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Consider a Bipartite Stochastic Block Model (BSBM) on vertex sets $V_1$ and $V_2$. We investigate sufficient conditions of exact and almost full recovery for clustering over $V_1$ using polynomial-time algorithms, in the regime where the cardinalities satisfy $|V_1| \ll |V_2|$. We improve upon the known conditions of almost full recovery for spectral clustering algorithms in BSBM. Furthermore, we propose a new computationally simple and fast procedure achieving exact recovery under milder conditions than the state of the art. This procedure is a variant of Lloyd’s iterations initialized with a well-chosen spectral algorithm leading to what we expect to be optimal conditions for exact recovery in this model. The latter fact is further supported by showing that a supervised oracle procedure requires similar conditions to achieve exact recovery. The key elements of the proof techniques are different from classical community detection tools on random graphs. Numerical studies confirm our theory, and show that the suggested algorithm is both very fast and achieves similar performance as the supervised oracle. Finally, using the connection between planted satisfiability problems and the BSBM, we improve upon the sufficient number of clauses to completely recover the planted assignment.

1. Introduction. Unsupervised learning or clustering is a recurrent problem in statistics and machine learning. Depending on the objects we wish to classify, we can generally consider two approaches: either the observed objects are individuals without any interaction, which is often described by a mixture model, or the observed objects are individuals with interactions, which is described by a graph model. In the latter case, the individuals correspond to vertices of the graph and two vertices are connected if the two corresponding individuals interact. The clustering problem becomes then a node clustering problem, which means grouping the individuals by communities. The most known and studied framework for node clustering is the Stochastic Block Model (abbreviated SBM), cf. [12]. In this paper, we focus on the Bipartite Stochastic Block Model (abbreviated BSBM), cf. [8], which is a non-symmetric generalization of the SBM. This model arises in several fields of applications. For example, it can be used to describe different types of interactions; documents/words [6, 14], genes/genetic se-
quences [7, 15] and objects/users in recommendation systems [13]. Some other examples are related to random computational problems with planted solutions such as planted satisfiability problems, cf. [9] for a general definition. As shown in [8], three planted satisfiability problems reduce to solving the BSBM. Namely, this concerns planted hypergraph partitioning, planted random $k$–SAT, and Goldreich’s planted CSP. Planted satisfiability can be viewed as a $k$–uniform hypergraph stochastic block model. The corresponding reduction to BSBM is characterized by a high imbalance between its two dimensions. For instance, one dimension is $n$ while the other is $n^{r-1}$, where $n$ is the number of boolean literals and $r$ (that can be large) is the distribution complexity of the model that we define later.

1.1. Definition of Bipartite Stochastic Block Model. Let $n_{1+}$, $n_{1-}$, $n_{2+}$ and $n_{2-}$ be four integers such that $n_1 := n_{1+} + n_{1-} \leq n_{2+} + n_{2-} := n_2$, where $n_1 \geq 2$, $n_2 \geq 2$, and let $\delta \in (0, 2)$, $p \in (0, 1/2)$. Consider two sets of vertices $V_1$ and $V_2$ such that:

- $V_1$ is composed of $n_{1+}$ vertices with label +1 and of $n_{1-}$ vertices with label −1;
- $V_2$ is composed of $n_{2+}$ vertices with label +1 and of $n_{2-}$ vertices with label −1.

Let $\gamma_1 := |n_{1+} - n_{1-}|/n_1$ (resp. $\gamma_2 := |n_{2+} - n_{2-}|/n_2$) be the imbalance of the set $V_1$ (respectively, $V_2$). We denote by $\sigma(u) \in \{-1, 1\}$ the label corresponding to vertex $u$.

Let $A$ denote the biadjacency matrix, i.e., a rectangular matrix of size $n_1 \times n_2$ whose entries $A_{ij}$ take value 1 if the two corresponding vertices $i \in V_1$ and $j \in V_2$ are connected and take value $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

We say that matrix $A$ is drawn according to the $BSBM(\delta, n_{1+}, n_{1-}, n_{2+}, n_{2-}, p)$ model if the entries $A_{ij}$ are independent and

- $A_{ij} \sim Ber(\delta p)$ if $\sigma(i) = \sigma(j)$, i.e., two vertices $i \in V_1$, $j \in V_2$ with the same label are connected with probability $\delta p$;
- $A_{ij} \sim Ber((2 - \delta)p)$ if $\sigma(i) \neq \sigma(j)$, i.e., two vertices $i \in V_1$, $j \in V_2$ with different labels are connected with a probability $(2 - \delta)p$.

Here, $Ber(q)$ denotes the Bernoulli distribution with parameter $q \in (0, 1)$.

In this definition, $p$ represents the overall edge density. The Bipartite SBM is a generalization of the SBM in the sense that we obtain the SBM if $V_1 = V_2$. Another possible definition of BSBM is obtained by fixing only $n_1$ and $n_2$ and letting $n_{1+}, n_{1-}, n_{2+}, n_{2-}$ be random variables such that the expectations of $n_{i+}$ and $n_{i-}$ are both equal to $n_i/2$ for $i = 1, 2$ (then the partitions are called balanced). This is the case when the vertices are
independent Rademacher random variables as assumed, for example, in the previous work [8, 10].

1.2. Recovery of communities. Assume that we observe a biadjacency matrix $A$ drawn according to a $BSBM(\delta, n_{1+}, n_{1-}, n_{2+}, n_{2-}, p)$ model. We consider the problem of recovering the node partition associated with $V_1$, which is the set of vertices of smaller size, from the observation of the biadjacency matrix $A$. Denote by $\eta_1 \in \{\pm 1\}^{n_1}$ the vector of vertex labels in $V_1$. Recovering the node partition of $V_1$ is equivalent to retrieving either $\eta_1$ or $-\eta_1$.

As estimators of $\eta_1$ we consider any measurable functions $\hat{\eta}$ of $A$ taking values in $\{\pm 1\}^{n_1}$. We characterize the loss of any such estimator $\hat{\eta}$ by the Hamming distance between $\hat{\eta}$ and $\eta_1$, that is, by the number of positions at which $\hat{\eta}$ and $\eta_1$ differ:

$$|\hat{\eta} - \eta_1| := \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} |\hat{\eta}_i - \eta_{1i}| = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{1}(\hat{\eta}_i \neq \eta_{1i}),$$

where $\hat{\eta}_i$ and $\eta_{1i}$ denote the $i$th components of $\hat{\eta}$ and $\eta_1$, respectively. Since for community detection it is enough to determine either $\eta_1$ or $-\eta_1$ we consider the loss

$$r(\eta_1, \hat{\eta}) = \min_{\nu \in \{-1, 1\}} |\hat{\eta} - \nu \eta_1|.$$

The quality of an estimator $\hat{\eta}$ is characterized by one of the following properties.

**Definition 1 (weak recovery).** The estimator $\hat{\eta}$ achieves weak recovery if there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \sup_{BSBM} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{r(\eta_1, \hat{\eta})}{n_1} \geq \alpha \right) = 0,$$

where $\sup_{BSBM}$ denotes the maximum over all distributions of $A$ drawn from $BSBM(\delta, n_{1+}, n_{1-}, n_{2+}, n_{2-}, p)$.

Weak recovery can be interpreted as the fact that $\hat{\eta}$ classifies the vertices better than chance.

**Definition 2 (almost full recovery).** The estimator $\hat{\eta}$ achieves almost full recovery if for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \sup_{BSBM} \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{r(\eta_1, \hat{\eta})}{n_1} \geq \alpha \right) = 0.$$
Almost full recovery means that $\hat{\eta}$ correctly classifies the vertices on average.

**Definition 3 (exact recovery).** The estimator $\hat{\eta}$ achieves exact recovery if

$$\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \inf_{BSBM} \mathbb{P}(r(\eta_1, \hat{\eta}) = 0) = 1.$$ 

Exact recovery means that $\hat{\eta}$ correctly classifies all the vertices.

Recall that $n_1 \leq n_2$ by the definition of the BSBM model. Hence, as the limits in Definitions 1 – 3 are taken as $n_1$ grows to infinity, the same holds for $n_2$. Also, as these definitions are asymptotic they assume that the values $p$ and $\delta$ are allowed to depend on $n_1$, $n_2$.

### 1.2.1. Notation.

We will use the following notation. For given sequences $a_n$ and $b_n$, we write that $a_n = O(b_n)$ (respectively, $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$) if there is an absolute constant $c$ such that $a_n \leq cb_n$ (respectively, $a_n \geq cb_n$). We write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $x^\top y$ the Euclidean scalar product, by $\|x\|_2$ the corresponding norm of $x$ and by $\text{sign}(x)$ the vector of signs of the components of $x$. For any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, we denote by $\|M\|_\infty$ its spectral norm. Further, $\mathbf{1}_m$ denotes the $m \times m$ identity matrix and $\mathbb{1} (\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function. We denote by $c$ positive constants that may vary from line to line.

### 2. Reduction to a spiked model.

The biadjacency matrix $A$ can be written as

$$A = \mathbb{E}(A) + W$$

where $A$ is observed, $\mathbb{E}(A)$ is interpreted as the signal, and $W := A - \mathbb{E}(A)$ as the noise. It is easy to check that

$$\mathbb{E}(A) = p \mathbf{1}_{n_1} \mathbf{1}_{n_2}^\top + (\delta - 1)p\eta_1 \eta_2^\top,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{n_1}$ (respectively, $\mathbf{1}_{n_2}$) is the vector of ones with dimension $n_1$ (respectively, $n_2$) and $\eta_1, \eta_2$ are the vectors of labels corresponding to the sets of vertices $V_1$ and $V_2$, respectively. The second component on the right hand side of (1) contains information about the vector $\eta_1$ that we are interested in, while the first component $p \mathbf{1}_{n_1} \mathbf{1}_{n_2}^\top$ is non-informative about the labels. Assuming parameter $p$ to be known we can simply subtract this component from $A$. From an adaptive perspective, one way to eliminate the non-informative component is by getting an estimator $\hat{p}$ of $p$, then considering
$A - \hat{p} 1_{n_1} 1_{n_2}^\top$ as the new data matrix. Another way to disregard this component is to assume, as in [8, 10], that the partitions are balanced, which implies the orthogonality of $1_{n_i}$ and $\eta_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. This assures that $\eta_1$ and $\eta_2$ are the singular vectors of $E(A)$ corresponding to the second largest singular value, which makes it possible to recover them with suitable accuracy from the observation of $A$.

In this paper, we follow the first approach where we estimate $p$ by

$$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n_1 n_2} 1_{n_1} 1_{n_2}^\top A 1_{n_2}.$$

Then we consider the corrected adjacency matrix

$$\hat{A} := A - \hat{p} 1_{n_1} 1_{n_2}^\top = (\delta - 1)p\eta_1 \eta_2^\top + W + (p - \hat{p}) 1_{n_1} 1_{n_2}^\top_{\text{noise}}.$$

This is a special case of spiked matrix model where the underlying signal and the noise have a particular structure. In the rest of this paper, we assume that the observed matrix $\hat{A}$ is of the form (3).

A well-known approach to community detection is the spectral approach, i.e., clustering according to the signs of the entries of eigenvectors or singular vectors of the adjacency matrix or its modified version. In our case, $\eta_1$ is the left singular vector associated with the largest singular value of the signal matrix $(\delta - 1)p\eta_1 \eta_2^\top$. Since $E(\hat{A})$ is unknown – only $\hat{A}$ is observed – a natural algorithm for recovering $\eta_1$ would, at first sight, consist in computing the left singular vector of $\hat{A}$ corresponding to the top singular value and then taking the signs of the entries of this vector as estimators of the entries of $\eta_1$. However, such a method provides a good estimator of $\eta_1$ only if the top singular value $(\delta - 1)p$ of the signal matrix is much larger than the spectral norm of the noise term in (3) that is dominated by the spectral norm of $W$ under mild assumptions on the imbalance $\gamma_1 \gamma_2$. As noticed in [10], this approach suffers from a strict deterioration of sufficient conditions of recovery when $n_2$ grows larger than $n_1$. The problem can be avoided by applying the spectral approach to hallowed matrix $H(\hat{A} \hat{A}^\top)$ rather than to $\hat{A}$, where $H : \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ is the linear operator defined by the relation

$$H(M) = M - \text{diag}(M), \forall M \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}.$$

Here, $\text{diag}(M)$ is a diagonal matrix with the same diagonal as $M$. The corresponding spectral estimator of $\eta_1$ is

$$\eta_1^0 = \text{sign}(\hat{v}),$$

(4)
where \( \hat{v} \) is the eigenvector corresponding to the top eigenvalue of \( H(\hat{A}\hat{A}^\top) \). We will further refer to \( \eta_1^0 \) as a spectral procedure on hollowed matrix. The properties of \( \eta_1^0 \) are studied in Section 4. In particular, we show that \( \eta_1^0 \) achieves almost full recovery under milder conditions than previously established in [10] for a different method called the diagonal deletion SVD. However, it is not known whether \( \eta_1^0 \) can achieve exact recovery.

In order to grant exact recovery, we propose a new estimator. Namely, we run the sequence of iterations \( (\hat{\eta}^k)_{k \geq 1} \) defined by the recursion

\[
\hat{\eta}^{k+1} = \text{sign} \left( H(\hat{A}\hat{A}^\top)\hat{\eta}^k \right), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots,
\]

with the spectral estimator as initializer: \( \hat{\eta}^0 = \eta_1^0 \). Our final estimator is \( \hat{\eta}^m \) with \( m \geq \log n_1 / \log 2 \). We call this procedure the hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm. It is inspired by Lloyd’s iterations, whose statistical guarantees were studied in the context of SBM and Gaussian Mixture Models by [17]. More recently, this approach was used in [20] to derive sharp optimal conditions for exact recovery in the Gaussian Mixture Model. It follows from those papers that the issue of proper initialization of Lloyd’s algorithm is essential. The question of proving optimality of recovery by Lloyd’s algorithm under random initialization is still open, both in the Gaussian Mixture Model and in the BSBM model.

3. State of the art and contributions. While the literature about the classical SBM abounds (we refer to the paper [1] and references therein), fewer results are known about the Bipartite SBM. Papers [25, 26, 21] consider a more general setting than ours. Being specified to our case, their results allow one to obtain consistency for clustering under conditions not suited for the regime \( n_2 \gg n_1 \) that we consider here. In particular, paper [25] shows that consistency can be achieved by spectral clustering on an appropriately regularized adjacency matrix when \( n_2 \asymp n_1 \). As an example of limitations used in [26], we refer to the main theorem in [26] (Theorem 1) that requires \( p^2 = O(n_1/n_2^2) \) in our setting (cf. assumption (A3) in [26]). This assumption combined with the necessary condition for weak recovery \( p^2 = \Omega((n_1n_2)^{-1}) \) only allows for values of \( n_1, n_2 \) such that \( n_2 = O(n_1^2) \). In [21], the focus is to deal with multiple and possibly overlapping clusters and the recovery conditions being specified to our setting (two non-overlapping clusters) are far from optimal. On the other hand, papers [8, 10] are closer to our work since they focus on finding proper thresholds for \( p \) in the case \( n_2 \gg n_1 \). In particular, [10] proves that the sharp phase transition for the weak recovery problem occurs around the critical probability \( p_c = \frac{(\delta-1)^2}{\sqrt{n_1n_2}} \).
The sufficient condition in this case is based on a reduction to SBM then using any optimal “black-box” algorithm for detection in the SBM as in [5, 18, 19].

For the problem of exact recovery, [8] obtained what we will further call state of the art sufficient conditions. Namely, using the Subsampled Power Iteration algorithm, [8] shows that the condition \( p = \Omega \left( \frac{(\delta - 1)^{-2} \log n_1}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} \right) \) is sufficient to achieve exact recovery. Although no necessary condition for this property is known, it is conjectured in [8] that at least \( \Omega \left( \sqrt{n_1 n_2 \log n_1} \right) \) edges are necessary for exact recovery.

Spectral algorithms for BSBM were investigated in [10]. That paper compared sufficient conditions for almost full recovery using the SVD algorithm versus the diagonal deletion SVD. It was shown in [10] that, in the high dimensional setting where \( n_2 \gg n_1 \), the diagonal deletion SVD provides a strict improvement over the classical SVD. One way to explain this improvement is by observing that, in this regime, the spectral norm of the expectation of the noise term \( WW^T \) is much larger than its deviation. It was proved in [10] that \( p = \Omega \left( \frac{\log n_1}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} \right) \) is sufficient to achieve almost full recovery through the diagonal deletion SVD algorithm. Note that [8] proved that under similar conditions the Subsampled Power Iteration algorithm achieves a better result, i.e., it provides exact recovery rather than almost full recovery. The results of [8] and [10] are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>Exact recovery</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} n_2 \geq n_1, \text{known } p, \ p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \frac{\log n_1}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} \end{cases} )</td>
<td>Subsampled iterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Almost full recovery</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} n_2 \geq n_1 \log^4 n_1, \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0, \ p \geq C\delta \frac{\log n_1}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} \end{cases} )</td>
<td>Diagonal deletion SVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Weak recovery</td>
<td>( \begin{cases} n_2 \geq n_1, \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0, \ p &gt; \frac{(\delta - 1)^{-2}}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} \end{cases} )</td>
<td>SBM reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We emphasize that in this paper we only focus on the case \( n_2 > n_1 \). The case \( n_2 \leq n_1 \) is more direct to solve since then SVD type algorithms applied to the initial matrix \( A \) achieve optimal results in the same spirit as for the SBM (cf. [25, 26]). While the behavior of the spectral norm of \( W \) is well understood (cf. [4]), similar results for the spectral norms of \( WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top) \) or of \( H(WW^\top) \) that one needs to control when \( n_2 \gg n_1 \) are not available, which makes the case \( n_2 \gg n_1 \) quite challenging. Under the condition \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \), the state of the art results can be summarized by the following diagram leaving open the optimal value \( p = p^* \) at which exact recovery can be achieved.

In parallel, another recent line of work developed optimal clustering algorithms for Gaussian Mixture Models [17, 11, 20, 16]. It was shown in [17] that clustering with optimality properties in Gaussian Mixture Models can be achieved by an iterative algorithm analogous to Lloyd’s procedure. Moreover, [20] proved that a version of such iterative clustering algorithm attains the sharp phase transition for exact recovery in those models. Based on an analogy between the Gaussian Mixture Model and the BSBM, it is conjectured in [20] that similar algorithms can achieve almost full recovery and exact recovery in bipartite graph models. Namely, comparing the first two moments of the matrices arising in the two models one may expect

\[
p = \Omega \left( (\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}} \right)
\]

to be sufficient to achieve exact recovery in the BSBM, provided that \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \). This heuristics presents a logarithmic improvement over the state of the art condition, but more interestingly suggests that, if \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \), we only need \( \Omega \left( \sqrt{n_1 n_2 \log n_1} \right) \) edges to exactly recover the partition of \( V_1 \), which goes against the usual intuition that \( \Omega \left( \sqrt{n_1 n_2 \log n_1} \right) \) edges are necessary for this purpose (cf. [8]).

The reduction of planted satisfiability problems to BSBM leads to straightforward sufficient conditions to completely recover the planted assignment. We refer to [8] for the details of this reduction. Namely, it is shown in [8] that considering a planted satisfiability problem is equivalent to considering a BSBM where \( n_1 = n \) and \( n_2 = n^{r-1} \), where \( n \) and \( r \geq 2 \) are defined...
For any satisfiability problem, we are interested in \( m \), which is the sufficient number of \( k \)-clauses from \( C_k \) in order to recover completely the planted assignment \( \sigma \). Here, \( C_k \) is the set of all ordered \( k \)-tuples of \( n \) literals \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) and their negations with no repetition of variables. For a \( k \)-tuple of literals \( C \) and an assignment \( \sigma \in \{-1, +1\}^n \), \( \sigma(C) \) denotes the vector of values that \( \sigma \) assigns to the literals in \( C \). For a planting distribution \( Q : \{-1, +1\}^k \to [0, 1] \), and an assignment \( \sigma \), we define the random constraint satisfaction problem \( F_{Q,\sigma}(n, m) \) by drawing \( m \) \( k \)-clauses from \( C_k \) independently according to the distribution 

\[
Q_{\sigma}(C) = \frac{Q(\sigma(C))}{\sum_{C' \in C_k} Q(\sigma(C'))}.
\]

A related class of problems is one in which for some fixed predicate \( P : \{-1, 1\}^k \to \{-1, 1\} \), an instance is generated by choosing a planted assignment \( \sigma \) uniformly at random and generating a set of \( m \) random and uniform \( P \)-constraints. That is, each constraint is of the form \( P(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}) = P(\sigma_{i_1}, \ldots, \sigma_{i_k}) \), where \( (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}) \) is a randomly and uniformly chosen \( k \)-tuple of variables (without repetitions).

In simpler words \( m \) plays the role of \( pn_1n_2 \) in the BSBM, and any sufficient condition on \( p \) leads to a sufficient condition for \( m \). It was shown in \([8]\) that the following conditions are sufficient to achieve exact recovery in some of the satisfiability problems.

- For any planting distribution \( Q : \{-1, 1\}^k \to [0, 1] \), there exists an algorithm that for any assignment \( \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^n \), given an instance of \( F_{Q,\sigma}(n, m) \), completely recovers the planted assignment \( \sigma \) for \( m = O(n^{r/2} \log n) \). Here, \( r \geq 2 \) is the smallest integer such that there is some \( S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\} \) with \( |S| = r \), for which the discrete Fourier coefficient \( \hat{Q}(S) \) is non-zero.

- For any predicate \( P : \{-1, 1\}^k \to \{-1, 1\} \), there exists an algorithm that for any assignment \( \sigma \), given \( m \) random \( P \)-constraints, completely recovers the planted assignment \( \sigma \) for \( m = O(n^{r/2} \log n) \) where \( r \geq 2 \) is the degree of the lowest-degree non-zero Fourier coefficient of \( P \).

### 3.1. Main contributions

Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We show that the condition \( p = \Omega \left( \frac{\log n_1}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2}} \right) \) based on the analogy with usual SBM is not necessary for exact recovery in the BSBM when \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \). We present a new method (the hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm) that achieves exact recovery under strictly milder conditions than the
state of the art. Under the condition $n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1$, we show that $p = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}\right)$ is sufficient to achieve exact recovery in the BSBM which we believe to be the optimal condition based on the Gaussian reduction described above. In order to confirm this conjecture, we show that even a supervised oracle procedure requires $p = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}\right)$ to achieve exact recovery.

- We provide a new sufficient condition for almost full recovery by spectral techniques using the diagonal deletion device. Our spectral estimator and its analysis are different from [10], where another diagonal deletion method was suggested. The analysis uses an adapted version of matrix Bernstein inequality applied to a sum of hollowed rank one random matrices where bounding the corresponding moments, in operator norm, involve combinatorics arguments. This leads to an improvement upon the sufficient condition of [10]. We show that, unlike in the Gaussian case, hollowing the Gram matrix yields, both theoretically and empirically, a strict improvement over debiasing, i.e., subtracting the expectation of the Gram matrix. This suggests that bounding the spectral norm of the hollowed Gram matrix is a problem of its own interest.

- The hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm that we propose is computationally faster than the previously known methods. Its analysis that we develop is novel and makes it possible to transform any estimator achieving weak recovery into another one achieving exact recovery. We expect this analysis to be useful to solve more general exact recovery problems for random graphs.

- In contrast to the previous work, where simplifying assumptions of either zero imbalance ($\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$) as in [10] or known $p$ as in [8] were imposed, our approach is more general. In particular, our exact recovery result holds adaptively to $p$ under mild assumption on $\gamma_1 \gamma_2$. Notice that as $\gamma_1 \gamma_2$ get closer to 1, then estimation of $p$ gets harder. Our theoretical findings are supported by numerical experiments, where we show that our iterative procedure (with or without spectral initialization) outperforms spectral methods and achieves almost the same performance as the supervised oracle.

- Our results regarding:
  (a) almost full recovery based on the spectral estimator,
  (b) exact recovery via the hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm,
  (c) impossibility of exact recovery via the supervised oracle
are summarized in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Almost full recovery is possible | \[
\begin{cases}
  n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1, 
  \gamma_1 \gamma_2 = o(1) \\
  p \geq C_n (\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}
\end{cases}
\] | Spectral on hollowed matrix |
| Exact recovery is possible | \[
\begin{cases}
  n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1, 
  \gamma_1 \gamma_2 < 1/480 \\
  p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}
\end{cases}
\] | Hollowed Lloyd’s |
| Exact recovery is impossible | \[
\begin{cases}
  n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1, 
  \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0 \\
  p < C_\delta \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}
\end{cases}
\] | Oracle |

Table 2: Summary of our contribution. Here, \(C_\delta > 0\) is a positive constant depending on \(\delta\), \(C\) is an absolute positive constant and \(C_{n_1}\) is any sequence such that \(C_{n_1} \to \infty\) as \(n_1 \to \infty\).

- As a byproduct, we also improve upon sufficient conditions of [8] for exact recovery in some of the satisfiability problems. Namely, our results imply the following.

  1. For any planting distribution \(Q : \{-1,1\}^k \to [0,1]\), there exists an algorithm that for any assignment \(\sigma\), given an instance of \(F_{Q,\sigma}(n, m)\), completely recovers the planted assignment \(\sigma\) for \(m = O(n^{r/2} \sqrt{\log n})\) where \(r \geq 3\) is the smallest integer such that there is some \(S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, k\}\) with \(|S| = r\), for which the discrete Fourier coefficient \(\hat{Q}(S)\) is non-zero.

  2. For any predicate \(P : \{-1,1\}^k \to \{-1,1\}\), there exists an algorithm that for any assignment \(\sigma\), given \(m\) random \(P\)-constraints, completely recovers the planted assignment \(\sigma\) for \(m = O(n^{r/2} \sqrt{\log n})\) where \(r \geq 3\) is the degree of the lowest-degree non-zero Fourier coefficient of \(P\).

**4. Properties of the spectral method.** In this section, we analyze the risk of the spectral initializer \(\eta_0\). As in the case of SDP relaxations...
of the problem, the matrix of interest is the Gram matrix $\hat{A}A^\top$. It is well known that it suffers from a bias that grows with $n_2$. In [22], a de-biasing procedure is proposed using an estimator of the covariance of the noise. In this section, we consider a different approach that consists in removing the diagonal entries of the Gram matrix.

We give some intuition about this procedure when $p$ is known. In this case the adjacency matrix can be replaced by

$$\tilde{A} = A - p\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top.$$  

The general case follows similarly since one can show that $|\hat{p} - p|$ does not exceed the noise level arising when $p$ is known (see the details below). The noise matrix $WW^\top$ concentrates around its expectation that has a spectral norm of the order of $p^2n_1$. If $n_2 \gg n_1$, which is the most interesting case in the applications, this is too large compared to the deviation of the noise matrix from its expectation, cf. [10]. Since the expectation of the noise $WW^\top$ is a diagonal matrix, removing diagonal terms is expected to reduce the spectral norm of the noise and hence to make the recovery problem easier. Specifically, observe that the matrix $H(\tilde{A}A^\top)$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$H(\tilde{A}A^\top) = (\delta - 1)^2p^2n_2H(\eta_1\eta_1^\top) + H(WW^\top) + p(\delta - 1)H(W\eta_2\eta_1^\top + \eta_1\eta_2^\top W^\top).$$

It turns out that the main driver of the noise is $H(WW^\top)$. On the other hand, it is easy to see (cf., e.g., Lemma 17 in [20]) that

$$\|H(WW^\top)\|_\infty \leq 2\|WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top)\|_\infty$$

for any random matrix $W$ with independent columns. This shows that removing the diagonal terms is a good candidate to remove the bias induced by the noise. Thus, diagonal deletion can be viewed as an alternative to de-biasing of the Gram matrix. Nevertheless, the operator $H(\cdot)$ may affect dramatically the signal. Fortunately, this does not happen in our case; the signal term is almost insensitive to this operation since it is a rank one matrix. In particular, we have:

$$\|H(\eta_1\eta_1^\top)\|_\infty = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_1}\right)\|\eta_1\eta_1^\top\|_\infty.$$  

Thus, as $n_1$ grows, the signal does not get affected by removing its diagonal terms while we get rid of the bias in the noise term. This motivates the
spectral estimator \( \eta_0^0 \) defined by (4), where \( \hat{v} \) is the eigenvector corresponding to the top eigenvalue of \( H(\hat{A}\hat{A}^\top) \). The next result gives sufficient conditions for the estimator \( \eta_0^0 \) to achieve almost full recovery.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( \eta_0^0 \) be the estimator given by (4) with \( \hat{p} \) defined in (2) and let \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). Let \( (C_n) \) be a sequence of positive numbers that tends to infinity as \( n_1 \to \infty \).

(i) Let the following conditions hold:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n_2}{n_1} > \log n_1, \\
&\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \leq \sqrt{\alpha}/96, \\
&\frac{p}{n_1 n_2} \geq \frac{C}{n_1} (\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}},
\end{aligned}
\]

where \( C > C_0/\sqrt{\alpha} \) for an absolute constant \( C_0 > 0 \) large enough. Then \( \eta_0^0 \) achieves weak recovery of \( \eta_1 \).

(ii) Let the following conditions hold:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n_2}{n_1} > \log n_1, \\
&\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \leq 1/C n_1, \\
&\frac{p}{n_1 n_2} \geq \frac{C n_1}{n_1 n_2} (\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}},
\end{aligned}
\]

Then \( \eta_1^0 \) achieves almost full recovery of \( \eta_1 \).

Theorem 1 improves upon the existing sufficient conditions of almost full recovery through a spectral method and gets the \( \sqrt{\log n_1} \) dependence in the regime \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \). The proof of Theorem 1 is given in the Appendix. It is based on a variant of matrix Bernstein inequality applied to a sum of independent hollowed rank one random matrices. In particular, it follows that, under conditions of Theorem 1,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \left\| H(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty^2 \right) = O(n_1 n_2 p^2).
\]

Under the Gaussian Mixture Model, spectral methods based on the hollowed Gram matrix or its debiased version are almost equivalent. Suprisingly, it is not the case for the BSBM model. It turns out that hollowing the Gram matrix can be stricly better than other debiasing techniques. In particular, we show that debiasing the Gram matrix through covariance subtraction is suboptimal in the regime where \( n_1 (\log n_1)^3 = O(n_2) \). Indeed, for the matrix \( WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top) \) the following result holds.

**Lemma 1.** Let \( \gamma_1 < 1, \gamma_2 < 1, n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \) and \( 18(n_1^{-1} n_2^{-1} \log n_1)^{1/2} \leq p \leq (206 n_1 \log n_1)^{-1} \). Then

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \left\| WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty^2 \right) \geq \frac{n_2 p}{40}.
\]
The regime considered in Lemma 1 is only possible when \( n_1 (\log n_1)^2 = O(n_2) \). In this regime, we have \( n_2 p \gg n_1 n_2 p^2 \), so that inequality (7) is loose, which explains the suboptimality of covariance debiasing. We further check this fact through simulations in Section 7.

Note that we did not show that the spectral estimator \( \eta_1^0 \) can achieve exact recovery under the conditions of Theorem 1. Pursuing similar arguments as developed in [3] for the case of SBM would lead to a logarithmic dependence of order \( \log n_1 \) in the sufficient condition and not to the desired \( \sqrt{\log n_1} \). By analogy to the Gaussian Mixture Model, where it was shown recently in [2] that the spectral estimator is optimal for exact recovery, we conjecture that the condition \( p > C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}} \) is sufficient for \( \eta_1^0 \) to achieve exact recovery whenever \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \). Proving such a result would most likely require developing novel concentration bounds for Bernoulli covariance matrices.

5. Exact recovery by the hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm. In this section, we present sufficient conditions, under which the hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm \((\hat{\eta}^k)_{k \geq 0}\) defined in (5) with spectral initialization achieves exact recovery for all \( k \) large enough.

**Theorem 2.** Let \((\hat{\eta}^k)_{k \geq 0}\) be the recursion (5) initialized with the spectral estimator (4) for \( \hat{p} \) given by (2). There exists a constant \( C > 0 \) such that if the following holds:

\[
\begin{align*}
& n_2 > n_1 \log n_1, \\
& \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \leq 1/480, \\
& p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}.
\end{align*}
\]

then the estimator \( \hat{\eta}^m \) with \( m = m(n_1) \geq \log n_1 / \log 2 \) achieves exact recovery of \( \eta_1 \).

Some comments are in order here.

1. The approach that we developed to construct \( \hat{\eta}^m \) is general and is in fact a tool that transforms any estimator achieving weak recovery into a new estimator achieving exact recovery under mild assumptions. This can be readily seen from the proof of Theorem 2.

2. Numerically, the procedure \((\hat{\eta}^k)_{k \geq 0}\) considered in Theorem 2 has the same complexity as the spectral initialization. It is still unclear whether the result of Theorem 2 holds with random initialization.

3. We conjecture that the conditions \( p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}} \) and \( n_2 > n_1 \log n_1 \) of Theorem 2 cannot be improved. In the next section, we provide a result supporting this fact. The imbalance condition \( \gamma_1 \gamma_2 = \)
$O(1)$ is only required to handle the estimation of $p$. If $p$ is known the results of this paper remain valid with no assumption on $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$.

6. Impossibility result for a supervised oracle. Motivated by the spiked reduction of the BSBM model when $p$ is known, we define the supervised oracle as follows

$$\tilde{\eta}_1 = \text{sign}(H(\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^\top)\eta_1).$$

For each label $\eta_{1i}$ to estimate, the supervised oracle has access to the remaining labels ($\eta_{1j}, j \neq i$) and to $p$. We refer the reader to [20] where more intuition about this estimator is presented. We state below an impossibility result corresponding to the supervised oracle.

**Proposition 1.** Assume that $n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$. There exists $c_5 > 0$ depending only on $\delta$ such that if $p^2 = c_5 \frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}$ then for the oracle $\tilde{\eta}_1$ we have

$$\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P(\tilde{\eta}_{1i} \neq \eta_{1i}) = \infty.$$

Hence, condition $p^2 = \Omega \left( \frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2} \right)$ is necessary for the supervised oracle to achieve exact recovery when $n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1$. Combining this result with the established sufficient conditions for exact recovery, we get now the full picture under the condition $n_1 (\log n_1)^4 = O(n_2)$. The diagram below completes the diagram in [10], which compares SVD versus diagonal deletion SVD when $n_2 \geq n_1 (\log n_1)^4$. We recall here that the SVD estimator is the one returning signs of the second eigenvector of $AA^\top$. In [10], a debiased spectral method is also considered which uses as an estimator the signs of the second eigenvector of $AA^\top - E(WW^\top)$. Under perfect balance (that is, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$), $E(WW^\top)$ is proportional to $I_{n_1}$ and hence SVD and debiased spectral method coincide in that case, while in general the debiased spectral method outperforms the SVD estimator. Comparison of the three methods: SVD, debiased spectral (DS) and hollowed Lloyd’s (HL), in the general case of imbalance, can be summarized as follows:

- **failure of the oracle**
- **failure of DS**
- **failure of SVD**
- **success of HL**
- **success of DS**
- **success of SVD**

The above diagram is confirmed by simulations in the next section.
7. Numerical experiments. The goal of this section is to provide numerical evidence to our theory. We compare the performance of methods defined previously, namely:

- SVD estimator (SVD),
- debiased spectral estimator (DS),
- diagonal deletion SVD estimator (DD),
- hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm with spectral initialization (HL),
- the oracle procedure (O).

In what follows, we fix the number of labels \( n = 300 \), the imbalance \( \gamma_1 = 0 \), \( \gamma_2 = 0.5 \) and \( \delta = 0.5 \). For the sake of readability of plots, we define the parameters \( a \) and \( b \) such that

\[
p = \sqrt{a/n_1} \quad \text{and} \quad b = n_1(\log n_1)/n_2.
\]

According to our improved sufficient conditions and using the above parameterization we expect the phase transition for exact recovery to happen at

\[
a \geq C_\delta b
\]

for some \( C_\delta > 0 \) when \( b \geq 1 \). Our simulation setup is defined as follows. We choose \( b \in \{0.1, 0.5, 5\} \) and we set \( a \) on a uniform grid of 20 points in a region where the phase transition occurs. Although our theory holds for \( b \leq 1 \), we added simulations for the case of \( b > 1 \). For each combination of values of \( a \) and \( b \), simulation was repeated 1000 times. Figure 1 presents the empirical probabilities of exactly recovering the vector of true labels \( \eta_1 \).

![Fig 1: Empirical probability of success over 1000 runs of the experiment for: \( b = 0.1 \) (left), \( b = 0.5 \) (center) and \( b = 5 \) (right).](image)

Overall, numerical experiments match our theoretical findings and provide some interesting insights:
1. Hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm with spectral initialization achieves a performance remarkably close to the oracle without any prior knowledge about the true labels. Notice that this holds also when only a fraction of labels can be recovered, i.e. when the probability of wrong recovery is not exactly zero. This, in particular, suggests that the theoretical comparison we established between the above algorithms can be extended beyond the problem of exact recovery. Further simulations show that randomly initialized hollowed Lloyd’s algorithm achieves the same performance as well (we omit these simulations since such an algorithm is not covered by our theory).

2. In the case $b = 0.1$ (high dimension), we recover empirically the diagram of Section 6. Observe that as $b$ gets larger (moderate and small dimension) all estimators converge to almost indistinguishable performance. This confirms the fact that the phenomena addressed in this paper are of high-dimensional nature.

3. In high dimensions, the DD method outperforms the DS, which supports the argument that in the BSBM model hollowing is more beneficial than debiasing (cf. Lemma 1 and the corresponding discussion).
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APPENDIX A: CONTROL OF THE SPECTRAL NORM OF THE HOLLOWED GRAM MATRIX

This section is devoted to the control of the spectral norm of the hollowed matrix \( H(WW^T) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} H(W_jW_j^T) \), where we denote by \( W_j \) the columns of \( W \). The following theorem will be used in the proofs.

**Theorem 3** (Matrix Bernstein inequality – adapted from [23], Theorem 6.2). Let \((Y_j)_{j=1}^n\) be a sequence of independent symmetric random matrices of size \( d \times d \), and \( a, R > 0 \). Assume that for all \( j \) in \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) we have \( E(Y_j) = 0 \) and \( \|E(Y_j^q)\|_\infty \leq \frac{q^1}{2}R^{q-2}a^2 \) for \( q = 2, 3, \ldots \).

Then, for all \( t \geq 0 \),
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j \right\|_\infty \geq t \right) \leq d \exp \left( -\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2 + 2Rt} \right) \text{ with } \sigma^2 = na^2.
\]

We will show that in our case this theorem can be applied with \( Y_j = H(W_jW_j^T) \), \( d = n_1 \), \( n = n_2 \), \( R = 3(1 + 2n_1p) \) and \( a^2 = 4p^2n_1 \). One can check that it gives a strict improvement over the matrix Hoeffding type inequality that uses only the fact that \( \|H(W_jW_j^T)\|_\infty \leq n_1 \) almost surely. Namely, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.** For all \( t \geq 0 \),
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} H(W_jW_j^T) \right\|_\infty \geq t \right) \leq n_1 \exp \left( -\frac{t^2}{8n_1n_2p^2 + 6(1 + 2n_1p)t} \right).
\]

**Proof.** Fix \( j \) in \( \{1, \ldots, n_2\} \). In view of Theorem 3, it is enough to show that for all integers \( q \geq 2 \) we have
\[
\|E(H(W_jW_j^T)^q)\|_\infty \leq 2q!(3(1 + 2n_1p))^{q-2}p^2n_1.
\]

We now prove (8). To alleviate the notation, we set \( w = W_j \) and we denote by \( w_k \) the entries of \( w \). Note that \( w_k \) are independent random variables taking value 1 − \( p \) w.p. \( p \) and \( -p \) w.p. 1 − \( p \), where \( p \) is either \( \delta p \) or \( (2 - \delta)p \). We have \( E(w_k) = 0 \) for all \( k \). Furthermore, for any integer \( m \geq 2 \),
\[
|E(w_k^m)| \leq 2p.
\]
Indeed,

\[ |\mathbb{E}(w_k^n)| \leq p(1-p) \max_{0 \leq p \leq 1} ((1-p)^{m-1} + p^{m-1}) = p(1-p). \]

Denote by \( h_{ik}(q) \) the \((i,k)\)th entry of matrix \( H(ww^\top)^q \). Note that the \((i,k)\)th entry of matrix \( H(ww^\top) \) is \( H(ww^\top)_{ik} = w_i w_k \mathbb{1}(i \neq k) \). It comes out that

\[ h_{ik}(q) = \sum_{(i_2,i_3,\ldots,i_q) \in J} w_i w_k \prod_{\ell=2}^q w_{i_\ell}^2, \]

where \( J = \{(i_2,i_3,\ldots,i_q) : i_2 \neq i_3,\ldots,i_{q-1} \neq i_q; i_2 \neq i, i_q \neq k\} \) and indices \( i_\ell \) take values in \( \{1,\ldots,n_1\} \). Thus,

(10) \[ |\mathbb{E}(h_{ik}(q))| \leq \mathbb{E}\left( w_i w_k \prod_{\ell=2}^q w_{i_\ell}^2 \right). \]

First note that for \( q = 2 \) the terms in this sum are non-zero only if \( i = k \) and in this case the sum is bounded by \( 4p^2 n_1 \). Thus, (8) holds for \( q = 2 \). In order to prove (8) for \( q \geq 3 \), it suffices to show that for all \( i, k \) we have

(11) \[ |\mathbb{E}(h_{ik}(q))| \leq 2q!(1 + 2pn_1)^{q-2}p^2, \quad i \neq k, \]

and

(12) \[ |\mathbb{E}(h_{ii}(q))| \leq 4q!(1 + 2pn_1)^{q-2}p^2 n_1. \]

We start by showing (11) for all \( q \geq 3 \). Let \( i \neq k \). We first bound the number of non-zero terms in the sum in (10). Since \( w_1,\ldots,w_{n_1} \) are independent zero-mean random variables, the term in this sum corresponding to some fixed \((i_2,i_3,\ldots,i_q)\) can be non-zero only if both \( i \) and \( k \) belong to the set \( \{i_2,i_3,\ldots,i_q\} \). In order to take into account equalities between different indices \( i_\ell \), consider all partitions \( \pi \) of the set \( \{i_2,i_3,\ldots,i_q\} \) into \( s \) subsets, with equal indices in each subset, where \( s \) runs from 2 to \( q - 1 \) (the case \( s = 1 \), that is \( i_2 = i_3 = \cdots = i_q \), is excluded since the corresponding expectation vanishes).

Assume a partition \( \pi \) in \( s \) subsets fixed. Then, for the expectation

\[ \mathbb{E}\left( w_i w_k \prod_{\ell=2}^q w_{i_\ell}^2 \right) \]
to be non-zero, two out of \( s \) subsets must contain variables with indices \( i \) and \( k \), and in this case due to independence of \( w_m \) and (9) we have

\[
\left| E\left( w_i w_k \prod_{\ell=2}^{q} w_{i_{\ell}}^2 \right) \right| \leq (2p)^s.
\]

Denote by \( \mathcal{P}_{s,2} \) the set of all partitions \( \pi \) of \( \{i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_q\} \) into \( s \) subsets such that for two of these subsets the indices \( i_\ell \) are equal to \( i \) and \( k \). To get an upper bound on the cardinality of \( \mathcal{P}_{s,2} \), notice that any such partition can be obtained by choosing \( s - 2 \) distinct indices among the \( q - 3 \) possible values (other than \( i \) and \( k \)) and then allocating the remaining \( q - s \) indices to \( s \) buckets. This leads to the bound \( \text{Card}(\mathcal{P}_{s,2}) \leq (q - 3)(q - 2s + 2)^{s-2}(2p)^s \). Denote by \( i_1(\pi) \neq \cdots \neq i_{s-2}(\pi) \) the \( s - 2 \) distinct indices (other than \( i \) and \( k \)) corresponding to the partition \( \pi \in \mathcal{P}_{s,2} \). Using (13) and the fact that the indices \( i_\ell(\pi) \) can take values from 1 to \( n_1 \) we obtain

\[
|E(h_{ik}(q))| \leq \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{s,2}} \sum_{i_1(\pi) \neq \cdots \neq i_{s-2}(\pi)} (2p)^s
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \binom{q-3}{s-2} s^{q-s} n_1^{s-2} (2p)^s
\]

\[
\leq 2p^2 q! \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \binom{q-2}{s-2} (2pn_1)^{s-2}
\]

\[
\leq 2q!(1 + 2pn_1)^{q-2} p^2,
\]

where we have used the inequalities \( s^{q-s} \leq (q-1)!/(s-1)! \leq q!/2 \). Thus, the bound (11) is proved for all \( q \geq 3 \).

It remains to show that (12) holds for \( q \geq 3 \). Denote by \( \mathcal{P}_{s,1} \) the set of all partitions \( \pi \) of \( \{i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_q\} \) into \( s \) subsets such that for one of these subsets the index \( i_\ell \) is equal to \( i \). Similarly to the argument for \( \mathcal{P}_{s,2} \), we obtain that \( \text{Card}(\mathcal{P}_{s,1}) \leq \binom{q-2}{s-1} s^{q-s} \) and

\[
|E(h_{ik}(q))| \leq \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{s,1}} \sum_{i_1(\pi) \neq \cdots \neq i_{s-1}(\pi)} (2p)^s
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \binom{q-2}{s-1} s^{q-s} n_1^{s-1} (2p)^s
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \binom{q-2}{s-2} \frac{q - s}{s - 1} \frac{(q - 1)!}{(s - 1)!} n_1^{s-1} (2p)^s
\]
\[ \leq 4p^2 n_1 q! \sum_{s=2}^{q-1} \frac{q-s}{s-2} (2pn_1)^{s-2} \]
\[ \leq 4q!(1 + 2pn_1)^{q-2} p^2 n_1. \]

**Lemma 1.** Let \( \gamma_1 < 1, \gamma_2 < 1, n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \) and \( 18(n_1^{-1} n_2^{-1} \log n_1)^{1/2} \leq p \leq (206 n_1 \log n_1)^{-1} \). Then

\[ \mathbb{E} \left( \left\| WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty^2 \right) \geq \frac{n_2 p}{40}. \]

**Proof.** Set \( p = \max(\delta p, (2 - \delta)p) \geq p \). Since \( \gamma_1 < 1 \) and \( \gamma_2 < 1 \) then at least one row of \( W \) has not less than \( n_2/2 \) entries that are centered Bernoulli variables with parameter \( p \). Without loss of generality, let it be the first row of \( W \). We denote this first row by \( X_1 \). We have

\[ \left\| WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty \geq \left\| X_1 \right\|^2 - \mathbb{E}(\left\| X_1 \right\|^2) - \mathbb{E}(\left\| H(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty^2), \]

so that

\[ \mathbb{E} \left( \left\| WW^\top - \mathbb{E}(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty^2 \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( (\left\| X_1 \right\|^2 - \mathbb{E}(\left\| X_1 \right\|^2))^2 \right) - \mathbb{E} \left( \left\| H(WW^\top) \right\|_\infty^2 \right). \]

Denoting by \( \eta \) the centered Bernoulli variable with parameter \( p \) (\( \eta \) takes value \( 1 - p \) with probability \( p \) and value \( -p \) with probability \( 1 - p \)) we get

\[ \mathbb{E} \left( (\left\| X_1 \right\|^2 - \mathbb{E}(\left\| X_1 \right\|^2))^2 \right) \geq \frac{n_2}{2} \text{Var}(\eta^2) \]
\[ = \frac{n_2}{2} p(1-p)(1-2p)^2 \geq \frac{9n_2p}{20}, \]

where we have used the inequalities \( p \leq p \leq 2p \leq 1/70 \).

Next, note that \( 2n_1 p \leq 1 \) and introduce the notation \( H = \|H(WW^\top)\|_\infty^2 \), \( t_1 = 4\sqrt{n_1 n_2 p^2 \log n_1} \), \( t_2 = 4n_1 n_2 p^2/(3(1+2n_1 p)) \). From Theorem 4 and the facts that \( t_2 \geq (2/3)n_1 n_2 p^2 \geq (2c/3) \log n_1 \) with \( c = 18^2 \), and \( n_1 \geq 2 \) we get

\[ \mathbb{E}(H^2) = 2 \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(H > t) t dt \leq t_1^2 + 2n_1 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \exp \left( -\frac{t^2}{16n_1 n_2 p^2} \right) t dt \]
\[ + 2n_1 \int_{t_2}^\infty \exp \left( -\frac{t}{12(1+2n_1 p)} \right) t dt. \]
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\[ \leq 16n_1n_2p^2 \log n_1 + 16n_1n_2p^2 + 2n_1 \int_{t_2}^{\infty} \exp \left( -\frac{t}{24} \right) t \, dt \]

\[ \leq 16n_1n_2p^2(\log n_1 + 1) + 2n_1(32n_1n_2p^2 + (24)^2) \exp(-c(\log n_1)/36) \]

\[ \leq 16n_1n_2p^2(\log n_1 + 1) + 2^{-3}n_1n_2p^2 + (3/2)^2 \]

\[ \leq n_1n_2p^2 \log n_1 \left( 16 + \frac{17}{\log n_1} \right) \]

where we have used the condition on \( p \). Combining the above displays we get the lemma.

\[ \square \]

APPENDIX B: LOWER BOUND ON THE ORACLE

We define the oracle as follows

\[ \tilde{\eta}_1 = \text{sign} \left( H((A - pI_{n_1}I_{n_2}^\top)(A - pI_{n_1}I_{n_2}^\top)^\top)\eta_1 \right) . \]

**Proposition 1.** Assume that \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \) and \( \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0 \). There exists \( c_3 > 0 \) depending only on \( \delta \) such that if \( p^2 = c_3 \frac{\log n_1}{n_1n_2} \) then for the oracle \( \tilde{\eta}_1 \) we have

\[ \lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\eta}_i \neq \eta_i) = \infty. \]

**Proof.** Since \( n_{1+} = n_{1-} \) and \( n_{2+} = n_{2-} \) we obtain that the ith entry of vector \( H((A - pI_{n_1}I_{n_2}^\top)(A - pI_{n_1}I_{n_2}^\top)^\top)\eta_1 \) is equal to

\[ h_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (A_{ij} - p) \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} A_{kj} \eta_{1k} - \eta_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (A_{ij} - p)^2. \]

For all \( i \) in \( \{1, \ldots, n_1\} \), since \( \tilde{\eta}_i \neq \eta_i \) is equivalent to \( h_i \eta_i < 0 \) we have

\[ \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\eta}_i \neq \eta_i) = \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k \neq i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \eta_i \eta_{1k} (A_{ij} - p) A_{kj} < p \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (p - A_{ij}) \right) . \]

Observe that

\[ \sum_{k \neq i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \eta_i \eta_{1k} (A_{ij} - p) A_{kj} = (1 - p) \sum_{k \neq i, j; A_{ij} = 1} \eta_i \eta_{1k} A_{kj} - p \sum_{k \neq i, j; A_{ij} = 0} \eta_i \eta_{1k} A_{kj} \]
\[24\] 

\[-(1 - p) \sum_{k \neq i, \eta_k \neq \eta_i} \sum_{j : A_{ij} = 1} A_{kj} + (1 - p) \sum_{k \neq i, \eta_k = \eta_i} \sum_{j : A_{ij} = 1} A_{kj} - p \sum_{k \neq i, j : A_{ij} = 0} \eta_i \eta_k A_{kj}.\]

Hence

\[\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\eta}_1 \neq \eta_1) = \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{k \neq i, \eta_k \neq \eta_i} \sum_{j : A_{ij} = 1} A_{kj} > \beta \right) \geq \mathbb{P} (\alpha > \beta) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{P}(\alpha > \beta | A_i) \mathbb{I}_F \right],\]

where \( A_i = (A_{ij})_{j=1}^{n_2}, \)

\[\alpha = \sum_{k \neq i, \eta_k \neq \eta_i} \sum_{j : A_{ij} = 1, n_2 = \eta_i} A_{kj},\]

\[\beta = \sum_{k \neq i, \eta_k = \eta_i} \sum_{j : A_{ij} = 1} A_{kj} + \frac{p}{1 - p} \left( \sum_{j = 1}^{n_2} A_{ij} - \sum_{k \neq i, j : A_{ij} = 0} \eta_i \eta_k A_{kj} \right),\]

and

\[F = \left\{ \sum_{j = 1}^{n_2} A_{ij} \leq 4n_2p \right\} \cap \left\{ \sum_{j : n_2 = \eta_i} A_{ij} \geq \delta pn_2/4 \right\}.\]

Note that \( F \) is an event of large enough probability for \( n_1 \) large enough. Indeed, as \( \mathbb{E}(A_{ij}) \leq 2p \) and \( \text{Var}(A_{ij}) \leq 2p \) we get from Chebyshev inequality that

\[\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{j = 1}^{n_2} A_{ij} > 4n_2p \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{j = 1}^{n_2} (A_{ij} - \mathbb{E}(A_{ij})) > 2n_2p \right) \leq \frac{1}{2pn_2} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{c} \log n_1},\]

where we have used the fact that \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \). Similarly, using Chebyshev inequality and the facts that for any \( i \) we have \( \text{Card}\{j : \eta_2 j = \eta_i\} = n_2/2 \) and that \( \mathbb{E}(A_{ij}) = \delta p \) for \( \eta_2 j = \eta_i \) we find

\[\mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{j : n_2 = \eta_i} A_{ij} < \delta pn_2/4 \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{j : n_2 = \eta_i} (\delta p - A_{ij}) > \delta pn_2/4 \right) \leq \frac{8}{\delta pn_2} \leq \frac{8}{\delta \sqrt{c} \log n_1}.\]
It follows from (14) and (15) that

\[ P(F) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_3} \log n_1} \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{8}{\delta} \right). \]

Next, from Chebyshev inequality and the facts that \( E(A_{kj}) \leq 2p \), \( \text{Var}(A_{kj}) \leq 2p \), we obtain, conditionally on \( A_i \),

\[ P\left( \left| \sum_{k \neq i, j : A_{ij} = 0} \eta_{1i}\eta_{1k} A_{kj} \right| \geq 4n_2n_1p | A_i \right) \leq \frac{1}{2n_2n_1p}. \]

Quite similarly, as \( \text{Card}\{k : \eta_{1k} = \eta_{1i}\} = n_1/2 \) and for \( A_i \in F \) we have \( \text{Card}\{j : A_{ij} = 1\} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} A_{ij} \leq 4pn_2 \), the following inequality holds

\[ \forall A_i \in F : \quad P\left( \sum_{k \neq i : \eta_{1k} = \eta_{1i}} \sum_{j : A_{ij} = 1} A_{kj} \geq 8n_2n_1p^2 | A_i \right) \leq \frac{1}{4n_2n_1p^2}. \]

Thus, for all \( n_1 \) large enough to have \( p \leq 1/2 \) we obtain

\[ \forall A_i \in F : \quad P(\beta \leq 24c_3 \log n_1 | A_i) = P(\beta \leq 24n_1n_2p^2 | A_i) \geq 1 - \frac{3}{4n_2n_1p^2} = 1 - \frac{3}{4c_3 \log n_1}. \]

Observe that random variables \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are independent conditionally on \( A_i \) since the sums over \( (k, j) \) in their definitions are taken over disjoint sets of indices. Using this we get

\[ P(\eta_{1i} \neq \eta_{1i}) \geq \left( 1 - \frac{3}{4c_3 \log n_1} \right) \mathbb{E}\left[ P\left( \alpha \geq 24c_3 \log n_1 | A_i \right) 1_F \right]. \]

Note that, conditionally on \( A_i \), the random variable \( \alpha \) has a Binomial distribution with probability parameter \( (2 - \delta)p \). Moreover, if \( A_i \in F \) then the number of terms in \( \alpha \) denoted by \( n \) is such that \( n \leq 4pn_1n_2 \) and \( n \geq (n_1/2 - 1)(\delta p n_2/4) \geq \delta p n_1 n_2/12 \) for \( n_1 \geq 6 \). It follows that, for any fixed \( A_i \in F \), the assumptions of Lemma 2 are satisfied with \( p = (2 - \delta)p \), \( t = 24c_3 \log n_1 \) provided that \( \sqrt{n_1/\log n_1} > 288\sqrt{c_3/\delta} \). Therefore, for \( n_1 \) large enough to satisfy this condition and \( c_4 \log n_1 \geq 1 \), \( n_1 \geq 6 \), Lemma 2 implies that, for any \( A_i \in F \),

\[ P(\alpha \geq 24c_3 \log n_1 | A_i) \geq \frac{e^{-1/6}}{\sqrt{50\pi c_3 \log n_1}} \exp\left( -25c_3 \log n_1 \log \left( \frac{300}{\delta(2 - \delta)} \right) \right). \]
With the choice $c_δ = \left(50 \log \left(\frac{300}{3^2-3}\right)\right)^{-1}$ this yields

$$
P(\alpha \geq 24c_δ \log n_1 | A_i) \geq \frac{e^{-1/6}}{\sqrt{50\pi c_δ n_1 \log n_1}}.
$$

Combining this inequality with (16) and (17) we get the proposition. \hfill \Box

The following lemma is used to control the lower tail of binomial variables.

**Lemma 2.** Let $ξ_1, \ldots, ξ_n$ be i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with parameter $p$ and $α = \sum_{i=1}^n ξ_i$. Then for all $np < t < n$ we have

$$
P(α \geq t) \geq \frac{e^{-1/6}}{\sqrt{2\pi(t+1)}} \exp \left( -(t+1) \log \left(\frac{t+1}{np}\right) \right).
$$

**Proof.** Set $k = \lceil t \rceil$. Since

$$
P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n ξ_i \geq t\right) \geq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n ξ_i = k\right)
$$

for $k = n$ the result is trivial. Assume that $k \leq n - 1$ and set $a = k/n$. Then $p < a < 1$. By Stirling’s approximation,

$$
\sqrt{2\pi n} (n/e)^n \leq n! \leq \sqrt{2\pi n} (n/e)^n e^{1/12}.
$$

Therefore,

$$
P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n ξ_i \geq t\right) \geq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n ξ_i = k\right) = \frac{n!p^k(1-p)^{n-k}}{k!(n-k)!}
$$

$$
\geq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi n} n^np^k(1-p)^{n-k}}{e^{1/6}} \frac{k^k}{(n-k)^{n-k}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(n-k)}} \frac{(n-k)^{n-k}}{(n-k)^{n-k}}
$$

$$
\geq \frac{p^k(1-p)^{n-k}}{e^{1/6}2\pi an a^k (1-a)^{n-k}} \geq \frac{p^k}{e^{1/6}2\pi an a^k}.
$$

\hfill \Box

**APPENDIX C: MAIN PROOFS**

C.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.** Recall that

$$
η_1^0 = \text{sign}(\hat{v}),
$$
where \( \hat{v} \) is the eigenvector corresponding to the top eigenvalue of the matrix
\[
H((A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)^\top)
\]
with \( \hat{p} = \frac{1}{n_1n_2} \mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top A \mathbb{I}_{n_2}. \) Recall the notation \( \tilde{A} = A - p\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top. \) We have
\[
H((A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)^\top) = H(\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^\top) + Z_4,
\]
where (cf. (6))
\[
H(\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^\top) = (\delta - 1)^2p^2n_2H(\eta_1\eta_1^\top) + H(WW^\top) + p(\delta - 1)H(W\eta_2\eta_1^\top + \eta_1\eta_2^\top W^\top)
\]
and
\[
Z_4 := H((A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)^\top) - H(\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^\top).
\]
Therefore,
\[
H((A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)^\top) = (\delta - 1)^2p^2n_2\eta_1\eta_1^\top + Z,
\]
where
\[
Z = H(WW^\top) + p(\delta - 1)H(W\eta_2\eta_1^\top + \eta_1\eta_2^\top W^\top) - (\delta - 1)^2p^2n_2I_{n_1} + Z_4.
\]
Notice that since \( Z_3 \) is a multiple of the identity matrix, \( \hat{v} \) is the eigenvector corresponding to the top eigenvalue of \( H' = H((A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{p}\mathbb{I}_{n_1}\mathbb{I}_{n_2}^\top)^\top) + Z_3. \) Thus, \( \hat{v} \) and \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1}}\eta_1 \) are the eigenvectors of \( \frac{1}{n_1}H' \) and \( (\delta - 1)^2p^2n_2\frac{\eta_1\eta_1^\top}{n_1} \) associated to their top eigenvalues, respectively. Since \( \eta_1\eta_1^\top \) is rank one matrix, we get from Davis-Kahan (Theorem 4.5.5. in [24]) that
\[
\min_{\nu \in \{-1, 1\}} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1}}\eta_1 - \nu\hat{v} \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{8\|Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_4\|_2^2}{(\delta - 1)^4p^4n_1^2n_2^2}.
\]
This implies (see Lemma 3 below) that
\[
\frac{1}{n_1}r(\eta_1, \eta_1^0) \leq \frac{16}{(\delta - 1)^4p^4n_1^2n_2^2}\|Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_4\|_\infty^2.
\]
Thus, in order to bound \( r(\eta_1, \eta_1^0) \), it remains to control the spectral norm of \( Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_4. \) Namely, we will prove that
\[
\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \|Z_i\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12}(\delta - 1)^2p^2n_1n_2 \right) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 4,
\]
which implies the theorem.
• **Control of** $\|Z_1\|_\infty$.
  Recall that $W$ is a random matrix with entries that are independent and distributed as $\zeta - \mathbb{E}(\zeta)$ where $\zeta$ is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\delta p$ or $(2 - \delta)p$. Therefore, both the expectation and the variance of each entry are bounded by $2p$. We now apply Theorem 4 with $t = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2$. This yields
  \[
  \mathbb{P} \left( \|Z_1\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \leq n_1 \exp \left[ -\frac{t^2}{(8n_1 n_2 p^2 + 6t) + 2n_1 pt} \right] \leq n_1 \exp \left[ -12^{-2} \alpha (\delta - 1)^4 n_1 n_2 p^2 / 17 \right] + n_1 \exp \left[ -\sqrt{\alpha} (\delta - 1)^2 p n_2 / 288 \right],
  \]
  where the last inequality uses the facts that $\exp(-a/(b+c)) \leq \exp(-a/(2b)) + \exp(-a/(2c))$ for all $a, b, c > 0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $|\delta - 1| < 1$. Recall that $p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\log n_1 / n_2}$ and $n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1$ by the assumption of the theorem. Using these conditions and choosing $C \geq 289/\sqrt{\alpha}$ we obtain
  \[
  \mathbb{P} \left( \|Z_1\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \leq 2n_1^{-\frac{1}{288}}.
  \]

• **Control of** $\|Z_2\|_\infty$.
  In order to control $Z_2$, we first observe, using the inequality $\|H(M)\|_\infty \leq 2\|M\|_\infty$ valid for any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ (cf., e.g., Lemma 17 in [20]), that
  \[
  \|H \left( \eta_2 W^\top + W \eta_2 \right) \|_\infty \leq 2\|\eta_2 \eta_2^\top W^\top + W \eta_2 \eta_1 \|_\infty \\
  \leq 2\|\eta_2 \eta_2^\top W^\top\|_\infty + 2\|W \eta_2 \eta_1\|_\infty \\
  \leq 4\sqrt{n_1} \|W \eta_2\|_2.
  \]
  Hence
  \[
  \mathbb{E}(\|Z_2\|_\infty^2) \leq 16(\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 \mathbb{E}(\|W \eta_2\|_2^2).
  \]
  Denote by $X_1, \ldots, X_{n_1}$ the column vectors equal to the transposed rows of matrix $W$. Since $\mathbb{E}(X_i X_i^\top)$ is a diagonal matrix with positive entries bounded from above by $2p$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n_1$, we obtain
  \[
  \mathbb{E}(\|W \eta_2\|_2^2) = \eta_2^\top \mathbb{E}(W^\top W) \eta_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta_2^i \mathbb{E}(X_i X_i^\top) \eta_2 \leq 2p n_1.
  \]
  This and Markov inequality yield the bound
  \[
  \mathbb{P} \left( \|Z_2\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \leq 9 \frac{2^6 (\delta - 1)^2 p^3 n_1^2 n_2}{(\delta - 1)^4 \alpha p^4 n_1^2 n_2^2}.
  \]
Now, note that since \( p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\log n_1/n_2} \) and \( n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1 \).

- **Control of \( \|Z_4\|_\infty \).**

We have

\[
Z_4 = H((A - \hat{p}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{p}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top) - (A - p\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top)(A - p\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top))
\]

\[
= H((p - \hat{p})(A\mathbb{1}_{n_2}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}^\top + \mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top A^\top) + ((\hat{p} - p)^2 - 2p(\hat{p} - p))n_2\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}^\top)
\]

\[
= (\delta - 1)p(n_{2+} - n_{2-})(\eta_1\mathbb{1}_{n_1}^\top + \mathbb{1}_{n_1}\eta_1^\top) + (\delta - 1)p(n_{2+} - n_{2-})n_2\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}^\top.
\]

Since

\[
\hat{p} - p = \frac{(\delta - 1)p(n_{1+} - n_{1-})(n_{2+} - n_{2-})}{n_1 n_2} + \frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{i,j} W_{ij}
\]

then, recalling the notation \( \gamma_i = |n_{i+} - n_{i-}|/n_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \), and setting \( y := \frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{i,j} W_{ij} \), we have

\[
|\hat{p} - p| \leq |\delta - 1|p|\gamma_1\gamma_2| + |y|.
\]

Thus, using again the inequality \( \|H(M)\|_\infty \leq 2\|M\|_\infty \) and introducing the notation \( L = \|W\mathbb{1}_{n_2}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}^\top + \mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top W^\top\|_\infty \) we obtain

\[
\|Z_4\|_\infty \leq 2|\hat{p} - p|L + 4|\delta - 1||p - \hat{p}|p n_1 n_2 + |p - \hat{p}|^2 n_2 \|H(\mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top)\|_\infty
\]

\[
\leq 2|\hat{p} - p|L + 4(\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + 4|y|p n_1 n_2 + |p - \hat{p}|^2 n_1 n_2
\]

\[
\leq V + 6(\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_2,
\]

where

\[
V = 2|\hat{p} - p|L + 4|y|p n_1 n_2 + 2y^2 n_1 n_2.
\]

Now, note that since \( W_{ij} \) are zero mean random variables

\[
\mathbb{E}(y^2) \leq \frac{2p}{n_1 n_2}, \quad \mathbb{E}(|\hat{p} - p|^2) \leq p^2 + \frac{2p}{n_1 n_2}.
\]

Moreover, by the same argument as in the control of \( \|Z_2\|_\infty \),

\[
\mathbb{E}(L^2) = \mathbb{E}(\|W\mathbb{1}_{n_2}\mathbb{1}_{n_1}^\top + \mathbb{1}_{n_1}\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top W^\top\|_\infty^2) \leq 32n_2 n_1^2 p^3 \leq 8n_2 n_1^2 p.
\]
Using these inequalities and the facts that $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $n_2 \geq 2$ and $\sqrt{p^2 n_1 n_2} \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\log n_1} \geq 289 \sqrt{\log 2}$, we obtain

$$E(V) \leq 2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}([\bar{p} - p]^2)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(L^2)} + 4 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(y^2) p n_1 n_2} + 2 \mathbb{E}(y^2 n_1 n_2)$$

$$\leq 2 n_1 \sqrt{8 n_2 p} \sqrt{p^2 + \frac{2p}{n_1 n_2}} + 4 \sqrt{2 n_1 n_2 p} + 4 p$$

$$\leq 12 \sqrt{p^2 n_1 n_2} (1 + \sqrt{p n_1}).$$

Putting the above arguments together and applying Markov inequality, we get that, for $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \leq \sqrt{\alpha}/96$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \left\| Z_4 \right\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left( V \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{48} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{576 (1 + \sqrt{p n_1})}{(\delta - 1)^2 \sqrt{\alpha} \sqrt{p^2 n_1 n_2}}$$

$$\leq \frac{576}{(\delta - 1)^2 \sqrt{\alpha}} ((p^2 n_1 n_2)^{-1/2} + (p n_2)^{-1/2}).$$

Recall that $p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_1 n_2}}$ and $n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1$, and that we have chosen $C \geq 289/\sqrt{\alpha}$. Hence, $p n_2 \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \log n_1$. Using these inequalities and the facts that $|\delta - 1| < 1$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ in the last display we find

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \left\| Z_4 \right\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \leq \frac{36}{\alpha^{1/4}|\delta - 1| \sqrt{\log n_1}}.$$

In conclusion, we have proved that, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $C \geq 289/\sqrt{\alpha}$ and $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \leq \sqrt{\alpha}/96$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left( \left\| Z_4 \right\|_\infty \geq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{12} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \leq \frac{36}{\alpha^{1/4}|\delta - 1| \sqrt{\log n_1}}.$$

Hence, given $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \leq \sqrt{\alpha}/96$, there exists an absolute constant $C_0 > 0$ such that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $C > C_0/\sqrt{\alpha}$ we have

$$\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \frac{1}{n_1} \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3 \geq \alpha \right) = 0.$$
Lemma 3. For \( \eta_1^0 = \text{sign}(\hat{v}) \) we have

\[
\frac{1}{n_1} r(\eta_1, \eta_1^0) \leq 2 \min_{\nu \in \{-1,1\}} \left\| \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n_1}} \eta_1 - \hat{v} \right\|_2^2.
\]

Proof. By definition, \( r(\eta_1, \eta_1^0) = 2 \min_{\nu \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{I} \left( \nu \eta_{1i} \neq \eta_{1i}^0 \right) \). Set \( \hat{b} = \hat{v} \sqrt{n_1} \). Then \( \eta_1^0 = \text{sign}(\hat{b}) \) and, for any \( \nu \in \{-1,1\} \),

\[
\left\| \frac{\nu}{\sqrt{n_1}} \eta_1 - \hat{v} \right\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_1} \| \nu \eta_1 - \hat{b} \|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{I} \left( \nu \eta_{1i} \neq \eta_{1i}^0 \right),
\]

where the last inequality is due to the fact that \( (x - y)^2 \geq 1 \) \( x \neq \text{sign}(y) \) for any \( x \in \{-1,1\} \) and \( y \in \mathbb{R} \). \( \square \)

C.2. Proof of Theorem 2. Note that the assumptions of Theorem 1(i) are satisfied with \( \alpha = 1/25 \). Note also that \( |\eta_1 - \eta_1^0| = n_1 - \eta_1^T \eta_1^0 \). It follows from Theorem 1 and the definition of \( r(\eta_1, \eta_1) \) that with probability that tends to 1 as \( n_1 \to \infty \) we have either \( \frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \eta_1^0 \geq 3/4 \) or \( \frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \eta_1^0 \leq -3/4 \).

Next, recall that

\[
\Gamma := H((A - \hat{\mu} \mathbb{1}_{n_1} \mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top)(A - \hat{\mu} \mathbb{1}_{n_1} \mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top)^\top) = (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 \eta_1 \eta_1^T + Z.
\]

From (18) we have

\[
\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \| Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_4 \|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{20} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) = 0,
\]

using the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 1. Observing that \( \| Z_3 \|_\infty = (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 \) we get moreover that

\[
\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \| Z \|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{16} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) = 0.
\]

Define the following random events:

\[
O_i = \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \eta_i \right) \eta_i \geq \frac{(\delta - 1)^2}{2} p^2 n_2 \right\}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n_1,
\]

\[
B = \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} \| Z \|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{16} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 \right\},
\]

where \( \Gamma_i \) denotes the \( i \)th row of matrix \( \Gamma \). From (19) we have that the probability of \( B \) tends to 1 as \( n_1 \to \infty \). We call \( O \), the oracle events since they are similar to the events arising in the analysis of the supervised oracle procedure that, given the labels \( (\eta_{1j}, j \neq i) \), estimates the label \( \eta_{1i} \). The proof is decomposed in three steps that we detail in what follows.
• Proving the contraction.

We place ourselves on the random event $B \cap O_1 \cap \cdots \cap O_{n_1}$. Our first goal is to prove that if $\frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^k \geq 3/4$, then $|\hat{\eta}^{k+1} - \eta_1| \leq \frac{1}{4} |\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1|$ and $\frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^{k+1} \geq 3/4$. We have

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \hat{\eta}^k = \frac{1}{n_1} z_i^T (\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1) + \frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \eta_1 - (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 \eta_{1i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^k\right),$$

where $z_i$ is a column vector equal to the transposed $i$th row of matrix $Z$. Hence, if $\eta_{1i} = -1$ then

$$\frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \hat{\eta}^k \leq \frac{1}{n_1} z_i^T (\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1) - (\delta - 1)^2 \frac{4}{4} p^2 n_2.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \hat{\eta}^k \geq 0 \right\} \leq \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} z_i^T (\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1) \geq \frac{(\delta - 1)^2}{4} p^2 n_2 \right\} \leq \left( \frac{4 z_i^T (\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1)}{n_1 (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2} \right)^2.$$

Similarly, if $\eta_{1i} = 1$ then

$$\mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \hat{\eta}^k \leq 0 \right\} \leq \left( \frac{4 z_i^T (\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1)}{n_1 (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2} \right)^2.$$

Now,

$$\frac{1}{2} |\hat{\eta}^{k+1} - \eta_1| = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \hat{\eta}^k \geq 0 \right\} \mathbb{I} \eta_{1i} = -1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{1}{n_1} \Gamma_i \hat{\eta}^k \leq 0 \right\} \mathbb{I} \eta_{1i} = 1.$$

Hence, we get

(20)

$$\frac{1}{2n_1} |\hat{\eta}^{k+1} - \eta_1| \leq \left( \frac{4 \|Z\|_\infty}{n_1 (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2} \right)^2 \frac{\|\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1\|_2^2}{n_1} \leq \frac{1}{8 n_1} |\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1|.$$

The fact that $\frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^{k+1} \geq 3/4$ follows immediately from the inequality $|\hat{\eta}^{k+1} - \eta_1| \leq \frac{1}{4} |\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1|$ and the relation $|\hat{\eta}^{k+1} - \eta_1| = n_1 - \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^k$.

Quite analogously, we find that that if $\frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^k \leq -3/4$, then $|\hat{\eta}^{k+1} + \eta_1| \leq \frac{1}{4} |\hat{\eta}^{k} + \eta_1|$.
• **Reduction to the oracle events.**
Assume that the event \(B \cap O_1 \cap \cdots \cap O_{n_1}\) holds. Let first \(\frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \eta_1^0 \geq \frac{3}{4}\).
Since \(|\eta_1^0 - \eta_1| = n_1 - \eta_1^T \eta_1^0|\) we get
\[
\frac{1}{n_1} |\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1| \leq \frac{1}{n_1} |\eta_1^0 - \eta_1| \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^k \leq \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{k+1}.
\]
For \(k \geq \frac{\log n_1}{\log 2}\) we have
\[
\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^k < \frac{1}{n_1},
\]
so that
\[
|\hat{\eta}^k - \eta_1| = 0.
\]
Quite similarly we prove that if \(\frac{1}{n_1} \eta_1^T \hat{\eta}^k \leq -\frac{3}{4}\), then for \(k \geq \frac{\log n_1}{\log 2}\),
\[
|\hat{\eta}^k + \eta_1| = 0.
\]
Recalling the definition of \(r(\hat{\eta}^k, \eta_1)\) we conclude that
\[
P\left(r(\hat{\eta}^k, \eta_1) \neq 0\right) \leq P(B^c) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P(O^c_i).
\]
It follows from (19) that \(\lim_{n_1 \to \infty} P(B^c) = 0\). Thus, the proof of the theorem will be complete if we show that
\[
(21) \lim_{n_1 \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} P(O^c_i) = 0.
\]
• **Control of the oracle events.**
We proceed now to the proof of (21). Let \(G_1, \ldots, G_{n_1}\) be the column vectors equal to the transposed rows of matrix \(G := A - \hat{p} \mathds{1}_{n_1} \mathds{1}_{n_2}^T = (p - \hat{p}) \mathds{1}_{n_1} \mathds{1}_{n_2}^T + (\delta - 1)p \eta_1 \eta_2^T + W\). For all \(i = 1, \ldots, n_1\), we have
\[
P(O^c_i) = P\left(\eta_1 G_i^T \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{1k} G_k\right) < \frac{(\delta - 1)^2}{2} p^2 n_2 n_1\right).
\]
Denoting by $X_1, \ldots, X_{n_1}$ the column vectors equal to the transposed rows of matrix $W$ we may write $\eta_{ii}G_i = v_i + \eta_{ii}X_i$, where $v_i = \eta_{ii}(p - \hat{p})\mathbb{1}_{n_2} + (\delta - 1)p\eta_2$. Therefore,

$$\eta_{ii}G_i^\top \left( \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} G_k \right) = (v_i^\top + \eta_{ii}X_i^\top) \left( \sum_{k \neq i} v_k + \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} X_k \right) = (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 (n_1 - 1) + T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4,$$

where

$$T_1 = \eta_{ii} \sum_{k \neq i} X_i^\top v_k, \quad T_2 = \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} v_i^\top X_k,$$

$$T_3 = \eta_{ii} \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} X_i^\top X_k, \quad T_4 = \sum_{k \neq i} v_i^\top v_k - (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 (n_1 - 1)$$

and we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(O_i^c) = \mathbb{P}(-T_1 - T_2 - T_3 - T_4 > (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 (n_1/2 - 1)).$$

We now bound from above the four corresponding probabilities. First, recall that

$$|\hat{p} - p| \leq |\delta - 1| p \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + \left| \frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{i,j} W_{ij} \right| \leq \frac{|\delta - 1| p}{480} + \left| \frac{1}{n_1 n_2} \sum_{i,j} W_{ij} \right|.$$

The entries $W_{ij}$ of matrix $W$ are independent zero-mean random variables distributed as $\zeta - \mathbb{E}(\zeta)$ where $\zeta$ is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\delta$ or $(2 - \delta)p$. As $W_{ij}$ are bounded in absolute value by 1 and have variances bounded by $2p$ we get from Bernstein’s inequality that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{p} - p| \geq |\delta - 1| p/64) \leq 2e^{-c(\delta - 1)^2 n_1 n_2 p}.$$

Here and below we denote by $c$ absolute positive constants that may vary from line to line. Next, on the event $|\hat{p} - p| \leq |\delta - 1| p/64$ we have

$$|T_1| \leq |\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top X_i| \left( \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} (p - \hat{p}) \right) + |\delta - 1|(n_1 - 1)p|\eta_2^\top X_i|$$

$$\leq |\delta - 1| p n_1 (|\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top X_i| + |\eta_2^\top X_i|).$$

Here, $\mathbb{1}_{n_2}^\top X_i$ and $\eta_2^\top X_i$ are two sums of $n_2$ independent zero-mean random variables bounded in absolute value by 1 and with variances
bounded by $2p$. Using these remarks and Bernstein’s inequality we obtain that, for $n_1 \geq 4$,
\[
P \left( |T_1| \geq \frac{1}{4} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 (n_1/2 - 1) \right) \\
\leq P \left( |1_{n_2}^\top X_1| + |\eta_2^\top X_i| \geq \frac{1}{16} |\delta - 1| p n_2 \right) + P(|\hat{p} - p| \geq |\delta - 1| p/64) \\
\leq 4 \exp \left( -c(\delta - 1)^2 p n_2 \right) + P(|\hat{p} - p| \geq |\delta - 1| p/64) \\
\leq 6 \exp \left( -c C \log n_1 \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1 \log n_1}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n_1^2}
\]
under the assumption that $p \geq C(\delta - 1)^{-2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n_1}{n_2}}$ for some $C > 0$ large enough and $n_2 \geq n_1 \log n_1$. Quite analogous application of Bernstein’s inequality, this time to two sums of $n_2(n_1 - 1)$ random variables, yields the bound
\[
P \left( -T_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 (n_1/2 - 1) \right) \leq P \left( -\sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} v_i^\top X_k \geq \frac{1}{16} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2 \right) \\
\leq 6 \exp \left( -c(\delta - 1)^2 p n_1 n_2 \right) \\
\leq 6 \exp \left( -c C n_1 \log n_1 \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1 \log n_1}} \right) \\
\leq \frac{1}{n_1^2}.
\]
Next, we consider the term $T_3 = \eta_{i1} \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} X_i^\top X_k$. We have
\[
P \left( -T_3 \geq \frac{1}{4} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 n_1 \right) \leq E \left[ P \left( -T_3 \geq \frac{1}{4} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 n_1 \Big| X_i \right) \mathbb{1}_{F_i} \right] + P(F_i^c),
\]
where $F_i = \{|X_i|_2^2 \leq 6 n_2 p\}$. Recall that $\|X_i\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} W_{ij}^2$ where $W_{ij}$ are the elements of matrix $W$. We now apply Bernstein’s inequality conditionally on $X_i$ to the random variable $T_3$, which is (conditionally on $X_i$) a sum of $n_2(n_1 - 1)$ independent zero-mean random variables bounded in absolute value by 1 and with the sum of variances bounded by $2p(n_1 - 1)\|X_i\|_2^2$. It follows from Bernstein’s inequality that for any fixed $X_i \in F_i$ we have
\[
P \left( -\eta_{i1} \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{ik} X_i^\top X_k \geq \frac{1}{4} (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 n_1 \Big| X_i \right) \leq \exp \left( -\frac{c(\delta - 1)^4 p^2 n_2 n_1^2}{p n_1 \|X_i\|_2^2 + (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2 n_1^2} \right)
\]
\[ \leq \exp \left( -c(\delta - 1)^4 p^2 n_2 n_1 \right) \leq \frac{1}{n_1^2}, \]

where the last inequality is valid if \( C > 0 \) is large enough. Applying once more Bernstein’s inequality we obtain the bound

\[ \mathbb{P}(F_i) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \left( W_{ij}^2 - \mathbb{E}(W_{ij}^2) \right) \geq 4n_2p \right) \leq \exp \left( -cn_2p \right) \leq \frac{1}{n_1^2} \]

if \( C > 0 \) is large enough. Finally, we consider the term \( T_4 = \sum_{k \neq i} v_i^\top v_k - (\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2(n_1 - 1) \). We have

\[ |T_4| \leq \left| \eta_i(p - \hat{\rho})^2 n_2 \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{1k} \right| + \left| (\delta - 1)p(p - \hat{\rho})(\eta_2^\top \mathbb{1}_{n_2}) \sum_{k \neq i} \eta_{1k} \right| \\
+ \left| \eta_i(\delta - 1)p(p - \hat{\rho})(n_1 - 1)(\eta_2^\top \mathbb{1}_{n_2}) \right| \\
\leq n_1 n_2(p - \hat{\rho})^2 + 2|\delta - 1|pn_1 n_2|\hat{\rho} - p|. \]

Therefore, on the event \(|\hat{\rho} - p| \leq p|\delta - 1|/64\) we have \(|T_4| < \frac{1}{n_1^2}(\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_1 n_2\), which implies that for \( n_1 \geq 4 \) and \( C > 0 \) large enough,

\[ \mathbb{P} \left( T_4 \geq \frac{1}{4}(\delta - 1)^2 p^2 n_2(n_1/2 - 1) \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\rho} - p| \geq p|\delta - 1|/64) \leq \frac{1}{n_1^2}. \]

Combining the above inequalities we find that, for \( C > 0 \) large enough,

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{P}(O_i) \leq \frac{4}{n_1} \rightarrow 0. \]

This proves (21) and hence the theorem.
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