

A unified analysis of likelihood-based estimators in the Plackett–Luce model

Ruijian Han^{*1} and Yiming Xu^{†‡2}

¹Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

²Corporate Model Risk, Wells Fargo

June 6, 2023

Abstract

The Plackett–Luce model is a popular approach for rank data analysis, where a utility vector is employed to determine the probability of each outcome based on Luce’s choice axiom. In this paper, we investigate the asymptotic theory of utility vector estimation by maximizing different types of likelihood, such as the full-, marginal-, and quasi-likelihood. We provide a rank-matching interpretation for the estimating equations of these estimators and analyze their asymptotic behavior as the number of items being compared tends to infinity. In particular, we establish the uniform consistency of these estimators under conditions characterized by the topology of the underlying comparison graph sequence and demonstrate that the proposed conditions are sharp for common sampling scenarios such as the nonuniform random hypergraph model and the hypergraph stochastic block model; we also obtain the asymptotic normality of these estimators and discuss the trade-off between statistical efficiency and computational complexity for practical uncertainty quantification. Both results allow for nonuniform and inhomogeneous comparison graphs with varying edge sizes and different asymptotic orders of edge probabilities. We verify our theoretical findings by conducting detailed numerical experiments.

1 Introduction

Combining scores of multiple agents to produce a collective ranking is a frequent task across various domains, including econometrics [30], game analytics [28, 19], psychometrics [37], and others [23, 4, 8]. One common statistical approach to modeling such situations involves incorporating latent parameters into the subjects under comparison. Assuming that pairwise comparison outcomes are not influenced by irrelevant alternatives [27], a unique parametrization of the model can be obtained, leading to what is known as the Plackett–Luce (PL) model [34].

As a special instance of random utility models [37], the PL model is particularly popular owing to striking a balance between the model complexity and computational tractability [40]. When the comparison data are pairwise, the PL model reduces to the Bradley–Terry (BT) model [6], which has been actively investigated over the last 20+ years [36, 24, 38, 35, 31, 10, 22, 9, 26, 17]. In contrast, the theory of the PL model received less attention due to the more involved data structure. Only recently emerged a few studies that examined the asymptotic properties of estimators in the PL model with equal-sized comparison data [25, 14]. Their approaches, however, do not easily extend to the PL model with a general comparison graph structure. To fill this gap, this paper develops a unified asymptotic theory for a class of likelihood-based estimators in the general PL model, assuming neither graph homogeneity nor uniform comparison data size. Before diving into the technical details, we provide a brief overview of related work in the field. We focus on the works directly related to the PL model rather than the BT model.

*Email address: ruijian.han@polyu.edu.hk

†Email address: yiming2358@gmail.com

‡We thank Mengxin Yu for kindly providing us with the supplementary file of [14].

1.1 Related work

A large body of work in the PL model involves estimating parameters using likelihood-based methods. [24] has used the Minorization-Maximization (MM) algorithm to find the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), and alternative Bayesian approaches have been proposed in [20, 7]. In [29], the authors provided a Markov chain interpretation of the MLE, leading to a spectral algorithm that was later improved in [2]. Additionally, [3] introduced a breaking technique in the full-ranking setting by first breaking multiple comparisons into pairwise comparisons and then applying the generalized method-of-moments. This data-breaking approach is closely related to the quasi-maximum likelihood estimation (QMLE) in Section 3.2.

The existing study of the asymptotic properties of the estimators in the PL model is focused on a special class of PL models with equal-sized comparison data. In [25], the conditions for achieving exact recovery of top- K ranking were discovered and a spectral method was applied to achieve this, albeit under suboptimal conditions. When only the top-1 comparison data are considered, the PL model falls into a general framework introduced in [35], and a weighted ℓ_2 convergence rate is established for the MLE. More recently, [14] conducted a comprehensive analysis of the top-1 MLE and obtained both the uniform convergence rate and asymptotic normality. However, none of these findings admit an immediate extension to the general PL model where the comparison graph is inhomogeneous and comparison data have varying sizes. Analyzing network models with a general nonuniform hypergraph structure is typically considered a challenging task [41].

1.2 Contributions

This paper aims to take a step forward to understand the asymptotic theory of utility vector estimation in the PL model with a general underlying hypergraph structure. Our contributions at a high level can be described as follows.

- We formulate several likelihood-based estimators in the PL model, including the full-likelihood, the marginal-likelihood, and the quasi-likelihood, and interpret their estimating equations through the lens of rank matching.
- We develop a unified uniform consistency theory for the likelihood-based estimators under suitable graph topology conditions. For several models of interest, including the nonuniform random hypergraph model and the hypergraph stochastic block model, the conditions are optimal in terms of the leading-order asymptotics describing the model sparsity.
- Under an additional balancing condition, we establish the asymptotic normality of the likelihood-based estimators and discuss the trade-off between statistical efficiency and computational complexity. These results provide both a theoretical foundation and practical guidance for statistical inference in the PL model.

Both the uniform consistency and asymptotic normality results employ an innovative graph chaining technique, only for the latter with light recourse to the commonly-used leave-out analysis [14, 9], which is tailored for analyzing homogeneous graphs. Our results not only broaden the scope of the comparison graph structure but also incorporate more efficient computational estimators like the QMLE, whose asymptotic properties have not yet been revealed in the literature. Numerical simulations are presented in the end to support our findings.

1.3 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the multiple comparison model and the multiple comparison graphs that are studied throughout the paper. Section 3 reviews several likelihood-based estimators in the comparison model, including the full MLE, the marginal MLE, and the QMLE. An intuitive interpretation of their estimating equations is given based on the view of fitting certain rank-related equations. Section 4 contains the main uniform consistency results for the likelihood-based estimators, while their proof is deferred to Section 5 where a more general result for deterministic hypergraph sequences is presented. We verify

that, under nearly sharp sparsity conditions, several commonly used random hypergraph models introduced in Section 2 can be used for sampling to ensure the desired uniform consistency. Section 6 establishes the asymptotic normality of the likelihood-based estimators and discusses the trade-off between statistical efficiency and computational complexity. Section 7 conducts a number of simulations to support our theoretical findings. To help the reader better understand the key ideas, the proofs of the main results are presented in Appendices. Other intermediate technical results are postponed to the supplementary file which is separate from the manuscript.

1.4 Notation

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $T \subseteq [n]$, the power set of T is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(T)$. A permutation π on T is a bijection from T to itself, and the set of permutations on T is denoted by $\mathcal{S}(T)$. If $|T| = m$, we write π as $\pi(1), \dots, \pi(m)$, where $\pi(i)$ is the element in T that is mapped to the i th element in T under π . For a multiple comparison model with n items, we reserve the notation $\mathbf{u}^* = (u_1^*, \dots, u_n^*)$ for the ground truth utility vector, and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ the corresponding (marginal) MLE and QMLE, respectively.

In the subsequent analysis, a comparison graph can be stated as a hypergraph $\mathsf{H}(V, E)$, where V is the vertex set and E is the edge set ($E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$). For $U_1, U_2 \subseteq V$ with $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$, we define the edges between U_1 and U_2 as $\mathcal{E}(U_1, U_2) = \{e \in E : e \cap U_i \neq \emptyset, i = 1, 2\}$. The set of boundary edges of U is defined as $\partial U = \mathcal{E}(U, U^c)$.

For a smooth function $f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $k_1, \dots, k_s \in [n]$, we let $\partial_{k_1 \dots k_s} f$ denote the s -order partial derivative of f with respect to the k_1, \dots, k_s components. We use \vee and \wedge to denote the *max* and *min* operator, respectively. We use $O_p(\cdot)$ and $o_p(\cdot)$ to represent the same and higher-order relation for two random sequences in probability, respectively. For a fixed sequence, we use $O(\cdot)$ in place of $O_p(\cdot)$. We use \lesssim and \gtrsim to denote the asymptotic inequality relations, and \asymp if both \lesssim and \gtrsim hold. We use $\mathbf{1}_A(x)$ to denote the indicator function on a set A , that is, $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 1$ if $x \in A$ and $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 0$ otherwise. We use $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$ to denote the all-ones vector $(1, \dots, 1)^\top$ with a compatible dimension that is often clear from the context.

2 Preliminaries and Problem set-up

We begin with a brief introduction to the PL model, then proceed to explain the data structure observed in a multiple comparison model based on the PL model, and two commonly used random hypergraph models to generate the comparison graphs.

2.1 The PL model

Consider a comparison model consisting of n items of interest. In the PL model, each item $k \in [n]$ is assumed with a latent score $e^{u_k^*}$, where $\mathbf{u}^* = (u_1^*, \dots, u_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is known as the utility vector. Given $T \subseteq [n]$ with $|T| = m$, a full observation on T is a totally ordered sequence $\pi(1) \succ \dots \succ \pi(m)$, where $\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T)$, the set of permutations on T , and $\pi(j)$ denotes the element with rank j . Sometimes it is more convenient to work with the rank of an element, for which we introduce the notation $r(i) := \pi^{-1}(i) = \{j : \pi(j) = i\}$. Given T and identifying the full observation as π , the PL model assumes the probability of observing π on T is

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}^*}(\pi|T) := \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{e^{u_{\pi(j)}^*}}{\sum_{t=j}^m e^{u_{\pi(t)}^*}}. \quad (2.1)$$

The subscript of \mathbb{P} denotes the dependence on the utility vector and is dropped whenever clear from the context. Note (2.1) is invariant under the shift of \mathbf{u}^* . An additional linear constraint is needed to make the model identifiable, for which we adopt the commonly used $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle^\top \mathbf{u}^* = \sum_{j \in [n]} u_j^* = 0$, where $\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle$ is the all-ones vector with compatible size.

As the name suggests, the PL model is related to Luce's choice axiom [27], which states that selecting one item over another is not affected by the presence or absence of other items. In fact, the PL model can be characterized using the following conditions:

Condition 1. There exist a family of *choice-one* selection probabilities $\{\mathbb{P}^T\}_{T \subseteq [n]}$ satisfying Luce's choice axiom.

Condition 2. For $T \subseteq [n]$ with $|T| = m$, $\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T)$ is a random permutation obtained by sequentially sampling $\pi(j)$ from $\mathbb{P}^{T_{-j+1}}$, where $T_{-0} = T$ and $T_{-j} = T \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(j)\}$.

Condition 1 is equivalent to parametrizing $\mathbb{P}^T(k) = e^{u_k^*} / \sum_{j \in T} e^{u_j^*}$ for some $\mathbf{u}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ [27]. Condition 2 says that π is obtained by independently selecting the top element from the remaining comparison set, that is, $\mathbb{P}(\pi|T) = \prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}^{T_{-j+1}}(\pi(j))$. With such interpretation, the equivalence between (2.1) and the above conditions is obvious.

An important property of the probability measures defined in (2.1) is that they are internally consistent [24]. In particular, for $T' \subseteq T$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\pi'|T') = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T), \pi^{-1}|_{T'} \sim \pi'^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(\pi|T) \quad \pi' \in \mathcal{S}(T'), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\pi^{-1}|_{T'} \sim \pi'^{-1}$ means that the relative ranks of T' under π and π' are the same. This implies that the probability of a multiple comparison observation in the PL model, whether treated as a full observation or a partial observation (on a larger comparison set), is well-defined.

2.2 Multiple comparison data

We now describe the data observed in a PL comparison model. Let N denote the number of *independent* comparisons, and $N_k := |\{i \in [N] : k \in T_i\}|$ denote the number of those containing the item k . For $i \in [N]$, the i th data can be represented as a pair $(T_i, \pi_i) \in \mathcal{P}([n]) \times \mathcal{S}(T_i)$, in which T_i (with $|T_i| = m_i$) is where multiple comparisons take place, and π_i encodes the observed ranks of items in T_i . Here we do *not* require $m_i = m_j$ for $i, j \in [N]$, namely, the sizes of the comparison sets are allowed to be different. We assume that m_i is independent of the utility vector \mathbf{u}^* . The corresponding full observation \mathcal{O}_i^{full} is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_i^{full} = \pi_i(1) \succ \dots \succ \pi_i(m_i).$$

The rank of k in π_i is denoted by $r_i(k)$.

More generally, one may consider the partial observation consisting of the top- $q_i \leq m_i$ items:

$$\mathcal{O}_i^{partial} = \pi_i(1) \succ \dots \succ \pi_i(q_i) \succ \text{others}.$$

When $q_i = 1$ for all $i \in [n]$, the partial observations reduce to the *choice-one* observations. The partial observations become full observations if $q_i = m_i$ for all $i \in [N]$.

It is helpful to recall the sequential sampling view in Condition 2. For every $\pi_i \sim \mathbb{P}(\cdot|T_i)$, it can be viewed as a random process adapted to the natural filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,j} = \sigma(\pi_i(s), s \leq j). \quad (2.3)$$

This perspective allows for convenient interpretation of certain quantities in the subsequent sections.

2.3 Comparison graphs

The n items under comparison together with the multiple comparison data can be viewed as a hypergraph $\mathbf{H}(V, E)$, where $V = [n]$ and $E = \{T_i : i \in [N]\}$. For $s \in [n]$, $\Omega_s := \{e \in \mathcal{P}([n]) : |e| = s\}$ denotes the set of subsets of $[n]$ with size s . In the following, we consider two types of random hypergraph models that can respectively capture nonuniform comparisons and cluster structures. All the parameters in the comparison graphs models are independent of the utility vector \mathbf{u}^* .

2.3.1 Nonuniform random hypergraph models

We consider the following nonuniform random hypergraph model (NURHM). Fixing an absolute integer $M \leq n$, we assume that

$$E = \bigcup_{s=2}^M E^{(s)} \quad E^{(s)} \subseteq \Omega_s, \quad (2.4)$$

where $E^{(s)}$ are independent s -uniform random hypergraphs generated as follows. Fixing s , $\mathbf{1}_{\{e \in E^{(s)}\}}$ are independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter $p_{e,n}^{(s)}$ for $e \in \Omega_s$. Denote by

$$p_n^{(s)} = \min_{e \in \Omega_s} p_{e,n}^{(s)} \quad q_n^{(s)} = \max_{e \in \Omega_s} p_{e,n}^{(s)}.$$

When $p_n^{(s)} = q_n^{(s)} = p_m \mathbf{1}_{\{s=m\}}$ for some $m \in [2, M]$ and $p_m \in [0, 1]$, $H(V, E)$ reduces to the m -way uniform hypergraph model that generalizes the Erdős–Rényi model [13] when $m > 2$. Nevertheless, NURHM is strictly more general as it can produce varying-size comparison data with different probabilities.

2.3.2 Hypergraph stochastic block model

The hypergraph stochastic block model (HSBM) is a special class of random hypergraph models with cluster structures. It was first studied in [18] and has been analyzed for community detection [15, 33]. Analogous to the stochastic block model for conventional graphs [1], an m -uniform HSBM model with $K < \infty$ clusters partitions V into K subsets, $V = \sqcup_{i \in [K]} V_i$, where edges within and across partitioned sets have different probabilities of occurrence:

$$\mathbb{P}(e \in E) = \begin{cases} \omega_{n,1} \mathbf{1}_{\{e \in \Omega_m\}} & e \subseteq V_1 \\ \vdots & \\ \omega_{n,K} \mathbf{1}_{\{e \in \Omega_m\}} & e \subseteq V_K \\ \omega_{n,0} \mathbf{1}_{\{e \in \Omega_m\}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (2.5)$$

The probabilities of the edges across different partitions are assumed the same in (2.5), although they can be further refined depending on which V_i intersects the edge as well as the intersected size. Moreover, the probabilities within the same partition can be made different but of the same order asymptotically. Such generalizations do *not* change our theoretical results but increase notational complexity. For simplicity, we adopt the setup in (2.5) for HSBM. With proper choices of $\omega_{n,k}$, (2.5) can be used to simulate heterogeneous clusterable networks in the sense that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_k \omega_{n,k} / \min_k \omega_{n,k}$ is allowed to diverge as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (NURHM can also be used to sample heterogeneous networks but the analysis is much harder if the degree of heterogeneity is uncontrolled due to the lack of cluster structure.) In the literature on classification, the setup is similar to the case of imbalanced data.

3 Estimation of utility scores

Conditioning on the edge set $E = \{T_i : i \in [N]\}$, we consider several commonly used likelihood-based approaches to estimating \mathbf{u}^* based on observed data. We provide a simple unified standpoint to interpret their estimating equations.

3.1 The likelihood approach

The likelihood function can be explicitly written down in a PL model with utility vector \mathbf{u} . Given data $\{(T_i, \pi_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$, the marginal log-likelihood function based on the top- q_i items in each

π_i ($q_i \leq |T_i|$ and is independent of \mathbf{u}^*) is

$$l_1(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in [q_i]} \left[u_{\pi_i(j)} - \log \left(\sum_{l=j}^{m_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(l)}} \right) \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}$ denote the expectation operator in a PL model with parameter \mathbf{u} . For convenience, we omit the subscript when \mathbf{u} is the ground truth, that is, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^*$. The following proposition shows that the (marginal) MLE $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies a system of estimating equations.

Proposition 3.1. *The MLE $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ obtained from maximizing (3.1) (subject to a linear constraint) satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i:k \in T_i} S_i(\hat{\mathbf{u}}; k) = 0 \quad k \in [n],$$

where

$$S_i(\mathbf{u}; k) = \left(\sum_{j \in [m_i]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = j \text{ and } r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} | \mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}] \right) - \mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} \quad (3.2)$$

and $\mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}$ are defined in (2.3). Meanwhile, the true parameter \mathbf{u}^* satisfies $\mathbb{E}[S_i(\mathbf{u}^*; k)] = 0$ for every $i \in [N]$.

The proof follows directly from the first-order optimality of the (marginal) MLE and is given in Appendix A.1. To better understand the estimating equations, we consider two special cases introduced in the previous section.

3.1.1 Full observations

In this case, $q_i = m_i$ for all $i \in [N]$. The quantity (3.2) in the estimating equation for each $i \in [N]$ and $k \in [n]$ reduces to

$$\left(\sum_{j \in [m_i]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = j\}} | \mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}] \right) - 1. \quad (3.3)$$

Note $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = j\}} | \mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}]$ estimates the probability of the rank of k being j given the information revealed before $\pi_i(j)$. The first term in (3.3) is thus an aggregation of such probability estimates for the potential ranks of k , whose expectation is 1 under the ground truth model \mathbf{u}^* by the tower property.

3.1.2 Choice-one observations

In this case, $q_i = 1$ for all $i \in [N]$. Similar to the full-observation case, the quantity (3.2) in the estimating equation for each $i \in [N]$ and $k \in [n]$ reduces to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = 1\}}] - \mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = 1\}}. \quad (3.4)$$

In this case, $\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = 1\}}$ estimates the probability of k being the first element in π_i without observing any information.

Remark 1. The conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}]$ in (3.2) is random and depends on the ranking outcome when $|T_i| > 2$. This is different from the BT model ($|T_i| = 2$), whose score function can be written as the difference of two parts: one that only depends on \mathbf{u} and the other that only depends on the ranking outcome. In dealing with the marginal MLE, only the choice-one form (3.4) can be split similarly to the BT model.

3.2 The quasi-likelihood approach

An alternative approach is to break the observations in a PL model into pairwise comparisons. According to Condition 2, multiple comparison data arising from a PL model implies a number of pairwise comparison outcomes. For example, for $T \subseteq [n]$ with $|T| = m$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T)$,

$$\{\pi(1) \succ \cdots \succ \pi(m)\} \implies \bigcap_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \{\pi(i) \succ \pi(j)\}. \quad (3.5)$$

The right-hand side of (3.5) is called the full breaking of π . Other types of breaking such as the top/bottom- K breaking can be considered similarly. For simplicity, we focus on the full breaking case.

The pairwise comparisons in a full breaking are partial observations from different comparison sets. Thanks to the internal consistency of the PL model (2.2), their individual probabilities could be treated under a unified setup, for example, the BT model, despite a loss of dependence among them. Treating the right-hand side of (3.5) as if rising from a BT model, we can write down the corresponding log-likelihood function

$$l_2(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i \in [N]} \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m_i} (u_{\pi_i(j)} - \log(e^{u_{\pi_i(j)}} + e^{u_{\pi_i(k)}})), \quad (3.6)$$

and seek the corresponding MLE $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, which is a QMLE approach per se. The general theory of QMLE estimation in finite dimensions says that the QMLE converges to an element in the quasi-likelihood parameter space that is closest to the true likelihood in the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence under suitable conditions. If the parameters of the convergent element coincide with the parameters of the true likelihood, then the QMLE is consistent. The next result shows that for every fixed n , the closest element to the true PL likelihood in the BT model in the sense of KL divergence has the same parameters as the true PL likelihood. Although the result provides evidence that the QMLE is a promising estimator in practice, it is different from the uniform consistency result in Section 4 where both n and N tend to infinity.

For ease of illustration, we consider a mixed model setup as follows. For $T \subseteq [n]$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PL likelihood: } f(\pi; \mathbf{u}) &= \mathbb{Q}(T) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{|T|} \frac{e^{u_{\pi(j)}}}{\sum_{k \geq j} e^{u_{\pi(k)}}}, \\ \text{BT likelihood: } g(\pi; \mathbf{u}) &= \mathbb{Q}(T) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq |T|} \frac{e^{u_{\pi(j)}}}{e^{u_{\pi(j)}} + e^{u_{\pi(k)}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{Q} is a probability measure on $\mathcal{P}([n])$.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that the expected connectivity condition holds: For every $k, k' \in [n]$, there exists a sequence of edges $\{T'_1, \dots, T'_s\} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ such that $\min_{j \in [s]} \mathbb{Q}(T'_j) > 0$, and $k \in T'_1, k' \in T'_s$ and $T'_j \cap T'_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq j < s$. Then for every $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\mathbf{u} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}: \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = 0} \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f} [\text{KL}(f(\pi; \mathbf{u}) \| g(\pi; \mathbf{v}))],$$

where $\text{KL}(\cdot \| \cdot)$ is the KL-divergence.

The expected connectivity condition is weaker than the resulting graph being connected since it only requires that for any k, k' there exists a configuration under \mathbb{Q} such that k and k' are connected. The proof is given in Appendix A.2. Moreover, an almost identical computation as the proof reproduces an analogous result as Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.3. *The QMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ obtained from maximizing (3.6) satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i: k \in T_i} (r_i(k) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}} [r_i(k)]) = 0. \quad k \in [n].$$

Meanwhile, for every $i \in [N]$, the true parameter \mathbf{u}^* satisfies $\mathbb{E}[r_i(k) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}^*} [r_i(k)]] = 0$ (this is trivial but stated as a comparison to the above equations for convenience).

4 Uniform consistency

In this section, we establish the uniform consistency of the MLE/QMLE in the previous section. To prove uniform consistency, we require the following assumption on the comparison model.

Assumption 1. The utility vector \mathbf{u}^* is uniformly bounded, that is, there exists a universal constant $C_1 \geq 1$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}^*\|_\infty \leq \log(C_1)$.

Moreover, we make additional assumptions on the comparison graph, one of which depends on whether the graph is sampled from a NURHM or an HSBM introduced in Section 2.3.

Assumption 2. The maximum size of the comparison sets is bounded as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that is, $M := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{i \in [N]} |T_i| < \infty$.

Assumption 3. For a NURHM defined in Section 2.3.1, we assume

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_{n,+}^2 (\log n)^3}{\xi_{n,-}^3} \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\xi_{n,-} := \sum_{s=2}^M n^{s-1} p_n^{(s)} \quad \xi_{n,+} := \sum_{s=2}^M n^{s-1} q_n^{(s)}. \quad (4.2)$$

Assumption 4. For an HSBM in Section 2.3.2, we assume

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\log n)^3}{\zeta_{n,-}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\zeta_{n,-} := n^{m-1} \min_{0 \leq i \leq K} \omega_{n,i}. \quad (4.3)$$

Assumption 2 is a realistic assumption on the maximum comparison data size. Both Assumption 3-4 are concerned with the minimal connectivity of the underlying graph, with the former imposing additional balancing conditions on the degree of heterogeneity of the edge probabilities. For homogeneous m -uniform hypergraph models, Assumption 3 is satisfied if the comparison rate $p_m \gtrsim (\log n)^{3+\kappa} / \binom{n-1}{m-1}$ for any $\kappa > 0$, a near-minimal sparsity condition that matches the result in [14]. We now state the main results of this section.

Theorem 4.1 (Uniform consistency under NURHM). *Suppose the comparison graph sequence is sampled from a NURHM in Section 2.3.1. Under Assumptions 1-3, a.s., both the marginal MLE $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and the QMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ in Section 3 uniquely exist and are uniformly consistent, that is,*

$$\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^2 (\log n)^3}{\xi_{n,-}^3}} \rightarrow 0 \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ or $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\xi_{n,\pm}$ are the same as (4.2).

Theorem 4.2 (Uniform consistency under HSBM). *Suppose the comparison graph sequence is sampled from an HSBM in Section 2.3.2. Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 4, a similar result as (4.4) holds:*

$$\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^3}{\zeta_{n,-}}} \rightarrow 0 \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ or $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\zeta_{n,-}$ is the same as (4.3).

The random hypergraph models in Theorems 4.1-4.2 cover a range of intriguing multiple comparison graph models. For instance, the conditions in Theorem 4.1 admit hyperedges with varying sizes independently generated with balanced probabilities. The balancing condition can be removed if community structure exists. In the case of HSBM, according to Theorem 4.2, requiring $(\min_{0 \leq i \leq K} n^{m-1} \omega_{n,i}) \geq (\log n)^{3+\kappa}$ in (2.5) alone is sufficient for the uniform consistency. Under such circumstances, typical configurations are extremely heterogeneous if $(\max_{0 \leq i \leq K} n^{m-1} \omega_{n,i}) \gtrsim n$. Both Theorems 4.1-4.2 significantly generalize the graph conditions in [25, 14]. The proofs of these theorems follow as an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.1 and Lemma 5.1.

Remark 2. The technical details of Theorem 4.1-4.2 are quite different from the leave-one-out analysis used in [9, 14]. The leave-one-out analysis is based on the intuition that ignoring one item in data has only a mild influence on the estimation of other items. This intuition holds when the data are homogeneous, that is, each item participates in the comparison with the same probability. Then, by standard degree concentration, the number of comparisons for each item is of the same order. Consequently, ignoring one item only reduces the $O_p(1/n)$ proportion of the data. However, in the inhomogeneous case, such as the HSBM, ignoring one item that compares with all the other items can potentially reduce $O_p(1/(\log n)^3)$ data which can result in a substantial change of the estimation of other items.

5 Uniform consistency for deterministic graph sequences

The uniform consistency in Theorem 5.1 can be deduced from a more general consequence stated for deterministic comparison graph sequences. To explain this result, we generalize the rapid expansion property introduced in [21] to the setup of hypergraph sequences. Toward this, we need the concept of modified Cheeger constant and admissible sequences.

Definition 1 (Modified Cheeger constant). Given a hypergraph $H(V, E)$ with $V = [n]$, let

$$h_H(U) = \frac{|\partial U|}{\min\{|U|, |U^c|\}} \quad U \subset [n].$$

The modified Cheeger constant of H is defined as $h_H = \min_U h_H(U)$.

A larger value of h_H suggests the better connectivity of H .

Definition 2 (Admissible sequences). Given a hypergraph $H(V, E)$, a strictly increasing sequence of vertices $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^J$ is called admissible if at least half of the boundary edges of A_j lie in A_{j+1} for $j < J$, that is,

$$\frac{|\{e \in \partial A_j : e \subseteq A_{j+1}\}|}{|\partial A_j|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad 1 \leq j < J.$$

In an admissible sequence $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^J$, less than half of the edges in ∂A_j are shared with A_{j+1} . Assuming the hypergraph is well-connected, $|A_j|$ is expected to grow quickly when $|A_j|$ is “small”. Such intuition is formalized via the following definition.

Definition 3 (Rapid expansion). Let $H_n(V_n, E_n)$ be a sequence of hypergraphs with $V_n = [n]$. Let \mathcal{A}_n denote the set of admissible sequences in H_n . $\{H_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to be rapidly expanding (RE) if

$$\Gamma_n^{RE} := \max_{\{A_j\}_{j=1}^J \in \mathcal{A}_n} \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{h_{H_n}(A_j)}} \rightarrow 0 \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $h_{H_n}(A_j)$ is defined in Definition 1.

The RE property provides a different approach to characterizing graph connectivity. To state the general uniform consistency theorem, we only need the following assumption:

Assumption 5. For every $U \subset [n]$, there exists a pair $(k_1, k_2) \in U \otimes U^{\mathbb{G}}$ and a comparison edge T_i , such that $k_1, k_2 \in T_i$ and $k_1 \succ k_2$ is observed.

Assumption 5 is both sufficient and necessary to ensure the unique existence of the MLE/QMLE. Intuitively, Assumption 5 implies that the log-likelihood function diverges to negative infinity as $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\infty} \rightarrow \infty$, and a concrete interpretation depends on the likelihood estimators. For example, for both the full MLE and QMLE, $k_1 \succ k_2$ is observed if and only if they appear in a common edge and $k_1 \succ k_2$ regardless of their absolute ranks. However, for the top-1 MLE, $k_1 \succ k_2$ is equivalent to k_1 being the top-ranked item in a common comparison.

Theorem 5.1. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 5, a.s., for all sufficiently large n , both the marginal MLE $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and the QMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ in Section 3 uniquely exist and satisfy $\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_{\infty} \lesssim \Gamma_n^{RE}$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$, where $\mathbf{w} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}$ or $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. Moreover, if the comparison hypergraph sequence is RE, then $\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$ a.s. That is, both $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ are uniformly consistent estimators for \mathbf{u}^* .*

The idea of the proof is to create a chain between vertices with large positive and negative biases, meanwhile ensuring a smooth transition of error along the chain. This technique is rather different from many existing results in the field [10, 14, 9] and has recently been employed to demonstrate uniform consistency of the MLE in pairwise comparison models [21]. However, the use of chaining for analyzing multiple comparison data is novel and requires addressing additional technical challenges when dealing with hypergraphs. The proof is given in Appendix B. The uniform consistency results in the previous section will follow if the corresponding comparison graph models are RE under the designated assumptions.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $H_n(V_n, E_n)$ be a hypergraph sequence with $V_n = [n]$. The following statements hold:*

1. *If H_n is sampled from a NURHM in Section 2.3.1, then under Assumption 3, H_n satisfies Assumption 5 and is RE a.s., with the corresponding Γ_n^{RE} satisfying*

$$\Gamma_n^{RE} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^2 (\log n)^3}{\xi_{n,-}^3}},$$

where $\xi_{n,\pm}$ are the same as (4.2).

2. *If H_n is sampled from an HSBM in Section 2.3.2, then under Assumption 4, H_n satisfies Assumption 5 and is RE a.s., with the corresponding Γ_n^{RE} satisfying*

$$\Gamma_n^{RE} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^3}{\zeta_{n,-}}},$$

where $\zeta_{n,-}$ is the same as (4.3).

The proof of Lemma 5.1 is given in Appendix C.

6 Asymptotic normality

To establish asymptotic normality, we need to strengthen the conditions in Assumptions 3-4.

Assumption 6. The comparison hypergraph is sampled from a NURHM defined in Section 2.3.1, satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_{n,+}^{10} (\log n)^8}{\xi_{n,-}^{11}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\xi_{n,-} = \sum_{s=2}^M n^{s-1} p_n^{(s)} \quad \xi_{n,+} = \sum_{s=2}^M n^{s-1} q_n^{(s)}.$$

Assumption 7. The comparison hypergraph is sampled from an HSBM in Section 2.3.2, satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta_{n,+}^6 (\log n)^8}{\zeta_{n,-}^7} \vee \frac{\zeta_{n,+}^{10} (\log n)^2}{\zeta_{n,-}^{11}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$\zeta_{n,-} = n^{m-1} \min_{0 \leq i \leq K} \omega_{n,i} \quad \zeta_{n,+} := n^{m-1} \max_{0 \leq i \leq K} \omega_{n,i}.$$

Contrary to Assumption 4, Assumption 7 imposes an additional requirement for an upper bound on $\zeta_{n,+}$ in the HSBM model. This can be heuristically explained by the distinction between uniform consistency and asymptotic normality. While uniform consistency requires the estimation errors of all parameters to converge to zero, asymptotic normality further demands that each estimated parameter converges at a rate consistent with its respective normalization. To illustrate this point, consider an item k that is involved in N_k comparisons. If asymptotic normality holds for k then its estimated error will converge to zero at a rate of $\mathcal{O}_p(1/\sqrt{N_k})$. However, in the presence of graph heterogeneity, the convergence of item k is influenced by other items with slower convergence rates. Such influence results in an additional bias term in the analysis. This is similar to the analysis of semi-parametric models where the nonparametric part plays a role as a bias term [32, Assumption 5.1(ii)]. Therefore, although our approach to asymptotic normality can handle inhomogeneous graphs, the level of inhomogeneity needs to be controlled to a certain extent.

To describe the asymptotic normality results of the marginal MLE and QMLE in detail, we require some additional notation. For the marginal MLE, given an edge $T \subseteq [n]$ with $|T| = m$ and $k \in T$, for $q = 1, \dots, m-1$, we define a sequence of quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*; q, T) \\ & := \sum_{S \subset T \setminus \{k\}: |S|=q-1} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}^*}(r(j) < r(k) = q \text{ for } j \in S | T) (1 - \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}^*}(r(k) = 1 | T \setminus S)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}^*}(\cdot | T)$ is the selection probability on edge T with the parameter \mathbf{u}^* defined in (2.1) and r is the rank on T . The quantity $\theta_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*; q, T)$ depends on the true utility score \mathbf{u}^* and its explicit form is tedious and thus deferred to the supplementary file. The inverse asymptotic variance of the marginal MLE is characterized by

$$\rho_{k,1}^2(\mathbf{u}^*) := \sum_{i:k \in T_i} \sum_{q \in [q_i]} \theta_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*; q, T_i), \quad (6.2)$$

where q_i refers to the top- q_i observations in the i th data as assumed in the marginal MLE estimation. The asymptotic normality of the marginal MLE is summarized as follows.

Theorem 6.1 (Asymptotic normality of marginal MLE). *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 6 or Assumptions 1, 2 and 7, for any fixed $k \in [n]$, the marginal MLE $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies*

$$\rho_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*)(\hat{u}_k - u_k^*) \rightarrow N(0, 1) \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In Theorem 6.1, $1/\rho_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*)$ is the asymptotic standard deviation of $\hat{u}_k - u_k^*$ for large n . Since each $\theta_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*; q, T_i) > 0$, (6.2) implies that the standard deviation of $\hat{u}_k - u_k^*$ will decrease if N_k increases.

On the other hand, (6.2) reveals a trade-off between statistical efficiency and computational complexity between different marginal MLEs. The larger q_i , the smaller the standard deviations, but with the increasing cost of computation. The computational cost for $\theta_{k,1}(\mathbf{u}^*; q, T_i)$ is $|T_i|!/(|T_i| - q)!$. When $|T_i| = M$ and $q_i = q$ for all $i \in [N]$, the total computational cost for (6.2) is $N_k(M!/(M - q)!)$. Specifically, for the full observation, the complexity reaches $N_k(M!)$. Despite obtaining the best statistical efficiency, the full MLE can be computationally prohibitive even for moderate M . For instance, in the horse-racing data analysis in Section 7.3, $M = 14$, and in this case, we don't use the full MLE due to its heavy computational cost.

Remark 3. Theorem 6.1 extends the results in [14] to the setting of both nonuniform and heterogeneous hypergraphs. In particular, among other asymptotic normality results for the BT model [22, 26, 17], Theorem 6.1 provides the first result that allows for truly inhomogeneous graphs in the sense that the upper and lower bounds can have different orders as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (although in a controlled manner). In the homogeneous case, our assumptions are similar to [14]. For example, when $\zeta_{n,-} = \zeta_{n,+}$, (6.1) becomes $\zeta_{n,-} \gg (\log n)^8$ while [14] requires $\zeta_{n,-} \gtrsim \text{poly}(\log n)$.

Remark 4. Theorem 6.1 comes from

$$\hat{u}_k - u_k^* = \frac{\partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*)}{\partial_{kk} l_1(\mathbf{u}^*)} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_k}}\right) \quad k \in [n]. \quad (6.3)$$

Instead of focusing on a single parameter, one can make use of (6.3) to further consider the inference on the space of different parameters, such as the difference between two parameters. Since our main goal is to provide asymptotic property for the likelihood-based estimators, the general inference on the parameter space is beyond the scope of this work. We leave them for future investigation.

For the QMLE, computing the asymptotic variance only uses probabilities of relative ranking of pairwise comparisons. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{k,2}(\mathbf{u}^*; T) &= \sum_{\{i\} \subset T \setminus \{k\}} \frac{e^{u_k^* + u_i^*}}{(e^{u_k^*} + e^{u_i^*})^2}; \\ \theta_{k,3}(\mathbf{u}^*; T) &= \theta_{k,2}(\mathbf{u}^*; T) + \sum_{\{i,j\} \subseteq T \setminus \{k\}} \left[\frac{e^{u_k^*}}{e^{u_k^*} + e^{u_i^*} + e^{u_j^*}} - \frac{e^{2u_k^*}}{(e^{u_k^*} + e^{u_i^*})(e^{u_k^*} + e^{u_j^*})} \right], \end{aligned}$$

we define

$$\rho_{k,2}^2(\mathbf{u}^*) = \frac{(\sum_{i:k \in T_i} \theta_{k,2}(\mathbf{u}^*; T_i))^2}{\sum_{i:k \in T_i} \theta_{k,3}(\mathbf{u}^*; T_i)}. \quad (6.4)$$

The asymptotic normality of the QMLE is summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2 (Asymptotic normality of QMLE). *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 6 or Assumptions 1, 2 and 7, for any fixed $k \in [n]$, the QMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies*

$$\rho_{k,2}(\mathbf{u}^*)(\tilde{u}_k - u_k^*) \rightarrow N(0, 1) \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The explicit form of $\rho_{k,2}^2(\mathbf{u}^*)$ is derived from a sandwich formula. Note

$$\tilde{u}_k - u_k^* = \frac{\partial_k l_2(\mathbf{u}^*)}{\partial_{kk} l_2(\mathbf{u}^*)} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_k}}\right).$$

Unlike the log-likelihood function $l_1(\mathbf{u}^*)$, $\mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 l_2(\mathbf{u}^*)] \neq \mathbb{E}[\nabla l_2(\mathbf{u}^*)^\top \nabla l_2(\mathbf{u}^*)]$.

Compared to the full MLE, the QMLE uses all the data information for estimation yet requires much less computational cost for uncertainty quantification. Consider again the ideal case where $|T_i| = M$ for each $i \in [N]$. The computational cost of (6.4) is $N_k M(M-1)$ which is tiny as opposed to $N_k(M!)$. On the other hand, our numerical studies in Section 7.2 show that the standard deviation of the QMLE is just slightly larger than the full MLE. This observation implies that the QMLE is a good alternative to the full MLE for practical uncertainty quantification in the PL model.

7 Numerical results

In this section, we provide a detailed numerical study to support the theoretical results established in the previous sections. This includes verification of the uniform consistency and asymptotic normality of the likelihood-based estimators using synthetic data generated from the PL model. Moreover, we apply the QMLE to analyze a real horse-racing dataset; we do

not apply the full/marginal MLE for computational reasons that are clarified in Section 7.3. All likelihood-based estimates are numerically computed using the MM algorithm in [24]. The estimated standard deviations are computed using the plug-in method by replacing \mathbf{u}^* with the estimated scores $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ in (6.2) and (6.4), respectively. All numerical experiments are conducted on a laptop with Intel i7-4790 CPU.

7.1 Uniform consistency

We verify the uniform consistency of both the (marginal) MLE and the QMLE in the PL model using two different sampling models: NURHM and HSBM. The edge sizes of the NURHM model are chosen in $\{3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, while the edge size m in HSBM is 5. Both the number of edges in NURHM and the sizes of different blocks in HSBM are generated in a balanced fashion. The total number of edges $N = 0.1n(\log n)^3$; see Table 1 for the exact values of N . A detailed description of the sampling procedure is given in the supplementary file. The utility vector \mathbf{u}^* is selected uniformly between the range $[-0.5, 0.5]$.

Number of items n	Number of edges N in Section 7.1	Number of edges N in Section 7.2
200	2,800	5,800
400	8,400	13,300
600	15,600	21,600
800	23,200	30,500
1,000	32,000	39,800

Table 1: Number of edges N used in the experiments. The second and third columns are the N used in the study of uniform consistency and asymptotic normality, respectively. N is the same for both NURHM and HSBM in the same testing procedure.

The total number of items n in the PL model ranges from 200 to 1000 with increments of 200. For each value of n , we repeat the experiment 300 times and compute the average estimation errors in the ℓ_∞ norm. To get a thorough comparison, the likelihood-based estimators considered in this experiment include the top-1 MLE, the top-2 MLE, the full MLE, and the QMLE. Due to the more stringent conditions (Assumption 5) for the existence, the top-1 MLE may not have solutions. In our setup, the top-1 MLE does not exist in 3 out of 300 experiments while other estimators always exist. We drop the invalid experiments when computing summary statistics which are reported in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Average ℓ_∞ error with corresponding quartiles for the marginal MLE (the top-1 MLE and the top-2 MLE), the full MLE, and the QMLE and the frequencies of each estimator yielding the smallest ℓ_∞ error among others in 300 experiments as the number of items n increases from 200 to 1000 : (a)-(b) the NURHM model, (c)-(d) the HSBM model.

Figure 1 shows the average ℓ_∞ error of the top-1 MLE, the top-2 MLE, the full MLE, and the QMLE in the PL model as the total number of items n increases. For each n , we also provide the frequency of each estimator obtaining the smallest ℓ_∞ error among others in the 300 simulations. As expected, in both sampling scenarios, the ℓ_∞ errors of the estimators decrease to zero as n increases, verifying the uniform consistency results in Section 4. For fixed n , the full MLE has the smallest ℓ_∞ error. The QMLE achieves a competitive result as the full MLE despite using

misspecified information, and in around one in five experiments on average, the QMLE has a smaller ℓ_∞ error than the full MLE. Meanwhile, the marginal MLE estimators in this example have a slower convergence rate due to using only a fraction of the data.

7.2 Asymptotic normality

We next demonstrate the asymptotic normality of both the (marginal) MLE and the QMLE in the PL model using two different sampling graphs: NURHM and HSBM. The experiment setup is almost identical to Section 7.1 except that we choose the edge sizes of the NURHM graph as $\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ to accelerate computation and a slightly larger N ; see the right-most column in Table 1. The calculation for the standard deviation of the full MLE is extremely slow if taking $\{3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ in the NURHM graph as Section 7.1. The results for NURHM and HSBM are reported in Tables 2-3, respectively.

Tables 2-3 show the average estimated standard deviation, coverage probability of 95% confidence interval, and the computational time of the estimated standard deviation for the top-1 MLE, the top-2 MLE, the full MLE, and the QMLE in the PL model under different values of n . For each method, the coverage probability is close to 95% in both NURHM and HSBM, supporting our result of asymptotic normality. Meanwhile, there appears to be a clear trade-off between statistical efficiency and computational cost. The full MLE has the smallest standard deviation but is significantly more expensive than the other methods. This is because the computation of the variance of the full MLE requires averaging over all possible permutations on each comparison set. The top-1 MLE is the cheapest but yields the worst efficiency. The QMLE strikes a good balance between accuracy and cost. In particular, the QMLE has a computational time of only one in 20-40 of the full MLE but only sacrifices a small amount of statistical efficiency.

	Method	Sample size n				
		200	400	600	800	1000
Standard Deviation	QMLE	0.131	0.122	0.118	0.114	0.112
	Full MLE	0.124	0.116	0.111	0.108	0.105
	Top-1 MLE	0.220	0.205	0.197	0.191	0.187
	Top-2 MLE	0.159	0.148	0.141	0.138	0.135
Coverage probability	QMLE	0.950	0.950	0.950	0.950	0.950
	Full MLE	0.950	0.950	0.950	0.949	0.950
	Top-1 MLE	0.951	0.951	0.950	0.949	0.950
	Top-2 MLE	0.950	0.950	0.950	0.950	0.950
Computation Time(s)	QMLE	0.933	2.149	3.676	4.755	5.485
	Full MLE	47.74	111.7	193.6	247.0	284.1
	Top-1 MLE	0.644	1.519	2.599	3.346	3.820
	Top-2 MLE	1.844	4.335	7.438	9.588	10.99

Table 2: NURHM: Simulation results are summarized over 300 replications.

7.3 Horse-racing data example

We apply the proposed likelihood-based estimators to the Hong Kong horse-racing data¹. The dataset contains horse-racing competitions from the year 1999 to the year 2005. After preprocessing, there are 3,981 horses and 6,348 races. The comparisons in this dataset are nonuniform and take values between 4 and 14. Aside from the nonuniformity, most of the sizes are either 12 or 14, making the estimation of the standard deviation in the full MLE computationally prohibitive. (The computational complexity for the full MLE reaches $\mathcal{O}(M!) \approx 10^{11}$.) In contrast, the QMLE requires much less computational cost and achieves a comparable efficiency with the full MLE. For this reason, we only apply the QMLE to this dataset. The results are reported in Table 4. We present the information on the top 10 horses based on the estimation from the QMLE, including the number of races, the average place in the race, the

¹<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/gdaley/hkracing>

	Method	Sample size n				
		200	400	600	800	1000
Standard Deviation	QMLE	0.153	0.143	0.137	0.133	0.130
	Full MLE	0.146	0.136	0.131	0.127	0.124
	Top-1 MLE	0.279	0.258	0.247	0.240	0.234
	Top-2 MLE	0.196	0.182	0.175	0.170	0.166
Coverage probability	QMLE	0.946	0.949	0.948	0.949	0.949
	Full MLE	0.945	0.947	0.948	0.948	0.948
	Top-1 MLE	0.946	0.948	0.949	0.946	0.943
	Top-2 MLE	0.947	0.948	0.949	0.949	0.949
Computation Time(s)	QMLE	1.208	2.607	4.202	5.607	6.833
	Full MLE	23.54	54.08	86.71	117.9	142.6
	Top-1 MLE	0.750	1.721	2.772	3.767	4.562
	Top-2 MLE	2.231	5.144	8.283	11.26	13.59

Table 3: HSBM: Simulation results are summarized over 300 replications.

Horse id	Race	Average place	Estimation	95% confidence interval	Rank
3780	6	1.667	6.239	(4.935, 7.543)	1
2402	14	2.000	5.591	(4.748, 6.433)	2
1033	21	1.952	5.578	(4.882, 6.275)	3
3331	3	1.333	5.565	(3.249, 7.881)	4
504	2	1.500	5.217	(2.748, 7.686)	5
3858	6	1.333	5.062	(3.398, 6.726)	6
1588	12	3.083	4.994	(4.215, 5.772)	7
218	16	2.438	4.912	(4.176, 5.649)	8
2558	28	2.536	4.831	(4.302, 5.359)	9
3569	2	4.000	4.829	(3.060, 6.598)	10

Table 4: Horse-racing data: the QMLE for the top ten horses.

estimated utility score, and the estimated 95% confidence interval. The identified top-10 horses by the QMLE performed consistently well with their historical record.

8 Summary

In this paper, we studied several likelihood-based estimators for utility vector estimation in the PL model. We showed that the estimators can be interpreted in a unified perspective through their estimating equations. With the aid of such interpretation, we established a uniform consistency result for the estimators under appropriate conditions characterized by the underlying comparison graph sequence. For a variety of sampling scenarios such as NURHM and HSBM, the proposed conditions hold optimally in terms of graph sparsity. We also proved that the estimators are asymptotically normal and discussed the trade-off between statistical efficiency and computational complexity. To our knowledge, the asymptotic results in this paper are amongst the first works in the PL model that apply to both nonuniform edge sizes and heterogeneous comparison probabilities while covering different likelihood-based estimators.

References

- [1] E. Abbe. “Community detection and stochastic block models: recent developments”. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 18 (2017), Paper No. 177, 86. issn: 1532-4435.
- [2] A. Agarwal, P. Patil, and S. Agarwal. “Accelerated spectral ranking”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2018, pp. 70–79.
- [3] H. Azari Soufiani, W. Chen, D. C. Parkes, and L. Xia. “Generalized method-of-moments for rank aggregation”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 26 (2013).

- [4] L. Baltrunas, T. Makcinskas, and F. Ricci. “Group recommendations with rank aggregation and collaborative filtering”. In: *Proceedings of the fourth ACM conference on Recommender systems*. 2010, pp. 119–126.
- [5] F. Bauer and J. Jost. “Bipartite and neighborhood graphs and the spectrum of the normalized graph Laplace operator”. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 21.4 (2013), pp. 787–845. ISSN: 1019-8385.
- [6] R. A. Bradley and M. E. Terry. “Rank analysis of incomplete block designs. I. The method of paired comparisons”. *Biometrika* 39 (1952), pp. 324–345. ISSN: 0006-3444.
- [7] F. Caron and A. Doucet. “Efficient Bayesian inference for generalized Bradley-Terry models”. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.* 21.1 (2012), pp. 174–196. ISSN: 1061-8600.
- [8] F. Caron, Y. W. Teh, and T. B. Murphy. “Bayesian nonparametric Plackett-Luce models for the analysis of preferences for college degree programmes”. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* 8.2 (2014), pp. 1145–1181. ISSN: 1932-6157.
- [9] P. Chen, C. Gao, and A. Y. Zhang. “Optimal full ranking from pairwise comparisons”. *Ann. Statist.* 50.3 (2022), pp. 1775–1805. ISSN: 0090-5364.
- [10] Y. Chen, J. Fan, C. Ma, and K. Wang. “Spectral method and regularized MLE are both optimal for top- K ranking”. *Ann. Stat.* 47.4 (2019), pp. 2204–2235.
- [11] H. Chernoff. “A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations”. *Ann. Math. Stat.* (1952), pp. 493–507.
- [12] F. R. K. Chung. *Spectral graph theory*. Vol. 92. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. 1997, pp. xii+207. ISBN: 0-8218-0315-8.
- [13] P. Erdős, A. Rényi, et al. “On the evolution of random graphs”. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* 5.1 (1960), pp. 17–60.
- [14] J. Fan, Z. Lou, W. Wang, and M. Yu. “Ranking Inferences Based on the Top Choice of Multiway Comparisons”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11957* (2022).
- [15] L. Florescu and W. Perkins. “Spectral thresholds in the bipartite stochastic block model”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2016, pp. 943–959.
- [16] L. R. Ford Jr. “Solution of a ranking problem from binary comparisons”. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 64.8, part II (1957), pp. 28–33. ISSN: 0002-9890.
- [17] C. Gao, Y. Shen, and A. Y. Zhang. “Uncertainty quantification in the Bradley-Terry-Luce model”. *Inf. Inference* 12.2 (2023), pp. 1073–1140. ISSN: 2049-8764.
- [18] D. Ghoshdastidar and A. Dukkipati. “Consistency of spectral partitioning of uniform hypergraphs under planted partition model”. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 27 (2014).
- [19] M. E. Glickman and A. C. Jones. “Rating the chess rating system”. *CHANCE-BERLIN THEN NEW YORK*- 12 (1999), pp. 21–28.
- [20] J. Guiver and E. Snelson. “Bayesian inference for Plackett-Luce ranking models”. In: *proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*. 2009, pp. 377–384.
- [21] R. Han, Y. Xu, and K. Chen. “A general pairwise comparison model for extremely sparse networks”. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* (2022), pp. 1–11.
- [22] R. Han, R. Ye, C. Tan, and K. Chen. “Asymptotic theory of sparse Bradley-Terry model”. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 30.5 (2020), pp. 2491–2515.
- [23] T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani. “Classification by pairwise coupling”. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 10 (1997).
- [24] D. R. Hunter. “MM Algorithms for Generalized Bradley-Terry Models”. *Ann. Stat.* (2004), pp. 384–406.
- [25] M. Jang, S. Kim, and C. Suh. “Top- k rank aggregation from m -wise comparisons”. *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.* 12.5 (2018), pp. 989–1004.
- [26] Y. Liu, E. X. Fang, and J. Lu. “Lagrangian inference for ranking problems”. *Oper. Res.* 71.1 (2023), pp. 202–223. ISSN: 0030-364X.
- [27] R. D. Luce. *Individual choice behavior: A theoretical analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York; Chapman & Hall Ltd. London, 1959, pp. xii+153.
- [28] K. Massey. “Statistical models applied to the rating of sports teams”. *Bluefield College* 1077 (1997).

- [29] L. Maystre and M. Grossglauser. “Fast and accurate inference of Plackett–Luce models”. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [30] D. McFadden. “Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior”. *Front. Econ.* (1973), pp. 105–142.
- [31] S. Negahban, S. Oh, and D. Shah. “Rank Centrality: Ranking from Pairwise Comparisons”. *Oper. Res.* 65.1 (2017), pp. 266–287.
- [32] W. K. Newey. “The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators”. *Econometrica* 62.6 (1994), pp. 1349–1382. ISSN: 0012-9682. DOI: [10.2307/2951752](https://doi.org/10.2307/2951752).
- [33] S. Pal and Y. Zhu. “Community detection in the sparse hypergraph stochastic block model”. *Random Structures Algorithms* 59.3 (2021), pp. 407–463. ISSN: 1042-9832.
- [34] R. L. Plackett. “The analysis of permutations”. *J. R. Stat. Soc., C: Appl. Stat.* 24.2 (1975), pp. 193–202.
- [35] N. B. Shah, S. Balakrishnan, J. Bradley, A. Parekh, K. Ramchandran, and M. J. Wainwright. “Estimation from Pairwise Comparisons: Sharp Minimax Bounds with Topology Dependence”. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 17 (2016), pp. 1–47.
- [36] G. Simons and Y.-C. Yao. “Asymptotics when the number of parameters tends to infinity in the Bradley-Terry model for paired comparisons”. *Ann. Stat.* 27.3 (1999), pp. 1041–1060.
- [37] L. L. Thurstone. “The method of paired comparisons for social values.” *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.* 21.4 (1927), p. 384.
- [38] T. Yan, Y. Yang, and J. Xu. “Sparse paired comparisons in the Bradley-Terry model”. *Stat. Sin.* (2012), pp. 1305–1318.
- [39] E. Zermelo. “Die Berechnung der Turnier-Ergebnisse als ein Maximumproblem der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung”. *Math. Z.* 29.1 (1929), pp. 436–460. ISSN: 0025-5874.
- [40] Z. Zhao and L. Xia. “Composite marginal likelihood methods for random utility models”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2018, pp. 5922–5931.
- [41] Y. Zhen and J. Wang. “Community detection in general hypergraph via graph embedding”. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* (2022), pp. 1–10.

A Proof of Propositions 3.1-3.2

A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

The linear constraint breaks the translation invariance to ensure the uniqueness of the maximizer. By the first-order optimality condition, $\partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = 0$ for $k \in [n]$. This can be further expanded as

$$\partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{i:k \in T_i} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} - \sum_{j=1}^{r_i(k) \wedge q_i} \frac{e^{\hat{u}_k}}{\sum_{t=j}^{m_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} \right) = 0,$$

where $r_i(k)$ is the rank of k in π_i . Dividing both sides by N_k and rewriting,

$$\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i:k \in T_i} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} - \sum_{j \in [m_i]} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq r_i(k) \wedge q_i\}} e^{\hat{u}_k}}{\sum_{t=j}^{m_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} \right) = 0.$$

To understand the second term in the parenthesis, note that assuming π_i (or r_i) is observed in a PL model with parameters \mathbf{u} ,

$$\sum_{j \in [m_i]} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq r_i(k) \wedge q_i\}} e^{u_k}}{\sum_{t=j}^{m_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}}} = \sum_{j \in [m_i]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} [\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = j \text{ and } r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} | \mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}].$$

The first statement in the lemma follows by setting $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\mathbf{u}}$, while the second statement follows by setting $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^*$ combined with taking expectation with respect to π_i (which is sampled from the PL model with the true utility vector \mathbf{u}^*):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in [m_i]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}^*} [\mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = j \text{ and } r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} | \mathcal{F}_{i,j-1}] - \mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in [m_i]} \mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) = j \text{ and } r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step uses the tower property.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 3.2

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}: \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle^\top \mathbf{v} = 0} \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f} [\text{KL}(f(\pi; \mathbf{u}) || g(\pi; \mathbf{v}))] &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{v}: \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle^\top \mathbf{v} = 0} \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f} \left[\log \frac{f(\pi; \mathbf{u})}{g(\pi; \mathbf{v})} \right] \\ &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}: \langle \mathbf{1} \rangle^\top \mathbf{v} = 0} \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f} [\log g(\pi; \mathbf{v})]. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $G(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f} [\log g(\pi; \mathbf{v})]$ and expanding $G(\mathbf{v})$,

$$G(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}([n])} \mathbb{Q}(T) \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T)} f(\pi; \mathbf{u}) \sum_{k \in T} \left[(|T| - r_\pi(k)) v_k - \sum_{k' \in T: r_\pi(k') > r_\pi(k)} \log(e^{v_k} + e^{v_{k'}}) \right],$$

where $r_\pi(k)$ is the rank of k in π . To show \mathbf{u} is the unique maximizer of $G(\mathbf{v})$, it suffices to verify that \mathbf{u} satisfies the first-order optimality conditions and $G(\mathbf{v})$ is concave. The former can be verified by a direct calculation as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k G(\mathbf{v}) &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}([n]): k \in T} \mathbb{Q}(T) \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}(T)} f(\pi; \mathbf{u}) \left(|T| - r_\pi(k) - \sum_{k' \in T: k' \neq k} \frac{e^{v_k}}{e^{v_k} + e^{v_{k'}}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}([n]): k \in T} \mathbb{Q}(T) (\mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f_T(\cdot; \mathbf{u})} [r_\pi(k)] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim f_T(\cdot; \mathbf{v})} [r_\pi(k)]), \end{aligned}$$

where f_T is the conditional distribution when knowing the comparison set is T . Taking $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}$ yields $\partial_k G(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ for all k .

To prove concavity, note

$$\partial_{kk'} G(\mathbf{v}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}([n]): k \in T} \mathbb{Q}(T) \sum_{k' \in T: k' \neq k} \frac{-e^{v_k + v_{k'}}}{(e^{v_k} + e^{v_{k'}})^2} & k' = k \\ \sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}([n]): k \in T} \mathbb{Q}(T) \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{k' \in T\}} e^{v_k + v_{k'}}}{(e^{v_k} + e^{v_{k'}})^2} & k' \neq k \end{cases}$$

This expression shows that $-\nabla^2 G(\mathbf{v})$ is the unnormalized graph Laplacian of the weighted graph on $[n]$ with weights $w_{kk'} := \partial_{kk'} G(\mathbf{v})$ for $k \neq k'$. As a result, $-\nabla^2 G(\mathbf{v})$ is nonnegative definite. Meanwhile, the assumption on \mathbb{Q} ensures that the weighted graph is connected. Hence, the eigenspace of $\nabla^2 G(\mathbf{v})$ associated with eigenvalue zero is one-dimensional and spanned by the all-ones vector $\langle 1 \rangle$. Since the constraint requires $\langle 1 \rangle^\top \mathbf{v} = 0$, $G(\mathbf{v})$ is strictly concave in the feasible set of \mathbf{v} . This verifies the uniqueness of the minimizer.

B Proof of Theorem 5.1

Recall that \mathbf{w} denotes either the (marginal) MLE $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ or the QMLE $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. The unique existence of \mathbf{w} follows from Assumption 5, which is a standard condition in the literature that ensures the log-likelihood function diverges to negative infinity if $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty$ diverges [39, 16]. The details of the proof are similar to [21, Lemma 1] and are omitted. In the rest, we shall focus on the uniform consistency part.

Since $\langle 1 \rangle^\top \mathbf{u}^* = \langle 1 \rangle^\top \mathbf{w} = 0$, where $\langle 1 \rangle$ is the all-ones vector of compatible size, $\langle 1 \rangle^\top (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) = 0$. Thus, the largest and smallest components of $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*$ have opposite signs, whence $\|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_\infty \leq \max_{k \in [n]} (w_k - u_k^*) - \min_{k \in [n]} (w_k - u_k^*)$. To prove the theorem, it suffices to show that for sufficiently large n , with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$,

$$\max_{k \in [n]} (w_k - u_k^*) - \min_{k \in [n]} (w_k - u_k^*) \lesssim \Gamma_n^{RE}.$$

Defining $\alpha \in \arg \max_{k \in [n]} (w_k - u_k^*)$ and $\beta \in \arg \min_{k \in [n]} (w_k - u_k^*)$, we show that $(w_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) - (w_\beta - u_\beta^*)$ is bounded by a constant times Γ_n^{RE} as n tends to infinity with high probability. To this end, we first construct an increasing sequence of neighbors based on RE-induced estimation errors to chain them together. We then show that a chain constructed in such a way is admissible (Definition 2) for all sufficiently large n . Under the assumption that the comparison graph sequence is RE, the desired bound follows.

Let $c > 0$, and $\{\Delta b_z\}_{z=0}^\infty, \{\Delta d_z\}_{z=0}^\infty$ be two increasing sequences that are specified shortly. Consider the two sequences of neighbors started at α and β respectively defined recursively as follows. Let $\Delta b_0 = \Delta d_0 = 0$, and for $z \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} B_z &= \left\{ j : (w_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) - (w_j - u_j^*) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{z-1} \Delta b_t \right\} & \Delta b_z &= c \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{h_{\mathbb{H}_n}(B_z)}} \\ D_z &= \left\{ j : (w_\beta - u_\beta^*) - (w_j - u_j^*) \geq -\sum_{t=0}^{z-1} \Delta d_t \right\} & \Delta d_z &= c \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{h_{\mathbb{H}_n}(D_z)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h_{\mathbb{H}_n}$ is defined in Definition 1. Let $Z_{n,1}$ and $Z_{n,2}$ be the stopping times

$$Z_{n,1} = \min \left\{ z : |B_z| > \frac{n}{2} \right\} \quad Z_{n,2} = \min \left\{ z : |D_z| > \frac{n}{2} \right\}.$$

Note Δb_z and Δd_z are defined similarly as the summand of Γ_n^{RE} in Definition 3 (up to a multiplicative constant) but for random sequences $\{B_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,1}]}$ and $\{D_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,2}]}$. We make the following claim:

Claim. There exists an absolute constant c such that for all sufficiently large n , with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$, $\{B_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,1}]}, \{D_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,2}]}$ are admissible sequences.

By the construction of $Z_{n,1}$ and $Z_{n,2}$, $B_{Z_{n,1}} \cap D_{Z_{n,2}} \neq \emptyset$, so that α and β can be chained together using $\{B_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,1}]} \cup \{D_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,2}]}$. As a result, $(w_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) - (w_\beta - u_\beta^*)$ is bounded by a constant times Γ_n^{RE} . The Borel–Cantelli lemma and noting $\Gamma_n^{RE} \rightarrow 0$ under the RE assumption do the rest. Therefore, it remains to verify the claim. For ease of illustration, we only prove for $\{B_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,1}]}$ as the case for $\{D_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,2}]}$ can be treated similarly.

B.1 The marginal MLE

Recall the marginal log-likelihood function based on the top- q_i observations in the i th data is given by

$$l_1(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i \in [N]} \left\{ \sum_{j \in [q_i]} u_{\pi_i(j)} - \log \left(\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}} \right) \right\} \quad |T_i| = m_i,$$

where $\pi_i \in \mathcal{S}(T_i)$ is the permutation associated with the i th observation. By the first-order optimality of the MLE,

$$\partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{i: k \in T_i} \psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) = 0 \quad k \in [n], \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where

$$\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{1}_{\{r_i(k) \leq q_i\}} - \sum_{j \in [r_i(k) \wedge q_i]} \frac{e^{u_k}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}}}$$

for every $k \in T_i$, $\pi_i \in \mathcal{S}(T_i)$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r_i(k)$ is the rank of k in π_i . Under Assumption 2, $\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u})$ are uniformly bounded random variables as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since

$$\sup_n \sup_{\mathbf{u}} \max_{i \in [N]} \psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}) \leq M. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Fixing T_i , π_i , and \mathbf{u} , a crucial property of ψ is that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in T_i} \psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}) &= q_i - \sum_{k \in T_i} \sum_{j \in [r_i(k) \wedge q_i]} \frac{e^{u_k}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}}} \\ &= q_i - \sum_{k \in T_i} \sum_{j \in [r_i(k) \wedge q_i]} \frac{e^{u_{\pi_i(r_i(k))}}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}}} \\ &= q_i - \sum_{s \in [q_i]} \sum_{k: r_i(k) \geq s} \frac{e^{u_{\pi_i(k)}}}{\sum_{t=s}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.1, the true parameter \mathbf{u}^* satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*)] = 0 \quad (\text{B.4})$$

for every k, T_i . Combining (B.1), (B.3), and (B.4) yields the following probabilistic upper bounds for all $S \subseteq [n]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in S} \partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*) - \sum_{k \in S} \partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) &\stackrel{(\text{B.1}), (\text{B.4})}{=} \sum_{k \in S} (\partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*) - \mathbb{E}[\partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*)]) \\ &= \sum_{k \in S} \sum_{i: k \in T_i} (\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*) - \mathbb{E}[\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*)]) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{B.3})}{=} \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial S} \sum_{k \in S \cap T_i} (\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*) - \mathbb{E}[\psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*)]). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Owing to Assumption 2 and (B.2), $\{\sum_{k \in S \cap T_i} \psi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*)\}_i$ are independent random variables uniformly bounded by $\max_i |T_i| M \leq M^2$. By Hoeffding's inequality, with probability at least $1 - n^{-|S|}$, (B.5) is bounded by $M^2 \sqrt{|S| |\partial S| \log n}$. Hence, for B_z (which are random) with all $z \leq Z_{n,1}$ (namely $|B_z| < n/2$), it follows from a union bound over all S with $|S| \leq n/2$ that, with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$,

$$\sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*) - \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) \leq M^2 \sqrt{|B_z| |\partial B_z| \log n} \quad z \leq Z_{n,1}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We now derive a lower bound for the left-hand side of (B.6) from which we deduce the desired property.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*) - \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) \quad (\text{B.7}) \\ \stackrel{(\text{B.3})}{=} & \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial B_z} \sum_{k \in B_z \cap T_i} \sum_{j \in [r_i(k) \wedge q_i]} \left(\frac{e^{\hat{u}_k}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} - \frac{e^{u_k^*}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \right) \\ = & \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial B_z} \sum_{j=1}^{\max_{k \in B_z \cap T_i} (r_i(k) \wedge q_i)} \underbrace{\left(\frac{\sum_{t \geq j: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} - \frac{\sum_{t \geq j: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \right)}_{(\star)} \\ \geq & \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}} \sum_{j=1}^{\max_{k \in B_z \cap T_i} (r_i(k) \wedge q_i)} \left(\frac{\sum_{t \geq j: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} - \frac{\sum_{t \geq j: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}}{\sum_{t=j}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \right) \\ \geq & \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}} \left(\frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}}{\sum_{t=1}^{|T_i|} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} - \frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}}{\sum_{t=1}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the key observation $(\star) \geq 0$ was used and can be seen by taking the quotient of the two terms in (\star) and using the elementary inequality $(a+b)/(c+d) \leq \max\{a/c, b/d\}$ for $a, b, c, d > 0$. By definition, for $T_i \in \partial B_{z+1} \cap \partial B_z$, $T_i \cap B_{z+1}^c \neq \emptyset$, so that

$$\max_{s \in T_i} \{(\hat{u}_\alpha - u_\alpha^*) - (\hat{u}_s - u_s^*)\} \geq \sum_{t=0}^z \Delta b_t.$$

In this case, under Assumption 1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}}{\sum_{t=1}^{|T_i|} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} \bigg/ \frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}}{\sum_{t=1}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \\ = & \frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}}{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*} + \sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z^c \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}}{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}} + \sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z^c \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} \\ \geq & 1 + k(C_1) \Delta b_z, \end{aligned}$$

where $k(C_1)$ is an absolute constant depending on C_1 only (see Assumption 1 for the definition of C_1). As a result,

$$\frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}}{\sum_{t=1}^{|T_i|} e^{\hat{u}_{\pi_i(t)}}} - \frac{\sum_{t \geq 1: \pi_i(t) \in B_z \cap T_i} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}}{\sum_{t=1}^{|T_i|} e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}^*}} \geq \frac{k(C_1)}{MC_1^2} \Delta b_z,$$

which is substituted into (B.7) to yield

$$\sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_1(\mathbf{u}^*) - \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_1(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) \geq \frac{k(C_1)}{MC_1^2} |\partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}| \Delta b_z. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Combining (B.6) and (B.8),

$$\frac{k(C_1)}{MC_1^2} |\partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}| \Delta b_z \leq M^2 \sqrt{|B_z| |\partial B_z| \log n}$$

Taking $c = 2M^3 C_1^2 / k(C_1)$ yields

$$|\partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}| \leq \frac{1}{2} |\partial B_z| \implies |\{e \in \partial B_z, e \subseteq B_{z+1}\}| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\partial B_z|.$$

This finishes the proof of $\{B_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,1}]}$ being admissible.

B.2 The QMLE

The proof is similar to the MLE case so we only provide a sketch of it. Writing down the log-quasi-likelihood, we have

$$l_2(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in [m_i]} \left(u_{\pi_i(j)} - \sum_{t > j} \log(e^{u_{\pi_i(j)}} + e^{u_{\pi_i(t)}}) \right)$$

By the first-order optimality of the MLE,

$$\partial_k l_2(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{i: k \in T_i} \varphi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = 0 \quad k \in [n],$$

where

$$\varphi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}) = |T_i| - r_i(k) - \sum_{k' \in T_i, k' \neq k} \frac{e^{u_k}}{e^{u_k} + e^{u_{k'}}}$$

for every $k \in T_i$, $\pi_i \in \mathcal{S}(T_i)$, and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Under Assumption 2, $\varphi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u})$ are uniformly bounded random variables as $n \rightarrow \infty$ since

$$\sup_n \sup_{\mathbf{u}} \max_{i \in [N]} \varphi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}) \leq M.$$

Analogously, when fixing T_i , π_i , and \mathbf{u} , $\sum_{k \in T_i} \varphi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[\varphi(k; T_i, \pi_i, \mathbf{u}^*)] = 0$. By similar reasoning, we obtain that, with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$,

$$\sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_2(\mathbf{u}^*) - \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_2(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \leq M^2 \sqrt{|B_z| |\partial B_z| \log n} \quad z \leq Z_{n,1}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The lower bound is also similar and in fact, simpler than the MLE case:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_2(\mathbf{u}^*) - \sum_{k \in B_z} \partial_k l_2(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) \\ &= \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial B_z} \sum_{j \in T_i \cap B_z} \sum_{t \in T_i \cap B_z^c} \underbrace{\left(\frac{e^{\tilde{u}_j}}{e^{\tilde{u}_j} + e^{\tilde{u}_t}} - \frac{e^{u_j^*}}{e^{u_j^*} + e^{u_t^*}} \right)}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq \sum_{i: T_i \in \partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}} \sum_{j \in T_i \cap B_z} \sum_{t \in T_i \cap B_z^c} \left(\frac{e^{\tilde{u}_j}}{e^{\tilde{u}_j} + e^{\tilde{u}_t}} - \frac{e^{u_j^*}}{e^{u_j^*} + e^{u_t^*}} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\tilde{k}(C_1)}{MC_1^2} |\partial B_z \cap \partial B_{z+1}| \Delta b_z, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{k}(C_1)$ is another absolute constant depending on C_1 only. Setting $c = 2M^3 C_1^2 / \tilde{k}(C_1)$ and combining the upper and lower bounds as before yields the admissibility of $\{B_z\}_{z \in [Z_{n,1}]}$.

C Proof of Lemma 5.1

The proof of that Assumption 5 is satisfied follows from a similar argument as [36, Lemma 1] or [21, Theorem 1] and thus is omitted. In the rest, we will focus on the RE part only. For any admissible sequence $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^J$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{h_{\mathbb{H}_n}(A_j)}} \leq J \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{h_{\mathbb{H}_n}}}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

To establish the RE property for the hypergraph sequences of interest, it suffices to show that the bound in (C.1) converges to zero uniformly regardless of the choice of $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^J$, and we proceed to show this case by case. To reduce notational clutter, we let

$$\begin{aligned} a_j &:= |A_j| & \Delta a_j &:= a_{j+1} - a_j \\ \partial A_{j \subseteq j+1} &:= \{e \in \partial A_j : e \subseteq A_{j+1}\} \subseteq \partial A_j. \end{aligned}$$

C.1 NURHM

For $2 \leq s \leq M$ and $U \subset V$ with $|U| = t$, the number of edges in ∂U with size s is a sum of $L_n(n, t, s)$ independent Bernoulli random variables with probabilities bounded between $p_n^{(s)}$ and $q_n^{(s)}$, where $L_n(n, t, s) = \binom{n}{s} - \binom{t}{s} - \binom{n-t}{s}$. Thus,

$$\sum_{s=2}^M L_n(n, t, s) p_n^{(s)} =: \mu_n(t) \leq \mathbb{E}[|\partial U|] \leq \nu_n(t) := \sum_{s=2}^M L_n(n, t, s) q_n^{(s)}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

For $U_2 \subset U_1 \subseteq V$ with $|U_1| = t_1$ and $|U_2| = t_2$, the number of edges in ∂U_2 contained in U_1 with size s is bounded by the number of edges in $\partial(U_1 \setminus U_2)$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\{e \in \partial U_2 : e \subset U_1\}|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\partial(U_1 \setminus U_2)|] \leq \nu_n(t_1 - t_2). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Both μ_n and ν_n will appear in the subsequent analysis. To begin with, we provide an estimate for $L_n(n, t, s)$.

Lemma C.1. *For $t \geq s$, the following inequalities hold:*

$$\frac{s \min\{t, n-t\}}{n} \binom{n}{s} \lesssim L_n(n, t, s) \leq \frac{s \min\{t, n-t\}}{n-s+1} \binom{n}{s}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Lemma C.1 can be verified by direct computation and its proof is given in the supplementary file. By the Chernoff bound [11], for all $U \subset V$ with $|U| = t \leq n/2$ and all sufficiently large n , it holds with probability at least n^{-t} ,

$$\frac{1}{2} \mu_n(t) \leq (1-\delta) \mu_n(t) \leq |\partial U| \leq (1+\delta) \nu_n(t) \leq 2\nu_n(t) \quad \delta = \sqrt{\frac{2t \log n}{\mathbb{E}[|\partial U|]}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where $\delta \rightarrow 0$ is implied by (4.1). Taking a union bound over U in (C.5) yields a uniform bound for all U with $|U| \leq n/2$ that holds with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$. In what follows we condition on this event. By definition, the modified Cheeger constant $h_{\mathbb{H}_n}$ can be bounded below as

$$h_{\mathbb{H}_n} \geq \min_{1 \leq t \leq n/2} \frac{\mu_n(t)}{2t} \stackrel{(\text{C.2}), (\text{C.4})}{\gtrsim} \xi_{n,-} \quad \xi_{n,-} := \sum_{s=2}^M n^{s-1} p_n^{(s)}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

A similar notation $\xi_{n,+} := \sum_{s=2}^M n^{s-1} q_n^{(s)}$ is used for the upper-bound counterpart of $\xi_{n,-}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume $a_j < n/2$ for all $j < J$, as those with size above $n/2$ can be handled similarly by working with A_j^c , namely the complement of A_j . It follows from (C.6) and (C.5) that

$$|\partial A_j| \gtrsim \max\{\mu_n(a_j), a_j \xi_{n,-}\} \stackrel{(4.1)}{\gtrsim} \max\{\mu_n(a_j), a_j (\log n)^3\}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Meanwhile,

$$|\partial A_{j \subseteq j+1}| \stackrel{\text{(C.3)}}{\leq} |\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)| \stackrel{\text{(C.5)}}{\leq} (1 + \gamma) \nu_n(\Delta a_j) \quad \gamma := \sqrt{\frac{2\Delta a_j \log n}{\nu_n(\Delta a_j)}}.$$

Therefore, depending on $\gamma > 1$ and $\gamma \leq 1$,

$$|\partial A_{j \subseteq j+1}| \leq \begin{cases} 4\Delta a_j \log n & \text{if } \nu_n(\Delta a_j) \leq 2\Delta a_j \log n \\ 2\nu_n(\Delta a_j) & \text{if } \nu_n(\Delta a_j) \geq 2\Delta a_j \log n \end{cases}. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Since $\{A_j\}_j$ is admissible, $|\partial A_{j \subseteq j+1}| \geq |\partial A_j|/2$. Comparing (C.8) with (C.7), we note that if $\nu_n(\Delta a_j) \leq 2\Delta a_j \log n$, a_j grows exponentially at least with rate $(\log n)^2$. This regime has at most $O((\log n)/(\log \log n))$ steps, and an upper bound for (C.1) is

$$\frac{\log n}{\log \log n} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\xi_{n,-}}} = \sqrt{\frac{(\log n)^3}{(\log \log n)^2 \xi_{n,-}}}. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

In the regime $\nu_n(\Delta a_j) \geq 2\Delta a_j \log n$, $|\partial A_{j \subseteq j+1}| \geq |\partial A_j|/2$ implies

$$\sum_{s=2}^M L_n(n, \Delta a_j, s) q_n^{(s)} \stackrel{\text{(C.2)}}{=} \nu_n(\Delta a_j) \gtrsim \mu_n(a_j) \gtrsim \sum_{s=2}^M L_n(n, a_j, s) p_n^{(s)} \stackrel{\text{(C.4)}}{\gtrsim} \xi_{n,-} a_j. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

According to the upper bound in (C.4),

$$L_n(n, \Delta a_j, s) \leq \frac{s\Delta a_j}{n-s+1} \binom{n}{s} \lesssim (\Delta a_j) n^{s-1}.$$

Consequently,

$$\nu_n(\Delta a_j) \lesssim \sum_{s=2}^M (\Delta a_j) n^{s-1} q_n^{(s)} = \xi_{n,+} \Delta a_j. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Substitution of (C.11) into (C.10) yields that, there exists an absolute $C > 0$ such that

$$\frac{a_{j+1}}{a_j} \geq 1 + \frac{C\xi_{n,-}}{\xi_{n,+}}.$$

The above inequality tells us that when $\nu_n(\Delta a_j) \geq 2\Delta a_j \log n$, a_j grows exponentially with the rate $1 + C\xi_{n,-}^+/ \xi_{n,+}^-$. Analyzing each factor separately, we find that it takes at most takes $O(\xi_{n,+}(\log n)/\xi_{n,-})$ steps for A_j to reach $n/2$. Combining this with (C.6), we get the following bound for (C.1):

$$\frac{\xi_{n,+} \log n}{\xi_{n,-}} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\xi_{n,-}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^2 (\log n)^3}{\xi_{n,-}^3}}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Combining (C.9) and (C.12) and applying the Borel–Cantelli lemma yields the desired RE property.

C.2 HSBM

The proof for the HSBM model requires more careful counting. Without loss of generality, we assume that the HSBM is m -uniform and has only two blocks V_1, V_2 with $|V_1| = n_1, |V_2| = n_2$, and $n_1 + n_2 = n$. More general cases of $K > 2$ can be analyzed similarly but require heavier notation. Recall the probabilities of an m -edge lying in V_1, V_2 , and crossing V_1 and V_2 are $\omega_{n,1}, \omega_{n,2}$, and $\omega_{n,0}$, respectively. Fixing an admissible sequence $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^J$, we further define

$$\begin{aligned} a_{j,1} &= |V_1 \cap A_j| & a_{j,2} &= |V_2 \cap A_j| \\ \Delta a_{j,1} &= |V_1 \cap (A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)| & \Delta a_{j,2} &= |V_2 \cap (A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)| \end{aligned}$$

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta a_{j,1} &= a_{j+1,1} - a_{j,1} & \Delta a_{j,2} &= a_{j+1,2} - a_{j,2} \\ \Delta a_j &= a_{j+1} - a_j.\end{aligned}\tag{C.13}$$

A similar concentration argument as before yields that, with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$, the following analogs of (C.7) and (C.8) hold for all admissible sequences:

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial A_j| &\gtrsim \max\{\mathbb{E}[|\partial A_j|], \min\{a_j, n - a_j\}(\log n)^3\} \\ |\partial A_{j \subseteq j+1}| \leq |\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)| &\leq \begin{cases} 4\Delta a_j \log n & \text{if } \mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] \leq 2\Delta a_j \log n \\ 2\mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] & \text{if } \mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] \geq 2\Delta a_j \log n \end{cases}.\end{aligned}$$

In this case, the modified Cheeger constant can be lower bounded as

$$h_{\mathbb{H}_n} \gtrsim \zeta_{n,-} \quad \zeta_{n,-} := \min_{0 \leq t \leq K} \omega_{n,t} \cdot n^{m-1}.\tag{C.14}$$

When $\mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] \leq 2\Delta a_j \log n$, it is similar as before that it takes at most $O((\log n)/(\log \log n))$ steps for A_j to reach n . It remains to consider the case $\mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] \geq 2\Delta a_j \log n$, which according to the definition of admissibility yields

$$\mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] \gtrsim |\partial A_{j \subseteq j+1}| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\partial A_j| \gtrsim \mathbb{E}[|\partial A_j|].\tag{C.15}$$

In what follows we estimate $\mathbb{E}[|\partial A_j|]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|]$ to obtain an expansion (decay) rate for A_j (A_j^c). Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\Delta a_{j,l} < \frac{n_l}{2} \quad l = 1, 2,\tag{C.16}$$

since otherwise it takes at most two steps for $a_{r,l}$ to reach n_l .

Recall $L_n(n, t, s) = \binom{n}{s} - \binom{t}{s} - \binom{n-t}{s}$ in Section C.1 that counts the number of s -boundary edges of a size- t subset of an size- n set. Grouping edges in ∂A_j and $\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)$ based on whether they are in V_1 , V_2 , or crossing between V_1 and V_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|\partial A_j|] &= \underbrace{\omega_{n,1} L(n_1, a_{j,1}, m)}_{\vartheta_1} + \underbrace{\omega_{n,2} L(n_2, a_{j,2}, m)}_{\vartheta_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\omega_{n,0} (L(n, a_j, m) - L(n_1, a_{j,1}, m) - L(n_2, a_{j,2}, m))}_{\vartheta_3} \\ \mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|] &= \underbrace{\omega_{n,1} L(n_1, \Delta a_{j,1}, m)}_{\tau_1} + \underbrace{\omega_{n,2} L(n_2, \Delta a_{j,2}, m)}_{\tau_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\omega_{n,0} (L(n, \Delta a_j, m) - L(n_1, \Delta a_{j,1}, m) - L(n_2, \Delta a_{j,2}, m))}_{\tau_3}.\end{aligned}$$

Substitution of these into (C.15) yields

$$\frac{\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3}{\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2 + \vartheta_3} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[|\partial(A_{j+1} \setminus A_j)|]}{\mathbb{E}[|\partial A_j|]} \gtrsim 1,$$

which implies

$$\max\left\{\frac{\tau_1}{\vartheta_1}, \frac{\tau_2}{\vartheta_2}, \frac{\tau_3}{\vartheta_3}\right\} \gtrsim 1.\tag{C.17}$$

We now examine the implication of $\tau_i/\vartheta_i \gtrsim 1$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. If $\tau_1/\vartheta_1 \gtrsim 1$, then by the inequalities in (C.4),

$$\frac{\Delta a_j}{\min\{a_{j,1}, n_1 - a_{j,1}\}} \stackrel{\text{(C.13)}}{=} \frac{\Delta a_{j,1}}{\min\{a_{j,1}, n_1 - a_{j,1}\}} \stackrel{\text{(C.4), (C.16)}}{\gtrsim} \frac{\tau_1}{\vartheta_1} \gtrsim 1.$$

Consequently, $\{a_{j,1}\}_j$ grows exponentially if $a_{j,1} \leq n_1/2$ with some rate greater than 1 or $\{n_1 - a_{j,1}\}_j$ decreases exponentially if $a_{j,1} > n_1/2$ with some rate that is less than 1, where both rates are absolute and depend neither on the choice of the admissible sequence nor n_1 . The same analysis applies if $\tau_2/\vartheta_2 \gtrsim 1$ and above statement holds for $\{a_{j,2}\}_j$ and $\{n_2 - a_{j,2}\}_j$.

The case $\tau_3/\vartheta_3 \gtrsim 1$ is slightly more complicated, for which we introduce the following notation for the index set:

$$\Gamma_{1,2} = \left\{ (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \mathbb{N}^4 : \sum_{i \in [4]} m_i = m, m_1 + m_2 < m, \right. \\ \left. m_3 + m_4 < m, m_1 + m_3 < m, m_2 + m_4 < m \right\}.$$

Similar to Vandermonde's identity, we can rewrite ϑ_3 and τ_3 as sums as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_3 &= \sum_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \Gamma_{1,2}} \binom{a_{j,1}}{m_1} \binom{n_1 - a_{j,1}}{m_2} \binom{a_{j,2}}{m_3} \binom{n_2 - a_{j,2}}{m_4} \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \Gamma_{1,2}} a_{j,1}^{m_1} (n_1 - a_{j,1})^{m_2} a_{j,2}^{m_3} (n_2 - a_{j,2})^{m_4} \\ \tau_3 &= \sum_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \Gamma_{1,2}} \binom{\Delta a_{j,1}}{m_1} \binom{n_1 - \Delta a_{j,1}}{m_2} \binom{\Delta a_{j,2}}{m_3} \binom{n_2 - \Delta a_{j,2}}{m_4} \\ &\leq \sum_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \Gamma_{1,2}} (\Delta a_{j,1})^{m_1} (n_1 - \Delta a_{j,1})^{m_2} (\Delta a_{j,2})^{m_3} (n_2 - \Delta a_{j,2})^{m_4} \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\Gamma_{1,2}|$ is a constant that does not depend on n , $\tau_3/\vartheta_3 \gtrsim 1$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Delta a_{j,1})^{m_1^*} (n_1 - \Delta a_{j,1})^{m_2^*} (\Delta a_{j,2})^{m_3^*} (n_2 - \Delta a_{j,2})^{m_4^*} \\ &\gtrsim \max_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \Gamma_{1,2}} a_{j,1}^{m_1} (n_1 - a_{j,1})^{m_2} a_{j,2}^{m_3} (n_2 - a_{j,2})^{m_4}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

where

$$(m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*) \in \arg \max_{(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) \in \Gamma_{1,2}} (\Delta a_{j,1})^{m_1} (n_1 - \Delta a_{j,1})^{m_2} (\Delta a_{j,2})^{m_3} (n_2 - \Delta a_{j,2})^{m_4}$$

According to (C.16), $\Delta a_{j,1} < n_1 - \Delta a_{j,1}$ and $\Delta a_{j,2} < n_2 - \Delta a_{j,2}$. Since $m_2^* + m_4^* < n$, $m_1^* \vee m_3^* > 0$. To achieve the maximum, we have $(m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*) = (1, 0, 0, m-1)$ or $(0, m-1, 1, 0)$. (One of these two choices remains optimal even if other solutions exist.) To see the consequences of (C.18), we consider four separate cases based on the values of $a_{j,1}$ and $a_{j,2}$.

- (I) When $a_{j,1} \leq n_1/2$ and $a_{j,2} \leq n_2/2$, choosing $(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) = (m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*)$ in (C.18) and combining (C.16) yields

$$\left(\frac{\Delta a_{j,1}}{a_{j,1}} \right)^{m_1^*} \left(\frac{\Delta a_{j,2}}{a_{j,2}} \right)^{m_3^*} \gtrsim 1 \implies \max \left\{ \frac{\Delta a_{j,1}}{a_{j,1}}, \frac{\Delta a_{j,2}}{a_{j,2}} \right\} \gtrsim 1.$$

Thus, at least one of $\{a_{j,1}\}_r$ or $\{a_{j,2}\}_r$ grows exponentially with an absolute rate greater than 1.

- (II) When $a_{j,1} > n_1/2$ and $a_{j,2} > n_2/2$, choose $(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) = (m_2^*, m_1^*, m_4^*, m_3^*) \in \Gamma_{1,2}$. Similar to case (I), we conclude that at least one of $\{n_1 - a_{j,1}\}_r$ or $\{n_2 - a_{j,2}\}_r$ decreases exponentially with an absolute rate smaller than 1.

- (III) When $a_{j,1} \leq n_1/2$ and $a_{j,2} > n_2/2$, choose

$$(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) = \begin{cases} (0, 1, m-1, 0) & \text{if } (m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*) = (1, 0, 0, m-1) \\ (0, m-1, 1, 0) & \text{if } (m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*) = (0, m-1, 1, 0) \end{cases}.$$

In this case, one can show that at least one of $\{a_{j,1}\}_r$ or $\{a_{j,2}\}_r$ grows exponentially with an absolute rate greater than 1.

(IV) When $a_{j,1} > n_1/2$ and $a_{j,2} \leq n_2/2$, choose

$$(m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) = \begin{cases} (1, 0, 0, m-1) & \text{if } (m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*) = (1, 0, 0, m-1) \\ (m-1, 0, 0, 1) & \text{if } (m_1^*, m_2^*, m_3^*, m_4^*) = (0, m-1, 1, 0) \end{cases}.$$

The conclusion is identical to case (III).

Putting all the cases in (C.17) together, we conclude that it takes at most $O(\log n)$ steps for $\{a_j\}_j$ to reach n . Combining both regimes and (C.14) gives a uniform upper bound $O(\sqrt{(\log n)^3/\zeta_{n,-}})$ for all admissible sequences. The Borel–Cantelli lemma does the rest.

D Proof of Theorems 6.1-6.2

We establish the asymptotic normality for both the (marginal) MLE and the QMLE. For convenience, we only sketch the proof and leave the technical details in the supplementary file. Denote by l the log-likelihood function and \mathbf{w} the corresponding (marginal) MLE or QMLE estimator. Recall in the uniform consistency proof we have $\mathbb{E}[\nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*)] = 0$ and $\nabla l(\mathbf{w}) = 0$. By the Taylor expansion of ∇l at \mathbf{u} ,

$$-\nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*) = \nabla l(\mathbf{w}) - \nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*) = H(\bar{\mathbf{w}})(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*), \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where $H(\mathbf{u}) := \nabla^2 l(\mathbf{u})$ is the Hessian of l at \mathbf{u} and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$ is some point on the line segment between \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{u} . Fixing the comparison graph, $H(\mathbf{u}^*)$ may still be random due to the multiple comparison outcome. To derandomize, we let $H^*(\mathbf{u}^*) := \mathbb{E}[H(\mathbf{u}^*)|E := \{T_i\}_{i \in [T]}]$ where the expectation is with respect to the potential randomness in the comparison model. Rewriting $H(\bar{\mathbf{w}})$ into three parts:

$$H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) = \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\} + \{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\} + H^*(\mathbf{u}^*).$$

Substituting this into (D.1) and reorganizing yields

$$\begin{aligned} & -H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) \\ = & \nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*) + \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) + \{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

For both the (marginal) MLE and the QMLE, a key observation is that $-H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)$ is the un-normalized graph Laplacian matrix of some weighted graph with weights $w_{kk'} = [H(\mathbf{u}^*)]_{kk'}$ for $k, k' \in [n]$. In particular, letting the corresponding degree matrix and weight matrix be \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{W} ,

$$-H^*(\mathbf{u}^*) = \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{D}^{1/2} \mathcal{L}_{sym} \mathcal{D}^{1/2} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{sym} = (I - \mathcal{A})$ is the symmetric normalized Laplacian with $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{D}^{-1/2}$. Meanwhile, the weighted graph is connected when \mathbf{w} exists so that the zero-eigenspace of $-H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)$ is one-dimensional and spanned by the all-ones vector, that is, $\text{span}(\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle)$. Since $\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^* \in \text{span}(\langle \mathbf{1} \rangle)^\perp$, we can use (D.2)-(D.3) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{1/2}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) &= \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*)}_{(i)} + \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)}_{(ii)} \\ &+ \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)}_{(iii)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger$ is the pseudoinverse of \mathcal{L}_{sym} . Since each component of $\nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*)$ is a sum of independent mean-zero independent random variables, each component of $\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*)$ is expected to converge to a normal distribution (of constant order) by the Central Limit Theorem (CLT). The distinct components of $\nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*)$ are weakly correlated for large n and asymptotically independent. Meanwhile, thanks to the uniform consistency and concentration, both (ii) and (iii) are higher-order terms ((ii) + (iii) = $o_p(1)$). The heuristics are made precise by the following lemmas.

Lemma D.1. Let l denote the log-likelihood of the marginal MLE or the QMLE. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 6 or Assumptions 1, 2 and 7, for any fix $k \in [n]$,

$$(\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*))_k \rightarrow N(0, \Sigma_{kk})$$

in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Sigma = \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}[\nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*) \nabla l(\mathbf{u}^*)^\top] \mathcal{D}^{-1/2}$.

Lemma D.2. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 6 or Assumptions 1, 2 and 7, the following events hold:

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty = o_p(1) \quad (\text{D.4})$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty = o_p(1). \quad (\text{D.5})$$

The desired CLT result follows immediately by combining Lemmas D.1-D.2. For the reader's convenience, we provide some key ideas for the proof of Lemmas D.1-D.2.

Lemma D.1 can be tackled using standard approaches such as the Berry–Esseen-type analysis [26, Lemma A.4] or through direct computation [36]. The key step is to uniformly bound the entrywise distance between $\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger$ and the identity matrix I , that is, $\|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger - I\|_{\max}$, under the heterogeneous graphs, for which we appeal to the chaining method again. Lemma D.2 is more interesting and requires the following intermediate estimates. For simplicity, we only present the result under the NURHM and the result for the HSBM is included in the supplementary file.

Lemma D.3. For the NURHM, under Assumptions 1, 2 and 6, the following equations hold

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^5 (\log n)^6}{\xi_{n,-}^6}} \right). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^2 (\log n)^4}{\xi_{n,-}^3}} + \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^5}{\xi_{n,-}^6}} \right). \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Assuming Lemma D.3 holds, we demonstrate how to prove Lemma D.2. Note that a crude ℓ_2 - ℓ_∞ estimate would fail since

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty \\ & \leq \|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_2 \\ & \leq \|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger\|_2 \|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_2 \\ & \leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger\|_2 \|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger\|_2 \gtrsim 1$, the last term diverges if using the bound in Lemma D.3. To address this issue, we need a more explicit computation. In particular, we write $\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t - \mathcal{P}_1$$

where \mathcal{P}_1 is the projection operator onto the zero-eigenspace of $\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger$. One key observation is that

$$\mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) = \mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) = \mathbf{0},$$

which can be checked by direct computation. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*).$$

To control the series on the right-hand side, we need to bound $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2$ away from 1. This is true when the underlying graph is homogeneous and in this case, $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2$ is uniformly bounded away from 1 (and in fact $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2 = o_p(1)$). For general inhomogeneous graphs, however, $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2$ can be arbitrarily close to 1. To quantify the difference between $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2$ and 1, we need to bound the second smallest and the largest eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_{sym} respectively from below and above, for which we appeal to the Cheeger's inequality [12, Theorem 2.2] and a dual version of it [5, Theorem 3.2]. In particular, we show that in a NURHM model, under appropriate conditions, there exists an absolute constant C such that $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2 \leq 1 - C((\xi_{n,-}/\xi_{n,+})^2)$ a.s.

Lemma D.4. *For the NURHM, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\xi_{n,+}^7 \log n) / (\xi_{n,-}^8) \rightarrow 0$, then an absolute constant C such that $\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2 \leq 1 - C((\xi_{n,-}/\xi_{n,+})^2)$ for all sufficiently large n a.s.*

The condition in Lemma D.4 is weaker than Assumption 6. Thus, according to Lemma D.4., there exists a universal constant C such that for

$$t \geq t_n := C(\xi_{n,+}/\xi_{n,-})^2 \log n,$$

$\|(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t\|_2 \leq n^{-3M}$, where M is the upper bound for the comparison set as defined in Assumption 2. As a result,

$$\left\| \sum_{t=t_n}^{\infty} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t \right\|_2 \leq \|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2^{t_n} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1\|_2} \lesssim n^{-3M} \cdot \left(\frac{\xi_{n,+}}{\xi_{n,-}} \right)^2 \lesssim n^{-M}.$$

Writing

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_{sym}^\dagger \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \Delta H(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{t=0}^{t_n-1} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \Delta H(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)}_{(iv)} + \underbrace{\sum_{t=t_n}^{\infty} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \Delta H(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)}_{(v)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta H = \{H(\bar{\mathbf{w}}) - H(\mathbf{u}^*)\}$ or $\{H(\mathbf{u}^*) - H^*(\mathbf{u}^*)\}$. We can bound $\|(v)\|_\infty$ as

$$\|(v)\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{n} \left\| \sum_{t=t_n}^{\infty} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t \right\|_2 \|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \Delta H(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty \stackrel{(D.6), (D.7)}{=} o_p(1).$$

Meanwhile,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(iv)\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{t_n} \|(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t \mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \Delta H(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty \lesssim t_n \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}}{\xi_{n,-}}} \|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2} \Delta H(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}^*)\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim t_n \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}}{\xi_{n,-}}} \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^5 (\log n)^8}{\xi_{n,-}^6}} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{n,+}^{10} (\log n)^8}{\xi_{n,-}^{11}}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is not straightforward and requires analysis of $(\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{P}_1)^t$. The details are deferred to the supplementary file.