

An estimator for the tail-index of graphex processes

Zacharie Naulet and Daniel M Roy

*Department of Statistics, University of Toronto
100 St George St, Toronto M5S 3G3, Ontario, Canada
e-mail: znaulet@utstat.toronto.edu; droy@utstat.toronto.edu*

Ekansh Sharma

*Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto
6 King's College Rd, Toronto M5S 3H3, Ontario, Canada
e-mail: ekansh@cs.toronto.edu*

Victor Veitch

*Department of Statistics, Columbia University
1255 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, New York, U.S.A.
e-mail: vcv2109@stat.columbia.edu*

Abstract: Graphex processes resolve some pathologies in traditional random graph models, notably, providing models that are both projective and allow sparsity. In a recent paper, [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#) show that for a large class of graphex models, the sparsity behaviour is governed by a single parameter: the tail-index of the function (the graphon) that parameterizes the model. We propose an estimator for this parameter and quantify its risk. Our estimator is a simple, explicit function of the degrees of the observed graph. In many situations of practical interest, the risk decays polynomially in the size of the observed graph. We illustrate the importance of a good estimator for the tail-index through the graph analogue of the unseen species problem. We also derive the analogous results for the bipartite graphex processes.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62F10; secondary 60G55, 60G70.

Keywords and phrases: Graphex processes, sparse random graphs, tail-index, estimation.

1. Introduction

Many statistical models for relational data are based on vertex-exchangeable random graphs (also called *graphon* models), see [Orbanz and Roy \(2015\)](#) for a review. These models are interpretable and easy to work with, but have the considerable limitation that, almost surely, they generate dense graphs; that is, the number of edges scales quadratically with the number of vertices. Several model classes have been proposed to address this issue. A non exhaustive list includes *Edge exchangeable* models ([Crane and Dempsey, 2015](#)), *(Linear) Preferential attachment* models ([Barabási and Albert, 1999](#)), and *Graphex processes* ([Caron and Fox, 2017](#); [Veitch and Roy, 2015](#); [Borgs et al., 2016](#)).

Graphex processes have been proposed as a generalization of the graphon models that preserve the key properties, but allow for sparsity and degree distribution power-law behaviour. We recall these models for unipartite graphs and bipartite graphs in sections 2.1 and 4.1.

Efficient estimation remains challenging for these new models. A situation of particular interest is to define graphex process models that are close analogues of dense models that have been already proven to be useful in practice; this is the approach of Todeschini and Caron (2016); Herlau, Schmidt and Mørup (2016), and a number of models of this kind are described in Borgs et al. (2016). Roughly speaking, we would like to combine efficient estimation procedures already developed in the dense case with some new procedures for estimating the additional parameters governing the sparse behaviour.

Recently, Caron and Rousseau (2017) have studied asymptotics for an important class of graphex models (encompassing most known examples). They derive the remarkable result that, for this model class, the sparsity (*i.e.* the scaling of number of edges with respect to number of vertices in the large graph limit) and the degree distribution of the graph are governed by a single parameter of the model, which we call the *tail-index* σ . The main contribution of the present paper is to propose a simple estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ for σ and to quantify its asymptotic risk. Our estimator is a simple, explicit function of the degree distribution of the graph. Moreover, we show that in many situations, the risk decays polynomially in the size of the graph—by contrast, the more direct estimator of Caron and Rousseau (2017) has risk that decays only logarithmically.

Empirical analysis of social network data shows that degree distributions follow power laws. In addition to the need of models accommodating this behaviour for efficient statistical analysis, there is also a growing interest in estimating the index of the degree distribution power-law tail (Wang and Resnick, 2019; Clauset, Shalizi and Newman, 2009). Data repositories such as KONECT¹ provide estimates of the degree distribution tail indices based on the Hill estimator (Hill, 1975). Consistency of the Hill estimator within the preferential attachment model has been proved recently by Wang and Resnick (2019). It is demonstrated in Caron and Rousseau (2017) that within the graphex model the index of degree distribution power-law tail is almost-surely $1 + \sigma$, and hence $1 + \hat{\sigma}$ constitutes a nice, easy to compute, alternative to the Hill estimator. Consistency (and rates of convergence) within the graphex model automatically follows from the present paper.

In section 3 we propose an application showing the importance of estimating the tail-index for real-world graphs. The proposed task is reminiscent to the *unseen species problem* (Good and Toulmin, 1956). Although being seemingly a simple task, the examples show great improvement when the tail-index is efficiently estimated. This example demonstrates on real-data examples the ability of graphex processes to better capture the structure of the network when σ is well-estimated, in contrast with dense models (graphon models and/or using $\sigma = 0$).

¹<http://konect.uni-koblenz.de/>

Throughout the document, we use the notations $X_t \sim Y_t$ for $\lim_t X_t/Y_t = 1$. If X_t and Y_t are random variables, the limit is understood almost-surely. We also write $X_t \asymp Y_t$ if there is a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_t X_t/Y_t = c$. Inequalities up to generic constants are denoted by the symbols \lesssim and \gtrsim . Moreover, we recall that a function $\ell : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is called slowly varying if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \ell(cx)/\ell(x) = 1$ for all $c > 0$. Also, it is assumed that all random variables are defined on a common probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The symbol \mathbb{E} will denote the expectation under \mathbb{P} , and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \cdot]$ and $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \cdot)$ stand respectively for conditional expectation and conditional distribution. For any set S with finite cardinality, we write $|S|$ the number of elements in S .

2. Unipartite undirected graphs

2.1. The model

An undirected graph g is an ordered pair $g = (v, e)$ where v is a set of vertices and e is a set of unordered pairs of vertices called edges. We also consider graphs with no isolated vertices, that is for all $u \in v$ there exists $u' \in v$ such that $\{u, u'\} \in e$.

The model for random undirected graphs we consider in that paper is the graphex framework introduced by Caron and Fox (2017) and further studied in Veitch and Roy (2015, 2016); Todeschini and Caron (2016); Borgs et al. (2016); Borgs et al. (2017); Janson (2017); Caron and Rousseau (2017). Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ) be a measured space. By the mean of random graph $G = (V, E)$, it is understood $V \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and E is a symmetric point process (Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003a,b) over $V \times V$, seen as a random edge set for G . Because we assume G has no isolated vertices, G is entirely determined by its edge set.

The model can be summarized as follows. First, denoting by λ the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}_+ and by $\text{PP}(m)$ the distribution of a Poisson process (Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003a,b) with mean intensity measure m , draw,

$$\Pi = \{(X_1, U_1), (X_2, U_2), \dots\} \sim \text{PP}(\rho \times \lambda).$$

The random variables $\{U_1, U_2, \dots\}$ are potential labels for vertices. By properties of Poisson processes, each of these labels is almost-surely unique. The random variables $\{X_1, X_2, \dots\}$ are latent features that govern how vertices will connect. Let $\mathbf{B} = (B_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be an array of binary variables that indicate the vertices U_i and U_j are connected if $B_{i,j} = 1$ and not connected if $B_{i,j} = 0$. Because we are considering undirected graphs, we always let $B_{i,j} = B_{j,i}$. Then, conditional on Π , for a jointly measurable, symmetric, function $W : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ we let independently for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j \leq i$,

$$B_{i,j} | \Pi \sim \text{Bernoulli}(W(X_i, X_j)).$$

Using the terminology of Veitch and Roy (2015); Borgs et al. (2016) we refer to the function W as the *graphon*. For technical reasons, we always assume in that

paper W and ρ are chosen so that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x, x') \rho(dx) \rho(dx') < +\infty. \quad (2.1)$$

The random edge set for G is then the point process E given in the random measure form by

$$E := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B_{i,j} \delta_{(U_i, U_j)}.$$

Equivalently, we shall write $\{U_i, U_j\} \in E$ if and only if $B_{i,j} = 1$ (and thus $B_{j,i} = 1$). The vertex set V of G is obtained from E according to the rule $U_i \in V$ if and only if there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{U_i, U_j\} \in E$.

The generative process for G is called a *graphex process*. A sample from a graphex process has an almost-surely infinite (but countable) number of vertices. We view the model as defining a growing sequence of graphs indexed by the (continuous) sample size $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The (almost-surely) finite graph $G_\alpha = (V_\alpha, E_\alpha)$ is obtained from G by taking

$$E_\alpha := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha} \delta_{(U_i, U_j)},$$

and $U_i \in V_\alpha$ if and only if $U_i \leq \alpha$ and there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{U_i, U_j\} \in E_\alpha$. The parameter $\alpha > 0$ is referred to as the *size* of the subgraph G_α since it controls the law of $|V_\alpha|$ and $|E_\alpha|$.

2.2. Graphex marginal and tail-index

It is well-known (Caron and Fox, 2017; Veitch and Roy, 2015; Caron and Rousseau, 2017) that when $\rho(\mathcal{X}) < +\infty$ a graph G drawn from a graphex process is almost-surely dense, in the sense that $|E_\alpha| \asymp |V_\alpha|^2$ almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$.

The most interesting situation happens when $\rho(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$. In that case, as shown by Caron and Rousseau (2017), the asymptotic behavior of G_α as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ is determined by the tail behaviour of the graphex marginal $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$\mu(x) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x, x') \rho(dx').$$

More specifically, they show that if there is $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ and a slowly varying function ℓ such that as $z \rightarrow 0$,

$$F(z) := \rho\{x \in \mathcal{X} : \mu(x) \geq z\} \sim z^{-\sigma} \ell(z^{-1}), \quad (2.2)$$

then, under mild supplementary assumptions on W , the asymptotic behaviour of $|V_\alpha|$, $|E_\alpha|$ and the degree distribution² of G_α is determined by σ . We call σ

²Here the degree distribution is understood as $p_\alpha := (p_{\alpha,k})_{k \geq 1}$ where $p_{\alpha,k} := |V_\alpha|^{-1} \sum_{U \in V_\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{U' \in V_\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{E_\alpha\{U, U'\}} = k\}}$. It is said that p_α has a power law if there is a constant $c > 0$ and a slowly-varying function at infinity L such that $p_{\alpha,k} \sim k^{-c} L(k)$ for k large enough.

in [equation \(2.2\)](#) the tail-index of μ . Interestingly, for $\sigma > 0$ it holds $|E_\alpha| \asymp |V_\alpha|^{2/(1+\sigma)}$, *i.e.* G is a sparse graph.

2.3. Estimation of the tail-index

An estimator for σ based on the asymptotic growth of $|E_\alpha|/|V_\alpha|$ has been proposed in [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#). We now describe our estimator. For some real numbers $p \in [0, 1]$, we first introduce the new random variables

$$N_{p,\alpha} := \begin{cases} p \sum_{U \in V_\alpha} \left(1 - (1-p)^{\sum_{U' \in V_\alpha \setminus \{U\}} \mathbf{1}_{E_\alpha}\{U, U'\}} \right) & \text{if } 0 \leq p < 1, \\ \sum_{U \in V_\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{U' \in V_\alpha \setminus \{U\}} \mathbf{1}_{E_\alpha}\{U, U'\} > 0\}} & \text{if } p = 1. \end{cases}$$

In general $N_{1,\alpha} \neq |V_\alpha|$ because $N_{1,\alpha}$ discards all vertices that have only self-edges, *i.e.* $N_{1,\alpha}$ counts vertices that are connected to at least one vertex distinct from themselves. Then, for a chosen value of $p \in (0, 1)$, we propose to use as an estimator for σ ,

$$\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} := \begin{cases} \frac{\log N_{1,\alpha} - \log N_{p,\alpha}}{-\log p} - 1 & \text{if } N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Notice that $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$ is well-defined since $N_{1,\alpha} \geq N_{p,\alpha}$ almost-surely for all $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Also note that $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$ does not depend explicitly on the sample size α ; this is important because α is generally considered to be unknown.

In order to be able to compute the risk of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$, we require further assumptions on the model. Our first assumption is analogous to the assumptions encountered in [Veitch and Roy \(2015\)](#); [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#). We first introduce the 2-points correlation function $\nu : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\nu(x, x') := \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x, y)W(y, x') \rho(dy).$$

Assumption 1. *If $0 \leq \sigma < 1$, we assume that there is a constant $\eta > \max(1/2, \sigma)$ and a constant $C \geq 0$ such that $\nu(x, x') \leq C\mu(x)^\eta\mu(x')^\eta$ for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. If $\sigma = 1$, we assume $\nu(x, x') \leq C\mu(x)\mu(x')$, and we set $\eta = 1$.*

Also, it is well-known ([Feller, 1971](#), Chapter XIII; [Caron and Rousseau, 2017](#)) that under [equation \(2.2\)](#) the asymptotic equivalence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha z}) F(dz) \sim \begin{cases} \alpha^\sigma \ell(\alpha) \Gamma(1 - \sigma) & \text{if } 0 \leq \sigma < 1, \\ \alpha \int_\alpha^\infty z^{-1} \ell(z) dz & \text{if } \sigma = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

holds as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. This relation is already enough to show consistency of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$. However, further assumptions on F are required to bound the bias of the estimator. In the present paper, we shall assume the following.

Assumption 2. We assume that [equation \(2.2\)](#) holds. We furthermore assume that for all $p \in (0, 1)$ there is a sequence $(\Gamma_{p,\alpha})_{\alpha>0}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-p\alpha z}) F(dz)}{p^\sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha z}) F(dz)} - 1 \right| \leq \Gamma_{p,\alpha}.$$

[Assumption 2](#) is closely related to second-order regular variation assumptions used in extreme values theory ([De Haan and Stadtmüller, 1996](#)). Its purpose is the following. The integral in [equation \(2.4\)](#) plays a determining role in computing the risk of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$. [Equation \(2.4\)](#), however, says nothing about the rate at which the integral approaches $\alpha^\sigma \ell(\alpha)$. Moreover, we know that $\ell(p\alpha)/\ell(\alpha) \rightarrow 1$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ by the assumptions on ℓ , but again, the rate of convergence is unknown. These two rates are encapsulated in [assumption 2](#), allowing us to quantify the risk of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$. Bounds on $\Gamma_{p,\alpha}$ for various examples are given in [section 2.5](#). These examples show that in many cases $\Gamma_{p,\alpha}$ has polynomial decay.

We are now in position to state the main theorem of this section, whose proof is deferred to [appendix A](#).

Theorem 1. Under [assumption 1](#) and [2](#), there is a constant $C'' > 0$ depending only on p and W such that for all $\alpha \geq 1$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2] \leq \frac{\Gamma_{p,\alpha}^2}{(-\log p)^2} + C'' \log(\alpha)^2 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha^{1+\sigma \ell(\alpha)}}, \alpha^{1-2\eta} \right\}.$$

In the rest of the paper, we will always choose $p = 0.5$ and write $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ for $\hat{\sigma}_{0.5,\alpha}$.

2.4. Interpretation of the estimator

It is interesting to discuss the genesis of our estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha}$ since it gives a nice interpretation. We assume here for simplicity that $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. In that case, inspection of the proofs in [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#) shows³ that almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$,

$$N_{p,\alpha} \sim (p\alpha)^{1+\sigma} \ell(\alpha) \Gamma(1 - \sigma).$$

Then, if we could observe G_α and $G_{p\alpha}$ for some $p \in (0, 1)$, we could estimate σ by noticing that almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{N_{1,p\alpha}}{N_{1,\alpha}} \sim p^{1+\sigma} \frac{\ell(p\alpha)}{\ell(\alpha)} \sim p^{1+\sigma},$$

because $\ell(p\alpha)/\ell(\alpha) \rightarrow 1$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ by the slowly-varying function assumption.

Unfortunately, we in general have only one sample $G_\alpha = (V_\alpha, E_\alpha)$ at our disposal. It is known, however, that if Z_1, Z_2, \dots is a collection of independent Bernoulli random variables with success probability $r \in (0, 1)$, then the

³Indeed, they state the proof for $|V_\alpha|$, but it is easily seen that the result for $N_{1,\alpha}$ follows from their proof by assuming $W(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

r -sampled graph $\tilde{G}_{r,\alpha} := (\tilde{V}_{r,\alpha}, \tilde{E}_{r,\alpha})$ such that

$$\tilde{E}_{r,\alpha} := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} Z_i Z_j \mathbf{1}_{E_\alpha} \{U_i, U_j\} \delta_{(U_i, U_j)}$$

has the same distribution as $G_{r,\alpha}$ (Borgs et al., 2017; Veitch and Roy, 2016). We should emphasize here that same distribution does not mean $\tilde{G}_{r,\alpha} = G_{r,\alpha}$; nevertheless, the intuition is useful. The random variable $N_{p,\alpha}$ is precisely equal to $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{V}_{p,\alpha}| \mid G_\alpha]$.

Rephrased, σ controls the rate of growth of the number of vertices. Intuitively, the number of vertices in the graph at smaller sizes can be estimated as $N_{p,\alpha}$; this allows us to estimate the growth rate, and thus also to estimate σ .

2.5. Discussion about the bias

In Caron and Rousseau (2017), the authors suggest to estimate the tail-index using

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}} := \frac{2 \log |V_\alpha|}{\log |E_\alpha|} - 1.$$

It is easily seen that $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}} - \sigma)^2]$ is in general a $O(1/\log \alpha)$. Although the variance of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ has polynomial decay in α , the bias is proportional to $\Gamma_{p,\alpha}$, whose decay can be anything. Hence it is not clear if $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ dominates $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ asymptotically. Here we present some examples where the bias of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ has also polynomial decay in α .

We consider the examples which were originally given in Caron and Rousseau (2017), because they cover a large spectrum of behaviours. From example 1 to 4, ρ is taken to be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}_+ with Borel σ -algebra.

Example 1. *Dense graphs.* Consider the function $W(x, y) = (1 - x)(1 - y)\mathbf{1}_{x \leq 1}\mathbf{1}_{y \leq 1}$. Then $\mu(x) = 0.5(1 - x)\mathbf{1}_{x \leq 1}$ and the graph is almost-surely dense. Assumption 1 is trivially satisfied with $\eta = 1$. Also, it follows from appendix D.1 that assumption 2 is satisfied with $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-1}$: the risk is polynomially decreasing on this example.

Example 2. *Sparse, almost dense graphs without power law.* Consider the function $W(x, y) = \exp(-x - y)$. Then $\mu(x) = \exp(-x)$ and assumption 1 is trivially satisfied with $\eta = 1$ and $\sigma = 0$. Moreover, it follows from appendix D.2 that assumption 2 is satisfied with $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto 1/\log(\alpha)$: the risk is logarithmically decreasing on this example.

Example 3. *Sparse graphs with power law, separable.* For $0 < \sigma < 1$, consider the function $W(x, y) = (1 + x)^{-1/\sigma}(1 + y)^{-1/\sigma}$. Then obviously $\mu(x) = \sigma(1 + x)^{-1/\sigma}/(1 - \sigma)$ and assumption 1 holds trivially with $\eta = 1$. Moreover, from appendix D.3, assumption 2 holds with $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-\sigma}$: the risk is polynomially decreasing on this example.

TABLE 1

Estimation of $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}} - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}$ using 10 000 MC samples for the examples described in [section 2.5](#) and various values of α .

α	25	50	100	200	400	800
Dense	0.1620	0.0698	0.0327	0.0150	0.0079	0.0039
Almost-dense	0.2971	0.2440	0.2081	0.1814	0.1608	0.1443
Sparse sep. ($\sigma = 0.3$)	0.2440	0.1658	0.1186	0.0875	0.0654	0.0488
Sparse non-sep. ($\sigma = 0.3$)	0.2947	0.1945	0.1356	0.0966	0.0686	0.0462
GGP ($\sigma = 0.5$)	0.1219	0.0801	0.0502	0.0283	0.0110	0.0050

TABLE 2

Estimation of $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}} - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}$ using 10 000 MC samples for the examples described in [section 2.5](#) and various values of α .

α	25	50	100	200	400	800
Dense	0.2719	0.2125	0.1757	0.1500	0.1305	0.1154
Almost-dense	0.4240	0.3882	0.3590	0.3349	0.3144	0.2967
Sparse sep. ($\sigma = 0.3$)	0.2963	0.2535	0.2230	0.1994	0.1802	0.1643
Sparse non-sep. ($\sigma = 0.3$)	0.3483	0.2947	0.2575	0.2285	0.2051	0.1851
GGP ($\sigma = 0.5$)	0.1805	0.1577	0.1392	0.1239	0.1103	0.0982

Example 4. Sparse graphs with power law, non separable. For $0 < \sigma < 1$, consider the function $W(x, y) = (1 + x + y)^{-1/\sigma-1}$. It is shown in [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#) that [assumption 1](#) holds with $\eta = (1 + \sigma)/2$. We have $\mu(x) = \sigma(1 + x)^{-1/\sigma}$, which is up to a constant the same marginal as the previous example, so that [assumption 2](#) is verified with $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-\sigma}$ and the risk is polynomially decreasing on this example.

Example 5. Generalized Gamma Process. For $0 < \sigma \leq 1$, let consider $\rho(dx) = x^{-1-\sigma} \exp(-x)/\Gamma(1 - \sigma)$ and $W(x, y) = 1 - \exp(-xy)$. This corresponds to the model considered in [Caron and Fox \(2017\)](#). Then, it is shown in [appendix D.4](#) that [assumption 1](#) is satisfied with $\eta = 1$ and [assumption 2](#) is satisfied with $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-\sigma}$.

Although the asymptotic behaviour of the graphs are relatively close for [examples 1](#) and [2](#), the bias decay is radically different and estimation is harder in the second example.

We also estimated $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}} - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}} - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}$ on the previous examples using 10000 Monte Carlo samples. In the simulations, we picked $\sigma = 0.3$ for the sparse separable and sparse non-separable example, while the GGP example corresponds to a choice of $\sigma = 0.5$. The raw numbers are given in [tables 1](#) and [2](#).

We pictured in [fig. 1](#) the risk of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ as functions of α for all the simulated examples. As expected, the risk of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ has polynomial decay everytime but the almost dense example, while the risk of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ remains logarithmically decreasing on all examples. We note, however, that even in the situation when the risk has logarithm decay, $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ seems to perform slightly better than $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$.




FIG 1. Comparative plot of $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{NSVR} - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}$ against $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{CR} - \sigma)^2]^{1/2}$ using 10 000 MC samples for the examples described in section 2.5.

3. Illustration example

3.1. Introduction

We illustrate the importance of estimating the tail-index of the process through the graph analogue of the unseen species problem (Good and Toulmin, 1956). In the unseen species problem, one wish to estimate how many new species will be discovered by increasing the sample size. In the graph context, we are interested in estimating the number of edges $|E_\beta|$ in a sample G_β from the observation of G_α with $\alpha < \beta$. This problem is of interest because (i) it is a simple litmus test for predictive power of the model, and (ii) this quantity can be of intrinsic interest—e.g., to predict how much space will be required to store a graph, or as a necessary component of predicting missing edges.

From the results of Caron and Rousseau (2017, Proposition 2), it is easily seen that for any $\beta > \alpha$ almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$

$$|E_\beta| \sim \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha^2} |E_\alpha| - \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha^2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} B_{i,i}.$$

This suggests to use the right hand side of the previous display as an estimator for $|E_\beta|$. Although it does not depend explicitly on α , it does depend on β/α which is typically unknown. For practical use, it is more convenient to construct an estimator depending only on G_α and the number of vertices $|V_\beta|$ at future size $\beta > \alpha$. Since there is a slowly varying function ℓ_σ such that $|V_\alpha| \sim \alpha^{1+\sigma} \ell_\sigma(\alpha)$ almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ (Caron and Rousseau, 2017, Theorem 4), then $|V_\beta|/|V_\alpha| \sim (\beta/\alpha)^{1+\sigma}$ almost-surely as well. Then, for any estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ of σ , a simple estimator for $|E_\beta|$ is given by

$$\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}, \alpha, \beta) := \left(\frac{|V_\beta|}{|V_\alpha|} \right)^{2/(1+\hat{\sigma})} \left\{ |E_\alpha| - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} B_{i,i} \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

3.2. Simulation results

We first study the performance of the $\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}, \alpha, \alpha)$ on simulated datasets. We simulate graphs from the *Generalized Gamma Process* (GGP) model of Caron and Fox (2017) for various sizes (α, β) and various values of σ . Every time we use the subgraph of size α to estimate the number of edges in the graph of size β (given the number of vertices at size β). We evaluate the performance of $\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}, \alpha, \beta)$ using the *normalized mean squared-error*

$$R_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma}) := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}, \alpha, \beta) - |E_\beta|)^2}{|E_\beta|^2} \right]^{1/2}.$$

We report in tables 3 and 4 the results of the experiments corresponding to $\sigma = 0.01$ (a nearly dense graph) and $\sigma = 0.5$ (sparse graph) for increasing values of β and $\alpha = \beta/2$. For each experiment, we evaluate using 1000 Monte

TABLE 3

Monte Carlo estimation of $R_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma})$ using the estimators $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$, $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$, $\hat{\sigma} = 0$ and the oracle $\hat{\sigma} = \sigma$ on graphs simulated from the GGP model of Caron and Fox (2017) with $\sigma = 0.01$, $\tau = 1$, $\alpha = \beta/2$ and increasing values of β .

β	$\mathbb{E}[V_\alpha]$	$\mathbb{E}[V_\beta]$	$\mathbb{E}[E_\alpha]$	$\mathbb{E}[E_\beta]$	$R(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}})$	$R(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}})$	$R(0)$	$R(\sigma)$
50	100.8	236.1	410.7	1612.3	0.1582	0.2682	0.4300	0.4071
100	238.1	546.5	1638.9	6463.4	0.1191	0.2436	0.3575	0.3365
200	546.5	1237.4	6444.0	25689	0.0853	0.2300	0.2989	0.2788
400	1235.6	2765.8	25553	102230	0.0613	0.2173	0.2614	0.2419
800	2768.0	6128.2	102645	409914	0.0460	0.2071	0.2320	0.2131

TABLE 4

Monte Carlo estimation of $R_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma})$ using the estimators $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$, $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$, $\hat{\sigma} = 0$ and the oracle $\hat{\sigma} = \sigma$ on graphs simulated from the GGP model of Caron and Fox (2017) with $\sigma = 0.5$, $\tau = 1$, $\alpha = \beta/2$ and increasing values of β .

β	$\mathbb{E}[V_\alpha]$	$\mathbb{E}[V_\beta]$	$\mathbb{E}[E_\alpha]$	$\mathbb{E}[E_\beta]$	$R(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}})$	$R(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}})$	$R(0)$	$R(\sigma)$
50	301.1	882.0	549.7	2188.9	0.1017	0.2058	1.1589	0.0986
100	881.6	2546.5	2185.4	8721.4	0.0734	0.1827	1.0898	0.0707
200	2546.7	7274.2	8698.8	34733	0.0526	0.1659	1.0427	0.0491
400	7264.0	20552	34684	138440	0.0363	0.1535	1.0051	0.0330
800	20570	57688	138668	553441	0.0263	0.1458	0.9703	0.0253

Carlo samples the number of vertices, the number of edges and the normalized mean square-error using the estimator of equation (2.3) with $p = 0.5$ ($\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$), using the estimator proposed in Caron and Rousseau (2017) ($\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$), using $\hat{\sigma} = 0$, and using the true value of σ . The case $\hat{\sigma} = 0$ is of particular interest since it corresponds morally to a graphon model.

As we can expect, when the simulated graph is sparse ($\sigma = 0.5$), predicting the number of edges in the future using a dense model ($\hat{\sigma} = 0$) leads to a huge predictive risk. This is because the number of edges is always overestimated in this situation. Using $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ improves performances, but it is clear that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ dominates and achieve performances close to the oracle. In the nearly dense example ($\sigma = 0.01$), it is not surprising that the dense model ($\hat{\sigma} = 0$) yields to performance comparable to the oracle. Surprisingly and interestingly, using $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ or $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ outperform the oracle in this example. It is not clear why it is the case, and there is no reason to believe this should be true in general, especially having in mind that in the GGP model convergence of $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ toward the oracle is rather slow when σ is small (see section 2.5).

3.3. Real world graphs and test-train split

We now wish to evaluate the performance of $\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}, \alpha, \beta)$ on real-world datasets. The situation here is more tedious than in section 3.2 since in this situation the sizes (α, β) have no realistic interpretation. Our estimation procedure, however, does not explicitly depend on the sizes, and can be evaluated on a real-world dataset (identified to G_β) by splitting it onto a training set (*i.e.* which plays the role of G_α) and a test set (playing the role of $G_\beta \setminus G_\alpha$).

Although test-train split is a common approach to model evaluation, there are seemingly natural ways to split a graph. In the case of independent and

TABLE 5

Monte Carlo estimation of $\hat{R}_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma})$ using the estimators $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$, $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ and $\hat{\sigma} = 0$ on graphs taken from the SNAP collection. $|V_\beta|$ and $|E_\beta|$ are respectively the number of vertices and the number of edges in the full graph. $\mathbb{E}[|V_\alpha| | G_\beta]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|E_\alpha| | G_\beta]$ are respectively the expectations of the number of vertices and edges under the 0.5-sampling procedure described in section 2.4.

dataset	$ V_\beta $	$ E_\beta $	$\mathbb{E}[V_\alpha G_\beta]$	$\mathbb{E}[E_\alpha G_\beta]$	$\hat{R}_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}})$	$\hat{R}_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}})$	$\hat{R}_{\alpha,\beta}(0)$
ego-Facebook	4040	88233	1978.53	22058.1	0.0606	0.3606	0.0550
gemsec-Deezer	54574	498201	26036	124498	0.0842	0.4131	0.0984
gemsec-Facebook	50516	819305	23781.7	204781	0.0761	0.3770	0.1284
com-LiveJournal	3997963	34681188	1.71803e+06	9.67036e+06	0.0574	0.3601	0.3528
com-Youtube	1134891	2987623	385694	747672	0.0488	0.2219	1.1671
com-DBLP	317081	1049865	135557	262502	0.1571	0.3867	0.3681
com-Amazon	334864	925871	149992	231503	0.2021	0.4252	0.2463
email-Enron	36693	183831	14575.5	45932	0.0971	0.2982	0.5890
ca-AstroPh	18773	198110	8690.57	49520.8	0.1009	0.3748	0.1675
ca-CondMat	23134	93497	10267.8	23386.4	0.1484	0.3951	0.2690
ca-GrQc	5243	14496	2114.97	3625.59	0.1405	0.3415	0.5383
ca-HepPh	12009	118521	5265.3	29591.1	0.1209	0.3295	0.3032
ca-HepTh	9878	25998	4026.84	6503.15	0.1363	0.3554	0.5036
roadnet-CA	1965207	2766607	801709	691716	0.2369	0.3931	0.5023
roadnet-PA	1088093	1541898	443878	385516	0.2347	0.3930	0.5024
roadnet-TX	1379918	1921660	559356	480454	0.2325	0.3896	0.5216
loc-Gowalla	196592	950327	80105.5	237578	0.0921	0.3314	0.5061
loc-Brightkite	58229	214078	22131	53506.5	0.0660	0.2842	0.7308

identically distributed observations $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} P^n$, it is natural to split the data (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) by subsampling uniformly without replacement $0 \leq m \leq n$ observations within the sample. This is because the obtained subsample has the desirable property to be distributed according to P^m . We argue that in the context of graphex processes, the natural way to split the graph is precisely the r -sampling procedure described in section 2.4, because it is the only procedure leaving (up to rescaling) the distribution of the graph invariant (Veitch and Roy, 2016; Borgs et al., 2017).

We apply the previous evaluation procedure to a collection of undirected simple graphs taken from SNAP⁴. We treat each graph as an observation G_β and subgraphs G_α are obtained using the r -sampling technique with $r = 0.5$. We compare the performance of $\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}, \alpha, \beta)$, $\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}, \alpha, \beta)$ and $\hat{e}(0, \alpha, \beta)$ using the (conditional) normalized mean squared-error

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\sigma}) := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\hat{e}(\hat{\sigma}, \alpha, \beta) - |E_\beta|)^2}{|E_\beta|^2} \mid G_\beta \right]^{1/2}.$$

In contrast with section 3.2, the expectation in the expression of the error is understood with respect to the r -sampling procedure. This is because we have access to only one sample of the original graph.

We collect in table 5 the results of the simulations. For each graphs, we display the number of vertices and edges in the full graph, the expectations of the number of vertices and edges in the subgraphs and the (conditional) normalized mean squared-errors for various tail-index estimators. All expectations are evaluated using 1000 Monte Carlo samples. Inspection of table 5 shows that the tail-index estimator of equation (2.3) does clearly improve the performance on predicting the number of future edges in these examples.

⁴<https://snap.stanford.edu/index.html>

TABLE 6

Prediction of the number of unique connections at time $t = 3600s$ to DEC routers from snapshots at time t using graphex processes. \hat{n}_{NSVR} is the estimation using $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NSVR}}$, \hat{n}_{CR} using $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{CR}}$ and \hat{n}_0 using $\hat{\sigma} = 0$. The true number of connections at $t = 3600s$ is $n = 4540$.

t (s)	$ V $	$ E $	\hat{n}_{NSVR}	\hat{n}_{CR}	\hat{n}_0
300	704	825	4087.29	3511.86	13960.70
600	947	1224	4397.94	3903.06	11446.70
900	1194	1631	4532.11	4113.27	9594.94
1200	1408	2015	4660.29	4294.93	8524.46
1500	1664	2435	4637.00	4360.10	7375.47
1800	1868	2780	4624.78	4410.80	6681.72
2100	2094	3121	4541.44	4390.00	5969.49
2400	2310	3499	4546.38	4440.12	5499.42
2700	2440	3722	4539.80	4458.75	5243.17
3000	2580	3976	4546.76	4491.46	5009.61
3300	2743	4275	4553.51	4527.20	4765.21
3600	2896	4540	4540.00	4540.00	4540.00

3.4. Influence of the splitting scheme

Although the evaluation procedure of [section 3.3](#) has the merit to shed some light on the difficulties to split a graph, it is still arguable that good performance of graphex model on the examples is imputable to the ‘right’ choice of splitting scheme. If one thinks the exchangeability assumption (in the sense of [Caron and Fox \(2017\)](#); [Veitch and Roy \(2015\)](#)) is reasonable, then we claim that the splitting scheme of [section 3.3](#) is the only acceptable procedure. We leave to the statistician the task to appreciate if exchangeability is a reasonable assumption in practice.

We finally demonstrate the interest of graphex processes and sparsity on the *Internet Traffic Archive*⁵ dataset. This dataset contains an hour trace of all wide-area traffic between *Digital Equipment Corporation* (DEC) and the rest of the world. It consists on a sequence of nested graphs where vertices are IP addresses and edges are connections. This dataset has the virtue to come naturally as a sequence of nested graphs, *i.e* the graph grows from time 0 to 3600 seconds as new IP addresses connect to DEC routers. Moreover, it is reasonable to think this dataset is exchangeable in the sense of [Caron and Fox \(2017\)](#); [Veitch and Roy \(2015\)](#)). We use the subgraph obtained by keeping only the trace between time 0 and t to predict the number total number of (unique) connections n at time $t = 3600s$. Likewise, performance of the prediction procedure cannot be imputed to an arbitrary choice of data splitting scheme.

We summarize in [table 6](#) the results of the experiment. Again, prediction using a dense model overestimate the number of future unique connections, especially when t is small. In contrast, using either the estimator of [Caron and Fox \(2017\)](#) or the estimator of [equation \(2.3\)](#) gives accurate predictions even for small values of t , with a clear advantage in favor of the latter.

⁵<http://ita.ee.lbl.gov/html/contrib/DEC-PKT.html>

4. Bipartite undirected graphs

4.1. The model

The model for undirected graphs described in the previous section can also be extended to bipartite graphs (Caron, 2012; Caron and Fox, 2017). Here we understand an undirected bipartite graph $g = (v, w, e)$ as an ordered triple where u, v are sets of vertices, and $e \subseteq v \times w$ is a set of edges. Informally, v and w are referred to as the parts of the graph, and only edges between vertices belonging to different parts are allowed.

The model for bipartite graphs we consider is a natural extension of section 2.1 already considered in (Caron, 2012; Caron and Fox, 2017). Let (\mathcal{X}, ρ) and (\mathcal{Y}, ψ) be measured spaces. By the mean of a random bipartite graph $G = (V, W, E)$, it is understood $V \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $W \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ and E is a point process over $V \times W$, seen as a random edge set for G .

The model can be summarized as follows. First, draw independently,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_v &= \{(X_1, U_1), (X_2, U_2), \dots\} \sim \text{PP}(\rho \times \lambda), \\ \Pi_w &= \{(Y_1, T_1), (Y_2, T_2), \dots\} \sim \text{PP}(\psi \times \lambda).\end{aligned}$$

The random variables $\{U_1, U_2, \dots\}$ and $\{T_1, T_2, \dots\}$ are potential labels for vertices of the different parts. As for the unipartite case, let $\mathbf{B} = (B_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be an array of binary variables that indicate the vertices U_i and T_j are connected if $B_{i,j} = 1$ and not connected if $B_{i,j} = 0$. Then, conditional on (Π_v, Π_w) , for a jointly measurable function $W : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we let independently for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$,

$$B_{i,j} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w \sim \text{Bernoulli}(W(X_i, Y_j)).$$

Note that W is no longer assumed to be symmetric, we in fact don't necessarily have $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$. However, we still assume that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} W(x, y) \rho(dx) \psi(dy) < +\infty. \quad (4.1)$$

The edge set of G is then the point process $E := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B_{i,j} \delta_{U_i, T_j}$. Equivalently, we write $(U_i, T_j) \in E$ if and only if $B_{i,j} = 1$. The vertex sets (V, W) are obtained from E according to the rule $U_i \in V$ if and only if there is $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(U_i, T_j) \in E$; similarly $T_j \in W$ if and only if there is $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(U_i, T_j) \in E$.

The previous process generates a bipartite graph with an infinite number of vertices in both parts. For real numbers $s, \alpha > 0$, we can obtain a subgraph $G_{s,\alpha} = (V_{s,\alpha}, W_{s,\alpha}, E_{s,\alpha})$ from G with an almost-sure finite number of vertices (see next section) by taking

$$E_{s,\alpha} := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} \delta_{(U_i, T_j)},$$

and $U_i \in V_{s,\alpha}$ if and only if $U_i \leq s$ and there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_j \leq \alpha$ and $(U_i, T_j) \in E_{s,\alpha}$; similarly $T_j \in W_{s,\alpha}$ if and only if $T_j \leq \alpha$ and there exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $U_i \leq s$ and $(U_i, T_j) \in E_{s,\alpha}$.

4.2. Asymptotic behaviour

We state here the counterparts of the results of [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#) for the bipartite situation. Proofs are given in [appendix B](#).

The first result is about the asymptotic behavior of $|E_{s,\alpha}|$ in the large graph limit.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that W satisfies [equation \(4.1\)](#). Then, \mathbb{P} -almost-surely as $\min(s, \alpha) \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$|E_{s,\alpha}| \sim s\alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} W(x, y) \psi(dy) \rho(dx).$$

We now state the results for the behavior of $|V_{s,\alpha}|$ and $|W_{s,\alpha}|$ in the large graph limit. As for the unipartite case, these behaviors are determined by the tails of the graphex marginals $\mu_v : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mu_w : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$\mu_v(x) := \int_{\mathcal{Y}} W(x, y) \psi(dy), \text{ and, } \mu_w(y) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x, y) \rho(dx).$$

We will state the results only for the v -part of the graph, because the corresponding statements for the w -part are obtained by a trivial symmetry argument. We make use of the assumption that there is a constant $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ and a slowly-varying function ℓ_v , such that as $z \rightarrow 0$,

$$F_v(z) := \rho\{x \in \mathcal{X} : \mu_v(x) \geq z\} \sim z^{-\sigma} \ell_v(z^{-1}). \quad (4.2)$$

Then we have the following proposition. There, when $\sigma = 1$ it is assumed that ℓ_v has enough decay at infinity so that the integral involved in the proposition converges. Moreover, we make here use of the 2-points correlation functions $\nu_v : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$\nu_v(x, x') := \int_{\mathcal{Y}} W(x, y) W(x', y) \psi(dy).$$

Proposition 2. *Suppose that W satisfies [equation \(4.1\)](#) and ν_v satisfies [equation \(4.2\)](#) and the same conditions as in [assumption 1](#). Then \mathbb{P} -almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$|V_{s,\alpha}| \sim \begin{cases} s\alpha^\sigma \ell_v(\alpha) \Gamma(1 - \sigma) & \text{if } 0 \leq \sigma < 1, \\ s\alpha \int_{\alpha}^{\infty} z^{-1} \ell_v(z) dz & \text{if } \sigma = 1. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we give the behavior of the degree distributions in the large graph limit. We consider the degree distribution for the v -part of the graph; that is for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the number of vertices belonging to the v -part that are connected to k vertices belonging to the w -part. More specifically, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

$$D_k^{(v)} := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbf{1} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j} = k \right\}.$$

Proposition 3. *Suppose that W satisfies [equation \(4.1\)](#) and ν_v satisfies [equation \(4.2\)](#) and the same conditions as in [assumption 1](#). Then \mathbb{P} -almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$D_k^{(v)} \sim \begin{cases} s \times o(\ell_v(\alpha)) & \text{if } \sigma = 0, \\ s\alpha^\sigma \sigma \Gamma(k - \sigma) \ell_v(\alpha) / k! & \text{if } 0 < \sigma < 1, \\ s\alpha \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{k=1} \int_\alpha^\infty z^{-1} \ell_v(z) dz + \frac{\ell_v(\alpha)}{k(k-1)} \mathbf{1}_{k \geq 2} \right\} & \text{if } \sigma = 1. \end{cases}$$

4.3. Tail-indexes estimation

As for the unipartite case, the parameter σ plays a crucial role in the asymptotic behavior of the graphex process. Here we show how the estimator proposed in [section 2.3](#) translates to the bipartite case. We assume for simplicity $p = 1/2$.

$$\hat{\sigma}_{s,\alpha} := \frac{\log |V_{s,\alpha}| - \log \left\{ 2^{-1} \sum_{U \in V_{s,\alpha}} \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_{T \in W_{s,\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{E_{s,\alpha}}(U,T)} \right) \right\}}{\log 2}$$

Then we have the main theorem of this section, whose proof is to be found in the supplementary material [appendix C](#).

Theorem 2. *Assume ν_v satisfies [assumption 1](#) and that [assumption 2](#) holds with F replaced by F_v . Then there is a constant $C'' > 0$ depending only on W such that for all $\alpha, s \geq 1$ it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\alpha,s} - \sigma)^2] \leq \frac{\Gamma_{1/2,\alpha}^2}{(\log 2)^2} + C'' \log(\alpha)^2 \max \left\{ \frac{1}{s\alpha^\sigma \ell_v(\alpha)}, \alpha^{1-2\eta} \right\}.$$

4.4. Discussion

The estimator from [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#) given in [section 2.5](#) can be tuned to handle the bipartite case as follows. Here we assume $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ for simplicity. Let $\overline{W} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} W(x, y) \psi(dy) \rho(dx)$. Then [Caron and Rousseau's](#) estimator for the parameters is based on the results of [propositions 1 and 2](#), implying that \mathbb{P} -almost-surely as $\min(s, \alpha) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{\log |V_{s,\alpha}|}{\log |E_{s,\alpha}|} \sim \sigma \frac{\log \alpha}{\log(s\alpha \overline{W})} + \frac{\log(s\ell_v(\alpha)\Gamma(1-\sigma))}{\log(s\alpha \overline{W})}.$$

If the behaviour of $\log s / \log \alpha$ is known as $\min(s, \alpha) \rightarrow \infty$, the previous equation can be used to construct a consistent estimator of σ . The main limitation of this approach is then clear: $\log s / \log \alpha$ is usually not known, and it is further unclear how to estimate this quantity from a single observation.

A second limitation of these estimators comes from the fact that they only use information about the graph size. Doing so, one cannot hope to achieve a rapidly decreasing risk of estimating σ as $\min(s, \alpha) \rightarrow \infty$, even when $\log s / \log \alpha$ is

known: the risk is necessarily bounded by a multiple constant of $1/\log \min(\alpha, s)$. Note that this limitation is also true in the unipartite case. Our estimator overcomes this issue by incorporating information from the degree distribution of the graph.

Appendix A: Proof of theorem 1

A.1. Bias-variance decomposition

The starting point of the proof is to decompose the risk onto a deterministic bias term and some stochastic variance terms. Then, when $N_{p,\alpha} = 0$ we have

$$(\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2 = \sigma^2 \leq 1. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In the situation where $N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\log(p)\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} &= \log \frac{\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}}{\mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}} + \log p + \log \left(1 + \frac{N_{1,\alpha} - \mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}}{\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}} \right) \\ &\quad - \log \left(1 + \frac{N_{p,\alpha} - \mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}}{\mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To ease notations, we define,

$$b_{\sigma,\alpha} := \frac{\log(\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}/\mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha})}{-\log p} - 1 - \sigma, \quad Z_p := \frac{N_{p,\alpha} - \mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}}{\mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}}.$$

Note that $Z_1, Z_p > -1$ because $N_{1,\alpha} \geq N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1$. Then when $N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2 &= \left(b_{\sigma,\alpha} + \frac{\log(1+Z_1)}{-\log p} - \frac{\log(1+Z_p)}{-\log p} \right)^2 \\ &= b_{\sigma,\alpha}^2 + 2b_{\sigma,\alpha} \frac{\log(1+Z_1)}{-\log p} - 2b_{\sigma,\alpha} \frac{\log(1+Z_p)}{-\log p} \\ &\quad + \frac{\log^2(1+Z_1)}{(-\log p)^2} + \frac{\log^2(1+Z_p)}{(-\log p)^2} - 2 \frac{\log(1+Z_1)\log(1+Z_p)}{(-\log p)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now introduce functions $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : (-1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for every $z \neq 0$,

$$\varphi_1(z) := \frac{\log(1+z)}{z}, \quad \varphi_2(z) := -\frac{\log(1+z) - z}{z^2}.$$

For $z = 0$ the functions φ_1 and φ_2 are extended by continuity. The functions φ_1 and φ_2 are non-negative and monotonically decreasing on $(-1, \infty)$. We can therefore write when $N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2 &= b_{\sigma,\alpha}^2 + \frac{Z_1^2 \varphi_1(Z_1)^2}{(-\log p)^2} + \frac{Z_p^2 \varphi_1(Z_p)^2}{(-\log p)^2} - 2 \frac{Z_1 Z_p \varphi_1(Z_1) \varphi_1(Z_p)}{(-\log p)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} Z_1}{-\log p} - \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} Z_1^2 \varphi_2(Z_1)}{-\log p} - \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} Z_p}{-\log p} + \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} Z_p^2 \varphi_2(Z_p)}{-\log p}. \quad (\text{A.2}) \end{aligned}$$

But, by Young's inequality we have $2|Z_1 Z_p \varphi_1(Z_1) \varphi_1(Z_p)| \leq Z_1^2 \varphi_1(Z_1)^2 + Z_p^2 \varphi_1(Z_p)^2$. Combining the Young inequality estimate with equations (A.1) and (B.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2 \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha}=0}] + \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2 \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(N_{p,\alpha} = 0) + b_{\sigma,\alpha}^2 + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[Z_1^2 \varphi_1(Z_1)^2 \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}]}{(-\log p)^2} + \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} \mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}]}{-\log p} \\ &\quad + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[Z_p^2 \varphi_1(Z_p)^2 \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}]}{(-\log p)^2} - \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} \mathbb{E}[Z_p \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}]}{-\log p} \\ &\quad + \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} \mathbb{E}[Z_p^2 \varphi_2(Z_p) \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}]}{-\log p} - \frac{2b_{\sigma,\alpha} \mathbb{E}[Z_1^2 \varphi_2(Z_1) \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}]}{-\log p}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, because $\mathbb{E}[Z_1] = \mathbb{E}[Z_p] = 0$ we get by Hölder's inequality the following estimates.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}] &= \mathbb{E}[Z_1(1 - \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha}=0})] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Z_1| \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha}=0}] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Z_1^2] \mathbb{P}(N_{p,\alpha} = 0)} \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_p \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1}] &= \mathbb{E}[Z_p(1 - \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha}=0})] = \mathbb{P}(N_{p,\alpha} = 0). \end{aligned}$$

Also, because $\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}] > 0$ (see [proposition 4](#) below), by Chebychev inequality, for any $t < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{p,\alpha} = 0) \leq \mathbb{P}(N_{p,\alpha} < \mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}(1-t)) \leq \mathbb{P}(Z_p < -t) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]}{t^2}.$$

Since this is true for all $t < 1$, we certainly have $\mathbb{P}(N_{p,\alpha} = 0) \leq \mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]$. Furthermore, $N_{1,\alpha} \geq N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1$ implies that $Z_1 \geq -1 + (\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha})^{-1}$, then

$$\varphi_1(Z_1) \mathbf{1}_{N_{p,\alpha} \geq 1} \leq \frac{\log \mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}}{1 - (\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha})^{-1}}.$$

Also,

$$\varphi_2(Z_1) = \varphi_1(Z_1) - \frac{(1 + Z_1) \log(1 + Z_1) - Z_1}{Z_1^2} \leq \varphi_1(Z_1).$$

Obviously, the same estimates hold for Z_p . Combining all the previous estimates yield the bound (where $(x)_+ = x$ if $x \geq 0$ and $(x)_+ = 0$ if $x < 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{p,\alpha} - \sigma)^2] &\leq b_{\sigma,\alpha}^2 + \left[1 + \frac{2(-b_{\sigma,\alpha})_+}{-\log p}\right] \mathbb{E}[Z_p^2] + \frac{2(b_{\sigma,\alpha})_+}{-\log p} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Z_1^2] \mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{\log \mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}}{1 - (\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha})^{-1}}\right]^2 \frac{2\mathbb{E}[Z_1^2]}{(-\log p)^2} + \left[\frac{\log \mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha}}{1 - (\mathbb{E}N_{1,\alpha})^{-1}}\right] \frac{2(-b_{\sigma,\alpha})_+ \mathbb{E}[Z_1^2]}{-\log p} \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{\log \mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}}{1 - (\mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha})^{-1}}\right]^2 \frac{2\mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]}{(-\log p)^2} + \left[\frac{\log \mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha}}{1 - (\mathbb{E}N_{p,\alpha})^{-1}}\right] \frac{2(b_{\sigma,\alpha})_+ \mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]}{-\log p}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the conclusion of [theorem 1](#) follows from the estimates in sections [A.2](#) and [A.3](#).

A.2. Study of the bias term $b_{\sigma,\alpha}$

The estimate for the bias term follows from the expectation of $N_{p,\alpha}$ for $p \in [0, 1]$ given in the next proposition. Remark that from the definition of $N_{p,\alpha}$, we have

$$N_{p,\alpha} = \begin{cases} p \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - (1-p)^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right) & \text{if } 0 \leq p < 1, \\ \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha} > 0\}} & \text{if } p = 1. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4. For any $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha > 0$ it holds,

$$\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}] = p\alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} \right) \rho(dx).$$

Proof. We assume here that $p \neq 1$. The case $p = 1$ follows from the steps, or by taking cautiously the limit $p \rightarrow 1$ in the proof. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}] &= p\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - (1-p)^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right) \right] \\ &= p\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[(1-p)^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi \right] \right) \right] \\ &= p\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E} \left[(1-p)^{B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi \right] \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from independence and dominated convergence theorem to take care of the infinite product. It is easily seen from the definition of \mathbf{B} that for all $i \neq j$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(1-p)^{B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi] = 1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}.$$

It follows, invoking the Slivnyak-Mecke formula (Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003b, Chapter 13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}] &= p\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right) \right] \\ &= p\alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right] \right) \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Then the conclusion of the proposition follows by Campbell's formula (Kingman, 1993, Section 3.2) because,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_j \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha} \log(1 - pW(x, X_j)) \right\} \right] \\ &= \exp \left\{ -p\alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x, x') \rho(dx') \right\}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

It is clear from the result of the previous proposition that we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[N_{1,\alpha}]}{\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}]} &= \log \left[\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha z}) F(dz)}{p \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-p\alpha z}) F(dz)} \right] \\ &= -(1 + \sigma) \log p - \log \left[\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-p\alpha z}) F(dz)}{p^\sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha z}) F(dz)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from [assumption 2](#) that,

$$|b_{\sigma,\alpha}| \leq \frac{\Gamma_{p,\alpha}}{-\log p}.$$

A.3. Variance estimates for $N_{p,\alpha}$

We now compute the estimate for $\mathbb{E}[Z_1^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]$ in the proof of the main theorem. We assume here that $p \neq 1$. The case $p = 1$ follows by taking cautiously the limit $p \rightarrow 1$ in the proof. To shorten coming equations, we write $q := 1 - p$. We then have,

$$\begin{aligned} N_{p,\alpha}^2 &= p^2 \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + p^2 \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right) \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq k} B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We call $p^2 S_1$ the first term of the rhs of the previous equation, and $p^2 S_2$ the second term, so that $N_{p,\alpha}^2 = p^2 S_1 + p^2 S_2$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &:= \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right)^2 \\ S_2 &:= \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right) \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq k} B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

We now compute $\mathbb{E}[S_1]$. Expanding the square,

$$S_1 = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - 2q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} + q^{2 \sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right)$$

By independence, and using the dominated convergence theorem to take care of the infinite product,

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1 \mid \Pi] = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left(1 - 2 \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E} \left[q^{B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi \right] + \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E} \left[q^{2 B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi \right] \right).$$

From the definition of \mathbf{B} we get that,

$$\mathbb{E}[q^{B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi] = 1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\mathbb{E}[q^{2 B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi] = 1 - p(1 + q)W(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_1] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \left\{ 1 - 2 \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - p(1+q)W(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem (Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003b, Chapter 13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_1] = \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - 2\mathbb{E}[\prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})] \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{E}[\prod_j (1 - p(1+q)W(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})] \right\} \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Campbell's formula (Kingman, 1993, Section 3.2) (see also the proof of proposition 4),

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1] = \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - 2e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} + e^{-p(1+q)\alpha\mu(x)} \right\} \rho(dx)$$

That is,

$$\mathbb{E}[S_1] = \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} \right\}^2 \rho(dx) + \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-p(1+q)\alpha\mu(x)} \left\{ 1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} \right\} \rho(dx).$$

We now compute $\mathbb{E}[S_2]$. We start with the expansion of the product in the expression of S_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} - q^{\sum_{j \neq k} B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha} + \sum_{j \neq k} B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - q^{\sum_{j \neq i} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} - q^{\sum_{j \neq k} B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q^{2B_{i,k} + \sum_{j \neq i, j \neq k} B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha} + \sum_{j \neq k, j \neq i} B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following is justified by independence and dominated convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2 \mid \Pi] &= \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[q^{B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \prod_{j \neq k} \mathbb{E}[q^{B_{k,j} \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi] + \mathbb{E}[q^{2B_{i,k}} \mid \Pi] \prod_{j \neq i, k} \mathbb{E}[q^{(B_{i,j} + B_{k,j}) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi] \right), \end{aligned}$$

That is, because of equations (A.3) and (A.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2 \mid \Pi] &= \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \prod_{j \neq k} (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) + (1 - p(1+q)W(X_i, X_k)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \prod_{j \neq i, k} (1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite the previous in a slightly different form in order to be able to use the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem ([Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003b](#), Chapter 13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2 \mid \Pi] &= \sum_i \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1 - pW(X_k, X_i)}{1 - pW(X_k, X_k)} \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - p(1+q)W(X_i, X_k)) \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (1 - pW(X_i, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})}{(1 - pW(X_i, X_k))(1 - pW(X_k, X_k))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we can apply the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem to find that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2] &= \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_k \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - \prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1 - pW(X_k, x)}{1 - pW(X_k, X_k)} \prod_j (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (1 - p(1+q)W(x, X_k)) \frac{\prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})}{(1 - pW(x, X_k))(1 - pW(X_k, X_k))} \right) \right] \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Again, we rewrite the previous in a more convenient form to apply the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem a second time,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2] &= \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_k \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha} \left(1 - (1 - pW(x, X_k)) \prod_{j \neq k} (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - (1 - pW(X_k, x)) \prod_{j \neq k} (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (1 - p(1+q)W(x, X_k)) \prod_{j \neq k} (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) (1 - pW(X_k, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) \right) \right] \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem to the previous,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2] &= \alpha^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - (1 - pW(x, x')) \mathbb{E}[\prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1 - pW(x, x')) \mathbb{E}[\prod_j (1 - pW(x', X_k) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - p(1+q)W(x, x')) \mathbb{E}[\prod_j (1 - pW(x, X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha}) (1 - pW(x', X_j) \mathbf{1}_{U_j \leq \alpha})] \right\} \\ &\quad \times \rho(dx) \rho(dx'). \end{aligned}$$

Using Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993](#), Section 3.2) (see also the proof of [proposition 4](#)), and defining $\nu(x, x') = \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x, y) W(y, x') \rho(dy)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_2] &= \alpha^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{ 1 - (1 - pW(x, x')) e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} - (1 - pW(x, x')) e^{-p\alpha\mu(x')} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - p(1+q)W(x, x')) e^{-p\alpha\mu(x) - p\alpha\mu(x') + p^2\alpha\nu(x, x')} \right\} \rho(dx) \rho(dx'). \end{aligned}$$

We are now in position to bound $\mathbb{E}[Z_p^2]$, using the expression of $\mathbb{E}[S_1]$, $\mathbb{E}[S_2]$ and [proposition 4](#). [Proposition 4](#) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}]^2 &= (p\alpha)^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x')}\right) \rho(dx)\rho(dx') \\ &= (p\alpha)^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x')} + e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)-p\alpha\mu(x')}\right\} \rho(dx)\rho(dx').\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the expression for $\mathbb{E}[S_1]$ and $\mathbb{E}[S_2]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}^2] - \mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}]^2 &= \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-p(1+q)\alpha\mu(x)} \left\{1 - e^{-p^2\alpha\mu(x)}\right\} \rho(dx) \\ &\quad + \alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left\{1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right\}^2 \rho(dx) + 2p^3\alpha^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mu(x)e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} \rho(dx) \\ &\quad + p^2\alpha^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)-p\alpha\mu(x')+p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')} \left\{1 - e^{-p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')}\right\} \rho(dx)\rho(dx') \\ &\quad - p^3(1+q)\alpha^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} W(x,x')e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)-p\alpha\mu(x')+p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')} \rho(dx)\rho(dx').\end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's and Young's inequality, we have $2\nu(x,x') \leq 2\sqrt{\mu(x)\mu(x')} \leq \mu(x) + \mu(x')$. Moreover, $p^2 \leq p$, and $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ imply,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)-p\alpha\mu(x')+p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')} \left\{1 - e^{-p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')}\right\} \rho(dx)\rho(dx') \\ \leq p^2\alpha \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\frac{p\alpha}{2}\mu(x)} e^{-\frac{p\alpha}{2}\mu(x')}\nu(x,x') \rho(dx)\rho(dx')\end{aligned}$$

If $\sigma = 1$ it follows from [assumption 1](#) that,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)-p\alpha\mu(x')+p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')} \left\{1 - e^{-p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')}\right\} \rho(dx)\rho(dx') \\ \leq Cp^2\alpha \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mu(x) \rho(dx) \right\}^2,\end{aligned}$$

which is finite because of [equation \(2.1\)](#). Now if $0 \leq \sigma < 1$, it follows from [assumption 1](#) and [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.4\)](#) that,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)-p\alpha\mu(x')+p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')} \left\{1 - e^{-p^2\alpha\nu(x,x')}\right\} \rho(dx)\rho(dx') \\ \leq Cp^2\alpha^{1-2\eta} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \alpha^\eta \mu(x)^\eta e^{-\frac{p\alpha}{2}\mu(x)} \rho(dx) \right\}^2 \lesssim \alpha^{1-2\eta+2\sigma} \ell(\alpha)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.4\)](#), it is easily seen that all other terms involved in $\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}^2] - \mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}]^2$ are bounded by a multiple constant of $\alpha^{1+\sigma} \ell(\alpha)$ for any $\sigma \in [0, 1]$. Since we set $\eta = 1$ when $\sigma = 1$, it follows the estimate,

$$\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}^2] - \mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}]^2 \lesssim \alpha^{1+\sigma} \ell(\alpha) + \alpha^{3-2\eta+2\sigma} \ell(\alpha)^2.$$

The conclusion follows because $\mathbb{E}[N_{p,\alpha}]^2 \gtrsim \alpha^{2+2\sigma} \ell(\alpha)^2$ by [proposition 4](#).

Appendix B: Proofs of asymptotic results for bipartite graphs

B.1. Path to the proof

The results in [section 4.2](#) are straightforward adaptations of the proofs in [Caron and Rousseau \(2017\)](#). We then just give the proof for [proposition 3](#) since the argument for the bipartite version can be made more direct.

The argument runs as follows. We first provide the asymptotic behavior of $\mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}]$ in [appendix B.2](#) and then the asymptotic behavior of the variance in [appendix B.3](#). The conclusion follows by [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.1\)](#), which provides the sufficient conditions under which $D_k^{(v)} \sim \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}]$ \mathbb{P} -almost-surely as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$.

In the whole section, we will use the random variables $(N_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined as follows. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$N_i := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j}.$$

B.2. Expectation of $D_k^{(v)}$

It is easily seen that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbb{P}(N_i = k \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbb{P}(N_i = k \mid \Pi_v) \right] \\ &= \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mu_v(X_i)^k \exp \{-\alpha \mu_v(X_i)\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by [lemma 1](#) below. By Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993, Section 3.2](#)),

$$\mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] = \frac{s \alpha^k}{k!} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mu_v(x)^k e^{-\alpha \mu_v(x)} \rho(dx).$$

Then the conclusion follows by straightforward adaption of [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.2\)](#).

B.3. Variance of $D_k^{(v)}$

Proceeding as for the expectation, we find that,

$$\mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i' \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbf{1}_{U_{i'} \leq s} \mathbb{P}(N_i = k, N_{i'} = k \mid \Pi_v) \right].$$

Then using the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem, ([Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003b, Chapter 13](#)),

$$\mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] = \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \sum_{i' \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbf{1}_{U_{i'} \leq s} \mathbb{P}(N_i = k, N_{i'} = k \mid \Pi_v) \right]$$

Then from the result of [lemma 2](#) below,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] + s \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} e^{-\alpha\mu_v(x) - \alpha\mu_v(X_i) + \alpha\nu_v(x, X_i)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\alpha^{k+m}}{(m!)^2 (k-m)!} \mu_v(X_{i'})^m \mu_v(x)^m \nu_v(x, X_{i'})^{k-m} \right] \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

By Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993](#), Section 3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] + s^2 \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\alpha\mu_v(x) - \alpha\mu_v(x') + \alpha\nu_v(x, x')} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\alpha^{k+m}}{(m!)^2 (k-m)!} \mu_v(x')^m \mu_v(x)^m \nu_v(x, x')^{k-m} \rho(dx) \rho(dx'). \end{aligned}$$

Using the expression for the expectation obtained in [appendix B.2](#), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] - \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}]^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] \\ &\quad + \frac{s^2 \alpha^{2k}}{(k!)^2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\alpha\mu_v(x) - \alpha\mu_v(x') + \alpha\nu_v(x, x')} \\ &\quad \quad \times \mu_v(x)^k \mu_v(x')^k \left\{ 1 - e^{-\alpha\nu_v(x, x')} \right\} \rho(dx) \rho(dx') \\ &\quad + s^2 \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\alpha^{k+m}}{(m!)^2 (k-m)!} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\alpha\mu_v(x) - \alpha\mu_v(x') + \alpha\nu_v(x, x')} \\ &\quad \quad \times \mu_v(x')^m \mu_v(x)^m \nu_v(x, x')^{k-m} \rho(dx) \rho(dx'). \end{aligned}$$

But $\nu(x, x') \leq (\mu(x) + \mu(x'))/2$ by Hölder's inequality, $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ for any $x \geq 0$, and $\nu_v(x, x') \leq C\mu_v(x)^\eta \mu_v(x')^\eta$ under [assumption 1](#). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] - \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}]^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}] + C \frac{s^2 \alpha^{1-2\eta}}{(k!)^2} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\frac{\alpha\mu_v(x)}{2}} [\alpha\mu_v(x)]^{k+\eta} \rho(dx) \right\}^2 \\ &\quad + s^2 \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{C^{k-m} \alpha^{-(2\eta-1)(k-m)}}{(m!)^2 (k-m)!} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\frac{\alpha\mu_v(x)}{2}} [\alpha\mu_v(x)]^{m(1-\eta)+\eta k} \right\}^2 \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

By straightforward adaption of [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.4\)](#), we conclude that there exists a $c > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[(D_k^{(v)})^2] - \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}]^2 \lesssim \alpha^{-c} \mathbb{E}[D_k^{(v)}]^2$.

B.4. Auxiliary results

In this section, we state a certain number of auxiliary results that are used in sections [B.2](#) and [B.3](#).

Notice that conditional on (Π_v, Π_w) , the law of $\{N_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ for every finite subset $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is characterized by the following Laplace transform, for every $t \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{I}}$ for which the rhs is defined,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} t_i N_i} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w] &= \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} [1 + (e^{-t_i} - 1)W(X_i, Y_j) \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha}] \\ &= \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} \log[1 + (e^{-t_i} - 1)W(X_i, Y_j)] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We use the previous result to characterize (by Fourier inversion) the distribution of N_i and the joint distribution of $(N_i, N_{i'})$ for $i \neq i'$, conditional on Π_v .

Lemma 1. *Assume that $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(N_i = k \mid \Pi_v) = e^{-\alpha \mu_v(X_i)} \frac{\alpha^k \mu_v(X_i)^k}{k!}.$$

Proof. It is easily seen from [equation \(B.1\)](#) and Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993](#), Section 3.2) that N_i has Laplace transform (conditional on Π_v), for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$ that makes sense,

$$t \mapsto \exp \left\{ \alpha \mu_v(X_i) (e^{-t} - 1) \right\}.$$

One recognizes the Laplace transform of a Poisson distribution. Hence the results follows. \square

Lemma 2. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_i = k, N_{i'} = k \mid \Pi_v) &\leq e^{-\alpha \mu_v(X_i) - \alpha \mu_v(X_{i'}) + \alpha \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})} \\ &\times \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\alpha^{k+m}}{(m!)^2 (k-m)!} \mu_v(X_{i'})^m \mu_v(X_i)^m \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})^{k-m}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993](#), Section 3.2), we deduce from [equation \(B.1\)](#) that for any $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi_1 N_i + i\xi_2 N_{i'}} \mid \Pi_v] &= \exp \left\{ \alpha \mu_v(X_i) (e^{i\xi_1} - 1) + \alpha \mu_v(X_{i'}) (e^{i\xi_2} - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \alpha \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'}) (e^{i\xi_1} - 1) (e^{i\xi_2} - 1) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using orthogonality of trigonometric polynomials, it is easily seen that

$$\mathbb{P}(N_i = k, N_{i'} = k \mid \Pi_v) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi_1 N_i + i\xi_2 N_{i'}} \mid \Pi_v] e^{-i(\xi_1 k + \xi_2 k)} d\xi_1 d\xi_2. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

We first compute the inner integral in [equation \(B.2\)](#). To do so, write the intermediate integral

$$I(\xi_2) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \exp \left\{ \alpha \mu_v(X_i) e^{i\xi} + \alpha \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'}) (e^{i\xi_2} - 1) e^{i\xi} - i\xi k \right\} d\xi.$$

It is convenient to remark that $I(\xi_2)$ is a contour integral along $\Gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$. Then,

$$I(\xi_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{\exp\{\alpha[\mu_v(X_i) + \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})](e^{i\xi_2} - 1)z\}}{iz^{k+1}} dz$$

The complex exponential is analytic in the whole complex plane, thus the integrand in the previous is holomorphic everywhere except at zero where it has a pole of order $k + 1$. Thus, by the residue theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\xi_2) &= \frac{1}{k!} \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^k}{dz^k} \exp\{\alpha[\mu_v(X_i) + \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})](e^{i\xi_2} - 1)z\} \\ &= \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} [\mu_v(X_i) + \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})](e^{i\xi_2} - 1)^k. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce the new intermediate integral,

$$\begin{aligned} J &:= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} I(\xi) \exp\{\alpha\mu_v(X_{i'})e^{i\xi} - \alpha\nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})e^{i\xi} - i\xi k\} d\xi \\ &=: \frac{\alpha^k}{2\pi k!} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{K(z)}{iz^{k+1}} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$K(z) := [\mu_v(X_i) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'}) + z\nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^k \exp\{\alpha\mu_v(X_{i'})z - \alpha\nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})z\}.$$

Again, the integrand $z \mapsto -iK(z)z^{-(k+1)}$ is holomorphic in the whole complex plane, except at zero where it has a pole of order $k + 1$. This time, however, the computation of the residue at zero is more involved, but still doable. Near $z = 0$, we have the Taylor series expansion,

$$\exp\{\alpha\mu_v(X_{i'})z - \alpha\nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})z\} = \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\alpha^m z^m}{m!} [\mu_v(X_{i'}) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^m + o(z^k),$$

and by Newton's binomial formula,

$$\begin{aligned} &[\mu_v(X_i) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'}) + \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})z]^k \\ &= \sum_{p=0}^k \binom{k}{p} [\mu_v(X_i) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^{k-p} \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})^p z^p. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $z \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} K(z) &= o(z^k) + \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{p=0}^k \binom{k}{p} \frac{\alpha^m}{m!} [\mu_v(X_{i'}) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^m \\ &\quad \times [\mu_v(X_i) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^{k-p} \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})^p z^{m+p}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the previous expression, it is easily seen that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^k}{dz^k} K(z) = k! \sum_{\substack{m+p=k \\ i \geq 0, p \geq 0}} \binom{k}{p} \frac{\alpha^m}{m!} [\mu_v(X_{i'}) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^m \\ \times [\mu_v(X_i) - \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})]^{k-p} \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})^p.$$

Then,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^k}{dz^k} K(z) \leq k! \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{k}{m} \frac{\alpha^m}{m!} \mu_v(X_{i'})^m \mu_v(X_i)^m \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})^{k-m}.$$

Therefore, by the residue theorem and after simple algebra,

$$J \leq \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\alpha^{k+m}}{(m!)^2 (k-m)!} \mu_v(X_{i'})^m \mu_v(X_i)^m \nu_v(X_i, X_{i'})^{k-m}.$$

Using this last result and [equation \(B.2\)](#), we get the following expression for the joint distribution at (k, k) . \square

Appendix C: Proof of the risk bound for the bipartite estimator

C.1. Expectation of $M_{s,\alpha}$

The proof of [theorem 2](#) follows the exact same line as for the [theorem 1](#). Here we only state the expectation and variance estimate for the random variable

$$M_{s,\alpha} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j}} \right).$$

By definition of the model and applying Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993](#), Section 3.2) a couple of times,

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \left(1 - \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[2^{-B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w \right] \right) \right] \\ = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \left(1 - \prod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{2} W(X_i, Y_j) \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} \right\} \right) \right] \\ = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha \mu_v(X_i)/2} \right) \right].$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] = \frac{s}{2} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2} \mu_v(x)} \right) \rho(dx). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

As $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, under our assumptions and by [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.2\)](#),

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] \sim \begin{cases} s(\alpha/2)^\sigma \ell_v(\alpha) \Gamma(1-\sigma)/2 & \text{if } 0 \leq \sigma < 1, \\ (s\alpha/4) \int_{\alpha}^{\infty} z^{-1} \ell_v(z) dz & \text{if } \sigma = 1. \end{cases}$$

C.2. Variance of $M_{s,\alpha}$

We write that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}^2] &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq s} \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j}} \right) \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_m \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha} B_{k,m}} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the rhs of the previous equation is obviously bounded by $\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}]/4$. We now take care of the second term. It is clear that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - 2^{-\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j}} \right) \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_m \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha} B_{k,m}} \right) \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w \right] \\ &= 1 - \prod_j \mathbb{E}[2^{-B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w] - \prod_m \mathbb{E}[2^{-B_{k,m} \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w] \\ &\quad + \prod_j \mathbb{E}[2^{-B_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w] \prod_m \mathbb{E}[2^{-B_{k,m} \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha}} \mid \Pi_v, \Pi_w] \\ &= 1 - \prod_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} W(X_i, Y_j) \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} \right) - \prod_m \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} W(X_k, Y_m) \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha} \right) \\ &\quad + \prod_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} W(X_i, Y_j) \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} \right) \prod_m \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} W(X_k, Y_m) \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the computation here are made slightly simpler as for the unipartite case since \mathbf{B} is not a symmetric array and Π_v and Π_w are independent. By Campbell's formula ([Kingman, 1993](#), Section 3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 - 2^{-\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{T_j \leq \alpha} B_{i,j}} \right) \left(1 - 2^{-\sum_m \mathbf{1}_{T_m \leq \alpha} B_{k,m}} \right) \mid \Pi_v \right] \\ &= 1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(X_i)}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(X_k)}{2}} + e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(X_i)}{2} - \frac{\alpha \mu_v(X_k)}{2} + \frac{\alpha \nu_v(X_i, X_k)}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Slivnyak-Mecke theorem ([Daley and Vere-Jones, 2003b](#), Chapter 13),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}^2] &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] + \frac{s}{4} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{U_i \leq s} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(X_i)}{2}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(x)}{2}} + e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(X_i)}{2} - \frac{\alpha \mu_v(x)}{2} + \frac{\alpha \nu_v(X_i, x)}{4}} \right) \right] \rho(dx). \end{aligned}$$

By Campbell's formula again,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}^2] &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] + \frac{s^2}{4} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(x')}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(x)}{2}} + e^{-\frac{\alpha \mu_v(x')}{2} - \frac{\alpha \mu_v(x)}{2} + \frac{\alpha \nu_v(x', x)}{4}} \right) \rho(dx) \rho(dx'). \end{aligned}$$

Using [equation \(C.1\)](#), we find that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}^2] - \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}]^2 &\leq \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] \\ &+ \frac{s^2}{4} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\frac{\alpha\mu_v(x')}{2} - \frac{\alpha\mu_v(x)}{2} + \frac{\alpha\nu_v(x',x)}{4}} \left\{ 1 - e^{-\frac{\alpha\nu_v(x',x)}{4}} \right\} \rho(dx)\rho(dx'). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\nu_v(x',x) \leq (\mu_v(x) + \mu_v(x'))/2$ by Hölder's inequality, $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ for all $x \geq 0$, and $\nu_v(x',x) \leq C\mu_v(x)^\eta\mu_v(x')^\eta$ by [assumption 2](#). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}^2] - \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}]^2 &\leq \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}] \\ &+ \frac{C\alpha s^2}{16} \left(\frac{8}{3\alpha} \right)^{2\eta} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-\frac{3\alpha\mu_v(x)}{8}} \left[\frac{3\alpha\mu_v(x)}{8} \right]^\eta \rho(dx) \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, by a simple adaption of [Caron and Rousseau \(2017, Lemma B.2 and B.4\)](#), for α large enough,

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}^2] - \mathbb{E}[M_{s,\alpha}]^2 \lesssim \begin{cases} s\alpha^\sigma \ell_v(\alpha) + s^2\alpha^{1-2\eta+2\sigma} \ell_v(\alpha)^2 & \text{if } 0 \leq \sigma < 1, \\ s\alpha \int_{\alpha}^{\infty} z^{-1} \ell_v(z) dz + \alpha s^2 & \text{if } \sigma = 1. \end{cases}$$

Appendix D: Proof of examples rates bounds

D.1. Dense graphs

For any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha\mu(x)} \right) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)} \right) dx \\ = \int_0^1 e^{-p\alpha u/2} \left\{ 1 - e^{-(1-p)\alpha u/2} \right\} du \lesssim \alpha^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have for α large enough,

$$\int_0^1 \left(1 - e^{-\alpha u/2} \right) du \gtrsim 1.$$

Hence, $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-1}$.

D.2. Sparse, almost dense graphs without power law

For any $\alpha > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha\mu(x)}\right) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) dx \\ &= \int_0^1 e^{-p\alpha u} \left\{1 - e^{-(1-p)\alpha u}\right\} \frac{du}{u} \\ &\leq \alpha(1-p) \int_0^{1/\alpha} e^{-p\alpha u} du + \int_{1/\alpha}^1 e^{-p\alpha u} \frac{du}{u} \\ &\leq (1-p) + \int_1^\alpha \frac{e^{-pv}}{v} dv \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when $\alpha > 0$ is large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (1 - e^{-\alpha u}) \frac{du}{u} &= (1 - e^{-\alpha}) \log(\alpha) - \int_0^\alpha \log(v) e^{-v} dv \\ &\geq (1 - e^{-\alpha}) \log(p\alpha) - \int_1^\alpha \log(v) e^{-v} dv \\ &\geq (1 - e^{-\alpha}) \log(\alpha) - \log(\alpha) \int_1^\alpha e^{-v} dv \gtrsim \log(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto 1/\log \alpha$.

D.3. Sparse graphs with power law

Let $b := 1/(1 - \sigma)$, then for any $\alpha > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} p^\sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha\mu(x)}\right) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) dx \\ &= \sigma \left(\frac{\sigma}{1 - \sigma}\right)^\sigma \alpha^\sigma \left\{ p^\sigma \int_0^{\frac{\sigma\alpha}{1-\sigma}} (1 - e^{-u}) u^{-1-\sigma} du - \int_0^{\frac{\sigma\alpha}{1-\sigma}} (1 - e^{-pu}) u^{-1-\sigma} du \right\} \\ &= \sigma \left(\frac{\sigma}{1 - \sigma}\right)^\sigma p^\sigma \alpha^\sigma \int_{\frac{p\sigma\alpha}{1-\sigma}}^{\frac{\sigma\alpha}{1-\sigma}} (1 - e^{-u}) u^{-1-\sigma} du \leq \frac{\sigma(1-p)}{p}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when α is large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha\mu(x)}\right) dx &= \alpha^\sigma \sigma \left(\frac{\sigma}{1 - \sigma}\right)^\sigma \int_0^{\frac{\sigma\alpha}{1-\sigma}} (1 - e^{-v}) v^{-1-\sigma} dv \\ &\geq \alpha^\sigma \sigma \left(\frac{\sigma}{1 - \sigma}\right)^\sigma \int_0^{\frac{\sigma\alpha}{1-\sigma}} e^{-v} v^{-\sigma} dv \gtrsim \alpha^\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-\sigma}$.

D.4. Generalized Gamma Process

It is clear that the graphex marginal is given by

$$\mu(x) = \frac{(1+x)^\sigma - 1}{\sigma},$$

and, as $z \rightarrow 0$,

$$z^\sigma F(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}\{x \geq (1+\sigma z)^{1/\sigma} - 1\} \frac{x^{-1-\sigma} e^{-x} dx}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sigma \Gamma(1-\sigma)}.$$

Not surprisingly, that means the graph is almost-surely sparse with a power-law degree distribution. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(x, y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-xz})(1 - e^{-zy}) \frac{z^{-1-\sigma} e^{-z} dz}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} \\ &= \frac{-1 + (1+x)^\sigma + (1+y)^\sigma - (1+x+y)^\sigma}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence [assumption 1](#) is satisfied with $\eta = 1$, because,

$$\frac{\nu(x, y)}{\mu(x)\mu(y)} = \sigma \frac{-1 + (1+x)^\sigma + (1+y)^\sigma - (1+x+y)^\sigma}{((1+x)^\sigma - 1)((1+y)^\sigma - 1)} \leq 1 - \sigma.$$

Furthermore, in this example, we have for any $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-u}) \left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{p\alpha}\right)^{-1+1/\sigma} \\ &\times \left(\left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{p\alpha}\right)^{1/\sigma} - 1\right)^{-1-\sigma} \exp\left\{-\left(\left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{p\alpha}\right)^{1/\sigma} - 1\right)\right\} \frac{du}{p\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

We will find a bound on $\Gamma_{p,\alpha}$ by first lower bounding,

$$A := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx),$$

and then upper bounding,

$$B = \left| p^\sigma \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx) \right|.$$

From the two bounds computed below, we will conclude that $\Gamma_{p,\alpha} \propto \alpha^{-\sigma}$.

Lower bound on A. Since the integrand is a positive function, we lower bound A by integrating on a smaller set. It is clear that when $u \in [0, \alpha]$,

$$\left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{\alpha}\right)^{-1+1/\sigma} \geq 1, \text{ and } \left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{\alpha}\right)^{1/\sigma} - 1 \lesssim \frac{u}{\alpha}.$$

Therefore, from [equation \(D.1\)](#) we deduce that,

$$A \gtrsim \alpha^\sigma \int_{[0,\alpha]} (1 - e^{-u}) u^{-1-\sigma} du \gtrsim \alpha^\sigma.$$

Upper bound on B. We first write,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx) \\ &= \int_0^\alpha \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx) + \int_\alpha^\infty \left(1 - e^{-p\alpha\mu(x)}\right) \rho(dx) =: C_{p,\alpha} + D_{p,\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen from [equation \(D.1\)](#) that for some constant $c > 0$ (eventually depending on σ and p , but not α),

$$\begin{aligned} D_{p,\alpha} &\lesssim \int_\alpha^\infty (1 - e^{-u}) \left(\frac{u}{\alpha}\right)^{-1+1/\sigma} \left(\frac{u}{\alpha}\right)^{(-1-\sigma)/\sigma} e^{-c(u/\alpha)^{1/\sigma}} \frac{du}{\alpha} \\ &= \alpha \int_\alpha^\infty (1 - e^{-u}) u^{-2} e^{-c(u/\alpha)^{1/\sigma}} du \\ &\leq \int_1^\infty u^{-2} e^{-cu^{1/\sigma}} du \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that $B \lesssim |p^\sigma C_{1,\alpha} - C_{p,\alpha}| + 1$. We now consider the function,

$$\begin{aligned} F(p, \sigma, \alpha, u) &:= \frac{1}{p\alpha} \left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{p\alpha}\right)^{-1+1/\sigma} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \left(\left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{p\alpha}\right)^{1/\sigma} - 1 \right)^{-1-\sigma} \exp \left\{ - \left(\left(1 + \frac{\sigma u}{p\alpha}\right)^{1/\sigma} - 1 \right) \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

With a little bit of effort, it is seen that for any $u \in [0, \alpha]$,

$$F(p, \sigma, \alpha, u) = u^{-1-\sigma} (\alpha p)^\sigma + u^{-\sigma} O(\alpha^{-1+\sigma}).$$

Hence, $p^\sigma F(1, \sigma, \alpha, u) - F(p, \sigma, \alpha u) = u^{-\sigma} O(\alpha^{-1+\sigma})$ whenever $u \in [0, \alpha]$. It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} |p^\sigma C_{1,\alpha} - C_{p,\alpha}| &\lesssim \alpha^{-1+\sigma} \int_0^\alpha (1 - e^{-u}) u^{-\sigma} du \\ &= \int_0^1 (1 - e^{-\alpha u}) u^{-\sigma} du \leq \frac{1}{1-\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, $B \lesssim 1$.

References

BARABÁSI, A.-L. and ALBERT, R. (1999). Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks. *Science* **286** 509-512.

- BORGS, C., CHAYES, J. T., COHN, H. and HOLDEN, N. (2016). Sparse exchangeable graphs and their limits via graphon processes. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- BORGS, C., CHAYES, J., COHN, H. and VEITCH, V. (2017). Sampling perspectives on sparse exchangeable graphs. Preprint.
- CARON, F. (2012). Bayesian nonparametric models for bipartite graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25* (F. Pereira, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou and K. Q. Weinberger, eds.) 2051–2059. Curran Associates, Inc.
- CARON, F. and FOX, E. B. (2017). Sparse graphs using exchangeable random measures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **79** 1295–1366.
- CARON, F. and ROUSSEAU, J. (2017). On sparsity and power-law properties of graphs based on exchangeable point processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03120*.
- CLAUSET, A., SHALIZI, C. R. and NEWMAN, M. E. (2009). Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM review* **51** 661–703.
- CRANE, H. and DEMPSEY, W. (2015). A framework for statistical network modeling. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- DALEY, D. J. and VERE-JONES, D. (2003a). *An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume I: elementary theory and methods*, Second ed. Springer Science & Business Media.
- DALEY, D. J. and VERE-JONES, D. (2003b). *An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume II: general theory and structure*, Second ed. Springer Science & Business Media.
- DE HAAN, L. and STADTMÜLLER, U. (1996). Generalized regular variation of second order. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society* **61** 381–395.
- FELLER, W. (1971). *An introduction to probability theory and its applications, volume II* **2**. Wiley, New York.
- GOOD, I. and TOULMIN, G. (1956). The number of new species, and the increase in population coverage, when a sample is increased. *Biometrika* **43** 45–63.
- HERLAU, T., SCHMIDT, M. N. and MØRUP, M. (2016). Completely random measures for modelling block-structured sparse networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29* (D. D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. V. Luxburg, I. Guyon and R. Garnett, eds.) 4260–4268. Curran Associates, Inc.
- HILL, B. M. (1975). A simple general approach to inference about the tail of a distribution. *The annals of statistics* 1163–1174.
- JANSON, S. (2017). On convergence for graphexes. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- KINGMAN, J. F. C. (1993). *Poisson Processes*. Oxford University Press.
- ORBANZ, P. and ROY, D. M. (2015). Bayesian Models of Graphs, Arrays and Other Exchangeable Random Structures. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on* **37** 437–461.
- TODESCHINI, A. and CARON, F. (2016). Exchangeable Random Measures for Sparse and Modular Graphs with Overlapping Communities. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- VEITCH, V. and ROY, D. M. (2015). The Class of Random Graphs Arising from Exchangeable Random Measures. *ArXiv e-prints*.

- VEITCH, V. and ROY, D. M. (2016). Sampling and Estimation for (Sparse) Exchangeable Graphs. *ArXiv e-prints*.
- WANG, T. and RESNICK, S. I. (2019). Consistency of Hill estimators in a linear preferential attachment model. *Extremes* **22** 1–28.