

# THE SPECTRAL DISTRIBUTION OF RANDOM GRAPHS WITH GIVEN DEGREE SEQUENCES

SHUYI WANG<sup>1</sup>, KEVIN LI<sup>2</sup>, AND JIAOYANG HUANG<sup>3</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** In this article, we study random graphs with a given degree sequence  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n$  from the configuration model. We show that under mild assumptions of the degree sequence, the spectral distribution of the normalized Laplacian matrix of such random graph converges in distribution to the semicircle distribution as the number of vertices  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This extends work by McKay [12] and Tran, Vu and Wang [15] which studied random regular graphs ( $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_n = d$ ). Furthermore, we extend the assumption to show that a slightly more general condition is equivalent to the weak convergence to semicircle distribution. The equivalence is also illustrated by numerical simulations.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Backgrounds.** Random graphs, since their introduction in the 1960s, have been a widely researched subject that continually receives attentions of scholars. The random graph models shed light on a variety of real-world phenomena and have found applications in the studies of social networks, economics, and biological engineering. Researchers have developed a comprehensive framework of various random graph models, such as the Erdős-Rényi model, the Preferential Attachment model, the stochastic block model, etc. [4] and [16] are excellent manuscripts that introduce popular random graph models in a systematic manner.

A key tool for studying random graphs is random matrix theory, which often focuses on properties such as spectral distribution. In the context of random graphs, researchers study the spectral distribution of the adjacency matrices and normalized Laplacians, for they provide significant insights into the graph's structural properties.

Previous work in this area has mostly focused on settings where the entries in the random matrix, which are essentially degrees in the random graphs, are uncorrelated [7] or have short-range correlation [1, 6]. When given degree sequences are introduced, entries have long-range negative correlation, which causes difficulties in the study of the spectral distribution.

A plethora of work have been done in the context of random  $d$ -regular graphs. In [12], McKay showed that the spectral distribution converges to the Kesten-McKay distribution when  $d$  is fixed. [2] showed that the spectral distribution holds under the optimally small scale. [11] improved on the rigidity of eigenvalues as well as an error bound on the extremal eigenvalue. In [15], Tran, Vu, and Wang showed that the spectral distribution converges to the semicircle distribution when  $d \rightarrow \infty$ .

In this work, we extend the  $d$ -regular assumptions to situations where each degree in the degree sequence is allowed to vary, to consider non-regular graphs. Such random graphs are called the configuration model, firstly introduced by Bollobás [3]. The configuration model is frequently studied due to its wide application in statistical inferences and unique properties. In [10], the authors studied the use of configuration model as null model to test empirical graph properties. In [9], the authors proved a new universality class for the configuration model due to their behavior of critical percolation. More general notions of configuration models are also discussed and investigated in the work of [5], such as erased configuration model and repeated configuration model.

In this paper, we assume mild conditions on the asymptotic behavior of the degree sequence and show that the spectral distribution of the normalized Laplacian converges in distribution to the

semicircle distribution. To prove convergence in distribution, we mainly use the moments method. To bound the moments, we use tools from Fourier analysis developed by Sarid [14]. To deal with combinatorial difficulties when bounding the moments, we apply several graph transformation techniques. To extend the condition to the equivalent condition, we use birth-death processes to model the graph pruning process.

**1.2. Preliminaries.** In this section, we introduce the configuration model and establish the necessary notations. Consider a graph with a fixed degree sequence  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n$ , where the total degree is  $D = d_1 + d_2 + \dots + d_n$ . The configuration model is constructed as follows: for  $n$  vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ , each vertex  $v_i$  is associated with  $d_i$  half-edges. A random perfect matching is then performed on these  $D$  half-edges. Specifically, one half-edge is randomly connected to any of the remaining  $D - 1$  half-edges, and the process is repeated for each unused half-edge, reducing the pool of available half-edges by two at each step. This procedure continues until all half-edges are matched. The result is a uniformly random graph (potentially with multi-edges and self-loops) among all graphs with the given degree sequence.

Given a degree sequence  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n$ , we can sample a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  from the configuration model. This random graph defines an adjacency matrix  $A$ , where  $A_{ij}$  represents the number of edges between vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . To obtain the normalized Laplacian, we normalize all entries of  $A$  to have a mean of 0 and variance  $1/n$ . Specifically, for each entry  $A_{ij}$ , we consider each pair of half-edges, one from  $v_i$  and one from  $v_j$ , as an indicator random variable that takes the value 1 if the two half-edges are connected in the random graph.

More precisely, for each vertex  $v_i$ , we enumerate its half-edges from 1 to  $d_i$ . For vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , and for  $1 \leq s \leq d_i$  and  $1 \leq t \leq d_j$ , we define the indicator function  $H_{ij}^{st}$ , which equals 1 if the  $s$ -th half-edge of  $v_i$  is connected to the  $t$ -th half-edge of  $v_j$ . Then, we can express  $A_{ij}$  as

$$(1) \quad A_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^{d_i} \sum_{t=1}^{d_j} H_{ij}^{st}.$$

Using linearity of expectation, the mean and variance can be computed as

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E}[A_{ij}] = \frac{d_i d_j}{D - 1}, \quad \text{Var}(A_{ij}) \approx \frac{d_i d_j}{D}.$$

We define the diagonal matrix  $\Delta$ , where  $\Delta_{ii} = d_i$  represents the degree of vertex  $v_i$  in the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $\Delta_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ . The normalized Laplacian matrix associated with  $\mathcal{G}$  is a scaled version of its adjacency matrix  $A$ , given by:

$$(3) \quad M = \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( A - \left[ \frac{d_i d_j}{D - 1} \right]_{ij} \right) \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} \left( \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} A \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \left[ \frac{\sqrt{d_i d_j}}{D - 1} \right]_{ij} \right)$$

Note that  $M$  is a normalized version of the standard Laplacian matrix associated with  $\mathcal{G}$  (see [8]). This normalization ensures that  $\mathbb{E}[M_{ij}] = 0$  and  $\text{Var}(M_{ij}) \approx 1/n$ , matching the mean and variance of Wigner matrices. However, unlike Wigner matrices, where the entries are independent, the entries of  $M$  exhibit long-range correlations.

Before presenting our main results, we introduce some necessary notation. Let  $\mu_n$  denote the empirical eigenvalue distribution of  $M$ , defined as  $\mu_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i}$ , where  $\lambda_i$  are the eigenvalues of  $M$ . We denote by  $\rho_{\text{sc}}$  the semicircle distribution supported on  $[-2, 2]$ , with the density function

$$d\rho_{\text{sc}}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{4 - x^2} dx.$$

The moments of the semicircle distribution are given by the Catalan numbers. Specifically,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-2}^2 x^n \sqrt{4 - x^2} dx = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ C_{n/2}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where  $C_k$  is the Catalan number with the following explicit formula

$$C_k = \frac{\binom{2k}{k}}{k+1}.$$

An important observation is that  $C_k$  also has a combinatorial interpretation: it counts the number of distinct rooted trees with  $k$  edges.

Throughout the paper, we will use several asymptotic notations. Suppose  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  are two sequences of non-negative numbers in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We write  $a_n = o(b_n)$  or  $a_n \ll b_n$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$ ;  $a_n = \omega(b_n)$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = \infty$ ;  $a_n = O(b_n)$  if there exists a large constant  $C > 0$ , such that  $a_n \leq Cb_n$ ;  $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$  if there exists a small constant  $c > 0$  such that  $a_n \geq cb_n$ . Additionally, for any integer  $n$ , we use  $[n]$  to denote the index set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

**1.3. Main Results.** In this section, we present the main results of this paper. The first main theorem indicates that moments of the eigenvalue distribution of  $M^{(n)}$  converge to those of the semicircle distribution.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Consider the degree sequence  $\{d_1^{(n)}, d_2^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)}\}$  with total degree  $D^{(n)} = d_1^{(n)} + d_2^{(n)} + \dots + d_n^{(n)}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $\min\{d_i^{(n)}\}_{i \in [n]} \gg \sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consider the normalized Laplacian matrix  $M^{(n)}$  as defined in (3). Then, the moments of the empirical eigenvalue distribution of  $M^{(n)}$  converge to the moments of the semicircle distribution:*

$$(4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}[(M^{(n)})^k]] = \begin{cases} C_{k/2} & \text{for even } k, \\ 0 & \text{for odd } k, \end{cases}$$

where  $C_{k/2}$  is the  $k/2$ -th Catalan number. Moreover, the empirical eigenvalue distribution  $\mu_n$  of  $M^{(n)}$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution  $\rho_{\text{sc}}$  in probability:

$$(5) \quad \mu_n \xrightarrow{D} \rho_{\text{sc}}, \quad \text{in probability.}$$

**Remark 1.2.** *In our statements and proofs, we work with the normalized Laplacian matrix  $M$  as defined in (3),*

$$M = \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( A - \left[ \frac{d_i d_j}{D-1} \right]_{ij} \right) \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

as it offers intuitive insights and simplifies computations. However, it is also valid to omit the subtraction of the matrix  $\left[ \frac{d_i d_j}{D-1} \right]_{ij}$ , since it is rank-1 and does not affect the limiting eigenvalue distribution of the resulting matrix  $M$ .

In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we use the method of moments to establish weak convergence. It is important to note that moment convergence is a sufficient condition for weak convergence. With more refined analysis, the condition “ $\min\{d_i^{(n)}\}_{i \in [n]} \gg \sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}$ ” in Theorem 1.1 can be relaxed if we are interested in a more general sufficient condition for weak convergence to the semicircle distribution.

Before introducing this more general condition, we first present a lemma that simplifies the analysis.

**Lemma 1.3.** *We assume that for arbitrarily large  $C > 0$  and arbitrarily small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the degree sequence satisfies that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{d_i^{(n)} < C\sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}\} \leq \varepsilon n$  for all large  $n > N(C, \varepsilon)$ . Then, with probability  $1 - o(1)$ , we may remove at most  $2\varepsilon n$  vertices and edges adjacent to them, so that the following holds:*

- (1) *The total number of edges removed is no larger than  $4\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$ ;*
- (2) *Each vertex of the remaining graph has a degree larger than  $C\sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}$ ;*

(3) Condition on the degree sequence of the remaining graph, its law is given by the configuration model.

Now, we are ready to present the more general sufficient condition for the weak convergence, whose proof follows from Lemma 1.3 and Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 1.4.** Consider the degree sequence  $\{d_1^{(n)}, d_2^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)}\}$  with total degree  $D^{(n)} = d_1^{(n)} + d_2^{(n)} + \dots + d_n^{(n)}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and recall the normalized Laplacian matrix  $M^{(n)}$  as defined in 1.2. Suppose the following condition holds: for arbitrarily large  $C > 0$  and arbitrarily small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the degree sequence satisfies that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{d_i^{(n)} < C\sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}\} \leq \varepsilon n$  for all large  $n > N(C, \varepsilon)$ . Then the empirical eigenvalue distribution  $\mu_n$  of  $M^{(n)}$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution  $\rho_{\text{sc}}$  in probability:

$$\mu_n \xrightarrow{D} \rho_{\text{sc}} \quad \text{in probability.}$$

**Remark 1.5** (Necessity of the condition). The condition in Theorem 1.4 is also necessary for weak convergence to hold. Suppose there is a fixed proportion of vertices with degrees on the order of  $C\sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}$ , and this proportion does not vanish as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case, Lemma 1.3 cannot be applied. Furthermore, as noted in Remark 2.15, we can construct a  $k$ -step walk that violates moment convergence, meaning that the moments of the eigenvalue distribution will no longer match those of the semicircle distribution. For readability, the technical details of this argument are postponed until Remark 2.15, after the proof of Theorem 1.1.

From now on, for the simplicity of notations in later proofs, we will drop the superscript of  $(n)$  in all symbols.

**1.4. Proof Ideas and Difficulties.** The main difficulty lies in the proof of Theorem 1.1. We use a variety of techniques such as the Fourier transform, graph pruning, and combinatorial arguments to tackle the proof. Particularly, the main idea behind is that we expand the quantity in terms of different graph types

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr} M^k] = \sum_G \frac{1}{n} t_G$$

where each  $G$  is a valid closed directed graph with  $k$  edges. We basically show that only the graphs that are trees and have  $k/2$  edges (thus each edge has multiplicity of 2) will make a contribution of 1. Other possible graphs will have contributions of 0 asymptotically. Therefore, if  $k$  is odd,  $G$  cannot be a tree and thus this quantity is 0. If  $k$  is even, this sum is counting the number of distinct trees which have  $k/2$  edges. That is exactly the combinatorial meaning of the Catalan number  $C_{k/2}$ .

Although the main idea is straightforward, there are two technical difficulties to overcome in the proof:

1. Fine enough bounds on different graphs are needed so that we can prove the asymptotic contribution of most graphs to be 0.
2. There are too many possibilities of graphs with  $k$  edges. We need to transform most of them into a limited set of graph types and apply combinatorial arguments so that we only need give bounds on a small number of graph types.

To tackle the first point, we have to attain a good upper bound on the part of graph where edges have multiplicities of 1. It is because this part appears most frequently in our computations. To do it, we recreate the methods developed in [14]. We develop a Fourier transform on the conditional probabilities of the edge indicators and bound the Fourier coefficients.

To tackle the second point, we introduce a variety of graph transformations which only increase  $t_G$ . Therefore, whenever we show that the transformed graph has contributions of  $o(1)$ , we know

that the untransformed graphs have contributions of  $o(1)$ . We basically define all possible transformations and show that the transformed graph consists of several components whose contributions are easier to compute.

Another difficulty lies in proving Lemma 1.3, since we need to make sure that the pruning operation will not continue forever and lead to an empty set of vertices in the end. We use a birth and death chain to keep track of the number of half-edges in vertices whose degrees are less than the threshold. By iterative probability arguments, we bound the stopping time of the chain and show that the impact will be no more than  $o(n)$  vertices.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section we prove the first statement (4) of Theorem 1.1, and the following theorem, which states that the moments of the empirical eigenvalue distribution of  $M^{(n)}$  concentrate on its expectation.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Consider the degree sequence  $\{d_1^{(n)}, d_2^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)}\}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $\min\{d_i^{(n)}\}_{i \in [n]} \gg \sqrt{D^{(n)}/n}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consider the normalized Laplacian matrix  $M^{(n)}$  as defined in (3). Then, the moments of the empirical eigenvalue distribution of  $M^{(n)}$  concentrates on its expectation: for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(M^{(n)})^k] - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}[(M^{(n)})^k]] \right| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

We use subsections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 to prove (4) of Theorem 1.1 and use subsection 2.5 to prove Theorem 2.1.

The second statement (5) of Theorem 1.1 follows from combining (4) and Theorem 2.1 by a standard argument. We thus postpone its proof to the Appendix A.

**2.1. Moments Expansion.** In this section we derive an expression for  $\text{Tr}[M^k]/n$ . Let

$$(6) \quad Q = \sqrt{D} \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( A - \left[ \frac{d_i d_j}{D-1} \right] \right) \Delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} = n^{\frac{1}{2}} M, \quad Q_{ij} = \sqrt{\frac{D}{d_i d_j}} \left( A_{ij} - \left[ \frac{d_i d_j}{D-1} \right] \right).$$

With the above notation, we have

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(M^k)] &= \frac{1}{n^{1+\frac{k}{2}}} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(Q^k)] = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k} \mathbb{E}[Q_{i_1 i_2} Q_{i_2 i_3} \cdots Q_{i_k i_1}] \\ &= \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} d_{i_2} \cdots d_{i_k}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( A_{i_1 i_2} - \left[ \frac{d_{i_1} d_{i_2}}{D-1} \right] \right) \cdots \left( A_{i_k i_1} - \left[ \frac{d_{i_k} d_{i_1}}{D-1} \right] \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We recall the indicator function  $H_{ij}^{st}$  from (1), which equals 1 if the  $s$ -th half-edge of  $v_i$  is connected to the  $t$ -th half-edge of  $v_j$ . Then, we have that  $A_{ij} - \frac{d_i d_j}{D-1} = \sum_{s=1}^{d_i} \sum_{t=1}^{d_j} (H_{ij}^{st} - \frac{1}{D-1})$ . And it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( A_{i_1 i_2} - \left[ \frac{d_{i_1} d_{i_2}}{D-1} \right] \right) \left( A_{i_2 i_3} - \left[ \frac{d_{i_2} d_{i_3}}{D-1} \right] \right) \cdots \left( A_{i_k i_1} - \left[ \frac{d_{i_k} d_{i_1}}{D-1} \right] \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{s_1=1}^{d_{i_1}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{d_{i_2}} \sum_{s_2=1}^{d_{i_2}} \sum_{t_3=1}^{d_{i_3}} \cdots \sum_{s_k=1}^{d_{i_k}} \sum_{t_1=1}^{d_{i_1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \left( H_{i_2 i_3}^{s_2 t_3} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the rest of this section, we will need to evaluation

$$(8) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \left( H_{i_2 i_3}^{s_2 t_3} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \right]$$

which involves the most important definition as below.




FIGURE 1. Two examples of walks with “good” (in green) and “bad” (in red) edges.

**Definition 2.2.** For any term in the form of (8), we view the term as a closed path with vertices  $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, v_{i_3}, \dots, v_{i_k}, v_{i_1}$ , where for each  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , the edge from  $v_{i_j}$  to  $v_{i_{j+1}}$  involves the  $s_j$ -th half-edge of vertex  $v_{i_j}$  and the  $t_{j+1}$ -th half-edge of vertex  $v_{i_{j+1}}$ . We define such a closed path of length  $k$  as a  **$k$ -walk**.

In general, the indicator functions  $H_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2}, H_{i_2 i_3}^{s_2 t_3}, \dots, H_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1}$  are weakly correlated, except when they share some half-edges. For example, if  $t \neq t'$  or  $j \neq j'$ , at most one of  $H_{ij}^{st}$  and  $H_{i'j'}^{s't'}$  can be equal to 1. To deal with such cases, we break the walk into two parts

- (“bad” part) For any  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $H_{i_j i_{j+1}}^{s_j t_{j+1}}$  is in “bad” part if it shares exactly one half edge with another term. More specifically, there exists some other  $1 \leq j' \neq j \leq k$ , such that

$$(9) \quad |\{(i_j, s_j), (i_{j+1}, t_{j+1})\} \cap \{(i_{j'}, s_{j'}), (i_{j'+1}, t_{j'+1})\}| = 1.$$

In this case we call the  $j$ -th step a “bad” edge, which consists of the  $s_j$ -th half-edge of vertex  $v_{i_j}$  and the  $t_{j+1}$ -th half-edge of vertex  $v_{i_{j+1}}$ .

- (“good” part) For any  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $H_{i_j i_{j+1}}^{s_j t_{j+1}}$  is in “good” part if it does not share exactly one half edge with other terms. More specifically, for any other  $1 \leq j' \neq j \leq k$ , we have

$$(10) \quad |\{(i_j, s_j), (i_{j+1}, t_{j+1})\} \cap \{(i_{j'}, s_{j'}), (i_{j'+1}, t_{j'+1})\}| \neq 1.$$

We remark that we allow that  $H_{i_j i_{j+1}}^{s_j t_{j+1}}$  share both half edges with some other term. In this case, then two indicator functions equal.

Some examples of “good” and “bad” edges are illustrated in Figure 1. We remark that the number of terms in “bad” parts is either zero, or is at least two, because there cannot be a single “bad” edge. Moreover, the number of walks with a “bad” part should be very small because it’s extremely rare to pick two edges that share a half-edge.

Let us rename the indicator random variables. For the “good” part, assume there are  $r$  edges that appear multiple times in the product (8), which we rename as  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$ . Further, assume that each  $H_i$  appears  $\alpha_i \geq 2$  times. For the remaining “good” part, there are  $p$  distinct edges, each appearing only once in the product (8). We denote the corresponding indicators as  $H_{r+1}, H_{r+2}, \dots, H_{r+p}$ . For the “bad” part, assume there are  $L$  distinct “bad” edges, denoted as  $H_{r+p+1}, H_{r+p+2}, \dots, H_{r+p+L}$ , where each  $H_i$  appears  $\beta_i \geq 1$  times for  $r+p+1 \leq i \leq r+p+L$ .

After renaming, we can rewrite (8) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \left( H_{i_2 i_3}^{s_2 t_3} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \right] \\
(11) \quad &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left( H_r - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\alpha_r} \right. \\
& \times \left( H_{r+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{r+p} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \\
& \left. \times \left( H_{r+p+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\beta_{r+p+1}} \cdots \left( H_{r+p+L} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\beta_{r+p+L}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i + p + \sum_{i=r+p+1}^{r+p+L} \beta_i = k$ . Note that  $\alpha_i \geq 2 \forall i$  and  $\beta_i \geq 1 \forall i$ .

We need to handle three parts involved in the product (11) differently. Recall that they are the “good” part where each indicator random variable is repeated (denoted as “**good**” **repeated edges**), the “good” part where each indicator random variable has multiplicity 1 (denoted as “**good**” **simple edges**), and the “bad” part (denoted as “**bad**” **edges**). For simplicity, when we are dealing with a part of the expectation, we usually rename the indicator random variables so that the index starts with 1. For example, when we are later dealing with the “good” simple edges, we use the notation of  $H_1, \dots, H_p$  instead of the cumbersome notation of  $H_{r+1}, \dots, H_{r+p}$ .

**2.2. Bounds.** In this section, we respectively show upper bounds on the three parts in the product (11) respectively.

First, we show the bounds for the “good” simple part.

**Proposition 2.3** (Bounds on “good” simple edges). *Suppose there are  $p$  distinct “good” edges with multiplicities 1. When conditioned on the first  $r$  “good” repeated edges and the last  $L$  “bad” edges, the following bound is achieved*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_{r+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{r+p} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \middle| H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r, H_{r+p+1}, \dots, H_{r+p+L} \right] \right| \leq \frac{C_p}{(D-1)^{\frac{3p}{2}}}.$$

First note that after conditioning on  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$  and  $H_{r+p+1}, \dots, H_{r+p+L}$ , the law of  $H_{r+1}, H_{r+2}, \dots, H_{r+p}$  is still from a configuration model, which differs from the original configuration model only by a factor of  $(1 + o(1))$ . This is because the new configuration model has degree sequence  $d_i - O(k) = (1 + o(1))d_i$ .

Next we rename  $\mathbb{E}[(H_{r+1} - \frac{1}{D-1}) \cdots (H_{r+p} - \frac{1}{D-1})]$  as  $\mathbb{E}[(X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1}) \cdots (X_p - \frac{1}{D-1})]$ , and bound its value using the techniques from [14].

Define the function  $p_i : \{0, 1\}^{i-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $p_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}) = \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1 | X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = x_{i-1})$ . Furthermore, for any  $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_j\} \subseteq [i-1]$ , let  $x_T = x_{t_1} x_{t_2} \cdots x_{t_j}$  and  $p_i(T)$  be the function  $p_i$  where  $x_l = 1$  if  $l \in T$  and 0 otherwise. From [13], we can write  $p_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) = \sum_{T \subseteq [i-1]} \chi_T(p_i) x_T$  for some unique  $\chi_T(p_i)$ . These are the Fourier coefficients of  $p_i$ . From [13],

$$\chi_T(p_i) = \sum_{S \subseteq T} (-1)^{|T|+|S|} p_i(S).$$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Suppose  $p^3 \ll D$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , and  $S \subseteq [i-1]$  is an arbitrary subset. Then, the following bound on the Fourier coefficient can be achieved*

$$\chi_\emptyset(p_i) = \frac{1}{D-1}, \quad |\chi_S(p_i)| \leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D-1} \left( \frac{2|S|}{D-1} \right)^{|S|}.$$

*Proof.* The probability that  $X_i = 1$  is determined by the number of available half-edges. Each  $X_j = 1$  for  $j < i$  makes two fewer available half-edges, so

$$(12) \quad p_i(X_i = 1 | X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = x_{i-1}) = \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D - 1 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j} = \frac{(1 + o(1))}{(D - 1) \left(1 - \frac{2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j}{D-1}\right)}.$$

We can expand (12) as an infinite series,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{D-1} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j}{D-1}} &= \frac{1}{D-1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j}{D-1} \right)^l = \frac{1}{D-1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^l}{(D-1)^l} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j \right)^l \\ &= \frac{1}{D-1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^l}{(D-1)^l} \sum_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_{i-1} = l} \frac{l!}{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j!} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j^{\alpha_j} \\ &= \frac{1}{D-1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^l}{(D-1)^l} \sum_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_{i-1} = l} \frac{l!}{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j!} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} x_j^{\min\{1, \alpha_j\}}. \end{aligned}$$

From [13], the Fourier coefficients are unique, so we have that the Fourier coefficient of  $S = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m\}$  where  $|S| = m$  is

$$(13) \quad \chi_S(p_i) = \frac{1}{D-1} \sum_{l=m}^{\infty} \frac{2^l}{(D-1)^l} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_{j_1} + \alpha_{j_2} + \dots + \alpha_{j_m} = l \\ \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}, \dots, \alpha_{j_m} \geq 1}} \frac{l!}{\prod_{q=1}^m \alpha_{j_q}! m!} (1 + o(1))$$

where the sum

$$(14) \quad \sum_{\substack{\alpha_{j_1} + \alpha_{j_2} + \dots + \alpha_{j_m} = l \\ \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}, \dots, \alpha_{j_m} \geq 1}} \frac{l!}{\prod_{q=1}^m \alpha_{j_q}!}$$

is the number of ways to arrange  $l$  marbles from  $m$  different colors in a line, with at least 1 from each color. This is equivalent to the number of ways to put  $l$  distinct marbles into  $m$  boxes, with no boxes empty. This is  $S(l, m)m!$ , the Stirling numbers of the second kind. Therefore, (14)/ $m! = S(l, m)$ . We can therefore provide an upper bound where the boxes can be empty so that (14)/ $m! \leq \frac{m^l}{m!}$ .

From here, we can bound (13) as

$$\chi_S(p_i) \leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D-1} \sum_{l=m}^{\infty} \frac{(2m)^l}{(D-1)^l} = \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D-1} \frac{\left(\frac{2|S|}{D-1}\right)^{|S|}}{1 - \frac{2|S|}{D-1}} = \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D-1} \left(\frac{2|S|}{D-1}\right)^{|S|}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5** (Proposition 3.2 from [14]). *Suppose there are  $p$  “good” simple edges. Then, their contribution can be evaluated using the following Fourier coefficients*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \left( X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( X_p - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{S_1, \dots, S_p \\ S_i \subseteq [i-1]}} \prod_{i=1}^p \left( 1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{i \in \cup_{j>i} S_j} \right) \chi_{S_i} \left( p_i - \frac{1}{D-1} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{i \notin \cup_{j>i} S_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is omitted, since it is the same as in [14].

*Proof of Proposition 2.3.* Using Lemma 2.5, we can further bound the expectation as

$$(15) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( X_p - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \right] \leq \sum_{\substack{S_1, \dots, S_p \\ S_i \subseteq [i-1]}} \prod_{i=1}^p \left| \chi_{S_i} \left( p_i - \frac{1}{D-1} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{i \notin \cup_{j>i} S_j} \right) \right|.$$

From here, our proof strategy is to recreate the method in [14]. For any set  $S = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_p) \in \mathcal{D} = 2^\emptyset \times 2^{[1]} \times \dots \times 2^{[p-1]}$ , denote  $\psi_S = \prod_{i=1}^p |\chi_{S_i}(p_i)|$ . We iteratively define sets  $\mathcal{C}_i$  and  $\mathcal{D}_i$  and corresponding functions  $f_i : \mathcal{D}_i \setminus \mathcal{C}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i$  such that  $M\psi_S \leq \psi_{f_i(S)}$  for all  $S \in \mathcal{D}_i \setminus \mathcal{C}_i$ . Furthermore, if there are at most  $N$  preimages for any  $f_i(S)$ , then we require  $N/M = o(1)$ . To see the motivation behind this, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}_i} \psi_S &= \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}_i \setminus \mathcal{C}_i} \psi_S + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}_i} \psi_S \\ &\leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}_i \setminus \mathcal{C}_i} \frac{1}{M} \psi_{f_i(S)} + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}_i} \psi_S \\ &\leq \sum_{U \in f_i(\mathcal{D}_i \setminus \mathcal{C}_i)} \frac{N}{M} \psi_U + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}_i} \psi_S. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, we have

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}_i} \psi_S \geq (1 - o(1)) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{D}_i} \psi_S,$$

so that the hypersets in  $\mathcal{C}_i$  contribute most of the sum that makes up the Fourier coefficient.

We start with  $\mathcal{D}_1 = \mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(S_1, \dots, S_p) \in \mathcal{D}_1 : S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset\}$ . For any  $U \in \mathcal{D}_1 \setminus \mathcal{C}_1$ , there must be an element  $a \in S_i \cap S_j$ . We set  $f_1 : \mathcal{D}_1 \setminus \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_1$  to be a function that takes the smallest  $a \in S_i \cap S_j$  and removes  $a$  from  $S_i$  where  $i < j$  without loss of generality. This multiplies the  $i$ -th bound in the product (15) by  $M \geq O(\frac{D-1}{p})(1 + o(1))$ . We also have that  $N \leq p^2$  since there are at most  $p$  choices for  $a$  and  $p$  choices for  $S_i$ . Then, as long as  $p^3 \ll D$ ,  $1 - o(1)$  of the Fourier coefficient comes from the set  $\mathcal{C}_1$ .

Next, we consider  $\mathcal{D}_2 = \mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(S_1, \dots, S_p) \in \mathcal{D}_2 : \cup_{j=1}^p S_j \subseteq \{i : S_i = \emptyset\}\}$ . For any  $U \in \mathcal{D}_2 \setminus \mathcal{C}_2$ , there must be  $i \in \cup_{j=1}^p S_j$  such that  $S_i \neq \emptyset$ . We set  $f_2 : \mathcal{D}_2 \setminus \mathcal{C}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_1$  to be a function that considers the smallest-indexed such  $S_i$  and removes  $i$  from a later set  $S_j$ . This results in the same  $M$  and  $N$  bounds as before, so as long as  $p^3 \ll D$ ,  $1 - o(1)$  of the Fourier coefficient comes from the set  $\mathcal{C}_2$ .

We claim at least half of the sets in any  $U \in \mathcal{C}_2$  must be empty. Suppose this is not the case. Then, fewer than half the sets are empty. All the other sets must take elements from these sets, so by the Pigeonhole principle, there must be at least two sets that share an element, which is a contradiction due to our definition of  $\mathcal{C}_1$ .

Next, we consider  $\mathcal{D}_3 = \mathcal{C}_2$  and  $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{(S_1, \dots, S_p) \in \mathcal{D}_3 : |S_i| \leq 1\}$ . For any  $U \in \mathcal{D}_3 \setminus \mathcal{C}_3$ , there must be a set  $S_i$  that contains at least two elements. We set  $f_3 : \mathcal{D}_3 \setminus \mathcal{C}_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_3$  which takes the smallest-indexed set  $S_i$  with at least two elements  $a < b$ , removes  $a$  and  $b$  from  $S_i$ , and adds  $a$  to  $S_b$ .  $S_i$ 's bound changes by a factor of  $O(\frac{(D-1)^2}{p^2})(1 + o(1))$  while  $S_b$ 's bound changes by a factor of  $O(\frac{p}{D-1})(1 + o(1))$  so that  $M \geq O(\frac{D-1}{p})(1 + o(1))$ . There are  $p$  choices for  $a$  and  $p$  choices for  $S_i$  so  $N \leq p^2$ . Then, if  $p^3 \ll D$ ,  $1 - o(1)$  of the Fourier coefficient comes from the set  $\mathcal{C}_3$ .

Next, we consider  $\mathcal{D}_4 = \mathcal{C}_3$  and  $\mathcal{C}_4 = \{(S_1, \dots, S_p) \in \mathcal{D}_4 : \sum_{i=1}^p |S_i| = \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor\}$ . For any  $U \in \mathcal{D}_4 \setminus \mathcal{C}_4$ , we must have  $\sum_{i=1}^p |S_i| < \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor$  by the claim that at least half of the sets are empty. Then, there must be a pair of  $i < j$  such that  $S_i = S_j = \emptyset$  and  $i, j \notin S_k$  for any  $k$  because the inequality is strict. We set  $f_4 : \mathcal{D}_4 \setminus \mathcal{C}_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_4$  to be a function that considers the smallest such pair  $i < j$  and

adds  $i$  to  $S_j$ . In this case, note that the bound on  $S_i$  is  $\chi_{S_i}(p_i - \frac{1}{D-1}) = 0$ , so that  $\mathcal{C}_4$  contributes  $1 - o(1)$  of the Fourier coefficient.

Then,  $1 - o(1)$  of  $\psi_S$  comes from elements where half the sets are empty and half the sets have one element. For any  $S \in \mathcal{C}_4$ , we must have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_S &\leq \prod_{i:S_i=\emptyset} |\chi_{\emptyset}(p_i)| \prod_{j:S_j=\{k\} \text{ for some } k} |\chi_{\{k\}}(p_j)|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{D-1}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{(D-1)^2}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{(D-1)^{\frac{3}{2}p}}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left(X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1}\right) \cdots \left(X_p - \frac{1}{D-1}\right) \right]$ , we must enumerate the number of such  $S$ . We pair all the elements up and then choose which element in each pair is the non-empty one, giving  $2^{\frac{p}{2}}(p-1)!!$ . Since  $p$  is fixed, asymptotically,  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left(X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1}\right) \cdots \left(X_p - \frac{1}{D-1}\right) \right] \leq \frac{C_p}{(D-1)^{\frac{3}{2}p}}$ .

Therefore, we have finished the proof for Proposition 2.3.  $\square$

Next, we show the bounds for the ‘‘good’’ repeated edges.

**Proposition 2.6** (Bounds on ‘‘good’’ repeated edges). *Suppose there are  $r$  distinct ‘‘good’’ repeated edges with multiplicities  $\alpha_i \geq 2$ . The following bound is achieved*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_1} \left| H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left| H_r - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_r} \right] \leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{(D-1)^r}.$$

*Proof.* We show the case via induction on  $r$ . The base case for  $r = 1$  and  $\alpha_1 = 2$  is easily verified. Now we assume the inductive hypothesis for  $r = k$  that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_1} \left| H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left| H_k - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_k} \right] \leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{(D-1)^k}$$

For  $r = k + 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_1} \left| H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left| H_{k+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_{k+1}} \right] \\ (16) \quad &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_{k+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_{k+1}} \left| H_1, H_2, \dots, H_k \right| X \right] \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_{k+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^2 \left| H_1, H_2, \dots, H_k \right| X \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(17) \quad X := \left| H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_1} \left| H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left| H_k - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_k}.$$

The conditional expectation of  $|H_{k+1} - 1/(D+1)|^2$  is given by  $(1 + o(1))/(D-1)$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_1} \left| H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left| H_{k+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_{k+1}} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D-1} |X| \right] \leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{D-1} \cdot \frac{(1 + o(1))}{(D-1)^k} \quad \text{by the inductive hypothesis} \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + o(1))}{(D-1)^{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude our proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** *The equality in Proposition 2.6 is achieved up to a factor of  $1 + o(1)$  when  $\alpha_i = 2$  for all  $i \in [r]$ . To see why, if all multiplicities are 2, then the equality is achieved on the line of 16 and this is the only place where the inequality is used.*

Then, we show the bounds for the “bad” part.

**Proposition 2.8** (Bounds on “bad” edges). *Suppose there are  $L$  distinct “bad” edges with multiplicities  $\beta_i \geq 1$ . When conditioned on the first  $r$  “good” repeated edges, the following bound is achieved*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_{r+p+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_{r+p+1}} \cdots \left| H_{r+p+L} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_{r+p+L}} \middle| H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r \right] \leq \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L}.$$

*Proof.* The same as in the proof of Proposition 2.3, we notice that conditioning on  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r$  only adds a factor of  $(1 + o(1))$ . We only need to consider  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_{r+p+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_{r+p+1}} \cdots \left| H_{r+p+L} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_{r+p+L}} \right]$  which we rename as  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_1} \cdots \left| X_L - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_L} \right]$ .

We can encode  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_L)$  by a subset  $S \subseteq [L]$ , where  $i \in S$  if  $X_i = 1$ , otherwise  $X_i = 0$ . We say  $S$  is realizable if it is possible to construct a corresponding graph with all edges in  $S$ . For example,  $S$  is not realizable if there are two edges in  $S$  which connect to the same half-edge of a vertex. Then, by using the definition of expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_1} \cdots \left| X_L - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_L} \right] \\ &= \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{D}\right) \right) \sum_{S \subseteq [L]} \mathbb{1}_{S \text{ is realizable}} \left| \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{|S|} \left| 1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{L-|S|} \left| 1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\sum_{i \in S} \beta_i} \left| 0 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\sum_{i \notin S} \beta_i} \\ &\leq \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{D}\right) \right) \sum_{S \subseteq [L]} \mathbb{1}_{S \text{ is realizable}} \left| \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{|S| + \sum_{i \notin S} \beta_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The expression above is a sum of terms of different orders. Note that for any subset  $S \subseteq [L]$ , we must have  $|S| + \sum_{i \notin S} \beta_i = \sum_{i \in S} 1 + \sum_{i \notin S} \beta_i \geq \sum_{i \in S} 1 + \sum_{i \notin S} 1 = L$ . Now we know that each term in the above sum is bounded by  $(D-1)^{-L}$ . Since there are at most  $2^L$  possible  $S$ 's, we know

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_1} \cdots \left| X_L - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_L} \right] \leq \frac{2^L}{(D-1)^L} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{D}\right) \right) \leq \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L}$$

where  $C_L$  is a constant only depending on  $L$ . Putting back the conditions, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| X_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_1} \cdots \left| X_L - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_L} \middle| H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r \right] \leq \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L} (1 + o(1)).$$

Thus we conclude our proof.  $\square$

Finally, we combine all the bounds together and prove the bound for a  $k$ -walk, as defined in Definition 2.2, with parameters of  $r, p, L$ .

**Proposition 2.9** (Bounds on an arbitrary  $k$ -walk). *Suppose an arbitrary  $k$ -walk consists of  $r$  “good” repeated edges,  $p$  “good” simple edges, and  $L$  “bad” edges. Then the following bound is*

achieved

$$\begin{aligned}
(18) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\alpha_1} \left( H_2 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\alpha_2} \cdots \left( H_r - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\alpha_r} \right. \\
& \left. \left( H_{r+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{r+p} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \right. \\
& \left. \left( H_{r+p+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\beta_{r+p+1}} \cdots \left( H_{r+p+L} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right)^{\beta_{r+p+L}} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{(1+o(1))}{(D-1)^r} \frac{C_p}{(D-1)^{\frac{3p}{2}}} \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $X$  denote the product of the first  $r$  terms and the last  $L$  terms on the lefthand side of (18). By using conditional expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
LHS & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( H_{r+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \cdots \left( H_{r+p} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right) \middle| X \right] |X| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{C_p}{(D-1)^{\frac{3p}{2}}} |X| \right] \text{ by Proposition 2.3} \\
& = \frac{C_p}{(D-1)^{\frac{3p}{2}}} \mathbb{E}[|X|].
\end{aligned}$$

Then we observe the expectation of the remaining terms. Let  $Y$  denote the product of the first  $r$  terms on the lefthand side of (18). By using conditional expectation again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|X|] & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_{r+p+1} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_{r+p+1}} \cdots \left| H_{r+p+L} - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\beta_{r+p+L}} \middle| Y \right] |Y| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L} |Y| \right] \text{ by Proposition 2.8} \\
& = \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L} \mathbb{E}[|Y|].
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we apply Proposition 2.6 and get

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y|] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| H_1 - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_1} \cdots \left| H_r - \frac{1}{D-1} \right|^{\alpha_r} \right] \leq \frac{1+o(1)}{(D-1)^r}.$$

Finally, we combine all estimates above together and get

$$LHS \leq \frac{C_p}{(D-1)^{\frac{3p}{2}}} \frac{C_L}{(D-1)^L} \frac{(1+o(1))}{(D-1)^r}$$

which concludes the proof. □

From here, we can put it all together. Our strategy now involves representing the entire sum we have bounded thus far, and then once again finding functions to reduce the size of the set until we are only counting trees with  $k/2$  edges.

Thanks to Proposition 2.9, we can upper bound (7) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} |\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr} M^k]| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1}} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_k}} \frac{(1+o(1))C_p C_L}{(D-1)^r (D-1)^{\frac{3p}{2}} (D-1)^L} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1}} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_k}} \frac{(1+o(1))C_p C_L}{D^r D^{\frac{3p}{2}} D^L} \\
&= \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_k} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \sum_{s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_k}} \frac{(1+o(1))C_p C_L}{D^{r+\frac{3p}{2}+L}}
\end{aligned}$$

where we take an approximation by replacing  $D-1$  with  $D$ . The set  $\mathcal{G}_k$  denotes the set of all possible shapes of a  $k$ -walk up to permutations of vertices and half-edges. However, we distinguish “good” edges and “bad” edges in the structure. For example, a circle consisting of  $k$  “good” edges is counted as a different shape than a circle consisting of  $k$  “bad” edges.

In the expression above, the second sum over  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  determines what vertices are used to instantiate the walk. One such example may be  $i_1 = 1, i_2 = n/2, i_3 = n, \dots$  out of the  $n$  vertices that we consider. The third sum over  $s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1$  refers to the previous step that we break up the terms  $A_{i_1 i_2} - \frac{d_i d_j}{D-1}$  into  $\sum_{s_1=1}^{d_{i_1}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{d_{i_2}} (H_{i_1 t_2}^{s_1} - \frac{1}{D-1})$ .

Now we focus on the following part

$$\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \sum_{s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_k}}.$$

We modify our notation a bit to better represent the results. Note that  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  encode a  $k$ -walk and  $s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1$  encode connected half-edges. We use  $V$  to denote its vertex set.

Now let  $E_k$  be all the edges traversed in the “good” part of the  $k$ -walk and  $V_k$  all the vertices involved the “good” part. Let  $E'_k$  be all the edges traversed in the “bad” part of the  $k$ -walk and  $V'_k$  all the vertices involved the “bad” part. Note that  $V_k$  and  $V'_k$  may overlap and that  $V = V_k \cup V'_k$ .

For each “good” edge  $e \in E_k$  (including both repeated edges and simple edges), we denote its multiplicity as  $\alpha_e$ . For each “bad” edge  $e' \in E'_k$ , we denote its multiplicity as  $\beta_{e'}$ . We also have that  $\sum_e \alpha_e + \sum_{e'} \beta_{e'} = k$ . For each vertex  $i \in V_k$ , we use  $z_i$  to denote the number of distinct half-edges used for vertex  $i$  that correspond to the “good” edges. For each vertex  $i \in V'_k$ , we use  $z'_i$  to denote the number of distinct half-edges used for vertex  $i$  that correspond to the “bad” edges.

If we sum over all such graphs, we can write, for every “good” edge  $e = (i_e, j_e) \in E_k$  and every “bad” edge  $e' = (i_{e'}, j_{e'}) \in E'_k$ ,

$$\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \sum_{s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_k}} = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \prod_{e \in E_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{i_e} d_{j_e}}^{\alpha_e}} \prod_{e \in E_k} d_{i_e} d_{j_e} \prod_{e' \in E'_k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{i_{e'}} d_{j_{e'}}}^{\beta_{e'}}} \prod_{i \in V'_k} d_i^{z'_i}.$$

Here is an important difference between the “good” part and “bad” part of the walk. For a “good” edge  $e \in E_k$ , we need to divide by  $\sqrt{d_{i_e} d_{j_e}}^{\alpha_e}$  to account for the multiplicity of  $\alpha_e$ . We further need to multiply by  $d_{i_e} d_{j_e}$  to select two new half-edges, one from  $i_e$  and one from  $j_e$ . It is not hard to verify that, for a vertex  $i \in V_k$ ,  $z_i = \sum_{i \in e, e \in E_k} 1$ , since “good” edges don’t share half-edges. For a “bad” edge  $e' \in E'_k$ , we still need to divide by  $\sqrt{d_{i_{e'}} d_{j_{e'}}}^{\beta_{e'}}$  to account for the multiplicity of  $\beta_{e'}$ . However, when selecting half-edges, the definition of “bad” part indicates that we may not need to select new half-edges for  $i_{e'}$  and  $j_{e'}$ . Thus, we use  $z'_i$  to denote the number of distinct half-edges used for vertex  $i$  in the “bad” part and loop over all vertices  $i \in V'_k$  to account for selecting half-edges.




FIGURE 2. An example of a walk with “good” (in green) and “bad” (in red) edges.

One example is illustrated in Figure 2, where our notations are defined in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned}
 k &= 8, & V_k &= \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, & V'_k &= \{2, 3, 4\} \\
 E_k &= \{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_7, H_8\}, & E'_k &= \{H_4, H_5, H_6\} \\
 z_1 &= 3, & z'_1 &= 0, & z_2 &= 2, & z'_2 &= 1, & z_3 &= 1, & z'_3 &= 1, & z_4 &= 2, & z'_4 &= 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Counting over vertices instead of edges, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \sum_{s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_k}} &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \prod_{i \in V} d_i^{\sum_{i \in e, e \in E_k} (1 - \frac{\alpha_e}{2}) + z'_i - \sum_{i \in e', e' \in E'_k} \frac{\beta_{e'}}{2}} \\
 &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \prod_{i \in V} d_i^{z_i - \sum_{i \in e, e \in E_k} \frac{\alpha_e}{2} + z'_i - \sum_{i \in e', e' \in E'_k} \frac{\beta_{e'}}{2}} \\
 &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \prod_{i \in V} d_i^{w_i} = \prod_{i \in V} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i}
 \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$(19) \quad w_i = z_i - \sum_{i \in e, e \in E_k} \frac{\alpha_e}{2} + z'_i - \sum_{i \in e', e' \in E'_k} \frac{\beta_{e'}}{2}.$$

The last equation is because we want to specify all  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  with vertices from 1 to  $n$ . By the Binomial Theorem, it's easy to establish the last equation.

Summarizing what we have here, we establish that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr} M^k] \right| &\leq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_k} \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}} \prod_{i \in V} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \frac{(1 + o(1)) C_p C_L}{D^{r + \frac{3p}{2} + L}} \\
 &= \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_k} \frac{(1 + o(1)) C_p C_L}{n} \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \prod_{i \in V} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \frac{1}{D^{r + \frac{3p}{2} + L}} \\
 &= \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_k} \frac{(1 + o(1)) C_p C_L}{n} t_G
 \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$(20) \quad t_G = \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \prod_{i \in V} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \frac{1}{D^{r + \frac{3p}{2} + L}}$$

Before constraining the set of graphs, we first establish some important observations about the powers  $w_i$ , summarized in the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.10** (Properties of  $w_i$ ). *If  $w_i = 1$ , then  $\sum_l d_l^{w_i} = D$ . If  $w_i = 0$ , then  $\sum_l d_l^{w_i} = n$ . If  $w_i \leq -1$ , then  $\sum_l d_l^{w_i} = o(n(n/D)^{|w_i|/2})$ .*

*Additionally, if  $w_i$  increases by 1, then  $\sum_l d_l^{w_i}$  increases by a factor of  $\omega(\sqrt{D/n})$ .*

*Proof.* The cases where  $w_i = 1$  and where  $w_i = 0$  are easy to verify. Now let us discuss the case  $w_i \leq -1$ . By the assumption of  $d_i = \omega(\sqrt{D/n})$  for all  $i$ , we have that

$$\sum_l d_l^{w_i} = \sum_l d_l^{-|w_i|} = \sum_l o\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{D}}^{|w_i|}\right) = o\left(n\sqrt{\frac{n}{D}}^{|w_i|}\right).$$

Additionally, let us discuss the effect of increasing  $w_i$  by 1. Again by the assumption of  $d_i = \omega(\sqrt{D/n})$  for all  $i$ , we know that each term of the sum increases by a factor of at least  $\omega(\sqrt{D/n})$ . Thus the sum will increase by a factor of at least  $\omega(\sqrt{D/n})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.11.** *The assumption “ $d_i \gg \sqrt{D/n}$  for all  $i$ ” is crucial for the lemma to hold. If such assumption is substituted by the weaker condition “ $d_i \geq \sqrt{D/n}$  for all  $i$ ”, then we have a slightly weaker conclusion: if  $w_i$  increases by 1,  $\sum_l d_l^{w_i}$  will increase by a factor of  $\Omega(\sqrt{D/n})$ .*

**2.3. Transformation.** We first consider any graph  $G$  which contains at least one edge with odd multiplicity. Our plan here is to transform  $G$  so that  $t_{\tilde{G}}$  of the final graph  $\tilde{G}$  will be convenient to deal with.

In the analysis below, we will frequently but implicitly refer to the bound of  $t_G$ , whose expression is in (20). There are three parts:

$$(21) \quad \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}}, \quad \prod_{i \in V} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i}, \quad \frac{1}{D^{r + \frac{3p}{2} + L}}.$$

Whenever we make a transformation, we will comment the changes on these three parts respectively and summarize the overall change in the bound. Our goal is to make sure that each step of transformation will only increase the bound, so that as long as the bound of the final transformed graph goes to 0 asymptotically, all such graphs have contribution of 0 asymptotically.

**2.3.1. Transformation of the “good” part.** Consider any  $\alpha_e \geq 4$  for  $e = (a, b)$ . In these cases, we can see that we upper bound the expression’s value by substituting  $\alpha_e$  with  $\alpha_e - 2$ . This increases  $w_a$  by 1 and  $w_b$  in (19) by 1, so the product increases by a factor of  $\omega(D/n)$ . Since  $k$  decreases by 2, the expression of  $t_G$  in (20) decreases by a factor of  $n/D$ . Thus, the overall bound increases by a factor of  $\omega(1)$ .

Therefore, we only need to consider “good” part where  $\alpha_e = 1, 2, 3$ . If  $\alpha_e = 2$ , the expression does not change if we substitute  $\alpha_e$  with  $\alpha_e - 2$ . To see why, suppose  $e = (a, b)$ . Let us first discuss the effect of deleting such an edge. Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms in (21) will be multiplied by  $D$  because one repeated “good” edge is gone. Secondly,  $w_a$  and  $w_b$  remain the same. Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 2, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $n/D$ . Thus, the overall bound will increase by a factor of at least  $n$ .

In this case, one may worry if the graph will be disconnected into two connected components since we delete an edge. Denote the graph with  $e$  deleted as  $G'$ . Note that  $G'$  may be a connected

graph or a disconnected graph, and either case works. The reason is best summarized with the following general decomposition lemma.

**Lemma 2.12** (Decomposition of graphs). *Suppose  $G = G_a \cup G_b$  is a  $k$ -step graph with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ .  $V_a$  (resp.  $V_b$ ) is the vertex set of  $G_a$  (resp.  $G_b$ ).  $E_a$  (resp.  $E_b$ ) is the edge set of  $G_a$  (resp.  $G_b$ ). Suppose  $E = E_a \sqcup E_b$  where  $\sqcup$  denotes disjoint union. Suppose  $V = V_a \cup V_b$ . Then, the following holds*

$$t_G \leq t_{G_a} t_{G_b}.$$

*Proof.* Observe the fact that  $\sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \leq \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w'_i} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w''_i}$  where  $w'_i + w''_i = w_i$  for all  $i$ . Then, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} t_G &= \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \prod_{i \in V} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \frac{1}{D^r D^{\frac{3p}{2}} D^L} \\ &\leq \frac{D^{\frac{k_a}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k_a}{2}}} \prod_{i \in V_a} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w'_i} \frac{1}{D^{r_a} D^{\frac{3p_a}{2}} D^{L_a}} \times \frac{D^{\frac{k_b}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k_b}{2}}} \prod_{i \in V_b} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w''_i} \frac{1}{D^{r_b} D^{\frac{3p_b}{2}} D^{L_b}} = t_{G_a} t_{G_b} \end{aligned}$$

where  $k_a$  (resp.  $k_b$ ) is the number of steps in  $G_a$  (resp.  $G_b$ ) and  $w'_i$  (resp.  $w''_i$ ) is the corresponding term for  $w$  in  $G_a$  (resp.  $G_b$ ).  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** *We will mainly use the lemma in the following two scenarios: (1) when  $G$  is a graph with one connected component but can be decomposed into two induced subgraphs  $G_a$  and  $G_b$ ; (2) when  $G$  is a graph with two separate connected components  $G_a$  and  $G_b$ . In both scenarios we have that  $t_G \leq t_{G_a} t_{G_b}$  and it suffices to achieve bounds separately on  $t_{G_a}$  and  $t_{G_b}$ . Note that the idea of decomposing a graph into several components or subgraphs will be frequently used in later proofs.*

Now we go back to the claim about  $G'$ . If  $G'$  is still a connected graph, we simply have  $t_G \leq t_{G'}$ . If  $G'$  has two connected components  $G_a$  and  $G_b$ , by Lemma 2.12 we know  $t_G \leq t_{G'} \leq t_{G_a} t_{G_b}$ . We can show asymptotic bounds for  $G_a$  and  $G_b$  separately. In the most special case where  $(a, b)$  is the only edge that involves  $b$ , we can still delete it. The only difference is that now the term in (21) with  $w_b = 1$ , which has a contribution of  $n$ , will disappear, leading to a decrease by the factor of  $1/n$ . The net effect of reduction in this special case is thus 1. Overall, we can freely drop the edges with multiplicities 2. Note that we will not drop the entire graph because we are discussing graphs which have at least one odd multiplicity.

**2.3.2. Transformation of the “bad” part.** The main idea here is “disentangling” the “bad” edges. For example,  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  are originally a pair of “bad” edges, where both edges pick the same half-edge from  $b$ . To “disentangle”  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  on  $b$  means transforming to the same pair of edges  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  but with the difference that they are “good” edges and that they pick two different half-edges from  $b$ . Note that we can also “disentangle” edges with multiplicities larger than one. For example,  $(a, b)$  with multiplicity 3 and  $(b, c)$  with multiplicity 2 are “bad” edges, sharing the same half-edge on  $b$ . In this case, only one half-edge from  $b$  is used. To “disentangle” them means that we consider the same pair of edges  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  with their corresponding multiplicities. However, two half-edges from  $b$  are used, one with multiplicity 3 for  $(a, b)$  and the other with multiplicity 2 for  $(b, c)$ .

Now we try to “disentangle” the “bad” edges as far as we can. At the same time we need to ensure that the bounds will not decrease during each step. Here we present two important observations on whether we can “disentangle” the edges.

**Observation 1.** If the disentanglement does not produce any new “good” edges, then we can conduct the disentanglement.

**Observation 2.** If all the “good” edges produced by the disentanglement have multiplicities larger than 1, then we can conduct the disentanglement.

*Proof.* Observation 1 is not hard to verify. Suppose  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  are disentangled on  $b$ . After the disentanglement,  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  are still “bad” edges sharing half-edges with some other edges. Since the disentanglement does not produce any new “good” edges, then everything in the terms of  $D$  in (21) remains the same. The only thing that changes is the power  $w_b = z_b - \sum_{b \in e, e \in E_k} \alpha_e/2 + z'_b - \sum_{b \in e', e' \in E'_k} \beta_{e'}/2$ .  $z'_b$  becomes larger because we are now picking one more distinct half-edge from  $b$  in the “bad” part. This change will only increase the bound thanks to Lemma 2.10.

For Observation 2, suppose  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  with multiplicities  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are disentangled on  $b$ . After the disentanglement,  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  both become “good” edges with their multiplicities unchanged. Since the disentanglement changes two “bad” edges into two “good” repeated edges, the value of  $L$  decreases by 2 and the value of  $r$  increases by 2, which doesn’t change the value of  $D$ ’s terms in (21). For  $w$ ’s terms, again, the powers will only become larger because we are picking more distinct half-edges. Thus, this change will only increase the bound.

Note that Observation 2 also includes the case where only one “good” edge is produced, which is easy to verify using the same logic.  $\square$

The essence of the two observations is that any disentanglement will be valid as long as it does not produce any “good” simple edges.

Now, we reduce the graphs by disentangling each “bad” edge as far as we can, until any further disentanglement will violate the conditions in the two observations. The final transformed graph will result in only 3 basic types of “bad” sub-graphs. We call them  $G1(m)$ ,  $G2(m)$ , and  $G3(m)$  respectively. Note that all these 3 basic types are minimal, which is easier to verify. Also, any “bad” sub-graph other than the 3 basics types can be further disentangled at some place.

**Type G1(m).** “Bad” graph of  $(a, b)$  with multiplicity 1 and  $(b, c)$  with multiplicity  $m$ . They share a half-edge on  $b$ .

**Type G2(m).** “Bad” graph of  $(a, b)$  with multiplicity 1,  $(b, c)$  with multiplicity  $m$ , and  $(c, d)$  with multiplicity 1. They share half-edges on  $b$  and  $c$ .

**Type G3(m).** “Bad” graph of  $(a, b_1)$  with multiplicity 1,  $(a, b_2)$  with multiplicity 1,  $\dots$ ,  $(a, b_m)$  with multiplicity 1. They all share one half-edge on  $a$ .

Here, we prove that any “bad” graph can be reduced into the union of 3 basic types above.

**Proposition 2.14.** *The “bad” part of any minimal graph will only contain copies of the 3 basic types above. A graph is said to be minimal if no further disentanglement can be performed on the graph.*

*Proof.* First, we show that the diameter of the minimal graph cannot exceed 3.

For the purpose of contradiction, we assume that the diameter of the final graph is equal to or larger than 4. By the definition of diameter, we know that there exist a chain of  $(a, b)$ ,  $(b, c)$ ,  $(c, d)$ ,  $(d, e)$ , which share half-edges on  $b, c, d$ . Thus, we can transform this final graph by disentangling  $(b, c)$  and  $(c, d)$  on  $c$ . This transformation will not produce any new “good” edges. Thus, the original final graph is not minimal. Therefore, the diameter of the minimal graph cannot exceed 3.

Next, we consider all cases of graphs with diameter less than or equal to 3 and check that they either fall into the 3 basic types or are not minimal.

Consider a graph with diameter 2. The most general form of such a graph will be a graph of  $(a, b_1), (a, b_2), \dots, (a, b_m)$  with multiplicities  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ . They all share one half-edge on  $a$ . Firstly, assume that  $m \geq 3$ . If any  $x_i$  is larger than 1, we can disentangle it from the graph, because the disentanglement will only produce a repeated “good” edge. By disentangling all repeated “bad” edges, we will get exactly  $G3(m')$ . Next, assume that  $m = 2$ . If both are repeated “bad” edges,

then we can disentangle them because the disentanglement will only produce two repeated “good” edges. If one is repeated and the other is simple, then it falls into the type  $G1(m')$ . If both are simple, then it falls into the type  $G1(1)$ .

Consider a graph with diameter 3. If the graph contains a circle, we can of course disentangle on one vertex of the circle without producing new “good” edges. Thus, we only need to consider acyclic graphs. The most general form will be a graph of  $(a, b_1), (a, b_2), \dots, (a, b_m)$  with multiplicities  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ ,  $(a, c)$  with multiplicity  $y$ , and  $(c, d_1), (c, d_2), \dots, (c, d_n)$  with multiplicities  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$ . Note that here we abuse the notation a bit, but such notations will only be used in this proof. Now, for any  $x_i$  and  $z_i$  larger than 1, we can directly disentangle those edges by the same logic. Without loss of generality, we consider 3 overall cases: (1)  $m \geq 2$  and  $n \geq 2$  with all  $x, z = 1$ ; (2)  $m \geq 2$  and  $n = 1$  with all  $x = 1$  but  $z_1$  being any integer; (3)  $m = 1$  and  $n = 1$  with  $x_1, z_1$  being any integer.

In case (1), we first disentangle the graph on  $a$  so that the left part becomes  $G3$  and the right part becomes  $(a, c)$  plus the cluster surrounding  $c$ . This disentanglement will not produce any “good” edges. If  $y = 1$ , the remaining part is also  $G3$  so we are done. If  $y \geq 2$ , we further disentangle  $(a, c)$  from the cluster surrounding  $c$  and the cluster becomes  $G3$ . This disentanglement will only produce a repeated “good” edge  $(a, c)$  so it’s valid.

In case (2), we again disentangle the graph on  $a$  so that the left part becomes  $G3$  and the right part becomes  $(a, c)$  plus  $(c, d_1)$ , both with general multiplicities. This disentanglement will not produce any “good” edges. If  $y \geq 2$  and  $z_1 \geq 2$ , we can of course disentangle them on  $c$ . If at least one of  $y$  and  $z_1$  is 1, it falls in type  $G1$ .

In case (3), we simply have a chain of  $(b_1, a)$ ,  $(a, c)$ , and  $(c, d_1)$ , each with arbitrary multiplicity. If all of them are repeated, we can of course disentangle all of them. If two of them are repeated, we further discuss their locations. If the two are adjacent, we disentangle on the vertex they share, producing one repeated “good” edge and one  $G1$ . If the two are separate, we disentangle on  $a$ , again producing one repeated “good” edge and one  $G1$ . If only one of them are repeated, we further discuss their locations. If the repeated edge is on the side  $((b_1, a)$  or  $(c, d_1))$ , we respectively disentangle on  $a$  or  $c$ , producing one repeated “good” edge and one  $G1$ . If the repeated edge is in the middle, it falls in type  $G2$ . If all of them are simple, it falls in type  $G2$ .

Therefore, we have proven that any minimal graph will fall in one of the 3 basic types.  $\square$

Then we investigate the 3 basic types and reduce the graph further.

For Type  $G1(m)$  where  $m \geq 3$ , we can always reduce  $m$  by 2. First of all, since  $m \geq 3$ , this reduction will not create any “good” edges. Thus, the  $D$ ’s terms in (21) remain the same. Also,  $w_b$  and  $w_c$  will both increase by 1 because  $\beta_{(b,c)}$  decreases by 2. The middle term in (21) will thus be multiplied by at least  $\sqrt{D/n} \times \sqrt{D/n} = D/n$ . Since the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 2, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $n/D$ . Thus, the overall bound for  $t_G$  in (20) will either remain the same or increase. This reduction is valid.

For Type  $G1(m)$  where  $m = 2$ , we can also reduce  $m$  by 2. An important difference is that the result will not be Type  $G1$  any more. Instead, the reduced graph will be one “good” edge. Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D^2 \times D^{-\frac{3}{2}} = \sqrt{D}$  because two “bad” edges are gone and one “good” simple edge is present. Secondly,  $w_b$  will increase by 1 and  $w_c$  will remain the same, which multiplies the product by at least  $\sqrt{D/n}$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 2, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $n/D$ . Thus, the overall bound for  $t_G$  in (20) will increase by a factor of at least  $\sqrt{n}$ . This reduction is valid.

For Type  $G2(m)$  where  $m \geq 3$ , we can again reduce  $m$  by 2 freely. The reason is the same as Type  $G1(m)$ .

For Type  $G2(m)$  where  $m = 2$ , we can also reduce  $m$  by 2. An important difference is that the result will be two “good” edges. Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D^3 \times D^{-3} = 1$  because

three “bad” edges are gone and two “good” simple edges are present. Secondly,  $w_b$  and  $w_c$  will both increase by 1, which multiplies the product by at least  $\sqrt{D/n} \times \sqrt{D/n} = D/n$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 2, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $n/D$ . Thus, the overall bound for  $t_G$  in (20) will either remain the same or increase. This reduction is valid.

For Type  $G3(m)$  where  $m \geq 4$ , we can reduce  $m$  by 2. We do this by removing  $(a, b_m)$  and  $(a, b_{m-1})$  and by adding  $(b_m, b_{m-1})$ . Note that the reduced graph will be  $G3(m-2)$  and a “good” edge  $(b_m, b_{m-1})$ . Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D^2 \times D^{-\frac{3}{2}} = \sqrt{D}$  because two “bad” edges are gone and one “good” simple edge is present. Secondly,  $w_a$  will increase by 1, which multiplies the product by at least  $\sqrt{D/n}$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 1, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $\sqrt{n/D}$ . Thus, the overall bound for  $t_G$  in (20) will increase by a factor of at least  $\sqrt{D}$ . This reduction is valid.

For Type  $G3(3)$ , we can also reduce  $m$  by 2. An important difference is that the result will be two “good” edges  $(a, b_1)$  and  $(b_2, b_3)$ . Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D^3 \times D^{-3} = 1$  because three “bad” edges are gone and two “good” simple edges are present. Secondly,  $w_a$  will increase by 1, which multiplies the product by at least  $\sqrt{D/n}$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 1, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $\sqrt{n/D}$ . Thus, the overall bound for  $t_G$  in (20) will either remain the same or increase. This reduction is valid.

After the reductions above, the transformed graph’s “bad” part will only contain  $G1(1)$  and  $G2(1)$ .

**2.3.3. Contribution of the transformed graph.** Putting together everything, the current graph have  $\alpha_e = 1, 3$  in the “good” part and  $G1(1), G2(1)$  in the “bad” part. Since all degrees are even, and we have only been removing even numbers of edges, the graph can be decomposed into cycles and, since we allow parallel edges, walks of the form  $a-b-a$ . Again note that  $\sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \leq \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w'_i} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w''_i}$  where  $w'_i + w''_i = w_i$  for all  $i$ . Then, if we decompose  $G$  into cycles  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_y$  and walks of the form  $a-b-a$  denoted by  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_z$ . We then have  $t_G \leq t_{C_1} t_{C_2} \dots t_{C_y} t_{W_1} t_{W_2} \dots t_{W_z}$ . From what we know before, any  $t_{W_i}$  has an asymptotic contribution of 0. For a cycle  $C_i$ , we have that  $\alpha_e = 1, 3$  and  $\beta_e = 1$ . In any cycle, we have  $w_i = 1, -1, 0$  since the two incoming edges in a cycle can have  $\alpha_e = 1, 3$ , so  $\sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \leq D$ .

Here is an important clarification. The  $k$  we are considering does not correspond to the original  $k$ , but refers to the number of steps in the part we are investigating, such as the cycle  $C_i$ . As long as we show that each part (with their distinct  $k$ ’s) goes to 0 asymptotically, we can conclude that  $t_G$  goes to 0 asymptotically.

Consider any circle  $C$  that consists of “good” simple edges, “good” repeated edges with multiplicity 3,  $G1(1)$ , and  $G2(1)$ . We need to show that such a circle will make an asymptotically small contribution to the expression.

It is noteworthy that the four components of the circle  $C$  are not equally costly.

If we change a  $G2(1)$  into  $G1(1)$ , the bound for (20) will only increase. Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D$  because one “bad” edge is gone. Secondly, one term with  $w = 0$  will be gone because we deleted one vertex, which multiplies the product by  $1/n$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 1, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $\sqrt{n/D}$ . Thus, the overall bound will increase by a factor of at least  $\sqrt{D/n}$ . Therefore, we change all  $G2(1)$  into  $G1(1)$ .

If we change a “good” simple edge into a “good” repeated edge with multiplicity 3, the bound will also only increase. Suppose the edge is  $(a, b)$ . Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $\sqrt{D}$  because one “good” simple edge is gone and one “good” repeated edge is present. Secondly,  $w_a$  will decrease by 1 and  $w_b$  will decrease by 1, which multiplies the product by  $n/D$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) increases by 2, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also increase by a factor of  $D/n$ . Thus,

the overall bound will increase by a factor of at least  $\sqrt{D}$ . Therefore, we change all “good” simple edges into “good” repeated edges with multiplicity 3.

Now, we only have two components left. We will show that if the two consecutive units are of the same kind, we can combine them into one.

Suppose that we have two consecutive “good” repeated edges with multiplicities 3, called  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  respectively. If we change them into  $(a, c)$  with multiplicity 3, the bound (20) will only increase. Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D$  because one “good” repeated edge is gone. Secondly, the term of  $w_b = 2 - 6/2 = -1$  will disappear, which multiplies the product by  $D^{\frac{1}{2}}n^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 3, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $n^{\frac{3}{2}}D^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ . Thus, the overall bound will remain the same. Therefore, we combine all consecutive “good” repeated edges.

Suppose that we have two consecutive  $G1(1)$ ’s, called  $(a, b)$ ,  $(b, c)$ ,  $(c, d)$ ,  $(d, e)$  where  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, c)$  share a half-edge on  $b$ ,  $(c, d)$  and  $(d, e)$  share a half-edge on  $d$ . If we change them into  $(a, c)$  and  $(c, e)$  which share a half-edge on  $c$ , the bound will only increase. Firstly, the  $D$ ’s terms will be multiplied by  $D^2$  because two “bad” edges are gone. Secondly, the term of  $w_b = 0$  and  $w_d = 0$  will disappear, which multiplies the product by  $1/n^2$ . The term of  $w_c$  will change from 1 to 0, which multiplies the product by  $n/D$ . Thirdly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 2, the term  $D^{\frac{k}{2}}/n^{\frac{k}{2}}$  will also decrease by a factor of  $n/D$ . Thus, the overall bound will remain the same. Therefore, we combine all consecutive  $G1(1)$ ’s.

Finally, we consider a cycle alternatively consisting of “good” repeated edges with multiplicity 3 and  $G1(1)$ . Suppose there are  $a$  copies of “good” repeated edges and  $a$  copies of  $G1(1)$ . (Recall that the two components appear alternatively) Since what we consider is a  $k$ -walk, we have  $3a + 2a = k$ . Note that  $k$  here may not correspond to the original  $k$  since we have transformed the graph. However, we will show that any  $k$  here will yield an asymptotic bound. Now consider the vertices within each  $G1(1)$  and the vertices on the interface between “good” repeated edge and  $G1(1)$ , it is not hard to see that all such vertices have  $w = 0$ . Finally, we can compute the bound for such a circle

$$t_C = \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}}} \prod_{i \in V_k} \sum_{l=1}^n d_l^{w_i} \frac{1}{D^r D^{\frac{3p}{2}} D^L} = \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}} n^{2a+a}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}} D^{2a+a}} = \left(\frac{n}{D}\right)^{3a-\frac{k}{2}} = \left(\frac{n}{D}\right)^{\frac{3k}{5}-\frac{k}{2}} = \left(\frac{n}{D}\right)^{\frac{k}{10}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, we conclude that all graphs  $G$  which have at least an edge with odd multiplicity make contributions of 0 asymptotically.

**2.4. Conclusion of (4).** Suppose  $k$  is odd. Then there must be an edge which has an odd multiplicity. As shown above, all such graphs have contribution of 0 asymptotically. Thus,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr} M^k] = 0$  for all odd  $k$ .

Suppose  $k$  is even. As shown above, a graph with any edge which has an odd multiplicity has a contribution of 0 asymptotically. Therefore, the only graphs that do not make small contributions must have even multiplicities for all edges. Among these graphs, we first investigate the “good” graphs whose edges all have multiplicities 2. Thus,  $p = 0$ ,  $r = k/2$ , and  $L = 0$ . Note that in this case, by Remark 2.7, the equality is achieved for the bounds in Proposition 2.6. Therefore, for any  $G$  of this kind,

$$\frac{(1 + o(1))C_p C_L}{n} t_G = \frac{(1 + o(1)) D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n} \prod_{i \in V_k} n \frac{1}{D^{\frac{k}{2}}} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{n^{|V_k|}}{n^{\frac{k}{2}+1}}.$$

We now note that  $|V_k| \leq |E_k| + 1 = k/2 + 1$  with equality holding if and only if  $G$  is a tree. If the equality does not hold, this term becomes asymptotically small. Therefore, the terms that make contributions to the sum are those that have  $\alpha_e = 2$  and are trees. Each of these makes a contribution of 1.

Then, let us consider the “good” graphs whose edges not only have multiplicities 2 but also larger even numbers. For those graphs, we may reduce the edges with larger even numbers by 2 as we did before and get a reduced graph that have  $\alpha_e = 2$  for all edges. The effect of reducing multiplicities is as follows. Suppose the reduced edge is  $(a, b)$ . Firstly, the length of the walk ( $k$ ) decreases by 2 so the expression decreases by a factor of  $n/D$ . Secondly, both  $w_a$  and  $w_b$  increases by 1, thus by Lemma 2.10 the sum increases by a factor of  $\omega(D/n)$ . Thus, the overall term increases by a factor of  $\omega(1)$ . Since the reduced graphs have contributions of at most 1, we know that the unreduced graphs which have multiplicities larger than 2 must have contributions of  $o(1)$ . Thus, such graphs make a contribution of 0 asymptotically.

Finally, let us consider the “bad” graphs with even multiplicities. Note that for all such graphs, we can always disentangle them and get a corresponding “good” graph of the same shape. However, during the process of disentangling, the  $w$ 's terms will increase by at least 1 because we are using more half-edges from the vertices. Thus, the bound will increase by a factor of at least  $\sqrt{D/n}$ . Since the disentangled graphs have contributions of at most 1, we know that the “bad” graphs must have contributions of  $o(n/D)$ . Thus, such graphs make a contribution of 0 asymptotically.

To summarize, for even  $k$ , the only graphs that make contributions of 1 are those rooted planar trees with lengths  $k/2$ . We conclude the proof for semicircle law.  $\square$

**Remark 2.15** (sufficient and necessary condition for the convergence of moments). *The condition of “ $d_i \gg \sqrt{D/n}$  for all  $i$ ” in Theorem 1.1 can be slightly relaxed to the weaker condition below*

$$\sum_l d_l^{w_i} = o\left(n\sqrt{\frac{n}{D}}^{|w_i|}\right) \text{ for all } w_i \leq -1.$$

We have proved in Lemma 2.10 that the former condition implies the latter. Note that the latter cannot imply the former, where a counter example can be easily constructed by only having one  $d_i = O(\sqrt{D/n})$ . The latter condition is optimal in the sense that it is the sufficient and necessary condition for the semicircle law to hold.

For the sufficient part, it is not hard to see that during the entire proof, we only used the latter condition. The only part we used the former condition is in Lemma 2.10 where we showed that it implies the latter condition. Therefore, the latter condition is sufficient for the semicircle law.

For the necessary part, we prove it below. Assume that there is a  $w_i \leq -1$  such that  $\sum_l d_l^{w_i} = \Omega(n(n/D)^{|w_i|/2})$ . Denote  $k = 2(1 - w_i)$ . Now consider a graph consisting of two vertices and one edge between them with multiplicity  $k$ . The contribution of such a graph is

$$\frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{1+\frac{k}{2}}} \left(\sum_l d_l^{1-\frac{k}{2}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{D} = \frac{D^{\frac{k}{2}}}{n^{1+\frac{k}{2}}} \Omega\left(n^2 \frac{n^{\frac{k}{2}-1}}{D^{\frac{k}{2}-1}}\right) \frac{1}{D} = \Omega(1).$$

Thus, graphs of the above shape will also make contributions of  $\Omega(1)$  even if they are not graphs with all multiplicities 2. In other words, semicircle law does not hold without the optimal condition. Therefore, the latter condition is necessary for the semicircle law to hold.

**2.5. Proof of Theorem 2.1.** In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.1, which basically states that the moments of the empirical eigenvalue distribution concentrate around their expectations. To show it, we prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[M^k] - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}[M^k]] \right|^2 \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, the above quantity is the same as the variance, so it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr}[M^k]^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}[M^k]]^2 \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Now we denote the term  $(H_{i_j i_k}^{s_l t_m} - \frac{1}{D-1})$  as  $h_{i_j i_k}^{s_l t_m}$ . By the same computations, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{Tr}[M^k]^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}[M^k]]^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{D^k}{n^{k+2}} \left( \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k, i'_1, \dots, i'_k \\ s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1, s'_1, t'_2, \dots, s'_k, t'_1}} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \dots d_{i_k} d_{i'_1} \dots d_{i'_k}} \mathbb{E} \left[ h_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} \dots h_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1} h_{i'_1 i'_2}^{s'_1 t'_2} \dots h_{i'_k i'_1}^{s'_k t'_1} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k, i'_1, \dots, i'_k \\ s_1, t_2, \dots, s_k, t_1, s'_1, t'_2, \dots, s'_k, t'_1}} \frac{1}{d_{i_1} \dots d_{i_k} d_{i'_1} \dots d_{i'_k}} \mathbb{E} \left[ h_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} \dots h_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ h_{i'_1 i'_2}^{s'_1 t'_2} \dots h_{i'_k i'_1}^{s'_k t'_1} \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{G}_{II'}$  denote the graph associated with the term  $\mathbb{E}[h_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} \dots h_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1} h_{i'_1 i'_2}^{s'_1 t'_2} \dots h_{i'_k i'_1}^{s'_k t'_1}]$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_I$  associated with  $\mathbb{E}[h_{i_1 i_2}^{s_1 t_2} \dots h_{i_k i_1}^{s_k t_1}]$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{I'}$  associated with  $\mathbb{E}[h_{i'_1 i'_2}^{s'_1 t'_2} \dots h_{i'_k i'_1}^{s'_k t'_1}]$ . From the analysis before, the maximum of the second term is achieved when  $\mathcal{G}_I$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{I'}$  both have  $k/2 + 1$  vertices and  $k/2$  “good” edges of multiplicities 2, without sharing any common vertex.

For the first term, we see that  $\mathcal{G}_{II'}$  has at most 2 connected components. However, by Lemma 2.12 and Remark 2.13, we can simply do the same analysis to the 2 connected components. By repeating all the transformation and reduction as in the previous proof, we note that the only contributing graphs are when all edges have multiplicities of 2. In this scenario,  $\mathcal{G}_{II'}$  has at most  $k$  distinct edges. Accompanied with the fact that  $\mathcal{G}_{II'}$  has at most 2 connected components, it has at most  $k + 2$  vertices. Therefore the terms are not asymptotically vanishing if and only if  $\mathcal{G}_{II'} = \mathcal{G}_I + \mathcal{G}_{I'}$  where  $\mathcal{G}_I \cap \mathcal{G}_{I'} = \emptyset$  and they both have  $k/2 + 1$  vertices and  $k/2$  edges. This implies that the leading terms of the two terms in the expression above cancels, and the contribution from remaining terms is  $o(1)$ , which concludes the proof.

### 3. PROOF OF LEMMA 1.3 AND THEOREM 1.4

**3.1. Proof of Lemma 1.3.** We generate a random graph  $\mathcal{G}$  with degree sequence  $d_{i_{1 \leq i \leq n}}$  using the configuration model as follows:

- (1) Begin with  $n$  vertices, where each vertex  $i$  has  $d_i$  half-edges. Index these half-edges sequentially from 1 to  $D$ .
- (2) While there exist vertices with fewer than  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  unused half-edges, choose the unused half-edge with the smallest index from these vertices (if there exists any) and match it uniformly at random with another unused half-edge.
- (3) Repeat step 2 until every vertex has either 0 or at least  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  unused half-edges.
- (4) Let  $\{\tilde{d}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  denote the number of unused half-edges at each vertex, so that either  $\tilde{d}_i = 0$  or  $\tilde{d}_i \geq C\sqrt{D/n}$  for each  $i$ . Matching these remaining half-edges yields a graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ , which is a configuration model graph with degree sequence  $\{\tilde{d}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ .

In the above procedure, the graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  can be obtained from  $\mathcal{G}$  by sequentially removing edges. In the following, we show the graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  satisfies the properties in Lemma 1.3. We remark that condition on the degree sequence  $\{\tilde{d}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ , the law of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  is the same as a configuration model graph with that degree sequence. And the third statement of Lemma 1.3 holds.

To get the degree sequence  $\{\tilde{d}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  (viewed as  $n$  vertices with each vertex  $i$  has  $\tilde{d}_i$  half-edges) from the degree sequence  $\{d_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  in the procedure above, we have the stochastic process: choose the half-edge with the smallest index from vertices with fewer than  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  half-edges, remove it, and another uniform randomly picked half-edge. We continue this process of dropping half-edges in pairs of two until all vertices have degrees either 0 or at least  $C\sqrt{D/n}$ .

For the conciseness of notation, we call vertices with degrees 0 or larger than  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  **heavy vertices** and other vertices **light vertices**. We call half edges associated with heavy vertices **heavy half-edges**, and half edges associated with light vertices **light half-edges**.

Note that the difficulty of this task lies in the fact that the action of eliminating light vertices will also eliminate a fraction of half-edges connected to heavy vertices and transfer them into light vertices. We want to make sure that this pruning process will not lead to the situation that each vertex has degree 0. Additionally, we specify the relative magnitudes of some asymptotic terms

$$(22) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_n = \infty, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_n \varepsilon_n C_n^2 = 0.$$

Although the terms above have asymptotic behaviors, in this proof we will deal with a fixed large enough  $n$  and thus fixed  $\varepsilon_n, C_n, K_n$ . Therefore, we simply write  $\varepsilon_n, C_n, K_n$  as  $\varepsilon, C, K$ .

For the rigorousness of proof, we formally model the pruning process. The pruning procedure is essentially removing half-edges in pairs of two, one from a light vertex and another one uniformly out of all half-edges. We repeat this step at each integer time stamp  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  until there are no light vertices. The number of light half-edges at each time  $t$ :  $\{S_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ , can be viewed as a birth-death process. Particularly,  $S_0 > 0$  is the number of light half-edges of the original graph. We write  $S_t = S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^t X_i$  where  $X_i$ 's are the increments or decrements of light half-edges at each time  $i$ . Since the process stops when there are no light vertices, we use  $\tau$  to denote the stopping time

$$(23) \quad \tau = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{N} : S_t = 0\} \wedge 3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}.$$

The second part in (23) is to make sure  $\tau \leq 3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$ . We will show with high probability  $\tau \leq 3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$ . Note that  $\tau$  is half of the total number of deleted half-edges because at each  $t$  we delete two half-edges.

Now we consider the distribution of  $X_t$ , which is the net change of  $S_t$  when we delete one half-edge from a light vertex and another one uniformly out of all half-edges. We denote  $D_t$  the number of vertices which have degrees of  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  at time  $t$ . Firstly, we delete one half-edge from a light vertex. It implies that  $S_t$  will decrease by 1. Secondly, we randomly delete a half-edge, which comes from a vertex  $v$ . There are three cases:

- (1) If  $v$  happens to be a light vertex, then we know that  $X_t = -1 - 1 = -2$ .
- (2) If  $v$  happens to be a vertex with degree  $C\sqrt{D/n}$ , then we will have to add  $C\sqrt{D/n} - 1$  to  $S_t$  because  $v$  has transferred from a heavy vertex to a light vertex. In this case,  $X_t = -1 + C\sqrt{D/n} - 1 = C\sqrt{D/n} - 2$ .
- (3) If  $v$  does not fit into the last two cases above, then  $X_t = -1$ .

In summary,

$$X_t = \begin{cases} -2 & \text{with probability } \frac{S_t}{D-2t+1}, \\ C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} - 2 & \text{with probability } \frac{D_t \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D-2t+1}, \\ -1 & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{S_t}{D-2t+1} - \frac{D_t \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D-2t+1}, \end{cases}$$

where  $D_t$  is the number of vertices which have degrees of  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  at time  $t$ .

Next we show that almost surely, for  $t \leq \tau$ , the random variable  $D_t \leq 2\varepsilon n$ . The meaning of the upper bound is that at any time  $t$ , the number of vertices which have degrees of  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  will be upper bounded by  $2\varepsilon n$ . The reason is as follows. Recall our definition of  $\tau$  from (23), we have  $\tau \leq 3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$ . Thus we are guaranteed that the total number of heavy half-edges deleted in this process will not exceed  $3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$ . We divide all vertices into two groups, those with degrees smaller than  $4C\sqrt{D/n}$  and those with degrees larger than  $4C\sqrt{D/n}$ . For the first group, we conservatively assume that all degrees are exactly  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  at time  $t$ . The cardinality of the first group can be bounded by  $\varepsilon n$  by simply letting  $C = 4C$  in our assumption, provided  $n$  is large enough. For the second group, if any vertex has its degree decreased to  $C\sqrt{D/n}$ , a number of at least  $3C\sqrt{D/n}$

heavy half-edges must be deleted from it. Since the total number of heavy half-edges deleted will not exceed  $3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$ , we know that the number of vertices which have degrees of  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  that are reduced from the second group will not exceed  $\frac{3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}}{3C\sqrt{D/n}} = \varepsilon n$ . Thus, the total number of vertices which have degrees of  $C\sqrt{D/n}$  will be upper bounded by  $\varepsilon n + \varepsilon n = 2\varepsilon n$  at any time  $t$ .

We can construct a new random variable  $\tilde{X}_t$

$$\tilde{X}_t = \begin{cases} C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} - 1 & \text{with probability } \frac{4\varepsilon n \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D}, \\ -1 & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{4\varepsilon n \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D}, \end{cases}$$

Then from the discussion above, almost surely, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_t = C\sqrt{D/n} - 1) = \frac{4\varepsilon n \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D} \geq \frac{2D_t \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D} \geq \frac{D_t \times C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}}{D - 2t + 1} = \mathbb{P}(X_t = C\sqrt{D/n} - 1).$$

We can couple  $\tilde{X}_t$  and  $X_t$ , such that  $\tilde{X}_t \geq X_t$  almost surely. We define  $\tilde{S}_t = \tilde{S}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^t \tilde{X}_i$ . It immediately follows that  $S_t \leq \tilde{S}_t$  almost surely for all  $t$ . We define the same stopping time

$$(24) \quad \tilde{\tau} = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{N} : \tilde{S}_t = 0\} \wedge 3\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD},$$

where

$$(25) \quad \tilde{\tau} \geq \tau$$

almost surely. Therefore, as long as we bound the stopping time  $\tilde{\tau}$ , we obtain an upper bound on the total number of deleted half-edges in the original process.

Now, let us investigate the behavior of the process  $\{\tilde{S}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Considering the construction above, we know that  $\tilde{X}_t$  will be  $-1$  for most of the time and an upsurge occasionally, i.e.  $\tilde{X}_t = C\sqrt{D/n} - 1$ . We treat the time interval  $t \in [1, T_1]$  with  $T_1 = \varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}$  as the first round, and define the number of upsurges  $\tilde{P}_1$  inside first round:

$$(26) \quad \tilde{P}_1 := \{1 \leq t \leq T_1 : \tilde{X}_t = C\sqrt{D/n} - 1\}.$$

Then after the first round, we have

$$(27) \quad \tilde{S}_{T_1} = \tilde{S}_0 + \tilde{P}_1(C\sqrt{D/n} - 1) - (T_1 - \tilde{P}_1) = \tilde{P}_1 C\sqrt{D/n},$$

which is the initial value for the second round,  $\tilde{P}_1 C\sqrt{D/n}$ . It is noteworthy that the distribution of  $\tilde{P}_1$  will be  $\text{Bin}(\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}, \frac{4\varepsilon n C\sqrt{D/n}}{D}) = \text{Bin}(\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}, 4\varepsilon C\sqrt{n/D})$ .

Then we treat the time interval  $[T_1 + 1, T_2]$  with  $T_2 - T_1 = \tilde{P}_1 C\sqrt{D/n}$  as the second round. Similarly, we define the number of upsurges during the second round as  $\tilde{P}_2$  and know that  $S_{T_2} = \tilde{P}_2 C\sqrt{D/n}$ , and  $\tilde{P}_2 \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{P}_1 C\sqrt{D/n}, \frac{4\varepsilon n C\sqrt{D/n}}{D})$ . We repeat this process. We treat the time interval  $[T_{k-1} + 1, T_k]$  with  $T_k - T_{k-1} = \tilde{P}_k C\sqrt{D/n}$  as the  $k$ -round, and define the number of upsurges during the  $k$ -round as  $\tilde{P}_k$

$$(28) \quad \tilde{P}_k := \{T_{k-1} + 1 \leq t \leq T_k : \tilde{X}_t = C\sqrt{D/n} - 1\}.$$

Then  $S_{T_k} = \tilde{P}_k C\sqrt{D/n}$ , and  $\tilde{P}_k \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{P}_k C\sqrt{D/n}, \frac{4\varepsilon n C\sqrt{D/n}}{D})$ .

Now that preparations are set up, we start to discuss the probability statements regarding the process. In the first round, we sample  $\tilde{P}_1 \sim \text{Bin}(\varepsilon C\sqrt{nD}, 4\varepsilon C\sqrt{n/D})$  and decide the starting point for the second round. By properties of the Binomial distribution and Chernoff bounds, we may obtain the expectation and the tail bound as follows,

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{P}_1 = \varepsilon C\sqrt{nD} \times 4\varepsilon C\sqrt{\frac{n}{D}} = 4\varepsilon^2 C^2 n =: \mu_1,$$

and it follows

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1 > 2\mu_1) \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{3}4\varepsilon^2 C^2 n).$$

For the second round, we condition on  $\tilde{P}_1 \leq 2\mu_1 = 8\varepsilon^2 C^2 n$ . Then we sample the Binomial distribution  $\tilde{P}_2 \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{P}_1 C \sqrt{D/n}, 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{n/D})$  where we know that  $\tilde{P}_1 \leq 8\varepsilon^2 C^2 n$ . Let  $\hat{P}_2 \sim \text{Bin}(8\varepsilon^2 C^3 \sqrt{nD}, 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{n/D})$ , and we can couple it with  $\tilde{P}_2$  such that  $\tilde{P}_2 \leq \hat{P}_2$  almost surely. Now we may obtain the expectation the the tail bound as follows,

$$(29) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{P}_2 | \tilde{P}_1 \leq 2\mu_1] \leq \mathbb{E}\hat{P}_2 = 8\varepsilon^2 C^3 \sqrt{nD} \times 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{\frac{n}{D}} = 32\varepsilon^3 C^4 n =: \mu_2$$

$$(30) \quad \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_2 > 2\mu_2 | \tilde{P}_1 \leq 2\mu_1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{P}_2 > 2\mathbb{E}\hat{P}_2) \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{3}32\varepsilon^3 C^4 n)$$

We repeat this process. In the  $k$ -th round, we condition on  $\tilde{P}_{k-1} \leq 2\mu_{k-1} = (8\varepsilon C^2)^{k-1} \varepsilon n$ . Then we sample  $\tilde{P}_k \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{P}_{k-1} C \sqrt{D/n}, 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{n/D})$  where we know that  $\tilde{P}_{k-1} \leq (8\varepsilon C^2)^{k-1} \varepsilon n$ . We couple  $\tilde{P}_k$  with  $\hat{P}_k \sim \text{Bin}((8\varepsilon C^2)^{k-1} \varepsilon C \sqrt{nD}, 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{n/D})$ , such that  $\hat{P}_k \geq \tilde{P}_k$  almost surely. This gives us the following expectation, and the tail bound,

$$(31) \quad \mathbb{E}[\tilde{P}_k | \tilde{P}_{k-1} \leq 2\mu_{k-1}] \leq \mathbb{E}\hat{P}_k = (8\varepsilon C^2)^{k-1} \varepsilon C \sqrt{nD} \times 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{\frac{n}{D}} = 2^{k-1} (4\varepsilon C^2)^k \varepsilon n =: \mu_k,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_k > 2\mu_k | \tilde{P}_{k-1} \leq 2\mu_{k-1}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{P}_k > 2\mathbb{E}\hat{P}_k) \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{3}2^{k-1} (4\varepsilon C^2)^k \varepsilon n).$$

We consider the  $N$ -th round such that  $2\mu_{N-1} = K$  where  $K$  is a large number whose magnitude is specified in (22). Recall that  $N$ -th round is for time  $t \in [T_{N-1} + 1, T_N]$ , where

$$(32) \quad T_N = (\varepsilon n + \tilde{P}_1 + \tilde{P}_2 + \cdots + \tilde{P}_{N-1}) \times C \sqrt{D/n}.$$

In the  $N$ -th round, we condition on  $\tilde{P}_{N-1} \leq 2\mu_{N-1} = K$ . Then we sample the binomial random variable  $\tilde{P}_N \sim \text{Bin}(\tilde{P}_{N-1} C \sqrt{D/n}, 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{n/D})$  where we know that  $\tilde{P}_{N-1} \leq K$ . Again we can couple  $\tilde{P}_N$  with  $\hat{P}_N \sim \text{Bin}(KC \sqrt{D/n}, 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{n/D})$  such that  $\hat{P}_N \geq \tilde{P}_N$  almost surely. This gives the following probability

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_N \geq 1 | \tilde{P}_{N-1} \leq 2\mu_{N-1}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{P}_N \geq 1) = 1 - (1 - 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{\frac{n}{D}})^{KC \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}} \\ &= 1 - e^{-4K\varepsilon C^2} \leq 4K\varepsilon C^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second last step follows from the definition of  $e$  and the fact that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{D/n} = \infty$ ; and the last step follows from (22) and a first-order Taylor expansion.

Recall  $\mu_k$  from (31). We compute the following quantity, which will be useful later

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} \varepsilon n + 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + \cdots + 2\mu_{N-1} + 1 &\leq \varepsilon n + 2\mu_1 + 2\mu_2 + \cdots + 2\mu_{N-1} + 2\mu_N + \cdots \\ &= \varepsilon n + 8\varepsilon^2 C^2 n + 64\varepsilon^3 C^4 n + \cdots \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - 8\varepsilon C^2} \varepsilon n \leq 2\varepsilon n \end{aligned}$$

where we know that  $\varepsilon C^2$  will go to 0 by using (22). Now we use  $\tilde{P} = \tilde{P}_1 + \tilde{P}_2 + \cdots + \tilde{P}_N$  to denote the total number of upsurges. Then it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P} > 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_{N-1}) + 1) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1 > 2\mu_1) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1 \leq 2\mu_1, \tilde{P}_2 > 2\mu_2) + \cdots + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1 \leq 2\mu_1, \tilde{P}_2 \leq 2\mu_2, \dots, \tilde{P}_N \geq 1) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1 > 2\mu_1) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_2 > 2\mu_2 | \tilde{P}_1 \leq 2\mu_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_N \geq 1 | \tilde{P}_{N-1} \leq 2\mu_{N-1}) \\
(35) \quad & \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{3}4\varepsilon^2 C^2 n) + \exp(-\frac{1}{3}32\varepsilon^3 C^4 n) + \cdots + \exp(-\frac{1}{3}2^{N-2}(4\varepsilon C^2)^{N-1}\varepsilon n) + 4K\varepsilon C^2 \\
& = \exp(-\frac{1}{3}4\varepsilon^2 C^2 n) + \exp(-\frac{1}{3}32\varepsilon^3 C^4 n) + \cdots + \exp(-\frac{1}{3}K) + 4K\varepsilon C^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1 - 8\varepsilon C^2} \exp(-\frac{1}{3}K) + 4K\varepsilon C^2 \\
& \leq 2 \exp(-\frac{1}{3}K) + 4K\varepsilon C^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (31) and (33) for the fourth line.

In the following we denote the event

$$(36) \quad \Omega := \{\tilde{P} \leq 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_{N-1}) + 1\}.$$

Then (35) implies

$$(37) \quad \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \geq 1 - 2 \exp(-\frac{1}{3}K) - 4K\varepsilon C^2 = 1 - o(1).$$

Moreover, on  $\Omega$ , we have

$$(38) \quad S_{T_N} = \tilde{P}_N C \sqrt{D/n} = 0.$$

Recall that  $\tilde{\tau}$  from (24) is the stopping time for the process, then  $\tilde{\tau} \leq T_N$ . Recall  $T_N$  from (32), it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(39) \quad \tilde{\tau} \leq T_N & \leq (\varepsilon n + \tilde{P}) \times C \sqrt{D/n} \leq (\varepsilon n + 2(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_{N-1}) + 1) \times C \sqrt{D/n} \\
& \leq 2\varepsilon n \times C \sqrt{D/n}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (34). By using the fact that  $\tilde{\tau} \geq \tau$  almost surely (recall from (25)), we conclude that on  $\Omega$ ,

$$\tau \leq \tilde{\tau} \leq 2\varepsilon \times C \sqrt{nD}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that the total number of half-edges deleted will be less than  $4\varepsilon C \sqrt{nD}$  condition on  $\Omega$ , because  $\tau$  is half of the total number of half-edges deleted. Meanwhile, the number of vertices deleted will be less than  $\varepsilon n + \tilde{P} \leq 2\varepsilon n$  condition on  $\Omega$ . This finishes the proof of Lemma 1.3.

**3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.4.** In this section, we define the following notation for matrices: given any matrix  $A$  and any index set  $\mathcal{I}$ , let  $A^{\mathcal{I}}$  denote the matrix obtained by removing the columns and rows of  $A$  indexed by  $\mathcal{I}$ .

By Lemma 1.3, we know that the original graph  $\mathcal{G}$  may be pruned using the graph pruning process and transferred into a graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  where all degrees are now larger than  $C \sqrt{D/n}$ . It also follows that, with probability  $1 - o(1)$ , the number of removed vertices is less than  $2\varepsilon n$  and the number of removed half-edges is less than  $4\varepsilon C \sqrt{nD}$ . The law for the pruned graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  follows the configuration model.

Consider the corresponding normalized Laplacian matrix  $\tilde{M}$  for the pruned graph  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$

$$\tilde{M} = \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{D}}{n}} \tilde{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \tilde{A} - \left[ \frac{\tilde{d}_i \tilde{d}_j}{\tilde{D} - 1} \right]_{ij} \right) \tilde{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

where  $\tilde{D}, \tilde{\Delta}, \tilde{A}, \tilde{d}_i$  are defined accordingly.

Since the law for  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  follows the configuration model, we apply Theorem 1.1 and conclude that the empirical distribution of eigenvalues  $\tilde{\mu}_n$  of  $\tilde{M}$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability. In this proof, we will make connections between the normalized Laplacians  $M$  and  $\tilde{M}$  and show that their eigenvalue distributions are asymptotically the same.

Note that  $A$  is the adjacency matrix for  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\tilde{A}$  is the adjacency matrix for  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ . Therefore,  $\tilde{A}$  is simply the resulting matrix by symmetrically setting at most  $2\varepsilon n$  rows and columns in  $A$  to be 0. We use the index set  $\mathcal{I}$  to denote the corresponding rows and columns of 0's. Here, we have  $\tilde{A}^{(\mathcal{I})} = A^{(\mathcal{I})}$ . Meanwhile, it is immediate that  $\tilde{D} = (1 - o(1))D$ . Additionally, the matrix  $\left[ \frac{\tilde{d}_i \tilde{d}_j}{\tilde{D} - 1} \right]_{ij}$  will not modify the eigenvalue distribution due to our observations in Remark 1.2. In other words, the Laplacians are connected in the following way,

$$\left( \tilde{\Delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M} \tilde{\Delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{(\mathcal{I})} = (1 - o(1)) \left( \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} M \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^{(\mathcal{I})}.$$

Hence by applying  $(\mathcal{I})$  to all matrices and moving terms,

$$\left( \Delta^{(\mathcal{I})} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \tilde{\Delta}^{(\mathcal{I})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I})} \left( \tilde{\Delta}^{(\mathcal{I})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \Delta^{(\mathcal{I})} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = (1 - o(1)) M^{(\mathcal{I})}.$$

The most important part is how  $\tilde{\Delta}^{(\mathcal{I})}$  differs from  $\Delta^{(\mathcal{I})}$ . We first establish an important observation. Denote the number of vertices whose degrees decrease by a factor of at least  $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$  as

$$K = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\frac{d_i - \tilde{d}_i}{d_i} \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon}}.$$

Noting that the total number of deleted half-edges is less than  $4\varepsilon C \sqrt{nD}$ , we conclude the following

$$\begin{aligned} K &\leq 3\varepsilon n + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\frac{d_i - \tilde{d}_i}{d_i} \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \text{ and } d_i \geq C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}} \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon n + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\frac{d_i - \tilde{d}_i}{C\sqrt{\frac{D}{n}}} \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon n + 4\sqrt{\varepsilon} n \end{aligned}$$

where  $3\varepsilon n$  accounts for the portion of vertices that are entirely removed. The third inequality holds because otherwise, the total number of removed half-edges will be greater than  $4\sqrt{\varepsilon} n \times \sqrt{\varepsilon} C \sqrt{\frac{D}{n}} = 4\varepsilon C \sqrt{nD}$ , which forms a contradiction. Therefore,  $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} n)$  entries in the diagonal matrix  $\tilde{\Delta}^{(\mathcal{I})}$  will be less than a factor of  $1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}$  of the corresponding entries in  $\Delta^{(\mathcal{I})}$ . The rest  $n - O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} n)$  entries in  $\tilde{\Delta}^{(\mathcal{I})}$  will be bounded above this cutoff.

We use  $\mathcal{J}$  to denote the index set of the  $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} n)$  rows and columns where their corresponding entries in  $\tilde{\Delta}^{(\mathcal{I})}$  are respectively less than a factor of  $1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}$  of their corresponding entries in  $\Delta^{(\mathcal{I})}$ . We further take off this part of the rows and columns with respect to the equation above and get

$$(40) \quad (I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})} (I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (1 - o(1)) M^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})}$$

where  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  is a diagonal matrix where all entries are within the range of  $(0, \sqrt{\varepsilon})$ . We want to show that the multiplication of  $(I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  on both sides does not vary the eigenvalues much.

Consider a symmetric matrix  $B(t)$ , its eigenvalue  $\lambda(t)$ , and its normalized eigenvector  $v(t)$  which all depend on a variable  $t$ . By taking derivatives on both sides of the equation  $Bv = \lambda v$ , we have

that  $\dot{B}v + B\dot{v} = \dot{\lambda}v + \lambda\dot{v}$ . Taking dot product with  $v$  on both sides and noting that  $v$  is perpendicular to  $\dot{v}$ , we have  $\dot{\lambda} = \langle v, \dot{B}v \rangle$ . If we substitute  $B(t) = (I - \Delta_\varepsilon t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})} (I - \Delta_\varepsilon t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{\lambda}| &= |\langle v, -\Delta_\varepsilon (I - \Delta_\varepsilon t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})} (I - \Delta_\varepsilon t)^{\frac{1}{2}} v \rangle| \\ &= |\langle v, -\Delta_\varepsilon (I - \Delta_\varepsilon t)^{-1} \lambda v \rangle| \\ &\leq |\lambda| \cdot \|v\|^2 \cdot \|\Delta_\varepsilon (I - \Delta_\varepsilon t)^{-1}\| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

It immediately follows that

$$|\lambda(1) - \lambda(0)| \leq \int_0^1 |\dot{\lambda}| dt \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\lambda| \cdot 1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall that  $\lambda(1)$  corresponds to a eigenvalue for the matrix  $B(1) = (I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})} (I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and that  $\lambda(0)$  corresponds to a eigenvalue for the matrix  $B(0) = \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})}$ .

Suppose we take an arbitrary Lipschitz function  $f$ . Note that the eigenvalue distribution of  $\tilde{M}$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability. By Cauchy interlace theorem, the eigenvalue distribution of  $\tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})}$  also weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability since we take off at most  $|\mathcal{I}| + |\mathcal{J}| = O(\varepsilon n) + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} n)$  entries. Therefore, we know that, with probability  $1 - o(1)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(0)) \rightarrow \int f(x) \rho_{SC}(x) dx$$

Particularly, if we simply take the second moment, we have that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(0)^2 \rightarrow \int x^2 \rho_{SC}(x) dx = C$$

where  $C$  is the second moment of a semicircle distribution. Moreover, if we consider the difference between  $\lambda(1)$  and  $\lambda(0)$ , with probability  $1 - o(1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(1)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(0)) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(1)) - f(\lambda_i(0)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \|f'\|_\infty \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(1) - \lambda_i(0)| \quad \text{because } f \text{ is Lipschitz} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \|f'\|_\infty \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} |\lambda_i(0)| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|f'\|_\infty \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i(0)|^2}{n}} \\ &\rightarrow 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|f'\|_\infty \cdot \sqrt{C} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that, with probability  $1 - o(1)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(1)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(0)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(1)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\lambda_i(0)) \rightarrow \int f(x) \rho_{SC}(x) dx,$$

which implies that the eigenvalue distribution of  $B(1) = (I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{M}^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})} (I - \Delta_\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability.




FIGURE 3. Spectral distribution for  $d_1 = 100$ ,  $d_2 = 500$ ,  $n = 10^5$ .




FIGURE 4. Spectral distribution for  $d_1 = 10$ ,  $d_2 = 200$ ,  $n = 10^5$ .

Moreover, by (40), the eigenvalue distribution of  $M^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})}$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability. Again by Cauchy interlace theorem, the eigenvalue distribution of  $M$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability, since we simply add at most  $|\mathcal{I}| + |\mathcal{J}| = O(\varepsilon n) + O(\sqrt{\varepsilon} n)$  entries to  $M^{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})}$ . Therefore, we know that the eigenvalue distribution of  $M$  weakly converges to the semicircle distribution in probability.

#### 4. COMPUTATIONAL VERIFICATION

To computationally verify our results, we used Python along with numerical computing libraries NumPy and SciPy to produce distributions of eigenvalues<sup>1</sup>. In particular, we randomly assigned each of  $n = 10,000$  vertices one of two degrees (denoted  $d_1, d_2$ ), then generated a random graph based on these fixed degree sequences. Figure 3 and Figure 4 show the spectral distributions for different values of  $(d_1, d_2)$ . In particular, Figure 3 demonstrates the semicircle law when our assumption that  $d_1, d_2 > \sqrt{D/n}$  is satisfied while Figure 4 demonstrates that when our assumption is not satisfied, the matrix can not follow the semicircle law.

In Figure 3, the fixed degree sequence matches our required conditions ( $d_1, d_2 > \sqrt{D/n}$ ), resulting in the semicircle distribution and supporting our conclusion. Note that Figure 4 is not a semicircle distribution. Since we used  $d_1 = 10$  and  $d_2 = 200$ , we have  $D/n \approx 105$  so  $\sqrt{D/n} \approx 10.25$ . Since in this case  $d_1 = 10 < \sqrt{D/n} \approx 10.25$ , this provides evidence that our assumption that  $d_i > \sqrt{D/n}$  is necessary.

**Acknowledgments** JH is supported by NSF grant DMS-2331096, and the Sloan research fellowship.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] O. H. Ajanki, L. Erdős, and T. Krüger. Local spectral statistics of gaussian matrices with correlated entries. *Journal of statistical physics*, 163:280–302, 2016.
- [2] R. Bauerschmidt, J. Huang, and H.-T. Yau. Local kesten–mckay law for random regular graphs. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 369:523–636, 2019.
- [3] B. Bollobás. A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 1(4):311–316, 1980.
- [4] B. Bollobás and B. Bollobás. *Random graphs*. Springer, 1998.

<sup>1</sup>The code is available at <https://github.com/kevinmli/Spectral-Distribution-Given-Degree-Sequences>.

- [5] T. Britton, M. Deijfen, and A. Martin-Löf. Generating simple random graphs with prescribed degree distribution. *Journal of statistical physics*, 124:1377–1397, 2006.
- [6] Z. Che. Universality of random matrices with correlated entries. 2017.
- [7] F. Chung, L. Lu, and V. Vu. The spectra of random graphs with given expected degrees, internet math. 2004.
- [8] F. R. Chung. *Spectral graph theory*, volume 92. American Mathematical Soc., 1997.
- [9] S. Dhara, R. Van Der Hofstad, and J. S. Van Leeuwen. Critical percolation on scale-free random graphs: New universality class for the configuration model. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 382:123–171, 2021.
- [10] B. K. Fosdick, D. B. Larremore, J. Nishimura, and J. Ugander. Configuring random graph models with fixed degree sequences. *Siam Review*, 60(2):315–355, 2018.
- [11] J. Huang and H.-T. Yau. Spectrum of random d-regular graphs up to the edge. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 77(3):1635–1723, 2024.
- [12] B. D. McKay. The expected eigenvalue distribution of a large regular graph. *Linear Algebra and its applications*, 40:203–216, 1981.
- [13] R. O’Donnell. *Analysis of boolean functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [14] A. Sarid. The spectral gap of random regular graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 63(2):557–587, 2023.
- [15] L. V. Tran, V. H. Vu, and K. Wang. Sparse random graphs: Eigenvalues and eigenvectors. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 42(1):110–134, 2013.
- [16] R. Van Der Hofstad. *Random graphs and complex networks*, volume 54. Cambridge university press, 2024.

### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF EQUATION (5)

*Proof of Equation (5).* Combining Equation (4) and Theorem 2.1, we have for any positive integer  $k$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int x^k d\mu_n - \int x^k d\rho_{sc} \right| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, for any polynomial  $p(x)$ , we have

$$(41) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int p(x) d\mu_n - \int p(x) d\rho_{sc} \right| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Now consider any continuous bounded function  $f$  such that  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f(x)| \leq M$ , and any arbitrarily small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We want to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int f(x) d\mu_n - \int f(x) d\rho_{sc} \right| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Fix an arbitrarily large number  $K$ . We define the truncated function  $\tilde{f}$  as

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in [-K, K], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now observe that

$$\mu_n([-K, K]^C) \leq \frac{\int x^2 d\mu_n}{K^2} \leq \frac{2C_1}{K^2}$$

where  $C_1$  is Catalan number with parameter 1. We take large  $K$  such that  $\frac{2C_1 M}{K^2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$ . Therefore, we know

$$(42) \quad \left| \int f d\mu_n - \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n \right| = \left| \int_{[-K, K]^C} f d\mu_n \right| \leq \sup_{x \in [-K, K]^C} |f(x)| \cdot \mu_n([-K, K]^C) \leq M \frac{2C_1}{K^2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}.$$

By Stone-Weierstrass theorem, on the finite interval of  $[-K, K]$ , we can approximate any continuous function by polynomials to arbitrary precision. Therefore, we may choose a polynomial  $p(x)$  which controls the difference between  $\tilde{f}$  and  $p$  on the interval of  $[-K, K]$ . On the interval of  $[-K, K]^C$ , a similar argument as in (42) can be applied. Therefore, by combining two arguments and choosing a polynomial with finer precision, we have

$$(43) \quad \left| \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n - \int p d\mu_n \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}$$

and

$$(44) \quad \left| \int p d\rho_{\text{sc}} - \int \tilde{f} d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{5}.$$

We notice the fact that

$$(45) \quad \left| \int \tilde{f} d\rho_{\text{sc}} - \int f d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| = 0$$

because  $\rho_{\text{sc}}$  has a support of  $[-2, 2]$ . Finally, by observations (41), (42), (43), (44), and (45), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int f(x) d\mu_n - \int f(x) d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int f d\mu_n - \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n + \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n - \int p d\mu_n + \int p d\mu_n - \int p d\rho_{\text{sc}} + \int p d\rho_{\text{sc}} - \int \tilde{f} d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \int \tilde{f} d\rho_{\text{sc}} - \int f d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int f d\mu_n - \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \right) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int \tilde{f} d\mu_n - \int p d\mu_n \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \right) \\ & \quad + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int p d\mu_n - \int p d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \right) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int p d\rho_{\text{sc}} - \int \tilde{f} d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \right) \\ & \quad + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \int \tilde{f} d\rho_{\text{sc}} - \int f d\rho_{\text{sc}} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

which concludes our proof. □

<sup>1</sup>UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA  
Email address: sywang25@sas.upenn.edu

<sup>1</sup>UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA  
Email address: kevinmli@seas.upenn.edu

<sup>3</sup>UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA  
Email address: huangjy@wharton.upenn.edu