

Strong Consistency Guarantees for Clustering High-Dimensional Bipartite Graphs with the Spectral Method

Guillaume Braun*
guillaume.braun@riken.jp

August 28, 2023

Abstract

In this work, we focus on the Bipartite Stochastic Block Model (BiSBM), a popular model for bipartite graphs with a community structure. We consider the high dimensional setting where the number n_1 of type I nodes is far smaller than the number n_2 of type II nodes. The recent work of Braun and Tyagi (2022) established a sufficient and necessary condition on the sparsity level p_{max} of the bipartite graph to be able to recover the latent partition of type I nodes. They proposed an iterative method that extends the one proposed by Ndaoud et al. (2022) to achieve this goal. Their method requires a good enough initialization, usually obtained by a spectral method, but empirical results showed that the refinement algorithm doesn't improve much the performance of the spectral method. This suggests that the spectral achieves exact recovery in the same regime as the refinement method. We show that it is indeed the case by providing new entrywise bounds on the eigenvectors of the similarity matrix used by the spectral method. Our analysis extend the framework of Lei (2019) that only applies to symmetric matrices with limited dependencies. As an important technical step, we also derive an improved concentration inequality for similarity matrices.

1 Introduction

Bipartite graphs are a convenient way to represent the relationships between objects of two different types. One can find examples of applications in many fields such as e-commerce with customers and products Huang et al. (2007), finance with investors and assets Squartini et al. (2017), and biology with plants of pollinators networks Young et al. (2021). These networks are often large, and sparse. Moreover, the number of type I and type II nodes can be quite different.

To extract relevant information from these networks one often relies on clustering methods. Amongst them, spectral clustering (SC) is one of the most popular approaches due to its efficiency in terms of computational complexity and statistical accuracy. However, the existing consistency guarantees for SC are often weak or require a sub-optimal sparsity level, and do not fully explain the performance of SC, as observed experimentally in Braun and Tyagi (2022) and Ndaoud et al. (2022).

In this work, we fill this gap by showing that the SC achieves exact recovery under the BiSBM, an asymmetric extension of the Stochastic Block Model (SBM) commonly used to evaluate the performance of the clustering algorithm for bipartite graphs. Besides, we show that SC is optimal in the sense that it achieves exact recovery whenever $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log n_1$, the optimal sparsity regime. We leave as future work the characterization of the precise constant necessary for exact recovery.

1.1 Main contributions

Our main contributions are summarized below.

- We show that the spectral method achieves exact recovery of the rows partition whenever $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log n_1$ and is hence optimal. To do that, we extend to similarity matrices the entrywise concentration bounds for eigenvectors obtained by Lei (2019) for matrices with independent entries, or limited dependencies.

*RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project

- Our analysis applies to rank deficient connectivity matrix. It allows for the partial removal of the “spectral gap condition” – a common condition in the analysis of spectral methods that requires that the matrices of interest satisfy some rank condition to ensure that there is a spectral gap – as in the recent work of Löffler et al. (2021); Zhang and Zhou (2022).
- Central to our proof is an improved concentration bound for similarity matrices. We derive this result by adapting the combinatorial argument of Feige and Ofek (2005) used to show the concentration of adjacency matrices sampled from the generalized Erdős-Renyi model.

1.2 Related work

Bipartite graphs and spectral clustering. The recent work of Braun and Tyagi (2022) confirmed the conjecture of Ndaoud et al. (2022) that $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log n_1$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for exact recovery of the rows partition under the high-dimensional BiSBM where $n_1 \ll n_2$. This threshold can be achieved by generalized power methods proposed in the aforementioned articles. However, existing strong consistency guarantees for SC requires stronger assumption. For example, when specialized to the setting of Ndaoud et al. (2022) (a special case of our more general model), the result of Cai et al. (2021) holds only when the sparsity level satisfies $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log^2 n_2$. When $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log n_1$, SC is only guaranteed to achieve weak consistency Braun and Tyagi (2022). The work of Florescu and Perkins (2016) also showed that when $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim 1$, one can recover a proportion of the type I nodes labels by a SBM reduction, but this is the weakest existing recovery guarantee and we are focusing on exact recovery. The recent work of Zhang and Zhou (2022) also proposed an improved analysis of the spectral method for asymmetric matrices with independent entries, but their bound becomes trivial in the high-dimensional regime $n_1 \ll n_2$ we are interested in.

Entrywise concentration bounds for eigenvectors. In recent years, spectral algorithms have been shown to successfully achieve exact recovery in various community detection tasks under various settings such as, e.g., the SBM Abbe et al. (2020b), the Contextual SBM Abbe et al. (2020a), the Censored Block Model Dhara et al. (2022a), Hierarchical SBM Lei et al. (2020) and uniform Hypergraph SBM Gaudio and Joshi (2022). Spectral methods have also been used in other estimation problems such as group synchronization d’Aspremont et al. (2021), ranking Chen et al. (2019), or planted subgraph detection Dhara et al. (2022b). To prove these results, one generally needs to obtain entrywise eigenvector concentration bounds. In this work, we will follow the framework developed by Lei (2019) that combines techniques used to obtain deterministic perturbation bounds Fan et al. (2016); Cape et al. (2019b); Damle and Sun (2020) with techniques that rely on some stochastic properties of the noise Abbe et al. (2020b); Cape et al. (2019a); Eldridge et al. (2018).

1.3 Notations

We use lowercase letters (ϵ, a, b, \dots) to denote scalars and vectors, except for universal constants that will be denoted by c_1, c_2, \dots for lower bounds, and C_1, C_2, \dots for upper bounds and some random variables. We will sometimes use the notation $a_n \lesssim b_n$ (or $a_n \gtrsim b_n$) for sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $a_n \leq C b_n$ (resp. $a_n \geq C b_n$) for all n . If the inequalities only hold for n large enough, we will use the notation $a_n = O(b_n)$ (resp. $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$). If $a_n \lesssim b_n$ (resp. $a_n = O(b_n)$) and $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ (resp. $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$), then we write $a_n \asymp b_n$ (resp. $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$).

Matrices will be denoted by uppercase letters. The i -th row of a matrix A will be denoted as $A_{i\cdot}$. The column j of A will be denoted by $A_{\cdot j}$, and the (i, j) th entry by A_{ij} . The transpose of A is denoted by A^\top and $A_{\cdot j}^\top$ corresponds to the j th row of A^\top by convention. I_k denotes the $k \times k$ identity matrix. For matrices, we use $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ respectively denote the spectral norm (or Euclidean norm in the case of vectors) and the Frobenius norm.

2 Model and algorithm description

2.1 The Bipartite Stochastic Block Model (BiSBM)

The BiSBM is a direct adaption of the SBM Holland et al. (1983) to bipartite graphs. The model depends on the following parameters.

- A set of nodes of type I, $\mathcal{N}_1 = [n_1]$, and a set of nodes of type II, $\mathcal{N}_2 = [n_2]$.
- A partition of \mathcal{N}_1 into K communities $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_K$ and a partition of \mathcal{N}_2 into L communities $\mathcal{C}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}'_L$.
- Membership matrices $Z_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1, K}$ and $Z_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{n_2, L}$ where $\mathcal{M}_{n, K}$ denotes the class of membership matrices with n nodes and K communities. Each membership matrix $Z_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{n_1, K}$ (resp. $Z_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{n_2, L}$) can be associated bijectively with a partition function $z : [n] \rightarrow [K]$ (resp. $z' : [n] \rightarrow [L]$) such that $z(i) = z_i = k$ where k is the unique column index satisfying $(Z_1)_{ik} = 1$ (resp. $(Z_2)_{ik} = 1$).
- A connectivity matrix of probabilities between communities

$$\Pi = (\pi_{kk'})_{k \in [K], k' \in [L]} \in [0, 1]^{K \times L}.$$

Let us write

$$P = (p_{ij})_{i, j \in [n]} := Z_1 \Pi (Z_2)^\top \in [0, 1]^{n_1 \times n_2}.$$

A graph \mathcal{G} is distributed according to BiSBM(Z_1, Z_2, Π) if the entries of the corresponding bipartite adjacency matrix A are generated by

$$A_{ij} \stackrel{\text{ind.}}{\sim} \mathcal{B}(p_{ij}), \quad i \in [n_1], j \in [n_2],$$

where $\mathcal{B}(p)$ denotes a Bernoulli distribution with parameter p . Hence the probability that two nodes are connected depends only on their community memberships. The sparsity level of the graph is denoted by $p_{\max} = \max_{i, j} p_{ij}$. We make the following assumptions on the model.

Assumption A1 (Approximately balanced communities). *The communities $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_K$, (resp. $\mathcal{C}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}'_L$) are approximately balanced, i.e., there exists a constant $\alpha \geq 1$ such that for all $k \in [K]$ and $l \in [L]$ we have*

$$\frac{n_1}{\alpha K} \leq |\mathcal{C}_k| \leq \frac{\alpha n_1}{K} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n_2}{\alpha L} \leq |\mathcal{C}'_l| \leq \frac{\alpha n_2}{L}.$$

We will consider throughout this work the parameters α, K and L as constants. We won't keep track in the stated bounds of the dependencies in these parameters.

We will rely on the following assumption to ensure that the communities are well separated.

Assumption A2 (Communities are well separated). *Let $U \Lambda U^\top$ be the spectral decomposition of PP^\top . All the communities are well separated if the following assumptions are satisfied.*

1. *The smallest non zero eigenvalue of $\text{III} \text{III}^\top$, denoted by $\lambda_{\min}(\text{III} \text{III}^\top)$, satisfies $\lambda_{\min}(\text{III} \text{III}^\top) \gtrsim p_{\max}^2$.*
2. *For all $i, j \in [n_1]$ such that $z_i \neq z_j$ we have $\|U_{i \cdot} - U_{j \cdot}\| \geq \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}}$.*

Remark 1. *This assumption doesn't require that $\text{III} \text{III}^\top$ is full rank contrary to classical assumptions used for analyzing spectral clustering. For example, consider the setting where $K = 2 = L$, the communities are exactly balanced and*

$$\text{III} \text{III}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} p & cp \\ cp & c^2 p \end{pmatrix}$$

where p is the sparsity parameter and $c > 0$ is a constant. Observe that

$$PP^\top = \frac{n_2}{2} Z_1 \text{III} \text{III}^\top Z_1^\top = \frac{n_1 n_2}{4} W \text{III} \text{III}^\top W^\top$$

where $W = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n_1}}$ has orthonormal columns. The SVD decomposition of $\text{III} \text{III}^\top$ is given by $cpVV^\top$ where $V = \left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{1+c^2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+c^2}}\right)^\top$. Hence, $U = WV$ and for $i \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $j \in \mathcal{C}_2$ we have

$$\|U_{i \cdot} - U_{j \cdot}\| \geq \frac{|1-c|}{\sqrt{n_1}}.$$

The quality of the clustering is evaluated through the **misclustering rate** r defined by

$$r(\hat{z}, z) = \frac{1}{n} \min_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{z}(i) \neq \pi(z(i))\}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathfrak{S} denotes the set of permutations on $[K]$. We say that an estimator \hat{z} achieves **exact recovery** if $r(\hat{z}, z) = 0$ with probability $1 - o(1)$ as n tends to infinity. It achieves **weak consistency** (or almost full recovery) if $\mathbb{P}(r(\hat{Z}, Z) = o(1)) = 1 - o(1)$ as n tends to infinity. A more complete overview of the different types of consistency and the sparsity regimes where they occur can be found in Abbe (2018).

2.2 Algorithm description

In the high-dimensional and sparse setting where $n_1 \ll n_2$ and $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2$ is of order $\log n_1$, there is no hope to recover the columns partition Z_2 . So, it is natural to form the similarity matrix AA^\top and compute the top- K eigenspace of this similarity matrix. Unfortunately, the diagonal elements of AA^\top create an important bias ($(AA^\top)_{ii}$ is typically of order $n_2 p_{max}$ while the diagonal entries of corresponding population similarity matrix are of order $n_2 p_{max}^2$). To avoid this issue, one can remove the diagonal of AA^\top and obtain a matrix B . In this work, we consider a slightly different variant of the spectral methods proposed by Braun and Tyagi (2022); Ndaoud et al. (2022); Florescu and Perkins (2016). See Algorithm 1 for a complete description of the method.

Algorithm 1 Spectral method on $\mathcal{H}(AA^\top)$ (Spec)

Input: The number of communities K , the rank r of $\Pi\Pi^\top$ and the adjacency matrix A .

- 1: Form the diagonal hollowed Gram matrix $B := \mathcal{H}(AA^\top)$ where $\mathcal{H}(X) = X - \text{diag}(X)$.
- 2: Compute the matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r}$ whose columns correspond to the top r -eigenvectors of B .
- 3: Apply approximate $(1 + 2/e + \epsilon)$ approximate **k-medians** on the rows of U and obtain a partition $z^{(0)}$ of $[n_1]$ into K communities.

Output: A partition of the nodes $z^{(0)}$.

When the rank of $\Pi\Pi^\top$ is not known, we propose **AdaSpec** (see Algorithm 2), an adaptive version of Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 Adaptive spectral method on $\mathcal{H}(AA^\top)$ (AdaSpec)

Input: The number of communities K , a threshold $T > 0$, and the adjacency matrix A .

- 1: Form the diagonal hollowed Gram matrix $B := \mathcal{H}(AA^\top)$ where $\mathcal{H}(X) = X - \text{diag}(X)$.
- 2: Let $\hat{r} \in [K]$ be the largest index such that the difference between two consecutive eigenvalues are larger than some threshold T

$$\hat{r} := \arg \max\{r \in [K] : \lambda_r(B) - \lambda_{r+1}(B) > T\}.$$

- 3: Compute the matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r}$ whose columns correspond to the top r -eigenvectors of B .
- 4: Apply approximate $(1 + 2/e + \epsilon)$ approximate **k-medians** on the rows of U and obtain a partition $z^{(0)}$ of $[n_1]$ into K communities.

Output: A partition of the nodes $z^{(0)}$.

Computational complexity. The cost for computing B is $O(n_1 \text{nnz}(A))$ and for U is¹ $O(n_1^2 K \log n_1)$. Applying the $(1 + 2/e + \epsilon)$ approximate **k-medians** has a complexity $O(f(K, \epsilon) n_1^{O(1)})$ where $f(K, \epsilon) =$

¹The $\log n_1$ term comes from the number of iterations needed when using the power method to compute the largest (or smallest) eigenvector of a given matrix.

$(\epsilon^{-2}K \log K)^K$, see Cohen-Addad et al. (2019). Here we used (approximate) **k-medians** because it can be linked easily with $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ perturbation bounds (see Lemma 5.1 in Lei (2019)). But we could also apply (approximate) **k-means** as a rounding step and use results from Su et al. (2020), Section 2.4 for the analysis. Depending on the rounding step used, the dependencies in some model parameters such as the number of communities K can change.

3 Main results

First, we derive a new concentration bound for the similarity matrix B . It improves the upper-bound $\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2} \vee \log n_1$ used in Braun and Tyagi (2022) to $\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$ when $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log n_1$. This improvement of a $\sqrt{\log n_1}$ factor is essential to show that **Spec** achieves exact recovery in the challenging parameter regime where $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2$ is of order $\log n_1$.

Theorem 1. *Let $B = \mathcal{H}(AA^\top)$ where $A \sim \text{BiSBM}(n_1, n_2, K, L, \Pi)$ with $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \gtrsim \log n_1$ and $n_2 \gtrsim n_1 \log^2 n_1$. Then with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-\Theta(1)}$*

$$\|B - \mathbb{E}(B)\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}.$$

Remark 2. *By using this concentration inequality, one could improve the conditions of applicability of Proposition 1. and Theorem 2. For example, Proposition 1 requires that $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \geq C \log n_1$ for a constant $C > 0$ large enough. But by using the concentration inequality of Theorem 1, we would only require $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \geq c \log n_1$ for an arbitrary constant $c > 0$. See also Remark 8 in Braun and Tyagi (2022).*

Finally, we show that **Spec** achieves exact recovery by proving the following $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ concentration bound for the top- r eigenspace U of B . Let us denote the $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ between two matrices of eigenvectors U and $U^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$ by

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) = \inf_{O \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r}, O^\top O = I} \|UO - U^*\|.$$

Theorem 2. *Assume that $A \sim \text{BiSBM}(n_1, n_2, K, L, \Pi)$ with $n_2 \gtrsim n_1 \log^2 n_1$, $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \geq C \log n_1$ for a large enough constant $C > 0$, and $n_2 p_{max}^2 = o(1)$. Let $U \Lambda U^\top$ (resp. $U^* \Lambda^* U^{*\top}$) be the spectral decomposition of $B = \mathcal{H}(AA^\top)$ (resp. $B^* = PP^\top$). Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ (that can be made arbitrarily small if C is chosen large enough) such that with probability at least $1 - n^{-\Theta(1)}$*

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n_1}}.$$

Corollary 1. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 2 **Spec** achieves exact recovery with probability at least $1 - n^{-\Theta(1)}$.*

Corollary 2. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 2 with the choice $T = n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 / \log \log n_1$, **AdaSpec** achieves exact recovery with probability at least $1 - n^{-\Theta(1)}$.*

4 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof strategy is based on the combinatorial argument developed by Feige and Ofek (2005).

Let us denote

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ \max_{l \in [n_2]} \sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il} \leq C \sqrt{\log n_1} \right\}.$$

By Chernoff bound and a union bound

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq n_2 e^{-0.5C^2 \frac{\log n_1}{n_1 p_{max}}} \leq e^{\log n_2 - 0.5C^2 \log(n_1) \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1 \log n_1}}} \leq e^{-\Omega(\log(n_1))}.$$

By choosing C large enough, we can ensure that \mathcal{E} occurs with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-3}$. From now, we will condition on this event.

Step 1. A standard ϵ -net argument with the Euclidean norm (see e.g. Lemma B.1 and B.2 in Lee et al. (2020)) shows that for all $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ there exists a ϵ -net \mathcal{N} of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that $|\mathcal{N}| \leq (1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon})^n$ and

$$\|B - \mathbb{E}(B)\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\epsilon} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} |x^\top (B - \mathbb{E}(B))x|.$$

In the following, we will fix $\epsilon = 1/4$.

Step 2. In order to bound the previous quantity, let us introduce for all $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ the set of “light pairs”

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \{(i, j) \in [n_1] \times [n_1] : |x_i x_j| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}\}$$

and the set of “heavy pairs”

$$\mathcal{H}(x) = [n_1] \times [n_1] \setminus \mathcal{L}(x).$$

When clear from the context, we will omit the dependency in x in the notations of the previous sets.

We have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} |x^\top (B - \mathbb{E}(B))x| \leq \underbrace{\sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}} x_i x_j B_{ij} - x^\top \mathbb{E}Bx \right|}_{(T1)} + \underbrace{\sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}} x_i x_j B_{ij} \right|}_{(T2)}.$$

Step 3. We are going to bound (T1) w.h.p. Observe that

$$(T1) \leq \underbrace{\left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}} x_i x_j (B_{ij} - \mathbb{E}B_{ij}) \right|}_{(E1)} + \underbrace{\left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}} x_i x_j \mathbb{E}B_{ij} \right|}_{(E2)}.$$

It is easy to bound the deterministic quantity (E2)

$$\begin{aligned} (E2) &\leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}B_{ij} \frac{(x_i x_j)^2}{|x_i x_j|} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_2}} p_{max}^{-1} n_2 p_{max}^2 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}} (x_i x_j)^2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max} \sum_{i \in [n_1]} x_i^2 \sum_{j \in [n_1]} x_j^2 \\ &= \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper-bound of (E1) conditioned on \mathcal{E} follows from Lemma 6 that gives

$$(E1) \leq C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-11n_1}$ for some constant $C_1 > 1$. Since $|\mathcal{N}| \leq e^{9n_1}$ according to Step 1, we obtain by a union bound argument that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{E} \cap \sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}} x_i x_j B_{ij} - x^\top \mathbb{E}Bx \right| > 2C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{E} \cap \sup_{x \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}} x_i x_j (B_{ij} - \mathbb{E}B_{ij}) \right| > C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max} \right) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{N}| e^{-11n_1} \leq e^{-2n_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. We are now going to bound the term involving the heavy pairs (T2). First, one needs to control the sum of the entries of each row and column of B .

Lemma 1. *There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2)}$*

$$\max_{i \in [n_1]} \sum_{j \in [n_1]} B_{ij} \leq C_2 n_2 n_1 p_{max}^2.$$

Proof. Fix $i \in [n_1]$. We have $S = \sum_j B_{ij} = \langle A_i, \sum_{j \neq i} A_j \rangle$. One can apply Lemma 7 (see appendix) with sets $I = \{i\}$ and $J = [n_1] \setminus I$. We conclude by using a union bound. \square

Then, we need to show that the matrix B satisfies w.h.p. the discrepancy property defined below, with appropriate parameters.

Definition 1. *Let M be a $n \times n$ matrix with non-negative entries. For every $S, T \subset [n]$, let $e_M(S, T)$ denote the number of edges between S and T*

$$e_M(S, T) = \sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j \in T} M_{ij}.$$

We say that M obeys the discrepancy property $DP(\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$ with parameters $\delta > 0$, $\kappa_1 > 0$ and $\kappa_2 \geq 0$ if for all non-empty $S, T \subset [n]$, at least one of the following properties hold

1. $e_M(S, T) \leq \kappa_1 \delta |S| |T|$;
2. $e_M(S, T) \log \frac{e_M(S, T)}{\delta |S| |T|} \leq \kappa_2 |S| \vee |T| \log \frac{en_1}{|S| \vee |T|}$.

If one can show that B satisfies $DP(\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$ where $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$ are absolute constants and $\delta = n_2 p_{max}^2$, then Lemma B.4 in Lee et al. (2020) would imply that

$$(T2) \lesssim_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2} \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max}.$$

Consequently, to bound (T2), it is sufficient to show that B satisfies $DP(\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$. W.l.o.g., one can assume that $|S| \leq |T|$. If $|T| \geq \frac{n_1}{e}$ then Lemma 1 leads to

$$\frac{e_B(S, T)}{\delta |S| |T|} \leq \frac{|S| C_2 n_2 n_1 p_{max}^2}{n_2 p_{max}^2 |S| n_1 / e} \leq C_2 e$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2)}$. Otherwise, we can write $e_B(S, T) = \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} \langle A_i, A_j \rangle$ where $w_{ii} = 0$ and $w_{ij} = \mathbf{1}_{i \in S} \mathbf{1}_{j \in T}$. By Lemma 7 we have

$$\mathbb{P}(e_B(S, T) \geq C \delta |S| |T|) \leq e^{-\frac{C}{2} \delta |S| |T|}$$

for all $C > C^*$ where $C^* > 0$ is a large enough constant. We can now continue as in the proof of Theorem 5.2 in Lei and Rinaldo (2015). For a given $c > 0$, let us denote

$$k(T, S) = \max \left(c \frac{|T| \log \frac{en_1}{|T|}}{\delta |S| |T|}, C^* \right).$$

We have

$$\mathbb{P}(e_B(S, T) \geq k(T, S) \delta |S| |T|) \leq e^{-\frac{c}{2} |T| \log \frac{en_1}{|T|}}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\exists S, T \subset [n_1], |S| \leq |T| : e_B(S, T) \geq k(T, S)\delta|S||T|) \\
& \leq \sum_{I, J: |I| \leq |J| < n_1/e} e^{-\frac{c}{2}|T| \log \frac{en_1}{|T|}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} \sum_{|S|=s, |T|=t} e^{-\frac{c}{2}|T| \log \frac{en_1}{|T|}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} \binom{n_1}{s} \binom{n_1}{t} e^{-\frac{c}{2}t \log \frac{en_1}{t}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} \left(\frac{en_1}{s}\right)^s \left(\frac{en_1}{t}\right)^t e^{-\frac{c}{2}t \log \frac{en_1}{t}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} e^{-\frac{c}{2}t \log \frac{en_1}{t} + t + s + t \log \frac{n_1}{t} + s \log \frac{n_1}{s}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} e^{-\frac{c}{2}t \log \frac{en_1}{t} + 2t + 2t \log \frac{n_1}{t}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} e^{-\frac{c-8}{2}t \log \frac{en_1}{t}} \\
& \leq \sum_{s \leq t \leq n_1/e} n_1^{-\frac{c-8}{2}} \\
& \leq n_1^{-\frac{c-12}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

by using repeatedly the fact that $t \log \frac{n_1}{t}$ is increasing on $[1, \frac{n_1}{e}]$. By choosing a constant $c > 12$, we have shown that B satisfies $DP(n_2 p_{max}^2, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$.

Step 4. We can conclude by summing all the terms that have been shown to be $O(\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}})$ w.h.p.

5 Entrywise analysis of the spectral method

To show that the spectral method achieves exact recovery, we need to derive $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ eigenspace perturbation bound. Unfortunately, existing results only apply to symmetric matrices with independent entries or weak dependencies (see Section 7 in Lei (2019)) and cannot be directly applied to our setting. We propose an extension of the main result of Lei (2019) to the hollowed Gram matrix B considered in this work. We believe that our result can be extended to more general Gram matrices or Kernel matrices.

5.1 Notations and preliminary results

First, let us introduce some notation. Let $\tilde{B}^* = \mathcal{H}(PP^\top)$ and $B^* = PP^\top$. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r$ (resp. $\lambda_1^* \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r^*$) be the top- r eigenvalues of B (resp. B^*) and U (resp. U^*) the corresponding matrix of eigenvectors.

The spectral decomposition of the matrices B and B^* is given by

$$B = \bar{U}\Lambda\bar{U}^\top, \quad B^* = U^*\Lambda^*U^{*\top}$$

where \bar{U} is the full eigenspace matrix of B and Λ is the diagonal matrix of non-zero eigenvalues of B (resp. $\Lambda^* = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_r^*)$). The noise $E = B - B^*$ can be further decomposed as

$$\underbrace{\mathcal{H}((A-P)(A-P)^\top)}_E + \underbrace{\mathcal{H}(P(A-P)^\top + (A-P)P^\top)}_{E'} + \underbrace{\tilde{B}^* - B^*}_{E''}.$$

First, let us establish analogous results to the Conditions (A2) and (A3) in Lei (2019).

Lemma 2. Under the assumption of Theorem 2, there is an absolute constant $C_1 > 0$, such that for any $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$, the following inequalities hold with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-\Theta(1)}$.

1. $\|\Lambda - \Lambda^*\| \leq C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$,
2. $\|E\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$,
3. $\|EU^*\| \leq C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$,
4. $\max_i \|E_i W\| \leq b_\infty(\delta) \|W\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + b_2(\delta) \|W\|$, where $b_\infty(\delta) = C_1 \frac{R(\delta)}{\log R(\delta)}$ and $b_2(\delta) = C_1 \frac{\sqrt{n_2 p_{max}^2} R(\delta)}{\log R(\delta)}$ with $R(\delta) = \log(n_1/\delta) + K$ and $\delta = n_1^{-c}$ for some constant $c > 0$.

Proof. Recall that by Theorem 1, we have with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-\Theta(1)}$

$$\|\tilde{E}\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}.$$

Also, by definition, $\max_i \|P_i\|^2 \leq n_2 p_{max}^2$ so $\|E''\| \leq \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}^2} = o(\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2})$. By Lemma 5 in Braun and Tyagi (2022) we have $\|(A - P)Z_2\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}$, hence by submultiplicativity of the norm

$$\|E'\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}} \|\Pi Z_1^\top\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} n_1 p_{max} = O(\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2})$$

because $n_1 p_{max} = O(1)$ by assumption. Consequently, the dominant error term is \tilde{E} and we have shown that

$$\|E\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof of 1. This is a direct consequence of Weyl's inequality and (5.1).

Proof of 2. It follows from the fact that $\|E\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \|E\|$.

Proof of 3. It is a direct consequence of the sub-multiplicativity of the norm and the fact that $\|U^*\| \leq 1$.

Proof of 4. By Proposition 2.2 in Lei (2019), if we can show that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ there exist $a_\infty(\delta), a_2(\delta) > 0$ such that for each $i \in [n_1]$

$$E_{i:} w \leq a_\infty(\delta) \|w\|_\infty + a_2(\delta) \|w\|$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, then we can choose $b_\infty(\delta) = 2a_\infty(\frac{\delta}{5^\kappa n_1})$ and $b_2(\delta) = 2a_2(\frac{\delta}{5^\kappa n_1})$. Fix $w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, i \in [n_1]$ and let us denote $R = A - P$. Consider $S = \tilde{E}_{i:} w = \sum_{j \in [n_2] \setminus \{i\}} \langle R_i, R_j \rangle w_j$. Conditionally on R_i , this is a sum of independent and centered r.v.s. By using Lemma F.3 in Lei (2019) with weights $\tilde{w}_{jl} = R_{il} w_j$ we obtain that conditionally on R_i the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$S \leq f(\delta) \left(\|\tilde{w}\|_\infty + \sqrt{\sum_{j,k} \tilde{w}_{jl}^2 p_{jl}} \right)$$

where $f(\delta) = \frac{2 \log(1/\delta)}{F^{-1}(2 \log(1/\delta))}$ and $F(t) = t^2 e^t$. But $\|\tilde{w}\|_\infty \leq \|w\|_\infty$ and

$$\|\tilde{w}\|^2 = \sum_{j,l} R_{il}^2 w_j^2 = \|w\|^2 \|R_i\|^2.$$

Besides, with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})}$, $\|R_i\|^2 \leq C n_2 p_{max}$ by Hoeffding's inequality. Therefore with probability at least $1 - \delta - e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})}$

$$S \leq f(\delta) \left((\|w\|_\infty + \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}^2} \|w\|) \right).$$

It remains to bound $S' = E'_{i \cdot} w = \sum_{j \in [n_2] \setminus \{i\}} (\langle R_i, P_j \rangle + \langle P_i, R_j \rangle) w_j$ and $S'' = E''_{i \cdot} w$. We have

$$S'' = \|P_{i \cdot}\|^2 w_i \leq \|w\|_\infty n_2 p_{max}^2 = o(\|w\|_\infty).$$

Also observe that $\sum_{j \in [n_2] \setminus \{i\}} \langle R_i, P_j \rangle w_j = \sum_{j \neq i, l} R_{j l} w_j P_{i l}$, so we can apply Lemma F.3 in Lei (2019) with weights $(w_j P_{i l})_{j \neq i, l}$. We obtain

$$S'' \leq f(\delta) p_{max} (\|w\|_\infty + \|w\| \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}})$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. A similar result holds for $S' = \sum_{j \neq i, l} \langle P_i, R_j \rangle w_j$: we can apply again Lemma F.3 in Lei (2019) with weights $(P_{j l} w_j)_{j, l}$ and obtain

$$S' \leq f(\delta) p_{max} (\|w\|_\infty + \|w\| \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}}).$$

So we can choose $a_\infty(\delta) = f(\delta)$ and $a_2(\delta) = f(\delta) \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}^2}$. One can check that, as in Lemma 3.1 in Lei (2019), $b_\infty(\delta) = \frac{4R(\delta)}{\log R(\delta)}$ and $b_2(\delta) = 4 \frac{\sqrt{n_2 p_{max}^2} R(\delta)}{\log R(\delta)}$. Also note that $n_2 p_{max} \gtrsim \log n_1$ by assumption so if we choose $\delta = n_1^{-c}$ for an appropriate constant $c > 0$, the term $e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})}$ will be negligible compared to δ . \square

5.2 A new decoupling argument

The main difficulty to adapting Theorem 2.3 and 2.5 Lei (2019) comes from the decoupling assumption (A1) which requires the existence of a matrix $B^{(i)}$ (typically obtained by replacing the i -th row and column of B by zeros or the expectation of the entries) such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$

$$d_{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{(B_i, B^{(i)})}, \mathbb{P}_{B_i} \times \mathbb{P}_{B^{(i)}}) \leq \frac{\delta}{n}. \quad (5.2)$$

If the matrix B had independent entries it would be straightforward to satisfy this condition, but in our setting, it is not clear how to obtain such a general result. Consequently, we adopted a different approach that avoids bounding the total variation distance between two probability distributions.

Let us denote by $B^{(i)}$ the matrix obtained by removing the i -th row and column of B . We have

$$\|B^{(i)} - B\| \leq \|B_{i \cdot}\| \leq \|E_{i \cdot}\| + \|B_{i \cdot}^*\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2)}$, since $\|B_{i \cdot}^*\| \leq \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$, $n_2 p_{max}^2 = o(1)$, and $\|E_{i \cdot}\| \leq \|E\| \leq \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$.

We also have by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \|(B^{(i)} - B)U\| &\leq \|B_{i \cdot} U\| + \|B_{i \cdot} U_{i \cdot}^\top\| \\ &\leq \|(BU)_{i \cdot}\| + \|B_{i \cdot}\| \|U_{i \cdot}\| \\ &\leq \|U_{i \cdot}\| \Lambda + \|B_{i \cdot}\| \|U_{i \cdot}\| \\ &\leq (\|\Lambda\| + \|B_{i \cdot}\|) \|U_{i \cdot}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, because of assumption A2 we obtain that w.h.p.

$$\frac{\|(B^{(i)} - B)U\|}{\lambda_r^*} \lesssim \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}}\right) \|U_{i \cdot}\| \lesssim \|U\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}.$$

These inequalities correspond to the Condition (C0) used in the proof of Theorem 2.3 in Lei (2019). They are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *The following inequalities hold with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2)}$*

1. $\|B^{(i)} - B\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2},$

$$2. \frac{\|(B^{(i)}-B)U\|}{\lambda_*^*} \lesssim \|U_i\| \lesssim \|U\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}.$$

Steps one and two of the proof of Theorem 2.3 Lei (2019) are deterministic and still hold in our setting (see the discussion in Section 5.3). The only step that uses the decoupling argument is the third step where one needs to bound $\|E_i:(U^{(i)}H^{(i)} - U^*)\|$ where $H^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is the orthogonal matrix that best aligns $U^{(i)}$ and U^* .

Lemma 4. *Let $W^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times K}$ be a matrix that only depends on $B^{(i)}$. Under the assumptions on Theorem 2, it holds with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-c'}$ for some constant $c' > 0$ that for all $i \in [n_1]$*

$$\|E_i:W^{(i)}\| \lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \|W^{(i)}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \frac{\sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \|W^{(i)}\|.$$

Proof. Recall that $E = \tilde{E} + E' + E''$. By triangular inequality

$$\|E_i:W^{(i)}\| \leq \|\tilde{E}_i:W^{(i)}\| + \|E'_i:W^{(i)}\| + \|E''_i:W^{(i)}\|.$$

We will first handle the first term. Let us denote $R = A - P$ and consider

$$S = \tilde{E}_i:w^{(i)} = \sum_{j \in [n_1] \setminus \{i\}, l \in [n_2]} R_{il} R_{jl} w_j^{(i)}$$

where $w^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ depends on A_{-i} .

Conditionally on A_{-i} , S is a weighted sum of independent and centered Bernoulli's r.v. Hence, by Lemma F.3 in Lei (2019) with $\delta = n_1^{-c}$, and weights $\tilde{w}_{jl} = R_{jl} w_j^{(i)}$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S \gtrsim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} (\|\tilde{w}\|_\infty + \sqrt{p_{max}} \|\tilde{w}\|) \middle| A_{-i}\right) \leq n^{-c}.$$

Since $R_{jl} \leq 1$, we have $\|\tilde{w}\|_\infty \leq \|w\|_\infty$. By definition we have

$$\|\tilde{w}\|^2 = \sum_{j \neq i, l} R_{jl}^2 (w_j^{(i)})^2.$$

Fact. We have with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})}$ that

$$\max_{j \neq k} \sum_l R_{jl}^2 \lesssim n_2 p_{max}.$$

Proof of the Fact. We have $R_{jl}^2 \leq 1$ and $\text{Var}(\sum_l R_{jl}^2) \leq 2n_2 p_{max}$. Hence by Bernstein inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_l R_{jl}^2 - \mathbb{E}(\sum_l R_{jl}^2)\right| \gtrsim n_2 p_{max}\right) \leq e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})}.$$

We can conclude by a union bound and the fact that $n_2 p_{max} \gtrsim \log n_1$ by assumptions on the sparsity level p_{max} and $n_2 \gtrsim n_1 \log n_1$. \square

Let us denote by Ω_1 the event under which the inequality of the previous fact holds. Note that this event only depends on A_{-i} . We have $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_1^c) \leq e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})}$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(S \gtrsim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left(\|w^{(i)}\|_\infty + \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \|w^{(i)}\|\right)\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(S \gtrsim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left(\|w^{(i)}\|_\infty + \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \|w^{(i)}\|\right) \middle| \Omega_1\right) + e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\Omega_1} \mathbb{P}\left(S \gtrsim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left(\|w^{(i)}\|_\infty + \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \|w^{(i)}\|\right) \middle| A_{-i}\right) + e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\Omega_1} \mathbb{P}\left(S \gtrsim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} (\|\tilde{w}\|_\infty + \sqrt{p_{max}} \|\tilde{w}\|) \middle| A_{-i}\right) + e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})} \\ & \leq n_1^{-c} + e^{-\Theta(n_2 p_{max})} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{E}_{Ω_1} denotes the expectation over A_{-i} conditioned on Ω_1 .

The other terms $E'_{i:}w^{(i)}$ and $E''_{i:}w^{(i)}$ can be handled in a similar way. They are actually easier to treat because one doesn't need to use a conditioning argument since $E'_{i:}$, $E''_{i:}$ are independent of A_{-i} .

We have by definition

$$E''_{i:}w^{(i)} \leq n_2 p_{max}^2 \left\| w^{(i)} \right\|_{\infty} \ll \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left\| w^{(i)} \right\|_{\infty}.$$

Also we can decompose

$$E'_{i:}w^{(i)} = \underbrace{\sum_{j \neq i, l} R_{il} P_{jl} w_j^{(i)}}_{S_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{j \neq i, l} P_{il} R_{jl} w_j^{(i)}}_{S_2}.$$

S_1 is a sum of n_2 weighted independent Bernoulli's r.v. with weights given by $w_l = \sum_{j \neq i} P_{jl} w_j^{(i)}$. Lemma F.3 in Lei (2019) gives with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-c}$

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} (\|w\|_{\infty} + \sqrt{p_{max}} \|w\|) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left(n_1 p_{max} \left\| w^{(i)} \right\|_{\infty} + \sqrt{n_1 p_{max}} \left\| w^{(i)} \right\| \right). \end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, we can show that with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-c}$

$$S_2 \lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left(p_{max} \left\| w^{(i)} \right\|_{\infty} + \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}^{1.5}} \left\| w^{(i)} \right\| \right).$$

Consequently, with probability at least $1 - O(n_1^{-c})$,

$$E_{i:}w^{(i)} \lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left(\left\| w^{(i)} \right\|_{\infty} + \sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \left\| w^{(i)} \right\| \right).$$

Then, by using Proposition 2.2 (ϵ -net argument) in Lei (2019) we obtain that with probability at least $1 - O(n_1^{-c})$

$$\left\| E_{i:}W^{(i)} \right\| \lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left\| W^{(i)} \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \frac{\sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \log n_1}{\log \log n_1} \left\| W^{(i)} \right\|. \quad (5.3)$$

Once we have obtained this inequality, the proof of Step III. is the same as in Lei (2019). \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 2

First, we will extend Theorem 2.3 in Lei (2019). In order to make the adaptation easier, we will use the same notations as in Lei (2019). Let $\Delta^* = \lambda_{min}^*$ be the effective eigengap (it corresponds with the definition in Lei (2019), with $s = 0$). In our setting, the condition number $\bar{\kappa}$ only depends on K and L and hence is considered a constant. Also, observe that U^* is the full eigenspace of B^* . We have shown in Section 5.1 and 5.2 that the following conditions (partially matching the assumptions (A1)-(A4) in Lei (2019)) hold with $\delta = n_1^{-q}$ for some constant $q > 0$.

Condition C1. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - O(n_1^{-q})$ the following conditions hold*

1. $\|B^{(i)} - B\| \leq L_1(\delta) := C_1 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$,
2. $\frac{\|(B^{(i)} - B)U\|}{\lambda^*} \leq C_1 \|U\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$.

With the notations of Lei (2019), the functions $L_2(\delta)$, $L_3(\delta)$ and $\kappa(\Lambda^*) = \bar{\kappa}$ that appears in Assumption (A1) are $O(1)$.

Condition C2. *There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - O(n_1^{-q})$ the following inequalities hold*

1. $\|\Lambda - \Lambda^*\| \leq \lambda_-(\delta) := C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$,
2. $\|EU^*\| \leq E_+(\delta) := C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$,
3. $\|E\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq E_\infty(\delta) = C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$.

Condition C3. *For any $i \in [n_1]$ and fixed matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times r}$,*

$$\|E_i \cdot W\| \leq b_\infty(\delta) \|W\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + b_2(\delta) \|W\|, \text{ with probability at least } 1 - O(n_1^{-q})$$

where $b_\infty(\delta) \lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1}$ and $b_2(\delta) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{n_2 p_{max}} \log n_1}{\log \log n_1}$.

Condition C4. *We have $\Delta^* \geq 4(\sigma(\delta) + L_1(\delta) + \lambda_-(\delta))$ where $\sigma(\delta) = E_\infty(\delta) + b_\infty(\delta) + b_2(\delta) + E_+(\delta)$.*

Theorem 3. *Let $\delta = n_1^{-q}$ for some constant $q > 0$. Then under conditions C1-C4 and the assumptions of Theorem 2, there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - O(n_1^{-q})$*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, BU^*(\Lambda^*)^{-1}) &\leq \frac{C_3}{\Delta^*} \sigma(\delta) \left(\|U^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \frac{\|EU^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\lambda_{min}^*} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{C_3}{\Delta^*} \left(\frac{E_+(\delta) b_2(\delta)}{\lambda_{min}^*} + \frac{E_+(\delta)}{\sqrt{n_1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We cannot directly apply Theorem 2.3 in Lei (2019) because Condition C1 doesn't include the condition stated in (A.1). But this condition is only used in the Step III. of Theorem 2.3 where one needs to control $\|E_i \cdot (U^{(i)} H^{(i)} - U^*)\|$. We used a different argument to control this quantity in Section 5.2 and we obtained by equation (5.3)

$$\|E_i \cdot (U^{(i)} H^{(i)} - U^*)\| \leq b_\infty(\delta) \|(U^{(i)} H^{(i)} - U^*)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + b_2(\delta) \|(U^{(i)} H^{(i)} - U^*)\|.$$

This concludes Step III in Theorem 2.3 in Lei (2019). \square

Corollary 3. *Under the same assumption as in Theorem 3, there is a constant $c > 0$ (possibly depending on q) such that with probability at least $1 - O(n_1^{-q})$*

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n_1}}.$$

Proof. By triangular inequality

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) \leq d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, BU^*(\Lambda^*)^{-1}) + d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(BU^*(\Lambda^*)^{-1}, U^*).$$

Notice that $U^* = B^* U^*(\Lambda^*)^{-1}$, so

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(BU^*(\Lambda^*)^{-1}, U^*) \leq \|(B - B^*)U^*(\Lambda^*)^{-1}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \frac{\|EU^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\lambda_{min}^*}.$$

We can bound $\|EU^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ by using the same proof technique as in Lemma 2, bullet 4, similarly to Lemma 3.3. in Lei (2019). We obtain with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-q}$

$$\|EU^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \lesssim \log n_1 \|U^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \sqrt{p_{max}} \log n_1.$$

Hence with probability at least $1 - n_1^{-q}$

$$\frac{\|EU^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\lambda_{min}^*} \lesssim \frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1}}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\delta) &= O\left(\frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1}\right) \\ \frac{E_+(\delta)b_2(\delta)}{\Delta^* \lambda_{min}^*} &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1} \log \log n_1}\right) \\ \frac{E_+(\delta)}{\Delta^* \sqrt{n_1}} &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n_1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

By consequence, triangular inequality and Theorem 3 implies that w.h.p.

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n_1}}$$

for a constant $c > 0$ that can be made small enough if the constant C such that $n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2 \geq C \log n_1$ is chosen large enough. □

5.4 Proof of Corollary 1

The proof is standard, but for completeness, we outline it. First, we need to relate the **k-medians** algorithm with the $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ perturbation bounds. It can be done by the following lemma.

Lemma 5 (Lei (2019)). *Let $U, U^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ be two matrices with orthonormal columns. Then the **k-medians** algorithm exactly recovers the clusters $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_K$ if*

$$d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) \leq \frac{1}{6\alpha} \min_{i,j \in [n_1]: z_i \neq z_j} \|U_{i:}^* - U_{j:}^*\|.$$

Since by Theorem 2 we have $d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*) \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n_1}}$ and by Assumption A2 $\min_{i,j \in [n_1]: z_i \neq z_j} \|U_{i:}^* - U_{j:}^*\| \geq \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n_1}}$, the assumption of Lemma 5 holds whenever $c_1/6\alpha > c$.

5.5 Proof of Corollary 2

It is sufficient to show that w.h.p. we have $\hat{r} = r$. But this is a straightforward consequence of Weyl's inequality and the fact that $\|B - B^*\| \lesssim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}^2}$.

Acknowledgement The work leading to the preliminary version of this manuscript was done while G.B. was a PhD student at Inria Lille in the MODAL team. G.B. would like to thank Hemant Tyagi for giving feedback on the preliminary version of the manuscript. Special appreciation is also owed to Yizhe Zhu for diligently pinpointing inaccuracies within the proofs presented in the preceding version of the manuscript.

Bibliography

- E. Abbe. Community detection and stochastic block models. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 14(1-2):1–162, 2018.
- E. Abbe, J. Fan, and K. Wang. An ℓ_p theory of pca and spectral clustering, 2020a.
- E. Abbe, J. Fan, K. Wang, and Y. Zhong. Entrywise eigenvector analysis of random matrices with low expected rank. *Annals of statistics*, 48(3):1452–1474, 2020b.
- G. Braun and H. Tyagi. Minimax optimal clustering of bipartite graphs with a generalized power method, 2022.
- C. Cai, G. Li, Y. Chi, H. V. Poor, and Y. Chen. Subspace estimation from unbalanced and incomplete data matrices: $\ell_{2,\infty}$ statistical guarantees. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):944 – 967, 2021. doi: 10.1214/20-AOS1986. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-AOS1986>.
- J. Cape, M. Tang, and C. E. Priebe. Signal-plus-noise matrix models: eigenvector deviations and fluctuations. *Biometrika*, 106(1):243–250, Jan 2019a.
- J. Cape, M. Tang, and C. E. Priebe. The two-to-infinity norm and singular subspace geometry with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5), Oct 2019b.
- Y. Chen, J. Fan, C. Ma, and K. Wang. Spectral method and regularized mle are both optimal for top- k ranking. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(4), Aug 2019. ISSN 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/18-aos1745. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/18-aos1745>.
- V. Cohen-Addad, A. Gupta, A. Kumar, E. Lee, and J. Li. Tight FPT Approximations for k-Median and k-Means. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*, volume 132 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, pages 42:1–42:14, 2019.
- A. Damle and Y. Sun. Uniform bounds for invariant subspace perturbations. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 41(3):1208–1236, Jan 2020.
- A. d’Aspremont, M. Cucuringu, and H. Tyagi. Ranking and synchronization from pairwise measurements via svd. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(19):1–63, 2021. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/19-542.html>.
- S. Dhara, J. Gaudio, E. Mossel, and C. Sandon. Spectral recovery of binary censored block models. In *SODA*, 2022a.
- S. Dhara, J. Gaudio, E. Mossel, and C. Sandon. Spectral algorithms optimally recover planted sub-structures, 2022b.
- J. Eldridge, M. Belkin, and Y. Wang. Unperturbed: spectral analysis beyond davis-kahan. In *Proceedings of Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 83 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 321–358, 07–09 Apr 2018.
- J. Fan, W. Wang, and Y. Zhong. An ℓ_∞ eigenvector perturbation bound and its application. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18:207:1–207:42, 2016.
- U. Feige and E. Ofek. Spectral techniques applied to sparse random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 27(2):251–275, 2005.

- L. Florescu and W. Perkins. Spectral thresholds in the bipartite stochastic block model. In *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 49, pages 943–959, 2016.
- J. Gaudio and N. Joshi. Community detection in the hypergraph sbm: Optimal recovery given the similarity matrix, 2022.
- P. W. Holland, K. B. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt. Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social Networks*, 5(2): 109 – 137, 1983.
- Z. Huang, D. D. Zeng, and H. Chen. Analyzing consumer-product graphs: Empirical findings and applications in recommender systems. *Management Science*, 53(7):1146–1164, 2007.
- J. Lee, D. Kim, and H. W. Chung. Robust hypergraph clustering via convex relaxation of truncated mle. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 1(3):613–631, 2020.
- J. Lei and A. Rinaldo. Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(1): 215–237, 2015.
- L. Lei. Unified $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ eigenspace perturbation theory for symmetric random matrices, 2019.
- L. Lei, X. Li, and X. Lou. Consistency of spectral clustering on hierarchical stochastic block models. *arXiv: Statistics Theory*, 2020.
- M. Löffler, A. Y. Zhang, and H. H. Zhou. Optimality of spectral clustering in the Gaussian mixture model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(5):2506 – 2530, 2021.
- M. Ndaoud, S. Sigalla, and A. B. Tsybakov. Improved clustering algorithms for the bipartite stochastic block model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(3):1960–1975, 2022.
- M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18(none):1 – 9, 2013.
- T. Squartini, A. Almog, G. Caldarelli, I. van Lelyveld, D. Garlaschelli, and G. Cimini. Enhanced capital-asset pricing model for the reconstruction of bipartite financial networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 96:032315, Sep 2017.
- L. Su, W. Wang, and Y. Zhang. Strong consistency of spectral clustering for stochastic block models. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(1):324–338, Jan 2020. ISSN 1557-9654. doi: 10.1109/tit.2019.2934157. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/tit.2019.2934157>.
- J.-G. Young, F. Valdivinos, and M. Newman. Reconstruction of plant–pollinator networks from observational data. *Nature Communications*, 12:3911, 2021.
- A. Y. Zhang and H. H. Zhou. Leave-one-out singular subspace perturbation analysis for spectral clustering, 2022.

A General concentration inequalities

In this section, we provide proofs of the lemmas stated in the main text.

Lemma 6. *Assume that the assumption of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Let us denote $S = \sum_{i,j \in [n_1]} w_{ij} \langle A_i, A_j \rangle$ where $w_{ii} = 0$ for all i , and $w_{ij} = x_i x_j \mathbf{1}_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(x)}$ where $\|x\| = 1$ and $\mathcal{L}(x)$ is the set of light pairs as defined in the proof of Theorem 1. In particular, $\|w\| \leq 1$, $\|w\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}$. Recall that $\mathcal{E} = \left\{ \max_{l \in [n_2]} \sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il} \leq C \sqrt{\log n_1} \right\}$. We have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \cap \{|S - \mathbb{E}S| \gtrsim \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}\}) \leq e^{-11n_1}.$$

Proof. We will use a similar decoupling approach as the one used in the proof of Hanson-Wright inequality, see Rudelson and Vershynin (2013). Let $(\delta_i)_{i \in [n_1]}$ be independent Bernoulli's r.v. with parameter 1/2 and let us define the set of indices

$$\Lambda_\delta = \{i \in [n_1] : \delta_i = 1\}$$

and the random variable

$$S_\delta = \sum_{i,j} \delta_i (1 - \delta_j) w_{ij} \langle A_i, A_j \rangle = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} \langle A_i, \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} w_{ij} A_j \rangle.$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}_\delta S_\delta = S/4$. To simplify the notations we will denote by $\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c}(\cdot)$ (resp. $\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c}(\cdot)$) the expectation over $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda_\delta^c}$ conditionally on δ and $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda_\delta}$, S_δ (resp. the expectation over $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda_\delta}$ conditionally on δ and $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda_\delta^c}$, S_δ).

Upper bound of the m.g.f. of S_δ conditionally on Λ_δ . Conditionally on δ and $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda_\delta}$, S_δ is a weighted sum of independent Bernoulli's r.v.:

$$S_\delta = \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} A_{jl} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} w_{ij} A_{il} \right).$$

Hence, for all $t > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} \left(e^{t(S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c}(S_\delta))} \right) = \\ & \log \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} (e^{tS_\delta}) - \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} \sum_{l \in [n_2]} w_{ij} t A_{il} p_{jl} \\ & = \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \left(\log(e^{t \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} w_{ij} A_{il}} p_{jl} + 1 - p_{jl}) - t \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} w_{ij} A_{il} p_{jl} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \left(p_{jl} (e^{t \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} w_{ij} A_{il}} - 1) - t \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} w_{ij} A_{il} p_{jl} \right) \quad (\log(1+x) \geq x, \text{ for all } x > -1) \\ & \leq p_{max} t^2 \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \frac{e^{t \|A_{:l}\|_1 \|w\|_\infty}}{2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} w_{ij} \right)^2 \quad (\text{by Taylor-Lagrange formula}) \end{aligned}$$

In order to upper-bound this m.g.f, it is necessary to control $\sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il}$ for each l . Since $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il}) = O(n_1 p_{max}) = o(1)$ one can expect that these sums are generally of constant order. Unfortunately, this is not

always the case and one needs to carefully control the number of indexes l such that $\sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il}$ scales as $\sqrt{\log n_1}$. Toward this perspective, let us introduce the events

$$L_1 = \left\{ l \in [n_2] : \sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il} \leq M \right\}$$

and

$$L_2 = \left\{ l \in [n_2] : M < \sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il} \leq C\sqrt{\log n_1} \right\}$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant that will be defined later. Note that conditionally on \mathcal{E} , $[n_2] \subset L_1 \cup L_2$. By using the fact that $w_{ij} = x_i x_j$ and $\sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c} x_j^2 \leq 1$ we obtain

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} \left(e^{t(S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c}(S_\delta))} \right) \leq p_{max} t^2 \frac{e^{tM\|w\|_\infty}}{2} \sum_{l \in L_1} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i \right)^2 + p_{max} t^2 \frac{e^{tC\sqrt{\log n_1}\|w\|_\infty}}{2} \sum_{l \in L_2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i \right)^2.$$

Control of the size of L_2 . Let

$$Y = \sum_l \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_i A_{il} \geq M\}}$$

be the r.v. corresponding to the size of L_1^c . By Chernoff bound,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_i A_{il} \geq M \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_i A_{il} \geq M - 4 \right) \leq e^{-\frac{(M-4)^2}{2n_1 p}} \leq e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}}$$

(by choosing M such that $(M-4)^2 \geq 2C$) since $n_1 p = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 \log n_1}{n_2}}$ and $n_2 \gtrsim n_1 \log^2 n_1$. Hence, by using Bernstein inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(Y - \mathbb{E}(Y) \gtrsim n_2 e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}} \right) \leq e^{-\Omega(n_2)}$$

since $\sqrt{\log n_1} \ll \log n_2$. As a consequence the event

$$\mathcal{E}' = \left\{ |L_1^c| \gtrsim n_2 e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}} \right\}$$

occurs with probability at most $e^{-\Omega(n_2)}$.

Control of the term $\sum_{l \in [L_1]} (\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i)^2$. Let us define the event

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \left\{ \sum_{l \in L_1} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i \right)^2 \geq C_1 n_2 p_{max} \right\}$$

for a constant $C_1 > 0$ large enough. Let us denote $Y_l = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i$. By assumption, $(Y_l^2 \mathbf{1}_{l \in L_1})_l$ are independent and $Y_l^2 \mathbf{1}_{l \in L_1} \leq M^2 \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}$. Besides, we have $\mathbb{E}(Y_l^2) \lesssim p_{max}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y_l^4) &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_4} \mathbb{E}(A_{i_1 l} A_{i_2 l} A_{i_3 l} A_{i_4 l}) x_{i_1} x_{i_2} x_{i_3} x_{i_4} \\ &\leq p \sum_i x_i^4 + 6p^2 \left(\sum_i x_i^2 \right)^2 + 4p^3 \sum_i x_i \sum_i x_i^3 + p^4 \left(\sum_i x_i \right)^4 \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}^2 + p_{max}^3 \sqrt{n_1} + p_{max}^4 n_1^2 \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

By consequence, Bernstein inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l \in [n_2]} \mathbf{1}_{l \in L_1} (Y_l^2 - \mathbb{E}Y_l^2) \gtrsim n_2 p_{max}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-c \min\left(\frac{(n_2 p_{max})^2}{n_2^{3/2} n_1^{-1/2} p_{max}^2}, \frac{n_2 p_{max}}{n_2^{1/2} n_1^{-1/2} p_{max}}\right)} \\ &\leq e^{-c\sqrt{n_1 n_2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Control of the term $\sum_{l \in L_2} (\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i)^2$. Let us define the event

$$\mathcal{E}'_1 = \left\{ \sum_{l \in [n_2]} Y_l^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in L_2\}} \geq C_1 n_2 e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}} p_{max} \right\}.$$

Note that

$$Y_l^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in L_2\}} \leq C \sqrt{\log n_1} \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}$$

for all distinct indices $i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 \in [n_1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(A_{i_1 l} A_{i_2 l} A_{i_3 l} A_{i_4 l} \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in L_2\}}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\{A_{i_1 l} A_{i_2 l} A_{i_3 l} A_{i_4 l} = 1\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_4\}} A_{il} \geq M - 4 \right\}\right) \\ &\leq p_{max}^4 e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}}.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{by independence})$$

By consequence, using the same calculation as in (A.1) we have $\mathbb{E}(Y_l^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in L_2\}}) \lesssim p_{max} e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}}$ and $\mathbb{E}(Y_l^4 \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in L_2\}}) \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}^2 e^{-C\sqrt{\log n_1}}$. Bernstein's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}'_1) \leq e^{-c\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} e^{-2C\sqrt{\log n_1}}.$$

But it is easy to check that, under the lemma assumptions, $n_1 \ll \sqrt{n_1 n_2} e^{-2C\sqrt{\log n_1}}$.

Control of $\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta$. Let us define the event

$$\mathcal{E}_2 = \{|\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta| \geq C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2} p_{max}\}.$$

We have for all $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\log \mathbb{E}(e^{\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta}) &= \sum_{i, j, l} \log(e^{t w_{ij} p_{jl}} p_{il} + 1 - p_{il}) - t w_{ij} p_{jl} p_{il} \\ &\leq \frac{n_2 p_{max}^3}{2} t^2 e^{t \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}} p_{max}^2}\end{aligned}$$

By using Chernoff bound and the choice $t = \frac{1}{p_{max}^2} \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_2}}$ we obtain $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) \leq e^{-cn_1}$ for C_2 large enough.

Conclusion. Let us define

$$\mathcal{E}(\delta) = \left\{ \max_{l \in \Lambda_\delta} \sum_{i \in [n_1]} A_{il} \leq C \sqrt{\log n_1} \right\}.$$

Note that for all δ , $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$ only depends on Λ_δ . For any fixed δ , we have for $t = \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_2 p_{max}^2}}$ and $C_2 > 0$ large enough

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\{S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta \geq 2C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}\} \cap \mathcal{E}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\{S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta \geq 2C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}\} \cap \mathcal{E} | \Lambda_\delta)) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}(\delta)} \mathbb{P}(\{S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta \geq 2C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}\} | \Lambda_\delta)) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}(\delta) \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \mathbb{P}(S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta \geq 2C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}} | \Lambda_\delta)) + 3e^{-cn_1} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}(\delta) \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2^c} \mathbb{P}(S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} S_\delta \geq C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}} | \Lambda_\delta)) + 3e^{-cn_1} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} e^{p_{max} t^2 \frac{e^{tM \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1} p_{max}}}}{2} \sum_{l \in L_1} (\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i)^2}) e^{-tC_2 \sqrt{n_2 n_1} p_{max}} \\
&+ \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^c} e^{p_{max} t^2 \frac{e^{tC \sqrt{\log n_1} \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1} p_{max}}}}{2} \sum_{l \in L_2} (\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta} A_{il} x_i)^2}) e^{-tC_2 \sqrt{n_2 n_1} p_{max}} + 3e^{-cn_1} \\
&\leq 2e^{0.5n_2 p_{max}^2} e^{t^2 \frac{e^{t \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1} p_{max}}}}{2} - tC_2 \sqrt{n_2 n_1} p_{max}} \\
&\lesssim e^{-cn_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By a union bound we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists \delta, \mathcal{E} \cap \{S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta \leq 2C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}\}) \lesssim 2^{n_1} e^{-cn_1} \lesssim e^{-c'n_1}$$

for a constant $c' > 0$. It follows that, conditioned on \mathcal{E} , with probability at least $1 - e^{-c'n_1}$

$$S - \mathbb{E}(S) = 4(\mathbb{E}_\delta(S_\delta) - \mathbb{E}_\delta \mathbb{E}_A S_\delta) \leq 8C_2 \sqrt{n_1 n_2 p_{max}}.$$

The stated result of the Lemma follows by symmetry of S (the weights w_{ij} can be negative). Note that the value of c' depends only on the constants in the events we conditioned on. So, by choosing such constants large enough, we obtain $c' > 11$. \square

Lemma 7. *Assume that the assumption of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Let, $I, J \subset [n_1]$ with $J \subset I$, $S = \sum_{i, j \in [n_1]} w_{ij} \langle A_{i \cdot}, A_{j \cdot} \rangle$ where $w_{ii} = 0$ for all i , $w_{ij} = \mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \mathbf{1}_{j \in J}$. Then for $C > 0$ large enough we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E} \cap \{S \geq C|I||J|n_2 p_{max}^2\}) \leq e^{-\frac{C}{2} n_2 p_{max}^2 C|I||J|}.$$

Proof. Following the same calculation as in Lemma 6 one can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} \left(e^{t(S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c}(S_\delta))} \right) \leq \\
& \leq p_{max} t^2 \sum_{j \in \Lambda_\delta^c \cap J} \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \frac{e^{t\|A_{:l}\|_1}}{2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2 \quad (\text{by Taylor-Lagrange formula}) \\
& \leq p_{max} t^2 |J| \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \frac{e^{t\|A_{:l}\|_1}}{2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2 \\
& \leq p_{max} t^2 |J| \sum_{l \in L_1} \frac{e^{tM}}{2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2 + p_{max} t^2 |J| \sum_{l \in L_2} \frac{e^{tC \sqrt{\log n_1}}}{2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We only highlight the main modifications since the proof is similar to Lemma 6.

Control of the term $\sum_{l \in L_1} (\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il})^2$. Let us define the event

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1 = \left\{ \sum_{l \in [n_2]} \mathbf{1}_{l \in L_1} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2 \geq C_1 n_2 p_{max} \right\}$$

for a constant $C_1 > 0$ large enough.

By the same calculation as in Lemma 6, one can show that Bernstein inequality leads to

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l \in L_1} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2 \gtrsim n_2 p_{max} |I| \right) \leq e^{-\Omega(n_2 p_{max} |I|)} \leq e^{-\Omega(n_2 p_{max}^2 |I| |J|)}.$$

Control of the term $\sum_{l \in L_2} (\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il})^2$. Let us define the event

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}'_1 = \left\{ \sum_{l \in [n_2]} Y_l^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{l \in L_2\}} \geq C_1 n_2 e^{-C \sqrt{\log n_1}} p_{max} \right\}.$$

By the same calculation as in Lemma 6, one can show that Bernstein inequality leads to

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l \in L_2} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_\delta \cap I} A_{il} \right)^2 \gtrsim n_2 p_{max} |I| e^{-C \sqrt{\log n_1}} \right) \leq e^{-\Omega(n_2 p_{max} |I|)} \leq e^{-\Omega(n_2 p_{max}^2 |I| |J|)}.$$

Conclusion. We have shown that conditionally on \mathcal{E}

$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c} \left(e^{t(S_\delta - \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda^c}(S_\delta))} \right) \lesssim n_2 p_{max}^2 |I| |J| t^2 e^{tM} + n_2 p_{max}^2 |I| |J| t^2 e^{(t-c')C \sqrt{\log n_1}}.$$

One can conclude by using Chernoff bound and choosing $t = 1$. □