

EXACT RECOVERY FOR THE NON-UNIFORM HYPERGRAPH STOCHASTIC BLOCK MODEL

IOANA DUMITRIU AND HAIXIAO WANG

ABSTRACT. Consider the community detection problem in random hypergraphs under the non-uniform hypergraph stochastic block model (HSBM), where each hyperedge appears independently with some given probability depending only on the labels of its vertices. We establish, for the first time in the literature, a sharp threshold for exact recovery under this non-uniform case, subject to minor constraints; in particular, we consider the model with multiple communities ($K \geq 2$). One crucial point here is that by aggregating information from all the uniform layers, we may obtain exact recovery even in cases when this may appear impossible if each layer were considered alone. Two efficient algorithms that successfully achieve exact recovery above the threshold are provided. The theoretical analysis of our algorithms relies on the concentration and regularization of the adjacency matrix for non-uniform random hypergraphs, which could be of independent interest. We also address some open problems regarding parameter knowledge and estimation.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Non-uniform hypergraph stochastic block model	3
1.2. Main results	5
1.3. Related literature	6
1.4. Organization	9
1.5. Notation	9
2. Proof of impossibility	9
3. Stage I: Weak consistency by spectral initialization	11
4. Stage II: Strong consistency without prior knowledge of probability parameters	14
5. Exact recovery with prior knowledge	16
5.1. Hypergraph splitting	16
5.2. Almost exact recovery	16
5.3. Local correction	16
6. Estimation for number of communities	19
Eigenvalue separation	20
Proportional degrees pitfalls and possible fixes	20
7. Concluding remarks	20
Acknowledgments	21
References	21
Appendices	28
Appendix A. The Kahn-Szemerédi Approach and Proofs of Concentration	28
A.1. Proof Outline of Theorem 3.1	28
A.2. Light couples	29
A.3. Heavy couples	29
A.4. Proof of Theorem 3.3	33
Appendix B. Proofs in Section 2	35
Appendix C. Proofs in Section 3	36
Appendix D. Proofs in Section 4	40
Appendix E. Proofs in Section 5	50
Appendix F. Technical Lemmas	55

Date: July 24, 2023.

1. INTRODUCTION

The task of *community detection*, or *clustering*, consists in partitioning the vertices of a graph into groups that are similarly connected [1]. It has become one of the central problems in network analysis and machine learning [98, 92, 93, 14]. Random graph models, which generate community structure with a specified ground truth, have been frequently employed in many clustering algorithms, for benchmarking and proving theoretical guarantees. Mathematically, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on n vertices, where $V = [n]$ is composed of K disjoint blocks, i.e., $V = \cup_{k=1}^K V_k$. Then the proportion of each block can be denoted by $\alpha_k = |V_k|/|V|$ and we define the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_1 = 1$. Let $\mathbf{z} \in [K]^n$ denote the membership vector of the vertices, i.e., $z_v = k$ if the vertex v belongs to block V_k . Let $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ denote an estimation of \mathbf{z} obtained from some algorithm. To evaluate the accuracy of $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, we define the *mismatch* ratio, which counts the proportion of incorrectly clustered nodes:

$$(1.1) \quad \eta_n := \eta(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \frac{1}{n} \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_K} \mathbb{D}_{\text{HD}}(\pi \circ \mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}),$$

where the *Hamming distance* $\mathbb{D}_{\text{HD}}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$ counts the number of entries having different values in \mathbf{z} and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$. Here, $\pi \circ \mathbf{z}$, defined by $(\pi \circ \mathbf{z})(i) = \pi(\mathbf{z}(i))$ entrywisely, is the same assignment as \mathbf{z} up to some permutation π , and \mathcal{S}_K denotes the group of all permutations on $[K]$. Note that a random guess estimator has expected accuracy $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^{-2}$ ¹, thus the output $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is meaningful only if $\eta_n \leq 1 - \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2$. Then, the recovery problem can be divided into several different regimes according to η_n [1].

- (1) Exact recovery (strong consistency): $\mathbb{P}(\eta_n = 0) \geq 1 - o(1)$.
- (2) Almost exact recovery (weak consistency): $\mathbb{P}(\eta_n = o(1)) \geq 1 - o(1)$.
- (3) Partial recovery: $\mathbb{P}(\eta_n \leq 1 - \gamma) \geq 1 - o(1)$ for $\gamma \in (\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2, 1)$.
- (4) Weak recovery (detection): $\mathbb{P}(\eta_n \leq 1 - \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2 - \Omega(1)) \geq 1 - o(1)$ ².

The *Stochastic block model* (SBM), where vertices are densely connected within each community but sparsely connected across different communities (*assortative* case), was first introduced in the pioneering work [64] for sociology research. It has been extensively studied in [26, 22, 46, 99, 37, 85, 19, 35, 20, 96, 34, 14, 104] over the past several decades, driven by exploring the phase transition behaviors in various connectivity regimes. In the regime where the expected degrees grow logarithmically with respect to the number of vertices, a major breakthrough was the establishment of the exact recovery thresholds for binary [2, 89] and multi-block case [4, 111, 8], where both necessary and sufficient conditions were provided. For the case where the expected degrees are of constant order, phase transition behavior for detection was discovered in [41, 40, 39], and later it was connected to the *Kesten-Stigum* (KS) threshold, with the necessity [90] and sufficiency [84, 88] rigorously proved for the binary block case. For the multi-block case, it was shown that a spectral clustering algorithm based on the non-backtracking operator [23], and the acyclic belief propagation method [5], succeed all the way down to the KS threshold, proving a conjecture in [75]. The necessity for $K = 3, 4$ was partly established in [91]. However, the threshold is not known when the number of communities is more than 4, although it is known to be below the KS threshold [16, 5, 91].

The literature abounds with different methods of approach, like spectral methods [85, 35, 108, 110, 111, 32, 78, 105, 79, 7], sphere comparison [4, 6], as well as *semidefinite programming* (SDP) [58, 59, 67, 68, 87, 8, 95, 15]. Recently, some more general variants of SBM have been introduced, such as degree-corrected SBM [72, 52, 9, 71], contextual SBM [42, 82, 3], labeled SBM [62, 108, 110, 111], and multilayer SBM [29, 9, 83]. Readers may refer to [1] for a more detailed review.

While graphs are usually used to depict pairwise relationships among data, hypergraphs are able to capture more complex relationships [18, 17], including but not limited to biological networks [86, 102], citation networks [69], recommendation systems [25, 80] and image data [56, 107], and they have been empirically shown to be better than graph models [114]. Besides that, hypergraphs and their spectral theory have also found applications in data science [66, 115, 61], combinatorics [50, 100, 45], and statistical physics [27, 97].

¹By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|_2^2 \geq 1/K$, which is the accuracy lower bound without knowing $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

²Here, we can only say that $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is better than random guess, while its accuracy is not characterized explicitly as γ in partial recovery.

The *hypergraph stochastic block model* (HSBM), as a generalization of graph SBM, was first introduced in [55], where each edge of the uniform hypergraph appears independently with some given probability. In recent years, many efforts have been made to study community detection problems on random hypergraphs. For exact recovery of uniform HSBMs, it was shown that the phase transition occurs in the regime where the expected degree is at least logarithmic in the number of vertices [81, 30], while the exact thresholds were given in [74, 53, 112] by generalizing techniques in [2, 7, 4]. Spectral methods were considered in [55, 11, 54, 30, 36, 53, 112], while SDP methods were analyzed in [74, 77, 53]. Meanwhile, results about almost exact and partial recovery were shown in [54, 30, 31, 73, 44]. For detection of the uniform HSBM, it is conjectured in [13] that the phase transition occurs in the regime of constant expected degrees, and the sufficiency for the binary and multi-block case was addressed in [94] and [101] respectively. [57] proved that detection is impossible below the *Kesten-Stigum* threshold for 3 and 4 uniform hypergraphs, while KS threshold is not tight for 7 or higher uniform hypergraphs.

It is worth noting that most results concern community detection on uniform hypergraphs, which require the same number of vertices per edge. This is a constraining and somewhat impractical assumption. As will be demonstrated in Remark 1.14, the thresholds for the non-uniform case show that using the information from all uniform layers yields strictly better results than considering each layer alone. However, the non-uniform HSBM was less explored in the literature, with notable results in [54, 44, 12, 33, 106]. Generally, the results here only regarded sufficiency and did not establish the fundamental thresholds.

In this paper, we establish, *for the first time in the literature*, both sufficiency and necessity conditions for exact recovery in the non-uniform HSBM case, with exact thresholds covering all but a negligible fraction of the space of problems. Above this threshold, the structural information about the communities is strong enough such that there exists efficient algorithms 1, 2 to label every vertex correctly with high probability; below this threshold, we prove that exact recovery is information-theoretically impossible.

1.1. Non-uniform hypergraph stochastic block model. The non-uniform HSBM was first studied in [54], which can be treated as a superposition of several uniform HSBMs with different model parameters. It is a more realistic model to study higher-order interaction on networks [107] since the equi-size constraint on each hyperedge is removed. We introduce the rigorous definition of uniform HSBM first, and extend it to non-uniform hypergraphs.

Definition 1.1 (Hypergraph). *A hypergraph H is a pair $H = (V, E)$ with V being a set of vertices and E denoting the set of non-empty subsets of V . If every hyperedge e is an m -subset of V , then H is called m -uniform. The degree of a vertex $v \in V$ is the number of hyperedges in H that contains v .*

A faithful representation of an m -uniform hypergraph is to associate it to a tensor.

Definition 1.2 (Adjacency tensor). *One can associate an m -uniform hypergraph $H_m = ([n], E_m)$ to an order- m symmetric tensor $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$, where $\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}$ denotes the presence of some m -hyperedge e , i.e., $\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} := \mathcal{A}_{i_1, \dots, i_m}^{(m)} = \mathbb{1}_{\{e \in E_m\}}$ for $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [n]$, and $\mathcal{A}_{i_{\pi(1)}, \dots, i_{\pi(m)}}^{(m)} = \mathcal{A}_{i_{\pi(1)}, \dots, i_{\pi(m)}}^{(m)}$ for any permutation π on $[m]$.*

Let $n, K \in \mathbb{N}_+$ represent the number of vertices and communities respectively. The vertex set V is partitioned into classes V_1, \dots, V_K probabilistically according to a *probability vector* $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$ with $\|\alpha\|_1 = 1$, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(v \in V_k) = \mathbb{P}(z_v = k) = \alpha_k$ with $V_k := \{v \in [n] | z_v = k\}$ for each $k \in [K]$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_K$ and no entry of α vanishes. The HSBM is characterized by a partition of vertices into different classes, such that all vertices in a given class are, in a very concrete sense, interchangeable.

Definition 1.3 (Uniform HSBM). *Let n, K, α be defined as above, and each entry of the membership vector \mathbf{z} is sampled independently under α . Let $\mathcal{Q}^{(m)} \in (\mathbb{R}^K)^{\otimes m}$ be an order- m symmetric tensor such that $\mathcal{Q}_{z_1, \dots, z_m}^{(m)} = \mathcal{Q}_{z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(m)}}^{(m)}$ for any permutation π on $[m]$. Each possible edge $e = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ is generated with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 1) = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{z}(e)}^{(m)}$, where $\mathbf{z}(e) = \{z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_m}\}$ represents the membership sequence of edge e . We denote this distribution on the set of m -uniform hypergraphs by*

$$(1.2) \quad (\mathbf{z}, H_m) \sim \text{HSBM}_m(n, \alpha, \mathcal{Q}^{(m)}), \quad m \in \mathcal{M}.$$




FIGURE 1. Symmetry of probability tensors $\mathcal{Q}^{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{(3)}$.


Due to the symmetry of $\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}$ shown in Figure 1, the probability of an edge $e \in E(H)$ being present will depend only on the *membership counts* of $\mathbf{z}(e)$, denoted by $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(e) = (w_1, \dots, w_K)$, i.e., w_k nodes belong to V_k , making \mathbf{w} a *weak composition* of m with K parts.

Definition 1.4 (Weak composition [21]). *A sequence of integers $\mathbf{w} := (w_1, \dots, w_K)$, fulfilling $\sum_{k=1}^K w_k = m$ and $w_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in [K]$, is called a weak composition of m . Let \mathcal{WC}_m^K denote the set of weak compositions of m into K parts, then the cardinality of this set is $|\mathcal{WC}_m^K| = \binom{m+K-1}{K-1}$.*

One can build $\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}$ from the set of probabilities $\{\mathcal{Q}_w^{(m)}\}_{w \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K}$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, since the probability of an edge, by symmetry, depends only on its weak composition formed by membership counts. In the following of this paper, we will use $\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_w^{(m)}$ alternately for ease of the presentation. The non-uniform HSBM can be built from uniform ones as illustrated in [54].

Definition 1.5 (Non-uniform HSBM). *Let $\mathcal{M} = \{m : m \geq 2, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a set of integers with finite cardinality. The membership vector \mathbf{z} is first sampled under α , then for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, H_m is independently drawn from $\text{HSBM}_m(n, \alpha, \mathcal{Q}^{(m)})$ 1.3. The non-uniform hypergraph H is a collection of m -uniform hypergraphs, i.e., $H = \cup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} H_m$.*

Examples of 2-uniform and 3-uniform HSBM, and an example of non-uniform HSBM with $M = 3$ and $K = 4$ can be seen in Figure 2a, Figure 2b, Figure 2c respectively.



Most of the computations involving tensors are NP-hard [63]. Instead, our analysis is based on the following key concept, the *adjacency matrix*.

Definition 1.6 (Adjacency matrix). For the non-uniform hypergraph H , let $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ be the order- m adjacency tensor corresponding to each underlying m -uniform hypergraph for $m \in \mathcal{M}$. The adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} := [A_{ij}]_{n \times n}$ of H is defined by

$$(1.3) \quad A_{ij} := \mathbb{1}_{\{i \neq j\}} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \supset \{i, j\}}} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)},$$

where $A_{ii} = 0$ for $i \in [n]$ since in our model each edge of size m contains m distinct vertices.

1.2. Main results. This paper focuses on establishing the threshold for exact recovery, which typically requires the average degree to be at least logarithmic in the number of vertices. For ease of presentation, we rewrite the notations to accommodate the regime.

Definition 1.7 (Exact recovery regime). For model 1.5, we write the generating probability of hyperedge $e = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ as

$$(1.4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 1) = \mathcal{Q}_{z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_m}}^{(m)} = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{z}(e)}^{(m)} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{z}(e)}^{(m)} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}}$$

where $\mathbf{z}(e)$ is the membership vector of the vertices in e , and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$ denotes the weak composition formulated by $\mathbf{z}(e)$. Under exact recovery regime, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{z}(e)}^{(m)} \gtrsim 1$ for any m -hyperedge $e \in E_m$ with $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

To establish the necessity condition (Theorem 1.8) for exact recovery, define the *generalized Chernoff-Hellinger* (GCH) divergence as follows

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} = \min_{j, k \in [K], j \neq k} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k),$$

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) := \max_{t \in [0, 1]} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} [t \mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1-t) \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^t \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t}],$$

where for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, $k \oplus \mathbf{w} := (w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_k + 1, w_{k+1}, \dots, w_K)$ and

$$(1.6) \quad \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} := \prod_{l=1}^K \binom{\lfloor \alpha_l n \rfloor}{w_l}.$$

Theorem 1.8 (Impossibility). For model 1.5 under (1.4), it is impossible to achieve exact recovery when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} < 1$, i.e., every algorithm will misclassify at least one vertex.

While Theorem 1.8 establishes the necessary conditions for exact recovery, Theorems 1.9 and 1.13 present the sufficient conditions for almost exact and exact recovery respectively.

Theorem 1.9 (Weak consistency). Let ρ_n (3.1) denote the maximum expected degree among all vertices. When Assumption 1.10 is satisfied, Algorithm 3 achieves almost exact recovery as long as $\rho_n = \omega(1)$, i.e., $\eta_n = o(1)$.

Assumption 1.10. For each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-2}^K$, denote $j \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w} := (w_1, \dots, w_j + 1, \dots, w_l + 1, \dots, w_K) \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$. For every distinct pair $j, k \in [K]$, there exists some $l \in [K]$ and constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the tensors $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ satisfy

$$(1.7) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\rho_n} \cdot \left| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-2}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot (\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \right| \geq \varepsilon.$$

Remark 1.11. The set of tensors violating Assumption 1.10 lies on the hyperplane $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-2}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot (\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) = 0$, which is a linear subspace of the entire parameter space. Therefore, the set of problems that can't be solved by Algorithm 3 is negligible in the entire problem space.

Remark 1.12. With the knowledge of tensors $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$, when Assumption 1.10 fails for the non-uniform hypergraph but holds true for at least one single layer, one could construct the weighted adjacency matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} w_m \mathbf{A}^{(m)}$ as an input for Algorithm 3 under some proper weights $\{w_m\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ to meet Assumption 1.10,

and obtain an almost exact labelling. Importantly, the second stage refinement, which reverts to using \mathbf{A} , does not rely on Assumption 1.10, therefore the threshold will not be affected by such weights.

Assumption 1.10 is equivalent to saying that no two rows of the expected adjacency matrix are equal (but, in our more general model where the probability connectivities $\mathcal{P}_w^{(m)}$ do not have to be specified exactly and may depend on n , the proper way to impose this condition is to use inequality (1.7) above). Remark 1.12 emphasizes that in fact this can be boiled down to an "all the layers" condition, where (1.7) happens on a layer by layer basis. This is a natural extension of the condition in [4] for the graph case $\mathcal{M} = \{2\}$, and it also appears in [112] in the special, critical case where the $\mathcal{P}_w^{(m)}$ are all constant and the $\liminf \geq \varepsilon$ becomes $\neq 0$.

However, while in the graph case this condition is truly necessary for achievability (since its absence creates two classes that are indistinguishable from one another), it is not yet clear this is the case for Assumption 1.10. It is certainly needed for any method using the adjacency matrix to succeed, but, as shown in [112], due to the many parameters involved, one may construct a model with distinguishable classes but for which the adjacency matrix has identical rows (this will be an "unsolvable", so far, uniform case). Remark 1.12 shows that the only cases not covered by Theorem 1.9 lie at the intersection of these unsolvable (so far) uniform cases.

Intuitively, Assumption 1.10 is originated from the loss of information when tensors $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ are compressed to matrix \mathbf{A} . It is worth noting that tensor-based models like [73, 60, 10] also necessitate additional assumptions, for example on the size of the smallest singular values (e.g., Assumption 2 in [10]). It remains to be seen if some other (non-spectral) method can be used to eliminate the few remaining boundary cases.

Theorem 1.13 (Strong consistency). *When Assumption 1.10 is satisfied.*

(1) (Agnostic) *If $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$ and Assumption 1.15 is satisfied, then with high probability, the output $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ by Algorithm 1 achieves exact recovery without prior knowledge of $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$.*

(2) (With knowledge) *If $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$ and parameters $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ of model 1.5 are known, then Algorithm 2 achieves exact recovery with high probability, i.e., $\eta_n = 0$.*

Remark 1.14. *Threshold (1.5) indicates that the structural information of the non-uniform hypergraph is stronger than the uniform one. Exact recovery is achievable when all uniform layers are aggregated, even if it is impossible when only one of the uniform layer is used. An example with numerical experiments is discussed in [106].*

Assumption 1.15. *There exists some absolute positive constant $C_{(1.8)} > 1$ such that the probability tensors $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ in model 1.5 satisfy*

$$(1.8) \quad C_{(1.8)} := \max_{\substack{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}C_m^K \\ m \in \mathcal{M}}} \frac{\mathcal{Q}_w^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{w'}^{(m)}}.$$

Remark 1.16. *Assumption 1.15 ensures that the expected degrees of vertices are proportional up to some universal constant. If $C_{(1.8)} = 1$, then $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} = 0$ and this results in a non-uniform Erdős-Rényi hypergraph. As will be discussed in Section 4, Assumption 1.15 is crucial for accurate estimation of $\mathcal{Q}_w^{(m)}$ in Algorithm 1. Algorithm 2 requiring the knowledge of $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ does not need this assumption.*

Both Algorithms 1 and 2 consist of two stages: initial estimation and refinement. They share the same first stage with the membership assignment obtained from a spectral algorithm. The initial stage Algorithm 3 assigns all but a vanishing fraction of vertices correctly. As for the second stage, the Algorithm 1 refines iteratively based on an estimator minimizing *Kullback-Leibler* (KL) divergence. Algorithm 2 refines according to *Maximum a posteriori* (MAP) estimation, where the knowledge of generating probabilities is needed.

Remark 1.17. *The number of communities K is required as an input for Algorithms 1, 2, 3. As will be discussed in Section 6, this requirement can be removed.*

1.3. Related literature. Our results are most general to date, covering non-uniform hypergraphs with multiple communities. We now illustrate how they fit into existing literature.

Algorithm 1: Agnostic Partition

Data: The adjacency tensors $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$, number of communities K .

- 1 Run **Trimming 4** on \mathbf{A} with $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_1$ in **3.3** to obtain the regularized matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$;
- 2 Run **Spectral Initialization 3** on with input $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}, K$ to obtain the initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$;
- 3 Run **Agnostic Refinement 5** with input $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}, K, \{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ and obtain the output $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$;

Result: $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$

Algorithm 2: Partition with Prior Knowledge

Data: $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, K$, probability tensors $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$.

- 1 Run **Splitting 6** on H with parameter $\theta_n = \log \log(n)$ to obtain two hypergraphs $H^{(0)}, H^{(1)}$.
- 2 Run **Trimming 4** on $H^{(0)}$ to construct the regularized adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ with $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_2$ in **3.3**.
- 3 Run **Spectral Initialization 3** with input $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}, K$ to obtain the initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$.
- 4 Run **Correction 7** on $H^{(1)}$ to refine the initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$ and output $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = (\hat{z}_1, \dots, \hat{z}_n)$.

Result: $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$

1.3.1. *Graphs.* For binary symmetric SBM($n, 2, a \frac{\log(n)}{n}, b \frac{\log(n)}{n}$), it is known that the threshold is $\mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(a, b) := (\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})^2/2$, which can be obtained from (2.1) by taking $\mathcal{M} = \{2\}$ and $K = 2$. Exact recovery can be achieved efficiently if $\mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(a, b) \geq 1$, but is impossible when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(a, b) < 1$ [2, 89]. For multi-block SBM($n, \alpha, \mathbf{P} \frac{\log(n)}{n}$), exact recovery can be achieved efficiently when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{CH}}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) \geq 1$, but is impossible when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{CH}}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) < 1$ [4, 6, 111], where

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{CH}}(\alpha, \mathbf{P}) = \min_{j, k \in [K], j \neq k} \mathbb{D}_{\text{CH}}(i, j), \quad \mathbb{D}_{\text{CH}}(i, j) := \max_{t \in [0, 1]} \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_l \cdot [tP_{jl} + (1-t)P_{kl} - (P_{jl})^t (P_{kl})^{1-t}]$$

denotes the *Chernoff-Hellinger* (CH) divergence, which can be deduced from (1.5) by taking $\mathcal{M} = \{2\}$. Table 1 reviews the related literature where exact recovery was achieved above the threshold. For simplicity, the time complexity of singular value decomposition in our case is $O(n^3)$. When referring to the complexity of SDP, a factor of $\log^{O(1)}(n/\varepsilon)$ is hidden, with ε being the accuracy of the output. If the algorithm has two stages, the entry (e.g., $n^3 + n$) represents the sum of the complexities for the first ($O(n^3)$) and second ($O(n)$) stages. If K is needed as input but $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ are not, the entry in column 'No prior' is marked as \checkmark . If K is not needed either, the entry is marked as \checkmark . The second stage algorithms in [2, 89] are based on the "Majority vote" principle. In [111], the estimator in second stage is aiming at minimizing *Kullback-Leibler* (KL) divergence between estimated and true distribution.

Graph	$K = 2$	$K \geq 3$	First-stage	Second-stage	Strong Consistency	Time Complexity	No prior
[2]	\checkmark	\times	Spectral	Majority	\checkmark	$2n^2 + n$	\checkmark
	\checkmark	\times	MLE	\times	\checkmark	NP-hard	\times
[59]	\checkmark	\times	SDP	\times	\checkmark	$n^{3.5}$ [70]	\checkmark
[4]	\checkmark	\checkmark	Sphere	Degree	\checkmark	$n^{1+1/\log(c)}$	\times
[6]	\checkmark	\checkmark	Comparison	Profiling	\checkmark	$n^{1+1/\log(c)}$	\checkmark
[89]	\checkmark	\times	Spectral	Majority	\checkmark	$2n^2 + n$	\checkmark
[111]	\checkmark	\checkmark	Spectral	KL	\checkmark	$Kn^2 + Kn \log(n)$	\checkmark
[51]	\checkmark	\checkmark	Spectral	MLE	\checkmark	$Kn^2 + Kn^3$	\checkmark
[7]	\checkmark	\times	Spectral	\times	\checkmark	$2n^2$	\checkmark

TABLE 1. Relevant literature for exact recovery in graph SBM

1.3.2. *Hypergraphs*. So far, all thresholds obtained in existing literature only for uniform hypergraphs. Our results establish, for the first time, the threshold for the non-uniform case, in the sense of showing both achievability above and impossibility below. Related literature can be seen in Table 2.

For the binary symmetric uniform model $\text{HSBM}(n, 2, a_m \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}}, b_m \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}})$, the threshold for exact recovery is given by $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GH}} := 2^{-(m-1)}(\sqrt{a_m} - \sqrt{b_m})^2$ [74], which is a special case of (2.1) by taking $\mathcal{M} = \{m\}$, $K = 2$ and symmetries among edges crossing two communities. Exact recovery is impossible if $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GH}} < 1$ [74], but can be achieved efficiently if $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GH}} > 1$ [74, 53]. For multi-block case, the model formulation of [112] is a bit different from our model 1.3, since multisets are allowed as edges there. Our proofs work for their case as well if some steps are skipped. If after proper scaling, their threshold for uniform $\text{HSBM}(n, \alpha, \mathcal{P}^{(m)} \log(n)/\binom{n-1}{m-1})$ can be written as $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} = \min_{j,k \in [K], j \neq k} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k)$, with

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) := \max_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} \mathcal{C}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} [t \mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1-t) \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^t \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t}],$$

which can be recovered from (1.5) if by taking $\mathcal{M} = \{m\}$. Exact recovery is impossible when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} < 1$, but can be achieved with the full knowledge of tensor $\mathcal{P}^{(m)}$ and number of communities K when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$ [112].

Hypergraph	Uni-form	Non-uni-form	$K = 2$	$K \geq 3$	First-stage	Second-stage	Strong Consistency	Time Complexity	No Prior
[54]	✓	✓	✓	✓	Spectral	✗	✗	Kn^2	✓
[74]	✓	✗	✓	✗	SDP	✗	✓ ³	$n^{3.5}$	✓
[31]	✓	✗	✓	✓	Spectral	MLE	✓	$Kn^2 + Kn^3$	✓
[53]	✓	✗	✓	✗	Spectral	✗	✓	$2n^2$	✓
	✓	✗	✓	✗	SDP	✗	✓	$n^{3.5}$	✓
[112]	✓	✗	✓	✓	Spectral	MAP	✓	$Kn^2 + n$	✗
[106]	✓	✓	✓	✗	Spectral	✗	✓	$2n^2$	✓
Algorithm 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	Spectral	KL	✓	$Kn^2 + Kn \log(n)$	✓✓
Algorithm 2	✓	✓	✓	✓	Spectral	MAP	✓	$Kn^2 + Kn$	✗

TABLE 2. Relevant literature for exact recovery in hypergraph SBM

1.3.3. *Our contributions*. Theorem 1.9 is the first result showing that weak consistency can be achieved under general non-uniform HSBM as long as $\rho_n = \omega(1)$. Previously, [44] achieved weak consistency when $1 \ll \rho_n \ll \log(n)$ only under a special case of model 1.5. Their results can't be generalized to the regime $\rho_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ since the theoretical guarantee of η_n is no longer valid. [113] analyzed non-uniform hypergraph community detection by using hypergraph embedding and optimization algorithms and obtained weak consistency when $\rho_n \gtrsim \omega(\log n)$, a regime covered by our results. In [73], the authors studied the degree-corrected uniform HSBM by using a tensor power iteration method, and achieved weak consistency when the average degree is $\omega(\log^2 n)$, again covered by our results. A way to generalize their algorithm to non-uniform hypergraphs was discussed, but the theoretical analysis remains open.

The setting in [54] is most similar to our model 1.5, but it only achieved weak consistency when the minimum expected degree is at least of order $\log^2(n)$ without establishing a sharp threshold. Their algorithm can't be applied to the regime $\rho_n \lesssim \log(n)$ straightforwardly due to the lack of concentration for the

³[53] proved that SDP achieves exact recovery when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{SDP}}^{(m)} > 1$ where $\mathbb{D}_{\text{SDP}}^{(m)} > \mathbb{D}_{\text{GH}}^{(m)}$, leaving the area between $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GH}}^{(m)}$ and $\mathbb{D}_{\text{SDP}}^{(m)}$ unexplored.

normalized Laplacian because of the existence of isolated vertices. We were able to overcome this issue by focusing on the adjacency matrix. Similar to [48, 76], we regularized the adjacency matrix by zeroing out rows and columns of the adjacency matrix with large degrees (Algorithm 4) and proved a concentration result for the regularized matrix down to the bounded expected degree regime (Theorem 3.3).

In terms of strong consistency, Theorem 1.8 establishes the necessary condition under general non-uniform HSBM for the first time, and Theorem 1.13 is the first result to provide efficient algorithms for the general non-uniform case. Previously, strong consistency was only achieved under uniform-HSBM for binary [74, 53], multi-block case [31, 60, 112] and non-uniform binary case [106]. The method in [60] was not specialized to HSBM, and no sharp threshold relevant to HSBM was provided. The refinement stage is crucial for multi-block case, which brings in the sharp threshold [4, 111, 31, 112]. In Algorithm 2 and [112], the second stage is based on *Maximum A Posteriori* (MAP) estimation, where the MAP achieves the minimum error and full knowledge of $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ is required. Meanwhile, the agnostic refinement scheme in [31] is based on *local Maximum Likelihood Estimation* (MLE), which works well for uniform hypergraphs. It remains to see whether this method can be generalized for non-uniform hypergraphs. Additionally, the time complexity of [31] is $O(n^4)$, since the spectral initialization is run n times during the refinement stage. So far, Algorithm 1 is the only one that achieves strong consistency agnostically with the lowest time complexity.

1.4. Organization. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the proof of Theorem 1.8. The proofs of Theorem 1.9, Theorem 1.13 (1), (2) are presented in Sections 3, 4, 5 respectively. We will discuss estimating the number of communities in Section 6. Some open problems will be addressed in Section 7.

1.5. Notation. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathbb{1}\{A\}$ denote the indicator function, and $\mathbb{1}\{A\} = 1$ when event A is true. The lowercase letters (e.g., a, b), lowercase boldface letters (e.g., \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), uppercase boldface letters (e.g., \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{W}), and boldface calligraphic letters (e.g., \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Q}) are used to denote scalars, vectors, matrices, and tensors respectively. Let $\mathbf{1}_n$ denote the all one column vector of length n . For vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\|\mathbf{a}\|_p = (\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p)^{1/p}$ denote the ℓ_p norm of \mathbf{a} for $p \geq 1$. For matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let A_{ij} , $\mathbf{A}_{i\cdot}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot j}$ denote its (i, j) th entry, i -th row and j -th column respectively. Let $\|\mathbf{A}\| := \max_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2=1} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} A_{ij}^2}$ denote the operator and Frobenius norm respectively. For any two sequences of numbers $\{a_n\}, \{b_n\}$, denote $a_n = O(b_n)$ or $a_n \lesssim b_n$ (resp. $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$ or $a_n \gtrsim b_n$) if there exists some constants C and n_0 such that $a_n \leq C b_n$ (resp. $a_n \geq C b_n$) for all $n \geq n_0$. Denote $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ or $a_n \asymp b_n$ if both $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $a_n \gtrsim b_n$. Denote $a_n = o(b_n)$ or $a_n \ll b_n$ (resp. $a_n = \omega(b_n)$ or $a_n \gg b_n$) if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ s.t. $a_n < \varepsilon b_n$ (resp. $a_n > \varepsilon b_n$) for all $n \geq n_0$.

2. PROOF OF IMPOSSIBILITY

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.8 with the proofs of Lemmas deferred to Appendix B. For model 1.5, the main idea is to show the existence of $2 \log(n)$ pairwise disconnected ambiguous vertices (deferred to Definition 2.2) when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} < 1$, half from V_j and half from V_k for some $j \neq k \in [K]$. Those vertices maintain the same degree profile and no algorithm performs better than random guess, which leads to the failure of exact recovery. By contrast, the central idea of [106, Theorem 2.1] is to explicitly construct some configuration where the optimal estimator MAP fails. Note that \mathbb{D}_{GCH} (1.5) can be reduced to \mathbb{D}_{GH} [106, Equation (2.1)] when the general model is restricted to the binary symmetric model. Therefore, those two distinct proofs can be viewed as a mutual verification for the correctness of the thresholds.

We focus on the border case first, where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = \Theta(1)$ in (1.4). Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) < 1$ for some $j, k \in [K]$. We are going to show that every algorithm would misclassify at least one node between V_j and V_k with high probability, where similar ideas appeared in [4]. For vertex $v \in [n]$, let d_v denote the number of hyperedges containing v . Note that each m -hyperedge $e \ni v$ can be classified into different categories according to the distribution of the other $m-1$ nodes among V_1, \dots, V_K , then d_v adapts the following decomposition as a summation of independent random variables $d_v := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ due to edge-wise independence, where $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ counts the number of m -hyperedges containing v with the other $m-1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} among V_1, \dots, V_K . Let \mathcal{D}_v and $\mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ denote the laws of d_v and $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ respectively,

then

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{D}_v := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}.$$

Assume that v belongs to block k , i.e., $z_v = k$, then the distribution of membership among blocks in e is denoted by $k \oplus \mathbf{w} := (w_1, \dots, w_{k-1}, w_k + 1, w_{k+1}, \dots, w_K)$. According to Definition 1.5, $\mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|_{z_v=k} \sim \text{Bin}(n_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$, where for each $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_K) \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$,

$$(2.2) \quad n_{\mathbf{w}} := \prod_{l=1}^K \binom{|V_l|}{w_l}$$

denotes the capacity of such m -hyperedges. Lemma 2.1 indicates that $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ in (1.6) is a good approximation of $n_{\mathbf{w}}$.

Lemma 2.1. *A simple application of Hoeffding (Lemma F.4) proves that $\|V_l| - \alpha_l n| \leq \sqrt{n} \log(n)$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-\log(n)}$. Consequently, $n_{\mathbf{w}}$ (2.2) can be approximated well by $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ (1.6) for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, since*

$$(2.3) \quad (1 - \log(n)/\sqrt{n})^{m-1} \leq n_{\mathbf{w}}/\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \leq (1 + \log(n)/\sqrt{n})^{m-1}.$$

Let $t^* \in [0, 1]$ be the point where the maximum of $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k)$ is attained, then t^* should be the critical point for the function we maximize, i.e.,

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} [\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} \log \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}] = 0.$$

The uniqueness of t^* is guaranteed by the fact that the function to the left of the equal sign in (2.4) is strictly decreasing. For each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$ with t^* being the solution to (2.4), define *degree profile* as

$$(2.5) \quad d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) := \left[(\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} (\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} \cdot \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \log(n) \left[\binom{n-1}{m-1} \right]^{-1} \right].$$

Definition 2.2 (Ambiguous). *A vertex $v \in [n]$ is said to be ambiguous between communities V_j and V_k if $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})$ for every weak composition $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$.*

Lemma 2.3 characterizes the probability of v being ambiguous.

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that vertex v is in cluster k , i.e., $z_v = k$. If $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) < 1$ for some $j \neq k$, then the probability of vertex v being ambiguous is $n^{-\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j,k)+o(1)}$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset [n]$ be a set of vertices with size $\lfloor n \log^{-3}(n) \rfloor$. A simple application of Chernoff shows that with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-3})$, $|\mathcal{S} \cap V_k|$ has size $\alpha_k n \log^{-3}(n)$ with deviation at most $O(\sqrt{n})$. A vertex $v \in \mathcal{S}$ with $z_v = k$ is said to be ambiguous between communities $V_j \setminus \mathcal{S}$ and $V_k \setminus \mathcal{S}$ if $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})$ for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, where the other $m-1$ vertices in each m -hyperedge are all from $V \setminus \mathcal{S}$. For distinct $v, u \in \mathcal{S}$, the events $\{v \text{ ambiguous}\}$ and $\{u \text{ ambiguous}\}$ are independent, since the random variables involved are distinct. By assumption, $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) = 1 - 2\varepsilon < 1$ for some absolute constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by Lemma 2.3, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbb{P}(v \text{ ambiguous}) = n^{-\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j,k)+o(1)} \geq n^{-1+2\varepsilon+o(1)} \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

By Bernstein F.6, the number of ambiguous vertices in $|\mathcal{S} \cap V_k|$ will concentrate around

$$n^{-1+\varepsilon} \cdot \alpha_k \lfloor n \log^{-3}(n) \rfloor,$$

which further satisfies $\gtrsim n^\varepsilon \log^{-3}(n) \gg \log(n)$. Let $\mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, then $\mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} \asymp n^{-m+1} \log(n)$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ since this is the border case $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \asymp 1$ in (1.4). For any two vertices $v, u \in \mathcal{S}$, the expected number of hyperedges containing v and u together is at most $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} \binom{n-2}{m-2} \asymp n^{-1} \log(n)$. A union bound shows that the probability of any two ambiguous vertices being connected is at most

$$n^{-1} \log(n) \cdot n^\varepsilon \log^{-3}(n) \asymp n^{-1+\varepsilon} \log^{-2}(n).$$

If $\log(n)$ ambiguous vertices are uniformly chosen in $\mathcal{S} \cap V_k$, the probability that any two of them are connected is at most $\frac{n^{-1+\varepsilon}}{\log^2(n)} \cdot \log^2(n) = n^{-1+\varepsilon}$, leading to the fact they are pairwise disconnected with probability at least $1 - n^{-1+\varepsilon}$. Similarly, there exist at least $\log(n)$ ambiguous vertices in $\mathcal{S} \cap V_j$ that are pairwise disconnected. These $2\log(n)$ vertices are indistinguishable, since they all share the same degree profile $d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{u,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})$ for $v \in \mathcal{S} \cap V_k$ and $u \in \mathcal{S} \cap V_j$, but they are pairwise isolated. It follows that no algorithm can perform better than random guess for *each* of these vertices, and by independence, no algorithm can have probability of success better than $[(\frac{2\log(n)}{\log(n)})]^{-1} \asymp 2^{-\log(n)} \asymp n^{-\delta}$ for some constant $\delta > 0$. Therefore when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) < 1$, every algorithm will misclassify at least one vertex with probability $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$.

We now extend our discussion to the regime $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \gg 1$ in (1.4) for some $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ might grow with n . Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) < 1$ for some $j, k \in [K]$. Denote

$$C_{j,k,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} / \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}.$$

The case $C_{j,k,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \neq 1$ while $\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = O(1)$, $\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = O(1)$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$ was discussed before. For the case $C_{j,k,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \neq 1$ with $\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \asymp \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \gg 1$, one could easily verify that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \gg 1$ in (1.5), contradicting the assumption for necessity. The only possible case remaining is $C_{j,k,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = 1$ for every $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$ while $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) < 1$, meaning that $\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ differ only in the subleading order. Then the induced sub-hypergraph on vertex set $V_j \cup V_k$ looks the same as homogeneous Erdős–Rényi hypergraph, where the task of partitioning all vertices correctly is impossible. \square

3. STAGE I: WEAK CONSISTENCY BY SPECTRAL INITIALIZATION

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.9 with the proofs of Lemmas deferred to Appendix C. We will show that Algorithm 3, inspired by [35, 110, 111, 112], achieves almost exact recovery, i.e., $\eta(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}) = o(1)$. Following the conventions in (1.4), (2.1), let ξ_n (resp. ρ_n) denote the *average* (resp. *maximum*) expected degree,

$$(3.1) \quad \xi_n := \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_i \right), \quad \rho_n := \max_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{D}_i).$$

In Algorithm 3, $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is obtained from Algorithm 4 with $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_1$ in Theorem 3.3. Due to the mystery of $\{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}$, one could take $\bar{d} = \sum_{v=1}^n d_v/n$ in practice, which preserves the same order as d_{\max} with high probability according to Lemma 3.4. The following procedures are illustrated in Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Illustration of Algorithm 3

Algorithm 3: Spectral Initialization

Data: $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$, number of communities K , radius $r = \lceil n \log(\bar{d}) \rceil^{-1} \bar{d}^2$ with $\bar{d} = \sum_{v=1}^n d_v/n$.

- 1 Compute the rank- K approximation $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} = \sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i^\top$ of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$.
- 2 Let \mathcal{S} be a set of $\lceil 2 \log^2(n) \rceil$ nodes randomly sampled from \mathcal{J} without replacement. For each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, construct the ball centered at s by $\mathcal{B}_r(s) = \{w \in \mathcal{J} : \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_s - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_w\|_2^2 \leq r\}$.
- 3 Take $\widehat{V}_1^{(0)} = \mathcal{B}_r(s_1)$ to be the ball with most vertices, i.e., $s_1 = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\mathcal{B}_r(s)|$. Break ties arbitrarily.
- 4 **while** $2 \leq k \leq K$ **do**
- 5 $s_k = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\mathcal{B}_r(s) \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} \widehat{V}_j^{(0)})|$;
- 6 $\widehat{V}_k^{(0)} = \mathcal{B}_r(s_k) \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} \widehat{V}_j^{(0)})$; // Exclude the assigned vertices and find the remaining largest ball.
- 7 **end**
- 8 **while** $v \in \mathcal{J} \setminus (\bigcup_{k=1}^K \widehat{V}_k^{(0)})$ **do**
- 9 $k = \arg \min_{k \in [K]} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_k} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2$;
- 10 $\widehat{V}_k^{(0)} \leftarrow \widehat{V}_k^{(0)} \cup \{v\}$; // Assign the remaining vertices to their nearest ball.
- 11 **end**
- 12 Randomly assign the remaining vertices $v \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{J}$ to one of the communities $\widehat{V}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \widehat{V}_K^{(0)}$;
- 13 Obtain the initial estimate of the membership vector $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$ based on $\widehat{V}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \widehat{V}_K^{(0)}$.

Result: $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$

Our analysis relies on the following two concentration results about the adjacency matrix. The proofs for Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 are deferred to Appendix A.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{M} = \{m : m \geq 2, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a set of integers with finite cardinality, and let M denote its maximum element. For each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, let $H_m = ([n], E_m)$ be an inhomogeneous m -uniform Erdős-Rényi hypergraph associated with a probability tensor $\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}$ and an adjacency tensor $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ such that each m -hyperedge $e = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\} \subset [n]$ appears with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 1) = \mathcal{Q}_{i_1, \dots, i_m}^{(m)} = \left[\binom{n-1}{m-1} \right]^{-1} d_{i_1, \dots, i_m}^{(m)}$. Denote $d_{\max}^{(m)} := \max_{i_1, \dots, i_m \in [n]} d_{i_1, \dots, i_m}^{(m)}$. Let $H = \cup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} H_m$ be the inhomogeneous non-uniform Erdős-Rényi hypergraph and define $d_{\max} := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\max}^{(m)}$. Suppose that*

$$(3.2) \quad d_{\max} := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\max}^{(m)} \geq c \log n,$$

for some constant $c > 0$, then with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-10} - 2e^{-n}$, the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} of H satisfies

$$(3.3) \quad \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| \leq C_{(3.3)} \cdot \sqrt{d_{\max}},$$

where constant $C_{(3.3)} := 10M^2 + 2\beta$ with $\beta = \beta_0 \sqrt{\beta_1} + M$, and β_0, β_1 ⁴ satisfying

$$\beta_0 = 16 + 32M(1 + e^2) + 1792(1 + e^{-2})M^2, \quad M^{-1}\beta_1 \log(M^{-1}\beta_1) - M^{-1}\beta_1 + 1 > 11/c.$$

Algorithm 3 works well even beyond the exact recovery regime. For the case $1 \ll \rho_n \ll \log(n)$, Theorem 3.1 is not reliable. Instead, one could prove the concentration for some regularized versions of \mathbf{A} (Definition 3.2) following the same proof strategy, leading to Theorem 3.3. This explains why the trimming stage Algorithm 4 is necessary.

Definition 3.2 (Regularization). *Given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and index set \mathcal{J} , let $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the matrix obtained from \mathbf{A} by zeroing out the rows and columns not indexed by \mathcal{J} . Namely,*

$$(3.4) \quad (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{ij} = \mathbb{1}_{\{i, j \in \mathcal{J}\}} \cdot A_{ij}.$$

⁴The existence of such β_1 is guaranteed since $g(x) = x \log(x) - x + 1$ takes its minimum at $x = 1$ and increases when $x > 1$.

Algorithm 4: Trimming

Data: \mathbf{A}, \mathcal{J}

1 Construct $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by zeroing out the columns $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot i}$ and rows $\mathbf{A}_{i \cdot}$, where $i \notin \mathcal{J}$;

Result: $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$

Theorem 3.3. *Following the conventions in Theorem 3.1, define $\gamma_n := \frac{\xi_n}{\log(n)}$ and $\zeta_n := \frac{\rho_n}{\log(n)}$. Let $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ be the regularized version of \mathbf{A} , where $\mathcal{J} \in \{\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2\}$ defined as below.*

- (1) *Let \mathcal{J}_1 be the set of nodes obtained by removing $\lfloor n \exp(-\bar{d}) \rfloor$ nodes having the largest d_v , where $\bar{d} = n^{-1} \sum_{v \in [n]} d_v$ is the sample average degree. If $\zeta_n \log(\frac{\xi_n}{\gamma_n}) \gtrsim 1^5$, there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that (3.5) holds with probability at least $1 - 2(e/2)^{-n} - 2n^{-c}$.*
- (2) *Define $\mathcal{J}_2 := \{i \in [n], d_v \leq Md_{\max}\}$, then (3.5) holds with probability at least $1 - 2(e/2)^{-n} - n^{-10}$ for some constant $C_{(3.5)}$.*

$$(3.5) \quad \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\| \leq C_{(3.5)} \sqrt{d_{\max}},$$

In the above, $C_{(3.5)} := 10M^2 + 2\beta$ with $\beta = \beta_0 \sqrt{\beta_1} + M$, $\beta_0 = 16 + 32M(1 + e^2) + 1792(1 + e^{-2})M^2$, $\beta_1 = M$.

To establish the proof of Theorem 1.9, several properties of the Algorithm 3 are presented in Lemmas 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8.

Lemma 3.4. *Deterministically, $\rho_n \asymp \xi_n$. With probability tending to 1, $\bar{d} - \xi_n \leq \rho_n / \sqrt{n}$. Let $\tilde{d} = \max_{v \in n} d_v$ denote the realized maximum degree, then under conditions of Theorem 3.1, $\tilde{d} \asymp \rho_n$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$ for some constant $c > 0$.*

Lemma 3.5. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3, $\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \lesssim \rho_n + \rho_n^2/n$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$ for some constant $c > 0$.*

Lemma 3.6. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3, if Assumption 1.10 is satisfied, then $\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u \cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v \cdot}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n^{-1} \rho_n^2$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$ for some constant $c > 0$ when u and v are from different clusters, otherwise $\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u \cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v \cdot}\|_2^2 \lesssim n^{-2} \rho_n^2$.*

Lemma 3.7. *Define the following sets of vertices*

$$\mathcal{I}_k := \{v \in V_k \cap \mathcal{J} : \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v \cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v \cdot}\|_2^2 \leq r/4\}$$

$$\mathcal{U}_k := \{v \in V_k \cap \mathcal{J} : \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v \cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v \cdot}\|_2^2 \leq 4r\}.$$

- (a) *For all $k \in [K]$, $|\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{I}_k| \geq 1$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$ for some $c > 0$.*
- (b) *For each $k \in [K]$, the s_k constructed in Algorithm 3 satisfies $s_k \in \mathcal{U}_k$ and $|\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)| \geq \alpha_k n(1 - o(1))$.*
- (c) *The centers $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^K$ constructed in Algorithm 3 are pairwise far away from each other,*

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j \cdot} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_k \cdot}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n^{-1} \rho_n^2, \quad \text{for any pair } j \neq k, j, k \in [K].$$

Lemma 3.8. *In Line 4, 8 of Algorithm 3, if $v \in V_i \cap \mathcal{J}$ is misclassified to $\widehat{V}_j^{(0)}$ for some $j \neq i$, then v is far away from its expected center, i.e., $\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v \cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v \cdot}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n^{-1} \rho_n^2$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_K$. Lemma 3.7 (a) ensures that at least one vertex will be picked in each V_k , while it is guaranteed in (b) that the constructed ball $\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)$ contains most of the vertices of V_k for each $k \in [K]$. Furthermore, Lemma 3.6 proves that the expected centers are pairwise far away from each other, while Lemma 3.7 (c) proves that the same argument holds as well for the centers $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^K$ of balls $\{\mathcal{B}(s_k)\}_{k=1}^K$. Throughout the Algorithm 3, vertices would be misclassified during lines 4, 8, 12. Lemma 3.8 indicates that the misclassified vertices in lines 4, 8 must be far away from their expected centers, while the probability that $v \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{J}_1$ is bounded by $\mathbb{P}(v \notin \mathcal{J}_1) \leq n^{-c}$

⁵This happens for example when $\zeta_n = O(1)$, $\gamma_n = O(1)$; when $\zeta_n = o(1)$, we can take $\zeta_n = (\log(\log n))^{-1}$, $\gamma_n = (\log n)^{-1} \cdot (\log(\log n))^{-1}$.

for some constant $c > 0$ according to Lemma A.9. Then with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$ for some $c > 0$, the mismatch ratio is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_n = \eta(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}) &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{\sum_{v \text{ misclassified}} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2}{\min_{v \text{ misclassified}} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2} + n^{1-c} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2}{\min_{v \text{ misclassified}} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2} + \frac{1}{n^c} \\
(3.6) \quad &\stackrel{\text{Lemmas 3.5, 3.8}}{\lesssim} \frac{1}{n} \frac{\rho_n + \rho_n^2/n}{\rho_n^2/n} + \frac{1}{n^c} \asymp \frac{1}{\rho_n} = o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds since $\rho_n = \omega(1)$. Therefore, Algorithm 3 achieves weak consistency.

Furthermore, Algorithm 3 works well when the average degree \bar{d} is replaced with the maximum degree \tilde{d} . It works agnostically when $\rho_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ since $\rho_n \asymp d_{\max} \asymp \tilde{d}$ for sufficiently large n with high probability according to Lemma 3.4. The analysis above goes through as long as the order of ρ_n is estimated correctly. However, an accurate estimate for the order of ρ_n can in general not be obtained when $\rho_n \lesssim \log(n)$ due to the lack of concentration. Instead, one could require the knowledge of tensors $\{\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ to construct the radius r in Algorithm 3, and the subsequent analysis will go through as long as $\rho_n = \omega(1)$. \square

4. STAGE II: STRONG CONSISTENCY WITHOUT PRIOR KNOWLEDGE OF PROBABILITY PARAMETERS

The goal of this section is to prove that Algorithm 5 achieves exact recovery by iteratively refining the initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$ with the proofs deferred to Appendix D. It is known that the *Kullback-Leibler* (KL) divergence is always non-negative, and it equals zero only if the two distributions are the same. Similar to [111], the optimal membership assignment of vertex v in Line 5 minimizes the divergence \mathbb{D}_{GKL} (4.1) between edge density and underlying edge sampling probability. In Section 3, it was shown that weak consistency is achieved by $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$, then $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ in Line 1 is a good approximation of $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, where the deviation could be bounded by some lower order terms. At each iteration step, the number of misclassified vertices will decrease with at least a constant reduction rate, and exact recovery is achieved with high probability after $\lceil \log(n) \rceil$ steps. All the proofs of Lemmas are deferred to Appendix D.

Algorithm 5 works well when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) > \log(n)$ for any distinct pair $j, k \in [K]$, where $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k)$ (4.1) denotes *generalized Kullback-Leibler* divergence. Lemma 4.1 proves that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) > \log(n)$ if $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) > 1$, meaning that the functionality of Algorithm 5 is guaranteed above the threshold.

Lemma 4.1 (Generalized Kullback-Leibler). *For each distinct pair $j, k \in [K]$, define*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) \\
(4.1) \quad &:= \min_{\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \max \{ \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathbf{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}), \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathbf{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ (1.6), $\mathbf{y}^{(m)} \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K|}$ for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathbf{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) := y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathbf{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathbf{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}$$

denotes the KL divergence between two Bernoulli distributions with means $y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$.

If $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = o(1)$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) = \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \cdot \log(n)$ with $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k)$ defined in (1.5).

We will refer to the case $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = o(1)$ for every m and \mathbf{w} as the *border case*. Lemma 4.1 establishes the equivalence of the two divergences for this regime. Above this regime, when $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = O(1)$ which is no longer on the border, $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) > \log(n)$ would certainly be satisfied and Algorithm 5 still yields exact recovery.

Proof of Theorem 1.13 (1). The vertex set V can be split into two disjoint subsets \mathcal{G} and $V \setminus \mathcal{G}$, where each $v \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies the following three properties,

Algorithm 5: Agnostic Refinement

Data: $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$.

- 1 For each m -hyperedge e of type \mathbf{w} at step 0 with $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$, i.e., w_l nodes in $\widehat{V}_l^{(0)}$ for each $l \in [K]$, its generating probability $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ (1.4) is estimated by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(0)}} \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e)=\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{A}_e, \quad \text{where } \hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} = \prod_{l=1}^K \binom{|\widehat{V}_l^{(t)}|}{w_l}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

- 2 **while** $0 \leq t \leq \lceil \log(n) \rceil$ **do**

3 $\widehat{V}_k^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \emptyset$ for all $k \in [K]$;

- 4 **while** $v \in [n]$ **do**

5 For each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, let $\widehat{E}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(t)}$ count the number of m -hyperedges containing v with the rest of the nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} , i.e., w_l nodes in $\widehat{V}_l^{(t)}$ for each $l \in [K]$. Find

$$k^* = \arg \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \widehat{E}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \log \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \widehat{E}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \cdot \log(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \right\},$$

Tie broken uniformly at random;

6 $\widehat{V}_{k^*}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \widehat{V}_{k^*}^{(t+1)} \cup \{v\}$.

7 **end**

8 $t \leftarrow t + 1$

9 **end**

- 10 Take $\widehat{V}_k = \widehat{V}_k^{(\lceil \log(n) \rceil)}$ for all $k \in [K]$ and obtain $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$.

Result: $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$

(G1): Denote $d_{\max} := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$ with $\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} := \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, then

$$(G1) \quad d_v \leq 10d_{\max}.$$

(G2): Denote $\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} := d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}$. Let $\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$ be the KL divergence in (4.2). If $v \in V_k \cap \mathcal{G}$, then for every $j \neq k$

$$(G2) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot [\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})] \geq \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)}.$$

(G3): Let M denote the maximum element of \mathcal{M} . For some small constant $\delta > 0$,

$$(G3) \quad e(v, V \setminus \mathcal{G}) \leq M(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}.$$

Lemma 4.2 (Size of $V \setminus \mathcal{G}$). *If $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$, then $|V \setminus \mathcal{G}| \leq s$ for all $s \geq 1/3$ with probability at least $1 - 10n^{-\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Let $\{\widehat{V}_k^{(t)}\}_{k=1}^K$ be the obtained partition at step t . Let $\mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t)} := (\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \cap V_k) \cap \mathcal{G}$ denote the set of vertices in \mathcal{G} which belongs to V_k but misclassified to $\widehat{V}_j^{(t)}$, then the misclassified vertices in $\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \cap \mathcal{G}$ can be represented as $\mathcal{E}_j^{(t)} := \cup_{k \neq j} \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t)} = (\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \setminus V_j) \cap \mathcal{G}$ where $\mathcal{E}^{(t)} := \cup_{j=1}^K \mathcal{E}_j^{(t)} = \cup_{j=1}^K (\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \setminus V_j) \cap \mathcal{G}$.

Lemma 4.3. *In outer for-loop of Algorithm 5, the number of misclassified nodes decays with ratio at most*

$$\frac{|\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}|}{|\mathcal{E}^{(t)}|} \leq \frac{\log C_{(1.8)}}{e \cdot C_{(1.8)}}.$$

Note that $\eta_n = \eta(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}) \lesssim (\rho_n)^{-1}$ according to (3.6) and $\rho_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ by (1.4), then by Lemma 4.3, the number of misclassified nodes in \mathcal{G} after $\lceil \log(n) \rceil$ iterations will be at most

$$\eta_n n \cdot \left(\frac{\log C_{(1.8)}}{e \cdot C_{(1.8)}} \right)^{\lceil \log(n) \rceil} \lesssim \frac{n}{\log(n)} \cdot n^{-1 - \log C_{(1.8)} + \log \log C_{(1.8)}} = o(1),$$

where the inequality holds since $C_{(1.8)} \geq 1$. Meanwhile, by taking $s = 1/2$, the number of misclassified nodes in $V \setminus \mathcal{G}$ is at most $1/2$ according to Lemma 4.2. Therefore all nodes are classified correctly. \square

Assumption 1.15 is crucial for the estimation $\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_w^{(m)}$ being accurate in Algorithm 5. In fact, when a mixture of Bernoulli random variables is collected where their expectations satisfy Assumption 1.15, it is possible to estimate each expectation accurately, since the sample average for each Bernoulli random variable (in this scenario, all but a negligible fraction of samples are chosen from their true law) would be well concentrated around its expectation with lower order deviations. However, if their expectations vary in magnitude, there is no hope to estimate the low order expectations accurately, since the fluctuation of the sample average with higher order expectation could be significantly larger than the low order expectations.

On the other hand, when $C_{(1.8)} = O(1)$ but large enough, Algorithm 5 converges faster by Lemma 4.3. Intuitively, a cluster with denser connections inside would distinguish itself from the others. However, as discussed above, the larger $C_{(1.8)}$ is, the less accurate the estimation $\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_w^{(m)}$ is for the smaller $\mathcal{Q}_w^{(m)}$, which is the trade-off between "accuracy" and "speed".

5. EXACT RECOVERY WITH PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

This section is devoted to the proof that Algorithm 2 achieves exact recovery when equipped with knowledge of K and $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$. All the proofs for Lemmas are deferred to Appendix E.

5.1. Hypergraph splitting. Algorithm 6 splits the non-uniform hypergraph H into $H^{(0)}$ and $H^{(1)}$, where the initial estimate $\hat{z}^{(0)}$ is obtained from $H^{(0)}$, and $H^{(1)}$ is used for second-stage correction. Define $K_n := ([n], E(K_n)) = \cup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} K_n^{(m)}$, where $K_n^{(m)} = ([n], E(K_n^{(m)}))$ denotes the complete m -uniform hypergraph with $E(K_n^{(m)})$ containing all m -subsets of $[n]$. The subgraph $K_n^{(0)}$ is formed by keeping each hyperedge $e \in E(K_n)$ with probability $\theta_n / \log(n)$, then the complementary $K_n^{(1)} = K_n \setminus K_n^{(0)}$. Hence $H^{(0)}$, $H^{(1)}$ are determined by the intersection between H and $K_n^{(0)}$, $K_n^{(1)}$, which is independent of the generating process of non-uniform HSBM 1.5. Consequently, $H^{(0)}$ and $H^{(1)}$ are two independent hypergraphs with the same underlying community assignment z with different edge densities.

Algorithm 6: Splitting

Data: The hypergraph H , K_n , θ_n .

```

1 for  $e \in E(K_n)$  do
2    $X_e \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_n / \log(n))$ ;
3   Hyperedge  $e$  is assigned to  $K_n^{(0)}$  if  $X_e = 1$ , otherwise  $K_n^{(1)}$ 
4 end
5  $H^{(0)} = ([n], E(H) \cap E(K_n^{(0)}))$  and  $H^{(1)} = ([n], E(H) \cap E(K_n^{(1)}))$ 

```

Result: $H^{(0)}$, $H^{(1)}$

5.2. Almost exact recovery. We take $\theta_n = \log \log(n)$ in Algorithm 6. Recall definitions of ρ_n , ξ_n in (3.1), then $\rho_n \gtrsim \xi_n \gtrsim \log \log(n)$ for $H^{(0)}$ under regime (1.4), where the order of ρ_n may not be estimated accurately and Theorem 3.1 can't be applied directly. To get rid of that, one could build radius r in Algorithm 3 with the knowledge of $\{\mathcal{Q}_w^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$. At the same time, one could regularize the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} by zeroing out vertices whose degree is larger than certain threshold, i.e., $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_2$, with the concentration result obtained in Theorem 3.3. Following the same analysis in Section 3, Algorithm 3 achieves weak consistency since $\eta(\hat{z}, \hat{z}^{(0)}) \lesssim \rho_n^{-1} \lesssim [\log \log(n)]^{-1} = o(1)$ by (3.6).

5.3. Local correction. To prove the correctness of Algorithm 7, the essential idea is to make full use of the MAP estimator, which showed up in several previous work [4, 31, 112]. Let $\hat{z}_v^{(0)}$ denote the membership estimation of v obtained from $H^{(0)}$, and $\hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}$ for vertices other than v . Let $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ denote the law of $H^{(1)}$. The

Algorithm 7: Correction

Data: $H^{(1)}$, $\hat{z}^{(0)}$, probability tensors $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K$.

1 while $v \in [n]$ **do**

2 $\hat{z}_v^{(1)} = \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k)$

3 end

Result: $\hat{z} = \hat{z}^{(1)}$.

probability of misclassifying vertex v is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_v^{(1)}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \neq z_v\right) \\
&= \sum_{H^{(1)}} \mathbb{P}(\hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \neq z_v | \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}) \\
(5.1) \quad &= \sum_{H^{(1)}} [1 - \mathbb{P}(\hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) = z_v | \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}),
\end{aligned}$$

Equipped with knowledge of $\hat{z}^{(0)}$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K$ and $\{\mathcal{Q}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$, (5.1) is minimized only if MAP (5.2) is taken,

$$(5.2) \quad \hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) := \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k | \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}).$$

However, (5.2) is not directly accessible. Lemma 5.1 proves that the (5.2) can be reformulated as (5.3), indicating that only hyperedges containing vertex v should be considered, which gives rise to the estimator in Line 2 of Algorithm 7.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_v^{(1)}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})$ denote the law of the MAP estimator (5.2), whose randomness comes from $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ for given $\hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}$. Recall definitions in (2.1), then*

$$(5.3) \quad \hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) = \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k).$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $z_v = k$. Together with Lemma 5.1 and the fact $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k) = \alpha_k$, the error probability (5.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_v^{(1)}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \neq k\right) = \sum_{d_v} \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \neq k \mid \mathcal{D}_v = d_v\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \\
&= \sum_{d_v} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}[\exists j \neq k, \text{ s.t. } \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = j, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \alpha_j > \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \alpha_k] \\
&= \sum_{d_v} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\exists j \neq k, \text{ s.t. } \hat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \hat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k),
\end{aligned}$$

where for ease of presentation, we denote the condition probabilities by

$$(5.4a) \quad \hat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})$$

$$(5.4b) \quad \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = z_{-v}).$$

Lemma 5.2. *The upper and lower bounds of $\mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v)$ are given by*

$$(5.5a) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) \leq \sum_{d_v} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}\left\{\hat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \hat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k\right\}$$

$$(5.5b) \quad \mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) \geq \sum_{d_v} \frac{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)}{K-1} \cdot \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}\left\{\hat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \hat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k\right\}.$$

However, the conditional probability $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)$ in (5.5a) is not directly accessible due to non-equivalence between $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}$ and \mathbf{z}_{-v} . One can substitute $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)$ with $\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)$ once certain condition of d_v is satisfied (referred as *good*, deferred to Definition 5.3). Consequently, (5.5a) adapts the following decomposition, which can be bounded separately

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) \\ (5.6a) \quad & \leq \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P} \left\{ \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k \right\} \right) \\ (5.6b) \quad & + \sum_{d_v \text{ not good}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P} \left\{ \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

5.3.1. *Bound for (5.6a).* Let $\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)}$ denote the presence of m -hyperedge e , which contains v and at least one node in e is misclassified by $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e)$, i.e.,

$$(5.7) \quad \mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} := \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} \Big|_{\{e \ni v\} \cap \{\mathbf{z}(e) \neq \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e)\}}.$$

Definition 5.3 (Good d_v). For each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} \subset_m^K} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ in (1.4), we say that $d_v^{(m)}$ is good if

$$\sum_e \mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} \leq \frac{2 \log(n)}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n))}.$$

We say that d_v is good if $d_v^{(m)}$ is good for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$.

To substitute $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)$ with $\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)$, it suffices to consider probabilities of $\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)} & := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \mathbf{z}_{-v})} = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\substack{e \ni v \\ e \text{ present}}} \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 1)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 1)} \cdot \prod_{\substack{e \ni v \\ e \text{ absent}}} \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 0)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = 0)} \\ & = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\substack{e \ni v \\ e \text{ present}}} \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 1)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 1)} \cdot \prod_{\substack{e \ni v \\ e \text{ absent}}} \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 0)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 0)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds since the probabilities of hyperedges $e \ni v$ with $\mathbf{z}(e) = \widehat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e)$ are cancelled out on denominator and numerator. Subsequently, bounds of ratio are obtained in Lemma 5.4 when d_v being good.

Lemma 5.4. For all good d_v , there exist some $L, U, c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for each $k \in [K]$,

$$L \leq \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)} \leq U,$$

where $U = 1/L$ and $U/L = n^c$ with $c/\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} = o(1)$.

With some calculations deferred, (5.6a) can be further bounded by,

$$(5.8) \quad (5.6a) \leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \frac{\alpha_j U}{\alpha_k L} \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \min\{\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\},$$

which brings in the *generalized Chernoff-Hellinger* (GCH) divergence $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k)$ (1.5).

Lemma 5.5. Under the regime (1.4), we have

$$(5.9) \quad \sum_{d_v} \min\{\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\} \leq n^{-(1-o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k)}.$$

5.3.2. *Bound for (5.6b).* The contribution is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} (5.6b) &\leq (K-1) \cdot \sum_{\substack{d_v \text{ not} \\ \text{good}}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \\ &\leq (K-1) \cdot \sum_{d_v} \#\{\text{realizations of } d_v\} \cdot \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}_k(d_v \text{ not good}) \leq n^{-2+o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds by $\sum_{d_v} \#\{\text{realizations of } d_v\} \cdot \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) = 1$ and Lemma 5.6.

Lemma 5.6. *The probability of d_v not being good is bounded by*

$$\mathbb{P}_k(d_v \text{ is not good}) \leq n^{-2+o(1)}$$

5.3.3. *Putting pieces together.* Combining the discussions in (5.5a), (5.6a) and (5.6b), the probability of v being misclassified is upper bounded by $\mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) \lesssim n^{-(1-o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j,k)} + n^{-2+o(1)}$. Then according to the assumption in Theorem 1.13, there exists some universal constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) = 1 + 2\varepsilon > 1$, and

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) \lesssim n^{-(1+2\varepsilon)+o(1)} + n^{-2+o(1)}.$$

Note that the analysis above is valid for any node $v \in [n]$ with $z_v = k$, hence by a simple union bound, the failure probability is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists v \in [n], \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_v^{(1)}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)}, \widehat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \neq z_v\right) \leq \sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) \leq n \cdot (n^{-1-2\varepsilon+o(1)} + n^{-2+o(1)}) \leq n^{-\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, MAP (5.3) achieves the exact recovery with probability at least $1 - n^{-\varepsilon}$.

6. ESTIMATION FOR NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES

For the practical purpose, it is better to assume as little prior knowledge as possible. To make Algorithm 1 completely agnostic, we propose the following Algorithm 8 for the estimation of the number of communities.

Algorithm 8: Number of Communities

Data: $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$

- 1 Compute the degree d_v for each vertex $v \in [n]$ and find $\tilde{d} = \max_{v \in [n]} d_v$;
- 2 Construct the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} and compute the eigenvalues $\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(\mathbf{A})$;
- 3 Find the first eigenvalue $\lambda_r(\mathbf{A})$ such that $\lambda_r \leq (\tilde{d})^{3/4}$;

Result: $\hat{K} = r - 1$

The functionality of Algorithm 8 relies on Assumption 1.15 and eigenvalue separation (Assumption 6.1) under exact recovery regime (1.4). Recall that ρ_n, ξ_n in (3.1) represent the maximum and average expected degrees, respectively. Let $\zeta_n := \min_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{D}_v)$ denote the minimum expected degree.

Assumption 6.1. *Define the matrix $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ where $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ij} = \mathbb{E}A_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$ and $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ii} = \mathbb{E}A_{ij}$ when i and j are from the same block. The eigenvalues $\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ satisfy $\lambda_K(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \gtrsim \zeta_n$ and $\lambda_{K+1}(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = 0$.*

Lemma 6.2. *Under Assumptions 1.15, 6.1, $\lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \gtrsim \rho_n$ for $k \in [K]$, and $\lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \lesssim n^{-1}\rho_n$ for $k \in [n] \setminus [K]$.*

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Define the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} := \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}$, then $\lambda_k(\mathbf{D}) = \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{kk} \lesssim n^{-1}\rho_n$. Note the facts that $\zeta_n \asymp \rho_n$ by Assumption 1.15, and $\lambda_K(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \gtrsim \zeta_n \gg n^{-1}\rho_n$ by Assumption 6.1, then the desired result follows by Weyl's inequality F.1, since $\lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) - \|\mathbf{D}\| \leq \lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \leq \lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) + \|\mathbf{D}\|$ for all $k \in [n]$. \square

Correctness of Algorithm 8. By Weyl's inequality F.1, for any $k \in [n]$, the eigenvalue $\lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})$ satisfies

$$\lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) - \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| \leq \lambda_k(\mathbf{A}) \leq \lambda_k(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) + \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\|.$$

By Lemma 3.4 $\tilde{d} \asymp d_{\max} \asymp \rho_n$, then by Lemma 6.2 and Theorem 3.1, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_K(\mathbf{A}) &\gtrsim \rho_n - C_{(3.3)} \cdot \sqrt{d_{\max}} \gtrsim \rho_n - \sqrt{\rho_n} \gg (\rho_n)^{3/4} \asymp (\tilde{d})^{3/4}, \\ \lambda_{K+1}(\mathbf{A}) &\leq n^{-1} \rho_n + C_{(3.3)} \cdot \sqrt{d_{\max}} \lesssim \sqrt{\rho_n} \ll (\rho_n)^{3/4} \asymp (\tilde{d})^{3/4}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the accuracy of \widehat{K} in Algorithm 8 is guaranteed by the separation between $\lambda_K(\mathbf{A})$ and $\lambda_{K+1}(\mathbf{A})$. \square

We have seen that Algorithm 8 works when all the degrees are proportional. One may be interested in exploring modifications of Algorithm 8 for scenarios not covered by Assumptions 1.15, 6.1, such as the presence of communities with outstandingly large degrees.

Eigenvalue separation. In particular, we want to emphasize that Assumption 6.1 is stronger than Assumption 1.10. Consider the following example, where $K = 3$, $M = 2$ with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 1/3$, and

$$\mathbf{Q}^{(2)} = \frac{\log(n)}{n} \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 7 \\ 3 & 5 & 8 \\ 7 & 8 & 15 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{Q}^{(2)} \otimes (\mathbf{1}_{n/3} \mathbf{1}_{n/3}^\top),$$

where \otimes denotes the *Kronecker* product. Obviously, Assumption 1.10 is satisfied. However, $\lambda_3(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = 0$ since $\mathbf{Q}_3^{(2)} = \mathbf{Q}_1^{(2)} + \mathbf{Q}_2^{(2)}$. As we can see, a mixture of assortative ($\mathbf{Q}_3^{(2)}$) and disassortative ($\mathbf{Q}_1^{(2)}, \mathbf{Q}_2^{(2)}$) clusters may result in violating Assumption 6.1 but satisfying Assumption 1.10. We further note that this would never happen when all communities are purely assortative (diagonally dominant) or purely disassortative due to the symmetry requirement for probability tensors.

As far as we know, even in the graph case, Assumption 6.1 is crucial in most algorithms aiming to estimate for the number of communities. For example, [28, Theorem 1] applies a *network cross-validation* algorithm. This implicitly requires Assumption 6.1, as it relies on Davis-Kahan [109, Theorem 4] to obtain an upper bound for the singular subspace perturbation, which is meaningful only if the K th largest singular value is at least of order $\log(n)$.

As we just mentioned, Assumption 1.10, which Algorithm 1 relies on, is weaker than Assumption 6.1. It would be interesting to close the gap between the those two assumptions, i.e., to find whether it is possible to give an accurate estimation the number of communities when the underlying generating model is a mixture of assortative and disassortative clusters.

Proportional degrees pitfalls and possible fixes. Assumption 1.15 is crucial for Algorithm 8. When this is dropped, and we are under the regime $\rho_n \gg \zeta_n \gtrsim \log(n)$, Algorithm 8 tends to underestimate the number of communities due to the possibility that the upper bound $(\tilde{d})^{3/4}$ is much larger than $\lambda_K(\mathbf{A})$, leading to the problem that sparse clusters would be absorbed by denser clusters. One could strengthen Assumption 6.1 to satisfy $\lambda_K(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \gtrsim \rho_n$ to make full use of Algorithm 8, though not so realistic in practice.

Instead, one could start with a lax overestimation of the number of communities, and then slightly modify Algorithm 3 to correct the overestimate. The intuition is that all but a vanishing fraction of the rows corresponding to vertices in V_k would concentrate around their expected center, thus their corresponding vertices will be located in the ball $\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)$, while $\widehat{V}_i^{(0)} = o(n)$ for $i > K$ by Lemma 3.7. Also, Algorithm 3 works agnostically without Assumption 1.15 when $\rho_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ as proved in Section 3. Thus, we propose Algorithm 9 as an informal alternative; here we pick some large enough i as an initial guess and iteratively decrease i until the partition has all classes proportional. However, we leave the criterion for deciding if a class is too small up to the reader, and we offer no guarantees. Note also that Algorithm 9 is computationally inefficient: it has time complexity $O(n^2 \log^2(n))$ since at least $\log(n)$ eigenpairs should be computed.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we characterize the phase transition of the exact recovery in model 1.5 by formulating the sharp threshold \mathbb{D}_{GCH} (1.5) and establishing necessary and sufficient conditions. Algorithms 1 and 2 achieve strong consistency within the stated assumptions. The area of community detection problems on random hypergraphs remains fruitful. Besides finding an algorithm for correct estimation for the number of communities discussed in Section 6, we mention a few other interesting directions below.

Algorithm 9: Number of Communities

Data: $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$, radius $r = [n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1} \rho_n^2$ with $\rho_n = \tilde{d} = \max_{v \in [n]} d_v$, $i = \log(n)$

```
1 while  $i \geq 2$  do
2   Compute the rank- $i$  approximation  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j \mathbf{u}_j \mathbf{u}_j^{\top}$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ .
3   Construct balls of vertices centered at  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  by  $\mathcal{B}_r(s) = \{w \in \mathcal{J} : \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_s - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_w\|_2^2 \leq r\}$ ,
   where  $\mathcal{S}$  is randomly sampled from  $\mathcal{J}$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| = \log^2(n)$ .
4   Let  $\mathcal{B}_r(s_1)$  denote the ball with most vertices and take  $\widehat{V}_1^{(0)} = \mathcal{B}_r(s_1)$ .
5   while  $2 \leq k \leq i$  do
6      $s_k = \arg \max_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\mathcal{B}_r(s) \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} \widehat{V}_j^{(0)})|$ ;
7      $\widehat{V}_k^{(0)} = \mathcal{B}_r(s_k) \setminus (\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} \widehat{V}_j^{(0)})$ ;
8   end
9   if  $|\widehat{V}_i^{(0)}| \ll n$ ; // Informal condition, should be replaced with an explicit
   criterion.
10  then
11     $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
12  else
13    Quit the loop;
14  end
15 end
```

Result: $\widehat{K} = i$

First, Assumption 1.10 and its refinement Remark 1.12 are crucial for any spectral algorithm based on \mathbf{A} , since they are required for separation between expected centers in Lemma 3.6. It will be interesting to see whether this condition can be removed, or at least weakened, such that some other non-spectral method, perhaps in the vein of [73, 60, 10], could achieve weak consistency for uniform hypergraphs. Additionally, the generalization of those methods to handle the non-uniform hypergraphs when a set of tensors $\{\mathcal{A}^{(m)}\}$ with different orders is given remains open.

Second, it is known that exact recovery is achievable at the threshold in the case of graph SBM, i.e., when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(a, b) = (\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})^2/2 = 1$ [89] and $\mathbb{D}_{\text{CH}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{P}) = 1$ [4]. However, it is still unclear whether exact recovery can be achieved when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} = 1$ for model 1.5.

Last but not least, it will be interesting to see if model 1.5 can be generalized to have other degree distributions [72, 52, 65], different edge labels [111] and contextual feature vectors [29, 83], which would be of particular interests for real-world applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I.D. and H.W. would like to thank Ery Arias-Castro and Yizhe Zhu for helpful discussions. Part of this work was done during the Fourth ZiF Summer School 2022 at Center for Interdisciplinary Research, Bielefeld University, Germany. The authors thank the organizers for their hospitality. The authors acknowledge support from NSF DMS-2154099.

REFERENCES

- [1] Emmanuel Abbe. “Community Detection and Stochastic Block Models: Recent Developments”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18.177 (2018), pp. 1–86. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-480.html> (cit. on p. 2).
- [2] Emmanuel Abbe, Afonso S Bandeira, and Georgina Hall. “Exact recovery in the stochastic block model”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 62.1 (2016), pp. 471–487 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 7).
- [3] Emmanuel Abbe, Jianqing Fan, and Kaizheng Wang. “An ℓ_p theory of PCA and spectral clustering”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 50.4 (2022), pp. 2359–2385 (cit. on p. 2).

- [4] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon. “Community Detection in General Stochastic Block models: Fundamental Limits and Efficient Algorithms for Recovery”. In: *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (2015), pp. 670–688 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 16, 21).
- [5] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon. “Detection in the stochastic block model with multiple clusters: proof of the achievability conjectures, acyclic BP, and the information-computation gap”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.09080* (2015) (cit. on p. 2).
- [6] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon. “Recovering Communities in the General Stochastic Block Model Without Knowing the Parameters”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by C. Cortes et al. Vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2015/file/cfee398643cbc3dc5eefc89334cacdc1-Paper.pdf> (cit. on pp. 2, 7).
- [7] Emmanuel Abbe et al. “Entrywise eigenvector analysis of random matrices with low expected rank”. In: *Annals of statistics* 48.3 (2020), pp. 1452–1474 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 7).
- [8] Naman Agarwal et al. “Multisection in the stochastic block model using semidefinite programming”. In: *Compressed Sensing and its Applications: Second International MATHEON Conference 2015*. Springer, 2017, pp. 125–162 (cit. on p. 2).
- [9] Joshua Agterberg, Zachary Lubberts, and Jesús Arroyo. “Joint Spectral Clustering in Multilayer Degree-Corrected Stochastic Blockmodels”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05053* (2022) (cit. on p. 2).
- [10] Joshua Agterberg and Anru R. Zhang. “Estimating Higher-Order Mixed Memberships via the $\ell_{2,\infty}$ Tensor Perturbation Bound”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08642* (2022) (cit. on pp. 6, 21).
- [11] Kwangjun Ahn, Kangwook Lee, and Changho Suh. “Community recovery in hypergraphs”. In: *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2016 54th Annual Allerton Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 657–663 (cit. on p. 3).
- [12] Kalle Alaluusua et al. “Multilayer hypergraph clustering using the aggregate similarity matrix”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11657* (2023) (cit. on p. 3).
- [13] Maria Chiara Angelini et al. “Spectral detection on sparse hypergraphs”. In: *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2015 53rd Annual Allerton Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 66–73 (cit. on p. 3).
- [14] Ery Arias-Castro and Nicolas Verzelen. “Community detection in dense random networks”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 42.3 (2014), pp. 940–969. DOI: [10.1214/14-AOS1208](https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1208). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1208> (cit. on p. 2).
- [15] Afonso S Bandeira. “Random Laplacian matrices and convex relaxations”. In: *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 18 (2018), pp. 345–379 (cit. on p. 2).
- [16] Jess Banks et al. “Information-theoretic thresholds for community detection in sparse networks”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2016, pp. 383–416 (cit. on p. 2).
- [17] Federico Battiston et al. “Networks beyond pairwise interactions: structure and dynamics”. In: *Physics Reports* 874 (2020), pp. 1–92 (cit. on p. 2).
- [18] Austin R Benson, David F Gleich, and Jure Leskovec. “Higher-order organization of complex networks”. In: *Science* 353.6295 (2016), pp. 163–166 (cit. on p. 2).
- [19] Peter J. Bickel and Aiyu Chen. “A nonparametric view of network models and Newman–Girvan and other modularities”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (2009), pp. 21068–21073 (cit. on p. 2).
- [20] Peter J. Bickel, Aiyu Chen, and Elizaveta Levina. “The method of moments and degree distributions for network models”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 39 (2011), pp. 2280–2301 (cit. on p. 2).
- [21] Miklos Bona and Richard P Stanley. *A walk through combinatorics: an introduction to enumeration and graph theory*. Fourth. New Jersey: WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 2017 (cit. on p. 4).
- [22] Ravi B. Boppana. “Eigenvalues and graph bisection: An average-case analysis”. In: *28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1987)* (1987), pp. 280–285 (cit. on p. 2).
- [23] Charles Bordenave, Marc Lelarge, and Laurent Massoulié. “Nonbacktracking spectrum of random graphs: Community detection and nonregular Ramanujan graphs”. In: *Annals of probability* 46.1 (2018), pp. 1–71 (cit. on p. 2).
- [24] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004 (cit. on p. 40).

- [25] Jiajun Bu et al. “Music recommendation by unified hypergraph: combining social media information and music content”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2010, pp. 391–400 (cit. on p. 2).
- [26] Thang Nguyen Bui et al. “Graph bisection algorithms with good average case behavior”. In: *Combinatorica* 7 (1987), pp. 171–191 (cit. on p. 2).
- [27] Elena Cáceres, Anderson Misobuchi, and Rafael Pimentel. “Sparse SYK and traversable wormholes”. In: *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2021.11 (2021), pp. 1–32 (cit. on p. 2).
- [28] Kehui Chen and Jing Lei. “Network Cross-Validation for Determining the Number of Communities in Network Data”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113 (2014), pp. 241–251 (cit. on p. 20).
- [29] Shuxiao Chen, Sifan Liu, and Zongming Ma. “Global and individualized community detection in inhomogeneous multilayer networks”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 50.5 (2022), pp. 2664–2693 (cit. on pp. 2, 21).
- [30] I Chien, Chung-Yi Lin, and I-Hsiang Wang. “Community detection in hypergraphs: Optimal statistical limit and efficient algorithms”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. 2018, pp. 871–879 (cit. on p. 3).
- [31] I Eli Chien, Chung-Yi Lin, and I-Hsiang Wang. “On the minimax misclassification ratio of hypergraph community detection”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 65.12 (2019), pp. 8095–8118 (cit. on pp. 3, 8, 9, 16).
- [32] Peter Chin, Anup Rao, and Van Vu. “Stochastic block model and community detection in sparse graphs: A spectral algorithm with optimal rate of recovery”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2015, pp. 391–423 (cit. on p. 2).
- [33] Philip Chodrow, Nicole Eikmeier, and Jamie Haddock. “Nonbacktracking Spectral Clustering of Nonuniform Hypergraphs”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 5.2 (2023), pp. 251–279. DOI: [10.1137/22M1494713](https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1494713). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1494713> (cit. on p. 3).
- [34] David S Choi, Patrick J Wolfe, and Edoardo M Airoidi. “Stochastic blockmodels with a growing number of classes”. In: *Biometrika* 99.2 (2012), pp. 273–284 (cit. on p. 2).
- [35] Amin Coja-Oghlan. “Graph Partitioning via Adaptive Spectral Techniques”. In: *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 19.2 (2010), pp. 227–284. DOI: [10.1017/S0963548309990514](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548309990514) (cit. on pp. 2, 11).
- [36] Sam Cole and Yizhe Zhu. “Exact recovery in the hypergraph stochastic block model: A spectral algorithm”. In: *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 593 (2020), pp. 45–73. ISSN: 0024-3795. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2020.01.039>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379520300562> (cit. on p. 3).
- [37] Anne Condon and Richard M. Karp. “Algorithms for graph partitioning on the planted partition model”. In: *Random Struct. Algorithms*. 1999 (cit. on p. 2).
- [38] Nicholas Cook, Larry Goldstein, and Tobias Johnson. “Size biased couplings and the spectral gap for random regular graphs”. In: *The Annals of Probability* 46.1 (2018), pp. 72–125 (cit. on pp. 28, 30, 31).
- [39] Richard K. Darst et al. “Algorithm independent bounds on community detection problems and associated transitions in stochastic block model graphs”. In: *Journal of Complex Networks* 3.3 (Oct. 2014), pp. 333–360. ISSN: 2051-1310. DOI: [10.1093/comnet/cnu042](https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnu042). eprint: <https://academic.oup.com/comnet/article-pdf/3/3/333/1083003/cnu042.pdf>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnu042> (cit. on p. 2).
- [40] Aurelien Decelle et al. “Inference and phase transitions in the detection of modules in sparse networks”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 107.6 (2011), p. 065701 (cit. on p. 2).
- [41] Aurélien Decelle et al. “Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications”. In: *Physical Review E* 84.6 (2011), p. 066106 (cit. on p. 2).
- [42] Yash Deshpande et al. “Contextual stochastic block models”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31 (2018) (cit. on p. 2).
- [43] Persi Diaconis and David Freedman. “An Elementary Proof of Stirling’s Formula”. In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 93.2 (1986), pp. 123–125. ISSN: 00029890, 19300972. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2322709> (cit. on p. 57).

- [44] Ioana Dumitriu, Haixiao Wang, and Yizhe Zhu. “Partial recovery and weak consistency in the non-uniform hypergraph Stochastic Block Model”. In: *arXiv* (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.11671> (cit. on pp. 3, 8).
- [45] Ioana Dumitriu and Yizhe Zhu. “Spectra of random regular hypergraphs”. In: *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 28.3 (2021), P3.36 (cit. on p. 2).
- [46] Martin E. Dyer and Alan M. Frieze. “The Solution of Some Random NP-Hard Problems in Polynomial Expected Time”. In: *J. Algorithms* 10 (1989), pp. 451–489 (cit. on p. 2).
- [47] Carl Eckart and G. Marion Young. “The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank”. In: *Psychometrika* 1 (1936), pp. 211–218 (cit. on p. 55).
- [48] Uriel Feige and Eran Ofek. “Spectral techniques applied to sparse random graphs”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 27.2 (2005), pp. 251–275 (cit. on pp. 9, 31).
- [49] Joel Friedman, Jeff Kahn, and Endre Szemerédi. “On the Second Eigenvalue of Random Regular Graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC’89. Seattle, Washington, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1989, pp. 587–598. ISBN: 0897913078. DOI: [10.1145/73007.73063](https://doi.org/10.1145/73007.73063). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/73007.73063> (cit. on p. 28).
- [50] Joel Friedman and Avi Wigderson. “On the second eigenvalue of hypergraphs”. In: *Combinatorica* 15.1 (1995), pp. 43–65 (cit. on p. 2).
- [51] Chao Gao et al. “Achieving optimal misclassification proportion in stochastic block models”. In: *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18.1 (2017), pp. 1980–2024 (cit. on p. 7).
- [52] Chao Gao et al. “Community detection in degree-corrected block models”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 46.5 (2018), pp. 2153–2185. DOI: [10.1214/17-AOS1615](https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AOS1615). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AOS1615> (cit. on pp. 2, 21).
- [53] Julia Gaudio and Nimit Joshi. “Community Detection in the Hypergraph SBM: Optimal Recovery Given the Similarity Matrix”. In: *ArXiv abs/2208.12227* (2022) (cit. on pp. 3, 8, 9).
- [54] Debarghya Ghoshdastidar and Ambedkar Dukkipati. “Consistency of spectral hypergraph partitioning under planted partition model”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 45.1 (2017), pp. 289–315 (cit. on pp. 3, 4, 8).
- [55] Debarghya Ghoshdastidar and Ambedkar Dukkipati. “Consistency of spectral partitioning of uniform hypergraphs under planted partition model”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2014, pp. 397–405 (cit. on p. 3).
- [56] Venu Madhav Govindu. “A tensor decomposition for geometric grouping and segmentation”. In: *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR’05)*. Vol. 1. IEEE, 2005, pp. 1150–1157 (cit. on p. 2).
- [57] Yuzhou Gu and Yury Polyanskiy. “Weak Recovery Threshold for the Hypergraph Stochastic Block Model”. In: (2023). arXiv: [2303.14689](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.14689) [math.PR] (cit. on p. 3).
- [58] Olivier Guédon and Roman Vershynin. “Community detection in sparse networks via Grothendieck’s inequality”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 165.3-4 (2016), pp. 1025–1049 (cit. on p. 2).
- [59] Bruce Hajek, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. “Achieving exact cluster recovery threshold via semi-definite programming”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 62.5 (2016), pp. 2788–2797 (cit. on pp. 2, 7).
- [60] Rungang Han et al. “Exact clustering in tensor block model: Statistical optimality and computational limit”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 84.5 (2022), pp. 1666–1698. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12547> (cit. on pp. 6, 9, 21).
- [61] Kameron Decker Harris and Yizhe Zhu. “Deterministic Tensor Completion with Hypergraph Expanders”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 3.4 (2021), pp. 1117–1140 (cit. on p. 2).
- [62] Simon Heimlicher, Marc Lelarge, and Laurent Massoulié. “Community detection in the labelled stochastic block model”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1209.2910* (2012) (cit. on p. 2).
- [63] Christopher J Hillar and Lek-Heng Lim. “Most tensor problems are NP-hard”. In: *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 60.6 (2013), p. 45 (cit. on p. 4).
- [64] Paul W Holland, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, and Samuel Leinhardt. “Stochastic blockmodels: First steps”. In: *Social networks* 5.2 (1983), pp. 109–137 (cit. on p. 2).

- [65] Jiaxin Hu and Miaoyan Wang. “Multiway Spherical Clustering via Degree-Corrected Tensor Block Models”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 1078–1119 (cit. on p. 21).
- [66] Prateek Jain and Sewoong Oh. “Provable tensor factorization with missing data”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2014, pp. 1431–1439 (cit. on p. 2).
- [67] Amin Jalali et al. “Exploiting Tradeoffs for Exact Recovery in Heterogeneous Stochastic Block Models”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016). Ed. by D. Lee et al. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2016/file/57bafb2c2dfeefba931bb03a835b1fa9-Paper.pdf> (cit. on p. 2).
- [68] Adel Javanmard, Andrea Montanari, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. “Phase transitions in semidefinite relaxations”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113.16 (2016), E2218–E2223 (cit. on p. 2).
- [69] Pengsheng Ji and Jiashun Jin. “Coauthorship and citation networks for statisticians”. In: *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 10.4 (2016), pp. 1779–1812. DOI: [10.1214/15-AOAS896](https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AOAS896). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AOAS896> (cit. on p. 2).
- [70] Haotian Jiang et al. “A Faster Interior Point Method for Semidefinite Programming”. In: (2020), pp. 910–918. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00089](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00089) (cit. on p. 7).
- [71] Jiashun Jin et al. “Phase transition for detecting a small community in a large network”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05024* (2023) (cit. on p. 2).
- [72] Brian Karrer and Mark EJ Newman. “Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks”. In: *Physical review E* 83.1 (2011), p. 016107 (cit. on pp. 2, 21).
- [73] Zheng Tracy Ke, Feng Shi, and Dong Xia. “Community detection for hypergraph networks via regularized tensor power iteration”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06503* (2019) (cit. on pp. 3, 6, 8, 21).
- [74] Chiheon Kim, Afonso S. Bandeira, and Michel X. Goemans. “Stochastic Block Model for Hypergraphs: Statistical limits and a semidefinite programming approach”. In: *arXiv* (2018). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.02884> (cit. on pp. 3, 8, 9).
- [75] Florent Krzakala et al. “Spectral redemption in clustering sparse networks”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110.52 (2013), pp. 20935–20940 (cit. on p. 2).
- [76] Can M Le, Elizaveta Levina, and Roman Vershynin. “Concentration and regularization of random graphs”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 51.3 (2017), pp. 538–561 (cit. on p. 9).
- [77] Jeonghwan Lee, Daesung Kim, and Hye Won Chung. “Robust hypergraph clustering via convex relaxation of truncated MLE”. In: *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory* 1.3 (2020), pp. 613–631 (cit. on p. 3).
- [78] Jing Lei and Alessandro Rinaldo. “Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 43.1 (2015), pp. 215–237. DOI: [10.1214/14-AOS1274](https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1274). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOS1274> (cit. on pp. 2, 28).
- [79] Lihua Lei. “Unified $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ Eigenspace Perturbation Theory for Symmetric Random Matrices”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04798* (2019) (cit. on p. 2).
- [80] Lei Li and Tao Li. “News recommendation via hypergraph learning: encapsulation of user behavior and news content”. In: *Proceedings of the sixth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*. 2013, pp. 305–314 (cit. on p. 2).
- [81] Chung-Yi Lin, I Eli Chien, and I-Hsiang Wang. “On the fundamental statistical limit of community detection in random hypergraphs”. In: *Information Theory (ISIT), 2017 IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 2178–2182 (cit. on p. 3).
- [82] Chen Lu and Subhabrata Sen. “Contextual stochastic block model: Sharp thresholds and contiguity”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09841* (2020) (cit. on p. 2).
- [83] Zongming Ma and Sagnik Nandy. “Community detection with contextual multilayer networks”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* (2023) (cit. on pp. 2, 21).
- [84] Laurent Massoulié. “Community detection thresholds and the weak Ramanujan property”. In: *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. ACM. 2014, pp. 694–703 (cit. on p. 2).

- [85] Frank McSherry. “Spectral partitioning of random graphs”. In: *Proceedings 2001 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing* (2001), pp. 529–537 (cit. on p. 2).
- [86] Tom Michoel and Bruno Nachtergaele. “Alignment and integration of complex networks by hypergraph-based spectral clustering”. In: *Physical Review E* 86.5 (2012), p. 056111 (cit. on p. 2).
- [87] Andrea Montanari and Subhabrata Sen. “Semidefinite programs on sparse random graphs and their application to community detection”. In: *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*. 2016, pp. 814–827 (cit. on p. 2).
- [88] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. “A proof of the block model threshold conjecture”. In: *Combinatorica* 38.3 (2018), pp. 665–708 (cit. on p. 2).
- [89] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. “Consistency thresholds for the planted bisection model”. In: *Electron. J. Probab* 21.21 (2016), pp. 1–24 (cit. on pp. 2, 7, 21).
- [90] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. “Reconstruction and estimation in the planted partition model”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 162.3-4 (2015), pp. 431–461 (cit. on p. 2).
- [91] Elchanan Mossel, Allan Sly, and Youngtak Sohn. “Exact Phase Transitions for Stochastic Block Models and Reconstruction on Trees”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03362* (2022) (cit. on p. 2).
- [92] Mark EJ Newman, Duncan J Watts, and Steven H Strogatz. “Random graph models of social networks”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99.suppl.1 (2002), pp. 2566–2572 (cit. on p. 2).
- [93] Andrew Y Ng, Michael I Jordan, and Yair Weiss. “On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2002, pp. 849–856 (cit. on p. 2).
- [94] Soumik Pal and Yizhe Zhu. “Community detection in the sparse hypergraph stochastic block model”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 59.3 (2021), pp. 407–463 (cit. on p. 3).
- [95] Amelia Perry and Alexander S Wein. “A semidefinite program for unbalanced multisection in the stochastic block model”. In: *2017 International Conference on Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 64–67 (cit. on p. 2).
- [96] Karl Rohe, Sourav Chatterjee, and Bin Yu. “Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 39 (2011), pp. 1878–1915 (cit. on p. 2).
- [97] Subhabrata Sen. “Optimization on sparse random hypergraphs and spin glasses”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 53.3 (2018), pp. 504–536 (cit. on p. 2).
- [98] Jianbo Shi and Jitendra Malik. “Normalized cuts and image segmentation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 22.8 (2000), pp. 888–905 (cit. on p. 2).
- [99] Tom A. B. Snijders and Krzysztof Nowicki. “Estimation and Prediction for Stochastic Blockmodels for Graphs with Latent Block Structure”. In: *Journal of Classification* 14 (1997), pp. 75–100 (cit. on p. 2).
- [100] Tasuku Soma and Yuichi Yoshida. “Spectral sparsification of hypergraphs”. In: *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM. 2019, pp. 2570–2581 (cit. on p. 2).
- [101] Ludovic Stephan and Yizhe Zhu. “Sparse random hypergraphs: Non-backtracking spectra and community detection”. In: *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE. 2022, pp. 567–575 (cit. on p. 3).
- [102] Ze Tian, TaeHyun Hwang, and Rui Kuang. “A hypergraph-based learning algorithm for classifying gene expression and arrayCGH data with prior knowledge”. In: *Bioinformatics* 25.21 (2009), pp. 2831–2838 (cit. on p. 2).
- [103] Roman Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018 (cit. on pp. 28, 56).
- [104] Nicolas Verzelen and Ery Arias-Castro. “Community detection in sparse random networks”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 25.6 (2015), pp. 3465–3510. DOI: [10.1214/14-AAP1080](https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AAP1080). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AAP1080> (cit. on p. 2).
- [105] Van Vu. “A Simple SVD Algorithm for Finding Hidden Partitions”. In: *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 27.1 (2018), pp. 124–140 (cit. on p. 2).

- [106] Haixiao Wang. “Strong consistency and optimality of spectral clustering in symmetric binary non-uniform Hypergraph Stochastic Block Model”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06845* (2023). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.06845> (cit. on pp. 3, 6, 8, 9).
- [107] Longyin Wen et al. “Learning non-uniform hypergraph for multi-object tracking”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*. Vol. 33. 2019, pp. 8981–8988 (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [108] Jiaming Xu, Laurent Massoulié, and Marc Lelarge. “Edge Label Inference in Generalized Stochastic Block Models: from Spectral Theory to Impossibility Results”. In: *Proceedings of The 27th Conference on Learning Theory*. Vol. 35. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. Barcelona, Spain: PMLR, 13–15 Jun 2014, pp. 903–920. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v35/xu14.html> (cit. on p. 2).
- [109] Yi Yu, Tengyao Wang, and Richard J. Samworth. “A useful variant of the Davis–Kahan theorem for statisticians”. In: *Biometrika* 102.2 (Apr. 2014), pp. 315–323. ISSN: 0006-3444. DOI: [10.1093/biomet/asv008](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asv008). eprint: <https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article-pdf/102/2/315/9642505/asv008.pdf>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asv008> (cit. on p. 20).
- [110] Seyoung Yun and Alexandre Proutière. “Community detection via random and adaptive sampling”. In: *Conference on learning theory*. PMLR. 2014, pp. 138–175 (cit. on pp. 2, 11).
- [111] Seyoung Yun and Alexandre Proutière. “Optimal cluster recovery in the labeled stochastic block model”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2016) (cit. on pp. 2, 7, 9, 11, 14, 21).
- [112] Qiaosheng Zhang and Vincent Y. F. Tan. “Exact Recovery in the General Hypergraph Stochastic Block Model”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 69.1 (2023), pp. 453–471. DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2022.3205959](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2022.3205959) (cit. on pp. 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 16).
- [113] Yaoming Zhen and Junhui Wang. “Community detection in general hypergraph via graph embedding”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (2022), pp. 1–10 (cit. on p. 8).
- [114] Denny Zhou, Jiayuan Huang, and Bernhard Schölkopf. “Learning with hypergraphs: Clustering, classification, and embedding”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2007, pp. 1601–1608 (cit. on p. 2).
- [115] Zhixin Zhou and Yizhe Zhu. “Sparse random tensors: Concentration, regularization and applications”. In: *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 15.1 (2021), pp. 2483–2516 (cit. on p. 2).

APPENDIX A. THE KAHN-SZEMERÉDI APPROACH AND PROOFS OF CONCENTRATION

A.1. Proof Outline of Theorem 3.1. We follow the approach in [49, 78, 38] to establish the proof of Theorem 3.1. According to Courant-Fischer-Weyl min-max principle, the spectral norm of any $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix \mathbf{W} can be reformulated as

$$(A.1) \quad \|\mathbf{W}\| := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \|\mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}|,$$

where $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = 1\}$ denotes the unit sphere, and the second equality makes use of the Hermitian property of \mathbf{W} . As indicated by a short continuity argument (Lemma A.1), if one wants to bound the supremum in (A.1), it suffices to control $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$ for all \mathbf{x} in a suitable ε -net \mathcal{N}_ε of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with cardinality bounded by $|\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon| \leq (1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon})^n$, while the existence of such \mathcal{N}_ε is guaranteed by compactness of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and [103, Corollary 4.2.13].

Lemma A.1 ([103, Lemma 4.4.1]). *Let \mathbf{W} be any Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix and \mathcal{N}_ε be an ε -net on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, then $\|\mathbf{W}\| \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} |\langle \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle|$.*

Define $\mathbf{W} := \mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}$ and take $\mathcal{N} := \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ with its size bounded by $|\mathcal{N}| \leq 5^n$, then

$$(A.2) \quad \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| =: \|\mathbf{W}\| \leq 2 \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} |\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}| \leq 2 \cdot 5^n \cdot |\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}|, \text{ for some } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}.$$

Therefore, upper bound of $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\|$ will be obtained once the concentration of random variable $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$ is demonstrated for each fixed $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathcal{N}$. Roughly speaking, one might seek upper bound on $|\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}|$ of order $O(\sqrt{d_{\max}})$ which holds with high probability, then a union bound over \mathcal{N} establishes Theorem 3.1, as long as concentration of $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$ is sufficient to beat the cardinality of the net \mathcal{N} .

The problem now reduces to prove $|\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}| = \sum_i \sum_j W_{ij} x_i x_j = O(\sqrt{d_{\max}})$ with high probability. However, two main difficulties lie on

- (1) the dependence between matrix elements W_{ij} ,
- (2) not every pair $W_{ij} x_i x_j$ enjoys the sufficient concentration to beat the cardinality of \mathcal{N} .

To get rid of those difficulties, we follow Kahn-Szemerédi's argument [49, Theorem 2.2] to split $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$ into *light* and *heavy* pairs according to $\max_{(i,j) \in [n]^2} |x_i x_j|$,

$$(A.3) \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) := \left\{ (i, j) : |x_i x_j| \leq \frac{\sqrt{d_{\max}}}{n} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) := \left\{ (i, j) : |x_i x_j| > \frac{\sqrt{d_{\max}}}{n} \right\},$$

where $d_{\max} := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\max}^{(m)}$. By triangle inequality, (A.2) adapts the following decomposition, where contribution from *light* and *heavy* couples can be bounded separately,

$$(A.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| &\leq 2 \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} |\langle \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle| = 2 \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in [n]^2} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \\ &\leq 2 \left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \right). \end{aligned}$$

As will be shown later, the contribution of *light* pairs is bounded by $\alpha \sqrt{d_{\max}}$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-n}$ according to (A.7), while contribution of *heavy* pairs is bounded by $\beta \sqrt{d_{\max}}$ with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-10}$ if $d_{\max} \geq c \log(n)$ for some constant $c > 0$, as in Lemma A.8. Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| \leq C_{(3.3)} \sqrt{d_{\max}},$$

holds with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-n} - 2n^{-10}$, where $C_{(3.3)} := 2(\alpha + \beta)$ with $\alpha = 5M^2$, $\beta = \beta_0 \sqrt{\beta_1} + M$,

$$\beta_0 = 16 + 32M(1 + e^2) + 1792(1 + e^{-2})M^2, \quad \frac{\beta_1}{M} \log\left(\frac{\beta_1}{M}\right) - \frac{\beta_1}{M} + 1 > \frac{11}{c},$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. The remaining of this section is organized as follows. The bounds for contributions of *light* and *heavy* pairs are provided in Appendix A.2, Appendix A.3, and the proof of Theorem 3.3 will be established in Appendix A.4.

A.2. Light couples. The contribution from *light* pairs can be decomposed into summation of contributions from independent hyperedges. An application of Bernstein's inequality (Lemma F.6) provides us with the concentration we need to beat the cardinality $|\mathcal{N}| = 5^n$.

For each m -hyperedge $e \in E(H_m)$, define $\mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} := \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}$. Then for each fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the contribution from light pair can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j &= \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \supset \{i,j\}}} \mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} \right) x_i x_j = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} \cdot \sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \{i,j\} \subset e}} x_i x_j \\ (A.5) \quad &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)} := \mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} \left(\sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \{i,j\} \subset e}} x_i x_j \right)$. Note that $e \supset (i, j)$ is an m -hyperedge, then the number of choices for the pair (i, j) under some fixed e is at most m^2 . By the definition of light pair in (A.3), $\mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)}$ is upper bounded by $|\mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)}| \leq m^2 \frac{\sqrt{d_{\max}}}{n} \leq M^2 \frac{\sqrt{d_{\max}}}{n}$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, (A.5) is a sum of independent, mean-zero ($\mathbb{E}\mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)} = 0$) random variables, and its second moment is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)})^2] &:= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \left[\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{W}_e^{(m)})^2] \left(\sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \{i,j\} \subset e}} x_i x_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \left[\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}] \cdot m^2 \left(\sum_{\substack{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \{i,j\} \subset e}} x_i^2 x_j^2 \right) \right] \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{n-2}{m-2} \cdot \frac{d_{\max}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \cdot m^2 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} x_i^2 x_j^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{m^2(m-1)}{n-m+2} \cdot d_{\max}^{(m)} \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m^3 \cdot d_{\max}^{(m)} \leq \frac{2M^3}{n} d_{\max}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we use the facts $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} = 1$ and

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} x_i^2 x_j^2 \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in [n]^2} x_i^2 x_j^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 = 1.$$

Then Bernstein's inequality (Lemma F.6) implies that for any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \geq \alpha \sqrt{d_{\max}} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathcal{Y}_e^{(m)} \right| \geq \alpha \sqrt{d_{\max}} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 d_{\max}}{\frac{2M^3}{n} d_{\max} + \frac{1}{3} M^2 \frac{\sqrt{d_{\max}}}{n} \cdot \alpha \sqrt{d_{\max}}} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\alpha^2 n}{4M^3 + \frac{2\alpha}{3} M^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently by a union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \geq \alpha \sqrt{d_{\max}} \right) &\leq |\mathcal{N}| \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \geq \alpha \sqrt{d_{\max}} \right) \\ (A.7) \quad &\leq 2 \exp \left(\log(5) \cdot n - \frac{\alpha^2 n}{4M^3 + \frac{2\alpha}{3} M^2} \right) \leq 2e^{-n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by taking $\alpha = 5M^2$.

A.3. Heavy couples.

A.3.1. *General Strategy.* The contribution of *heavy* couples can be bounded separately,

$$(A.8) \quad \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} W_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \leq \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} A_{ij} x_i x_j \right| + \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} (\mathbb{E}A)_{ij} x_i x_j \right|.$$

Meanwhile, for any pair $(i, j) \in [n]^2$,

$$(A.9) \quad (\mathbb{E}A)_{ij} \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{n-2}{m-2} \frac{d_{\max}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{(m-1)}{n-1} \cdot d_{\max}^{(m)} = \frac{M d_{\max}}{n-1},$$

and by definition of *heavy* pair

$$(A.10) \quad \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} (\mathbb{E}A)_{ij} x_i x_j \right| = \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} (\mathbb{E}A)_{ij} \frac{x_i^2 x_j^2}{x_i x_j} \right| \leq \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{M d_{\max}}{n-1} \frac{x_i^2 x_j^2}{|x_i x_j|} \\ \leq M \sqrt{d_{\max}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} x_i^2 x_j^2 \leq M \sqrt{d_{\max}},$$

where we use the fact $\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} x_i^2 x_j^2 \leq 1$ again. Therefore it suffices to show that, with high probability,

$$(A.11) \quad \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(x)} A_{ij} x_i x_j \right| = O(\sqrt{d_{\max}}).$$

Unfortunately, the contribution of *heavy* couples does not enjoy sufficient concentration to beat the cardinality of the net \mathcal{N} , which was the strategy we used in Appendix A.2. Instead, the key idea here is to prove the *discrepancy property* (Definition A.2) holds with high probability for the associated random regular graph. Essentially, the edge counts $e_{\mathbf{A}}(S, T) := \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{v \in T} \mathbf{1}_S^{\top} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{1}_T$ are not much larger than their expectation, uniformly over choices of $S, T \subset [n]$, which can be proved by using tail estimates of random variables $e_{\mathbf{A}}(S, T)$. Conditioning on the event that *discrepancy* property holds, one can show that the contribution of *heavy* couples is deterministically of order $O(\sqrt{d_{\max}})$ by Lemma A.3, as long as row and column sums of \mathbf{A} are bounded by $\sqrt{d_{\max}}$ up to some constant.

Definition A.2 (Discrepancy property, **DP**). *Let \mathbf{A} be an $n \times n$ matrix with non-negative entries. For subsets $S, T \subset [n]$, define*

$$e_{\mathbf{A}}(S, T) := \sum_{i \in S} \sum_{j \in T} A_{ij}.$$

*We say that \mathbf{A} has the discrepancy property with parameter $\delta > 0$, $\kappa_1 > 1$, $\kappa_2 \geq 0$, denoted by **DP**($\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$), if for all non-empty $S, T \subset [n]$, at least one of the following hold:*

- (1) $e_{\mathbf{A}}(S, T) \leq \kappa_1 \delta |S| |T|$;
- (2) $e_{\mathbf{A}}(S, T) \cdot \log \left(\frac{e_{\mathbf{A}}(S, T)}{\delta |S| |T|} \right) \leq \kappa_2 (|S| \vee |T|) \cdot \log \left(\frac{en}{|S| |T|} \right)$.

Lemma A.3 ([38, Lemma 6.6], **DP** \implies heavy couples are small). *Let \mathbf{A} be a non-negative symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. Suppose that*

- (1) *all row and column sums of \mathbf{A} are bounded by d ,*
- (2) *\mathbf{A} has **DP**($\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$) with $\delta = \frac{Cd}{n}$ for some $C > 0$, $\kappa_1 > 1$, $\kappa_2 \geq 0$,*

then for any $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, deterministically,

$$\left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(x)} A_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \leq \beta_0 \sqrt{d},$$

where $\beta_0 = 16 + 32C(1 + \kappa_1) + 64\kappa_2(1 + \frac{2}{\kappa_1 \log \kappa_1})$.

A.3.2. *Our model.* To prove the *discrepancy* property in our model, we follow the discrepancy analysis in [48, 38], and consider the weighted graph associated with the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} . By Lemma A.5, the *discrepancy* property follows with high probability if *uniform upper tail* property (Definition A.4) holds. Therefore, our tasks reduce to prove that row sums of \mathbf{A} are bounded and **UUTP** holds with high probability, which are shown in Lemma A.6 and Lemma A.7 respectively.

Definition A.4 (Uniform upper tail property, **UUTP**). *Let \mathbf{A} be a random symmetric $n \times n$ matrix with non-negative entries. An $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{Q} is associated to \mathbf{A} through $f_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij} A_{ij}$. Define*

$$\mu := f_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij} \mathbb{E}A_{ij}, \quad \tilde{\sigma}^2 := f_{\mathbf{Q} \circ \mathbf{Q}}(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij}^2 \mathbb{E}A_{ij},$$

where \circ denotes the Hadamard (entrywise) matrix product. We say that \mathbf{A} satisfies the uniform upper tail property **UUTP**(c_0, γ_0) with $c_0 > 0, \gamma_0 \geq 0$, if for any $a, t > 0$ and any symmetric $n \times n$ matrix \mathbf{Q} satisfying $Q_{ij} \in [0, a]$ for all $i, j \in [n]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(f_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{A}) \geq (1 + \gamma_0)\mu + t\right) \leq \exp\left(-c_0 \frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{a^2} h\left(\frac{at}{\tilde{\sigma}^2}\right)\right).$$

where the function $h(x) := (1 + x) \log(1 + x) - x$ for all $x > -1$.

Lemma A.5 ([38, Lemma 6.4], **UUTP** \implies **DP**). *Let \mathbf{A} be a symmetric $n \times n$ random matrix with non-negative entries. Assume that*

- (1) $\mathbb{E}A_{ij} \leq \delta$ for all $i, j \in [n]$ for some $\delta > 0$,
- (2) \mathbf{A} has **UUTP**(c_0, γ_0) with parameter $c_0, \gamma_0 > 0$.

Then for any $\theta > 0$, the discrepancy property **DP**($\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$) holds for \mathbf{A} with probability at least $1 - n^{-\theta}$ with $\kappa_1 = e^2(1 + \gamma_0)^2, \kappa_2 = \frac{2}{c_0}(1 + \gamma_0)(\theta + 4)$.

Lemma A.6. *If $d_{\max} \geq c \log(n)$ for some constant $c > 0$, then for some large enough constant β_1 ⁶ satisfying $M^{-1}\beta_1 \log(M^{-1}\beta_1) - M^{-1}\beta_1 + 1 > 11/c$, with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$, we have*

$$(A.12) \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} \right) \leq \beta_1 d_{\max}$$

Proof of Lemma A.6. Note that by a union bound

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} \right) > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right).$$

Thus one can focus on bounding tail probability of one row sum. For each fixed $i \in [n]$,

$$(A.13) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \supset \{i, j\}}} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \ni i}} (m-1) \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}.$$

⁶The existence of such β_1 is guaranteed since $g(x) = x \log(x) - x + 1$ takes its minimum at $x = 1$ and increases when $x > 1$.

Then by Markov inequality (Lemma F.3) and independence between hyperedges

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \ni i}} (m-1) \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(\exp(-\theta \beta_1 d_{\max}) \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \ni i}} \mathbb{E} \exp[\theta(m-1) \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}] \right) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(\exp(-\theta \beta_1 d_{\max}) \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \ni i}} \left[\frac{d_{\max}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} e^{\theta(m-1)} + 1 - \frac{d_{\max}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \right] \right) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(\exp(-\theta \beta_1 d_{\max}) \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ e \ni i}} \exp \left[\frac{d_{\max}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} (e^{\theta(m-1)} - 1) \right] \right), \quad (1+x \leq e^x) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(\exp(-\theta \beta_1 d_{\max}) \cdot \exp \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\max}^{(m)} (e^{\theta(m-1)} - 1) \right] \right), \quad (\text{at most } \binom{n-1}{m-1} \text{ edges contains } i) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \exp[-d_{\max}(\theta \beta_1 - e^{\theta M} + 1)] = \exp \left[-d_{\max} \left(\frac{\beta_1}{M} \log \left(\frac{\beta_1}{M} \right) - \frac{\beta_1}{M} + 1 \right) \right] \\
& \leq \exp \left[-\log(n) \cdot c \left(\frac{\beta_1}{M} \log \left(\frac{\beta_1}{M} \right) - \frac{\beta_1}{M} + 1 \right) \right] \leq n^{-11}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by the union bound $\mathbb{P}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij}) > \beta_1 d_{\max}) \leq n^{-10}$. \square

Lemma A.7 (UTP from Non-uniform Inhomogeneous Hypergraph). *Let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of $H = \cup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} H_m$, then \mathbf{A} satisfies **UUTP**(c_0, γ_0) with $c_0 = M^{-2}, \gamma_0 = 0$.*

Proof of Lemma A.7. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{A}) - \mu &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij} (A_{ij} - \mathbb{E}A_{ij}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij} W_{ij} = \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij} \left(\sum_{\substack{m \in \mathcal{M} \\ e \in E(H_m) \\ e \supset \{i,j\}}} \mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} \left(\sum_{\{i,j\} \subset e} Q_{ij} \right) = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathcal{Z}_e^{(m)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_e^{(m)} = \mathcal{W}_e^{(m)} (\sum_{\{i,j\} \subset e} Q_{ij})$ are independent centered random variables upper bounded by $|\mathcal{Z}_e^{(m)}| \leq \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset e} Q_{ij} \leq M^2 a$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ since $Q_{ij} \in [0, a]$. Moreover, the variance can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}_e^{(m)})^2 := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{W}_e^{(m)})^2 \left(\sum_{\{i,j\} \subset e} Q_{ij} \right)^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \in E(H_m)} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}] \cdot m^2 \sum_{\{i,j\} \subset e} Q_{ij}^2 \leq M^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n Q_{ij}^2 \mathbb{E}A_{ij} = M^2 \tilde{\sigma}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since by definition $\mathbb{E}A_{ij} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E(H_m) \\ \{i,j\} \subset e}} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}]$. Then by Bennett's inequality (Lemma F.7), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(f_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{A}) - \mu \geq t) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{M^2 a^2} h \left(\frac{at}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \right) \right),$$

where the last line holds since $xh(\frac{1}{x}) = (1+x) \log(1 + \frac{1}{x}) - 1$ decreases when $x > 0$. \square

A.3.3. *Contribution of (A.11).*

Lemma A.8. *If $d_{\max} \geq c \log(n)$ for some constant $c > 0$, there exists some constant β such that with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-10}$,*

$$(A.14) \quad \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} (A_{ij} - \mathbb{E}A_{ij})x_i x_j \right| \leq \beta \sqrt{d_{\max}}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.8. Note that $\mathbb{E}A_{ij}$ is bounded (Equation (A.9)) and \mathbf{A} satisfies **UUTP**($M^{-2}, 0$) (Lemma A.7), then by Lemma A.5, for any $\theta > 0$, the *discrepancy* property **DP**($\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$) holds for \mathbf{A} with probability at least $1 - n^{-\theta}$, where

$$\delta = \frac{M}{n} d_{\max}, \quad \kappa_1 = e^2(1 + \gamma_0)^2 = e^2, \quad \kappa_2 = \frac{2}{c_0}(1 + \gamma_0)(\theta + 4) = 2M^2(\theta + 4).$$

Let \mathcal{E}_1 be the event that **DP**($\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$) holds for \mathbf{A} , and \mathcal{E}_2 be the event that all row sums of \mathbf{A} are bounded by $\beta_1 d_{\max}$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - 2n^{-10}$ where we take $\theta = 10$ for convenience. On the event $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$, by Lemma A.3, Equation (A.14) holds with $\beta = \beta_0 \sqrt{\beta_1} + M$, where β_0, β_1 satisfying

$$\beta_0 = 16 + 32M(1 + \kappa_1) + 64\kappa_2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{\kappa_1 \log(\kappa_1)}\right) = 16 + 32M(1 + e^2) + 1792(1 + e^{-2})M^2,$$

$$\frac{\beta_1}{M} \log\left(\frac{\beta_1}{M}\right) - \frac{\beta_1}{M} + 1 > \frac{11}{c}.$$

□

A.4. **Proof of Theorem 3.3.** Following the strategy in Appendix A.1, for any $J \subset [n]$,

$$(A.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}\| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} [(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}]_{ij} x_i x_j \right| + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} [(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}]_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \right), \end{aligned}$$

we want to bound the contribution of *light* and *heavy* pairs separately.

A.4.1. *Light couples.* By (A.7), with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-n}$,

$$(A.16) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})} [(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}]_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \leq 5M^2 \sqrt{d_{\max}}.$$

A union bound proves that (A.16) holds for any given subset $\mathcal{J} \subset [n]$ with probability at least $1 - 2(e/2)^{-n}$, since the number of possible choices for \mathcal{J} is at most 2^n , including the options $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2$ of our interests.

A.4.2. *Heavy couples.* Our goal is to prove

$$(A.17) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{N}} \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} [(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}]_{ij} x_i x_j \right| \leq \beta \sqrt{d_{\max}},$$

Similar to Equation (A.10), deterministically for $\mathcal{J} := \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2$.

$$(A.18) \quad \left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})} [(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}]_{ij} \right| \leq M \sqrt{d_{\max}}.$$

To control the contribution of *heavy* pairs, it suffices to show that *discrepancy* holds for $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ and all row sums of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ are bounded by $\beta_1 d_{\max}$, according to Lemma A.3.

To verify the *discrepancy* property, it suffices to show that **UUTP**($M^{-2}, 0$) holds for $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$, which is true since $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is obtained from \mathbf{A} by restricting rows and columns to \mathcal{J} . Then by Lemma A.5, for any $\theta > 0$, the *discrepancy* property **DP**($\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$) holds for $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-\theta}$, where

$$\delta = \frac{M}{n} d_{\max}, \quad \kappa_1 = e^2(1 + \gamma_0)^2 = e^2, \quad \kappa_2 = \frac{2}{c_0}(1 + \gamma_0)(\theta + 4) = 2M^2(\theta + 4).$$

The remaining is to verify the boundedness of row sums of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$.

- For \mathcal{J}_1 , Lemma A.9 proves that row sums of each $v \in \mathcal{J}_1$ is bounded by $\beta_1 d_{\max}$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$ for some constant $c > 0$ under the regime of our interests.
- Deterministically, it is true for $v \in \mathcal{J}_2 := \{i \in [n], \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} \leq \beta_1 d_{\max}\}$ by taking $\beta_1 = M$.

Let \mathcal{E}_1 be the event that $\mathbf{DP}(\delta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$ holds for $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$, and \mathcal{E}_2 be the event that all row sums of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ are bounded by $\beta_1 d_{\max}$.

- For \mathcal{J}_1 , $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - 2n^{-c}$, where we take $\theta = c$ for convenience.
- For \mathcal{J}_2 , $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - n^{-10}$, where we take $\theta = 10$ for convenience.

On the event $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$, (A.17) holds with $\beta = \beta_0 \sqrt{\beta_1} + M$, $\beta_1 = M$,

$$\beta_0 = 16 + 32M(1 + \kappa_1) + 64\kappa_2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{\kappa_1 \log(\kappa_1)}\right) = 16 + 32M(1 + e^2) + 1792(1 + e^{-2})M^2.$$

Lemma A.9. Define $\zeta_n := \log^{-1}(n)\rho_n$, $\gamma_n := \log^{-1}(n)\xi_n$. If $\zeta_n \log(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}) \gtrsim 1$, then there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that row sums of each $v \in \mathcal{J}_1$ is bounded by $\beta_1 d_{\max}$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$.

Proof of Lemma A.9. By (2.1), (3.1), $\mathcal{D}_v := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, and

$$\xi_n := \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_v \right), \quad \rho_n := \max_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{D}_v),$$

then $\gamma_n \leq \zeta_n$. The boundedness of row sum $\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj}$ for each $v \in [n]$ was proved in Lemma A.6 under the regime $\zeta_n = O(1)$. We only discuss the regime $\zeta_n = o(1)$ here. By definition of set \mathcal{J}_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{v \in \mathcal{J}_1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} \right) > \beta_1 d_{\max} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\#\left\{v : \sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right\} > \lfloor n \exp(-\bar{d}) \rfloor \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(Markov)}}{\leq} \frac{1}{\lfloor n \exp(-\bar{d}) \rfloor + 1} \mathbb{E} \left(\#\left\{v : \sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right\} \right) = \frac{\sum_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \mathbb{1}\left\{v : \sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right\}}{\lfloor n \exp(-\bar{d}) \rfloor + 1} \\ &\leq \frac{n}{\lfloor n \exp(-\bar{d}) \rfloor + 1} \max_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\exp(-\bar{d})} \max_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max} \right). \end{aligned}$$

- On the numerator, $\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj}$ can be reformulated as a summation of independent Bernoulli random variables according to Equation (A.13), with each $\mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}$ indicating the presence of an m -hyperedge and M denoting the largest element in \mathcal{M} , then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \ni v} (m-1) \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} \leq M \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \ni v} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m \sum_{e \ni v} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}) \asymp \xi_n$ due to the constraint $e \ni v$, and

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \ni v} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m \sum_{e \ni v} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} \leq M \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \ni v} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)},$$

then $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{e \ni v} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)}) \asymp \xi_n$ since M is constant. By Lemma F.8, for each $v \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E_m(H_m) \\ e \ni v}} (m-1) \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} > \beta_1 d_{\max} \right), \quad (\text{take } \beta_1 = M) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\substack{e \in E_m(H_m) \\ e \ni v}} \mathcal{A}_e^{(m)} > \frac{\beta_1}{M} \zeta_n \log(n) \right) \leq \exp \left\{ -\log(n) \left[\zeta_n \log\left(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}\right) + (\gamma_n - \zeta_n) \right] \right\} = n^{-c}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is some constant, while the existence of such c is guaranteed since we are under the regime $\zeta_n = o(1)$, $\gamma_n = o(1)$ and $\zeta_n \log(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}) \gtrsim 1$, and $f(t) = t \log(\frac{t}{\mu}) + (\mu - t) > 0$ for all $t > \mu$.

- For the denominator, $\bar{d} = n^{-1} \sum_{v \in [n]} d_v$ and $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_v) \asymp n\xi_n$. By hypergraph Handshaking Lemma $\sum_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_v = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m \sum_{e \in E_m} \mathcal{A}_e$. Then by Lemma F.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\bar{d} > \beta_1 d_{\max}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} m \sum_e \mathcal{A}_e > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{M}{n} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_e \mathcal{A}_e > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_e \mathcal{A}_e > \frac{\beta_1 n}{M} \cdot \zeta_n \log(n)\right], \quad (\text{take } \beta_1 = M), \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-\log(n) \cdot n \left[\zeta_n \log\left(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}\right) + (\gamma_n - \zeta_n)\right]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{d} \leq \beta_1 d_{\max}) \geq 1 - n^{-\omega(1)}$ when $\zeta_n \log(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}) = \omega(n^{-1})$, where $\omega(n^{-1}) \cap O(1) \neq \emptyset$. Namely, \bar{d} is bounded by $\beta_1 d_{\max} := M\zeta_n \log(n)$ with probability tending to 1.

Consequently, when $\zeta_n = o(1)$, $\gamma_n = o(1)$ and $\zeta_n \log(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}) \gtrsim 1$, there exists some constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{v \in \mathcal{J}_1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj}\right) > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) &\leq \exp(\bar{d}) \cdot \max_{v \in [n]} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n A_{vj} > \beta_1 d_{\max}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(M\zeta_n \log(n)) \cdot \exp\left\{-\log(n) \left[\zeta_n \log\left(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}\right) + (\gamma_n - \zeta_n)\right]\right\} \\ &= \exp\left\{-\log(n) \left[\zeta_n \log\left(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}\right) + (\gamma_n - \zeta_n) - M\zeta_n\right]\right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{-\log(n) \left[\zeta_n \log\left(\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n}\right)(1 - o(1))\right]\right\} = n^{-c}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

A.4.3. *Putting together.* Following the discussions above, Equation (A.15) adapts the following upper bound

$$\|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})_{\mathcal{J}}\| \leq C_{(3.3)} \sqrt{d_{\max}},$$

where the constant $C_{(3.3)} := 2(\alpha + \beta)$, with $\alpha = 5M^2$, $\beta = \beta_0 \sqrt{\beta_1} + M$, $\beta_0 = 16 + 32M(1 + e^2) + 1792(1 + e^{-2})M^2$, and $\beta_1 = M$.

APPENDIX B. PROOFS IN SECTION 2

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Thanks to hyperedge independence, under the condition $z_v = k$, the probability of v being ambiguous can be written as

$$\mathbb{P}(v \text{ ambiguous}) = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})].$$

Note that $n_{\mathbf{w}} = n^{m-1}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = O(\frac{\log(n)}{n^{m-1}}) = o(1)$, then $n_{\mathbf{w}} \log(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) = -n_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + o(\log(n))$. At the same time, $1 \ll d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) \asymp \log(n) \ll n$ in (2.5), by Stirling's approximation Lemma F.9, for large enough

n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})] &= \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})} (\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})} (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})} \\
&= \exp \left\{ \log \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})} + d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \log(\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) + [n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})] \cdot \log(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) \log \left(\frac{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})} \right) + d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) + d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right) + n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \log(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) + o(\log(n)) \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \log \left(\frac{n_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) \cdot (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right) - n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w}) + o(\log(n)) \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \left[t^* (\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} \log \frac{\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + \mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} + o(1) \right] \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we use the fact $\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}} := \mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}} \log(n) [\binom{n-1}{m-1}]^{-1}$ in (1.4), plug in $d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})$ in (2.5), and replace $n_{\mathbf{w}}$ with $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ according to Lemma 2.1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(v \text{ ambiguous}) &= \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{j,k}^*(\mathbf{w})] \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \left[t^* (\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} + o(1) \right] \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \left[t^* \mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1-t^*) \mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{t^*} (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t^*} + o(1) \right] \right\} \\
&= n^{-\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j,k) + o(1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where first order condition (2.4) was used in the second to last equality. \square

APPENDIX C. PROOFS IN SECTION 3

Proof of Lemma 3.4. For the first part, $\xi_n \asymp \rho_n$ is trivially true when Assumption 1.15 holds. On the other hand, due to the fact $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K = \Omega(1)$, the conclusion $\xi_n \asymp \rho_n$ still holds since the dense part inside the summation $\xi_n = n^{-1} \sum_{v=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}_v]$ distinguishes itself.

For the second part, the concentration of average degree can be proved by a simple application of Bernstein F.6 as long as $\rho_n = \omega(1)$.

For the last part, let $\tilde{d} = \max_{v \in [n]} d_v$ denote realized maximum degree. Define the random variable $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_v$, then $\mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \mathbb{E} \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_v$. Define $\mathcal{W}_v := \mathcal{D}_v - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{D}_v$, then following (2.1), $\mathcal{W}_v = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ where $\mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ are mean zero random variables, and define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{W}} := \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{W}_v \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \sim \text{Bin}(n_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$ when $z_v = k$, then $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^2 = n_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \leq \mathbb{E} \mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} < \mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. By Bernstein F.6, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}] \leq \exp \left(- \frac{3(1 - \varepsilon)^2 (\mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathcal{D}})^2}{6\sigma^2 + 2\sqrt{(1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}}} \right) \leq \exp \left(- \frac{1}{2} (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \right)$$

Denote $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \geq c \log(n)$ for some $c > 0$ under regime (1.4). By the union bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{W}} \geq (1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{P}(\max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \geq (1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \sum_{v=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{W}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \geq (1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}] \leq (M-1) \cdot \binom{M+K-1}{K-1} \exp\left(\log(n) - \frac{1}{2}(1-\varepsilon)^2 \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\right) \\ &\lesssim \exp\left\{-\log(n) \cdot [(1-\varepsilon)^2 c^2 / 2 - 1]\right\} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{when } c > \sqrt{2}/(1-\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $c > \sqrt{2}/(1-\varepsilon)$. Note that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$ implies $c > 2^{m-1}$ for $m \in \mathcal{M}$, then it just a matter of choosing proper ε . Similarly, $\tilde{\mathcal{W}} \geq -(1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ with probability tending to 1. Note that $|\tilde{\mathcal{D}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}| \leq |\tilde{\mathcal{W}}| \leq (1-\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ with high probability, then

$$\varepsilon \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \leq 2\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}.$$

We now refer to the magnitude of $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. By Jensen's inequality, for any $t > 0$, we have

$$\exp(t\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp(t\tilde{\mathcal{D}}) = \mathbb{E} \exp\left(t \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_v\right) \leq \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{E} \exp\left(t \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\right),$$

since $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$. By the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp\left(t \max_{v \in [n]} \mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\right) &\leq \sum_{v=1}^n \mathbb{E} \exp\left(t \mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\right) = \sum_{v=1}^n [\mathcal{Q}_{z(v) \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} e^t + (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{z(v) \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})]^{n_{\mathbf{w}}} \\ &\leq n[1 + \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)}(e^t - 1)]^{n_{\mathbf{w}}} \leq \exp[\log(n) + n_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)}(e^t - 1)], \end{aligned}$$

since by definition $\mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ and $1 + x \leq e^x$. We adapt the notation in (1.4), (3.1), then $d_{\max} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$ where $\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} = \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$. Note that $n_{\mathbf{w}} \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} \leq \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$, by taking $t = 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} (\log(n) + \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)) \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} |\mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K| \cdot (\log(n) + \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)) \lesssim d_{\max},$$

where $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \geq 1$ when $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$ and $|\mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K| = \binom{m+K-1}{K-1} = O(1)$. Also,

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \geq \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n) \gtrsim d_{\max}.$$

Therefore $\tilde{d} \asymp d_{\max}$ with high probability. The desired result follows if $d_{\max} \asymp \rho_n$, which is obviously true when Assumption 1.15 holds. When the assumption is not true, where some specific configuration $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$ dominates for some $m \in \mathcal{M}$, then the vertex with maximum expected degree should certainly contain this type of edge. At the same time, $d_{\max} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} d_{\max}^{(m)}$ in Theorem 3.1, where $d_{\max}^{(m)} = \max_{i_1, \dots, i_m \in [n]} d_{i_1, \dots, i_m}$ should contain the dominant type \mathbf{w} as well. Therefore $d_{\max} \asymp \rho_n \asymp \tilde{d}$ with high probability. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Define the matrix $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ where $\mathbb{E}\tilde{A}_{ij} = \mathbb{E}A_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$ and $\mathbb{E}\tilde{A}_{ii} = \mathbb{E}A_{ij}$ for some $j \in [n]$ in the same community as i , i.e., $z_i = z_j$, then $\text{rank}(\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = K$. By triangle inequality and $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$,

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 + 2\|\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2$$

The matrices $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ and $\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}$ only differ in diagonal elements while $\mathbb{E}\tilde{A}_{ii} \lesssim n^{-1}d_{\max}$, then $\|\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \lesssim n^{-1}d_{\max}^2$. Meanwhile, the rank of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is at most $2K$, then by rank inequality

$$\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \leq 2K\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2 \leq 4K(\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2).$$

By Eckart–Young–Mirsky Lemma F.2, $\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)}\|_2 = \lambda_{K+1} \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2$. Also, $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \text{diag}(\mathbb{E}A_{ii})$. Then desired the argument holds since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &\lesssim 8K(\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2) + 2d_{\max}^2/n \\ &\leq 16K \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2 + 2d_{\max}^2/n \lesssim 32K \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_2^2 + (32K + 2)d_{\max}^2/n \\ &\stackrel{\text{Theorem 3.3}}{\leq} 32KC_{(3.5)}^2 d_{\max} + (32K + 2)d_{\max}^2/n \asymp \rho_n + \rho_n^2/n, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds since $\rho_n \asymp d_{\max}$, as proved in Lemma 3.4. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.6. We discuss the case $u, v \in \mathcal{J}$ first. By definition,

$$\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2 = \sum_{l \in [n]} [(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{ul} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{vl}]^2.$$

For vertex l with $z_l = t$ for some $t \in [K]$, entry $(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{ul}$ denotes the expected number of hyperedges containing u and l . Hyperedges can be classified into different categories according to the distribution of the remaining $m - 2$ nodes among K communities. Assuming that $u \in V_j$ and $v \in V_k$ with $j \neq k$, the membership distribution of e can be represented by $j \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}$ for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-2}^K$ with $n_{\mathbf{w}} \asymp n^{-(m-2)}$. For each $l \in \mathcal{J}$, the difference between $(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{ul}$ and $(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{vl}$ is

$$(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{ul} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{vl} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-2}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot (\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus l \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}).$$

As proved in Lemma A.9, $l \in [J]$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$ for some constant $c > 0$. At the same time, we can approximate $n_{\mathbf{w}}$ with $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ (Lemma 2.1), then according to Assumption 1.10, it follows that with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$,

$$\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n [(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{ul} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{vl}]^2 \gtrsim n^{-1} \rho_n^2.$$

If u and v are from the same cluster, it follows

$$\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2 = [(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{uw}]^2 + [(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{vu}]^2 \lesssim n^{-2} \rho_n^2,$$

since $(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{uu} = (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{vv} = 0$ due to the fact that self loops are not allowed in model 1.5. The conclusion holds similarly when $u \in \mathcal{J}$ but $v \notin \mathcal{J}$. As for the case $u \notin \mathcal{J}$, $v \notin \mathcal{J}$, it follows directly from the definition of $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ that $\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2 = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Define $\mathcal{O}_k := \{v \in V_k \cap \mathcal{J} : \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2 > 4r\}$, while $\mathcal{I}_k, \mathcal{U}_k, \mathcal{O}_k$ and $\mathcal{B}_r(v)$ enjoy the following properties.

(i) For each $k \in [K]$, $\mathcal{I}_k \subset \mathcal{B}_r(v) \subset \mathcal{U}_k$ for any $v \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$, since $(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot} = (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{w\cdot}$ for all $w \in \mathcal{I}_k$,

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{w\cdot}\|_2^2 \leq 2\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2 + 2\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{w\cdot} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{w\cdot}\|_2^2 \leq r.$$

(ii) For each $k \in [K]$, $\mathcal{B}_r(v) \subset \mathcal{U}_k$ for any $v \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$.

(iii) $|\mathcal{I}_k| \geq \alpha_k n(1 - o(1))$ for each $k \in [K]$, which follows from the fact that almost all nodes in $V_k \cap \mathcal{J}$ are $r/4$ -close to its expected center, since the number of vertices outside \mathcal{I}_k is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|(V_k \cap \mathcal{J}) \setminus \mathcal{I}_k|}{n} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{\sum_{v \in (V_k \cap \mathcal{J}) \setminus \mathcal{I}_k} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2}{\min_{v \in (V_k \cap \mathcal{J}) \setminus \mathcal{I}_k} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v\cdot} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v\cdot}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2}{r/4} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \frac{\rho_n + \rho_n^2/n}{[n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1} \rho_n^2} = \frac{\log(\rho_n)}{\rho_n} + \frac{\log(\rho_n)}{n} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last two equalities hold since $\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \lesssim \rho_n + \rho_n^2/n$ (Lemma 3.5), $r = [n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1} \rho_n^2$ and $\rho_n = \omega(1) \cap O(n^{M-1})$. Thus $|\mathcal{I}_k| = |V_k \cap \mathcal{J}| - |(V_k \cap \mathcal{J}) \setminus \mathcal{I}_k| \geq \alpha_k n(1 - o(1))$.

(iv) Following from (iii), for all $k \in [K]$,

$$|\mathcal{U}_k| \leq n - |\cup_{j \neq k} \mathcal{U}_j| \leq n - \sum_{j \neq k} |\mathcal{I}_j| \leq \alpha_k n \left[1 + O\left(\frac{\log(\rho_n)}{\rho_n}\right) \right] = \alpha_k n(1 + o(1)).$$

(v) $|\cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}_k| \leq o(n)$, since most nodes are in $|\cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{I}_k|$, and

$$|\cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}_k| \leq \frac{\sum_{v \in \mathcal{J}} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v:} - (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v:}\|_2^2}{\min_{v \in (\cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}_k)} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v:} - (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v:}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_F^2}{4r} = o(n)$$

(vi) $|\mathcal{B}_r(v)| = o(n)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{O}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$. First, $\mathcal{B}_r(v) \cap \mathcal{I}_k = \emptyset$ because the distance between $v \in \mathcal{O}_k$ and $w \in \mathcal{I}_k$ is larger than r , due to the facts $(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v:} = (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{w:}$, $(x-y)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(x-z)^2 - (y-z)^2$, and

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v:} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{w:}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{v:} - (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v:}\|_2^2 - \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{w:} - (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{w:}\|_2^2 > r.$$

Then as a consequence of (v), $|\mathcal{B}_r(v)| \leq |\cup_{k=1}^K \mathcal{O}_k| = o(n)$.

(vii) $\mathcal{B}_r(u) \cap \mathcal{B}_r(v) = \emptyset$ for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_j$ and $v \in \mathcal{U}_k$ with $j \neq k$. This follows the fact that $|\mathcal{B}_r(v) \cap \mathcal{U}_j| = 0$ when $|\mathcal{B}_r(v) \cap \mathcal{U}_k| \geq 1$, since the distance between expected centers $\|(\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{v:} - (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{u:}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n^{-1} \rho_n^2$ (Lemma 3.6) is much larger than the radius $4r \asymp [n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1} \rho_n^2$ where $\rho_n = \omega(1)$.

We now prove those three arguments using the properties above.

(a). For each $k \in [K]$, the probability that a randomly selected node $s \in [n]$ does not belong to \mathcal{I}_k is

$$1 - \frac{|\mathcal{I}_k|}{n} \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} 1 - \alpha_k(1 - o(1)) = \sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_j + o(1) < 1,$$

where $1 > \alpha_1 > \dots > \alpha_K > 0$ are some constants by Definition 1.3, then the probability that there exists at least one node $s \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{I}_k$ is

$$1 - \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{I}_k|}{n}\right)^{\log(n)} \geq 1 - \left(\sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_j + o(1)\right)^{\log(n)} = 1 - n^{-\log\left(\frac{1}{\sum_{j \neq k} \alpha_j + o(1)}\right)},$$

A simple union bound completes the argument.

(b). We prove part (b) by induction.

(1) $k = 1$. By part (a), there exists a node v_1 in $\mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}$, satisfying $\mathcal{B}_r(v_1) \supset \mathcal{I}_1$ due to (i). By algorithm procedure, $|\mathcal{B}_r(s_1)|$ is at least $|\mathcal{B}_r(v_1)|$, then $|\mathcal{B}_r(s_1)| \geq |\mathcal{B}_r(v_1)| \geq |\mathcal{I}_1| \geq \alpha_1 n(1 - o(1))$ thanks to (iii). To prove $s_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1$, one should verify the failure of other possibilities, namely, for $v \notin \mathcal{U}_1$, the cardinality of $\mathcal{B}_r(v)$ is too small to make v selected as a center.

- For any $v \in \mathcal{O}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$ for each $k \in [K]$, $|\mathcal{B}_r(v)| = o(n) < |\mathcal{B}_r(s_1)|$ by property (vi).

- For any $v \in \mathcal{U}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$ with $k \neq 1$, $|\mathcal{B}_r(v)| \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} |\mathcal{U}_k| \stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \alpha_k n(1 + o(1)) < \alpha_1 n$ since $\alpha_1 > \alpha_k$.

(2) $2 \leq k \leq K$. Suppose $s_j \in \mathcal{U}_j$ for all $j \in [k-1]$. Similarly by (i), there exists a node $v_k \in \mathcal{I}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $\mathcal{B}_r(v_k) \supset \mathcal{I}_k$. By induction hypothesis $|\widehat{\mathcal{V}}_j^{(0)}| = |\mathcal{B}_r(v_j) \setminus (\cup_{l=1}^{j-1} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_l^{(0)})| \geq \alpha_j n(1 - o(1))$ for $j \in [k-1]$. Then by (vii), $\mathcal{B}_r(v_k) \setminus (\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_l^{(0)}) = \mathcal{B}_r(v_k)$, and $|\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)| \geq |\mathcal{B}_r(v_k)| \geq |\mathcal{I}_k| \geq \alpha_k n(1 - o(1))$ thanks to (iii). To prove $s_k \in \mathcal{U}_k$, one should verify the failure of other possibilities, namely, for $v \notin \mathcal{U}_k$, the cardinality of so obtained set $\mathcal{B}_r(v) \setminus (\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_l^{(0)})$ is too small to make v selected as a center.

- For any $v \in \mathcal{O}_k \cap \mathcal{S}$ for all $k \in [K]$, $|\mathcal{B}_r(v)| = o(n) < |\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)|$ by property (vi).

- For any $v \in \mathcal{U}_j \cap \mathcal{S}$ where $j < k$, note that $|\mathcal{B}_r(s_j)| \geq \alpha_j n(1 - o(1))$ by induction, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}_r(v) \setminus (\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_l^{(0)})| &\stackrel{(vii)}{\leq} |\mathcal{B}_r(v) \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_j^{(0)}| \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} |\mathcal{U}_j| - |\mathcal{B}_r(s_j)| \stackrel{(iv)}{=} o(n) \\ &< |\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)| = \alpha_k n(1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

- For any $v \in \mathcal{U}_j \cap \mathcal{S}$ where $j > k$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}_r(v) \setminus (\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_l^{(0)})| &\stackrel{(vii)}{\leq} |\mathcal{B}_r(v)| \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} |\mathcal{U}_j| \stackrel{(iv)}{=} \alpha_j n(1 + o(1)) \\ &< \alpha_k n(1 + o(1)) = |\mathcal{B}_r(s_k)|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $\alpha_k > \alpha_j$.

(c). Consequently, $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^K$ are pairwise far from each other, i.e., for any pair $j \neq k$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_k}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_k}\|_2^2 - \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_k} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_k}\|_2^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_k}\|_2^2 - \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \right) - \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_k} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_k}\|_2^2 \gtrsim \frac{\rho_n^2}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by since Lemma 3.6 $\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_k}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n^{-1}\rho_n^2 \gg [n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1}\rho_n^2 \asymp 4r \geq \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2$ with $\rho_n = \omega(1)$ by the property that $s_j \in \mathcal{U}_j$ for each $j \in [K]$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Note that $(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_v = (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i}$: when $v \in V_i \cap \mathcal{J}$ where s_i is the center of \widehat{V}_i^0 obtained in Line 4. There are two scenarios where $v \in V_i \cap \mathcal{J}$ would be misclassified into $\widehat{V}_j^{(0)}$ ($j \neq i$).

(1) In Line 4 of Algorithm 3, if v is r -close to center of $\widehat{V}_j^{(0)}$, i.e., $\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \leq r$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 - \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 - 2\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j}\|_2^2 - 2\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \gtrsim \frac{\rho_n^2}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \gtrsim n^{-1}\rho_n^2$ by Lemma 3.6, and $\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \leq 4r \asymp [n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1}\rho_n^2 \ll \rho_n^2/n$ since $\rho_n = \omega(1)$ and $s_j \in \mathcal{U}_j$ as proved in Lemma 3.7.

(2) In Line 8 of Algorithm 3, when v is closer to the center of $\widehat{V}_j^{(0)}$ than $\widehat{V}_i^{(0)}$, i.e., $\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2 \leq \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2$. One can verify that v is far from its expected center, namely,

$$\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v - (\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2 - \|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i}\|_2^2 \gtrsim \frac{\rho_n^2}{n},$$

where $\|(\mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i}\|_2^2 \leq 4r \asymp [n \log(\rho_n)]^{-1}\rho_n^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2 + \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_v\|_2^2 \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \|(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_i} - (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{J}}^{(K)})_{s_j}\|_2^2 \stackrel{\text{Lemma 3.7}}{\gtrsim} \frac{\rho_n^2}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds since $(x - y)^2 \leq 2(x - z)^2 + 2(y - z)^2$. \square

APPENDIX D. PROOFS IN SECTION 4

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We rewrite $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(D.1)} \quad & \min_{\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left\{ y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right\} \\ & \text{s.t.} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left\{ \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \right\} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By [24], the associated Lagrangian is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \lambda) & := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left\{ y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right\} \\ & \quad + \lambda \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left\{ y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal choice of $\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$, which minimizes $L(\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \lambda)$, satisfies the first order condition

$$\frac{\partial L(\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \lambda)}{\partial \mathbf{y}^{(m)}} = \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left[\left(\log \frac{y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} - \log \frac{1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right) + \lambda \left(\log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} - \log \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right) \right] = 0.$$

Note that $\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} := \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \asymp n^{-(m-1)} \log(n) = o(1)$ in (1.4), then the solution to (D.1) has to satisfy $y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = o(1)$ for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, otherwise optimal value of (D.1) goes to infinity since $y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}$ would diverge. Thus $\log \frac{1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}$ and $\log \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}$ converge to 0 as n grows. Then (D.1) is minimized at

$$y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = (\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^\lambda \cdot (\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-\lambda} \cdot (1 + o(1)), \text{ for each } \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K, m \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Consider the Lagrange dual function

$$\begin{aligned} g(\lambda) &:= \min_{\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}} L(\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}, \lambda) \\ &= \min_{\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left\{ y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{(\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{\lambda-1} y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{(\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^\lambda} + (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{\lambda-1} (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^\lambda} \right\} \\ &= \min_{\{\mathbf{y}^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot (1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \cdot \left[(\lambda - 1) \log(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) + \log(1 - y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \lambda \log(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left[\lambda \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^\lambda \cdot (\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-\lambda} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last two equalities we use the facts $y_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = o(1)$, $\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = o(1)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \log(1 + x) = x$. By taking maximum of $g(\lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) &= (\text{D.1}) = \max_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} g(\lambda) \\ &= \max_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left[\lambda \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^\lambda \cdot (\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-\lambda} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(1.4)}{=} \log(n) \cdot \max_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \cdot \left[\lambda \mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^\lambda \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-\lambda} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \cdot \log(n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma D.1. *If $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} \geq 1 + 2\varepsilon$ for some absolute constant $\varepsilon > 0$, then for all $s \geq 1/3$, the number of nodes which don't satisfy either (G1) or (G2) is at most $s/3$ with probability at least $1 - 10n^{-\varepsilon}$.*

Proof of Lemma D.1. Probability of satisfying (G1). Recall Equation (2.1) and $d_v := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, where $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ counts the number of m -hyperedges containing v with the rest $m - 1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} among V_1, \dots, V_K with $\mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ denoting the law of $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$. Under the regime Equation (1.4), we have $d_{\max} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$. For each $m \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, we know $\mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|_{z_v=k} \sim \text{Bin}(n_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$ where $n_{\mathbf{w}} = \prod_{l=1}^K \binom{|V_l|}{w_l}$.

Thanks to hyperedges independence and Markov inequality, for each $v \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v > 10d_{\max}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} > 10d_{\max}\right) \\
&\leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \left[\exp(-10\theta d_{\max}) \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{E} \exp(\theta \cdot \mathcal{D}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \right] \\
&\leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \exp(-10\theta d_{\max}) \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \exp\left[(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} e^\theta]^{n_{\mathbf{w}}}\right], \quad (1 + x \leq e^x) \\
&\leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \exp(-10\theta d_{\max}) \exp\left(\binom{n}{m-1} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)}{\binom{n}{m-1}} (e^\theta - 1)\right), \quad \text{since } n_{\mathbf{w}} \leq \binom{n}{m-1} \\
&\leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \exp\left((e^\theta - 1 - 10\theta) \cdot d_{\max}\right) \leq e^{-10d_{\max}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds by taking $\theta = 2$. Note that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} > 1$, then there exists some $\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} > 1$, otherwise it would not be possible to find $j, k \in [n]$ with $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) > 1$. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v \leq 10d_{\max}) \leq e^{-10d_{\max}} \leq n^{-10}$.

Probability of satisfying (G2) Note that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \geq 1 + 2\varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. It suffices to prove that the following holds with probability at least $1 - n^{-10} - n^{-(1+\varepsilon)}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(D.2)} \quad &\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{m-1} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) - \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the proof is deferred to Lemma D.2. Assuming Equation (D.2), subsequent logic is indicated as follows.

- (1) Remind that $(1 - \log(n)/\sqrt{n})^{m-1} \leq n_{\mathbf{w}}/\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ by Lemma 2.1, then by Equation (D.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \\
&\leq \left(1 - \frac{\log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-m+1} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) < \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k).
\end{aligned}$$

- (2) Then according to (4.1), $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \geq \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k)$, since $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \max\{\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}), \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})\} \geq \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k)$ and part (1).
(3) Then we use part (2) and $(1 - \log(n)/\sqrt{n})^{m-1} \leq n_{\mathbf{w}}/\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ again,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{\log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{m-1} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{m-1} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k).
\end{aligned}$$

- (4) Therefore by part (3) and (D.2), $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot [\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})] \geq d_{\max}/\log \log(n)$, which proves (G2).

According to Lemma D.2 and Markov inequality, for all $s \geq 1/3$, the probability that there are more than $s/3$ nodes in V not satisfying either (G1) or (G2) is upper bounded by

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\# \text{ of nodes that do not satisfy either (G1) or (G2)}]}{s/3} \leq \frac{n \cdot (n^{-10} + n^{-(1+\varepsilon)})}{s/3} \leq 10n^{-\varepsilon}.$$

□

Lemma D.2. *With probability at least $1 - n^{-10} - n^{-(1+\varepsilon)}$, vertex v satisfies (G1) and (G2) simultaneously.*

Proof of Lemma D.2. Let \mathcal{X} denote the set of degree profiles satisfying (G1), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \{x^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mid x^{(m)} \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K|}, \text{ s.t. } x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \gtrsim \log(n) \text{ for each } m, \mathbf{w}, \text{ and } \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \leq 10d_{\max}, \right\}.$$

Note that $x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \gtrsim \log(n)$ is the requirement from exact recovery regime (1.4). Since the cardinality $|\mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K| = \binom{m+K-1}{K-1}$, for simplicity, we denote

$$T = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{K-1}.$$

Let $\{\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m,\mathbf{w}}$ denote the event $\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m,\mathbf{w}}) = \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \cdot [\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \cdot (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}.$$

Note that $\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} := d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}$ where $n_{\mathbf{w}} := \prod_{l=1}^K \binom{|V_l|}{w_l} \asymp n^{m-1}$. For any $D > 0$, by Markov inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) > D \right\} \cap \{\mathcal{D}_v \leq 10d_{\max}\}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\{x^{(m)}\} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\{\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m,\mathbf{w}}) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) > D \mid \{\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m,\mathbf{w}}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\{x^{(m)}\} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\{\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m,\mathbf{w}}) \cdot e^{-D} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left(\exp\left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})\right] \mid \{\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}\}_{m,\mathbf{w}}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-D} \sum_{\{x^{(m)}\} \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \cdot \exp\left(x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}\right) \\ &\text{(D.3)} \\ &\lesssim e^{-D} \exp\left(\frac{T}{2} \log(d_{\max})\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the proof of (D.3) is deferred later. Note that $C_{(1.8)} = O(1)$ by Assumption 1.15, and $\frac{d_{\max}}{C_{(1.8)} \log(n)} \asymp \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \geq 1 + 2\varepsilon$, then by Lemma 4.1, $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) = \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \log(n) \gg \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)}$. Also, $T = O(1)$ and $\log(n) \lesssim d_{\max} \ll n^{M-1}$, we take

$$D = \left(1 - \frac{\log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{m-1} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) - \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)} \stackrel{\text{Lemma 4.1}}{=} (1 - o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \log(n) \asymp \frac{d_{\max}}{C_{(1.8)}} \gg \log(d_{\max}).$$

Then we are able to establish Equation (D.2),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\log(n)}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{m-1} \mathbb{D}_{\text{GKL}}(j, k) - \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)} \right\} \cap \{\mathcal{D}_v \leq 10d_{\max}\}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v \leq 10d_{\max}) \cdot \left(1 - e^{-D} \exp\left(\frac{T}{2} \log(d_{\max})\right)\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v \leq 10d_{\max}) - e^{-D} \exp\left(\frac{T}{2} \log(d_{\max})\right) \\ &\geq 1 - n^{-10} - n^{-(1+\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of inequality (D.3). Note that $\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|_{z_v=k} \sim \text{Bin}(n_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$, then by Lemma F.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) &= \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \exp\left(x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \mathcal{Q}^{(m)} + (n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log(1 - \mathcal{Q}^{(m)})\right) \\ \log \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} &= -\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 - \frac{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{n_{\mathbf{w}}}\right) + n_{\mathbf{w}} \log n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \\ &\quad - (n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log(n_{\mathbf{w}}) - (n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log\left(1 - \frac{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{n_{\mathbf{w}}}\right) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \cdot \exp\left(x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 - \frac{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{n_{\mathbf{w}}}\right) + o(1)\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) + o(1)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since $\log(n) \lesssim x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \lesssim d_{\max}^{(m)} \ll n^{m-1}$. Also, for sufficiently large n , the cardinality of \mathcal{X} is bounded by

$$|\mathcal{X}| \leq \binom{10d_{\max}}{T} \leq \frac{(10d_{\max})^T}{T!} \leq \exp\left(T \log(d_{\max})\right),$$

where $T = O(1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\{\mathbf{x}^{(m)}\} \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \cdot \exp\left(x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log \frac{x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (n_{\mathbf{w}} - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \log \frac{1 - x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}\right) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{X}| \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{T}{2} \log(2\pi x_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) + o(1)\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{T}{2} \log(d_{\max})\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let $e_m(v, S)$ denote the number of m -hyperedges containing v with the rest $m-1$ nodes in $S \subset V$, and $e_m(S, S) := \sum_{v \in S} e_m(v, S)$ denote the number of m -hyperedges with all vertices in $S \subset V$, where the repeated edges were dropped, and $e(S, S) := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} e_m(S, S)$ similarly.

To conclude the proof, we build the following sequence of sets. Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of nodes which do not satisfy (G1) or (G2). Let $\{S^{(t)} \subset V\}_{0 \leq t \leq t^*}$ be generated as follows

- $S^{(0)} = \mathcal{S}$, where $|\mathcal{S}| \leq s/3$ with probability at least $1 - 10n^{-\varepsilon}$ by Lemma D.1.
- For $t \geq 1$, $S^{(t)} = S^{(t-1)} \cup \{v_t\}$ if there exists $v_t \in V$ s.t. $e(v, S^{(t-1)}) > M(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}$.
- The sequence ends if no such vertex can be found in $V \setminus S^{(t)}$, and we obtain $S^{(t^*)}$.

Assume that the number of items that do not satisfy (G3) is strictly larger than s/M . Those nodes violating (G3) will be added to sets $S^{(t)}$ at some point. By construction, each of these nodes contributes more than $M(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}$ in $e(S^{(t)}, S^{(t)})$. Starting from $S^{(0)}$, we have added s/M more nodes violating (G3), and obtained $S^{(t^*)}$ with nodes $s/3 + s/M$. Some other nodes can be placed into $S^{(t^*)}$ to reach cardinality s . However, $e(S^{(t^*)}, S^{(t^*)}) > s/M \cdot M(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} = s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}$, which contradicts to conclusion of Lemma D.3. Thus the number of nodes violating (G3) is at most s/M . Consequently, $|V \setminus \mathcal{G}| \leq s/3 + s/M \leq s$. □

Lemma D.3. *With probability at least $1 - e^{-s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}/4}$, there is no subset $S \subset V$ with $|S| = s$ such that $e(S, S) \geq s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$.*

Proof of Lemma D.3. For any given subset $S \subset V$ with $|S| = s$, by Markov and Assumption 1.15,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(e(S, S) \geq s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} e^{-\theta s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta \cdot e(S, S))] = \inf_{\theta > 0} e^{-\theta s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta \cdot e_m(S, S))] \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} e^{-\theta s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} [\mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} \cdot e^\theta + (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)}) \binom{s}{m}], \quad (\text{edge independence and } 1 + x \leq e^x) \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta > 0} \exp \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{s}{m} \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} (e^\theta - 1) - \theta s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} \right] \\
& = \exp \left\{ - \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{s}{m} \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} - s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} \right] - s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} \cdot \log \frac{s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}}{\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{s}{m} \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)}} \right\} \\
& \leq \exp \left[- \frac{s}{2} (d_{\max})^{1+\delta} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $o(1) = \mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} \ll s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}$ and the third to last inequality holds since the function $h(\theta) = a(e^\theta - 1) - b\theta$ achieves minimum at $\theta = \log \frac{b}{a}$. The number of subsets $S \subset V$ with size s is $\binom{n}{s} \leq \left(\frac{en}{s}\right)^s$. The proof is then established by a simple application of Markov inequality, since the probability of existing a subset $S \subset V$ with $|S| = s$ such that $e(S, S) > s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}$ is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\{|S : e(S, S) > s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} \text{ and } |S| = s\}|] = \binom{n}{s} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\{e(S, S) \geq s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} \text{ and } |S| = s\}) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{en}{s}\right)^s \cdot \exp(-s(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}) = \exp\left(-\frac{s}{2}(d_{\max})^{1+\delta} + s \log \frac{en}{s}\right) \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{s}{4}(d_{\max})^{1+\delta}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Let $\{\widehat{V}_k^{(t)}\}_{k=1}^K$ denote the partition at time t . Remind that $\mathcal{E}^{(t)} := \cup_{j=1}^K \mathcal{E}_j^{(t)} = \cup_{j=1}^K (\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \setminus V_j) \cap \mathcal{G}$, where $\mathcal{E}_j^{(t)} := \cup_{k \neq j} \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t)} = (\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \setminus V_j) \cap \mathcal{G}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t)} := (\widehat{V}_j^{(t)} \cap V_k) \cap \mathcal{G}$, representing the set of vertices in \mathcal{G} which belong to V_k but are misclassified in $\widehat{V}_j^{(t)}$.

For node $v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}$ ($v \in V_k$ but misclassified in $\widehat{V}_j^{(t+1)}$), by Algorithm 5, it has to satisfy

$$0 \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} \mathcal{C}_{m-1}^K} \left(\widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \log \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + [\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}] \cdot \log \frac{(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right)$$

where $\widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}$ counts the number of m -hyperedges containing v with the rest $m - 1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} at step t , i.e., w_l nodes from $\widehat{V}_l^{(t)}$ for each $l \in [K]$, and $\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)}$ denotes the capacity of such hyperedges. Then with

the proofs of (D.4a), (D.4b), (D.4c) (D.4d) deferred to next several pages, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \sum_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq K} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left(\widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \log \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \cdot \log \frac{(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq K} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left\{ \widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \left(\log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + \log \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} - \log \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \cdot \left[\log \frac{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} + \log \frac{(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} - \log \frac{(1 - \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right] \right\} \\
\text{(D.4a)} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq K} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left\{ \widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \widehat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \cdot \log \frac{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right\} \\
&\quad + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot C_{\text{(D.4a)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \cdot \log \log(n) \\
\text{(D.4b)} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq K} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left\{ d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \cdot \log \frac{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right\} \\
&\quad + 2 \log C_{\text{(1.8)}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) \\
&\quad + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot (C_{\text{(D.4a)}} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \cdot \log \log(n) + C_{\text{(D.4b)}}) \\
\text{(D.4c)} &\leq -|\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)} + 2 \log C_{\text{(1.8)}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) \\
&\quad + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot (C_{\text{(D.4a)}} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \cdot \log \log(n) + C_{\text{(D.4b)}}) \\
\text{(D.4d)} &\leq -|\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)} + C_{\text{(D.4d)}} \cdot \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}^{(t)}| \cdot |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot d_{\max}} \\
&\quad + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot \left(C_{\text{(D.4a)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n) + C_{\text{(D.4b)}} + 2 \log C_{\text{(1.8)}} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w})$ in (D.4b) denotes the number of m -hyperedges e containing v where the rest $m-1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} among $\{\widehat{V}_l^{(t)}\}_{l=1}^K$ with at least one of those $m-1$ nodes in $\mathcal{E}^{(t)}$, and $C_{\text{(D.4d)}} := 2C_{\text{(3.3)}} \log C_{\text{(1.8)}}$. Note that $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \asymp \sqrt{d_{\max}/\log(n)}$, and $C_{\text{(D.4a)}}, C_{\text{(D.4b)}}, C_{\text{(1.8)}}, M, K = O(1)$, then

$$\frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)} \gg C_{\text{(D.4a)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n) + C_{\text{(D.4b)}} + 2 \log C_{\text{(1.8)}} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m}.$$

At the same time, $d_{\max} \gtrsim C_{\text{(1.8)}} \log(n)$ by Assumption of Theorem 3.1. Then for sufficiently large n , we have

$$\frac{|\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}|}{|\mathcal{E}^{(t)}|} \leq 2C_{\text{(3.3)}} \log C_{\text{(1.8)}} \cdot \frac{[\log \log(n)]^2}{d_{\max}} \leq \frac{2C_{\text{(3.3)}} \log C_{\text{(1.8)}} [\log \log(n)]^2}{C_{\text{(1.8)}} \log(n)} \leq \frac{\log C_{\text{(1.8)}}}{C_{\text{(1.8)}}} \frac{1}{e}.$$

□

Proof of (D.4a). Note that for any $\hat{q}, q > 0$ with $\hat{q} < 2q$, the following holds

$$\left| \log \frac{\hat{q}}{q} \right| \leq \log \left(\frac{q}{q - |\hat{q} - q|} \right) \leq \frac{|\hat{q} - q|}{q - |\hat{q} - q|},$$

where the first inequality follows by discussions on cases $2q > \hat{q} > q$ and $\hat{q} < q$, and the second comes from $\log(1+x) \leq x$. Thus one may focus on bounding $|\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|$. As estimated in Line 1 of Algorithm 5,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = \frac{1}{\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}} \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e) = k \oplus \mathbf{w}} \mathcal{A}_e = \frac{E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}}{\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}},$$

where $E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}$ denotes the number of m -hyperedges with $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e) = k \oplus \mathbf{w}$ at step 0, i.e., at least one node from $\widehat{V}_k^{(0)}$ with the other $m-1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} , and $\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}$ denotes the capacity of such m -hyperedges,

$$\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} := \binom{|\widehat{V}_k^{(0)}|}{1} \prod_{l=1}^K \binom{|\widehat{V}_l^{(0)}|}{w_l} \asymp n^m.$$

Then for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$,

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}| = \frac{|E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}|}{\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}} \leq \frac{1}{\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}} \left(|E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}| + |\mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}| \right).$$

We will bound the two terms in the numerator separately.

For the first term $|E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}|$, recall ρ_n in (3.1) and denote $\mathcal{P}_{\min}^{(m)} := \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} := \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K} \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$, then $\mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} \asymp \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \cdot n \log(n)$, since $C_{(1.8)} = O(1)$, and

$$\mathcal{P}_{\min}^{(m)} \cdot n \log(n) \asymp \hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \cdot \mathcal{P}_{\min}^{(m)} \leq \mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} \leq \hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \cdot \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \asymp \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \cdot n \log(n)$$

Thanks to independence between hyperedges, Bernstein (Lemma F.6) shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(|E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}| \geq \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \cdot n \log \log(n)) \leq 2 \exp \left(-n \frac{[\log \log(n)]^2}{2 \log(n)} \right),$$

for any $\{\widehat{V}_k^{(0)}\}_{k=1}^K \in \widehat{\mathcal{V}}$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ denote the set of partitions $\{\widehat{V}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ such that

$$\left| \bigcup_{k=1}^K (V_k \setminus \widehat{V}_k) \right| \leq \eta_n \cdot n, \quad \forall \{\widehat{V}_k\}_{k=1}^K \in \widehat{\mathcal{V}},$$

with η_n being the mismatch ratio (1.1). The cardinality of $\widehat{\mathcal{V}}$ is at most

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{V}}| \leq \binom{n}{\eta_n n} K^{\eta_n n} \leq \left(\frac{enK}{\eta_n n} \right)^{\eta_n n} = \exp \left(\eta_n n \log \left(\frac{eK}{\eta_n} \right) \right) \lesssim \exp \left(C \frac{n \log \rho_n}{\rho_n} \right)$$

for some constant $C > 0$, where $\eta_n \lesssim (\rho_n)^{-1}$ by (3.6). A simple union bound shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\exists \{\widehat{V}_k^{(0)}\}_{k=1}^K \in \widehat{\mathcal{V}} \text{ s.t. } |E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}| \geq \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \cdot n \log \log(n) \right) \\ & \leq |\widehat{\mathcal{V}}| \binom{K}{2} \cdot 2 \exp \left(-n \frac{[\log \log(n)]^2}{2 \log(n)} \right) \lesssim \exp \left(-n \frac{\log \log(n)}{\log(n)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $\rho_n \asymp \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$ and the function $h(x) = \frac{x}{\log(x)}$ is increasing when $x \geq e$.

Consider the second term $\mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} = \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e) = k \oplus \mathbf{w}} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{z}(e)}^{(m)}$. For hyperedge $e \subset V \setminus \mathcal{E}^{(0)}$, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e) = k \oplus \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{z}(e)$, the contribution of such e inside the $|\mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}|$ cancels out. Thus it suffices to

consider contributions from e which contains at least one node from $\mathcal{E}^{(0)}$, and the number of such hyperedges is at most $\eta_n n \cdot \binom{n-1}{m-1}$. According to (3.6), $\eta_n \lesssim (\rho_n)^{-1}$ where $\rho_n \asymp \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$, then

$$|\mathbb{E}E_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}| \leq \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \cdot \eta_n n \binom{n-1}{m-1} \lesssim n.$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - e^{-\frac{n \log \log(n)}{\log(n)}}$,

$$|\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}| \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} n \log \log(n) + n}{\hat{n}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(0)}} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n)}{n^{m-1}}.$$

According to the discussion in the beginning at the proof of (D.4a), for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \log \frac{\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right| &\leq \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - |\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n)}{\mathcal{P}_{\min}^{(m)} \log(n)}, \\ \left| \log \frac{(1 - \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right| &\leq \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - |\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n)}{n^{m-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, $\hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \lesssim d_{\max} \ll n^{m-1}$ by (G1) and $\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} := \prod_{l=1}^K (|\hat{V}_l^{(t)}|) \asymp n^{m-1}$, then $(\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \asymp n^{m-1}$, and $d_{\max} \leq C_{(1.8)} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\min}^{(m)} \log(n)$, as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \left| \log \frac{\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} - \log \frac{\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right| &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n), \\ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} (\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \cdot \left| \log \frac{(1 - \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} - \log \frac{(1 - \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right| &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \log \log(n). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, with probability at least $1 - e^{-\frac{n \log \log(n)}{\log(n)}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j \neq k} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{j_k}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left\{ \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \cdot \left| \log \frac{\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} - \log \frac{\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \cdot \left| \log \frac{(1 - \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} - \log \frac{(1 - \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} \right| \right\} \\ &\leq C_{(D.4a)} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}} \cdot |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot \log \log(n), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{(D.4a)} > 0$ is some constant. □

Proof of (D.4b). We want to replace $\hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}$ with $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ in this step, where $d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}$ (resp. $\hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}$) denotes the number of m -hyperedges containing v with the rest $m-1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} , i.e., w_l nodes in V_l (resp. $\hat{V}_l^{(t)}$) for each $l \in [K]$. Note that $\hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} \leq d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + |\hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|$ and $(\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) \leq (n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) + |(\hat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) - (n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})|$, then it suffices to control the contribution from deviation terms.

- For hyperedge $e \ni v$ with $\mathbf{z}(e) = \hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(t)}(e)$, the contribution of such e inside $|\hat{E}_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - d_{v, \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|$ cancels out. Thus it suffices to consider $e \in e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w})$, where $e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w})$ denotes the number of m -hyperedges e containing v where the rest $m-1$ nodes distributed as \mathbf{w} among $\{\hat{V}_l^{(t)}\}_{l=1}^K$ with at least one of

those $m - 1$ nodes in $\mathcal{E}^{(t)}$. Then under the regime (1.4) and Assumption 1.15,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq K} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} |\widehat{E}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}| \cdot \log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \\ & \leq \log C_{(1.8)} \cdot \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

- Meanwhile, $(1 - \eta_n)^{m-1} \lesssim \left(\frac{|\widehat{V}_i^{(t)}|}{|V_i|} \right)^{m-1} \asymp \frac{\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)}}{n_{\mathbf{w}}} \lesssim (1 + \eta_n)^{m-1}$, $\eta_n \lesssim (\rho_n)^{-1}$ by (3.6),

$$|\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - n_{\mathbf{w}}| = n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left| 1 - \frac{\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)}}{n_{\mathbf{w}}} \right| \leq [1 - (1 - \eta_n)^{m-1}] n_{\mathbf{w}} \leq (m - 1) \eta_n n_{\mathbf{w}} \lesssim n^{m-1} (\rho_n)^{-1}.$$

Also, $\log \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} = \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \right) = \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} (1 + o(1)) \asymp n^{-(m-1)} \rho_n$, then there exists some constant $C_{(D.4b)} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq K} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}_{jk}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} |(\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - \widehat{E}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(t)}) - (n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})| \cdot \log \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \\ & \leq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} |\widehat{n}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - n_{\mathbf{w}}| \cdot \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} |\widehat{E}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(t)} - d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}| \cdot \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \\ & \leq C_{(D.4b)} \cdot |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| + \log C_{(1.8)} \cdot \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of (D.4c). For $\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} := d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}/n_{\mathbf{w}}$, $n_{\mathbf{w}} \asymp n^{m-1}$ in (2.2) for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, then

$$d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \cdot \log \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} + (n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) \cdot \log \frac{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})}{(1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})} = n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot [\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})],$$

where $\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$ denotes the KL divergence defined in (4.2). It suffices to show

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot [\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)}) - \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}(\mu_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{j \oplus \mathbf{w}}^{(m)})] \leq -\frac{d_{\max}}{\log \log(n)}$$

for each $v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t)}$, which is true according to (G2) since $\mathcal{E}^{(t)} \subset \mathcal{G}$. □

Proof of (D.4d). For $\rho_n \asymp d_{\max} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$ and $\eta_n \lesssim (\rho_n)^{-1}$ by (3.6), then

$$\mathbb{E}e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) \leq \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \frac{\log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \cdot \eta_n n \cdot \binom{n-2}{m-2} \leq \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \eta_n \log(n) \leq 1,$$

and

$$\max_{v \in [n]} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{E}e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m}$$

Then by Theorem 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) \\
&= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} [e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbb{E}e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w})] + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{E}e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) \\
&\leq \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}}^\top \cdot (\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}^{(t)}} + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m} \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}^{(t)}}\|_2 + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m} \\
&\leq C_{(3.3)} \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}^{(t)}| \cdot |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot d_{\max}} + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, define $C_{(D.4d)} := 2C_{(3.3)} \log C_{(1.8)}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \log C_{(1.8)} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w}} e(v, \mathcal{E}^{(t)}, \mathbf{w}) + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot (C_{(D.4a)} \log \log(n) + C_{(D.4b)}) \\
&\leq C_{(D.4d)} \cdot \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}^{(t)}| \cdot |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot d_{\max}} \\
&\quad + |\mathcal{E}^{(t+1)}| \cdot \left(C_{(D.4a)} \log \log(n) + C_{(D.4b)} + 2 \log C_{(1.8)} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \binom{m+K-1}{m} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX E. PROOFS IN SECTION 5

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Let $H_{-v}^{(1)}$ denote the hypergraph obtained by deleting vertex v from $H^{(1)}$, with $\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)}$ denoting its law. By independence between hyperedges and Bayes's Theorem, we know

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)} | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)} = H_{-v}^{(1)} | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)} = H_{-v}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)} = H_{-v}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)} | \mathcal{Z}_v = k) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)} = H_{-v}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds since $\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)}$ and \mathcal{Z}_{-v} are independent of \mathcal{Z}_v according to the generating process in model 1.5. Then by Bayes's Theorem, we know

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k | \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)})} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)} = H_{-v}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_{-v}^{(1)} = H_{-v}^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)})} \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k) \cdot [\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}_{-v}^{(0)})]^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the denominator $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D} = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})$ can be factored out since it is independent of k , then the MAP can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) &= \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k | \mathcal{H}^{(1)} = H^{(1)}, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \\ &= \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k).\end{aligned}$$

Another way to verify this transformation is to employ the independence $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})$, then

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k) \cdot [\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D} = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})]^{-1} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{D}_v = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k | \mathcal{D}_v = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot [\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})]^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

where the denominator $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)})$ can be factored out, then the MAP becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{z}_v^{(1)}(H^{(1)}, \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) &= \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k | \mathcal{D}_v = d_v, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \\ &= \arg \max_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v | \mathcal{Z}_v = k, \mathcal{Z}_{-v} = \hat{z}_{-v}^{(0)}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_v = k).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5.2. For ease of presentation, define the event \hat{E}_{jk} to be

$$\hat{E}_{jk} := \mathbb{1} \left\{ \hat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \hat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k \right\}$$

Equivalently, the probability of vertex v ($z_v = k$) being misclassified can be formulated as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{err}}(v) = \sum_{d_v} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\exists j \neq k, \text{ s.t. } \{\hat{E}_{jk} = 1\}).$$

Then (5.5a) follows by a simple union bound, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists j \neq k, \text{ s.t. } \{\hat{E}_{jk} = 1\}) \leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 1\}) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\})\right).$$

On the other hand, $\mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\}) \geq \prod_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\})$ for any $j \in [K]$ with $j \neq k$, then

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\}) \geq (K-1) \prod_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\}) \\ \iff & \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\})\right) \leq (K-1) \left(1 - \prod_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\})\right)\end{aligned}$$

Then (5.5b) follows since

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists j \neq k, \text{ s.t. } \{\hat{E}_{jk} = 1\}) = 1 - \prod_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\}) \geq \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{E}_{jk} = 0\})\right).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)}$ (5.7). Under the fact that $z_v = k$ and finiteness of the set \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K , there exist $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \mathbf{w}_3, \mathbf{w}_4 \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$ such that

$$\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} = \max_{w, w' \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus w}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus w'}^{(m)}}, \quad \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}} = \max_{w, w' \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus w}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus w'}^{(m)}}.$$

Then the ratios can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}} &\leq \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 1)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 1)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \\ \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}} &\leq \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 0)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} = 0)} \leq \frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}}. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we denote $c_n^{(m)} = \frac{2 \log(n)}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n))}$. Note that d_v is *good* (Definition 5.3), then for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$,

the number of m -hyperedges containing v and at least one misclassified node, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(e) \neq \mathbf{z}(e)$, is at most $c_n^{(m)}$. Let $n_v^{(m)} := \eta_n n \binom{n-2}{m-2} = O(n^{m-1}/\rho_n)$ denote the capacity of such m -hyperedges, since the number of misclassified nodes is at most $\eta_n n$ after first round according to (3.6), then let

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)} &\leq \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \right)^{c_n^{(m)}} \left(\frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}} \right)^{n_v^{(m)} - c_n^{(m)}} =: U, \\ \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)}{\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)} &\geq \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}} \right)^{c_n^{(m)}} \left(\frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}} \right)^{n_v^{(m)} - c_n^{(m)}} =: L. \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite the terms above in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \right)^{c_n^{(m)}} &= \exp \left(\log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \right) \cdot c_n^{(m)} \right) \\ \left(\frac{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}} \right)^{n_v^{(m)} - c_n^{(m)}} &= \exp \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}} \right) \cdot (n_v^{(m)} - c_n^{(m)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using the facts $\log(1+x) = x$ for $x = o(1)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \binom{n-1}{m-1} = \mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \log(n) = o(1)$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K$, by plugging in $c_n^{(m)}$ and $n_v^{(m)}$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \exp \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}} \right) \cdot (n_v^{(m)} - c_n^{(m)}) + \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \right) \cdot c_n^{(m)} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} n_v^{(m)} \cdot \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)} - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)}}{1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)}} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)} (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)})}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)} (1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_3}^{(m)})} \right) \cdot c_n^{(m)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \exp \left(\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)} \log(n)}{\rho_n} + \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \right) \cdot \frac{2 \log(n)}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\rho_n \asymp \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$, using the fact $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) > 1$ for any $j \neq k$, the first term in the exponent is bounded by

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_4}^{(m)} \log(n)}{\rho_n} \lesssim 1 \ll \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \cdot \log(n).$$

For the second term, recall that $1 \lesssim \mathcal{P}_{\min}^{(m)} \lesssim \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \ll n^{m-1}/\log(n)$ under the exact recovery regime (1.4) since $\mathcal{Q}_{\max}^{(m)} = o(1)$, then there are two possible scenarios.

- $\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} = O(1)$. Using the fact $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) > 1$, it is bounded by

$$\log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \right) \cdot \frac{2 \log(n)}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n))} \lesssim \frac{\log(n)}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} + \log \log(n))} \ll \log(n) \lesssim \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \cdot \log(n).$$

- $\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{Q}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}} \gg 1$, then $\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)} \gg 1$ and $\log\left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}}{\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)}}\right) = O(\log(n))$ since $1 \lesssim \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} \ll n^{m-1}/\log(n)$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_m^K$. According to the definition of \mathbb{D}_{GCH} (1.5), there must exist some $j \in [K]$ such that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \gtrsim \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}$, and the second term can be written as

$$\frac{2 \log(n)}{\frac{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)})}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}) - \log(\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)})} + \frac{\log \log(n)}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)}) - \log(\mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_2}^{(m)})}} \lesssim \log(n) \ll \mathcal{P}_{k \oplus \mathbf{w}_1}^{(m)} \log(n) \lesssim \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \cdot \log(n).$$

According to discussions above, $\log U \ll \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k) \cdot \log(n)$, then there exists some constant $c > 0$ with $c/\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}} = o(1)$ such that $U = n^c$. \square

Proof of inequality (5.8). Condition on the fact $z_v = k$. If v is misclassified to \widehat{V}_j , i.e., the event $\{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k\}$ is true, then the event $\{U \cdot \alpha_j \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) > L \cdot \alpha_k \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\}$ is true as well when d_v is *good*, since

$$L \cdot \alpha_k \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \leq \alpha_k \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) < \alpha_j \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \leq U \cdot \alpha_j \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v).$$

$$\begin{aligned} (5.6a) &= \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_j > \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \alpha_k\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left\{U \cdot \alpha_j \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) > L \cdot \alpha_k \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\left\{U \cdot \alpha_j \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) > L \cdot \alpha_k \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \frac{\alpha_j U}{\alpha_k L} \cdot \min\{\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^K \frac{\alpha_j U}{\alpha_k L} \sum_{d_v \text{ good}} \min\{\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\} \leq \frac{1 - \alpha_k}{\alpha_k} \cdot n^{-(1-o(1))\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line holds since $U/L = n^{\circ(\mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j, k))}$ by Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.5. Recall definitions in Equation (2.1) and the independence between hyperedges, then for any $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{d_v} \min\left\{\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v)\right\} \\ &= \sum_{d_v^{(2)}} \cdots \sum_{d_v^{(M)}} \min\left\{\prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)}), \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{d_v^{(2)}} \cdots \sum_{d_v^{(M)}} \left(\prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right)^t \cdot \left(\prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right)^{1-t} \\ &= \sum_{d_v^{(2)}} \cdots \sum_{d_v^{(M)}} \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right)^t \left(\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right)^{1-t} \\ &= \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\sum_{d_v^{(m)}} \left(\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right)^t \left(\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)})\right)^{1-t}\right], \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}|_{z_v=k} \sim \text{Bin}(n_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})$ with $n_{\mathbf{w}}$ (2.2) denoting the capacity of such m -hyperedges, then

$$\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)}) = \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \mathbb{P}_k[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}].$$

Consequently for any $t \in [0, 1]$, by exchanging the order of sum and product, we have the

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{d_v^{(m)}} \left(\mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)}) \right)^t \left(\mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v^{(m)} = d_v^{(m)}) \right)^{1-t} \\ &= \sum_{d_{v,\mathbf{w}'}^{(m)}} \cdots \sum_{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left(\mathbb{P}_j[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] \right)^t \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}_k[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] \right)^{1-t} \\ &\leq \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \sum_{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \left(\mathbb{P}_j[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] \right)^t \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}_k[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] \right)^{1-t}. \end{aligned}$$

By plugging in the probability $\mathbb{P}_k[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] = \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} [\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \cdot [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \left(\mathbb{P}_j[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] \right)^t \cdot \left(\mathbb{P}_k[\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}] \right)^{1-t} \\ &= \sum_{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \binom{n_{\mathbf{w}}}{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \left(\frac{[\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t}{[\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{t-1}} \right)^{d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \cdot \left(\frac{[1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t}{[1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{t-1}} \right)^{n_{\mathbf{w}} - d_{v,\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}} \\ &= \left([\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} + [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} \right)^{n_{\mathbf{w}}}, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by Binomial theorem. Then we put pieces together

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{d_v} \min \left\{ \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \right\} \\ &\leq \prod_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \prod_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \left([\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} + [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} \right)^{n_{\mathbf{w}}} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \log \left([\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} + [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [1 - \mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for sufficiently small x and y , $\log(1 - x) = -x + O(x^2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - x)^t (1 - y)^{1-t} &= \exp(t \log(1 - x) + (1 - t) \log(1 - y)) = \exp(-tx - (1 - t)y + O(x^2 + y^2)) \\ &= 1 - tx - (1 - t)y + O(x^2 + y^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then under the regime (1.4) where $\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} = o(1)$, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{d_v} \min \left\{ \mathbb{P}_j(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v), \mathbb{P}_k(\mathcal{D}_v = d_v) \right\} \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \log \left[[\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} + 1 - t\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (1-t)\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + O((\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^2) \right] \right\} \\
& = \exp \left\{ - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} n_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \left[t\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1-t)\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - [\mathcal{Q}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^t \cdot [\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}]^{1-t} + O((\mathcal{Q}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^2) \right] \right\} \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ - \log(n) \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}} \left(\frac{t\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} + \frac{(1-t)\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} - \frac{(\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^t (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \right) \cdot (1 - o(1)) \right\} \\
& = \exp \left\{ - \log(n) \cdot \max_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{WC}_{m-1}^K} \frac{\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \left[t\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} + (1-t)\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)} - (\mathcal{P}_{j\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^t \cdot (\mathcal{P}_{k\oplus\mathbf{w}}^{(m)})^{1-t} \right] \cdot (1 - o(1)) \right\} \\
& = n^{-(1-o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{D}_{\text{GCH}}(j,k)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we replaced $n_{\mathbf{w}}$ with $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{w}}$ in the third to last inequality according to Lemma 2.1, and the second to last equality holds since we take maximizer t . \square

Proof of Lemma 5.6. A simple union bound $\mathbb{P}_k(d_v \text{ is not good}) \leq \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{P}_k(d_v^{(m)} \text{ is not good})$ allows one to focus on the probability of each $d_v^{(m)}$ not being good, since M is a fixed integer. The number of misclassified nodes in $\hat{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}$ is at most $\eta_n n$ with $\eta_n \lesssim (\rho_n)^{-1}$ from (3.6), then the cardinality of $\mathcal{X}_e^{(m)}$ (5.7) is at most $\eta_n n \binom{n-2}{m-2} \lesssim n^{m-1} / \rho_n$. Note that $\rho_n \asymp d_{\max} := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_e \mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} \right) \leq \eta_n n \binom{n-2}{m-2} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)}{\binom{n-1}{m-1}} \lesssim \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}}{\rho_n} \log(n),$$

where the sequence $\gamma_n^{(m)} := \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)}}{\rho_n}$. We take $\zeta_n^{(m)} := 2 / \log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n))$, which satisfies $\zeta_n^{(m)} \geq \gamma_n^{(m)}$, then for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\zeta_n^{(m)} \log \left(\frac{\zeta_n^{(m)}}{\gamma_n^{(m)}} \right) + (\gamma_n^{(m)} - \zeta_n^{(m)}) \geq \frac{2 \log(2\rho_n) - 2 \log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n)))}{\log(\mathcal{P}_{\max}^{(m)} \log(n))} \geq 2 - o(1).$$

Using a variant of Chernoff (Lemma F.8), we finally have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_k(d_v^{(m)} \text{ is not good}) &= \mathbb{P}_k \left(\sum_e \mathcal{X}_e^{(m)} > \zeta_n^{(m)} \log(n) \right) \\
&= \exp \left(- \left[\zeta_n^{(m)} \log \left(\frac{\zeta_n^{(m)}}{\gamma_n^{(m)}} \right) + (\gamma_n^{(m)} - \zeta_n^{(m)}) \right] \right) \leq n^{-2+o(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

APPENDIX F. TECHNICAL LEMMAS

Lemma F.1 (Weyl's inequality). *Let $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be two real $m \times n$ matrices, then $|\sigma_i(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{E}) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A})| \leq \|\mathbf{E}\|$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \min\{m, n\}$. Furthermore, if $m = n$ and $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are real symmetric, then $|\lambda_i(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{E}) - \lambda_i(\mathbf{A})| \leq \|\mathbf{E}\|$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Lemma F.2 (Eckart–Young–Mirsky Theorem [47]). *Suppose that the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ($m \leq n$) adapts the singular value decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^\top$, where $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ contains diagonal elements $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_m$. Let $\mathbf{A}^{(K)} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sigma_k \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{v}_k^\top$ be the rank- K approximation of \mathbf{A} . Then $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^{(K)}\|_2 = \sigma_{K+1} \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_2$ for any matrix \mathbf{B} with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{B}) = K$.*

Lemma F.3 (Markov's inequality, [103, Proposition 1.2.4]). *For any non-negative random variable X and $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X > t) \leq \mathbb{E}(X)/t.$$

Lemma F.4 (Hoeffding's inequality, [103, Theorem 2.2.6]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables with $X_i \in [a_i, b_i]$, then for any, $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i)\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}\right).$$

Lemma F.5 (Chernoff's inequality, [103, Theorem 2.3.1]). *Let X_i be independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters p_i . Consider their sum $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and denote its mean by $\mu = \mathbb{E}S_n$. Then for any $t > \mu$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq t) \leq e^{-\mu} \left(\frac{e\mu}{t}\right)^t.$$

Lemma F.6 (Bernstein's inequality, [103, Theorem 2.8.4]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent mean-zero random variables such that $|X_i| \leq K$ for all i . Let $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_i^2$. Then for every $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Kt/3}\right).$$

Lemma F.7 (Bennett's inequality, [103, Theorem 2.9.2]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables. Assume that $|X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i| \leq K$ almost surely for every i . Then for any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E}X_i) \geq t\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{K^2} \cdot h\left(\frac{Kt}{\sigma^2}\right)\right),$$

where $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_i)$ is the variance of the sum, and $h(u) := (1+u) \log(1+u) - u$.

Lemma F.8 (Variants of Chernoff). *Let X_i be independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters p_i . Consider their sum $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and denote its mean by $\mu := \mathbb{E}S_n$.*

(1) *If $\mu = \gamma \log(n)$ for some $\gamma > 0$, then for any $\zeta > \gamma$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq \zeta \log(n)) \leq n^{-[\zeta \log \frac{\zeta}{\gamma} + (\gamma - \zeta)]}.$$

(2) *If $\mu = \gamma_n \cdot \log(n)$ for some vanishing sequence $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ with $\gamma_n = o(1)$, then for any vanishing sequence $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ with $\zeta_n = \omega(\gamma_n)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq \zeta_n \cdot \log(n)) \leq n^{-[\zeta_n \log \frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n} (1+o(1))]}.$$

Proof of Lemma F.8. Chernoff Lemma F.5 gives

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq t) \leq e^{-\mu} \left(\frac{e\mu}{t}\right)^t = \exp\left(-(\mu - t) - t \log\left(\frac{t}{\mu}\right)\right)$$

Let $f(t) = t \log\left(\frac{t}{\mu}\right) + (\mu - t)$, where $f(\mu) = 0$ and $f'(t) = \log\left(\frac{t}{\mu}\right) > 0$ for $t > \mu$, thus $f(t) > 0$ for all $t > \mu$.

(1) By taking $t = \zeta \log(n)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-(\gamma - \zeta) \log(n) - \zeta \log\left(\frac{\zeta}{\gamma}\right) \cdot \log(n)\right) = n^{-[\zeta \log \frac{\zeta}{\gamma} + (\gamma - \zeta)]}.$$

(2) Note that $\gamma_n = o(1)$, $\zeta_n = o(1)$ but $\frac{\zeta_n}{\gamma_n} = \omega(1)$, then $\frac{\gamma_n - \zeta_n}{\zeta_n \log(\zeta_n/\gamma_n)} = o(1)$, hence follows. □

Lemma F.9. *For integers $n, k \geq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \log\binom{n}{k} &= \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{n}{2\pi k(n-k)} + n \log(n) - k \log(k) - (n-k) \log(n-k) + O\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{n-k}\right) \\ \log\binom{n}{k} &= k \log\left(\frac{n}{k}\right) + k + o(k), \text{ for } k = \omega(1) \text{ and } \frac{k}{n} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $1 \leq k \leq \sqrt{n}$, we have

$$\frac{n^k}{4 \cdot k!} \leq \binom{n}{k} \leq \frac{n^k}{k!}, \quad \log \binom{n}{k} \geq k \log \left(\frac{en}{k} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \log(k) - \frac{1}{12k} - \log(4\sqrt{2\pi}).$$

Proof of Lemma F.9. According to Stirling's series [43], $\sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n e^{\frac{1}{12n+1}} < n! < \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n e^{\frac{1}{12n}}$ for any $n \geq 1$, then

$$\left| \log(n!) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi n) + n \log(n) - n \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{12n}.$$

Thus for any $k \geq 1$, we have $\log \binom{n}{k} = \log(n!) - \log(k!) - \log((n-k)!)$, as well as

$$\left| \log \binom{n}{k} - \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{n}{2\pi k(n-k)} + n \log(n) - k \log(k) - (n-k) \log(n-k) \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{n-k} \right).$$

When $k = \omega(1)$ but $\frac{k}{n} = o(1)$, we have $\log(1 - \frac{k}{n}) = -\frac{k}{n} + O(n^{-2})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \log \binom{n}{k} &= -\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi k) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{k}{n} \right) + n \log(n) - k \log(k) \\ &\quad - (n-k) \log(n) - (n-k) \log \left(1 - \frac{k}{n} \right) + o(1) \\ &= k \log(n) - k \log(k) + k + o(k). \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, we write

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n(n-1)\cdots(n-k+1)}{k!} = \frac{n^k}{k!} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right) \cdots \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{n}\right) \geq \frac{n^k}{k!} \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{n}\right)^{k-1}$$

The upper bound is trivial. For the lower bound, let $f(x) = (1 - x/n)^x$ denote the function. It is easy to see that $f(x)$ is decreasing with respect to x , and

$$\left(1 - \frac{k-1}{n}\right)^{k-1} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Let $g(t) = (1 - 1/t)^t$ and we know that $g(t)$ is increasing when $t \geq 1$, hence $g(t) \geq g(2) = 1/4$ for any $t \geq 2$ and the desired lower bound follows. Then for any $k \leq \sqrt{n}$, we have

$$\log \binom{n}{k} \geq \log \frac{n^k}{4 \cdot k!} \geq \log \left(\frac{n^k}{4 \cdot \sqrt{2\pi k} \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^k e^{\frac{1}{12k}}} \right) = k \log \left(\frac{en}{k} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \log(k) - \frac{1}{12k} - \log(4\sqrt{2\pi}).$$

□

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO, LA JOLLA, CA 92093
Email address: idumitriu@ucsd.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO, LA JOLLA, CA 92093
Email address: h9wang@ucsd.edu