

Exact Community Recovery (under Side Information): Optimality of Spectral Algorithms

Julia Gaudio*

Nirmit Joshi†

Abstract

In this paper, we study the problem of exact community recovery in general, two-community block models considering both Bernoulli and Gaussian matrix models, capturing the Stochastic Block Model, submatrix localization, and \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization as special cases. We also study the settings where *side information* about community assignment labels is available, modeled as passing the true labels through a noisy channel: either the binary erasure channel (where some community labels are known while others are erased) or the binary symmetric channel (where some labels are flipped). We provide a unified analysis of the effect of side information on the information-theoretic limits of exact recovery, generalizing prior works and extending to new settings. Additionally, we design a simple but optimal spectral algorithm that incorporates side information (when present) along with the eigenvectors of the matrix observation. Using the powerful tool of entrywise eigenvector analysis [Abbe, Fan, Wang, Zhong 2020], we show that our spectral algorithm can mimic the so called *genie-aided estimators*, where the i^{th} genie-aided estimator optimally computes the estimate of the i^{th} label, when all remaining labels are revealed by a genie. This perspective provides a unified understanding of the optimality of spectral algorithms for various exact recovery problems in a recent line of work.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider inference problems of the following form: there is an unknown partition of the set $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into two *communities*, denoted (C_+, C_-) that can be encoded by the community assignment vector $\sigma^* \in \{\pm 1\}^n$. We observe a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, which is specified by three distributions: \mathcal{P}_+ , \mathcal{P}_- , and \mathcal{Q} . The entries of A are independent, such that $A_{ij} \sim \mathcal{P}_+$ if $i, j \in C_+$, $A_{ij} \sim \mathcal{P}_-$ if $i, j \in C_-$, and $A_{ij} \sim \mathcal{Q}$ otherwise. One famous example is the Stochastic Block Model (SBM), where $\mathcal{P}_+ \equiv \text{Bern}(p_1)$, $\mathcal{P}_- \equiv \text{Bern}(p_2)$, and $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \text{Bern}(q)$. Other prominent examples include \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization and submatrix localization, in which $\mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q}$ are Gaussian distributions. Given the observation A , the goal is to recover the unknown σ^* .

While these inference problems have received significant attention in the literature, with many precise results about the fundamental limits of community recovery [DKMZ11, MNS15, ABH15, HWX16, Abb17, BBS17, JMRT16, CLR17], less is known about inference in the presence of *side information*. Yet, from a practical standpoint, side information is abundant in inference tasks, such as e-commerce platforms and recommender systems [FL19] and opinion recovery in social networks [FSR18]. More broadly, network inference under side information is part of a larger research effort on semi-supervised inference [JHB15].

In community detection tasks, we may have prior knowledge of the community labels; either (i) the true community assignment of some subset of vertices are known and we want to determine the rest or (ii) we may have a “guess” on community assignment of each vertex and interested in

*Northwestern University, julia.gaudio@northwestern.edu

†Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago (TTIC), nirmit@ttic.edu

recovering the true assignment. The former can be modeled as a receiving a side information vector $y \in \{-1, 0, +1\}^n$ by passing σ^* through a binary erasure channel (BEC) where each label is erased to 0, independently with probability $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ to form y . Similarly, (ii) can be modeled as receiving a noisy community guess vector $y \in \{\pm 1\}^n$, where each ground-truth label is independently flipped with probability $\alpha \in (0, 0.5]$, i.e. σ^* went through a binary symmetric channel (BSC) with crossover probability parameter α . The presence of side information turns community detection from an unsupervised learning problem into a semi-supervised learning problem. In this paper, we ask: *can we design algorithms that optimally incorporate side information, allowing us to recover σ^* which would be impossible to recover without side information?*




Figure 1: Visualization of BSC and BEC side information. The red-colored, blue-colored, and uncolored vertices have side information labels of $+1$, -1 , and 0 respectively.

Besides the practical motivation, considering exact recovery under side information is also interesting from an information-theoretic viewpoint. To fix ideas, consider the symmetric Stochastic Block Model with two communities C_+, C_- of equal size, and equal intra-community probability parameters $p_1 = p_2 = p$. Different notions of recovery (exact, almost exact, and partial) are achievable depending on the regime of the parameters; our focus will be on the exact recovery problem. When the intra- and inter-community probabilities are of the same order, they need to be of order $\Omega(\log n/n)$ for exact recovery to be possible; otherwise there will be an isolated vertex with high probability and hence no hope of exact recovery. In contrast, if we are willing to relax our goal to recover a $(1 - o(1))$ -fraction of the community labels (i.e., achieve almost exact recovery), then it is possible to recover the community label of all but vanishing fraction of vertices as long as $(a_n - b_n)^2 / 2(a_n + b_n) = \omega(1)$ where $p = a_n/n$ and $q = b_n/n$ [YP14, MNS15, AS15, Abb17]. In particular, almost exact recovery does not require connectivity of C_+ or C_- and is possible in much sparser regimes. This suggests that exact recovery is a very demanding condition. To better understand this landscape of inference problems, another way to relax the exact recovery problem is to consider the availability of BEC or BSC side information. A natural question is then, how small should the erasure probability $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ or flipping probability $\alpha \in (0, 0.5]$ be in order to shift the information-theoretic threshold for exact recovery?

Saad and Nosratinia [SN18, SN20] provided the answer to this question in several cases, including the symmetric SBM and the Planted Dense Subgraph (PDS) model, under both models of side information. It turns out that side information must be substantial in order to shift the exact recovery threshold. For example, the side information helps only when $\epsilon = O(n^{-\beta})$ and $\alpha = O(n^{-\beta})$, where $\beta > 0$ for the case of partially observed labels (BEC) and noisy labels (BSC) respectively. In particular, ϵ or α must vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and that too at a sufficient rate. In other words, the side information must tell us all but some $n^{1-\beta}$ vertex labels correctly in order to have an effect on the information-theoretic threshold. Note that the side information vector y already satisfies the almost exact recovery criterion. [SN18, SN20] further derived sharp information-theoretic thresholds for the symmetric SBM and PDS in terms of the model parameters and constant β for both BEC

and BSC type side information (see also Section 1.2 for additional references).

In this paper, our goal is to shed light on the demand of exact recovery in a unified way. We study the effect of side information in two settings:

1. Rank One Spike (ROS): A Gaussian community detection problem, where a vertex belongs to C_+ with probability ρ and to C_- with probability $1 - \rho$, and \mathcal{P}_+ , \mathcal{P}_- , and \mathcal{Q} are Gaussian distributions, which captures \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization and submatrix localization as special cases.
2. SBM: The general two community stochastic block model, where C_+ and C_- are sampled as specified in the above, and \mathcal{P}_+ , \mathcal{P}_- , and \mathcal{Q} are Bernoulli distributions.

For $\beta \geq 0$, we parameterize¹

$$\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{n^\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_n = \frac{1}{n^\beta + 1}. \tag{1}$$

for BEC and BSC side information respectively. Note that as β increases, the strength of side information increases.

Remark 1.1. *The parameterization is only for convenience and to derive threshold in terms of β . All of our results hold for general sequences of ϵ_n and α_n such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_n)}{\log n} = \beta$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/\alpha_n)}{\log n} = \beta$, like [SN18].*

In addition to establishing the fundamental statistical limits of exact recovery, we are also interested in computational aspects. Some progress has already been made in this direction: [SN18] developed an efficient two-stage algorithm for the symmetric SBM, which achieves exact recovery. In this paper, we investigate the capabilities of single-stage algorithms, which do not require a clean-up phase. Motivated by the recent success of spectral algorithms [AFWZ20, DLS21, DGMS22b, DGMS23] in achieving the sharp thresholds for exact community recovery in various settings, we ask: *how can we design simple spectral strategies that can optimally make use of the BSC or BEC side information?*

1.1 Our Contribution

Our contributions can be summarized in the following informal result.

Main Result. (Informal) *Consider the ROS or SBM model, with or without side information. Then for each of these models, there is a sharp information-theoretic threshold such that:*

- *Below the threshold, with high probability, there exists $i \in [n]$ for which it is not possible to recognize its own label even when the remaining labels are revealed. It follows that any estimator fails to exactly recover the community labels, with high probability.*
- *Above the corresponding threshold, there is a simple spectral algorithm that achieves exact recovery with high probability.*

In more detail, we establish the information-theoretic limits for exact recovery in both inference tasks, and under both models of side information. We show that impossibility of exact recovery is essentially driven by the failure of the so-called *genie-aided estimators*, whose goal is to determine the i^{th} label given all of the remaining labels. Even though these genie-aided estimators are not

¹This parameterization ensure that $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha_n \in (0, 0.5]$ for $\beta \geq 0$.

possible to compute exactly, we show that they can be mimicked using a spectral strategy, which is efficient. When no side information is present, this is done by first computing a carefully chosen linear combination of the leading eigenvectors of the observation matrix A , and thresholding the entries of the vector by a prescribed value in order to arrive at the community assignments. Under BEC side information, we show that the strategy of first computing the estimator ignoring the side information, and then simply replacing the labels with the already provided ones in y is optimal. Under BSC side information, we instead propose shifting the linear combination of eigenvectors computed, in the direction of the side information vector y by a carefully chosen scalar in terms of the crossover probability α , which we call the *trust factor*.

Using the powerful technique of entrywise eigenvector approximation developed by the influential work of Abbe, Fan, Wang, and Zhong [AFWZ20], we show that taking an appropriately weighted sum of the leading eigenvectors of A (along with side information use prescribed above when they are available) produces a vector whose i^{th} entry is well-approximated by the statistic computed by these genie-aided estimators in each of the settings. Thus, the spectral algorithm without any clean-up step is able to mimic the genie, and therefore achieves exact recovery down to the information-theoretic limits. Both the negative and positive results are driven by the genie-aided estimators, so it comes as no surprise that there is a certain *threshold collapse*: the genie-aided estimators, spectral estimator, and MAP estimator all achieve the same recovery threshold.

Degree-Profiling Algorithm. The genie-based estimation can also be seen as an extreme form of side information, where for each $i \in [n]$, we receive all but its own label denoted by σ_{-i}^* . A natural question is what happens if we naïvely try to emulate the genie for each label by trusting the side information y instead of the vectors $\{\sigma_{-i}^* : i \in [n]\}$? We call this a *degree-profiling* algorithm and show that in the regimes when side information is substantial to change the thresholds of exact recovery, even this naïve strategy of emulating the genie achieves optimality. While the success of this algorithm crucially relies on the availability of high quality side information with most labels correct, the spectral algorithm continues to succeed even otherwise.

1.2 Related Work

Spectral algorithms for exact recovery. Spectral algorithms were popularized by classical works such as McSherry’s algorithm for community detection [McS01] and the planted clique recovery algorithm of Alon, Krivilevich, and Sudakov [AKS98]. In recent years, attention has shifted to spectral algorithms without the need of a combinatorial cleanup phase. This line of work was initiated by Abbe, Fan, Wang, and Zhong [AFWZ20], who developed the powerful tool of entrywise eigenvector analysis, which led to a new proof technique for exact recovery problems. They show a vanilla spectral algorithm that just sign thresholds entries of the second eigenvector in the symmetric, balanced SBM and the first eigenvector for \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization is information-theoretically optimal.

Following [AFWZ20], a series of papers used the entrywise eigenvector technique to give strong guarantees for spectral algorithms. For example, [DLS21] showed that, in the symmetric SBM, using the Laplacian instead of the adjacency matrix also yields an optimal algorithm. [DGMS22a] studied another popular special case of PDS and showed that one needs to choose an appropriate linear combination of the top two eigenvectors of the adjacency matrix, and then threshold at a critically chosen value, to achieve optimality. Another line of work [DGMS22b, DGMS23] considered the censored variant of the problem, where the status of some edges is unknown. Even for the censored variant, they show that spectral algorithms are optimal, where the encoding of the unknown edges is chosen carefully to achieve optimality. Perhaps surprisingly, [DGMS23] showed that for this

censored variant of the problem, to handle cases beyond the symmetric SBM and the PDS, any clustering algorithm based on a single adjacency matrix does not reach the information-theoretic threshold. Instead, the authors devised a spectral algorithm which forms two matrices of the same network and carefully combines their eigenvectors. All these results at their core rely on entrywise behavior of eigenvectors.

This raises a fundamental question: what governs the optimality of these seemingly different problem specific choices? Is there some principle behind designing new algorithms in related settings? For example, for the standard uncensored variant as we study here, it was not clear what strategy would be optimal (beyond the symmetric SBM or PDS)? Do we need two matrices like its censored counterpart [DGMS23]? Our work settles all these closely related questions; these strategies are mimicking the genie-aided estimators in their respective models. Moreover, we do not need two matrices to achieve optimality, unlike the censored variant of general SBM.

Community recovery under side information. Community detection problems with side information have been studied in numerous settings. Saad and Nosratinia [SN18] considered exact recovery in the symmetric, balanced SBM, under the BEC, BSC, and more general side information with K features, where K may grow with n . Additionally, an efficient two-stage exact recovery algorithm was proposed. Vector-valued side information was also studied in [SN20], in the recovery of a planted dense subgraph of size $o(n)$. Community detection in the sparse setting under side information has received significant attention- see for example [MX16, CLR16, KACS17, KMS16, DSMM18]; we note that [DSMM18] considers Gaussian side information with either Bernoulli or Gaussian observations. See also [ZMZ14] which includes statistical physics conjectures for recovery thresholds derived from the cavity method. Numerous approaches for clustering have been proposed in the network science literature, such as [NC16, ZVA10, YJCZ09, XKW⁺12, YML13, ZLZ16, GVB12, ZCY09, GFRS13, CZY11, BVR17]; see [BCMM15] for a survey.

Other inference problems with side information Related problems in the literature include document classification [KARG08, CB10] and text classification [BC11]. A recent line of work studies the problem of community detection from correlated graphs [RS21, GRS22], so that the additional graph plays the role of side information. See also [ZWW21], which considers attributed graph alignment. More broadly, inference with side information falls under the area of semi-supervised learning (see e.g. [VEH20, CWS02, Bai13, BBM04, NC16]).

1.3 Organization

Section 2 contains our models and other preliminary setup. Our main results are stated in Section 3. Section 4 contains our proof ideas. Future directions are proposed in Section 5. The proofs are postponed to the appendices.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Models

We first introduce the General Two Community Block Model (GBM), which captures the two special cases that we consider.

Definition 2.1 (General Two Community Block Model (GBM)). *For any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and distributions $\mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-$, and \mathcal{Q} , we say that $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{GBM}_n(\rho, \mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q})$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\sigma^* \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ are sampled as follows. Each coordinate of σ^* is sampled i.i.d. such that $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) = \rho$ and $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1) = 1 - \rho$. Moreover, we will use the notation $C_+ := \{i : \sigma_i^* = +1\}$ and*

$C_- := \{i : \sigma_i^* = +1\}$. Conditioned on σ^* , we sample A , a zero diagonal symmetric matrix with independent entries, such that for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, we have

$$A_{ij} \sim \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_+, & \text{if } i, j \in C_+; \\ \mathcal{P}_-, & \text{if } i, j \in C_-; \\ \mathcal{Q}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the above definition, we restrict to distributions which are either (i) a continuous distribution or (ii) a finite, discrete distribution. We then let $\mathcal{P}_+(\cdot), \mathcal{P}_-(\cdot), \mathcal{Q}(\cdot)$ identify the corresponding probability density function or probability mass function, respectively. We will consider special cases where the distributions $(\mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q})$ are either all Gaussian or Bernoulli distributions. The specialized definitions are given below.

Definition 2.2 (Rank One Spike (ROS)). *Fix any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. We say that $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$ if they are sampled as follows. First sample σ^* as mentioned for GBM. Conditioned on σ^* consider the vector $v^* \in \{a, b\}^n$ such that for $i \in [n]$*

$$v_i^* = a \cdot \mathbf{1}[\sigma_i^* = +1] + b \cdot \mathbf{1}[\sigma_i^* = -1]. \quad (2)$$

Finally, conditioned on σ^* , we get independent noisy measurements for every $i < j$ of the following form.

$$A_{ij} = v_i^* v_j^* \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + W_{ij}, \quad \text{where } W_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Note that the model $\text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$ is a special case of $\text{GBM}_n(\rho, \mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q})$, by taking

$$\mathcal{P}_+ \equiv \mathcal{N}\left(a^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}, 1\right), \mathcal{P}_- \equiv \mathcal{N}\left(b^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}, 1\right), \text{ and } \mathcal{Q} \equiv \mathcal{N}\left(ab \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}, 1\right).$$

Taking $b = 0$ yields a version of the Gaussian submatrix localization problem [HWX18], for which the goal is to recover a submatrix of elevated mean (corresponding to the entries in C_+). Taking $a = -b$ yields the \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization problem [BBS17] after rescaling.

Remark 2.3. *We remark that the \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization problem is typically formulated as $A_{ij} = x_i^* x_j^* + \sigma W_{ij}$, where x^* is chosen uniformly at random from the set $\{\pm 1\}^n$ is an unknown vector, W is a zero-diagonal symmetric matrix with independent entries sampled from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ [BBS17]. In that case, the relevant parameterization of σ is $\sigma = c \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}}$, as $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2 \log n}}$ is the threshold value for exact recovery [BBS17]. Thus, taking $a = 1/\sqrt{c}, b = -1/\sqrt{c}$ and $\rho = 1/2$ in our ROS model (Definition 2.2) produces a matrix A such that*

$$A_{ij} = \frac{1}{c} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} x_i^* x_j^* + W, \quad x^* \sim \text{Uniform}(\{\pm 1\}^n).$$

After scaling A by $c \sqrt{n/\log n}$, we achieve the standard model $x^* x^{*\top} + \sigma W$ (with zero diagonal).

Our scaling choice allows both submatrix localization and \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization to be handled under a unified model. We also consider the Stochastic Block Model (SBM) in the logarithmic-degree regime, which is the relevant regime for exact recovery.

Definition 2.4 (Stochastic Block Model (SBM)). *Fix any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2 > b > 0$. Then the model $\text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$ is a special case of $\text{GBM}_n(\rho, \mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q})$ with*

$$\mathcal{P}_+ \equiv \text{Bern}\left(\frac{a_1 \log n}{n}\right), \mathcal{P}_- \equiv \text{Bern}\left(\frac{a_2 \log n}{n}\right), \text{ and } \mathcal{Q} \equiv \text{Bern}\left(\frac{b \log n}{n}\right).$$

Finally, we consider the following noise models for the side information.

Definition 2.5 (Binary Erasure Channel (BEC)). *For any $\sigma^* \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, we say $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon)$ where each entry of σ^* is erased to 0, independently with probability ϵ , to form $y \in \{-1, 0, +1\}^n$.*

Definition 2.6 (Binary Symmetric Channel (BSC)). *For any $\sigma^* \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$, we say $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha)$ where each entry of σ^* is flipped independently with probability α , to form $y \in \{\pm 1\}^n$.*

2.2 Exact Recovery

Our goal is to exactly recover the community labels σ^* given the observation matrix A and the side information y when available, as formalized below.

Definition 2.7 (Exact Recovery). *We say that an estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ succeeds if*

- (i) $\hat{\sigma} \in \{\pm \sigma^*\}$ when $\mathcal{P}_+ \equiv \mathcal{P}_-, \rho = 1/2$ and there is no side information (the symmetric case);
- (ii) $\hat{\sigma} = \sigma^*$, when $\mathcal{P}_+ \not\equiv \mathcal{P}_-$ or $\rho \neq 1/2$ or side information (non-symmetric case).

Otherwise, we say $\hat{\sigma}$ fails. We say that $\hat{\sigma}$ achieves exact recovery if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma} \text{ succeeds}) = 1$.

Note that in the symmetric setting described in Definition 2.7, it is not possible to recover σ^* with high probability, and we can only hope to recover the partition. In all other cases, we wish to recover the labels and not just the partition. All our positive results will demonstrate recovery in this strong sense, while our negative results will show that even recovering the partition is impossible below the threshold. The optimal predictor for any model and side information is the one which has maximum posterior probability given the observation matrix A and the side information y , when it is present.

Definition 2.8 (MAP Estimator). *Consider the observation matrix A and the side information y (either BSC or BEC). We define the Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) estimator as*

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} = \arg \max_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \sigma \mid A, y).$$

When no side information is present, define $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} = \arg \max_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^ = \sigma \mid A)$.*

2.3 Genie-Aided Estimators

We now define the framework of genie-aided estimation, which plays a crucial role in our analysis. We note that the concept of genie-aided estimation is attributed to the survey of [Abb17], while our contribution is a systematic method of connecting spectral algorithms to genie estimators. In the genie-aided setting, we suppose that all labels but the i^{th} are known, and the goal is to determine

the i^{th} label. More formally, let σ_{-i}^* denote the true labels, apart from σ_i^* . The optimal estimator for the i^{th} label is given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*) \geq \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*). \\ -1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

(where the conditioning on y is omitted when there is no side information is present). Moreover, we say that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i}$ fails on an instance if the posterior probability of the incorrect label is *strictly* greater than the posterior probability of the correct label. The following lemma rigorously establishes the intuitive claim that the failure of some genie-aided estimator implies the global MAP also fails.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q}$ be any distributions. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{GBM}_n(\rho, \mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q})$. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ for $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1]$ or $\alpha_n \in (0, 1/2]$ respectively. Define the genie-aided estimators $\{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} : i \in [n]\}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ for the respective model. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists i \in [n] : \hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} \text{ fails}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \text{ fails}).$$

Genie scores. We form a vector $z^* \in (\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\})^n$, called the *genie score* vector, where z_i^* records the log of the ratio of posterior probabilities of the label σ_i^* given σ_{-i}^* by a genie. That is,

$$z_i^* = \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) \quad \text{or} \quad z_i^* = \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right), \quad (4)$$

in the cases of side information and no side information respectively. Then the optimal genie-based estimator corresponds to $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} = \text{sgn}(z_i^*)$. The following lemma gives the form of the genie scores, when there is no side information, under the BEC channel, and under the BSC channel, respectively. Here we define $C_+^{-i} := C_+ \setminus \{i\}$ and $C_-^{-i} := C_- \setminus \{i\}$.

Lemma 2.10. *Consider any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-$ and \mathcal{Q} be either all Gaussian or Bernoulli distributions. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{GBM}_n(\rho, \mathcal{P}_+, \mathcal{P}_-, \mathcal{Q})$. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ for $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1]$ or $\alpha_n \in (0, 1/2]$. Then for any $i \in [n]$, the genie score for the i^{th} label is given by*

- No side information:

$$z_i^* = \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right).$$

- BEC side information: If $y_i = +1$ then $z_i^* = +\infty$, and if $y_i = -1$ then $z_i^* = -\infty$. Otherwise

$$z_i^* = \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right).$$

- BSC side information:

$$z_i^* = \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) + \log \left(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) y_i.$$

We devise a principled method for determining the weights and threshold value in our spectral algorithm such that i^{th} entry of the vector formed, approximates the the genie score z_i^* under no side information. The statistic z_i^* only depends on the i^{th} row of A but knows the locations C_+^{-i} and C_-^{-i} due to a genie. In light of Lemma 2.10, it is possible to see the motivation behind the use of BEC and BSC side information prescribed in Section 1.1. In particular, the genie scores undergo exactly the same transformation when the side information becomes available according to Lemma 2.10; for BEC side information, overriding the scores with $+\infty$ or $-\infty$, depending on the side information label is $+1$ or -1 respectively, and for BSC side information, shifting the genie score vector in the direction of side information. The *trust factor* discussed previously in Section 1.1 exactly corresponds to the scalar quantity $\log\left(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right)$, which is the log ratio of the probabilities of seeing the correct label and the incorrect label. Note that this is a decreasing function of the flipping probability α_n .

3 Main Results

3.1 Results for ROS

Define $\Psi := \Psi(\rho, a, b) = (a-b)^2(\rho a^2 + (1-\rho)b^2)$, the quantity that controls the signal-to-noise ratio in the $\text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Then the information-theoretic (IT) threshold without or in the presence of side information of strength β (see Remark 1.1) is given by the following table in terms Ψ and β .

Model	IT Threshold
No side information	$\Psi/8 = 1$
BEC side information	$\Psi/8 + \beta = 1$
BSC side information	$\frac{(\Psi+2\beta)^2}{8\Psi} \mathbb{1}\{\Psi > 2\beta\} + \beta \mathbb{1}\{\Psi \leq 2\beta\} = 1$

Table 1: Information-Theoretic Thresholds for ROS.

	Possible without needing any side information
	Trivial just based on side information
	Possible using either BEC or BSC but not otherwise
	Possible using BEC but not with BSC
	Impossible despite BEC or BSC side information




Figure 2: Visualization of Information Theoretic Thresholds for ROS. The colored regions in the above Ψ vs β plot indicate how BEC or BSC side information of strength β helps.

We show that above the IT threshold (as in, $\Psi/8 > 1$ in the case of no side information, for example), we can achieve exact recovery with spectral algorithm with high probability. On the other hand, below the IT threshold (as in, $\Psi/8 < 1$ in the case of no side information), any algorithm fails to achieve exact recovery with high probability. More formally:

Theorem 1. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n be parameterized as (1) for $\beta \geq 0$. Then for the respective IT threshold given in Table 1

- Below the IT threshold, no estimator achieves exact recovery. Moreover, for any (sequence of) estimator $\hat{\sigma}_n$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_n \text{ succeeds}) = 0$.
- Above the IT threshold, there is a spectral algorithm (Algorithm 1) that returns the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$ which achieves exact recovery.

Figure 2 provides a visualization of the IT threshold in the ROS model. Recalling the scaling of the error given by (1) (and Remark 1.1), we see that $\epsilon_n = O(n^{-\beta})$ and $\alpha_n = O(n^{-\beta})$, so that the achievable regimes in the two error models are comparable according to the parameter β . Side information improves the asymptotic IT threshold whenever $\beta > 0$ (and makes the problem trivial when $\beta > 1$). For any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there is a regime where recovery is possible using the BEC but not the BSC. The reason that the BEC is more powerful comes from a coupling argument: consider the BSC with additional information which reveals whether the side information is true or false. That is, we observe either (y_i, true) or (y_i, false) . But then the distribution of (y_i, true) and (y_i, false) is the same as the distribution of y_i (which is always a true observation) and 0 in the BEC.

To give some further intuition for the IT thresholds, note that the genie-aided estimator of a given label takes the form of a Gaussian testing problem. Here, the quantity $\Psi/8$ is the Chernoff exponent for testing between two Gaussian distributions, which arise from taking weighted sums of A_i for $i \in C_+$ or $i \in C_-$. When side information in the form of the BEC is included, this translates into a reduced need for confidence in the Gaussian testing problem, as only a small (sublinear) number of labels need to be determined. The BSC threshold arises from two different failure modes, depending on the correctness of the side information for a given vertex.

Finally, when the side information is already substantial to shift the thresholds of recovery ($\beta > 0$), then we also propose a degree-profiling algorithm which is optimal in the following sense.

Theorem 2. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n be parameterized as (1) for $\beta > 0$. Then there is a degree-profiling algorithm (Algorithm 2) that returns the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$ which achieves exact recovery above the IT threshold.

Remark 3.1. It is important to note that the success of the degree-profiling algorithm crucially relies on the side information because it just uses that as the ground truth to emulate the genie. For example, the algorithm would fail to recover communities under weak side information, even though the recovery was possible using just using the observation matrix A . However, the spectral algorithm does not have this limitation as it uses the eigenvectors of A and will continue to succeed even under weak or no side information.

3.2 Results for SBM

The IT thresholds for the SBM are stated in terms of a Chernoff-Hellinger divergence, as introduced by [AS15]. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, define

$$D_t(\mu, \nu) := \sum_{i \in [k]} t\mu_i + (1-t)\nu_i - \mu_i^t \nu_i^{1-t}. \quad (5)$$

The Chernoff–Hellinger divergence between μ and ν is given by $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} D_t(\mu, \nu)$. We also define the profiles of two communities

$$\theta_+ := (\rho a_1, (1 - \rho)b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_- := (\rho b, (1 - \rho)a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (6)$$

Then the IT thresholds are given in Table 2.

Model	IT Threshold
No side information	$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = 1$
BEC side information	$\beta + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = 1$
BSC side information	$\min \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-), \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta(1 - t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) \right\} = 1$

Table 2: Information-Theoretic Thresholds for SBM.

Theorem 3. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2 > b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n are parameterized as (1) for $\beta \geq 0$. Then for the respective IT threshold given in Table 2,*

- *Below the IT threshold, no estimator achieves exact recovery. Moreover, for any (sequence of) estimator $\hat{\sigma}_n$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_n \text{ succeeds}) = 0$.*
- *Above the IT threshold, there is a spectral algorithm (Algorithms 4 and 5) that returns the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$ which achieves exact recovery above the IT threshold.*

In the absence of side information, the CH-divergence $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = 1$ is the Chernoff exponent when distinguishing a pair of labels, given all the other labels. As in ROS, the IT threshold shifts by β in the presence of BEC side information. The IT threshold in the BSC requires two conditions to hold (namely, $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1$ and $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta(1 - t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1$), since there are two ways that the genie estimator of a given label i could fail, depending on whether the label of i is correctly transmitted or not.

Finally, we also state the result for the degree profiling algorithm for the SBM, while drawing attention to Remark 3.1.

Theorem 4. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n be parameterized as (1) for $\beta > 0$. Then there is a degree-profiling algorithm (Algorithm 6) that returns the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$ which achieves exact recovery above the IT threshold.*

4 Proof Ideas

All our impossibility results and algorithmic results are proved in a unified way.

4.1 Unified proof strategy and the threshold collapse phenomenon

In order to derive the fundamental statistical limits of a recovery problem, it suffices to show that the MAP estimator (Definition 2.8) fails below the threshold, due to the optimality of MAP. However, here we take a different approach and instead analyze the collection of genie-aided estimators. These individual estimators are clearly optimal for the recovery of each individual label, and thus, the failure $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen}, i}$ for some $i \in [n]$, in recovering the i^{th} label, implies the failure of the MAP (Lemma 2.9). The implication (c) in Figure 3 is a direct contrapositive of this. In turn, the genie scores are

sums of independent random variables, conditioned on the community assignments (Lemma 2.10). Below the threshold, we show that each genie-aided estimator fails with probability $\omega(1/n)$; from there, standard tools [HWX17] are used to show that with high probability at least one genie-aided estimator fails.

Conversely, above the IT threshold, the genie-aided estimators all succeed with high probability; moreover, they succeed with a *margin*. Indeed, we show that for both ROS and SBM, without or with either type of side information, above the respective IT threshold, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^* > \delta \log n. \quad (7)$$

In order to design optimal algorithms for exact recovery, we exploit this margin, recalling that the i^{th} genie estimator thresholds z_i^* at 0. Obviously, exactly computing the genie scores is impossible without the genie. But as we will show, the spectral algorithm computes a score for each vertex $i \in [n]$, which we denote by z_i^{spec} that approximates z_i^* well. In vector notation, the genie score vector z^* , is well-approximated *entrywise*, by the score vector z^{spec} formed by the algorithm:

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{spec}}\|_\infty = o(\log n). \quad (8)$$

Since the spectral algorithm thresholds z^{spec} at 0 to come up with the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$, the margin property (7) implies the optimality of the spectral algorithm. In summary, the genie-aided estimators, spectral estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$, and MAP estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ all achieve the same threshold. The entire discussion can be summarized in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Summary of our unified proof framework. Our spectral algorithm is designed such that (a) holds. Note that: (b) follows from the optimality of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ and (c) follows from Lemma 2.9. Finally, we establish the threshold collapse phenomenon by showing: below the IT threshold, the event in the fourth block happens with probability $o(1)$, and above the IT threshold, the event in the first block happens with high probability.

Finally, when the side information is strong enough to shift the IT threshold, the degree profiling algorithm forms z^{dp} that approximates z^* similar to (8). The same phenomenon described by Figure 3 governs the optimality of degree-profiling algorithm.

4.2 Overview of algorithms

We first establish that for both ROS and SBM the genie score vector takes a special form

$$z^* \approx Aw + \gamma \mathbf{1}_n,$$

where the approximation is in the ℓ_∞ norm, for a certain $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with entries $(w_+, w_-) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ in the locations of C_+ and C_- respectively. See Lemmas D.1 (ROS) and E.2 (SBM) for precise statements. Note that (w_+, w_-, γ) are just scalars that can be calculated from the model parameters and do not depend on σ^* . The main power of the genie lies in forming the vector w , which requires knowing the locations C_+ and C_- . Then the question that remains is how one may come up with a proxy for w such that the genie score is well-approximated.

Degree-Profiling Algorithm. In this, we use the proxy for w where we just trust the side information on the face value and use the locations of $S_+ := \{i \in [n] : y_i = +1\}$ and $S_- := \{i \in [n] : y_i = -1\}$ instead of C_+ and C_- . When the side information is such that $|C_+ \Delta S_+|, |C_- \Delta S_-| = o(n)$ with high probability, these scores are well-approximated as given in (8). We emphasize that this step crucially relies on the availability of side information that already satisfies the almost exact recovery criterion.

Spectral Algorithm. The spectral algorithm affords more versatility than the degree-profiling algorithm, as it emulates the genie score z^* without any clean-up step even when no side information is present. The design of our spectral algorithm is informed by the entrywise eigenvector analysis result of [AFWZ20], which allows us to say that the leading eigenvectors of A satisfy $u \approx \frac{Au^*}{\lambda^*}$, where (λ^*, u^*) is the corresponding eigenvector of the expectation matrix $\mathbb{E}[A \mid \sigma^*]$, and the approximation is in the ℓ_∞ norm. Since the matrix $\mathbb{E}[A \mid \sigma^*]$ has a block structure, its eigenvectors do as well. Thus, we can take an appropriate linear combination of the leading eigenvectors of A , in order to approximate Aw .

5 Discussion and Future Work

In this paper, we provide a systematic treatment of two-community matrix inference problems under side information, focused on the Bernoulli and Gaussian cases. When the side information is already substantial, it shifts the thresholds of exact recovery and there are sharp new recovery thresholds. Moreover, we propose simple algorithms that achieve these thresholds. From a technical standpoint, our work makes the precise connection between spectral algorithms and genie-aided estimators, characterizing its effectiveness in achieving sharp thresholds for various exact recovery problems in a recent line of work. We refer the reader to Section 1.2 for a detailed discussion. Understanding the capabilities of such vanilla spectral algorithms, without any clean-up stage, is of fundamental interest; we hope this perspective will guide the design and analysis of spectral algorithms for exact community recovery problems moving forward. Some directions for future work include:

- **Exact recovery in Gaussian Mixture Block Model:** In a recent work, Li and Schramm [LS23] proposed an alternative model to better capture real-world networks and sketched out the general landscape for recovery by studying almost exact recovery. What about exact recovery? Interestingly, [LS23] proposed exactly the same vanilla spectral algorithm and showed it achieves almost exact recovery. Does it also succeed for exact recovery?
- **A refined analysis of degree-profiling:** In the weak side information regimes, i.e. when the noise parameters satisfy $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/\epsilon_n)}{\log n} = 0$ or $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/\alpha_n)}{\log n} = 0$, what can we say about the success of degree profiling?
- **Minimax error rates:** In similar spirit to [ZZ16] but now in the presence of side information, what can we say about the minimax error rates when exact recovery is impossible?
- **More general settings:** What is the IT threshold with more general side information, more general observation distributions, or more than two communities? Can we adapt the algorithms to these more general settings?

Acknowledgements. J.G. was supported in part by NSF CCF-215410, and N.J. was supported in part by the Institute for Data, Econometric, Algorithms, and Learning (NSF TRIPODS HDR). The authors thank Raghav Sinha from the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, who simulated the algorithms as they were developed.

References

- [Abb17] Emmanuel Abbe. Community detection and stochastic block models: recent developments. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6446–6531, 2017. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#)
- [ABH15] Emmanuel Abbe, Afonso S Bandeira, and Georgina Hall. Exact recovery in the stochastic block model. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 62(1):471–487, 2015. [1](#)
- [AFWZ20] Emmanuel Abbe, Jianqing Fan, Kaizheng Wang, and Yiqiao Zhong. Entrywise eigenvector analysis of random matrices with low expected rank. *Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1452–1474, 2020. [3](#), [4](#), [13](#), [24](#), [25](#), [28](#), [39](#)
- [AKS98] Noga Alon, Michael Krivelevich, and Benny Sudakov. Finding a large hidden clique in a random graph. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 13(3-4):457–466, 1998. [4](#)
- [AS15] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon. Community detection in general stochastic block models: Fundamental limits and efficient algorithms for recovery. In *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 670–688, 2015. [2](#), [10](#), [67](#)
- [Bai13] Eric Bair. Semi-supervised clustering methods. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, 5(5):349–361, 2013. [5](#)
- [BBM04] Sugato Basu, Mikhail Bilenko, and Raymond J Mooney. A probabilistic framework for semi-supervised clustering. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 59–68, 2004. [5](#)
- [BBS17] Afonso S Bandeira, Nicolas Boumal, and Amit Singer. Tightness of the maximum likelihood semidefinite relaxation for angular synchronization. *Mathematical Programming*, 163:145–167, 2017. [1](#), [6](#), [26](#)
- [BC11] Ramnath Balasubramanian and William W Cohen. Block-LDA: Jointly modeling entity-annotated text and entity-entity links. In *Proceedings of the 2011 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 450–461. SIAM, 2011. [5](#)
- [BCMM15] Cécile Bothorel, Juan David Cruz, Matteo Magnani, and Barbora Micenkova. Clustering attributed graphs: models, measures and methods. *Network Science*, 3(3):408–444, 2015. [5](#)
- [BVR17] Norbert Binkiewicz, Joshua T Vogelstein, and Karl Rohe. Covariate-assisted spectral clustering. *Biometrika*, 104(2):361–377, 2017. [5](#)
- [CB10] Jonathan Chang and David M Blei. Hierarchical relational models for document networks. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 124–150, 2010. [5](#)
- [CLR16] T Tony Cai, Tengyuan Liang, and Alexander Rakhlin. Inference via message passing on partially labeled stochastic block models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.06923*, 2016. [5](#)

- [CLR17] T Tony Cai, Tengyuan Liang, and Alexander Rakhlin. Computational and statistical boundaries for submatrix localization in a large noisy matrix. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(4):1403–1430, 2017. 1
- [CWS02] Olivier Chapelle, Jason Weston, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Cluster kernels for semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 15, 2002. 5
- [CZY11] Hong Cheng, Yang Zhou, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. Clustering large attributed graphs: A balance between structural and attribute similarities. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 5(2):1–33, 2011. 5
- [DGMS22a] Souvik Dhara, Julia Gaudio, Elchanan Mossel, and Colin Sandon. Spectral algorithms optimally recover (censored) planted dense subgraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11847*, 2022. 4, 27
- [DGMS22b] Souvik Dhara, Julia Gaudio, Elchanan Mossel, and Colin Sandon. Spectral recovery of binary censored block models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3389–3416. SIAM, 2022. 3, 4
- [DGMS23] Souvik Dhara, Julia Gaudio, Elchanan Mossel, and Colin Sandon. The power of two matrices in spectral algorithms for community recovery. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023. 3, 4, 5
- [DKMZ11] Aurelien Decelle, Florent Krzakala, Cristopher Moore, and Lenka Zdeborová. Asymptotic analysis of the stochastic block model for modular networks and its algorithmic applications. *Physical Review E*, 84(6):066106, 2011. 1
- [DLS21] Shaofeng Deng, Shuyang Ling, and Thomas Strohmer. Strong consistency, graph Laplacians, and the stochastic block model. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22(117):1–44, 2021. 3, 4
- [DSMM18] Yash Deshpande, Subhabrata Sen, Andrea Montanari, and Elchanan Mossel. Contextual stochastic block models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018. 5
- [FL19] Vivek F Farias and Andrew A Li. Learning preferences with side information. *Management Science*, 65(7):3131–3149, 2019. 1
- [FSR18] Dylan Foster, Karthik Sridharan, and Daniel Reichman. Inference in sparse graphs with pairwise measurements and side information. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1810–1818. PMLR, 2018. 1
- [GFRS13] Stephan Günnemann, Ines Färber, Sebastian Raubach, and Thomas Seidl. Spectral subspace clustering for graphs with feature vectors. In *2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 231–240. IEEE, 2013. 5
- [GJ23] Julia Gaudio and Nirmal Joshi. Community detection in the hypergraph SBM: Exact recovery given the similarity matrix. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 469–510. PMLR, 2023. 39

- [GRS22] Julia Gaudio, Miklos Z Racz, and Anirudh Sridhar. Exact community recovery in correlated stochastic block models. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2183–2241. PMLR, 2022. [5](#)
- [GVB12] Jaume Gibert, Ernest Valveny, and Horst Bunke. Graph embedding in vector spaces by node attribute statistics. *Pattern Recognition*, 45(9):3072–3083, 2012. [5](#)
- [HWX16] Bruce Hajek, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. Achieving exact cluster recovery threshold via semidefinite programming. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(5):2788–2797, 2016. [1](#), [27](#)
- [HWX17] Bruce Hajek, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. Information limits for recovering a hidden community. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(8):4729–4745, 2017. [12](#), [34](#)
- [HWX18] Bruce Hajek, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. Submatrix localization via message passing. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(186):1–52, 2018. [6](#)
- [JHB15] Rico Jonschkowski, Sebastian Höfer, and Oliver Brock. Patterns for learning with side information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06429*, 2015. [1](#)
- [JMRT16] Adel Javanmard, Andrea Montanari, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. Phase transitions in semidefinite relaxations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(16):E2218–E2223, 2016. [1](#)
- [KACS17] Arun Kadavankandy, Konstantin Avrachenkov, Laura Cottatellucci, and Rajesh Sundaresan. The power of side-information in subgraph detection. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 66(7):1905–1919, 2017. [5](#)
- [KARG08] Anastasia Krithara, Massih R Amini, Jean-Michel Renders, and Cyril Goutte. Semi-supervised document classification with a mislabeling error model. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 30th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2008, Glasgow, UK, March 30-April 3, 2008. Proceedings 30*, pages 370–381. Springer, 2008. [5](#)
- [KBG18] Chiheon Kim, Afonso S Bandeira, and Michel X Goemans. Stochastic block model for hypergraphs: Statistical limits and a semidefinite programming approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02884*, 2018. [19](#), [20](#)
- [KMS16] Varun Kanade, Elchanan Mossel, and Tselil Schramm. Global and local information in clustering labeled block models. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(10):5906–5917, 2016. [5](#)
- [LS23] Shuangping Li and Tselil Schramm. Spectral clustering in the gaussian mixture block model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00979*, 2023. [13](#)
- [McS01] Frank McSherry. Spectral partitioning of random graphs. In *Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 529–537. IEEE, 2001. [4](#)
- [MNS15] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. Consistency thresholds for the planted bisection model. In *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 69–75, 2015. [1](#), [2](#)

- [MU17] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and computing: Randomization and probabilistic techniques in algorithms and data analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2017. 21, 51, 57
- [MX16] Elchanan Mossel and Jiaming Xu. Local algorithms for block models with side information. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 71–80, 2016. 5
- [NC16] Mark EJ Newman and Aaron Clauset. Structure and inference in annotated networks. *Nature communications*, 7(1):11863, 2016. 5
- [RS21] Miklos Racz and Anirudh Sridhar. Correlated stochastic block models: Exact graph matching with applications to recovering communities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22259–22273, 2021. 5
- [SN18] Hussein Saad and Aria Nosratinia. Community detection with side information: Exact recovery under the stochastic block model. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 12(5):944–958, 2018. 2, 3, 5
- [SN20] Hussein Saad and Aria Nosratinia. Recovering a single community with side information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(12):7939–7966, 2020. 2, 5
- [VEH20] Jesper E Van Engelen and Holger H Hoos. A survey on semi-supervised learning. *Machine Learning*, 109(2):373–440, 2020. 5
- [XKW⁺12] Zhiqiang Xu, Yiping Ke, Yi Wang, Hong Cheng, and James Cheng. A model-based approach to attributed graph clustering. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGMOD international conference on management of data*, pages 505–516, 2012. 5
- [YJCZ09] Tianbao Yang, Rong Jin, Yun Chi, and Shenghuo Zhu. Combining link and content for community detection: a discriminative approach. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 927–936, 2009. 5
- [YML13] Jaewon Yang, Julian McAuley, and Jure Leskovec. Community detection in networks with node attributes. In *2013 IEEE 13th international conference on data mining*, pages 1151–1156. IEEE, 2013. 5
- [YP14] Se-Young Yun and Alexandre Proutiere. Community detection via random and adaptive sampling. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 138–175. PMLR, 2014. 2
- [ZCY09] Yang Zhou, Hong Cheng, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. Graph clustering based on structural/attribute similarities. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 2(1):718–729, 2009. 5
- [ZLZ16] Yuan Zhang, Elizaveta Levina, and Ji Zhu. Community detection in networks with node features. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10:3153–3178, 2016. 5
- [ZMZ14] Pan Zhang, Cristopher Moore, and Lenka Zdeborová. Phase transitions in semisupervised clustering of sparse networks. *Physical Review E*, 90(5):052802, 2014. 5
- [ZVA10] Hugo Zanghi, Stevann Volant, and Christophe Ambroise. Clustering based on random graph model embedding vertex features. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 31(9):830–836, 2010. 5

- [ZWW21] Ning Zhang, Weina Wang, and Lele Wang. Attributed graph alignment. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1829–1834. IEEE, 2021. 5
- [ZZ16] Anderson Y Zhang and Harrison H Zhou. Minimax rates of community detection in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2016. 13

Appendices

A	Notation and Probability Facts	19
A.1	Notation	19
A.2	Standard Probability Lemmas	19
B	Omitted Proofs from Preliminaries	21
C	Entrywise Behavior of Eigenvectors	24
C.1	Entrywise Analysis for Eigenvectors for ROS	24
C.2	Entrywise Analysis of Eigenvectors for SBM	27
D	Proofs and Algorithms for ROS	29
D.1	Genie scores’ success with margin above the IT threshold	29
D.2	Failure of genie-aided estimation below the threshold	34
D.3	Statistical Achievability without Side Information	39
D.4	Spectral Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 1	43
D.5	Degree-Profiling Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 2	47
E	Proofs and Algorithms for SBM	50
E.1	Genie scores’ success with margin above the IT threshold	50
E.2	Failure of genie-aided estimation below the threshold	56
E.3	Spectral Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 3	63
E.4	Degree-Profiling Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 4	68

A Notation and Probability Facts

A.1 Notation

Let X and Y be any two collections of random variables, then we write $X \perp Y$ if they are independent. For any real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. Let $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ be the function defined by $\text{sgn}(x) = 1$ if $x \geq 0$ and $\text{sgn}(x) = -1$ if $x < 0$. We also extend the definition to vectors; let $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}^n$ be the map defined by applying the sign function componentwise. We define $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We use the standard notation $o(\cdot)$, $O(\cdot)$, $\omega(\cdot)$, $\Omega(\cdot)$, $\Theta(\cdot)$ etc. throughout the paper. For nonnegative sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ to mean $a_n \leq Cb_n$ for some constant $C > 0$. The notation \asymp is similar, hiding two constants in upper and lower bounds. Moreover, we denote $a_n \approx b_n$ as a shorthand for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = 1$.

For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $\|x\|_2 = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2)^{1/2}$, $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$, and $\|x\|_\infty = \max_i |x_i|$. Additionally, for any $i \in [n]$, we define x_{-i} as the vector in \mathbb{R}^n such that $(x_{-i})_j = x_j$ for $j \neq i$ and $(x_{-i})_i = 0$. For any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, M_i refers to its i^{th} row, which is a row vector, and $M_{\cdot i}$ refers to its i^{th} column, which is a column vector. The matrix spectral norm is $\|M\|_2 = \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Mx\|_2$, the matrix $2 \rightarrow \infty$ norm is $\|M\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Mx\|_\infty = \sup_i \|M_i\|_2$. Let $\text{zd} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be such that for any $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\text{zd}(A)_{ij} = A_{ij}$ if $i \neq j$ and 0 otherwise.

Finally, we will adopt the standard extended real line algebra and let $+\infty$ and $-\infty$ respectively be greater and less than any other real number. Moreover, for any two $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$, we consider the convention that $a - b = 0$ means $a = b$.

A.2 Standard Probability Lemmas

Lemma A.1. *Let $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The for any $t > 0$,*

$$\left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t^3}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2} \leq \mathbb{P}(Z \geq t) \leq \frac{1}{t\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-t^2/2}.$$

Lemma A.2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $p \in [0, 1]$ and $X \sim \text{Binom}(N, p)$. Then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] \leq \exp(Np(e^t - 1)).$$

Proof. By the moment generating function of the Binomial distribution

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] = (1 - p + pe^t)^N = (1 + p(e^t - 1))^N \leq e^{Np(e^t - 1)},$$

where in the last inequality we used that $(1 + x) \leq e^x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. \blacksquare

Finally, in our proofs, we will need to analyze a tail of weighted sum of binomials. Formally, we show the following lemma, which is a minor variant of [KBG18, Theorem 10].

Lemma A.3. *Let r be positive integers. Let c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r be real numbers such that $\min_{i \in [r]} c_i < 0$. Let X_i be the random variable distributed as the binomial distribution $\text{Binom}(N_i, p_i)$ where*

$$N_i = (1 + o(1))\rho_i n \quad \text{and} \quad p_i = \zeta_i \frac{\log n}{n}$$

for some positive constant (not depending on n) ρ_i and ζ_i . Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i X_i$. Then for any δ such that $\delta \leq \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq (1 + o(1))\delta \log n) \geq \exp(-(1 + o(1))I^* \log n),$$

where

$$I^* = \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(-t\delta + \sum_{i=1}^r \zeta_i \rho_i (1 - e^{-tc_i}) \right).$$

If $\delta > \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq (1 + o(1))\delta \log n) \geq n^{-o(1)} = n^{-I^* - o(1)}, \text{ with } I^* = 0.$$

Proof. The proof is directly adapted from [KBG18]. Let us begin by considering $\delta \leq \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i$. Let $x := (1 + o(1))\delta \log n$. Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \geq \prod_{i=1}^r \mathbb{P}(X_i = x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^r \binom{N_i}{x_i} p_i^{x_i} (1 - p_i)^{N_i - x_i}. \quad (9)$$

for any positive integers x_1, \dots, x_r such that $\sum_{i=1}^r c_i x_i \leq x$. Let $\phi(t) := -\delta t + \sum_{i=1}^r \zeta_i \rho_i (1 - e^{-tc_i})$. Then $\phi''(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^r c_i^2 \rho_i \zeta_i < 0$. Additionally, we have $\phi'(0) = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i - \delta \geq 0$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi'(t) = -\infty$, since $\min_{i \in [r]} c_i < 0$. Therefore, there exists a unique maximizer $t^* \geq 0$ such that $\phi'(t^*) = 0$.

We now let $\tau_i = \rho_i \zeta_i e^{-c_i t^*}$ and let $x_i = (1 - o(1))\tau_i \log n$ for $i \in [r]$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$\sum_{i=1}^r c_i x_i = (1 - o(1)) \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \tau_i \log n = (1 - o(1)) \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i e^{-c_i t^*} \log n = (1 - o(1))\delta \log n \leq x.$$

When $\ell \leq \sqrt{N}$, the binomial coefficient bound is

$$\binom{N}{\ell} \geq \frac{N^\ell}{4 \cdot \ell!} \text{ which gives us } \log \binom{N}{\ell} \geq \ell \log \left(\frac{eN}{\ell} \right) - \log(4e\sqrt{\ell}),$$

where in the last step we use The Stirling's approximation $\ell! \leq e\sqrt{\ell} \left(\frac{\ell}{e}\right)^\ell$. Note that $x_i = \Theta(\log n) = o(\sqrt{N_i})$, thus using the above simplification

$$\log \left(\binom{N_i}{x_i} p_i^{x_i} (1 - p_i)^{N_i - x_i} \right) \geq x_i \log \left(\frac{eN_i p_i}{(1 - p_i)x_i} \right) + N_i \log(1 - p_i) - \log(4e\sqrt{x_i}). \quad (10)$$

We simplify each term

$$\begin{aligned} x_i \log \left(\frac{eN_i p_i}{(1 - p_i)x_i} \right) &= (1 - o(1))\tau_i \log n \log \left(\frac{e\rho_i \zeta_i}{\tau_i} \right). \\ N_i \log(1 - p_i) &= -(1 + o(1))\rho_i n \cdot \frac{\zeta_i \log n}{n} = -(1 + o(1))\rho_i \zeta_i \log n. \\ \log(4e\sqrt{x_i}) &= o(\log n). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above with (9) and (10), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \geq \exp \left(-(1 + o(1)) \log n \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\rho_i \zeta_i - \tau_i \log \left(\frac{e\rho_i \zeta_i}{\tau_i} \right) \right) \right).$$

Since we had $\tau_i = \rho_i \zeta_i e^{-c_i t^*}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \left(\rho_i \zeta_i - \tau_i \log \left(\frac{e\rho_i \zeta_i}{\tau_i} \right) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\rho_i \zeta_i - \rho_i \zeta_i e^{-c_i t^*} (1 + c_i t^*) \right)$$

$$= -t^* \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i e^{-c_i t^*} + \sum_{i=1}^r \rho_i \zeta_i (1 - e^{-c_i t^*}) = -\delta t^* + \sum_{i=1}^r \rho_i \zeta_i (1 - e^{-c_i t^*}) = I^*,$$

where we used that $\delta = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i e^{-c_i t^*}$. Finally, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \geq \exp(-(1 + o(1))I^* \log n).$$

Finally, we consider the case where $\delta > \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i$. Then $\phi'(0) = -\delta + c_i \rho_i \zeta_i < 0$. Note that $\phi(t)$ being a strictly concave function, we conclude that $I^* = \sup_{t \geq 0} \phi(t) = \phi(0) = 0$. Now consider $\delta' = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i \rho_i \zeta_i < \delta$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq (1 + o(1))\delta \log n) \geq \mathbb{P}(X \leq (1 + o(1))\delta' \log n) \geq \exp(-o(\log n)) = n^{-o(1)},$$

where the second inequality follows from the already derived tail bound for δ' . \blacksquare

B Omitted Proofs from Preliminaries

In this section, we prove some preliminary lemmas. We first show that the sampling procedure of the community assignment vector σ^* in any of the models leads to communities with roughly ρ and $(1 - \rho)$ fraction of vertices.

Lemma B.1. *Let $\sigma^* \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ be a vector whose coordinates are i.i.d. with $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) = \rho$. Then, let $C_+ := \{i : \sigma_i^* = +1\}$ and $C_- := \{i : \sigma_i^* = -1\}$. Define the event E as follow.*

$$E := \{|C_+| - \rho n \leq \rho n^{2/3} \quad \text{and} \quad ||C_-| - (1 - \rho)n| \leq \rho n^{2/3}\}. \quad (11)$$

Then $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - o(1)$.

Proof. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^*) = \rho$ i.i.d., we have that $|C_+| = |\{i : \sigma_i^* = +1\}|$ follows $\text{Bin}(n, \rho)$. The Chernoff bound for binomial random variables [MU17, Theorem 4.4, Theorem 4.5] implies that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|C_+| - \mathbb{E}[|C_+|] \leq \delta n) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\delta^2 \mathbb{E}[|C_+|]/3).$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[|C_+|] = \rho n$. Choosing $\delta = \rho n^{-1/3} = o(1)$ (as $\rho > 0$ is a constant)

$$\mathbb{P}(|C_+| - \rho n \leq \rho n^{2/3}) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\rho^3 n^{1/3}/3) = 1 - 2 \exp(-\rho^3 n^{1/3}/3).$$

Since $n^{1/3} = \omega(\log n)$ and $\rho > 0$ is a constant,

$$\mathbb{P}\left((1 - n^{-1/3})\rho n \leq |C_+| \leq (1 + n^{-1/3})\rho n\right) \geq 1 - O(\exp(-10 \log n/3)) = 1 - O(n^{-3}),$$

which implies the lemma. \blacksquare

We next show the proof of Lemma 2.9, which establishes that the failure of some genie-aided estimator implies that the global MAP estimator also fails.

Proof of Lemma 2.9. We first consider the case when side information y (either BEC or BSC) is provided. Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{y}) : \exists i \in [n] \text{ such that } \hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} \text{ fails}\}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{y}) : \hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \text{ fails}\}$. To show the desired claim, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2$.

To this end, fix any instance $(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{S}_1$ of (A, σ^*, y) . Then by definition of the failure of the genie-aided estimators give below Equation (3), there exists $i \in [n]$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -\bar{\sigma}_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}, \bar{\sigma}_{-i}) > \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = \bar{\sigma}_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}, \bar{\sigma}_{-i}). \quad (12)$$

We now consider the community assignment vector $\sigma' \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ whose labeling agrees with $\bar{\sigma}$ except for the i^{th} label, for which $\sigma'_i = -\bar{\sigma}_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \sigma' \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}) &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{-i}^* = \sigma'_{-i}, \sigma_i^* = \sigma'_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{-i}^* = \sigma'_{-i} \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = \sigma'_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}, \sigma_{-i}^* = \sigma'_{-i}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{-i}^* = \bar{\sigma}_{-i} \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -\bar{\sigma}_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}, \sigma_{-i}^* = \bar{\sigma}_{-i}) \\ &\quad \text{(as } \sigma'_{-i} = \bar{\sigma}_{-i} \text{ but } \sigma'_i = -\bar{\sigma}_i) \\ &> \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{-i}^* = \bar{\sigma}_{-i} \mid A, y) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \bar{\sigma}_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}, \sigma_{-i}^* = \bar{\sigma}_{-i}) \quad \text{(using (12))} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{-i}^* = \bar{\sigma}_{-i}, \sigma_i^* = \bar{\sigma}_i \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \bar{\sigma} \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

By the definition of the MAP estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} = \arg \max_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \sigma \mid \bar{A}, \bar{y}) \neq \bar{\sigma}$, which implies $(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{S}_2$.

Finally, we consider the case when there is no side information. Define \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 similarly, but after dropping y .

- Case $\mathcal{P}_+ \not\equiv \mathcal{P}_-$ or $\rho \neq 1/2$. Consider any $(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and follow exactly the same argument used in in deriving (13) (after dropping the conditioning on y). This will lead to the conclusion that $(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{S}_2$, yielding $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2$.
- Case $\mathcal{P}_+ \equiv \mathcal{P}_-$ and $\rho = 1/2$. Consider any $(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Follow exactly the same argument as in (13) and conclude that $\mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \sigma' \mid \bar{A}) > \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \bar{\sigma} \mid \bar{A})$. Additionally, due to the symmetry, $\mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \bar{\sigma} \mid \bar{A}) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = -\bar{\sigma} \mid \bar{A})$. Combining these two, we obtain that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \notin \{\pm \sigma^*\}$, which implies $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ fails by Definition 2.7. Conclude $(\bar{A}, \bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{S}_2$, as desired.

We now derive the expressions for genie scores given by Lemma 2.10, without or with either type of side information.

Proof of Lemma 2.10. We first recall the definition of genie scores from (4). For any $i \in [n]$, we do the following analysis in each model of side information.

No side information:

$$\begin{aligned} z_i^* &= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) = \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A, \sigma_{-i}^* \mid \sigma_i^* = +1)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A, \sigma_{-i}^* \mid \sigma_i^* = -1)} \right) \\ &= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A \mid \sigma_i^* = +1, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A \mid \sigma_i^* = -1, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) \quad (\sigma_{-i}^* \text{ is independent of } \sigma_i^*) \\ &= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A_i \mid \sigma_i^* = +1, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A_i \mid \sigma_i^* = -1, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) \\ &\quad \text{(the likelihood of all but } i^{\text{th}} \text{ row is same conditioned under } \sigma_{-i}^* \text{ irrespective of } \sigma_i^*) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \log \left(\rho \cdot \prod_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij}) \cdot \prod_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \mathcal{Q}(A_{ij}) \Big/ (1 - \rho) \cdot \prod_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \mathcal{Q}(A_{ij}) \cdot \prod_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij}) \right) \\
&\quad \text{(due to the conditional independence of the entries and the law of GBM)} \\
&= \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

BEC side information: From (4), we have

$$z_i^* = \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right).$$

If $y_i = +1$ then we have $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*) = 0$, so that $z_i^* = +\infty$. Similarly, when $y_i = -1$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*) = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*) = 1$, which gives us $z_i^* = -\infty$. Finally, when $y_i = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i^* &= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) = \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y_i = 0, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y_i = 0, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) \\
&= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) \quad \text{(since } y_i = 0 \text{ and } \sigma_{-i}^* \text{ already subsumes } y_{-i}) \\
&= \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we used (4) and the genie score expression without side information.

BSC side information: Again by (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i^* &= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) = \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, y_i, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, y_i, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) \\
&\quad \text{(conditioned on } \sigma_{-i}^*, \text{ we have } \sigma_i^* \perp y_{-i}) \\
&= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A, y_i, \sigma_{-i}^* \mid \sigma_i^* = +1)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A, y_i, \sigma_{-i}^* \mid \sigma_i^* = -1)} \right) \\
&= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A, \sigma_{-i}^* \mid \sigma_i^* = +1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = +1)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1) \cdot \mathcal{L}(A, \sigma_{-i}^* \mid \sigma_i^* = -1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = -1)} \right) \\
&\quad \text{(conditioned on } \sigma_i^*, \text{ we have } y_i \perp A \text{ and } y_i \perp \sigma_{-i}^*) \\
&= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*) \cdot \mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = +1)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*) \cdot \mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = -1)} \right) \\
&= \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = -1 \mid A, \sigma_{-i}^*)} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = +1)}{\mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = -1)} \right) \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = +1)}{\mathbb{P}(y_i \mid \sigma_i^* = -1)} \right) = \log \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) \mathbf{1}[y_i = +1] + \log \left(\frac{\alpha_n}{1 - \alpha_n} \right) \mathbf{1}[y_i = -1] = \log \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) y_i.$$

Substituting this in (14) along with the definition of genie score without side information (4) and using the expression from without side information case

$$z_i^* = \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_+(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{\mathcal{Q}(A_{ij})}{\mathcal{P}_-(A_{ij})} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) + \log \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) y_i. \quad \blacksquare$$

C Entrywise Behavior of Eigenvectors

Abbe, Fan, Wang, and Zhong [AFWZ20] showed the powerful entrywise behavior of eigenvectors for a general ensemble of random matrices under certain assumptions. Their result [AFWZ20, Theorem 2.1] applies more generally to eigenspaces; below we note a special case of their result when the eigenspace has a single eigenvalue.

Suppose $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric random matrix and $A^* = \mathbb{E}[A]$. Let the eigenvalues of A be $|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n|$, and their associated eigenvectors be $\{u_j\}_{j \in [n]}$ (defined up to rotation if eigenvalues are repeated). Analogously for A^* , the eigenvalues and eigenvectors are $|\lambda_1^*| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n^*|$ and $\{u_j^*\}_{j \in [n]}$, respectively. For any fixed (λ_i^*, u_i^*) , define the eigengap quantity

$$\Delta^* := |\lambda_i^*| \wedge \min_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} |\lambda_i^* - \lambda_j^*|. \quad (15)$$

Here we define the eigengap for the special case of [AFWZ20, Theorem 2.1] applied to a single eigenvector, rather than for an eigenspace associated with consecutive eigenvalues. For more general definition when the eigenspace contains multiple eigenvalues, see [AFWZ20, Equation (2.1)]. We define $\kappa := |\lambda_i^*|/\Delta^*$, which is always bounded from below by 1. For a parameter $\gamma \geq 0$, consider the following four assumptions.

A1 (Incoherence). $\|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \gamma \Delta^*$.

A2 (Row- and column-wise independence). For any $m \in [n]$, the entries in the m^{th} row and column of A are independent from others, i.e. $\{A_{ij} : i = m \text{ or } j = m\} \perp \{A_{ij} : i \neq m, j \neq m\}$.

A3 (Spectral norm concentration). For some $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, suppose $\mathbb{P}(\|A - A^*\|_2 \leq \gamma \Delta^*) \geq 1 - \delta_0$.

A4 (Row concentration). Suppose $\varphi(x)$ is continuous and non-decreasing in \mathbb{R}_+ and $\varphi(x)/x$ is non-increasing for $x > 0$. Additionally $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $32\kappa \max\{\gamma, \varphi(\gamma)\} \leq 1$. Let there be some $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $m \in [n]$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|(A - A^*)_{m \cdot} w| \leq \Delta^* \|w\|_\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\|w\|_2}{\sqrt{n} \|w\|_\infty}\right)\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta_1}{n}.$$

Lemma C.1 (Theorem 2.1 [AFWZ20]). Under Assumptions 1 to 4, with probability at least $1 - \delta_0 - 2\delta_1$, we have

$$\min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| su_i - \frac{Au_i^*}{\lambda_i^*} \right\|_\infty \lesssim \kappa(\kappa + \varphi(1))(\gamma + \varphi(\gamma)) \|u_i^*\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma \|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\Delta^*}.$$

C.1 Entrywise Analysis for Eigenvectors for ROS

In this subsection, we will show that the top eigenvector of A sampled from ROS exhibits the entrywise behavior discussed above. More formally, we show the following lemma.

Lemma C.2. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Condition on σ^* satisfying E from (11). Let $A^* := \mathbb{E}[A \mid \sigma^*]$. Define (λ_1, u_1) and (λ_1^*, u_1^*) as above. Then with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| su_1 - \frac{Au_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n \log n}},$$

for some constant $C := C(\rho, a, b) > 0$.

According to the definition of the ROS model, we have $A = \text{zd} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} v^* v^{*\top} + W \right)$. The entire analysis is done conditioned on σ^* , so the only randomness in this analysis is from the added noise matrix W . We verify Assumptions 1-4 required to apply Lemma C.1 using similar ideas as [AFWZ20, Theorem 3.1].

First, observe that $A^* = \text{zd}(v^* v^{*\top} \sqrt{\log n/n})$. Let (λ_1^*, u_1^*) be the top eigenpair. The corresponding eigengap quantity defined in (15) is $\Delta^* := |\lambda_1^*| \wedge \min_{2 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_1^* - \lambda_i^*|$. We begin by characterizing u_1^* , λ_1^* , and Δ^* .

Lemma C.3. *Let (λ_1^*, u_1^*) be the top eigenpair of A^* . Then*

$$u_1^* = \frac{(1 + o(1))v^*}{\|v^*\|_2} \quad \lambda_1^* = (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|v^*\|_2^2, \quad \Delta^* \approx |\lambda_1^*| = \Theta(\sqrt{n \log n}).$$

Proof. Note that $v^* v^{*\top} \sqrt{\log n/n}$ is a rank-1 matrix. Let $|\tilde{\lambda}_1| \geq \dots \geq |\tilde{\lambda}_n|$ be its eigenvalues. Then we have that only non-zero eigenvalue is $\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|v^*\|_2^2 = \Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})$ and the corresponding normalized eigenvector is $v^*/\|v^*\|_2$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_2 = \dots = \tilde{\lambda}_n = 0$. After zeroing out the diagonal, the entries of the corresponding eigenvector $v^*/\|v^*\|_2$ will be perturbed by a factor of $(1 + o(1))$ since the diagonal correction is of the order of $O(\sqrt{\log n/n})$. Hence, we obtain $u_1^* = (1 + o(1))v^*/\|v^*\|_2$. By Weyl's inequality, we calculate the effect of zeroing out the diagonal on the eigenvalue:

$$|\lambda_1^* - \tilde{\lambda}_1| \leq \left\| v^* v^{*\top} \sqrt{\log n/n} - \text{zd} \left(v^* v^{*\top} \sqrt{\log n/n} \right) \right\|_2 = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda_1^* = \tilde{\lambda}_1 + O(\sqrt{\log n/n}) = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|v^*\|_2^2 + O(\sqrt{\log n/n}) = (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|v^*\|_2^2 \asymp \sqrt{n \log n}.$$

Applying Weyl's inequality, for $2 \leq i \leq n$, we get $|\lambda_i^*| = O(\sqrt{\log n/n})$. Hence, $\Delta^* \approx |\lambda_1^*| \asymp \sqrt{n \log n}$. ■

Proof of Lemma C.2. We will let $\gamma := \frac{3\sqrt{n}}{\Delta^*} = 1/\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$, due to Lemma C.3. Let us now verify Assumption 1. For any $i \in C_+$

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{i.}^*\|_2 &= \sqrt{|C_+^{-i}| \cdot a^4 \frac{\log n}{n} + |C_-| \cdot a^2 b^2 \frac{\log n}{n}} \\ &= \sqrt{(1 + o(1))\rho n \cdot a^4 \frac{\log n}{n} + (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n \cdot a^2 b^2 \frac{\log n}{n}} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from using Lemma B.1. Similarly, also for any $i \in C_-$

$$\|A_{i.}^*\|_2 = \sqrt{|C_+| \cdot a^2 b^2 \frac{\log n}{n} + |C_-^{-i}| \cdot b^4 \frac{\log n}{n}} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n}).$$

Overall, combining these two we obtain $\|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n}) \leq 3\sqrt{n} = \gamma\Delta^*$, verifying Assumption 1. Assumption 2 on row and column-wise independence trivially holds due to the i.i.d. noise matrix W (up to symmetry).

To verify Assumption 3 on spectral norm concentration, first observe that $A - A^* = W$, where W is the zero diagonal symmetric matrix with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ entries. Applying [BBS17, Proposition 3.3], we have that with probability at least $1 - e^{-n/2}$,

$$\|A - A^*\|_2 = \|W\|_2 \leq 3\sqrt{n} = \gamma\Delta^*,$$

Therefore, Assumption 3 holds with $\delta_0 = e^{-n/2}$. We now turn our attention to Assumption 4. Let us choose $\varphi(x) = cx$ for some constant $c > 0$ which we will decide later. Clearly, φ is continuous, non-decreasing in \mathbb{R}_+ with $\varphi(0) = 0$, and $\varphi(x)/x = c$ is also non-increasing in $(0, \infty)$. Letting $\kappa = 1$, it is straightforward to see that $32\kappa \max\{\gamma, \varphi(\gamma)\} = 32\gamma \max\{1, c\} = o(1) \leq 1$, as $\gamma = o(1)$.

We now verify the row concentration part of the assumption. Using Lemma C.3, we have $\Delta^* \approx |\lambda_1^*| \geq \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\}\sqrt{n \log n}$. Therefore, it holds that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a sufficiently large n such that $\Delta^* \geq (1 - \epsilon) \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\}\sqrt{n \log n}$. Moreover, for any fixed $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, one can say that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^* \|w\|_\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\|w\|_2}{\sqrt{n} \|w\|_\infty}\right) &\geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon) \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{n \log n} \cdot \|w\|_\infty \cdot c \|w\|_2}{\sqrt{n} \|w\|_\infty} \\ &= (1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{\log n} \|w\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, for any fixed $m \in [n]$, $(A - A^*)_{m \cdot w} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \|w_{-m}\|_2^2)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(|(A - A^*)_{m \cdot w}| \leq \Delta^* \|w\|_\infty \varphi\left(\frac{\|w\|_2}{\sqrt{n} \|w\|_\infty}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(|(A - A^*)_{m \cdot w}| \leq (1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{\log n} \|w\|_2\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{N}(0, \|w_{-m}\|_2^2)| \leq (1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{\log n} \|w\|_2\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{N}(0, \|w\|_2^2)| \leq (1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{\log n} \|w\|_2\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{N}(0, 1)| \leq (1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{\log n}\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2e^{-(1-\epsilon)^2 c^2 \max\{\rho a^2, (1-\rho)b^2\}^2 \log n/2}}{(1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{2n^{-(1-\epsilon)^2 c^2 \max\{\rho a^2, (1-\rho)b^2\}^2/2}}{(1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{2\pi \log n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, letting

$$\delta_1 = \frac{2n^{1-(1-\epsilon)^2 c^2 \max\{\rho a^2, (1-\rho)b^2\}^2/2}}{(1 - \epsilon)c \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\} \sqrt{2\pi \log n}}, \quad \text{and setting } c = \frac{2}{(1 - \epsilon) \max\{\rho a^2, (1 - \rho)b^2\}},$$

we get $\delta_1 = o(1)$. Finally, applying Lemma C.1, we obtain that with probability $1 - \delta_0 - 2\delta_1 = 1 - o(1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| u_1 - \frac{A u_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} \right\|_\infty &\lesssim \kappa(\kappa + \varphi(1))(\gamma + \varphi(\gamma)) \|u_1^*\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma \|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\Delta^*} \\ &\leq (1 + c)(1 + c)\gamma \|u_1^*\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma \|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\Delta^*} \quad (\text{since } \kappa = 1 \text{ and } \varphi(x) = cx) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})}. \end{aligned}$$

We used $\gamma = \frac{1}{\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})}$, $\|u_1^*\|_\infty = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$, $\|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = \sqrt{\log n}$, and $\Delta^* = \sqrt{n \log n}$. \blacksquare

C.2 Entrywise Analysis of Eigenvectors for SBM

In this subsection, we show that the similar behavior also holds for eigenvectors of A sampled from the SBM. More specifically, we restrict ourselves to the case when the expectation A^* (after the appropriate diagonal correction) has rank 2. This is achieved when

$$\frac{a_1}{b} \neq \frac{b}{a_2}.$$

In this case, the eigenvectors that correspond to the top two leading eigenvalues (in magnitude) exhibit the entrywise behavior, which is formalized in the following lemma.

Lemma C.4. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$ such that $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds and let $A := \mathbb{E}[A \mid \sigma^*]$. Define $\{(\lambda_i, u_i)\}_{i \in [n]}$ and $\{(\lambda_i^*, u_i^*)\}_{i \in [n]}$ as above. Then with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$*

$$\min_{s_1 \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| s_1 u_1 - \frac{A u_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n} \log \log n} \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{s_2 \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| s_2 u_2 - \frac{A u_2^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n} \log \log n},$$

for some constant $C := C(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$.

This again requires verifying Assumptions 1-4 for the top two eigenpairs. We note that [DGMS22a] showed a similar lemma for the special case of Planted Dense Subgraph (PDS), and our proof just generalizes their results. In order to do this, we first note down a couple of important lemmas. The first one directly establishes the spectral norm concentration (Assumption 3).

Lemma C.5. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Sample $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. Let $A^* := \mathbb{E}[A \mid \sigma^*]$, then there exists a constant $c_1 = c_1(\rho, a_1, a_2, b) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|A - A^*\|_2 \leq c_1 \sqrt{\log n}) \geq 1 - n^{-3}.$$

Proof. The lemma is a special case of [HWX16, Theorem 5], invoking the theorem with $c = 3$. ■

The next lemma establishes that the leading two eigenvalues of A^* , in the rank-2 case, are different in the following sense.

Lemma C.6. *Consider $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$ such that $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Condition on a labelling σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. Let $A^* := \mathbb{E}[A \mid \sigma^*]$. Then the top two eigenvalues in magnitude are given by $\lambda_1^* = (1 + o(1))\theta_1 \log n$ and $\lambda_2^* = (1 + o(1))\theta_2 \log n$, for some non-zero constants $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$ in terms of (ρ, a_1, a_2, b) . As a consequence, $|\lambda_1^* - \lambda_2^*| = \Theta(\log n)$.*

Proof. The proof follows similar arguments as the proof of [DGMS22a, Lemma 3.2]. We note that they prove the special case of the PDS when $a_2 = b$, but the same argument directly generalizes as long as $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$. ■

Proof of Lemma C.4. The entire analysis is done conditioned on σ^* such that E holds. We will verify Assumptions 1-4 for the leading two eigenpairs. First note that after adding a diagonal matrix D , whose entries are $O(\frac{\log n}{n})$, the matrix $A^* + D$ has rank 2, and its remaining eigenvalues satisfy $\tilde{\lambda}_3 = \dots = \tilde{\lambda}_n = 0$, where $|\tilde{\lambda}_1| \geq \dots \geq |\tilde{\lambda}_n|$. Applying Weyl's inequality for $3 \leq i \leq n$,

$$|\lambda_i^* - \tilde{\lambda}_i| = |\lambda_i^*| \leq \|D\|_2 = O(\log n/n). \tag{16}$$

By the definition of the eigengap quantity in (15) for both the eigenvalues respectively

$$\Delta_1^* := |\lambda_1^*| \wedge \min_{i \neq 1} |\lambda_i^* - \lambda_1^*| = \Theta(\log n) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_2^* := |\lambda_2^*| \wedge \min_{i \neq 2} |\lambda_i^* - \lambda_2^*| = \Theta(\log n),$$

where we used (16) and Lemma C.6. We also define $\kappa_1 := \frac{|\lambda_1^*|}{\Delta_1^*}$ and $\kappa_2 := \frac{|\lambda_2^*|}{\Delta_2^*}$. We first make an important observation, that to verify Assumptions 1-4 for both eigenpairs separately, it suffices to just verify them with Δ^* and κ such that

$$\Delta^* := \min\{\Delta_1^*, \Delta_2^*\} = \Theta(\log n) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa := \max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\}$$

To verify Assumption 1, first let $\tau = 2 \max\{a_1, a_2, b\}$. Fixing any $i \in C_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_i\|_2 &= \sqrt{|C_+^{-i}| \left(\frac{a_1 \log n}{n}\right)^2 + |C_-| \left(\frac{b \log n}{n}\right)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{(1 + o(1))\rho \left(\frac{a_1^2 \log^2 n}{n}\right) + (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho) \left(\frac{b^2 \log^2 n}{n}\right)} \leq \frac{\tau \log n}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, even for $i \in C_-$

$$\|A_i\|_2 = \sqrt{|C_+| \left(\frac{b \log n}{n}\right)^2 + |C_-^{-i}| \left(\frac{a_2 \log n}{n}\right)^2} \leq \frac{\tau \log n}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Combining both bounds, we obtain

$$\|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \frac{\tau \log n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

We now define the parameter γ in terms of Δ^* and the constant c_1 from Lemma C.5:

$$\gamma \triangleq \frac{c_1 \sqrt{\log n}}{\Delta^*} = \frac{c_1 \sqrt{\log n}}{\Theta(\log n)} = o(1).$$

Then $\gamma \Delta^* = c_1 \sqrt{\log n} = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$, which dominates $\tau \log n / \sqrt{n}$. This implies $\|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \gamma \Delta^*$, verifying Assumption 1. Assumption 2 trivially holds due to the conditional independence of the entries of A , conditioned on σ^* . By Lemma C.5, Assumption 3 holds with $\delta_0 = n^{-3}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\|A - A^*\|_2 \leq \gamma \Delta^*) \geq 1 - n^{-3}.$$

To verify Assumption 4, we let

$$\varphi(x) \triangleq \frac{(2\tau + 4) \log n}{\Delta^* (1 \vee \log(1/x))} \quad \text{for } x > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(0) = 0.$$

It is straightforward to verify that φ satisfies the desired property stated in Assumption 4 and $\varphi(\gamma) = O(1/\log \log n)$. Also, $\kappa = O(1)$ since both $\Delta_1^* \asymp \Delta_2^* \asymp \log n$, and by Lemma C.6, also $|\lambda_1^*| \asymp |\lambda_2^*| \asymp \log n$. This implies $32\kappa \max\{\gamma, \varphi(\gamma)\} = o(1)$ verifying the first part of the assumption.

To verify the row concentration part, we simply apply [AFWZ20, Lemma 7] with $p = \tau \log n / n$ and $\alpha = 4/\tau$. We obtain that for a fixed vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $m \in [n]$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|(A - A^*)_{m \cdot} w\right| \leq \frac{(2\tau + 4) \log n}{\max\left\{1, \log\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\|w\|_\infty}{\|w\|_2}\right)\right\}} \|w\|_\infty\right) \geq 1 - 2n^{-4}.$$

Substituting the definition of Δ^* and $\varphi(\cdot)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|(A - A^*)_{m \cdot} w| \leq \Delta^* \|w\|_\infty \varphi \left(\frac{\|w\|_2}{\sqrt{n} \|w\|_\infty} \right) \right) \geq 1 - 2n^{-4},$$

which verifies Assumption 4 with $\delta_1 = 2n^{-3}$. Finally, applying Lemma C.1, with probability $1 - \delta_0 - 2\delta_1 = 1 - O(n^{-3})$,

$$\min_{s_1 \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| s_1 u_1 - \frac{A u_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} \right\|_\infty \lesssim \kappa(\kappa + \varphi(1))(\gamma + \varphi(\gamma)) \|u_1^*\|_\infty + \frac{\gamma \|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\Delta^*} = O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n} \log \log n} \right).$$

We used $\gamma = \frac{1}{\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})}$, $\varphi(\gamma) = O(\frac{1}{\log \log n})$, $\|u_1^*\|_\infty = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$, $\|A^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = O(\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}})$, and $\Delta^* = \Theta(\log n)$.

Similarly, with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$, we have

$$\min_{s_2 \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| s_2 u_2 - \frac{A u_2^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right\|_\infty = O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n} \log \log n} \right).$$

The proof is complete by a union bound. \blacksquare

D Proofs and Algorithms for ROS

In Appendix D.1, we first show that the genie scores succeed with margin above the IT threshold. In Appendix D.2, we show some genie-aided estimator fails below the threshold, while in Appendix D.3, we show statistical achievability above the threshold when side information is not present, which will be crucially required to show the optimality of spectral algorithm. Finally, in Appendices D.4 and D.5, we provide algorithms and the proof of main results.

D.1 Genie scores' success with margin above the IT threshold

We start by noting the form of genie scores when no side information is present.

Lemma D.1. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Then for any $i \in [n]$*

$$\begin{aligned} z_i^* &= (a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(a \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + b \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \right) + \frac{\log n}{2n} (|C_+^{-i}|(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + |C_-^{-i}|(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) \\ &\quad + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, conditioned on the event E from (11), the genie score vector $z^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be written as

$$z^* = (a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} A v^* + \left(\gamma + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) \right) \mathbf{1}_n + o(1),$$

where $\gamma = (\rho(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) \log n / 2$ and v^* is given by (2).

Proof. For ease of notation, we denote $f(n) = \sqrt{\log n/n}$. First, note that ROS is a special case of GBM with $\mathcal{P}_+ = \mathcal{N}(a^2 f(n), 1)$, $\mathcal{P}_- = \mathcal{N}(b^2 f(n), 1)$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{N}(ab f(n), 1)$. Applying Lemma 2.10 for this special case, we obtain the Genie score expressions; for any $i \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i^* &= \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(e^{-\frac{(A_{ij} - a^2 f(n))^2}{2}} / e^{-\frac{(A_{ij} - ab f(n))^2}{2}} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(e^{-\frac{(A_{ij} - ab f(n))^2}{2}} / e^{-\frac{(A_{ij} - b^2 f(n))^2}{2}} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) \\
&= \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} \left(\frac{(A_{ij} - ab f(n))^2}{2} - \frac{(A_{ij} - a^2 f(n))^2}{2} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \left(\frac{(A_{ij} - b^2 f(n))^2}{2} - \frac{(A_{ij} - ab f(n))^2}{2} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) \\
&= (a^2 - ab)f(n) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + (ab - b^2)f(n) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \\
&\quad + \frac{f^2(n)}{2} (|C_+^{-i}|(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + |C_-^{-i}|(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) \\
&= (a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(a \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + b \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\log n}{2n} (|C_+^{-i}|(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + |C_-^{-i}|(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right). \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

Conditioned on E , simplifying a term from (17)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\log n}{2n} (|C_+^{-i}|(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + |C_-^{-i}|(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) \\
&= \frac{\log n}{2n} (\rho n(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)n \cdot (b^4 - a^2 b^2)) + o(1) \\
&= (\rho(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) \log n / 2 + o(1) \\
&= \gamma + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, substituting this in (17), we obtain that for any $i \in [n]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i^* &= (a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(a \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + b \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \right) + \gamma + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) + o(1). \\
&= (a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} A_i \cdot v^* + \gamma + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Writing the same for all $i \in [n]$ in vector notation, we obtain

$$z^* = (a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} A v^* + \left(\gamma + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - \rho} \right) \right) \mathbf{1}_n + o(1). \quad \blacksquare$$

Roughly speaking, these genie scores in absolute value are on a $\log n$ scale for both ROS and SBM. This is when the exact recovery becomes statistically possible and explains the scaling choices for both models. We next analyze the distribution of the genie scores from two different communities (still without side information).

Lemma D.2. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. Then $z_i^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_n^+, \sigma_n^2)$ and $z_i^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_n^-, \sigma_n^2)$ for any $i \in C_+$ and $i \in C_-$ respectively, where*

$$\mu_n^+ = \frac{\Psi \log n}{2} + O(1), \quad \mu_n^- = \frac{-\Psi \log n}{2} + O(1), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_n^2 = \Psi \log n + o(1).$$

Proof. Recall that, by Lemma D.1, we have $z_i^* = (a - b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}A_i.v^* + \gamma + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) + o(1)$ for any $i \in [n]$. Since the entries of $A_i.$ are independent Gaussians conditioned on σ^* , it follows that z_i^* is a Gaussian random variable. Now consider the following calculation of the mean and variance of z_i^* , in which we substitute the community sizes under the event E . For any $i \in C_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^+ &= \mathbb{E}[z_i^*] = (a - b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \mathbb{E}[A_i.v^*] + \gamma + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) + o(1) \\ &= (a - b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(\sum_{i \in C_+^i} a^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} v_i^* + \sum_{i \in C_-} ab \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} v_i^* \right) + \gamma + O(1) \\ &= (a - b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(|C_+^i| a^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \cdot a + |C_-| ab \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \cdot b \right) + \gamma + O(1) \\ &= (a - b) \frac{\log n}{n} (\rho n a^3 + (1 - \rho)n \cdot ab^2) + \gamma + O(1) \\ &= (a - b)(\rho a^3 + (1 - \rho)ab^2) \log n + (\rho(a^2b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)(b^4 - a^2b^2)) \log n/2 + O(1) \\ &= \left(\rho \left(a^3(a - b) + \frac{a^2b^2 - a^4}{2} \right) + (1 - \rho) \left(ab^2(a - b) + \frac{b^4 - a^2b^2}{2} \right) \right) \log n + O(1) \\ &= \left(\frac{\rho a^2}{2} (a - b)^2 + \frac{(1 - \rho)b^2}{2} (a - b)^2 \right) \log n + O(1) = \frac{\Psi}{2} \log n + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

A very similar calculation gives that for any $i \in C_-$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n^- &= (a - b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \mathbb{E}[A_i.v^*] + \gamma + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) + o(1) \\ &= (a - b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(\sum_{i \in C_+} abf \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} v_i^* + \sum_{i \in C_-^i} b^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} v_i^* \right) + \gamma + O(1) \\ &= (a - b)(\rho a^2b + (1 - \rho)b^3) \log n + (\rho(a^2b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)(b^4 - a^2b^2)) \log n/2 + O(1) \\ &= \left(\rho \left(a^2b(a - b) + \frac{a^2b^2 - a^4}{2} \right) + (1 - \rho) \left(b^3(a - b) + \frac{b^4 - a^2b^2}{2} \right) \right) \log n + O(1) \\ &= - \left(\frac{\rho a^2}{2} (a - b)^2 + \frac{(1 - \rho)b^2}{2} (a - b)^2 \right) \log n + O(1) = -\frac{\Psi}{2} \log n + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $i \in [n]$ (irrespective of its community assignment)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_n^2 &= \frac{(a-b)^2 \log n}{n} \cdot \text{Var}[A_i v^*] = \frac{(a-b)^2 \log n}{n} \left(\sum_{i \in C_+^{-i}} (v_i^*)^2 + \sum_{i \in C_-^{-i}} (v_i^*)^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{(a-b)^2 \log n}{n} (a^2 |C_+^{-i}| + b^2 |C_-^{-i}|) = \frac{(a-b)^2 \log n}{n} (\rho n a^2 + (1-\rho) n b^2) + o(1) \\
&= (a-b)^2 (\rho a^2 + (1-\rho) b^2) \log n + o(1) = \Psi \log n + o(1). \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show that the genie scores succeed with $\Omega(\log n)$ margin above the threshold.

Lemma D.3. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Condition on a labeling σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n be parameterized as (1) for $\beta \geq 0$. Let z^* be the genie score vector for the corresponding model of side information. Then above the information-theoretic threshold as specified in Table 1, there exists some constant $\delta := \delta(\rho, a, b, \beta) > 0$ such that, for any $i \in [n]$:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

Proof. Let $Z_+ \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_n^+, \sigma_n^2)$ and $Z_- \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_n^-, \sigma_n^2)$, where μ_n^+, μ_n^- , and σ_n^2 are defined in Lemma D.2 and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Moreover, $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ denotes the standard normal random variable.

No side information: In this case, by Lemma D.2, for any $i \in C_+$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(Z_+ < \delta \log n) = \mathbb{P}\left(Z < \frac{-\mu_n^+ + \delta \log n}{\sigma_n}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{\mu_n^+ - \delta \log n}{\sigma_n}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 - \delta + o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $i \in C_-$ by Lemma D.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(-Z_- < \delta \log n) = \mathbb{P}(Z_- > -\delta \log n) = \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{-\mu_n^- - \delta \log n}{\sigma_n}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 - \delta + o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that the above Gaussian tail is bounded by $o(n^{-1})$ for some $\delta > 0$. Towards this, for any constant $\delta < \Psi/2$, observe that

$$\frac{(\Psi/2 - \delta + o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}} = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n}) = \omega(1).$$

Applying Lemma A.1 then implies that, for a sufficiently large n :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 - \delta + o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(\Psi/2 - \delta + o(1))^2 \log n}{2(\Psi + o(1))}\right) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{(\Psi - 2\delta + o(1))^2 \log n}{8\Psi}\right) = n^{-\frac{(\Psi - 2\delta)^2}{8\Psi} + o(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Above the information theoretic threshold, we have $\Psi/8 > 1$ from Table 1. Thus, we can choose $\delta(\rho, a, b) > 0$ such that $\frac{(\Psi-2\delta)^2}{8\Psi} > 1$. This finally implies for any $i \in [n]$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

BEC side information: We now let z^* be the genie score vector with BEC side information and switch to z' to denote the Genie score vector without side information. By Lemma 2.10,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = 0) \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = 0) + \mathbb{P}(y_i = \sigma_i^*) \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = \sigma_i^*) \\ &= \epsilon_n \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' < \delta \log n) \leq n^{-\beta} \cdot n^{-\frac{(\Psi-2\delta)^2}{8\Psi} + o(1)} \quad (\text{from the previous case}) \\ &= n^{-\frac{(\Psi-2\delta)^2}{8\Psi} - \beta + o(1)} \end{aligned}$$

When above the information-theoretic threshold, from Table 1, we have $\Psi/8 > 1 - \beta$. Hence we can choose $\delta := \delta(\rho, a, b, \beta)$ sufficiently small such that $\frac{(\Psi-2\delta)^2}{8\Psi} > 1 - \beta$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) = o(n^{-(1-\beta)-\beta}) = o(n^{-1}).$$

BSC side information: Let z^* and z' denote the genie score vector for BSC and no side information respectively. By Lemma 2.10, recall that $z^* = z' + \log(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{\alpha_n})y = z' + (\beta \log n)y$, as $\log(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{\alpha_n}) = \log(n^\beta) = \beta \log n$. Now for any constant $\delta > 0$ and any $i \in C_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}(z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = +1) + \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1) \mathbb{P}(z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = -1) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(z_i' + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + \alpha_n \mathbb{P}(z_i' - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(Z_+ + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + \alpha_n \mathbb{P}(Z_+ - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_+ + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + n^{-\beta} \cdot \mathbb{P}(Z_+ - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 + \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) + n^{-\beta} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 - \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) \\ &:= P_1(\delta) + P_2(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $i \in C_-$ and constant $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1) \mathbb{P}(-z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = -1) + \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}(-z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = +1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1) \mathbb{P}(z_i^* > -\delta \log n \mid y_i = -1) + \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}(z_i^* > -\delta \log n \mid y_i = +1) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(z_i' - \beta \log n > -\delta \log n) + \alpha_n \mathbb{P}(z_i' + \beta \log n > -\delta \log n) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(Z_- - \beta \log n > -\delta \log n) + \alpha_n \mathbb{P}(Z_- + \beta \log n > -\delta \log n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_- > (\beta - \delta) \log n) + n^{-\beta} \cdot \mathbb{P}(Z_- > -(\beta + \delta) \log n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 + \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) + n^{-\beta} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 - \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) \\ &= P_1(\delta) + P_2(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

From the above two equations, it suffices to show that whenever the parameters satisfy the IT threshold conditions, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $P_1(\delta) = o(n^{-1})$ and $P_2(\delta) = o(n^{-1})$. We first show that there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $P_1(\delta_1) = o(n^{-1})$. It is straightforward

to see that above the information theoretic limit, we always have $\frac{(\Psi+2\beta)^2}{8\Psi} > 1$. Moreover, for any constant $\delta < \Psi/2 + \beta$

$$\frac{(\Psi/2 + \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}} = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n}) = \omega(1).$$

Applying the Gaussian tail bound from Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(\delta) &= \mathbb{P} \left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 + \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}} \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{-(\Psi/2 + \beta - \delta - o(1))^2 \log n}{2(\Psi + o(1))} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{-(\Psi + 2\beta - 2\delta - o(1))^2 \log n}{8\Psi} \right) = n^{-\frac{(\Psi+2\beta-2\delta-o(1))^2}{8\Psi}}. \end{aligned}$$

Above the IT threshold, since $(\Psi+2\beta)^2/8\Psi > 1$, one can choose $\delta_1(\rho, a, b)$ sufficiently small such that $P_1(\delta_1) = o(n^{-1})$.

We now show that there exists $\delta_2 > 0$ small enough such that $P_2(\delta_2) = o(n^{-1})$.

Case 1: ($\Psi \leq 2\beta$). In this case, the threshold is governed by $\beta > 1$. For any $\delta_2 > 0$

$$P_2(\delta_2) = n^{-\beta} \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(Z > \frac{\Psi/2 - \beta - \delta_2 - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}} \right) \leq n^{-\beta} = o(n^{-1}).$$

Case 2: ($\Psi > 2\beta$). In this case, $\Psi/2 > \beta$ and for any constant $\delta < \Psi/2 - \beta$

$$\frac{(\Psi/2 - \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}} = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n}) = \omega(1).$$

Using the Gaussian tail bound from Lemma A.1, for any constant $\delta < \Psi/2 - \beta$

$$\begin{aligned} P_2(\delta) &= n^{-\beta} \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(Z > \frac{(\Psi/2 - \beta - \delta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}} \right) \leq n^{-\beta} \exp \left(\frac{-(\Psi/2 - \beta - \delta - o(1))^2 \log n}{2\Psi + o(1)} \right) \\ &= n^{-\beta} \exp \left(\frac{-(\Psi - 2\beta - 2\delta - o(1))^2 \log n}{8\Psi} \right) = n^{-\beta} n^{-\frac{(\Psi-2\beta-2\delta-o(1))^2}{8\Psi}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, above the IT threshold, the condition $(\Psi+2\beta)^2/8\Psi > 1$ also implies $(\Psi-2\beta)^2/8\Psi > 1 - \beta$. Therefore, one can choose $\delta_2(\rho, a, b, \beta) > 0$ sufficiently small such that $(\Psi-2\beta-2\delta_2)^2/8\Psi > 1 - \beta$, which gives us

$$P_2(\delta_2) \leq n^{-\beta} o(n^{-(1-\beta)}) = o(n^{-1}).$$

Finally, choosing $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, we have that both $P_1(\delta_1)$ and $P_2(\delta_2)$ are $o(n^{-1})$. ■

D.2 Failure of genie-aided estimation below the threshold

Our proof involves similar techniques from [HWX17]. We first need a helper lemma along the way.

Lemma D.4. *Consider $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E holds. Fix any set $T \subset C_+$ or $T \subset C_-$ such that $|T| = O(n/\log^{10} n)$. Then for any $i \in [n]$, let us define $Y_i = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in T} A_{ij}$.*

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall i \in [n] : |Y_i| \leq 1) \geq 1 - O(n^{-3}).$$

We show the proof of this lemma at the end of this subsection. We now show our desired claim; below the IT threshold, there is some $i \in [n]$, such that its genie score has the incorrect sign. Formally,

Lemma D.5. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and a, b such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$ and condition on σ^* such that E from (11) holds. For any $\beta \geq 0$, we optionally sample $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ for ϵ_n and α_n parameterized according to (1). Let z^* be the genie score vector for the corresponding model. Then below the information-theoretic threshold given by Table 1,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < -\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Proof. We have conditioned on σ^* such that E happens. First consider the following general analysis with or without side information. Fix any set $T \subseteq C_+$ such that $|T| = \left\lceil \frac{\rho n}{\log^{10} n} \right\rceil$. For each $i \in T$, define the following random variables.

$$X_i := a(a - b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in T} A_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad R_i := z_i^* - X_i.$$

Essentially, we defined R_i to be the genie score for the i^{th} label but without the contribution of $\{A_{ij}\}_{j \in T}$. By using Lemma D.4 for the set T since it is a fixed set with $|T| = \Theta(n/\log^{10} n)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall i \in [n] : |X_i| \leq |a(a - b)|) \geq 1 - O(n^{-3}). \quad (18)$$

This is simple to see using the genie score form in Lemma D.1 when no side information is present. And, also in the cases of either type of side information, Lemma 2.10 implies that z_i^* only depends on $\{A_{ij} : j \in T\}$ through the sum X_i . Therefore, subtracting off X_i from z_i^* , the resultant random variable R_i only depends on $\{A_{ij} : j \in [n] \setminus T\}$, and y_i when considering side information. Observe that for any $i, \ell \in T$ with $i \neq \ell$, the sets $\{A_{ij} : j \in [n] \setminus T\}$ and $\{A_{\ell j} : j \in [n] \setminus T\}$ are disjoint. Therefore, condition on σ^* , the random variables $\{R_i : i \in T\}$ are independent. This follows from conditional independence of the entries of A , and the side information labels y_i when they are present.

Therefore, if we manage to show that below the IT threshold for the corresponding model of side information given by Table 1, there is some constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : R_i \leq \frac{-2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}, \quad (19)$$

then the following analysis directly implies the lemma.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : z_i^* < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : R_i + X_i < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : R_i < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n} + O(1)\right) - o(1) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : R_i < \frac{-2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) - o(1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\forall i \in T : R_i \geq -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) - o(1) \\
&= 1 - \prod_{i \in T} \left(1 - \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right)\right) - o(1) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} 1 - (1 - n^{-1+\varepsilon})^{|T|} - o(1) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} 1 - \exp(-|T|n^{-1+\varepsilon}) - o(1) \\
&= 1 - \exp(-n^{1-1+\varepsilon+o(1)}) - o(1) = 1 - \exp(-n^{\varepsilon+o(1)}) \\
&= 1 - o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (18), (b) from (18), and (c) by using the fact that $(1+x) \leq e^x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We now show (18) holds in each case.

No side information: By Lemma D.1 and the way we defined R_i , for any $i \in T$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_i := & (a-b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \left(a \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus T} A_{ij} + b \sum_{j \in C_-} A_{ij} \right) \\
& + \frac{\log n}{2n} (|C_+^{-i}|(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + |C_-|(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that each R_i is a Gaussian random variable and follows the same distribution. Let it be denoted by $R \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. We follow exactly the same steps as in Lemma D.1 and derive

$$\mu = \frac{\Psi \log n}{2} + O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \Psi \log n + o(1).$$

Letting $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, for every $i \in T$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(R < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(Z < \frac{-\mu - \frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}}{\sigma}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(Z < -\frac{(\Psi + o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\Psi + o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) \\
&\geq \exp\left(-\frac{(\frac{\Psi}{2} + o(1))^2 \log n}{2(\Psi + o(1))}\right) \quad (\text{applying Lemma A.1}) \\
&= n^{-\frac{\Psi}{8} + o(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall from Table 1, below the IT threshold means $\Psi/8 < 1$, thus, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

BEC side information: First note that the definition of R_i is such that $R_i = +\infty$ when $y_i = +1$ or otherwise R_i has the same distribution as R . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = 0) \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = 0\right) \\
&= n^{-\beta} \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq n^{-\beta} \cdot n^{-\frac{\Psi}{8}+o(1)} \\
&= n^{-\frac{\Psi}{8}-\beta+o(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Below the IT threshold, we have $\frac{\Psi}{8} + \beta < 1$ from Table 1. Hence there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

BSC side information: Recall Lemma 2.10 as to how genie score changes under BSC side information. We consider the two cases $\Psi > 2\beta$ and $\Psi \leq 2\beta$ separately.

- When $\Psi > 2\beta$: From the way we have defined R_i ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = +1\right) \\
&\geq (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}\left(R + \beta \log n < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq 0.5 \mathbb{P}\left(Z < \frac{-\mu - \beta \log n - \frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}}{\sigma}\right) \\
&= 0.5 \mathbb{P}\left(Z < -\frac{(\frac{\Psi}{2} + \beta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) = 0.5 \mathbb{P}\left(Z < -\frac{(\frac{\Psi}{2} + \beta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) \\
&= 0.5 \mathbb{P}\left(Z > \frac{(\frac{\Psi}{2} + \beta - o(1)) \log n}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) \\
&\geq n^{-o(1)} \exp\left(-\frac{(\frac{\Psi}{2} + \beta - o(1))^2 \log n}{2\Psi}\right) \quad (\text{applying Lemma A.1}) \\
&\geq n^{-\frac{(\Psi+2\beta)^2}{8\Psi}-o(1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall from Table 1, below the IT threshold means $\frac{(\Psi+2\beta)^2}{8\Psi} < 1$. Therefore, there exists $\delta > 0$ small enough such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

- When $\Psi \leq 2\beta$: From the definition of R_i ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1) \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = -1\right) \\
&\geq \alpha_n \mathbb{P}\left(R - \beta \log n < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \\
&\geq n^{-\beta+o(1)} \mathbb{P}\left(Z < \frac{-\mu + \beta \log n - \frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}}{\sigma}\right) \\
&= n^{-\beta+o(1)} \mathbb{P}\left(Z < \frac{(-\frac{\Psi}{2} + \beta) \log n - O(1)}{\sqrt{\Psi \log n + o(1)}}\right) \\
&\geq n^{-\beta+o(1)} \mathbb{P}(Z > O(1/\sqrt{\log n})) \\
&\geq n^{-\beta+o(1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $\mathbb{P}(Z > O(1/\sqrt{\log n}))$ is at least some constant. In this case, by Table 1, below the IT threshold corresponds to $\beta < 1$, and thus, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < -\frac{2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}. \quad \blacksquare$$

We now return to the deferred proof.

Proof of Lemma D.4. First of all, observe that Y_i is a Gaussian random variable. Let us say $Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$, for some μ_i and $\sigma_i^2 > 0$. Applying Lemma A.1 for any Y_i (after renormalizing) yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{|Y_i - \mu_i|}{\sigma_i} \geq 4\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq e^{-8 \log n} = n^{-8}.$$

Rearrangement of the terms using the triangle inequality along with a union bound over all $i \in [n]$ gives us

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : |Y_i| \geq |\mu_i| + 4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq n^{-7}.$$

Therefore it simply suffices to show that for every $i \in [n]$, we have $|\mu_i| + 4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n} \leq 1$. Indeed, we will show that these terms are $o(1)$. To this end, first consider the term $4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n}$ for any $i \in [n]$. Recall that Y_i is the sum of at most $|T|$ i.i.d. Gaussian random variables, all with variance 1, scaled by $\sqrt{\log n/n}$. Therefore,

$$\sigma_i^2 \leq \frac{\log n}{n} |T| = O\left(\frac{1}{\log^9 n}\right) \implies 4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n} = O\left(\frac{1}{\log^2 n}\right) = o(1),$$

where we used $|T| = O(n/\log^{10} n)$. We now show that $|\mu_i| = o(1)$ too for all $i \in [n]$, which requires some casework. First consider $T \subset C_+$, then for any $i \in C_+$:

$$|\mu_i| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} |T| a^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\log^9 n}\right),$$

Similarly, for any $i \in C_-$:

$$|\mu_i| = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} |T| |ab| \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\log^9 n}\right).$$

Exactly following the same arguments, we also get the same bounds on μ_i even when $T \subset C_-$. Overall, we established that

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall i \in [n] : |Y_i| \leq 1) \geq 1 - O(n^{-7}). \quad \blacksquare$$

D.3 Statistical Achievability without Side Information

In this section, we establish the statistical achivability for ROS when side information is absent. This claim is crucially used in establishing the optimality of the spectral algorithm. Roughly speaking, the spectral algorithm can compute the leading eigenvector of A only up to a global sign flip, and the spectral algorithm must resolve a sign ambiguity in order to compute the correct estimator. The spectral algorithm will keep two candidates (of which one is correct) and choose the one that maximizes the posterior probability. This will establish that the spectral algorithm succeeds as long as the MAP estimator succeeds. Thus, to complete the argument, we also need to show that the MAP estimator succeeds above the IT threshold. When side information is substantial ($\beta > 0$), the Degree-Profiling Algorithm (Algorithm 2) succeeds above the threshold, and hence so does the MAP. However, when side information is not present or weak ($\beta = 0$), the Degree-Profiling Algorithm does not apply. Hence, we will directly establish statistical achievability.

Lemma D.6. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Let $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ be the estimator of σ^* . If $\Psi/8 > 1$, then $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ achieves exact recovery.*

The proof uses ideas from [GJ23, Theorem 3.2]. Rather than showing that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ achieves exact recovery, we will show that the *restricted MLE* achieves exact recovery. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a constant, to be specified. Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ denote the standard Normal PDF. The restricted MLE $\hat{\sigma} : V \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}^n$ maximizes

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(A, \sigma) \triangleq & \sum_{i:\hat{\sigma}(i)=1} \sum_{j:\hat{\sigma}(j)=1} \log(f(A_{ij} - a^2)) + \sum_{i:\hat{\sigma}(i)=-1} \sum_{j:\hat{\sigma}(j)=-1} \log(f(A_{ij} - b^2)) \\ & + 2 \sum_{i:\hat{\sigma}(i)=1} \sum_{j:\hat{\sigma}(j)=-1} \log(f(A_{ij} - ab)) \end{aligned}$$

subject to

$$|C_+(\hat{\sigma}) - \rho n| \leq \epsilon n, \tag{20}$$

where $C_+(\hat{\sigma}) = |\{i : \hat{\sigma}(i) = 1\}|$ is the number of indices classified as +1 by $\hat{\sigma}$. Thus, the restricted MLE maximizes (twice) the log-likelihood of A , subject to having community sizes that are close to their expectations. Note that σ^* satisfies (20) with high probability.

The case where $\rho = 1/2$ and $a = -b$ corresponds to \mathbb{Z}_2 -synchronization after rescaling. In this case, exact recovery requires determining the partition, but not the labeling. Here we may scale the observation matrix, obtaining $A' = \frac{1}{a^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} A$. Then A' has the same distribution as $xx^\top + W'$, where x has i.i.d. Rademacher entries, and W' is a symmetric Gaussian matrix with independent $\mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$ entries, where $\tau = \frac{1}{a^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$. In this case, [AFWZ20, Theorem 3.1] gives that $a^4/2 > 1$ is sufficient for exact recovery, which verifies the threshold of $\frac{\Psi}{8} = 1$, as $\frac{\Psi}{8} = \frac{(2a)^2 \cdot a^2}{8} = \frac{a^4}{2}$.

In all other cases, exact recovery requires recovering the labels of the vertices, not just the partition. Thus, our goal is to show that with high probability, any labeling σ which satisfies (20) but does not exactly coincide with σ^* satisfies $\ell(\sigma) < \ell(\sigma^*)$. Similarly to [GJ23], we separately consider labelings σ with many or few errors relative to σ^* .

Lemma D.7. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$, excluding the case where $\rho = 1/2$ and $a = -b$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Then there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that with high probability, $\ell(A, \sigma) < \ell(A, \sigma^*)$ for all σ satisfying $1 \leq d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \leq c_1 n$.*

Lemma D.8. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$, excluding the case where $\rho = 1/2$ and $a = -b$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Then for any $0 < c_2 < 1$, with high probability, $\ell(A, \sigma) < \ell(A, \sigma^*)$ for all σ satisfying (20) and $d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \geq c_2 n$.

Proof of Lemma D.6. We omit the case where $\rho = 1/2$ and $a = -b$, as discussed above. Let $c_1 > 0$ be the constant from Lemma D.7, and set c_2 in Lemma D.8 to be equal to c_1 . Let ϵ in (20) be set as $\epsilon = \frac{1}{6} \min\{|2\rho - 1|, c_2\}$ if $\rho \neq 1/2$, and otherwise the constraint is not needed. Together, Lemmas D.7 and D.8 imply that $\ell(A, \sigma) < \ell(A, \sigma^*)$ for all σ satisfying (20) and $d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \geq 1$. Finally, Lemma B.1 implies that σ^* itself satisfies (20), completing the proof. \blacksquare

We now return to the proofs of Lemmas D.7 and D.8.

Proof of Lemma D.7. For a given labeling σ , we bound the difference $\ell(A, \sigma) - \ell(A, \sigma^*)$. Since σ is assumed to satisfy $d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \leq cn$, for small $c > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell(A, \sigma) - \ell(A, \sigma^*) \\ & \approx 2 \sum_{i \in C^+ : \sigma(i) = -1} \left[\sum_{j \in C_+} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{i \in C^- : \sigma(i) = 1} \left[\sum_{j \in C_+} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Bounding the difference of log-likelihoods essentially reduces to bounding the above right hand side. More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell(A, \sigma) - \ell(A, \sigma^*) \\ & = 2 \sum_{i \in C^+ : \sigma(i) = -1} \left[\sum_{j \in C_+} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{i \in C^- : \sigma(i) = 1} \left[\sum_{j \in C_+} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{i \in C^+ : \sigma(i) = -1} \sum_{j \in C_+ : \sigma(j) = -1} \left(\log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) - 2 \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{i \in C^- : \sigma(i) = 1} \sum_{j \in C_- : \sigma(j) = 1} \left(\log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) - 2 \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Since $f(\cdot)$ is the standard Normal PDF, we have that for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\log \left(\frac{f(A_{ij} - x_1)}{f(A_{ij} - x_2)} \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \left((A_{ij} - x_1)^2 - (A_{ij} - x_2)^2 \right) = (x_1 - x_2)A_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}(x_2^2 - x_1^2).$$

Therefore, the last two lines in (22), which represent the error in the approximation (21), are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(C\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \max_{i,j} |A_{ij}| + C' \frac{\log n}{n} \right) (|\{(i, j) : \sigma(i) \neq \sigma^*(i), \sigma(j) \neq \sigma^*(j)\}|) \\ &= \left(C\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \max_{i,j} |A_{ij}| + C' \frac{\log n}{n} \right) \cdot (d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*))^2 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where C and C' are functions of a and b .

Next, consider $i \in C^+$ such that $\sigma(i) = 1$. The contribution to the first line of (22) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in C_+} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \\ &= 2a(b-a) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+} A_{ij} + 2b(b-a) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_-} A_{ij} \\ &\quad + (|C_+| - 1)(a^4 - a^2b^2) \frac{\log n}{n} + |C_-|(a^2b^2 - b^4) \frac{\log n}{n} \\ &= -2 \left(z_i^* - \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to Lemma D.1.

Similarly, consider $i \in C_-$ such that $\sigma(i) = -1$. The contribution to the second line of (22) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in C_+} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - a^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-} \log \left(\frac{f \left(A_{ij} - ab \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)}{f \left(A_{ij} - b^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)} \right) \\ &= 2a(a-b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+} A_{ij} + 2b(a-b) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_-} A_{ij} \\ &\quad + |C_+|(a^2b^2 - a^4) \frac{\log n}{n} + (|C_-| - 1)(b^4 - a^2b^2) \frac{\log n}{n} \\ &= 2 \left(z_i^* - \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma D.3, we have $\sigma_i^* z_i^* > \delta \log n$ with probability $1 - o(n^{-1})$ where $\delta = \delta(\rho, a, b) > 0$. A union bound gives that $\sigma_i^* z_i^* > \delta \log n$ for all $i \in [n]$ with probability $1 - o(1)$.

Combining these observations along with a (23), we obtain that with probability $1 - o(1)$, for all σ such that $1 \leq d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \leq cn$

$$\ell(A, \sigma) - \ell(A, \sigma^*) \leq -2d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \cdot \left(\delta \log n - 2 \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(C\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \max_{i,j} |A_{ij}| + C' \frac{\log n}{n} \right) \cdot (d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*))^2 \\
& \leq -d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \cdot \delta' \log n + C'' \frac{\log n}{n} \cdot (d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*))^2 \\
& = -d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \log(n) \left(\delta' - \frac{C'' d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*)}{n} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is due to $\log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) = \Theta(1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\max_{i,j} |A_{ij}|] = \theta(\log n)$, taking $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $C'' = 2C'$. Finally, setting $c_1 = \frac{\delta'}{2C''}$ ensures that the right hand side is bounded by

$$-d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) \log(n) \frac{\delta'}{2} < 0. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Lemma D.8. Fix $0 < c < 1$. Consider a labeling σ with $d_H(\sigma, \sigma^*) > c_2 n$. For this labeling σ , let X_{ij} denote the contribution of the (i, j) matrix entry to the difference $\ell(A, \sigma) - \ell(A, \sigma^*)$. For example, if $i, j \in C_+$ with $\sigma(i) = 1$ and $\sigma(j) = -1$, then the distribution of X_{ij} is the same as the distribution of

$$\log \frac{f\left(A_{ij} - ab\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)}{f\left(A_{ij} - a^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)},$$

where $A_{ij} \sim N\left(0, a^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)$.

In order to bound the difference in likelihoods, we employ a Chernoff bound strategy, letting $\lambda > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\ell(A, \sigma) - \ell(A, \sigma^*) \geq 0) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij} \geq 0\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i}^n X_{ij}\right)\right] \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=i}^n \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda X_{ij}}\right]. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above case where $i, j \in C_+$, $\sigma(i) = 1$ and $\sigma(j) = -1$, observe that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda X_{ij}}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{f\left(A_{ij} - ab\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)}{f\left(A_{ij} - a^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)}\right)^\lambda\right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f\left(x - ab\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)^\lambda f\left(x - a^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)^{1-\lambda} dx,$$

where the second equality comes from the observation that the density of A_{ij} evaluated at x is $f\left(x - a^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)$. We set $\lambda = 1/2$ and use the fact that the (squared) Hellinger divergence of $P \equiv N(\mu_1, 1)$, $Q \equiv N(\mu_2, 1)$ is given by

$$H^2(P, Q) = 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sqrt{P(x)Q(x)} dx = 1 - e^{-\frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{8}}. \tag{25}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{1}{2}X_{ij}} \right] = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} (a^2 - ab)^2 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} \right\} = \exp \left\{ -\frac{a^2}{8} (a - b)^2 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} \right\}.$$

A similar derivation holds for $i, j \in C_-$ with $\sigma(i) = -1$ and $\sigma(j) = 1$; in that case,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{1}{2}X_{ij}} \right] = \exp \left\{ -\frac{b^2}{8} (a - b)^2 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} \right\}.$$

Also note that in all cases, $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{1}{2}X_{ij}} \right] \leq 1$, due to the identity (25).

First suppose $\rho \neq 1/2$. Recalling the constraint (20), set $\epsilon = \frac{1}{6} \min\{|2\rho - 1|, c_2\} > 0$. Observe that one community must have at least $c_2 n/2$ errors, by the pigeonhole principle. Furthermore, the other community must have at least $c_2 n/3$ errors; otherwise, (20) would be violated as $\epsilon \leq \frac{c}{6}$. When $\rho \neq 1/2$, the larger community necessarily contains at least $(|2\rho - 1| - 2\epsilon)n$ correctly labeled indices. Thus, when $\rho \neq 1/2$, (24) is bounded by

$$\exp \left\{ -Cn^2 \cdot \frac{\min\{a^2, b^2\}}{8} (a - b)^2 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} \right\} = e^{-\Theta(n \log n)}.$$

where $C = \frac{c_2}{3} \cdot (|2\rho - 1| - 2\epsilon)$.

Next, suppose $\rho = 1/2$. In that case, we only need to treat the case where $a^2 \neq b^2$. Due to the previous observations, there are at least $\binom{c_2 n/2}{2} = \Theta(n^2)$ pairs of vertices which are both misclassified; for such a pair (i, j) , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{1}{2}X_{ij}} \right] = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} (a^2 - b^2)^2 \cdot \frac{\log n}{n} \right\}.$$

Thus we again obtain that (24) is bounded by $e^{-\Theta(n \log n)}$.

Finally, there are at most 2^n candidate labelings, and since $2^n e^{-\Theta(n \log n)} = o(1)$, the claim follows by a union bound.

D.4 Spectral Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 1

Below is our spectral algorithm which takes A (and optionally y when available) as input along with the parameters and returns an estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$. One of the (two) score vectors formed by the algorithm approximates the genie score z^* .

Algorithm 1 Spectral recovery algorithm for ROS, without or with BEC or BSC side information.

Input: An $n \times n$ observation matrix A and parameters (ρ, a, b) . Optionally, BEC side information y and parameter $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1]$ or BSC side information y and parameter $\alpha_n \in (0, 1/2]$.

Output: An estimate of community assignments $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$.

- 1: **Compute leading eigenpairs.** Compute the top eigenpair of A , denoted by (λ_1, u_1) , where $|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n|$.
- 2: **Compute coefficients of linear combination.**

$$c_1 := \sqrt{n} \log n \cdot (a - b) \cdot (\rho a^2 + (1 - \rho)b^2)^{3/2} \text{ and } \gamma := (\rho(a^2 b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)(b^4 - a^2 b^2)) \frac{\log n}{2}.$$

- 3: **Compute spectral scores.** For any $s \in \{\pm 1\}$, prepare the spectral score vectors as follows.

- No side information:

$$z^{(s)} = sc_1 u_1 + \gamma \mathbf{1}_n.$$

- BEC side information: For any $i \in [n]$,

$$z_i^{(s)} = \begin{cases} sc_1(u_1)_i + \gamma & \text{if } y_i = 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y_i = +1; \\ -\infty & \text{if } y_i = -1; \end{cases}$$

- BSC side information:

$$z^{(s)} = sc_1 u_1 + \gamma \mathbf{1}_n + \ln \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) y$$

4: **Remove sign ambiguity.** For each $s \in \{\pm 1\}$, let $\hat{\sigma}^{(s)} = \text{sgn}(z^{(s)})$.

- No side information: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \arg \max_{\{\hat{\sigma}^{(s)}: s \in \{\pm 1\}\}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \hat{\sigma}^{(s)} \mid A)$.
- BEC or BSC side information: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \arg \max_{\{\hat{\sigma}^{(s)}: s \in \{\pm 1\}\}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \hat{\sigma}^{(s)} \mid A, y)$.

The values c_1 and γ are carefully designed to emulate the genie score. Since the eigenvectors are only recovered up to a global direction flip, we need to keep both candidates in the algorithm. One of them is approximating the genie score well. Finally, whichever one has the higher posterior probability is picked in step 4. To show the proof of the score approximation guarantee, we need the following lemma, whose proof is included at the end of this subsection.

Lemma D.9. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$. Condition on σ^* satisfying E from (11) holds for it. Then there exists a constant $c := c(\rho, a, b)$ such that with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$, the following event holds

$$E_1 := \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|Av^*\|_\infty \leq c \log n \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Below is our primary lemma which shows the spectral and genie score vector approximation in ℓ_∞ norm.

Lemma D.10. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and a, b such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$ and condition on σ^* such that E from (11) holds. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n is parameterized as (1) for $\beta \geq 0$. Let z^* and $z^{(s)}$ be the genie score and the spectral score vectors respectively for the corresponding model. Then (irrespective of the parameter values), with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \|z^* - z^{(s)}\|_\infty = o(\log n).$$

Proof. First of all, note that conditioned on E , we have $\lambda_1^* = (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \|v^*\|_2^2$, and $u_1^* = (1 + o(1)) \frac{v^*}{\|v^*\|_2}$. Additionally, $\|v^*\|_2 = \sqrt{|C_+|a^2 + |C_-|b^2} = (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{n} \sqrt{\rho a^2 + (1 - \rho)b^2}$. Using these, one can simplify

$$\frac{c_1 A u_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} = \frac{(1 + o(1)) c_1 A v^*}{\lambda_1^* \|v^*\|_2} \approx \frac{\sqrt{n} \log n (a - b) (\rho a^2 + (1 - \rho) b^2)^{3/2} A v^*}{\sqrt{\log n / n} \|v^*\|_2^3} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} (a - b) A v^*, \quad (27)$$

where in the last step we substitute $\|v^*\|_2$.

Now the high probability event in this lemma is such that (i) the behavior of eigenvectors as stated in Lemma C.4 and (ii) the event E_1 from (26) hold. By Lemma C.2 and D.9, they both happen with probability $1 - o(1)$. Additionally, let s be the sign for which the conclusion of Lemma C.2 holds. We now analyze the three models separately.

- No side information: For every $i \in [n]$

$$\begin{aligned}
|z^{(s)} - z_i^*| &= |c_1 s (u_1)_i + \gamma - z_i^*|, && \text{(recall Algorithm 1)} \\
&= \left| \frac{c_1 (Au_1^*)_i}{\lambda_1^*} + \gamma - z_i^* \right| + O\left(\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n \log n}}\right) \\
&&& \text{(by Lemma C.4 and the triangle inequality)} \\
&= \left| (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} (a - b) (Av^*)_i + \gamma - z_i^* \right| + O(\sqrt{\log n}) \\
&&& \text{(using (27) and } c_1 \asymp \sqrt{n \log n} \text{)} \\
&= \left| (1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} (a - b) (Av^*)_i + \gamma - \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} (a - b) A_i \cdot v^* - \gamma - O(1) \right| \\
&\quad + O(\sqrt{\log n}) && \text{(putting } z_i^* \text{ from Lemma D.1)} \\
&= o(1) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} |(Av^*)_i| + O(\sqrt{\log n}) = o(\log n), && \text{(recall } E_1 \text{ from (26))}
\end{aligned}$$

- BEC side information: By Lemma 2.10 and Algorithm 1 (Step 3), when $y_i = +1$, we have $z_i^* = z_i^{(s)} = +\infty$ and thus by our convention, $|z_i^{(s)} - z_i^*| = 0$. Similarly, for $y_i = -1$, we have $z_i^* = z_i^{(s)} = -\infty$, which gives us $|z_i^{(s)} - z_i^*| = 0$. Finally, when $y_i = 0$, both $z_i^{(s)}$ and z_i^* are the same as in the case when no side information is provided. Then the analysis in the previous immediately implies that $|z_i^{(s)} - z_i^*| = o(\log n)$.
- BSC side information: By Lemma 2.10 and Algorithm 1 (step 3), when BSC side information is provided, both the Genie score vector z^* and the spectral score vector $z^{(s)}$ are achieved by adding $\log\left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right) y$ to their counterpart when no side information is provided. Therefore, the triangle inequality along with the analysis in the no side information case gives us that for every $i \in [n]$, we have $|z_i^{(s)} - z_i^*| = o(\log n)$.

In either case, one can equivalently write conclusions for all $i \in [n]$ together in vector notation

$$\min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| z^{(s)} - z^* \right\|_\infty = o(\log n). \quad \blacksquare$$

We are finally set to prove our first main result in Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let z^* be the genie score vector for the respective model of side information. By Lemma D.5, below the respective IT threshold given in Table 1

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists i : [n] : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) = 1 - o(1).$$

By the definition of the failure genie-aided estimator below (3),

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists i \in [n] : \hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} \text{ fails}) = 1 - o(1).$$

Using Lemma 2.9

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \text{ fails}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\exists i \in [n] : \hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} \text{ fails}) = 1 - o(1).$$

Using the optimality of the MAP estimator; for any estimator $\hat{\sigma}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma} \text{ fails}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \text{ fails}) = 1 - o(1)$. This immediately implies for any estimator $\hat{\sigma}$.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma} \text{ succeeds}) = 0.$$

To show the positive result, first note that step 4 of Algorithm 1 keeps two candidates $\{\hat{\sigma}^{(s)} : s \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ and chooses the one which has maximum posterior probability. Therefore, to show that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$ achieves exact recovery above the IT threshold, it suffices to show that one of the two candidates achieves exact recovery, and $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ also succeeds above the IT threshold, which ensures that the algorithm selects the correct vector by maximizing the posterior probability. We already showed statistical achievability in Lemma D.6 when no side information. The statistical achievability in the case of BEC or BSC side information follows from Theorem 2, where we showed $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$ (and so $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$) achieves exact recovery. It remains to show that one of $\{\hat{\sigma}^{(s)} : s \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ succeeds. To this end, recall Lemma D.10 that with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\min_{s \in \{\pm 1\}} \left\| z^* - z^{(s)} \right\|_{\infty} = o(\log n).$$

Moreover, above the IT threshold by Lemma D.3 and union bound over $i \in [n]$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^* > \delta \log n \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Taking a union bound over these two events, there exists $\varsigma > 0$ and $s^* \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^{(s^*)} > \varsigma \log n \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Since $\hat{\sigma}^{(s^*)} = \text{sgn}(z^{(s^*)})$ in step 4, we obtain $\hat{\sigma}^{(s^*)}$ achieves exact recovery. As a consequence, even $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$ achieves exact recovery above the IT threshold. In other words,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} \text{ succeeds}) = 1. \quad \blacksquare$$

We finally return to the proof of the lemma already mentioned.

Proof of Lemma D.9. For each $i \in [n]$, first define $Y_i = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} (Av^*)_i$. We first note that Y_i is a Gaussian random variable as it is the sum of at most n independent Gaussian random variables. Therefore, we have $Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$ for certain μ_i and σ_i^2 , which we will calculate later. Applying Lemma A.1 for any Y_i (after normalizing) yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{|Y_i - \mu_i|}{\sigma_i} \geq 4\sqrt{\log n} \right) \leq e^{-8 \log n} = n^{-8}.$$

Rearrangement of the terms using the triangle inequality along with a union bound over all $i \in [n]$ gives us

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall i \in [n] : |Y_i| \leq |\mu_i| + 4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n}\right) \geq 1 - n^{-7}.$$

Therefore it simply suffices to show that for every $i \in [n]$, the quantity $|\mu_i| + 4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n} = O(\log n)$. To this end, we first observe that $(Av^*)_i$ is the sum of $n-1$ independent Gaussian random variables all with means whose absolute values are $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right)$. Thus,

$$|\mu_i| = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \mathbb{E}[(Av^*)_i] = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}(n-1) \cdot O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right) = O(\log n).$$

Similarly, $(Av^*)_i$ is the sum of $n-1$ independent Gaussian random variables with variances $O(1)$. This gives us

$$\sigma_i^2 = \text{Var}\left[\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}(Av^*)_i\right] = \frac{\log n \cdot \text{Var}[(Av^*)_i]}{n} = \frac{\log n \cdot O(n)}{n} = O(\log n),$$

which also implies

$$4\sigma_i\sqrt{\log n} = O(\log n). \quad \blacksquare$$

D.5 Degree-Profiling Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 2

The following is a simple degree-profiling algorithm that tries to mimic the genie naïvely and achieves exact recovery if side information is substantial to shift the thresholds of exact recovery.

Algorithm 2 Degree-Profiling algorithm for ROS in the presence of BEC or BSC side information.

Input: An $n \times n$ observation matrix A and parameters (ρ, a, b) . For $\beta > 0$, the BEC side information y with parameter ϵ_n or BSC side information y with parameter α_n , parameterized as in (1).

Output: An estimate of community assignments $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$.

1: Let $S_+ := \{i : y_i = +1\}$, $S_- := \{i : y_i = -1\}$, and

$$\gamma := (\rho(a^2b^2 - a^4) + (1 - \rho)(b^4 - a^2b^2)) \log n / 2.$$

Compute $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for every $i \in [n]$

$$z_i = a(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in S_+} A_{ij} + b(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in S_-} A_{ij} + \gamma.$$

2: Prepare the degree-profile score vector z^{dp} as follows.

- BEC side information: For any $i \in [n]$,

$$z_i^{\text{dp}} = \begin{cases} z_i & \text{if } y_i = 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y_i = +1; \\ -\infty & \text{if } y_i = -1; \end{cases}$$

- BSC side information:

$$z^{\text{dp}} = z + \ln \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) y$$

3: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}} = \text{sgn}(z^{\text{dp}})$.

The following lemma plays a crucial role in the analysis of our degree profiling algorithm which formalizes the notion of receiving most of the labels correct.

Lemma D.11. *Let $\sigma^* \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ be sampled such that each entry is i.i.d. with $\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* = +1) = \rho$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. For any $\beta > 0$, we let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ for ϵ_n and α_n parameterized as (1). Define $S_+ = \{i : y_i = +1\}$ and $S_- = \{i : y_i = -1\}$. Then with probability $1 - o(1)$*

$$\max \{|C_+ \setminus S_+|, |C_- \setminus S_-|\} = O \left(\frac{n}{\log^{10} n} \right).$$

Proof. First, recall that conditioned on the event E about σ^* , we have $|C_+| = \Theta(n)$ and $|C_-| = \Theta(n)$. We now consider the two types of side information.

- BEC side information: Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[|C_+ \setminus S_+|] = \sum_{i \in C_+} \mathbb{P}(y_i = 0) = |C_+| \epsilon_n = n^{-\beta} |C_+| \leq n^{1-\beta}.$$

Then Markov's inequality immediately implies that, with probability $1 - O(n^{-\beta/2})$, we have

$$|C_+ \setminus S_+| \leq n^{1-\beta/2} = O(n/\log^{10} n).$$

Similarly, we also have $\mathbb{E}[|C_- \setminus S_-|] = n^{-\beta} |C_-| \leq n^{1-\beta}$. Thus, applying Markov's inequality again implies $|C_- \setminus S_-| = O(n/\log^{10} n)$ with probability $1 - O(n^{-\beta/2})$. A simple union bound over these two events implies, with probability $1 - O(n^{-\beta/2}) = 1 - o(1)$

$$\max \{|C_+ \setminus S_+|, |C_- \setminus S_-|\} = O \left(\frac{n}{\log^{10} n} \right).$$

- BSC side information: Under BSC side information, $\mathbb{E}[|C_+ \setminus S_+|] = \alpha_n |C_+| \leq n^{1-\beta}$ and $\mathbb{E}[|C_- \setminus S_-|] = \alpha_n |C_-| \leq n^{1-\beta}$. Therefore, using the Markov's inequality for both of these sets along with a union bound immediately implies that with probability $1 - O(n^{-\beta/2}) = 1 - o(1)$,

$$\max \{|C_+ \setminus S_+|, |C_- \setminus S_-|\} = O \left(\frac{n}{\log^{10} n} \right).$$

Using this lemma, we now show that the degree profiling vector z^{dp} is a good approximation to the genie score vector z^* in ℓ_∞ norm.

Lemma D.12. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and a, b such that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a, b)$ and condition on σ^* such that E from (11) holds. For $\beta > 0$, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ where ϵ_n and α_n are parameterized as (1). Let z^* and z^{dp} respectively be the genie score vector and the degree-profiling score vector produced by Algorithm 2 for the corresponding model of side information. Then (irrespective of the parameter values), with probability $1 - o(1)$,*

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{dp}}\|_\infty = O(1).$$

Proof. We first start by observing, in the case of BEC side information z^{dp} is just formed by overriding the entries of z from step 1 of Algorithm 2 with $+\infty$ or $-\infty$ depending on the side information label being $+1$ or -1 . Also, for BSC side information, $z^{\text{dp}} = z + \log\left(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right)y$. By Lemmas 2.10, this is precisely how the genie score vector z^* in the respective model of side information relates to the genie score vector without side information which we denote by z' .

Therefore, to show the lemma, it suffices to show that, with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\|z' - z\|_\infty = O(1).$$

- BEC side information:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z' - z\|_\infty &= \max_{i \in [n]} |z'_i - z_i| \\ &= \max_{i \in [n]} \left| a(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} + b(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) + o(1) \right| \\ &\quad \text{(substituting } z' \text{ from Lemma D.1 and } z \text{ from Algorithm 2)} \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \left| a(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} \right| + \left| b(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| + O(1), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the last step follows from the triangle inequality. By Lemma D.11, both $|C_+ \setminus S_+|$ and $|C_- \setminus S_-|$ are bounded by $O(n/\log^{10} n)$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. Moreover, these sets are chosen only based on the side information y and hence independent of A , conditioned on σ^* . Using Lemma D.4 for these set $C_+ \setminus S_+$ and $C_- \setminus S_-$ as T , and using a union bound, we obtain that with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \left| a(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} \right| = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{i \in [n]} \left| b(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| = O(1).$$

Substituting these bounds in (28), with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\|z' - z\|_\infty = O(1).$$

- BSC side information:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z' - z\|_\infty &= \max_{i \in [n]} |z'_i - z_i| \\ &= \max_{i \in [n]} \left| a(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} - a(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in S_+ \setminus C_+} A_{ij} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} - b(a-b)\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in S_- \setminus C_-} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) + o(1) \right| \\ &\quad \text{(substituting } z' \text{ from Lemma D.1 and } z \text{ from Algorithm 2)} \\ &= \max_{i \in [n]} \left| (a-b)^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} - (a-b)^2\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right) + o(1) \right| \\ &\quad \text{(since } S_+ \setminus C_+ = C_- \setminus S_- \text{ and } S_- \setminus C_- = C_+ \setminus S_+) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \left| (a-b)^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} \right| + \left| (a-b)^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| + O(1), \quad (29)$$

where in the last step, we used the triangle inequality. Again by similar arguments, first using Lemma D.11, both $|C_+ \setminus S_+|$ and $|C_- \setminus S_-|$ is $O(n/\log^{10} n)$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. Using Lemma D.4 for these set $C_+ \setminus S_+$ and $C_- \setminus S_-$ further implies that, with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \left| (a-b)^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} \right| = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{i \in [n]} \left| (a-b)^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| = O(1).$$

Substituting these bounds in (29), with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\|z' - z\|_\infty = O(1).$$

Finally, we prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. When $\beta > 0$, by Lemma D.12 that with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{dp}}\|_\infty = O(1).$$

Above the IT threshold by Lemma D.3 and union bound over $i \in [n]$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^* > \delta \log n \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Taking a union bound, there exists $\varsigma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^{\text{dp}} > \varsigma \log n \right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Observing $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}} = \text{sgn}(z^{\text{dp}})$, we obtain $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$ achieves exact recovery, i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}} \text{ succeeds}) = 1. \quad \blacksquare$$

E Proofs and Algorithms for SBM

We follow the same structure: in Appendices E.1 and E.2, respectively, we show the success with margin and failure of genie-based estimation. In Appendices E.3 and E.4, we present the spectral and the degree profiling algorithms respectively, with our main results.

E.1 Genie scores' success with margin above the IT threshold

We begin by showing that, with high probability, all the vertices have degrees logarithmic in n .

Lemma E.1. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E from (30) holds then. For $c = 6 \max\{1, a_1, a_2, b\}$ let*

$$E_1 = \left\{ \forall i : \sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij} \leq c \log n \right\}; \quad (30)$$

then with $\mathbb{P}(E_1) = 1 - O(n^{-3})$.

Proof. Note that the entries of A (up to symmetry) are independent conditioned on σ^* . Therefore, for any $i \in [n]$, the i^{th} row has independent Bernoulli entries with means either p_1, p_2 or q , where $(p_1, p_2, q) = (a_1, a_2, b) \log n/n$. Therefore, defining $X \sim \text{Binom}(n, \tau \log n/n)$, where $\tau = \max\{a_1, a_2, b\}$, we have that X stochastically dominates $\sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij}$, for any $i \in [n]$. Then applying the Chernoff bound for Binomial random variables [MU17, Theorem 4.4, Equation 4.3] we get, for any $i \in [n]$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij} > 6 \max\{1, \tau\} \log n \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(X > 6 \max\{1, \tau\} \log n) \leq 2^{-6 \log n} = O(n^{-4}).$$

Taking a union bound over all $i \in [n]$ yields the desired claim. \blacksquare

We next analyze the form of genie scores without side information.

Lemma E.2. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Denote $(p_1, p_2, q) := (a_1, a_2, b) \log n/n$. Then for any $i \in [n]$, the genie score can be written as*

$$\begin{aligned} z_i^* &= \log \left(\frac{p_1(1-q)}{q(1-p_1)} \right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{q(1-p_2)}{p_2(1-q)} \right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) \\ &\quad + |C_+^{-i}| \log \left(\frac{1-p_1}{1-q} \right) + |C_-^{-i}| \log \left(\frac{1-q}{1-p_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, conditioned on the event E from (11) and E_1 from (30),

$$\|z^* - Aw - \gamma \mathbf{1}_n\|_\infty = O(1),$$

where $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector with entries $(w_+, w_-) := (\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2))$ on locations of C_+ and C_- respectively and $\gamma := (\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)) \log n$.

Proof. First of all, note that the SBM is a special case of the GBM model with $\mathcal{P}_+ \equiv \text{Bern}(p_1)$, $\mathcal{P}_- \equiv \text{Bern}(p_2)$ and $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \text{Bern}(q)$. Using Lemma 2.10 for this special case, for any $i \in [n]$

$$\begin{aligned} z_i^* &= \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) + \sum_{i \in C_+^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{p_1^{A_{ij}} (1-p_1)^{(1-A_{ij})}}{q^{A_{ij}} (1-q)^{(1-A_{ij})}} \right) + \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} \log \left(\frac{q^{A_{ij}} (1-q)^{(1-A_{ij})}}{p_2^{A_{ij}} (1-p_2)^{(1-A_{ij})}} \right) \\ &= \log \left(\frac{p_1(1-q)}{q(1-p_1)} \right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{q(1-p_2)}{p_2(1-q)} \right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \right) \\ &\quad + |C_+^{-i}| \log \left(\frac{1-p_1}{1-q} \right) + |C_-^{-i}| \log \left(\frac{1-q}{1-p_2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

To show the second part of the lemma, we further simplify

$$\left| \log \left(\frac{1-q}{1-p_1} \right) \right| = \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{p_1 - q}{(1-p_1)} \right) \right| = \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{(a_1 - b) \log n}{(1-p_1)n} \right) \right| = O \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right). \tag{32}$$

In the last inequality, we used $\frac{x}{x+1} \leq \log(1+x) \leq x$ for $x > -1$. Similarly,

$$\left| \log \left(\frac{1-p_2}{1-q} \right) \right| = \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{q - p_2}{(1-q)} \right) \right| = \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{(b - a_2) \log n}{(1-q)n} \right) \right| = O \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right). \tag{33}$$

Recall the definition of event E from (11) and E_1 from (30). Conditioned on $E \cap E_1$, we simplify (31) using (32) and (33).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log \left(\frac{p_1(1-q)}{q(1-p_1)} \right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{q(1-p_2)}{p_2(1-q)} \right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \\
&= \log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + O \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right) \sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij} \\
&= \log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + o(1), \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality followed by conditioning on E_1 . We also simplify

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_+^{-i}| \log \left(\frac{1-p_1}{1-q} \right) &= |C_+^{-i}| \log \left(1 + \frac{q-p_1}{(1-q)} \right) = |C_+^{-i}| \log \left(1 + \frac{(b-a_1) \log n}{(1-q)n} \right) \\
&= |C_+^{-i}| \left(\frac{(b-a_1) \log n}{(1-q)n} + O \left(\frac{\log^2 n}{n^2} \right) \right) \\
&\quad \text{(using a Taylor expansion of } \log(1+x) \text{)} \\
&= (1 + O(n^{-1/3})) \rho n \left(\frac{(b-a_1) \log n}{(1-q)n} + O \left(\frac{\log^2 n}{n^2} \right) \right) \\
&= \rho(b-a_1) \log n + o(1) \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$|C_-^{-i}| \log \left(\frac{1-q}{1-p_2} \right) = |C_-^{-i}| \log \left(1 + \frac{p_2-q}{(1-p_2)} \right) = (1-\rho)(a_2-b) \log n + o(1) \tag{36}$$

Substituting (34), (35) and (36) into (31),

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i^* &= \log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + \rho(b-a_1) + (1-\rho)(a_2-b) \log n + O(1) \\
&= w_+ \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + w_- \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + \gamma + O(1) = A_i \cdot w + \gamma + O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Writing the above for all $i \in [n]$ in a vector notation, we obtain

$$\|z^* - (Aw + \gamma \mathbf{1}_n)\|_\infty = O(1). \quad \blacksquare$$

Finally, we turn our attention to the lemma which establishes that above the IT threshold, the genie score succeeds with margin.

Lemma E.3. *Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Condition σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n be parameterized as (1) for $\beta \geq 0$. Let z^* be the genie score vector for the corresponding model of side information. Then above the information-theoretic threshold as specified in Table 2, there exists some constant $\delta := \delta(\rho, a_1, a_2, b, \beta) > 0$ such that, for any $i \in [n]$:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

In order to prove Lemma E.3, we need the following concentration result, whose proof is deferred to the end of this subsection. For any $i \in [n]$, we define the random variables X_i as follows.

$$X_i \triangleq \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + \gamma, \quad (37)$$

where $\gamma = (\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)) \log n$. Note that X_i is the weighted sum of binomial random variables shifted by γ . Using the standard Chernoff style analysis, we show the following tail bound. Recall the definition of D_t from (5) and the community profile vectors θ_+ and θ_- from (6).

Lemma E.4. *Consider any $i \in C_+$ and fixed $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for any $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i < (1 + o(1))\varepsilon \log n) \leq n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + \varepsilon t + o(1)}.$$

Similarly, for any $i \in C_-$, fixed $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(-X_i < (1 + o(1))\varepsilon \log n) \leq n^{-D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) + \varepsilon t + o(1)}.$$

With Lemma E.4 in hand, we prove Lemma E.3.

Proof of Lemma E.3. We discuss different side information cases in order.

No side information: First, note that under the event E_1 , which happens with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$, we have

$$z_i^* = \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} + \gamma + O(1) := X_i + O(1).$$

For any $i \in C_+$ and any fixed $\delta, t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_i + O(1) < \delta \log n) + O(n^{-3}) && \text{(union bound with } E_1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_i < (1 + o(1))\delta \log n) + O(n^{-3}) \\ &\leq n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where we use Lemma E.4 in the final step. Recall from Table 2, above the IT threshold means $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1$, which also implies $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) > 1$ by the change of variables from t to $1 - t$ and noting that $D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) = D_{1-t}(\theta_+, \theta_-)$. Moreover, D_t is a continuous function t and therefore, there exists $t^* \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta_1 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $D_{t^*}(\theta_-, \theta_+) - \delta_1 t^* - o(1) > 1$. Substituting this above we obtain that there exists $\delta_1 := \delta_1(\rho, a_1, a_2, b) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* \leq \delta_1 \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

Similarly, for any $i \in C_-$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(-X_i - O(1) < \delta \log n) + O(n^{-3}) && \text{(union bound with } E_1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(-X_i < (1 + o(1))\delta \log n) + O(n^{-3}) \\ &\leq n^{-D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

using Lemma E.4. Above the IT threshold corresponds to $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1$, which implies there exists $t^* \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta_2 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $D_{t^*}(\theta_+, \theta_-) - \delta_2 t^* - o(1) > 1$.

Substituting this above, we obtain that there exists $\delta_2 := \delta_2(\rho, a_1, a_2, b) > 0$ such that for any $i \in C_-$

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* \leq \delta_2 \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

Choosing $\delta = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, we get the desired claim.

BEC side information: For any $i \in [n]$, let z_i^* and z_i' , respectively, be the genie score under side information and without any side information. For any $i \in [n]$ and constants $\delta, t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = 0) \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = 0) + \mathbb{P}(y_i = \sigma_i^*) \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = \sigma_i^*) \\ &\leq n^{-\beta} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' < \delta \log n \mid y_i = 0) && \text{(using Lemma 2.10)} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} n^{-\beta - D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}), & \text{if } i \in C_+; \\ n^{-\beta - D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}), & \text{if } i \in C_-; \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The last inequality follows from using (38) and (39). Again from Table 2, above the IT threshold, we have $\beta + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1$, which also implies $\beta + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) > 1$. Therefore, in either case $i \in C_+$ or $i \in C_-$, there exists $t^* \in (0, 1)$ and constant $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that the exponent of n in (40) is strictly less than -1 . This gives us, for any $i \in [n]$, there exists $\delta > 0$ small enough for which

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* \leq \delta \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

BSC side information: We now denote the genie score for the i^{th} label with BSC side information and without side information by z_i^* and z_i' respectively. By Lemma 2.10, for any $i \in [n]$

$$z_i^* = z_i' + y_i \log \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) = z_i' + y_i \beta \log n.$$

Consider any $i \in C_+$. For any constants $\delta, t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}(z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = +1) + \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1) \mathbb{P}(z_i^* < \delta \log n \mid y_i = -1) \\ &= (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(z_i' + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + \alpha_n \cdot \mathbb{P}(z_i' - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(z_i' + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + n^{-\beta} \mathbb{P}(z_i' - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(z_i' < (\delta - \beta) \log n) + n^{-\beta} \mathbb{P}(z_i' < (\delta + \beta) \log n) \\ &\leq n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) - \beta t + \delta t + o(1)} + n^{-\beta} n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + \beta t + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}) \\ & && \text{(by Lemma E.4)} \\ &= n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) - \beta t + \delta t + o(1)} + n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) - \beta(1-t) + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}) \\ &:= P_1(\delta, t) + P_2(\delta, t) + O(n^{-3}) \end{aligned}$$

Above the IT threshold in this case (see Table 2), we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1 \text{ and } \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) > 1.$$

Replacing t with $1-t$ also implies

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) > 1 \text{ and } \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) > 1.$$

Therefore, it is possible to choose $t_1, t_2 \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ small enough such that $P_1(\delta_1, t_1) = o(n^{-1})$ and $P_2(\delta_2, t_2) = o(n^{-1})$.

We finally turn our focus to any $i \in C_-$. Again by similar calculation, for any $\delta, t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) &= (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + \alpha_n \cdot \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' + \beta \log n < \delta \log n) + n^{-\beta} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' - \beta \log n < \delta \log n) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' < (\delta - \beta) \log n) + n^{-\beta} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i' < (\delta + \beta) \log n) \\
&\leq n^{-D_i(\theta_+, \theta_-) - \beta t + \delta t + o(1)} + n^{-D_i(\theta_-, \theta_+) - \beta(1-t) + \delta t + o(1)} + O(n^{-3}) \\
&:= P_3(\delta, t) + P_4(\delta, t) + O(n^{-3}).
\end{aligned}$$

The second last line follows from taking a union bound with E_1 from (30) and using Lemma E.4. Finally, above the threshold, it is possible to choose $t_3, t_4 \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta_3, \delta_4 > 0$ small enough such that both $P_3(\delta_3, t_3)$ and $P_4(\delta_4, t_4)$ are $o(n^{-1})$. Choosing $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4\} > 0$ finally implies that for any $i \in [n]$

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^* < \delta \log n) = o(n^{-1}). \quad \blacksquare$$

Finally, we prove Lemma E.4.

Proof of Lemma E.4. Define $(p_1, p_2, q) := (a_1, a_2, b) \log n/n$. For any $i \in C_+$, note that

$$\sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} \equiv \text{Binom}(N_1, p_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \equiv \text{Binom}(N_2, q).$$

where $N_1 = (1 + o(1))\rho n$ and $N_2 = (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n$. Let $Z_1 \sim \text{Binom}(N_1, p_1)$ and $Z_2 \sim \text{Binom}(N_2, q)$ be independent. Then $X_i \sim \log(a_1/b)Z_1 + \log(b/a_2)Z_2 + \gamma$. For any constant $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_i < (1 + o(1))\varepsilon \log n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\log(a_1/b)Z_1 + \log(b/a_2)Z_2 + \gamma < (1 + o(1))\varepsilon \log n) \\
&\leq e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-t \left(\log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) Z_1 + \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) Z_2 + \gamma \right) \right) \right] \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\delta t \log n} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-t \log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) Z_1} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-t \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) Z_2} \right] e^{-t\gamma} \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left(N_1 p_1 (e^{-t \log(a_1/b)} - 1) \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \exp \left(N_2 q (e^{-t \log(b/a_2)} - 1) \right) \cdot \exp(-t\gamma) \quad (\text{by Lemma A.2}) \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left((1 + o(1)) \rho n \frac{a_1 \log n}{n} \left(\left(\frac{b}{a_1} \right)^t - 1 \right) \right) \\
&\quad + (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n \frac{b \log n}{n} \left(\left(\frac{a_2}{b} \right)^t - 1 \right) - t\gamma \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left((1 + o(1)) \log n \left[\rho(a_1^{1-t} b^t - a_1) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + (1 - \rho)(b^{1-t} a_2^t - b) - t(\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)) \right] \right) \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left(- (1 + o(1)) \log n \left[(1 - t)\rho a_1 + t\rho b \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + (1 - t)(1 - \rho)b + t(1 - \rho)a_2 - \rho a_1^{1-t} b^t - (1 - \rho)(b^{1-t} a_2^t) \right] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \exp(\log n [-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + \varepsilon t + o(1)]) \\
&= n^{-D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + \varepsilon t + o(1)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Similarly, for any $i \in C_-$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in C_+^{-i}} A_{ij} \equiv \text{Binom}(N_1, q) \text{ and } \sum_{j \in C_-^{-i}} A_{ij} \equiv \text{Binom}(N_2, p_2).$$

where $N_1 = (1 + o(1))\rho n$ and $N_2 = (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n$. Let $Z_3 \sim \text{Binom}(N_1, q)$ and $Z_4 \sim \text{Binom}(N_2, p_2)$ be independent. Then $X_i \sim \log(a_1/b)Z_3 + \log(b/a_2)Z_4 + \gamma$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(-X_i < (1 + o(1))\varepsilon \log n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(-\log(a_1/b)Z_3 - \log(b/a_2)Z_4 - \gamma < (1 + o(1))\varepsilon \log n) \\
&\leq e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(t \left(\log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) Z_3 + \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) Z_4 + \gamma \right) \right) \right] \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\delta t \log n} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[e^{t \log \left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right) Z_3} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{t \log \left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right) Z_4} \right] e^{t\gamma} \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left(N_1 q (e^{t \log(a_1/b)} - 1) \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \exp \left(N_2 p_2 (e^{t \log(b/a_2)} - 1) \right) \cdot \exp(t\gamma) \quad (\text{by Lemma A.2}) \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left((1 + o(1)) \rho n \frac{b \log n}{n} \left(\left(\frac{a_1}{b} \right)^t - 1 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n \frac{a_2 \log n}{n} \left(\left(\frac{b}{a_2} \right)^t - 1 \right) + t\gamma \right) \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left((1 + o(1)) \log n [\rho(b^{1-t} a_1^t - b) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 - \rho)(a_2^{1-t} b^t - a_2) + t(\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b))] \right) \\
&= e^{(1+o(1))\varepsilon t \log n} \cdot \exp \left(-(1 + o(1)) \log n [t\rho a_1 + (1 - t)\rho b \right. \\
&\quad \left. + t(1 - \rho)b + (1 - t)(1 - \rho)a_2 - \rho a_1^t b^{1-t} - (1 - \rho)(b^t a_2^{1-t})] \right) \\
&= \exp(\log n [-D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) + \varepsilon t + o(1)]) \\
&= n^{-D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) + \varepsilon t + o(1)}. \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

E.2 Failure of genie-aided estimation below the threshold

We begin by showing a helper lemma.

Lemma E.5. *Consider $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$. Condition on σ^* such that the event E from (11) holds. Fix any set $T \subset C_+$ or $T \subset C_-$ such that $|T| = O(n/\log^{10} n)$. Then for any $i \in [n]$, define $Y_i := \sum_{j \in T} A_{ij}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\forall i \in [n] : Y_i \leq \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} \right) \geq 1 - O(n^{-3}).$$

Proof. Fix any set T according to the lemma and define $\{Y_i : i \in [n]\}$. Let $\tau = \max\{a_1, a_2, b\}$ and $Y \sim \text{Binom}(|T|, \frac{\tau \log n}{n})$. Observe that for any $i \in [n]$, we have Y_i is stochastically dominated by Y . Applying the following Chernoff bound for Binomial random variable [MU17, Theorem 4.4]: for any $r > 1$ and $X \sim \text{Binom}(N, p)$, $\mathbb{P}(X \geq rnp) \leq (e/r)^{rnp}$, we obtain for any $i \in [n]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_i \leq \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Y \leq \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right) \leq \left(\frac{e|T|\tau \log n/n}{\log n/\log \log n}\right)^{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \\ &= O\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log^{10} n}\right)^{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} = n^{-10+o(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

A simple union bound over all $i \in [n]$ gives us

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall i \in [n] : Y_i \leq \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq 1 - O(n^{-3}). \quad \blacksquare$$

We will handle the degenerate case of $a_1 = a_2 = b$ when we show the failure of MAP. Throughout this section, we focus on the case when they are not equal simultaneously. Below is the lemma that we want to show.

Lemma E.6. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$ such that not all are equal simultaneously. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{ROS}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$ and condition on σ^* such that E from (11) holds. Let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ where ϵ_n and α_n are parameterized as (1). Let z^* be the genie score vector the corresponding model of side information. Then below the IT threshold given by Table 2

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < \frac{-2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq 1 - o(1).$$

The proof of this lemma follows similar ideas from the proof of Lemma D.5. We have conditioned on σ^* such that E happens. Choose fixed $T_+ \subset C_+$ and $T_- \subset C_-$ such that both $|T_+|$ and $|T_-|$ are $\Theta(n/\log^{10} n)$. It would be possible to choose such sets because of community sizes under E . For each $i \in T_+ \cup T_-$, we define two random variables as follows:

$$H_i := \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus T_+} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus T_-} A_{ij} + \gamma,$$

where γ is defined in Lemma E.2, and

$$Y_i := \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in T_+} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in T_-} A_{ij}.$$

The purpose of defining $\{H_i\}_{i \in T_+ \cup T_-}$ in this fashion is that they are all independent now using the same argument used for ROS in Lemma D.5; it just follows from the independence of the entries of A and that H_i does not depend on $\{A_{ij}\}_{j \in T_+ \cup T_-}$. Under BEC side information, let R_i be the random variables that are formed after applying the same transformation that the genie score would go under from the case of no side information to BEC side information in Lemma 2.10; overriding with $+\infty$ or $-\infty$ when $y_i = +1$ or $y_i = -1$. Similarly, in the BSC channel, $R_i = H_i + \log\left(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right) y_i$. Again, the random variables $\{R_i\}_{i \in T}$ are independent since A and y are independent conditioned on σ^* . Then we show the following lemma.

Lemma E.7. *Below the IT threshold, for one of the $T := T_+$ or $T := T_-$, for all $i \in T$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

Using this lemma, we now prove Lemma E.6.

Proof of Lemma E.6. Let z'_i be the genie score without side information. From the definition of Y_i and H_i , Lemma E.2 implies that with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$, we have $|H_i + Y_i - z'_i| = O(1)$ for all $i \in T_+ \cup T_-$. From the definition of R_i and Lemma 2.10, we continue to have $|R_i + Y_i - z_i^*| = O(1)$ with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$, where z_i^* is the genie score for the corresponding model of side information. Let T be the set from Lemma E.7. Using the lemma, we derive the desired result.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : \sigma_i^* R_i + \sigma_i^* Y_i + O(1) < \frac{-\log n}{\log \log n}\right) - o(1) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in T : \sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) - o(1), \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \prod_{i \in T} \left(1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right)\right) - o(1) \\ &\geq 1 - (1 - n^{-1+\varepsilon})^{|T|} - o(1) \quad (\text{using Lemma E.7}) \\ &\geq 1 - \exp(-|T|n^{-1+\varepsilon}) - o(1) \quad (1 + x \leq e^x) \\ &= 1 - \exp(-n^{\varepsilon-o(1)}) - o(1) = 1 - o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from $|T| = \Theta(n/\log^{10} n) = n^{1-o(1)}$. The inequality (a) follows from the way we defined R_i and Y_i , (b) follows from using Lemma E.5 and (c) follows from the independence of $\{R_i\}_{i \in T}$ as argued already. ■

Note that each R_i is a sum of weighted Binomial random variables up to some constant shift. The goal is to provide a lower bound on the tail of a binomial. To do this end, we will heavily use Lemma A.3. To show Lemma E.7, we need equivalent ways of writing the conditions that hold below the IT threshold.

Lemma E.8. *Let $a_1, a_2, b > 0$ such that not all are equal simultaneously. Refer to the IT thresholds from Table 2. When no side information is present, below the IT threshold*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1.$$

Under BEC side information, below the threshold

$$\beta + \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta + \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1.$$

Under the BSC channel, below the IT threshold

1. *When $\max\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} \leq 0$*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1.$$

2. When $\min\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} \geq 0$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1 \quad \underline{\text{or}} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1.$$

3. When $\max\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} > 0$ and $\min\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} < 0$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1.$$

Proof. Let $\phi(t) := D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)$. It is easy to verify that

$$\phi''(t) = -\rho b \left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right)^t \log^2\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) - (1-\rho)a_2 \left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right)^t \log^2\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) < 0,$$

when (a_1, a_2, b) are not equal simultaneously. Thus $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly concave function with a unique maximizer located in $[0, 1]$ because $\phi(0) = \phi(1) = 0$. Therefore, $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \leq 1} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+)$.

Under no side information, below the threshold corresponds to $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$. The above calculation implies $\sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. Under the BEC channel, below the threshold, we have $\beta + \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$. The same calculation implies $\beta + \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \beta + \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$.

Finally, we consider the BSC channel. It is straightforward to verify that $\phi_1(t) := \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)$ and $\phi_2(t) := \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+)$ are again strictly concave functions, each with a unique minimizer. $\phi'(0) = D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=0} > 0$ and $\phi'(1) = D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=1} < 0$. We use these observations below.

1. When both $\log(a_1/b)$ and $\log(b/a_2)$ are non-positive: If $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, we have $\sup_{t \leq 1} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, giving us $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. We now consider $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$. Here, we have to consider two further subcases: first consider $0 \geq \phi'_2(0) = -\beta + D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=0}$. Then using $a_1 \leq b \leq a_2$, it can be deduced that $-D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=1} \leq D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=0} \leq \beta$; rather than, this implies $\beta + D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=1} = \phi'_1(1) \geq 0$. Thus, $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \leq 1} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \beta < 1$. Again, we conclude $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. Lastly, the other subcase is $0 < \phi'_2(0)$. In this case, the unique minimizer of ϕ_2 is located in $[0, 1]$ and we have $\sup_{t \leq 1} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, which implies $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$.
2. When both $\log(a_1/b)$ and $\log(b/a_2)$ are nonnegative, i.e $a_1 \geq b \geq a_2$: If we have $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, then it immediately implies $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$. If $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, we again need to consider two subcases: the first is $\phi'_1(1) > 0$. We have $\beta \geq -D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=1} \geq D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=0}$, where the last inequality follows from $a_1 \geq b \geq a_2$. Therefore, $\phi'_2(0) = -\beta + D'_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)|_{t=0} \leq 0$. This gives us $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \beta < 1$. Finally, the other subcase is $\phi'_1(1) \leq 0$. In this case, the function $\phi_1(t)$ has its unique minimizer in $[0, 1]$ and we have $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$.
3. When $(\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2))$ has one each positive and negative: If $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, we have $\sup_{t \leq 1} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, which is equivalent to $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. In the other case, we have $1 > \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-)$, which concludes the proof.

We return to the pending proof of Lemma E.7.

Proof of Lemma E.7. Denote $Z_1 \sim \text{Binom}(N_1, p_1)$, $Z_2 \sim \text{Binom}(N_2, q)$, $Z_3 \sim \text{Binom}(N_1, q)$, and $Z_4 \sim \text{Binom}(N_2, p_2)$, where $N_1 := (1 + o(1))\rho n$, $N_2 = (1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n$ and $(p_1, p_2, q) := (a_1, a_2, b)^{\log n/n}$. We handle each side information separately.

No side information: By our consideration in the lemma, when not all (a_1, a_2, b) are equal simultaneously, at least one of $\log(a_1/b)$ and $\log(b/a_2)$ is non-zero. We first consider the case when at least one of them is negative. For any $i \in T_+$, first observe that R_i has the same distribution as $\log(a_1/b)Z_1 + \log(b/a_2)Z_2 + \gamma$.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(\log(a_1/b)Z_1 + \log(b/a_2)Z_2 \leq -(1 + o(1))\gamma) \quad (43)$$

Thus, we will apply Lemma A.3 with $\delta := -\gamma/\log n = \rho(a_1 - b) + (1 - \rho)(b - a_2)$ which is a constant. Using $\log(x) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{x}$, it is immediately verifiable that

$$\log(a_1/b)\rho a_1 + \log(b/a_2)(1 - \rho)b - \delta \geq 0.$$

Applying Lemma A.3 for the two binomials Z_1 and Z_2 for the tail in (43),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq n^{-I^* + o(1)}, \\ \text{where } I^* &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(-t(a_1 - b)\rho - t(1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \rho a_1 \left(1 - \left(\frac{b}{a_1}\right)^t\right) + (1 - \rho)b \left(1 - \left(\frac{a_2}{b}\right)^t\right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{following identical calculation used in deriving (41)})$$

Similarly, when both $\log(a_1/b)$ and $\log(b/a_2)$ are non-negative, at least one of $(-\log(a_1/b), -\log(b/a_2))$ is negative; recall that they both are not zero simultaneously when (a_1, a_2, b) are not all equal. We consider any $i \in T_-$, then R_i has the same distribution as $\log(a_1/b)Z_3 + \log(b/a_2)Z_4 + \gamma$, and so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(-\log(a_1/b)Z_3 - \log(b/a_2)Z_4 \leq (1 + o(1))\gamma) \quad (44)$$

We now apply Lemma A.3 with $\delta := \gamma/\log n = \rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)$. The fact $\log(x) \leq x - 1$ gives us

$$-\log(a_1/b)\rho b - \log(b/a_2)(1 - \rho)a_2 - \delta \geq 0.$$

Using Lemma A.3 for the two binomials Z_3 and Z_4 in (44), for any $i \in T_-$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq n^{-I^* + o(1)}, \\ \text{where } I^* &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(t(a_1 - b)\rho + t(1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \rho b \left(1 - \left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right)^t\right) + (1 - \rho)a_2 \left(1 - \left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right)^t\right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{following identical calculation used in deriving (41)})$$

Below the IT threshold, we have $\sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$ by Lemma E.8. Finally, we conclude that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1 + \varepsilon}.$$

Overall, we established that at least for one of $T = T_+$ or $T = T_-$ the desired property from the lemma holds, under no side information.

BEC side information: The claim mainly just follows from the fact that R_i is $+\infty$ or $-\infty$ (depending on the true label) when side information is given or otherwise just follow the same distribution as its corresponding counterpart when no side information is present. Doing the same case analysis, first suppose that at least one of $\log(a_1/b)$ or $\log(b/a_2)$ is negative. For any $i \in T_+$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &= \epsilon_n \mathbb{P}\left(R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = 0\right) + (1 - \epsilon_n) \cdot \mathbb{P}(R_i < 0 \mid y_i = +1) \\ &= n^{-\beta} \cdot n^{-\sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) + o(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma E.8, use $\beta + \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. This implies there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

Similarly, below the threshold, we also have $\beta + \sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$. Thus, even when both $\log(a_1/b)$ and $\log(b/a_2)$ are non-negative, we consider any $i \in T_-$, and conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &= \epsilon_n \mathbb{P}\left(-R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = 0\right) + (1 - \epsilon_n) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(-R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = -1\right) \\ &\geq n^{-\beta} \cdot n^{-\sup_{t \geq 0} D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) + o(1)} \\ &= n^{-1+\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

for some small constant $\varepsilon > 0$, as desired, concluding the BEC side information case.

BSC side information: Refer Lemma E.8 for the conditions that hold below the IT threshold. We first consider the case when both $\max\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} \leq 0$ and we have $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. For any $i \in T_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = +1\right) \\ &\geq (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}(\log(a_1/b)Z_1 + \log(b/a_2)Z_2 \leq -(1 + o(1))\gamma - \beta \log n) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\min\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} < 0$ because not both are zero simultaneously. We apply Lemma A.3 with $\delta := -\gamma/\log n = \rho(a_1 - b) + (1 - \rho)(b - a_2) - \beta$. Using $\log(x) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{x}$, it is immediately verifiable that

$$\log(a_1/b)\rho a_1 + \log(b/a_2)(1 - \rho)b - \delta \geq 0.$$

Applying Lemma A.3 for the two binomials Z_1 and Z_2 for the tail in (43),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-I^* + o(1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } I^* &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(t\beta - t(a_1 - b)\rho - t(1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \rho a_1 \left(1 - \left(\frac{b}{a_1}\right)^t\right) + (1 - \rho)b \left(1 - \left(\frac{a_2}{b}\right)^t\right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{following identical calculation used in deriving (41)})$$

Thus, using $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$, we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

The case when $\min\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} \geq 0$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, follows exactly symmetrical argument but for $T = T_-$.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) = (1 - \alpha_n) \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = -1\right) \quad (45)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{P}(-\log(a_1/b)Z_3 - \log(b/a_2)Z_4 \leq (1 + o(1))\gamma - \beta \log n) \quad (46)$$

We observe that it must be that $\min\{-\log(a_1/b), -\log(b/a_2)\} < 0$. We again apply Lemma A.3 with $\delta := \gamma/\log n - \beta = \rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b) - \beta$. Using $\log(x) \leq x - 1$, we have that

$$-\log(a_1/b)\rho b - \log(b/a_2)(1 - \rho)a_2 - \delta \geq 0.$$

Using Lemma A.3 for the two binomials Z_3 and Z_4 in (44), for any $i \in T_-$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-I^*+o(1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } I^* &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(t\beta + t(a_1 - b)\rho + t(1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \rho b \left(1 - \left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right)^t\right) + (1 - \rho)a_2 \left(1 - \left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right)^t\right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{following identical calculation used in deriving (41)})$$

Given that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

We now turn to the cases when $\min\{\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2)\} < 0$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1 - t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$. This covers one scenario each from (1) and (3) in Lemma E.8. For any $i \in T_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1) \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = -1\right) \\ &\geq \alpha_n \mathbb{P}(\log(a_1/b)Z_1 + \log(b/a_2)Z_2 \leq -(1 + o(1))\gamma + \beta \log n) \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma A.3 with $\delta := -\gamma/\log n = \rho(a_1 - b) + (1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \beta$ for the two binomials Z_1 and Z_2

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-\beta} \cdot n^{-I^*+o(1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } I^* &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(-t\beta - t(a_1 - b)\rho - t(1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \rho a_1 \left(1 - \left(\frac{b}{a_1}\right)^t\right) + (1 - \rho)b \left(1 - \left(\frac{a_2}{b}\right)^t\right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} -\beta t + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{following identical calculation used in deriving (41)})$$

Thus, when $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1 - t) + D_t(\theta_-, \theta_+) < 1$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1+\varepsilon}.$$

Finally, we turn our attention to $\min\{-\log(a_1/b), -\log(b/a_2)\} < 0$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1-t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$. This covers the remaining scenarios from (1) and (3) in Lemma E.8. For any $i \in T_-$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}(y_i = +1) \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n} \mid y_i = +1\right) \\ &\geq \alpha_n \mathbb{P}(-\log(a_1/b)Z_3 - \log(b/a_2)Z_4 \leq (1 + o(1))\gamma + \beta \log n) \end{aligned}$$

We apply Lemma A.3 with $\delta := \gamma/\log n + \beta = \rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b) + \beta$.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^\beta \cdot n^{-I^* + o(1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } I^* &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(-t\beta + t(a_1 - b)\rho + t(1 - \rho)(b - a_2) + \rho b \left(1 - \left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right)^t\right) + (1 - \rho)a_2 \left(1 - \left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right)^t\right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} -\beta t + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{following identical calculation used in deriving (41)})$$

Using $\sup_{t \geq 0} \beta(1 - t) + D_t(\theta_+, \theta_-) < 1$, we conclude that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_i^* R_i < \frac{-3 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) \geq n^{-1 + \varepsilon}.$$

Overall, we established that at least for one of $T = T_+$ or $T = T_-$, the desired property from the lemma holds under BSC side information, concluding the proof of the lemma. \blacksquare

E.3 Spectral Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we present our spectral algorithm for the SBM that can emulate the genie. As discussed in Section 4.2, this requires taking an appropriate linear combination of eigenvectors such that the top two eigenvectors such that $c_1 u_1^* + c_2 u_2^*$ approximates w in the ℓ_∞ norm. The vector w is a block vector with entries (w_+, w_-) on the locations of C_+ and C_- . Recall by Lemma E.2 that

$$w_+ = \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad w_- = \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right).$$

We first present a subroutine that finds these coefficients (c_1, c_2) . We will introduce the formal correctness of the subroutine later, but first we provide informal discussion as to how these coefficients are computed. Roughly speaking, both u_1^* and u_2^* also have a block structure, and therefore, finding (c_1, c_2) just corresponds to solving a system of 2×2 linear equations. Also, the coefficients do not depend on the locations of σ^* with $+1$ or -1 labels, so exploiting this fact we just do calculation as if C_+ is on the first $\lfloor \rho n \rfloor$ vertices and compute the proxy for actual A^* . This results into the following subroutine.

Algorithm 3 Find Linear Combination Coefficients

Input: The parameter set (ρ, a_1, a_2, b) such that $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$ (Rank-2) and the graph size n .

Output: The desired linear combination (c_1, c_2) .

1: Let $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $S = \{i : i \leq \rho n\}$ and compute the matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_1 \log n/n & \text{if } i, j \in S; \\ b \log n/n & \text{if } i \in S \text{ but } j \notin S; \\ a_2 \log n/n & \text{if } i \notin S \text{ and } j \notin S. \end{cases}$$

- 2: Compute the two eigenpairs $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{v}_1)$ and $(\tilde{\lambda}_2, \tilde{v}_2)$ of B (note that B is rank-2).
 3: Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the block vector such that:

$$w_i = \begin{cases} w_+ = \log(a_1/b), & \text{if } i \in S; \\ w_- = \log(b/a_2) & \text{if } i \notin S. \end{cases}$$

- 4: Return $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that satisfies

$$c_1 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{v}_1 \\ \tilde{\lambda}_1 \end{pmatrix} + c_2 \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{v}_2 \\ \tilde{\lambda}_2 \end{pmatrix} = w. \quad (47)$$

Both \tilde{v}_1 and \tilde{v}_2 are block-vectors and they are linearly independent. Thus, Finding (c_1, c_2) corresponds to solving a system of 2×2 linear equations.

We note that in the rank-2 case when $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$, the vectors \tilde{v}_1 and \tilde{v}_2 have block structure and are linearly independent. Therefore, it is possible to span any vector with block structure, and in particular, even w . We now propose our spectral algorithm in the rank-2 case.

Algorithm 4 Spectral recovery algorithm for SBM (Rank-2)

Input: An $n \times n$ observation matrix A and parameters (ρ, a_1, a_2, b) such that $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$. Optionally, BEC side information y and parameter $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1]$ or BSC side information y and parameter $\alpha_n \in (0, 1/2]$.

Output: An estimate of community assignments $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$.

- 1: **Compute leading eigenpairs.** Compute the top eigenpair of A , denoted by (λ_1, u_1) , where $|\lambda_1| \geq \dots \geq |\lambda_n|$.
- 2: **Compute coefficients of linear combination.** Run Algorithm 3 to find (c_1, c_2) and

$$\gamma := (\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)) \log n.$$

- 3: **Compute spectral scores.** For any $s = (s_1, s_2) \in \{\pm 1\}^2$, prepare the spectral score vectors

- No side information:

$$z^{(s)} = s_1 c_1 u_1 + s_2 c_2 u_2 + \gamma \mathbf{1}_n.$$

- BEC side information: For any $i \in [n]$,

$$z_i^{(s)} = \begin{cases} s_1 c_1 (u_1)_i + s_2 c_2 (u_2)_i + \gamma & \text{if } y_i = 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y_i = +1; \\ -\infty & \text{if } y_i = -1. \end{cases}$$

- BSC side information:

$$z^{(s)} = s_1 c_1 u_1 + s_2 c_2 u_2 + \gamma \mathbf{1}_n + \ln \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \right) y.$$

- 4: **Remove sign ambiguity.** For each $s \in \{\pm 1\}^2$, let $\hat{\sigma}^{(s)} = \text{sgn}(z^{(s)})$.

- No side information: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \arg \max_{\{\hat{\sigma}^{(s)}: s \in \{\pm 1\}^2\}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \hat{\sigma}^{(s)} \mid A)$.
 - BEC or BSC side information: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \arg \max_{\{\hat{\sigma}^{(s)}: s \in \{\pm 1\}^2\}} \mathbb{P}(\sigma^* = \hat{\sigma}^{(s)} \mid A, y)$.
-

Finally, when $a_1 a_2 = b^2$, from Lemma E.2 we have $w_+ = w_- = \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right)$. In this case, we can just use the deterministic vector along $\mathbf{1}_n$ to emulate the genie-score vector. Strictly speaking, in this degenerate case, we do not even need a spectral strategy to achieve optimality. Despite this, we just refer to this as a spectral algorithm in the rest of the analysis for simplicity of exposition.

Algorithm 5 (Spectral) Recovery algorithm for SBM (Rank-1)

Input: An $n \times n$ observation matrix A and parameters (ρ, a_1, a_2, b) such that $a_1 a_2 = b^2$. Optionally, BEC side information y and parameter $\epsilon_n \in (0, 1]$ or BSC side information y and parameter $\alpha_n \in (0, 1/2]$.

Output: An estimate of community assignments $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$.

1: Let

$$c := \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right), \quad \gamma := (\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)) \log n.$$

2: Prepare the spectral score vector z^{spec} as follows.

- No side information:

$$z^{\text{spec}} = cA\mathbf{1}_n + \gamma\mathbf{1}_n.$$

- BEC side information: For any $i \in [n]$,

$$z_i^{\text{spec}} = \begin{cases} c(A\mathbf{1})_i + \gamma & \text{if } y_i = 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y_i = +1; \\ -\infty & \text{if } y_i = -1. \end{cases}$$

- BSC side information:

$$z^{\text{spec}} = cA\mathbf{1}_n + \gamma\mathbf{1}_n + \ln\left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right) y.$$

3: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \text{sgn}(z^{\text{spec}})$.

We now show that the score vectors formed by these algorithms approximate the genie score vector z^* in each case.

Lemma E.9. *Consider $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$ and condition on σ^* such that E from (11) holds. Optionally, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$, where ϵ_n and α_n is parameterized as (1) for $\beta \geq 0$. Let z^* be the genie score vector for the corresponding model. Then (irrespective of the parameter values), with probability $1 - o(1)$*

- Case $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$: for some $s = (s_1, s_2) \in \{\pm 1\}^2$

$$\|z^* - z^{(s)}\|_\infty = o(\log n).$$

- Case $a_1 a_2 = b^2$:

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{spec}}\|_\infty = o(\log n)$$

Proof. Recall from Lemma 2.10, how the genie score changes in the presence of BEC and BSC side information. In Algorithm 4 (step 3) and Algorithm 5 (step 2), this is precisely how the spectral score vectors are updated from the case when no side information is present. Therefore, it suffices

to show that the score approximation holds in the case when no side information is present, which now will be the focus of the proof. The argument is exactly analogous to the one done used in Lemma D.10. We now discuss the rank 1 and rank 2 cases one by one.

Rank-1 case: $a_1 a_2 = b^2$. In this case, when no side information is present

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{spec}}\|_\infty = \|z^* - \log(a_1/b)A\mathbf{1}_n - \gamma\mathbf{1}_n\|_\infty = O(1),$$

where the last equation follows from Lemma E.2 and using that $\frac{a_1}{b} = \frac{b}{a_2}$.

Rank-2 case: $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$. Fix $(s_1, s_2) \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ to be the signs for which the high probability event in Lemma C.4 holds. Define w to be the vector from Lemma E.2 with entries $(w_+, w_-) = (\log(a_1/b), \log(b/a_2))$ on the locations of C_+ and C_- respectively. In this case, using Lemma C.4, we will show that with probability $1 - o(1)$, we have

$$\|Aw - s_1 c_1 u_1 - s_2 c_2 u_2\|_\infty = o(\log n). \quad (48)$$

Combing this (48) along with Lemma E.2 implies the desired result: with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|z^* - z^{(s)}\|_\infty &\leq \|z^* - Aw - \gamma\mathbf{1}_n\|_\infty + \|Aw + \gamma\mathbf{1}_n - z^{(s)}\|_\infty \\ &= \|z^* - Aw - \gamma\mathbf{1}_n\|_\infty + \|Aw - s_1 c_1 u_1 - s_2 c_2 u_2\|_\infty \quad (\text{step 3 of Algorithm 4}) \\ &= o(\log n). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show (48). Note that, we calculate (c_1, c_2) in Algorithm 3 using the matrix B where community sizes are exactly ρn . But, condition on E , we have community sizes $(1 + o(1))\rho n$ and $(1 + o(1))(1 - \rho)n$. Also, in A^* , we have zero diagonal, where as, the matrix B has diagonal entries of the order of $O(\log n/n)$. These changes only affect the eigenvalues by the multiplicative factor of $(1 + o(1))$ by Weyl's inequality. Therefore,

$$\lambda_1^* = (1 + o(1))\tilde{\lambda}_1 \text{ and } \lambda_2^* = (1 + o(1))\tilde{\lambda}_2.$$

Moreover, the entries of u_1^* in location of C_+ are $(1 + o(1))$ factor of the entries of \tilde{v}_1 in the location S . By the same argument, one can say the same for u_1^* in locations of C_- and \tilde{v}_1 in locations of $[n] \setminus S$, and also for u_2^* and \tilde{v}_2 . From the way we calculate (c_1, c_2) in (47), we have

$$c_1 \left(\frac{\tilde{v}_1}{\tilde{\lambda}_1} \right) + c_2 \left(\frac{\tilde{v}_2}{\tilde{\lambda}_2} \right) = w.$$

Then the above discussion implies

$$w_+ = (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{c_1 u_{1,i}^*}{\lambda_1^*} + \frac{c_2 u_{2,i}^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right), \text{ for } i \in C_+ \text{ and } w_- = (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{c_1 u_{1,i}^*}{\lambda_1^*} + \frac{c_2 u_{2,i}^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right), \text{ for } i \in C_-.$$

Finally using Lemma C.4, with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|Aw - s_1 c_1 u_1 - s_2 c_2 u_2\|_\infty &\leq \left\| Aw - c_1 \frac{Au_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} - c_2 \frac{Au_2^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right\|_\infty + o(1) \\ &= \left\| (1 + o(1)) \left(c_1 \frac{Au_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} + c_2 \frac{Au_2^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right) - c_1 \frac{Au_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} - c_2 \frac{Au_2^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right\|_\infty + o(1) \\ &= o(1) \left(\max_{i \in [n]} \|A_i\|_1 \right) \cdot \left(\left\| \frac{c_1 u_1^*}{\lambda_1^*} \right\|_\infty \vee \left\| \frac{c_2 u_2^*}{\lambda_2^*} \right\|_\infty \right) \\ &= o(\log n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows by using Lemma E.1 and (c_1, c_2) are chosen in such a way that the entries of vectors $\frac{c_1 u_1^*}{\lambda_1^*}$ and $\frac{c_2 u_2^*}{\lambda_2^*}$ are $O(1)$ by (47). \blacksquare

We finally combine all the pieces and give the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. We first show the impossibility result below the IT threshold. When $a_1 = a_2 = b$, it is clear that the recovery is impossible without side information. Even under side information, when $\beta < 1$, for at least $\omega(1)$ vertices, it is impossible to recover the true labels, and exact recovery is impossible. Also, under side information, verify that below the IT threshold simply corresponds to $\beta < 1$ when $a_1 = a_2 = b$.

We now consider the case when all three (a_1, a_2, b) are not same simultaneously. Let z^* be the genie score vector (for the model of side information in consideration). By Lemma E.6, below the IT threshold

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in [n] : \sigma_i^* z_i^* < \frac{-2 \log n}{\log \log n}\right) = 1 - o(1).$$

The definition of genie scores (3) and Lemma 2.9 then implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \text{ fails}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\exists i \in [n] : \hat{\sigma}_{\text{Gen},i} \text{ fails}) = 1 - o(1).$$

Using the optimality of the MAP estimator, we finally conclude, for any estimator $\hat{\sigma}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma} \text{ fails}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \text{ fails}) = 1 - o(1).$$

To show the positive result, we break into cases.

1. Rank 1, i.e. $a_1 a_2 = b^2$: First note that Algorithm 5 creates a score vector $z^{\text{spec}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|z^* - z^{\text{spec}}\|_\infty = o(\log n)$ by Lemma E.9. Using Lemma E.3, above the IT threshold, there exists $\vartheta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i^* z_i^{\text{spec}} \leq \varsigma \log n) = o(n^{-1}).$$

Taking a union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall i \in [n], \sigma_i^* z_i^{\text{spec}} > \varsigma \log n) = 1 - o(1).$$

Finally, the algorithm outputs $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \text{sgn}(z^{\text{spec}})$ (step 3), this immediately implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} = \sigma^*) = 1 - o(1).$$

2. Rank 2, i.e. $a_1 a_2 \neq b^2$: We first note that, above the IT threshold (in the corresponding side information case), the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}}$ succeeds with high probability. That is $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} = \sigma^*$, unless $a_1 = a_2$ and no side information, in which case $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{MAP}} \in \{\pm \sigma^*\}$, with high probability. This follows from the achievability result [AS15, Theorem 6] when no/weak side information, and Theorem 2 when $\beta > 1$ under side information cases. Recall that Algorithm 4 creates four candidates for σ^* and chooses the one with maximum posterior probability. Due to statistical achievability, it suffices to show that one of the $\{\sigma^{(s)} : s = (s_1, s_2) \in \{\pm 1\}^2\}$ maintained by the algorithm is σ^* with high probability. To this end, recall Lemma E.9 that with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\min_{s^* \in \{\pm 1\}^2} \left\| z^* - z^{(s^*)} \right\|_\infty = o(\log n).$$

Combining this with Lemma E.3, there exists $s^* \in \{\pm 1\}^2$ such that, there exists $\varsigma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^{(s^*)} > \varsigma \log n\right) = 1 - o(1),$$

after taking a union bound. As $\hat{\sigma}^{(s^*)} = \text{sgn}(z^{(s^*)})$ in step 4, we obtain $\hat{\sigma}^{(s^*)} = \sigma^*$ with high probability. Overall, we established that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}}$ achieves exact recovery above the IT threshold.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{spec}} \text{ succeeds}) = 1. \quad \blacksquare$$

E.4 Degree-Profiling Algorithm and Proof of Theorem 4

Algorithm 6 Degree-Profiling algorithm for SBM in the presence of BEC or BSC side information.

Input: An $n \times n$ observation matrix A and parameters (ρ, a_1, a_2, b) . For $\beta > 0$, the BEC side information y with parameter ϵ_n or BSC side information y with parameter α_n , parameterized according to (1).

Output: An estimate of community assignments $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$.

- 1: Let $S_+ := \{i : y_i = +1\}$, $S_- := \{i : y_i = -1\}$, and $\gamma := (\rho(b - a_1) + (1 - \rho)(a_2 - b)) \log n$. Compute $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for every $i \in [n]$

$$z_i = \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in S_+} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in S_-} A_{ij} + \gamma.$$

- 2: Prepare the degree-profile score vector z^{dp} as follows.

- BEC side information: For any $i \in [n]$,

$$z_i^{\text{dp}} = \begin{cases} z_i & \text{if } y_i = 0; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y_i = +1; \\ -\infty & \text{if } y_i = -1; \end{cases}$$

- BSC side information:

$$z^{\text{dp}} = z + \ln\left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right) y$$

- 3: Return $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}} = \text{sgn}(z^{\text{dp}})$.
-

Lemma E.10. Fix $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and $a_1, a_2, b > 0$. Let $(A, \sigma^*) \sim \text{SBM}_n(\rho, a_1, a_2, b)$ and condition on σ^* such that E from (11) holds. For $\beta > 0$, let $y \sim \text{BEC}(\sigma^*, \epsilon_n)$ or $y \sim \text{BSC}(\sigma^*, \alpha_n)$ where ϵ_n and α_n are parameterized as (1). Let z^* and z^{dp} respectively be the genie score vector and the degree-profiling score vector produced by Algorithm 6 for the corresponding model of side information. Then with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{dp}}\|_{\infty} = O\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right).$$

Proof. The proof has similar calculations as in Lemma D.12 for ROS. We again first start by noting that z^{dp} is just formed by overriding the entries of z from step 1 of Algorithm 6 with $+\infty$ or $-\infty$ depending on the side information label being $+1$ or -1 under BEC channel. Also, in step 2 under the BSC channel, we have $z^{\text{dp}} = z + \log\left(\frac{1 - \alpha_n}{\alpha_n}\right) y$. Recall Lemma 2.10 as to how the genie scores change under both types of side information. It suffices to show that, with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\|z' - z\|_{\infty} = O\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right),$$

where z' is the genie score vector without side information and z is formed in step 1. Recall that E_1 holds with probability $1 - O(n^{-3})$ from (30). Using Lemma E.2 along with the triangle inequality we obtain the following.

- BEC side information:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z' - z\|_\infty &= \max_{i \in [n]} |z'_i - z_i| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| + O(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we substitute z' from step 1. From Lemma D.11, both $|C_+ \setminus S_+|$ and $|C_- \setminus S_-|$ are bounded by $O(n/\log^{10} n)$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. These sets are independent of A and are chosen based on y . Using Lemma E.5 for these sets, with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\|z' - z\|_\infty \leq \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} \right| + \left| \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| + O(1) = O\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right).$$

- BSC side information: There are additional error terms caused by the sets $S_+ \setminus C_+$ and $S_- \setminus C_-$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z' - z\|_\infty &= \max_{i \in [n]} |z'_i - z_i| = \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} - \log\left(\frac{a_1}{b}\right) \sum_{j \in S_+ \setminus C_+} A_{ij} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} - \log\left(\frac{b}{a_2}\right) \sum_{j \in S_- \setminus C_-} A_{ij} \right| + O(1) \\ &\quad \text{(substituting } z' \text{ from Lemma E.2 and } z \text{ from step 1)} \\ &= O(1) \cdot \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \sum_{j \in C_+ \setminus S_+} A_{ij} + \sum_{j \in C_- \setminus S_-} A_{ij} \right| + O(1). \\ &\quad \text{(since } S_+ \setminus C_+ = C_- \setminus S_- \text{ and } S_- \setminus C_- = C_+ \setminus S_+) \end{aligned}$$

Exactly the same argument of using Lemma D.11, both $|C_+ \setminus S_+|$ and $|C_- \setminus S_-|$ is $O(n/\log^{10} n)$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. Using Lemma E.5 for these sets, with probability $1 - o(1)$

$$\|z' - z\|_\infty = O\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right).$$

We finally prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4. When $\beta > 0$, by Lemma E.10, with probability $1 - o(1)$,

$$\|z^* - z^{\text{dp}}\|_\infty = O(1).$$

Above the IT threshold by Lemma E.3 and union bound over $i \in [n]$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^* > \delta \log n\right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Taking a union bound of these two events, there exists $\varsigma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^* z_i^{\text{dp}} > \varsigma \log n\right) = 1 - o(1).$$

Observing $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}} = \text{sgn}(z^{\text{dp}})$ in step 3 of Algorithm 6, we obtain $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}}$ achieves exact recovery, i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{dp}} \text{ succeeds}) = 1. \quad \blacksquare$$