

# NON-UNIVERSAL MODERATE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR THE NODAL LENGTH OF ARITHMETIC RANDOM WAVES

Claudio Macci<sup>1</sup>, Maurizia Rossi<sup>2</sup>, Anna Vidotto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”*

<sup>2</sup>*Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università di Milano-Bicocca*

<sup>3</sup>*Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II*

## Abstract

Inspired by the recent work [MRT21], we prove a non-universal non-central Moderate Deviation principle for the nodal length of arithmetic random waves (Gaussian Laplace eigenfunctions on the standard flat torus) both on the whole manifold and on shrinking toral domains. Second order fluctuations for the latter were established in [MPRW16] and [BMW20] respectively, by means of chaotic expansions, number theoretical estimates and full correlation phenomena. Our proof is simple and relies on the interplay between the long memory behavior of arithmetic random waves and the chaotic expansion of the nodal length, as well as on well-known techniques in Large Deviation theory (the contraction principle and the concept of exponential equivalence).

KEYWORDS AND PHRASES: Arithmetic Random Waves; Nodal length; Moderate Deviation Principle; Wiener chaos.

AMS CLASSIFICATION: 60G60; 60F10; 58J50.

## 1 Introduction and main results

In this Section we introduce our random model and recall some basic notions in Large Deviation theory, eventually describing our main results.

*Some conventions.* Given two sequences of positive numbers  $\{a_n\}_n$  and  $\{b_n\}_n$ , we write  $a_n \vee b_n$  to indicate the maximum between  $a_n$  and  $b_n$ ,  $a_n = o(b_n)$  if  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $a_n = O(b_n)$  or equivalently  $a_n \ll b_n$  if  $a_n/b_n$  is asymptotically bounded and  $a_n \sim b_n$  if  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Moreover, for random variables  $\{X_n\}_n$ ,  $X$  and  $Y$  we write  $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$  if  $X$  and  $Y$  share the same law, and finally  $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$  if the sequence  $X_n$  converges to  $X$  in distribution.

### 1.1 Arithmetic random waves

Let  $\mathbb{T}^2 := \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$  be the standard two-dimensional flat torus and  $\Delta$  the Laplacian on  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . The eigenvalues  $E \in \mathbb{R}$  of the Helmholtz equation

$$\Delta f + E f = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

are all numbers of the form  $E_n = 4\pi^2 n$  with  $n \in S$ , where

$$S = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \text{ for some } \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

In order to describe Laplace eigenspaces, for  $n \in S$  we denote by  $\Lambda_n$  the set of frequencies

$$\Lambda_n := \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 = n\}$$

whose cardinality  $\mathcal{N}_n := |\Lambda_n|$  equals the number of ways to express  $n$  as a sum of two square integers. For  $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ , we denote by

$$e_\lambda(x) := \exp(2\pi i \langle \lambda, x \rangle), \quad x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{T}^2,$$

the complex exponential associated to the frequency  $\lambda$ . The family  $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n}$  is an  $L^2$ -orthonormal basis of the eigenspace of  $-\Delta$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $E_n$ . In particular, its dimension is  $\mathcal{N}_n = |\Lambda_n|$ . The number  $\mathcal{N}_n$  grows [Lan08] *on average* as  $\sqrt{\log n}$ , but could be as small as 8 for prime numbers  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , or as large as a power of  $\log n$ .

**Definition 1.1.** For  $n \in S$ , the  $n$ -th arithmetic random wave is the random field

$$T_n(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} a_\lambda e_\lambda(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^2, \quad (1.2)$$

where the coefficients  $a_\lambda$  are standard complex-Gaussian random variables<sup>1</sup> verifying the following properties:  $a_\lambda$  is stochastically independent of  $a_\gamma$  whenever  $\gamma \notin \{\lambda, -\lambda\}$ , and  $a_{-\lambda} = \overline{a_\lambda}$  (ensuring that  $T_n$  is real-valued).

Let us define, for  $n \in S$  such that  $\sqrt{n}$  is not an integer,

$$\Lambda_n^+ := \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda_n : \lambda_2 > 0\}, \quad (1.3)$$

otherwise  $\Lambda_n^+ := \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda_n : \lambda_2 > 0\} \cup \{(\sqrt{n}, 0)\}$ . We assume that  $\{a_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+, n \in S}$  is a family of independent random variables, in particular  $\{T_n\}_{n \in S}$  is a family of independent random fields. From (1.2),  $T_n$  is stationary, centered Gaussian with covariance function  $r_n : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow [-1, 1]$

$$\mathbb{E}[T_n(x)T_n(y)] = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} e_\lambda(x-y) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \cos(2\pi \langle x-y, \lambda \rangle) =: r_n(x-y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{T}^2.$$

Note that  $r_n(0) = 1$ , i.e.  $T_n$  has unit variance.

## 1.2 Nodal length: prior work

For  $n \in S$ , the nodal set  $T_n^{-1}\{0\} := \{x \in \mathbb{T}^2 : T_n(x) = 0\}$  is a.s. a smooth curve on the torus, we are interested in the *nodal length* of the random eigenfunctions, i.e. the collection  $\{\mathcal{L}_n\}_{n \in S}$  of all random variables of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_n := \text{length}(T_n^{-1}\{0\}). \quad (1.4)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>From now on, we assume that every random object considered in this paper is defined on a common complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , with  $\mathbb{E}$  denoting mathematical expectation with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ .

### 1.2.1 Mean and variance

The authors of [RW08] computed the expected value of  $\mathcal{L}_n$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_n] = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{E_n}, \quad (1.5)$$

which is well reflecting Yau's conjecture [Yau82]. A bound for the variance of  $\mathcal{L}_n$  was obtained in [RW08], but the challenging task of attaining an exact asymptotic behaviour for  $\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n)$  was completely settled in [KKW13] as follows. Let  $\mathcal{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be the unit circle and set, for  $n \in S$ ,  $\mu_n$  to be the probability measure on  $\mathcal{S}^1$  defined as

$$\mu_n := \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \delta_{\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}}.$$

Thanks to [EH99], we know that there exists a density-1 subsequence  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  such that

$$\mu_{n_j} \Rightarrow \frac{d\phi}{2\pi}, \quad (1.6)$$

namely  $\mu_{n_j}$  converges to the uniform measure on the unit circle (where  $\Rightarrow$  denotes weak-\* convergence of probability measures, and  $d\phi$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathcal{S}^1$ ). Nevertheless, the sequence  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in S}$  has an infinity of other weak-\* adherent points, see [Cil93, KKW13], which are the so-called *attainable measures*, see [KW17, Sar18].

Finally, we can state the main result of [KKW13], which is the following: as  $\mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n) = c_n \frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^2} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n^{1/2}}\right) \right), \quad c_n = c(\mu_n) := \frac{1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2}{512}, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\widehat{\mu}(k) = \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} z^{-k} d\mu(z)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , represent the Fourier coefficients of a measure  $\mu$  on the unit circle. Moreover, from (1.7) it is clear that, in order for  $\mathcal{L}_n$  to exhibit an asymptotic law one has to consider a subsequence  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  such that the limit  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)|$  exists. Indeed, if  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  is a subsequence such that  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\mu_{n_j} \Rightarrow \mu$  for some probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}^1$ , then

$$\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_{n_j}) \sim c(\mu) \frac{E_{n_j}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}^2}, \quad c(\mu) := \frac{1 + \widehat{\mu}(4)^2}{512}. \quad (1.8)$$

Thanks to [KKW13, KW17], we know that for every  $\eta \in [-1, 1]$  there exists a subsequence  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  such that, as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4) \rightarrow \eta.$$

As a consequence, the possible values of the ‘‘asymptotic’’ constant  $c(\mu)$  cover the whole interval  $[\frac{1}{512}, \frac{1}{256}]$ . In particular, for the full density subsequence  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  such that the lattice points in  $\Lambda_{n_j}$  are asymptotically equidistributed (1.6),  $\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4) \rightarrow 0$ . On the other hand, the work by [Cil93] has shown that there are *thin*<sup>2</sup> sequences  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$ , with  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow \infty$ , such that  $\mu_{n_j}$  converges weakly to an atomic probability measure supported at the four symmetric points  $\pm 1, \pm i$ ; hence,  $\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)^2 \rightarrow 1$  and  $c_{n_j} \rightarrow 1/256$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>We say that a subsequence  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  is *thin* if it has density equal to zero.

### 1.2.2 Asymptotic distribution

From now on, for a (non-zero) finite variance random variable  $X$ , we set  $\tilde{X}$  to be its normalized version, that is

$$\tilde{X} := \frac{X - \mathbb{E}[X]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}}.$$

Fix  $\eta \in [-1, 1]$  and let  $\mathcal{M}_\eta$  be the random variable

$$\mathcal{M}_\eta := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1+\eta^2}}(2 - (1+\eta)X_1^2 - (1-\eta)X_2^2), \quad (1.9)$$

where  $X_1, X_2$  are independent standard Gaussians. Note that

$$\mathcal{M}_\eta \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{M}_{-\eta},$$

moreover  $\mathcal{M}_\eta$  is not Gaussian, indeed its support is  $(-\infty, 1/\sqrt{1+\eta^2}]$ . Except for  $\eta_2 = -\eta_1$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{\eta_1}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\eta_2}$  have different laws.

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 1.1, [MPRW16]). *Let  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  be a subsequence of  $S$  satisfying  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow \infty$ , such that the sequence  $\{|\hat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)|\}_j$  converges, that is:*

$$|\hat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)| \rightarrow \eta, \quad (1.10)$$

for some  $\eta \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{M}_\eta, \quad (1.11)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_\eta$  is defined as in (1.9).

In [PR18] a quantitative version of Theorem 1.2 has been proved. Let us recall the definition of 1-Wasserstein distance (see e.g. [NP12, §C] and the references therein): given two random variables  $X, Y$  whose laws are  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$ , respectively, the Wasserstein distance between  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$ , written  $d_W(X, Y)$ , is defined as

$$d_W(X, Y) := \inf_{(A, B)} \mathbb{E}[|A - B|],$$

where the infimum runs over all pairs of random variables  $(A, B)$  with marginal laws  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$ , respectively. We will mainly use the dual representation

$$d_W(X, Y) = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1} |\mathbb{E}[h(X) - h(Y)]|, \quad (1.12)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_1$  denotes the class of Lipschitz functions  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  whose Lipschitz constant is less or equal than 1. Relation (1.12) implies in particular that, if  $d_W(X_n, X) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$  (the converse implication is false in general).

**Theorem 1.3** (Theorem 2, [PR18]). *Let  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  be a subsequence of  $S$  satisfying  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow \infty$ , such that the sequence  $\{|\hat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)|\}_j$  converges, that is:*

$$|\hat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)| \rightarrow \eta,$$

for some  $\eta \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$d_W(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j}, \mathcal{M}_\eta) \ll \mathcal{N}_{n_j}^{-1/4} \vee ||\hat{\mu}_{n_j}(4) - \eta|^{1/2}. \quad (1.13)$$

### 1.2.3 Shrinking domains

For  $0 < s < 1/2$ , we set

$$\mathcal{L}_{n;s} := \text{length} (T_n^{-1}\{0\} \cap B(s))$$

to be the nodal length of  $T_n$  restricted to a radius- $s$  ball  $B(s)$ , where by the stationarity of  $T_n$  we may assume that  $B(s)$  is centered. Kac-Rice formula (see e.g. [AT07, Chapter 11]) immediately gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{n;s}] = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(\pi s^2) \cdot \sqrt{E_n}.$$

One of the main results of [BMW20] is that the variance of the nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_{n;s}$  of  $T_n$  restricted to balls that are shrinking slightly above the so-called Planck scale has a similar form to (1.7), and in particular one has the precise identity [BMW20, (3.36)]

$$\text{Cov}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}, \mathcal{L}_n) = (\pi s^2) \cdot \text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n).$$

In what follows we keep the notation of [BMW20] to avoid confusion.

**Theorem 1.4** (Theorem 1.1, [BMW20]). *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a density-1 sequence of numbers*

$$S' = S'(\varepsilon) \subseteq S$$

so that the following hold.

1. *Along  $n \in S'$  we have  $\mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow \infty$ , and the set of accumulation points of  $\{\widehat{\mu}_n(4)\}_{n \in S'}$  contains the interval  $[0, 1]$ .*
2. *For  $n \in S'$ , uniformly for all  $s > n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$  we have*

$$\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}) = c_n \cdot (\pi s^2)^2 \cdot \frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^2} \left( 1 + O_\varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n^{1/2}} \right) \right), \quad (1.14)$$

where  $c_n$  is defined as in (1.7), and the constant involved in the ‘ $O$ ’-notation depends on  $\varepsilon$  only.

3. *For random variables  $X, Y$  we denote as usual their correlation*

$$\text{Corr}(X, Y) := \frac{\text{Cov}(X, Y)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X)} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Var}(Y)}}.$$

Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have that

$$\sup_{s > n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}} |\text{Corr}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}, \mathcal{L}_n) - 1| \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.15)$$

*i.e. the nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_{n;s}$  of  $T_n$  restricted to a small ball is asymptotically fully correlated with the total nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_n$  of  $T_n$ , uniformly for all  $s > n^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$ .*

Under the same assumptions as Theorem 1.4, in view of (1.15),  $\mathcal{L}_{n;s}$  obeys the same limiting law (1.11) as the total nodal length. The aim of this paper is to refine the result of Theorem 1.2 and the consequences of Theorem 1.4 by means of Large Deviation theory.

### 1.3 Large Deviation Principles

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a complete probability space, and  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  a sequence of random variables taking values in some topological space  $\mathcal{X}$ . For our purpose we can restrict ourselves to the case where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a metric space; we denote by  $d$  its metric and by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  its Borel  $\sigma$ -field.

**Definition 1.5.** *We say that  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies the Large Deviation Principle (LDP) with speed  $0 \leq s_n \nearrow +\infty$  and good rate function  $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  if the level sets  $\{x : \mathcal{I}(x) \leq \alpha\}, \alpha \geq 0$  are compact and for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$  we have*

$$-\inf_{x \in \mathring{B}} \mathcal{I}(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{s_n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \in B) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{s_n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_n \in B) \leq -\inf_{x \in \bar{B}} \mathcal{I}(x),$$

where  $\mathring{B}$  (resp.  $\bar{B}$ ) denotes the interior (resp. the closure) of  $B$ .

**Remark 1.6.** In this paper, and in several common cases in the literature, there exists  $x_0$  such that  $\mathcal{I}(x) = 0$  if and only if  $x = x_0$ . As a consequence, if  $X_n$  satisfies the LDP in Definition 1.5, then it converges to  $x_0$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , at least in probability. Roughly speaking, one can also say that for every Borel set  $B$  such that  $x_0 \notin \bar{B}$ , the quantity  $\mathbb{P}(X_n \in B)$  decays as  $e^{-s_n \mathcal{I}(B)}$ , where  $\mathcal{I}(B) := \inf \{\mathcal{I}(x) : x \in B\} > 0$ . Thus, in some sense, the larger is the rate function  $\mathcal{I}$  locally around  $x_0$ , the faster is the convergence to  $x_0$ .

Let us state the so-called Contraction Principle [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.1].

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}))$  be a metric space with its Borel  $\sigma$ -field, and  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  a continuous function. If  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies a LDP with (good) rate function  $\mathcal{I}$ , then  $\{Y_n := f(X_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies a LDP with (good) rate function  $\mathcal{I}_f : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  defined as*

$$\mathcal{I}_f(y) := \inf_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} \mathcal{I}(x).$$

Theorem 1.7 ensures that the LDP is preserved under continuous transformations. In order to extend the Contraction Principle beyond the continuous case, it is beneficial to recall the notion of exponential equivalence [DZ98, Definition 4.2.10].

**Definition 1.8.** *Let  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be two sequences of random variables taking values in  $\mathcal{X}$ . We say that they are exponentially equivalent at speed  $0 \leq s_n \nearrow +\infty$  if, for every  $\delta > 0$ , the set  $\Gamma_\delta := \{d(X_n, Y_n) > \delta\} \subseteq \Omega$  is measurable and*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{s_n} \log \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_\delta) = -\infty. \tag{1.16}$$

The following theorem states that, from the point of view of Large Deviations, sequences of random variables that are exponentially equivalent are identical, see also [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.13].

**Theorem 1.9.** *Assume that  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies the LDP with speed  $s_n$  and good rate function  $\mathcal{I}$ . Then, if  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are exponentially equivalent at speed  $s_n$ , the same LDP holds for  $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .*

A Moderate Deviation Principle (MDP) is a class of LDPs that allows to fill the gap between the following asymptotic regimes:

- a convergence to a constant, which is governed by a suitable LDP;

- a weak convergence to a centered Normal distribution.

In the recent literature it is also possible to find examples of *non-central* MDPs, i.e. cases where a convergence in law towards a non-Gaussian law holds; see e.g. [GM21] and the references cited therein.

Typically a MDP is class of LDPs concerning families of random variables which depend on the choice of certain scalings satisfying some suitable conditions, and these LDPs are governed by the same rate function. As a prototype example we can consider the empirical means of i.i.d. random variables, see e.g. [DZ98, Theorem 3.7.1], where the asymptotic regimes cited above concern the Law of Large Numbers (LLN) and the Central Limit Theorem (CLT); in particular a LDP related to the LLN is provided by the well-known Cramér Theorem [DZ98, Theorem 2.2.3].

Actually we cannot say that the MDP in this paper, see Theorems 1.10 and 1.11, (as well as the MDP in [MRT21]) allows to fill the gap between two asymptotic regimes as we said above because we do not have, for the moment, a LDP for the convergence to a constant<sup>3</sup>. However, if it is possible to fill that gap, we would have a *non-central* MDP where the weak convergence is towards the distribution of the random variable  $\mathcal{M}_\eta$  defined in (1.9). Since the limiting distribution of the nodal length is not universal, in particular it depends on the subsequence of energy levels, accordingly we say that our MDP is also *non-universal*.

## 1.4 Statement of the main results

In this Section we finally state our main results, which are non-universal non-central MDPs (see Section 1.3) refining Theorem 1.2 and the consequences of Theorem 1.4, specifically a class of LDPs for the nodal length of Arithmetic Random Waves for certain scalings  $\{\alpha_{n_j}\}_j$  ( $\{n_j\}_j \subset S$ ) that grow to infinity slowly as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  (see condition (1.17)), with speed  $\alpha_{n_j}$ , and an  $\eta$ -dependent rate function  $I_\eta$  (see (1.10)). Moreover, for  $\alpha_{n_j} \equiv 1$  (note that in this case the condition (1.17) fails) we have the convergence in distribution to the random variable  $\mathcal{M}_\eta$  defined in (1.9), that is, we retrieve Theorems 1.2 and the consequences of Theorem 1.4.

**Theorem 1.10.** *Let  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  be such that  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4) \rightarrow \eta \in [-1, 1]$  as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ , and  $\{\alpha_{n_j}\}_j$  be any sequence of positive numbers such that, as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ ,*

$$\alpha_{n_j} \longrightarrow +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{n_j} / \log \mathcal{N}_{n_j} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (1.17)$$

*Then the sequence of random variables  $\{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j} / \alpha_{n_j}\}_j$  satisfies a Moderate Deviation Principle (MDP) with speed  $\alpha_{n_j}$  and rate function*

$$I_\eta(y) = \begin{cases} -y \frac{\sqrt{1+\eta^2}}{1+|\eta|} & \text{if } y \leq 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } y > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (1.18)$$

**Theorem 1.11.** *Let  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  and  $n_j^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} < s_{n_j} < 1/2$  be such that  $s_{n_j} \rightarrow 0$ . If  $\{\alpha_{n_j}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is any sequence of positive numbers such that, as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ ,*

$$\alpha_{n_j} \longrightarrow +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{n_j} / \log \mathcal{N}_{n_j} \longrightarrow 0.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>The investigation of a LDP is more delicate and it deserves a separate study, eventually together with a LDP for the nodal length of random spherical harmonics.

Then the sequence of random variables  $\left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j, s_{n_j}} / \alpha_{n_j} \right\}_j$  satisfies a Moderate Deviation Principle (MDP) with speed  $\alpha_{n_j}$  and the same rate function as in (1.18).

Clearly, the sequences of random variables in Theorems 1.10 and 1.11 converge to zero (this is a known consequence of the weak convergence of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j, s}$ , combined with the Slutsky Theorem); indeed their common rate function uniquely vanishes at  $y = 0$ , see also Remark 1.6. Then, in both cases, the smaller is  $|\eta|$ , the larger is the rate function  $I_\eta$  in (1.18). Then, considering once more what we said in Remark 1.6, the smaller is  $|\eta|$ , the faster is the convergence to zero.

**Remark 1.12.** It is worth noticing that the condition on the speed  $\alpha_n$  in (1.17) may be suboptimal. However, our technique is flexible enough to deal with other geometric properties of nodal sets of arithmetic random waves, even in higher dimension [Maf19, Cam19]. All these interesting cases were left uncovered by the strategy pursued in [MRT21], where the spherical counterpart has been investigated and (central) MDPs has been established for the nodal length of random spherical harmonics (Gaussian Laplace eigenfunctions on the round sphere) both on the whole manifold and on shrinking spherical caps. It is worth stressing that on the sphere these objects has Gaussian fluctuations in the high-energy limit, and are independent, in marked contrast with the toral case where they show a non-universal non-central asymptotic behavior, and full correlation. See Section 1.5 for more details on this comparison.

## 1.5 On the proof of the main results

In order to list and motivate the proof steps, we start by recalling that our nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_n$  in (1.4) lives in the Wiener chaos (being a finite variance functional of a Gaussian field), in particular it can be written as an orthogonal series, converging in  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ , of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_n] + \sum_{q=1}^{+\infty} \mathcal{L}_n[q], \quad (1.19)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_n[q]$  denotes the orthogonal projection of  $\mathcal{L}_n$  into the so-called  $q$ -th Wiener chaos. Roughly, this expansion relies on the fact that Hermite polynomials form an orthogonal basis of the space of square integrable functions on the real line with respect to the Gaussian density. It turns out that projections onto *odd* order chaoses vanish, and moreover  $\mathcal{L}_n[2] = 0$  (related to so-called Berry's cancellation phenomenon [KKW13, MPRW16]).

Our argument relies on the fact that the asymptotic behavior of the (centered) nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_n - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_n]$  is completely determined by  $\mathcal{L}_n[4]$ , its fourth chaotic component [MPRW16], and, moreover, that the dominant term of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n[4]$ , the standardized nodal length, that we will denote with  $\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\mu}_n(4)}$  abusing notation, is a continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of a random vector  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_n$  (whose components live in the 2-nd Wiener chaos),  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_n$  converging in law towards a multivariate Gaussian. First we establish a Moderate Deviation Principle for  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_n / \sqrt{\alpha_n}$  at speed  $\alpha_n$ , and then, thanks to the celebrated contraction principle (see [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.1] as well as Theorem 1.7), we transfer this result to  $\mathcal{M}_n / \alpha_n$  with an explicit rate function (indeed,  $f$  is a multivariate polynomial) and speed  $\alpha_n$ . It remains to deal with the tail of the series (1.19), i.e. with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \mathcal{M}_n.$$

To this aim, we prove that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n/\alpha_n$  and  $\mathcal{M}_n/\alpha_n$  – under some additional constraint on the speed  $\alpha_n$  – are exponentially equivalent (Definition 1.8), so that they satisfy the same Deviation Principle (Theorem 1.9). Finally, we will take advantage of the full correlation result in [BMW20, Theorem 1.5] (see also Theorem 1.4) to check that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n/\alpha_n$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n;s}/\alpha_n$ , the standardized nodal length restricted to the ball  $B(s)$  whose radius is slightly above the Planck scale, are exponentially equivalent, thus sharing the same deviations.

### 1.5.1 The spherical case

Our proofs are inspired by [MRT21], where a Moderate Deviation Principle has been established for the nodal length of *random spherical harmonics*, both on the whole sphere and on shrinking spherical caps. However, there are marked differences with the toral case. Indeed, on the sphere the limiting distribution of these two geometric functionals is Gaussian, and they are asymptotically independent (see [Tod20] and the references therein). On  $\mathbb{T}^2$  instead, the high-energy behavior of the total nodal length is non-Gaussian and non-universal (Theorem 1.2), and it is asymptotically fully correlated with the nodal length in shrinking domains slightly above the Planck scale (Theorem 1.4). Moreover, the rate function  $J$  in the main results of [MRT21] is quadratic

$$J(y) = y^2/2, \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

while our rate function (1.18) is a line whose angular coefficient depends on  $\eta$ . However, the condition (1.17) on the MDP speed is comparable in some sense to those on the sphere (see (2.1) and (2.2) in [MRT21]), indeed  $\mathcal{N}_n$  grows on average as  $\sqrt{\log n}$  [Lan08].

For the nodal length on the sphere, the starting point is a chaotic expansion similar to (1.19) and also in this case the dominant term is the fourth chaotic component, that however behaves much differently than the corresponding term on the torus: it is equivalent in the high-energy limit to the so-called sample trispectrum (i.e., the integral of the fourth Hermite polynomial evaluated at the field), which is *not* true in the toral case, and it is asymptotically Gaussian. To prove a MDP for the total nodal length on the sphere, the authors of [MRT21] first showed a MDP for the sample trispectrum via the result established in [ST16], which is a link between the fourth moment theorem for Gaussian approximation [NP12] and the LD theory, and then checked its exponential equivalence with the total nodal length (a similar argument works for shrinking domains).

**Plan of the paper.** In Section 2 we recall the notion of Wiener chaos and explicit formulas for the chaotic expansion (1.19). In particular, in Section 2.3 we focus on the fourth chaotic component of  $\mathcal{L}_n$  and its dominant term  $\mathcal{M}_n$ . Finally in Section 3 we give the proofs of our main results, and we postpone to Section 4 the proof of the MDP for  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_n$  for the sake of readability.

## 2 Nodal length and Wiener chaos

In this Section we recall the chaotic expansion of the nodal length for arithmetic random waves.

## 2.1 Wiener chaos

The family of Hermite polynomials  $\{H_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined as follows:  $H_0 \equiv 1$  and

$$H_q(t) := (-1)^q \phi^{-1}(t) \frac{d^q}{dt^q} \phi(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, q \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}, \quad (2.20)$$

where  $\phi$  denotes the standard Gaussian density. It is well known [NP12, Proposition 1.4.2] that  $\{H_q/\sqrt{q!}\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a complete orthonormal system in the space of square integrable real functions with respect to the standard Gaussian measure on the real line.

Arithmetic Random Waves (1.2) are generated (see Definition 1.1) from a family of standard complex-valued Gaussian random variables  $\{a_\xi\}_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ , defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and stochastically independent, save for the relations  $a_{-\xi} = \overline{a_\xi}$ .

Let  $X$  be the closure in  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$  of all real finite linear combinations of random variables  $\zeta$  of the form

$$\zeta = z a_\xi + \overline{z} a_{-\xi},$$

where  $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , thus  $X$  is a real centered Gaussian Hilbert subspace of  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ . Now let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ ; the  $q$ -th Wiener chaos  $C_q$  associated with  $X$  is defined as the closure in  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$  of all real finite linear combinations of random variables of the form

$$H_{p_1}(\zeta_1) H_{p_2}(\zeta_2) \cdots H_{p_k}(\zeta_k)$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ , where  $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy  $p_1 + \cdots + p_k = q$ , and  $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_k)$  is a standard Gaussian vector extracted from  $X$  ( $C_0 = \mathbb{R}$  and  $C_1 = X$ ). Note that (from (1.2)) for every  $n$  the random fields  $T_n, \nabla T_n$  viewed as collections of Gaussian random variables indexed by  $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$  are all lying in  $X$ .

It turns out that (see e.g. [NP12, Theorem 2.2.4])  $C_q \perp C_{q'}$  in  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$  whenever  $q \neq q'$ , and moreover

$$L_X^2(\mathbb{P}) = \bigoplus_{q=0}^{\infty} C_q,$$

where  $L_X^2(\mathbb{P}) := L^2(\Omega, \sigma(X), \mathbb{P})$ , that is, every finite-variance real-valued functional  $F$  of  $X$  admits a unique representation as a series, converging in  $L_X^2(\mathbb{P})$ , of the form

$$F = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} F[q], \quad (2.21)$$

$F[q] := \text{proj}(F | C_q)$  being the orthogonal projection of  $F$  onto  $C_q$  (in particular,  $F[0] = \mathbb{E}[F]$ ). For a complete discussion on Wiener chaos see [NP12, §2.2] and the references therein.

Since the nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_n$  is a finite-variance *explicit* functional (2.22) of the Gaussian field  $T_n$ , its Wiener-Îto chaos expansion (1.19) can be fruitfully exploited, as we will see in the proofs of our main results in Section 3.

## 2.2 Nodal length: chaos expansion

The nodal length (1.4) can be formally written as

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \delta_0(T_n(\theta)) \|\nabla T_n(\theta)\| d\theta, \quad (2.22)$$

where  $\delta_0$  denotes the Dirac delta function and  $\|\cdot\|$  the Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (see [RW08, Lemma 3.1]). Clearly, we mean that the approximating random variables  $\mathcal{L}_n^\epsilon$  defined by replacing the Dirac mass  $\delta_0$  with  $1_{[-\epsilon, \epsilon]}/(2\epsilon)$ , for  $\epsilon > 0$ , in (2.22), converge a.s. and in  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$  to  $\text{length}(T_n^{-1}\{0\}) = \mathcal{L}_n$ .

Note that a straightforward differentiation of the definition (1.2) of  $T_n$  yields, for  $j = 1, 2$

$$\partial_j T_n(x) = \frac{2\pi i}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n}} \sum_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_j a_\lambda e_\lambda(x), \quad (2.23)$$

(here  $\partial_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ ). Hence the random fields  $T_n, \partial_1 T_n, \partial_2 T_n$  viewed as collections of Gaussian random variables indexed by  $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$  are all lying in  $X$ , i.e. for every  $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$  we have

$$T_n(x), \partial_1 T_n(x), \partial_2 T_n(x) \in X.$$

We shall often use the following result from [RW08]:

**Lemma 2.1** ([RW08], (4.1)). *For  $j = 1, 2$  we have that*

$$\text{Var}[\partial_j T_n(x)] = \frac{4\pi^2}{\mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_j^2 = 4\pi^2 \frac{n}{2},$$

where the derivatives  $\partial_j T_n(x)$  are as in (2.23).

Accordingly, for  $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $j = 1, 2$ , we will denote by  $\partial_j \tilde{T}_n(x)$  the normalized derivative

$$\partial_j \tilde{T}_n(x) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} T_n(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}} \frac{i}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_j a_\lambda e_\lambda(x). \quad (2.24)$$

In view of convention (2.24), we formally rewrite (2.22) as

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi^2 n}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \delta_0(T_n(x)) \sqrt{(\partial_1 \tilde{T}_n(x))^2 + (\partial_2 \tilde{T}_n(x))^2} dx.$$

We also introduce two collections of coefficients  $\{\alpha_{2n, 2m} : n, m \geq 1\}$  and  $\{\beta_{2l} : l \geq 0\}$ , that are related to the Hermite expansion of the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and the (formal) Hermite expansion of the Dirac mass  $\delta_0(\cdot)$ , respectively. These are given by

$$\beta_{2l} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} H_{2l}(0), \quad (2.25)$$

where  $H_{2l}$  denotes the  $2l$ -th Hermite polynomial, and

$$\alpha_{2n, 2m} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{(2n)!(2m)!}{n!m!} \frac{1}{2^{n+m}} p_{n+m} \left( \frac{1}{4} \right), \quad (2.26)$$

where for  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$p_N(x) := \sum_{j=0}^N (-1)^j \cdot (-1)^N \binom{N}{j} \frac{(2j+1)!}{(j!)^2} x^j.$$

**Proposition 2.2** ([MPRW16], Proposition 3.2). (a) For  $q = 2$  or  $q = 2m + 1$  odd ( $m \geq 0$ ),

$$\mathcal{L}_n[q] \equiv 0,$$

that is, the corresponding chaotic projection vanishes.

(b) For  $q = 0$  or  $q \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_n[2q] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{4\pi^2 n}{2}} \sum_{u=0}^q \sum_{k=0}^u \frac{\alpha_{2k, 2u-2k} \beta_{2q-2u}}{(2k)!(2u-2k)!(2q-2u)!} \times \\ & \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{T}} H_{2q-2u}(T_n(x)) H_{2k}(\partial_1 \tilde{T}_n(x)) H_{2u-2k}(\partial_2 \tilde{T}_n(x)) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Consolidating the above, the Wiener-Itô chaotic expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_n$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_n] + \sqrt{\frac{4\pi^2 n}{2}} \sum_{q=2}^{+\infty} \sum_{u=0}^q \sum_{k=0}^u \frac{\alpha_{2k, 2u-2k} \beta_{2q-2u}}{(2k)!(2u-2k)!(2q-2u)!} \times \\ & \quad \times \int_{\mathbb{T}} H_{2q-2u}(T_n(x)) H_{2k}(\tilde{\partial}_1 T_n(x)) H_{2u-2k}(\tilde{\partial}_2 T_n(x)) dx, \end{aligned}$$

in  $L^2(\mathbb{P})$ .

### 2.3 Nodal length: formula for the fourth chaotic component

For  $n \in S$ , we set

$$W(n) := \begin{pmatrix} W_1(n) \\ W_2(n) \\ W_3(n) \\ W_4(n) \end{pmatrix} := \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/2}} \sum_{\lambda=(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \Lambda_n^+} (|a_\lambda|^2 - 1) \begin{pmatrix} n \\ \lambda_1^2 \\ \lambda_2^2 \\ \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.28)$$

where  $\Lambda_n^+$  is defined as in (1.3). Starting from the formula (2.27) in the case  $q = 2$ , the authors of [MPRW16] show the following.

**Lemma 2.3** (Lemma 4.2, [MPRW16], Lemma 4, [PR18]). *We have, for diverging subsequences  $\{n_j\} \subseteq S$  such that  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\hat{\mu}_{n_j}(4)$  converges,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{n_j}[4] = \sqrt{\frac{E_{n_j}}{512 \mathcal{N}_{n_j}^2}} \left( W_1(n_j)^2 - 2W_2(n_j)^2 - 2W_3(n_j)^2 - 4W_4(n_j)^2 + R(n_j) \right),$$

where

$$R(n_j) = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{N}_{n_j}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}} |a_\lambda|^4$$

is a sequence of random variables converging in probability to 1.

It is crucial to note that (see [PR18, (46)])

$$W_2(n) + W_3(n) = W_1(n),$$

which implies that the fourth chaotic component of  $\mathcal{L}_{n_j}$  can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{n_j}[4] = \sqrt{\frac{E_{n_j}}{512\mathcal{N}_{n_j}^2}} \left( (W_2(n_j) + W_3(n_j))^2 - 2W_2(n_j)^2 - 2W_3(n_j)^2 - 4W_4(n_j)^2 + R(n_j) \right). \quad (2.29)$$

We will use also the following important Lemma from [MPRW16].

**Lemma 2.4** (Lemma 4.3, [MPRW16]). *Assume that the subsequence  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  is such that  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4) \rightarrow \eta \in [-1, 1]$ . Then, as  $n_j \rightarrow \infty$ , the following CLT holds:*

$$W(n_j) \xrightarrow{d} Z(\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 \\ Z_2 \\ Z_3 \\ Z_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.30)$$

where  $Z(\eta)$  is a centered Gaussian vector with covariance

$$\Gamma = \Gamma(\eta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{3+\eta}{8} & \frac{1-\eta}{8} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1-\eta}{8} & \frac{3+\eta}{8} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1-\eta}{8} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.31)$$

The eigenvalues of  $\Gamma$  are  $0, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1-\eta}{8}, \frac{1+\eta}{4}$ , in particular  $\Gamma$  is singular.

The fourth chaotic component  $\mathcal{L}_n[4]$  is the dominating term in the series expansion (found in Proposition 2.2) of the total nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_n$ . Indeed, in [MPRW16] it was proved that, as  $\mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n) \sim \text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n[4]), \quad (2.32)$$

by showing that the asymptotic variance of  $\mathcal{L}_n[4]$  equals the right hand side of (1.7). Indeed,

$$\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n[4]) = \frac{E_n}{512\mathcal{N}_n^2} \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right). \quad (2.33)$$

The asymptotic equality in (2.32) and the orthogonality properties of Wiener chaoses, that we have seen in Section 2.1, guarantee that, as  $\mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}_n - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_n]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n)}} = \frac{\mathcal{L}_n[4]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n[4])}} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (2.34)$$

where  $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$  denotes a sequence converging to 0 in probability.

Moreover, thanks to [PR18, Lemma 2], which was proved using [BB14, Theorem 1], we know that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_n[4]|^2 \right] = O \left( \frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^{5/2}} \right). \quad (2.35)$$

### 3 Proofs of the main results

In this Section we give the proofs of our main results.

### 3.1 Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.10

From now on  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  will denote a sequence of energy levels such that  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_{n_j}(4) \rightarrow \eta \in [-1, 1]$  as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$ : for the sake of notation brevity we will write  $n$  instead of  $n_j$  in the sequel.

As anticipated in Section 1.5, the proof of Theorem 1.10 is divided into three steps. The first step is a MDP for a random vector, called  $S_n$ , whose components are linear combinations of independent and centered chi-square random variables, see Section 3.1.1. Then we will show that our functional of interest, which is the nodal length  $\mathcal{L}_n$  is *exponentially equivalent* to a simpler functional that we will call  $\mathcal{M}_n$ , see Section 3.1.2. In the third and final step Section 3.1.3, we will prove through a contraction principle that  $\mathcal{M}_n$  (and hence  $\mathcal{L}_n$ ), which is a continuous function of  $S_n$ , satisfies a MDP with rate function as in (1.18).

#### 3.1.1 MDP for $S_n$

Recalling the content of Section 2.3, we define

$$S_n := \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} (|a_\lambda|^2 - 1) \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^2/n \\ \lambda_2^2/n \\ \lambda_1 \lambda_2/n \end{pmatrix}; \quad (3.36)$$

in particular  $S_n$  is a linear combination of independent and centered chi-square random variables, where the coefficients are three-dimensional. From Lemma 2.4 which is [MPRW16, Lemma 4.3], we know that

$$\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/2}} = \begin{pmatrix} W_2(n) \\ W_3(n) \\ W_4(n) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} Z_2 \\ Z_3 \\ Z_4 \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \quad \Sigma = \Sigma_\eta := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3+\eta}{8} & \frac{1-\eta}{8} & 0 \\ \frac{1-\eta}{8} & \frac{3+\eta}{8} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-\eta}{8} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.37)$$

Note that  $\eta \in [-1, 1]$ , and  $\det(\Sigma) \neq 0$  if and only if  $\eta \neq -1, 1$ . Note that  $\widetilde{S}_n$  introduced in Section 1.5 coincides with  $S_n/\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/2}$ .

Thanks to the Gärtner-Ellis Theorem (see point (c) of [DZ98, Theorem 2.3.6]), in order to establish a MDP for  $S_n$ , it suffices to prove that, for suitable  $\{\alpha_n\}_n$ , there exists

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \alpha_n \left\langle \theta, \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\alpha_n \mathcal{N}_n/2}} \right\rangle \right) \right] =: \psi(\theta),$$

where  $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is a three-dimensional vector, and that

$$\psi(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \theta, \Sigma \theta \rangle. \quad (3.38)$$

Once this is proven, we have the desired Large Deviation Principle (for any choice of  $\{\alpha_n\}$  such that (3.40) holds) with rate function

$$\psi^*(x) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^3} \{ \langle \theta, x \rangle - \psi(\theta) \}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (3.39)$$

which is the Legendre transform of  $\psi$  (see, as already mentioned before, the statement of Gärtner-Ellis Theorem, in particular point (c) of [DZ98, Theorem 2.3.6]). Note that, for  $\eta \neq -1, 1$ , it holds

$$\psi^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \Sigma^{-1} x \rangle, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *The random vector  $\left\{ \alpha_n^{-1/2} \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/2}} \right\}_n$  satisfies a MDP with rate function*

$$\psi^*(x) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^3} \{ \langle \theta, x \rangle - \psi(\theta) \}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where  $\psi$  is as in (3.38), and speed  $\alpha_n$ , as soon as

$$\alpha_n \longrightarrow +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha_n}{\mathcal{N}_n} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (3.40)$$

For the sake of readability, we postpone the proof of Lemma 3.1 to Section 4.

### 3.1.2 Exponential equivalence

In light of (2.29) and (2.33), let us define, slightly abusing notation,

$$\mathcal{M}_n = \mathcal{M}_{\widehat{\mu}_n(4)} := \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} \left( (W_2(n) + W_3(n))^2 - 2W_2(n)^2 - 2W_3(n)^2 - 4W_4(n)^2 \right). \quad (3.41)$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Consider as usual  $\{n_j\}_j \subseteq S$  such that  $\mathcal{N}_{n_j} \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $j \rightarrow +\infty$  and assume that*

$$\alpha_{n_j} \longrightarrow +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha_{n_j}}{\log \mathcal{N}_{n_j}} \longrightarrow 0,$$

then, for every  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n_j}} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_{n_j}^{-1} \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j} - \mathcal{M}_{n_j} \right| > \delta \right) = -\infty,$$

i.e.  $\alpha_{n_j}^{-1} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n_j}$  and  $\alpha_{n_j}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{n_j}$  are exponentially equivalent.

**Proof.** From Lemma 2.3 and (2.33) we can write

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n[4] = \mathcal{M}_n + \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} R(n)$$

where we recall that

$$R(n) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n/2} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} |a_\lambda|^4$$

is a sequence of (independent) random variables converging in probability to 1 (note that  $\mathbb{E}[R(n)] = 1$ ). We have, for  $n$  large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \mathcal{M}_n \right| > \delta \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n[4] + \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} R(n) \right| > \delta \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n[4] \right| > \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} |R(n) - 1| > \frac{\delta}{4} \right) \end{aligned}$$

since  $\alpha_n^{-1} \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} \longrightarrow 0$  as  $\mathcal{N}_n \longrightarrow +\infty$ . As for the first summand, thanks to Markov inequality, we can write

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \mathcal{M}_n \right| > \delta/2 \right) \leq \frac{\alpha_n^{-1}}{\delta/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \mathcal{M}_n \right| \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{\alpha_n^{-1}}{\delta/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n[4] \right|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and from (2.35) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n[4] \right|^2 \right] = O \left( \mathcal{N}_n^{-1/2} \right).$$

Since  $\alpha_n / \log \mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow 0$  we deduce

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_n \right| > \delta/2 \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \frac{\alpha_n^{-1}}{\delta/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n - \mathcal{L}_n[4] \right|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = -\infty.$$

Regarding the second summand, from [PR18, (85)],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( |R(n) - 1| > \frac{\delta}{4} \alpha_n \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{1/2} \right) &\leq \frac{\text{Var}(R(n))}{\alpha_n^2 \delta^2 / (16) \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)} \\ &\ll \frac{1}{\alpha_n^2 \mathcal{N}_n} \end{aligned}$$

so that, since  $\alpha_n / \log \mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow 0$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( |R(n) - 1| > \frac{\delta}{4} \alpha_n \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{1/2} \right) = -\infty$$

thus concluding the proof of the exponential equivalence.  $\square$

### 3.1.3 Contraction principle

In light of the exponential equivalence obtained in the previous section, in order to obtain a MDP for the nodal length of arithmetic random waves, it suffices to prove the following.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The sequence of random variables  $\{\alpha_n^{-1} \mathcal{M}_n\}_n$ , where  $\mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow +\infty$  such that  $\widehat{\mu}_n(4) \rightarrow \eta \in [-1, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_n$  is defined as in (3.41), and  $\{\alpha_n\}_n$  is a sequence of positive numbers satisfying (3.40), enjoys a MDP with speed  $\alpha_n$  and rate function*

$$I_\eta(y) = \begin{cases} -y \frac{\sqrt{1+\eta^2}}{1+|\eta|}, & y \leq 0 \\ +\infty, & y > 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.42)$$

**Proof.** First of all we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n^{-1} \mathcal{M}_n &= \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} f \left( \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\alpha_n \mathcal{N}_n / 2}} \right) \\ &= \left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right)^{-1/2} f \left( \alpha_n^{-1/2} (W_2(n), W_3(n), W_4(n))' \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

where  $S_n$  is defined as in (3.36) and  $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= (x_1 + x_2)^2 - 2x_1^2 - 2x_2^2 - 4x_3^2 \\ &= -(x_1 - x_2)^2 - 4x_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the contraction principle (see [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.1] and Theorem 1.7), the sequence of random variables

$$\left\{ f \left( \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\alpha_n \mathcal{N}_n/2}} \right) \right\}_n$$

satisfies a LDP with speed  $\alpha_n$  and rate function

$$I_f(y) = \inf \{ \psi^*(x) : f(x) = y \}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

where  $\psi^*$  is defined as in (3.39). Since  $f$  takes non-positive values,

$$I_f(y) = +\infty \quad \text{whenever } y > 0$$

and

$$I_f(0) = 0 \quad \text{since } \psi^*(x) \iff x = 0 \quad \text{and } f(0) = 0.$$

We are going to explicitly compute  $I_f(y)$  for  $y < 0$ . Assume that  $\eta \in (-1, 1)$ , then the matrix  $\Sigma$  in (3.37) is non-singular and

$$I_f(y) = \inf \{ \psi^*(x) : f(x) = y \} = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \Sigma^{-1} x \rangle : f(x) = y \right\}.$$

Now

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \frac{8}{1+\eta} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3+\eta}{8} & \frac{\eta-1}{8} & 0 \\ \frac{\eta-1}{8} & \frac{3+\eta}{8} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta} \end{pmatrix},$$

and therefore

$$\langle x, \Sigma^{-1} x \rangle = \frac{8}{1+\eta} \left( \frac{3+\eta}{8} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \frac{\eta-1}{4} x_1 x_2 + \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta} x_3^2 \right).$$

As a consequence,

$$\psi^*(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \Sigma^{-1} x \rangle = \frac{4}{1+\eta} \left( \frac{3+\eta}{8} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \frac{\eta-1}{4} x_1 x_2 + \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta} x_3^2 \right)$$

and

$$I_f(y) = \inf \left\{ \frac{4}{1+\eta} \left( \frac{3+\eta}{8} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \frac{\eta-1}{4} x_1 x_2 + \frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta} x_3^2 \right) : -x_1^2 - x_2^2 + 2x_1 x_2 - 4x_3^2 = y \right\}. \quad (3.44)$$

Let us assume for the moment that  $\eta = 0$ , then (3.44) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(y) &= \inf \left\{ \frac{3}{2} (x_1^2 + x_2^2) - x_1 x_2 + 4x_3^2 : -x_1^2 - x_2^2 + 2x_1 x_2 - 4x_3^2 = y \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (x_1 + x_2)^2 - y \right\} = -y, \end{aligned}$$

so we just obtained that for  $\eta = 0$ , the rate function takes the form  $I_f(y) = -y$ , coherently with (3.42). Let us now compute  $I_f(y)$  for any  $\eta \in (-1, 1)$ . We will use the Lagrange multipliers method with

$$L(x_1, x_2, x_3, \lambda) = h(x_1, x_2, x_3) + \lambda g(x_1, x_2, x_3)$$

where

$$h(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{3 + \eta}{2(1 + \eta)}(x_1^2 + x_2^2) + \frac{(\eta - 1)}{1 + \eta}x_1x_2 + \frac{4}{1 - \eta}x_3^2$$

$$g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = -x_1^2 - x_2^2 + 2x_1x_2 - 4x_3^2 - y.$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} h_{x_1} + \lambda g_{x_1} = 0 \\ h_{x_2} + \lambda g_{x_2} = 0 \\ h_{x_3} + \lambda g_{x_3} = 0 \\ g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0 \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} \frac{3 + \eta}{1 + \eta}x_1 + \frac{(\eta - 1)}{1 + \eta}x_2 + \lambda(-2x_1 + 2x_2) = 0 \\ \frac{3 + \eta}{1 + \eta}x_2 + \frac{(\eta - 1)}{1 + \eta}x_1 + \lambda(-2x_2 + 2x_1) = 0 \\ \frac{8}{1 - \eta}x_3 + \lambda(-8x_3) = 0 \\ g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\implies \begin{cases} \frac{3 + \eta}{1 + \eta}x_1 + \frac{(\eta - 1)}{1 + \eta}x_2 + \lambda(-2x_1 + 2x_2) = 0 \\ x_1 = -x_2 \\ x_3 = 0 \vee \lambda = \frac{1}{1 - \eta} \\ g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0 \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} x_2 = 0 \vee \lambda = \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \\ x_1 = -x_2 \\ x_3 = 0 \vee \lambda = \frac{1}{1 - \eta} \\ -4x_2^2 - 4x_3^2 = y \end{cases}$$

$$\implies \begin{cases} \lambda = \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \\ x_1 = -\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ x_2 = \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ x_3 = 0 \end{cases} \vee \begin{cases} \lambda = \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \\ x_1 = \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ x_2 = -\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ x_3 = 0 \end{cases} \vee \begin{cases} \lambda = \frac{1}{1 - \eta} \\ x_1 = 0 \\ x_2 = 0 \\ x_3 = \pm\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \end{cases},$$

where we recall that we assume  $y < 0$ . For the first two solutions we have that

$$\psi^* \left( \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}}, -\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}}, 0 \right) = \psi^* \left( -\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}}, \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}}, 0 \right) = \frac{-y}{1 + \eta},$$

while for the other two solutions we have that

$$\psi^* \left( 0, 0, \pm\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \right) = \frac{-y}{1 - \eta}.$$

As a consequence, the rate function is given by

$$I_f(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{-y}{1 + \eta} & \text{if } 0 < \eta < 1 \\ -y & \text{if } \eta = 0 \\ \frac{-y}{1 - \eta} & \text{if } -1 < \eta < 0 \end{cases} = \frac{-y}{1 + |\eta|}.$$

If  $\eta \in \{-1, 1\}$ , then  $\Sigma$  is singular. In this case, in order to compute  $\psi^*(x)$  one has to consider the gradient with respect to  $\theta$  to obtain the supremum in (3.39) and it is a known fact that one obtains  $\Sigma\theta = x$ . Then there are two possibilities:

- $x \notin \text{Im}(\Sigma) \implies \Sigma\theta = x$  has no solution  $\implies \psi^*(x) = +\infty$ ;
- $x \in \text{Im}(\Sigma) \implies \Sigma\theta = x$  has solution  $\theta = \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}x$  where  $\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}$  is the inverse of  $\Sigma$  restricted to  $\text{Im}(\Sigma)$   
 $\implies \psi^*(x) = [\langle \theta, x \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle \theta, \Sigma\theta \rangle]_{\theta=\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}x} = \frac{1}{2}\langle x, \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}x \rangle$ .

Then, considering the case when  $\eta = 1$ , we have:

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and hence  $\text{Im}(\Sigma) = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_3 = 0\}$ . As a consequence, for  $x \in \text{Im}(\Sigma)$ ,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \theta_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \implies \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} x$$

and hence

$$\psi^*(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle x, \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}x \rangle = x_1^2 + x_2^2.$$

So what we have to compute now is the following rate function

$$I_f(y) = \inf_{x \in \text{Im}(\Sigma)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\langle x, \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}x \rangle : f(x) = y \right\} = \inf_{x \in \text{Im}(\Sigma)} \{x_1^2 + x_2^2 : -x_1^2 - x_2^2 + 2x_1x_2 = y\}.$$

We will use again the Lagrange method, to obtain

$$\begin{cases} 2x_1 + \lambda(-2x_1 + 2x_2) = 0 \\ 2x_2 + \lambda(-2x_2 + 2x_1) = 0 \\ -x_1^2 - x_2^2 + 2x_1x_2 - y = 0 \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} x_1 = -x_2 \\ 2x_2 + \lambda(-2x_2 + 2x_1) = 0 \\ (x_1 - x_2)^2 = -y \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} x_1 = -x_2 \\ \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \\ 4x_1^2 = -y \end{cases}$$

$$\implies \begin{cases} x_1 = \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ x_2 = -\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \vee \begin{cases} x_1 = -\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ x_2 = \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \quad \text{and } \psi^* \left( \pm\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}}, \mp\sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}}, 0 \right) = -\frac{y}{2}.$$

So we just proved that in the case that  $\eta = 1$ , the rate function is  $I_f(y) = -y/2$ .

Let us now consider the case when  $\eta = -1$ , we have:

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix}$$

and hence  $\text{Im}(\Sigma) = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_1 = x_2\}$ . As a consequence, for  $x \in \text{Im}(\Sigma)$ ,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \theta_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_1 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \implies \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}\theta_1 + \frac{1}{4}\theta_2 = x_1 \\ \frac{1}{4}\theta_1 + \frac{1}{4}\theta_2 = x_1 \\ \frac{1}{4}\theta_3 = x_3 \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} \theta_1 + \theta_2 = 4x_1 \\ \theta_1 + \theta_2 = 4x_1 \\ \theta_3 = 4x_3 \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^*(x_1, x_1, x_3) &= \left[ \langle \theta, x \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \theta, \Sigma \theta \rangle \right]_{\Sigma \theta = x, x_1 = x_2} \\ &= \theta_1 x_1 + \theta_2 x_1 + \theta_3 x_3 - \frac{1}{2} \left( \theta_1 \left( \frac{1}{4} \theta_1 + \frac{1}{4} \theta_2 \right) + \theta_2 \left( \frac{1}{4} \theta_1 + \frac{1}{4} \theta_2 \right) + \theta_3 \frac{1}{4} \theta_3 \right) \Big|_{\Sigma \theta = x} \\ &= 2x_1^2 + 2x_3^2.\end{aligned}$$

So what we have to compute now is the following rate function

$$I_f(y) = \inf_{x \in \text{Im}(\Sigma)} \{2x_1^2 + 2x_3^2 : -4x_3^2 = y\}.$$

We will use again the Lagrange method, to obtain

$$\begin{cases} 4x_1 + \lambda \cdot 0 = 0 \\ 4x_3 + \lambda(-8x_3) = 0 \\ -4x_3^2 = y \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} x_1 = 0 \\ x_3 = \pm \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \\ \lambda = \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi^* \left( 0, 0, \pm \sqrt{-\frac{y}{4}} \right) = -\frac{y}{2}.$$

So we just proved that also in the case that  $\eta = -1$ , the rate function is  $I_f(y) = -y/2$ .

Finally, recalling (3.43), since as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\left( 1 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)^2 + \frac{34}{\mathcal{N}_n} \right) \longrightarrow 1 + \eta^2,$$

one can prove the desired LDP of  $\{\alpha_n^{-1} \mathcal{M}_n\}_n$ , with the rate function in (3.42), with some standard computations (in particular, for the proof of the lower bound for open sets, one can use Lemma 19 in [GT08]).  $\square$

### 3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.10

Bearing in mind the result of Sections 3.1.1–3.1.3, the proof of Theorem 1.10 immediately follows.

**Proof.** From Lemma 3.2 the two sequences of random variables  $\{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n/\alpha_n\}_n$  and  $\{\mathcal{M}_n/\alpha_n\}_n$  are exponential equivalent at speed  $\alpha_n$ . From Theorem 1.9 and Lemma 3.3,  $\{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n/\alpha_n\}_n$  enjoys a MDP with speed  $\alpha_n$  and rate function (3.42).  $\square$

### 3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.11

**Proof.** The proof consists in showing that  $\alpha_n^{-1} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n;s}$  and  $\alpha_n^{-1} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n$  are exponentially equivalent at speed  $\alpha_n$ : this guarantees that they enjoy the same MDP as in Theorem 1.10. In order to do that, it suffices to find an upper bound for

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n;s} - \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n \right|^2 \right] = 1 + 1 - 2 \text{Corr}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}, \mathcal{L}_n).$$

Recalling (1.7), (1.14) and the precise identity [BMW20, (3.36)], we can write, uniformly for  $s > n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon}$ ,

$$\text{Corr}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}, \mathcal{L}_n) = \frac{\text{Cov}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}, \mathcal{L}_n)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}) \text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n)}} = \frac{\pi s^2 \text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s}) \text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n)}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\pi s^2 \sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_n)}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mathcal{L}_{n;s})}} = \frac{\pi s^2 \sqrt{\frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^2} c_n + O\left(\frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^{5/2}}\right)}}{\sqrt{(\pi s^2)^2 \left(\frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^2} c_n + O_\varepsilon\left(\frac{E_n}{\mathcal{N}_n^{5/2}}\right)\right)}} \\
&= 1 + O_\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}_n^{-1/2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant involved in the  $O$ -notation only depends on  $\varepsilon$ . As a consequence, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n;s} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n \right|^2 \right] = O_\varepsilon\left(\mathcal{N}_n^{-1/4}\right). \quad (3.45)$$

Now, for every  $\delta > 0$ , thanks to (3.45) we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \mathbb{P} \left( \alpha_n^{-1} \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n;s} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n \right| > \delta \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \frac{\alpha_n^{-2}}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n;s} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n \right|^2 \right] = -\infty$$

and the proof is hence concluded.  $\square$

## 4 MDP for $S_n$ : proof of Lemma 3.1

As anticipated in Section 3.1.1, here we establish a MDP for  $S_n$  as defined in (3.36) via Gärtner-Ellis Theorem [DZ98, Theorem 2.3.6].

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** Let us define, for  $\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+$ ,

$$b_n(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1^2/n \\ \lambda_2^2/n \\ \lambda_1 \lambda_2/n \end{pmatrix}.$$

We start by studying the following quantity:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \alpha_n \left\langle \theta, \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\alpha_n \mathcal{N}_n/2}} \right\rangle \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} \log \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} (|a_\lambda|^2 - 1) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} \left\{ -\frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} + \log \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} |a_\lambda|^2 \right) \right] \right\} \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} \left\{ -\frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} + \log \left( \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}}} \right) \right\} & \text{if } \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} < 1, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the fact that  $2 \cdot |a_\lambda|^2$  is distributed as a  $\chi^2(2)$  random variable<sup>4</sup>. Now note that, for fixed  $\theta$  and sufficiently large  $j$ , we have that

$$\frac{\langle \theta, b_{n_j}(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}/(2\alpha_{n_j})}} < 1.$$

<sup>4</sup>Recall that  $a_\lambda = b_\lambda + ic_\lambda$ , where  $b_\lambda$  and  $c_\lambda$  are iid  $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/2)$ .

Indeed,

$$\frac{|\langle \theta, b_{n_j}(\lambda) \rangle|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}/(2\alpha_{n_j})}} \leq \frac{\|\theta\| \|b_{n_j}(\lambda)\|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}/(2\alpha_{n_j})}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}\|\theta\|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}/(2\alpha_{n_j})}} \rightarrow 0$$

as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , so we can assume to be in the first case. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \alpha_n \left\langle \theta, \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{\alpha_n \mathcal{N}_n/2}} \right\rangle \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \left\{ -\frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} + \log \left( \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}}} \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \left\{ -\frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} - \left( -\frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)}} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^2}{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^3}{(\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n))^{3/2}} + o \left( \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^3}{(\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n))^{3/2}} \right) \right) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^2}{\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n)} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^3}{(\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n))^{3/2}} + o \left( \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^3}{(\mathcal{N}_n/(2\alpha_n))^{3/2}} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

So our goal becomes proving that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}/2} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \langle \theta, b_{n_j}(\lambda) \rangle^2 = \langle \theta, \Sigma \theta \rangle, \quad (4.46)$$

and that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \frac{\langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^3}{(\mathcal{N}_n/\alpha_n)^{3/2}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.47)$$

As far as (4.46) is concerned, given the fact that for every  $n \in S$  (see [MPRW16, Lemma 4.1])

$$\frac{1}{n^2 \mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_1^4 = \frac{1}{n^2 \mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_2^4 = \frac{3 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n^2 \mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2 = \frac{1 - \widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8},$$

we simply have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n/2} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} \langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n/2} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} \left( \theta_1 \frac{\lambda_1^2}{n} + \theta_2 \frac{\lambda_2^2}{n} + \theta_3 \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}{n} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \left( \theta_1^2 \frac{\lambda_1^4}{n^2} + \theta_2^2 \frac{\lambda_2^4}{n^2} + \theta_3^2 \frac{\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2}{n^2} + 2\theta_1 \theta_2 \frac{\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2}{n^2} \right) \\ &= \theta_1^2 \frac{3 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} + \theta_2^2 \frac{3 + \widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} + \theta_3^2 \frac{1 - \widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} + 2\theta_1 \theta_2 \frac{1 - \widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} \end{aligned}$$

since clearly

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_1 \lambda_2^3 = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \lambda_1^3 \lambda_2 = 0.$$

As a consequence we just proved that

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_n/2} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n^+} \langle \theta, b_n(\lambda) \rangle^2 = \langle \theta, \Sigma_n \theta \rangle,$$

where

$$\Sigma_n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3+\widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} & \frac{1-\widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} & 0 \\ \frac{1-\widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} & \frac{3+\widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-\widehat{\mu}_n(4)}{8} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, since  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\mu}_n(4) = \eta$ , we obtain (4.46).

As for (4.47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\alpha_{n_j}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \frac{\langle \theta, b_{n_j}(\lambda) \rangle^3}{(\mathcal{N}_{n_j}/\alpha_{n_j})^{3/2}} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}^{3/2} \alpha_{n_j}^{-1/2}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n_j}^+} \langle \theta, b_{n_j}(\lambda) \rangle^3 \\ &\leq c \frac{\|\theta\|^3}{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}^{1/2} \alpha_{n_j}^{-1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

(for some absolute constant  $c > 0$ ), which tends to 0 as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , since  $\alpha_{n_j}$  is chosen such that

$$\alpha_{n_j} \longrightarrow +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha_{n_j}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}} \longrightarrow 0,$$

thus concluding the proof.  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

C. M. has been supported by the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome ‘‘Tor Vergata’’ (CUP E83C18000100006) and by the GNAMPA-INdAM Project *Stime asintotiche: principi di invarianza e grandi deviazioni*. M. R. has been supported by the ANR-17-CE40-0008 project *Unirandom*. A. V. has been supported by the co-financing of the European Union - FSE-REACT-EU, PON Research and Innovation 2014–2020, DM 1062/2021.

## References

- [AT07] R. J. Adler and J. E. Taylor. *Random Fields and Geometry*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag New York, 2007.
- [BB14] E. Bombieri and J. Bourgain. A Problem on Sums of Two Squares. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015(11):3343–3407, 03 2014.
- [BMW20] J. Benatar, D. Marinucci, and I. Wigman. Planck-scale distribution of nodal length of arithmetic random waves. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, 141(2):707–749, 2020.
- [Cam19] V. Cammarota. Nodal area distribution for arithmetic random waves. *Transactions of the A. M. S.*, 372:3539–3564, 2019.
- [Cil93] J. Cilleruelo. The distribution of the lattice points on circles. *Journal of Number Theory*, 43(2):198–202, 1993.

- [DZ98] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [EH99] P. Erdős and R. R. Hall. On the angular distribution of gaussian integers with fixed norm. *Discrete Mathematics, Paul Erdős memorial collection*, 200(1–3):87–94, 1999.
- [GM21] R. Giuliano and C. Macci. Some examples of non-central moderate deviations for sequences of real random variables. [arXiv:2110.05859](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.05859), 2021.
- [GT08] A. J. Ganesh and G. L. Torrisi. Large deviations of the interference in a wireless communication model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(8):3505–3517, 2008.
- [KKW13] M. Krishnapur, P. Kurlberg, and I. Wigman. Non-universality of nodal length distribution for arithmetic random waves. *Ann. Math.*, 177(2):699–737, 2013.
- [KW17] P. Kurlberg and I. Wigman. On probability measures arising from lattice points on circles. *Mathematische Annalen*, 367(3-4):1057–1098, 2017.
- [Lan08] E. Landau. Über die einteilung der positiven zahlen nach vier klassen nach der mindestzahl der zu ihrer addition zusammensetzung erforderlichen quadrate. *Archiv der Math. und Physik*, 13(3):305–312, 1908.
- [Maf19] R. W. Maffucci. Nodal intersections for arithmetic random waves against a surface. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 20(11):3651–3691, 2019.
- [MPRW16] D. Marinucci, G. Peccati, M. Rossi, and I. Wigman. Non-universality of nodal length distribution for arithmetic random waves. *GAFa*, 3:926–960, 2016.
- [MRT21] C. Macci, M. Rossi, and A. P. Todino. Moderate deviation estimates for nodal lengths of random spherical harmonics. *ALEA*, 18:249–263, 2021.
- [NP12] I. Nourdin and G. Peccati. *Normal Approximation with Malliavin Calculus: From Stein’s Method to Universality*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [PR18] G. Peccati and M. Rossi. Quantitative limit theorems for local functionals of arithmetic random waves. In *Computation and combinatorics in dynamics, stochastics and control*, volume 13 of *Abel Symp.*, pages 659–689. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [RW08] Z. Rudnick and I. Wigman. On the volume of nodal sets for eigenfunctions of the Laplacian on the torus. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 9(1):109–130, 2008.
- [Sar18] A. Sartori. On the fractal structure of attainable probability measures. *Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math.*, 66(2):123–133, 2018.
- [ST16] M. Schulte and C. Thäle. Cumulants on Wiener chaos: moderate deviations and the fourth moment theorem. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 270(6):2223–2248, 2016.
- [Tod20] A. P. Todino. Nodal lengths in shrinking domains for random eigenfunctions on  $S^2$ . *Bernoulli*, 26(4):3081–3110, 2020.
- [Yau82] S.T. Yau. *Seminar on Differential Geometry*. Annals of mathematics studies. Princeton University Press, 1982.