

# SMALL GAPS OF GSE

RENJIE FENG, JIAMING LI, AND DONG YAO

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the smallest gaps for the Gaussian symplectic ensemble (GSE). We prove that the rescaled smallest gaps and their locations converge to a Poisson point process with an explicit rate. The approach provides an alternative proof for the GOE case and complements the results in [8]. By combining the main results from [2, 8, 9], the study of the smallest gaps for the classical random matrix ensembles  $C\beta E$  and  $G\beta E$  for  $\beta = 1, 2$ , and  $4$  is now complete.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In random matrix theory, one of the main concerns is the distributions of eigenvalues and the gaps between consecutive eigenvalues. Back in the 1950s, Wigner predicted that the spacings between the spectrum of a heavy atom's nucleus should resemble the spacings between the eigenvalues of certain Gaussian random matrices. This prediction is confirmed by experiments in nuclear physics [14]. Wigner also predicted the distribution of average gaps, which follow the Gaudin-Mehta distribution [4, 14]. In fact, the Gaudin-Mehta distribution has been proved to be true even for a single gap in the bulk of the semicircle law of GUE [16] and GOE [6], which is universal for more general random matrices. Other than the average gaps and the single gap, another fundamental quantity of interest is the extreme spacings.

To state the main results, we first recall two types of point processes studied intensively in random matrix theory. The first is the Gaussian  $\beta$ -ensemble ( $G\beta E$ ) for  $\beta > 0$ : Given  $n$  points  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  with the joint density

$$J(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta,n}} \prod_{k=1}^n e^{-\frac{\beta n}{4} \lambda_k^2} \prod_{i < j} |\lambda_j - \lambda_i|^\beta, \quad (1.1)$$

where by the Selberg integral,

$$Z_{\beta,n} = (2\pi)^{n/2} \left( \frac{\beta n}{2} \right)^{-\frac{n(n-1)\beta}{4} - \frac{n}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(1 + j\frac{\beta}{2})}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{\beta}{2})}.$$

In particular,  $\beta = 1, 2$  and  $4$  correspond to the joint density of eigenvalues of the classical random matrices of GOE, GUE and GSE, respectively. A remarkable fact is that GUE is a determinantal point process, while GOE and GSE are Pfaffian point processes. The limit of the global distribution of the point processes of  $G\beta E$  is given by the Wigner semicircle law as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\rho_{\text{sc}}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{4 - x^2}, \quad x \in [-2, 2]. \quad (1.2)$$

---

Date: September 6, 2024.

Another point process is the circular  $\beta$ -ensemble ( $C\beta E$ ) for  $\beta > 0$ : Given  $n$  points  $e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_n}$  on  $\mathbb{S}^1$ , the eigenangles  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  have the joint density

$$J(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = \frac{1}{C_{\beta,n}} \prod_{i < j} |e^{i\theta_j} - e^{i\theta_i}|^\beta,$$

where by the Selberg integral again,

$$C_{\beta,n} = (2\pi)^n \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta n/2)}{(\Gamma(1 + \beta/2))^n}.$$

In particular,  $\beta = 1, 2$  and  $4$  correspond to the joint density of eigenangles of classical random matrices of COE, CUE and CSE, respectively. Similarly, CUE has a determinantal structure, while COE and CSE have Pfaffian structures. The global distribution of the eigenangles of  $C\beta E$  tends to the uniform measure on  $\mathbb{S}^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We first summarize the existing results on the smallest gaps for both the circular ensembles and Gaussian ensembles. In [17], Vinson first obtained limiting distributions of rescaled smallest gap of CUE and GUE. In [15], Soshnikov studied the smallest gaps of determinantal point processes with translation invariant kernels. In [2], Ben Arous-Bourgade employed Soshnikov's method to further derive the limiting joint density of  $k$  smallest gaps of CUE and GUE for  $k \geq 1$ , along with the locations where these gaps occur. Note that the proofs in [2, 15, 17] rely heavily on the determinantal structures.

In [8], the authors derived the smallest gaps for GOE, addressing the problem beyond the determinantal structures. Note that [8] only proves the limiting distribution of the smallest gaps of GOE, without providing information on their locations. The intuitive idea behind the method in [8] is based on the following observation from a statistical physics perspective: for a pair of two particles with charge 1 forming the smallest gap, these two particles will stick together to form one 'double particle' with charge 2 in the limit. That is, the original system of one-component log-gas will become a new system of two-component log-gas. To prove the main results, it is necessary to study the limit of the ratios of the partition functions of these two systems, which can be analyzed using Selberg-type integrals. In [9], using the same method, the authors derived the smallest gaps of  $C\beta E$  with integer-valued  $\beta$ , with results holding particularly for the classical random matrices of COE, CUE, and CSE.

However, one of the main obstacles with this method is that the Selberg-type integrals are intractable in most cases, such as GSE. In the current paper, we derive the smallest gaps of GSE and the locations where they occur. Our approach relies on combinatorial arguments to bound certain quantities arising from the Pfaffian structure. We expect our computations to provide new insights into the study of various Pfaffian point processes. In particular, it provides an alternative proof for GOE, where the previously omitted location information will be included. This, together with the main results in [2, 8, 9], will complete the study of the smallest gaps and their locations for the classical random matrices of  $C\beta E$  and  $G\beta E$  with  $\beta = 1, 2$  and  $4$ .

Regarding the largest gaps, only a few results are known. In [2], Ben Arous-Bourgade determined the decay order of the largest gaps for both the CUE and GUE (within the interior of the semicircle law). Additionally, [10] proves that these largest gaps converge to Poisson point processes. Consequently, the fluctuations of the largest

gaps are shown to follow Gumbel distributions in the limit. Again, the determinantal structures of the CUE and GUE play a crucial role in the analyses in [2, 10]. It is worth noting that the decay orders and fluctuations of the largest gaps for other ensembles, such as the COE and CSE, remain unknown.

The works [3, 13] proved that the results in [2, 8, 10] are universal, i.e., they hold for Wigner ensembles with general distributions. Figalli-Guionnet also derived the smallest gaps for a several-matrix model in [7].

**1.1. Main results.** Let  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_n$  be sampled from  $G\beta E$  with joint density given in (1.1). For any fixed small  $\epsilon > 0$ , consider the two-dimensional point process

$$\Upsilon_n^{(\beta)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta_{\left(n^{\frac{\beta+2}{\beta+1}}(\lambda_{i+1}-\lambda_i), \lambda_i\right)} \cdot \mathbb{1}[\lambda_i \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)].$$

The main result is

**Theorem 1.1** For  $\beta = 1, 2$  and  $4$ ,  $\Upsilon_n^{(\beta)}$  converges to a Poisson point process  $\Upsilon^{(\beta)}$  on  $(0, +\infty) \times (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$  with intensity

$$\mathbb{E}\Upsilon^{(\beta)}(A \times I) = \left(\frac{1}{c_\beta} \int_A u^\beta du\right) \int_I (2\pi\rho_{sc}(x))^{\beta+2} dx,$$

where  $\rho_{sc}$  is the semicircle law (1.2),  $A$  is any bounded measurable set in  $(0, +\infty)$ ,  $I$  is any interval in  $(-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ , and

$$c_1 = 48\pi, \quad c_2 = 48\pi^2, \quad c_4 = 540\pi^2.$$

As we mentioned earlier, the case for  $\beta = 2$  has been proven in [2]. For  $\beta = 1$ , [8] only studies the 1-dimensional point process of the smallest gaps  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta_{n^{3/2}(\lambda_{i+1}-\lambda_i)}$ , where the location information is missing. In this paper, we prove Theorem 1.1 for  $\beta = 4$  in detail, and then sketch the proof for GOE.

As a direct corollary of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the limiting distribution of the  $k$ -th smallest gap in the bulk of the semicircle law.

**Corollary 1.2** Let  $I$  be any interval in  $(-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ , and  $t_k^{(\beta)}(I)$  be the  $k$ -th smallest gap for eigenvalues falling in  $I$ , we define the normalized gap

$$\tau_k^{(\beta)}(I) := \left(\frac{1}{(\beta+1)c_\beta} \int_I (2\pi\rho_{sc}(x))^{\beta+2} dx\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta+1}} n^{\frac{\beta+2}{\beta+1}} t_k^{(\beta)}(I).$$

Then for  $\beta = 1, 2$  and  $4$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau_k^{(\beta)}(I) \in A\right) = \int_A \frac{\beta+1}{(k-1)!} x^{k(\beta+1)-1} e^{-x^{\beta+1}} dx$$

for any bounded interval  $A \subset (0, +\infty)$ .

Now we outline the main steps to prove Theorem 1.1. Given the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_n$  of GSE. For given  $\epsilon > 0$  small, consider the point processes consisting of the eigenvalues of GSE in the bulk  $(-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ ,

$$\xi_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i} \mathbb{1}[|\lambda_i| < 2 - \epsilon].$$

Now we construct an auxiliary point process  $\tilde{\xi}_n \subset \xi_n$  as follows. For any bounded measurable set  $A \subset (0, +\infty)$ , let  $A_n = n^{-6/5}A$ . The process  $\tilde{\xi}_n$  is selected from  $\xi_n$  such that the following two conditions hold:

- $|\xi_n(\lambda_k + A_n)| = 1$ .
- There does not exist  $\lambda_\ell \neq \lambda_k$  such that  $|\xi_n(\lambda_\ell + A_n)| = 1$  and  $|\lambda_k - \lambda_\ell| < \log^{-1} n$ .

Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of the following two lemmas. We first have

**Lemma 1.3** The two point processes  $\Upsilon_n^{(4)}(A \times \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_n(\cdot)$  are asymptotically equivalent, i.e., for any bounded interval  $I \subset (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ , the cardinalities satisfy

$$|\Upsilon_n(A \times I)| - |\tilde{\xi}_n(I)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next, we prove that  $\tilde{\xi}_n$  converges to a Poisson point process by the moment method.

**Lemma 1.4** For any fixed positive integer  $k$ , one has the following convergence of the  $k$ -th factorial moment

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{|\tilde{\xi}_n(I)|!}{(|\tilde{\xi}_n(I)| - k)!} \right) = \left( \frac{1}{540\pi^2} \int_A u^4 du \right)^k \left( \int_{I^k} (2\pi\rho_{sc}(\lambda))^6 d\lambda \right)^k. \quad (1.3)$$

We now provide a brief overview of the key steps of the proof. The starting point is the Pfaffian structure of GSE, where the correlation function is the Pfaffian of an anti-symmetric matrix (see (3.1) and (3.2)). This matrix can be expressed in terms of a scalar kernel  $S_n$ , along with its derivative and antiderivative (see (3.3)).

There are several significant challenges in analyzing the correlation functions of Pfaffian processes compared to determinantal processes. For instance, because the kernel matrices for Pfaffian processes are anti-symmetric, the Hadamard-Fischer inequality for positive symmetric matrices, as used in [2, 15], can no longer be applied to estimate their correlation functions. Additionally, the growth orders of different entries in the anti-symmetric matrix are mixed and interwoven (see Lemma 3.2 below).

In Lemma 5.1, our first observation is that the integral of the product of the Pfaffians of the on-diagonal  $4 \times 4$  blocks provides the leading order term for the factorial moments. Therefore, one of the main tasks is to demonstrate that the contributions from the off-diagonal  $4 \times 4$  blocks are negligible in the limit. To address this, in Section 5.2, we will first perform two rounds of transformations on the anti-symmetric kernel matrix with its Pfaffian unchanged, so that the orders of different entries become more balanced (e.g., Lemma 5.2). Then, the negligibility of the contribution from off-diagonal blocks (e.g., Lemma 5.3) follows from the combinatorial counting arguments (e.g., Lemma 5.4). In Section 6, the similar arguments are applied to prove the negligibility of two error terms ( $E_{1,k,n}$  and  $E_{2,k,n}$  in (4.6)) appearing when estimating the correlation functions. This approach provides an alternative proof for GOE, which is sketched in Section 7. We anticipate that these computations, particularly the two rounds of transformations and combinatorial counting arguments, can be applied to study the intricate structures of other Pfaffian point processes.

*Notation.* In this paper, we use  $C$  to denote some uniform constant whose specific value may vary from line to line. For two sequences of real numbers  $x_n$  and  $y_n$ , we

write  $x_n \lesssim y_n$  or  $x_n = O(y_n)$  if  $|x_n| \leq C|y_n|$  for some  $C > 0$ . We write  $x_n \sim y_n$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n/y_n = 1$ . Given a matrix  $A$ , we denote  $A(i, j)$  as its  $(i, j)$ -entry. For two sequences of matrices  $M_n$  and  $M'_n$  of the same (fixed) size, we write  $M_n \lesssim M'_n$  if  $|M_n(i, j)| \lesssim |M'_n(i, j)|$  for every  $(i, j)$ -entry. Given a set  $S$ ,  $|S|$  denotes its cardinality.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Correlation functions.** First, we review some basic concepts regarding the factorial moments and the correlation functions of a point process. Let

$$\xi = \sum_i \delta_{X_i}$$

be a simple point process on  $\mathbb{R}$ . For any  $k \geq 1$ , we can construct a new point process  $\xi_k$  in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  via

$$\xi_k = \sum_{X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k} \text{ pairwise distinct}} \delta_{(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k})}.$$

The  $k$ -point correlation function of  $\xi$  is a function  $\rho_k$  on  $\mathbb{R}^k$  such that for any bounded Borel sets  $B_1, \dots, B_k$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}|\xi_k(B_1 \times \dots \times B_k)| = \int_{B_1 \times \dots \times B_k} \rho_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_k.$$

In particular, for any bounded Borel set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ , one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{|\xi(B)|!}{(|\xi(B)| - k)!} \right) = \int_{B^k} \rho_k(x_1, \dots, x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_k,$$

which is the  $k$ -th factorial moment of the cardinality  $|\xi(B)|$ .

**2.2. Pfaffian.** Now we recall the definition of the Pfaffian of an anti-symmetric matrix. Let  $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{M}(i, j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2N}$  be a  $2N \times 2N$  anti-symmetric matrix, where  $N$  is a positive integer. Then the Pfaffian of  $\mathbf{M}$  is defined by

$$\text{Pf } \mathbf{M} := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{2N}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \mathbf{M}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}(\sigma_{2N-1}, \sigma_{2N}),$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_{2N}$  consists of all permutations  $\sigma$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, 2N\}$  such that

$$\sigma_1 < \sigma_3 < \dots < \sigma_{2N-1}, \text{ and } \sigma_1 < \sigma_2, \sigma_3 < \sigma_4, \dots, \sigma_{2N-1} < \sigma_{2N}.$$

For any  $2N \times 2N$  matrix  $A$ , we have

$$\text{Pf } (A^T \mathbf{M} A) = (\det A) (\text{Pf } \mathbf{M}).$$

This identity implies that  $\text{Pf } \mathbf{M}$  is invariant under congruent transformations when  $A$  has unit determinant, which in particular includes the case of the product of elementary matrices.

**2.3. Hermite polynomials.** The monic orthogonal polynomials on  $\mathbb{R}$  for the weight

$$dv(x) = w(x)dx, \quad w(x) = \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$$

are called Hermite polynomials, which are given by

$$H_n(x) := (-1)^n e^{x^2/2} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \left( e^{-x^2/2} \right)$$

for integer  $n \geq 0$ . The  $L^2$ -normalized Hermite wave functions

$$\varphi_n(x) := \frac{e^{-x^2/4} H_n(x)}{(2\pi)^{1/4} \sqrt{n!}}$$

are orthonormal, i.e.,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_n(x) \varphi_m(x) dx = \delta_{n,m}.$$

For any  $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ , we set

$$\begin{aligned} b(\theta) &= \theta - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta, \quad R_n(\theta) = \sin \left( nb(\theta) + \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\theta}{2} \right), \\ Q_n(\theta) &= \frac{3}{16} (\sin \theta)^{-2} \sin \left( nb(\theta) - \frac{3}{4}\pi - \frac{5}{2}\theta \right) + \frac{5}{96} (\sin \theta)^{-3} \sin \left( nb(\theta) - \frac{5}{4}\pi - \frac{7}{2}\theta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following classical Plancherel-Rotach formula (see [5]),

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi_n \left( 2\sqrt{n+1} \cos \theta \right) \\ &= (\pi \sin \theta)^{-1/2} n^{-1/4} \left( R_{n+1}(\theta) + \frac{1}{n} \left( Q_{n+1}(\theta) - \frac{5}{24} R_{n+1}(\theta) \right) + O(n^{-2}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Here, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , the error bound  $O(n^{-2})$  is uniform for  $\theta \in (-\pi + \epsilon, \pi - \epsilon)$ . The Plancherel-Rotach formula will imply the following

**Lemma 2.1** Given any  $\epsilon > 0$ , for  $x \leq y$  such that  $x, y \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ , one has uniform estimates,

$$\int_{\sqrt{nx}}^{\sqrt{ny}} \varphi_n(t) dt = O(n^{-3/4}) \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\int_{\sqrt{2nx}}^{+\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt = O(n^{-1/4}). \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \pi$  be such that  $2\sqrt{n+1} \cos \theta_1 = \sqrt{ny}$ ,  $2\sqrt{n+1} \cos \theta_2 = \sqrt{nx}$ . Since  $(x, y) \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ ,  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  are also bounded away from 0 and  $\pi$  for large  $n$ . By a change of variable  $t = 2\sqrt{n+1} \cos \theta$  and using (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sqrt{nx}}^{\sqrt{ny}} \varphi_n(t) dt &= 2\sqrt{n+1} \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \varphi_n(2\sqrt{n+1} \cos \theta) \sin \theta d\theta \\ &= 2\sqrt{n+1} \pi^{-1/2} n^{-1/4} \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} R_{n+1}(\theta) (\sin \theta)^{1/2} d\theta + O(n^{-3/4}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

The integrand  $R_{n+1}(\theta)(\sin \theta)^{1/2}$  can be written as  $g_1(\theta) \sin((n+1)b(\theta)) + g_2(\theta) \cos((n+1)b(\theta))$  for some  $C^1(0, \pi)$  functions  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , where  $b(\theta) = \theta - \sin(2\theta)/2$  belongs to  $C^1(0, \pi)$  and satisfies  $b'(\theta) = 1 - \cos(2\theta) > c > 0$  on  $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ . Integration by parts will simply imply

$$\left| \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} R_{n+1}(\theta)(\sin \theta)^{1/2} d\theta \right| \lesssim n^{-1}. \quad (2.5)$$

This will prove (2.2) by (2.4) and (2.5). By identities (7.376) in [11], we can derive

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-x^2/4} H_{2n}(x) dx = (2n-1)!! \sqrt{\pi}, \quad \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-x^2/4} H_{2n+1}(x) dx \lesssim (2n)!! \sqrt{\pi}. \quad (2.6)$$

By Stirling's formula, the integral of the Hermite wave functions satisfies

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt \lesssim \frac{(2n-2)!!}{\sqrt{(2n-1)!}} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{4(n-1)} \left(\frac{2n-2}{e}\right)^{n-1}}{(2\pi(2n-1))^{1/4} \left(\frac{2n-1}{e}\right)^{n-1/2}} \lesssim n^{-1/4}. \quad (2.7)$$

By the decomposition  $\int_{\sqrt{2nx}}^{+\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt = \int_0^{+\infty} \dots - \int_0^{\sqrt{2nx}} \dots$ , (2.3) follows directly from (2.2) and (2.7).  $\square$

### 3. KERNEL ESTIMATES OF GSE

GSE is a Gaussian measure on the space of Hermitian self-dual matrices [14]. The eigenvalues of GSE are real, and the joint density is given by (1.1) with  $\beta = 4$ . The eigenvalues of GSE form a Pfaffian point process. Specifically, for any integer  $k \geq 1$ , the  $k$ -point correlation function can be expressed as the Pfaffian of a  $2k \times 2k$  anti-symmetric matrix (see Section 3.9 in [1])

$$\rho_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) = \text{Pf} (JK_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $K_n(x, y)$  is the kernel given by

$$K_n(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} S_n(x, y) & V_n(x, y) \\ J_n(x, y) & S_n(y, x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(x, y) &= \frac{\sqrt{2n}}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi_j(\sqrt{2nx}) \varphi_j(\sqrt{2ny}) - \frac{n}{2} \varphi_{2n}(\sqrt{2nx}) \int_{\sqrt{2ny}}^{\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt, \\ V_n(x, y) &= -\partial_y S_n(x, y), \\ J_n(x, y) &= \int_y^x S_n(t, y) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $JK_n(x, y)$  is anti-symmetric where

$$V_n(x, y) = -V_n(y, x), \quad \int_y^x S_n(t, y) dt = \int_y^x S_n(t, x) dt. \quad (3.4)$$

For any given  $x_0 \in (-2, 2)$ , we define the following rescaled GSE kernel

$$\widehat{K}_n(x, y) := \frac{1}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}} \end{bmatrix} K_n(x, y) \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

We further denote it by

$$\widehat{K}_n(x, y) := \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{S}_n(x, y) & \widehat{V}_n(x, y) \\ \widehat{J}_n(x, y) & \widehat{S}_n(y, x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $K_{\text{sin}}$  be the sine kernel

$$K_{\text{sin}}(t) := \frac{\sin(\pi t)}{\pi t}. \quad (3.6)$$

We have the following uniform estimates regarding the rescaled GSE kernel.

**Lemma 3.1** For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , uniformly over  $x_0 \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$  and  $x, y \in [-1, 1]$ ,

$$\left| \widehat{S}_n \left( x_0 + \frac{x}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}, x_0 + \frac{y}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \right) - K_{\text{sin}}(2(x - y)) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\left| \widehat{J}_n \left( x_0 + \frac{x}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}, x_0 + \frac{y}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \right) - \int_0^{x-y} K_{\text{sin}}(2t) dt \right| \lesssim \frac{|x - y|}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\left| \widehat{V}_n \left( x_0 + \frac{x}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}, x_0 + \frac{y}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \right) - \partial_x [K_{\text{sin}}(2(x - y))] \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.9)$$

*Proof.* Let  $K_n^{(2)}(x, y)$  be the kernel of the GUE. It can be expressed in terms of Hermite wave functions as follows (e.g., Lemma 3.2.2 in [1]):

$$K_n^{(2)}(x, y) = \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi_i(\sqrt{n}x) \varphi_i(\sqrt{n}y).$$

One first has the uniform estimates (e.g., Theorem 1 in [12])

$$\sup_{x, y \in [-1, 1]} \left| \frac{1}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} K_n^{(2)} \left( x_0 + \frac{x}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}, x_0 + \frac{y}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \right) - K_{\text{sin}}(x - y) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$\sup_{x, y \in [-1, 1]} \left| \partial_x \left( \frac{1}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} K_n^{(2)} \left( x_0 + \frac{x}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}, x_0 + \frac{y}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \right) - K_{\text{sin}}(x - y) \right) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.11)$$

By (3.3), we have the relation

$$S_n(x, y) = \frac{K_{2n}^{(2)}(x, y)}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \varphi_{2n}(\sqrt{2n}x) \int_{\sqrt{2n}y}^{\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt. \quad (3.12)$$



The estimate (3.7) then follows from the bound  $O(n^{-1/4})$  for  $\varphi_{2n}$  (see (2.1)) and the bound  $n^{-1/4}$  for the integral term (see (2.3)). We also obtain (3.8) by integrating both sides of (3.7). Taking the derivative with respect to  $y$  on (3.12), by (2.1) again, we get

$$\left| \partial_y S_n(x, y) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_y K_{2n}^{(2)}(x, y) \right| = \left| \frac{\sqrt{2}n^{3/2}}{2} \varphi_{2n}(\sqrt{2nx}) \varphi_{2n-1}(\sqrt{2ny}) \right| \lesssim n. \quad (3.13)$$

Then, (3.9) follows from the estimate (3.11).  $\square$

Subsequently, we need to control the behavior of the kernel at different scales. To achieve this, we provide the following uniform upper bounds.

**Lemma 3.2** Let  $d := d(x, y) = |x - y|$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $(x, y) \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ ,

$$|S_n(x, y)| \lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n \right\} + n^{1/2}, \quad (3.14)$$

$$|\partial_x S_n(x, y)| \lesssim n \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n^2 d \right\} + n^{3/2}, \quad (3.15)$$

$$|V_n(x, y)| = |\partial_y S_n(x, y)| \lesssim n \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n^2 d \right\} + n, \quad (3.16)$$

$$|\partial_x V_n(x, y)| + |\partial_y V_n(x, y)| \lesssim n^2 \min \left\{ n, \frac{1}{d} \right\}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$|\partial_{xy}^2 V_n(x, y)| + |\partial_{yx}^2 V_n(x, y)| + |\partial_{yy}^2 V_n(x, y)| \lesssim n^3 \min \left\{ n, \frac{1}{d} \right\}, \quad (3.18)$$

$$\left| \int_x^y S_n(t, w) dt \right| \lesssim \log n, \quad \forall w \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon). \quad (3.19)$$

*Proof.* We first prove the following estimates for the GUE kernel  $K_n^{(2)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |K_n^{(2)}(x, y)| &\lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n \right\}, \\ |\partial_x K_n^{(2)}(x, y)| + |\partial_y K_n^{(2)}(x, y)| &\lesssim n \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n^2 d \right\} + n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

When  $d \leq 1/n$ , (3.20) directly follows from (3.10) and (3.11). For  $d \geq 1/n$ , by Christoffel-Darboux formula, we can rewrite (e.g., Lemma 3.2.5 in [1])

$$K_n^{(2)}(x, y) = \sqrt{n} \frac{\varphi_n(\sqrt{nx}) \varphi_{n-1}(\sqrt{ny}) - \varphi_n(\sqrt{ny}) \varphi_{n-1}(\sqrt{nx})}{x - y}. \quad (3.21)$$

By Plancherel-Rotach formula (2.1), we have  $|\varphi_n(\sqrt{nx})| + |\varphi_{n-1}(\sqrt{nx})| \lesssim n^{-1/4}$ . This proves the first inequality in (3.20). We note the relation (e.g., Lemma 3.2.7 in [1])

$$\frac{d}{dx} (\varphi_n(\sqrt{nx})) = n \varphi_{n-1}(\sqrt{nx}) - \frac{nx}{2} \varphi_n(\sqrt{nx}).$$

The second inequality in (3.20) follows by differentiating (3.21) with respect to  $x$  together with the estimate

$$\left| \frac{d}{dx} (\varphi_n(\sqrt{nx})) \right| \leq n (|\varphi_{n-1}(\sqrt{nx})| + |\varphi_n(\sqrt{nx})|) \lesssim n^{3/4}. \quad (3.22)$$

In fact, performing further differentiations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^2}{dx^2} (\varphi_n(\sqrt{nx})) \right| &\lesssim n^{7/4}, \\ \sum_{i+j=2, i, j \geq 0} \left| \partial_x^i \partial_y^j K_n^{(2)}(x, y) \right| &\lesssim n^2 \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n \right\}, \\ \sum_{i+j=3, i, j \geq 0} \left| \partial_x^i \partial_y^j K_n^{(2)}(x, y) \right| &\lesssim n^3 \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Now we are ready to prove (3.14) - (3.19). To prove (3.14), by (2.1), (2.2), (2.3), (3.12) and (3.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |S_n(x, y)| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left| K_{2n}^{(2)}(x, y) \right| + \frac{n}{2} \left| \varphi_{2n}(\sqrt{2nx}) \right| \left| \int_{\sqrt{2ny}}^{\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt \right| \\ &\lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n \right\} + n^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

To prove (3.15), by (2.3), (3.20) and (3.22), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x S_n(x, y)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{2} \left| \partial_x K_{2n}^{(2)}(x, y) \right| + \frac{n}{2} \left| \frac{d}{dx} (\varphi_{2n}(\sqrt{2nx})) \right| \cdot \left| \int_{\sqrt{2ny}}^{\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt \right| \\ &\lesssim n \min \left\{ \frac{1}{d}, n^2 d \right\} + n^{3/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Now, (3.16) follows directly from (3.13) and the second part of (3.20). And (3.17) and (3.18) can be proved similarly, thanks to (3.23). It remains to show (3.19). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_x^y S_n(t, w) dt \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_x^y K_{2n}^{(2)}(t, w) dt \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{n}{2} \left| \int_x^y \varphi_{2n}(\sqrt{2nt}) dt \right| \cdot \left| \int_{\sqrt{2nw}}^{\infty} \varphi_{2n-1}(t) dt \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

By (3.20), we can bound the first term in (3.26) as follows:

$$\int_x^y \left| K_n^{(2)}(t, x) \right| dt \lesssim \left( \int_0^{1/n} n dt + \int_{1/n}^4 \frac{1}{t} dt \right) \lesssim \log n. \quad (3.27)$$

By (2.2) and (2.3), we can bound the second term in (3.26) by  $Cn \cdot n^{-5/4} \cdot n^{-1/4} = Cn^{-1/2}$ , which completes the proof of (3.19).  $\square$

## 4. MAIN LEMMAS

In this section, we introduce two main lemmas that will imply Lemma 1.3 and Lemma 1.4, and thus Theorem 1.1 for GSE. Recall in Section 1 that for any bounded measurable set  $A \subset (0, +\infty)$ , we set  $A_n = n^{-6/5}A$ . First, Lemma 1.3 is the direct consequence of the following

**Lemma 4.1** Suppose  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$  are the eigenvalues of GSE. For any interval  $I \subset (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ , define  $G_n$  to be the union of the following two sets:

$$\{(\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}, \lambda_{i+2}) \in I^3 : 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \in A_n \text{ and } 0 \leq \lambda_{i+2} - \lambda_i \leq 2 \sup(A_n)\},$$

and

$$\left\{ (\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}, \lambda_j, \lambda_{j+1}) \in I^4 : 1 \leq i < j \leq n-1, \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \in A_n, \lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j \in A_n, \right. \\ \left. \text{and } 2 \sup(A_n) < \lambda_j - \lambda_i < \log^{-1} n \right\},$$

respectively. Then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|G_n| > 0) \leq \mathbb{E}[|G_n|] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Recall the definitions of the point processes  $\xi_n$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_n$  from Section 1. Let  $\rho_k$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_k$  denote the  $k$ -point correlation functions of  $\xi_n$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_n$ , respectively. To prove Lemma 1.4, we will derive some upper and lower bounds for the correlation functions  $\tilde{\rho}_k$  and show that these two bounds match up to the leading order. Then we will prove that the integral of the leading order term yields the limit in (1.3).

Specifically, we define the set

$$\Omega_k := \left\{ (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)^k : \min_{i \neq j} |\lambda_i - \lambda_j| > \log^{-1} n \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

By the definition of  $\tilde{\xi}_n$ , we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for } (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \Omega_k^c. \quad (4.2)$$

On  $\Omega_k$  we first have the upper bound

$$\tilde{\rho}_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \leq \int_{\lambda_1 + A_n} \dots \int_{\lambda_k + A_n} \rho_{2k}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k) dx_1 \dots dx_k \\ := L_{k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k). \quad (4.3)$$

Given any  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \Omega_k$ , we define two sets

$$T_{1,k,n} = T_{1,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) := \cup_{i=1}^k (\lambda_i, \lambda_i + 2 \sup(A_n)), \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$T_{2,k,n} = T_{2,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \\ := \cup_{i=1}^k \{(x, y) : y \in x + A_n, 2 \sup(A_n) < |x - \lambda_i| \leq \log^{-1} n\}. \quad (4.5)$$

Then on  $\Omega_k$  we have the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\rho}_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \\
& \geq \int_{\lambda_1+A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k+A_n} \rho_{2k}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\
& - \int_{\lambda_1+A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k+A_n} \int_{T_{1,k,n}} \rho_{2k+1}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k, z) dz dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\
& - \int_{\lambda_1+A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k+A_n} \int_{T_{2,k,n}} \rho_{2k+2}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k, z_1, z_2) dz_1 dz_2 dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\
& := L_{k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) - E_{1,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) - E_{2,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

In the following, we will simply write these terms as  $L_{k,n}$ ,  $E_{1,k,n}$ , and  $E_{2,k,n}$ . The main task of the article is to prove the following lemma to control the integration of the leading order term  $L_{k,n}$  and the error terms  $E_{1,k,n}$  and  $E_{2,k,n}$ .

**Lemma 4.2** For any interval  $I \subset (-2 + \epsilon, 2 - \epsilon)$ , we have the convergence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} L_{k,n} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k = \left( \frac{1}{540\pi^2} \int_A u^4 du \right)^k \int_{I^k} \prod_{i=1}^k (2\pi\rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i))^6 d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k. \tag{4.7}$$

We also have the negligibility of the error terms

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} E_{1,k,n} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k = 0, \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} E_{2,k,n} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Lemma 4.1 is a direct consequence of (4.8) and (4.9) for the special case  $k = 1$ , which, in turn, implies Lemma 1.3 as mentioned earlier at the beginning of this section.

Recall the relation between the correlations function and the factorial moment, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{|\tilde{\xi}_n(I)|!}{(|\tilde{\xi}_n(I)| - k)!} \right) = \int_{I^k} \tilde{\rho}_k d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k = \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k^c} \cdots + \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} \cdots.$$

This together with (4.2), (4.3), (4.6) and Lemma 4.2 will imply Lemma 1.4.

Therefore, to prove Theorem 1.1 for GSE, it is sufficient to prove Lemma 4.2. We will prove (4.7) in Section 5. The limits (4.8) and (4.9) will be established in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, respectively.

## 5. ESTIMATES OF THE LEADING ORDER TERM

In this section, we prove (4.7). Recall that

$$L_{k,n} = \int_{\lambda_1+A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k+A_n} \rho_{2k}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_k.$$

By the Pfaffian structure of GSE in (3.1), the correlation function is

$$\rho_{2k}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k) = \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k}.$$

Here,  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}$  is an anti-symmetric  $4k \times 4k$  matrix:

$$\mathbf{M}_{4k} := (M_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq k}, \quad M_{i,j} = \begin{bmatrix} JK_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) & JK_n(\lambda_i, x_j) \\ JK_n(x_i, \lambda_j) & JK_n(x_i, x_j) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.1)$$

where each block  $M_{i,j}$  is a  $4 \times 4$  matrix.

Recall the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{4k}$  in (2.2), we define its *diagonal subset*

$$\mathcal{D}_{4k} := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k} : \lceil \sigma_{2i-1}/4 \rceil = \lceil \sigma_{2i}/4 \rceil, i = 1, \dots, 2k\},$$

where  $\lceil a \rceil$  is the smallest integer greater than or equal to  $a$ . We can thus decompose

$$\text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k} := \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k} + \text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}, \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$\text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k} = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_{4k}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \mathbf{M}_{4k}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}_{4k}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}_{4k}(\sigma_{4k-1}, \sigma_{4k}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \text{Pf } M_{i,i}$$

and

$$\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k} = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{4k}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \mathbf{M}_{4k}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}_{4k}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}_{4k}(\sigma_{4k-1}, \sigma_{4k}).$$

**5.1. On-diagonal part  $\text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}$ .** For the on-diagonal part, we will prove

**Lemma 5.1** Uniformly in  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in I^k$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{\lambda_i + A_n} \text{Pf } M_{i,i} dx_i = \left( \frac{1}{540\pi^2} \int_A u^4 du \right)^k \prod_{i=1}^k (2\pi \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i))^6.$$

*Proof.* For the diagonal block  $M_{i,i}$ , by (3.3), its Pfaffian reads

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pf } M_{i,i} &= S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_i) S_n(x_i, x_i) - S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) S_n(x_i, \lambda_i) + J_n(\lambda_i, x_i) V_n(\lambda_i, x_i) \\ &= S_n(x_i, x_i) \int_{\lambda_i}^{x_i} V_n(\lambda_i, t) dt - S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) \int_{\lambda_i}^{x_i} V_n(x_i, t) dt \\ &\quad + J_n(\lambda_i, x_i) V_n(\lambda_i, x_i). \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

By Lemma 3.1 and the bound  $|x_i - \lambda_i| \lesssim n^{-6/5}$ , we have the uniform estimates,

$$S_n(x_i, x_i) = n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) + O(n^{1/2}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\lambda_i}^{x_i} V_n(\lambda_i, t) dt &= \int_0^{x_i - \lambda_i} n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) \left( \partial_t [K_{\sin}(-2n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) t)] + O(1) \right) dt \\ &= n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) (K_{\sin}(2u_i) - 1) + O(n^{-1/5}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $u_i := n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) (x_i - \lambda_i) \lesssim n^{-1/5}$  and thus  $n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) (K_{\sin}(2u_i) - 1) \lesssim n^{3/5}$ . This will yield the estimate for the first term in (5.3) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} &S_n(x_i, x_i) \int_{\lambda_i}^{x_i} V_n(\lambda_i, t) dt - n^2 \rho_{\text{sc}}^2(\lambda_i) (K_{\sin}(2u_i) - 1) \\ &\lesssim n \cdot n^{-1/5} + n^{1/2} \cdot n^{3/5} + n^{1/2} \cdot n^{-1/5} \lesssim n^{11/10}. \end{aligned}$$

The estimates of the other two terms in (5.3) can be derived in the same way. In the end we obtain the following uniform estimate

$$\text{Pf } M_{i,i} = n^2 \rho_{\text{sc}}^2(\lambda_i) \left( 1 - K_{\sin}^2(2u_i) + \partial_{u_i}[K_{\sin}(2u_i)] \int_0^{u_i} K_{\sin}(2t) dt \right) + O\left(n^{11/10}\right).$$

Note that the Lebesgue measure  $\mathcal{L}(A_n)$  is  $O(n^{-6/5})$ . Recall the sine kernel in (3.6), if we further apply the Taylor expansion

$$K_{\sin}(t) = 1 - \frac{\pi^2 t^2}{6} + \frac{\pi^4 t^4}{120} + O(t^6) \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0,$$

we will complete the proof of the lemma as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{\lambda_i + A_n} \text{Pf } M_{i,i} dx_i \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=1}^k \left[ \int_{n^{-1/5} \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) A} n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) \left( \frac{16\pi^4 u_i^4}{135} + O(u_i^5) \right) du_i + O\left(n^{-1/10}\right) \right] \\ &= \left( \int_A \frac{u^4}{540\pi^2} du \right)^k \prod_{i=1}^k (2\pi \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i))^6. \end{aligned}$$

□

**5.2. Two rounds of transformations.** In order to bound the off-diagonal part  $\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}$ , we need to bound all its entries. Note that Pfaffian is invariant under the congruent transformations, we can perform the following *Round 1 transformation* to reduce the order of the entries of  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}$  without changing its Pfaffian.

- Calculate  $(\lambda_{i+1} - x_{i+1})$  times the  $(4i+2)$ -th row, and add the result to the  $(4i+1)$ -th row for  $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ . Then perform the same operations to the columns.
- Then subtract the  $(4i+1)$ -th row from the  $(4i+3)$ -th row, and subtract the  $(4i+2)$ -th row from the  $(4i+4)$ -th row for  $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ . Then perform the same operations to the columns.

We shall use a superscript  $(R)$  to denote the matrix after Round 1 transformation. Now we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k} &= \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(\sigma_{4k-1}, \sigma_{4k}). \end{aligned}$$

Since off-diagonal  $4 \times 4$  blocks have no influences on diagonal  $4 \times 4$  blocks during the transformation, we have

$$\text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k} = \prod_{i=1}^k \text{Pf } M_{i,i} = \prod_{i=1}^k \text{Pf } M_{i,i}^{(R)} = \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}.$$

Consequently,

$$\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k} = \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k} - \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k} = \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)} - \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)} = \text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}.$$

As will be clear later, it will be more convenient to bound  $\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}$  if we make the following *Round 2 transformation* for  $\mathbf{M}^{(R)}$ : by multiplying certain factors, we define

$$\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(i, j) =: \begin{cases} n^{-6/5} \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(i, j), & \text{for } i, j \text{ both even,} \\ n^{6/5} \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(i, j), & \text{for } i, j \text{ both odd,} \\ \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(i, j), & \text{for all other } i, j. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

For any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\{1 \leq \ell \leq 2k : \sigma_{2\ell-1} \text{ and } \sigma_{2\ell} \text{ are both odd}\}| \\ &= |\{1 \leq \ell \leq 2k : \sigma_{2\ell-1} \text{ and } \sigma_{2\ell} \text{ are both even}\}|. \end{aligned}$$

And thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)}(\sigma_{4k-1}, \sigma_{4k}) \\ &= \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(\sigma_{4k-1}, \sigma_{4k}). \end{aligned}$$

This further implies that

$$\text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)} = \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)} = \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}, \quad \text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)} = \text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(R)} = \text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}. \quad (5.5)$$

Hence, it suffices to bound  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}$ . For this purpose we need the following lemma, which will be used to control the integral of  $\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}$  in Subsection 5.3. We first define the following subset of  $I^k$ ,

$$\tilde{\Omega}_k =: \left\{ (\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k) \in I^{2k} : \begin{array}{l} |\lambda_i - \lambda_j| > \log^{-1} n \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j \leq k; \\ x_i \in \lambda_i + A_n \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k \end{array} \right\}. \quad (5.6)$$

Then we have

**Lemma 5.2** For  $\lambda_i \in I$  and  $x_i \in \lambda_i + A_n$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , the diagonal block  $M_{i,i}^{(F)}$  has the upper bound,

$$\left| M_{i,i}^{(F)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & n & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n & 0 & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & 0 & n^{1/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{1/5} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.7)$$

On  $\tilde{\Omega}_k$  the off-diagonal part  $M_{i,j}^{(F)} (i < j)$  can be controlled by

$$\left| M_{i,j}^{(F)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} n^{6/5} \log n & n^{1/2} & n^{3/10} & n^{3/10} \\ n^{1/2} & n^{-1/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n \\ n^{3/10} & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-1/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n \\ n^{3/10} & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-3/5} \log n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.8)$$

*Proof.* Let  $M_{i,j,11}^{(R)}, M_{i,j,12}^{(R)}, M_{i,j,21}^{(R)}, M_{i,j,22}^{(R)}$  be the upper left, upper right, lower left and lower right  $2 \times 2$  blocks of  $M_{i,j}^{(R)}$  after the Round 1 transformation, respectively.

We first prove (5.7). Recall (5.1), the original on-diagonal blocks are

$$M_{i,i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_i) & J_n(\lambda_i, x_i) & S_n(x_i, \lambda_i) \\ -S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_i) & 0 & -S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) & -V_n(\lambda_i, x_i) \\ J_n(x_i, \lambda_i) & S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) & 0 & S_n(x_i, x_i) \\ -S_n(x_i, \lambda_i) & -V_n(x_i, \lambda_i) & -S_n(x_i, x_i) & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

After the Round 1 transformation, the (1,1)-entry of  $M_{i,i,12}^{(R)}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_i}^{\lambda_i} S_n(t, x_i) dt - (\lambda_i - x_i) S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) &= (\lambda_i - x_i) S_n(\xi, x_i) - (\lambda_i - x_i) S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) \\ &= -(\lambda_i - x_i)(\lambda_i - \xi) \partial_\gamma S_n(\gamma, x_i), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\xi \in [\lambda_i, x_i]$  and  $\gamma \in [\lambda_i, \xi]$ . By (3.15) and (3.16) we have

$$\sup_{|x-y| \leq \sup(A_n)} |\partial_x S_n(x, y)| = O\left(n^{9/5}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{|x-y| \leq \sup(A_n)} |V_n(x, y)| = O\left(n^{9/5}\right).$$

This implies that the (1,1)-entry of  $M_{i,i,12}^{(R)}$  is of order  $O(n^{-3/5})$ . The (1,2)-entry of  $M_{i,i,12}^{(R)}$  is given by

$$S_n(x_i, \lambda_i) - S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_i) - (\lambda_i - x_i) V_n(\lambda_i, x_i) = (x_i - \lambda_i) \partial_\xi S_n(\xi, \lambda_i) + O\left(n^{3/5}\right),$$

which is of order  $O(n^{3/5})$ . Similar analysis works for the (2,1) and (2,2) entries of  $M_{i,i}^{(R)}$ , and we get the estimate

$$\left| M_{i,i,12}^{(R)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} n^{-3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{9/5} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Due to the anti-symmetry of  $M_{i,i}^{(R)}$ ,  $M_{i,i,21}^{(R)}$  has the same order estimate as above. For  $M_{i,i,22}^{(R)}$ , its (1,2)-entry is

$$\begin{aligned} &S_n(x_i, x_i) + S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_i) - S_n(\lambda_i, x_i) - S_n(x_i, \lambda_i) + (x_i - \lambda_i) V_n(\lambda_i, x_i) \\ &= - \int_{\lambda_i}^{x_i} V_n(x_i, t) dt + \int_{\lambda_i}^{x_i} V_n(\lambda_i, t) dt + (x_i - \lambda_i) V_n(\lambda_i, x_i). \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

By the estimate (3.9), we have

$$\left| V_n(\lambda_i, x_i) - n^2 \rho_{\text{sc}}^2(\lambda_i) \frac{d}{du} [K_{\sin}(2u)] \right| = O(n),$$

where  $u := n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i)(\lambda_i - x_i) \lesssim n^{-1/5}$ . Then (5.9) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &- 2n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) \int_0^u \left( \frac{d}{dt} [K_{\sin}(2t)] \right) dt + n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) u \frac{d}{du} [K_{\sin}(2u)] + O\left(n^{-1/5}\right) \\ &= 2n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) \left( 1 - K_{\sin}(2u) + \frac{d}{du} [K_{\sin}(2u)] \right) + O\left(n^{-1/5}\right) \\ &= \frac{4n \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) u^4}{15} + O\left(n^{-1/5}\right). \end{aligned}$$



Hence we get

$$\left| M_{i,i,22}^{(R)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & n^{1/5} \\ n^{1/5} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Combining above estimates, we have the following bound for the diagonal block  $M_{i,i}^{(R)}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq k$ ) after the Round 1 transformation,

$$\left| M_{i,i}^{(R)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & n & n^{-3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n & 0 & n^{3/5} & n^{9/5} \\ n^{-3/5} & n^{3/5} & 0 & n^{1/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{9/5} & n^{1/5} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.10)$$

Therefore, (5.7) follows from (5.10) and the definition of Round 2 transformation (5.4)

Now we prove (5.8). Recall (5.1) again, the original off-diagonal blocks are

$$M_{i,j} = \begin{bmatrix} J_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) & S_n(\lambda_j, \lambda_i) & J_n(\lambda_i, x_j) & S_n(x_j, \lambda_i) \\ -S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) & -V_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) & -S_n(\lambda_i, x_j) & -V_n(\lambda_i, x_j) \\ J_n(x_i, \lambda_j) & S_n(\lambda_j, x_i) & J_n(x_i, x_j) & S_n(x_j, x_i) \\ -S_n(x_i, \lambda_j) & -V_n(x_i, \lambda_j) & -S_n(x_i, x_j) & -V_n(x_i, x_j) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We consider the upper left  $2 \times 2$  block  $M_{i,j,11}^{(R)}$  of  $M_{i,j}^{(R)}$  after the Round 1 transformation. Its entries are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{i,j,11}^{(R)}(1,1) &= J_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - (\lambda_i - x_i)S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) + (\lambda_j - x_j)S_n(\lambda_j, \lambda_i) \\ &\quad - (\lambda_j - x_j)(\lambda_i - x_i)V_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j), \\ M_{i,j,11}^{(R)}(1,2) &= S_n(\lambda_j, \lambda_i) - (\lambda_i - x_i)V_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j), \\ M_{i,j,11}^{(R)}(2,1) &= -(\lambda_j - x_j)V_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) - S_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j), \\ M_{i,j,11}^{(R)}(2,2) &= -V_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j). \end{aligned}$$

The requirement that  $x_i \in \lambda_i + A_n$  implies

$$|\lambda_i - x_i| \leq \sup(A_n) (= \sup\{x : x \in A_n\}) \lesssim n^{-6/5}.$$

In addition, using (5.6) where  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \tilde{\Omega}_k$ , for all  $i \neq j$ , we have

$$\min\{|\lambda_j - \lambda_i|, |\lambda_j - x_i|, |x_j - \lambda_i|, |x_i - x_j|\} \geq \log^{-1} n - 2 \sup(A_n) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log^{-1} n.$$

Then by the estimates (3.14), (3.16) and (3.19), we get

$$\left| M_{i,j,11}^{(R)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} \log n & n^{1/2} \\ n^{1/2} & n \log n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Other parts of  $M_{i,j}^{(R)}$  can be bounded in the same manner; therefore, we omit the details. This leads us to the final estimate,

$$\left| M_{i,j}^{(R)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} \log n & n^{1/2} & n^{-9/10} & n^{3/10} \\ n^{1/2} & n \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{4/5} \log n \\ n^{-9/10} & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-7/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n \\ n^{3/10} & n^{4/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{3/5} \log n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.11)$$

Now (5.8) follows from (5.11) and the definition of the Round 2 transformation (5.4).  $\square$

**5.3. Off-diagonal part  $\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}$ .** Next, we prove the following lemma, which indicates that the contribution from the off-diagonal blocks is negligible.

**Lemma 5.3** Uniformly in  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \Omega^k$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\lambda_1 + A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k + A_n} |\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}| dx_1 \cdots dx_k = 0.$$

We first construct a  $4k \times 4k$  matrix  $\mathbf{U}_{4k}$  in the block form

$$\mathbf{U}_{4k} = (U_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k},$$

where  $U_{i,i}$  and  $U_{i,j}$  are  $4 \times 4$  upper bound matrices given by the right-hand side of (5.7) and (5.8), respectively; that is,

$$|\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(i, j)| \lesssim U_{4k}(i, j).$$

For example,  $U_{4k}(i, j) = n^{6/5} \log n$  if  $i \equiv j \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  and  $i \neq j$ . We set

$$U_{4k}(\sigma) := \prod_{i=1}^{2k} U_{4k}(\sigma_{2i-1}, \sigma_{2i}). \quad (5.12)$$

Let  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}$  be a 0-1 matrix of size  $4k \times 4k$  corresponding to  $\sigma$ :

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \exists \ell \text{ s.t. } (\sigma_{2\ell-1}, \sigma_{2\ell}) = (i, j). \quad (5.13)$$



We rewrite  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k} = (\Lambda_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$  where each  $\Lambda_{i,j}$  is a  $4 \times 4$  block. We now partition the non-zero entries of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}$  into diagonal regimes (denoted by a letter ‘ $D$ ’) and off-diagonal regimes (denoted by a letter ‘ $O$ ’). The partition is performed according to the growth order of  $n$  as described in (5.7) and (5.8). The diagonal part contains 4 regimes:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &:= \{(i, j) \in [4k] \times [4k] : \lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, j \equiv 2 \pmod{4}\}, \\ D_2 &:= \{(i, j) \in [4k] \times [4k] : \lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, j \equiv 3, 4 \pmod{4}\}, \\ D_3 &:= \{(i, j) \in [4k] \times [4k] : \lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv 2 \pmod{4}, j \equiv 3, 4 \pmod{4}\}, \\ D_4 &:= \{(i, j) \in [4k] \times [4k] : \lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $[4k] := \{1, 2, \dots, 4k\}$ .

Figure 1 illustrates the partition for each  $4 \times 4$  diagonal blocks  $\Lambda_{i,i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , providing the information on which nonzero entries belong to each  $D_i$ . For example, for the block  $\Lambda_{1,1}$ ,  $(1, 2) \in D_1$  if  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(1, 2) = 1$ ;  $(1, 3) \in D_2$  if  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(1, 3) = 1$ , etc. Note that we only consider and partition entries in the upper triangle of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}$ , since the entries in the lower triangle of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}$  are all 0. Figure 2 shows the partition information for  $4 \times 4$  off-diagonal blocks in the upper triangle, defined similarly to the  $D_i$ ’s. To avoid redundancy, their definitions are omitted. We also let

$$O_4 = O_{4,1} \cup O_{4,2}, \quad O_5 = O_{5,1} \cup O_{5,2}.$$

FIGURE 1. Partition of  $4 \times 4$  diagonal blocks.FIGURE 2. Partition of  $4 \times 4$  off-diagonal blocks.

Given  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{4k}$ , by the definitions of  $\mathbf{U}_{4k}$  and  $U_{4k}(\sigma)$  and Lemma 5.2, we get

$$U_{4k}(\sigma) \lesssim (\log^C n) n^{\text{Ord}_1}, \quad (5.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ord}_1 &:= |D_1| + \frac{3}{5}|D_2| + \frac{3}{5}|D_3| + \frac{1}{5}|D_4| \\ &+ \frac{6}{5}|O_1| + \frac{1}{2}|O_2| + \frac{3}{10}|O_3| - \frac{1}{5}|O_{4,1}| - \frac{1}{5}|O_{4,2}| - \frac{2}{5}|O_5| - \frac{3}{5}|O_6|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

Interestingly, the following lemma shows that  $\text{Ord}_1$  for any off-diagonal permutation is always less than  $6k/5$ , which is exactly the factor needed to derive the negligibility of off-diagonal blocks as in Lemma 5.3.

**Lemma 5.4** For any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{4k}$ , it holds that

$$\text{Ord}_1 < 6k/5. \quad (5.16)$$

Assuming Lemma 5.4, we can complete the proof of Lemma 5.3.

*Proof of Lemma 5.3.* Recall the set  $\tilde{\Omega}_k$  in (5.6), its Lebesgue measure satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\Omega}_k) \lesssim \mathcal{L}(A_n)^k \lesssim n^{-6k/5}.$$

This, together with (5.16), implies that for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{4k}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\tilde{\Omega}_k} \left| \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(\sigma_3, \sigma_4) \cdots \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(\sigma_{4k-1}, \sigma_{4k}) \right| d\lambda_1 dx_1 \cdots d\lambda_k dx_k \\ &\lesssim \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_k} U_{4k}(\sigma) d\lambda_1 dx_1 \cdots d\lambda_k dx_k \\ &\lesssim (\log^C n) n^{-6k/5 + \text{Ord}_1}, \end{aligned}$$

which converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Here, we have used the fact that  $|\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}(i, j)| \lesssim \mathbf{U}_{4k}(i, j)$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq 4k$ . This implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\lambda_1 + A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k + A_n} |\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(F)}| dx_1 \cdots dx_k = 0,$$

which completes the proof by (5.5).  $\square$

Now we prove Lemma 5.4.

*Proof of Lemma 5.4.* The starting point of the proof is to derive some identities which hold for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k}$ . Since the two sets  $\{\sigma_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4k\}$  and  $[4k]$  are the same, if we group  $\sigma'_i$ 's according to their congruence classes modulo 4, then for each  $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$|\{i \in [4k] : \sigma_i \equiv \ell \pmod{4}\}| = |\{i \in [4k] : i \equiv \ell \pmod{4}\}| = k. \quad (5.17)$$

We can also rewrite the left hand hand of (5.17) via

$$\begin{aligned} |\{i \in [4k] : \sigma_i \equiv \ell \pmod{4}\}| &= |\{(i, j) : \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv \ell, j \not\equiv \ell \pmod{4}\}| \\ &\quad + |\{(i, j) : \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \not\equiv \ell, j \equiv \ell \pmod{4}\}| \\ &\quad + 2|\{(i, j) : \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv j \equiv \ell \pmod{4}\}|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Consider first the case  $\ell = 1$ . By the definition of the sets  $D'_i$ 's and  $O'_i$ 's, we see that sum of the first and second lines on the right hand side of (5.18) is equal to  $|D_1| + |O_2| + |O_3|$ , while the third lines are  $2|O_1|$ . It follows from this observation and (5.17) (with  $\ell = 1$ ) that

$$2|O_1| + |O_2| + |O_3| + |D_1| + |D_2| = k. \quad (5.19)$$

Similarly, for  $\ell = 2$ , we get

$$|O_2| + 2|O_{4,1}| + |O_{5,1}| + |D_1| + |D_3| = k. \quad (5.20)$$

Now, combining the cases of  $\ell = 3$  and  $\ell = 4$ , we get

$$|O_3| + 2|O_{4,2}| + |O_{5,1}| + 2|O_{5,2}| + 2|O_6| + |D_2| + |D_3| + 2|D_4| = 2k. \quad (5.21)$$

We will need one more identity. Since the number of nonzero  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j)$ 's is  $2k$ , we have

$$|D_1| + |D_2| + |D_3| + |D_4| + |O_1| + |O_2| + |O_3| + |O_4| + |O_5| + |O_6| = 2k. \quad (5.22)$$

By computing the linear combination

$$\frac{3}{5} \times (5.19) + \frac{3}{5} \times (5.20) + \frac{1}{5} \times (5.21) - \frac{1}{5} \times (5.22),$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{6k}{5} &= |D_1| + \frac{3}{5}|D_2| + \frac{3}{5}|D_3| + \frac{1}{5}|D_4| + |O_1| + |O_2| \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{5}|O_3| + |O_{4,1}| + \frac{1}{5}|O_{4,2}| + \frac{3}{5}|O_{5,1}| + \frac{1}{5}|O_{5,2}| + \frac{1}{5}|O_6|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Comparing (5.15) and (5.23), we see that the assertion  $\text{Ord}_1 < 6k/5$  for  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k}/\mathcal{D}_{4k}$  is equivalent to

$$|O_1| < \frac{3}{2}|O_3| + 2|O_{4,2}| + \frac{5}{2}|O_2| + 3|O_{5,2}| + 4|O_6| + 5|O_{5,1}| + 6|O_{4,1}|. \quad (5.24)$$

Actually, we shall prove a stronger conclusion for  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k}$ :

$$|O_1| \leq |O_2| + |O_3| + |O_4| + |O_5| + |O_6|. \quad (5.25)$$

Indeed, assuming that (5.25) holds, then (5.24) follows by combining (5.25) and the trivial fact  $\sum_{i=1}^6 |O_i| > 0$  for  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k}/\mathcal{D}_{4k}$ .

We now provide an intuitive explanation of (5.25). Suppose that  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(1, 5) = 1$ , i.e.,  $(1, 5) \in O_1$ , then there must exist at least one element  $b \in \{2, 3, 4\}$  and  $b' > 5$  such that  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(b, b') = 1$ , leading to  $(b, b') \in \cup_{i=2}^6 O_i$ . This suggests that the right hand side of (5.25) should dominate  $|O_1|$ .

To prove (5.25) formally, we observe that, by the construction of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}$ , for each  $1 \leq i \leq 4k$ ,

$$\sum_{j:j \neq i} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(j, i)) = 1. \quad (5.26)$$

Summing this equality over all  $4\ell - 3 \leq i \leq 4\ell$  for some  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ , and using the fact that  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) = 0$  for  $i \geq j$ , we get

$$2 \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil = \ell} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) + \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil = \ell < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) + \sum_{\lceil j/4 \rceil < \lceil i/4 \rceil = \ell} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(j, i) = 4. \quad (5.27)$$

We now define a function  $h_\sigma$  as follows:

$$h_\sigma(\ell) := \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil = \ell < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) + \sum_{\lceil j/4 \rceil < \lceil i/4 \rceil = \ell} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(j, i), \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq k. \quad (5.28)$$

By (5.27),  $h_\sigma(\ell)$  is an even integer for all  $\ell$ . In particular, we have the implications

$$\begin{aligned} \forall 1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq k, (4\ell_1 - 3, 4\ell_2 - 3) \in O_1 &\Rightarrow \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(4\ell_1 - 3, 4\ell_2 - 3) = 1 \\ &\Rightarrow \min\{h_\sigma(\ell_1), h_\sigma(\ell_2)\} \geq 1 \Rightarrow \min\{h_\sigma(\ell_1), h_\sigma(\ell_2)\} \geq 2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

where we used the evenness of  $h_\sigma(\ell_1)$  and  $h_\sigma(\ell_2)$  in the last step. Consider the set

$$\widehat{O}_1 := \{1 \leq \ell \leq k : \exists \ell' \in [1, k], \text{ s.t. } (4 \min\{\ell, \ell'\} - 3, 4 \max\{\ell, \ell'\} - 3) \in O_1\}. \quad (5.30)$$

It follows from (5.28) and (5.29) that

$$\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} h_\sigma(\ell) \geq \sum_{\ell \in \widehat{O}_1} h_\sigma(\ell) \geq 2 |\widehat{O}_1| = 4 |O_1|. \quad (5.31)$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} h_\sigma(\ell) &= \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil = \ell < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) + \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \sum_{\lceil j/4 \rceil < \lceil i/4 \rceil = \ell} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(j, i) \\ &= \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(i, j) + \sum_{\lceil j/4 \rceil < \lceil i/4 \rceil} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}(j, i) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^6 |O_j|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Now (5.25) follows by combining (5.31) and (5.32). And thus we completes the proof of Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

**5.4. Proof of (4.7): the limit of the main term  $L_{k,n}$ .** Recall the definition of  $L_{k,n}$  in (4.3), and the decomposition of the correlation function  $\rho_{2k} = \text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k} + \text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}$  in (5.2), we can decompose  $L_{k,n}$  into  $L_{k,n,D}$  and  $L_{k,n,O}$  by integrating  $\text{Pf}_D \mathbf{M}_{4k}$  and  $\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}$ , respectively.

By Lemma 5.1 and the fact that the measure of the set  $I^k \cap \Omega_k^c$  converges to 0, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} L_{k,n,D} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k \\ &= \int_{I^k} \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{\lambda_i + A_n} \text{Pf } M_{i,i} dx_i \right) d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{540\pi^2} \int_A u^4 du \right)^k \int_{I^k} (2\pi \rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i))^6 d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other side, by Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} L_{k,n,O} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k \right| \\ & \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} \int_{\lambda_1 + A_n} \cdots \int_{\lambda_k + A_n} |\text{Pf}_O \mathbf{M}_{4k}| dx_1 \cdots dx_k d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (4.7).

## 6. ESTIMATES OF THE ERROR TERMS

Recall the definitions of  $E_{1,k,n}$  and  $E_{2,k,n}$  in (4.6), we now prove (4.8) and (4.9). This will complete the proof of Lemma 4.2, and subsequently, Theorem 1.1 for GSE.

**6.1. Estimates of  $E_{1,k,n}$ .** To bound  $E_{1,k,n}$ , we need to control the  $(2k+1)$ -point correlation function  $\rho_{2k+1,n}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k, z)$  where  $z \in T_{1,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$  (recall (4.4)). We denote

$$T_{1,k,n}^{[i]} := (\lambda_i, \lambda_i + 2 \sup(A_n)).$$

Without loss of generality, we may further assume  $z \in T_{1,k,n}^{[k]}$ . Then we have

$$\rho_{2k+1,n}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k, z) = \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k+2},$$

which is a  $(4k+2) \times (4k+2)$  matrix that can be written in a block form

$$\mathbf{M}_{4k+2} = (M_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq k}.$$

Here, for  $i, j < k$ ,  $M_{i,j}$  has size  $4 \times 4$ , while the sizes for  $M_{i,k}$  ( $i < k$ ) and  $M_{k,k}$  are  $4 \times 6$  and  $6 \times 6$ , respectively.

As before we make two rounds of transformations to  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+2}$ . We first make the same transformations as in Section 5 to the first  $4k-4$  rows and columns of  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+2}$ . Then we perform the following additional operations to the last 6 rows/columns of  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+2}$ :

- Add  $(\lambda_k - x_k)$  times of the  $(4k-2)$ -th row to the  $(4k-3)$ -th row. Also subtract  $(x_k - z)$  times of the  $(4k+2)$ -th row from  $(4k+1)$ -th row. Then perform the same operations to the columns.

- Subtract the  $(4k - 3)$ -th row from the  $(4k - 1)$ -th and  $(4k + 1)$ -th rows, and also subtract the  $(4k - 2)$ -th row from the  $4k$ -th and  $(4k + 2)$ -th rows. Then also perform the same operations to the columns.

After these row/column transformations are done, we make the same operation as in (5.4). And we denote the new matrix by  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+2}^{(F)}$  as before.

Then the upper-left minor of size  $4k - 4$  in  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+2}^{(F)}$  become the same as in Section 5, since they are not affected by the last 6 rows/columns in the transformations. Hence the diagonal blocks  $M_{i,i}^{(F)}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ ) and off-diagonal blocks  $M_{i,j}$  ( $i, j < k$ ) have the same bound given by (5.7) and (5.8), respectively. Moreover, we can show that the last diagonal block  $M_{k,k}^{(F)}$  have the bound

$$\left| M_{k,k}^{(F)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & n & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n & 0 & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & 0 & n^{1/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{1/5} & 0 & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & 0 & n^{1/5} \\ n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{3/5} & n^{1/5} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.1)$$

For the off-diagonal part, it remains to control  $M_{i,k}^{(F)}$  for  $i < k$ . We decompose

$$M_{i,k}^{(F)} = \left( M_{i,k,1}^{(F)}, M_{i,k,2}^{(F)} \right),$$



where  $M_{i,k,1}^{(F)}$  is a square matrix consisting of the first 4 rows/columns of  $M_{i,k}^{(F)}$ , and  $M_{i,k,2}^{(F)}$  is the remaining part with size  $4 \times 2$ . Here  $M_{i,k,1}^{(F)}$  has the same bound as (5.8). For  $M_{i,k,2}^{(F)}$ , we can show that

$$\left| M_{i,k,2}^{(F)} \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} n^{3/10} & n^{3/10} \\ n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n \\ n^{-1/5} \log n & n^{-2/5} \log n \\ n^{-2/5} \log n & n^{-3/5} \log n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.2)$$

Using (6.1) and (6.2), we can construct a  $(4k + 2) \times (4k + 2)$  matrix  $\mathbf{U}_{4k+2}$  that serves as an entrywise upper bound for  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+2}^{(F)}$ .

Now we can bound the diagonal and off-diagonal parts of  $E_{1,k,n}$  in a unified way. Recall that for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k+2}$ , we associate it with a 0-1 matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k+2}$  via (5.13). We now introduce additional diagonal sets  $D_5$  and  $D_6$  (which lie in the on diagonal block where the indices of entries are  $[4k - 3, 4k + 2] \times [4k + 1, 4k + 2]$ , which is the last  $6 \times 6$  diagonal block), and off-diagonal sets  $O_7, O_8, O_9, O_{10}$  (which lie in  $4 \times 2$  blocks where the indices of entries are  $[4i - 3, 4i] \times [4k + 1, 4k + 2]$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ ). Together they constitute the last two columns of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k+2}$ . Their positions are shown in the Figure 3 and Figure 4 below, respectively.

We define  $U_{4k+2}(\sigma)$  as in (5.12) (we need to replace  $2k$  by  $2k + 1$  in the upper limit of the product). Similarly to (5.14) for all  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \Omega$  and  $|z - \lambda_k| < 2 \sup(A_n)$ , we

FIGURE 3. Partition of the last  $6 \times 6$  diagonal block .FIGURE 4. Partition of  $4 \times 2$  off-diagonal block.

have

$$U_{4k+2}(\sigma) \lesssim (\log^C n) n^{\text{Ord}_2}, \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$\text{Ord}_2 := \text{Ord}_1 + \frac{3}{5}|D_5| + \frac{1}{5}|D_6| + \frac{3}{10}|O_7| - \frac{1}{5}|O_8| - \frac{2}{5}|O_9| - \frac{3}{5}|O_{10}|, \quad (6.4)$$

and  $\text{Ord}_1$  is given in (5.15). As before, we will show

$$\text{Ord}_2 < 6(k+1)/5. \quad (6.5)$$

Indeed, assuming (6.5) and using the definition of  $\tilde{\Omega}_k$  in (5.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} E_{1,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \cdot d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k+2}} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_k} \int_{T_{1,k,n}^{[i]}} U_{4k+2}(\sigma) dz d\lambda_1 dx_1 \cdots d\lambda_k dx_k \\ & \lesssim (\log^C n) n^{\text{Ord}_2} \mathcal{L}(A_n)^k \cdot \sup(A_n) \\ & \lesssim (\log^C n) n^{\text{Ord}_2 - 6(k+1)/5}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

which vanishes as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , as desired. This will complete (4.8).

It remains to establish (6.5). Analogously to (5.19) - (5.22), we have

$$2|O_1| + |O_2| + |O_3| + |D_1| + |D_2| + W_1 = k + 1, \quad (6.7)$$



$$|O_2| + 2|O_{4,1}| + |O_{5,1}| + |D_1| + |D_3| + W_2 = k + 1, \quad (6.8)$$

$$|O_3| + 2|O_{4,2}| + |O_{5,1}| + 2|O_{5,2}| + 2|O_6| + |D_2| + |D_3| + 2|D_4| + W_3 = 2k, \quad (6.9)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^6 |D_i| + \sum_{i=1}^{10} |O_i| = 2k + 2, \quad (6.10)$$

where

$$W_1 := 2|O_{7,1}| + |O_8| + |O_{9,1}| + |O_{9,4}| + 2|D_{5,1}| + |D_{5,2}| + |D_{5,4}| + |D_6|,$$

$$W_2 := |O_{7,2}| + 2|O_{9,2}| + |O_{9,3}| + |D_{5,2}| + 2|D_{5,3}| + |D_{5,5}| + |D_6|,$$

$$W_3 := |O_8| + |O_{9,3}| + |O_{9,4}| + |O_{10}| + |D_{5,4}| + |D_{5,5}|.$$

Computing the linear combination

$$\frac{3}{5} \times (6.7) + \frac{3}{5} \times (6.8) + \frac{1}{5} \times (6.9) - \frac{1}{5} \times (6.10),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{6k+5}{5} = & |D_1| + \frac{3}{5}|D_2| + \frac{3}{5}|D_3| + \frac{1}{5}|D_4| + |O_1| + |O_2| + \frac{3}{5}|O_3| + |O_{4,1}| + \frac{1}{5}|O_{4,2}| \\ & + \frac{3}{5}|O_{5,1}| + \frac{1}{5}|O_{5,2}| + \frac{1}{5}|O_6| + W_4, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_4 := & |O_{7,1}| + \frac{2}{5}|O_{7,2}| + \frac{3}{5}|O_8| + \frac{2}{5}|O_{9,1}| + |O_{9,2}| + \frac{3}{5}|O_{9,3}| + \frac{3}{5}|O_{9,4}| \\ & + |D_{5,1}| + |D_{5,2}| + |D_{5,3}| + \frac{3}{5}|D_{5,4}| + \frac{3}{5}|D_{5,5}| + |D_6|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

The condition (6.5) is thus equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} |O_1| < & 1 + \frac{5}{2}|O_2| + \frac{3}{2}|O_3| + 6|O_{4,1}| + 2|O_{4,2}| + 5|O_{5,1}| + 3|O_{5,2}| + 4|O_6| \\ & + 7|O_{7,1}| + \frac{1}{2}|O_{7,2}| + 4|O_8| + 4|O_{9,1}| + 7|O_{9,2}| + 5|O_{9,3}| + 5|O_{9,4}| + 3|O_{10}| \\ & + 2|D_{5,1}| + 2|D_{5,2}| + 2|D_{5,3}|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Clearly (6.12) holds if  $|O_1| = 0$ . Thus we only consider the case  $|O_1| > 0$ . Repeating the argument around (5.25), we get

$$|O_1| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{10} |O_i|. \quad (6.13)$$

Then (6.12) follows from (6.13) and the fact  $|O_{7,2}| \leq 1$  which implies  $|O_{7,2}| < 1 + |O_{7,2}|/2$ . Therefore, we establish (6.5).

**6.2. Estimates of  $E_{2,k,n}$ .** Given  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in I^k \cap \Omega_k$ , let  $T_{3,k,n}$  be the first margin of  $T_{2,k,n}$ ,

$$T_{3,k,n} = T_{3,k,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) := \cup_{i=1}^k \{z_1 : 2 \sup(A_n) < |z_1 - \lambda_i| \leq \log^{-1} n\}.$$

Then we have the relation

$$\int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} E_{2,k,n} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k = \int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k \int_{T_{3,k,n}} L_{k+1,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k, z_1) dz_1, \quad (6.14)$$

where  $L_{k+1,n}$  is defined by (4.3). Similarly to the decomposition of  $L_{k,n}$  in Section 5.4, we decompose  $L_{k+1,n}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k, z_1)$  into  $L_{k+1,n,D}$  and  $L_{k+1,n,O}$ . By Lemma 5.1,  $L_{k+1,n,D}$  is uniformly bounded on  $I^{k+1}$ . Since the Lebesgue measure  $\mathcal{L}(T_{3,k,n})$  converges to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\int_{I^k \cap \Omega_k} d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_k \int_{T_{3,k,n}} L_{k+1,n,D}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k, z_1) dz_1 \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.15)$$

We now turn to estimate the off-diagonal part  $L_{k+1,n,O}$ . Since  $|\lambda_i - \lambda_j| \geq \log^{-1} n$  on  $\Omega_k$ , we can rewrite  $T_{3,k,n} = \cup_{i=1}^k T_{3,k,n}^{[i]}$  where

$$T_{3,k,n}^{[i]} = \left\{ z_1 : 2 \sup(A_n) < |z_1 - \lambda_i| \leq \log^{-1} n; |z_1 - \lambda_j| \geq \frac{1}{2} \log^{-1} n, \forall j \neq i \right\}. \quad (6.16)$$

Without loss of generality, we may only consider  $T_{3,k,n}^{[1]}$  here. Similarly to  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}$  defined in (5.1), we let  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+4}$  be the  $(4k+4) \times (4k+4)$  kernel matrix of the  $2k+2$  points given in the order of  $\lambda_1, x_1, z_1, z_2, \lambda_2, x_2, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k$ .

We perform the two rounds of transformations on  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+4}$  as in Section 5.2, and write the final transformed matrix in a block form

$$\mathbf{M}_{4k+4}^{(F)} = \left( M_{i,j}^{(F)} \right)_{1 \leq i,j \leq k+1}.$$

By the definition of  $T_{3,k,n}^{[1]}$  in (6.16), for  $i \geq 2$ , we have  $|z_1 - \lambda_i| > (\log^{-1} n)/2$ . Thus, for  $(i,j) \neq (1,2)$ ,  $M_{i,j}^{(F)}$  has the same bounds (5.7) for  $i=j$  and (5.8) for  $i \neq j$ . To express the estimate for  $M_{1,2}^{(F)}$ , we define two function  $f_n$  and  $\bar{f}_n$  by

$$f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) := \min \left\{ n, \frac{1}{|\lambda_1 - z_1|} \right\}, \bar{f}_n := f_n + n^{1/2}.$$

Inspecting the proof of (5.8) in Lemma 5.2, we see that the off-diagonal block  $M_{1,2}^{(F)}$  can be bounded by

$$M_{1,2}^{(F)} \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} n^{6/5} \log n & \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-1/5} \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-1/5} \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1) \\ \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-1/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-2/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-2/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) \\ n^{-1/5} \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-2/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-1/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-2/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) \\ n^{-1/5} \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-2/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-2/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) & n^{-3/5} f_n(\lambda_1, z_1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.17)$$

We will not give a detailed proof of (6.17), but rather point out that (6.17) is related to (5.8) by replacing  $\log n$  and  $n^{1/2}$  with  $f_n$  and  $\bar{f}_n$ , respectively. In deriving (6.17) we have also used the condition  $2 \sup(A_n) < |z_1 - \lambda_1|$  so that

$$\min \{|\lambda_1 - z_1|, |\lambda_1 - z_2|, |x_1 - z_1|, |x_1 - z_2|\} \geq \frac{2|\lambda_1 - z_1|}{2}.$$

As in Section 5.3, we construct a  $(4k+4) \times (4k+4)$  matrix  $\mathbf{U}_{4k+4}$  which dominates  $\mathbf{M}_{4k+4}$  in the entrywise sense. We define  $U_{4k+4}(\sigma)$  and  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k+4}$  similarly to (5.12) and (5.13), respectively.

Note that (6.17) indicates that terms of the form

$$\int_{\lambda_1 - \log^{-1} n}^{\lambda_1 + \log^{-1} n} \left( f_n(\lambda_1, z_1)^a \times \bar{f}_n(\lambda_1, z_1)^b \right) dz_1 \quad (6.18)$$

will appear in the integral of  $U_{4k+4}(\sigma)$ , for certain integers  $a, b \geq 0$ . (The relevant combinations of  $(a, b)$  will be indicated in Table 1 below.)

To get the upper bound for (6.18), we let  $\kappa(a, b)$  be the unique non-negative real number which satisfies the following inequality for some  $C > 0$ ,

$$\log^{-C} n \lesssim \left( \int_{-\log^{-1} n}^{\log^{-1} n} \left( n^{1/2} + \min\left\{n, \frac{1}{x}\right\} \right)^a \min\left\{n, \frac{1}{x}\right\}^b dx \right) n^{-(\kappa(a, b) + a/2)} \lesssim \log^C n. \quad (6.19)$$

A direct computation gives the Table 1 below. The combinations (1,3) and (2,3) are not needed so their values  $\kappa(a, b)$  are omitted.

	$b = 0$	$b = 1$	$b = 2$	$b = 3$
$a = 0$	0	0	1	2
$a = 1$	0	1/2	3/2	\
$a = 2$	0	1	2	\

TABLE 1. The value of  $\kappa(a, b)$  for relevant pairs  $(a, b)$ .

For sets like  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  defined in the last section, we use a bar to denote their restriction to the off-diagonal  $4 \times 4$  block  $(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k+4}(i, j))_{1 \leq i \leq 4, 5 \leq j \leq 8}$ , and use a prime to denote its complement. For instance,

$$\bar{O}_1 = O_1 \cap \{(i, j) : [i/4] = 1, [j/4] = 2\}, \quad O'_1 = O_1 \setminus \bar{O}_1. \quad (6.20)$$

We define two quantities  $Y_1(\sigma)$  and  $Y_2(\sigma)$ , corresponding to the exponents  $a$  and  $b$  in (6.18),

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\sigma) &= |\bar{O}_2| + |\bar{O}_3|, \\ Y_2(\sigma) &= |\bar{O}_4| + |\bar{O}_5| + |\bar{O}_6|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

The comparison between (5.8) and (6.17) as well as the definition of the function  $\kappa(\cdot, \cdot)$  makes it clear that, for some constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$\int_{z_1 \in T_{3,k,n}^{[1]}} U_{4k+4}(\sigma) dz_1 \lesssim (\log^C n) n^{\text{Ord}_3}, \quad (6.22)$$

where

$$\text{Ord}_3 = \text{Ord}_1 + \kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)), \quad (6.23)$$

and  $\text{Ord}_1$  takes the same expression as (5.15).

Recall from Section 5.3 that in our analysis of off-diagonal part of  $L_{k,n}$ , we established  $\text{Ord}_1 < 6k/5$  to ensure the associated error converges to zero. Here, since we have  $(k+1)$  pairs of small gaps, in order to prove (4.9), it suffices to show

$$\text{Ord}_3 < 6(k+1)/5. \quad (6.24)$$

As in the right hand side of (5.24), we set

$$\begin{aligned} Y_3(\sigma) &:= \frac{3}{2}|O_3| + 2|O_{4,2}| + \frac{5}{2}|O_{5,1}| + 3|O_{5,2}| + 4|O_6| + 5|O_2| + 6|O_{4,1}|, \\ \bar{Y}_3(\sigma) &:= \frac{3}{2}|\bar{O}_3| + 2|\bar{O}_{4,2}| + \frac{5}{2}|\bar{O}_2| + 3|\bar{O}_{5,2}| + 4|\bar{O}_6| + 5|\bar{O}_{5,1}| + 6|\bar{O}_{4,1}|, \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

and let

$$Y'_3(\sigma) := Y_3(\sigma) - \bar{Y}_3(\sigma). \quad (6.26)$$

Repeating the analysis that leads to (5.24), we find that (6.24) is equivalent to

$$Y_3(\sigma) - |O_1| > 5\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)). \quad (6.27)$$

The proofs for (5.24) show that  $Y_3(\sigma) - |O_1| > 0$  always holds. Therefore, we only need to consider the situations where  $\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)) > 0$ , which, by Table 1 above, include the cases where  $Y_1(\sigma) = 0$  and  $Y_2(\sigma) \in \{2, 3\}$ ; and also both  $Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma) \in \{1, 2\}$ .

To prove (6.27), we rewrite it as

$$(Y'_3(\sigma) - |O'_1|) + (\bar{Y}_3(\sigma) - |\bar{O}_1| - 5\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma))) > 0. \quad (6.28)$$

The first part  $Y'_3(\sigma) - |O'_1|$  in (6.28) can be controlled by the following

**Lemma 6.1** We always have

$$|O'_1| \leq Y'_3(\sigma). \quad (6.29)$$

Moreover, if  $|\bar{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) > 0$  and  $|\bar{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) + Y_2(\sigma)$  is odd, then

$$|O'_1| < Y'_3(\sigma). \quad (6.30)$$

*Proof.* Define a set  $\hat{O}_{1,NEW}$  so that it equals  $\hat{O}_1$  (defined in (5.30)) if  $(1, 2) \notin O_1$ , and  $\hat{O}_1 \setminus \{0, 1\}$  otherwise. We have the relation

$$|\hat{O}_{1,NEW}| = 2|O'_1|. \quad (6.31)$$

Moreover,

$$\text{if } |\bar{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^3 |\bar{O}_i| > 0, \quad \text{then } \left| \hat{O}_{1,NEW} \cap \{1, 2\} \right| \leq 1. \quad (6.32)$$

Recall the definition of the function  $h_\sigma$  in (5.28). Similarly to (5.31) and (5.32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{3 \leq \ell \leq k} h_\sigma(\ell) &\geq \sum_{\ell \in \hat{O}_{1,NEW} \cap [3, k]} h_\sigma(\ell) \geq 2 \left| \hat{O}_{1,NEW} \cap [3, k] \right| \\ &= 2 \left( \left| \hat{O}_{1,NEW} \right| - \left| \hat{O}_{1,NEW} \cap \{1, 2\} \right| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.33)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{3 \leq \ell \leq k} h_\sigma(\ell) &= \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil \leq 2 < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \Lambda_{4k}(i, j) + 2 \sum_{3 \leq \lceil i/4 \rceil < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \Lambda_{4k}(i, j) \\
&= 2 \left( \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil \leq 2 < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \Lambda_{4k}(i, j) + \sum_{3 \leq \lceil i/4 \rceil < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \Lambda_{4k}(i, j) \right) - \sum_{\lceil i/4 \rceil \leq 2 < \lceil j/4 \rceil} \Lambda_{4k}(i, j) \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^6 |O'_i| - \left| \widehat{O}_{1,NEW} \cap \{1, 2\} \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

Combining (6.31), (6.33) and (6.34), we get

$$|O'_1| \leq \sum_{i=2}^6 |O'_i| + \frac{1}{2} \left| \widehat{O}_{1,NEW} \cap \{1, 2\} \right|. \tag{6.35}$$

Thus in any case, we have

$$|O'_1| \leq \sum_{i=2}^6 |O'_i| + 1. \tag{6.36}$$

Furthermore, if  $\sum_{i=1}^3 |\overline{O}_i| > 0$ , then by (6.32), we get

$$|O'_1| \leq \sum_{i=2}^6 |O'_i|. \tag{6.37}$$

Equation (6.30) now follows directly from (6.26), (6.37) and the implication

$$|\overline{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) + Y_2(\sigma) \text{ is odd} \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^6 |O'_i| > 0,$$

which is due to the evenness of  $h_\sigma(1)$  and  $h_\sigma(2)$  (see the line below (5.28)).

To prove (6.29), we note that all coefficients in front of  $|O_i|$  and  $|\overline{O}_i|$  in the right hand side of (6.25) are at least 2, except for  $|O'_3|$ . Hence, the only possible way to make  $Y'_3(\sigma) < |O'_1|$  is by requiring  $|O'_1| = 2$ ,  $|O'_3| = 1$ , and  $|O'_i| = 0$  for  $i = 2, 4, 5, 6$ . This implies that, there exists  $i_0 > 2$  such that  $h_\sigma(i_0) = 1$ , which again contradicts with the property that  $h_\sigma(\ell)$  is even for all  $\ell$ . Therefore, we prove (6.29).  $\square$

The second part of the right hand side of (6.28) is controlled by the following Lemma 6.2. Combining this result and Lemma 6.1, we deduce (6.28) and thus (6.24). Therefore, we finish (4.9).

**Lemma 6.2** If  $|\overline{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) > 0$  and  $|\overline{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) + Y_2(\sigma)$  is odd, then we have

$$\overline{Y}_3(\sigma) - |\overline{O}_1| \geq 5\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)). \tag{6.38}$$

Otherwise, we have

$$\overline{Y}_3(\sigma) - |\overline{O}_1| > 5\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)). \tag{6.39}$$

*Proof.* We shall only give a detailed proof of (6.38). The argument for (6.39) is similar. We first rewrite (6.38) in a more convenient form. Let  $Z$  be a  $4 \times 4$  matrix given by

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 5/2 & 3/2 & 3/2 \\ 5/2 & 6 & 5 & 5 \\ 3/2 & 5 & 2 & 3 \\ 3/2 & 5 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.40)$$

We observe that

$$\min \{Z(i, j) : i = 1 < j \text{ or } j = 1 < i\} = \frac{3}{2}, \quad \min \{Z(i, j) : i, j \geq 2\} = 2. \quad (6.41)$$

Let  $\mathcal{X}_0$  be the set of  $4 \times 4$  doubly sub-stochastic matrix with entries being 0 or 1,

$$\mathcal{X}_0 = \{X \in \{0, 1\}^{4 \times 4} : \forall 1 \leq j \leq 4, \sum_{i'=1}^4 X(i', j) \leq 1; \forall 1 \leq i \leq 4, \sum_{j'=1}^4 X(i, j') \leq 1\}.$$

Given three integer  $a_1, a_2, a_3$ , we define  $\mathcal{X}(a_1, a_2, a_3)$  to be the set

$$\{X \in \mathcal{X}_0 : X(1, 1) = a_1, \sum_{i=2}^4 X(1, i) + \sum_{i=2}^4 X(i, 1) = a_2, \sum_{i=2}^4 \sum_{j=2}^4 X(i, j) = a_3\}.$$

Clearly, given the values of  $|\overline{O}_1|, Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)$ , the  $4 \times 4$  matrix  $(\Lambda_{4k+4}(i, j))_{1 \leq i \leq 4, 5 \leq j \leq 8}$  has to belong to the set  $\mathcal{X}(|\overline{O}_1|, Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma))$ . Hence, by the definition of  $\overline{Y}_3(\sigma)$ , to prove (6.38), it suffices to prove

$$\min_{X \in \mathcal{X}(|\overline{O}_1|, Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma))} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} Z(i, j)X(i, j) \geq |\overline{O}_1| + \kappa(Y_1(\sigma) + Y_2(\sigma)). \quad (6.42)$$

The condition ' $|\overline{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) > 0$  and  $|\overline{O}_1| + Y_1(\sigma) + Y_2(\sigma)$  is odd' includes three cases.

Case ①:  $|\overline{O}_1| = 0, Y_1(\sigma) = 1$  and  $Y_2(\sigma) = 2$ . Since  $\kappa(1, 2) = 3/2$ , (6.42) becomes

$$\min_{X \in \mathcal{X}(0, 1, 2)} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} Z(i, j)X(i, j) \geq 15/2. \quad (6.43)$$

The condition  $X \in \mathcal{X}(0, 1, 2)$  implies

$$\sum_{i=2}^4 (X(i, 1) + X(1, i)) = 1,$$

and that there are two distinct pairs  $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2) \in [2, 4] \times [2, 4]$  such that  $X(i_1, j_1) = X(i_2, j_2) = 1$ . We consider the following two scenarios.

- If  $X(3, 3) = 1$ , say,  $(i_1, j_1) = (3, 3)$ , then we must have  $(i_2, j_2) \neq (3, 4)$  or  $(4, 3)$ . Hence  $Z(i_2, j_2) \geq 4$ . Consequently, by (6.41),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} Z(i, j)X(i, j) &\geq \frac{3}{2} \left( \sum_{i=2}^4 (X(i, 1) + X(1, i)) \right) + Z(3, 3) + Z(i_2, j_2) \\ &\geq \frac{3}{2} + 2 + 4 = \frac{15}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

- If  $X(3, 3) = 0$ , then both  $(i_1, j_1)$  and  $(i_2, j_2)$  are not equal to  $(3, 3)$ . Thus  $Z(i_1, j_1), Z(i_2, j_2) \geq 3$ , which implies that, by (6.41),

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} Z(i, j)X(i, j) \geq \frac{3}{2} + 3 + 3 = \frac{15}{2}.$$

Hence we have verified (6.43) in Case ①.

Case ②:  $|\overline{O}_1| = 0$ ,  $Y_1(\sigma) = 2$  and  $Y_2(\sigma) = 1$ . Then  $\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)) = 1$ . Using (6.41),

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} Z(i, j)X(i, j) \geq \frac{3}{2}Y_1(\sigma) + 2Y_2(\sigma) = 5 = 5\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)),$$

proving (6.42) in this case.

Case ③:  $|\overline{O}_1| = 1$ ,  $Y_1(\sigma) = 0$  and  $Y_2(\sigma) = 2$ . Then  $\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)) = 1$ . From the arguments in Case ①, we see that

$$\min_{X \in \mathcal{X}(1,0,2)} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} Z(i, j)X(i, j) \geq \min\{2 + 4, 3 + 3\} = 6 = |\overline{O}_1| + 5\kappa(Y_1(\sigma), Y_2(\sigma)).$$

We have verified (6.42) in all possible cases, and thus we deduce (6.38). The other statement (6.39) can be proved similarly.  $\square$

## 7. THE CASE OF GOE

**7.1. Pfaffian structure of GOE.** GOE is a Gaussian measure on the space of Hermitian matrices. The joint density of eigenvalues of GOE is given by (1.1) with  $\beta = 1$ . In this section, we use a superscript (1) to denote various quantities regarding GOE. The  $k$ -point correlation function of eigenvalues of GOE is [14]

$$\rho_{k,n}^{(1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) = \text{Pf} \left( JK_n^{(1)}(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}, \quad (7.1)$$

where

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K_n^{(1)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} S_n^{(1)}(x, y) + \alpha_n(x) & V_n^{(1)}(x, y) \\ J_n^{(1)}(x, y) & S_n^{(1)}(y, x) + \alpha_n(y) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.2)$$

Here,

$$\alpha_n(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2m+1}\varphi_{2m}(\sqrt{2m+1}x) / \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_{2m}(t)dt, & \text{if } n = 2m + 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } n = 2m, \end{cases}$$

and

$$S_n^{(1)}(x, y) = \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi_j(\sqrt{n}x) \varphi_j(\sqrt{n}y) + \frac{n}{2} \varphi_{n-1}(\sqrt{n}x) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon(\sqrt{n}y - t) \varphi_n(t) dt,$$

$$V_n^{(1)}(x, y) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y} S_n^{(1)}(x, y),$$

$$J_n^{(1)}(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon(x - t) S_n^{(1)}(t, y) dt - \varepsilon(x - y) + \gamma_n(x) - \gamma_n(y),$$

where

$$\gamma_n(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon(x-t) \alpha_n(t) dt,$$

and  $\varepsilon(x) = (1/2) \text{sign}(x)$  is  $1/2$ ,  $-1/2$  or  $0$  according as  $x > 0$ ,  $x < 0$  or  $x = 0$ ,

Let  $\widehat{K}_n^{(1)}$  be the rescaled version of  $K_n^{(1)}$  defined as in (3.5). As in the proof of Lemma 3.1, using the result in [12], we get

$$\left| \widehat{K}_n^{(1)} \left( x_0 + \frac{x}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)}, x_0 + \frac{y}{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(x_0)} \right) - K^{(1)}(x, y) \right| \lesssim \begin{bmatrix} n^{-1/2} & n^{-1} \\ n^{-1/2} & n^{-1/2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (7.3)$$

uniformly for  $|x|, |y| \lesssim n^{-1/2}$ . Here, the limiting kernel

$$K^{(1)}(x, y) = \begin{bmatrix} K_{\text{sin}}(x-y) & \partial_x K_{\text{sin}}(x-y) \\ \int_0^{x-y} K_{\text{sin}}(t) dt - \varepsilon(x-y) & K_{\text{sin}}(x-y) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.4)$$

In addition to the local scaling limit for  $K_n^{(1)}$ , we can also obtain global bounds for  $K_n^{(1)}$  and its derivatives. Indeed, one can check that Lemma 3.2 still holds true if we replace the GSE kernels  $S_n, V_n, J_n$  with GOE kernels  $S_n^{(1)} + \alpha_n, V_n^{(1)}, J_n^{(1)}$ , respectively. We do not repeat the details.

**7.2. Estimates of Pfaffians.** We follow the proof outline given in Section 4. Let  $A_n^{(1)} := n^{-3/2}A$ ,  $A \subset (0, +\infty)$ . As in the proof of GSE case, we separate  $L_{k,n}^{(1)}$  into the diagonal part  $L_{k,n,D}^{(1)}$  and the off-diagonal part  $L_{k,n,O}^{(1)}$ . Again, we denote by  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1)}$  the  $4k \times 4k$  correlation matrix so that

$$\rho_{2k,n}^{(1)}(\lambda_1, x_1, \dots, \lambda_k, x_k) = \text{Pf } \mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1)}.$$

Let  $M_{i,j}^{(1)}$  be the  $(i, j)$ -th block of  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1)}$  with size  $4 \times 4$ . Using the estimate (7.4), we have the uniform estimate for the diagonal part:

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{k,n,D}^{(1)}(\lambda, \dots, \lambda_k) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{\lambda_i + A_n^{(1)}} \text{Pf } M_{i,i}^{(1)} dx_i \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{n\rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i)A_n^{(1)}} n\rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) \left( 1 - K_{\text{sin}}^2(u) + \partial_u K_{\text{sin}}(u) \left( \int_0^u K_{\text{sin}}(t) dt + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) du \\ &\quad + O\left(n^{-1/2}\right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{n^{-1/2}\rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i)A} n\rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i) \left( \frac{\pi^2 u}{6} + O(u^2) \right) du + O\left(n^{-1/2}\right) \\ &= \left( \int_A \frac{u}{48\pi} du \right)^k \prod_{i=1}^k (2\pi\rho_{\text{sc}}(\lambda_i))^3 + O\left(n^{-1/2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

To control the off-diagonal part, we have to make two rounds of transformations to  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1)}$ , similar to those for GSE, which eventually change  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1)}$  to  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1,F)}$ . The only difference



is that we need to replace the factors  $n^{6/5}$  and  $n^{-6/5}$  with  $n^{3/2}$  and  $n^{-3/2}$ , respectively, in the definition (5.4). Ultimately, we can bound  $\mathbf{M}_{4k}^{(1,F)}$  from above by  $\mathbf{U}_{4k}^{(1)}$  in the entrywise sense as in Lemma 5.2, while this time the diagonal block  $U_{i,i}$  and off-diagonal block  $U_{i,j}$  ( $j > i$ ) are given by

$$U_{i,i}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & n & n^{3/2} & 1 \\ n & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ n^{3/2} & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_{i,j}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} n^{3/2} \log n & n^{1/2} & 1 & 1 \\ n^{1/2} & n^{-1/2} & n^{-1} & n^{-1} \\ 1 & n^{-1} & n^{-1/2} & n^{-1} \\ 1 & n^{-1} & n^{-1} & n^{-3/2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.6)$$

Define  $U_{4k}^{(1)}(\sigma)$  similarly to (5.12) and consider the set partitions given in Figure 1 and Figure 2. According to the growth order of  $n$  in  $U_{i,i}^{(1)}$ , we need to further decompose

$$D_2 := D_{2,1} \cup D_{2,2}, \quad (7.7)$$

where

$$D_{2,1} := \left\{ (i, j) \in [4k] \times [4k] : \lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}^{(1)}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, j \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \right\},$$

$$D_{2,2} := \left\{ (i, j) \in [4k] \times [4k] : \lceil i/4 \rceil = \lceil j/4 \rceil, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{4k}^{(1)}(i, j) = 1, i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, j \equiv 4 \pmod{4} \right\}.$$

By the estimates (7.6), we get

$$U_{4k}^{(1)}(\sigma) \lesssim (\log^C n) n^{\text{Ord}_4}, \quad (7.8)$$

where

$$\text{Ord}_4 = |D_1| + \frac{3}{2}|D_{2,1}| + \frac{3}{2}|O_1| + \frac{1}{2}|O_2| - \frac{1}{2}|O_4| - |O_5| - \frac{3}{2}|O_6|. \quad (7.9)$$

The constraint  $2|O_1| + |O_2| + |O_3| + |D_1| + |D_2| = k$  thus implies that  $\text{Ord}_4 \leq 3k/2$ . Moreover, the equality holds if and only if  $|D_{2,1}| = k$  and  $|O_i| = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq 6$ . In particular, we have

$$\text{Ord}_4 < \frac{3k}{2}, \quad \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{4k} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{4k}.$$

This implies that  $L_{k,n,O}^{(1)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , as desired. Analysis for  $E_{1,k,n}^{(1)}$  and  $E_{2,k,n}^{(2)}$  also follows from similar reasoning to those given for GSE, and we omit further details. Combining these estimates and recalling (7.5), we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the GOE case ( $\beta=1$ ).

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet and O. Zeitouni, *An introduction to random matrices*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 118. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [2] G. Ben Arous and P. Bourgade, Extreme gaps between eigenvalues of random matrices, *Ann. Probab.* 41 (2013), no. 4, 2648–2681.
- [3] P. Bourgade, Extreme gaps between eigenvalues of Wigner matrices. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 24 (2022), no. 8, 2823–2873.
- [4] P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, K. T-R. McLaughlin, S. Venakides and X. Zhou, Uniform asymptotics for polynomials orthogonal with respect to varying exponential weights and applications to universality questions in random matrix theory. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 1999, 52(11), 1335–1425.
- [5] B. Delyon and J. Yao, On the spectral distribution of Gaussian random matrices, *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica*, English Series 22, 297–312 (2006).

- [6] L. Erdős and H.-T. Yau, Gap universality of generalized Wigner and  $\beta$ -ensembles, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 17, 1927–2036.
- [7] A. Figalli and A. Guionnet, Universality in several-matrix models via approximate transport maps. *Acta Math.*, 217(1) 81–176, 2016.
- [8] R. Feng, G. Tian, and D. Wei, Small gaps of GOE, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 29 (2019), no. 6, 1794–1827.
- [9] R. Feng and D. Wei, Small gaps of circular  $\beta$ -ensemble, *Ann. Probab.* 49 (2021), no. 2, 997–1032.
- [10] R. Feng and D. Wei, Large gaps of CUE and GUE, arXiv:1807.02149.
- [11] I. S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of integrals, series, and products*. Translated from the Russian. Translation edited and with a preface by Alan Jeffrey and Daniel Zwillinger. Seventh edition. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2007.
- [12] T. Kriecherbauer and K. Schubert, Spacings: an example for universality in random matrix theory. *Random matrices and iterated random functions*, 45–71, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., 53, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [13] B. Landon, P. Lopatto and J. Marcinek, Comparison theorem for some extremal eigenvalue statistics, *Ann. Probab.* 48 (2020), no. 6, 2894–2919.
- [14] M. Mehta, *Random matrices*. Third edition. Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam), 142. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2004.
- [15] A. Soshnikov, Statistics of extreme spacing in determinantal random point processes, *Mosc. Math. J.* 5 705–719, 744.
- [16] T. Tao, The asymptotic distribution of a single eigenvalue gap of a Wigner matrix, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 157, 81–106 (2013).
- [17] J. Vinson, Closest spacing of eigenvalues, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, 2001.

SYDNEY MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.  
*Email address:* renjie.feng@sydney.edu.au

LSEC, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,  
BEIJING, CHINA, 100190.  
*Email address:* jiamingli19960730@163.com

RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, JIANGSU NORMAL UNIVERSITY, XUZHOU,  
CHINA, 221116.  
*Email address:* dongyao@jsnu.edu.cn