

# CONSISTENT NONPARAMETRIC ESTIMATION FOR HEAVY-TAILED SPARSE GRAPHS

CHRISTIAN BORGS, JENNIFER T. CHAYES, HENRY COHN, AND SHIRSHENDU GANGULY

ABSTRACT. We study graphons as a non-parametric generalization of stochastic block models, and show how to obtain compactly represented estimators for sparse networks in this framework. Our algorithms and analysis go beyond previous work in several ways. First, we relax the usual boundedness assumption for the generating graphon and instead treat arbitrary integrable graphons, so that we can handle networks with long tails in their degree distributions. Second, again motivated by real-world applications, we relax the usual assumption that the graphon is defined on the unit interval, to allow latent position graphs where the latent positions live in a more general space, and we characterize identifiability for these graphons and their underlying position spaces.

We analyze three algorithms. The first is a least squares algorithm, which gives an approximation we prove to be consistent for all square-integrable graphons, with errors expressed in terms of the best possible stochastic block model approximation to the generating graphon. Next, we analyze a generalization based on the cut norm, which works for any integrable graphon (not necessarily square-integrable). Finally, we show that clustering based on degrees works whenever the underlying degree distribution is atomless. Unlike the previous two algorithms, this third one runs in polynomial time.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	9
3. Least squares estimation	18
4. Cut norm estimation for general $L^1$ graphons	23
5. Graphon estimation via degree sorting	26
6. Hölder-continuous graphons	29
7. Power-law graphs	32
Acknowledgments	35
References	35
Appendix A. Couplings, metrics, and equivalence	37
Appendix B. Concentration bounds	40
Appendix C. Proofs of Lemmas 2.19, 2.20, and 2.21	43

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Motivated by numerous real-world technological, social, and biological networks, the study of large networks has become increasingly important. Much work in the statistics and machine learning communities has focused on the questions of modeling and estimation for these networks.

**1.1. Stochastic block models and  $W$ -random graphs.** Many previous papers have described these networks in terms of parametric models, one of the most popular being the stochastic block model, introduced in [42]. These models can be characterized by a vector of probabilities  $\mathbf{p} = (p_i)$  on a finite set of communities and a matrix  $B = (\beta_{ij})$  of “affinities.” Given these parameters, one

---

Ganguly was supported by an internship at Microsoft Research New England.

then generates a graph on labeled  $n$  nodes by assigning a community to each vertex, independently at random according to the probability distribution  $\mathbf{p}$ , and then connecting vertices belonging to communities  $i$  and  $j$  with probability  $\beta_{ij}$ . Hence the stochastic block model for  $k$  groups is determined by  $(k-1) + k(k+1)/2$  parameters. Such a model is often considered a reasonable approximation of a small social network characterized by a limited number of communities.

More recently, motivated by extremely large networks, researchers have begun to consider non-parametric stochastic block models, for which there is a continuous family of communities, i.e., for which the  $k \times k$  matrix of edge probabilities is replaced by a two-dimensional function. The non-parametric models we study in this paper are usually referred to as  $W$ -random graphs or latent position graphs. In the most general setup, such a model is defined in terms of a probability space<sup>1</sup>  $(\Omega, \pi)$  (the space of latent positions or features) and a *graphon*  $W$  over  $(\Omega, \pi)$ , defined as an integrable, non-negative function on  $\Omega \times \Omega$  that is symmetric in the sense that  $W(x, y) = W(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in \Omega$ . To generate a graph on  $n$  nodes, one then chooses  $n$  “positions”  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  i.i.d. at random from  $(\Omega, \pi)$  and, conditioned on these, chooses edges independently, with the probability of an edge between vertices  $i$  and  $j$  given by  $W(x_i, x_j)$ . The resulting graph is called a *W-random graph*.

As originally proposed in [41], the space of latent positions  $\Omega$  comes equipped with a metric and the probability of connection is a function of distance, but the more general setting we have described is commonly studied. Note that in the dense setting, this model is quite natural, since it can be shown [6, 32, 43] that if a random graph  $G$  is the restriction of (an ergodic component of) an infinite, exchangeable random graph, then  $G$  must be an instance of a  $W$ -random graph for some function  $W$  with values in  $[0, 1]$ . Due to this connection,  $W$ -random graph models are often called exchangeable graph models.

**1.2. Dense and sparse graphs.** To model sparse graphs in this non-parametric setup, one uses connection probabilities which are given by symmetric function  $W$  times a *target density*  $\rho$ , leading to the model of “inhomogeneous random graphs” defined in [11], with nodes  $i$  and  $j$  now being connected with probability  $\min\{1, \rho W(x_i, x_j)\}$ . For both dense and sparse graphs, this kind of model is related to the theory of convergent graph sequences [12, 15–19]. In the setting of dense graph limits,  $W$ -random graphs were first explicitly proposed in [53], although they can be implicitly traced back to the much earlier work of [43] and [6] mentioned above. The term graphon originated in [18].

While for dense graphs one only needs to consider bounded graphons (indeed, the results of [6, 43] imply that it is enough to consider graphons that take values in  $[0, 1]$ ), this boundedness assumption is not very natural for sparse graphs. Indeed, it is not hard to see that for bounded graphons  $W$ , all degrees in a  $W$ -random graph are of the same order (except in very sparse settings, where the maximum degree might differ from the average degree by a logarithmic factor). While this is no problem for dense graphs, since here the average degree is of the same order as the number of vertices, and hence automatically of the same order as the maximal degree, it is a serious restriction for sparse graphs. Indeed, many real-world networks have long-tailed degree distributions. For applications, one would therefore want to consider unbounded graphons  $W$ .

**1.3. Estimation and previous literature.** How can we estimate a graphon  $W$  given a sample  $G$  of a  $W$ -random graph? This problem encapsulates the idea of inferring the underlying structure in a random network.

For the special case where  $W$  is a stochastic block model, the estimation problem is closely related to the problem of graph partitioning and has been intensely studied in the literature [34, 42, 65], using methods that range from maximum likelihood estimates [64] and Gibbs sampling [60] or

<sup>1</sup>As usual, a full specification of the probability space  $(\Omega, \pi)$  requires the specification of a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  in addition to the underlying space  $\Omega$  and measure  $\pi$ . We will discuss measure-theoretic technicalities only when they seem important or could potentially cause confusion.

simulated annealing [45] to spectral clustering [13, 25, 30, 31, 55] and tensor algebra [8]. Proving consistency of these methods is often not hard in the dense regime, but it becomes more difficult for sparse graphs. See, for example, [50, 51] for a proof of consistency for spectral clustering when the average degree is as small as  $\log n$ , and [2, 3] for an effective algorithm that is provably consistent as long as the average degree diverges.

Estimating graphons that are not block models is more challenging. This problem is implicit in [46], but the first explicit discussion of the non-parametric problem we are aware of was given in [9], even though the actual consistency proof there is still limited to stochastic block models with a fixed number of blocks. The restriction to a fixed number of blocks was relaxed in [58] and [29]. The full non-parametric model was studied in [10], under the assumption that none of the eigenfunctions of the operator associated with the kernel  $W$  is orthogonal to the constant function 1 and the eigenvalues are distinct.

Many further papers have been written on graphon estimation, including [1, 5, 7, 20–23, 26–28, 35, 37–39, 47, 48, 52, 54, 56–58, 61, 63, 66–69]. Each paper makes different assumptions about the density and the underlying graphon. Strong results are known for dense graphs: [23] shows how to approximate arbitrary measurable graphons  $W$  with values in  $[0, 1]$  given a dense  $W$ -random graph, and [37] attains an optimal rate for least squares estimators of both stochastic block models and Hölder-continuous graphons from a dense graph. For sparse graphs, [66] proves convergence of a maximum likelihood estimator under the assumption that  $W$  is bounded, bounded away from 0, and Hölder-continuous. Most recently, [20] introduces a modified version of the least squares algorithm that optimizes over block models with bounded  $L^\infty$  norm; this algorithm achieves consistency for arbitrary bounded graphons and arbitrary densities, as long as the average degree diverges with the number of vertices. The same paper also gives a differentially private version of the least squares algorithm which works again for arbitrary bounded graphons, now requiring that the average degree grows at least like a logarithm of the number of vertices. Independently, [47] proposes and analyzes the modified (non-private) algorithm and proves matching upper and lower bounds for the rates achieved by this algorithm.

But more important than some of the technical assumptions used by previous authors is the fact that *all* the previous results we are aware of require  $W$  to be *bounded*. As pointed out before, this assumption, while natural for dense graphs, rules out most degree distributions observed in real-world networks. Our goal here is to remove this assumption.

**1.4. Identifiability.** Before summarizing our contributions, we need to discuss the fact that in general,  $W$  cannot be uniquely determined from the observation of even the full sequence  $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ , a problem called the identifiability issue in the literature; see, for example, [9, 22]. To discuss this, consider two graphons  $W$  and  $W'$  over two probability spaces  $(\Omega, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \pi')$ , as well as a measure-preserving map  $\phi: (\Omega, \pi) \rightarrow (\Omega', \pi')$ . Define the pullback of  $W'$  to  $\Omega$  as the graphon  $(W')^\phi$  defined by  $(W')^\phi(x, y) = W'(\phi(x), \phi(y))$ . It is not hard to see that then the sequences of random graphs generated from  $W$  and  $W'$  have the same distribution if  $W = (W')^\phi$ . While it was stated in some of the early literature on graphon estimation that the converse is true as well, that turns out to be false; see, for example, Example 2.7 below for a counterexample. To formulate the correct statement, we define  $W$  and  $W'$  to be *equivalent* if there exists a third graphon  $U$  over a probability space  $(\Omega'', \pi'')$  such that  $W = U^\phi$  and  $W' = U^\psi$  for two measure-preserving maps  $\phi, \psi$  from  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$  to  $\Omega''$ ; see Section 2.4 for more details.

With this definition, we are now ready to characterize the full extent to which  $W$  is not identifiable: *The sequences generated from two graphons  $W$  and  $W'$  are identically distributed if and only if  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent.* In the dense case, this was proved in [32] for the case where  $W$  and  $W'$  are defined over  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the uniform distribution, and for the case of general probability spaces it follows from the results of [14] by a simple argument involving subgraph counts. But for the sparse case, and general integrable (rather than bounded) graphons, this is a new result, proved

in this paper (Theorem 2.6 in Section 2.4). Thus, both the feature space  $(\Omega, \pi)$  and the graphon  $W$  are unobservable in general, and even if we fix the feature space there is no “canonical graphon” an estimation procedure can output. The best we can hope for is a representative from an equivalence class of graphons.

In light of these facts, the natural way of dealing with the identification problem is to admit that there is nothing canonical about any particular representative  $W$ , and to define consistency as consistency with respect to a metric between equivalence classes, rather than between graphons themselves. The papers [66] and [47] follow this strategy, by using a variant of the  $L^2$  metric which is a metric over equivalence classes. Most other papers either avoid the identifiability problem altogether, by redefining the problem as the problem of finding an approximation  $\hat{H}$  to the matrix  $H_n(W) = (W(x_i, x_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  (see, for example, [23] or [37]), or by making additional assumptions which guarantee the existence of a canonical representative, e.g., by postulating that  $W$  is defined over the interval  $[0, 1]$  and assuming that after a measure-preserving transformation, the “degrees”  $W_x = \int_0^1 W(x, y) dy$  are strictly monotone in  $x$ , in which case there *is* a canonical representative of the graphon  $W$ .

**1.5. Goals.** In this paper, we follow the spirit of [66] and define consistency with respect to a metric on equivalence classes of graphons, but in contrast to [66], we allow for more general spaces than just the uniform distribution over the unit interval.<sup>2</sup> To define our notion of distance, we recall that a *coupling* between two probability measures  $\pi, \pi'$  is a measure  $\nu$  on the product space such that the projections of  $\nu$  to the two coordinates are equal to  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$ , respectively. Given  $p \geq 1$  and two  $L^p$  graphons  $W$  over  $(\Omega, \pi)$  and  $W'$  over  $(\Omega', \pi')$  (i.e., graphons such that  $\int_{\Omega} |W|^p d\pi < \infty$  and  $\int_{\Omega'} |W'|^p d\pi' < \infty$ ), we then define the distance  $\delta_p(W, W')$  by

$$(1.1) \quad \delta_p(W, W') = \inf_{\nu} \left( \int |W(x, y) - W'(x', y')|^p d\nu(x, x') d\nu(y, y') \right)^{1/p},$$

where the infimum is over all couplings  $\nu$  of  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$ .

Having defined a metric on equivalence classes of graphons, we can now formulate the estimation problem considered in this paper: *Given a single instance of a  $W$ -random graph defined on an unobserved probability space  $(\Omega, \pi)$ , find an algorithm that (a) outputs an estimator  $\widehat{W}$  such that  $\widehat{W}$  has a *concise representation* whose size grows only slowly with  $n$ ; (b) estimates  $W$  consistently *assuming just integrability conditions*; (c) works for *arbitrary target densities*, as long as the graph is not too sparse (say has divergent average degree); and (d) runs in *polynomial time*.*

While efficiency (property (d)) is clearly important for practical applications, our main focus in this paper will be the fundamental problem of consistent estimation under as few restrictions on  $W$  as possible, i.e., algorithms achieving properties (a)–(c). Indeed, none of the three algorithms we study in this paper achieves all four properties. Two of them achieve (a)–(c), and hence solve the desired problem of consistent estimation, but do not run in polynomial time. The third achieves (a), (c), and (d), and hence is efficient, but requires an additional condition to ensure consistency.

**1.6. Summary of results.** In this paper, our estimator  $\widehat{W}$  will be given in terms of a block model, with a number of blocks that grows slowly with the number of vertices of the input graph. Given this framework, it is natural to compare the performance of our algorithm to the best possible block model in a suitable class of block models. Here we consider the class  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa} = \{(\mathbf{p}, B) : \min_i p_i \geq \kappa\}$

<sup>2</sup>Note that from a purely measure theoretic approach to  $W$ -random graphs, one can restrict oneself to graphons over the unit interval without any loss of generality, since every integrable graphon  $W$  is equivalent to a graphon  $W'$  defined over  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the uniform distribution; see Theorem 2.9 in Section 2.4. However, when  $W$  is given in an application, it is often a continuous function over a higher dimensional space, and while  $W'$  leads to the same distribution of  $W$ -random graphs, the transformation from  $W$  to  $W'$  ruins continuity, which is often needed to prove good approximation bounds. For applications, the general setup is therefore more natural.

of all block models with minimal block size at least  $\kappa$ . For an approximation outputting a block model in  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq\kappa}$ , the best error we could achieve is

$$(1.2) \quad \varepsilon_{\geq\kappa}^{(p)}(W) = \inf_{W' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq\kappa}} \delta_p(W, W').$$

We often refer to this benchmark as an *oracle error*, since it is the best an oracle with access to the unknown  $W$  could do. Our goal is to prove *oracle inequalities* that bound the estimation error in terms of the oracle error, as well as a few additional terms that account for variance and the visibility of heavy tails at finite scale.

When establishing the estimation error for  $W$ , we usually first prove a bound on the estimation error for the intermediate matrix  $Q_n = (\min\{1, \rho W(x_i, x_j)\})_{i,j \in [n]}$ , which will be expressed in terms of an oracle error for  $Q_n$  plus a concentration error stemming from the fact that, even after conditioning on  $Q_n$ , the observed graph  $G_n$  is random; see Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.2 below. In a second step, we then prove consistency for the original estimation error, given bounds that estimate the difference between  $\widehat{W}$  and  $W$ . Note that part of the literature stops at the first step, effectively avoiding the identifiability issue discussed above.

In this paper, we consider three algorithms for producing a block model approximation to  $W$  from a single instance of a  $W$ -random graph  $G$ : two inefficient ones and one whose running time is polynomial in  $n$ .

- (1) The well-known *least squares algorithm*, which has been analyzed under various additional assumptions on  $W$ , until recently [20] not even covering arbitrary bounded graphons. Here we will prove consistency of this algorithm in the metric  $\delta_2$  for arbitrary  $L^2$  graphons.
- (2) A *least cut norm algorithm*, which we prove to be consistent under the cut norm for arbitrary  $L^1$  graphons.
- (3) A *degree sorting algorithm*, which we show is consistent whenever the degree distribution of  $W$  is atomless. (Graphons with this property are equivalent to graphons over  $[0, 1]$  such that  $W_x = \int_0^1 W(x, y) dy$  is strictly monotone in  $x$ .) This algorithm runs in polynomial time.

To state our results, we need a few definitions. As usual,  $[n]$  denotes the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Given an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$ , we use  $\|A\|_p$  to denote its  $L^p$  norm, defined by  $\|A\|_p^p = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} |A_{ij}|^p$ . Given a graph  $G$  on  $[n]$ , we use  $A(G)$  to denote the adjacency matrix of  $G$ , and  $\rho(G) = \|A(G)\|_1$  to denote its density. We identify partitions of  $[n]$  into  $k$  classes (some of which can be empty) with maps  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ , where  $V_i = V_i(\pi) = \pi^{-1}(\{i\})$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  class of the partition. Given such a map and a  $k \times k$  matrix  $B$ , we will use  $B^\pi$  for the  $n \times n$  matrix with entries  $B_{\pi(i), \pi(j)}$ . Finally, for an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$ , we use  $A_\pi$  to denote the matrix where for each  $(x, y) \in V_i \times V_i$ , the matrix element  $A_{xy}$  is replaced by the average over  $V_i \times V_j$ , and  $A/\pi$  to denote the  $k \times k$  matrix of block averages

$$(A/\pi)_{ij} = \frac{1}{|V_i||V_j|} \sum_{(u,v) \in V_i \times V_j} A_{uv},$$

defined to be 0 if either  $V_i$  or  $V_j$  is empty; note that the two are related by  $A_\pi = (A/\pi)^\pi$ .

Throughout this paper, we will assume that the graph is sparse (in the sense that  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ ), but that it has divergent average degree (i.e., we assume that  $n\rho \rightarrow \infty$ ). Under these assumptions we will prove the following results.

*Least squares algorithm.* Given an input graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices and a parameter  $\kappa \in (0, 1]$  such that  $\kappa n \geq 1$ , let

$$(1.3) \quad (\hat{\pi}, \hat{B}) \in \underset{\pi, B}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|A(G) - B^\pi\|_2,$$

where the optimization is over all  $k \times k$  matrices  $B$  and all partitions  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  such that all non-empty classes of  $\pi$  have size at least  $\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ , with  $k$  chosen such that it can accommodate all such

partitions, say  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{n\kappa} \rceil$ . Setting  $\hat{p}_i$  to be the relative size of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partition class of  $\hat{\pi}$ , i.e.,

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{1}{n} |V_i(\hat{\pi})|,$$

the least squares algorithm then outputs the block model  $\widehat{W} = (\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \hat{B})$ . Note that the above minimization problem is slightly helped by the fact that we minimize the  $L^2$  norm. For a given  $\pi$ , the minimizer  $\hat{B}$  can therefore be obtained by averaging  $A(G)$  over the classes of  $\pi$ , showing that  $\hat{B}$  is of the form  $A(G)/\pi$ . Nevertheless the algorithm is inefficient, since we still need to minimize over partitions  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ .

Our main result concerning this algorithm is that if  $G$  is a  $W$ -random graph at target density  $\rho$  and  $W \in L^2$ , then the algorithm is consistent in the sense that

$$\delta_2 \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{W}, \frac{1}{\|W\|_1} W \right) \rightarrow 0$$

with probability one as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , as long as  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$  and  $\kappa^{-2} \log(1/\kappa) = o(n\rho)$ . If instead of almost sure convergence we content ourselves with convergence in probability, then for  $\kappa \in (n^{-1}, 1]$  and  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2} = O(\rho n)$ , we have the oracle inequality

$$\delta_2 \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \widehat{W}, W \right) = O_p \left( \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) + \sqrt[4]{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 \rho n}} + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{\kappa n}} + \text{tail}_{\rho}^{(2)}(W) \right),$$

when  $\|W\|_1 = 1$ , where  $\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(2)}(W)$  is a term which measures the difference between  $W$  and  $\frac{1}{\rho} \min\{1, \rho W\}$  in the  $L^2$  norm; see Theorem 3.1 for the details.

The four error terms above arise for different reasons: first, when estimating the  $L^2$  distance between the matrix of probabilities  $Q_n$  and the estimator  $\widehat{W}$ , one encounters an oracle error for  $Q_n$  and a concentration error, the latter being the second term in the above bound. Second, one encounters an additional error when bounding the oracle error for  $Q_n$  in terms of the oracle error for  $W$ . Since  $Q_n$  is random, this involves another concentration error, which is the third term in the bound above. Finally, we need to estimate the  $\delta_2$  distance between  $W$  and  $\frac{1}{\rho} Q_n$ , which involves both bounding the distance between  $W$  and  $\frac{1}{\rho} \min\{1, \rho W\}$ , and the distance between  $\min\{1, \rho W\}$  and  $Q_n$ . It turns out that the latter error can be absorbed in the other terms present above, while the former leads to the term  $\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(2)}(W)$ .

Note that the term  $\sqrt[4]{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 \rho n}}$  in the oracle inequality is larger than the next term  $\sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{\kappa n}}$  when  $\rho \leq 1/\log n$ . We have included both terms to handle the case in which  $\rho$  is large enough that the latter term dominates, but  $\sqrt[4]{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 \rho n}}$  should be viewed as the primary term.

For general graphons, our results do not give explicit error bounds, since all we know is that  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$  and  $\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(2)}(W)$  go to 0 as  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$  and  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ . But in many applications, one has additional information on the generating graphon, for example that it is actually a stochastic block model with a fixed number of classes, in which case both  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$  and  $\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(2)}(W)$  become identically zero once  $\kappa$  and  $\rho$  are small enough, leaving us only with the explicit terms in the above bound.

Another class of examples is  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous graphons over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with a probability measure that decays fast enough to make the function  $|x|^\beta$  integrable. This class encompasses many models of latent position spaces used in practice. When  $W$  is  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous and  $|x|^\beta$  is integrable with  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta > 2\alpha$ , we prove that  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) = O(\kappa^{\alpha'})$  and  $\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(2)}(W) = O(\rho^{\beta'})$  for some  $\alpha', \beta' > 0$ , with  $\alpha' = \alpha/d$  and  $\beta' = \infty$  in the simple case of the uniform distribution over a box of the form  $[-R, R]^d$ . See Propositions 6.1 and 6.3 in Section 6 below.

This scaling behavior for the oracle error and tail bounds is typical. We have stated the oracle inequality in full generality, but when the graphon is sufficiently well behaved to estimate the

oracle error and tail bounds, one can balance the error terms and derive the scaling rate for  $\kappa$  that optimizes these bounds. For example, suppose the error bound is

$$O_p\left(\kappa^{\alpha'} + \sqrt[4]{\frac{1 + \log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 \rho n}} + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{\kappa n}} + \rho^{\beta'}\right).$$

Choosing  $\kappa$  proportional to  $\left(\frac{\log(\rho n)}{\rho n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4\alpha'+2}}$  optimizes this bound (assuming  $n\rho \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) and yields an error bound of

$$O_p\left(\left(\frac{\log(\rho n)}{\rho n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha'}{4\alpha'+2}} + \rho^{\beta'}\right),$$

which becomes  $O_p\left(\left(\frac{\log(\rho n)}{\rho n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{4\alpha+2d}}\right)$  in the case of an  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous graphon over  $[-R, R]^d$  equipped with the uniform distribution.

*Least cut norm algorithm.* To give an explicit description of the least cut norm algorithm, we need the notion of the cut norm, first introduced in [36]. For an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$ , it is defined as

$$(1.4) \quad \|A\|_{\square} = \max_{S, T \subseteq [n]} \frac{1}{n^2} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in S \times T} A_{ij} \right|.$$

One way to define the least cut norm algorithm would be to output a block model defined in terms of the minimizer of  $\|A(G) - B^{\pi}\|_{\square}$ . But since we now need to minimize the cut norm rather than an  $L^2$  norm, this would involve yet another optimization problem to find the best matrix  $B$  for each distribution  $\pi$ . To circumvent this issue, we always obtain  $B$  by averaging. In other words, we calculate

$$(1.5) \quad \hat{\pi} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi} \|A(G) - (A(G))_{\pi}\|_{\square},$$

where the argmin is again over partitions  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  such that every non-empty partition class has size at least  $\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ . The least cut norm algorithm then outputs the block average corresponding to  $\hat{\pi}$ ; i.e., it outputs the block model  $\widehat{W} = (\hat{\mathbf{p}}, \hat{B})$  where  $\hat{p}_i$  is again the relative size of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  partition class of  $\hat{\pi}$  and  $\hat{B} = A(G)/\hat{\pi}$ .

We will show that the least cut norm algorithm is consistent in the cut metric  $\delta_{\square}$  on graphons, defined similar to  $\delta_p$ , except that now we use the cut norm instead of the  $L^p$  norm  $\|\cdot\|_p$ ; see (2.3) below for the precise definition. More precisely, we will show that a.s., the error in the  $\delta_{\square}$  distance goes to zero for a  $W$ -random graph  $G$  if  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$  in such a way that  $\kappa^{-1} = o\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$ . In addition to consistency, we will again show a quantitative bound, this time stating that for an arbitrary normalized  $L^1$  graphon  $W$  and  $\kappa \in \left(\frac{\log n}{n}, 1\right]$ ,

$$\delta_{\square}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) = O_p\left(\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\kappa n}} + \operatorname{tail}_{\rho}^{(1)}(W)\right);$$

see Theorem 4.1 in Section 4. The four error terms have the same explanation as the error terms for the least squares algorithm: the oracle error for  $W$ , a concentration error appearing when estimating the cut norm error with respect to  $Q_n$ , a concentration error stemming from the random nature of the oracle error for  $Q_n$ , and a tail bound stemming from the fact that for unbounded graphons, the matrix  $Q_n$  generating  $G_n$  involves a truncation of the entries which are larger than 1. For Hölder-continuous graphons over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we can again give explicit error bounds of the form  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) = O(\kappa^{\alpha'})$  and  $\operatorname{tail}_{\rho}^{(1)}(W) = O(\rho^{\beta'})$ ; see Propositions 6.1 and 6.3 in Section 6.

*Degree sorting algorithm.* The last algorithm we consider in this paper is the degree sorting algorithm, which proceeds as follows. Given a degree  $G$  on  $n$  vertices with vertex degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_n$ ,

we sort the vertices by choosing a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[n]$  such that

$$d_{\sigma(1)} \geq d_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq d_{\sigma(n)}.$$

To separate the sorted vertices into  $k$  classes of nearly equal size, we choose integers  $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_k = n$  such that

$$\left| n_i - \frac{in}{k} \right| < 1,$$

and we define  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  by  $\pi(j) = i$  if  $n_{i-1} < \sigma(j) \leq n_i$ . Thus,  $\pi$  groups the vertices into  $k$  classes, sorted by degree. The output of the algorithm is the block model  $\widehat{W} = (\widehat{\rho}, \widehat{B})$  with  $\widehat{\rho}_i = 1/k$  and  $\widehat{B} = A(G)/\pi$ . In other words, we simply cluster vertices with similar degrees, and then average over these clusters.

This algorithm has the advantage of being very efficient, but it has no hope of working unless the degrees suffice to distinguish between the vertices. More precisely, we need the limiting distribution of normalized degrees to be atomless (i.e., there should not exist a nonzero fraction of the vertices with nearly the same degree). If  $G$  is a  $W$ -random graph, then we can express the limiting degree distribution as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in terms of  $W$ . We do so in Section 2.6. If the degree distribution of  $W$  is atomless, then the degree sorting algorithm is consistent in the sense that  $\delta_1(\rho^{-1}\widehat{W}, W) \rightarrow 0$  almost surely, provided that the number  $k$  of classes tends to infinity in such a way that  $\log k = o(n\rho_n)$  and  $k = o(n\sqrt{\rho_n})$ . See Theorem 5.1 for a precise statement.

*Graphs with power-law degree distribution.* As an example of random graphs which require unbounded graphons, we consider two simple models for graphs with power-law degree distributions. Both are generated by graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , with the first one given by  $W(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(g(x) + g(y))$ , where  $g(x) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - x)^{-\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and the second one given by  $W(x, y) = g(x)g(y)$ . Both can be seen to have a degree distribution with density function  $f(\lambda) = \Theta(\lambda^{-(1+1/\alpha)})$ , i.e., a power-law degree distribution with exponent  $1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}$ . Both graphons are in  $L^p$  as long as  $1 \leq p < \frac{1}{\alpha}$ .

It turns out that the first graphon can be expressed as an equivalent Hölder-continuous graphon over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with a heavy-tailed distribution, while this is not possible for the second; see Section 7 for details. But both fit into our general theory, implying consistency for all three algorithms without any additional work, and both allow for explicit bounds similar to the ones obtained for Hölder-continuous graphons, even though only one of them can actually be expressed as a Hölder-continuous graphon. See Lemma 7.1 for the precise estimates.

**1.7. Comparison with related results.** As discussed above, our primary contribution in this paper is to analyze the case of unbounded graphons, thus removing the restriction to networks in which all the degrees are of the same order. We also formulate our results over general probability spaces, which increases their applicability. (One can always pass to an equivalent graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , but standardizing the underlying space prevents taking advantage of any smoothness or regularity the graphon possesses, because these properties are not invariant under equivalence.)

Least squares estimation is of course not a novel idea. Motivated by results of Choi and Wolfe [28] on estimating block models, Wolfe and Olhede proved consistency of least squares estimation for bounded graphons given sparse graphs (in an updated version of [66] that has not yet, as of this writing, been circulated publicly), under the additional hypotheses of Hölder continuity and being bounded away from zero. Borgs, Chayes, and Smith [20] and Klopp, Tsybakov, and Verzelen [47] proved consistency for bounded graphons, again given sparse graphs, with no additional assumptions, but they did not handle the unbounded case. Our paper thus completes the analysis of this important algorithm, by extending it to the full range of graphons that describe sparse networks.

Bounded graphons are automatically square-integrable, but that is not necessarily true for unbounded graphons. Least squares estimation is an appropriate technique only for  $L^2$  graphons, and we propose least cut norm estimation as a substitute that is applicable to arbitrary graphons.

Exact optimization is asymptotically inefficient for both the least squares and the least cut norm algorithms. Thus, our consistency results should be viewed not as a proposal that exact optimization should be carried out in practice for large networks, but rather as a benchmark for approximate or heuristic optimization.

Degree sorting has the advantage of efficiency, although it works only for graphons whose degrees are sufficiently well distributed. The idea of clustering vertices according to degree has a long history (see, for example, [33]), as well as connections with the theory of random graphs with a given degree sequence [24, 49]. Degree sorting has recently been analyzed as a graphon estimation algorithm by Chan and Airolidi [22]. They showed that their sorting and smoothing algorithm is consistent for dense graphs under a two-sided Lipschitz conditions on the degrees of the underlying graphon. Our analysis accommodates sparse graphs and even unbounded graphons, while avoiding these Lipschitz conditions.

**1.8. Organization.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 covers preliminary definitions and results, including equivalence and identifiability, random graph convergence, and degree distributions. Our three main algorithms are analyzed in Sections 3, 4, and 5. Section 6 examines how our bounds behave given a greater degree of regularity than we assume elsewhere in the paper (namely, Hölder continuity). Finally, Section 7 analyzes two examples of graphons that yield power-law degree distributions.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Notation.** As usual, we use  $[n]$  to denote the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . The density of an  $n \times n$  matrix  $H$  is defined as  $\rho(H) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} H_{ij}$ , and the density  $\rho(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is defined as the density of its adjacency matrix.<sup>3</sup> We use  $\lambda$  to denote the standard Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$  (or, when we do not expect this to create confusion, for the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]^2$ ). We use  $\Delta_k$  to denote the simplex of probability measures on  $[k]$ , i.e.,  $\Delta_k = \{\mathbf{p} = (p_i) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k : \sum_i p_i = 1\}$ . The notation  $O_p$  means big- $O$  in probability: if  $X$  and  $Y$  are random variables, then  $X = O_p(Y)$  means for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists an  $M$  such that  $|X| \leq M|Y|$  with probability at least  $1 - \varepsilon$ .

Finally, we use the abbreviation a.s. for “almost surely” or “almost sure” and i.i.d. for “independent and identically distributed.”

We will also consider general probability spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega$  and  $\pi$  is a probability measure on  $\Omega$  with respect to  $\mathcal{F}$ . As usual, a map  $\phi: (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi) \rightarrow (\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  is called *measure preserving* if for all  $F' \in \mathcal{F}'$ ,  $\phi^{-1}(F') \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\pi(\phi^{-1}(F')) = \pi'(F')$ . We call such a map an *isomorphism* if it is a bijection and its inverse is measure preserving as well, and an *isomorphism modulo 0* if, after removing sets of measure zero from  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$ , it becomes an isomorphism between the resulting probability spaces.

In addition to the distance  $\delta_p$ , we also consider the (in general larger) distance  $\hat{\delta}_p(A, B)$  between two  $n \times n$  matrices  $A, B$ , defined as

$$(2.1) \quad \hat{\delta}_p(A, B) = \min_{\sigma} \|A^{\sigma} - B\|_p,$$

where the minimum is over all bijections  $\sigma: [n] \rightarrow [n]$ , the matrix  $A^{\sigma}$  is defined by  $(A^{\sigma})_{ij} = A_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}$ , and the  $L^p$  norm of an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  is defined by  $\|A\|_p^p = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} |A_{ij}|^p$ . Note that by definition,  $\hat{\delta}_p(A, B)$  is a distance invariant under relabeling; i.e., it is a distance on equivalence classes of  $n \times n$  matrices with respect to relabeling of the “vertices” in  $[n]$ . We will need a similar version of the cut distance  $\|A - B\|_{\square}$ . It is defined as

$$(2.2) \quad \hat{\delta}_{\square}(A, B) = \min_{\sigma} \|A^{\sigma} - B\|_{\square},$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that the density of a simple graph is often defined as the number of non-zero entries in  $A(G)$  divided by  $\binom{n}{2}$ ; this definition is related to ours by a multiplicative factor  $\frac{n-1}{n}$ , which becomes irrelevant as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

where the minimum is again over all bijections  $\sigma: [n] \rightarrow [n]$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\square}$  is defined in (1.4).

Note also that the  $L^2$  norm is related to a scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  via  $\|A\|_2^2 = \langle A, A \rangle$ , with the scalar product between two  $n \times n$  matrices  $A, B$  defined as

$$\langle A, B \rangle = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} A_{ij} B_{ij}.$$

**2.2. Graphons and the cut metric.** Given a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$ , a measurable function  $W: \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called symmetric if  $W(x, y) = W(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in \Omega$ . We call such a function a *graphon* if it takes non-negative values and  $\|W\|_1 < \infty$ , where as usual, the  $L^p$  norm of a function  $f: \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by  $\|f\|_p^p = \int_{\Omega \times \Omega} |f(x, y)|^p d\pi(x) d\pi(y)$ . We call  $W$  an  $L^p$  graphon if  $\|W\|_p < \infty$ , and we say that  $W$  is *normalized* if  $\|W\|_1 = 1$ .

We will refer to  $W$  as a graphon over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$ , or often just as a graphon over  $\Omega$  when the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  and the probability measure  $\pi$  are clear from the context. For example, when we say that  $W$  is a graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , we mean that  $W$  is a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and the uniform measure, unless stated otherwise. Note that graphs are special cases of graphons: given a graph with vertex set  $V$  and adjacency matrix  $A$ , we view it as a graphon on  $V$  by equipping  $V$  with the uniform distribution and choosing  $W(u, v)$  to be  $A_{uv}$ .

In addition to the  $L^p$  norm of a graphon  $W$ , we will also use the cut norm  $\|W\|_{\square}$ , defined as

$$\|W\|_{\square} = \sup_{S, T \subseteq \Omega} \left| \int_{S \times T} W(x, y) d\pi(x) d\pi(y) \right|,$$

where the supremum is over measurable subsets of  $\Omega$  (i.e., elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ ). The corresponding metric is defined for a pair of graphons  $W$  and  $W'$  on two probability spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  by

$$(2.3) \quad \delta_{\square}(W, W') = \inf_{\nu} \sup_{S, T \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega'} \left| \int_{S \times T} (W(x, y) - W'(x', y')) d\nu(x, x') d\nu(y, y') \right|,$$

where the infimum is over couplings  $\nu$  of the two measures  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  and the supremum is over measurable subsets of  $\Omega \times \Omega'$ . Because graphs are special cases of graphons, this in particular defines a distance between a graph and an arbitrary graphon.

*Remark 2.1.* We will often consider graphons over  $[0, 1]$  (with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra unless otherwise specified). For such graphons, both the cut distance  $\delta_{\square}$  and the  $L^p$  distance  $\delta_p$  can be defined in a simpler way. Specifically,

$$(2.4) \quad \delta_p(W, W') = \inf_{\Phi} \|W^{\Phi} - W'\|_p \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{\square}(W, W') = \inf_{\Phi} \|W^{\Phi} - W'\|_{\square},$$

where the infima over  $\Phi$  are over isomorphisms from  $[0, 1]$  to itself. In fact, this simpler definition is equivalent to the definitions (1.1) and (2.3) for many spaces used in practice, as long as they are atomless; see Lemma A.1 in Appendix A for the precise setting. Lemma A.1 also shows that for many spaces of interest, in particular both the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  with the uniform distribution and any finite probability space, the infima in the expressions (1.1) and (2.3) are actually minima.

**2.3.  $W$ -random graphs.** Given a normalized graphon  $W$  and a *target density*  $\rho$ , we define two random graphs  $Q_n(\rho W)$  and  $G_n(\rho W)$  on  $[n]$  as follows. First, we choose i.i.d. elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  from the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$ ; these elements will index the vertices of the graphs. Let  $Q_n = Q_n(\rho W)$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix whose  $ij$  entry is equal to  $\min\{1, \rho W(x_i, x_j)\}$  if  $i \neq j$  and 0 if  $i = j$ . We view  $Q_n$  as a weighted graph on  $n$  vertices, and we define a corresponding unweighted graph  $G_n$  by including the edge between vertices  $i$  and  $j$  with probability  $(Q_n)_{ij}$  (independently for each  $i$  and  $j$ ). We call  $Q_n$  a *weighted  $W$ -random graph* at target density  $\rho$ , and  $G_n$  a  *$W$ -random graph* at target density  $\rho$ .

In addition to the graph  $G_n(\rho W)$  and the weighted graph  $Q_n(\rho W)$ , we will sometimes also consider the weighted graph  $H_n(W)$ , defined as weighted graph with entries  $(H_n(W))_{ij} = W(x_i, x_j)$

for  $i \neq j$ , and  $(H_n(W))_{ii} = 0$ ; in contrast to the definitions of  $G_n(\rho W)$  and  $Q_n(\rho W)$ , which we will only use for graphons, the latter notation will be used even if  $W$  takes values in  $\mathbb{R}$ , rather than in  $[0, \infty)$ .

Since  $G_n$ ,  $Q_n$ , and  $H_n$  are trivial for  $n = 1$ , we will always assume that  $n \geq 2$  without explicitly stating this.

*Remark 2.2.* The expected densities of the graphs  $Q_n$  and  $G_n$  are  $\|\min\{1, \rho W\}\|_1$ , which is  $\rho$  when  $\rho W$  is bounded above by 1 and  $W$  is normalized, and which is  $(1 + o(1))\rho$  if  $\rho = \rho_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . That is why we call  $\rho$  the target density for  $Q_n$  and  $G_n$ .

Note that many models of random graphs can be written as  $W$ -random graphs.

**Example 2.3** (Stochastic block model on  $k$  blocks). Let  $\Omega = [k]$ , and let the probability distribution  $\pi$  on  $\Omega$  be given by a vector  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Delta_k$ . Setting  $W(i, j) = \beta_{ij}$  for some symmetric matrix  $B = (\beta_{ij})$  of non-negative numbers then describes the standard stochastic block model.<sup>4</sup> with parameters  $(\mathbf{p}, B)$  We denote the set of all block models on  $k$  blocks by  $\mathcal{B}_k$  and use  $\mathcal{B}$  to denote the union  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{B}_k$ . For  $\kappa \in (0, 1/2]$ , we use  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  to denote all block models  $(\mathbf{p}, B)$  such that  $p_i \geq \kappa$  for all  $i$ .

Alternatively, we can use the uniform distribution over the interval  $[0, 1]$  as our probability space. Then we define  $\widetilde{W}$  by first partitioning  $[0, 1]$  into  $k$  adjacent intervals of lengths  $p_1, \dots, p_k$ , and then setting  $\widetilde{W}$  equal to  $\beta_{ij}$  on  $I_i \times I_j$ . Note that the random graphs generated by  $W$  and  $\widetilde{W}$  are equal in distribution. We denote the graphon  $\widetilde{W}$  by  $W[\mathbf{p}, B]$ , or by  $W[B]$  if all the probabilities  $p_i$  are equal. (We will also sometimes abuse notation by identifying it with  $W$ , when this does not seem likely to cause confusion.)

**Example 2.4** (Mixed membership stochastic block model). To express the mixed membership block model of [4] as a  $W$ -random graph, we define  $\Omega$  to be the  $k$  dimensional simplex  $\Delta_k$  and equip it with a Dirichlet distribution with some parameters  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ . In other words, the probability density at  $(p_1, \dots, p_k)$  is proportional to

$$\prod_i p_i^{\alpha_i - 1}.$$

Given a symmetric matrix  $(\beta_{ij})$  of non-negative numbers, we then define

$$W(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}') = \sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij} p_i p'_j.$$

As in the stochastic block model,  $\beta_{ij}$  describes the affinity between communities  $i$  and  $j$ , but now each vertex is assigned a probability distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  over the set of communities (rather than being assigned a single community).

**2.4. Equivalence and identifiability.** In this section, we determine when two different graphons lead to sequences of random graphs that are indistinguishable, in the sense that they are equal in distribution. As we will see, this is the case if and only if the two graphons are equivalent according to the following definition.

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $W$  and  $W'$  be graphons over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ . We call  $W$  and  $W'$  *equivalent*<sup>5</sup> if there exist two measure-preserving maps  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  to

<sup>4</sup>We will not restrict the entries to be bounded by 1, since we want to consider normalized graphons, which become trivial if all entries are bounded by 1.

<sup>5</sup>Our notion of equivalence is closely related to the notion of “weak isomorphism” from [14], the only difference being that in [14] the maps  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  were required to be measure preserving with respect to the completion of the spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ . We will not use the term weak isomorphism since we want to avoid the impression that it implies that the underlying probability spaces are isomorphic after removing suitable sets of measure 0. It does not; see Example 2.7 for two equivalent graphons on non-isomorphic probability spaces.

a third probability space  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', \pi'')$  and a graphon  $U$  on  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', \pi'')$ , such that  $W = U^\phi$  and  $W' = U^{\phi'}$  almost everywhere. We call  $W$  and  $W'$  *isomorphic modulo 0* if there exists a map  $\phi: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$  such that  $\phi$  is an isomorphism modulo 0 and  $W = (W')^\phi$  almost everywhere.

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $W$  and  $W'$  be graphons over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ , respectively. Assume that  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$  and that either  $\rho_n \max\{\|W\|_\infty, \|W'\|_\infty\} \leq 1$  or  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then the sequences  $(G_n(\rho_n W))_{n \geq 0}$  and  $(G_n(\rho_n W'))_{n \geq 0}$  are identically distributed if and only if  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent.*

For the dense case and bounded graphons, this follows from the results of [14] and [18] (or from those of [32], provided we only consider graphons over  $[0, 1]$ ). The sparse case and general (possibly unbounded) graphons is new, and relies on the theory of graph convergence for  $L^p$  graphons. We prove it in the next section.

The two representations  $W$  and  $\widetilde{W}$  for the stochastic block model from Example 2.3 are clearly equivalent in the sense of Definition 2.5. In this case, we actually have  $\widetilde{W} = W^\phi$  for a measure-preserving map  $\phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [k]$  (namely the map which maps all points in the interval  $I_i$  to  $i \in [k]$ ). But in general, equivalence does not imply the existence of a measure-preserving map  $\phi$  such that  $\widetilde{W} = W^\phi$  or  $\widetilde{W}^\phi = W$ . This is the content of the next example.

**Example 2.7.** Let  $\Omega = [4]$  and  $\Omega' = [6]$ , both equipped with the uniform distribution. Define  $W$  and  $W'$  to be zero if both arguments are even or both arguments are odd, and set both of them to a constant  $p$  otherwise. It is easy to see that they are equivalent: indeed, let  $\Omega'' = \{1, 2\}$  and define  $\phi: [4] \rightarrow [2]$  and  $\psi: [6] \rightarrow [2]$  by mapping even elements to 2 and odd elements to 1. Setting  $U$  to 1 if its two arguments are different and to 0 otherwise, we see that  $W = U^\phi$  and  $W' = U^\psi$ . This shows that in general, we cannot restrict ourselves to a single, measure-preserving map  $\phi: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$ , since there is simply no measure-preserving map between  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$ .

But even if both probability spaces are  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the uniform measure (in which case there are many measure-preserving maps between the two), we can in general not find a measure-preserving map such that  $W' = W^\phi$  or the other way around. To see this, let  $\phi_k(x) = kx \bmod 1$ , define  $W_1(x, y) = xy$ , and let  $W_k = W_1^{\phi_k}$ . Then there is no measure-preserving transformation  $\phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $W_2^\phi = W_3$  or  $W_3^\phi = W_2$ ; see Example 8.2 in [44] for the proof.

There is however, a special case where it is possible to just use a single map, namely the case where  $W$  and  $W'$  are twin-free Borel graphons. Here a graphon is called a *Borel graphon* if the underlying probability space is a *Borel space*, i.e., a space that is isomorphic to a Borel subset of a complete separable metric space equipped with an arbitrary probability measure with respect to the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. A graphon  $W$  is called *twin-free* if the set of twins of  $W$  has measure zero, where a *twin* is a point  $x$  in the underlying probability space for which there is another point  $y$  such that  $W(x, \cdot)$  is equal to  $W(y, \cdot)$  almost everywhere. Note that in Example 2.7 above, the graphons  $U$  and  $W_1$  are twin-free, while  $W$ ,  $W'$ , and  $W_k$  for  $k \geq 2$  are not.

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $W$  and  $W'$  be twin-free Borel graphons. Then  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent if and only if they are isomorphic modulo 0.*

The theorem can easily be deduced from the results of [14], and is proved in Appendix A.

To state our next theorem, we define a *standard Borel graphon*<sup>6</sup> as a graphon over a probability space that is the disjoint union of an interval  $[0, p]$  equipped with the uniform distribution and the usual Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, plus a countable number of isolated points  $\{x_j\}_{j \in J}$  with non-zero mass  $p_j$  for each of them, allowing for the special cases where either the set of atoms or the interval  $[0, p]$  is absent. The former is the case of graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , while the latter is the case of block models over  $[k]$  equipped with a probability measure in  $\Delta_k$ .

<sup>6</sup>Note that some authors use the notion of standard graphons or standard kernels for graphons with values in  $[0, 1]$ ; here we don't require such a condition.

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let  $W$  be a graphon over an arbitrary probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$ .*

(i) *There exists an equivalent graphon over  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the uniform distribution.*

(ii) *There exists a twin-free standard Borel graphon  $U$  and a measure-preserving map  $\phi$  from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  to the space on which  $U$  is defined such that  $W = U^\phi$  almost everywhere, showing in particular that  $W$  is equivalent to a twin-free standard Borel graphon.*

Again, the theorem follows easily from the results of [14]; see Appendix A.

*Remark 2.10.* (i) The above theorem states that for any graphon  $W$ , we can find both an equivalent graphon  $U$  over  $[0, 1]$  and an equivalent twin-free standard Borel graphon  $\tilde{U}$ . But in general, it is not possible to find a single equivalent graphon  $U$  which is both twin-free and a graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , as the example of a block model shows, since any representation of it over  $[0, 1]$  has uncountably many twins.

(ii) As claimed in the introduction, the metric (1.1) is indeed a distance on equivalence classes; in other words,  $\delta_p(W, W') = 0$  if  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent. To see this, let  $W, W', \phi, \phi'$  and  $U$  be as in Definition 2.5. Define a coupling  $d\nu(x, x'')$  of  $\pi''$  and  $\pi$  by choosing  $x \in \Omega$  according to  $\pi$  and then setting  $x'' = \phi(x)$ . Using this coupling, it is easy to see that  $\delta_p(U, W) = 0$ . Similarly,  $\delta_p(U, W') = 0$ , which together with the triangle inequality proves the claim.

(iii) When comparing finite graphs to graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , we will sometimes use a stronger version of the  $\delta_p$  distance. This distance extends the definition (2.1) to a distance between an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  and a graphon  $W$  over  $[0, 1]$ , defined by

$$(2.5) \quad \hat{\delta}_p(A, W) = \min_{\sigma} \|W[A^\sigma] - W\|_p,$$

where, again, the minimum is over all bijections  $\sigma: [n] \rightarrow [n]$  and  $(A^\sigma)_{ij} = A_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}$ , and where  $W[\cdot]$  is defined in Example 2.3.

We close this section with a theorem giving a different characterization of equivalence in terms of the metrics  $\delta_p$  and  $\delta_\square$ .

**Theorem 2.11.** *Let  $p \geq 1$ , and let  $W$  and  $W'$  be  $L^p$  graphons over two arbitrary probability spaces. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i)  $\delta_\square(W, W') = 0$ ;

(ii)  $\delta_p(W, W') = 0$ ;

(iii)  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent.

The theorem follows again from the results of [14], even though the details are a little more involved than for the previous two theorems and in particular make use of the fact that the infimum in (2.3) is actually a minimum if the underlying space is the unit interval; see Appendix A for the proof.

**2.5. Relation to graph convergence.** As mentioned before,  $W$ -random graphs arise very naturally as non-parametric models when considering a given graph as a finite subgraph of an infinite, exchangeable array, at least in the dense setting. Indeed, as the works of Hoover [43] and Aldous [6] show, any graph which is an induced subgraph of an infinite, exchangeable array can be modelled as a  $W$ -random graph<sup>7</sup> for some graphon  $W$ .

A different window into the theory of  $W$ -random graphs is given by the theory of graph convergence. Here one asks when a sequence of graphs  $G_n$  should be considered convergent. Motivated by extremal

<sup>7</sup>Strictly speaking, the results of [6, 43] only imply that the *extremal components* of a infinite, exchangeable random graph are given by a graphon; see [32] for a review of this connection. But if we are given only one sample, the difference between an exchangeable random graph and an ergodic component is unobservable, since by the results of [62], a single observation of an exchangeable random graph only reveals one of the ergodic components, just like a single observation of an infinite set of coin-flips from an exchangeable sequence looks like a sequence of independent coin flips.

combinatorics, one way to address this question is to define a sequence of graphs to be convergent if the number of subgraphs isomorphic to a given graph  $H$  converges for every finite graph  $H$ , once suitably normalized. It turns out that in the dense setting, this notion is equivalent to many other natural notions of graph convergence that are relevant in computer science, statistical physics, and other fields [17–19].

One of these equivalent notions is convergence in metric, defined in terms of the cut metric (2.3). We say that a sequence of dense graphs *converges to a graphon  $W$  in metric* if  $\delta_{\square}(G_n, W) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that the limit  $W$  is not unique, since two graphons  $W$  and  $W'$  which are equivalent have distance  $\delta_{\square}(W, W') \leq \delta_1(W, W') = 0$ . The results of [14] imply that this is the only ambiguity: if  $W$  and  $W'$  are such that  $\delta_{\square}(G_n, W) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\delta_{\square}(G_n, W') \rightarrow 0$ , then  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent.

Given this notion of convergence, one may want to ask whether all sequences of graph  $G_n$  have a limit, or whether they at least have a subsequence which converges in the metric  $\delta_{\square}$ . For dense graphs, the answer to this question is yes and was given in [53], where it was shown that every sequence of dense graphs has a subsequence that is a Cauchy sequence in the metric  $\delta_{\square}$ , and that every Cauchy sequence converges to a graphon  $W$  over  $[0, 1]$ .

Thus the results of [53] completely parallel the results on exchangeable arrays of [6, 43]: given an ergodic component of an infinite, exchangeable graph, one can find a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  that generates this array, and given an arbitrary sequence of (random or non-random) dense graphs, one can find a subsequence and a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  such that the subsequence converges to that graphon. In both cases, the graphon is identifiable only up to equivalence. Finally, combining [53] with [14], we know that if the sequence of graphs happens to be a sequence of  $W$ -random graphs, then it converges a.s., and the generating graphon is a representative from the equivalence class of limits.

The net result of this theory is that a convergent sequence of dense networks behaves like a sequence of  $W$ -random graphs for some graphon  $W$  and can thus be viewed as  $W$ -quasi-random graphs. Having established this connection between  $W$ -random graphs and  $W$ -quasi-random graphs in the dense setting, one might ask whether it can be extended to a convergence theory for sparse graph sequences. It is clear that we cannot just simply consider Cauchy sequences in the cut metric  $\delta_{\square}$ , since all sequences of sparse graphs have this property. Indeed, by the triangle inequality

$$\delta_{\square}(G_n, G_m) \leq \delta_1(G_n, G_m) \leq \delta_1(G_n, 0) + \delta_1(G_m, 0) = \rho(G_n) + \rho(G_m).$$

But if instead of the graphon given by the adjacency matrix of  $G_n$  we consider the normalized adjacency matrix  $\frac{1}{\rho(A(G_n))}A(G_n)$ , this argument no longer holds.

This motivates the following definition. To state it, we define, for an arbitrary graph  $G$  with adjacency matrix  $A(G)$  and a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , the graph  $cG$  to be the weighted graph with adjacency matrix  $cA(G)$ .

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $W$  be a graphon over an arbitrary probability space. A sequence of graphs  $G_n$  *converges to  $W$  in metric* if

$$\delta_{\square}\left(\frac{1}{\rho(G_n)}G_n, W\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In this case, we call  $G_n$  a  *$W$ -quasi-random sequence with target density  $\rho\|W\|_1$* .

*Remark 2.13.* This definition is an extension of the one given in [15] for graphons  $W$  over  $[0, 1]$ . There, as in the earlier literature on graph convergence for dense graphs, the distance between a graph  $G$  and a graphon  $W$  was defined as the distance between  $W$  and the embedding  $W[G]$  of  $G$  into the space of graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , i.e.,  $\delta_{\square}(G, W) = \delta_{\square}(W[G], W)$ , with  $W[G]$  defined as in Example 2.3, by setting  $W[G]$  to  $A_{ij}(G)$  on  $I_i \times I_j$ , where  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  is a partition of  $[0, 1]$  into adjacent intervals of lengths  $1/n$ . In our setting, this embedding is not needed, since the cut distance (2.3) is defined on equivalence classes of graphons, and  $G$  and its embedding  $W[G]$  are equivalent.

Given the above definition of convergence for sparse graphs, one might ask whether this notion is again equivalent to other notions of convergence, and whether sparse  $W$ -random graphs converge again to the generating graphon. The answer to both questions is yes, with one exception: convergence of subgraph counts is no longer equivalent to convergence in metric.<sup>8</sup> But all other notions of convergence proved to be equivalent for dense graphs in [19] remain equivalent in the sparse setting, as shown in [16]. It is also again true that a sequence of  $W$ -random graphs converges to the generating graphon. This is the content of the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.14.** *Let  $G_n = G_n(\rho_n W)$  where  $W$  is a normalized graphon over an arbitrary probability space, and  $\rho_n$  is such that  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$  and either  $\limsup \rho_n \|W\|_\infty \leq 1$  or  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ . Then a.s.  $\rho(G_n)/\rho_n \rightarrow 1$  and*

$$\delta_\square\left(\frac{1}{\rho(G_n)}G_n, W\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.9, we can find a graphon  $W'$  over  $[0, 1]$  that is equivalent to  $W$ . Since equivalent graphons lead to identically distributed random graphs, it is enough to prove the theorem for graphons over  $[0, 1]$ . But for this case, it has been established in [15].  $\square$

*Remark 2.15.* The above theorem has many interesting consequence for graphon estimation. In particular, assume that an algorithm releases an estimator  $\widehat{W}$  for the generating graphon  $W$  which is close in  $\delta_p$  for  $p \geq 1$ . These distances dominate the invariant  $L^1$  distance  $\delta_1$ , which in turn dominates the cut distance  $\delta_\square$ . Combined with the results from [16] which state that many other notions of convergence are equivalent to convergence in metric (see Theorem 2.10), we obtain that consistent approximation for  $W$  leads to consistent approximations for various quantities of interest, such as minimal energies of graphical models defined on  $G_n$  (see Proposition 5.12 in [16], which actually gives a quantitative bound in terms of the cut distance) or collections of cuts in  $G_n$  (see Lemma 5.11 in [16], which again gives a quantitative bound). By Theorem 2.16 below, we also get good approximations for the empirical distributions of the degrees of  $G_n$ .

Combined with Theorem 2.11, Theorem 2.14 immediately implies Theorem 2.6.

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.* Let  $G_n = G_n(\rho_n W)$  and  $G'_n = G_n(\rho_n W')$ . Since  $\delta_\square(\frac{1}{\rho_n}G_n, W) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\delta_\square(\frac{1}{\rho_n}G'_n, W') \rightarrow 0$  by Theorem 2.14, we have  $\delta_\square(W, W') = 0$  if  $G_n$  and  $G'_n$  are identically distributed. Since, on the other hand,  $G_n$  and  $G'_n$  are clearly identically distributed if  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent, Theorem 2.6 follows from Theorem 2.11.  $\square$

**2.6. Convergence of degree distributions.** In this subsection we show that convergence in the cut metric  $\delta_\square$  implies convergence of the empirical degree distributions. We define the *normalized degree* of a vertex  $x \in V(G)$  as  $d_x/\bar{d}$ , where  $d_x$  is its degree and  $\bar{d}$  is the average degree

$$\bar{d} = \frac{1}{|V(G)|} \sum_{x \in V(G)} d_x = \frac{2|E(G)|}{|V(G)|}.$$

The *normalized degree distribution* of  $G$  is the empirical distribution of the normalized degrees, with cumulative distribution function

$$D_G(\lambda) = \frac{1}{|V(G)|} \sum_{x \in V(G)} 1_{d_x \leq \lambda \bar{d}}.$$

---

<sup>8</sup>Indeed, it is possible to modify a sparse graph sequence by very little while greatly changing its subgraph counts: a  $W$ -random graph with sufficiently low target density will have far fewer triangles than edges, so one can eliminate triangles without making any substantial change in the cut metric. For details, see the discussion after Theorem 2.18 in [15].

In a similar way, we define the *degrees* of a normalized graphon  $W : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  as the random variable

$$W_x = \int_{\Omega} W(x, y) d\pi(y),$$

where  $x$  is chosen according to the probability measure  $\pi$  on  $\Omega$ . This random variable has cumulative distribution function

$$D_W(\lambda) = \pi(\{x : W_x \leq \lambda\}).$$

Recalling that convergence in distribution can be formulated as convergence in the Lévy-Prokhorov distance, we say that the normalized degree distributions of a sequence  $G_n$  of graphs converge to the degree distribution of  $W$  if  $d_{\text{LP}}(D_{G_n}, D_W) \rightarrow 0$ , where as usual, the Lévy-Prokhorov distance  $d_{\text{LP}}$  between two distribution functions  $D$  and  $D'$  is defined by

$$d_{\text{LP}}(D, D') = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : D'(\lambda - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq D(\lambda) \leq D'(\lambda + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Our next theorem implies that convergence in the cut metric implies convergence of the normalized degree distributions. Combined with Theorem 2.14, this gives that a.s., the normalized degree distributions of a sequence of  $W$ -random graphs converge to the degree distribution of  $W$  as long as  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ . Indeed, observing that for any graph  $G$ , the normalized degree distribution  $D_G$  is equal to the degree distribution of  $\frac{1}{\|A(G)\|_1} A(G)$  considered as a graphon over  $V(G)$  equipped with the uniform distribution, both statements follow immediately from the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.16.** *Let  $U$  and  $W$  be two normalized graphons. Then*

$$d_{\text{LP}}(D_U, D_W) \leq \sqrt{2\delta_{\square}(U, W)}.$$

The proof will make use of the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.17.** *Let  $U$  and  $W$  be two normalized graphons over the same probability space  $\Omega$ . If  $x$  is chosen at random from  $\Omega$ , then*

$$\Pr(|W_x - U_x| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \|U - W\|_{\square}.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|W_x - U_x| \geq \varepsilon) &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[|W_x - U_x|] \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[(W_x - U_x)1_{W_x \geq U_x}] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[(U_x - W_x)1_{W_x \leq U_x}]. \end{aligned}$$

Defining  $S$  as the set of points  $x \in \Omega$  such that  $W_x \geq U_x$  and  $\tilde{S}$  as the set of points  $x \in \Omega$  such that  $W_x \leq U_x$ , we write the right side as

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{[0,1] \times S} (W - U) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{[0,1] \times \tilde{S}} (U - W) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \|U - W\|_{\square},$$

as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.16.* To prove the theorem, we will prove that for two arbitrary graphons and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad D_W(\lambda) \leq D_U(\lambda + \varepsilon) + 2 \frac{\delta_{\square}(U, W)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Because the degree distributions of equivalent graphons are identical, it will be enough to prove (2.6) for two graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , with an upper bound of  $\|U - W\|_{\square}$  instead of  $\delta_{\square}(U, W)$ .

To this end, we estimate the probability that  $U_x$  and  $W_x$  differ by at least  $\varepsilon$  by Lemma 2.17. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} D_W(\lambda) &= \Pr[W_x \leq \lambda] \\ &\leq \Pr[U_x \leq \lambda + \varepsilon] + \Pr[|U_x - W_x| \geq \varepsilon] \\ &\leq D_U(\lambda + \varepsilon) + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \|U - W\|_{\square}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (2.6) and hence the theorem.  $\square$

**2.7. Existence of approximating block models.** Having seen that block models are special cases of  $W$ -random graphs, one might wonder how well an arbitrary graphon can be approximated by a stochastic block model. The answer is given by the following lemma. To state it, we recall the definition of  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  as the set of all block models with minimal block size at least  $\kappa$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa} = \{(\mathbf{p}, B) \in \mathcal{B} : \min_i p_i \geq \kappa\}$ .

**Lemma 2.18.** *Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ , let  $W$  be an  $L^p$  graphon, and let  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W)$  be as in (1.2). Then the infimum in (1.2) is achieved for some  $W' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  that has norm  $\|W'\|_p \leq 2\|W\|_p$ . Furthermore,  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* We clearly have  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) = \inf_{W'} \delta_p(W, W') \leq \|W\|_p$ , so by the triangle inequality, we only need to consider block models  $W'$  with  $\|W'\|_p \leq 2\|W\|_p$ . Again by the triangle inequality, the distance  $\delta_p(W, W')$  is continuous in  $W'$ , which implies that the infimum is actually a minimum.

To see that  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ , we first replace  $W$  by an equivalent graphon  $U$  over  $[0, 1]$ , and then use the approximation  $U_n$  to  $U$  given by averaging over the partition consisting of consecutive intervals of length  $1/n$ . This approximation is a block model with minimal block size  $1/n$ , and it converges to  $U$  by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem and a truncation argument (see Lemma 5.6 in [16]).  $\square$

When applying the lemma, we will sometimes be constrained to use only block models whose block sizes are all a multiple of  $1/n$ , i.e., block models in

$$\mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa} = \{(\mathbf{p}, B) \in \mathcal{B} : \text{for all } i, p_i n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } p_i n \geq \lfloor n\kappa \rfloor\}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}$  naturally corresponds to the set  $\mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$  of  $n \times n$  block matrices  $A$  such that each block in  $A$  has size at least  $\lfloor n\kappa \rfloor$ , via

$$(2.7) \quad \{\mathbb{W}[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}\} = \{\mathbb{W}[\mathbf{p}, B] : (\mathbf{p}, B) \in \mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}\}.$$

Our next lemma shows that every block model in  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  can be well approximated by a block model in  $\mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ , and it also shows that  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}$  can be bounded from above in terms of a minimum over  $\mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ . It is proved in Appendix C.

**Lemma 2.19.** *Let  $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ . Then there exists a constant  $n_0(\kappa)$  such for all  $p \geq 1$  and all  $L^p$  graphons  $W$ , the following holds:*

*If  $W' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  is a block model on  $[k]$ , then the labels in  $[k]$  can be reordered in such a way that for each  $n \geq 1/\kappa$  there exists a block model  $W'' \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$  with*

$$\hat{\delta}_p(W'', \mathbb{W}[W']) \leq \sqrt[p]{\frac{4}{\kappa n}} \|W'\|_p.$$

*If  $n \geq n_0(\kappa)$ , then*

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq \min_{W'' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa, n}} \delta_p(W'', W) + 2 \sqrt[p]{\frac{4}{\kappa^2 n}} \|W\|_p.$$

**2.8. Convergence of  $W$ -weighted graphs.** Recall that by Theorem 2.14, the sequence  $G_n = G_n(\rho_n W)$  converges to  $W$  in the cut metric if  $W \in L^p$  is normalized,  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ , and either  $\limsup \rho_n \|W\|_\infty \leq 1$  or  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ . Our next lemma, which is a slight strengthening of Theorem 2.14(a) from [15], states that for the weighted graphs  $Q_n(\rho_n W)$ , the same holds in the tighter distance  $\hat{\delta}_p$ . Recalling that for any graphon, we can find an equivalent graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , we will restrict ourselves to the case where  $W$  is a graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , in which case we can use an even tighter distance, the distance  $\hat{\delta}_p$  defined in (2.5).

**Lemma 2.20.** *Let  $p \geq 1$ , let  $W$  be a normalized  $L^p$  graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , let  $x_1, x_2, \dots \in [0, 1]$  be chosen i.i.d. uniformly at random, and let  $\rho_n$  be a sequence of positive numbers such that  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ . Given  $n \geq 2$ , let  $Q_n$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix with entries  $\min\{1, \rho_n W(x_i, x_j)\}$ , relabelled in such a way that  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n$ . Then a.s.  $\|\frac{1}{\rho_n} W[Q_n] - W\|_p \rightarrow 0$ , so in particular  $\rho(Q_n)/\rho_n \rightarrow 1$  and  $\hat{\delta}_p(\frac{1}{\rho_n} Q_n, W) \rightarrow 0$ .*

The lemma is proved in Appendix C. The next lemma is a quantitative version of Lemma 2.20 for block models, and is also proved in Appendix C.

**Lemma 2.21.** *Let  $C$  be a positive real number, let  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $W'$  be a block model with minimal class size at least  $\kappa$ , represented as a graphon over  $[0, 1]$ . If  $\frac{1}{n\kappa} \log n \leq C$ , then*

$$\hat{\delta}_p(H_n(W'), W') = O_p \left( \sqrt[2p]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}} \right) \|W'\|_p,$$

and if  $\kappa = \kappa_n$  is such that  $\limsup \frac{1}{\kappa_n} \log n < C$ , then with probability one, there exists a random  $n_0$  such that for  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\hat{\delta}_p(H_n(W'), W') = O \left( \sqrt[2p]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}} \right) \|W'\|_p.$$

Here the constants implicit in the big- $O$  and  $O_p$  symbols depend only on  $C$ .

### 3. LEAST SQUARES ESTIMATION

In this section, we prove the following theorem, which shows that the least squares estimator is consistent. To state the theorem, we define

$$\text{tail}_\rho^{(p)}(W) = \|W - \min\{W, \rho^{-1}\}\|_p.$$

These tail bounds are easy to estimate when  $W$  is an  $L^{p'}$  graphon for some  $p' > p$ , in which case they decay as a power of  $\rho$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tail}_\rho^{(p)}(W) &= \|(W - \rho^{-1})1_{W \geq \rho^{-1}}\|_p \\ &\leq \|W 1_{W \geq \rho^{-1}}\|_p \\ &\leq \|W(W\rho)^{p'/p-1}\|_p \\ &= \rho^{p'/p-1} \|W\|_{p'}^{p'/p}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $W$  is an  $L^{p'}$  graphon for  $p' = p$  but not  $p' > p$ , tail bounds become more subtle, but it remains the case that

$$\text{tail}_\rho^{(p)}(W) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $W$  be an  $L^2$  graphon, normalized so that  $\|W\|_1 = 1$ , and let  $\widehat{W} = (\hat{\rho}, \hat{B})$  be the output of the least squares algorithm (1.3) for a  $W$ -random graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices with target density  $\rho$ .*

(i) If  $\kappa \in (n^{-1}, 1]$  and  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2} = O(\rho n)$ , then

$$\delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) = O_p\left(\varepsilon_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(W) + \sqrt[4]{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2\rho n}} + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{\kappa n}} + \text{tail}_\rho^{(2)}(W)\right).$$

(ii) If  $\kappa \in (0, 1]$  is fixed and  $\rho = \rho_n$  is such that  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) \rightarrow \varepsilon_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(W) \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

(iii) If  $\rho = \rho_n$  and  $\kappa = \kappa_n$  are such that  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\kappa_n \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\kappa_n^{-2}\log(1/\kappa_n) = o(n\rho_n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

Conceptually, the proof of Theorem 3.1 is based on the following two observations. First, for any map  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  and any  $k \times k$  matrix  $B$ ,

$$\|A(G) - B^\pi\|_2^2 = \|A(G)\|_2^2 - 2\langle A(G), B^\pi \rangle + \|B^\pi\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, the argmin of the left side is the same as the argmax of  $2\langle A(G), B^\pi \rangle - \|B^\pi\|_2^2$ . Second, conditioned on the weighted  $W$ -random graph  $Q = Q_n(\rho_n W)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[2\langle A(G), B^\pi \rangle - \|B^\pi\|_2^2\right] = 2\langle Q, B^\pi \rangle - \|B^\pi\|_2^2.$$

Up to errors stemming from imperfect concentration, we therefore expect that the argmin  $(\hat{B}, \hat{\pi})$  from (1.3) is a maximizer for  $2\langle Q, B^\pi \rangle - \|B^\pi\|_2^2$ , and hence a minimizer for  $\|Q - B^\pi\|_2$ . Thus, we would expect that, again up to issues of concentration, the  $L^2$  error is bounded by  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(Q)$ , where for an arbitrary  $n \times n$  matrix  $H$ ,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(H) = \min_{B \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq\kappa}} \|H - B\|_2.$$

For bounded graphons, this strategy was implemented in [20], leading to (i) a proof of consistency for all bounded graphons  $W$  and (ii) a differentially private algorithm achieving the same goal under slightly less general conditions (requiring  $\rho n$  to grow at least like  $\log n$ ). For the case of general  $L^2$  graphons, the above motivation still lies behind our proof, but the actual implementation proceeds along slightly different lines, and combines elements of the (sparse graph) strategy of [20] with elements of the (dense graph) strategy developed in [37]. The resulting estimates are stated in Theorem 3.2, which bounds the  $L^2$  difference between the output of the algorithm (1.3) and the matrix  $Q$  in terms of  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(Q)$  and an error term representing errors from imperfect concentration. To obtain Theorem 3.1 from Theorem 3.2, we will need to transform an estimate on the  $L^2$  error with respect to  $Q$  into an  $L^2$  error with respect to  $W$ , and we will want to express the result in terms of  $\varepsilon_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(W)$  instead of  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(Q)$ . This leads to two extra error terms, the last two terms in the bound of statement (i) in Theorem 3.1.

Before stating Theorem 3.2 formally, we recall that any block model  $W \in \mathcal{B}_{n, \geq\kappa}$  can be represented by an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M_n(W) \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq\kappa}$  such that  $W$  and  $M_n(W)$  are equivalent as graphons; see (2.7) and the discussion preceding it.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $W$  be a normalized  $L^2$  graphon, let  $0 < \rho, \kappa \leq 1$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $G = G_n(\rho W)$ ,  $Q = Q_n(\rho W)$  and let  $\widehat{W} = (\hat{\rho}, \hat{B})$  be the output of the least squares algorithms (1.3) with input  $G$ . If  $n\kappa > 1$  and  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2} = O(\rho n)$ , then*

$$\hat{\delta}_2\left(M_n(\widehat{W}), Q\right) \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq\kappa}^{(2)}(Q) + O_p\left(\rho \sqrt[4]{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2\rho n}}\right),$$

where the constant implicit in the  $O_p$  symbol depends on the  $L^2$  norm of  $W$ .

If  $\rho = \rho_n$  is such that  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ , then almost surely, for  $n$  large enough and all  $\kappa$  with  $n\kappa > 1$  and  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2} = O(\rho n)$ ,

$$\hat{\delta}_2(M_n(\widehat{W}), Q) \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(Q) + O\left(\rho \sqrt[4]{\frac{1 + \log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 \rho n}}\right),$$

where again the constant implicit in the big- $O$  symbol depends on the  $L^2$  norm of  $W$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\hat{M} = M_n(\widehat{W})$ ,  $A = A(G)$ , and  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\kappa n} \rceil$ .

As a first step, we will prove that

$$(3.1) \quad \hat{\delta}_2(\hat{M}, Q) \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(Q) + 2k\varepsilon + 2\sqrt{k\varepsilon\|Q\|_2} \quad \text{where} \quad \varepsilon = \max_{\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]} \|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1.$$

To prove (3.1) we note that  $\hat{M} = M_n(\widehat{W})$  is a minimizer of  $\|A - M\|_2$  over all  $M \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ . As a consequence,

$$-2\langle A, \hat{M} \rangle + \|\hat{M}\|_2^2 \leq -2\langle A, M \rangle + \|M\|_2^2$$

for all  $M \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ , which in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}_2(\hat{M}, Q)^2 &\leq \|\hat{M} - Q\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|M\|_2^2 - 2\langle \hat{M}, Q \rangle + \|Q\|_2^2 + 2\langle \hat{M} - M, A \rangle \\ &= \|M - Q\|_2^2 + 2\langle \hat{M} - M, A - Q \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $M, \hat{M} \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ , we know that there are partitions  $\pi, \hat{\pi}: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  such that  $M = M_\pi$ ,  $\hat{M} = \hat{M}_{\hat{\pi}}$ , and all non-empty classes of  $\pi$  and  $\hat{\pi}$  have size at least  $\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ . As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle M, A - Q \rangle| &= |\langle M, (A - Q)_\pi \rangle| \leq \|M\|_\infty \|(A - Q)_\pi\|_1 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|M\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \frac{n}{\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor} \|M\|_2 \leq k\varepsilon \|M\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last step we used that  $M$  is an  $n \times n$  block matrix such that each block contains at least  $\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor^2$  elements. Bounding  $|\langle \hat{M}, A - Q \rangle|$  in the same way, we find that

$$\hat{\delta}_2(\hat{M}, Q)^2 \leq \|M - Q\|_2^2 + 2k\varepsilon(\|M\|_2 + \|\hat{M}\|_2).$$

Bounding  $\|\hat{M}\|_2 = \hat{\delta}_2(0, \hat{M}) \leq \|Q\|_2 + \hat{\delta}_2(\hat{M}, Q)$  and  $\|M\|_2 \leq \|Q\|_2 + \|M - Q\|_2$ , a small calculation then shows that

$$\left(\hat{\delta}_2(\hat{M}, Q) - k\varepsilon\right)^2 \leq (\|M - Q\|_2 + k\varepsilon)^2 + 4k\varepsilon\|Q\|_2.$$

Choosing  $M$  in such a way that  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(Q) = \|M - Q\|_2$ , this proves (3.1).

For all  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[A_\pi | Q] = Q_\pi$ . Using this fact and a concentration argument, one can show that conditioned on  $Q$ , with probability at least  $1 - e^{-n}$

$$(3.2) \quad \varepsilon \leq 8\sqrt{\rho(Q) \left( \frac{1 + \log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2} \right)},$$

whenever  $\rho(Q)n \geq 1$ ; see Lemma B.2 in Appendix B. The lemma also gives a bound on the expectation, implying in particular that conditioned on  $Q$ ,

$$\varepsilon = O_p \left( \sqrt{\rho(Q) \left( \frac{1 + \log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2} \right)} \right),$$

whether or not the condition  $\rho(Q)n \geq 1$  holds.

Since  $\mathbb{E}[\rho(Q)] \leq \rho\|W\|_1 = \rho$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\|Q\|_2^2] \leq \rho^2\|W\|_2^2$ , this proves that

$$2k\varepsilon + 4\sqrt{k\varepsilon\|Q\|_2} = O_p\left(\rho\sqrt{\frac{k^2(1+\log k)}{\rho n} + \frac{k^4}{\rho n^2}}\right) + O_p\left(\rho^4\sqrt{\frac{k^2(1+\log k)}{\rho n} + \frac{k^4}{\rho n^2}}\right),$$

with the constant implicit in the  $O_p$  symbol depending on  $\|W\|_2$ . To transform this bound into the bound in the statement of the theorem, we observe that for  $\kappa = 1$ ,  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\lceil \kappa n \rceil} \rceil$  is equal to  $\frac{1}{\kappa}$ , while for  $\kappa < 1$ , the assumption  $n\kappa > 1$  implies that  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\lceil \kappa n \rceil} \rceil \leq \frac{3}{2\kappa}$ . In either case,

$$\frac{k^2(1+\log k)}{n} = O\left(\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n}\right)$$

and

$$\frac{k^4}{n^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{\kappa^4 n^2}\right) = O\left(\left(\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n}\right)^2\right) = O\left(\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n}\right),$$

where in the last step we used that the assumption  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2} = O(\rho n)$  implies that  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n} = O(1)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 2k\varepsilon + 4\sqrt{k\varepsilon\|Q\|_2} &= O_p\left(\rho\sqrt{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n}} + \rho^4\sqrt{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n}}\right) \\ &= O_p\left(\rho^4\sqrt{\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

again because  $\frac{1+\log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 n} = O(1)$ . This completes the proof of the bound in probability.

To prove the a.s. statement, we note that by Lemma 2.20,  $\rho(Q_n)/\rho_n \rightarrow 1$ , which together with hypothesis that  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$  implies that almost surely,  $n\rho(Q_n) \geq 1$  holds for sufficiently large  $n$ , which allows us to use the bound (3.2). By a simple union bound, this bound holds for all  $k \leq n$  with probability at least  $1 - ne^{-n}$ . Since the failure probability is summable, we conclude that there exists a random  $n_0$  (depending on  $W$  and the sequence  $\rho_n$ , but not on  $k$  or  $\kappa$ ) such that the bound (3.2) holds for all  $n \geq n_0$  and all  $k \leq n$ . Combined with the fact that by the law of large numbers for  $U$ -statistics (see Lemma C.1 in Appendix C),  $\frac{1}{\rho_n}\|Q\|_2 \rightarrow \|W\|_2$  a.s. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain the almost sure statement of the theorem.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  be the probability space on which  $W$  is defined, and let  $Q = Q_n(\rho W)$  as before. Defining  $W_\rho = \min\{W, 1/\rho\}$ , we will write  $Q$  as  $\rho H_n(W_\rho)$  and  $\text{tail}_\rho^{(2)}(W) = \|W - W_\rho\|_2$ .

By the triangle inequality and the fact that the  $\hat{\delta}_2$  distance dominates the  $\delta_2$  distance, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.3) \quad \delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) &= \delta_2\left(M_n\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}\right), W\right) \\ &\leq \hat{\delta}_2\left(M_n\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}\right), \frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) + \delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W\right). \end{aligned}$$

To bound the first term on the right side, we will use Theorem 3.2 and then bound  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right)$  in terms of  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$ .

Recall that by Lemma 2.18 the infimum in the definition (1.2) of  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$  is a minimum, and the minimizer  $W' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  satisfies  $\|W'\|_2 \leq 2\|W\|_2$ . As established in Lemma 2.19, we can relabel the

blocks of the block model  $W'$  in such a way that

$$\hat{\delta}_2(W'', \mathbf{W}[W']) \leq \sqrt{\frac{4}{\kappa n}} \|W'\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{4}{\kappa n}} \|W\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{16}{\kappa n}} \|W\|_2$$

for some  $W'' \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ . Setting  $\widetilde{W}' = \mathbf{W}[W']$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) &\leq \hat{\delta}_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W''\right) \\ &\leq \hat{\delta}_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, \widetilde{W}'\right) + \sqrt{\frac{16}{\kappa n}} \|W\|_2 \\ &= \hat{\delta}_2\left(H_n(W_\rho), \widetilde{W}'\right) + \sqrt{\frac{16}{\kappa n}} \|W\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Next we would like to choose a coupling  $\mu$  of  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\pi$  such that

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) = \delta_2(W', W) = \|W' - W\|_{2, \mu},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{2, \mu}$  denotes the  $L^2$  norm with respect to the coupling  $\mu$ . (This an abuse of notation, but it is more convenient than writing out the formula, as in (1.1).) Such a coupling needn't exist, but that is not a significant obstacle. We could complete the proof by looking at couplings that come arbitrarily close to the oracle error, but instead we will switch to equivalent graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , because Lemma A.1 then guarantees the existence of an optimal coupling. The oracle error and tail bounds are invariant under equivalence, so we can assume without loss of generality that the coupling  $\mu$  exists.

We use this coupling to couple the random graphs  $Q(\rho W)$  and  $Q(\rho W')$ . With the help of the triangle inequality, we then conclude that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) &\leq \|H_n(W_\rho) - H_n(W)\|_2 + \|H_n(W) - H_n(W')\|_2 \\ &\quad + \hat{\delta}_2\left(H_n(W'), \widetilde{W}'\right) + \sqrt{\frac{16}{\kappa n}} \|W\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

After these preparations, we start with the proof of (i). To this end, we first use the triangle inequality and the fact that  $\delta_2(W', W) = \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$  to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W\right) &= \delta_2(H_n(W_\rho), W) \\ &\leq \|H_n(W_\rho) - H_n(W)\|_2 + \|H_n(W) - H_n(W')\|_2 \\ &\quad + \delta_2(H_n(W'), W') + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W). \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|H_n(W_\rho) - H_n(W)\|_2] &= \mathbb{E}[\|H_n(W_\rho - W)\|_2] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|H_n(W_\rho - W)\|_2^2]} \\ &= \|W_\rho - W\|_2 = \text{tail}_\rho^{(2)}(W) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|H_n(W) - H_n(W')\|_2] \leq \|W - W'\|_{2, \mu} = \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W).$$

Since  $\hat{\delta}_2(H_n(W'), \widetilde{W}')$  has the same distribution as  $\hat{\delta}_2(H_n(\widetilde{W}'), \widetilde{W}')$ , we may then use Lemma 2.21 and the fact that  $\|W'\|_2 \leq 2\|W\|_2$  to conclude that

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) = O_p\left(\text{tail}_\rho^{(2)}(W) + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}} \|W\|_2\right).$$

(Note that  $(1 + \log(1/\kappa))\kappa^{-2} = O(\rho n)$  implies that  $1/\sqrt{n} = O(\kappa)$  and hence  $\log n = O(\kappa n)$ , as required for the application of Lemma 2.21.) In a similar way, we use the fact that  $\delta_2(H_n(W'), W')$  has the same distribution as  $\delta_2(H_n(\widetilde{W}'), \widetilde{W}')$  to conclude that

$$\delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W\right) = O_p\left(\text{tail}_\rho^{(2)}(W) + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}}\|W\|_2\right).$$

With the help of (3.3) and Theorem 3.2, this implies that

$$\delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) = O_p\left(\text{tail}_\rho^{(2)}(W) + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}}\|W\|_2 + \sqrt[4]{\frac{1 + \log(1/\kappa)}{\kappa^2 \rho n}}\right),$$

which concludes the proof of (i).

Next we prove (ii). Since  $W$  is square integrable,  $\|W - W_\rho\|_2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , so by combining the law of large numbers for  $U$ -statistics (see Lemma C.1 in Appendix C) with a simple two  $\varepsilon$  argument, we conclude that a.s., the first term in (3.4) goes to zero. Again by the law of large numbers for  $U$ -statistics, the second term goes to  $\|W' - W\|_{2,\mu} = \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$ , and by Lemma 2.21 and the fact that  $H_n(W')$  and  $H_n(\widetilde{W}')$  have the same distribution, the third term goes to zero as well. Thus a.s., the right side of (3.4) goes to  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W)$ . Combined with (3.3), Lemma 2.20, and Theorem 3.2, we see that for fixed  $\kappa$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) \leq \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

On the other hand, by the second bound in Lemma 2.19,

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{W'' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa, n}} \delta_p(W'', W).$$

Since  $\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W} \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa, n}$ , this gives  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(2)}(W) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_2\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right)$ , completing the proof of (ii).

To prove (iii), note that the condition  $\kappa_n^{-2} \log(1/\kappa_n) = o(n\rho_n)$  implies in particular that  $\kappa_n \sqrt{n} \rightarrow \infty$ , which in turn implies that  $\frac{1}{\kappa_n n} \log n \rightarrow 0$ . We may therefore again use Lemma 2.21 to show that the third term in (3.4) goes to zero a.s. The first term does not depend on  $\kappa$ , and hence goes to zero just as before, but now the second term goes to zero as well, by a two  $\varepsilon$  argument invoking now the fact that  $\|W' - W\|_{2,\mu} = \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa_n}^{(2)}(W) \rightarrow 0$ . Since the condition  $\kappa_n^{-2} \log(1/\kappa_n) = o(n\rho_n)$  clearly implies that  $n\kappa_n \rightarrow \infty$ , we conclude that a.s.,  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa_n}^{(2)}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) \rightarrow 0$ . Combined with (3.3), Lemma 2.20, and Theorem 3.2, this implies (iii).  $\square$

#### 4. CUT NORM ESTIMATION FOR GENERAL $L^1$ GRAPHONS

In this section, we prove the following theorem, which shows that the least cut norm estimator is consistent.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $W$  be an  $L^1$  graphon, normalized so that  $\|W\|_1 = 1$ , and let  $\widehat{W} = (\hat{p}, \hat{B})$  be the output of the least cut norm algorithms (1.5).*

(i) *If  $\kappa \in [\frac{\log n}{n}, 1]$ , then*

$$\delta_\square\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) = O_p\left(\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\kappa n}} + \text{tail}_\rho^{(1)}(W)\right).$$

(ii) *If  $\kappa \in (0, 1]$  is fixed and  $\rho = \rho_n$  is such that  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$\limsup \delta_\square\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) \leq 2\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

(iii) If  $\rho = \rho_n$  and  $\kappa = \kappa_n$  are such that  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\kappa_n \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\frac{\log n}{n\kappa_n} \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$\delta_{\square}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

The proof relies again on a concentration argument, this time starting from the observation that for all  $S, T \subseteq [n]$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{(x,y) \in S \times T} A_{xy}(G)\right] = \sum_{(x,y) \in S \times T} Q_{x,y}.$$

Therefore, up to issues of concentration, minimizing the cut distance between  $A(G)$  and a block model in  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa, n}$  is the same as minimizing the cut distance between  $Q$  and a block model in  $\mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa, n}$ . In other words, up to issues of concentration, one might hope that the distance between  $Q$  and the output  $\widehat{W}$  of the algorithm (1.5) is just  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}(Q)$ , where for an arbitrary  $n \times n$  matrix  $H$ ,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}(H) = \min_{B \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}} \|H - B\|_{\square}.$$

It turns out that we lose a factor of two with respect to this optimum, due to the fact that in (1.5), we optimize over all block matrices of the form  $A(G)_{\pi}$ , rather than all block matrices that are constant on the blocks determined by  $\pi$ . While these two minimizations are equivalent in the least squares case, they are not here, leading to the loss of a factor of two.<sup>9</sup>

The following theorem states our approximation guarantees with respect to  $Q$ . Theorem 4.1 follows from it in essentially the same way as Theorem 3.1 follows from Theorem 3.2. To state it, we recall the definition (2.2) of the distance  $\hat{\delta}_{\square}$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $W$  be a normalized  $L^1$  graphon, let  $0 < \rho \leq 1$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $G = G_n(\rho W)$  and  $Q = Q_n(\rho W)$ . If  $\kappa \in (n^{-1}, 1]$  and  $\widehat{W} = (\hat{p}, \hat{B})$  is the output of the least cut norm algorithm (1.5) with input  $G$ , then*

$$\hat{\delta}_{\square}\left(M_n(\widehat{W}), Q\right) \leq 2\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}(Q) + O_p\left(\rho\sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho n}}\right).$$

If  $\rho = \rho_n$  is such that  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ , then almost surely, for  $n$  large enough and all  $\kappa \in (n^{-1}, 1]$ ,

$$\hat{\delta}_{\square}\left(M_n(\widehat{W}), Q\right) \leq 2\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}(Q) + O\left(\rho\sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho n}}\right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $A = A(G)$  and  $k = \lceil \frac{n}{\kappa n} \rceil$ . We will show that

$$(4.2) \quad \hat{\delta}_{\square}\left(M_n(\widehat{W}), Q\right) \leq 2\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}(Q) + 3\|Q - A\|_{\square}.$$

To this end, we first prove that

$$(4.3) \quad \|M_n(\widehat{W}) - A\|_{\square} \leq 2 \min_{M \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}} \|M - A\|_{\square}.$$

To see this, we note that  $\mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$  consists of all  $n \times n$  matrices  $M$  such that  $M = M_{\pi}$  for some  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  such that the smallest non-empty class of  $\pi$  has at least size  $\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ . Next we observe that for all  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ , the map  $H \mapsto H_{\pi}$  is a contraction in the cut norm. As a consequence, for all  $n \times n$  matrices  $M$  with  $M = M_{\pi}$ ,

$$\|A_{\pi} - A\|_{\square} \leq \|A_{\pi} - M_{\pi}\|_{\square} + \|M_{\pi} - A\|_{\square} \leq 2\|M - A\|_{\square}.$$

Because  $M_n(\widehat{W}) = A_{\hat{\pi}}$  for some  $\hat{\pi}: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  that minimizes  $\|A - A_{\pi}\|_{\square}$  over all  $\pi$  whose smallest non-empty class has size at least  $\lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ , the bound (4.3) now follows.

<sup>9</sup>At the cost of an even slower algorithm, this could be cured by redefining the algorithm (1.5) to optimize over all block matrices that are constant on the blocks determined by  $\pi$ .

After this preparation, the proof of (4.2) is straightforward. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\delta}_\square(M_n(\widehat{W}), Q) &\leq \|M_n(\widehat{W}) - A\|_\square + \|A - Q\|_\square \\
 &\leq 2 \min_{M \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}} \|M - A\|_\square + \|A - Q\|_\square \\
 &\leq 2 \min_{M \in \mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}} \|M - Q\|_\square + 3\|A - Q\|_\square \\
 &= 2\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}(Q) + 3\|Q - A\|_\square.
 \end{aligned}$$

From here on, the proof proceeds along the same lines as that of Theorem 3.2, this time starting from the observation (4.1). Using this fact and a concentration argument, we now can show that conditioned on  $Q$ , if  $\rho(Q)n \geq 1$  then

$$\|Q - A\|_\square \leq 15\sqrt{\frac{\rho(Q)}{n}}$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - e^{-n}$ , and

$$\|Q - A\|_\square = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\rho(Q)}{n}}\right),$$

independently of the condition  $\rho(Q)n \geq 1$ ; see Lemma B.3 in Appendix B for details. The assertions of the theorem now follow.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Keeping the notation from the proof of Theorem 3.1, and using the fact that the distance  $\hat{\delta}_\square$  is dominated by the distance  $\hat{\delta}_1$ , we now bound

$$(4.4) \quad \delta_\square\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}, W\right) \leq \hat{\delta}_\square\left(M_n\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\widehat{W}\right), \frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) + \delta_1\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W\right).$$

Using Lemma 2.18 and Lemma 2.19 for  $p = 1$ , we now bound

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) \leq \hat{\delta}_1\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, \widetilde{W}'\right) + \frac{8}{\kappa n} = \hat{\delta}_1\left(H_n(W_\rho), \widetilde{W}'\right) + \frac{8}{\kappa n},$$

where  $W'$  is a minimizer for (1.2) for  $p = 1$ , with  $\|W'\|_1 \leq 2\|W\|_1 = 2$ , and  $\widetilde{W}'$  again stands for  $W[W']$ . Writing  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W)$  as  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) = \delta_1(W', W) = \|W' - W\|_{1, \mu}$  for some coupling  $\mu$  of  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\pi$  (which we can assume exists without loss of generality by passing to equivalent graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , as in the proof of Theorem 3.1), we then get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) &\leq \|H_n(W_\rho) - H_n(W)\|_1 + \|H_n(W) - H_n(W')\|_1 \\
 &\quad + \hat{\delta}_1\left(H_n(W'), \widetilde{W}'\right) + \frac{8}{\kappa n}
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_1\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W\right) &\leq \|H_n(W_\rho) - H_n(W)\|_1 + \|H_n(W) - H_n(W')\|_1 \\
 &\quad + \delta_1(H_n(W'), W') + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W),
 \end{aligned}$$

where as before  $H_n(W)$  and  $H_n(W')$  are coupled with the help of  $\mu$ . From here on the proof of Theorem 4.1 proceeds exactly as the proof of Theorem 3.1, with the condition  $\frac{1}{n\kappa} \log n = O(1)$  that is needed to apply Lemma 2.21 guaranteed by the hypotheses of the theorem. We finally arrive at

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{\geq \kappa, \square}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q\right) = O_p\left(\text{tail}_\rho^{(1)}(W) + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}}\right)$$

and

$$\delta_1\left(\frac{1}{\rho}Q, W\right) = O_p\left(\text{tail}_\rho^{(1)}(W) + \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(1)}(W) + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}}\right).$$

With the help of (4.4) and Theorem 4.2, this gives the bound in probability.

The almost sure statements are proved similarly.  $\square$

## 5. GRAPHON ESTIMATION VIA DEGREE SORTING

In this section we analyze the behavior of the degree sorting algorithm described in the introduction. We will use the notation from Section 2.6 for degrees and the degree distribution.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $W$  be a graphon whose degree distribution function  $D_W: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is continuous, let  $G_n$  be a  $W$ -random graph on  $n$  vertices with target density  $\rho_n$ , and let  $\widehat{W}_n$  be the output of the degree sorting algorithm with  $k_n$  parts and input  $G_n$ .*

*Suppose  $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ ,  $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\log k_n = o(n\rho_n)$ , and  $k_n = o(n\sqrt{\rho_n})$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\rho_n^{-1}\widehat{W}_n$  converges a.s. to  $W$  under  $\delta_1$ .*

Note that  $D_W$  is continuous if and only if the degree distribution of  $W$  is atomless. Graphons with this property have a useful characterization as graphons over  $[0, 1]$ :

**Lemma 5.2.** *The degree distribution function  $D_W$  of a graphon  $W$  is continuous if and only if  $W$  is equivalent to a graphon  $U$  over  $[0, 1]$  whose degrees  $U_x$  are strictly decreasing in  $x$ .*

*Proof.* Every graphon  $W$  is equivalent to a graphon  $U$  over  $[0, 1]$ , and via monotone rearrangement we can furthermore assume that  $U_x$  is weakly decreasing in  $x$  (see [59] for a thorough discussion of the measure-theoretic technicalities). Then  $D_U = D_W$ , while  $D_U$  is continuous if and only if  $U_x$  is strictly decreasing.  $\square$

If  $W$  is a graphon over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  is a partition of  $\Omega$  into finitely many measurable pieces, then  $W_{\mathcal{P}}$  denotes the step function defined by

$$W_{\mathcal{P}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{\pi(I)\pi(J)} \int_{I \times J} W(u, v) d\pi(u) d\pi(v)$$

whenever  $x$  is in the part  $I$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $y$  is in the part  $J$ . (This is not well defined for parts of measure zero, but they can be ignored.) We will need the following sufficient condition for when averaging over partitions converges under the  $L^1$  norm.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $W$  be an  $L^1$  graphon over  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots$  be partitions of  $[0, 1]$  into finitely many measurable pieces. Let  $p_{n,\varepsilon}$  be the probability that independent random elements  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  satisfy  $|x - y| \geq \varepsilon$ , conditioned on  $x$  and  $y$  lying in the same part of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . If*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_{n,\varepsilon} = 0$$

for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|W_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 = 0.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can assume that  $W$  is continuous, because continuous functions are dense in  $L^1$  and  $\|W_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W'_{\mathcal{P}_n}\|_1 \leq \|W - W'\|_1$ .

Let  $J_1, \dots, J_N$  be the parts of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Then for  $(x, y) \in J_i \times J_j$ ,

$$W_{\mathcal{P}_n}(x, y) = \frac{1}{\lambda(J_i)\lambda(J_j)} \int_{J_i \times J_j} W(u, v) du dv.$$

By combining this formula with

$$W(x, y) = \frac{1}{\lambda(J_i)\lambda(J_j)} \int_{J_i \times J_j} W(x, y) du dv,$$

we find that

$$\|W_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{1}{\lambda(J_i)\lambda(J_j)} \int_{J_i \times J_j} \int_{J_i \times J_j} |W(u, v) - W(x, y)| du dv dx dy.$$

Because  $W$  is continuous on  $[0, 1]^2$  (and hence uniformly continuous), for each  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $|W(x, y) - W(u, v)| < \delta$  whenever  $|x - u| < \varepsilon$  and  $|y - v| < \varepsilon$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 &\leq \delta + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{2\|W\|_\infty}{\lambda(J_i)\lambda(J_j)} \int_{J_i \times J_j} \int_{J_i \times J_j} 1_{|x-u| \geq \varepsilon \text{ or } |y-v| \geq \varepsilon} du dv dx dy \\ &\leq \delta + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{4\|W\|_\infty}{\lambda(J_i)\lambda(J_j)} \int_{J_i \times J_j} \int_{J_i \times J_j} 1_{|x-u| \geq \varepsilon} du dv dx dy \\ &= \delta + 4\|W\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\lambda(J_i)} \int_{J_i \times J_i} 1_{|x-u| \geq \varepsilon} du dx \\ &= \delta + 4\|W\|_\infty p_{n,\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|W_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 \leq \delta$$

for each  $\delta > 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* By Lemma 5.2, we can assume that  $W$  is a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  for which the degrees  $W_x$  are strictly decreasing in  $x$ .

Let  $I_{i,n} = [(i-1)/n, i/n]$ , so that  $I_{1,n}, I_{2,n}, \dots, I_{n,n}$  form a partition of  $[0, 1]$  (up to the measure-zero set of their endpoints, which we will ignore). We will assume the vertices of  $G_n$  are ordered so that the corresponding sample points in  $[0, 1]$  satisfy  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n$ , and we view  $G_n$  as a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  via the blocks  $I_{i,n}$  and this vertex ordering.

Let  $d_1, \dots, d_n$  be the vertex degrees, and set  $\bar{d} = (d_1 + \dots + d_n)/n$ . Recall that the degree sorting algorithm works as follows. We choose a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[n]$  such that

$$d_{\sigma(1)} \geq d_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq d_{\sigma(n)}$$

and integers  $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_k = n$  such that

$$\left| n_i - \frac{in}{k} \right| < 1.$$

Then we define  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$  by  $\pi(j) = i$  if  $n_{i-1} < \sigma(j) \leq n_i$ . The output of the algorithm is the block model  $\widehat{W} = (\widehat{p}, \widehat{B})$  with  $\widehat{p}_i = 1/k$  and  $\widehat{B} = A(G)/\pi$ .

Let  $V_1, \dots, V_k$  be the preimages of  $1, \dots, k$  under  $\pi$ , and set

$$J_i = \bigcup_{j \in V_i} I_{j,n}.$$

Then  $J_1, \dots, J_k$  form a partition  $\mathcal{P}_n$  of  $[0, 1]$ , and  $\widehat{W}_n$  is equivalent to  $(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}$ . (Recall that we view  $G_n$  as a graphon over  $[0, 1]$ .) We wish to prove that

$$\delta_1(\rho_n^{-1}(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}, W) \rightarrow 0.$$

In fact, we will prove that  $\|\rho_n^{-1}(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ , given our ordering of the vertices of  $G_n$ .

We will use the notation established in previous sections, such as  $Q_n$  for the weighted random graph used to generate  $G_n$ . Recall from Lemma 2.20 that a.s.  $\rho(Q_n)/\rho_n \rightarrow 1$  and  $\|\rho_n^{-1}Q_n - W\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ .

We begin with the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_n^{-1}(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 &\leq \|\rho_n^{-1}(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - \rho_n^{-1}(Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}\|_1 + \|\rho_n^{-1}(Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - \rho_n^{-1}Q_n\|_1 \\ &\quad + \|\rho_n^{-1}Q_n - W\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

The third term on the right tends to zero a.s. For the first term, we have

$$\|\rho_n^{-1}(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - \rho_n^{-1}(Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}\|_1 = \rho_n^{-1} \|(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - (Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}\|_1.$$

By Lemma B.2 and the fact that  $\rho(Q_n)/\rho_n \rightarrow 1$  a.s., we can bound  $\|(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - (Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}\|_1$  by  $O\left(\sqrt{\rho\left(\frac{1+\log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2}\right)}\right)$  a.s., and thus the hypotheses that  $\log k_n = o(n\rho_n)$  and  $k_n = o(n\sqrt{\rho_n})$  imply that

$$\|\rho_n^{-1}(G_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - \rho_n^{-1}(Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n}\|_1 \rightarrow 0.$$

All that remains is to handle the second term, namely  $\|\rho_n^{-1}(Q_n)_{\mathcal{P}_n} - \rho_n^{-1}Q_n\|_1$ . Because  $\|\rho_n^{-1}Q_n - W\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ , it will suffice to show that  $\|W_{\mathcal{P}_n} - W\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ . We will do so using Lemma 5.3.

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and let  $p_{n,\varepsilon}$  be the probability that independent random elements  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  satisfy  $|x - y| \geq \varepsilon$ , conditioned on  $x$  and  $y$  lying in the same part of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . By contrast, let  $p'_{n,\varepsilon}$  be the probability that  $|x - y| \geq \varepsilon$  and both points lie in the same part of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , without the conditioning. Because each part  $J_i$  of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  satisfies  $\lambda(J_i) = (1 + o(1))/k_n$ , proving that  $p_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$  is equivalent to proving that  $k_n p'_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, to apply Lemma 5.3, we must show that  $k_n p'_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ .

Instead of analyzing the points  $x$  and  $y$ , it will be convenient to consider the intervals  $I_{\ell,n}$  and  $I_{m,n}$  containing them. We will use the bound

$$\begin{aligned} p'_{n,\varepsilon} &\leq \Pr_{\ell,m \in [n]} (\pi(\ell) = \pi(m) \text{ and } \max\{|x - y| : x \in I_{\ell,n}, y \in I_{m,n}\} \geq \varepsilon) \\ (5.1) \quad &= \Pr_{\ell,m \in [n]} (\pi(\ell) = \pi(m) \text{ and } |\ell/n - m/n| \geq \varepsilon - 1/n), \end{aligned}$$

where of course  $\Pr_{\ell,m \in [n]}$  denotes the probability if  $\ell$  and  $m$  are chosen uniformly at random from  $[n]$ .

To analyze these probabilities, we need to bound how close the degrees in  $G_n$  are to those in  $W$ . Lemma 2.17 will provide suitable bounds. To apply this lemma, we must quantify how quickly the degrees in  $W$  change as a function of distance. Let

$$\delta = \inf_{|x-y| \geq \varepsilon/4 - 1/n} |W_x - W_y|.$$

Because  $x \mapsto W_x$  is strictly decreasing,  $\delta > 0$ . Call an element  $i \in [n]$  *good* if the normalized degree  $d_i/\bar{d}$  is within  $\delta/3$  of  $W_x$  for some  $x \in I_{i,n}$ . Taking  $U = \rho_n^{-1}G_n$  in Lemma 2.17 shows that the fraction of bad elements is at most

$$\frac{2}{\delta/3} \|\rho_n^{-1}G_n - W\|_{\square},$$

which tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $i$  and  $j$  are good and  $|i/n - j/n| \geq \varepsilon/4$ , then

$$\left| \frac{d_i}{\bar{d}} - \frac{d_j}{\bar{d}} \right| \geq \delta/3.$$

It follows that if  $i$  and  $j$  are good and  $|i/n - j/n| \geq 3\varepsilon/4$ , then at least the middle  $\lfloor n\varepsilon/4 \rfloor$  vertices between  $i$  and  $j$  have degrees strictly between  $d_i$  and  $d_j$ . When  $n$  is large enough, this is much larger than the number of vertices in any part of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . In particular, if  $n$  is large enough then good  $i$  and  $j$  with  $|i/n - j/n| \geq 3\varepsilon/4$  cannot possibly end up in the same part after the degrees are sorted.

Thus, by (5.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
 p'_{n,\varepsilon} &\leq \Pr_{\ell,m \in [n]} (\ell \text{ or } m \text{ is bad and } \pi(\ell) = \pi(m)) \\
 &\leq 2 \Pr_{\ell,m \in [n]} (\ell \text{ is bad and } \pi(\ell) = \pi(m)) \\
 &\leq 2 \Pr_{m \in [n]} (\ell \text{ is bad}) \max_i \lambda(J_i) \\
 &\leq \frac{4}{\delta/3} \|\rho_n^{-1} G_n - W\|_{\square} \frac{1 + o(1)}{k_n}.
 \end{aligned}$$

It now follows from  $\|\rho_n^{-1} G_n - W\|_{\square} \rightarrow 0$  that  $k_n p'_{n,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

## 6. HÖLDER-CONTINUOUS GRAPHONS

In this section, we analyze the least squares and the least cut norm algorithms for the case of Hölder-continuous graphons. As discussed in the introduction, our approach allows us to reduce this to the analysis of the two error terms  $\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(p)}(W)$  and  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W)$  for  $p = 2$  and  $p = 1$ , respectively, which reduces the analysis to pure approximation theory.

Throughout this section, we consider graphons  $W$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (equipped with the standard Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and some probability measure  $\pi$ ) that are  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , i.e., graphons  $W$  for which there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$|W(x, y) - W(x', y)| \leq C|x - x'|_{\infty}^{\alpha} \quad \text{for all } x, x', y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with  $|\cdot|_{\infty}$  denoting the  $L^{\infty}$  distance on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (note that we only require this for one of the two coordinates of  $W$ , since for the other one it follows from the fact that  $W$  is symmetric). We denote the set of graphons obeying this bound by  $\mathcal{H}_{C,\alpha}$ . If we restrict ourselves to graphons on a subset  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we use the notation  $\mathcal{H}_{C,\alpha}(\Lambda)$ .

Our first proposition concerns the case when the support of the underlying measure  $\pi$  is compact, in which case we may assume without loss of generality that  $\pi$  is a measure on  $\Lambda_R = [-R, R]^d$  for some  $R \in [0, \infty)$ . Note that many examples of  $W$ -random graphs considered in the statistics and machine learning literature fit into this setting, e.g., the mixed membership block model of [4]. Note also that while these models can be mapped onto  $W$ -random graphs over  $[0, 1]$  with the uniform distribution by a measure-preserving map, such a map will typically not do this in a continuous way. So if one wants to use continuity properties of the generating graphon  $W$ , one has to analyze it on the original space on which it was defined, not on  $[0, 1]$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $d \geq 1$ ,  $R \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , and  $C < \infty$ , let  $\pi$  be a probability measure on  $\Lambda_R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $W$  be a normalized graphon in  $\mathcal{H}_{C,\alpha}(\Lambda_R)$ . Then there exists a constant  $D$  depending only on  $R, C$ , and  $\alpha$  such that the following holds:*

(i) *We have  $\|W\|_{\infty} \leq D$ . So in particular*

$$\text{tail}_{\rho}^{(p)}(W) = 0 \quad \text{if } \rho \leq \frac{1}{D}.$$

(ii) *For  $p \geq 1$  and  $\kappa > 0$ ,*

$$(6.1) \quad \varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 4D\kappa^{\alpha'}.$$

where  $\alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{p\alpha + d}$ . If  $\pi$  is the uniform measure, then the bound (6.1) holds for  $\alpha' = \alpha/d$ .

*Proof.* We will prove the proposition for  $D = 1 + 2C(2R)^{\alpha}$ .

To prove the first statement, let  $C_0 = \min_{x,y \in \Lambda_L} W(x, y)$ . Since  $C_0 = \int C_0 \leq \|W\|_1 = 1$ , Hölder continuity implies that  $\|W\|_{\infty} \leq 1 + 2C(2R)^{\alpha} = D$ .

To prove the second statement, consider  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the partition of  $\Lambda_R$  into  $k^d$  cubes of side-length  $a = 2R/k$ . For a given class  $Y \in \mathcal{P}$ , two points  $x, x' \in Y$  have distance  $|x - x'|_{\infty} \leq a$ .

Thus, if  $Y$  and  $Y'$  are two classes in  $\mathcal{P}$ , then  $|W(x, y) - W(x', y')| \leq 2Ca^\alpha = 2C(2Rk^{-1})^\alpha$  whenever  $x, y \in Y$  and  $x', y' \in Y'$ . As a consequence  $\|W - W_{\mathcal{P}}\|_\infty \leq 2C(2Rk^{-1})^\alpha \leq Dk^{-\alpha}$ .

If  $\pi$  is the uniform measure over  $\Lambda_R$ , then each class  $Y$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  has measure  $\pi(Y) = k^{-d}$ , so setting  $k = \lfloor \kappa^{-1/d} \rfloor$ , we obtain  $k^{-1} \leq 2\kappa^{1/d}$  and thus

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 2D\kappa^{\alpha/d},$$

which proves the proposition for the case of the uniform measure. (Recall that  $\delta_p$  and hence  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W)$  are decreasing functions of  $p$ .)

But for general measures, some of the classes of  $\mathcal{P}$  might have tiny measure. To fix this, we merge all classes of measure less than  $\kappa$  (where  $\kappa$  will now be smaller than  $k^{-d}$ ) with the smallest of those which have measure at least  $\kappa$ . Lemma 6.2 below will show that for  $\kappa$  small enough, this actually works. To apply the lemma, we set  $N = k^d$  and observe that  $\|W_{\mathcal{P}}\|_\infty \leq \|W\|_\infty \leq D$  and  $\|W - W_{\mathcal{P}}\|_\infty \leq DN^{-\alpha/d}$ . Lemma 6.2 then implies that

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 2DN^{-\alpha/d}$$

provided  $2\kappa \leq N^{-\frac{p\alpha+d}{d}}$ . Thus for  $\kappa \leq 1/2$ , we may choose  $k = \lfloor (2\kappa)^{-1/(p\alpha+d)} \rfloor$  to show that (6.1) holds for  $\kappa \leq 1/2$ . For  $\kappa \geq 1/2$ , that would amount to  $k = 0$ , but fortunately this case is trivial: the right side of (6.1) is at least  $2D$  and hence at least 2, while  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 1$  for a normalized graphon, showing that (6.1) holds for  $\kappa \geq 1/2$  as well.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $W$  be a bounded graphon over some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$ , and let  $W'$  be a graphon over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  such that  $\|W - W'\|_p \leq \varepsilon$  and  $W'$  is a block model with  $N$  classes. Then*

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 2\varepsilon \quad \text{whenever} \quad \kappa \leq \frac{1}{2N} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\|W'\|_\infty} \right)^p.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $W'$  is based on the partition  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_N)$  of  $\Omega$ . Arranging the classes  $Y_i$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  in order of decreasing measure, let  $Y_\ell$  be the last class of measure  $\kappa$  or more. We then define  $Y'_\ell = \bigcup_{i \geq \ell} Y_i$ , and  $Y'_i = Y_i$  for all  $i < \ell$ . Let  $W''$  be a block model with blocks  $Y'_1, \dots, Y'_\ell$  and the same values as  $W'$  on  $Y_i \times Y_j$  when  $i, j < \ell$  but the value 0 when  $i$  or  $j$  equals  $\ell$ . Clearly  $W'' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$ . To prove the proposition, we will have to show that  $\|W' - W''\|_p \leq \varepsilon$ . To this end, we note that  $W''$  and  $W'$  agree on  $\Omega_0 \times \Omega_0$ , where  $\Omega_0 = Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_{\ell-1}$ , and that  $\|W' - W''\|_\infty \leq \|W'\|_\infty$ . As a consequence,

$$\|W' - W''\|_p = \|(W' - W'')(1 - 1_{\Omega_0 \times \Omega_0})\|_p \leq \|W'\|_\infty (1 - \pi(\Omega_0)^2)^{1/p}.$$

But because the classes  $Y_{\ell+1}, \dots, Y_N$  have measure smaller than  $\kappa$ ,

$$\pi(\Omega_0) \geq 1 - \ell\kappa \geq 1 - N\kappa,$$

showing that

$$\|W' - W''\|_p \leq \|W'\|_\infty (2N\kappa)^{1/p},$$

which is bounded by  $\varepsilon$  if  $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2N} (\varepsilon / \|W'\|_\infty)^p$ .  $\square$

In many applications, the underlying measure on the latent position space  $\Omega$  does not have compact support. Gaussians are a noteworthy case, as are distributions with heavier tails (such as Student distributions). Another reason to consider measures without compact support comes from the desire to model graphs with power-law degree distributions. As discussed already in Section 1.2, bounded graphons do not allow for power-law degree distributions, showing in particular that Hölder-continuous graphons over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with a measure with compact support do not lead to graphs that exhibit power-law degree distributions.<sup>10</sup> For all these reasons, we aim for a generalization of Proposition 6.1 to measures whose supports are not necessarily compact.

<sup>10</sup>Once the assumption of compact support is removed, this reasoning no longer applies, and as shown in Section 7, there are indeed Hölder-continuous graphons over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which generate graphs with power-law degree distributions.

Since we want graphons to be integrable (in fact, for the least squares algorithm to be consistent, we need them to be square integrable) we will restrict ourselves to probability distributions  $\pi$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in

$$\mathcal{M}_\beta = \left\{ \pi \mid \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|_\infty^\beta d\pi(x) < \infty \right\},$$

where  $\beta > 0$  is a parameter which we will choose to be at least  $\alpha$  (or at least  $2\alpha$  when we want to guarantee that the graphons in  $\mathcal{H}_{C,\alpha}$  are in  $L^2$ ).

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $d \geq 1$  and  $\beta \geq \alpha > 0$ , let  $\pi \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ , and let  $W$  be an  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous graphon over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with the probability distribution  $\pi$ , normalized in such a way that  $\|W\|_1 = 1$ . If  $1 \leq p < \beta/\alpha$  and  $\kappa \leq 1/2$ , then*

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) = O(\kappa^{\alpha'}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tail}_p^{(p)}(W) = O(\rho^{\beta'}),$$

where  $\beta' = \frac{\beta}{p\alpha} - 1$  and  $\alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{p\alpha+d} \frac{\beta'}{1+\beta'}$ , and the constants implicit in the big- $O$  symbols depend on the distribution  $\pi$  and the constants  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $p$ , and  $C$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R_0 \geq 1$  be such that  $\pi(\Lambda_{R_0}) \geq 1/2$ , and let  $D_0 = 4 + 2CR_0^\alpha$ . Then

$$\min_{x,y \in \Lambda_{R_0}} W(x,y) \leq \frac{1}{\pi(\Lambda_{R_0})^2} \int_{\Lambda_{R_0} \times \Lambda_{R_0}} W \leq \frac{\|W\|_1}{\pi(\Lambda_{R_0})^2} \leq 4.$$

Denoting the minimizer of  $W$  in  $\Lambda_{R_0} \times \Lambda_{R_0}$  by  $(x_0, y_0)$ , we then have  $W(0,0) \leq 4 + C|x_0|_\infty^\alpha + C|y_0|_\infty^\alpha \leq 4 + 2CR_0^\alpha$ , implying that

$$W(x,y) \leq D_0 + C|x|_\infty^\alpha + C|y|_\infty^\alpha$$

for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . It will be convenient to introduce the functions  $f(x,y) = C|x|_\infty^\alpha$  and  $g(x,y) = C|y|_\infty^\alpha$  and write this inequality as

$$W \leq D_0 + f + g.$$

By our definition of  $\beta'$  and our assumption on  $\pi$ ,

$$\|f\|_{p(1+\beta')} = C \left( \int |x|_\infty^\beta d\pi(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p(1+\beta')}} < \infty.$$

To prove the bound on  $\text{tail}_p^{(p)}(W)$ , we observe that  $0 \leq W - W_\rho \leq W 1_{W \geq 1/\rho}$ . As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tail}_p^{(p)}(W) &\leq \|W 1_{W \geq 1/\rho}\|_p \leq \rho^{\beta'} \|W^{1+\beta'}\|_p = \rho^{\beta'} \|W\|_{p(1+\beta')}^{1/(1+\beta')} \\ &\leq \rho^{\beta'} \left( \|D_0 + f + g\|_{p(1+\beta')} \right)^{1/(1+\beta')} \\ &\leq \rho^{\beta'} \left( D_0 + \|f\|_{p(1+\beta')} + \|g\|_{p(1+\beta')} \right)^{1/(1+\beta')} \leq D\rho^{\beta'} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $D$  depending on  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $p$ , and  $C$ , as well as the measure  $\pi$  (via  $R_0$  and the norm  $\|f\|_{p(1+\beta')}$ ).

To prove the bound on the oracle error, we want to construct a good block model approximation to  $W$ . To this end, we first bound the contributions to  $\|W\|_p$  that come from points  $x, y$  outside a box  $\Lambda_R$ , where  $R \geq 1$  will be chosen later. If we set  $r = CR^\alpha$ , then the condition  $(x,y) \notin \Lambda_R \times \Lambda_R$  implies  $|x|_\infty > R$  or  $|y|_\infty > R$  and hence  $f + g > r$ . But

$$\|W 1_{f+g>r}\|_p \leq r^{-\beta'} \|(f+g)^{\beta'} W\|_p \leq r^{-\beta'} \|(D_0 + f + g)^{\beta'+1}\|_p \leq Dr^{-\beta'},$$

and hence

$$(6.2) \quad \|W 1_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \setminus (\Lambda_R \times \Lambda_R)}\|_p \leq D_1 R^{-\beta'\alpha},$$

as long as  $D_1$  is chosen so that  $D_1 \geq DC^{-\beta'}$ .

Next we consider a partition  $\mathcal{P} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)$  of  $\Lambda_R$  into cubes of side length  $2R/k$ , with  $N = k^d$ . We define  $\beta_{ij}$  to be the average of  $W$  over  $Y_i \times Y_j$ , and

$$W' = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \beta_{ij} 1_{Y_i \times Y_j}.$$

Since  $W'$  is composed of parts obtained by averaging over subsets in  $\Lambda_R$ , where  $W$  is bounded by  $D_0 + 2CR^\alpha \leq D_0(1 + R^\alpha) \leq 2D_0R^\alpha$ , we have

$$\|W'\|_\infty \leq 2D_1R^\alpha,$$

provided  $D_1$  is chosen to be at least  $D_0$ .

Inside  $\Lambda_R \times \Lambda_R$ , we bound  $|W(x, y) - W'(x, y)|$  by

$$2C(2R/k)^\alpha = 2C(2R)^\alpha N^{-\alpha/d} \leq D_1R^\alpha N^{-\alpha/d},$$

where  $D_1 = \max\{D_0, DC^{-\beta'}, 2C2^\alpha\}$ . Finally  $W - W' = W$  outside  $\Lambda_R$ . Combined with the bound (6.2), we conclude that

$$\|W - W'\|_p \leq \varepsilon,$$

where  $\varepsilon = D_1(R^\alpha N^{-\alpha/d} + R^{-\beta'\alpha})$ . With the help of Lemma 6.2 we conclude that

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 2D_1(R^\alpha N^{-\alpha/d} + R^{-\beta'\alpha}),$$

provided that

$$\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2N} \left( \frac{R^\alpha N^{-\alpha/d} + R^{-\beta'\alpha}}{2R^\alpha} \right)^p = \frac{1}{2N} \left( \frac{N^{-\alpha/d} + R^{-(\beta'+1)\alpha}}{2} \right)^p$$

and  $R \geq 1$ . Choosing  $R = N^{\frac{1}{d(\beta'+1)}}$ , we find that

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 4D_1 N^{-\frac{\beta'\alpha}{d(1+\beta')}},$$

provided that  $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2} N^{-\frac{p\alpha+d}{d}}$ .

Because  $\kappa \leq 1/2$ , we can choose  $k = \left\lfloor \left( \frac{1}{2\kappa} \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha+d}} \right\rfloor$ . Then  $N = k^d$  implies

$$\frac{1}{2^d} \left( \frac{1}{2\kappa} \right)^{\frac{d}{p\alpha+d}} \leq N \leq \left( \frac{1}{2\kappa} \right)^{\frac{d}{p\alpha+d}}.$$

This yields a bound of

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) \leq 4D_1 \left( 2^d (2\kappa)^{\frac{d}{p\alpha+d}} \right)^{\frac{\beta'\alpha}{d(1+\beta')}},$$

which is  $O(\kappa^{\alpha'})$ . Again the implicit constant depends only on  $\alpha, \beta, p, C$ , and  $\pi$ .  $\square$

## 7. POWER-LAW GRAPHS

Recall that the normalized degree distribution of a graph  $G$  on  $[n]$  is defined as the empirical distribution of the normalized degrees  $d_i/\bar{d}$ , where  $\bar{d}$  is the average degree. We say that a sequence  $(G_n)_{n \geq 0}$  has *convergent degree sequences* if the cumulative distribution functions  $D_{G_n}$  of the normalized degrees converge to some distribution function<sup>11</sup>  $D$  in the Lévy-Prokhorov distance  $d_{LP}$  or, equivalently, if  $D_{G_n}(\lambda) \rightarrow D(\lambda)$  for all  $\lambda$  at which  $D$  is continuous.

We say that the sequence  $(G_n)_{n \geq 0}$  has a *power-law degree distribution with exponent  $\gamma$*  if its degree distributions converge to  $D$  satisfying

$$D(\lambda) = 1 - \Theta(\lambda^{-(\gamma-1)}) \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty,$$

<sup>11</sup>That is, a non-decreasing, right-continuous function  $D: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow -\infty} D(\lambda) = 0$  and  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} D(\lambda) = 1$ .

and we say that a graphon  $W$  has a *power-law degree distribution with exponent  $\gamma$*  if  $D_W = 1 - \Theta(\lambda^{-(\gamma-1)})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

Note that it is  $\gamma - 1$  that appears in the exponent, not  $\gamma$ . The naming conventions in the above definitions are based on density functions, rather than distribution functions: if the degree distribution is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure and thus has a density function  $f(\lambda)$ , and if  $f(\lambda) = \Theta(\lambda^{-\gamma})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , then the distribution function  $D$  satisfies

$$1 - D(\lambda) = \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} f(\lambda) d\lambda = \Theta(\lambda^{-(\gamma-1)}).$$

In this section, we give two examples of  $W$ -random graphs with power-law degree distributions and establish bounds on the convergence rate of our estimation procedures for these graphons.

We start with an example that can be expressed as a Hölder-continuous graphon over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , even though we will first define it as a graphon over  $[0, 1]$ . It is the graphon

$$(7.1) \quad W(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(g(x) + g(y)) \quad \text{where } g(x) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - x)^{-\alpha}.$$

for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Note that the degrees of this graphon are  $W_x = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}g(x)$ , with a distribution function  $D_W(\lambda)$  that goes to 1 like  $1 - \Theta(\lambda^{-1/\alpha})$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , showing that the graphs  $G_n(\rho_n W)$  have a power-law degree distribution with exponent  $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}$ .

As a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the uniform measure, this graphon is not continuous, but it turns out that it can be expressed as an equivalent graphon over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that is Hölder-continuous. To see this, let us consider a probability distribution  $\pi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that the distribution of the  $L^2$  norm  $r = |x|_2$  of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, \infty)$ , with a strictly positive density function  $f(r)$ . We will want to construct a measure-preserving map  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  to obtain an equivalent graphon  $W^\phi$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Requiring  $\phi$  to be measure preserving is equivalent to requiring that  $\pi(\phi^{-1}([0, a])) = \pi(\{x: \phi(x) \leq a\}) = a$ . We will construct  $\phi$  radially, via a map  $F$  such that  $\phi(x) = F(|x|_2)$ , and we will make sure that  $F$  is strictly increasing, in which case  $\phi(x) \leq a$  is equivalent to  $|x|_2 \leq F^{-1}(a)$ . Thus, our condition for  $\phi$  to be measure preserving becomes  $a = \int \mathbf{1}_{|x|_2 \leq F^{-1}(a)} d\pi(x)$ , or equivalently,  $\int \mathbf{1}_{|x|_2 \leq r} d\pi(x) = F(r)$ , showing that  $F(r)$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $|x|_2$  (which is strictly monotone by our assumption that  $f(r) > 0$  for all  $r \in [0, \infty)$ ). Taking  $F(r) = 1 - \frac{1}{r+1}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} W^\phi(x, y) &= \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \left( \frac{1}{1 - F(|x|_2)} \right)^\alpha + \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \left( \frac{1}{1 - F(|y|_2)} \right)^\alpha \\ &= \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} ((1 + |x|_2)^\alpha + (1 + |y|_2)^\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

showing that  $W$  is equivalent to an  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous graphon over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with any measure for which the cumulative distribution function of  $|x|_2$  is equal to  $F$ . As a consequence, we may use the results of Section 6 to give explicit bounds on the estimation errors for the least squares and least cut algorithms. We will not give these bounds here, since for  $W$  of the form (7.1), one can obtain slightly better bounds using the actual form of  $W$ ; see Lemma 7.1 below.

The second example we consider in this section is the graphon  $W$  over  $[0, 1]$  that is defined by

$$(7.2) \quad W(x, y) = g(x)g(y) \quad \text{where again } g(x) = (1 - \alpha)(1 - x)^{-\alpha}.$$

As before, we equip  $[0, 1]$  with the uniform measure. Now the degrees of  $W$  are equal to  $g(x)$ , which shows that again, the  $W$ -random graphs obtained from  $W$  have power-law degrees with exponent  $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}$ .

Note that the second graphon cannot be expressed as a Hölder-continuous graphon over  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in the sense of Section 6. Indeed, suppose  $\tilde{W}$  were such a graphon. By Theorem 2.9, there would exist a standard Borel twin-free graphon  $U$  such that  $\tilde{W} = U^\phi$  for some measure-preserving map  $\phi$  from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to the space on which  $U$  is defined. Since  $W$  is twin-free as well we may without loss of

generality assume that  $U = W$  (use Theorem 2.8). But this means that  $\tilde{W}$  would be of the form  $\tilde{W}(x, y) = W(\phi(x), \phi(y)) = g(\phi(x))g(\phi(y))$  for some measure-preserving map  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Since  $g(\phi(x))$  is unbounded, this cannot be a Hölder-continuous function of the argument  $y$ .

Nevertheless, we can give explicit bounds on our estimation error since for  $W$  of the form (7.1) or (7.2), we can estimate  $\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W)$  and  $\text{tail}_\rho^{(p)}(W)$  directly.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , let  $1 \leq p < 1/\alpha$ , and define  $\alpha' = \frac{1}{p} - \alpha$  and  $\beta' = \frac{1-p\alpha}{p\alpha}$ . If  $W$  is the power-law graphon (7.1), then*

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) = O(\kappa^{\alpha'}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tail}_\rho^{(p)}(W) = O(\rho^{\beta'}),$$

while if  $W$  is the power-law graphon (7.2), then

$$\varepsilon_{\geq \kappa}^{(p)}(W) = O(\kappa^{\alpha'}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tail}_\rho^{(p)}(W) = O(\rho^{\beta'} |\log \rho|^{1/p}).$$

*Proof.* We start with the proof of the tail bounds. Defining  $g_1, g_2: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by  $g_1(x, y) = g(x)$  and  $g_2(x, y) = g(y)$ , we write the first graphon as  $\frac{1}{2}(g_1 + g_2)$ . Noting that  $W \geq \rho^{-1}$  implies that either  $g_1 \geq 1/\rho$  or  $g_2 \geq 1/\rho$ , we bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|W - W_\rho\|_p &\leq \|W 1_{W \geq 1/\rho}\|_p \leq \|W(1_{\rho g_1 \geq 1} + 1_{\rho g_2 \geq 1})\|_p \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|g_1 1_{\rho g_1 \geq 1} + g_2 1_{\rho g_1 \geq 1} + g_1 1_{\rho g_2 \geq 1} + g_2 1_{\rho g_2 \geq 1}\|_p \\ &\leq \|g 1_{\rho g \geq 1}\|_p + \|1_{\rho g \geq 1}\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

The two terms can easily be calculated explicitly, giving a term of order  $O(\rho^{\frac{1-p\alpha}{p\alpha}})$  for the first and a term of order  $O(\rho^{\frac{1}{p\alpha}})$  for the second. For the second graphon, we note that the condition  $W(x, y) \geq 1/\rho$  is equivalent to  $(1-x)(1-y) \leq (\rho(1-\alpha)^2)^{1/\alpha}$ . Changing to the variables  $1-x$  and  $1-y$ , we have to estimate the integral

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^1 (xy)^{-p\alpha} 1_{xy \leq \rho^{1/\alpha}} dx dy.$$

The integral can again be calculated explicitly, giving an error term of order  $O(\rho^{\frac{1-p\alpha}{\alpha}} |\log \rho|)$ . Taking the  $p^{\text{th}}$  root, we obtain the claimed tail bound for the second graphon.

All that remains is to estimate the oracle errors. Let  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  be a partition of  $[0, 1]$  into  $k$  adjacent intervals of size  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{k}$  (ordered from left to right), let  $g'$  be the function obtained by averaging  $g$  over these intervals on  $I_1 \cup I_2 \cdots \cup I_{k_0}$  (where  $k_0$  will be determined later), and let  $g' = 0$  on the remaining intervals. Define  $g_1, g_2: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  as above, define  $g'_1$  and  $g'_2$  analogously, and set  $W' = \frac{1}{2}(g'_1 + g'_2)$  for the graphon (7.1) and  $W' = g'_1 g'_2$  for the graphon (7.2). With this notation,

$$\|W - W'\|_p = \frac{1}{2} \|g_1 + g_2 - g'_1 - g'_2\|_p = \|g - g'\|_p$$

for the graphon (7.1), and

$$\|W - W'\|_p = \|g_1 g_2 - g'_1 g'_2\|_p \leq \|(g_1 - g'_1)g_2\|_p + \|g'_1(g_2 - g'_2)\|_p \leq \|g\|_p \|g - g'\|_p$$

for the graphon (7.2). So all we need to show is that  $\|g - g'\|_p = O(\varepsilon^\alpha)$ .

For  $i \leq k_0$ , let  $\bar{x}_i \in I_i$  be defined by  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{I_i} g = g(\bar{x}_i)$ . For  $x \in I_i$ , we bound  $|g(x) - g(\bar{x}_i)| \leq \max_{y \in I_i} \left| \frac{dg(y)}{dy} \right| |x - \bar{x}_i|$ , implying that the integral of  $|g(x) - g(\bar{x}_i)|^p$  over  $I_i$  can be bounded by  $\varepsilon^{p+1} \max_{y \in I_i} \left| \frac{dg(y)}{dy} \right|^p \leq \varepsilon^{p+1} (1 - i\varepsilon)^{-p(1+\alpha)}$ . Summing over  $i = 1, \dots, k_0$ , we get a contribution of

$O(\varepsilon^p(1-k_0\varepsilon)^{1-p(1+\alpha)})$  to  $\|g-g'\|_p^p$ . The integral of  $g^p$  from  $k_0\varepsilon$  to 1 will contribute  $O((1-k_0\varepsilon)^{1-\alpha p})$ . As a consequence, the choice  $k_0 = k - 1$  (which gives  $1 - k_0\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ ) leads to the estimate

$$\|g - g'\|_p^p = O(\varepsilon^{1-\alpha p}),$$

as desired.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank David Choi, Sofia Olhede, and Patrick Wolfe for initially introducing us to applications of graphons in machine learning of networks, and, in particular, to the problem of graphon estimation. We are indebted to Sofia Olhede and Patrick Wolfe for numerous helpful discussions in the early stages of this work, and to Alessandro Rinaldo for providing valuable feedback on our paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. Abbe, A. S. Bandeira, and G. Hall, *Exact recovery in the stochastic block model*, preprint, arXiv:1405.3267 (2014).
- [2] E. Abbe and C. Sandon, *Community detection in general stochastic block models: fundamental limits and efficient recovery algorithms*, preprint, arXiv:1503.00609 (2015). To appear in FOCS 2015.
- [3] E. Abbe and C. Sandon, *Recovering communities in the general stochastic block model without knowing the parameters*, preprint, arXiv:1506.03729 (2015).
- [4] E. M. Airoldi, D. M. Blei, S. E. Fienberg, and E. P. Xing, *Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **9** (2008), 1981–2014.
- [5] E. M. Airoldi, T. B. Costa, and S. H. Chan, *Stochastic blockmodel approximation of a graphon: theory and consistent estimation*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26, 2013, pp. 692–700. Extended version with proofs available at arXiv:1311.1731.
- [6] D. Aldous, *Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables*, J. Multivar. Anal. **11** (1981), 581–598.
- [7] A. A. Amini, A. Chen, P. J. Bickel, and E. Levina, *Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks*, Ann. Statist. **41** (2013), 2097–2122.
- [8] A. Anandkumar, R. Ge, D. Hsu, and S. M. Kakade, *A tensor approach to learning mixed membership community models*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **15** (2014), 2239–2312.
- [9] P. J. Bickel and A. Chen, *A nonparametric view of network models and Newman-Girvan and other modularities*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **106** (2009), 21068–21073.
- [10] P. J. Bickel, A. Chen, and E. Levina, *The method of moments and degree distributions for network models*, Annals of Statistics **39** (2011), 2280–2301.
- [11] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan, *The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs*, Random Struct. Algorithms **31** (2007), 3–122.
- [12] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, *Metrics for sparse graphs*, Surveys in combinatorics 2009 (eds. S. Huczynska, J. D. Mitchell, and C. M. Roney-Dougal), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **365**, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 211–287.
- [13] R. B. Boppana, *Eigenvalues and graph bisection: an average-case analysis*, 28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 1987, pp. 280–285.
- [14] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, and L. Lovász, *Moments of two-variable functions and the uniqueness of graph limits*, Geometric And Functional Analysis **19** (2010), no. 6, 1597–1619.
- [15] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, H. Cohn, and Y. Zhao, *An  $L^p$  theory of sparse graph convergence I: limits, sparse random graph models, and power law distributions*, preprint, arXiv:1401.2906 (2014).
- [16] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, H. Cohn, and Y. Zhao, *An  $L^p$  theory of sparse graph convergence II: LD convergence, quotients, and right convergence*, preprint, arXiv:1408.0744 (2014).
- [17] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. Sós, and K. Vesztegombi, *Counting graph homomorphisms*, Topics in discrete mathematics (eds. M. Klazar, J. Kratochvíl, M. Loeb, J. Matoušek, R. Thomas, and P. Valtr), Springer, 2006, pp. 315–371.
- [18] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. Sós, and K. Vesztegombi, *Convergent graph sequences I: subgraph frequencies, metric properties, and testing*, Advances in Math. **219** (2008), 1801–1851.
- [19] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. Sós, and K. Vesztegombi, *Convergent graph sequences II: multiway cuts and statistical physics*, Ann. of Math. **176** (2012), 151–219.
- [20] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, and A. Smith, *Private graphon estimation for sparse graphs*, preprint, arXiv:1506.06162 (2015).

- [21] D. Cai, N. Ackerman, and C. Freer, *An iterative step-function estimator for graphons*, preprint, arXiv:1412.2129 (2014).
- [22] S. H. Chan and E. M. Airoldi, *A consistent histogram estimator for exchangeable graph models*, Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings Volume 32), 2014, pp. 208–216.
- [23] S. Chatterjee, *Matrix estimation by universal singular value thresholding*, Annals of Statistics **43** (2015), no. 1, 177–214.
- [24] S. Chatterjee, P. Diaconis, and A. Sly, *Random graphs with a given degree sequence*, Annals of Applied Probability **21** (2011), no. 4, 1400–1435.
- [25] K. Chaudhuri, F. Chung, and A. Tsiatas, *Spectral clustering of graphs with general degrees in the extended planted partition model*, Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings Volume 23), 2012, pp. 35.1–35.23.
- [26] Y. Chen, S. Sanghavi, and H. Xu, *Clustering sparse graphs*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25, 2012, pp. 2204–2212.
- [27] P. Chin, A. Rao, and V. Vu, *Stochastic block model and community detection in sparse graphs: a spectral algorithm with optimal rate of recovery*, Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Learning Theory (JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings Volume 40), 2015, pp. 391–423.
- [28] D. S. Choi and P. J. Wolfe, *Co-clustering separately exchangeable network data*, Ann. Statist. **42** (2014), 29–63.
- [29] D. S. Choi, P. J. Wolfe, and E. M. Airoldi, *Stochastic blockmodels with a growing number of classes*, Biometrika **99** (2012), 273–284.
- [30] A. Coja-Oghlan, *Graph partitioning via adaptive spectral techniques*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **19** (2010), 227–284.
- [31] A. Dasgupta, J. Hopcroft, R. Kannan, and P. Mitra, *Spectral clustering by recursive partitioning*, Algorithms – ESA 2006 (eds. Y. Azar and T. Erlebach), Lecture Notes in Computer Science **4168**, Springer, 2006, pp. 256–267.
- [32] P. Diaconis and S. Janson, *Graph limits and exchangeable random graphs*, Rendiconti di Matematica **28** (2008), 33–61.
- [33] M. E. Dyer and A. M. Frieze, *The solution of some random NP-hard problems in polynomial expected time*, J. Algorithms **10** (1989), 451–489.
- [34] S. E. Fienberg, M. M. Meyer, and S. S. Wasserman, *Statistical analysis of multiple sociometric relations*, Journal of the American Statistical Association **80** (1985), 51–67.
- [35] D. E. Fishkind, D. L. Sussman, M. Tang, J. T. Vogelstein, and C. E. Priebe, *Consistent adjacency-spectral partitioning for the stochastic block model when the model parameters are unknown*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **34** (2013), 23–39.
- [36] A. Frieze and R. Kannan, *Quick approximation to matrices and applications*, Combinatorica **19** (1999), 175–220.
- [37] C. Gao, Y. Lu, and H. H. Zhou, *Rate-optimal graphon estimation*, preprint, arXiv:1410.5837 (2014).
- [38] B. Hajek, Y. Wu, and J. Xu, *Achieving exact cluster recovery threshold via semidefinite programming*, preprint, arXiv:1412.6156 (2014).
- [39] B. Hajek, Y. Wu, and J. Xu, *Achieving exact cluster recovery threshold via semidefinite programming: extensions*, preprint, arXiv:1502.07738 (2015).
- [40] W. Hoeffding, *The strong law of large numbers for U-statistics*, North Carolina State University, Institute of Statistics Mimeograph Series **302** (1961).
- [41] P. D. Hoff, A. E. Raftery, and M. S. Handcock, *Latent space approaches to social network analysis*, Journal of the American Statistical Association **97** (2002), no. 460, 1090–1098.
- [42] P. W. Holland, K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt, *Stochastic blockmodels: first steps*, Social Networks **5** (1983), 109–137.
- [43] D. Hoover, *Relations on probability spaces and arrays of random variables*, preprint, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ (1979).
- [44] S. Janson, *Graphons, cut norm and distance, couplings and rearrangements*, NYJM Monographs, vol. 4, State University of New York, University at Albany, Albany, NY, 2013. 76 pp.
- [45] M. Jerrum and G. B. Sorkin, *The Metropolis algorithm for graph bisection*, Discrete Appl. Math. **82** (1998), 155–175.
- [46] O. Kallenberg, *Multivariate sampling and the estimation problem for exchangeable arrays*, Journal of Theoretical Probability **12** (1999), 859–883.
- [47] O. Klopp, A. B. Tsybakov, and N. Verzelen, *Oracle inequalities for network models and sparse graphon estimation*, preprint, arXiv:1507.04118 (2015).
- [48] P. Latouche and S. Robin, *Bayesian model averaging of stochastic block models to estimate the graphon function and motif frequencies in a W-graph model*, preprint, arXiv:1310.6150 (2013).
- [49] S. L. Lauritzen, *Rasch models with exchangeable rows and columns*, Bayesian Statistics 7 (eds. J. M. Bernardo, M. J. Bayarri, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, D. Heckerman, A. F. M. Smith, and M. West), 2003, pp. 215–232.

- [50] J. Lei and A. Rinaldo, *Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models*, Annals of Statistics **43** (2014), no. 1, 215–237.
- [51] J. Lei and L. Zhu, *A generic sample splitting approach for refined community recovery in stochastic block models*, preprint, arXiv:1411.1469 (2014).
- [52] J. R. Lloyd, P. Orbanz, Z. Ghahramani, and D. M. Roy, *Random function priors for exchangeable arrays with applications to graphs and relational data*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25, 2012, pp. 1007–1015.
- [53] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy, *Limits of dense graph sequences*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **96** (2006), 933–957.
- [54] L. Massoulié, *Community detection thresholds and the weak Ramanujan property*, preprint, arXiv:1311.3085 (2013).
- [55] F. McSherry, *Spectral partitioning of random graphs*, Proceedings of the 42nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2001, pp. 529–537.
- [56] S. C. Olhede and P. J. Wolfe, *Network histograms and universality of blockmodel approximation*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **111** (2014), 14722–14727.
- [57] T. Qin and K. Rohe, *Regularized spectral clustering under the degree-corrected stochastic blockmodel*, preprint, arXiv:1309.4111 (2013).
- [58] K. Rohe, S. Chatterjee, and B. Yu, *Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel*, Ann. Statist. **39** (2011), 1878–1915.
- [59] J. V. Ryff, *Measure preserving transformations and rearrangements*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **31** (1970), 449–458.
- [60] T. A. B. Snijders and K. Nowicki, *Estimation and prediction for stochastic blockmodels for graphs with latent block structure*, Journal of Classification **14** (1997), 75–100.
- [61] M. Tang, D. L. Sussman, and C. E. Priebe, *Universally consistent vertex classification for latent positions graphs*, Ann. Statist. **41** (2013), 1406–1430.
- [62] V. S. Varadarajan, *Groups of automorphisms of Borel spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1963), 191–220.
- [63] V. Vu, *A simple SVD algorithm for finding hidden partitions*, preprint, arXiv:1404.3918 (2014).
- [64] Y. J. Wang and G. Y. Wong, *Stochastic blockmodels for directed graphs*, Journal of the American Statistical Association **82** (1987), 8–19.
- [65] H. C. White, S. A. Boorman, and R. L. Breiger, *Social structure from multiple networks. I. Blockmodels of roles and positions*, American Journal of Sociology **80** (1976), 730780.
- [66] P. J. Wolfe and S. C. Olhede, *Nonparametric graphon estimation*, preprint, arXiv:1309.5936 (2013).
- [67] J. J. Yang, Q. Han, and E. M. Airoldi, *Nonparametric estimation and testing of exchangeable graph models*, Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings Volume 33), 2014, pp. 1060–1067.
- [68] S.-Y. Yun and A. Proutiere, *Accurate community detection in the stochastic block model via spectral algorithms*, preprint, arXiv:1412.7335 (2014).
- [69] S.-Y. Yun and A. Proutiere, *Community detection via random and adaptive sampling*, Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Learning Theory (JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings Volume 35), 2014, pp. 138–175.

APPENDIX A. COUPLINGS, METRICS, AND EQUIVALENCE

We start this appendix by reformulating Remark 2.1 in the more general setting of Borel spaces.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $p \geq 1$  and let  $W$  and  $W'$  be  $L^p$  graphons over two Borel spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ . Then the following hold:*

(i) *The infima in (1.1) and (2.3) are attained for some couplings  $\nu$ .*

(ii) *If  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  are atomless, then the distances  $\delta_p(W, W')$  and  $\delta_{\square}(W, W')$  can be expressed as*

$$\delta_p(W, W') = \inf_{\phi} \|W - (W')^{\phi}\|_p = \inf_{\Phi} \|W - (W')^{\Phi}\|_p$$

and

$$\delta_{\square}(W, W') = \inf_{\phi} \|W - (W')^{\phi}\|_{\square} = \inf_{\Phi} \|W - (W')^{\Phi}\|_{\square},$$

where the infima over  $\phi$  are over measure-preserving maps from  $\Omega$  to  $\Omega'$  and the infima over  $\Phi$  are over isomorphisms from  $\Omega$  to  $\Omega'$ .

For the cut metric, the first statement is a special case of Theorem 6.16 in [44] (see also Lemma 2.6 in [12], which proves the statement for bounded graphons over  $[0, 1]$ ), while the second is

essentially<sup>12</sup> given in Lemma 3.5 in [18]. The proofs for the distance  $\delta_p$  are virtually identical. For the convenience of the reader, we sketch them below.

Note that the first statement does not hold without the assumption that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  are Borel spaces; see, for example, Example 8.13 in [44] for a counterexample. Similarly, the assumption that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  are atomless is needed for the second statement to hold; see Remark 6.10 in [44]. (Indeed, the condition involving  $\Phi$  does not even make sense unless  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$  are isomorphic, but all atomless Borel spaces are isomorphic by Theorem A.7 in [44]. For arbitrary probability spaces there may not even be any measure-preserving maps from  $\Omega$  to  $\Omega'$ .)

*Proof.* We begin with part (i). For the cut metric, this is a special case of Theorem 6.16 in [44]. The proof for the metric  $\delta_p$  is very similar. For the convenience of the reader, we give the proof below, combining proof techniques from [44] and [12].

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the set of all probability measures on  $\Omega \times \Omega'$  for which the marginals are  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$ . We first observe that  $\mathcal{M}$  is compact in the weak\* topology. To see why, first note that by Theorem A.4(iv) in [44], the measurable spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  are either countable (with all subsets measurable) or isomorphic to  $[0, 1]$  with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $\mathcal{A}_0$  be the set of all  $A \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega'$  that are products of intervals with rational endpoints in the  $[0, 1]$  case and finite sets in the countable case. Since  $\mathcal{A}_0$  is countable, any sequence of measures  $\nu_n \in \mathcal{M}$  has a subsequence  $\nu'_n$  such that  $\nu'_n(A)$  converges for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}_0$  generates the product  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega \times \Omega'$ , the limit can be extended to a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Omega \times \Omega'$ , which can easily be checked to have  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  as marginals, implying that  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Consider a sequence of couplings  $\nu_n$  such that

$$(A.1) \quad \delta_p(W, W') = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int \left| W(x, y) - W'(x', y') \right|^p d\nu_n(x, x') d\nu_n(y, y') \right)^{1/p}.$$

By the compactness of  $\mathcal{M}$ , we may pass to a subsequence (which we again denote by  $\nu_n$ ) for which there is a limit  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\nu_n(A) \rightarrow \nu(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$ . Since  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\delta_p(W, W') \leq \left( \int \left| W(x, y) - W'(x', y') \right|^p d\nu(x, x') d\nu(y, y') \right)^{1/p}.$$

To prove a matching lower bound we fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  to be sent to zero later. By (A.1), we can find an  $n_0$  such that

$$\delta_p(W, W') \geq \left( \int \left| W(x, y) - W'(x', y') \right|^p d\nu_n(x, x') d\nu_n(y, y') \right)^{1/p} - \varepsilon.$$

for all  $n \geq n_0$ . Since  $W \in L^p$ , we can find an  $M$  such that  $\|W 1_{W \geq M}\|_p \leq \varepsilon$ , and since  $W 1_{W < M}$  is bounded, we can find a graphon  $\tilde{W}$  which is a finite sum of the form  $\tilde{W} = \sum_{i,j} \beta_{i,j} 1_{A_i \times A_j}$  with  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_0$  such that  $\|W 1_{W < M} - \tilde{W}\|_p \leq \varepsilon$ , implying in particular  $\|W - \tilde{W}\|_p \leq 2\varepsilon$ . In a similar way, we can find  $\tilde{W}'$  of the form  $\tilde{W}' = \sum_{k,\ell} \beta'_{k,\ell} 1_{B_k \times B_\ell}$  with  $B_i \in \mathcal{A}_0$  and  $\|W' - \tilde{W}'\|_p \leq 2\varepsilon$ . As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_p(W, W') &\geq \left( \int \left| \tilde{W}(x, y) - \tilde{W}'(x', y') \right|^p d\nu_n(x, x') d\nu_n(y, y') \right)^{1/p} - 5\varepsilon \\ &= \left( \sum_{i,j,k,\ell} |\beta_{ij} - \beta'_{k\ell}|^p \nu_n(A_i \times B_k) \nu_n(A_j \times B_\ell) \right)^{1/p} - 5\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

<sup>12</sup>While Lemma 3.5 in [18] was only stated for bounded graphons over  $[0, 1]$ , the generalization to unbounded graphons over an atomless Borel space is straightforward.

for all  $n \geq n_0$ . We can take the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  on the right side, to obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_p(W, W') &\geq \left( \sum_{i,j,k,\ell} |\beta_{ij} - \beta'_{k\ell}|^p \nu(A_i \times B_k) \nu(A_j \times B_\ell) \right)^{1/p} - 5\varepsilon \\ &= \left( \int \left| \tilde{W}(x, y) - \tilde{W}'(x', y') \right|^p d\nu(x, x') d\nu(y, y') \right)^{1/p} - 5\varepsilon \\ &\geq \left( \int \left| W(x, y) - W'(x', y') \right|^p d\nu(x, x') d\nu(y, y') \right)^{1/p} - 9\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary, this proves part (i) of the lemma.

We now turn to part (ii). All atomless Borel spaces are isomorphic to  $[0, 1]$  (with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and uniform distribution), by Theorem A.7 in [44]. Thus, we can assume without loss of generality that  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$  are both  $[0, 1]$ .

Choosing  $z$  uniform at random from  $[0, 1]$ , the map  $z \mapsto (z, \phi(z))$  provides a coupling showing that  $\delta_p(W, W') \leq \inf_\phi \|W - (W')^\phi\|_p$  and  $\delta_\square(W, W') \leq \inf_\phi \|W - (W')^\phi\|_\square$ . It is also obvious that  $\inf_\phi \|W - (W')^\phi\|_p \leq \inf_\Phi \|W - (W')^\Phi\|_p$  and  $\inf_\phi \|W - (W')^\phi\|_\square \leq \inf_\Phi \|W - (W')^\Phi\|_\square$ .

To prove equality, one first approximates  $W$  and  $W'$  by piecewise constant functions (more precisely, graphons on  $[n]$  equipped with the uniform measure), and then approximates an arbitrary coupling of two uniform measures on  $[n]$  by a bijection on a ‘‘blow-up’’  $[nk]$  of  $[n]$ . Mapping this bijection back to an isomorphism  $\Phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  then gives a lower bound on  $\delta_p(W, W')$  in terms of  $\inf_\Phi \|W^\Phi - W'^\Phi\|_p$ , minus some error which can be taken to be arbitrarily small. The details are very similar to the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [18], which proves equality for the cut norm when  $W$  and  $W'$  are bounded, and we leave them to the reader. Note that the generalization to unbounded graphons is straightforward, given that  $\|W1_{W \geq M}\|_p \rightarrow 0$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\|W1_{W \geq M}\|_\square \leq \|W1_{W \geq M}\|_1$ .  $\square$

In the remainder of this appendix, we prove most of the theorems from Section 2.4. We rely heavily on both the results and the techniques of [14] and [44]; see also [12]. Before turning to these proofs, we relate the notion of equivalence from Definition 2.5 to the notion of ‘‘weak isomorphism’’ from [14], which requires the maps  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  to be measure preserving with respect to the completion of the spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ . It is clear that equivalence implies weak isomorphism, since maps that are measurable with respect to  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  are clearly measurable with respect to their completions. We can also turn this around, at least when the third space is a *Lebesgue space*, i.e., the completion of a Borel space. This follows from part (i) of the following technical lemma.

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $W$  and  $W'$  be graphons over two probability spaces  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ , respectively.*

(i) *Assume that there exist measure-preserving maps  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  from the completions of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  to a Lebesgue space  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', \pi'')$  and a graphon  $U$  over  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', \pi'')$  such that  $W = U^\phi$  and  $W' = U^{\phi'}$  almost everywhere. Then there exists a standard Borel graphon  $\tilde{U}$  and measure-preserving maps  $\tilde{\phi}$  and  $\tilde{\phi}'$  from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  to the Borel space on which  $\tilde{U}$  is defined such that  $W = \tilde{U}^{\tilde{\phi}}$  and  $W' = \tilde{U}^{\tilde{\phi}'}$  almost everywhere. If  $U$  is twin-free, then  $\tilde{U}$  can be chosen to be twin-free as well.*

(ii) *If  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  are Borel spaces and  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0 when considered as graphons over the completion of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ , then they are also isomorphic modulo 0 as graphons over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Since every Lebesgue space is isomorphic modulo 0 to the union of an interval  $[0, p]$  and a collection of atoms  $x_i$  (see Theorem A.10 in [44]), we may without loss of generality assume that  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', \pi'')$  is of this form. Assume without loss of generality that the atoms are represented as

points  $x_i \in (p, 1]$ , so that  $\phi$  takes values in  $[0, 1]$ . Noting that  $\mathcal{F}''$  is the completion of a Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}''$ , define  $\tilde{U}$  as the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}[U \mid \mathcal{B}'' \times \mathcal{B}'']$ . Then  $\tilde{U}$  is a Borel graphon such that  $U = \tilde{U}$  almost everywhere. Since  $\phi$  is measure preserving from the completion  $(\Omega, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \pi)$  of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  to  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'', \pi'')$ , it is also measure preserving from  $(\Omega, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \pi)$  to  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{B}'', \pi'')$ . Replacing  $\phi$  by the conditional expectation  $\tilde{\phi} = \mathbb{E}[\phi \mid \mathcal{F}]$ , we obtain a measure-preserving map  $\tilde{\phi}$  from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  to  $(\Omega'', \mathcal{B}'', \pi'')$  such that  $W = \tilde{U}^{\tilde{\phi}}$  almost everywhere. If  $U$  is twin-free, then so is  $\tilde{U}$ .

(ii) The completions of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  are Lebesgue spaces. Since every Lebesgue space is isomorphic modulo 0 to the disjoint union of an interval  $[0, p]$  (equipped with the Lebesgue  $\sigma$ -algebra and the uniform measure) and countably many atoms  $x_i$ , we have that as graphons over the completion of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ , both  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0 to a graphon  $U$  over such a space. Proceeding as in the proof of (i), we can then replace  $U$  by a Borel graphon  $\tilde{U}$  such that  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0 to the graphon  $\tilde{U}$ , which in particular implies that  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.8.* If  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0, they are clearly equivalent. Assume on the other hand that  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent. Moving from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  to their completion, we obtain graphons which are defined on a Lebesgue space and are weakly isomorphic in the sense of [14]. For bounded graphons, we can then use Theorem 2.1 of [14] to conclude that  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0 as graphons over the completion of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ . By Lemma A.2, this implies that they are also isomorphic modulo 0 as graphons over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$ .

If  $W$  and  $W'$  are unbounded, let  $\tilde{W} = \tanh W$  and  $\tilde{W}' = \tanh W'$ . Clearly,  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent if and only if  $\tilde{W}$  and  $\tilde{W}'$  are equivalent, and  $W$  and  $W'$  are isomorphic modulo 0 if and only if  $\tilde{W}$  and  $\tilde{W}'$  are isomorphic modulo 0. Therefore the unbounded case follows from the bounded case.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.9.* For bounded graphons, the analogous statement for graphons over a Lebesgue space was proven in [14]; in particular, by Corollary 3.3 from [14], we can find a twin-free graphon  $U$  over a Lebesgue space  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  and a measure-preserving map  $\phi$  from the completion of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  to  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \pi')$  such that  $W = U^\phi$  almost everywhere. By Lemma A.2, this implies the existence of a twin-free standard Borel graphon  $\tilde{U}$  on a Borel space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\pi})$  and a measure-preserving map from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  to  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\pi})$  such that  $W = \tilde{U}^{\tilde{\phi}}$  almost everywhere, which proves (ii) for bounded graphons. Statement (i) follows from (ii) by expanding the atoms  $x_i$  in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  into intervals of widths  $p_i = \tilde{\pi}(x_i)$ .

To reduce the case of unbounded graphons to the case of bounded graphons, we again use the transformation  $W \mapsto \tanh W$ , which maps arbitrary graphons to bounded graphons.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.11.* We first note that the implications (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) are trivial. So all that remains to prove is that (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii), and by Theorem 2.9, it will be enough to prove this for graphons  $W$  and  $W'$  over  $[0, 1]$  equipped with the uniform distribution.

Assume thus that  $W$  and  $W'$  are graphons over  $[0, 1]$  with  $\delta_\square(W, W') = 0$ . By Lemma A.1 this implies that  $W$  and  $W'$  can be coupled in such a way that  $\|W - W'\|_\square = 0$ , which in turn implies that  $W(x, y) = W'(x', y')$  almost surely with respect to this coupling. As a consequence,  $\delta_\square(\tanh W, \tanh W') = 0$ . By the results of [14], this implies that  $\tanh W$  and  $\tanh W'$  are equivalent, which in turn gives that  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent, as required.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. CONCENTRATION BOUNDS

We start with a slight generalization of the multiplicative Chernoff bound.

**Lemma B.1.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random variables with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ , let  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ , and suppose there exists  $X_0 \in [0, \infty)$  such that*

$$\sum_i \mathbb{E}[X_i^m] \leq X_0 \quad \text{for all } m \geq 2.$$

Then

$$\Pr(X - \mathbb{E}[X] \geq X_0 t) \leq \exp\left(-\min\{t, t^2\} \frac{X_0}{3}\right)$$

for  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* As in the proof of the standard Chernoff bound, we estimate the expectation of  $e^{\alpha X}$  for a constant  $\alpha \geq 0$  to be determined later. To this end, we first bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha X_i}] &= 1 + \alpha \mathbb{E}[X_i] + \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{\alpha^m \mathbb{E}[X_i^m]}{m!} \\ &\leq \exp\left(\alpha \mathbb{E}[X_i] + \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{\alpha^m \mathbb{E}[X_i^m]}{m!}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which together with the assumption of the lemma proves that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha X}] \leq \exp\left(\alpha \mathbb{E}[X] + \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{\alpha^m}{m!} \sum_i \mathbb{E}[X_i^m]\right) \leq e^{\alpha \mathbb{E}[X] + (e^\alpha - \alpha - 1)X_0}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X \geq \mathbb{E}[X] + tX_0) &= \Pr\left(e^{\alpha X - \alpha \mathbb{E}[X] - t\alpha X_0} \geq 1\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha X}] e^{-\alpha \mathbb{E}[X] - t\alpha X_0} \\ &\leq e^{(e^\alpha - \alpha - 1)X_0 - t\alpha X_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\alpha = \log(1+t)$  gives  $e^\alpha - 1 - \alpha - t\alpha = t - (t+1)\log(t+1)$  and hence

$$\Pr(X \geq \mathbb{E}[X] + tX_0) \leq e^{-X_0((t+1)\log(t+1)-t)} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{X_0}{3} \min\{t, t^2\}\right).$$

□

Lemma B.1 immediately implies the following lemma. To state it, we define, for an arbitrary symmetric matrix  $Q \in [0, 1]^{n \times n}$  with empty diagonal, the random symmetric matrix  $A = \text{Bern}(Q) \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$  obtained by setting  $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = 1$  with probability  $Q_{ij}$ , independently for all  $i < j$ , and  $A_{ij} = 0$  whenever  $i = j$ . Note that with this notation,  $\mathbb{E}[A_\pi] = Q_\pi$  for all  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ . The following lemma states that  $A_\pi$  is tightly concentrated around its expectation.

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , let  $Q$  be a symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix with entries in  $[0, 1]$  and empty diagonal, and let  $A = \text{Bern}(Q)$ . Let  $\varepsilon$  be the random variable  $\varepsilon = \max_{\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]} \|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1$ . Then*

$$(B.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon] \leq 9 \sqrt{\rho(Q) \left( \frac{1 + \log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2} \right)}.$$

If  $n\rho(Q) \geq 1$ , then with probability at least  $1 - e^{-n}$

$$(B.2) \quad \varepsilon \leq 8 \sqrt{\rho(Q) \left( \frac{1 + \log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2} \right)}.$$

Recall that  $\rho(Q)$  means  $\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j} Q_{ij}$ .

*Proof.* We begin with the proof of (B.2). We distinguish two cases:

If  $\frac{1+\log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2} \geq \rho(Q)$ , all we need to show is that with probability at least  $1 - e^{-n}$ , the left side is at most  $8\rho(Q)$ . To prove this, we bound

$$\|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1 \leq \|A_\pi\|_1 + \|Q_\pi\|_1 = \|A\|_1 + \|Q\|_1.$$

Now we apply Lemma B.1 to the random variable  $X = \sum_{i<j} A_{ij}$ . Because  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i<j} A_{ij}^n] = \sum_{i<j} Q_{ij} = \frac{n^2}{2}\rho(Q)$ , we can take  $X_0 = \frac{n^2}{2}\rho(Q)$ . Taking  $t = 6$ , we see that with probability at least  $1 - e^{-n^2\rho(Q)} \geq 1 - e^{-n}$ ,

$$\|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1 \leq 2\|Q\|_1 + 6\rho(Q) = 8\rho(Q).$$

If  $\frac{1+\log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2} \leq \rho(Q)$ , we will use a union bound over all  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ . Considering first a fixed  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ , we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1 &= \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{u<v} (Q_{uv} - A_{uv}) \text{sign}((Q_\pi)_{uv} - (A_\pi)_{uv}) \\ &= \max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\pi} \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{u<v} B_{uv} (Q_{uv} - A_{uv}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_\pi$  consists of all matrices with entries  $\pm 1$  that are constant on the partition classes of  $\pi$  (note that  $\mathcal{B}_\pi$  has size  $2^{k_0^2}$ , where  $k_0 \leq k$  is the number of non-empty classes in  $\pi$ ). Applying Lemma B.1 again, this time to the random variables  $B_{uv}A_{uv}$ , noting that  $\sum_{u<v} \mathbb{E}[(B_{uv}A_{uv})^\alpha] \leq \sum_{u<v} \mathbb{E}[A_{uv}] \leq \frac{n^2}{2}\rho(Q)$ , and using the union bound to deal with the maximum over  $B' \in \mathcal{B}_\pi$ , we find that

$$\Pr(\|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1 \geq t\rho(Q)) \leq 2^{k^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\min\{t, t^2\}}{6} n^2 \rho(Q)\right).$$

Setting

$$t = 6\sqrt{\frac{1 + \log k}{n\rho(Q)} + \frac{k^2}{n^2\rho(Q)}},$$

our case assumption implies that  $t \leq 6$ , which in turn implies that

$$\min\{t, t^2\} \geq \frac{t^2}{6} = 6\left(\frac{1 + \log k}{n\rho(Q)} + \frac{k^2}{n^2\rho(Q)}\right).$$

As a consequence, for each partition  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\|A_\pi - Q_\pi\|_1 \geq t\rho(Q)) &\leq \exp(k^2 \log 2 - n(1 + \log k) - k^2) \\ &\leq e^{-n(1+\log k)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the union bound over all partitions  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ , we obtain the desired bound.

All that remains is to prove (B.1). If  $n\rho(Q) \leq 1$ , we bound

$$\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|A - Q\|_1] \leq \|Q\|_1 + \mathbb{E}[\|A\|_1] = 2\rho(Q) \leq 2\sqrt{\rho(Q)/n}.$$

If  $n\rho(Q) \geq 1$ , we use (B.2) and the fact that  $\varepsilon \leq \|Q\|_1 + \|A\|_1 \leq 2$  to bound

$$\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon] \leq 8\sqrt{\rho(Q)} \left(\frac{1 + \log k}{n} + \frac{k^2}{n^2}\right) + 2e^{-n}.$$

Because  $2e^{-n} \leq 1/n \leq \sqrt{n\rho(Q)}/n = \sqrt{\rho(Q)/n}$ , this completes the proof.  $\square$

Our next lemma states that a similar bound holds for the cut norm of  $A - Q$ .

**Lemma B.3.** *Let  $n \geq 2$ , let  $Q$  be a symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix with entries in  $[0, 1]$  and empty diagonal, and let  $A = \text{Bern}(Q)$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|A - Q\|_{\square}] \leq 16\sqrt{\frac{\rho(Q)}{n}}.$$

If  $n\rho(Q) \geq 1$ , then with probability at least  $1 - e^{-n}$ ,

$$(B.3) \quad \|A - Q\|_{\square} \leq 15\sqrt{\frac{\rho(Q)}{n}}.$$

*Proof.* A bound of the form (B.3) can easily be inferred from Lemma 7.2 in [15]. For the convenience of the reader, we give an independent, slightly simpler proof here.

Let  $\mathcal{F}_n$  be the set of functions  $f: [n] \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$ . It is not hard to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A - Q\|_{\square} &\leq \max_{f, g \in \mathcal{F}_n} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i, j} f(i)g(j)(A_{ij} - Q_{ij}) \\ &\leq \max_{f, g \in \mathcal{F}_n} \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} f(i)g(j)(A_{ij} - Q_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma B.2, a union bound and Lemma B.1 now imply that

$$\Pr(\|A - Q\|_{\square} \geq t\rho(Q)) \leq 4^n \exp\left(-\frac{\min\{t, t^2\}}{6} n^2 \rho(Q)\right).$$

Choosing  $t = 6 \log(4e) / \sqrt{n\rho(Q)}$  and observing that  $6 \log(4e) \leq 15$  then gives the high probability bound. The bound in expectation follows from this bound and the observation that  $\|A - Q\|_{\square} \leq 2\rho(Q)$ . Indeed, if  $n\rho(Q) \geq 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} 15\sqrt{\rho(Q)/n} + 2e^{-n}\rho(Q) &\leq 15\sqrt{\rho(Q)/n} + 2\rho(Q)/(en) \\ &\leq 16\sqrt{\rho(Q)/n} \end{aligned}$$

(for the final step recall that  $\rho(Q) \leq 1$ ), and if  $n\rho(Q) \leq 1$ , then  $2\rho(Q) \leq 2\sqrt{\rho(Q)/n}$ .  $\square$

### APPENDIX C. PROOFS OF LEMMAS 2.19, 2.20, AND 2.21

We start with the following lemma, which is an easy consequence of the law of large numbers for  $U$ -statistics.

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \pi)$  be a probability space, and let  $W: \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be in  $L^p$  for some  $p \geq 1$ . Then  $\|H_n(W)\|_p \rightarrow \|W\|_p$  a.s.*

*Proof.* Define  $U = |W|^p$ , and choose  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  i.i.d. with distribution  $\pi$ . Then

$$\|H_n(W)\|_p^p = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} |W(x_i, x_j)|^p = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} U(x_i, x_j).$$

By the strong law of large numbers for  $U$ -statistics (see, for example, [40]), the right side converges to  $\|U\|_1 = \|W\|_p^p$  as claimed.  $\square$

Next we prove Lemma 2.20.

*Proof of Lemma 2.20.* We first note that the statement clearly holds if  $W$  is replaced by the block model  $W^{(k)} = W_{\mathcal{P}_k}$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_k$  is the partition of  $[0, 1]$  into consecutive intervals of length  $1/k$ . To see this, one just needs to use the fact that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the fraction of points  $x_i$  which fall into the  $j^{\text{th}}$  interval converges a.s. to  $1/k$ .

To prove the statement of the lemma for general  $W$ , we will use Lemma C.1. Let  $\rho = \rho_n$ , fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , choose  $k$  so that  $\|W - W^{(k)}\|_p \leq \varepsilon$ , and let  $M$  be large enough that  $\|W1_{W \geq M}\|_p \leq \varepsilon$ . Also, define  $W_\rho = \min\{W, 1/\rho\}$ . Noting that  $\frac{1}{\rho}Q_n = H_n(W_\rho)$ , we then bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|W - \frac{1}{\rho}Q_n\|_p &= \|W - H_n(W_\rho)\|_p \\ &\leq \|W - W^{(k)}\|_p + \|W^{(k)} - H_n(W^{(k)})\|_p \\ &\quad + \|H_n(W^{(k)}) - H_n(W)\|_p + \|H_n(W) - H_n(W_\rho)\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming  $n$  is large enough to ensure that  $\rho^{-1} \geq M$  (which in turn implies that  $|W - W_\rho| = W - W_\rho \leq W1_{W \geq M}$ ), we then bound the right side by

$$\varepsilon + \|W^{(k)} - H_n(W^{(k)})\|_p + \|H_n(W^{(k)} - W)\|_p + \|H_n(W1_{W \geq M})\|_p.$$

As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the second term goes to zero with probability one, and the third and the fourth both converge to quantities which are at most  $\varepsilon$  by Lemma C.1. Thus, with probability one, the limit superior of  $\|W - \frac{1}{\rho}Q_n\|_p$  is at most  $3\varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary, this proves the claim.  $\square$

Next we prove Lemma 2.19. To this end, we start with a simple technical lemma. We use  $\lambda$  to denote the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$  or  $[0, 1]^2$  (depending on the context), and, as usual, we use  $A \triangle B$  to denote the symmetric difference of two sets  $A, B$ , i.e.,  $A \triangle B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ .

**Lemma C.2.** *Let  $W$  and  $W'$  be of the form  $W = \sum_{i,j} B_{ij}1_{Y_i \times Y_j}$  and  $W' = \sum_{i,j} B_{ij}1_{Y'_i \times Y'_j}$ , where  $B$  is a  $k \times k$  matrix, and  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k), (Y'_1, \dots, Y'_k)$  are partitions of  $[0, 1]$ . If  $\lambda(Y_i \triangle Y'_i) \leq \varepsilon \lambda(Y_i)$  for all  $i$ , then*

$$\|W - W'\|_p \leq \sqrt[p]{2\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon)} \|W\|_p.$$

*Proof.* We begin with the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|W - W'\|_p^p &= \left\| \sum_{i,j} (W1_{Y_i \times Y_j} - W'1_{Y'_i \times Y'_j}) \right\|_p^p \\ &\leq \sum_{i,j} |B_{ij}|^p \lambda((Y_i \times Y_j) \triangle (Y'_i \times Y'_j)). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$(Y_i \times Y_j) \triangle (Y'_i \times Y'_j) \subseteq ((Y_i \cup Y'_i) \times (Y_j \triangle Y'_j)) \cup ((Y_i \triangle Y'_i) \times (Y_j \cup Y'_j)).$$

Combining this containment with  $\lambda(Y_i \triangle Y'_i) \leq \varepsilon \lambda(Y_i)$  and  $\lambda(Y_i \cup Y'_i) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda(Y_i)$  yields

$$\|W - W'\|_p^p \leq 2\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{i,j} |B_{ij}|^p \lambda(Y_i \cup Y_j) = 2\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon) \|W\|_p^p,$$

as desired.  $\square$

*Remark C.3.* A slight variation of the above proof also shows that

$$\|W - W'\|_p \leq \max_i \frac{1}{\lambda(Y_i)^{2/p}} \|W\|_p,$$

no matter how large the measure of the symmetric differences  $Y_i \triangle Y'_i$  is. To see this, just bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|W - W'\|_p^p &\leq \sum_{i,j} |B_{ij}|^p \max\{\lambda(Y_i \times Y_j), \lambda(Y'_i \times Y'_j)\} \\ &\leq \|W\|_p^p \max_i \left( \frac{\lambda(Y'_i)}{\lambda(Y_i)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \|W\|_p^p \max_i \frac{1}{\lambda(Y_i)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.19.* If  $\kappa = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}(W) = \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}(W)$  and there is nothing to prove. We may therefore assume without loss of generality that  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ .

To prove the first bound, we write  $W'$  as  $(\mathbf{p}, B)$  and reorder the elements of  $[k]$  so that  $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_k$ . Also, without loss of generality, we may remove all labels with  $p_i = 0$ , so that  $p_i \geq \kappa$  for all  $i$ . Define  $W'' = (\mathbf{p}'', B)$ , where  $\mathbf{p}''$  is obtained from  $\mathbf{p}$  so that for each  $i$ ,  $p_1'' + \dots + p_i''$  equals  $p_1 + \dots + p_i$  rounded to the nearest multiple of  $1/n$  (with the convention that in the case of ties, we choose the point to the left). After embedding both  $W'$  and  $W''$  into the space of graphons on  $[0, 1]$ , we can write the resulting graphons  $\widetilde{W}'' = \mathbf{W}[W'']$  and  $\widetilde{W}' = \mathbf{W}[W']$  in the form  $\widetilde{W}'' = \sum_{i,j} B_{ij} 1_{Y_i'' \times Y_j''}$  and  $\widetilde{W}' = \sum_{i,j} B_{ij} 1_{Y_i \times Y_j}$ , where  $Y_i$  and  $Y_i''$  are intervals whose endpoints differ by at most  $1/(2n)$ . As a consequence  $\lambda(Y_i \triangle Y_i'') \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa n} \lambda(Y_i)$ . By Lemma C.2 and the fact that  $\frac{1}{\kappa n} \leq 1$ , this implies that

$$(C.1) \quad \|\mathbf{W}[W'] - \mathbf{W}[W'']\|_p^p \leq \frac{4}{\kappa n} \|W'\|_p^p.$$

To complete the proof of the first bound, all we need to show is that  $W'' \in \mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ , which means we need to show that  $np_i'' = n\lambda(Y_i'') \geq \lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$  for all  $i$ . Let  $i_0$  be the first  $i$  such that  $np_i$  is not an integer. For  $i < i_0$ , we then have  $np_i'' = np_i \geq \kappa n \geq \lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ . On the other hand, for  $i \geq i_0$ , we can use  $|np_i - np_i''| \leq 1$ , which follows from  $|n(p_1 + \dots + p_i) - n(p_1'' + \dots + p_i'')| \leq 1/2$ . We then conclude that  $np_i'' \geq np_i - 1 \geq np_{i_0} - 1 > \lfloor np_{i_0} \rfloor - 1 \geq \lfloor \kappa n \rfloor - 1$ , where we used that  $np_{i_0}$  is not an integer. Since  $np_i''$  is an integer, this implies  $np_i'' \geq \lfloor \kappa n \rfloor$ , which shows that  $W'' \in \mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ . Identifying  $W''$  with the corresponding matrix in  $\mathcal{A}_{n, \geq \kappa}$ , this proves the first bound.

To prove the second bound we first observe that the minimizer  $W'' = (\mathbf{p}'', B) \in \mathcal{B}_{n, \geq \kappa}$  obeys the bound  $\|W''\|_p \leq 2\|W'\|_p$ . Our task is now to find a block model  $W' \in \mathcal{B}_{\geq \kappa}$  that approximates  $W''$  in the norm  $\delta_p$ . Let  $k''$  be the number of classes in  $W''$ ; again, we assume without loss of generality that they are all non-empty, which means we have that  $p_i'' \geq \kappa$  for all  $i \in [k'']$ , where  $\kappa_n := \frac{1}{n} \lfloor n\kappa \rfloor$ .

We would like to increase  $p_i''$  to  $\kappa$  whenever it is smaller than that, while compensating for this by decreasing those probabilities that are larger than  $\kappa$ . However, there is a potential obstruction, namely that  $k''\kappa$  could be greater than 1, in which case it is clearly impossible to increase all  $k''$  probabilities to at least  $\kappa$ . For comparison, we know that  $k''\kappa_n \leq 1$ , but that is a slightly weaker assertion.

To deal with this difficulty, we will show that there exist some  $n_0$  depending on  $\kappa$  such that for  $n \geq n_0$ , we do have  $\kappa k'' \leq 1$ . First, note that  $\kappa_n > \kappa - \frac{1}{n}$ . Thus,

$$k'' \leq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\kappa - 1/n} \right\rfloor.$$

As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $1/(\kappa - 1/n)$  approaches  $1/\kappa$  from above, and thus

$$\left\lfloor \frac{1}{\kappa - 1/n} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\kappa} \right\rfloor$$

for all sufficiently large  $n$ . If we take  $n_0$  to be sufficiently large, then for  $n \geq n_0$  we have

$$k''\kappa \leq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\kappa} \right\rfloor \kappa \leq 1.$$

Given this, we now define  $W' = (\mathbf{p}, B)$  as follows: let  $I_-$  be the set of indices  $i \in [k'']$  such that  $p_i'' < \kappa$ , and let  $\delta = \sum_{i \in I_-} (\kappa - p_i'')$ . For  $i \in I_-$ , we then set  $p_i = \kappa$ , while for  $i \notin I_-$  we first decrease the largest  $p_i''$  until we either hit  $\kappa$  or have used up the excess  $\delta$ . If we stop because we hit  $\kappa$ , then we move to the next largest  $p_i''$ , etc. Since in the second step, we will eventually use up the excess  $\delta$ , this process constructs a distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  such that  $p_i \geq \kappa$  for all  $i \in [k'']$ , and such that  $\sum_i |p_i'' - p_i| = 2\delta$ . Note for future reference that  $\delta \leq k''/n$ .

Writing the embedding  $W[W'']$  of  $W''$  into the set of graphons over  $[0, 1]$  as  $\sum_{i,j} B_{ij} 1_{Y'_i \times Y'_j}$ , we construct corresponding measurable sets  $Y_i$  such that  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{k''}$  forms a partition of  $[0, 1]$  with  $\lambda(Y_i) = p_i$  and  $\lambda(Y_i \triangle Y_i'') \leq |p_i - p_i''|$ . (Each set  $Y_i$  will be either a superset or a subset of  $Y_i''$ , according to whether  $p_i''$  was increased or decreased.)

For  $i \in I_-$ ,

$$\lambda(Y_i \triangle Y_i'') \leq |p_i - p_i''| \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_n n} \lambda(Y_i'').$$

For  $i \notin I_-$ ,

$$\lambda(Y_i \triangle Y_i'') \leq |p_i - p_i''| \leq \delta \leq \frac{k''}{n} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa^2 n} \lambda(Y_i'').$$

When  $n$  is sufficiently large,  $\kappa_n \geq \kappa^2$ . Increase  $n_0$  enough for this to hold, as well as  $n_0 \geq 1/\kappa^2$ . Then for  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\delta_p(W', W'') \leq \sqrt[p]{\frac{4}{\kappa^2 n}} \|W''\|_p \leq 2 \sqrt[p]{\frac{4}{\kappa^2 n}} \|W\|_p$$

by Lemma C.2, as in the proof of the first bound. This concludes the proof of the second bound.  $\square$

For bounded graphons, the next lemma was proved in [20].

**Lemma C.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{P} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$  be a partition of  $[0, 1]$  into consecutive intervals, and let  $W$  be a graphon over  $[0, 1]$  that is constant on sets of the form  $Y_i \times Y_j$ . If  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are chosen i.i.d. uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$  and  $H_n$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix with entries  $W(x_i, x_j)$ , then*

$$\hat{\delta}_p(H_n, W) \leq \sqrt[p]{2\varepsilon(1+\varepsilon)} \|W\|_p,$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is the random variable

$$\varepsilon = \max_{i \in [k]} \frac{1}{\lambda(Y_i)} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \left| \frac{n_i}{n} - \lambda(Y_i) \right| \right),$$

with  $n_i$  denoting the number of points  $x_\ell$  that lie in  $Y_i$ .

*Proof.* Let  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  be a partition of  $[0, 1]$  into adjacent intervals of lengths  $1/n$ . Then  $W[H_n]$  is of the form  $\sum_{i,j} B_{ij} 1_{Y'_i \times Y'_j}$ , where  $Y'_i$  is the union of  $n_i$  of the intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  (which particular  $n_i$  intervals depends on the labeling of the vertices of  $H_n$ ). In fact, given a map  $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [k]$ , define  $Y'_i = Y'_i(\pi)$  to be the union of all intervals  $I_\ell$  such that  $\pi(\ell) = i$ , and let  $W(\pi) = \sum_{i,j} B_{ij} 1_{Y'_i(\pi) \times Y'_j(\pi)}$ . Then

$$\hat{\delta}_2(H_n, W) = \min_{\pi} \|W(\pi) - W\|_2,$$

where the minimum is over all  $\pi$  such that  $|\pi^{-1}(\{i\})| = n_i$  for all  $i$ . In view of Lemma C.2, we will want to keep the Lebesgue measure of  $Y_i \triangle Y'_i$  small for all  $i$ . We claim that this is indeed possible, and that  $\pi$  can be chosen in such a way that

$$(C.2) \quad \lambda(Y_i \triangle Y'_i) \leq \left| \frac{n_i}{n} - \lambda(Y_i) \right| + \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for all } i.$$

To prove this, we note that choosing  $\pi$  is equivalent to choosing, for all  $i$ ,  $n_i$  of the intervals  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  to make up  $Y'_i$ .

Let  $\tilde{Y}_1, \dots, \tilde{Y}_k$  be obtained from  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$  by rounding the endpoints to the nearest integer multiples of  $1/n$ , choosing the multiple to the left in case of a tie. With this convention,

$$\lfloor \lambda(Y_i)n \rfloor \leq \lambda(\tilde{Y}_i)n \leq \lceil \lambda(Y_i)n \rceil.$$

Thus, if  $n_i \leq \lambda(Y_i)n$ , then  $n_i \leq n\lambda(\tilde{Y}_i)$ , while if  $n_i \geq \lambda(Y_i)n$ , then  $n_i \geq n\lambda(\tilde{Y}_i)$ . Keeping this in mind, we see that for  $n_i \leq \lambda(Y_i)n$ , we can find at least  $n_i$  intervals  $I_\ell$  that, except possibly for their endpoints, are subsets of  $\tilde{Y}_i$ . We will define  $Y'_i$  to be the union of these intervals. In a similar way, if  $n_i > \lambda(Y_i)n$ , we choose  $n\lambda(\tilde{Y}_i) \leq n_i$  intervals (namely, those forming  $\tilde{Y}_i$ ) to build a preliminary

set  $Y_i^{(0)}$ . Having done this for all  $i$ , we take a second run through all  $i$  with  $n_i > \lambda(Y_i)n$ , choosing an arbitrary set of  $n_i - \lambda(\tilde{Y}_i)n$  intervals  $I_\ell$  from those not yet assigned at this point. At the end of this round, we end up with sets  $Y_i'$  such that  $Y_i'$  is the union of  $n_i$  intervals from  $I_1, \dots, I_n$ , with the additional property that

$$\text{either } Y_i' \subseteq \tilde{Y}_i \text{ or } Y_i' \subseteq \tilde{Y}_i.$$

But this implies that  $\lambda(Y_i' \Delta \tilde{Y}_i) = |\frac{n_i}{n} - \lambda(\tilde{Y}_i)|$  for all  $i$ . Since the endpoints of  $Y_i$  get shifted by at most  $1/(2n)$  in order to obtain  $\tilde{Y}_i$ , the additional error in going from  $\tilde{Y}_i$  to  $Y_i'$  is at most  $1/n$ , proving (C.2). Combined with Lemma C.2, this concludes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, the following lemma implies Lemma 2.21.

**Lemma C.5.** *Let  $\varepsilon$  and the other notation be as in the previous lemma, suppose that all sizes of  $\mathcal{P}$  have measure at least  $\kappa$ , and let  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ . Then*

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{\kappa n} + \max \left\{ \frac{3}{n\kappa} \log \frac{2}{\kappa\eta}, \sqrt{\frac{3}{n\kappa} \log \frac{2}{\kappa\eta}} \right\}$$

with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ . As a consequence, if  $C$  is a positive real number, then

$$\hat{\delta}_p(H_n, W) = O_p \left( \sqrt[2p]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}} \|W\|_p \right)$$

whenever  $\frac{\log n}{n\kappa} \leq C$ , with the constant implicit in the  $O_p$  symbol depending on  $C$ . In addition, if  $\kappa = \kappa_n$  is such that  $\limsup \frac{1}{\kappa_n} \log n < C$ , then with probability one, there exists a random  $n_0$  such that for  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\hat{\delta}_p(H_n, W) = O \left( \sqrt[2p]{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}} \|W\|_p \right),$$

with the constant implicit in the big- $O$  symbol again depending on  $C$ .

*Proof.* By the multiplicative Chernoff bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left( \left| \frac{n_i}{n} - \lambda(Y_i) \right| \geq t\lambda(Y_i) \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{n\lambda(Y_i)}{3} \min\{t, t^2\} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{n\kappa}{3} \min\{t, t^2\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

so by the union bound and the fact that the number  $k$  of classes is at most  $1/\kappa$ , we get

$$\varepsilon \leq t + \frac{1}{\kappa n} \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \frac{2}{\kappa} \exp \left( -\frac{n\kappa}{3} \min\{t, t^2\} \right).$$

Setting  $y = \frac{3}{n\kappa} \log \frac{2}{\kappa\eta}$  we see that with probability at least  $1 - \eta$ ,  $\varepsilon \leq t + \frac{1}{\kappa n}$  whenever  $\min\{t, t^2\} \geq y$ . This implies the bound on  $\varepsilon$ .

For the remaining part of the proof, choose  $\eta = 2n^{-2}$ . Then with probability at least  $1 - 2n^{-2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa n} + \max \left\{ \frac{3}{n\kappa} \log \frac{n^2}{\kappa}, \sqrt{\frac{3}{n\kappa} \log \frac{n^2}{\kappa}} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa n} + \max \left\{ \frac{9}{n\kappa} \log 2Cn, \sqrt{\frac{9}{n\kappa} \log 2Cn} \right\} \quad \left( \text{because } \frac{1}{n\kappa} \leq \frac{C}{\log n} \leq \frac{C}{\log 2} \leq 2C \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{C'' \log n}{n\kappa}} \leq \sqrt{CC''}, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $C''$  depending on  $C$ . This implies  $2\varepsilon(1 + \varepsilon) \leq 2(1 + \sqrt{CC''})\sqrt{\frac{C' \log n}{n\kappa}} =: C' \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n\kappa}}$  and hence

$$\hat{\delta}_p(H_n, W) \leq \sqrt[2p]{\frac{C' \log n}{n\kappa}} \|W\|_p.$$

Since the failure probability  $2n^{-2}$  is summable, this implies the a.s. statement. To prove the statement in probability, we note that by Remark C.3,  $\hat{\delta}_p(H_n, W) \leq \kappa^{-2/p} \|W\|_p$ , which shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{\delta}_p(H_n, W))^p \right] &\leq \left( \sqrt{\frac{C' \log n}{n\kappa}} + \frac{\eta}{\kappa^2} \right) \|W\|_p^p \\ &= \left( \sqrt{\frac{C' \log n}{n\kappa}} + \frac{2}{\kappa^2 n^2} \right) \|W\|_p^p. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the statement in probability. □

MICROSOFT RESEARCH, ONE MEMORIAL DRIVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142  
*E-mail address:* borgs@microsoft.com

MICROSOFT RESEARCH, ONE MEMORIAL DRIVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142  
*E-mail address:* jchayes@microsoft.com

MICROSOFT RESEARCH, ONE MEMORIAL DRIVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142  
*E-mail address:* cohn@microsoft.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195  
*E-mail address:* sganguly@math.washington.edu