

A Regression Framework for Studying Relationships among Attributes under Network Interference

Cornelius Fritz
Michael Schweinberger*
Subhankar Bhadra
David R. Hunter

Abstract

To understand how the interconnected and interdependent world of the twenty-first century operates and make model-based predictions, joint probability models for networks and interdependent outcomes are needed. We propose a comprehensive regression framework for networks and interdependent outcomes with multiple advantages, including interpretability, scalability, and provable theoretical guarantees. The regression framework can be used for studying relationships among attributes of connected units and captures complex dependencies among connections and attributes, while retaining the virtues of linear regression, logistic regression, and other regression models by being interpretable and widely applicable. On the computational side, we show that the regression framework is amenable to scalable statistical computing based on convex optimization of pseudo-likelihoods using minorization-maximization methods. On the theoretical side, we establish convergence rates for pseudo-likelihood estimators based on a single observation of dependent connections and attributes. We demonstrate the regression framework using simulations and an application to hate speech on the social media platform X in the six months preceding the insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Keywords: Dependent data, Generalized Linear Models, Minorization-Maximization, Pseudo-likelihood

*Corresponding author. The authors acknowledge support by DFG award FR 4768/1-1 (CF) and ARO award W911NF-21-1-0335 (CF, MS, SB).

1 Introduction

In the interconnected and interdependent world of the twenty-first century, individual and collective outcomes (e.g., personal and public health, economic welfare, war and peace) are affected by relationships among individual, corporate, state and non-state actors. To understand how the interconnected and interdependent world operates and make model-based predictions, it is vital to study networks of relationships and gain insight into how the structure of networks affects individual or collective outcomes.

While the structure of networks has been widely studied (see, e.g., Kolaczyk, 2017, and references therein), the structure of networks is rarely of primary interest. More often than not, the question of primary interest is how networks affect individual or collective outcomes. For example, social, economic, and financial relationships between individual and corporate actors can affect the welfare of people, but the outcome of primary interest is the welfare of billions of people around the world. A second example is war and peace: Relationships among state and non-state actors can affect war and peace, but the outcome of primary interest is the welfare of nations. A third example is epidemics: Contact networks mediate the spread of infectious diseases, but the outcome of primary interest is public health. A final example is causal inference under interference: If the outcomes of units are affected by the treatments or outcomes of other units, the spillover effect of treatments on outcomes can be represented by an intervention network, but the target of causal inference is the direct and indirect causal effects of treatments on outcomes.

To learn how networks are wired and how the structure of networks affects individual or collective outcomes, data on outcomes $\mathbf{Y} := (Y_i)_{i=1}^N$ and connections $\mathbf{Z} := (Z_{i,j})_{i,j}^N$ among N units are needed along with predictors $\mathbf{X} := (\mathbf{X}_i)_{i=1}^N$. Despite the abundance of models for outcomes $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and connections $\mathbf{Z} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, statistical work on joint probability models for dependent outcomes and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ is scarce. Snijders et al. (2007) and Niezink and Snijders (2017) develop models for behavioral outcomes and connections using continuous-time Markov processes, assuming that the behavioral outcomes and connections are observed at two or more time points. Fellows and Handcock (2012) and Wang et al. (2024) combine Ising models for binary outcomes with exponential family models for binary connections, with applications to causal inference (Clark

and Handcock, 2024). In a Bayesian framework, Fosdick and Hoff (2015) unite models for continuous outcomes with latent variable models that capture dependencies among connections. A common feature of these approaches is that the models and methods in these works may be useful in small populations (with, e.g., hundreds of members) but may be less useful in large populations (with, e.g., thousands or millions of members). For example, many of these models make dependence assumptions that are reasonable in small populations but are less reasonable in large populations. In the special case of exponential-family models, it is known that models that make strong dependence assumptions can give rise to undesirable probabilistic and statistical behavior in large populations (Handcock, 2003; Rinaldo et al., 2009; Schweinberger, 2011; Chatterjee and Diaconis, 2013). In addition, the cited works rely on Monte Carlo and Markov chain Monte Carlo methods for moment- and likelihood-based inference, which limits the scalability of the mentioned approaches. Last, but not least, the theoretical properties of statistical procedures based on such complex models for dependent data—e.g., the convergence rates of estimators—are unknown.

We propose a comprehensive regression framework for studying relationships among attributes under network interference with important advantages over existing work, including interpretability, scalability, and provable theoretical guarantees:

1. We show in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 that the proposed regression framework can be viewed as a generalization of linear regression, logistic regression, and other regression models for studying relationships among attributes under network interference, adding a simple and widely applicable set of tools to the toolbox of data scientists. We demonstrate the advantages of the regression framework with an application to hate speech on the social media platform X in the six months preceding the insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021 in Section 6.
2. The proposed regression framework can be applied to small and large populations by leveraging additional structure to control the dependence among outcomes and connections, facilitating the construction of models with complex dependencies among outcomes and connections in small and large populations.
3. We develop scalable methods using minorization-maximization algorithms for convex optimization of pseudo-likelihoods in Section 3. To disseminate the regression

framework and its scalable methods, we will publish an R package.

4. We establish theoretical guarantees for pseudo-likelihood estimators in Section 4. To the best of our knowledge, these are the first theoretical guarantees for joint probability models of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ based on a single observation (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) of (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) . The simulation results in Section 5 demonstrate that pseudo-likelihood estimators perform well as the number of units N and the number of parameters p increases.

In addition, the regression framework has conceptual and statistical advantages:

5. Compared with separate models of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and $\mathbf{Z} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, the proposed regression framework for dependent outcomes and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ provides insight into outcome-connection dependencies, in addition to outcome-outcome and connection-connection dependencies.
6. Compared with models of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, statistical conclusions based on the proposed regression framework are not limited to a specific population network \mathbf{z} , but can be extended to the superpopulation of all possible population networks. In addition, the proposed regression framework provides insight into the probability law governing the superpopulation of all possible population networks.
7. The proposed regression framework retains the advantages of two general approaches to building joint probability models for dependent data, elucidated in the celebrated paper by Besag (1974): Specifying a joint probability distribution directly guarantees desirable mathematical properties, while specifying it indirectly via conditional probability distributions helps build complex models from simple building blocks. We show how to directly specify a joint probability model from simple building blocks. The resulting regression framework possesses desirable mathematical properties and induces conditional distributions that can be represented by regression models, facilitating interpretation. We showcase these advantages in Sections 2.2 and 6.2.

We elaborate the proposed regression framework in the remainder of the article.

2 Regression under Network Interference

Consider a population of $N \geq 2$ units $\mathcal{P}_N := \{1, \dots, N\}$, where each unit $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ possesses

- one or more binary, count-valued, or real-valued predictors $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, which may include covariates and treatment assignments;
- binary, count-valued, or real-valued outcomes or responses $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$;
- binary, count-valued, or real-valued connections $Z_{i,j} \in \mathcal{Z}_{i,j}$ to other units $j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}$, which represent indicators of connections or weights of connections (e.g., the number of interactions between i and j).

We first consider undirected connections for which $Z_{i,j} = Z_{j,i}$, and describe extensions to directed connections for which $Z_{i,j}$ may not be equal to $Z_{j,i}$ in Section 6. We write $\mathbf{X} := (\mathbf{X}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$, $\mathbf{Y} := (Y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$, $\mathbf{Z} := (Z_{i,j})_{1 \leq i < j \leq N}$, $\mathcal{X} := \times_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}_i$, $\mathcal{Y} := \times_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i$, and $\mathcal{Z} := \times_{i < j}^N \mathcal{Z}_{i,j}$, and refer to \mathbf{Y} without Y_i and \mathbf{Z} without $Z_{i,j}$ as $\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in \mathcal{Y}_{-i}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}} \in \mathcal{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}$, respectively. In line with Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), we introduce a known scale parameter $\psi \in (0, +\infty)$ and define $Y_i^* := Y_i / \psi$ and $\mathbf{Y}_{-i}^* := \mathbf{Y}_{-i} / \psi$. Throughout, $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function, which is 1 if its argument is true and is 0 otherwise.

Following the bulk of the literature on regression models, we consider a fixed design in the sense that we condition on $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, although the proposed regression framework can handle random predictors \mathbf{X} . Throughout, we consider a single observation of dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. To construct joint probability models for dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, we consider a family of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$ dominated by a σ -finite measure ν , with densities of the form

$$f_\theta(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\varphi(\theta)} \left[\prod_{i=1}^N a_y(y_i) \exp(\theta_g^\top g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i^*)) \right] \times \left[\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=i+1}^N a_z(z_{i,j}) \exp(\theta_h^\top h_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}, y_i^*, y_j^*, \mathbf{z})) \right] : \quad (1)$$

- $a_y : \mathcal{Y}_i \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ and $a_z : \mathcal{Z}_{i,j} \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ are known functions of responses Y_i of units $i \in \mathcal{P}_i$ and connections $Z_{i,j}$ of pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$;
- $g_i : \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_i \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q$ are known functions describing the relationship of predictors \mathbf{x}_i and responses Y_i of units $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$, which can depend on ψ ;

- $h_{i,j} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_i \times \mathcal{Y}_j \times \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^r$ are known functions specifying how the responses and connections of pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ depend on the predictors, responses, and connections to other units, which can depend on ψ ;
- $\boldsymbol{\theta} := (\boldsymbol{\theta}_g, \boldsymbol{\theta}_h) \in \Theta$ is a parameter vector of dimension $p := q + r$, where $\Theta := \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \varphi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty\}$ and $\varphi : \Theta \mapsto (0, +\infty]$ ensures that $\int_{\mathbf{y} \times \mathbf{z}} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}) d\nu(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = 1$, with the dependence of φ on \mathbf{x} suppressed;
- ν is a σ -finite product measure of the form

$$\nu(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \prod_{i=1}^N \nu_{\mathbf{y}}(y_i) \prod_{j=i+1}^N \nu_{\mathbf{z}}(z_{i,j}),$$

where $\nu_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\nu_{\mathbf{z}}$ are σ -finite measures that depend on the support sets of responses Y_i and connections $Z_{i,j}$ (e.g., Lebesgue or counting measure).

Joint probability models of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be built in two steps using two simple building blocks, the vector-valued functions g_i and $h_{i,j}$:

Step 1: For each unit $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$, specify the relationship between predictors \mathbf{x}_i and response Y_i , by specifying g_i .

Step 2: For each pair of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$, describe how the responses Y_i and Y_j depend on each other, and how Y_i and Y_j depend on the predictors of other units and the connections to other units, by specifying $h_{i,j}$.

In large populations, the functions $h_{i,j}$ will not depend on the attributes and connections of all other units: Time, geography, and other real-world constraints prevent a unit from knowing the attributes and connections of most other units. In addition, models that allow for dependence among the attributes and connections of all units may suffer from model near-degeneracy and other undesirable properties, which have been explored elsewhere (Handcock, 2003; Schweinberger, 2011; Chatterjee and Diaconis, 2013). Motivated by these considerations, we encourage a form of local dependence by leveraging additional structure in the form of overlapping neighborhoods. We provide an example of local dependence in Section 2.2, but we first explore the relationship of joint probability models for dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ to the conditional distributions of responses

$Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ and connections $Z_{i,j} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$, which facilitates the interpretation of models.

2.1 GLM Representations

The proposed joint probability models of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be viewed as generalizations of Generalized Linear Models (GLMs) (Efron, 2022). GLMs form a well-known, interpretable, and widely applicable statistical framework for univariate responses $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ given predictors $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 1$), including logistic regression ($Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$), Poisson regression ($Y_i \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$), and linear regression ($Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$). GLMs are characterized by two properties:

1. *Conditional mean:* The conditional mean $\mu_i(\eta_i) := \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}(Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i)$ of response $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, conditional on predictors $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with weights $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, is a (possibly nonlinear) function of a linear predictor $\eta_i := \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}_i$.
2. *Conditional distribution:* The conditional distribution of response Y_i is an exponential family distribution with a known scale parameter $\psi \in (0, +\infty)$, which admits a density with respect to a σ -finite measure ν_y of the form

$$f_{\eta_i}(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}_i) := a_y(y_i) \exp\left(\frac{\eta_i y_i - b_i(\eta_i)}{\psi}\right),$$

with cumulant-generating function

$$b_i(\eta_i) := \psi \log \int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} a_y(y) \exp\left(\frac{\eta_i y}{\psi}\right) d\nu_y(y).$$

The conditional mean $\mu_i(\eta_i)$ can be obtained by differentiating $b_i(\eta_i)$ with respect to η_i , that is, $\mu_i(\eta_i) = \nabla_{\eta_i} b_i(\eta_i)$ (Corollary 2.3, Brown, 1986, pp. 35–36).

The relationship to GLMs facilitates the interpretation and dissemination of results. The following proposition clarifies the relationship to GLMs.

Proposition 1. *Consider any pair of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ ($i < j$) and assume that g_i and $h_{i,j}$ are affine functions of y_i^* for any given $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_{-i} \times \mathcal{Z}$, in the sense that there exist known functions $g_{i,0} : \mathcal{X}_i \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q$, $g_{i,1} : \mathcal{X}_i \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q$, $h_{i,j,0} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_j \times \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^r$, and $h_{i,j,1} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}_j \times \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^r$ such that*

$$g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i^*) := g_{i,0}(\mathbf{x}_i) + g_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}_i) y_i^*$$

$$h_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}, y_i^*, y_j^*, \mathbf{z}) := h_{i,j,0}(\mathbf{x}, y_j^*, \mathbf{z}) + h_{i,j,1}(\mathbf{x}, y_j^*, \mathbf{z}) y_i^*.$$

Then the conditional distribution of response $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ by unit i can be represented by a GLM with linear predictor

$$\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z}) := \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \left(g_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}_i), \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} h_{i,j,1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_j^*, \mathbf{z}) \right)$$

and cumulant-generating function

$$b_i(\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z})) := \psi \log \int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} a_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \exp\left(\frac{\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z}) y}{\psi}\right) d\nu_{\mathcal{Y}}(y).$$

To ease the notation, we henceforth write η_i instead of $\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z})$.

Proposition 1 supplies a recipe for representing the conditional distribution of responses $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ by a GLM:

1. *Conditional distribution:* The conditional distribution of response Y_i by unit i is an exponential family distribution, which can be represented by a GLM with conditional mean $\mu_i(\eta_i)$, linear predictor η_i , and scale parameter ψ .
2. *Conditional mean:* The conditional mean of response Y_i by unit i ,

$$\mu_i(\eta_i) := \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}(Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}),$$

can be obtained by differentiating $b_i(\eta_i)$ with respect to η_i :

$$\mu_i(\eta_i) = \nabla_{\eta_i} b_i(\eta_i).$$

Since the map $\eta_i \mapsto \mu_i$ is one-to-one and invertible (Theorem 3.6, Brown, 1986, p. 74), η_i can be obtained by inverting $\mu_i(\eta_i)$.

Thus, the proposed joint probability models for dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ inherit the advantages of GLMs by being widely applicable to binary, count-valued, and real-valued responses Y_i and facilitating interpretation, while dropping the unwarranted independence assumptions of GLMs and permitting dependence among responses Y_i . As a result, the proposed framework for dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be viewed as a generalization of GLMs.

2.2 Example: Model Specification

We showcase how a joint probability model for dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be constructed, while controlling the dependence among responses and connections by leveraging additional structure in the form of neighborhoods: We assume that each unit $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ has a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_i \subset \mathcal{P}_N$, which includes i and is independent of the connections \mathbf{Z} . While the functions a_y and a_z in Equation (1) should be chosen in accordance with the support sets of \mathbf{Y} and \mathbf{Z} , we focus on specifying the vector-valued functions g_i and $h_{i,j}$ with a view to capturing interesting real-world phenomena. To ease the presentation, we focus on units $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ with binary, count-valued, or real-valued predictors $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and responses $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, and connections $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ to other units $j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}$.

Starting with g_i , we capture the main effect of Y_i^* and the interaction effect of x_i and Y_i^* by specifying g_i as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_g := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_x \\ \beta_{x,y} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad g_i := \begin{pmatrix} y_i^* \\ x_i y_i^* \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (2)$$

Turning to $h_{i,j}$, we define neighborhood-bound terms

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,j} &:= \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset) \\ d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) &:= \mathbb{1}(\exists k \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j : z_{i,k} = z_{k,j} = 1). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To capture heterogeneity in the propensities of units to form connections, we introduce N -vectors $\mathbf{e}_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}^N$, whose i th and j th coordinates are 1 and whose other coordinates are 0, along with N -vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_z := (\alpha_{z,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which quantifies the propensities of units to form connections. In addition, we penalize connections among units i and j with non-overlapping neighborhoods and capture transitive closure along with treatment and outcome spillover by specifying $h_{i,j}$ as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_h := \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z \\ \lambda \\ \gamma_{z,z} \\ \gamma_{x,y,z} \\ \gamma_{y,y,z} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+4}, \quad h_{i,j} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{i,j} z_{i,j} \\ -(1 - c_{i,j}) z_{i,j} \log N \\ d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i,j} \\ c_{i,j} (x_i y_j^* + x_j y_i^*) z_{i,j} \\ c_{i,j} y_i^* y_j^* z_{i,j} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+4}. \quad (4)$$

The parameters $\alpha_{z,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}$ can be interpreted as the propensities of units $1, \dots, N$ to form connections; $\lambda > 0$ discourages connections among units with non-overlapping

neighborhoods; $\gamma_{z,z}$ quantifies the tendency towards transitive closure among connections; and $\gamma_{x,y,z}$ and $\gamma_{y,y,z}$ capture treatment and outcome spillover, respectively. We demonstrate in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 that the interpretation of these effects is facilitated by the fact that the conditional distributions of Y_i and $Z_{i,j}$ can be represented by GLMs.

Remark. We assume that the neighborhoods \mathcal{N}_i of units $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ are known, because we do not have independent replications that would enable us to learn them from data, in contrast to the literature on graphical models (Maathuis et al., 2019). The assumption that the neighborhoods are known dovetails with the bulk of the literature on spatio-temporal models (Wikle et al., 2019) and is not too restrictive in applications. As a case in point, consider the application to hate speech on the social media platform X in Section 6: Users choose whom to follow and hence decide who can influence them. These choices can be observed and can therefore be used to define users’ neighborhoods. In scenarios in which neighborhoods are unknown, researchers can take advantage of the growing body of work on “who is close to whom,” including stochastic block models (Gao and Ma, 2021) and latent space models (Athreya et al., 2021), to specify neighborhoods. That said, the problem of determining “who is close to whom” is an important problem in its own right and is orthogonal to the proposed regression framework.

2.2.1 GLM Representation of Responses Y_i

To interpret the model specified by Equations (2) and (4), we take advantage of the fact that the conditional distribution of response $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ by unit i can be represented by a GLM with linear predictor

$$\eta_i = \alpha_y + \beta_{x,y} x_i + \gamma_{x,y,z} \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset} x_j z_{i,j} + \gamma_{y,y,z} \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset} y_j^* z_{i,j}. \quad (5)$$

A graphical representation of the predictors, responses, and connections that affect the conditional distribution of response Y_i is provided by Figure 1. We provide three specific examples, depending on the support set of response Y_i .

Example 1: Real-valued responses $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\psi \in (0, +\infty)$ and

$$a_y(y_i) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\psi}} \exp\left(-\frac{y_i^2}{2\psi}\right) \mathbb{I}(y_i \in \mathbb{R}).$$

1. *Conditional distribution:* The conditional distribution of response Y_i is $N(\mu_i(\eta_i), \psi)$.




Figure 1: Arrows indicate which predictors, responses, and connections can affect the conditional distribution of response Y_1 by unit 1 according to the model specified by Equations (2) and (4), when the population consists of $N = 3$ units 1, 2, and 3 with neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_1 := \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{N}_2 := \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $\mathcal{N}_3 := \{2, 3\}$, respectively.

2. *Conditional mean:* The conditional mean $\mu_i(\eta_i)$ can be obtained by differentiating $b_i(\eta_i) = \eta_i^2/2$ with respect to η_i , giving $\mu_i(\eta_i) = \eta_i$:

$$\mu_i(\eta_i) = \alpha_y + \beta_{x,y} x_i + \gamma_{x,y,z} \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset} x_j z_{i,j} + \gamma_{y,y,z} \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset} y_j^* z_{i,j}.$$

Under certain restrictions on $\gamma_{y,y,z}$, the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is N -variate Gaussian. The restrictions on $\gamma_{y,y,z}$ depend on the neighborhoods \mathcal{N}_i and \mathcal{N}_j and connections $Z_{i,j}$ of pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$; see Proposition 2 in Section A of the Supplementary Materials.

Example 2: Count-valued responses $Y_i \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. Let $\psi := 1$ and

$$a_y(y_i) := \frac{1}{y_i!} \mathbb{I}(y_i \in \{0, 1, \dots\}).$$

1. *Conditional distribution:* The conditional distribution of response Y_i is $\text{Poisson}(\mu_i(\eta_i))$.
2. *Conditional mean:* The conditional mean $\mu_i(\eta_i)$ can be obtained by differentiating $b_i(\eta_i) = \exp(\eta_i)$ with respect to η_i , giving $\mu_i(\eta_i) = \exp(\eta_i)$.

Example 3: Binary responses $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $\psi := 1$ and $a_y(y_i) := \mathbb{I}(y_i \in \{0, 1\})$.

1. *Conditional distribution:* The conditional distribution of response Y_i is $\text{Bernoulli}(\mu_i(\eta_i))$.
2. *Conditional mean:* The conditional mean $\mu_i(\eta_i)$ can be obtained by differentiating $b_i(\eta_i) = \log(1 + \exp(\eta_i))$ with respect to η_i , giving $\mu_i(\eta_i) = \text{logit}^{-1}(\eta_i)$.

Interpretation of Examples. The GLM representations of the conditional distribution of response Y_i by unit i in Examples 1, 2, and 3 help interpret the parameters of the joint probability model of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ specified by Equations (2) and (4). For instance, α_y can be viewed as an intercept, while $\beta_{x,y}$ captures the relationship between predictor x_i and response Y_i . The parameters $\gamma_{x,y,z}$ and $\gamma_{y,y,z}$ capture spillover effects, provided x_i represents the treatment assigned to $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ and Y_i represents the outcome of $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$:

- *Treatment spillover:* $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$ allows the outcome Y_i of unit i to be affected by the treatments x_j of its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and non-neighbors $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i$, provided $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and i and j are connected (see Figure 1).
- *Outcome spillover:* $\gamma_{y,y,z} \neq 0$ allows the outcome Y_i of unit i to be affected by the outcomes y_j of its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and non-neighbors $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i$, provided $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and i and j are connected (see Figure 1).

Treatment spillover is widely studied in the literature on causal inference under interference, while outcome spillover is less studied. That said, we do not focus on causal inference: Instead, we are interested in a regression framework that can be used for studying either non-causal or causal relationships among attributes under network interference. The question of how the proposed regression framework can be used for causal inference under interference is an interesting topic in its own right, which we leave to future research.

2.2.2 GLM Representation of Connections $Z_{i,j}$

The conditional distribution of connection $Z_{i,j} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$ can be represented by a logistic regression model with linear predictor

$$\eta_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{z,i} + \alpha_{z,j} - \lambda \log N & \text{if } \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j = \emptyset \\ \alpha_{z,i} + \alpha_{z,j} + \gamma_{z,z} \Delta_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) & \text{if } \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset \\ + \gamma_{x,y,z} (x_i y_j^* + x_j y_i^*) & \\ + \gamma_{y,y,z} y_i^* y_j^*, & \end{cases}$$

where $\Delta_{i,j} : \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the change in $\sum_{a < b}^N d_{a,b}(\mathbf{z})$ due to transforming $z_{i,j}$ from 0 to 1. The conditional mean of $Z_{i,j} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$ is

$$\mu_{i,j}(\eta_{i,j}) := \mathbb{E}_{\eta_{i,j}}(Z_{i,j} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}) = \text{logit}^{-1}(\eta_{i,j}).$$

The fact that the conditional distribution of $Z_{i,j}$ can be represented by a logistic regression model facilitates interpretation: e.g., the model captures heterogeneity among units i in forming connections via $\alpha_{z,i}$. If $\lambda > 0$, the term $-\lambda \log N$ penalizes connections among units i and j with non-overlapping neighborhoods; size-dependent terms of the form $\log N$ were introduced by Krivitsky et al. (2011) and Krivitsky and Kolaczyk (2015), studied by Butts (2019), and expanded by Krivitsky et al. (2023) and others. The model captures three forms of dependencies. First, the model encourages i and j to be connected when i and j are both connected to some $k \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j$, provided $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma_{z,z} > 0$. Second, the model encourages i and j to be connected when $x_i y_j^* > 0$ or $x_j y_i^* > 0$, provided $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma_{x,y,z} > 0$. Third, the model encourages i and j to be connected when $y_i^* y_j^* > 0$, provided $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma_{y,y,z} > 0$.

3 Scalable Statistical Computing

While likelihood-based inference is natural, evaluating the likelihood is often infeasible. For instance, if $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$, the normalizing constant of the joint probability mass function of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ involves a sum over all $2^{N + \binom{N}{2}}$ elements $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \{0, 1\}^{N + \binom{N}{2}}$. Approximations exist, but stochastic ones (e.g., Markov chain Monte Carlo methods) can be time-consuming, while deterministic ones (e.g., variational methods) can result in non-concave maximization problems. Worse, large-sample advantages often enjoyed by maximum likelihood estimators do not follow from standard theory owing to the complex dependencies induced by the joint probability model of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$.

As a scalable alternative, we propose pseudo-likelihoods that give rise to concave maximization problems solvable by minorization-maximization (MM) methods. The convergence rates for these pseudo-likelihood estimators, presented in Section 4, are the first theoretical guarantees based on a single observation (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) of dependent responses and connections (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) conditional on predictors $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. In addition, we provide disclaimers by quantifying uncertainty, an important yet non-trivial task: for instance, van Duijn et al. (2009) demonstrate that the negative inverse Hessian of the pseudo-loglikelihood can be a poor covariance estimate. We address uncertainty quantification in Section 3.3.

3.1 Pseudo-Loglikelihood

Let

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \ell_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (6)$$

where ℓ_i and $\ell_{i,j}$ are defined by

$$\ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \log f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \log f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(z_{i,j} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}), \quad (7)$$

with the dependence of ℓ , ℓ_i and $\ell_{i,j}$ on $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ suppressed. The pseudo-loglikelihood ℓ is based on full conditional densities of responses Y_i and connections $Z_{i,j}$ and is hence tractable. In addition, ℓ is a sum of exponential family loglikelihood functions ℓ_i and $\ell_{i,j}$, each of which is concave and twice differentiable on the convex set Θ (Brown, 1986, Theorem 1.13, p. 19 and Lemma 5.3, p. 146), proving Lemma 1:

Lemma 1. *The set Θ is convex and $\ell : \Theta \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is twice differentiable with a negative semidefinite Hessian matrix on Θ .*

In light of the tractability and concavity of ℓ , it makes sense to base statistical learning on pseudo-likelihood estimators of the form

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) := \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{\infty} \leq \delta_N\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ denotes the gradient with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ while $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\infty} := \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} |v_k|$ denotes the ℓ_{∞} -norm of vectors $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The quantity $\delta_N \in [0, +\infty)$ can be viewed as a convergence criterion of a root-finding algorithm and can depend on N .

3.2 Minorization-Maximization

Pseudo-likelihood estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ can be obtained by root-finding algorithms. Having said that, root-finding algorithms that require inverting the $p \times p$ negative Hessian of ℓ are time-consuming, because inverting the Hessian at each iteration requires $O(p^3)$ operations, and p can be an increasing function of N .

To reduce the computational burden, we divide the task of estimating p parameters into two subtasks using minorization-maximization (MM) methods (Hunter and Lange, 2004). In the example model specified by Equations (2) and (4) with $p = N + 6$ parameters,

we partition $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+6}$ into N nuisance parameters, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 := (\alpha_{z,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and 6 parameters of primary interest, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 := (\lambda, \alpha_y, \beta_{x,y}, \gamma_{z,z}, \gamma_{x,y,z}, \gamma_{y,y,z}) \in \mathbb{R}^6$. In accordance, we partition the negative Hessian as follows:

$$-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top & \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, $\mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 6}$, and $\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}$. Writing $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ instead of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we compute at iteration $t + 1$:

Step 1: Find $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}$ satisfying $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \geq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$.

Step 2: Find $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}$ satisfying $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}) \geq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$.

In Step 1, it is inconvenient to invert the high-dimensional $N \times N$ matrix

$$\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) := -\sum_{i < j}^N \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}^2 \ell_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}} = \sum_{i < j}^N \pi_{i,j}^{(t)} (1 - \pi_{i,j}^{(t)}) \mathbf{e}_{i,j} \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^\top, \quad (10)$$

where $\pi_{i,j}^{(t)} := \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$. We thus increase ℓ by maximizing a minorizer of ℓ , replacing $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})$ by a constant matrix \mathbf{A}^* that only needs to be inverted once.

Lemma 2. *Define*

$$\mathbf{A}^* := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i < j}^N \mathbf{e}_{i,j} \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^\top = \frac{1}{4} [(N-2)\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top] = \left[\frac{4}{N-2} \left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{2N-2} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top \right) \right]^{-1},$$

where \mathbf{I} is the $N \times N$ identity matrix and $\mathbf{1}$ is the N -vector of ones. Then the function

$$\begin{aligned} m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) &:= \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) + \left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}} \right)^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)})^\top (-\mathbf{A}^*) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}) \end{aligned}$$

is a minorizer of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$ for fixed $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}$, in the sense that

$$m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \leq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \text{ for all } \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

$$m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}).$$

Lemma 2 is proved in Section B of the Supplementary Materials. Step 1 may be implemented by an MM algorithm, as the closed-form maximizer of $m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ is

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)} := \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)} + (\mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} \left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}} \right). \quad (11)$$

This MM step reduces the computational complexity per iteration from $O(N^3)$ to $O(N^2)$.

Step 2 updates $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}$ using a quasi-Newton step, which helps accelerate the algorithm. Details can be found in Section E of the Supplementary Materials.

The concavity of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, established in Lemma 1, guarantees that

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}) \geq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}).$$

Remarks. The MM algorithm for binary connections can be extended to non-binary connections using the de Pierro method (Becker et al., 1997). If the scale parameter ψ is unknown, it can be estimated by iterative methods.

3.3 Quantifying Uncertainty

In general, the pseudo-likelihood is not equivalent to the likelihood based on the data-generating model (1). We quantify the uncertainty about pseudo-likelihood estimators based on Godambe rather than Fisher information (Schmid and Hunter, 2023): We approximate the covariance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ by $\mathbb{V}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \approx \mathbf{H}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1} \mathbb{V}[\mathbf{G}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] \mathbf{H}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^{-1}$, where $\mathbf{G}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ and $\mathbf{H}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ are the gradient and Hessian of (6) evaluated at the maximum pseudo-likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. The variance $\mathbb{V}[\mathbf{G}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]$ of $\mathbf{G}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ can be approximated by Monte Carlo draws.

4 Theoretical Guarantees

We establish convergence rates for pseudo-likelihood estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\delta_N)$ based on a single observation of dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. To cover a wide range of models for binary, count-valued, and real-valued predictors, responses, and connections, we first introduce a general theoretical framework, and then showcase convergence rates in a specific example.

Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ be the data-generating parameter vector and $\mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho) := \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty < \rho\}$ be a hypercube with center $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta$ and width $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$. We henceforth write $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ instead of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to make the dependence of the pseudo-loglikelihood on the

observations $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ explicit, while suppressing predictors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$. Let

$$\mathcal{H} \subseteq \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z} : -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \text{ is invertible for all } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)\}$$

$$\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \sup_{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)} \|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}))^{-1}\|_{\infty},$$

where $\epsilon^* \in (0, +\infty)$ is a constant and $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ is the ℓ_{∞} -induced matrix norm. The set \mathcal{H} can be a proper subset of all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ for which $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ is invertible on $\mathcal{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$, provided \mathcal{H} is a high probability subset of $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$. The definition of \mathcal{H} is motivated by the fact that characterizing the set of all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ for which the Hessian is invertible can be challenging, but finding a sufficient condition for invertibility is often possible.

Theorem 1. *Consider a single observation of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ generated by model (1) with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, where $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ is a finite, countably infinite, or uncountable set. Suppose that there exists a sequence $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots \in [0, +\infty)$ satisfying $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho_N = 0$ along with functions $\tau : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ and $v : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ satisfying $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tau(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t) = 0$, such that the event $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} - \mathbb{E} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\|_{\infty} < \delta_N$ occurs with probability at least $1 - \tau(\delta_N)$ and the event $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{H}$ occurs with probability at least $1 - v(\delta_N)$, where $\delta_N := \rho_N / (2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))$. Then there exists an integer $N_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_0$, the random set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies*

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho_N)$$

with probability at least $1 - \tau(\delta_N) - v(\delta_N)$.

Theorem 1 is proved in Section C of the Supplementary Materials. It provides a theoretical framework for obtaining convergence rates based on a single observation of dependent responses and connections (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) conditional on predictors $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. The requirement $\delta_N := \rho_N / (2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))$ implies that $\rho_N \propto \delta_N \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$, so the convergence rate ρ_N depends on

- the strength of concentration of the gradient $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$ around its expectation $\mathbb{E} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$ via δ_N ;
- the inverse negative Hessian $(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}))^{-1}$ in a neighborhood $\mathcal{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta$ and a high probability subset $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ via $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$.

The strength of concentration of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$ can be quantified by concentration inequalities for dependent random variables (Chatterjee, 2007; Vershynin, 2018). In general,

the strength of concentration depends on the sample space and the tails of the distribution, the smoothness of the functions g_i and $h_{i,j}$, and the dependence induced by model (1).

Specific convergence rates depend on the model. To demonstrate, consider predictors $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$, responses $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$, and connections $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ generated by a model that captures heterogeneity in the propensities $\alpha_{z,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}$ of units $1, \dots, N$ to form connections (with weights α_z and statistics $e_{i,j} z_{i,j}$ in $h_{i,j}$ for all $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$), transitive closure among connections (with weight $\gamma_{z,z}$ and statistics $d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i,j}$ in $h_{i,j}$ for all $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$), and treatment spillover (with weight $\gamma_{x,y,z}$ and statistics $c_{i,j} (x_i y_j^* + x_j y_i^*) z_{i,j}$ in $h_{i,j}$ for all $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$) (compare Equations (2) and (4) in Section 2.2). Since $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$, it is reasonable to specify $a_y(y_i) := \mathbb{I}(y_i \in \{0, 1\})$ and $a_z(z_{i,j}) := \mathbb{I}(z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\})$. The resulting model is non-trivial, because it captures (1) attribute-connection dependencies (treatment spillover) and (2) connection-connection dependencies (transitive closure among connections), and it includes (3) $p = N + 2 \rightarrow \infty$ parameters estimated from a single observation of dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$.

We obtain convergence rates under the following conditions.

Condition 1. *There exist constants $0 < c < C < +\infty$ such that, for each unit $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$, the predictor $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $x_i \in [0, C]$ and there exists a unit $j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}$ such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and $x_j \in [c, C]$.*

Condition 2. *The parameter space is $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ and the data-generating parameter vector $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ satisfies $\|\theta^*\|_\infty < A$, where $A \in (0, +\infty)$ is a constant.*

Condition 1 imposes restrictions on $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Condition 2 allows the parameter space $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ to be non-compact and its dimension to increase with N , but assumes that the data-generating parameter vector θ^* is contained in a compact subset of $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$. The set of estimators $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is not restricted by Condition 2 and consists of all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ such that $\|\nabla_\theta \ell(\theta; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})\|_\infty \leq \delta_N$. Condition 2 can be weakened in special cases, allowing $\|\theta^*\|_\infty$ to grow as fast as $\log N$; see Section D.3 of the Supplementary Materials. In addition, we need to control the dependence of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, which requires more background and is therefore delegated to the Supplementary Materials; see Condition 3 in Section D.1.

Corollary 1. *Consider a single observation of dependent responses and connections (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) generated by the model with parameter vector $\theta^* := (\alpha_{z,1}^*, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}^*, \gamma_{z,z}^*, \gamma_{x,y,z}^*) \in$*

\mathbb{R}^{N+2} . If Conditions 1–3 hold, there exist constants $K \in (0, +\infty)$ and $0 < L \leq U < +\infty$ along with an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_0$, the quantity δ_N satisfies

$$L\sqrt{N \log N} \leq \delta_N \leq U\sqrt{N \log N},$$

and the random set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, K \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - 6/N^2$.

Corollary 1 is proved in Section D of the Supplementary Materials. The same method of proof can be used to establish convergence rates for pseudo-likelihood estimators $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ based on other models for dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. To the best of our knowledge, these results provide the first theoretical guarantees based on a single observation (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) of dependent responses and connections $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$.

5 Simulation Results

We evaluate the performance of pseudo-likelihood estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ using simulations; note that we cannot compare the performance of pseudo-likelihood estimators to other approaches due to a lack of scalability of those approaches (as discussed in Section 1).

We simulate data from the example model specified by Equations (2) and (4), with data-generating parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* := (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+6}$. The coordinates of the nuisance parameter vector, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^* := (\alpha_{z,1}^*, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, are independent draws from a Gaussian with mean $-7/5$ and standard deviation $1/5$. The parameter vector of primary interest, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^* := (\lambda^*, \alpha_y^*, \beta_{x,y}^*, \gamma_{z,z}^*, \gamma_{x,y,z}^*, \gamma_{y,y,z}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^6$, is specified as $(3/10, -2, 2, 2/10, 1/10, 1/10)$. Network sparsity is induced by setting $\lambda^* = 3/10$, which ensures that each unit has on average approximately 30 connections. Since the bounds on the quantity δ_N in Corollary 1 depend on unknown constants, it is impossible to determine whether $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}} \leq \delta_N$. We therefore declare convergence when both $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t)}\|_2$ and $|(\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t)})) / \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t)})|$ are less than 10^{-6} . The neighborhood structure is based on $L = (N - 25)/25$ intersecting subpopulations $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_L$, where \mathcal{A}_l consists of the 50 units $1 + 25(l - 1), \dots, 25(l + 1)$




Figure 2: Simulation results based on 1,000 simulated data sets. Left: Statistical error $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_\infty$ of the maximum pseudo-likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+6}$ as a function of N . Right: Statistical errors $|\hat{\lambda} - \lambda^*|$, $|\hat{\alpha}_y - \alpha_y^*|$, $|\hat{\beta}_{x,y} - \beta_{x,y}^*|$, $|\hat{\gamma}_{z,z} - \gamma_{z,z}^*|$, $|\hat{\gamma}_{x,y,z} - \gamma_{x,y,z}^*|$, and $|\hat{\gamma}_{y,y,z} - \gamma_{y,y,z}^*|$ in case $N = 250$. CP denotes the coverage probability of interval estimators with a nominal coverage probability of .95.

($l = 1, \dots, L - 1$). Thus, each neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_i \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ consists of the 50- or 75-unit union of all subpopulations \mathcal{A}_l containing $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ (including i).

Increasing population size N . To explore how the statistical error $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_\infty$ of the maximum pseudo-likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+6}$ decreases with population size N , we consider $N \in \{250, 500, 1,000, 2,000, 4,000\}$. Keeping the average number of connections of each unit approximately constant by setting $\lambda^* := 3/10$ helps separate the effects of network sparsity and increasing N on the statistical error. We generate 1,000 data sets in each scenario. Figure 2 demonstrates that $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|_\infty$ decreases as N increases.

Coverage probabilities of interval estimators. To assess the properties of interval estimators with a nominal coverage probability of .95 based on the Godambe information in Section 3.3, we generate 1,000 data sets with $N = 250$ units. The right plot in Figure 2 shows that the empirical coverage probabilities approximately match the nominal coverage probability. Estimators related to connections ($\hat{\gamma}_{z,z}$, $\hat{\gamma}_{x,y,z}$, $\hat{\gamma}_{y,y,z}$) exhibit lower statistical errors compared to those related to responses ($\hat{\alpha}_y$ and $\hat{\beta}_{x,y}$), reflecting the fact that the

number of possible connections $\binom{N}{2}$ exceeds the number of responses N .

6 Hate Speech on X

We analyze posts of U.S. state legislators on the social media platform X in the six months preceding the insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021 (Kim et al., 2022), with a view to studying how hate speech depends on the attributes of legislators and connections among them. Using Large Language Models (LLMs), we classify the contents of 109,974 posts by $N = 2,191$ legislators as “non-hate speech” or “hate speech,” as explained in Section G of the Supplementary Materials. The response Y_i of legislator i indicates whether i released at least one post classified as hate speech. We use four covariates: $x_{i,1}$ indicates that legislator i ’s party affiliation is Republican, $x_{i,2}$ indicates that legislator i is female, $x_{i,3}$ indicates that legislator i is white, and $x_{i,4}$ is the state legislature that legislator i is a member of (e.g., New York). The directed connections $Z_{i,j}$ are based on the mentions and reposts exchanged between January 6, 2020 and January 6, 2021: $Z_{i,j} = 1$ if legislator i mentioned or reposted posts by legislator j in a post. To construct the neighborhoods \mathcal{N}_i of legislators i , we exploit the fact that users of X choose whom to follow and that these choices are known, so \mathcal{N}_i is defined as the union of i and the set of users followed by i .

6.1 Model Specification

To accommodate binary responses $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and connections $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ that are directed (i.e., $Z_{i,j}$ may not be equal to $Z_{j,i}$), we consider a model of the form

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x}) \propto \left[\prod_{i=1}^N a_y(y_i) \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g^\top g_i(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i^*)) \right] \times \left[\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^N a_z(z_{i,j}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}_h^\top h_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}, y_i^*, y_j^*, \mathbf{z})) \right], \quad (12)$$

where $y_i^* := y_i/\psi = y_i$ because $\psi := 1$ when $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$; see Example 3 in Section 2.2.1. Since $y_i^* = y_i$, we henceforth write y_i instead of y_i^* .

Using the definitions of $c_{i,j}$ and $d_{i,j}$ in Equation 3, we specify g_i and $h_{i,j}$ as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_g := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_x \\ \beta_{x,y,m}, m = 1, 2, 3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_i := \begin{pmatrix} y_i \\ x_{i,m} y_i, m = 1, 2, 3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_h := \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z,O} \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z,I} \\ \lambda \\ \gamma_{x,z,1} \\ \gamma_{x,z,m}, m = 2, 3, 4 \\ \gamma_{y,z} \\ \gamma_{z,z,1} \\ \gamma_{z,z,2} \\ \gamma_{x,y,z} \end{pmatrix}, \quad h_{i,j} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_i z_{i,j} \\ \mathbf{e}_j z_{i,j} \\ -(1 - c_{i,j}) z_{i,j} \log N \\ c_{i,j} x_{i,1} z_{i,j} \\ c_{i,j} \mathbb{I}(x_{i,m} = x_{j,m}) z_{i,j}, m = 2, 3, 4 \\ c_{i,j} y_j z_{i,j} \\ \frac{1}{2} z_{i,j} z_{j,i} \\ d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i,j} \\ c_{i,j} x_{i,1} y_j z_{i,j} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where the i th coordinate of N -vector $\mathbf{e}_i \in \{0, 1\}^N$ is 1 and all other coordinates are 0. Here, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z,O} := (\alpha_{z,O,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,O,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ quantifies the activity of legislators $1, \dots, N$ (i.e., the tendency of legislators $1, \dots, N$ to mention or repost posts of other legislators); $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z,I} := (\alpha_{z,I,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,I,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ quantifies the attractiveness of legislators $1, \dots, N$ (i.e., the tendency that other legislators mention or repost posts by legislators $1, \dots, N$); $\lambda > 0$ discourages connections between legislators with non-overlapping neighborhoods; $\gamma_{x,z,1}, \dots, \gamma_{x,z,4} \in \mathbb{R}$ capture the effects of covariates $x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,4}$ on connections $Z_{i,j}$; $\gamma_{y,z} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the weight of the interaction of Y_j and $Z_{i,j}$; $\gamma_{z,z,1} \in \mathbb{R}$ quantifies the tendency to reciprocate connections; $\gamma_{z,z,2} \in \mathbb{R}$ quantifies the tendency to form transitive connections; and $\gamma_{x,y,z}$ captures spillover from covariate $x_{i,1}$ on response Y_j through connection $Z_{i,j}$; note that the spillover effect should not be interpreted as a causal effect, because the party affiliations $x_{i,1}$ of legislators i are not under the control of investigators (Kim et al., 2022). Since $\sum_i Z_{i,j} = \sum_j Z_{i,j}$ with probability 1, we set $\alpha_{z,I,N} := 0$ to address the identifiability problem that would result if all $\alpha_{z,O,i}$ and $\alpha_{z,I,j}$ were allowed to vary freely. The model is estimated by an extension of the algorithm in Section 3.2 to directed connections; see Section F of the Supplementary Materials.

Table 1: Hate speech on X: maximum pseudo-likelihood estimates and standard errors based on the model specified by Equations (13) and (14).

Weight	Estimate	Standard Error	Weight	Estimate	Standard Error
α_y	-.893	.143	$\gamma_{z,z,1}$.604	.037
$\beta_{x,y,1}$	-.257	.159	$\gamma_{z,z,2}$	2.57	.031
$\beta_{x,y,2}$	-.034	.117	$\gamma_{x,z,1}$.035	.005
$\beta_{x,y,3}$.069	.095	$\gamma_{x,z,2}$.236	.015
$\gamma_{y,z}$	-.007	.055	$\gamma_{x,z,3}$.756	.028
$\gamma_{x,y,z}$.038	.014	$\gamma_{x,z,4}$	4.729	.041
			λ	.184	.005

6.2 Results

To interpret the results, we exploit the fact that the conditional distributions of responses Y_i and connections $Z_{i,j}$ can be represented by logistic regression models, with log odds

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\theta}(Y_i = 1 \mid \text{others})}{1 - \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(Y_i = 1 \mid \text{others})} = \begin{cases} \alpha_y + \sum_{m=1}^3 \beta_{x,y,m} x_{i,m} & \text{if } \mathcal{N}_i = \emptyset \\ \alpha_y + \sum_{m=1}^3 \beta_{x,y,m} x_{i,m} \\ \quad + \gamma_{y,z} \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset} z_{j,i} \\ \quad + \gamma_{x,y,z} \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset} x_{j,1} z_{j,i} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \text{others})}{1 - \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \text{others})} = \begin{cases} \alpha_{z,i,O} + \alpha_{z,j,I} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{z,z,1} z_{j,i} & \text{if } \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j = \emptyset \\ -\lambda \log N \\ \alpha_{z,i,O} + \alpha_{z,j,I} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{z,z,1} z_{j,i} & \text{if } \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset \\ + \gamma_{z,z,2} \Delta_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) + \gamma_{x,z,1} x_{i,1} \\ + \sum_{m=2}^4 \gamma_{x,z,m} \mathbb{I}(x_{i,m} = x_{j,m}) \\ + \gamma_{y,z} y_i + \gamma_{x,y,z} x_{i,1} y_j. \end{cases}$$

For instance, the positive sign of $\hat{\gamma}_{x,y,z} = .038$ suggests that the more Republicans interact with legislator i , the higher is the conditional probability that legislator i uses offensive text in a post, holding everything else constant. Alternatively, one can interpret $\hat{\gamma}_{x,y,z}$ in terms of the conditional probability of observing a connection: The positive sign of $\hat{\gamma}_{x,y,z} = .038$ indicates that Republican legislators are more likely to interact with legislators who post harmful language. Other estimates align with expectations. For example, serving for the same state is the strongest predictor for reposting and mentioning activities ($\hat{\gamma}_{x,z,4} = 4.729$), while matching gender ($\hat{\gamma}_{x,z,2} = .236$) and race ($\hat{\gamma}_{x,z,3} = .756$) likewise increase the conditional probability to interact. At the same time, connections affect other connections: For example, forming a connection that leads to a transitive connection is observed more often than expected under the model with $\gamma_{z,z,2} = 0$, holding everything else constant.

6.3 Goodness-of-Fit

We provide three checks on whether model-based predictions match the observed data. First, we focus on the subnetwork of all pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ with $x_{i,1} = Y_j = 1$ and $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$, with a view to assessing how well the interplay of $x_{i,1}$, Y_j , and $Z_{i,j}$ can be represented by the model. Figure 3 shows that the model captures the effect of $x_{i,1}$ on Y_j among pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ with $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$. Second, we compare model-based predictions of responses Y_i based on the proposed joint probability model $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ to a logistic regression model; note that the joint probability model implies that the log odds of $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ is (15), whereas the logistic regression model




Figure 3: Hate speech on X: model-based predictions of spillover in- and out-degrees of U.S. state legislators in the subnetwork with i being Republican, j using offensive language, and the neighborhoods of i and j overlapping, that is: $x_{i,1} = Y_j = 1$ and $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$. By construction, the possible connections in the subnetwork act as potential channels of spillover. The spillover in- and out-degrees are defined as the respective degree of a unit in the subnetwork with $x_{i,1} = Y_j = 1$ and $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$. The observed spillover in- and out-degrees are colored red.

implies that the log odds $Y_i | (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ is $\alpha_y + \sum_{m=1}^3 \beta_{x,y,m} x_{i,m}$. Figure 4 demonstrates that the joint probability model outperforms the logistic regression model regardless of whether neighborhood sizes are below or above the median neighborhood size of 30. Third, we demonstrate in Figure 5 in Section G.2 of the Supplementary Materials that the model preserves salient features of the connections \mathbf{Z} .

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The supplementary materials contain proofs of all theoretical results.

References

Athreya, A., M. Tang, Y. Park, and C. E. Priebe (2021). On estimation and inference in latent structure random graphs. *Statistical Science* 36, 68–88.




Figure 4: Hate speech on X : Comparing predictions of responses Y_i based on the joint probability model $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ (red) to a logistic regression model (black). Sensitivity is the true positive rate: the percentage of legislators who are correctly predicted to make offensive posts, out of all legislators who are predicted to make offensive posts. Specificity refers to the true negative rate: the percentage of legislators who are correctly predicted not to make offensive posts, out of all legislators who are predicted not to make offensive posts. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) is the area under the two respective curves.

Becker, M. P., I. Yang, and K. Lange (1997). EM algorithms without missing data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 6, 38–54.

Besag, J. (1974). Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 36, 192–225.

Brown, L. (1986). *Fundamentals of Statistical Exponential Families: With Applications in Statistical Decision Theory*. Hayworth, CA, USA: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

Butts, C. T. (2019). A dynamic process interpretation of the sparse ERGM reference model. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*.

Chatterjee, S. (2007). Stein’s method for concentration inequalities. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 138, 305–321.

Chatterjee, S. and P. Diaconis (2013). Estimating and understanding exponential random graph models. *The Annals of Statistics* 41, 2428–2461.

- Chazottes, J. R., P. Collet, C. Külske, and F. Redig (2007). Concentration inequalities for random fields via coupling. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 137, 201–225.
- Clark, D. A. and M. S. Handcock (2024). Causal inference over stochastic networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*. To appear.
- Efron, B. (2022). *Exponential families in theory and practice*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Fellows, I. and M. S. Handcock (2012). Exponential-family random network models. Technical report, Department of Statistics, University of California, Los Angeles. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1208.0121>.
- Fosdick, B. K. and P. D. Hoff (2015). Testing and modeling dependencies between a network and nodal attributes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 110, 1047–1056.
- Gao, C. and Z. Ma (2021). Minimax rates in network analysis: Graphon estimation, community detection and hypothesis testing. *Statistical Science* 36, 16–33.
- Handcock, M. S. (2003). Statistical models for social networks: Inference and degeneracy. In R. Breiger, K. Carley, and P. Pattison (Eds.), *Dynamic Social Network Modeling and Analysis: Workshop Summary and Papers*, pp. 1–12. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Harville, D. A. (1997). *Matrix Algebra From a Statistician’s Perspective*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hunter, D. R. and K. Lange (2004). A tutorial on MM algorithms. *The American Statistician* 58(1), 30–37.
- Kim, T., N. Nakka, I. Gopal, B. A. Desmarais, A. Mancinelli, J. J. Harden, H. Ko, and F. J. Boehmke (2022). Attention to the COVID-19 pandemic on Twitter: Partisan differences among U.S. state legislators. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 47, 1023–1041.
- Kolaczyk, E. D. (2017). *Topics at the Frontier of Statistics and Network Analysis: (Re)Visiting the Foundations*. Cambridge University Press.

- Krivitsky, P. N., P. Coletti, and N. Hens (2023). A tale of two datasets: Representativeness and generalisability of inference for samples of networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118, 2213–2224.
- Krivitsky, P. N., M. S. Handcock, and M. Morris (2011). Adjusting for network size and composition effects in exponential-family random graph models. *Statistical Methodology* 8, 319–339.
- Krivitsky, P. N. and E. D. Kolaczyk (2015). On the question of effective sample size in network modeling: An asymptotic inquiry. *Statistical Science* 30, 184–198.
- Lindvall, T. (2002). *Lectures On The Coupling Method*. Courier Corporation.
- Maathuis, M., M. Drton, S. Lauritzen, and M. Wainwright (2019). *Handbook of Graphical Models*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- Niezink, N. M. D. and T. A. B. Snijders (2017). Co-evolution of social networks and continuous actor attributes. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 11, 1948–1973.
- Rinaldo, A., S. E. Fienberg, and Y. Zhou (2009). On the geometry of discrete exponential families with application to exponential random graph models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 3, 446–484.
- Schmid, C. S. and D. R. Hunter (2023). Computing pseudolikelihood estimators for exponential-family random graph models. *Journal of Data Science* 21, 1–15.
- Schweinberger, M. (2011). Instability, sensitivity, and degeneracy of discrete exponential families. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106, 1361–1370.
- Snijders, T. A. B., C. E. G. Steglich, and M. Schweinberger (2007). Modeling the co-evolution of networks and behavior. In K. van Montfort, H. Oud, and A. Satorra (Eds.), *Longitudinal models in the behavioral and related sciences*, pp. 41–71. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- van Duijn, M. A., K. J. Gile, and M. S. Handcock (2009). A framework for the comparison of maximum pseudo-likelihood and maximum likelihood estimation of exponential family random graph models. *Social Networks* 31(1), 52–62.

- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-Dimensional Probability. An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Z., I. E. Fellows, and M. S. Handcock (2024). Understanding networks with exponential-family random network models. *Social Networks* 78, 81–91.
- Wikle, C. K., A. Zammit-Mangion, and N. Cressie (2019). *Spatio-Temporal Statistics with R*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.

Supplementary Materials: A Regression Framework for Studying Relationships among Attributes under Network Interference

A	Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2	2
B	Proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2	4
C	Proof of Theorem 1	5
D	Corollaries 1 and 2	7
	D.1 Notation and Background	8
	D.2 Proof of Corollary 1	12
	D.3 Statement and Proof of Corollary 2	15
	D.4 Bounding $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$	16
	D.5 Bounding Ψ_N	25
	D.6 Bounding $\ \mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\ _2$	28
	D.7 Auxiliary Results	33
E	Quasi-Newton Acceleration	42
F	MM Algorithm: Directed Connections	44
G	Hate Speech on X: Additional Information	45
	G.1 Data	45
	G.2 Plots	46

A Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1. The joint probability density function of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ stated in Equation (1) in Section 2 implies that the conditional probability density function of $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) &= \frac{f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y_i, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x})}{\int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x}) \, d\nu_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)} \\ &= \frac{a_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_i) \exp \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g^\top g_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}_i) y_i^* + \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^\top h_{i,j,1}(\mathbf{x}, y_j^*, \mathbf{z}) \right) y_i^* \right)}{\int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} a_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \exp \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_g^\top g_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}_i) y^* + \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^\top h_{i,j,1}(\mathbf{x}, y_j^*, \mathbf{z}) \right) y^* \right) \, d\nu_{\mathcal{Y}}(y)} \\ &= a_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_i) \exp \left(\frac{\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z}) y_i - b_i(\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z}))}{\psi} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $y^* := y/\psi$, $y_i^* := y_i/\psi$, and $\mathbf{y}_{-i}^* := \mathbf{y}_{-i}/\psi$, while

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z}) &:= \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \left(g_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}_i), \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} h_{i,j,1}(\mathbf{x}, y_j^*, \mathbf{z}) \right) \\ b_i(\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z})) &:= \psi \log \int_{\mathcal{Y}_i} a_{\mathcal{Y}}(y) \exp \left(\frac{\eta_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}^*, \mathbf{z}) y}{\psi} \right) \, d\nu_{\mathcal{Y}}(y). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2. Consider Example 1 in Section 2.2.1. Let $\mathbf{U} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ be the $N \times N$ matrix with elements

$$u_{i,j} := c_{i,j} z_{i,j} = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset) z_{i,j}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be the N -vector with coordinates

$$v_i := \alpha_{\mathcal{Y}} + \beta_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} x_i + \gamma_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} x_j. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Denote by \mathbf{I} the $N \times N$ identity matrix and define $\xi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}} := \gamma_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}}/\psi$. If $(\mathbf{I} - \xi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{U})$ is positive definite, the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is N -variate Gaussian with mean vector $(\mathbf{I} - \xi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{v}$ and covariance matrix $\psi (\mathbf{I} - \xi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{U})^{-1}$.

Remark. The requirement that $(\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U})$ be positive definite imposes restrictions on $\gamma_{y,y,z}$. The restrictions on $\gamma_{y,y,z}$ depend on the neighborhoods \mathcal{N}_i of units $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ and connections $Z_{i,j}$ among pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2. Example 1 in Section 2.2.1 demonstrates that the conditional distribution of $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ is Gaussian with conditional mean

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) &= \alpha_y + \beta_{x,y} x_i + \gamma_{x,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} x_j + \gamma_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} y_j^* \\ &= v_i + \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} y_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where

$$v_i := \alpha_y + \beta_{x,y} x_i + \gamma_{x,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} x_j$$

and

$$\xi_{y,y,z} := \frac{\gamma_{y,y,z}}{\psi}.$$

The conditional variance of $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ is

$$\mathbb{V}(Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) = \psi. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Let $\mathbf{m} := (m_i) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be the conditional mean of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$. Upon taking expectation on both sides of (A.3) conditional on $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, we obtain

$$m_i = v_i + \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} m_j, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which implies that

$$v_i = m_i - \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} m_j$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) &= v_i + \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} y_j \\ &= m_i - \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} m_j + \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} y_j \\ &= m_i + \xi_{y,y,z} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} u_{i,j} (y_j - m_j) \\ &= m_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} b_{i,j} (y_j - m_j), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$b_{i,j} := -\xi_{y,y,z} u_{i,j}.$$

By comparing Equations (A.4) and (A.6) to Equations (2.17) and (2.18) of Rue and Held (2005) and invoking Theorem 2.6 of Rue and Held (2005), we conclude that the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is N -variate Gaussian with mean vector $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and precision matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with elements

$$p_{i,j} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\psi} & \text{if } i = j \\ \frac{b_{i,j}}{\psi} & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

provided $u_{i,j} = u_{j,i}$ for all $i \neq j$ and \mathbf{P} is positive definite; note that $u_{i,j} = u_{j,i}$ is satisfied in undirected networks with $z_{i,j} = z_{j,i}$.

To state these results in matrix form, note that (A.5) can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{v} + \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{m},$$

implying

$$\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{v},$$

while \mathbf{P} can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{\psi} (\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U}),$$

implying

$$\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \psi (\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U})^{-1}.$$

To conclude, the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is N -variate Gaussian with mean vector $(\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{v}$ and covariance matrix $\psi (\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U})^{-1}$, provided $(\mathbf{I} - \xi_{y,y,z} \mathbf{U})$ is positive definite.

B Proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. Lemma 1 is proved in the sentence preceding the statement of Lemma 1 in Section 3.1.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. Letting Θ_1 denote the parameter space of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$, suppose that $v : \Theta_1 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is any twice differentiable function and that $\nabla^2 v(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{M}$ is non-negative

definite for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_1$ for some constant matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ($d \geq 1$). Then the function $u : \Theta_1 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$u(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) := v(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \nabla v(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \mathbf{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0), \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in \Theta_1$$

satisfies $u(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) \leq v(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \in \Theta_1$, because Taylor's theorem (Theorem 6.11, Magnus and Neudecker, 2019, p. 124) gives

$$u(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - v(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top \left[\nabla^2 v(\dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \mathbf{M} \right] (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0),$$

where $\dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}} := \phi \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + (1 - \phi) \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \in \Theta_1$ ($\phi \in [0, 1]$). The inequality $1/4 \geq \pi_{i,j}(1 - \pi_{i,j})$ implies that

$$-[\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - \mathbf{A}^*] = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \left[\frac{1}{4} - \pi_{i,j}^{(t)}(1 - \pi_{i,j}^{(t)}) \right] \mathbf{e}_{i,j} \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^\top$$

is non-negative definite. Lemma 1 proves that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ is concave and that the restriction of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ has the properties of $v(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$ stated above, proving Lemma 2.

C Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 is a generalization of Theorem 2 of Stewart and Schweinberger (2023, abbreviated as S23) from exponential family models for binary connections \mathbf{Z} to exponential family models for binary, count-valued, and real-valued responses and connections (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) conditional on predictors $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. We henceforth suppress predictors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Let $\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) := \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$ and consider the events

$$\mathcal{C}(\delta_N) := \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z} : \|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \delta_N\}$$

$$\mathcal{H} \subseteq \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z} : -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \text{ is invertible for all } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)\}.$$

Define

$$\Lambda_{N,\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)} \|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}))^{-1}\|_\infty, \quad (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}$$

$$\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \sup_{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}} \Lambda_{N,\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*).$$

In the event $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N)$, the set $\Theta(\delta_N)$ is non-empty. By construction of the sets $\mathcal{C}(\delta_N)$ and $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$, the set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty for all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N)$, because $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$

contains the data-generating parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta$ provided $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N)$:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) := \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : \|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \delta_N\}.$$

In the event $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$, the set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ satisfies $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho_N)$ provided $N > N_0$. By assumption, there exists a sequence $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots \in [0, +\infty)$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho_N = 0$. As a result, there exists an integer $N_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ such that $\rho_N < \epsilon^*$ for all $N > N_0$. Consider any $N > N_0$ and any $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$. By definition of \mathcal{H} , $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ is invertible for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$. By Lemma 2 of S23, $\ell(\cdot; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ is strictly concave on Θ , which implies that $\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$, considered as a function of $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ for fixed $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$, is a homeomorphism. Since $\mathbf{s}^{-1}(\cdot; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ is continuous on Θ , there exists, for each $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}$, a real number $\epsilon_N(\rho_N) \in (0, \infty)$ (which depends on $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}$) such that

$$\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_N(\rho_N) \text{ implies } \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty \leq \rho_N. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Since the joint probability density function of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ is an exponential family density, we can invoke the main argument in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 of S23 to conclude that $\epsilon_N(\rho_N)$ is related to ρ_N by the following fundamental inequality:

$$\frac{\rho_N}{\Lambda_{N, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \leq \epsilon_N(\rho_N). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

To leverage (C.2), observe that, for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ and all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty &\leq \|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2\delta_N \\ &= \frac{\rho_N}{\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

because $\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \delta_N$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$, $\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \delta_N$ for all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$, and $\delta_N := \rho_N / (2\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))$. Using (C.3) along with the definition of $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \sup_{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{H}} \Lambda_{N, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) > 0$, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \frac{\rho_N}{\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \leq \frac{\rho_N}{\Lambda_{N, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

and, using (C.2),

$$\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \frac{\rho_N}{\Lambda_{N, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \leq \epsilon_N(\rho_N). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Since

$$\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_N(\rho_N) \text{ implies } \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty \leq \rho_N,$$

the set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho_N) \tag{C.6}$$

in the event $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$, provided $N > N_0$.

The event $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$ occurs with probability at least $1 - \tau(\delta_N) - v(\delta_N)$ provided $N > N_0$. The probability of event $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}$ is bounded below by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}(\delta_N) \cap \mathcal{H}) &\geq 1 - \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \notin \mathcal{C}(\delta_N)) - \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \notin \mathcal{H}) \\ &\geq 1 - \tau(\delta_N) - v(\delta_N), \end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

provided $N > N_0$. The first inequality in (C.7) stems from a union bound, while the second inequality in (C.7) follows the assumption that the probabilities of the events $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \notin \mathcal{C}(\delta_N)$ and $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \notin \mathcal{H}$ are bounded above by $\tau(\delta_N)$ and $v(\delta_N)$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \notin \mathcal{C}(\delta_N)) &= \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})\|_\infty \geq \delta_N) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})\|_\infty \geq \delta_N) \leq \tau(\delta_N) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) \notin \mathcal{H}) \leq v(\delta_N),$$

where the first bound leverages the fact that $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{0}$ by Lemma 4 of S23.

Conclusion. Combining (C.6) with (C.7) establishes that, for all $N > N_0$, the random set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \rho_N)$$

with probability at least $1 - \tau(\delta_N) - v(\delta_N)$.

D Corollaries 1 and 2

To state and prove Corollaries 1 and 2, we first introduce notation along with background on conditional independence graphs (Maathuis et al., 2019) and couplings (Lindvall, 2002).

D.1 Notation and Background

We consider the model of Corollary 1, with joint probability mass function

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta((\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})). \quad (\text{D.1})$$

The parameter vector is $\boldsymbol{\theta} := (\alpha_{z,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}, \gamma_{z,z}, \gamma_{x,y,z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ and the vector of sufficient statistics is $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$, with coordinates

- $b_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}} z_{i,j}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$),
- $b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i,j}$,
- $b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N c_{i,j} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i) z_{i,j}$,

where the terms $c_{i,j}$ and $d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z})$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,j} &:= \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset) \\ d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) &:= \mathbb{1}(\exists k \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j : z_{i,k} = z_{k,j} = 1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

In light of $\psi := 1$, we do not distinguish between \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{y}^* or y_i and y_i^* . To ease the presentation, we write $Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}$ rather than $Y_i \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$, and $Z_{i,j} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}$ rather than $Z_{i,j} \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$. Expectations, variances, and covariances with respect to the conditional distributions of $Y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}$ and $Z_{i,j} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}$ are denoted by $\mathbb{E}_{y,i}$, $\mathbb{V}_{y,i}$, $\mathbb{C}_{y,i}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{z,i,j}$, $\mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}$, $\mathbb{C}_{z,i,j}$, respectively.

Conditional independence graph. Let $M := N + \binom{N}{2}$ be the total number of responses and connections and

$$\mathbf{W} := (W_1, \dots, W_M) := (Y_1, \dots, Y_N, Z_{1,2}, \dots, Z_{N-1,N}) \in \mathcal{W} := \{0, 1\}^{N + \binom{N}{2}} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

be the vector consisting of responses and connections. The conditional independence structure of the model can be represented by a conditional independence graph $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with a set of vertices $\mathcal{V} := \{W_1, \dots, W_M\}$ and a set of undirected edges \mathcal{E} . We refer to elements of \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{E} as vertices and edges of \mathcal{G} . There are two distinct subsets of vertices in \mathcal{G} :

- the subset $\mathcal{V}_y := \{W_1, \dots, W_N\}$ corresponding to responses Y_1, \dots, Y_N ;
- the subset $\mathcal{V}_z := \{W_{N+1}, \dots, W_M\}$ corresponding to connections $Z_{1,2}, \dots, Z_{N-1,N}$.

An undirected edge between two vertices in \mathcal{G} represents dependence of the two corresponding random variables conditional on all other random variables. The vertices in \mathcal{G} are connected to the following subsets of vertices (neighborhoods):

- The neighborhood of Y_i in \mathcal{G} consists of all Y_j and all $Z_{i,j}$ such that $j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$.
- The neighborhood of $Z_{i,j}$ in \mathcal{G} consists of
 1. Y_i and Y_j ;
 2. all $Z_{i,h}$ and $Z_{j,h}$ such that $h \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i, j\}$ and $h \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j$;
 3. all $Z_{i,h}$ and $Z_{j,h}$ such that $h \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i, j\}$ and $h \notin \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j$ provided that either $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_h$ holds or $i \in \mathcal{N}_j \cap \mathcal{N}_h$ holds.

Let $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, j)$ be the length of the shortest path from vertex $W_i \in \mathcal{V}$ to vertex $W_j \in \mathcal{V}$ in \mathcal{G} and let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}, i, k}$ be the set of vertices with distance $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ to the i th vertex W_i in \mathcal{G} :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}, i, k} := \{W_j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{W_i\} : d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, j) = k\}.$$

We define the maximum degree of vertices relating to connections in \mathcal{G} as follows:

$$D_N := \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}, i, 1}|. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

In principle, the quantity D_N can depend on N : e.g., S23 demonstrate that D_N can grow as fast as $D_N = O(\log N)$ in special cases. That said, we consider D_N to be constant, which simplifies results. We henceforth assume that the constant D_N does not depend on N and satisfies $D_N := D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$.

Coupling matrix. Let $\mathbf{W}_{a:b} := (W_a, \dots, W_b) \in \mathcal{W}_{a:b}$ be the subvector consisting of responses and connections with indices $1 \leq a \leq b \leq M$. The set of random variables excluding the random variable $W_v \in \mathcal{V}$ with $v \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{w}_{-v} \in \mathcal{W}_{-v}$. Consider any $\mathbf{a} \in \{0, 1\}^{M-i}$ and define

$$\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}, w_i}(\mathbf{W}_{(i+1):M} = \mathbf{a}) := \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}(\mathbf{W}_{(i+1):M} = \mathbf{a} \mid (\mathbf{W}_{1:(i-1)}, W_i) = (\mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}, w_i)).$$

We use the total variation distance between the conditional distributions $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}, 0}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}, 1}$ for quantifying the amount of dependence induced by the model, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta$

is the data-generating parameter vector. The total variation distance between $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),0}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),1}}$ can be bounded from above by using coupling methods (Lindvall, 2002). A coupling of $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),0}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),1}}$ is a joint probability distribution $\mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}$ for a pair of random vectors $(\mathbf{W}_{(i+1):M}^*, \mathbf{W}_{(i+1):M}^{**}) \in \{0, 1\}^{M-i} \times \{0, 1\}^{M-i}$ with marginals $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),0}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),1}}$. For convenience, we define $(\mathbf{W}^*, \mathbf{W}^{**}) \in \{0, 1\}^M \times \{0, 1\}^M$, where the first i elements are given by $\mathbf{W}_{1:i}^* = (\mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}, 0)$ and $\mathbf{W}_{1:i}^{**} = (\mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}, 1)$, respectively. The basic coupling inequality (Lindvall, 2002, Theorem 5.2, p. 19) shows that any coupling satisfies

$$\left\| \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),0}} - \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),1}} \right\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}(\mathbf{W}_{(i+1):M}^* \neq \mathbf{W}_{(i+1):M}^{**}), \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ denotes the total variance distance between probability measures. If the two sides in Equation (D.5) are equal, the coupling is called optimal. An optimal coupling is guaranteed to exist, but may not be unique (Lindvall, 2002, pp. 99–107). To prove Corollary 1, we need an upper bound on the spectral norm $\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$ of the coupling matrix $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$, so we construct a coupling that is convenient but may not be optimal.

A coupling $\mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}$ of $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),0}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1),1}}$ can be constructed as follows:

Step 1: Set $\mathcal{U} = \{1, \dots, i\}$ and $\mathcal{K} = \{1, \dots, M\}$.

Step 2: Set $\mathcal{A} = \{j \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{U} : (W_i, W_j) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ with } i \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{U} \text{ such that } W_j^* \neq W_j^{**}\}$.

- (a) If $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$, pick the smallest element $j \in \mathcal{A}$ and let (W_j^*, W_j^{**}) be distributed according to an optimal coupling of $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}(W_j = \cdot \mid \mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{U}}^*)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}(W_j = \cdot \mid \mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{U}}^{**})$.
- (b) If $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, pick the smallest element $j \in \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{U}$ and let (W_j^*, W_j^{**}) be distributed according to an optimal coupling of $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}(W_j = \cdot \mid \mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{U}}^*)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}(W_j = \cdot \mid \mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{U}} = \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{U}}^{**})$.

Step 3: Replace \mathcal{U} by $\mathcal{U} \cup \{j\}$ and repeat Step 2 until $\mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{U} = \emptyset$.

Based on $\mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}$, we construct a coupling matrix $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ with elements

$$\mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i < j \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ \max_{\mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)} \in \mathcal{W}_{1:i-1}} \mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}(W_j^* \neq W_j^{**}) & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

Overlapping subpopulations. To obtain convergence rates based on a single observation of dependent random variables \mathbf{W} , we need to control the dependence of \mathbf{W} in the form of $\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$. In line with the simulation setting in Section 5, we therefore assume that overlapping subpopulations $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots$ characterize the neighborhoods. The neighborhood \mathcal{N}_i of unit $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ is then defined as

$$\mathcal{N}_i := \{j \in \mathcal{P}_N : \text{there exists } k \in \{1, 2, \dots\} \text{ such that } i \in \mathcal{A}_k \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{A}_k\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a subpopulation graph with a set of vertices $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}} := \{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots\}$ and a set of edges connecting distinct subpopulations \mathcal{A}_k and \mathcal{A}_l with $\mathcal{A}_k \cap \mathcal{A}_l \neq \emptyset$. Define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}, i, k} := \{\mathcal{A}_j \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \{\mathcal{A}_i\} : d_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}}(i, j) = k\}.$$

Using the background introduced above, we state a condition that controls the dependence induced by the model by restricting the sizes $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}, i, k}|$ of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}, i, k}$.

Condition 3. Let $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ be the constant defined in (D.4) and assume that

$$\max_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}} |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}, k, l}| \leq \omega_1 + \frac{\omega_2}{2D^3} \log(l+1), \quad l = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $\omega_1 \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \omega_2 \leq \min\{\omega_1, 1/((\omega_1 + 1)|\log(1 - U)|)\}$ with $U := (1 + \exp(-A))^{-1} > 0$. The constant $A > 0$ is identical to the constant A in Condition 2.

D.2 Proof of Corollary 1

To prove Corollary 1, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &:= \mathcal{H}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2 \\ \mathcal{H}_1 &:= \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} : \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \geq \frac{N}{2(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2} \right\} \\ \mathcal{H}_2 &:= \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W} : \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \geq \frac{c^2 N}{2(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w}) := (d_{i,1}(\mathbf{z}), \dots, d_{i,i-1}(\mathbf{z}), d_{i,i+1}(\mathbf{z}), \dots, d_{i,N}(\mathbf{z}))$$

$$\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{w}) := (c_{i,1} x_1^2 z_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,i-1} x_{i-1}^2 z_{i,i-1}, c_{i,i+1} x_{i+1}^2 z_{i,i+1}, \dots, c_{i,N} x_N^2 z_{i,N})$$

and

$$\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \exp(C D^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*)), \quad (\text{D.7})$$

where the constants $0 < c < C < \infty$ and $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ are identical to the corresponding constants defined in Condition 1 and Equation (D.4), respectively.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1. We prove Corollary 1 using Theorem 1 in five steps:

Step 1: We bound

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{W}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} - \mathbb{E} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{W}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} \right\|_\infty < \frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \right) \geq 1 - \tau \left(\frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \right),$$

and choose ρ_N so that $1 - \tau(\rho_N/(2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))) \geq 1 - 2/\max\{N, p\}^2$.

Step 2: We show that $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w})$ is invertible for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Step 3: We prove that the event $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{H}$ occurs with probability at least $1 - v(\rho_N/(2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))) \geq 1 - 4/\max\{N, p\}^2$.

Step 4: We bound δ_N .

Step 5: We bound ρ_N .

The proof of Corollary 1 leverages auxiliary results supplied by Lemmas 3, 4, and 5, which show that there exists an integer $N_1 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_1$,

$$\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \leq C_1 \frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N} \quad \text{by Lemma 3}$$

$$\sqrt{N/2} \leq \Psi_N \leq C_2 \sqrt{N} \quad \text{by Lemma 4}$$

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq C_3 \quad \text{by Lemma 5,}$$

where $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, and $C_3 \geq 1$ are constants.

Step 1: Since $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, 1\}^{M \times M}$, Lemma 3 of S23 establishes

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{W})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} - \mathbb{E} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{W})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\|_{\infty} < \frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \right) \geq 1 - \tau \left(\frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \right),$$

where

$$\tau \left(\frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \right) := 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\rho_N^2}{32 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 (1+D)^2 \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2^2 \Psi_N^2} + \log p \right),$$

with $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ defined in (D.4). Choosing

$$\rho_N := \sqrt{96} \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) (1+D) \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \Psi_N \sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

implies that the event

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{W})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} - \mathbb{E} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{W})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\|_{\infty} < \frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}$$

occurs with probability at least

$$1 - \tau \left(\frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2}.$$

Step 2: Let \mathcal{H} be defined in (D.6). Lemma 3 establishes that $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w})$ is invertible for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Step 3: Lemma 11 shows that there exists an integer $N_2 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_2$, the event $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{H}$ occurs with probability at least

$$1 - v(\delta_N) = 1 - \frac{4}{\max\{N, p\}^2}.$$

Step 4: The quantity

$$\delta_N := \frac{\rho_N}{2 \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} = \sqrt{24} (1+D) \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \Psi_N \sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}}$$

is bounded below by

$$\delta_N \geq \sqrt{24} D \sqrt{N/2} \sqrt{\log N} = \sqrt{12} D \sqrt{N \log N}$$

and is bounded above by

$$\delta_N \leq \sqrt{24} C_2 C_3 (2D) \sqrt{N} \sqrt{2 \log N} = \sqrt{192} C_2 C_3 D \sqrt{N \log N},$$

using $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, $1 \leq \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq C_3$, $\sqrt{N/2} \leq \Psi_N \leq C_2 \sqrt{N}$, and $\max\{N, p\} = p = N + 2$. Since $C_2 > 0$, $C_3 \geq 1$, and $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ defined in (D.4) are constants, there exist constants $0 < L \leq U < \infty$ such that

$$L \sqrt{N \log N} \leq \delta_N \leq U \sqrt{N \log N}.$$

Step 5: Substituting the bounds on $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$, Ψ_N , and $\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$ supplied by Lemmas 3, 4, and 5 into (D.8) reveals that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_N &:= \sqrt{96} \Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) (1 + D) \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \Psi_N \sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{96} C_1 C_2 C_3 (2D) \frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N} \sqrt{N \log(N + 2)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{768} C_1 C_2 C_3 D \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9 \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}, \end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

using $\max\{N, p\} = p = N + 2$ and $\log(N + 2) \leq \log(2N) \leq 2 \log N$ ($N \geq 2$). To bound $\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$, we invoke Condition 2:

$$\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9 := \exp(C D^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*))^9 \leq \exp(C D^2 (A + \epsilon^*))^9 = \exp(9 C D^2 (A + \epsilon^*)).$$

Define

$$K := \sqrt{768} C_1 C_2 C_3 D \exp(9 C D^2 (A + \epsilon^*)) > 0.$$

Since A, C, C_1, C_2, C_3, D , and ϵ^* are independent of N , so is K . We conclude that

$$\rho_N \leq K \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Conclusion. Theorem 1 implies that, for all $N > N_0 := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, the random set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, K \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}} \right)$$

with probability at least

$$1 - \tau(\delta_N) - v(\delta_N) \geq 1 - \frac{6}{\max\{N, p\}^2} \geq 1 - \frac{6}{N^2},$$

using $\max\{N, p\}^2 = p^2 = (N + 2)^2 \geq N^2$.

D.3 Statement and Proof of Corollary 2

If subpopulations do not overlap, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty$ can grow as a function N . Condition 4 details how fast $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty$ can grow.

Condition 4. *The parameter space is $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ and the data-generating parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$ satisfies*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{E + \vartheta \log N}{C D^2} - \epsilon^*,$$

where $E \geq 0$ and $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$ are constants, $C > 0$ is identical to the constant C in Condition 1, $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ is identical to the constant D in (D.4), and $\epsilon^* > 0$ is identical to the constant ϵ^* in the definition of $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ in Section 4.

Corollary 2 replaces Condition 2 by Condition 4. Resulting from this, the constant U coming up in Condition 3 is redefined as $U := (1 + \exp(-D))^{-1} > 0$.

Corollary 2. *Consider a single observation of dependent responses and connections (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) generated by the model with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* := (\alpha_{z,1}^*, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}^*, \gamma_{z,z}^*, \gamma_{x,y,z}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+2}$. If Conditions 1, 3, and 4 are satisfied with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$, there exist constants $K \in (0, +\infty)$ and $0 < L \leq U < +\infty$ along with an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_0$, the quantity δ_N satisfies*

$$L \sqrt{N \log N} \leq \delta_N \leq U \sqrt{N \log N},$$

and the random set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, K \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N^{1-18\vartheta}}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - 6/N^2$.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 2. The proof of Corollary 2 resembles the proof of Corollary 1, with Condition 2 replaced by Condition 4. The proof of Corollary 1 shows that

$$\rho_N \leq \sqrt{768} C_1 C_2 C_3 D \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9 \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}},$$

where the constants $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, $C_3 \geq 1$, and $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ are defined in Lemmas 3, 4, and 5, and Equation (D.4), respectively. Condition 4 implies that

$$\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9 := \exp(C D^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*))^9 \leq \exp \left(C D^2 \left(\frac{E + \vartheta \log N}{C D^2} \right) \right)^9 = \exp(9 E) N^{9\vartheta},$$

which in turn implies that

$$\rho_N \leq \sqrt{768} C_1 C_2 C_3 D \exp(9E) \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N^{1-18\vartheta}}} = K \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N^{1-18\vartheta}}},$$

where $K := \sqrt{768} C_1 C_2 C_3 D \exp(9E) > 0$. The remainder of the proof of Corollary 2 resembles the proof of Corollary 1. We conclude that there exists an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_0$, the random set $\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N)$ is non-empty and satisfies

$$\widehat{\Theta}(\delta_N) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\infty \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, K \sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N^{1-18\vartheta}}} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - 6/N^2$.

D.4 Bounding $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$

Lemma 3. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. If Conditions 1 and 3 are satisfied along with either Condition 2 or Condition 4 with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ along with an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_0$,*

- $(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w}))^{-1}$ is invertible for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$,
- the event $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{H}$ occurs with probability at least $1 - 4 / \max\{N, p\}^2$,
- $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)} \|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w}))^{-1}\|_\infty \leq C_1 \frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N}$,

where \mathcal{H} is defined in (D.6) and $\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ is defined in (D.7).

PROOF OF LEMMA 3. We first partition $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w})$ in accordance with $\boldsymbol{\theta} := (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$, given by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 := (\alpha_{z,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 := (\gamma_{z,z}, \gamma_{x,y,z}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w}) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top & \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{D.10})$$

where the matrices $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ define the covariance matrices of the sufficient statistics corresponding to the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$, respectively. Define $\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) := (\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), \mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 2}$, where $\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are the covariances of the degree terms with the transitive connection term with weight $\gamma_{z,z}$ and spillover term with weight $\gamma_{x,y,z}$, respectively.

We wish to bound the infinity norm of $(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{w}))^{-1}$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}))^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top & \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} & \mathbf{0}_{N,2} \\ \mathbf{0}_{2,N} & \mathbf{0}_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \\
&\quad + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \\ -\mathbf{I}_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \\ -\mathbf{I}_{2,2} \end{pmatrix}^\top,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{0}_{a,b} := \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0) \in \{0, 1\}^{a \times b}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{a,b} := \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1) \in \{0, 1\}^{a \times b}$ ($a, b \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$) are diagonal matrices, and

$$\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$$

is the Schur complement of $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ with respect to the block $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$.

The ℓ_∞ -induced norm is submultiplicative, so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}))^{-1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty \\
&\quad + \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ -\mathbf{I}_{p,p} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty \|\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \\ -\mathbf{I}_{p,p} \end{pmatrix}^\top \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty + \max\{1, \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty\} \\
&\quad \times \|\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty (\|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty + 1) \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty + \max\{1, \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty\} \\
&\quad \times \|\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty (\|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top\|_\infty \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.11}$$

We bound the terms $\|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty$, $\|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top\|_\infty$, and $\|\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty$ one by one.

Bounding $\|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty$. The proof of Lemma 6 in S23 shows that

$$\|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \frac{18 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N} \tag{D.12}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$, where $\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ is an upper bound on the inverse standard deviation of connections $Z_{i,j}$ of pairs of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ with $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ conditional on $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}$.

Under the model considered here, the conditional distribution of $Z_{i,j}$ is Bernoulli, as shown in Section 2.2.2. Therefore, $\mathbb{V}_{z_{i,j}}(Z_{i,j})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{V}_{z_{i,j}}(Z_{i,j}) = \mathbb{P}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})).$$

Applying the bounds on $\mathbb{P}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$ supplied by Lemma 7 gives

$$\mathbb{V}_{z_{i,j}}(Z_{i,j}) \geq \frac{1}{(\exp(C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty))^2} \geq \frac{1}{(\exp(C D^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*)))^2}, \quad (\text{D.13})$$

provided $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, where D corresponds to the constant D defined in (D.4) and C corresponds to the constant C in Condition 1. For the second inequality of (D.13), we use the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$. With

$$\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \exp(C D^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*)),$$

we therefore deduce that $\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ is an bound on the inverse standard deviation of connections $Z_{i,j}$:

$$\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{z_{i,j}}(Z_{i,j})}}.$$

Bounding $\|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top\|_\infty$. Define $\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) := (\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), \mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}))$, where $\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ are the covariance terms of the degree terms with the sufficient statistics pertaining to the transitive connection term weighted by $\gamma_{z,z}$ and the spillover term weighted by $\gamma_{x,y,z}$, respectively. Then

$$\|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty.$$

We bound the terms $\|\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty$ and $\|\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty$ one by one.

By Lemma 10 of S23, $\|\mathbf{C}_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty \leq 3 D^3$. The term $\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) := (C_{2,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), \dots, C_{2,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ refers to the covariances between the degrees $b_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ of units $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$. An upper bound on t -th

element of $\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ can be obtained by

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_{2,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{C}_{z,i,j}(b_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}), b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{C}_{z,i,j} \left(\sum_{h \neq t} Z_{h,t}, \sum_{h=1}^N \sum_{k=h+1}^N c_{h,k} (x_h y_k + x_k y_h) Z_{h,k} \right) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i \neq t: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_t \neq \emptyset} \mathbb{C}_{z,i,t}(Z_{i,t}, (x_i y_t + y_i x_t) Z_{i,t}) \right| \tag{D.14} \\
&= \left| \sum_{i \neq t: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_t \neq \emptyset} (x_i y_t + y_i x_t) \mathbb{V}_{z,i,t}(Z_{i,t}) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{C}{2} \sum_{i \neq t: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_t \neq \emptyset} 1 \right| \leq C D^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where C corresponds to the constant from Condition 1 and D is defined in (D.4). On the third line, note that $b_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ only depends on connection $Z_{i,j}$ if $t \in \{i, j\}$. Therefore, the covariance of $b_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ with respect to any other connection is 0. The first inequality follows from the observation that $x_i y_j + x_j y_i \leq 2C$ and $\mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(Z_{i,j}) \leq 1/4$, which follows from $0 \leq x_i \leq C < \infty$ by Condition 1 and $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$. The second inequality follows from Lemma 12 in S23 bounding the pairs of units i and t such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_t \neq \emptyset$ from above by D^2 .

Since the bound from (D.14) holds for all $t \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we obtain $\|\mathbf{C}_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_\infty \leq C D^2$. Taken together,

$$\|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top\|_\infty \leq 3 D^3 + C D^2 \leq \max\{3, C\} D^3. \tag{D.15}$$

Bounding $\|\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &:= \begin{pmatrix} B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &:= \begin{pmatrix} V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

The elements of $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ are then given by

$$V_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) = B_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{C}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}).$$

The inverse of $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ is

$$\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} = \frac{1}{V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2} \begin{pmatrix} V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & -V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ -V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \end{pmatrix},$$

implying that

$$\|(\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}))^{-1}\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{\max\{V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\} + |V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})|}{|V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2|}. \quad (\text{D.16})$$

Invoking the inequalities from (D.12) and (D.15), we obtain for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & |C_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| \\ & \leq N \|C_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_{\infty} \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|C_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_{\infty} \\ & \leq N \|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_{\infty} \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_{\infty} \|\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\|_{\infty} \\ & \leq 18 \max\{9, C^2\} D^6 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.17})$$

where D corresponds to the constant D defined in (D.4) and C corresponds to the constant C from Condition 1.

By applying Lemma 9 along with (D.17), we get for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| & = |B_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| + |C_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| \\ & \leq \max\{1, C^2\} \frac{N D^5}{4} + 18 \max\{9, C^2\} D^6 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \\ & \leq \max\{9, C^2\} D^5 \left(\frac{N}{4} + 18 D \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the numerator of (D.16) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\} + |V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| \\ & \leq \max\{9, C^2\} D^5 \left(\frac{N}{2} + 36 D \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.18})$$

The denominator of (D.16), which is the determinant of $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$, is

$$\begin{aligned} & V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \\ & = (B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) \\ & \times (B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) \\ & - (B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}))^2 \\ & = B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ & - B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \\ & + (C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) (C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) - B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \\ & + 2 B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) (C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})) - (C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} C_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the property of positive semidefinite matrices $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ that $(\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{a})(\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{b}) \geq (\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{b})^2$ is true for all vectors $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 1$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \\
& \geq B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \\
& - 4 \max_{i,j} |B_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| \max_{i,j} |\mathbf{C}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1} \mathbf{C}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| \\
& \geq B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 - 18 \max\{81, C^4\} N D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \\
& = U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - 18 \max\{81, C^4\} N D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) := B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2. \quad (\text{D.19})$$

The final inequality follows from invoking (D.17) along with Lemma 9.

For (D.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) & = B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \\
& = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \\
& \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{y},i}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{z})) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \\
& - \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}), b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right)^2 \\
& = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{y},i}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{z})) \right) \\
& + \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \\
& - \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}), b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that the third term

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}), b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right)^2$$

is smaller than the second term

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right).$$

Define

$$u_{1,i,j} := \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}))} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{2,i,j} := \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}))}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then the second term can be restated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N u_{1,i,j}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N u_{2,i,j}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

while the third term is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{C}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}), b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N |\mathbb{C}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}), b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}))| \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \sqrt{\mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}))} \right)^2 \\ & = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N u_{1,i,j} u_{2,i,j} \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N u_{1,i,j}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N u_{2,i,j}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality is invoked on the third and last line. This translates to the following lower bound on $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$:

$$\begin{aligned} U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &= B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{V}_{y,i}(b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{z})) \right) \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j \neq i}^N c_{i,j} x_j z_{i,j} \right)^2 \mathbb{V}_{y,i}(Y_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})$ is defined in (D.6) and the function $c_{i,j}$ is defined in (D.2). For the second inequality, we use the result from the proof of Lemma 10 in S23, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(Z_{i,j}) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j}(Z_{i,j}), \end{aligned} \tag{D.20}$$

where the function $d_{i,j}(\mathbf{Z})$ is defined in (D.2). By Lemma 7, we get

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{Z},i,j}(Z_{i,j}) = \mathbb{P}(Z_{i,j} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(Z_{i,j} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})) \geq \frac{1}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2},$$

where $\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ is defined in (D.7). When combined with (D.20), this results in

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{Z},i,j}(b_{N+1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2}.$$

By applying Lemma 8 and expanding the quadratic term, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^4} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N x_j^2 c_{i,j} z_{i,j} + \sum_{h=1}^N \sum_{k \neq h}^N c_{i,h} c_{i,k} x_h x_k z_{i,h} z_{i,k} \right) \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^4} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N x_j^2 c_{i,j} z_{i,j} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \right)}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{w})$ is defined in (D.6) and C corresponds to the constant from Condition 1. The second inequality follows from the assumption $x_i \in [0, C]$ by Condition 1 along with $c_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$. Lemma 11 shows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{H}) \geq 1 - \frac{4}{\max\{N, p\}^2},$$

where \mathcal{H} is defined in (D.6). For all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$, we obtain by definition

$$U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \right)}{(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^4} \geq \frac{c^2 N^2}{4(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^7},$$

which results in the following bound for the denominator of (D.16):

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 &\geq U(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - 18 \max\{81, C^4\} N D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{c^2 N^2}{4(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^7} - 18 \max\{81, C^4\} N D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \\ &> \frac{c^2 N^2}{4(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^7} \left(1 - \frac{9216 \max\{81, C^4\} D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{c^2 N} \right), \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $C > 0$, $D \geq 2$, and $\epsilon^* > 0$, which implies that

$$\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \exp(C D^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_\infty + \epsilon^*)) > 1.$$

Under Conditions 2 and 4 with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$, we have, for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\frac{9216 \max\{81, C^4\} D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{c^2 N} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, there exists a real number $\epsilon > 0$ along with an integer $N_3 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that

$$\frac{9216 \max\{81, C^4\} D^{11} \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{c^2 N} \leq \epsilon$$

for all $N > N_3$, which implies that

$$V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2 \geq \frac{c^2 N^2}{4(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^7} (1 - \epsilon). \quad (\text{D.21})$$

Observe that (D.21) provides a positive lower bound on the determinant of $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ for $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$, demonstrating that

$$|V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2| = V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2. \quad (\text{D.22})$$

Combining (D.18), (D.21), and (D.22) shows that, for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^{-1}\|_\infty &\leq \frac{\max\{V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\} + V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})}{V_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) V_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) - V_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})^2} \\ &\leq \max\{9, C^2\} D^5 \left(\frac{N}{2} + 32 D \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 \right) \frac{4(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^7}{c^2 N^2 (1 - \epsilon)} \\ &\leq K_1 \frac{D^5 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^7}{N} \max \left\{ 1, \frac{D \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.23})$$

where $K_1 > 0$ is a constant.

Conclusion. We show in two steps that $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ is invertible for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$. First, by Lemma 7 in S23, the matrix $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ is invertible for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$. Second, (D.22) demonstrates that the determinant of $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ is bounded away from 0 for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus, $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ is nonsingular for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$, and so is $-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ by Theorem 8.5.11 of Harville (1997, p. 99). Combining (D.11), (D.12), (D.15), and (D.23) shows that,

for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)$ and all $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w}))^{-1}\|_\infty &\leq \| \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w})^{-1} \|_\infty \\
&+ \max\{1, \| \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w})^{-1} \|_\infty \| \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w}) \|_\infty\} \| \mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w})^{-1} \|_\infty \\
&\times (N \| \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w}) \|_\infty \| \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w})^{-1} \|_\infty + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{18\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N} \\
&+ \max\left\{1, \max\{3, C\} D^3 \frac{18\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N}\right\} K_1 \frac{D^5 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^7}{N} \\
&\times \max\left\{1, \frac{D^2 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N}\right\} (\max\{3, C\} D^3 18\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Conditions 2 and 4 with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$ imply that

$$\frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N} < \frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, there exists an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that the two maxima in the upper bound on $\|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w}))^{-1}\|_\infty$ are equal to 1 for all $N > N_0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{w}))^{-1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{18\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N} + K_1 \frac{D^5 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^7}{N} (\max\{3, C\} D^3 18\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2 + 1) \\
&\leq \frac{18\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2}{N} + K_2 \frac{D^8 \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N} \\
&\leq C_1 \frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N},
\end{aligned} \tag{D.24}$$

where $K_2 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ are constants. Substituting (D.24) into the definition of $\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ concludes the proof of Lemma 3:

$$\Lambda_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \sup_{\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{B}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \epsilon^*)} \|(-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{w}))^{-1}\|_\infty \leq C_1 \frac{\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^9}{N}.$$

D.5 Bounding Ψ_N

Lemma 4. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. Then $\sqrt{N/2} \leq \Psi_N \leq C_2 \sqrt{N}$, where $C_2 > 0$ is a constant.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 4. The term Ψ_N is defined in

$$\Psi_N := \max_{1 \leq a \leq N+2} \|\Xi_a\|_2,$$

where

$$\Xi_a := (\Xi_{\{1\},a}, \dots, \Xi_{\{N\},a}, \Xi_{\{1,2\},a}, \dots, \Xi_{\{N,N-1\},a}) = (\Xi_{y,a}, \Xi_{z,a}), \quad a \in \{1, \dots, N+2\}.$$

The sensitivity of the sufficient statistic vector $b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ with respect to changes of responses is quantified by the vector $\Xi_{y,a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$\Xi_{y,a} := (\Xi_{\{1\},a}, \dots, \Xi_{\{N\},a}),$$

where

$$\Xi_{\{i\},a} := \max_{(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}: y_k = y'_k \text{ for all } k \neq i, \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}'} |b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{z}')|.$$

The sensitivity of the sufficient statistic vector $b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ with respect to changes of connections is quantified by the vector $\Xi_{z,a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$\Xi_{z,a} := (\Xi_{\{1,2\},a}, \dots, \Xi_{\{N,N-1\},a}),$$

where

$$\Xi_{\{i,j\},a} := \max_{(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}') \in \mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}: \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}', z_{k,l} = z'_{k,l} \text{ for all } \{k,l\} \neq \{i,j\}} |b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{z}')|.$$

Define

$$\Psi_N = \max_{1 \leq a \leq N+2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N |\Xi_{\{i\},a}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N |\Xi_{\{i,j\},a}|^2}. \quad (\text{D.25})$$

- For $a = 1, \dots, N$, the statistic $b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ refers to the degree effects of unit a :

$$b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{j=1; j \neq a}^N z_{a,j}.$$

The term $\Xi_{\{i,j\},a}$ is 1 if $a \in \{i, j\}$ and is 0 otherwise. Since the statistic is unaffected by the response, $\Xi_{\{i\},a} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. For the sum in (D.25) over all $i < j$, where $\mathbb{I}(a \in \{i, j\}) = 1$ holds N times, yielding $\|\Xi_a\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N}$ for all $a = 1, \dots, N$.

- The statistic $b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ refers to the transitive connections effect given by

$$b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N d_{i,j}(\mathbf{z}) z_{i,j},$$

where the function $d_{i,j}(\mathbf{Z})$ is defined in (D.2). Since this statistic is not affected by \mathbf{y} , $\Xi_{\{i\},a} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Following Lemma 15 in S23,

$$\|\Xi_{N+1}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N D^2 (1+D)^2} \leq \sqrt{4 N D^4} = 2 D^2 \sqrt{N},$$

where D corresponds to the constant defined in D.4.

- The statistic $b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ refers to the spillover effect given by

$$b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N c_{i,j} (x_i y_j + y_i x_j) z_{i,j},$$

where the function $c_{i,j}$ is defined in (D.2). For $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$, the terms $\Xi_{\{i,j\},N+2}$ are $(y_i x_j + y_j x_i) \leq 2C$ if $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and 0 otherwise. For all $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$,

$$\Xi_{\{i\},N+2} = \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j} x_j z_{i,j} \leq \sum_{j: \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j} C \leq C D^2,$$

because according to Lemma 12 in S23 there are at most D^2 units such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and $x_i \leq C$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ according to Condition 1. Combining $\Xi_{\{i,j\},N+2}$ and $\Xi_{\{i\},N+2}$ gives

$$\|\Xi_{N+2}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2 N C D^2 + N C D^2} \leq D \sqrt{3 N C} \leq 2 D \sqrt{N C},$$

where C corresponds to the constant C in Condition 1.

Combining the results for $\|\Xi_a\|_2$ for $a = 1, \dots, N+2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{N/2} &\leq \Psi_N \leq 2 D \sqrt{N C} \\ \sqrt{N/2} &\leq \Psi_N \leq C_2 \sqrt{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_2 := 2 D \sqrt{C} > 0$ is a constant.

D.6 Bounding $\|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$

Lemma 5. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. If Conditions 1, 2, and 3 are satisfied with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$, there exists a constant $C_3 \geq 1$ such that $\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq C_3$ for all $N \geq 2$. If the population \mathcal{P}_N consists of non-overlapping subpopulations with dependence restricted to subpopulations, the same result holds when Condition 2 is replaced by Condition 4.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 5. To bound $\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$ from above, we use the Hölder's inequality

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_1 \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_\infty}, \quad (\text{D.26})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_1 &:= \max_{1 \leq j \leq M} \sum_{i=1}^M |\mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)| \\ \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_\infty &:= \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1}^M |\mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)|. \end{aligned}$$

We can therefore bound $\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$ by bounding the elements of the upper triangular coupling matrix $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ which are

$$\mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i < j \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ \max_{\mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)} \in \mathcal{W}_{1:i-1}} \mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}(W_j^* \neq W_j^{**}) & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

Next, we define a symmetrized version of the coupling matrix denoted by $\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ with elements

$$\mathcal{T}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{j,i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) & \text{if } i < j \\ \mathcal{D}_{i,i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) & \text{if } i = j \\ \mathcal{D}_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

The symmetry of $\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$ yields the following upper bound for (D.26):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{\|\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_1 \|\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_\infty} = \|\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_\infty \\ &= 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}(W_j^* \neq W_j^{**}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.27})$$

where the constant 1 in the second line stems from the diagonal elements of $\mathcal{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$.

Consider any $(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, M\} \times \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $i \neq j$ and define the event $W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j$ as the event that there exists a path of disagreement between vertices W_i and W_j in \mathcal{G} . A path of disagreement between vertices W_i and W_j in \mathcal{G} is a path from W_i to W_j in \mathcal{G} such that the coupling $(W_{(i+1):M}^*, W_{(i+1):M}^{**})$ with joint probability mass function $\mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}$ disagrees at each vertex on the path, in the sense that $W^* \neq W^{**}$ holds for all vertices W on the path. Theorem 1 of van den Berg and Maes (1994, p. 753) shows that

$$\mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}(W_j^* \neq W_j^{**}) \leq \mathbb{B}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}), \quad (\text{D.28})$$

where $\mathbb{B}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ is a Bernoulli product measure based on M independent Bernoulli experiments with success probabilities $\boldsymbol{\pi} := (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_M) \in [0, 1]^M$. With $v \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, the success probabilities π_v are

$$\pi_v := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in \{1, \dots, i-1\} \\ 1 & \text{if } v = i \\ \max_{(\mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \in \mathcal{W}_{-v} \times \mathcal{W}_{-v}} \pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} & \text{if } v \in \{i+1, \dots, M\}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} := \left\| \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}_{-v}) - \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \right\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (\text{D.29})$$

Lemma 10 provides the following upper bound:

$$\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_{\infty})}, \quad (\text{D.30})$$

where C corresponds to the positive constant from Condition 1 and D is defined in (D.4).

Combining (D.30) with Condition 4 shows that

$$\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_{\infty})} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-E - \vartheta \log N)} =: U_N. \quad (\text{D.31})$$

The constant $U_N = U$ coincides with the constant U considered in Condition 3.

With (D.31), we define the vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [0, 1]^M$ with elements

$$\xi_v := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \in \{1, \dots, i-1\} \\ 1 & \text{if } v = i \\ U_N & \text{if } v \in \{i+1, \dots, M\}, \end{cases}$$

and obtain

$$\mathbb{B}_\pi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}) \leq \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}), \quad (\text{D.32})$$

because $\pi_v \leq \xi_v$ for all $v = 1, \dots, M$.

Next, we construct the set

$$\mathcal{M}_{a,b} := \{\{c, d\} : c \in \mathcal{N}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_b, d \in \mathcal{N}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_b \setminus \{c\}\} \cup \{\{c\} : c \in \mathcal{N}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_b\}$$

and two additional graphs with the same set of vertices as \mathcal{G} :

1. $\mathcal{G}_1 := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_1)$:

- Vertex $W \in \mathcal{V}_z$ relating to connection $Z_{i,j}$ has edges to vertices that relate to all connections $Z_{h,k}$ and responses Y_h with $\{h, k\}, \{h\} \in \mathcal{M}_{i,j}$.
- Vertex $W \in \mathcal{V}_y$ relating to attribute Y_i has edges to vertices that relate to all connections $Z_{h,k}$ and responses Y_h with $\{h, k\}, \{h\} \in \mathcal{M}_{i,N+1}$ for a fictional unit $N + 1$ with $\mathcal{N}_{N+1} = \emptyset$.

2. $\mathcal{G}_2 := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2)$: The set \mathcal{E}_2 includes edges of all vertices $W_i \in \mathcal{V}$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ to vertices in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 2}$.

The graph \mathcal{G}_2 is a covering of \mathcal{G} , so

$$\mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}) \leq \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2). \quad (\text{D.33})$$

Combining the previous results gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 &\leq 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{Q}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, i, \mathbf{w}_{1:(i-1)}}(W_j^* \neq W_j^{**}) \\ &\leq 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{B}_\pi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq 1 + \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.34})$$

using (D.27), (D.28), (D.32), (D.33). Sorting the vertices without W_i by the geodesic distance to W_i (i.e., by the length of the shortest path to W_i), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) &\leq |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, 1}| \left(\max_{W_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, 1}} \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) \right) \\
&+ \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}| \left(\max_{W_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}} \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) \right) \quad (\text{D.35}) \\
&\leq |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, 1}| \\
&+ \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}| \max_{W_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}} \mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

For the event $W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j$ in \mathcal{G}_2 with $W_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}$ and $k \geq 2$ to occur, there must exist at least one vertex in each set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, 1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k-1}$ at which the coupling disagrees. Therefore, we next derive bounds on $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}|$ to obtain an upper bound on $\mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2)$. Following Lemma 6, Condition 3 implies that for $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $k \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$

$$|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}| \leq K_1 + K_2 \log k \quad (\text{D.36})$$

and $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, 1}| \leq K_3$, with constants $K_1 \geq 0$, $K_2 \geq 0$, and $K_3 > 0$ being functions of the constants $\omega_1 \geq 0$ and $\omega_2 \geq 0$ defined in Condition 3 and the constant $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ defined in (D.4). The probability of event $W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j$ in \mathcal{G}_2 can then be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) &\leq U_N (1 - (1 - U_N)^{K_3}) \prod_{l=2}^{k-1} [1 - (1 - U_N)^{K_1 + K_2 \log l}] \\
&\leq \prod_{l=2}^{k-1} [1 - (1 - U_N)^{K_1 + K_2 \log l}] \\
&\leq [1 - (1 - U_N)^{K_1 + K_2 \log(k-1)}]^{k-2},
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from

$$U_N (1 - (1 - U_N)^{K_3}) \leq 1,$$

because $U_N \in [0, 1]$ and $K_3 > 0$. Defining $K_N := \exp(-K_1 |\log(1 - U_N)|)$, we obtain for $W_j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{B}_\xi(W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) &\leq [1 - (1 - U_N)^{K_1 + K_2 \log(k-1)}]^{k-2} \\
&\leq \exp(-K_N (k-1)^{1 - K_2 |\log(1 - U_N)|}) \quad (\text{D.37})
\end{aligned}$$

with the inequality $1 - a \leq \exp(-a)$ for all $a \in (0, 1)$.

Plugging (D.36) and (D.37) in (D.35), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{B}_\xi (W_i \not\leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) \\
& \leq K_3 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} (K_1 + K_2 \log k) \\
& \quad \times \exp(-K_N (k-1)^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}) \\
& = K_3 + K_1 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \exp(-K_N (k-1)^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}) \\
& \quad + K_2 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \log k \exp(-K_N (k-1)^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}),
\end{aligned} \tag{D.38}$$

resulting in two series that we bound one by one. With $\lceil \cdot \rceil : [0, \infty) \mapsto \{1, 2, \dots\}$ being the function giving the upper ceiling of a positive real number and $u_N := \lceil 2/(1 - K_2 |\log(1 - U_N)|) \rceil$, the first series can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \exp(-K_N (k-1)^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}) \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp(-K_N k^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}) \\
& \leq \frac{u_N!}{(K_N)^{u_N}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} = \frac{u_N! \pi^2}{(K_N)^{u_N} 6}.
\end{aligned}$$

The above bound is based on a Taylor expansion of $\exp(z)$, which establishes the inequality $\exp(z) > z^u / u!$ implying for any $z > 0$ and any $u \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. This, in turn, implies the inequality $\exp(-z) < u! / z^u$ for any $z > 0$ and any $u \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. With $v_N := \lceil 3/(1 - K_2 |\log(1 - U_N)|) \rceil$, we apply the same inequality to the second series:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \log(k) \exp(-K_N (k-1)^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}) \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \log(k+1) \exp(-K_N k^{1-K_2 |\log(1-U_N)|}) \\
& \leq \frac{v_N!}{(K_N)^{v_N}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log(k+1)}{k^3} \\
& \leq \frac{v_N!}{(K_N)^{v_N}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^3} = \frac{v_N!}{(K_N)^{v_N}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} = \frac{v_N! \pi^2}{(K_N)^{v_N} 6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging these results into (D.38) gives

$$\sum_{j=1: j \neq i}^M \mathbb{B}_{\xi}(W_i \leftrightarrow W_j \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_2) \leq K_3 + \frac{\pi^2}{6} \left(K_1 \frac{u_N!}{(K_N)^{u_N}} + K_2 \frac{v_N!}{(K_N)^{v_N}} \right). \quad (\text{D.39})$$

Last but not least, combining (D.39) with (D.34) yields

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq 1 + K_3 + \frac{\pi^2}{6} \left(K_1 \frac{u_N!}{(K_N)^{u_N}} + K_2 \frac{v_N!}{(K_N)^{v_N}} \right).$$

Under Condition 2, $\vartheta = 0$ holds, hence $U_{\vartheta, N}$, K_N , $u_{\vartheta, N}$, and $v_{\vartheta, N}$ in (D.31) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} U_N &= \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-E)} & =: U \\ K_N &= \exp(-K_1 |\log(1 - U)|) & =: K_4 \\ u_N &= \left\lceil \frac{2}{1 - K_2 |\log U|} \right\rceil & =: u \\ v_N &= \left\lceil \frac{3}{1 - K_2 |\log U|} \right\rceil & =: v, \end{aligned}$$

which are constants independent of ϑ and N . The constant U corresponds to the constant U from Condition 3. This translates to

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq C_3,$$

with $C_3 := 1 + K_3 + (\pi^2/6) (K_1 u!/K_4^u + K_2 v!/K_4^v) \geq 1$. For non-overlapping subpopulations, we have $K_1 = K_2 = 0$ and

$$\|\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq 1 + K_3 = C_3.$$

D.7 Auxiliary Results

Lemma 6. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. Condition 3 implies that there exist constants $K_1 \geq 0$, $K_2 \geq 0$, $K_3 > 0$ such that, for all $k \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$,*

$$|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}| \leq K_1 + K_2 \log k$$

$$|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, 1}| \leq K_3.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 6. With the set

$$\mathcal{M}_{a,b} := \{\{c, d\} : c \in \mathcal{N}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_b, d \in \mathcal{N}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_b \setminus \{c\}\} \cup \{\{c\} : c \in \mathcal{N}_a \cup \mathcal{N}_b\},$$

we constructed from \mathcal{G} two additional graphs \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 as follows:

1. $\mathcal{G}_1 := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_1)$:

- Vertex $W \in \mathcal{V}_z$ relating to connection $Z_{i,j}$ has edges to vertices that relate to all connections $Z_{h,k}$ and responses Y_h with $\{h, k\}, \{h\} \in \mathcal{M}_{i,j}$.
- Vertex $W \in \mathcal{V}_y$ relating to attribute Y_i has edges to vertices that relate to all connections $Z_{h,k}$ and responses Y_h with $\{h, k\}, \{h\} \in \mathcal{M}_{i,N+1}$ for a fictional unit $N + 1$ with $\mathcal{N}_{N+1} = \emptyset$.

2. $\mathcal{G}_2 := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2)$: The set \mathcal{E}_2 includes edges of all vertices $W_i \in \mathcal{V}$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ to vertices in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 2}$.

The graph \mathcal{G}_1 is equivalent to the graph cover \mathcal{G}^* defined in Lemma 13 of S23. Therefore, we are able to use results from the proof of Lemma 13 in S23 demonstrating that Condition 3 implies the following bound for $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, k}$:

$$|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, k}| \leq (\omega_1 + 1)(2D^3\omega_1 + \omega_2 \log(k - 1)), \quad k \in \{2, 3, \dots\},$$

where D corresponds to the constant defined in (D.4) and the constants $\omega_1 \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \omega_2 \leq \min\{\omega_1, 1/((\omega_1 + 1)|\log(1 - U)|)\}$ with $U := (1 + \exp(-A))^{-1} > 0$ correspond to the constant from Condition 3. Defining $K_5 := 2\omega_1(\omega_1 + 1)D^3 \geq 0$ and $K_6 := \omega_2(\omega_1 + 1) \geq 0$, this bound is:

$$|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, k}| \leq K_5 + K_6 \log(k - 1), \quad k \in \{2, 3, \dots\}.$$

The bound for $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 1} \leq 4D^2 + D$ differs to the result from S23 since for our definition of $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$ there are additional $|\mathcal{N}_i \cup \mathcal{N}_j| \leq D$ responses in $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$.

Adding edges \mathcal{E}_2 , defined as the edges from vertices to other vertices with a geodesic distance of two in \mathcal{G}_1 , to \mathcal{G}_2 reduces the geodesic distance between all vertices from $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ in \mathcal{G}_1 to $\lceil k/2 \rceil$ in \mathcal{G}_2 . Therefore, $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}| = |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 2k}| + |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 2k-1}|$ holds for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. This allows us to relate the bounds for $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, k}|$ to bounds for $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}|$ with $k = 2, 3, \dots$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_2, i, k}| &= |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 2k}| + |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{G}_1, i, 2k-1}| \\ &\leq 2K_5 + K_6(\log(2k) + \log(2k - 1)) \\ &\leq 2K_5 + 2K_6 \log(2k) \\ &= K_1 + K_2 \log k \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\mathcal{S}_{g_2, i, 1}| \leq 4D^2 + D + K_1 =: K_3,$$

with $K_1 := 2K_5 + 2K_6 \log 2$ and $K_2 := 2K_6$. This proves the statement with $K_1 \geq 0$, $K_2 \geq 0$, and $K_3 > 0$.

Lemma 7. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. Then, for any pair of units $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$,*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \exp(CD^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)} \leq \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-CD^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 7. For all $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$, the conditional probability of $Z_{i,j}$ given $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}})$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Z_{i,j} = z_{i,j} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}) \\ &= \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z_{i,j}))}{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, 1)) + \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, 0))} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + g(1 - z_{i,j}; \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z_{i,j}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$g(z; \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z_{i,j}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top (\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z_{i,j}))).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{z_{-\{i,j\}} \in \mathcal{Z}_{-\{i,j\}}} |b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, 0) - b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, 1)| \\ & \leq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \in \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i, j\} \\ 1 & \text{if } a \in \{i, j\} \\ 1 + D & \text{if } a = N + 1 \\ 2C & \text{if } a = N + 2 \end{cases}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_{-\{i,j\}} := \prod_{(k,h) \neq (i,j)}^N \mathcal{Z}_{k,h}$ is the domain of \mathbf{Z} excluding $Z_{i,j}$, C corresponds to the constant from Condition 1, and D matches the constant defined in (D.4). The bounds for $a = 1, \dots, N$ follow from the observation, that the degree statistic of unit a can, first, only be affected by connections $z_{i,j}$ with $a \in \{i, j\}$ and, second, be at most 1 if this is the case. For $a = N + 1$, the bound follows from Lemma 14 of S23. For $a = N + 2$, the sufficient statistic

counts the number of connections with overlapping neighborhoods and either $Y_i x_j > 0$ or $Y_j x_i > 0$. For $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$, the maximal change in the statistic is $2C$ since $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x_i \leq C$ for $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$, otherwise the maximal change is 0.

Upon applying the triangle inequality,

$$|\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z) - \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z_{i,j})| \leq (2 + 2C + D) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty,$$

we obtain for $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$

$$\exp(-(2 + 2C + D) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty) \leq g(1 - z_{i,j}; \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}, z_{i,j}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \exp((2 + 2C + D) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty).$$

Upon collecting terms, we obtain the final result:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 + \exp(C_6 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)} &\leq \mathbb{P}_\theta(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C_6 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)} \\ \frac{1}{1 + \exp(C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)} &\leq \mathbb{P}_\theta(Z_{i,j} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)} \end{aligned}$$

where $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and $C_6 := 2 + 2C + D > 0$ are constants.

Lemma 8. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. Then, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \exp(C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)} \leq \mathbb{P}_\theta(Y_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty)}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 8. The conditional probability of Y_i given $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_{-i}, \mathbf{Z}) = (\mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z})$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\theta(Y_i = y_i \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) &= \frac{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, y_i, \mathbf{z}))}{\exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, 0, \mathbf{z})) + \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, 1, \mathbf{z}))} \\ &= \frac{1}{g(0; \mathbf{y}_{-i}, y_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + g(1; \mathbf{y}_{-i}, y_i, \boldsymbol{\theta})}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g(y; \mathbf{y}_{-i}, y_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp(\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top (\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, y, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, y_i, \mathbf{z}))).$$

Note that

$$\max_{y_{-i} \in \mathcal{Y}_{-i}} |b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, 0, \mathbf{z}) - b_a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{-i}, 1, \mathbf{z})| \leq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \in \{1, \dots, N+1\} \\ C D^2 & \text{if } a = N+2, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{-i} := \times_{j \neq i}^N \mathcal{Y}_j$ is the domain of \mathbf{Y} without Y_i , C corresponds to the constant from Condition 1, and D matches the constant defined in (D.4). The bounds for $a = 1, \dots, N+1$

are 0 as the corresponding statistics are not affected by changes in \mathbf{y} . For $a = N + 2$, the maximal change is bounded by the number of units j such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$, which is D^2 , times the maximal value C of the predictors. The remainder of the proof of Lemma 8 resembles the proof of Lemma 7.

Lemma 9. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. If Conditions 1, 3, and 4 are satisfied with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$, we obtain the following bounds for all elements of $\mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$, being the covariance matrix of the sufficient statistics $b_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ and $b_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ defined in Section D.1, for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ and all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &\leq \frac{ND^5}{4} \\ |B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| &\leq \frac{NC^2D^5}{4} \\ B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &\leq \frac{NC^2D^5}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 9. We first bound $B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$ from above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(s_{N+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j} \left(\sum_{a=1}^N \sum_{b=a+1}^N d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z}) Z_{a,b} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N c_{i,j} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j} \left(\sum_{a=1}^N \sum_{b=a+1}^N Z_{a,b} d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z}) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N c_{i,j} D^2 \left(\sum_{a=1}^N \sum_{b=a+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(Z_{a,b} d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z})) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{D.40}$$

where D matches the constant defined in (D.4) and the function $d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z})$ is defined in (D.2). On the second line of (D.40), we use that the fact that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j = \emptyset$ implies that $d_{i,j}(\mathbf{Z}) Z_{i,j} = 0$ and $d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z}) Z_{a,b}$ does not depend on $Z_{i,j}$ for any $\{a, b\} \neq \{i, j\}$. For the inequality in the last line of (D.40), we use the fact that the number of pairs (a, b) for which $d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z}) Z_{a,b}$ is a function of $Z_{i,j}$ is bounded above by D (see proof of Lemma 16 in S23). Invoking Lemma 12 of S23 together with applying

$$\sum_{a=1}^N \sum_{b=a+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{z},i,j}(d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z}) Z_{a,b}) \leq \frac{D}{4}$$

gives:

$$B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N c_{i,j} D^2 \left(\sum_{a=1}^N \sum_{b=a+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j} (Z_{a,b} d_{a,b}(\mathbf{Z})) \right) \leq \frac{N D^5}{4}$$

We proceed with bounding $B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})$:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{V}_{y,i} (s_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{z})) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j} (s_{N+2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z})) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{V}_{y,i} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^N c_{i,j} x_j z_{i,j} \right) Y_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j} (c_{i,j} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i) Z_{i,j}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^N c_{i,j} x_j z_{i,j} \right)^2 \mathbb{V}_{y,i} (Y_i) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i+1}^N c_{i,j} (x_i y_j + x_j y_i)^2 \mathbb{V}_{z,i,j} (Z_{i,j}) \\ &\leq \frac{5 N C^2 D^4}{4} \leq \frac{N C^2 D^5}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

because $|x_j| \leq C$ according to Condition 1. For the first inequality, we also use that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N c_{i,j} \leq D^2$$

by Lemma 12 in S23. We obtain

$$\max\{B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}), B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})\} \leq \frac{N C^2 D^5}{4},$$

which provides an upper bound on $|B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})|$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$|B_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})| \leq \sqrt{B_{1,1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})} \sqrt{B_{2,2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w})} \leq \frac{N C^2 D^5}{4}.$$

Lemma 10. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. Define*

$$\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} := \left\| \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}_{-v}) - \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \right\|_{TV}$$

$$\pi^* := \max_{1 \leq v \leq M} \max_{(\mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \in \mathcal{W}_{-v} \times \mathcal{W}_{-v}} \pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}}.$$

Let $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ be the maximum degree of vertices $Z_{i,j}$ in \mathcal{G} . Then

$$\pi^* \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_{\infty})}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 10. The proof of Lemma 10 resembles the proof of Lemma 18 in S23, adapted to the bounds on the conditional probabilities derived in Lemmas 7 and 8. We distinguish four cases, where W_v with $v \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ relates to:

1. Connection $Z_{i,j}$ of a pair of nodes $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ with $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j = \emptyset$.
2. Attribute Y_i with $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ and $\{j \in \mathcal{P}_N : \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset\} = \emptyset$.
3. Connection $Z_{i,j}$ of a pair of nodes $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ with $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$.
4. Attribute Y_i with $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ and $\{j \in \mathcal{P}_N : \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset\} \neq \emptyset$.

In cases 1 and 2, W_v is independent of \mathbf{W}_{-v} , so that $\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} = 0$; note that case 2 cannot occur, because Condition 1 ensures that there are no units $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$ with $\{j \in \mathcal{P}_N : \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset\} = \emptyset$. In cases 3 and 4, W_v depends on a non-empty subset of other vertices in \mathcal{G} . Consider any $v \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} > 0$ for some $(\mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \in \mathcal{W}_{-v} \times \mathcal{W}_{-v}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} a_{0,v} &:= \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(W_v = 0 \mid \mathbf{W}_{-v} = \mathbf{w}_{-v}) \quad \text{and} \quad a_{1,v} := \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(W_v = 1 \mid \mathbf{W}_{-v} = \mathbf{w}_{-v}) \\ b_{0,v} &:= \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(W_v = 0 \mid \mathbf{W}_{-v} = \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{1,v} := \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(W_v = 1 \mid \mathbf{W}_{-v} = \mathbf{w}'_{-v}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 18 in S23 shows that

$$\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} \leq \min\{\max\{a_{0,v}, b_{0,v}\}, \max\{a_{1,v}, b_{1,v}\}\}.$$

Plugging in the bounds on the conditional probabilities in Lemmas 7 and 8, we obtain

$$\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_{\infty})}, \quad v \in \mathcal{V}_Z$$

and

$$\pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_{\infty})}, \quad v \in \mathcal{V}_Y.$$

Since $D \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, we obtain

$$\pi^* := \max_{1 \leq v \leq M} \max_{(\mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}) \in \mathcal{W}_{-v} \times \mathcal{W}_{-v}} \pi_{v, \mathbf{w}_{-v}, \mathbf{w}'_{-v}} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-C D^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_{\infty})}.$$

Lemma 11. *Consider the model of Corollary 1. If Conditions 1 and 3 are satisfied along with either Condition 2 or Condition 4 with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$, there exists an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \notin \mathcal{H}) \leq \frac{4}{\max\{N, p\}^2},$$

where \mathcal{H} is defined in (D.6).

PROOF OF LEMMA 11. We prove Lemma 11 by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty < \frac{N}{2(1+\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2}\right) &\leq \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2} \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty < \frac{c^2 N}{2(1+\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))}\right) &\leq \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.41}$$

To prove the first line of (D.41), we first bound $(1/2)\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty$ from below. We then use Theorem 1 of Chazottes et al. (2007, p. 207) to concentrate $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty$. Last, but not least, we show that there exists an integer $N_0 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that the obtained lower bound for $(1/2)\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty$ is, with high probability, greater than the deviation of $\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty$ from its mean. The first line of (D.41) follows from combining these steps. The second line of (D.41) can be established along the same lines. A union bound then establishes the desired result:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{W} \notin \mathcal{H}) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty < \frac{N}{2(1+\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty < \frac{c^2 N}{2(1+\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\max\{N, p\}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 1: Let $j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}$ be any unit with $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$. We obtain by Lemma 7, Lemma 14 of S23, and Condition 2:

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} d_{i,j}(\mathbf{Z}) \geq \frac{N}{2(1+\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2} \geq \frac{N}{4\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^2} \geq \frac{N^{1-2\vartheta}}{4\exp(2E)}.$$

Lemma 1 of S23 implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty\right| < t\right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\Psi_N^2 \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2^2}\right).$$

Choosing

$$t := \sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \Psi_N \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty\right| < \sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \Psi_N \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we demonstrate that there exists an integer $N_1 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_1$,

$$\sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \Psi_N \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{N^{1-2\vartheta}}{4 \exp(2E)}.$$

To do so, we bound the three terms one by one. Using $\max\{N, p\} = N + 2$, the first term, $\sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}}$, is bounded above by $\sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \leq 2\sqrt{\log N}$ provided $N \geq 2$. The second term is bounded above by $\Psi_N \leq D\sqrt{N}$ by Lemma 11 of S23. The third term is bounded above by $\|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 < C_3$ by Lemma 5, where $C_3 > 0$ is a constant.

Combining these results gives

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sqrt{N \log N} C_3, D &\leq \frac{N^{1-\vartheta}}{4 \exp(E)} \\ 8C_3 D \exp(E) &\leq \sqrt{\frac{N^{1-2\vartheta}}{\log N}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 11 in S23, this implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty \geq \frac{N}{2(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))^2}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2}.$$

Step 2: Condition 1 implies that, for each unit $i \in \mathcal{P}_N$, there exists a unit $j \in \mathcal{P}_N \setminus \{i\}$ such that $\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{N}_j \neq \emptyset$ and $x_j \in [c, C]$. Condition 2 and Lemma 7 then establish

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{w})\|_\infty \geq \frac{c^2}{2} \mathbb{E} Z_{i,j} \geq \frac{c^2 N}{2(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))} \geq \frac{c^2 N}{4\chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)} \geq \frac{c^2 N^{1-\vartheta}}{4 \exp(E)}.$$

Once more, we invoke Lemma 1 of S23 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty\right| < \sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \Psi_N \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by showing that there exists an integer $N_2 \in \{3, 4, \dots\}$ such that, for all $N > N_2$,

$$\sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}} \Psi_N \|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2 \leq \frac{c^2 N^{1-\vartheta}}{4 \exp(E)}. \quad (\text{D.42})$$

We bound the three terms on the left-hand side of (D.42) one by one. The bounds on the first term, $\sqrt{\log \max\{N, p\}}$, and third term, $\|\mathcal{D}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)\|_2$, are the same as in the first step. With regard to the second term, we obtain $\psi_N \leq C_2\sqrt{N}$ by the proof of Lemma 4 with $C_2 > 0$.

Combining these bounds gives

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sqrt{N \log N} C_3 &\leq \frac{c^2 N^{1-\vartheta}}{4 \exp(E)} \\ \frac{8}{c^2} C_3 \exp(E) &\leq \sqrt{\frac{N^{1-2\vartheta}}{\log N}}, \end{aligned}$$

which vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$ under Conditions 2 and 4 with $\vartheta \in [0, 1/18)$. Thus, for all $N > N_2$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{H}_{i,2}(\mathbf{W})\|_\infty \geq \frac{c^2 N}{2(1 + \chi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*))} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{2}{\max\{N, p\}^2}.$$

E Quasi-Newton Acceleration

The two-step algorithm described in Section 3.2 iterates two steps:

Step 1: Update $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t-1)}$ using a MM algorithm with a linear convergence rate (Böhning and Lindsay, 1988, Theorem 4.1).

Step 2: Update $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$ using a Newton-Raphson update with a quadratic convergence rate.

To accelerate Step 1, we use quasi-Newton methods (Lange et al., 2000): We approximate the difference between $(\mathbf{A}^*)^{-1}$ and $[\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})]^{-1}$ (defined in Lemma 2 and Equation 10, respectively) iteratively by rank-one updates.

A first-order Taylor approximation of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$ shows that

$$-\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) \mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \approx (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1), \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where

$$\mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) := \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}). \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Since a standard Newton-Raphson algorithm is also based on the approximation in (E.1), setting $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}$ from a Newton-Raphson algorithm shows that the change in consecutive

estimates carries information on $[\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})]^{-1}$, which is what we effectively want to approximate. More specifically, we approximate the difference between $(\mathbf{A}^*)^{-1}$ and $[\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})]^{-1}$. Thus we write $(\mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} - (\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}))^{-1} \approx \mathbf{M}^{(t)}$ and set $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}$, so that (E.1) becomes

$$\mathbf{M}^{(t)} \mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}) + (\mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) =: \mathbf{r}^{(t)}, \quad (\text{E.3})$$

which is called the inverse secant condition for updating $\mathbf{M}^{(t)}$. Given that (E.3) relates $[\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})]^{-1}$ to the score functions through the definition of $\mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ in (E.2) and estimates $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}$, it should hold for all updates of $\mathbf{M}^{(t+1)}$. We employ the parsimonious symmetric, rank-one update of Davidon (1991) to satisfy (E.3) by updating $\mathbf{M}^{(t)}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{M}^{(t)} = \mathbf{M}^{(t-1)} + \frac{\mathbf{q}^{(t)} (\mathbf{q}^{(t)})^\top}{c^{(t)}}, \quad (\text{E.4})$$

with $\mathbf{q}^{(t)} := \mathbf{r}^{(t)} - \mathbf{M}^{(t-1)} \mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ and $c^{(t)} := (\mathbf{q}^{(t)})^\top \mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$. We seed the algorithm with the MM update described in Section 3.2 by setting $\mathbf{M}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0} \in \{0\}^{N \times N}$, which is a matrix filled with zeroes.

In short, the quasi-Newton acceleration of the MM algorithm updates $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$ as follows:

Step 1: Calculate $\mathbf{k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t-1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ defined in (E.2).

Step 2: Update $\mathbf{M}^{(t)}$ according to (E.4).

Step 3: Update $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}$ from $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}$:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)} + ((\mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} - \mathbf{M}^{(t)}) \left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}} \right). \quad (\text{E.5})$$

The described quasi-Newton algorithm does not enjoy the ascent property of the MM algorithm, in the sense that $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}) \geq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$ is not guaranteed. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}$ is updated by either the quasi-Newton update (E.5) or the MM update (11), whichever gives rise to the highest pseudo-likelihood. The resulting updates do not decrease the computing time per iteration, but reduce the total number of iterations.

F MM Algorithm: Directed Connections

If connections are directed, $Z_{i,j}$ may differ from $Z_{j,i}$. In such cases, the pseudo-loglikelihood can be written as

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \ell_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

where ℓ_i and $\ell_{i,j}$ are defined by

$$\ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y_i | \mathbf{y}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(z_{i,j} | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}_{-\{i,j\}}).$$

We partition the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} := (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N+12}$ into

- the nuisance parameter vector: $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 := (\alpha_{z,O,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,O,N}, \alpha_{z,I,1}, \dots, \alpha_{z,I,N-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N-1}$;
- the parameter vector of primary interest: $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 := (\alpha_y, \beta_{x,y,1}, \beta_{x,y,2}, \beta_{x,y,3}, \lambda, \gamma_{z,z,1}, \gamma_{z,z,2}, \gamma_{x,z,1}, \gamma_{x,z,2}, \gamma_{x,z,3}, \gamma_{x,z,4}, \gamma_{y,z}, \gamma_{x,y,z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{13}$.

As explained in Section 6.1, $\alpha_{z,N,I}$ is set to 0 in order to address identifiability issues. The negative Hessian is partitioned in accordance:

$$-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) & \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top & \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N-1) \times (2N-1)}$, $\mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(2N-1) \times 13}$, and $\mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{13 \times 13}$. Writing $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2)$ in place of $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we compute at iteration $t+1$:

Step 1: Given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}$, find $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}$ satisfying $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \geq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$.

Step 2: Given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}$, find $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}$ satisfying $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t+1)}) \geq \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)})$.

In Step 1, it is inconvenient to invert the high-dimensional $(2N-1) \times (2N-1)$ matrix

$$\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) := -\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}^2 \ell_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^{(t)}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \pi_{i,j}^{(t)} (1 - \pi_{i,j}^{(t)}) \mathbf{e}_{i,j} \mathbf{e}_{i,j}^\top.$$

Note that the definition of vector $\mathbf{e}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N-1}$ differs from the undirected case described in Section 3.2. For $j \neq N$, let $\mathbf{e}_{i,j}$ be the $(2N-1)$ -vector whose i th and $(j+N)$ th coordinates are 1 and whose other coordinates are 0. For $j = N$, let $\mathbf{e}_{i,j}$ be the $(2N-1)$ -vector whose i th

coordinate is 1 and whose other coordinates are 0. Along the lines of the MM algorithm for undirected connections described in Section 3.2, we increase ℓ by maximizing a minorizing function of ℓ , replacing $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})$ by a constant matrix \mathbf{A}^* that is more convenient to invert. The constant matrix \mathbf{A}^* is defined as

$$\mathbf{A}^* := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{1,1}^* & \mathbf{A}_{1,2}^* \\ (\mathbf{A}_{1,2}^*)^\top & \mathbf{A}_{2,2}^* \end{pmatrix}$$

where

- $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{2,2}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times (N-1)}$ are diagonal matrices with elements $(N-1)/4$ on the main diagonal;
- $\mathbf{A}_{1,2}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (N-1)}$ is a matrix with vanishing elements on its main diagonal and off-diagonal elements $1/4$.

Applying Theorem 8.5.11 in Harville (1997) to $\mathbf{A}_{1,2}^*$ and \mathbf{A}^* shows that matrix can be inverted in $O(N)$ operations. With the above change in the constant matrix \mathbf{A}^* , we estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ along the lines of Section 3.2.

G Hate Speech on X: Additional Information

G.1 Data

For the application, we use posts of $N = 2,191$ U.S. state legislators on the social media platform X collected by Kim et al. (2022) in the six months leading up to and including the insurrection at the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. We restrict attention to active legislators, that is, legislators who posted during the aforementioned period and mentioned or reposted content from other active legislators. Since reposts do not necessarily reflect politicians’ opinions, we exclude all reposts and non-unique posts that are direct copies of other users’ messages to gather information on responses. Employing large language models of Camacho-Collados et al. (2022) pre-trained on these posts enables categorizing the 109,974 posts into those containing hate speech statements versus those that do not. Accordingly, the binary attribute Y_i equals 1 if the corresponding legislator sent at least one post classified as hate speech and 0 otherwise. The algorithm of Camacho-Collados

et al. (2022) provides for each Tweet a continuous value between 0 and 1. We classify the respective Tweet as using hate speech if its value is larger than 0.5. The attribute $x_{i,1} \in \{0, 1\}$ is 1 if legislator i is a Republican and 0 otherwise. In addition, we incorporate information on each legislator’s gender ($x_{i,2} = 1$ if legislator i is female and 0 otherwise), race ($x_{i,3} = 1$ if legislator is white and 0 otherwise), and state ($x_{i,4}$). On the social media platform X, users have the ability to either mention or repost other users’ posts. The resulting network, denoted as \mathbf{Z} , is based on the mentions and reposts exchanged between January 6, 2020 and January 6, 2021: $Z_{i,j} = 1$ if legislator i mentioned or reposted legislator j in a post. To construct the neighborhoods \mathcal{N}_i of the legislators i , we respect the choices of the legislators: We take the set of followers of legislator i as neighborhood \mathcal{N}_i . This is reasonable, because users view primarily information from followers, which implies that users have chosen who can influence them.

G.2 Plots

In addition to the goodness-of-fit checks reported in Section 6, we assess whether the model preserves salient characteristics of connections \mathbf{Z} . Figure 5 suggests that the proposed model captures the shared partner distribution, i.e., the numbers of connected pairs of legislators $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{P}_N$ with 1, 2, \dots shared partners.

References

- Böhning, D. and B. G. Lindsay (1988). Monotonicity of quadratic-approximation algorithms. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 40(4), 641–663.
- Camacho-Collados, J., K. Rezaee, T. Riahi, A. Ushio, D. Loureiro, D. Antypas, J. Boisson, L. Espinosa-Anke, F. Liu, E. Martínez-Cámara, G. Medina, T. Buhrmann, L. Neves, and F. Barbieri (2022). TweetNLP: Cutting-Edge Natural Language Processing for Social Media. In *Proceedings of the 2022 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: System demonstrations*.
- Davidon, W. C. (1991). Variable metric method for minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 1, 1–17.




Figure 5: Hate speech on X: The red line indicates the observed shared partners distribution of the network of repost and mention interactions of U.S. legislators, while the boxplots represent the shared partners distributions of simulated networks from the estimated model.

Harville, D. A. (1997). *Matrix Algebra From a Statistician's Perspective*. New York, NY: Springer.

Kim, T., N. Nakka, I. Gopal, B. A. Desmarais, A. Mancinelli, J. J. Harden, H. Ko, and F. J. Boehmke (2022). Attention to the COVID-19 pandemic on Twitter: Partisan differences among U.S. state legislators. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 47, 1023–1041.

Lange, K., D. R. Hunter, and I. Yang (2000). Optimization transfer using surrogate objective functions. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 9, 1–20.

Lindvall, T. (2002). *Lectures On The Coupling Method*. Courier Corporation.

Magnus, J. R. and H. Neudecker (2019). *Matrix Differential Calculus with Applications in Statistics and Econometrics* (Third Edition ed.). Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Rue, H. and L. Held (2005). *Gaussian Markov random fields: theory and applications*. CRC press.

Stewart, J. R. and M. Schweinberger (2023). Pseudo-likelihood-based M -estimators for random graphs with dependent edges and parameter vectors of increasing di-

mension. Technical report, Department of Statistics, Florida State University.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.07167>.

van den Berg, J. and C. Maes (1994). Disagreement percolation in the study of Markov fields. *The Annals of Probability* 22, 749–763.