
DISCRETIZED NORMAL APPROXIMATION OF SUMS OF LOCALLY DEPENDENT RANDOM VARIABLES VIA STEIN'S METHOD

Zhonggen Su, Xiaolin Wang

School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University
Hangzhou 310058, China
{suzhonggen, 12035020}@zju.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Let $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ be a family of locally dependent non-negative integer-valued random variables with finite expectation and variance. We consider the sum $W = \sum_{i \in J} X_i$ and establish general error upper bounds for the total variation distance $d_{TV}(W, Y^d)$, where Y^d is the discretized normal distribution. The major ingredient of the proof is to approximate W by a three-parametric intermediate random variable M based on Stein's method. As applications, we study in detail four well-known examples, which are counting vertices of all edges point inward, birthday problem, counting monochromatic edges in uniformly colored graphs, and triangles in the Erdős-Rényi random graph. Through delicate analysis and computations we obtain sharper upper error bounds than existing results.

Keywords Erdős-Rényi random graph; Local dependence; Monochromatic edges; Stein's method; Total variation distance.

MSC(2020): 60F05, 60B10

1 Introduction and main result

Locally dependent random variables appear widely in many applied fields, such as risk theory, extreme value theory, reliability theory, run and scan statistics, and graph theory. The interested reader is referred to [3], [9], [11], [16] and [19] for related backgrounds. The purpose of this present paper is to provide a discretized normal approximation for sums of locally dependent random variables and to take a close look at a few of well-known examples.

Let $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ be a family of discrete non-negative integer-valued random variables where J is an index set. Assume that $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ satisfy the following local dependence structure:

(LD1) For each $i \in J$, there exists $A_i \subset J$ such that X_i is independent of $\{X_j : j \notin A_i\}$.

(LD2) For each $i \in J$ and $j \in A_i$, there exists $A_{ij} \supset A_i$ such that $\{X_i, X_j\}$ is independent of $\{X_k : k \notin A_{ij}\}$.

(LD3) For each $i \in J$, $j \in A_i$ and $k \in A_{ij}$, there exists $A_{ijk} \supset A_{ij}$ such that $\{X_i, X_j, X_k\}$ is independent of $\{X_l : l \notin A_{ijk}\}$.

We remark that such a dependence structure follows Ross [14], and was also adopted by Fang [8], Liu and Austern [10]. Let $W = \sum_{i \in J} X_i$, and assume $\mathbb{E}W^2$ exists. Set $\mu = \mathbb{E}W$, $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(W)$, and denote by $Y^d(\mu, \sigma^2)$ the discretized normal random variable. Namely,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y^d(\mu, \sigma^2) = k) = \int_{k-0.5}^{k+0.5} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left[-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] dx, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

What we are concerned with is to present a general approach to obtain the effective approximation of W by Y^d in terms of the total variation distance and the local distance. Recall the total variation distance and the local distance between two integer-valued random variables U and V is respectively defined by

$$d_{TV}(U, V) = \sup_{A \subset \mathbb{Z}} |\mathbb{P}(U \in A) - \mathbb{P}(V \in A)|$$

and

$$d_{\text{loc}}(U, V) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mathbb{P}(U = a) - \mathbb{P}(V = a)|.$$

Obviously, we have by the triangle inequality

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq d_{TV}(W, M) + d_{TV}(M, Y^d)$$

where M is an intermediate nonnegative integer-valued random variable.

The major job of this paper is to introduce three special random variables M_1, M_2, M_3 , where

$$M_1 = B(n, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda), \quad M_2 = NB(r, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda), \quad M_3 = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) * 2\mathcal{P}\left(\frac{\omega}{2}\right) * 3\mathcal{P}\left(\frac{\eta}{3}\right), \quad (1.1)$$

and to control the approximation error bounds $d_{TV}(W, M_i)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ separately.

It is a key step to select properly the parameters in (1.1). Our basic principle is to ensure the first three factorial cumulants of M_i equal (or approximately equal) to those of W . Thus both $d_{TV}(M_i, Y^d)$ and $d_{TV}(W, M_i)$ can be as well controlled as we would like.

Specifically speaking, given a nonnegative integer-valued random variable U , let $\phi_U(z)$ be its probability generating function (PGF), i.e. $\phi_U(z) = \mathbb{E}z^U$, and the j -th factorial cumulant $\Gamma_j(U)$ is defined as

$$\Gamma_j(U) = \frac{d^j}{dz^j} \log \phi_U(z)|_{z=1}.$$

Denote by m_i the i -th origin moment of W . Then it is easy to see

$$\Gamma_1(W) = m_1, \quad \Gamma_2(W) = (m_2 - m_1^2 - m_1)$$

and

$$\Gamma_3(W) = m_3 - 3m_1m_2 - 3m_2 + 2m_1^3 + 3m_1^2 + 2m_1.$$

In addition, some simple calculation yields

$$\Gamma_1(M_1) = np + \lambda; \quad \Gamma_2(M_1) = -np^2; \quad \Gamma_3(M_1) = 2np^3; \quad (1.2)$$

$$\Gamma_1(M_2) = \frac{rq}{p} + \lambda; \quad \Gamma_2(M_2) = \frac{rq^2}{p^2}; \quad \Gamma_3(M_2) = 2\frac{rq^3}{p^3}; \quad (1.3)$$

$$\Gamma_1(M_3) = \lambda + \omega + \eta; \quad \Gamma_2(M_3) = \omega + 2\eta; \quad \Gamma_3(M_3) = 2\eta. \quad (1.4)$$

Now consider the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \Gamma_1(W) = \Gamma_1(M_i) \\ \Gamma_2(W) = \Gamma_2(M_i) \\ \Gamma_3(W) = \Gamma_3(M_i) \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. Using (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) and solving (1.5), a simple but lengthy calculus yields

$$n = \lfloor \frac{4\Gamma_2(W)^3}{\Gamma_3(W)^2} \rfloor, \quad p = -\frac{\Gamma_3(W)}{2\Gamma_2(W)}, \quad q = 1 - p, \quad \lambda = \mu - np, \quad \delta = \frac{4\Gamma_2(W)^3}{\Gamma_3(W)^2} - n; \quad (1.6)$$

$$r = \frac{4\Gamma_2(W)}{\Gamma_3(W)}, \quad p = \frac{2\Gamma_2(W)}{2\Gamma_2(W) + \Gamma_3(W)}, \quad q = 1 - p, \quad \lambda = \mu - \frac{rq}{p}; \quad (1.7)$$

$$\lambda = \Gamma_1(W) - \Gamma_2(W) + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_3(W), \quad \omega = \Gamma_2(W) - \Gamma_3(W), \quad \eta = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_3(W). \quad (1.8)$$

Here we notice that n in (1.6) may not be an integer, in which we shall take its integer part.

Another technical issue is: which M_i is selected to approximate the target variable W ? It turns out to rely on the size of $\Gamma_2(W)$. Specifically speaking, we consider three cases separately: (1) select M_1 if $\Gamma_2(W) \ll 0$; (2) select M_2 if $\Gamma_2(W) \gg 0$; (3) select M_3 if $\Gamma_2(W) \approx 0$.

We are ready to state our main results. Some additional notations are needed. Set $X_{A_{ijk}} = \{X_l, l \in A_{ijk}\}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_2(W|X_{A_{ijk}}) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\mathbb{P}(W = k|X_{A_{ijk}}) - 2\mathbb{P}(W = k-1|X_{A_{ijk}}) + \mathbb{P}(W = k-2|X_{A_{ijk}})|, \\ \mathcal{S}_{i,j,k}(W) &= \text{esssup } \mathcal{S}_2(W|X_{A_{ijk}}), \quad S(W) = \sup_{i,j,k} \mathcal{S}_{i,j,k}(W), \end{aligned} \quad (1.9)$$

where $\text{esssup } X$ denotes the essential supremum of X . Also, define

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_i &= \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E} X_i(\mathbb{E}) X_j \mathbb{E} X_k(\mathbb{E}) X_l \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E} X_i(\mathbb{E}) X_j X_k(\mathbb{E}) X_l, \\ \gamma &= \sum_{i \in J} \gamma_i,\end{aligned}$$

where $\sum_{(\mathbb{E})}$ denotes the sum over all possible choices of \mathbb{E} in front of each X_i .

Theorem 1.1. *Use the setting and notations presented above.*

(i) Assume $\mu \gg \sigma^2$ and $2\lambda < q[n + \lambda/q]$, where $\{n, p, q, \lambda\}$ was given in (1.6), then we have

$$d_{TV}(W, M_1) \leq C \left[\frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_1)q\mu} + \frac{1}{\mu} \right],$$

where $\theta_1 = \frac{\lambda}{[n + \lambda/p]q}$.

(ii) Assume $\mu \ll \sigma^2$ and $2\lambda q < rq + \lambda p$, where $\{r, p, q, \lambda\}$ was given in (1.7), then we have

$$d_{TV}(W, M_2) \leq C \left(1 \vee \frac{q}{p} \right) \frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_2)\mu},$$

where $\theta_2 = \frac{\lambda q}{rq + \lambda p}$.

(iii) Assume $\mu \approx \sigma^2$ and $2\omega + 2\eta < \lambda + \omega + \eta$, where $\{\lambda, \omega, \eta\}$ was given in (1.8), then we have

$$d_{TV}(W, M_3) \leq C \frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_3)\mu},$$

where $\theta_3 = \frac{\omega + 2\eta}{\lambda + \omega + \eta}$.

Moreover, for $i = 1, 2, 3$

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq d_{TV}(W, M_i) + \frac{C}{\sigma}.$$

Here and in the sequel, C is a numeric constant and its value may differ from line to line.

Set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_2(W) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\mathbb{P}(W = k) - 2\mathbb{P}(W = k - 1) + \mathbb{P}(W = k - 2)| \\ \mathcal{S}_2(Y^d) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\mathbb{P}(Y^d = k) - 2\mathbb{P}(Y^d = k - 1) + \mathbb{P}(Y^d = k - 2)|.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1 together with Theorem 2.2 of [13] easily gives the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *Use the same setting and notations as in Theorem 1.1.*

(i) Assume $\mu \gg \sigma^2$, then

$$d_{loc}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left[\frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_1)q\mu} + \frac{1}{\mu} \right]^{1/2} \times [\mathcal{S}_2(W) + \mathcal{S}_2(Y^d)]^{1/2}.$$

(ii) Assume $\mu \ll \sigma^2$, then

$$d_{loc}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left[\left(1 \vee \frac{q}{p} \right) \frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_2)\mu} \right]^{1/2} \times [\mathcal{S}_2(W) + \mathcal{S}_2(Y^d)]^{1/2}.$$

(iii) Assume $\mu \approx \sigma^2$, then

$$d_{loc}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left[\frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_3)\mu} \right]^{1/2} \times [\mathcal{S}_2(W) + \mathcal{S}_2(Y^d)]^{1/2}.$$

To conclude the introduction, we state a corollary for classical m -dependent random variable sequence. Recall X_1, \dots, X_n is said to be m -dependent if $\{X_i, i \leq j\}$ is independent of $\{X_i, i \geq j + m + 1\}$ for any $j = 1, \dots, n - m - 1$. Let $W = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, assume that $\mathbb{E}X_i > 0$, $\mathbb{E}X_i^3 < \infty$. We have

Corollary 1.3. *Use the same setting and notations as in Theorem 1.1.*

(i) Assume $\mu \gg \sigma^2$, then

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left(\frac{m^3 S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_1)npq} \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E}X_i^4 + \frac{1}{np} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{npq}} \right).$$

(ii) Assume $\mu \ll \sigma^2$, then

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left((p \vee q) \frac{m^3 S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_2)rq} \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E}X_i^4 + \sqrt{\frac{p^2}{rq}} \right).$$

(iii) Assume $\mu \approx \sigma^2$, then

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left(\frac{m^3 S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_3)(\lambda + \omega + \eta)} \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E}X_i^4 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda + \omega + \eta}} \right).$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first review briefly the basic steps of Stein's method and give the Stein operator associated with each M_i . Then we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 by repeatedly using Newton's expansion and controlling error terms. In Section 3, we consider four interesting examples, three of which are related to random graphs. Through delicate analysis, we verify the local dependent structures and determine exactly the corresponding parameters for each example. Two claims used involve elementary but lengthy computations, which are postponed to Appendix A and B. Compared to relevant results in literature, our approximation upper bounds seem sharper.

2 Proofs of main results

2.1 Preliminaries

Suppose we are given two integer-valued random variables U and V , where U is the object of study and V is the target variable. Let \mathcal{H} be a family of functions and the distance in the sense of \mathcal{H} is defined by

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(U, V) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}} |\mathbb{E}f(U) - \mathbb{E}f(V)|. \quad (2.1)$$

In particular, let $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbf{1}_A, A \subset \mathbb{Z}\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbf{1}_a, a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$), (2.1) reduces to $d_{TV}(U, V)$ (resp. $d_{loc}(U, V)$).

The Stein method turns out to be a powerful tool in the study of $d_{\mathcal{H}}$. It usually consists of the following three steps. The first step is to find an appropriate operator \mathcal{A}_V which satisfies $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_V g(V) = 0$ for any bounded function with $g(0) = 0, g(m) = 0$ for $m \notin \text{supp}(V)$. The second step is to find for each $f \in \mathcal{H}$ the solution to the following equation

$$\mathcal{A}_V g(m) = f(m) - \mathbb{E}f(V), \quad m \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (2.2)$$

and to characterize the properties of g . The third step is to re-express the distance $d_{\mathcal{H}}(U, V)$ as

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(U, V) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{H}} |\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_V g_f(U)|. \quad (2.3)$$

The following lemma gives the Stein operator associated with $M_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, whose proofs can be found in [17] and [18].

Lemma 2.1. *We have*

(1) for $M_1 = B(n, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{M_1} g(k) = \left(n \frac{p}{q} + \frac{\lambda}{q} - \frac{p}{q} k \right) g(k+1) - k g(k) + \lambda \frac{p}{q} \Delta g(k+1); \quad (2.4)$$

(2) for $M_2 = NB(r, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{M_2} g(k) = q \left(r + \frac{\lambda p}{q} + k \right) g(k+1) - k g(k) - \lambda q \Delta g(k+1); \quad (2.5)$$

(3) for $M_3 = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) * 2\mathcal{P}(\frac{\omega}{2}) * 3\mathcal{P}(\frac{\eta}{3})$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{M_3} g(k) = (\lambda + \omega + \eta) g(k+1) - k g(k) + \omega \Delta g(k+1) + \eta [\Delta g(k+1) + \Delta g(k+2)]. \quad (2.6)$$

Denote by g_A (resp. g_a) the solution to the equation (2.2) corresponding to $f = \mathbf{1}_A$ (resp. $\mathbf{1}_a$), where $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $a \in \mathbb{Z}$). Write $\|\cdot\|$ for the maximum parametric value. The following lemma gives consistent upper bounds for $\|\Delta g_A\|$ and $\|g_a\|$, which can be seen in Lemma 2.3 of [17] and Lemma 3.1 of [18], respectively.

Lemma 2.2. *We have*

(i) for $M_1 = B(n, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$, if $2\lambda < q[n + p/q]$,

$$\|\Delta g_A\| \leq \frac{q}{[n + \lambda/p]pq - 2\lambda p}, \quad \|g_a\| \leq \frac{q}{[n + \lambda/p]pq - 2\lambda p};$$

(ii) for $M_2 = NB(r, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$, if $2\lambda q < (rq + \lambda p)$,

$$\|\Delta g_A\| \leq \frac{1}{(rq + \lambda p) - 2\lambda q}, \quad \|g_a\| \leq \frac{1}{(rq + \lambda p) - 2\lambda q};$$

(iii) for $M_3 = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) * 2\mathcal{P}(\frac{\omega}{2}) * 3\mathcal{P}(\frac{\eta}{3})$, if $2(\omega + 2\eta) < \lambda + \omega + \eta$,

$$\|\Delta g_A\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda + \omega + \eta - 2(\omega + 2\eta)}, \quad \|g_a\| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda + \omega + \eta - 2|\omega + 2\eta|}.$$

We finally need the following lemma about the normal approximation of M_i , which is a direct consequence of Theorem 7.3 in Chen et.al. [6] together with the unimodality of M_i .

Lemma 2.3. *For M_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, we have*

$$d_{TV}(M_i, Y^d) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\text{Var } W}}.$$

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Denote

$$W_i = W - \sum_{l \in A_i} X_l; \quad W_{ij} = W - \sum_{l \in A_{ij}} X_l; \quad W_{ijk} = W - \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} X_l,$$

where A_i, A_{ij}, A_{ijk} were defined in (LD1)-(LD3).

Let us begin with the proof of (iii). From Lemma 2.1 and the independence of X_i and W_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{A}_{M_3} g(W) &= (\lambda + \omega + \eta) \mathbb{E} g(W + 1) - \mathbb{E} W g(W) + \omega \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \eta \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(W + 1) + \Delta g(W + 2)] \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} g(W + 1) - \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} X_i g(W) + \omega \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \eta \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(W + 1) + \Delta g(W + 2)] \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} [g(W + 1) - g(W_i + 1)] - \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} X_i [g(W) - g(W_i + 1)] \\ &\quad + \{\omega \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \eta \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(W + 1) + \Delta g(W + 2)]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Now we analyze each item in the RHS of (2.7) separately. Start from $\sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} [g(W + 1) - g(W_i + 1)]$. Using Newton's expansion (see page 518 of [2]), we have

$$g(w + s) = g(w + 1) + (s - 1) \Delta g(w + 1) + \frac{(s - 1)(s - 2)}{2} \Delta^2 g(w + 1) + \sum_{u=1}^{s-1} \sum_{v=1}^{k-2} (u - v - 1) \Delta^3 g(w + v),$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [g(W + 1) - g(W_i + 1)] &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \Delta g(W_i + 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \Delta^2 g(W_i + 1) + E_1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where the error term E_1 is defined by

$$E_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{u=1}^{\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j} \sum_{v=1}^{u-2} (u - v) \Delta^3 g(W_i + v) \right]. \quad (2.9)$$

Let $p_l^* = \mathbb{P}(W_{ijk} = l \mid X_{A_{ijk}})$. Then for every fixed v ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\Delta^3 g(W_i + v) \mid X_{A_{ijk}}) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} p_l^* \left[\Delta g(X_{A_{ijk}}^* + l + v + 2) - 2\Delta g(X_{A_{ijk}}^* + l + v + 1) + \Delta g(X_{A_{ijk}}^* + l + v) \right] \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \Delta g(X_{A_{ijk}}^* + l + v) (p_l^* - 2p_{l-1}^* + p_{l-2}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the fact that $\mathcal{S}_2(W \mid X_{A_{ijk}}) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} |p_l^* - 2p_{l-1}^* + p_{l-2}^*|$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\Delta^3 g(W_i + v) \mid X_{A_{ijk}})| &\leq \|\Delta g\| \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} |p_l^* - 2p_{l-1}^* + p_{l-2}^*| \\ &= \|\Delta g\| \mathcal{S}_2(W \mid X_{A_{ijk}}) \\ &\leq \|\Delta g\| S(W), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality followed from the fact $\mathcal{S}_2(W \mid X_{A_{ijk}}) \leq S(W)$.

Summing over u and v , we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{u=1}^{\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j} \left[\sum_{v=1}^{u-2} (u-v) \mathbb{E}(\Delta^3 g(W_i + v) \mid X_{A_{ijk}}) \right] \\ &\leq \|\Delta g\| S(W) \mathbb{E} \left(X_i \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_i} X_k \sum_{l \in A_i} X_l \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term in the RHS of (2.8), note that for $j \in A_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta g(W_i + 1) &= \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + [\Delta g(W_i + 1) - \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W_{ij} + 1)] \\ &\quad + [\mathbb{E} \Delta g(W_{ij} + 1) - \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1)]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

So by the independence of $\{X_i, X_j\}$ and W_{ij} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \Delta g(W_i + 1) &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j [\Delta g(W_i + 1) - \Delta g(W_{ij} + 1)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(W_{ij} + 1) - \Delta g(W + 1)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \Delta^2 g(W_{ij} + 1) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \Delta^2 g(W_{ij} + 1) + E_2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where E_2 denotes the error term. By a similar argument, it follows

$$E_2 \leq \|\Delta g\| S(W) \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \sum_{l \in A_{ij}} X_l + \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \sum_{l \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_l \right).$$

Note also the following equality

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 g(W_{ij} + 1) &= \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) + [\Delta^2 g(W_{ij} + 1) - \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W_{ijk} + 1)] \\ &\quad + [\mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W_{ijk} + 1) - \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

So by the independence of $\{X_i, X_j, X_k\}$ and W_{ijk} ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \Delta^2 g(W_{ij} + 1) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) + E_3 \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \Delta^2 g(W_{ij} + 1) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) + E_4, \tag{2.13}$$

where E_3 and E_4 denote the error terms.

By a similar argument to (2.9), we have

$$E_3 \leq \|\Delta g\|S(W) \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \right) \mathbb{E} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} X_l + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \sum_{l \in A_{ijk} \setminus A_{ij}} X_l \right) \right]$$

and

$$E_4 \leq \|\Delta g\|S(W) \left[\mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \mathbb{E} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} X_l + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \sum_{l \in A_{ijk} \setminus A_{ij}} X_l \right) \right].$$

Substituting (2.12) and (2.13) into (2.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \Delta g(W_i + 1) &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) + E_2 + E_3 + E_4. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

For the second term in the RHS of (2.8), a similar argument gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \Delta^2 g(W_i + 1) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \right] + E_5, \quad (2.15)$$

where the error term E_5 is controlled by

$$E_5 \leq \|\Delta g\|S(W) \left[\mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right].$$

Putting (2.11)-(2.15) together and noting E_1, \dots, E_5 each is bounded by $\gamma_i \|\Delta g\|S(W)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} [g(W + 1) - g(W_i + 1)] &\leq \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad + O(\gamma_i \|\Delta g\|S(W)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Next we turn to the second item in the RHS of (2.7), i.e., $\sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{E} X_j [g(W) - g(W_j + 1)]$. Using Newton's expansion again and some simple algebra yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} X_i [g(W) - g(W_i + 1)] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \right] \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 2 \right) \right] \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1) \\ &\quad + O(\gamma_i \|\Delta g\|S(W)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

In addition, noting $\Delta g(W + 2) = \Delta g(W + 1) + \Delta^2 g(W + 1)$, the third term in the RHS of (2.7) can be written as

$$\omega \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \eta \mathbb{E} [\Delta g(W + 1) + \Delta g(W + 2)] = (\omega + 2\eta) \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W + 1) + \eta \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W + 1). \quad (2.18)$$

Define

$$G_1 = \sum_{i \in J} \left[\mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - \mathbb{E} X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \right], \quad (2.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k + \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \right] \mathbb{E} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} X_k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j \left(\sum_{k \in A_i} X_k - 1 \right) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1 \right) \left(\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Combining (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18), we get

$$\mathbb{E} \mathcal{A}_{M_3} g(W) \leq (G_1 + \omega + 2\eta) \mathbb{E} \Delta g(W+1) + (G_2 + \eta) \mathbb{E} \Delta^2 g(W+1) + O(\gamma \|\Delta g\| S(W)). \quad (2.21)$$

To complete the proof, we need a lemma, which is one of the most important findings of this paper.

Lemma 2.4.

$$G_1 = -\Gamma_2, \quad G_2 = -\frac{\Gamma_3}{2}. \quad (2.22)$$

Proof. Note that for every $B \supseteq A_i$,

$$\sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in B} \mathbb{E} X_i X_j - \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in B} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j = \text{Var } W. \quad (2.23)$$

Taking A_i as B , we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \sum_{i \in J} [\mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} \sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - \mathbb{E} X_i (\sum_{j \in A_i} X_j - 1)] \\ &= -\text{Var } W + \mathbb{E} W = -\Gamma_2; \end{aligned}$$

It remains to proving $G_2 = 0$. Rearrange G_2 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= -\sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E} X_i \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} (\mathbb{E} X_i X_k - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_k) + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i X_j - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} (\mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j X_k - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j \mathbb{E} X_k - \mathbb{E} X_i X_j X_k + \mathbb{E} X_i X_j \mathbb{E} X_k) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j, k \in A_i} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j X_k + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i X_j X_k \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

Taking B as A_{ij} in (2.23),

$$\sum_{i \in J} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} (\mathbb{E} X_i X_k - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_k) + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i X_j - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j \right) = \frac{3}{2} \text{Var } W. \quad (2.25)$$

By the independence of X_i and $\{X_j, j \notin A_i\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} (\mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j X_k - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j \mathbb{E} X_k - \mathbb{E} X_i X_j X_k + \mathbb{E} X_i X_j \mathbb{E} X_k) \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} (\mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j W - \mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j \mathbb{E} W - \mathbb{E} X_i X_j W + \mathbb{E} X_i X_j \mathbb{E} W) \\ &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} (\mathbb{E} X_i \mathbb{E} X_j W - \mathbb{E} X_i X_j W) + \text{Var } W \cdot \mathbb{E} W. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Substituting (2.25) and (2.26) into (2.24),

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} (\mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_j W - \mathbb{E}X_i X_j W) + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j, k \in A_i} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_j X_k + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k \right) \\ &\quad + \text{Var } W \cdot \mathbb{E}W + \frac{3}{2} \text{Var } W - \mathbb{E}W. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

In addition, noting $W = X_{A_i}^* + X_{A_i^c}^*$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i} (\mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_j W - \mathbb{E}X_i X_j W) + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j, k \in A_i} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_j X_k + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in J} [\mathbb{E}X_i (X_{A_i}^*)^2 - \mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}(X_{A_i}^*)^2 + 2(\mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_{A_i}^* W - \mathbb{E}X_i X_{A_i}^* W)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in J} [-\mathbb{E}X_i (X_{A_i}^*)^2 + \mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}(X_{A_i}^*)^2 - 2\mathbb{E}X_i X_{A_i}^* X_{A_i^c}^* + 2\mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_{A_i}^* X_{A_i^c}^*] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in J} [-\mathbb{E}X_i (X_{A_i}^* + X_{A_i^c}^*)^2 + \mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}(X_{A_i}^* + X_{A_i^c}^*)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in J} (-\mathbb{E}X_i W^2 + \mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}W^2) = -\frac{\mathbb{E}W^3}{2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}W \mathbb{E}W^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Substituting (2.28) into (2.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= -\frac{\mathbb{E}W^3}{2} + \frac{\mathbb{E}W \mathbb{E}W^2}{2} + \text{Var } W \cdot \mathbb{E}W + \frac{3}{2} \text{Var } W - \mathbb{E}W \\ &= -\frac{\Gamma_3}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \mathbb{E}W (\mathbb{E}W^2 + \mathbb{E}W + \Gamma_2) - \frac{3}{2} (\mathbb{E}W^2 + \mathbb{E}W + \Gamma_2) + \mathbb{E}W^3 + \frac{3}{2} \mathbb{E}W^2 + \mathbb{E}W \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{E}W (\mathbb{E}W^2 + \mathbb{E}W + \Gamma_2)}{2} + (\mathbb{E}W + \Gamma_2) \times \mathbb{E}W + \frac{3}{2} (\mathbb{E}W + \Gamma_2) - \mathbb{E}W \\ &= -\frac{\Gamma_3}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Next we continue the proof of Theorem 1.1. Substituting (2.22) into (2.21) and using the relationship (1.4), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_3} g(W) = O(\gamma \|\Delta g\| S(W)).$$

Replacing g with g_A , $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$ and using the triangle inequality

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq d_{TV}(W, M_3) + d_{TV}(M_3, Y^d)$$

and Lemma 2.2-2.3, the proof of (iii) is completed.

Turn to (i), (ii). Following the line of the proof of (iii), one can prove

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_1} g(W) = (G_1 - np^2 - \delta) \mathbb{E}\Delta g(W+1) + \left(\frac{G_2}{q} + \frac{np^3}{q} \right) \mathbb{E}\Delta^2 g(W+1) + \frac{1}{q} O(\gamma \|\Delta g\| S(W))$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_2} g(W) = \left(G_1 + \frac{rq^2}{p^2} \right) \mathbb{E}\Delta g(W+1) + \left(pG_2 + \frac{rq^3}{p^2} \right) \mathbb{E}\Delta^2 g(W+1) + (p \vee q) O(\gamma \|\Delta g\| S(W)),$$

where δ is defined in (1.6), G_1, G_2 are defined in (2.19) and (2.20).

Applying Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_1} g(W) = \frac{1}{q} O(\gamma \|\Delta g\| S(W) + \delta \mathbb{E}\Delta g(W+1))$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_2} g(W) = (p \vee q) O(\gamma \|\Delta g\| S(W)),$$

which together with Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 concludes the proofs of (i) and (ii).

3 Applications

3.1 Counting vertices of all edges point inward

In this subsection, we consider the problem which was studied by Arratia et.al. [1]. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}^d$, $\mathcal{E} = \{(u, v) : u, v \in \mathcal{V}, \text{ and } d_H(u, v) = 1\}$, where $d \geq 2$ and d_H denotes the Hamming distance in \mathcal{V} . Assume that each edge in \mathcal{E} is assigned a random direction by tossing a fair coin. Denote by J the set of all 2^d vertices, and let X_i be the indicator that vertex i has all of its edges directed inward.




Figure 1: An configuration in $\{0, 1\}^3$

Set

$$A_i = \{j : |j - i| = 1\}, \quad A_{ij} = \{k : j \in A_i; |k - i| = 1 \text{ or } |k - j| = 1\},$$

$$A_{ijk} = \{l : j \in A_i; k \in A_{ij}; |l - i| = 1 \text{ or } |l - j| = 1 \text{ or } |l - k| = 1\}.$$

Obviously, $\#A_i = d$, $\#A_{ij} \leq 2d$ and $\#A_{ijk} \leq 3d$. It is also easy to verify that conditions (LD1)-(LD3) are satisfied for $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ with A_i, A_{ij}, A_{ijk} . We are concerned with the number of vertices at which all d edges point inward. In particular, set $W = \sum_{i \in J} X_i$. Figure 1 represents an configuration in $\{0, 1\}^3$ with $W = 1$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under the setting described above, we have*

$$d_{TV}(W, M_3) = O(d^3 2^{-3d}), \quad (3.1)$$

where $\{\lambda, \omega, \eta\}$ satisfy the following equations:

$$\lambda + \omega + \eta = 1; \quad \omega + 2\eta = (d - 1)2^{-d}; \quad 2\eta = (3d^2 + 3d + 2) \times 2^{-2d+1}. \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 3.1. *We remark that Arratia et.al. [1] used $\mathcal{P}(1)$ to approximate W and obtained*

$$d_{TV}(W, \mathcal{P}(1)) \leq d2^{-d}. \quad (3.3)$$

Observably, (3.1) is better than (3.3) in the numerical approximation of probability at the cost of calculating the probability value of three-parameter model $\mathcal{P}(\lambda) * 2\mathcal{P}(\frac{\omega}{2}) * 3\mathcal{P}(\frac{\eta}{3})$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By a simple but lengthy calculation,

$$\Gamma_1(W) = 1; \quad \Gamma_2(W) = (d - 1)2^{-d}; \quad \Gamma_3(W) = (3d^2 + 3d + 2) \times 2^{-2d+1}.$$

We use $M_3 = \mathcal{P}(\lambda) * 2\mathcal{P}(\frac{\omega}{2}) * 3\mathcal{P}(\frac{\eta}{3})$ to approximate W , where three parameters λ, ω, η are exactly determined by (3.2).

To apply (iii) of Theorem 1.1, we need to further control γ , $S(W)$ and θ_3 . First, it is easy to see $S(W) \leq 4$. Also, it follows $\theta_3 = (d - 1)2^{-d}$. Finally, notice $\mathbb{E}X_i = 2^{-d}$ and $\mathbb{E}X_i X_j = 0$ whenever $d_H(i, j) = 1$. So it follows $\gamma \leq Cd^3 2^{-3d}$.

We now complete the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

3.2 Birthday problem

In this subsection, we consider the well-known birthday problem. It can be equivalently described as follows. Fix $k \geq 2$, put n balls into d boxes randomly with equal probability and estimate the probability that at least one box receives k or more balls.

Let $J = \{i : i \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \#i = k\}$. For each $i \in J$, denote

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the balls indexed by } i \text{ all go into the same box,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= \{j : j \cap i \neq \emptyset\}, & A_{ij} &= \{k : k \cap i \neq \emptyset \text{ or } k \cap j \neq \emptyset\}, \\ A_{ijk} &= \{l : l \cap i \neq \emptyset \text{ or } l \cap j \neq \emptyset \text{ or } l \cap k \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\#(A_i)$, $\#(A_{ij})$ and $\#(A_{ijk})$ are all $O(n^{k-1})$. It is also easy to show $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ satisfy (LD1)-(LD3) with A_i, A_{ij}, A_{ijk} . It is also easy to see $p := \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = d^{1-k}$. Define $W = \sum_{i \in J} X_i$, so

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{no box gets } k \text{ or more balls}) = \mathbb{P}(W = 0).$$

Simple calculation gives

$$m_1 = \mathbb{E}W = \sum_{i \in J} \mathbb{E}X_i = \binom{n}{k} d^{1-k}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m_2 &= \mathbb{E}W^2 = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i \in J} X_i [X_i + \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} X_j + \sum_{J \setminus A_i} X_j] \\ &= m_1 + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \binom{n-k}{k-j} d^{1+j-2k} + \binom{n}{k} \binom{n-k}{k} d^{2-2k}. \end{aligned}$$

By $\Gamma_2(W) = m_2 - m_1^2 - m_1$, we have

$$\Gamma_2(W) = \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \binom{n-k}{k-j} d^{1+j-2k} + \binom{n}{k} \left[\binom{n-k}{k} - \binom{n}{k} \right] d^{2-2k}.$$

Lemma 3.2. Denote

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_1 = \frac{n^k}{k!d^{k-1}}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_2 = \frac{n^{k+1}}{(k-1)!d^k}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_3 = \frac{kn^{k+2}}{(k-1)!d^{k+1}}.$$

Suppose both n and d tend to ∞ in such a way that $n^k \asymp d^{k-1}$. We have for $i = 1, 2, 3$

$$|\Gamma_i(W) - \tilde{\Gamma}_i| \leq \frac{C}{n}.$$

Proof. It is easy to calculate

$$|\Gamma_1(W) - \tilde{\Gamma}_1| = \frac{n^k - n(n-1)\cdots(n-k+1)}{k!d^{k-1}} \leq \frac{kn^{k-1}}{d^{k-1}} \leq \frac{C}{n}.$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_2(W) - \tilde{\Gamma}_2| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{k}{j} \binom{n-k}{k-j} d^{1+j-2k} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{n^k}{k!} - \binom{n}{k} \right] nd^{-k} + 2 \binom{n}{k} k^2 d^{-k} \\ &\quad + \binom{n}{k} \left[\binom{n-k}{k} - \binom{n}{k} \right] d^{2-2k} \\ &\leq C[n^{k-2}d^{-1-k} + n^k d^{-k} + n^{2k-1} d^{2-2k}] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

For $|\Gamma_3(W) - \tilde{\Gamma}_3|$, note

$$m_3 = \mathbb{E}W^3 = \sum_{\{i,j,k\} \in J^3} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k.$$

Consider the following five cases separately. Let

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \{\{i, j, k\} : \#\{i, j, k\} = 1\}, & M_2 &= \{\{i, j, k\} : \#\{i, j, k\} = 2\}, \\ M_3 &= \{\{i, j, k\} : \#\{i, j, k\} = 3, \#(i \cup j \cup k) = 3k\}, \\ M_4 &= \{\#\{i, j, k\} : \{i, j, k\} = 3, i \cap j \cup k = \emptyset \text{ or } i \cup j \cap k = \emptyset \text{ or } i \cap k \cup k = \emptyset, \#(i \cup j \cup k) < 3k\}, \\ M_5 &= J^3 \setminus (M_1 \cup M_2 \cup M_3 \cup M_4). \end{aligned}$$

A simple calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\{i,j,k \in M_1\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k &= \mathbb{E}W; \\ \sum_{\{i,j,k \in M_2\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k &= 3(\mathbb{E}W^2 - \mathbb{E}W); \\ \sum_{\{i,j,k \in M_3\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k &= (\mathbb{E}W)^3 + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right); \\ \sum_{\{i,j,k \in M_4\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k &= 3\mathbb{E}W^2 \mathbb{E}W - 3(\mathbb{E}W)^3 - 3(\mathbb{E}W)^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right); \\ \sum_{\{i,j,k \in M_5\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k &= \frac{kn^{k+2}}{(k-1)!d^{k+1}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now $\Gamma_3(W)$ can be calculated by $m_3 - 3m_1m_2 - 3m_2 + 2m_1^3 + 3m_1^2 + 2m_1$. A direct but laborious computation yields

$$|\Gamma_3(W) - \tilde{\Gamma}_3| \leq Cn^{-1}.$$

The proof is now complete. \square

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose both n and d tend to ∞ in such a way that $n^k \asymp d^{k-1}$. We have*

$$d_{TV}(W, M_3) \leq Cn^{-\frac{k}{k-1}}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$d_{loc}(W, M_3) \leq Cn^{-\frac{k}{k-1}}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\{\lambda, \omega, \eta\}$ is exactly determined by

$$\lambda + \omega + \eta = \Gamma_1(W), \quad \omega + 2\eta = \Gamma_2(W), \quad 2\eta = \Gamma_3(W). \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. We only give the proof of (3.4) since the proof of (3.5) is similar. We use M_3 to approximate W since $\Gamma_2(W) \approx 0$ under the assumption $n^k \asymp d^{k-1}$. In order to apply (iii) of Theorem 1.1, we need to control γ , $S(W)$ and θ_3 .

Trivially, $S(W) \leq 4$. Also, by Lemma 3.2 and noting $\frac{\tilde{\Gamma}_2}{\tilde{\Gamma}_1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, we know

$$\theta_3 = \frac{\Gamma_2(W)}{\Gamma_1(W)} \rightarrow 0.$$

It remains to control γ . Note

$$\sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \binom{n-k}{k-j} d^{1+j-2k}. \quad (3.7)$$

One easily finds for each $j \in A_i \setminus i$,

$$\mathbb{E}X_i \mathbb{E}X_j \leq \mathbb{E}X_i X_j.$$

According to the argument in [1], with $\frac{d}{n}$ large, the dominant contribution to (3.7) comes from the pairs (i, j) with $\#(i \cap j) = k - 1$. which in turn implies

$$\sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \leq Cnd^{-k} \leq Cd^{-k+1}.$$

Observe

$$\{j, m : j \in A_i \setminus i, m \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i\} = \{j, m : \sharp(i \cap j) > 0, \sharp(i \cap m) = 0, \sharp(j \cap m) > 0\},$$

thus

$$\sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{m \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m = \sum_{\{m: \sharp(i \cap m)=0\}} \sum_{\{j: \sharp(i \cap j)>0, \sharp(m \cap j)>0\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m. \quad (3.8)$$

Fix i, m with $\sharp(i \cap m) = 0$, set

$$F_t^{i,m} = \{j : \sharp(i \cap j) + \sharp(j \cap m) = k - t, \sharp(i \cap j) > 0, \sharp(j \cap m) > 0\}$$

with $t \geq 0$. The dominant contribution about j to (3.8) comes from $F_0^{i,m}$. Indeed, by simple calculation,

$$\mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m = d^{-2k-t+1},$$

for $j \in F_t^{i,m}$ and $\sharp F_t^{i,m} = \binom{n-2k}{t} \cdot \binom{2k}{k-t}$, which in turn implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{m \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m &= \sum_{\{m: \sharp(i \cap m)=0\}} \sum_{t=0}^{k-2} \sum_{\{j: j \in F_t^{i,m}\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m \leq Cn^k d^{-2k+1} \\ &\leq Cn^k \sum_{t=0}^{k-2} n^t d^{-2k-t+1} \leq Cn^k d^{-2k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

So (3.8) is asymptotically as large as $\sum_{\{m: \sharp(i \cap m)=0\}} \sum_{\{j: j \in F_0^{i,m}\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m$.

For fixed i, m with $\sharp(i \cap m) = 0$, set

$$F_{t,s}^{i,m} = \{j, l : \sharp(i \cap j) + \sharp(j \cap m) = k - t, \sharp(i \cap j) > 0, \sharp(j \cap m) > 0, \sharp[l \cap (i \cup j \cup m)] = k - s\}$$

with $t, s \geq 0$. Under By a similar argument we claim without proof that $F_{0,0}^{i,m}$ is the dominant contribution of the sum

$$\sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk} \setminus k} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k X_l = \sum_{\{m: \sharp(i \cap m)=0\}} \sum_{t=1}^{k-2} \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} \sum_{\{j, l: j, l \in F_{t,s}^{i,m}\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k X_l. \quad (3.9)$$

Also, $\mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_m X_l = d^{-2k+1}$ for $j \in F_{0,0}^{i,m}$, and $\sharp F_{0,0}^{i,m} = \left(\binom{2k}{k}\right)^2$, (3.9) is up to a constant factor as large as $n^k d^{-2k+1}$.

Finally, note

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^1 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j \mathbb{E}X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l; \\ \gamma^2 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^1 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j \mathbb{E}X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk} \setminus k} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \mathbb{E}X_k X_l + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \mathbb{E}X_k \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{n^{2k+1}}{d^{2k}} \vee \frac{n^{2k}}{d^{2k-1}} \right) = Cn^{-\frac{k}{k-1}}, \\ \gamma^2 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk} \setminus k} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k X_l + \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus i} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k \\ &\leq C \left(\frac{n^{2k}}{d^{2k-1}} \right) = Cn^{-\frac{k}{k-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \leq Cn^{-\frac{k}{k-1}}$. We can now conclude the proof of (3.4). \square

Remark 3.2. Theorem 3.14 is a significant improvement compared to [1] in which Arratai obtained

$$d_{TV}(W, \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)) \leq Cn^{-\frac{1}{k-1}},$$

where $\Lambda = \binom{n}{k}d^{1-k}$.

As reader might realize, it is hard to obtain an explicit formula for three parameters λ, ω, η by solving the equations (3.6) since $\Gamma_1(W), \Gamma_2(W), \Gamma_3(W)$ are so complex. For sake of practical computation, we would like to provide an alternative approximation using a new mixture of Poisson variables. Define

$$\lambda' = \frac{n^k}{k!d^k} - \frac{n^{k+1}}{(k-1)!d^k}, \quad \omega' = \frac{n^{k+1}}{(k-1)!d^k} - \frac{kn^{k+2}}{2(k-1)!d^{k+1}}, \quad \eta' = \frac{kn^{k+2}}{(k-1)!d^{k+1}} \quad (3.10)$$

and denote $M'_3 = \mathcal{P}(\lambda') * 2\mathcal{P}(\frac{\omega'}{2}) * 3\mathcal{P}(\frac{\eta'}{3})$.

Lemma 3.4. Assume $\theta_3 < 1/2$, we have

$$d_{TV}(M_3, M'_3) \leq \frac{C}{n}.$$

Proof. We basically follow the proof of Corollary 2.4 in [5], which deals with two parametric cases. Recall

$$\mathcal{A}_{M_3}g(k) = (\lambda + \omega + \eta)g(k+1) - kg(k) + \omega\Delta g(k+1) + \eta[\Delta g(k+1) + \Delta g(k+2)]$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_{M'_3}g(k) = (\lambda' + \omega' + \eta')g(k+1) - kg(k) + \omega'\Delta g(k+1) + \eta'[\Delta g(k+1) + \Delta g(k+2)].$$

So it follows

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M'_3}g(M_3) = (\lambda' + \omega' + \eta')\mathbb{E}g(M_3+1) - \mathbb{E}M_3g(M_3) + \omega'\mathbb{E}\Delta g(M_3+1) + \eta'[\mathbb{E}\Delta g(M_3+1) + \mathbb{E}\Delta g(M_3+2)]$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_3}g(M_3) = (\lambda + \omega + \eta)\mathbb{E}g(M_3+1) - \mathbb{E}M_3g(M_3) + \omega\mathbb{E}\Delta g(M_3+1) + \eta[\mathbb{E}\Delta g(M_3+1) + \mathbb{E}\Delta g(M_3+2)].$$

Thus by the fact $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_3}(M_3) = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(M_3, M'_3) &= \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M'_3}g_A(M_3)| = \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M'_3}g_A(M_3) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{A}_{M_3}g_A(M_3)| \\ &\leq (|\lambda - \lambda'| + |\omega - \omega'| + |\eta - \eta'|) \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{E}g_A(M_3)| \\ &\quad + (|\omega - \omega'| + 2|\eta - \eta'|) \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{E}\Delta g_A(M_3)|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Hence from Theorem 2.5 of Barbour and Xia [5] and Lemma 2.2,

$$d_{TV}(M_3, M'_3) \leq \frac{3(|\lambda - \lambda'| + |\omega - \omega'| + |\eta - \eta'|)}{(1 - 2\theta_3)(\lambda + \omega + \eta)^{1/2}}.$$

In addition, note

$$\lambda + \omega + \eta = \tilde{\Gamma}_1(W), \quad \omega + 2\eta = \tilde{\Gamma}_2(W), \quad 2\eta = \tilde{\Gamma}_3(W) \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\lambda' + \omega' + \eta' = \tilde{\Gamma}_1, \quad \omega' + 2\eta' = \tilde{\Gamma}_2, \quad 2\eta' = \tilde{\Gamma}_3,$$

then by Lemma 3.2, it easily follows

$$|\lambda - \lambda'| + |\omega - \omega'| + |\eta - \eta'| \leq \frac{C}{n}. \quad (3.13)$$

Substituting (3.12) and (3.13) into (3.11), we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 3.5. Suppose both n and d tend to ∞ in such a way that $n^k \asymp d^{k-1}$. We have


$$d_{TV}(W, M'_3) \leq Cn^{-1}, \quad (3.14)$$

$$d_{loc}(W, M'_3) \leq Cn^{-1}. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 3.3 and 3.4 and triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(W, M'_3) &\leq d_{TV}(W, M_3) + d_{TV}(M'_3, M_3) \\ &\leq Cn^{-\frac{k}{k-1}} + Cn^{-1} \leq \frac{C}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

We have proven that (3.14) is true. The proof of (3.15) is similar and so is omitted. \square

Figure 2: $n = 7$, $c_7 = 3$, $W = 2$

3.3 Counting monochromatic edges in uniformly colored graphs.

Let $G = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ be a simple undirected graph, where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is the vertex set and $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{m_n}\}$ is the edge set. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let D_i be the neighborhood of vertex v_i , namely $D_i = \{1 \leq j \leq n, j \neq i, (v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Set $d_i = \#D_i$, then obviously $2m_n = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$. Each vertex is colored independently and uniformly with $c_n \geq 2$ colors, and we are interested in the number of monochromatic edges in \mathcal{E} .

Denote $J = \{1, 2, \dots, m_n\}$. For each edge $e_i \in \mathcal{E}$, we denote by e_{i1}, e_{i2} the two vertices it connects, i.e., $e_i = (e_{i1}, e_{i2})$. Define

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } e_{i1}, e_{i2} \text{ are colored same,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It can be easily verified that $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ satisfy the local dependence structure (LD1)-(LD3) with A_i , A_{ij} and A_{ijk} , where A_i consists of all edges connecting to e_i , A_{ij} consists of all edges connecting to e_i and e_j where $j \in A_i$, and A_{ijk} consists of all edges connecting to e_i , e_j and e_k where $j \in A_i, k \in A_j$.

The number of monochromatic edges in $G = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ is defined by

$$W = \sum_{j \in J} X_j.$$

In Figure 2, $n = 7$, $c_7 = 3$, and $W = 2$, where a and f are both blue, while b and e are green.

It is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}W &= \frac{m_n}{c_n}, & \mathbb{E}W^2 &= \frac{m_n(m_n - 1)}{c_n^2} + \frac{m_n}{c_n}, \\ \mathbb{E}W^3 &= \frac{m_n(m_n - 1)(m_n - 2)}{c_n^3} + 3 \frac{m_n(m_n - 1)}{c_n^2} + \frac{m_n}{c_n}. \end{aligned}$$

And so we have

$$\Gamma_1(W) = \frac{m_n}{c_n}, \quad \Gamma_2(W) = -\frac{m_n}{c_n^2}, \quad \Gamma_3(W) = \frac{4m_n}{c_n^3}.$$

Theorem 3.6. Denote $d_{(n)} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$, and assume $d_{(n)}^2 \ll c_n \ll m_n$, then

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}} + \frac{d_{(n)}^4}{c_n^3} \right); \quad (3.16)$$

$$d_{loc}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}} + \frac{d_{(n)}^4}{c_n^3} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n} + \frac{d_{(n)}}{\sqrt{c_n}}}. \quad (3.17)$$

Remark 3.3. We notice that Barbour [3] used a single parameter Poisson random variable to approximate W and obtained

$$d_{TV} \left(W, \mathcal{P} \left(\frac{m_n}{c_n} \right) \right) \leq \frac{\sqrt{8m_n}}{c_n}. \quad (3.18)$$

Obviously, (3.18) make sense only for $c_n \ll m_n \ll c_n^2$, and the upper bound would increase with m_n . In contrast, our result becomes better as m_n is larger.

We would also like to mention some recent results due to [7] and [15], which provide the upper bound in terms of Wasserstein distance and Berry-Essen bound:

$$d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), N(\mu, \sigma^2)) \leq 3\sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}} + \frac{10\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{c_n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{2^{7/4}}{m_n^{1/4}},$$

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(W \leq \sigma z + \mu) - \Phi(z)| \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{c_n}} + \sqrt{\frac{d_{(n)}}{m_n}} + \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}} \right).$$

By comparison, we find that the upper bounds in (3.16) and (3.17) are reasonable and correct, and is indeed better when $d_{(n)}$ is relatively small.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We only prove (3.16), since the proof of (3.17) is similar. Since $\Gamma_2 \leq 0$ we prefer to use $M_1 = B(n, p) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ to approximate W . In our context, three parameters becomes $n = m_n, p = c_n^{-1}, \lambda = 0$, namely $M_1 = B(m_n, c_n^{-1})$. In order to apply (i) of Theorem 1.1, we need to control $\gamma, S(W), \theta_1$ separately.

First, note that for each $i \in J$,

$$\mathbb{E}X_i = \mathbb{E}X_i^2 = \frac{1}{c_n} \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$\sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \leq \frac{d_{(n)}}{c_n^2}. \quad (3.20)$$

Then by (3.19), (3.20) and the assumption $d_{(n)} \leq \sqrt{c_n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^1 &:= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j \mathbb{E}X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l \\ &\leq C \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \mathbb{E}X_k^2 \\ &\leq C \frac{m_n d_{(n)}^2}{c_n^3}, \\ \gamma^2 &:= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l \\ &\leq C \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} X_k^2 \\ &\leq C \frac{m_n d_{(n)}^2}{c_n^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\gamma = \gamma^1 + \gamma^2 \leq C \frac{m_n d_{(n)}^2}{c_n^3}. \quad (3.21)$$

Second, note $\lambda = 0$ and so $\theta_1 = 0$.

It remains to calculate $S(W)$. From Proposition 4.6 of [5], we easily get

$$\mathcal{S}_2(M_1) \leq C \frac{c_n}{m_n}. \quad (3.22)$$

Denote $p_k = \mathbb{P}(W = k)$ and $q_k = \mathbb{P}(M_1 = k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. It follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}_2(W) - \mathcal{S}_2(M_1)| &\leq \left| \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} [(p_{k+2} - 2p_{k+1} + p_k) - (q_{k+2} - 2q_{k+1} + q_k)] \right| \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} |p_k - q_k| = 4d_{TV}(W, M_1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

In addition, we have for each configuration x ,

$$\mathcal{S}_2(W \mid X_{A_{ijk}} = x) - \mathcal{S}_2(W) \leq C \frac{d_n^2}{c_n}, \quad (3.24)$$

whose proof is postponed to **A**.

Combining (3.22), (3.23) and (3.24) implies directly

$$\begin{aligned} S(W) &\leq \mathcal{S}_2(W) + C \frac{d_n^2}{c_n} \\ &\leq 4d_{TV}(W, M_1) + C \frac{c_n}{m_n} + C \frac{d_n^2}{c_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Then by (i) of Theorem 1.1 and noting (3.21), (3.25) and $\theta_1 = 0$, $\mu = \frac{m_n}{c_n}$

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(W, M_1) &\leq C \left[\frac{\gamma S(W)}{(1 - 2\theta_1)q\mu} + \frac{1}{\mu} \right] \\ &\leq C \frac{d_n^2}{c_n^2} \left[\frac{c_n}{m_n} + \frac{d_n^2}{c_n} + 4d_{TV}(W, M_1) \right] + C \frac{c_n}{m_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

In turn, since $d_n^2 \ll c_n$, solving (3.26) yields

$$d_{TV}(W, M_1) \leq C \left(\frac{d_n^2}{m_n c_n} + \frac{d_n^4}{c_n^3} + \frac{c_n}{m_n} \right). \quad (3.27)$$

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 2.3

$$d_{TV}(M_2, Y^d) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\text{Var } W}} = C \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}},$$

which with (3.27) implies

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}} + \frac{d^2}{m_n c_n} + \frac{d^4}{c_n^3} \right) \leq C \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}} + \frac{d^4}{c_n^3} \right),$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that $\frac{d^2}{m_n c_n} \leq \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{m_n}}$.

The proof is now complete assuming (3.24). □

3.4 Triangles in the Erdős-Rényi random graph

In this subsection, we consider the number of triangles in the classical Erdős-Rényi random graph. In particular, let $G = G(n, p)$ be a random graph with n vertices, where each edge appears with probability p , independent of all other edges. Set $J = \{1, 2, \dots, \binom{n}{3}\}$ and denote by $\{T_i, i \in J\}$ all the possible triangles between these n vertices. Define for each $i \in J$,

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } T_i \text{ indeed exists in } G(n, p), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Set for each $i \in J$,

$$A_i = \{j \in J : e(T_j \cap T_i) \geq 1\};$$

and for each $j \in A_i$,


$$A_{ij} = \{k \in J : e(T_k \cap (T_i \cup T_j)) \geq 1\};$$

and for each $k \in A_{ij}$,

$$A_{ijk} = \{l \in J : e(T_l \cap (T_i \cup T_j \cup T_k)) \geq 1\}.$$

We can easily verify $\{X_i, i \in J\}$ satisfies the local dependence structure (LD1)-(LD3) with the above A_i, A_{ij} and A_{ijk} .

Denote by W the number of triangles in $G(n, p)$, namely $W = \sum_{i \in J} X_i$. Figure 3 represents a $G(10, 0.2)$, where both $\{v_1, v_4, v_5\}$ and $\{v_2, v_5, v_7\}$ form two triangles, so $W = 2$.

Figure 3: Erdős-Rényi random graph with $n = 10, p = 0.2$

It is easy to see

$$\mathbb{E}W = \binom{n}{3}p^3, \quad \text{Var}(W) = \binom{n}{3}p^3 + \binom{n}{3}(3n-9)p^5 - \binom{n}{3}(3n-8)p^6,$$

and

$$\Gamma_1 = \binom{n}{3}p^3, \quad \Gamma_2 = \binom{n}{3}(3n-9)p^5 - \binom{n}{3}(3n-8)p^6, \quad \Gamma_3 = n^5p^7 + o(n^5p^7). \quad (3.28)$$

Our main result about W reads as follows.

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose $n^\alpha p \rightarrow c > 0$ with $1/2 \leq \alpha < 1$, then we have*

$$d_{TV}(W, Y^d) \leq n^{-3/2+3\alpha/2}; \quad (3.29)$$

$$d_{loc}(W, Y^d) \leq n^{-3+3\alpha}. \quad (3.30)$$

Remark 3.4. *Under the setting of Theorem 3.7, Röllin and Ross [13] studied the total variation distance between W and an translated Poisson Z , where $Z - \lfloor \mu - \sigma^2 \rfloor \sim \mathcal{P}(\sigma^2 + \gamma)$, and obtained*

$$d_{TV}(W, Z) \leq O((n^{-1+\alpha}),$$

where $\mu = \mathbb{E}W, \sigma^2 = \text{Var} W$ and $\gamma = \mu - \sigma^2 - \lfloor \mu - \sigma^2 \rfloor$. Our result (3.29) is a normal approximation with higher accuracy.

There exist some results about the normal approximation of W in terms of Wasserstein-1 distance and Kolmogorov distance in literature. For instance, Barbour [4] gave

$$d_{W_1}(W, Y) \leq C \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{3}{2}}p^{-\frac{3}{2}}, & \text{if } 0 < p \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ n^{-1}p^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } n^{-\frac{1}{2}} < p \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ n^{-1}(1-p)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < p < 1, \end{cases}$$

and Röllin [12] showed that for every $n \geq 3$ and every $0 < p < 1$,

$$d_K(W, Y) \leq C \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{3}{2}}p^{-\frac{3}{2}}, & \text{if } 0 < p \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ n^{-1}p^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } n^{-\frac{1}{2}} < p \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ n^{-1}(1-p)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < p < 1, \end{cases}$$


where $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$.

We remark that our upper bound (3.29) for the total variation distance reaches same good accuracy in the case of $n^{-1} \leq p \leq n^{-1/2}$. However, for $p > n^{-1/2}$, the corresponding upper bound is not satisfactory. In fact, Röllin realized this point and mentioned in [13]: It is not clear if this is an artifact of our method or if a standard LLT(local limit theorem) does not hold if $p > n^{-1/2}$.

Our method can be also extended to other subgraphs. A technical issue is to estimate $S(W)$ and $\mathbb{E}W^3$, it is left to the interested reader.

Remark 3.5. *We believe that the error bound in Theorem 3.7 is nearly optimal for such problems. The following Table 1 contains numerical experiments to support our belief. In addition, one can see from Figure 4 below that the R-square is very close to 1 and the fitness is good, so further confirms that the order of approximation is consistent with what we get here.*

$N \backslash p$	300	400	500	600
$N^{-0.6}$	0.04600	0.03589	0.03360	0.03050
$N^{-0.7}$	0.06490	0.05900	0.05100	0.04727
$N^{-0.8}$	0.1198	0.1112	0.1074	0.1015

Table 1: The error for N is 300, 400, 500, 600 and p is $N^{-0.6}$, $N^{-0.7}$, $N^{-0.8}$.Figure 4: The linear function fitting graph of $y(x)$, where $R^2 = 0.9736$.

Proof of Theorem 3.7. We only give the proof of (3.29) since the proof of (3.30) is similar. It follows from (3.28) that

$$\Gamma_1(W) \sim n^3 p^3 / 6, \quad \Gamma_2(W) \sim n^4 p^5 / 2, \quad \Gamma_3(W) \sim n^5 p^7.$$

Since $\Gamma_2 > 0$, we choose $M_2 = NB(r, \bar{p}) * \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ to approximate W , where r, \bar{p} , and λ is determined by (1.3). Some simple calculation shows

$$r = O(n^2 p), \quad \bar{p} = 1 - O(np^2), \quad \bar{q} = 1 - \bar{p} = O(np^2), \quad \lambda = O(n^3 p^3).$$

We need to control γ, θ_2 and $S(W)$ below, separately. Note that $np^2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\mathbb{E}X_i = \mathbb{E}X_i^2 = p^3 \geq Cnp^5 \geq \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j.$$

Therefore, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^1 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j \mathbb{E}X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{k \in A_{ij}} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j \mathbb{E}X_k^2 \leq Cn^5 p^8, \\ \gamma^2 &= \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \sum_{l \in A_{ijk}} \sum_{(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{E}X_i(\mathbb{E})X_j X_k(\mathbb{E})X_l \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J} \sum_{j \in A_i \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{k \in A_{ij} \setminus A_i} \mathbb{E}X_i X_j X_k^2 \leq Cn^5 p^7, \end{aligned}$$

from which it follows

$$\gamma = \gamma^1 + \gamma^2 \leq Cn^5 p^7. \quad (3.31)$$

Turn to θ_2 . It is easy to see from Lemma 2.2

$$\theta_2 = \frac{\lambda q}{\lambda p + r q} \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.32)$$

Finally, we have

$$S(W) = O(n^{-3}p^{-3}), \quad (3.33)$$

whose proof basically follows Lemma 4.10 of [13] and is postponed to B.

Substituting (3.33), (3.31) and (3.32) into (ii) of Theorem 1.1, we complete the proof of (3.29). \square

Acknowledgements: Supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China(12271475,11731012, 11871425) and Fundamental Research Funds for Central Universities grant(2020XZZX002-03).

References

- [1] Richard Arratia, Larry Goldstein, and Louis Gordon, *Two moments suffice for poisson approximations: the chen-stein method*, The Annals of Probability (1989), 9–25.
- [2] Andrew D Barbour and V Ćekanavičius, *Total variation asymptotics for sums of independent integer random variables*, The Annals of Probability **30** (2002), no. 2, 509–545.
- [3] Andrew D Barbour, Lars Holst, and Svante Janson, *Poisson approximation*, vol. 2, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, 1992.
- [4] Andrew D Barbour, Michal Karoński, and Andrzej Ruciński, *A central limit theorem for decomposable random variables with applications to random graphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **47** (1989), no. 2, 125–145.
- [5] Andrew D Barbour and Aihua Xia, *Poisson perturbations*, ESAIM: Probability and Statistics **3** (1999), 131–150.
- [6] Louis HY Chen, Larry Goldstein, and Qi-Man Shao, *Normal approximation by stein’s method*, vol. 2, Springer, 2011.
- [7] Xiao Fang, *A universal error bound in the clt for counting monochromatic edges in uniformly colored graphs*, Electronic Communications in Probability **20** (2015), 1–6.
- [8] ———, *Wasserstein-2 bounds in normal approximation under local dependence*, Electronic Journal of Probability **24** (2019), 1–14.
- [9] Marc J Goovaerts and Jan Dhaene, *The compound poisson approximation for a portfolio of dependent risks*, Insurance: Mathematics and Economics **18** (1996), no. 1, 81–85.
- [10] Tianle Liu and Morgane Austern, *Wasserstein-p bounds in the central limit theorem under weak dependence*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09377 (2022).
- [11] Adrian Röllin, *Symmetric and centered binomial approximation of sums of locally dependent random variables*, Electronic Journal of Probability **13** (2008), 756–776.
- [12] ———, *Kolmogorov bounds for the normal approximation of the number of triangles in the erdős–rényi random graph*, Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences **36** (2022), no. 3, 747–773.
- [13] Adrian Röllin and Nathan Ross, *Local limit theorems via landau–kolmogorov inequalities*, Bernoulli **21** (2015), no. 2, 851–880.
- [14] Nathan Ross, *Fundamentals of stein’s method*, Probability Surveys **8** (2011), 210–293.
- [15] Qi-Man Shao and Zhuo-Song Zhang, *Berry–esseen bounds of normal and nonnormal approximation for unbounded exchangeable pairs*, The Annals of Probability **47** (2019), no. 1, 61–108.
- [16] Richard L Smith, *Extreme value theory for dependent sequences via the stein-chen method of poisson approximation*, Stochastic processes and their applications **30** (1988), no. 2, 317–327.

- [17] Zhonggen Su and Xiaolin Wang, *Approximation of sums of locally dependent random variables via perturbation of stein operator*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09770 (2022).
- [18] Neelesh S Upadhye, Vydas Čekanavičius, and P Vellaisamy, *On stein operators for discrete approximations*, Bernoulli **23** (2017), no. 4A, 2828–2859.
- [19] Howard Wainer and David Thissen, *How is reliability related to the quality of test scores? what is the effect of local dependence on reliability?*, Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice **15** (1996), no. 1, 22–29.

A Proof of (3.24)

Call an edge *undetermined* if its vertices are colored independently and uniformly with c_n colors. Let A denote the event that each of the l *undetermined* edges has two vertices of different colors. Now we give a lemma which plays a crucial role in estimating the probability $\mathbb{P}(A)$.

Lemma A.1. $1 - \frac{l}{c_n} \leq \mathbb{P}(A) < 1$.

Proof. The upper bound is trivial. Turn to the lower bound. Assume that l edges contain m vertices $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Denote by $r_{j,k,\dots,l}^i$ the total number of edges between $\{i\}$ and $\{j, k, \dots, l\}$, and by $R_{j,k,\dots,l}^i$ the indicator that the two vertices of each edge between $\{i\}$ and $\{j, k, \dots, l\}$ have different colors. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A) &= \mathbb{P}(R_2^1 R_{1,2}^3 \cdots R_{1,2,\dots,m-1}^m = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(R_2^1 = 1) \mathbb{P}(R_{1,2}^3 = 1 \mid R_2^1 = 1) \cdots \mathbb{P}(R_{1,2,\dots,m-1}^m = 1 \mid R_{1,2,\dots,m-2}^{m-1} = 1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Easily note for each $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{1,2,\dots,i-1}^i = 1 \mid R_{1,2,\dots,i-2}^{i-1} = 1) \geq (1 - \frac{r_{j,k,\dots,i}^i}{c_n}), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and

$$\sum_{i=2}^m r_{j,k,\dots,i}^i = l. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

substituting (A.2) and (A.3) into (A.1), we get

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \geq (1 - \frac{r_2^1}{c_n}) (1 - \frac{r_{1,2}^3}{c_n}) \cdots (1 - \frac{r_{1,2,\dots,m-1}^m}{c_n}) \geq 1 - \frac{l}{c_n}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The proof is complete. \square

Set $m = \#\{l \in A_{ijk}, X_l = 1\}$, and use W_x to denote a random variable distributed as $\mathcal{L}(W \mid X_{A_{ijk}} = x)$. It is not difficult to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_2(W \mid X_{A_{ijk}} = x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} |\mathbb{P}(W_x = m+k) - 2\mathbb{P}(W_x = m+k-1) + \mathbb{P}(W_x = m+k-2)| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} |\mathbb{P}(W = k) - 2\mathbb{P}(W = k-1) + \mathbb{P}(W = k-2)| \\ &\quad + 4 \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} |\mathbb{P}(W_x = m+k) - \mathbb{P}(W = k)| \\ &= \mathcal{S}_2(W) + 4 \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} |\mathbb{P}(W_x = m+k) - \mathbb{P}(W = k)|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It remains to estimate the upper bound for the second term in the RHS of (A.5). To do this, we introduce some additional notations. Divide the index set J into two disjoint subsets, denoted by J_1 and J_2 , where J_1 consists of

$l \in J$ such that edge e_l has no common vertex with the edges from $\{e_l, l \in A_{ijk}\}$. Define $W_1 = \sum_{i \in J_1} X_i$, $W_2 = \sum_{i \in J_2} X_i$. Obviously, $W = W_1 + W_2$. For simplicity of writing, set

$$\begin{aligned} W_{2,l} &\stackrel{d}{=} W_2 \mid W_1 = l, & W_x &\stackrel{d}{=} W \mid X_{A_{ijk}} = x, \\ W_{x,1} &\stackrel{d}{=} W_1 \mid X_{A_{ijk}} = x, & W_{x,2,l} &\stackrel{d}{=} W_2 \mid X_{A_{ijk}} = x, W_1 = l \end{aligned}$$

We can easily derive that for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(W = k) = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k-i) \mathbb{P}(W_{2,k-i} = i)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(W_x = k+m) = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{P}(W_{x,1} = k-i) \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k-i} = m+i).$$

Note that W_1 is independent of $X_{A_{ijk}}$, so $W_{x,1} \stackrel{d}{=} W_1$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}(W = k) - \mathbb{P}(W = k+m \mid x_{A_{ijk}}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k-i) [\mathbb{P}(W_{2,k-i} = i) - \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k-i} = m+i)]. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Lemma A.2. *We have*

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{2,k} = 0) \geq 1 - \frac{C d_{(n)}^2}{c_n}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k} = m) \geq 1 - \frac{C d_{(n)}^2}{c_n}.$$

Proof. Introduce the following subsets

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \text{the vertex set of all edges in } \{e_l, l \in J_1\}; \\ V_2 &= \text{the vertex set of all edges in } \{e_l, l \in J_2\}; \\ V_3 &= \text{the vertex set of all edges in } \{e_l, l \in J \setminus A_{ijk}\}; \\ U_1 &= \{e : e = \{v_s, v_t\}, v_s \in V_1, v_t \in V_2\}, \\ U_2 &= \{e : e = \{v_s, v_t\}, v_s \in V_2, v_t \in V_2\}, \\ V &= \{v \in \mathcal{V}, \text{ the color of } v \text{ is different from that of its neighborhoods}\}, \\ U &= \{u \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ the two vertices of } u \text{ have different colors}\} \\ V_{1,3} &= V_1 \cap V_3, \quad U^{1,2} = U_1 \cup U_2. \end{aligned}$$

Some calculus easily gives

$$\#V_1 = O(d_{(n)}^3), \quad \#V_2 = O(d_{(n)}^2), \quad \#V_{1,3} = O(d_{(n)})$$

and

$$\#U_2 = O(d_{(n)}^2), \quad \#U_2 = O(d_{(n)}^2), \quad \#U^{1,2} = O(d_{(n)}^2).$$

Applying Lemma A.1 to the event $\{X_l = 0, l \in U_2\}$ yields

$$1 - \frac{\#U_2}{c_n} \leq \mathbb{P}(X_l = 0, l \in U_2) < 1. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Also, we note

$$\{v \in V \text{ for all } v \in V_{1,3}; X_l = 0, l \in U_2\} = \{\{v_s, v_t\} \in U \text{ for all } s \in V_{1,3}, t \in V_1; X_l = 0, l \in U_2\}$$

and

$$\{\{v_s, v_t\} \in U \text{ for all } s \in V_{1,3}, t \in V_1\} \supset \{v \in V \text{ for all } v \in V_{1,3}\}.$$

For $\{v_s, v_t\}, s \in V_{1,3}, t \in V_1$, it is independent of the edges in U_2 . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(v \in V \text{ for all } v \in V_{1,3} | X_l = 0, l \in U_2) &= \mathbb{P}(\{v_s, v_t\} \in U \text{ for all } s \in V_{1,3}, t \in V_1 | X_l = 0, l \in U_2) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\{v_s, v_t\} \in U \text{ for all } s \in V_{1,3}, t \in V_1) \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}(v \in V \text{ for all } v \in V_{1,3}) \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{d_{(n)}}{c_n}\right)^{\#V_{1,3}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Also, note the restriction $\{W_1 = k\}$ only affects the color of vertices in $V_{1,3}$. Therefore it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(W_{2,x} = 0) &= \mathbb{P}(X_l = 0, l \in U^{1,2}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_l = 0, l \in U_2; v \in V \text{ for all } v \in V_{1,3}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_l = 0, l \in U_2) \mathbb{P}(v \in V \text{ for all } v \in V_{1,3} | X_l = 0, l \in U_2) \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{\#U_2}{c_n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{d_{(n)}}{c_n}\right)^{\#V_{1,3}}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

Since $\#U_2 = O(d_n^2)$ and $\#V_{1,3} = O(d_n)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{2,x} = 0) \geq 1 - \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n}.$$

By the same token,

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k} = m) \geq 1 - \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n}.$$

□

Proof of (3.24). By Lemma A.2,

$$|\mathbb{P}(W_{2,k} = 0) - \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k} = m)| \leq \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n}. \tag{A.10}$$

Therefore, substituting (A.10) into (A.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{P}(W = k) - \mathbb{P}(W = k + m | X_{A_{ijk}} = x)| \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k) \frac{Cd^2}{c_n} + \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k - i) \left[\mathbb{P}(W_{2,k-i} = i) - \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k-i} = m + i) \right] \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing over k from zero to m_n yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=0}^{m_n} |\mathbb{P}(W = k) - \mathbb{P}(W = k + m | X_{A_{ijk}} = x)| \\
&\leq \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n} + \left| \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k - i) \left[\mathbb{P}(W_{2,k-i} = i) - \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k-i} = m + i) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n} + \left| \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k) \left[\mathbb{P}(W_{2,k} = i) - \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k} = m + i) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n} + \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} \mathbb{P}(W_{2,k} > 0) \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(W_{x,2,k} > m) \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k) \\
&= C \left\{ \frac{d_{(n)}^2}{c_n} + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{m_n} \frac{d_{(n)}^2}{c_n} \mathbb{P}(W_1 = k) \right\} \\
&= \frac{Cd_{(n)}^2}{c_n},
\end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

where in the third inequality we used Lemma A.2 again. Since x is arbitrary, substituting (A.11) into (A.5), we have proved $S(W) \leq \mathcal{S}_2(W) + Cd_{(n)}^2/c_n$. □

B Proof of (3.33)

Fix $X_{A_{ijk}} = x_{A_{ijk}}$. Let \mathcal{G} be all possible graphs with vertex set $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Denote by V_1 the vertices in T_i, T_j and T_k , and $V_2 = V \setminus V_1$. Construct a stationary reversible Markov chain $\{Z_n, n \geq 0\}$ on \mathcal{G} as follows.

Step 1 The initial graph X_0 consists of the following edges. Suppose we are given a pair of vertices $i, j \in V$. If either i or j is from V_1 , then assign an edge e_{ij} as in $G(n, p)$; otherwise, generate a new edge with probability p independently.

Step 2 Given the present graph Z_n , the Z_{n+1} is obtained by choosing two vertices from Z_n uniformly at random except from A_{ijk} and independently resampling the ‘‘edge’’ between them.

It is easy to verify that the Markov chain constructed above is stationary and reversible. Let W_0, W_1, W_2 be the number of triangles in Z_0, Z_1, Z_2 , respectively. Define

$$Q_m(x) = \mathbb{P}[W_1 = W_0 + m \mid Z_0 = x], \quad q_m = \mathbb{E}Q_m(Z_0) = \mathbb{P}(W_1 = W_0 + m),$$

$$Q_{m_1, m_2}(x) = \mathbb{P}[W_1 = W_0 + m_1, W_2 = W_1 + m_2 \mid Z_0 = x].$$

We need the following lemma, which is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.7 of [13].

Lemma B.1. *For any positive integers m, m_1, m_2 , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_2(W_0) \leq & \frac{1}{q_m^2} (2 \operatorname{Var} Q_m(Z_0) + \mathbb{E} |Q_{m,m}(Z_0) - Q_m(Z_0)|^2) \\ & + 2 \operatorname{Var} Q_{-m}(Z_0) + \mathbb{E} |Q_{-m,-m}(Z_0) - Q_{-m}(Z_0)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Next, it is sufficient to compute $\operatorname{Var} Q_m(Z_0)$ and $\mathbb{E} |Q_{m,m}(Z_0) - Q_m(Z_0)|^2$ for $m = 1, -1$.

Lemma B.2. *We have*

$$\operatorname{Var} Q_1(Z_0) = O(p^5); \tag{B.1}$$

$$\operatorname{Var} Q_{-1}(Z_0) = O\left(\frac{p^3}{n}\right). \tag{B.2}$$

Proof. We basically follow the line of the proof in [13]. Denote by $E_{i,j}$ an indicator that there exists an edge between vertices i and j , and set $V_i^{k,j} = E_{i,j}E_{i,k}$. Define

$$Y_i^{j,k} = (1 - E_{j,k}) V_i^{j,k} \prod_{l \neq i, j, k} (1 - V_l^{j,k}), \quad p_{jk} = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } j, k \text{ are both in } V_2, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \text{ or } k \text{ is in } V_1. \end{cases}$$

Then it follows

$$Q_1(Z_0) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{\{j,k\}} p_{jk} \sum_{i \neq j,k} Y_i^{j,k}. \tag{B.3}$$

Let E_1 be the set of all triples $\{r, s, t\}$ with s or t in V_1 , E_2 the set of all triples $\{r, s, t\}$ with only r in V_1 , and E_3 the set of all triples $\{r, s, t\}$ with all in V_2 . After some basic calculations,

$$p_{st} \mathbb{E} Y_r^{s,t} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \{r, s, t\} \in E_1, \\ 0 \text{ or } p(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-7}, & \text{if } \{r, s, t\} \in E_2, \\ 0 \text{ or } p^3(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-8}, & \text{if } \{r, s, t\} \in E_3. \end{cases}$$

For $\operatorname{Var} Q_1(Z_0)$, we need to calculate the covariances $\operatorname{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v})$ since Q_1 is a sum of Y 's. It follows from (B.3),

$$\operatorname{Var} Q_1(Z_0) = \left(\sum_{\substack{\{r,s,t\} \in E_3 \\ \{u,v,w\} \in E_3}} + \sum_{\substack{\{r,s,t\} \in E_2 \\ \{u,v,w\} \in E_2}} + 2 \sum_{\substack{\{r,s,t\} \in E_2 \\ \{u,v,w\} \in E_3}} \right) p_{s,t} p_{u,v} \operatorname{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}).$$

We shall below deal with each sum separately.

Case 1: $\{r, s, t\}$ and $\{u, v, w\}$ are all in E_3 .

It follows directly from Lemma 4.12 of [13],

$$\sum_{\substack{\{r,s,t\} \in E_3 \\ \{u,v,w\} \in E_3}} p_{st} p_{uv} \operatorname{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) = O(n^4 p^5).$$

Case 2: $\{r, s, t\}$ and $\{u, v, w\}$ are all in E_2 .

If $\{r, s, t\} = \{u, v, w\}$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^2(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-7} \left(1 - (1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-7}\right),$$

which contribute $O(n^2)$ equal covariance terms;

If $r = w$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^2(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-18} (4p^3 - 7p^4 + 4p^6 - p^8),$$

which contribute $O(n^4)$ equal covariance terms.

If $\{r, s, t\}, \{u, v, w\}$ only have one common point and $\#\{s, t\} \cap \{u, v\} = 1$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^2(1-p)^2 \left((1-p)^{n-8} (1+p-p^2)^{n-9} - (1-p^2)^{2n-14}\right),$$

which contribute $O(n^3)$ equal covariance terms.

If $r = w$ and $\#\{r, s, t\} \cap \{w, u, v\} = 2$,

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^2(1-p)^2((1-2p^2+p^3)^{n-8} - (1-p^2)^{2n-14}),$$

which contribute $O(n^3)$ equal covariance terms.

If $r \neq w$ and $\{s, t\} = \{u, v\}$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) = 0.$$

In other cases,

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) = 0.$$

Case 3: $\{r, s, t\}$ is in E_2 and $\{u, v, w\}$ is in E_3 .

If $\#\{r, s, t\} \cap \{u, v, w\} = 0$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^4(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-19} (4p^3 - 7p^4 + 4p^6 - p^8),$$

which contribute $O(n^5)$ equal covariance terms.

If $s = w$ or $t = w$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^4(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-18} (-2p + 4p^2 - 3p^4 + p^6),$$

which contribute $O(n^4)$ equal covariance terms.

If $\{r, s, t\}, \{u, v, w\}$ only have one common point and $\#\{s, t\} \cap \{u, v\} = 1$,

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) \leq p^4(1-p)^2 \left((1-p)^{n-8} (1+p-p^2)^{n-10} - (1-p^2)^{2n-m_2-15}\right),$$

which contribute $O(n^4)$ equal covariance terms.

If $r \neq w$ and $\{s, t\} = \{u, v\}$, then

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) = 0.$$

In other cases,

$$p_{st}p_{uv} \text{Cov}(Y_r^{s,t}, Y_w^{u,v}) = 0.$$

Combining **Cases 1-3**, we prove **(B.1)**.

A similar argument can establish **(B.2)** since $Q_{-1}(Z_0)$ can be written as

$$Q_{-1}(Z_0) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{\{j,k\}} \sum_{i \neq j,k} (1-p_{jk}) E_{j,k} V_i^{j,k} \prod_{l \neq i,j,k} (1 - V_l^{j,k}).$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma B.3. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} |Q_{1,1}(Z_0) - Q_1(Z_0)^2| &\leq \frac{2p^4(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-8}}{n-1}; \\ \mathbb{E} |Q_{-1,-1}(Z_0) - Q_{-1}(Z_0)^2| &\leq \frac{2p^3(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{n-8}}{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It easily follows

$$Q_{1,1}(Z_0) = \sum_{\{s,t\}} \frac{p_{st}}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{r \neq s,t} Y_r^{s,t} \sum_{\{u,v\} \neq \{s,t\}} \frac{p_{uv}}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{w \neq u,v} Y_w^{u,v}.$$

For fixed $\{j, k\}$, since at most one $i \in V$ such that $\{Y_i^{jk}\}$ is possibly non-zero, then

$$\mathbb{E} |Q_{1,1}(Z_0) - Q_1(Z_0)^2| = \mathbb{E} \sum_{\{s,t\}} \frac{p_{st}^2}{\binom{n}{2}^2} \sum_{r \neq s,t} Y_r^{s,t} \leq \frac{p}{\binom{n}{2}} q_1, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

By the same token, we get

$$\mathbb{E} |Q_{-1,-1}(Z_0) - Q_{-1}(Z_0)^2| \leq \frac{1-p}{\binom{n}{2}} q_1. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Simple algebra yields

$$q_1 = \mathbb{E} Q_1(Z_0) \leq (n-2)p^3(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-8}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Substituting (B.6) into (B.4) and (B.5), Lemma B.3 holds true. \square