

The feasibility of multi-graph alignment: a Bayesian approach

Louis Vassaux

INRIA, DMA/ENS, PSL Research University, Paris, France

LOUIS.VASSAUX@ENS.PSL.EU

Laurent Massoulié

INRIA, DI/ENS, PSL Research University, Paris, France

LAURENT.MASSOULIE@INRIA.FR

Abstract

We establish thresholds for the feasibility of random multi-graph alignment in two models. In the Gaussian model, we demonstrate an "all-or-nothing" phenomenon: above a critical threshold, exact alignment is achievable with high probability, while below it, even partial alignment is statistically impossible. In the sparse Erdős–Rényi model, we rigorously identify a threshold below which no meaningful partial alignment is possible and conjecture that above this threshold, partial alignment can be achieved. To prove these results, we develop a general Bayesian estimation framework over metric spaces, which provides insight into a broader class of high-dimensional statistical problems.

Keywords: graph alignment, Bayesian estimation, information-theoretic limits, high-dimensional statistics

1. Introduction

1.1. The graph alignment problem

There are various statistical problems where we observe a network of linked objects which can be represented by a large graph; for instance, a network of protein-protein interactions or a social network. The **graph alignment problem**, in a broad sense, is the following: we observe the same underlying data multiple times, obtaining $p \geq 2$ **unlabelled** graphs which should be very similar, and attempt to retrieve the underlying isomorphism which pairs up any two nodes representing the same element.

Formally, the problem can be described as follows. Assume that we have an underlying p -uple of labelled random graphs $(G^{(1)}, \dots, G^{(p)})$ with vertex set $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. We select $\pi^* = (\pi_1^* = \text{Id}, \pi_2^*, \dots, \pi_p^*)$ with π_2^*, \dots, π_p^* chosen i.i.d, uniformly at random, over \mathcal{S}_n ; we observe

$$(\pi^*)^{-1}(G) = (G_{(\pi_1^*)^{-1}(e)}^{(1)})_{e \in E}, \dots, (G_{(\pi_p^*)^{-1}(e)}^{(p)})_{e \in E} \quad (1.1)$$

(where E is the set of edges in the complete graph on $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$), and our aim is to recover π_2^*, \dots, π_p^* .

Typically, in order to analyse the problem for "typical" values of G , we assume that G is also a random variable, chosen from a distribution where the $(G_e^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ are correlated, for any fixed $e \in E$. Two important examples are the following models:

- the **Gaussian model** $\mathcal{N}(n, \rho)$, where G_1, \dots, G_p are weighted graphs: the weights $(G_e^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq p, e \in E}$ are drawn as a centred normal vector over $\mathbb{R}^E \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$, with the following covariance matrix:

$$\text{Cov}(G_e^{(i)}, G_{e'}^{(j)}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e = e', i = j \\ \rho \in [0, 1] & \text{if } e = e', i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

- the **(correlated) Erdős–Rényi model** $\mathcal{G}(n, \lambda, s)$, in which G_1, \dots, G_p are unweighted graphs: we sample a "master graph" G_0 from the standard Erdős–Rényi model $\mathcal{G}(n, \frac{\lambda}{n})$ (for some $\lambda > 0$); then, the (G_i) are subgraphs of G_0 , which are mutually independent conditional on G_0 , and which contain any given edge of G_0 with a (fixed) probability $0 < s < 1$.

1.2. Previous works

The graph alignment problem has been studied extensively in the 2-graph case, particularly for the two toy models described above. Much attention has been given to finding algorithms which, with high probability, recover the underlying permutation in reasonable time (Dym and Maron (2017), Feizi et al. (2017), Ding et al. (2018), Fan et al. (2019a), Fan et al. (2019b), Ganassali et al. (2019), Mao et al. (2022), Ganassali et al. (2024), Even et al. (2024)). These algorithms, in turn, can be used in various applications: for instance, de-anonymisation problems (Narayanan and Shmatikov (2009)), natural language processing (Bayati et al. (2013)), or the analysis of protein interaction networks (Kazemi et al. (2016)).

Another line of research consists in the information-theoretical analysis of the alignment problem, i.e. understanding when alignment is feasible (without regards to time complexity). Again, much progress has been made on the subject (Cullina and Kiyavash (2017), Cullina et al. (2019), Ganassali et al. (2021), Ding and Du (2022), Ganassali (2022), Wu et al. (2022)) and we have a good understanding of the cutoffs for alignment feasibility. Note that, often enough, there is a real difference between feasibility and polynomial-time feasibility: there can be a "hard phase" where alignment is feasible, but likely not in polynomial time (Ding et al. (2023)).

When there are more than two graphs, the problem has been less extensively studied. Several studies have focused on developing algorithms (Liao et al. (2009), Vijayan and Milenković (2016), Zhu et al. (2024)); however, to our knowledge, the only existing investigation into information-theoretical properties (as of submission) is by Ameen and Hajek (2024). This paper aims to extend that line of inquiry by establishing further results in this area.

1.3. Contributions

Let us state the main results of this paper. We begin by examining whether alignment is possible for the Gaussian model.

Theorem 1.1 *Let $c_p = \frac{8}{p}$; there is a cutoff for graph alignment at $\rho_0 = \sqrt{\frac{c_p \log n}{n}}$.*

Specifically, for any $\varepsilon > 0$:

- *if $\rho \geq (1 + \varepsilon)\rho_0$, there exists an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ which is equal to the underlying permutation π^* with high probability;*
- *if $\rho \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\rho_0$, partial alignment is intractable: for any estimator $\hat{\pi}$ of π^* , $ov(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, where the overlap $ov(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*)$ is defined in (2.2).*

As in the 2-graph case (see Wu et al. (2022)), we observe an "all-or-nothing" phenomenon: either exact alignment is possible, or partial alignment is intractable. This is a broad phenomenon, which has been observed for many classes of dense models; we thus see that it still holds for $p \geq 3$ graphs.

During the proof of Theorem 1.1, we also prove a lower bound on the weight of the maximal spanning tree of certain weighted graphs, which is novel (to our knowledge) and may be of independent interest. The specific result is detailed in Theorem L.1 and Remark L.2.

We will also formulate some similar statements for the Erdős–Rényi model.

Theorem 1.2 *Assume that $\lambda s(1 - (1 - s)^{p-1}) < 1$. Then, partial alignment is intractable.*

Conjecture 1.3 *Assume that $\lambda s(1 - (1 - s)^{p-1}) > 1$. Then, partial alignment is feasible: there exists an estimator $\hat{\pi}$ and some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, with high probability, $ov(\hat{\pi}, \pi^*) > \varepsilon$.*

Just like in the two-graph case, this hypothetical cutoff represents a topological phenomenon: $\lambda s(1 - (1 - s)^{p-1})$ is the parameter of the Erdős–Rényi graph $H_1 = G_1 \cap (G_2 \cup \dots \cup G_p)$, and so our theorem-conjecture pair states that the feasibility of partial alignment should depend only on whether the graph H_1 has a giant component. This idea is supported by the results from the recent preprint [Ameen and Hajek \(2024\)](#), where it is proven that the cutoff for exact alignment is the same as the cutoff for H_1 to be connected.

The proofs of these theorems are based upon a common framework, which we develop in Section 2: we establish some necessary and sufficient conditions for the feasibility of a certain class of Bayesian estimation problems (including partial graph alignment). This framework is applicable to a large number of high-dimensional statistical problems, beyond simply graph alignment problems.

This framework requires us to have very good control over the *a posteriori* probability distribution, but - if this is feasible - it provides a deep understanding of the system’s behaviour. For instance, in the Gaussian case, it seems quite plausible that for ”seeded” alignment, where the true correspondence is revealed to the observer on a proportion x of nodes, there is a threshold at $\frac{\rho_0}{\sqrt{1+x}}$, above which almost exact alignment is possible and under which we cannot align a meaningful extra amount of vertices. This is fairly close to being a consequence of the theorems which we prove here (notably Proposition 3.5), but there are some extra technical issues which emerge in this case.

1.4. Structure of the paper and notation

In section 2, we lay out the aforementioned framework for analysing a certain class of Bayesian estimation problems. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.1 regarding the Gaussian model; in Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.2 regarding the Erdős–Rényi model.

Throughout this paper, n represents the size of the considered graphs; all limits are taken as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. For random variables X_n, Y_n , we write $X = O_{\mathbb{P}}(Y)$ (resp. $X = o_{\mathbb{P}}(Y)$) to mean that $\frac{X_n}{Y_n}$ is tight (resp. $\frac{X_n}{Y_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$). We write $x_n \ll y_n$ to mean $x_n = o(y_n)$, and we define $\ll_{\mathbb{P}}$ similarly. We say that a sequence (A_n) of events occurs with high probability if $\mathbb{P}(A_n) \rightarrow 1$. E is the set of edges (i.e. unordered pairs of integers) in $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$.

An alignment π of p graphs (G_1, \dots, G_p) is p -uple $(\pi_1 = \text{Id}, \dots, \pi_p)$, where π_i is a bijection $G_i \rightarrow G_1$. Since the vertex set of G_i is assumed to be $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, the set of alignments can be identified with $\{\text{Id}\} \times \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} \simeq \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, which we will do for the rest of this paper.

For any matrix M , $\|M\|_F$ is its Frobenius norm and $\|M\|_{op}$ is the associated operator norm.

Proofs of the various statements made below can be found in the appendix if they are not in the main body of text.

2. Bayesian estimation over metric spaces

2.1. The graph alignment problem as a Bayesian inference problem

The graph alignment problem is a Bayesian inference problem. As defined previously, it involves sampling p random graphs (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_p) from some fixed joint distribution; a permutation $\sigma^* \in$

\mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} is then picked uniformly at random, and we try to recover σ from the observation of the graphs $(\sigma_1^*(G_1), \sigma_2^*(G_2), \dots, \sigma_p^*(G_p))$. Another way to formulate this is that we have observed a p -uple of random graphs (G'_1, \dots, G'_p) , sampled from a distribution \mathbb{P}_σ for some unknown $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, whose prior distribution is assumed to be the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{S}_n^{p-1})$; again, we wish to estimate σ^* . This reformulation of the problem places it squarely within the zoo of Bayesian inference problems. Formally, we are trying to construct an estimator $\hat{\sigma}$, which is a $(\sigma_1^*(G_1), \sigma_2^*(G_2), \dots, \sigma_p^*(G_p))$ -measurable random variable, such that the expected loss

$$L = \mathbb{E}_{\sigma^* \sim \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{S}_n^{p-1})} [\mathbb{E}_{(G_1, \dots, G_p) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\sigma^*}} [l(\sigma^*, \hat{\sigma})]] \quad (2.1)$$

is as small as possible, where $l : (\mathcal{S}_n^{p-1})^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a predetermined loss function.

What would be an adequate choice for l ? A natural default choice could be the all-or-nothing loss function $l(\sigma, \sigma') = \mathbb{1}_{\sigma \neq \sigma'}$; with this loss function, this inference problem is known as **exact alignment**. However, we have a notion of closeness for permutations, and we would like to acknowledge estimators which are "close enough" to the true alignment.

To begin with, let us assume that $p = 2$. We may define

$$ov(\sigma, \sigma') = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\sigma(i) = \sigma'(i)} \in [0, 1] \quad (2.2)$$

and $d = (1 - ov)$ is a distance over \mathcal{S}_n . This means that we now have other natural loss functions: for instance, the functions $l_r(\sigma, \sigma') = \mathbb{1}_{d(\sigma, \sigma') \geq r}$, for $0 \leq r < 1$. This allows us to ask slightly different questions: namely, the so-called **almost exact** and **partial** alignment problems, which we shall describe in the next section. We may similarly extend the notion of overlap to \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} when $p \geq 3$, and we will discuss this more in Section 2.3: the exact choice of extension will matter.

Before proceeding, let us describe what the metric space \mathcal{S}_n actually looks like. One way to conceptualise it is as a hyperbolic space: for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$, the size of the ball $B(\sigma, r)$ grows roughly like $(n^n)^r$, for $0 \leq r \leq 1$.

Another, more explicit, description of this space is the following. Within $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$, the set B_n of doubly stochastic matrices is a polytope (known as the Birkhoff polytope), whose vertices are the permutation matrices (which we may identify with \mathcal{S}_n). Within this space, the canonical Euclidean structure gives us

$$\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle = ov(\sigma, \sigma') \text{ ie. } d_B(\sigma, \sigma') = \sqrt{2(1 - ov(\sigma, \sigma'))} \quad (2.3)$$

which largely serves the same purpose as our previous distance d for our purposes. This description also shows quite nicely why we often relax the alignment problem to solve a more general quadratic assignment problem over B_n .

2.2. Metric estimation problems

What follows is fairly general; as motivation for our definitions, it may be helpful to think of the specific case of the graph alignment problem, as defined above.

Fix a sequence $(A_n, d = d_n, \mu = \mu_n)$ of parameter spaces, which are metric spaces equipped with an a priori probability distribution. Fix a sequence (B_n) of (measurable) observation spaces, equipped with probability distributions $(\nu_x)_{x \in A_n}$ such that $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x$ is measurable. To fix ideas, we will assume that $\text{diam } A_n = 1$, so that $d(x, y) \simeq 1$ means that x, y are far apart.

We set $X_n \in A_n$ a random variable with law μ , and $Y_n \in B_n$ a random variable with law ν_{X_n} ; from the observation of Y_n , we are trying to estimate the value of X_n . We will define $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_n$ to be the distribution of (X_n, Y_n) , and, for any measurable $S_n \subseteq A_n$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{post}(S_n) = \mathbb{P}(S_n|Y_n) \quad (2.4)$$

the a posteriori probability of S_n .

Definition 2.1 A *partial estimator* \hat{X}_n of X_n is a Y_n -measurable random variable such that, for some $0 \leq r < 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[l_r(\hat{X}_n, X_n)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \mathbb{P}(d(\hat{X}_n, X_n) > r) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad (2.5)$$

On the other hand, we will say that partial estimation of X_n is intractable if, for any $0 \leq r < 1$, and for any sequence (\hat{X}_n) of estimators,

$$\mathbb{E}[l_r(\hat{X}_n, X_n)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 1 \quad (2.6)$$

An *almost exact estimator* \hat{X}_n of X_n is a Y_n -measurable random variable such that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[l_\varepsilon(\hat{X}_n, X_n)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \mathbb{P}(d(\hat{X}_n, X_n) > \varepsilon) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad (2.7)$$

On the other hand, we will say that almost exact estimation of X_n is intractable if, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, and for any sequence (\hat{X}_n) of estimators,

$$\mathbb{E}[l_\varepsilon(\hat{X}_n, X_n)] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 1 \quad (2.8)$$

A classical result from Bayesian decision theory (see (Berger, 1985, Section 4) for instance) is the following.

Proposition 2.2 Fix $r \geq 0$: we define

$$\hat{X}_n^{opt} = \arg \min_{x \in A_n} \mathbb{E}[l_r(x, X_n)|Y_n] = \arg \max_{x \in A_n} \mathbb{P}_{post}(B(x, r)) \quad (2.9)$$

Then, \hat{X}_n^{opt} minimises the expected loss $\mathbb{E}[l_r]$.

As a result, we know exactly when estimators exist for our different problems.

Corollary 2.3 Consider, for $r \geq 0$, the random variable

$$C_n(r) = \max_{x \in A_n} \mathbb{P}_{post}(B(x, r)) \quad (2.10)$$

which measures to what extent the random measure \mathbb{P}_{post} concentrates around a single point. Then,

1. a partial estimator exists iff, for some $0 \leq r < 1$, $C_n(r) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1$.
2. an almost exact estimator exists iff, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $C_n(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1$.

On the other hand,

1. partial estimation is intractable iff, for any $0 \leq r < 1$, $C_n(r) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$.
2. almost exact estimation is intractable iff, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, $C_n(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$.

Remark 2.4 Assume that almost exact estimation is feasible, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition of the optimal estimator \hat{X}_n^{opt} , for large enough n , there will (with high probability) be $x \in A_n$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{post}(B(x, r))$ is maximal and $d(x, X) \leq \varepsilon$. In other words, the point around which \mathbb{P}_{post} concentrates will be close to the true value of X .

2.3. A brief aside on multi-graph alignment

As we previously suggested, there are a few natural extensions of ov to \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} . Two particularly relevant ones here are:

$$ov(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}') = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_2(i)=\sigma'_2(i), \dots, \sigma_p(i)=\sigma'_p(i)} \quad (2.11)$$

$$ov_w(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}') = \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{i=2}^p ov(\sigma_i, \sigma'_i) \quad (2.12)$$

Essentially, ov measures how often the (σ_i, σ'_i) all agree at the same time; while ov_w measures how often they will agree pairwise. Thus, informally, graph alignment for $d = 1 - ov$ involves determining $(\pi_2^*, \dots, \pi_p^*)$ on some given set X , while graph alignment for $d_w = 1 - ov_w$ involves determining π_2^* on some (large) set X_2, \dots , and π_p^* on some (large) set X_p . With this in mind, it seems that the distance d should be more natural as a choice, motivating the following definition.

Definition 2.5 We will say that partial graph alignment is possible (resp. intractable) if there exists a partial estimator for the true alignment π^* , for the distance function d . For the distance d_w , we will instead speak of **weak** partial alignment.

The same definition applies to almost exact alignment. However, in this case, we do not need to make the distinction between normal and weak alignment:

Proposition 2.6 If partial alignment is possible (resp. not intractable), then weak partial alignment is possible (resp. not intractable).

Almost exact alignment is possible (resp. intractable) if and only if weak almost exact alignment is possible (resp. intractable).

Proof This follows from the fact that $d \leq d_w \leq (p-1)d$. ■

Naturally, a converse proposition also holds for alignment intractability.

For technical reasons, we will also want to work with a "square correlated overlap", defined by

$$ov_c(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}')^2 = \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} ov(\sigma_i^{-1} \sigma'_i, (\sigma_j)^{-1} \sigma'_j)^2 \quad (2.13)$$

Note that, setting $d_c = \sqrt{1 - ov_c^2}$, $\frac{1}{p}d_w \leq d_c^2 \leq 1 - (1 - d)^2 \leq 2d$. Thus, the previous proposition also holds if we replace "weak alignment" with "alignment for the distance d_c ".

2.4. Applying metric estimation

If we want to understand partial, or almost exact, alignment, our job is thus to control the random variable $C_n(r)$ defined earlier. In the Gaussian case, in order to show impossibility of partial alignment, we can directly perform calculations to estimate $C_n(r)$.

In the Erdős–Rényi case, however, our arguments are much more combinatorial in nature. The general idea is quite simple: if $B = B(\pi_0, r)$ is a ball, we would like to take the permutations within B (which we may conceptualise as being close to the "real" alignment π_0) and modify them to obtain a large number of other permutations, which are nowhere near π_0 but which seem just as plausible to an outside observer. In the case where $p = 2$, this is done in [Ganassali et al. \(2021\)](#): they construct a large number of $(\sigma_i) \in S_n$ which are far apart and which preserve \mathbb{P}_{post} , so that $\mathbb{P}_{post}(\sigma_i(B)) = \mathbb{P}_{post}(B)$ and the $\sigma_i(B)$ are all disjoint. This is fairly technical, and not quite necessary: at the cost of some abstraction, we can provide a significantly more robust argument, which holds for any metric estimation problem, and does not require that we preserve \mathbb{P}_{post} exactly.

Lemma 2.7 *Assume that the state space A_n is finite. Let $\text{Neg}_n \subseteq A_n$, such that $\mathbb{P}_{post}(\text{Neg}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. (This contains states which are implausibly ill-behaved and which we may ignore.)*

For any ball $B = B(x_0, r)$ with radius $r < 1$, assume that there exists a random function $F : B \setminus \text{Neg}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A_n)$ (which depends upon n, B), satisfying certain conditions:

- (i) *F outputs an overwhelmingly plausible set of states, in the following sense: for any $r < 1$, there exists $\varepsilon_n(r) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} 0$ such that, for $x \in B \setminus \text{Neg}_n$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_{post}(x) \leq \varepsilon_n(r) \mathbb{P}_{post}(F(x)). \quad (2.14)$$

- (ii) *F is quasi-injective, in the following sense. For any $r < 1$, there exists a (possibly random) $K_n(r) > 0$ such that $K_n(r)\varepsilon_n(r) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$ and, if $y \in A_n$, there are at most $K_n(r)$ values of $x \in B$ such that $y \in F(x)$.*

Then, partial alignment is intractable.

Here, F replaces the function $\pi \rightarrow (\sigma_i \circ \pi)_i$ in the previous version of the argument.

Proof Let $B = B(x, r)$ be a ball with radius $r < 1$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{post}(B) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{post}(\text{Neg}_n) + \sum_{y \in B \setminus \text{Neg}_n} \mathbb{P}_{post}(y) \\ &\leq o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \varepsilon_n(r) \sum_{y \in B \setminus \text{Neg}_n} \mathbb{P}_{post}(F(\pi)) \\ &\leq o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \varepsilon_n(r) \sum_{y' \in A_n} \sum_{y \text{ s.t. } y' \in F(y)} \mathbb{P}_{post}(y') \\ &\leq o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \varepsilon_n(r) \sum_{y' \in A_n} K_n(r) \mathbb{P}_{post}(y') \\ &= o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \varepsilon_n(r) K_n(r) \mathbb{P}_{post}(A_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Applying Corollary 2.3, the lemma is shown. ■

3. Solving the Gaussian model

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. As discussed in Section 2.3, it will be sufficient for us to prove it for the distance function $d = d_c$.

In all of the following theorems, we assume that

$$\rho = \sqrt{\frac{8(1+\eta)\log n}{pn}} \quad (3.1)$$

for some $\eta = O(1)$. We will prove the feasibility of exact alignment for any fixed $\eta > 0$, and show that partial alignment is intractable when $\eta = -(\log n)^{-\frac{1}{5}}$. This will prove the proposition for general ρ : indeed, if we observe $(\pi^*)^{-1}(G)$ for some $G \sim \mathcal{N}(n, \rho)$, we may add independent weights to the edges of G , creating a set of graphs $(\pi^*)^{-1}(G')$ where $G' \sim \mathcal{N}(n, \rho')$ for any $\rho' \leq \rho$ and solve the alignment problem for G' .

In what follows, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq p$, we will set $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_j(\pi_j^*)^{-1}\pi_i^*\sigma_i^{-1}$, which depends upon the true alignment π^* . It may be helpful to imagine that $\pi^* = \text{Id}$, since this is true up to a relabelling of nodes; in this case, σ_{ij} measures how different σ_i and σ_j are.

3.1. The Gibbs measure

The main appeal of the Gaussian model is that the a posteriori distribution has a nice expression. Specifically:

Proposition 3.1 *For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, we may write*

$$\mathbb{P}_{post}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}(\sigma)} \quad (3.2)$$

where the partition function Z is independent from σ . Here,

$$\mathcal{H}(\sigma) = - \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} G_e^{(i)} G_{\sigma_{ij}(e)}^{(j)}; \quad \beta = \frac{\rho}{2(1-\rho)(1+(p-1)\rho)} = \frac{\rho}{2}(1+o(1)) \quad (3.3)$$

This Hamiltonian is quite descriptive, and invites a natural visual interpretation of the graph alignment problem: we have p weighted graphs which we "stick" together with our alignment σ , and each edge has a fixed "spin" such that edges with similar spins try to stick to each other.

From a technical perspective however, this Hamiltonian is not quite what we want. Recall that our ultimate goal is to understand to what extent the measure \mathbb{P}_{post} concentrates around any given point; and, if it is to be concentrated around a point, we should expect that point to be the ground truth π^* . As a result, it makes sense to renormalise our system, writing

$$\mathbb{P}_{post}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta V(\sigma)} \quad (3.4)$$

where the potential $V(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &= \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) \\
 &= \sum_{e \in E, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} G_e^{(i)} (G_e^{(j)} - G_{\sigma_{ij}(e)}^{(j)}) \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{e \in E, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p \\ \sigma_{ij}(e) \neq e}} G_e^{(i)} G_e^{(j)} - \sum_{\substack{e \in E, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p \\ \sigma_{ij}(e) \neq e}} G_e^{(i)} G_{\sigma_{ij}(e)}^{(j)} \\
 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

We have split up the potential V into two terms for a couple of reasons. The first one is that, viewing V as a quadratic form of $G \in \mathbb{R}^E \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$, V_{diag} contains the block-diagonal terms while V_{off} contains the off-diagonal blocks. (The expression of V as a quadratic form is made explicit in Appendices D and C.) It is typical, when studying quadratic forms of Gaussian vectors, to separate the two; they tend to require different tools. The second reason is that $V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ is almost independent from $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, in a sense which we will make explicit in a moment.

3.2. Behaviour of V

For the rest of this section, we will define $d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \#\{u \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \sigma_{ij}(u) = u\}$: we will see that this combinatorial quantity appears a fair amount in our analysis, as it is closely linked to the number of terms in the sums defining V_{diag} and V_{off} . In fact, let us begin by controlling the behaviour of $(d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))$ as a function of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$.

Theorem 3.2 *Let $(d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p}$ be positive integers, with $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$ for any i, j . We set*

$$F((d_{ij})) = \#\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \geq d_{ij}\} \tag{3.6}$$

Then:

$$F((d_{ij})) \leq \frac{(n!)^{p-1}}{\left(\prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (d_{ij}!) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \tag{3.7}$$

We will note that, by definition, $ov_c(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*)^2 = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\pi})^2$; this is why we defined d_c in such a way.

We will now move on to understanding the distribution of V_{diag} and V_{off} . The behaviour of V_{diag} is the simplest to bound: it is nearly constant as a function of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$.

Lemma 3.3 *With high probability, the following property (C) holds:*

$$\forall \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, |V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]| \leq (\log n)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{2}} \tag{3.8}$$

Consequently, for any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$,

$$V(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\mathbb{1}_C = \rho \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{2} \right) + V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \quad (3.9)$$

where the error term is bounded uniformly in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$.

We now turn to V_{off} , whose fluctuations are harder to control.

Proposition 3.4 *Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$. Then,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\beta V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}] = \beta^2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{2} \right) + O(n) \quad (3.10)$$

where, again, the error term is bounded uniformly in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$.

3.3. The cutoff for approximate alignment

Armed with a good understanding of V , we may now prove Theorem 1.1. Under the notations of Corollary 2.3, this means that we must prove that, writing $\rho = \sqrt{\frac{8(1+\eta)\log n}{pn}}$,

- if $\eta > 0$ is fixed, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $C_n(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1$;
- if $\eta = -(\log n)^{-\frac{1}{5}}$, then for any $0 \leq r < 1$, $C_n(r) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$.

As mentioned earlier, we will also need an extra step for exact alignment when $\eta > 0$.

What does this mean concretely? Recall that, in our context, we may write

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{post}}(B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r)) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r)} e^{-\beta V(\boldsymbol{\sigma})} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi})}{Z} \quad (3.11)$$

where $B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r)$ is the ball of radius r , for the distance d_c defined previously. Our job is thus to estimate Z_r and Z ; we will begin with a first moment computation.

Proposition 3.5 *Let $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$ and $0 < r' < r \leq 1$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi})] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)]e^{O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})}$. Furthermore,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}[(Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - Z_{r'}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*))\mathbb{1}_C] \leq (p-1)n \log n \max_{r' \leq \rho \leq r} \varphi(\rho) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \quad (3.12)$$

where $\varphi(\rho) = (1+\eta)\rho^2 - (1+2\eta)\rho$ for $\rho \in [0, 1]$.

If $\eta > 0$, this implies feasibility of almost exact alignment, as it shows that for some $c > 0$,

$$Z - Z_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}[(Z - Z_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*))\mathbb{1}_C]) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(e^{-cn \log n}) \ll_{\mathbb{P}} 1 \leq Z \quad (3.13)$$

However, when $\eta < 0$, things are more complicated. We will need the following proposition:

Proposition 3.6 *Assume that $\eta = -(\log n)^{-\frac{1}{5}}$. Then, $\log Z \geq \log \mathbb{E}[Z\mathbb{1}_C] + O_{\mathbb{P}}(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})$.*

Using these two propositions, we may see that in this case, for any $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, and any $r < 1$,

$$Z_r(\pi) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}[Z_r(\pi)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}]) \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}[Z_r(\pi^*)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}]) = \exp(c_r(p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{4}{5}}(1+o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))) \quad (3.14)$$

for some $0 \leq c_r < 1$. However,

$$Z \geq \exp(\log \mathbb{E}[Z\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}] + O_{\mathbb{P}}(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})) = \exp((p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{4}{5}}(1+o_{\mathbb{P}}(1))) \quad (3.15)$$

which shows that $Z_r(\pi) \ll_{\mathbb{P}} Z$.

Finally, in order to prove that **exact** alignment is possible when $\eta > 0$, we will prove the following statement.

Proposition 3.7 *Assume that $\eta > 0$. Then, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, with high probability, for any $\sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon)$, $V(\sigma) > 0$.*

Since, for any $\sigma \notin B(\pi^*, \varepsilon)$, $e^{-\beta V(\sigma)} \leq Z - Z_{\varepsilon} \ll_{\mathbb{P}} 1$, this means that with high probability,

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}} \mathbb{P}_{post}(\pi) \quad (3.16)$$

concluding the proof.

4. The Erdős–Rényi model: proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we will provide a proof of Theorem 1.2. Our first step is to evaluate the Hamiltonian of our system.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$. For any subset $X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$, we define $e_X = e_X(\sigma)$ to be the number of edges $e \in E$ "of type X "; i.e. such that for any $1 \leq i \leq p$, $e \in \sigma_i(G_i)$ if and only if $i \in X$. (In this sense, $\sum_X e_X = \binom{n}{2}$.)*

With this setup, we may write

$$\mathbb{P}_{post}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}(\sigma)} \text{ with } \beta = \log n; \mathcal{H}(\sigma) \underset{\mathbb{P}}{\sim} \sum_{X \neq \emptyset} e_X \quad (4.1)$$

($\mathcal{H}(\sigma)$ is an explicit function of σ whose expression is provided in the appendix.)

In other words, if we "glue" together all of our graphs using the correspondence σ , the associated energy for this configuration is equal to the total number of edges in the combined graph (plus a smaller, negligible term). Also note that, contrary to the Gaussian case, we are now in a low-temperature configuration: we care very much about correctly matching our edges since we have so much fewer of them.

As we mentioned in Section 2.4, starting from a plausible permutation π , our proof method is to build many other plausible-looking permutations $(\sigma_k \pi)_{1 \leq k \leq N}$. If the map $\pi \rightarrow (\sigma_k \pi)$ is close enough to being injective then this will imply the diffuseness of \mathbb{P}_{post} . If $p = 2$, this was done in Ganassali et al. (2021): if the graph $G_1 \cap \pi(G_2)$ has automorphisms (σ_k) , then $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_k \pi) \leq \mathcal{H}(\pi)$ for any k . We will use a similar argument here.

Proposition 4.2 Let $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$; set $H_1 = H_1(\pi) = \bigcup_{i=2}^p \pi_i(G_i)$.

Then, if $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is an automorphism of $G_1 \cap H_1$, setting $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma, \sigma, \dots, \sigma) \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$,

$$\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{H}((\sigma \circ \pi_1, \dots, \sigma \circ \pi_p)) \leq \mathcal{H}(\pi). \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 4.3 There is of course nothing special about G_1 : we could have defined $H_i(\pi)$ similarly for any $2 \leq i \leq p$, and the same proposition would hold for any automorphisms of $G_i \cap H_i$.

We are now tasked with finding such automorphisms (σ_k) of $A(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G_1 \cap H_1(\pi)$. For the true alignment π^* , given that the intersection graph $G_1 \cap H_1(\pi^*)$ is an Erdős–Rényi graph, this is possible when that graph is subcritical. Specifically:

Proposition 4.4 Let G be a graph over $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, and let $c > 0, \delta > 0$. We will say that G verifies the property $(P_{c,\delta})$ if, for any $X \subseteq G$ of size at least δn with no outgoing edges, there are at least $(cn)!$ automorphisms of G which leave X^c fixed, and which have at most $\delta^2 n$ fixed points within X .

Now, assume that A is an Erdős–Rényi graph with size n and parameter $\rho < 1$, and let $\delta > 0$. Then, there exists $c = c(\rho, \delta)$ such that, with high probability, A verifies the property $(P_{c,\delta})$.

Corollary 4.5 Let $\delta > 0$. If $\lambda_s(1 - (1 - s)^{p-1}) < 1$, the graph $A(\pi^*) = G_1 \cap H_1(\pi^*)$ is subcritical: there exists $c > 0$ such that A verifies the property $(P_{c,\delta})$ defined above with high probability. Otherwise put, the set

$$\text{Neg} = \{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} \mid G_1 \cap H_1(\pi) \text{ does not verify } (P_{c,\delta})\} \quad (4.3)$$

verifies $\mathbb{P}(\pi^* \in \text{Neg}) = o(1)$. Consequently, $\mathbb{P}_{\text{post}}(\pi^* \in \text{Neg}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

We may now prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof Let $\pi_0 \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$; we will build $F : B(\pi_0, 1 - \varepsilon) \setminus \text{Neg} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$ verifying the conditions of Lemma 2.7.

Thus, let $\pi \in B(\pi_0, r) \setminus \text{Neg}$. We consider the set $X(\pi) = \{u \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \pi(u) = \pi_0(u)\}$; by construction, $|X| \geq \varepsilon$. We then consider the set $\overline{X}(\pi)$, which the minimal subset of $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ containing X such that no edges of $A(\pi)$ link \overline{X} and \overline{X}^c . Since $\pi \notin \text{Neg}$, by Proposition 4.4, we may construct $(cn)!$ automorphisms $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)$ of the graph A which leave \overline{X}^c fixed, and which have at most $\varepsilon^2 n$ fixed points within \overline{X} , for some $c > 0$ independent of n . The function F is defined as mapping π to the set $\{\sigma_i \pi, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$.

Does F satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.7? Condition (i) is verified by construction: for any $\pi \in B(\pi_0, r)$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{post}}(\pi) \leq \frac{1}{(cn)!} \mathbb{P}_{\text{post}}(F(\pi)) \quad (4.4)$$

since $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_i \pi) \leq \mathcal{H}(\pi)$ for any $1 \leq i \leq N$. Condition (ii), however, is less obvious: we prove in Appendix K that it also holds. Applying Lemma 2.7, this concludes the proof. \blacksquare

References

- Taha Ameen and Bruce Hajek. Exact random graph matching with multiple graphs, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.12293>.
- Mohsen Bayati, David F. Gleich, Amin Saberi, and Ying Wang. Message-passing algorithms for sparse network alignment. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, 7(1), March 2013. ISSN 1556-4681. doi: 10.1145/2435209.2435212. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2435209.2435212>.
- James O. Berger. *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, NY, 2 edition, 1985. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-4286-2.
- Béla Bollobás. *Random Graphs*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2001.
- Stéphane Boucheron, Gabor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities : a non asymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013. Section 2.8.
- Daniel Cullina and Negar Kiyavash. Exact alignment recovery for correlated erdos renyi graphs. *ArXiv*, abs/1711.06783, 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:126055588>.
- Daniel Cullina, Negar Kiyavash, Prateek Mittal, and H. Vincent Poor. Partial recovery of erdős-*r*ényi graph alignment via k-core alignment. *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, 3(3), 2019. doi: 10.1145/3366702. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3366702>.
- Jian Ding and Hang Du. Matching recovery threshold for correlated random graphs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:249191610>.
- Jian Ding, Zongming Ma, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. Efficient random graph matching via degree profiles. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 179:29 – 115, 2018. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:53764280>.
- Jian Ding, Hangyu Du, and Zhangsong Li. Low-degree hardness of detection for correlated erdős-*r*ényi graphs. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.15931, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:265456457>.
- Nadav Dym and Haggai Maron. Ds++: A flexible, scalable and provably tight relaxation for matching problems. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 36, 05 2017. doi: 10.1145/3130800.3130826.
- Mathieu Even, Luca Ganassali, Jakob Maier, and Laurent Massoulié. Aligning embeddings and geometric random graphs: Informational results and computational approaches for the procrustes-wasserstein problem, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14532>.
- Xiequan Fan, Ion Grama, and Quansheng Liu. Sharp large deviation results for sums of independent random variables. *Science China Mathematics*, 58:1939–1958, 09 2015. doi: 10.1007/s11425-015-5049-6.

- Zhou Fan, Cheng Mao, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. Spectral graph matching and regularized quadratic relaxations i: The gaussian model, 07 2019a.
- Zhou Fan, Cheng Mao, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu. Spectral graph matching and regularized quadratic relaxations ii. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 23:1567 – 1617, 2019b. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:198148075>.
- Soheil Feizi, Gerald Quon, Mariana Recamonde-Mendoza, Muriel Medard, Manolis Kellis, and Ali Jadbabaie. Spectral alignment of graphs, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.04181>.
- Luca Ganassali. Sharp threshold for alignment of graph databases with gaussian weights. In Joan Bruna, Jan Hesthaven, and Lenka Zdeborova, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd Mathematical and Scientific Machine Learning Conference*, volume 145 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 314–335. PMLR, 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v145/ganassali22a.html>.
- Luca Ganassali, Marc Lelarge, and Laurent Massoulié. Spectral alignment of correlated gaussian random matrices, 11 2019.
- Luca Ganassali, Laurent Massoulié, and Marc Lelarge. Impossibility of partial recovery in the graph alignment problem. In Mikhail Belkin and Samory Kpotufe, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Fourth Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2080–2102. PMLR, 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v134/ganassali21a.html>.
- Luca Ganassali, Laurent Massoulié, and Guilhem Semerjian. Statistical limits of correlation detection in trees. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 34(4):3701 – 3734, 2024. doi: 10.1214/23-AAP2048. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/23-AAP2048>.
- Ehsan Kazemi, Hamed Hassani, Matthias Grossglauser, and Hasan Pezeshgi Modarres. Proper: Global protein interaction network alignment through percolation matching. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 17, 12 2016. doi: 10.1186/s12859-016-1395-9.
- Chung-Shou Liao, Kanghao Lu, Michael Baym, Rohit Singh, and Bonnie Berger. Isorankn: Spectral methods for global alignment of multiple protein networks. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 25:i253–8, 07 2009. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp203.
- Cheng Mao, Yihong Wu, Jiaming Xu, and Sophie H. Yu. Random graph matching at otter’s threshold via counting chandeliers. *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252531751>.
- Arvind Narayanan and Vitaly Shmatikov. De-anonymizing social networks. In *2009 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 173–187, 2009. doi: 10.1109/SP.2009.22.
- Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18(none):1 – 9, 2013. doi: 10.1214/ECP.v18-2865. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/ECP.v18-2865>.

Vipin Vijayan and Tijana Milenković. Multiple network alignment via multimagna++. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 15:1669–1682, 2016. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:7425112>.

Yihong Wu, Jiaming Xu, and Sophie H. Yu. Settling the sharp reconstruction thresholds of random graph matching. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(8):5391–5417, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2022.3169005.

Xinwen Zhu, Liangliang Zhu, and Xiurui Geng. k-wise multi-graph matching. *IET Image Processing*, 18:4760–4777, 11 2024. doi: 10.1049/ipr2.13285.

Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 3.1

By definition, the probability density function for $(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, G^{(1)}, \dots, G^{(p)})$ is proportional to

$$p(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, G^{(1)}, \dots, G^{(p)}) = \frac{1}{(n!)^{p-1}} \prod_{e \in E} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} (M^{-1})_{ij} G_e^{(i)} G_e^{(j)} \right) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $M = (1 - \rho)I_p + \rho J_p$ is our covariance matrix. Consequently, if we observe the graphs $H^{(i)} = (\pi_i^*)^{-1}(G^{(i)})$, the distribution \mathbb{P}_{post} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{post}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &= \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^* = \boldsymbol{\sigma} | H^{(1)}, \dots, H^{(p)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z'} p(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \sigma_1(H^{(1)}), \dots, \sigma_p(H^{(p)})) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z'} \prod_{e \in E} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} (M^{-1})_{ij} G_{(\pi_i^*)^{-1}\sigma_i(e)}^{(i)} G_{(\pi_j^*)^{-1}\sigma_j(e)}^{(j)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (M^{-1})_{ij} G_{(\pi_i^*)^{-1}\sigma_i(e)}^{(i)} G_{(\pi_j^*)^{-1}\sigma_j(e)}^{(j)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

since the product over the diagonal terms ($i = j$) is independent from $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. However, for $i \neq j$, $(M^{-1})_{ij} = 2\beta$; we thus obtain our desired expression, with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &= \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} G_{(\pi_i^*)^{-1}\sigma_i(e)}^{(i)} G_{(\pi_j^*)^{-1}\sigma_j(e)}^{(j)} \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} G_e^{(i)} G_{\sigma_{ij}(e)}^{(j)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 3.2

We will begin by proving a slightly more general version of the theorem.

Theorem B.1 Let $(d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p}$ be positive integers, with $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$ for any i, j . We set

$$F((d_{ij})) = \#\{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, d_{ij}(\sigma) \geq d_{ij}\} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Then, for any $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$,

$$F((d_{ij})) \leq \frac{(n!)^{p-1}}{(\max_{j < 2} d_{\tau(j)\tau(2)})! (\max_{j < 3} d_{\tau(j)\tau(3)})! \dots (\max_{j < p} d_{\tau(j)\tau(p)})!} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

We will explain afterwards how this implies Theorem 3.2.

Proof It is sufficient to handle the case where $\pi^* = \text{Id}$; the general case follows by replacing σ by $\pi^* \circ \sigma$ in the following proof.

We will begin by noting that F is a symmetric function of (d_{ij}) , in the sense that if $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$, $F((d_{\tau(i)\tau(j)})) = F((d_{ij}))$. As a result, we just need to show the theorem when $\tau = \text{Id}$; the general statement then follows.

We will now note that, for any (d_{ij}) , setting $Y_{ij}(\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \in E, \sigma_{ij}(e) = e\}$,

$$F((d_{ij})) = \frac{1}{n!} \#\{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^p, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, |Y_{ij}(\sigma)| \geq d_{ij}\} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

(ie. counting the p -uples of permutations where we do **not** enforce that $\sigma_1 = \text{Id}$). To see this, note that the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_n^p &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} \simeq \{\text{Id}\} \times \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} \\ (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_p) &\longmapsto (\text{Id}, \sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_1^{-1}\sigma_p) \end{aligned}$$

preserves the values of $(d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p}$, and any given element of \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} has exactly $n!$ preimages. We will therefore count the number of elements of the subset defined in (B.3).

Fix $(d_{ij})_{i \neq j}$. We are going to bound the number of possible choices for σ_1 , then bound the number of possible choices for σ_2 given a choice of σ_1 and so on; finally bounding the number of choices for σ_p given a choice of $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{p-1}$.

There are $n!$ choices for σ_1 . In order to fix σ_2 given σ_1 , it is sufficient to determine the set $X_2 = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus Y_{12}(\sigma)$ of points where $\sigma_2 \neq \sigma_1$, as well as $\sigma_2|_{X_2}^{\sigma_1(X_2)}$, giving at most

$$\binom{n}{n - d_{12}} (n - d_{12})! = \frac{n!}{d_{12}!} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

possible choices.

Recursively, given $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{l-1}$, in order to fix σ_l , it is sufficient to choose $j < l$, and determine the set $X_l = \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket \setminus Y_{jl}(\sigma)$ of points where $\sigma_l \neq \sigma_j$ as well as the restriction $\sigma_l|_{X_l}^{\sigma_j(X_l)}$, giving at most $\frac{n!}{d_{jl}!}$ possibilities. Since j can be chosen arbitrarily, we can pick j such that d_{jl} is maximal. The total number of possible choices is thus at most

$$\frac{1}{n!} \cdot n! \cdot \frac{n!}{(\max_{j < 2} d_{j2})!} \cdots \frac{n!}{(\max_{j < p} d_{jp})!} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

giving us the desired inequality.

■

For $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$, set $D_i(\tau) = \max_{j < i} d_{\tau(j)\tau(i)}$. In order to deduce Theorem 3.2 from Theorem B.1, we need to show that, for some choice of τ ,

$$\prod_{i=2}^p D_i(\tau)! \geq \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (d_{ij}!) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

In order to show this, we will use the probabilistic method, showing that if $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$ is chosen uniformly at random, then

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \log(d_{ij}!) \leq \mathbb{E}_\tau \left[\sum_{i=2}^p \log(D_i(\tau)!) \right] \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Indeed, more generally, if φ is any increasing function,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\tau \left[\sum_{i=2}^p \varphi(D_i(\tau)) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_\tau \left[\sum_{i=2}^p \max_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} \varphi(d_{\tau(i)\tau(j)}) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_\tau \left[\sum_{i=2}^p \frac{1}{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \varphi(d_{\tau(i)\tau(j)}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{1}{i-1} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}_\tau[\varphi(d_{\tau(i)\tau(j)})] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

However, for any $i, j \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$, $\mathbb{E}_\tau[\varphi(d_{\tau(i)\tau(j)})] = \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \varphi(d_{ij})$. Plugging this in to (B.8), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \varphi(d_{ij}) \leq \mathbb{E}_\tau \left[\sum_{i=2}^p \varphi(D_i(\tau)) \right] \quad (\text{B.9})$$

and this holds in particular for the function $\varphi(d) = \log(d!)$, concluding the proof.

Appendix C. Cumulants and proof of Proposition 3.4

We begin with a general lemma on cumulants of quadratic forms of normal vectors.

Lemma C.1 *Let M be a symmetric matrix: then, if $A \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and $Q = A^T M A$ is a quadratic form of A , the log-moment generating function of Q exists for small enough t , and can be written as*

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{tQ}] = -\frac{1}{2} \log \det(\text{Id} - 2t\Sigma M) = \sum_{k \geq 1} 2^{k-1} \text{Tr}((\Sigma M)^k) \frac{t^k}{k} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The following proof is a standard calculation, often used to prove the Hanson-Wright inequality (see [Rudelson and Vershynin \(2013\)](#) for instance).

Proof Replacing A by $\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}A$, it is sufficient for us to handle the case where $\Sigma = \text{Id}$.

We may diagonalise M to obtain the expression $M = P^T D P$, where P is an orthogonal matrix. Then, we may write

$$Q = (PA)^T D (PA) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Y^T D Y \quad (\text{C.2})$$

However, since the standard Gaussian distribution is invariant by the action of the orthogonal group $O(n)$, Y is also a (standard, centred) normal vector. As such, setting $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ and denoting by $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ the eigenvalues of M ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{tQ}] &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{t\lambda_i Y_i^2}] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - 2t\lambda_i}} \\ &= (\det(\text{Id} - 2tM))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

for small enough t , showing the first identity.

For the second one, note that if t is small enough, we may write $\text{Id} - 2tM = e^L$ for some matrix $L = -\sum_{k \geq 1} 2^k M^k \frac{t^k}{k}$. Thus,

$$\log \det(\text{Id} - 2tM) = \text{Tr} L = -\sum_{k \geq 1} 2^k \text{Tr}(M^k) \frac{t^k}{k} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

concluding the proof. ■

We now turn to proving [Proposition 3.4](#). Here, for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, we may write $V_{\text{off}}(\sigma) = -G^T M_\sigma G$, as a quadratic form over $\mathbb{R}^E \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$, where

$$(M_\sigma)_{(e,i),(e',j)} = \mathbb{1}_{e'=\sigma_{ij}(e)} \mathbb{1}_{e \neq e'} \mathbb{1}_{i \neq j} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

for any $e, e' \in E$, $1 \leq i, j \leq p$; and, as described in [\(1.2\)](#), the covariance matrix of G is

$$\Sigma = (1 - \rho)I_N + \rho(I_{\binom{n}{2}} \otimes J_p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - \rho)I_N + \rho\tilde{J} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where J_p is the $p \times p$ all-ones matrix. For the sake of convenience, we will set $\mathcal{M}_\sigma = \Sigma M_\sigma$ for the rest of this proof.

We will also note that, for symmetric positive U, V ,

$$\text{Tr} UV \leq \|V\|_{op} \text{Tr} U. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

This will allow us to bound the traces of our matrices in order to properly control our error terms. Explicitly, since $\|M_\sigma\|_{op} \leq p - 1$ and $\|\Sigma\|_{op} = 1 + o(1)$, we may use the fact that \mathcal{M}_σ^2 is positive, so that for $k \geq 2$ and large enough n

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma^k) \leq n^2 p^{k-2}. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

This allows us, by applying Lemma C.1, to obtain that:

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\beta V_{\text{off}}(\sigma)}] = \beta \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma) + \beta^2 \mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma^2) + O(\beta^3 n^2) \quad (\text{C.9})$$

We now simply need to evaluate some traces.

To begin with, by definition, Σ and M_σ can be written as block matrices of size $|E| \times |E|$, where each block is of size $p \times p$. The matrix Σ is block diagonal, while the diagonal blocks of M_σ are all zero matrices. Consequently, $\mathrm{Tr}(\Sigma M_\sigma) = 0$.

We now move on to $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma^2)$. Given that $\|\Sigma - \mathrm{Id}\|_{op} = O(\rho)$,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_\sigma^2) = \mathrm{Tr}(M_\sigma^2) + O(\rho n^2) \quad (\text{C.10})$$

by (C.7).

We may now compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(M_\sigma^2) &= \sum_{e, e' \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} (M_\sigma)_{(e,i), (e',j)}^2 \\ &= \#\{e \neq e' \in E, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p, e' = \sigma_{ij}(e)\} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \#\{e \in E, \sigma_{ij}(e) = e\} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - D_{ij}(\sigma) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Thus:

$$\log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\beta V_{\text{off}}(\sigma)}] = \beta^2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - D_{ij}(\sigma) \right) + O(\beta^3 n^2) \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Note that $\beta^3 n^2 = o(n)$; thus, to conclude the proof, we just need to show the following lemma.

Lemma C.2 For $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$,

$$D_{ij}(\sigma) = \binom{d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2} + R_\sigma \quad (\text{C.13})$$

where $0 \leq R_\sigma \leq \frac{n - d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2}$.

Proof If $e \in E$, writing $e = \{u, v\}$, we may see that $\sigma_{ij}(e) = e$ if and only if

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_{ij}(u) = u \\ \sigma_{ij}(v) = v \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{cases} \sigma_{ij}(u) = v \\ \sigma_{ij}(v) = u \end{cases}. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

There are $\binom{d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2}$ pairs verifying the first condition. The pairs verifying the second condition are the orbits of length 2 for the action of σ_{ij} over $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$: there are at most $\frac{n - d_{ij}}{2}$ of these. \blacksquare

We have proven the proposition. Before moving on, we will perform a final computation which we will need later on. Namely, if $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Tr}(M_\sigma M_{\sigma'}) &= \sum_{e, e' \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} (M_\sigma)_{(e,i),(e',j)} (M_{\sigma'})_{(e,i),(e',j)} \\
 &= \#\{e \neq e' \in E, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p, e' = \sigma_{ij}(e) = \sigma'_{ij}(e)\} \\
 &= \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \#\{e \in E, \sigma_{ij}(e) = \sigma'_{ij}(e) \neq e\} \\
 &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \#\{e \in E, \sigma_{ij}(e) = \sigma'_{ij}(e)\} \\
 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} C_{ij}(\sigma, \sigma')
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.15}$$

As for $(D_{ij}(\sigma))$, we may show that, setting $c_{ij}(\sigma, \sigma') = \{u \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \sigma_{ij}(u) = \sigma'_{ij}(u)\}$,

$$C_{ij}(\sigma, \sigma') = \binom{c_{ij}(\sigma, \sigma')}{2} + O(n) \tag{C.16}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Tr}((\mathcal{M}_\sigma + \mathcal{M}_{\sigma'})^2) &= \text{Tr}((M_\sigma + M_{\sigma'})^2) + O(\rho n^2) \\
 &= \text{Tr}(M_\sigma^2) + \text{Tr}(M_{\sigma'}^2) + 2 \text{Tr}(M_\sigma M_{\sigma'}) \\
 &= \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\sigma')}{2} + 2 \binom{c_{ij}(\sigma, \sigma')}{2} \right) + O(\rho n^2).
 \end{aligned} \tag{C.17}$$

Appendix D. Proof of Lemma 3.3

We will use the following inequality:

Proposition D.1 *Let X be a centred normal vector with covariance matrix Σ , S_N a symmetric matrix with size $N \rightarrow +\infty$, with operator norm $\|S_N\|_{op} \leq K$ independent of N . Then, if $C_N > 0$ with $1 \ll C_N^6 \ll \text{Tr}((\Sigma S_N)^2)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(X^T S_N X - \mathbb{E}[X^T S_N X] < -C_N) \underset{N \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{\sqrt{\text{Tr}((\Sigma S_N)^2)}}{\sqrt{\pi} C_N} \exp\left(-\frac{C_N^2}{4 \text{Tr}((\Sigma S_N)^2)}\right) \tag{D.1}$$

This is a very sharp improvement upon classical large-deviations results, which can be deduced from Lemma C.1; as such, the methods used to prove this are fairly similar.

Proof As in the proof of Lemma C.1, we may write

$$X^T S_N X = Y^T D Y \tag{D.2}$$

where Y is a standard centred normal vector and $D = \text{diag}_{1 \leq i \leq N}(\lambda_i)$ is a diagonal matrix, orthogonally conjugate to $\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} S_N \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$. As a result, we wish to obtain a tail bound on

$$Q_N = Z^T S_N Z - \mathbb{E}[Z^T S_N Z] = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (X_i^2 - 1) \quad (\text{D.3})$$

since $\mathbb{E}[Z^T S_N Z] = \text{Tr}(\Sigma S_N) = \sum_i \lambda_i$. We will apply the following theorem from [Fan et al. \(2015\)](#):

Proposition D.2 *Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N be independent centred random variables such that, for some $A > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\xi_i|^k] \leq A^k k! \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Then, setting $\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du$, and $s^2 = \sum_i \mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2]$, if $1 \ll x^3 \ll s$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i > x\right) \underset{N \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} 1 - \Phi(x) \underset{N \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}x} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

In this case, $s^2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 = \text{Tr}((\Sigma S_N)^2)$; the theorem follows immediately. ■

In our case, we may write $V_{\text{diag}}(\sigma) = -G^T S_\sigma G$, as a quadratic form over $G \in \mathbb{R}^E \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$, where

$$(S_\sigma)_{(e,i),(e',j)} = \mathbb{1}_{e'=e} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{ij}(e) \neq e} \mathbb{1}_{i \neq j} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

and G is the graph $(G_e^{(i)})_{e \in E, 1 \leq i \leq p}$. As described in [\(C.6\)](#), the covariance matrix Σ of G verifies $\|\Sigma - \text{Id}\|_{op} = O(\rho)$: thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma S_\sigma\|_F^2 &= \|S_\sigma\|_F^2 + O(\rho n^2) \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{ij}(e) \neq e} + O(\rho n^2) \\ &\leq p(p-1) \binom{n}{2} + O(\rho n^2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Now, recall that the value of $V_{\text{diag}}(\sigma)$ only depends on the sets $Y_{ij}(\sigma) = \{e \in E, \sigma_{ij}(e) = e\}$: it is equal to

$$V_{\text{diag}}(Y_{ij}) = - \sum_{\substack{e \in E, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p \\ e \notin Y_{ij}}} G_e^{(i)} G_e^{(j)} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Thus, we may apply [Proposition D.1](#):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}(\exists \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, |V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]| > (\log n)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(\exists (Y_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \subseteq E, |V_{\text{diag}}(Y_{ij}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(Y_{ij})]| > (\log n)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{(Y_{ij}) \subseteq E} \mathbb{P}(V_{\text{diag}}(Y_{ij}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(Y_{ij})] > (\log n)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{(Y_{ij}) \subseteq E} \exp\left(-\frac{n^3 (\log n)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{4p(p-1) \binom{n}{2}} (1 + o(1))\right) \\
 &= \exp(-n\sqrt{\log n} + o(n\sqrt{\log n})) = o(1)
 \end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

showing the first part of the lemma.

The second part follows, simply by noting that, if $D_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \#\{e \in E, \sigma_{ij}(e) = e\}$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})] &= - \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \sum_{\substack{e \in E \\ \sigma_{ij}(e) \neq e}} \mathbb{E}[G_e^{(i)} G_e^{(j)}] \\
 &= -\rho \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - D_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \right) \\
 &= -\rho \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{2} \right) + O(\rho n)
 \end{aligned} \tag{D.10}$$

by Lemma C.2.

Appendix E. Proof of Proposition 3.5

If $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, $r \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[(Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi}) - Z_{r'}(\boldsymbol{\pi})) \mathbb{1}_C] &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r')} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\beta V(\boldsymbol{\sigma})} \mathbb{1}_C] \\
 &\leq \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r')} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\beta(V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})] + O((\log n)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}))}] \\
 &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r')} \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2}{4} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{2} \right) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})\right) \\
 &= e^{O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r) \setminus B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r')} \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2}{4} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\frac{n^2 - d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2}{2} \right)\right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{E.1}$$

The summand is here a decreasing function of $d_c(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^*) = \sqrt{1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2}$. As a result,

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, r)} \exp \left(-\frac{\rho^2}{4} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\frac{n^2 - d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2}{2} \right) \right) \leq \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in B(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*, r)} \exp \left(-\frac{\rho^2}{4} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\frac{n^2 - d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2}{2} \right) \right) \quad (\text{E.2})$$

and so $\mathbb{E}[Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi})] \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)] e^{O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})}$.

Furthermore, $B(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*, r)$ is - by definition - the set $\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p, \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2 > (1-r)n\}$. Thus, setting $A = \{(\alpha_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p}, \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \alpha_{ij} > (1-r)\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - Z_{r'}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)) \mathbb{1}_C] \\ & \leq \sum_{(d_{ij}) \in nA} F(d_{ij}) \exp \left(-\frac{\rho^2}{4} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\frac{n^2 - d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2}{2} \right) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \right) \\ & \leq \max_{(\alpha_{ij}) \in A} F(n\alpha_{ij}) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{p} n \log n \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (1 + \eta)(1 - \alpha_{ij}^2) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.3})$$

where F was defined in Theorem 3.2. We may furthermore use said theorem to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E}[(Z_r(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*) - Z_{r'}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*)) \mathbb{1}_C] & \leq n \log n \max_{(\alpha_{ij}) \in A} \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (1 - \alpha_{ij} - (1 + \eta)(1 - \alpha_{ij}^2)) \right) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \\ & \leq (p-1)n \log n \max_{(\alpha_{ij}) \in A} \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \varphi(\rho_{ij}) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \\ & = (p-1)n \log n \max_{(\alpha_{ij}) \in A} \varphi(\rho) + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

since φ is convex.

Appendix F. Proof of Proposition 3.6

We will begin by showing that $\log Z$ is concentrated around its mean, via the following concentration theorem:

Theorem F.1 *Let (X_1, \dots, X_N) be a standard centred normal vector, and let $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an L -Lipschitz function. Then, if $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)] \geq t) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2L^2}} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

A proof of this theorem can be found in [Boucheron et al. \(2013\)](#).

Note that this remains almost true if (X_1, \dots, X_N) is a centred normal vector with covariance matrix Σ , such that $\|\Sigma\|_{op} = 1 + o(1)$. Specifically, in this case, applying the theorem to the standard normal vector $\tilde{X} = \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} X$ and to $g = f(\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)] \geq t) = \mathbb{P}(g(\tilde{X}) - \mathbb{E}[g(\tilde{X})] \geq t) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2L^2}(1+o(1))} \quad (\text{F.2})$$

as g is a $L(1 + o(1))$ -Lipschitz function.

Here, $\log Z$ is a function F of the normal random variables $(G_i^{(e)})_{e \in E, 1 \leq i \leq p}$; in order to apply this, we therefore want to evaluate ∇F . Thus, if $e \in E$ and $1 \leq i \leq p$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{(e,i)} F((G_e^{(i)})) &= \frac{1}{Z} \partial_{e,i} Z((G_e^{(i)})) \\ &= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}} 2\beta \left(\sum_{j \neq i} (G_{\sigma_{ij}(e)}^{(j)} - G_e^{(j)}) \right) e^{-\beta V(\sigma)} \\ &= 2\beta \sum_{e' \in E, j \neq i} G_{e'}^{(j)} \left(\mathbb{1}_{e=e'} + \mathbb{1}_{e \neq e'} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1} \\ \sigma_{ij}(e)=e'}} \frac{e^{-\beta V(\sigma)}}{Z} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\beta \sum_{e' \in E, j \neq i} G_{e'}^{(j)} \alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.3})$$

(We set $\alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)} = 0$ when $i = j$.) Defined as such, we may notice that $0 \leq \alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)} \leq 1$, and that for any fixed e', j (resp. any fixed e, i),

$$\sum_{e \in E, 1 \leq i \leq p} \alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)} = 2 \text{ resp. } \sum_{e' \in E} \alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)} = 2 \quad (\text{F.4})$$

This means that, defining the matrix A by $A_{(e,i),(e',j)} = \alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)}$, the matrix $\frac{A}{2p}$ is doubly stochastic. This will help us in bounding ∇F , as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F(G)\|^2 &= 4\beta^2 \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{i=1}^p (\partial_{(e,i)} F(G))^2 \\ &= 4\beta^2 \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\sum_{e' \in E, j \neq i} G_{e'}^{(j)} \alpha_{(e,i),(e',j)} \right)^2 \\ &= 4\beta^2 \|AG\|_F^2 \leq 16p^2 \beta^2 \|G\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.5})$$

since $\|A\|_{op} \leq 2p$.

As a result, for $M > 0$, we will define p_M to be the orthogonal projection onto the $\|\cdot\|_F$ ball of radius M : if we truncate our function to obtain $F_M(G) = F(p_M(G))$ for $M > 0$, then F_M is $(4p\beta M)$ -Lipschitz. In this instance, we will take $M = pn^2$.

Consequently, if $\varepsilon > 0$, and $K \leq n^{\frac{3}{2}}$, for large enough n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(\log Z - \mathbb{E}[\log Z] > K) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \geq M) + \mathbb{P}(F_M(G) - \mathbb{E}[F_M(G)] > K) \\
 &\leq \exp(-Cn^2) + e^{-\frac{K^2}{16p^2\beta^2M^2}(1+o(1))} \\
 &\leq \exp(-C' \frac{K^2}{n \log n})
 \end{aligned} \tag{F.6}$$

where C, C' are independent from n .

This means that $\log Z = \mathbb{E}[\log Z] + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{n \log n})$. In order to conclude, we therefore need to show that $\mathbb{E}[\log Z] \sim \log \mathbb{E}[Z]$, ie. that Z doesn't have too long of a tail. We will establish this through the following lemma.

Lemma F.2 $\mathbb{P}((\log Z) \mathbb{1}_c \geq (p-1)|\eta|n \log n - (p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}}) \geq \exp(-O(n))$.

By F.6, this means that $\mathbb{E}[\log Z]$ cannot be much smaller than $(p-1)|\eta|n \log n$. Indeed, for large enough n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}((\log Z) \mathbb{1}_c > \mathbb{E}[\log Z] + n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}}) &\leq \exp(-C'n(\log n)^{\frac{1}{5}}) \\
 &< \exp(-O(n)) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}((\log Z) \mathbb{1}_c \geq (p-1)|\eta|n \log n - (p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}})
 \end{aligned} \tag{F.7}$$

so that $\mathbb{E}[\log Z] + n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}} \geq (p-1)|\eta|n \log n - (p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}} \geq \log \mathbb{E}[Z \mathbb{1}_c] + O(n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{4}})$, concluding the proof.

Proof of Lemma F.2

Set

$$U = \{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq 2\} \tag{F.8}$$

Then, by Theorem 3.2, $|U| \geq \frac{1}{2}(n!)^{p-1}$. We will estimate

$$N = \#\{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in U, \beta V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \geq -c(p-1)n \log n\} \tag{F.9}$$

where $c = 2\sqrt{1+\eta} > 0$.

Here, $V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = G^T M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} G$ for some matrix $M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ defined in (G.1) such that, for any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in U$,

$$\text{Tr}((\Sigma M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})^2) = p(p-1) \binom{n}{2} (1 + O(\rho)). \tag{F.10}$$

Thus, we may apply Proposition D.1:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[N] &= (n!)^{p-1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq -\frac{c}{\beta}(p-1)n \log n\right) \\
 &\sim (n!)^{p-1} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{8p}{c^2\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}} \exp\left(-\frac{c^2(p-1)n \log n}{4(1+\eta)}(1+O(\rho))\right). \\
 &= \exp\left((p-1)n \log \frac{n}{e} - (p-1)n \log n + O(\sqrt{n \log^3 n})\right) \\
 &= \exp(O(n)).
 \end{aligned} \tag{F.11}$$

We would like to show that $\mathbb{E}[N^2] = \exp O(n)$. Assuming this, by the Paley-Zygmund inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(N > 0) \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[N]^2}{\mathbb{E}[N^2]} = \exp(-O(n)) \quad (\text{F.12})$$

However, if $N > 0$, there exists $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in U$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z &\geq -\beta V(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \\ &\geq -\rho\beta p(p-1) \binom{n}{2} - \beta V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + \beta(V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]) \\ &\geq -2(1+\eta)(p-1)n \log n + 2\sqrt{1+\eta}(p-1)n \log n + \beta(V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]) \\ &\geq -\eta n \log n - (p-1)\eta^2 n \log n + \beta(V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]) \\ &= |\eta|n \log n - (p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}} + \beta(V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.13})$$

We may also recall from the proof of Lemma 3.3 that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, |V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \mathbb{E}[V_{\text{diag}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})]| \geq (\log n)^{\frac{1}{4}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \exp(-n\sqrt{\log n}(1+o(1))). \quad (\text{F.14})$$

This means that $\mathbb{P}((\log Z)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \geq -\eta n \log n - (p-1)n(\log n)^{\frac{3}{5}}) \geq \exp(-O(n)) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) = \exp(-O(n))$, which is what we wished to show.

We now just need to show that $\mathbb{E}[N^2] = \exp(O(n))$. Indeed, by Proposition D.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[N^2] &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in U} \mathbb{P}\left(V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \leq -\frac{c}{\beta}(p-1)n \log n, V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}') \leq -\frac{c}{\beta}(p-1)n \log n\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in U} \mathbb{P}\left(V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) + V_{\text{off}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}') \leq -2\frac{c}{\beta}(p-1)n \log n\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta\sqrt{\text{Tr}((\Sigma(M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}'})^2))}}{2\sqrt{\pi}c(p-1)n \log n} \exp\left(-\frac{c^2 n^2 \log^2 n}{\beta^2 \text{Tr}((\Sigma(M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}'})^2))}\right) (1+o(1)) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{c^2(p-1)^2 n^2 \log^2 n}{\beta^2 \text{Tr}((\Sigma(M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}'})^2))} + O(\log n)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.15})$$

To continue, we will note that, as we showed in (C.17), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}((\Sigma(M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + M_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}'})^2)) &\leq 2p(p-1) \binom{n}{2} + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \binom{c_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}')}{2} + O(\rho n^2) \\ &\leq \left(p(p-1)n^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} c_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}')^2\right) (1+O(\rho)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.16})$$

where $c_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}') = \#\{u \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \sigma_{ij}(u) = \sigma'_{ij}(u)\} = n \cdot \text{ov}(\pi_i^* \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma'_i (\pi_i^*)^{-1}, \pi_j^* \sigma_j^{-1} \sigma'_j (\pi_j^*)^{-1})$. Note that this definition parallels that of $d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = n \cdot \text{ov}(\pi_i^* \sigma_i^{-1}, \pi_j^* \sigma_j^{-1})$; in particular, we will point out that, for fixed $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, if $0 \leq (c_{ij})_{i \neq j} \leq n$,

$$\#\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p, c_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}') = c_{ij}\} = F(c_{ij}) \quad (\text{F.17})$$

where F was defined in Theorem 3.2. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[N^2] &\leq \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in U} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in U} \exp\left(-\frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} c_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}')^2} (1 + O(\rho))\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}} \exp\left(-\frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} c_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}')^2} (1 + O(\rho))\right) \\ &\leq (n!)^{p-1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}} \exp\left(-\frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}')^2} (1 + O(\rho))\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.18})$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}[N^2] \leq (n!)^{p-1} \sum_{0 \leq (d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \leq n} F(d_{ij}) \exp\left(-\frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}^2} (1 + O(\rho))\right) \quad (\text{F.19})$$

However, instead of using Theorem 3.2 to bound $F(d_{ij})$, we will need to use the more powerful Theorem B.1. For any $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[N^2] &\leq \sum_{0 \leq (d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \leq n} \frac{(n!)^{p-1}}{(\max_{j < 2} d_{\tau(j)\tau(2)})! \dots (\max_{j < p} d_{\tau(j)\tau(p)})!} \exp\left(-\frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}^2} + O(n)\right) \\ &\leq (n!)^{2(p-1)} \sum_{0 \leq (d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \leq n} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=2}^p D_i(\tau) \log_+(D_i(\tau)) - \frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}^2} + O(n)\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.20})$$

where we have set $D_i(\tau) = \max_{j < i} d_{\tau(j)\tau(i)}$ for $2 \leq i \leq p$.

Note that, in fact, $D_i(\tau) \log_+(D_i(\tau)) = D_i(\tau) \log n + O(n)$. Thus, in order to show that $\mathbb{E}[N^2] \leq e^{O(n)}$, we will prove that, for any values of (d_{ij}) , there exists τ such that

$$\sum_{i=2}^p D_i(\tau) \log n + \frac{2(p-1)n \log n}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} d_{ij}^2} \geq 2(p-1)n \log n. \quad (\text{F.21})$$

Setting $\alpha_{ij} = \frac{d_{ij}}{n}$ and $A_i(\tau) = \frac{1}{n} D_i(\tau)$, this is equivalent to showing that there exists τ such that

$$\frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{i=2}^p A_i(\tau) \geq \frac{\frac{2}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \alpha_{ij}^2}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \alpha_{ij}^2}. \quad (\text{F.22})$$

This fact is true, but its proof is quite technical: we defer it to Appendix L. ■

Appendix G. Proof of Proposition 3.7

The main difference between this argument and the proof of Proposition 3.5 is that, in this instance, we cannot ignore the fluctuations of V_{diag} : we will be directly evaluating $\sum_{\sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon)} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\beta V(\sigma)}]$. To this end, note that, for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, we may write $V_{\text{off}}(\sigma) = -G^T M'_\sigma G$, as a quadratic form over $\mathbb{R}^E \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$, where

$$(M'_\sigma)_{(e,i),(e',j)} = \mathbb{1}_{i \neq j} (\mathbb{1}_{e' = \sigma_{ij}(e)} - \mathbb{1}_{e' = e}) \quad (\text{G.1})$$

for any $e, e' \in E, 1 \leq i, j \leq p$. As we saw in Appendix C, the covariance matrix of G is equal to $(1 - \rho) \text{Id} + \rho \tilde{J}$, where $\|\tilde{J}\|_{op} \leq p - 1$. Therefore, for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, by (C.7),

$$\text{Tr}((\Sigma M'_\sigma)^k) \leq \text{Tr}((\Sigma M'_\sigma)^2) p^{k-2}. \quad (\text{G.2})$$

Furthermore, again by (C.7):

$$\text{Tr}((\Sigma M'_\sigma)^2) = \text{Tr}((M'_\sigma)^2) (1 + o(1)) + \rho^2 \text{Tr}((\tilde{J} M'_\sigma)^2). \quad (\text{G.3})$$

Here, by Lemma C.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}((M'_\sigma)^2) &= \sum_{(e,i),(e',j)} \mathbb{1}_{i \neq j} (\mathbb{1}_{e' = \sigma_{ij}(e)} - \mathbb{1}_{e' = e})^2 \\ &= 2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - D_{ij}(\sigma) \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2} \right) (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.4})$$

Similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Tr}((\tilde{J}M'_\sigma)^2) &= \sum_{(e,i),(e',j),(e'',k)} \left(\sum_{l=1}^p \mathbb{1}_{l \neq k} (1_{e''=\sigma_{lk}(e)} - 1_{e''=e}) \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^p \mathbb{1}_{l \neq j} (1_{e'=\sigma_{lj}(e'')} - 1_{e'=e''}) \right) \\
 &\leq 2 \sum_{(e,i),(e',j)} \sum_{1 \leq k,l,l' \leq p} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{lk}(e) \neq e} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{l'j}(e') \neq e'} \mathbb{1}_{e' \in \{\sigma_{l'j}\sigma_{lk}(e), \sigma_{l'k}(e), \sigma_{lj}(e), e\}} \\
 &\leq 2 \sum_{(e,i)} \sum_{1 \leq k,l,l' \leq p} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{lk}(e) \neq e} \left(\sum_{(e',j)} \mathbb{1}_{e' \in \{\sigma_{l'j}\sigma_{lk}(e), \sigma_{l'k}(e), \sigma_{lj}(e), e\}} \right) \\
 &\leq 8p^2 \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{1 \leq k,l \leq p} \mathbb{1}_{\sigma_{lk}(e) \neq e} \\
 &= 4p^2(1 + o(1)) \text{Tr}((M'_\sigma)^2)
 \end{aligned} \tag{G.5}$$

and so

$$\text{Tr}((\Sigma M'_\sigma)^2) = 2 \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2} \right) (1 + o(1)). \tag{G.6}$$

As a result, if $\varepsilon > 0$, by Lemma D.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{P}(\exists \sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon) \setminus \{\pi^*\}, V(\sigma) \leq 0) \\
 &\leq \sum_{\sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon)} \mathbb{P}(V(\sigma) \leq 0) \\
 &\leq \sum_{\sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon) \setminus \{\pi^*\}} \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{E}[V(\sigma)]^2}{4 \text{Tr}((\Sigma M'_\sigma)^2)}\right) \\
 &= \sum_{\sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon) \setminus \{\pi^*\}} \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2}{8} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}(\sigma)}{2} \right) (1 + o(1))\right) \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{(1-p(p-1)\varepsilon)n < (d_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \leq 1 \\ (d_{ij}) \neq (1)}} F(d_{ij}) \exp\left(-\frac{\rho^2}{8} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}}{2} \right) (1 + o(1))\right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{G.7}$$

since $B(\pi^*, \varepsilon) \subseteq \{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}, \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq p, d_{ij}(\sigma) > 1 - p(p-1)\varepsilon\}$ By Theorem 3.2, thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{P}(\exists \sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon) \setminus \{\pi^*\}, V(\sigma) \leq 0) \\
 &\leq \sum_{\substack{(1-p(p-1)\varepsilon)n < (d_{ij}) \leq 1 \\ (d_{ij}) \neq (1)}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (n - d_{ij}) \log n - \frac{\rho^2}{8} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left(\binom{n}{2} - \binom{d_{ij}}{2} \right) (1 + o(1))\right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{G.8}$$

since $\frac{n!}{(d_{ij})!} \leq n^{n-d_{ij}} = e^{(n-d_{ij}) \log n}$. Setting $\alpha_{ij} = \frac{d_{ij}}{n}$, we may simplify this:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}(\exists \sigma \in B(\pi^*, \varepsilon) \setminus \{\pi^*\}, V(\sigma) \leq 0) \\
 & \sum_{\substack{(1-p(p-1)\varepsilon)n < (d_{ij}) \leq 1 \\ (d_{ij}) \neq (1)}} \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} n \log n \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \left((1 - \alpha_{ij}) - (1 + \eta)(1 + o(1)) \frac{1 - \alpha_{ij}^2}{2} \right) \right) \\
 & \leq \sum_{\substack{(1-p(p-1)\varepsilon)n < (d_{ij}) \leq 1 \\ (d_{ij}) \neq (1)}} \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} n \log n \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (1 - \alpha_{ij}) \left(1 - (1 + \eta)(1 + o(1)) \frac{2 - p(p-1)\varepsilon}{2} \right) \right) \\
 & = \sum_{\substack{(1-p(p-1)\varepsilon)n < (d_{ij}) \leq 1 \\ (d_{ij}) \neq (1)}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{p} n \log n c_\varepsilon \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} (1 - \alpha_{ij}) \right) = o(1)
 \end{aligned} \tag{G.9}$$

where $c_\varepsilon > 0$ as soon as $\varepsilon < \frac{\eta}{p(p-1)}$.

Appendix H. Proof of Proposition 4.1

Let $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$, and let (A_1, \dots, A_p) be graphs over $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(\pi^* = \pi, G_1 = A_1, \dots, G_p = A_p) &= \frac{1}{(n!)^{p-1}} \mathbb{P}(G_1 = A_1, \dots, G_p = A_p | \pi^* = \pi) \\
 &= \frac{1}{(n!)^{p-1}} \prod_{e \in E} \mathbb{P}(\forall i \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket, e \in G_i \Leftrightarrow e \in A_i)
 \end{aligned} \tag{H.1}$$

since the variables $((\mathbb{1}_{e \in G_1}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{e \in G_p}))_{e \in E}$ are all independent. In fact, we know the laws of these variables explicitly, and so we may write:

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall i \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket, e \in G_i \Leftrightarrow e \in A_i) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\lambda(1-(1-s)^{p-1})}{n} & \text{if } \forall 1 \leq i \leq p, e \notin A_i \\ \frac{\lambda}{n} s^k (1-s)^{n-k} & \text{if } \#\{1 \leq i \leq p, e \in A_i\} = k > 0 \end{cases} \tag{H.2}$$

Consequently, since we observe the graphs $(\pi_i^*)^{-1}(G_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$, we are interested in the following quantity, for any given graphs A'_1, \dots, A'_p over $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P}(\pi^* = \pi | (\pi_1^*)^{-1}(G_1) = A'_1, \dots, (\pi_p^*)^{-1}(G_p) = A'_p) \\
 &= \frac{1}{Z} \mathbb{P}(\pi^* = \pi, G_1 = \pi_1(A'_1), \dots, G_p = \pi_p(A'_p)) \\
 &= \frac{1}{Z} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(1-(1-s)^{p-1})}{n} \right)^{e_\emptyset(\pi)} \prod_{X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket \setminus \emptyset} \left(\frac{\lambda s^{|X|} (1-s)^{p-|X|}}{n} \right)^{e_X(\pi)}
 \end{aligned} \tag{H.3}$$

Since $\sum_{X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \binom{n}{2}$ is independent from $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, we may therefore rewrite:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^* = \boldsymbol{\pi} | (\pi_1^*)^{-1}(G_1) = A'_1, \dots, (\pi_p^*)^{-1}(G_p) = A'_p) \\
 &= \frac{1}{Z'} \prod_{X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket \setminus \emptyset} \left(\frac{\lambda s^{|X|} (1-s)^{p-|X|}}{n} \right)^{e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(1-(1-s)^{p-1})}{n} \right)^{-e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi})} \\
 &= \frac{1}{Z'} \exp(-\log n \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))
 \end{aligned} \tag{H.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) &= \sum_{X \neq \emptyset} e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log n} \log \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\lambda(1-(1-s)^{p-1})}{n}}{\lambda s^{|X|} (1-s)^{p-|X|}} \right) \right) \\
 &= (1 + o(1)) \sum_{X \neq \emptyset} e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{H.5}$$

which proves the proposition.

Appendix I. Proof of Proposition 4.2

Let σ be an automorphism of $G_1 \cap H_1(\boldsymbol{\pi})$, and denote $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma, \dots, \sigma) \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$. We will note a few identities relating the $e_X(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\pi})$ to the $e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi})$.

First of all,

$$\sum_{X \neq \emptyset, \{1\}} e_X(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\pi}) = e(\sigma(H_1)) = e(H_1) = \sum_{X \neq \emptyset, \{1\}} e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \tag{I.1}$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} e_X(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\pi}) = e(G_1) = \sum_{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \tag{I.2}$$

(These identities are true for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$.) Furthermore, since σ is an automorphism of $G_1 \cap H_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\substack{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket \\ X \neq \{1\}}} e_X(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\pi}) &= e(G_1 \cap \sigma(H_1)) \\
 &\geq e((G_1 \cap H_1) \cap \sigma(G_1 \cap H_1)) \\
 &= e(G_1 \cap H_1) \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket \\ X \neq \{1\}}} e_X(\boldsymbol{\pi})
 \end{aligned} \tag{I.3}$$

Putting these three identities together, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{X \neq \emptyset} e_X(\sigma\pi) &= \left(\sum_{X \neq \emptyset, \{1\}} e_X(\sigma\pi) \right) + e_{\{1\}}(\sigma\pi) \\
 &= \sum_{X \neq \emptyset, \{p\}} e_X(\sigma\pi) + \sum_{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} e_X(\sigma\pi) - \sum_{\substack{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket \\ X \neq \{1\}}} e_X(\sigma\pi) \\
 &\leq \sum_{X \neq \emptyset, \{p\}} e_X(\pi) + \sum_{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} e_X(\pi) - \sum_{\substack{1 \in X \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket \\ X \neq \{1\}}} e_X(\pi) \\
 &= \sum_{X \neq \emptyset} e_X(\pi)
 \end{aligned} \tag{I.4}$$

concluding the proof.

Appendix J. Proof of Proposition 4.4

Let A be as in the proposition. Fix an ordering $(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \dots)$ of all isomorphism classes of trees. For any $i \geq 1$, we set n_i to be the number of connected components of A which are isomorphic to \mathcal{T}_i . Then, for any i , there exists a constant c_i with

$$\frac{n_i}{n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} c_i \tag{J.1}$$

and $\sum_{i \geq 1} |\mathcal{T}_i| c_i = 1$. (This is shown in [Bollobás \(2001\)](#).)

Thus, let $\delta > 0$. If $K > 0$ is large enough, with high probability,

$$\sum_{\substack{i \geq 1 \\ |\mathcal{T}_i| \leq K}} |\mathcal{T}_i| \frac{n_i}{n} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta^2}{2} \tag{J.2}$$

As a result, any $X \subseteq \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ with size at least δn and with no outgoing edges, contains a subset $X' \subseteq X$ of size at least $(\delta - \frac{\delta^2}{2})n$ which is a disjoint union of connected components of size at most K .

Call m_i the number of connected components of X' isomorphic to \mathcal{T}_i , for any i : then, we may assume that $m_i \neq 1$ for any $i \geq 1$, even if that means decreasing the size of X' to be at least $(\delta - \delta^2)n$. Consequently, we may build automorphisms of X' by permuting its connected components which are isomorphic. The number of automorphisms with no fixed point which we can build in this way is at least equal to

$$\prod_{\substack{i \geq 1 \\ |\mathcal{T}_i| \leq K}} \frac{m_i!}{3} \tag{J.3}$$

since, for any $k \neq 1$, there are at least $\frac{k!}{3}$ elements of \mathcal{S}_k with no fixed points. Since K is independent from n and $\sum_i m_i \geq \frac{(\delta - \delta^2)n}{K}$, this provides us with at least

$$\exp\left(\frac{(\delta - \delta^2)n}{K}n \log n + O(n)\right) \geq (cn)! \quad (\text{J.4})$$

automorphisms of X' , for large enough n (and some $c > 0$ independent from n).

Finally, we may extend these automorphisms to be Id on the complement of X' , proving the proposition.

Appendix K. Quasi-injectivity of the function F

Let F be the (random) function defined in the proof of Theorem 1.2. We will prove that condition (ii) from Lemma 2.7 holds with $K_n(r) = \exp O_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$.

Let $\pi' \in \mathcal{S}_n^{p-1}$. We may partition $F^{-1}(\pi')$ as

$$\begin{aligned} F^{-1}(\pi') &= \bigsqcup_{\substack{Y \subseteq Z \subseteq [1, n] \\ S \text{ subgraph of } (G_1)|_Z}} \{\pi \in F^{-1}(\pi'), X(\pi) = Y, \overline{X}(\pi) = Z, (G_1 \cap H_1(\pi))|_Z = S\} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{\substack{Y \subseteq Z \subseteq [1, n] \\ S \text{ subgraph of } (G_1)|_Z}} W(Y, Z, S) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{K.1})$$

Then, there are only $\exp O_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$ possible values for (Y, Z, S) , as $|G_1| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$. We therefore just need to show that $|W(Y, Z, S)| \leq \exp O_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$ for any triplet (Y, Z, S) . To this end, let $\pi, \pi' \in W(Y, Z, S)$: by construction, $\pi' \pi^{-1}$ is of the form (σ, \dots, σ) for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$. Furthermore, given such a σ , we know that $\sigma|_Y = \text{Id}$, and σ must be an automorphism of $S|_Z$. This allows us to use the following lemma to conclude.

Lemma K.1 *Let H be a graph over some set V , with degree distribution $(d_v)_{v \in V}$. Then, H has at most $\prod_{v \in V} (d_v)!$ automorphisms which send each connected component of H to itself.*

Indeed, by construction of $\overline{X}(\pi) = Z$, any connected component of S intersects Y , and so σ must send it to itself. This gives us at most $\prod_{i=1}^n (d_i)!$ possible values for σ , concluding the proof as

$$\log \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i!) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \log d_i = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n \mathbb{E}[d_i \log d_i]) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n). \quad (\text{K.2})$$

given that $\mathbb{E}[d_i \log d_i] = O(1)$.

Proof of Lemma K.1 We may assume without loss of generality that H is connected. We will prove by recursion that, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, there exists $X \subseteq V$ such that the cardinal of $\{\sigma|_X, \sigma \in \text{Aut } H\}$ is at most equal to

$$v(H) \prod_{\substack{u \in X \\ N_u \subseteq X}} (d_u)! \quad (\text{K.3})$$

where, for any vertex u , N_u is the set of neighbour of u .

This is clear for $i = 1$. Furthermore, if we have such a set $X \neq V$, then there exist $u \in X$ such that N_u is not contained within X . However, if $\sigma \in \text{Aut } G$, $\sigma|_{N_u} = N_{\sigma(u)}$ and so, given the

value of $\sigma(u)$, there are at most $d_u!$ possible values for $\sigma|_{N_u}$. Thus, the property remains true for $X' = X \cup N_u$. By recursion, this concludes the proof. ■

Appendix L. An extra theorem

Theorem L.1 *Let $0 \leq (x_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} \leq 1$ be real numbers with $x_{ij} = x_{ji}$ for all $i \neq j$. If $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$, and $2 \leq i \leq p$, define $X_i(\tau) = \max_{j < i} x_{\tau(j)\tau(i)}$. We also set*

$$S_*(\tau) = S_*(\tau, (x_{ij})) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{i=2}^p X_i(\tau) \quad (\text{L.1})$$

Then, there exists $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that

$$S_*(\tau) \geq \frac{\frac{2}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2} \quad (\text{L.2})$$

Remark L.2 *Consider the complete graph K_p over $\llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$; we put the weight x_{ij} on the edge linking i to j , obtaining a graph \mathcal{G} . We construct a spanning tree of \mathcal{G} , by:*

- *picking $\tau(1)$;*
- *picking $\tau(2)$ and connecting it to $\tau(1)$;*
- *picking $\tau(3)$ and connecting it to $\tau(1)$ or $\tau(2)$ (depending on whether $x_{\tau(1)\tau(3)}$ or $x_{\tau(2)\tau(3)}$ is larger);*
- *and continuing the process in this fashion.*

$X_i(\tau)$ is the $(i-1)$ th edge constructed by this process, and so $(p-1)S_(\tau)$ is the total weight of the tree. Furthermore, if τ is chosen correctly, this is simply the application of Prim's algorithm; thus, $\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_p} (p-1)S_*(\tau)$ is the total weight of the maximal spanning tree of \mathcal{G} . We are therefore claiming that there exists a spanning tree of \mathcal{G} , with weight at least*

$$(p-1) \cdot \frac{\frac{2}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2}. \quad (\text{L.3})$$

Proof We will proceed by recursion over $p \geq 1$. If $p = 1$, there is nothing to prove. From now on, we assume that $p \geq 2$.

Let x be the minimum weight of an edge contained in the maximal spanning tree. Then, the graph over $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ with edges $\{\{i \neq j\}, x_{ij} > x\}$ cannot be connected; otherwise, Prim's algorithm would give us a maximal spanning tree with edges whose weights are strictly larger than x . Thus, we may partition $\llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$ into two (nonempty) subsets $B_1, B_2 \subseteq \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$ such that $x_{ij} \leq x$ for $i \in B_1, j \in B_2$, and there exists a maximal spanning tree which is the union of

- a maximal spanning tree of the induced subgraph of \mathcal{G} over B_1 ;
- a maximal spanning tree of the induced subgraph of \mathcal{G} over B_2 ;
- an edge with weight x .

Also note that we may assume, without loss of generality, that $x_{ij} \geq x$ for any $i \neq j \in B_1$ or $i \neq j \in B_2$. Indeed, even after increasing the x_{ij} to satisfy this condition, applying Prim's algorithm (with suitable tiebreakers) will still give us the same spanning tree, (since all of the edges of the spanning tree are $\geq x$) but the quantity $\frac{2\sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2}{1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2}$ will have increased.

Noting $|B_1| = k_1$ and $|B_2| = k_2 = p - k_1$, this means that

$$(p-1)S_* = (k_1-1)S_*((x_{ij})_{i,j \in B_1}) + (k_2-1)S_*((x_{ij})_{i,j \in B_2}) + x. \quad (\text{L.4})$$

However, by induction, we have

$$(k_1-1)S_*((x_{ij})_{i,j \in B_1}) + (k_2-1)S_*((x_{ij})_{i,j \in B_2}) \geq (k_1-1)\frac{2S_1}{1+S_1} + (k_2-1)\frac{2S_2}{1+S_2} \quad (\text{L.5})$$

where $S_l = \frac{1}{k_l(k_l-1)} \sum_{i,j \in B_l} x_{ij}^2$ for $l = 1$ or 2 . (Note that, in our case, $S_l \geq x^2$.) In order to conclude, we thus simply need to show that

$$(k_1-1)\frac{2S_1}{1+S_1} + (k_2-1)\frac{2S_2}{1+S_2} + x \geq (p-1)\frac{2\frac{1}{p(p-1)}\sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2}{1 + \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2} \quad (\text{L.6})$$

To simplify notations, we define

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{k_1-1}{p-1}, \alpha_2 = \frac{k_2-1}{p-1}, \alpha_3 = \frac{1}{p-1} \quad (\text{L.7})$$

$$\beta_1 = \frac{k_1(k_1-1)}{p(p-1)}, \beta_2 = \frac{k_2(k_2-1)}{p(p-1)}, \beta_3 = \frac{2k_1k_2}{p(p-1)} \quad (\text{L.8})$$

such that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 = 1$. By definition of our blocks, we have:

$$\frac{1}{p(p-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq p} x_{ij}^2 \leq \beta_1 S_1 + \beta_2 S_2 + \beta_3 x^2 \quad (\text{L.9})$$

and so, in order to show (L.6), we just need to show that

$$\alpha_1 \frac{2S_1}{1+S_1} + \alpha_2 \frac{2S_2}{1+S_2} + \alpha_3 x \geq \frac{2(\beta_1 S_1 + \beta_2 S_2 + \beta_3 x^2)}{1 + \beta_1 S_1 + \beta_2 S_2 + \beta_3 x^2} \quad (\text{L.10})$$

Expanding out, the above inequality reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(S_1, S_2) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2\alpha_1 S_1(1 + S_2) + 2\alpha_2 S_2(1 + S_1) + \alpha_3 x(1 + S_1)(1 + S_2))(1 + \beta_1 S_1 + \beta_2 S_2 + \beta_3 x^2) \\
 &\quad - (2\beta_1 S_1 + 2\beta_2 S_2 + 2\beta_3 x^2)(1 + S_1)(1 + S_2) \\
 &\geq 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{L.11}$$

We will show that:

- for $x \leq S_1, S_2 \leq 1$, $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial S_i^2}(S_1, S_2) \leq 0$, ie. f is concave in both arguments;
- $f(x^2, 1) \geq 0$, $f(1, x^2) \geq 0$, $f(1, 1) \geq 0$, and $f(x^2, x^2) \geq 0$,

proving that indeed $f(S_1, S_2) \geq 0$ for $x^2 \leq S_1, S_2 \leq 1$.

First of all,

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial S_1^2}(S_1, S_2) = 2\alpha_1 \beta_1 (1 + S_2) - 2\beta_1 (1 + S_2) \leq 0. \tag{L.12}$$

and, by symmetry, $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial S_2^2} \leq 0$. Secondly, expanding out f ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x^2, 1) &= 2\alpha_3 x(1 - x)^2 + 2\alpha_3(1 - \beta_2)x^3(1 - x)^2 \\
 &\quad + 2\alpha_2(1 + \beta_2) - 4\beta_2 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 x + 4\alpha_1\beta_2 x^2 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 x^3 - 2\alpha_2(1 - \beta_2)x^4 \\
 &\geq 2\alpha_2(1 + \beta_2) - 4\beta_2 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 + 4\alpha_1\beta_2 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 - 2\alpha_2(1 - \beta_2) = 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{L.13}$$

since $2\alpha_2(1 + \beta_2) - 4\beta_2 = \frac{2k_1(k_2-1)}{p(p-1)} \geq 0$.

Thirdly, by symmetry, $f(1, x^2) \geq 0$.

Fourthly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(1, 1) &= 4(1 - \alpha_3(1 - x))(2 - \beta_3(1 - x^2)) - 8(1 - \beta_3(1 - x^2)) \\
 &= 8\frac{k_1 k_2}{p(p-1)}(1 - x^2) - \frac{8}{p-1}(1 - x) + \frac{8k_1 k_2}{p(p-1)^2}(1 - x)(1 - x^2) \\
 &= \frac{8}{p(p-1)^2}(k_1(p - k_1)(p - 1)(1 - x^2) - p(p - 1)(1 - x) + k_1(p - k_1)(1 - x)(1 - x^2))
 \end{aligned} \tag{L.14}$$

If $k_1 \geq 2$ and $k_2 = p - k_1 \geq 2$, then $k_1(p - k_1) \geq p$ and $f(1, 1) \geq 0$. Otherwise $\{k_1, k_2\} = \{1, p - 1\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(1, 1) &= \frac{8}{p(p-1)^2}((p-1)^2(1 - x^2) - p(p-1)(1 - x) + (p-1)(1 - x)(1 - x^2)) \\
 &= \frac{8}{p(p-1)^2}(p-1)(p-2)x^2(1 - x) \geq 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{L.15}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x^2, x^2) &= (1 + x^2)^2(2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)x^2 + \alpha_3x(1 + x^2) - 2x^2) \\ &= (1 + x^2)^2\alpha_3x(1 - x)^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{L.16}$$

■