

Spike Estimation from Heteroscedastic Noise via Random Splitting

Zhigang Bao*, Kha Man Cheong†, Yuji Li‡, Jiaxin Qiu§

September 11, 2026

Abstract

In this paper, we consider a spiked Wigner type matrix with a heteroscedastic and unknown variance profile. It is well known that in the supercritical regime of the BBP transition, strong spikes can create outliers in the spectrum. Unfortunately, in the heteroscedastic case, in general it is not possible to estimate the spike strength from these observed outlier consistently, as the latter is a solution to a Dyson equation with unknown parameters from the variance profile. In this paper, inspired by the work on sparse matrix completion [Bordenave et al., 2023], we introduce an asymmetrized model by randomly splitting the spiked matrix into two parts, which transforms the noisy Wigner type matrix into a non Hermitian random matrix, while preserving the Hermitian spikes at the cost of a dilution. We establish a BBP type transition for the asymmetrized model, from which we can estimate the strength of the spikes precisely, even without knowing the variance profile of the noise part. We then further apply our approach to study the correlation between two correlated spiked models, where the spike/signal parts of the two models are correlated, and the noise parts are independent but may both be heteroscedastic. By applying our asymmetrization approach to the two models separately and also jointly, we are able to obtain a precise estimate of the correlation between the signal parts of the two models.

1 Introduction

Low rank signal plus noise models provide a basic framework for high dimensional inference. Estimating the low rank signal from a single noisy observation is a fundamental problem in statistics, machine learning, and signal processing. In this paper, we consider a data matrix Y modelled as

$$Y = X + S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}, \quad \text{rank}(S) = r, \quad (1.1)$$

where X is a centered noise matrix and S is a deterministic signal of fixed rank. The inferential goals are to estimate the singular values of S , and recover information about the associated signal subspaces from the observed data matrix Y . In this paper, the noise matrix X is allowed to be heteroscedastic with a unknown variance profile

$$T = (t_{ij}), \quad t_{ij} = \mathbb{E}X_{ij}^2 \asymp n^{-1}.$$

Heteroscedastic noise arises naturally in several matrix valued data types, such as the adjacency matrix of a network with heterogeneous expected degrees [Karrer and Newman, 2011; Guionnet et al., 2025], count matrices from single cell and spatial genomics, Hi-C, and document term data [Landa et al., 2022; Landa and Kluger, 2025], and photon limited imaging with Poisson distributed pixel counts [Liu et al., 2018]. These examples include both symmetric and rectangular data matrices, and the variance profile may be heterogeneous across both rows and columns.

We study two settings of (1.1). In the symmetric setting, $p = n$, the matrices X and S are symmetric, and

$$S = UDU^\top, \quad D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_r),$$

*University of Hong Kong, zgbao@hku.hk

†Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, kmcheong@connect.ust.hk

‡University of Hong Kong, u3011732@connect.hku.hk

§University of Hong Kong, jxqiu@hku.hk

where U contains orthonormal columns. In the rectangular setting, $p/n \rightarrow \phi \in (0, \infty)$ and

$$S = UDV^\top,$$

where both U and V contain orthonormal columns. Our first goal is to estimate the spike strengths d_k from a single noisy observation Y . The second goal is to estimate the correlation between two signal matrices S_1 and S_2 from two given noisy data sets Y_1 and Y_2 .

The spectral properties of signal plus noise models have been extensively studied in Random Matrix Theory, High-dimensional Statistics and their applications; see, for example, [Baik and Silverstein \[2006\]](#); [Féral and Pécché \[2007\]](#); [Bai and Yao \[2008\]](#); [Capitaine et al. \[2009\]](#); [Benaych-Georges et al. \[2011\]](#); [Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi \[2011\]](#); [Capitaine et al. \[2011\]](#); [Loubaton and Vallet \[2011\]](#); [Bai and Yao \[2012\]](#); [Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi \[2012\]](#); [Hachem et al. \[2012\]](#); [Bloemendal and Virág \[2013\]](#); [Knowles and Yin \[2013\]](#); [Pizzo et al. \[2013\]](#); [Knowles and Yin \[2014\]](#); [Capitaine \[2014\]](#); [Bloemendal and Virág \[2016\]](#); [Bao et al. \[2021\]](#); [Geng et al. \[2024\]](#); [Bykhovskaya et al. \[2025\]](#), etc. But nearly all these works assumed that the noise entries have the same and known variance. Our main focus of this work is on estimating spike strengths from the observed spectrum without knowing the noise variance profile.

Even in the homogeneous Wigner model, a sample outlier does not directly estimate its underlying spike. For example, if $t_{ij} = \sigma^2/n$, then a supercritical rank one signal of strength d produces a sample outlier near $d + \sigma^2/d$ [[Capitaine et al., 2009](#); [Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi, 2011](#)], rather than near d itself. Recovering d therefore requires a noise dependent correction or transformation. Under a general profile, the correction even depends on the signal directions. Indeed, the noise resolvent $G_X(z) := (X - zI_n)^{-1}$ is approximated by the diagonal matrix $M_X(z) = \text{diag}(m_1(z), \dots, m_n(z))$, where $m_i(z)$ solves the vector Dyson equation [[Ajanki et al., 2017, 2019b](#)]

$$-\frac{1}{m_i(z)} = z + \sum_{j=1}^n t_{ij} m_j(z), \quad i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket := \{1, 2, \dots, n\},$$

and the finite rank perturbation argument gives the outlier equation

$$\det(I_r + D U^\top M_X(z) U) = 0.$$

Hence the map from an observed sample outlier to d_k depends on both the unknown profile and the unknown signal directions. The same issue persists in the rectangular model if we aim to estimate the signal strength via the singular values of the data matrix. For rectangular models with Gaussian noise, [Bigot and Male \[2021\]](#) describe singular value outliers through deterministic equations involving both the variance profile and the signal singular vectors. Consequently, the direct spectral analysis of Y does not yield a noise profile free and signal direction free estimation from observed outliers to spike strengths. This has been a fundamental difficulty on the heteroscedastic spike models.

There exist several methods in the literature that can estimate the spike strengths from the observed data, but they all require either additional assumptions on the noise or additional observations. [Shabalin and Nobel \[2013\]](#) invert the rectangular outlier map and estimates the noise variance, but assumes i.i.d. Gaussian noise. [[Nadakuditi, 2014](#)] assumes bi-unitarily/bi-orthogonally invariant noise, and proposes the **OptShrink** estimator by inverting a noise D -transform [[Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi, 2012](#)]. [Su and Wu \[2025\]](#) extend this approach to noise with separable covariance structure. [Chen et al. \[2021\]](#) estimate the spike strength in a rank one model under heteroscedastic noise using the leading eigenvalue of an asymmetric/non-Hermitian data matrix. Along this line, [Bao et al. \[2025\]](#) propose an asymmetrization based detection method to detect signal even when the noise itself produces large spikes, and the method requires two independent noisy observations. [Gavish et al. \[2023\]](#) propose a pseudo whitening based singular value shrinkage procedure by leveraging auxiliary pure noise samples and the outlier asymptotics of spiked F matrices. To our knowledge, there is no existing method that can estimate the spike strengths from a single noisy observation with heteroscedastic noise and an unknown variance profile for spiked symmetric matrices.

The use of a non-Hermitian matrix instead of a Hermitian one is a key input to our work. This idea originates in Tao's observation that, for a bounded rank deformation of an i.i.d. non-Hermitian matrix, an outlier outside the circular law support converges to the corresponding signal eigenvalue, without an order one bias which exists in the spiked Hermitian models [[Tao, 2013](#)]. In [Chen et al. \[2021\]](#), the authors extended this idea to the low rank estimation problem with independent, possibly heteroscedastic, asymmetric noise, and further in [Bao et al. \[2025\]](#) the authors used the asymmetrization idea for signal detection under heteroscedastic and heavy-tailed noise, when the noise itself could create

large singular values. However, the former work assumes direct access to an asymmetric perturbation, whereas the latter requires two independent samples. Consequently, these constructions cannot in general be applied when only one symmetric observation is available, or an asymmetric rectangular matrix is observed but one wants to estimate the leading singular values in the signal which again boils down to the eigenvalue problem of a symmetric matrix. Several other methods based on one sample which bear an asymmetrization natural are also related to various extent. For very sparse matrix completion, in [Bordenave et al. \[2023\]](#), the authors randomly split the observed entries into two disjoint matrices and analyze their asymmetric cross-product. This construction is distinct from, although closely related to, the non-backtracking operator studied in the same paper, which can be regarded as another type of asymmetrization approach. However, the approach developed in the paper applies to very sparse random observations, and does not seem to apply to the dense matrix case. In [Ding et al. \[2020\]](#), the authors instead use self-avoiding walks to estimate a rank one spike under independent heavy-tailed noise with only finite second moments. But the variances of the noise matrix are required to be the same and known, and the focus is the eigenvector. Related non-backtracking and self-avoiding constructions also appear in other works such as [Massoulié \[2014\]](#); [Bordenave et al. \[2018\]](#); [Stephan and Zhu \[2024\]](#). These works motivate constructing asymmetry from a single sample by preventing the repeated use of the same noisy observation.

Our starting point of this paper is inspired by the work of [Bordenave et al. \[2023\]](#), who randomly split the observed matrix into complementary parts and analyze the resulting non-Hermitian cross-product. Their setting is sparse matrix completion rather than a dense additive signal plus noise model (1.1), but their random splitting idea motivates the construction below. Let $P \in \{0, 1\}^{p \times n}$ be independent of the observation and have Bernoulli(1/2) entries. In the rectangular model these entries are i.i.d.; in the symmetric model, $p = n$ and P is generated symmetrically from independent upper triangular entries. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y} &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \circ Y \\ ((\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_n^\top - P) \circ Y)^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \circ X \\ ((\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_n^\top - P) \circ X)^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \circ S \\ ((\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_n^\top - P) \circ S)^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

The two off-diagonal blocks contain complementary subsets of the entries of Y . The signal part of Y admits the decomposition

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \circ S \\ ((\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_n^\top - P) \circ S)^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S \\ S^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{R} \\ -\mathcal{R}^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{R} := \left(P - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_n^\top\right) \circ S.$$

The first matrix on the right hand side has nonzero eigenvalues $\{\pm d_k/2 : k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket\}$, in both the symmetric and rectangular models. A rather weak incoherence condition on the signal directions ensures that $\mathcal{R}$ is negligible in operator norm. Thus a positive outlier $\lambda_{k,+}(\mathcal{Y})$ leads to the direct estimator

$$\hat{d}_k := 2\text{Re } \lambda_{k,+}(\mathcal{Y}). \quad (1.3)$$

We will derive two main results based on the asymmetrized model via random splitting in (1.2).

Our first result establishes a BBP type transition for our estimator. The asymmetrized noise matrix, i.e., the first term in the RHS of (1.2), has asymptotic outer radius $b_{*,n} = \sqrt{\|T\|_2/2}$. For fixed rank positive spikes whose directions are sufficiently incoherent in the sense that $\max_{k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket} \|u_k\|_\infty = o(1)$, every spike satisfying $d_k/2 > b_{*,n}$ by a fixed margin generates two outliers. They can be labeled so that

$$\lambda_{k,\pm}(\mathcal{Y}) = \pm \frac{d_k}{2} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Conversely, spikes that remain a fixed distance below $b_{*,n}$ produce no eigenvalues outside the noise bulk. It follows that, when the rank is known and the spikes are supercritical, $2\text{Re } \lambda_{k,+}(\mathcal{Y})$ consistently estimates d_k without estimating T or applying a profile dependent bias correction.

The second result concerns the estimation of correlation between two correlated spiked models. We consider two noisy observations

$$Y_a = X_a + U_a D_a V_a^\top, \quad a = 1, 2,$$

where the spike parts are correlated and the noise parts are independent but may both be heteroscedastic. The statistical target is the cross sample overlap matrix $U_1^\top U_2$ and $V_1^\top V_2$, which is identifiable only up to

sign changes. We use samplewise random splitting and the resulting eigenvector projections to construct estimates of the entrywise overlap magnitudes. This problem connects to recent work on signal recovery and prediction from correlated spiked models. [Keup and Zdeborová \[2025\]](#); [Nandy and Ma \[2024\]](#) develop approximate message passing (AMP) methods for signal recovery. [Mergny and Zdeborová \[2026\]](#) analyze outliers and signal direction overlaps of singular vectors of $Y_1^\top Y_2$. [Li \[2025\]](#); [Du et al. \[2026\]](#); [Yang et al. \[2026\]](#) study detection and recovery thresholds using combinatorial and spectral methods. However, the above references mainly assume that the spikes are generated from a joint probability distribution and the goal is to detect the presence of correlated spikes or to recover the individual spike vectors. Our problem instead treats the spikes and strengths as deterministic and seeks to estimate their unknown overlap/correlation directly from two independent spiked Wigner observations. Hence, our contribution is a consistent estimation of signal overlaps under unknown and possibly different variance profiles.

Further, although our construction uses a similar random splitting idea as [Bordenave et al. \[2023\]](#), the resulting spectral problem is technically rather different. In [Bordenave et al. \[2023\]](#), entries are initially observed with probability of order n^{-1} , so the split matrices have bounded expected degree. Their analysis therefore relies on sparse graph geometry: logarithmic powers are expanded as weighted path sums, local neighborhoods are coupled to marked Galton–Watson trees, and tangle free decompositions together with high trace estimates are used to construct approximate eigenvectors and control the remaining spectrum. By contrast, our random matrix models are dense, with entry correlations inherited from the Wigner symmetry and the complementary splitting of a single sample. Consequently, no locally tree like approximation is available. Following the dense random matrix strategy of [Bao et al. \[2025\]](#), we instead use linearization and Hermitization, analyze the corresponding Dyson equation, and establish isotropic Green function estimates; the signal outliers are then characterized by a finite dimensional determinant equation. The main additional difficulty relative to [Bao et al. \[2025\]](#) is that the linearized noise has a nontrivial entry correlation structure, rather than independent off diagonal blocks, and this dependence must be retained throughout the resolvent analysis. In particular, we will apply the approach in [Ajanki et al. \[2019a\]](#) for random matrix with correlated entries. We also emphasize that although the previous work [Bao et al. \[2025\]](#) requires two samples, it has a different focus as it is mainly for the scenario when the noise itself could create much larger singular values than the signal part, and the asymmetrization is used to distinguish the signal from the noise spikes. It is not mainly aim for dealing with a heteroscedastic noise with mild variance profile only. It is not clear if the one sample approach applied here can be extended to deal with the scenario when a big spike presents in the noise part as we previously discussed in [Bao et al. \[2025\]](#). It will be left a a future research direction.

Throughout this paper, we will use the following notations. We use c, C for positive constants that may change from line to line. The symbol $X := Y$ (or $Y =: X$) indicates that X is defined as Y . For a positive integer n , we write $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any matrix A , we denote its (i, j) -th entry by A_{ij} , its transpose by $A^\top$, its Hermitian transpose by A^* , and its spectral norm by $\|A\|_2$. For $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, we write $\sigma_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{m, n\}}(A) \geq 0$ for its singular values and set $\sigma_{\min}(A) := \sigma_{\min\{m, n\}}(A)$. If A is square, then $\text{Tr}(A)$ and $\text{spec}(A)$ denote its trace and spectrum, respectively, and $\varrho(A) := \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \text{spec}(A)\}$ denotes its spectral radius. Let $\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_m(A)$ denote the eigenvalues of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$, ordered by decreasing real parts. We write $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ when $a_n \geq cb_n$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$, and $a_n \lesssim b_n$ when $b_n \gtrsim a_n$. We write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $c_0 \leq a_n/b_n \leq C_0$ for some absolute constants $c_0, C_0 > 0$. For random variables $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and positive real numbers $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we write $X_n = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(a_n)$ if X_n/a_n is bounded in probability, and $X_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(a_n)$ if X_n/a_n converges to zero in probability.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the random-splitting estimators for spike strengths, overlaps, and signal correlation in the symmetric Wigner model, together with their theoretical guarantees. In Section 3, we extend these estimators and results to rectangular matrices. Section 4 reports numerical simulations for the Wigner model. We present the proof strategy and proofs of the main Wigner results in Section 5. The supplementary material contains additional numerical results and proofs of the auxiliary lemmas.

2 Symmetric Wigner Model

2.1 Random-Splitting Estimator

Recall the signal plus noise model defined in (1.1). We first introduce the following rather general assumptions on the noise and signal.

Assumption (A).

(A1) (*Noise moments*) The matrix $X = (X_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ is real symmetric, and the variables $\{X_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}$ are independent. For constants $0 < C_* \leq C^* < \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}X_{ij} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}X_{ij}^2 = t_{ij}, \quad \frac{C_*}{n} \leq t_{ij} \leq \frac{C^*}{n}.$$

Set

$$T := (t_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n, \quad \mathbb{T} := \frac{T}{2}.$$

For every fixed integer $k \geq 1$, there is a constant $C_k < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_n \sup_{i,j \in [n]} \mathbb{E}|\sqrt{n} X_{ij}|^k \leq C_k.$$

(A2) (*Incoherent signal directions*) The deterministic unit vectors $u_1, \dots, u_r$ are orthonormal and satisfy

$$\mu_n := \max_{k \in [r]} \|u_k\|_\infty = \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

(A3) (*Population spikes*) The rank r is fixed. The spike strengths $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_r > 0$ are fixed deterministic numbers, independent of n , and $d_{\max} := d_1 \leq C$ for a fixed constant C . There exists a fixed integer $r_+ \in [r]$ such that, for some fixed $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n ,

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq r_+} \frac{d_k}{2} \geq b_{*,n} + \delta, \quad \max_{r_+ < k \leq r} \frac{d_k}{2} \leq b_{*,n} - \delta, \quad b_{*,n} := \sqrt{\|\mathbb{T}\|_2}.$$

The second condition is omitted when $r_+ = r$.

To estimate the spike strengths, we construct an asymmetric matrix $\mathcal{Y}$ defined in (1.2). Let $\{\lambda_i(\mathcal{Y})\}_{i=1}^{2n}$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$, ordered by decreasing real parts. For $J = \text{diag}(I_n, -I_n)$, the block form of $\mathcal{Y}$ gives $\mathcal{Y}J = -J\mathcal{Y}$. This implies that the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ are symmetric about the origin, and we can label them as

$$\lambda_{i,+}(\mathcal{Y}) := \lambda_i(\mathcal{Y}), \quad \lambda_{i,-}(\mathcal{Y}) := -\lambda_i(\mathcal{Y}), \quad i \in [n].$$

Writing

$$\mathbf{A} = P \circ X, \quad \mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top - P) \circ X, \quad \mathcal{X} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{B} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, P is a symmetric matrix with independent upper triangular Bernoulli(1/2) entries. For $\mathbf{s} \in \{+, -\}$, define

$$\mathbf{u}_{k,\mathbf{s}} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u_k^\top, \mathbf{s}u_k^\top)^\top, \quad \alpha_{k,\mathbf{s}} := \mathbf{s} \frac{d_k}{2}. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $\mathcal{U}$ collect these $2r$ vectors and let $\mathcal{D}$ be the diagonal matrix containing the corresponding values $\alpha_{k,\mathbf{s}}$. We have the following decomposition

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{U}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{U}^\top, \quad \mathcal{E} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{R} \\ -\mathcal{R} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{R} := \left(P - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^\top\right) \circ S. \quad (2.3)$$

Thus, the leading signal has eigenvalues $\pm d_k/2$, while the remainder $\mathcal{R}$ is confined to $\mathcal{E}$. The incoherence condition (A2) makes $\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ (see Lemma 5.1).

Algorithm 1 (Wigner case) Spike estimation by random splitting

Require: A symmetric observation $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a known r_+ .

Ensure: Estimates $\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{r_+}$.

- 1: Draw an independent symmetric mask P with upper triangular entries distributed as Bernoulli(1/2).
- 2: Form $\mathcal{Y}$ as in (1.2).
- 3: Compute the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ and set

$$\hat{d}_k := 2\text{Re } \lambda_{k,+}(\mathcal{Y}), \quad k \in [r_+].$$

- 4: **Return** $\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{r_+}$.
-

Remark 2.1. Our Algorithm 1 assumes that r_+ is known. When r_+ is unknown, one may estimate it by first estimating the bulk edge from eigenvalues whose arguments stay away from the real axis, and then count positive real axis outliers beyond that estimate. Following Bao et al. [2025, Section 2], we define the data-based estimator and the corresponding candidate signal region

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{\max}^s &:= \max_{j \in \llbracket 2n \rrbracket} |\lambda_j(\mathcal{Y})| \mathbb{1} \left\{ \arg \lambda_j(\mathcal{Y}) \in \left[\frac{\pi}{\log(2n)}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right] \right\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_n &:= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} z \geq \lambda_{\max}^s + (2n)^{-1/2}\}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

The sector in (2.4) is designed to avoid the signal outliers, so that $\lambda_{\max}^s$ serves as a data-based estimator for the bulk radius. We identify $\lambda_j(\mathcal{Y})$ as a signal eigenvalue whenever $\lambda_j(\mathcal{Y}) \in \mathcal{D}_n$. More specifically, we estimate r_+ by

$$\hat{r}_+ := \sum_{j=1}^{2n} \mathbb{1} \{ \lambda_j(\mathcal{Y}) \in \mathcal{D}_n \}.$$

Fix $\vartheta \in (0, 1/2)$ and define the error scale

$$\eta_n := n^{-1/2+\vartheta} + d_{\max} \mu_n.\tag{2.5}$$

Assumptions (A2) and (A3) imply $\eta_n = \mathfrak{o}(1)$. The following theorem establishes the consistency of the spike estimator in Algorithm 1.

Theorem 2.2 (Consistency of Algorithm 1). *Under Assumption (A), Algorithm 1 satisfies*

$$\max_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket} |\hat{d}_k - d_k| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Theorem 2.2 is a direct consequence of the following proposition, which establishes a phase transition for the asymmetrized model $\mathcal{Y}$.

Proposition 2.3 (Phase transition). *Suppose that Assumption (A) hold. For every fixed $\kappa \in (0, \delta)$, with probability tending to one, the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq b_{\star, n} + \kappa\}$ consist of exactly $2r_+$ eigenvalues, counted with algebraic multiplicity, and*

$$\max_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket, s \in \{+, -\}} |\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y}) - \alpha_{k,s}| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n),\tag{2.6}$$

where $\alpha_{k,s}$ is defined in (2.2). There are no other eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq b_{\star, n} + \kappa\}$.

2.2 Correlated Spiked Model and Identifiability

For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, observe

$$Y_a = X_a + U_a D_a U_a^\top, \quad D_a = \operatorname{diag}(d_{a1}, \dots, d_{ar}).\tag{2.7}$$

The noise matrices X_1 and X_2 are independent, may have different variance profiles T_1 and T_2 , and each satisfies Assumption (A1). For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, set $\mathbb{T}_a := T_a/2$. For each $a \in \{1, 2\}$, suppose that Assumption (A) holds with (X, U, D, T, r_+) replaced by $(X_a, U_a, D_a, T_a, r_{a,+})$ and $\operatorname{rank}(D_1) = \operatorname{rank}(D_2) = r$. For notational simplicity, we denote $r_a := r_{a,+}$. The quantities $r_1, r_2 \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$ are assumed known and need not be equal. Write $S_a = U_a D_a U_a^\top$ and define the supercritical part by

$$S_{a,+} := \sum_{i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket} d_{ai} u_{a,i} u_{a,i}^\top, \quad U_{a,+} := (u_{a,1}, \dots, u_{a,r_a}).$$

We aim to estimate the overlap matrix between $U_{1,+}$ and $U_{2,+}$:

$$R := U_{1,+}^\top U_{2,+} = (u_{1,k}^\top u_{2,\ell})_{k \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket, \ell \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times r_2}.$$

Since both $U_{1,+}$ and $U_{2,+}$ have orthonormal columns, the singular values of R are the canonical correlations between $\operatorname{span}(U_{1,+})$ and $\operatorname{span}(U_{2,+})$. Writing the principal angles as $0 \leq \theta_{n,1} \leq \dots \leq \theta_{n,\min\{r_1, r_2\}} \leq \pi/2$, we have $\sigma_k(R) = \cos \theta_{n,k}$ for $k \in \llbracket \min\{r_1, r_2\} \rrbracket$. Hence, the entries of R measure the overlap between the two spike subspaces $\operatorname{span}(U_{1,+})$ and $\operatorname{span}(U_{2,+})$.

The sign of entries of R is not identifiable from Y_1 and Y_2 alone. For a positive integer m , define

$$\mathcal{S}_m := \{\text{diag}(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m) : \varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}\}.$$

For $\Xi_1, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_r$, we have $U_a D_a U_a^\top = (U_a \Xi_a) D_a (U_a \Xi_a)^\top$ for $a = 1, 2$, but the overlap matrix R changes to $\Xi_1 R \Xi_2$, while the distribution of the observed data is unchanged. Therefore the identifiable overlap parameters are the entrywise magnitude $|R_{ij}|$.

The projector-based estimator below uses samplewise random splitting to recover a representative of the identifiable sign-equivalence class. Define the equivalence class

$$[R]_\pm := \{\Xi_1 R \Xi_2 : \Xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_1}, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_2}\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Since $[\Xi_1 R \Xi_2]_\pm = [R]_\pm$ for any $\Xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_1}, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_2}$, estimating one representative of $[R]_\pm$ is already sufficient to recover the entire equivalence class. Moreover, each representative of $[R]_\pm$ preserves some quantities of interest, such as $|R_{ij}|$, $R^{\circ 2}$, $\text{rank}(R)$, $\|R\|_F$, and $\|R\|_2$. Also, $(\Xi_1 R \Xi_2)(\Xi_1 R \Xi_2)^\top = \Xi_1 R R^\top \Xi_1^\top$, so $R R^\top$ and the transformed version have identical eigenvalues. Hence, all principal angle information between $\text{span}(U_{1,+})$ and $\text{span}(U_{2,+})$ is preserved. We aim to estimate a representative of $[R]_\pm$ consistently.

Assume that the rank r is known and fixed. For $a = 1, 2$, define

$$b_{*,a,n} := \sqrt{\|\mathbb{T}_a\|_2}, \quad \mu_{a,n} := \max_{i \in \llbracket r \rrbracket} \|u_{a,i}\|_\infty, \quad \eta_{a,n} := n^{-1/2+\vartheta} + d_{a,\max} \mu_{a,n},$$

where $d_{a,\max} := d_{a1} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\mu_{a,n} = \mathfrak{o}(1)$ by Assumption (A2). To guarantee the identifiability of the overlap matrix, we impose the following separation condition.

Assumption (B). For some fixed $\tau > 0$, assume

$$\min_{a \in \llbracket 2 \rrbracket} \min_{i, k \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket, i \neq k} |d_{ai} - d_{ak}| \geq \tau.$$

For each $a \in \llbracket 2 \rrbracket$, the second minimum is interpreted as $+\infty$ when $r_a = 1$.

Remark 2.4. Assumption (B) requires all supercritical spikes to be distinct. To see why this matters for the overlap estimation, suppose that $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$ indexes a block of equal spikes, with $d_{ai} = d$ for each $i \in \mathcal{K}$. Let $m := |\mathcal{K}| \geq 2$, and write $\tilde{U} = (u_{a,i})_{i \in \mathcal{K}}$. For every $m \times m$ orthogonal matrix Q , $(\tilde{U}Q)(\tilde{U}Q)^\top = \tilde{U}\tilde{U}^\top$. Thus, replacing $\tilde{U}$ by $\tilde{U}Q$ leaves the signal matrix unchanged, but the corresponding overlap block becomes $Q^\top R_{\mathcal{K},\cdot}$ or $R_{\cdot,\mathcal{K}}Q$. These rotations can change the individual overlap magnitudes $|R_{ij}|$ while leaving the distribution of the observed data unchanged. Consequently, these magnitudes are not identifiable when there are multiple spiked eigenvalues.

Finally, we introduce a normalized correlation between the supercritical parts of two signal matrices. Denote $\langle A, B \rangle_F := \text{Tr}(A^\top B)$. Define

$$\rho_{\text{sig}} := \frac{\langle S_{1,+}, S_{2,+} \rangle_F}{\|S_{1,+}\|_F \|S_{2,+}\|_F} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{r_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{r_2} d_{1k} d_{2\ell} |u_{1,k}^\top u_{2,\ell}|^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{r_1} d_{1k}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{r_2} d_{2k}^2}}$$

be the normalized correlation between supercritical parts of S_1 and S_2 . It measures the alignment between the two signal matrices, and is invariant under sign changes of the spike directions. When $r_1 = r_2 = 1$, the normalized correlation reduces to the squared overlap between the two spike directions, i.e.,

$$\rho_{\text{sig}} = |u_{1,1}^\top u_{2,1}|^2 = \cos^2 \angle(u_{1,1}, u_{2,1}).$$

2.3 A Projector-Based Overlap Estimator

In this section, we construct estimators for a representative of the sign-equivalence class in (2.8) and ρ_{sig} .

Draw independent masks P_1 and P_2 and form $\mathcal{Y}_1$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2$ by applying (1.2) to Y_1 and Y_2 . For each sample, order the eigenvalues by decreasing real part as $\lambda_{a,(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{a,(2n)}$. For $i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$, select

$$\hat{\lambda}_{a,i,+} := \lambda_{a,(i)}, \quad \hat{\lambda}_{a,i,-} := \lambda_{a,(2n-i+1)}.$$

For each selected eigenvalue, choose the normalized right and left eigenvectors $\tilde{r}_{a,i,s}$ and $\tilde{\ell}_{a,i,s}$ satisfying

$$\|\tilde{r}_{a,i,s}\|_2 = 1, \quad \tilde{\ell}_{a,i,s}^\top \tilde{r}_{a,i,s} = 1,$$

and set $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s} = \tilde{r}_{a,i,s} \tilde{\ell}_{a,i,s}^\top$. Define the estimated direction projector

$$\hat{\Pi}_{a,i} := \left[\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,+} + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,-} \right]_{11}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $[A]_{11}$ is the upper-left $n \times n$ block. At the population level,

$$[\mathbf{u}_{a,i,+} \mathbf{u}_{a,i,+}^\top + \mathbf{u}_{a,i,-} \mathbf{u}_{a,i,-}^\top]_{11} = u_{a,i} u_{a,i}^\top.$$

For $i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket$, define

$$\hat{q}_{ij} := \text{Re Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_{1,i} \hat{\Pi}_{2,j}), \quad \hat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}} := \sqrt{\min\{1, \max\{0, \hat{q}_{ij}\}\}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Abbreviate $\tilde{r}_{a,i} = \tilde{r}_{a,i,+}$ and $\tilde{\ell}_{a,i} = \tilde{\ell}_{a,i,+}$. Choose the sign of each right eigenvector associated with a positive outlier so that its first nonzero coordinate is positive, and write

$$\tilde{r}_{a,i} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{a,i} \\ x'_{a,i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\ell}_{a,i} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{a,i} \\ y'_{a,i} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.11)$$

With the convention $\text{sgn}(0) = 1$, define

$$\hat{R}_{n,ij}^{\text{eqv}} := \text{sgn}(y_{1,i}^\top x_{2,j}) \hat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}}. \quad (2.12)$$

Moreover, set $\hat{d}_{ai} := 2\text{Re } \hat{\lambda}_{a,i,+}$, use the samplewise estimator from Algorithm 1, and define the signal correlation estimator as

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}} := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} \hat{d}_{1i} \hat{d}_{2j} (\hat{R}_{n,ij}^{\text{eqv}})^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \hat{d}_{1i}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{r_2} \hat{d}_{2j}^2}}. \quad (2.13)$$

Algorithm 2 summarizes the overlap and signal correlation estimators.

Algorithm 2 (Wigner case) Overlap and signal correlation estimation

Require: Observed matrices $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and known rank r_1, r_2 .

Ensure: Overlap estimate $\hat{R}_n^{\text{eqv}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times r_2}$ and signal correlation estimate $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$.

- 1: **for** $a = 1, 2$ **do**
 - 2: Draw one independent symmetric Bernoulli mask P_a and form one matrix $\mathcal{Y}_a$ as in (1.2).
 - 3: Compute one eigendecomposition of this same $\mathcal{Y}_a$ and set $\hat{d}_{ai} = 2\text{Re } \hat{\lambda}_{a,i,+}$ for $i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$.
 - 4: From these same outliers, form the normalized and oriented eigenvectors and $\hat{\Pi}_{a,i}$ as in (2.9).
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Compute the magnitudes in (2.10) and signed representatives in (2.11)–(2.12).
 - 7: Compute $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$ from (2.13).
 - 8: **Return** $\hat{R}_n^{\text{eqv}} := (\hat{R}_{n,ij}^{\text{eqv}})_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket}$ and $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$.
-

Theorem 2.5 (Consistency of Algorithm 2). *Consider the matrix model (2.7). For each $a \in \{1, 2\}$, suppose that Assumption (A) holds with (X, U, D, T, r_+) replaced by $(X_a, U_a, D_a, T_a, r_a)$, and suppose that Assumption (B) holds. The overlap estimator satisfies*

$$\min_{\Xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_1}, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_2}} \left\| \hat{R}_n^{\text{eqv}} - \Xi_1 R \Xi_2 \right\|_{\max} = \mathbf{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ denotes the entrywise maximum norm. Moreover, the signal correlation estimator satisfies

$$|\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}} - \rho_{\text{sig}}| = \mathbf{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

The proof of Theorem 2.5 relies on the following proposition, which establishes the consistency of the one-sample empirical projections $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s}$ toward the population projections $\mathcal{P}_{k,s}$ in the sense of bilinear forms.

Suppose that $d_1 > \dots > d_{r_+} > 0$. For $k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket$ and $s \in \{+, -\}$, define the population projection

$$\mathcal{P}_{k,s} := \mathbf{u}_{k,s} \mathbf{u}_{k,s}^*.$$

From the proof of Proposition 2.6, the spiked eigenvalues $\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})$ are algebraically simple and real with probability tending to one. Choose corresponding right and left eigenvectors $\tilde{r}_{k,s}$ and $\tilde{\ell}_{k,s}$ normalized so that

$$\mathcal{Y}\tilde{r}_{k,s} = \lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})\tilde{r}_{k,s}, \quad \mathcal{Y}^*\tilde{\ell}_{k,s} = \lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})\tilde{\ell}_{k,s}, \quad \tilde{\ell}_{k,s}^*\tilde{r}_{k,s} = 1.$$

Define the empirical projection corresponding to $\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})$ by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s} := \tilde{r}_{k,s}\tilde{\ell}_{k,s}^*.$$

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that Assumption (A) hold and that $d_1 > \dots > d_{r_+} > 0$. For every $k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket$, $s \in \{+, -\}$, and deterministic vectors $a_n, b_n \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ with $\|a_n\|_2 \vee \|b_n\|_2 \leq 1$,*

$$a_n^*(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s} - \mathcal{P}_{k,s})b_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (2.14)$$

3 Rectangular Model

In this section, we extend the random-splitting method to the rectangular model. We estimate the supercritical spikes, the overlaps between the corresponding left and right signal directions, and correlation between the supercritical signal parts. To simplify the notations, we reuse some notation from Section 2 if there is no confusion.

We consider the rectangular signal plus noise model

$$Y = X + S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}, \quad S = UDV^T = \sum_{k=1}^r d_k u_k v_k^T,$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ have orthonormal columns. Let P be a $p \times n$ matrix with i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) entries and be independent of X . We construct the asymmetrized matrix

$$\mathcal{Y} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P \circ Y \\ ((\mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_n^T - P) \circ Y)^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

For $k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$ and $s \in \{+, -\}$, define

$$u_{k,s} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u_k^T, s v_k^T)^T, \quad \alpha_{k,s} := s \frac{d_k}{2}. \quad (3.2)$$

Let $\mathcal{U}$ collect these $2r$ orthonormal vectors and let $\mathcal{D}$ be diagonal with entries $\alpha_{k,s}$. Define $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ similarly to (2.1). We have the decomposition

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{U}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{U}^T.$$

Let $T = (t_{ij})_{p \times n}$ be the variance profile and set

$$\mathbb{T} := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T \\ T^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b_{*,n} := \sqrt{\|\mathbb{T}\|_2} = \sqrt{\frac{\|T\|_2}{2}}.$$

For the rectangular model, we impose the following assumptions on the noise and the signals. These assumptions are analogues of Assumption (A) in Section 2.

Assumption (C).

(C1) *(Noise moments) As $p, n \rightarrow \infty$, $p/n \rightarrow \phi \in (0, \infty)$. The variables $\{X_{ij} : i \in \llbracket p \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket\}$ are mutually independent and satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}X_{ij} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}X_{ij}^2 = t_{ij}, \quad \frac{C_*}{n} \leq t_{ij} \leq \frac{C^*}{n}$$

for fixed $0 < C_* \leq C^* < \infty$. For every fixed integer $k \geq 1$, there is a constant $C_k < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_n \max_{i \in \llbracket p \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} \mathbb{E}|\sqrt{n}X_{ij}|^k \leq C_k.$$

(C2) (*Incoherent signal directions*) The deterministic unit vectors $u_1, \dots, u_r \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $v_1, \dots, v_r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are orthonormal and satisfy

$$\mu_{U,n} := \max_{k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket} \|u_k\|_\infty = \mathfrak{o}(1), \quad \mu_{V,n} := \max_{k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket} \|v_k\|_\infty = \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

(C3) (*Population spikes*) The rank r is fixed. The singular spikes $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_r > 0$ are fixed deterministic constants, independent of n , and $d_{\max} := d_1 \leq C$ for a fixed constant C . There exists a fixed integer $r_+ \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$ such that, for some fixed $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n ,

$$\min_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket} \frac{d_k}{2} \geq b_{\star,n} + \delta, \quad \max_{r_+ < k \leq r} \frac{d_k}{2} \leq b_{\star,n} - \delta.$$

The second condition is omitted when $r_+ = r$.

Fix $\vartheta \in (0, 1/2)$ and define the rectangular error scale

$$\eta_n := n^{-1/2+\vartheta} + d_{\max}(\mu_{U,n} + \mu_{V,n}).$$

Under Assumptions (C2)–(C3), $\eta_n = \mathfrak{o}(1)$. The following proposition establishes the rectangular analogue of the phase transition in Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose Assumption (C) hold. For every fixed $\kappa \in (0, \delta)$, with probability tending to one, $\mathcal{Y}$ has exactly $2r_+$ eigenvalues, counted with algebraic multiplicity, in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq b_{\star,n} + \kappa\}$, and*

$$\max_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket, s \in \{+, -\}} |\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y}) - \alpha_{k,s}| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n),$$

where $\alpha_{k,s} = sd_k/2$. There are no other eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq b_{\star,n} + \kappa\}$.

Based on Proposition 3.1, we design Algorithm 3 to estimate the singular spikes by applying the random splitting procedure. The consistency is established in Theorem 3.2.

Algorithm 3 (Rectangular case) Spike estimation by random splitting

Require: A rectangular observation $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and a known rank r_+ .

Ensure: Estimates $\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{r_+}$.

- 1: Draw one independent mask P with i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) entries.
- 2: Form $\mathcal{Y}$ as in (3.1).
- 3: Compute the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ and set

$$\hat{d}_k := 2\operatorname{Re} \hat{\lambda}_{k,+}, \quad k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket.$$

- 4: **Return** $\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{r_+}$.
-

Theorem 3.2 (Consistency of Algorithm 3). *Under Assumption (C), Algorithm 3 produces consistent estimates of the singular spikes:*

$$\max_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket} |\hat{d}_k - d_k| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Theorem 3.2 is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.1.

We next consider the rectangular model for two observed matrices. For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, one observes

$$Y_a = X_a + S_a, \quad S_a = U_a D_a V_a^\top, \quad D_a = \operatorname{diag}(d_{a1}, \dots, d_{ar}), \quad (3.3)$$

where U_a, V_a are deterministic and the X_1, X_2 are independent. Their variance profiles may differ. For each noise matrix, define

$$T_a := (\mathbb{E} X_{a,ij}^2)_{i,j}, \quad \mathbb{T}_a := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T_a \\ T_a^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b_{\star,a,n} := \sqrt{\|\mathbb{T}_a\|_2} = \sqrt{\frac{\|T_a\|_2}{2}}.$$

For each $a \in \{1, 2\}$, suppose that $(X_a, U_a, V_a, D_a, T_a)$ satisfies Assumption (C) with supercritical count $r_{a,+}$. The two signal matrices have the same fixed rank r . For notational simplicity, write $r_a := r_{a,+}$.

The quantities $r_1, r_2 \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$ are assumed known and need not be equal. Define the supercritical signal parts and their left and right singular vectors by

$$S_{a,+} := \sum_{i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket} d_{ai} u_{a,i} v_{a,i}^\top, \quad U_{a,+} := (u_{a,1}, \dots, u_{a,r_a}), \quad V_{a,+} := (v_{a,1}, \dots, v_{a,r_a}).$$

The left and right overlap matrices are

$$R_U := U_{1,+}^\top U_{2,+}, \quad R_V := V_{1,+}^\top V_{2,+}.$$

Define the equivalence classes $[R_U]_+$ and $[R_V]_+$ similarly to (2.8).

Moreover, let the normalized signal correlation between the S_1 and S_2 be

$$\rho_{\text{sig}} := \frac{\langle S_{1,+}, S_{2,+} \rangle_F}{\|S_{1,+}\|_F \|S_{2,+}\|_F} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} d_{1i} d_{2j} (R_U)_{ij} (R_V)_{ij}}{(\sum_{i=1}^{r_1} d_{1i}^2)^{1/2} (\sum_{j=1}^{r_2} d_{2j}^2)^{1/2}}.$$

Our goal is to estimate this correlation and representatives of $[R_U]_+$ and $[R_V]_+$.

Similar to Assumption (B), we also require the following separation condition on the singular spikes.

Assumption (D). For some fixed $\tau > 0$,

$$\min_{a \in \llbracket 2 \rrbracket} \min_{i, j \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket, i \neq j} |d_{ai} - d_{aj}| \geq \tau.$$

For each a , the second minimum is interpreted as $+\infty$ when $r_a = 1$.

Draw independent masks P_1, P_2 with i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) entries, independently of X_1, X_2 . For each $a \in \{1, 2\}$, use P_a to form $\mathcal{Y}_a$ as in (3.1) and write its decomposition as

$$\mathcal{Y}_a = \mathcal{X}_a + \mathcal{E}_a + \mathcal{U}_a \mathcal{D}_a \mathcal{U}_a^\top.$$

For $i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$ and $s \in \{+, -\}$, choose right and left eigenvectors associated with $\hat{\lambda}_{a,i,s}$ normalized by

$$\|\tilde{r}_{a,i,s}\|_2 = 1, \quad \tilde{\ell}_{a,i,s}^\top \tilde{r}_{a,i,s} = 1, \quad (3.4)$$

and set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s} := \tilde{r}_{a,i,s} \tilde{\ell}_{a,i,s}^\top.$$

With $\mathbf{u}_{a,i,s}$ defined by applying (3.2) samplewise, we have

$$\mathbf{u}_{a,i,+} \mathbf{u}_{a,i,+}^\top + \mathbf{u}_{a,i,-} \mathbf{u}_{a,i,-}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} u_{a,i} u_{a,i}^\top & 0 \\ 0 & v_{a,i} v_{a,i}^\top \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

This identity motivates extracting both diagonal blocks from the same pair of empirical outlier projections.

For a $(p+n) \times (p+n)$ matrix M , let $[M]_{11}$ and $[M]_{22}$ denote its upper left $p \times p$ and lower right $n \times n$ blocks. Define

$$\hat{\Pi}_{a,i}^U := [\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,+} + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,-}]_{11}, \quad \hat{\Pi}_{a,i}^V := [\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,+} + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,-}]_{22}. \quad (3.6)$$

Their targets are $u_{a,i} u_{a,i}^\top$ and $v_{a,i} v_{a,i}^\top$. For $i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{q}_{ij}^U &:= \text{Re Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_{1,i}^U \hat{\Pi}_{2,j}^U), & \hat{r}_{ij}^{U,\text{abs}} &:= \sqrt{\min\{1, \max\{0, \hat{q}_{ij}^U\}\}}, \\ \hat{q}_{ij}^V &:= \text{Re Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_{1,i}^V \hat{\Pi}_{2,j}^V), & \hat{r}_{ij}^{V,\text{abs}} &:= \sqrt{\min\{1, \max\{0, \hat{q}_{ij}^V\}\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Choose the sign of each right eigenvector associated with a positive outlier so that its first nonzero coordinate is positive. Change the sign of the corresponding left eigenvector to preserve (3.4), and partition the eigenvectors as

$$\tilde{r}_{a,i,+} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{a,i}^U \\ x_{a,i}^V \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\ell}_{a,i,+} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{a,i}^U \\ y_{a,i}^V \end{pmatrix}.$$

With $\text{sgn}(0) = 1$, define

$$\hat{R}_{ij}^{U,\text{eqv}} := \text{sgn}((y_{1,i}^U)^\top x_{2,j}^U) \hat{r}_{ij}^{U,\text{abs}}, \quad \hat{R}_{ij}^{V,\text{eqv}} := \text{sgn}((y_{1,i}^V)^\top x_{2,j}^V) \hat{r}_{ij}^{V,\text{abs}}. \quad (3.8)$$

Finally, set $\hat{d}_{ai} := 2\text{Re } \hat{\lambda}_{a,i,+}$ for $i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$ and define the signal correlation estimator as

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}} := \frac{\sum_{i,j} \hat{d}_{1i} \hat{d}_{2j} \hat{R}_{ij}^{U,\text{eqv}} \hat{R}_{ij}^{V,\text{eqv}}}{(\sum_i \hat{d}_{1i}^2)^{1/2} (\sum_j \hat{d}_{2j}^2)^{1/2}}. \quad (3.9)$$

The following algorithm summarizes the complete signal correlation estimator for the rectangular case, and its consistency is established in Theorem 3.3.

Algorithm 4 (Rectangular case) Overlap and signal correlation estimation

Require: Two observations $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and known r_1, r_2 .

Ensure: Left/right overlap estimates and the signal correlation estimate $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$.

- 1: **for** $a = 1, 2$ **do**
 - 2: Draw a Bernoulli mask P_a and form $\mathcal{Y}_a$ as in (3.1).
 - 3: Compute the eigendecomposition of $\mathcal{Y}_a$; set $\hat{d}_{ai} = 2\text{Re } \hat{\lambda}_{a,i,+}$ for $i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$.
 - 4: Form the normalized eigenvectors and $\hat{\Pi}_{a,i}^U, \hat{\Pi}_{a,i}^V$ in (3.4)–(3.6).
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: Compute the left/right overlap magnitudes in (3.7) and signed estimates in (3.8).
 - 7: Compute $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$ from (3.9).
 - 8: **Return** $\hat{R}^{U,\text{eqv}}, \hat{R}^{V,\text{eqv}}$, and $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$.
-

Theorem 3.3. Consider the rectangular model (3.3). For each $a \in \llbracket 2 \rrbracket$, suppose that Assumptions (C) and (D) hold for Y_a with its own parameters. Then the left and right overlap estimators satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\Xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_1}, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_2}} \left\| \hat{R}^{U,\text{eqv}} - \Xi_1 R_U \Xi_2 \right\|_{\max} &= \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \\ \min_{\Xi_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_1}, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{r_2}} \left\| \hat{R}^{V,\text{eqv}} - \Xi_1 R_V \Xi_2 \right\|_{\max} &= \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

The signal correlation estimator satisfies

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}} - \rho_{\text{sig}} = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

4 Numerical Simulations

This section perform a Monte Carlo simulation for the proposed estimators in Algorithms 1–2. Additional simulation results for Propositions 2.3 and 3.1 and Algorithms 3–4 are provided in Supplementary Material.

Common setup For each configuration, use $n \in \{250, 500, 750, 1000\}$ and $B = 500$ independent data replications. Taking $\kappa \in \{1, 4, 8\}$ and define the variance profile $T^{(\kappa)}$ as follows:

$$T^{(\kappa)} = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa J_{n/2} & J_{n/2} \\ J_{n/2} & J_{n/2} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $J_m := \mathbf{1}_m \mathbf{1}_m^\top$. For $T = (t_{ij}) \in \{T^{(\kappa)}, \kappa = 1, 4, 8\}$, set $\mathbb{T} := T/2$ and $b_{\star,n} := \sqrt{\|\mathbb{T}\|_2}$. For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, generate the noise matrix X by $X_{ij} = \sqrt{t_{ij}} \xi_{ij}$, $X_{ji} = X_{ij}$. In the primary experiment, the variables ξ_{ij} are independent standard Gaussian variables. In the robustness experiment, replace them with independent Rademacher variables satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\xi_{ij} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{ij} = -1) = 1/2$. For every use of random splitting, draw $P_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Bernoulli}(1/2)$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ and set $P_{ji} = P_{ij}$. All auxiliary masks are independent of the observations and are redrawn independently across replications.

Set $m = n/2$. For $i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket$ and $k \in \llbracket r-1 \rrbracket$, define the orthonormal vectors by

$$h_1(i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}, \quad h_{k+1}(i) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m}} \cos\left\{ \frac{\pi k(i-1/2)}{m} \right\},$$

where $h_k(i)$ denotes the i -th entry of h_k . Then, let

$$u_k = (\sqrt{0.9} h_k^\top, \sqrt{0.1} h_k^\top)^\top, \quad k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket.$$

These vectors satisfy the required incoherence condition (A2).

4.1 Simulation for Algorithm 1

We use two different variance profiles $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(4)}$. Set $r = 3$ and $U = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$. Consider the normalized spike configuration $\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$ and $(2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$. With $d_k = 2b_{*,n}\gamma_k$ and $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, d_3)$, form $Y = X + UDU^\top$ and apply Algorithm 1 for $n \in \{250, 500, 750, 1000\}$ to assess its finite-sample performance.

Let $\hat{d}_k^{(b)}$ denote the estimate returned in replication b . We report the mean absolute error and empirical standard deviation

$$\widehat{\text{MAE}}_k := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B |\hat{d}_k^{(b)} - d_k|, \quad \widehat{\text{SD}}_k := \left[\frac{1}{B-1} \sum_{b=1}^B (\hat{d}_k^{(b)} - \bar{d}_k)^2 \right]^{1/2},$$

where $\bar{d}_k := B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \hat{d}_k^{(b)}$ denotes the mean of estimates.

The simulation results are summarized in Table 1. It reports the mean absolute errors and empirical standard deviations for Algorithm 1 under the homogeneous and heterogeneous variance profiles for both normalized spike configurations. Each entry has the form $\widehat{\text{MAE}}_k$ ($\widehat{\text{SD}}_k$). For both normalized spike configurations and variance profiles, $\widehat{\text{MAE}}_k$ and $\widehat{\text{SD}}_k$ generally decrease as n increases. The Gaussian and Rademacher results are close, indicating the robustness of the proposed estimator.

We also compare Algorithm 1 with two alternative methods. For readers's convenience, we provide a brief description of each method. To our knowledge, there are no existing methods for estimating spikes for Wigner type matrices under a general variance profile. Both methods are designed for the homogeneous noise setting. For the comparison, we set $r = 1$ and $d_1 = 2b_{*,n}\gamma$ with $\gamma = 1.50$, and use $T^{(\kappa)}$ for $\kappa \in \{1, 4, 8\}$ under both Gaussian and Rademacher noise at $n = 1000$.

- [Bykhovskaya et al. \[2025\]](#)'s BGS25 estimator: This estimator is based on the classical deformed Wigner outlier map. Let $\lambda_1(Y) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(Y)$, and let $\ell \approx 0.81$ be the positive number satisfying

$$\int_{-2}^{-\ell} \frac{\sqrt{4-x^2}}{2\pi} dx = \int_{\ell}^2 \frac{\sqrt{4-x^2}}{2\pi} dx = \frac{1}{4},$$

and set

$$\sigma_0^2 := \int_{-\ell}^{\ell} \frac{x^2 \sqrt{4-x^2}}{2\pi} dx.$$

They estimate the noise variance by

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 := \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2 n} \sum_{i=\lfloor n/4 \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor 3n/4 \rfloor} \lambda_i(Y)^2.$$

The proposed estimator for d_k is

$$\hat{d}_{k,\text{BGS25}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda_k(Y) + \sqrt{\lambda_k(Y)^2 - 4\hat{\sigma}^2}}{2}, & \lambda_k(Y) > 2\hat{\sigma}, \\ 0, & \lambda_k(Y) \leq 2\hat{\sigma}. \end{cases}$$

- The second comparison method is based on the outlier equation for an additive finite rank perturbation. [Benaych-Georges and Nadakuditi \[2011\]](#) show that a supercritical population spike d and its associated sample spike λ satisfies $d + 1/m(\lambda) = 0$, where $m(\lambda)$ denotes the Stieltjes transform of the noise eigenvalue distribution. We estimate $m(z)$ from the empirical bulk spectrum after deleting the leading r eigenvalues:

$$\hat{m}(z) := \frac{1}{n-r} \sum_{j=r+1}^n \frac{1}{\lambda_j(Y) - z}.$$

Then, we define the spike estimator by

$$\hat{d}_{k,\text{BGN11}} := -\frac{1}{\hat{m}(\lambda_k(Y))}.$$

The closely related method was proposed by [Bai and Ding \[2012\]](#) and [Fan et al. \[2020\]](#) for the spiked covariance model and spiked correlation model, respectively.

The simulation results for the comparison methods are summarized in Figure 1. At $n = 1000$, the three estimators have similar distributions under $T^{(1)}$, whereas Algorithm 1 is centered much closer to the target under $T^{(4)}$ and $T^{(8)}$ for both noise laws.

4.2 Simulation for Algorithm 2

Set $r = 2$ and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0.8 & 0.3 \\ -0.2 & 0.6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R(\omega) := \omega \frac{A}{\|A\|_2}, \quad \omega \in \{0.25, 0.60, 0.90\}.$$

For each ω , let

$$U_1 = (u_1, u_2), \quad U_2 = U_1 R(\omega) + (u_3, u_4) (I_2 - R(\omega)^T R(\omega))^{1/2},$$

where the square root is the positive semidefinite square root. Then $U_1^T U_1 = U_2^T U_2 = I_2$ and $U_1^T U_2 = R(\omega)$, and columns of U_1 and U_2 satisfy the incoherence condition (A2). Use $D_1 = \text{diag}(5, 4)$, $D_2 = \text{diag}(6, 4.5)$, and the profile pairs

$$(T_1, T_2) \in \{(T^{(1)}, T^{(1)}), (T^{(1)}, T^{(4)}), (T^{(4)}, T^{(4)})\}.$$

Generate X_1 and X_2 independently and form $Y_a = X_a + U_a D_a U_a^T$ for $a \in \{1, 2\}$. The three values of ω represent weak, moderate, and strong subspace overlap, respectively. For every configuration, $\|R(\omega)\|_2 = \omega < 1$. This matrix has nonzero off-diagonal entries and therefore tests recovery of the full overlap matrix. The corresponding population signal correlations ρ_{sig} are 0.0510, 0.2939, and 0.6612, respectively. Generate $B = 500$ independent replications and apply Algorithm 2 to estimate the overlap matrix $R(\omega)$ and the signal correlation ρ_{sig} .

For each replication b , define

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{eqv}}^{(b)} := \min_{\Xi_1, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2} \left\| \widehat{R}_n^{\text{eqv}, (b)} - \Xi_1 R(\omega) \Xi_2 \right\|_{\max}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{\text{sig}}^{(b)} := \left| \widehat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}^{(b)} - \rho_{\text{sig}} \right|.$$

We report the mean errors $B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{E}_{\text{eqv}}^{(b)}$ and $B^{-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{E}_{\text{sig}}^{(b)}$, see Tables 2 and 3. For both metrics, every variance-profile pair and value of ω exhibits a decrease in mean error as n increases, and the Gaussian and Rademacher results are close.

n	Homogeneous $T^{(1)}$			Heterogeneous $T^{(4)}$		
	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$
$\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$						
Gaussian						
250	0.0860 (0.1037)	0.1070 (0.1195)	0.1602 (0.1469)	0.1534 (0.1895)	0.1807 (0.2097)	0.2653 (0.2474)
500	0.0599 (0.0723)	0.0686 (0.0798)	0.0994 (0.1119)	0.1066 (0.1341)	0.1183 (0.1430)	0.1934 (0.2058)
750	0.0465 (0.0581)	0.0557 (0.0669)	0.0771 (0.0941)	0.0893 (0.1123)	0.1011 (0.1224)	0.1415 (0.1651)
1000	0.0424 (0.0519)	0.0503 (0.0601)	0.0670 (0.0799)	0.0762 (0.0946)	0.0875 (0.1061)	0.1203 (0.1410)
Rademacher						
250	0.0909 (0.1084)	0.1021 (0.1124)	0.1608 (0.1483)	0.1460 (0.1788)	0.1661 (0.1947)	0.2657 (0.2496)
500	0.0604 (0.0739)	0.0698 (0.0830)	0.1045 (0.1135)	0.1051 (0.1330)	0.1232 (0.1482)	0.1931 (0.2079)
750	0.0495 (0.0609)	0.0550 (0.0659)	0.0789 (0.0920)	0.0860 (0.1071)	0.0969 (0.1204)	0.1516 (0.1764)
1000	0.0408 (0.0512)	0.0480 (0.0565)	0.0614 (0.0781)	0.0799 (0.1003)	0.0886 (0.1090)	0.1164 (0.1415)
$\gamma = (2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$						
Gaussian						
250	0.0854 (0.1013)	0.0836 (0.1028)	0.2302 (0.1391)	0.1551 (0.1877)	0.1494 (0.1803)	0.3848 (0.2405)
500	0.0580 (0.0710)	0.0625 (0.0723)	0.1271 (0.0825)	0.1151 (0.1437)	0.1135 (0.1272)	0.2438 (0.1653)
750	0.0482 (0.0589)	0.0535 (0.0581)	0.0977 (0.0631)	0.0920 (0.1130)	0.0979 (0.1080)	0.1855 (0.1259)
1000	0.0404 (0.0506)	0.0515 (0.0527)	0.0836 (0.0578)	0.0753 (0.0940)	0.0893 (0.0947)	0.1469 (0.1010)
Rademacher						
250	0.0906 (0.1082)	0.0772 (0.0928)	0.2188 (0.1331)	0.1551 (0.1870)	0.1506 (0.1825)	0.4023 (0.2506)
500	0.0594 (0.0733)	0.0611 (0.0688)	0.1239 (0.0816)	0.1057 (0.1345)	0.1217 (0.1353)	0.2461 (0.1704)
750	0.0473 (0.0588)	0.0501 (0.0540)	0.0988 (0.0662)	0.0889 (0.1118)	0.0974 (0.1069)	0.1819 (0.1264)
1000	0.0403 (0.0499)	0.0475 (0.0492)	0.0781 (0.0547)	0.0736 (0.0907)	0.0906 (0.0878)	0.1385 (0.0981)

Table 1: Mean absolute errors and empirical standard deviations, shown in parentheses, for Algorithm 1 under the homogeneous profile $T^{(1)}$ (left) and heterogeneous profile $T^{(4)}$ (right), for two normalized spike configurations, based on $B = 500$ replications.




Figure 1: Violin plots of the normalized spike estimates $\hat{d}_1/d_1$ at $n = 1000$ for Algorithm 1, BGS25, and EmpM under $T^{(1)}$, $T^{(4)}$, and $T^{(8)}$, with Gaussian noise (top) and Rademacher noise (bottom). Each violin is based on $B = 500$ replications; the embedded boxplot shows the median and interquartile range, and the dashed horizontal line marks the target value 1. The normalized spike strength is $\gamma = 1.50$.

n	$(T^{(1)}, T^{(1)})$			$(T^{(1)}, T^{(4)})$			$(T^{(4)}, T^{(4)})$		
	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$
Gaussian									
250	0.0397	0.0495	0.0658	0.0583	0.0708	0.0885	0.0804	0.1038	0.1230
500	0.0270	0.0337	0.0438	0.0403	0.0485	0.0620	0.0549	0.0700	0.0901
750	0.0206	0.0273	0.0347	0.0302	0.0400	0.0489	0.0435	0.0595	0.0718
1000	0.0177	0.0228	0.0302	0.0275	0.0326	0.0421	0.0372	0.0478	0.0617
Rademacher									
250	0.0409	0.0483	0.0636	0.0600	0.0726	0.0865	0.0778	0.1050	0.1296
500	0.0262	0.0343	0.0453	0.0403	0.0493	0.0570	0.0555	0.0717	0.0912
750	0.0210	0.0274	0.0347	0.0311	0.0382	0.0497	0.0434	0.0568	0.0734
1000	0.0181	0.0241	0.0307	0.0265	0.0337	0.0434	0.0380	0.0470	0.0627

Table 2: Mean sign-equivalence-class errors for the Wigner overlap estimator in Algorithm 2 under three variance-profile pairs, based on $B = 500$ replications.

n	$(T^{(1)}, T^{(1)})$			$(T^{(1)}, T^{(4)})$			$(T^{(4)}, T^{(4)})$		
	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$
Gaussian									
250	0.0051	0.0119	0.0252	0.0077	0.0171	0.0286	0.0108	0.0235	0.0370
500	0.0036	0.0077	0.0131	0.0053	0.0118	0.0173	0.0069	0.0148	0.0226
750	0.0029	0.0061	0.0102	0.0042	0.0096	0.0127	0.0054	0.0128	0.0168
1000	0.0025	0.0053	0.0078	0.0037	0.0074	0.0108	0.0052	0.0114	0.0145
Rademacher									
250	0.0054	0.0110	0.0246	0.0081	0.0172	0.0301	0.0101	0.0247	0.0394
500	0.0037	0.0079	0.0143	0.0055	0.0117	0.0174	0.0072	0.0155	0.0236
750	0.0030	0.0063	0.0095	0.0044	0.0089	0.0130	0.0061	0.0117	0.0176
1000	0.0026	0.0056	0.0077	0.0036	0.0078	0.0103	0.0050	0.0111	0.0143

Table 3: Mean absolute errors of the Wigner signal correlation estimator $\hat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}$ in Algorithm 2 under three variance-profile pairs, based on $B = 500$ replications.

5 Proof Strategy for the Spiked Wigner Model

5.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

We start from the decomposition in (2.3). The $\mathcal{U}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{U}^\top$ term has the desired eigenvalues $\alpha_{k,s} = sd_k/2$. The following lemma controls the remainder $\mathcal{E}$ in the decomposition (2.3).

Lemma 5.1. *Recall the definition of $\mathcal{E}$ in (2.3). Suppose that Assumption (A2) and (A3) hold, then*

$$\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu_n) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Since $\mathcal{X}$ is non-Hermitian, its eigenvalues cannot be controlled directly by a Hermitian local law. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, using Girko's Hermitization trick [Girko, 1985], we analyze the spectrum of $\mathcal{X}$ by introducing the $4n \times 4n$ Hermitian linearization

$$H_z := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{X} - zI_{2n} \\ (\mathcal{X} - zI_{2n})^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.1)$$

For any $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^+$, the resolvent of H_z is denoted by

$$\mathfrak{G}_z(\zeta) := (H_z - \zeta I_{4n})^{-1}.$$

The eigenvalues of H_z are the signed singular values of $\mathcal{X} - zI_{2n}$. In particular, z is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{X}$ if and only if zero is an eigenvalue of H_z .

Following Ajanki et al. [2019a], we will show that the resolvent $\mathfrak{G}_z(\zeta)$ can be approximated by a deterministic matrix $M_z(\zeta)$, which is the unique solution with positive imaginary part to the matrix Dyson equation (MDE)

$$-M_z(\zeta)^{-1} = \zeta I_{4n} - \mathbb{E}H_z + \mathcal{S}[M_z(\zeta)], \quad \mathcal{S}[B] := \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}B\mathcal{H}], \quad (5.2)$$

where $\mathcal{H} := H_z - \mathbb{E}H_z$.

Lemma 5.2 (MDE solution). *The MDE solution to (5.2) has the form*

$$M_z(\zeta) = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & 0 & M_{13} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{11} & 0 & M_{13} \\ M_{31} & 0 & M_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{31} & 0 & M_{11} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $M_{11} = \text{diag}(m_{z,1}(\zeta), \dots, m_{z,n}(\zeta))$, $M_{13} = \text{diag}(w_{z,1}(\zeta), \dots, w_{z,n}(\zeta))$, and $M_{31} = \text{diag}(\tilde{w}_{z,1}(\zeta), \dots, \tilde{w}_{z,n}(\zeta))$ are diagonal matrices, with

$$\begin{aligned} m_{z,i}(\zeta) &= -\frac{\zeta + a_{z,i}(\zeta)}{(\zeta + a_{z,i}(\zeta))^2 - |z|^2}, & a_{z,i}(\zeta) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{T}_{ik} m_{z,k}(\zeta), \\ w_{z,i}(\zeta) &= \frac{z}{(\zeta + a_{z,i}(\zeta))^2 - |z|^2}, & \tilde{w}_{z,i}(\zeta) &= \frac{\bar{z}}{(\zeta + a_{z,i}(\zeta))^2 - |z|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

The explicit coordinate representation in Lemma 5.2 is the starting point for the support analysis in Lemma 5.3. It reduces the matrix valued MDE to the scalar system (5.3), whose stability near zero determines whether the self consistent density has a gap around the origin. Set $N := 4n$ and let ν_z be the self consistent density of states associated with M_z , defined by

$$\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} M_z(\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{x - \zeta} d\nu_z(x). \quad (5.4)$$

The following lemma shows that the support of the self-consistent density is away from 0 by a distance of δ' .

Lemma 5.3. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Under Assumption (A1), there exists $\delta'(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\text{dist}(0, \text{supp } \nu_z) > \delta'(\varepsilon)$$

for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| > b_{*,n} + \varepsilon$.

Throughout the remainder of the paper, we adopt the notion of stochastic domination notation introduced by Erdős et al. [2013].

Definition 5.4 (Stochastic domination). Let

$$\xi = (\xi_N(u) : N \in \mathbb{N}, u \in \mathcal{I}_N), \quad \chi = (\chi_N(u) : N \in \mathbb{N}, u \in \mathcal{I}_N)$$

be two families of real random variables, where χ is nonnegative and $\mathcal{I}_N$ is a possibly N -dependent parameter set. We say that ξ is *stochastically dominated* by χ , uniformly in u , if, for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$ and large $D > 0$, there exists $N_0(\varepsilon, D)$ such that

$$\sup_{u \in \mathcal{I}_N} \mathbb{P}(|\xi_N(u)| > N^\varepsilon \chi_N(u)) \leq N^{-D}$$

for all $N \geq N_0(\varepsilon, D)$. We write $\xi = \mathcal{O}_{\prec}(\chi)$ or $\xi \prec \chi$ when ξ is stochastically dominated by χ uniformly in u . If ξ and χ are deterministic, then $\xi \prec \chi$ means that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|\xi_N(u)| \leq N^\varepsilon \chi_N(u)$$

uniformly in u for all sufficiently large $N \geq N_0(\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 5.5 (Local law of H_z). Fix $C_z < \infty$ and assume that $|z| \leq C_z$. Fix $\tau > 0$ and define

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{out}}^\tau := \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^+ : |\zeta| \leq N^{C_0}, \text{dist}(\zeta, \text{supp } \nu_z) \geq N^{-\tau}\},$$

where $C_0 > 100$ is an arbitrary fixed constant. Under Assumption (A1),

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{out}}^\tau} (1 + |\zeta|)^2 |x^*(\mathfrak{G}_z(\zeta) - M_z(\zeta))y| \prec \frac{\|x\|_2 \|y\|_2}{\sqrt{N}}$$

for deterministic vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^N$, and

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{out}}^\tau} (1 + |\zeta|)^2 \left| \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}[B(\mathfrak{G}_z(\zeta) - M_z(\zeta))] \right| \prec \frac{\|B\|_2}{N}$$

for every deterministic matrix $B \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$.

Proof. The lemma is actually a consequence of the local law of Erdős et al. [2019, Theorem 2.1] applied to (5.1). One needs to check if our model satisfies the Assumptions (A)–(D) in Erdős et al. [2019]. Especially, we shall verify some cumulant and correlation decay conditions for our matrix entries. Such verification is deferred to Section B.6 of the supplement. $\square$

For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\varrho(\mathcal{X}) < |z|$, define

$$G(z) := (z^2 I - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B})^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{G}(z) := (z^2 I - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A})^{-1}. \quad (5.5)$$

Notice that $G(z)\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}\mathcal{G}(z)$ and $\mathbf{B}G(z) = \mathcal{G}(z)\mathbf{B}$. Using these identities, the resolvent of $\mathcal{X}$ can be expressed in block form as

$$(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X})^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} zG(z) & G(z)\mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{B}G(z) & z\mathcal{G}(z) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.6)$$

The following lemma shows that the smallest singular values of $z - \mathcal{X}$ and $z - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}$ are bounded away from 0.

Lemma 5.6. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C < \infty$, let

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : b_{*,n} + \varepsilon \leq |z| \leq C\}. \quad (5.7)$$

Under Assumption (A1), there exists $\gamma_{\varepsilon,C} > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}} \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X}) \geq \gamma_{\varepsilon,C} \quad (5.8)$$

with probability tending to one. Consequently, if the matrix $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies $\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, then

$$\inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}} \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}$$

with probability tending to one.

Equation (5.6) and Lemma 5.5 yield the following general quadratic form estimates.

Lemma 5.7 (Quadratic form estimate). *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C < \infty$, and let $\mathcal{K}_n$ be any deterministic compact subset of the annulus $\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$ defined in (5.7). Under Assumption (A1), for every pair of deterministic vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfying $\|x\|_2 \vee \|y\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(1)$,*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} |x^* \{G(z) - z^{-2} I_n\} y| \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad \sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} |x^* \{\mathcal{G}(z) - z^{-2} I_n\} y| \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad (5.9)$$

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} |x^* \mathbf{B}G(z) y| \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad \sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} |x^* \mathbf{A}G(z) y| \prec n^{-1/2}. \quad (5.10)$$

Lemma 5.7 is used directly in the outlier analysis and is also an input to Lemma 5.8.

By Lemmas 5.1 and 5.6, $zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}$ is invertible with high probability for $z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$. Set

$$\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) := (zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E})^{-1}. \quad (5.11)$$

The following lemma shows that the projected resolvent of $\mathcal{X}$ is close to its deterministic limit uniformly over the exterior annulus.

Lemma 5.8 (Resolvent estimates). *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $C < \infty$, and let $\mathcal{K}_n$ be any deterministic compact subset of the annulus $\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$ defined in (5.7). Suppose that Assumptions (A1)–(A2) hold, that r is fixed, and $d_{\max} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Then, for every deterministic unit vector $a \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$,*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} \left\| a^* \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathcal{U} - \frac{1}{z} a^* \mathcal{U} \right\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n).$$

Here η_n is defined in (2.5), and $\mathcal{U}$ is the signal basis defined in (2.2).

Lemma 5.8 follows from the block inverse (5.6), the resolvent identity, Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7.

5.2 Proof of Proposition 2.3

Recall the decomposition (2.3) and the definition of $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z)$ from (5.11). Set

$$F_n(z) := I_{2r} - \mathcal{D} \mathcal{U}^T \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathcal{U}, \quad F_0(z) := I_{2r} - \frac{1}{z} \mathcal{D}.$$

A standard norm bound for Wigner type matrices [Erdős and Mühlbacher, 2019, Corollary 1.2], the deterministic bounds

$$\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{S}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{r}}{2} d_{\max} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{U} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{U}^T\|_2 = \frac{d_{\max}}{2},$$

and (2.3) give a deterministic $C < \infty$ such that, for every fixed $D > 0$ and all sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{Y}\|_2 \geq C) \leq n^{-D}. \quad (5.12)$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and work on $\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$ (see (5.7)). With probability tending to one, Lemmas 5.1 and 5.6 make $zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}$ uniformly invertible on $\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$. Applying Lemma 5.8 implies that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}} \|F_n(z) - F_0(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n). \quad (5.13)$$

The deterministic function has the explicit determinant

$$\det F_0(z) = \prod_{k=1}^r \prod_{s \in \{+, -\}} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{k,s}}{z}\right), \quad (5.14)$$

so its only exterior zeros are the signed spike locations $\alpha_{k,s}$.

Let

$$\Lambda_+ := \{\alpha_{k,s} : k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket, s \in \{+, -\}\}$$

be the set of distinct signed spike locations. Let $\delta > 0$ be constant in Assumption (A3). Fix $\kappa \in (0, \delta)$ and take $\varepsilon = \kappa$ in the annulus $\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$. Increase the deterministic norm cutoff C if necessary so that

$\max_{\alpha \in \Lambda_+} |\alpha| < C$. For each $\alpha \in \Lambda_+$, let m_α be the multiplicity of α as a zero of $\det F_0$. The equation (5.14) shows that α is a zero of $\det F_0$ of order m_α , and $\sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_+} m_\alpha = 2r_+$. Fix $\zeta > 0$. Equation (5.13) gives $M \equiv M_\zeta < \infty$ such that, for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C}} \|F_n(z) - F_0(z)\|_2 \leq M\eta_n \right) \geq 1 - \zeta.$$

Let $\Omega_n(M)$ be the intersection of the event in the previous probability bound and

$$\left\{ \inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C}} \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\kappa,C} \right\} \cap \{\|\mathcal{Y}\|_2 < C\}.$$

Lemmas 5.1 and 5.6 and the bound (5.12) give

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n(M)) \geq 1 - \zeta - \mathfrak{o}(1).$$

On this event, the determinant factorization (5.16) holds there.

Set $c_r := 2^{1/(2r)} - 1$ and choose $C_\eta > CM/c_r$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t > 0$, set $D_\alpha(t) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \alpha| < t\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{W}_n := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Lambda_+} D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n)$$

Since $\eta_n = \mathfrak{o}(1)$, we have $C_\eta\eta_n < \delta - \kappa$ for all sufficiently large n , and then the closed disks $\overline{D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n)}$ lie in $\mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C}$, and they are pairwise disjoint. For $z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C} \setminus \mathcal{W}_n$, if $k \leq r_+$, then $\alpha_{k,s} \in \Lambda_+$, and hence $|z - \alpha_{k,s}| \geq C_\eta\eta_n$; if $k > r_+$, then Assumption (A3) and the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C}$ give $|z - \alpha_{k,s}| \geq |z| - |\alpha_{k,s}| \geq \delta + \kappa$. Consequently, for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\|F_0(z)^{-1}\|_2 = \max_{k,s} \frac{|z|}{|z - \alpha_{k,s}|} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{C}{C_\eta\eta_n}, \frac{C}{\delta + \kappa} \right\} = \frac{C}{C_\eta\eta_n}.$$

Consequently, on $\Omega_n(M)$,

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C} \setminus \mathcal{W}_n} \|F_0(z)^{-1}\{F_n(z) - F_0(z)\}\|_2 \leq \frac{CM}{C_\eta} < c_r < 1. \quad (5.15)$$

Hence, for $z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,C} \setminus \mathcal{W}_n$, the matrix

$$F_n(z) = F_0(z) [I_{2r} + F_0(z)^{-1}\{F_n(z) - F_0(z)\}]$$

is invertible, and thus $\det F_n(z) \neq 0$.

For each $\alpha \in \Lambda_+$, both F_n and F_0 are analytic on a neighborhood of $\overline{D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n)}$ on $\Omega_n(M)$. Set

$$K_n(z) := F_0(z)^{-1}\{F_n(z) - F_0(z)\}, \quad z \in \partial D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n).$$

The bound (5.15) gives

$$\sup_{z \in \partial D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n)} \|K_n(z)\|_2 < c_r = 2^{1/2r} - 1,$$

and

$$F_n(z) = F_0(z)\{I_{2r} + K_n(z)\}, \quad z \in \partial D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n).$$

Writing $\lambda_1(K_n(z)), \dots, \lambda_{2r}(K_n(z))$ for the eigenvalues of $K_n(z)$ and using $|\lambda_j(K_n(z))| \leq \|K_n(z)\|_2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\det\{I_{2r} + K_n(z)\} - 1| &= \left| \prod_{j=1}^{2r} \{1 + \lambda_j(K_n(z))\} - 1 \right| \\ &\leq \{1 + \|K_n(z)\|_2\}^{2r} - 1 \\ &< (1 + c_r)^{2r} - 1 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $z \in \partial D_\alpha(C_\eta\eta_n)$,

$$|\det F_n(z) - \det F_0(z)| = |\det F_0(z)| |\det\{I_{2r} + K_n(z)\} - 1| < |\det F_0(z)|.$$

Rouché's theorem shows that $\det F_n$ and $\det F_0$ have the same number of zeros inside $D_\alpha(C_\eta \eta_n)$, counted with multiplicity. This disk contains no zero of $\det F_0$ other than α , whose order is m_α . Hence it contains exactly m_α zeros of $\det F_n$, counted with multiplicity.

On $\Omega_n(M)$, the matrix determinant lemma gives

$$\det(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{Y}) = \det(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}) \det F_n(z), \quad z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,\mathbb{C}}. \quad (5.16)$$

Since $zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}$ is invertible on $\mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,\mathbb{C}}$, the order of each zero of $\det F_n$ equals its order as a zero of $\det(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{Y})$. Collecting the eigenvalues in $D_\alpha(C_\eta \eta_n)$ for $\alpha \in \Lambda_+$, and repeating them according to algebraic multiplicity, we may label them as $\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})$ for $k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket$ and $s \in \{+, -\}$, so that, on $\Omega_n(M)$,

$$\max_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket, s \in \{+, -\}} |\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y}) - \alpha_{k,s}| \leq C_\eta \eta_n.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n(M)) \geq 1 - \zeta - \mathfrak{o}(1)$ and $\zeta > 0$ was arbitrary, this proves (2.6).

Since $\sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_+} m_\alpha = 2r_+$, there are exactly $2r_+$ eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{n,\kappa,\mathbb{C}}$ and no others there. The norm cutoff gives $|\lambda| \leq \|\mathcal{Y}\|_2 < C$ for every eigenvalue λ of $\mathcal{Y}$. Therefore, there are exactly $2r_+$ eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Y}$ in $\{z : |z| \geq b_{*,n} + \kappa\}$ and no others there.

5.3 Proof of Proposition 2.6

Fix $k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket$ and $s \in \{+, -\}$. Choose a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$. Assumption (A3) then gives $b_{*,n} + \varepsilon < \min_{k \in \llbracket r_+ \rrbracket} d_k/2$ for all sufficiently large n . Set

$$\Delta_{k,s} := 1 \wedge |\alpha_{k,s}| \wedge (|\alpha_{k,s}| - b_{*,n} - \varepsilon) \wedge \min_{\substack{\ell \in \llbracket r \rrbracket, t \in \{+, -\} \\ (\ell, t) \neq (k, s)}} |\alpha_{k,s} - \alpha_{\ell,t}|, \quad (5.17)$$

$$D_{k,s} := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \alpha_{k,s}| < \frac{\Delta_{k,s}}{4} \right\}, \quad \Gamma_{k,s} := \partial D_{k,s}. \quad (5.18)$$

The contour $\Gamma_{k,s}$ is positively oriented. The spike locations $\alpha_{k,s}$ are pairwise distinct, so Assumption (A3) implies that $\Delta_{k,s}$ is bounded away from zero for all sufficiently large n , uniformly in (k, s) . Consequently, $\eta_n = \mathfrak{o}(1)$ gives

$$\eta_n = \mathfrak{o}(\Delta_{k,s})$$

uniformly in (k, s) . Proposition 2.3 and $\eta_n = \mathfrak{o}(\Delta_{k,s})$ imply that, with probability tending to one, the disk $D_{k,s}$ contains exactly one eigenvalue of $\mathcal{Y}$, and $\Gamma_{k,s}$ contains none. Hence this eigenvalue is algebraically simple with probability tending to one.

Since the spectrum of $\mathcal{Y}$ is finite, there exists an open neighborhood $U_{k,s}$ of $\overline{D_{k,s}}$ such that $U_{k,s} \cap \text{spec}(\mathcal{Y}) = \{\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})\}$. For $z \in U_{k,s} \setminus \{\lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})\}$, the resolvent has the following Laurent expansion

$$(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{Y})^{-1} = \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s}}{z - \lambda_{k,s}(\mathcal{Y})} + H_{k,s}(z),$$

where $H_{k,s}$ is analytic on $U_{k,s}$. The Cauchy residue theorem therefore gives

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_{k,s}} (zI_{2n} - \mathcal{Y})^{-1} dz = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s}. \quad (5.19)$$

Lemmas 5.1 and 5.6 also imply that $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z)$ is analytic on $U_{k,s}$. Set

$$L(z) := \mathcal{D}^{-1} - \mathcal{U}^* \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathcal{U}, \quad L_0(z) := \mathcal{D}^{-1} - \frac{1}{z} I_{2r}, \quad K_0(z) := L_0(z)^{-1}.$$

The definition of $D_{k,s}$ in (5.18) therefore gives

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|K_0(z)\|_2 = \sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \max_{\ell, t} \left| \frac{z \alpha_{\ell,t}}{z - \alpha_{\ell,t}} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\Delta_{k,s}}. \quad (5.20)$$

Write $E(z) := L(z) - L_0(z)$. Lemma 5.8 yields

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|E(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta_n). \quad (5.21)$$

This, together with (5.20) and (5.21), implies that

$$q_n := \sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|K_0(z)E(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{\eta_n}{\Delta_{k,s}}\right) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

For every $z \in \Gamma_{k,s}$,

$$L(z) = L_0(z)\{I_{2r} + K_0(z)E(z)\}.$$

On the event $\{q_n \leq 1/2\}$, the Neumann series gives

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|\{I_{2r} + K_0(z)E(z)\}^{-1}\|_2 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q_n^j \leq \frac{1}{1-q_n} \leq 2.$$

Because $q_n = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, this event has probability tending to one. Hence $L(z)$ is invertible on $\Gamma_{k,s}$ with probability tending to one, and

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|L(z)^{-1}\|_2 = \sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|\{I_{2r} + K_0(z)E(z)\}^{-1}K_0(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Delta_{k,s}^{-1}) \quad (5.22)$$

on this event, where the last inequality uses (5.20). The resolvent identity then gives

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{k,s}} \|L(z)^{-1} - K_0(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{\eta_n}{\Delta_{k,s}^2}\right). \quad (5.23)$$

The Woodbury identity and the analyticity of $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$ reduce the integral (5.19) to

$$a_n^* \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s} b_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_{k,s}} a_n^* \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathcal{U} L(z)^{-1} \mathcal{U}^* \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) b_n \, dz. \quad (5.24)$$

Lemma 5.8, Equation (5.23), and $|\Gamma_{k,s}| = \pi \Delta_{k,s}/2$ give

$$a_n^* \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,s} b_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_{k,s}} \frac{1}{z^2} a_n^* \mathcal{U} K_0(z) \mathcal{U}^* b_n \, dz + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{\eta_n}{\Delta_{k,s}}\right).$$

Since $0 \notin \overline{D_{k,s}}$ and $\alpha_{\nu} \in D_{k,s}$ exactly when $\nu = (k, s)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_{k,s}} \frac{\alpha_{\nu}}{z(z - \alpha_{\nu})} \, dz = \mathbf{1}\{\nu = (k, s)\}.$$

Summing these residues gives $a_n^* \mathcal{P}_{k,s} b_n$, which proves (2.14).

5.4 Proof of Theorem 2.5

Fix $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \tau)$ and, for $a \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket$, and $s \in \{+, -\}$, set

$$\alpha_{a,i,s} := s \frac{d_{ai}}{2}, \quad \mathbf{u}_{a,i,s} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} u_{a,i} \\ s u_{a,i} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Define $\Delta_{a,i,s}$ analogously to (5.17) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$, reference radius $b_{*,a,n}$, and all $2r$ signed spike locations $\{\alpha_{a,k,t} : k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket, t \in \{+, -\}\}$, where $\alpha_{a,k,t} = t d_{ak}/2$ for every $k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$. By Assumptions (A) and (B), we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{a,i,s} \Delta_{a,i,s} > 0, \quad \max_{a,i,s} \frac{\eta_{a,n}}{\Delta_{a,i,s}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.25)$$

For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$ be the event that, for every $k \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$ and $t \in \{+, -\}$, the disk centered at $\alpha_{a,k,t}$ with radius $\Delta_{a,k,t}/4$ contains exactly one eigenvalue of $\mathcal{Y}_a$, counted with algebraic multiplicity. Applying Proposition 2.3 to sample a and using (5.25), we obtain

$$\frac{\max_{k,t} |\hat{\lambda}_{a,k,t} - \alpha_{a,k,t}|}{\min_{k,t} \Delta_{a,k,t}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\max_{k,t} \frac{\eta_{a,n}}{\Delta_{a,k,t}}\right) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus, with probability tending to one, every selected eigenvalue lies in its corresponding disk. These $2r_a$ disks are pairwise disjoint and contained in $\{z : |z| > b_{*,a,n} + \varepsilon_0\}$. The exact exterior count

in Proposition 2.3, applied with $\kappa = \varepsilon_0$, then implies that each disk contains exactly one eigenvalue, counted with algebraic multiplicity. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{a,n}^c) = \mathfrak{o}(1). \quad (5.26)$$

On $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$, every selected eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}_{a,i,s}$ is algebraically simple. It is also real. Indeed, $\mathcal{Y}_a$ is real, and the disk centered at the real number $\alpha_{a,i,s}$ is invariant under complex conjugation. If $\hat{\lambda}_{a,i,s}$ were nonreal, its distinct complex conjugate would lie in the same disk, contradicting the definition of $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$.

We next verify that the eigenvector normalization in the estimator is well defined. For any real, algebraically simple eigenvalue, let r_0 and ℓ_0 be nonzero real right and left eigenvectors, respectively, and set

$$A := \mathcal{Y}_a - \hat{\lambda}_{a,i,s} I_{2n}.$$

Then

$$Ar_0 = 0, \quad \ker(A^\top) = \text{span}\{\ell_0\}.$$

If $\ell_0^\top r_0 = 0$, then r_0 is orthogonal to $\ker(A^\top)$ and hence belongs to the column space of A . Thus $Av = r_0$ for some v , while $Ar_0 = 0$. This gives a Jordan chain of length two and contradicts algebraic simplicity. Therefore $\ell_0^\top r_0 \neq 0$. After normalizing r_0 and rescaling ℓ_0 , we may impose

$$\|r_0\|_2 = 1, \quad \ell_0^\top r_0 = 1.$$

It follows that the eigenvector convention in the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}$ is well defined on $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$. On this event, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}$ is the rank one Riesz projection appearing in Proposition 2.6.

Lemma 5.9. *For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \in \llbracket r \rrbracket$, and $s \in \{+, -\}$, define*

$$\mathcal{P}_{a,i,s} := \mathbf{u}_{a,i,s} \mathbf{u}_{a,i,s}^\top, \quad \Pi_{a,i} := u_{a,i} u_{a,i}^\top,$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}} := \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s} - \mathcal{P}_{a,i,s}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{a,i} := \hat{\Pi}_{a,i} - \Pi_{a,i}.$$

Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.5,

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}}) \leq 2, \quad \|\mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_{a,i}) \leq 3, \quad \|\mathcal{E}_{a,i}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.27)$$

For every fixed $\eta > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{x,y \in \mathbb{C}^{2n} \\ \|x\|_2 \vee \|y\|_2 \leq 1}} \mathbb{P}(|x^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}} y| > \eta) = \mathfrak{o}(1), \quad (5.28)$$

and the analogous assertion holds for $\mathcal{E}_{a,i}$ and deterministic vectors in $\mathbb{C}^n$. If x_n, y_n are independent of (X_a, P_a) and satisfy $\|x_n\|_2 \vee \|y_n\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, then

$$x_n^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i} y_n = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad x_n^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}} y_n = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.29)$$

Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 5.9 therefore apply to each sample. Write $\hat{\Pi}_{a,i} = \Pi_{a,i} + \mathcal{E}_{a,i}$. For fixed i, j ,

$$\text{Tr}(\hat{\Pi}_{1,i} \hat{\Pi}_{2,j}) - \text{Tr}(\Pi_{1,i} \Pi_{2,j}) = \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{1,i} \Pi_{2,j}) + \text{Tr}(\Pi_{1,i} \mathcal{E}_{2,j}) + \text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{1,i} \mathcal{E}_{2,j}).$$

The first two terms are $\mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ by the deterministic-vector part of Lemma 5.9. For the third term, condition on sample 1 and take a singular value decomposition

$$\mathcal{E}_{1,i} = \sum_{k=1}^3 \sigma_k a_k b_k^*,$$

where zero singular values are added if necessary. Then

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{1,i} \mathcal{E}_{2,j}) = \sum_{k=1}^3 \sigma_k b_k^* \mathcal{E}_{2,j} a_k.$$

The vectors a_k, b_k are independent of X_2, P_2 . Lemma 5.9 shows that every bilinear form in the sum is $\mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. The same lemma gives $\max_k \sigma_k = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and hence

$$\text{Tr}(\mathcal{E}_{1,i} \mathcal{E}_{2,j}) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Finally,

$$\text{Tr}(\Pi_{1,i}\Pi_{2,j}) = (u_{1,i}^\top u_{2,j})^2 = R_{ij}^2.$$

Taking real parts gives

$$\max_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} |\widehat{q}_{ij} - R_{ij}^2| = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.30)$$

Let

$$\mathbf{c}(x) := \min\{1, \max\{0, x\}\}.$$

Since $R_{ij}^2 \in [0, 1]$, projection onto $[0, 1]$ and the inequality $|\sqrt{x} - \sqrt{y}| \leq \sqrt{|x - y|}$ for $x, y \geq 0$ give

$$|\widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}} - |R_{ij}|| \leq \sqrt{|\mathbf{c}(\widehat{q}_{ij}) - R_{ij}^2|} \leq \sqrt{|\widehat{q}_{ij} - R_{ij}^2|}.$$

This, together with (5.30), gives

$$\max_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} |\widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}} - |R_{ij}|| = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.31)$$

Set

$$h_{a,i} := \mathbf{u}_{a,i,+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} u_{a,i} \\ u_{a,i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad J_1 := \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad c_{a,i} := h_{a,i}^\top \widetilde{r}_{a,i,+}.$$

Lemma 5.9 gives

$$c_{a,i} \widetilde{\ell}_{a,i,+}^\top h_{a,i} = 1 + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \|\widetilde{\ell}_{a,i,+}\|_2 = \|\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,+}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

The bounds above and the fact that r is fixed imply that the event

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \left\{ \min_{a,i} |c_{a,i}| > 0 \right\}$$

has probability tending to one, and $c_{a,i}^{-1} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ on $\mathcal{C}_n$. On this event, for deterministic or independent $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ test vectors v , by Lemma 5.9,

$$\mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = h_{a,i}^\top (\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,+} - h_{a,i} h_{a,i}^\top) v = c_{a,i} \widetilde{\ell}_{a,i,+}^\top v - h_{a,i}^\top v,$$

which gives

$$\widetilde{\ell}_{a,i,+}^\top v = c_{a,i}^{-1} h_{a,i}^\top v + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Similarly, we have

$$v^\top \widetilde{r}_{a,i,+} = c_{a,i} v^\top h_{a,i} + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Applying these relations successively across the two independent samples yields

$$y_{1,i}^\top x_{2,j} = \widetilde{\ell}_{1,i,+}^\top J_1 \widetilde{r}_{2,j,+} = \frac{1}{2} c_{1,i}^{-1} c_{2,j} R_{ij} + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

If $|R_{ij}|$ is bounded away from zero, we get

$$\text{sgn}(y_{1,i}^\top x_{2,j}) = \text{sgn}(c_{1,i}) \text{sgn}(c_{2,j}) \text{sgn}(R_{ij}) \quad (5.32)$$

with probability tending to one. Equation (5.31) provides the estimate

$$\widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}} = |R_{ij}| + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Combining this magnitude with the sign in (5.32) gives, for entries bounded away from zero,

$$\widehat{R}_{n,ij}^{\text{eqv}} := \text{sgn}(y_{1,i}^\top x_{2,j}) \widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}} = \text{sgn}(c_{1,i}) \text{sgn}(c_{2,j}) R_{ij} + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

If R_{ij} tends to zero, no stable sign estimate is needed because $\widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}}$ also tends to zero. By convention, we set $\text{sgn}(0) = 1$.

Define $\Xi_{a,n} = \text{diag}(\text{sgn}(c_{a,1}), \dots, \text{sgn}(c_{a,r_a}))$. For any fixed $\delta > 0$, (5.32) holds simultaneously for all entries satisfying $|R_{ij}| \geq \delta$ with probability tending to one. For the remaining entries, (5.31) bounds the error caused by an arbitrary sign by $2\delta + \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Letting $\delta \downarrow 0$ and using that r is fixed yield

$$\left\| \widehat{R}_n^{\text{eqv}} - \Xi_{1,n} R \Xi_{2,n} \right\|_{\max} = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

which implies the first assertion of Theorem 2.5.

It remains to prove the asserted consistency of the signal correlation estimator. By (2.12) and (5.31),

$$\max_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} \left| (\widehat{R}_{n,ij}^{\text{eqv}})^2 - R_{ij}^2 \right| \leq 2 \max_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} \left| \widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}} - |R_{ij}| \right| = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (5.33)$$

where we used that both $\widehat{r}_{ij}^{\text{abs}}$ and $|R_{ij}|$ belong to $[0, 1]$. Applying Theorem 2.2 to Y_1 and Y_2 gives

$$\max_{a \in \{1,2\}} \max_{i \in \llbracket r \rrbracket} |\widehat{d}_{ai} - d_{ai}| = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5.34)$$

Set

$$\widehat{N}_n := \sum_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket} \sum_{j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} \widehat{d}_{1i} \widehat{d}_{2j} (\widehat{R}_{n,ij}^{\text{eqv}})^2, \quad N_n := \sum_{i \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket} \sum_{j \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket} d_{1i} d_{2j} R_{ij}^2,$$

and

$$\widehat{A}_{a,n} := \left(\sum_{i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket} \widehat{d}_{ai}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad A_a := \left(\sum_{i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket} d_{ai}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

The estimates (5.33) and (5.34) imply

$$|\widehat{N}_n - N_n| = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad |\widehat{A}_{a,n} - A_a| \leq \left(\sum_{i \in \llbracket r_a \rrbracket} (\widehat{d}_{ai} - d_{ai})^2 \right)^{1/2} = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

In particular, $A_1 A_2 > 0$ and $\widehat{A}_{1,n} \widehat{A}_{2,n}$ is bounded away from zero with probability tending to one. Moreover, $|N_n| = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Therefore, using (2.13) and the definition of ρ_{sig} ,

$$|\widehat{\rho}_{\text{sig}} - \rho_{\text{sig}}| \leq \frac{|\widehat{N}_n - N_n|}{\widehat{A}_{1,n} \widehat{A}_{2,n}} + |N_n| \left| \frac{1}{\widehat{A}_{1,n} \widehat{A}_{2,n}} - \frac{1}{A_1 A_2} \right| = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

which proves the remaining assertion of Theorem 2.5.

Acknowledgement

Z. Bao would like to thank Yizhe Zhu for helpful discussions and references. Z. Bao, Y. Li and J. Qiu are partially supported by Hong Kong RGC Grant GRF 17304225 and 17303826. K. Cheong is partially supported by Hong Kong PhD Fellowship Scheme (HKPFS).

AI usage declaration

The project started in January 2026 and was largely completed in June 2026. All statistical methodology and mathematical derivations are the authors' own. Nevertheless, since June 2026, we have used ChatGPT 5.6 to generate more simulation code, polish the writing, and check the proofs.

Supplementary Material for “Spike Estimation from Heteroscedastic Noise via Random Splitting”

A Additional Simulation Results

This section provides additional simulation results for Propositions 2.3 and 3.1, and Algorithms 3 and 4 in the main text.

A.1 Simulations for Propositions 2.3 and 3.1

We compare the Wigner and rectangular models through a common normalized-spike design. Every panel uses $n = 1000$, standard Gaussian noise, an independent Bernoulli(1/2) splitting mask, and one realization; hence no Monte Carlo averaging is used. In the rectangular model, we set $p = 3n/5 = 600$.

For $J_{a,b} := \mathbf{1}_a \mathbf{1}_b^\top$ and $\kappa \in \{1, 4\}$, define

$$T_{a,n}^{(\kappa)} = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa J_{a/2,n/2} & J_{a/2,n/2} \\ J_{a/2,n/2} & J_{a/2,n/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus $T^{(\kappa)} := T_{n,n}^{(\kappa)}$ is the Wigner profile, whereas $T_{\text{rec}}^{(\kappa)} := T_{p,n}^{(\kappa)}$ is its rectangular analogue. The choice $\kappa = 1$ is homogeneous, while $\kappa = 4$ increases the variance in the upper left block. For a selected profile $T = (t_{ij})$, the noise entries have the form $X_{ij} = \sqrt{t_{ij}} \xi_{ij}$ with standard Gaussian ξ_{ij} . In the Wigner model, the upper triangular entries of X and of the mask are generated independently and then symmetrized. In the rectangular model, all entries of X and of the $p \times n$ mask are generated independently.

For each even $a \in \{p, n\}$, put $m_a = a/2$ and, for $i \in \llbracket m_a \rrbracket$, define

$$h_1^{(a)}(i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_a}}, \quad h_{k+1}^{(a)}(i) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m_a}} \cos\left\{\frac{\pi k(i-1/2)}{m_a}\right\}, \quad k \in \{1, 2\}.$$

The block-oriented directions are

$$g_k^{(a)} = \left(\sqrt{0.9} (h_k^{(a)})^\top, \sqrt{0.1} (h_k^{(a)})^\top \right)^\top, \quad k \in \{1, 2, 3\}.$$

For each a , these vectors are orthonormal, and every vector has squared mass 0.9 in its first half and 0.1 in its second half. In the Wigner model, we take $U = (g_1^{(n)}, \dots, g_r^{(n)})$ and $S = UDU^\top$. In the rectangular model, we take $U = (g_1^{(p)}, \dots, g_r^{(p)})$, $V = (g_1^{(n)}, \dots, g_r^{(n)})$, and $S = UDV^\top$.

For both $\kappa = 1$ and $\kappa = 4$, the rank one experiment uses $\gamma_1 \in \{0.80, 1.20, 1.60\}$ and is shown for the Wigner and rectangular models in Figures 2 and 4, respectively. The rank-three experiment appears in Figures 3 and 5. In both models, the distinct-spike configuration is $\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$, while the repeated-spike configuration is $\gamma = (2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$, with $d_2 = d_3$.


A.2 Simulation for Algorithms 3 and 4

Common setup We use a rectangular analogue of the design in Section 4. For each configuration, take $n \in \{250, 500, 750, 1000\}$, $p = 3n/5$, and $B = 500$ independent data replications. For $J_{a,b} := \mathbf{1}_a \mathbf{1}_b^\top$ and $\kappa \in \{1, 4\}$, define


$$T_{\text{rec}}^{(\kappa)} = \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa J_{p/2,n/2} & J_{p/2,n/2} \\ J_{p/2,n/2} & J_{p/2,n/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$ is homogeneous, whereas $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$ increases the variance in the upper-left block. For a selected profile $T = (t_{ij})$, set

$$\mathbb{T} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T \\ T^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b_{\star,n} = \sqrt{\|\mathbb{T}\|_2} = \sqrt{\frac{\|T\|_2}{2}},$$




(a) Homogeneous variance profile



(b) Heterogeneous variance profile


Figure 2: Single-spike phase transition under the homogeneous variance profile $T^{(1)}$ (top row) and the heterogeneous variance profile $T^{(4)}$ (bottom row). From left to right, $\gamma_1 \in \{0.80, 1.20, 1.60\}$. The light-blue points ($\bullet$) show the spectrum of $\mathcal{Y}$, the dotted black circle marks $|z| = b_{*,n}$, the red stars ($\star$) mark the theoretical locations $\pm d_1/2$ in the supercritical panels, and the blue points ($\bullet$) mark the matched outliers.




(a) Homogeneous variance profile

(b) Heterogeneous variance profile

Figure 3: Outlier locations for distinct and repeated rank-three spikes. The top row uses $\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$, and the bottom row uses $\gamma = (2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$. The left and right columns correspond to $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(4)}$, respectively. The plotting symbols have the same meanings as in Figure 2.




(a) Homogeneous rectangular variance profile



(b) Heterogeneous rectangular variance profile

Figure 4: Single-spike phase transition in the rectangular model with $n = 1000$ and $p = 600$, under $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$ (top) and $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$ (bottom). From left to right, $\gamma_1 \in \{0.80, 1.20, 1.60\}$. The plotting symbols have the same meanings as in Figure 2.



(a) Homogeneous rectangular variance profile

(b) Heterogeneous rectangular variance profile

Figure 5: Rectangular outlier locations for distinct and repeated rank-three spikes with $n = 1000$ and $p = 600$. The top row uses $\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$, and the bottom row uses $\gamma = (2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$. The left and right panels correspond to $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$ and $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$, respectively. The plotting symbols have the same meanings as in Figure 2.

and independently generate $X_{ij} = \sqrt{t_{ij}} \xi_{ij}$ for $i \in [p]$ and $j \in [n]$. As in Section 4, the primary and robustness experiments use independent standard Gaussian and Rademacher variables ξ_{ij} , respectively. Every auxiliary mask has i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) entries, is independent of the observations, and is redrawn across replications and samples.

For each even $a \in \{p, n\}$, put $m_a = a/2$ and, for $i \in [m_a]$, define

$$h_1^{(a)}(i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_a}}, \quad h_{k+1}^{(a)}(i) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{m_a}} \cos\left\{\frac{\pi k(i-1/2)}{m_a}\right\},$$

for the required values of k . The block-oriented directions are

$$g_k^{(a)} = \left(\sqrt{0.9} (h_k^{(a)})^\top, \sqrt{0.1} (h_k^{(a)})^\top \right)^\top.$$

For each a , the vectors $g_k^{(a)}$ are orthonormal, satisfy Assumption (C2), and have squared mass 0.9 in the first half and 0.1 in the second half.

Simulation for Algorithm 3

Set $r = 3$,

$$U = (g_1^{(p)}, g_2^{(p)}, g_3^{(p)}), \quad V = (g_1^{(n)}, g_2^{(n)}, g_3^{(n)}),$$

and consider $\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$ and $\gamma = (2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$. For each variance profile, set $d_k = 2b_{*,n}\gamma_k$, let $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, d_3)$, generate $Y = X + UDV^\top$, and apply Algorithm 3.

Table 4 reports the mean absolute errors and empirical standard deviations for Algorithm 3; each entry has the form $\widehat{\text{MAE}}_k(\widehat{\text{SD}}_k)$. For every fixed spike configuration, variance profile, noise law, and component k , both quantities decrease monotonically over the four values of n . The Gaussian and Rademacher results are close.

We also compare Algorithm 3 with two other rectangular spike estimators. For readers' convenience, we briefly summarize the comparison methods below.

- [Shabalin and Nobel \[2013\]](#)'s SN13 estimator: They assume homogeneous Gaussian noise and estimates the noise variance by

$$\widehat{\sigma}_R^2 := \frac{\|Y\|_F^2}{p}.$$

Let $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_p$ be the singular values of Y , and set

$$A_k := s_k^2 - \widehat{\sigma}_R^2(1 + \phi_n), \quad \phi_n := p/n.$$

The proposed estimator is

$$\widehat{d}_{k,\text{SN13}} = \begin{cases} \left\{ \frac{A_k + \sqrt{A_k^2 - 4\phi_n \widehat{\sigma}_R^4}}{2} \right\}^{1/2}, & s_k > \widehat{\sigma}_R(1 + \sqrt{\phi_n}), \\ 0, & s_k \leq \widehat{\sigma}_R(1 + \sqrt{\phi_n}). \end{cases}$$

- [Nadakuditi \[2014\]](#)'s OptShrink estimator: For $z > s_{r+1}$, form the empirical left and companion transforms

$$\widehat{a}_r(z) := \frac{1}{p-r} \sum_{j=r+1}^p \frac{z}{z^2 - s_j^2}, \quad \widehat{b}_r(z) := \frac{1}{n-r} \left\{ \sum_{j=r+1}^p \frac{z}{z^2 - s_j^2} + \frac{n-p}{z} \right\},$$

and set

$$\widehat{D}_r(z) := \widehat{a}_r(z) \widehat{b}_r(z), \quad \widehat{d}_{k,\text{OptShrink}} := \widehat{D}_r(s_k)^{-1/2}.$$

We assign zero if $\widehat{D}_r(s_k)$ is nonpositive or nonfinite.

The SN13 estimator is correctly specified for $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$. The OptShrink estimator requires bi-orthogonally invariant noise matrix, that is, $X \stackrel{d}{=} UXV^\top$ for any orthogonal U and V .

For numerical simulation, we set $r = 1$ and $d_1 = 2b_{*,n}\gamma$ with $\gamma = 1.50$. In addition to $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$ and $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$, include $T_{\text{rec}}^{(8)}$, defined by the same block-profile formula with $\kappa = 8$, under both noise laws at $(p, n) = (600, 1000)$. Figure 6 shows the violin plots of the normalized spike estimates $\widehat{d}_1/d_1$ to compare Algorithm 3 with SN13 and OptShrink. At $(p, n) = (600, 1000)$, all estimators have similar distributions under $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$, whereas Algorithm 3 is much closer to 1 under $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$ and $T_{\text{rec}}^{(8)}$ for both noise laws.

Simulation for Algorithm 4

Set $r = 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= (g_1^{(p)}, g_2^{(p)}), & U_2 &= U_1 R_U(\omega) + (g_3^{(p)}, g_4^{(p)})(I_2 - R_U(\omega)^\top R_U(\omega))^{1/2}, \\ V_1 &= (g_1^{(n)}, g_2^{(n)}), & V_2 &= V_1 R_V(\omega) + (g_3^{(n)}, g_4^{(n)})(I_2 - R_V(\omega)^\top R_V(\omega))^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

To vary the overlap strength while retaining nonzero off-diagonal entries, take

$$A_U = \begin{pmatrix} 0.8 & 0.3 \\ -0.2 & 0.6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_V = \begin{pmatrix} 0.7 & -0.1 \\ 0.4 & 0.6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_U(\omega) = \omega \frac{A_U}{\|A_U\|_2}, \quad R_V(\omega) = \omega \frac{A_V}{\|A_V\|_2},$$

with $\omega \in \{0.25, 0.60, 0.90\}$. Thus $U_1^\top U_2 = R_U(\omega)$, $V_1^\top V_2 = R_V(\omega)$, and both overlap matrices have operator norm $\omega < 1$.

Use the variance-profile pairs

$$(T_1, T_2) \in \{(T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}), (T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}), (T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)})\}.$$

For sample $a \in \{1, 2\}$, let $b_{\star, a, n} = \sqrt{\|T_a\|_2/2}$, use the distinct normalized singular strengths

$$\gamma_1 = (2.00, 1.60), \quad \gamma_2 = (2.20, 1.70), \quad d_{ai} = 2b_{\star, a, n}\gamma_{ai},$$

generate X_1 and X_2 independently, and form $Y_a = X_a + U_a D_a V_a^\top$ with $D_a = \text{diag}(d_{a1}, d_{a2})$.

Apply Algorithm 4 to each replication and record

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{\text{eqv}}^{(b)} &:= \min_{\Xi_1, \Xi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2} \max \left\{ \|\widehat{R}^{U, \text{eqv}, (b)} - \Xi_1 R_U(\omega) \Xi_2\|_{\max}, \|\widehat{R}^{V, \text{eqv}, (b)} - \Xi_1 R_V(\omega) \Xi_2\|_{\max} \right\}, \\ \mathbf{E}_{\text{sig}}^{(b)} &:= |\widehat{\rho}_{\text{sig}}^{(b)} - \rho_{\text{sig}}|. \end{aligned}$$

We report $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{eqv}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{E}_{\text{eqv}}^{(b)}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{sig}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{E}_{\text{sig}}^{(b)}$ in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. For each fixed variance-profile pair, noise law, and overlap strength ω , both quantities decrease monotonically over the four values of n . The Gaussian and Rademacher results are close.

n	Homogeneous $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$			Heterogeneous $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$		
	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$
$\gamma = (2.00, 1.60, 1.30)$						
Gaussian						
250	0.0735 (0.0722)	0.0938 (0.0951)	0.1244 (0.1248)	0.1276 (0.1407)	0.1610 (0.1702)	0.1962 (0.2041)
500	0.0487 (0.0546)	0.0593 (0.0649)	0.0722 (0.0876)	0.0836 (0.0990)	0.1049 (0.1154)	0.1255 (0.1530)
750	0.0386 (0.0453)	0.0439 (0.0481)	0.0561 (0.0667)	0.0679 (0.0802)	0.0797 (0.0918)	0.1010 (0.1223)
1000	0.0311 (0.0381)	0.0374 (0.0421)	0.0447 (0.0556)	0.0548 (0.0663)	0.0676 (0.0789)	0.0871 (0.1076)
Rademacher						
250	0.0711 (0.0744)	0.0943 (0.0961)	0.1215 (0.1240)	0.1295 (0.1428)	0.1589 (0.1750)	0.2143 (0.2164)
500	0.0479 (0.0562)	0.0557 (0.0619)	0.0722 (0.0786)	0.0843 (0.0987)	0.1044 (0.1193)	0.1268 (0.1484)
750	0.0371 (0.0425)	0.0447 (0.0493)	0.0598 (0.0693)	0.0681 (0.0789)	0.0808 (0.0950)	0.1049 (0.1228)
1000	0.0315 (0.0384)	0.0367 (0.0424)	0.0447 (0.0520)	0.0584 (0.0722)	0.0674 (0.0799)	0.0824 (0.1025)
$\gamma = (2.00, 1.50, 1.50)$						
Gaussian						
250	0.0710 (0.0745)	0.0704 (0.0851)	0.1441 (0.1018)	0.1368 (0.1562)	0.1187 (0.1450)	0.2465 (0.1823)
500	0.0490 (0.0539)	0.0438 (0.0543)	0.0820 (0.0587)	0.0846 (0.0984)	0.0805 (0.0998)	0.1384 (0.1097)
750	0.0379 (0.0449)	0.0357 (0.0445)	0.0637 (0.0483)	0.0693 (0.0826)	0.0661 (0.0817)	0.0981 (0.0892)
1000	0.0313 (0.0371)	0.0299 (0.0374)	0.0518 (0.0393)	0.0586 (0.0712)	0.0605 (0.0733)	0.0883 (0.0738)
Rademacher						
250	0.0719 (0.0739)	0.0652 (0.0793)	0.1424 (0.0982)	0.1292 (0.1447)	0.1219 (0.1508)	0.2454 (0.1765)
500	0.0507 (0.0549)	0.0446 (0.0548)	0.0840 (0.0602)	0.0859 (0.0974)	0.0774 (0.0982)	0.1516 (0.1150)
750	0.0358 (0.0420)	0.0353 (0.0440)	0.0581 (0.0456)	0.0667 (0.0808)	0.0655 (0.0795)	0.1049 (0.0866)
1000	0.0318 (0.0362)	0.0302 (0.0379)	0.0501 (0.0403)	0.0571 (0.0704)	0.0566 (0.0668)	0.0921 (0.0760)

Table 4: Mean absolute errors and empirical standard deviations, shown in parentheses, for Algorithm 3 under the homogeneous and heterogeneous rectangular variance profiles, for two normalized singular spike configurations, based on $B = 500$ replications.




Figure 6: Violin plots of the normalized spike estimates $\hat{d}_1/d_1$ at $(p, n) = (600, 1000)$ for Algorithm 3, SN13, and OptShrink under $T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}$, $T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}$, and $T_{\text{rec}}^{(8)}$, with Gaussian noise (top) and Rademacher noise (bottom). Each violin is based on $B = 500$ replications; the embedded boxplot shows the median and interquartile range, and the dashed horizontal line marks the target value 1. The normalized singular spike strength is $\gamma = 1.50$.

n	$(T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)})$			$(T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)})$			$(T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)})$		
	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$
Gaussian									
250	0.1299	0.1522	0.1788	0.1386	0.1689	0.1961	0.1562	0.1918	0.2248
500	0.0836	0.0982	0.1165	0.0929	0.1086	0.1293	0.1039	0.1218	0.1486
750	0.0677	0.0762	0.0958	0.0735	0.0848	0.1041	0.0824	0.0988	0.1166
1000	0.0536	0.0663	0.0786	0.0625	0.0729	0.0891	0.0719	0.0840	0.1026
Rademacher									
250	0.1265	0.1480	0.1816	0.1375	0.1647	0.1960	0.1466	0.1874	0.2207
500	0.0817	0.0959	0.1183	0.0918	0.1060	0.1238	0.1027	0.1205	0.1506
750	0.0646	0.0803	0.0891	0.0737	0.0862	0.1016	0.0836	0.1010	0.1177
1000	0.0562	0.0657	0.0781	0.0609	0.0727	0.0860	0.0721	0.0847	0.0992

Table 5: Mean absolute errors $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{eqv}}$ for Algorithm 4 under three rectangular variance-profile pairs, based on $B = 500$ replications.

n	$(T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)})$			$(T_{\text{rec}}^{(1)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)})$			$(T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)}, T_{\text{rec}}^{(4)})$		
	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$	$\omega = 0.25$	$\omega = 0.60$	$\omega = 0.90$
Gaussian									
250	0.0113	0.0279	0.0611	0.0114	0.0328	0.0667	0.0149	0.0369	0.0698
500	0.0068	0.0166	0.0328	0.0073	0.0183	0.0362	0.0086	0.0220	0.0423
750	0.0053	0.0137	0.0239	0.0058	0.0142	0.0256	0.0065	0.0166	0.0299
1000	0.0043	0.0118	0.0188	0.0052	0.0136	0.0225	0.0057	0.0149	0.0244
Rademacher									
250	0.0106	0.0272	0.0604	0.0112	0.0301	0.0645	0.0137	0.0389	0.0725
500	0.0064	0.0184	0.0325	0.0073	0.0184	0.0337	0.0081	0.0223	0.0419
750	0.0051	0.0129	0.0236	0.0058	0.0144	0.0254	0.0065	0.0169	0.0313
1000	0.0045	0.0112	0.0187	0.0048	0.0128	0.0210	0.0059	0.0134	0.0234

Table 6: Mean absolute errors $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\text{sig}}$ for Algorithm 4 under three rectangular variance-profile pairs, based on $B = 500$ replications.

B Proofs of Lemmas

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

By (2.3), $\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = \|\mathcal{R}\|_2$. Let Q be the upper triangular matrix with entries

$$Q_{ij} := \begin{cases} (P_{ij} - 1/2)S_{ij}, & i < j, \\ \frac{1}{2}(P_{ii} - 1/2)S_{ii}, & i = j, \\ 0, & i > j. \end{cases}$$

Then $\mathcal{R} = Q + Q^\top$, and the entries of Q are independent and centered. By [Latała, 2004, Theorem 2],

$$\mathbb{E}\|Q\|_2 \lesssim \max_i \left(\sum_j \mathbb{E}|Q_{ij}|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \max_j \left(\sum_i \mathbb{E}|Q_{ij}|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}|Q_{ij}|^4 \right)^{1/4}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Since $S = UDU^\top$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n S_{ij}^2 = (S^2)_{ii} = \sum_{k=1}^r d_k^2 u_k(i)^2 \leq r d_{\max}^2 \mu_n^2,$$

where $u_k(i)$ is the i -th entry of the vector u_k . The same bound holds for each column because S is symmetric. As $\mathbb{E}|P_{ij} - 1/2|^2 = 1/4$, the first two terms on the right hand side of (B.1) are bounded by $C_r d_{\max} \mu_n$.

For the fourth moment term, Cauchy–Schwarz gives

$$|S_{ij}| = |e_i^\top U D U^\top e_j| \leq d_{\max} \|U^\top e_i\|_2 \|U^\top e_j\|_2 \leq r d_{\max} \mu_n^2.$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n S_{ij}^2 = \|S\|_F^2 = \sum_{k=1}^r d_k^2 \leq r d_{\max}^2.$$

Using $\mathbb{E}|P_{ij} - 1/2|^4 = 1/16$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}|Q_{ij}|^4 \leq \frac{1}{16} \sum_{i,j} S_{ij}^4 \leq \frac{1}{16} \max_{i,j} S_{ij}^2 \sum_{i,j} S_{ij}^2 \leq C_r d_{\max}^4 \mu_n^4.$$

Thus the last term in (B.1) is also bounded by $C_r d_{\max} \mu_n$. Since $\mathcal{R} = Q + Q^\top$,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = \mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{R}\|_2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|Q\|_2 \leq C_r d_{\max} \mu_n.$$

Markov’s inequality now gives $\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu_n) = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Recall that $\mathcal{H} := H_z - \mathbb{E}H_z$. Let

$$J := \text{diag}(I_n, -I_n, I_n, -I_n).$$

Then $J(\mathbb{E}H_z)J = \mathbb{E}H_z$ and $J\mathcal{H}J = -\mathcal{H}$. For any deterministic matrix $D \in \mathbb{C}^{4n \times 4n}$,

$$\mathcal{S}[JDJ] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H}JDJ\mathcal{H}] = J \mathbb{E}[(J\mathcal{H}J)D(J\mathcal{H}J)] J = J\mathcal{S}[D]J.$$

For notational simplicity, we abbreviate $M_z(\zeta)$ as M in this proof. Conjugating the MDE by J therefore gives

$$-(JMJ)^{-1} = \zeta I_{4n} - \mathbb{E}H_z + \mathcal{S}[JMJ].$$

By uniqueness of the MDE solution, $JMJ = M$. This forces the entries in the $(1, 2)$, $(1, 4)$, $(2, 1)$, $(2, 3)$, $(3, 2)$, $(3, 4)$, $(4, 1)$, and $(4, 3)$ block positions to vanish.

Next fix a diagonal sign matrix

$$Q_\varepsilon = \text{diag}(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n), \quad \varepsilon_i \in \{-1, +1\}, \quad Q_\varepsilon := \text{diag}(Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon, Q_\varepsilon).$$

We claim that for every deterministic D ,

$$\mathcal{S}[Q_\varepsilon D Q_\varepsilon] = Q_\varepsilon \mathcal{S}[D] Q_\varepsilon. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Indeed, for $a, b, c, d \in \llbracket 4 \rrbracket$ and $i, j, k, \ell \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$,

$$(\mathcal{S}[Q_\varepsilon D Q_\varepsilon])_{(a,i),(b,j)} = \sum_{c,d=1}^4 \sum_{k,\ell=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\mathcal{H}_{(a,i),(c,k)} D_{(c,k),(d,\ell)} \mathcal{H}_{(d,\ell),(b,j)} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell \right),$$

where the notation $A_{(a,i),(b,j)}$ denotes the $((a-1)n+i, (b-1)n+j)$ -th entry of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{4n \times 4n}$. If

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{H}_{(a,i),(c,k)} \mathcal{H}_{(d,\ell),(b,j)}) \neq 0,$$

then the two $\mathcal{H}$ entries must involve the same underlying entry of X and the same mask type (A or B), hence $\{i, k\} = \{j, \ell\}$. Therefore $\varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j$, and the previous display becomes

$$(\mathcal{S}[Q_\varepsilon D Q_\varepsilon])_{(a,i),(b,j)} = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j (\mathcal{S}[D])_{(a,i),(b,j)} = (Q_\varepsilon \mathcal{S}[D] Q_\varepsilon)_{(a,i),(b,j)}.$$

This proves (B.2). Since $Q_\varepsilon(\mathbb{E}H_z)Q_\varepsilon = \mathbb{E}H_z$, uniqueness of the MDE implies $Q_\varepsilon M Q_\varepsilon = M$. Fix any surviving block, say M_{11} , and let $i \neq j$. Choose Q_ε with $\varepsilon_i = -1$, $\varepsilon_j = 1$, and $\varepsilon_k = 1$ for all $k \notin \{i, j\}$. Then

$$(M_{11})_{ij} = (Q_\varepsilon M_{11} Q_\varepsilon)_{ij} = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j (M_{11})_{ij} = -(M_{11})_{ij},$$

so $(M_{11})_{ij} = 0$. The same argument applies to $M_{22}, M_{33}, M_{44}, M_{13}, M_{24}, M_{31}, M_{42}$; hence all surviving blocks are diagonal.

Now let

$$\Pi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_n & 0 & 0 \\ I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_n \\ 0 & 0 & I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\Pi(\mathbb{E}H_z)\Pi = \mathbb{E}H_z$. Because $P_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1/2)$, the pair (A, B) has the same distribution as (B, A), hence $\Pi\mathcal{H}\Pi \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, for deterministic D ,

$$\mathcal{S}[\Pi D \Pi] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{H} \Pi D \Pi \mathcal{H}] = \Pi \mathbb{E}[(\Pi \mathcal{H} \Pi) D (\Pi \mathcal{H} \Pi)] \Pi = \Pi \mathcal{S}[D] \Pi.$$

Uniqueness of the MDE gives $\Pi M \Pi = M$, so

$$M_{11} = M_{22}, \quad M_{33} = M_{44}, \quad M_{13} = M_{24}, \quad M_{31} = M_{42}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Since the surviving blocks are diagonal, the i th diagonal coordinate of the MDE reduces to

$$-\begin{pmatrix} m_{z,i}(\zeta) & w_{z,i}(\zeta) \\ \tilde{w}_{z,i}(\zeta) & \tilde{m}_{z,i}(\zeta) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta + \alpha_{z,i}(\zeta) & z \\ \bar{z} & \zeta + \beta_{z,i}(\zeta) \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$m_{z,i}(\zeta) := (M_{11})_{ii}, \quad \tilde{m}_{z,i}(\zeta) := (M_{33})_{ii}, \quad w_{z,i}(\zeta) := (M_{13})_{ii}, \quad \tilde{w}_{z,i}(\zeta) := (M_{31})_{ii},$$

and

$$\alpha_{z,i}(\zeta) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{A}M_{33}\mathbf{A})_{ii} = \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathbb{T})_{ik} \tilde{m}_{z,k}(\zeta), \quad \beta_{z,i}(\zeta) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{B}M_{11}\mathbf{B})_{ii} = \sum_{k=1}^n (\mathbb{T})_{ik} m_{z,k}(\zeta).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} m_{z,i}(\zeta) &= -\frac{\zeta + \beta_{z,i}(\zeta)}{\{\zeta + \alpha_{z,i}(\zeta)\}\{\zeta + \beta_{z,i}(\zeta)\} - |z|^2}, \\ \tilde{m}_{z,i}(\zeta) &= -\frac{\zeta + \alpha_{z,i}(\zeta)}{\{\zeta + \alpha_{z,i}(\zeta)\}\{\zeta + \beta_{z,i}(\zeta)\} - |z|^2}, \\ w_{z,i}(\zeta) &= \frac{z}{\{\zeta + \alpha_{z,i}(\zeta)\}\{\zeta + \beta_{z,i}(\zeta)\} - |z|^2}, \\ \tilde{w}_{z,i}(\zeta) &= \frac{\bar{z}}{\{\zeta + \alpha_{z,i}(\zeta)\}\{\zeta + \beta_{z,i}(\zeta)\} - |z|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Swapping $m_{z,i}(\zeta)$ and $\tilde{m}_{z,i}(\zeta)$ interchanges $\alpha_{z,i}(\zeta)$ and $\beta_{z,i}(\zeta)$ while leaving $w_{z,i}(\zeta)$ and $\tilde{w}_{z,i}(\zeta)$ unchanged. Therefore, using (B.3), the block matrix

$$\widetilde{M} := \begin{pmatrix} M_{33} & 0 & M_{13} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{44} & 0 & M_{24} \\ M_{31} & 0 & M_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{42} & 0 & M_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

satisfies the same reduced equations in both paired block coordinates and hence solves the full MDE. By uniqueness, $\widetilde{M} = M$, so

$$M_{11} = M_{33}, \quad M_{22} = M_{44}.$$

Combining this with (B.3) yields

$$M_{11} = M_{22} = M_{33} = M_{44}, \quad M_{13} = M_{24}, \quad M_{31} = M_{42}.$$

This proves the lemma.

B.3 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Let

$$\ell(z) := \limsup_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta} \max_{j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket} |\operatorname{Im} m_{z,j}(i\eta)|. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

For $\tau > 0$, define

$$\mathbb{D}_\tau := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{dist}(0, \operatorname{supp} \nu_z) \leq \tau\}, \quad \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_\tau := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ell(z) \geq 1/\tau\}.$$

The set $\mathbb{D}_\tau$ is the self consistent τ -pseudospectrum of $\mathcal{X}$. The following lemma compares the self consistent pseudospectra $\mathbb{D}_\tau$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_\tau$.

Lemma B.1. *Suppose that Assumption (A1) hold. There exist constants $c, \tau_0 > 0$, depending only on C_* and C^* , such that, for every $\tau \in (0, \tau_0)$,*

$$\mathbb{D}_{c\tau^{3/2}} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\tau^{1/2}}.$$

The proof of Lemma B.1 is given in Section B.4.

Recall the definitions of $m_{z,i}(\zeta)$ and $a_{z,i}(\zeta)$ in (5.3). Set $\zeta = i\eta$ with $\eta > 0$. For each $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, define

$$m_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta) := -\overline{m_{z,i}(i\eta)}, \quad a_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta) := -\overline{a_{z,i}(i\eta)}.$$

Since the entries of $\mathbb{T}$ are real,

$$a_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{T}_{ik} m_{z,k}^\sharp(i\eta).$$

Taking the negative complex conjugate of (5.3) at $\zeta = i\eta$ gives

$$m_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta) = -\frac{i\eta + a_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta)}{\{i\eta + a_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta)\}^2 - |z|^2}.$$

Thus $m^\sharp$ satisfies the same vector MDE as m . Moreover, $\operatorname{Im} m_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta) = \operatorname{Im} m_{z,i}(i\eta) > 0$. Uniqueness of the MDE solution therefore gives

$$m_{z,i}^\sharp(i\eta) = m_{z,i}(i\eta).$$

Consequently,

$$m_{z,i}(i\eta) = \overline{m_{z,i}(i\eta)},$$

and $m_{z,i}(i\eta)$ is purely imaginary for every $i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$. Define

$$u := (\operatorname{Im} m_{z,1}(i\eta), \dots, \operatorname{Im} m_{z,n}(i\eta))^\top.$$

Substituting $m_z(i\eta) = iu$ and $a_z(i\eta) = i\mathbb{T}u$ into (5.3) yields

$$\frac{1}{u} = \eta + \mathbb{T}u + \frac{|z|^2}{\eta + \mathbb{T}u}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where division is interpreted entrywise. This equation is scaling invariant under $\mathbb{T} \mapsto c\mathbb{T}$ for $c > 0$. Indeed, if $\mathbb{T}$ is replaced by $c\mathbb{T}$, then

$$\tilde{\eta} = c^{1/2}\eta, \quad \tilde{z} = c^{1/2}z, \quad \tilde{u} = c^{-1/2}u$$

satisfy the corresponding rescaled equation

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{u}} = \tilde{\eta} + c\mathbb{T}\tilde{u} + \frac{|\tilde{z}|^2}{\tilde{\eta} + c\mathbb{T}\tilde{u}}.$$

Since $\mathbb{T}$ is symmetric and nonnegative, $\varrho(\mathbb{T}) = b_{\star,n}^2$. By this rescaling, it suffices below to work under the normalization $\varrho(\mathbb{T}) = 1$, for which $b_{\star,n} = 1$.

The lemma below provides an estimate of the solution to (B.5).

Lemma B.2. *For some $\varepsilon > 0$, uniformly for $0 < \eta \leq 1$ and $|z| > b_{\star,n} + \varepsilon$, the solution of (B.5) satisfies*

$$u(\eta) \asymp \langle u(\eta) \rangle \asymp \frac{\eta}{|z|^2 - 1 + \eta^{2/3}} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where $\langle u(\eta) \rangle := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\eta)$.

The proof of Lemma B.2 is given in Section B.5.

For every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, Lemma B.2 gives, uniformly for $|z| > 1 + \varepsilon$,

$$\ell(z) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon} =: C_\varepsilon.$$

Let c and τ_0 be the constants in Lemma B.1, and choose

$$\tau_\varepsilon := \min \left\{ \frac{\tau_0}{2}, \frac{1}{2C_\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

Then $\ell(z) < \tau_\varepsilon^{-1}$, so $z \notin \tilde{\mathbb{D}}_{\tau_\varepsilon}$. Using Lemma B.1, we have $z \notin \mathbb{D}_{c\tau_\varepsilon^{3/2}}$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{dist}(0, \operatorname{supp} \nu_z) > c\tau_\varepsilon^{3/2}.$$

The claim follows with

$$\delta'(\varepsilon) := c\tau_\varepsilon^{3/2}.$$

B.4 Proof of Lemma B.1

Set

$$g(z) := \text{dist}(0, \text{supp } \nu_z), \quad \delta := |z|^2 - b_{*,n}^2,$$

and write $\langle x \rangle := n^{-1} \sum_i x_i$ for vectors $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$. We also use the vector notation

$$m_z(\zeta) := (m_{z,1}(\zeta), \dots, m_{z,n}(\zeta))^\top.$$

All constants below depend only on C_* and C^* .

We first prove the second inclusion. For each $j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, there exists a unique probability measure $\mu_{z,j}$ such that

$$m_{z,j}(\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{x - \zeta} d\mu_{z,j}(x).$$

Lemma 5.2 and equation (5.4) imply that

$$\nu_z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{z,j}.$$

Since all these measures are nonnegative, $\text{supp } \mu_{z,j} \subseteq \text{supp } \nu_z$. If $g(z) > 0$, then

$$\frac{\text{Im } m_{z,j}(i\eta)}{\eta} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu_{z,j}(x)}{x^2 + \eta^2} \leq \frac{1}{g(z)^2}.$$

The definition of $\ell(z)$ in (B.4) therefore gives $\ell(z) \leq g(z)^{-2}$. Thus $\ell(z) \geq \tau^{-1}$ implies $g(z) \leq \tau^{1/2}$. If $g(z) = 0$, this inequality holds trivially. Hence

$$\tilde{\mathbb{D}}_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\tau^{1/2}}.$$

We next analyze $\ell(z)$ separately in the regimes $\delta \leq 0$ and $\delta > 0$. By the derivation preceding (B.5), for $\eta > 0$ we may write $m_z(i\eta) = iu(\eta)$ for a vector $u(\eta) > 0$. Define

$$h(\eta) := \eta \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbb{T}u(\eta).$$

Equation (B.5) is equivalent to

$$u_i(\eta) = \frac{h_i(\eta)}{|z|^2 + h_i(\eta)^2}, \quad i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Suppose first that $\delta \leq 0$. We claim that $\ell(z) = \infty$ and prove it by contradiction. Assume $\ell(z) < \infty$, then $x_\eta := u(\eta)/\eta$ is bounded as $\eta \downarrow 0$. From (B.7), we have

$$|z|^2 x_\eta + \eta^2 x_\eta \circ (\mathbf{1}_n + \mathbb{T}x_\eta)^{\circ 2} = \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbb{T}x_\eta. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Along a convergent subsequence of x_η as $\eta \downarrow 0$, its limit $x \geq 0$ would therefore satisfy $(|z|^2 I_n - \mathbb{T})x = \mathbf{1}_n$. By the Perron–Frobenius theorem, there exists a positive eigenvector v_{PF} of $\mathbb{T}$ corresponding to the largest eigenvalue $b_{*,n}^2$. Since $\mathbb{T}$ is symmetric, multiplying the last equation by $v_{\text{PF}}^\top$ gives $\delta v_{\text{PF}}^\top x = v_{\text{PF}}^\top \mathbf{1}_n$, which is impossible for $\delta \leq 0$. Consequently,

$$\ell(z) = \infty, \quad \delta \leq 0. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Suppose now that $\delta > 0$ and set $\mathbb{T}_z := |z|^2 I_n - \mathbb{T}$. Since $|z|^2 > b_{*,n}^2$,

$$\mathbb{T}_z^{-1} = \frac{1}{|z|^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\mathbb{T}}{|z|^2} \right)^k \geq 0$$

entrywise. This, together with (B.8), gives

$$0 \leq x_\eta \leq \mathbb{T}_z^{-1} \mathbf{1}_n. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Every subsequential limit x for x_η as $\eta \downarrow 0$ satisfies $\mathbb{T}_z x = \mathbf{1}_n$ by (B.8). Uniqueness of this solution thus gives

$$\ell(z) = \|\mathbb{T}_z^{-1} \mathbf{1}_n\|_\infty.$$

Multiplying $\mathbb{T}_z(\mathbb{T}_z^{-1}\mathbf{1}_n) = \mathbf{1}_n$ by $v_{\text{PF}}^\top$ gives $\delta v_{\text{PF}}^\top(\mathbb{T}_z^{-1}\mathbf{1}_n) = v_{\text{PF}}^\top\mathbf{1}_n$. Since $v_{\text{PF}} > 0$, it follows that

$$\ell(z) \geq \frac{1}{\delta}, \quad \delta > 0. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

It remains to relate δ to the central gap of ν_z . We claim that there is a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$g(z) \geq \kappa \min\{\delta^{3/2}, 1\}, \quad \delta > 0. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

We prove this claim by constructing a local MDE solution near zero and then identifying it with the MDE solution m_z associated with the self consistent measure ν_z . Normalize v_{PF} by $\langle v_{\text{PF}}^2 \rangle = 1$. Since $C_*/(2n) \leq (\mathbb{T})_{ij} \leq C^*/(2n)$ and $\mathbb{T}v_{\text{PF}} = b_{\star,n}^2 v_{\text{PF}}$, we have

$$\frac{C_*}{2} \langle v_{\text{PF}} \rangle \leq b_{\star,n}^2 (v_{\text{PF}})_i \leq \frac{C^*}{2} \langle v_{\text{PF}} \rangle.$$

This, together with the chosen normalization and $C_*/2 \leq b_{\star,n}^2 \leq C^*/2$, gives

$$b_{\star,n}^2 \asymp 1, \quad (v_{\text{PF}})_i \asymp 1, \quad i \in [n].$$

Equip $\mathbb{C}^n$ with the weighted norm

$$\|q\|_v := \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{|q_i|}{(v_{\text{PF}})_i}.$$

Positivity of $\mathbb{T}$ and $\mathbb{T}v_{\text{PF}} = b_{\star,n}^2 v_{\text{PF}}$ imply

$$\|\mathbb{T}\|_{v \rightarrow v} \leq b_{\star,n}^2, \quad \left\| \left(I_n - \frac{\mathbb{T}}{|z|^2} \right)^{-1} \right\|_{v \rightarrow v} \leq \frac{|z|^2}{\delta}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

For a complex spectral parameter ζ near zero, set

$$q(\zeta, z) := \zeta \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbb{T}m_z(\zeta).$$

Equation (5.3) then gives

$$m_z(\zeta) = \frac{q(\zeta, z)}{|z|^2 - q(\zeta, z)^2}.$$

For brevity, write $q = q(\zeta, z)$ below. The vector MDE then reduces to the fixed-point equation $q = \Phi_\zeta(q)$, where

$$\Phi_\zeta(q) := \left(I_n - \frac{\mathbb{T}}{|z|^2} \right)^{-1} \{ \zeta \mathbf{1}_n + \mathbb{T}\Psi_z(q) \}, \quad (\Psi_z(q))_i := \frac{q_i^3}{|z|^2(|z|^2 - q_i^2)}. \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Since $\delta > 0$, we have $|z|^2 > b_{\star,n}^2 \geq C_*/2$, while $(v_{\text{PF}})_i \asymp 1$. Hence there is a fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\|q\|_v \vee \|p\|_v \leq \varepsilon_0$ implies

$$|q_i| \vee |p_i| \leq \frac{|z|}{2}, \quad ||z|^2 - q_i^2| \wedge ||z|^2 - p_i^2| \geq \frac{3|z|^2}{4}.$$

Hence,

$$|(\Psi_z(q))_i| \leq C|q_i|^3, \quad \left| \frac{\partial(\Psi_z(q))_i}{\partial q_i} \right| = \left| \frac{q_i^2(3|z|^2 - q_i^2)}{|z|^2(|z|^2 - q_i^2)^2} \right| \leq C|q_i|^2.$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$|(\Psi_z(q) - \Psi_z(p))_i| \leq C(|q_i|^2 + |p_i|^2)|q_i - p_i|.$$

Using $|q_i| \leq (v_{\text{PF}})_i \|q\|_v$ and the analogous bounds for p_i and $q_i - p_i$, then taking the maximum over i , yields

$$\|\Psi_z(q)\|_v \leq C\|q\|_v^3, \quad \|\Psi_z(q) - \Psi_z(p)\|_v \leq C(\|q\|_v^2 + \|p\|_v^2)\|q - p\|_v. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Fix a sufficiently small $\delta_0 > 0$. If $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, then (B.13) and (B.15) give, whenever $\|q\|_v \vee \|p\|_v \leq \varepsilon_0$,

$$\|\Phi_\zeta(q)\|_v \leq \frac{C}{\delta}(|\zeta| + \|q\|_v^3), \quad \|\Phi_\zeta(q) - \Phi_\zeta(p)\|_v \leq \frac{C}{\delta}(\|q\|_v^2 + \|p\|_v^2)\|q - p\|_v.$$

Choose $\rho > 0$ and then $\kappa_1 > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$2C\rho^2 < 1, \quad C(\kappa_1 + \rho^3) \leq \rho, \quad \rho\sqrt{\delta_0} \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

If q and p belong to the ball

$$B_\delta := \{q : \|q\|_v \leq \rho\sqrt{\delta}\}$$

and $|\zeta| < \kappa_1\delta^{3/2}$, then the preceding inequalities imply

$$\|\Phi_\zeta(q)\|_v \leq C(\kappa_1 + \rho^3)\sqrt{\delta} \leq \rho\sqrt{\delta}, \quad \|\Phi_\zeta(q) - \Phi_\zeta(p)\|_v \leq 2C\rho^2\|q - p\|_v.$$

Thus Φ_ζ maps B_δ into itself and is a contraction there. If $\delta \geq \delta_0$, the second bound in (B.13) is uniform, and the same argument on a fixed ball gives a contraction whenever $|\zeta| < \kappa_2$. After decreasing $\kappa > 0$ if necessary, both regimes yield a unique fixed point, denoted by $q_\star(\zeta, z)$, in the corresponding contraction ball for

$$|\zeta| < R_\delta := \kappa \min\{\delta^{3/2}, 1\}.$$

Moreover, $\Psi_z(0) = 0$, and hence $\Phi_0(0) = 0$. Since $q_\star(0, z)$ is the unique fixed point of Φ_0 in the B_δ , it follows that $q_\star(0, z) = 0$. Let $E \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|E| < R_\delta$. By construction, $q_\star(E, z) = \Phi_E(q_\star(E, z))$. This, together with (B.14), implies that

$$\Phi_E(\overline{q_\star(E, z)}) = \overline{\Phi_E(q_\star(E, z))} = \overline{q_\star(E, z)}.$$

Uniqueness of the fixed point therefore gives $\overline{q_\star(E, z)} = q_\star(E, z)$, and hence $q_\star(E, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

We finally identify $q_\star(\zeta, z)$ with the function $q(\zeta, z)$ obtained from the MDE solution m_z . For $\zeta = i\eta$, the bound (B.10) gives $0 \leq u(\eta) \leq \eta\mathbb{T}_z^{-1}\mathbf{1}_n$. Therefore, the associated function q satisfies

$$q(i\eta, z) = i\{\eta\mathbf{1}_n + \mathbb{T}u(\eta)\} \rightarrow 0 \quad (\eta \downarrow 0).$$

For all sufficiently small η , this solution lies in B_δ and hence equals $q_\star(i\eta, z)$. The identity theorem shows that the identity $q(\zeta, z) = q_\star(\zeta, z)$ holds in $\{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\zeta| < R_\delta, \text{Im } \zeta > 0\}$. Consequently, every component $m_{z,j}$ extends holomorphically through $(-R_\delta, R_\delta)$ via $m_z(\zeta) = q_\star(\zeta, z)/(|z|^2 - q_\star(\zeta, z)^{\circ 2})$, and is real on this interval. The Stieltjes inversion formula then gives

$$(-R_\delta, R_\delta) \cap \text{supp } \nu_z = \emptyset,$$

which proves (B.12).

We now prove the first inclusion. Choose $c \leq \kappa$ and $0 < \tau_0 < 1$. Let $0 < \tau < \tau_0$ and suppose that $z \in \mathbb{D}_{c\tau^{3/2}}$, so that $g(z) \leq c\tau^{3/2}$. If $\delta \leq 0$, then (B.9) gives $\ell(z) = \infty$. If $\delta > 0$, then (B.12) gives

$$\kappa \min\{\delta^{3/2}, 1\} \leq c\tau^{3/2}.$$

The case $\delta \geq 1$ is impossible because $c \leq \kappa$ and $\tau < 1$. Thus

$$\delta \leq \left(\frac{c}{\kappa}\right)^{2/3} \tau \leq \tau.$$

By (B.11), $\ell(z) \geq \delta^{-1} \geq \tau^{-1}$. In both cases $z \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_\tau$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{D}_{c\tau^{3/2}} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_\tau.$$

This completes the proof.

B.5 Proof of Lemma B.2

Here we follow the proof strategy of Proposition 3.2 in Alt et al. [2018]. The algebraic operations and comparisons are to be understood entrywise.

We first need to show an auxiliary bound,

$$\eta \lesssim \langle u \rangle \lesssim 1. \tag{B.16}$$

From (B.5) and Assumption (A1), we have

$$u = \frac{\eta + \mathbb{T}u}{(\eta + \mathbb{T}u)(\eta + \mathbb{T}u) + |z|^2} \asymp \frac{\eta + \langle u \rangle}{(\eta + \langle u \rangle)(\eta + \langle u \rangle) + |z|^2}. \tag{B.17}$$

Since $|z| > b_{*,n} + \varepsilon \gtrsim 1$, then the lower bound follows immediately from (B.17).

To show the upper bound, we have from (B.5) that

$$1 = \eta u + u(\mathbb{T}u) + \frac{|z|^2 u}{\eta + \mathbb{T}u} \geq u(\mathbb{T}u).$$

Taking the average gives

$$1 \geq \langle u(\mathbb{T}u) \rangle \gtrsim \langle u \rangle^2.$$

Thus the upper bound in (B.16) follows. Now (B.17) implies

$$u \asymp \frac{1}{\eta + \langle u \rangle + \frac{|z|^2}{\eta + \langle u \rangle}} \asymp \langle u \rangle, \quad (\text{B.18})$$

and

$$\eta = u(\eta + \mathbb{T}u)(\eta + \mathbb{T}u) + |z|^2 u - \mathbb{T}u. \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Since we assume $\varrho(\mathbb{T}) = 1$, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, there exists a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ such that

$$\mathbb{T}v = v, \quad \langle v \rangle = 1, \quad v \asymp 1.$$

Taking the scalar product of (B.19) with v , we get

$$\eta = \langle (u(\eta + \mathbb{T}u)(\eta + \mathbb{T}u))v \rangle + (|z|^2 - 1)\langle vu \rangle \asymp \langle u \rangle^3 + (|z|^2 - 1)\langle u \rangle.$$

Now we can conclude the estimate (B.6) for $\langle u \rangle$, and thus for u by (B.18).

B.6 Proof of Lemma 5.5

B.6.1 Cumulant norms and correlation assumptions

In this section, we recall the cumulant norms and correlation assumptions from Erdős et al. [2019], which are used to establish the local law for H_z in Lemma 5.5. We state the real-symmetric version, which is the version needed for the random part of the linearization considered in this paper. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the row-column index set of the matrix under consideration, let $N := |\mathcal{J}|$, and set $\mathcal{I} := \mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{J}$. For $a, b \in \mathcal{J}$ we abbreviate the ordered pair $(a, b) \in \mathcal{I}$ by ab . If $\mathcal{W} = (\mathbf{w}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$ denotes the centered, $N^{1/2}$ -rescaled random part of the matrix, then for $k \geq 2$ we write

$$\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) := \kappa(\mathbf{w}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{\alpha_k}), \quad \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathcal{I},$$

for the joint cumulant. We use the same notation $\kappa(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ for the joint cumulant of arbitrary random variables. All sums over variables of the form a_i, b_i are over $\mathcal{J}$, while all sums over variables of the form α_i are over $\mathcal{I}$.

Definition B.3 (Cumulant norms). For each $k \geq 2$, define

$$\|\kappa\|_k := \|\kappa\|_k^{\text{av}} + \|\kappa\|_k^{\text{iso}}, \quad \|\kappa\|_{\leq R}^{\text{av}} := \max_{2 \leq k \leq R} \|\kappa\|_k^{\text{av}}, \quad \|\kappa\|_{\leq R}^{\text{iso}} := \max_{2 \leq k \leq R} \|\kappa\|_k^{\text{iso}}.$$

The averaged norms are

$$\|\kappa\|_2^{\text{av}} := \left\| \left(|\kappa(\alpha, \beta)| \right)_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}} \right\|, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

$$\|\kappa\|_k^{\text{av}} := N^{-2} \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathcal{I}} |\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)|, \quad k \geq 4, \quad (\text{B.21})$$

and, for third cumulants,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\kappa\|_3^{\text{av}} &:= \left\| \left(\sum_{\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{I}} |\kappa(\alpha_1, \beta, \gamma)| \right)_{\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{I}} \right\| \\ &\quad + \inf_{\kappa = \kappa_{dd} + \kappa_{dc} + \kappa_{cd} + \kappa_{cc}} \left(\|\kappa_{dd}\|_{dd} + \|\kappa_{dc}\|_{dc} + \|\kappa_{cd}\|_{cd} + \|\kappa_{cc}\|_{cc} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

where the infimum is over all decompositions of the third cumulant into four symmetric functions κ_{dd} , κ_{dc} , etc. The letters d and c in the subscripts refer to “direct” and “cross”. The corresponding norms appearing in (B.22) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\|\kappa\|_{cc} = \|\kappa\|_{dd} &:= N^{-1} \left[\sum_{b_2, a_3} \left(\sum_{a_2, b_3} \sum_{\alpha_1} |\kappa(\alpha_1, a_2 b_2, a_3 b_3)| \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}, \\ \|\kappa\|_{cd} &:= N^{-1} \left[\sum_{b_3, a_1} \left(\sum_{a_3, b_1} \sum_{\alpha_2} |\kappa(a_1 b_1, \alpha_2, a_3 b_3)| \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}, \\ \|\kappa\|_{dc} &:= N^{-1} \left[\sum_{b_1, a_2} \left(\sum_{a_1, b_2} \sum_{\alpha_3} |\kappa(a_1 b_1, a_2 b_2, \alpha_3)| \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}.\end{aligned}\tag{B.23}$$

For $x = (x_a)_{a \in \mathcal{J}} \in \ell^2(\mathcal{J})$ define two nonnegative $\mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{J}$ matrices

$$(A_d^{\kappa, x})_{ij} := \left[\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{J}} \left| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{J}} x_a \kappa(ai, \ell j) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2}, \quad (A_c^{\kappa, x})_{ij} := \left[\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{J}} \left| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{J}} x_a \kappa(ai, j\ell) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

Then

$$\|\kappa\|_d := \sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq 1} \|A_d^{\kappa, x}\|, \quad \|\kappa\|_c := \sup_{\|x\|_2 \leq 1} \|A_c^{\kappa, x}\|.$$

The second cumulant isotropic norm is

$$\|\kappa\|_2^{\text{iso}} := \inf_{\kappa = \kappa_d + \kappa_c} (\|\kappa_d\|_d + \|\kappa_c\|_c),\tag{B.24}$$

where the infimum is over all decompositions of κ into the sum of symmetric κ_d and κ_c . Finally, for $k \geq 3$,

$$\|\kappa\|_k^{\text{iso}} := \left\| \left(\sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2} \in \mathcal{I}} |\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}, \beta, \gamma)| \right)_{\beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{I}} \right\|.\tag{B.25}$$

Assumption (E) (Assumption (C) in Erdős et al. [2019], κ -correlation decay). *There exist constants $C, C_{\varepsilon, R} < \infty$, independent of N , such that for every $R \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\|\kappa\|_2^{\text{iso}} \leq C, \quad \max_{2 \leq k \leq R} \|\kappa\|_k \leq C_{\varepsilon, R} N^{\varepsilon}.$$

Assumption (F) (Assumption (D) in Erdős et al. [2019], higher-order correlation decay). *There exists $\mu > 0$ such that the following holds: For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$ and every $q, R \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a sequence of nested sets*

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{N}_2(\alpha) \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{N}_R(\alpha) =: \mathcal{N}(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{I}, \quad |\mathcal{N}(\alpha)| \leq N^{1/2-\mu}.$$

For any $n_1, \dots, n_q < R$, any $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q \in \mathcal{I}$, and any functions $f, g_1, \dots, g_q$ of the indicated variables,

$$\begin{aligned}& \left| \kappa \left(f(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^q \mathcal{N}_{n_j+1}(\alpha_j)}), g_1(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{N}_{n_1}(\alpha_1) \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq 1} \mathcal{N}(\alpha_j)}), \dots, g_q(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{N}_{n_q}(\alpha_q) \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq q} \mathcal{N}(\alpha_j)}) \right) \right| \\ & \leq C_{R, q, \mu} N^{-3q} \|f\|_{q+1} \prod_{j=1}^q \|g_j\|_{q+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, for $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes the family $(\mathbf{w}_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, and $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the L^p norm with respect to the underlying randomness.

B.6.2 Proof of Lemma 5.5

We verify the assumptions of the outside-spectrum local law of [Erdős et al., 2019, Theorem 2.1] for the Hermitian matrix H_z .

Since $|z| \leq C_z$, we have $\|\mathbb{E}H_z\| = |z| \leq C_z$, which verifies the bounded expectation assumption (see [Erdős et al., 2019, Assumption (A)]). Moreover, we define $\mathcal{W} := \sqrt{N}\mathcal{H}$ and write

$$H_z = \mathbb{E}H_z + N^{-1/2}\mathcal{W}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{J} := \llbracket 4 \rrbracket \times \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{I} := \mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{J}.$$

The entries of $\mathcal{W}$ are

$$\mathfrak{w}_{(r,i),(s,j)} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{N}P_{ij}X_{ij}, & (r,s) \in \{(1,4),(4,1)\}, \\ \sqrt{N}(1-P_{ij})X_{ij}, & (r,s) \in \{(2,3),(3,2)\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\sqrt{N} = 2\sqrt{n}$ and $0 \leq P_{ij} \leq 1$, Assumption (A1) implies that, for every fixed $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}|\mathfrak{w}_\alpha|^q \leq C_q.$$

This verifies the finite moment assumption (see [Erdős et al., 2019, Assumption (B)]).

We now verify the cumulant assumptions. For each unordered pair

$$e = \{i, j\}, \quad i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad i \leq j,$$

define its companion class by

$$\mathcal{C}_e := \{((r,k),(s,\ell)) \in \mathcal{I} : (r,s) \in \{(1,4),(4,1),(2,3),(3,2)\}, \{k,\ell\} = e\}.$$

Thus $|\mathcal{C}_e| \leq 8$, and $|\mathcal{C}_e| \leq 4$ when $i = j$. We call a label $\alpha = ((r,i),(s,j)) \in \mathcal{I}$ *nonzero* if $(r,s) \in \{(1,4),(4,1),(2,3),(3,2)\}$, so that $\mathfrak{w}_\alpha$ is not identically zero. We call it *zero* if $\mathfrak{w}_\alpha \equiv 0$. If α is a nonzero label, let $\mathcal{C}(\alpha)$ denote the unique class $\mathcal{C}_e$ containing α . If α is a zero label, we set $\mathcal{C}(\alpha) := \{\alpha\}$.

The random variables attached to different nonzero companion classes are independent, because they depend on disjoint families

$$(X_{ij}, P_{ij}), \quad i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad i \leq j.$$

Therefore, by the basic vanishing property of joint cumulants,

$$\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) := \kappa(\mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_k}) = 0$$

unless all nonzero labels $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ belong to the same companion class.

For every fixed $q \in \mathbb{N}$, the rescaled entries $\mathfrak{w}_\alpha$ have uniformly bounded q -th moments. Indeed, if $\mathfrak{w}_\alpha$ is not identically zero, then it is either $\sqrt{N}P_{ij}X_{ij}$ or $\sqrt{N}(1-P_{ij})X_{ij}$. Since $N = 4n$ and $0 \leq P_{ij} \leq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathfrak{w}_\alpha|^q \leq 2^q \mathbb{E}|\sqrt{n}X_{ij}|^q \leq C'_q.$$

If $\mathfrak{w}_\alpha \equiv 0$, the same bound is trivial. Hence

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}|\mathfrak{w}_\alpha|^q \leq C'_q.$$

By the moment-cumulant formula,

$$\kappa(\mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_k}) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_k} (|\pi| - 1)! (-1)^{|\pi|-1} \prod_{B \in \pi} \mathbb{E} \prod_{r \in B} \mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_r},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k$ is the set of partitions of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, and $|\pi|$ is the number of blocks in the partition π . Applying Hölder's inequality to each block $B \in \pi$, we get

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{r \in B} \mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_r} \right| \leq \prod_{r \in B} \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_r}|^{|B|} \right)^{1/|B|} \leq (C'_k)^{|B|/k}.$$

Therefore

$$\prod_{B \in \pi} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{r \in B} \mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_r} \right| \leq (C'_k)^{\frac{1}{k} \sum_{B \in \pi} |B|} = C'_k.$$

Since the number of partitions of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ depends only on k , we conclude that

$$|\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)| = |\kappa(\mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_{\alpha_k})| \leq C'_k \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_k} (|\pi| - 1)! =: C_k$$

uniformly in $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathcal{I}$.

Verification of Assumption (E).

First consider $k \geq 4$. Since a nonzero cumulant forces all labels to lie in one companion class, we have

$$\|\kappa\|_k^{\text{av}} \stackrel{\text{(B.21)}}{=} N^{-2} \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathcal{I}} |\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)| \leq N^{-2} \sum_{\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k \in \mathcal{C}(\alpha_1)} C_k \leq C_k 8^{k-1},$$

because $|\mathcal{I}| = N^2$.

For $k \geq 3$, define the nonnegative matrix

$$M_{\beta\gamma}^{(k)} := \sum_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2} \in \mathcal{I}} |\kappa(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}, \beta, \gamma)|, \quad \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Then $M_{\beta\gamma}^{(k)} = 0$ unless $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\beta)$, and in the latter case $M_{\beta\gamma}^{(k)} \leq C_k 8^{k-2}$. Each row and each column of $M^{(k)}$ has at most 8 nonzero entries. Thus,

$$\max \{ \|M^{(k)}\|_1, \|M^{(k)}\|_\infty \} \leq C_k 8^{k-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\kappa\|_k^{\text{iso}} \stackrel{\text{(B.25)}}{=} \|M^{(k)}\| \leq \sqrt{\|M^{(k)}\|_1 \cdot \|M^{(k)}\|_\infty} \leq C_k 8^{k-1}, \quad k \geq 3.$$

For $k = 2$, the averaged norm satisfies the same estimate:

$$\|\kappa\|_2^{\text{av}} \stackrel{\text{(B.20)}}{=} \left\| (|\kappa(\alpha, \beta)|)_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{I}} \right\| \leq C.$$

It remains to bound the special second-order isotropic norm. For a nonzero label $\alpha = ((r, i), (s, j)) \in \mathcal{I}$, we write

$$\varpi(\alpha) := (i, j), \quad \varpi(\alpha)^t := (j, i).$$

Define relations $D(\alpha, \beta)$ and $C(\alpha, \beta)$ as follows:

$$D(\alpha, \beta) \iff \varpi(\beta) = \varpi(\alpha),$$

and

$$C(\alpha, \beta) \iff \varpi(\beta) = \varpi(\alpha)^t \text{ and the two coordinates of } \varpi(\alpha) \text{ are distinct.}$$

Set

$$\kappa_d(\alpha, \beta) := \kappa(\alpha, \beta) \mathbb{1}_{D(\alpha, \beta)}, \quad \kappa_c(\alpha, \beta) := \kappa(\alpha, \beta) \mathbb{1}_{C(\alpha, \beta)}.$$

Then $\kappa = \kappa_d + \kappa_c$, and both κ_d, κ_c are symmetric functions on $\mathcal{I}^2$.

We prove $\|\kappa_d\|_d = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Let $u = (s, j), v = (t, \ell) \in \mathcal{J}$. By definition,

$$(A_d^{\kappa_d, x})_{uv}^2 = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{J}} \left| \sum_{a \in \mathcal{J}} x_a \kappa_d(au, mv) \right|^2.$$

Write $a = (r, i)$ and $m = (p, k)$. If $\kappa_d(au, mv) \neq 0$, then the direct relation forces

$$(k, \ell) = \varpi(mv) = \varpi(au) = (i, j).$$

Therefore the entry $(A_d^{\kappa_d, x})_{uv}$ vanishes unless $\ell = j$. In each nonzero summand, the direct relation also forces $k = i$. Under these conditions, we have

$$(A_d^{\kappa_d, x})_{uv}^2 \leq C \sum_{p=1}^4 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{r=1}^4 |x_{(r, i)}| \right)^2 \leq C \sum_{r=1}^4 \sum_{i=1}^n |x_{(r, i)}|^2 = C \|x\|_2^2.$$

Thus, for $\|x\|_2 \leq 1$, all entries of $A_d^{\kappa_d, x}$ are bounded by a constant, and each row and each column has at most 4 nonzero entries. Hence

$$\|A_d^{\kappa_d, x}\| \leq C, \quad \|\kappa_d\|_d \leq C.$$

Similarly, we have $\|\kappa_c\|_c \leq C$. Hence, we have

$$\|\kappa\|_2^{\text{iso}} \stackrel{\text{(B.24)}}{\leq} \|\kappa_d\|_d + \|\kappa_c\|_c \leq C.$$

Finally we treat the averaged third-order norm $\|\kappa\|_3^{\text{av}}$. The operator-norm term in $\|\kappa\|_3^{\text{av}}$ was already bounded above as the case $k = 3$ of $\|\kappa\|_k^{\text{iso}}$. For the special direct-cross part, use the trivial decomposition

$$\kappa_{dd} := \kappa, \quad \kappa_{dc} := \kappa_{cd} := \kappa_{cc} := 0.$$

This is admissible because κ is symmetric in its three label arguments and the zero functions are symmetric. We claim that $\|\kappa\|_{dd} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Recall the definition of $\|\kappa\|_{dd}$ from (B.23). Fix $b_2, a_3 \in \mathcal{J}$. If

$$\kappa(\alpha_1, a_2 b_2, a_3 b_3) \neq 0,$$

then $\varpi(a_2 b_2) = \varpi(a_3 b_3)$. Write $a_2 b_2 = ((r_2, i_2), (s_2, j_2))$ and $a_3 b_3 = ((r_3, i_3), (s_3, j_3))$. For fixed b_2 and a_3 , the coordinates j_2 and i_3 are fixed. The direct relation forces $i_2 = i_3$ and $j_3 = j_2$. Thus, a_2 has only 4 possible block choices, b_3 has only 4 possible block choices, and α_1 must belong to the same companion class associated with the unordered pair $\{i_3, j_2\}$, which has size at most 8. Therefore

$$\sum_{a_2, b_3} \sum_{\alpha_1} |\kappa(\alpha_1, a_2 b_2, a_3 b_3)| \leq 128 C_3 = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

uniformly in b_2, a_3 . Therefore, using the definition (B.23), we have $\|\kappa\|_{dd} \leq C$, and thus

$$\|\kappa\|_3^{\text{av}} \leq C.$$

Combining the estimates above, for every fixed $R \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\kappa\|_2^{\text{iso}} \leq C, \quad \max_{2 \leq k \leq R} \|\kappa\|_k \leq C_R.$$

This is stronger than Assumption (E).

Verification of Assumption (F).

For a nonzero label α , set

$$\mathcal{N}_1(\alpha) = \cdots = \mathcal{N}_R(\alpha) := \mathcal{C}(\alpha).$$

For a zero label, set

$$\mathcal{N}_1(\alpha) = \cdots = \mathcal{N}_R(\alpha) := \{\alpha\}.$$

Then $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_1(\alpha)$, the sets are nested, and

$$|\mathcal{N}_R(\alpha)| \leq 8 \leq N^{1/2-\mu}$$

for any fixed $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$ and all sufficiently large N .

Consider the cumulant in Assumption (F). If the companion classes $\mathcal{C}(\alpha_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}(\alpha_q)$ are pairwise distinct, then the variables entering $g_j(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{N}_{n_j}(\alpha_j) \cup \cup_{\ell \neq j} \mathcal{N}(\alpha_\ell)})$ depend on mutually independent companion classes, while the variable $f(\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{I} \cup \cup_{j=1}^q \mathcal{N}_{n_j+1}(\alpha_j)})$ depends only on the remaining classes. Therefore the collection of arguments of the cumulant can be split into independent subfamilies, and the cumulant is zero. If two companion classes coincide, say $\mathcal{C}(\alpha_i) = \mathcal{C}(\alpha_j)$ with $i \neq j$, then

$$\mathcal{N}_{n_i}(\alpha_i) \setminus \bigcup_{\ell \neq i} \mathcal{N}(\alpha_\ell) = \emptyset.$$

Thus the corresponding argument $g_i(\mathcal{W}_\emptyset)$ is constant. A joint cumulant of order at least two vanishes whenever one of its arguments is constant. Hence the cumulant in Assumption (F) is again zero. Thus the left-hand side of Assumption (F) is identically zero for the above choice of neighbourhoods, and Assumption (D) follows.

We have verified Erdős et al. [2019]'s assumptions. Applying [Erdős et al., 2019, Theorem 2.1] gives the stated outside-spectrum isotropic and averaged local laws.

B.7 Proof of Lemma 5.6

Before proving Lemma 5.6, we first establish a lemma which shows that, with high probability, there are no eigenvalues of H_z outside the support of the self-consistent density $\text{supp } \nu_z$.

Lemma B.4 (No eigenvalues outside $\text{supp } \nu_z$). *Fix $\varepsilon, \delta' > 0$ and $C_z < \infty$. Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy*

$$b_{\star, n} + \varepsilon < |z| \leq C_z,$$

and let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a fixed compact interval such that

$$\text{dist}(I, \text{supp } \nu_z) \geq \delta'.$$

Under Assumption (A1),

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{spec}(H_z) \cap I = \emptyset) \rightarrow 1.$$

Set $\delta := \varepsilon/2$. For every $z \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \varepsilon, C}$, $|z| > b_{\star, n} + \delta$. Lemma 5.3, applied with the separation parameter δ on the bounded range $|z| \leq C$, gives a deterministic constant $d_{\varepsilon, C} > 0$, independent of n and z , such that

$$\text{dist}(0, \text{supp } \nu_z) > d_{\varepsilon, C} \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \varepsilon, C}.$$

Let

$$a_{\varepsilon, C} := \frac{d_{\varepsilon, C}}{2}, \quad I_{\varepsilon, C} := [-a_{\varepsilon, C}, a_{\varepsilon, C}].$$

If $x \in I_{\varepsilon, C}$ and $t \in \text{supp } \nu_z$, then

$$|t - x| \geq ||t| - |x|| \geq \text{dist}(0, \text{supp } \nu_z) - a_{\varepsilon, C} > a_{\varepsilon, C}.$$

Consequently,

$$\text{dist}(I_{\varepsilon, C}, \text{supp } \nu_z) \geq a_{\varepsilon, C} \quad \text{uniformly for } z \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \varepsilon, C}.$$

Set

$$h := \frac{a_{\varepsilon, C}}{4}$$

and choose a h -net $\mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}$ of $\mathcal{A}_{n, \varepsilon, C}$. The disks of radius $h/2$ centered at the points of $\mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}$ have pairwise disjoint interiors and are contained in the disk $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq C + h/2\}$. Comparing their areas gives

$$|\mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}| \pi \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^2 \leq \pi \left(C + \frac{h}{2}\right)^2.$$

Hence

$$|\mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}| \leq \left(1 + \frac{2C}{h}\right)^2 \leq M_{\varepsilon, C}$$

for a deterministic integer $M_{\varepsilon, C}$ independent of n .

For each $w \in \mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}$, we have

$$b_{\star, n} + \delta < |w| \leq C, \quad \text{dist}(I_{\varepsilon, C}, \text{supp } \rho_w) \geq a_{\varepsilon, C}.$$

With parameters $(\varepsilon, \delta', C_z) = (\delta, a_{\varepsilon, C}, C)$, Lemma B.4 applies to every deterministic sequence $w_n \in \mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}$ and gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{spec}(H_{w_n}) \cap I_{\varepsilon, C} \neq \emptyset) \rightarrow 0.$$

The union-bound gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}} \{\text{spec}(H_w) \cap I_{\varepsilon, C} \neq \emptyset\}\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{M_{\varepsilon, C}} \mathbb{P}(\text{spec}(H_{w_{n,j}}) \cap I_{\varepsilon, C} \neq \emptyset) \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore the event

$$\Omega_n := \bigcap_{w \in \mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}} \{\text{spec}(H_w) \cap I_{\varepsilon, C} = \emptyset\}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \rightarrow 1$. On Ω_n ,

$$\text{dist}(0, \text{spec}(H_w)) \geq a_{\varepsilon, C} \quad \text{for every } w \in \mathcal{N}_{n, \varepsilon, C}. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Fix an arbitrary $z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$ and choose $w \in \mathcal{N}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$ such that $|z - w| \leq h$. Directly from the definition of the Hermitian linearization, we have

$$H_z - H_w = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(z - w)I_{2n} \\ -(\bar{z} - \bar{w})I_{2n} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and hence

$$\|H_z - H_w\|_2 = |z - w| \leq h. \quad (\text{B.27})$$

Let $\lambda_1(H_z) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{4n}(H_z)$ and $\lambda_1(H_w) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{4n}(H_w)$. Weyl's perturbation inequality and (B.26)–(B.27) imply, for every $j \in \llbracket 4n \rrbracket$,

$$|\lambda_j(H_z)| \geq |\lambda_j(H_w)| - |\lambda_j(H_z) - \lambda_j(H_w)| \geq a_{\varepsilon,C} - h = \frac{3a_{\varepsilon,C}}{4}.$$

Taking the minimum over j shows that, on Ω_n ,

$$\inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}} \text{dist}(0, \text{spec}(H_z)) \geq \frac{3a_{\varepsilon,C}}{4}.$$

Combining this identity with

$$\text{dist}(0, \text{spec}(H_z)) = \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X}).$$

proves (5.8) with

$$\gamma_{\varepsilon,C} := \frac{3a_{\varepsilon,C}}{4} > 0.$$

Finally, suppose that $\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Since $\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}$ is deterministic and positive,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}}{2} \right) \rightarrow 1.$$

No independence between $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is needed: by the union bound, the event

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n := \Omega_n \cap \left\{ \|\mathcal{E}\|_2 \leq \frac{\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}}{2} \right\}$$

satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\Omega}_n) \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(\Omega_n^c) - \mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathcal{E}\|_2 > \frac{\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}}{2} \right) \rightarrow 1.$$

For any $z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}$, the variational characterization of the least singular value and the triangle inequality give

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}) &= \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} \|(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E})v\|_2 \\ &\geq \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} \{ \|(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X})v\|_2 - \|\mathcal{E}v\|_2 \} \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X}) - \|\mathcal{E}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

On $\tilde{\Omega}_n$, we have

$$\inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\varepsilon,C}} \sigma_{\min}(zI_{2n} - \mathcal{X} - \mathcal{E}) \geq \gamma_{\varepsilon,C} - \frac{\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}}{2} = \frac{\gamma_{\varepsilon,C}}{2}.$$

This proves the second assertion.

B.8 Proof of Lemma B.4

Let

$$m_N(\zeta) := \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \mathfrak{G}_z(\zeta).$$

Choose $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2}$ and set

$$\eta_N := N^{-1+\tau}.$$

Let m be the Stieltjes transform of ν_z . For every $E \in I$, we have

$$\text{Im } m(E + i\eta_N) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\eta_N}{(x - E)^2 + \eta_N^2} d\nu_z(x) \leq \frac{\eta_N}{\delta^2}.$$

Hence

$$\sup_{E \in I} \operatorname{Im} m(E + i\eta_N) \leq \frac{\eta_N}{\delta'^2} = \mathfrak{o}(N^{-\tau}).$$

From Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\sup_{E \in I} |m_N(E + i\eta_N) - m(E + i\eta_N)| \prec \frac{1}{N}.$$

This implies that

$$\sup_{E \in I} |m_N(E + i\eta_N) - m(E + i\eta_N)| = \mathfrak{o}(N^{-\tau})$$

with probability tending to one for all sufficiently large N . Combining this with the previous deterministic bound gives

$$\sup_{E \in I} \operatorname{Im} m_N(E + i\eta_N) = \mathfrak{o}(N^{-\tau})$$

with probability tending to one.

Now suppose that $\operatorname{spec}(H_z) \cap I \neq \emptyset$, and choose $\lambda \in \operatorname{spec}(H_z) \cap I$. Then

$$\operatorname{Im} m_N(\lambda + i\eta_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\eta_N}{(\lambda_k(H_z) - \lambda)^2 + \eta_N^2} \geq \frac{1}{N\eta_N} = N^{-\tau}.$$

This contradicts the previous high-probability upper bound. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\operatorname{spec}(H_z) \cap I = \emptyset) \rightarrow 1.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma B.4.

B.9 Proof of Lemma 5.7

Set $N = 4n$. For $z \in \mathcal{K}_n$, let

$$\mathcal{X}_z := \mathcal{X} - zI_{2n} = \begin{pmatrix} -zI_n & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{B} & -zI_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

When $\mathcal{X}_z$ is invertible,

$$H_z^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\mathcal{X}_z^*)^{-1} \\ \mathcal{X}_z^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{X}_z^{-1} = - \begin{pmatrix} zG(z) & \mathbf{A}\mathcal{G}(z) \\ \mathbf{B}G(z) & z\mathcal{G}(z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, in the 4×4 block decomposition of H_z^{-1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} (H_z^{-1})_{31} &= -zG(z), & (H_z^{-1})_{41} &= -\mathbf{B}G(z), \\ (H_z^{-1})_{42} &= -z\mathcal{G}(z), & (H_z^{-1})_{32} &= -\mathbf{A}\mathcal{G}(z). \end{aligned} \tag{B.28}$$

Since $\mathcal{K}_n \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > b_{\star, n} + \varepsilon/2\}$, Lemma 5.3, applied with $\varepsilon/2$, gives $\gamma > 0$, depending only on ε and C , such that

$$(-\gamma, \gamma) \cap \operatorname{supp} \nu_z = \emptyset, \quad z \in \mathcal{K}_n.$$

Evaluating the MDE at $\zeta = 0$ gives

$$M_z(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\bar{z}^{-1}I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\bar{z}^{-1}I_n \\ -z^{-1}I_n & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -z^{-1}I_n & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.29}$$

We first upgrade the exterior singular gap to overwhelming probability. Fix $\tau \in (0, 1/2)$, set $\eta_0 = N^{-1+\tau}$, and let $I = [-\gamma/2, \gamma/2]$. The support gap and the Stieltjes representation of M_z imply

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n, E \in I} \operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} M_z(E + i\eta_0) \leq C\eta_0.$$

If H_z had an eigenvalue $\lambda \in I$, then

$$\operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \mathfrak{G}_z(\lambda + i\eta_0) \geq \frac{1}{N\eta_0} = N^{-\tau}.$$

Since $\tau < 1/2$, one has $\eta_0 = \mathfrak{o}(N^{-\tau})$. The averaged estimate in Lemma 5.5, which is uniform for $z \in \mathcal{K}_n$ and $E \in I$, gives

$$\sup_{E \in I} \left| \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\mathfrak{G}_z(E + i\eta_0) - M_z(E + i\eta_0)) \right| \prec N^{-1}.$$

It follows that, for every fixed $D > 0$, the probability that $\text{spec}(H_z) \cap I \neq \emptyset$ is at most N^{-D} for all sufficiently large N . A finite $\gamma/8$ -net of $\mathcal{K}_n$, followed by a union bound and Weyl's inequality using $\|H_z - H_w\|_2 = |z - w|$, therefore yields a constant $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} \text{dist}(0, \text{spec}(H_z)) \geq \gamma_0 \right) \geq 1 - N^{-D} \quad (\text{B.30})$$

for every fixed $D > 0$ and all sufficiently large N .

For $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, let $\iota_\alpha(x) \in \mathbb{C}^{4n}$ denote the vector whose α -th n -block equals x and whose other blocks are zero. Set $\eta = N^{-1}$ and let $\mathcal{N}_N$ be an N^{-1} -net of $\mathcal{K}_n$. Since $\mathcal{K}_n \subset \{|z| \leq C\}$, $|\mathcal{N}_N| = \mathcal{O}(N^2)$. On the event in (B.30), the resolvent identity gives

$$\sup_{w \in \mathcal{N}_N} \|H_w^{-1} - \mathfrak{G}_w(i\eta)\|_2 \leq C\eta.$$

The matrix valued Stieltjes representation and the deterministic support gap similarly give

$$\sup_{w \in \mathcal{N}_N} \|M_w(i\eta) - M_w(0)\|_2 \leq C\eta.$$

For fixed $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, the z -uniform isotropic estimate in Lemma 5.5 and a union bound over $\mathcal{N}_N$ yield

$$\sup_{w \in \mathcal{N}_N} |\iota_\alpha(x)^* (H_w^{-1} - M_w(0)) \iota_\beta(y)| \prec N^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{B.31})$$

On the event in (B.30), the resolvent identity also gives

$$\|H_z^{-1} - H_w^{-1}\|_2 \leq C|z - w|.$$

The explicit formula (B.29) and $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} |z| \geq \varepsilon$ imply

$$\|M_z(0) - M_w(0)\|_2 \leq C|z - w|.$$

Thus (B.31) extends from the net to all of $\mathcal{K}_n$:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\iota_\alpha(x)^* (H_z^{-1} - M_z(0)) \iota_\beta(y)| \prec N^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{B.32})$$

Taking $(\alpha, \beta) = (3, 1), (4, 2), (4, 1), (3, 2)$ in (B.32), and using (B.28)–(B.29), proves respectively the four scalar estimates in (5.9)–(5.10), because $N = 4n$ and $\varepsilon \leq |z| \leq C$ on $\mathcal{K}_n$.

B.10 Proof of Lemma 5.8

We first establish the resolvent estimates for $R_{\mathcal{X}}(z)$, and then pass from $R_{\mathcal{X}}(z)$ to $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z)$ using the resolvent identity and Lemma 5.6.

Recall the definitions of $G(z)$ and $\mathcal{G}(z)$ in (5.5). From Lemma 5.7, for deterministic vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with bounded Euclidean norm, we have the following estimates uniformly for $z \in K$:

$$x^* G(z) y - \frac{x^* y}{z^2} \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad x^* \mathcal{G}(z) y - \frac{x^* y}{z^2} \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad (\text{B.33})$$

$$x^* \mathbf{B}G(z) y \prec n^{-1/2}, \quad x^* \mathbf{A}\mathcal{G}(z) y \prec n^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{B.34})$$

Write $a = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}$, with $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$. For $\nu = (k, \mathbf{s})$, using (5.6) and (2.2),

$$a^* R_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathbf{u}_\nu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[z a_1^* G(z) u_k + \mathbf{s} a_1^* \mathbf{A}\mathcal{G}(z) u_k + a_2^* \mathbf{B}G(z) u_k + \mathbf{s} z a_2^* \mathcal{G}(z) u_k \right].$$

Applying (B.33) and (B.34) gives

$$a^* R_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathbf{u}_\nu = \frac{1}{z} a^* \mathbf{u}_\nu + \mathcal{O}_{\prec}(n^{-1/2}), \quad z \in \mathcal{K}_n.$$

Since r is fixed, this implies

$$\sup_{z \in K} \left\| a^* R_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathcal{U} - \frac{1}{z} a^* \mathcal{U} \right\|_2 \prec n^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{B.35})$$

It remains to pass from $R_{\mathcal{X}}$ to $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}$. By Lemma 5.6,

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} \|R_{\mathcal{X}}(z)\|_2 + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} \|\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

This, together with the resolvent identity $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) - R_{\mathcal{X}}(z) = R_{\mathcal{X}}(z) \mathcal{E} \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z)$ and Lemma 5.1, implies that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{K}_n} \left\| a^* (\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}}(z) - R_{\mathcal{X}}(z)) \mathcal{U} \right\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mu_n). \quad (\text{B.36})$$

By (B.36) and (B.35), we complete the proof.

B.11 Proof of Lemma 5.9

Recall the event $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$ defined above and the bound (5.26). On $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}$ is the Riesz projection appearing in Proposition 2.6. Hence, for any deterministic sequences $x_n, y_n \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ with $\|x_n\|_2 \vee \|y_n\|_2 \leq 1$, that theorem and (5.25) give, for every fixed $\eta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|x_n^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}} y_n| > \eta, \mathcal{G}_{a,n}) = \mathfrak{o}(1). \quad (\text{B.37})$$

If (5.28) failed for some fixed $\eta > 0$, then, in view of (5.26), there would exist $c > 0$, a subsequence n_ℓ , and deterministic vectors $x_{n_\ell}, y_{n_\ell} \in \mathbb{C}^{2n_\ell}$ with norms at most one such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|x_{n_\ell}^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}} y_{n_\ell}| > \eta, \mathcal{G}_{a,n_\ell}) \geq c$$

for every ℓ . Extend these vectors arbitrarily to deterministic sequences along all n . Equation (B.37) then makes the displayed probability tend to zero along n_ℓ , a contradiction. This proves (5.28).

For the corresponding assertion about the upper-left block, define

$$J_1 := \begin{pmatrix} I_n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times n}.$$

Since $[A]_{11} = J_1^\top A J_1$ and $J_1^\top J_1 = I_n$, we have

$$|x^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i} y| \leq |(J_1 x)^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i,+}^{\text{out}} (J_1 y)| + |(J_1 x)^* \mathcal{E}_{a,i,-}^{\text{out}} (J_1 y)|.$$

Applying (5.28) to the two terms proves the claimed deterministic-vector bound for $\mathcal{E}_{a,i}$.

We next prove the operator-norm bounds. Let

$$\Gamma_{a,i,s} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \alpha_{a,i,s}| = \rho_{a,i,s}\}, \quad \rho_{a,i,s} := \frac{\Delta_{a,i,s}}{4}.$$

We orient $\Gamma_{a,i,s}$ counterclockwise. Define $\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}_a}(z)$, $\mathcal{U}_a$, $\mathcal{D}_a$ for the samplewise analogues of the quantities in (5.24), and let

$$L_a(z) := \mathcal{D}_a^{-1} - \mathcal{U}_a^* \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}_a}(z) \mathcal{U}_a.$$

On $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$, the contour formula and the Woodbury identity give

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\Gamma_{a,i,s}} \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}_a}(z) \mathcal{U}_a L_a(z)^{-1} \mathcal{U}_a^* \tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}_a}(z) \, dz. \quad (\text{B.38})$$

Lemma 5.6 and (5.22) imply

$$\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{a,i,s}} \|\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}_a}(z)\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \sup_{z \in \Gamma_{a,i,s}} \|L_a(z)^{-1}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\Delta_{a,i,s}^{-1}). \quad (\text{B.39})$$

Since $\|\mathcal{U}_a\|_2 = 1$ and $|\Gamma_{a,i,s}| = 2\pi\rho_{a,i,s}$, (B.38)–(B.39) give

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}\|_2 \leq \rho_{a,i,s} \left(\sup_{z \in \Gamma_{a,i,s}} \|\tilde{R}_{\mathcal{X}_a}(z)\|_2 \right)^2 \sup_{z \in \Gamma_{a,i,s}} \|L_a(z)^{-1}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\rho_{a,i,s} \Delta_{a,i,s}^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (\text{B.40})$$

For every $M > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}\|_2 > M \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{a,n}^c) + \mathbb{P} \left(\|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}\|_2 > M, \mathcal{G}_{a,n} \right).$$

It follows from (5.26) and (B.40) that the same norm bound holds without restricting to $\mathcal{G}_{a,n}$. Thus

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}}\|_2 \leq \|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}\|_2 + \|\mathcal{P}_{a,i,s}\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (\text{B.41})$$

By construction, $\text{rank}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}) \leq 1$, while $\text{rank}(\mathcal{P}_{a,i,s}) = 1$. Hence

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}}) \leq \text{rank}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}) + \text{rank}(\mathcal{P}_{a,i,s}) \leq 2. \quad (\text{B.42})$$

Finally,

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{a,i}\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\Pi}_{a,i}\|_2 + \|\Pi_{a,i}\|_2 \leq \sum_{s \in \{+, -\}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{a,i,s}\|_2 + 1 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (\text{B.43})$$

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{E}_{a,i}) \leq \text{rank}(\hat{\Pi}_{a,i}) + \text{rank}(\Pi_{a,i}) \leq 3. \quad (\text{B.44})$$

Equations (B.41), (B.42), (B.43), and (B.44) prove (5.27).

It remains to treat random test vectors. Let $Z_{a,n}$ denote either $\mathcal{E}_{a,i,s}^{\text{out}}$ or $\mathcal{E}_{a,i}$, with the corresponding dimension, and

$$\mathcal{B}_{M,n} := \{\|x_n\|_2 \vee \|y_n\|_2 \leq M\},$$

where M is a fixed constant. For any deterministic vectors x, y and constant $\eta > 0$, define

$$p_n(x, y) := \mathbb{P}(|x^* Z_{a,n} y| > \eta).$$

Since (x_n, y_n) is independent of $Z_{a,n}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|x_n^* Z_{a,n} y_n| > \eta, \mathcal{B}_{M,n}) = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{B}_{M,n}) p_n(x_n, y_n)\} \leq \sup_{\substack{x, y \text{ deterministic} \\ \|x\|_2 \vee \|y\|_2 \leq M}} p_n(x, y).$$

Hence, for every fixed $M < \infty$ and $\eta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|x_n^* Z_{a,n} y_n| > \eta) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_{M,n}^c) + \sup_{\substack{x, y \text{ deterministic} \\ \|x\|_2 \vee \|y\|_2 \leq M}} \mathbb{P}(|x^* Z_{a,n} y| > \eta). \quad (\text{B.45})$$

For fixed M , write $x = M\tilde{x}$ and $y = M\tilde{y}$. The deterministic-vector bound applied to $\|\tilde{x}\|_2 \vee \|\tilde{y}\|_2 \leq 1$ with threshold η/M^2 shows that the last supremum is $\mathfrak{o}(1)$. The assumption $\|x_n\|_2 \vee \|y_n\|_2 = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ gives

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_{M,n}^c) = 0.$$

Taking first $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $M \rightarrow \infty$ in (B.45) yields $x_n^* Z_{a,n} y_n = \mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. This proves (5.29) and completes the proof.

References

- O. H. Ajanki, L. Erdős, and T. Krüger. Universality for general Wigner-type matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 169(3–4):667–727, 2017. doi: [10.1007/s00440-016-0740-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-016-0740-2). (cited on page 2)
- O. H. Ajanki, L. Erdős, and T. Krüger. Stability of the matrix Dyson equation and random matrices with correlations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 173(1–2):293–373, 2019a. doi: [10.1007/s00440-018-0835-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-018-0835-z). (cited on pages 4 and 16)
- O. H. Ajanki, L. Erdős, and T. Krüger. *Quadratic vector equations on complex upper half-plane*, volume 261. American Mathematical Society, 2019b. (cited on page 2)
- J. Alt, L. Erdős, and T. Krüger. Local inhomogeneous circular law. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 28(1):148–203, 2018. doi: [10.1214/17-AAP1302](https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AAP1302). (cited on page 37)
- Z. Bai and X. Ding. Estimation of spiked eigenvalues in spiked models. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 01(02):1150011, 2012. doi: [10.1142/s2010326311500110](https://doi.org/10.1142/s2010326311500110). (cited on page 13)
- Z. Bai and J. Yao. Central limit theorems for eigenvalues in a spiked population model. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 44(3):447–474, 2008. doi: [10.1214/07-AIHP118](https://doi.org/10.1214/07-AIHP118). (cited on page 2)

- Z. Bai and J. Yao. On sample eigenvalues in a generalized spiked population model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 106: 167–177, 2012. doi: [10.1016/j.jmva.2011.10.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2011.10.009). (cited on page 2)
- J. Baik and J. W. Silverstein. Eigenvalues of large sample covariance matrices of spiked population models. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 97(6):1382–1408, 2006. ISSN 0047-259X,1095-7243. doi: [10.1016/j.jmva.2005.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2005.08.003). URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2005.08.003>. (cited on page 2)
- Z. Bao, X. Ding, and K. Wang. Singular vector and singular subspace distribution for the matrix denoising model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1):370–392, 2021. doi: [10.1214/20-AOS1960](https://doi.org/10.1214/20-AOS1960). (cited on page 2)
- Z. Bao, K. M. Cheong, J. Lee, and Y. Li. Signal detection from spiked noise via asymmetrization, 2025. (cited on pages 2, 4, and 6)
- F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi. The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of finite, low rank perturbations of large random matrices. *Advances in Mathematics*, 227(1):494–521, 2011. doi: [10.1016/j.aim.2011.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2011.02.007). (cited on pages 2 and 13)
- F. Benaych-Georges and R. R. Nadakuditi. The singular values and vectors of low rank perturbations of large rectangular random matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 111:120–135, 2012. doi: [10.1016/j.jmva.2012.04.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2012.04.019). (cited on page 2)
- F. Benaych-Georges, A. Guionnet, and M. Maïda. Fluctuations of the extreme eigenvalues of finite rank deformations of random matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:1621–1662, 2011. doi: [10.1214/EJP.v16-929](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v16-929). (cited on page 2)
- J. Bigot and C. Male. Freeness over the diagonal and outliers detection in deformed random matrices with a variance profile. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 10(3):863–919, 2021. doi: [10.1093/imaiai/iaaa012](https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/iaaa012). (cited on page 2)
- A. Bloemendal and B. Virág. Limits of spiked random matrices I. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 156(3–4):795–825, 2013. doi: [10.1007/s00440-012-0443-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-012-0443-2). (cited on page 2)
- A. Bloemendal and B. Virág. Limits of spiked random matrices II. *The Annals of Probability*, 44(4):2726–2769, 2016. doi: [10.1214/15-AOP1033](https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AOP1033). (cited on page 2)
- C. Bordenave, M. Lelarge, and L. Massoulié. Nonbacktracking spectrum of random graphs: Community detection and nonregular Ramanujan graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, 46(1):1–71, 2018. doi: [10.1214/16-AOP1142](https://doi.org/10.1214/16-AOP1142). (cited on page 3)
- C. Bordenave, S. Coste, and R. R. Nadakuditi. Detection thresholds in very sparse matrix completion. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 23(5):1619–1743, 2023. doi: [10.1007/s10208-022-09568-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-022-09568-6). (cited on pages 1, 3, and 4)
- A. Bykhovskaya, V. Gorin, and S. Sodin. How weak are weak factors? uniform inference for signal strength in signal plus noise models, 2025. (cited on pages 2 and 13)
- M. Capitaine. Exact separation phenomenon for the eigenvalues of large information-plus-noise type matrices. Application to spiked models. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 63(6):1875–1910, 2014. doi: [10.1512/iumj.2014.63.5432](https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.2014.63.5432). (cited on page 2)
- M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, and D. Féral. The largest eigenvalues of finite rank deformation of large Wigner matrices: convergence and nonuniversality of the fluctuations. *The Annals of Probability*, 37(1):1–47, 2009. doi: [10.1214/08-AOP394](https://doi.org/10.1214/08-AOP394). (cited on page 2)
- M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, D. Féral, and M. Février. Free convolution with a semicircular distribution and eigenvalues of spiked deformations of Wigner matrices. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:1750–1792, 2011. doi: [10.1214/EJP.v16-934](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v16-934). (cited on page 2)
- Y. Chen, C. Cheng, and J. Fan. Asymmetry helps: Eigenvalue and eigenvector analyses of asymmetrically perturbed low-rank matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(1):435–458, 2021. doi: [10.1214/20-AOS1963](https://doi.org/10.1214/20-AOS1963). (cited on page 2)
- J. Ding, S. B. Hopkins, and D. Steurer. Estimating rank-one spikes from heavy-tailed noise via self-avoiding walks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 5576–5586, 2020. (cited on page 3)
- H. Du, H. Hu, and S. Lepsveridze. Optimal spectral algorithms for correlated two-view models in high dimensions, 2026. arXiv:2605.19364. (cited on page 4)
- L. Erdős and P. Mühlbacher. Bounds on the norm of Wigner-type random matrices. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 08(03):1950009, 2019. doi: [10.1142/s2010326319500096](https://doi.org/10.1142/s2010326319500096). (cited on page 18)
- L. Erdős, A. Knowles, and H.-T. Yau. Averaging fluctuations in resolvents of random band matrices. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 14(8):1837–1926, 2013. doi: [10.1007/s00023-013-0235-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00023-013-0235-y). (cited on page 17)
- L. Erdős, T. Krüger, and D. Schröder. Random matrices with slow correlation decay. *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, 7, 2019. doi: [10.1017/fms.2019.2](https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2019.2). (cited on pages 17, 38, 39, 40, and 42)
- J. Fan, J. Guo, and S. Zheng. Estimating number of factors by adjusted eigenvalues thresholding. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(538):852–861, 2020. doi: [10.1080/01621459.2020.1825448](https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2020.1825448). (cited on page 13)
- D. Féral and S. Pécché. The largest eigenvalue of rank one deformation of large Wigner matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 272(1):185–228, 2007. doi: [10.1007/s00220-007-0209-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-007-0209-3). (cited on page 2)

- M. Gavish, W. Leeb, and E. Romanov. Matrix denoising with partial noise statistics: Optimal singular value shrinkage of spiked F -matrices. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(3):2020–2065, 2023. doi: [10.1093/imaiai/iaad028](https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/iaad028). (cited on page 2)
- R. Geng, D.-Z. Liu, and G. Zou. Outliers for deformed inhomogeneous random matrices, 2024. (cited on page 2)
- V. L. Girko. Circular law. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 29(4):694–706, 1985. doi: [10.1137/1129095](https://doi.org/10.1137/1129095). (cited on page 16)
- A. Guionnet, J. Ko, F. Krzakala, and L. Zdeborová. Low-rank matrix estimation with inhomogeneous noise. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 14(2), 2025. doi: [10.1093/imaiai/iaaf010](https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/iaaf010). (cited on page 1)
- W. Hachem, P. Loubaton, X. Mestre, J. Najim, and P. Vallet. Large information plus noise random matrix models and consistent subspace estimation in large sensor networks. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 1(2):1150006, 2012. doi: [10.1142/S2010326311500067](https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010326311500067). (cited on page 2)
- B. Karrer and M. E. J. Newman. Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 83(1):016107, 2011. doi: [10.1103/PhysRevE.83.016107](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.83.016107). (cited on page 1)
- C. Keup and L. Zdeborová. Optimal thresholds and algorithms for a model of multi-modal learning in high dimensions. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2025(9):093302, 2025. doi: [10.1088/1742-5468/ae0428](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/ae0428). (cited on page 4)
- A. Knowles and J. Yin. The isotropic semicircle law and deformation of Wigner matrices. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 66(11):1663–1749, 2013. doi: [10.1002/cpa.21450](https://doi.org/10.1002/cpa.21450). (cited on page 2)
- A. Knowles and J. Yin. The outliers of a deformed Wigner matrix. *The Annals of Probability*, 42(5):1980–2031, 2014. doi: [10.1214/13-AOP855](https://doi.org/10.1214/13-AOP855). (cited on page 2)
- B. Landa and Y. Kluger. The Dyson equalizer: Adaptive noise stabilization for low-rank signal detection and recovery. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 14(1):iaae036, 2025. doi: [10.1093/imaiai/iaae036](https://doi.org/10.1093/imaiai/iaae036). (cited on page 1)
- B. Landa, T. T. C. K. Zhang, and Y. Kluger. Biwhitening reveals the rank of a count matrix. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 4(4):1420–1446, 2022. doi: [10.1137/21M1456807](https://doi.org/10.1137/21M1456807). (cited on page 1)
- R. Latała. Some estimates of norms of random matrices. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 133(5):1273–1282, 2004. doi: [10.1090/s0002-9939-04-07800-1](https://doi.org/10.1090/s0002-9939-04-07800-1). (cited on page 31)
- Z. Li. The algorithmic phase transition in correlated spiked models, 2025. arXiv:2511.06040. (cited on page 4)
- L. T. Liu, E. Dobriban, and A. Singer. ePCA: High dimensional exponential family PCA. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 12(4):2121–2150, 2018. doi: [10.1214/18-AOAS1146](https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOAS1146). (cited on page 1)
- P. Loubaton and P. Vallet. Almost sure localization of the eigenvalues in a Gaussian information plus noise model. Application to the spiked models. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:1934–1959, 2011. doi: [10.1214/EJP.v16-943](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v16-943). (cited on page 2)
- L. Massoulié. Community detection thresholds and the weak Ramanujan property. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC ’14, pages 694–703. ACM, 2014. doi: [10.1145/2591796.2591857](https://doi.org/10.1145/2591796.2591857). (cited on page 3)
- P. Mergny and L. Zdeborová. Spectral thresholds in correlated spiked models and fundamental limits of partial least squares. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 300 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3925–3933. PMLR, 2026. (cited on page 4)
- R. R. Nadakuditi. OptShrink: An algorithm for improved low-rank signal matrix denoising by optimal, data-driven singular value shrinkage. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(5):3002–3018, 2014. doi: [10.1109/TIT.2014.2311661](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2014.2311661). (cited on pages 2 and 28)
- S. Nandy and Z. Ma. Multimodal data integration and cross-modal querying via orchestrated approximate message passing, 2024. arXiv:2407.19030. (cited on page 4)
- A. Pizzo, D. Renfrew, and A. Soshnikov. On finite rank deformations of Wigner matrices. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 49(1):64–94, 2013. doi: [10.1214/11-AIHP459](https://doi.org/10.1214/11-AIHP459). (cited on page 2)
- A. A. Shabalin and A. B. Nobel. Reconstruction of a low-rank matrix in the presence of gaussian noise. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 118:67–76, 2013. doi: [10.1016/j.jmva.2013.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2013.03.005). (cited on pages 2 and 28)
- L. Stephan and Y. Zhu. A non-backtracking method for long matrix and tensor completion. In S. Agrawal and A. Roth, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 247 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4636–4690. PMLR, 2024. (cited on page 3)
- P.-C. Su and H.-T. Wu. Data-driven optimal shrinkage of singular values under high-dimensional noise with separable covariance structure with application. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 74:101698, 2025. doi: [10.1016/j.acha.2024.101698](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2024.101698). (cited on page 2)
- T. Tao. Outliers in the spectrum of iid matrices with bounded rank perturbations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 155(1–2):231–263, 2013. doi: [10.1007/s00440-011-0397-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-011-0397-9). (cited on page 2)
- X. Yang, S. Sen, and Y. M. Lu. Sharp spectral thresholds for multi-view spiked Wigner models, 2026. arXiv:2605.19894. (cited on page 4)