

Robust random graph matching in dense graphs via vector approximate message passing

Zhangsong Li
Peking University

December 24, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we focus on the matching recovery problem between a pair of correlated Gaussian Wigner matrices with a latent vertex correspondence. We are particularly interested in a robust version of this problem such that our observation is a perturbed input $(A + E, B + F)$ where (A, B) is a pair of correlated Gaussian Wigner matrices and E, F are adversarially chosen matrices supported on an unknown $\epsilon n * \epsilon n$ principle minor of A, B , respectively. We propose a vector-approximate message passing (vector-AMP) algorithm that succeeds in polynomial time as long as the correlation ρ between (A, B) is a non-vanishing constant and $\epsilon = o\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^{20}}\right)$.

The main methodological inputs for our result are the iterative random graph matching algorithm proposed in [22, 23] and the spectral cleaning procedure proposed in [43]. To the best of our knowledge, our algorithm is the first efficient random graph matching type algorithm that is robust under any adversarial perturbations of $n^{1-o(1)}$ size.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the problem of matching two correlated random matrices, and we consider the case of symmetric matrices in order to be consistent with the graph matching problem. More precisely, this problem is defined as follows. Let U_n be the set of unordered pairs (i, j) with $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$.

Definition 1.1 (Correlated weighted random graphs). *Let π be a latent permutation on $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We generate two random weighted graphs on the common vertex set $[n]$ with adjacency matrices A and B such that given π , we have $(A_{i,j}, B_{\pi(i), \pi(j)}) \sim \mathbf{F}$ independent among all $(i, j) \in U_n$ where \mathbf{F} is the law of a pair of correlated random variables. Of particular interest are the following special cases:*

- Correlated Gaussian Wigner model. *In this case, we let \mathbf{F} be the law of two mean-zero Gaussian random variables with variance 1 and correlation ρ .*

- Correlated Erdős-Rényi model. *In this case, we let \mathbf{F} be the law of two Bernoulli random variables with mean $q \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and correlation ρ .*

Given two correlated weighted random graphs (A, B) , our goal is to recover the latent vertex correspondence π . For both the correlated Gaussian Wigner model and the correlated Erdős-Rényi model, by the collective effort of the community, it is fair to say that our understanding of the statistical and computational aspects on the matching recovery problem in both models are more or less satisfactory. However, there is a new fascinating issue that arises in the context of the works on matching recovery, namely the *robustness issue*: many of the algorithms used to achieve matching recovery are believed to be fragile in the sense that adversarially modifying a small fraction of edges could fool the algorithm into outputting a result which deviates strongly from the true underlying matching. The reason is that these algorithms are either based on enumeration of sophisticated subgraph structures (see, e.g., [3, 54, 38] for example) or are based on delicate spectral properties of the adjacency matrices (see, e.g., [30, 31] where the authors design an efficient algorithm based on *all* the eigenvectors of the adjacency matrix) that can be affected disproportionately by adding small cliques or other “undesired” subgraph structure. Thus, a natural question is whether we can find efficient random graph matching algorithms that are robust under a small fraction of adversarial perturbations. To be more precise, we want to study the following corrupted correlated random weighted graph model.

Definition 1.2 (Corrupted correlated weighted random graphs). *We say two weighted graphs (A', B') (denoted by their adjacency matrices) are a pair of ϵ -corrupted correlated weighted random graphs, if there exists a pair of correlated weighted random graphs (A, B) with latent matching π such that $(A', B') = (A + E, B + F)$, where E, F are arbitrary matrices supported on an $\epsilon n \times \epsilon n$ principle minor of A, B , respectively.*

In this paper, we will focus on the case of corrupted Gaussian Wigner model, in which the observations are two $n \times n$ matrices (A', B') such that there exists a pair of correlated Gaussian Wigner matrices (A, B) with correlation ρ satisfying $(A', B') = (A + E, B + F)$. Our main result can then be summarized as follows:

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose $\epsilon = o\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^{2\sigma}}\right)$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. Then for a pair of ϵ -corrupted Gaussian Wigner model with correlation ρ (we denoted them as A', B'), there exists a constant $C = C(\rho)$ and an algorithm (See Algorithm 3 below) with $O(n^C)$ running time that takes (A', B') as input and outputs the latent matching π with probability tending to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Remark 1.4. *It is natural to consider the related problem of matching a pair of ϵ -corrupted Erdős-Rényi graph model with correlation $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and density q , where the observations are the adjacency matrices (A', B') of two graphs such that there exists a pair of correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs (A, B) with correlation ρ and density q and two unknown index sets*

$|Q|, |R| \leq \epsilon n$ satisfying

$$A_{i,j} = A'_{i,j} \text{ for all } (i,j) \notin Q \times Q, B_{i,j} = B'_{i,j} \text{ for all } (i,j) \notin R \times R.$$

For this model, using appropriate modifications similar to modifying [22, Algorithm 1] to get [23, Algorithm 2], we can get a similar algorithm that achieves exact matching when $\epsilon = o(\frac{1}{(\log n)^{20}})$ and ρ, q are two constants in $(0, 1)$. We will omit the detailed arguments due to its high-similarity to generalizing [22] to [23].

1.1 Related works

Random graph matching. Graph matching (also known as network alignment) refers to the problem of finding the bijection between the vertex sets of two graphs that maximizes the total number of common edges. When the two graphs are exactly isomorphic to each other, this reduces to the classical graph isomorphism problem, for which the best known algorithm runs in quasi-polynomial time [2]. In general, graph matching is an instance of the quadratic assignment problem [9], which is known to be NP-hard to solve or even approximate [50]. Motivated by real-world applications (such as social network deanonymization [60, 61], computer vision [5, 12], natural language processing [40] and computational biology [65]) as well as the need to understand the average-case computational complexity, a recent line of work is devoted to the study of statistical theory and efficient algorithms for graph matching under statistical models, by assuming the two graphs are randomly generated with correlated edges under a *hidden* vertex correspondence.

In recent years, by the collective efforts of the community, the information-theoretic thresholds for both exact and partial recovery have been derived [14, 13, 41, 71, 70, 36, 18, 19] and various efficient graph matching algorithms have been developed with performance guarantees [16, 24, 30, 31, 35, 37, 51, 52, 38, 53, 54, 22, 23]. We now focus on the algorithmic aspect of this problem since it is more relevant to our work. The state-of-the-art algorithm can be summarized as follows: in the sparse regime, efficient matching algorithms are available when the correlation exceeds the square root of Otter’s constant (the Otter’s constant is approximately 0.338) [53, 54, 37, 38]; in the dense regime, efficient matching algorithms exist as long as the correlation exceeds an arbitrarily small constant [22, 23]. Roughly speaking, the separation between the sparse and dense regimes mentioned above depends on whether the average degree of the graph grows polynomially or sub-polynomially. In addition, while proving the hardness of typical instances of the graph matching problem remains challenging even under the assumption of $P \neq NP$, evidence based on the analysis of a specific class known as low-degree polynomials from [20] indicates that the state-of-the-art algorithms may essentially capture the correct computational thresholds.

Robust algorithms. Finding robust algorithms to solve statistical estimation and random optimization problems has received a huge amount of attentions in recent years. One prominent example is the problem of robust community recovery in sparse stochastic block models. A large body of work has focused on the settings where an adversary may

arbitrarily modify $\Omega(n)$ edges (see, e.g., [58, 25]). Other important robust algorithms include optimizing the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) Hamiltonian [56], mean estimation [46], and so on.

As for the random graph matching problem, previous robustness results mainly focus on the information-theoretic side. For example, in [1] the authors considered the behavior of the maximum overlap estimator and the k -core estimator for matching recovery in a pair of correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs with corruption (although their definition of corruption is a bit different from ours). They also conduct valuable numerical experiments which imply that several widely used graph matching algorithms (e.g., the spectral graph matching algorithm in [30, 31] and the degree profile matching algorithm in [24]) behave poorly even when only a small portion of the graph is corrupted. In fact, it seems that simply planting an arbitrary $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ size clique in both graphs will significantly change the spectral properties and the degree distribution of the graph and thus cause the failure of these algorithms. This leaves it an important question to find computationally feasible algorithms when an adversary corruption of the graph presents. We answer this problem partly by constructing an efficient random graph matching algorithm which is robust under any $\frac{n}{\text{poly}(\log n)} * \frac{n}{\text{poly}(\log n)}$ adversarial perturbations, which improves the robustness guarantees for a $\text{poly}(n)$ factor.

Approximate message passing. Approximate Message Passing (AMP) is a family of algorithmic methods which generalizes matrix power iteration. Originated from statistical physics and graphical ideas [66, 45, 55, 6], it has emerged as a popular class of first-order iterative algorithms that find diverse applications in both statistical estimation problems and probabilistic analyses of statistical physics models. Some non-exhaustive examples include compressed sensing [27], sparse Principal Components Analysis (PCA) [17], linear regression [27, 4, 47], non-negative PCA [57], perceptron models [26, 32, 7, 29] and more (many additional examples may be found in the survey [34]).

One major drawback of the original AMP algorithms is that they are not robust under small adversarial perturbations. To address this issue, in [42, 43] the authors propose to apply AMP algorithm using “suitably preprocessed” initialization and data matrix. Building on this idea, they give the first robust AMP-based iterative algorithm for non-negative PCA problem. While this work is inspired by their work, we point out we need to deal with several specific issues that arise in the setting of random graph matching: firstly, dealing with two random matrices with sophisticated correlation structure is much more difficult than dealing with one GOE matrix. Secondly, our AMP algorithm has $\omega(1)$ iterative steps and we need to show the output only changes $O(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(\log n)})$ fraction under adversarial perturbations.

1.2 Open problems

Our work reiterates a number of future research directions as we discuss below.

Optimal corruption scale. In this paper, we design an efficient Gaussian matrix match-

ing algorithm that is robust under $\frac{n}{\text{poly}(\log n)} * \frac{n}{\text{poly}(\log n)}$ size of adversarial corruptions. However, it remains an interesting problem on whether we can develop Gaussian matching algorithms for any $\epsilon n * \epsilon n$ adversarial perturbations where ϵ is a small constant.

Sparse graphs. Although our algorithm can be extended to correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs with edge density $q \in (0, 1)$ a constant, to deal with the adversarial perturbations our current design and analysis of the algorithm crucially relies on the fact that the two matrices are *dense* (i.e., each column and row of the adjacency matrix have $n^{1-o(1)}$ non-zero entries) and cannot extend to the case where the average density of a graph $q = n^{-c}$ for some $c > 0$. Of course in this case one cannot expect to estimate the latent matching exactly since an adversarial perturbation may corrupt all the edges incident to one vertex. However, it remains an open question that whether almost-exact matching recovery is still possible by efficient algorithms in this regime. Perhaps an even more challenging case is when the average degree of the graph is a constant (i.e., $nq = O(1)$). In this case, if no adversarial perturbation occurs, it was shown in [37, 38, 54] that we can find an efficient algorithm that achieves partial matching given the correlation $\rho > \sqrt{\alpha}$, where $\alpha \approx 0.338$ is the Otter’s constant. It would be interesting to consider the problem that whether partial matching is still achievable when $o(n)$ edges in both graphs are adversarially corrupted.

Other graph models. Another important direction is to design robust graph matching algorithms for other important correlated random graph models, such as the random geometric graph model [69, 39], the random inhomogeneous graph model [21] and the stochastic block model [63, 11, 10]. We emphasize that it is also important to propose and study correlated graph models based on important real-world and scientific problems, albeit the models do not appear to be “canonical” from a mathematical point of view.

1.3 Notations

We record in this subsection some notation conventions. Recall that (A', B') are two $n * n$ matrices with $(A', B') = (A + E, B + F)$. Denote Q, R as the support of E, F , respectively. We then have

$$E_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for all } (i, j) \notin Q \times Q \text{ and } F_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for all } (i, j) \notin R \times R.$$

Note that A, B, E, F, Q, R are inaccessible to the algorithm. Given two random variables X, Y and a σ -algebra \mathfrak{F} , the notation $X|_{\mathfrak{F}} \stackrel{d}{=} Y|_{\mathfrak{F}}$ means that for any integrable function ϕ and for any bounded random variable Z measurable on \mathfrak{F} , we have $\mathbb{E}[\phi(X)Z] = \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)Z]$. In words, X is equal in distribution to Y conditioned on \mathfrak{F} . When \mathfrak{F} is the trivial σ -field, we simply write $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$.

We also need some standard notations in linear algebra. For a matrix or a vector M , we will use M^\top to denote its transpose. For an $m * m$ matrix $M = (a_{ij})_{m * m}$, if M is symmetric we let $\varsigma_1(M) \geq \varsigma_2(M) \geq \dots \geq \varsigma_m(M)$ be the eigenvalues of M . Denote by $\text{rank}(M)$ the rank of the matrix M . For two $l * m$ matrices M_1 and M_2 , we define their

inner product to be

$$\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{j=1}^m M_1(i, j) M_2(i, j).$$

We also define the Frobenius norm, operator norm, and ∞ -norm of M respectively by

$$\|M\|_F = \text{tr}(MM^\top) = \langle M, M \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|M\|_{\text{op}} = \varsigma_1(MM^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \|M\|_\infty = \max_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq l \\ 1 \leq j \leq m}} |M_{i,j}|$$

where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ is the trace for a squared matrix. For two vectors $\gamma, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we say $|\gamma| \geq |\mu|$ if the entries satisfy $|\gamma(i)| \geq |\mu(i)|$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$; we define $|\gamma| \leq |\mu|, \gamma \leq \mu$ similarly. In addition, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $|\gamma| \leq \alpha$ if $|\gamma(i)| \leq \alpha$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Denote \mathfrak{S}_n to be the set of all permutations on $[n]$. For a bijection $\sigma : U \rightarrow V$ and a matrix M with rows and columns indexed by V, W respectively, we define $\sigma \circ M$ to be the matrix indexed by U, W , with entries given by $(\sigma \circ M)_{i,j} = M_{\sigma(i),j}$. For any $d \times l$ matrix M and two index sets $I \subset [d], J \subset [l]$, we denote $M_{I \times J}$ to be the matrix indexed by $I \times J$ with $(M_{I \times J})_{i,j} = M_{i,j}$ for $i \in I, j \in J$. We will use $\mathbb{I}_{d \times d}$ to denote the $d \times d$ identity matrix (and we drop the subscript if the dimension is clear from the context). Similarly, we denote $\mathbb{O}_{m \times d}$ the $m \times d$ zero matrix and denote $\mathbb{J}_{m \times d}$ the $m \times d$ matrix with all entries being 1. The indicator function of sets A is denoted by $\mathbf{1}_A$.

For any two positive sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we write equivalently $a_n = O(b_n)$, $b_n = \Omega(a_n)$, $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \gtrsim a_n$ if there exists a positive absolute constant c such that $a_n/b_n \leq c$ holds for all n . We write $a_n = o(b_n)$, $b_n = \omega(a_n)$, $a_n \ll b_n$, and $b_n \gg a_n$ if $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We write $a_n = \Theta(b_n)$ if both $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$ hold.

2 Algorithms and discussions

In this section we will provide the detailed statement of our algorithm and discuss some intuitions behind it. Our algorithm is a modified version of [22, Algorithm 1]. In fact, one of the key observation in our work is under suitable modifications, we can write [22, Algorithm 1] into a vector-approximate message passing algorithm. We first describe in detail our algorithm, which consists of a few steps including spectral cleaning and preprocessing (see Subsection 2.1), initialization (see Subsection 2.2), spectral subroutine (see Subsection 2.3), vector-approximate passing (see Subsection 2.4) and rounding (see Subsection 2.5). We formally present our algorithm and analyze the time complexity of the algorithm in Subsection 2.6. In Subsection 2.7 we discuss some heuristics behind this algorithm.

2.1 Spectral cleaning and preprocessing

The first step of our algorithm is to make some preprocessing on A', B' for technical convenience. We first make a technical assumption that we only need to consider the case when

ρ is a sufficiently small constant, which can be easily achieved by deliberately add i.i.d. noise to each $\{A'_{i,j}\}$ and $\{B'_{i,j}\}$. Sample i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables $G_{i,j}, H_{i,j}$ and let

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{A}'_{i,j} &= \frac{A'_{i,j} + G_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \widehat{B}_{i,j} = \frac{B'_{i,j} + H_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } i > j, \\ \widehat{A}'_{i,j} &= \frac{A'_{i,j} - G_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \widehat{B}_{i,j} = \frac{B'_{i,j} - H_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } i < j.\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

Note that $(\widehat{A}', \widehat{B}') = (\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}) + (\widehat{E}, \widehat{F})$, where

$$\widehat{A}_{i,j} = \frac{A_{i,j} + G_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \widehat{B}_{i,j} = \frac{B_{i,j} + H_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } i > j,\tag{2.2}$$

$$\widehat{A}_{i,j} = \frac{A_{i,j} - G_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \widehat{B}_{i,j} = \frac{B_{i,j} - H_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } i < j.\tag{2.3}$$

$$\widehat{E}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}E_{i,j}, \quad \widehat{F}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F_{i,j} \text{ for } i > j,\tag{2.4}$$

$$\widehat{E}_{i,j} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}E_{i,j}, \quad \widehat{F}_{i,j} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F_{i,j} \text{ for } i < j.\tag{2.5}$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\{\widehat{A}_{i,j}\}$ and $\{\widehat{B}_{i,j}\}$ are two families of i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Also, we have

$$\text{Cov}(\widehat{A}_{i,j}, \widehat{B}_{i,j}) = \text{Cov}(\widehat{A}_{i,j}, \widehat{B}_{\pi(i), \pi(j)}) = \frac{\rho}{2}.$$

We further employ a ‘‘spectral cleaning’’ procedure proposed in [43] to $\widehat{A}', \widehat{B}'$ respectively. Note in (2.4), (2.5) that \widehat{E}, \widehat{F} are still supported on $Q, R \subset [n]$ with $|Q|, |R| \leq \epsilon n$ respectively. In addition, since \widehat{A}, \widehat{B} are random matrices with i.i.d. sub-Gaussian entries, from [67, Theorem 4.4.5] we see that with probability $1 - o(1)$ we have $\|\widehat{A}\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{B}\|_{\text{op}} \leq (2 + o(1))\sqrt{n}$. Now we introduce the spectral cleaning procedure. Informally speaking, this procedure enables us to zero-out $O(\epsilon n)$ rows and columns of $\widehat{A}', \widehat{B}'$ respectively to get two ‘‘cleaned’’ matrices $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}, \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\|\widehat{\mathcal{A}}\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{\mathcal{B}}\|_{\text{op}} = O(\sqrt{n})$. This spectral cleaning procedure is a modified version of [43, Algorithm 3.7]:

Algorithm 1 Spectral Cleaning

- 1: **Input:** $n \times n$ Matrix M' .
 - 2: Let $\mathcal{M} = M'$.
 - 3: **while** $\|\mathcal{M}\|_{\text{op}} \geq 10\sqrt{n}$ **do**
 - 4: Compute the unit left singular eigenvector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and right singular eigenvector $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ of \mathcal{M} corresponding to the leading singular value.
 - 5: Sample $i \in [n]$ with probability $\frac{v_i^2 + u_i^2}{2}$.
 - 6: Zero-out the i 'th row and column of \mathcal{M} .
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: **Output:** \mathcal{M} .
-

Clearly, by running Algorithm 1 with input $\widehat{A}', \widehat{B}'$ respectively we get two matrices $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}, \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\|\widehat{\mathcal{A}}\|_{\text{op}}, \|\widehat{\mathcal{B}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 10\sqrt{n}$. In addition, denote $S, T \subset [n]$ to be the set of index of $\widehat{A}', \widehat{B}'$ which are zeroed-out by the algorithm, the following lemma (similar to [43, Lemma 3.5]) controls the cardinality of S and T .

Lemma 2.1. *If the input matrix $M' = M + E$ with $\|M\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2\sqrt{n}$ and the support of E (denoted as Q) is bounded by ϵn , then with probability $1 - o(1)$ we have Algorithm 1 terminates in $4\epsilon n$ steps. In particular, with probability $1 - o(1)$ we have $|S|, |T| \leq 4\epsilon n$.*

The proof of Lemma 2.1 is incorporated in Subsection B.1. From now on we will work on $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$.

2.2 Initialization

We first choose the denoiser function which will be used throughout our algorithm.

Definition 2.2. *We choose a smooth function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\varphi(x)$ is analytic for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (i.e., the Taylor expansion of φ at x is valid for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$) and $|\varphi(x)|, |\varphi'(x)|, |\varphi''(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (here 1 is somewhat arbitrarily chosen).
- (2) $\varphi(x) = \varphi(-x)$ and for a standard normal variable X , we have $\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)^2] = 1$.

In addition, for a pair of standard bivariate normal variables (X, Y) with correlation u , we define $\phi : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$\phi(u) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)\varphi(Y)]. \quad (2.6)$$

We need the following properties of $\phi(u)$, whose proof is incorporated in Subsection B.2.

Lemma 2.3. *We have the following results:*

- (1) If we write $\phi(u) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m u^m$, then we have $c_0 = c_1 = 0$ and there exists a constant $\Lambda = \Lambda(\varphi)$ such that $|c_k| \leq \Lambda \cdot 2^k$ for all $k \geq 2$.
- (2) We have $|\phi(u)| \leq \frac{|\phi''(0)|}{2} \cdot u^2$ for all sufficiently small u .

We now describe the initialization. Define

$$\varepsilon_0 = \phi\left(\frac{\rho}{2}\right). \quad (2.7)$$

Also let $K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be a sufficiently large constant depending on ρ such that

$$K_0 \geq 10^{30} \rho^{-30} |\phi''(0)|^4 \Lambda^4 \varepsilon_0^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\log(10^{-30} |\phi''(0)|^2 \Lambda^2 \rho^{20} K_0)}{\log(10^{40} |\phi''(0)|^4 \Lambda^{-4} \rho^{24} K_0 \varepsilon_0^2)} < 1.01. \quad (2.8)$$

We then list all the sequences of length K_0 with distinct elements in $[n]$ as $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_M$ where $M = \mathbf{M}(n, K_0) = n(n-1) \dots (n-K_0+1)$. for each $1 \leq i, j \leq M$, we will run a procedure of initialization and iteration for each $(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$ and we know that for at least one of them (although we cannot decide which one it is *a priori*) we are running an algorithm as if we have K_0 true pairs as seeds (i.e., $\mathbf{V}_j = \pi(\mathbf{V}_i)$ and $\mathbf{V}_i \cap (Q \cup S) = \mathbf{V}_j \cap (R \cup T) = \emptyset$). For notation convenience, when describing the initialization and iteration we will drop i, j from notations, but we should keep in mind that this procedure is applied to each pair $(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$. With this clarified, we take a pair of fixed i, j and denote $\mathbf{V}_i = (u_1, \dots, u_{K_0}), \mathbf{V}_j = (v_1, \dots, v_{K_0})$. Define two $(n-K_0) * K_0$ matrices $f^{(0)}, g^{(0)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i,k}^{(0)} &= \varphi(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{i,u_k}) \text{ for } i \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{V}_i, k \in [K_0]; \\ g_{i,k}^{(0)} &= \varphi(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{i,v_k}) \text{ for } i \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{V}_i, k \in [K_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

In addition, define two $K_0 * K_0$ matrices

$$\Phi^{(0)} = \mathbb{I} \text{ and } \Psi^{(0)} = \varepsilon_0 \mathbb{I}. \quad (2.10)$$

2.3 Spectral subroutine

Before describing the vector-AMP iteration, we need to introduce more notations which will be used to define the AMP-activating function. Recall (2.7), (2.8) and (2.10). We iteratively define

$$K_{t+1} = 10^{-20} \rho^{20} |\phi''(0)|^2 \Lambda^{-2} K_t^2 \text{ for } t \geq 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Now, assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{(t)} &\text{ has } \frac{3K_t}{4} \text{ eigenvalues between } 0.9 \text{ and } 1.1, \\ \Psi^{(t)} &\text{ has } \frac{3K_t}{4} \text{ eigenvalues between } 0.9\varepsilon_t \text{ and } 1.1\varepsilon_t. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

We may write the spectral decomposition

$$\Phi^{(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^{K_t} \lambda_i^{(t)} \nu_i^{(t)} \left(\nu_i^{(t)} \right)^\top \text{ and } \Psi^{(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^{K_t} \mu_i^{(t)} \zeta_i^{(t)} \left(\zeta_i^{(t)} \right)^\top, \quad (2.13)$$

where for $1 \leq i \leq \frac{3K_t}{4}$ we have $\lambda_i^{(t)} \in (0.9, 1.1)$ and $\mu_i^{(t)} \in (0.9\varepsilon_t, 1.1\varepsilon_t)$. As shown in [22, Equations (2.10),(2.11)], we can choose

$$\eta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \eta_{K_t/12}^{(t)} \in \text{span} \left\{ \nu_1^{(t)}, \dots, \nu_{3K_t/4}^{(t)} \right\} \cap \text{span} \left\{ \zeta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \zeta_{3K_t/4}^{(t)} \right\}$$

such that

$$\eta_i^{(t)} \Phi^{(t)} \eta_j^{(t)} = \eta_i^{(t)} \Psi^{(t)} \eta_j^{(t)} = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j, \quad (2.14)$$

$$\eta_i^{(t)} \Phi^{(t)} \eta_i^{(t)} = 1, 2\varepsilon_t \geq \eta_i^{(t)} \Psi^{(t)} \eta_i^{(t)} \geq 0.5\varepsilon_t \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq K_t/12. \quad (2.15)$$

Set $\Xi^{(t)}$ to be a $K_t * \frac{K_t}{12}$ matrix such that

$$\Xi^{(t)} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1^{(t)} & \dots & \eta_{\frac{K_t}{12}}^{(t)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.16)$$

In addition, for each $t \geq 0$ we sample $\beta^{(t)}$ to be a $\frac{K_t}{12} * K_{t+1}$ matrix such that $\beta_{i,j}^{(t)}$ are i.i.d. uniform random variables in $\{-\sqrt{12/K_t}, +\sqrt{12/K_t}\}$. Denote $\beta^{(t)} = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{K_{t+1}}^{(t)})$ and we further define two $K_{t+1} * K_{t+1}$ matrices by (recall (2.6) and $\|\beta_i^{(t)}\| = 1$)

$$\Phi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} = \phi\left((\beta_i^{(t)})^\top \beta_j^{(t)}\right), \Psi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} = \phi\left(\frac{\rho}{2} \cdot (\beta_i^{(t)})^\top (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \beta_j^{(t)}\right). \quad (2.17)$$

And we define

$$\varepsilon_{t+1} = \phi\left(\frac{\rho}{2} \cdot \frac{12}{K_t} \text{tr}\left((\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}\right)\right). \quad (2.18)$$

Note that using (2.14) and (2.15), we see that $(\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}$ is a $\frac{K_t}{12} * \frac{K_t}{12}$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries lie in $(0.9\varepsilon_t, 1.1\varepsilon_t)$. Thus we have

$$\frac{12}{K_t} \text{tr}\left((\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}\right) \in (0.9\varepsilon_t, 1.1\varepsilon_t).$$

Using Item (2) in Lemma 2.3, we see that when ρ is sufficiently small we have

$$\varepsilon_{t+1} \geq \frac{\rho^2 |\phi''(0)|}{16} \cdot \varepsilon_t^2. \quad (2.19)$$

We now state the following lemma which helps us to inductively verify (2.12), which makes our algorithm well-defined.

Lemma 2.4. *Let K_t, ε_t be initialized as in (2.8), (2.7) and inductively defined as in (2.11), (2.18). Suppose $\Phi^{(t)}, \Psi^{(t)}$ satisfy (2.12). Then with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ over $\beta^{(t)}$ we have $\Phi^{(t+1)}, \Psi^{(t+1)}$ satisfy (2.12).*

The proof of Lemma 2.4 is incorporated in Subsection B.3. Based on Lemma 2.4, since $K_t, \varepsilon_t, \Phi^{(t)}, \Psi^{(t)}$ are accessible by our algorithm, we can resample $\beta^{(t)}$ if the condition (2.12) is not satisfied. This will increase the sampling complexity by a constant factor thanks to Lemma 2.4. For this reason in what follows, we assume that we have performed resampling until (2.12) is satisfied.

2.4 Vector-approximate message passing

In this subsection we introduce the vector-approximate message passing iteration. We remind here again that we will run the iteration procedure for all pairs V_i, V_j . Recall (2.9). Define iteratively

$$\widehat{h}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus V_i \times [n] \setminus V_i)} \widehat{f}^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}, \quad \widehat{\ell}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{([n] \setminus V_j \times [n] \setminus V_j)} \widehat{g}^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}; \quad (2.20)$$

$$\widehat{f}^{(t+1)} = \varphi \circ (\widehat{h}^{(t)} \beta^{(t)}), \quad \widehat{g}^{(t+1)} = \varphi \circ (\widehat{\ell}^{(t)} \beta^{(t)}), \quad (2.21)$$

where for a matrix $A = (A_{i,j})$ we use $\varphi \circ (A)$ to denote the matrix $(\varphi(A_{i,j}))$.

Remark 2.5. We remark here that the iteration (2.20), (2.21) is intrinsically the same as the iteration in [22, Equation (2.13), (2.25)]. The main change is that in [22] we choose $\varphi(x) = \mathbf{1}_{|x| \geq 1} - \alpha$, but in this paper we choose a smooth function φ to further assist the analysis (although we also make some other slight modifications along the way). This change is helpful when we establish Lemma 3.4 later.

To this end, define

$$t^* = \min \left\{ t \geq 0 : K_t \geq (\log n)^{1.1} \right\}. \quad (2.22)$$

Using (2.11) we see that

$$(\log n)^{1.1} \leq K_{t^*} \leq (\log n)^{2.2}. \quad (2.23)$$

Recall that for each $1 \leq i, j \leq M$, we run the procedure of initialization and then run the AMP-iteration up to time t^* , and then we construct a permutation $\pi_{i,j}$ (with respect to $\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j$) as follows. For $\mathbf{V}_i = (u_1, \dots, u_{K_0})$ and $\mathbf{V}_j = (v_1, \dots, v_{K_0})$ we set $\pi_{i,j}(u_k) = v_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq K_0$. And we let the restriction for $\pi_{i,j}$ on $[n] \setminus \mathbf{V}_i$ to be the solution of

$$\max \left\langle \widehat{h}^{(t^*)}, \sigma \circ \widetilde{\ell}^{(t^*)} \right\rangle \text{ for all bijections } \sigma : [n] \setminus \mathbf{V}_i \rightarrow [n] \setminus \mathbf{V}_j. \quad (2.24)$$

Note that the above optimization problem (2.24) is a *linear assignment problem*, which can be solved in time $O(n^3)$ by a linear program (LP) over doubly stochastic matrices or by the Hungarian algorithm [48].

We say a pair of sequences $\mathbf{V}_i = (u_1, \dots, u_{K_0})$ and $\mathbf{V}_j = (v_1, \dots, v_{K_0})$ is a *good pair* if

$$\mathbf{V}_i \cap (Q \cup S) = \mathbf{V}_j \cap (R \cup T) = \emptyset \text{ and } v_j = \pi(u_j) \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq K_0. \quad (2.25)$$

The success of our algorithm lies in the following proposition which states that starting from a good pair we have that $\pi_{i,j}$ correctly recovers almost all vertices.

Proposition 2.6. For any $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \subset [n]$ with cardinality K_0 , define $\pi(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = \pi_{i,j}$ if $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = (\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{V}_j)$. For a good pair \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} we have

$$\#\{v : \pi(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})(v) = \pi(v)\} \geq \left(1 - \frac{10}{\log n}\right)n. \quad (2.26)$$

2.5 Rounding

In this subsection, we employ a seeded matching algorithm [3] (see also [59]) to enhance an almost exact matching (which we denote as $\tilde{\pi}$ in what follows) to an exact matching. Our matching algorithm is a simplified version of [3, Algorithm 4]. Let

$$\alpha = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \text{ where } X \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (2.27)$$

$$\psi(\rho) = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 1, Y \geq 1) \text{ where } (X, Y) \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \rho & \rho \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right). \quad (2.28)$$

Algorithm 2 Seeded Matching Algorithm

- 1: **Input:** A triple $(A', B', \tilde{\pi}, \rho)$ where (A', B') are corrupted Gaussian Wigner model with correlation ρ , and $\tilde{\pi}$ agrees with π on $1 - o(1)$ fraction of vertices.
- 2: Define α as in (2.27) and define $\psi(\rho)$ as in (2.28).
- 3: Define $\Delta = \frac{\psi(\rho)n}{10}$ and set $\hat{\pi} = \tilde{\pi}$.
- 4: For $u, v \in [n]$, define their $\hat{\pi}$ -neighborhood

$$N_{\hat{\pi}}(u, v) = \sum_{w \in [n]} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{A'_{u,w} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{B'_{v, \hat{\pi}(w)} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right).$$

- 5: Repeat the following: if there exists a pair u, v such that $N_{\hat{\pi}}(u, v) \geq \Delta$ and $N_{\hat{\pi}}(u, \hat{\pi}(u)), N_{\hat{\pi}}(\hat{\pi}^{-1}(v), v) < \frac{\Delta}{10}$, then modify $\hat{\pi}$ to map u to v and map $\hat{\pi}^{-1}(v)$ to $\hat{\pi}(u)$; otherwise, move to Step 6.
 - 6: **Output:** $\hat{\pi}$.
-

Lemma 2.7. *With probability $1 - o(1)$, for all possible $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ that agrees with π on at least $(1 - \frac{10}{\log n})n$ coordinates, we have $\hat{\pi} = \pi$.*

The proof of Lemma 2.7 is incorporated in Subsection B.4. At this point, we can run Algorithm 2 for each $\pi_{i,j}$ (which serves as input $\tilde{\pi}$), and obtain the corresponding refined matching $\hat{\pi}_{i,j}$ (which is the output $\hat{\pi}$). By Lemma 2.7 and Proposition 2.6, we see that $\hat{\pi}_{i,j} = \pi$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. Finally, we set

$$\hat{\pi}_{\diamond} = \arg \max_{\hat{\pi}_{i,j}} \left\{ \sum_{(u,v) \in E(V)} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{A'_{u,v} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{B'_{\hat{\pi}_{i,j}(u), \hat{\pi}_{i,j}(v)} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right) \right\}. \quad (2.29)$$

Our main result is the following theorem, which states that the statistics achieves exact matching with probability $1 - o(1)$.

Theorem 2.8. *With probability $1 - o(1)$, we have $\hat{\pi}_{\diamond} = \pi$.*

2.6 Formal description of the algorithm and running time analysis

We are now ready to present our algorithm formally.

Algorithm 3 Robust Gaussian Matrix Matching Algorithm

- 1: Define \hat{A}', \hat{B}' as in (2.1).
- 2: Run Algorithm 1 with input \hat{A}', \hat{B}' respectively; the output is denoted as $\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mathcal{B}}$.
- 3: Define $\phi, \mathbb{M}, K_0, \varepsilon_0, \Phi^{(0)}, \Psi^{(0)}$ as above.
- 4: Define t^* as in (2.22).

- 5: For $1 \leq t \leq t^*$ calculate $\Phi^{(t)}, \Psi^{(t)}, \Xi^{(t)}$ according to (2.17), (2.16); sample $\beta^{(t)}$ according to Lemma 2.4.
- 6: List all sequences with K_0 distinct elements in $[n]$ by S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M .
- 7: **for** $i, j = 1, \dots, M$ **do**
- 8: Define $\hat{f}^{(0)}, \hat{g}^{(0)}$ as in (2.9).
- 9: Set $\pi_m(u_j) = v_j$ where u_j, v_j are the j -th coordinate of A_i, A_j respectively.
- 10: **while** $K_t \leq \exp\{(\log \log n)^2\}$ **do**
- 11: Calculate $K_{t+1}, \varepsilon_{t+1}$ according to (2.11), (2.18).
- 12: Define $\hat{h}^{(t)}, \hat{\ell}^{(t)}, \hat{f}^{(t+1)}, \hat{g}^{(t+1)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq K_{t+1}$ according to (2.21), (2.20);
- 13: **end while**
- 14: Suppose we stop at $t = t^*$;
- 15: Solve the linear assignment problem; the solution is denoted as $\pi_{i,j}$.
- 16: Run Algorithm 2 with input $\pi_{i,j}$ and obtain $\hat{\pi}_{i,j}$.
- 17: **end for**
- 18: Find $\pi_{i,j}^*$ which maximizes (2.29).
- 19: **return** $\hat{\pi} = \pi_{i,j}^*$.

We now show that Algorithm 3 runs in polynomial time.

Proposition 2.9. *The running time for computing each $\pi_{i,j}$ is $O(n^{3+o(1)})$. Furthermore, the running time for Algorithm 3 is $O(n^{2K_0+3+o(1)})$.*

The proof of Proposition 2.9 is incorporated in Subsection B.5. Also, it is straightforward to verify that Theorem 1.3 follows directly from Theorem 2.8 and Proposition 2.9.

2.7 Discussions

Before moving to the formal proof of Theorem 2.8, we feel that it is a bit necessary to discuss some heuristics behind this algorithm. The main intuition is that we expect the following concentration phenomenon. Without losing of generality, we may assume that $\pi = \text{id}$. Informally speaking, we expect the following results hold:

$$(\hat{f}^{(t)})^\top \hat{f}^{(t)}, (\hat{g}^{(t)})^\top \hat{g}^{(t)} \approx n\Phi^{(t)}, (\hat{f}^{(t)})^\top \hat{g}^{(t)} \approx n\Psi^{(t)}. \quad (2.30)$$

To get a feeling about (2.30), let us assume that (2.30) holds at time t and try to verify (2.30) for $t+1$ in a (highly) non-rigorous way. We first regard $\hat{f}^{(t)}, \hat{g}^{(t)}$ as fixed and simply ignore the adversary corruption (i.e., by viewing $E, F = \mathbb{O}$), we see that $\hat{h}^{(t)}$ and $\hat{\ell}^{(t)}$ are two Gaussian matrices, with sample covariance structure given by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{h}^{(t)})^\top \hat{h}^{(t)} \right] \stackrel{(2.20)}{\approx} \frac{1}{n} (\Xi^{(t)})^\top (\hat{f}^{(t)})^\top \hat{f}^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \approx (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Phi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} = \mathbb{I}_{K_t/12}; \quad (2.31)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{\ell}^{(t)})^\top \hat{\ell}^{(t)} \right] \stackrel{(2.20)}{\approx} \frac{1}{n} (\Xi^{(t)})^\top (\hat{g}^{(t)})^\top \hat{g}^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \approx (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Phi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} = \mathbb{I}_{K_t/12}; \quad (2.32)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{h}^{(t)})^\top \hat{\ell}^{(t)} \right] \stackrel{(2.20)}{\approx} \frac{1}{n} (\Xi^{(t)})^\top (\hat{f}^{(t)})^\top \hat{g}^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \approx (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}. \quad (2.33)$$

(also note that by (2.16) and Lemma 2.4, we have $(\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries lie in $(0.9\varepsilon_t, 1.1\varepsilon_t)$) Thus, we further expect that

$$\begin{aligned} ((\widehat{f}^{(t+1)})^\top \widehat{f}^{(t+1)})_{i,j} &= \sum_u \widehat{f}_{u,i}^{(t+1)} \widehat{f}_{u,j}^{(t+1)} \stackrel{(2.21)}{=} \sum_u \varphi\left(\sum_k \widehat{h}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)}\right) \varphi\left(\sum_k \widehat{h}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)}\right) \\ &\approx n \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(X)\varphi(Y) : X = \sum_k \widehat{h}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)}, Y = \sum_k \widehat{h}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where in the “ \approx ” we use the law of large numbers. Note that X, Y are approximately two normal random variables with variance and covariance given by

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2], \mathbb{E}[Y^2] \approx (\beta_i^{(t)})^\top \beta_j^{(t)} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[XY] \approx (\beta_i^{(t)})^\top (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \beta_j^{(t)}.$$

Combining (2.17), we expect that (2.30) holds for $t+1$. Now we focus on time t^* . Using (2.31)–(2.33), we see that at time t^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h_i^{(t^*)}, \ell_i^{(t^*)} \rangle &\text{ has variance } K_{t^*} \text{ and mean } K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}; \\ \langle h_i^{(t^*)}, \ell_j^{(t^*)} \rangle &\text{ has variance } K_{t^*} \text{ and mean } 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the key quantity is the signal-to-noise ratio $\frac{(K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*})^2}{K_{t^*}} = K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}^2$. Using (2.11) and (2.19), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{t+1} \varepsilon_{t+1}^2 &\geq \left(10^{-20} \rho^{20} |\phi''(0)|^2 \Lambda^{-2} K_t^2\right) \cdot \left(\frac{\rho^2 |\phi''(0)|}{16} \varepsilon_t^2\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{10^{-20} \rho^{24} |\phi''(0)|^4 \Lambda^{-4}}{256} (K_t \varepsilon_t^2)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

Using (2.8) and (2.7), we see that $K_0 \varepsilon_0^2 \geq 10^{30} \Lambda^4 \rho^{-30} |\phi''(0)|^{-4}$ and thus $K_t \varepsilon_t^2$ is strictly increasing in t . In addition, from (2.22) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}^2 &\geq \left(\frac{10^{-20} \rho^{24} |\phi''(0)|^4 \Lambda^{-4}}{256} K_0 \varepsilon_0^2\right)^{2^{t^*}} \stackrel{(2.8)}{\geq} \left(10^{-20} \rho^{20} |\phi''(0)|^2 \Lambda^{-2} K_0\right)^{2^{t^*}/1.01} \\ &\stackrel{(2.11)}{\geq} K_{t^*}^{1/1.01} \geq (\log n)^{1.01}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

which implies by a simple union bound that at t^* the signal strength is strong enough to guarantee the correctness of $\widehat{\pi}$ on “most” of the coordinates.

At this point, it seems the major remaining challenge is to control the influence of the adversarial corruption E, F and the correlation among different iterative steps. However, let us stress that this challenge has quite some novel features. Our method to control the corruption E, F is relatively straightforward, where the main approach is to establish a suitable “comparison” theorem between the output of our algorithm in the “clean” case

(where $E, F = \mathbb{O}$) and the “corrupted” case. We now move to control the correlation among different iterative steps. A natural attempt (which is used quite a lot in the analysis of approximate message passing literature; see, e.g., [4]) is to employ Gaussian projections to remove the influence of conditioning on outcomes in previous steps. This is indeed very useful since all the conditioning can be expressed as conditioning on linear combinations of Gaussian variables. Although it is a highly non-trivial task to generalize this approach for analyzing AMP-type algorithm from one “clean” random matrix to two matrices having sophisticated correlation structures, it is doable as demonstrated in [22]. We also remark that usually this method suggests to add a suitable “Onsager correction term” in the AMP-iteration (2.20), (2.21); however, as we shall see in Section 3 in our case our delicate spectral design will make the Onsager correction term to be zero, which implies that the correlation among different iterative steps is indeed vanishing.

3 Proof of the main results

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 2.8. Without losing of generality, we may assume that

$$\frac{1}{(\log n)^{100}} \leq \epsilon = o\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^{20}}\right). \quad (3.1)$$

To this end, we first establish the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Recall (2.27). With probability $1 - o(1)$, for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ we have*

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{A'_{i,j} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{B'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right) \geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{A'_{i,j} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{B'_{\sigma(i),\sigma(j)} \geq 1\}} - \alpha \right).$$

The proof of Lemma 3.1 is incorporated in Subsection B.6. Provided with Lemma 3.1, we see that once we can show Proposition 2.6, we can use Lemma 2.7 to deduce that we have $\hat{\pi}_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}} = \pi$ for all good pair $(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{j}})$ and then we can deduce Theorem 2.8 using Lemma 3.1. The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2.6.

Without losing of generality, we may assume throughout the rest of this paper that $\pi = \text{id}$. To this end, we fix a good pair (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) and recall that $A' = A + E$ and $B' = B + F$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{i,j} &= \frac{A_{i,j} + G_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \mathcal{B}_{i,j} = \frac{B_{i,j} + H_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } i > j, \\ \mathcal{A}_{i,j} &= \frac{A_{i,j} - G_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \mathcal{B}_{i,j} = \frac{B_{i,j} - H_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ for } i < j. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

In addition, define $(f^{(0)}, g^{(0)}) = (\hat{f}^{(0)}, \hat{g}^{(0)})$ and let

$$h^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus \mathbf{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U})} f^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}, \quad \ell^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathcal{B}_{([n] \setminus \mathbf{V} \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{V})} g^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)}; \quad (3.3)$$

$$f^{(t+1)} = \varphi \circ (h^{(t)} \beta^{(t)}), \quad g^{(t+1)} = \varphi \circ (\ell^{(t)} \beta^{(t)}), \quad (3.4)$$

Our approach is to first control of “cleaned” iteration $(f^{(t)}, g^{(t)}, h^{(t)}, \ell^{(t)})$ in a delicate way and then establish proper “comparison” results to transfer our knowledge on $(f^{(t)}, g^{(t)}, h^{(t)}, \ell^{(t)})$ to $(\widehat{f}^{(t)}, \widehat{g}^{(t)}, \widehat{h}^{(t)}, \widehat{\ell}^{(t)})$. To this end, we first show the following lemma. Write

$$\Delta_t = n^{-0.1} (\log n)^{10t} \prod_{i \leq t} K_i^{100} \quad (3.5)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq t^*$.

Lemma 3.2. *Denote \mathcal{E}_t to be the following event:*

- (1) $\|\mathbb{J}_{(1 \times [n] \cup \cup)} f^{(s)}\|_\infty, \|\mathbb{J}_{(1 \times [n] \cup \cup)} f^{(s)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta_s n$ for $s \leq t$.
- (2) $\|(f^{(s)})^\top f^{(s)} - \Phi^{(s)}\|_\infty, \|(f^{(s)})^\top f^{(s)} - \Phi^{(s)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta_s n$ for $s \leq t$.
- (3) $\|(f^{(s)})^\top g^{(s)} - \Psi^{(s)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta_s n$ for $s \leq t$.
- (4) $\|(f^{(s)})^\top g^{(r)}\|_\infty, \|(f^{(r)})^\top g^{(s)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta_{\max(s,r)} n$ for $s \neq r \leq t$.
- (5) $\|f_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\text{HS}}, \|g_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 100 \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n}$ for all $|W| \leq 10\epsilon n$.
- (6) $\|h_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\text{HS}}, \|\ell_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 100 \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n}$ for all $|W| \leq 10\epsilon n$.

We then have

$$\mathbb{P}(\cap_{0 \leq t \leq t^*} \mathcal{E}_t) = 1 - o(1). \quad (3.6)$$

The proof of Lemma 3.2 is incorporated in Section A. In fact, it has been shown in [22, Proposition 3.4] that Items (1)–(4) hold for all $0 \leq t \leq t^*$ with probability $1 - o(1)$ (although we need to make some slight modifications since we slightly simplified the iteration process). The main effort in this paper is to establish Items (5), (6). We also need the following lemma which controls the behavior of $h^{(t^*)}, \ell^{(t^*)}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Denote $h^{(t^*)} = (h_1^{(t^*)}, \dots, h_n^{(t^*)})^\top$ and $\ell^{(t^*)} = (\ell_1^{(t^*)}, \dots, \ell_n^{(t^*)})^\top$. With probability $1 - o(1)$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h_i^{(t^*)}, \ell_i^{(t^*)} \rangle &\geq \frac{9}{10} K_{t^*} \epsilon_{t^*} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \\ \text{and } \langle h_i^{(t^*)}, \ell_j^{(t^*)} \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{10} K_{t^*} \epsilon_{t^*} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

We note that Lemma 3.3 has been established in [22, Subsection 3.5], and we omit further details here of simplicity. Now, in order to prove Proposition 2.6, we need to establish the following lemma which shows that $(\widehat{f}^{(t)}, \widehat{g}^{(t)}, \widehat{h}^{(t)}, \widehat{\ell}^{(t)})$ is close to $(f^{(t)}, g^{(t)}, h^{(t)}, \ell^{(t)})$ in certain sense.

Lemma 3.4. *Define*

$$\aleph_t = \prod_{s \leq t} \left(1000 \log(\epsilon^{-1})^2 K_s \right) \quad (3.7)$$

Under $\cap_{0 \leq t \leq t^} \mathcal{E}_t$, we have the following results: for all $0 \leq t \leq t^*$*

$$\|\widehat{f}^{(t)} - f^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}}, \|\widehat{g}^{(t)} - g^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \aleph_t \cdot \sqrt{\epsilon n}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\|\widehat{h}^{(t)} - h^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}}, \|\widehat{\ell}^{(t)} - \ell^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 1000 \aleph_t \sqrt{K_t \log(\epsilon^{-1})} \cdot \sqrt{\epsilon n}, \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. Our proof is based on induction on t . Recall that we have $\widehat{f}^{(0)} = f^{(0)}$ and $\widehat{g}^{(0)} = g^{(0)}$. Now suppose (3.8) holds for t . Recall from (2.16) that the columns of $\Xi^{(t)}$ are unit vectors, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \|\widehat{h}^{(t)} - h^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\stackrel{(2.20), (3.3)}{=} \left\| \left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} \widehat{f}^{(t)} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} f^{(t)} \right) \Xi^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} \widehat{f}^{(t)} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} f^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \cdot \|\Xi^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{K_t} \cdot \left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} \widehat{f}^{(t)} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} f^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

In addition, using triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.10) &\leq \sqrt{K_t} \left(\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} (\widehat{f}^{(t)} - f^{(t)}) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \left\| (\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})}) f^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{K_t} \left(\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} \right\|_{\text{op}} \|\widehat{f}^{(t)} - f^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \left\| (\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})}) f^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{K_t} \left(10 \aleph_t \cdot n \sqrt{\epsilon} + \left\| (\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})}) f^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where in the last inequality we use $\|\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\widehat{\mathcal{A}}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 10\sqrt{n}$ and the induction hypothesis. Recall (2.2)–(2.5). Also recall (3.2) and (2.1), we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} - \mathcal{A}_{([n] \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} = \begin{cases} \frac{\widehat{E}_{i,j} + \mathcal{A}_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, & (i, j) \in (Q \setminus S) \times (Q \setminus S); \\ \frac{\mathcal{A}_{i,j}}{\sqrt{2}}, & i \in S \text{ or } j \in S, (i, j) \notin (Q \setminus S) \times (Q \setminus S); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus \mathbb{U} \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U})} - \mathcal{A}_{(Q \cup S \setminus \mathbb{U}) \times (Q \cup S \setminus \mathbb{U})} \right) \widehat{f}^{(t)} \\ &= \widehat{E}_{(Q \setminus S) \times (Q \setminus S)} f_{(Q \setminus S) \times [K_t]}^{(t)} + \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus (\mathbb{U} \cap S)) \times S} f_{S \times [K_t]}^{(t)} + \mathcal{A}_{S \times [n] \setminus \mathbb{U}} f^{(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Note that $\widehat{E}_{(Q \setminus S) \times (Q \setminus S)} = \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{(Q \setminus S) \times (Q \setminus S)} - \mathcal{A}_{(Q \setminus S) \times (Q \setminus S)}$, we then have

$$\|\widehat{E}_{(Q \cap S) \times (Q \cap S)}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\widehat{\mathcal{A}}\|_{\text{op}} + \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 20\sqrt{n}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| E_{(QNS) \times (QNS)} f_{(QNS) \times [K_t]}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \left\| E_{(QNS) \times (QNS)} \right\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \left\| f_{(QNS) \times [K_t]}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq 20\sqrt{n} \cdot 10\sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n} = 200n\sqrt{\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})K_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where in the second inequality we used Item (5) in Lemma 3.2. Similarly, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus (UN_S)) \times S} f_{S \times [K_t]}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &\leq \left\| \mathcal{A}_{([n] \setminus (UN_S)) \times S} \right\|_{\text{op}} \left\| f_{S \times [K_t]}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{n} \left\| f_{S \times [K_t]}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 20n\sqrt{\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})K_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Finally, we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{A}_{S \times [n] \setminus U} f^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \stackrel{(2.20)}{=} \sqrt{n} \cdot \left\| h_{S \times [n] \setminus U}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 10n\sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})}. \quad (3.15)$$

Plugging (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15) into (3.12) we get that

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{([n] \setminus U) \times [n] \setminus U} - \mathcal{A}_{(QUS \setminus U) \times (QUS \setminus U)} \widehat{f}^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 300n\sqrt{\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})K_t}$$

Combined with (3.11), we see that

$$\left\| \widehat{h}^{(t)} - h^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 1000\aleph_t \cdot \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n}. \quad (3.16)$$

Similarly we can show $\left\| \widehat{\ell}^{(t)} - \ell^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 1000\aleph_t \cdot \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n}$. Thus we have (3.9) holds for t . Recall (2.20) and (3.3). Using the fact that φ' is uniformly bounded by 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{f}^{(t+1)} - f^{(t+1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{K_{t+1}} \left(\varphi(h^{(t)} \beta^{(t)})_{i,j} - \varphi(\widehat{h}^{(t)} \beta^{(t)})_{i,j} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{K_{t+1}} \left((h^{(t)} \beta^{(t)})_{i,j} - (\widehat{h}^{(t)} \beta^{(t)})_{i,j} \right)^2 \\ &= \left\| (\widehat{h}^{(t)} - h^{(t)}) \beta^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \left\| \widehat{h}^{(t)} - h^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \left\| \beta^{(t)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ &\leq K_{t+1} \cdot \left(1000\aleph_t \cdot \sqrt{K_t \epsilon (\log(\epsilon^{-1})n)} \right)^2 \stackrel{(3.7)}{\leq} \aleph_{t+1}^2 \epsilon n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

We can similarly show that

$$\left\| \widehat{\ell}^{(t+1)} - \ell^{(t+1)} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \aleph_{t+1}^2 \epsilon n.$$

Thus we have (3.8) holds for $t+1$. This completes our induction. \square

Now we can present the proof of Proposition 2.6.

Proof of Proposition 2.6. Note that using Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\|\widehat{h}^{(t^*)} - h^{(t^*)}\|_{\mathbb{F}}, \|\widehat{\ell}^{(t^*)} - \ell^{(t^*)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \aleph_{t^*} \sqrt{\epsilon n} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{t^*} \sqrt{n}}{10000(\log n)^2},$$

where in the last inequality we use the fact that $\epsilon = o(\frac{1}{(\log n)^{20}})$, $t^* = O(\log \log \log n)$ and

$$\aleph_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}^{-1} \stackrel{(2.11), (2.35)}{\leq} K_{t^*}^2 \log(\epsilon^{-1})^{2t^*} \stackrel{(2.22)}{\leq} (\log n)^5 \ll \epsilon^{-1/2}.$$

Thus, using Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\#\left\{i : \|\widehat{h}_i^{(t^*)} - h_i^{(t^*)}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_{t^*}}{100}\right\}, \#\left\{i : \|\widehat{\ell}_i^{(t^*)} - \ell_i^{(t^*)}\| \leq \frac{K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}}{100}\right\} \leq \frac{n}{\log n}. \quad (3.18)$$

Recall Lemmas 3.3. We define \mathbf{U} to be the collection of $u \in [n]$ such that

$$\langle \widehat{h}_u^{(t^*)}, \widehat{\ell}_u^{(t^*)} \rangle < \frac{K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}}{2},$$

and we define \mathbf{E} to be the collection of directed edges $(u, w) \in [n] \times [n]$ (with $u \neq w$) such that

$$\langle \widehat{h}_u^{(t^*)}, \widehat{\ell}_w^{(t^*)} \rangle > \frac{K_{t^*} \varepsilon_{t^*}}{8}.$$

It is clear that \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{E} will potentially lead to mis-matching for our algorithm in the finishing stage. In addition, from (3.18) we have the following observations:

- (I) $|\mathbf{U}| \leq \frac{n}{\log n}$;
- (II) All subset of \mathbf{E} has cardinality at most $\frac{n}{\log n}$ if each vertex is incident to at most one edge in this subset.

To this end, Let $V_{\text{fail}} = \{v \in [n] : \widehat{\pi}(v) \neq \pi(v)\} = \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$. Note that if $\widehat{\pi}(u) = v$ for some $u \neq v$, at least one of the the following four events

$$\{u \in \mathbf{U}\}, \{v \in \mathbf{U}\}, \cup_{w \in [n] \setminus \{u\}} \{(u, w) \in \mathbf{E}\}, \cup_{w \in [n] \setminus \{v\}} \{(w, v) \in \mathbf{E}\}$$

must occurs, since otherwise by setting

$$\widetilde{\pi}(u) = u, \widetilde{\pi}(\widehat{\pi}^{-1}(u)) = v \text{ and } \widetilde{\pi}(w) = \widehat{\pi}(w) \text{ otherwise}$$

will makes

$$\langle \widehat{h}^{(t^*)}, \widehat{\pi} \circ \widehat{\ell}^{(t^*)} \rangle < \langle \widehat{h}^{(t^*)}, \widetilde{\pi} \circ \widehat{\ell}^{(t^*)} \rangle.$$

We then construct a directed graph \vec{H} on vertices $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m\} \cup \mathbf{U}$ as follows: for each $v \in \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m\} \cup \mathbf{U}$, if the finishing step matches v to some $\pi(u)$ with $u \neq v$ and $(u, v) \in \mathbf{E}$, then we connect a directed edge from v to u . Note our algorithm will not match a vertex twice, so all vertices have in-degree and out-degree both at most 1. Thus, the directed graph \vec{H} is a collection of non-overlapping directed chains. Since there are at least $\frac{m-|\mathbf{U}|}{2}$ edges in \vec{H} (recall that each $w_k \notin \mathbf{U}$ is incident to at least one edge in \vec{H}), we can get a matching with cardinality at least $\frac{m-|\mathbf{U}|}{4}$. By Observation (II), we see that

$$\frac{m - |\mathbf{U}|}{4} \leq \frac{n}{\log n}.$$

Combined with Observation (I), we have $m \leq 5n/\log n$, completing the proof. \square

Acknowledgment. The author thanks Hang Du and Shuyang Gong for stimulating discussions. The author is partially supported by National Key R&D program of China (No. 2023YFA1010103) and NSFC Key Program (Project No. 12231002).

A Proof of Lemma 3.2

In this section, we will prove Lemma 3.2 by induction. We first show that Items (1)–(5) holds for time $t = 0$. Recall (2.9) and $(f^{(0)}, g^{(0)}) = (\widehat{f}^{(0)}, \widehat{g}^{(0)})$. We then have (denote $\mathbf{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_{K_0}\}$ and $\mathbf{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_{K_0}\}$)

$$\left(\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} f^{(0)}\right)_k = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{i, u_k}) = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi(\mathcal{A}_{i, u_k}),$$

where in the last equality we use the fact that $\mathbf{U} \cap (Q \cup S) = \emptyset$ and thus $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{i, u_k} = \mathcal{A}_{i, u_k}$. Note that from Definition 2.2, we have

$$\left\{ \varphi(\mathcal{A}_{i, u_k}) : i \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U} \right\}$$

are i.i.d. bounded random variables with mean zero and variance 1. Thus, using Bernstein's inequality [28, Theorem 1.4] we see that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} f^{(0)}\right|_k > \Delta_0 n\right) \leq e^{-n^{0.5}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Thus, from a union bound on k we see that $\|\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} f^{(0)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta_0 n$ holds with probability $1 - O(e^{-n^{0.1}})$. Similarly, we can show that $\|\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} g^{(0)}\|_\infty \leq \Delta_0 n$ holds with probability $1 - O(e^{-n^{0.1}})$ and thus Item (1) holds for $t = 0$ with probability $1 - O(e^{-n^{0.1}})$. In addition, recall (2.10) we see that

$$\left((f^{(0)})^\top f^{(0)} - \Phi^{(0)}\right)_{i,j}, \left((g^{(0)})^\top g^{(0)} - \Phi^{(0)}\right)_{i,j}, \left((f^{(0)})^\top g^{(0)} - \Psi^{(0)}\right)_{i,j}$$

can be written as sums of i.i.d. mean-zero bounded random variables. For instance,

$$\left((f^{(0)})^\top g^{(0)} - \Psi^{(0)} \right)_{i,i} = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \left(\varphi(\mathcal{A}_{i,u_k}) \varphi(\mathcal{B}_{i,u_k}) - \varepsilon_0 \right)$$

(recall that we have assumed $\pi = \text{id}$ and $\mathbf{V} = \pi(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{U}$). Thus we can obtain similar concentration bounds as in (A.1). This yields that Items (2)–(4) hold for $t = 0$ with probability $1 - O(e^{-n^{0.1}})$. Finally, using Bernstein’s inequality again, for all $|W| \leq \epsilon n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\|f_{W \times [K_0]}^{(0)}\|_{\text{F}} > 10\sqrt{K_0 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{1 \leq k \leq K_0} \sum_{i \in W} \varphi(\mathcal{A}_{i,u_k})^2 > 100K_0 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-90K_0 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the enumerations of W is bounded by

$$\sum_{k \leq \epsilon n} \binom{n}{k} \leq \exp(2\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n),$$

we conclude by a union bound that we have $\|f_{W \times [K_0]}^{(0)}\|_{\text{F}} \leq 10\sqrt{K_0 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n}$ with probability $1 - O(e^{-\epsilon n})$. We can similarly show that $\|g_{W \times [K_0]}^{(0)}\|_{\text{F}} \leq 10\sqrt{K_0 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n}$ with probability $1 - O(e^{-\epsilon n})$. In conclusion, we have shown that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\text{Items (1)–(5) hold for } t = 0 \right) \geq 1 - O(e^{-n^{0.1}}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now we assume that Items (1)–(5) in Lemma 3.2 hold up to time t and Item (6) holds up to time $t - 1$ (we denote this event as \tilde{E}_t). Our goal is to bound the probability that Item (6) holds for time t and Items (1)–(5) hold for time $t + 1$. To this end, define

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma \left\{ f^{(s)}, g^{(s)}, h^{(r)}, \ell^{(r)} : s \leq t, r \leq t - 1 \right\}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We will use the following key observation constructed in [22], which characterized the conditional distribution of $h^{(t)}$ and $\ell^{(t)}$ given \mathcal{F}_t .

Claim A.1. *We have*

$$(h^{(t)}, \ell^{(t)}) \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathcal{G}^{(t)} + \delta^{(t)}, \mathcal{H}^{(t)} + \kappa^{(t)}),$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{u,i}^{(t)}, \mathcal{H}_{u,i}^{(t)}$ are independent mean-zero normal random variables with variances $1 + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t)$, and $\delta_{u,i}^{(t)}, \kappa_{u,i}^{(t)}$ are Gaussian random variables with

$$\mathbb{E}[(\delta_{u,i}^{(t)})^2] = \mathbb{E}[(\kappa_{u,i}^{(t)})^2] = O(K_t^{40} \Delta_t^2).$$

The proof of Claim A.1 is established [22] in which they take

$$\varphi(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| \geq 10\}} - \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}(0, 1)| \geq 10);$$

their proof can be easily adapted to the case of all symmetric, mean-zero and bounded φ and thus we omit further details here for simplicity. In particular, by a simple union bound we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\delta_{u,i}^{(t)}|, |\kappa_{u,i}^{(t)}| \leq K_t^{20} (\log n)^2 \Delta_t\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(\log n)^2}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

which we will assume to happen throughout the remaining part of this section.

A.1 Proof of Item (6)

We first show that Item (6) holds for t . Note that conditioned on \mathcal{F}_t , we have

$$\|h_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} = \|\mathcal{G}_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)} + \delta_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \|\mathcal{G}_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \|\delta^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}}.$$

Using (A.4), we see that we have

$$\|\delta^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \sqrt{K_t n} \cdot \|\delta^{(t)}\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{K_t n} \cdot (\log n)^3 K_t^{20} \Delta_t.$$

Using (3.5), we see that it suffices to show that

$$\|\mathcal{G}_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 90 \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n} \text{ for all } |W| = 10\epsilon n. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

We now verify (A.5) via a union bound on W . For each fixed $|W| \leq \epsilon n$, using Chernoff's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathcal{G}_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} > 90 \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n}\right) \leq \exp(-100 K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n),$$

thus leading to (A.5) since the enumeration of W is bounded by

$$\sum_{k \leq 10\epsilon n} \binom{n}{k} \leq \exp(20\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n).$$

We can similarly show that $\|\ell_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq 10 \sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}) n}$ for all $|W| \leq \epsilon n$. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Item (6) holds for } t \mid \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_t\right) \geq 1 - O(e^{-\epsilon n}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

A.2 Proof of Item (1)

In this subsection we show that Item (1) holds for $t+1$. Recall (3.4). We have conditioned on \mathcal{F}_t

$$\begin{aligned} f_{u,i}^{(t)} &= \varphi\left(\left(h^{(t)}\beta^{(t)}\right)_{u,i}\right) = \varphi\left(\sum_j h_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)} + \sum_j \delta_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) \\ &= \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) + O(1) \cdot \left|\sum_j \delta_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right| = \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) + O(K_{t+1}K_t^{20}(\log n)^2\Delta_t), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we use (A.4). Thus, we have (recall (3.5))

$$\left(\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} f^{(t)}\right)_i = \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) + o(\Delta_{t+1}n).$$

Note that

$$\left\{\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)} : u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}\right\}$$

are independent Gaussian random variables with mean zero and variance $1 + O(K_t^{20}\Delta_t)$, (recall that φ is symmetric and bounded) using Chernoff's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) \geq \frac{\Delta_{t+1}}{2}n\right) \leq \exp(-n^{0.1}).$$

Thus by a union bound we have $\|\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} f^{(t)}\|_\infty$ holds with probability $1 - o(e^{-(\log n)^2})$. Similarly result holds for $\|\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \mathbf{V}} g^{(t)}\|_\infty$. Thus, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Item (1) holds for } t+1 \mid \tilde{E}_t\right) \geq 1 - O(e^{-n^{0.1}}). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

A.3 Proofs of Items (2)–(4)

In this subsection we show that Items (2)–(4) hold for $t+1$. Recall that we have shown

$$f_{u,i}^{(t+1)} = \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)}\beta_{j,i}^{(t)}\right) + O(K_{t+1}K_t^{20}(\log n)^2\Delta_t).$$

Thus, combining the fact that $\varphi(x)$ is bounded by 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left((f^{(t+1)})^\top f^{(t+1)}\right)_{i,j} &= \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} f_{u,i}^{(t+1)} f_{u,j}^{(t+1)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi\left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)}\beta_{k,i}^{(t)}\right) \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)}\beta_{k,j}^{(t)}\right) + O(K_{t+1}K_t^{20}(\log n)^2\Delta_t n) \\ &= \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi\left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)}\beta_{k,i}^{(t)}\right) \varphi\left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)}\beta_{k,j}^{(t)}\right) + o(\Delta_{t+1}n), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we use (3.5). Note that

$$\left\{ \varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)} \right) \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) : u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U} \right\}$$

are independent bounded random variables, with

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)} \right) \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(X) \varphi(Y) : X, Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1 + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t)), \text{Cov}(X, Y) = (1 + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t)) \langle \beta_i^{(t)}, \beta_j^{(t)} \rangle \right] \\ &= \phi(\langle \beta_i^{(t)}, \beta_j^{(t)} \rangle) + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t) = \Phi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using Bernstein's inequality we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left((f^{(t+1)})^\top f^{(t+1)} \right)_{i,j} - n \Phi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} \right| > \Delta_{t+1} n \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)} \right) \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) - n \Phi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} \right| > \Delta_{t+1} n / 2 \right) \leq e^{-n^{0.1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using a union bound we see that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \left((f^{(t+1)})^\top f^{(t+1)} \right) - n \Phi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} \right\|_\infty \leq \Delta_{t+1} n \right) \geq 1 - n^2 e^{-n^{0.1}}.$$

Similar results also holds for $(g^{(t+1)})^\top g^{(t+1)}$. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Item (2) holds for } t+1 \mid \tilde{E}_t) \geq 1 - 2n^2 e^{-n^{0.1}}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left((f^{(t+1)})^\top g^{(t+1)} \right)_{i,j} = \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U}} \varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)} \right) \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{H}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) + O(K_{t+1} K_t^{20} \Delta_t n),$$

where

$$\left\{ \varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)} \right) \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{H}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) : u \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{U} \right\}$$

are independent bounded random variables with

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,i}^{(t)} \right) \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{H}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) \right] = \Psi_{i,j}^{(t+1)} + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t).$$

Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Item (3) holds for } t+1 \mid \tilde{E}_t) \geq 1 - 2n^2 e^{-n^{0.1}}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Furthermore, we control the concentration of $\|(f^{(s)})^\top f^{(t+1)}\|_\infty$. Note that under \mathcal{F}_t , $f^{(s)}$ is fixed for $s \leq t$. So,

$$((f^{(s)})^\top f^{(t+1)})_{i,j} = \sum_{u \in [n] \setminus \cup} f_{i,u}^{(s)} \varphi \left(\sum_k \mathcal{G}_{u,k}^{(t)} \beta_{k,j}^{(t)} \right) + O(K_t^{20} \Delta_t n),$$

which can be handled similarly to that for $\|\mathbb{J}_{1 \times [n] \setminus \cup} f^{(t+1)}\|_\infty$. We omit further details since the modifications are minor. In conclusion, we have shown that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Item (4) holds for } t+1 \mid \tilde{E}_t) \geq 1 - 3n^2 e^{-n^{0.1}}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

A.4 Proof of Item (5)

In this section we prove that Item (5) holds for time $t+1$. Recall again that

$$f_{u,i}^{(t+1)} = \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right) + O(K_{t+1} K_t^{20} (\log n)^2 \Delta_t).$$

Thus, for all $|W| \leq 10\epsilon n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t+1)}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 &= \sum_{u \in W} \sum_{i \leq K_{t+1}} \left(\varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right) \right)^2 + O(K_{t+1} K_t^{20} (\log n)^2 \Delta_t) \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in W} \sum_{i \leq K_{t+1}} \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right)^2 + O(K_{t+1}^2 K_t^{20} (\log n)^2 \Delta_t n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{u \in W} \sum_{i \leq K_{t+1}} \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right)^2 \leq 90K_{t+1}^2 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n \text{ for all } |W| \leq 10\epsilon n. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

For each fixed $|W| \leq 10\epsilon n$, note that

$$\left\{ \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right)^2 : u \in W \right\}$$

are bounded independent random variables with mean bound by 1. Thus, using Bernstein's inequality again we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{u \in W} \sum_{i \leq K_{t+1}} \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right)^2 > 90K_{t+1}^2 \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n \right) \\ &\leq K_{t+1} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{u \in W} \varphi \left(\sum_j \mathcal{G}_{u,j}^{(t)} \beta_{j,i}^{(t)} \right)^2 > 90K_{t+1} \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n \right) \leq e^{-90\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1})n}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (A.11) since the enumeration of W is bounded by

$$\sum_{k \leq 10\epsilon n} \binom{n}{k} \leq \exp(20\epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}n)).$$

We can similarly show that $\|g_{W \times [K_t]}^{(t)}\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 10\sqrt{K_t \epsilon \log(\epsilon^{-1}n)}$ for all $|W| \leq 10\epsilon n$. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Item (5) holds for } t+1 \mid \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_t\right) \geq 1 - O(e^{-\epsilon n}). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

A.5 Conclusion

By putting together (A.4), (A.7), (A.6), (A.8), (A.9), (A.10) and (A.12), we have proved

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{t+1} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_t) \geq 1 - O(e^{-(\log n)^2}).$$

In addition, since $t^* + 1 = O(\log \log \log n)$, our quantitative bounds imply that all these hold simultaneously for $0 \leq t \leq t^* + 1$ except with probability $O(e^{-0.5(\log n)^2})$. This concludes Lemma 3.2.

B Supplementary proofs

This Section collects postponed proofs of the main part of the paper.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2.1

Although intrinsically the same argument has been established in [43, Lemma 3.5], we still choose to present the whole formal proof here for completeness. Let $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{M}^{(t)}$ be the matrix \mathcal{M} after each iteration of the “while” loop. Denote $Q^{(t)} \subset Q$ to be the set of non-zeroed out indices at t and let $E^{(t)}$ be the restriction of E on $Q^{(t)}$. Note that the iteration will terminate once $Q^{(t)} = \emptyset$. We will show that with probability $1 - o(1)$ we will have $\|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 10\sqrt{n}$ under at most $4\epsilon n$ iterations via the following lemma.

Lemma B.1. *Suppose the iteration does not terminate at t . Let v, u be the left and right singular eigenvector of $\mathcal{M}^{(t)}$ corresponding to the leading eigenvalue, respectively. Then with probability $1 - o(1)$ we have*

$$\sum_{i \in Q^{(t)}} \frac{v_i^2 + u_i^2}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Since the iteration does not terminate at t , we have $|v^\top \mathcal{M}^{(t)} u| = \|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} > 10\sqrt{n}$. Let \tilde{v} be the restriction of v in $Q^{(t)}$ and \tilde{u} be the restriction of u in $Q^{(t)}$. We then have

$$\|E^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} \cdot \|\tilde{v}\| \|\tilde{u}\| \geq \tilde{v}^\top E^{(t)} \tilde{u} = v^\top E^{(t)} u = v^\top (\mathcal{M}^{(t)} - M) u \geq \|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} - \|M\|_{\text{op}}.$$

In addition, we have $\|E^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|M^{(t)} - M\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|M^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} + \|M\|_{\text{op}}$. Thus,

$$\frac{\|\tilde{v}\|^2 + \|\tilde{u}\|^2}{2} \geq \frac{\|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} - \|M\|_{\text{op}}}{\|E^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}}} \geq \frac{\|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} - \|M\|_{\text{op}}}{\|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} + \|M\|_{\text{op}}} \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

as desired. \square

To prove that our “while” loop terminates in $4\epsilon n$ steps with probability $1 - o(1)$, define the stopping time $\tau = \min \{t \geq 0 : \|\mathcal{M}^{(t)}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 10\sqrt{n}\}$. Now for each $t \leq \tau$, let I_t be the indicator of whether index removed between $\mathcal{M}^{(t)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(t+1)}$ was in Q . Then we have conditioned on $\tau > t$ and I_1, \dots, I_{t-1} , each I_t is stochastically dominated by a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau \geq 4\epsilon n) \leq \mathbb{P}(I_1 + \dots + I_{4\epsilon n} \leq \epsilon n) = o(1).$$

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2.3

Note that for bivariate standard normal variables X, Y with correlation u , we can write $Y = uX + \sqrt{1 - u^2}Z$ where Z is independent with X . Thus

$$\phi(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(X) \varphi(uX + \sqrt{1 - u^2}Z) \right].$$

Thus, direct calculation yield that

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \phi(0) = \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(X) \varphi(Z) \right] \stackrel{\text{Item (2), Definition 2.2}}{=} 0; \\ c_1 &= \phi'(0) = \mathbb{E} \left[X \varphi(X) \varphi'(Z) \right] \stackrel{\text{Item (2), Definition 2.2}}{=} 0. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, since $\varphi(x)$ is analytic, we see that $\phi(u)$ is analytic for all $u \in (-1, 1)$. This implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |c_k| \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k < \infty,$$

which shows that $|c_k| \leq \Lambda \cdot 2^k$ for a constant Λ .

B.3 Proof of Lemma 2.4

Before proving Lemma 2.4, we first need several preliminary results characterizing $\phi(x)$ and $\beta^{(t)}$. Our proof is based on induction and thus from now on we assume that Lemma 2.4 holds up to time t .

Lemma B.2. Recall that we sample $\beta^{(t)}$ to be a $\frac{K_t}{12} * K_{t+1}$ matrix with entries uniformly in $\{-\sqrt{12/K_t}, +\sqrt{12/K_t}\}$. Also denote $\beta^{(t)} = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{K_{t+1}}^{(t)})$. With probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ we have the following conditions hold:

$$\left\| (\beta^{(t)})^\top \beta^{(t)} \right\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\log K_t / K_t}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\left\| (\beta^{(t)})^\top (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \beta^{(t)} \right\|_\infty \leq 2\varepsilon_t \sqrt{\log K_t / K_t}; \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq K_{t+1}} ((\beta_i^{(t)})^\top \beta_j^{(t)})^4 \leq 100 K_{t+1}^2 / K_t^2, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq K_{t+1}} ((\beta_i^{(t)})^\top (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \beta_j^{(t)})^4 \leq 100 \varepsilon_t^2 K_{t+1}^2 / K_t^2. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma B.2 was incorporated in [22, Proposition 2.4], and we omit further details here. \square

We are now finally ready to provide the proof of Lemma 2.4.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. We first consider Φ . By (2.17) and Lemma 2.3, we can write Φ as

$$\Phi = \mathbb{I} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \text{ with } \Phi_k(i, j) = \langle \beta_i^{(t)}, \beta_j^{(t)} \rangle^k.$$

By Lemma B.2, we have (also recall $c_2 = \frac{1}{2} \varphi''(0)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| c_2 \Phi_2 \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &= \sum_{i, j} \left(c_2 \Phi_2(i, j) \right)^2 \leq \sum_{i \neq j} c_2^2 \left(\frac{12}{K_t} \langle \beta_i^{(t)}, \beta_j^{(t)} \rangle \right)^4 \\ &\stackrel{(\text{B.3})}{\leq} 10^6 |\varphi''(0)|^2 \cdot \frac{K_{t+1}^2}{K_t^2} \stackrel{(2.11)}{\leq} \frac{1}{4} \cdot 10^{-6} K_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

In addition, by Lemmas B.2 and 2.3, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \right\|_\infty \leq \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} 2^k \left(\frac{24 \sqrt{\log K_t}}{\sqrt{K_t}} \right)^k \leq \frac{10^6 (\log K_t)^{1.5}}{(\alpha - \alpha^2) K_t^{1.5}}.$$

Thus we have (using $K_t \geq K_0 \geq 10^{24}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &\leq K_{t+1}^2 \left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \right\|_\infty^2 \leq \frac{10^{12} K_{t+1}^2 (\log K_t)^3}{K_t^3} \\ &\stackrel{(2.11)}{\leq} \frac{\Lambda^2 10^{12} \Lambda^2 (\log K_t)^3}{K_t} \cdot K_{t+1} \leq \frac{1}{4} 10^{-6} K_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Using $\|A + B\|_F^2 \leq 2(\|A\|_F^2 + \|B\|_F^2)$ for all A and B, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \right\|_F^2 \leq 2 \left(\left\| c_2 \Phi_2 \right\|_F^2 + \left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \right\|_F^2 \right) \leq 10^{-6} K_{t+1}.$$

Applying [22, Lemma 2.12], we then have that

$$\#\left\{l : \left| \varsigma_l \left(\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Phi_k \right) \right| \geq 0.01 \right\} \leq 0.01 K_{t+1}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Applying [22, Lemmas 2.10], we can write $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \Phi_k = C + D$, where $\|C\|_{\text{op}} \leq 0.01$ and $\text{rank}(D) \leq 0.01 K_{t+1}$. Noting $\Phi = (\mathbb{I} + C) + D$, we apply [22, Lemmas 2.11] and get

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_{0.99 K_{t+1}}(\Phi) &\geq \varsigma_{K_{t+1}}(\mathbb{I} + C) \geq 0.99, \\ \varsigma_{0.01 K_{t+1} + 1}(\Phi) &\leq \varsigma_1(\mathbb{I} + C) \leq 1.01. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that Φ has at least $0.98 K_{t+1}$ eigenvalues in $(0.99, 1.01)$.

We deal with Ψ in a similar way. By (2.18), (2.17) and Lemma 2.3, we can write Ψ as

$$\Psi = \varepsilon_t \mathbb{I} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k \text{ with } \Psi_k(i, j) = \left((\beta_i^{(t)})^\top (\Xi^{(t)})^\top \Psi^{(t)} \Xi^{(t)} \beta_j^{(t)} \right)^k.$$

Again by (B.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| c_2 \Psi_2 \right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i, j} \left(c_2 \Psi_2(i, j) \right)^2 \leq \frac{4^2 \cdot 10^5 \rho^4 \varepsilon_t^4 K_{t+1}^2}{2^4 K_t^2} \\ &\stackrel{(2.11)}{\leq} \frac{10^{12} \varepsilon_{t+1}^2 K_{t+1}^2}{\iota^2 K_t^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} 10^{-6} \varepsilon_{t+1}^2 K_{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

By Lemmas B.2 and 2.3,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} 2^k \left(\frac{\rho}{2} \frac{24 \Lambda \varepsilon_t \sqrt{\log K_t}}{\sqrt{K_t}} \right)^k \leq \frac{10^6 \rho^3 \varepsilon_t^3 \Lambda (\log K_t)^{1.5}}{K_t^{1.5}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k \right\|_F^2 &\leq K_{t+1}^2 \left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k \right\|_{\infty}^2 \leq \frac{10^{12} \rho^6 \varepsilon_t^6 \Lambda^2 (\log K_t)^3 K_{t+1}^2}{K_t^3} \\ &\stackrel{(2.11)}{\leq} \frac{10^{12} \rho^4 \varepsilon_t^4 \Lambda^2 \Lambda^2 (\log K_t)^3 K_{t+1}^2}{K_t^3} \stackrel{(2.18), (2.11)}{\leq} \frac{\varepsilon_{t+1}^2 (\log K_t)^3}{K_t} K_{t+1} \leq \frac{1}{4} 10^{-6} \varepsilon_{t+1}^2 K_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Combined with (B.8), it yields that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq 2 \left(\left\| c_2 \Psi_2 \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \left\| \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right) \leq 10^{-6} K_{t+1} \varepsilon_{t+1}^2.$$

By [22, Lemma 2.12] the matrix $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k$ has at most $0.01K_{t+1}$ eigenvalues with absolute values larger than $0.01\varepsilon_{t+1}$. By [22, Lemma 2.10], we can write $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} c_k \Psi_k = C + D$, where $\|C\|_{\text{op}} \leq 0.01\varepsilon_{t+1}$ and $\text{rank}(D) \leq 0.01K_{t+1}$. By [22, Lemma 2.11], we know $\Psi = (\varepsilon_t \mathbb{I} + C) + D$ satisfies $\varsigma_{0.99K_{t+1}}(\Psi) \geq 0.98\varepsilon_{t+1}$ and $\varsigma_{0.01K_{t+1}+1}(\Psi) \leq 1.02\varepsilon_{t+1}$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

B.4 Proof of Lemma 2.7

To prove Lemma 2.7, it suffices to show the following result:

Lemma B.3. *With probability $1 - o(1)$ we have*

$$N_{\pi}(u, \pi(u)) \geq 2\Delta \text{ for all } u \in [n] \text{ and } N_{\pi}(u, v) \leq \frac{\Delta}{20} \text{ for all } v \neq \pi(u).$$

Proof. For all $u \in [n]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_{\pi}(u, \pi(u)) \leq 2\Delta) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in [n] \setminus Q \cup R} (\mathbf{1}_{\{A'_{u,v} \geq 1\}} - \alpha) (\mathbf{1}_{\{B'_{\pi(u), \pi(v)} \geq 0\}} - \alpha) \leq 2.1\Delta \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in [n] \setminus Q \cup R} (\mathbf{1}_{\{A_{u,v} \geq 1\}} - \alpha) (\mathbf{1}_{\{B_{\pi(u), \pi(v)} \geq 0\}} - \alpha) \leq 2.1\Delta \right) \\ &\leq e^{-\rho^2 n / 100}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

where in the first inequality we use the fact that $|Q|, |R| \leq \varepsilon n \ll \Delta$ and in the second inequality we used Bernstein's inequality [28, Theorem 1.4]. Similarly, for all $u \neq v \in [n]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N(u, \pi(u)) \geq \frac{\Delta}{10}) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in [n] \setminus Q \cup R} (\mathbf{1}_{\{A'_{u,v} \geq 1\}} - \alpha) (\mathbf{1}_{\{B'_{\pi(u), \pi(v)} \geq 0\}} - \alpha) \geq \frac{\Delta}{20} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in [n] \setminus Q \cup R} (\mathbf{1}_{\{A_{u,v} \geq 1\}} - \alpha) (\mathbf{1}_{\{B_{\pi(u), \pi(v)} \geq 0\}} - \alpha) \geq \frac{\Delta}{20} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

$$\leq e^{-\rho^2 n / 100}, \tag{B.12}$$

where in the third inequality we again used Bernstein's inequality. Then the desired result follows from a simple union bound. \square

We now present the proof of Lemma 2.7.

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Note that for all $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $\hat{\pi}$ agrees with π on at least $(1 - \frac{10}{\log n})n$ coordinates, we have

$$N_{\hat{\pi}}(u, \pi(u)) \geq 2\Delta - \frac{n}{\log n} > \Delta \text{ and } N_{\hat{\pi}}(u, v) \leq \frac{\Delta}{20} + \frac{n}{\log n} < \frac{\Delta}{10} \text{ for all } v \neq u. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Thus, in each update in Step 5 of Algorithm 2 will correct a mistaken coordinate, and thus Step 5 will terminate at a permutation $\hat{\pi} \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $\hat{\pi}(u) = \pi(u)$ for all $\tilde{\pi}(u) = \pi(u)$. Note that if there exists $u \neq v \in [n]$ such that $\hat{\pi}(u) = \pi(v) \neq \pi(u)$, then using (B.13) Step 5 should not stop and corrects u to $\pi(u)$, this yields $\hat{\pi} = \pi$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. \square

B.5 Proof of Proposition 2.9

We first prove the first claim. Algorithm 1 takes time $O(n^{3+o(1)})$. We can compute $\hat{f}^{(0)}, \hat{g}^{(0)}$ in $O(K_0 n)$ time. Calculating $\Phi^{(t)}, \Psi^{(t)}, \Xi^{(t)}$ takes time

$$\sum_{t \leq t^*} O(K_t^3) = O(n^{o(1)}).$$

In addition, the iteration has $t^* = O(\log \log \log n)$ steps, and in each step for $t \leq t^*$ calculating $\hat{h}^{(t)}, \hat{\ell}^{(t)}, \hat{f}^{(t+1)}, \hat{g}^{(t+1)}$ takes $O(K_t n^2)$ time. Furthermore, in the linear assignment step calculating $\pi_{i,j}$ takes $O(K_{t+1}^2 n^3)$ time and Algorithm 2 takes time $O(n^3)$. Therefore, the total amount of time spent on computing each $\pi_{i,j}$ is upper-bounded by

$$O(K_0 n) + O(n^{o(1)}) + \sum_{t \leq t^*} O(K_t n^2) + O(K_{t^*}^2 n^3) + O(n^3) = O(n^{3+o(1)}).$$

We now prove the second claim. Since $M \leq n^{K_0}$, the running time for computing all $\pi_{i,j}$ is $O(n^{2K_0+3+o(1)})$. In addition, finding $\hat{\pi}$ from $\{\pi_{i,j}\}$ takes $O(n^{2K_0+2})$ time. So the total running time is $O(n^{2K_0+3+o(1)})$.

B.6 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Without losing of generality, we may assume that $\pi = \text{id}$ be the identity permutation. Denote $\bar{A}_{i,j} = \mathbf{1}_{A_{i,j} \geq 1} - \alpha$ and $\bar{B}_{i,j} = \mathbf{1}_{B_{i,j} \geq 1} - \alpha$. Define $\bar{A}'_{i,j}$ and $\bar{B}'_{i,j}$ in the similar manner. Note that for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n \setminus \text{id}$, we have π admits a cycle decomposition $\pi = \sqcup_{O \in \mathcal{O}(\pi)} O$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}'_{i,j} \bar{B}'_{i,j} - \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}'_{i,j} \bar{B}'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} &\geq \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}_{i,j} \bar{B}_{i,j} - \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}_{i,j} \bar{B}_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} - \epsilon n \cdot N(\pi) \\ &= \sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}(\pi)} Z_O - \epsilon n \cdot N(\pi), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Z_O = \prod_{(i,j) \in O} \bar{A}_{i,j} (\bar{B}_{i,j} - \bar{B}_{\pi(i),\pi(j)}).$$

Note that marginally $(\bar{A}_{i,j}, \bar{B}_{i,j})$ are two centered Bernoulli random variables with parameter α and correlation $\phi(\rho)$. Thus, using [71, Lemma 8] we have $\{Z_O : O \in \mathcal{O}(\pi)\}$ are independent and

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-Z_O}] = (1 - \alpha\phi(\rho))^{|O|/2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i,j} \bar{A}'_{i,j} \bar{B}'_{i,j} - \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}'_{i,j} \bar{B}'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)} \leq 0\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}(\pi)} Z_O \leq \epsilon n \cdot N(\pi)\right) \\ & \leq e^{\epsilon n N(\pi)} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\sum_{O \in \mathcal{O}(\pi)} Z_O}\right] \leq e^{\epsilon n N(\pi)} \prod_{O \in \mathcal{O}(\pi)} (1 - \alpha\phi(\rho))^{|O|/2} \\ & \leq e^{\epsilon n N(\pi)} (1 - \alpha\phi(\rho))^{nN(\pi)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by a union bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\exists \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n \setminus \{\text{id}\}, \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}'_{i,j} \bar{B}'_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i,j} \bar{A}'_{i,j} \bar{B}'_{\pi(i),\pi(j)}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n e^{\epsilon n k} (1 - \alpha\phi(\rho))^{nk} \cdot \#\{\pi : N(\pi) = k\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} e^{\epsilon n k} (1 - \alpha\phi(\rho))^{nk} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use $\epsilon = o(\frac{1}{(\log n)^4})$. This leads to Lemma 3.1.

References

- [1] T. Ameen and B. Hajek. Robust graph matching when nodes are corrupt. Preprint, [arXiv:2310.18543](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.18543).
- [2] L. Babai. Graph isomorphism in quasi-polynomial time. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 684–697. ACM, 2016.
- [3] B. Barak, C. N. Chou, Z. Lei, T. Schramm, and Y. Sheng. (Nearly) efficient algorithms for the graph matching problem on correlated random graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.

- [4] M. Bayati and A. Montanari. The dynamics of message passing on dense graphs, with applications to compressed sensing. In *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(2):764–785, 2011.
- [5] A. Berg, T. Berg, and J. Malik. Shape matching and object recognition using low distortion correspondences. In *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, volume 1, pages 26–33. IEEE, 2005.
- [6] E. Bolthausen. An iterative construction of solutions of the TAP equations for the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model. In *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 325(1):333–366, 2014.
- [7] E. Bolthausen, S. Nakajima, N. Sun, and C. Xu. Gardner formula for Ising perceptron models at small densities. In *Proceedings of 35th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 1787–1911. PMLR, 2022.
- [8] M. Bozorg, S. Salehkaleybar, and M. Hashemi. Seedless graph matching via tail of degree distribution for correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs. Preprint, [arXiv:1907.06334](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.06334).
- [9] R. E. Burkard, E. Cela, P. M. Pardalos, and L. S. Pitsoulis. The quadratic assignment problem. In *Handbook of combinatorial optimization*, pages 1713–1809. Springer, 1998.
- [10] S. Chai and M. Z. Racz. Efficient graph matching for correlated stochastic block models. To appear in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) 2024*.
- [11] G. Chen, J. Ding, S. Gong, and Z. Li. A computational transition for detecting correlated stochastic block models by low-degree polynomials. Preprint, [arXiv:2409.00966](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.00966).
- [12] T. Cour, P. Srinivasan, and J. Shi. Balanced graph matching. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, volume 19. MIT Press, 2006.
- [13] D. Cullina and N. Kiyavash. Exact alignment recovery for correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs. Preprint, [arXiv:1711.06783](https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.06783).
- [14] D. Cullina and N. Kiyavash. Improved achievability and converse bounds for Erdős-Rényi graph matching. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Science (SIGMETRICS)*, pages 63–72. ACM, 2016.
- [15] D. Cullina, N. Kiyavash, P. Mittal, and H. V. Poor. Partial recovery of Erdős-Rényi graph alignment via k -core alignment. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Science (SIGMETRICS)*, pages 99–100. ACM, 2020.
- [16] O. E. Dai, D. Cullina, N. Kiyavash, and M. Grossglauser. Analysis of a canonical labeling algorithm for the alignment of correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, 3(2), 2019.
- [17] Y. Deshpande and A. Montanari. Information-theoretically optimal sparse PCA. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2197–2201. IEEE, 2014.
- [18] J. Ding and H. Du. Detection threshold for correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs via densest subgraph. In *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(8):5289–5298, 2023.
- [19] J. Ding and H. Du. Matching recovery threshold for correlated random graphs. In *Annals of Statistics*, 51(4): 1718–1743, 2023.

- [20] J. Ding, H. Du and Z. Li. Low-Degree Hardness of Detection for Correlated Erdős-Rényi Graphs. Preprint, arXiv: 2311.15931.
- [21] J. Ding, Y. Fei, and Y. Wang. Efficiently matching random inhomogeneous graphs via degree profiles. Preprint, [arXiv:2310.10441](#).
- [22] J. Ding and Z. Li. A polynomial time iterative algorithm for matching Gaussian matrices with non-vanishing correlation. To appear in *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*.
- [23] J. Ding and Z. Li. A polynomial-time iterative algorithm for random graph matching with non-vanishing correlation. Preprint, [arXiv:2306.00266](#).
- [24] J. Ding, Z. Ma, Y. Wu, and J. Xu. Efficient random graph matching via degree profiles. In *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 179(1-2):29–115, 2021.
- [25] J. Ding, T. d’Orsi, R. Nasser, and D. Steurer. Robust recovery for stochastic block models. In *IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 387–394. IEEE, 2022.
- [26] J. Ding and N. Sun. Capacity lower bound for the Ising perceptron. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 816–827. ACM, 2019.
- [27] D. L. Donoho, A. Maleki, and A. Montanari. Message-passing algorithms for compressed sensing. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(45):18914–18919, 2009.
- [28] D. P. Dubhashi and A. Panconesi. Concentration of measure for the analysis of randomized algorithms. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- [29] Z. Fan, Y. Li, and S. Sen. TAP equations for orthogonally invariant spin glasses at high temperature. Preprint, [arXiv:2202.09325](#).
- [30] Z. Fan, C. Mao, Y. Wu, and J. Xu. Spectral graph matching and regularized quadratic relaxations I: Algorithm and theory. In *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 23(5):1511–1565, 2023.
- [31] Z. Fan, C. Mao, Y. Wu, and J. Xu. Spectral graph matching and regularized quadratic relaxations II: Erdős-Rényi graphs and universality. In *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 23(5):1567–1617, 2023.
- [32] Z. Fan and Y. Wu. The replica-symmetric free energy for Ising spin glasses with orthogonally invariant couplings. To appear in *Probability Theory and Related Fields*.
- [33] S. Feizi, G. Quon, M. Medard, M. Kellis, and A. Jadbabaie. Spectral alignment of networks. Preprint, [arXiv:1602.04181](#).
- [34] O. Y. Feng, R. Venkataramanan, C. Rush, and R. J. Samworth. A unifying tutorial on approximate message passing. In *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 15(4):335–536, 2022.
- [35] L. Ganassali and L. Massoulié. From tree matching to sparse graph alignment. In *Proceedings of 33rd Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 1633–1665. PMLR, 2020.

- [36] L. Ganassali, L. Massoulié, and M. Lelarge. Impossibility of Partial Recovery in the Graph Alignment Problem. In *Proceedings of 34th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 2080–2102. PMLR 2021.
- [37] L. Ganassali, L. Massoulié, and M. Lelarge. Correlation detection in trees for planted graph alignment. In *Annals of Applied Probability*, 34(3):2799–2843, 2024.
- [38] L. Ganassali, L. Massoulié, and G. Semerjian. Statistical limits of correlation detection in trees. In *Annals of Applied Probability*, 34(4):3701–3734, 2024.
- [39] S. Gong and Z. Li. The Umeyama algorithm for matching correlated Gaussian geometric models in the low-dimensional regime. Preprint, [arXiv:2402.15095](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.15095).
- [40] A. Haghighi, A. Ng, and C. Manning. Robust textual inference via graph matching. In *Proceedings of Human Language Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 387–394, 2005.
- [41] G. Hall and L. Massoulié. Partial recovery in the graph alignment problem. In *Operations Research*, 71(1):259–272, 2023.
- [42] M. Ivkov and T. Schramm. Semidefinite programs simulate approximate message passing robustly. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 348–357. ACM, 2024.
- [43] M. Ivkov and T. Schramm. Fast, robust approximate message passing. Preprint, [arXiv:2411.02764](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.02764).
- [44] E. Kazemi, S. H. Hassani, and M. Grossglauser. Growing a graph matching from a handful of seeds. In *Proceedings of VLDB Endowment*, 8(10):1010–1021, 2015.
- [45] D. Koller and N. Friedman. Probabilistic graphical models: principles and techniques. MIT press, 2009.
- [46] P. K. Kothari, J. Steinhardt, and D. Steurer. Robust moment estimation and improved clustering via sum of squares. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1035–1046. ACM, 2018.
- [47] F. Krzakala, M. Mézard, F. Sausset, Y. Sun, and L. Zdeborová. Probabilistic reconstruction in compressed sensing: algorithms, phase diagrams, and threshold achieving matrices. In *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2012(08):P08009, 2012.
- [48] H. W. Kuhn. The Hungarian method for the assignment problem. In *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97, 1955.
- [49] V. Lyzinski, D. E. Fishkind, and C. E. Priebe. Seeded graph matching for correlated Erdős-Rényi graphs. In *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15:3513–3540, 2014.
- [50] K. Makarychev, R. Manokaran, and M. Sviridenko. Maximum quadratic assignment problem: Reduction from maximum label cover and lp-based approximation algorithm. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 594–604. Springer, 2010.
- [51] C. Mao, M. Rudelson, and K. Tikhomirov. Random Graph Matching with Improved Noise Robustness. In *Proceedings of 34th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 3296–3329. PMLR, 2021.

- [52] C. Mao, M. Rudelson, and K. Tikhomirov. Exact matching of random graphs with constant correlation. In *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 186(2):327–389, 2023.
- [53] C. Mao, Y. Wu, J. Xu, and S. H. Yu. Testing network correlation efficiently via counting trees. To appear in *Annals of Statistics*.
- [54] C. Mao, Y. Wu, J. Xu, and S. H. Yu. Random graph matching at Otter’s threshold via counting chandeliers. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1345–1356. ACM, 2023.
- [55] A. Montanari. Graphical models concepts in compressed sensing. *Compressed sensing*, Cambridge University Press, pages 394–438, 2012.
- [56] A. Montanari. Optimization of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick hamiltonian. In *SIAM Journal on Computing*, special issue of *FOCS 2019*, 2021.
- [57] A. Montanari and E. Richard. Non-negative principal component analysis: Message passing algorithms and sharp asymptotics. In *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(3):1458–1484, 2015.
- [58] A. Montanari and S. Sen. Semidefinite programs on sparse random graphs and their application to community detection. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 814–827. ACM, 2016.
- [59] E. Mossel and J. Xu. Seeded graph matching via large neighborhood statistics. In *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 57(3):570–611, 2020.
- [60] A. Narayanan and V. Shmatikov. Robust de-anonymization of large sparse datasets. In *2008 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 111–125. IEEE, 2008.
- [61] A. Narayanan and V. Shmatikov. De-anonymizing social networks. In *2009 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 173–187. IEEE, 2009.
- [62] P. Pedarsani and M. Grossglauser. On the privacy of anonymized networks. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1235–1243. ACM, 2011.
- [63] M. Z. Racz and A. Sridhar. Correlated stochastic block models: Exact graph matching with applications to recovering communities. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, volume 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [64] F. Shirani, S. Garg, and E. Erkip. Seeded graph matching: Efficient algorithms and theoretical guarantees. In *2017 51st Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, pages 253–257, 2017.
- [65] R. Singh, J. Xu, and B. Berger. Global alignment of multiple protein interaction networks with application to functional orthology detection. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105:12763–12768, 2008.
- [66] D. J. Thouless, P. W. Anderson, and R. G. Palmer. Solution of ‘solvable model of a spin glass’. In *Philosophical Magazine* 35(3):593–601, 1977.
- [67] R. Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*. Cambridge university press, 2018.

- [68] J. T. Vogelstein, J. M. Conroy, V. Lyzinski, L. J. Podrazik, S. G. Kratzer, E. T. Harley, D. E. Fishkind, R. J. Vogelstein, and C. E. Priebe. Fast approximate quadratic programming for graph matching. In *PLOS ONE*, 10(4):1–17, 2015.
- [69] H. Wang, Y. Wu, J. Xu and I. Yolou. Random graph matching in geometric models: the case of complete graphs. In *Proceedings of 35th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 3441–3488. PMLR, 2022.
- [70] Y. Wu, J. Xu and S. H. Yu. Testing correlation of unlabeled random graphs. In *Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(4): 2519–2558, 2023.
- [71] Y. Wu, J. Xu and S. H. Yu. Settling the sharp reconstruction thresholds of random graph matching. In *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(8):5391–5417, 2022.
- [72] L. Yartseva and M. Grossglauser. On the performance of percolation graph matching. In *Proceedings of the First ACM Conference on Online Social Networks*, pages 119–130. ACM, 2013.