. We also assume that $n_k = 1$ whenever $(\sigma_{k,N})_N = (\text{Id}_N)_N$. Furthermore, as in Section 2.2, let $m(0) = 0$ and, for $1 \leq t \leq r$, put $m(t) = m(t-1) + n_t$; denote $m = m(r)$, then define $\varepsilon : [m] \rightarrow \{1, *\}$ via $\varepsilon(s) = \varepsilon_s = \theta_t$ whenever $m(t-1) + 1 \leq s \leq m(t)$.

We shall prove the theorem by applying the results from the previous sections to the moment-free cumulant expansion of

$$\mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} \left([(U_N^{n_1})^{\sigma_{1,N}}]^{\theta_1} \cdot [(U_N^{n_2})^{\sigma_{2,N}}]^{\theta_2} \cdots [(U_N^{n_r})^{\sigma_{r,N}}]^{\theta_r} \right).$$

and utilizing the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, suppose that $p, q \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$ are such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) \neq 0$. Further suppose that $x, y \in [r]$ are such that $x < y$ and, for $a = m(x)$, $b = m(y)$, the set $S = [b] \setminus [a]$ have the property that $p(S) = q(S) = S$. Then:*

- (i) *If $v \in [r]$ is such that $(\sigma_{v,N})_N \neq (\text{Id}_N)_N$, then there exists some $w \in [r]$ with $p(S_v) = q(S_v) = S_w$.*
- (ii) *The partition $p \vee q$ is non-crossing.*
- (iii) *If $(i_{a+1}, \dots, i_{b+1}) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$, then $i_{a+1} = i_{b+1}$.*

Proof. For (i), Corollary 4.2 gives the existence of $w \in [r]$ such that $p(S_v), q(S_v) \subseteq S_w$. If $(\sigma_{w,N})_N = (\text{Id}_N)_N$, then S_w is a singleton and the statement is trivial. If $(\sigma_{w,N})_N$ satisfies condition (16), then the property follows from Corollary 4.2.

To show (ii), suppose that $t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_4$ is a crossing of $p \vee q$, i.e. $t_1, t_3 \in B_1$ and $t_2, t_4 \in B_2$ for B_1, B_2 distinct blocks of $p \vee q$. For $1 \leq \nu \leq 4$, let $v_\nu \in [r]$ be such that $i_\nu \in S_{v_\nu}$. From Corollary 3.5(iii), we have that $v_1 \neq v_3$ and $v_2 \neq v_4$. If $v_1 = v_2$, then S_{v_1} is not a singleton, so $(\sigma_{v_4,N})_N \neq (\text{Id}_N)_N$ and part (i) gives that $p(S_{v_1}) = q(S_{v_1}) = S_{v_3} = S_{v_4}$, which contradicts Lemma 3.9.

For (iii), via a circular permutation of the sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r , without loss of generality we can suppose that $x = 1$, that is $a = 0$ and $S = [b]$. We shall prove the result by induction on b .

If $b = 2$, then $S_1 = \{1\}$, $S_2 = \{2\}$ and $p(1) = q(1) = 2$. Hence $(i_1, i_2, i_3) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S)$ implies that

$$1 = \delta_{k_1}^{k_2} \delta_{l_1}^{l_2} = \delta_{\sigma_{1,N}(i_1, i_2)}^{\sigma_{2,N}(i_3, i_2)}.$$

If $\sigma_{1,N} \neq \sigma_{2,N}$ then condition (19) gives that $|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(\{1, 2\})| = o(N^2)$ and, according to Corollary 3.5(ii), we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = 0$. Therefore $\sigma_{1,N} = \sigma_{2,N}$, which gives $i_1 = i_3$, that is (iii).

To prove the induction step, remember that the blocks of $p \vee q$ have an even number of elements and, since $p \vee q$ is non-crossing, its restriction to $[b]$ has at least one block with consecutive elements, $B = \{t+1, t+2, \dots, t+s\}$. From Corollary 3.5(iii), there is some $w \in [r]$ such that $t+\nu \in S_{w+\nu}$ for $\nu = 1, 2, \dots, s$.

Note that the set $S' = S_{w+1} \cup S_{w+2} \cup \dots \cup S_{w+s}$ is also invariant under p and q . Indeed, if all $S_{w+\nu}$ are singletons, then $S' = B$. If $S_{w+\nu}$ is not a singleton for some $\nu \in [s]$, then $(\sigma_{w+\nu,N})_N \neq (\text{Id}_N)_N$, and part (i) of the Lemma gives that $s = 2$ and $p(S_{w+1}) = q(S_{w+1}) = S_{w+2}$. It suffices therefore to show that S' satisfies property (iii); then the conclusion follows by the induction hypothesis applied to the set obtained by removing S' from S .

If $s = 2$, then $S' = S_{w+1} \cup S_{w+2}$. Denote by n the common value of n_{w+1} and n_{w+2} and by $\alpha + 1$ the first element of S_{w+1} . From Lemma 3.9, $p(\nu) = q(\nu) = \alpha + 2n + 2 - \nu$ for

all $\nu = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, using the construction of (k_ν, l_ν) in Section 2.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S')| &\leq |\{(i_{\alpha+1}, \dots, i_{\alpha+2n+1}) \in [N]^{2n+1} : (k_{\alpha+\nu}, l_{\alpha+\nu}) = (k_{p(\alpha+\nu)}, l_{q(\alpha+\nu)}), 1 \leq \nu \leq 2n\}| \\ &\leq |\{(i_{\alpha+1}, \dots, i_{\alpha+2n+1}) \in [N]^{2n+1} : \sigma_{w+1,N}(i_{\alpha+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1}) = \sigma_{w+2,N}(i_{\alpha+2n+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1}) \\ &\quad \text{and } i_{\alpha+\nu} = i_{\alpha+2n+2-\nu} \text{ whenever } 2 \leq \nu \leq n\}| \\ &\leq N^{n-2} \cdot |\{(i_{\alpha+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1}, i_{\alpha+2n+1}) : \sigma_{w+1,N}(i_{\alpha+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1}) = \sigma_{w+2,N}(i_{\alpha+2n+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1})\}|. \end{aligned}$$

If $(\sigma_{w+1,N})_N \neq (\sigma_{w+2,N})_N$ or if $i_{\alpha+1} \neq i_{\alpha+2n+1}$, then condition (19) gives that

$$|\{(i_{\alpha+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1}, i_{\alpha+2n+1}) : \sigma_{w+1,N}(i_{\alpha+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1}) = \sigma_{w+2,N}(i_{\alpha+2n+1}, i_{\alpha+n+1})\}| = o(N^2).$$

On the other hand, according to Lemma 3.9, $B(S_{w+1} : S_{w+2}) = n$, so

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_{w+1} \cup S_{w+2})| = o(N^{n+1}) = o(N^{1+|S_{w+1} \cup S_{w+2}| - B(S_{w+1} : S_{w+2})})$$

and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = 0$ according to Corollary 3.5(ii). Therefore $(\sigma_{w+1,N})_N = (\sigma_{w+2,N})_N$ and $i_{\alpha+1} = i_{\alpha+2n+1}$, in particular S' satisfies (iii).

If $s > 2$, then Corollary 4.2 gives that $(\sigma_{w+\nu,N})_N = (\text{Id}_N)_N$, so each $S_{w+\nu}$ is a singleton, that is $S_{w+\nu} = \{t + \nu\}$ and also $\theta_{w+1} \neq \theta_{w+2} \neq \dots \neq \theta_{w+s}$.

Suppose first that $\theta_{w+1} = 1$. Then $\theta_{w+2\nu-1} = 1$ and $\theta_{w+2\nu} = *$ for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2$. From Lemma 3.6, either $p(t+1) = t+s$ or $q(t+1) = t+s$. If $q(t+1) = t+s$, then Lemma 3.6 gives that $p(t+2\nu-1) = t+2\nu$ for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2$, while $q(t+1) = a+s$ and $q(t+2\nu) = t+2\nu+1$, for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2-1$. That is $i_{t+s} = i_{t+2\nu}$ and $i_{t+1} = i_{t+2\nu+1}$ for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2$. It follows that

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_{w+1} \cup \dots \cup S_{w+s})| \leq N^2$$

and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = 0$ according to Corollary 3.5(ii). If $p(t+1) = t+s$, then the conditions $(k_{t+\nu}, l_{t+\nu}) = (k_{p(t+\nu)}, l_{q(t+\nu)})$ for $1 \leq \nu \leq s$ are equivalent to $i_{t+1} = i_{t+s+1}$ and $i_{t+2\nu} = i_{t+2\nu+1}$ for $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2-1$ so property (iii) follows.

The case $\theta_{w+1} = *$ is similar. If $p(t+1) = t+s$, then this time Lemma 3.6 gives that $q(t+2\nu-1) = a+2\nu$ for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2$, while $p(t+2\nu) = t+2\nu+1$, for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2-1$. That is $i_{t+s} = i_{t+2\nu}$ and $i_{t+1} = i_{a+2\nu+1}$ for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2$, so again $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = 0$.

If $q(t+1) = t+s$, then again Lemma 3.6 gives that $p(a+2\nu-1) = a+2\nu$ for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2$ while $q(t+2\nu) = t+2\nu+1$, for all $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2-1$. That is $i_{t+1} = i_{t+s+1}$ and $i_{t+2\nu} = i_{t+2\nu+1}$ for $1 \leq \nu \leq s/2-1$, so again (iii) follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3: We shall show that all mixed free cumulants in U_N , U_N^* , and elements of the set $\{(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}, [(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}]^* : 1 \leq l \leq M, 1 \leq k \leq P\}$ vanish as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and that, for each $k \in [P]$ and each $l \in [M]$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_2((U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}, [(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}]^*) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_2([(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}]^*, (U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}) = 1$$

and all other free cumulants of $(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}$ and $[(U_N^l)^{\tau_{k,N}}]^*$ vanish as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote $V_{kN} = [(U_N^{n_k})^{\sigma_{k,N}}]^{\theta_k}$, and, without loss of generality (via a taking adjoints and doing a circular permutation of S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r) assume that $\theta_1 = 1$, $(\sigma_{1,N})_N \neq (\text{Id}_N)_N$. It suffices then to show that

$$(20) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{1,N} \cdot V_{2,N} \cdots V_{r,N}) \\ = \sum_{t=2}^r \phi(t) \cdot \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{2,N} \cdots V_{t-1,N}) \cdot \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{t+1,N} \cdots V_{r,N}),$$

where

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } V_{t,N}^* = V_{1,N}, \text{ that is } n_t = n_1, \sigma_{t,N} = \sigma_{1,N}, \theta_t \neq \theta_1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

To proceed with the proof, note that, with the notations from 2.2, the left-hand side of equation (20) develops as follows:

$$(21) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{1,N} \cdot V_{2,N} \cdots V_{r,N}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=2}^r \sum_{\substack{p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\varepsilon(m) \\ p(1) \in S_t}} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q).$$

Let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\varepsilon(m)$ be such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) \neq 0$ and let x be given by $p(1) \in S_x$. From Lemma 4.4(i), it follows that $\theta_x = *$ and n_1 and n_x have the same value, that we shall denote by n . Moreover, Lemma 3.9 gives that, for all $\nu \in [n]$.

$$(22) \quad p(\nu) = q(\nu) = m(x) + 2 - \nu.$$

So, using that $p \vee q$ is non-crossing, as seen in Lemma 4.4(ii), we have that $S_2 \cup S_3 \cup \dots \cup S_{x-1}$ and $S_{x+1} \cup \dots \cup S_r$ are invariant under p and q , hence Lemma 4.4(iii) gives that $i_{n+1} = i_{m(x-1)+1}$ and $i_1 = i_{m(x)+1}$. Using the construction of (k_ν, l_ν) in Section 2.2, we then get

$$|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}(S_1 \cup S_x)| \leq |\{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{n+1}, i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(x)+1}) \in [N]^{2n+2} : \\ (k_{\alpha+\nu}, l_{\alpha+\nu}) = (k_{p(\alpha+\nu)}, l_{q(\alpha+\nu)}), 1 \leq \nu \leq n\}| \\ \leq |\{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{n+1}, i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(x)+1}) \in [N]^{2n+2} : \\ \sigma_{1,N}(i_1, i_{n+1}) = \sigma_{x,N}(i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x)+1}) \text{ and } i_\nu = i_{m(x)+2-\nu} \text{ whenever } 1 \leq \nu \leq n\}| \\ \leq N^{n-2} \cdot |\{(i_1, i_{n+1}, i_{m(x)+1}) : \sigma_{1,N}(i_1, i_{n+1}) = \sigma_{x,N}(i_1, i_{n+1})\}|.$$

But $B(S_1 : S_x) = n$, so, using Corollary 3.5(ii) and condition (19), we have that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = 0$ unless $(\sigma_{1,N})_N = (\sigma_{x,N})_N$. We conclude that the summands in the right-hand side of equation (21) vanish as $N \rightarrow \infty$ unless $\phi(t) = 1$, that is

$$(23) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{1,N} \cdot V_{2,N} \cdots V_{r,N}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{t=2}^r \phi(t) \cdot \left[\sum_{\substack{p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2^\varepsilon(m) \\ p(1) \in S_t}} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) \right].$$

Moreover, let us define $\varepsilon' : [m(x-1) - m(1)] \rightarrow \{1, *\}$ and $\varepsilon'' : [m - m(x+1)] \rightarrow \{1, *\}$ given by $\varepsilon'(\nu) = \varepsilon(\nu + m(1))$ and $\varepsilon''(\nu) = \varepsilon(m(x+1) + \nu)$. For $p_1 \in P_2^{\varepsilon'}(m(x-1) - m(1))$ and $p_2 \in P_2^{\varepsilon''}(m - m(x))$ we define $p_1 \diamond p_2 \in P_2^\varepsilon(m)$ given by

$$p_1 \diamond p_2(\nu) = \begin{cases} m(x) + 2 - \nu & \text{if } \nu \in S_1 \cup S_x \\ m(1) + p_1(\nu) & \text{if } \nu \in S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{x-1} \\ m(x) + p_2(\nu) & \text{if } \nu \in S_{x+1} \cup \dots \cup S_r. \end{cases}$$

As seen above, if $p(1) \in S_x$ then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = 0$ unless $p = p_1 \diamond p_2$ and $q = q_1 \diamond q_2$ for some $p_1, q_1 \in P_2^{\varepsilon'}(m(x-1) - m(1))$ and $p_2, q_2 \in P_2^{\varepsilon''}(m - m(x))$. Therefore

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{1,N} \cdot V_{2,N} \cdots V_{r,N}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x=2}^r \phi(x) \cdot \left[\sum_{\substack{p_1, q_1 \in P_2^{\varepsilon'}(m(x-1) - m(1)) \\ p_2, q_2 \in P_2^{\varepsilon''}(m - m(x))}} \mathcal{E}_N(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2) \right].$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{2,N} \cdots V_{x-1,N}) &= \sum_{p_1, q_1 \in P_2^{\varepsilon'}(m(x-1) - m(1))} \mathcal{E}_N(p_1, q_1) \\ \mathbb{E} \circ \text{tr} (V_{x+1,N} \cdots V_{r,N}) &= \sum_{p_2, q_2 \in P_2^{\varepsilon''}(m - m(x))} \mathcal{E}_N(p_2, q_2), \end{aligned}$$

so it suffices to show that

$$(24) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [\mathcal{E}_N(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2) - \mathcal{E}_N(p_1, q_1) \cdot \mathcal{E}_N(p_2, q_2)] = 0,$$

with the convention that $\mathcal{E}(p_1, q_1) = 1$ if $[m(x-1)] \setminus [m(1)] = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{E}(p_2, q_2) = 1$ if $[m] \setminus [m(x)] = \emptyset$.

To prove (24), we shall use Lemma 4.4(iv) the multiplicative property of the leading term of the Wiegarten function, as mentioned in Preliminaries.

First, note that the restriction of $(p_1 \diamond p_2) \vee (q_1 \diamond q_2)$ to $S_1 \cup S_x$ consists on n blocks, each with 2 elements, therefore we have that

$$|(p_1 \diamond p_2) \vee (q_1 \diamond q_2)| = |p_1 \vee q_1| + |p_2 \vee q_2| + n$$

and equation (3) from Section 2.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Wg}_N(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2) &= \text{Wg}_N(p_1, q_1) \cdot \text{Wg}_N(p_2, q_2) \cdot N^{-n} + O(N^{-m+|(p_1 \diamond p_2) \vee (q_1 \diamond q_2)|-2}). \end{aligned}$$

with $\text{Wg}_N(p_1, q_1) \cdot \text{Wg}_N(p_2, q_2) \cdot N^{-n} = O(N^{-m+|(p_1 \diamond p_2) \vee (q_1 \diamond q_2)|})$.

But $\mathcal{E}_N(p, q) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Wg}_N(p, q) \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}| = O(N^0)$, therefore to prove (24) it suffices to show that

$$(25) \quad |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2)}| = N^{n-1} \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1, q_1)}| \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p_2, q_2)}|.$$

Remember that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2)} &= \{(i_1, \dots, i_m) : (k_\nu, l_\nu) = (k_{p_1 \diamond p_2(\nu)}, l_{q_1 \diamond q_2(\nu)}) \text{ for all } \nu \in [m]\} \\ &= \{(i_1, \dots, i_m) : (k_\nu, l_\nu) = \begin{cases} (k_{m+2-\nu}, l_{m+2-\nu}) & \text{if } \nu \in S_1 \cup S_x \\ (k_{p_1(\nu)}, l_{q_1(\nu)}) & \text{if } \nu \in [m(x-1)] \setminus [m(1)] \\ (k_{p_2(\nu)}, l_{q_2(\nu)}) & \text{if } \nu \in [m] \setminus [m(x)] \end{cases} \}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\nu \in S_1 \cup S_x$, the conditions $(k_\nu, l_\nu) = (k_{m+2-\nu}, l_{m+2-\nu})$ are equivalent to $i_\nu = i_{m(x)+2-\nu}$ for $2 \leq \nu \leq m(1)$ and $\sigma_{1,N}(i_1, i_{m(1)+1}) = \sigma_{x,N}(i_{m(x)+1}, i_{m(x-1)+1})$, but, as shown above, $\sigma_{1,N} = \sigma_{x,N}$, so $i_\nu = i_{m(x)+2-\nu}$ for all $\nu \in [m(1) + 1]$.

On the other hand, the definition of $\mathcal{A}_N^{(p,q)}$ gives that the conditions

$$\begin{cases} (k_\nu, l_\nu) = (k_{p_1(\nu)}, l_{q_1(\nu)}) & \text{for all } \nu \in [m(x-1)] \setminus [m(1)] \\ i_{m(x-1)+1} = i_{m(x)+1} \end{cases}$$

are equivalent to $(i_{m(x-1)+1}, i_{m(x-1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(x)}) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1, q_1)}$. Similarly, the conditions

$$\begin{cases} (k_\nu, l_\nu) = (k_{p_2(\nu)}, l_{q_2(\nu)}) & \text{for all } \nu \in [m] \setminus [m(x)] \\ i_{m(x)+1} = i_1 \end{cases}$$

are equivalent to $(i_{m(x)+1}, i_{m(x)+2}, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p_2, q_2)}$.

Therefore $(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2)}$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $(i_{m(1)+1}, i_{m(1)+2}, \dots, i_{m(x-1)}) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1, q_1)}$
- $(i_{m(x)+1}, i_{m(x)+2}, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{A}_N^{(p_2, q_2)}$
- $i_1 = i_{m(x)+1}$ and $i_{m(x-1)+1} = i_{m(1)+1}$
- $i_\nu = i_{m+2-\nu}$ whenever $2 \leq \nu \leq m(1) = n$.

It follows that $|\mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1 \diamond p_2, q_1 \diamond q_2)}| = |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p_1, q_1)}| \cdot |\mathcal{A}_N^{(p_2, q_2)}| \cdot N^{n-1}$, which is (25). \square

5. PARTICULAR CASES

We will apply the results from Section 4 to some particular classes of entry permutations. In particular, it will be shown that the original question from [14] has an affirmative answer.

5.1. Partial transposes. The (b, d) -partial transpose is an entry permutation of matrices of size $bd \times bd$ defined as follows. Define first the bijection $\varphi_{b,d} : [b \cdot d]^2 \rightarrow ([b] \times [d])^2$ given by $\varphi_{b,d}(i, j) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2)$ whenever

$$(i, j) = ((\alpha_1 - 1)d + \beta_1, (\alpha_2 - 1)d + \beta_2).$$

Then define $\rho : ([b] \times [d])^2 \rightarrow ([b] \times [d])^2$ by

$$\rho(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) = (\alpha_1, \beta_2, \alpha_2, \beta_1).$$

The (b, d) -partial transpose is the permutation

$$\Gamma_{b,d} = \varphi_{b,d}^{-1} \circ \rho \circ \varphi_{b,d}.$$

A more intuitive description of the partial transpose is given by seeing each $bd \times bd$ square matrix as a $b \times b$ matrix whose entries are $d \times d$ block matrices. Its (b, d) -partial transpose is obtained by taking the matrix transpose of each of the b^2 blocks, but keeping the position of the blocks.

We shall consider first one sequence of partial transposes. So let us suppose that $(b_N)_N$ and $(d_N)_N$ are two increasing sequences of positive integers such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} b_N \cdot d_N = \infty$. For fixed $i = (\alpha_1 - 1)d + \beta_1$ and $i = (\alpha_2 - 1)d + \beta_2$, we have that

$$\sum_{\alpha=1,2} |\{\nu \in [N] : i \in \{\pi_\alpha \circ \Gamma_{b,d}(\nu, j), \pi_\alpha \circ \Gamma_{b,d}(j, \nu)\}\}| = 2(\delta_{\alpha_1}^{\alpha_2} \cdot d + \delta_{\beta_1}^{\beta_2} \cdot b)$$

so the sequence $(\Gamma_{b_N, d_N})_N$ satisfies condition (16) if and only if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} b_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_N = \infty$. Moreover, the last relation also implies that the sequences $(\text{Id}_N)_N$ and $(\Gamma_{b_N, d_N})_N$ satisfy relation (19), since

$$|\{(i_1, i_2, i_3) : \Gamma_{b,d}(i_1, i_2) \in \{(i_1, i_3), (i_3, i_2)\}\}| = bd^2 + b^2d.$$

Therefore, Theorem 4.3 implies the following.

Corollary 5.1. *If $(b_N)_N$ and $(d_N)_N$ are two increasing sequences of positive integers such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} b_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_N = \infty$, then, for any positive integer P , the family $U_{b_N d_N}^{\Gamma_{b_N, d_N}}$, $(U_{b_N d_N}^2)^{\Gamma_{b_N, d_N}}, \dots, (U_{b_N d_N}^P)^{\Gamma_{b_N, d_N}}$ is asymptotically free circular and free from $U_{b_N d_N}$.*

For the case of several different sequences of partial transposes, [17] gives a rather simple way to check condition (19). More precisely, part of Theorem 3.2 from [17] states the following property:

If $b \cdot d = b' \cdot d'$, then the relation $\Gamma_{b,d}(i, j) \in \{\Gamma_{b',d'}(i, k), \Gamma_{b',d'}(k, j)\}$ is equivalent to $\Gamma_{b,d}(i, j) = \Gamma_{b',d'}(i, j)$.

Furthermore, Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.8 from [17] give a more practical manner to check condition (19), stated below.

Let $(b_N)_N, (d_N)_N, (b'_N)_N, (d'_N)_N$ be increasing sequences of positive integers such that $b_N \cdot d_N = b'_N \cdot d'_N$ for each N . The following relations are then equivalent:

- (c.1) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} |\{(i, j) \in [b_N \cdot d_N]^2 : \Gamma_{b_N, d_N}(i, j) = \Gamma_{b'_N, d'_N}(i, j)\}| = 0$
- (c.2) *If $Q_N = \min\{d_N, d'_N\} \cdot L_N$ is the least common multiple of the positive integers d_N and d'_N , then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} L_N = \infty$.*

(For example, each two of the following sequences satisfy condition (19): $(\Gamma_{N, N^{p-1}})_N, (\Gamma_{N^2, N^{p-2}})_N, \dots, (\Gamma_{N^{p-1}, N})_N$.)

Henceforth, Theorem 4.3 gives the following corollary, which extends the results from [?]:

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ there exist two increasing and unbounded sequences of positive integers $(b_{i,N})_N$ and $(d_{i,N})_N$ such that:*

- (i) $b_{k,N} \cdot d_{k,N} = b_{l,N} \cdot d_{l,N}$ for each $k, l \in [n]$ and each N
- (ii) if $k \neq l$, then the sequences $(b_{k,N})_N$, $(d_{k,N})_N$, and $(b_{l,N})_N$, $(d_{l,N})_N$ satisfy condition (c.2) from above.

Then the family $\{(U_{b_{i,N} \cdot d_{i,N}}^k)^{\Gamma_{b_{i,N}, d_{i,N}}} : i \in [n], k \in [P]\}$ is asymptotically free circular and free from $(U_{b_{i,N} \cdot d_{i,N}})_N$.

5.2. Mixing map. With the notations from Subsection 5.1, the “mixing map” from [?] is defined as the permutation $\mu_N : [N^2] \times [N^2] \rightarrow [N^2] \times [N^2]$ given by

$$\mu_N = \varphi_{N,N}^{-1} \circ \psi_N \circ \varphi_{N,N}$$

where $\varphi_{N,N} : [N^2]^2 \rightarrow [N]^4$ is given by $\varphi_{N,N}(i, j) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2)$ whenever

$$(i, j) = ((\alpha_1 - 1)N + \beta_1, (\alpha_2 - 1)N + \beta_2),$$

and $\psi_N : [N]^4 \rightarrow [N]^4$ is given by $\psi_N(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2)$.

Fix $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in [N]$. For $a = (\alpha_1 - 1)N + \beta_1$ and $b = (\alpha_2 - 1)N + \beta_2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\{\nu \in [N^2] : a \in \{\pi_k \circ \nu_N(\nu, b), \pi_k \circ \nu_N(b, \nu) : k = 1, 2\}\}| &= N(\delta_{\alpha_2}^{\beta_2} + \delta_{\alpha_2}^{\alpha_1} + \delta_{\beta_2}^{\beta_1} + \delta_{\beta_2}^{\alpha_1}) \\ &\leq 4N = o(N^2), \end{aligned}$$

so μ_N satisfies condition (16).

Also, the pair of sequences $(\mu_N)_N$ and $(\text{Id}_{N^2})_N$ satisfy condition (19), because

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \in [N^2]^3 : \mu_N(i_1, i_2) \in \{(i_1, i_3), (i_3, i_2)\}\}| \\ &= |\{(\alpha_k, \beta_k)_{1 \leq k \leq 3} \in [N]^6 : (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2) \in \{(\alpha_1, \beta_3, \alpha_3, \beta_1), (\alpha_3, \beta_2, \alpha_2, \beta_3)\}\}| \\ &= O(N^3) = o((N^2)^2). \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth Theorem 4.3 gives the following result.

Corollary 5.3. *For any positive integer P , the family $\{(U_{N^2}^k)^{\mu_N} : 1 \leq k \leq P\}$ is asymptotically free circular and free from $(U_{N^2})_N$.*

Remark 5.4. Suppose that $(b_N)_N, (d_N)_N$ are two increasing, unbounded sequences of positive integers such that $b_N \cdot d_N = N^2$ for each N . Then the family $\{\{(U_{N^2}^k)^{\mu_N}, \{(U_{N^2}^k)^{\Gamma_{b_N, d_N}} : 1 \leq k \leq P\}\}$ is asymptotically free circular and free from $(U_{N^2})_N$.

Indeed, from the arguments above it suffices to show that the pair of sequences $(\mu_N)_N$ and $(\Gamma_{b_N, d_N})_N$ satisfies condition (19).

For $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in [N^2]$ and let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in [N]$, $a_1, a_3 \in [b_N]$, and $b_1, b_2 \in [d_N]$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} i_1 &= (\alpha_1 - 1)N + \beta_1 = (A_1 - 1)d_N + B_1 \\ i_2 &= (\alpha_2 - 1)N + \beta_2 \\ i_3 &= (A_3 - 1)d_N + B_3. \end{aligned}$$

The equality $\mu_N(i_1, i_2) = \Gamma_{b_N, d_N}(i_1, i_3)$ is then equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}(\alpha_1 - 1)N + \alpha_2 &= (A_1 - 1)d_N + B_3 \\ (\beta_1 - 1)N + \beta_2 &= (A_3 - 1)d_N + B_1\end{aligned}$$

so, for A_3 to be integer, we need $\beta_2 \equiv B_1 - (\beta_1 - 1)N \pmod{d_N}$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}& \left| \{ (i_1, i_2, i_3) \in [N^2]^3 : \mu_N(i_1, i_2) = \Gamma_{b_N, d_N}(i_1, i_3) \} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \{ (i_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2) \in [N^2] \times [N]^2 : \beta_2 \equiv B_1 - (\beta_1 - 1)N \pmod{d_N} \} \right| \\ & \leq N^3 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{N}{d_N}\right) = o(N^4).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\left| \{ (i_1, i_2, i_3) \in [N^2]^3 : \mu_N(i_1, i_2) = \Gamma_{b_N, d_N}(i_3, i_2) \} \right| = o(N^4)$, so the conclusion follows.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Adamczak, D. Chafaï, and P. Wolff. Circular law for random matrices with exchangeable entries. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 48(3):454–479, 2016.
- [2] O. Arizmendi, I. Nechita, and C. Vargas, On the asymptotic distribution of block-modified random matrices, *J. Math. Phys.* 57 (2016), no. 1, 015216, 25 pp.
- [3] B. Au, Semicircular families of general covariance from Wigner matrices with permuted entries, arXiv:2106.10611
- [4] G. Aubrun, Partial Transposition Of Random States And Non-Centered Semicircular Distributions, *Random Matrix Theory and Applications*, **1** (2012), no. 2, 1250001, 29 pp.
- [5] G. Aubrun, S. Szarek, E. Werner, Hastings’s additivity counterexample via Dvoretzky’s theorem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 305(1), 85–97 (2011).
- [6] T. Banica and I. Nechita, Asymptotic eigenvalue distributions of block-transposed Wishart matrices, *J. Theor. Probab.* February 2012, 1–15 (2012).
- [7] T. Banica and I. Nechita, *Asymptotic eigenvalue distributions of block-transposed Wishart matrices*, *J. Theor. Probab.* February 2012, 1–15 (2012)
- [8] B. Collins, I. Nechita, *Random matrix techniques in quantum information theory*, *J. of Math. Phys.* 57(1), 015215 (2016)
- [9] B. Collins, Moments and cumulants of polynomial random variables on unitary groups, the Itzykson-Zuber integral, and free probability. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (17):953–982, 2003.
- [10] B. Collins, P. Śniady Integration with respect to the Haar measure on unitary, orthogonal and symplectic group. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 264(3):773–795, 2006.
- [11] A. Edelman, Y. Wang, Random Matrix Theory and Its Innovative Applications, Fields Institute Communications: *Advances in Applied Mathematics, Modeling, and Computational Science* (2013): 91–116.
- [12] M. Fukuda and P. Śniady, Partial Transpose Of Random Quantum States: Exact Formulas And Meanders, *J. Math. Phys.* 54 (2013), no. 4, 042202, 23 pp.
- [13] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Separability of mixed states: Necessary and sufficient conditions, *Phys. Lett. A* 223(1–2), 1–8 (1996).
- [14] A. Mandarino, T. Linowski, K. Życzowski, *Bipartite unitary gates and billiard dynamics in the Weyl chamber*, *Phys. Rev. A* 98, 012335 (2018), arXiv:1710.10983 [quant-ph]
- [15] J. A. Mingo, M. Popa, Freeness and the transposes of unitarily invariant random matrices, *J. of Funct. Anal.* 271(4), 2014, 883–921.

- [16] J. A. Mingo, M. Popa, Freeness and the partial transpose of Wishart random matrices, *Canad. J. Math.*, 71 (2019), 659–681.
- [17] J. A. Mingo, M. Popa, *Freeness and the partial transpose of Wishart random matrices. Part II*, preprint, arXiv:2005.04348
- [18] J. A. Mingo, M. Popa, K. Szpojankowski, Asymptotic *-distributions of permuted Haar unitary random matrices, arXiv:2006.05408.
- [19] J. A. Mingo, M. Popa, K. Szpojankowski, On the partial transpose of a Haar Unitary matrix, arXiv:2105.04076
- [20] J. A. Mingo, R. Speicher, *Free Probability and Random Matrices*. Fields Institute Monographs, Vol. 35, Springer, New York, 2017.
- [21] A. Nica, R. Speicher, *Lectures on the Combinatorics of Free Probability*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 335, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [22] M. Popa, *Asymptotic free independence and entry permutations for Gaussian random matrices*, arXiv:1812.01692v2.
- [23] M. Popa, Zh. Hao, *A Combinatorial Result on Asymptotic Independence Relations for Random Matrices with Non-Commutative Entries*, J. Operator Theory 80 (2018), no. 1, 47–76
- [24] M. Popa, Zh. Hao, *An asymptotic property of large matrices with identically distributed Boolean independent entries*, Infin. Dimens. Anal., Quantum Probab. Relat. Top., Vol. 22, No. 04, 1950024 (2019)

(M. Popa) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO, ONE UTSA CIRCLE SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78249, USA,
AND “SIMON STOILOW” INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY, P.O. Box 1-764,
014700 BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

Email address: mihai.popa@utsa.edu