

# Geometric planted matchings beyond the Gaussian model

Lucas R. Schwengber <sup>\*1</sup> and Roberto I. Oliveira <sup>†1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

2024

## Abstract

We consider the problem of recovering an unknown matching between a set of  $n$  randomly placed points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and random perturbations of these points. This can be seen as a model for particle tracking and more generally, entity resolution. We use matchings in random geometric graphs to derive minimax lower bounds for this problem that hold under great generality. Using these results we show that for a broad class of distributions, the order of the number of mistakes made by an estimator that minimizes the sum of squared Euclidean distances is minimax optimal when  $d$  is fixed and is optimal up to  $n^{o(1)}$  factors when  $d = o(\log n)$ . In the high-dimensional regime we consider a setup where both initial positions and perturbations have independent sub-Gaussian coordinates. In this setup we give sufficient conditions under which the same estimator makes no mistakes with high probability. We prove an analogous result for an adapted version of this estimator that incorporates information on the covariance matrix of the perturbations.

---

\*lucas.schwengber@impa.br

†rimfo@impa.br

# 1 Introduction

We study the geometric planted matching model introduced by D. Kunisky and J. Niles-Weed in [11]. Given  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we generate a sequence  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random positions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and independently a sequence of i.i.d. random perturbations  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ , from which we derive,

$$Y_i = X_{\pi^*(i)} + Z_i, \quad i \in [n], \quad (1.1)$$

a sequence of perturbed versions of the original points with the label information hidden by an unknown random permutation  $\pi^* \sim \text{Unif}(S_n)$ . The goal is to recover  $\pi^*$  given direct observation of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ .

We can interpret  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$  as being snapshots at different times of the positions of  $n$  particles performing some form of random motion in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Based on these snapshots we would like to track each particle's trajectory. This is a natural problem that arises in the life sciences [18, 3, 9] in the context of analyzing single-cell dynamics, and in the physical sciences [12] in problems involving fluid dynamics. This model also makes sense for growing  $d$ . For instance, if we imagine that the  $X_i$ 's are high-dimensional feature vectors, and the  $Y_i$ 's are noisy versions of the  $X_i$ 's, then estimating  $\pi^*$  is a toy model for *entity resolution* or *deduplication* [5].

Under the assumption that  $X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$ , [11] established sufficient and necessary conditions on  $\sigma^2$  for the number of mistakes made by the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) to be 0 or  $o(n)$  with high-probability for different regimes of  $d$ . Under the same Gaussian model, [24] showed that some of these conditions are information theoretical optimal. In [6] and [2] information-theoretical limits were also established under different models for database matching with Gaussian assumptions. Another line of research, tracing back to [4], considers the problem of recovering planted matchings in weighted bipartite graphs without a latent geometric structure. In that case, more general results are available [13, 17, 8].

In this work we consider the geometric planted matching problem following (1.1) for broader classes of distributions for  $X_i$  and  $Z_i$ . In this more general setting, we obtain a general lower bound on the expected number of mistakes made by any estimator. Our proof is based on a simple argument involving matchings in random geometric graphs. The same strategy can also be used to establish negative results similar to the ones in [11] and [24]. We showcase some consequences for the regime when  $d = \Theta(1)$  and  $d = o(\log n)$  providing natural scenarios where it gives optimal results up to constant factors in the first regime, and up to  $n^{o(1)}$  factors in the latter one.

We also obtain results in high-dimensional settings when both the initial positions and noise vectors have anisotropic sub-Gaussian distributions. This is motivated by the connection with data deduplication, where non-isotropy seems natural. Our main finding is that there seems to be natural “effective dimension” and “effective SNR” parameters that govern the matching problem in this setting, much like the true dimension determines the error rate for isotropic Gaussians [11].

## 1.1 Main results

In what follows, an *estimator*  $\hat{\pi}$  is a map that takes as input two sequences of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ , and outputs a permutation  $\hat{\pi} \in S_n$ . We measure the performance of such estimator  $\hat{\pi}$  using the Hamming distance with respect to the true planted matching  $\pi^*$ :

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{\pi}(j) \neq \pi^*(j)]}. \quad (1.2)$$

As in previous works [4, 13, 17, 8, 11, 24] we want to understand the behaviour of the above quantity and its expectation for large  $n$ . More concretely, we would like to establish upper bounds on the expected number of mistakes made by a certain estimator (positive results), and lower bounds on the same quantity that hold for some, or for any, estimator (negative results).

For our positive results, we focus on an estimator that solves:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}} &= \arg \min_{\pi \in S_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|X_{\pi(j)} - Y_j\|_2^2 \\ &= \arg \max_{\pi \in S_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle X_{\pi(j)}, Y_j \rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{1.3}$$

Under the Gaussian model from [11] this coincides with the MLE, but it can also be used in more general settings. Following [6] we will refer to this estimator as the *Least Sum of Squares Estimator* (LSS).

This estimator is distribution agnostic and can also be evaluated efficiently using the Hungarian method [10] since it is an instance of a linear assignment problem. It appeared in previous theoretical analysis [11, 24, 2, 6] under Gaussian assumptions and in practical applications [9]. Not directly related to this work there exists an extensive literature on understanding the asymptotic behaviour of so-called Euclidean Bipartite Matching Problems [19, 20], which have the same structure as the random optimization problem in (1.3), but the  $Y_i$ 's are assumed to be an independent copy of the  $X_i$ 's.

### 1.1.1 Low-dimension

Our first two results are specially informative when  $d = o(\log n)$ . This includes the case where  $d$  is fixed, which is the natural setting for the problem of particle tracking when the number of particles being tracked is very large [4].

**Model LD.** We generate a model following (1.1) with the assumption that:

- (a)  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{P}$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a probability distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that:
  - (i)  $\mathcal{P}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \|x\| < R_d\}) \geq \gamma$  for some norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $R_d, \gamma > 0$ .
  - (ii)  $\mathcal{P}$  has a density  $f_{\mathcal{P}}$ , with respect to Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , such that:

$$\frac{\text{ess sup}_{\|x\| < R_d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x)}{\text{ess inf}_{\|x\| < R_d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x)} \leq e^{\beta d},\tag{1.4}$$

for some constant  $\beta \geq \log(2)$ .

- (b)  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n = \sigma \tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \sigma \tilde{Z}_n$ , where  $\sigma > 0$  is the noise level and  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$  are random directions of motion following  $\mathcal{Q}$  a distribution in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that:

$$\sup_{\|v\| < R_d} \|\mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v) - \mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q}\|_{TV} \leq 1 - e^{-\beta d},\tag{1.5}$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}(v)$  is the law of  $\tilde{Z}_1 + v$ , and  $\|\cdot\|, R_d, \gamma$  and  $\beta$  are the same as in assumption (a).

Loosely speaking, assumption (a) says that there is a ball carrying a positive part of the mass of  $\mathcal{P}$  where the density  $f_{\mathcal{P}}$  does not vary too much. Assumption (b) is expected to be satisfied when  $\mathcal{Q}$  has a density with a significant overlap with bounded translations of itself. For instance, these assumptions naturally hold for  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  with  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$ ,  $R_d = \sqrt{2d}$  and  $\beta, \gamma > 0$  which are independent of  $d$  and  $n$ . But they also hold if we only assume that  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  have bounded continuous densities (see §2.2 below).

Under the above assumptions, we have following explicit minimax lower bound:

**Theorem 1.1** (Minimax lower bound (proof in §3.3)). *Under Model LD, for all  $n \geq 3$ ,*

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{32} e^{-7\beta d} ((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n),\tag{1.6}$$

where the infimum above is taken over all estimators  $\hat{\pi}$ .

The proof of this result is based on a natural argument that uses matchings in the random geometric graph  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|) = G(\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  constructed by joining pairs of initial positions which are within a distance  $r$  of each other with respect to norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . As a main step in this proof we also show the following result of independent interest:

**Lemma 1.2** (Largest matching size lower bound (proof in §3.2)). *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{P}$  and  $M_r$  be the largest matching in  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  and suppose  $\mathcal{P}, \|\cdot\|, R_d, \gamma$  and  $\beta$  follow assumption (a) from Model LD. Then for all  $n \geq 3$  and  $r > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|M_r|] \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{16} e^{-6\beta d} \left( \left( n^2 \left( \frac{r}{R_d} \right)^d \right) \wedge n \right). \quad (1.7)$$

Given Lemma 1.2, the idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is that a large matching in  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  implies that a large number of pairs of points  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  are very close to one another. Since points which are close to each other are hard to distinguish once noise is added, they are likely to lead to mistakes. This phenomenon is illustrated in Figure 1 for  $\hat{\pi}_{LSS}$ . Following this proof strategy, when  $d$  is fixed, the order  $(n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n$  appearing in Theorem 1.1 has a very natural geometrical interpretation: it is the order of the size of the largest matching of initial positions within distance  $\Theta(\sigma)$ .




Figure 1: A small window of a simulation of the performance of  $\hat{\pi}_{LSS}$  on a sample following (1.1) of total size  $n = 3000$  with  $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ ,  $Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$  for two different values of  $\sigma^2$ . Arrows indicate to which initial position  $X_i$  a given  $Y_j$  was associated by  $\hat{\pi}_{LSS}$ . Red arrows indicate that the estimated match for the given point was incorrect, while grey arrows indicate that the estimated match was correct. Blue lines between pairs of initial positions indicate that they are within a distance of  $r = \sqrt{2}\sigma$  of each other. Note that most incorrect matches involve initial positions that share an edge on  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|_2)$ . Our strategy to prove our lower bounds takes inspiration from this observation. The code to generate this image can be found at [https://github.com/Lucas-Schwengber/particle\\_tracking](https://github.com/Lucas-Schwengber/particle_tracking).

Although to the best of our knowledge understanding matchings in random geometric graphs has not received direct attention in previous works, Lemma 1.2 is not significantly far from what is already well-known in the literature. For instance, if  $d, \mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  are fixed,  $r \rightarrow 0$  and  $n^2 r^d \rightarrow +\infty$ , one can use general results of the classical monograph by Penrose [15, Propositions 3.2 and 3.3] to count isolated edges in a random geometric graph, giving a lower bound on the size of its largest matching which is sharp up to constant factors. For our purposes, the main advantage of Lemma 1.2 is that it is general, nonasymptotic and can be made to work in growing dimensions. Moreover, its proof is simple and constructive.

**Remark 1.3.** Our approach to establish lower bounds is different from what was done in [11] where the authors look at matchings in a different random graph, which is built by adding edges between the endpoints

of augmenting 2-cycles (see Appendix B.1 below for a definition). There is a direct connection between the two approaches, which we outline in Appendix B. In particular, when  $d = o(\log n)$  or  $d$  is fixed, our techniques are able to recover the lower bounds from [11] up to factors of order  $n^{o(1)}$ , while also working under greater generality (see Theorem B.1).

**Remark 1.4.** The proof strategy of our negative results also differs from the one in [24] where the authors either count augmenting 2-cycles as in [11] or use classical tools from information theory. But one can also prove a version of Theorem 1.1 that gives a lower bound in probability for the performance of any estimator, thus allowing us to derive negative results that complement and extend the negative results from [24] (see Corollary B.6 in Appendix B) when  $d$  is fixed or  $d = o(\log n)$ .

**Remark 1.5.** We note that, similar to this work, [2] and [6] also established information-theoretical limits by analyzing the distances between uncorrupted feature vectors. However their conditions are stated in terms of the minimum distance between uncorrupted feature vectors.

**Remark 1.6.** Although the negative results established in this paper concern the case when  $d = o(\log n)$ , we believe our strategy can also lead to non-trivial results when  $d = \Omega(\log n)$ . In particular, in Appendix C we showcase how they can be used to partially recover the lower bounds from [11] in the regime where  $d = \Theta(\log n)$ .

Our next result shows that the LSS estimator achieves minimax optimal rates in a slightly more restrictive setting than Model LD. Specifically, let **Model LD+S** be Model LD with the additional assumptions that:

(c)  $\|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty} \leq e^{\beta d}$ , for the same  $\beta$  as in assumption (a).

(d) The distribution of the  $\tilde{Z}_i$ 's satisfy:

$$\sup_{\|v\|=1} \left\| \left\langle \tilde{Z}_i, v \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq K_Q \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i] = 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Under these additional assumptions, we have the following upper bound on  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$ :

**Theorem 1.7** (LSS error upper bound (proof in §4.1)). *Under Model LD+S, for all  $n \geq 2$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] \leq (3K^d n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n, \quad (1.9)$$

where  $K = b_{\text{LD}} \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}^{\frac{2}{d}} K_Q^2 e^{2\beta}$  for some absolute constant  $b_{\text{LD}} > 0$ .

In Section 2.2 below we show that if  $d$  is fixed we can improve our constant  $3K^d$  to a constant  $\tau_{d, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}}$  which we conjecture to be sharp when  $n^2 \sigma^d \ll n$  (see Figure 2). This constant depends very mildly on the geometrical properties of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  thus suggesting that when  $n^2 \sigma^d = o(n)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$  behaves as in the Gaussian model for a broad class of distributions.

The proof of Theorem 1.7 follows a similar strategy as in [11]. Given a  $t$ -cycle  $C_t = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t)$  of distinct elements from  $[n]$  we say that it is an *augmenting cycle* (for  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$ ), or just *augmenting*, if:

$$\sum_{k=1}^t \langle X_{\pi^*(i_k)}, Y_{i_{k+1}} \rangle \geq \sum_{k=1}^t \langle X_{\pi^*(i_k)}, Y_{i_k} \rangle, \quad (1.10)$$

where  $i_{t+1} := i_1$ . If we assume that  $\pi^* = \text{Id}$ , all cycles of size 2 or greater on the cycle decomposition of  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$  will be mistakes. Moreover, these cycles must be *augmenting cycles*, otherwise they would not appear in the optimal assignment  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$ . It follows that we have the following deterministic bound:

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) \leq \sum_{t=2}^n \sum_{C_t} t \mathbf{1}_{[C_t \text{ is augmenting}]}, \quad (1.11)$$

where the inner sum is over all  $t$ -cycles  $C_t$ .

To bound  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$ , we bound the probability that  $t$ -cycles are augmenting. Similarly to [11] our upper bounds on these probabilities involve bounding the expectation of exponentials of certain quadratic

forms on the initial positions. Unlike in the Gaussian setting of [11], we cannot evaluate these expectations explicitly. Fortunately, the assumptions in Model LD+S are good enough for calculations to go through.

In Section 2 we show that Theorems 1.1 and 1.7 can be combined to obtain optimal rates for some natural choices of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$ . One such rate is when both  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  have continuous and bounded densities with  $d$  fixed. Another case is the Gaussian model studied in [11] in the regime where  $d = o(\log n)$ , where our bounds are optimal up to  $n^{o(1)}$  factors. We additionally consider the cases of  $\mathcal{P}$  uniform or from the Laplace family.

### 1.1.2 High-dimension

Our next results concern the high-dimensional setting. As mentioned above, this is a natural toy model for *deduplication* and *entity resolution* between high-dimensional datasets [5].

**Model HD.** In this setup we let  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  while making the following assumptions in (1.1):

- (a)  $d = \omega(\log n)$ .
- (b)  $X_1, \dots, X_n = (\Sigma_X)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{X}_1, \dots, (\Sigma_X)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{X}_n$  and  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n = (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{Z}_1, \dots, (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{Z}_n$  where:
  - (i)  $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$  are i.i.d. and independent from  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n$ , which are also i.i.d.
  - (ii) Both  $\tilde{X}_1$  and  $\tilde{Z}_1$  have independent coordinates with:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_1[j]] = 0, \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_1[j]] = 0, \forall j \in [d], \quad (1.12)$$

and,

$$\max_{j \in [d]} \left\| \tilde{X}_1[j] \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq K_X, \quad \max_{j \in [d]} \left\| \tilde{Z}_1[j] \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq K_Z, \quad (1.13)$$

for constants  $K_X, K_Z > 0$  that do not depend on  $n$ .

- (iii)  $\Sigma_X = \text{diag}(\sigma_X[1], \dots, \sigma_X[d])$  and  $\Sigma_Z = \text{diag}(\sigma_Z[1], \dots, \sigma_Z[d])$  are diagonal matrices with strictly positive diagonal entries.

We leave implicit the dependence on  $n$  of the distribution of the  $X_i$ 's,  $Z_i$ 's and  $Y_i$ 's as well as  $\Sigma_X$  and  $\Sigma_Z$ . Under the above model we have the following result:

**Theorem 1.8** (Perfect recovery for LSS in high-dimensions (proof in §4.2)). *Under Model HD, suppose  $\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X)}{\|\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X\|_{op}} = \omega(\log n)$ ,  $\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_X)}{\|\Sigma_X\|_{op}} = \omega(\log n)$  and let,*

$$\tilde{\sigma}_X^2[j] = \frac{\sigma_X^2[j]}{\sum_{k=1}^d \sigma_X^2[k]}, \quad j \in [d]. \quad (1.14)$$

There exists an absolute constant  $b_{\text{HD}} > 0$  such that if

$$b_{\text{HD}} K_Z^2 \leq \log n^{-1} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \sigma_X^2[j]}{\left( \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{\sigma}_X^2[j] \sigma_Z^2[j] \right)} \quad (1.15)$$

then  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) = 0$  with high probability.

This theorem establishes a sufficient condition for perfect recovery for an estimator which is agnostic to any information on the distribution of the noise and its covariance structure. It extends the results on the high-dimensional setting from [11]. This condition can be slightly improved if we assume knowledge of  $\Sigma_Z$ . We consider a modified version of LSS, LSS-C, which incorporates the information from  $\Sigma_Z$ . It is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS-C}} &:= \arg \min_{\pi \in S_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (X_{\pi(j)} - Y_j) \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \arg \max_{\pi \in S_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} X_{\pi(j)}, Y_j \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.16}$$

Regarding this estimator we have the following sufficient condition for perfect recovery:

**Theorem 1.9** (Perfect recovery for LSS-C in high-dimensions (proof in §4.2)). *Under Model HD, suppose  $\frac{\text{tr}((\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X)}{\|(\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X\|_{op}} = \omega(\log n)$  and let  $(\tilde{\sigma}_X^2[j])_{j=1}^d$  and  $b_{\text{HD}}$  be as in Theorem 1.8. If*

$$b_{\text{HD}} K_Z^2 \leq \log n^{-1} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \sigma_X^2[j]}{\left( \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{\sigma}_X^2[j] \sigma_Z^{-2}[j] \right)^{-1}}, \tag{1.17}$$

then  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS-C}}, \pi^*) = 0$  with high probability.

The terms on the right hand side of Equation (1.15) and Equation (1.17) play the role of signal-to-noise ratios. When  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$  they simplify to  $\frac{d}{\log n \sigma^2}$  recovering the signal-to-noise ratio from the high-dimensional setting in [11]. In [11] the authors conjecture that for the Gaussian case there exists a phase transition as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  from *partial recovery* (i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] = \Omega(n)$ ) when  $\frac{d}{\log n \sigma^2} < 4$  to *perfect recovery* (i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] = o(1)$ ) when  $\frac{d}{\log n \sigma^2} > 4$ . Similar to our results, they prove the sufficient condition for perfect recovery. However showing sharp necessary conditions for perfect recovery by  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$  when  $d = \omega(\log n)$  is still an open problem. In [24] Appendix E.1 the authors show that when  $d = \omega(\log n)$ , any estimator that achieves *strong recovery* (i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] = o(n)$ ) must have  $\frac{d}{\log n \sigma^2} > 2$ . This seems to settle the information theoretic threshold for *strong recovery* in this regime as this condition is conjectured to be sufficient for the greedy inner product algorithm studied in [11] Appendix A.2 to achieve *strong recovery*.

The difference between Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9 lies in how the variance of the coordinates of the initial positions and noise interact. In Theorem 1.8 the noise term includes a weighted arithmetic mean of the variances of the noise vector with weights given by the proportion of each coordinate on the signal term. The noise term in Theorem 1.9 has a similar interpretation but with a weighted harmonic mean. Since the harmonic mean is always smaller than the arithmetic mean, the signal-to-noise term in Theorem 1.9 dominates the one from Theorem 1.8, as expected. The conditions,

$$\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X)}{\|\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X\|_{op}} = \omega(\log n), \quad \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_X)}{\|\Sigma_X\|_{op}} = \omega(\log n) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\text{tr}((\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X)}{\|(\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X\|_{op}} = \omega(\log n) \tag{1.18}$$

are technical conditions on the stable rank of  $\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X$ ,  $\Sigma_X$  and  $(\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X$  respectively. These conditions roughly state that the sum of the entries of these diagonal matrices cannot be too concentrated along a small subset of coordinates. All three conditions necessarily require that  $d = \omega(\log n)$ . For  $\Sigma_X$  this condition can be interpreted as saying that we must *effectively* be in a high-dimensional setting by ruling out scenarios where we might have  $d = \omega(\log n)$  but our signal is concentrated in a low-dimensional subspace. If  $\Sigma_X$  is isotropic, the first condition in (1.18) rules out the possibility of the strength of noise being concentrated along a low-dimensional subset of coordinates and the last condition rules out the possibility of there being a small subset of coordinates with a level of noise much smaller than the other ones.

Before proceeding, we note that the proofs of our high-dimensional results also rely on the concept of augmenting cycles that was outlined in the discussion of Theorem 1.7. The main difference is that we must use the Hanson-Wright inequality to show that the quadratic forms on the initial positions concentrate around their expected value. This allows us to obtain sharp estimates as the dimension grows.

## 1.2 Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 1.3 we set our notation. Section 2 presents examples that showcase some consequences of our results when  $d = o(\log n)$ . In Section 3 we discuss matchings in random geometric graphs and their application to minimax lower bounds. In particular, this is where we prove Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 1.2. Section 4 discusses augmenting cycles and proves our upper bound results in both low and high-dimensions. Section 5 provides some directions for future work. The Appendix contains comments on and extensions of the arguments in the main text.

## 1.3 Notation

Throughout this work we will use the following conventions:

**General notation:**  $\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$  denote the set of positive integers, integers and real numbers respectively and for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

**Linear Algebra and Analysis:** For a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we denote its  $i$ -th coordinate by  $v[i]$  and its Euclidean norm by  $\|v\|_2$ .  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes an arbitrary norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . If  $A$  is a  $m \times n$  matrix, we denote by  $A[i, j]$  the entry at its  $i$ -th row and  $j$ -th column.  $A[i, :] \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the  $i$ -th row and  $A[:, j] \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is the  $j$ th column of  $A$  represented as vectors. If  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $Av \in \mathbb{R}^m$  denotes the matrix-vector product.

$$\|A\|_{op} = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\|_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}(A) = \sum_{k=1}^n A[k, k] \quad (1.19)$$

are the operator norm and trace of  $A$  respectively, while  $\|A\|_2$  is the Frobenius norm of  $A$ . If  $B$  is another  $k \times l$  matrix,  $A \otimes B$  denotes the Kronecker product between  $A$  and  $B$ . If  $k = n$  then,  $AB$  denotes the matrix product of  $A$  and  $B$ , and if  $k = m$  and  $l = n$ ,  $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{tr}(B^T A)$  is the inner product between  $A$  and  $B$ .  $B_{\|\cdot\|}(v, s) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \|x - v\| < s\}$  is the open ball centered at  $v$  with radius  $s > 0$  on norm  $\|\cdot\|$ .  $\rho_d$  denotes the volume of  $B_{\|\cdot\|_2}(0, 1)$  in dimension  $d$ .  $\wedge, \vee$  denote the minimum and maximum between two real numbers.  $\log(x)$  denotes the natural logarithm of  $x > 0$ .

**Discrete structures:**  $d_H(\omega, \omega')$  denotes the Hamming distance between two strings  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  of equal length. If  $G = (V, E)$  is a graph then  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  denote its set of vertices and edges respectively.  $\binom{n}{k}$  is the binomial coefficient. If  $A$  is a discrete set we denote its cardinality by  $|A|$ .  $S_n$  is the group of permutations on  $[n]$ .

**Asymptotic Notation:** Let  $a_n = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $b_n = (b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be two sequences of real numbers. The asymptotic notation  $O(\cdot), o(\cdot), \omega(\cdot), \Omega(\cdot), \Theta(\cdot)$  has its standard meaning,  $a_n \ll b_n$  and  $a_n \gg b_n$  are synonymous with  $a_n = o(b_n)$  and  $b_n = o(a_n)$  respectively.  $a_n \sim b_n$  indicates that  $\frac{a_n}{b_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$ .

**Probability:**  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  denote probabilities and expectations respectively. We say  $Z \sim \mathcal{Q}$  if the random element  $Z$  has law  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$  indicates a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random elements with common law  $\mathcal{Q}$ .  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$  denotes a multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $d \times d$  covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ .  $\text{Unif}(S_n)$  is the uniform distribution over  $S_n$ . If  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  then  $\Phi(x) = \mathbb{P}(Z \leq x)$  is the cumulative distribution function of a standard Gaussian random variable  $Z$ . If  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  are two probability distributions on  $\mathcal{Z}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}_2$  denotes the product measure on  $\mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Z}_2$  with marginals  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_2$ . When  $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \mathcal{Z}_2$ ,  $\|\mathcal{Q}_1 - \mathcal{Q}_2\|_{TV}$  indicates the total variation distance between  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_2$ .

We say that a sequence of events  $A_n = (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  happens with high probability if  $\mathbb{P}(A_n) = 1 - o(1)$ . Given a sequence  $U_n = (U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of random variables, we say that  $U_n = \Theta(a_n)$  with high probability if there exists absolute constants  $c$  and  $C$ , not depending on  $n$ , such that  $ca_n \leq U_n \leq Ca_n$  holds with high probability.

$$U_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(\mathbb{P})} U, U_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} U \quad \text{and} \quad U_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} U \quad (1.20)$$



denote convergence in probability, almost sure convergence and convergence in law respectively. If  $U'$  is another random variable, then  $U \stackrel{d}{=} U'$  indicates equality in law.  $o_p(1)$  denotes a random quantity that converges to 0 in probability as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ .  $\|U\|_{\psi_2}$  denotes the sub-Gaussian norm of  $U$ . If  $V$  is a random vector,  $\|V\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{\|v\|=1} \|(V, v)\|_{\psi_2}$  is the sub-Gaussian norm of  $V$ .

## 2 Examples in the low-dimensional regime

In this section we show that Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.7 can be used to derive positive and negative results for multiple choices of distributions for the  $X_i$ 's and  $Z_i$ 's.

### 2.1 Gaussian initial positions and noise

We first consider the Gaussian model from [11] and show that the rate obtained for the MLE is informational theoretical optimal up to factors of order  $n^{o(1)}$ . More precisely we have:

**Proposition 2.1** (Low-dimension, Gaussian initial positions, Gaussian noise). *In (1.1), let  $d = o(\log n)$ ,  $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$ . Then as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,*

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = (n^{(2+o(1))\sigma^d} \wedge n^{(1+o(1))}). \quad (2.1)$$

*Proof.* If we take  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $R_d = \sqrt{2d}$ , we have that for all sufficiently large  $d$ , assumption (a) from Model LD holds with  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$ ,  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\beta = 1$ . If we let  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ , using Bretagnolle–Huber inequality [1] and the formula for the Kullback-Leibler divergence between multivariate Gaussian distributions we have:

$$\|\mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v) - \mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q}\|_{TV} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\|v\|_2^2\right), \quad (2.2)$$

and so assumption (b) holds with  $\beta = 2 + \log(2)$ . From Theorem 1.1 it follows that:

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = \Omega\left((n^{(2-o(1))\sigma^d} \wedge n^{(1-o(1))})\right). \quad (2.3)$$

Since  $\|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty} \leq (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  is sub-Gaussian and zero-mean, assumptions (c) and (d) are also satisfied. It follows from Theorem 1.7 that,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] \leq \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] = O\left((n^{(2+o(1))\sigma^d} \wedge n^{(1+o(1))})\right), \quad (2.4)$$

from which the result follows.  $\square$

Note that our upper bound for the Gaussian model is slightly worse than the one in [11] because of an extra  $n^{o(1)}$  factor. This is natural since our results make use of less properties of the distribution of the noise. On the other hand, if  $d$  is fixed we can ignore the  $n^{o(1)}$  terms in the exponent and thus obtain that the optimal error rate is of order  $\Theta((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n)$ . This in particular confirms that the upper bound for the expected number of mistakes made by the greedy distance algorithm analyzed in Appendix A.1 of [11] is sharp.

### 2.2 Fixed dimension, continuous initial positions and noise

If we take  $d, \mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  to be fixed with  $n$  we can establish the optimal rate for a much wider class of distributions. These assumptions are very natural if one considers for instance the problem of particle tracking.

**Proposition 2.2** (Fixed dimension, continuous initial positions, continuous and sub-Gaussian noise). *In (1.1), let  $d$  be fixed,  $X_1 \sim \mathcal{P}$  and  $Z_1 = \sigma \tilde{Z}_1$  for  $\sigma > 0$  and  $\tilde{Z}_1 \sim \mathcal{Q}$  with  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  two fixed distributions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  having bounded continuous densities, the latter also being zero-mean and sub-Gaussian. Then, as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,*

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = \Theta((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n). \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof.* Since  $f_{\mathcal{P}}$ , the density of  $\mathcal{P}$ , is continuous, it follows that for any choice of norm  $\|\cdot\|$  there must exist  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $R_d > 0$  such that:

$$\inf_{\|x-v\| < R_d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x) > 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Suppose without loss of generality that  $v = 0$ , the case  $v \neq 0$  is analogous. Then assumption (a) from Model LD is satisfied with this same choice of  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $R_d$  and with,

$$\gamma = \mathcal{P}(B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R_d)) > 0 \text{ and } \beta = \log(2) \vee \left( \frac{1}{d} \left( \log(\|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}) - \log \left( \inf_{\|x\| < R_d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x) \right) \right) \right). \quad (2.7)$$

Also, we have:

$$\|\mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v) - \mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q}\|_{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_1 - v)f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_2 + v) - f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_1)f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_2)| dz_1 dz_2. \quad (2.8)$$

Since for each  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_1 - v)f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_2 + v) \rightarrow f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_1)f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z_2)$  as  $\|v\| \rightarrow 0$  due to the continuity of  $f_{\mathcal{Q}}$ , it follows from Scheffé's Lemma that the integral on the right hand side of (2.8) goes to 0. Taking  $R_d$  smaller and  $\beta$  larger if necessary, assumption (b) from Model LD also holds. Thus Theorem 1.1 follows and  $\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = \Omega((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n)$ . Since  $\|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}$  is finite (and thus  $\leq e^{\beta d}$  for some  $\beta$ ) and we are assuming that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is zero-mean and sub-Gaussian,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = O((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n) \quad (2.9)$$

follows from Theorem 1.7. □

Under the same assumptions we can also improve our constant in the upper bounds from Theorem 1.7:

**Proposition 2.3** (Improved error upper bound for LSS (proof in §4.1)). *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 2.2, we have that for all  $n \geq 2$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] \leq ((\tau + o(n\sigma^d))(n^2 \sigma^d)) \wedge n, \quad (2.10)$$

for,

$$\tau = \tau_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, d} = 2^{-d} \rho_d \mathbb{E}[f_{\mathcal{P}}(X_1)] \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2\|_2^d], \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\rho_d$  is the volume of  $B_{\|\cdot\|_2}(0, 1)$ .

We conjecture that our constant  $\tau$  in Proposition 2.3 is sharp in the regime where  $n\sigma^d = o(1)$ . This is supported by the simulations shown in Figure 2. The interesting feature of this result, which is illustrated in the same figure, is that when  $n\sigma^d = o(1)$  the error rate depends very weakly on the geometry of the distribution  $\mathcal{Q}$ , so distributions with significantly different geometric structures give rise to an error rate similar to the Gaussian model. When  $\sigma^d n^2$  starts to have order  $\Omega(n)$ , other geometric properties of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  seem to play crucial roles and the predicted value of  $\tau n^2 \sigma^d$  ceases to be a good approximation to  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$  as suggested by the same figure.




Figure 2: Simulated experiments to estimate the error rate  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]}{n}$  as a function of  $\sigma^2$  for different choices of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . We consider (1.1) with  $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $Z_1 = \sigma \tilde{Z}_1$  with four different choices for the distribution of  $\tilde{Z}_1$ :  $\tilde{Z}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  (Gaussian),  $\tilde{Z}_1 \sim \text{Unif}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$  (Spherical),  $\tilde{Z}_1 \sim \text{Unif}([-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3}]^d)$  (Uniform) and  $\tilde{Z}_1 \sim \text{Unif}(\{-1, 1\}^d)$  (Rademacher). We also plot  $\tau n^2 \sigma^d$  (Gaussian prediction) for the value of  $\tau$  from Proposition 2.3 obtained for the Gaussian model. Although some of these distributions do not directly satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 2.3, we will see in Section 4.1 that the same result holds under weaker assumptions which includes all examples shown in the figure. For choice of  $\mathcal{Q}$  in the simulations we considered  $n = 100$ ,  $d = 2, 3$  and took the average of  $\frac{d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)}{n}$  over 10000 independent trials. Both axis are plotted using log-scale. The code to reproduce the figures can also be found at [https://github.com/Lucas-Schwengber/particle\\_tracking](https://github.com/Lucas-Schwengber/particle_tracking).

### 2.3 Uniformly distributed initial positions

We now consider a model where the initial positions are uniformly distributed on the unit cube in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and we allow  $d$  to grow slowly with  $n$ .

**Proposition 2.4** (Low-dimension, uniform initial positions, noise with i.i.d. sub-Gaussian coordinates). *In (1.1), let  $d = o(\log n)$ ,  $X_1 \sim \text{Unif}([-1, 1]^d)$  and  $Z_1 = \sigma \tilde{Z}_1$ , where  $\sigma > 0$ ,*

$$\tilde{Z}_1 \sim \mathcal{Q} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^d \mathcal{Q}', \quad (2.12)$$

for  $\mathcal{Q}'$  a zero-mean, sub-Gaussian distribution in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that:

$$\sup_{|v| < 1} \|\mathcal{Q}'(v) - \mathcal{Q}'\|_{TV} < 1 - \delta, \quad (2.13)$$

for some  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . We have that as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = (n^{(2+o(1))} \sigma^d) \wedge n^{(1+o(1))}. \quad (2.14)$$

*Proof.* Taking  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Unif}([-1, 1]^d)$ , assumption (a) from Model LD is satisfied with  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_\infty$ ,  $R_d = 1$ ,  $\gamma = 1$  and  $\beta = \log(2)$ . Using a simple coupling argument one can show that the total variation distance of product measures satisfies:

$$(1 - \|\mathcal{Q}_1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}_2 - \mathcal{Q}'_1 \otimes \mathcal{Q}'_2\|_{TV}) \geq (1 - \|\mathcal{Q}_1 - \mathcal{Q}'_1\|_{TV})(1 - \|\mathcal{Q}_2 - \mathcal{Q}'_2\|_{TV}). \quad (2.15)$$

Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  from our assumption is a product measure, it follows that condition (b) from Model LD holds with,

$$\beta = \log(2) \vee (-2 \log(\delta)), \quad (2.16)$$

and so Theorem 1.1 holds and we have a lower bound of order  $\Omega((n^{2-o(1)})\sigma^d \wedge n^{(1-o(1))})$ . Since  $\mathcal{Q}'$  is also zero-mean, sub-Gaussian and  $\|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty} \leq 2^{-d}$ , the assumptions from Model LD+S also hold and thus the upper bound of order  $O((n^{2+o(1)})\sigma^d \wedge n^{(1+o(1))})$  follows.  $\square$

## 2.4 Noise with a log-Lipschitz density

We consider a lower bound in the regime where  $d = o(\log n)$  with initial positions following a Laplace distribution and a distribution on the noise which is compatible with this assumption.

**Proposition 2.5** (Low-dimension, Laplace initial positions, noise with log-Lipschitz density). *In (1.1), let  $d = o(\log n)$  and assume that  $X_1$  has a standard multivariate Laplace distribution, i.e.,*

$$X_1[1], \dots, X_1[d] \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Lap}(0, 1), \quad (2.17)$$

where  $\text{Lap}(0, 1)$  is the standard Laplace distribution on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Assume also that  $\mathcal{Q}$  has a continuous density  $f_{\mathcal{Q}}$  such that  $\log(f_{\mathcal{Q}})$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz on the  $\|\cdot\|_1$  norm. Then as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] = \Omega((n^{2-o(1)})\sigma^d \wedge n^{(1-o(1))}). \quad (2.18)$$

*Proof.* Note that  $|X_1[j]| \sim \text{Exp}(1)$  and so  $\|X_1\|_1$  is sub-Exponential with  $\mathbb{E}[\|X_1\|_1] = d$ . It follows that condition (a) from Model LD hold for sufficiently large  $d$  taking  $R_d = 2d, \gamma = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\beta = 2$ . Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  has a continuous density  $f_{\mathcal{Q}}$  such that  $\log(f_{\mathcal{Q}})$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz on the  $\|\cdot\|_1$  norm, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q} \| \mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v)) &= D_{KL}(\mathcal{Q} \| \mathcal{Q}(v)) + D_{KL}(\mathcal{Q} \| \mathcal{Q}(-v)) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\log(f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z)) - \log(f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z+v))) f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z) dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\log(f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z)) - \log(f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z-v))) f_{\mathcal{Q}}(z) dz \\ &\leq 2L \|v\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

It follows by the Bretagnolle–Huber inequality that,

$$\|\mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v) - \mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q}\|_{TV} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \exp(-2L \|v\|_1), \quad (2.20)$$

and so condition (b) holds taking  $\beta = 4L + \log(2)$ . So Theorem 1.1 holds and we have a lower bound of order  $\Omega((n^{2-o(1)})\sigma^d \wedge n^{(1-o(1))})$ .  $\square$

A natural choice for  $\mathcal{Q}$  in this case would be also a standard Laplace distribution. One might wonder if in this case the order of the expected number of mistakes obtained for  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$  is also nearly sharp, as  $\mathcal{Q}$  fails to be sub-Gaussian but it still is sub-Exponential. Although our techniques to prove the upper bounds cannot be directly extended to this case we believe the rate should have the same behaviour, but leave this question for future work.

## 3 Lower bounds via matchings in Random Geometric Graphs

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 1.2. We first introduce some notation for this section. Given a finite collection of points  $\mathcal{X}_n = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d, r > 0$  and a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we define a geometric graph as a graph  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|) = G(\mathcal{X}_n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  with,

$$V(G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)) = [n] \text{ and } E(G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)) = \{\{i, j\} \subseteq [n]; i \neq j \text{ and } \|x_i - x_j\| < r\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Following the convention of the literature, we leave the dependence of  $r$  and  $d$  on  $n$  implicit. If we take:

$$\mathcal{X}_n = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} \text{ with } X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{P}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a distribution in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we call the corresponding random graph  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  a random geometric graph (RGG). As noted previously, asymptotic properties of random geometric graphs have been previously explored in several works, see for instance the book [15] for results in fixed dimension and [7] for the high-dimensional regime (*i.e.*  $d = \omega(\log n)$ ).

Recall that a matching in a graph  $G$  is a subset of edges  $M \subset E(G)$  with no vertices in common, *i.e.* such that  $e \cap e' = \emptyset$  for any pair of distinct  $e, e'$  from  $M$ . We let  $M_r = M_r(\mathcal{X}_n)$  denote the largest matching on  $G(\mathcal{X}_n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$ .

### 3.1 A general lower bound

The next result gives us a general method to move from large matchings in  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  to lower bounds on  $\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)]$ . For a distribution  $\mathcal{Q}$  over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}(v)$  denote the law of  $\tilde{Z} + v$  where  $\tilde{Z} \sim \mathcal{Q}$  and set:

$$t_s(\mathcal{Q}, \|\cdot\|) = t_s(\mathcal{Q}) := \left(1 - \sup_{\|v\| < s} \|\mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v) - \mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q}\|_{TV}\right). \quad (3.3)$$

Our lower bound is as follows:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be distinct. Given  $\sigma > 0$  set,*

$$Y_i = x_{\pi^*(i)} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_{\pi^*(i)}, \quad i \in [n], \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\pi^* \sim \text{Unif}(S_n)$  is generated uniformly at random and (independently)  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$ , for  $\mathcal{Q}$  a distribution over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, for any estimator,

$$\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in S_n, \quad (3.5)$$

the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] \geq \frac{|M_r| t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})}{2}, \quad (3.6)$$

for  $t_s(\mathcal{Q})$  as in (3.3) above and  $M_r = M_r(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$  the largest matching in  $G(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$ .

The Lemma above gives a lower bound which takes into account two effects:  $|M_r|$  accounts for pairs of close initial positions, while  $t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})$  accounts for the difficulty of distinguishing their associated noisy versions. The free parameter  $r$  controls the trade-off between these two quantities: as  $r$  increases we have more matched initial positions but their noisy versions become more distinguishable.

*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* Given  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\sigma > 0$  we let  $\mathcal{Q}(v, \sigma)$  denote the law of  $v + \sigma \tilde{Z}$  for  $\tilde{Z} \sim \mathcal{Q}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{Q}(v) = \mathcal{Q}(v, 1)$ . We assume for ease of notation that  $M_r = \{\{2j-1, 2j\}\}_{j=1}^m$ , but the general case follows analogously. Letting  $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^m$ , we associate to each element of  $\Omega$  a permutation  $\pi_\omega \in S_n$  given by:

$$\pi_\omega = \prod_{j=1}^m ((2j-1)2j)^{\omega_j}. \quad (3.7)$$

In other words,  $\pi_\omega$  swaps  $(2j-1)$  and  $2j$  if  $\omega_j = 1$  and leave all other indices unchanged. Denote by  $S_\Omega \subseteq S_n$  the subset of permutations of this form. We associate to each  $\omega \in \Omega$  a probability measure  $P_\omega$  on  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$  given by:

$$P_\omega = \left( \bigotimes_{j=1}^m (\mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_\omega(2j-1)}, \sigma) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_\omega(2j)}, \sigma)) \right) \otimes \bigotimes_{k=2m+1}^n \mathcal{Q}(x_k, \sigma). \quad (3.8)$$

That is, letting  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be random vectors with joint distribution  $P_\omega$ , we have that for  $j \in [m]$ , if  $\omega_j = 0$  then,

$$Y_{2j-1} = x_{2j-1} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_{2j-1}, \quad Y_{2j} = x_{2j} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_{2j}, \quad (3.9)$$

if  $\omega_j = 1$  then,

$$Y_{2j-1} = x_{2j} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_{2j-1}, \quad Y_{2j} = x_{2j-1} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_{2j}, \quad (3.10)$$

and for  $k = 2m + 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$Y_k = x_k + \sigma \tilde{Z}_k, \quad (3.11)$$

where  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$ . Note that if  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  differ by a single coordinate  $j$  then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\omega - P_{\omega'}\|_{TV} &= \left\| \mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_\omega(2j-1)}, \sigma) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_\omega(2j)}, \sigma) - \mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_{\omega'}(2j-1)}, \sigma) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_{\omega'}(2j)}, \sigma) \right\|_{TV} \\ &= \left\| \mathcal{Q}\left(\frac{x_{\pi_\omega(2j-1)}}{\sigma}\right) \otimes \mathcal{Q}\left(\frac{x_{\pi_\omega(2j)}}{\sigma}\right) - \mathcal{Q}\left(\frac{x_{\pi_{\omega'}(2j-1)}}{\sigma}\right) \otimes \mathcal{Q}\left(\frac{x_{\pi_{\omega'}(2j)}}{\sigma}\right) \right\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \sup_{\|v\| < \frac{r}{\sigma}} \|\mathcal{Q}(v) \otimes \mathcal{Q}(-v) - \mathcal{Q} \otimes \mathcal{Q}\|_{TV} = 1 - t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where the second equality and third inequality follow since the total variation distance is invariant under translations and dilations respectively and in the last inequality we also used the fact that  $\|x_{2j} - x_{2j-1}\| < r$ . Suppose we observe  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \sim P_\omega$  from an unknown  $\omega$ . Given  $\hat{\omega}$  an estimator for  $\omega$  based on  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ , it follows by Assouad's Lemma [21] and (3.12) that:

$$\inf_{\hat{\omega}} \max_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{E}_\omega [d_H(\hat{\omega}, \omega)] \geq \frac{mt_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})}{2}, \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_\omega[\cdot]$  denotes expectations under  $P_\omega$  and the infimum is taken over all (possibly non-deterministic) estimators  $\hat{\omega}$ .

We can convert any estimator  $\hat{\pi}$  for a hidden permutation  $\pi^*$  based on  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  into an estimator  $\hat{\omega}^{(\hat{\pi})}$  for  $\omega$  by setting:

$$\hat{\omega}_j^{(\hat{\pi})} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \hat{\pi}(2j-1) = 2j \text{ and } \hat{\pi}(2j) = 2j-1 \\ 0, & \text{if } \hat{\pi}(2j-1) = 2j-1 \text{ and } \hat{\pi}(2j) = 2j \\ \epsilon, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (3.14)$$

where  $\epsilon$  indicates an error regardless of the true  $\omega_j$ . For any  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\hat{\omega}_j^{(\hat{\pi})} \neq \omega_j$  implies that  $\hat{\pi}(2j) \neq \pi_\omega(2j)$  or  $\hat{\pi}(2j-1) \neq \pi_\omega(2j-1)$ . It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi_\omega) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{\pi}(i) \neq \pi_\omega(i)]} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{\pi}(2j) \neq \pi_\omega(2j)]} + \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{\pi}(2j-1) \neq \pi_\omega(2j-1)]} \\ &\geq d_H(\hat{\omega}^{(\hat{\pi})}, \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

and so,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \max_{\pi_\omega \in S_\Omega} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi_\omega) | \pi^* = \pi_\omega] \geq \frac{mt_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})}{2}, \quad (3.16)$$

where expectations are taken with respect to (3.4). Since  $S_\Omega \subseteq S_n$ ,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \max_{\pi \in S_n} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi) | \pi^* = \pi] \geq \frac{mt_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})}{2}. \quad (3.17)$$

This proves the minimax lower bound. Note that we could take  $\hat{\pi}$  to be a non-deterministic estimator and the argument still follows. Also, due to the structure of the problem, we always have that:

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \max_{\pi \in S_n} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi) | \pi^* = \pi] = \inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)], \quad (3.18)$$

where the infimum is taken over all (possibly non-deterministic) estimators  $\hat{\pi}$ . We provide a proof of (3.18) on Appendix A in a more general setting. From (3.18) the result follows.  $\square$

### 3.2 Matchings in random geometric graphs

Our next step to use Lemma 3.1 to prove Theorem 1.1 is proving Lemma 1.2. As in the Introduction, we consider a random geometric graph  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|) = G(\mathcal{X}_n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  induced by  $\mathcal{X}_n = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ , where  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{P}$  a distribution with density  $f_{\mathcal{P}}$  satisfying assumption (a) from Model LD.

*Proof of Lemma 1.2.* Let

$$l = \frac{2R_d e^{-\beta}}{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{d}}}. \quad (3.19)$$

Assume first that  $r \leq l$ , which implies in particular that  $r < R_d$  since  $\beta \geq \log(2)$ . Let  $B_d = B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, R_d)$  be such that  $\mathcal{P}(B_d) \geq \gamma > 0$ . Let  $k_n$  be the maximum number of non-overlapping (open) balls of radius  $\frac{r}{2}$  (on norm  $\|\cdot\|$ ) that are entirely contained in  $B_d$ . Since  $r < R_d$ ,  $k_n$  is at least the size of the largest  $r$ -packing in  $B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, \frac{R_d}{2})$ . Following the volumetric lower bound for the size of the  $r$ -packing number in [25, Theorem 14.2], we obtain

$$\left(\frac{R_d}{2r}\right)^d \leq k_n. \quad (3.20)$$

Let  $\mathcal{K}_n = \{B_{i,d}\}_{i=1}^{k_n}$  be a collection of  $k_n$  non-overlapping balls of radius  $\frac{r}{2}$  fully contained in  $B_d$ . Denote by  $N = |\mathcal{X}_n \cap B_d|$  the number of samples from  $\mathcal{X}_n = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  that fall inside  $B_d$ , and define

$$U_{i,d} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{[X_j \in B_{i,d}]} = |\mathcal{X}_n \cap B_{i,d}|, \quad i \in [k_n], \quad (3.21)$$

the number of points from  $\mathcal{X}_n$  that fall inside  $B_{i,d}$ . It is clear that, conditionally on  $N$ ,  $U_{i,d} \sim \text{Bin}(N, p_{i,d})$ , where  $p_{i,d} = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_{i,d} | X_1 \in B_d)$  for each  $i \in [k_n]$ . Moreover,

$$e^{-\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^d \leq p_{i,d} \leq e^{\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^d, \quad (3.22)$$

since  $\frac{\text{ess sup}_{x \in B_d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x)}{\text{ess inf}_{x \in B_d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x)} \leq e^{\beta d}$  by assumption. Let

$$I_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbf{1}_{[U_{i,d}=2]}, \quad (3.23)$$

be the number of balls  $B_{i,d} \in \mathcal{K}_n$  that have exactly 2 elements from  $\mathcal{X}_n$ . Note that  $|M_r| \geq I_n$  since we can build a matching in  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  by considering the edges between each pair of points on the same  $B_{i,d}$  such that  $U_{i,d} = 2$ . Moreover, for  $k \in \{0\} \cup [n]$  and  $n \geq 3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2 | N = k) &= \binom{k}{2} p_{i,d}^2 (1 - p_{i,d})^{k-2} \\ &\geq \binom{k}{2} p_{i,d}^2 (1 - p_{i,d})^{n-2} \\ &\geq \binom{k}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^{2d}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where we used (3.22) to bound  $p_{i,d}$  above and below and also  $e^{\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^d \leq \frac{1}{n-1}$  by our assumption that  $r \leq l$ , and the fact that  $(1 - \frac{1}{(n-1)})^{n-1} \geq \frac{1}{4}$  if  $n \geq 3$ . It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2 | N)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\binom{N}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^{2d}\right] \\ &\geq \gamma^2 \binom{n}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^{2d}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that  $N \sim \text{Bin}(n, \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_d))$  implies  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \binom{N}{2} \right] = (\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_d))^2 \binom{n}{2}$  and also  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_d) \geq \gamma$  by assumption. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|M_r|] &\geq \mathbb{E}[I_n] \\ &\geq k_n \gamma^2 \binom{n}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} \left( \frac{r}{2R_d} \right)^{2d} \\ &\geq \gamma^2 \binom{n}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} \left( \frac{r}{8R_d} \right)^d, \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

where the last inequality follows from (3.20). If  $r > l$ , then  $|M_r| \geq |M_l|$ , and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|M_r|] &\geq \mathbb{E}[|M_l|] \\ &\geq \gamma^2 \binom{n}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} \left( \frac{l}{8R_d} \right)^d \\ &= \gamma^2 \frac{n}{2} \frac{e^{-2\beta d}}{4} e^{-\beta d} 4^{-d} \\ &= \gamma^2 4^{-d} n \frac{e^{-3\beta d}}{8}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Since  $\binom{n}{2} \geq \frac{n^2}{4}$  for all  $n \geq 2$ , it follows that for a general  $r > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[|M_r|] \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{16} e^{-d(3\beta + \log(8))} \left( n^2 \left( \frac{r}{R_d} \right)^d \wedge n \right), \tag{3.28}$$

and so the result follows.  $\square$

The size of the largest matching  $M_r$  in  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  cannot exceed  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  or the total number of edges of  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$ ,  $|E(G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|))|$ . This implies that:

$$\mathbb{E}[|M_r|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|E(G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|))| \wedge \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor]. \tag{3.29}$$

A simple calculation shows that this implies:

$$\mathbb{E}[|M_r|] \leq \left( \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty} \text{Vol}(B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)) r^d \binom{n}{2} \right) \wedge \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor. \tag{3.30}$$

It follows that for fixed  $d$ , the order from Lemma 1.2 is sharp.

### 3.3 Minimax lower bound

We now prove Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Under Model LD, using our assumptions on  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  and applying Lemma 1.2 to Lemma 3.1 with  $r = R_d \sigma$ , we have that whenever  $n \geq 3$ ,

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)] \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{32} e^{-7\beta d} ((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n). \tag{3.31}$$

$\square$



## 4 Upper bounds

In this section we provide the technical results necessary to prove the upper bounds in Theorem 1.7, Proposition 2.3, Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9.

We first note that conditioned on  $\pi^* = \pi$ , for some fixed  $\pi \in S_n$ , the law of  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$  is the same regardless of the choice of  $\pi$  [11]. So in this section, unless stated otherwise, we assume without loss of generality that  $\pi^* = \text{Id}$ . Under this condition we will consider a  $t$ -cycle  $C_t = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$  to be augmenting for  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$  if and only if:

$$\sum_{k=1}^t \langle X_{i_k}, Y_{i_{k+1}} \rangle \geq \sum_{k=1}^t \langle X_{i_k}, Y_{i_k} \rangle. \quad (4.1)$$

The main content of the Lemmata we use to prove our upper bounds are bounds on the probability that  $t$ -cycles are augmenting. Taking expectations on (1.11) we can use these bounds to bound  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$ .

### 4.1 Upper bounds for low-dimension

Recall that a random variable  $U$  is sub-Gaussian [22] if  $\|U\|_{\psi_2} < +\infty$ , where:

$$\|U\|_{\psi_2} := \inf \left\{ L > 0; \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{U^2}{L^2} \right) \right] \leq 2 \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, a random vector  $V$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is sub-Gaussian if:

$$\|V\|_{\psi_2} := \sup_{\|v\|=1} \|\langle V, v \rangle\|_{\psi_2} < +\infty. \quad (4.3)$$

We have the following bound on the probability that a given  $t$ -cycle is augmenting:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Under Model LD+S, for any  $t$ -cycle  $C_t$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(C_t \text{ is augmenting}) \leq 2(K\sigma)^{d(t-1)}, \quad (4.4)$$

for  $K = b_{\text{LD}} \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}^{\frac{2}{\alpha}} K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2 e^{2\beta}$  where  $b_{\text{LD}} > 0$  is an absolute constant.

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta_1 := X_t - X_1$ ,  $\Delta_i := X_{i-1} - X_i$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, t$ ,  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times d}$  be a matrix with entries  $Z[i, j] = Z_i[j]$ , i.e. the matrix whose rows are given by  $Z_i$ , and define the matrices  $\tilde{Z}$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $\underline{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times d}$  analogously. We first assume that  $C_t = (1, 2, \dots, t)$ . It is easy to see that  $C_t$  will be augmenting if and only if,

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \langle \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right). \quad (4.5)$$

This is equivalent to,

$$\langle Z, \Delta \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta\|_2^2, \quad (4.6)$$

and,

$$\left\langle \tilde{Z}, \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|_2} \right\rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|\Delta\|_2}{\sigma}. \quad (4.7)$$

This last step is valid since  $\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\|_2 = 0) = 0$ , as  $\mathcal{P}$  has no atoms, so we can also assume that  $\|\Delta\|_2 \neq 0$ . Let  $v_1, \dots, v_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times d}$  with  $v[i, j] = v_i[j]$  and  $\|v\|_2 = 1$ . We have that for some absolute constant

$\kappa > 0$  and  $K_{\mathcal{Q}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \left\langle \tilde{Z}, v \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{Z}[i, j] v[i, j] \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\
&\leq \kappa \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{Z}_i[j] v_i[j] \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\
&= \kappa \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{1}_{[\|v_i\|_2 \neq 0]} \|v_i\|_2^2 \left\| \left\langle \tilde{Z}_i, \frac{v_i}{\|v_i\|_2} \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\
&\leq \kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

For any sub-Gaussian random variable  $U$  we have that,

$$\mathbb{P}(|U| \geq t) \leq 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{\|U\|_{\psi_2}^2}}. \tag{4.9}$$

It follows that since  $\tilde{Z}$  and  $\Delta$  are independent,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\left\langle \tilde{Z}, \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|_2} \right\rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|\Delta\|_2}{\sigma} \mid \Delta\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4\kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2} \frac{\|\Delta\|_2^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4\kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4\kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \|\Delta_i\|_2^2}{\sigma^2}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that  $\|\Delta_t\|_2^2 \geq 0$ . Although this last step might seem arbitrary we will see that it allows us to bound the expectation of the expressions above by a Gaussian integral. Remember that  $f_{\mathcal{P}}$  denotes the density of  $X_1$  with respect to Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Clearly  $X$  also has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^{t \times d}$ , but  $\Delta$  does not, since  $\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \Delta_i = -\Delta_t$  and thus  $\Delta$  takes values in a  $((t-1) \times d)$ -dimensional sub-space of  $\mathbb{R}^{t \times d}$ . However, setting  $\Delta_{(t-1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{(t-1) \times d}$  to be  $\Delta$  without its  $t$ -th row, we have that  $\Delta_{(t-1)}$  has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{(t-1) \times d}$  given by:

$$f_{\Delta_{(t-1)}}(b) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^{(t-1)} f_{\mathcal{P}}\left(x - \sum_{i=1}^j b[i, :]\right) f_{\mathcal{P}}(x) dx, \quad b \in \mathbb{R}^{(t-1) \times d}. \tag{4.11}$$

In particular,

$$\|f_{\Delta_{(t-1)}}\|_{\infty} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}^{(t-1)} f_{\mathcal{P}}(x) dx = \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}^{(t-1)}. \tag{4.12}$$

It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(C_t \text{ is augmenting}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{P} \left( \left\langle \tilde{Z}, \frac{\Delta}{\|\Delta\|_2} \right\rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|\Delta\|_2}{\sigma} \mid \Delta \right) \right] \\
&\leq 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{(t-1) \times d}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \|b[i, :]\|_2^2}{\sigma^2} \right) f_{\Delta_{(t-1)}}(b) db \\
&\leq 2 \|f_{\Delta_{(t-1)}}\|_{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{(t-1) \times d}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \|b[i, :]\|_2^2}{\sigma^2} \right) db \\
&\leq 2 \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty}^{(t-1)} (4\pi\kappa K_{\mathcal{Q}}^2 \sigma^2)^{\frac{d(t-1)}{2}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

and so the result follows for  $C_t = (1, 2, \dots, t)$  taking  $b_{\text{LD}} = 4\pi\kappa$ . Since both  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  have exchangeable distributions, the same argument follows if we take  $C_t$  to be any other  $t$ -cycle.  $\square$

We now proceed to prove the upper bound from Theorem 1.7.

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* Using (1.11) and Lemma 4.1, we have that,

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] \leq \sum_{t=2}^n t |\{C_t; C_t \text{ is a } t\text{-cycle}\}| \mathbb{P}((1, \dots, t) \text{ is augmenting}) \tag{4.14}$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=2}^n n^t \mathbb{P}((1, \dots, t) \text{ is augmenting}) \tag{4.15}$$

$$\leq 2K^d n^2 \sigma^d \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (K^d n \sigma^d)^t \tag{4.16}$$

where the second inequality follows since  $t |\{C_t; C_t \text{ is a } t\text{-cycle}\}| = t \binom{n}{t} (t-1)! \leq n^t$ . The upper bound in (4.16) implies

$$\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] \leq 3K^d n^2 \sigma^d \leq n \text{ when } K^d n \sigma^d \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

On the other hand, when  $K^d n \sigma^d > 1/3$  we still have the trivial upper bound  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] \leq n$  because no estimator makes more than  $n$  mistakes. Combining these estimates finishes the proof.  $\square$

The proof of the upper bound from Proposition 2.3 is very similar but we need the following additional result:

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $C_2 = (i, j)$ ,  $i, j \in [n]$  be any 2-cycle and assume  $d$  is fixed in Model LD+S. Then,*

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}(C_2 \text{ is augmenting})}{\sigma^d} = 2^{-d} \rho_d \mathbb{E}[f_{\mathcal{P}}(X_1)] \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2 \right\|_2^d \right], \tag{4.17}$$

where  $\rho_d$  is the volume of  $B_{\|\cdot\|_2}(0, 1)$ ,  $X_1 \sim \mathcal{P}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$ .

*Proof.* Set  $Z_1 = \sigma \tilde{Z}_1$  and  $Z_2 = \sigma \tilde{Z}_2$  where  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$ . In view of (4.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(C_2 \text{ is augmenting}) &= \mathbb{P} \left( \langle Z_1 - Z_2, X_1 - X_2 \rangle \geq \|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \frac{Z_1 - Z_2}{2} \right\|_2 \geq \left\| \frac{Z_1 - Z_2}{2} - (X_1 - X_2) \right\|_2 \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2, \|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where  $\Delta_Z = \frac{Z_1 - Z_2}{2}$  and  $\Delta_X = X_1 - X_2$  and the last equality follows since  $\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_X\|_2 = 0) = 0$  as  $\mathcal{P}$  has no atoms. Let  $f_{\Delta_X}$  be the density of  $\Delta_X$ , which exists and is continuous since  $f_{\mathcal{P}}$  is. We can rewrite (4.18) as:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d \frac{\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2 \mid \Delta_Z)}{\rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d} \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0} \right]. \quad (4.19)$$

Note that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2 \mid \Delta_Z) = \int_{B_{\|\cdot\|_2}(\Delta_Z, \|\Delta_Z\|_2)} f_{\Delta_X}(x) dx \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.20)$$

Now, as  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} 0$ . Since  $f_{\Delta_X}$  is continuous it follows that,

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2 \mid \Delta_Z)}{\rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d} \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0} = f_{\Delta_X}(0) \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0} \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.21)$$

In particular, since  $\frac{\|\Delta_Z\|_2}{\sigma} = \left\| \frac{\tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2}{2} \right\|_2$ ,

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d}{\sigma^d} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2 \mid \Delta_Z)}{\rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d} \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0} = 2^{-d} \rho_d \left\| \tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2 \right\|_2^d f_{\Delta_X}(0) \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0} \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.22)$$

Note that  $f_{\Delta_X}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_{\mathcal{P}}(y+x) f_{\mathcal{P}}(y) dy$ , so,

$$\frac{\rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d}{\sigma^d} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta_Z\|_2 \geq \|\Delta_Z - \Delta_X\|_2 \mid \Delta_Z)}{\rho_d \|\Delta_Z\|_2^d} \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0} \leq \rho_d \left\| \frac{\tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2}{2} \right\|_2^d \|f_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\|\Delta_Z\|_2 > 0}. \quad (4.23)$$

By our sub-Gaussian assumption on  $\mathcal{Q}$  we have that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2 \right\|_2^d \right] < +\infty$ . So taking expectations on (4.22),

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}(C_2 \text{ is augmenting})}{\sigma^d} = 2^{-d} \rho_d \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2 \right\|_2^d \right] f_{\Delta_X}(0), \quad (4.24)$$

follows by the dominated convergence theorem. Since  $f_{\Delta_X}(0) = \mathbb{E}[f_{\mathcal{P}}(X_1)]$ , (4.17) follows.  $\square$

The result above implies that  $\mathbb{P}(C_2 \text{ is augmenting}) = \tau + o(\sigma^d)$  for  $\tau$  as in the right hand side of (4.2). To obtain Proposition 2.3 we repeat the proof of Theorem 1.7 but use this sharper estimate for  $\mathbb{P}(C_2 \text{ is augmenting})$  on (4.14).

We believe the upper bound from Proposition 2.3 is sharp when  $\sigma^d n = o(1)$  since in this regime  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$  seems to be roughly the expected the mass of augmenting 2-cycles which is  $n^2 \mathbb{P}(C_2 \text{ is augmenting})$ . Since our sharp estimate from Lemma 4.2 gives a sharp estimate on the latter quantity, it should give a sharp estimate on  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$ .

**Remark 4.3.** We note that in the proofs above we only needed to use assumption (d) from Model LD+S on  $\mathcal{Q}$ . In particular, if we take  $\mathcal{Q}$  to be as in the examples shown in Figure 2, the results of this section still hold.

## 4.2 Upper bounds for high-dimensions

We now proceed to prove the upper bounds on the high-dimensional case from Model HD. In this regime we also consider  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}-C}$  as defined in (1.16). The same strategy of bounding the mass of *augmenting cycles* using (1.11) also work for this estimator, but in this case a  $t$ -cycle  $C_t$  is augmenting if and only if:

$$\sum_{k=1}^t \langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} X_{i_k}, Y_{i_{k+1}} \rangle \geq \sum_{k=1}^t \langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} X_{i_k}, Y_{i_k} \rangle. \quad (4.25)$$

The upper bounds on the probability of a given cycle being augmenting under Model HD are given by:

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $\Delta_1 := X_t - X_1$ ,  $\Delta_i := X_{i-1} - X_i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, t$ . For any  $t$ -cycle  $C_t$  we have that:

$$\mathbb{P}(C_t \text{ is augmenting for } \hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}) \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2} \right) \right], \quad (4.26)$$

and,

$$\mathbb{P}(C_t \text{ is augmenting for } \hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS-C}}) \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right) \right], \quad (4.27)$$

where  $\kappa > 0$  is an absolute constant and  $K_Z > 0$  is any constant satisfying (ii) from Model HD.

*Proof.* We prove again for  $C_t = (1, 2, \dots, t)$  and the general case follows due to the exchangeability of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ . Following the proof of Lemma 4.1,  $C_t$  will be augmenting for  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$ , if and only if:

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \langle \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right). \quad (4.28)$$

Conditioned on  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_t$ , each  $\langle \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle$  is a linear combination of independent zero-mean sub-Gaussian random variables with,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle\|_{\psi_2}^2 &= \left\| \left\langle \Delta_i, (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} Z_1 \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\ &= \left\| \left\langle (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i, (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} Z_1 \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\ &\leq \kappa \sum_{j=1}^d (\sigma_Z[j] \Delta_i[j])^2 \left\| \tilde{Z}_1[j] \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\ &\leq \kappa K_Z^2 \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

for some absolute constant  $\kappa > 0$ . It follows that (conditioned on  $\Delta$ ),

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \langle \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq \kappa^2 K_Z^2 \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2. \quad (4.30)$$

Letting  $\underline{\Delta}$  be as in Lemma 4.1 we have that,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \langle \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right) \mid \underline{\Delta} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2} \right). \quad (4.31)$$

For  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS-C}}$ ,  $C_t$  will be augmenting if and only if,

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right). \quad (4.32)$$

In this case, conditioned on  $\Delta_i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle\|_{\psi_2}^2 &= \left\| \left\langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i, (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} Z_1 \right\rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\ &\leq \kappa \sum_{j=1}^d \left( (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} [j] \Delta_i[j] \right)^2 \left\| \tilde{Z}_1[j] \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \\ &\leq \kappa K_Z^2 \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

and so conditioned on  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_t$ ,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \right\|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq \kappa^2 K_Z^2 \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2. \quad (4.34)$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \langle (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Delta_i, Z_i \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right) \mid \Delta \right) \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right). \quad (4.35)$$

Taking expected values with respect to  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$  we have the result.  $\square$

In order to estimate the expected values on the right hand side of (4.26) and (4.27) we use the concentration of the norm of  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_t$ . We do so with the following consequence of Hanson-Wright Inequality [16]:

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $U_1, \dots, U_t$ ,  $t \geq 2$ , be i.i.d. random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with zero-mean, unit variance, independent sub-Gaussian coordinates and let  $D$  be a diagonal matrix with non-negative diagonal entries. We have that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{i=1}^t \|D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Xi_i\|_2^2 - 2t \operatorname{tr}(D) \right| \geq \epsilon 2t \operatorname{tr}(D) \right) \leq e^{-c_1 \left(\frac{\epsilon}{K^2}\right) 2t \frac{\operatorname{tr}(D)}{\|D\|_{op}}}, \quad (4.36)$$

where  $\Xi_1 := U_t - U_1$ ,  $\Xi_i := U_{i-1} - U_i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, t$ ,  $\max_{j \in [d]} \|U_1[j]\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$  and  $c_1 \left(\frac{\epsilon}{K^2}\right) > 0$  is a positive constant that depends on  $\frac{\epsilon}{K^2}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{td}$  be a concatenation of  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_t$ , i.e.

$$U[d(i-1) + j] = U_i[j], \text{ for } i \in [t] \text{ and } j \in [d]. \quad (4.37)$$

We first consider the case  $t \geq 3$ . Let  $L^{C^t}$  and  $E^{C^t}$  be the Laplacian and incidence matrix respectively, of the cycle graph on  $t$  vertices. Taking  $A = (L^{C^t} \otimes D)$  and  $B = (E^{C^t} \otimes D^{\frac{1}{2}})$  we have that  $A = BB^T$ . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^t \|D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Xi_i\|_2^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^t \left\langle D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Xi_i, D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Xi_i \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j=1}^d \left( D^{\frac{1}{2}}[j, j] \Xi_i[j] \right)^2 \\ &= \langle B^T U, B^T U \rangle \\ &= \langle AU, U \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

Since the eigenvalues of  $L^{C^t}$  are given by  $4 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi k}{t}\right)$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, t-1$  [14], we have that,

$$\|A\|_{op} = \|L^{C^t}\|_{op} \|D\|_{op} = 4 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi \lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}{t}\right) \|D\|_{op} \leq 4 \|D\|_{op}. \quad (4.39)$$

Also,

$$\|A\|_2^2 = \|L^{C^t}\|_2^2 \|D\|_2^2 = 6t \operatorname{tr}(D^2) \leq 6t \|D\|_{op} \operatorname{tr}(D), \quad (4.40)$$

and,

$$\operatorname{tr}(A) = 2t \operatorname{tr}(D). \quad (4.41)$$

Since  $U$  has independent, zero-mean and unit variance coordinates we have that  $\mathbb{E}[\langle AU, U \rangle] = \operatorname{tr}(A)$ . It follows that using Hanson-Wright inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\langle AU, U \rangle - \text{tr}(A)| \geq \varepsilon \text{tr}(A)) &\leq 2 \exp \left( -c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2 \text{tr}(A)^2}{K^4 \|A\|_2^2}, \frac{\varepsilon \text{tr}(A)}{K^2 \|A\|_{op}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left( -c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2 (2t \text{tr}(D))^2}{K^4 6t \text{tr}(D) \|D\|_{op}}, \frac{\varepsilon 2t \text{tr}(D)}{4K^2 \|D\|_{op}} \right) \right) \\
&= 2 \exp \left( -2t \frac{\text{tr}(D)}{\|D\|_{op}} c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{3K^4}, \frac{\varepsilon}{4K^2} \right) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

for some absolute constant  $c > 0$ . Following a similar reasoning, if  $t = 2$ , letting  $A = 2(L^{P_2} \otimes D)$ , where  $L^{P_2}$  is the Laplacian of the path graph on 2 vertices, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^2 \|D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Xi_i\|_2^2 &= 2 \|D^{\frac{1}{2}} \Xi_1\|_2^2 \\
&= \langle AU, U \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

Since the eigenvalues of  $L^{P_t}$  are 0 and 2 [14] we have,

$$\|A\|_{op} = 4 \|D\|_{op}, \tag{4.44}$$

$$\|A\|_2^2 = 16 \text{tr}(D^2) \leq 16 \|D\|_{op} \text{tr}(D), \tag{4.45}$$

and,

$$\text{tr}(A) = 4 \text{tr}(D). \tag{4.46}$$

It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\langle AU, U \rangle - \text{tr}(A)| \geq \varepsilon \text{tr}(A)) &\leq 2 \exp \left( -c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2 \text{tr}(A)^2}{K^4 \|A\|_2^2}, \frac{\varepsilon \text{tr}(A)}{K^2 \|A\|_{op}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left( -c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2 (4 \text{tr}(D))^2}{16K^4 \text{tr}(D) \|D\|_{op}}, \frac{\varepsilon 4 \text{tr}(D)}{4K^2 \|D\|_{op}} \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left( -4 \frac{\text{tr}(D)}{\|D\|_{op}} c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4K^4}, \frac{\varepsilon}{4K^2} \right) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

The result follows by taking  $c_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{K^2} \right) = c \min \left( \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4K^4}, \frac{\varepsilon}{4K^2} \right)$ .  $\square$

We now prove Theorem 1.8 taking  $b_{\text{HD}} := 2\kappa^2$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.8.* Given  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $t \geq 2$ , we have that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2} \right) \right] &\leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{(1+\varepsilon)} \frac{(2t \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X))^2}{(2t \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X))} \right) \\
&+ \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \leq (1-\varepsilon) 2t \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X) \right) \\
&+ \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \geq (1+\varepsilon) 2t \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X) \right) \\
&\leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{(1+\varepsilon)} \frac{(2t \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X))^2}{(2t \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X))} \right) \\
&+ \exp \left( -2t \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X)}{\|\Sigma_X\|_{op}} c_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{(K_X)^2} \right) \right) \\
&+ \exp \left( -2t \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X)}{\|\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X\|_{op}} c_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{(K_X)^2} \right) \right), \tag{4.48}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4.5 taking  $U_1 = \tilde{X}_1$  with  $D = \Sigma_X$  and with  $D = \Sigma_Z \Sigma_X$  respectively. Using the same reasoning as in (4.15) it follows that,

$$\mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)] \leq \sum_{t=2}^n n^t \mathbb{P}((1, \dots, t) \text{ is augmenting for } \hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}) \tag{4.49}$$

$$\leq \sum_{t=2}^n 2 \exp(t \log n) \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^t \|\Delta_i\|_2^2 \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2} \right) \right] \tag{4.50}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_{t=2}^n \exp \left( t \log n \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2\kappa^2 K_Z^2 \log n} \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{(1+\varepsilon)} \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X)}{\frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X)}{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X)}} \right) \right) \tag{4.51}$$

$$+ 2 \sum_{t=2}^n \exp \left( t \log n \left( 1 - 2 \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_X)}{\log n \|\Sigma_X\|_{op}} c_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{(K_X)^2} \right) \right) \right) \tag{4.52}$$

$$+ 2 \sum_{t=2}^n \exp \left( t \log n \left( 1 - 2 \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X)}{\log n \|\Sigma_Z \Sigma_X\|_{op}} c_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{(K_X)^2} \right) \right) \right) \tag{4.53}$$

$$\leq 6 \sum_{t=2}^{+\infty} e^{-t\omega(1)} = o(1), \tag{4.54}$$

where the last equality is a consequence of our hypothesis taking  $b_{\text{HD}} = 2\kappa^2$ . It follows by Markov's inequality that we have perfect recovery.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.9 is analogous.

*Proof of Theorem 1.9.* Note that,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right] = 2t \operatorname{tr}((\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X). \tag{4.55}$$



Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right) \right] &\leq \exp \left( -\frac{(1-\varepsilon)}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} 2t \operatorname{tr} \left( (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X \right) \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \leq (1-\varepsilon) 2t \operatorname{tr} \left( (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.56)$$

We can bound the last term using Lemma 4.5 once again with  $U_1 = \tilde{X}_1$  and  $D = (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X$  to estimate the last probability above. We then have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS-C}}, \pi^*)] &\leq 2 \sum_{t=2}^n \exp(t \log n) \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4\kappa^2 K_Z^2} \sum_{i=1}^t \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Delta_i \right\|_2^2 \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{t=2}^n \exp \left( t \log n \left( 1 - \frac{(1-\varepsilon)}{2\kappa^2 K_Z^2 \log n} \operatorname{tr} \left( (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X \right) \right) \right) \\ &+ 2 \sum_{t=2}^n \exp \left( t \log n \left( 1 - 2c_1 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{K_X^2} \right) \frac{\operatorname{tr} \left( (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X \right)}{\log n \left\| (\Sigma_Z)^{-1} \Sigma_X \right\|_{op}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{t=2}^{+\infty} e^{-t\omega(1)} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is again a consequence of our hypothesis taking  $b_{\text{HD}} = 2\kappa^2$ . Once again we have perfect recovery following Markov's inequality.  $\square$

## 5 Future work

Besides the open problems already posed in [11], we propose the following directions for future work:

**Direction 5.1.** Although the minimax lower bounds established in this work hold under mild assumptions on the tail of the noise distribution, we were only able to show that they are optimal making the assumption that the noise is sub-Gaussian. A natural follow-up question is what happens with noise distributions that do not have sub-Gaussian tails. What are the minimal assumptions on the noise we need to obtain rates of order  $(n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n$  as in Section 2? And beyond these assumptions, what rates can be established for heavy-tailed noise?

**Direction 5.2.** Proving the following conjecture of independent interest:

**Conjecture 5.3.** *Given  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{P}_n$ , let  $M_r$  be the largest matching in  $G(\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$ , where we allow both  $r$  and  $d$  to scale with  $n$ . Assume,*

$$\mathbb{E} [E(G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|))] = \binom{n}{2} \mathbb{P} (\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 < r^2) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty. \quad (5.1)$$

Then:

$$\mathbb{E} [|M_r|] = \Theta (\mathbb{E} [E(G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|))] \wedge n), \quad (5.2)$$

and moreover the same order holds with high probability for  $|M_r|$ .

That is, the size of the largest matching in a random geometric graph is of the order of the minimum between the expected number of edges of  $G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  and  $n$ . Proving this conjecture in the regime where  $d = \Theta(\log n)$  would allow us to partially recover the lower bound for the logarithmic regime (*i.e.*  $d = \Theta(\log n)$ ) from [11], following a more general framework, as we outline in Appendix C.

## References

- [1] J. Bretnagolle and C. Huber. “Estimation des densités : Risque minimax”. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XII*. Ed. by C. Dellacherie, P. A. Meyer, and M. Weil. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1978, pp. 342–363. ISBN: 978-3-540-35856-5.
- [2] S. Chen, S. Jiang, Z. Ma, G. P. Nolan, and B. Zhu. “One-way matching of datasets with low rank signals”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.13858* (2022).
- [3] N. Chenouard, I. Smal, F. De Chaumont, M. Maška, I. F. Sbalzarini, Y. Gong, J. Cardinale, C. Carthel, S. Coraluppi, M. Winter, et al. “Objective comparison of particle tracking methods”. In: *Nature methods* 11.3 (2014), pp. 281–289.
- [4] M. Chertkov, L. Kroc, F. Krzakala, M. Vergassola, and L. Zdeborová. “Inference in particle tracking experiments by passing messages between images”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107.17 (2010), pp. 7663–7668. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0910994107. eprint: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.0910994107>. URL: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.0910994107>.
- [5] P. Christen. *Data Matching: Concepts and Techniques for Record Linkage, Entity Resolution, and Duplicate Detection*. Data-Centric Systems and Applications. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN: 9783642311642. URL: <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=LZrT6eWf9NMC>.
- [6] O. Collier and A. S. Dalalyan. “Minimax rates in permutation estimation for feature matching”. In: *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17.1 (2016), pp. 162–192.
- [7] L. Devroye, A. György, G. Lugosi, and F. Udina. “High-dimensional random geometric graphs and their clique number”. In: (2011).
- [8] J. Ding, Y. Wu, J. Xu, and D. Yang. *The planted matching problem: Sharp threshold and infinite-order phase transition*. 2021. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2103.09383. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.09383>.
- [9] K. Jaqaman, D. Loerke, M. Mettlen, H. Kuwata, S. Grinstein, S. L. Schmid, and G. Danuser. “Robust single-particle tracking in live-cell time-lapse sequences”. In: *Nature methods* 5.8 (2008), pp. 695–702.
- [10] H. W. Kuhn. “The Hungarian method for the assignment problem”. In: *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 2.1-2 (1955), pp. 83–97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/nav.3800020109>. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/nav.3800020109>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/nav.3800020109>.
- [11] D. Kunisky and J. Niles-Weed. “Strong recovery of geometric planted matchings”. In: *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. 2022, pp. 834–876. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611977073.36. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611977073.36>. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611977073.36>.
- [12] A. La Porta, G. A. Voth, A. M. Crawford, J. Alexander, and E. Bodenschatz. “Fluid particle accelerations in fully developed turbulence”. In: *Nature* 409.6823 (2001), pp. 1017–1019.
- [13] M. Moharrami, C. Moore, and J. Xu. “The planted matching problem: Phase transitions and exact results”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 31.6 (2021), pp. 2663–2720. DOI: 10.1214/20-AAP1660. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-AAP1660>.
- [14] B. Nica. *A Brief Introduction to Spectral Graph Theory*. EMS Press, 2018. DOI: 10.4171/188. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4171/188>.
- [15] M. Penrose. *Random Geometric Graphs*. Oxford University Press, 2003. ISBN: 9780198506263. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198506263.001.0001. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198506263.001.0001>.
- [16] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. “Hanson-wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration”. In: (2013).
- [17] G. Semerjian, G. Sicuro, and L. Zdeborová. “Recovery thresholds in the sparse planted matching problem”. In: *Phys. Rev. E* 102 (2 2020), p. 022304. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.102.022304. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.102.022304>.

- [18] H. Shen, L. J. Tauzin, R. Baiyasi, W. Wang, N. Moringo, B. Shuang, and C. F. Landes. “Single particle tracking: from theory to biophysical applications”. In: *Chemical reviews* 117.11 (2017), pp. 7331–7376.
- [19] G. Sicuro. *Euclidean matching problems*. Springer, 2017.
- [20] M. Talagrand. “Scaling and non-standard matching theorems”. In: *Comptes Rendus Mathematique* 356.6 (2018), pp. 692–695. ISSN: 1631-073X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2018.04.018>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1631073X18301328>.
- [21] A. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, 2008. ISBN: 9780387790527. URL: <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=mwB8rUBsbqoC>.
- [22] R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018. DOI: 10.1017/9781108231596.
- [23] C. Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*. Vol. 338. Springer, 2009.
- [24] H. Wang, Y. Wu, J. Xu, and I. Yolou. “Random graph matching in geometric models: the case of complete graphs”. In: *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR. 2022, pp. 3441–3488.
- [25] Y. Wu. *Lecture notes on: Information-theoretic methods for high-dimensional statistics*. URL: <http://www.stat.yale.edu/~yw562/teaching/it-stats.pdf>.

## A A technical result on estimation in groups

We prove the equality in (3.18), under a more general setting.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\{P_g\}_{g \in G}$  be a family of probability measures on some measure space  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{A})$ , indexed by  $G$  a finite group. Assume that there exists a family of (measurable) mappings  $\{T_g : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}; g \in G\}$  such that for any  $g, h \in G$ ,*

$$Z \sim P_g \text{ implies } T_h(Z) \sim P_{gh}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Let  $d_G : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a distance metric which is invariant under right multiplication by a group element, i.e., for any  $g, g', h \in G$ ,

$$d_G(g, g') = d_G(gh, g'h). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Let  $g^* \sim \text{Unif}(G)$  be a random group element and  $Z \sim P_{g^*}$ . Then,

$$\inf_{\hat{g}} \max_{g \in G} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*) | g^* = g] = \inf_{\hat{g}} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*)], \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the infimum is taken over all (possibly non-deterministic) estimators  $\hat{g} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow G$  of  $g^*$ .

*Proof.* It is always the case that,

$$\inf_{\hat{g}} \max_{g \in G} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*) | g^* = g] \geq \inf_{\hat{g}} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*)]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

As for the other direction, let  $\hat{g}$  be some (possibly non-deterministic) estimator of  $g^*$ . Letting  $\tilde{h} \sim \text{Unif}(G)$  be sampled independently from  $Z$  and  $g^*$ , set  $\tilde{Z} = T_{\tilde{h}}(Z)$ . Note that  $\tilde{Z} \sim P_{g^*\tilde{h}}$  by (A.1). Define a new non-deterministic estimator:

$$\check{g}(Z) := \hat{g}(\tilde{Z})\tilde{h}^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Due to the invariance of  $d_G$ ,

$$d_G(\check{g}(Z), g^*) = d_G(\hat{g}(\tilde{Z}), g^*\tilde{h}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

In particular, conditioned on  $g^* = g$ ,  $d_G(\check{g}(Z), g^*)$  has the same law as  $d_G(\hat{g}(\tilde{Z}), g^*\tilde{h})$  and  $g^*\tilde{h} \sim \text{Unif}(G)$ . Thus  $d_G(\hat{g}(\tilde{Z}), g^*\tilde{h})$  conditioned on  $g^* = g$  has the same law as  $d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*)$  with  $g^* \sim \text{Unif}(G)$ . It follows that for any  $g \in G$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} [d_G(\check{g}(Z), g^*) | g^* = g] = \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(\tilde{Z}), g^*\tilde{h}) | g^* = g] = \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*)], \quad (\text{A.7})$$

and so,

$$\max_{g \in G} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\check{g}(Z), g^*) | g^* = g] \leq \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*)]. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

From this it follows that,

$$\inf_{\hat{g}} \max_{g \in G} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*) | g^* = g] \leq \inf_{\hat{g}} \mathbb{E} [d_G(\hat{g}(Z), g^*)]. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

□

In the particular setting of Lemma 3.1 we have that Lemma A.1 holds with  $G = S_n$ ,  $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ ,  $P_\pi$  the law of  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$  where,

$$Y_i := x_{\pi(i)} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_i, \quad i \in [n], \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} Q$ ,  $d_G$  the Hamming distance and,

$$T_\alpha(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) := (Y_{\alpha(1)}, \dots, Y_{\alpha(n)}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

## B Negative results in probability

In this section we show how one can use the same strategy from Section 3 to derive high probability lower bounds for  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$  that recover the results from [11] up to  $n^{o(1)}$  factors when  $d = o(\log n)$ , and also how it can be used to establish negative results that complement the ones from [24].

## B.1 High probability lower bounds on LSS

Our goal in this section is to prove the following high probability analogue of Theorem 1.1 which partially recovers the lower bound from [11] when  $d = o(\log n)$ , under greater generality:

**Theorem B.1** (High probability lower bound on  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$ ). *Consider a model as in (1.1) with  $X_1 \sim \mathcal{P}_n$  following assumption (a) from Model LD for each  $n$  for some  $R_d, \|\cdot\|, \gamma$  and  $\beta$ , with  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  that do not depend on  $n$ . Assume also that  $Z_1 = \sigma \tilde{Z}_1$ , where  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}_n$  a sequence of distributions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that,*

$$q_{R_d}(\mathcal{Q}) = q_{R_d}(\mathcal{Q}_n, \|\cdot\|) := \inf_{\|v\|=1} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\langle \tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2, v \right\rangle \geq R_d\right) \geq e^{-\beta d}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

for the same  $R_d$  and  $\beta$  as in the assumption on  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . If  $e^{-10\beta d} \sigma^d n^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty$  then with high probability,

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{64} e^{-7\beta d} ((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For brevity we omit the dependence on  $n$  of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ . We already know that if we assume  $d$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  to be fixed with the latter having a bounded continuous density, assumption (a) is verified. One can also verify that if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is fixed with a bounded continuous density then  $q_{s^*}(\mathcal{Q}) > 0$  for some  $s^* > 0$ , and thus (B.1) also holds, thus giving us a high-probability lower bound of order  $(n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n$  for  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$ . Similarly, if  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  follow the Gaussian model and  $d = o(\log n)$  one can verify that the assumptions of Theorem B.1 also hold and obtain a high probability lower bound of order  $(n^{2-o(1)} \sigma^d) \wedge n^{(1-o(1))}$  for  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$ .

As noted previously, when dealing with  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$ , augmenting 2-cycles are of particular interest as they seem to dominate the total mass of augmenting  $t$ -cycles in the case of fixed dimension when  $\sigma^d = o(\frac{1}{n})$ , as seen in [11] and as suggested by the proof of Theorem 1.7. As in [11], we let,

$$G^{\text{aug}} = G^{\text{aug}}(n; X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

be the graph of augmenting 2-cycles characterized by:

$$V(G^{\text{aug}}) = [n] \text{ and } E(G^{\text{aug}}) = \{\{i, j\} \subseteq [n], (i, j) \text{ is an augmenting cycle}\}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Proving the existence of large matchings in  $G^{\text{aug}}$  can be used to prove lower bounds on  $\mathbb{E}[d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)]$  due to the following result from [11] (Proposition 4.1):

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $M^*$  be a largest matching in  $G^{\text{aug}}$ . We have,*

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) \geq |M^*|. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

In order to show the existence of a large matching on  $G^{\text{aug}}$ , instead of using an enhanced second moment argument as in [11], we use the fact that a fraction of edges from the largest matching in  $G(n, d, r, \|\cdot\|)$  will also be augmenting cycles thus enabling us to move from a large matching in the random geometric graph induced by the initial positions to a large matching on the graph of augmenting 2-cycles. Since we are dealing with  $\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}$ , in this subsection assume that  $\pi^* = \text{Id}$  as in Section 4. Letting  $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$ , set:

$$q_s(\mathcal{Q}) = q_s(\mathcal{Q}, \|\cdot\|) := \inf_{\|v\|=1} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\langle \tilde{Z}_1 - \tilde{Z}_2, v \right\rangle \geq s\right). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We have the following high-probability analogue of Lemma 3.1 for  $d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*)$ :

**Lemma B.3.** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be distinct and set:*

$$Y_i := x_i + \sigma \tilde{Z}_i, \quad i \in [n], \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$  and  $\sigma > 0$ . Let  $q_s(\mathcal{Q})$  be as in (B.6) above and  $M_r = M_r(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$  the largest matching in  $G(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, r, d, \|\cdot\|_2)$ . If  $|M_r| q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty$ , then,

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) \geq \frac{|M_r| q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})}{2} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

with high probability.

*Proof.* Let  $G^{\text{aug}} = G^{\text{aug}}(n; x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$  be the graph of augmenting 2-cycles and let  $M^*$  denote its largest matching. Given  $\{i, j\} \in M_r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\{i, j\} \text{ is an edge on } G^{\text{aug}}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left\langle \tilde{Z}_i - \tilde{Z}_j, \frac{x_i - x_j}{\|x_i - x_j\|} \right\rangle \geq \frac{\|x_i - x_j\|}{\sigma}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\langle \tilde{Z}_i - \tilde{Z}_j, \frac{x_i - x_j}{\|x_i - x_j\|} \right\rangle \geq \frac{r}{\sigma}\right) \\ &\geq q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}). \end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

Let  $H \sim \text{Bin}(|M_r|, q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}))$ . Using a simple coupling argument we get the bound:

$$|M^*| \geq \sum_{e \in M_r} \mathbf{1}_{[e \in G^{\text{aug}}]} \geq H. \tag{B.10}$$

Given our hypothesis we have that,

$$\mathbb{P}(|H - \mathbb{E}[H]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[H]) \leq \frac{|M_r| q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})(1 - q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}))}{\varepsilon^2 |M_r|^2 q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}^2(\mathcal{Q})} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 |M_r| q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \tag{B.11}$$

It follows that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have that  $H \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|M_r| q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}$  with high probability and so the result follows using Lemma B.2.  $\square$

We now show that our lower bound on  $\mathbb{E}[|M_r|]$  from Lemma 1.2 also holds with high probability:

**Lemma B.4.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{P}$  and  $M_r$  be the largest matching in  $G(\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$  and assume that for each  $n$  assumption (a) from Model LD holds for  $\mathcal{P}$  and some  $\|\cdot\|, R_d, \gamma$  and  $\beta$ , with  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  that do not depend on  $n$ . If  $e^{-9\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{R_d}\right)^d n^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty$ , then with high probability,*

$$|M_r| \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{32} e^{-6\beta d} \left( \left( n^2 \left( \frac{r}{R_d} \right)^d \right) \wedge n \right). \tag{B.12}$$

*Proof.* Letting once again,

$$l = \frac{2R_d e^{-\beta}}{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{d}}}, \tag{B.13}$$

assume first that  $r \leq l$ , and thus  $r < R_d$ . Let  $N, B_d, p_{i,d}, U_{i,d}$  and  $I_n$  be as in the proof of Lemma 1.2. We will verify that  $I_n$  concentrates around its expected value  $\mathbb{E}[I_n]$ . Using Chebyshev's inequality, it suffices to show that:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[I_n^2]}{\mathbb{E}[I_n]^2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1. \tag{B.14}$$

Note that,

$$\mathbb{E}[I_n^2] = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2, U_{j,d} = 2) \tag{B.15}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[I_n]^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2) \mathbb{P}(U_{j,d} = 2). \tag{B.16}$$

Also, using (3.22) and (3.20),

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2) \leq \binom{n}{2} e^{2\beta d} \left( \frac{r}{8R_d} \right)^d. \tag{B.17}$$

On the other hand, for  $k_n \geq 2$ , letting  $q = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_d)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_n]^2 &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \sum_{j \in [k_n] \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2) \mathbb{P}(U_{j,d} = 2) \\
&\geq \frac{k_n^2}{2} q^4 \binom{n}{2}^2 \frac{e^{-4\beta d}}{16} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^{4d} \\
&\geq q^4 \binom{n}{2}^2 \frac{e^{-4\beta d}}{32} \left(\frac{r}{8R_d}\right)^{2d} \\
&\gg \binom{n}{2} e^{2\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{8R_d}\right)^d,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.18}$$

since  $e^{-9\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{R_d}\right)^d n^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty$  by assumption. Since  $\mathbb{E}[I_n^2] \geq \mathbb{E}[I_n]^2$ , it follows that both sums (B.15) and (B.16) are dominated by the sums over terms with  $i, j \in [k_n]$  with  $i \neq j$ . So to conclude that  $\frac{\mathbb{E}[I_n^2]}{\mathbb{E}[I_n]^2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$ , it suffices to show that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n$  large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2) \mathbb{P}(U_{j,d} = 2) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2, U_{j,d} = 2), \quad \forall i \neq j \in [k_n]. \tag{B.19}$$

Now, given  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2) \mathbb{P}(U_{j,d} = 2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \binom{N}{2} p_{i,d}^2 (1 - p_{i,d})^{N-2} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \binom{N}{2} p_{j,d}^2 (1 - p_{j,d})^{N-2} \right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}(|N - qn| < \delta qn)^2 \binom{(1 - \delta)qn}{2}^2 p_{i,d}^2 p_{j,d}^2 (1 - p_{i,d})^{(1+\delta)qn} (1 - p_{j,d})^{(1+\delta)qn},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.20}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(U_{i,d} = 2, U_{j,d} = 2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \binom{N}{4} \binom{4}{2} p_{i,d}^2 p_{j,d}^2 (1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})^{N-4} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(|N - qn| < \delta qn) \frac{(1 + \delta)^4 q^4 n^4}{4} p_{i,d}^2 p_{j,d}^2 (1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})^{(1-\delta)qn-4} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}(|N - qn| \geq \delta qn).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.21}$$

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \left( \frac{(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})^{(1-\delta)qn-4}}{(1 - p_{i,d})^{(1+\delta)qn-2} (1 - p_{j,d})^{(1+\delta)qn-2}} \right) &= -qn \log \left( 1 + \frac{p_{i,d} p_{j,d}}{(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})} \right) \\
&\quad - (\delta qn + 4) \log(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d}) \\
&\quad - \delta qn \log(1 - p_{i,d}) \\
&\quad - \delta qn \log(1 - p_{j,d}).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.22}$$

For sufficiently large  $n$ , using our assumption that  $r \leq l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| qn \log \left( 1 + \frac{p_{i,d} p_{j,d}}{(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})} \right) \right| &\leq 2qn p_{i,d} p_{j,d} \\
&\leq 2qn e^{2\beta d} \left(\frac{r}{2R_d}\right)^{2d} \\
&\leq 2qn \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

Also, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$|(\delta qn + 4) \log(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})| \leq 2\delta qn \left| \log \left( 1 - \frac{2}{(n-1)} \right) \right| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 4\delta q. \quad (\text{B.24})$$

Since,

$$(\delta qn + 4) |\log(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})| \geq \delta qn |\log(1 - p_{i,d})| \vee \delta qn |\log(1 - p_{j,d})|, \quad (\text{B.25})$$

it follows that,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \log \left( \frac{(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})^{(1-\delta)qn-4}}{(1 - p_{i,d})^{(1+\delta)qn-2} (1 - p_{j,d})^{(1+\delta)qn-2}} \right) \right| \leq 12\delta q, \quad (\text{B.26})$$

thus taking  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small, for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\frac{(1 - p_{i,d})^{(1+\delta)qn} (1 - p_{j,d})^{(1+\delta)qn}}{(1 - p_{i,d} - p_{j,d})^{(1-\delta)qn-4}} \geq \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right). \quad (\text{B.27})$$

From this (B.19) follows taking  $n$  large and  $\delta$  smaller if necessary to make the other factors of the ratio become closer to 1. It follows that,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[I_n^2]}{\mathbb{E}[I_n]^2} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1, \quad (\text{B.28})$$

from which it follows that  $I_n \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[I_n]}{2}$  with high probability. Repeating the last part of the proof of Lemma 1.2 for the case  $r > l$ , it follows that,

$$|M_r| \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{32} e^{-d(3\beta + \log(8))} \left( n^2 \left( \frac{r}{R_d} \right)^d \wedge n \right) \quad (\text{B.29})$$

with high probability and thus the result follows.  $\square$

With the above results the proof of Theorem B.1 follows readily:

*Proof of Theorem B.1.* The result follows by combining Lemma B.3 and Lemma B.4 by taking  $r = R_d \sigma$ .  $\square$

## B.2 Information theoretic results

In this subsection we give the following positive probability analogue of Theorem 1.1:

**Theorem B.5** (Positive probability lower bound). *Assume that for each  $n$ , Model LD in (1.1) holds for some  $R_d, \|\cdot\|, \gamma$  and  $\beta$  with  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  that do not depend on  $n$ . If  $e^{-10\beta d} \sigma^d n^2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , then as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ,*

$$\inf_{\hat{\pi}} \mathbb{P} \left( d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{128} e^{-7\beta d} ((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n) \right) \geq \frac{(1 - o(1))}{8}, \quad (\text{B.30})$$

where the infimum above is taken over all estimators  $\hat{\pi}$ .

This result in particular completes the picture given by Theorem 3 in [24] for  $d = o(\log n)$  and generalizes their conclusions when  $d$  is fixed for a wider class of distributions:

**Corollary B.6.** *Given the assumptions of Theorem B.5 and  $d = o(\log n)$ , for any estimator  $\hat{\pi}$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ , if*

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) = o(n^\alpha) \text{ with high probability,} \quad (\text{B.31})$$

then,

$$\sigma = o\left(n^{\frac{\alpha-2}{d}}\right). \quad (\text{B.32})$$

If we assume additionally that  $d$  is fixed, the result also holds for  $\alpha = 1$ .



*Proof.*  $d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) = o(n^\alpha)$  with high probability implies that,

$$\mathbb{P}(d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) \leq n^\alpha) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1. \quad (\text{B.33})$$

But then from our lower bound in Theorem B.5,

$$n^\alpha \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{128} e^{-7\beta d} ((n^2 \sigma^d) \wedge n), \quad (\text{B.34})$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ . Since  $e^{-7\beta d} n = n^{1-o(1)} > n^\alpha$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , this implies that,

$$n^\alpha \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{128} e^{-7\beta d} n^2 \sigma^d, \quad (\text{B.35})$$

and thus,

$$\sigma = o\left(n^{\frac{\alpha-2}{d}}\right), \quad (\text{B.36})$$

as claimed. If we assume that  $d$  is fixed and  $d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) = o(n)$  with high probability, then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) < \varepsilon \frac{\gamma^2}{128} e^{-7\beta d} n\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 \quad (\text{B.37})$$

and in particular we must have:

$$\varepsilon n \geq n^2 \sigma^d, \quad (\text{B.38})$$

which implies  $\sigma = o(n^{-\frac{1}{d}})$ .  $\square$

In order to prove Theorem B.5 we prove the following analogue of Lemma 3.1:

**Lemma B.7** (Positive probability lower bound on  $d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)$ ). *Given the same setting as Lemma 3.1, if  $|M_r| t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}) \geq 8$ , then for any estimator  $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in S_n$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(d_H(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) \geq \frac{|M_r| t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})}{4}\right) \geq \frac{1}{8}, \quad (\text{B.39})$$

for  $t_s(\mathcal{Q})$  as in (3.3) and  $M_r = M_r(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$  the largest matching in  $G(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, r, d, \|\cdot\|)$ .

*Proof.* Assume once again for ease of notation that  $M_r = \{\{2j-1, 2j\}\}_{j=1}^m$  and let  $\mathcal{Q}(v, \sigma)$  denote the law of  $v + \sigma \tilde{Z}$ ,  $\tilde{Z} \sim \mathcal{Q}$ . Note that given  $P$  and  $Q$  two measures on  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^2$ ,

$$\|P - Q\|_{TV} = \inf_{(W^{(0)}, W^{(1)})} \mathbb{P}(W^{(0)} \neq W^{(1)}), \quad (\text{B.40})$$

where the infimum is taken over all pairs  $(W^{(0)}, W^{(1)})$  such that  $W^{(0)} \sim P$  and  $W^{(1)} \sim Q$ . Following [23] Theorem 4.1 we have that for any pair  $x_{2j-1}, x_{2j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  there exists an optimal coupling  $(W^{(0)}, W^{(1)})$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^2 \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^2$  with,

$$W^{(0)} \sim Q(x_{2j-1}, \sigma) \otimes Q(x_{2j}, \sigma) \text{ and } W^{(1)} \sim Q(x_{2j}, \sigma) \otimes Q(x_{2j-1}, \sigma) \quad (\text{B.41})$$

such that,

$$\mathbb{P}(W^{(0)} = W^{(1)}) = 1 - \|Q(x_{2j-1}, \sigma) \otimes Q(x_{2j}, \sigma) - Q(x_{2j}, \sigma) \otimes Q(x_{2j-1}, \sigma)\|_{TV} =: p_j. \quad (\text{B.42})$$

Note that from (3.12) we know that for all  $j \in [m]$ ,

$$p_j \geq t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}). \quad (\text{B.43})$$

Let  $\{(W_j^{(0)}, W_j^{(1)})\}_{j=1}^m$  be independent optimal couplings of the respective collection of pairs of laws,

$$\{(Q(x_{2j-1}, \sigma) \otimes Q(x_{2j}, \sigma), Q(x_{2j}, \sigma) \otimes Q(x_{2j-1}, \sigma))\}_{j=1}^m. \quad (\text{B.44})$$

Let  $C_j$  be the indicator of the event  $W_j^{(0)} = W_j^{(1)}$ . We define  $b$  and  $b'$  two random elements of  $\{0, 1\}^m$  by doing the following procedure independently for each  $j \in [m]$ :

- (i)  $b_j, b'_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Unif}(\{0, 1\})$  if  $C_j = 1$ ,
- (ii)  $b_j \sim \text{Unif}(\{0, 1\})$  and  $b'_j = b_j$  if  $C_j = 0$ .

The key aspect of this construction is that although the joint pair  $(b_j, b'_j)$  depends on  $C_j$ , taken individually, both  $b_j$  and  $b'_j$  have the same marginal distribution and are each independent of  $C_j$ , and thus from  $W_j^{(0)}, W_j^{(1)}$ .

Let  $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{Q}$  be generated independently. Given  $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^m$  we define a sequence of final positions  $Y_1^{(\omega)}, \dots, Y_n^{(\omega)}$  by:

$$(Y_{2j-1}^{(\omega)}, Y_{2j}^{(\omega)}) = W_j^{(\omega_j)}, \quad j \in [m], \quad (\text{B.45})$$

and,

$$Y_i^{(\omega)} = x_i + \sigma \tilde{Z}_i, \quad i = 2m + 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{B.46})$$

Note that  $Y_1^{(b)}, \dots, Y_n^{(b)} = Y_1^{(b')}, \dots, Y_n^{(b')}$  by construction. Moreover, conditioned on  $b = \omega$ , since  $b$  is independent of the  $W_j^{(0)}$ 's and  $W_j^{(1)}$ 's,

$$Y_1^{(b)}, \dots, Y_n^{(b)} \sim \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Q}(x_{\pi_\omega(i)}, \sigma), \quad (\text{B.47})$$

where  $\pi_\omega = \prod_{j=1}^m ((2j-1)2j)^{\omega_j}$ . By symmetry the same conclusion holds for  $b'$ . Since  $b, b' \sim \text{Unif}(\{0, 1\}^m)$  it follows that,

$$(b, Y_1^{(b)}, \dots, Y_n^{(b)}) \stackrel{(d)}{=} (b', Y_1^{(b')}, \dots, Y_n^{(b')}). \quad (\text{B.48})$$

Let  $\pi^* \sim \text{Unif}(S_n)$  be sampled independently. Note that conditioned on  $b = \omega$  and  $\pi^* = \pi$ ,

$$Y_{\pi^*(1)}^{(b)}, \dots, Y_{\pi^*(n)}^{(b)} \sim \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Q}(x_{(\pi_\omega \circ \pi)(i)}, \sigma). \quad (\text{B.49})$$

Since  $\pi_b \circ \pi^*, \pi_{b'} \circ \pi^* \sim \text{Unif}(S_n)$ , it follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi_b \circ \pi^*, Y_{\pi^*(1)}^{(b)}, \dots, Y_{\pi^*(n)}^{(b)}) &\stackrel{(d)}{=} (\pi_{b'} \circ \pi^*, Y_{\pi^*(1)}^{(b')}, \dots, Y_{\pi^*(n)}^{(b')}) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} (\pi^*, Y_1, \dots, Y_n), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.50})$$

where  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  is defined by:

$$Y_i = x_{\pi^*(i)} + \sigma \tilde{Z}_i, \quad i \in [n]. \quad (\text{B.51})$$

In particular, since  $\hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_{\pi^*(1)}^{(b)}, \dots, Y_{\pi^*(n)}^{(b)}) = \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_{\pi^*(1)}^{(b')}, \dots, Y_{\pi^*(n)}^{(b')})$ , setting,

$$\hat{\pi}_b = \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_{\pi^*(1)}^{(b)}, \dots, Y_{\pi^*(n)}^{(b)}), \quad (\text{B.52})$$

for ease of notation, we have by the triangular inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(\hat{\pi}_b, \pi_b \circ \pi^*) + d_H(\hat{\pi}_b, \pi_{b'} \circ \pi^*) &\geq d_H(\pi_b \circ \pi^*, \pi_{b'} \circ \pi^*) \\ &= 2d_H(b', b). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.53})$$

Now, by a coupling argument using (B.43) and the independence of  $\{(b_j, b'_j)\}_{j=1}^m$ ,

$$d_H(b', b) \geq H, \quad (\text{B.54})$$

where  $H \sim \text{Binom}(m, \frac{1}{2}t_{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}))$ . Since  $|M_r|t_{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}) \geq 8$  using Chernoff's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H \geq \frac{t_{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})|M_r|}{4}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(H \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[H]}{2}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (\text{B.55})$$

We thus have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left( d_H(\hat{\pi}_b, \pi_b \circ \pi^*) \geq \frac{t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})|M_r|}{4} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left( d_H(\hat{\pi}_b, \pi_{b'} \circ \pi^*) \geq \frac{t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})|M_r|}{4} \right) &\geq \mathbb{P} \left( d_H(b', b) \geq \frac{t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})|M_r|}{4} \right) \\
&\geq \mathbb{P} \left( H \geq \frac{t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})|M_r|}{4} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.56}$$

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_H \left( \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1^{(b)}, \dots, Y_n^{(b)}), \pi_b \circ \pi^* \right) &\stackrel{(d)}{=} d_H \left( \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n), \pi^* \right) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{=} d_H \left( \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1^{(b')}, \dots, Y_n^{(b')}), \pi_{b'} \circ \pi^* \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{B.57}$$

and so,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( d_H \left( \hat{\pi}(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n), \pi^* \right) \geq \frac{t_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q})|M_r|}{4} \right) \geq \frac{1}{8}, \tag{B.58}$$

as desired. □

We are now in position to prove Theorem B.5:

*Proof of Theorem B.5.* Just combine Lemma B.7 and Lemma B.4 taking  $r = R_d \sigma$ . □

## C Recovering lower bounds for the logarithmic regime in the Gaussian model

In this section we show that if Conjecture 5.3 holds, then we can use Lemma B.3 to recover the lower bound from [11] on the logarithmic regime for some choices of  $a > 0$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$ .

We assume the Gaussian model from [11], *i.e.*  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_d)$  in (1.1), and the logarithmic regime *i.e.*  $d = a \log n$ . For the Gaussian model we have:

$$q_{\frac{r}{\sigma}}(\mathcal{Q}) = \left( 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right), \tag{C.1}$$

where  $\Phi$  is the cumulative distribution function of a standard Gaussian random variable. Let,

$$I(t) = \frac{1}{2} (t - 1 - \log(t)) \text{ for } t > 0 \tag{C.2}$$

be the large deviation rate function of a chi-squared random variable with 1 degree of freedom. For a fixed  $\sigma^2 > 0$  consider  $r^2 = \gamma d$  for some  $\gamma \in (0, 2)$ . Letting  $G(n, r, d) = G(n, r, d, \|\cdot\|_2)$  be the random geometric graph induced by joining initial positions within Euclidean distance  $r$ , we have that:

$$\log \left( \mathbb{E} [E(G(n, r, d))] \left( 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right) \right) = \log \left( \binom{n}{2} \right) + \log \left( \mathbb{P} (\|X_1 - X_2\|_2^2 \leq \gamma d) \right) + \log \left( 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{\sqrt{\gamma d}}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right).$$

Dividing all terms by  $\log n$ , taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and using that  $d = a \log n$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\log \left( \mathbb{E} [E(G(n, r, d))] \left( 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \right) \right)}{\log n} = 2 - aI \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) - \frac{a\gamma}{4\sigma^2} \tag{C.3}$$

$$= 2 - \frac{a}{2} \left( 2I \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) + \frac{\gamma}{2\sigma^2} \right) \tag{C.4}$$

$$= 2 - \frac{a}{2} \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right) - 1 - \log \left( \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \right). \tag{C.5}$$

The last expression is maximized by taking  $\gamma^* = 2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^{-1}$  which gives a value of  $2 - \frac{a}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)$ , precisely the rate established in [11]. Let  $r^* = \sqrt{\gamma^* d}$ . If we assume Conjecture 5.3 then  $|M_{r^*}| = \Theta(\mathbb{E}[E(G(n, r^*, d))] \wedge n)$  with high probability, from which it follows that:

$$\frac{\log(|M_{r^*}|)}{\log(\mathbb{E}[E(G(n, r^*, d))] \wedge n)} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(\mathbb{P})} 1, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[E(G(n, r^*, d))] \rightarrow +\infty$ . In particular, if  $1 \ll \mathbb{E}[E(G(n, r^*, d))] \ll n$ , then by Lemma B.3, we have with high probability that,

$$\frac{\log(d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) \vee 1)}{\log(n)} \geq \frac{\log\left(|M_{r^*}| q_{\frac{r^*}{\sigma}}\right) - \log(2)}{\log n}. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Since the last expression converges to  $2 - \frac{a}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)$  in probability we have that,

$$d_H(\hat{\pi}_{\text{LSS}}, \pi^*) \vee 1 \geq n^{\alpha + o_p(1)}, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where  $\alpha = 2 - \frac{a}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)$ .

Unfortunately the additional constraint that  $1 \ll \mathbb{E}[E(G(n, r^*, d))] \ll n$  implies that  $2 - aI\left(\frac{\gamma^*}{2}\right) \in (0, 1)$  and so in (C.8) we have an additional constraint on  $a > 0$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$ . Moreover, similar to [11] we are unable to establish a lower bound of order  $\Omega(n)$  with this strategy, as it also only deals with augmenting cycles of size 2.