

SUBCRITICAL MULTIPLICATIVE CHAOS AND THE CHARACTERISTIC POLYNOMIAL OF THE $C\beta E$

GAULTIER LAMBERT AND JOSEPH NAJNUDEL

ABSTRACT. The goal of this article is to expand on the relationship between random matrix and multiplicative chaos theories using the integrability properties of the circular β -ensembles. We give a comprehensive proof of the multiplicative chaos convergence for the characteristic polynomial and eigenvalue counting function of the circular β -ensembles throughout the subcritical phase, including negative powers. This generalizes recent results in the unitary case, [NSW20, BF22], to any $\beta > 0$ and for the eigenvalue counting field.

CONTENTS

1. Intro	1
1.1. Main result	1
1.2. $C\beta E$ coupling; martingale approximations	5
1.3. Related results and state of the art.	8
1.4. Notations	10
2. Martingale convergence; Proof of Theorem 2	11
2.1. OPUC theory	11
2.2. Convergence for real part in case $\gamma \geq 0$	14
2.3. Convergence for real part in case $\gamma \leq 0$	16
2.4. Convergence for imaginary part	19
3. Convergence for the characteristic polynomials	21
3.1. Proof of Theorem 1	21
3.2. Main steps	23
3.3. Gaussian coupling and Linearization.	25
3.4. Proof of Proposition 15	28
3.5. Gaussian calculations; proof of Proposition 19	28
Appendix A. Properties of the $C\beta E$ model	29
Appendix B. Concentration bounds	32
References	34

1. INTRO

1.1. Main result. Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. The circular β -ensembles ($C\beta E$) is the family of probability measures, for $\beta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{Z_n(\beta)} \prod_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} |e^{i\theta_k} - e^{i\theta_j}|^\beta \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{d\theta_k}{2\pi}, \quad (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \in \mathbb{T}^n. \quad (1)$$

This model was introduced by Dyson [Dy62], it generalizes the circular unitary ensembles (CUE – for $\beta = 2$, (1) corresponds to the law of the eigenvalues of a Haar-distributed random matrix on the group \mathbb{U}_n) and it is a fundamental model in random matrix theory with a rich analytic structure. For any $\beta > 0$, (1) can be viewed

G.L. acknowledges the support of the starting grant 2022-04882 from the Swedish Research Council and of the starting grant from the Ragnar Söderbergs Foundation.

as the equilibrium distribution of a Coulomb gas on the unit circle $\mathbb{U} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ or as the distribution of the eigenvalues of some random unitary matrices, and the partition function $Z_n(\beta)$ is known explicitly by Selberg's integral. We refer to Section 1.3 for additional background and motivations on circular ensembles.

In this paper, we take a random matrix perspective and the goal is to study a central object; the large n limit of characteristic polynomials. Such limits are expected to be universal for β -ensembles or log-gases. Our analysis exploits the fact that (1) can be realized consistently as the eigenvalues of a sequence of (sparse) unitary matrices on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$. These matrices have been introduced in [KN04], using CMV representation, and they depend only on a sequence of random coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ and an independent uniform random variable η in \mathbb{T} . We review the main details of the underlying theory in Section 2.1. In particular, the specific law of the coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is given in Fact 1 below. The focal point is that this provides an explicit coupling to study the asymptotics as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the eigenvalues and characteristic polynomials of the circular β -ensembles. We record the following description of the $C\beta E$ from [KN04, KS09].

Proposition 1 (Prüfer phases). *For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we define the quantity $\varpi_n : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\varpi_0(\theta) = \theta$ and*

$$\varpi_{n+1}(\theta) = \theta + \varpi_n(\theta) - 2\Im \log(1 - \alpha_n e^{i\varpi_n(\theta)}), \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi]. \quad (2)$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $\theta \in [0, 2\pi] \mapsto \varpi_{n-1}(\theta)$ is continuously increasing, $\varpi_{n-1}(2\pi) = \varpi_{n-1}(0) + 2\pi n$, and the set

$$\mathfrak{Z}_n = \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi] : \varpi_{n-1}(\theta) = -\eta[2\pi]\}$$

is distributed according to (1). In the sequel, we write $\mathfrak{Z}_n = (\theta_j)_{j=1}^n$ with the order $0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_n < 2\pi$.

The quantities ϖ_n are called the Prüfer phases, they play the role of the eigenvalue counting functions for the circular β -ensembles and their behavior can be analyzed via the recursion¹ (2). This type of analysis has been initiated in the seminal paper [KS09] and further continued in e.g. [CMN18, CN19, VV20, VV22, NPS23, PZ22].

We define the $C\beta E$ characteristic polynomials; for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{X}_n(z) = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 - z e^{-i\theta_j}). \quad (3)$$

Then, we can define $\log \mathcal{X}_n(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n \log(1 - z e^{-i\theta_j})$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$, using the principle branch of $\log(\cdot)$, and by continuity, $\mathcal{Y}_n : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto \Im \log \mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})$. We verify that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^n h(\theta - \theta_j) \quad (4)$$

where $h : \mathbb{T} \mapsto [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ is defined by $h(\theta) = \frac{\theta - \pi}{2}$ for $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$, (20). In particular, the function \mathcal{Y}_n is piecewise linear on \mathbb{T} with slope $\frac{n}{2}$ and it jumps by $-\pi$ on \mathfrak{Z}_n . Then, \mathcal{Y}_n is called the eigenvalue counting function and we verify that for any function $f \in C^1(\mathbb{T})$,

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f'(\theta) \mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) d\theta = \sum_{j=1}^n f(\theta_j) - n \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \sum_{j=1}^n f(\theta_j) - \mathbf{E}(\sum_{j=1}^n f(\theta_j))$$

where the last identity follows by rotation-invariance of (1).

An important property of the $C\beta E$ and other log-gases is that the eigenvalues are logarithmically correlated. At first, this is a consequence of the central limit theorem (CLT) for eigenvalue statistics. Given $f \in C^{1+\epsilon}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ for a $\epsilon > 0$, it holds in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f'(\theta) \mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) d\theta \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{2}{\beta} \Sigma(f)) \quad (5)$$

where the variance

$$\Sigma(f) = \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} f'(\theta) f'(\vartheta) \log |1 - e^{i(\theta - \vartheta)}|^{-1} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \frac{d\vartheta}{2\pi} = \sum_{k \geq 1} k |f_k|^2$$

and $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the Fourier coefficients of the test function. The interpretation of this result is that the random field $\{\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{T}\}$ converges weakly towards a Gaussian generalized function with mean-zero and correlation kernel, $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \mapsto \beta^{-1} \log |e^{i\theta} - e^{i\vartheta}|^{-1}$. A similar convergence result also holds for

¹Observe that for $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, the map $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \Im \log(1 - \alpha e^{i\omega})$ is smooth. Then, the recursion (2) can be extended for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

$\theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto \log |\mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})|$, which is a continuous function taking values $-\infty$ on \mathfrak{Z}_n . Theorem (5) was first obtained for $\beta = 2$ by Johansson [Jo88] (although the same proof can be applied to any $\beta > 0$, [La21]) and the interpretation in terms of a log-correlated field is due to [HKO01]. The result for general $\beta > 0$ follows from [JM15] (see also [Ki07, FTW19]). In particular, the parameter β simply controls the variance of limiting Gaussian field. To further elaborate on these results, we recall the following property from [CN19, Sect 3].

Proposition 2. *For a fixed $\beta > 0$, within the coupling from [KN04], it holds almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathcal{X}_n(z) \rightarrow e^{\varphi(z)} \quad \text{locally uniformly for } z \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $\{\varphi(z) : z \in \mathbb{D}\}$ is a mean-zero Gaussian analytic function (GAF) with covariances

$$\mathbf{E}[\varphi(z)\overline{\varphi(w)}] = -\frac{2}{\beta} \log(1 - z\bar{w}), \quad \mathbf{E}[\varphi(z)\varphi(w)] = 0. \quad (6)$$

For completeness, we provide the main steps of the proof of Proposition 2 in the Appendix A. We emphasize again that in this framework, the GAF $\{\varphi(z) : z \in \mathbb{D}\}$ and the CβE $_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ are defined on the same probability space.

The limits $\chi(u) : u \in \mathbb{U} \mapsto \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \Re \varphi(ru)$ and $\psi : u \in \mathbb{U} \mapsto \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \Im \varphi(ru)$ exist, for instance, in the Sobolev space $H^{-\epsilon}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ and (χ, ψ) are independent Gaussian log-correlated fields on \mathbb{U} . These fields are identically distributed with covariance kernel

$$(u, v) \in \mathbb{U}^2 \mapsto \beta^{-1} \log |u - v|^{-1}.$$

Then, we can associate to these fields two families of Gaussian multiplicative chaos measures (GMC). The proof of the next proposition follow directly² from [Be15, Thm 1.1].

Proposition 3 (GMC). *Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{\gamma} := \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta}$. Suppose that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. There are two random measures on \mathbb{T} such that*

$$\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{|e^{\gamma\varphi(re^{i\theta})}|^\gamma d\theta}{\mathbf{E}|e^{\gamma\varphi(r)}|^\gamma 2\pi}, \quad \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{e^{\gamma\Im\varphi(re^{i\theta})} d\theta}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\Im\varphi(r)} 2\pi}. \quad (7)$$

Both limits hold in probability with respect to the topology of weak convergence for non-negative measures on \mathbb{T} . Moreover, the GMC $\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}, \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}$ are independent, with the same law. The distribution of the random measure $\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}$ depends on (γ, β) only via $\hat{\gamma}$ and $0 < \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(\mathbb{T}) < \infty$ for $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$.

Gaussian multiplicative chaos has many crucial applications in modern probability and we refer to the survey [RV14] for an overview of the theory. For now, we recall that these random measures have exact Hausdorff dimension $1 - \hat{\gamma}^2$ (almost surely). They are continuous with respect to the parameter $\hat{\gamma}$ in the appropriate topology and $\mathbf{E}\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta) = \mu^0(d\theta) = \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$. For $|\hat{\gamma}| \geq 1$, the limits (7) also exists in probability, but they are equal to 0. The non-trivial regime $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ is called the subcritical phase.

Proposition 2 raises the question whether the CβE characteristic polynomials also give raise to suitable approximations of the GMC measures (7). Our main goal is to obtain the following results.

Theorem 1. *Recall (3) and the subsequent definition of $(\mathcal{Y}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{\gamma} := \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta}$ such that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. If $\gamma > -1$, it holds in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{|\mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma d\theta}{\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{X}_n(1)|^\gamma 2\pi} \rightarrow \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta).$$

It holds in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{e^{\gamma\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta)} d\theta}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\mathcal{Y}_n(0)} 2\pi} \rightarrow \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta).$$

²Since φ is a GAF in \mathbb{D} , $\Re\varphi(z) = P_z\chi$ (and similarly for $\Im\varphi$) where P is the Poisson kernel of \mathbb{D} (P_z is a smooth mollifier on \mathbb{U} for $z \in \mathbb{D}$).

Both results hold with respect to the topology of weak convergence for non-negative measures on \mathbb{T} and they cover the whole subcritical phase as in Proposition 3. Observe that the convergence to $\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}$ only makes sense for $\gamma > -1$, since obviously $\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{X}_n(1)|^\gamma < \infty$ if and only if $\gamma > -1$. Prior to Theorem 1, the only complete results on multiplicative chaos in random matrix theory are due to [We15, NSW20, BF22] for the modulus of the CUE characteristic polynomial with $\gamma \geq 0$. These results rely on the determinantal structure of the model ($\beta = 2$) and more analytic methods. In contrast, the proof of Theorem 1 is probabilistic, based on martingale convergence arguments, albeit being specific to circular β -ensembles, it yields stronger convergence results.

This article is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1 and the arguments are organized as follows;

- In Subsection 1.2, we review in details the results from [KN04], further developed in [CMN18, CN19]. This section relies on the theory of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle (OPUC) [Sim04]. In particular, this yields a martingale approximation $\varphi_n = \mathbf{E}(\varphi|\mathcal{F}_n)$, with $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ for the GAF from Proposition 2. We also discuss some additional results which follow from our analysis, included an alternative elementary proof of the main result from [CN19].
- In Subsection 1.3, we review the main results related to Theorem 1 in random matrix theory. Given the extend of the literature, we focus mostly on the log-correlated structure of the eigenvalues, multiplicative chaos, circular β -ensembles and the Fyodorov Bouchaud conjecture.
- In Section 2, we obtain a GMC convergence for the martingale sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$; see Theorem 2 below. The method is analogous for both real and imaginary part of the martingale $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ so we explain the main steps for the real part. Define $\mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) := \frac{e^{\gamma \Re \varphi_n(e^{i\theta})} d\theta}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Re \varphi_n(1)} 2\pi}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Formally, the goal is to prove that for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and $f \in C(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^\gamma(f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \left(\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{e^{\gamma \Re \varphi_n(r e^{i\theta})}}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Re \varphi_n(r)}} \right) f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \int \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{\gamma \Re \varphi_n(r e^{i\theta})}}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Re \varphi_n(r)}} \right) f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \int \frac{e^{\gamma \Re \varphi(r e^{i\theta})}}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Re \varphi(r)}} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The first step follows by continuity and the third step from a martingale convergence theorem (the last step is Proposition 3). The main technical challenge is to justify exchanging the limits (8). A similar analysis has been performed in [CN19] with $\gamma = -2$ (in the regime $\beta > 2$). However, we give a new and *elementary* proof of (8) based on martingale arguments (Proposition 4).

- The final step is to relate the asymptotics of $\frac{|\mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma d\theta}{\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_n(1)|^\gamma 2\pi}$ to that of μ_n^γ . In Section 3, we show that these measures have the same limit, in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The starting point is the relationship between the characteristic polynomial \mathcal{X}_{n+1} and φ_n ; one has for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with $u = e^{i\theta}$,

$$\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(u) = e^{\varphi_n(u)} (1 - e^{i\eta + i\varpi_n(\theta)}), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{T},$$

with ϖ_n and η as in Proposition 1. If $\gamma > -1$, the function $f : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto |1 - e^{i\theta}|^\gamma$ is L^1 with mean $f_0 > 0$, so the mass of the random measure associated with the characteristic polynomial is well-defined;

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma d\theta}{\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(1)|^\gamma 2\pi} = f_0^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\eta + \varpi_n(\theta)) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta).$$

By density of the trigonometric polynomials in $L^1(\mathbb{T})$, it will suffice to show that for any $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{i\kappa \varpi_n(\theta)} \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \rightarrow 0. \quad (9)$$

This implies convergence of the mass; $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma d\theta}{\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(1)|^\gamma 2\pi} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n^\gamma(\mathbb{T}) = \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(\mathbb{T})$ in probability. By standard results, such arguments imply Theorem 1 (an analogous result holds for the imaginary part). The property (9) is formulated as Proposition 13 below and its proof relies on a *second moment method* using the *branching properties* of the Prüfer phases; this strategy is explained in details in Subsection 3.2.

For convenience, the main notations used throughout this article are gathered in Section 1.4 and we review some previous results on $C\beta E$ in the Appendix A. In the Appendix B, we gather some concentration inequalities for martingales that we use in the proofs. We emphasize that our proof is independent from previous works on this model, including [CN19] and the arguments are self-contained.

1.2. $C\beta E$ coupling; martingale approximations. In this section, we give a short introduction to the theory of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle (OPUC) and explain how this relates to the circular β -ensembles. As already emphasized, this idea originates from [KN04] and also [Sim04]. Starting from a probability measure μ on \mathbb{T} , with infinite support, by applying the Gram-Schmidt procedure to the sequence $1, z, z^2, \dots$, one obtains a sequence of (analytic) polynomials $(\Phi_k)_{k \geq 0}$, with $\Phi_k(z) = z^k + \dots$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, orthogonal with respect to μ . By [Sim04, Thm 1.5.2], there is a sequence of coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ in \mathbb{D} , such that the sequence $(\Phi_k)_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies the recursion

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_{k+1}(z) = z\Phi_k(z) - \overline{\alpha_k}\Phi_k^*(z) \\ \Phi_k^*(z) = z^k \overline{\Phi_k(1/\overline{z})} \end{cases} \quad z \in \mathbb{C}, k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (10)$$

Conversely, one can associate to $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, a unitary operator \mathcal{U}_α whose spectral measure is μ . The sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ are called Verblunsky coefficients and they characterize the measure μ ; see [Sim04, Chap. 4]. Moreover, the regularity properties of μ are intimately related to the properties of the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, [Sim04, Part 2]. An alternative way to reconstruct the probability measure μ is using the sequence of orthogonal polynomials, via the so-called Bernstein-Szegő approximation [Sim04, Thm 1.7.8]; for the weak convergence of measures on \mathbb{T} ,

$$\mu(d\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{c}_n^2 |\Phi_n^*(e^{i\theta})|^{-2} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad \mathbf{c}_n^2 = \|\Phi_n^*\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2. \quad (11)$$

In this framework, the following description of the circular β -ensembles follows from [KN04, Thm 1], see also [KS09, (10)]. We will use these conventions throughout this article.

Fact 1. Let $\beta > 0$ be a fixed parameter. Consider the Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_k = |\alpha_k|e^{i\eta_k}$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where $\{\eta_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{|\alpha_k|\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ are independent;

- η_k are i.i.d. uniform in \mathbb{T} .
- $|\alpha_k|^2$ are independent Beta-distributed random variables with distribution function, for $\beta_k := \beta \frac{k+1}{2}$,

$$\mathbf{P}[|\alpha_k|^2 \geq r] = (1-r)^{\beta_k}, \quad r \in [0, 1], k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (12)$$

Let μ_β be the spectral measure associated with these Verblunsky coefficients. For this model, the Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ (almost surely) and $\mathbf{E}|\alpha_k|^2 = (1 + \beta_k)^{-1}$.

Let η be a random variable, uniform in \mathbb{T} , independent of $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$. One can construct a sequence of unitary matrices $\{\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$, called CMV matrices, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)} \in \mathbb{U}_n$ is a function of $(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-2}, \eta)$, its eigenvalue set \mathfrak{Z}_n is distributed according to (1), and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \varprojlim \mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the characteristic polynomials satisfy

$$\mathcal{X}_n(z) := \det(1 - z\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)*}) = \Phi_{n-1}^*(z) - e^{i\eta}z\Phi_{n-1}(z) \quad z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (13)$$

In the sequel, the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ carries the random variables $\{\alpha_k\}$, η from Fact 1 and we consider the filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (14)$$

One of the goal of this article is to understand, just as (11), the asymptotics of powers $|\Phi_n^*(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma$ for the $C\beta E$. We establish that for suitable values of $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, after an appropriate renormalization, these powers converge to a family of random measures, which are Gaussian multiplicative chaos; see Theorem 2 below. In particular, the asymptotics of the characteristic polynomial (Theorem 1) will be obtained via the recursion (16) rather than using the CMV matrices. In the sequel, we will study the sequence of polynomials $(\Phi_k^*)_{k \geq 0}$ (or rather its logarithm), instead of $(\Phi_k)_{k \geq 0}$, since one has the following properties (see [Sim04, Sec 1.7]);

1. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\Phi_k^*(0) = 1$, Φ_k^* has no zeros in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ so one can define

$$\varphi_k(z) := \log \Phi_k^*(z), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} \quad (15)$$

in such a way that the functions φ_k are analytic in a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $\varphi_k(0) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

2. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define $B_k(z) := z\Phi_k(z)/\Phi_k^*(z)$ for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. One has $|B_k(z)| = 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{U}$ and (by the maximum principle) $|B_k(z)| \leq |z|$ for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Then, with the principal branch of $\log(\cdot)$, one can rewrite the recursion (10) as;

$$\varphi_{k+1}(z) = \varphi_k(z) + \log(1 - \alpha_k B_k(z)), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}, k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (16)$$

In particular, since $|\alpha_k| < 1$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the quantity $\log(1 - \alpha_k B_k(z))$ is analytic for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and it vanishes at $z = 0$.

3. The Prüfer phase from Proposition 1 are defined by $B_n(e^{i\theta}) := e^{i\varpi_n(\theta)}$ for an appropriate determination of $\varpi_n(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$.
3. The characteristic polynomial (13) satisfies

$$\mathcal{X}_n(z) = \Phi_{n-1}^*(z)(1 - e^{i\eta} B_{n-1}(z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, since Φ_n^* has no zero in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we recover that eigenvalues of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)}$ are given by $\mathfrak{Z}_n = \{\theta \in \mathbb{T} : \varpi_{n-1}(\theta) = -\eta[2\pi]\}$; see Proposition 1.

Properties 1 and 2 hold for general OPUC whose Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{D}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, while Property 4 is specific to rotation-invariant models (see Remark 1 below). A fundamental observation from [KS09], also used in subsequent work on this model, is that the sequence $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 0}$ from (15) is a martingale (uniformly integrable inside \mathbb{D}). This property follows directly from the recursion (16) and the fact that α_k is independent of \mathcal{F}_k and $\mathbf{E}[\log(1 - \alpha_k B_k(z)) | \mathcal{F}_k] = 0$ by rotation-invariance. Then, by a martingale convergence theorem (see Proposition 23 in appendix), almost surely $\varphi_k \rightarrow \varphi$ locally uniformly on \mathbb{D} as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\varphi_k(z) = \mathbf{E}_k \varphi(z), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0, z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

The limit φ is a GAF as in Proposition 2 and this generates two independent Gaussian multiplicative chaos (μ, ν) associated with $(\Re\varphi, \Im\varphi)$, measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma(\alpha_k; k \in \mathbb{N}_0)$, defined as in Proposition 3. In Section 2, we prove that these GMC can be directly approximated in terms of $\varphi_n := \log \Phi_n^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\psi_n(\theta) = \Im\varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta}$ such that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. It holds almost surely (with respect to the topology of weak convergence for non-negative measures on \mathbb{T}), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{|\Phi_n^*(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \rightarrow \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{e^{\gamma\psi_n(\theta)}}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\psi_n(0)}} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \rightarrow \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta).$$

As a consequence of Theorem 2 with $\gamma = -2$, using (11), we recover the spectral measure μ_β in the *subcritical phase* $\beta > 2$. For C β E, also for $\beta > 2$, the asymptotics of (11) have been investigated in [CN19], using the same coupling but different arguments. [CN19, Thm 2.1] establishes that the spectral measure μ_β is a (normalized) GMC with index $\hat{\gamma} = -\sqrt{2/\beta}$ for $\beta \geq 2$ (by continuity). This recovers the fact that in this regime, μ_β is singular continuous on \mathbb{T} with exact dimension $1 - \hat{\gamma}^2$ and this yields a proof of the Fyodorov-Bouchaud formula [FB08] for the mass of the (classical) GMC on \mathbb{T} . We review these results, which are also consequences of Theorem 2.

Corollary 3. *For $\beta > 2$, the spectral measure of the C β E is a normalized GMC measure on \mathbb{T} , $\mu_\beta = \mathbf{c}_\beta^{-1} \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}$, with index $\hat{\gamma} = -\sqrt{2/\beta}$. Moreover the mass $\mathbf{c}_\beta = \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(\mathbb{T})$ satisfies almost surely*

$$\mathbf{c}_\beta^{-1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{c}_n^2 \mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^{-2}. \quad (17)$$

It follows that $\mathbf{c}_\beta^{-1} \stackrel{d}{=} \Gamma(1 - \hat{\gamma}^2) \mathbf{e}^{\hat{\gamma}^2}$, where Γ denotes the Gamma function and \mathbf{e} is a standard exponential random variable.

The distribution of \mathbf{c}_β^{-1} is known as the Fyodorov-Bouchaud formula and it is elementarily deduced from (17) using the explicit law of the $C\beta E$ Verblunsky coefficients; see [CN19, Sec 2.4] for details. There is an alternative proof based on ideas from conformal field theory to compute negative moments of the GMC mass on \mathbb{T} , [Re20].

The proof of Theorem 2 amounts to the exchange of limits (8) as described above. This is the strategy used in [CN19] for $\gamma = -2$. In Section 2, we follow a different route and obtain the following martingale approximations;

Proposition 4. *Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta}$ such that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbf{E}_n \mu_n^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \mu_n^\gamma(f) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|\Phi_n^*(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi},$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_n \nu_n^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \nu_n^\gamma(f) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{e^{\gamma\psi_n(\theta)}}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\psi_n(0)}} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}.$$

Observe that in Proposition 4, the condition $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ is necessary, otherwise the random variable $\mu_n^{\hat{\gamma}} = 0$. Then, there is $\delta > 0$ so that for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\mu_n^\gamma(f) \rightarrow \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ almost surely and in } \mathbf{L}^{1+\delta}, \quad (18)$$

and similarly for ν . Here, the random variable $\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \in \mathbf{L}^{1+\delta}$ provided that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$; see (22). Hence, we deduce Theorem 2 by standard arguments (the topological space $C(\mathbb{T})$ is separable).

We close this section by several remarks concerning the $C\beta E$ model.

Remark 1 (OPUC theory). We focus on the case where the support of the probability measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is infinite. This condition guarantees that the Verblunsky coefficients are defined for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{D}$. In contrast, if $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ has a finite support, with say n points on \mathbb{T} , then the Gram-Schmidt procedure stops at step n and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-2} \in \mathbb{D}$ while $\alpha_{n-1} \in \mathbb{T}$ – this is the case for the spectral measure of the matrix $\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)}$. In particular, for $C\beta E$, by rotation-invariance, α_{n-1} is uniformly distributed on \mathbb{T} . Then, observe that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, upon replacing $\alpha_{n-1} \leftarrow e^{i\eta}$ and $\Phi_n^* \leftarrow \mathcal{X}_n$ in the recursion (10), this yields formula (13) for the $C\beta E$ characteristic polynomials.

Remark 2 (Non-universality). The convergence of the sequence $\{\varphi_k\}$ follows from the martingale convergence theorem using the properties of the Verblunsky coefficients. However, the fact that the limit φ is a GAF in \mathbb{D} (Proposition 2) is an exceptional property of the $C\beta E$ model. This property cannot be directly deduced from the specific law of the Verblunsky coefficients and it is a consequence of the CLT (5); see Appendix A. For another CMV model with independent, rotation-invariant, Verblunsky coefficients with $\mathbf{E}|\alpha_k|^2 \sim \beta_k^{-1}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we expect that the limit φ is a non-Gaussian analytic function in \mathbb{D} .

Remark 3 (Non-Gaussian multiplicative chaos). Our analysis relies crucially on three properties of the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$; independence, rotation-invariance and a specific decay rate. Even though, we rely on the specific distributions of the $C\beta E$ Verblunsky coefficients at different stages of the proof for simplicity, these arguments can be adapted if the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}$ satisfies these three properties. Then, by [AN22], the spectral measure $\boldsymbol{\mu}_\beta$ also has Hausdorff dimension exactly $1 - 2/\beta$ for $\beta > 2$ (subcritical phase), but it is not expected to be a normalized GMC. The question whether it is absolutely continuous with respect to a GMC is of interest for future research.

Remark 4 (Deterministic case). The limit $\beta = \infty$ corresponds (by continuity) to the case where the Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by (10), $\Phi_k^*(z) = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (that is, the orthogonal polynomials are $\Phi_k(z) = z^k$ for $k \geq 0$) and the spectral measure $\mu^0 = \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$ is the uniform measure on \mathbb{T} . In this case, by Proposition 1, the point configuration is $\mathfrak{Z}_n = \left\{ \frac{2\pi k + \eta}{n} : k \in [n] \right\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where η is uniform in $[0, 2\pi]$. Observe that this configuration is *the minimizer* of the Coulomb energy from (1):

$$(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) \in \mathbb{T}^n \mapsto \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq n} \log |e^{i\theta_k} - e^{i\theta_j}|^{-1}.$$

1.3. Related results and state of the art. There are many important works on fluctuations of eigenvalues and characteristic polynomials of β -ensembles and we focus on the most relevant recent results in the context of this paper, that is, in relation to log-correlated fields and multiplicative chaos.

CUE. An important motivation to study the measure (1) is the case $\beta = 2$, which corresponds to the distribution of the eigenvalues of a Haar distributed random matrix in \mathbb{U}_n , this is known as the circular unitary ensemble (CUE). This is arguably the most basic model in random matrix theory [Me19], it can be analyzed via many different methods and there are notable connections with functional analysis, through Toeplitz determinants, representation theory and probabilistic model for the Riemann ζ function. In addition, the heuristics of [FB08, FHK12] which treats the CUE characteristic polynomial as a log-correlated landscapes to make predictions about its extreme values by analogy with the statistical mechanics of random energy models have stimulated a lot of recent developments in random matrix theory.

Gaussian fluctuations. The central limit theorem (5) was first obtained in [Jo88] using the *Coulomb gas method*. At first, this result is surprising because the eigenvalue field is asymptotically Gaussian without renormalization, this is due to the log range correlations of log-gases. Johansson's method is written for $\beta = 2$, but it is easily generalized to arbitrary $\beta > 0$, [La21]. There is an alternative approach to the CLT based on the moment method and representation theory [DE01, JM15]. This approach is explained in a concise way in [CN19, Appendix A]. Moreover, another remarkable property of the CUE is that moments of trace in polynomials of Haar-distributed random matrix exactly match moments of Gaussian random variables (see Remark 8). In fact, these traces approximate Gaussians with a super-exponential rate, we refer to [JL21, CJL24] for quantitative results. We refer to [Sim04, Chap.6] for a comprehensive discussion of the CLT for CUE eigenvalues and related *Szegő's asymptotics*, including several different proofs. There are also an alternative approach based on Stein's method and transport which applies to general β -ensembles [We16, LLW19, BLS18, AHMP24]. It is also worth to mention that some non-integrable generalizations have been studied recently, this includes the fluctuations of β -ensembles on a regular curve in \mathbb{C} [CJ23] and the circular Riesz gases [Bo21, Bo22].

Sine $_\beta$ process. For general $\beta > 0$, the measure (1) was introduced by Dyson as a simple statistical model for a one-dimensional gas with long range interaction [Dy62]. It can be interpreted as the equilibrium distribution of a two-dimensional Coulomb gas confined on \mathbb{U} , which corresponds to the stationary measure for the Dyson Brownian motion on \mathbb{T} , where the strength of the interaction term is determined by β . In many body quantum mechanics, (1) also corresponds to the ground state of the Calogero-Sutherland Hamiltonian. The CMV matrix models for (1) have been introduced in [KN04]. As explained in Section 1.2, these models depend on a single sequence of independent random variables $\{\alpha_k\}$ and this provides a useful coupling to study the asymptotic properties of (1) as the dimension $n \rightarrow \infty$. This framework has been used in the seminal paper [KS09] to describe the microscopic scaling limit of β -ensembles. This is a stationary point process on \mathbb{R} , called the sine $_\beta$ process, which is universal, e.g. [BEY14]. It can be simply described in terms of the Prüfer phases, scaling $\theta \leftarrow \frac{\lambda}{n}$ and approximated $\{\alpha_k\}$ by complex Gaussians with variance $\frac{2}{\beta k}$ (Lemma 16) in (2), one obtains a diffusive limit;

$$\begin{cases} dw_t(\lambda) = \lambda dt - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\beta t}} \Im(dW_t e^{i w_t(\lambda)}), & t \in (0, 1] \\ w_0(\lambda) = 0 & \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases}$$

where $\{W_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ is a complex Brownian motion. It is established in [KS09] that this SDE system has a unique solution with $\mathbf{E}w_t(\lambda) = \lambda t$ and the sine $_\beta$ process is the point process $\mathfrak{Z} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : w_1(\lambda) = -\eta[2\pi]\}$ where the random variable η is uniform in \mathbb{T} . One can also view the CMV operators has a discrete form of one-dimensional Dirac operator and taking this perspective, one can construct an operator whose spectrum is the sine $_\beta$ point process [VV20] and the scaling limit of the C β E characteristic polynomial [VV22, NN22].

Fyodorov-Hiary-Keating Conjecture. The CLT for eigenvalue statistics can be interpreted as the convergence of the log characteristic polynomial in a Sobolev space of generalised functions to a log-correlated field [HKO01]. Based on the statistical mechanic property of random energy models and log-correlated landscapes [FB08, FHK12], this perspective allows to predict the limits from Theorem 1 as well as the asymptotic behavior of *extreme values* of the characteristic polynomial. Significant progress on these conjectures have been achieved recently for C β E [CMN18, PZ22] based on the framework described in Section 1.2. The state of the art [PZ22,

Thm 1.1] gives a distributional convergence for the *centred maximum*; as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\left(\max_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} \log |\mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})| - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\beta}} \left(\log N - \frac{3}{4} \log \log N \right) \right) \Rightarrow C_\beta + \mathcal{G}_\beta + \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_\beta}{\sqrt{2\beta}} \quad (19)$$

where C_β is a (deterministic) constant, \mathcal{G}_β is a Gumbel with parameter $1/\sqrt{2\beta}$, independent of \mathcal{B}_β . Similar asymptotics hold for the eigenvalue field \mathcal{Y}_n . The random variable \mathcal{B}_β is constructed in [PZ22, Sect 1.2] has the limit of a *derivative martingale*, conjecturally it relates to *critical multiplicative chaos* (the counterpart of Theorem 1 for $\hat{\gamma} = 1$) and one expects that $\mathcal{B}_\beta = c\mu'(\mathbb{T})$ where $\mu'(\mathbb{T}) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 1} \frac{\mu_\gamma(\mathbb{T})}{1-\gamma}$ and $c > 0$ is an explicit constant. Then, it follows from the Fyodorov–Bouchaud formula ([FB08] and Corollary 3) that $\mathcal{B}_\beta \stackrel{d}{=} c^{-1}\mathbf{e}^{-1}$, with \mathbf{e} a standard exponential random variable. In particular, up to an additive constant, $\mathcal{G}_\beta \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\log \mathcal{B}_\beta}{\sqrt{2\beta}} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{-\log \mathbf{e}}{\sqrt{2\beta}}$ are independent Gumbel random variables. Using the CUE characteristic polynomial as a probabilistic model, [FHK12] also proposed asymptotics for the maximum of the Riemann ζ function in a typical short interval on the critical line. The precise tails for the maximum have been obtained in a series of work [Ha19] and [ABR23] combining methods from analytic number theory and the theory of branching processes.

Multiplicative chaos. For CUE, part of Theorem 1, for $|\mathcal{X}_n|^\gamma$ with $0 < \gamma < 2$, is due to [We15, NSW20]. The proofs rely on the determinantal structure of the CUE to compute asymptotics of joint moments of the characteristic polynomial. The approach involves the asymptotics of Riemann–Hilbert problems with Fisher–Hartwig singularities. In [CFLW21], these results have been generalized to other Hermitian unitary-invariant matrix ensembles, including the GUE, and application to *eigenvalue rigidity* are discussed. *Moments of moments* of CUE characteristic polynomials have also been studied in several regimes, we refer to [BK22] for an overview. Recently, the characteristic polynomial a Brownian motion on \mathbb{U}_n has been consider in [BF22]. The authors obtained multi-time Fisher–Hartwig asymptotics, as well as the convergence to a two-dimensional GMC on a cylinder. In contrast to previous works, Theorem 1 is the only GMC result in random matrix theory which does not rely on Fisher–Hartwig type asymptotics. It is also the only result valid for any $\beta > 0$ in the whole subcritical regime, including for $\gamma < 0$.

A related concept of *Holomorphic chaos* has been introduced in [NPS23] to describe the limiting random field $\{\Phi_\infty^*(u); u \in \mathbb{U}\}$. In contrast to Theorem 1, this field is well-defined, without renormalization, as a complex-valued generalised function on \mathbb{U} . This property has been used to derive asymptotics for the (Fourier) coefficients of the characteristic polynomial (3); see [NPS23, Thm 1.10]

Finally, it has been established in [CN19, Thm 2.1] (see Corollary 3) that the spectral measure of the CMV operator for $C\beta E$ is a normalized GMC measure in the subcritical phase $\beta > 2$. The exact Hausdorff dimension of these measure have been computed in [AN22] for all $\beta > 0$. In particular, there is a similar *freezing transition* as for GMC; one has almost surely

- μ_β is singular continuous with Hausdorff dimension $1 - 2/\beta$ if $\beta \geq 2$.
- μ_β is purely atomic if $\beta < 2$.

This raises the question on how to describe μ_β in the supercritical phase ($\beta < 2$); see [CN19, Sec 2.5].

Open questions. There are several natural continuations of this work and, to conclude this section, we collect some open problems in the field.

- By (19), the final key step to establish the Fyodorov–Bouchaud asymptotics for the maximum of the $C\beta E$ characteristic polynomial is to prove that the *derivative martingale* $\mathcal{B}_\beta = c\mu'(\mathbb{T})$. This goes beyond the scope of this paper as it pertains to *critical multiplicative chaos*, which involves a different renormalisation scheme, and we intend to return to this problem in a subsequent work.
- For CUE, asymptotics of joint moments of characteristic polynomials are known using Toeplitz determinant with Fisher–Hartwig singularities; see [Fa21] for optimal results, and [BF22] for an alternative proof. Such Fisher–Hartwig asymptotics are still an open problem for $C\beta E$.

- The GMC measures from Theorem 1 are supported on the *thick points of the characteristic polynomial*. By [JLW24, Thm 1.5], for $\gamma > 0$ with $\hat{\gamma} < 1$, and $g \in C(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, it holds in probability as $r \rightarrow 1$,

$$\frac{\mathbf{1}\{\Re\varphi(re^{i\theta}) \geq \gamma \log N - g(\theta)/\sqrt{2}\}}{N^{-\hat{\gamma}^2} \sqrt{\pi/\hat{\gamma}^2 \log N}} d\theta \rightarrow e^{\hat{\gamma}g(\theta)} \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(d\theta).$$

One also expects that an analogous result holds directly for the characteristic polynomial.

- The GMC $\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}$ from Proposition 3 are random analytic functions, taking values in the space of Schwartz distributions, for $\hat{\gamma} \in \mathcal{L}$ where $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a deterministic domain containing $(-1, 1)$, see [La22]. It is of interest to generalize the results of Theorem 1 to complex GMC in the subcritical domain \mathcal{L} .
- Viewing the C β E as a Coulomb gas, $z \in \mathbb{U} \mapsto -\log |\mathcal{X}_n(z)|$ corresponds to the electric potential generated by the configuration of charges and Theorem 1 gives the asymptotics of the corresponding Gibbs measures in the subcritical phase. Such question are important for two-dimensional Coulomb system at equilibrium in a background potential. There are strong motivations, coming from the connection with the two-dimensional Gaussian free field and two-dimensional quantum gravity to consider the asymptotics of characteristic polynomials of two-dimensional Coulomb gases.

1.4. Notations. We collect the main notations that will be used in this article.

Let $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$, $\mathbb{U} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ be the boundary of \mathbb{D} , and let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$. Let $\frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$ denotes the uniform (Lebesgue) measure on \mathbb{T} and let du denotes the uniform measure on \mathbb{U} ; du is the pushforward of $\frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$ by the map $\theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto e^{i\theta}$. In the sequel, we identify measures on \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{U} .

We always consider the (principal) branch of $w \mapsto \log(1-w)$ which is analytic for $w \in \mathbb{D}$ and vanishes at $w = 0$. By continuity, we define $h(\theta) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \Im \log(1 - re^{i\theta})$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. Then $h : \mathbb{T} \mapsto [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$

$$h(0) = 0, \quad h(\theta) = \frac{\theta - \pi}{2} \quad \text{for } \theta \in (0, 2\pi). \quad (20)$$

We also let

$$d(z) := 1 - |z|^2, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Throughout this article, $\beta > 0$ is any fixed parameter and, for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $\hat{\gamma} := \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta}$. In the context of Proposition 2, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\Re\varphi(z)} = \mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\Im\varphi(z)} = d(z)^{-\hat{\gamma}^2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (21)$$

Then, $\Re\varphi$, $\Im\varphi$ are identically distributed, rotation-invariant, Gaussian fields in \mathbb{D} . Recall that with the C β E coupling,

$$\Phi_\infty^*(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n^*(z) = e^{\varphi(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

In the context of Proposition 3, if $\hat{\gamma}^2 < 1$, then for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R})$, it holds in \mathbf{L}^q as $r \rightarrow 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{|\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^\gamma} f(u) du \rightarrow \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f), \quad \int \frac{\mathbf{E}_n e^{\gamma\Im\varphi(ru)}}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\Im\varphi(r)}} f(u) du \rightarrow \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \quad (22)$$

for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$ with $q\hat{\gamma}^2 < 1$ – see e.g. [RV14]. In particular, $\mathbf{E}\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \mu^0(f) = f_0$, the mean of f , in the subcritical regime.

Throughout the article, the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and η are as in Fact 1. We endow the probability space with the filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma(\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

We will use the shorthand notation $\mathbf{E}_k = \mathbf{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_k]$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Recall that for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\varphi_n(z) = \log \Phi_n^*(z) = \mathbf{E}_n \varphi(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

are well-defined analytic functions in \mathbb{D} , continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Moreover, by (16), it holds for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\varphi_n(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log(1 - \alpha_k B_k(z)), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}, \quad (23)$$

where $B_k(z) := z\Phi_k(z)/\Phi_k^*(z)$. One has $|B_k(z)| \leq |z|$ for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $|B_k(z)| = 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{U}$.

The Prüfer phase from Proposition 1 are given by, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$B_n(e^{i\theta}) = e^{i\varpi_n(\theta)}, \quad \varpi_n(\theta) = (n+1)\theta - 2\psi_n(\theta), \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi]. \quad (24)$$

We let $\psi_n(\theta) = \Im\varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. In Section 1.2, we considered the measures

$$\mu_n^\gamma(du) = \frac{e^{\gamma\Re\varphi_n(u)}}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\Re\varphi_n(1)}} du = \frac{|\Phi_n^*(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma d\theta}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma 2\pi}, \quad \nu_n^\gamma(du) = \frac{e^{\gamma\Im\varphi_n(u)}}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\Im\varphi_n(1)}} du = \frac{e^{\gamma\psi_n(\theta)} d\theta}{\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\psi_n(0)} 2\pi}. \quad (25)$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the $C\beta E_n$ characteristic polynomial (3) is given, in terms of (23), by

$$\mathcal{X}_n(z) = e^{\varphi_{n-1}(z)}(1 - e^{i\eta}B_{n-1}(z)), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}. \quad (26)$$

Then, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one has on the unit circle,

$$\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(e^{i\theta}) = e^{\varphi_{n-1}(e^{i\theta})}(1 - e^{i\eta+i\varpi_n(\theta)}), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (27)$$

We write $X \lesssim Z$ if there is constant $C > 0$, possibly depending on $\beta > 0$, such that $0 < X \leq CZ$. Such constant $C > 0$ are deterministic and vary from line to line.

We write $\epsilon_n \ll \delta_n$ if $\{\epsilon_n\}$ and $\{\delta_n\}$ are two deterministic sequences of positive numbers so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n \delta_n^{-1} = 0$.

If X, X' are two random variables, we write $X \stackrel{d}{=} X'$ if both have the same distribution.

2. MARTINGALE CONVERGENCE; PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We rely on the framework from Section 1.2 and the main goal is to prove Proposition 4. In the end, Theorem 2 is a direct consequence of the martingale approximation. Recall that $\beta > 0$ is fixed, the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$ are as in Fact 1 and the notation (25). The proof is organized as follows;

- In Section 2.1, we review some additional basic facts from OPUC theory that we will need. In particular, what happens while *shifting* and *rotating* the Verblunsky coefficients.
- In Section 2.2, we show that for the real part, $\mathbf{E}_n \mu^{\hat{\gamma}} = \mu_n^\gamma$ when $\gamma > 0$ with $\hat{\gamma} < 1$ by a simple arguments.
- In Section 2.3, we adapt the arguments to prove that $\mathbf{E}_n \mu^{-\hat{\gamma}} = \mu_n^{-\gamma}$ when $\gamma > 0$ with $\hat{\gamma} < 1$. This requires more delicate estimates to obtain the *uniform integrality*. This is of particular interest when $\gamma = 2$ in the context of the Bernstein-Szegő approximation (11).
- In Section 2.4, we adapt the arguments of Section 2.2 to the imaginary part to show that $\mathbf{E}_n \nu^{\hat{\gamma}} = \nu_n^\gamma$ when $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. This is mainly a case of checking that the relevant quantities are well-defined.

2.1. OPUC theory. To set up the analysis for this theorem, we review some properties of OPUC, following [Sim04, Chap. 3.2]. We will use the following conventions;

- For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$, let $(\Phi_{k,n}^\lambda)_{n \geq 0}$ the OPUC family associated with the Verblunsky coefficients $(\lambda\alpha_{n+k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. In particular, $(\Phi_{k,n})_{n \geq 0}$ denotes the OPUC family associated with the Verblunsky coefficients $(\alpha_{n+k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and one has $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 0} = (\Phi_{0,n}^1)_{n \geq 0}$.
- For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$, we denote by $(\Psi_{k,n}^\lambda)_{n \geq 0} = (\Phi_{k,n}^{-\lambda})_{n \geq 0}$. The sequence $(\Psi_n)_{n \geq 0} = (\Phi_{0,n}^{-1})_{n \geq 0}$ are called the second kind polynomials (dual to $(\Phi_n)_{n \geq 0}$). Then, the Szegő recursion (10) implies that for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{n+1}(z) & \Phi_{n+1}(z) \\ -\Psi_{n+1}^*(z) & \Phi_{n+1}^*(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z & -\bar{\alpha}_n \\ -\alpha_n z & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_n(z) & \Phi_n(z) \\ -\Psi_n^*(z) & \Phi_n^*(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (28)$$

- By linearity of the Szegő recursion, one has for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\Phi_{k,n}^{\lambda*} = \Phi_{k,n}^* \frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \Psi_{k,n}^* \frac{1-\lambda}{2} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq k}. \quad (29)$$

- We denote for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{\Phi_k(z)}{\Phi_k^*(z)} = \rho_k(z)\lambda_k(z) \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}, \quad (30)$$

where $\rho_k : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a continuous function, the phase $\lambda_k : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ can be defined pointwise, e.g. taking the value $\lambda_k(z) = 1$ for $z \in \{\Phi_k = 0\}$. This decomposition is related to B_k (Property 2 in Section 1.2) and Φ_k/Φ_k^* is analytic in a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ with $|\Phi_k/\Phi_k^*| = 1$ on $\partial\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. So, the modulus $\rho_k = 1$ on \mathbb{U} and $\rho_k < 1$ on \mathbb{D} , by the maximum principle for subharmonic functions.

- Consequently the functions ρ_k are Lipschitz-continuous on \mathbb{D} . That is, there are random constant \mathcal{C}_k (\mathcal{F}_k -measurable) so that

$$|1 - \rho_k(z)| \leq \mathcal{C}_k d(z), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}. \quad (31)$$

The starting point for our analysis and the proof of Proposition 4 is the following (deterministic) relationship between $\Phi_\infty^* = e^\varphi$ and Φ_k^* for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 5. *Almost surely, for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{k,n}^{\lambda*}$ exists, and $\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*}$ is an analytic function without zero in \mathbb{D} . In addition, for any $\gamma > 0$, $\mathbf{E} \exp(\gamma |\log \Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*}(z)|) < \infty$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Then, one has for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\infty^* &= \Phi_k^* \left(\frac{\Psi_{k,\infty}^* + \Phi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} + \rho_k \lambda_k \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} \right) \\ &= \Phi_k^* \Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*} \left(1 + \frac{1 - \rho_k}{2} \left(\frac{\Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*}}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*}} - 1 \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $(\Phi_k^*, \rho_k, \lambda_k)$ are \mathcal{F}_k -measurable and $(\Phi_{k,\infty}^*, \Psi_{k,\infty}^*)$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_k .

Proof. Proposition 23 from [CN19] implies that almost surely, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the limits $(\Phi_{k,\infty}^*, \Psi_{k,\infty}^*)$ exist and are analytic functions without zero in \mathbb{D} . It also yields the bound $\mathbf{E} |\Phi_{k,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma < \infty$ for $\gamma \geq 1$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Moreover, by rotation-invariance (of the Verblunsky coefficients), $\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*} \stackrel{d}{=} \Phi_{k,\infty}^*$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Then, by (29), one can define (almost surely) for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*} = \Phi_{k,\infty}^* \frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \Psi_{k,\infty}^* \frac{1-\lambda}{2}.$$

In particular, we have the relationships; for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$,

$$\frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*} + \Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*}}{2} = \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2}, \quad \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*} - \Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*}}{2} = \lambda \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2}. \quad (33)$$

Now, fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Using (28), one has for any $n \geq k$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Psi_n & \Phi_n \\ -\Psi_n^* & \Phi_n^* \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{k,n-k} & \Phi_{k,n-k} \\ -\Psi_{k,n-k}^* & \Phi_{k,n-k}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_k & \Phi_k \\ -\Psi_k^* & \Phi_k^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

Taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, this implies that almost surely,

$$\Phi_\infty^* = \Psi_{k,\infty}^* \frac{\Phi_k^* - \Phi_k}{2} + \Phi_{k,\infty}^* \frac{\Phi_k^* + \Phi_k}{2}, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}.$$

Then, rearranging the previous formula using (30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\infty^* &= \Phi_k^* \left(\Psi_{k,\infty}^* \frac{1 - \rho_k \lambda_k}{2} + \Phi_{k,\infty}^* \frac{1 + \rho_k \lambda_k}{2} \right) \\ &= \Phi_k^* \left(\frac{\Psi_{k,\infty}^* + \Phi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} + \rho_k \lambda_k \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $(\Phi_k^*, \rho_k, \lambda_k)$ are \mathcal{F}_k -measurable and for $u \in \mathbb{U}$, $(\Phi_{k,\infty}^{u*}, \Psi_{k,\infty}^{u*})$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_k , since they are defined in terms of $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq n}$ which are independent of $(\alpha_k)_{k < n}$. Finally, using (33), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\infty^* &= \Phi_k^* \left(\frac{\Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*} + \Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*}}{2} + \rho_k \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*} - \Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*}}{2} \right) \\ &= \Phi_k^* \Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*} \left(1 + \frac{1 - \rho_k}{2} \left(\frac{\Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*}}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda_k^*}} - 1 \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda^*}$ have no zero in \mathbb{D} , for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{U}$, so the last formula is well-posed in \mathbb{D} . \square

We illustrate how Lemma 5 is used to prove Proposition 4 in a simplified case. By (32), conditioning on \mathcal{F}_k , we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_k \Phi_\infty^* = \Phi_k^* \left(\frac{1 - \rho_k \lambda_k}{2} \mathbf{E} \Psi_{k,\infty}^* + \frac{1 + \rho_k \lambda_k}{2} \mathbf{E} \Phi_{k,\infty}^* \right)$$

since $(\Phi_{k,\infty}^*, \Psi_{k,\infty}^*)$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_k . Then, by rotation-invariance $\mathbf{E} \Phi_{k,\infty}^* = \mathbf{E} \Psi_{k,\infty}^*$, we obtain for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_k \Phi_\infty^* = \Phi_k^* \mathbf{E} \Phi_{k,\infty}^* \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

Taking expectation, one has $\mathbf{E} \Phi_k^* \mathbf{E} \Phi_{k,\infty}^* = \mathbf{E} \Phi_\infty^* = 1$ in \mathbb{D} , since $\Phi_\infty^* = e^\varphi$ with φ the GAF from (6). This implies that for $r \in [0, 1]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_k \Phi_\infty^*(ru) = \frac{\Phi_k^*(ru)}{\mathbf{E} \Phi_k^*(r)} \quad u \in \mathbb{U}.$$

This gives a *martingale approximation* for $\int \Phi_\infty^*(ru) f(u) du$ where $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{U})$ is a test function. Consequently, if there is a random distribution \mathcal{L} so that $\int \Phi_\infty^*(ru) f(u) du \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(f)$ in \mathbf{L}^1 as $r \rightarrow 1$, then one has for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\mathbf{E}_k \mathcal{L}(f) = \int \frac{\Phi_k^*(ru)}{\mathbf{E} \Phi_k^*(r)} f(u) \frac{du}{2\pi}.$$

In [NPS23], the random distribution \mathcal{L} is called a *holomorphic multiplicative chaos*, it is well-defined in a Sobolev space $H^{-\alpha}$ for α sufficiently large (depending on β). Note that the convergence occurs without renormalization and this argument is therefore much simpler than the proof of Proposition 4.

We will also need two additional facts about OPUC. By [Sim04, Thm 3.2.4], if $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the spectral measure associated with the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{u+z}{u-z} d\boldsymbol{\mu}(u) = \frac{\Psi_\infty^*(z)}{\Phi_\infty^*(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (34)$$

This function is called the *Carathéodory function* (or *Schur function*, or *m-function*) of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, it plays an important role in the spectral theory of CMV operators. By convention, it is analytic and takes value 1 at $z = 0$ and for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\Re \left(\frac{\Psi_\infty^*(z)}{\Phi_\infty^*(z)} \right) = \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{1 - |z|^2}{|u - z|^2} d\boldsymbol{\mu}(u) > 0$$

Moreover, we compute with $\mathfrak{M} = \Psi_\infty^*/\Phi_\infty^*$,

$$\left| \frac{\Phi_\infty^* - \Psi_\infty^*}{\Phi_\infty^* + \Psi_\infty^*} \right|^2 = \left| \frac{1 - \mathfrak{M}}{1 + \mathfrak{M}} \right|^2 = \frac{1 + |\mathfrak{M}|^2 - 2\Re \mathfrak{M}}{1 + |\mathfrak{M}|^2 + 2\Re \mathfrak{M}} < 1$$

since $\Re \mathfrak{M} > 0$ in \mathbb{D} . Consequently, for the OPUC sequence $(\Phi_{k,n}^*)_{n \geq 0}$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, we record the following estimates.

Fact 2. • For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one has (almost surely)

$$\left| \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*} \right| < 1 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D}.$$

- We define for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\mathbf{g}_k^\lambda(z) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Psi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*}(z)}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{\lambda*}(z)} - 1 \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

We also let $\mathbf{g}_k = \mathbf{g}_k^1$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \mathbf{g}_k^λ is analytic on \mathbb{D} with $\mathbf{g}_k^\lambda(0) = 0$ and $\Re \mathbf{g}_k^\lambda(z) > -\frac{1}{2}$, for $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Finally, we record the following estimates for moments of \mathbf{g}_k .

Lemma 6. *Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and recall that $d(z) := 1 - |z|^2$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$*

$$\mathbf{E} |\mathbf{g}_k(z)|^{1+\epsilon} \leq C_\epsilon d(z)^{-\epsilon}.$$

Proof. Here $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is fixed. From (34),

$$\mathbf{g}_k(z) = z \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_k(du)}{u - z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ is the spectral measure for the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_{k+j}\}_{j \geq 0}$. Since $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ is a (random) probability measure on \mathbb{U} , by Jensen's inequality, almost surely for any $\gamma \geq 1$ and $|z| = r < 1$,

$$|\mathbf{g}_k(z)|^\gamma \leq r^\gamma \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_k(du)}{|u - r|^\gamma}.$$

Observe that by rotation-invariance, the spectral measures $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ satisfy $\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\mu}_k(du) = du$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} |\mathbf{g}_k(z)|^\lambda &\leq r^\lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |e^{i\theta} - r|^{-\lambda} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\frac{r^2}{(1-r)^2 + 2r(1-\cos\theta)} \right)^{\lambda/2} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} \left(\frac{r}{(1-r)^2/r + 4\sin^2(\theta)} \right)^{\lambda/2} d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $(1-r) \geq d(r)/2$ and $16\sin^2\theta \geq \theta^2$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E} |\mathbf{g}_k(z)|^\lambda \lesssim d(z)^{-\lambda} \int_0^{\pi/2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + (\theta/2d(z))^2} \right)^{\lambda/2} d\theta \lesssim d(z)^{1-\lambda}$$

where the implied constants depend only on $\lambda > 1$. □

2.2. Convergence for real part in case $\gamma \geq 0$. The goal of this section is to show that for $0 \leq \hat{\gamma} = \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta} < 1$ and $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U})$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \mu_n^\gamma(f) = \int \frac{|\Phi_n^*(u)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma} f(u) du. \quad (35)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $f \geq 0$.

We start by some estimates which follow directly from Lemma 5.

Lemma 7. *For $\gamma \geq 0$, there is a (deterministic) constant c_γ so that (almost surely) for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$0 \leq 1 - \frac{\mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^\gamma}{|\Phi_n^*(z)|^\gamma \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma} \leq c_\gamma (1 - \rho_n(z)).$$

Proof. Fix $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define for $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\Theta_n(\rho; z) := \mathbf{E}_n \left| \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z) + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*(z)}{2} + \rho \lambda_n(z) \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z) - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*(z)}{2} \right|^\gamma$$

with λ_n as in (30) – λ_n is \mathcal{F}_n -measurable. Then, by (32), it holds for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^\gamma = |\Phi_n^*(z)|^\gamma \Theta_n(\rho_n(z); z). \quad (36)$$

Moreover, by rotation-invariance; for every $u \in \mathbb{U}$, $(\Phi_{k,n}^{u*}, \Psi_{k,n}^{u*})_{n \geq 0}$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_k and $(\Phi_{k,n}^{u*}, \Psi_{k,n}^{u*})_{n \geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} (\Phi_{k,n}^*, \Psi_{k,n}^*)_{n \geq 0}$ so that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_k(\rho; \cdot) &= \mathbf{E}_k \left| \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{u*} + \Psi_{k,\infty}^{u*}}{2} + \rho \lambda_k \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{u*} - \Psi_{k,\infty}^{u*}}{2} \right|^\gamma \\ &= \mathbf{E}_k \left| \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} + \rho \lambda_k u \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} \right|^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

using the relationships (33). Hence, by Fact 2, integrating this formula over \mathbb{U} , we obtain

$$\Theta_n(\rho; \cdot) = \mathbf{E}_n \left[\left| \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{2} \right|^\gamma F_\gamma \left(\rho \left| \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*} \right| \right) \right] \quad (37)$$

where, for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$F_\gamma : r \in [0, 1] \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{U}} |1 + ur|^\gamma du.$$

Using the binomial formula, we record that

$$F_\gamma(r) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \binom{\gamma/2}{k}^2 r^{2k}, \quad r \in [0, 1]. \quad (38)$$

The coefficients $\binom{\gamma/2}{k}^2 \sim c_\gamma k^{-2-\gamma}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ where $c_\gamma = \Gamma(-\gamma/2)^{-2}$ for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus 2\mathbb{N}_0$ or $c_\gamma = 0$ else.

We now specialize to $\gamma > 0$, in which case, $F_\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ is increasing, continuous, convex with $F_\gamma(1), F'_\gamma(1) < \infty$. This implies that for any $\rho, r \in [0, 1]$,

$$0 \leq F_\gamma(r) - F_\gamma(\rho r) \leq F'_\gamma(1)(1 - \rho) \leq F'_\gamma(1)(1 - \rho)F_\gamma(r)$$

since $F_\gamma(r) \geq 1$. Combining this bound and (37), with $c_\gamma = F'_\gamma(1)$, we obtain that (almost surely) for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1 - c_\gamma(1 - \rho))\Theta_n(1; \cdot) \leq \Theta_n(\rho; \cdot) \leq \Theta_n(1; \cdot).$$

Using the relationship (33), by definition of Θ_n , one has

$$\Theta_n(1; \cdot) = \mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_{n,\infty}^{*\lambda_n}|^\gamma = \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^\gamma \quad (39)$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n , $\Phi_{n,\infty}^{*\lambda_n}$ has the same law as $\Phi_{n,\infty}^*$ (by rotation-invariance) and $\Phi_{n,\infty}^*$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_n . Using the previous estimates with $\rho = \rho_n(z)$ (which is \mathcal{F}_n -measurable), by (36), we conclude that (almost surely), for any $\gamma \geq 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$(1 - c_\gamma(1 - \rho_n(z))) |\Phi_n^*(z)|^\gamma \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^\gamma \leq \mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma \leq |\Phi_n^*(z)|^\gamma \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^\gamma. \quad \square$$

Remark 5. If $\gamma < 0$, by (38), the function F_γ is still increasing on $[0, 1)$ so that by (37), we have $\Theta_k(\rho; z) \leq \Theta_k(1; z)$ for any $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Thus, by (36) and (39), we still have the estimate for $\gamma > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^{-\gamma} \leq |\Phi_n^*(z)|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z)|^{-\gamma}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

To finish the proof of convergence, we will also need the following estimates.

Lemma 8. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\max_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}} |\Im \varphi_n(z)| < 2n$ and $\max_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}} \Re \varphi_n(z) < n$. Moreover, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$, one has for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$,

$$\mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(z)|^\gamma \leq \mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E} [|1 - \alpha_k|^\gamma] < \infty.$$

Proof. Here $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed. Recall that φ_n is an analytic function in a neighborhood of \mathbb{D} and (23) holds. Since $w \in \mathbb{D} \mapsto |\Im \log(1 + w)|$ is bounded by $\pi/2$, one has $\max_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}} |\Im \varphi_n(z)| < 2n$. Similarly, $w \in \mathbb{D} \mapsto \log |1 + w|$ is bounded above by $\log 2$ so $\max_{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}} \Re \varphi_n(z) < n$. However, there is no deterministic lower-bound for the real part.

Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. By subharmonicity (the function $x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto e^{\gamma x}$ is convex), one has for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$|\Phi_k^*(z)|^\gamma \leq \int_{\mathbb{U}} |\Phi_k^*(u)|^\gamma P(z; du)$$

where P denotes Poisson kernel of \mathbb{D} . Taking expectation, by rotation-invariance, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}|\Phi_k^*(z)|^\gamma \leq \mathbf{E}|\Phi_k^*(1)|^\gamma, \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

This estimate holds for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, but the RHS may be $+\infty$ if γ is too negative.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $B_k(1) \in \mathcal{U}$ is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable, independent of α_k , so by rotation-invariance,

$$\Phi_n^*(1) \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log(1 - \alpha_j).$$

This shows that for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E}[|1 - \alpha_j|^\gamma]$. These quantities are finite if and only if $\gamma > -1 - \beta_0$; see (69) in the Appendix and fact that $\{\beta_j\}$ are increasing. Note that $1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \geq \sqrt{2\beta}$ for any $\beta > 0$, so the condition $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta} > -1$ implies that $\gamma > -1 - \beta_0$ with $\beta_0 = \frac{\beta}{2}$. Then, we conclude that $\mathbf{E}|\Phi_k^*(1)|^\gamma < \infty$ if $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. Finally, note that $1 + \frac{\beta}{2} - \sqrt{2\beta} = (1 - \sqrt{\beta/2})^2$, so this inequality is sharp at the critical value $\beta = 2$. \square

We now turn to the proof of (35). First, taking expectation in Lemma 7, one has for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r < 1$,

$$\mathbf{E}[|\Phi_n^*(r)|^\gamma (1 - c_\gamma(1 - \rho_n(r)))] \leq \frac{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^\gamma} \leq \mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(r)|^\gamma.$$

By Lemma 8, $|\Phi_n^*(z)| \leq e^n$ for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and since $\rho_n(r) \in (0, 1)$ and $\rho_n(r) \rightarrow 1$ as $r \rightarrow 1$ (almost surely), by the dominated convergence theorem for $\gamma \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}[|\Phi_n^*(r)|^\gamma (1 - c_\gamma(1 - \rho_n(r)))] = \mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma.$$

Hence, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \frac{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^\gamma} = \mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^\gamma. \quad (40)$$

Using Lemma 7 again, with $|z| = r < 1$,

$$\frac{|\Phi_n^*(z)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(r)|^\gamma} \geq \frac{\mathbf{E}_n|\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^\gamma} \frac{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(r)|^\gamma \mathbf{E}|\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^\gamma}$$

so that by (40), for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} \int f(u) \frac{|\Phi_n^*(ru)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(r)|^\gamma} du \geq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}_n \left(\int f(u) \frac{|\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^\gamma} du \right).$$

Using the (uniform) continuity of Φ_n^* on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, the LHS limit exists and equals $\mu_n^\gamma(f)$. For the RHS, using the GMC convergence in \mathbf{L}^1 , see (22), if $\hat{\gamma} < 1$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{E}_n \left(\int f(u) \frac{|\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^\gamma} du \right) = \mathbf{E}_n \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f)$$

almost surely. Thus, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $0 \leq \hat{\gamma} < 1$,

$$\mu_n^\gamma(f) \geq \mathbf{E}_n \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f).$$

Since both random variables have the same expectation (equal to f_0), they are equal. This concludes the proof of Proposition 4 in case $\gamma \geq 0$.

2.3. Convergence for real part in case $\gamma \leq 0$. In this case, only the lower bound from Lemma 7 holds (see Remark 5), so we need a different strategy to replace (40). We rely on the following estimates.

Proposition 9. *Recall Fact 2. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and $\delta > 0$. It holds almost surely, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} d(r)^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \sup_{|z|=r} \mathbf{E}_k [|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma \mathbf{1}\{(1 - \rho_k(z))|\mathbf{g}_k(z)| > \delta\}] = 0.$$

We postpone the proof of Proposition 9 and we now proceed to deduce that for $0 \leq \hat{\gamma} < 1$ and $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n \mu^{-\hat{\gamma}}(f) \geq \mu_n^{-\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \int \frac{|\Phi_n^*(u)|^{-\hat{\gamma}}}{\mathbf{E}|\Phi_n^*(1)|^{-\hat{\gamma}}} f(u) du \quad (41)$$

Observe that according to Lemma 8, the RHS is well-defined if the condition $\hat{\gamma} < 1$ holds. Moreover, like in the previous section, since both random variables have the same expectation, (41) suffices to prove of Proposition 4.

Let $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We consider the events $\mathcal{A}(z; \delta) := \{(1 - \rho_n(z))|\mathfrak{g}_n^{\lambda_n}(z)| \leq \delta\}$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Since $\Re \mathfrak{g}_n^{\lambda_n} > -\frac{1}{2}$, by (32), one has for $\gamma \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_\infty^*|^{-\gamma} &= |\Phi_n^*|^{-\gamma} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^{\lambda_n^*}|^{-\gamma} |1 + (1 - \rho_n)\mathfrak{g}_n^{\lambda_n}|^{-\gamma} \\ &\geq (1 + \delta)^{-\gamma} |\Phi_n^*|^{-\gamma} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^{\lambda_n^*}|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}} \end{aligned}$$

Recall that (ρ_n, λ_n) are \mathcal{F}_n measurable and that, by rotation-invariance, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n , $(\Phi_{n,\infty}^{\lambda_n^*}, \Psi_{n,\infty}^{\lambda_n^*}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\Phi_{n,\infty}^*, \Psi_{n,\infty}^*)$ as processes. This implies that inside \mathbb{D} ,

$$\mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*|^{-\gamma} \geq (1 + \delta)^{-\gamma} |\Phi_n^*|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{E}_n [|\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}'}]$$

where $\mathcal{A}'(z; \delta) := \{(1 - \rho_n(z))|\mathfrak{g}_n(z)| \leq \delta\}$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Here, we used that by rotation-invariance ($\lambda_n \in \mathbb{U}$ is \mathcal{F}_n -measurable), conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n , $(\Phi_{n,\infty}^{\lambda_n^*}, \mathfrak{g}_n^{\lambda_n}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\Phi_{n,\infty}^*, \mathfrak{g}_n)$. Moreover, by Proposition 9,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E}_n [|\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}'}] = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E}_n [|\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^{-\gamma}] = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*|^{-\gamma}$$

since $\Phi_{n,\infty}^*$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_n . Hence, as $|\Phi_n^*|$ is continuous and positive on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, we obtain that almost surely; for $u \in \mathbb{U}$,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^{-\gamma} \geq (1 + \delta)^{-\gamma} |\Phi_n^*(u)|^{-\gamma} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^{-\gamma}. \quad (42)$$

Now, by Remark 5, for $\gamma \geq 0$ and $r < 1$,

$$d(r)^{-\hat{\gamma}^2} = \mathbf{E} |\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^{-\gamma} \leq \mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(r)|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^{-\gamma}.$$

Then, by Lemma 8,

$$\mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(1)|^{-\gamma} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^{-\gamma} \geq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(r)|^{-\gamma} \mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(r)|^{-\gamma} \geq 1. \quad (43)$$

Combining (42) (which holds for any $\delta > 0$) with (43), this implies that almost surely, for $u \in \mathbb{U}$,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} (d(r))^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^{-\gamma} \geq \frac{|\Phi_n^*(u)|^{-\gamma}}{\mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(1)|^{-\gamma}}.$$

Thus, by Fatou's Lemma, for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 1} \left(\int \frac{\mathbf{E}_n |\Phi_\infty^*(ru)|^{-\gamma}}{\mathbf{E} |\Phi_\infty^*(r)|^{-\gamma}} f(u) du \right) \geq \int \frac{|\Phi_n^*(u)|^{-\gamma}}{\mathbf{E} |\Phi_n^*(1)|^{-\gamma}} f(\theta) du = \mu_n^{-\hat{\gamma}}(f).$$

If $\hat{\gamma} < 1$, using the GMC convergence (22), the LHS equals $\mathbf{E}_n \mu^{-\hat{\gamma}}(f)$ which concludes the proof of (41).

We now return to the proof of Proposition 9. This relies on Lemma 6 the following estimates for the moments of $\Phi_{k,\infty}^*$. The proof is based on a change of measure to *shift the sequence of Verblunsky coefficients*. Compared to (21), we expect that a sharp estimates holds with $\epsilon = 0$.

Lemma 10. *Fix $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_{k,\epsilon}$ so that for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,*

$$\mathbf{E} |\Phi_{k,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma \leq C_{k,\epsilon} d(z)^{-\hat{\gamma}^2(1+\epsilon)}.$$

Proof. Let $\varkappa := \sqrt{2/\beta}$ and fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For $C\beta E$ (Fact 1), for any $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the random variable $(1 - |\alpha_j|^2)^{1/\varkappa^2}$ has p.d.f. $x \in [0, 1] \mapsto (j+1)x^j$. Let for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathcal{Q}_{k,n} := \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{(1 - |\alpha_j|^2)^{k/\varkappa^2}}{\mathbf{E}(1 - |\alpha_j|^2)^{k/\varkappa^2}}. \quad (44)$$

Clearly $\{\mathcal{Q}_{k,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a positive \mathcal{F}_n -martingale and there is a numerical constant c so that for any $\gamma \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}\mathcal{Q}_{k,n}^\gamma = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{j+k+1}{j+1} \right)^\gamma \left(\frac{j+1}{j+\gamma k+1} \right) \leq \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2 k^2}{2(j+1)^2} \right) \leq \exp(c\gamma^2 k^2)$$

using that by convexity, $(1+\lambda)^\gamma \leq e^{\gamma\lambda}$ and $(1+\gamma\lambda)^{-1} \leq e^{-\gamma\lambda+(\gamma\lambda)^2/2}$ for $\lambda, \gamma \geq 0$.

In particular, $\{\mathcal{Q}_{k,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is uniformly bounded in L^2 and for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathcal{Q}_{k,n} = \mathbf{E}_n \mathcal{Q}_{k,\infty}, \quad \mathcal{Q}_{k,\infty} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Q}_{k,n} \text{ (almost surely).}$$

Moreover, if $\gamma > 1$, then as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbf{E}\mathcal{Q}_{k,n}^\gamma \nearrow \mathbf{E}\mathcal{Q}_{k,\infty}^\gamma.$$

The idea is to make a change of measure $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_k}{d\mathbb{P}} = \mathcal{Q}_{k,\infty}$. The sequence $(\alpha_j)_{j \geq 0}$ under \mathbb{Q}_k has the same law as $(\alpha_{j+k})_{j \geq 0}$ under \mathbb{P} . Then, for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\mathbf{E}|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma = \mathbf{E}[|\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^\gamma \mathcal{Q}_{k,\infty}].$$

By Hölder's inequality and using that $\mathbf{E}|\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^\gamma = d(z)^{-\hat{\gamma}^2}$, we have for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*(z)|^\gamma &\leq \mathbf{E}[|\Phi_\infty^*(z)|^{\gamma(1+\epsilon)}]^{1/(1+\epsilon)} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{Q}_{k,\infty}^{1+1/\epsilon}]^{1/(1+\epsilon)} \\ &= C_{k,\epsilon} d(z)^{-\hat{\gamma}^2(1+\epsilon)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 9. We record a version of Hölder's inequality; if Z is a non-negative random variable, for any event \mathcal{A} and any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}[Z\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}\}]^{1+\epsilon} \leq \mathbf{E}[Z^{1+\epsilon}] \mathbf{P}\{\mathcal{A}\}^\epsilon. \quad (45)$$

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta > 0$ and set $\Phi_{k,\infty}^* = \Phi_{k,\infty}^*(z)$, $\mathfrak{g}_k = \mathfrak{g}_k(z)$, $\rho_k = \rho_k(z)$, $d = d(z)$ and $r = |z|$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. By (45) and Markov's inequality, for any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_k[|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*|^\gamma \mathbf{1}\{(1-\rho_k)|\mathfrak{g}_k| > \delta\}]^{1+\epsilon_1} &\leq \mathbf{E}_k[|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*|^{\gamma(1+\epsilon_1)}] \mathbf{P}_k[(1-\rho_k)|\mathfrak{g}_k| > \delta]^{\epsilon_1} \\ &\leq \delta^{-(1+\epsilon_2)} \mathbf{E}[|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*|^{\gamma(1+\epsilon_1)}] \mathbf{E}[|\mathfrak{g}_k|^{1+\epsilon_2}]^{\epsilon_1} (1-\rho_k)^{(1+\epsilon_2)\epsilon_1} \end{aligned}$$

where we used that ρ_k is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable and $(\Phi_{k,\infty}^*, \mathfrak{g}_k)$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_k . Then, using the estimates from Lemmas 6 and 10, there exists a constant $C = C_{k,\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\delta}$ so that for $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}_k[|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*|^\gamma \mathbf{1}\{(1-\rho_k)|\mathfrak{g}_k| > \delta\}]^{1+\epsilon_1} \leq C d^{-\hat{\gamma}^2(1+\epsilon_1)^2(1+\epsilon_3) - \epsilon_2\epsilon_1} (1-\rho_k)^{(1+\epsilon_2)\epsilon_1}.$$

so that

$$d^{\hat{\gamma}^2} \mathbf{E}_k[|\Phi_{k,\infty}^*|^\gamma \mathbf{1}\{(1-\rho_k)|\mathfrak{g}_k| > \delta\}] \leq C d^{-\hat{\gamma}^2(\epsilon_1+\epsilon_3(1+\epsilon_1)) - \frac{\epsilon_2\epsilon_1}{1+\epsilon_1}} (1-\rho_k)^{\frac{1+\epsilon_2}{1+\epsilon_1}\epsilon_1}.$$

In the subcritical regime, $\hat{\gamma}^2 < 1$, we can choose small parameters $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 > 0$ so that

$$\hat{\gamma}^2(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_3(1 + \epsilon_1)) + \frac{\epsilon_2\epsilon_1}{1 + \epsilon_1} < \frac{1 + \epsilon_2}{1 + \epsilon_1}\epsilon_1.$$

Hence, by (31) (ρ_k is Lipschitz-continuous), we conclude that almost surely,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \sup_{|z|=r} \left\{ d(r)^{-\hat{\gamma}^2(\epsilon_1+\epsilon_3(1+\epsilon_1)) - \frac{\epsilon_2\epsilon_1}{1+\epsilon_1}} (1-\rho_k(z))^{\frac{1+\epsilon_2}{1+\epsilon_1}\epsilon_1} \right\} = 0.$$

This proves the claim. \square

Remark 6. The argument shows that one can take $\delta = d(r)^\epsilon$ for a small $\epsilon > 0$ depending on $|\hat{\gamma}|$ in the statement of Proposition 9.

2.4. Convergence for imaginary part. In this section, we prove the second part of Proposition 4. We rely on the same method as in Section 2.2 and our goal is to show that, for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \geq \nu_n^\gamma(f) = \int \frac{e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(u)}}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(1)}} f(u) du. \quad (46)$$

Since both random measures have the same expectation ($\mathbf{E} \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \mathbf{E} \nu_n^\gamma(f) = \nu^0(f)$ for $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$), this bound suffices to conclude that $\mathbf{E}_n \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) = \nu_n^\gamma(f)$ (almost surely).

We need the counterpart of Lemma 7 for the imaginary part.

Lemma 11. *There is a (deterministic) constant C (depending only on β) so that for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$, it holds (almost surely) for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$,*

$$0 \leq e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(z)} \mathbf{E} [e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_{n,\infty}(z)}] - \mathbf{E}_n [e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(z)}] \leq C \sqrt{1 - \rho_n(z)} \mathbf{E} [e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_{n,\infty}(z)}]$$

where $\varphi_{n,\infty} := \log \Phi_{n,\infty}^*$.

Proof. Here $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed. We start by taking the $\log(\cdot)$ of (32), we claim that inside \mathbb{D} ,

$$\varphi = \varphi_n + \log \left(\frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{2} + \rho_n \lambda_n \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{2} \right)$$

with the interpretation that,

$$\log \left(\frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{2} + \rho_n \lambda_n \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{2} \right) = \log \Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \log(1 + \mathfrak{g}_n) + \log \left(1 + \rho_n \lambda_n \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*} \right). \quad (47)$$

In (47), by Fact 2, all $\log(\cdot)$ are well-defined and vanish at $z = 0$.

Fix $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. We define for $\rho \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\Upsilon_n(\rho; z) := \mathbf{E}_n \left[\exp \left(\gamma \Im \log \left(\frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z) + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*(z)}{2} + \rho \lambda_n(z) \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^*(z) - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*(z)}{2} \right) \right) \right]$$

where the $\log(\cdot)$ is interpreted as in (47). In particular, since ρ_n is \mathcal{F}_n measurable, it holds for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(z)} = e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(z)} \Upsilon_n(\rho_n(z); z). \quad (48)$$

Observe that using the relationships (33), by rotation-invariance, one has

$$\Upsilon_n(1; \cdot) = \mathbf{E}_n \left[\exp(\gamma \Im \log \Phi_{n,\infty}^*) \right] = \mathbf{E}_n \left[\exp(\gamma \Im \log \Phi_{n,\infty}^*) \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\exp(\gamma \Im \varphi_{n,\infty}) \right]. \quad (49)$$

At last, we used $\Phi_{n,\infty}^*$ is independent from \mathcal{F}_n and $\log \Phi_{n,\infty}^* = \varphi_{n,\infty}$ is well-defined in \mathbb{D} .

Similarly, for every $u \in \mathbb{U}$, $(\Phi_{k,n}^{u*}, \Psi_{k,n}^{u*})_{n \geq 0}$ are independent of \mathcal{F}_k and $(\Phi_{k,n}^{u*}, \Psi_{k,n}^{u*})_{n \geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} (\Phi_{k,n}^*, \Psi_{k,n}^*)_{n \geq 0}$ so that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_k(\rho; \cdot) &= \mathbf{E}_k \left[\exp \left(\gamma \Im \log \left(\frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{u*} + \Psi_{k,\infty}^{u*}}{2} + \rho \lambda_k \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^{u*} - \Psi_{k,\infty}^{u*}}{2} \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_k \left[\exp \left(\gamma \Im \log \left(\frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} \right) + \Im \log \left(1 + \rho \lambda_n u \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*} \right) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

using (47) with $\log \left(\frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{2} \right) = \log \Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \log(1 + \mathfrak{g}_k)$. Then, averaging over $u \in \mathbb{U}$, we obtain

$$\Upsilon_n(\rho; \cdot) = \mathbf{E}_n \left[\exp \left(\gamma \Im \log \left(\frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{2} \right) G_\gamma \left(\rho \left| \frac{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* - \Psi_{n,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{n,\infty}^* + \Psi_{n,\infty}^*} \right| \right) \right) \right] \quad (50)$$

where, for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$G_\gamma : r \in [0, 1) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{U}} \exp(\gamma \Im \log(1 + ru)) du. \quad (51)$$

We record the following properties of the function G .

Fact 3. For $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $G_\gamma : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, is smooth, bounded, increasing, convex, with $G_\gamma(0) = 1$. For $\alpha < 1$ and $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$, G_γ is α -Hölder continuous with a constant C depending only on α, β .

We postpone the (elementary) proof of Fact 3 to the end of this section and we record the following consequences for (50). Since G_γ is increasing, by (48), one has for $z \in \mathbb{D}$

$$\mathbf{E}_n e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(z)} \leq e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(z)} \Upsilon_n(1; z)$$

Moreover, since G_γ is Hölder-continuous, one has for $\rho \in [0, 1]$,

$$G_\gamma\left(\rho \left| \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*} \right| \right) \geq G_\gamma\left(\left| \frac{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* - \Psi_{k,\infty}^*}{\Phi_{k,\infty}^* + \Psi_{k,\infty}^*} \right| \right) - C\sqrt{1-\rho}.$$

Since $G_\gamma(0) = 1 \leq G_\gamma(1)$, this implies that for some deterministic constant C ,

$$\Upsilon_n(\rho_n; \cdot) \geq \Upsilon_n(1; \cdot)(1 - C\sqrt{1-\rho_n})$$

and, by (48), one has for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(z)} \geq e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(z)} \Upsilon_n(1; z)(1 - C\sqrt{1-\rho_n(z)}).$$

Combining these bounds, according to (49), this completes the proof. \square

We return to the proof of (46), which is straightforward using Lemma 11. Recall that for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r < 1$, $\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(r)} = d(r)^{-\hat{\gamma}}$. Using the lower-bound and taking expectation, we obtain

$$1 \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} (d(r)^{\hat{\gamma}} \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}] \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}]). \quad (52)$$

Then, using the upper-bound and that $\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}] \geq 1$ (by Jensen's inequality since $\mathbf{E} \varphi_n(z) = \varphi_0(z) = 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$), one has for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\int \frac{\mathbf{E}_n e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(ru)} f(u) du}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Im \varphi(r)}} \geq d(r)^{\hat{\gamma}} \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}] \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}] \left(\int \frac{e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(ru)} f(u) du}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}} - C \int \sqrt{1-\rho_n(ru)} f(u) du \right).$$

If $\hat{\gamma} < 1$, using the GMC convergence (see (22)), the RHS converges almost surely to $\mathbf{E}_n \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f)$ as $r \rightarrow 1$. Moreover, since φ_n is (uniformly) continuous on \mathbb{D} , one has almost surely, as $r \rightarrow 1$,

$$\int \frac{e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(ru)} f(u) du}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(r)}} \rightarrow \nu_n^\gamma(f).$$

Thus, since $\rho_n(ru) \rightarrow 1$ uniformly for $u \in \mathbb{U}$ (almost surely) as $r \rightarrow 1$, the error converges to 0. By (52), we conclude that

$$\mathbf{E}_n \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \geq \int \frac{e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(u)} f(u) du}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \Im \varphi_n(1)}}$$

as required. This completes the whole proof of Proposition 4.

To finish this section, we prove Fact 3 which is a simple analysis exercise.

Proof of Fact 3. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa = \gamma/2i$. According to (51), one has for $r < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_\gamma(r) &= \int_{\mathbb{U}} \exp(\kappa \log(1+ru)) \exp(-\kappa \log(1+r\bar{u})) du \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{U}} \frac{(1+ru)^\kappa}{(1+r\bar{u})^\kappa} du. \end{aligned}$$

Using the binomial formula $(1+z)^\kappa = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{\kappa}{k} z^k$, for $\kappa \in \mathbb{C}$, where both sides are analytic for $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and rotation-invariance of the uniform measure on \mathbb{U} , we obtain for $r < 1$,

$$G_\gamma(r) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{\kappa}{k} \binom{-\kappa}{k} r^{2k}.$$

The coefficients $\binom{\kappa}{0} = 1$, $\binom{\kappa}{1} = \kappa$ and for $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$,

$$\binom{\kappa}{k} \binom{-\kappa}{k} = -\frac{\kappa(1-\kappa) \cdots (1-\kappa/(k-1)) \kappa(1+\kappa) \cdots (1+\kappa/(k-1))}{k^2} = -\frac{\kappa^2(1-\kappa^2) \cdots (1-\kappa^2/(k-1)^2)}{k^2}.$$

Here $\kappa^2 = -\gamma^2/4 = -\hat{\gamma}^2 \frac{\beta}{2}$, so that for $r \in [0, 1]$

$$G_\gamma(r) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{c_{k-1}(\gamma)}{k^2} r^{2k}, \quad \begin{cases} c_0(\gamma) = \frac{\beta \hat{\gamma}^2}{2} \\ c_k(\gamma) = \frac{\beta \hat{\gamma}^2}{2} (1 + \frac{\beta \hat{\gamma}^2}{2}) (1 + \frac{\beta \hat{\gamma}^2}{2 \cdot 4}) \cdots (1 + \frac{\beta \hat{\gamma}^2}{2 \cdot k^2}), \quad k \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

In particular, $0 \leq c_k(\gamma) \leq c_\beta = \frac{\beta}{2} \exp \frac{\beta}{2}$ for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| \leq 1$.

Formula (53) implies that G_γ is smooth on $[0, 1]$, increasing, convex, bounded on $[0, 1]$ with $G_\gamma(0) = 1$. The fact that G_γ is α -Hölder continuous is a consequence of the following observation. If $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $r \in [0, 1]$, one has for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$1 - r^k \leq \min(k(1-r), 1) \leq \min(k(1-r), 1)^\alpha \leq k^\alpha (1-r)^\alpha.$$

Then, if $\alpha < 1$,

$$0 \leq G_\gamma(r) - G_\gamma(\rho r) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{c_{k-1}(\gamma)}{k^2} r^{2k} (1 - \rho^{2k}) \leq (1 - \rho)^\alpha \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{c_\beta}{k^{2-\alpha}} r^{2k} \lesssim r^2 (1 - \rho)^\alpha$$

where the implied constant depends only on α, β . \square

3. CONVERGENCE FOR THE CHARACTERISTIC POLYNOMIALS

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1. The main goal of this section will be to prove the following results.

Proposition 12. *Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. For a small $\delta > 0$ (depending on $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$), it holds in $\mathbf{L}^{1+\delta}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_n(\theta)}}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_n(0)}} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \rightarrow \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|\mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_n(1)|^\gamma} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \rightarrow \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \quad \text{if } \gamma \geq 0.$$

The second limit still holds in probability if $\gamma > -1$.

Proposition 12 imply Theorem 1 by standard arguments, we refer to [La24, Appendix B] for instance. As we explain in the introduction the conditions $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and $\gamma > -1$ are necessary and sufficient and the main step is to obtain the following properties.

Proposition 13. *Recall that $(\varpi_k)_{k \geq 0}$ denotes the Prüfer phases and the notations (25). Let $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$. It holds in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{i\kappa \varpi_n(\theta)} f(\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{i\kappa \varpi_n(\theta)} f(\theta) \nu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall that $\eta \in \mathbb{T}$ is a uniform random variable independent of \mathcal{F}_∞ . Proposition 13 implies that for any trigonometric polynomial $g : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $g_0 = 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) g(\varpi_n(\theta) + \eta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, if $g \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$, by averaging over η first (η is independent of \mathcal{F}_∞),

$$\mathbf{E} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) g(\varpi_n(\theta) + \eta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \right| \leq \|f\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{L^1}$$

since $\mathbf{E} \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) = \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Consequently, by density (of trigonometric polynomials in $L^1(\mathbb{T})$) and (18), for any $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$, if $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(\theta) g(\varpi_n(\theta) + \eta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \rightarrow g_0 \cdot \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (54)$$

An analogous result holds for the measures ν_n^γ and $\nu^{\hat{\gamma}}$.

Let $f : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto |1 + e^{i\theta}|^\gamma$. $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ if and only if $\gamma > -1$ (it is positive with mean $f_0 = F_\gamma(1)$, see (38)) Then, according to (27), for $\gamma > -1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, with $u = e^{i\theta}$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\mathbf{E}_n |\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(u)|^\gamma = |\Phi_n^*(u)|^\gamma \mathbf{E}_n |1 - e^{i\eta + i\varpi_n(\theta)}|^\gamma = |\Phi_n^*(u)|^\gamma f_0. \quad (55)$$

Thus, for $\gamma > -1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(u)|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(1)|^\gamma} = f_0^{-1} \cdot f(\varpi_n(\theta) + \eta) \mu_n^\gamma(du).$$

By (54), we conclude that if $\gamma > -1$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$, for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\int \frac{|\mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{X}_n(1)|^\gamma} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \rightarrow \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In case $f \leq C$ for some constant, we can upgrade this convergence in $\mathbf{L}^{1+\delta}$. Suppose that $f \geq 0$, $\gamma \geq 0$ and let $X_n = \int \frac{|\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(e^{i\theta})|^\gamma}{\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(1)|^\gamma} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that according to Proposition 4,

$$X_n \leq C \mu_n^\gamma(f) = C \mathbf{E}_n \mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f).$$

By (22), since the limit $\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f) \in \mathbf{L}^{1+\delta}$, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbf{E}[X_n^{1+\delta}] \lesssim \mathbf{E}[\mu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f)^{1+\delta}] < \infty.$$

This yields the required uniform integrability condition.

For the imaginary part of the characteristic polynomial, according to (13), for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\Im \log \mathcal{X}_n(z) = \Im \varphi_{n-1}(z) + \Im \log(1 - e^{i\eta} B_{n-1}(z)).$$

The previous $\log(\cdot)$ is well-defined since $|B_n(z)| < 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $c \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Recall that $\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) = \Im \log \mathcal{X}_n(e^{i\theta})$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ defined as in (4). Since $B_n = e^{i\varpi_n(\theta)}$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\varpi_n(\theta) = (n+1)\theta - 2\psi_n(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, by continuity, we obtain

$$\mathcal{Y}_{n+1}(\theta) = \psi_n(\theta) + h(\varpi_n(\theta) + \eta) \tag{56}$$

with h as in (20). Thus

$$e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_{n+1}} = e^{\gamma \psi_n} g(\varpi_n(\theta) + \eta)$$

where $g : \mathbb{T} \mapsto e^{\gamma h(\cdot)}$, satisfies $g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ with $g_0 > 0$. Again, $\mathbf{E}_n e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_{n+1}} = g_0 \cdot e^{\gamma \psi_n}$, so that by (54), if $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$, for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\int \frac{e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_n(\theta)}}{\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_n(0)}} f(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \rightarrow \nu^{\hat{\gamma}}(f). \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 12. \square

Remark 7. To check that formulae (4) and (56) are consistent, observe that both functions are smooth on $\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathfrak{Z}_n$ and they jump by $-\pi$ on \mathfrak{Z}_n ; see Proposition 1. Moreover, taking a derivative, one checks that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{Y}'_n(\theta) = \frac{n}{2} = \psi'_{n-1} + \varpi'_{n-1}(\theta)/2, \quad \theta \notin \mathfrak{Z}_n,$$

where the previous equality follows from (24). The value of both functions at $\theta = 0$ satisfies $\mathcal{Y}_n(0) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \Im \log \mathcal{X}_n(r)$ (almost surely). Formula (56) implies that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) = \psi_{n-1}(\theta) & \theta \in \mathfrak{Z}_n \\ |\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) - \psi_{n-1}(\theta)| < \pi/2 & \theta \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

In this sense, \mathcal{Y}_n is a linear interpolation of the smooth function ψ_{n-1} on \mathbb{T} .

3.2. Main steps. In this section, we go over the proof of Proposition 13. We fix $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T}, [0, 1])$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$. The method is the same for both μ_n^γ (real part) and ν_n^γ (imaginary part), so we focus on the real part. We introduce a small parameter $\epsilon_n > 0$ and, by expanding the square, we split

$$Z_n := \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{i\kappa\varpi_n(\theta)} f(\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \right|^2 \leq Z_n^1 + Z_n^2$$

where

$$Z_n^1 := \iint_{|\theta-\vartheta| < \epsilon_n} \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\vartheta), \quad Z_n^2 := \iint_{|\theta-\vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n} e^{i\kappa(\varpi_n(\theta) - \varpi_n(\vartheta))} f(\theta) f(\vartheta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\vartheta). \quad (57)$$

Then, for any event \mathcal{A}_n and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, by Jensen's inequality ($x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto x \wedge 1$ is concave and subadditive),

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_n \wedge 1] \leq \mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}_n^c] + \mathbf{E}[Z_n^1 \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\}] + \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\} |\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2| \wedge 1]. \quad (58)$$

In particular, if $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}_n] \rightarrow 1$, and we show that both $\mathbf{E}[Z_n^1 \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\}] \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ in probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, we conclude that also $Z_n \rightarrow 0$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$, as required.

- The *local part* Z_n^1 will be controlled on the event that the maximum of the field χ_n on \mathbb{T} is typical, in which case the density μ_n^γ is uniformly bounded. On this event, $Z_n^1 \rightarrow 0$ provided that $\epsilon_n \leq n^{\delta-1}$ for a small $\delta > 0$ (depending on $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$).
- For the part Z_n^2 , choosing a sequence $m(n)$ such that $n \geq m(n) \gg \epsilon_n^{-1}$, for $|\theta - \vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n$, the increments

$$\{\varphi_n(\theta) - \varphi_m(\theta), \varphi_n(\vartheta) - \varphi_m(\vartheta)\}$$

are approximately independent complex Gaussian random variables, with mean 0 and variance $\frac{2}{\beta} \log \frac{n}{m}$. To explain this property, if $m \gg 1$, one can approximate the C β E Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_k \approx G_k(1 + \beta_k)^{-1/2}$ where G_k are independent standard complex Gaussians. Then, linearizing the recursion (23), one obtains a toy model

$$\varphi_n(\theta) \approx \varphi_m(\theta) - \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \beta_k^{-1} G_k e^{i(k-m)\theta + i\varpi_m(\theta)}.$$

Conditionally on \mathcal{F}_m , the RHS is a Gaussian process for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and its increments are independent if $m \gg |\theta - \vartheta|^{-1}$ because of the *variation of the phase*. To control the approximation errors, we introduce events \mathcal{B}_m so that for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $|\theta - \vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n$,

$$|\mathbf{E}_m[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_m(\theta), \mathcal{B}_m(\vartheta)\} e^{i\kappa(\varpi_n(\theta) - \varpi_n(\vartheta))} \mu_n^\gamma(\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(\vartheta)]| \lesssim \mathbf{E}[e^{2i\kappa G \sqrt{\beta^{-1} \log \frac{n}{m}}}]^2 \mu_m^\gamma(\theta) \mu_m^\gamma(\vartheta)$$

where G is a standard real Gaussian, and there is a $\varkappa > 0$ so that $\mathbf{P}_m[\mathcal{B}_m^c(\theta)] \lesssim e^{-n^{-\varkappa}}$ uniformly for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. Then

$$|\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2| \lesssim \left(\frac{n}{m}\right)^{-8\hat{\kappa}^2} \mu_m^\gamma(f)^2.$$

Based on this heuristic, we conclude that $\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ (almost surely) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ provided that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ and we choose $m(n)$ appropriately within the range $\epsilon_n^{-1} \ll m(n) \ll n$.

In the rest of the subsection, we elaborate on the details of the method.

Control of Z_n^1 . For $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, let $\chi_n(\theta) := \Re \varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ and $\psi_n(\theta) := \Im \varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$. We need the following bounds.

Lemma 14. *Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. It holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,*

$$\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \psi_n(\theta)}] = \exp(\hat{\gamma}^2 \log n + \mathcal{O}(1)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma \chi_n(\theta)}] = \exp(\hat{\gamma}^2 \log n + \mathcal{O}(1)),$$

where the implied constants depend only on (γ, β) .

Lemma 14 is proved in the Appendix A using the explicit distribution of the C β E Verblunsky coefficients. An alternative proof, albeit more technical, follows from the Gaussian approximations of Proposition 17 below.

We fix a small $\delta > 0$ and let $\epsilon_n = n^{\delta-1}$ in (57). We introduce the following events,

$$\mathcal{A}_n(\delta) := \left\{ \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} |\chi_n(\theta)|, \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} |\psi_n(\theta)| \leq \frac{2+\delta}{\sqrt{2\beta}} \log n \right\}.$$

By Theorem 4, $\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{A}_n(\delta)] \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. On this event, by Lemma 14, we can bound the density of the random measure at hand,

$$\max \{ \mu_n^\gamma(\theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \} \lesssim n^{(2+\delta)\hat{\gamma}-\hat{\gamma}^2} \leq n^{1+\delta-(1-\hat{\gamma})^2}$$

using that $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ – the last bound holds for n sufficiently large.

This implies that

$$|Z_n^1| \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\} \leq n^{1+\delta-(1-\hat{\gamma})^2} \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \mu_n^\gamma(d\vartheta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \leq n^{2\delta-(1-\hat{\gamma})^2} \mu_n^\gamma(\mathbb{T}).$$

In the subcritical regime ($\mathbf{E}\mu_n^\gamma(\mathbb{T}) = 1$), choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small (depending on $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$), we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[|Z_n^1| \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\}] = 0. \quad (59)$$

Control of Z_n^2 . Recall (23)–(24). We set for $n \geq m \geq 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_{n,m}(u) := \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \log(1 - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)}) \\ \chi_{n,m}(\theta) = \Re \varphi_{n,m}(u), \quad \psi_{n,m}(\theta) = \Im \varphi_{n,m}(u) \end{cases} \quad u = e^{i\theta}, \theta \in \mathbb{T}, \quad (60)$$

where $\varpi_k(\theta) = (k+1)\theta - 2\psi_k(\theta)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, one decompose for any $n \geq m \geq 1$,

$$\chi_n = \chi_{n,0} = \chi_{n,m} + \chi_m, \quad \psi_n = \psi_{n,0} = \psi_{n,m} + \psi_m.$$

In particular, (χ_m, ψ_m) are \mathcal{F}_m -measurable and $\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_n(0)}] = \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_{n,m}(0)}] \mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_m(0)}]$ (by independence of the Verblunsky coefficient), so that for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $\theta \neq \vartheta$,

$$|\mathbf{E}_m[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\theta)\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\vartheta)\}] e^{i\kappa(\varpi_n(\theta) - \varpi_n(\vartheta))} \mu_n^\gamma(\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(\vartheta)]| \leq \mathcal{W}_n(\vartheta, \vartheta) \mu_m^\gamma(\theta) \mu_m^\gamma(\vartheta)$$

where, with $m \leq n$,

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) := \frac{|\mathbf{E}_m[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\theta)\} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\vartheta)\}] e^{i2\kappa(\psi_{m,n}(\theta) - \psi_{m,n}(\vartheta))} e^{\gamma\chi_{m,n}(\theta) + \gamma\chi_{m,n}(\vartheta)}|}{\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_{m,n}(0)}]^2}. \quad (61)$$

Then, by (57),

$$|\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2| \leq \max \{ \mathcal{W}_n(\vartheta, \vartheta); (\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2 : |\theta - \vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n \} \mu_m^\gamma(f)^2 + \mathcal{E}_n$$

where the error satisfies on \mathcal{A}_n (using a crude bound for the density $\mu_n^\gamma \leq n$ if $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$),

$$\mathcal{E}_n \leq 2n^2 \mathbf{P}_m[\mathcal{B}_n^c(\theta)].$$

We will prove the following estimates.

Proposition 15. *Let $\epsilon_n = n^{\delta-1}$ for a small $\delta > 0$ and let $m = m(n) = \lfloor n^{1-\frac{\delta}{8}} \rfloor$. Then, almost surely, uniformly over $\{(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2; |\theta - \vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n\}$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) \lesssim n^{-\frac{\delta/5}{1+\beta}}.$$

Moreover, there is a $\varkappa > 0$ (depending on (δ, β)) so that almost surely $\mathbf{P}_m[\mathcal{B}_n^c(\theta)] \lesssim e^{-n^\varkappa}$ uniformly for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$.

Hence, by Proposition 15, we conclude that for a small $c_\beta > 0$ and large $C > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\} |\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2| \wedge 1] \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{-c_\beta}) + \mathbf{P}[\mu_m^\gamma(f) \geq C].$$

Note that the contribution from \mathcal{E}_n is asymptotically negligible. Consequently, by Theorem 2, for every $C > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}_n\} |\mathbf{E}_m Z_n^2| \wedge 1] \leq \mathbf{P}[\mu^\gamma(f) \geq C].$$

Taking $C \rightarrow \infty$, both sides vanish, then going back to (57) and (59), we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left[\left| \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{i\kappa\varpi_n(\theta)} f(\theta) \mu_n^\gamma(d\theta) \right|^2 \wedge 1 \right] = 0.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 13 for the real part. The method for the imaginary part is exactly the same, one only needs to change (61) to

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) = \frac{\mathbf{E}_m[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\theta)\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\vartheta)\}e^{\zeta\psi_{m,n}(\theta)+\bar{\zeta}\psi_{m,n}(\vartheta)}]}{\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_{m,n}(0)}]^2}$$

where $\zeta = \gamma + 2i\kappa$, $m \leq n$ and $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $\theta \neq \vartheta$. Then, the estimates from Proposition 15 hold true with the same events $\{\mathcal{B}_n\}$. These events control both the real and imaginary part of $\varphi_{n,m}(\theta)$ for a fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$; see Section 3.4.

The rest of this section is organized as follows;

- In Section 3.3, we linearize the recurrence (23) and develop the necessary Gaussian approximations. This section is independent from the rest of the paper and we rely on the convention from the Appendix B.
- In Section 3.4, we deduce Proposition 15 from these approximations.
- In Section 3.5, we prove some Gaussian estimates which are required in the proof.

3.3. Gaussian coupling and Linearization. The first step of the proof of Proposition 15 is to show that one can *linearize* the recursion (29) and then replace the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq m}$ by independent (complex) Gaussian random variables, up to a small error, with overwhelming probability. To perform such approximations, we rely on the following property of the C β E model which has been observed in [CMN18]. In this section, $c > 0$ denotes a numerical constant and $C > 0$ a constant which depends on the parameter $\beta > 0$ of the model. Recall Fact 1 and that $\beta_k = \frac{\beta}{2}(k+1)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Fact 4. We can enlarge our probability space and the filtration (14) so that for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(\alpha_0, \Gamma_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-1}),$$

where $\{\Gamma_k\}$ is a sequence independent random variables, independent of $\{\alpha_k\}$, and Γ_k is Gamma-distributed with p.d.f. $x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \Gamma(1 + \beta_k)^{-1} x^{\beta_k} e^{-x}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $G_k := \alpha_k \sqrt{\Gamma_k}$ are i.i.d. complex Gaussian with

$$\mathbf{E}G_k = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}G_k^2 = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}|G_k|^2 = 1.$$

Then to linearize the recursion (29), we can work on the following event.

Lemma 16. *For any $0 \leq \eta < 1/2$, there is a $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta)$ so that if m is sufficiently large,*

$$\mathbf{P}[|\alpha_k| \leq k^{-\eta} \text{ for all } k \geq m] \geq 1 - \exp(-\beta m^{-\epsilon}). \quad (62)$$

Moreover, there is a numerical constant c so that $\|\alpha_k - G_k/\sqrt{\beta_k}\|_{\Psi_1} \leq c\beta_k^{-1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. First, we record that by (12), for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathbf{P}[|\alpha_k|^2 \geq t] \leq e^{-\beta_k t}, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (63)$$

Equivalently, $\|\alpha_k\|_{\Psi_2} \leq c\beta_k^{-1/2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By a union bound, this implies that for some numerical constant $c > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}[|\alpha_k| > k^{-\eta} \text{ for a } k \geq m] \leq 2 \sum_{k \geq m} \exp(-c\beta k^{1-2\eta})$$

which proves (62).

Let $\gamma_k := \sqrt{\Gamma_k/\beta_k} - 1$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. γ_k has a p.d.f. $\propto (x+1)^{\beta_k} e^{-\beta_k(x+1)^2}$ on $[-1, \infty)$, using that $2\beta_k - 1 = \beta_k$. One has for $x \geq -1$,

$$(x+1)^{\beta_k} e^{-(1+\beta_k)(x+1)^2} \leq e^{-\beta_k x^2}.$$

By scaling, this shows that for some numerical constant, $\|\gamma_k\|_{\Psi_2} \leq c\beta_k^{-1/2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Now, we have

$$G_k/\sqrt{\beta_k} - \alpha_k = \alpha_k \gamma_k$$

and the second claim follows from the bound $\|\alpha_k \gamma_k\|_{\Psi_1} \leq \|\alpha_k\|_{\Psi_2} \|\gamma_k\|_{\Psi_2}$. \square

Definition 5. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq m}$, let $X_k := -G_k/\sqrt{\beta_k}$ where G_k are the i.i.d. complex Gaussians from Fact 4. In terms of the Prüfer phase $\{\varpi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, we define

$$\check{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta) := \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} X_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)}, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{T}, \quad n \geq m.$$

The process $\{\check{\varphi}_{m,n}\}_{n \geq m}$ is a continuous $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ martingale.

Using Lemma 16, one can show that for a given $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, the processes $\{\psi_{m,n}(\theta)\}_{n \geq m}$ from (29) and $\{\check{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta)\}_{n \geq m}$ are close with overwhelming probability as $m \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, for a fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, the new process $\{\check{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta)\}_{n \geq m}$ has independent (complex) Gaussian increments and quadratic variation $[\check{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta)] = \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} (1 + \beta_k)^{-1} \simeq \frac{2}{\beta} \log(\frac{n}{m})$ for $n \geq m$.

Proposition 17 (Linearization). *For any $0 < \eta < 1/2$, there is a $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta)$ so that for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_m \left[\sup_{n \geq m} |\varphi_{m,n}(\theta) - \check{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta)| \geq m^{-\eta} \right] \lesssim \exp(-\beta m^{-\epsilon}).$$

Proof. On the event (62), it holds for $k \geq m$,

$$\left| \log(1 - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)}) - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)} + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k^2 e^{2i\varpi_k(\theta)} \right| \leq |\alpha_k|^3 \leq k^{-3\eta}.$$

Choosing $1/3 < \eta < 1/2$, these error are summable. By (60), this implies that for any $n \geq m$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{m,n}(\theta) &= \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \log(1 - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)}) \\ &= -\sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \alpha_k^2 e^{2i\varpi_k(\theta)} + O(m^{1-3\eta}). \end{aligned}$$

The error control (deterministically) on the event (62), uniformly for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. Since the process $\{\varpi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is adapted and $\mathbf{E}_k \alpha_k^2 = 0$ (by rotation invariance), $\{\sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \alpha_k^2 e^{2i\varpi_k(\theta)}\}_{n \geq m}$ is a complex-valued martingale whose increments satisfy by (63),

$$\|\alpha_k^2\|_{\Psi_1} \leq c/\beta k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence, by Proposition 25, there is a numerical constant c so that for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and any $\lambda \leq \beta^{-1}$,

$$\mathbf{P}_m \left[\sup_{n \geq m} \left| \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \alpha_k^2 e^{2i\varpi_k(\theta)} \right| \geq \lambda \right] \leq 2 \exp(-c\beta^2 m \lambda^2).$$

Taking $\lambda = m^{-\eta}$, this implies that for any $0 < \eta < 1/2$, there is a $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta) > 0$ so that for a fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\psi_{m,n}(\theta) = -\sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)} + O(m^{-\eta}) \quad \text{uniformly for all } n \geq m,$$

with probability $1 - \exp(-\beta m^{-\epsilon})$ if m is sufficiently large. This implies that for $n \geq m$,

$$\check{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta) - \varphi_{m,n}(\theta) = \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} (\alpha_k - G_k \beta_k^{-1/2}) e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)} + O(m^{-\eta}).$$

The main term is again a martingale whose increments are controlled by Lemma 16 – its quadratic variation is summable and bounded by β_m^{-1} . Hence, as above, $\sup_{n \geq m} \left| \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} (\alpha_k - G_k \beta_k^{-1/2}) e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)} \right| \lesssim m^{-\eta}$ with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\beta m^{-\epsilon})$. This proves the claim. \square

We now focus on the process from Definition 5

Definition 6. Recall that $m = m(n) = \lfloor n\Lambda^{-1} \rfloor$ where $\Lambda(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We write $\Lambda = e^{\eta L}$ where $\eta(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is a parameter to be chosen later on and $L(n) \leq n$. The relevant condition will be that $\eta \gg \Lambda n^{-\delta}$ and it will be convenient to choose $\Lambda := n^{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ and $\eta := n^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} = \Lambda n^{-\frac{3\delta}{4}}$ and Then, we let

$$n_\ell := \lfloor n e^{\eta(\ell-L)} \rfloor, \quad \ell \in [0, L]$$

so that $n_0 = m$, $n_L = n$ and n_ℓ is a geometric progression at rate e^η . We introduce a new process;

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\varphi}_{m,n}(\theta) := \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} X_k e^{i\hat{\varpi}_k(\theta)}, & \theta \in \mathbb{T}, \quad n \geq m \\ \hat{\varpi}_k(\theta) = (k - n_j)\theta + \varpi_{n_j}(\theta), & k \in [n_j, n_{j+1}), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \end{cases}.$$

Again $\{\hat{\varphi}_{m,n}\}_{n \geq m}(\theta)$ is a Gaussian process, with a piecewise continuous phase, and also a continuous $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ martingale.

Proposition 18 (Approximation). *For any $R \geq 1$ sufficiently large, and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, with $\epsilon = R\sqrt{\eta \log \Lambda}$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_m \left[\max_{k \in [m, n]} |\hat{\varphi}_{m,k}(\theta) - \check{\varphi}_{m,k}(\theta)| \geq \epsilon \right] \lesssim n e^{-c\beta R}$$

Using the conventions from Definition 6, take $R = \frac{n^\varkappa}{\sqrt{\log n}}$ with $0 < \varkappa < \frac{\delta}{4}$, then $\epsilon \leq n^{\varkappa - \frac{\delta}{4}}$.

Proof. Here we fix $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ (by rotation-invariance, one can also assume that $\theta = 0$), so we omit the θ -dependence. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a small parameter. We introduce a stopping time

$$\tau := \inf \{k \geq m; |\varpi_k - \hat{\varpi}_k| > 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\}.$$

Recall that by (29), for any $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\varpi_k - \hat{\varpi}_k = -2\psi_{k, n_j}, \quad k \in [n_j, n_{j+1}].$$

For $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the process $\{\psi_{k, n_j}\}_{k \geq n_j}$ is a martingale and according to (75),

$$\mathbf{P}_{n_j} \left[\max_{n_j < k \leq n_{j+1}} |\psi_{k, n_j}| \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \right] \leq 2 \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1}).$$

using that $\log \frac{n_{j+1}}{n_j} \leq \eta$. Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[\tau > n_{j+1}] &= \mathbf{P} \left[\max_{n_j < k \leq n_{j+1}} |\psi_{k, n_j}| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}; \tau > n_j \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}[\tau > n_j] (1 - 2 \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1})) \\ &\geq (1 - 2 \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1}))^j \geq 1 - 2j \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last bound follows from convexity. Since $n_L = n$ and $L \leq n$, this shows that

$$\mathbf{P}[\tau \leq n] \leq 2n \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1}). \quad (64)$$

Let $\Delta_{m,n} := (\hat{\varphi} - \check{\varphi})_{m, n \wedge \tau}$ for $m \geq n$. The process $\{\Delta_{m,n}\}_{n \geq m}$ is also a martingale, whose increments are given by

$$\mathbf{1}\{k < \tau\} X_k (e^{i\hat{\varpi}_k} - e^{i\varpi_k}) = X_k e^{i\frac{\varpi_k + \hat{\varpi}_k}{2}} \sin\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_k - \varpi_k}{2}\right) \mathbf{1}\{k < \tau\} \quad \text{for } k \geq m.$$

On the event $\{k < \tau\}$,

$$\|X_k e^{i\frac{\varpi_k + \hat{\varpi}_k}{2}} \sin\left(\frac{\hat{\varpi}_k - \varpi_k}{2}\right)\|_{\Psi_2, \mathbf{P}_k}^2 \leq \epsilon \|X_k\|_{\Psi_2}^2 \lesssim \frac{\epsilon}{\beta(k+1)}$$

since X_k is a complex Gaussian, independent of \mathcal{F}_k , with variance $\beta_k^{-1} = \frac{2}{\beta(k+1)}$.

Then, by Proposition 24 with $\sigma_k^2 = \frac{\epsilon}{\beta(k+1)}$, we obtain for $\lambda > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}_m \left[\max_{k \leq n \wedge \tau} |\Delta_{m,k}| \geq \lambda \right] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{c\beta\lambda^2}{\epsilon \log \Lambda}\right)$$

where $\Lambda = \frac{n}{m}$. Choosing $\lambda = \epsilon \sqrt{\eta^{-1} \log \Lambda}$, by (64), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_m \left[\max_{k \leq n} |\Delta_{m,k}| \geq \lambda \right] &\leq 2 \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1}) + \mathbf{P}[\tau \leq n] \\ &\leq 2(n+1) \exp(-c\beta\epsilon\eta^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Using that $L \leq n$ and choosing $\epsilon = R\eta$, this completes the proof. \square

3.4. Proof of Proposition 15. We use the convention from Definition 6. Define the events, for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$

$$B_n(\theta) := \left\{ \max_{k \in [m, n]} |\hat{\varphi}_{m,k}(\theta) - \varphi_{m,k}(\theta)| \leq n^{\varkappa - \frac{\delta}{5}} \right\}.$$

Combining Proposition 17 (with e.g. $\varkappa = \frac{1}{4}$) and Proposition 18, there is a $\varkappa > 0$ so that for any fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\mathbf{P}_m[B_n^c(\theta)] \lesssim e^{-\beta n^{-\varkappa}} \quad (65)$$

and, according to (61), one has for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $\theta \neq \vartheta$,

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) = \frac{\mathbf{E}_m[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\theta)\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\vartheta)\}e^{i2\kappa(\hat{\psi}_{m,n}(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{m,n}(\vartheta)) + \gamma(\hat{\chi}_{m,n}(\theta) + \hat{\chi}_{m,n}(\vartheta)) + \mathcal{O}(n^{\varkappa - \delta/4})}]}{\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_{m,n}(0)}]^2}$$

where the implies constants are deterministic. Define $\Sigma := \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \beta_k^{-1}$ and for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $\theta \neq \vartheta$,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^\kappa(\theta, \vartheta) := \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\Sigma\right) \mathbf{E}_m\left[e^{i2\kappa(\hat{\psi}_{m,n}(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{m,n}(\vartheta))} e^{\gamma\hat{\chi}_{m,n}(\theta) + \gamma\hat{\chi}_{m,n}(\vartheta)}\right].$$

Proposition 19. *Almost surely, $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^0(\theta, \vartheta) \lesssim 1$ uniformly for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ and, for any $\kappa \geq 1$,*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^\kappa(\theta, \vartheta) \lesssim n^{-\frac{\delta/4}{1+\beta}} \quad \text{uniformly for } |\theta - \vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n = n^{\delta-1}.$$

These estimates are proved in Section 3.5. Moreover, according to Lemma 22, one has $\mathbf{E}[e^{\gamma\chi_{m,n}(0)}]^2 \simeq \exp(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\Sigma) \simeq \Lambda^{2\gamma^2}$, so that

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) \simeq \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\Sigma\right) \mathbf{E}_m[\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\theta)\}\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_n(\vartheta)\}e^{i2\kappa(\hat{\psi}_{m,n}(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_{m,n}(\vartheta))} e^{\gamma\hat{\chi}_{m,n}(\theta) + \gamma\hat{\chi}_{m,n}(\vartheta)}] + \mathcal{O}(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^0(\theta, \vartheta)n^{-\delta/5})$$

By (65), one can remove the events \mathcal{B}_n up to a negligible error so that (almost surely), for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $\theta \neq \vartheta$,

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) \simeq \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^\kappa(\theta, \vartheta) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-\delta/5})$$

Hence, by Proposition 19, we conclude that uniformly for $|\theta - \vartheta| \geq \epsilon_n = n^{\delta-1}$,

$$\mathcal{W}_n(\theta, \vartheta) \leq n^{-\frac{\delta/5}{1+\beta}}. \quad \square$$

3.5. Gaussian calculations; proof of Proposition 19. Recall that $\kappa \geq 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ are fixed and $\Sigma = \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \beta_k^{-1}$. Here $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$, we let $\Delta := |\theta - \vartheta|_{\mathbb{T}}$ and we assume that $\Delta \geq \epsilon_n = n^{\delta-1}$.

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we write for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$,

$$\mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta) := \gamma\hat{\chi}_{n_\ell, n_{\ell+1}}(\theta) + i2\kappa\hat{\psi}_{n_\ell, n_{\ell+1}}(\theta), \quad \mathbf{Z}_\ell := \exp(\mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta) + \overline{\mathbf{X}_\ell}(\vartheta)).$$

Here, $\{\mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta) : \theta \in \mathbb{T}\}$ are Gaussian fields with obvious independence properties. We do not emphasize that \mathbf{Z}_ℓ depends on (γ, \varkappa) and $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ as the only relevant quantity for the analysis is $\Delta = |\theta - \vartheta|_{\mathbb{T}}$. In particular, one has

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^\kappa = \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\Sigma\right) \mathbf{E}_m\left[\prod_{\ell=0}^{L-1} \mathbf{Z}_\ell\right]. \quad (66)$$

We rely on the following basic computations.

Lemma 20. *Let $\zeta = (\frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2}} + i\sqrt{2}\kappa)^2$, $\sigma_\ell := \sum_{k=n_\ell}^{n_{\ell+1}-1} \beta_k^{-1}$ and $q_\ell := \sum_{k=n_\ell}^{n_{\ell+1}-1} \beta_k^{-1} e^{ik\Delta}$, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. From Definition 6, one has $\Sigma = \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} \sigma_\ell$ and $\sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} |q_\ell| \lesssim \beta^{-1} n^{-\delta/4}$ if $\Delta = |\theta - \vartheta|_{\mathbb{T}} \geq n^{\delta-1}$. For every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is a random $\omega_\ell \in \mathbb{T}$, \mathcal{F}_{n_ℓ} -measurable, so that*

$$\mathbf{E}_{n_\ell}[\mathbf{Z}_\ell] = \exp\left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\sigma_\ell + \Re(\zeta e^{i\omega_\ell} q_\ell)\right)$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_{n_\ell}[|\mathbf{Z}_\ell|] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\sigma_\ell + \frac{\gamma^2}{2}|q_\ell|\right). \quad (67)$$

Proof. For a (standard) complex Gaussian X and deterministic $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[\Re(Xe^{i\omega_1})\Re(Xe^{i\omega_2})] = \mathbf{E}[\Im(Xe^{i\omega_1})\Im(Xe^{i\omega_2})] = \frac{\cos(\omega_1 - \omega_2)}{2}, \quad \mathbf{E}[\Re(Xe^{i\omega_1})\Im(Xe^{i\omega_2})] = \frac{\sin(\omega_1 - \omega_2)}{2}.$$

Then, since $\{X_k\}$ are independent complex Gaussians, one has for $(\theta, \vartheta) \in \mathbb{T}^2$,

$$\mathbf{E}_{n_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta)^2 = \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\sigma_\ell$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_{n_\ell} \mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta)\overline{\mathbf{X}_\ell(\vartheta)} = \sum_{n_\ell \leq k < n_{\ell+1}} \beta_k^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right) \cos \Delta_k - 2i\gamma\kappa \sin \Delta_k \right) = \Re \left(\zeta \sum_{n_\ell \leq k < n_{\ell+1}} \beta_k^{-1} e^{i\Delta_k} \right)$$

where $\Delta_k := \hat{\varpi}_k(\theta) - \hat{\varpi}_k(\vartheta) = (k - n_j)(\theta - \vartheta) + \varpi_{n_\ell}(\theta) - \varpi_{n_\ell}(\vartheta)$.

This implies that

$$\mathbf{E}_{n_\ell} [\exp \mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta) \exp \overline{\mathbf{X}_\ell(\vartheta)}] = \exp \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{n_\ell} (\mathbf{X}_\ell(\theta) + \overline{\mathbf{X}_\ell(\vartheta)})^2 = \exp \left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\sigma_\ell + \Re(\zeta e^{i\omega_\ell} q_\ell) \right)$$

with $\omega_\ell = \pm(\varpi_{n_\ell}(\theta) - \varpi_{n_\ell}(\vartheta))[2\pi] - \omega_\ell \in \mathbb{T}$ is \mathcal{F}_{n_ℓ} -measurable. The estimate (67) follows from the previous formula with $\kappa = 0$ and using that $|\Re(e^{i\omega_\ell} q_\ell)| \leq |q_\ell|$. Finally, one has

$$|q_\ell| \leq \frac{2}{\beta} \left| \sum_{n_\ell \leq k < n_{\ell+1}} \frac{e^{ik\Delta}}{k+1} \right| \leq \frac{2}{\beta} \left(\left| \sum_{n_\ell \leq k < n_{\ell+1}} \frac{e^{ik\Delta}}{n_\ell} \right| + \frac{n_{\ell+1}}{n_\ell^2} \right) \lesssim \frac{\beta^{-1}}{n_\ell \Delta}.$$

using that $n_{\ell+1} = n_\ell e^\eta$ with $e^\eta \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \leq \Delta^{-1}$. Consequently, $\sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} |q_\ell| \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta \Delta m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} e^{-\eta \ell} \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta \Delta m \eta}$. With the convention from Definition 6, $\eta = \Lambda n^{-\frac{3\delta}{4}}$, $m \simeq n\Lambda^{-1}$ so that $\sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} |q_\ell| \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta n^{\delta/4}}$ if $\Delta \geq n^{\delta-1}$. \square

Lemma 20 allows us to compute $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^\kappa$ recursively using (66).

First, using the estimate (67), one has for any $j \in \mathbb{N}_{<L}$,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^0 = \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^j |Z_\ell|] \lesssim \exp \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \Sigma \right). \quad (68)$$

Then, one has for $j \in \mathbb{N}_{<L}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^j Z_\ell] &= \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^{j-1} Z_\ell \mathbf{E}_{n_j} Z_j] \\ &= \exp \left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\sigma_j \right) \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^{j-1} Z_\ell \exp \Re(\zeta e^{i\omega_\ell} q_j)] \\ &= \exp \left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\sigma_j \right) \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^{j-1} Z_\ell] + \mathcal{O}(|q_j| \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^{j-1} |Z_\ell|] \exp \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \sigma_j \right)) \\ &= \exp \left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\sigma_j \right) \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^{j-1} Z_\ell] + \mathcal{O}(|q_j| \exp \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \Sigma \right)). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by induction, using that $\Sigma = \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} \sigma_\ell$ and $\sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} |q_\ell| \lesssim n^{-\delta/4}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_m [\prod_{\ell=0}^{L-1} Z_\ell] &= \exp \left(\left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} - 2\kappa^2\right)\Sigma \right) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-\delta/4} \exp \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \Sigma \right)) \\ \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n^\kappa &= \exp \left(-2\kappa^2 \Sigma \right) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-\delta/4}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we choose $\Lambda = n^{\frac{\delta}{5}}$ and $\Sigma \simeq \frac{2}{\beta} \log \Lambda$, so we conclude that for $\kappa \geq 1$

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_n| \lesssim n^{-\frac{\delta/4}{1+\beta}}. \quad \square$$

APPENDIX A. PROPERTIES OF THE $C\beta E$ MODEL

In this section, we collect *known facts* about the circular β -ensembles which are relevant in our context.

Selberg formulae. We record the following explicit formulae for the C β E model (Section 1.2).

Lemma 21. *Recall that $\beta_k := \beta \frac{k+1}{2}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\chi_n : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto \Re \varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ and $\psi_n : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto \Im \varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It holds for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \psi_n(\theta)} = \prod_{k < n} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta_k)^2}{|\Gamma(1 + \beta_k - \gamma/2i)|^2}, \quad \mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \chi_n(\theta)} = \prod_{k < n} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta_k) \Gamma(1 + \gamma + \beta_k)}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2 + \beta_k)^2} \quad \text{for } \gamma > -1 - \frac{\beta}{2}.$$

Proof. By (16), one has $\varphi_n(e^{i\theta}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log(1 - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)})$ where the phase $\{\varpi_k\}$ is adapted. Then, by independence and rotation-invariance of the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$, for a fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, $\varphi_n(e^{i\theta}) \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log(1 - \alpha_k)$. Thus these formulae follow from and the facts (see e.g. [BNR09, Lem 3.1]),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} |1 - \alpha_k|^\gamma &= \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta_k) \Gamma(1 + \gamma + \beta_k)}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2 + \beta_k)^2} \quad \text{for } \Re \gamma > -1 - \beta_k, \\ \mathbf{E} \exp(\gamma \Im \log(1 - \alpha_k)) &= \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta_k)^2}{|\Gamma(1 + \beta_k - \gamma/2i)|^2} \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

In particular, the formulae extend naturally for $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$. \square

Recall that the C β E characteristic polynomial satisfies (27), where η is a uniform random variable in \mathbb{T} , independent of $\{\alpha_k\}$. Then

$$\mathbf{E} |1 - e^{i\eta}|^\gamma = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{\gamma/2}{k}^2 = \frac{\Gamma(1 + \gamma)}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2)^2} \quad \text{for } \gamma > -1.$$

This corresponds to (27) with $\beta_k = 0$, see also (38) with $r = 1$. Then by lemma 21, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\gamma > -1$,

$$\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(1)|^\gamma = \frac{\Gamma(1 + \gamma)}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2)^2} \prod_{k < n} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta_k) \Gamma(1 + \gamma + \beta_k)}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2 + \beta_k)^2}.$$

Similarly, with $\Im \log(1 - e^{i\eta}) = h(\eta)$, (20), one has for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\kappa = \gamma/2i$,

$$\mathbf{E} \exp(\gamma h(\eta)) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{\kappa}{k} \binom{-\kappa}{k} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + \kappa) \Gamma(1 - \kappa)} = |\Gamma(1 - \kappa)|^{-2}.$$

Then, by (56), the imaginary part of the characteristic polynomial satisfies for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbf{E} e^{\gamma \mathcal{Y}_{n+1}(1)} = \frac{1}{|\Gamma(1 - \gamma/2i)|^2} \prod_{k < n} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta_k)^2}{|\Gamma(1 + \beta_k - \gamma/2i)|^2}.$$

Moment estimates. We need the following estimates. In particular, the case $m = 0$ corresponds to Lemma 14. Recall that $\chi_{m,n} = \chi_n - \chi_m$ and $\psi_{m,n} = \psi_n - \psi_m$ for $n > m \geq 0$.

Lemma 22. *Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma/\sqrt{2\beta}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$. It holds for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $n > m$ and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,*

$$\mathbf{E}_m [e^{\gamma \psi_{n,m}(\theta)}] = \exp\left(\hat{\gamma}^2 \log \frac{n}{m+1} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m+1}\right)\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}_m [e^{\gamma \chi_{n,m}(\theta)}] = \exp\left(\hat{\gamma}^2 \log \frac{n}{m+1} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m+1}\right)\right),$$

where the implied constants depend only on (γ, β) .

Proof. For $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ fixed, by e.g. [TE51], one has as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}) \Gamma(1 + \gamma + \frac{\kappa}{2})}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2 + \frac{\kappa}{2})^2} = \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4(\kappa+1)} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-2})\right) \left(1 + \frac{3\gamma^2}{4(\kappa+1)} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-2})\right) = 1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{2\kappa} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-2}).$$

Similarly

$$\frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{\kappa}{2})^2}{\Gamma(1 + \gamma/2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}) \Gamma(1 - \gamma/2 + \frac{\kappa}{2})} = \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4(\kappa+1)} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-2})\right) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4(\kappa+1)} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-2})\right) = 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2\kappa} + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^{-2}).$$

Then, by (69), we obtain for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|\hat{\gamma}| < 1$ (this condition guarantees that $\gamma > -1 - \frac{\beta}{2}$, so this expectation is well defined for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$),

$$\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\chi_n, m} = \prod_{m \leq k < n} \left(1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma}^2}{k+1} + \mathcal{O}(k^{-2})\right) = \exp\left(\hat{\gamma}^2 \log \frac{n}{m+1} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m+1}\right)\right).$$

We used that the harmonic sum $\sum_{k=m}^{n-1} (k+1)^{-1} = \log \frac{n}{m+1} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m+1}\right)$. A similar expansion holds for $\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma\psi_n}$. \square

Leading order of the maximum. As a consequence of Theorem 2 and the bounds of Lemma 22 (with $m = 0$) one controls the asymptotics of the maximums of the fields $\chi_n(\theta) = \Re\varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ and $\psi_n(\theta) = \Im\varphi_n(e^{i\theta})$ on \mathbb{T} .

Corollary 4. *For any $\delta > 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\frac{2-\delta}{\sqrt{2\beta}} \log n \leq \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} |\chi_n(\theta)| \leq \frac{2+\delta}{\sqrt{2\beta}} \log n\right] \rightarrow 1.$$

An analogous result holds for $\max_{\theta \in \mathbb{T}} |\psi_n(\theta)|$.

We refer to [CFLW21, Sec 3] for details. As explained in Section 1.3, following from [CMN18, PZ22], precise asymptotics for the maximums are available. The upper-bound from Corollary 4 is used in Section 3.2 to prove Theorem 1.

OPUC convergence. We are interested in the asymptotics of $\{\varphi_k = \log \Phi_k^*\}_{k \geq 0}$ where $\{\Phi_k^*\}_{k \geq 0}$ are the Szegő polynomial, (10). Recall that $\{\varphi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a \mathcal{F}_k -martingale and we will need the following non-trivial result from [CN19, Proposition 3.6].

Proposition 23. *Assume that $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ are independent, rotation-invariant, random variables such that for any $\gamma > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \exp\left(\gamma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} |\alpha_n|^3\right) < \infty. \quad (70)$$

Then, almost surely, $\varphi_k \rightarrow \varphi_\infty$ locally uniformly on \mathbb{D} as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, the function φ_∞ analytic in \mathbb{D} and for any $\gamma > 0$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{E} \exp\left(\gamma |\varphi_n(z)|\right) < \infty.$$

The condition (70) is satisfied for the C β E model. For $\gamma > 0$, there is a constant $c_\gamma > 0$ so that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathbf{E}e^{\gamma|\alpha_n|^3} \leq \int_0^1 (1 + c_\gamma t^{3/2}) e^{-\beta_n t} dt \leq 1 + c'_\gamma \beta_n^{-3/2}.$$

Thus, for any $\beta, \gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} \exp\left(\gamma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} |\alpha_n|^3\right) \leq \exp\left(c'_\gamma \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \beta_n^{-3/2}\right) \leq \exp\left(c''_\gamma \beta^{-3/2}\right).$$

This guarantees that the limits introduced in Lemma 5 are well-defined (analytic in \mathbb{D}) functions.

Next, we explain the connection with the central limit theorem for the C β E eigenvalue statistics.

Proof of Proposition 2. By [Sim04, Thm 1.7.4], since the C β E Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then $B_k(z) = z\Phi_k(z)/\Phi_k^*(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Then, according to (26),

$$\log \mathcal{X}_n(z) \rightarrow \varphi(z) \quad \text{almost surely as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ locally uniformly for } z \in \mathbb{D}. \quad (71)$$

On the other hand, we deduce from (5) (taking $f : \theta \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k} e^{ik\theta}$ for a fixed $z \in \mathbb{D}$), that for any $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\left\{\frac{1}{\pi} \log \mathcal{X}_n(z_j)\right\}_{j=1}^k \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \quad \text{in distribution as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (72)$$

where the RHS is a multivariate complex Gaussian distribution³ with covariance matrix $\Sigma_{ij} = \frac{2}{\beta} \log(1 - z_i \overline{z_j})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Combining (71) and the finite dimensional distribution convergence (72), we conclude that the field $\{\varphi(z) : z \in \mathbb{D}\}$ is a GAF with covariance structure (6). \square

³Let $M_k(\mathbb{X})$ be the set of $k \times k$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{X} . If $X \in \mathbb{C}^k$ is a random vector with $X_j \in L^2(\mathbf{P})$, its covariance matrix $\Sigma \in M_k(M_2(\mathbb{R}))$ is defined by $\Sigma_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{E}(\Re X_i \Re X_j) & \mathbf{E}(\Re X_i \Im X_j) \\ \mathbf{E}(\Im X_i \Re X_j) & \mathbf{E}(\Im X_i \Im X_j) \end{pmatrix}$.

Remark 8 (GAF in \mathbb{D}). The field $\{\varphi(z) : z \in \mathbb{D}\}$ can be realized as follows; for a fixed $\beta > 0$, there is a sequence of i.i.d. complex Gaussian random variables $\{\mathcal{N}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ so that for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathcal{N}_k}{\sqrt{k}} z^k \quad \mathbf{E}|\mathcal{N}_k|^2 = \frac{2}{\beta}, \quad \mathbf{E}\mathcal{N}_k^2 = 0.$$

Observe that by (3), the log characteristic polynomial has an expansion for $z \in \mathbb{D}$,

$$\log \mathcal{X}_n(z) = - \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{z^k}{k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n e^{-ik\theta_j} \right).$$

Hence, within the $C\beta E$ coupling, almost surely for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{Tr} [\mathcal{U}_\alpha^{(n)k}] = \sum_{j=1}^n e^{ik\theta_j} \rightarrow \sqrt{k} \mathcal{N}_k \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (73)$$

Remarkably, for CUE ($\beta = 2$), the rate of convergence in (73) is super-exponential. We refer to [JL21, CJL24] for quantitative results.

Prüfer phases. The (relative) Prüfer phases have been introduced in [KS09, Sec. 2] to study the microscopic landscape of the $C\beta E$.

Proof of Proposition 1. Since the Szegő polynomials Φ_n^* have no zero in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, it is a direct consequence of (26)–(27) that, within the $C\beta E$ coupling, the eigenvalues lie on the unit circle and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathfrak{Z}_n = \{u \in \mathbb{U} : \mathcal{X}_n(u) = 0\} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{T} : \varpi_{n-1}(\theta) = -\eta[2\pi]\}.$$

where $B_n(e^{i\theta}) = e^{i\varpi_n(\theta)}$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, one has $\Phi_n(u) = u^n \overline{\Phi_n^*(u)} = u^n e^{\overline{\varphi_n(u)}}$ so that $B_n(u) := u\Phi_n(u)/\Phi_n^*(u) = u^{n+1} e^{-2\Im\varphi_n(u)}$. This yield for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\varpi_n(\theta) = (n+1)\theta - 2\psi_n(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, see (24), and the recursion (2) is a direct consequence of (16). In particular, the determination of the Prüfer phases are consistent with $\varpi_0(\theta) = \theta$ and (2) and with this choice, one has $\mathbf{E}\varpi_n(\theta) = (n+1)\theta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It remains to show that the functions ϖ_n are continuously increasing. We consider the relative phase $\varpi'_n(\theta) := \varpi_n(\theta) - \varpi_n(0)$. We will now show by induction that (almost surely) for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varpi'_{n-1} : [0, 2\pi] \nearrow [0, 2\pi n]$. Then, it follows that the eigenvalues

$$\mathfrak{Z}_n = \{\varpi'_{n-1}(\theta_j) = 2\pi j - \eta_n; j \in [n]\}$$

where $\eta_n = \{\varpi_{n-1}(0) + \eta\}_{[2\pi]}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, \mathfrak{Z}_n consists of n ordered points $0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_n < 2\pi$.

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, we consider the map

$$\Upsilon_\alpha : \omega \in [0, 2\pi] \mapsto \omega - 2\Im \log(1 - \alpha e^{i\omega}) + 2\Im \log(1 - \alpha).$$

This is a diffeomorphism $\Upsilon_\alpha : [0, 2\pi] \nearrow [0, 2\pi]$. Indeed its derivative is $\Upsilon'_\alpha(\omega) = \Re\left(\frac{1+\alpha e^{i\omega}}{1+\alpha e^{i\omega}}\right) > 0$, that is the Poisson kernel P_α for \mathbb{D} . Moreover, one can rewrite the recursion (2) in terms of the relative phase, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\varpi'_n(\theta) = \theta + \Upsilon_{\alpha'_n}(\varpi'_{n-1}(\theta)), \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi],$$

with $\varpi'_0(\theta) = \theta$ and $\alpha'_n = \alpha_n e^{i\varpi_{n-1}(0)}$. Hence, if $\varpi_{n-1} : [0, 2\pi] \nearrow [0, 2\pi n]$, we can extend $\Upsilon_{\alpha'_n}(\varpi'_{n-1}) : [0, 2\pi] \nearrow [0, 2\pi n]$ continuously and we conclude that $\varpi'_n : [0, 2\pi] \nearrow [0, 2\pi(n+1)]$. \square

APPENDIX B. CONCENTRATION BOUNDS

We require different tail bounds for martingale sums in this paper. In this section, we review some relevant results.

Sub-exponential distributions. We refer to [Ve18, Chap 2] for some background on concentration estimates. For a complex-valued random variable X , define for $p \geq 1$,

$$\|X\|_{\Psi_p} = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \mathbf{E} e^{|X|^p/t^p} \leq 2 \right\}.$$

$\|X\|_{\Psi_2}$ is called the *sub-gaussian norm*, and $\|X\|_{\Psi_1}$ the *sub-exponential norm* of the random variable X . One has

$$\|X\|_{\Psi_1} \lesssim \|X\|_{\Psi_2} \lesssim \|X\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty}.$$

In fact, $\|XZ\|_{\Psi_1} \leq \|X\|_{\Psi_2}\|Z\|_{\Psi_2}$ for any random variables (X, Z) . Moreover, Prop 2.6.1

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \right\|_{\Psi_2}^2 \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^n \|X_k\|_{\Psi_2}^2$$

Generally, the *Orlicz norm* controls the tails of a distribution. For $p \geq 1$, if $\|X\|_{\Psi_p}^{-p} = c > 0$, then (by Markov inequality),

$$\mathbf{P} [|X| \geq t] \leq 2 \exp(-ct^p), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (74)$$

Conversely, if (74) holds, then $\|X\|_{\Psi_p} < \infty$. Moreover, if $\|X\|_{\Psi_p} \leq 1$, then (by Holder inequality),

$$\mathbf{E} e^{|X|^p} \leq 2 \|X\|_{\Psi_p}^p$$

Concentration inequality for (discrete) martingales. We consider a martingale sequence $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of the type, for $n \geq 0$,

$$M_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} X_k, \quad \mathbf{E}|X_k|^2 < \infty \text{ and } \mathbf{E}(X_k|\mathcal{F}_k) = 0 \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Here, $M_0 = 0$ and $\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma(X_0, \dots, X_{k-1})$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, in the framework of the article, the increments X_k are generally complex-valued. For a sequence of martingale increments $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, we define for $p \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\sigma_n^p := \left\| \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \mathbf{E}(e^{|X_n|^p/t^p} | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq 2 \right\} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^\infty}.$$

The infimum corresponds to the *Orlicz norm* $\|X\|_{\Psi_p, \mathbf{P}_n}^p$ with respect to the conditional measure $\mathbf{P}_n = \mathbf{P}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_n)$, so it is a random variable. However, if there is a sequence of independent random variables $\{Z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that, conditioning on \mathcal{F}_n , $|X_n| \lesssim Z_n$, then $\sigma_n^p \lesssim \|Z_n\|_{\Psi_p}^p$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

The next Proposition is a Hoeffding-type inequality for a complex-valued martingale with sub-gaussian increments.

Proposition 24. *Suppose that the martingale increments satisfy $\sigma_n^2 < \infty$ all for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\left\| \max_{k \leq n} |M_k| \right\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma_k^2}.$$

In particular, there is a numerical constant $c > 0$, so that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\max_{k \leq n} |M_k| \geq \lambda \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{c\lambda^2}{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma_k^2} \right).$$

We will also need a Bernstein-type inequality for a complex-valued martingale with sub-exponential increments.

Proposition 25. *Suppose that the martingale increments satisfy $\sigma_n^1 < \infty$ all for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, there is a numerical constant $c > 0$, so that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\max_{k \leq n} |M_k| \geq \lambda \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{c\lambda^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n (\sigma_k^1)^2 + \lambda \max_{k \leq n} \sigma_k} \right).$$

We refer to [LP] for proofs of Propositions 24 and 25.

To illustrate these techniques, we consider the martingale $\psi_{n,m}(\theta) = \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \Im \log(1 - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k(\theta)})$ for a fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. Modulo a deterministic shift, this process corresponds to the Prüfer phase and $\{\psi_{n,m}\}_{n \geq m}$ is a martingale

by independence and rotation-invariance of the Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$. Observe that for a deterministic constant,

$$|\Im \log(1 - \alpha_k e^{i\varpi_k})| \lesssim |\alpha_k|.$$

Then, by (63), $\sigma_k^2 \lesssim \|\alpha_k\|_{\Psi_2}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\beta(k+1)}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Thus, by Proposition 24, for any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $n > m$, any $\lambda > 0$ and any fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\max_{m < k \leq n} |\psi_{k,m}(\theta)| \geq \lambda \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{c\beta\lambda^2}{\log \frac{n}{m}} \right). \quad (75)$$

REFERENCES

- [AHMP24] J. Angst, R. Herry, D. Malicet, G. Poly. Sharp total variation rates of convergence for fluctuations of linear statistics of β -ensembles. Preprint arXiv:2403.17211.
- [ABR23] L.P. Arguin, P. Bourgade, M. Radziwill. The Fyodorov-Hiary-Keating conjecture I, II. Preprints arXiv:2007.00988, arXiv:2307.00982.
- [AN22] T. Alberts, R. Normand. Dimension results for the spectral measure of the circular β -ensembles. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 32 (2022), no. 6, 4642–4680.
- [BK22] E.C. Bailey, J.P. Keating. Maxima of log-correlated fields: some recent developments. *J. Phys. A* 55 (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 053001.
- [Be15] N. Berestycki. An elementary approach to Gaussian multiplicative chaos. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 22 (2017), Paper No. 27.
- [BLS18] F. Bekerman, T. Leblé, S. Serfaty. CLT for fluctuations of β -ensembles with general potential. *Electron. J. Probab.* 23 (2018), Paper no. 115.
- [BEY14] P. Bourgade, L. Erdős, H.-T. Yau. Universality of general β -ensembles. *Duke Math. J.* 163 (2014), no. 6, 1127–1190.
- [BF22] P. Bourgade, H. Falconet. Liouville quantum gravity from random matrix dynamics. Preprint arXiv:2206.03029.
- [BNR09] P. Bourgade, A. Nikeghbali, A. Rouault. Circular Jacobi ensembles and deformed Verblunsky coefficients. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2009), no. 23, 4357–4394.
- [Bo21] J. Boursier. Optimal local laws and CLT for the circular Riesz gas. Preprint arXiv:2112.05881
- [Bo22] J. Boursier. Decay of correlations and thermodynamic limit for the circular Riesz gas. Preprint arXiv:2209.00396
- [CMN18] R. Chhaibi, T. Madaule, J. Najnudel. On the maximum of the $C\beta E$ field. *Duke Math. J.* 167 (2018), no. 12, 2243–2345.
- [CN19] R. Chhaibi, J. Najnudel. On the circle, $GMC^\gamma = \lim_{\leftarrow} C\beta E_n$ for $\gamma = \sqrt{2/\beta}$, ($\gamma \leq 1$). Preprint arXiv:1904.00578,
- [CFLW21] T. Claeys, B. Fahs, G. Lambert, C. Webb. How much can the eigenvalues of a random Hermitian matrix fluctuate? *Duke Math. J.* 170 (2021), no. 9, 2085–2235.
- [CJL24] K. Courteaut, K. Johansson, G. Lambert. From Berry–Esseen to super-exponential. *Electron. J. Probab.* 29 (2024), Paper No. 11.
- [CJ23] K. Courteaut, K. Johansson. Partition function for the 2d Coulomb gas on a Jordan curve. Preprint arXiv:2304.09726.
- [DE01] P. Diaconis, S.N. Evans. Linear functionals of eigenvalues of random matrices. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 353 (2001), no. 7, 2615–2633.
- [Dy62] F.J. Dyson. Statistical theory of the energy levels of complex systems. I–III. *J. Math. Phys.* 3 (1962), 140–170.
- [FTW19] R. Feng, G. Tian, D. Wei. The Berry–Esseen theorem for circular β -ensemble. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 33 (2023), no. 6B, 5050–5070.
- [Fa21] B. Fahs. Uniform asymptotics of Toeplitz determinants with Fisher–Hartwig singularities. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 383 (2021), no. 2, 685–730.
- [FB08] Y.V. Fyodorov, J.-P. Bouchaud. Freezing and extreme-value statistics in a random energy model with logarithmically correlated potential. *J. Phys. A* 41 (2008), no. 37, 372001.
- [FHK12] Y.V. Fyodorov, G.A. Hiary, J.P. Keating. Freezing transition, characteristic polynomials of random matrices, and the Riemann Zeta function. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 170601 (2012)
- [Ha19] A.J. Harper. On the partition function of the Riemann zeta function, and the Fyodorov–Hiary–Keating conjecture. Preprint arXiv:1906.05783
- [HKO01] C.P. Hughes, J.P. Keating, N. O’Connell. On the characteristic polynomial of a random unitary matrix. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 220 (2001), no.2, 429–451.
- [KN04] R. Killip, I. Nenciu. Matrix models for circular ensembles. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2004), no. 50, 2665–2701.
- [Ki07] R. Killip. Gaussian fluctuations for β -Ensembles. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2008), no. 8.
- [KS09] R. Killip, M. Stoiciu. Eigenvalue statistics for cmv matrices: from poisson to clock via random matrix ensembles. *Duke Math. J.* 146 (2009), no. 3, 361–399.
- [JM15] T. Jiang, S. Matsumoto. Moments of traces of circular β -ensembles. *Ann. Probab.* 43 (2015), no. 6, 3279–3336.
- [Jo88] K. Johansson. On Szegő’s asymptotic formula for Toeplitz determinants and generalizations. *Bull. Sci. Math.* (2) 112 (1988), no. 3, 257–304.

- [JL21] K. Johansson, G. Lambert. Multivariate normal approximation for traces of random unitary matrices *Ann. Probab.* 49 (2021), no. 6, 2961–3010.
- [JLW24] J. Junnila, G. Lambert, C. Webb. Multiplicative chaos measures from thick points of log-correlated fields. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* (2024). Preprint arXiv:2209.06548.
- [La22] H. Lacoïn. A universality result for subcritical complex Gaussian multiplicative chaos. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 32 (2022), no. 1, 269–293.
- [La24] H. Lacoïn. Critical Gaussian Multiplicative Chaos revisited. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré*. Preprint arXiv:2209.06683
- [LLW19] G. Lambert, M. Ledoux, C. Webb. Quantitative normal approximation of linear statistics of β -ensembles. *Ann. Probab.* 47 (2019), no. 5, 2619–2685.
- [La21] G. Lambert. Mesoscopic central limit theorem for the circular β -ensembles and applications. *Electron. J. Probab.* 23 (2018), Paper No. 7.
- [LP] G. Lambert, E. Paquette, In preparation.
- [Me19] E. Meckes. *The Random Matrix Theory of the Classical Compact Groups*. Cambridge University Press; 2019.
- [NN22] J. Najnudel, A. Nikeghbali. Convergence of random holomorphic functions with real zeros and extensions of the stochastic zeta function. Preprint arXiv:2202.04284
- [NSW20] M. Nikula, E. Saksman, C. Webb. Multiplicative chaos and the characteristic polynomial of the CUE: the L^1 -phase. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 373 (2020), no. 6, 3905–3965.
- [NPS23] J. Najnudel, E. Paquette, N. Simm. Secular coefficients and the holomorphic multiplicative chaos. *Ann. Probab.* 51 (2023), no. 4, 1193–1248.
- [PZ22] E. Paquette, O. Zeitouni. The extremal landscape for the $C\beta E$ ensemble arXiv:2209.06743
- [Re20] G. Remy. The Fyodorov-Bouchaud formula and Liouville conformal field theory. *Duke Math. J.* 169 (2020), no. 1, 177–211.
- [RV14] R. Rhodes, V. Vargas. Gaussian multiplicative chaos and applications: a review. *Probab. Surv.* 11 (2014), 315–392.
- [SW20] E. Saksman, C. Webb. The Riemann zeta function and gaussian multiplicative chaos: Statistics on the critical line. *Ann. Probab.* 48 (2020), no. 6, 2680–2754.
- [Sim04] B. Simon. *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle, Parts I, II*. American Math. Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [TE51] F.G. Tricomi, A. Erdélyi. The asymptotic expansion of a ratio of Gamma functions, *Pacific. J. Math.* 1 (1951), 133–142.
- [VV20] B. Valkó, B. Virág. Operator limit of the circular β -ensemble. *Ann. Probab.* 48 (2020), no. 3, 1286–1316.
- [VV22] B. Valkó, B. Virág. The many faces of the stochastic zeta function. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 32 (2022), no. 5, 1160–1231.
- [Ve18] R. Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018.
- [We15] C. Webb. The characteristic polynomial of a random unitary matrix and Gaussian multiplicative chaos – the L^2 -phase. *Electron. J. Probab.* 20 (2015), no. 104.
- [We16] C. Webb. Linear statistics of the circular β -ensemble, Stein’s method, and circular Dyson Brownian motion. *Electron. J. Probab.* 21 (2016), Paper No. 25.

(Gaultier Lambert) KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, MATEMATIK
Email address: glambert@kth.se

(Joseph Najnudel) UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
Email address: joseph.najnudel@bristol.ac.uk