


Community Detection on Block Models with Geometric Kernels

Konstantin Avrachenkov^{*} B. R. Vinay Kumar^{†} Lasse Leskelä^{‡}

March 6, 2024

Abstract

We consider the community recovery problem on a one-dimensional random geometric graph where every node has two independent labels: an observed location label and a hidden community label. A geometric kernel maps the locations of pairs of nodes to probabilities. Edges are drawn between pairs of nodes based on their communities and the value of the kernel corresponding to the respective node locations. Given the graph so generated along with the location labels, the latent communities of the nodes are to be inferred. In this work, we will look into the fundamental statistical limits for recovering the communities in such models. Additionally, we propose a linear-time algorithm (in the number of edges) and show that it recovers the communities of nodes exactly up to the information theoretic threshold.

1 Introduction

Community detection is an important unsupervised machine learning task with numerous applications in diverse fields. The goal is to recover clusters of nodes by observing the interactions between them. Stochastic block models (SBM) are popular generative models to introduce community-based interactions. They have been investigated in both theoretical and practical domains of community detection [1, 11]. They can be viewed as counterparts of Erdős–Rényi random graphs with additional community structure.

In many real-world networks such as social and biological networks, the graph structure is correlated with auxiliary node covariates, e.g. geographic locations. The property of transitivity wherein ‘friends of friends are friends’ prevalent in social networks is not observed in SBMs. Similarly, in co-authorship networks, authors of research articles tend to collaborate more with researchers in the same region. The geometric dependence is typically evidenced by the sparsity of long-distance edges and the abundance of triangles and short-distance edges. Likewise, several methods in image analysis [13] or DNA haplotype reconstruction [21] are known to yield better results when mapped into a geometric space. The dependence on geometry is often subtle or hidden in these applications.

Random geometric graphs (RGGs) are a popular model class for spatial data. In these graphs, N nodes are uniformly distributed in a bounded region and edges are placed between two points if they are within a prescribed distance r of each other. Based on the average degree of a (typical) node, RGGs are said to operate in different regimes. In the *sparse* regime, the average degree is a constant and there are numerous components. In the *logarithmic* regime, the average degree grows logarithmic in the size of the network and the graph is connected with high probability. Lastly, in the *dense* regime, the average degree grows linearly in the network size. Recent works [2, 12, 5] introduce communities into RGGs and investigate the problem of community detection in the different regimes.

*INRIA, Sophia Antipolis, 2004 Rte des Lucioles, 06902 Valbonne, France

†Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands

‡Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University, Otakaari 1, 02150 Espoo, Finland

The geometric block model (GBM) analyzed by Galhotra, Mazumdar, Pal, and Saha [12] distributes nodes uniformly at random in a Euclidean unit sphere and connects two nodes of the same (resp. different) community when they are within a distance of r_{in} (resp. r_{out}) from each other. Here $r_{\text{in}} > r_{\text{out}}$ are chosen so that the RGG operates in the logarithmic regime.

The authors characterize a parameter region where community recovery is impossible. In another region, they provide a triangle-counting algorithm that recovers the communities exactly. However, there is a gap between the two regions where it is not known whether community recovery is possible. In [8], the authors Chien, Tulino, and Llorca study the clustering problem on the same model in an active learning setting. It is to be noted here that, in these works, the community recovery algorithm observes only the graph and not the locations of nodes.

Motivated by applications in DNA haplotype assembly [21], Abbe, Baccelli, and Sankararaman in [2] propose the Euclidean random graph (ERG) model. Consider a Poisson point process within a box $\mathcal{S}_{n,d} = \left[-\frac{n^{1/d}}{2}, \frac{n^{1/d}}{2}\right]^d$ and communities assigned independently among $\{-1, +1\}$ with equal probability to all nodes. A graph is generated by connecting nodes that are within a prescribed distance r and with probability either p or q based on whether they are from the same community or from different communities respectively. Here $p > q$. The authors of [2] provided necessary conditions on the parameters for recovering the communities given the graph and the node locations. Additionally, they provide an algorithm, called the Good-Bad grid algorithm, to recover the communities both in the sparse and the logarithmic regime. However, in the logarithmic regime, the conditions were not tight and the authors conjectured that one could bridge the gap to recover the communities for all possible parameter values. They also suggested an additional refinement step for their algorithm that could remove the gap. In a recent paper [14] by Gaudio, Niu, and Wei, the conjecture is resolved in the positive using a novel two-step algorithm. The first step discretizes the space and recovers communities in a small region which is then propagated throughout the space $\mathcal{S}_{n,d}$ to obtain an initial estimate of the node communities. The second step refines this estimate to recover the true communities exactly. The authors in [14] show that with a clever choice of discretization, the gap between the necessary and sufficient conditions in [2] can indeed be closed. Additionally, their algorithm generalizes to parameter values p, q not necessarily satisfying $p > q$.

In this work, we build on this latter body of literature. More specifically, while the ERG model class is able to capture applications with a hard spatial threshold, several practical applications involve interactions between points that vary as a function of the distance between them. For example, in a co-authorship network, researchers in the same university could interact more while those in the same city could interact less (but not negligibly less). Such interactions can be captured using soft random geometric graphs, initially proposed by Penrose in [20] wherein a connection function governs the probability of connecting two points given their locations. We introduce community interactions on soft RGGs via the *geometric kernel block model* (GKBM). Instead of possible edges between nodes that are within a distance of r from each other as in the ERG model, we introduce a connection function, referred to as a geometric kernel, that outputs a probability of connection between two nodes given their locations. The graph is generated by accounting for this probability along with the node communities, which for two communities is parametrized by p and q . Our interest is in the logarithmic regime. We refer the reader to [20, 22] for conditions of connectivity of the soft RGG in this regime.

Similar models for community detection on geometric graphs generated via a kernel have been investigated in the sparse regime by Eldan, Mikulincer, and Pieters in [10]. However, the authors think of the locations as the communities and provide a spectral algorithm to recover an embedding given the inhomogeneous Erdős-Rényi random graph generated using a rotational invariant kernel. Yet another closely related work is [5] wherein Avrachenkov, Bobu, and Dreveton propose the soft geometric block model where there are two spatial kernels; one for nodes within a community and the other for nodes across communities. The authors use techniques from Fourier analysis to show that higher order eigenvectors recover the communities even when the locations are unknown. However, the analysis there is limited to the dense regime of the RGG.

The main contributions of the present paper are:

- Information-theoretic conditions on the GKBM model parameters that guarantee the possibility of exact recovery (existence of a strongly consistent estimator) of node communities for a large class of geometric kernels.
- A general analytical framework to obtain tight impossibility results for exact recovery on graphs generated from spatial kernels.
- A linear-time algorithm that achieves exact recovery under mild assumptions on the kernel.

We restrict ourselves to the case of one-dimensional RGGs in this work, but we believe that most of the techniques carry over to higher dimensions as well. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the GKBM model, and Section 3 states the exact recovery problem and discusses in detail the related literature. The main results are presented in Section 4, and the linear-time algorithm is described in Section 5. The proofs of the impossibility and achievability results are provided in Section 6 and Section 7, respectively, with some auxiliary results provided in the appendix. Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Model description

We study a network model in which nodes are partitioned into two communities and are assigned locations within a one-dimensional torus represented by the points of $\mathcal{S} = (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ equipped with metric

$$d(x, y) := \min\{|x - y|, 1 - |x - y|\}.$$

To model a large sparse network, we fix a number $\lambda > 0$ and study a sequence of models indexed by the positive integers. For each integer $n \geq 1$, we sample the number of nodes N from a Poisson distribution with mean λn , and index the nodes by $[N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Nodes are assigned community labels $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)} = (\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(N))$ independently and uniformly in $\{-1, +1\}$, and location labels $\mathbf{X}^{(n)} = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ independently and uniformly in \mathcal{S} . Given the community labels and locations, we sample an adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(n)} = (A_{uv})_{u, v \in [N]}$ of an undirected graph in which each undirected node pair (u, v) is linked as follows:

$$A_{uv} | \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)} \sim \begin{cases} \text{Ber}(p\psi_n(X_u, X_v)) & \text{if } \sigma(u) = \sigma(v), \\ \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(X_u, X_v)) & \text{if } \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(v), \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

independently, where $\text{Ber}(r)$ denotes the Bernoulli distribution with parameter r , and

$$\psi_n(x, y) = \phi\left(\frac{n}{\log n}d(x, y)\right)$$

with $\phi: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ being a measurable function describing the geometric dependence of link probabilities. The normalising factor on the right is chosen so that the average degree of a node is $\Theta(\log n)$, which is the critical connectivity regime for soft random geometric graphs [20, 22].

We denote by $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{(n)}$ the joint law of $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{A}^{(n)})$, and say that this random triple is generated by the *geometric kernel block model* GKBM($\lambda n, p, q, \phi$). The undirected graph with adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(n)}$ is denoted by G_n .

In the special case where the number of nodes is deterministic $N = n$ and $\psi_n(x, y) = \rho_n$, this model reduces to the standard stochastic block model (SBM) with intra- and inter-community link probabilities $p\rho_n$ and $q\rho_n$ and average degree $\Theta(n\rho_n)$. Both the bounded-degree regime with $\rho_n = \frac{1}{n}$ (e.g. [9, 17]), and the logarithmic-degree regime with $\rho_n = \frac{\log n}{n}$ (e.g. [3, 18]) have received considerable attention in the past. For the interested reader, paper [1] provides a comprehensive survey of results in this direction.

3 Problem statement and relation to previous works

We study the unsupervised machine learning task of recovering the community labels $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}$ given the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(n)}$ and the location labels $\mathbf{X}^{(n)}$. An estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(n)} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{A}^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)})$ is said to recover the community structure *exactly* if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{(n)} \in \{\pm \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}\}) = 1, \quad (3.1)$$

and *almost exactly* if for any $\eta > 0$, there exists an n_0 large enough such that for all $n \geq n_0$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} |\{v: \tilde{\sigma}(v) = s\sigma(v)\}| \geq (1 - \eta)n\right) = 1 - o(1). \quad (3.2)$$

In this study we focus on the exact recovery task, aiming to characterise for which combinations of model parameters (λ, p, q, ϕ) exact recovery is possible in large networks with $n \gg 1$ nodes, and to identify fast algorithms capable of performing this task.

For the stochastic block model, the problem of community recovery has been investigated by Mossel, Neeman, and Sly [17] in the sparse regime where the authors prove the conditions for impossibility of community recovery almost exactly, and in [19] they provide an algorithm to recover when possible. Massoulié in [16] provides a spectral algorithm in the same regime. In the logarithmic regime, the problem of recovering communities exactly have been addressed by Abbe, Bandeira, and Hall in [3]. For models involving geometric interactions, Abbe, Baccelli, and Sankararaman [2] investigate almost exact recovery in the sparse regime and exact recovery in the logarithmic regime. In their model, the geometric kernel is $\phi(x) = \mathbb{1}\{x \in [0, 1]\}$, so that the underlying graph is generated by connecting all nodes that are within a distance of $\frac{\log n}{n}$. In the logarithmic regime, they obtain an information quantity

$$I'(\lambda, p, q) = 2\lambda \left[1 - \sqrt{pq} - \sqrt{(1-p)(1-q)}\right], \quad (3.3)$$

that governs community recovery. Specifically, they show that if $I'(\lambda, p, q) < 1$, no algorithm can recover the communities exactly and produce an algorithm that can recover the communities when $I'(\lambda, p, q) > C > 1$. They conjecture that the condition could be tightened to $I'(\lambda, p, q) > 1$ using a variation of their algorithm. Recently, this conjecture was resolved in the positive by Gaudio, Niu, and Wei in [14] where they provided a two-phase algorithm that achieves exact recovery. The first phase involves triangle and neighbour counting techniques to obtain an almost exact estimate of the communities. The second phase refines this estimate to obtain exact recovery. However, their results are limited to hard threshold geometric models where a vertex connects to all other vertices within a prescribed distance. In particular, it does not capture the scenario where the propensity of forming an edge between nodes dwindles with the distance between them; a property observed on several practical networks.

In the present paper, we generalize the model of [2, 14] to incorporate a wide range of geometric kernels. We first show an impossibility result by obtaining an information-theoretic threshold below which no algorithm can recover the communities exactly. On the algorithmic side, we also provide a two-phase algorithm that can recover the communities exactly upto the information theoretic threshold. Our work builds on the algorithm in [14] and adapts it to general geometric kernels. For general geometric kernels, techniques such as neighbour counting do not suffice since they cannot capture the dependence with the distance. Our algorithm initially recovers the communities exactly within a small block and propagates it using a function of the recovered communities with distance dependent weights. In addition, we also show matching lower bounds governed by information quantities akin to (3.3). Our results are summarized in the next section.

4 Main results

To state our main results, we define an information metric

$$I_\phi(p, q) := 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - \sqrt{pq}\phi(x) - \sqrt{(1-p\phi(x))(1-q\phi(x))} \right) dx \quad (4.1)$$

and a normalised interaction range

$$\kappa := \sup\{x: \phi(x) \neq 0\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Note that $\kappa \frac{\log n}{n}$ is the maximum distance between two nodes for which an edge is possible. The following theorem characterizes the impossibility of exact recovery in the GKBM model.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $p, q \in [0, 1]$, and let $0 < \kappa < \infty$. If $\lambda\kappa < 1$ or $\lambda I_\phi(p, q) < 1$, then no estimator recovers the community structure exactly for the GKBM($\lambda n, p, q, \phi$) model.*

On the other hand, as long as the parameters of the model do not lie in the regime described in Theorem 4.1, we believe that exact-recovery is possible. In the present paper, we show this for kernels that are bounded away from 0 within the support. We then have the following theorem for recovery.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $0 < q < p < 1$, $0 < \kappa < \infty$, and assume that $\phi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \kappa]$. If $\lambda\kappa > 1$ and $\lambda I_\phi(p, q) > 1$, then there exists a linear-time algorithm (in the number of edges) that recovers the community structure exactly for the GKBM($\lambda n, p, q, \phi$) model.*

Indeed, in Section 5 we provide a two-phase algorithm and analyze its run time. Section 6 provides the proof of Theorem 4.1 and Section 7 discusses the accuracy of our algorithm, proving Theorem 4.2.

5 Algorithm

In this section, we provide an algorithm that achieves exact recovery. To begin, the one-dimensional space \mathcal{S} is divided into blocks of size $\kappa \frac{\log n}{n}$ where κ is defined as in (4.2). These blocks¹ are denoted by B_i for $i = 1, \dots, \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$. Our algorithm consists of two phases. Phase I outputs an estimate that achieves almost exact recovery and Phase II refines this estimate to achieve exact recovery.

5.1 Phase I: Almost exact recovery

Phase I of the algorithm begins by first recovering the communities of nodes within a local region B_1 . Define the average number of common neighbours within a set B that nodes located at $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ share when they are of the same and different community respectively as

$$M_{\text{in}}^B(x, y) = \lambda \int_B \left(\frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} \right) \psi_n(x, z) \psi_n(y, z) dz \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\text{out}}^B(x, y) = \lambda \int_B pq \psi_n(x, z) \psi_n(y, z) dz.$$

Define $I(x, y, B) := \int_B \psi_n(x, z) \psi_n(y, z) dz$, the expected number of nodes within B with a possibility of edges to nodes located at x and y . Then, the quantities above can be expressed as $M_{\text{in}}^B(x, y) = \lambda \left(\frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} \right) I(x, y, B)$ and $M_{\text{out}}^B(x, y) = \lambda pq I(x, y, B)$.

To recover the communities of nodes within an initial block $B_1 = \left[0, \kappa \frac{\log n}{n}\right]$, Algorithm 1a picks two vertices within B_1 and counts the number of neighbours they share. This is compared against a threshold to ascertain whether they are in the same community or not. For the GKBM model, Algorithm 1a when used on block B_1 with the threshold chosen as described in Lines 4-7 of Algorithm 1, solves exact-recovery for the communities of nodes within B_1 . The probability of success of Algorithm 1a is evaluated in Lemma 5.1 below.

¹The last block with $i = \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$ might be of a smaller size. This will not affect our analysis and we work with the notation $\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$ to mean $\lceil \frac{n}{\kappa \log n} \rceil$.

Algorithm 1a Initial block recovery

Input: Graph $G = (V = [N], E)$, initial block $B_1 \subset \mathcal{S}$, locations $\{X_i \in B_1 : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, and a set of constants $\mathcal{M}^{B_1} := \{M^{B_1}(X_u, X_v) : \text{for } X_u, X_v \in B_1\}$

Output: $\hat{\sigma}(u), u \in V_1 := \{u \in V : X_u \in B_1\}$

- 1: Choose an arbitrary vertex $u_0 \in V_1$
 - 2: Assign $\hat{\sigma}(u_0) \leftarrow +1$
 - 3: **for** $u \in V_1$ **do**
 - 4: $N_{u_0, u} \leftarrow |\{v \in V_1 : (u_0, v) \in E \text{ and } (u, v) \in E\}|$
 - 5: **if** $N_{u_0, u} > M^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})$ **then**
 - 6: $\hat{\sigma}(u) \leftarrow +1$
 - 7: **else**
 - 8: $\hat{\sigma}(u) \leftarrow -1$
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **end for**
-

Algorithm 1b Propagate

Input: Graph $G = (V = [N], E)$ where $E = \{(u, v) : A_{uv} = 1\}$, locations $\{X_i \in \mathcal{S} : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, subsets $S_1, S_2 \subset \mathcal{S}$, community estimates $\{\hat{\sigma}(u) : X_u \in S_1\}$, parameters p, q and kernel $\psi_n(\cdot)$.

Output: $\{\hat{\sigma}(u) : X_u \in S_2\}$

- 1: $U_i := \{u \in V | X_u \in S_i\}$ for $i = 1, 2$.
 - 2: **for** $u \in U_2$ **do**
 - 3: $f(u, \hat{\sigma}(U_1)) = \sum_{v \in U_1} \hat{\sigma}(v) \left[A_{uv} \log \frac{p(1-q\psi_n(X_u, X_v))}{q(1-p\psi_n(X_u, X_v))} + \log \frac{(1-p\psi_n(X_u, X_v))}{(1-q\psi_n(X_u, X_v))} \right]$
 - 4: **if** $f(u, \hat{\sigma}(U_1)) > 0$ **then**
 - 5: $\hat{\sigma}(u) \leftarrow +1$
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: $\hat{\sigma}(u) \leftarrow -1$
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **end for**
-

Lemma 5.1. *Let $G_n \sim GKBM(\lambda n, p, q, \phi)$ with $p > q$. For any $\Delta > 0$, Algorithm 1a with inputs $G = G_n$, $B_1 = \left[0, \kappa \frac{\log n}{n}\right]$ and $M = M^B(x, y)$ recovers the communities of nodes in the initial block B_1 with high probability, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{u \in V_1} \{\hat{\sigma}(u) = \sigma(u)\} \mid |V_1| \leq \Delta \log n \right) \geq 1 - \Delta n^{-c_1} \log n.$$

The community labels recovered within the initial block B_1 are then propagated to an adjacent block. Algorithm 1b outlines the procedure to deduce the communities in a block S_2 from the community estimates in another block S_1 . The idea is to assume that the communities recovered in S_1 indeed correspond to the ground-truth, and subsequently deduce the communities of nodes in S_2 based on the knowledge of the edges and non-edges between S_1 and S_2 , and the locations of nodes within these two subsets. Algorithm 1b when employed by taking S_1 and S_2 to be adjacent blocks, recovers the communities of nodes in the next block with at most a constant number of mistakes. To state this formally, let us define \mathcal{A}_i to be the event that the propagation step makes at most $M \equiv M(p, q, \phi)$ errors in block B_i , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \{|\{u \in V_i : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| \leq M\}.$$

Then Algorithm 1b recovers the communities in block B_{i+1} by making at most M mistakes with high probability as stated in the Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $(\sigma^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{A}^{(n)}) \sim GKBM(\lambda n, p, q, \phi)$ with $p > q$. Algorithm 1b when run on graph $G = G_n$ with inputs being the locations $\{X_i \in \mathbf{S} : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, subsets $S_1 = B_i, S_2 = B_{i+1}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$, community estimates $\{\hat{\sigma}(u) : X_u \in B_i\}$ recovers the communities of nodes in block B_{i+1} with at most a constant number of errors, i.e., there exists an $M \equiv M(p, q, \phi) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{A}_{i+1} \mid \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \mathcal{A}_i, |V_{i+1}| \leq \Delta \log n, |V_i| \geq \delta \log n \right) \geq 1 - o(1).$$

Algorithm 1b can be used recursively to propagate the community labels across adjacent blocks within \mathbf{S} as outlined in Lines 10–12 of Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Almost exact recovery

Input: Graph $G = (V = [N], E)$, locations $\mathbf{X} = \{X_i \in \mathbf{S} : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, parameters p, q, λ , and kernel ψ_n

Output: $\hat{\sigma}(u), u \in \mathbf{S}$

- 1: Divide \mathbf{S} into blocks of size $\kappa \frac{\log n}{n}$.
 - 2: $B_1 \leftarrow \left[0, \kappa \frac{\log n}{n}\right], V_1 \leftarrow \{u \in V \mid X_u \in B_1\}$
 - 3: **for** $u, v \in V_1$ **do**
 - 4: $M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_v) = \lambda \int_{B_1} \left(\frac{p^2 + q^2}{2}\right) \psi_n(X_u, z) \psi_n(X_v, z) dz$
 - 5: $M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_v) = \lambda \int_{B_1} pq \psi_n(X_u, z) \psi_n(X_v, z) dz dz.$
 - 6: $M^{B_1}(X_u, X_v) := \frac{M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_v) + M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_v)}{2}$
 - 7: $\mathcal{M}^{B_1} \leftarrow \mathcal{M}^{B_1} \cup \{M^{B_1}(X_u, X_v)\}$
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: $\hat{\sigma}(B_1) \leftarrow \mathbf{Initial\ Block\ Recovery}(G, B_1, \mathbf{X}_{B_1}, p, q, \mathcal{M}^{B_1})$
 - 10: **for** $i = 1, \dots, \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$ **do**
 - 11: $\hat{\sigma}(B_{i+1}) \leftarrow \mathbf{Propagate}(G, \mathbf{X}, B_i, B_{i+1}, p, q, \psi_n)$
 - 12: **end for**
-

Algorithm 1 comprising of the initialization and propagation steps constitutes the first phase of our algorithm and results in an estimate of the node communities $\hat{\sigma}$ that achieves almost exact recovery. This is formalized in Lemma 5.3 below.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $0 < q < p < 1$, $0 < \kappa < \infty$, and assume that $\phi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \kappa]$. If $\lambda\kappa > 1$, then Algorithm 1 outputs an estimate $\hat{\sigma}$ that achieves almost exact recovery, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\{u \in V : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| \leq \frac{\eta n}{3\kappa}\right) = 1 - o(1) \quad \text{for any } \eta > 0.$$

5.2 Phase II: Exact recovery

The community estimates obtained in Phase I are refined using a likelihood-based estimator. For every node u , Algorithm 2 computes the likelihood of it being in either of the communities based on the presence and absence of edges to all nodes in $\mathcal{V}(u) := \{v \in V \mid \psi_n(X_u, X_v) > 0\}$, the *visibility region* of node u . The resulting estimate $\tilde{\sigma}$ is shown to achieve exact recovery thus proving Theorem 4.2.

Algorithm 2 Refine

Input: Graph G , locations \mathbf{X} , (initial) community labeling $\hat{\sigma}$, kernel ψ_n , parameters p, q

Output: $\tilde{\sigma}(u), u \in V$

```

1: for  $u \in V$  do
2:    $\mathcal{V}(u) \leftarrow \{v \in V \mid \psi_n(X_u, X_v) > 0\}$ 
3:    $g(u, \hat{\sigma}) := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}(u)} \hat{\sigma}(v) \left[ A_{uv} \log \frac{p(1-q\psi_n(X_u, X_v))}{q(1-p\psi_n(X_u, X_v))} + \log \frac{1-p\psi_n(X_u, X_v)}{1-q\psi_n(X_u, X_v)} \right]$ 
4:   if  $g(u, \hat{\sigma}) > 0$  then
5:      $\tilde{\sigma}(u) \leftarrow +1$ 
6:   else
7:      $\tilde{\sigma}(u) \leftarrow -1$ 
8:   end if
9: end for

```

5.3 Runtime analysis

In the Initial block recovery step of Phase I, Algorithm 1a goes over all edges of the vertices in V_1 to count the common neighbors, with a runtime of $O(\log^2 n)$. Next, the Propagation step evaluates a sum over (at most) the vertices in the previous block for every vertex in the current block, yielding a runtime of $O(n \log n)$. Similarly, the Refine algorithm runs in $O(n \log n)$ time, since the neighbourhood of every vertex contains $O(\log n)$ vertices. We conclude that our algorithm for exact recovery runs in $O(n \log n)$ time, which is linear in the number of edges.

6 Proof of impossibility

This section provides the details of the proof of Theorem 4.1. Section 6.1 justifies the necessity of the condition $\lambda\kappa > 1$ by alluding to the connectivity of the underlying graph, and Section 6.2 proves the necessity of the condition $\lambda I_\phi(p, q) > 1$, which is the information-theoretic criterion to distinguish the two communities.

6.1 Connectivity of the underlying graph

To establish the condition $\lambda\kappa > 1$, recall that we divided our space \mathcal{S} into blocks B_i for $i = 1, \dots, \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$ of size $\kappa \frac{\log n}{n}$ each. Notice that there are no edges possible between non-adjacent blocks since the support of the kernel is at most $\kappa \frac{\log n}{n}$. Thus, if two non-consecutive blocks are empty, the underlying soft geometric graph contains at least two disjoint components.

Note that any algorithm can recover communities only upto a global flip. When there are multiple components, any algorithm recovers a community assignment for each component. However, one can obtain another valid community assignment by flipping the node communities in one component while retaining the assignments in other components. This is possible since there are no interactions (neighbours or non-neighbours) across components. However, only one of these corresponds to the ground-truth. Thus, it is impossible for any algorithm to unanimously decide the node communities when there are multiple components in the underlying soft random geometric graph. In other words, exact-recovery is not possible.

The probability that a single block is empty is given by the probability that there are no points of the Poisson process of intensity $\lambda n \times \kappa \frac{\log n}{n} = \lambda\kappa \log n$. This probability is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Block } B_i \text{ is empty}) = e^{-\lambda\kappa \log n} = n^{-\lambda\kappa}. \quad (6.1)$$

Let \mathcal{C} be the event that at least two non-adjacent blocks are empty. Let \mathcal{Y}_k be the event of having exactly k empty blocks with at least two empty non-adjacent blocks. Denote the number of blocks by $b = \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$, and let $\gamma = n^{-\lambda\kappa}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) &= \sum_{k=2}^{b-1} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_k) = \sum_{k=2}^{b-1} \left(\binom{b}{k} - b \right) \gamma^k (1-\gamma)^{b-k} \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^b \binom{b}{k} \gamma^k (1-\gamma)^{b-k} - b(1-\gamma)^b \sum_{k=1}^b \gamma^k (1-\gamma)^{-k} \\ &\geq 1 - (1-\gamma)^b - \frac{b\gamma}{1-2\gamma} (1-\gamma)^b \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is obtained by evaluating the binomial and geometric sums. Since $\gamma = n^{-\lambda\kappa} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ for sufficiently large n , we have that $\frac{1}{1-2\gamma} \leq 2$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) &\geq 1 - (1-\gamma)^b (1+2b\gamma) \\ &\geq 1 - e^{-\gamma^b} (1+2b\gamma) \\ &\geq 1 - e^{-\frac{n^{1-\lambda\kappa}}{\kappa \log n}} \left[1 + \frac{2n^{1-\lambda\kappa}}{\kappa \log n} \right] \end{aligned}$$

If $\lambda\kappa < 1$, then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, the underlying soft random geometric graph is disconnected and exact recovery is impossible.

6.2 Information-theoretic criterion for cluster separation

Define the Maximum-A-Posteriori (MAP) estimate of the node communities as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} = \arg \max_{\sigma'} \mathbb{P}(\sigma' \mid \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}),$$

and the component MAP of a typical vertex u as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{u,\text{MAP}} := \arg \max_{\sigma'(u) \in \{-1,+1\}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma'(u) | \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim u}), \quad (6.2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim u} = (\sigma(v) : v \neq u)$ denotes the communities of all nodes except u . The MAP estimate is the best estimate for the unknown ground-truth communities $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. In other words, if there exists an estimate that can recover the ground-truth communities exactly, then the MAP estimate recovers the communities exactly. The following lemma provides a necessary condition for exact recovery using the component MAP estimator.

Lemma 6.1. *If there exists a vertex for which the component MAP estimate does not coincide with the ground-truth community, then the communities cannot be recovered exactly. In other words*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists u : \hat{\sigma}_{u,\text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(u)) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\text{MAP}} \neq \boldsymbol{\sigma}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E} := \{(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) : \exists u \text{ such that } \hat{\sigma}_{u,\text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(u)\}$. Then, from the definition of the component-MAP estimate, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= \{(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) : \exists u \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}(-\sigma(u) | \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim u}, \mathbf{X}) > \mathbb{P}(\sigma(u) | \mathbf{A}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim u}, \mathbf{X})\} \\ &\subseteq \{(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) : \exists \bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} | \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}) > \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\sigma} | \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X})\} \\ &= \{(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) : \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\text{MAP}} \neq \boldsymbol{\sigma}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second step above is obtained by taking $\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = (-\sigma(u), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim u})$. □

A node u is called *Bad* if $\hat{\sigma}_{u,\text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(u)$. The number of Bad nodes will be written as $Z_n = \sum_{u \in [N]} \xi_u$, where $\xi_u := \mathbf{1}\{\text{Node } u \text{ is Bad}\}$. The probability of a node being bad can be computed as

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_u = 1) = \sum_{k \in \{-1,+1\}} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(\xi_u = 1 | \sigma(u) = k). \quad (6.3)$$

The term $\mathbb{P}(\xi_u = 1 | \sigma(u) = k)$ corresponds to the probability of error for assigning node u into community $\ell \neq k$ conditioned on the true community of node u being k . From Lemma 6.1, it is clear that the MAP estimator fails if $Z_n \geq 1$.

Using the second moment method, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n \geq 1) \geq 1 - \frac{\text{Var}(Z_n)}{(\mathbb{E}[Z_n])^2} = 2 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^2]}{(\mathbb{E}[Z_n])^2}. \quad (6.4)$$

Therefore it suffices to show that $\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^2]}{(\mathbb{E}[Z_n])^2}$ is strictly less than 2 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Owing to translation invariance of the underlying space and the probability measure $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$, we have that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_u] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{u'}]$ for all nodes u, u' . Further, using the Campbell-Mecke theorem (see Theorem A.6), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \lambda n \mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1), \quad (6.5)$$

where \mathbb{P}^0 denotes the Palm probability given a point at the origin. The reader is referred to Section A.4 for a brief discussion of Palm theory and other theorems concerning Poisson point processes. In the following discussion, for $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$, we use the notation $\mathbb{E}^{x,y}$ to denote the expectation with respect to the Palm probability given two points at x and y .

Computing the second moment of Z_n , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_n^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_u \xi_u \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{u \neq u'} \mathbf{1}\{u \text{ is Bad}\} \mathbf{1}\{u' \text{ is Bad}\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Z_n] + \lambda^2 n^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}^{x,y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\text{Node at } x \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{x, y\}\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbf{1}\{\text{Node at } y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{x, y\}\} \right] dx dy \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Z_n] + \lambda^2 n^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}^{0,y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\text{Node at } 0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbf{1}\{\text{Node at } y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy. \tag{6.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (6.5) and (6.6), we have that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^2]}{(\mathbb{E}[Z_n])^2} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[Z_n]} + \frac{\lambda^2 n^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}^{0,y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy}{(\lambda n \mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1))^2} \tag{6.7}$$

In the following two lemmas, we will show that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}^{0,y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy}{n (\mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1))^2} \leq 1, \tag{6.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda n \mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1) = \infty. \tag{6.9}$$

Lemma 6.2. *For all $\lambda > 0$, $p, q \in (0, 1)$, and geometric kernels ϕ with a bounded normalised interaction range κ , if $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{A}^{(n)}) \sim \text{GKBM}(\lambda n, p, q, \phi)$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}^0(0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\}) = n^{-\lambda I_\phi(p,q) - o(1)}.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds by considering an approximation of the kernel ϕ via simple functions. Consider a sequence of simple functions $\phi_\ell \rightarrow \phi$ with $\phi_\ell : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined as $\phi_\ell := \sum_{s=0}^{\ell} c_s \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_s}$. Here, the sets $\Gamma_s \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ are disjoint for $s \neq s'$ and $c_s \neq c_{s'}$. On the underlying space, the sets Γ_s are mapped to sets $\mathcal{R}_s := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{S} : \frac{n}{\log n} d(0, x) \in \Gamma_s \right\}$. The Lebesgue measure of the region $\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s)$ can be expressed as $\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s) = 2 \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \frac{\log n}{n}$. Let \mathbb{P}_ℓ denote the joint law of $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{A}^{(n)})$ sampled from $\text{GKBM}(\lambda n, p, q, \phi_\ell)$. Further, let \mathbb{P}_ℓ^0 denote the Palm measure conditioned on the origin being present in G_n^ℓ .

From (6.3), the probability that the node at the origin 0 is Bad under \mathbb{P}_ℓ is given by $\mathbb{P}_\ell^0(\hat{\sigma}_{0, \text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(0)) = \sum_{k \in \{\pm 1\}} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}_\ell(\hat{\sigma}_{0, \text{MAP}} \neq k)$. The component MAP estimate of the node at the origin assigns it to a community, having observed the communities and locations of all other nodes. From the definition of the component MAP estimator in (6.2) we have that

$$\mathbb{P}_\ell(\sigma'_0 | A, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0}) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_\ell(A | \sigma'_0, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0}) \mathbb{P}_\ell(\sigma'_0 | \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0})}{\mathbb{P}_\ell(A | \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0})} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{P}_\ell(A | \sigma'_0, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0})}{\mathbb{P}_\ell(A | \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0})}$$

The component MAP estimate can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_{0, \text{MAP}} &= \arg \max_{k \in \{\pm 1\}} \log \mathbb{P}_\ell(A | k, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sim 0}) \\
&= \arg \max_{k \in \{\pm 1\}} \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \left(P_s^+ \log(p c_s) + P_s^- \log(1 - p c_s) + Q_s^+ \log(q c_s) + Q_s^- \log(1 - q c_s) \right), \tag{6.10}
\end{aligned}$$

where P_s^+, P_s^- (respectively Q_s^+, Q_s^-) are the number of neighbours and non-neighbours of the same (resp., different) community in region \mathcal{R}_s of the origin respectively. From this expression, it can be seen that $(P_s^+, P_s^-, Q_s^+, Q_s^-)$ form sufficient statistics for the component MAP estimate to determine the community of the node at the origin.

Owing to Slivnyak's theorem (see Section A.4), the distribution of the nodes belonging to each community form a thinned Poisson point process of intensity $\frac{\lambda n}{2}$ conditioned on a node being present at the origin. Furthermore, the statistics $(P_s^+, P_s^-, Q_s^+, Q_s^-)$ are distributed as in Table 1. Stacking the neighbours and non-neighbours of each community and for each region, we obtain a vector of length 4ℓ with independent Poisson entries. The independence between $P_s^+(Q_s^+)$ and $P_s^-(Q_s^-)$ is due to the thinning property, and the independence between different regions \mathcal{R}_s is due to the spatial independence property of the Poisson point process. Note that we have used the relation $\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s) = 2 \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \frac{\log n}{n}$ to express the intensities as a factor of $\log n$.

The probability $\mathbb{P}_\ell^0(\hat{\sigma}_{0,\text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(0))$ is the probability of error of a hypothesis test between two vectors with independent Poisson entries. The null hypothesis corresponds to the community of the node at the origin having $\sigma(0) = +1$. Under the alternate hypothesis, the community of the node at the origin gets flipped and therefore the neighbours (and non-neighbours) of the same community under the null hypothesis become the neighbours (and non-neighbours resp.) of the different community under the alternate hypothesis. Consequently, the distribution of the resulting vector is obtained by interchanging the rows in Table 1.

In \mathcal{R}_s	Neighbours	Non-neighbours
Same community	$P_s^+ \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda p c_s \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \log n)$	$P_s^- \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda(1 - p c_s) \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \log n)$
Different community	$Q_s^+ \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda q c_s \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \log n)$	$Q_s^- \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda(1 - q c_s) \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \log n)$

Table 1: Distribution of neighbours and non-neighbours in a region \mathcal{R}_s around the origin.

Testing between two Poisson vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_m) \log n$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_m) \log n$ has been investigated in [4], and the probability of error is given by

$$P_e = n^{-D_+^m(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - o(1)}, \quad (6.11)$$

where D_+ is the Chernoff-Hellinger (CH) divergence defined as

$$D_+^m(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) := \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{i=0}^m (t\alpha_i + (1-t)\beta_i - \alpha_i^t \beta_i^{1-t}). \quad (6.12)$$

In our case, the Poisson vectors under the two hypotheses have the parameters as indicated in Table 2.

Evaluating the CH divergence between the two vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, we obtain

$$D_+^\ell(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \lambda \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \left[2 - p^t q^{1-t} c_s - (1 - p c_s)^t (1 - q c_s)^{1-t} - q^t p^{1-t} c_s - (1 - q c_s)^t (1 - p c_s)^{1-t} \right].$$

Null hypothesis		Alternate hypothesis			
$\alpha_i =$	$\lambda p c_s \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 1$	$\beta_i =$	$\lambda q c_s \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 1$
	$\lambda(1 - p c_s) \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 2$		$\lambda(1 - q c_s) \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 2$
	$\lambda q c_s \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 3$		$\lambda p c_s \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 3$
	$\lambda(1 - q c_s) \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 0$		$\lambda(1 - p c_s) \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)$	if $i \% 4 = 0$

Table 2: Poisson parameters under the null and the alternate hypothesis. Here $s = \lfloor \frac{i}{4} \rfloor + 1$ and $0 \leq i \leq 4\ell - 1$.

Owing to symmetry in the above expression, the supremum for each region is achieved at $t = \frac{1}{2}$. Substituting $t = 1/2$, we obtain

$$D_+^\ell(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{k_1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{k_2}) = 2\lambda \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \left[1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)} \right] \quad (6.13)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \cdot 2 \int_{\Gamma} \left[1 - \sqrt{pq}\phi(x) - \sqrt{(1-p\phi(x))(1-q\phi(x))} \right] dx. \quad (6.14)$$

The limit as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ is taken over increasing uniformly converging sequence of simple approximations of the kernel ϕ . Using Proposition A.1 along with the continuity of probability, we assert that $\mathbb{P}_\ell^{\mathbf{0}}(\xi_0 = 1) \searrow \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{0}}(0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\})$. From (6.11), we now obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{0}}(0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\}) &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\ell^{\mathbf{0}}(0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\}) \\ &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\ell^{\mathbf{0}}(\hat{\sigma}_{0, \text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(0)) \\ &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} n^{-D_+^\ell(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{k_1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{k_2}) - o(1)} \\ &= n^{-\lambda I_\phi(p, q) - o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the statement of the lemma. \square

Lemma 6.3. *For all $\lambda > 0$, $p, q \in (0, 1)$, and geometric kernels ϕ with a bounded normalised interaction range κ , if $\lambda I_\phi(p, q) < 1$, then the graph $G_n \sim \text{GKBM}(\lambda n, p, q, \phi)$ model satisfies condition (6.8).*

Proof. With κ as defined in (4.2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}^{0, y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy \\ &= \int_{y \in B(0, 2(\frac{\kappa \log n}{n}))} \mathbb{E}^{0, y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y \in \mathcal{S} \cap B(0, 2(\frac{\kappa \log n}{n}))^c} \mathbb{E}^{0, y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy \\ &\leq \int_{y \in B(0, 2(\frac{\kappa \log n}{n}))} \mathbb{E}^{0, y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy \\ &\quad + \int_{y \in \mathcal{S} \cap B(0, 2(\frac{\kappa \log n}{n}))^c} \mathbb{E}^{0, y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy \end{aligned}$$

Owing to spatial independence of the Poisson point process and our choice of κ , for two nodes at x and y that are at least a distance of $d(x, y) > 2 \left(\frac{\kappa \log n}{n} \right)$ apart, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{x, y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{x \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{x, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{x, y\}\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\mathbf{1}\{x \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{x\}\} \right] \mathbb{E}^y \left[\mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{y\}\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[\mathbf{1}\{x \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{x\}\} \right]^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to translation invariance on the torus. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\int_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}^{0,y} \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \mathbf{1}\{y \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0, y\}\} \right] dy}{(\mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1))^2} \\
& \leq \frac{\left(\frac{4\kappa \log n}{n} \right) \mathbb{E}^0 \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\}\} \right] + \left(1 - \frac{4\kappa \log n}{n} \right) \mathbb{E}^0 \left[\mathbf{1}\{0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\}\} \right]^2}{(\mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1))^2} \\
& = \left(\frac{4\kappa \log n}{n} \right) \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}^0(\xi_0 = 1)} + \left(1 - \frac{4\kappa \log n}{n} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 6.2, we have that for $I_\phi(p, q) < 1$, there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$n\mathbb{P}^0(0 \text{ is Bad in } G_n \cup \{0\}) = n^{1-I_\phi(p,q)} = n^\gamma \rightarrow \infty \quad (6.15)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This gives the desired result in the statement of the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It was already shown in Section 6.1 that if $\lambda\kappa < 1$, then exact-recovery is not possible. For the information criterion, note that the statements of Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3 imply (6.8) and (6.9). Thus, from (6.7) and (6.4), we have that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_n^2]}{(\mathbb{E}[Z_n])^2} \leq 1$ yielding $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_n \geq 1) = 1$. Therefore, with high probability, there is at least one *Bad* node and the community structure cannot be recovered exactly. \square

7 Proof of achievability

Recall the following definitions provided in Section 5. The average number of common neighbours of two nodes u and v at locations x and y was denoted by $M_{\text{in}}^B(x, y) = \lambda \left(\frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} \right) I(x, y, B)$ if u and v are in the same community and $M_{\text{out}}^B(x, y) = \lambda pq I(x, y, B)$ if they are in different communities. Here, $I(x, y, B) = \int_B \psi_n(x, z) \psi_n(y, z) dz$. Additionally, the algorithm chooses an initial block denoted as $B_1 = \left[0, \kappa \frac{\log n}{n} \right]$ with the nodes denoted by $V_1 = \{v : X_v \in B_1\}$. Phase I of the algorithm proceeds by first recovering the communities of nodes within this initial block, and then propagating them to other blocks B_i , $i = 2, \dots, \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$ with $\text{vol}(B_i) = \frac{\kappa \log n}{n}$.

7.1 Number of nodes in each block

In this subsection, we obtain bounds on the number of nodes within each block B_i .

Lemma 7.1. *There exists a constant $\Delta > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n/(\kappa \log n)} \{|V(B_i)| < \Delta \log n\} \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. For a block B_i with $\text{vol}(B_i) = \frac{\kappa \log n}{n}$, the number of nodes within B_i is distributed as a Poisson random variable with parameter $|V_i| \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda\kappa \log n)$. Using the Chernoff bound from Lemma A.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|V_i| > \Delta \log n) & \leq \exp \left(-\frac{(\Delta - \lambda\kappa)^2 \log n}{2\Delta} \right) \\
& = n^{-\frac{(\Delta - \lambda\kappa)^2}{2\Delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\Delta > \lambda\kappa + 1 + \sqrt{2\lambda\kappa + 1}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(|V_i| > \Delta \log n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. The union bound now gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n/(\kappa \log n)} \{|V_i| \leq \Delta \log n\}\right) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n/(\kappa \log n)} \{|V_i| > \Delta \log n\}\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n/(\kappa \log n)} \mathbb{P}(|V_i| > \Delta \log n) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{n}{\kappa \log n} \cdot \frac{1}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Similarly, we will also use the following lemma which bounds the number of vertices in each block from below.

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose B is a block of volume $\frac{\kappa \log n}{n}$ with $\lambda\kappa > 1$, then there exists constants $\delta, \epsilon' > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(|V(B)| > \delta \log n) \geq 1 - n^{-1-\epsilon'}.$$

Proof. The number of vertices within B is a Poisson random variable with mean $\lambda\kappa \log n$. Using Lemma A.2 for the lower tail of a Poisson random variable, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|V(B)| \leq \delta \log n) &\leq \exp[-\log n ((\lambda\kappa - \delta)(\log(\lambda\kappa - \delta) - \log(\lambda\kappa)) + \delta)] \\ &= n^{-[(\lambda\kappa - \delta)(\log(\lambda\kappa - \delta) - \log(\lambda\kappa)) + \delta]} = n^{-h(\lambda\kappa - \delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

where $h(x) = x[\log x - \log(\lambda\kappa)] + \lambda\kappa - x$, we note that $h(\lambda\kappa) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} h(x) = \lambda\kappa$ with $h(\cdot)$ being convex (and therefore continuous) and decreasing within $(0, \lambda\kappa]$. Since $\lambda\kappa > 1$, there exists $\gamma \in (0, \lambda\kappa]$ such that $h(\gamma) > \frac{1+\lambda\kappa}{2}$. Taking $\delta = \lambda\kappa - \gamma > 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|V(B)| \leq \delta \log n) \leq n^{-h(\gamma)} \leq n^{-\frac{1+\lambda\kappa}{2}} \leq n^{-1-\epsilon'},$$

for some $\epsilon' > 0$.

□

We next show that each of the blocks $B_i, i = 1, \dots, \frac{n}{\kappa \log n}$ has at least $\delta \log n$ vertices with high probability.

Lemma 7.3. *For $\lambda\kappa > 1$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}} \{|V(B_i)| > \delta \log n\}\right) \geq 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. Using the union bound and Lemma 7.2, it is easy to infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}} \{|V(B_i)| > \delta \log n\}\right) &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}} \mathbb{P}(\{|V(B_i)| \leq \delta \log n\}) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}} n^{-1-\epsilon'} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa n^{\epsilon'} \log n}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We bound the number of vertices in all the blocks as follows:

Lemma 7.4. *For $\lambda\kappa > 1$, there exists constants $\delta, \Delta > 0$ with $\delta \leq \Delta$ such that the event*

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}} \{|V(B_i)| \in [\delta \log n, \Delta \log n]\}$$

occurs with high probability, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \geq 1 - o(1)$.

Proof. The proof is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.3.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{\kappa \log n}} \{|V(B_i)| \in [\delta \log n, \Delta \log n]\} \right) &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n/(\kappa \log n)} \mathbb{P}(|V(B_i)| \notin [\delta \log n, \Delta \log n]) \\ &= 1 - \frac{n}{\kappa \log n} (\mathbb{P}(|V_i| \leq \delta \log n) + \mathbb{P}(|V_i| > \Delta \log n)) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{n}{\kappa \log n} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\epsilon'}} + \frac{1}{n} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2}{\kappa \log n}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, we also have

$$\delta = \lambda\kappa - h^{-1} \left(\frac{1 + \lambda\kappa}{2} \right) \leq \lambda\kappa + 1 + \sqrt{2\lambda\kappa + 1} = \Delta,$$

where $h(\cdot)$ is defined in the proof of Lemma 7.2. □

7.2 Initialization step

Algorithm 1a chooses an initial node $u_0 \in V_1$ and assigns $\hat{\sigma}(u_0) = +1$. In the following, we assume that this is the true community of u_0 . If not, the recovered communities are the same upto a flip. Let $N_{u_0, u} = |\{v \in V : X_v \in B_1, (u, v) \in E \text{ and } (u_0, v) \in E\}|$ denote the number of common neighbours of u_0 and u within B_1 . The number of common neighbours of two nodes u_0 and u can be expressed as

$$N_{u_0, u} = \sum_{v \in V_1} Z_v^{u, u_0},$$

where $Z_v^{u, u_0} := A_{u_0 v} A_{uv}$. Given the locations and communities of nodes u, u_0 and v , the random variable Z_v^{u, u_0} is distributed as

$$Z_v^{u, u_0} \sim \begin{cases} \text{Ber}(\psi_n(X_u, X_v)\psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v)p^2) & \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(v) \\ \text{Ber}(\psi_n(X_u, X_v)\psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v)q^2) & \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(v) \\ \text{Ber}(\psi_n(X_u, X_v)\psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v)pq) & \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0) \end{cases}. \quad (7.1)$$

Let $M(u, u_0, B_1) := \frac{1}{2} \left(M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) + M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) \right) = \frac{\lambda}{4}(p+q)^2 I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B)$ and define the event $\mathcal{T}_{u_0, u} := \{N_{u_0, u} < M(u, u_0, B_1)\}$. Lines 3-10 of Algorithm 1a make an error in recovering the community of node u with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0, u} | \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0))$ if nodes u and u_0 are of the same community and with probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0, u}^c | \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0))$ if nodes u and u_0 are of different communities. In the following, we will bound each of these error terms separately.

Proposition 7.5. For any vertex $u \in V_1 \setminus u_0$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0,u}^c | \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0)) \leq \exp \left[-\lambda I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B_1) \left(\frac{(p+q)^2}{4} \log \frac{(p+q)^2}{4pq} + \frac{(p-q)^2}{2} \right) \right].$$

Proof. Conditioned on the locations \mathbf{X} , the probability of the error event can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(N_{u_0,u} > M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}\right) \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{tN_{u_0,u}} | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}\right]}{e^{tM(u, u_0, B_1)}} \\ & = \exp \left[-tM(u, u_0, B_1) + \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{t \sum_{v: X_v \in B_1} Z_v^{u, u_0}} | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}\right] \right] \\ & = \exp \left[-tM(u, u_0, B_1) + \sum_{v: X_v \in B_1} \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{tZ_v^{u, u_0}} | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}\right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality above is obtained since given the communities and locations of all the nodes, the random variables Z_v^{u, u_0} and Z_w^{u, u_0} are independent for $v \neq w$. The distribution of Z_v^{u, u_0} in (7.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(N_{u_0,u} > M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}\right) \\ & = \exp \left[-tM(u, u_0, B_1) + \sum_{v: X_v \in B_1} \log \left(1 + pq\psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^t - 1) \right) \right] \\ & = \exp \left[-tM(u, u_0, B_1) \right] \prod_{v: X_v \in B_1} \left(1 + pq\psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^t - 1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the initial phase depends only on the locations of nodes within B_1 . In the following, we denote them by \mathbf{X}_{B_1} . The required error probability can now be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} > M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u)) \\ & = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda|B_1|} \frac{(\lambda|B_1|)^k}{k!} \frac{1}{|B_1|^k} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_1} \mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} > M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}_{B_1}) dx_1 dx_2 \cdots dx_k \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda|B_1|} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_1} \prod_{v=1}^k \left(1 + pq\psi_n(X_u, x_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v) (e^t - 1) \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda|B_1|} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \prod_{v=1}^k \left(\int_{B_1} \left(1 + pq\psi_n(X_u, x_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v) (e^t - 1) \right) dx_v \right) \end{aligned}$$

Representing it as a Poisson sum, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} > M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u)) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda|B_1|} \frac{\left[\lambda \left(\int_{B_1} (1 + pq\psi_n(X_u, x_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v) (e^t - 1)) dx_v \right) \right]^k}{k!} e^{-tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda|B_1|} \frac{\left[\lambda|B_1| + \lambda(e^t - 1) \int_{B_1} pq\psi_n(X_u, x_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v) dx_v \right]^k}{k!} e^{-tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda|B_1|} \frac{\left[\lambda|B_1| + \lambda(e^t - 1) M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) \right]^k}{k!} e^{-tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \\
&= e^{-\lambda|B_1|} e^{\lambda|B_1| + \lambda(e^t - 1) M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})} e^{-\frac{t\lambda}{2} (M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) + M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}))} \\
&= \exp \left[-\frac{t\lambda}{2} (M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) + \lambda (e^t - 1 - \frac{t}{2}) M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating the exponent with respect to t we obtain

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} (M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) - \lambda (e^t - \frac{1}{2}) M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})) = 0,$$

which yields $t = \log \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})}{M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})} + 1 \right)$. Substituting this back, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} > M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u)) \\
&\leq \exp \left[-\lambda \left(\frac{M(u, u_0, B_1)}{\lambda} \log \frac{M(u, u_0, B_1)}{\lambda M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0})} + M_{\text{in}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) - M_{\text{out}}^{B_1}(X_u, X_{u_0}) \right) \right] \\
&= \exp \left[-\lambda I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B_1) \left(\frac{(p+q)^2}{4} \log \frac{(p+q)^2}{4pq} + \frac{(p-q)^2}{2} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the statement of the proposition. \square

Proposition 7.6. *For any vertex $u \in V_1 \setminus u_0$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0,u} | \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0)) \leq \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B_1)}{4} \left((p-q)^2 - (p+q)^2 \log \frac{2(p^2 + q^2)}{(p+q)^2} \right) \right].$$

Proof. The proof for this proposition is similar to that of Proposition 7.5 with minor modifications. Since the nodes in community -1 and $+1$ form independent thinned point processes, conditioning on the locations of all nodes is equivalent to conditioning on the locations of nodes in each community. We denote the locations of nodes within community $+1$ and -1 using $\mathbf{X}^+ = \{X_i^+\}$ and $\mathbf{X}^- = \{X_i^-\}$ respectively. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}^+, \mathbf{X}^-) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [e^{-tN_{u_0,u}} | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}^+, \mathbf{X}^-]}{e^{-tM(u, u_0, B_1)}}$$

It suffices to investigate the case when $\sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u) = +1$. For vertices v in the same (different) community $\sigma(v) = +1$ (resp., $\sigma(v) = -1$), the random variables $\{Z_v^{u, u_0} : v \in V_1\}$ depend only on the

locations \mathbf{X}^+ (resp., \mathbf{X}^-). Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-tN_{u_0,u}} | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}^+, \mathbf{X}^- \right]}{e^{-tM(u,u_0,B_1)}} \\
&= \exp \left[tM(u, u_0, B_1) + \sum_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) = \sigma(u)}} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-tZ_v^{u,u_0}} | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}^+ \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) \neq \sigma(u)}} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-tZ_v^{u,u_0}} | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}^- \right] \right] \\
&= \exp \left[tM(u, u_0, B_1) + \sum_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) = \sigma(u)}} \log (1 + p^2 \psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^{-t} - 1)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) \neq \sigma(u)}} \log (1 + q^2 \psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^{-t} - 1)) \right] \\
&= e^{tM(u,u_0,B_1)} \prod_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) = \sigma(u)}} (1 + p^2 \psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^{-t} - 1)) \\
&\quad \prod_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) \neq \sigma(u)}} (1 + q^2 \psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^{-t} - 1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, conditioned on the locations of nodes in both communities, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} (N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}^+, \mathbf{X}^-) \\
&= e^{tM(u,u_0,B_1)} \prod_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) = \sigma(u)}} (1 + p^2 \psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^{-t} - 1)) \\
&\quad \prod_{\substack{v: X_v \in B_1 \\ \sigma(v) \neq \sigma(u)}} (1 + q^2 \psi_n(X_u, X_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, X_v) (e^{-t} - 1)). \quad (7.2)
\end{aligned}$$

With $\lambda' = \frac{\lambda}{2}$ and conditioning on the number of nodes in each community separately, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} (N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u)) \\
&= \sum_{k_+=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda'|B_1|} \frac{(\lambda'|B_1|)^{k_+}}{k_+!} \sum_{k_-=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda'|B_1|} \frac{(\lambda'|B_1|)^{k_-}}{k_-!} \times \frac{1}{|B_1|^{k_+}} \frac{1}{|B_1|^{k_-}} \\
&\quad \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_1} \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_1} \mathbb{P} (N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) \neq \sigma(u), \mathbf{X}_{B_1}^+, \mathbf{X}_{B_1}^-) dx_1^+ \cdots dx_{k_+}^+ dx_1^- \cdots dx_{k_-}^-
\end{aligned}$$

The probability term within the integral is obtained in (7.2) using which we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u)) \\
& \leq e^{tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \sum_{k_+=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda'|B_1|} \frac{(\lambda'|B_1|)^{k_+}}{k_+!} \sum_{k_-=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda'|B_1|} \frac{(\lambda'|B_1|)^{k_-}}{k_-!} \\
& \quad \frac{1}{|B_1|^{k_+}} \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_1} \prod_{v=1}^{k_+} (1 + p^2 \psi_n(X_u, x_v^+) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v^+) (e^{-t} - 1)) dx_1^+ dx_2^+ \cdots dx_{k_+}^+ \\
& \quad \frac{1}{|B_1|^{k_-}} \int_{B_1} \cdots \int_{B_1} \prod_{v=1}^{k_-} (1 + q^2 \psi_n(X_u, x_v^-) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v^-) (e^{-t} - 1)) dx_1^- dx_2^- \cdots dx_{k_-}^- \\
& = e^{tM(u, u_0, B_1)} \sum_{k_+=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda'|B_1|} \frac{\lambda'^{k_+}}{k_+!} \prod_{v=1}^{k_+} \left(\int_{B_1} (1 + p^2 \psi_n(X_u, x_v^+) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v^+) (e^{-t} - 1)) dx_v^+ \right) \\
& \quad \sum_{k_-=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda'|B_1|} \frac{\lambda'^{k_-}}{k_-!} \prod_{v=1}^{k_-} \left(\int_{B_1} (1 + q^2 \psi_n(X_u, x_v^-) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v^-) (e^{-t} - 1)) dx_v^- \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Going over similar calculation as in the proof of Proposition 7.5 for each of the summations above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u)) \\
& \leq \exp \left[tM(u, u_0, B_1) + \lambda(e^{-t} - 1) \int_{B_1} \frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} \psi_n(X_u, x_v) \psi_n(X_{u_0}, x_v) dx_v \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating with respect to t and equating to 0, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& M(u, u_0, B_1) - \lambda \frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B_1) e^{-t} = 0 \\
& \frac{\lambda}{4} (p + q)^2 I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B) - \lambda \frac{p^2 + q^2}{2} I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B_1) e^{-t} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives $t = \log \frac{2(p^2 + q^2)}{(p+q)^2}$. Substituting this back, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{u_0,u} \leq M(u, u_0, B_1) | \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u)) \leq \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B)}{4} \left((p - q)^2 - (p + q)^2 \log \frac{2(p^2 + q^2)}{(p + q)^2} \right) \right].$$

□

Letting

$$I'(p, q) \triangleq \min \left\{ \frac{(p + q)^2}{4} \log \frac{(p + q)^2}{pq} + 2(p - q)^2, (p - q)^2 - (p + q)^2 \log \frac{2(p^2 + q^2)}{(p + q)^2} \right\} > 0, \quad (7.3)$$

from Propositions 7.5 and 7.6, we obtain

$$\max \{ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0,u}^c | \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0)), \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0,u} | \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0)) \} \leq \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B) I'(p, q)}{4} \right]. \quad (7.4)$$

Note that $I(X_u, X_{u_0}, B) > \epsilon^2 \kappa \log n$. Defining $c_1 = \frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p, q)}{4}$ the above bound can be rewritten as

$$\max \{ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0,u}^c | \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0)), \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0,u} | \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0)) \} \leq n^{-\left[\frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p, q)}{4} \right]} = n^{-c_1}. \quad (7.5)$$

The following lemma bounds the probability of making an error in assigning community for a node in the initial block

Lemma 7.7. *For any vertex $u \in V_1 \setminus u_0$, the initial phase recovery algorithm makes an error in estimating the community of node u with probability*

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)) \leq n^{-\left\lfloor \frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p,q)}{4} \right\rfloor}.$$

Proof. This is an easy consequence of Propositions 7.5 and 7.6.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)) &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u) | \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0)) \mathbb{P}(\sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u) | \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0)) \mathbb{P}(\sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0, u}^c | \sigma(u) \neq \sigma(u_0)) \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_{u_0, u} | \sigma(u) = \sigma(u_0)) \frac{1}{2} \\ &\leq n^{-\left\lfloor \frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p,q)}{4} \right\rfloor} = n^{-c_1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now prove Lemma 5.1 that estimates the probability of success of recovering the communities in the initial block using Algorithm 1a. For convenience, we reproduce it here.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $G_n \sim GKBM(\lambda n, p, q, \phi)$ with $p > q$. For any $\Delta > 0$, Algorithm 1a with inputs $G = G_n$, $B_1 = \left[0, \kappa \frac{\log n}{n}\right]$ and $M = M^B(x, y)$ recovers the communities of nodes in the initial block B_1 with high probability, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{u \in V_1} \{\hat{\sigma}(u) = \sigma(u)\} \mid |V_1| \leq \Delta \log n \right) \geq 1 - \Delta n^{-c_1} \log n.$$

Proof. Using the union bound and Lemma 7.7, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{u \in V_1} \{\hat{\sigma}(u) = \sigma(u)\} \mid |V_1| \leq \Delta \log n \right) &\geq 1 - \sum_{u \in V_1} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u) \mid |V_1| \leq \Delta \log n) \\ &\geq 1 - |V_1| n^{-\left\lfloor \frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p,q)}{4} \right\rfloor} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{\Delta \log n}{n^{\frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p,q)}{4}}} \\ &= 1 - \Delta n^{-c_1} \log n, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 = \frac{\lambda \epsilon^2 \kappa I'(p,q)}{4}$.

□

7.3 Propagation step

(All probabilities in this section are conditioned on the locations \mathbf{X}). We wish to compute the probability that the propagate phase makes an error in estimating the community of node u i.e., to evaluate $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u) | \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i))$. Due to the symmetry in assigning node labels, it suffices to evaluate

$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}(u) = -1 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i))$ which is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i)) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-tf(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i))} | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_i} \left[\prod_{\substack{v \in V_i \\ \hat{\sigma}(v) = +1}} \left[\left(\frac{q}{p} \right)^{A_{uv}} \left(\frac{1 - q\psi_n(X_u, X_v)}{1 - p\psi_n(X_u, X_v)} \right)^{1 - A_{uv}} \right]^t \prod_{\substack{v \in V_i \\ \hat{\sigma}(v) = -1}} \left[\left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{A_{uv}} \left(\frac{1 - p\psi_n(X_u, X_v)}{1 - q\psi_n(X_u, X_v)} \right)^{1 - A_{uv}} \right]^t \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

where \mathcal{F}_i is the sigma algebra generated by $\{\sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i)\}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_i}$ is the expectation conditional on \mathcal{F}_i . The last step is obtained since given the locations and the true community labels of nodes in V_i , the entries A_{uv} are independent. Before we proceed, we introduce a few definitions and notations which will be useful in the following analysis. For the i -th block, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{++}(V_i) &= \{v \in V_i | \sigma(v) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(v) = +1\} \\ \mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i) &= \{v \in V_i | \sigma(v) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(v) = -1\} \\ \mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i) &= \{v \in V_i | \sigma(v) = -1, \hat{\sigma}(v) = +1\} \\ \mathcal{Z}_{--}(V_i) &= \{v \in V_i | \sigma(v) = -1, \hat{\sigma}(v) = -1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

To describe in words, $\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)$, for example, is the set of nodes $v \in V_i$ that belong to the ground-truth community $\sigma(v) = +1$ but get assigned a label $\hat{\sigma}(v) = -1$ by Algorithm 1. Naturally, $\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i) \cup \mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)$ constitute all the mistakes that Algorithm 1 makes in region V_i . We next introduce the definition of the α -Rényi divergence between two probability measures and provide some additional notations.

Definition 7.1. For any $\alpha \neq 1$, the α -Rényi divergence between two probability measures P and Q is defined as

$$D_\alpha(P||Q) = \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \log \sum_x P(x)^\alpha Q(x)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (7.8)$$

Specifically, we have

$$D_{3/2}(P||Q) = 2 \log \sum_x \frac{P(x)^{3/2}}{Q(x)^{1/2}} \text{ for } \alpha = \frac{3}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{1/2}(P||Q) = -2 \log \sum_x \sqrt{P(x)Q(x)} \text{ for } \alpha = \frac{1}{2}.$$

The $\frac{1}{2}$ -Rényi divergence is symmetric in its arguments and we denote it by $D_{1/2}(P, Q)$. Lastly, in the following, we write $\psi_n(u, v)$ instead of $\psi_n(X_u, X_v)$.

Using the notation above, the probability in (7.6) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i)) \\ & = \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{++}(V_i)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_i} \left[\left[\left(\frac{q}{p} \right)^{A_{uv}} \left(\frac{1 - q\psi_n(u, v)}{1 - p\psi_n(u, v)} \right)^{1 - A_{uv}} \right]^t \right] \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_i} \left[\left[\left(\frac{q}{p} \right)^{A_{uv}} \left(\frac{1 - q\psi_n(u, v)}{1 - p\psi_n(u, v)} \right)^{1 - A_{uv}} \right]^t \right] \\ & \times \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_i} \left[\left[\left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{A_{uv}} \left(\frac{1 - p\psi_n(u, v)}{1 - q\psi_n(u, v)} \right)^{1 - A_{uv}} \right]^t \right] \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{--}(V_i)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_i} \left[\left[\left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{A_{uv}} \left(\frac{1 - p\psi_n(u, v)}{1 - q\psi_n(u, v)} \right)^{1 - A_{uv}} \right]^t \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

Taking $t = \frac{1}{2}$ and computing the expectations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i)) \\
&\leq \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{++}(V_i)} \sqrt{pq} \psi_n(u, v) + \sqrt{(1 - p\psi_n(u, v))(1 - q\psi_n(u, v))} \\
&\quad \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)} \left(\frac{q^{3/2}}{p^{1/2}} \psi_n(u, v) + \frac{(1 - q\psi_n(u, v))^{3/2}}{(1 - p\psi_n(u, v))^{1/2}} \right) \\
&\quad \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{--}(V_i)} \sqrt{pq} \psi_n(u, v) + \sqrt{(1 - p\psi_n(u, v))(1 - q\psi_n(u, v))} \\
&\quad \prod_{\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)} \left(\frac{p^{3/2}}{q^{1/2}} \psi_n(u, v) + \frac{(1 - p\psi_n(u, v))^{3/2}}{(1 - q\psi_n(u, v))^{1/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Exponentiating and taking logarithms, the products can be written using α -Rényi divergences as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i)) \\
&= \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{++}(V_i)} D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{--}(V_i)} D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)} D_{3/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)) || \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)} D_{3/2}(\text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v)) || \text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v))) \right) \right] \\
&= \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in B_i} D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)} D_{3/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)) || \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) + D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)} D_{3/2}(\text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v)) || \text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v))) + D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon \leq \psi_n(u, v) \leq 1$, we can bound the divergences above as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{3/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)) || \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) &= 2 \log \left[\frac{(p\psi_n(u, v))^{3/2}}{(q\psi_n(u, v))^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 - p\psi_n(u, v))^{3/2}}{(1 - q\psi_n(u, v))^{1/2}} \right] \\
&\leq 2 \log \left[\frac{p^{3/2}}{q^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 - p\epsilon)^{3/2}}{(1 - q)^{1/2}} \right] =: \xi_1(p, q, \epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$D_{3/2}(\text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v)) || \text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v))) \leq 2 \log \left[\frac{q^{3/2}}{p^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 - q\epsilon)^{3/2}}{(1 - p)^{1/2}} \right] =: \xi_2(p, q, \epsilon).$$

Computing the $\frac{1}{2}$ -Rényi divergence, we obtain

$$D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) = -2 \log \left(\sqrt{pq}\psi_n(u, v) + \sqrt{(1-p\psi_n(u, v))(1-q\psi_n(u, v))} \right)$$

which can be bounded as

$$D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \leq -2 \log \left(\sqrt{pq}\epsilon + \sqrt{(1-p)(1-q)} \right) =: \xi_3(p, q, \epsilon).$$

For the other direction, we use

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) &\geq \text{Hel}^2(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \\ &= (\sqrt{p\psi_n(u, v)} - \sqrt{q\psi_n(u, v)})^2 + (\sqrt{1-p\psi_n(u, v)} - \sqrt{1-q\psi_n(u, v)})^2 \\ &\geq \epsilon(\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{q})^2 := \xi_4(p, q, \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Define $\xi \equiv \xi(p, q, \epsilon) := \max\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3\}$. Using these definitions and further conditioning on the number of errors in block B_i to be at most a constant, i.e., $|\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)| + |\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)| \leq M$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i), |\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)| + |\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)| \leq M) \\ &\leq \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in B_i} D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{+-}} \xi_1 + \xi_3 + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)} \xi_2 + \xi_3 \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{v \in B_i} D_{1/2}(\text{Ber}(p\psi_n(u, v)), \text{Ber}(q\psi_n(u, v))) \right) + \xi(|\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)| + |\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)|) \right] \\ &\leq e^{\xi M} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \xi_4 |V(B_i)| \right] \end{aligned}$$

If $|V(B_i)| > \delta \log n$, then we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i), |\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)| + |\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)| \leq M) \leq \eta_1 n^{-c_2}, \quad (7.10)$$

where $\eta_1 = e^{\xi M}$ and $c_2 = \frac{\delta \xi_4}{2}$. In a similar way, we can also obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(f(u, \hat{\sigma}(V_i)) > 0 | \sigma(u) = -1, \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \sigma(V_i), |\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(V_i)| + |\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(V_i)| \leq M) \leq \eta_1 n^{-c_2} \quad (7.11)$$

Let \mathcal{A}_i be the event that the propagation step makes at most M errors in block B_i , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \{|\{u \in V_i : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| \leq M\}.$$

The following lemma is a restatement of Lemma 5.2, and characterizes the total number of errors made in a single block B_i .

Lemma 7.8. *Let $M = \frac{10}{4\delta\epsilon(\sqrt{p}-\sqrt{q})^2}$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\{u \in V(B_{i+1}) : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| > M \mid \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \mathcal{A}_i, |V_{i+1}| \leq \Delta \log n, |V_i| \geq \delta \log n\right) \leq \eta_2 n^{-9/8}$$

Proof. Since the estimate $\hat{\sigma}$ is independent for each vertex conditional on the previous block, the number of errors in each block can be stochastically dominated by a binomial random variable

$$|\{u \in V(B_{i+1}) : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| \preceq \text{Bin}(\Delta \log n, \eta_1 n^{-c_2}) \triangleq Z,$$

with mean μ_Z . The required probability can then be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^c \mid \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \mathcal{A}_i, |V_{i+1}| \leq \Delta \log n, |V_i| \geq \delta \log n\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(\Delta \log n, \eta_1 n^{-c_2}) > M) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(Z - \mu_Z \geq M - \mu_Z) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(Z \geq \mu_Z \left(1 + \frac{M - \mu_Z}{\mu_Z}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.3 on the concentration of the binomial distribution, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^c \mid \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \mathcal{A}_i, |V_{i+1}| \leq \Delta \log n, |V_i| \geq \delta \log n\right) &\leq \frac{e^{-\frac{M - \mu_Z}{\mu_Z}}}{\left(\frac{M}{\mu_Z}\right)^{\frac{M}{\mu_Z}}} \\ &\leq e^{M - \mu_Z} \left(\frac{\mu_Z}{M}\right)^M \\ &\leq \left(\frac{e\Delta\eta_1}{M}\right)^M \frac{(\log n)^M}{n^{c_2 M}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $c_2 = \frac{\delta\xi_4}{2}$ which gives $c_2 M = \frac{\delta M \epsilon (\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{q})^2}{2} = \frac{10}{8}$. Along with $(\log n)^M \leq n^{1/8}$ for large enough n , this gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^c \mid \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \mathcal{A}_i, |V_{i+1}| \leq \Delta \log n, |V_i| \geq \delta \log n) \leq \eta_2 n^{-9/8}.$$

□

We now evaluate the effectiveness of the propagation phase in the following lemma.

Lemma 7.9. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $0 < q < p < 1$, $0 < \kappa < \infty$, and assume that $\phi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \kappa]$. If $\lambda\kappa > 1$, then Algorithm 1b ensures that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/\kappa \log n \rfloor} \mathcal{A}_i\right) \geq 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. Firstly note that the bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^c \mid \hat{\sigma}(V_i), \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{G}) \leq \eta_2 n^{-9/8}$ does not depend on the estimated communities $\hat{\sigma}(V_i)$ and hence we can uniformly bound the probability as $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^c \mid \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{G}) \leq \eta_2 n^{-9/8}$. Additionally, the event that there are at most M errors in a block depends only on the previous block which can be written as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_{i+1} \mid \bigcap_{j < i} \mathcal{A}_j, \mathcal{G}\right) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{i+1} \mid \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{G}).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n/\kappa \log n} \mathcal{A}_i\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n/\kappa \log n} \mathcal{A}_i \mid \mathcal{G}\right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \mid \mathcal{G}) \prod_{i=2}^{n/\kappa \log n} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_i \mid \bigcap_{j<i} \mathcal{A}_j, \mathcal{G}\right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1 \mid \mathcal{G}) \prod_{i=2}^{n/\kappa \log n} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_i \mid \mathcal{A}_{i-1}, \mathcal{G}\right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \\
&\geq (1 - \Delta n^{-c_1} \log n) \left(1 - \eta_2 n^{-9/8}\right)^{n/\kappa \log n} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \\
&\geq (1 - \Delta n^{-c_1} \log n) \left(1 - \frac{\eta_2}{\kappa n^{1/8} \log n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{\kappa \log n}\right) \\
&= 1 - o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 7.10. *Let $\lambda > 0$, $0 < q < p < 1$, $0 < \kappa < \infty$, and assume that $\phi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \kappa]$. If $\lambda \kappa > 1$, then for large n*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{u \in V} \left\{|\{v \in \mathcal{V}(u) : \hat{\sigma}(v) \neq \sigma(v)\}| \leq \eta \log n\right\}\right) \geq 1 - o(1) \quad \text{for any } \eta > 0.$$

Proof. Let $\delta = \frac{\eta}{3}$. From Lemma 5.2, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n/\kappa \log n} \left\{|\{u \in V_i : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| \leq M\right\}\right) \geq 1 - o(1)$$

For sufficiently large n , $M \leq \delta \log n$ and hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n/\kappa \log n} \left\{|\{u \in V_i : \hat{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}| \leq \delta \log n\right\}\right) \geq 1 - o(1)$$

If $\hat{\sigma}$ makes fewer than $\delta \log n$ mistakes within each block B_i , then it makes at most $\frac{n\delta}{\kappa} = \frac{n\eta}{3\kappa}$ mistakes on the whole. This proves Lemma 5.3. Moreover, since the neighbourhood of a node $u \in B_i$ intersects at most 3 blocks, $\{B_{i-1}, B_i, B_{i+1}\}$, the number of mistakes in the neighbourhood of every vertex can be bounded as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{u \in V} \left\{|\{v \in \mathcal{V}(u) : \hat{\sigma}(v) \neq \sigma(v)\}| \leq 3\delta \log n\right\}\right) \geq 1 - o(1).$$

□

7.4 Refinement step

Define the random variable

$$Y := -\log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) (P^+ - Q^+) - \log\left(\frac{1-p}{1-q}\right) (P^- - Q^-), \tag{7.12}$$

where $P^+ \sim \text{Poi}(p^+ \log n)$, $P^- \sim \text{Poi}(p^- \log n)$, $Q^+ \sim \text{Poi}(q^+ \log n)$, and $Q^- \sim \text{Poi}(q^- \log n)$ with all of them being independent of each other. The following lemma characterizes the moment generating function of Y .

Lemma 7.11. *Define the vectors $x = (p^+, p^-, q^+, q^-) \log n$ and $y = (q^+, q^-, p^+, p^-) \log n$. For any $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{tY}] = \exp[-D_t(y||x)],$$

where $D_t(y||x) := \sum_{i=1}^4 ty_i + (1-t)x_i - y_i^t x_i^{1-t}$. In particular, for $t = 1/2$, $p^+ = p = 1 - p^-$, and $q^+ = q = 1 - q^-$, we have that $D_{1/2}(x, y) = 2 \left(1 - \sqrt{pq} - \sqrt{(1-p)(1-q)}\right)$.

In order to analyze the refinement step, recall the approximation of the kernel $\phi_\ell := \sum_{s=0}^{\ell} c_s \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_s}$ where the sets $\Gamma_s, \Gamma_{s'} \subset \Gamma$ are disjoint for $s \neq s'$ and $c_s \neq c_{s'}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{R}_s = \left\{x \in \mathcal{S} : \frac{d(0, x)}{\log n} \in \Gamma_s\right\}$ with $\text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s) = 2 \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \frac{\log n}{n}$. We first obtain a concentration bound for the random variable

$$Z_\ell := - \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) (P_s^+ - Q_s^+) + \log\left(\frac{1-pc_s}{1-qc_s}\right) (P_s^- - Q_s^-) \quad (7.13)$$

where $P_s^+ \sim \text{Poi}\left(\frac{\lambda n p c_s}{2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s)\right)$, $Q_s^+ \sim \text{Poi}\left(\frac{\lambda n q c_s}{2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s)\right)$, $P_s^- \sim \text{Poi}\left(\frac{\lambda n (1-pc_s)}{2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s)\right)$, and $Q_s^- \sim \text{Poi}\left(\frac{\lambda n (1-qc_s)}{2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s)\right)$. Note that each term of the summation (and each of the random variables therein) is independent of other terms owing to spatial independence of the Poisson point process.

Lemma 7.12. *Let $x_s = \lambda \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \log n (pc_s, 1 - pc_s, qc_s, 1 - qc_s)$ and $y_s = \lambda \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) \log n (qc_s, 1 - qc_s, pc_s, 1 - pc_s)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_\ell > -\beta\eta \log n) \leq n^{\frac{\beta\eta}{2} - 2\lambda \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)} \left[1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)}\right]$$

Proof. We begin by evaluating the moment generating function of Z

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{tZ_\ell}] &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-t\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)(P_s^+ - Q_s^+) + \log\left(\frac{1-pc_s}{1-qc_s}\right)(P_s^- - Q_s^-)\right)}\right] \\ &= \prod_{s=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-t\left(\log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)(P_s^+ - Q_s^+) + \log\left(\frac{1-pc_s}{1-qc_s}\right)(P_s^- - Q_s^-)\right)}\right] \\ &= \prod_{s=1}^{\ell} \exp[-D_t(y_s||x_s)] \\ &= \exp\left[-\sum_{s=1}^{\ell} D_t(y_s||x_s)\right] \end{aligned}$$

Using the Chernoff bound with $t = \frac{1}{2}$, the tail probability can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_\ell > -\beta\eta \log n) &\leq \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \exp\left[\left(t\beta\eta \log n - \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} D_t(x_s, y_s)\right)\right] \\ &\leq n^{\frac{\beta\eta}{2}} \exp\left[-\sum_{s=1}^{\ell} D_{1/2}(x_s, y_s)\right] \\ &= n^{\frac{\beta\eta}{2}} \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda n}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} 2 \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s) \left[1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)}\right]\right] \\ &= n^{\frac{\beta\eta}{2} - 2\lambda \sum_{s=1}^{\ell} \text{vol}(\Gamma_s)} \left[1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.2. To prove the correctness of Algorithm 2, a natural way to proceed is to show that the probability of error that the algorithm makes in assigning the community to a single node is $o(\frac{1}{n})$ and then use a union bound. However, since there are a random (Poisson) number of nodes and the statistics $g(u, \hat{\sigma})$ are dependent we use an alternate procedure that is detailed in [14].

For this fix a $c > \lambda$ and let $\mathcal{E}_0 = \{|V| < cn\}$. Since $|V| = N \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda n)$, using the Chernoff bound from Lemma A.2 we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_0^c) \leq \exp\left[-\frac{(c-\lambda)^2 n}{2c}\right] = o(1).$$

For (still to be determined) $\eta > 0$, let \mathcal{E}_1 be the event that Algorithm 1 makes at most $\eta \log n$ mistakes in the visibility region for all nodes, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \cap_{u \in V} \{|v \in \mathcal{V}(u) | \hat{\sigma}(v) \neq \sigma(v)| \leq \eta \log n\}.$$

From Corollary 7.10, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c) = o(1)$. Our interest is in bounding the probability of the error event $\mathcal{E}_2 = \cup_{u \in V} \{\tilde{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\} = \cup_{u \in V} \mathcal{E}_2(u)$ where $\mathcal{E}_2(u) := \{\tilde{\sigma}(u) \neq \sigma(u)\}$. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_0) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_0^c) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_0) + o(1). \quad (7.14)$$

To address the term on the RHS, sample $N \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda n)$ nodes and distribute $N' \sim \max\{N, cn\}$ nodes uniformly at random within \mathcal{S} . Label the N' nodes arbitrarily and run Algorithms 1 and 2 on the first N nodes. Assume that any $u \in \{N+1, \dots, cn\}$ must also be assigned the right community using the information of edges and non-edges to nodes $v \in [N]$. Then for $u \in [cn]$, from (7.14) we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_0) \leq \sum_{u \in [cn]} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2(u) \cap \mathcal{E}_1). \quad (7.15)$$

Analyzing $\mathcal{E}_2(u) \cap \mathcal{E}_1$ reduces to robust Poisson testing (see [4]) which is described as follows. Let $W(u) = \{\sigma' : \mathcal{V}(u) \rightarrow \{-1, 0, +1\}\}$ be the set of community assignments to all nodes in the visibility region of u . The value 0 is assigned to all nodes in $\mathcal{V}(u) \cap \{N+1, \dots, cn\}$ which ensures that they do not contribute to the estimator $g(u, \hat{\sigma})$ in Algorithm 2. Additionally, note that for node $u \in [cn]$ the estimate $g(u, \hat{\sigma})$ depends only on the nodes in $\mathcal{V}(u)$. Hence, for a fixed u , we can think of the estimate g as a function with inputs being the node u and the communities of nodes within the visibility region of u . In other words, $g(u, \hat{\sigma}) \equiv g(u, \hat{\sigma}_{\mathcal{V}(u)})$. We will exploit this notation in the following discussion. Denote the Hamming distance by d_H and let $W'(u; \eta)$ be the set of all community estimates that differ from the ground-truth σ on at most $\eta \log n$ vertices within $\mathcal{V}(u)$, i.e.,

$$W'(u; \eta) = \{\sigma' \in W(u) \mid d_H(\sigma', \sigma_{\mathcal{V}(u)}) \leq \eta \log n\}.$$

Consider a vertex $u \in [cn]$ such that $\sigma(u) = +1$. If vertex u is assigned to the wrong community (i.e., $\mathcal{E}_2(u)$ occurs), then there must be at least one labeling $\sigma' \in W'(u; \eta)$ for which $g(u, \sigma') < 0$. A similar reasoning holds when $\sigma(u) = -1$. If we now define

$$\mathcal{E}_u := \left\{ \{\sigma(u) = 1\} \cap \left\{ \cup_{\sigma' \in W'(u; \eta)} g(u, \sigma') < 0 \right\} \right\} \cup \left\{ \{\sigma(u) = -1\} \cap \left\{ \cup_{\sigma' \in W'(u; \eta)} g(u, \sigma') > 0 \right\} \right\},$$

we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2(u) \cap \mathcal{E}_1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u)$, and from (7.14) and (7.15) we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) \leq \sum_{u=1}^{cn} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u). \quad (7.16)$$

Conditioning on the community of node u , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u | \sigma(u) = -1) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u | \sigma(u) = +1) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\mathbb{P}(g(u, \sigma') > 0 | \sigma(u) = -1) + \mathbb{P}(g(u, \sigma') < 0 | \sigma(u) = +1) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

We bound these probabilities by assuming that Algorithm 1 outputs the worst case estimate σ' . To go about this we obtain a bound on the difference $|g(u, \sigma') - g(u, \sigma)|$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |g(u, \sigma') - g(u, \sigma)| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\substack{v \sim u \\ \hat{\sigma}(v)=+1 \\ \sigma(v)=-1}} 2 \log \frac{p}{q} + \sum_{\substack{v \not\sim u \\ \hat{\sigma}(v)=+1 \\ \sigma(v)=-1}} 2 \log \frac{1 - p\psi_n(u, v)}{1 - q\psi_n(u, v)} + \sum_{\substack{v \sim u \\ \hat{\sigma}(v)=-1 \\ \sigma(v)=+1}} 2 \log \frac{q}{p} + \sum_{\substack{v \not\sim u \\ \hat{\sigma}(v)=-1 \\ \sigma(v)=+1}} 2 \log \frac{1 - q\psi_n(u, v)}{1 - p\psi_n(u, v)} \right| \\
&= \left| \left(2 \log \frac{p}{q} + 2 \log \frac{1 - p\epsilon}{1 - q} \right) |\mathcal{Z}_{-+}(\mathcal{V}(u))| + \left(2 \log \frac{q}{p} + 2 \log \frac{1 - q\epsilon}{1 - p} \right) |\mathcal{Z}_{+-}(\mathcal{V}(u))| \right| \\
&\leq \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n
\end{aligned} \tag{7.18}$$

where $\beta_\epsilon := \left| 2 \log \frac{p}{q} + 2 \log \frac{1 - p\epsilon}{1 - q} + 2 \log \frac{q}{p} + 2 \log \frac{1 - q\epsilon}{1 - p} \right|$. Thus the worst case estimate σ' is such that

$$g(u, \sigma) - \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \leq g(u, \sigma') \leq g(u, \sigma) + \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n.$$

Using (7.18), we can now write

$$\mathbb{P}(g(u, \sigma') > 0 \mid \sigma(u) = -1) \leq \mathbb{P}(g(u, \sigma) > -\beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \mid \sigma(u) = -1) \tag{7.19}$$

We now use the simple function approximation of the kernel. To formalize this, let $Z = g(u, \sigma)$. Since $\phi_\ell \rightarrow \phi$ uniformly as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, and $h(x) = \log x$ is a continuous function, from Proposition A.5, there exists a sufficiently large $\ell' \equiv \ell'(n)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|Z_{\ell'} - Z| < \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n) \geq 1 - 1/n^2$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(g(u, \sigma') > 0 \mid \sigma(u) = -1) &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z > -\beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \mid \sigma(u) = -1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Z > -\beta_\epsilon \eta \log n, |Z_{\ell'} - Z| < \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \mid \sigma(u) = -1) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}(Z > -\beta_\epsilon \eta \log n, |Z_{\ell'} - Z| > \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \mid \sigma(u) = -1) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_{\ell'} > -\beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \mid \sigma_u = -1) + \mathbb{P}(|Z_{\ell'} - Z| > \beta_\epsilon \eta \log n \mid \sigma(u) = -1) \\
&\leq n^{\frac{\beta_\epsilon \eta}{2} - \lambda n \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s) [1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)}]} + \frac{1}{n^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can also obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(g(u, \sigma') < 0 \mid \sigma(u) = +1) \leq n^{\frac{\beta_\epsilon \eta}{2} - \lambda n \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \text{vol}(\mathcal{R}_s) [1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)}]} + \frac{1}{n^2} \tag{7.20}$$

The probability that the refinement step makes an error in assigning the community of node u is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u) &= \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{P}(g(u, \hat{\sigma}) > 0 \mid \sigma(u) = -1) + \mathbb{P}(g(u, \hat{\sigma}) < 0 \mid \sigma(u) = +1)] \\
&\leq n^{\frac{\beta_\epsilon \eta}{2} - 2\lambda \sum_{s=1}^{\ell'} \text{vol}(\Gamma_s) [1 - \sqrt{pq}c_s - \sqrt{(1-pc_s)(1-qc_s)}]} + \frac{1}{n^2} \\
&\rightarrow n^{\frac{\beta_\epsilon \eta}{2} - \lambda I_\phi(p, q)} + \frac{1}{n^2}
\end{aligned}$$

as $\ell' \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that

$$I_\phi(p, q) = 2 \left[\text{vol}(\Gamma) - \sqrt{pq} \int_\Gamma \phi(x) dx - \int_\Gamma \sqrt{(1 - p\phi(x))(1 - q\phi(x))} dx \right].$$

Since $\lambda I_\phi(p, q) > 1$, taking $\eta = \frac{\lambda I_\phi(p, q) - 1}{\beta} > 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u) \leq n^{-\frac{\lambda I_\phi(p, q) - 1}{2}} + \frac{1}{n^2}$$

Using (7.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_2) &= \sum_{u=1}^{cn} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_u) \\ &\leq c \left[n^{\frac{1-\lambda I_\phi(p,q)}{2}} + \frac{1}{n} \right] \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

whenever $\lambda I_\phi(p, q) > 1$. □

8 Conclusions

In this work, we consider the problem of community recovery on block models in which edges are present based on the community of nodes as well as their geometric position in a Euclidean space. The dependence on the communities is through the intra-community and inter-community connection parameters p and q respectively, and the dependence on the underlying Euclidean space is via a geometric kernel ϕ . For the one-dimensional case with two communities, we have obtained conditions on the model parameters p, q, ϕ for which no algorithm can recover the communities exactly. Additionally, we have provided a linear-time algorithm that guarantees recovery upto the information theoretic threshold. Our techniques for the information-theoretic criterion (Section 6.2) extend to higher dimensions and larger number of communities as well. We also believe that our algorithm could be extended to higher dimensions by propagating over a spanning tree on the blocks as in [14]. This constitutes an important topic for future work.

References

- [1] E. Abbe. Community detection and stochastic block models: Recent developments. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6446–6531, 2017.
- [2] E. Abbe, F. Baccelli, and A. Sankararaman. Community detection on Euclidean random graphs. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 10(1):109–160, 2021.
- [3] E. Abbe, A. S. Bandeira, and G. Hall. Exact recovery in the stochastic block model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(1):471–487, 2015.
- [4] E. Abbe and C. Sandon. Community detection in general stochastic block models: Fundamental limits and efficient algorithms for recovery. In *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2015.
- [5] K. Avrachenkov, A. Bobu, and M. Dreveton. Higher-order spectral clustering for geometric graphs. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 27(2):1–29, 2021.
- [6] F. Baccelli, B. Błaszczyszyn, and M. Karray. *Random Measures, Point processes, and Stochastic Geometry*. Inria, 2020. <https://inria.hal.science/hal-02460214>.
- [7] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [8] E. Chien, A. Tulino, and J. Llorca. Active learning in the geometric block model. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.

- [9] A. Decelle, F. Krzakala, C. Moore, and L. Zdeborová. Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications. *Physical Review E*, 84(6):066106, 2011.
- [10] R. Eldan, D. Mikulincer, and H. Pieters. Community detection and percolation of information in a geometric setting. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 31(6):1048–1069, 2022.
- [11] S. Fortunato and M. E. Newman. 20 years of network community detection. *Nature Physics*, 18(8):848–850, 2022.
- [12] S. Galhotra, A. Mazumdar, S. Pal, and B. Saha. Community recovery in the geometric block model. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(338):1–53, 2023.
- [13] F. Gao, G. Wolf, and M. Hirn. Geometric scattering for graph data analysis. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- [14] J. Gaudio, X. Niu, and E. Wei. Exact community recovery in the geometric SBM. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2024.
- [15] G. Last and M. Penrose. *Lectures on the Poisson process*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [16] L. Massoulié. Community detection thresholds and the weak Ramanujan property. In *ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2014.
- [17] E. Mossel, J. Neeman, and A. Sly. Reconstruction and estimation in the planted partition model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162:431–461, 2015.
- [18] E. Mossel, J. Neeman, and A. Sly. Consistency thresholds for the planted bisection model. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 21:1–24, 2016.
- [19] E. Mossel, J. Neeman, and A. Sly. A proof of the block model threshold conjecture. *Combinatorica*, 38(3):665–708, 2018.
- [20] M. D. Penrose. Connectivity of soft random geometric graphs. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 26(2):986–1028, 2016.
- [21] A. Sankararaman, H. Vikalo, and F. Baccelli. ComHapDet: a spatial community detection algorithm for haplotype assembly. *BMC Genomics*, 21:1–14, 2020.
- [22] M. Wilsher, C. P. Dettmann, and A. Ganesh. Connectivity in one-dimensional soft random geometric graphs. *Physical Review E*, 102(6):062312, 2020.

A Auxiliary results

A.1 Monotonicity of error probability

Increasing the value of the kernel provides a better visibility of the interactions thus aiding in community recovery. This idea is formalized in the following proposition. Denote the event that the node at 0 is Bad by $\mathcal{E}^0 = \{\hat{\sigma}_{0,\text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(0)\}$.

Proposition A.1. *Let ϕ_ℓ be a simple function approximation of ϕ and let \mathbb{P}_ℓ denote the law of $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(n)}, \mathbf{X}^{(n)}, \mathbf{A}^{(n)})$ sampled from $GKBM(\lambda n, p, q, \phi_\ell)$. Additionally, let $\mathbb{P}_\ell^{\mathbf{0}}$ denote the Palm measure conditioned on the origin in G_n^ℓ . Then, for $p > q$, $\mathbb{P}_\ell^{\mathbf{0}}(\mathcal{E}^0)$ is non-increasing in ℓ .*

Proof. The proof is via a coupling argument. Let $\sigma(0) = +1$. Consider two approximations of the kernel $\phi_{\ell_1} = \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} c_s \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_s}$ and $\phi_{\ell_2} = \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} d_t \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_t}$ with $\phi_{\ell_1}(x) \leq \phi_{\ell_2}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$. For $1 \leq s \leq \ell_1$ and $1 \leq t \leq \ell_2$ define $\mathcal{B}_{st} = \mathcal{C}_s \cap \mathcal{D}_t$, and let $c_{st} = c_s$ if $\mathcal{B}_{st} \cap \mathcal{C}_s \neq \emptyset$ and $d_{st} = d_t$ if $\mathcal{B}_{st} \cap \mathcal{D}_t \neq \emptyset$ or 0 otherwise. The two approximations can equivalently be written as

$$\phi_{\ell_1} = \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} c_{st} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{st}} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{\ell_2} = \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} d_{st} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_{st}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Denote by $N_{k,st}^+$ ($N_{k,st}^-$) the number of neighbours (non-neighbours) of the node at the origin 0 in community $k \in \{+1, -1\}$ in the region \mathcal{B}_{st} . Using (6.10), the component-MAP estimator for two communities with kernel ϕ_{ℓ_1} can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{0,\text{MAP}} &= \arg \max_{k \in \{-1, +1\}} \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} \sum_{k' \in \{-1, +1\}} N_{k',st}^+ \log(p_{kk'} c_{st}) + N_{k',st}^- \log(1 - p_{kk'} c_{st}) \\ &= \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} N_{-1,st}^+ \log(p c_{st}) + N_{-1,st}^- \log(1 - p c_{st}) + N_{+1,st}^+ \log(q c_{st}) + N_{+1,st}^- \log(1 - q c_{st}) \\ & > \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} N_{+1,st}^+ \log(p c_{st}) + N_{+1,st}^- \log(1 - p c_{st}) + N_{-1,st}^+ \log(q c_{st}) + N_{-1,st}^- \log(1 - q c_{st}) \\ +1 & \text{else} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Using Slivnyak's theorem, the probability of the event \mathcal{E}^0 under the Palm measure $\mathbb{P}_{\ell_1}^0$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\ell_1}^0(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = +1) &= \mathbb{P}_{\ell_1}^0(\hat{\sigma}_{0,\text{MAP}} \neq \sigma(0) = +1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} N_{-1,st}^+ \log(p c_{st}) + N_{-1,st}^- \log(1 - p c_{st}) + N_{+1,st}^+ \log(q c_{st}) + N_{+1,st}^- \log(1 - q c_{st}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. > \sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} N_{+1,st}^+ \log(p c_{st}) + N_{+1,st}^- \log(1 - p c_{st}) + N_{-1,st}^+ \log(q c_{st}) + N_{-1,st}^- \log(1 - q c_{st})\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} N_{-1,st}^+ \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + N_{-1,st}^- \log\left(\frac{1 - p c_{st}}{1 - q c_{st}}\right) + N_{+1,st}^+ \log\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) + N_{+1,st}^- \log\left(\frac{1 - q c_{st}}{1 - p c_{st}}\right) > 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} (N_{+1,st}^+ - N_{-1,st}^+) \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + (N_{-1,st}^- - N_{+1,st}^-) \log\left(\frac{1 - q c_{st}}{1 - p c_{st}}\right) < 0\right) \end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, we also obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{\ell_1}^0(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = -1) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} (N_{-1,st}^+ - N_{+1,st}^+) \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + (N_{+1,st}^- - N_{-1,st}^-) \log\left(\frac{1 - q c_{st}}{1 - p c_{st}}\right) < 0\right).$$

Using Proposition A.4, since $c_{st} \leq d_{st}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\ell_1}^0(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = +1) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} (N_{+1,st}^+ - N_{-1,st}^+) \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + (N_{-1,st}^- - N_{+1,st}^-) \log\left(\frac{1 - q c_{st}}{1 - p c_{st}}\right) < 0\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{s=1}^{\ell_1} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_2} (N_{+1,st}^+ - N_{-1,st}^+) \log\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) + (N_{-1,st}^- - N_{+1,st}^-) \log\left(\frac{1 - q d_{st}}{1 - p d_{st}}\right) < 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\ell_2}^0(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = +1), \end{aligned}$$

and likewise $\mathbb{P}_{\ell_1}^0(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = -1) \geq \mathbb{P}_{\ell_2}^0(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = -1)$. Since $\mathbb{P}_{\ell}(\mathcal{E}^0) = \mathbb{P}_{\ell}(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = +1) \mathbb{P}(\sigma(0) = +1) + \mathbb{P}_{\ell}(\mathcal{E}^0 | \sigma(0) = -1) \mathbb{P}(\sigma(0) = -1)$ with $\mathbb{P}(\sigma(0) = -1) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma(0) = +1) = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain the statement of the proposition. \square

A.2 Some useful concentration bounds

In this section, we provide some useful concentration bounds for the Poisson and binomial distributions. These can be obtained from standard texts such as [7].

Lemma A.2 (Chernoff bound for Poisson random variables). *Let $X \sim \text{Poi}(\mu)$ with $\mu > 0$. For any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \leq \exp\left[-\frac{(t - \mu)^2}{2t}\right].$$

For any $0 < t < \mu$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq t) \leq \exp\left[-\left(t \log \frac{t}{\mu} + \mu - t\right)\right].$$

Lemma A.3 (Chernoff bound for binomial random variables). *Let $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, \mu)$. For any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq \mu(1 + t)) \leq \left(\frac{e^t}{(1 + t)^{(1+t)}}\right)^\mu.$$

A.3 Other required results

Proposition A.4. *Suppose $p > q$ and $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 \leq 1$, then*

$$\log\left(\frac{1 - qt_1}{1 - pt_1}\right) \leq \log\left(\frac{1 - qt_2}{1 - pt_2}\right).$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\frac{1 - qt_1}{1 - pt_1} \leq \frac{1 - qt_2}{1 - pt_2},$$

since $f(x) = \log x$ is an increasing function. This reduces to

$$1 - qt_1 - pt_2 + pqt_1t_2 \leq 1 - qt_2 - pt_1 + pqt_1t_2,$$

which is true whenever $p > q$. □

Proposition A.5. *If $h : [s, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function and $\phi_\ell : [0, \kappa] \rightarrow [s, 1]$ converges uniformly to ϕ , then $h \circ \phi_\ell$ converges uniformly to $h \circ \phi$.*

Proof. Fix an $\epsilon > 0$. Since the domain of h is compact, it is uniformly continuous. Thus, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $|h(x) - h(y)| < \epsilon$ whenever $|x - y| < \delta$. Using uniform convergence of the ϕ_ℓ functions, for this δ there exists a sufficiently large L such that $|\phi_\ell(z) - \phi(z)| < \delta$ for all $z \in [0, \kappa]$ and $\ell \geq L$. Thus, $|h(\phi_\ell(z)) - h(\phi(z))| < \epsilon$ for all $z \in [0, \kappa]$ and $\ell \geq L$ proving the uniform convergence of $h \circ \phi_\ell$. □

A.4 Essentials of Poisson point processes

Let $\Phi = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N\}$ be a stationary Poisson point process on $[0, 1]$ with periodic boundary conditions. Here $N \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda n)$. Denote the space of all locally finite measures on $[0, 1]$ by \mathbf{N} . For $x \in [0, 1]$, let $\theta_x : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be a measure-preserving translation operation given by $(\theta_x \mu)(A) = \mu(A + x)$ for any Borel set A .

Theorem A.6 (Campbell-Mecke theorem). *Let $f : [0, 1] \times \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Then, there exists a unique probability measure \mathbb{P}^0 such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{X_i \in \Phi_n} f(X_i, \theta_{X_i} \Phi) \right] = \lambda n \int_{[0,1]} \int_{\mathbf{N}} f(x, \mu) \mathbb{P}^0(d\mu) dx.$$

The measure \mathbb{P}^0 is referred to as the Palm probability and can be interpreted as the probability conditioned on there being a point at the origin. The following theorem due to Slivnyak suggests that for a stationary Poisson point process, the Palm measure is the same as the measure induced by the Poisson point process.

Theorem A.7 (Slivnyak's theorem). *Let $\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i}$ be a stationary point process with positive finite intensity. Then Φ is a Poisson process if and only if*

$$\mathbb{P}^0(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\Phi + \delta_0 \in \cdot).$$

For additional explanation about these theorems, the reader is referred to [15, Chapter 9] or [6, Chapter 6].