

SANDWICHING BIREGULAR RANDOM GRAPHS

TEREZA KLIMOŠOVÁ, CHRISTIAN REIHER, ANDRZEJ RUCIŃSKI, AND MATAS ŠILEIKIS

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ be a uniformly random m -edge subgraph of the complete bipartite graph K_{n_1, n_2} with bipartition (V_1, V_2) , where $n_i = |V_i|$. Given a real number $p \in [0, 1]$ such that $d_1 := pn_2$ and $d_2 := pn_1$ are integers, let $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ be a random subgraph of K_{n_1, n_2} such that every $v \in V_i$ has degree d_i , for $i = 1, 2$. In this paper we determine sufficient conditions on n_1, n_2, p , and m under which one can embed $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ into $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ and vice versa with probability tending to 1. In particular, in the balanced case $n_1 = n_2$, we show that if $p \gg \log n/n$ and $1-p \gg (\log n/n)^{1/4}$, then for some $m \sim pn^2$, asymptotically almost surely one can embed $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ into $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$, while for $p \gg (\log^3 n/n)^{1/4}$ and $1-p \gg \log n/n$ we have the opposite embedding.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. History and motivation. The Sandwich Conjecture of Kim and Vu [7] claims that if $d \gg \log n$, then for some sequences $p_1 = p_1(n) \sim d/n$ and $p_2 = p_2(n) \sim d/n$ there is a joint distribution of a random d -regular graph $\mathbb{R}(n, d)$ and two binomial random graphs $\mathbb{G}(n, p_1)$ and $\mathbb{G}(n, p_2)$ such that with probability tending to 1

$$\mathbb{G}(n, p_1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n, d) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n, p_2).$$

If true, the Sandwich Conjecture would essentially reduce the study of any monotone graph property of the random graph $\mathbb{R}(n, d)$ in the regime $d \gg \log n$ to the more manageable graph $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$.

For $\log n \ll d \ll n^{1/3}(\log n)^{-2}$, Kim and Vu proved the embedding $\mathbb{G}(n, p_1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n, d)$ as well as an imperfect embedding $\mathbb{R}(n, d) \setminus H \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n, p_2)$, where H is some pretty sparse subgraph of $\mathbb{R}(n, d)$. In [4] the lower embedding was extended to $d \ll n$ (and, in fact, to uniform hypergraph counterparts of the models $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ and $\mathbb{R}(n, d)$). Recently Gao, Isaev and McKay [5] came up with a result which confirms the conjecture for $d \gg n/\sqrt{\log n}$ ([5] is the first paper that gives the embedding $\mathbb{R}(n, d) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n, p_2)$ for any range of d).

Initially motivated by a paper of Perarnau and Petridis [11] (see Section 8), we consider sandwiching for bipartite graphs, in which the natural counterparts of $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ and $\mathbb{R}(n, d)$ are random subgraphs of the complete bipartite graph K_{n_1, n_2} rather than of K_n .

1.2. New Results. We consider three models of random subgraphs of K_{n_1, n_2} , the complete bipartite graph with bipartition (V_1, V_2) where $|V_1| = n_1, |V_2| = n_2$. Given an integer $m \in [0, n_1 n_2]$, let $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ be an m -edge subgraph of K_{n_1, n_2} chosen uniformly at random (the bipartite Erdős–Rényi model). Given a number $p \in [0, 1]$, let $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p)$ be the binomial bipartite random graph where each edge of K_{n_1, n_2} is included independently with probability p . Note that in the latter model, pn_{3-i} is the expected degree of each vertex in V_i , $i = 1, 2$. If, in addition,

$$d_1 := pn_2 \quad \text{and} \quad d_2 := pn_1$$

are integers (we shall always make this implicit assumption), we let $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ be the class of subgraphs of K_{n_1, n_2} such that every $v \in V_i$ has degree d_i , for $i = 1, 2$ (it is an easy exercise to show that $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ is non-empty — see Proposition 21(ii) in the Section 7).

Date: 29 October 2020.

Research of TK was supported by the grant no. 19-04113Y of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) and the Center for Foundations of Modern Computer Science (Charles Univ. project UNCE/SCI/004).

Research of AR was supported by Polish NSC grant 2018/29/B/ST1/00426.

Research of MŠ was supported by the Czech Science Foundation, grant number GJ20-27757Y, with institutional support RVO:67985807.

We call such graphs p -*biregular*. Let $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ be a random graph chosen uniformly from $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$.

In this paper we establish an embedding of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ into $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$. This easily implies an embedding of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p)$ into $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$. Moreover, by taking complements, our result translates immediately to the opposite embedding of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ into $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ (and thus into $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p)$). This idea was first used in [5] to prove $\mathbb{R}(n, p) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n, p)$ for $p \gg \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}}$. We prove a corresponding embedding for balanced bipartite graphs for $p \gg (\log^3 n/n)^{1/4}$.

The proof is far from a straightforward adaptation of the proof in [4]. The common aspect shared by the proofs is that if we reveal edges of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ in a random order, we obtain a graph process which is, for most of the time, similar to the basic Erdős–Rényi process which generates $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$. The rest of the current proof is different in that it avoids using the configuration model. Instead we focus on showing that both $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ and a random subgraph of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ are pseudorandom. We achieve this by applying the switching method (when $\min\{p, 1-p\}$ is small) and otherwise via asymptotic enumeration of bipartite graphs with a given degree sequence proved in [2] (see Theorem 5).

In addition, for $p > 0.49$, we rely on a non-probabilistic result about existence of alternating cycles in 2-edge-colored pseudorandom graphs (Lemma 19), which might be of separate interest.

Throughout the paper we assume that the underlying complete bipartite graph K_{n_1, n_2} grows on both sides, that is $\min\{n_1, n_2\} \rightarrow \infty$, and any parameters (e.g., p, m), events, random variables, etc, are allowed to depend on (n_1, n_2) . In most cases we will make the dependence on (n_1, n_2) implicit, with all limits and asymptotic notation like O, Ω, \sim considered with respect to $\min\{n_1, n_2\} \rightarrow \infty$. We say that an event $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(n_1, n_2)$ holds *asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.)* if $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow 1$.

Our main results are Theorem 2 below and its immediate Corollary 3. For a gentle start we first state an abridged version of both in the case $n_1 = n_2 = n$. Note that pn^2 is the number of edges in $\mathbb{R}(n, n, p)$.

Theorem 1. *If $p \gg \frac{\log n}{n}$ and $1-p \gg \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{1/4}$, then for some $m \sim pn^2$ there is a joint distribution of random graphs $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ and $\mathbb{R}(n, n, p)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{G}(n, n, m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n, n, p) \quad \text{a.a.s.} \quad (1)$$

If $p \gg \left(\frac{\log^3 n}{n}\right)^{1/4}$ and $1-p \gg \frac{\log n}{n}$, then for some $m \sim pn^2$ there is a joint distribution of random graphs $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ and $\mathbb{R}(n, n, p)$ such that

$$\mathbb{R}(n, n, p) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n, n, m) \quad \text{a.a.s.} \quad (2)$$

Moreover, in both inclusions, one can replace $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ by the binomial random graph $\mathbb{G}(n, n, p')$, for some $p' \sim p$.

The condition $p \gg (\log n)/n$ is necessary for (1) to hold with $m \sim pn^2$ (see Remark 25), since otherwise the maximum degree of $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ is no longer $pn(1+o(1))$ a.a.s. We guess that the maximum degree is, vaguely speaking, the only obstacle for embedding $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ (or $\mathbb{G}(n, n, p')$) into $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$, see Conjecture 1 in Section 9.

We further write $N := n_1 n_2$, $q := 1-p$, $\hat{n} := \min\{n_1, n_2\}$, $\hat{p} := \min\{p, q\}$, and let

$$\mathbb{I} := \mathbb{I}(n_1, n_2, p) = \begin{cases} 1, & \hat{p} < 2 \frac{n_1 n_2^{-1} + n_1^{-1} n_2}{\log N} \\ 0, & \hat{p} \geq 2 \frac{n_1 n_2^{-1} + n_1^{-1} n_2}{\log N}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Note that $\mathbb{I} = 0$ entails that the vertex classes are rather balanced: the ratio of their sizes cannot exceed $\frac{1}{4} \log N$. Also, $\mathbb{I} = 0$ implies that $\hat{p} \geq 4/\log N$.

Theorem 2. *For every constant $C > 0$ there is a constant C^* such that whenever the parameter $p \in [0, 1]$ satisfies*

$$q \geq 680 (3(C+4)\hat{n}^{-1} \log N)^{1/4} \quad (4)$$

and

$$1 \geq \gamma := \begin{cases} C^* \left(p^2 \mathbb{I} + \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{p\hat{n}}} \right), & p \leq 0.49 \\ C^* \left(q^{3/2} \mathbb{I} + \left(\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}} \right)^{1/4} + \frac{1}{q} \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}}} \log \frac{\hat{n}}{\log N} \right), & p > 0.49, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

there is, for $m := \lceil (1 - \gamma)pN \rceil$, a joint distribution of random graphs $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ and $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (6)$$

If, in addition $\gamma \leq 1/2$, then for $p' := (1 - 2\gamma)p$, there is a joint distribution of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ and $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p') \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (7)$$

The constant C^* will be made explicit in Section 3.2 (see (36)). By inflating C^* , the constant 0.49 in (5) can be replaced by any constant smaller than 1/2. It can be shown (see Remark 26 in Section 9) that if $p \leq 1/4$ and $\gamma = \Theta\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{p\hat{n}}}\right)$, then γ has optimal order of magnitude. For more remarks about the conditions of Theorem 2 and the role of the indicator \mathbb{I} , see Section 9.

By taking the complements of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ and $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ and swapping p and q , we immediately obtain the following consequence of Theorem 2 which provides the opposite embedding.

Corollary 3. *For every constant $C > 0$ there is a constant C^* such that whenever the parameter $p \in [0, 1]$ satisfies*

$$p \geq 680 (3(C + 4)\hat{n}^{-1} \log N)^{1/4} \quad (8)$$

and

$$1 \geq \bar{\gamma} := \begin{cases} C^* \left(p^{3/2} \mathbb{I} + \left(\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}} \right)^{1/4} + \frac{1}{p} \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}}} \log \frac{\hat{n}}{\log N} \right), & p < 0.51, \\ C^* \left(q^2 \mathbb{I} + \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{q\hat{n}}} \right), & p \geq 0.51, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

there is, for $\bar{m} = \lfloor (p + \bar{\gamma}q)N \rfloor$, a joint distribution of random graphs $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, \bar{m})$ and $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, \bar{m})) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (10)$$

If, in addition, $\bar{\gamma} \leq 1/2$, then for $p'' := (p + 2\bar{\gamma}q)N$ there is joint distribution of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p'')$ and $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p'')) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (11)$$

Proof. The assumptions of Corollary 3 yield the assumptions of Theorem 2 with $\gamma = \bar{\gamma}$ and with p and q swapped. Note also that

$$m = \lceil (1 - \bar{\gamma})qN \rceil = \lceil N - pN - \bar{\gamma}qN \rceil = N - \lfloor (p + \bar{\gamma}q)N \rfloor = N - \bar{m}.$$

Thus, by Theorem 2, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$ we have $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, N - \bar{m}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, q)$, which, by taking complements, translates into (10). Similarly

$$p' = (1 - 2\bar{\gamma})qN = N - (p + 2\bar{\gamma}q)N = N - p''N.$$

Thus, by Theorem 2, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$ we have $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, N - p''N) \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, q)$, which, by taking complements yields embedding (11). \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We apply Theorem 2 and Corollary 3 with $C = 1$ and the corresponding C^* . Note that for $n_1 = n_2 = n$, the ratio in (3) equals $4/\log N = 2/\log n$, so

$$\mathbb{I} = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \hat{p} < 2/\log n. \quad (12)$$

To prove (1), assume $p \gg \log n/n$ and $q \gg \left(\frac{\log n}{\hat{n}}\right)^{1/4}$ and apply Theorem 2. Note that condition (4) holds and it is straightforward to check that, regardless of whether $p \leq 0.49$ or $p > 0.49$, $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. In particular, $\gamma \leq 1/2$. We conclude that, indeed, embedding (1) holds




FIGURE 1. The structure of the proof of Theorem 2. An arrow from statement A to statement B means that A is used in the proof of B. The numbers in the brackets point to the section where a statement is stated and where it is proved (unless the proof follows the statement immediately); external results have instead an article reference in square brackets.

with $m = \lceil (1 - \gamma)pN \rceil \sim pn^2$ and (1) still holds if we replace $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ by $\mathbb{G}(n, n, p')$ with $p' = (1 - 2\gamma)p \sim p$.

For (2) we assume that $p \gg \left(\frac{\log^3 n}{n}\right)^{1/4}$ and $q \gg \frac{\log n}{n}$ and apply Corollary 3. Note that condition (8) holds. It is routine to check, taking into account (12), that $\bar{\gamma} \leq 1/2$ and, moreover, $\bar{\gamma}q = o(p)$. We conclude that (2) holds with $m = \lfloor (p + \bar{\gamma}q)N \rfloor \sim Np = n^2p$ and (2) still holds if $\mathbb{G}(n, n, m)$ is replaced by $\mathbb{G}(n, n, p')$ with $p' = p + 2\bar{\gamma}q \sim p$. \square

1.3. Organization. In Section 2 we introduce notation and tools used throughout the paper: the switching technique, probabilistic inequalities, and an enumeration result for bipartite graphs with a given degree sequence. In Section 3 we state a crucial Lemma 6 and show how it implies Theorem 2.

In Section 4 we give a proof of Lemma 6 based on two technical lemmas, one about concentration of a degree related parameter (Lemma 9), the other (Lemma 10) facilitating the switching technique used in the proof of Lemma 6. Lemma 9 is proved in Section 5, after we give some auxiliary results establishing concentration of degrees and co-degrees in $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ and its conditional versions. In Section 6, we give the proof of Lemma 10, preceded by a purely deterministic result about alternating cycles in 2-edge-colored pseudorandom graphs. A flowchart of results ultimately leading to the proof of Theorem 2 is presented in Figure 1.

Section 8 contains an application of our main Theorem 2, which was part of the motivation for our research. In Section 9 we present some concluding remarks and our version of the (bipartite) sandwiching conjecture. We defer some technical but straightforward results and their proofs to Section 7.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. Recall that

$$d_1 = pn_2 \quad \text{and} \quad d_2 = pn_1$$

are the degrees of vertices in a p -biregular graph, and thus, the number of edges in any p -biregular graph $H \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ is

$$M := pN \quad \text{where} \quad N = n_1 n_2.$$

Throughout the proofs we also use shorthand notation

$$q = 1 - p, \quad \hat{p} = \min\{p, q\}, \quad \hat{n} = \min\{n_1, n_2\}, \quad (13)$$

and $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. All logarithms appearing in this paper are natural.

We denote a set of neighbors of a vertex v in a graph G by $\Gamma_G(v)$.

2.2. Switchings. The switching technique is used to compare the size of two classes of graphs, say \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' , by defining an auxiliary bipartite graph $B := B(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}')$, in which two graphs $H \in \mathcal{R}$, $H' \in \mathcal{R}'$ are connected by an edge whenever H can be transformed into H' by some operation (a *forward switching*) that, typically, alters (deletes and/or creates) a small number of edges of H . By counting the number of edges of $B(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}')$ in two ways we see that

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H) = \sum_{H' \in \mathcal{R}'} \deg_B(H'), \quad (14)$$

which easily implies that

$$\frac{\min_{H' \in \mathcal{R}'} \deg_B(H')}{\max_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H)} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{|\mathcal{R}'|} \leq \frac{\max_{H' \in \mathcal{R}'} \deg_B(H')}{\min_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H)}. \quad (15)$$

The reverse operation mapping $H' \in \mathcal{R}'$ to its neighbors in graph B , is called a *backward switching*. Usually one defines the forward switching in such a way that the backward switching can be easily described.

All switchings used in this paper follow the same pattern. For a fixed graph $G \subseteq K$ (possibly empty), where $K := K_{n_1, n_2}$, the families $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}'$ will be subsets of

$$\mathcal{R}_G := \{H \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p) : G \subseteq H\}. \quad (16)$$

Every $H \in \mathcal{R}_G$ will be interpreted as a blue-red coloring of the edges of $K \setminus G$: those in $H \setminus G$ will be dubbed *blue* and those in $K \setminus H - G$ — *red*. Given $H \in \mathcal{R}$, consider a subset S of the edges of $K \setminus G$ in which for every vertex $v \in V_1 \cup V_2$ the blue degree equals the red degree, i.e., $\deg_{(H \setminus G) \cap S}(v) = \deg_{(K \setminus H) \cap S}(v)$. Then switching the colours within S produces another graph $H' \in \mathcal{R}_G$. Formally, $E(H')$ is the symmetric difference $E(H) \Delta S$. In each application of the switching technique we will restrict the choices of S to make sure that $H' \in \mathcal{R}'$.

As an elementary illustration of this technique, which nevertheless turns out to be critically useful in Section 6, we prove here the following result. A cycle in $K \setminus G$ is *alternating* if it is a union of a blue matching and a red matching. Note that the definition depends on H . We will omit mentioning this dependence, as H will be always clear from the context. Given $e \in K \setminus G$, set

$$\mathcal{R}_{G,e} := \{H \in \mathcal{R}_G : e \in H\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{G,-e} := \{H \in \mathcal{R}_G : e \notin H\}. \quad (17)$$

Proposition 4. *Let a graph $G \subseteq K$ be such that $\mathcal{R}_G \neq \emptyset$ and let $e \in K \setminus G$. Assume that for some number $D > 0$ and every $H \in \mathcal{R}_G$ the edge e is contained in an alternating cycle of length at most $2D$. Then $\mathcal{R}_{G,-e} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{R}_{G,e} \neq \emptyset$, and*

$$\frac{1}{N^D - 1} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,-e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|} \leq N^D - 1.$$

Proof. Let B be a bipartite graph with vertex classes $\mathcal{R}_{G,e}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{G,-e}$, where an edge joins H to H' whenever H' is obtained from H by choosing an alternating cycle S containing e and the switching the colors of edges within S . Note that by the assumption, the minimum degree $\delta(B) \geq 1$.

Since $\mathcal{R}_G = \mathcal{R}_{G,e} \cup \mathcal{R}_{G,-e} \neq \emptyset$, one of the classes $\mathcal{R}_{G,e}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{G,-e}$ is non-empty and, in view of $\delta(B) \geq 1$, the other one is non-empty as well. Further, the number of cycles of length 2ℓ containing e is, crudely, at most $n_1^{\ell-1} n_2^{\ell-1} = N^{\ell-1}$, hence the maximum degree is

$$\Delta(B) \leq N + N^2 + \dots + N^{D-1} \leq N^D - 1.$$

Thus, by (15), we obtain the claimed bounds. \square

2.3. Probabilistic inequalities. We first state a few basic concentration inequalities that we apply in our proofs. For a sum X of independent Bernoulli (not necessarily identically distributed) random variables, writing $\mu = \mathbb{E}X$, we have by [6, Theorem 2.8 and equations (2.5),(2.6), and (2.11)] that

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mu + t) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{2(\mu + t/3)}\right\}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (18)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq \mu - t) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{2\mu}\right\}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq x) \leq \exp\{-x\}, \quad x \geq 7\mu. \quad (20)$$

Let Γ be a set of size $|\Gamma| = g$ and let $A \subseteq \Gamma$, $|A| = a \geq 1$. For an integer $r \in [0, g]$, choose uniformly at random a subset $R \subseteq \Gamma$ of size $|R| = r$. The random variable $Y = |A \cap R|$ has then the *hypergeometric* distribution $\text{Hyp}(g, a, r)$ with expectation $\mu := \mathbb{E}Y = ar/g$. By [6, Theorem 2.10], inequalities (18) and (19) hold for Y , too.

Moreover, by [6, Remark 2.6], inequalities (18) and (19) also hold for a random variable Z which has Poisson distribution $\text{Po}(\mu)$ with expectation μ . In this case, we also have the following simple consequence of Chebyshev's inequality. For $k \geq 0$, set $q_k = \mathbb{P}(Z = k)$. Then $q_k/q_{k-1} = \mu/k$, and thus, $k = \lfloor \mu \rfloor$ maximizes q_k (we say that such k is a *mode* of Z). Since $\text{Var} Z = \mu$, by Chebyshev's inequality, $\mathbb{P}(|Z - \mu| < \sqrt{2\mu}) \geq 1/2$. Moreover, the interval $(\mu - \sqrt{2\mu}, \mu + \sqrt{2\mu})$ contains at most $4\lceil \mu \rceil^{1/2}$ integers, hence it follows that

$$q_{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \geq \frac{1}{8\lceil \mu \rceil^{1/2}}. \quad (21)$$

2.4. Asymptotic counting of dense bipartite graphs. To estimate co-degrees we will use the following asymptotic formula by Canfield, Greenhill and McKay [2]. We reformulate it in slightly different notation.

Given two vectors $\mathbf{d}_1 = (d_{1,v}, v \in V_1)$ and $\mathbf{d}_2 = (d_{2,v}, v \in V_2)$ of positive integers such that $\sum_{v \in V_1} d_{1,v} = \sum_{v \in V_2} d_{2,v}$, let $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)$ be the class of bipartite graphs on (V_1, V_2) , $|V_i| = n_i$, and vertex degrees $\deg(v) = d_{i,v}$, $v \in V_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Write $\bar{d}_i = n_i^{-1} \sum_{v \in V_i} d_{i,v}$, $D_i = \sum_{v \in V_i} (d_{i,v} - \bar{d}_i)^2$, $p = \bar{d}_1/n_2 = \bar{d}_2/n_1$, and $q = 1 - p$.

Theorem 5 ([2]). *Given any positive constants a, b, C such that $a + b < 1/2$, there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ so that the following holds. Consider the set of degree sequences $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ satisfying*

- (i) $\max_{v \in V_1} |d_{1,v} - \bar{d}_1| \leq C(n_2^{1/2+\epsilon})$, $\max_{v \in V_2} |d_{2,v} - \bar{d}_2| \leq C(n_1^{1/2+\epsilon})$
- (ii) $\max\{n_1, n_2\} \leq C(pq)^2 (\min\{n_1, n_2\})^{1+\epsilon}$
- (iii) $\frac{(1-2p)^2}{4pq} \left(1 + \frac{5n_1}{6n_2} + \frac{5n_2}{6n_1}\right) \leq a \log \max\{n_1, n_2\}$.

If $\min\{n_1, n_2\} \rightarrow \infty$, then uniformly for all such $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$

$$|\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)| = \binom{n_1 n_2}{pn_1 n_2}^{-1} \prod_{v \in V_1} \binom{n_2}{d_{1,v}} \prod_{v \in V_2} \binom{n_1}{d_{2,v}} \times \\ \times \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{D_1}{pq n_1 n_2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{D_2}{pq n_1 n_2}\right) + O((\max\{n_1, n_2\})^{-b})\right], \quad (22)$$

where the constants implicit in the error term may depend on a, b, C .

Note that condition (ii) of Theorem 5 implies the corresponding condition in [2] after adjusting ϵ . Also, the uniformity of the bound is not explicitly stated in [2], but, given n_1, n_2 , one should take $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$ with the worst error and apply the result in [2].

3. A CRUCIAL LEMMA

3.1. The set-up. Recall that $K = K_{n_1, n_2}$ has $N = n_1 n_2$ edges. Consider a sequence of graphs $\mathbb{G}(t) \subseteq K$ for $t = 0, \dots, N$, where $\mathbb{G}(0)$ is empty and, for $t < N$, $\mathbb{G}(t+1)$ is obtained

from $\mathbb{G}(t)$ by adding an edge ε_{t+1} chosen from $K \setminus \mathbb{G}(t)$ uniformly at random, that is, for every graph $G \subseteq K$ of size t and every edge $e \in K \setminus G$

$$\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_{t+1} = e \mid \mathbb{G}(t) = G) = \frac{1}{N-t}. \quad (23)$$

Of course $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N)$ is just a uniformly random ordering of the edges of K .

Our approach to proving Theorem 2 is to represent the random regular graph $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ as the outcome of a random process which behaves similarly to $(\mathbb{G}(t))_t$. Recalling that a p -biregular graph has $M = pN$ edges, let

$$(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_M)$$

be a uniformly random ordering of the edges of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$. By taking the initial segments, we obtain a sequence of random graphs

$$\mathbb{R}(t) = \{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_t\}, \quad t = 0, \dots, M.$$

For convenience we shorten

$$\mathbb{R} := \mathbb{R}(M) = \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p).$$

Let us mention here that for a fixed $H \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$, conditioning on $\mathbb{R} = H$, the edge set of the random subgraph $\mathbb{R}(t)$ is a uniformly random t -element subset of the edge set of H . This observation often leads to a hypergeometric distribution and will be utilized several times in our proofs.

We say that a graph G with t edges is *admissible*, if it *can* occur in the regular graph process, that is, if

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}(t) = G) > 0.$$

For an admissible graph G with t edges and any edge $e \in K \setminus G$, let

$$p_{t+1}(e, G) := \mathbb{P}(\eta_{t+1} = e \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G). \quad (24)$$

The conditional space underlying (24) can be described as first extending G uniformly at random to an element of \mathcal{R}_G (see definition (16)) and then randomly permuting the new $M - t$ edges.

The main idea behind the proof of Theorem 2 is that conditional probabilities in (24) behave similarly to those in (23). Observe that without specifying $\mathbb{R}(t)$, the probabilities $p_{t+1}(e, \mathbb{R}(t))$ are themselves random variables. Given a real number $\chi \geq 0$ and $t \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, we define an $\mathbb{R}(t)$ -measurable event

$$\mathcal{A}(t, \chi) := \left\{ p_{t+1}(e, \mathbb{R}(t)) \geq \frac{1-\chi}{N-t} \text{ for every } e \in K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t) \right\}. \quad (25)$$

In the crucial lemma below, we are going to show that for suitably chosen γ_t , a.a.s. the events $\mathcal{A}(t, \gamma_t)$ occur simultaneously for all $t = 0, \dots, t_0 - 1$ where t_0 is quite close to M . Deferring the choice of γ_t and t_0 for later, we define an event

$$\mathcal{A} := \bigcap_{t=0}^{t_0-1} \mathcal{A}(t, \gamma_t). \quad (26)$$

Intuitively, the event \mathcal{A} asserts that up to time t_0 the process $\mathbb{R}(t)$ maintains close “distance” to the process $\mathbb{G}(t)$, which will enable us to embed $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ into $\mathbb{R}(t_0)$.

To define time t_0 it is convenient to switch to the residual time and denote by $\tau = \tau(t)$ the proportion of edges of \mathbb{R} “not yet revealed” after t steps, that is,

$$\tau := 1 - \frac{t}{M} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{and so} \quad t = (1 - \tau)M. \quad (27)$$

For a given constant $C > 0$, recalling notation in (13), we define the “final” value τ_0 of τ as

$$\tau_0 := \begin{cases} \frac{3 \cdot 3240^2 (C+4) \log N}{p\tilde{n}}, & p \leq 0.49, \\ 700(3(C+4))^{1/4} \left(q^{3/2} \mathbb{I} + \left(\frac{\log N}{\tilde{n}} \right)^{1/4} \right), & p > 0.49. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

(Some of the constants appearing here and below are sharp or almost sharp, but other have room to spare as we round them up to the nearest “nice” number.)

Further, let

$$\gamma_t := 1080\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I} + \begin{cases} 3240\sqrt{\frac{2(C+3)\log N}{\tau p \hat{n}}}, & p \leq 0.49, \\ 25000\sqrt{\frac{(C+3)\log N}{\tau^2 q^2 \hat{n}}}, & p > 0.49. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Consider the following assumptions on p (which we will later show to follow from the assumptions of Theorem 2):

$$\hat{p} \geq \frac{3 \cdot 3240^2 (C+4) \log N}{\hat{n}}, \quad (30)$$

$$\hat{p} \cdot \mathbb{I} \leq \frac{49}{51} \cdot \frac{1}{340^2 (C+4)^{1/6}}, \quad (31)$$

and

$$q \geq 680 \left(\frac{3(C+4)\log N}{\hat{n}} \right)^{1/4}. \quad (32)$$

At the end of this subsection we show that these three assumptions imply

$$\tau_0 \leq 1, \quad (33)$$

so that

$$t_0 := \lfloor (1 - \tau_0)M \rfloor \quad (34)$$

is a non-negative integer.

Taking (33) for granted, we are now ready to state our crucial lemma.

Lemma 6. *For every constant $C > 0$, if assumptions (30), (31), and (32) hold, then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (35)$$

The constant implicit in the O -term in (35) may also depend on C .

It remains to show (33). When $p \leq 0.49$, inequality (33) is equivalent to (30). For $p > 0.49$, we have $q \leq 51\hat{p}/49$, which together with assumptions (31) and (32) implies that

$$\tau_0 \leq 700(3(C+4))^{1/4} \left(\frac{51}{49}\hat{p} \cdot \mathbb{I} \right)^{3/2} + 700 \cdot \frac{q}{680} \leq \frac{700 \cdot 3^{1/4}}{340^3} + \frac{700 \cdot 0.51}{680} < 1.$$

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2. Fix $C > 0$ and set

$$C^* = 15 \cdot 10^9 (C+4). \quad (36)$$

From Lemma 6, which is proved in Section 4, we are going to deduce Theorem 2 with the above C^* using a coupling argument similar to the one which was employed by Dudek, Frieze, Ruciński and Šileikis [4], but with an extra tweak (inspired by Kim and Vu [7]) of letting the probabilities of Bernoulli random variables depend on t .

It is easy to check that the assumptions of Lemma 6 follow from the assumptions of Theorem 2. Indeed, (32) coincides with assumption (4) of Theorem 2, while (30) and (31) follow from assumption (5) of Theorem 2 for sufficiently large C^* . To see this, note that each summand on the RHS of (5) is at most $1/C^*$.

Our aim is to couple $(\mathbb{G}(t))_t$ and $(\mathbb{R}(t))_t$ on the event \mathcal{A} defined in (26). For this we will define a graph process $\mathbb{R}'(t) := \{\eta'_1, \dots, \eta'_t\}$, $t = 0, \dots, M$ so that for every admissible graph G with $t \in [0, M-1]$ edges and every $e \in K \setminus G$

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta'_{t+1} = e \mid \mathbb{R}'(t) = G) = p_{t+1}(e, G), \quad (37)$$

where $p_{t+1}(e, G)$ was defined in (24). Since the distribution of the process $(\mathbb{R}(t))_t$ is determined by the conditional probabilities (24), in view of (37), the distribution of $\mathbb{R}' := \mathbb{R}'(M)$ is the same as that of \mathbb{R} and thus we can define \mathbb{R} as the graph \mathbb{R}' . As the second step we will show that a.a.s. $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ can be sampled from the subgraph $\mathbb{R}'(t_0)$ of \mathbb{R}' .

Proceeding with the definition, set $\mathbb{R}'(0)$ to be the empty graph and define graphs $\mathbb{R}'(t)$, $t \geq 1$, inductively, as follows. Fix $t \in [0, M-1]$ and suppose that

$$\mathbb{R}'(t) = R_t \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{G}(t) = G_t$$

have been already chosen. Our immediate goal is to select a random pair of edges ε_{t+1} and η'_{t+1} , according to, resp., (23) and (37), in such a way that the event $\varepsilon_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}'(t+1)$ is quite likely.

To this end, draw ε_{t+1} uniformly at random from $K \setminus G_t$ and, independently, generate a Bernoulli random variable ξ_{t+1} with the probability of success $1 - \gamma_t$ (which is in $[0, 1]$ by (157)). If event $\mathcal{A}(t, \gamma_t)$ has occurred, that is, if

$$p_{t+1}(e, R_t) \geq \frac{1 - \gamma_t}{N - t} \quad \text{for every } e \in K \setminus R_t, \quad (38)$$

then draw a random edge $\zeta_{t+1} \in K \setminus R_t$ according to the distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{t+1} = e \mid \mathbb{R}'(t) = R_t) := \frac{p_{t+1}(e, R_t) - (1 - \gamma_t)/(N - t)}{\gamma_t} \geq 0,$$

where the inequality holds by (38). Observe also that

$$\sum_{e \in K \setminus R_t} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{t+1} = e \mid \mathbb{R}'(t) = R_t) = 1,$$

so ζ_{t+1} has a properly defined distribution. Finally, fix an arbitrary bijection

$$f_{R_t, G_t} : R_t \setminus G_t \rightarrow G_t \setminus R_t$$

between the sets of edges and define

$$\eta'_{t+1} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_{t+1}, & \text{if } \xi_{t+1} = 1, \varepsilon_{t+1} \in K \setminus R_t, \\ f_{R_t, G_t}(\varepsilon_{t+1}), & \text{if } \xi_{t+1} = 1, \varepsilon_{t+1} \in R_t, \\ \zeta_{t+1}, & \text{if } \xi_{t+1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that for η'_{t+1} defined above, (37) indeed holds. On the other hand, if event $\mathcal{A}(t, \gamma_t)$ has failed, then η'_{t+1} is sampled directly (without defining ζ_{t+1}) according to the distribution (37).

Most importantly, we conclude that, for $t = 0, \dots, t_0$

$$\mathcal{A}(t, \gamma_t) \cap \{\xi_{t+1} = 1\} \implies \varepsilon_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}'(t+1). \quad (39)$$

In view of this, define a subset of edges of $\mathbb{G}(M)$,

$$S := \{\varepsilon_t : \xi_t = 1, 1 \leq t \leq t_0\}$$

and recall that $m = \lceil (1 - \gamma)M \rceil$. If $|S| \geq m$, define $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ as, say, the first m edges of S (note that since the vectors (ξ_i) and (ε_i) are independent, these m edges are uniformly distributed), and if $|S| < m$, then define $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ as, say, the graph with edges $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m\}$. Recalling the definition (26) of the event \mathcal{A} , by (39) we observe that \mathcal{A} implies the inclusion $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}'$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m) \subseteq \mathbb{R}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\{|S| \geq m\} \cap \mathcal{A}).$$

Since, by Lemma 6, event \mathcal{A} holds with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$, to complete the proof of (6) it suffices to show that also

$$\mathbb{P}(|S| \geq m) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (40)$$

To this end, let

$$X = t_0 - |S|$$

be the number of edges not included in S . Note that X is a sum of t_0 independent Bernoulli random variables:

$$X = \sum_{t=1}^{t_0} (1 - \xi_t), \quad 1 - \xi_t \sim \text{Be}(\gamma_t).$$

We need the following claim whose technical proof is deferred to Section 7.

Claim 7. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E}X \leq \theta M, \quad (41)$$

where

$$\theta := 1080\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I} + \begin{cases} 6480\sqrt{\frac{2(C+3)\log N}{p\hat{n}}}, & p \leq 0.49 \\ 25000\sqrt{\frac{(C+3)\log N}{q^2\hat{n}}} \log \frac{2}{\tau_0}, & p > 0.49. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$\theta \geq \frac{C \log N}{M} \quad (42)$$

and, with γ as in (5),

$$\gamma \geq \tau_0 + 7\theta + 2/M. \quad (43)$$

In view of (41), we can apply the tail bound (20) and then use (42) to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq 7\theta M) \leq e^{-7\theta M} \leq N^{-7C}. \quad (44)$$

Noting that $t_0 - m \geq (\gamma - \tau_0)M - 2$ and using (43), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|S| < m) = \mathbb{P}(X > t_0 - m) \leq \mathbb{P}(X \geq (\gamma - \tau_0)M - 2) \leq \mathbb{P}(X \geq 7\theta M).$$

This and (44) yield together (40) which completes the proof of (6).

Finally, we prove (7) by coupling $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ with $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ so that the former is a subset of the latter with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$. Denote by $X := e(\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p'))$ the number of edges of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$. Whenever $X \leq m$, choose X edges of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$ at random and declare them to be a copy of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$. Otherwise sample $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ independently from $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, m)$. Hence it remains to show that $\mathbb{P}(X > m) = O(N^{-C})$.

Recalling that $m = \lceil (1 - \gamma)pN \rceil$ and $p' = (1 - 2\gamma)p$, we have $m/N \geq (1 - \gamma)p = p' + \gamma p$. Since $X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p')$, Chernoff's bound (18) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(X > m) = \mathbb{P}(X > p'N + \gamma pN) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\gamma pN)^2}{2(p'N + \gamma pN/3)} \right\} \leq e^{-\gamma^2 pN/2}. \quad (45)$$

The definition (5) implies $\gamma \geq C^* \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{pn}} \geq C^* \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{pN}}$. By the choice of C^* , $C^* \geq \sqrt{2C}$. Thus, from (45) we obtain $\mathbb{P}(X > m) \leq N^{-C}$.

4. PROOF OF LEMMA 6

4.1. Preparations. Recalling our shorthand notation $K = K_{n_1, n_2}$, fix an admissible graph G with t edges (i.e., such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}(t) = G) > 0$) and let $e, f \in K \setminus G$. With \mathcal{R}_G defined in (16), we write

$$\mathcal{R}_{G, e, \neg f} := \{H \in \mathcal{R}_G : e \in H, f \notin H\}.$$

By skipping a few technical steps, we will see that the essence of the proof of Lemma 6 is to show that the ratio $|\mathcal{R}_{G, e, \neg f}|/|\mathcal{R}_{G, f, \neg e}|$ is approximately 1 for any pair of edges e, f , where G is a ‘typical’ instance of $\mathbb{R}(t)$.

Recalling our generic definition of switchings from Subsection 2.2, let us treat the graphs in $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}_{G, e, \neg f}$ and $\mathcal{R}' := \mathcal{R}_{G, f, \neg e}$ as blue-red edge colorings of the graph $K \setminus G$. We say that a path or a cycle in $K \setminus G$ is *alternating*, if it is a union of a blue matching and a red matching.

When edges e, f are disjoint, we define the switching graph $B(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}')$ by putting an edge between $H \in \mathcal{R}$ and $H' \in \mathcal{R}'$ whenever there is an alternating 6-cycle containing e and f in H such that switching the colors in the cycle gives H' (see Figure 2). If e and f share a vertex, instead of 6-cycles we use alternating 4-cycles containing e and f .

It is easy to describe vertex degrees in B . For $u, v \in V_i$, let $\theta_{G, H}(u, v)$ be the number of (alternating) paths uxv such that ux is blue and xv is red. In other words, $\theta_{G, H}(u, v)$ counts the vertices x which are simultaneously a neighbor of u in $H \setminus G$ and a non-neighbor of v in H , or $x \in \Gamma_{H \setminus G}(u) \cap \Gamma_{K \setminus H}(v)$. Then, setting $f = u_1 u_2$ and $e = v_1 v_2$, where $u_i, v_i \in V_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

$$\deg_B(H) = \prod_{i: u_i \neq v_i} \theta_{G, H}(u_i, v_i), \quad H \in \mathcal{R} \quad (46)$$

and

$$\deg_B(H') = \prod_{i: u_i \neq v_i} \theta_{G, H'}(v_i, u_i), \quad H' \in \mathcal{R}'. \quad (47)$$

Note that equation (14) is equivalent to

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{|\mathcal{R}'|} = \frac{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}'|} \sum_{H' \in \mathcal{R}'} \deg_B(H')}{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H)}. \quad (48)$$




FIGURE 2. Switching between H and H' when e and f are disjoint: solid edges are in $H \setminus G$ (or $H' \setminus G$) and the dashed ones in $K \setminus H$ (or $K \setminus H'$).

In view of (46) and (47), the denominator of the RHS above is the (conditional) expectation of the random variable $\prod_{i:u_i \neq v_i} \theta_{G,\mathbb{R}}(u_i, v_i)$, given that \mathbb{R} contains G and e , but not f (and similarly for the numerator).

To get an idea of how large that expectation could be, let us focus on one factor, say, $\theta_{G,\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$. Clearly, the red degree of v_1 equals $|\Gamma_{K \setminus \mathbb{R}}(v_1)| = n_2 - d_2 = qn_2$. Since $|\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(v_1)| = pn_2$, viewing $\mathbb{R} \setminus G$ as a τ -dense subgraph of \mathbb{R} we expect that the blue neighborhood $|\Gamma_{\mathbb{R} \setminus G}(v_1)|$ is approximately τpn_2 . It is reasonable to expect that for typical G and \mathbb{R} the red and blue neighborhoods intersect proportionally, that is, on a set of size about $q \cdot \tau p \cdot n_2 = \tau q d_1$. This heuristic argument, indicating that the expected value of $\theta_{G,\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$ is close to $\tau q d_1$, could be made rigorous, but we do not need it here.

Inspired by this heuristic, we say that, for $\delta > 0$, an admissible graph G is δ -typical if

$$\max_{u_1 u_2, v_1 v_2 \in K \setminus G} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in [2]: u_i \neq v_i} \left| \frac{\theta_{G,\mathbb{R}}(u_i, v_i)}{\tau q d_i} - 1 \right| > \delta \mid G \subseteq \mathbb{R}, v_1 v_2 \in \mathbb{R}, u_1 u_2 \notin \mathbb{R} \right) \leq \tau^2 \delta, \quad (49)$$

where the outer maximum is taken over distinct pairs of edges. (The bound $\tau^2 \delta$ has hardly any intuition, but it is simple and sufficient for our purposes.)

Lemma 6 is a relatively easy consequence of Lemma 8 below which states that for a suitably chosen function $\delta(t)$ it is very likely that for all $t \leq t_0$, the initial segment $\mathbb{R}(t)$ of (η_1, \dots, η_M) is $\delta(t)$ -typical.

For each $t = 0, \dots, M - 1$, define

$$\delta(t) := 120\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I} + 360\sqrt{\frac{(C+3)\lambda(t)}{6\tau pq\hat{n}}}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\lambda(t) := \begin{cases} 6 \log N, & p \leq 0.49, \\ 6 \log N + \frac{64 \log N}{\tau pq}, & p > 0.49. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

For future reference, note that

$$\delta = \delta(t) \leq \gamma_t/9. \quad (52)$$

Indeed, recalling (29), for $p \leq 0.49$,

$$9\delta \leq 1080\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I} + 3240\sqrt{\frac{2(C+3)\log N}{\tau p\hat{n}}} = \gamma_t,$$

while, for $p > 0.49$, noting that $\lambda(t) \leq 70 \log N / (\tau pq)$, we have

$$9\delta \leq 1080\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I} + 3240\sqrt{\frac{70(C+3)\log N}{0.49^2 \cdot 6\tau^2 q^2 \hat{n}}} \leq \gamma_t.$$

Lemma 8. *For every constant $C > 0$, under the conditions of Lemma 6,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}(t) \text{ is } \delta(t)\text{-typical for all } t \leq t_0) = 1 - O(N^{-C}). \quad (53)$$

Note that the LHS of (49) is a function of graph G , say $f(G)$. Hence Lemma 8 asserts that if we choose a random argument $G = \mathbb{R}(t)$, then the $f(\mathbb{R}(t))$ is small a.a.s. The main idea of proof of Lemma 8, which we defer to Subsection 4.3, is to bound $f(\mathbb{R}(t))$ by a ratio of two simpler functions (again conditional probabilities) of $\mathbb{R}(t)$. Lemmas 9 and 10 below bound each of these conditional probabilities separately.

For any $t = 0, \dots, M$ and distinct $u_i, v_i \in V_i$, $i = 1, 2$, set

$$\theta_t(u_i, v_i) := \theta_{\mathbb{R}(t), \mathbb{R}}(u_i, v_i), \quad (54)$$

where $\theta_{G, H}(u_i, v_i) = |\Gamma_{H \setminus G}(u_i) \cap \Gamma_{K \setminus H}(v_i)|$ was introduced earlier in this subsection.

Lemma 9. *For every constant $C > 0$, under the conditions of Lemma 6, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$, for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{u, v \in V_i, u \neq v} \left| \frac{\theta_t(u, v)}{\tau q d_i} - 1 \right| > \delta(t) \mid \mathbb{R}(t) \right) \leq e^{-2\lambda(t)}, \quad \text{for } t \leq t_0. \quad (55)$$

Lemma 10. *For every constant $C > 0$, under the conditions of Lemma 6, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$*

$$\min_{e, f \in K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t), e \neq f} \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathbb{R}, f \notin \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{R}(t)) \geq e^{-\lambda(t)}, \quad \text{for } t \leq t_0. \quad (56)$$

4.2. Proof of Lemma 6. In view of Lemma 8, it suffices to show that if $t \leq t_0$, and a t -edge graph G is $\delta(t)$ -typical, then

$$\min_{e \in K \setminus G} p_{t+1}(e, G) \geq \frac{1 - \gamma_t}{N - t}.$$

Fix $f \in K \setminus G$ which maximizes $p_{t+1}(f, G)$. Since the average of $p_{t+1}(e, G)$ over $e \in K \setminus G$ is exactly $\frac{1}{N-t}$, we have $p_{t+1}(f, G) \geq \frac{1}{N-t}$ and therefore it is enough to prove that, for every $e \in K \setminus (G \cup \{f\})$,

$$\frac{p_{t+1}(e, G)}{p_{t+1}(f, G)} \geq 1 - \gamma_t. \quad (57)$$

Recalling the definition of \mathcal{R}_G in (16) and $\mathcal{R}_{G,e}, \mathcal{R}_{G,-e}$ in (17) and observe that $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{G,e,-f} = \mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}, -f}$. In view of the remark immediately following (24),

$$p_{t+1}(e, G) = \mathbb{P}(e \in \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\eta_{t+1} = e \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G, e \in \mathbb{R}) = \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_G|} \cdot \frac{1}{M-t}.$$

Therefore,

$$1 \geq \frac{p_{t+1}(e, G)}{p_{t+1}(f, G)} = \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,f}|} = \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e,f\}}| + |\mathcal{R}_{G,e,-f}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e,f\}}| + |\mathcal{R}_{G,f,-e}|} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{|\mathcal{R}'|},$$

where, recall, $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{G,e,-f}$ and $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}_{G,f,-e}$. Write $e = v_1 v_2$ and $f = u_1 u_2$ and for simplicity assume that both $u_1 \neq v_1$ and $u_2 \neq v_2$ (otherwise the proof goes mutatis mutandis and is, in fact, a bit simpler). By (46), (47), and (48),

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{|\mathcal{R}'|} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{top}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\text{bottom}}}, \quad (58)$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{top}} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}'|} \sum_{H' \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H') = \mathbb{E}[\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(v_1, u_1) \theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(v_2, u_2) \mid G \subseteq \mathbb{R}, f \in \mathbb{R}, e \notin \mathbb{R}]$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{bottom}} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H) = \mathbb{E}[\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) \theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_2, v_2) \mid G \subseteq \mathbb{R}, e \in \mathbb{R}, f \notin \mathbb{R}].$$

Since G is δ -typical with $\delta = \delta(t)$, denoting the LHS of (49) as p_* , we have $p_* \leq \tau^2 \delta$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{top}} &\geq (1 - \delta) \tau q d_1 \cdot (1 - \delta) \tau q d_2 \cdot (1 - p_*) + 0 \cdot p_* \\ &\geq (1 - \delta)^2 \tau^2 p^2 q^2 n_1 n_2 (1 - \tau^2 \delta) \geq (1 - \delta)^3 \tau^2 p^2 q^2 N. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since, deterministically,

$$\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) \theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_2, v_2) \leq \min\{p, q\} n_2 \cdot \min\{p, q\} n_1 \leq 4p^2 q^2 N,$$

using (49) again, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{bottom}} &\leq (1 + \delta) \tau q d_1 \cdot (1 + \delta) \tau q d_2 \cdot (1 - p_*) + 4p^2 q^2 N \cdot p_* \\ &\leq (1 + \delta)^2 \tau^2 p^2 q^2 N + 4p^2 q^2 N \cdot \tau^2 \delta \leq (1 + 6\delta + \delta^2) \tau^2 p^2 q^2 N. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining the bounds on \mathbb{E}_{top} and $\mathbb{E}_{\text{bottom}}$ and using (52), we conclude that

$$\frac{p_{t+1}(e, G)}{p_{t+1}(f, G)} \geq \frac{(1 - \delta)^3}{(1 + 6\delta + \delta^2)} \geq 1 - 9\delta \geq 1 - \gamma_t,$$

and the proof of Lemma 6 is complete. \square

4.3. Proof of Lemma 8. Owing to Lemmas 9 and 10 it suffices to fix arbitrary $t \leq t_0$ and a realization of $\mathbb{R}(t)$, say $\mathbb{R}(t) = G$ satisfying the events (55) and (56). Fix any such G and define events

$$\mathcal{E} := \cup_{i \in [2]} \left\{ \max_{u, v \in V_i, u \neq v} \left| \frac{\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u, v)}{\tau q d_i} - 1 \right| > \delta(t) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{e, f} := \{e \in \mathbb{R}, f \notin \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Since, conditioning on the event $\mathbb{R}(t) = G$, we have $\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_i, v_i) = \theta_t(u_i, v_i)$, by choice of G we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G) \leq 2e^{-2\lambda(t)} \quad (59)$$

and

$$\min_{e, f \in K \setminus G} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_{e, f} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G) \geq e^{-\lambda(t)}. \quad (60)$$

Note that the probability on the LHS of (49) does not change if we replace $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ by $\mathbb{R}(t) = G$, since conditioning on either event makes \mathbb{R} uniformly distributed over \mathcal{R}_G (i.e., biregular graphs containing G) and the random variables $\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_i, v_i)$ do not depend on the random ordering of the edges of \mathbb{R} . Hence it remains to prove that (59) and (60) imply, for any distinct edges $e = v_1 v_2, f = u_1 u_2 \in K \setminus G$, that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{i \in [2]: u_i \neq v_i} \left| \frac{\theta_{G, \mathbb{R}}(u_i, v_i)}{\tau q d_i} - 1 \right| > \delta(t) \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G, e \in \mathbb{R}, f \notin \mathbb{R} \right) \leq \tau^2 \delta(t). \quad (61)$$

The probability on the LHS of (61) is at most $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G, \mathcal{F}_{e, f})$. Inequalities (59) and (60) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G, \mathcal{F}_{e, f}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F}_{e, f} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_{e, f} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_{e, f} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G)} \leq 2e^{-\lambda(t)}.$$

Finally, even a quick glance at the definitions of $\delta(t)$ and τ_0 (see (50) and (28)) reveals that $\min\{\tau_0, \delta(t)\} \geq 1/\hat{n}$. Thus, we get, with a huge margin,

$$2e^{-\lambda(t)} \leq 2/N^6 \leq 1/N^2 \leq 1/\hat{n}^4 \leq \tau_0^2 \delta(t) \leq \tau^2 \delta(t). \quad (62)$$

\square

5. DEGREES AND CO-DEGREES

In this section we prove facts about neighborhood structure of $\mathbb{R}(t)$, one of which will be enough to deduce Lemma 9, while the other two will be used in the proof of Lemma 10 in Section 6. We start, in Subsection 5.1, with a tail bound for the co-degrees in $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ (Lemma 11). In Subsection 5.2 we analyze the process $(\mathbb{R}(t))_t$. First, we show that the vertex degrees in the process grow proportionally until almost the very end (Lemma 12). Then, conditioning on \mathbb{R} having concentrated co-degrees, we prove that the co-degrees in $\mathbb{R}(t)$ do not exceed their expectation too much (Lemma 13). Finally, in Subsection 5.3, we present a proof of Lemma 9 based on Lemma 11.

5.1. Co-degrees in the random biregular graph. Recall that $\Gamma_F(v)$ is the set of neighbors of a vertex v in a graph F . We define the *co-degree* of two distinct vertices u, v as

$$\text{cod}_F(u, v) := |\Gamma_F(u) \cap \Gamma_F(v)|. \quad (63)$$

Due to symmetry, we prove the following concentration result for pairs of vertices on one side of the bipartition only.

Lemma 11. *Suppose that $\hat{p}\hat{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and let $\lambda = \lambda(n_1, n_2)$ be such that $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any distinct $u_1, v_1 \in V_1$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) - p^2 n_2| > 20 \left(\hat{p}^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + \frac{\hat{p} n_2}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{\lambda \hat{p}^2 n_2} \right) + \lambda \right) = O \left(\sqrt{N} e^{-\lambda} \right), \quad (64)$$

where \mathbb{I} is defined in (3).




FIGURE 3. Switching between $H \in \mathcal{R}_k$ and $H' \in \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$: solid edges are in H (or H') and the dashed ones in $K \setminus H$ (or $K \setminus H'$).

Proof. We first claim that it is sufficient to assume $p \leq 1/2$ and prove that for any distinct $u_1, v_1 \in V_1$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) - p^2 n_2| > 20\left(p^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + \frac{pn_2}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{\lambda p^2 n_2}\right) + \lambda\right) = O\left(\sqrt{N}e^{-\lambda}\right). \quad (65)$$

To see this, note that

$$\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) = |\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1)| + |\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(v_1)| - |\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1) \cup \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}(v_1)| = 2pn_2 - (n_2 - \text{cod}_{K \setminus \mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1))$$

and therefore

$$\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) - p^2 n_2 = \text{cod}_{K \setminus \mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1) - q^2 n_2. \quad (66)$$

Further, $K \setminus \mathbb{R} = K \setminus \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ has the same distribution as $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, q)$. So, if $p > 1/2$, applying (65) with q instead of p yields (64).

A crude idea behind the bound we are going to prove comes from our anticipation that $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$ behaves similarly as $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p)}(u_1, v_1)$, which is distributed as $\text{Bin}(n_2, p^2)$ or, approximately, as $\text{Po}(p^2 n_2)$. We will show that each tail of $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$ is comparable to the tail of $\text{Po}(\mu)$ with expectation μ fairly close to $p^2 n_2$. The proof will be completed by the Chernoff bounds for the Poisson distribution, stated in Section 2.3.

Fix distinct $u_1, v_1 \in V_1$ and set $X := \text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$. Further, for $k = 0, \dots, d_1$, let \mathcal{R}_k be the set of graphs $H \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ for which $\text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1) = k$. By Proposition 21.(i), all families \mathcal{R}_k , $0 \leq k \leq d_1$, are non-empty. Given integers $i, m \in \{0, \dots, d_1\}$, we may bound, for $i \geq m$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq i) = \frac{\sum_{j \geq i} |\mathcal{R}_j|}{|\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)|} \leq \sum_{j \geq i} \frac{|\mathcal{R}_j|}{|\mathcal{R}_m|} = \sum_{j \geq i} \prod_{k=m+1}^j \frac{|\mathcal{R}_k|}{|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|}, \quad (67)$$

and, similarly, for $i \leq m$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq i) \leq \sum_{j \leq i} \frac{|\mathcal{R}_j|}{|\mathcal{R}_m|} = \sum_{j \leq i} \prod_{k=j+1}^m \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|}{|\mathcal{R}_k|}. \quad (68)$$

Our choice of m will be guided by an intuition that the ‘shape’ of the sequence $|\mathcal{R}_k|$ is similar to the distribution $\text{Bin}(n_2, p^2)$, which is increasing up to some point (approximately $n_2 p^2$) and then decreasing. However, due to errors in the forthcoming estimates of the ratios $|\mathcal{R}_k|/|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|$ we cannot guarantee monotonicity of $|\mathcal{R}_k|$ for k close to $p^2 n_2$. Hence we will choose two different values of m for each tail: a slightly larger m_+ in (67) and a slightly smaller m_- in (68).

We consider separately (and quite differently) the cases $\mathbb{I} = 1$ and $\mathbb{I} = 0$.

Case $\mathbb{I} = 1$. If $p \geq 1/5$, then deterministically $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, u_2) \leq pn_2 \leq 5p^2 n_2 \leq p^2 n_2 + 20p^3 n_2$ and $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, u_2) - p^2 n_2 \geq -p^2 n_2 \geq -5p^3 n_2$, and hence (65) holds trivially. So we further assume $p \leq 1/5$.

We are going to prove bounds on $|\mathcal{R}_k|/|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|$, $k \geq 1$, using a switching between $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_k$ and $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$. To this end, recall our terminology from Subsection 2.2 (with $G = \emptyset$): any graph $H \subseteq K$ is interpreted as a coloring of the edges of K , with the edges in H blue and the rest red. We define a forward switching as follows: pick a common blue neighbor $w_2 \in \Gamma_H(u_1) \cap \Gamma_H(v_1)$ and find two alternating 4-cycles $u_1 w_2 x_1 x_2$ and $v_1 w_2 y_1 y_2$ so that $x_1 \neq y_1$, $x_2 \neq y_2$. Moreover, we restrict the choice of the cycles to those for which $v_1 x_2$ and $u_1 y_2$ are red; this is to make sure that swapping of the colors on each of the two cycles

(but keeping the color of v_1x_2, u_1y_2 red) indeed decreases $\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$ by one, thus mapping $H \in \mathcal{R}_k$ to $H' \in \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$ (see Figure 3).

Let $B = B(\mathcal{R}_k, \mathcal{R}_{k-1})$ be the auxiliary bipartite graph with $H \in \mathcal{R}_k$ adjacent to $H' \in \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$ whenever H is transformed into H' by the described switching.

Since the number of choices of w_2 is k for any $H \in \mathcal{R}_k$, we will show upper and lower bounds on $\text{deg}_B(H)/k$, by fixing w_2 and proving upper and lower bounds on the possible choices of (x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) . For the upper bound, since there are $n_2 - 2d_1 + k$ common red neighbors of u_1 and v_1 , the number of choices of distinct x_2, y_2 is exactly $(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2$, while the number of choices of x_1 and y_1 , as blue neighbors of, resp., x_2 and y_2 , is at most d_2^2 . Ignoring the requirements that $x_1 \neq y_1$ and that both x_1w_2 and y_1w_2 should be red, we have shown that possible 4-tuples (x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) is at most $(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2$, whence

$$\text{deg}_B(H)/k \leq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2. \quad (69)$$

For the lower bound, we subtract from the upper bound (69) the number of choices of (x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) for which either $x_1 = y_1$ or at least one of x_1w_2 and y_1w_2 is blue (the assumption $x_2 \neq y_2$ was taken into account in the upper bound). The number of the choices with $x_1 = y_1$ is at most $n_1d_1^2$, and those with, say, x_1w_2 blue, is at most $d_2d_1 \cdot (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)d_2$. Indeed, there are $\text{deg}_H(w_2) \leq d_2$ candidates for x_1 and, then, at most d_1 candidates for x_2 , $\text{cod}_{K \setminus H}(u_1, u_2) \leq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)$ candidates for y_2 , and then d_2 choices of y_1 . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{deg}_B(H)/k &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2 - n_1d_1^2 - 2(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)d_1d_2^2 \\ &= (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2 \left(1 - \frac{n_1d_1^2}{(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2} - \frac{2d_1}{n_2 - 2d_1 + k - 1} \right) \\ \boxed{d_1 = n_2p, d_2 = n_1p, k \geq 1} &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2 \left(1 - \frac{n_2^2}{(n_2 - 2pn_2)^2n_1} - \frac{2pn_2}{n_2 - 2pn_2} \right) \\ &= (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1 - 2p)^2n_1} - \frac{2p}{1 - 2p} \right) \\ \boxed{p \leq 1/5} &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2 \left(1 - \left(\frac{25}{9pn_1} + \frac{10}{3} \right) p \right) \\ \boxed{pn \rightarrow \infty} &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k)_2d_2^2 (1 - 4p). \end{aligned}$$

A moment of thought (and a glance at Figure 3) reveals that the backward switching corresponds to choosing a common red neighbor w_2 of u_1 and v_1 , choosing alternating cycles $u_1w_2x_1x_2$ and $v_1w_2y_1y_2$ such that $x_1 \neq y_1$ and the edges v_1x_2 and u_1y_2 are red (note that these assumptions imply $x_2 \neq y_2$), and swapping the colors along the cycles.

Since for every $H' \in \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$ the number of choices of $x_2 \in \Gamma_{H'}(u_1) \setminus \Gamma_{H'}(v_1)$ and $y_2 \in \Gamma_{H'}(v_1) \setminus \Gamma_{H'}(u_1)$ is exactly $(d_1 - k + 1)^2$, we will bound $\text{deg}_B(H')/(d_1 - k + 1)^2$ from above and below by fixing x_2, y_2 and estimating the number of possible triplets (w_2, x_1, y_1) . For the upper bound, we can choose w_2 in exactly $\text{cod}_{K \setminus H'}(u_1, u_2) = n_2 - 2d_1 + k - 1$ ways, and a pair x_1, y_1 of distinct blue neighbors of w_2 in at most $(d_2)_2$ ways (we ignore the requirement that x_1x_2, y_1y_2 are red). Thus,

$$\text{deg}_B(H')/(d_1 - k + 1)^2 \leq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k - 1)(d_2)_2. \quad (70)$$

For the lower bound, given x_2, y_2 , we need to subtract from the upper bound (70) the number of choices of w_2, x_1, y_1 for which x_1x_2 or y_1y_2 is blue. In the former case, ignoring other constraints, there are at most d_2 choices of a blue neighbor x_1 of x_2 , at most d_1 choices of a blue neighbor w_2 of x_1 , and at most d_2 choices of a blue neighbor y_1 of w_2 . By symmetry, the total number of bad choices is at most $2d_1d_2^2$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{deg}_B(H')/(d_1 - k + 1)^2 &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k - 1)(d_2)_2 - 2d_1d_2^2 \\ \boxed{k \geq 1} &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k - 1)d_2^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{d_2} - \frac{2d_1}{n_2 - 2d_1} \right) \\ \boxed{d_1 = n_2p, p \leq 1/5} &\geq (n_2 - 2d_1 + k - 1)d_2^2 (1 - d_2^{-1} - 4p). \end{aligned}$$

Since, by our assumptions, $d_2 \geq \hat{p}\hat{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \leq 1/5$, it follows that the minimum degree $\delta_B(H) \geq 1$. Thus, using (15) and bounds on the degrees in B , for $k = 1, \dots, d_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathcal{R}_k|}{|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|} &\leq \frac{\max_{H' \in \mathcal{R}'} \deg_B(H')}{\min_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H)} \leq \frac{(d_1 - k + 1)^2}{k(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - 4p} \\ &\leq \frac{(d_1 - k + 1)^2}{k(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)} \cdot (1 + 20p), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

(where the last inequality holds because $p \leq 1/5$ implies $\frac{1}{1-4p} = 1 + \frac{4p}{1-4p} \leq 1 + 20p$), and

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}_k|}{|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{\min_{H' \in \mathcal{R}'} \deg_B(H')}{\max_{H \in \mathcal{R}} \deg_B(H)} \geq \frac{(d_1 - k + 1)^2}{k(n_2 - 2d_1 + k)} (1 - d_2^{-1} - 4p). \quad (72)$$

Let μ be a real number such that

$$\frac{(d_1 - \mu + 1)^2}{\mu(n_2 - 2d_1 + \mu)} = 1. \quad (73)$$

After solving for μ , we have

$$\mu = \frac{(d_1 + 1)^2}{n_2 + 2} \in [p^2 n_2, p^2 n_2 (1 + 3d_1^{-1})]. \quad (74)$$

Define

$$\mu_+ := \mu(1 + 20p) \quad (75)$$

and

$$\mu_- := \mu(1 - d_2^{-1} - 4p). \quad (76)$$

From (71), (75), and (73), for $\mu \leq k \leq d_1$, we have

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}_k|}{|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|} \leq \frac{(d_1 - \mu + 1)^2 (1 + 20p)}{\mu(n_2 - 2d_1 + \mu)} \cdot \frac{\mu}{k} = \frac{\mu_+}{k}. \quad (77)$$

Let Z_{\pm} be a random variable with distribution $\text{Po}(\mu_{\pm})$. Then, writing $q_k^{\pm} := \mathbb{P}(Z_{\pm} = k)$, observe that the RHS of (77) equals q_k^+ / q_{k-1}^+ , and so, $|\mathcal{R}_k| / |\mathcal{R}_{k-1}| \leq q_k^+ / q_{k-1}^+$ for every $\mu \leq k \leq d_1$.

Let $m_{\pm} := \lfloor \mu_{\pm} \rfloor$ be the mode of Z_{\pm} (see Section 2.3). Using (67) with $m := m_+$, and the above inequality, for $i \geq m_+$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq i) \leq \sum_{j \geq i} \prod_{k=m_++1}^j \frac{q_k^+}{q_{k-1}^+} = \sum_{j \geq i} \frac{q_j^+}{q_{m_+}^+} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_+ \geq i)}{q_{m_+}^+}. \quad (78)$$

Turning to the lower tail, it follows from (72), (76), and (73) that, for $1 \leq k \leq \mu$,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{R}_{k-1}|}{|\mathcal{R}_k|} \leq \frac{\mu(n_2 - 2d_1 + \mu)}{(d_1 - \mu + 1)^2 (1 - 1/d_2 - 4p)} \cdot \frac{k}{\mu} = \frac{k}{\mu_-} = \frac{q_{k-1}^-}{q_k^-}. \quad (79)$$

Using (68) with $m := m_-$, for $i \leq m_-$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq i) \leq \sum_{j \leq i} \prod_{k=j+1}^{m_-} \frac{q_{k-1}^-}{q_k^-} = \sum_{j \leq i} \frac{q_j^-}{q_{m_-}^-} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_- \leq i)}{q_{m_-}^-}. \quad (80)$$

Note that, since $\min\{d_1, d_2\} = p\hat{n} \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \leq 1/5$, it follows by (74), (75), and (76) that

$$p^2 n_2 (1 - (p\hat{n})^{-1} - 4p) \leq \mu_- \leq \mu_+ \leq p^2 n_2 (1 + 15(p\hat{n})^{-1} + 20p) \leq 6p^2 n_2.$$

Thus, setting

$$x := 20\sqrt{\lambda p^2 n_2} + \lambda, \quad (81)$$

we have

$$p^2 n_2 + 20 \left(p^3 n_2 + \frac{pn_2}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{\lambda p^2 n_2} \right) + \lambda \geq \mu_+ + x$$

and

$$p^2 n_2 - 20 \left(p^3 n_2 + \frac{pn_2}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{\lambda p^2 n_2} \right) - \lambda \leq \mu_- - x.$$

Consequently, recalling the lower bounds on $q_{m_{\pm}}^{\pm}$ given by (21), applying (18) to Z_+ and (19) to Z_- , and combining, respectively, with (78) and (80), we obtain bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(X \geq p^2 n_2 + 20 \left(np_2^3 + \frac{pn_2}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{p^2 \lambda n_2} \right) + \lambda\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}(X \geq \mu_+ + x) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_+ \geq \mu_+ + x)}{q_{m_+}} \leq 8^{\lceil \mu_+ \rceil^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\mu_+ + x/3)}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(X \leq p^2 n_2 - 20 \left(p^3 n_2 + \frac{pn_2}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{p^2 \lambda n_2} \right) - \lambda\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}(X \leq \mu_- - x) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_- \leq \mu_- - x)}{q_{m_-}} \leq 8^{\lceil \mu_- \rceil^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\mu_-}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

It is easy to check that the RHS of both (82) and (83) is $O(\sqrt{N}e^{-\lambda})$. Indeed, we have $\mu_- \leq \mu_+ \leq 6p^2 n_2 \leq n_2 \leq N$, while

$$\frac{x^2}{2\mu_-} \geq \frac{x^2}{2(\mu_+ + x/3)} \geq \frac{x^2}{12p^2 n_2 + 2x/3} = \frac{\lambda \left(400p^2 n_2 + 40\sqrt{\lambda p^2 n_2} + \lambda \right)}{12p^2 n_2 + \frac{40}{3}\sqrt{\lambda p^2 n_2} + \frac{2}{3}\lambda} \geq \lambda. \quad (84)$$

This completes the proof in the case $\mathbb{I} = 1$.

Case $\mathbb{I} = 0$. For the switching argument used in the previous case it was crucial that p was small, as otherwise several estimates would be negative and so meaningless. Therefore, it cannot be used now. Fortunately, in this case we are in a position to apply an asymptotic enumeration approach analogous to the proof of [8, Theorem 2.1] and based on Theorem 5.

Recall that, given two vectors $\mathbf{d}_1 = (d_{1,v}, v \in V_1)$ and $\mathbf{d}_2 = (d_{2,v}, v \in V_2)$ of positive integers such that $\sum_{v \in V_1} d_{1,v} = \sum_{v \in V_2} d_{2,v}$, notation $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)$ stands for the class of bipartite graphs on (V_1, V_2) and vertex degrees $\deg(v) = d_{i,v}, v \in V_i, i = 1, 2$. Writing $A = \Gamma_H(u_1)$ and $B = \Gamma_H(v_1)$, we note that every graph in \mathcal{R}_k induces an ordered partition of V_2 into four sets $A \cap B, A \setminus B, B \setminus A$ and $V_2 \setminus (A \cup B)$, of sizes, respectively, $k, d_1 - k, d_1 - k$, and $n_2 - 2d_1 + k$. After removing vertices u_1 and v_1 , we obtain a graph $H^* \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)$ on $(V_1 \setminus \{u_1, v_1\}, V_2)$, with \mathbf{d}_1 having all its $n_1 - 2$ entries equal to d_1 , and entries of \mathbf{d}_2 determined by the partition: entries equal to $d_2 - 2$ on $A \cap B$, to $d_2 - 1$ on $A \Delta B$ and the remaining ones equal to d_2 . Since H^* together with the ordered partition uniquely determines H , we have

$$|\mathcal{R}_k| = \frac{n_2!}{k!(d_1 - k)!^2(n_2 - 2d_2 + k)!} |\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)|.$$

In order to apply Theorem 5 to approximate $|\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)|$, we need to check the three assumptions (i)–(iii). When doing so we should remember that we have $n_1 - 2$ instead of n_1 , but that the parameter $p = d_1/n_2$ remains intact. With a foresight, choose $a = 0.35$ and, say, $b = 0.1$, and, for convenience $C = 1$, which determine, via Theorem 5, an $\epsilon > 0$.

Note that $\mathbb{I} = 0$ implies

$$\hat{n} \geq \frac{4 \max\{n_1, n_2\}}{\log N} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n_1}{n_2} + \frac{n_2}{n_1} \leq \frac{p \log N}{2} \leq p \log \max\{n_1, n_2\}. \quad (85)$$

As the degrees on one side are all equal and on the other side they differ from each other by at most 2, assumption (i) holds true with a big margin. Using $q \geq 1/2$ and the first inequality in (85), we get

$$(pq)^2 \min\{n_1 - 2, n_2\}^{1+\epsilon} \geq \frac{p^2 \hat{n}^{1+\epsilon}}{4} (1 + o(1)) = \Omega\left(\frac{(\max\{n_1, n_2\})^{1+\epsilon}}{(\log N)^{3+\epsilon}}\right) \gg \max\{n_1, n_2\},$$

which implies assumption (ii) for large \hat{n} . Finally, using elementary inequalities $(1 - 2p)^2 \leq q$ (since $p \leq 1/2$), $1 \leq (n_1/n_2 + n_2/n_1)/2$, and the second inequality in (85), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1 - 2p)^2}{4pq} \left(1 + \frac{5(n_1 - 2)}{6n_2} + \frac{5n_2}{6(n_1 - 1)} \right) &\leq \frac{1}{4p} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{5}{6} \right) \left(\frac{n_1}{n_2} + \frac{n_2}{n_1} \right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3} \log \max\{n_1, n_2\} (1 + o(1)) \ll 0.35 \cdot \log \max\{n_1 - 2, n_2\}, \end{aligned}$$

which for large \hat{n} implies assumption (iii) with $a = 0.35$.

Note that in (22) we have $D_1 = 0$, while $D_2 \leq 4n_2 \ll pqn_1n_2$, by the assumption $\hat{p}\hat{n} \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, uniformly over k , the exponent in (22) is $-1/2 + o(1)$ and, by Theorem 5,

$$|\mathcal{R}_k| \sim \frac{e^{-1/2} n_2! \binom{n_2}{d_1}^{n_1-2} \binom{n_1-2}{d_2-2}^k \binom{n_1-2}{d_2-1}^{2d_1-2k} \binom{n_1-2}{d_2}^{n_1-2d_1+k}}{k!(d_1-k)!^2(n_2-2d_1+k)! \binom{(n_1-2)n_2}{(n_1-2)d_1}} =: t_k. \quad (86)$$

The rest of the proof is similar to the Case $\mathbb{I} = 1$, with t_k playing the role of $|\mathcal{R}_k|$, but without switchings. Straightforward calculations yield

$$\frac{t_k}{t_{k-1}} = \frac{(d_1-k+1)^2(n_1-2-d_2+1)(d_2-1)}{k(n_2-2d_1+k) \cdot d_2(n_1-d_2)} \leq \frac{(d_1-k+1)^2}{k(n_2-2d_1+k)}$$

and, because $d_2/n_1 = p \leq 1/2$,

$$\frac{t_k}{t_{k-1}} \geq \frac{(d_1-k+1)^2}{k(n_2-2d_1+k)} (1-2d_2^{-1}).$$

(Compare with (71) and (72) to note the absence of $\Theta(p)$ error terms.) With μ as in (74), we redefine

$$\mu_+ := \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_- := \mu(1-2d_2^{-1}). \quad (87)$$

As in the previous case we set $m_\pm := \lfloor \mu_\pm \rfloor$ and $q_k^\pm := \mathbb{P}(Z_\pm = k)$, where Z_\pm is a Poisson random variable with expectation μ_\pm . Repeating the argument in (77) and (79), we obtain that

$$\frac{t_k}{t_{k-1}} \leq \frac{\mu^+}{k} = \frac{q_k^+}{q_{k-1}^+}, \quad k \geq \mu, \quad (88)$$

$$\frac{t_{k-1}}{t_k} \leq \frac{k}{\mu^-} = \frac{q_{k-1}^-}{q_k^-}, \quad k \leq \mu. \quad (89)$$

Recall our notation $X = \text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}}(u_1, v_1)$. Using (67), (86), and (88), we further obtain, for $i \geq m_+$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq i) \leq \sum_{j \geq i} \frac{|\mathcal{R}_j|}{|\mathcal{R}_{m_+}|} \sim \sum_{j \geq i} \frac{t_j}{t_{m_+}} = \sum_{j \geq i} \prod_{k=m_++1}^j \frac{t_k}{t_{k-1}} \leq \sum_{j \geq i} \prod_{k=m_++1}^j \frac{q_k^+}{q_{k-1}^+} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_+ \geq i)}{q_{m_+}^+}, \quad (90)$$

whereas (68), (86), and (89) similarly imply, for $i \leq m_-$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq i) \leq \sum_{j \leq i} \frac{|\mathcal{R}_j|}{|\mathcal{R}_{m_-}|} \sim \sum_{j \leq i} \frac{t_j}{t_{m_-}} \leq \sum_{j \leq i} \prod_{k=j+1}^{m_-} \frac{q_{k-1}^-}{q_k^-} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_- \leq i)}{q_{m_-}^-}. \quad (91)$$

From (74) and (87) it follows that

$$\mu_+ = \mu \leq p^2 n_2 (1 + 3d_1^{-1}) \leq p^2 n_2 + \frac{3pn_2}{n_1} \leq p^2 n_2 + \frac{20pn_2}{\hat{n}} \quad (92)$$

and

$$\mu_- = p^2 n_2 (1 - 2d_2^{-1}) \geq p^2 n_2 - 2p \geq p^2 n_2 - \frac{20pn_2}{\hat{n}}. \quad (93)$$

Note that $\mu_- \leq \mu_+ = \mu \leq 2p^2 n_2 \leq n_2 \leq N$. Moreover, for x defined in (81), inequalities (84) still hold (since they use only $\mu_- \leq \mu_+ \leq 6p^2 n_2$).

Hence, by (92), (93), (90), (91), (21), (18), and (19), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X - p^2 n_2| \geq \frac{20pn_2}{\hat{n}} + x\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_+ \geq \mu_+ + x)}{q_{m_+}^+} + \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_- \leq \mu_- - x)}{q_{m_-}^-} = O(\sqrt{N}e^{-\lambda}),$$

which is (65) in the case $\mathbb{I} = 0$. This completes the proof of Lemma 11. \square

5.2. Degrees and co-degrees in $\mathbb{R}(t)$. For the ease of notation, having fixed an $H \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$, we will denote by \mathbb{P}_H and \mathbb{E}_H the conditional probability and expectation with respect to the event $\mathbb{R} = H$.

We first show that the degrees of vertices in the process $\mathbb{R}(t)$ grow proportionally almost until the end. Due to subsequent applications, we state the result also in the residual form. Recall that $d_1 = pn_2$, $d_2 = pn_1$.

Lemma 12. *If $\lambda = \lambda(n_1, n_2) \leq \tau_0 p \hat{n}$, then for $i = 1, 2$, with probability $1 - O(N^2 e^{-9\lambda/4})$*

$$\forall t \leq t_0 \quad \forall v \in V_i \quad |\deg_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(v) - (1 - \tau)d_i| = |\deg_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)}(v) - \tau d_i| \leq 3\sqrt{\lambda \tau d_i}. \quad (94)$$

Proof. Fix $t \leq t_0$ and $v \in V_i$ and set $X_t(v) := \deg_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)}(v)$. For any $H \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$, conditioning on $\mathbb{R} = H$, the random variable $X_t(v) \sim \text{Hyp}(M, d_i, M - t)$ has hypergeometric distribution. Since the distribution does not depend on H , $X_t(v)$ has the same distribution unconditionally. In view of (27), $\mathbb{E} X_t(v) = \tau d_i$, therefore combining (18) and (19), for all $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_t(v) - \tau d_i| \geq x) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2(\tau d_i + x/3)} \right\} = 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2\tau d_i(1 + x/(3\tau d_i))} \right\}. \quad (95)$$

Let $x := 3\sqrt{\lambda \tau d_i}$. Since $\tau \geq \tau_0$, by the assumption $\lambda \leq \tau_0 p \hat{n}$,

$$x/(3\tau d_i) = \sqrt{\lambda/(\tau d_i)} \leq \sqrt{\tau_0 \hat{n} p / (\tau_0 d_i)} \leq 1. \quad (96)$$

Consequently, taking the union bound over all $(1 - \tau_0)Mn_i \leq N^2$ choices of t and v and using (95) and (96), we conclude that (94) fails with probability at most

$$2N^2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2\tau d_i(1 + x/(3\tau d_i))} \right\} \leq 2N^2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{9\tau d_i \lambda}{4\tau d_i} \right\} = 2N^2 e^{-9\lambda/4}. \quad \square$$

In the proof of Lemma 10, in order to have a pseudorandom-like property of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)$ for $p > 0.49$, we will need a bound on the upper tail of co-degrees in $\mathbb{R}(t)$. Recall the definition of co-degree from (63).

Lemma 13. *Assume that $n_1 \geq n_2$ and $p > 0.49$. If $\lambda = \lambda(n_1, n_2) \geq \log N$, then, with probability $1 - O(N^3 e^{-\lambda/3})$,*

$$\forall t \leq M \quad \forall u_1 \neq v_1 \quad \text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(u_1, v_1) \leq (1 - \tau)^2 p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 43\sqrt{\lambda n_2}. \quad (97)$$

Proof. If $\lambda \geq n_2$, inequality (97) holds trivially, so let us assume $\lambda < n_2$. By Lemma 11 and the union bound, we can condition on $\mathbb{R} = H$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall u_1, v_1 \in V_1 \quad \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1) &\leq p^2 n_2 + 20 \left(\hat{p}^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + n_2 \hat{p} / \hat{n} + \sqrt{\hat{p}^2 \lambda n_2} + \lambda \right) \\ \boxed{\hat{p} \leq \min\{q, 0.5\}, n_2 = \hat{n}} &\leq p^2 n_2 + 20 \left(q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 0.5 + 0.5\sqrt{\lambda n_2} + \lambda \right) \\ \boxed{1 \ll \lambda < n_2} &\leq p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 40\sqrt{\lambda n_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

It suffices to show that if H satisfies (98), then for any distinct $u_1, v_1 \in V_1$ and $t \leq M$

$$\mathbb{P}_H \left(\text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(u_1, v_1) > (1 - \tau)^2 p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 43\sqrt{\lambda n_2} \right) = 2e^{-\lambda/3}, \quad (99)$$

since then the proof is completed by a union bound over $O(N^3)$ choices of t, u_1, v_1 .

Fix $t \leq M, u_1 \neq v_1$ and let $Y := |\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(u_1) \cap \Gamma_H(v_1)|$ and $\text{cod}_H := \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1)$. Conditional on $\mathbb{R} = H$, we have that Y has hypergeometric distribution $\text{Hyp}(M, \text{cod}_H, t)$, and hence, by (98),

$$\mu_Y := \mathbb{E}_H Y = \frac{t \text{cod}_H}{M} = (1 - \tau) \text{cod}_H \leq (1 - \tau) p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 40\sqrt{\lambda n_2}.$$

Using (18), a trivial bound $\mu_Y \leq n_2$, and our assumption $\lambda < n_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}_H \left(Y \geq \mu_Y + \sqrt{\lambda n_2} \right) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda n_2}{2(\mu_Y + \sqrt{\lambda n_2/3})} \right\} \leq e^{-3\lambda/8} \leq e^{-\lambda/3}.$$

Since also trivially $Y \leq \min\{d_1, t\}$, we have shown that, given $\mathbb{R} = H$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-\lambda/3}$,

$$Y \leq y_0 := \min\{\mu_Y + \sqrt{\lambda n_2}, d_1, t\} \leq (1 - \tau)p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 41\sqrt{\lambda n_2}. \quad (100)$$

Let $\mathcal{E}_{(99)}$ be the event (in the conditional space $\mathbb{R} = H$) that the inequality in (99) holds. By the law of total probability,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_H(\mathcal{E}_{(99)}) &= \sum_y \mathbb{P}_H(\mathcal{E}_{(99)} | Y = y) \mathbb{P}_H(Y = y) \\ \boxed{(100)} &\leq \sum_{y \leq y_0} \mathbb{P}_H(\mathcal{E}_{(99)} | Y = y) \mathbb{P}_H(Y = y) + e^{-\lambda/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, to prove (99), it suffices to show that, for any $y = 0, \dots, y_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_H(\mathcal{E}_{(99)} | Y = y) \leq e^{-\lambda/3}. \quad (101)$$

Fix integer $y \in [0, y_0]$ and some set $S \subseteq V_2$ of size $|S| = y \leq y_0$. Under an additional conditioning $\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(u_1) \cap \Gamma_H(v_1) = S$, set $\mathbb{R}(t)$ is the union of a fixed y -element set $\{u_1 w : w \in S\}$ and a random $(t - y)$ -element subset of $E(H) \setminus \{u_1 w : w \in \Gamma_H(u_1) \cap \Gamma_H(v_1)\}$. Thus, in this conditional space, $X := \text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(u_1, u_2)$ counts how many of these $t - y$ random edges fall into the set $\{v_1 w : w \in S\}$ and therefore $X \sim \text{Hyp}(M - \text{cod}_H, y, t - y)$. Moreover, the distribution of X is the same for all S of size y , so X has the same distribution conditional on $Y = y$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_X &:= \mathbb{E}_H(X | Y = y) = \frac{y(t - y)}{M - \text{cod}_H} \\ \boxed{y \geq 0} &\leq \frac{yt}{M} \left(1 + \frac{\text{cod}_H}{M - \text{cod}_H}\right) \\ \boxed{M = pn_1 n_2, \text{cod}_H \leq pn_2} &\leq (1 - \tau)y \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_1 - 1}\right) \\ \boxed{y \leq y_0 \text{ and } (100)} &\leq (1 - \tau)^2 p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 41\sqrt{\lambda n_2} + \frac{n_2}{n_1 - 1}. \\ \boxed{n_1 \geq n_2} &\leq (1 - \tau)^2 p^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 42\sqrt{\lambda n_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using again (18), as well as inequalities $\mu_X \leq n_2$ and $\lambda \leq n_2$, we infer that

$$\mathbb{P}_H\left(X \geq \mu_X + \sqrt{\lambda n_2} | Y = y\right) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda n_2}{2(\mu_X + \sqrt{\lambda n_2}/3)}\right\} \leq e^{-\lambda/3},$$

which, together with the above upper bound on μ_X , implies (101). This completes the proof of Lemma 13. \square

5.3. Proof of Lemma 9. Recall the definitions of $\delta(t)$ in (50) and $\lambda(t)$ in (51), and observe that (157) and (52) imply

$$\delta(t) \leq 1/9 \leq 1. \quad (102)$$

We now derive an upper bound on $\lambda(t)$. By (158), with a huge margin,

$$6 \log N \leq \frac{\tau \hat{p} \hat{n}}{16(C + 3)} \leq \frac{\tau p q \hat{n}}{8(C + 3)}.$$

On the other hand, for $p > 0.49$, squaring and rearranging the inequality (156) implies

$$\frac{64 \log N}{\tau p q} \leq \frac{\tau p q \hat{n}}{8(C + 3)}.$$

Summing up, for any p ,

$$\lambda(t) \leq \frac{\tau p q \hat{n}}{4(C + 3)}. \quad (103)$$

Without loss of generality, we prove Lemma 9 just for $i = 1$. Let \mathcal{F}_t be the family of graphs H satisfying, for any distinct $u_1, v_1 \in V_1$,

$$|d_1 - \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1) - p q n_2| \leq 20 \hat{p} n_2 \left(\hat{p}^2 \mathbb{I} + \frac{1}{\hat{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{(C + 3)\lambda(t)}{n_2}} + \frac{(C + 3)\lambda(t)}{20 \hat{p} n_2} \right). \quad (104)$$

By Lemma 11 with $\lambda = (C+3)\lambda(t)$ and a union bound over the $O(N^2)$ choices of u_1, v_1 , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{F}_t) = 1 - O(N^{2.5}e^{-(C+3)\lambda(t)}) \stackrel{\lambda(t) \geq 6 \log n}{\geq} 1 - O(N^{-(C+1)}e^{-2\lambda(t)}). \quad (105)$$

Writing $\delta_* = \sqrt{\frac{(C+3)\lambda(t)}{\tau pq \hat{n}}}$ and noting that (103) implies $\delta_* \leq 1/2$, the sum of the last three terms in the parentheses in (104) is at most

$$2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{(C+3)\lambda(t)}{\hat{n}}} + \frac{(C+3)\lambda(t)}{20\hat{p}\hat{n}} \leq 2\sqrt{pq}\delta_* + \frac{pq\delta_*^2}{20\hat{p}} \leq (1 + 1/40)\delta_* \leq \frac{3\delta_*}{\sqrt{6}}.$$

In addition, the factor in front of the brackets is at most $40pq n_2$. Thus, (104) implies

$$|d_1 - \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1) - pq n_2| \leq 40pq n_2 \left(\hat{p}^2 \mathbb{I} + \frac{3\delta_*}{\sqrt{6}} \right) = pq n_2 \cdot \delta(t)/3. \quad (106)$$

We claim that for $t = 0, \dots, t_0$

$$\max_{H \in \mathcal{F}_t} \mathbb{P}_H \left(\max_{u_1 \neq v_1} \left| \frac{\theta_t(u_1, v_1)}{\tau pq n_2} - 1 \right| \geq \delta(t) \right) \leq 2N^2 e^{-(C+3)\lambda(t)}, \quad (107)$$

and deferring its proof to the end we first show how (105) and (107) imply the lemma.

Inequalities (107) and (105) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{u_1 \neq v_1} \left| \frac{\theta_t(u_1, v_1)}{\tau pq n_2} - 1 \right| \geq \delta(t) \right) &\leq 2N^2 e^{-(C+3)\lambda(t)} + \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R} \notin \mathcal{F}_t) \\ &= O(N^{-(C+1)}e^{-2\lambda(t)}). \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

Consider random variables, for $t = 0, \dots, t_0$,

$$Y_t := \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{u_1 \neq v_1} \left| \frac{\theta_t(u_1, v_1)}{\tau pq n_2} - 1 \right| > \delta(t) \mid \mathbb{R}(t) \right).$$

Using Markov's inequality and (108), we infer that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_t > e^{-2\lambda(t)}) \leq e^{2\lambda(t)} \mathbb{E} Y_t = e^{2\lambda(t)} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{u_1 \neq v_1} \left| \frac{\theta_t(u_1, v_1)}{\tau pq n_2} - 1 \right| \geq \delta(t) \right) = O(N^{-(C+1)}),$$

which, taking the union bound over the $O(N)$ choices of t , implies that (55) holds with desired probability, completing the proof of lemma.

Returning to the proof of (107), fix $t \leq t_0$, $H \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and two distinct vertices $u_1, v_1 \in V_1$. Conditioning on $\mathbb{R} = H$, note that from (54) that random variable $X := \theta_t(u_1, v_1) = |\Gamma_{H \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)}(u_i) \cap \Gamma_{K \setminus H}(v_i)|$ counts elements in the intersection of two subsets of $E(H)$: a fixed set $\{(u_i, w) : w \in \Gamma_H(u_i) \cap \Gamma_{K \setminus H}(v_i)\}$ of size $d_1 - \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1)$ and a random set $H \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)$ of size $M - t$. Hence $X \sim \text{Hyp}(M, d_1 - \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1), M - t)$ has hypergeometric distribution with expectation

$$\mu_X := \mathbb{E} X = (d_1 - \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1))(M - t)/M = \tau(d_1 - \text{cod}_H(u_1, v_1)).$$

Note that by (106),

$$|\mu_X - \tau pq n_2| \leq \tau pq n_2 \cdot \delta(t)/3. \quad (109)$$

Let $\lambda^* := (3C+9)\lambda(t)$. From (109), (102), and (103) it follows that

$$\mu_X \geq \frac{26}{27} \tau pq n_2 \geq \lambda^*. \quad (110)$$

Note that (50) implies

$$\delta(t)^2 \geq 7200 \frac{\lambda^*}{\tau pq n_2} \geq 10 \frac{\lambda^*}{\tau pq n_2}. \quad (111)$$

By (18), (19), and (110),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_H \left(|X - \mu_X| \geq \sqrt{\mu_X \lambda^*} \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{\lambda^*}{2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\lambda^*/\mu_X} \right)} \right\} \\ &\leq 2e^{-3\lambda^*/8} \leq 2e^{-\lambda^*/3} = 2e^{-(C+3)\lambda(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

Thus, with probability $1 - 2e^{-(C+3)\lambda(t)}$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\theta_t(u_1, v_1) - \tau pq n_2| &\leq |X - \mu_X| + |\mu_X - \tau pq n_2| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\mu_X \lambda^*} + |\mu_X - \tau pq n_2| \\
\boxed{(109), (111)} &\leq \sqrt{(1 + \delta(t)/3) \tau pq n_2 \cdot \delta^2(t) \tau pq n_2 / 10} + (\delta(t)/3) \tau pq n_2 \\
\boxed{(102)} &\leq \delta(t) \tau pq n_2 (\sqrt{(1 + 1/27)/10} + 1/3) \\
&\leq \delta(t) \tau pq n_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, applying also the union bound over all $n_1^2 \leq N^2$ choices of u_1, v_1 , we infer (107). \square

6. ALTERNATING CYCLES IN REGULARLY 2-EDGE-COLORED JUMBLED GRAPHS

The ultimate goal of this section is to prove Lemma 10. While for $p \leq 0.49$ the proof follows relatively easily from Lemma 12 by a standard switching technique, the case $p > 0.49$ is much more involved. To cope with it, we first need to study the existence of alternating walks and cycles in a class of 2-edge-colored pseudorandom graphs.

In Subsection 6.1, we define an appropriate notion of pseudorandom bipartite graphs (*jumbledness*), inspired by a similar notion introduced implicitly by Thomason in [13]. We show that for $p > 0.49$ and suitably chosen parameters the random graph $K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)$ is jumbled with high probability (Lemma 16).

The next two subsections are devoted to 2-edge-colored jumbled graphs which are almost regular in each color. After proving a technical Lemma 17 in Subsection 6.2, in Subsection 6.3 we show the existence of alternating short walks between any two vertices of almost regular 2-edge-colored jumbled graphs (Lemma 18).

An immediate consequence of Lemma 18 is Lemma 19, which states that every edge belongs to an alternating short cycle. The latter result together with a standard switching argument (Proposition 4) will be used in the proof of Lemma 10 for $p > 0.49$. That proof, for both cases $p \leq 0.49$ and $p > 0.49$, is presented in Subsection 6.4.

6.1. Jumbled graphs. Let $K := K_{n_1, n_2}$ be the complete bipartite graph with partition classes V_1 and V_2 , where $|V_i| = n_i$. Given a bipartite graph $F \subseteq K$ and two subsets $A \subseteq V_1$, $B \subseteq V_2$, denote by $e_F(A, B)$ the number of edges of F between A and B . Recall that $N = n_1 n_2$ and $M = pN$.

Given real numbers $\pi, \delta \in (0, 1)$, we say that a graph $F \subseteq K$ is (π, δ) -jumbled if for every $A \subseteq V_1$ and $B \subseteq V_2$

$$|e_F(A, B) - \pi|A||B|| \leq \delta \sqrt{N|A||B|}. \quad (113)$$

The following result of Thomason [13, Theorem 2], which quantifies a variant of jumbledness in terms of the degrees and co-degrees of a graph, will turn out to be crucial for us.

Theorem 14 ([13]). *Let $F \subseteq K$ be a bipartite graph and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu \geq 0$ be given. If*

$$\min_{v \in V_1} \deg_F(v) \geq \rho n_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{u, v \in V_1} \text{cod}_F(u, v) \leq \rho^2 n_2 + \mu, \quad (114)$$

then, for all $A \subseteq V_1$ and $B \subseteq V_2$,

$$|e_F(A, B) - \rho|A||B|| \leq \sqrt{(\rho n_2 + \mu|A|)|A||B|} + |B| \mathbb{I}_{\{|A| \rho < 1\}}.$$

Remark 15. The proof in [13] is given only in the case $n_1 = n_2 = n$. However, it carries over in this more general setting, as in [13] n always refers to $|V_2|$.

Recall that the random graph $K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)$ has precisely $N - t = N - (1 - \tau)M = (\tau p + q)N$ edges. The following result states that with high probability $K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)$ is jumbled for certain parameters.

Lemma 16. *Let $\alpha = \min\{\tau p, q\}$. If p satisfies $p > 0.49$ and the conditions of Lemma 6, then, for every constant $C > 0$, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$ it holds that*

$$\forall t \leq t_0 \quad K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t) \quad \text{is} \quad (\tau p + q, \alpha/17)\text{-jumbled}. \quad (115)$$

Proof. Since the definition of jumbledness (see (113)) is symmetric with respect to the bipartition (V_1, V_2) , we may, w.l.o.g., assume that $n_1 \geq n_2$.

Let $C > 0$ and $\lambda := 3(C+4) \log N$ and

$$\delta := 20(\lambda/n_2)^{1/4} + 10q^{3/2}\mathbb{I}. \quad (116)$$

Set $a := |A|$ and $b := |B|$, for convenience. We aim to show that for every fixed $t \leq t_0$, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C-1})$, for all $A \subseteq V_1$ and $B \subseteq V_2$

$$|e_{K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - (\tau p + q)ab| \leq \frac{\alpha}{17} \sqrt{Nab}. \quad (117)$$

Then, of course, Lemma 16 will follow by the union bound over all (at most $t_0 \leq M \leq N$) choices of t . Since

$$e_{K \setminus \mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) = ab - e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B),$$

setting $\pi := 1 - (\tau p + q) = (1 - \tau)p$, it is enough to prove that with probability $1 - O(N^{-C-1})$

$$|e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \pi ab| \leq \delta \sqrt{Nab} \quad \text{for every } A \subseteq V_1 \text{ and } B \subseteq V_2, \quad (118)$$

and that

$$\delta \leq \frac{\alpha}{17}. \quad (119)$$

Observe that if $\pi \leq \delta^2$, then inequality (118) holds rather trivially. This is because (noting that $\pi = t/N$)

$$e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \pi ab \leq e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) \leq \min\{t, ab\} \leq \sqrt{tab} = \sqrt{\pi Nab} \leq \delta \sqrt{Nab}$$

and, using $\delta \geq \pi$ (which follows from $1 \geq \pi$ and $\delta^2 \geq \pi$) and $N = n_1 n_2 \geq ab$,

$$e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \pi ab \geq -\pi ab \geq -\delta \sqrt{Nab}.$$

So, from now on we assume, recalling the choice of δ in (116), that

$$\pi > \delta^2 \geq 400\sqrt{\lambda/n_2}. \quad (120)$$

We will first show that, with probability $1 - O(N^{-C-1})$, conditions (114) are satisfied by $F = \mathbb{R}(t)$ for suitably chosen ρ and μ . Then we will apply Theorem 14 to deduce (118) and, finally, show that (119) holds.

By (158), $\lambda \leq \tau_0 p \hat{n}$ with a big room to spare. Hence, by Lemma 12 and inequalities $d_1 \leq n_2$, $\tau \leq 1$, with probability $1 - O(N^2 e^{-9\lambda/4})$,

$$\min_{v \in V_1} \deg_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(v) \geq (1 - \tau) d_1 - 3\sqrt{\lambda \tau d_1} = \pi n_2 - 3\sqrt{\lambda \tau d_1} \geq (\pi - 3\sqrt{\lambda/n_2}) n_2. \quad (121)$$

Moreover, since $n_1 \geq n_2$, Lemma 13 implies that, with probability $1 - O(N^3 e^{-\lambda/3})$,

$$\max_{u, v \in V_1, u \neq v} \text{cod}_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(u, v) \leq \pi^2 n_2 + 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 43n_2 \sqrt{\lambda/n_2}. \quad (122)$$

Since $\lambda = 3(C+4) \log N$, the intersection of events (122) and (121) holds with probability $1 - O(N^3 e^{-\lambda/3}) = 1 - O(N^{-C-1})$. Hence, it remains to show that they deterministically imply, via Theorem 14, inequality (118). Setting

$$\rho := \pi - 3\sqrt{\lambda/n_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu := 20q^3 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 49n_2 \sqrt{\lambda/n_2} - 9\lambda,$$

we see that (121) and (122) are equivalent to the assumptions (114) with $F = \mathbb{R}(t)$. By (120) we have $0 < \rho < \pi < 1$ and, trivially, $\mu \leq 20q^3 n_2 + 49n_2 \sqrt{\lambda/n_2}$. Applying the conclusion of Theorem 14, we obtain (using $a \leq n_1$)

$$|e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \rho ab| \leq \sqrt{\left(\pi n_2 + 20q^3 n_1 n_2 \mathbb{I} + 49n_1 n_2 \sqrt{\lambda/n_2}\right) ab} + b.$$

Using $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq b$ and $a \geq 1$, we have

$$\pi < 1 \leq n_1 \sqrt{\lambda/n_2} \quad \text{and} \quad b \leq \sqrt{bn_2} \leq \sqrt{Nab} (\lambda/n_2)^{1/4}.$$

It follows, using also $\sqrt{x+y} \leq \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}$ and (116), that

$$|e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \rho ab| \leq \left((\sqrt{50} + 1)(\lambda/n_2)^{1/4} + 5q^{3/2} \mathbb{I} \right) \sqrt{Nab} \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \sqrt{Nab}. \quad (123)$$

Moreover, note that (120) yield that

$$|(\pi - \rho)ab| = 3\sqrt{\lambda/n_2} \cdot ab \leq \frac{3\delta^2}{400} \cdot \sqrt{Nab} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}\sqrt{Nab}, \quad (124)$$

where the last inequality holds generously (say, by (120) and $\pi \leq 1$). Hence, (123) and (124) imply

$$|e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \pi ab| \leq |e_{\mathbb{R}(t)}(A, B) - \rho ab| + |(\pi - \rho)ab| \leq \delta\sqrt{Nab},$$

establishing (118).

It remains to show that (119) holds. We start by noting that, owing to $\hat{p} > \frac{49}{51}q$, (31) implies that $1/(340) \geq q^{1/2}\mathbb{I}$. After multiplying both sides by $10q$, we get

$$\frac{q}{34} \geq 10 \cdot q^{3/2}\mathbb{I}. \quad (125)$$

We separately consider the cases $\alpha = q$ and $\alpha = \tau p$. If $\alpha = q$, then (32), (125), and (116) imply

$$\frac{\alpha}{17} = \frac{q}{34} + \frac{q}{34} \geq 20 \left(\frac{3(C+4)\log N}{n_2} \right)^{1/4} + 10 \cdot q^{3/2}\mathbb{I} = \delta.$$

If $\alpha = \tau p$, then, using $p > 0.49$, $\tau \geq \tau_0$ (see (28)), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{17} = \frac{\tau p}{17} &\geq \frac{0.49 \cdot 700 \cdot (3(C+4))^{1/4}}{17} \left(\left(\frac{\log N}{n_2} \right)^{1/4} + q^{3/2}\mathbb{I} \right) \\ &\geq 20 \left(\frac{3(C+4)\log N}{n_2} \right)^{1/4} + 10q^{3/2}\mathbb{I} = \delta. \end{aligned}$$

□

6.2. A technical inequality for blue-red graphs. We find it convenient to introduce *relative* counterparts of basic graph quantities. Below $i \in \{1, 2\}$. As before, let $K := K_{n_1, n_2}$ be the complete bipartite graph with partition classes V_1 and V_2 , where $|V_i| = n_i$. The *relative size* of a subset of vertices $S \subseteq V_i$ is

$$s(S) := \frac{|S|}{n_i}.$$

Further, for $X \subseteq V_1$ and $Y \subseteq V_2$ and a subgraph $F \subseteq K$, we define *the relative edge count*

$$\varepsilon_F(X, Y) = \varepsilon_F(Y, X) = \frac{e_F(X, Y)}{n_1 n_2}.$$

Moreover, for $v \in V_i$ and $Y \subseteq V_{3-i}$, we define *the relative degree*

$$d_F(v, Y) = \frac{e_F(\{v\}, Y)}{n_{3-i}}.$$

If $Y = V_{3-i}$, we shorten $d_F(v, Y)$ to $d_F(v)$.

In this notation, a graph F is (π, δ) -jumbled if for every $X \subseteq V_1$, $Y \subseteq V_2$

$$|\varepsilon_F(X, Y) - \pi s(X)s(Y)| \leq \delta\sqrt{s(X)s(Y)}. \quad (126)$$

Note that

$$\varepsilon_{B \cup R}(X, Y) = \varepsilon_F(X, Y) = \varepsilon_R(X, Y) + \varepsilon_B(X, Y).$$

We say that a blue-red graph F is (r, b, δ) -regular, if

$$b - \delta \leq d_B(v) \leq b + \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad r - \delta \leq d_R(v) \leq r + \delta \quad \text{for every } v \in V_1 \cup V_2. \quad (127)$$

If F is at the same time $(r + b, \delta)$ -jumbled and (r, b, δ) -regular, as in the technical lemma below, we will sometimes loosely refer to such a graph as *regularly jumbled*.

Finally, for every $S \subseteq V_i$, $i = 1, 2$, set $\bar{S} := V_i \setminus S$.

Lemma 17. *Let $r, b \in (0, 1)$ be real numbers and define $\alpha := \min\{r, b\}$. Let $\nu < \alpha/16$ and $\delta \leq \alpha/16$ be positive reals and let $F \subseteq K$ be a (r, b, δ) -regular, $(b + r, \delta)$ -jumbled bipartite blue-red graph. If sets $X \subseteq V_i$, $Y \subseteq V_{3-i}$ satisfy*

$$\varepsilon_B(X, \bar{Y}) + \varepsilon_R(\bar{X}, Y) \leq \nu, \quad (128)$$

and

$$\min\{bs(X), rs(Y)\} \leq \frac{rb}{r+b}, \quad (129)$$

then

$$\max\{bs(X), rs(Y)\} \leq \frac{\nu}{1-7\delta/\alpha}. \quad (130)$$

Proof. Since

$$\varepsilon_R(X, Y) = \frac{e_R(X, Y)}{n_1 n_2} = \frac{\sum_{v \in X} e_R(\{v\}, Y)}{n_1 n_2} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{v \in X} d_R(v, Y),$$

from (127) we have

$$\varepsilon_R(X, Y) + \varepsilon_R(X, \bar{Y}) \leq (r + \delta)s(X) \quad (131)$$

and, similarly,

$$\varepsilon_B(X, Y) + \varepsilon_B(\bar{X}, Y) \leq (b + \delta)s(Y). \quad (132)$$

By summing (128), (131) and (132), we infer that

$$\varepsilon_F(X, Y) + \varepsilon_F(X, \bar{Y}) + \varepsilon_F(\bar{X}, Y) \leq \nu + (r + \delta)s(X) + (b + \delta)s(Y). \quad (133)$$

On the other hand, by (127),

$$\varepsilon_F(X, \bar{Y}) = \varepsilon_F(X, V_2) - \varepsilon_F(X, Y) \geq (b + r - 2\delta)s(X) - \varepsilon_F(X, Y)$$

and

$$\varepsilon_F(\bar{X}, Y) = \varepsilon_F(V_1, Y) - \varepsilon_F(X, Y) \geq (b + r - 2\delta)s(Y) - \varepsilon_F(X, Y).$$

Hence, by (126) with $\pi = b + r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_F(X, Y) + \varepsilon_F(X, \bar{Y}) + \varepsilon_F(\bar{X}, Y) &\geq (b + r - 2\delta)(s(X) + s(Y)) - \varepsilon_F(X, Y) \\ &\geq (b + r - 2\delta)(s(X) + s(Y)) - (b + r)s(X)s(Y) - \delta\sqrt{s(X)s(Y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with (133), we obtain the inequality

$$bs(X) + rs(Y) - \frac{(b+r)bs(X)rs(Y)}{br} \leq \nu + \delta \left(3s(X) + 3s(Y) + \sqrt{s(X)s(Y)} \right).$$

Introducing shorthand notation $x := bs(X)$ and $y := rs(Y)$ and $h = rb/(b+r)$, this becomes

$$x + y - \frac{xy}{h} \leq \nu + \delta \left(\frac{3x}{b} + \frac{3y}{r} + \sqrt{\frac{xy}{br}} \right) =: \psi. \quad (134)$$

Trivially, by the definitions of $s(X)$ and α , and by our assumptions on ν and δ , we have

$$\psi \leq \nu + 7\delta < \frac{1}{2}\alpha \leq \frac{1}{1/b + 1/r} = h.$$

Since our goal — inequality (130) — now reads as

$$\max\{x, y\} \leq \frac{\nu}{1-7\delta/\alpha},$$

to complete the proof it is enough to assume that, w.l.o.g., $\max\{x, y\} = y$ and show, equivalently, that

$$y \leq \nu + 7\delta y/\alpha. \quad (135)$$

By (129) we have $x = \min\{x, y\} \leq h$. Note that $x = h$ cannot hold, since then the LHS of (134) would equal h , contradicting the fact that $\psi < h$. Hence, we have $x < h$, which, together with $\psi < h$ and (134), implies that

$$y \leq \frac{\psi - x}{1 - x/h} = h - \frac{h - \psi}{1 - x/h} \leq h - (h - \psi) = \psi = \nu + \delta \left(\frac{3x}{b} + \frac{3y}{r} + \sqrt{\frac{xy}{br}} \right) \leq \nu + 7\delta y/\alpha,$$

and (135) is proved. \square

6.3. Alternating walks and cycles. A cycle in a blue-red bipartite graph is said to be *alternating* if it is a union of a red matching and a blue matching, that is, every other edge is blue and the remaining edges are red. The ultimate goal of this subsection is to show that for every edge in a regularly jumbled blue-red bipartite graph, there is an alternating cycle of bounded length containing that edge. We are going to achieve it by utilizing walks.

Given $x, y \in V_1 \cup V_2$, an *alternating walk from x to y* in a blue-red graph F is a sequence of (not necessarily distinct) vertices $(v_1 = x, \dots, v_s = y)$ such that for each $i = 1, \dots, s-1$, $v_i v_{i+1} \in F$, every other edge is blue and the remaining edges are red. There is no restriction on the color of the initial edge $v_1 v_2$. The *length* of a walk is defined as the number of edges, or $s-1$.

If the vertices v_1, \dots, v_s are all distinct, an alternating walk is called an *alternating path*. Note also that if F is bipartite, $x \in V_1$, $y \in V_2$, and the edge xy is, say, blue, then every alternating path from x to y which begins (and thus ends) with a red edge together with xy forms an alternating cycle containing xy .

The first result of this section asserts that regularly jumbled blue-red bipartite graphs have a short alternating walk between any pair of vertices.

Lemma 18. *Given $r, b \in (0, 1)$ such that $\alpha := \min\{r, b\}$, let $\delta \in (0, \alpha/16]$ and let $F \subseteq K$ be an (r, b, δ) -regular, $(b+r, \delta)$ -jumbled blue-red graph. Let $L = 4\lceil 16/rb \rceil + 1$. For any $x \in V_i$ and $y \in V_{3-i}$ there exist at least two alternating walks from x to y of length at most L , one starting with a blue edge and another starting with a red edge.*

Proof. For $w \in V_1 \cup V_2$ and an integer $k \geq 1$, define R_k^w and B_k^w as the sets of vertices $v \in V(F)$ such that there is an alternating walk from v to w of length $\ell \leq k$, $\ell \equiv k \pmod{2}$, starting with, respectively, a red edge and a blue edge. (Note that these definitions concern walks ending with w .)

Clearly, for every $k \geq 3$, $B_{k-2}^w \subseteq B_k^w$ and $R_{k-2}^w \subseteq R_k^w$. Observe also that for any $k \geq 2$, by definition the sets R_{k-1}^w and B_k^w are contained in opposite sides of the bipartition (V_1, V_2) and, moreover,

$$\varepsilon_B(\overline{B_k^w}, R_{k-1}^w) = 0. \quad (136)$$

By symmetry, B_{k-1}^w and R_k^w are contained in opposite sides of (V_1, V_2) and

$$\varepsilon_R(\overline{R_k^w}, B_{k-1}^w) = 0. \quad (137)$$

Set $\nu = rb/16$ and note that, since $rb < \alpha$, we have $\nu < \alpha/16$. There exists an integer $t \leq T := \lceil 1/\nu \rceil = \lceil 16/rb \rceil$ such that

$$s(R_{2t+1}^w \setminus R_{2t-1}^w) \leq \nu, \quad (138)$$

since otherwise $1 \geq s(R_{2T+1}^w) \geq \sum_{i=1}^T s(R_{2i+1}^w \setminus R_{2i-1}^w) > \nu T \geq 1$, which is a contradiction.

By (136) and (138),

$$\varepsilon_B(R_{2t+1}^w, \overline{B_{2t}^w}) = \varepsilon_B(R_{2t-1}^w, \overline{B_{2t}^w}) + \varepsilon_B(R_{2t+1}^w \setminus R_{2t-1}^w, \overline{B_{2t}^w}) \leq s(R_{2t+1}^w \setminus R_{2t-1}^w) \leq \nu. \quad (139)$$

Combining (137) for $k = 2t+1$ and (139), we get

$$\varepsilon_B(R_{2t+1}^w, \overline{B_{2t}^w}) + \varepsilon_R(\overline{R_{2t+1}^w}, B_{2t}^w) \leq \nu. \quad (140)$$

Set $X = R_{2t+1}^w, Y = B_{2t}^w$, for convenience. We claim that

$$s(X) > r/(r+b) \quad \text{and} \quad s(Y) > b/(r+b). \quad (141)$$

Assuming the contrary, we have

$$\min\{bs(X), rs(Y)\} \leq br/(r+b)$$

which, together with (140), constitute the assumptions of Lemma 17. Applying this lemma, we get (130), that is,

$$\max\{bs(X), rs(Y)\} \leq \frac{\nu}{1-7\delta/\alpha} = \frac{rb}{16(1-7\delta/\alpha)} \leq \frac{rb}{16(1-7/16)} = \frac{rb}{9}, \quad (142)$$

where the second inequality follows by our assumption $\delta \leq \alpha/16$.

On the other hand, since X contains the set $R_1^w = \Gamma_R(w)$ of red neighbors of w , by (r, b, δ) -regularity of F we have $s(X) \geq r - \delta \geq \frac{15}{16}r$, a contradiction with (142). Hence, we have shown (141). Since $X = R_{2i+1}^w \subseteq R_{2T+1}^w$ and $Y = B_{2i}^w \subseteq B_{2T}^w$, we also have

$$s(R_{2T+1}^w) > \frac{r}{r+b}, \quad s(B_{2T}^w) > \frac{b}{r+b}. \quad (143)$$

Since we chose w arbitrarily, (143) holds for $w \in \{x, y\}$, implying

$$s(R_{2T+1}^y) > \frac{r}{r+b}, \quad s(B_{2T}^x) > \frac{b}{r+b}. \quad (144)$$

Let us assume, w.l.o.g., that $x \in V_1$ and $y \in V_2$. Then, $B_{2T}^x, R_{2T+1}^y \subseteq V_1$ and, in particular, for every vertex $v \in B_{2T}^x$ there is a walk (of even length at most $2T$) from v to x starting with a blue and thus ending with a red edge. By (144), $s(B_{2T}^x) + s(R_{2T+1}^y) > 1$, so there exists $v \in B_{2T}^x \cap R_{2T+1}^y$. This means that there is an alternating walk of length at most $2T + (2T + 1) = 4\lceil 16/rb \rceil + 1 = L$ from x to y (through v) that starts with a red edge.

By an analogous reasoning with the roles of the colors red and blue swapped, $R_{2T}^x \cap B_{2T+1}^y \neq \emptyset$, and thus there is an alternating walk of length at most $2T + (2T + 1) = L$ from x to y which starts with a blue edge. \square

The following result is an easy consequence of Lemma 18.

Lemma 19. *Let $r, b \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha := \min\{r, b\}$, and $\delta \in (0, \alpha/16]$. If $F \subseteq K$ is a (r, b, δ) -regular $(r+b, \delta)$ -jumbled blue-red bipartite graph, then every edge of F belongs to an alternating cycle of length at most $2D$, where $D = 2\lceil 16/rb \rceil + 1$.*

Proof. Let xy be an edge with $x \in V_1, y \in V_2$. Without loss of generality we assume that xy is blue. Then, by Lemma 18, there exists at least one alternating walk from x to y of length at most $4\lceil 16/rb \rceil + 1 = 2D - 1$ starting with a red edge. Consider a shortest such walk W . We claim W is a path. Indeed, assume that W is not a path and let w be the first repeated vertex on W . If we remove the whole segment of the walk between the first two occurrences of w , what remains is still an alternating walk from x to y starting with a red edge (since this segment has an even number of edges), contradicting the minimality of W . The path W is not just a single edge xy (since xy is blue) and therefore W and xy form an alternating cycle of length at most $2D$. \square

6.4. Proof of Lemma 10. Let $\alpha = \min\{\tau p, q\}$. We claim that it is enough to fix an admissible graph G with $t \leq t_0$ edges which satisfies that

$$\forall v \in V_i \quad |\deg_{\mathbb{R} \setminus G}(v) - \tau d_i| \leq \delta_i \tau d_i, \quad \text{with } \delta_i = 3\sqrt{(C+1) \log N / (\tau d_i)} \quad (145)$$

and, if $p > 0.49$, also that

$$K \setminus G \quad \text{is } (\tau p + q, \alpha/17)\text{-jumbled}, \quad (146)$$

and prove that for every distinct edges $e, f \in K \setminus G$

$$\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathbb{R}, f \notin \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G) \geq e^{-\lambda(t)} = \begin{cases} N^{-6}, & p \leq 0.49, \\ N^{-64/\tau p q - 6}, & p > 0.49. \end{cases} \quad (147)$$

Indeed, applying Lemma 12 with $\lambda = (C+1) \log N$ (note that the condition $\lambda \leq \tau_0 p \hat{n}$ follows generously from (158)) we have that with probability $1 - O(N^{-C})$ condition (145) is satisfied by $G = \mathbb{R}(t)$ for every $t \leq t_0$, and, whenever $p > 0.49$, by Lemma 16, condition (146) is satisfied by $G = \mathbb{R}(t)$ for every $t \leq t_0$.

Proceeding with the proof of (147), fix distinct edges $e, f \in K \setminus G$. Let $D = 3$ if $p \leq 0.49$ and $D = 32/\tau p q + 3$, if $p > 0.49$. Aiming to apply Proposition 4, we need to verify the assumption on the existence of alternating cycles containing a given edge.

Given a graph G' and $H \in \mathcal{R}_{G'}$, recall our convention to call the edges of $H \setminus G'$ blue and the edges of $K \setminus H$ red.

Claim 20. *Let $G' \in \{G, G \cup \{e\}\}$. For every $H \in \mathcal{R}_{G'}$, every edge $g \in K \setminus G'$ is contained in an alternating cycle of length at most $2D$.*

From Claim 20 we complete the proof of (147) as follows. Since G is admissible, we have $\mathcal{R}_G \neq \emptyset$. Therefore Proposition 4 implies

$$\mathcal{R}_{G,e} \neq \emptyset, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,\neg e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|} \leq N^D - 1. \quad (148)$$

Since (148) implies $\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}} = \mathcal{R}_{G,e} \neq \emptyset$, Proposition 4 applied to graph $G \cup \{e\}$ and edge f implies

$$\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}, \neg f} \neq \emptyset, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}, f}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}, \neg f}|} \leq N^D - 1. \quad (149)$$

Using (148) and (149), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(e \in \mathbb{R}, f \notin \mathbb{R} \mid \mathbb{R}(t) = G)} &= \frac{|\mathcal{R}_G|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e,\neg f}|} = \frac{|\mathcal{R}_G|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|} \cdot \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e,\neg f}|} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,\neg e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e,f}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e,\neg f}|}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G,\neg e}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G,e}|}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}, f}|}{|\mathcal{R}_{G \cup \{e\}, \neg f}|}\right) \leq N^{2D}, \quad (151)$$

which implies (147).

It remains to prove Claim 20. As a preparation we derive the following bounds on the vertex degrees in G and $G \cup \{e\}$. From (145) we infer

$$\forall v_i \in V_i \quad \tau d_i(1 - \delta) \leq d_i - \deg_G(v_i) \leq \tau d_i(1 + \delta), \quad i \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (152)$$

where

$$\delta = \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} = 3\sqrt{(C+1)\log N/(\tau p \hat{n})}.$$

Note that the inequality (158) implies

$$\delta \leq 0.001, \quad (153)$$

and

$$\delta \tau d_i \geq 3\sqrt{C \tau p \hat{n} \log N} \geq 3C \log N \geq 1. \quad (154)$$

The latter, together with (152), implies that, for an arbitrary $e \in K \setminus G$,

$$\forall v_i \in V_i \quad \tau d_i(1 - 2\delta) \leq d_i - \deg_{G \cup \{e\}}(v_i) \leq \tau d_i(1 + \delta), \quad i \in \{1, 2\} \quad (155)$$

We consider two cases with respect to p .

Case $p \leq 0.49$. We first claim that for any two vertices $x_i \in V_i, i = 1, 2$, there is an alternating path $x_1 y_2 y_1 x_2$ such that $x_1 y_2$ is red (and thus $y_1 y_2$ is blue and $y_1 x_2$ is red). We can choose a blue edge $y_1 y_2$ in

$$M - |G'| \geq M - t - 1 = \tau p N - 1$$

ways. We bound the bad choices of $y_1 y_2$ which do not give a desired alternating path. These correspond to the walks (we must permit $y_1 = x_1$ and $y_2 = x_2$) $x_1 y_2 y_1$ and $x_2 y_1 y_2$ whose first edge is non-red, i.e., it belongs to H , while the second one is blue, i.e., it belongs to $H \setminus G'$. By second inequalities in (152) and in (155), there are at most $d_1 \cdot \tau(1 + \delta)d_2$ choices of such $x_1 y_2 y_1$ and at most $d_2 \cdot \tau(1 + \delta)d_1$ choices of such $x_2 y_1 y_2$, so altogether there are at most $2p^2 \tau(1 + \delta)N$ bad choices of $y_1 y_2$. Thus, noting that $1/\tau p N \leq \delta \leq 0.001$ (cf. (154) and (153)), the number of good choices of $y_1 y_2$ is

$$\tau p N - 1 - 2p^2 \tau(1 + \delta)N \geq \tau p N(1 - 2p - 3\delta) > 0,$$

implying that there exists a desired path $x_1 y_2 y_1 x_2$.

This immediately implies that if $g = x_1 x_2$ is blue then g is contained in an alternating 4-cycle. If $g = u_1 u_2$ is red, then we choose blue neighbors $x_1 \in \Gamma_{H \setminus G'}(u_2)$ and $x_2 \in \Gamma_{H \setminus G'}(u_1)$ (which exist due to the lower bounds in (152) and (155) being positive). Since there exists an alternating path $x_1 y_2 y_1 x_2$ starting with a red edge, we obtain an alternating 6-cycle containing g . This proves Claim 20 in the case $p \leq 0.49$.

Case $p > 0.49$. We aim to apply Lemma 19. We first verify that, for $G' \in \{G, G \cup \{e\}\}$ and every $H \in \mathcal{R}_{G'}$, blue-red graph $K \setminus G'$ is $(q, \tau p, \alpha/16)$ -regular. This assumption is trivial for the red graph $K \setminus H$, which is q -biregular regardless of G' . In view of (152) and (155),

the relative degrees $d_{H \setminus G'}(v)$ in the blue graph fall into the interval $(\tau p - 2\delta\tau p, \tau p + 2\delta\tau p)$. Since (32) implies

$$\delta\tau p = 3\sqrt{\frac{(C+1)\tau p \log N}{\hat{n}}} \leq 3\sqrt{\frac{(C+1)\log N}{\hat{n}}} \leq \sqrt{3} \left(\frac{q}{680}\right)^2 \leq \frac{q}{32}$$

and (153) implies $\delta\tau p \leq \tau p/32$, we obtain $2\delta\tau p \leq \alpha/16$. Hence, indeed, $K \setminus G'$ is $(q, \tau p, \alpha/16)$ -regular.

Now we check that $K \setminus G'$ is $(q + \tau p, \alpha/16)$ -jumbled. For $G' = G$ this follows from (146). For $G' = G \cup \{e\}$ we first note that (158) and (32) imply $\alpha\sqrt{N} = \Omega((\log N/\hat{n})^{1/4}\sqrt{N}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\hat{n} \rightarrow \infty$; therefore, for all $A \subseteq V_1$ and $B \subseteq V_2$,

$$|e_{K \setminus (G \cup \{e\})}(A, B) - (q + \tau p)|A||B|| \leq |e_{K \setminus G}(A, B) - (q + \tau p)|A||B|| + 1$$

$$\boxed{(146)} \leq \frac{\alpha}{17} \sqrt{N|A||B|} + 1$$

$$\boxed{\hat{n} \text{ large enough}} \leq \frac{\alpha}{16} \sqrt{N|A||B|}.$$

(We silently assumed that $|A|, |B| > 0$, since otherwise the inequality is trivial.)

By Lemma 19 with $F = K \setminus G'$, $r = q$ and $b = \tau p$, the edge g belongs to an alternating cycle of length at most $2D$ with $D = 2\lceil 16/\tau p q \rceil + 1 \leq 32/\tau p q + 3$. Claim 20 is proven. \square

7. TECHNICAL FACTS

Here we collect a few technical or very plausible facts with their easy proofs. Most of them have been already utilized in the paper. An exception is Proposition 23 to be used only in Remark 25, Section 9.

We begin with simple observations on existence of biregular graphs.

Proposition 21. *Recall that $n_1 = |V_1|$ and $n_2 = |V_2|$.*

- (i) *If $d_2 \geq 2$, $p \leq 1/2$ and $0 \leq k \leq d_1$, then for any pair of vertices $u_1, u_2 \in V_1$, there exists a graph in $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ in which u_1 and u_2 have k common neighbors.*
- (ii) *For all n_1, n_2, p such that $d_1 = pn_2$ and $d_2 = pn_1$ are integers, $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. (i) Writing $V_1 = \{u_1, \dots, u_{n_1}\}$, we will define a sequence of bipartite graphs $G_i, i = 2, \dots, n_1$, such that $G_{n_1} \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ and u_1, u_2 have k common neighbors in G_{n_1} . Let G_2 be any graph in which vertices u_1 and u_2 have each degree d_1 and share precisely k neighbors, while u_3, \dots, u_{n_1} have no neighbors, so that vertex degrees in V_2 belong to the set $\{0, 1, 2\}$. For $i \geq 3$, graph G_i is obtained from G_{i-1} by connecting vertex u_i to d_1 vertices with smallest degrees (say by ordering V_2 so that degrees do not decrease and connecting u_i to the d_1 first of them).

Let i' be the first index $i \geq 2$ for which the graph G_i has fewer than d_1 vertices of degree 0 in V_2 . The number of vertices in V_2 of degree 0 or 1 in $G_{i'}$ is still the same as in G_2 , that is, $n_2 - k \geq n_2 - d_1 \geq d_1$. Then $G_{i'+1}$ is obtained from $G_{i'}$ by connecting vertex $u_{i'+1}$ to all vertices of degree 0 and some vertices of degree 1. Hence, vertex degrees in V_2 in $G_{i'+1}$ lie in $\{1, 2\}$. It is clear that for $i \geq i' + 1$ the degrees in V_2 will continue to belong to some set $\{x_i, x_i + 1\}$ (if they are all equal we agree they equal x_i). In particular, the average degree of G_i over V_2 lies in the interval $[x_i, x_i + 1)$. Since in the final graph G_{n_1} the average degree over V_2 is $\frac{n_1 d_1}{n_2} = n_1 p = d_2$, an integer, it means that all vertices in V_2 have the same degree $x_1 = d_2$, implying that G_{n_1} is p -biregular.

(ii) First, assume that $p \leq 1/2$. Case $d_2 = 0$ is trivial and in the case $d_2 = 1$ the set $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ is any union of vertex-disjoint stars K_{1, d_1} with centers in V_1 and leaves in V_2 . The remaining case $d_2 \geq 2$ follows from the claim (i).

If $p > 1/2$, by the previous argument there exists $G \in \mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, 1-p)$ and then $K_{n_1, n_2} \setminus G$ belongs to $\mathcal{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$. \square

We continue with convenient consequences of the assumptions of Lemma 6.

Proposition 22. *For $t \leq t_0$, the conditions of Lemma 6, namely (30), (31), and (32), imply that*

$$\tau q \geq \tau_0 q \geq 700 \cdot 680 \sqrt{\frac{3(C+4)\log N}{\hat{n}}}, \quad \text{whenever } p > 0.49, \quad (156)$$

$$\gamma_t \leq \gamma_{t_0} \leq 1, \quad (157)$$

and

$$\tau \hat{p} \hat{n} \geq \tau_0 \hat{p} \hat{n} \geq 3000^2 (C+4) \log N. \quad (158)$$

Proof. Since $\tau = \tau(t) \geq \tau(t_0) \geq \tau_0$ and γ_t is increasing in t , the first inequalities in (156)–(158) are immediate and it is enough to prove the second inequalities.

Inequality (156) follows from the definition (28) of τ_0 and (32).

To show (157), for $p \leq 0.49$, using the definition of τ_0 (see (28)) and (31), we get

$$\gamma_{t_0} \leq \frac{1080}{340^4} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} < 0.01 + 0.82 < 1,$$

while for $p > 0.49$

$$\gamma_{t_0} \leq 0.01 + \frac{25000}{680 \cdot 700} < 1.$$

To see (158) first note that for $p \leq 0.49$ it is straightforward from the definition of τ_0 in (28). For $p > 0.49$, observing that (30) implies $\sqrt{\frac{3(C+4)\log N}{\hat{n}}} \leq \sqrt{\hat{p}/3240} \leq 1/3240$, we argue that

$$\tau_0 \hat{p} \geq \frac{49}{51} \tau_0 q \stackrel{(156)}{\geq} \frac{49}{51} \cdot 700 \cdot 680 \sqrt{\frac{3(C+4)\log N}{\hat{n}}} \geq 3000^2 \frac{(C+4)\log N}{\hat{n}},$$

whence (158) follows. \square

Next, we give a proof of Claim 7 which was instrumental in deducing Theorem 2 from Lemma 6 in Section 3.2.

Proof of Claim 7. Writing $\alpha := 1080\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I}$ and

$$\beta := \begin{cases} 3240 \sqrt{\frac{2(C+3)\log N}{p\hat{n}}}, & p \leq 0.49, \\ 25000 \sqrt{\frac{(C+3)\log N}{q^2\hat{n}}}, & p > 0.49, \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\gamma_t = \alpha + \begin{cases} \beta\tau^{-1/2}, & p \leq 0.49, \\ \beta\tau^{-1}, & p > 0.49. \end{cases}$$

Since, trivially, $\sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \alpha = \alpha t_0 \leq \alpha M = 1080\hat{p}^2\mathbb{I} \cdot M$, in order to prove (41), it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \tau^{-1/2} \leq 2M, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \tau^{-1} \leq M \log \frac{2}{\tau_0}. \quad (159)$$

Since $\tau = \tau(t) = 1 - t/M$ is positive and decreasing on $[0, M)$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \tau^{-1/2} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{M-1} \tau^{-1/2} \leq \int_0^M \tau^{-1/2} dt = M \int_0^1 \tau^{-1/2} d\tau \leq M \int_0^1 \tau^{-1/2} d\tau = 2M,$$

implying the first inequality in (159). On the other hand

$$\sum_{t=1}^{t_0} \tau^{-1} \leq \int_0^{t_0+1} \tau^{-1} dt \leq M \int_{\tau_0-1/M}^1 \tau^{-1} d\tau = M \log \frac{1}{\tau_0 - 1/M}.$$

Since (158) implies $\tau_0 - 1/M \geq \tau_0/2$, we obtain the second inequality in (159).

For (42), note that (30) implies $C \log N / (\hat{p}\hat{n}) \leq 1$ and thus

$$\theta \geq \sqrt{\frac{C \log N}{\hat{p}\hat{n}}} \geq \frac{C \log N}{\hat{p}\hat{n}} \geq \frac{C \log N}{pN} = \frac{C \log N}{M}.$$

To prove (43), consider first the case $p \leq 0.49$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= C^* \left(p^2 \mathbb{I} + \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{p\hat{n}}} \right) \\ &\geq 7 \cdot 1080 p^2 \mathbb{I} + 7 \cdot 6480 \sqrt{\frac{(C+3) \log N}{p\hat{n}}} + 3240 \sqrt{\frac{3(C+4) \log N}{p\hat{n}}} + 2 \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{p\hat{n}}} \\ &\geq 7\theta + \sqrt{\tau_0} + 2\sqrt{1/M} \stackrel{(33)}{\geq} 7\theta + \tau_0 + 2/M. \end{aligned}$$

In the case $p > 0.49$ first note that $q^{3/2} \geq q^2 \geq \hat{p}^2$. Next, since

$$\tau_0 \geq 2 \left(\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}} \right)^{1/4},$$

we have $\log \frac{2}{\tau_0} \leq \frac{1}{4} \log \frac{\hat{n}}{\log N}$. Therefore

$$\gamma/3 \geq 7 \cdot 1080 q^{3/2} \mathbb{I} + 7 \cdot 25\,000 \sqrt{\frac{(C+3) \log N}{q^2 \hat{n}}} \log \frac{\hat{n}}{\log N} \geq 7\theta.$$

On the other hand, with a huge room to spare,

$$\gamma/3 \geq 700 (3(C+4))^{1/4} \left(q^{3/2} \mathbb{I} + \left(\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}} \right)^{1/4} \right) = \tau_0,$$

and finally, because $p > 0.49$,

$$\gamma/3 \geq 10^9 (\log N / \hat{n})^{1/4} \geq \frac{2}{p\hat{n}} \geq 2/M,$$

which, with the previous two inequalities, implies (43). \square

The last two facts deal with random binomial graphs. The first of them completes the proofs of Theorem 2 and Corollary 3.

We conclude this technical section with a lower bound on the maximum degree in a binomial random graph.

Proposition 23. *If $p' \leq 1/4$ and $n_2 \leq n_1$, then a.a.s. the maximum degree of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ in V_1 is at least $\kappa := \min\{[p'n_2 + \sqrt{p'(1-p')n_2 \log n_1}], n_2\}$.*

Proof. Writing $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(n_2 p', n_2 p'(1-p'))$, by Slud's inequality [12, Theorem 2.1] we have

$$r := \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(n_2, p') \geq \kappa) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z \geq \kappa) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(Z \geq \sqrt{p'(1-p')n_2 \log n_1}\right),$$

hence by a standard approximation of the normal tail we obtain

$$r \geq \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{2\pi \log n_1}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \log n_1} = e^{-(1/2 + o(1)) \log n_1}.$$

Therefore, the probability that all vertices in V_1 have degree smaller than κ is

$$(1-r)^{n_1} \leq e^{-n_1 r} \leq \exp\left(-n_1 e^{-(1/2 + o(1)) \log n_1}\right) \rightarrow 0,$$

proving the proposition. \square

8. APPLICATION: PERFECT MATCHINGS BETWEEN SUBSETS OF VERTICES

Perarnau and Petridis in [11], in connection with a problem of Plünnecke, studied existence of perfect matchings between fixed subsets of vertices in random biregular graphs. In particular, they proved the following result (which we state in our notation to make it easier to apply Theorem 2).

Theorem 24 (Theorem 2 in [11]). *Let $k > 0$ be a constant, and assume $n_2 = kn_1$ and $pn_2 \leq n_1$. Take subsets $A \subseteq V_1$ and $B \subseteq V_2$ of size pn_2 and let $\mathcal{M}_{A,B}$ denote the event that the subgraph of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ induced by A and B contains a perfect matching. As $\hat{n} \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_{A,B}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{if } p^2 n_2 - \log pn_2 \rightarrow -\infty \text{ or } pn_2 \text{ is constant,}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_{A,B}) \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{if } p^2 n_2 - \log p n_2 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (160)$$

The authors of [11] speculated that if the bipartite version of the Sandwich Conjecture was true, then Theorem 24 would follow straightforwardly from the classical result of Erdős and Rényi on perfect matchings in the random bipartite graph (see [6, Theorem 4.1]). That result, in particular, implies that the bipartite binomial random graph $\mathbb{G}(n', n', p')$ contains a perfect matching a.a.s. whenever $p'n' - \log n' \rightarrow \infty$ as $n' \rightarrow \infty$. We show how this, together with Theorem 2, implies the 1-statement in (160), provided that condition (4) of Theorem 2 is satisfied, which in particular implies

$$q \geq \left(\frac{\log N}{\hat{n}} \right)^{1/4}. \quad (161)$$

By Theorem 2, the random graph $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ a.a.s. contains a random graph $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ with

$$p' = (1 - 2\gamma)p,$$

where γ is defined in (5). In particular, the subgraph of $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ induced by A and B contains a random graph $\mathbb{G}(pn_2, pn_2, p')$. To see that the latter random graph contains a perfect matching a.a.s., let us verify the Erdős–Rényi condition

$$p'pn_2 - \log p n_2 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (162)$$

From the assumption in (160) it follows that

$$p \geq n_2^{-1/2} = \Theta(\hat{n}^{-1/2}). \quad (163)$$

For our purposes it is sufficient to check that

$$\gamma \ll (\log N)^{-1}, \quad (164)$$

since then

$$\gamma \log p n_2 \leq \gamma \log N \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and } \gamma \rightarrow 0,$$

which together with the condition in (160) imply

$$p'pn_2 - \log p n_2 = (1 - 2\gamma)(p^2 n_2 - \log p n_2) - 2\gamma \log p n_2 \rightarrow \infty.$$

To see that (164) holds, first note that $\mathbb{I} = 1$ implies $p = O((\log N)^{-1})$ for $p \leq 0.49$ and $q = O((\log N)^{-1})$ for $p > 0.49$; hence, regardless of p , the first term in the definition of γ is $o((\log N)^{-1})$. The remaining terms are much smaller: for $p \leq 0.49$ inequality (163) implies that the second term in the definition of γ is $O((\log N)^{1/2} \hat{n}^{-1/4}) \ll (\log N)^{-1}$, while in the case $p > 0.49$ assumption (161) implies that the last two terms in the definition of γ are at most $(\log N)^{O(1)} \hat{n}^{-1/4} \ll (\log N)^{-1}$.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Remark 25. Assume $p \leq 1/4$. If a.a.s. $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p') \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$, then we must have

$$p' = p \left(1 - \Omega \left(\min \left\{ \sqrt{\log N / (p\hat{n})}, 1 \right\} \right) \right). \quad (165)$$

To see this, assume, without loss of generality, that $n_2 \leq n_1$, and note that by Proposition 23 we must have $p'n_2 + \sqrt{p'(1-p')n_2 \log n_1} \leq pn_2$, and therefore $p/p' \geq 1 + \sqrt{\frac{(1-p') \log n_1}{p'n_2}}$. Since $p' \leq p \leq 1/4$ and $n_2 \leq n_1$, we have $p/p' = 1 + \Omega \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{p\hat{n}}} \right)$, whence (165) follows.

Remark 26. In view of Remark 25, the error γ in Theorem 2 has optimal order of magnitude, whenever $p \leq 1/4$, provided that also $p^2 \mathbb{I} = O \left(\sqrt{\log N / p\hat{n}} \right)$ (that is, if either $p = O \left(((\log N) / \hat{n})^{1/5} \right)$ or $\mathbb{I} = 0$).

From Remark 25 it also follows that we cannot have $\gamma = o(1)$ for $\log N = \Omega(p\hat{n})$. Theorem 2 does not apply to the case $\log N \geq p\hat{n}/(C^*)^2$, but we think it would be interesting to find the largest p' for which one can a.a.s. embed $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ into $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ even in this case. The tightest embedding one can expect is the one permitted by the maximum degree. We conjecture that such an embedding is possible.

Conjecture 1. *Suppose that a sequence of parameters (n_1, n_2, p, p') is such that a.a.s. in $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ the maximum degree over V_1 is at most $d_1 = n_2 p$ and the maximum degree over V_2 is at most $d_2 = n_1 p$. There is a joint distribution of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ and $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p') \subseteq \mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p) \quad \text{a.a.s.}$$

Note that if Conjecture 1 is true, then by taking complements we also have the tightest embedding $\mathbb{R}(n_1, n_2, p) \subseteq \mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ that the minimum degrees of $\mathbb{G}(n_1, n_2, p')$ permit.

Remark 27. For constant p , in order to obtain $\gamma = o(1)$ in Theorem 2, we need to assume $\mathbb{I} = 0$, which requires a rather restricted ratio n_1/n_2 . For example one cannot afford $n_1 = n_2^{1+\delta}$ for any constant $\delta > 0$. This restriction comes from an enumeration result we use in the proof, namely Theorem 5 (see condition (iii) therein). Should enumeration be proven with a relaxed condition, it would automatically improve our Theorem 2.

Remark 28. The terms $p^2\mathbb{I}$ and $q^{3/2}\mathbb{I}$ in (5) are artefacts of the application of switchings in Lemma 11. In the sparse case ($\hat{p} \rightarrow 0$) it is plausible that the condition $\mathbb{I} = 0$ can be made much milder by using a very recent enumeration result of Liebenau and Wormald [9] instead of Theorem 5. Due to the schedule of this manuscript, we did not check what this would imply, but the readers seeking smaller errors in (5) are encouraged to do so.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bollobás. Random Graphs, 2nd ed., CUP, 2001.
- [2] E. R. Canfield, C. Greenhill, and B. D. McKay. Asymptotic enumeration of dense 0-1 matrices with specified line sums. *J. Comb. Th. A*, 115:32–66, 2008.
- [3] A. Dudek, A. Frieze, A. Ruciński, and M. Šileikis. Loose hamilton cycles in regular hypergraphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 24(1):179–194, 2015.
- [4] A. Dudek, A. Frieze, A. Ruciński, and M. Šileikis. Embedding the Erdős-Rényi Hypergraph into the Random Regular Hypergraph and Hamiltonicity. *J. Combin. Theory B*, 122:719–740, 2017.
- [5] P. Gao, M. Isaev, B. McKay. Sandwiching random regular graphs between binomial random graphs. *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 690–701, 2020.
- [6] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random graphs*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000.
- [7] J. H. Kim and V. H. Vu. Sandwiching random graphs: universality between random graph models. *Adv. Math.*, 188(2):444–469, 2004.
- [8] M. Krivelevich, B. Sudakov, V. H. Vu, N. Wormald. Random regular graphs of high degree. *Random Struct. Alg.*, 18:346–363, 2001.
- [9] A. Liebenau, N. Wormald. Asymptotic enumeration of digraphs and bipartite graphs by degree sequence. [arXiv:2006.15797](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.15797).
- [10] B. D. McKay. Asymptotics for symmetric 0-1 matrices with prescribed row sums. *Ars Combin.*, 19(A):15–25, 1985.
- [11] G. Perarnau and G. Petridis. Matchings in Random Biregular Bipartite Graphs *Electron. J. Combin.*, 20(1) #P60 1, 2013.
- [12] E. V. Slud. Distribution inequalities for the binomial law *Ann. Prob.*, 5(3):404–412, 1977.
- [13] A. Thomason. Dense expanders and pseudo-random bipartite graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 75:381–386, 1989.

TEREZA KLIMOŠOVÁ, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, CHARLES UNIVERSITY, PRAGUE, CZECH REPUBLIC.

Email address: tereza@kam.mff.cuni.cz

CHRISTIAN REIHER, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG, HAMBURG, GERMANY.

Email address: Christian.Reiher@uni-hamburg.de

ANDRZEJ RUCIŃSKI, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY, POZNAŃ, POLAND.

Email address: rucinski@amu.edu.pl

MATAS ŠILEIKIS, THE CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, INSTITUTE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, PRAGUE, CZECH REPUBLIC.

Email address: matas.sileikis@gmail.com