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Abstract—Graphs provide a natural mathematical abstraction for systems with pairwise interactions, and thus have become a prevalent tool across various scientific domains. However, as uncertainty permeates data-acquisition methods, and the size of relational datasets continues to grow, traditional graph-based approaches are increasingly replaced by more flexible modeling paradigms. A promising framework in this regard is that of graphons, which provide an overarching class of non-parametric random graph models. While the theory of graphons is already well developed, some prominent tools in network analysis still have no counterpart within the realm of graphons. In particular, node centrality measures, which have been successfully employed in various applications to reveal important nodes in a network, have so far not been defined for graphons. A key motivation for closing this gap is that centrality measures defined at the modeling level of graphons will be inherently robust to stochastic variations of specific graph realizations. In this work we introduce formal definitions of centrality measures for graphons and establish their connections to centrality measures defined on finite graphs. In particular, we build on the theory of linear integral operators to define degree, eigenvector, and Katz centrality functions for graphons. We further establish concentration inequalities showing that these centrality functions arise naturally as limits of their analogous counterparts defined on sequences of converging graphs of increasing size. Moreover, we show that the same concentration inequalities can also be used to give high-probability bounds on the distance between the graphon centrality function and the centrality measures realized in any sampled graph; and, similarly, to quantify the expected variability between centrality measures of different graphs realizations (thus giving an indication of robustness in uncertain networks). We discuss and exemplify several strategies for computing graphon centrality functions, and illustrate the aforementioned concentration inequalities through numerical experiments.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Many biological [1], social [2], and economic [3] systems can be better understood when interpreted as networks, comprising a large number of individual components that interact with each other to generate a global behavior. These networks are aptly formalized by graphs, in which nodes are used to denote individual entities, and edges represent pairwise interactions between those nodes. Consequently, a surge of studies concerning the modeling, analysis, and design of networks have appeared in the literature, using graphs as modeling devices.

A fundamental task in network analysis is to identify salient features in the underlying system, such as key nodes or agents in the network. To identify such important agents, researchers have developed centrality measures in various contexts [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], each of them capturing different aspects of node importance. Prominent examples for the utility of centrality measures include the celebrated pagerank algorithm [9], employed in the search of relevant sites on the web, as well as the identification of influential agents in social networks to facilitate viral marketing campaigns [10].

A common feature among all centrality measures is that the importance of each agent derives entirely from the observed network. A crucial assumption for the applicability of standard centrality measures is thus that the observation of this network is complete and noise free. However, for very large systems and human-centric networks we might not be able to extract a complete and accurate graph-based representation, e.g., due to computational or measurement constraints, errors in the observed data, or due to the fact that the network itself might be slightly changing over time. For such reasons, some recent approaches have considered the issue of robustness of centrality measures [11], [12], [13], [14] and their computation in dynamic graphs [15], [16], [17]. The closest work to ours is [18], where convergence results are derived for eigenvector and Katz centralities in the context of random graphs generated from a stochastic block model.

As the size of the analyzed systems continues to grow, traditional tools for network analysis have been pushed to their limit. For example, systems such as the world wide web, the brain, or social networks can consist of billions of interconnected agents, leading to computational challenges and the irremediable emergence of uncertainty in the observations. In this context, graphons have been suggested as an alternative framework to analyze large networks [19], [20]. While graphons have been initially studied as limiting objects of large graphs [21], [22], [23], they also provide a rich non-parametric modeling tool for networks of any...
In particular, graphons encapsulate a broad class of network models including the stochastic block model [27], [28], random dot-product graphs [29], the infinite relational model [30], and others [31]. A testament of the practicality of graphons is their use in applied disciplines such as signal processing [32], collaborative learning [33], and control [34].

In this work we aim at harnessing the additional flexibility provided by such graphon framework to suggest a statistical approach to agents’ centralities that inherently accounts for network uncertainty, as detailed next.

### 1.1 Motivation

Most existing applications of network centrality measures follow the paradigm in Fig. 1a: a specific graph — such as a social network with friendship connections — is observed, and based on this observation a centrality measure is computed to obtain a ranking of the nodes. Conclusions are then drawn from this analysis about the importance of each agent, e.g., which are the individuals with more friends or with most influential connections. A crucial assumption hidden in this type of analysis is that the observed empirical network captures all the data we care about, as the centrality of any node derives solely from the network structure [4], [5], [6], [7], [8].

However, in many instances in which centrality measures are employed this assumption is arguably not fulfilled: we usually do not observe all of the network at once. Further, even for those parts we observe there are measurement errors, such as false positive or false negative links, and other forms of uncertainty. The key question is therefore how to identify crucial nodes via network-based centrality measures without having access to an accurate depiction of the ‘true’ latent network.

One answer to this problem is to adopt a statistical inference based viewpoint towards centrality measures, by assuming that the observed graph is a specific realization of an underlying stochastic generative process; see Fig. 1b. In this work, in particular, we use graphons to model such underlying generative process because they provide a rich non-parametric statistical framework and it has been recently shown that they can be efficiently estimated from one (or multiple) noisy graph observations [25], [35]. Our main contribution is to show that, based on the inferred graphon, one can compute a latent centrality profile of the nodes (that we term graphon centrality function), which may be seen as a fundamental measure of node importance, irrespective of the specific realization of the graph at hand. This leads to a robust estimate of the centrality profiles of all nodes in the network. In fact, we provide explicit formulas in terms of network size that bound the distance between such latent graphon centrality function and the centrality profile that one can obtain in any realized network, with high probability.

To illustrate the dichotomy of the classical approach towards centrality and the one outlined here, let us consider the graphon in Fig. 1c. This object will be formally defined in Section 2.2, but the fundamental feature is that it defines a random graph model from where graphs of any pre-specified size can be obtained. If we generate one of these graphs with 100 nodes, we can apply the procedure in Fig. 1d to obtain a centrality value for each agent, as shown in the red curve in Fig. 1c. In the standard paradigm we would then sort the centrality values to find the most central nodes (for clarity, label the most central node as $v_1$). The sorting of these values is represented by the yellow curve in Fig. 1c. On the other hand, if we have access to the generative graphon model (or an estimate thereof), then we can compute the continuous graphon centrality function and compare the deviations from it in the specific graph realization; see blue and red curves in Fig. 1c.

The result is that while $v_1$ is the most central node in this specific realization (see red curve), we would expect it to be the third most central node within the model-based framework since the two nodes at its right have higher latent centrality (see blue curve). Stated differently, in this specific realization, the random effects benefited its centrality. If at a different point in time another random graph is drawn
from the same graphon model, then the rank of \( v_1 \) might change, e.g., \( v_1 \) might indeed be the third most central node or rank even lower. Based on a classical centrality analysis akin to Fig. 1a, we would conclude that the centrality of this node decreased relative to other agents in the network. However, this difference is due exclusively to random variations, hence, it is not statistically significant. The approach outlined in Fig. 1b, and, in particular, centrality measures defined on graphons thus provide a statistical framework to analyze centralities in the presence of uncertainty, shielding us from making the wrong conclusion about the change in centrality of node \( v_1 \) if the network is subject to uncertainty.

A prerequisite to apply the perspective outlined above is to have a consistent theory of centrality measures for graphons, with well-defined limiting behaviors and well-understood convergence rates. Such a theory is developed in this paper, as we detail in the next section.

1.2 Contributions and article structure

Our contributions are listed below.

1) We lay the theoretical foundations and develop suitable definitions for centrality measures on graphons. Specifically, by using the spectral theory of linear integral operators, we define the degree, eigenvector, and Katz centrality functions.

2) We discuss and illustrate three different analytical approaches to compute such centrality functions.

3) We derive concentration inequalities showing that our newly defined graphon centrality functions are natural limiting objects of centrality measures for finite graphs.

4) We illustrate how such bounds can be used to quantify the distance between the latent graphon centrality function and the centrality measures of finite graphs sampled from the graphon.

The remainder of the article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we review preliminaries regarding graphs, graph centralities, and graphons. Subsequently, in Section 3, we define the graphon operator and use it to introduce centrality measures for graphons. Section 4 discusses how centrality measures for graphons can be effectively computed using different strategies, and provides some detailed numerical examples. Thereafter, in Section 5, we derive our main convergence results. Section 6 provides concluding remarks and the Appendix contains proofs omitted throughout the paper.

**Notation:** The entries of a matrix \( X \) and a (column) vector \( x \) are denoted by \( X_{ij} \) and \( x_i \), respectively; however, in some cases \( [X]_{ij} \) and \( [x]_i \) are used for clarity. The notation \( ^T \) stands for transpose. \( \text{diag}(x) \) is a diagonal matrix whose \( i \)-th diagonal entry is \( x_i \). \( \lceil x \rceil \) denotes the ceiling function that returns the smallest integer larger than or equal to \( x \). Sets are represented by calligraphic capital letters, and \( 1_B(i) \) denotes the indicator function over the set \( B \). \( 0, 1, e_i, \) and \( I \) refer to the all-zero vector, the all-one vector, the \( i \)-th canonical basis vector, and the identity matrix, respectively. The symbols \( \nu, \varphi, \) and \( \lambda \) are reserved for eigenvectors, eigenfunctions, and eigenvalues, respectively. Additional notation is provided at the beginning of Section 3.

2 Preliminaries

In Section 3, we introduce basic graph-theoretic concepts as well as the notion of node centrality measures for finite graphs, emphasizing the three measures studied throughout the paper. A brief introduction to graphons and their relation to random graph models is given in Section 2.2.

2.1 Graphs and centrality measures

An undirected and unweighted graph \( G = (V, E) \) consists of a set \( V \) of \( N \) nodes or vertices and an edge set \( E \) of unordered pairs of elements in \( V \). An alternative representation of such a graph is through its adjacency matrix \( A \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N} \), where \( A_{ij} = A_{ji} = 1 \) if \( (i, j) \in E \) and \( A_{ij} = 0 \) otherwise. In this paper we consider simple graphs (i.e., without self-loops), so that \( A_{ii} = 0 \) for all \( i \).

Node centrality is a measure of the importance of a node within a graph. This importance is not based on the intrinsic nature of each node, but rather on the location that the nodes occupy within the graph. More formally, a centrality measure assigns a nonnegative centrality value to every node such that the higher the value, the more central the node is. The centrality ranking imposed on the node set \( V \) is in general more relevant than the absolute centrality values. Throughout the paper, we focus on three centrality measures, namely, the degree, eigenvector, and Katz centrality measures overviewed next; see [8] for further details.

**Degree centrality** is a local measure of the importance of a node within a graph. The degree centrality \( c^d_i \) of a node \( i \) is given by the number of nodes connected to \( i \), that is,

\[
c^d_i := A_{1i},
\]

where the vector \( c^d \) collects the values of \( c^d_i \) for all \( i \in V \).

**Eigenvector centrality**, just as degree centrality, depends on the neighborhood of each node. However, the centrality measure \( c^e_i \) of a given node \( i \) does not depend only on the number of neighbors, but also on how important such neighbors are. The importance of the neighbors in turn depends on how important their neighbors are, and so on. This recursive definition leads to an equation of the form \( A c^e = \lambda c^e \), from where it follows that the vector of centralities \( c^e \) is an eigenvector of \( A \). Note that since \( A \) is symmetric its eigenvalues are real and can be ordered as \( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_N \). Among all eigenvectors, \( c^e \) is defined as the principal eigenvector \( v_1 \), associated with \( \lambda_1 \):

\[
c^e := \sqrt{N} v_1.
\]

For connected graphs, the Perron-Frobenius theorem guarantees that \( \lambda_1 \) is a simple eigenvalue, and that there is a unique associated (normalized) eigenvector \( v_1 \) with positive real entries, so that \( c^e \) is well defined. As will become apparent later, the \( \sqrt{N} \) normalization introduced in (2) facilitates the comparison of the eigenvector centrality on a graph to the corresponding centrality measure defined on a graphon.

**Katz centrality** measures the importance of a node based on the number of immediate neighbors in the graph as well as the number of two-hop neighbors, three-hop neighbors, and so on. The effect of nodes further away is discounted at each step by a factor \( \alpha \geq 0 \). Accordingly, the vector of centralities \( c^k_\alpha \) is computed as \( c^k_\alpha = I + (\alpha A)^2 I + (\alpha A)^3 I + \ldots \), where we add the number of one-hop neighbors weighted by \( \alpha \), the number of two-hop neighbors weighted by \( \alpha^2 \),
and so on. By choosing \( \alpha \) small enough, namely \( 0 < \alpha < 1/\lambda_1(A) \), the above series converges and we can write the Katz centrality compactly as

\[
e_{\alpha}^k := (I - \alpha A)^{-1} \mathbf{1}.
\]

(3)

Notice that if \( \alpha \) is close to zero, the relative weight given to neighbors further away decreases fast, and \( e_{\alpha}^k \) is driven mainly by the one-hop neighbors just like degree centrality. In contrast, if \( \alpha \) is close to \( 1/\lambda_1(A) \), the solution to (3) is close to zero, the relative weight given to neighbors further away decreases fast, and \( e_{\alpha}^k \) is driven mainly by the one-hop neighbors just like degree centrality. Intuitively, for intermediate values of \( \alpha \), Katz centrality captures a hybrid notion of importance by combining degree and eigenvector centralities. We remark that Katz centrality is sometimes defined as \( e_{\alpha}^k - 1 \). Since a constant shift does not alter the centrality ranking, we here use formula (3). We also note that Katz centrality is sometimes referred to as Bonacich centrality in the literature.

2.2 Graphons

A graphon is the limit of a convergent sequence of graphs of increasing size, that preserves certain desirable features of the graphs contained in the sequence [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [36]. Formally, a graphon is a measurable function \( W : [0, 1]^2 \to [0, 1] \) that is symmetric \( W(x, y) = W(y, x) \). Intuitively, one can interpret the value \( W(x, y) \) as the probability of existence of an edge between \( x \) and \( y \), where \( x \) and \( y \) no longer take values in a finite node set (as in classical finite graphs) but rather in the continuous interval \([0, 1]\). Based on this intuition, graphons also provide a natural way of generating random graphs [35], [37]. More precisely, the symmetric adjacency matrix \( S^{(N)} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N} \) of a random graph of size \( N \) constructed from a graphon is such that for all \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \)

\[
\Pr[S^{(N)}_{ij} = 1|u_i, u_j] = W(u_i, u_j),
\]

(4)

where \( u_i \) and \( u_j \) are latent variables selected uniformly at random from \([0, 1]\) (see also Definition 7). This means that, when conditioned on the latent variables \((u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N)\), the off-diagonal entries of the symmetric matrix \( S^{(N)} \) are independent Bernoulli random variables with success probability given by \( W \). In this sense, the constant graphon \( W(x, y) = p \) gives rise to Erdős-Rényi random graphs with edge probability \( p \). Analogously, a piece-wise constant graphon gives rise to stochastic block model graphs [27], [28]; for more details see Section 4.1. Interestingly, it can be shown that the distribution of any exchangeable random graph [31], [36] is characterized by a function \( W \) as discussed above [36], [38], [39]. Finally, observe that for any measure preserving map \( \pi : [0, 1] \to [0, 1] \), the graphons \( W(x, y) \) and \( W^\pi(x, y) := W(\pi(x), \pi(y)) \) define the same probability distribution on random graphs. A precise characterization of the equivalence classes of graphons defining the same probability distribution can be found in [20] Ch. 10.

3 Extending centralities to graphons

In order to introduce centrality measures for graphons we first define a linear integral operator associated with a graphon and recall its spectral properties. From here on, we denote by \( L^2([0, 1]) \) the Hilbert function space with inner product \( \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle := \int_0^1 f_1(x) f_2(x) dx \) for \( f_1, f_2 \in L^2([0, 1]) \), and norm \( \|f_1\| := \sqrt{\langle f_1, f_1 \rangle} \). The elements of \( L^2([0, 1]) \) are the equivalence classes of Lebesgue integrable functions \( f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R} \), that is, we identify two functions \( f \) and \( g \) with each other if they differ only on a set of measure zero (i.e., \( f \equiv g \Leftrightarrow \|f - g\| = 0 \)). \( 1_{[0,1]} \) is the identity function in \( L^2([0, 1]) \). We use blackboard bold symbols (such as \( L \)) to denote linear operators acting on \( L^2([0, 1]) \), with the exception of \( \mathbb{N} \) and \( \mathbb{R} \) that denote the sets of natural and real numbers. The induced (operator) norm is defined as \( \|L\| := \sup_{f \in L^2([0,1])} \text{s.t. } \|f\|=1 \|Lf\| \).

3.1 The graphon integral operator and its properties

Following [20], we introduce a linear operator that is fundamental to derive the notions of centrality for graphons.

Definition 1 (Graphon operator). For a given graphon \( W \), we define the associated graphon operator \( \mathcal{W} \) as the linear integral operator \( \mathcal{W} : L^2([0, 1]) \to L^2([0, 1]) \)

\[
f(y) \to (\mathcal{W} f)(x) = \int_0^1 W(x, y) f(y) dy.
\]

From an operator theory perspective, the graphon \( W \) is the integral kernel of the linear operator \( \mathcal{W} \). Given the key importance of \( \mathcal{W} \), we review its spectral properties in the next definition and lemma.

Definition 2 (Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions). A complex number \( \lambda \) is an eigenvalue of \( \mathcal{W} \) if there exists a nonzero function \( \varphi \in L^2([0, 1]) \), called the eigenfunction, such that

\[
(\mathcal{W} \varphi)(x) = \lambda \varphi(x).
\]

(5)

It follows from the above definition that the eigenfunctions are only defined up to a rescaling parameter. Indeed, if \( \varphi(x) \) is an eigenfunction of \( \mathcal{W} \) with eigenvalue \( \lambda \), then for any arbitrary nonzero \( \beta \in \mathbb{R} \) the function \( \tilde{\varphi}(x) := \beta \varphi(x) \) is also an eigenfunction of \( \mathcal{W} \) with the same eigenvalue \( \lambda \). Hence, from now on we assume that all eigenfunctions are normalized such that \( \|\varphi\| = 1 \).

Lemma 1. The graphon operator \( \mathcal{W} \) has the following properties.

1) \( \mathcal{W} \) is self-adjoint, bounded, and continuous.

2) \( \mathcal{W} \) is diagonalizable. Specifically, \( \mathcal{W} \) has countably many eigenvalues, all of which are real and can be ordered as \( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \ldots \). Moreover, there exists an orthonormal basis for \( L^2([0, 1]) \) of eigenfunctions \( \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \). That is, \( (\mathcal{W} \varphi_i)(x) = \lambda_i \varphi_i(x) \), \( \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \) for all \( i, j \) and any function \( f \in L^2([0, 1]) \) can be decomposed as \( f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \langle f, \varphi_i \rangle \varphi_i(x) \).

Consequently,

\[
(\mathcal{W} f)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i \langle f, \varphi_i \rangle \varphi_i(x).
\]

If the set of nonzero eigenvalues is infinite, then 0 is its unique accumulation point.

3) Let \( \mathcal{W}^k \) denote \( k \) consecutive applications of the operator \( \mathcal{W} \). Then, for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \),

\[
(\mathcal{W}^k f)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i^k \langle f, \varphi_i \rangle \varphi_i(x).
\]
4) The maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_1$ is positive and there exists an associated eigenfunction $\varphi_1$ which is positive, that is, $\varphi_1(x) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, $\lambda_1 = \|W\|$. Just as the topology of a graph is invariant with respect to relabelings or permutations of its nodes, graphons are defined only up to measure preserving transformations. We show in the next lemma that the linear operator $W$ associated with any such ‘permutation’ $\pi$ (formalized via a measure preserving transformation) of a graphon $W$ shares the same eigenvalues of $W$ and ‘permuted’ eigenfunctions.

**Lemma 2.** Consider the graphon $W^\pi(x, y) := W(\pi(x), \pi(y))$ obtained by transforming $W$ using the measure preserving function $\pi : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$. Let $W$ and $W^\pi$ be the associated linear integral operators. If $(\lambda, \varphi)$ is an eigenvalue-eigenfunction pair of $W$, then $(\lambda, \varphi \circ \pi)$ is an eigenvalue-eigenfunction pair of $W^\pi$.

**Proof.** From a direct computation we obtain that

$$
(W^\pi(x, y)\varphi(y))dy = \int_0^1 W(\pi(x), \pi(y))\varphi(y)dy = \int_0^1 W(\pi(x), y)\varphi(y)dy
$$

The third equality uses the fact that $\pi$ is a measure preserving transformation and the ergodic theorem [41, Ch. 8].

Lemma 2 complements the discussion at the end of Section 2.2 by showing the effect of measure preserving transformations on the spectral properties of the graphon.

### 3.2 Definitions of centrality measures for graphons

We define centrality measures for graphons based on the graphon operator introduced in the previous section. These definitions closely parallel the construction of centrality measures in finite graphs; see Section 2.2. The main difference, however, is that the linear operator defining the respective centralities is an infinite dimensional operator, rather than a finite dimensional matrix.

**Definition 3** (Centrality measures for graphons). Given a graphon $W$ and its associated operator $W$, we define the following centrality functions:

1) **Degree centrality:** We define $c^d : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$
c^d(x) := \int_0^1 W(x, y)dy.
$$

2) **Eigenvalue centrality:** For $W$ with a simple largest eigenvalue $\lambda_1$, let $\varphi_1$ be the associated positive eigenfunction ($\|\varphi_1\| = 1$). The eigenvalue centrality function $c^\varphi : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is

$$
c^\varphi(x) := \varphi_1(x).
$$

3) **Katz centrality:** Consider the operator $M_\alpha$ where $(M_\alpha f)(x) := f(x - \alpha W f(x))$. For any $0 < \alpha < 1/\|W\|$, we define the $\alpha$-Katz centrality function $c^k_\alpha : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$
c^k_\alpha(x) := (M_\alpha^{-1}1_{[0, 1]})(x).
$$

**Remark 1.** Note that the Katz centrality function is well defined, since for $0 < \alpha < 1/\|W\|$ the operator $M_\alpha$ is invertible [41, Theorem 2.2]. Moreover, denoting by $\mathbb{I}$ the identity operator, it follows that $M_\alpha = I - \alpha W$. Hence, by using a Neumann series representation and the properties of the higher order powers of $W$ we obtain the equivalent representation

$$
(M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x) = ((I - \alpha W)^{-1} f)(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k (W^k f)(x)
$$

$$
= f(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^k}{1 - \alpha} \phi_k(\varphi_1, f)\varphi_1(x)
$$

where we used that $|\lambda_1| < \|W\|$ for all $i$.

Since a graph describes the limit of an infinite dimensional graph, there is a subtle difference in the semantics of the centrality measure compared to the finite graph setting. Specifically, in the classical setting the network consists of a finite number of nodes and thus for a graph of $N$ nodes we obtain an $N$-dimensional vector with one centrality value per node. In the graphon setting, we may think of each real $x \in [0, 1]$ as corresponding to one of infinitely many nodes, and thus the centrality measure is described by a function.

### 4 Computing centralities on graphons

We illustrate how to compute centrality measures for graphons by studying three examples in detail. The graphons that we consider are ordered by increasing complexity of their respective eigenspaces and by the generality of the methods used in the computation of the centralities.

#### 4.1 Stochastic block model graphons

We consider a class of piecewise constant graphons that may be seen as the equivalent of a stochastic block model (SBM). Such graphons play an important role in practice, as they enable us to approximate more complicated graphons in a ‘stepwise’ fashion. This approximation idea has been exploited to estimate graphons from finite data [25, 42, 43]. In fact, optimal statistical rates of convergence can be achieved over smooth graphon classes [44, 45]. The SBM graphon is defined as follows

$$
W_{SBM}(x, y) := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij} 1_{B_i}(x) 1_{B_j}(y),
$$

where $P_{ij} \in [0, 1]$, $P_{ij} = P_{ji}$, $\sum_{i=1}^m B_i = [0, 1]$ and $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. We define the following $m$ dimensional vector of indicator functions

$$
1(x) := [1_{B_1}(x), \ldots, 1_{B_m}(x)]^T,
$$

enabling us to compactly rewrite our graphon as

$$
W_{SBM}(x, y) = 1(x)^T P 1(y).
$$

We also define the following auxiliary matrices.

**Definition 4.** Let us define the effective measure matrix $Q_{SBM} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and the effective connectivity matrix $E_{SBM} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ for SBM graphons as follows

$$
Q_{SBM} := \int_0^1 1(x)1(x)^T dx,
$$

$$
E_{SBM} := PQ_{SBM}.
$$

Notice that $Q_{SBM}$ is a diagonal matrix with entries collecting the sizes of each block. Similarly, the matrix $E_{SBM}$ is obtained by weighting the probabilities in $P$ by the sizes of the different blocks. Hence, the effective connectivity from block $B_i$ to two blocks $B_j$ and $B_k$ may be equal even...
if the latter block $B_k$ has twice the size ($Q_{kk} = 2Q_{jj}$), provided that it has half the probability of edge appearance ($2P_{kk} = P_{jj}$). Notice also that the matrix $E_{SBM}$ need not be symmetric. As will be seen in Section 4.2, the definitions in [12] are specific examples of more general constructions.

The following lemma relates the spectral properties of $E_{SBM}$ to those of the operator $W_{SBM}$ induced by $W_{SBM}$. We do not prove this lemma since it is a special case of Lemma 3 introduced in Section 4.2 and shown in the Appendix.

**Lemma 3.** Let $\lambda_i$ and $v_i$ denote the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $E_{SBM}$ in [12], respectively. Then, all the nonzero eigenvalues of $W_{SBM}$ are given by $\lambda_i$ and the associated eigenfunctions are of the form $\varphi_i(x) = 1(x)^T v_i$.

Using the result above, we can compute the centrality measures for stochastic block model graphons based on the effective connectivity matrix.

**Proposition 1 (Centrality measures for SBM graphons).** Let $\lambda_i$ and $v_i$ denote the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $E_{SBM}$ in [12], respectively. The centrality functions $c^d$, $c^e$, and $c^k_\alpha$ of the graphon $W_{SBM}$ can be computed as follows

\[
c^d(x) = 1(x)^T E_{SBM} 1, \quad c^e(x) = \frac{1(x)^T v_1}{\sqrt{v_1^T E_{SBM} v_1}}, \quad c^k_\alpha(x) = 1(x)^T (I - \alpha E_{SBM})^{-1} 1.
\]

Proposition 1 leverages Lemma 3 to provide specific expressions for the graphon centrality functions whenever the graphon is of the form given in [9]. We illustrate this result with an example.

**4.1.1 Example of a stochastic block model graphon**

Consider the stochastic block model graphon $W_{SBM}$ depicted in Fig. 2(a), with corresponding symmetric matrix $P$ [cf. [9]] as in [12]. Let us define the vector of indicator functions specific to this graphon $1(x) := [1_{B_1}(x), \ldots, 1_{B_5}(x)]^T$, where the blocks coincide with those in Fig. 2(a), that is, $B_1 = [0, 0.1), B_2 = [0.1, 0.4), B_3 = [0.4, 0.6), B_4 = [0.6, 0.9), \text{ and } B_5 = [0.9, 1]$. To apply Proposition 1 we need to compute the effective measure and effective connectivity matrices [cf. (12)], which for our example are given by

\[
Q_{SBM} = \text{diag} \left( 0.1, 0.3, 0.2, 0.3, 0.1 \right), \quad P = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0.25 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0.5 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
E_{SBM} = \begin{pmatrix}
0.1 & 0.3 & 0.2 & 0 & 0 \\
0.1 & 0.15 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0.1 & 0 & 0.05 & 0 & 0.1 \\
0 & 0 & 0.15 & 0.1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The principal eigenvector of $E_{SBM}$ is given by $v_1 \approx [0.59, 0.28, 0.38, 0.28, 0.59]^T$. Furthermore, from [13] we can compute the graphon centrality functions to obtain

\[
c^d(x) = 1(x)^T [0.6, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.6]^T, \\
c^e(x) \approx 1(x)^T [1.56, 0.72, 0.99, 0.72, 1.56]^T, \\
c^k_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases}
1(x)^T [1.36, 1.15, 1.16, 1.15, 1.36]^T & \text{if } \alpha = 0.5, \\
1(x)^T [2.86, 1.84, 2.01, 1.84, 2.86]^T & \text{if } \alpha = 1.5,
\end{cases}
\]

where for illustration purposes we have evaluated the Katz centrality for two specific choices of $\alpha$. These three centrality functions are respectively depicted in Fig. 2(b) through (d).

Firstly note that these functions are piecewise constant functions. Specifically, we consider graphons of the form $\lambda(x) = 1_{B_1}(x)$ and $\alpha(x) = 1_{B_2}(x)$. Whence, for illustration purposes we have evaluated the Katz centrality for two specific choices of $\alpha$. These three centrality functions are respectively depicted in Fig. 2(b) through (d).

**4.2 Finite-rank graphons**

We now consider a class of finite-rank (FR) graphons that can be written as a finite sum of products of integrable functions. Specifically, we consider graphons of the form

\[
W_{FR}(x, y) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) h_i(y) = g(x)^T h(y),
\]

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and we have defined the vectors of functions $g(x) = [g_1(x), \ldots, g_m(x)]^T$ and $h(y) = [h_1(y), \ldots, h_m(y)]^T$. Observe that $g(x)$ and $h(y)$ must be
chosen so that \( W_{\text{FR}}(x, y) \in [0, 1] \) for all \((x, y) \in [0, 1]^2\). Based on \( g(x) \) and \( h(y) \), we can define the generalizations of \( Q_{\text{SBM}} \) and \( E_{\text{SBM}} \) introduced in Section 4.1 for this class of finite-rank graphons.

**Definition 5.** The effective measure matrix \( Q \) and the effective connectivity matrix \( E \) for a finite-rank graphon \( W_{\text{FR}} \) as defined in (15) are given by

\[
Q := \int_0^1 g(x)g(x)^T dx, \quad E := \int_0^1 h(x)g(x)^T dx.
\]

The stochastic block model graphon operator introduced in (9) is a special case of the class of operators in (15). More precisely, we recover the SBM graphon by choosing \( g_i(x) = 1_{B_i}(x) \) and \( h_i(y) = \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}1_{B_j}(y) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). The matrices defined in (12) are recovered when specializing Definition 1 to this specific choice of \( g_i(x) \) and \( h_i(y) \). We may now relate the eigenfunctions of the FR graphon with the spectral properties of \( E \), as explained in the following lemma [46].

**Lemma 4.** Let \( \lambda_i \) and \( v_i \) denote the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of \( E \) in (16), respectively. Then, all the nonzero eigenvalues of \( W_{\text{FR}} \), the operator associated with (15), are given by \( \lambda_i \) and the associated eigenfunctions are of the form \( \varphi_i(x) = g(x)^Tv_i \).

Notice that Lemma 5 follows from Lemma 4 when specializing the finite rank operator to the SBM case as explained after Definition 5. Moreover, we can leverage the result in Lemma 4 to find closed-form expressions for the centrality functions of FR graphons.

**Proposition 2 (Centrality measures for FR graphons).** Let \( h := \int_0^1 h(y)dy \) and let \( v_1 \) be the principal eigenvector of \( E \) in (16). Then, the centrality functions \( c^d \), \( c^e \), and \( c^k_\alpha \) of the graphon \( W_{\text{FR}} \) can be computed as follows

\[
c^d(x) = g(x)^T h, \quad c^e(x) = \frac{g(x)^Tv_1}{\sqrt{v_1^Tv_1}}, \quad c^k_\alpha(x) = 1 + \alpha g(x)^T (I - \alpha E)^{-1} v_1.
\]

**Proof.** Degree centrality follows readily from (6), i.e. \( c^d(x) = \int_0^1 g(x)^T h(y)dy = g(x)^T h(y)dy = g(x)^T h \). Based on Lemma 4 for \( c^e \) it is sufficient to prove that \( \|c^e\| = 1 \). To this end, note that

\[
\|c^e\|^2 = \frac{1}{v_1^Tv_1} \int_0^1 (g(x)^Tv_1)^2 dx = \frac{1}{v_1^Tv_1} \int_0^1 (v_1^T g(x))(g(x)^Tv_1) dx = \frac{1}{v_1^Tv_1} \int_0^1 g(x)g(x)^T v_1 = \frac{v_1^Tv_1}{v_1^Tv_1} = 1.
\]

Finally, we defer the proof for \( c^k_\alpha \) to the Appendix. \( \square \)

In the following subsection we illustrate the use of Proposition 2 for the computation of graphon centralities.

### 4.2.1 Example of a finite-rank graphon

Consider the finite-rank graphon given by

\[
W_{\text{FR}}(x, y) = \frac{(x^2 + y^2)}{2},
\]

and illustrated in Fig. 3(a). Notice that this FR graphon can be written in the canonical form (15) by defining the vectors \( g(x) = [x^2, 1/2]^T \) and \( h(y) = [1/2, y]^T \). From (16) we then compute the relevant matrices \( Q \), \( E \), and \( h \) in the statement of Proposition 2 to obtain

\[
Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1/5 & 1/6 \\ 1/6 & 1/4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E = \begin{bmatrix} 1/6 & 1/4 \\ 1/5 & 1/6 \end{bmatrix}, \quad h = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 1/3 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

A simple computation reveals that the principal eigenvector of \( E \) is \( v_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{10}/3, 2\sqrt{2}/3 \end{bmatrix}^T \). We now leverage the result in Proposition 2 to obtain

\[
c^d(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x^2, 1/2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 \\ 1/3 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{x^2}{2} + \frac{1}{6},
\]

\[
c^e(x) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{3}{3 + \sqrt{3}} x^2, 1/2 \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{10}/3 \\ 2\sqrt{2}/3 \end{bmatrix} \approx 1.07 x^2 + 0.54,
\]

\[
c^k_\alpha(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 1, 1/2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1/0 \\ 1/1 \end{bmatrix} - \alpha \begin{bmatrix} 1/6 \\ 1/5 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1/6 \\ 1/5 \end{bmatrix} \approx 10.19 x^2 + 5.44.
\]

We have evaluated the Katz centrality for \( \alpha = 0.9/\lambda_1 \) where, recall, \( \lambda_1 \) is the largest eigenvalue of \( E \). The three centrality functions are depicted in Fig. 3(b) through (d). As anticipated from the form of \( W_{\text{FR}} \), there is a simple monotonicity in the centrality ranking for all the measures considered. More precisely, highest centrality values are located close to 1 in the interval \([0, 1]\), whereas low centralities are localized close to 0. Unlike in the example of the stochastic block model in Section 4.1.1 all centralities here have the same functional form of a quadratic term with a constant offset.

### 4.3 General smooth graphons

In general, a graphon \( W \) need not induce a finite-rank operator as in the preceding Sections 4.1 and 4.2. However, as shown in Lemma 1 a graphon always induces a diagonalizable operator with countably many nonzero eigenvalues. In most cases, obtaining the degree centrality function is immediate since it entails the computation of an integral [cf. (6)]. On the other hand, for eigenvector and Katz centralities that depend on the spectral decomposition of
Specializing the differential equations in (18) for graphon the following functional form

\[ \lambda \phi(x) \equiv \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \int_0^1 W(x,y)\phi(y)dy = \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \phi(x). \]

for \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). In the following section we illustrate this technique on a specific smooth graphon that does not belong to the finite-rank class.

4.3.1 Example of a general smooth graphon

Consider the graphon \( W_G \) depicted in Fig. 4(a) with the following functional form

\[ W_G(x,y) = \min(x,y)[1 - \max(x,y)]. \]

Specializing the differential equations in (18) for graphon \( W_G \) we obtain

\[ \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left[ (1-x) \int_0^x W(x,y)\phi(y)dy + x \int_x^1 (1-y)\phi(y)dy \right] = \lambda \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \phi(x). \]

First notice that without differentiating (i.e. for \( k = 0 \)) we can determine the boundary conditions \( \phi(0) = \phi(1) = 0 \). Moreover, by computing the second derivatives in (19), we obtain that \( -\phi(x) = \lambda \phi''(x) \). From the solution of this differential equation subject to the boundary conditions it follows that the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the operator \( W_G \) are

\[ \lambda_n = \frac{1}{\pi^2 n^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_n(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(n \pi x) \quad \text{for} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \]

Notice that \( W_G \) has an infinite — but countable — number of nonzero eigenvalues, with an accumulation point at zero. Thus, \( W_G \) cannot be written in the canonical form for finite-rank graphons [15]. Nevertheless, having obtained the eigenfunctions we can still compute the centrality measures for \( W_G \). For degree centrality, a simple integration gives us

\[ c^d(x) = (1-x) \int_0^x y \, dy + x \int_x^1 (1-y) \, dy = \frac{x(1-x)}{2}. \]

From (20) it follows that the principal eigenfunction is achieved when \( \alpha = 1 \). Thus, the eigenvector centrality function [cf. (7)] is given by

\[ c^e(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(\pi x). \]

Finally, for the Katz centrality we leverage Remark 1 and the eigenfunction expressions in (20) to obtain

\[ c^k_\alpha = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^\infty \alpha^k \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left( \frac{1}{n^2 \pi^2} \right) \frac{1}{\pi n} 2 \sin(n \pi x) \]

\[ = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{2 \alpha}{n^2 \pi^2 - \alpha} \left( \frac{1}{\pi n} \right) \sin(n \pi x), \]

which is guaranteed to converge as long as \( \alpha < 1/\lambda_1 = \pi^2 \). We plot the three centrality functions in Fig. 4(b) through (d), where we selected \( \alpha = 0.9 \pi^2 \) for the Katz centrality. According to all centralities, the most important nodes within this graphon are those located in the center of the interval \([0,1]\), in line with our intuition. Likewise, nodes at the boundary have low centrality values. Note that while the ranking according to all centrality functions is consistent, unlike in the example in Section 4.2.1, here there are some subtle differences in the functional forms. In particular, degree centrality is again a quadratic function whereas the eigenvector and Katz centralities are of sinusoidal form.

5 Convergence of centrality measures

In this section we derive concentration inequalities relating the newly defined graphon centrality functions with standard centrality measures. To this end, we start by noting that while graphon centralities are functions, standard centrality measures are vectors. To be able to compare such objects, we first show that there is a one to one relation between any finite graph \( A \) and a suitably constructed stochastic block model graphon \( W_{SBM,A} \). Consequently, any centrality measure of \( A \) is in one to one relation with the corresponding centrality function of \( W_{SBM,A} \). To this end, for each \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), we define a partition of \([0,1]\) into the intervals \( B_i^N \), where \( B_i^N = [(i-1)/N, i/N) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, N-1 \), and \( B_N^N = [(N-1)/N, 1] \). We denote the associated indicator function vector by \( 1_N(x) := [1_{B_1^N}(x), \ldots, 1_{B_N^N}(x)]^T \), consistently with (10).

Lemma 5. For any graph \( A \in [0,1]^{N \times N} \) define the corresponding stochastic block model graphon as

\[ W_{SBM,A}(x,y) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N A_{ij} 1_{B_i^N}(x) 1_{B_j^N}(y). \]

Then the centrality function \( c_N(x) \) corresponding to the graphon \( W_{SBM,A} \) is given by

\[ c_N(x) = 1_N(x)^T c_A, \]

where \( c_A \) is the centrality measures of the graph with rescaled adjacency matrix \( A \).
Proof. The graphon $W_{SBM|A}$ has the stochastic block model structure described in Section 4.1, with $N$ uniform blocks. By setting $m = N$ and $B_i = B_i^*$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we obtain $Q_{SBM} = \frac{1}{N}I$. Consequently, the formulas in Proposition 3 simplify as given in the statement of this lemma.

Remark 2. Note that the scaling factor $\frac{1}{N}$ does not affect the ordering of the nodes in the graph $A$, but only the magnitude of the centrality measures. This re-scaling is needed to avoid diverging centrality measures for graphs of increasing size. We finally note that $c_N(x)$ is the piecewise-constant function corresponding to the vector $c_A$.

By using the previous lemma, we can compare centralities of graphons and graphs by working in the function space. Using this equivalence, we demonstrate that the previously defined graphon centrality functions are not only defined analogously to the centrality measures on finite graphs, but also emerge as the limit of those centrality measures for a sequence of graphs of increasing size. Stated differently, just like a graphon provides an appropriate measure of graphs and the step-wise constant function associated with the centrality vector of any graph sampled from the graphon can be bounded, with high probability, in terms of the sampled graph size $N$.

Definition 6 (Sampled graphon). Given a graphon $W$ and a size $N \in \mathbb{N}$ fix the latent variables $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^N$ by choosing either:
- ‘deterministic latent variables’: $u_i = \frac{x_i}{N}$.
- ‘stochastic latent variables’: $u_i = U(i)$ where $U(i)$ is the $i$-th ordered statistic of $N$ random samples from $U[0,1]$.

Utilizing such latent variables construct

- the ‘probability’ matrix $P^{(N)} \in [0,1]^{N \times N}$
  \[
  P^{(N)}_{ij} := W(u_i, u_j) \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}.
  \]
- the sampled graphon
  \[
  W_N(x,y) := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N P^{(N)}_{ij} 1_{B_i^N}(x)1_{B_j^N}(y).
  \]
- the operator $\mathbb{W}_N$ of the sampled graphon
  \[
  (\mathbb{W}_N f)(x) := \sum_{j=1}^N P^{(N)}_{ij} \int_{B_j^N} f(y)dy \quad \text{for any } x \in B_i^N
  \]

The sampled graphon $W_N$ obtained by using deterministic latent variables can intuitively be seen as an approximation of the graphon $W$ by using a stochastic block model graphon with $N$ blocks, as the one described in Section 4.1, and is useful to study graphon centrality functions as limit of graph centrality measures. The sampled graphon $W_N$ obtained by using stochastic latent variables is instead useful as an intermediate step to analyze the relation between the graphon centrality function and the centrality measure of graphs sampled from the graphon according to the following procedure.

Definition 7 (Sampled graph). Given the ‘probability’ matrix $P^{(N)}$ of a sampled graphon we define
- the sampled matrix $S^{(N)} \in \{0,1\}^{N \times N}$ as the adjacency matrix of a symmetric (random) graph obtained by taking $N$ isolated vertices $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, and adding undirected edges between vertices $i$ and $j$ at random with probability $P^{(N)}_{ij}$ for all $i \neq j$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[S^{(N)}] = P^{(N)}$.
- the associated (random) linear operator
  \[
  (S_N f)(x) := \sum_{j=1}^N S^{(N)}_{ij} \int_{B_j^N} f(y)dy \quad \text{for any } x \in B_i^N \quad (21)
  \]

In general, we denote the centrality functions associated with the sampled graphon operator $\mathbb{W}_N$ by $c_N(x)$ whereas the centrality functions associated with the operator $S_N$ are denoted by $c_\delta(x)$. Note that thanks to Lemma 5 such centrality functions are in one to one correspondence with the centrality measures of the finite graphs $P^{(N)}$ and $S^{(N)}$, respectively. Consequently, studying the relation between $c(x)$, $c_N(x)$ and $c_\delta(x)$ allows us to relate the graphon centrality function with the centrality measure of graphs sampled from the graphon. To this end, we start by showing in the next theorem that, under mild regularity conditions, the sampled graphon operator $\mathbb{W}_N$ converges to $\mathbb{W}$ when $N \to \infty$ and that the sequence of random linear operators $S_N$ converges to the graphon operator $\mathbb{W}$ almost surely. Specifically, we make use of the following smoothness assumption on $W$.

Assumption 1 (Piecewise Lipschitz graphon). There exists a constant $L$ and a sequence of non-overlapping intervals $\mathcal{I}_k = [\alpha_k-1, \alpha_k]$ defined by $0 = \alpha_0 < \cdots < \alpha_{K+1} = 1$, for a (finite) $K \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $k, l$, any set $\mathcal{I}_{kl} = \mathcal{I}_k \times \mathcal{I}_l$ and pairs $(x,y) \in \mathcal{I}_{kl}, (x',y') \in \mathcal{I}_{kl}$ we have that
\[
|W(x,y) - W(x',y')| \leq L(|x-x'| + |y-y'|).
\]

This assumption has also been used in the context of graphon estimation [25], [44] and is typically fulfilled for most of the graphons of interest.

Theorem 1 (Convergence of graphon operators). For a graphon fulfilling Assumption 1 it holds with probability $1 - \delta'$ that:
\[
\|\mathbb{W}_N - \mathbb{W}\| := \sup_{\|f\|=1} \|\mathbb{W}_N f - \mathbb{W} f\| \leq 2\sqrt{(L^2 - K^2) d_N^2 + Kd_N} =: \rho(N), \tag{22}
\]
where $\delta' = 0$ and $d_N = \frac{1}{N}$ in the case of deterministic latent variables and $\delta' = \delta \in (Ne^{-N/5}, e^{-1})$ and $d_N = \frac{1}{N} + \frac{\delta \log(N/\delta)}{(N+1)}$ in the case of stochastic latent variables. Moreover, if $N$ is such that
\[
2d_N < \Delta^{(\alpha)}_{\min} := \max_{\alpha_k \in \{\ldots, \alpha_{K+1}\}} (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}), \tag{23a}
\]
\[
\frac{1}{N} \log (\frac{2N}{\delta}) + d_N(2K + 3L) < C^d := \max_x c^d(x) \tag{23b}
\]

then with probability at least $1 - \delta - \delta'$

$$\|S_N - W\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\log(2N/\delta)}{N}} + \rho(N).$$

(24)

Hence

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \|S_N - W\| = 0, \text{ almost surely.}$$

(25)

Proof of (22). First of all note that by definition, for any $(x,y) \in B_i^N \times B_j^N$ it holds $W(x,y) = W(u_i,u_j)$, but it is not necessarily true that $(u_i,u_j) \in B_i^N \times B_j^N$. Let us define $k_i,k_j \in \{1, \ldots, K + 1\}$ such that the point $(u_i,u_j)$ belongs to the Lipschitz block $I_{k_i,k_j}$, as defined in Assumption 1 and illustrated in Fig. 5. We define as $S_{ij}$ the subset of points in $B_i^N \times B_j^N$ that belong to the same Lipschitz block $I_{k_i,k_j}$ as $(u_i,u_j)$. Mathematically,

$$S_{ij} = \{(x,y) \in B_i^N \times B_j^N \mid (u_i,u_j) \in I_{k_i,k_j}, \text{and } (x,y) \in I_{k_i,k_j}\}.$$

In the following, we partition the set $[0,1]^2$ into the set $A_N := \cup_{i,j}S_{ij}$ and its complement $A_N^c := [0,1]^2 \setminus A_N$. In words, $A_N$ is the set of points, for which $(x,y)$ and its corresponding sample $(u_i,u_j)$ belong to the same Lipschitz block. We now prove that, with probability $1 - \delta'$, $A_N^c$ has area

$$\text{Area}(A_N^c) \leq \text{Area}(A_N) = 4Kd_N - 4K^2d_N^2.$$  

(26)

We define the set $D_N$ by constructing a stripe of width $2d_N$ centered at each discontinuity. This guarantees that any point in $[0,1]^2 \setminus D_N$ has distance more than $d_N$ component-wise from a discontinuity. Note that in the case of deterministic latent variables for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and any $x \in B_i^N$ it holds by construction that $|x - u_i| = |x - \frac{i}{N}| \leq d_N = \frac{1}{N}$ and similarly $|y - u_j| \leq d_N$. On the other hand, in the case of stochastic latent variables, Proposition 3 guarantees that with probability at least $1 - \delta'$ for any $i,j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and any $x \in B_i^N$, $y \in B_j^N$ it holds $|x - u_i| = |x - U(i)| \leq d_N$, $|y - u_j| \leq d_N$. In both cases, with probability $1 - \delta'$, all the points in $[0,1]^2 \setminus D_N$ are less than $d_N$ close to their sample $(u_i,u_j)$ and more than $d_N$ far from any discontinuity (component-wise) hence they surely belong to $A_N$. Consequently, with probability $1 - \delta'$ it holds $A_N^c \subset D_N$. Each stripe in $D_N$ has width $2d_N$, length 1 and there are $2K$ stripes in total. Formula (26) is then immediately by noticing that multiplying $2d_N$ times $2K$ counts twice the $K^2$ intersections between horizontal and vertical stripes. Consider now any $f \in L^2([0,1])$ such that $\|f\| = 1$. Let

$$D(x,y) := W(x,y) - W(x,y) \text{ and note that } |D(x,y)| \leq 1.$$

Then we get

$$\|W_Nf - Wf\|^2 = \int_0^1 (\|W_Nf - Wf\|^2(x))\,dx$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 D(x,y)f(y)dy\right)^2\,dx$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 D(x,y)^2\,dy\right) \left(\int_0^1 f^2(y)\,dy\right)\,dx$$

$$= \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 D(x,y)^2\,dy\right) \|f\|^2\,dx = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 D(x,y)^2\,dy\,dx = \int_{A_N} D(x,y)^2\,dy\,dx + \int_{A_N^c} D(x,y)^2\,dy\,dx.$$  

(27)

Expression (27) follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality; we used $\|f\| = 1$ and, in the last equation, we split the interval $[0,1]$ into the sets $A_N$ and $A_N^c$, as described above and illustrated in Fig. 5.

We now bound both terms in (28) individually. For the first term, note that all the points $(x,y)$ in $A_N$ are such that their corresponding sample $(u_i,u_j)$ belongs to the same Lipschitz block and is at most $d_N$ apart (component-wise). Consequently, for these points $|D(x,y)| \leq 2Ld_N$. Overall, we get

$$\int_{A_N} D(x,y)^2\,dy\,dx \leq 4L^2d_N^2 \int_{A_N} 1\,dy\,dx \leq 4L^2d_N^2.$$

For the second term in (28), we use (26) and the fact that $|D(x,y)| \leq 1$ to get

$$\int_{A_N^c} D(x,y)^2\,dy\,dx \leq \int_{A_N^c} 1\,dy\,dx = \text{Area}(A_N^c).$$

Substituting these two terms into (28) yields

$$\|W_Nf - Wf\|^2 \leq 4L^2d_N^2 + 4Kd_N^2 - 4K^2d_N^2.$$  

Since this bound holds for all functions $f$ with unit norm, we recover (22).

Proof of (24). From the triangle inequality we get that

$$\|S_N - W\| \leq \|S_N - W_N\| + \|W_N - W\|.$$  

(29)

We have already bounded the second term on the right hand side of (29), so we now concentrate on the first term. The operator $S_N - W_N$ can be seen as the graphon operator of an SBM graphon with matrix $S(N) - P(N)$. By Lemma 3 we then have that its eigenvalues coincide with the eigenvalues of the corresponding $E_{SBM}$ matrix which is

![Fig. 5: Schematic for the sets $A_N$ and $A_N^c$ in the case of stochastic latent variables for $K = 1$, threshold $\alpha_1$ and 4 Lipschitz blocks. The plot on the left shows the original graphon $W(x,y)$, the 4 Lipschitz blocks and some representative latent variables. The plot on the right shows the sampled graphon $W_N(x,y)$ which is a step function like graphon with uniform steps of size $\frac{1}{N}$. The $\frac{1}{N}$-grid is illustrated in grey. The constant value in each block $B_i^N \times B_j^N$ corresponds to the value in the original graph sampled at the point $(u_i,u_j)$ (as illustrated by the arrows). The set $B_i^N \times B_j^N$ in the bottom left is an example where all the points $(x,y) \in B_i^N \times B_j^N$ belong to the same Lipschitz block as their corresponding sample, which is $(u_i,u_j)$, so that $B_i^N \times B_j^N = S_{ij}$ and therein $|D(x,y)| \leq 2Ld_N$. The set $B_i^N \times B_j^N$ instead is one of the problematic ones since part of its points (cyan) belong to the same Lipschitz block as $(u_i,u_j)$ and are thus in $S_{ij}$ but part of its points (red) do not and therefore belong to $A_N$. Note that by construction with probability $1 - \delta'$ all such problematic points are contained in the set $D_N$ (which is illustrated in light red). This figure also illustrates that in general $D_N$ is a strict superset of $A_N^c$ (hence the bound in (22) is conservative).
\[ \frac{1}{N}(S^{(N)} - P^{(N)}) \] since in this case \( Q_{SBM} = \frac{1}{N}I_N \) (given that all the intervals \( B_i^N \) have length \( \frac{1}{N} \)). Consequently,

\[
\|S_N - W_N\| = \lambda_{\max}(S_N - W_N) = \frac{1}{N} \lambda_{\max}(S^{(N)} - P^{(N)}) = \frac{1}{N} \|S^{(N)} - P^{(N)}\|.
\]

Hence, to bound the norm of the difference between a random SBM graphon operator \( S \) based on the graphon \( 1(x)^T S^{(N)}(y) \), with \( S_{ij}^{(N)} = Ber(P_{ij}^{(N)}) \), and its expectation \( W_N \) defined via the graphon \( W_N = 1(x)^T P^{(N)}(y) \), we can employ matrix concentration inequalities. Specifically, we use [27] Theorem 1.

To this end, we need to verify that, for the chosen \( \delta \), the maximum expected degree of the random graph of size \( N \) grows at least as \( \frac{1}{4} \log(\frac{2N}{\delta}) \). Let \( C_{ij}^d := \max\{\sum_{j=1}^N P_{ij}^{(N)}\} \) denote the maximum degree in the sampled graphon (which is exactly the maximum expected degree of the random graph) then it suffices to verify \( C_{ij}^d \geq \frac{1}{4} \log(\frac{2N}{\delta}) \). Using the definition of \( W_N \) and the reverse triangle inequality yields

\[
\frac{1}{N} C_{ij}^d = \frac{1}{N} \max_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^N W_{ij}^{(N)} \right) = \frac{1}{N} \max_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^N W_{ij} \right) = \frac{1}{N} \max_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^N W_{ij} \right) \geq \frac{1}{N} \max_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^N W_{ij} \right).
\]

where \( C_N := \{ x \in [0, 1] \mid \exists k \in \{1, \ldots, K\} \text{ s.t. } |x - a_k| \leq d_N \} \) is the subset of points in \([0, 1]\) that are up to \( d_N \) close to a discontinuity. Note that for any \( x \in C_N^C \), with probability 1 - \( \delta' \) (see previous part 1)

\[
\int_0^1 |D(x, y)|dy = \int_{C_N^C} |D(x, y)|dy + \int_{C_N} |D(x, y)|dy \leq 2Ld_N + \text{Area}(C_N) \leq 2Ld_N + 2Kd_N.
\]

Substituting in (30) we get

\[
\frac{1}{N} C_{ij}^d \geq \max_{x \in C_N} \left( \int_0^1 W_{ij}(x, y)dy \right) - 2(L + K)d_N.
\]

Finally, note that Assumption 1 implies that the degree \( c^d(x) \) is piecewise Lipschitz continuous, that is, for any \( k \in \{1, \ldots, K\} \) and any \( x, x' \in I_k \) it holds \( |c^d(x) - c^d(x')| \leq L|x - x'| \). If \( \Delta(a)_{\min} > 2d_N \) this implies that

\[
|\int_0^1 W_{ij}(x, y)dy| - |c^d| \leq Ld_N,
\]

since there must be at least one point in \( C_N^C \) which belongs to the same Lipschitz block as \( \arg\max c^d(x) \) and has distance \( d_N \) from it. Overall, we have proven

\[
C_{ij}^d \geq NC_{ij}^d - (3L + 2K)d_N \geq N \log \left( \frac{2N}{\delta} \right) \geq \frac{4}{9} \log \left( \frac{2N}{\delta} \right).
\]

1. Note that Lemma 1 is formulated for graphon operators (i.e. linear integral operators with positive kernels). An identical proof shows that the result holds also if the kernel assumes negative values.

Consequently, all the conditions of [27] Theorem 1 are met and we get that with probability \( 1 - \delta - \delta' \)

\[
\|S_N - W_N\| = \frac{1}{N} \|S^{(N)} - P^{(N)}\| \leq \sqrt{4C_{ij}^d \log(2N/\delta)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\log(2N/\delta)}{N}},
\]

where we used that \( C_{ij}^d \leq N \) since each element in \( P^{(N)} \) belongs to \([0, 1]\).

Proof of 25. We finally show that (24) implies almost sure convergence. We start by restating (24) as

\[
\Pr \left( \|S_N - W_N\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{4\log(2N/\delta)}}{N} + \rho(N) \right) \geq 1 - 2\delta.
\]

Further, pick any \( \gamma > 0 \) and define the infinite sequence of events

\[
\mathcal{E}_N := \{ \|S_N - W_N\| \geq \gamma + \rho(N) \},
\]

for each \( N \geq 1 \). From (31) it follows that \( \Pr[\mathcal{E}_N] \leq 2N^{-\gamma / 2} \). Consequently,

\[
\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \Pr[\mathcal{E}_N] \leq 2 \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} N \exp \left( -\frac{\gamma^2}{4} \right) \leq \infty
\]

and by the Borel-Cantelli lemma there exists a positive integer \( N_\gamma \) such that for all \( N \geq N_\gamma \), the complement of \( \mathcal{E}_N \), i.e. \( \|S_N - W_N\| \leq \gamma + \rho(N) \), holds almost surely. To see that \( \|S_N - W_N\| \to 0 \) almost surely we follow the ensuing argument. For any given deterministic sequence \( \{a_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty} \) the fact that for each \( \gamma > 0 \) there is a positive integer \( N_\gamma \) such that for all \( N \geq N_\gamma \), \( |a_N| \leq \gamma + \rho(N) \) implies that \( a_N \to 0 \). In fact for all \( \epsilon > 0 \), if we set \( \gamma = \epsilon / 2 \) and \( N_\epsilon := \max\{N_\epsilon, N_\gamma\} \) (where \( N_\epsilon \) is the smallest \( N \) such that \( \epsilon / 2 \)) then we get that for all \( N > N_\epsilon \), \( \|S_N - W_N\| \leq \epsilon \). Hence, we can conclude that \( \|S_N - W_N\| \to 0 \) almost surely, as wanted.

Having proved the convergence for the graphon operators in the previous theorem, we are able to show a convergence result for centrality measures of graphs with a simple dominant eigenvalue.

**Assumption 2 (Simple dominant eigenvalue).** Let the eigenvalues of \( W \) be ordered such that \( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \ldots \) and assume that \( \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \).

We note that in most empirical studies degeneracy of the dominant eigenvalue is not observed, justifying the above assumption. A noteworthy exception in which a non-unique dominant eigenvalue may arise is if the graph consists of multiple components. In this case, however, one can treat each component separately.

**Theorem 2.** (Convergence of centrality measures) For degree, eigenvector, and Katz centrality, the following holds:

1. For any \( N > 1 \), the centrality functions \( c_N(x) \) and \( \hat{c}_N(x) \) corresponding to the operators \( S_N \) and \( S_N \), respectively, are in one to one relation with the centrality measures \( c_{SN} \in R_N^N \), \( c_{S\hat{N}} \in R_N^N \) of the graphs with rescaled adjacency matrices \( \frac{1}{N}P^{(N)} \) and \( \frac{1}{N}S^{(N)} \), via the formula

\[
c_N(x) = 1_N(x)^T c_{SN}(x), \quad \hat{c}_N(x) = 1_N(x)^T c_{S\hat{N}}(x).
\]

2. Note that \( \frac{1}{N}P^{(N)} \) belongs to \([0, 1]^{N \times N}\) as opposed to \([0, 1]^{N \times N}\). Nonetheless, the definitions of centrality measures given in Section 22 can be extended to the continuous interval case in a straightforward manner.
2) Under Assumptions 1 and 2 and $N$ sufficiently large, with probability at least $1 - \delta'$

$$||c_N - c|| \leq C\rho(N)$$

for some constant $C$ and $\rho(N)$ defined as in (22).

3) Under Assumptions 1 and 2 and $N$ sufficiently large, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$,

$$||\hat{c}_N - c|| \leq C'\left(\frac{4\log(2N/\delta)}{N} + \rho(N)\right),$$

for some constant $C'$.

4) Under Assumptions 1 and 2

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} ||\hat{c}_N - c|| = 0, \text{ almost surely.}$$

Proof. 1) Follows immediately from Lemma 6 since $W_N$ and $S_N$ are the operators of the graphons corresponding to $P^{(N)}$ and $S^{(N)}$, respectively.

2) We showed in Theorem 2 that, under Assumption 1

$$||W_N - W|| \leq \rho(N)$$

with probability $1 - \delta'$. This fact can be exploited to prove convergence of the centrality measures $c_N$ to $c$. All the subsequent statements hold with probability $1 - \delta'$.

For degree centrality: $c_N(x) = (W_N\chi\{0,1\})(x)$ and $c(x) = (W_1\chi\{0,1\})(x)$. Since $||1\chi\{0,1\}|| = 1$ we get

$$||c_N - c|| = ||W_N - W||\chi\{0,1\} \leq ||W_N - W|| \leq \rho(N). \quad (32)$$

For eigenvector centrality: Let $\{\lambda_k, \varphi_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, $\{\lambda_k^{(N)}, \varphi_k^{(N)}\}_{k \geq 1}$ be the ordered eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $W$ and $W_N$, respectively. Note that $|\lambda_1^{(N)} - \lambda_1| \leq \rho(N)$ since $\lambda_1^{(N)} = ||W_N|| \leq ||W|| + ||W_N - W|| \leq \lambda_1 + \rho(N)$ and $\lambda_1 = ||W|| \leq ||W_N|| + ||W_N - W|| \leq \lambda_1^{(N)} + \rho(N)$. Furthermore, since by Assumption 2 we have that $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, there exists a large enough $N$ such that for all $N > N$ it holds that $\lambda_1^{(N)} > \lambda_2$ and $1 - \lambda_2 > 0$, then $\lambda_1^{(N)} - \lambda_1 > 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 6 in the Appendix, we obtain

$$||\varphi_1^{(N)} - \varphi_1|| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}||W_N - W||}{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| - |\lambda_1^{(N)} - \lambda_1|}. \quad (33)$$

From the facts that $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ (by Assumption 2), $|\lambda_1^{(N)} - \lambda_1| \leq \rho(N)$, and $||W_N - W|| \leq \rho(N)$, it follows that (33) implies that for $N > N$

$$||\varphi_1^{(N)} - \varphi_1|| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\rho(N)}{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| - \rho(N)} = O(\rho(N)). \quad (34)$$

For Katz centrality: Take any value of $\alpha < 1/||W||$, so that $M_\alpha = 1 - \alpha W$ is invertible and $c(x) = (M_\alpha^{-1}\chi\{0,1\})(x)$ is well defined. Since $||W_N - W|| \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, there exists $N_\alpha > 0$ such that $\alpha < 1/||W_N||$ for all $N > N_\alpha$. This implies that for any $N > N_\alpha$, $M_\alpha^{(N)} := 1 - \alpha W_N$ is invertible and $c_N(x) = ((M_\alpha^{(N)})^{-1}\chi\{0,1\})(x)$ is well defined. Note that $||W_N - W|| \leq \rho(N)$ implies $||M_\alpha^{(N)} - M_\alpha|| = O(\rho(N))$. We now prove that

$$||M_\alpha^{(N)} - M_\alpha|| = O(\rho(N)). \quad (35)$$

To this end, note that $L^2([0,1])$ is an Hilbert space, the inverse operator $M_\alpha^{-1}$ is bounded and for $N$ large enough it holds $||M_\alpha^{(N)} - M_\alpha|| < 1/||M_\alpha^{-1}||$, since $||M_\alpha^{(N)} - M_\alpha|| \to 0$. It then follows by [18, Theorem 2.3.5] with $L := M_\alpha, M := [M_\alpha]$ that

$$||M_\alpha^{(N)} - M_\alpha|| \leq \frac{(||M_\alpha^{-1})^2||}{1 - ||M_\alpha^{-1}||} = O(\rho(N)),$$

thus proving (35). Finally, since $||1\chi\{0,1\}|| = 1$,

$$||c_N - c|| = ||M_\alpha^{(N)}\chi\{0,1\} - M_\alpha\chi\{0,1\}|| \leq ||M_\alpha^{(N)} - M_\alpha|| = O(\rho(N)). \quad (36)$$

3) To show this result it suffices to mimic the argument made above for $||c_N - c||$ adapting it for the case $||\hat{c}_N - c||$ by making use of (34). The proof is omitted to avoid redundancy.

4) By Theorem 1 we have that $||S_N - W|| \to 0$ almost surely. This means that the set of realizations $\{\tilde{S}_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ of $\{S_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ for which $||\tilde{S}_N - W|| \to 0$ has probability one. For each of these realizations it can be proven (exactly as in part 2) that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} ||\tilde{c}_N - c|| = 0,$$

where $\tilde{c}_N(x)$ is the deterministic sequence of centrality measures associated with the realization $\{\tilde{S}_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$. Consequently, $\text{Pr}_{N \to \infty} ||\tilde{c}_N - c|| = 0$ almost surely.

To sum up, Theorem 2 shows that, on the one hand, the centrality functions of the finite-rank operators $W_N$ and $S_N$ can be computed by simple interpolation of the centrality vectors of the corresponding finite-size graphs with adjacency matrices $P^{(N)}$ and $S^{(N)}$ (suitably rescaled). On the other hand, such centrality functions $c_N(x)$ and $\hat{c}_N(x)$ become better approximations of the centrality function $c(x)$ of the graphon $W$ as $N$ increases. As alluded above, the importance of this result derives from the fact that it establishes that the centrality functions here introduced are the appropriate limits of the finite centrality measures, thus validating the presented framework. We finally note that as immediate corollary of the previous theorem we get the following robustness result for the centrality measures of different realizations.

**Corollary 1.** Consider two graphs $S^{N_1}$ and $S^{N_2}$ sampled from a graphon $W$ satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2. Assume without loss of generality that $N_1 \leq N_2$ and let $c_{S^{N_1}} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be the centrality of the graphs with rescaled adjacency matrices $\frac{1}{N_1}S^{(N_1)}$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then for $N$ sufficiently large, with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$

$$||1_N(x)^Tc_{S^{(N_1)}} - 1_N(x)^Tc_{S^{(N_2)}}|| \leq 2C'\left(\frac{4\log(2N_1/\delta)}{N_1} + \rho(N_1)\right)$$

for some constant $C'$.

To check our analytical results, we performed numerical experiments as illustrated in Figs. 3 and 7 in Fig. 7. In Fig. 6, we consider again the finite-rank graphon from our example in Section 4.2.1 and assess the convergence of the eigenvector

3. In part 2(b) the rate of convergence of $W_N$ to $W$ was used. Nonetheless, the same statement holds under the less stringent condition $||W_N - W|| \to 0$, since this is sufficient to prove that $\lambda_1^{(N)} \to \lambda_1$. 
centrality function $\hat{c}_N$ from the sampled networks (with deterministic latent variables), to the true underlying graphon centrality measure $c$. As this graphon is smooth we have $K = 0$, i.e., there is only a single Lipschitz block, and we observe a smooth decay of the error when increasing the number of grid points $N$, corresponding to the number of nodes in the sampled graph.

For the stochastic block model graphon $W_{SBM}$ from our example in Section 4.1.1, however, we have $K = 4$ and thus 25 Lipschitz blocks, which are delimited by discontinuous jumps in the value of the graphon. The effect of these jumps is clearly noticeable when assessing the convergence of the centrality measures, as illustrated in Fig. 6 for the example of Katz centrality. If the deterministic sampling grid of the discretized graphon $P^{(N)}$ is aligned with the structure of the stochastic block model $W_{SBM}$, there is no mismatch introduced by the sampling procedure and thus the approximation error of the centrality measure $c_N$ is smaller (also in the sampled version $\hat{c}_N$). Stated differently, if the grid is exactly aligned with the underlying graphon, we are effectively in a situation in which the area $A_N$ is zero, which is analogous to the case of $K = 0$ (see Fig. 5). In contrast, if there is a misalignment of the graphon and the discretized version, then additional errors are introduced leading to an overall slower convergence, which is consistent with our results above.

6 Discussion and Future Work

In many applications of centrality based network analysis, the system of interest is subject to uncertainty. In this context, a desirable trait for a centrality measure is that the relative importance of agents should be impervious to random fluctuations contained in a particular realization of a network. In this paper, we formalized this intuition by extending the notion of centrality to graphons. More precisely, we proposed a departure from the traditional concept of centrality measures applied to deterministic graphs in favor of a graphon-based probabilistic interpretation of centralities. To this end, we 1) introduced suitable definitions of centrality measures for graphons, 2) showed how such measures can be computed for specific classes of graphons, 3) proved that the standard centrality measures defined for graphs of finite size converge to our newly defined graphon centralities, and 4) bound the distance between graphon centrality function and centrality measures over sampled graphs.

The results presented here are a first step towards a systematic analysis of centralities in graphons and many questions are still unanswered. First, the generalization of centralities for graphons beyond the three studied in this paper. For centralities defined in terms of spectral graph prop-
erties, such as page-rank, the framework presented here based on integral operators can be applied. The extensions of other centralities, such as closeness and betweenness, appears to be a more challenging task since, for example, a suitable notion of path for infinite-size networks needs to be defined first. Second, the identification of classes of graphons (other than the ones here discussed) for which explicit and efficient formulas of the centrality functions can be derived. Third, the determination of whether the convergence rates provided in Theorem 2 are also optimal. Finally, the extension of the centrality definitions from regular graphons to more complex objects, such as asymmetric, sparse graphons [45, 49, 50] and time-varying graphons [51].

APPENDIX A: OMITTED PROOFS

Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. We provide only a sketch of the proof since the facts stated are well known; see [20] for more details.
1) The fact that \( \mathcal{W} \) is self-adjoint can be proven by direct calculation. Since \( |W(x, y)| \leq 1 \), we can show that \( \mathcal{W} \) is bounded. Furthermore linear operators in metric space are bounded if and only if they are continuous [52] Theorem 3, Ch. II [6].
2) The spectral theorem for compact self-adjoint operators in Hilbert spaces [53] Theorem 2, Ch. VIII [7] applies to \( \mathcal{W} \) and immediately yields the claimed result.
3) This result can be proven by induction.
4) The result follows from the Krein-Rutman theorem [54] Theorem 19.2., upon noticing that the graphon operator \( \mathcal{W} \) is positive with respect to the cone \( K \) defined by the set of nonnegative functions in \( L^2([0, 1]) \). □

Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Since it does not lead to confusion, we drop the subscript \( SBM \) in \( Q_{SBM} \) and \( E_{SBM} \).

From the definition of degree centrality for graphons in 4, we have that
e(\( x \)) = \( \int_0^1 W_{SBM}(x, y)dy = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} P_{ij} 1_{B_i}(x) 1_{B_j}(y)dy = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} P_{ij} \int_0^1 1_{B_i}(y)dy 1_{B_j}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} P_{ij} Q_{jj} 1_{B_j}(x) \). (36)

Further notice that from (12) it follows that \( P_{ij} Q_{jj} = E_{ij} \). Thus, \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} P_{ij} Q_{jj} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} E_{ij} \). The result follows by substituting this into (36).

In order to show the result for eigenvector centrality, observe that from Lemma 3 it follows that any multiple of the function \( 1(x)^T v_1 \) is an eigenfunction associated with the largest eigenvalue of \( \mathcal{W}_{SBM} \). Thus, to prove that \( \varphi_1(x) := (1/\sqrt{v_1^T \mathcal{W}_{SBM} v_1})1(x)^T v_1 \) is equal to \( e(\( x \)) \) we only need to show that \( ||\varphi_1|| = 1 \). By computing this norm explicitly we get that
\[
||\varphi_1||^2 = \frac{1}{v_1^T \mathcal{W}_{SBM} v_1} \int_0^1 (1(x)^T v_1)^2 \, dx = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} Q_{jj} (v_1^T 1_{B_j}(x)) dx} = 1,
\]
where the last equality follows from the fact that \( Q_{ii} = \int_0^1 1_{B_i}(x)dx \).

For the proof of Katz centrality we leverage Remark 1. We start by showing that for repeated applications of the stochastic block model graphon it holds
\[
\mathcal{W}_{SBM}^k(x) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{ij} 1_{B_i}(x) 1_{B_j}(y)dy.
\]

We show (37) by induction. Notice that from the definition of \( \mathcal{W}_{SBM} \), expression (37) holds for \( k = 1 \). Suppose now that it holds for \( k - 1 \), then we have that
\[
\mathcal{W}_{SBM}^k(x) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{ij} 1_{B_i}(x) 1_{B_j}(y)f(y)dydz = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-2} \mathcal{P}]_{ij} 1_{B_i}(z) 1_{B_j}(z)f(y)dydz.
\]

Leveraging the fact that \( 1_{B_i}(z)1_{B_j}(z) = 0 \) for \( i \neq j \) and \( 1_{B_i}(z)1_{B_i}(z) = 1_{B_i}(z) \), we may discard the index \( t \) to obtain
\[
\mathcal{W}_{SBM}^k(x) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_0^1 [\mathcal{E}^{k-2} \mathcal{P}]_{ij} 1_{B_i}(z) 1_{B_j}(y)f(y)dydz.
\]

Notice that \( \int_0^1 1_{B_i}(z)dz = Q_{ii} \). Moreover, from the definition of effective connectivity matrix in (12) it follows that \( P_{ij} Q_{il} = E_{il} \). Hence, we have that \( \mathcal{W}_{SBM}^k(x) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} E_{il} [\mathcal{E}^{k-2} \mathcal{P}]_{lj} 1_{B_i}(x) 1_{B_j}(y)dydz \). Finally, using that fact that \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} E_{il} [\mathcal{E}^{k-2} \mathcal{P}]_{lj} = [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{il} \), we recover (37), as desired. We now use (37) to compute the Katz centrality for graphons as explained in Remark 1. More specifically,
\[
c_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^k (\mathcal{W}_{SBM}^k 1_{[0, 1]}(x)) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^k \int_0^1 \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{lj} 1_{B_l}(x) 1_{B_j}(y)dy = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^k \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{lj} (\int_0^1 1_{B_l}(y)dy) 1_{B_j}(x) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^k \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{lj} Q_{jj} 1_{B_j}(x) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha^k \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^{k-1} \mathcal{P}]_{lj} 1_{B_j}(x),
\]

where we have used the definition of \( E \) for the last equality. By noticing that \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^k]_{ij} = [\mathcal{E}^k]_{ii} \) and that \( \sum_{j=1}^{m} [\mathcal{E}^k]_{ij} 1_{B_j}(x) = 1(x)^T [\mathcal{E}^k]_i 1 \), we may write
\[
c_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k (1(x)^T [\mathcal{E}^k]_i 1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k (1(x)^T [\mathcal{E}^k]_i 1) (1(x)^T (\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \alpha^k [\mathcal{E}^k]_i 1).\]

By computing the geometric series \( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k [\mathcal{E}^k]_i 1 = (I - \alpha [\mathcal{E}])^{-1} \), the result follows.

□

Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. Assume that \( v \) is an eigenvector of \( E \) such that \( Ev = \lambda v \) with \( \lambda \neq 0 \). We now show that this implies that \( \varphi(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j g_j(x) \) is an eigenfunction of \( \mathcal{W} \) with eigenvalue \( \lambda \). From an explicit computation of \( (\mathcal{W}\varphi)(x) \) we have that
\[
(\mathcal{W}\varphi)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) \int_0^1 h_i(y) \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j g_j(y)dy = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j \int_0^1 h_i(y)g_j(y)dy.
\]

Recalling the definition of \( E \) from (16), it follows that
\[
(\mathcal{W}\varphi)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j E_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) \lambda v_i = \lambda \varphi(x),
\]

□
where we used the fact that \( \mathbf{v} \) is an eigenvector of \( \mathbf{E} \) for the second equality.

In order to show the converse statement, let us assume that \( \varphi \) is an eigenfunction of \( \mathcal{W} \) with associated eigenvalue \( \lambda \neq 0 \). Then, we may write that

\[
(\mathcal{W} \varphi)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) f_i^0 h_i(y) \varphi(y) dy = \lambda \varphi(x),
\]

from where it follows that

\[
\varphi(x) = \lambda^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) f_i^0 h_i(y) \varphi(y) dy = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_i(x) v_i, \tag{38}
\]

where we have implicitly defined \( v_i := \lambda^{-1} \int_{0}^{1} h_i(y) \varphi(y) dy \).

Substituting (38) into this definition yields, for all \( i = 1, \ldots, m, \)

\[
\lambda v_i = \int_{0}^{1} h_i(y) \sum_{j=1}^{m} g_j(y) v_j dy = \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j E_{ij} = |\mathbf{E}v|_i.
\]

By writing the above equality in vector form we get that \( \mathbf{E}v = \lambda \mathbf{v} \), thus completing the proof. \( \square \)

**Proof of Proposition 2**

**Proof.** We are left to show the Katz centrality expression in [17]. We first prove by induction that

\[
(\mathcal{W}_k^{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}}} f)(x) = \int_{0}^{1} g(x)^{T} \mathbf{E}^{-k} h(y) f(y) dy, \tag{39}
\]

for all finite-rank operators \( \mathcal{W}_k^{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}}} \). The equality holds trivially for \( k = 1 \). Now suppose that it holds for \( k = 1 \), we can then compute

\[
(\mathcal{W}_k^{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}}} f)(x) = (\mathcal{W}_1^{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}}} \mathcal{W}_k^{\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{R}}} f)(x)
\]

\[
= \int_{0}^{1} g(x)^{T} h(z) \int_{0}^{1} g(z)^{T} \mathbf{E}^{-k+2} h(y) f(y) dy dz
\]

\[
= \int_{0}^{1} g(x)^{T} \left( \int_{0}^{1} h(z) g(z)^{T} dz \right) \mathbf{E}^{-2} h(y) f(y) dy
\]

\[
= \int_{0}^{1} g(x)^{T} \mathbf{E}^{-1} h(y) f(y) dy,
\]

where we used Definition 5 for the last equality. We leverage (39) to compute \( c^k \) using the expression in Remark 1.

\[
c^k(x) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k (\mathcal{W}_k^{1}[0,1](x)
\]

\[
= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k \int_{0}^{1} g(x)^{T} \mathbf{E}^{-k-1} h(y) dy
\]

\[
= 1 + \alpha \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k g(x)^{T} \mathbf{E}^k h
\]

\[
= 1 + \alpha g(x)^{T} (\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k \mathbf{E}^k h) = 1 + \alpha g(x)^{T} (\mathbf{I} - \alpha \mathbf{E})^{-1} h,
\]

as we wanted to show. \( \square \)

**A useful variant of the Davis-Kahan theorem**

The following technical lemma is used to prove the convergence of the eigenvector centrality for graphs and is a consequence of the Davis-Kahan sin \( \theta \) theorem for compact operators in Hilbert space [25].

**Lemma 6.** Consider two linear integral operators \( L \) and \( \tilde{L} \), with ordered eigenvalues \( \{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 1}, \{\tilde{\lambda}_k\}_{k \geq 1} \). Let \( \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \) be the eigenfunctions associated with the dominant eigenvalues \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \tilde{\lambda}_1 \) (normalized to norm one) and suppose that \( |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| > |\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_2| \). Then

\[
||\varphi_1 - \varphi_2|| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}||\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_2||}{||\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|| - ||\tilde{\lambda}_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_2||}.
\]  \tag{40}

**Proof.** The angle between two elements \( f, g \in L^2([0,1]) \) is defined as

\[
\Theta(f,g) = \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\langle f, g \rangle}{\|f\| \|g\|} \right).
\]

Consequently,

\[
||f - g||^2 = ||f||^2 + ||g||^2 - 2 ||f|| \|g\| \cos \Theta(f,g).
\]

If follows that the distance between two unit length functions \( f \) and \( g \) can be bounded by

\[
||f - g||^2 = 2 \left( 1 - \cos \Theta(f,g) \right)
\]

\[
= 2 \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \Theta(f,g)} \right) \leq 2 \sin^2 \Theta(f,g)
\]

as long as \( |\Theta(f,g)| \leq \pi/2 \). Note that, if \( f \) and \( g \) are eigenfunctions, this last requirement is not restrictive because eigenfunctions are defined up to their sign. By applying this to the eigenfunctions \( \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \), we get

\[
||\varphi_1 - \varphi_2||^2 \leq 2 \sin^2 \Theta(\varphi_1, \varphi_2).
\]

Using these operators we see that

\[
E_0 L_0 E_0^* f + E_1 L_1 E_1^* f
\]

\[
= E_0 L_0 (f, \varphi_1) + E_1 L_1 (f, \varphi_2), (f, \varphi_3), \ldots)^T
\]

\[
= E_0 \lambda_1 (f, \varphi_1) + E_1 [\lambda_2 (f, \varphi_2), \lambda_3 (f, \varphi_3), \ldots)^T
\]

\[
= \varphi_1 \lambda_1 (f, \varphi_1) + \sum_{k \geq 2} \varphi_k \lambda_k (f, \varphi_k) = \sum_{k \geq 2} \varphi_k \lambda_k (f, \varphi_k) = L f,
\]

where the last line comes from the spectral theorem for integral operators. Hence,

\[
L = E_0 L_0 E_0^* + E_1 L_1 E_1^*.
\]

Equivalently it can be proven that \( \tilde{L} = F_0 \tilde{L}_0 F_0^* + F_1 \tilde{L}_1 F_1^* \). The eigenvalue of \( L_0 \) is \( \lambda_1 \), while the eigenvalues of \( L_1 \) are \( \{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 2} \). Since \( \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \) we get that the eigenvalues \( \{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 2} \) are excluded from the interval \( (\lambda_1 - \delta, \lambda_1 + \delta) \) where \( \delta = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 > 0 \). By Davis-Kahan (Theorem 3 in Appendix B) we then obtain

\[
|\sin \Theta(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)| = \frac{|\sin \Theta(\mathbf{E}_0, \mathbf{F}_0)|}{\|\mathbf{F}_0^* \mathbf{E}_0 \|}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{E}_0^* \mathbf{F}_0 \|}{\|\mathbf{F}_0^* \mathbf{E}_0 \| \|\mathbf{E}_0 \|} \|\mathbf{E}_0 \| = \frac{\|\mathbf{E}_0 \|}{\|\mathbf{F}_0^* \mathbf{E}_0 \|}
\]

since \( \|\mathbf{E}_0 \| = \|\mathbf{F}_0^* \| = 1 \) as \( \mathbf{E}_0 \) and \( \mathbf{F}_0 \) are isometries. Indeed, \( \mathbf{E}_0^* \mathbf{E}_0 = \varphi_1^* \varphi_1 = 1 \) and \( \mathbf{F}_0^* \mathbf{F}_0 = \text{diag}(\{\varphi_k^* \varphi_k\}_{k \geq 2}) = \text{diag}(1)_{k\geq 2} \), and therefore \( \|\mathbf{E}_0 \| = 1 \) and \( \|\mathbf{F}_0 \| = 1 \) for all \( f \in L^2([0,1]) \). Overall we have proven that

\[
||\varphi_1 - \varphi_2|| \leq \sqrt{2} \sin \Theta(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{E}_0 \|}{\|\mathbf{E}_0 \|} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} \|\mathbf{E}_0 \|}{\|\mathbf{E}_0 \| - |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|}
\]

where we used the reverse triangular inequality \( \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| - |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \). \( \square \)
Concentration of uniform ordered statistics

We derive a concentration inequality for order statistics. Let \( U_1, \ldots, U_N \sim \text{Unif}(0,1) \) and define their correspondent order statistics \( U_1(1) \leq U_2(2) \leq \cdots \leq U_N(N) \) and spacings \( \Delta_i = U_i(i) - U_{i-1}(i-1) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, N+1 \) with the convention \( U_0 = 0 \) and \( U_{N+1} = 1 \). It is shown in [50] that

- Each \( U_i(i) \) is distributed according to \( \text{Beta}(i, N+1-i) \) and thus has mean \( \frac{N+1-i}{N+1} \).
- The joint survival function of the spacings is

\[
P(\Delta_1 > s_1, \ldots, \Delta_{N+1} > s_{N+1}) = \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} s_i\right)^N.
\]

Consequently the spacings are identically (but not independently) distributed with cumulative distribution \( F_{\Delta}(s) = 1 - (1-s)^N \) and marginal density \( f_{\Delta}(s) = N(1-s)^{N-1} \).

The following lemma is a key intermediate step in the derivation of concentration inequalities for order statistics drawn from a uniform distribution.

**Lemma 7.** For any \( \lambda \geq 0 \) it holds

\[
\log \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda U_i(i) - EU_i(i)} \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)].
\]

**Proof.** We show this result by first proving

\[
\begin{align*}
\log \mathbb{E} & e^{\lambda U(i) - EU(U)} \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)] \quad \text{and} \\
\log \mathbb{E} & e^{\lambda U(U) - EU(U)} \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)].
\end{align*}
\]

To this end, note that the hazard rate of a uniform distribution is increasing since it has the form \( h(x) = \frac{1}{x} \). Therefore applying Theorem 2.9 of [57] shows (a). Note that therein the result is proven only for \( k \geq N/2 + 1 \) (equivalently in the notation of [57] \( k := N+1-i \leq N/2 \)) but such condition on \( i \) is never used in the proof.

Let us now turn to the proof of (b). Note that the beta distribution is reflection symmetric i.e. if \( X \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta) \) then \( 1-X \sim \text{Beta}(\beta, \alpha) \) for \( \alpha, \beta > 0 \). Therefore \( U_{i}(i) \sim \text{Unif}(N-i+1) \) and \( EU_i(i) \sim U_{N-i+1} \sim EU(N-i+1) \).

Hence by (a) we have that

\[
\log \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda U(U) - EU(U)} = \log \mathbb{E} e^{\lambda U(U) - EU(U)} \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)]
\]

where in the last step we used the fact that the spacings \( \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_N \) have the same marginal distribution. Finally, the statement of the lemma is an immediate consequence of (a) and (b).

**Lemma 8.** Suppose that \( N > 5 \) and \( \delta_i \in (e^{-N/5}, e^{-1}) \) then, for \( i = 1, \ldots, N \), with probability at least \( 1 - \delta_i \)

\[
\left| U_i(i) - \frac{i}{N+1} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(1/\delta_i)}{N+1}}.
\]

**Proof.** We note that by Chernoff’s inequality

\[
P\left[ \left| U_i(i) - \frac{i}{N+1} \right| > t \right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda U_i(i) - \frac{\lambda N + 1}{N+1}}}{e^{\lambda t}}
\]

and from Lemma 7 we see that

\[
\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda U_i(i) - \frac{\lambda N + 1}{N+1}} \leq e^{\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)]}.
\]

From the marginal density of the spacings we get

\[
\mathbb{E} [\Delta_i^k] = N \int_0^1 (s_i)^k (1-s_i)^{N-1} ds_i = NB(k+1, N) = \frac{k! N!}{(N+k)!}.
\]

where we used the definition of the beta function \( B(x, y) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1} dt = \frac{(x-1)(y-1)!}{(x+y-1)!} \) for integers \( x, y \).

Thus

\[
\mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)] = \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(\sum_{k=0}^\infty (\frac{\lambda \Delta_i}{k})^k - 1)]
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \mathbb{E} [\Delta_i^{k+1}] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^k (k+1) N!}{(N+k)^{k+1}}
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda^k (k+1) N!}{N^{k+1}} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{(N+k)^{k+1}} = \frac{\lambda}{N} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{(N+k)^k}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N} \left[ 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda}{N} \right)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{N+1} \left[ 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda}{N+1} \right)^2 \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{\lambda}{N(N+1)} \left[ \frac{2 - \frac{\lambda}{(N+1)^2}}{(1 - \frac{\lambda}{N+1})^2} \right]
\]

(43)

where we used \( \sum_{k=0}^\infty k^k/k! = \frac{e}{N} \) (obtained by differentiating the geometric sum for \( \frac{1}{N} < 1 \)). If we set \( \lambda < 0.35N \) then

\[
\mathbb{E} [\Delta_i(e^{\lambda \Delta_i} - 1)] \leq \frac{4 \lambda}{N(N+1)}
\]

since \( y < \frac{\pi - 0.35}{8} \approx 0.36 \) implies \( \left[ \frac{2 - y}{(1 - y)^2} \right] < 4 \). Combining (41), (42) and (43) yields

\[
P\left[ \left| U_i(i) - \frac{i}{N+1} \right| > t \right] \leq e^{\frac{2\lambda^2}{(N+1)^2}} e^{-\lambda t}.
\]

Minimizing over \( \lambda \) leads to the choice \( \lambda = \frac{t(N+1)}{4} \) and thus

\[
P\left[ \left| U_i(i) - \frac{i}{N+1} \right| > t \right] \leq \exp \left( - \frac{t^2(N+1)}{8} \right).
\]

The proof is concluded if we select \( t = \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(1/\delta_i)}{N+1}} \). Note that for this choice

\[
\lambda = \frac{t(N+1)}{4} = \sqrt{8 \log(1/\delta_i)} \quad (N+1)
\]

We need to verify that \( \lambda < 0.35N \) or equivalently that \( 2(0.35)^2 N^2 - \log(1/\delta_i) N - \log(1/\delta_i) > 0 \). A sufficient condition is \( N > \frac{\log(1/\delta_i)}{2(0.35)^2} \) or \( 8 \log(1/\delta_i) (N+1) > 2 \). Note that \( N < \frac{1 + 1/4 + 8(0.35)^2}{8 (0.35)^2} \log(1/\delta_i) < 5 \log(1/\delta_i) \), since \( \log(1/\delta_i) > 1 \) for \( \delta_i \leq e^{-1} \). Hence a simpler sufficient condition is \( N > 5 \log(1/\delta_i) \).

**Proposition 3.** Suppose that \( N \geq 20 \) and \( \delta \in (Ne^{-N/5}, e^{-1}) \).

With probability at least \( 1 - \delta \)

\[
P\left[ \left| U_i(i) - \frac{i}{N+1} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(N/\delta)}{(N+1)}} \right] \text{ for all } i.
\]

**Proof.** From Lemma 8 we known that for each \( i = 1, \ldots, N \) if we set \( \delta_i = \frac{\delta}{N} \) then with probability at least \( 1 - \delta_i \) it holds \( G_i := \left| U_i(i) - \frac{i}{N+1} \right| \leq \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(N/\delta)}{(N+1)}} =: t \). It then follows from the union bound that \( P(\bigcap_{i \leq N} \{ G_i \leq t \} ) = \left( 1 - P \left( \bigcup_{i \leq N} \{ G_i > t \} \right) \right) \geq 1 - N \sum_{i=1}^N P \left( G_i > t \right) \geq 1 - N \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta}{N} = 1 - \delta \).
APPENDIX B: MATHEMATICAL BACKGROUND

For completeness, we provide a self-contained review of the mathematical tools required in the proofs of our results. The subsection on bounded linear operators is a condensed overview of concepts detailed in, e.g., [53], [54], [58]. The subsection on perturbation theory introduces concepts necessary for a formal statement of the sin θ theorem of [55] in the case of compact operators.

Bounded linear operators in Hilbert space

Let us start by introducing some basic notions regarding linear operators in metric spaces.

Definition 8. Let $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ be normed linear spaces and let $L : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a linear operator.

(a) $L$ is continuous at a point $f \in \mathcal{X}$ if $f_n \to f$ in $\mathcal{X}$ implies $L f_n \to L f$ in $\mathcal{Y}$.

(b) $L$ is continuous at every point, i.e. if $f_n \to f$ in $\mathcal{X}$ implies $L f_n \to L f$ in $\mathcal{Y}$ for every $f$.

(c) $L$ is bounded if there exists a finite $M \geq 0$ such that, for all $f \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\|L f\| \leq M \|f\|.$$  

Note that $\|L f\|$ is the norm of $L f$ in $\mathcal{Y}$, while $\|f\|$ is the norm of $f$ in $\mathcal{X}$.

(d) The operator norm of $L$ is $\|L\| := \sup\{\|L f\| : \|f\| = 1\}$.

(e) We let $B(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ denote the set of all bounded linear operators mapping $\mathcal{X}$ into $\mathcal{Y}$, that is

$$B(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = \{L : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y} | L \text{ is bounded and linear}\}.$$  

If $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ we write $B(\mathcal{X}) = B(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X})$

The following Proposition shows that (a), (b) and (c) are equivalent.

Proposition 4. Let $L : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a linear operator. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

(a) $L$ is continuous at every point of $\mathcal{X}$.

(b) $L$ is continuous at $0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

(c) $\|L f\|$ is bounded on the unit ball $\{f \in \mathcal{X} | \|f\| \leq 1\}$.

Let us now focus on linear operators acting on Hilbert spaces.

Proposition 5. (Adjoint) Let $L \in B(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, where $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are Hilbert spaces. Then there exists a unique bounded linear map $L^* : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$\langle L x, y \rangle = \langle x, L^* y \rangle$$  

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Definition 9. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Hilbert space and $L \in B(\mathcal{X})$.

(a) $L$ is self-adjoint if $L = L^*$ i.e. $\langle L x, y \rangle = \langle x, L y \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$.

(b) $L$ is compact if it maps the unit ball in $\mathcal{X}$ to a set with compact closure.

We are now ready to state the spectral theorem for compact operators.

Theorem 3. (Spectral theorem, [41] Theorem 2, Chapter 8 §7]) Let the $L : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ be a compact self-adjoint operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying $L \neq 0$. Then we have a finite or countably infinite system of orthonormal elements $\{\varphi_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ in $\mathcal{X}$ such that

(a) The elements $\varphi_k$ are eigenfunctions associated with the eigenvalues $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

$$\langle L \varphi_k, \varphi_k \rangle = \lambda_k \langle \varphi_k, \varphi_k \rangle$$  

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(b) $\|L \varphi_k\| = \lambda_k \|\varphi_k\|$, i.e. $\|L f\| = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k \langle \varphi_k, f \rangle \varphi_k$ for all $f \in \mathcal{X}$.

If the set of nonzero eigenvalues is infinite, then 0 is the unique accumulation point.

The following useful result shows that linear integral operators are compact.

Proposition 6. (Chapter 2, Proposition 4.7]) If $K \in L^2([0, 1]^2)$, then $\Phi(f)(x) = \int_0^1 K(x, y) f(y) dy$ is a compact operator.

We conclude this subsection with a generalization of the Perron-Frobenius theorem to linear operators in Hilbert space. Let us first introduce some additional notions used in the statement of the result. A closed convex set $K \subset \mathcal{X}$ is called a cone if $\lambda K \subset K$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and $K \cap (-K) = \{0\}$. If the set $\{u - v : u, v \in K\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{X}$, then $K$ is called a total cone.

Theorem 4. (Krein-Rutman theorem, [54] Theorem 19.2]) Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a Hilbert space, $K \subset \mathcal{X}$ a total cone and $\Pi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ a compact linear operator that is positive (i.e. $\Pi (K) \subset K$) with positive spectral radius $r(\Pi)$. Then $r(\Pi)$ is an eigenvalue with an eigenvector $\varphi \in K \setminus \{0\}$: $\Pi \varphi = r(\Pi) \varphi$.

Perturbation theory for compact self-adjoint operators

The natural definition of the angle between two nonzero vectors $\varphi$ and $\tilde{\varphi}$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{X}$ is the number

$$\Theta(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) = \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\langle \varphi, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle}{\|\varphi\| \|\tilde{\varphi}\|} \right).$$  

(44)

Note that the above concept is well defined because of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Consider now the two subspaces spansed by the two nonzero vectors $\varphi$ and $\tilde{\varphi}$, that is $[\varphi] := \varphi^* \mathcal{X}$ and $[\tilde{\varphi}] := \tilde{\varphi}^* \mathcal{X}$. One can extend (44) to define an angle between the two subspaces $[\varphi]$ and $[\tilde{\varphi}]$ as

$$\Theta([\varphi], [\tilde{\varphi}]) := \inf_{u,v} \left\{ \Theta(u, v) : u \in [\varphi], v \in [\tilde{\varphi}] \right\}.$$  

More generally, one can extend this definition of angle to subspaces spansed by eigenfunctions. This will be particularly useful in situations where we are interested in a compact self-adjoint operator $L$ but we only have access to a modified operator $\tilde{L} = L + \tilde{M}$. Indeed, in this case one way to measure how close these operators are is to measure the angle between subspaces spansed by their eigenfunctions. Let us introduce some notation in order to formalize this. We write the subspace (eigenspace) spanned by the eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^m$ of $L$ by $[\varphi_0] := [\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \ldots, \varphi_m]$. We
denote the projector of \([E_0]\) by \(P_0 = E_0E_0^* = \sum_{k=1}^m \varphi_k \varphi_k^*\) and its complementary projector by \(P_1 = E_1E_1^*\). Now any vector \(x \in \mathcal{X}\) can be written as

\[x = (E_0 \quad E_1) (x_0 \quad x_1) = E_0x_0 + E_1x_1,\]

where \(x_0 = E_0^*x\) and \(x_1 = E_1^*x\). We therefore say that \(x\) is represented by \((x_0 \quad x_1)\). The corresponding notation for an operator \(L : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\) is

\[L = (E_0 \quad E_1) (L_0 \quad L_1) (E_0^* \quad E_1^*) = E_0L_0E_0^* + E_1L_1E_1^*,\]

where \(L_0 = E_0L_0E_0^*\) and \(L_1 = E_1L_1E_1^*\). Similarly, we can consider the eigenspace \([F_0]\) spanned by the eigenfunctions \(\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^m\) of \(L + H\) and write

\[\tilde{L} = L + H = F_0\tilde{L}_0F_0^* + F_1\tilde{L}_1F_1^*.\]

The problem of measuring the closeness between the eigenspaces \([E_0]\) and \([F_0]\) can be tackled by looking at the angle between these subspaces. To do so, we can define a diagonal operator \(\Theta_0\) using the principal angles between \(E_0\) and \(F_0\), i.e.,

\[(\cos^{-1}(s_1) ... \cos^{-1}(s_m)) \text{ where } s_1 \geq ... \geq s_m\]

are the singular values of \(E_0F_0^*\), or equivalently the square-root of the nonzero eigenvalues of \(E_0F_0^*E_0\). Then, writing \(S := \text{diag}(\cos^{-1}(s_1) ... \cos^{-1}(s_m))\), we can define \(\Theta_0 = \Theta(E_0, F_0)\) as

\[\Theta_0 = \cos^{-1}(S) \text{ i.e. } \Theta_0 f = \sum_{k=1}^m \cos^{-1}(s_k) \langle \varphi_k, f \rangle \varphi_k\]

for all \(f \in \mathcal{X}\) and any basis \(\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty\). We are now ready to state the Davis-Kahan \(\sin \theta\) theorem.

**Theorem 5. (Davis-Kahan \(\sin \theta\) theorem [55])** Let \(L\) and \(\tilde{L}\) be two self-adjoint operators acting on the Hilbert space \(\mathcal{X}\) such that \(L = E_0L_0E_0^* + E_1L_1E_1^*\) and \(L + H = F_0\tilde{L}_0F_0^* + F_1\tilde{L}_1F_1^*\) with \([E_0, E_1]\) and \([F_0, F_1]\) orthogonal. If the eigenvalues of \(L_0\) are contained in an interval \((a, b)\), and the eigenvalues of \(\tilde{L}_1\) are excluded from the interval \((a - \delta, b + \delta)\) for some \(\delta > 0\), then

\[\| \sin \Theta(E_0, F_0) \| = \| F_1^*E_0 \| \leq \frac{\| F_1^*HE_0 \|}{\delta}\]

for any unitarily invariant operator norm \(\| : :\|\).

Note that the above theorem holds even for non-compact operators. Indeed, one might consider more general orthogonal subspaces defined through their projectors, which in turn might not be written as countable sums of the product of the elements of an orthogonal basis [55].
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