

ON SAMPLING DILUTED SPIN GLASSES USING GLAUBER DYNAMICS

CHARILAOS EFTHYMIU AND KOSTAS ZAMPETAKIS

ABSTRACT. *Spin-glasses* are natural Gibbs distributions that have been studied in theoretical computer science for many decades. Recently, they have been gaining renewed attention from the community as they emerge naturally in *neural computation* and *learning, network inference, optimisation* and many other areas.

Here we consider the *Edwards-Anderson* spin-glass distribution at inverse temperature β when the underlying graph is an instance of $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$. This is a random graph on n vertices such that each edge appears independently with probability d/n , where the expected degree $d = \Theta(1)$. We study the problem of efficiently sampling from the aforementioned distribution using the well-known Markov chain called *Glauber dynamics*.

For a certain range of β , that depends only on the expected degree d of the graph, and for typical instances of the Edwards-Anderson model on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, we show that the corresponding (single-site) Glauber dynamics exhibits mixing time $O(n^{2+\frac{3}{\log^2 d}})$.

The range of β for which we obtain our rapid-mixing result corresponds to the expected influence being smaller than $1/d$. This bound is very natural, and we conjecture that it is the best possible for rapid mixing.

As opposed to the *mean-field* spin-glasses, where the Glauber dynamics has been studied before, less is known for the *diluted* cases like the one we consider here. The latter problems are more challenging to work with because the corresponding instances involve *two levels* of randomness, i.e., the random graph instance and the random Gibbs distribution.

We establish our results by utilising the well-known *path-coupling* technique. In the standard setting of Glauber dynamics on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ one has to deal with the so-called effect of high degree vertices. Here, with the spin-glasses, rather than considering vertex-degrees, it is more natural to use a different measure on the vertices of the graph, that we call *aggregate influence*.

We build on the block-construction approach proposed by [Dyer, Flaxman, Frieze and Vigoda: 2006] to circumvent the problem with the high degrees in the path-coupling analysis. Specifically, to obtain our results, we first establish rapid mixing for an appropriately defined block-dynamics. We design this dynamics such that vertices of large aggregate influence are placed deep inside their blocks. Then, we obtain rapid mixing for the (single-site) Glauber dynamics by utilising a comparison argument.

1. INTRODUCTION

Spin-glasses are natural, high dimensional Gibbs distributions that have been studied in theoretical computer science for many decades. Recently, they have been gaining renewed attention from the community as they emerge naturally in *neural computation* and *learning*, e.g., in the Hopfield model, as models of *network inference*, e.g., in the stochastic block model, in *optimisation, counting-sampling* and many other areas, e.g., see [38, 26, 13, 3, 29, 23, 18].

Furthermore, spin-glasses are widely considered to be canonical models of *extremely* disordered systems [31, 38] and, as such, they have been studied extensively in mathematics & mathematical physics, e.g., see [39, 33, 24, 28], and also in statistical physics [31, 38, 35]. In particular, as far as physics is concerned, spin-glasses have been studied intensively since the early '80s, while the

seminal, groundbreaking work of Giorgio Parisi on spin-glasses got him the Nobel Prize in Physics in 2021.

In this work, we consider the natural problem of sampling from these distributions. To this end, our endeavour is to employ the powerful Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method. Typically, the MCMC sampling algorithms are very simple to describe and implement in practice, however, analysing their performance can be extremely challenging.

We focus on one of the best-known cases of spin-glasses, called the *Edwards-Anderson model* (EA model) [16]. Given a fixed graph $G = (V, E)$, and the vector $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{J}_e : e \in E\}$ of independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) standard Gaussians, the EA model with *inverse temperature* $\beta > 0$, corresponds to the *random* Gibbs distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$ on the configuration space $\{\pm 1\}^V$ such that

$$\mu(\sigma) \propto \exp \left(\beta \sum_{\{w, u\} \in E} \mathbb{1}\{\sigma(u) = \sigma(w)\} \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\{u, w\}} \right) ,$$

where \propto stands for “proportional to”.

In the literature, we also encounter this distribution as the *Viana-Bray model* (e.g. see [28]), or as the *2-spin model* (e.g., see [34, 26]). It is worth mentioning at this point that the Edwards-Anderson model on the complete graph corresponds to the well-known *Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model* (SK model) [36].

On a first account, the EA model may look innocent, i.e., it looks similar to the standard Ising model with just the addition of the Gaussian couplings. It turns out, though, that it is a *fascinating* distribution with a lot of intricacies, while the configuration space has extremely rich structure, e.g. in various settings, it is conjectured to exhibit the “*infinite* Replica Symmetry Breaking” [31].

We use the *Glauber dynamics* to sample from the Edwards-Anderson spin-glass. We assume that the underlying geometry is an instance of the *sparse* random graph $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$. This is a random graph on n vertices, such that each edge appears, independently, with probability $p = d/n$, for some constant $d > 0$. Note that we obtain an instance of the problem by first drawing the underlying graph from the distribution $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and then, given the graph, we generate the random Gibbs distribution.

Sampling from Gibbs distributions induced by instances of $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, or, more generally, instances of so-called random constraint satisfaction problems, is at the heart of recent endeavors to investigate connections between *phase transitions* and the efficiency of algorithms, e.g. [1, 2, 12, 25, 27, 37]. The MCMC sampling problem on random graphs has garnered a lot of attention, e.g., see [14, 7, 19, 32, 20, 15, 11], as it is considered to be an intriguing case to study. So far the focus has been on sampling standard Gibbs distributions, which, already, is a very challenging problem. The study of spin-glasses takes us a step further. Working with the EA model, we introduce an *extra level of disorder* which is due to the random couplings at the edges of the graph. Hence, in our analysis, we need to deal with the disorder of both $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and the random couplings.

For typical instances of *both* the random graph $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and the EA model, we show that the Glauber dynamics exhibits mixing time $O(n^{2 + \frac{3}{\log^2 d}})$ for any inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\tanh \left(\frac{\beta}{2} |\mathbf{J}| \right) \right] < 1/d , \tag{1}$$

where the expectation is with respect to the standard Gaussian random variable \mathbf{J} . It is elementary to show that for large d , the above condition corresponds to having $0 < \beta < \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{d}$. In turn, this implies that the *expected influence* is smaller than $1/d$, a quite natural requirement to have. We *conjecture* that the region for β in which we establish the rapid-mixing of Glauber dynamics is the *best possible*.

We also believe that the bound we obtain on the mixing time is very close to the optimal one. Our conjecture is that the mixing time for Glauber dynamics, in the aforementioned range of β , is $n \exp(\Theta(\sqrt{\log n}))$. This is because we typically have isolated stars with rather large couplings at their edges. Note that we expect to see couplings of magnitude as large as $\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$.

To the best of our knowledge, not much is known about the mixing time of Glauber dynamics for the EA model on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$. There is only a weaker, non-MCMC, sampler for this distribution, proposed in [18]. The error at the output for this algorithm is a vanishing function of n . Here, with the Glauber dynamics, we obtain the standard approximation guarantees one gets from the MCMC samplers, which are considered to be the best possible.

As opposed to the MCMC samplers for the EA model on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, more is known about the *mean-field* SK model, with the most recent works being [4, 6, 29, 23]. For the cases we consider here, these results imply a much weaker bound on β compared to what we get with our approach, i.e., they require β to be a vanishing function of n ¹. This comes without surprise as the SK model lives on the complete graph, hence there is *no geometry* in the problem. On the other hand, the EA model on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ has a very rich, and as it turns out, intricate geometry. Overall, the results for the SK-model fare poorly because they cannot address the geometric challenges that emerge in the EA model on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$.

Our analysis does not rely on the newly introduced *Spectral Independence* (SI) method [5, 10, 9], even though there are rapid mixing results for Gibbs distributions on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ that utilise SI, e.g., see [7, 19]. When it comes to spin-glasses, the natural quantities that arise with SI turn out to be too complicated to work with. Our approach exploits the classic *path-coupling* technique [8]. Specifically, we build on the machinery developed in the sequence of results in [14, 17, 21] that establish fast mixing for Glauber dynamics on (standard) Gibbs distributions on $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$. Basically, our approach builds on these ideas so that we can accommodate the extra disorder that the problem exhibits. Note that these previous works are about distributions such as the colouring model, the hard-core model, etc., and not for spin-glasses.

For typical instances of $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ all but an $\exp(-\Theta(d))$ fraction of the vertices are of degree close to d , while we expect to have degrees as huge as $\Theta\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right)$. In that respect, it is natural to have the parameters of the problem expressed in terms of the expected degree d , rather than, e.g., the maximum degree. Hence, a major challenge in the analysis is how to circumvent the so-called “effect of high degrees”.

Roughly speaking, the approach underlying [21] is as follows: Rather than considering (single site) Glauber dynamics, we consider *block dynamics*. That is, there is an appropriately constructed block-partition of the set of vertices such that, at each step, we update the configuration of a randomly chosen block. As it was already observed in [14], the typical instances of $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ admit a block-partition, such that the high-degree vertices are hidden deep inside the blocks, in a way that makes their effect vanish. This allows one to circumvent the problem that the high-degree vertices pose in the path-coupling analysis and show fast mixing for the block dynamics. Subsequently, one obtains the bounds on the mixing time for the single-site dynamics by using *comparison*.

A primary challenge of the above approach is to construct the desirable block-partition. The contribution coming from the aforementioned works amounts to introducing a *weighting-scheme* (a set of potentials) for the paths in the graph, which is further leveraged for the block construction. Typically, this approach entails heavy probabilistic analysis.

It turns out that the use of potentials for the paths is quite natural in our setting, too. One of our main contributions here is to introduce *new* weights (new potentials) for the paths of the graph, which accommodate the richer structure of the problem. Unlike the previous works that focus only

¹More concretely, it is elementary to verify that they require $\beta = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}}\right)$.

vertex-degrees, we utilise concepts from Spectral Independence and introduce a new measure for the vertices of the graph, which we call *aggregate influence*

Overall, getting a handle on the behaviour of the weights of the paths is one of the most technically demanding parts of this work. It is worth mentioning that the set of blocks we obtain here is quite different than the one appears in [21]. Note that in this work, the block partition is such that vertices with large degree are hidden deep inside the blocks. Here, it is typical to have single-vertex blocks consisting of a high-degree vertex, or having multi-vertex blocks whose vertices are all low-degree ones. This comes without surprise, as the notions of the aggregate influence and the degree of a vertex are different from each other.

1.1. Results. We let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ be the Erdős–Rényi graph on a set V_n of n vertices, with edge probability d/n , where $d > 0$ is a fixed number. The Edwards-Anderson model on \mathbf{G} at *inverse temperature* $\beta > 0$, is defined as follows: for $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{J}_e : e \in E(\mathbf{G})\}$ a family of independent, *standard Gaussians*, and for $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{V_n}$, we let

$$\mu_{\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z_{\beta}(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J})} \cdot \exp \left(\beta \sum_{x \sim y} \mathbb{1}\{\sigma(y) = \sigma(x)\} \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\{x, y\}} \right) , \quad (2)$$

where

$$Z_{\beta}(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}) = \sum_{\tau \in \{\pm 1\}^{V_n}} \exp \left(\beta \sum_{x \sim y} \mathbb{1}\{\tau(y) = \tau(x)\} \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\{x, y\}} \right) .$$

Typically, we study this distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We use the discrete time, (single site) *Glauber dynamics* $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to approximately sample from the aforementioned distributions $\mu = \mu_{\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$. Glauber dynamics is a Markov chain with state space the support of the distribution μ . We assume that the chain starts from an arbitrary configuration $X_0 \in \{\pm 1\}^{V_n}$. For $t \geq 0$, the transition from the state X_t to X_{t+1} is according to the following steps:

- (1) choose uniformly at random a vertex v ,
- (2) for every vertex w different than v , set $X_{t+1}(w) = X_t(w)$,
- (3) set $X_{t+1}(v)$ according to the marginal of μ at v , conditional on the neighbours of v having the configuration specified by X_{t+1} .

It is standard to show that when a Markov chain satisfies a set of technical conditions called *ergodicity*, then it converges to a unique stationary distribution. For the cases we consider here, the Glauber dynamics is trivially ergodic.

Let P be the transition matrix of an ergodic Markov chain (X_t) with a finite state space Ω and equilibrium distribution μ . For $t \geq 0$, and $\sigma \in \Omega$, let $P^t(\sigma, \cdot)$ denote the distribution of X_t , when the initial state of the chain satisfies $X_0 = \sigma$. The *mixing time* of the Markov chain $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined by

$$T_{\text{Mix}} = \max_{\sigma \in \Omega} \min \{t > 0 : \|P^t(\sigma, \cdot) - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1/e\} .$$

Our focus is on the mixing time of the aforementioned Markov chain.

Finally, for $k > 1$ we let

$$\beta_c(k) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{k} . \quad (3)$$

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for $d \geq d_0$, for $\beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that the following is true:*

Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, while let μ be the Edwards-Anderson model on \mathbf{G} , at inverse temperature β . Then, with probability $1 - n^{-1/4}$ over the instances of \mathbf{G} and μ , the Glauber dynamics on μ exhibits mixing time

$$T_{\text{Mix}} \leq C \cdot n^{2 + \frac{3}{\log^2 d}} .$$

A couple of remarks are in order. First, in Theorem 1.1, we write $\beta < \beta_c(d)$ to specify the region that we have rapid mixing. This condition is equivalent to what we have in (1), since we assume sufficiently large d . Using $\beta < \beta_c(d)$ instead of (1), leads to cleaner derivations.

Second, we note that Theorem 1.1 continues to hold if we replace the Gaussian couplings with couplings drawn from an arbitrary *sub-Gaussian* distribution. To see this, notice that if J' is sub-Gaussian, and J is a zero-mean Gaussian, there exist a constant $c \geq 0$, such that for all $t > 0$ we have that $\Pr[|J'| \geq t] \leq c \cdot \Pr[|J| \geq t]$. Therefore, for any (using coupling) any sub-Gaussian model to the EA-model we consider here.

2. APPROACH

In this section, we give a high-level overview of the construction we use to prove Theorem 1.1. Note that the construction relies on introducing a good number of potentials.

2.1. Aggregate Influence. Consider the graph $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, and the vector of real numbers $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{J}_e : e \in E(\mathbf{G})\}$, where \mathbf{J}_e 's are i.i.d. standard Gaussians, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. For $\beta > 0$, consider also the Edwards-Anderson model $\mu = \mu_{\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$ on $\{\pm 1\}^{V_n}$, that is,

$$\mu(\sigma) \propto \exp\left(\beta \sum_{x \sim y} \mathbb{1}\{\sigma(y) = \sigma(x)\} \cdot \mathbf{J}_{\{x, y\}}\right), \quad \forall \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^{V_n} . \quad (4)$$

We usually refer to each \mathbf{J}_e as the *coupling* at the edge e in the graph.

For each edge $e \in E(\mathbf{G})$ consider the *influence* Γ_e defined by

$$\Gamma_e = \frac{|1 - \exp(\beta \mathbf{J}_e)|}{1 + \exp(\beta \mathbf{J}_e)} . \quad (5)$$

A natural way of viewing the influence Γ_e is as a measure of correlation decay over the edge e . Note that the influence is a very natural quantity to consider and emerges in many different contexts such as [10, 18, 22], just to mention a few.

To get some intuition, note that $\Gamma_e \in [0, 1]$ is an increasing function of $|\mathbf{J}_e|$. For a “heavy edge”, i.e., an edge e that $|\mathbf{J}_e|$ is “big”, the corresponding influence is close to 1. On the other hand, for a “light edge”, i.e., when $|\mathbf{J}_e|$ is “small”, the corresponding influence is close to 0.

Given the set of influences $\{\Gamma_e\}_{e \in E(\mathbf{G})}$, for every vertex $w \in V(\mathbf{G})$, we define the *aggregate influence* such that

$$A(w) = \sum_{z \sim w} \Gamma_{\{w, z\}} . \quad (6)$$

The quantities $A(w)$'s play a key role in the analysis, as they are used in our construction of blocks.

The choice of parameters in Theorem 1.1, implies that for each vertex w , we have that $\mathbb{E}[A(w)] = (1 - \varepsilon)$, where the expectation is with respect to both the degree of w and the couplings at its incident edges.

In Theorem 3.1, in the appendix, we show that $A(w)$ is well-concentrated, i.e., for any fixed $\delta > 0$, we have that

$$\Pr[A(w) > \mathbb{E}[A(w)] + \delta] \leq \exp(-\Omega(d)) . \quad (7)$$

In our analysis, we would have liked that each vertex in \mathbf{G} has aggregate influence < 1 . From the above tail bound we expect to have many, but relatively rare, heavy vertices in \mathbf{G} , i.e., vertices

with aggregate influence > 1 . Note that, we typically have $\text{poly}(n)$ many vertices each of aggregate influence as huge as $\Theta(\log^{4/3} n)$.

2.2. Path Weights. We introduce a weighting-scheme for the vertices of the graph \mathbf{G} that uses $A(w)$'s. There are parameters $d, \delta > 0$ in the scheme, where $d > 0$ is a large number, while $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Each vertex w is assigned weight $M(w)$ defined by

$$M(w) = \begin{cases} 1 - \delta/2 & \text{if } A(w) \leq 1 - \delta, \\ d \cdot A(w) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Given the above weights for the vertices, we define a weight for each path in \mathbf{G} . Specifically, the path $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$ is assigned weight $M(P)$, defined by

$$M(P) = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell} M(v_i) .$$

Subsequently, we introduce the notion of *block-vertices* in \mathbf{G} . A vertex w is called block-vertex if every path P that emanates from w is “light”, i.e., it has weight $M(P) < 1$. Intuitively, w being a block-vertex implies that $A(w) < 1$, while every heavy vertex v , i.e., having $A(v) > 1$, needs to be far from w .

For the range of the parameters we consider here, it turns out that there is a plethora of block-vertices in \mathbf{G} . Specifically, we show the following result (Theorem 9.1, in the appendix). Let \mathcal{P} be the set of paths P in \mathbf{G} of length $|P| = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, such that there is no block-vertex in P . Then, we have that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P} \text{ is empty}] = 1 - o(1) . \quad (9)$$

Establishing the above, is one of the main technical challenges in this paper, as the quantities we consider are inherently quite involved.

Below, we show how we use (9) for the block construction.

2.3. Block construction. The aim is to obtain a block partition $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_N\}$ such that each $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is small, simply structured, while $\partial_{\text{out}} B$, the outer boundary of B , consists exclusively of block vertices. Note that $\partial_{\text{out}} B$ is the set of vertices outside B which have a neighbour inside the block.

Let us give a high-level description of how \mathcal{B} looks like. Recall that, typically, \mathbf{G} is locally tree-like, however, there are some relatively rare short cycles, i.e., cycles of length less than $4 \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$, which are far apart from each other.

Each block $B \in \mathcal{B}$ can be one of the following

- (1) single vertex,
- (2) a tree,
- (3) a unicyclic graph.

If B consists of a single vertex, then this vertex must be a block-vertex. If B is multi-vertex, then $\partial_{\text{out}} B$ consists of block-vertices. This, somehow, guarantees that the heavy vertices are hidden deep inside the blocks. The unicyclic blocks contain only short cycles.

Intuitively, (9) guarantees that the blocks are not extensive structures. Note that, for a heavy vertex w , we can reach the boundary of its block, by following any path of length as small as $\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$ that emanates from w .

Compared to the blocks we have in [17, 21] the ones we get here are quite different. Note that the actual structure of the blocks depends on both graph \mathbf{G} and the EA model $\mu_{\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$ on this graph. Furthermore, here, it is typical to see single vertex blocks consisting of a high-degree vertex, i.e., degree $\gg d$, or having multi-vertex blocks whose vertices are all low-degree ones, i.e., degree $\approx d$.

Of course, this has to do with the fact that the aggregate influence is a different quantity than the degree of a vertex.

2.4. Rapid Mixing of Block Dynamics. Suppose that we have a block partition $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_N\}$ as the one we describe in Section 2.3.

We consider the *block dynamics* $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with respect to the set of blocks \mathcal{B} . The transition from X_t to X_{t+1} is according to the following steps:

- (1) Choose uniformly at random a block $B \in \mathcal{B}$.
- (2) For every vertex w outside B , set $X_{t+1}(w) = X_t(w)$.
- (3) Draw $X_{t+1}(B)$, the configuration at B , according to the marginal of μ at B , conditional on the vertices in $\partial_{\text{out}} B$ having the configuration specified by X_{t+1} .

At this stage, the goal is to show that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ exhibits mixing time T_{Mix} such that

$$T_{\text{Mix}} = O(N \log N) , \tag{10}$$

where N is the number of blocks in \mathcal{B} .

We use path coupling [8] to show (10). That is, we consider $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$, two copies of the block dynamics. Assume that at some time $t \geq 0$, the configurations X_t and Y_t differ at a single vertex, u^* . It suffices to show that we have one-step contraction i.e., we can couple the two copies of the block dynamics such that the expected distance between X_{t+1} and Y_{t+1} is smaller than that of X_t and Y_t .

Typically, we establish contraction with respect to the *Hamming metric* between two configurations. It turns out that, for block dynamics, this metric is suboptimal. In contrast to the single-site dynamics, when we update a block B that is adjacent to the disagreeing vertex u^* , the number of disagreements grows by the size of B . For this reason, we follow an analysis for path coupling which adapts to the setting of block dynamics.

For each vertex z , we write B_z for the block that z belongs to. Furthermore, let

$$A_{\text{out}}(z) = \sum_{\substack{z \sim w \\ w \notin B_z}} \Gamma_{\{z,w\}} . \tag{11}$$

That is, $A_{\text{out}}(z)$ is the sum of influences over the edges that connect z with its neighbours outside the block B_z . Typically, if vertex z has at least one neighbour outside B_z , then $A_{\text{out}}(z) > n^{-7/3}$.

We let $W \subseteq V$ be the set that of vertices z such that $A_{\text{out}}(z) > 0$. We call W the set of *external* vertices. On the other hand, we call *internal* all the vertices in $V \setminus W$. Note that the internal vertices have no neighbours outside their block and hence $A_{\text{out}}(z) = 0$.

For the path coupling, we introduce the following distance metric for any two $\sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}^V$

$$\text{dist}(\sigma, \tau) = \sum_{z \in V \setminus W} \mathbf{1}\{z \in \sigma \oplus \tau\} + n^4 \cdot \sum_{z \in W} A_{\text{out}}(z) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{z \in \sigma \oplus \tau\} ,$$

where $\sigma \oplus \tau$ is the set of vertices $w \in V$ that the two configurations disagree, i.e., it consists of the vertices w such that $\sigma(w) \neq \tau(w)$.

The above metric assigns completely different weights to the internal and external vertices, respectively. If some vertex z is internal, then its disagreement gets (tiny) weight 1. On the other hand, if z is external, its disagreement gets weight which is equal to $n^4 \times A_{\text{out}}(z) \gg 1$. Particularly, we have that $n^4 \times A_{\text{out}}(z) = \Omega(n^{4/3})$, for all external vertices z .

The above metric essentially captures that the disagreements that do matter in the path coupling analysis, are those which involve vertices at the boundary of blocks, i.e., external vertices. In particular, the ‘‘potential’’ for an external vertex to spread disagreements to adjacent blocks increases with $A_{\text{out}}(z)$. Let us remark that this observation was first introduced and exploited in [21] in an analogous setting.

In the path coupling analysis, we also exploit properties of the block partition \mathcal{B} . Particularly, we use that the block vertices are far from the heavy ones, i.e., the vertices that have aggregate influence larger than 1. A heavy vertex in block B , once it becomes disagreeing, tends to create higher than typical number of new disagreements. This is highly undesirable. Having a large distance between the heavy vertices inside B and the boundary $\partial_{\text{out}}B$ implies that the probability of a heavy vertex becoming disagreeing is very small. As a consequence, the overall expected contribution of the heavy vertices becomes negligible.

In light of all the above, we conclude that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any vertex $u^* \in V$, for any pair of configurations X_t, Y_t that differ on u^* there is a coupling such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) \mid X_t, Y_t] \leq (1 - C/N) \cdot \text{dist}(X_t, Y_t) . \quad (12)$$

Using path coupling, and arguing that $N = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$, it is standard to obtain (10) from the above inequality. For further details, see Theorem 5.1, in the appendix.

2.5. Rapid Mixing for Glauber Dynamics - Comparison. This part is a bit technical. Recall that our aim is to obtain a bound on the mixing time for the single-site Glauber dynamics, whereas so far we only have a bound for the mixing time of the block-dynamics. To this end, we utilise a well-known comparison argument from [30], which relates the relaxation times of the Glauber dynamics and the block dynamics. Recall that the relaxation time of a Markov chain with transition matrix P is equal to $\frac{1}{1-\lambda^*}$, where λ^* is the second largest eigenvalue in magnitude of P .

Letting τ_{rel} and τ_{block} be the relaxation times of the Glauber dynamics and the block dynamics, respectively, from [30], we obtain that

$$\tau_{\text{rel}} \leq \tau_{\text{block}} \cdot (\max_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \{\tau_B\}) , \quad (13)$$

where τ_B is the relaxation time of the (single site) Glauber dynamics on each block $B \in \mathcal{B}$, under worst-case condition σ at the boundary $\partial_{\text{out}}B$.

From the rapid mixing result of block dynamics it is standard to obtain a bound on τ_{block} , hence, it remains to get a bound on τ_B , for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Our endeavour to bound τ_B gives rise to a new weight over the paths in $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$. Specifically, for a path P in \mathbf{G} , we define the weight

$$\Upsilon(P) = \beta \sum_e |J_e| + \sum_v \log \deg(v) . \quad (14)$$

In the first sum, which involves the couplings, the variable e varies over all edges having at least one endpoint in P . The second sum varies over all the vertices in P .

Building on a recursive argument from [21, 32], for every tree-like block B rooted at vertex v , we show

$$\tau_B \leq \exp(\max_P \{\Upsilon(P)\}) , \quad (15)$$

where the maximum is over all the paths P in B from the root v to $\partial_{\text{out}}B$. Note that such a path P is at most $\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$ long. We also get a similar bound for the relaxation time when B is unicyclic.

We show that with probability $1 - o(1)$ over the instances of \mathbf{G} and μ , every path P in \mathbf{G} of length at most $\frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$, satisfies $\Upsilon(P) \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$. This implies that for every block B we have that

$$\tau_B \leq n^{\frac{3}{\log^2 d}} . \quad (16)$$

As mentioned earlier, it is standard to obtain an estimate for τ_{block} from our rapid mixing results for the block-dynamics. Hence, plugging τ_B 's and τ_{block} into (13), gives the desired bound on τ_{rel} , the relaxation time for Glauber dynamics. From this point on, it is standard to get Theorem 1.1. For further details, see Section 6, in the appendix.

3. BASIC NOTIONS

Gibbs distribution & Influences: Even though most of the notions we describe below have been already introduced earlier, we present them here in full detail and formality.

We use the triplet (G, \mathcal{J}, β) , where $G = (V, E)$ is a graph, $\mathcal{J} = \{J_e \in \mathbb{R} : e \in E\}$, and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, to represent the “glassy” Gibbs distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$ on $\{\pm 1\}^V$ defined by

$$\mu(\sigma) \propto \exp \left(\beta \cdot \sum_{x \sim y} \mathbb{1}\{\sigma(y) = \sigma(x)\} \cdot J_{\{x,y\}} \right), \quad \forall \sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^V . \quad (17)$$

Clearly, the above gives rise to the EA model on G once we take the couplings on the edges to be i.i.d. standard Gaussians.

The above triplet specifies a set of *influences* over the edges of G . That is, for every $e \in E$ we define the *edge-influence* Γ_e such that

$$\Gamma_e = \frac{|1 - \exp(\beta J_e)|}{1 + \exp(\beta J_e)} . \quad (18)$$

This is the standard influence we encounter in the context of Spectral Independence, e.g., see [10].

The following argument concerning influences is standard. Consider two adjacent vertices u and w in G , and let σ, τ be any two configurations at the neighbours of w disagreeing only on at u . Writing $e = \{u, w\}$ for the edge between w and u , we have that

$$\|\mu_w^\sigma - \mu_w^\tau\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \Gamma_e , \quad (19)$$

where μ_w^σ is the marginal of μ at w conditional on the configuration σ , and similarly for μ_w^τ .

Aggregate Influences: For each vertex $u \in V$ we define the aggregate influence $A(u)$ such that

$$A(u) = \sum_{w \sim u} \Gamma_{\{u,w\}} . \quad (20)$$

Consider now the random graph $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and the EA model on this graph with inverse temperature β . For a vertex u in this graph, the corresponding quantity, $A(u)$, turns out to be an involved random variable. The number of edges incident to u , hence the number of summands in $A(u)$, is Binomially distributed, i.e., $\text{Bin}(n, d/n)$, while for each edge e incident to u the influence is also a random variable, i.e., for each e , we have $\Gamma_e = \frac{|1 - \exp(\beta J_e)|}{1 + \exp(\beta J_e)}$, where J_e is a standard Gaussian.

There is a natural connection between the aggregate influence and the condition for the inverse temperature $\beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$ we have in Theorem 1.1. Specifically, for any such β we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[A(u)] \leq 1 - \varepsilon .$$

In the analysis we establish the following tail bound for $A(u)$ establishing this random variable is well-concentrated.

Theorem 3.1. *For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$ and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

Consider $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and the EA model on this graph at inverse temperature β . For a fixed vertex u in \mathbf{G} , we have that

$$\Pr \left[A(u) \geq \mathbb{E}[A(u)] + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\varepsilon^4}{8\pi} \cdot d \right) . \quad (21)$$

A crucial corollary from the above result is that, for the range of the parameters we consider in Theorem 1.1, the probability of having $A(u) > 1$ is exponentially small in d .

Weighting-Scheme: As before, consider the triplet (G, \mathcal{J}, β) , for a fixed graph $G = (V, E)$, couplings $\mathcal{J} = \{J_e \in \mathbb{R} : e \in E\}$, and $\beta > 0$. Also, consider the distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$, i.e., the Gibbs distribution defined with respect to (G, \mathcal{J}, β) .

We use the $A(u)$'s induced by \mathcal{J} to introduce a weight scheme for both the vertices and the paths of G . Let us start with the weights for the vertices.

Definition 3.2 ((d, ε) Vertex-Weight). *For parameters $\varepsilon > 0$ and $d > 0$, and for any $u \in V$ define the vertex weight*

$$M(u) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} & \text{if } A(u) \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ d \cdot A(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Then, having defined the weights $M(u)$, we define the weight of paths in G .

Definition 3.3 ((d, ε) Path-Weight). *For parameters $\varepsilon > 0$ and $d > 0$, and for any path $P = (w_0, \dots, w_\ell)$ in G , we define the path weight*

$$M(P) = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell} M(w_i) .$$

That is, the weight of a path, is obtained by multiplying the weights of its vertices. Finally, we have the notion of block vertex, which plays a key role in the construction of the block-partition in Section 4.

Definition 3.4 ((d, ε) -Block Vertex). *For $\varepsilon, d > 0$, a vertex u in G is called (d, ε) -block vertex, if for every path P of length at most $\log n$ emanating from u , the (d, ε) -weight of P is less than 1, i.e., $M(P) < 1$.*

Definitions 3.3 and 3.4 make it apparent that every path P connecting a heavy vertex w and a block vertex u , must contain a large ‘‘buffer’’ of light vertices. We exploit this property of the block vertices in the block construction that follows.

4. BLOCK PARTITION & OTHER STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES

In order to show Theorem 1.1, rather than considering (single site) Glauber dynamics, firstly, we consider *block dynamics*. Specifically, we show that there is an appropriately constructed block-partition \mathcal{B} of the set of vertices such that the corresponding block dynamics mixes fast. Subsequently, we utilise a comparison argument to show that the above result implies rapid mixing for the Glauber dynamics, as well.

The block partition \mathcal{B} is specified with respect to the weights we defined in the previous section. Hence, \mathcal{B} depends on $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and the specification of the Edwards-Anderson model on this graph. In what follows, we describe in full detail how the set of blocks \mathcal{B} looks like. Furthermore, we show that the typical instances of \mathbf{G} and μ , the Edwards-Anderson model on \mathbf{G} at inverse temperature β as specified in Theorem 1.1, admit such a partition.

Definition 4.1 ((d, ε) -Block Partition). *For $\varepsilon, d > 0$, the vertex partition $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_N\}$ is called (d, ε) -block partition if for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ the following is true:*

- (1) *block B is a tree with at most one extra edge,*
- (2) *if B is a multi-vertex block, then we have the following:*
 - (a) *every $w \in \partial_{\text{out}} B$ is a (d, ε) -block vertex,*
 - (b) *every $w \in \partial_{\text{out}} B$ has exactly one neighbour in B ,*
 - (c) *if B contains a cycle, this is a short one, i.e., its length is at most $4 \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$,*
 - (d) *the distance of the short cycle from the boundary of its block is at least $\log^5 d$.*
- (3) *if B is a single-vertex block, then this vertex is (d, ε) -block.*

We would like to stress here that the blocks in \mathcal{B} are really simply structured, i.e., these are trees or unicyclic graphs.

Apart from the weight on paths introduced in Definition 3.3, we consider yet another weight for the paths. In particular, for a path P , we define

$$\Upsilon(P) = \beta \sum_e |J_e| + \sum_v \log \deg(v) , \quad (23)$$

where the first sum varies over all edges e in G having least one endpoint in P , while the second sum varies over all vertices of P . As we discuss later, this weight arises in our comparison argument.

For any $d, \varepsilon > 0$, for $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, we define $\mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$ to be the set of triplets (G, \mathcal{J}, β) possessing the following properties:

- (1) G admits a (d, ε) -block partition,
- (2) every path P in G of length $|P| \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$, satisfies $\Upsilon(P) \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$,
- (3) every edge e in G satisfies $n^{-7/3} \leq |J_e| \leq 10\sqrt{\log n}$.

In light of all the above, we prove the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that for any $d \geq d_0$, and for any $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

For $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, and for $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{J}_e : e \in E(\mathbf{G})\}$ a family of i.i.d. standard Gaussians we have

$$\Pr[(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4} .$$

The proof of Theorem 4.2 appears in Section 8.

5. FAST MIXING OF BLOCK DYNAMICS

For $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large $d > 0$, we consider a triplet $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$, and a (d, ε) -block partition \mathcal{B} obtained from this triplet. We also consider $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the block-dynamics defined with respect to the Gibbs distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, G}$ and the set of blocks \mathcal{B} . We show that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is optimally mixing, i.e., the mixing time is $O(N \log N)$, where N is the number of blocks in \mathcal{B} .

Recall that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a discrete-time Markov chain. We get X_{t+1} from X_t by choosing uniformly at random a block $B_t \in \mathcal{B}$ and updating the configuration of B_t according to the marginal of μ at this block, conditional on that the configuration outside B_t being as specified by X_t .

Theorem 5.1. *For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, for $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$ and any $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that the following is true:*

Let \mathcal{B} a (d, ε) -block partition of G and consider the Gibbs distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$. The block dynamics defined with respect to μ and the set of blocks \mathcal{B} , exhibits mixing time

$$T_{\text{Mix}} \leq C \cdot N \log N ,$$

where N is the number of blocks in \mathcal{B} .

The proof of Theorem 5.1 appears in Section 7. Some remarks are in order. First, note that in the above theorem we do not need to have an instance of $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, or Gaussian couplings at the edges, i.e., it holds for every triplet in \mathcal{G} .

Second, even though we use block dynamics only as a tool for the analysis, it is worth mentioning that one can actually implement this dynamics efficiently. This is due to the fact that the blocks in \mathcal{B} are trees with at most one extra edge. Hence, each step t of the dynamics can be implemented in $O(|B_t|)$ using *dynamic programming*, where $|B_t|$ is the number of vertices in the block B_t .

6. FAST MIXING FOR SINGLE SITE GLAUBER DYNAMICS - PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We use the rapid mixing result from Section 5 to upper bound the mixing time of the single site Glauber dynamics by means of the following well-known comparison result from [30].

Proposition 6.1. *For the graph $G = (V, E)$, let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the block dynamics, with set of blocks \mathcal{R} , such that each vertex $u \in V$ belongs to M_u different blocks. Furthermore, let $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the single site dynamics on G .*

Let τ_{block} and τ_{rel} be the relaxation times of (X_t) and (Y_t) , respectively. Furthermore, for each block $B \in \mathcal{R}$, let τ_B be the relaxation time of the single site dynamics on B , given any arbitrary condition at $\partial_{\text{out}} B$. Then,

$$\tau_{\text{rel}} \leq \tau_{\text{block}} \cdot (\max_{B \in \mathcal{R}} \{\tau_B\}) \cdot (\max_{u \in V} \{M_u\}) .$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large $d > 0$, consider $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$ and the corresponding distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$, specified as in (17). Also, let \mathcal{B} be a (d, ε) -block partition for G .

Let $(X)_{t \geq 0}$ be the block dynamics defined with respect to μ and the set of blocks \mathcal{B} . Also, let $(Y)_{t \geq 0}$ let be the (single site) Glauber dynamics on μ .

Suppose that τ_{block} is the relaxation time for (X_t) , while let τ_{rel} be the relaxation time for (Y_t) . Finally, for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let τ_B be the relaxation time of the single site dynamics on B , for arbitrary condition σ at $\partial_{\text{out}} B$. We have the following result.

Theorem 6.2. *It holds that $\tau_{\text{block}} = O(n \log n)$, while for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ we have that $\tau_B \leq n^{\frac{3}{\log^2 d}}$.*

The proof of Theorem 6.2 appears in Section 16. The following corollary is immediate from Theorem 6.2 and Proposition 6.1.

Corollary 6.3. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for every $d \geq d_0$ and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$ the following is true:*

For any graph $G = (V, E)$, and $\mathcal{J} = \{J_e : e \in E\}$ such that $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$, consider the Gibbs distribution $\mu = \mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$. Then, the single site Glauber dynamics on μ exhibits relaxation time

$$\tau_{\text{rel}} \leq n^{1 + \frac{3}{\log^2 d}} .$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. According to Theorem 4.2 we have the following:

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon)$ such that for any $d \geq d_0$ and for $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$ the following is true: For $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, for $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathbf{J}_e : e \in E(\mathbf{G})\}$ a family of i.i.d. standard Gaussians, we have that

$$\Pr[(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)] \geq 1 - n^{-1/4} .$$

Hence, due to Corollary 6.3, with probability at least $1 - n^{-1/4}$ over the instances of $(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J})$ the single site, Glauber dynamics exhibits relaxation time τ_{rel} such that

$$\tau_{\text{rel}} \leq n^{1 + \frac{3}{\log^2 d}} .$$

It is now standard that

$$T_{\text{Mix}} = O\left(n^{2 + \frac{3}{\log^2 d}}\right) ,$$

concluding the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

We use path coupling [8] for the proof of Theorem 5.1. We establish contraction by introducing a metric on the configuration space $\{\pm 1\}^V$ (also discussed in Section 2.4). For each vertex $z \in V$, we let B_z denote the block that z belongs to. Furthermore, let

$$A_{\text{out}}(z) = \sum_{\substack{z \sim w \\ w \notin B_z}} \Gamma_{\{z,w\}} . \quad (24)$$

That is, A_{out} is the aggregate influence of vertex z on its neighbours *outside* block B_z . Let also $W \subseteq V$ consist of all vertices $z \in V$ such that $A_{\text{out}}(z) > 0$. Perhaps it is useful to remind the reader that all couplings J_e 's are assumed to be non-zero. Specifically, for every edge e , we have that $|J_e| > n^{-7/3}$. The above implies that, if $A_{\text{out}}(z) = 0$, i.e., $z \in V \setminus W$, then z has no neighbours outside B_z . We call such a vertex *internal*.

In light of the above, we introduce the following distance metric on the configuration space $\{\pm 1\}^V$: For any two $\sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}^V$, we let

$$\mathbf{dist}(\sigma, \tau) = \sum_{z \in V \setminus W} \mathbf{1}\{z \in \sigma \oplus \tau\} + n^4 \cdot \sum_{z \in W} A_{\text{out}}(z) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{z \in \sigma \oplus \tau\} , \quad (25)$$

where $\sigma \oplus \tau$ is the set of vertices $w \in V$ that the two configurations disagree, i.e., $\sigma(w) \neq \tau(w)$. Let us note that a similar distance metric first appeared in [20].

We proceed now with the path coupling argument. Consider two copies of the block dynamics $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Assume that at time $t \geq 0$, the configurations X_t and Y_t differ at a single vertex u^* . It suffices to show that we have contraction at $t + 1$, i.e., the expected distance between X_{t+1} and Y_{t+1} is smaller than that between X_t and Y_t . To this end, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *Suppose that $u^* \in W$. For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $u^* \in \partial_{\text{out}} B$, there exists a coupling between X_{t+1} and Y_{t+1} , such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbf{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t, B \text{ updated at time } t + 1] \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/6) ,$$

where $z \in B$ is the unique neighbour of u^* in B .

The proof of Theorem 7.1 appears in Section 7.1.

In light of Theorem 7.1, we proceed with the path coupling analysis. Consider now two cases for vertex u^* . In the first case, assume that $u^* \in W$, whereas in the second one, assume that $u^* \notin W$. We establish contraction for both cases.

We start by assuming that u^* is external, i.e., $u^* \in W$. Suppose that at time $t + 1$ the block $B_{t+1} \in \mathcal{B}$ is updated. If we have $B_{u^*} = B_{t+1}$, then we use identity coupling and get that $X_{t+1} = Y_{t+1}$. Hence, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbf{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t, B_{t+1} = B_{u^*}] = -n^4 \cdot A_{\text{out}}(u^*) . \quad (26)$$

If B_{t+1} is such that $u^* \notin \partial_{\text{out}} B_{t+1}$, we have that $\mathbf{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) = \mathbf{dist}(X_t, Y_t)$ by using identity coupling. Hence, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbf{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t, u^* \notin \partial_{\text{out}} B_{t+1}] = 0 . \quad (27)$$

Finally, if B_{t+1} is such that $u^* \in \partial_{\text{out}} B_{t+1}$, then Theorem 7.1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \mathbf{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t, u^* \in \partial_{\text{out}} B_{t+1}] &\leq \sum_{\substack{z \sim u^* \\ z \notin B_{u^*}}} \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/6) \\ &= n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/6) \cdot A_{\text{out}}(u^*) , \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}(u^*)$. Combining now (26), (27) and (28), we get that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \text{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t, u^* \in \partial_{\text{out}} B_{t+1}] \leq -\varepsilon \cdot \frac{n^4}{6N} \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}(u^*) . \quad (29)$$

On the other hand, if the disagreeing vertex, u^* is internal, i.e., $u^* \in V \setminus W$, then the disagreement cannot spread. Hence, when the block B_{u^*} updates, then the disagreement disappears, and thus, if $u^* \notin W$, then we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \text{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t] \leq -\frac{1}{N} . \quad (30)$$

From (30) and (29) it is standard to get Theorem 5.1.

7.1. Proof of Theorem 7.1. For any set of vertices Λ such that $\Lambda \subseteq B$, we define the quantity

$$\mathcal{D}(\Lambda, X_t, Y_t) = \sum_{w \in \Lambda} n^4 \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}(w) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{w \in X_t \oplus Y_t\} .$$

Furthermore, for any $w \in B \cup \partial_{\text{out}} B$ we let

$$S_w(\Lambda) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}(\Lambda, X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) \mid X_{t+1}(w) \neq Y_{t+1}(w), X_t, Y_t, B \text{ updated at } t+1] .$$

Recall that $z \in B$ is the unique neighbour of u^* in B . We have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) - \text{dist}(X_t, Y_t) \mid X_t, Y_t, B \text{ updated at } t+1] \leq S_{u^*}(B) + \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n . \quad (31)$$

To see the above, notice that the term $S_{u^*}(B)$ equals the contribution of the external vertices in the block B , i.e., those vertices w such that $\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}}(w) > 0$. The term $\Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n$ is an overestimation for the contribution of the internal vertices of B . Specifically, once the disagreement of u^* propagates at z , which happens with probability at most $\Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}}$, then the contribution of internal vertices in B is at most n .

The theorem follows by showing that

$$S_{u^*}(B) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/5) . \quad (32)$$

The following standard, technical, result is useful in our analysis.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $H = (V_H, E_H)$ be the graph induced by $B \cup \partial_{\text{out}} B$, for a multi-vertex block $B \in \mathcal{B}$.*

For any $\Lambda \subset V_H$ that includes $\partial_{\text{out}} B$, for any vertex $w \in V_H \setminus \Lambda$, where $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^\Lambda$, let $\mu^+ = \mu(\cdot \mid \{\Lambda, \sigma\}, \{w, +\})$ and $\mu^- = \mu(\cdot \mid \{\Lambda, \sigma\}, \{w, -\})$. There exist a coupling ν of the measures μ^+ and μ^- such that the following is true:

Let $M \subseteq V_H \setminus \Lambda$, be a subset of neighbours of w in B which do not belong to the cycle inside B , if such a cycle exists. Then, for (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) distributed as in ν , we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y}) \cap M|] \leq \sum_{u \in M} \Gamma_{\{w, u\}} ,$$

where $\Gamma_{\{w, u\}}$ is the influence of the edge $\{w, u\}$.

Proof. Choose ν to be the maximal coupling for each one of neighbours of w in M . Since none of the vertices in M belongs to the same cycle, it is elementary to show that we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\mathbf{X} \oplus \mathbf{Y}) \cap M|] = \sum_{u \in M} \|\mu_u^+ - \mu_u^-\|_{\text{TV}} ,$$

where μ_u^+, μ_u^- are the marginals of μ^+, μ^- , respectively, at vertex $u \in M$. It is standard to show that $\|\mu_u^+ - \mu_u^-\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \Gamma_{\{w, u\}}$. For example, see discussion in (19).

The above concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

To proceed with the proof of (32), we make some useful observation following from the definition of the block-vertex (Definition 3.4) and that of the block-partition \mathcal{B} (Definition 4.1).

Corollary 7.3. *For any multi-vertex block $B \in \mathcal{B}$, for any $u \in \partial_{\text{out}}B$ and any vertex $w \in B$ the following is true:*

Let P be any path of length ℓ connecting u and w . Let also M be the set of heavy vertices in P , i.e., for all $x \in M$ we have $A(x) > 1 - \varepsilon/2$. Then, we have that

$$\prod_{x \in M} A(x) \leq d^{-|M|} (1 - \varepsilon/4)^{|M| - \ell} .$$

The above corollary follows by noticing that any path P in B connecting w to a vertex in $\partial_{\text{out}}B$, needs to satisfy $M(P) < 1$. The inequality then follows from the definition of the weight $M(P)$.

Corollary 7.4. *For every multi-vertex block B and every vertex $w \in B$ such that $A(w) > 1 - \varepsilon/2$, the closest block-vertex to w is at distance $> \log d$.*

Corollary 7.4 follows from Corollary 7.3 by noticing that if there is a path P from w to $\partial_{\text{out}}B$ with $|P| \leq \log(d)$, then $M(P) > 1$. Clearly, this cannot be true, since $\partial_{\text{out}}B$ consists only of block-vertices.

Let us introduce a few useful concepts. We let \widehat{T} be the subset of B that contains all vertices reachable from u^* through a path within B of length at most $\log d$. It is easy to see that \widehat{T} always induces a tree, since property (2d) of the block partition \mathcal{B} implies that the distance of the cycle in B , if any, is at least $\log^5 d$ from z . Furthermore, all vertices in $w \in \widehat{T}$ satisfy that $A(w) < 1 - \varepsilon/2$. This is due to Corollary 7.4.

Consider the root of \widehat{T} to be the vertex z , this is the unique vertex in B adjacent to u^* . Also, let $\widehat{R} = B \setminus \widehat{T}$. Then, the linearity of expectation yields

$$S_{u^*}(B) = S_{u^*}(\widehat{T}) + S_{u^*}(\widehat{R}) . \quad (33)$$

We estimate the quantities $S_{u^*}(\widehat{T})$ and $S_{u^*}(\widehat{R})$, separately. As far as $S_{u^*}(\widehat{T})$ is concerned, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.5. *We have that $S_{u^*}(\widehat{T}) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/2)$.*

As far as $S_{u^*}(\widehat{R})$ is concerned, we work as follows: Let S_A be the contribution to $S_{u^*}(\widehat{R})$ coming from vertices reachable from z with paths in B that do not include vertices of the cycle in B (if there is any). Also, let S_B be contribution to $S_{u^*}(\widehat{R})$ coming from vertices that are reachable from z via a path that includes vertices from the cycle (if there is any). The linearity of expectation implies that

$$S_{u^*}(\widehat{R}) = S_A + S_B . \quad (34)$$

We prove the following bounds for S_A and S_B in sections 7.3 and 7.4, respectively.

Lemma 7.6. *We have that $S_A \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot d^{-\varepsilon/5}$.*

Proposition 7.7. *We have that $S_B \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot d^{-12}$.*

Plugging the bounds from Lemma 7.6 and Proposition 7.7 into (34), we get

$$S_{u^*}(\widehat{R}) \leq 2\Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot d^{-\varepsilon/5} .$$

Plugging the above bound for $S_{u^*}(\widehat{R})$, and the bound from Lemma 7.5 for $S_{u^*}(\widehat{T})$ into (33), gives the desired bound for $S_{u^*}(B)$, and Theorem 7.1 follows. \square

7.2. Proof of Lemma 7.5. Since $\widehat{T} \cup \{u^*\}$ is a tree, while there is a single disagreement at u^* , we can use the coupling introduced in Lemma 7.2.

We prove the lemma using induction on the height of \widehat{T} . The base case is when \widehat{T} is a single vertex tree, i.e., the height is 0. Let $\widehat{T} = \{z\}$. In this case, recall that due to Corollary 7.4, we must have $A_{\text{out}}(z) \leq A(z) \leq 1 - \varepsilon/2$. Then, by Lemma 7.2, we have that

$$S_{u^*}(\widehat{T}) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot A_{\text{out}}(z) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/2) .$$

We proceed with the inductive step. Recall that z is the root of \widehat{T} . For every vertex y , child of vertex z in \widehat{T} , we let \widehat{T}_y be the subtree of \widehat{T} rooted at y , and containing all its decedents. The induction hypothesis is that $S_z(\widehat{T}_y) \leq \Gamma_{\{z, y\}} n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/2)$, for every y child of z . Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{u^*}(\widehat{T}) &\leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot \left(n^4 A_{\text{out}}(z) + \sum_{y \in N(z) \cap \widehat{T}} S_z(\widehat{T}_y) \right) \\ &\leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot \left(n^4 A_{\text{out}}(z) + \sum_{y \in N(z) \cap \widehat{T}} \Gamma_{\{z, y\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/2) \right) \quad [\text{induction hypothesis}] \\ &\leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (A_{\text{out}}(z) + [A(z) - A_{\text{out}}(z)]) \\ &\leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon/2) . \end{aligned}$$

The above proves the inductive step, and thus, the lemma follows. \square

7.3. Proof of Lemma 7.6. First note that the vertices in B that are reachable from z using a path that does not include vertices in the cycle, induce a tree. Let us denote this tree with \overline{T} .

Working as in Lemma 7.5 we have that

$$S_{u^*}(\overline{T}) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot \left(n^4 \cdot A_{\text{out}}(z) + \sum_{x \in N(z) \cap B} S_z(\overline{T}_x) \right) ,$$

where \overline{T}_x is the subtree of \overline{T} including x and all its decedents. Repeating the above step, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{u^*}(\overline{T}) &\leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \left(n^4 A_{\text{out}}(z) + \sum_{x \in N(z) \cap B} \Gamma_{\{z, x\}} \left(n^4 A_{\text{out}}(x) + \sum_{y \in (N(x) \cap B) \setminus \{z\}} S_x(\overline{T}_y) \right) \right) \\ &\leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \left(n^4 A_{\text{out}}(z) + [A(z) - A_{\text{out}}(z)] \max_{x \in N(z) \cap B} \left\{ n^4 A_{\text{out}}(x) + \sum_{y \in (N(x) \cap B) \setminus \{z\}} S_x(\overline{T}_y) \right\} \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Repeating the above steps deeper on \overline{T} , and using induction, we find a worst-case path emanating from z , $P^* = (w_0 = z, \dots, w_\ell)$, such that

$$S_{u^*}(\overline{T}) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} A_{\text{out}}(w_j) \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} [A(w_i) - A_{\text{out}}(w_i)] \right) . \quad (35)$$

For $r = \log d$, it is direct that

$$S_A \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot \sum_{j \geq r+1} A_{\text{out}}(w_j) \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} [A(w_i) - A_{\text{out}}(w_i)] . \quad (36)$$

Since for every vertex $w \in B$ we have $0 \leq A_{\text{out}}(w) \leq 1 - \varepsilon/2 < 1$, we get that

$$S_A \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot \sum_{j \geq r+1} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} [A(w_i) - A_{\text{out}}(w_i)] \leq n^4 \cdot \sum_{j \geq r+1} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} A(w_i) . \quad (37)$$

The lemma follows by bounding appropriately the magnitude of each summand in (37), separately.

For $j \geq 1$, let M_j be the set of heavy vertices in $\{w_0, \dots, w_{r+j-1}\}$, i.e, those vertices w with $A(w) > 1 - \varepsilon/2$. Letting also $m_j = |M_j|$, we define

$$\Phi(j) = \prod_{i=0}^{r+j-1} A(w_i) \leq (1 - \varepsilon/2)^{r+j-m_j} \prod_{w \in M_j} A(w) . \quad (38)$$

To bound $\Phi(j)$, we need to argue about $\prod_{w \in M_j} A(w)$. Using Corollary 7.3 we get that

$$\prod_{w \in M_j} A(w) \leq d^{-m_j} (1 - \varepsilon/4)^{-r-j+m_j} . \quad (39)$$

Plugging (39) into (38) we get that

$$\Phi(j) \leq \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon/2}{1 - \varepsilon/4} \right)^{r+j-m_j} d^{-m_j} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right)^{r+j-m_j} d^{-m_j} \leq d^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right)^j . \quad (40)$$

In the last inequality we use that $(1 - \varepsilon/4)^r < d^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}$ and $(d/(1 - \varepsilon/4))^{-m_j} \leq 1$, since $r = \log d$. Plugging (40) into (37), and changing variable, we get

$$S_A \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} n^4 \cdot \sum_{j \geq 1} \Phi(j) \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} n^4 \cdot d^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \sum_{j \geq 0} (1 - \varepsilon/4)^j = \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} n^4 \cdot d^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \cdot 4\varepsilon^{-1} \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} n^4 \cdot d^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{5}},$$

where the last inequality holds for sufficiently large d . The lemma follows. \square

7.4. Proof of Proposition 7.7. If there is no cycle in B , then $S_B = 0$, hence the proposition is trivially true. For what follows, assume that block B contains the short cycle C .

Recall the definition of \overline{T} from the proof of Lemma 7.6. That is, \overline{T} is the sub-block of B which contains all vertices that are reachable from u^* through a path inside B that does not pass through any vertex of C . Let w be the vertex in the cycle C that is closest to z . Note that w is not in \overline{T} . Let the set Λ consists of all vertices in B apart from w , that do not belong to \overline{T} .

Lemma 7.8. *Let \mathbb{P} be the set of paths from w to the external vertices in Λ , i.e., that have at least one neighbour in $\partial_{\text{out}} B$. We have that*

$$S_w(\Lambda) \leq 2\Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot \max_{P \in \mathbb{P}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{|P|} A_{\text{out}}(u_j) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} [A(u_i) - A_{\text{out}}(u_i)] \right\} .$$

Repeating the same line of argument to that we used in (35) (proof of Lemma 7.6) we get that

$$S_B \leq 2\Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot \sum_{j \geq q+1} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} [A(u_i) - A_{\text{out}}(u_i)] \leq 2\Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot \sum_{j \geq q+1} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} A(u_i) , \quad (41)$$

where $q \geq \log^5 d$ is the distance from u^* to the cycle in B . Then, using arguments which are almost identical to those in the proof of Lemma 7.6 we conclude that

$$S_B \leq \Gamma_{\{u^*, z\}} \cdot n^4 \cdot d^{-12} .$$

All the above conclude the proof of Proposition 7.7. \square

7.4.1. *Proof of Lemma 7.8.* Let x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k be the vertices in the cycle C , for some integer $k \geq 3$. Also, we identify w with the vertex x_0 , i.e., $w = x_0$.

Let M be the set of vertices in B that are outside A but have at least one neighbour inside A . Note that $w \in M$. Furthermore, our assumptions imply that the graph induced by A is a tree as it does not contain the whole cycle C , recall that w is not included in A .

We need to show that there exists a coupling κ of the marginals $\mu_A(\cdot | M, \sigma^+)$ and $\mu_A(\cdot | M, \sigma^-)$, where σ^+, σ^- are configurations at M that disagree only at w such that

$$S_w(A) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}(A, X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) \mid X_{t+1}(M) = \sigma, Y_{t+1}(M) = \tau, B \text{ updated at } t+1] \\ \leq 2n^4 \cdot \max_{P \in \mathbb{P}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{|P|} A_{\text{out}}(u_j) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} [A(u_i) - A_{\text{out}}(u_i)] \right\}. \quad (42)$$

For σ^+ we imply that $\sigma^+(w) = +1$ and, similarly, for σ^- we imply that $\sigma^-(w) = -1$.

For the sake of the analysis, rather than considering set M , we consider a slightly different set for the boundary of A . We call this new set \widehat{M} . Specifically, we introduce a new vertex z in the cycle C between w and x_1 . That is, instead of having w connected to x_1 , we have that w is connected to z and, in turn, z is connected to x_1 .

Note that for any configuration σ at M we have that the measure $\mu_A(\cdot | M, \sigma)$ is identical to the measure $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma})$, where $\widehat{\sigma}$ is the configuration at \widehat{M} such that for every $u \in M \cap \widehat{M}$ we have $\sigma(u) = \widehat{\sigma}(u)$, and $\widehat{\sigma}(z) = \widehat{\sigma}(w)$.

We consider below a coupling κ_1 between the distributions $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{++})$ and $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{+-})$, where $\widehat{\sigma}^{++}, \widehat{\sigma}^{+-}$ are configurations at \widehat{M} such that for every $u \in M \cap \widehat{M}$ we have $\widehat{\sigma}^{+-}(u) = \widehat{\sigma}^{++}(u) = \sigma^+(u)$, while $\widehat{\sigma}^{++}(z) = +1$ and $\widehat{\sigma}^{+-}(z) = -1$.

Furthermore, we also consider below a coupling κ_2 between the distributions $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{--})$ and $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{+-})$, where $\widehat{\sigma}^{+-}$ is as defined above, while $\widehat{\sigma}^{--}$ is a configuration at \widehat{M} such that for every $u \in M \cap \widehat{M}$ we have $\widehat{\sigma}^{--}(u) = \sigma^-(u)$ and $\widehat{\sigma}^{--}(z) = -1$.

Note that $\widehat{\sigma}^{+-}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}^{--}$ differ only on the configuration at w .

It is immediate that we can compose κ_1 and κ_2 to obtain the coupling κ . That is, we generate a configuration \mathbf{Y}_A from $\mu_A(\cdot | M, \sigma^+)$ (which is identical distribution to $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{++})$). Then, we use κ_1 to obtain a configuration \mathbf{Y}_B from $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{+-})$ conditional on \mathbf{Y}_A . Similarly, we use κ_2 to obtain a configuration \mathbf{Y}_C from $\mu_A(\cdot | \widehat{M}, \widehat{\sigma}^{--})$ (which is identical distribution to $\mu_A(\cdot | M, \sigma^-)$) conditional on \mathbf{Y}_B . The pair $(\mathbf{Y}_A, \mathbf{Y}_C)$ induce the coupling κ .

With a slight abuse of notation, we let

$$S_w^{(1)}(A) = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{D}(A, X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}) \mid X_{t+1}(\widehat{M}) = \sigma, Y_{t+1}(\widehat{M}) = \tau, B \text{ updated at } t+1 \right]$$

where we use coupling κ_1 for the configuration of $X_{t+1}(A)$ and $Y_{t+1}(A)$. Similarly, we define the quantity $S_w^{(2)}(A)$ with respect to the coupling κ_2 .

The triangle inequality yields that

$$S_w(A) \leq S_w^{(1)}(A) + S_w^{(2)}(A). \quad (43)$$

We use couplings κ_1 and κ_2 similar to what we have in the proofs of Lemmas 7.2 and 7.6.

Then, (42) standard arguments we have seen in the proof of Lemmas 7.2 and 7.6. The lemma follows. \square

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.2

We show that each of the three properties defining $\mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$ holds with high probability.

8.1. Property 1: Existence of Block Partition. For ε, d and β as specified in Theorem 4.2, let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, while let the set of influences $\{\Gamma_e\}$ be induced by the Edwards-Anderson model on \mathbf{G} , with inverse temperature β .

Recall that a cycle C of \mathbf{G} is short if its length is at most $4\frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$. Recall also that a vertex u of \mathbf{G} is a (d, ε) -block vertex, if for every path P of length at most $\log n$ that emanates from u , we have that $M(P) < 1$, where M is the (d, ε) path-weight, (see Definition 3.3).

In order to prove Property 1, we provide an algorithm which, for typical instances of $(\mathbf{G}, \{\Gamma_e\})$, outputs an (d, ε) -block partition $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_N\}$.

Specifically, the algorithm takes as input two parameters $\varepsilon, d > 0$, and a graph-influence pair $(G, \{\Gamma_e\})$. Then, it proceeds as follows.

As a preprocessing step, we determine the set of (d, ε) -block vertices in $(G, \{\Gamma_e\})$, and the set \mathcal{C} of short cycles in G . Then, the algorithm checks whether the following condition is true:

Condition 1. The distance of any two cycles in \mathcal{C} is at least $2\frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$.

If Condition 1 is false, then the algorithm terminates and reports failure.

At the next step the algorithm constructs the blocks containing the short cycles in \mathcal{C} . The aim is for each cycle $C \in \mathcal{C}$ to have its own block B_C . Let us denote with \widehat{C} the set of all vertices within distance $\log^5 d$ from C . To proceed with the construction of unicyclic blocks, we need the following condition to be true:

Condition 2. For every $C \in \mathcal{C}$, for every vertex w at distance $\geq 2\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$ from \widehat{C} , every path that connects \widehat{C} to w contains at least one (d, ε) -block vertex .

If Condition 2 is false, then the algorithm terminates and reports failure. The block B_C contains \widehat{C} , and all vertices reachable from \widehat{C} through a path (v_0, \dots, v_ℓ) such that none of the v_i 's, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, is a (d, ε) -block vertex. Note that due to Condition 2, we must have that

$$B_C \subseteq N\left(\widehat{C}, 2\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}\right), \text{ for all } C \in \mathcal{C} , \quad (44)$$

where $N(S, r)$ is the set of vertices in G that are reachable from S via a path of length at most r .

In the next stage, the algorithm constructs the tree-structured blocks. Let U be the set of vertices u that are not contained in any block constructed in the previous step, and are such that $A(u) > 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, i.e., u is a ‘‘heavy’’ vertex. For each $u \in U$, we check whether the following condition is true:

Condition 3. For every $u \in U$, and for every vertex w at distance $\geq 4\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$ from u , every path that connects u to w contains at least one (d, ε) -block vertex .

If Condition 3 is false, then the algorithm terminates and reports failure.

We create the tree blocks iteratively, as follows: For each vertex $u \in U$ whose block has not been specified yet, the algorithm creates the block B_u that consists of u , and all vertices w that are reachable from u through a path (v_0, \dots, v_ℓ) such that none of the v_i 's, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, is a (d, ε) -block vertex. Note that due to Condition 3, we must have

$$B_u \subseteq N\left(u, 4\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}\right), \text{ for all } u \in U . \quad (45)$$

Finally, for every vertex w of G , which is not included in any block constructed so far, we define $B_w = \{w\}$. The algorithm concludes by returning the set of blocks \mathcal{B} comprised by all the blocks created in each of the three steps.

Theorem 8.4 below, which we prove in Section 9, establishes that the algorithm successfully returns a block-partition \mathcal{B} with high probability over the instances $(\mathbf{G}, \{\Gamma_e\})$.

Theorem 8.4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that for any $d \geq d_0$, and for any $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, and let the set of influences $\{\Gamma_e\}$ be induced by the Edwards-Anderson model on \mathbf{G} , with inverse temperature β . Then,

$$\Pr[\text{the above algorithm successfully returns a block-partition}] \geq 1 - n^{-2/3} \quad (46)$$

In light of Theorem 8.4, all it remains to show is that when the algorithm returns a partition \mathcal{B} , then, \mathcal{B} is indeed a (d, ε) -block partition, i.e., \mathcal{B} satisfies all properties of Definition 4.1.

First, note that for every singleton block $B_w = \{w\}$, vertex w must be a (d, ε) -block, since otherwise w would have been considered during the two first stages of the algorithm.

If B is a multi-vertex block, i.e., was created in the first or second stage of the algorithm, then, by construction, every vertex of $\partial_{\text{out}}B$ must be a (d, ε) -block vertex, establishing property (2a).

We observe that no two blocks intersect. Unicyclic blocks do not intersect due to Condition 1 and (44) implying that (2d) is true. The heavy vertices in U do not belong to any of the unicyclic blocks. Any two block B_z and B_x generated at the second stage cannot intersect with each other as they are separated by using block vertices at their boundaries. Hence, we conclude that the set of blocks that is created by the algorithm is a partition of the vertex set.

We finally notice that $B \cup \partial_{\text{out}}B$ should contain the same number of cycles as B , yielding that every vertex in $\partial_{\text{out}}B$ has exactly one neighbour in B , which implies (2b). To see why this true, for the sake of contradiction assume the opposite. That is, there exists a multi-vertex block B and $z \in \partial_{\text{out}}B$ such that z has two neighbours in B . Then, since our blocks are low diameter, our assumption implies that there is a short cycle in the vertices induced by $B \cup \partial_{\text{out}}B$ that contains z . This is a contradiction. If B is unicyclic, then the existence of this additional short cycle violates Condition 1. On the other hand, if B is a tree, then this short cycle must have been considered at the first stage of the algorithm, so it cannot emerge at the second stage of the algorithm.

8.2. Property 2: Lower Bound on Υ . To establish Property 2, it suffices to use the following lemma. For $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ and the EA model with temperature β at this graph, recall from (23), the following weight over the paths P in \mathbf{G} :

$$\Upsilon(P) = \beta \sum_e \beta |J_e| + \sum_v \log \deg(v) \quad , \quad (47)$$

where J_e are the couplings in the EA model.

Lemma 8.5. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that for any $d \geq d_0$, and for any $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, and let μ be the EA model on \mathbf{G} . Then,

$$\Pr \left[\text{every path } P \text{ in } \mathbf{G} \text{ with } |P| \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d} \text{ has } \Upsilon(P) \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} \right] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{8/10}} \quad . \quad (48)$$

Proof of Lemma 8.5. Let \mathcal{K} be the set of paths P in \mathbf{G} with $|P| \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$, while $\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$. For every path P , let $\mathcal{A}(P)$, and $\mathcal{L}(P)$ be the set of edges in \mathbf{G} that have exactly one, and exactly two endpoints in P , respectively. Let also $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$.

Clearly, each vertex of P contributes at most n edges in $\mathcal{A}(P)$, and each of them with probability d/n . Hence, $|\mathcal{A}(P)|$ is dominated by a $\text{Binom}(n\ell, d/n)$, and the Chernoff bound gives

$$\Pr[|\mathcal{A}(P)| \geq 3d \cdot \ell] \leq e^{-d \cdot \ell} \leq n^{-d^{9/10}} \quad , \quad (49)$$

where the last inequality holds for large enough d . Similarly, we see that $|\mathcal{L}(P)|$ is dominated by a $\text{Binom}(\ell^2, d/n) + \ell$, as there are already ℓ edges in P , and there can be at most ℓ^2 edges in total

with both endpoints in P . Applying the Chernoff bound with $\xi = \frac{n}{\ell} - 2$, we see that

$$\Pr \left[|\mathcal{L}(P)| \geq (1 + \xi) \cdot \frac{d \cdot \ell^2}{n} + \ell \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\xi^2}{2 + \xi} \cdot \frac{d \cdot \ell^2}{n} \right) \leq n^{-d^{9/10}} , \quad (50)$$

where the last inequality holds for large enough d . Noticing that $(1 + \xi) \cdot \frac{d \cdot \ell^2}{n} + \ell \leq 3d \cdot \ell$, from the union bound, we have that

$$\Pr [|\mathcal{A}(P)| + |\mathcal{L}(P)| \geq 6d \cdot \ell] \leq 2 \cdot n^{-d^{9/10}} \leq n^{-d^{85/100}} . \quad (51)$$

Let us write \mathcal{E}_P for the conjunction of the events $\{|\mathcal{A}(P)| \leq 3d \cdot \ell\}$ and $\{|\mathcal{L}(P)| \leq 3d \cdot \ell\}$. From the law of total probability we see that

$$\Pr \left[\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} \right] \leq \Pr \left[\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} \mid \mathcal{E}_P \right] + \Pr[\bar{\mathcal{E}}_P] , \quad (52)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_P$ is the complement of the event \mathcal{E}_P . Using the union bound, we have that

$$\Pr[\bar{\mathcal{E}}_P] \leq \Pr[|\mathcal{A}(P)| \geq 3d \cdot \ell] + \Pr[|\mathcal{L}(P)| \geq 3d \cdot \ell] \leq 2n^{-d^{9/10}} . \quad (53)$$

We now focus on bounding $\Pr \left[\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} \mid \mathcal{E}_P \right]$. Specifically, since \mathcal{E}_P occurs, there are at most $6d \cdot \ell$ edges incident to P , and thus, the first term of $\Upsilon(P)$ is dominated by a sum of $6d \cdot \ell$ half-normal distributions with parameter β . Due to Theorem A.1, we have that

$$\Pr \left[\sum_e \beta |J_e| \geq 2 \cdot 6d \cdot \ell \cdot \beta \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right] \leq \exp \left(-6d \cdot \ell \cdot \frac{1}{\pi} \right) ,$$

where the sum is over all edges incident to P . Since $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, we have that for large enough d

$$\Pr \left[\beta \sum_e |J_e| \geq 80 \cdot \ell \right] \leq n^{-d^{9/10}} . \quad (54)$$

For the second term, we first note that

$$\sum_{v \in V(P)} \log \deg(v) = \log \left(\prod_{v \in V(P)} \deg(v) \right) \leq \ell \cdot \log \left(\ell^{-1} \cdot \sum_{v \in V(P)} \deg(v) \right) , \quad (55)$$

where the last inequality follows from the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality. Since \mathcal{E}_P occurs, we also have that

$$\sum_{v \in V(P)} \deg(v) = |\mathcal{A}(P)| + 2 \cdot |\mathcal{L}(P)| \leq 9d \cdot \ell . \quad (56)$$

Plugging the above into (55) we get that

$$\sum_{v \in V(P)} \log \deg(v) \leq \ell \cdot \log(9d) . \quad (57)$$

Noticing that for large enough d , $\ell \cdot \log(9d) + 80\ell \leq \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2}$, and combining (54) and (57), we get

$$\Pr \left[\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} \mid \mathcal{E}_P \right] \leq n^{-d^{9/10}} ,$$

which per (52), and (51), yields $\Pr \left[\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2} \right] \leq n^{-d^{85/100}}$. Finally, we focus on the cardinality of the set \mathcal{K} . It is easy to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{K}|] \leq 2n \cdot d^\ell \cdot \Pr \left[\Upsilon(P) > \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2} \right] \leq n^{-d^{8/10}} .$$

The lemma follows from the above and the Markov's inequality. \square

8.3. Property 3: Bound on extremal coupling values. Let \mathcal{H} be the event that there is an edge e in $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ such that the coupling $|\mathbf{J}_e|$ is larger than $10\sqrt{\log n}$, or smaller than $n^{-7/3}$.

Lemma 8.6. *We have that $\Pr[\mathcal{H}] \leq n^{-1/3}$.*

Proof. It is standard to show that for the standard normal random variable \mathbf{I} , taking large n , we have that

$$\Pr \left[|\mathbf{I}| \geq 10\sqrt{\log n} \right] \leq n^{-5} . \quad (58)$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$\Pr \left[|\mathbf{I}| \leq n^{-7/3} \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-n^{-7/3}}^{n^{-7/3}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-n^{-7/3}}^{n^{-7/3}} dx \leq n^{-7/3} . \quad (59)$$

Furthermore, note that the graph instance $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ has at most $\binom{n}{2}$ edge couplings which are i.i.d standard Gaussians. Let N be the expected number of the edges e whose coupling \mathbf{J}_e is larger than $10\sqrt{\log n}$. Then, (58) and (59) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}[N] \leq \binom{n}{2} \cdot \left(\Pr \left[|\mathbf{I}| \geq 10\sqrt{\log n} \right] + \Pr \left[|\mathbf{I}| \leq n^{-7/3} \right] \right) \leq n^{-1/3} . \quad (60)$$

Using the Markov's inequality, we get that $\Pr[\mathcal{H}] \leq n^{-1/3}$, concluding the proof of the lemma. \square

8.4. Proof of Theorem 4.2. Consider the triplet $(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta)$ as this is specified in Theorem 4.2. For $j = 1, 2, 3$, let \mathcal{L}_j be the event that $(\mathbf{G}, \mathcal{J}, \beta)$ does *not* satisfy the Property j . From Theorem 8.4, we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{L}_1] \leq n^{-2/3}$. From Lemma 8.5, we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{L}_2] \leq n^{-d^{8/10}}$. Finally, from Lemma 8.6, we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{L}_3] \leq n^{-1/3}$.

The theorem follows by applying the union bound. That is, we have that

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{j=1,2,3} \mathcal{L}_j \right] \leq \sum_{j=1,2,3} \Pr[\mathcal{L}_j] \leq n^{-1/4} . \quad (61)$$

9. PROOF OF THEOREM 8.4

Let us start with an additional definition. For some integer $r \geq 0$, a path P of G is *r-locally simple* if $N_r(P)$, i.e., the set of all vertices reachable from a vertex in P via a path of length r , induces a tree in G . Furthermore, for $\ell \geq 0$, we define the set of paths

$$\mathcal{P}_{r,\ell}(G) = \{P : P \text{ is } r\text{-locally simple, and has length at least } \ell\} .$$

The following theorem states that for $r = \ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, and for large enough fixed d , every path in $\mathcal{P}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{G}(n, d/n))$ contains at least one (d, ε) -block vertex.

Theorem 9.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that for any $d \geq d_0$, and for any $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$, and let the set of influences $\{\Gamma_e\}$ be induced by the Edwards-Anderson model on \mathbf{G} , with inverse temperature β . Then, for $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, and $r = \ell$ we have that

$$\Pr \left[\text{every path in } \mathcal{P}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{G}) \text{ contains a } (d, \varepsilon)\text{-block vertex} \right] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/8}} , \quad (62)$$

where the probability is over the instances of $(\mathbf{G}, \{\Gamma_e\})$.

The proof of Theorem 9.1 appears in Section 10. We also use the following standard lemma, which we prove in Appendix C.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$. There exist $d_0 \geq 1$ such that for every $d \geq d_0$, with probability at least $1 - n^{-3/4}$, every set of vertices S in \mathbf{G} with $|S| \leq 2\frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$, spans at most $|S|$ edges in \mathbf{G} .*

Let us denote with $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}$ the desirable events of Theorem 9.1 and Lemma 9.2, respectively. We show that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}$ imply all of the Conditions 1, 2, and 3, and thus, the algorithm successfully returns a block-partition. Per the union bound, we have that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}] \geq 1 - n^{-2/3} , \quad (63)$$

yielding Theorem 8.4.

We start by noticing that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}$ yields Condition 1. To the contrary, assume that there exist two short cycles C, C' within distance $\frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$ from each other. Let P be a path of minimum length connecting C to C' . Then, for sufficiently large d

$$|C \cup C' \cup P| \leq 2 \cdot 4 \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d} + \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} < 2 \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d} ,$$

but $C \cup C' \cup P$ contains more at least $|C \cup C' \cup P| + 1$ edges, contradiction.

We now show the following

Lemma 9.3. *If $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}$ occurs, then Conditions 2 and 3 hold.*

Proof of Lemma 9.3. Let B_C be a unicyc block created in the first stage of the algorithm due to the cycle $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$ be any path that emanates from \widehat{C} , and is such that none of the v_i 's, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, is a (d, ε) -block vertex. Let $q = 2 \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$. We claim that $|P| < q$, which clearly implies Condition 2.

Indeed, we first observe that, under $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}$, every path in \mathbf{G} of length q must contain a subpath in $\mathcal{P}_{r, \ell}(\mathbf{G})$. If no such subpath exists, then we can find another short cycle C' intersecting P . Considering the set of vertices $C \cup C' \cup P$, we see that $|C \cup C' \cup P| < 2 \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$, which violates our assumption that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}}$ occurs.

Our assumption that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ occurs, now implies that $|P| < q$, since otherwise, there must exist some v_i in P that is a (d, ε) -block vertex, contradiction.

Condition 3 follows by the same line of argument as above, with the additional observation every path in \mathbf{G} of length $2q$ either contains a subpath in $\mathcal{P}_{r, \ell}(\mathbf{G})$, or connects two short cycles C, C' . \square

All the above conclude the proof of Theorem 8.4. \square

10. PROOF OF THEOREM 9.1

Let us first recall that the path P of G is r -locally simple if $N_r(P)$, i.e., the set of all vertices reachable from a vertex in P via a path of length r , induces a tree in G . Let $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and recall we defined

$$\mathcal{P}_{r, \ell}(G) = \{P : P \text{ is } r\text{-locally simple, and has length at least } \ell\} .$$

Also recall that given $\varepsilon, d > 0$, a vertex u in G is called (d, ε) -block vertex, if for every path P of length at most $\log n$ emanating from u , we have that the (d, ε) -weight of P is less than 1, i.e., $M(P) < 1$.

Let the event

$$\mathcal{S}_A = \{\text{every path in } \mathcal{P}_{r, \ell}(\mathbf{G}) \text{ contains a block vertex}\} .$$

Theorem 9.1 follows by showing $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_A] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/8}}$.

For our proof we will also use the following refinement: Given $\varepsilon, d > 0$, and an integer $k \leq \log n$, we say that a vertex u in G is (d, ε) -block vertex of range k , if for every path P of length at most k emanating from u , we have that $M(P) < 1$, (so that a (d, ε) -block vertex is also a (d, ε) -block vertex of range $\log n$). In the following, we omit d and ε , when they are clear from the context.

We establish Theorem 9.1 in two steps. First, we consider the event

$$\mathcal{S}_B = \{\text{every path in } \mathcal{P}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{G}) \text{ contains a block vertex of range } r\} .$$

Note that \mathcal{S}_B is different from \mathcal{S}_A in that it considers block vertices of range r , rather than standard block vertices. We show that $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_B] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{10/75}}$.

Next, we consider the event

$$\mathcal{S}_C = \{\text{for every path } P \text{ in } \mathbf{G}, \text{ with } r \leq |P| \leq \log n, \text{ we have } M(P) < 1\}$$

We prove that $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_C] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/5}}$.

Note that $\mathcal{S}_C \cap \mathcal{S}_B$ implies \mathcal{S}_A . This follows from the observation that, under the event \mathcal{S}_C every block vertex of range r is also a standard block vertex. Theorem 9.1 follows from the aforementioned bounds on $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_C]$ and $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_B]$.

More specifically, in Section 17.2 we show the following result.

Lemma 10.1. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 9.1, we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_C] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/5}}$.*

Moreover, in the Section 10.1, we prove the following bound for the probability of \mathcal{S}_B .

Theorem 10.2. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 9.1, we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{S}_B] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{10/75}}$.*

Observing that $\mathcal{S}_A \supseteq \mathcal{S}_A \cap \mathcal{S}_B$, and applying the union bound gives that:

$$\Pr[\mathcal{S}_A] \geq \Pr[\mathcal{S}_C \cap \mathcal{S}_B] = 1 - \Pr[\overline{\mathcal{S}_C} \cup \overline{\mathcal{S}_B}] \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/5}} - n^{-d^{10/75}} \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/8}} .$$

Theorem 9.1 follows. □

10.1. Proof of Theorem 10.2. For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and for every $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$ of vertices inducing a path in \mathbf{G} , we define the events

$$\mathcal{C}_P = \{P \in \mathcal{P}_{r,\ell}(\mathbf{G})\} , \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_P = \{P \text{ contains less than } (4/10)\ell \text{ block vertices of range } r\} .$$

We wish to show that $\mathcal{E}_P \cap \mathcal{C}_P$ is unlikely to occur. To this end, we introduce a new probabilistic construction, that gives rise to a tree-model $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ enjoying more independence properties than $(\mathbf{G}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$, using *Galton-Watson trees* (GW trees for short).

Given a distribution $\zeta : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ over the non-negative integers, and a single vertex u , recall that the (random) tree \mathbf{T} is a Galton-Watson tree rooted at u with offspring distribution ζ , if the root of \mathbf{T} is vertex u , and the number of children for each vertex in \mathbf{T} is distributed according to ζ , independently from the other vertices.

For an integer $n \geq 1$, a number $d > 0$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple of vertices $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, we define the following random process giving rise to the triplet $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$, where $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}(P, n, d)$ is a tree, and each edge $e \in E(\mathbf{T})$ has coupling \mathbf{J}_e . Specifically, starting from the set P we execute the following steps

- (1) we (deterministically) add the edges $\{v_{i-1}, v_i\}$, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, making P a path,
- (2) from each v_i in P , we hang a GW tree rooted at v_i , with offspring distribution $\text{Binom}(n, d/n)$,
- (3) we truncate each GW tree at depth r
- (4) for every edge e of \mathbf{T} , we sample \mathbf{J}_e according to $N(0, 1)$, independently.

We also define the following event

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}} = \{P \text{ contains fewer than } (4/10)\ell \text{ block vertices of range } r \text{ in } \mathbf{T}\} , \quad (64)$$

and claim that the following is true.

Lemma 10.3. *There exists a coupling between $(\mathbf{G}, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ and $(\mathbf{T}, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$, such that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}}$.*

Proof. We consider the following ‘‘BFS tree of the path P ’’ in \mathbf{G} , which we denote with \mathbf{T} .

Specifically, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, \ell$, we obtain a tree \mathbf{T}_i of depth r , which is rooted at vertex v_i using the following recursive exploration procedure.

For $0 \leq k \leq r-1$, assume that the first k levels of \mathbf{T}_i have been determined, and let $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ be the vertices of its k -th level. To obtain the level $(k+1)$ of \mathbf{T}_i we proceed as follows.

For $j = 1, \dots, m$, we reveal x_j 's neighbors in \mathbf{G} , excluding the connection with vertices that have been already explored, or belong to the path P . That is, the children of x_j in \mathbf{T}_i will be precisely its neighbors in \mathbf{G} that do not belong to: (i) any tree \mathbf{T}_l for $l < i$, (ii) any of the vertices that have been revealed to belong in \mathbf{T}_i , up to this point, (iii) the path P .

The tree \mathbf{T} is simply the tree obtained by union of the \mathbf{T}_i 's and P .

Clearly, the offspring of each vertex u in \mathbf{T} , is dominated by $\text{Binom}(n, d/n)$. Therefore, we can couple the graph structures of \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{T} , so that \mathbf{T} is always a subtree of \mathbf{T} .

Since \mathbf{T} is a subtree of \mathbf{T} , let $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ be a subtree of \mathbf{T} which is isomorphic to \mathbf{T} , while let $h : V(\mathbf{T}) \rightarrow V(\widehat{\mathbf{T}})$ be a adjacency preserving bijection. For each pair of edges $e = \{u, w\}$ in $E(\mathbf{T})$ and $\hat{e} = \{h(u), h(w)\}$ in $E(\widehat{\mathbf{T}})$ we couple $\mathbf{J}_e, \mathbf{J}_{\hat{e}}$ identically. That is, we have $\mathbf{J}_e = \mathbf{J}_{\hat{e}}$. For the remaining edges e of \mathbf{T} , we draw $\mathbf{J}_e \sim N(0, 1)$, independently.

All the above, complete the coupling construction.

Consider now the subgraph of \mathbf{G} induced by $N_r(P)$, and notice that this will be different from \mathbf{T} exactly when $N_r(P)$ contains at least one cycle. Clearly, in that case $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} = 0$, and thus, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{T}}$.

On the other hand, if $N_r(P)$ is a tree, then we have that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} = 1$, and $N_r(P)$ coincides with \mathbf{T} . Since the number of block vertices of P decreases if we add more vertices or more edges in $N_r(P)$, and \mathbf{T} is a subtree of \mathbf{T} we have that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{T}}$.

All the above conclude the proof of Lemma 10.3. \square

Proposition 10.4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to P, d, r and β . Then,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{T}] \leq n^{-d^{1/7}} ,$$

where the event $\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{T}$ is defined by (64).

We prove Proposition 10.4 in Section 11. Defining now

$$X = \sum_{P \in V^{(\ell+1)}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} , \tag{65}$$

we have the following corollary of Proposition 10.4

Lemma 10.5. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for every $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}[X] \leq n^{-d^{10/75}} .$$

Proof of Lemma 10.5. We have that

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{P \in V^{(\ell+1)}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P}] \leq n^{(\ell+1)} \cdot \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^\ell \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_P} \times \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_P} \mid P \text{ is a path}] ,$$

which due to Lemma 10.3, and Proposition 10.4, yields

$$\mathbb{E}[X] \leq n \cdot d^\ell \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_\mathbf{T}}] \leq n \cdot n^{\frac{\log d}{\sqrt{d}}} \cdot n^{-d^{1/7}} .$$

Therefore, there exists a $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for every $d \geq d_0$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq n^{-d^{10/75}}$. \square

Since X takes non-negative, integral values, Markov's inequality, and Corollary 10.5 yield

$$\Pr[X > 0] \leq \mathbb{E}[X] \leq n^{-d^{10/57}} ,$$

concluding the proof of the theorem.

11. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 10.4

Let us start with a few more definitions. Recall that $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$.

Definition 11.1 (Vertex Weight induced by Path). *Let $P = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$ be a path in \mathbf{G} . Then, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ we define the weight*

$$\mathbb{W}_P(v_i) = \max_Q \{M(Q)\} , \quad (66)$$

where Q varies over all paths of length at most r , that emanate from v_i and do not intersect with P , i.e., they do not share vertices.

Definition 11.2 (Left/Right-Block Vertex). *For $\varepsilon, d > 0$, and a path $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, we say that a vertex v_j is a*

- (d, ε) -left-block vertex with respect to P , if for all $t \leq j$, we have that $\prod_{k=t}^j \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) < 1$,
- (d, ε) -right-block vertex with respect to P , if for all $t \geq j$, we have that $\prod_{k=j}^t \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) < 1$,

where the weights \mathbb{W}_P are specified with respect to ε, d .

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 11.3. *For any $\varepsilon, d, \beta > 0$, for $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to P, d, r and β .*

If a vertex v_i of P , is both (d, ε) -left-block, and (d, ε) -right-block vertex with respect to P , then v_i is an (d, ε) -block vertex for the tree \mathbf{T} .

Proof of Lemma 11.3. Let Q be an arbitrary path of length r , starting at vertex v_i . We will show that $M(Q) < 1$. Let v_j be the last vertex of P that appears on Q , (note that this is well-defined since Q starts at v_i , and \mathbf{T} is a tree).

W.l.o.g. assume that $j \geq i$, using just the fact that v_i is (d, ε) -right-block, we will show that $M(Q) < 1$, (if $j \leq i$, we use the fact that v is (d, ε) -left-block). Let Q_1 be the sub-path of Q starting at v_i and arriving at v_{j-1} , and Q_2 be the sub-path of Q starting at v_j and arriving at the last vertex of Q , (so that Q is the concatenation of Q_1 and Q_2). We have

$$M(Q) = M(Q_1) \cdot M(Q_2) = \left(\prod_{k=i}^{j-1} M(v_k) \right) \cdot M(Q_2) \leq \left(\prod_{k=i}^{j-1} \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) \right) \cdot \mathbb{W}_P(v_j) < 1 ,$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of \mathbb{W}_P , and the last inequality is due to the fact that v_i is an (d, ε) -right-block vertex. \square

Given an instance of $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ as in Section 10.1, we define

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{left}} = \{P \text{ contains fewer than } (7/10)\ell \text{ vertices that are } (d, \varepsilon)\text{-left-block in } \mathbf{T}\} , \quad (67)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{right}} = \{P \text{ contains fewer than } (7/10)\ell \text{ vertices that are } (d, \varepsilon)\text{-right-block in } \mathbf{T}\} , \quad (68)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}} = \{P \text{ contains fewer than } (4/10)\ell \text{ vertices that are } r\text{-block in } \mathbf{T}\} ,$$

We will prove the following bounds.

Theorem 11.4. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:

For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to P, d, r and β . Then,

$$\Pr \left[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{left}} \right] \leq n^{-d^{1/6}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr \left[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{right}} \right] \leq n^{-d^{1/6}}, \quad (69)$$

where the probability is over the instances of $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$.

Using Theorem 11.4, and the union bound, we further get that

$$\Pr [\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}] \leq \Pr \left[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{left}} \right] + \Pr \left[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{right}} \right] \leq 2 \cdot n^{-d^{1/6}} \leq n^{-d^{1/7}},$$

yielding Proposition 10.4.

12. PROOF OF THEOREM 11.4

We prove the bound of Theorem 11.4 only for $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{left}}]$, as the derivations for $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\text{right}}]$ are identical.

Let us start with a few definitions. We define the set of *heavy* vertices of P by ,

$$H = H(P) = \{i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\} : \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq 1\} .$$

For $i \in H$, let t_i be the greatest index in $\{i, i + 1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that for all $t \in \{i, i + 1, \dots, t_i\}$

$$\prod_{k=i}^t \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) \geq 1 ,$$

and let $L_i = \{i, i + 1, \dots, t_i\}$. For $i \notin H$, define $L_i = \emptyset$, and let $L = L_0 \cup L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_\ell$.

Lemma 12.1. For all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\} \setminus L$, vertex v_j is a (d, ε) -left-block vertex with respect to P .

Proof. We show the contrapositive, i.e., assuming v_j is not (d, ε) -left-block with respect to P , we show that $j \in L$. If v_j is not (d, ε) -left-block, then there must exist at least one index $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, j\}$ such that $\prod_{k=i}^j \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) \geq 1$.

Let i^* be the greatest such index; we claim that $j \in L_{i^*}$, i.e., for every $t \in \{i^*, i^* + 1, \dots, j\}$ we have that $\prod_{k=i^*}^t \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) \geq 1$. Indeed, if there was a $t \in \{i^*, i^* + 1, \dots, j\}$ such that $\prod_{k=i^*}^t \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) < 1$, then we would have that $\prod_{k=t+1}^j \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) \geq 1$, which contradicts with the fact that i^* is the greatest such index. \square

The proposition below shows that we should expect no more than a small fraction of vertices in P to belong in L .

Proposition 12.2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:

For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to P, d, r and β . Then,

$$\Pr \left[|L| \geq \frac{3}{10} \ell \right] \leq n^{-d^{1/6}} . \quad (70)$$

In light of Lemma 12.1, and Proposition 12.2, Theorem 11.4 follows easily. Therefore, to finish proving Theorem 11.4, let us prove Proposition 12.2.

13. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 12.2

Using the union bound, we have that

$$|L| = \left| \bigcup_{i \in H} L_i \right| \leq \sum_{i \in H} |L_i| .$$

To estimate each $|L_i|$ for $i \in H$ we think as follows: Each heavy vertex, v_i , introduces a weight, $\mathbb{W}_P(v_i) > 1$. If $L_i = \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$, then notice that $\{i, i+1, \dots, j+1\}$ is the first interval on the right of i that “absorbs” the weight $\mathbb{W}_P(v_i)$, i.e., j is the smallest index in $\{0, \dots, i\}$ such that

$$\prod_{k=i}^{j+1} \mathbb{W}_P(v_k) < 1 .$$

Let $\theta = \varepsilon/2$. If $H \cap L_i = \emptyset$, we observe that v_i requires at most a number of $\log_{(1-\theta)} \mathbb{W}_P(v_i)$ light vertices to get $\mathbb{W}_P(v_i)$ absorbed. Similarly, if $H \cap L_i \neq \emptyset$, then we observe that the number of light vertices needs to be

$$\sum_{j \in H \cap L_i} \log_{(1-\theta)} \mathbb{W}_P(v_j) .$$

Therefore, with the above union-bound we obtain that $|L| \leq |H| + \sum_{i \in H} \log_{(1-\theta)} \mathbb{W}_P(v_i)$. Hence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 13.1. *Let $\theta = \varepsilon/2$, then we have that*

$$|L| \leq |H| + \sum_{i \in H} \log_{(1-\theta)} \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \leq |H| + \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i \in H} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) . \quad (71)$$

Next, we prove tail bounds for each term in the rhs of (71), using the following technical lemma, which we prove in Section 14.

Lemma 13.2. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to P, d, r and β . Then, for $t = d^{95/100}$ and $q = d^{93/100}$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E} [(\mathbb{W}_P(v_1))^t] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^q . \quad (72)$$

We start by overestimating $|H|$, as follows

Proposition 13.3. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to P, d, r and β . Then,

$$\Pr \left[|H| \geq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] \leq n^{-d^{1/4}} , \quad (73)$$

where H is the set of heavy vertices defined above.

Proof of Proposition 13.3. Let I_1 , and I_2 , be the sets of odd, and even indices of $\{0, \dots, \ell\}$, respectively. Writing $H_1 = H \cap I_1$, and $H_2 = H \cap I_2$, and using the union bound, it is easy to see that

$$\Pr \left[|H| \geq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] \leq \Pr \left[|H_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] + \Pr \left[|H_2| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] , \quad (74)$$

therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\Pr \left[|H_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot n^{-d^{1/4}} .$$

Notice that for any two indices $i, j \in I_1$, the corresponding random variables $W_P(v_i), W_P(v_j)$, are i.i.d., and thus, each index $i \in I_1$ belongs to H_1 with probability at most $\Pr[W_P(v_1) \geq 1]$. Specifically, per Lemma 13.2, and Markov's inequality, we have that for $t = d^{95/100}$ and $q = d^{93/100}$

$$\Pr[W_P(v_1) \geq 1] \leq \mathbb{E}[(W_P(v_i))^t] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^q.$$

Therefore, $|H_1|$ is upper bounded by the number of successes of a binomial distribution with $\ell/2$ number of trials, and probability of success $(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2})^q$. Expanding the tail-probability of aforementioned distribution, and bounding appropriately, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[|H_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}}\right] &= \Pr\left[|H_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\log n}{d^{3/5}}\right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\log n}{2 \cdot d^{1/2}}\right) \cdot \exp\left(\log\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \cdot d^{93/100} \cdot \frac{\log n}{d^{3/5}}\right) \\ &\leq \left(e \cdot d^{1/10}\right)^{\frac{\log n}{d^{3/5}}} \cdot \exp\left(\log\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \cdot d^{86/100} \cdot \log n\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\log n \left[\frac{4 \log d}{d^{3/5}} + \log\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \cdot d^{86/100}\right]\right). \end{aligned}$$

So that for $d \geq d_0(\varepsilon)$, we have that

$$\Pr\left[|H_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}}\right] \leq n^{-d^{4/5}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot n^{-d^{1/4}},$$

as desired, concluding the proof of Proposition 13.3. \square

We have the following bound on the upper tail of $\sum_{i \in H} \log W_P(v_i)$.

Theorem 13.4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $d_0 = d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for all $d \geq d_0$, and $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, the following is true:*

For $\ell = \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$, $r = \ell$, and an $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple $P = (v_0, \dots, v_\ell)$, let $(\mathbf{T}, \beta, \{\mathbf{J}_e\})$ be the random tree construction defined on Section 10.1 with respect to d, ℓ, r and β . Then, we have that

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i \in H} \log W_P(v_i) \geq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/50}} \mid |H| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}}\right] \leq n^{-d^{1/3}}.$$

Given Theorem 13.4, we establish Proposition 12.2 as follows.

Proof of Proposition 12.2. Write $\theta = \varepsilon/2$, due to Corollary 13.1, we have that

$$\Pr\left[|L| \geq \frac{3}{10}\ell\right] \leq \Pr\left[|H| + \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i \in H} \log W_P(v_i) \geq \frac{3}{10}\ell\right]. \quad (75)$$

From the law of total probability it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[|H| + \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i \in H} \log W_P(v_i) \geq \frac{3}{10}\ell\right] &\leq \\ &\Pr\left[|H| \geq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}}\right] + \Pr\left[|H| + \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i \in H} \log W_P(v_i) \geq \frac{3}{10}\ell \mid |H| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Moreover, we also have that for appropriately large d

$$\Pr \left[|H| + \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i \in H} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq \frac{3}{10} \ell \mid |H| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] \leq \Pr \left[\sum_{i \in H} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/50}} \mid |H| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] .$$

Applying Theorem 13.4, and Proposition 13.3 in the above, we get that for every $d \geq d_0$

$$\Pr \left[|H| + \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i \in H} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq \frac{3}{10} \ell \right] \leq n^{-d^{1/3}} + n^{-d^{1/4}} \leq n^{-d^{1/6}} ,$$

concluding the proof of Proposition 12.2. \square

Let us now prove Theorem 13.4.

Proof of Theorem 13.4 . Similarly to the proof of Proposition 13.3, we let I_1 , and I_2 , be the sets of odd, and even indices of $\{0, \dots, \ell\}$, respectively. Writing $H_1 = H \cap I_1$, and $H_2 = H \cap I_2$, and using the union bound, we see it is sufficient to prove that

$$2 \cdot \Pr \left[\sum_{i \in H_1} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/50}} \mid |H_1| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] \leq n^{-d^{1/3}} .$$

From Markov's inequality we get that for every $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_{i \in H_1} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/50}} \mid |H_1| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\exp(t \cdot \sum_{i \in H_1} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i)) \mid |H_1| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right]}{\exp \left(\frac{t}{2 \cdot d^{1/50}} \cdot \ell \right)} \\ &= \frac{(\mathbb{E} [\exp(t \cdot \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_1)) \mid v_1 \in H_1])^{\ell \cdot d^{-1/10}}}{\exp \left(\frac{t}{2 \cdot d^{1/50}} \cdot \ell \right)} , \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where the equality follows from the fact that the random variables $\mathbb{W}_P(v_j)$'s where $j \in H_1$ are i.i.d.

Let us write v instead of v_1 , and notice that since $\mathbb{W}_P(v)$ is non-negative, we also have

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp(t \cdot \log \mathbb{W}_P(v)) \mid v \in H_1] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\mathbb{W}_P(v))^t]}{\Pr[\mathbb{W}_P(v) \geq 1]} . \quad (78)$$

Notice that an upper bound for the numerator of (78) is provided by Lemma 13.2. Let us now bound the denominator of (78), i.e., $\Pr[\mathbb{W}_P(v) \geq 1]$. First, recalling the definitions of A , M , and W , it is easy to see that

$$\Pr[\mathbb{W}_P(v) \geq 1] \geq \Pr[M(v) \geq 1] \geq \Pr[A(v) \geq 1] \geq \Pr[A(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{d < \deg(v) \leq 2d\} \geq 1] ,$$

so that using Baye's rule, we get

$$\Pr[\mathbb{W}_P(v) \geq 1] \geq \Pr[A(v) \geq 1 \mid d \leq \deg(v) \leq 2d] \cdot \Pr[d \leq \deg(v) \leq 2d] . \quad (79)$$

Let us now focus on the first factor in the rhs of (79). As we show in the proof of Theorem 3.1,

$$A(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{\deg(v)} \left| \tanh \left(\frac{\beta}{2} \mathbf{J}_i \right) \right| ,$$

where each \mathbf{J}_i follows the standard normal distribution. With that in mind, we underestimate the probability $\Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq 1 \mid d \leq \deg(v) \leq 2d]$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq 1 \mid d \leq \deg(v) \leq 2d] &\geq \left(\Pr \left[\left| \tanh \left(\frac{\beta}{2} \mathbf{J}_i \right) \right| \geq \frac{1}{d} \right] \right)^{2d} \\ &\geq \left(2 \cdot \Pr \left[\mathbf{J}_i \geq \frac{2}{\beta} \cdot \operatorname{arctanh} \left(\frac{1}{d} \right) \right] \right)^{2d} \\ &\geq \left(2 \cdot \Pr \left[\mathbf{J}_i \geq \frac{2}{\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1 + (1/d)}{1 - (1/d)} - 1 \right) \right] \right)^{2d} \\ &\geq \left(2 \cdot \Pr \left[\mathbf{J}_i \geq \frac{2}{\beta \cdot (d-1)} \right] \right)^{2d}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, there must exist a $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that $\beta(d-1) = \sqrt{2\pi} \cdot (1 - \lambda)$, and thus, we can rewrite the last inequality as

$$\Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq 1 \mid d \leq \deg(v) \leq 2d] \geq \left(2 \cdot \Pr \left[\mathbf{J}_i \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot (1 - \theta)^{-1} \right] \right)^{2d}.$$

Therefore, for d large enough, there exists and a constant $C_1 > 0$, such that

$$\Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq 1 \mid d \leq \deg(v) \leq 2d] \geq \exp(-C_1 \cdot d). \quad (80)$$

Regarding the second factor in the rhs of (79), we have

$$\Pr[d < \deg(v) \leq 2d] = \sum_{k=d}^{2d} \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{d}{n} \right)^k \left(1 - \frac{d}{n} \right)^{n-k} \geq \sum_{k=d}^{2d} \left(\frac{d}{k} \right)^k \cdot e^{-d}.$$

Therefore, for d large enough, there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$, such that

$$\Pr[d < \deg(v) \leq 2d] \geq \exp(-C_2 \cdot d). \quad (81)$$

Substituting (80) and (81) in (79), we get that for $C = \max\{C_1, C_2\}$, and for every $d \geq d_0$

$$\Pr[\mathbb{W}_P(v) \geq 1] \geq \exp(-C \cdot d). \quad (82)$$

Choosing $t = d^{95/100}$, invoking Lemma 13.2, and putting everything together, we get that for every $d \geq d_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_{i \in H_1} \log \mathbb{W}_P(v_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ell}{d^{1/50}} \mid |H_1| \leq \frac{\ell}{d^{1/10}} \right] &\leq \left(e^{d \cdot C} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right)^{d^{93/100}} \right)^{\ell \cdot d^{-\frac{1}{10}}} \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{t \cdot \ell}{2 \cdot d^{1/50}} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\exp \left(d^{9/10} \cdot C - \frac{t}{d^{1/50}} \right) \right)^{\ell} \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot n^{-d^{1/3}}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. This concludes the proof of Theorem 13.4. \square

14. PROOF OF LEMMA 13.2

Let us write v instead of v_1 . For $s \geq 0$, and a path $Q = (w_0, \dots, w_s)$, let us define

$$\mathbf{M}^{\text{even}}(Q) = \prod_{i=0}^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor} \mathbf{M}(w_{2i}),$$

that is, the weight of Q contributed only by vertices at even distance from w_0 . Similarly, define $\mathbf{M}^{\text{odd}}(Q)$ to be the weight of Q contributed only by vertices at odd distance from w_0 . Let us

also define also define $W_P^{\text{even}}(v) = \max_Q \{M^{\text{even}}(Q)\}$, and $W_P^{\text{odd}}(v) = \max_Q \{M^{\text{odd}}(Q)\}$ where the maximisation is over all paths Q of length at most r , that emanate from v and do not intersect with P , i.e., they do not share vertices. Since $W_P(v) \leq W_P^{\text{odd}}(v) \cdot W_P^{\text{even}}(v)$, the union bound yields

$$\Pr[W_P(v) \geq 1] \leq \Pr[W_P^{\text{odd}}(v) \geq 1] + \Pr[W_P^{\text{even}}(v) \geq 1] ,$$

and thus, it suffices to show that

$$\Pr[W_P^{\text{even}}(v) \geq 1] \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^q ,$$

Writing $\text{path}_v(r)$ to denote all paths of length r in \mathbf{T} , that emanate from v , and do not intersect with P , and $\text{path}_v(\leq r) = \cup_{k \leq r} \text{path}_v(k)$, we see that for any $t > 0$ we have that

$$\mathbb{E} [(W_P^{\text{even}}(v))^t] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\max_{Q \in \text{path}_v(\leq r)} \{M^{\text{even}}(Q)\} \right)^t \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{Q \in \text{path}_v(\leq r)} (M^{\text{even}}(Q))^t \right] . \quad (83)$$

Note that we cannot pull the sum out of the expectation in the rhs of the inequality above, as the set $\text{path}_v(\leq r)$ is a random variable. Therefore, we think in the following way. For $k = 0 \dots r$, there are at most n^k potential paths of length k emanating from v , and each potential path has probability $(d/n)^k$ to be present in \mathbf{T} . Denoting with (w_0, \dots, w_k) an arbitrary such potential path emanating from v , i.e., $w_0 = v$, we see that

$$\mathbb{E} [(W_P^{\text{even}}(v))^t] \leq \sum_{k=0}^r n^k \cdot \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^k \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\prod_{i=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} M(w_{2i}) \right)^t \right] \leq \sum_{k=0}^r d^k \cdot (\mathbb{E} [M^t(v)])^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor + 1} , \quad (84)$$

where the last inequality follows from the independence of the weights M corresponding to same parity vertices along (w_0, \dots, w_ℓ) . To upper bound $\mathbb{E} [M^t(v)]$ we consider two regimes in terms of the degree of vertex v :

$$\mathbb{E} [M^t(v)] = \mathbb{E} [M^t(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\text{deg}(v) \leq 3d\}] + \mathbb{E} [M^t(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\text{deg}(v) > 3d\}] \quad (85)$$

Let us now focus on the first term of (85). Writing $g(x)$ for the pdf of $M(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\text{deg}(v) \leq 3d\}$, and noticing that $M(v)$ is at most $3d^2$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [M^t(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\text{deg}(v) \leq 3d\}] &= \int_0^{1-\varepsilon/4} x^t \cdot g(x) dx + \int_{1-\varepsilon/4}^{3d^2} x^t \cdot g(x) dx \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^t \cdot \Pr[A(v) \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}] + (3d^2)^t \cdot \int_{1-\varepsilon/2}^{3d^2} g(x) dx \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^t + (3d^2)^t \cdot \Pr[A(v) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}] \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^t + (3d^2)^t \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^4}{8\pi} \cdot d\right) , \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

where (86) follows from Theorem 3.1. We now focus the large-degree case. Accounting only for the randomness on the degree of v , and overestimating each term of $M(v)$ to be equal to d , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [M^t(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\text{deg}(v) > 3d\}] &\leq \sum_{k=3d}^n (d \cdot k)^t \cdot \Pr[\text{deg}(v) = k] \leq d^t \cdot \sum_{k=3d}^n k^t \cdot \binom{n}{k} \cdot \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^k \\ &\leq d^t \cdot \sum_{k=3d}^n k^t \cdot \left(\frac{ne}{k}\right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^k \leq d^t \cdot \sum_{k=3d}^n k^t \cdot \left(\frac{de}{k}\right)^k . \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Substituting (86) and (87) to (85), gives

$$\mathbb{E} [M^t(v)] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^t + (3d^2)^t \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^4}{8\pi} \cdot d\right) + d^t \cdot \sum_{k=3d}^n k^t \cdot \left(\frac{de}{k}\right)^k.$$

Since $ed/k < 1$, for every $k > 3d$, choosing $t = d^{95/100}$, we see that there exist $d_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$, such that for every $d \geq d_0$, we have that $\mathbb{E} [M^t(v)] \leq (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4})^{t'}$, where $t' = d^{94/100}$. We now bound (84) as

$$\mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{W}_P^{\text{even}}(v))^t] \leq \frac{(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4})^{t'}}{1 - d^2 \cdot (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4})^{t'}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)^q,$$

where we can take $q = d^{93/100}$.

15. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

Let $d_0, \theta, \eta > 0$, to be determined later. First, note that due to the total probability law we have

$$\Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq (1 - \theta)] \leq \Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq (1 - \theta) \mid \deg(v) \leq (1 + \eta)d] + \Pr[\deg(v) > (1 + \eta)d]. \quad (88)$$

Let us now focus on the first term of (88). Recall that $\mathbf{A}(v) = \sum_{z \sim v} \Gamma_{\{v,z\}}$, with

$$\Gamma_e = \frac{|1 - \exp(\beta \mathbf{J}_e)|}{1 + \exp(\beta \mathbf{J}_e)} = \left| \tanh\left(\frac{\beta}{2} \mathbf{J}_e\right) \right|.$$

where \mathbf{J}_e follows the standard Gaussian distribution. Since $|\tanh(x)| \leq |x|$, for every real x , we get further that

$$\Gamma_e \leq \frac{\beta}{2} |\mathbf{J}_e|,$$

Hence, bounding from above the upper-tail of $\sum_e \frac{\beta}{2} |\mathbf{J}_e|$, provides an upper bound to the corresponding tail for $\sum_e \Gamma_e$, i.e., for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq x] \leq \Pr\left[\sum_e \frac{\beta}{2} |\mathbf{J}_e| \geq x\right]. \quad (89)$$

Applying the bound (134) of Theorem A.1 in the rhs of (89) and since $0 < \beta \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\beta_c(d)$, we have that for every $\eta \leq (\varepsilon - \theta)/(1 - \varepsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq (1 - \theta) \mid \deg(v) \leq (1 + \eta)d] &\leq \exp\left(-\left[\frac{\left((1 - \theta)\sqrt{\pi} - \frac{\beta}{2}(1 + \eta)d\sqrt{2}\right)^2}{2\pi(1 + \eta)^2 d^2 \frac{\beta^2}{4}}\right] (1 + \eta)d\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\left[\frac{\left((1 - \theta) - (1 + \eta)\frac{\beta d}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2}{(1 + \eta)^2 d^2 \beta^2}\right] 2(1 + \eta)d\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\left[\frac{\left((1 - \theta) - (1 + \eta)(1 - \varepsilon)\right)^2}{2\pi(1 + \eta)^2 (1 - \varepsilon)^2}\right] 2(1 + \eta)d\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\left[\frac{\left((1 - \theta) - (1 + \eta)(1 - \varepsilon)\right)^2}{\pi(1 + \eta)(1 - \varepsilon)^2}\right] d\right). \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

Choosing $\theta = \eta = \varepsilon/2$ in (90) gives that

$$\Pr[\mathbf{A}(v) \geq (1 - \theta) \mid \deg(v) \leq (1 + \eta)d] \leq \exp\left(-\left[\frac{\varepsilon^4}{2\pi(2 + \varepsilon)(1 - \varepsilon)^2}\right] d\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^4}{6\pi} \cdot d\right). \quad (91)$$

Let us now turn to the second term of (88). Since $\deg(v)$ is a sum of independent Bernoulli random variables, applying the Chernoff tail bound gives that for every $\eta \geq 0$

$$\Pr [\deg(v) > (1 + \eta)d] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\eta^2 d}{2 + \eta}\right) . \quad (92)$$

Taking $\eta = \varepsilon$, and substituting (91) and (92), in (88) gives that

$$\Pr [A(v) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2)] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^4}{6\pi} \cdot d + \log 2\right) ,$$

which for $d \geq d_0 := 53 \cdot \varepsilon^{-4}$, yields

$$\Pr [A(v) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/2)] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^4}{8\pi} \cdot d\right) .$$

16. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.2

Since, $1 \leq N \leq n$, it is standard to show that Theorem 5.1 implies that

$$\tau_{\text{block}} = O(n \log n) . \quad (93)$$

For the rest of the proof we focus on bounding τ_B for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

For each block $B \in \mathcal{B}$ that is unicyclic with cycle $C = (w_1, \dots, w_\ell)$, let $T_i(B)$ be the connected component in $B \cup \partial_{\text{out}} B$ that includes w_i , once we delete *all* the edges in C .

Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{B})$ be the collection of the following trees:

- (a) for every multi-vertex block $B \in \mathcal{B}$ that is tree, \mathcal{T} includes the tree $B \cup \partial_{\text{out}} B$,
- (b) for every unicyclic block $B \in \mathcal{B}$, \mathcal{T} includes every tree $T_i(B)$.

For each tree of the type (a) above, the root is assumed to be a (any) heavy vertex w such that $A(w) > 1 - \varepsilon/2$. For each tree of type (b), i.e., for each $T_i(B)$, the root is assumed to be the vertex w_i , i.e., the vertex that $T_i(B)$ intersects with the cycle of the block.

In order to avoid repetitions, we use the following convention for the rest of the proof: the Glauber dynamics, or the block dynamics on a subgraph H of G , is always assumed to be with respect to the marginal of the Gibbs distribution $\mu_{G, \mathcal{J}, \beta}$ at the subgraph H . When necessary, we impose boundary conditions at $\partial_{\text{out}} H$. Recall that $\partial_{\text{out}} H$ is the set of vertices outside H that have neighbouring vertices inside H .

The following result provides a bound on the relaxation time of tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ by utilising a recursive argument. This argument relies on ideas used to derive a similar bound in [20, 32].

Theorem 16.1. *For a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$, having vertex v as its root, and a fixed configuration σ at $\partial_{\text{out}} T$, consider the Glauber dynamics on T . Let $\tau_{\text{rel}} = \tau_{\text{rel}}(T, \sigma)$ be the relaxation time of this dynamics. We have that*

$$\tau_{\text{rel}} \leq \exp(m(T, v)) ,$$

where $m(T, v) = \max_P \{\Upsilon(P)\}$ and the maximum is over all root-to-leaf paths P in T .

The proof of Theorem 16.1 appears in Section 16.1. For every block $B \in \mathcal{B}$ which is tree, Theorem 16.1 immediately implies that

$$\tau_B \leq \exp(m(B, v)) , \quad (94)$$

for any vertex $v \in B$ being the root of B .

Recall that $m(B, v) = \max_P \{\Upsilon(P)\}$ and the maximum is over all the paths P in T from the root v to the leaves of the tree. By construction of the block partition \mathcal{B} , we have that all paths considered

for $m(B, v)$ are of length at most $2\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{d}}$. Moreover, our assumption that $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$ implies that $m(B, v) \leq \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$. Plugging this bound for $m(B, v)$ into (94) we get that

$$\tau_B \leq n^{\frac{1}{\log^2 d}} , \quad (95)$$

establishing the desired bound for τ_B for the case where $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is a tree. We now focus on the case where B is a unicyclic factor graph. Specifically, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 16.2. *For the case where $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is unicyclic we have that $\tau_B \leq n^{\frac{3}{\log^2 d}}$.*

For the proof of Lemma 16.2 see Section 17.1. Given the bound for τ_{block} in (93), and the bounds of τ_B in (95) and Lemma 16.2, we conclude the proof of the theorem. \square

16.1. Proof of Theorem 16.1. For a vertex $u \in T$, let T_u denote the subtree of T containing u and all its descendants. Unless otherwise specified, we assume that the root of T_u is u . Note also that $\partial_{\text{out}}T_u$ is the subset of $\partial_{\text{out}}T$ comprised by all $w \in \partial_{\text{out}}T$ having a neighbour in T_u .

Proposition 16.3. *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $u \in T$. Consider T_u and let w_1, \dots, w_R be the children of the root u . Consider the block dynamics $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in T_u with set of blocks $\mathcal{M} = \{\{u\}, T_{w_1}, \dots, T_{w_R}\}$.*

Under any boundary condition at $\partial_{\text{out}}T_u$, the block dynamics $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ exhibits relaxation time

$$\tau_{\text{block}}(T_u) \leq \exp \left(10 \log(R) + 2\beta \sum_{i=1}^R |J_{\{u, w_i\}}| \right) .$$

The proof of Proposition 16.3 appears in Section 16.2. In light of the above proposition, the theorem follows by induction on the height of the tree T .

The base case corresponds to a single vertex tree, where trivially, we have that $\tau_{\text{rel}}(T) = 1$. Assume, now, that the root u of T has children w_1, \dots, w_ℓ , for some $\ell \geq 1$. Then, per the induction hypothesis we have that

$$\tau_{\text{rel}}(T_{w_i}) \leq \exp(m(T_{w_i}, w_i)) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, \ell , \quad (96)$$

where recall that $\tau_{\text{rel}}(T_{w_i})$ corresponds to the relaxation time for the Glauber dynamics on T_{w_i} .

In order to derive $\tau_{\text{rel}}(T)$, i.e., the relaxation time for the Glauber dynamics on T , consider first the block dynamics on T where the set of blocks is $\{\{u\}, T_{w_1}, \dots, T_{w_\ell}\}$. The relaxation time for this process is given by Proposition 16.3. That is,

$$\tau_{\text{block}}(T) = \exp \left(10 \log(\ell) + 2\beta \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |J_{\{u, w_i\}}| \right) . \quad (97)$$

Using the bounds from (97), (96), and Proposition 6.1 we deduce that $\tau_{\text{rel}}(T) \leq \exp(m(T, u))$.

All the above conclude the proof of the theorem. \square

16.2. Proof of Proposition 16.3. We prove the proposition using coupling. Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}, (Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be two copies of the Markov chain, with configuration σ at $\partial_{\text{out}}T$.

We couple the two chains such that at each transition we update the same block in the two copies. Also, note that the coupling has the following basic property: if for some t_0 we have $X_{t_0} = Y_{t_0}$, then for every $t > t_0$ we also have $X_t = Y_t$.

We divide the evolution of the chains into ‘‘epochs’’. Each epoch consists of $N = 5R \log(R)$ transitions. We argue that at the end of each epoch the pair of chains in the coupling are at the same configuration with probability at least $\frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-2\beta \sum_{j=1}^R |J_{\{u, w_j\}}| \right)$, i.e., we have that

$$\min_{X_0, Y_0} \Pr[X_N = Y_N \mid X_0, Y_0] \geq \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-2\beta \sum_{j=1}^R |J_{\{u, w_j\}}| \right) , \quad (98)$$

where $J_{\{u,w_j\}}$ is the coupling parameter at the edge $\{u,w_j\}$. Then, it is elementary to show that after $100 \exp\left(2\beta \sum_{j=1}^R |J_{\{u,w_j\}}|\right)$ epochs, the probability that the two chains agree is larger than 0.8.

Clearly, the above implies that $\tau_{\text{block}}(T_u) \leq 500R \log(R) \exp\left(2\beta \sum_{j=1}^R |J_{\{u,w_j\}}|\right)$. Hence, the proposition follows by showing that (98) holds.

Suppose that at time $t > 0$, we update block T_{w_j} . Recall that we update the same block in the two copies. We further design our coupling such that the following are satisfied at each update:

(a) If we have agreement at the root, i.e., we have that $X_t(u) = Y_t(u)$, then deterministically, i.e., with probability 1, we have $X_t(T_{w_j}) = Y_t(T_{w_j})$. We can achieve this because the marginal distributions at the block T_{w_j} is the same for both copies, and thus, we can use identical coupling.

(b) If we have a disagreement at the root of T_u , i.e., we have that $X_t(u) \neq Y_t(u)$, then we have $X_t(T_{w_j}) = Y_t(T_{w_j})$ with probability $1 - \Gamma_{\{u,w_j\}}$. To see this, note that we first couple the configuration at w_j . Using maximal coupling, and due to Lemma 7.2, we have $X_t(w_j) = Y_t(w_j)$ with probability at least $1 - \Gamma_{\{u,w_j\}}$. Subsequently, i.e., once we obtain the configuration at w_j , we couple maximally the configuration for the remaining vertices in T_{w_j} . In that respect, it is easy to see that if $X_t(w_j) = Y_t(w_j)$, then we can couple identically the configuration at the remaining vertices of the block. On the other hand, having $X_t(w_j) \neq Y_t(w_j)$ precludes having $X_t(T_{w_j}) = Y_t(T_{w_j})$.

From the above we conclude that there is coupling such that, if at time $t > 0$ we update any of the blocks $\{T_{w_1}, \dots, T_{w_R}\}$, then we have that

$$\Pr[X_t(T_{w_j}) = Y_t(T_{w_j}) \mid \mathcal{F}] \geq 1 - \Gamma_{\{u,w_j\}} \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, R, \quad (99)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the σ -algebra generated by the configurations of X_t, Y_t at the blocks in $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{T_{w_j}\}$.

W.l.o.g. let us focus on the first epoch. Let \mathcal{U}_r be the event the root is updated at least once between the transitions $3R \log(R)$ and $5R \log(R)$. Also, let \mathcal{U}_{all} be the event that prior to $3R \log(R)$ all the blocks in $\{T_{w_1}, \dots, T_{w_R}\}$ are updated at least once. A standard coupon collector type argument implies that for any X_0, Y_0 we have that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}} \mid X_0, Y_0] \geq 1 - 10^{-2}. \quad (100)$$

Furthermore, for each T_{w_j} , let \mathcal{A}_j be the event that the last time block T_{w_j} was updated, prior to the update of the root, the two chains agree on the configuration of this block. Similarly, let \mathcal{A}_r be the probability that, after its update, the root has the same configuration in both copies.

By the design of our coupling, e.g. see (99), we have that for any X_0, Y_0 it holds that

$$\Pr\left[\bigcap_{j=1}^R \mathcal{A}_j \mid \mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}}, X_0, Y_0\right] \geq \prod_{j=1}^R (1 - \Gamma_{\{u,w_j\}}). \quad (101)$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}_r \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^R \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}}, X_0, Y_0] = 1. \quad (102)$$

The above holds by noticing that under the event $\bigcap_{i=1}^R \mathcal{A}_i$, when the root is updated the distributions of its configuration in the two copies are identical, and thus, we can use identical coupling.

From (100), (101) and (102), we conclude that for any X_0, Y_0 , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X_N = Y_N \mid X_0, Y_0] &\geq \Pr\left[\mathcal{A}_r, \bigcap_{i=1}^R \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}} \mid X_0, Y_0\right] \\ &= \Pr[\mathcal{A}_r \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^R \mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}}, X_0, Y_0] \times \\ &\quad \times \Pr\left[\bigcap_{i=1}^R \mathcal{A}_i \mid \mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}}, X_0, Y_0\right] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{U}_r, \mathcal{U}_{\text{all}} \mid X_0, Y_0] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=1}^R (1 - \Gamma_{\{u,w_j\}}). \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

The proposition follows by showing that for every w_j we have that

$$1 - \Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}} \geq \exp\left(-2\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|\right) . \quad (104)$$

We distinguish two cases. In the first one, we assume that $|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|$ is such that $\exp(\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|) \geq 3$. The second case corresponds to having $|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|$ such that $\exp(\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|) < 3$.

Case 1: Recall that we assume that $\exp(\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|) \geq 3$. It is elementary to show that, for any $J_{\{u, w_j\}}$, i.e., not necessarily large, we have that

$$\Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}} = \frac{|1 - \exp(\beta J_{\{u, w_j\}})|}{1 + \exp(\beta J_{\{u, w_j\}})} = \frac{1 - \exp(-\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|)}{1 + \exp(-\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|)} . \quad (105)$$

From the above, we have that

$$1 - \Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}} = 2 \frac{\exp(-\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|)}{1 + \exp(-\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|)} \geq \frac{3}{2} \exp\left(-\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|\right) \geq \exp\left(-2\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|\right) . \quad (106)$$

The above proves (104) for the case where $\exp(\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|) \geq 3$.

Case 2: Recall that now we assume that $\exp(\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|) < 3$. Then, using (105) we get that

$$\Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}} < 1/2 . \quad (107)$$

Furthermore, using the standard inequality: $1 - x \geq \exp(-\frac{x}{1-x})$ for $0 < x \leq 1/2$, we get that

$$1 - \Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{\Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}}}{1 - \Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}}}\right) \geq \exp\left(-2\Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}}\right) ,$$

where, for the last inequality we use that $\Gamma_{\{u, w_j\}} < 1/2$, i.e., we use (107). The above proves (104) for the case where $\exp(\beta|J_{\{u, w_j\}}|) < 3$. All the above conclude the proof of the proposition. \square

17. REMAINING PROOFS

17.1. Proof of Lemma 16.2. Consider the unicyclic block B . As per standard notation, we let $C = (w_1, \dots, w_\ell)$ be the cycle inside B , for some $\ell \leq 4 \frac{\log n}{\log^4 d}$.

Consider the, block dynamics, on B with a fixed boundary σ at $\partial_{\text{out}} B$. There are two blocks in this dynamics. The first block, B_1 , corresponds to the tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ which intersects with the cycle C at vertex w_1 . The second block B_2 corresponds to the vertices in $B \setminus B_1$. Note that both B_1, B_2 are trees. Let τ_{block} be the relaxation of this block dynamics.

Similarly to Proposition 16.3, we divide the evolution of the dynamics into epochs to prove that

$$\tau_{\text{block}} \leq 500n^{\frac{1}{\log^3 d}} . \quad (108)$$

Let (X_t) and (Y_t) be two copies of the block dynamics with the same boundary condition at σ at $\partial_{\text{out}} T$. We couple the two chains maximally such that at each transition we update the same block in both of them. Also, note that the coupling is such that, if for some t_0 we have $X_{t_0} = Y_{t_0}$, then for any $t > t_0$, we also have $X_t = Y_t$.

We consider epochs each of length $N = 10$. We argue that at the end of each epoch the chains in the pair are at the same configuration with probability at least $(1/2)n^{-1/\log^3 d}$, i.e., we have that

$$\min_{X_0, Y_0} \Pr[X_N = Y_N \mid X_0, Y_0] \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot n^{-\frac{1}{\log^3 d}} . \quad (109)$$

Then, it is elementary to show that after $500n^{1/\log^3 d}$ many epochs, the probability the two chains agree is larger than 0.8. Clearly, the above yields $\tau_{\text{block}}(T_u) \leq 500n^{1/\log^3 d}$, establishing (108).

Suppose that at time $t > 0$, we update the block B_1 . Recall that we update the same block in the two copies. Then we use the following result.

Claim 17.1. *There is a coupling such that*

$$\Pr[X_t(B_1) = Y_t(B_1) \mid \mathcal{F}_1] \geq n^{-\frac{1}{\log^3 d}}, \quad (110)$$

where \mathcal{F}_1 is the σ -algebra generated by the configurations of X_t, Y_t at B_2 .

Similarly, suppose that at time $t > 0$, we update B_2 in both copies. We use the following result.

Claim 17.2. *There is a coupling such that*

$$\Pr[X_t(B_2) = Y_t(B_2) \mid \mathcal{F}_2] \geq n^{-\frac{1}{\log^3 d}}, \quad (111)$$

where \mathcal{F}_2 is the σ -algebra generated by the configurations of X_t, Y_t at B_1 .

Then, using the above claims and arguing as in Proposition 16.2, we get (109) directly.

Let τ_1 be the relaxation time of the Glauber dynamics at B_1 with, arbitrary boundary fixed condition σ at $\partial_{\text{out}} B_1$. Similarly, we define τ_2 to be the relaxation time for block B_2 . Then, working as in Theorem 16.1 and recalling that $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$ we obtain

$$\tau_1 \leq n^{\frac{2}{\log^2 d}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2 \leq n^{\frac{2}{\log^2 d}}. \quad (112)$$

From (108), (112) and Proposition 6.1 we get that $\tau_B \leq n^{\frac{3}{\log^2 d}}$.

All the above conclude the proof of Lemma 16.2. \square

Proof of Claim 17.1. Let J_a and J_b be the coupling parameters for the edges connecting w_1 to w_2 , and w_1 to w_ℓ , respectively. The probability $\Pr[X_t(B_1) = Y_t(B_1) \mid \mathcal{F}_1]$ is minimised by choosing η^+ and η^- two configurations at w_2 and w_ℓ , such that η^+ maximises the probability of having +1 in the Gibbs marginal at w_1 , while η^- maximises -1 for the same marginal.

Specifically, note that η^+ is such that $\eta^+(w_\ell) = \text{sign}(J_b)$ and $\eta^+(w_2) = \text{sign}(J_a)$. Similarly, η^- is such that $\eta^-(w_\ell) = -\text{sign}(J_b)$ and $\eta^-(w_2) = -\text{sign}(J_a)$. Then, letting

$$\Gamma^* = \frac{1 - \exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_b|))}{1 + \exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_b|))},$$

it is standard to show that the maximal coupling of the configuration at w_1 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X_t(B_1) = Y_t(B_1) \mid \mathcal{F}_1] &\geq 1 - \Gamma^* \\ &= 2 \frac{\exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_b|))}{1 + \exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_b|))} \geq \exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_b|)). \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Recall that we assume $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$, and in particular, that $|J_a|, |J_b| \leq 10\sqrt{\log n}$. Clearly, this implies that $\exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_b|)) \geq n^{-1/\log^3 d}$, for large d and n . The claim follows by plugging this bound into (113). \square

Proof of Claim 17.2. The probability $\Pr[X_t(B_2) = Y_t(B_2) \mid \mathcal{F}_2]$ is minimised by having a disagreement at w_1 , i.e., otherwise this probability is 1. Note that w_1 has two neighbours in B_2 .

The coupling we use is as follows: First we couple maximally vertex w_2 and then, given the outcome for w_2 , we couple maximally vertex w_ℓ . We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X_t(B_2) = Y_t(B_2) \mid \mathcal{F}_2] &\geq \Pr[X_t(w_\ell) = Y_t(w_\ell) \mid X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2), \mathcal{F}_2] \cdot \Pr[X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2) \mid \mathcal{F}_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

We start by focusing on the coupling for w_2 . We have that

$$\Pr[X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2) \mid X_t(w_1) \neq Y_t(w_1), \mathcal{F}_2] \quad (115)$$

$$\leq \max_{\eta^+, \eta^-} \Pr[X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2) \mid X_t(\{w_1, w_3\}) = \eta^+, Y_t(\{w_1, w_3\}) = \eta^-, \mathcal{F}_2]. \quad (116)$$

To see the reason why the above is true, first note that the disagreement at vertex w_1 affects the marginal at w_2 from two directions. The first one is over the edge $\{w_1, w_2\}$, the second one is over the path $(w_1, w_\ell, \dots, w_2)$.

The probability of having a disagreement at w_2 in (115) is under maximal coupling, conditional on the configurations at w_1 . The probability of having a disagreement at w_2 in (116) is under maximal coupling, conditional on the configurations at w_1 and w_3 . The inequality follows by a standard convexity argument.

Then, arguing as in Claim 17.1, we get that

$$\Pr[X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2) \mid X_t(w_1) \neq Y_t(w_1), \mathcal{F}_2] \geq \exp(-\beta(|J_a| + |J_c|)) ,$$

where recall that J_a and J_c are the coupling parameters for the edge that connects w_2 , with w_1 and w_3 , respectively. Recall that we assume that $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$. This implies that $|J_a|, |J_c| \leq 10\sqrt{\log n}$. Plugging this bound into the inequality above, for large d and n , we get that

$$\Pr[X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2) \mid X_t(w_1) \neq Y_t(w_1), \mathcal{F}_2] \geq n^{-1/(\log d)^4} . \quad (117)$$

Then, conditional on $X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2)$, we couple maximally $X_t(w_\ell), Y_t(w_\ell)$. Note that the disagreement at w_1 only affects the distribution of the configuration at w_ℓ through the edge $\{w_1, w_\ell\}$. Hence, using standard arguments (e.g. the same as those in the proof of Proposition 16.3), we get that

$$\Pr[X_t(w_\ell) = Y_t(w_\ell) \mid X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2), \mathcal{F}_2] \geq 2 \frac{\exp(-\beta|J_b|)}{1 + \exp(-\beta|J_b|)} .$$

Recall that we assume that $(G, \mathcal{J}, \beta) \in \mathcal{G}(d, \varepsilon)$. This implies that $|J_b| \leq 10\sqrt{\log n}$. Plugging this bound into the inequality above, for large d and n , we get that

$$\Pr[X_t(w_\ell) = Y_t(w_\ell) \mid X_t(w_2) = Y_t(w_2), \mathcal{F}_2] \geq n^{-1/(\log d)^4} . \quad (118)$$

The claim follows by plugging (117) and (118) into (114). \square

17.2. Proof of Lemma 10.1. We show that for an arbitrary path P in \mathbf{G} , with $r \leq |P| \leq \log n$, we have that

$$\Pr[M(P) \geq 1] \leq n^{-d^{1/4}} . \quad (119)$$

In light of (119), applying the union bound over all such paths gives us the result

$$\Pr[\mathcal{S}_1] \geq 1 - \sum_{k=r}^{\log n} \binom{n}{k+1} \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^k \cdot n^{-d^{1/4}} \geq 1 - \sum_{k=r}^{\log n} n \cdot d^k \cdot n^{-d^{1/4}} \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/5}} ,$$

where the last inequality holds for large d and n . Therefore, we now focus on proving (119).

Let $P = (v_0, \dots, v_k)$, with $r \leq k \leq \log n$. We split the vertices of P into two sets, $\text{In}(P)$, and $\text{Out}(P)$. The set $\text{In}(P)$ is comprised by all vertices v_i of P that are adjacent to a vertex in $V(P) \setminus \{v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}\}$, and $\text{Out}(P) = V(P) \setminus \text{In}(P)$, so that

$$M(P) = M(\text{In}(P)) \cdot M(\text{Out}(P)) = \prod_{v \in \text{In}(P)} M(v) \cdot \prod_{w \in \text{Out}(P)} M(w) . \quad (120)$$

We next bound separately $M(\text{In}(P))$, and $M(\text{Out}(P))$, so that their product is less than 1, w.h.p..

Let us start by bounding $M(\text{In}(P))$. We first notice the following tail bound for $|\text{In}(P)|$:

$$\Pr[|\text{In}(P)| \geq 2\sqrt{d}] \leq \sum_{s=\sqrt{d}}^k \binom{k^2}{s} \cdot \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^s \leq \sum_{s=\sqrt{d}}^k \left(\frac{d \cdot k^2}{n}\right)^s \leq 2 \cdot \left(\frac{d \cdot k^2}{n}\right)^{\sqrt{d}} \leq n^{-\sqrt{d}/2} , \quad (121)$$

where the last two inequalities hold for large d and n .

For a vertex v_i in P , let $\deg_{\text{in}}(v_i)$ be the number of neighbors that v_i has in P , while let $\deg_{\text{out}}(v_i)$ be the number of neighbors in $V \setminus P$.

For a vertex $w \in \text{In}(P)$ we have that $\deg_{\text{out}}(w)$ is dominated by $\text{Binom}(n, d/n)$. Then, we obtain that

$$\Pr \left[\deg_{\text{out}}(w) \geq d \cdot \log n, \text{ for at least one } w \in \text{In}(P) \mid |\text{In}(P)| < 2\sqrt{d} \right] \leq n^{-d^{9/10}}. \quad (122)$$

Indeed, the Chernoff bound gives

$$\Pr \left[\deg_{\text{out}}(w) \geq d \cdot \log n \mid w \in \text{In}(P) \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{(\log n - 2)^2}{\log n} \cdot d \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\log n}{2} \cdot d \right) \leq n^{-d^{95/100}},$$

where the last two inequalities hold for large enough d and n . The above and a simple union-bound imply (122).

Let B_1 be the event that $|\text{In}(P)| < 2\sqrt{d}$, while let B_2 be the event that for all $w \in \text{In}(P)$ we have $\deg_{\text{out}}(w) < d \log n$.

On the events B_1 and B_2 , we have that for all $w \in \text{In}(P)$

- (1) $\deg(w) < d \log n + 2 + 2\sqrt{d}$,
- (2) $M(w) \leq 2d^2 \log n$.

The first item follows by noticing that $\deg(w) = \deg_{\text{in}}(w) + \deg_{\text{out}}(w)$, and that $\deg_{\text{in}}(w) \leq 2 + |\text{In}(P)|$, for all $w \in \text{In}(P)$.

The second item follows from the first item, and by noticing that for any vertex v in the graph we have $M(v) \leq d \cdot \deg(v)$. Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[M(\text{In}(P)) < (2d^2 \log n)^{2\sqrt{d}} \right] &\geq \Pr[B_1 \cap B_2] \\ &\geq 1 - \Pr[\overline{B_1}] - \Pr[\overline{B_2}] && \text{[union bound]} \\ &\geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/3}}. && \text{[from eq. (122) \& eq. (121)]} \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

To bound $M(\text{Out}(P))$, we follow the proof strategy of Lemma 13.2. In particular, we partition $\text{Out}(P)$ into two sets: the set of vertices with even index in P , and the set of vertices with odd index in P . Moreover, we let $M_{\text{even}}(\text{Out}(P))$ be the product of weights over the set of even vertices in $\text{Out}(P)$, and $M_{\text{odd}}(\text{Out}(P))$ similarly. We claim that

$$\Pr \left[M_{\text{even}}(\text{Out}(P)) \geq (\log n)^{-d} \right] \leq n^{-d^{2/5}}. \quad (124)$$

Indeed, Markov's inequality yields that for every $t > 0$

$$\Pr \left[M_{\text{even}}(\text{Out}(P)) \geq (\log n)^{-d} \right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[M_{\text{even}}^t(\text{Out}(P)) \right]}{(\log n)^{-t \cdot d}}. \quad (125)$$

In the proof of Lemma 13.2, we have that for $t = d^{95/100}$, and $s = d^{94/100}$ and arbitrary vertex v , we have that $\mathbb{E} \left[M^t(v) \right] \leq (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4})^s$, (notice that although we prove this for the random tree construction, the arguments work precisely for $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ as well). Acknowledging the fact that $M_{\text{even}}(\text{Out}(P))$ is a product of i.i.d. random variables, we get that

$$\Pr \left[M_{\text{even}}(\text{Out}(P)) \geq (\log n)^{-d} \right] \leq \frac{(1 - \varepsilon/4)^{ks/2}}{(\log n)^{-t \cdot d}} \leq (\log n)^{d^2} \cdot n^{-d^{42/100}} \leq n^{-d^{2/5}}, \quad (126)$$

Notice that, by symmetry, (124) holds for $M_{\text{odd}}(\text{Out}(P))$ as well. Moreover, since $M(\text{Out}(P)) = M_{\text{odd}}(\text{Out}(P)) \cdot M_{\text{even}}(\text{Out}(P))$, using the union bound further yields

$$\Pr \left[M(\text{Out}(P)) < (\log n)^{-2d} \right] \geq 1 - 2 \cdot n^{-d^{2/5}} \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/3}}. \quad (127)$$

From the union bound, equations (123) and (127) , and the fact that $M(P) = M(\text{In}(P)) \cdot M(\text{Out}(P))$, we have that

$$\Pr [M(P) < 1] \geq 1 - 2 \cdot n^{-d^{1/3}} \geq 1 - n^{-d^{1/4}} ,$$

concluding the proof of Lemma 10.1.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dimitris Achlioptas and Amin Coja-Oghlan. Algorithmic barriers from phase transitions. In *49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2008*, pages 793–802. IEEE Computer Society, 2008. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2008.11>.
- [2] Ahmed El Alaoui and Andrea Montanari. Algorithmic thresholds in mean field spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11481*, 2020.
- [3] Ahmed El Alaoui, Andrea Montanari, and Mark Sellke. Optimization of mean-field spin glasses. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(6):2922 – 2960, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-AOP1519>.
- [4] Ahmed El Alaoui, Andrea Montanari, and Mark Sellke. Sampling from the sherrington-kirkpatrick gibbs measure via algorithmic stochastic localization. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022*, pages 323–334. IEEE, 2022.
- [5] Nima Anari, Kuikui Liu, and Shayan Oveis Gharan. Spectral independence in high-dimensional expanders and applications to the hardcore model. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 1319–1330. IEEE, 2020.
- [6] Roland Bauerschmidt and Thierry Bodineau. A very simple proof of the lsi for high temperature spin systems. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 276(8):2582–2588, 2019.
- [7] Ivona Bezáková, Andreas Galanis, Leslie Ann Goldberg, and Daniel Stefankovic. Fast sampling via spectral independence beyond bounded-degree graphs. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2022*, volume 229, pages 21:1–21:16, 2022.
- [8] Russ Bubley and Martin Dyer. Path coupling: A technique for proving rapid mixing in markov chains. In *Proceedings 38th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 223–231. IEEE, 1997.
- [9] Xiaoyu Chen, Weiming Feng, Yitong Yin, and Xinyuan Zhang. Optimal mixing for two-state anti-ferromagnetic spin systems. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022*, pages 588–599. IEEE, 2022.
- [10] Zongchen Chen, Kuikui Liu, and Eric Vigoda. Optimal mixing of glauber dynamics: entropy factorization via high-dimensional expansion. In *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 1537–1550. ACM, 2021.
- [11] Zongchen Chen, Nitya Mani, and Ankur Moitra. From algorithms to connectivity and back: Finding a giant component in random k -sat. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023*, pages 3437–3470. SIAM, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977554.ch132>.
- [12] Amin Coja-Oghlan and Charilaos Efthymiou. On independent sets in random graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2011*, pages 136–144. SIAM, 2011. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973082.12>.
- [13] Amin Coja-Oghlan, Charilaos Efthymiou, Nor Jaafari, Mihyun Kang, and Tobias Kapetanopoulos. Charting the replica symmetric phase. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 359:603–698, 2018.
- [14] Martin Dyer, Abraham D Flaxman, Alan M Frieze, and Eric Vigoda. Randomly coloring sparse random graphs with fewer colors than the maximum degree. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 29(4):450–465, 2006.
- [15] Martin E. Dyer and Alan M. Frieze. Randomly coloring random graphs. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 36(3):251–272, 2010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20286>.
- [16] Samuel Frederick Edwards and Phil W Anderson. Theory of spin glasses. *Journal of Physics F: Metal Physics*, 5(5):965, 1975.
- [17] Charilaos Efthymiou. MCMC sampling colourings and independent sets of $G(n, d/n)$ near uniqueness threshold. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014*, pages 305–316. SIAM, 2014.
- [18] Charilaos Efthymiou. On Sampling Symmetric Gibbs Distributions on Sparse Random Graphs and Hypergraphs. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2022, July 4-8, 2022*, volume 229, pages 57:1–57:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [19] Charilaos Efthymiou and Weiming Feng. On the mixing time of glauber dynamics for the hard-core and related models on $g(n, d/n)$. *CoRR*, abs/2302.06172, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.06172>, [arXiv:2302.06172](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.06172).

- [20] Charilaos Efthymiou, Thomas P. Hayes, Daniel Stefankovic, and Eric Vigoda. Sampling random colorings of sparse random graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018*, pages 1759–1771. SIAM, 2018.
- [21] Charilaos Efthymiou, Thomas P Hayes, Daniel Štefankovič, and Eric Vigoda. Sampling random colorings of sparse random graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1759–1771. SIAM, 2018.
- [22] Charilaos Efthymiou and Kostas Zampetakis. Broadcasting with random matrices. *CoRR*, abs/2302.11657, 2023. [arXiv:2302.11657](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11657), [doi:10.48550/arXiv.2302.11657](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.11657).
- [23] Ronen Eldan, Frederic Koehler, and Ofer Zeitouni. A spectral condition for spectral gap: fast mixing in high-temperature ising models. *Probability theory and related fields*, 182(3-4):1035–1051, 2022.
- [24] Silvio Franz, Michele Leone, Federico Ricci-Tersenghi, and Riccardo Zecchina. Exact solutions for diluted spin glasses and optimization problems. *Physical review letters*, 87(12):127209, 2001.
- [25] Andreas Galanis, Daniel Stefankovic, and Eric Vigoda. Inapproximability for antiferromagnetic spin systems in the tree nonuniqueness region. *J. ACM*, 62(6):50:1–50:60, 2015.
- [26] David Gamarnik, Aukosh Jagannath, and Alexander S. Wein. Low-degree hardness of random optimization problems. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 131–140. IEEE, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00021>.
- [27] David Gamarnik and Madhu Sudan. Performance of sequential local algorithms for the random NAE-K-SAT problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(2):590–619, 2017.
- [28] Francesco Guerra and Fabio Lucio Toninelli. The high temperature region of the Viana-Bray diluted spin glass model. *Journal of statistical physics*, 115:531–555, 2004.
- [29] Frederic Koehler, Holden Lee, and Andrej Risteski. Sampling approximately low-rank ising models: MCMC meets variational methods. In *Conference on Learning Theory, 2022*, volume 178 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4945–4988. PMLR, 2022.
- [30] Fabio Martinelli. Lectures on glauber dynamics for discrete spin models. *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1997)*, 1717:93–191, 1999.
- [31] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M. Virasoro. *Spin glass theory and beyond*. World Scientific, 1987.
- [32] Elchanan Mossel and Allan Sly. Gibbs rapidly samples colorings of $g(n, d/n)$. *Probability theory and related fields*, 148(1-2):37–69, 2010.
- [33] Dmitry Panchenko. The parisi ultrametricity conjecture. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 383–393, 2013.
- [34] Dmitry Panchenko and Michel Talagrand. Bounds for diluted mean-fields spin glass models. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 130(3):319–336, 2004. [doi:10.1007/s00440-004-0342-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-004-0342-2).
- [35] Giorgio Parisi. Infinite number of order parameters for spin-glasses. *Physical Review Letters*, 43(23):1754, 1979.
- [36] David Sherrington and Scott Kirkpatrick. Solvable model of a spin-glass. *Physical review letters*, 35(26):1792, 1975.
- [37] Allan Sly and Nike Sun. The computational hardness of counting in two-spin models on d -regular graphs. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012*, pages 361–369. IEEE Computer Society, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2012.56>.
- [38] Daniel L Stein and Charles M Newman. *Spin glasses and complexity*, volume 4. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- [39] Michel Talagrand. The Parisi formula. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 163(1):221–263, 2006. [doi:10.4007/annals.2006.163.221](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2006.163.221).

APPENDIX A. TAIL BOUND FOR SUMS OF HALF-NORMAL

We say that Y follows the *half-normal* distribution with parameter σ , if $Y = |X|$, where X follows the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. For $N > 0$ integer, and $\sigma \geq 0$, let $X_1, \dots, X_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ be i.i.d standard Gaussians, and write

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N |X_i| .$$

We show the following concentration bound for X

Theorem A.1. *For every $\delta \geq 0$, we have that*

$$\Pr [X > (1 + \delta) \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \exp \left(-N \cdot \frac{\delta^2}{\pi} \right) .$$

Proof. For every real $t \geq 0$, consider the moment generating function $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot X)]$, as a non-negative random variable. Applying Markov's inequality on $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot X)]$, we get that for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\Pr[X > a] = \Pr[\exp(t \cdot X) > \exp(t \cdot a)] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot X)]}{\exp(t \cdot a)}. \quad (128)$$

To calculate $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot X)]$, we first observe that since X_i 's are i.i.d., so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot X)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(t \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N |X_i|\right)\right] = (\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot |X_1|)])^N. \quad (129)$$

We now focus on $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot |X_1|)]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot |X_1|)] &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp(t \cdot |x|) \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\ &= 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(tx - \frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\ &= 2 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2}\right) \cdot \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2} + tx - \frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\ &= 2 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2}\right) \cdot \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x}{\sigma} - \sigma t\right)^2\right) dx \\ &= 2 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2}\right) \cdot \Phi(\sigma t). \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

Hence, from (129) and (128), we further have that

$$\Pr[X > a] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp(t \cdot X)]}{\exp(t \cdot a)} = \exp\left(N \cdot \frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2} - t \cdot a + N \cdot \log[2 \cdot \Phi(\sigma t)]\right). \quad (131)$$

As we prove in Lemma B.1, for every $x \geq 0$, we have $\Phi(x) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X > a] &\leq \exp\left(N \cdot \frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2} - t \cdot a + N \cdot \log\left[1 + \sigma t \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\right]\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(N \cdot \frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2} - t \cdot a + N \cdot \sigma t \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(N \left[t^2 \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{2} + t \cdot \left(\sigma \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} - \frac{a}{N}\right)\right]\right). \end{aligned} \quad (132)$$

Minimizing the exponent in the rhs of (132) with respect to $t \geq 0$, yields that for every

$$a \geq N\sigma \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}, \quad (133)$$

we have

$$\Pr[X > a] \leq \exp\left(N \left[-\frac{(a\sqrt{\pi} - \sigma N\sqrt{2})^2}{2\pi N^2\sigma^2}\right]\right). \quad (134)$$

Considering the derivative at $t = 0$ of the moment generating function of $|X_1|$ in (130), it is easy to check that

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^N |X_i|\right] = N \cdot \mathbb{E}[|X_1|] = N\sigma \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}.$$

So that condition (133), can be written as $a \geq \mathbb{E}[X]$, or equivalently, $a = (1 + \delta) \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]$ for some $\delta \geq 0$. Substituting $a = (1 + \delta) \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]$ in (134), gives

$$\Pr [X > (1 + \delta) \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \exp \left(-N \cdot \frac{\delta^2}{\pi} \right) ,$$

as desired. \square

APPENDIX B. LINEAR APPROXIMATION OF THE GAUSSIAN CDF

Lemma B.1. *Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the CDF of the Standard Gaussian distribution. Then, for every $x \geq 0$*

$$\Phi(x) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{2\pi}} .$$

Proof. Define $H : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$H(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{x}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - \Phi(x) .$$

Differentiating gives

$$H'(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} - \frac{\exp(-\frac{x^2}{2})}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \geq 0 ,$$

so that H is increasing. Noticing also that $H(0) = 0$, yields $H \geq 0$, as desired. \square

APPENDIX C. CYCLES IN $\mathbf{G}(n, d/n)$ - PROOF OF LEMMA 9.2

Write \mathcal{E}_S for the event that every set of vertices $S \subseteq V(\mathbf{G})$, with cardinality at most $2 \frac{\log n}{\log^2 d}$, spans at most $|S|$ edges in \mathbf{G} . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [\overline{\mathcal{E}_S}] &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{2 \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2}} \binom{n}{k} \binom{\binom{k}{2}}{k+1} \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^{k+1} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{2 \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2}} \left(\frac{ne}{k}\right)^k \left(\frac{k^2 e}{2(k+1)}\right)^{k+1} \left(\frac{d}{n}\right)^{k+1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{2 \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2}} \left(\frac{ekd}{2}\right) \left(\frac{e^2 d}{2}\right)^k \leq \frac{ed}{(\log d)^2} \frac{\log n}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{2 \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2}} \left(\frac{e^2 d}{2}\right)^k \\ &\leq n^{-9/10} (e^2 d/2)^{2 \frac{\log n}{(\log d)^2}} \leq n^{-3/4} , \end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities hold for sufficiently large d .