

Consistency of Spectral Clustering on Hierarchical Stochastic Block Models

Lihua Lei¹, Xiaodong Li², and Xingmei Lou²

¹Department of Statistics, Stanford University

²Department of Statistics, University of California, Davis

Abstract

We propose a generic network model, based on the Stochastic Block Model, to study the hierarchy of communities in real-world networks, under which the connection probabilities are structured in a binary tree. Under the network model, we show that the eigenstructure of the expected unnormalized graph Laplacian reveals the community structure of the network as well as the hierarchy of communities in a recursive fashion. Inspired by the nice property of the population eigenstructure, we develop a recursive bi-partitioning algorithm that divides the network into two communities based on the Fiedler vector of the unnormalized graph Laplacian and repeats the split until a stopping rule indicates no further community structures. We prove the weak and strong consistency of our algorithm for sparse networks with the expected node degree in $O(\log n)$ order, based on newly developed theory on $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ eigenspace perturbation, without knowing the total number of communities in advance. Unlike most of existing work, our theory covers multi-scale networks where the connection probabilities may differ in order of magnitude, which comprise an important class of models that are practically relevant but technically challenging to deal with. Finally we demonstrate the performance of our algorithm on synthetic data and real-world examples.

Keywords: Hierarchy, binary tree, Stochastic Block Model, Laplacian, spectral method, eigenspace perturbation

1 Introduction

Community detection in networks is an important problem in statistics, theoretical computer science and physics. For a summary, see the survey of Abbe (2017); Fortunato (2010). One of the most widely studied statistical models in this area is the Stochastic Block Model (Holland et al., 1983), henceforth SBM. The most basic task of community detection consists of partitioning the vertices of a graph into clusters with similar connection patterns. There are numerous community detection methods in the literature, among which the spectral methods under SBM or its variants are extensively explored (McSherry, 2001; Dasgupta et al., 2006; Rohe et al., 2011; Balakrishnan et al., 2011; Lei et al., 2015; Jin et al., 2015; Abbe et al., 2015; Li et al., 2018). Rohe et al. (2011) studied spectral clustering based on normalized graph Laplacian under SBM and provided the asymptotic clustering results that allow the number of blocks in the SBM to grow with the number of nodes. Jin et al. (2015) proposed a modified spectral clustering method for degree-corrected

SBM in particular. Although all of the aforementioned works are very encouraging, their results do not apply to a sparse networks with the expected node degree in $O(\log n)$ order, whereas it is more realistic. Later, Lei et al. (2015) showed that spectral clustering applied to the adjacency matrix of a network can consistently recover hidden communities under SBM even in the sparse regime.

Generally speaking, spectral clustering methods first perform a spectral decomposition of a matrix associated with the network, which can be the adjacency matrix, the unnormalized graph Laplacian, the normalized graph Laplacian, etc. Then the community membership is inferred through applying a clustering algorithm to the rows, sometimes normalized, of the matrix formed by the first few leading eigenvectors. The typical clustering algorithm used in this step is K -means. We call this type of methods the K -way spectral clustering methods, which find a single partition of a network into K communities. As we can see, the K -way spectral clustering methods require the true number of communities K as a prior knowledge. However, the true number of communities is usually unknown and may not even have a scientific meaning, since communities in real-world networks are often hierarchically structured and different communities can be observed at different granularities.

These practical concerns motivate hierarchical network models and hierarchical clustering algorithms. In terms of the model, the hierarchical structure is conventionally represented by a tree in which closely related pairs of nodes have lower common ancestors. In a network, the connection probability between a pair of vertices usually depends on how related they are in the hierarchy. One mainstream strategy to model the network hierarchy mathematically is through random graphs. Clauset et al. (2008) introduced the Hierarchical Random Graph model (HRG) in which each internal node of a full binary tree is endowed with a probability and then connect each pair of vertices for whom this internal node is the lowest common ancestor independently with the associated probability. It was further extended by Peel and Clauset (2015) to general dendrograms. Balakrishnan et al. (2011) extended HRGs to a class of weighted HRGs with subgaussian weights that can characterize the similarity between nodes. Later, Lyzinski et al. (2016) proposed another class of models, referred to as the Hierarchical Stochastic Block model (HSBM), based on Random Dot Product models and SBMs. More recently, Li et al. (2018) proposed a Binary Tree Stochastic Block model (BTSBM) as a hybrid of the original HRG and the SBM, that embeds the communities as terminal nodes and mega-communities as internal nodes of a full binary tree. In this paper, we generalize the BTSBM by relaxing the requirement of a balanced full binary tree, that restricts the number of communities to be powers of 2. The generalized version includes a more flexible and realistic class of network hierarchies that may arise in practice.

In terms of hierarchical clustering algorithms, while there is rich literature on algorithmic design, their theoretical properties have not been fully understood. Most algorithms for hierarchical community detection can be basically divided into two categories: agglomerative algorithms that iteratively merge the nodes to build the hierarchy from bottom up, and divisive algorithms that iteratively split the network from top down. In this paper, we are focusing on top-down recursive partitioning algorithms. This class of algorithms has been studied in several previous works. Dasgupta et al. (2006) analyzed the second eigenvector technique of spectral partitioning on the planted partition random graph model. Balakrishnan et al. (2011) discussed a top-down hierarchical clustering algorithm based on the exploration of the eigen-structure of unnormalized graph Laplacian of a hierarchically structured pairwise similarity matrix, which is similar with our work in terms of the algorithm. Li et al. (2018) considered a recursive bi-partitioning algorithm based on adjacency matrix. These methods are algorithmically similar in that they proceed by recursively dividing

clusters into two and deciding for each cluster whether to cease based on a stopping rule assessing if the cluster is pure. The bi-partitioning step is practically appealing since it typically only relies on one or two leading eigenvectors, thereby facilitating the implementation and computation.

Let $G = (V, E)$ denote an undirected graph where $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is the vertex set and E represents the edge set. \mathbf{L} is the associated unnormalized graph Laplacian. A common approach in practice is to bisect the vertices into two communities based on the signs of the components of the Fiedler vector (Fiedler (1975)), which is an eigenvector of \mathbf{L} corresponding to the second least eigenvalue. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1 below.

Algorithm 1 Graph Laplacian based Spectral Sign Bi-partitioning Algorithm

Input: graph $G = (V, E)$

Output: estimate of bi-partitioning assignment vector $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$

- 1: Compute the unnormalized Laplacian \mathbf{L} of the graph.
 - 2: Compute the Fiedler vector \mathbf{u} corresponding to the second smallest eigenvalue of \mathbf{L} .
 - 3: Partition the vertices into two communities based on the signs of the components of \mathbf{u} . Let $\hat{c}_i = 0$ if $u_i \geq 0$ and $\hat{c}_i = 1$ otherwise.
-

As with other bi-partitioning algorithms, one execution of the above algorithm results in two subgraphs, on each of which the same procedure is executed again. This procedure is repeated iteratively until a stopping rule indicates that there are no further communities in any of remaining subgraphs. Basically, the stopping rule needs to decide whether the number of communities in a network is greater than one consistently. There are various methods that can serve as the stopping rule, as suggested by Li et al. (2018). They provide concrete stopping rules that are provably consistent under regularity conditions and show empirically that a broader class of stopping rules work reasonably well. To highlight our main technical contribution and keep the succinctness, we leave the investigation of stopping rules to the future work. The hierarchical community detection algorithm by recursive bi-partitioning is computationally efficient and easy to implement, and requires no tuning parameter other than selecting a stopping rule. As suggested by the analysis of computational complexity in Li et al. (2018), the above algorithm has a strictly better computational complexity than its K -way spectral clustering counterpart, especially when K is large.

This simple spectral bi-partitioning algorithm has been studied in Balakrishnan et al. (2011) with hierarchically structured similarity matrix instead of a network. Direct extension of their results to networks requires the expected node degree to grow polynomially in n . Li et al. (2018) considered hierarchical community detection in sparse networks with expected node degree $O(\log^{2+\epsilon} n)$ under their BTSBM and the strong assumption of equal block sizes. The requirement on the expected node degree was later relaxed to $O(\log n)$ by Lei (2019), though still under the same restricted network model. In summary, Balakrishnan et al. (2011) considers a more flexible and hierarchical model at the cost of unrealistic network density while Li et al. (2018) and Lei (2019) consider the opposite.

The focus of this paper is to extend the previous works to networks with both reasonably flexible density and hierarchical structures. In this paper, we consider the networks with expected node degree in $O(\log n)$ order, as opposed to the polynomial degree in Balakrishnan et al. (2011), while significantly relax the modelling assumptions of Li et al. (2018) and Lei (2019). First we extend the results to imbalanced binary trees, thereby removing the constraint on the number of communities to be power of 2. Second, we completely remove the assumption of equal connection probabilities

within each layer made by BTSBM. As a result, given a tree with K terminal nodes, the number of free parameters permitted is $2K - 1$ in our model, in contrast to $O(\log K)$ in a BTSBM. Finally, we relax the assumption of equal block sizes. In particular, a bounded ratio between the sizes of the left and the right subgraphs at each split is sufficient for our purpose.

In order to prove exact recovery, it is vital to derive the entrywise bound of eigenvector perturbation of the Fiedler vector. The study of $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ perturbation between eigenspaces has attracted a lot of interest recently (Abbe et al., 2017; Eldridge et al., 2017; Mao et al., 2017; Li et al., 2018; Lei, 2019). Eldridge et al. (2017) derived an ℓ_∞ perturbation bound for a single eigenvector by applying the Neumann trick that expands the perturbation of eigenvectors into an infinite series. This result was applied by Li et al. (2018) to prove the sign preserving property of the hierarchy-revealing eigenvector under some assumptions and exact recovery as a consequence. Instead of showing $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ perturbation bound between eigenspaces directly, Abbe et al. (2017) provided a first-order approximation of the eigenspace of interest that achieves a tighter bound in terms of $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ norm than the eigenvector per se, using a novel leave-one-out approach. Mao et al. (2017) derived another $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ bound using Kato’s integral (Kato, 1949). Their bound outperforms that in Abbe (2017) in some regimes while underperforms it in others. Lei (2019) bridged their ideas and applied some new techniques to derive a generic $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ eigenspace perturbation bound for symmetric binary random matrices that outperforms them in most regimes. In addition, the result covers non-binary matrices and matrices with dependent entries, including unnormalized graph Laplacians that is the major object of our work.

In this paper, we derive the error bound for Fiedler vector in terms of both ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ norms, which are valid for sparse networks, thereby proving that the recursive bi-partitioning method achieves exact recovery of the community membership as well as the hierarchy with high probability. Although it appears to be a straightforward application of aforementioned bounds, we found that existing tools can only be used to prove a narrow class of models where all connection probabilities are almost in the same scale, say $O(\log n)$. Despite being the common setting in the literature, we argue that this is restrictive in practice since real-world networks tend to be multi-scale in the sense that the connection probabilities may differ drastically depending on how they are related in the hierarchy. To overcome this limitation, we need to apply novel techniques together with Lei (2019)’s $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ bound in a highly non-trivial way.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next subsection summarises the notations. In Section 2, we give formal introduction to the generalized BTSBM and derive the eigen-structure of the associated population unnormalized graph Laplacian. The main theoretical results are presented and compared to related works in Section 3. In Section 4, we apply our recursive bi-partitioning method to simulated and real-world data for both community detection and estimating the hierarchy. Section 5 concludes the paper with a summary of our work along with some future research directions. Technical proofs are relegated to Section 6.

1.1 Notations

In this section we introduce some notations used throughout the paper. We use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and \mathbf{e}_j denote the j -th canonical basis where the j -th element equals to 1 and all other elements equal to 0 with the dimension depending on the context. Vectors and matrices are boldfaced whereas scalars are not, for example, vector \mathbf{v} and matrix \mathbf{M} . We denote by \mathbf{I}_n the $n \times n$ identity matrix, by $\mathbf{1}_n$ the $n \times 1$ column vector with all entries 1 and by $\mathbf{1}_{n \times m}$ the $n \times m$ matrix with all entries 1. For any vector \mathbf{v} , let $\|\mathbf{v}\|_p$ denote its ℓ_p norm. For any matrix \mathbf{M} , let \mathbf{M}_k^T

denote the k -th row of \mathbf{M} , $\|\mathbf{M}\|$ denote its spectral norm and $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F$ denote its Frobenius norm. Further we denote by $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M})$ (resp. $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$) the largest (resp. the smallest) eigenvalue of \mathbf{M} in absolute values, by $\kappa(\mathbf{M})$ the condition number $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M})/\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$. For any vector \mathbf{v} , $\text{diag}(\mathbf{v})$ denotes the diagonal matrix with \mathbf{v} as the diagonal entries. For any square matrix \mathbf{M} , $\text{diag}(\mathbf{M})$ denotes the matrix obtained by setting all off-diagonal entries of \mathbf{M} to 0. For two sequences of real numbers $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$, we write $x_n = o(y_n)$ or $y_n = \omega(x_n)$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_n}{y_n} = 0$, $x_n = O(y_n)$ if $|x_n| < C|y_n|$ for some constant C . Likewise, $x_n = \Omega(y_n)$ or $x_n \gtrsim y_n$ represents that there exists a constant C such that $x_n > Cy_n$, and $x_n \lesssim y_n$ represents that there exists a constant C such that $x_n \leq Cy_n$. Finally, we denote $x_n \asymp y_n$ if $x_n \lesssim y_n$ and $y_n \lesssim x_n$.

2 Hierarchical Stochastic Block Model

2.1 Model formulation

The *Stochastic Block Model* (SBM) proposed in Holland et al. (1983) is a widely used statistical model to study the empirical and theoretical properties of various community detection approaches. The model can be described as follows. Let $G = (V, E)$ denote a graph, where V is the set of n vertices, i.e., $|V| = n$, and E is the set of edges. V admits a hidden partition of K non-overlapping clusters or communities V_1, \dots, V_K ($V = \bigcup_{k=1}^K V_k$). A SBM can be characterized with a membership vector $c = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ where c_i is the label of vertex i and takes value in $\{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, and a $K \times K$ symmetric matrix \mathbf{B} where vertices i and j are connected independently with probability $\mathbf{B}_{c_i c_j}$. Then the connection probability matrix is $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Z}^\top - \text{diag}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Z}^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$ denotes the membership matrix with the i -th row vector $\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{e}_{c_i}^\top$.

The idea of the generalized BTSBM considered in this paper is originated from Balakrishnan et al. (2011). To be concrete, consider the Hierarchical Block Matrix (HBM) proposed in Balakrishnan et al. (2011) in the unweighted graph case. The adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is assumed to be a binary Wigner matrix with $\mathbf{P} = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}$. The *hierarchy* of \mathbf{P} is characterized by a binary but potentially unbalanced tree \mathcal{T} , in which the root node corresponds to the whole graph and each pair of children nodes forms a two-way partition of the subgraph corresponding to the parent node. We can encode each node in \mathcal{T} by a binary string of length equal to the depth of the node in the tree, and the digits reflecting the path from the root to this node with 0 indicating the left move and 1 indicating the right move. For completeness, we encode the root node as an empty string, denoted by \emptyset . For each node $s \in \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \{0, 1\}^k$, let $|s|$ denote the length of s . For any $s \in \mathcal{T}$ with $s = b_1 b_2 \dots b_{|s|}$, where $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$, let \bar{s} be the sibling node, i.e.

$$\bar{s} \triangleq b_1 b_2 \dots b_{|s|-1} (1 - b_{|s|}), \quad (1)$$

and $s_{(i)}$ be the i -th ancestor of s , defined as

$$s_{(i)} \triangleq b_1 b_2 \dots b_{|s|-i}, \quad \forall i = 0, 1, \dots, |s| - 1, \text{ and } s_{(|s|)} = \emptyset. \quad (2)$$

Given a binary tree \mathcal{T} , we define the hierarchy of the nodes in a network \mathcal{G} through \mathcal{T} as follows. The root corresponds to the entire graph. For each node, the subgraphs embedded in the two child nodes form a partition of the subgraph in this node. Each terminal node s corresponds to a community \mathcal{G}_s , with $n_s = |\mathcal{G}_s|$ denoting the size of the community, while each internal node corresponds to the union of communities from all descendant leaf nodes. For any unit $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

let $c(i)$ be the terminal node to which i is assigned, i.e.,

$$c(i) = \{s : i \in \mathcal{G}_s \text{ and } s \text{ is a terminal node}\}.$$




Figure 1: Illustration of the hierarchy of a generalized BTSBM.

We illustrate in Figure 1 the above definitions by a toy example with $n = 8$ nodes and \mathcal{T} being a binary tree with $K = 5$ leaf nodes. In this example, $c(1) = c(7) = 00$, $c(2) = 10$, $c(3) = c(8) = 011$, $c(4) = 010$, $c(5) = c(6) = 11$ and $n_{00} = n_{011} = n_{11} = 2$, $n_{010} = n_{10} = 1$.

Following Clauset et al. (2008) and Li et al. (2018), we define the entries of the population adjacency matrix \mathbf{P} by assigning a probability $p_s \in (0, 1)$ to node s . Specifically, for any pair of distinct units i and j , we assume that the connection probability $\mathbf{P}_{ij} = p_{\mathcal{A}(c(i), c(j))}$, where $\mathcal{A}(c(i), c(j))$ denotes the lowest common ancestor of tree nodes $c(i)$ and $c(j)$.




Figure 2: An example of generalized BTSBM.

For illustration, consider the configuration in Figure 2 and the hierarchy in Figure 1. Then

$$\mathbf{P}_{34} = p_{01}, \quad \mathbf{P}_{17} = p_{00}, \quad \mathbf{P}_{87} = p_{\emptyset}.$$

For general community sizes, the associated community-wise connection probability matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 5}$ in this example is

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{00} & p_0 & p_0 & p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} \\ p_0 & p_{010} & p_{01} & p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} \\ p_0 & p_{01} & p_{011} & p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} \\ p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} & p_{10} & p_1 \\ p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} & p_{\emptyset} & p_1 & p_{11} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The population adjacency matrix \mathbf{P} in this case is equivalent to the Hierarchical Constant Block Matrix (HCBM) in Balakrishnan et al. (2011) where the similarity is a constant for each block. Figure 2 gives one example of HCBM with the same structure as Figure 2. It is easy to see that the BTSBM proposed Li et al. (2018) is a restrictive special case with a balanced tree \mathcal{T} and

$$p_s = p_{s'}, n_s = n_{s'}, \quad \text{whenever } |s| = |s'|.$$

Finally we impose the weak assortativity as in Li et al. (2018) on the generalized BTSBM, i.e. for any internal node s ,

$$p_s < \min\{p_{L(s)}, p_{R(s)}\},$$

where $L(s)$ and $R(s)$ denote the left and the right child of s , respectively. Indeed the setting in Figure 2 satisfies weak assortativity. Although some networks may violate this assumption, such as hatred networks, we expect most real-world networks satisfy it because this is essentially compatible with the intuitive definition of hierarchies. Li et al. (2018) also discuss the dis-assortative setting. We leave the investigation of more general structures in the future work.

2.2 Unnormalized graph Laplacian

Let us consider a network with adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} generated from HSBM defined above. Let d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n be the degrees of nodes $1, 2, \dots, n$ in the network, and define the diagonal matrix of degrees as $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$. The graph Laplacian corresponding to \mathbf{A} is defined as $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$, which is known to be positive semidefinite, denoting as $\mathbf{L} \succeq \mathbf{0}$. Let $\mathbf{L}^* = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{L}$ denote the expected unnormalized graph Laplacian. It is easy to see that $\mathbf{L}^* = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{1}) - \mathbf{P}$ where $\mathbf{P} = \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}$ is the connection probability matrix. Based on $\mathbf{P} = (p_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we define the following quantities that are used for various results and proofs in this paper for ease of presentation. Let

$$p^* = \max_{ij} p_{ij}, \quad \bar{p}^* = \max_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}, \quad p_* = \min_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}.$$

It is easy to see that $p^* \geq \bar{p}^* \geq p_*$.

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1} \geq \lambda_n$ denote the eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} , and $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-1}, \mathbf{u}_n$ represent the corresponding unit eigenvectors. Similarly, the eigenvalues and unit eigenvectors of \mathbf{L}^* are named as $\lambda_1^* \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{n-1}^* \geq \lambda_n^*$ and $\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*, \mathbf{u}_n^*$. The eigen-structure of \mathbf{L}^* under the generalized BTSBM enjoys some nice properties, which shed light on the rationale of our Algorithm 1. We state these properties in the following Theorem 2.1 and defer the proof to Section 6.2.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that the connection probabilities $\{p_s : s \in \mathcal{T}\}$ satisfies the weak assortativity, i.e. $p_s > p_{s'}$ if s is a child node of s' . Then*

(1) $\lambda_{n-1}^* = np_\emptyset$ with multiplicity 1 and

$$u_{n-1,i}^* = \begin{cases} \sqrt{(n_1/n_0)n} & i \in \mathcal{G}_0 \\ -\sqrt{(n_0/n_1)n} & i \in \mathcal{G}_1 \end{cases};$$

(2) $\lambda_{n-2}^* = \min\{n_1p_1 + n_0p_\emptyset, n_0p_0 + n_1p_\emptyset\}$;

(3) *The number of eigenvalues, accounting for the multiplicity, that are strictly less than np_* is at most K , the number of terminal nodes in \mathcal{T} ;*

(4) *If $\max\{\frac{n_0}{n_1}, \frac{n_1}{n_0}\} = O(1)$ and $K = O(1)$, then $\max_{j:\lambda_j^* < np_*} \|\mathbf{u}_j^*\|_\infty = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$.*

It is easy to see that \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* encodes the first split of the graph at the coarsest level by Theorem 2.1. Part (1) and (2) of Theorem 2.1 have been proved by Balakrishnan et al. (2011). We include them here just for completeness. However, part (3) and (4) are new. Although it is attempting to think that the eigenvalues and eigenvectors other than Fiedler eigenpair are irrelevant since they are not involved in Algorithm 1, they turn out to be crucial in our proof for multi-scale networks where $p^* \gg p_\emptyset$, as briefly mentioned in Introduction.

3 Main results

3.1 Weak consistency of the first split

Theorem 2.1 states that \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* is able to separate \mathcal{G}_0 from \mathcal{G}_1 exactly. In practice, however, what is available from the data is the sample Fiedler vector \mathbf{u}_{n-1} instead of the population one, \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* . The standard method to bound the difference between \mathbf{u}_{n-1} and \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* is applying the Davis-Kahan $\sin \Theta$ theorem (Lemma 6.5). However, if we apply the Davis-Kahan $\sin \Theta$ theorem directly to bound the difference in eigenspaces between the graph Laplacian \mathbf{L} and its population counterpart \mathbf{L}^* , in order to obtain a small enough ℓ_2 perturbation bound between \mathbf{u}_{n-1} and \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* , it is required that

$$\lambda_{n-2}^* - \lambda_{n-1}^* \gg \|\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}^*\|.$$

By Lemma 6.3 and Theorem 2.1, we indeed require the following eigen-gap condition

$$\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\emptyset), n_1(p_1 - p_\emptyset)\} \gg \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}. \quad (3)$$

This condition is very stringent by the following simple example: Suppose there are only 4 communities corresponding to the terminal nodes in a balanced tree \mathcal{T} with equal block size and the community-wise connection probability matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} p^* & p_0 & p_\emptyset & p_\emptyset \\ p_0 & p^* & p_\emptyset & p_\emptyset \\ p_\emptyset & p_\emptyset & p^* & p_1 \\ p_\emptyset & p_\emptyset & p_1 & p^* \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Then the eigen-gap condition (3) can hold if

$$p_0 - p_\emptyset \asymp p_1 - p_\emptyset \asymp p^* = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right).$$

However, it does not hold if

$$p_0 - p_\emptyset \asymp p_1 - p_\emptyset = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad p^* = O(1).$$

This contrast is counterintuitive and contrary to our simulation studies. In fact, p^* represents the within-group edge density in the leaf communities, so it should behave as a ‘‘signal’’ parameter in the model for clustering. Therefore, in order to build a general theoretical study for hierarchical community detection, we are particularly interested in relaxing the condition (3) by decoupling the dependency between the eigen-gap and \bar{p}^* .

A key observation is that the perturbation between \mathbf{u}_{n-1} and its population counterpart is essentially caused by the random connection across \mathcal{G}_0 and \mathcal{G}_1 instead within each of them. This inspires us to create an intermediate graph Laplacian that keeps the edges inside \mathcal{G}_0 and \mathcal{G}_1 while only eliminates the randomness in the connection between \mathcal{G}_0 and \mathcal{G}_1 . To be more specific, as will be shown in Section 6.3, we can find another decomposition of $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2$, such that the Fiedler vector corresponding to \mathbf{L}_1 is the same as that corresponding to \mathbf{L}^* , i.e., $\mathbf{u}_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) = \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*$. On the other hand, \mathbf{L}_2 can be controlled more tightly than $\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}^*$. In fact, we can obtain that $\|\mathbf{L}_2\| \lesssim \sqrt{(np_\emptyset + \log n) \log n}$, which is independent of \bar{p}^* .

Then, for the purpose to tightly bound the difference between \mathbf{u}_{n-1} and \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* in ℓ_2 norm via invoking Davis-Kahan $\sin \Theta$ theorem, it actually suffices to establish the lower bound of the eigen-gap $\lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_1) - \lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1)$. In fact, we can show that $\lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) = np_\emptyset$, so it remains to find a lower bound of $\lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_1)$. To this end, we found a neat and tricky decomposition $\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{L}_3 + \mathbf{L}_4 + \mathbf{L}_5$, such that

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_3) = \min\{n_0p_0 + n_1p_\emptyset, n_1p_1 + n_0p_\emptyset\}, \\ \|\mathbf{L}_4\| \lesssim \sqrt{(n_0p_0 + n_1p_1 + \log n) \log n}, \\ \mathbf{L}_5 \succeq \mathbf{0}. \end{cases}$$

Then by Weyl’s inequality, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_1) &\geq \lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_3) - \|\mathbf{L}_4\| + \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_5) \\ &\geq \min\{n_0p_0 + n_1p_\emptyset, n_1p_1 + n_0p_\emptyset\} - C(\sqrt{(n_0p_0 + n_1p_1 + \log n) \log n}) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C .

With all these bounds in place, we can apply the Davis-Kahan $\sin \Theta$ theorem to obtain the following ℓ_2 perturbation result, the detailed proof of which will be deferred to Section 6.3.

Theorem 3.1 (ℓ_2 perturbation). *Fix any $r > 0$ and $c > 0$. Let C_0 denote a generic constant that only depends on r and c . Assume that $\max\{\frac{n_0}{n_1}, \frac{n_1}{n_0}\} = O(1)$ and*

$$\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\emptyset), n_1(p_1 - p_\emptyset)\} \geq C_0 \sqrt{(n_1p_1 + n_0p_0) \log n}.$$

If C_0 is sufficiently large,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} \text{sign}(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*) - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 < c$$

with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-r}$.

When $c \ll \min\{\sqrt{n_1/n_0}, \sqrt{n_0/n_1}\}$, we can show that the misclassification error of the first split is also small via a standard argument. To be concrete, assume $\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* \geq 0$ without loss of generality and let $\mathcal{M} = \{i : \text{sign}(\mathbf{u}_{n-1,i}) \neq \text{sign}(\mathbf{u}_{n-1,i}^*)\}$. Then for any $i \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$|\mathbf{u}_{n-1,i} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1,i}^*| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \min \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_0}}, \sqrt{\frac{n_0}{n_1}} \right\} \triangleq \frac{C'}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\frac{C'|\mathcal{M}|}{n} \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}} (\mathbf{u}_{n-1,i} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1,i}^*)^2 \leq \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2^2 \leq c^2.$$

This entails that the misclassification error $|\mathcal{M}|/n$ is bounded by c^2/C' where c can be arbitrarily small when $\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\emptyset), n_1(p_1 - p_\emptyset)\} \gg C_0 \sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n}$ while C' is a constant.

3.2 Strong consistency

As pointed out in Li et al. (2018), by ℓ_2 perturbation between \mathbf{u}_{n-1} and \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* , one can only obtain weak consistency in separating \mathcal{G}_0 from \mathcal{G}_1 . An ℓ_∞ perturbation bound is needed in order to achieve strong consistency. Although the $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ perturbation theory for unnormalized Laplacians in Lei (2019) appears to be promising for our case, direct application of their result for eigenvectors of graph Laplacians of generalized BTSBMs still requires the eigen-gap condition (3) to hold. In fact, decoupling the dependency between the eigen-gap and \bar{p}^* for ℓ_∞ perturbation relies on Theorem 3.1, and is technically much more involved. Roughly speaking, by the Pigeonhole principle, there exists $j \in [2, K]$, such that

$$\lambda_{n-j}^* - \lambda_{n-j+1}^* \geq \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K}.$$

Denote $\mathbf{U}_j^* = (\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-j}^*)$ and $\mathbf{U}_j = (\mathbf{u}_{n-1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-j})$. By some algebra, one can show that $\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_\infty$ can be bounded by $\|\mathbf{U}_j \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}_j^T \mathbf{U}_j^*) - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$, $\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2$, $\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|$, and $\|\mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$. Notice that $\|\mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ can be controlled by Theorem 2.1 and $\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2$ is controlled by Theorem 3.1. On the other hand, due to the eigen-gap between λ_{n-j}^* and λ_{n-j+1}^* , $\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|$ can be controlled by the Davis-Kahan sin Θ theorem and $\|\mathbf{U}_j \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}_j^T \mathbf{U}_j^*) - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ can be controlled by the recent results on the $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ perturbation of Laplacians in Lei (2019). We state the results as follows and defer the proof to Section 6.4.

Theorem 3.2 (ℓ_∞ perturbation). *Fix any absolute constant $r > 0$. Let C_1 denote a generic constant that only depends on r, c, K and $\{s \in \mathcal{T} : n_{L(s)}/n_{R(s)}\}$. Assume that*

$$C1 \quad K = O(1), \quad \max_{s \in \mathcal{T}} \max \left\{ \frac{n_{L(s)}}{n_{R(s)}}, \frac{n_{S(s)}}{n_{L(s)}} \right\} = O(1);$$

$$C2 \quad (n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^4 \geq C_1 (n\bar{p}^*)^3 \log n;$$

$$C3 \quad \min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\emptyset), n_1(p_1 - p_\emptyset)\} \geq C_1 \sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n}.$$

If C_1 is sufficiently large,

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} \text{sign}(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*) - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_\infty < \min\{\sqrt{n_0/n_1}, \sqrt{n_1/n_0}\}$$

with probability at least $1 - (10K + 4)n^{-r}$.

Recalling Theorem 2.1 that $\sqrt{n} \min_i |\mathbf{u}_{n-1,i}^*| = \min\{\sqrt{n_0/n_1}, \sqrt{n_1/n_0}\}$, Theorem 3.2 implies that the signs of the entries of \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* are preserved in \mathbf{u}_{n-1} with high probability under some regularity conditions. Since the signs of elements in \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* align with the latent community membership, Theorem 3.2 allows us to exactly identify the community structure at the coarsest granularity via the signs of the entries of \mathbf{u}_{n-1} .

Once the strong consistency is achieved in the first split, the resulting subgraphs are precisely generated from the generalized BTSBMs induced by the left and the right subtrees. Therefore, if the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 hold for the induced generalized BTSBMs, the strong consistency will carry over to the subnetworks in the child nodes. In the ideal case where the networks embedded in every node of the tree satisfy the assumptions, all communities and the hierarchy can be exactly recovered simultaneously with high probability. On the other hand, even if the conditions fail to hold for some nodes, Theorem 3.2 still guarantees the exact recovery of other splits. This highlights the advantage of our hierarchical algorithm over the K -way clustering algorithms. A similar point was also made in Li et al. (2018) and Lei (2019).

It is worth emphasizing that the assumption **C2** is much weaker than (3), the condition that would have been obtained from a direct application of Lei (2019)’s technique. This significantly extends the scope of the applicability of our theory to multi-scale networks. For the 4-community example (4) in the last subsection with $p^* \gg \max\{p_1, p_0\}$, \underline{p}^* is still lower bounded by p^* in order under **C1**. As a result, **C2** holds whenever $p^* \gtrsim \log n$ which is automatically guaranteed by **C3**.

3.3 Comparison with previous theoretical works

In comparison to Balakrishnan et al. (2011), where the hierarchically structured matrices consist of sub-Gaussian entries, we have Bernoulli entries in the case of generalized BTSBMs, which are sub-Gaussian with parameter 1. According to their result (Theorem 1 in Balakrishnan et al. (2011)), to recover the first level of the hierarchy, the amount of noise they can tolerate in our model is $o(\min\{\gamma^5 \sqrt{n/\log n}, \gamma^4 \sqrt[4]{n/\log n}\})$ where $\gamma = \min_{s \in \mathcal{T}} p_s - p_{s(1)}$, which implies that the expected degree to be $\bar{d} = \omega(n^{15/16})$. So their strong consistency guarantee is only valid for very dense networks. In contrast, our results hold for sparse networks as discussed above.

As with Theorem 3.2, Li et al. (2018) and Lei (2019) provided an entrywise bound for the error in the eigenvector of the adjacency matrix associated with the second largest eigenvalue, in sparse regime where the expected degree can be $O(\log^{2+\epsilon} n)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. However, their theoretical work is built on the restrictive BTSBM model with balanced full binary tree, equal connection probabilities within each level, equal block sizes and equal scale of all connection probabilities. Under their BTSBMs, the expected degree matrix \mathbf{D}^* has identical diagonal elements. Hence the eigenvectors of the population unnormalized graph Laplacian are the same with those of the connection probability matrix. In contrast, our theoretical results guarantee strong consistency of hierarchical community detection for a much broader class of hierarchical networks in terms of the tree structure and the connection probabilities.

4 Experiments

As mentioned before, we leave the investigation of stopping rules to the future work. So for all the experiments in this section, we focus on the empirical performance of the first few splits from our recursive bi-partitioning algorithm while not invoking any stopping rule. Our experiments are

conducted on real-world networks where the true community labels are known in order to evaluate the accuracy.

4.1 Synthetic data

In this section, we investigate the empirical performance of the spectral bi-partitioning method with unnormalized graph Laplacian under different schemes. The graphs are generated according to the model described in Section 2. We adopt the same hierarchy of the generalized BTSBM as shown in Figure 2, with 5 clusters at the finest level, $n = 1000$ vertices and 200 vertices in each finest cluster, and vary connection probabilities embedded in the binary tree. Figure 3 displays the generalized BTSBM and the corresponding Fiedler vectors of unnormalized graph Laplacian matrices. The eigenvectors of the adjacency matrices associated with the second largest eigenvalues are also shown for comparison. As displayed below, we merely examine the Fiedler vector corresponding to the whole graph. Hence only the first split is considered for these simulations and none of the stopping rules is used.




Figure 3: Generalized BTSBMs and the associated eigenvectors, including population Fiedler vector (black), sample Fiedler vector (red) and the second largest eigenvector of adjacency matrix (blue)

Figure 3a shows exactly the same setting with Figure 2, where the connection probabilities are at the same order of magnitude. The signs of elements of the Fiedler vector perfectly align with the community assignments at the first level of the binary tree, whereas the eigenvector of the adjacency matrix fails as there is no obvious threshold to split the graph based on the values of the eigenvector components.

For the case shown in Figure 3b, \bar{p}^* is much higher than p_* . Thus the condition C2 in Theorem 3.2 is violated and it is obvious that the bound given by Theorem 3.2 does not hold. However, the Fiedler vector is still able to exactly recover the first bi-partition of the network. This demonstrates the possibility that the assumptions in Theorem 3.2 are only sufficient for exact recovery but not necessary.

In Figure 3c, we choose the connection probabilities in analogy to the BTSBM in Li et al. (2018) where the connection probabilities are identical within each level, while the binary tree is not balanced. Then the spectral clustering with adjacency matrix groups the vertices according to their degrees, but not how close they are on the associated binary tree.

For the last example in Figure 3d, the connection probabilities are set to be so small that the resulting graph is extremely sparse. In this case, the Fiedler vector is very likely to have some spikes and forces the other values close to zero, which also suggests that the bound in 3.2 does not hold any more. When there are spikes in the Fiedler vector, the performance of the spectral bi-clustering with unnormalized graph Laplacian degrades drastically. Repetition of the experiments shows that the probability of spikes occurring in the Fiedler vector is quite high when the network is too sparse.

4.2 Real-world data

This paper is aimed at studying the empirical and theoretical properties of the recursive bi-partitioning algorithm. Now, we explore the performance of this algorithm on some real datasets. To be more specific, we implement recursive spectral bi-clustering based on adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} , unnormalized graph Laplacian $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$ and normalized graph Laplacian $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$ onto the following network datasets: Dolphins, Karate, Political books, Political blogs, UK faculty, Football and C. elegans. The sources and some basic summary statistics of these datasets are summarized in Table 1.

Dataset	Source	$ V $	$ E $	K	d_{\min}	d_{\max}	\bar{d}
Dolphins	Lusseau et al. (2003)	62	159	2	1	12	5.129
Karate	Zachary (1977)	34	78	2	1	17	4.588
Political books	Krebs (unpublished)	92	374	2	1	24	8.130
Political blogs	Adamic and Glance (2005)	1222	16714	2	1	351	27.355
UK faculty	Nepusz et al. (2008)	79	552	3	2	39	13.975
Football	Girvan and Newman (2002)	110	570	11	7	13	10.364
C. elegans	Jarrell et al. (2012)	229	1085	6	1	34	9.585

Table 1: Seven network datasets

All of these networks contain explicit information regarding the true community memberships, which we use to evaluate the performance of clustering algorithms. We refer the readers to the articles in the second column of Table 1 for more details. For clustering performance evaluation, we opt to a quantity called completeness score (Rosenberg and Hirschberg (2007)), an external entropy-based cluster evaluation measure. A clustering result satisfies the completeness if all the vertices that are members of a given true community are also elements of the same estimated cluster. Equivalently, each estimated cluster from a complete clustering must be the union of a subset of true communities. Grouping all of the vertices into a single cluster is an extreme example of a perfectly complete clustering. This property of completeness score is important for assessing hierarchical algorithms because we allow the recovered clusters to be coarser than the true clusters. Let n vertices belong to K communities V_1, \dots, V_K , and assume that an algorithm divides the vertices into \hat{K} clusters $\hat{V}_1, \dots, \hat{V}_{\hat{K}}$. Let a_{ij} denote the vertices that are members of community V_i

and elements of estimated cluster \hat{V}_j . Then the completeness score is defined as follows.

$$c = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H(\hat{V}) = 0 \\ 1 - \frac{H(\hat{V}|V)}{H(\hat{V})} & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $H(\hat{V}|V)$ is the conditional entropy of the estimated clusters given the true community assignments, and $H(\hat{V})$ is the entropy of the estimated clusters. They are given by

$$H(\hat{V}|V) = - \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{K}} \frac{a_{ij}}{n} \log \frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\hat{K}} a_{ij}}, \quad H(\hat{V}) = - \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{K}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K a_{ij}}{n} \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^K a_{ij}}{n}.$$

As we can see, the completeness score (5) takes value in $[0, 1]$ and 1 stands for perfectly complete clustering. This metric is asymmetric and invariant to label permutations. And the completeness score will not necessarily degrade when the number of clusters \hat{K} gets larger.

We summarized the completeness scores of the first split produced by the recursive bi-partitioning algorithm using the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} , the unnormalized Laplacian \mathbf{L} and the normalized Laplacian \mathbf{N} in Table 2.

Dataset	\mathbf{A}	\mathbf{L}	\mathbf{N}
Dolphins	0.470	1	0.883
Karate	1	0.840	0.840
Political books	0.823	0.869	0.869
Political blogs	0.675	0.007	0.012
UK faculty	0.765	0.908	1
Football	0.763	0.802	0.802
C. elegans	0.416	0.939	0.807

Table 2: Completeness scores of the first split

From Table 2, we have some interesting observations. First, we can see that the spectral bi-clustering algorithms based on unnormalized graph Laplacian or normalized graph Laplacian lead to similar results for all datasets. And they perform almost perfectly in Dolphins, Karate, Political books, UK faculty, Football and C. elegans, but completely fail in Political blogs, while in this case, spectral bi-clustering based on adjacency matrix results in fairly accurate community recovery. The undesirable performance on Political blogs of graph Laplacians is not surprising in light of that Political blogs network endures high degree heterogeneity.

Apart from the coarsest level of the hierarchical community structure, the recovery of the entire community hierarchy is of great importance as well. In order to investigate the performance of recursive bi-clustering algorithm on rebuilding the hierarchy, we apply the algorithm recursively to UK faculty, Football and C. elegans. We will examine the performance of the first few splits without using any stopping rule for these examples based on the completeness scores. The rest of this section discusses these applications in detail.

UK faculty, is the social network of the academic staffs of a given Faculty of a UK university consisting of three separate schools. These three separate schools form three disjoint communities naturally, which are reckoned as the ground truth of community memberships. The following

Figure 4 displays the intermediate clustering results after each round of the recursive bi-partitioning algorithm based on the unnormalized graph Laplacian. We can observe that the algorithm succeeds in both recovering the community memberships and building a reasonable hierarchy, in the sense that the communities that split later are those have denser connections between each other.

With the first split, we separate the green community from the others and achieve a high completeness score 0.908. This indicates that we successfully capture the two mega-communities in this network with our method. However, The second split results in a drop in the score. This is not surprising as in the network with true labels, the connections within or cross the red and blue vertices are comparably similar and thus makes it harder to distinguish them.




Figure 4: Recursive bi-partition on the UK faculty network, with the completeness scores in the parentheses

Football, is a network of American college football teams during regular season Fall 2000. In the graph, vertices represent teams and edges represent regular season games between the two teams they connect. The teams are divided into “conferences containing around 8 to 12 teams each. Thus the network incorporates a known community structure, which can be treated as the ground truth.

We apply the recursive bi-partitioning algorithm based on the unnormalized graph Laplacian to recover both the hierarchy and community membership. Figure 5 demonstrates the estimated community structure at the first, second and third level of a balanced hierarchy, with 2, 4 and 8 resulting clusters respectively. For the purpose of validating our theory, we simply build a balanced hierarchy of depth three iteratively in this example without resorting to any stopping rule. We refer the readers to Li et al. (2018) for extensive discussion on stopping rules. The result is still quite commendable as a meaningful hierarchy is produced and the completeness score is maintained at a high level.




Figure 5: Recursive bi-partition on the Football network, with the completeness scores in the parentheses

C. elegans, is a neural network consisting of gap junctional synaptic connections in the posterior nervous system of a single adult male of *Caenorhabditis elegans*, a primitive worm. The cells are grouped according to the modules and categories described in Jarrell et al. (2012). Explicitly, there are six types of cells: sensory neurons, interneurons, gender-shared neurons, command and motor neurons, gender-shared muscle cells, sex-specific muscle cells. We use the cell types as the ground truth for community labels. The true labels are given in the Database S9 which can be found in the supplementary materials for Jarrell et al. (2012).




Figure 6: Recursive bi-partition on the *C. elegans* network, with the completeness scores in the parentheses: (a) Bi-partition with unnormalized graph Laplacian; (b) Further bi-partition with unnormalized graph Laplacian; (c) Further bi-partition with normalized graph Laplacian; (d) Ground truth

Figure 6 shows the first and second bi-partition based on the unnormalized or normalized graph Laplacian. The algorithm with unnormalized graph Laplacian performs perfectly in the first split, with completeness score 0.939. Closer examination shows that the two mega-communities produced in the first split of our algorithm are perfectly meaningful – they exactly correspond to neurons and muscle cells. As we proceed to the subsequent split, the algorithm with unnormalized graph Laplacian fails to accurately recover the communities. The same procedure based on normalized graph Laplacian performs slightly better in the second split. Nevertheless, we are able to capture a precise hierarchical structure at modest granularity.

5 Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we presented a novel analysis of spectral clustering in hierarchical community detection in sparse network. We formulate a general model to characterize the hierarchical structure of communities and demonstrate that under this model, recursive spectral bi-partition algorithm is effective in both community detection and hierarchy estimation. The theoretical guarantee is established in terms of both ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ perturbation bounds to ensure weak and strong consistency respectively. The main contribution we have made in the theoretical analysis is that our result applies to sparse networks and gets rid of the constraint that the connection probabilities are at the same scale, which is required in previous works, by taking full advantage of the inherent structure of the graph Laplacian matrix.

As we have observed in the Experiment section, the ℓ_∞ perturbation bound is sufficient for exact recovery, yet not necessary. Thus we may be able to relax the current conditions further in pursuing an optimal bound. Besides, our result is tailored to binary hierarchical community detection, while non-binary hierarchies are common in practice. Extending our analysis to non-binary hierarchical community detection is another interesting direction. Finally, high degree heterogeneity can cause great trouble under our framework. We are also interested in how to involve degree heterogeneity into the model formulation and corresponding hierarchical community detection method. More work will be needed to address these problems properly.

6 Proofs of main results

6.1 Supporting lemmata

Lemma 6.1. *Let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of a random graph on n nodes in which edges occur independently. Let $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{P} = (p_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$ and assume $n\bar{p}^* = \max_i \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} \geq c_0 \log n$ for some constant c_0 . Then for any $r > 0$, there exist an absolute constants C_3 only depending on c_0 and r , such that*

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P}\| \leq C_3(\sqrt{n\bar{p}^*} + \sqrt{\log n})$$

with probability at least $1 - n^{-r}$.

Remark. Lemma 6.1 is a natural result from several earlier works Feige and Ofek (2005); Chin et al. (2015); Lei et al. (2015); Latała et al. (2018).

Lemma 6.2 (Chernoff inequalities, Theorem 2.4 of Chung et al. (2006)). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables with*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = p_i, \quad \mathbb{P}(X_i = 0) = 1 - p_i.$$

We consider the sum $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, with expectation $\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X \leq \mathbb{E}(X) - \lambda) &\leq e^{-\lambda^2/2\mathbb{E}(X)}, \\ \mathbb{P}(X \geq \mathbb{E}(X) + \lambda) &\leq e^{-\lambda^2/2(\mathbb{E}(X)+\lambda/3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.3. Let \mathbf{L} denote the unnormalized graph Laplacian, and $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{L}^*$. Then for any $r > 0$, there exist absolute constants C_4 that only depends on c_0 and r , such that

$$\|\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}^*\| \leq C_4 \sqrt{(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} L_{ii}^* + \log n) \log n}$$

with probability at least $1 - n^{-r}$.

Lemma 6.4 (Weyl's inequality). Let $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric matrices, with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and $\lambda_1^* \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n^*$ respectively. Then the following inequality holds for $j \in [n]$,

$$|\lambda_j - \lambda_j^*| \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*\|.$$

Lemma 6.5 (Theorem 2 of Yu et al. (2014), a variant of Davis-Kahan $\sin \Theta$ theorem). Let $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be symmetric matrices, with eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and $\lambda_1^* \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n^*$ respectively. Fix positive integers s, d and assume that $\min(\lambda_{s-1}^* - \lambda_s^*, \lambda_{s+d-1}^* - \lambda_{s+d}^*) > 0$ where $\lambda_0^* := -\infty$ and $\lambda_{n+1}^* := \infty$. Let $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}_s, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{s+d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $\mathbf{U}^* = (\mathbf{u}_s^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{s+d-1}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ have orthonormal columns satisfying $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}_j = \lambda_j \mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{u}_j^* = \lambda_j^* \mathbf{u}_j^*$ for $j \in \{s, \dots, s+d-1\}$. Then

$$\sin \Theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*) \leq \frac{2d^{1/2} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*\|}{\min(\lambda_{s-1}^* - \lambda_s^*, \lambda_{s+d-1}^* - \lambda_{s+d}^*)}.$$

Moreover, there exists an orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, such that

$$\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{U}^*\|_F \leq \frac{2^{3/2} d^{1/2} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*\|}{\min(\lambda_{s-1}^* - \lambda_s^*, \lambda_{s+d-1}^* - \lambda_{s+d}^*)}.$$

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we first clarify some facts about the eigen-structure of \mathbf{L}^* under the generalized BTSBM in the lemma below.

Lemma 6.6. Denote

$$g(s; \mathcal{T}) = \begin{cases} 1 & (s \text{ is an internal node}) \\ n_s - 1 & (s \text{ is a leaf node}) \end{cases}.$$

The eigen-structure of \mathbf{L}^* has the following properties:

- (1) $\lambda_n^* = 0$, $\mathbf{u}_n^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}[1, 1, \dots, 1]^\top = \mathbf{1}_n / \sqrt{n}$, and $\lambda_{n-1}^* > 0$.
- (2) For each node s ,

$$\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T}) \triangleq n_s p_s + \sum_{i=1}^{|s|} (n_{s(i)} - n_{s(i-1)}) p_{s(i)}, \tag{6}$$

is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{L}^* with multiplicity

$$\sum_{s': \lambda^*(s'; \mathcal{T}) = \lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T})} g(s'; \mathcal{T}).$$

(3) The eigen-space corresponding to $\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T})$ is spanned by

$$\bigcup_{s': \lambda^*(s'; \mathcal{T}) = \lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T})} \text{colspan}(\mathbf{U}(s'; \mathcal{T}))$$

where $\mathbf{U}(s; \mathcal{T}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times g(s; \mathcal{T})}$ such that

- if s is an internal node,

$$U_i(s; \mathcal{T}) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{n_{R(s)}/n_{L(s)}n_s} & i \in \mathcal{G}_{L(s)} \\ -\sqrt{n_{L(s)}/n_{R(s)}n_s} & i \in \mathcal{G}_{R(s)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} ;$$

- if s is a leaf node, $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{G}_s}(s; \mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{0}_{(n-n_s) \times (n_s-1)}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{G}_s}(s; \mathcal{T}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times (n_s-1)}$ is any orthogonal matrix with $\mathbf{1}_{n_s}^\top \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{G}_s}(s; \mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{0}^\top$.

Lemma 6.6 can be verified through simple algebra. Now with Lemma 6.6 at hand, it is quite natural to prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. (1) By Lemma 6.6, np_\emptyset is an eigenvalue, corresponding to the root node and $g(\emptyset; \mathcal{T}) = 1$ since it is an internal node. Under weak assortativity, for any node $s \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T}) > n_s p_\emptyset + \sum_{i=1}^{|s|} (n_{s(i)} - n_{s(i-1)}) p_\emptyset = np_\emptyset.$$

Therefore, $\lambda_{n-1}^* = np_\emptyset$ with multiplicity 1.

(2) By Lemma 6.6, $n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_\emptyset$ and $n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_\emptyset$ are both eigenvalues corresponding to node 1 and 0 respectively. For all other nodes $s \in \mathcal{T}$, it is easy to show that $\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T}) > n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_\emptyset$ if s is a descendant of node 0, while $\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T}) > n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_\emptyset$ if s is a descendant of node 1. Therefore, λ_{n-2}^* must be the minimum of them.

(3) For each leaf node s , it is not hard to see that

$$\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T}) = \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}, \quad \forall i \text{ in the community } s.$$

By definition,

$$\lambda^*(s; \mathcal{T}) \geq np_*$$

The number of eigenvalues that are at least np_* , accounting for multiplicity, is at least

$$\sum_{s \text{ leaf node}} g(s; \mathcal{T}) = \sum_{s \text{ leaf node}} (n_s - 1) = n - K.$$

(4) Based on the previous part in this proof, if the eigenvalue $\lambda_j^* < np_*$, then λ_j^* must correspond to a leaf node. Therefore, by the observation in part (3) of Lemma 6.6, the associated eigenvector \mathbf{u}_j can be fully characterized. Under the assumptions that $\max\{\frac{n_0}{n_1}, \frac{n_1}{n_0}\} = O(1)$ and $K = O(1)$, we can conclude $\|\mathbf{u}_j^*\|_\infty = O(1/\sqrt{n})$. □

6.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Consider the following 2-by-2 partition of the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} ,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{00} & \mathbf{A}_{01} \\ \mathbf{A}_{01}^\top & \mathbf{A}_{11} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{A}_{00} and \mathbf{A}_{11} are adjacency matrices of subgraphs \mathcal{G}_0 and \mathcal{G}_1 respectively. Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{00}] \geq p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_0}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{11}] \geq p_1 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_1}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{01}] = p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1}.$$

Let

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{00} & p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & \mathbf{A}_{11} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{n_0 \times n_0} & \mathbf{A}_{01} - p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ \mathbf{A}_{01}^\top - p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & \mathbf{0}_{n_1 \times n_1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 are independent. Further let \mathbf{L}_1 and \mathbf{L}_2 be the unnormalized graph Laplacians of \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 respectively. Similarly, let \mathbf{L}_{00} and \mathbf{L}_{11} be the unnormalized graph Laplacians of \mathbf{A}_{00} and \mathbf{A}_{11} respectively. Then $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2$ where

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{00} + (n_1 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_0} & -p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ -p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & \mathbf{L}_{11} + (n_0 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_1} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathbf{L}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}_{01} \mathbf{1}_{n_1}) - (n_1 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_0} & -\mathbf{A}_{01} + p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ -\mathbf{A}_{01}^\top + p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}_{01}^\top \mathbf{1}_{n_0}) - (n_0 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathbf{L}_1 \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and $\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_1) = 0$ given it is a graph Laplacian matrix. Furthermore, we can check that the vector \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* defined in Theorem 2.1 is also an eigenvector of \mathbf{L}_1 with eigenvalue np_0 using the fact that \mathbf{L}_{00} and \mathbf{L}_{11} are both graph Laplacians. This implies that $\lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) \leq np_0$. On the other hand, since $\mathbf{L}_{11}, \mathbf{L}_{00} \succeq \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\mathbf{L}_1 \succeq \begin{bmatrix} (n_1 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_0} & -p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ -p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & (n_0 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} \implies \lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) \geq \lambda_{n-1} \left(\begin{bmatrix} (n_1 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_0} & -p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ -p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & (n_0 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_1} \end{bmatrix} \right) = np_0.$$

Therefore, $\lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}) = np_0$. The matrix \mathbf{L} can be viewed as a perturbation of \mathbf{L}_1 by \mathbf{L}_2 . It is obvious that \mathbf{L}_1 and \mathbf{L}_2 are statistically independent. To apply the Davis-Kahan sin Θ Theorem for ℓ_2 perturbation bound of eigenvectors, it remains to obtain a lower bound of the eigengap of \mathbf{L}_1 .

Lemma 6.7. *We can decompose \mathbf{A}_{00} in the form as*

$$\mathbf{A}_{00} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00} + \tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}$$

such that $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00}$ is a symmetric adjacency matrix whose upper triangular entries are i.i.d. $\text{Ber}(p_0)$ variables, while $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}$ is also a symmetric 0 – 1 matrix.

Proof. For any $1 \leq i < j \leq n_0$, denote $\mathbb{E}[A_{00}(i, j)] = p_{ij}$. By the definition of hierarchical SBM, we know $p_{ij} \geq p_0$. Define a new random variable $H_{ij} \sim \text{Ber}(\frac{p_0}{p_{ij}})$. We assume the construction is independent for each entry, and also independent of \mathbf{A} . In other words, $\{A_{00}(i, j)\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_0}$, $\{H(i, j)\}_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_0}$ are mutually independent. Define $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00}(i, j) = A_{00}(i, j)H(i, j)$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}(i, j) = A_{00}(i, j)(1 - H(i, j))$. By the above construction, we know $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}$ satisfy the required properties. \square

By Lemma 6.7, we have the decomposition $\mathbf{A}_{00} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00} + \tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}$, where both $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00}$ is a symmetric $0-1$ matrix whose upper triangular entries are i.i.d $\text{Ber}(p_0)$ entries, and $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}$ is another random symmetric $0-1$ matrix. Notice that here $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00}$ are dependent. Similarly, $\mathbf{A}_{11} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{11} + \tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{11}$, where both the upper triangular entries of the symmetric $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{11}$ are i.i.d. $\text{Ber}(p_1)$ entries, and $\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{11}$ is a symmetric $0-1$ matrix. With these decompositions, we can further decompose \mathbf{L}_1 into $\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{L}_3 + \mathbf{L}_4 + \mathbf{L}_5$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} (n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_\emptyset) \mathbf{I}_{n_0} - p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_0} & -p_\emptyset \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_1} \\ -p_\emptyset \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_0} & (n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_\emptyset) \mathbf{I}_{n_1} - p_1 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_1} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{L}_4 &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00} \mathbf{1}_{n_0}) - (n_0 p_0) \mathbf{I}_{n_0} + p_0 \mathbf{1}_{n_0 \times n_0} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{11} \mathbf{1}_{n_1}) - (n_1 p_1) \mathbf{I}_{n_1} + p_1 \mathbf{1}_{n_1 \times n_1} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{11} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{L}_5 &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{diag}(\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00} \mathbf{1}_{n_0}) - \tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{00} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{diag}(\tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{11} \mathbf{1}_{n_1}) - \tilde{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}}_{11} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathbf{L}_3 is deterministic while $\mathbf{L}_4, \mathbf{L}_5$ are random. It is straightforward to see that \mathbf{L}_3 is the population unnormalized graph Laplacian of a generalized BTSBM with only the root node with parameter p_\emptyset and two child nodes with parameters p_0 and p_1 . By Theorem 2.1,

$$\lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_3) = \min\{n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_\emptyset, n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_\emptyset\}.$$

By Lemma 6.3, with probability $1 - n^{-r}$, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{L}_4\| \leq C_4(\sqrt{(n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1) \log n} + \log n).$$

Hence we have

$$\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_4) \geq -C_4(\sqrt{(n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1) \log n} + \log n).$$

Finally, since \mathbf{L}_5 is a graph Laplacian, we have $\mathbf{L}_5 \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and hence $\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_5) \geq 0$.

Therefore, Weyl's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_1) &\geq \lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_3) + \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_4) + \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_5) \\ &\geq \min\{n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_\emptyset, n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_\emptyset\} - C_4(\sqrt{(n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1) \log n} + \log n). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the vector \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* is an eigenvector of \mathbf{L}_1 with eigenvalue $n p_\emptyset$. In summary, as long as

$$\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\emptyset), n_1(p_1 - p_\emptyset)\} > C_4(\sqrt{(n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1) \log n} + \log n),$$

we have

$$\lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) = n p_\emptyset = \lambda_{n-1}^*, \quad \mathbf{u}_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) = \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*,$$

and

$$\lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_1) - \lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1) \geq \min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\emptyset), n_1(p_1 - p_\emptyset)\} - C_4(\sqrt{(n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1) \log n} + \log n).$$

Besides, we know that $\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}) = \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_1) = 0$ and the associated eigenvectors are also identical up to the sign. Without loss of generality, let $\mathbf{u}_n(\mathbf{L}) = \mathbf{u}_n(\mathbf{L}_1) = \mathbf{1}_n / \sqrt{n}$. Then it is obvious that

$$\|(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}), \mathbf{u}_n(\mathbf{L})) - (\mathbf{u}_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1), \mathbf{u}_n(\mathbf{L}_1))\|_F = \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}) - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1)\|_2 = \|u_{n-1} - u_{n-1}^*\|_2. \quad (7)$$

Again, by Lemmas 6.3, with probability at least $1 - n^{-r}$, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{L}_2\| \leq \tilde{C}_4(\sqrt{np_0 \log n} + \log n).$$

Notice that $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2$. Assume $\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* \geq 0$ without loss of generality, then by Davis-Kahan $\sin \Theta$ Theorem and (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 &\leq \frac{4\|\mathbf{L}_2\|}{\lambda_{n-2}(\mathbf{L}_1) - \lambda_{n-1}(\mathbf{L}_1)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{np_0 \log n} + \log n}{\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\theta), n_1(p_1 - p_\theta)\} - C_4 \left(\sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n} + \log n \right)} \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, there exists a constant C_5 that only depends on r and n_0/n_1 such that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 \leq \frac{C_5(\sqrt{np_0 \log n} + \log n)}{\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\theta), n_1(p_1 - p_\theta)\} - C_4 \left(\sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n} + \log n \right)}$$

By the assumption of Theorem 3.1,

$$n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1 \geq \min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\theta), n_1(p_1 - p_\theta)\} \geq C_0 \sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n}.$$

This implies

$$n_0 p_0 + n_1 p_1 \gtrsim \log n \implies \sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n} + \log n \asymp \sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n}.$$

As a consequence, if C_0 is sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} &\min\{n_0(p_0 - p_\theta), n_1(p_1 - p_\theta)\} - C_4 \left(\sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n} + \log n \right) \\ &\geq \frac{C_0}{2} \left(\sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n} + \log n \right), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 \leq \frac{2C_5}{C_0} \frac{\sqrt{np_0 \log n} + \log n}{\sqrt{(n_1 p_1 + n_0 p_0) \log n} + \log n} \leq \frac{2C_5}{C_0},$$

where the last line uses the fact that $p_0, p_1 > p_\theta$. Therefore, for any $c > 0$, if C_0 is sufficiently large,

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 \leq c$$

with probability $1 - 2n^{-r}$.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Without loss of generality we assume $\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^T \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* \geq 0$. For each $j \in [n]$ such that $\lambda_{n-j+1}^* < \lambda_{n-j}^*$, let $\mathbf{U}_j^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times j}$ and $\mathbf{U}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times j}$ denote the eigenvector matrices $(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-j}^*)$ and $(\mathbf{u}_{n-1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-j})$, respectively. Using the theory of Lei (2019), under regularity conditions we can derive a bound for

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}_j \mathbf{O}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}, \quad \mathbf{O}_j = \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}_j^T \mathbf{U}_j^*)$$

where $\text{sign}(\mathbf{M})$ denotes the matrix sign. Specifically, if $U\Sigma V^T$ is the singular value decomposition of \mathbf{M} , then $\text{sign}(\mathbf{M}) = UV^T$. Since $\mathbf{O}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{j \times j}$ is an orthogonal matrix, we have

$$\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{U}_j\mathbf{O}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{U}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\mathbf{O}_j^T\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}.$$

Let $O_{j,1,i}$ denote the entry of \mathbf{O}_j in the first row and i -th column and $\mathbf{U}_{j,-1}^*$ denote the matrix \mathbf{U}_j^* with the first column \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* removed. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{U}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\mathbf{O}_j^T\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} &\geq \sqrt{n}\left\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \sum_{i=1}^j O_{j,1,i}\mathbf{u}_{n-i}^*\right\|_{\infty} \\ &\geq \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - O_{j,1,1}\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} - \sqrt{n}\sqrt{\sum_{i \neq 1} O_{j,1,i}^2}\|\mathbf{U}_{j,-1}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - O_{j,1,1}\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} &\geq \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^* - O_{j,1,1}\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} \\ &\geq \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} - \sqrt{n}|1 - O_{j,1,1}|\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} \\ &= \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} - |1 - O_{j,1,1}| \max\left\{\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_0}}, \sqrt{\frac{n_0}{n_1}}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality uses the fact that $\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} = \max\{\sqrt{n_1/n_0}, \sqrt{n_0/n_1}\}$. Since \mathbf{O}_j is orthogonal,

$$\sum_{i=1}^j O_{j,1,i}^2 = 1 \implies \sum_{i \neq 1} O_{j,1,i}^2 = 1 - O_{j,1,1}^2 \leq 2(1 - O_{j,1,1}).$$

Also notice that $\|\mathbf{U}_{j,-1}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \|\mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{U}_j\mathbf{O}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \sqrt{2(1 - O_{j,1,1})}(\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}) + |1 - O_{j,1,1}| \max\left\{\sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_0}}, \sqrt{\frac{n_0}{n_1}}\right\}. \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

To further simplify the second and the third terms, let $\mathbf{H}_j = \mathbf{U}_j^T\mathbf{U}_j^*$ with singular value decomposition $\mathbf{H}_j = \bar{\mathbf{U}}_j(\cos\theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*))\bar{\mathbf{V}}_j^T$, where $\cos\theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*) = \text{diag}(\cos\theta_{j1}, \dots, \cos\theta_{jj})$ and θ_{ji} 's are the principal angles between \mathbf{u}_{n-i} and \mathbf{u}_{n-i}^* . By definition, $\mathbf{O}_j = \bar{\mathbf{U}}_j\bar{\mathbf{V}}_j^T$. As a result,

$$\|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{O}_j\|_{\text{op}} = \|\bar{\mathbf{U}}_j(\mathbf{I} - \cos\Theta_j)\bar{\mathbf{V}}_j^T\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathbf{I} - \cos\theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|_{\text{op}}.$$

For any $\theta \leq \pi/2$,

$$1 - \cos\theta \leq 1 - \cos^2\theta = \sin^2\theta.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{O}_j\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\sin\theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|_{\text{op}}^2$$

On the other hand,

$$|1 - H_{j,1,1}| = |1 - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^T\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*| = |(\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*)^T\mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*| \leq \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2.$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - O_{j,1,1}| &\leq |1 - H_{j,1,1}| + |H_{j,1,1} - O_{j,1,1}| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 + \|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{O}_j\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 + \|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|_{\text{op}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (8) imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}_j \mathbf{O}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \left(\sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 + \sqrt{2} \|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|_{\text{op}} \right) (\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}) \\ &\quad + \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_0}}, \sqrt{\frac{n_0}{n_1}} \right\} (\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 + \|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|_{\text{op}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption **C1**,

$$\max_{s \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{n}{n_s} = O(1).$$

We also denote by \tilde{K} the number of eigenvalues that are strictly smaller than np_* . By Theorem 2.1, $\tilde{K} \leq K$. Then for any $j \leq \tilde{K}$, by part (4) of Theorem 2.1,

$$\|\mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Thus, to prove $\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_{\infty} < \min\{\sqrt{n_0/n_1}, \sqrt{n_1/n_0}\}$, it remains to prove

$$\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 \leq c, \quad \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}_j \mathbf{O}_j - \mathbf{U}_j^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq c, \quad \|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}_j, \mathbf{U}_j^*)\|_{\text{op}} \leq c, \quad (9)$$

for a sufficiently small constant c that only depends on K and $\{n_{L(s)}/n_{R(s)} : s \in \mathcal{T}\}$ with high probability for some $2 \leq j \leq \tilde{K}$. The first bound $\|\mathbf{u}_{n-1} - \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*\|_2 \leq c$ has been proved in Theorem 3.1. We will show the other two bounds in the following subsections.

6.4.1 Preliminaries

We start by some notation and a few simple facts that will be used repeatedly. Let

$$p^* = \max_{ij} p_{ij}, \quad \bar{p}^* = \max_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}, \quad \underline{p}^* = \min_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}, \quad \bar{p}_2^* = \max_i \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}^2}.$$

Then

$$p^* \geq \bar{p}_2^* \geq \bar{p}^* \geq \frac{n_s}{n} p^* \implies p^*, \bar{p}_2^* = O(\bar{p}^*). \quad (10)$$

By definition of \tilde{K} , $np_{\emptyset} = \lambda_{n-1}^* \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{n-\tilde{K}}^* < np_* \leq \lambda_{n-\tilde{K}-1}^*$. Let

$$\delta_j^* = \min\{np_*, \lambda_{n-j-1}^*\} - \lambda_{n-j}^*, \quad \tilde{k} = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \leq \tilde{K}} \delta_j^*. \quad (11)$$

By Theorem 2.1, $\tilde{K} \leq K$ and thus

$$\delta_{\tilde{k}}^* \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{K}} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{K}} \delta_j^* = \frac{n(p_* - p_{\emptyset})}{\tilde{K}}. \quad (12)$$

Throughout the rest of the proof we will fix $j = \tilde{k}$ and depress the subscript j when no confusion can arise. This option guarantees sufficiently large eigen-gap so the off-the-shelf technical tools can be applied directly to obtain meaningful perturbation bounds.

For notational convenience, denote by $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ the diagonal matrix of the \tilde{K} smallest eigenvalues and by \mathbf{E} the perturbation matrix between sample and population Laplacians, i.e.

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{n-1}, \dots, \lambda_{n-\tilde{k}}), \quad \mathbf{\Lambda}^* = \text{diag}(\lambda_{n-1}^*, \dots, \lambda_{n-\tilde{k}}^*), \quad \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{L} - \mathbf{L}^*.$$

Furthermore, for any $\nu > 0$, let

$$\mathbf{L}_\nu = \mathbf{L} + \nu \mathbf{J}, \quad \mathbf{L}_\nu^* = \mathbf{L}^* + \nu \mathbf{J}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T. \quad (13)$$

Since $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{U}^* = 0$,

$$\mathbf{L}_\nu \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{\Lambda} + \nu \mathbf{I}), \quad \mathbf{L}_\nu^* \mathbf{U}^* = \mathbf{U}^*(\mathbf{\Lambda}^* + \nu \mathbf{I}).$$

Throughout we take

$$\nu = n\bar{p}^*. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, by assumption **C2**,

$$(n\bar{p}^*)^4 \geq (n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^4 \geq (n\bar{p}^*)^3 \log n \implies n\bar{p}^* \gtrsim \log n. \quad (15)$$

Finally, since $\tilde{k} \leq K \lesssim 1$,

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \lesssim 1. \quad (16)$$

6.4.2 Bounding $\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$

We will apply Theorem 2.6 of Lei (2019) on \mathbf{L}_ν and \mathbf{L}_ν^* .¹ To be self-contained, we stated the theorem in Appendix A together with all necessary definitions. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L} + \nu \mathbf{J}$ and $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{L}^* + \nu \mathbf{J}$. Now we verify each of assumptions **A1** - **A5**. We add the subscript ν into all quantities defined in Appendix A to denote their counterparts for \mathbf{L}_ν or \mathbf{L}_ν^* . Moreover, we let

$$M(\delta) = \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log(n/\delta)} + \log(n/\delta), \quad R(\delta) = \log(n/\delta) + \tilde{k}. \quad (17)$$

By definition (11), $\tilde{k} \leq \tilde{K} \leq K = O(1)$. In each of the following steps, δ is always set to be n^{-r} . Unless otherwise specified, $a \gtrsim b$ ($a \lesssim b$) iff $a \geq Cb$ ($a \leq Cb$) for some constant C that only depends on r, K and $\{s \in \mathcal{T} : n_{L(s)}/n_{R(s)}\}$. To apply the Theorem in Appendix A, we need to verify Assumptions **A1** - **A5**.

Checking Assumption A1: We recall Lemma 3.12 of Lei (2019), rephrased for our purpose.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $\Theta(\delta)$ be defined in assumption **A1** in Appendix A. Further let*

$$\Theta^* = \frac{\min_{j \in [n-\tilde{k}, n-1]} |\Lambda_{jj}^*|}{\min_{j \in [n-\tilde{k}, n-1], k \in [n]} |\Lambda_{jj}^* - \Sigma_{kk}^*|}.$$

Then $\Theta(\delta) \leq 5\Theta^*$ if

$$\min_{j \in [n-\tilde{k}, n-1], k \in [n]} |\Lambda_{jj}^* - \Sigma_{kk}^*| \geq 5M(\delta).$$

¹Indeed we are using a weaker version of Theorem 2.6 discussed in Remark 2.3 of Lei (2019) that bounds $\|U \text{sign}(U^T U^*) - U^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ instead of $d_{2 \rightarrow \infty}(U, U^*)$. This result replaces the effective condition number $\bar{\kappa}^*$ by the condition number κ^* . It is proved in Step I-IV in the proof of Theorem 2.5 in Appendix B.

In this case, $\Lambda_{jj}^* < n\underline{p}_*$ for all $j \in [n - \tilde{k}, n - 1]$ and $\Sigma_{kk}^* \geq n\underline{p}_*$ for all $k \in [n]$. Thus,

$$\min_{j \in [n - \tilde{k}, n - 1], k \in [n]} |\Lambda_{jj}^* - \Sigma_{kk}^*| = \min_{k \in [n]} \Sigma_{kk}^* - \max_{j \in [n - \tilde{k}, n - 1]} \Lambda_{jj}^* = n\underline{p}_* - \lambda_{n - \tilde{k}}^*.$$

By definition of \tilde{k} and equation (12),

$$n\underline{p}_* - \lambda_{n - \tilde{k}}^* \geq \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K}.$$

By definition,

$$\Lambda_{\nu, jj}^* = \Lambda_{jj}^* + \nu, \quad \Sigma_{\nu, kk}^* = \Sigma_{kk}^* + \frac{n - 1}{n} \nu.$$

Thus,

$$\min_{j \in [n - \tilde{k}, n - 1], k \in [n]} |\Lambda_{\nu, jj}^* - L_{\nu, kk}^*| \geq \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K} - \frac{\nu}{n}.$$

By assumption **C2** and (15)

$$\frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K} \geq \frac{C_1^{1/4} (n\bar{p}^*)^{3/4} (\log n)^{1/4}}{K} \gtrsim \log n.$$

If C_1 is sufficiently large,

$$\frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K} \geq 2 \geq 2\bar{p}^*.$$

By the definition (14) of ν ,

$$\frac{\nu}{n} = \bar{p}^* \leq \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{2K}.$$

As a result,

$$\min_{j \in [n - \tilde{k}, n - 1], k \in [n]} |\Lambda_{\nu, jj}^* - L_{\nu, kk}^*| \geq \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{2K}.$$

On the other hand, by (15),

$$M(n^{-r}) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}$$

By (15) again and assumption **C2**, if C_1 is sufficiently large,

$$\frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{2K} \geq 5M(n^{-r}).$$

Therefore,

$$\Theta_\nu(n^{-r}) \lesssim \Theta_\nu^* \leq \frac{np_\emptyset + \nu}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)/2K} \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^*}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}. \quad (18)$$

Checking Assumption A2: We recall Lemma 3.10 of Lei (2019).

Lemma 6.9. *There exists $\mathbf{A}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{A}^{(n)}$ satisfying **A2** for $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}$ with*

$$L_1(\delta) \lesssim M(\delta), \quad L_2(\delta) = 1, \quad L_3(\delta) \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^* + \log(n/\delta)}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^*)},$$

where \lesssim only hides absolute constants and $L_1(\delta), L_2(\delta), L_3(\delta)$ are defined in Assumption **A2** in Appendix A.

In this case, let

$$\mathbf{A}_\nu^{(k)} = \mathbf{A}^{(k)} + \nu \mathbf{J}.$$

Then it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{A}_\nu^{(k)} - \mathbf{L}_\nu = \mathbf{A}^{(k)} - \mathbf{L}.$$

Therefore, Lemma 6.9 holds for any $\nu > 0$. Let $\delta = n^{-r}$, we have

$$L_{1,\nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}, \quad L_{2,\nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim 1, \quad L_{3,\nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^* + \log n}{np_\emptyset + \nu} \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^* + \log n}{n\bar{p}^*} \lesssim 1, \quad (19)$$

where the last inequality uses (15).

Checking Assumption A3: We recall Lemma 3.8 of Lei (2019).

Lemma 6.10. *Assumption A3 is satisfied for $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}$ with*

$$\tilde{E}_\infty(\delta) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^*} + \sqrt{\log(n/\delta)}, \quad E_+(\delta), \lambda_-(\delta) \lesssim M(\delta),$$

where \lesssim only hides absolute constants and $\tilde{E}_\infty(\delta), E_+(\delta), \lambda_-(\delta)$ are defined in Assumption A3 in Appendix A.

Since $\mathbf{\Lambda}_\nu = \mathbf{\Lambda} + \nu \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_\nu^* = \mathbf{\Lambda}^* + \nu \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_\nu - \mathbf{\Lambda}_\nu^* = \mathbf{\Lambda} - \mathbf{\Lambda}^*$ is invariant to ν . Similarly, $\mathbf{E}_\nu = \mathbf{E}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_\nu = \tilde{\mathbf{E}}$. Thus Lemma 6.10 holds for any $\nu > 0$. By (15),

$$\tilde{E}_{\infty,\nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^*}, \quad E_{+,\nu}(n^{-r}), \lambda_{-,\nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}. \quad (20)$$

Checking Assumption A4: We recall Lemma 3.7 of Lei (2019).

Lemma 6.11. *Assumption A4 is satisfied for $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}$ with*

$$\tilde{b}_\infty(\delta) \lesssim \frac{R(\delta)}{\alpha \log R(\delta)}, \quad \tilde{b}_2(\delta) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{p^*} R(\delta)^{(1+\alpha)/2}}{\alpha \log R(\delta)},$$

where \lesssim only hides absolute constants and $\tilde{b}_\infty(\delta), \tilde{b}_2(\delta)$ are defined in Assumption A4 in Appendix A.

As with Assumption A3, \tilde{E} is invariant to ν . Thus Lemma 6.11 holds for any $\nu > 0$. Let $\alpha = 1/\log R(\delta)$. Since $\tilde{k} \leq K = O(1)$,

$$\tilde{b}_{\infty,\nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim R(n^{-r}) \lesssim \log n, \quad \tilde{b}_{2,\nu}(\delta) \lesssim \sqrt{R(\delta)p^*} \lesssim \sqrt{(\log n)p^*} \lesssim \sqrt{(\log n)\bar{p}^*}. \quad (21)$$

where the last inequality uses (10).

Checking Assumption A5: We first refer the readers to Appendix A for the definitions of $\kappa^*, \Delta^*, \tilde{\eta}(\delta)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(\delta)$. By definition,

$$\kappa_\nu^* = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_\nu^*)}{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_\nu^*)} = \frac{\lambda_{n-\tilde{k}}^* + \nu}{np_\emptyset + \nu} \lesssim 1, \quad (22)$$

and

$$\Delta_\nu^* = \min\{\nu, n\underline{p}_* - \lambda_{n-\tilde{k}+1}\} \geq \min\left\{\nu, \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K}\right\} = \frac{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}{K}. \quad (23)$$

By definition of $\tilde{\eta}$, (20) and (21),

$$\tilde{\eta}_\nu(n^{-r}) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^*} + \log n.$$

By (19), (20) and (15),

$$\tilde{\sigma}_\nu(n^{-r}) \lesssim \tilde{\eta}(n^{-r}) + \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^*} + \log n + \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}. \quad (24)$$

By (18), (19) and (20),

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_\nu(n^{-r})\tilde{\sigma}_\nu(n^{-r}) + L_{1,\nu}(n^{-r}) + \lambda_{-,\nu}(n^{-r}) + E_{+,\nu}(n^{-r}) \\ & \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^*}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} + \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^*}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}. \end{aligned}$$

By (23) and assumption **C2**, if C_1 is sufficiently large,

$$\Delta_\nu^* \geq 4 \left(\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})\tilde{\sigma}_\nu(n^{-r}) + L_{1,\nu}(n^{-r}) + \lambda_{-,\nu}(n^{-r}) + E_{+,\nu}(n^{-r}) \right), \quad (25)$$

Thus Assumption **A5** is satisfied.

Final Result:

In the previous five steps, we show that Assumption **A1** - **A5** are satisfied under assumptions **C1** and **C2**, if C_1 is sufficiently large. By Theorem A.1, with probability $1 - B(\tilde{k})n^{-r}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{U} \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}^*) - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} & \lesssim \frac{\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})}{\lambda_{\min}(\Lambda_\nu^*)} \|\mathbf{E}_\nu \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \left(\frac{E_{+,\nu}^2(n^{-r})}{(\Delta_\nu^*)^2} + \frac{\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})\tilde{\sigma}_\nu(n^{-r})}{\Delta_\nu^*} \right) \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \\ & \quad + \frac{\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})E_{+,\nu}(n^{-r})\tilde{b}_{2,\nu}(n^{-r}) + \|\mathbf{L}_\nu^* - \Sigma_\nu^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}}{\Delta_\nu^* \lambda_{\min}(\Lambda_\nu^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound $\|\mathbf{E}_\nu \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$, we recall Lemma 3.9 of Lei (2019).

Lemma 6.12. *Let $M(\delta)$ and $R(\delta)$ be defined in (17). Then with probability $1 - \delta$,*

$$\|\mathbf{E} \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \lesssim (M(\delta) + \tilde{k}) \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \sqrt{R(\delta)p^*}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{E}_\nu = \mathbf{E}$. When $\delta = n^{-r}$, by (10) and (15),

$$\|\mathbf{E}_\nu \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \sqrt{(\log n)p^*} \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}, \quad (26)$$

where the last line uses the fact that $\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \geq 1$.

Now we derive bounds for other terms. By (18) and the definition (14) of ν ,

$$\frac{\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})}{\lambda_{\min}(\Lambda_\nu^*)} \leq \frac{\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})}{\nu} \lesssim \frac{1}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} \quad (27)$$

Furthermore, by (18), (20), (23) and (24),

$$\frac{E_{+, \nu}^2(n^{-r})}{(\Delta_\nu^*)^2} + \frac{\Theta_\nu(n^{-r})\tilde{\sigma}_\nu(n^{-r})}{\Delta_\nu^*} \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^* \log n}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2} + \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2} \lesssim \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2}, \quad (28)$$

where the last inequality uses (15). For the third term, note that

$$\mathbf{L}_\nu^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\nu^* = \mathbf{L}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^* + \nu \mathbf{J} - \frac{n-1}{n} \nu \mathbf{I}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{L}_\nu^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\nu^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} &\leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{L}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \sqrt{n} \nu \|\mathbf{J} - \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbf{I}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{L}^* - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \nu \leq n\bar{p}_2^* + \nu \lesssim n\bar{p}^*, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the last inequality uses (10) and the fact that $\nu \lesssim n\bar{p}_* \leq n\bar{p}^*$. Furthermore, by (21),

$$\sqrt{n} \tilde{b}_{2, \nu}(n^{-r}) \lesssim \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}. \quad (30)$$

Putting (26) - (30) and using (16), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U} \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}^*) - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} + \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2} + \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2} \frac{n\bar{p}^*}{n\bar{p}^*} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} + \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2} \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\lesssim} \frac{(n\bar{p}^*)^{3/4} (\log n)^{1/4}}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} + \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\lesssim} \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) uses (15) and (ii) uses assumption **C2**. As a consequence, there exists a constant C_6 that only depends on r, K and $\{s \in \mathcal{T} : n_{L(s)}/n_{R(s)}\}$ such that

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U} \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}^*) - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq C_6 \frac{n\bar{p}^* \sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{(n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset))^2}.$$

By assumption **C2**,

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U} \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}^*) - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \frac{C_6}{\sqrt{C_1}}.$$

If C_1 is sufficiently large,

$$\sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{U} \text{sign}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}^*) - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq c,$$

with probability $1 - (B(\tilde{k}) + 1)n^{-r} \geq 1 - (10K + 1)n^{-r}$.

6.4.3 Bounding $\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)\|_{\text{op}}$

Applying Lemma 6.3, we have

$$\|\mathbf{E}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C'_4 \left(\sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n} + \log n \right) \quad \text{with probability } 1 - n^{-r} \quad (31)$$

where C'_4 is a constant that only depends on r . Since Θ is invariant to ν , by Davis-Kahan Theorem,

$$\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{2\|\mathbf{E}\|_{\text{op}}}{\Delta_\nu^*}.$$

By (20), (23) and (15), with probability $1 - n^{-r}$,

$$\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{n\bar{p}^* \log n}}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)} \lesssim \frac{(n\bar{p}^*)^{3/4}(\log n)^{1/4}}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}.$$

As a consequence, there exists a constant C_7 that only depends on r, K and $\{s \in \mathcal{T} : n_{L(s)}/n_{R(s)}\}$ such that

$$\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)\|_{\text{op}} \leq C_7 \frac{(n\bar{p}^*)^{3/4}(\log n)^{1/4}}{n(\underline{p}_* - p_\emptyset)}.$$

By assumption **C2**,

$$\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{C_7}{C_1^{1/4}}.$$

Therefore, if C_1 is sufficiently large,

$$\|\sin \theta(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^*)\|_{\text{op}} \leq c,$$

with probability $1 - n^{-r}$.

Acknowledgment

X. Li and X. Lou acknowledge support from the NSF via the Career Award DMS-1848575. X. Lou also acknowledges support from the NSF via the Grant CCF-1934568.

References

- Abbe, E. (2017). Community detection and stochastic block models: recent developments. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6446–6531.
- Abbe, E., Bandeira, A. S., and Hall, G. (2015). Exact recovery in the stochastic block model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(1):471–487.
- Abbe, E., Fan, J., Wang, K., and Zhong, Y. (2017). Entrywise eigenvector analysis of random matrices with low expected rank. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.09565*.
- Adamic, L. A. and Glance, N. (2005). The political blogosphere and the 2004 us election: divided they blog. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international workshop on Link discovery*, pages 36–43.

- Balakrishnan, S., Xu, M., Krishnamurthy, A., and Singh, A. (2011). Noise thresholds for spectral clustering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 954–962.
- Chin, P., Rao, A., and Vu, V. (2015). Stochastic block model and community detection in sparse graphs: A spectral algorithm with optimal rate of recovery. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 391–423.
- Chung, F., Chung, F. R., Graham, F. C., Lu, L., Chung, K. F., et al. (2006). *Complex graphs and networks*. Number 107. American Mathematical Soc.
- Clauset, A., Moore, C., and Newman, M. E. (2008). Hierarchical structure and the prediction of missing links in networks. *Nature*, 453(7191):98.
- Dasgupta, A., Hopcroft, J., Kannan, R., and Mitra, P. (2006). Spectral clustering by recursive partitioning. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 256–267. Springer.
- Eldridge, J., Belkin, M., and Wang, Y. (2017). Unperturbed: spectral analysis beyond davis-kahan. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06516*.
- Feige, U. and Ofek, E. (2005). Spectral techniques applied to sparse random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 27(2):251–275.
- Fiedler, M. (1975). A property of eigenvectors of nonnegative symmetric matrices and its application to graph theory. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 25(4):619–633.
- Fortunato, S. (2010). Community detection in graphs. *Physics reports*, 486(3-5):75–174.
- Girvan, M. and Newman, M. E. (2002). Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 99(12):7821–7826.
- Holland, P. W., Laskey, K. B., and Leinhardt, S. (1983). Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks*, 5(2):109–137.
- Jarrell, T. A., Wang, Y., Bloniarz, A. E., Brittin, C. A., Xu, M., Thomson, J. N., Albertson, D. G., Hall, D. H., and Emmons, S. W. (2012). The connectome of a decision-making neural network. *Science*, 337(6093):437–444.
- Jin, J. et al. (2015). Fast community detection by score. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):57–89.
- Kato, T. (1949). On the upper and lower bounds of eigenvalues. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 4(4-6):334–339.
- Latała, R., van Handel, R., and Youssef, P. (2018). The dimension-free structure of nonhomogeneous random matrices. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 214(3):1031–1080.
- Lei, J., Rinaldo, A., et al. (2015). Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):215–237.
- Lei, L. (2019). Unified $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ eigenspace perturbation theory for symmetric random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04798*.

- Li, T., Lei, L., Bhattacharyya, S., Sarkar, P., Bickel, P. J., and Levina, E. (2018). Hierarchical community detection by recursive partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01509*.
- Lusseau, D., Schneider, K., Boisseau, O. J., Haase, P., Slooten, E., and Dawson, S. M. (2003). The bottlenose dolphin community of doubtful sound features a large proportion of long-lasting associations. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 54(4):396–405.
- Lyzinski, V., Tang, M., Athreya, A., Park, Y., and Priebe, C. E. (2016). Community detection and classification in hierarchical stochastic blockmodels. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, 4(1):13–26.
- Mao, X., Sarkar, P., and Chakrabarti, D. (2017). Estimating mixed memberships with sharp eigenvector deviations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00407*.
- McSherry, F. (2001). Spectral partitioning of random graphs. In *Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 529–537. IEEE.
- Nepusz, T., Petróczy, A., Négyessy, L., and Bazsó, F. (2008). Fuzzy communities and the concept of bridgeness in complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 77(1):016107.
- Peel, L. and Clauset, A. (2015). Detecting change points in the large-scale structure of evolving networks. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Rohe, K., Chatterjee, S., Yu, B., et al. (2011). Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(4):1878–1915.
- Rosenberg, A. and Hirschberg, J. (2007). V-measure: A conditional entropy-based external cluster evaluation measure. In *Proceedings of the 2007 joint conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and computational natural language learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pages 410–420.
- Yu, Y., Wang, T., and Samworth, R. J. (2014). A useful variant of the davis–kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika*, 102(2):315–323.
- Zachary, W. W. (1977). An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups. *Journal of anthropological research*, 33(4):452–473.

A $\ell_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ Perturbation Theory for Unnormalized Laplacians

In this appendix, we rephrase the weaker version Theorem 2.6 of Lei (2019) , discussed in their Remark 2.3, by only keeping the parts that are relevant to our purpose. Throughout this section, we consider two generic symmetric real matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{A}^* with

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^*. \quad (32)$$

Let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and $\lambda_1^* \geq \lambda_2^* \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n^*$ be the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{A}^* , respectively. Given positive integers s and r , let

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{s+1}, \lambda_{s+2}, \dots, \lambda_{s+r}), \quad \mathbf{\Lambda}^* = \text{diag}(\lambda_{s+1}^*, \lambda_{s+2}^*, \dots, \lambda_{s+r}^*). \quad (33)$$

Let $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ be a matrix of eigenvectors such that

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}, \quad \mathbf{A}^*\mathbf{U}^* = \mathbf{U}^*\mathbf{\Lambda}^*. \quad (34)$$

To state the generic bound, we define the following quantities.

- *Modified perturbation matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$:*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{\Sigma} - (\mathbf{A}^* - \mathbf{\Sigma}^*)$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}), \quad \mathbf{\Sigma}^* = \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}^*).$$

- *Condition number κ^* :*

$$\lambda_{\max}^* = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^*), \quad \lambda_{\min}^* = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Lambda}^*), \quad \kappa^* = \lambda_{\max}^*/\lambda_{\min}^*. \quad (35)$$

- *Effective eigen-gap Δ^* :*

$$\Delta^* \triangleq \min\{\text{sep}^*, \lambda_{\min}^*\}, \quad (36)$$

where $\text{sep}^* = \lambda_{n-\tilde{k}}^* - \lambda_{n-\tilde{k}+1}^*$.

The assumptions for the generic bound are stated below.

A1 For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\frac{\min_{j \in [s+1, s+r]} |\Lambda_{jj}^*|}{\min_{j \in [s+1, s+r], k \in [n]} |\Lambda_{jj}^* - \Sigma_{kk}|} \leq \Theta(\delta),$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for some deterministic function $\Theta(\delta) > 0$.

A2 For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a random matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that v

$$d_{TV} \left(\mathbb{P}_{(\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_k, \mathbf{A}^{(k)})}, \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_k} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{A}^{(k)}} \right) \leq \delta/n.$$

where d_{TV} denotes the total variation distance and it holds simultaneously for all k and all contiguous subsets $S \subset [r]$ that

$$\|\mathbf{A}^{(k)} - \mathbf{A}\|_{\text{op}} \leq L_1(\delta), \quad \frac{\|(\mathbf{A}^{(k)} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{U}\|_{\text{op}}}{\lambda_{\min}^*} \leq (\kappa(\mathbf{\Lambda}^*)L_2(\delta) + L_3(\delta)) \|\mathbf{U}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty},$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for some deterministic functions $L_1(\delta), L_2(\delta), L_3(\delta)$.

A3 There exists deterministic functions $\lambda_-(\delta), E_+(\delta), \tilde{E}_\infty(\delta)$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the following event holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\|\mathbf{\Lambda} - \mathbf{\Lambda}^*\|_{\max} \leq \lambda_-(\delta), \quad \|\mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}^*\|_{\text{op}} \leq E_+(\delta), \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \tilde{E}_\infty(\delta).$$

A4 There exists deterministic functions $\tilde{b}_\infty(\delta), \tilde{b}_2(\delta) > 0$, such that for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $k \in [n]$, and fixed matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \tilde{k}}$,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_k^T \mathbf{W}\|_2 \leq \tilde{b}_\infty(\delta) \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \tilde{b}_2(\delta) \|\mathbf{W}\|_{\text{op}}, \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - \delta/n.$$

A5 $\Delta^* \geq 4(\Theta(\delta)\tilde{\sigma}(\delta) + L_1(\delta) + \lambda_-(\delta) + E_+(\delta))$ where

$$\tilde{\eta}(\delta) = \tilde{E}_\infty(\delta) + \tilde{b}_\infty(\delta) + \tilde{b}_2(\delta), \quad \tilde{\sigma}(\delta) = \{\kappa^* L_2(\delta) + L_3(\delta) + 1\}\tilde{\eta} + E_+(\delta). \quad (37)$$

Theorem A.1 (Theorem 2.6 of Lei (2019)). *Under assumptions A1 - A5,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{U}\text{sign}(\mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{U}^*) - \mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq C \left\{ \frac{\Theta(\delta)}{\lambda_{\min}^*} \|\mathbf{E}\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} + \left(\frac{E_+(\delta)^2}{(\Delta^*)^2} + \frac{\Theta(\delta)\tilde{\sigma}(\delta)}{\Delta^*} \right) \|\mathbf{U}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\Theta(\delta)(\tilde{b}_2(\delta) + \|\mathbf{A}^* - \mathbf{\Sigma}^*\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty})E_+(\delta)}{\lambda_{\min}^* \Delta^*} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - B(r)\delta$, where C is a universal constant (that can be chosen as 136) and

$$B(r) = 10 \min\{r, 1 + \log_2 \kappa^*\}, \quad (38)$$