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Abstract

Using our recent results on convergence of interacting dynamical systems on graphs to the continuum limit, we propose a numerical scheme for the initial value problem for a nonlocal diffusion equation. Our method is based on the approximation of the nonlocal term by averaging it over a set of small subdomains chosen randomly. We prove convergence of the numerical scheme and estimate the rate of convergence. Our method applies to models with low regularity of the kernel defining the nonlocal diffusion term.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we propose a randomized numerical scheme for solving an initial value problem (IVP) for the following nonlocal diffusion equation

\[ \partial_t u(t, x) = f(u, x, t) + \int W(x, y) D(u(t, y) - u(t, x)) \, dy, \quad x \in Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \]

\[ u(0, x) = g(x). \]

For analytical convenience, we take \( Q = [0, 1]^d \) as a spatial domain. Further, \( W \in L^2(Q^2) \), \( f \) is a jointly measurable bounded function that is Lipschitz continuous in \( u \), continuous in \( t \), integrable in \( x \), and \( D \) is Lipschitz continuous function on \( \mathbb{R} \):

\[ |D(u_1) - D(u_2)| \leq L_D |u_1 - u_2| \quad \text{and} \quad |f(u_1, x, t) - f(u_2, x, t)| \leq L_f |u_1 - u_2| \]

for all \((x, t) \in Q \times \mathbb{R}\). Throughout this paper we assume

\[ \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} |D(u)| \leq 1. \]

For nonnegative symmetric \( W \), (1.1) is a nonlocal analog of a reaction-diffusion equation. Integro-differential equations of this type are used for modeling population dynamics \([21, 4, 20, 2, 3]\), porous media flows \([7, 8]\),
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1The boundedness assumption may be dropped if an apriori estimate on \( \|u\|_{C(0, T; Q)} \) is available.
and various other biological and physicochemical processes involving anomalous diffusion [23]. Similar models arise in neuroscience and other fields of mathematical biology (see, e.g., [5]). In the context of population dynamics, \( u(t, x) \) stands for the density of a population at spatial location \( x \) at time \( t \). Function \( f(u(x, t)) \) describes intrinsic dynamics and the integral term models diffusive dispersal. In particular, \( W(x, y)D(u(t, y) - u(t, x)) \, dy \) describes the flux of the species from an infinitesimal neighborhood of point \( y \) to \( x \). Our approach applies to a more general class of interaction functions, like those that are used in neural field models [5], for instance. In fact, the nonlinear function \( D \) can be taken in a more general form \( D(u, v) \) as long as

\[
|D(u_1, v_1) - D(u_2, v_2)| \leq L_D \left(|u_1 - u_2| + |v_1 - v_2|\right) \quad \forall u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}.
\]  

(1.5)

However, in this paper we consider \( D \) as in (1.1) to emphasize the connection to nonlinear diffusion and related applications (c.f. [13] [18]).

Our goal is to develop a numerical scheme for (1.1), (1.2) under minimal regularity assumptions on the kernel \( W \in L^2(Q^2) \) subject to some technical restrictions explained below. Under these assumptions, we approximate the nonlocal equation (1.1) by a system of ordinary differential equations

\[
\dot{u}_{n,i} = f_{n,i}(u_{n,i}, t) + \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} a_{n,j}D(u_{n,j} - u_{n,i}),
\]

(1.6)

where \( \bar{i} := (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d) \in [n]^d \), and \( \alpha_k \searrow 0 \) is a decreasing sequence of positive numbers specified below. Further,

\[
f_{n,\bar{i}}(u, t) = n^d \int_{Q_{n,\bar{i}}} f(u, x, t) \, dx, \quad Q_{n,\bar{i}} = \left[ \frac{i_1 - 1}{n}, \frac{i_1}{n} \right] \times \left[ \frac{i_2 - 1}{n}, \frac{i_2}{n} \right] \times \cdots \times \left[ \frac{i_d - 1}{n}, \frac{i_d}{n} \right].
\]

(1.7)

The key ingredient of the discrete model is a random array \( (a_{n,\bar{i}}), (\bar{i}, \bar{j}) \in [n]^{2d} \). Here, \( (a_{n,\bar{i}}) \) are independent \( 0/1 \)-valued random variables, whose distribution we explain below. We show that with the appropriate choice of \( (a_{n,\bar{i}}) \),

\[
u_n(t, x) = \sum_{\bar{i} \in [n]^d} u_{n,\bar{i}}(t) 1_{Q_{n,\bar{i}}}(x)
\]

(1.8)

approximates the solution of the IVP for (1.1)\footnote{\(1_A \) stands for the characteristic function of \( A \).}. Specifically, we show that \( \|u_n - u\|_{C([0,T];L^2(Q))} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), and estimate the rate of convergence. We do not discuss numerical discretization of the system of ODEs (1.6). This can be done using any classical numerical scheme (e.g. Euler’s, Runge-Kutta, etc), whose convergence is well understood. Instead, we focus on the relation of solutions of (1.1) and (1.6).

We use the random array \( (a_{n,\bar{i}}) \) to approximate the nonlocal term in (1.1) in the spirit of the Monte Carlo method. This affords a more efficient numerical procedure: we do not compute the integrand at every grid point but only at a random subset of these points. Furthermore, the distribution of \( a_{n,\bar{i}} \) is chosen in such a way that in the regions of fast growth of \( W \) are automatically covered by more grid points. Similar to the Monte Carlo approximation of integrals, the randomization of the numerical scheme is especially effective in nonlocal problems with low regularity of the kernel \( W \).
System of ODEs (1.6) can be viewed as coupled dynamical systems on a random graph defined by 
\((a_{n,ij})\). Convergence of such coupled systems on graphs to the continuum limit similar to (1.1) in one space 
dimension was studied in [16] [17] [12] [15]. The goal of this work is to study the implications of the analysis 
of the continuum limits for networks in [16] [17] [12] [15] to numerical discretization of the IVPs for nonlocal 
evolution equations. The main distinctions of the present study from the papers listed above are as follows. 
First, we consider (1.1) on a multidimensional spatial domain \(Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d\). In the previous work, the analysis 
was restricted to the problems on a unit interval. Second, we obtain rate of convergence estimates and relate 
the speed of convergence to the regularity of \(W \in L^2(Q^2)\). Finally, we analyze two examples illustrating 
how jump discontinuities and singularities in \(W\) affect the rate of convergence of the numerical scheme.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we formulate the assumptions on the model 
and present the discretization of (1.1). In Section 3, we prove convergence of the numerical metod. The 
error of the discretization depends on the accuracy of approximation of the kernel \(W\) and initial data by 
step functions. For smooth functions, it is straightforward to estimate the rate of convergence of such 
approximation. For integrable functions, the convergence of the appropriately constructed step functions 
can be shown via Lebesgue-Besicovitch Theorem [9] or Martingale Convergence Theorem [24] (see, e.g., 
the proof of Lemma 5.3 in [12]). However, neither of these theorems yields the rate of convergence. In fact, 
there are examples showing that the convergence can be made arbitrarily slow in general (see Theorem 4.1 
in [16]). Thus, the rate of convergence analysis requires additional assumptions beyond integrability. The 
discussion in Section 4 is aimed at finding the right approach to this this question. On one hand, we want to 
have a scale of function spaces that would allow to discern the accuracy of approximation of an integrable 
function by the step functions. On the other hand, we want to keep the regularity requirements as low as 
possible. To this end, we identify two main scenarios of the error formation in this problem and develop 
analytical estimates for the error of approximation by step functions for each case. When the error of 
approximation is distributed uniformly over the entire domain, it can be effectively estimated through a 
discrete analog of the bounded mean oscillation (BMO) norm of a function (cf. [22]), defined in § 4.2. This 
scenario holds for functions of vanishing mean oscillation (VMO) [19]. Alternatively, the error of 
approximation may be localized around codimension 1 hypersurfaces as the example in § 4.4 shows. To 
estimate the error of approximation in this case, we invoke a different approach. In § 4.1, we estimate the 
error of approximation through the \(L^p\)-modulus of continuity [1]. In Appendix A, for dyadic discretization 
of the spatial domain we present an alternative more direct derivation of the rate of convergence estimate. 
We illustrate our error estimates by analyzing two representative examples. In § 4.3, we consider a function 
with a singularity and in § 4.4 we deal with a \(\{0, 1\}\)-valued function. The analysis of the latter example 
shows that the rate of convergence estimate using the modulus of continuity compares well with the results 
of the direct analysis. In Section 5, we show how to deal with models, where \(W\) can take both positive and 
negative values. This allows to drop the nonnegativity assumption on \(W\), which was used for convenience 
throughout this paper. Finally, in Appendix B, we revisit the estimate of the error caused approximating 
the nonlocal coupling term by a random sum in (2.5) cited in Lemma 3.2. Here, we improve the result in 
Lemma 3.2 by imposing stronger assumptions on \(W\). The new error estimate when applicable yields faster 
overall convergence of the numerical method.
2 The model and its discretization

In this section, we formulate the technical assumptions on the kernel $W$ and describe the numerical scheme for solving the IVP (1.1)-(1.2).

We assume that $W \in L^2(\mathbb{Q}^2)$ is subject to the following assumptions:

$$\max \left\{ \text{ess sup}_{x \in \mathbb{Q}} \int |W(x,y)|dy, \text{ess sup}_{y \in \mathbb{Q}} \int |W(x,y)|dx \right\} \leq W_1,$$  \hfill (W-1)

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $W \in L^2(\mathbb{Q}^2)$ satisfy (W-1). Then for any $g \in L^2(\mathbb{Q})$ and $T > 0$ there is a unique solution of the IVP (1.1), (1.2) $u \in C^1(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{Q}))$.

**Proof.** The proof is as in [12, Theorem 3.1] with minor adjustments. \qed

We now present a randomized discretization of (1.1), (1.2). From now on we assume that $W \geq 0$. (2.1)

This is done to simplify presentation. In Section 5, we show how to construct the discrete scheme without this assumption. Next, we introduce a random directed graph on $N$ nodes, $\Gamma_n = (V(\Gamma_n), E(\Gamma_n))$. Throughout this paper, $N = n^d$. The set of vertices, $V(\Gamma_n)$, consists of $d$–tuples $\bar{i} = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d) \in [n]^d$. Two nodes $\bar{i} = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d)$ and $\bar{j} = (j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_d)$ form a directed edge with probability

$$P(\bar{i} \to \bar{j}) = \alpha_n W_{n,\bar{i},\bar{j}}, \quad \bar{i}, \bar{j} \in [n]^d,$$  \hfill (2.2)

where $1 \geq \alpha_k \searrow 0$ is a decreasing sequence of positive numbers such that $k\alpha_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Further,

$$W_{n,\bar{i},\bar{j}} = N^2 \int_{Q_{n,\bar{i}} \times Q_{n,\bar{j}}} \tilde{W}_n(x,y) dx dy,$$  \hfill (2.3)

where

$$\tilde{W}_n(x,y) := \alpha_n^{-1} \land W(x,y)$$  \hfill (2.4)

and $Q_{n,\bar{i}}, \tilde{\bar{i}} \in [n]^d$, are defined in (1.7).

As a discretization of the IVP (1.1), (1.2), we propose the following system of ODEs on random graph $\Gamma_n$:

$$\dot{u}_{n,\bar{i}} = f_{n,\bar{i}}(u_{n,\bar{i}},t) + (\alpha_nN)^{-1} \sum_{\bar{j} \in [n]^d} a_{n,\bar{i},\bar{j}} D(u_{n,\bar{j}} - u_{n,\bar{i}}), \quad \bar{i} \in [n]^d,$$  \hfill (2.5)

$$u_{n,\bar{i}}(0) = g_{n,\bar{i}},$$  \hfill (2.6)

where

$$g_{n,\bar{i}} = g_{Q_{n,\bar{i}}} := n^d \int_{Q_{n,\bar{i}}} g(x) dx, \quad f_{n,\bar{i}}(u,t) = N \int_{Q_{n,\bar{i}}} f(u,x,t) dx, \quad \text{and} \quad a_{n,\bar{i},\bar{j}} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \bar{i} \to \bar{j}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$  \hfill (2.7)
3 Convergence of the numerical method

Theorem 3.1. Suppose $W \in L^p(Q^2)$, $p \geq 2$, is subject to \( (W-1), D, f, \) and $g$ are as in (1.1), (1.2). Then for arbitrary $0 < \delta < 0.5 - \gamma$, we have

$$
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| u(t, \cdot) - u_n(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C \left( \| g - g_n \|_{L^2(Q)} + \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0,T]} \| f(u, \cdot, t) - f_n(u, \cdot, t) \|_{L^2(Q)} ight) + \| W - W_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2 + \| \tilde{W}_n - P_n \tilde{W}_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2 + n^{-d(1/2 - \gamma - \delta)} \),
$$

(3.1)

where $C$ is a positive constant independent of $n$, and $P_n \tilde{W}_n =: W_n$ stands for the $L^2$-projection of $\tilde{W}_n$ onto the finite-dimensional subspace $X_n = \text{span}\{ \mathbf{1}_{Q_{n,i} \times Q_{n,j}}, (i, j) \in [n]^{2d} \}$:

$$
W_n(x, y) = \sum_{(i, j) \in [n]^{2d}} W_{n, ij} \mathbf{1}_{Q_{n,i} \times Q_{n,j}}(x, y).
$$

and

$$
f_n(u, x, t) = \sum_{\bar{i} \in [n]^d} f_{n, \bar{i}}(u, t) \mathbf{1}_{Q_{n, \bar{i}}}(x).
$$

The first two terms on the right-hand side of (3.1) correspond to the error of approximation of the initial data $g \in L^2(Q)$ and $f(u, x)$ by the step functions in $x$. Further, $\| \tilde{W}_n - W \|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2$ and $\| \tilde{W}_n - P_n \tilde{W}_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2$ bound the error of approximation of (the unbounded, in general) $W \in L^2(Q^2)$ by a bounded step function $W_n$. Here, the first term $\| \tilde{W}_n - W \|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2$ is the error of truncating $W$ and the second term $\| \tilde{W}_n - P_n \tilde{W}_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)}$ is the error of approximating the truncated function $\tilde{W}_n$ by projecting it onto $X_n$. Finally, the last term on the right-hand side of (3.1) is the error of the approximation of the nonlocal term by the random sum in (2.5).

The proof of Theorem 3.1 modulo a few minor details proceeds as the proof of convergence to the continuum limit in [17][15]. First, the solution of the IVP (2.5), (2.6) is compared to that of the IVP for the averaged equation:

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{v}_{n, \bar{i}} &= f_{n, \bar{i}}(v_{n, \bar{i}}, t) + N^{-1} \sum_{\bar{j} \in [n]^d} W_{n, \bar{i} \bar{j}} D(u_{n, \bar{j}} - u_{n, \bar{i}}), \quad \bar{i} \in [n]^d, \\
v_{n, \bar{i}}(0) &= g_{n, \bar{i}}.
\end{align*}
$$

(3.2)

(3.3)

Then the solution of the averaged problem is compared to the solution of the IVP (1.1), (1.2). It is convenient to view the solution of the averaged problem as a function on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times Q$:

$$
v_n(t, x) = \sum_{\bar{i} \in [n]^d} v_{n, \bar{i}}(t) \mathbf{1}_{Q_{n, \bar{i}}}(x).
$$

(3.4)

Likewise, we interpret the solution of the discrete problem (2.5), (2.6) as a function on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times Q$:

$$
u_n(t, x) = \sum_{\bar{i} \in [n]^d} u_{n, \bar{i}}(t) \mathbf{1}_{Q_{n, \bar{i}}}(x).
$$

(3.5)
We recast the IVP (2.5), (2.6) as follows
\[
\partial_t v_n(t, x) = f_n(v_n(t, x), x, t) + \int W_n(x, y) D (v_n(t, y) - v_n(t, x)) \, dy, \quad (3.6)
\]
\[
v_n(t, x) = g_n(x). \quad (3.7)
\]

The first step of the proof of convergence of the numerical scheme (2.5), (2.6) is accomplished in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** [15, Corollary 4.1] Let nonnegative \( W \in L^2(Q^2) \) subject to \((W-1), \) and \( \alpha_n = n^{-d\gamma}, \gamma \in (0, 0.5) \) (cf. (4.17)). Then for solutions of (2.5) and (3.2) subject to the same initial conditions, we have
\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| u_n(t, \cdot) - v_n(t, \cdot) \|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C n^{-d(1/2 - \gamma - \delta)} \text{ a.s.,} \quad (3.8)
\]
for arbitrary \( T > 0, 0 < \delta < 1/2 - \gamma, \) and positive constant \( C \) independent of \( n. \)

**Remark 3.3.** Under slightly stronger assumptions on \( W, \) the rate of convergence in (3.8) can be improved to \( O(n^{-d(1-\gamma-\delta)}) \) (see Section B).

**Remark 3.4.** For the proof of Lemma 3.2, we need the following conditions
\[
\max \left\{ \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in Q} \int \tilde{W}_n(x, y) dx, \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in Q} \int \tilde{W}_n(x, y) dy \right\} \leq \tilde{W}_1 \quad (W'-1)
\]
for some positive constant \( \tilde{W}_1. \) In [15], these conditions were postulated. Here, we show that \((W'-1)\) follows from \((W-1)\) with the same constant \( \tilde{W}_1 = W_1. \) Indeed, recall that \( W \geq 0 \) and note that for fixed \( \bar{k} \in [n]^d \) and any \( x \in Q_{n, \bar{k}}, \) we have
\[
\int \tilde{W}_n(x, y) dy = \int \sum_{j \in [n]^d} (\tilde{W}_n)_{Q_{n, \bar{k}} \times Q_{n,j}} \mathbf{1}_{Q_{n, \bar{k}} \times Q_{n,j}} (x, y) \, dy
\]
\[
= \sum_{j \in [n]^d} N \int_{Q_{n,j}} \tilde{W}_n \, dx \, dy \quad (3.9)
\]
\[
\leq N \int_{Q_{n, \bar{k}}} \left\{ \int_{Q} |W(x, y)| \, dy \right\} \, dx \leq W_1.
\]
The bound for \( \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in Q} \int \tilde{W}_n(x, y) dy \) is proved similarly.

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Denote the difference between the solutions of the original IVP (1.1), (1.2) and the averaged IVP (3.6), (3.7)
\[
w_n(t, x) = u(t, x) - v_n(t, x). \quad (3.10)
\]
By subtracting (3.2) from (1.1), multiplying the resultant equation by \( w_n \), and integrating over \( Q \), we obtain
\[
\int \partial_t w_n(t, x) w_n(t, x) dx = \int (f(u(t, x), x, t) - f(v_n(t, x), x, t)) w_n(t, x) dx \\
+ \int (f(v_n(t, x), x, t) - f_n(v_n(t, x), x, t)) w_n(t, x) dx \\
+ \int \int W(x, y) [D(u(t, y) - u(t, x)) - D(v_n(t, y) - v_n(t, x))] w_n(t, x) dy dx \\
+ \int \int (W(x, y) - W_n(x, y)) D(v_n(t, y) - v_n(t, x)) w_n(t, x) dy dx.
\]
(3.11)

Using Lipschitz continuity of \( f(u, x, t) \) in \( u \) and an elementary case of the Young’s inequality, we obtain
\[
\left| \int (f(u(t, x), x, t) - f(v_n(t, x), x, t)) w_n(t, x) dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} (1 + L_f^2) \int w_n(t, x)^2 dx,
\]
(3.12)
\[
\left| \int (f(v_n(t, x), x, t) - f_n(v_n(t, x), x, t)) w_n(t, x) dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int (f(v_n(t, x), x, t) - f_n(v_n(t, x), x, t))^2 dx \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \| w_n(t, \cdot) \|^2,
\]
(3.13)
where \( \| \cdot \| \) stands for the \( L^2(Q) \)-norm. Recall that \( D \) is bounded by 1 (cf. (1.4)). Using this bound and the Young’s inequality, we obtain
\[
\left| \int \int (W(x, y) - W_n(x, y)) D(v_n(t, y) - v_n(t, x)) w_n(t, x) dy dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \| W - W_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)} \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \| w_n \|^2.
\]
(3.14)

Finally, using Lipschitz continuity of \( D \) and Young’s inequality, we estimate
\[
\left| \int \int W(x, y) [D(u(t, y) - u(t, x)) - D(v_n(t, y) - v_n(t, x))] w_n(t, x) dy dx \right| \\
\leq L_D \int \int W(x, y) (|w_n(t, y)| + |w_n(t, x)|) |w_n(t, x)| dy dx \\
\leq L_D \int \int W(x, y) \left( \frac{1}{2} |w_n(t, y)|^2 + \frac{3}{2} |w_n(t, x)|^2 \right) dy dx \\
\leq \frac{3L_D}{2} \int \int W(x, y) |w_n(t, x)|^2 dy dx + \frac{L_D}{2} \int \int W(x, y) |w_n(t, y)|^2 dy dx \\
\leq 2W_1 L_D \| w_n \|^2,
\]
(3.15)
where we used Fubini theorem and (W-1) in the last line.

By combining (3.11)-(3.15), we arrive at
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \| w_n(t, \cdot) \|^2 \leq L \| w_n(t, \cdot) \|^2 + \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0,T]} \| f(u, \cdot, t) - f_n(u, \cdot, t) \|^2 + \| W_n - W \|^2,
\]
(3.16)
where $L = 2 + L_f^2 + L_D(3W_1 + W_2)$.

By Gronwall’s inequality, we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|w_n(t, \cdot)\| \leq e^{LT/2} \sqrt{\|w_n(0, \cdot)\|^2 + \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0,T]} \|f(u, \cdot, t) - f_n(u, \cdot, t)\|^2 + \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2}
\leq e^{LT/2} \left( \|g - g_n\|_{L^2(Q)} + \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0,T]} \|f(u, \cdot, t) - f_n(u, \cdot, t)\| + \|W_n - W\|_{L^2(Q^2)} \right).$$

\[\square\]

4 Approximation by step functions

4.1 The rate of convergence estimate using the modulus of continuity

To obtain quantitative estimates for the convergence rate using (3.1), we need to clarify the accuracy of approximation of function $f \in L^p(Q)$ by the piecewise constant function

$$f_n = \sum_{i \in [n]^d} f_{Q_{n,i}} 1_{Q_{n,i}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where as before each $Q_{n,i}$ is a $d$-cube with the side $h = n^{-1}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $f$ is extended to $\mathbb{R}^d$ by zero. The error of approximation

$$\Delta_{n,p}(Q) = \|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} \quad (4.2)$$

can be effectively estimated through the $L^p$–modulus of continuity of $f$

$$\omega_p(f, \delta) = \sup_{|\xi| \leq \delta} \|f(\cdot + \xi) - f(\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (4.3)$$

In fact, we have the following lemma

**Lemma 4.1.**

$$\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq C \omega_p(f, \sqrt{dh}) \quad (4.4)$$

where $C$ depends only on $d$.

**Corollary 4.2.** In particular, if $f$ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ then

$$\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq Ch^\alpha.$$

**Proof of Corollary 4.2** Clearly, $\omega_p(f, \delta) \leq Ch^\alpha. \quad \square$
Proof of Lemma 4.1. We include a short proof following [11, Theorem 5]. Using Jensen’s inequality and Fubini’s theorem, we have

\[
\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)}^p = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^d} \int_{Q_{n,i}} h^{-d} \left(\int_{Q_{n,i}} |f(x) - f(z)|^p \, dz\right)^p \, dx
\]

\[
\leq h^{-d} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^d} \int_{Q_{n,i}} \left(\int_{B_{\sqrt{\sigma}h} = \{ |y| \leq \sqrt{\sigma}h \}} |f(x) - f(y)|^p \, dy\right) dx
\]

\[
= h^{-d} \int_{B_{\sqrt{\sigma}h}} \int_{Q} |f(x) - f(x + y)|^p \, dx \, dy
\]

\[
\leq \omega^p_p(f, \sqrt{\sigma}h)|B_{\sqrt{\sigma}h}| h^{-d}
\]

\[
= C_d \omega^p_p(f, \sqrt{\sigma}h), \quad C_d = |B_{\sqrt{\sigma}h}| h^{-d} = \frac{(\pi d)^{d/2}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2} + 1\right)},
\]

where \(|B_{\sqrt{\sigma}h}|\) stands for the volume of \(B_{\sqrt{\sigma}h}\). \(\square\)

Remark 4.3. To estimate \(\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)}\) for dyadic discretization of \(Q\), one can use a more direct method, which does not require the Jensen’s inequality and yields a smaller constant. We include an alternative proof in Appendix A.

4.2 The rate of convergence estimate for VMO functions

Let \(Q_h\) denote a \(d\)-cube with sides parallel to coordinate planes and side \(h\).

Definition 4.4. For \(f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d), \ p \geq 1\) and \(h > 0\), define

\[
\sigma_p(f, h) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\sup_{Q_h} \left( h^{-d} \int_{Q_h} |f(x) - f_{Q_h}|^p \, dx \right)^{1/p}, & p \in [1, \infty), \\
\sup_{Q_h} \sup_{x \in Q_h} |f(x) - f_{Q_h}|, & p = \infty.
\end{array} \right.
\]

(4.6)

If \(f\) is a BMO function then \(\sup_{h \to 0} \sigma_1(f, h)\) coincides with the BMO norm of \(f\) [22]. Likewise, for \(p \geq 1\), \(\sup_{h \to 0} \sigma_p(f, h)\) is a norm in \(BMO_p\) [22]. If \(\lim_{h \to 0} \sigma_1(f, h) = 0\) function \(f\) is said to have vanishing mean oscillation, \(f \in VMO\) [19]. By analogy, for \(p > 1\) we say that \(f \in VMO_p\) if \(\lim_{h \to 0} \sigma_p(f, h) = 0\).

The following lemma shows that \(\sigma_p(f, h)\) yields an upper bound for \(\Delta_{n,p}(Q)\).

Lemma 4.5. For \(f \in L^p(Q), \ p \geq 1\),

\[
\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq \sigma_p(f, h).
\]

Moreover, if \(f \in VMO_p\) then

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} = 0.
\]

(4.8)
Proof. Both (4.7) and (4.8) clearly hold for \( p = \infty \). Thus, below we assume \( p \in [1, \infty) \). By rewriting \( \Delta_{n,p}(Q) \), we obtain

\[
\Delta_{n,p}(Q) = \left\{ \int_{Q} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \left( f(x) - h^{-d} \int_{Q_{n,i}} f(y) dy \right) 1_{Q_{n,i}}(x) \right|^p dx \right\}^{1/p}
\]

\[
= \left\{ \int_{Q} \left| \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \left( f(x) - h^{-d} \int_{Q_{n,i}} f(y) dy \right) 1_{Q_{n,i}}(x) \right|^p dx \right\}^{1/p}
\]

\[= \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \| f - f_n \|_{L^p(Q_{n,i})}^p \right\}^{1/p}
\]

Further,

\[
\Delta_{n,p}^p(Q_{n,\tilde{i}}) = \int_{Q_{n,\tilde{i}}} |f(x) - f_{Q_{n,\tilde{i}}}|^p dx \leq Q_{n,\tilde{i}} \sigma_p^p(f, h).
\]

Thus,

\[\Delta_{n,p}(Q) \leq \sigma_p(f, h). \tag{4.11}\]

If \( f \in VMO_p, \ p \geq 1 \), the right–hand side of (4.11) tends to 0 as \( h \to 0 \) and (4.8) follows.

It follows from (4.9) that

\[\| f - f_n \|_{L^p(Q)} = \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \Delta_{n,p}^p(Q_{n,i}).\]

Suppose that the local error \( \Delta_{n,p}(Q_{n,\tilde{i}}) \) has the same order of magnitude as \( \sigma_p(f, h) \) for most \( \tilde{i} \in [n]^d \). Then Lemma 4.5 gives a good estimate of the error of approximation through \( \sigma_p(f, h) \). We refer to this scenario as a uniform error distribution. It holds when \( f \in VMO_p \). In this case, the rate of convergence of (4.8) to 0 is completely determined by the asymptotic behavior of \( \sigma_p(f, h) \). To quantify the convergence rate, we introduce the following scale of function spaces

\[ S_{p,\alpha}(Q) = \{ \phi \in L^p(Q) : \sigma_p(\phi, h) = O(h^\alpha) \}, \ p \geq 1, \ 0 < \alpha \leq 1. \tag{4.12}\]

In §4.4 we present an example illustrating an alternative scenario of nonuniform error distribution.

### 4.3 A singular graphon

In the remainder of this section, we analyze the rate of convergence for two representative examples. In the first example, we estimate the error of approximation of a singular function. The second example deals with the approximation of a \( \{0,1\} \)-valued function with fractal boundary of support.

\(^{3}\) \( f \in VMO \) iff \( f \) is in the \( BMO \)-closure of uniformly continuous functions (cf. [19]).
Consider the problem of approximation by step functions of the singular kernel graphon

\[ W(x, y) = \frac{1}{|x - y|^{\lambda}}, \quad x, y \in Q = [0, 1]^d, \quad (4.13) \]

where \( 0 < \lambda < d/2 \).

**Lemma 4.6.**

\[ \| W - W_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)} \leq \max \left\{ O \left( h^{d\gamma \left( \frac{d}{2\lambda} - 1 \right)} \right), O \left( h^{1-d\gamma \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \right)} \right) \right\}. \quad (4.14) \]

**Proof.**

1. Below, we will use the following change of variables \((x, y) = T(u, v)\) for \((x, y)\) and \((u, v)\) from \( \mathbb{R}^{2d} \), defined by

\[ u_i = x_i - y_i \quad \text{and} \quad v_i = x_i + y_i, \quad i \in [d]. \quad (4.15) \]

2. Let \( \alpha_n = n^{-d\gamma} \) and recall that \( \tilde{W}_n = h^{-d\gamma} \land W \). Denote \( \tilde{Q} = \{(x, y) \in Q^2 : |x - y|^{-\lambda} \geq h^{-d\gamma} \} \). Further,

\[
\| W - \tilde{W}_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)}^2 = \int_{Q^2} \left( \frac{1}{|x - y|^{\lambda}} - n^{d\gamma} \right)^2 \, dxdy \\
\leq C_1 \int_{\{|u| \leq h^{\frac{d\gamma}{\lambda}}\}} \left( \frac{1}{|u|^{\lambda}} - n^{d\gamma} \right)^2 \, du \\
\leq C_2 \int_0^{h^{\frac{d\gamma}{\lambda}}} \left( \frac{1}{r^{\lambda}} - n^{d\gamma} \right)^2 r^{d-1} \, dr \\
= O \left( (d-2\lambda)^{-1} h^{2d\gamma \left( \frac{d}{2\lambda} - 1 \right)} \right),
\]

where we used (4.15) followed by the change to polar coordinates.

Thus,

\[
\| W - \tilde{W}_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)} = O \left( h^{d\gamma \left( \frac{d}{2\lambda} - 1 \right)} \right), \quad 0 < \lambda < d/2, \quad \gamma > 0. \quad (4.17)
\]

3. Next we turn to estimating \( \| \tilde{W}_n - W_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)} \). Since the truncated function \( \tilde{W}_n \) is Lipschitz continuous on \( Q^2 \), by Corollary 4.2,

\[
\| \tilde{W}_n - W_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)} \leq L(\tilde{W}_n) h.
\]

It remains to estimate the Lipschitz constant \( L(\tilde{W}_n) \leq \text{ess sup}_{Q^2} |\nabla \tilde{W}_n| \). On \( Q^2 - \tilde{Q} \),

\[
|\nabla \tilde{W}_n| = \lambda |x - y|^{-1-\lambda} |\nabla_{x,y}|x - y|| = \sqrt{2}\lambda |x - y|^{-1-\lambda}. \quad (4.18)
\]

The gradient approaches its greatest value as \( |x - y| \gtrsim h^{\frac{d\gamma}{\lambda}} \). Thus,

\[
\text{ess sup}_{Q^2} |\nabla \tilde{W}_n| = \sqrt{2}\lambda h^{-d\gamma \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} + 1 \right)}
\]

and

\[
\| \tilde{W}_n - W_n \|_{L^2(Q^2)} = O \left( h^{1-d\gamma \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \right)} \right). \quad (4.19)
\]
4. The statement of the lemma follows (4.17) and (4.19) and the triangle inequality.

The analysis of this example shows that $\gamma$ can be used to optimize the rate of convergence. Specifically, by setting the two exponents of $h$ on the right–hand side of (4.14) equal, we see that the rate is optimal for

$$\gamma = \lambda \left( \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

which yields the optimal convergence rate

$$\|W - W_n\|_{L^2(Q^2)} = O(h^{\left(\frac{d}{2} - \lambda\right)\left(\frac{d}{2} + 1\right)}).$$

4.4 $\{0, 1\}$-valued functions

Our next example concerns approximation of $\{0, 1\}$–valued functions on $Q$ by step functions of the form (4.1). An example in [16] shows that the accuracy of approximation of such functions depends on the fractal dimension of the boundary of support of the function at hand. Furthermore, the rate of convergence can be made arbitrarily slow by making the boundary more complex. It is therefore of interest to show that the $L^p$–modulus of continuity used in Lemma 4.1 captures the rate of convergence of $\Delta_{n,p}(Q)$ to zero for such functions. To this end, we generalize the example from [16].

Let $Q^+$ be a closed subset of $Q$ and consider

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in Q^+ \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(4.20)

Denote by $\partial Q^+$ the boundary of $Q$ and recall the box-counting dimension of $\partial Q^+$

$$\gamma := \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\log N_h(\partial Q^+)}{-\log h},$$

(4.21)

where $N_h(\partial Q^+)$ stands for the number of $Q_{n,\tilde{i}}, \tilde{i} \in [n]^d$, having nonempty intersection with $\partial Q^+$ (cf. [10]). Below, for simplicity we assume that the limit in (4.21) exists.\footnote{Otherwise, one can use the upper box–counting dimension [19].}

**Lemma 4.7.**

$$\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq C h^{\frac{d-\gamma}{p}},$$

(4.22)

for some positive $C$ independent on $n$.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq h^{-d} \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \int_{Q_{n,i}} \int_{Q_{n,\tilde{i}}} |f(x) - f(z)|^p \, dz \, dx.$$  

(4.23)
Note that the only nonzero terms in the sum on the right-hand side of (4.23) are the integrals over $Q_{n,i}$'s having nonempty intersection with $\partial Q^+$. Thus,

$$\|f - f_n\|_{L^p(Q)} = h^d N_h(\partial Q^+) \leq C h^{d-\gamma},$$

(4.24)

where we used (4.21).

**Remark 4.8.** Note that as $\gamma \to d - 0$ the rate of convergence in (4.22) can be made arbitrarily slow.

Next, we show that $\omega(f, h) = O(h^{d-\gamma})$. To this end, we recall an alternative characterization of the box–counting dimension of $\partial Q^+$

$$\gamma = d - \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\log |(\partial Q^+)_\delta|}{\log \delta},$$

(4.25)

where $|(\partial Q^+)_\delta|$ stands for the volume of the $\delta$–neighborhood of $\partial Q^+$. With this definition in hand, we estimate

$$\omega_p^p(f, h) = \sup_{|\xi| \leq h} \int_Q |f(x) - f(x + \xi)|^p \, dx \leq \int_{(\partial Q^+)_h} dx \leq C h^{d-\gamma},$$

(4.26)

where we used (4.21) in the second line.

We conclude that the rate of convergence analysis using the $L^p$–modulus of continuity is consistent with the direct estimation in (4.24).

On the other hand, we have

$$\omega_p(W, h) = \sup_{0 \leq h_1, h_2 \leq h} \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |W(x + h_1, y + h_2) - W(x, y)|^p \, dx \, dy \right)^{1/p}$$

$$\leq 2 \sup_{0 \leq h_1 \leq h} \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |W(x + h_1, y) - W(x, y)|^p \, dx \, dy \right)^{1/p}$$

(4.27)

$$\leq 4 \left( \int_0^1 \int_y^{y+h} \, dx \, dy \right)^{1/p}$$

$$= O(h^{1/p}).$$

By (A.2), we have $\Delta_{n,p}([0, 1]^2) = O(h^{1/p})$. Thus, the error using the modulus of continuity agrees with the results of the direct analysis above.

### 5 Generalizations

The nonnegativity assumption (2.1) was used for analytical convenience only. Here, we comment how to extend our results to models without the restriction on the sign of $W \in L^2(Q^2)$. 
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Write \( W = W^+ - W^- \), where \( W^+ \) and \( W^- \) stand for the positive and negative parts of \( W \) and denote
\[
\tilde{W}^+_n = \alpha_n \wedge W^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{W}^-_n = \alpha_n \wedge W^-.
\]
We define graphs on \( n \) nodes, \( \Gamma^+_n \) and \( \Gamma^-_n \), whose edge sets are defined using the graphons \( W^+ \) and \( W^- \) respectively. Thus, the original model can be rewritten as
\[
\tilde{u}_{n,i} = f(u_{n,i}, t) + (n\alpha_n)^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{n,ij}^+ D(u_{n,j} - u_{n,i}) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{n,ik}^- D(u_{n,k} - u_{n,i}) \right), \quad i \in [n], \tag{5.1}
\]
where \( (a_{n,ij}^+) \) and \( (a_{n,ij}^-) \) are weighted adjacency matrices of \( \Gamma^+_n \) and \( \Gamma^-_n \). The numerical scheme for (5.1) is set up and analyzed in exactly the same way as that for (1.1).

For the analysis of the discrete scheme (5.1), we need the following observation. We note that assumption (1.1) implies
\[
\max \left\{ \sup_{x \in Q} \int_{Q} \tilde{W}^+_n(x,y)dy, \sup_{y \in Q} \int_{Q} \tilde{W}^-_n(x,y)dx \right\} \leq W_1, \tag{W" - 1}
\]
where
\[
\tilde{W}^+_n = \sum_{i,j \in [n]^d} \langle \tilde{W}^+_n \rangle_{Q_{n,i} \times Q_{n,j}} 1_{Q_{n,i}} \times 1_{Q_{n,j}}
\]
The proof is based on the argument in Remark 3.4.

### A Dyadic discretization

In this section, we consider dyadic discretization of \( Q \). In particular, we approximate \( f \in L^p(Q) \) by a piecewise constant function
\[
f_{2^m} = \sum_{i \in [2^m]^d} f_{Q_{2^m,i}} 1_{Q_{2^m,i}}, \tag{A.1}
\]
where \( Q_{2^m, i} = [x_{2^m, i_1-1}, x_{2^m, i_1}) \times [x_{2^m, i_2-1}, x_{2^m, i_2}) \times \cdots \times [x_{2^m, i_d-1}, x_{2^m, i_d}) \) and \( x_{2^m, i} = i/2^m, \ i \in [2^m] \).

**Lemma A.1.** For \( f \in \text{Lip}(p, \alpha) \), we have
\[
\| f - f_{2^m} \|_{L^p(Q)} \leq C 2^{-\alpha m}, \tag{A.2}
\]
where \( C \) is independent of \( m \).

**Proof.** Fix \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) and denote \( h := 2^{-m} \). To simplify notation, throughout the proof we drop \( 2^m \) in the subscript of \( x_{2^m, i} \) and \( Q_{2^m, i} \).

We write
\[
f_{2^{m+1}}(x) = \sum_{i \in [2^m]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0,1\}^d} \left( \frac{2}{h} \right)^d \int_{Q_{i,j}} f \left( s + \frac{j}{2} \right) ds 1_{Q_{i,j}}(x), \tag{A.3}
\]
Further, where
\[
\|s + \frac{jh}{2} = \left( s_1 + \frac{j_1 h}{2}, s_2 + \frac{j_2 h}{2}, \ldots, s_d + \frac{j_d h}{2} \right),
\]
\[
Q^j_i = \left[ x_{i_1-1} + \frac{h}{2}, x_{i_1-1} + (j_1 + 1) \frac{h}{2} \right] \times \cdots \times \left[ x_{i_d-1} + \frac{h}{2}, x_{i_d-1} + (j_d + 1) \frac{h}{2} \right),
\]
and
\[
Q^j_i = \left[ x_{i_1-1}, x_{i_1-1} + \frac{h}{2} \right] \times \cdots \times \left[ x_{i_d-1}, x_{i_d-1} + \frac{h}{2} \right).
\]

Rewrite (A.1)
\[
f^{2m}(x) = \sum_{i \in [2m]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0,1\}^d} \left( \frac{1}{h} \right)^d \left\{ \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^d} \int_{Q^j_i} f \left( s + \frac{k h}{2} \right) ds \right\} 1_{Q^j_i}(x). \tag{A.4}
\]

By subtracting (A.3) from (A.4) we have
\[
f^{2m} - f^{2m+1} = \sum_{i \in [2m]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0,1\}^d} \frac{1}{h^d} \left\{ \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^d, k \neq j} \int_{Q^j_i} f \left( s + \frac{k h}{2} \right) - f \left( s + \frac{j h}{2} \right) ds \right\} 1_{Q^j_i}.
\]

Further,
\[
|f^{2m} - f^{2m+1}|^p \leq h^{-dp} \sum_{i \in [2m]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^d, k \neq j} \left| \int_{Q^j_i} f \left( s + \frac{k h}{2} \right) - f \left( s + \frac{j h}{2} \right) ds \right|^p 1_{Q^j_i}. \tag{A.5}
\]

Integrating both sides of (A.5) over Q and using Holder’s inequality, we continue
\[
\|f^{2m} - f^{2m+1}\|_{L^p(Q)}^p \leq h^{-d(p-1)} \sum_{i \in [2m]^d} \sum_{j \in \{0,1\}^d} \sum_{k \in \{0,1\}^d, k \neq j} \left( \int_{Q^j_i} | f \left( s + \frac{k h}{2} \right) - f \left( s + \frac{j h}{2} \right) | ds \right)^p \left( \int_{Q^j_i} dx \right)^{p-1}
\]
\[
\leq 2^{-d(p-1)} \omega_p^p(f, h/2). \tag{A.6}
\]

Thus,
\[
\|f^{2m} - f^{2m+1}\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq 2^{-d(p+1)} \omega_p(f, 2^{-(m+1)}). \tag{A.7}
\]

Since \(f \in \text{Lip}(p, \alpha)\),
\[
\omega_p(f, h) \leq Ch^\alpha \tag{A.8}
\]
for some $C$. Using (A.7) and (A.8), we have
\[
\|f - f_2\|_{L^p(Q)} = \left\| \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} (f_{2k+1} - f_{2k}) \right\|_{L^p(Q)} \leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \|f_{2k+1} - f_{2k}\|_{L^p(Q)} \\
\leq 2^{-p+1} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \omega_p(f, 2^{-(k+1)}) \leq 2^{-p+1} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} C 2^{\alpha(k+1)} \leq C 2^{\alpha} = Ch^\alpha.
\]

\[\square\]

**B Averaging**

In this section, we revise the estimate of the error due to approximating the nonlocal coupling term by a random sum in (2.5) cited in Lemma 3.2. Below we improve the result in Lemma 3.2 by imposing stronger assumptions on $W$. The proof of the new estimate follows the lines of the proof of the corresponding result in [15]. The improvement is due to the use of higher order moments and a more careful use of the concentration inequalities. While these modifications are technical, the new error estimate can yield a faster overall convergence of the numerical method. For this reason, we present the proof of the improved estimate below.

**Theorem B.1.** Let nonnegative $W \in L^4(Q^2)$ satisfy
\[
\max \left\{ \text{ess sup}_{x \in Q} \int W^k(x, y) dy \leq W_1, \text{ ess sup}_{y \in Q} \int W^k(x, y) dx \leq \bar{W}_k, \quad k \in [4] \right\} \quad \text{(W-1s)}
\]
and
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{\alpha_n n^d}{\ln n} > 0. \quad \text{(B.1)}
\]

Then for solutions of (2.5) and (3.2) subject to the same initial conditions and arbitrary $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have
\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_n(t, \cdot) - v_n(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C (\alpha_n n^d)^{1-\epsilon} \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \text{(B.2)}
\]
for arbitrary $T > 0$ and positive constant $C$ independent of $n$. In particular, for $\alpha_n = n^{-d\gamma}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we have
\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_n(t, \cdot) - v_n(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C n^{-d(1-\gamma-\delta)} \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \text{(B.3)}
\]
where $0 < \delta < 1 - \gamma$ can be taken arbitrarily small.

Arguing as in (3.9) and using Jensen’s inequality, we see that (W-1s) implies
\[
\max \left\{ \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{i \in [n]^d} N^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} W^k_{n, ij}, \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{i \in [n]^d} N^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} W^k_{n, ij} \right\} \leq \bar{W}_k, \quad k \in [4]. \quad \text{(B.4)}
\]

We precede the proof of Theorem B.1 with two auxiliary estimates. The following two lemmas are adapted from [6].
Lemma B.2. For $K \geq 2\bar{W}_1$, we have
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left| \frac{a_{n,ij}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,ij} \right| \geq KN \right) \leq N \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(K - 2\bar{W}_1)^2}{\bar{W}_1 + O(\alpha_n) + K} \right) \right\}. \tag{B.5}
\]
In particular, with probability 1 there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
\[
\max \left\{ \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left| \frac{a_{n,ij}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,ij} \right|, \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left| \frac{a_{n,ji}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,ji} \right| \right\} \leq KN \tag{B.6}
\]
for all $n \geq n_0$.

For the next lemma, we will need the following notation
\[
Z_{n,i}(t) = N^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} b_{n,ij}(t) \eta_{n,ij}, \tag{B.7}
\]
\[
b_{n,ij}(t) = D \left( v_{n,j}(t) - v_{n,i}(t) \right), \tag{B.8}
\]
\[
\eta_{n,ij} = a_{n,ij} - \alpha_n W_{n,ij}, \tag{B.9}
\]
and $Z_n = (Z_{n,i}, i \in [n]^d)$.

Lemma B.3. For arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, we have
\[
\alpha_n^{-2} \int_0^\infty e^{-L_s} \|Z_n(s)\|_{2,N}^2 ds \leq C(\alpha_n N)^{1-\epsilon}, \tag{B.10}
\]
where $C$ is a positive constant independent of $n$ and
\[
\|Z_n(s)\|_{2,N} = \left( n^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} Z_{n,j}(s)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{B.11}
\]

Proof of Theorem B.1. Recall that $f(u, x, t)$ and $D$ are Lipschitz continuous function in $u$ with Lipschitz constants $L_f$ and $L_D$ respectively.

Further, $a_{n,ij}$, are Bernoulli random variables
\[
\mathbb{P}(a_{n,ij} = 1) = \alpha_n W_{n,ij}. \tag{B.12}
\]

Denote $\psi_{n,i} := v_{n,i} - u_{n,i}$. By subtracting 13 from 10, multiplying the result by $N^{-1}\psi_{n,i}$, and summing over $i \in [n]^d$, we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\psi_n\|_{2,N}^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \left( f(v_{n,i}, t) - f(u_{n,i}, t) \right) \psi_{n,i} + N^{-2} \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{i, j \in [n]^d} \left( \alpha_n W_{n,ij} - a_{n,ij} \right) D(v_{n,j} - v_{n,i}) \psi_{n,i} + N^{-2} \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{i, j \in [n]^d} a_{n,ij} \left[ D(v_{n,j} - v_{n,i}) - D(u_{n,j} - u_{n,i}) \right] \psi_{n,i} =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \tag{B.13}
\]
where $\| \cdot \|_{2,N}^2$ is the discrete $L^2$-norm (cf. (B.11)).

Using Lipschitz continuity of $f$ in $u$, we have
\[
|I_1| \leq L_f \| \psi_n \|_{2,N}^2. \tag{B.14}
\]

Using Lipschitz continuity of $D$ and the triangle inequality, we have
\[
|I_3| \leq L_D N^{-2} \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{i,j \in [n]^d} a_{n,i,j} (|\psi_{n,i}| + |\psi_{n,j}|) |\psi_{n,i}| \leq L_D N^{-2} \alpha_n^{-1} \left( \frac{3}{2} \sum_{i,j \in [n]^d} a_{n,i,j} |\psi_{n,i}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in [n]^d} a_{n,i,j} |\psi_{n,j}|^2 \right). \tag{B.15}
\]

Using Lemma [B.2] and (B.4), we obtain
\[
\alpha_n N^{-2} \sum_{i,j \in [n]^d} a_{n,i,j} |\psi_{n,i}|^2 \leq N^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]^d} \left\{ N^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left( \left| \frac{a_{n,j}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,j} \right|^2 + |\psi_{n,j}|^2 \right) \right\} \leq N^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]^d} (K + \bar{W}_1) |\psi_{n,i}|^2 = (K + \bar{W}_1) \| \psi_n \|_{2,N}^2. \tag{B.16}
\]

Similarly,
\[
N^{-2} \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{i,j \in [n]^d} a_{n,i,j} |\psi_{n,j}|^2 \leq (K + \bar{W}_2) \| \psi_n \|_{2,N}^2. \tag{B.17}
\]

By plugging (B.16) and (B.17) into (B.15), we have
\[
|I_3| \leq L_D \left( 2K + \frac{3}{2} \bar{W}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{W}_2 \right) \| \psi_n \|_{N,2}^2. \tag{B.18}
\]

It remains to bound $I_2$:
\[
|I_2| = |N^{-1} \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]^d} Z_{n,i} |\psi_{n,i}| \leq 2^{-1} \alpha_n^{-2} \| Z_n \|_{2,N}^2 + 2^{-1} \| \psi_n \|_{2,N}^2. \tag{B.19}
\]

The combination of (B.13), (B.14), (B.18) and (B.19) yields
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \| \psi_n(t) \|_{2,n}^2 \leq L \| \psi_n(t) \|_{2,n}^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha_n^2} \| Z_n(t) \|_{2,n}^2, \tag{B.20}
\]

where $L = L_f + L_D \left( 2K + \frac{3}{2} \bar{W}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{W}_2 \right) + \bar{f}$. 

Using the Gronwall's inequality and Lemma [B.3] we have
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| \psi_n(t) \|_{2,N}^2 \leq \alpha_n^{-2} e^{LT} \int_0^\infty e^{-Ls} \| Z_n(s) \|_{2,N}^2 ds \leq \alpha_n^{-2} e^{LT} (N \alpha_n)^{-1+\epsilon}. \tag{B.21}
\]

\[
\square
\]
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Proof of Lemma B.2. Let

\[ \xi_{n,i,j} = \left| \frac{a_{n,i,j}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,i,j} \right| - 2W_{n,i,j} (1 - \alpha_n W_{n,i,j}) , \quad i, j \in [n]^d. \]  

(B.22)

Note that for fixed \( i \in [n]^d \), \( \{\xi_{n,i,j}, j \in [n]^d\} \) are mean zero independent RVs. Further, using the definition of \( \xi_{n,i,j} \), it is straightforward to bound

\[ |\xi_{n,i,j}| \leq \alpha_n^{-1} + 2W_{n,i,j} \leq 3\alpha_n^{-1} =: M, \]

(B.23)

\[ \mathbb{E} \xi_{n,i,j}^2 \leq 2\alpha_n^{-1} W_{n,i,j} + 2W_{n,i,j}^2 + 4\alpha_n W_{n,i,j}^2 + 4\alpha_n W_{n,i,j}^3. \]

(B.24)

From (B.24), we have

\[ \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \xi_{n,i,j}^2 \right) \leq \alpha_n^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left( 2W_{n,i,j} + \alpha_n 2W_{n,i,j}^2 + 4\alpha_n W_{n,i,j}^2 + 4\alpha_n W_{n,i,j}^3 \right), \]

(B.25)

\[ \leq \alpha_n^{-1} NW_1 + O(\alpha_n). \]

Using Bernstein’s inequality and the union bound, we have

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \xi_{n,i,j} \geq (K - 2\bar{W}_1) N \right) \leq N \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{K - 2\bar{W}_1)^2 N^2}{\sum_{j \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \xi_{n,i,j}^2 + (1/3) M (K - 2\bar{W}_1) N} \right) \right\}
\]

\[
\leq N \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{K - 2\bar{W}_1)^2 N^2}{\alpha_n^{-1} N (W_1 + O(\alpha_n)) + \alpha_n^{-1} (K - 2\bar{W}_1) N} \right) \right\}
\]

\[
\leq N \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(K - 2\bar{W}_1)^2 \alpha_n N}{W_1 + O(\alpha_n) + K} \right) \right\}.
\]

(B.26)

Finally, the combination of (B.22) and (B.26) yields

\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left| \frac{a_{n,i,j}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,i,j} \right| \geq KN \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \xi_{n,i,j} \geq \left( K - \frac{2}{N} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} W_{n,i,j} \right) N \right)
\]

\[
\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in [n]^d} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \xi_{n,i,j} \geq (K - 2\bar{W}_1) N \right)
\]

\[
\leq N \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{(K - 2\bar{W}_1)^2 \alpha N}{W_1 + O(\alpha_n) + K} \right) \right\}.
\]

This proves (B.12). By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, (B.6) follows.
Proof of Lemma B.3. Recall (B.7)-(B.9) and rewrite
\[
\int_0^\infty e^{-L_s} \| Z_n(s) \|^2_{L^2} ds = N^{-3} \sum_{i,k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,ikl} \eta_{n,ik} \eta_{n,il},
\]  
(B.27)
where
\[
c_{n,ikl} = \int_0^\infty e^{-L_s} b_{n,ik}(s) b_{n,il}(s) ds \quad \text{and} \quad |c_{n,ikl}| \leq L^{-1} = c.
\]  
(B.28)

By (B.1), one can choose a sequence \( \delta_n \downarrow 0 \) such that
\[
N \delta_n \gg \alpha_n^{-1}.
\]  
(B.29)

Specifically, let
\[
\delta_n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln n}}.
\]  
(B.30)

and define events
\[
\Omega_n = \left\{ (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{i,k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,ikl} \eta_{n,ik} \eta_{n,il} > \delta_n N \right\},
\]  
(B.31)
\[
A_{n,\bar{i}} = \left\{ \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left| \frac{a_{n,ij}}{\alpha_n} - W_{n,ij} \right| > KN \right\}, \text{ and } A_n = \bigcup_{\bar{i} \in [n]^d} A_{n,\bar{i}}.
\]  
(B.32)

Clearly,
\[
P(\Omega_n) \leq P(\Omega_n \cap A_n^c) + P(A_n).
\]  
(B.33)

We want to show that \( P(\Omega_n \text{ infinitely often}) = 0 \). By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, it is sufficient to show that
\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} P(\Omega_n) < \infty.
\]

From Lemma B.2, we know that \( \sum_{n \geq 1} P(A_n) < \infty \) for \( K > 2 \tilde{W}_1 \). In the remainder of the proof, we show that \( \sum_{n \geq 1} P(\Omega_n \cap A_n^c) \) is convergent.

Applying the exponential Markov inequality to \( P(\Omega_n \mid A_n^c) \), from \( P(\Omega_n \cap A_n^c) \leq P(\Omega_n \mid A_n^c) \) and (B.31), we have
\[
P(\Omega_n \cap A_n^c) \leq \exp \left\{ -N \delta_n + \ln \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{A_n^c} \exp \left( (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{i,k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,ikl} \eta_{n,ik} \eta_{n,il} \right) \right] \right\}.
\]  
(B.34)

Using the independence of \( \eta_{n,ikl} \) in \( \bar{i} \in [n]^d \), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{A_n^c} \exp \left( (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{i,k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,ikl} \eta_{n,ik} \eta_{n,il} \right) \right] = \prod_{\bar{i} \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{A_n^c} \exp \left( (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,ikl} \eta_{n,ik} \eta_{n,il} \right) \right].
\]  
(B.35)
Using \( e^x \leq 1 + |x|e^{|x|}, \ x \in \mathbb{R} \), and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we bound the right-hand side of (B.35) as follows

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{A_c} \exp \left\{ (N\alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,\bar{k}\bar{l}} \eta_{n,k} \eta_{n,l} \right\} \right]
\leq 1 + \left( \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\{ (N\alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,\bar{k}\bar{l}} \eta_{n,k} \eta_{n,l} \right\}^2}{(N\alpha_n)^{-4} \sum_{j,k,l,p \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{n,j\bar{j}} \eta_{n,k\bar{k}} \eta_{n,l\bar{l}} \eta_{n,p\bar{p}} \right) c_{n,j\bar{j}} c_{n,k\bar{k}} c_{n,l\bar{l}} c_{n,p\bar{p}} \right)^{1/2} 
\leq 1 + \left( \frac{\mathbb{E} \left\{ (N\alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,\bar{k}\bar{l}} \eta_{n,k} \eta_{n,l} \right\}^2}{(N\alpha_n)^{-4} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \eta_{n,j\bar{j}}^4 + 6 \left( \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \eta_{n,j\bar{j}}^2 \right)^2} \right)^{1/2}
\]

From (B.9), (B.28), and under \( A_n^c \) (cf. (B.32)), we have

\[
1_{A_n^c} (N\alpha_n)^{-2} \left| \sum_{k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,\bar{k}\bar{l}} \eta_{n,k} \eta_{n,l} \right| \leq 2\bar{c}.
\]

Further,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left\{ (N\alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k,l \in [n]^d} c_{n,\bar{k}\bar{l}} \eta_{n,k} \eta_{n,l} \right\}^2 \leq (N\alpha_n)^{-4} \sum_{j,k,l,p \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{n,j\bar{j}} \eta_{n,k\bar{k}} \eta_{n,l\bar{l}} \eta_{n,p\bar{p}} \right) c_{n,j\bar{j}} c_{n,k\bar{k}} c_{n,l\bar{l}} c_{n,p\bar{p}}
\leq \frac{(\bar{c})^2}{(N\alpha_n)^4} \left( \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \eta_{n,j\bar{j}}^4 + 6 \left( \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \eta_{n,j\bar{j}}^2 \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]

Using (B.9), we estimate sum of the fourth moments of \( \eta_{n,j\bar{j}} \)

\[
\sum_{j \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \eta_{n,j\bar{j}}^4 = \sum_{j \in [n]^d} \left\{ \alpha_n W_{n,j\bar{j}} (1 - \alpha_n W_{n,j\bar{j}})^4 + \alpha_n^4 W_{n,j\bar{j}}^4 (1 - \alpha_n W_{n,j\bar{j}}) \right\}
\leq N\alpha_n \left( N^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} W_{n,j\bar{j}} + \alpha_n^3 N^{-1} \sum_{j \in [n]^d} W_{n,j\bar{j}}^4 \right)
\leq N\alpha_n (\bar{W}_1 + \alpha_n^3 \bar{W}_4) = O(\alpha_n N),
\]
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where we also use (B.4). Similarly,

$$
\sum_{\bar{j} \in [n]^d} \mathbb{E} \eta_{\bar{i} \bar{j}}^2 = \sum_{\bar{j} \in [n]^d} \left\{ \alpha_n W_{n,\bar{i} \bar{j}} (1 - \alpha_n W_{n,\bar{i} \bar{j}})^2 + \alpha_n^2 W_{n,\bar{i} \bar{j}}^2 (1 - \alpha_n W_{n,\bar{i} \bar{j}}) \right\}
\leq N \alpha_n \left( N^{-1} \sum_{\bar{j} \in [n]^d} W_{n,\bar{i} \bar{j}} + \alpha_n N^{-1} \sum_{\bar{j} \in [n]^d} W_{n,\bar{i} \bar{j}}^2 \right)
\leq N \alpha_n (\bar{W}_1 + \alpha_n \bar{W}_2) = O(\alpha_n N).
$$

(B.40)

By combining (B.38)-(B.40), we obtain

$$
\mathbb{E} \left\{ (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k, l \in [n]^d} c_{n, \bar{i} \bar{k} \bar{l}} \eta_{n, \bar{i} \bar{k}} \eta_{n, \bar{i} \bar{l}} \right\}^2 = O \left( (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \right).
$$

(B.41)

By plugging (B.37) and (B.41) into (B.36), we obtain

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{A_n^c} \exp \left\{ (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{k, l \in [n]^d} c_{n, \bar{i} \bar{k} \bar{l}} \eta_{n, \bar{i} \bar{k}} \eta_{n, \bar{i} \bar{l}} \right\} \right] \leq 1 + \frac{C_1}{N \alpha_n} e^{C_2}.
$$

(B.42)

Using this bound on the right–hand side of (B.35), we further obtain

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{A_n^c} \exp \left\{ (N \alpha_n)^{-2} \sum_{\bar{i}, k, l \in [n]^d} c_{n, \bar{i} \bar{k} \bar{l}} \eta_{n, \bar{i} \bar{k}} \eta_{n, \bar{i} \bar{l}} \right\} \right] \leq e^{C_3 \alpha_n^{-1}}.
$$

(B.43)

Using (B.43), from (B.34) we obtain

$$
\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n \cap A_n^c) \leq \exp \left\{ -N \delta_N + C_3 \alpha_n^{-1} \right\} \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.
$$

(B.44)

Furthermore, using (B.30) it is straightforward to check that

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_n \cap A_n^c) < \infty.
$$

The statement of the lemma then follows from (B.31)-(B.33) via Borel-Cantelli Lemma.
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