We consider Green’s functions $G(z) := (H - z)^{-1}$ of Hermitian random band matrices $H$ on the $d$-dimensional lattice $(\mathbb{Z}/L\mathbb{Z})^d$. The entries $h_{xy} = \tilde{h}_{xy}$ of $H$ are independent centered complex Gaussian random variables with variances $s_{xy} = \mathbb{E}|h_{xy}|^2$. The variances satisfy a banded profile so that $s_{xy}$ is negligible if $|x - y|$ exceeds the band width $W$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we construct an expansion of the $T$-variable, $T_{xy} = |m|^2 \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} |G_{\alpha y}|^2$, with an error $O(W^{-nd/2})$, and use it to prove a local law on the Green’s function. This $T$-expansion was the main tool to prove the delocalization and quantum diffusion of random band matrices for dimensions $d \geq 8$ in part I [32] of this series.
1 Introduction

Random band matrices $H = (h_{xy})$ model interacting quantum systems on a lattice of scale $L$ with random transition amplitudes effective up to a short scale $W \ll L$. In this paper, we consider a general Hermitian random band matrix ensemble on the $d$-dimensional integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}_d^L := \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}^d$ with $N := L^d$ many lattice sites. The entries of $H$ are centered independent random variables up to the Hermitian condition $h_{xy} = h_{yx}$. The variance $s_{xy} := \mathbb{E}|h_{xy}|^2$ typically decays with the distance between $x$ and $y$ on a characteristic length scale $W$, called the band width of $H$, and is negligible when $|x - y| \gg W$. We require that the variances satisfy the normalization condition

$$
\sum_x s_{xy} = \sum_y s_{xy} = 1. \tag{1.1}
$$

It is well-known that under the condition (1.1), the global eigenvalue distribution of $H$ converges weakly to the Wigner’s semicircle law supported in $[-2, 2]$.

As $W$ varies, the random band matrices naturally interpolate between the random Schrödinger operator and mean-field (generalized) Wigner matrix ensembles. One important conjecture about random band matrices is that a sharp localization-delocalization transition occurs at some critical band width $W_c$. An eigenvector is said to be localized if most of its weight resides in a region of scale $\ell \ll L$, and delocalized if $\ell \sim L$. In physics, this length scale $\ell$ is called the localization length, which generally depends on the energy level of the eigenvector. We restrict ourselves to the bulk eigenvectors with eigenvalues in $(-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa)$ for a small constant $\kappa > 0$. It is conjectured that there exists $W_c \in [1, L]$ such that if $W \ll W_c$, all bulk eigenvectors of $H$ are localized, while if $W \gg W_c$, all bulk eigenvectors of $H$ are delocalized. Based on simulations and non-rigorous supersymmetric arguments, the critical band width of one-dimensional random band matrices is conjectured to be of order $W_c \sim \sqrt{\log L}$ when $d = 2$ and $W_c \sim 1$ when $d \geq 3$; see for more details about these conjectures.

Many partial results have been proved rigorously concerning the localization-delocalization conjecture of random band matrices in dimension $d = 1$ [2, 4–6, 10, 12, 13, 17–26, 33] and dimensions $d \geq 2$ [9, 10, 12, 17, 33]. We refer the reader to [32] for a brief review. In this series (i.e. part I [32] and the current paper), we prove that, as long as $W \geq L^\varepsilon$ for a small constant $\varepsilon > 0$, most bulk eigenvectors of $H$ have localization lengths comparable to $L$. This gives a positive answer to the delocalization conjecture (in the weak delocalization sense) for dimensions $d \geq 8$ under the slightly stronger assumption $W \geq L^\varepsilon$ (vs. $W \geq C$).

In part I [32], we described the main structure of the proof of the delocalization conjecture and quantum diffusion of random band matrices. This paper will provide some key results used in [32]. Our proof is based on the resolvent (or Green’s function) of $H$ defined by

$$
G(z) = (H - z)^{-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im } z > 0\},
$$

and the $T$-matrix defined by $[12]$

$$
T_{xy}(z) := |m|^2 \sum_\alpha s_{\alpha x}|G_{\alpha y}(z)|^2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d. \tag{1.2}
$$

An important tool is an expansion of the $T$-matrix, called the T-expansion, with errors $W^{-nd/2}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In [32], we defined basic graph operations in the construction of the T-expansion (see Section 4), studied the local expansion strategy, and explored a key self-energy renormalization property. In this paper, we will describe the subtle global expansion strategy (see Sections 5 and 6) and complete the construction of the T-expansion up to any fixed order. The T-expansion thus obtained gives a precise description of the fluctuation of the $T$-matrix by decomposing it into a sum of terms with sophisticated but sufficiently nice structures. Furthermore, given an $n$-th order $T$-expansion for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we will use it to prove an almost sharp local law on $G(z)$ (cf. Theorem 3.6), which is also a key input for [32]. For the convenience of the reader, we will repeat some notations and definitions of [32] in Sections 2, 4 so that this paper is relatively self-contained.

1.1 The model and T-expansion

We will consider $d$-dimensional random band matrices indexed by a cube of linear size $L$ in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, i.e.,

$$
\mathbb{Z}_L^d := (\mathbb{Z} \cap (-L/2, L/2))^d. \tag{1.3}
$$
We will view \( Z_L^d \) as a torus and denote by \([x - y]_L\) the representative of \( x - y \) in \( Z_L^d \), i.e.,
\[
[x - y]_L := [(x - y) + L\mathbb{Z}^d] \cap Z_L^d.
\]
(1.4)

Clearly, \(|x - y|_L := \|[x - y]_L\|\) is the periodic distance on \( Z_L^d \) for any norm \( \| \cdot \| \) on \( \mathbb{Z}^d \). For definiteness, we use \( \ell^\infty\)-norm in this paper, i.e. \(|x - y|_L := \|x - y\|_\infty \). In this paper, we consider the following class of \( d \)-dimensional random band matrices.

**Assumption 1.1 (Random band matrix).** Fix any \( d \in \mathbb{N} \). For \( L \gg W \gg 1 \) and \( N := L^d \), we assume that \( H = H_{d,f,W,L} \) is an \( N \times N \) complex Hermitian random matrix whose entries \((\text{Re} h_{xy}, \text{Im} h_{xy} : x,y \in Z_L^d)\) are independent Gaussian random variables (up to symmetry \( H = H^\dagger \)) such that
\[
\mathbb{E} h_{xy} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(\text{Re} h_{xy})^2 = \mathbb{E}(\text{Im} h_{xy})^2 = s_{xy}/2, \quad x,y \in Z_L^d,
\]
(1.5)
where the variances \( s_{xy} \) satisfy that
\[
s_{xy} = f_{W,L}([x - y]_L)
\]
(1.6)
for a positive symmetric function \( f_{W,L} \) satisfying Assumption 1.2 below. Then we say that \( H \) is a \( d \)-dimensional random band matrix with linear size \( L \), band width \( W \) and variance profile \( f_{W,L} \). Denote the variance matrix by \( S := (s_{xy})_{x,y \in Z_L^d} \), which is a doubly stochastic symmetric \( N \times N \) matrix.

**Assumption 1.2 (Variance profile).** We assume that \( f_{W,L} : Z_L^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \) is a positive symmetric function on \( Z_L^d \) that can be expressed by the Fourier transform
\[
f_{W,L}(x) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d Z_{W,L}} \int \psi(Wp) e^{ip \cdot x} dp.
\]
(1.7)
Here \( Z_{W,L} \) is the normalization constant so that \( \sum_{x \in Z_L^d} f_{W,L}(x) = 1 \), and \( \psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) is a symmetric smooth function independent of \( W \) and \( L \) and satisfies the following properties:

\[(i) \quad \psi(0) = 1 \text{ and } \|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1;\]
\[(ii) \quad \psi(p) \leq \max\{1 - c_\psi |p|^2, 1 - c_\psi\} \text{ for a constant } c_\psi > 0;\]
\[(iii) \quad \psi \text{ is in the Schwartz space, i.e.,}\]
\[
\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} (1 + |p|^k) |\psi^{(l)}(p)| = 0, \quad \text{for any } k,l \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
(1.8)

Clearly, \( f_{W,L} \) is of order \( O(W^{-d}) \) and decays faster than any polynomial, that is, for any fixed \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), there exists a constant \( C_k > 0 \) so that
\[
|f_{W,L}(x)| \leq C_k W^{-d} (\|x\|_L/W)^{-k}.
\]
(1.9)
Hence the variance profile \( S \) defined in (1.6) has a banded structure, namely, for any constants \( \tau, D > 0 \),
\[
1_{|x - y| \geq W^{1 + \tau}} |s_{xy}| \leq W^{-D}.
\]
(1.10)
Combining (1.8) and (1.9) with the Poisson summation formula, we obtain that
\[
Z_{W,L} = \psi(0) + O(W^{-D}) = 1 + O(W^{-D}),
\]
(1.11)
for any large constant \( D > 0 \) as long as \( L \geq W^{1+\varepsilon} \) for a constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \).

The diagonal resolvent entries of \( G(z) \) are expected to be given by the Stieltjes transform of Wigner’s semicircle law,
\[
m(z) := \frac{-z + \sqrt{z^2 - 4}}{2} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-2}^2 \frac{\sqrt{4 - \xi^2}}{\xi - z} d\xi, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}_+.
\]
(1.12)
On the other hand, it was proved in [32] that the off-diagonal resolvent entries can be approximated by a **diffusive kernel** \( \Theta \) defined by
\[
\Theta(z) := \frac{|m(z)|^2 S}{1 - |m(z)|^2 S},
\]
(1.13)
for any constant \( \eta \geq W^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2 \) for a constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \). In this case, it is well-known that (see, e.g., \([12,33]\) for a proof of (1.14))

\[
\Theta_{xy}(z) \leq \frac{W^\tau|z|}{W^2(\|x-y\|_L + W)^d - 2} + \frac{1}{(\|x-y\|_L + W)^D} \leq W^\tau B_{xy},
\]

(1.14)

for any small constant \( \tau > 0 \) and large constant \( D > 0 \), where we have abbreviated that

\[
B_{xy} := W^{-2(\|x-y\|_L + W)^{-d+2}}.
\]

(1.15)

In part I of this series \([32]\), we proved the following local law in Theorem 1.3 and the quantum diffusion in Theorem 1.4. In addition, Theorem 1.3 was used in \([32]\) to prove the delocalization of random band matrices. We remark that all the results in this paper hold only for large enough \( W \) and \( L \), and, for simplicity, we do not repeat it in our statements.

**Theorem 1.3** (Theorem 1.4 of \([32]\)). Fix \( d \geq 8 \) and any small constants \( c_w, \varepsilon, \kappa > 0 \). Suppose that \( L^{c_w} \leq W \leq L \), and \( H \) is a \( d \)-dimensional random band matrix satisfying Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2. Then for any small constant \( \tau > 0 \) and large constant \( D > 0 \), we have the following estimate on \( G(z) \) for \( z = E + i\eta \) and all \( x,y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d \):

\[
P\left( \sup_{E \in (-2+\kappa,-2-\kappa)} \sup_{L^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2 \leq \eta \leq 1} |G_{xy}(z) - m(z)\delta_{xy}|^2 \leq W^\tau B_{xy} \right) \geq 1 - L^{-D}.
\]

(1.16)

**Theorem 1.4** (Theorem 1.5 of \([32]\)). Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold. Fix any small constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and large constant \( M \in \mathbb{N} \). Then for all \( x,y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d \) and \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( E \in (-2+\kappa,2-\kappa) \) and \( W^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2 \leq \eta \leq 1 \), we have that

\[
\mathbb{E}T_{xy} = \left[ \Theta^{(M)} \right]_{xy} + O(W^{-Md/2}).
\]

(1.17)

Here \( \Theta^{(M)} \) is the \( M \)-th order renormalized diffusive matrix

\[
\Theta^{(M)} := \frac{1}{1 - |m|^2 S \left( 1 + \Sigma^{(M)} \right)} |m|^2 S,
\]

(1.18)

and it satisfies the bound

\[
|\Theta^{(M)}_{xy}| \leq W^\tau B_{xy},
\]

(1.19)

for any constant \( \tau > 0 \). Furthermore, the self-energy correction \( \Sigma^{(M)} \) is given by \( \Sigma^{(M)}(z) := \sum_{l=1}^{M} \Sigma_l(z) \) where \( \{\Sigma_l\}_{l=1}^{M} \) is a sequence of deterministic matrices satisfying the following properties:

\[
\Sigma_l(x,x+a) = \Sigma_l(0,a), \quad \Sigma_l(0,a) = \Sigma_l(0,-a), \quad \forall \ x,a \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d,
\]

(1.20)

and for any constant \( \tau > 0 \),

\[
|\Sigma_l(x)| \leq W^{-l^d/2+\tau} \frac{W^{d+2}}{(\|x\|_L + W)^{d+2}}, \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d, \eta \in [W^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2,1],
\]

(1.21)

\[
\left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d} \Sigma_l(x) \right| \leq \eta W^{-(l-2)^d/2+\tau}, \quad \forall \ \eta \in [W^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2,1].
\]

(1.22)

Here in (1.20) and throughout the rest of this paper, for any matrix \( \mathcal{A} \), we will use \( \mathcal{A}_{xy} \) and \( \mathcal{A}(x,y) \) interchangeably. The \( M \)-th order local correction \( G^{(M)} \) satisfies that

\[
|G^{(M)}_{xy}| \leq W^\tau B_{xy}^{3/2},
\]

(1.23)

for any constant \( \tau > 0 \).
As remarked in [32], the proof in this paper can be adapted to non-Gaussian band matrices after some technical modifications. The proof for the real symmetric Gaussian case is similar to the complex case except that the number of terms will double in every expansion step (which is due to the fact that $\mathbb{E}h_{xy}^2 = 0$ in the complex case but not in the real case). The condition $d \geq 8$ can also be improved, but it seems to require substantial improvements in estimating the terms in the $T$-expansion to reach the physical dimension $d = 3$. We will deal with these improvements in forthcoming papers.

The proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 in [32] depend on main results of this paper. More precisely, we will prove Lemmas 5.2, 5.4, 5.6 and 5.7 of [32]. We summarize our main results in Section 3.3 in Theorem 3.7, we will construct a $T$-equation defined in Definition 3.3 as a corollary of Theorem 3.7, we will construct the $T$-expansion defined in Definition 3.2 in Theorem 3.6, we will prove the local law on $G(z)$ using the $T$-expansion.

Define the $T$-variable with three subscripts by

$$T_{x,yy'} := |m|^2 \sum_\alpha s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y} G_{\alpha y'}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_{yy',x} := |m|^2 \sum_\alpha G_{y\alpha} G_{y'\alpha} s_{\alpha x}.$$  \hfill (1.24)

By definition, the $T$-variable in (1.2) can be written as $T_{xy} \equiv T_{x,yy}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d$, we define $E_x$ as the partial expectation with respect to the $x$-th row and column of $H$, i.e., $E_x(\cdot) := \mathbb{E}(\cdot | H^{(x)})$, where $H^{(x)}$ denotes the $(N - 1) \times (N - 1)$ minor of $H$ obtained by removing the $x$-th row and column. For simplicity, in this paper we will use the notations

$$P_x := E_x, \quad Q_x := 1 - E_x.$$  

Then we write

$$T_{x,yy'} = |m|^2 \sum_\alpha s_{x\alpha} P_\alpha (G_{\alpha y} G_{\alpha y'}) + |m|^2 \sum_\alpha s_{x\alpha} Q_\alpha (G_{y\alpha} G_{y'\alpha'}).$$

The $Q_\alpha$ term is a fluctuation term. We will calculate the $P_\alpha$ term using Gaussian integration by parts to derive an expression of the form

$$T_{x,yy'} = mG_{yy'} \Theta_{xy} + \text{(higher order term)} + \text{(fluctuation term)},$$

where the higher order term is a sum of expressions of order $O(W^{-3d/2})$ (see (3.8) for the explicit form). We call this expansion a second order $T$-expansion. However, this expansion is useful only when $L$ is not too large, because the error is bounded in terms of a power of $W$ instead of $L$.

In order to handle the case $L \geq WC$ for any large constant $C > 0$, we need to obtain much finer expansions of the $T$-matrix with arbitrarily high order errors. In this paper, we will construct a sequence of $n$-th order $T$-expansions with leading terms $\Theta^{(n)}$ and errors of order $O(W^{-(n+1)d/2})$. Roughly speaking, we will construct an expansion of the form

$$T_{x,yy'} = mG_{yy'} \Theta_{xy}^{(n)} + \text{(recollision term)} + \text{(higher order term)} + \text{(fluctuation term)} + \text{(error term)}, \quad (1.25)$$

where the recollision term is a sum of expressions with coincidences in the summation indices, the higher order term is a sum of expressions of order $O(W^{-(n+1)d/2})$, the fluctuation term is a sum of expressions that can be written into the form $\sum_\alpha Q_\alpha(\cdot)$, and the error term is negligible for all of our proofs. In the expansion process, we need to give a precise construction of the self-energies, and show that they lead to the renormalized diffusive matrix $\Theta^{(n)}$ defined in (1.18). In addition, we also need to track the recollision, higher order and fluctuation terms very carefully, so that they satisfy a key structural property—doubly connected property in Definition 2.12—which we will explain now.

In this paper, we represent all expressions using graphs with edge labels $G$, $\Theta$ or $S$ as in the standard graphic language in quantum physics. These graphs naturally have two-level structures: a pair of atoms are at most $O(W)$ apart from each other if they are connected by a path of $S$ edges; otherwise the distance between them can vary up to $L$. We define the quotient graphs by the equivalence relation that two vertices are equivalent if they are connected by a path of $S$ edges. Following the notations in [32, 33], we call the equivalent classes of vertices molecules (cf. Definition 2.10) and the quotient graphs molecular graphs (cf. Definition 2.11). The (original) subgraph inside a molecule is called the local structure of this molecule, and the structures of molecular graphs are said to be global. The local structures are easy to track while the global structures are our main focus. In particular, the doubly connected property defined in Definition 2.12.
is the most important global structural property of this paper. Roughly speaking, a doubly connected graph contains a spanning tree of $\Theta$ edges and a spanning tree of $G$ edges that connect all molecules together. This property is needed to derive effective estimates on the graphs in (1.25). By (1.14) and (1.16), the typical sizes of $\Theta_{xy}$ and $G_{xy}$ are of order $B_{xy}$ and $B_{1/2}^{1/2}$, respectively. The doubly connected property of a graph ensures that in each sum of an index, we have at least a product of a $\Theta$ factor and a $G$ factor, so that the sum can be controlled by the row sums of $B_{xy}^{3/2}$, which are bounded by $O(W^{-d/2})$ independently of $L$. This is one of the reasons why we can treat random band matrices with large $L \geq W^{C}$.

The main difficulty in constructing the $T$-expansion is that the doubly connectedness is not necessarily preserved in arbitrary graph expansions. With terminologies that will be introduced in Section 4 local expansions in Section 4.2 will always preserve the doubly connectedness and have been discussed in details in part I [32]. On the other hand, global expansions in Section 4.3 may break the doubly connected structure of a graph. Roughly speaking, a global expansion involves a substitution of a $T$-variable with a lower order $T$-expansion. We will see that a global expansion does not break the doubly connected property if and only if it involves a substitution of a redundant $T$-variable, where a $T$-variable is said to be redundant in a graph if after removing it, the remaining graph is still doubly connected (cf. Definition 5.5). In this paper, we find a global expansion strategy such that we only need to expand a redundant $T$-variable in every global expansion until getting the expansion (1.25). Hence the doubly connected structures of the graphs in (1.25) will follow immediately from our construction. The global expansion strategy is based on a deeper study of the subtle structures of molecular graphs, where we identify two key graphical properties: the sequentially pre-deterministic property (cf. Definition 5.9) and the global standard property (cf. Definition 6.2). We refer the reader to Section 3.4 for a more detailed discussion of the key ideas.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some graphical notations that will be used in the definition of the $T$-expansion. In Section 3 we define two main concepts of this paper—the $T$-equation and $T$-expansion. In the next two sections we will state the main results of this paper, that is, Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.8 regarding the construction of the $T$-equation and $T$-expansion up to arbitrarily high order, and, Theorem 3.6 giving a sharp local law on $G(z)$ as a consequence of the $n$-th order $T$-expansion for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In Section 4, we introduce the basic graph operations that are used to construct the $T$-equation and $T$-expansion, and in Section 5 we explore a so-called pre-deterministic property of the graphs appearing in our expansions. With the tools in Sections 4 and 5, we prove Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.8 in Section 6. In Section 7 we give the proof of Theorem 3.6 based on three lemmas, Lemma 7.2, Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 7.4. The proofs of Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.4 will be given in Section 8 and the proof of Lemma 7.3 will be given in Section 9.
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## 2 Graphical tools

To be prepared for the definition of the $T$-equation and $T$-expansion, we introduce the concept of atomic and molecular graphs, and some important graphical properties that will be satisfied by the graphs. The graphical notations in this section have been defined in [32]. We repeat them in this section for completeness of this paper.

We introduce the following two deterministic matrices that will appear in the expansions:

\[
S^{+}(z) := \frac{m^2(z)S}{1 - m^2(z)S}, \quad S^{-}(z) := S^{+}(z).
\]

(2.1)

For the reason of defining these two matrices, we refer the reader to Definition 4.5 below. The matrix $S^{+}(z)$ satisfies the following Lemma 2.1, which is a folklore result. A formal proof is given in equation (4.21) of [5].

For simplicity of notations, throughout the rest of this paper, we abbreviate

\[
|x - y| \equiv \|x - y\|_{L}, \quad \langle x - y \rangle := \|x - y\|_{L} + W.
\]

(2.2)

**Lemma 2.1.** Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 hold and $\eta \geq W^{2+\epsilon}/L^{2}$ for a small constant $\epsilon > 0$. Then for any small constant $\tau > 0$ and large constant $D > 0$, we have that

\[
|S_{xy}^{\pm}(z)| \lesssim W^{-d} 1_{|x - y| \leq W^{1+\tau}} + O \left( \langle x - y \rangle^{-D} \right).
\]

(2.3)
2.1 Atomic graphs

In an \(n\)-th order \(T\)-expansion, the number of terms will grow super-exponentially with respect to \(n\) (there are about \(n^C\) many terms). Moreover, each term has a complicated structure, which will be represented by a graph. Our goal is to expand the \(T\)-variable \(T_{a,b_1,b_2}\) for some special indices \(a, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d\). We represent these three indices by special vertices \(a \equiv \otimes, \ b_1 \equiv \oplus, \ b_2 \equiv \ominus, \) (2.4)
in the graphs. In other words, we use \(a, b_1, b_2\) in expressions, and draw them as \(\otimes, \oplus, \ominus\) in graphs. Some of these indices can be equal to each other. For example, if \(b_1 = b_2\), then we only have two special vertices \(\otimes\) and \(\oplus\). We first introduce the atomic graphs, and the concept of subgraphs.

**Definition 2.2** (Atomic graphs). Given a standard oriented graph with vertices and edges, we assign the following structures and call the resulting graph an atomic graph.

- **Atoms:** We will call the vertices atoms. Each graph has some external atoms and internal atoms. The external atoms represent external indices whose values are fixed, while internal atoms represent summation indices that will be summed over. In particular, each graph in expansions of \(T_{a,b_1,b_2}\) has \(\otimes, \oplus\) and \(\ominus\) atoms. By fixing the value of an internal atom, it will become an external atom; by summing over an external atom, it will become an internal atom.

- **Regular weights:** A regular weight on an atom \(x\) represents a \(G_{xx}\) or \(\overline{G}_{xx}\) factor. Each regular weight has a charge, where \(+\) charge indicates that the weight is a \(G\) factor, represented by a blue solid \(\Delta\), and \(−\) charge indicates that the weight is a \(\overline{G}\) factor, represented by a red solid \(\Delta\).

- **Light weights:** Corresponding to the regular weights defined above, we define the light weights on atom \(x\) representing \(G_{xx} \cdot m\) and \(\overline{G}_{xx} \cdot \overline{m}\) factors. They are drawn as blue or red hollow \(\Delta\) in graphs depending on their charges.

- **Edges:** The edges are divided into the following types.

  (i) **Solid edges:** A solid edge represents a \(G\) factor. More precisely,
  - each oriented edge from atom \(\alpha\) to atom \(\beta\) with \(+\) charge represents a \(G_{\alpha \beta}\) factor;
  - each oriented edge from atom \(\alpha\) to atom \(\beta\) with \(-\) charge represents a \(\overline{G}_{\alpha \beta}\) factor.

  The plus \(G\) edges will be drawn as blue solid edges, while minus \(G\) edges will be drawn as red solid edges. In this paper, whenever we say \(\text{"G edges"}\), we mean both the plus and minus \(G\) edges.

  (ii) **Waved edges:** We have neutral black, positive blue and negative red waved edges:
  - a neutral waved edge connecting atoms \(x\) and \(y\) represents an \(s_{xy}\) factor;
  - a blue waved edge of positive charge between atoms \(x\) and \(y\) represents an \(S^+_{xy}\) factor;
  - a red waved edge of negative charge between atoms \(x\) and \(y\) represents an \(S^-_{xy}\) factor.

  (iii) **Diffusive edges:** A diffusive edge connecting atoms \(x\) and \(y\) represents a \(\Theta_{xy}\) factor; we draw it as a double-line edge between atoms \(x\) and \(y\).

  (iv) **Dotted edges:** A dotted line connecting atoms \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) represents the factor \(1_{\alpha = \beta} = \delta_{\alpha \beta}\); a dotted line with a cross \((\times)\) represents the factor \((1 - \delta_{\alpha \beta})\). There is at most one dotted or \(\times\)-dotted edge between each pair of atoms. By definition, a \(\times\)-dotted edge between the two ending atoms of a \(G\) edge indicates that this \(G\) edge is off-diagonal. Moreover, we also allow for dotted edges between external atoms.

For non-solid edges, the orientations do not matter. The edges between internal atoms are called internal edges; the edges with at least one end at an external atom are called external edges.

- **\(P\) and \(Q\) labels:** Some solid edges and weights may have a label \(P_x\) or \(Q_x\), where \(x\) is an atom in the graph. Moreover, each edge or weight can have at most one \(P\) or \(Q\) label.

- **Coefficients:** There is a coefficient (which is a polynomial of \(m\), \(m^{-1}\), \((1 - m^2)^{-1}\) and their complex conjugates) associated with each graph.
Along the proof, we will introduce some other types of weights and edges.

**Definition 2.3 (Sugraphs).** A graph $G_1$ is said to be a subgraph of $G_2$, denoted by $G_1 \subset G_2$, if every graphical component of $G_1$ is also in $G_2$. Moreover, $G_1$ is a proper subgraph of $G_2$ if $G_1 \subset G_2$ and $G_1 \neq G_2$. Given a subset $S$ of atoms in a graph $G$, the subgraph $G|S$ induced on $S$ refers to the subgraph of $G$ with atoms in $S$ as vertices, the edges between these atoms, and the weights on these atoms.

To each graph, we assign a **value** as follows.

**Definition 2.4 (Values of graphs).** For an atomic graph $G$, we define its value, denoted by $[G]$, as an expression obtained as follows. We first take the product of all the edges, all the weights and the coefficient of the graph $G$. Then for the edges and weights with the same $P_x$ or $Q_x$ label, we take the product of them and apply $P_x$ or $Q_x$ to them. Finally, we sum over all the internal indices represented by the internal atoms. The values of the external indices are fixed by their given values. For a linear combination of graphs $\sum c_i G_i$, where $\{c_i\}$ is a sequence of coefficients and $\{G_i\}$ is a sequence of graphs, we naturally define its value by

$$[\sum_i c_i G_i] = \sum_i c_i [G_i].$$

For simplicity of notation, we will abuse the notation by identifying a graph (which is a geometric object) with its value (which is an analytic expression).

Next, we introduce the concept of regular and normal regular graphs.

**Definition 2.5 (Normal regular graphs).** We say an atomic graph $G$ is **regular** if it satisfies the following properties:

(i) it is a connected graph that contains at most $O(1)$ many atoms and edges;

(ii) all the internal atoms are connected together through paths of waved and diffusive edges;

(iii) there are no dotted edges between internal atoms.

Moreover, we say a regular graph is **normal** if it satisfies the following additional property:

(iv) for any pair of atoms $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in the graph, they are connected by a $\times$-dotted edge if and only if they are connected by a $G$ edge.

By this definition, every $G$ edge in a normal regular graph is off-diagonal, while all the diagonal $G$ factors will be represented by weights. Given a normal regular graph, we define its scaling order as follows.

**Definition 2.6 (Scaling order).** Given a normal regular graph $G$, we define its scaling order as

$$ \text{ord}(G) := \#\{\text{off-diagonal } G \text{ edges}\} + \#\{\text{light weights}\} + 2\#\{\text{waved edges}\} + 2\#\{\text{diffusive edges}\} - 2 [\#\{\text{internal atoms}\} - \#\{\text{dotted edges}\}] . $$

Here each dotted edge in a normal regular graph means that an internal atom is equal to an external atom, so we lose one free summation index. The concept of scaling order can be also defined for subgraphs.

In the following proof, whenever we say the order of a graph, we are referring to its scaling order. We emphasize that in general the scaling order does not imply the real size of the graph value directly. In order to establish such a connection, we need to introduce the **doubly connected property** in Definition 2.12 below.

### 2.2 Self-energies and labelled diffusive edges

One of the most important concepts in the $T$-expansion is the so-called self-energy introduced in [32]. More precisely, an $l$-th order self-energy is a linear combination of deterministic graphs satisfying the following definition.

**Definition 2.7 (Self-energies).** Fix any $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $E_l(z)$ be a deterministic matrix depending on $m(z)$, $S$, $S^\pm(z)$ and $\Theta(z)$ only, and satisfying the following properties for $z = E + i\eta$ with $E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa)$ and $\eta \in [W^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2, 1]$. 


(i) For any \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d \), \( (E_l)_{xy} \) is a sum of at most \( C_l \) many deterministic graphs of scaling order \( l \) and with external atoms \( x \) and \( y \). Here \( C_l \) is a large constant depending on \( l \). Some graphs, say \( G \), in \( E_l \) can be diagonal matrices satisfying \( G_{xy} = G_{xx} \delta_{xy} \), i.e., there is a dotted edge between the external atoms \( x \) and \( y \).

(ii) \( E_l \) is a self-energy and graphically we will use a square, \( \square \), between atoms \( x \) and \( y \) with a label \( l \) to represent \( (E_l)_{xy} \).

By Definition 2.6, the scaling order of a deterministic graph can only be even. Moreover, every nontrivial self-energy \( E_l \) used in this paper has scaling order \( \geq 4 \). Hence we always have

\[
E_1 = E_2 = E_3 = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad E_{2l+1} := 0, \quad l \in \mathbb{N}.
\]  

In this paper, the self-energies will be constructed in our expansions. Using the properties \((1.20), (1.21)\) and \((1.22)\), we have proved the following crucial estimates in \( [32] \). These estimates are necessary for bounding the graphs in the \( T \)-expansion and \( T \)-equation.

Lemma 2.8 (Lemma 6.2 of \( [32] \)). Let \( E_{2l} \) be a self-energy satisfying Definition 2.7. We have that for any constant \( \tau > 0 \) and \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d \),

\[
\left| \sum_\alpha \Theta_{xo}(E_{2l})_{oy} \right| \leq \frac{W^\tau}{W(l-1)d(x-y)d}. \tag{2.7}
\]

Let \( E_{2k_1}, E_{2k_2}, \cdots, E_{2k_l} \) be a sequence of self-energies satisfying Definition 2.7. Then we have that for any constant \( \tau > 0 \) and \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d \),

\[
\left| (\Theta E_{2k_1} \Theta E_{2k_2} \Theta \cdots \Theta E_{2k_l} \Theta)_{xy} \right| \leq W^{-(k-2)d/2+\tau} B_{xy}, \tag{2.8}
\]

and

\[
\left| \sum_y (\Theta E_{2k_1} \Theta E_{2k_2} \Theta \cdots \Theta E_{2k_l} \Theta)_{xy} \right| \leq \eta^{-1} W^{-(k-2)d/2+\tau}. \tag{2.9}
\]

where \( k := \sum_{i=1}^l 2k_i - 2(l-1) \) is the scaling order of \( (\Theta E_{2k_1} \Theta E_{2k_2} \Theta \cdots \Theta E_{2k_l} \Theta)_{xy} \).

By \((2.8), (\Theta E_{2k_1} \Theta E_{2k_2} \Theta \cdots \Theta E_{2k_l} \Theta)_{xy} \) has the same decay with respect to \( |x-y| \) as \( \Theta_{xy} \) except for an extra \( W^{-(k/2-1)d} \) factor. Hence we will regard it as another type of diffusive edge. The proof of Lemma 2.8 uses a summation by parts argument. In particular, the \( \eta \) factor in \((1.22)\) plays an essential role in the sense that it will cancel the following factor from a row sum of \( \Theta \):

\[
\sum_y \Theta_{xy}(z) = \frac{|m(z)|^2}{1 - |m(z)|^2} \sim \eta^{-1}. \tag{2.10}
\]

In \( [32] \), we refer to \((1.22)\) as a sum zero property.

Definition 2.9 (Labelled diffusive edges). Given \( l \) self-energies \( E_{2k_i}, i = 1, 2, \cdots, l \), we represent the entry

\[
(\Theta E_{2k_1} \Theta E_{2k_2} \Theta \cdots \Theta E_{2k_l} \Theta)_{xy} \tag{2.11}
\]

by a labelled diffusive edge between atoms \( x \) and \( y \) with label \((k; 2k_1, \cdots, 2k_l)\), where \( k := \sum_{i=1}^l 2k_i - 2(l-1) \) is the scaling order of this edge. In graphs, each labelled diffusive edge is drawn as one single double-line edge with a label but without any internal structure as in the following figure:
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2.3 Molecular graphs and doubly connected property

Each of our graphs has a two-level structure, that is, a local structure varying on scales of order $W$, and a global structure varying on scales up to $L$. To explain this, we introduce the following concept of molecules.

**Definition 2.10 (Molecules).** We partition the set of all atoms into a union of disjoint sets \( \{ \text{all atoms} \} = \bigcup_j M_j \), where each \( M_j \) is called a molecule. Two internal atoms belong to the same molecule if and only if they are connected with a path of neutral/plus/minus waved edges and dotted edges (note there may be dotted edges if the graph is not regular). Each external atom will be by definition called an external molecule (such as \( \otimes \), \( \oplus \) and \( \ominus \) molecules). An edge is said to be inside a molecule if its ending atoms belong to this molecule.

By (1.9) and (2.3), if two atoms \( x \) and \( y \) are in the same molecule, then we essentially have \( |x - y| \leq W^{1+\tau} \) up to a negligible error \( O(W^{-D}) \). Given an atomic graph, we will call the subgraph inside a molecule the local structure of this molecule. On the other hand, the global structure of an atomic graph refers to its molecular graph, which is the quotient graph with each molecule regarded as a vertex.

**Definition 2.11 (Molecular graphs).** Molecular graphs are graphs consisting of
- external molecules which represent the external atoms (such as the \( \otimes \), \( \oplus \) and \( \ominus \) molecules);
- the internal molecules;
- blue and red solid edges, which represent the plus and minus $G$ edges between molecules;
- diffusive edges between molecules;
- dotted edges between external and internal molecules.

Given any atomic graph \( \mathcal{G} \), we define its molecular version, called \( \mathcal{G}_M \), in the following way:
- each molecule of \( \mathcal{G} \) is represented by a vertex in \( \mathcal{G}_M \);
- each blue solid or red solid edge of \( \mathcal{G} \) between atoms in different molecules is represented by a blue solid or red solid edge between these two molecules in \( \mathcal{G}_M \);
- each diffusive edge of \( \mathcal{G} \) between atoms in different molecules is represented by a diffusive edge between these two molecules in \( \mathcal{G}_M \);
- each dotted edge of \( \mathcal{G} \) between an external atom and an internal atom is represented by a dotted edge between the corresponding external and internal molecules;
- we discard all the other components in \( \mathcal{G} \) (including the weights, $\times$-dotted edges, and edges inside molecules).

In this paper, the molecular graphs are used solely to help with the analysis of the graph structures, while all the graph expansions are applied to atomic graphs only. In the proof, we assume that there is automatically a molecular graph associated with each atomic graph. In general, the local structures are almost trivial to bound, while the global structure is much harder to analyze. This is one of the main reasons why we want to introduce the molecular graphs—we want to get rid of the local structures and focus on the more intricate global structure instead.

The following **doubly connected property** is crucial for our proof, because it allows us to establish a direct connection between the scaling order of a graph and a bound on its value. All the graphs in the $T$-expansion and $T$-equation will satisfy this property (cf. Definitions 3.2 and 3.3).

**Definition 2.12 (Doubly connected property).** A subgraph $\mathcal{G}$ without external molecules is said to be doubly connected if its molecular graph $\mathcal{G}_M$ satisfies the following property. There exists a collection, say $B_{\text{black}}$, of diffusive edges, and another collection, say $B_{\text{blue}}$, of either blue solid or diffusive edges such that (a) $B_{\text{black}} \cap B_{\text{blue}} = \emptyset$, and (b) both $B_{\text{black}}$ and $B_{\text{blue}}$ contain a spanning tree that connects all molecules in the graph. For simplicity of notations, we call the diffusive edges in $B_{\text{black}}$ as black edges, and the blue solid and diffusive edges in $B_{\text{blue}}$ as blue edges. Correspondingly, $B_{\text{black}}$ and $B_{\text{blue}}$ are referred to as black net and blue net, respectively, where a “net” refers to a subset of edges that contains a spanning tree.

A graph $\mathcal{G}$ with external molecules is called doubly connected if its subgraph with all external molecules removed is doubly connected, i.e. the spanning trees in the two nets are not required to contain the external molecules.
Note that the red solid edges are not tracked in the doubly connected property. In fact, the connectivity of red solid edges will be broken in our expansion procedures. Due to this reason, in the proof we will often consider molecular graphs with all red solid edges removed; see Section 5 below. Doubly-connected graphs satisfy some important bounds that depend explicitly on their scaling orders; see Lemma 8.4 below.

3 Main results

In this section, we define the concepts of $T$-expansion and $T$-equation, which were first introduced in [32 Section 2]. Then we will state the main results of this paper in Section 3.3. In this paper, we will focus on the expansions of the $T$-variable $T_{a,b_1b_2}$. The expansion of $T_{b_1b_2,a}$ can be obtained immediately by considering the transposition of $T_{a,b_1b_2}$.

3.1 $T$-expansion

In this subsection, we define the $T$-expansion using the notations introduced in Section 2. In addition, we also introduce the following two types of graphs.

Definition 3.1 (Recollision graphs and $Q$-graphs). (i) We say a graph is a $\oplus/\ominus$-recollision graph, if there is at least one dotted edge connecting $\oplus$ or $\ominus$ to an internal atom. In other words, a recollision graph represents an expression where we set at least one summation index to be equal to $b_1$ or $b_2$.

(ii) We say a graph is a $Q$-graph if all $G$ edges and $G$ weights in the graph have the same $Q_x$ label with a specific atom $x$, i.e., all $Q$ labels in the graph are the same $Q_x$ for some atom $x$. In other words, the value of a $Q$-graph can be written as $Q_x(\Gamma)$ for an external atom $x$ or $\sum_x Q_x(\Gamma)$ for an internal atom $x$, where $\Gamma$ is a graph without $Q$ labels.

Given any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we now define the $n$-th order $T$-expansion. The graphs in it actually satisfy several more delicate properties to be stated later in Definition 6.3.

Definition 3.2 ($n$-th order $T$-expansion). Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a large constant $D > n$. For $a, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d$, an $n$-th order $T$-expansion of $T_{a,b_1b_2}$ with $D$-th order error is an expression of the following form:

$$T_{a,b_1b_2} = m\Theta_{ab}, G_{b_1b_2} + m(\Theta\Sigma_T^{(n)}\Theta)_{ab}, G_{b_1b_2} + (R^{(n)}_{T})_{a,b_1b_2} + (\mathcal{A}_{T}^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2} + (\mathcal{E}_l T^{(n)} D)_{a,b_1b_2}. \quad (3.1)$$

The graphs on the right side depend only on $n, D, m(z), S, S^\pm(z), \Theta(z)$ and $G(z)$, but do not depend on $W$, $L$ and $d$ explicitly. Moreover, they satisfy the following properties with $C_n$ and $C_D$ denoting large constants depending on $n$ and $D$, respectively.

(i) The graphs on the right side are normal regular graphs (recall Definition 2.5) with external atoms $\otimes \equiv a, \oplus \equiv b_1$ and $\ominus \equiv b_2$, and with at most $C_D$ many atoms.

(ii) A diffusive edge in the graphs on the right-hand side of (3.1) is either a $\Theta$ edge or a labelled diffusive edge of the form (2.11) with $4 \leq 2k_1 \leq n$.

(iii) $\Sigma_T^{(n)}$ is a sum of at most $C_n$ many deterministic normal regular graphs. We decompose it according to the scaling order as

$$\Sigma_T^{(n)} = \sum_{k \leq n} \Sigma_{T,k}. \quad (3.2)$$

We have a sequence of self-energies $\mathcal{E}_k$ satisfying Definition 2.7 for $4 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\Sigma_{T,k}$ can be written into the following form

$$\Sigma_{T,k} = \mathcal{E}_k + \sum_{l=2}^{k} \sum_{k=(k_1, \ldots, k_l) \in \Omega^{(n)}_l} \mathcal{E}_{k_1} \Theta \mathcal{E}_{k_2} \cdots \Theta \mathcal{E}_{k_l}. \quad (3.3)$$
Here all the deterministic graphs with \( l = 1 \) are included into \( \mathcal{E}_k \) so that the summation starts with \( l = 2 \). Moreover, \( \mathcal{S}_k^{(l)} \subset \mathbb{N}^l \) is the subset of vectors \( \mathbf{k} \) satisfying that
\[
4 \leq k_i \leq k - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^l k_i - 2(l - 1) = k. \tag{3.4}
\]

The second condition of (3.4) guarantees that the subgraph \((\mathcal{E}_{k_1} \Theta \mathcal{E}_{k_2} \Theta \cdots \Theta \mathcal{E}_{k_l})_{xy}\) has scaling order \( k \).

(iv) \((\mathcal{R}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of at most \( C_n \) many \( \oplus/\ominus\)-recollision graphs of scaling order \( \leq n \) and without any \( P/Q \) labels. Moreover, it can be decomposed as
\[
(\mathcal{R}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2} = \sum_{k=3}^n (\mathcal{R}_{T,k})_{a,b_1b_2}, \tag{3.5}
\]
where each \((\mathcal{R}_{T,k})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of the \( \oplus/\ominus\)-recollision graphs of scaling order \( k \) in \((\mathcal{R}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\).

(v) \((\mathcal{A}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of at most \( C_D \) many graphs of scaling order \( > n \) and without any \( P/Q \) labels.

(vi) \((\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of at most \( C_D \) many \( Q\)-graphs. Moreover, it can be decomposed as
\[
(\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2} = \sum_{k=2}^n (\mathcal{Q}_{T,k})_{a,b_1b_2} + (\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}, \tag{3.6}
\]
where \((\mathcal{Q}_{T,k})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of the scaling order \( k \) \( Q\)-graphs in \((\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) and \((\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of all the scaling order \( > n \) \( Q\)-graphs in \((\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\).

(vii) \(\Sigma_{T,k}, \mathcal{R}_{T,k}\) and \(\mathcal{Q}_{T,k}\) are independent of \( n \).

(viii) \((\mathcal{E}_{rr,n,D})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is a sum of at most \( C_D \) many graphs, each of which has scaling order \( > D \) and may contain some \( P/Q \) labels in it.

(ix) In each graph of \((\mathcal{R}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}, (\mathcal{A}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}, (\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) and \((\mathcal{E}_{rr,n,D})_{a,b_1b_2}\), there is a unique (labelled) diffusive edge connected to \( \ominus \). Furthermore, there is at least an edge, which is either plus solid \( G \) or (labelled) diffusive or dotted, connected to \( \ominus \), and there is at least an edge, which is either minus solid \( G \) or (labelled) diffusive or dotted, connected to \( \oplus \).

(x) Each graph in \((\mathcal{R}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}, (\mathcal{A}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}, (\mathcal{Q}_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) and \((\mathcal{E}_{rr,n,D})_{a,b_1b_2}\) is doubly connected in the sense of Definition 2.13.

The graphs on the right-hand side of (3.1) satisfy some additional properties given in Definition 6.3 below.

By (2.8), the \((\Theta \Sigma_{T,k} \Theta)_{ab_1}\) term can be bounded as
\[
(\Theta \Sigma_{T,k} \Theta)_{ab_1} \leq W^{-(k-2)d/2+\tau} B_{ab_1}, \tag{3.7}
\]
for any constant \( \tau > 0 \). This bound shows that when \( b_1 = b_2 = b \), the second term on the right-hand side of (3.1) can be bounded by \( m \Theta_{bb}(\Sigma_{T,k} \Theta)_{ab} < B_{ab} \), which is necessary for the local law (1.16) to hold.

In the following second order \( T \)-expansion is given explicitly in Lemma 2.5:
\[
T_{a,b_1b_2} = m \overline{G}_{b_1b_2} \Theta_{ab_1} + (A_T^{(2)})_{a,b_1b_2} + (Q_T^{(2)})_{a,b_1b_2}, \tag{3.8}
\]
where
\[
(A_T^{(2)})_{a,b_1b_2} := m \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{ax} s_{xy} (G_{yy} - m) G_{xb_1} \overline{G}_{xb_2} + m \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{ax} s_{xy} (\overline{G}_{xx} - \overline{m}) G_{yb_1} \overline{G}_{yb_2}, \tag{3.9}
\]
\[
(Q_T^{(2)})_{a,b_1b_2} := \sum_x Q_x (\Theta_{ax} G_{xb_1} \overline{G}_{xb_2} - m Q_{b_1} (\Theta_{ab_1} \overline{G}_{b_1b_2}))
- m \sum_{x,y} Q_x [\Theta_{ax} s_{xy} (G_{yy} - m) G_{yb_1} \overline{G}_{yb_2}] - m \sum_{x,y} Q_x [\Theta_{ax} s_{xy} G_{xx} G_{yb_1} \overline{G}_{yb_2}] \tag{3.10}
\]

We still need to expand \((A_T^{(2)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) and \((Q_T^{(2)})_{a,b_1b_2}\) into sums of normal regular graphs using the operation in Definition 4.2 below, but we omit this minor issue here.
3.2 T-equation

In this subsection, we define the n-th order T-equation for any fixed n ∈ N.

**Definition 3.3** (n-th order T-equation). Fix any n ∈ N and a large constant D > n. For a, b, b₂ ∈ \( \mathbb{Z}_L^d \), an n-th order T-equation of \( T_{a, b, b₂} \) with D-th order error is an expression of the following form:

\[
T_{a, b, b₂} = m \Theta_{a, b} \Gamma_{b, b₂} + \sum_x (\Theta \Sigma^{(n)})_{a, x} T_{x, b, b₂}
\]

\[
+ (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} + (A_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} + (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} + (Err_{n, D})_{a, b, b₂},
\]

where the graphs on the right-hand side depend only on n, D, m(z), S, S⁺(z), Θ(z) and G(z), but do not depend on W, L, and d explicitly. Moreover, they satisfy the following properties.

(i) \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂}, (A_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂}, (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Err_{n, D})_{a, b, b₂} \) respectively satisfy the same properties as \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂}, (A_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂}, (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Err_{n, D})_{a, b, b₂} \) in Definition 3.2. Furthermore, \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) can be decomposed as

\[
(R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} = \sum_{k=3}^{n}(R_{IT,k})_{a, b, b₂},
\]

and

\[
(Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} = \sum_{k=2}^{n}(Q_{IT,k})_{a, b, b₂} + (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂},
\]

where \( (R_{IT,k})_{a, b, b₂} \) is a sum of the scaling order \( k \) \( \oplus \)-\( \ominus \)-collision graphs in \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (Q_{IT,k})_{a, b, b₂} \) is a sum of the scaling order \( k \) Q-graphs in \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) is a sum of the scaling order \( n \) Q-graphs in \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \). Moreover, \( R_{IT,k} \) and \( Q_{IT,k} \) are independent of n.

(ii) \( \Sigma^{(n)} \) can be decomposed according to the scaling order as

\[
\Sigma^{(n)} = \mathcal{E}_n + \sum_{l=4}^{n-1} \mathcal{E}_l,
\]

where \( \mathcal{E}_l \) (it is the same as that appeared in (3.3)), 1 ≤ l ≤ n − 1, is a sequence of self-energies satisfying Definition 2.7. For any x, y ∈ \( \mathbb{Z}_L^d \), \( (\mathcal{E}_n)_{xy} \) is a sum of at most \( C_n \) many deterministic graphs of scaling order n and with external atoms x and y.

(iii) A diffusive edge in \( \mathcal{E}_n \), \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (A_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Err_{n, D})_{a, b, b₂} \) is either a \( \Theta \) edge or a labelled diffusive edge of the form (2.11) with 4 ≤ 2k ≤ n − 1.

(iv) Each graph in \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (A_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Err_{n, D})_{a, b, b₂} \) can be written as

\[
\sum_x \Theta_{x, b} G_{x, b, b₂},
\]

where \( G_{x, b, b₂} \) is a normal regular graph with external atoms x, b₁ and b₂. Moreover, \( G_{x, b, b₂} \) has at least an edge, which is either plus solid \( G \) or diffusive or dotted, connected to \( \oplus \), and at least an edge, which is either minus solid \( G \) or diffusive or dotted, connected to \( \ominus \).

(v) Each graph in \( \mathcal{E}_n \), \( (R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (A_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \), \( (Q_{IT}^{(n)})_{a, b, b₂} \) and \( (Err_{n, D})_{a, b, b₂} \) is doubly connected in the sense of Definition 2.12.

The graphs on the right side of (3.11) satisfy some additional properties given in Definition 6.3 below.

**Remark 3.4.** The form of (3.11) is different from (3.1) only in the second term on the right-hand side. Moreover, it can be regarded as a linear equation of the \( T \)-variable \( T_{x, b, b₂} \). If we move the second term on the right-hand side of (3.11) to the left-hand side and multiply both sides with \( (1 - \Theta \Sigma^{(n)})^{-1} \), we can get
the $n$-th order $T$-equation (see Section 6.1 for more details). Furthermore, taking expectation and choosing $b_1 = b_2$ and $n = M$, we will get (1.17) as discussed in [32]. We remark that using the language of Feynman diagrams, $\Sigma_n$ in (3.14) is a sum of one-particle irreducible graphs, while $\Sigma^{(n)}_u$ in (3.2) is a sum of one-particle reducible graphs. Note that $\Theta \Sigma^{(n)}_\Theta$ is exactly the sum of scaling order $\ll n$ graphs in the Taylor expansion of $\Theta^{(n)} = (1 - \Theta \Sigma^{(n)})^{-1} \Theta$.

The $\mathcal{E}^r_s$'s in (3.14) are the same self-energies as in Definition 3.2. We will construct a sequence of $T$-equations inductively. In particular, before constructing the $n$-th order $T$-equation, we have obtained the $k$-th order $T$-expansion and proved the properties (1.20)–(1.22) for $\mathcal{E}_k$ for all $4 \leq k \leq n - 1$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{E}_n$ is a new sum of deterministic graphs obtained in the $n$-th order $T$-equation, whose properties (1.20)–(1.22) are yet to be shown. Moreover, we perform the expansions in a careful way so that the doubly connected property of the graphs in $\mathcal{E}_n$ will follow easily from the construction.

3.3 Main results

We are ready to state the main results of this paper. First, given an $n$-th order $T$-expansion, we can prove a local law in Theorem 3.6 for random band matrices satisfying (3.15). For simplicity of presentation, we will adopt the following convention of stochastic domination introduced in [11].

Definition 3.5 (Stochastic domination and high probability event). (i) Let

$$\xi = (\xi^{(W)}(u) : W \in \mathbb{N}, u \in U^{(W)}), \quad \zeta = (\zeta^{(W)}(u) : W \in \mathbb{N}, u \in U^{(W)}),$$

be two families of non-negative random variables, where $U^{(W)}$ is a possibly $W$-dependent parameter set. We say $\xi$ is stochastically dominated by $\zeta$, uniformly in $u$, if for any fixed (small) $\varepsilon > 0$ and (large) $D > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \bigcup_{u \in U^{(W)}} \{ \xi^{(W)}(u) > W^\varepsilon \zeta^{(W)}(u) \} \right] \leq W^{-D},$$

for large enough $W \geq W_0(\varepsilon, D)$, and we will use the notation $\xi \prec \zeta$. If some complex family $\xi$ satisfies $|\xi| \prec \zeta$, then we will also write $\xi \prec \zeta$ or $\xi \equiv \mathrm{O}_\prec(\zeta)$.

(ii) As a convention, for two deterministic non-negative quantities $\xi$ and $\zeta$, we will write $\xi \prec \zeta$ if and only if $\xi \leq W^\tau \zeta$ for any constant $\tau > 0$.

(iii) We say that an event $\Xi$ holds with high probability (w.h.p.) if for any constant $D > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(\Xi) \geq 1 - W^{-D}$ for large enough $W$. More generally, we say that an event $\Omega$ holds w.h.p. in $\Xi$ if for any constant $D > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(\Xi \setminus \Omega) \leq W^{-D}$ for large enough $W$.

Theorem 3.6 (Local law). Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, suppose we have an $n$-th order $T$-expansion satisfying Definition 3.2. Assume that $L$ satisfies

$$L^2/W^2 \leq W^{(n-1)d/2-\varepsilon_0}$$

(3.15)

for a constant $c_0 > 0$. Then for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$, the local law

$$|G_{xy}(z) - m(z) \delta_{xy}|^2 \prec B_{xy}$$

(3.16)

holds uniformly in all $z = E + i\eta$ with $E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa)$ and $\eta \in [W^{2+\varepsilon}/L^2, 1]$.

Next we show that we can construct the $T$-equation and $T$-expansion up to any fixed order $M \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 3.7 (Construction of the $T$-equation). Given any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we can construct a sequence of $n$-th order $T$-equations satisfying Definition 3.2 for all $2 \leq n \leq M$.

Solving the $n$-th order $T$-equation, we can get an $n$-th order $T$-expansion.

Corollary 3.8 (Construction of the $T$-expansion). Assume that Theorem 3.7 holds. Then we can construct a sequence of $n$-th order $T$-expansions satisfying Definition 3.2 for all $2 \leq n \leq M - 1$. If we further assume that $\mathcal{E}_M$ satisfies (1.20)–(1.22), then we can also construct the $M$-th order $T$-expansion.
In the proof of Theorem 3.7, we will construct a sequence of $T$-equations inductively. Suppose we have constructed the $T$-equation up to order $n$. Then by Corollary 3.8, we have an $(n-1)$-th order $T$-expansion. Using this $T$-expansion, we obtain from Theorem 3.6 that the local law (3.10) holds when $L$ satisfies the condition (with $n$ in (3.15) replaced by $n - 1$)

$$L^2/W^2 \leq W^{(n-2)d/2-c_{0}}.$$  

(3.17)

Using the local law (3.10), it was proved in [32] that $\mathcal{E}_n$ constructed in the $n$-th order $T$-equation in Theorem 3.7 is actually an $n$-th order self-energy.

**Lemma 3.9** (Lemma 5.8 of [32]). The deterministic matrix $\mathcal{E}_n$ constructed in the $n$-th order $T$-equation in Theorem 3.7 satisfies the properties (1.20)–(1.22) with $l = n$.

After showing that $\mathcal{E}_n$ is a self-energy satisfying Definition 2.7, we can use Corollary 3.8 again to get the $n$-th order $T$-expansion. Then we use the $n$-th order $T$-expansion to construct the $(n + 1)$-th order $T$-equation and to prove the properties (1.20)–(1.22) for $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}$. Continuing this process, we can construct the $T$-equation up to any fixed order. One contribution of this paper is that we develop a sophisticated strategy to construct the $n$-th order $T$-equation by using the $(n-1)$-th order $T$-expansion. The reader can refer to Section 3.4 for a discussion of some main ideas in the proof.

### 3.4 Main ideas

In this subsection, we briefly discuss the main ideas for the proof of Theorem 3.7 in Sections 4–6. Similar ideas will also be used in the proof of Theorem 3.6 in Sections 7–9. We remark that the following discussions are only for heuristic purposes, and they are not completely rigorous regarding some technical details.

#### 3.4.1 Basic strategy

As discussed above, we will construct a sequence of $T$-equations (3.11) inductively. We start with the second order $T$-expansion in (3.8). As an induction hypothesis, suppose we have obtained the $(n-1)$-th order $T$-expansion. We then construct the $n$-th order $T$-equation by repeating the following two steps: *local expansions* and *global expansions*. Roughly speaking, given the second order $T$-equation (3.8), we first apply local expansions in Section 4 to expand $\mathcal{A}_{T}^{(n-2)}$ into a sum of *locally standard* graphs in which every blue solid edge ($G$ entry) is paired with a red solid edge ($\overline{G}$ entry) to form a $T$-variable. Then in every locally standard graph, we choose a $T$-variable and substitute it with the $(n-1)$-th order $T$-expansion. This is called a global expansion. If a resulting graph can be included into one of the terms on the right-hand side of (3.11), then we will not expand it anymore. Otherwise, we will apply the local and global expansions to further expand it. Our basic strategy is to repeat the above process until we get (3.11). The main difficulty with this strategy is to maintain the doubly connected structures of graphs throughout the expansions, which will be discussed in next few subsections.

The above expansion strategy involves inserting the $(n-1)$-th order $T$-expansion into the second order $T$-equation (3.8) and then repeating local and global expansions to obtain the $n$-th order $T$-equation. This is different from the following “naturally inductive” strategy: given an $(n-1)$-th order $T$-equation, we further expand the $n$-th order graphs in $\mathcal{A}_{T}^{(n-1)}$ into $n$-th order graphs satisfying Definitions 3.3 plus higher order graphs of scaling order $> n$. However, this procedure fails because there may be some non-expandable graphs in $\mathcal{A}_{T}^{(n-1)}$, i.e. graphs that cannot be expanded without breaking the doubly connected property. The existence of such graphs does not indicate that the concept of $T$-equation fails, because there may be other graphs in the expansion that cancel this graph up to a small error (although it is almost impossible to know what these graphs are). On the other hand, our global expansion strategy explicitly maintains the self-energies (especially their delicate cancellations given by the sum zero property (1.22)) by replacing each $T$-variable with a lower order $T$-expansion. In particular, this allows us to plug into terms $(\Theta \Sigma_{T,\lambda} \Theta)_{xy}$ as a whole, which are well-behaved by (3.7).

#### 3.4.2 Redundant edges and pre-deterministic property

Local expansions preserve the doubly connected property (cf. Lemma 4.10), they were dealt with in [32]. On the other hand, global expansions may break doubly connected structures of the graphs, and hence are much harder to deal with. We will see that a global expansion will preserve the doubly connected property
if and only if we expand a redundant blue solid edge. (Here an expansion of a blue solid edge refers to an expansion of a $T$-variable containing this edge.) As will be defined in Definition 5.5, a blue solid edge is redundant if after removing it, the remaining graph is still doubly connected. A non-redundant blue solid edge is called pivotal. To preserve the doubly connected structures of graphs, we will follow the strict rule that we only expand a redundant blue solid edge in a global expansion.

Under the above rule, if we expand the blue solid edges in an arbitrary order, then we may get graphs that are locally standard and only contain pivotal blue solid edges, namely, non-expandable graphs. These graphs may not be included into one of the six terms on the right-hand side of (3.11). To avoid such “bad” graphs, we need to impose structural properties that are stronger than the doubly connected property.

Note that the leading term of a global expansion corresponds to replacing a blue solid edge with a diffusive edge (i.e. the first term on the right-hand side of (3.1) with $n$ replaced by $n - 1$). By this observation, we see that in order to expand a graph, say $\mathcal{G}$, into deterministic graphs (together with some recollision, $Q$, higher order or error graphs) using global expansions under the rule about redundant edges, we need the following property. All the blue solid edges in $\mathcal{G}$ can be replaced by diffusive edges one by one according to an order, such that at each step we are dealing with a redundant edge. We call this property a pre-deterministic property (cf. Definition 5.8), and the corresponding order of blue solid edges a pre-deterministic order.

The term “pre-deterministic” refers to that pre-deterministic graphs will finally contribute to deterministic graphs (i.e. graphs in the second term on the right-hand side of (3.11)) after the prescribed expansion procedure. Since there is at least one redundant edge in a pre-deterministic graph, that is, the first edge in the pre-deterministic order, a pre-deterministic graph is always expandable unless it is deterministic.

We remark that the pre-deterministic property is defined by only looking at the leading terms of global expansions (i.e. replacing a $T$-variable with a graph in the first two terms on the right-hand side of (3.1) with $n$ replaced by $n - 1$). If we consider the subleading graphs obtained by inserting recollision, $Q$ or higher order graphs, the pre-deterministic property may be broken in a global expansion. The subleading graphs actually satisfy a slightly weaker sequentially pre-deterministic property, which we introduce now.

### 3.4.3 Isolated subgraphs and sequentially pre-deterministic property

In a doubly connected molecular graph (by convention, blue and black nets are selected), every subset of molecules are connected to other molecules through at least an edge in the blue net and an edge in the black net. Then we define an isolated subgraph to be a subgraph induced on a subset of molecules that are connected to other molecules exactly by two edges in the molecular graph with all red solid edges removed (because red solid edges are not used in the definition of doubly connected property). It is easy to see that if a graph contains a proper isolated subgraph, then this graph cannot be pre-deterministic because of the pivotal external blue solid edge connected with the isolated subgraph. In general, global expansions may create isolated subgraphs, and hence break the pre-deterministic property of our graphs. Hence we need to introduce a weaker property, called the sequentially pre-deterministic (SPD) property.

A SPD graph is a doubly connected graph satisfying Definition 5.9 below. Roughly speaking, the term “sequentially” refers to that a SPD graph contains a sequence of isolated subgraphs, say $I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_1$, as shown in the following figure:

![Isolated subgraphs](image)

(3.18)

Here we draw a molecular graph without red solid edges, and inside the black circles are some subgraphs. $\Gamma_k$ is the minimal isolated subgraph (MIS) $I_k$, $\Gamma_k \cup \Gamma_{k-1}$ plus the two edges between them form the isolated subgraph $I_{k-1}$, and $\Gamma_k \cup \Gamma_{k-1} \cup \cdots \cup \Gamma_1$ plus the edges between these components form the isolated subgraph $I_1$. $\Gamma_0$ is a subgraph containing internal molecules that are connected with external edges, and we do not treat it as an isolated subgraph. The term “pre-deterministic” refers to that the MIS of a SPD graph is pre-deterministic.

As a key step of our proof, we will show that the SPD property will be preserved both in local expansions (cf. Lemma 4.10) and global expansions (cf. Lemma 6.5) if we always expand the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS of every SPD graph. Hence continuing the expansions, we can finally expand $T_{a,b_1,b_2}$ into a sum of SPD graphs, which, by definition, imply the doubly property of them. However, unlike pre-deterministic graphs, a SPD graph is not always expandable. For example, if (3.18) corresponds
to a locally standard atomic graph and all its components \( \Gamma_i \) do not contain any blue solid edges, then the graph only contains pivotal blue solid edges and cannot be expanded without breaking the doubly connected property.

### 3.4.4 Globally standard property

Our goal is thus to find a graphical property as a compromise between the pre-deterministic and SPD properties, so that it is preserved in both local and global expansions and also guarantees that we will not get non-expandable graphs. We will identify such a property in Definition 6.2, called the **globally standard property**. Roughly speaking, a globally standard graph is a SPD graph such that its MIS is connected with at least two red solid edges. First, using the fact that SPD property is preserved by local and global expansions, it is not hard to show that the globally standard property is also preserved by both local and global expansions (as long as we expand the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS). Second, a globally standard graph is always expandable. To see why, we again consider the setting (3.18). If \( \Gamma_k \) contains a blue solid edge, then it contains a redundant edge due to its pre-deterministic property. Otherwise, \( \Gamma_k \) is connected with at least two external red solid edges and at most one blue solid edge. This shows that we cannot have a perfect pairing between the blue and red solid edges, so the graph is not locally standard. Then we can apply local expansions to the graph.

Now our expansion strategy roughly proceeds as follows. We first apply local expansions to (3.8) to get locally and globally standard graphs. Then we expand the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS in every graph using the \((n-1)\)-th order \( T \)-expansion. Next we apply local expansions to the resulting graphs and get new locally and globally standard graphs. In every such graph, we further expand the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS. Repeating this process for sufficiently many times, we finally obtain a linear combination of graphs that can be written into the form (1.25). Throughout the expansion process, the doubly connected property is preserved, so all the graphs in (1.25) are also doubly connected.

### 4 Basic graph operations

A graph operation \( O[G] \) on a graph \( G \) is a linear combination of new graphs such that the graph value of \( G \) is unchanged, i.e. \( [O[G]] = [G] \). All graph operations are linear, that is,

\[
O \left[ \sum_i c_i G_i \right] = \sum_i c_i O \left[ G_i \right].
\]

(4.1)

The graphs operations in Sections 4.1–4.3 have been defined in [32, Section 3], while the \( Q \)-expansions in Section 4.4 are new.

#### 4.1 Dotted edges operations

Recall that a dotted edge between atoms \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) represents a \( \delta_{\alpha\beta} \) factor. We will identify internal atoms connected by dotted edges, but we will not identify an external and an internal atom due to their different roles in graphs. We define the following simple merging operation regarding the dotted edges.

**Definition 4.1 (Merging operation).** Given a graph \( G \) that contains dotted edges between different atoms, we define an operator \( O_{\text{merge}} \) in the following way: \( O_{\text{merge}}[G] \) is a graph obtained by merging every pair of internal atoms, say \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), that are connected by a path of dotted edges into a single internal atom, say \( \gamma \). Moreover, the weights and edges attached to \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are now attached to the atom \( \gamma \) in \( O_{\text{merge}}[G] \). In particular, the \( G \) edges between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) become weights on \( \gamma \), and the waved and diffusive edges between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) become self-loops on \( \gamma \).

Given any regular graph, we can rewrite it into a linear combination of normal regular graphs using the following **dotted edge partition** operation.

**Definition 4.2 (Dotted edge partition).** Given a regular graph \( G \), for any pair of atoms \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), if there is at least one \( G \) edge but no \( \times \)-dotted edge between them, then we write

\[
1 = 1_{\alpha=\beta} + 1_{\alpha \neq \beta};
\]
if there is a $\times$-dotted line $1_{\alpha \neq \beta}$ but no $G$ edge between them, then we write

$$1_{\alpha \neq \beta} = 1 - 1_{\alpha = \beta}.$$  

Expanding the product of all these sums on the right-hand sides, we can expand $G$ as

$$O_{\text{dot}}[G] := \sum O_{\text{merge}}[\text{Dot} \cdot G],$$  

(4.2)

where each Dot is a product of dotted and $\times$-dotted edges together with a + or $-$ sign. In Dot $\cdot G$, if there is a $\times$-dotted edge between $\alpha$ and $\beta$, then the $G$ edges between them are off-diagonal; otherwise, the $G$ edges between them become weights after the merging operation. If Dot is “inconsistent” (i.e., two atoms are connected by a $\times$-dotted edge and a path of dotted edges), then we trivially have $[\text{Dot} \cdot G] = 0$. Thus we will drop all inconsistent graphs. Finally, if the graph $G$ is already normal, then $O_{\text{dot}}$ acting on $G$ is a null operation and we let $O_{\text{dot}}[G] := G$.

From this definition, we see that $O_{\text{dot}}[G]$ of a regular graph $G$ is a sum of normal regular graphs.

4.2 Local expansions

In this section, we define the local expansions. We call them “local” because these expansions do not create new molecules, that is, every molecule in the new graphs is obtained by adding atoms to existing molecules or merging some molecules in the original graph. It is easy to see that $O_{\text{dot}}$ is a local expansion. We emphasize that the local expansions can change the global structure, but they will preserve the doubly connected property as we will show in Lemma 4.10.

As introduced in \[32\], there are four basic local expansions, including one weight expansion and three edge expansions. We now define them one by one.

**Definition 4.3 (Weight expansion operator).** Given a normal regular graph $G$ containing an atom $x$, if there is no weight or light weight on $x$, then we trivially define $O_{\text{weight}}^{(x)}[G] := G$. Otherwise, we define $O_{\text{weight}}^{(x)}[G]$ in the following way.

(i) **Removing regular weights:** Suppose there are regular $G_{xx}$ or $\overline{G}_{xx}$ weights on $x$. Then we rewrite $G_{xx} = m + (G_{xx} - m)$, or $\overline{G}_{xx} = m + (\overline{G}_{xx} - m)$.

Expanding the product of all these sums, we can rewrite $G$ into a linear combination of normal regular graphs containing only light weights on $x$. We denote this graph expansion operator as $O_{\text{weight}}^{(x)}$.

(ii) **Expanding light weight:** If $G$ has a light weight $G_{xx} - m$ of positive charge on $x$ and is of the form $G = (G_{xx} - m)f(G)$, then we define the light weight expansion on $x$ by

$$O_{\text{weight}}^{(x)}[G] := m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha}(G_{xx} - m)(G_{\alpha\alpha} - m)f(G) + m \sum_{\alpha,\beta} S_{x\alpha}^+ s_{\alpha\beta}(G_{\alpha\alpha} - m)(G_{\beta\beta} - m)f(G)$$

$$- m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha\alpha} \partial h_{\alpha} f(G) - m \sum_{\alpha,\beta} S_{x\alpha}^+ s_{\alpha\beta} G_{\beta\alpha} \partial h_{\beta} f(G) + Q_w,$$

(4.3)

where $Q_w$ is a sum of $Q$-graphs,

$$Q_w := Q_x [(G_{xx} - m)f(G)] + \sum_{\alpha} Q_{\alpha} [S_{x\alpha}^+ (G_{\alpha\alpha} - m)f(G)]$$

$$- mQ_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} (G_{\alpha\alpha} - m)G_{xx} f(G) \right] - m \sum_{\alpha} Q_{\alpha} \left[ \sum_{\beta} S_{x\alpha}^+ s_{\alpha\beta} (G_{\beta\beta} - m)G_{\alpha\alpha} f(G) \right]$$

$$+ mQ_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha\alpha} \partial h_{\alpha} f(G) \right] + m \sum_{\alpha} Q_{\alpha} \left[ \sum_{\beta} S_{x\alpha}^+ s_{\alpha\beta} G_{\beta\alpha} \partial h_{\beta} f(G) \right].$$

If $G = (\overline{G}_{xx} - m)f(G)$, then we define

$$O_{\text{weight}}^{(x)}[G] := O_{\text{weight}}^{(x)} \left[(G_{xx} - m)f(G)\right],$$

(4.4)
where the right-hand side is defined using (4.3). When there are more than one light weights on \( x \), we pick any one of them and apply (4.3) or (4.4).

Combining the above two graph operators, we define

\[
\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{weight}}[G] := \mathcal{O}^{(x),1}_{\text{weight}} \circ \mathcal{O}_{\text{dot}} \circ \mathcal{O}^{(x),2}_{\text{weight}} \circ \mathcal{O}^{(x),1}_{\text{weight}}[G],
\]

where \( \mathcal{O}_{\text{dot}} \) is applied to ensure that the resulting graphs after applying \( \mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{weight}} \) are normal regular.

We introduce the following notion of degree of atoms:

\[
\deg(x) := \# \{ \text{solid edges connected with } x \}. \tag{4.6}
\]

In other words, we only count the plus and minus \( G \) edges connected with an atom regarding its “degree”.

We define the following three edges expansions on atoms of nonzero degrees.

**Definition 4.4** (Multi-edge expansion operator). Given a normal regular graph \( G \), if there are no solid edges connected with atom \( x \), then we trivially define \( \mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-}e}[G] := G \). Otherwise, we define \( \mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-}e} \) in the following way. Suppose the graph takes the form

\[
G := \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} G_{xy_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k_2} G_{xy'_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k_3} G_{w_ix} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k_4} G_{w'_ix} \cdot f(G), \tag{4.7}
\]

where \( f(G) \) does not contain \( G \) edges does attached to \( x \), and the atoms \( y_i, y'_i, w_i \) and \( w'_i \) are all not equal to \( x \).

(i) If \( k_1 > 1 \), then we define the multi-edge expansion on \( x \) as

\[
\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-}e}[G] := \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} m_i^2 \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{\alpha y'_i} \right) \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} G_{xy'_i}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} m_i \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w_ix} \right) \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} G_{w ix}}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} m_i (G_{xx} - m) \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{\alpha y'_i} \right) \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} G_{xy'_i}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k_3} m_i (G_{xx} - m) \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w_ix} \right) \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} G_{w ix}}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G + (k_1 - 1) m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{xy_i} + k_4 m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} \frac{G}{G_{xy_i}}
\]

\[
- m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} f(G)} G_{\alpha y_i} \partial_{x\alpha} f(G) + Q_{\text{multi-}e}. \tag{4.8}
\]

On the right-hand side of (4.8), the first two terms are main terms with the same scaling order as \( G \), but the degree of atom \( x \) is reduced by 2 and a new atom \( \alpha \) with degree 2 is created; the third to fifth terms contain one more light weight and hence are of strictly higher scaling order than \( G \); the sixth to eighth terms contain at least one more off-diagonal \( G \) edge and hence are of strictly higher scaling order than \( G \). The last term \( Q_{\text{multi-}e} \) is a sum of \( Q \)-graphs defined by

\[
Q_{\text{multi-}e} := Q_x(G) - m \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} m Q_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{\alpha y'_i} \right] \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} G_{xy'_i}}
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} m Q_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w_ix} \right] \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} G_{w ix}} - m Q_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G \right]
\]

\[
- (k_1 - 1) m Q_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha y_i} \frac{G}{G_{xy_i}} \right] - k_4 m Q_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} G_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} \frac{G}{G_{xy_i}} \right]
\]

\[
+ m Q_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x\alpha} \frac{G}{G_{xy_i} f(G)} G_{\alpha y_i} \partial_{x\alpha} f(G) \right].
\]

(ii) If \( k_1 = 0 \) and \( k_2 > 1 \), then we define

\[
\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-}e}[G] := \mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-}e} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{k_2} G_{xy'_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k_3} G_{w_ix} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k_4} G_{w'_ix} \cdot f(G) \right],
\]
where the right-hand side can be defined using (i).

(iii) If $k_1 = k_2 = 0$ and $k_3 \geq 1$, then we can define $\tilde{O}_{\text{multi-}e}^{(x)}[G]$ by exchanging the order of matrix indices in (i). More precisely, we define

\[
\tilde{O}_{\text{multi-}e}^{(x)}[G] := \sum_{i=1}^{k_4} [m]^2 \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{w_1 \alpha} G_{w_2 \alpha} \right) \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x} G_{w_2 y}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k_4} m \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{w_1 \alpha} G_{w_2 \alpha} \right) \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x} G_{w_2 y}}
\]

\[
+ m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G + (k_3 - 1)m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{w_1 \alpha} G_{w_2 \alpha} \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x}}
\]

\[
- m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x}} G_{w_1 \alpha} \partial_{h_{x \alpha}} f(G) + Q_{\text{multi-}e},
\]

where

\[
Q_{\text{multi-}e} := Q_{x}(G) - \sum_{i=1}^{k_4} m Q_{x} \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{w_1 \alpha} G_{w_2 \alpha} \right) \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x} G_{w_2 y}} - m Q_{x} \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G \right)
\]

\[
- (k_3 - 1)m Q_{x} \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{w_1 \alpha} G_{w_2 \alpha} \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x}} + m Q_{x} \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} \frac{G}{G_{w_1 x}} G_{w_1 \alpha} \partial_{h_{x \alpha}} f(G).
\]

(iv) If $k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 0$ and $k_4 \geq 1$, then we define

\[
\tilde{O}_{\text{multi-}e}^{(x)}[G] := \tilde{O}_{\text{multi-}e} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{k_4} G_{w_1 x} \cdot f(G) \right],
\]

where the right-hand side can be defined using (iii).

Finally, applying the $O_{\text{dot}}$ in Definition 4.2, we define

\[
O_{\text{multi-}e}^{(x)}[G] := O_{\text{dot}} \circ \tilde{O}_{\text{multi-}e}^{(x)}[G].
\]

**Definition 4.5 (GG expansion operator).** Suppose a normal regular graph $G$ takes the form $G = G_{xy} G_{y'y} f(G)$ with $y, y' \neq x$, where $f(G)$ does not contain $G$ edges attached to $x$. Then we define

\[
\tilde{O}_{GG}^{(x)}[G] := m S_{xy} S_{y'y} f(G) + m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G + m \sum_{\alpha, \beta} S_{x \alpha}^+ S_{\alpha \beta} (G_{\beta \beta} - m) G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} f(G)
\]

\[
+ m (G_{xx} - m) \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} f(G) + m \sum_{\alpha, \beta} S_{x \alpha}^+ S_{\alpha \beta} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G_{\beta y} G_{y' \beta} f(G)
\]

\[
- m \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} \partial_{h_{x \alpha}} f(G) - m \sum_{\alpha, \beta} S_{x \alpha}^+ S_{\alpha \beta} G_{\beta y} G_{y' \alpha} \partial_{h_{x \alpha}} f(G) + Q_{GG}.
\]

Here on the right hand side, the first term is the main term which is either of the same scaling order as $G$ if $y = y'$ or of strictly higher scaling order if $y \neq y'$; the second to fifth terms contain one more light weight and hence are of strictly higher scaling order than $G$; the sixth and seventh terms contain at least one more off-diagonal $G$ edge and hence are of strictly higher scaling order than $G$; $Q_{GG}$ is a sum of $Q$-graphs defined by

\[
Q_{GG} := Q_{x}(G) + \sum_{\alpha} Q_{x} \left[ S_{x \alpha} G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} f(G) \right] - m Q_{y} \left[ S_{xy}^+ G_{y'y} f(G) \right] - m Q_{x} \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) G \right]
\]

\[
- m \sum_{\alpha} Q_{x} \left[ \sum_{\beta} S_{x \alpha}^+ S_{\alpha \beta} (G_{\beta \beta} - m) G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} f(G) \right] - m Q_{y} \left[ G_{xx} \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} f(G) \right]
\]

\[
- m \sum_{\alpha} Q_{x} \left[ \sum_{\beta} S_{x \alpha}^+ s_{\alpha \beta} G_{\alpha \alpha} G_{\beta y} G_{y' \beta} f(G) \right] + m Q_{x} \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{x \alpha} G_{\alpha y} G_{y' \alpha} \partial_{h_{x \alpha}} f(G) \right]
\]

\[
+ m \sum_{\alpha} Q_{x} \left[ \sum_{\beta} S_{x \alpha}^+ s_{\alpha \beta} G_{\beta y} G_{y' \alpha} \partial_{h_{x \alpha}} f(G) \right].
\]
If \( \mathcal{G} \) takes the form \( \mathcal{G} = G_{xy}G_{y'x}f(G) \), then we define
\[
\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{GG}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}] := \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{GG}^{(x)} \left[ G_{xy}G_{y'x}f(G) \right],
\]
where the right-hand side is defined using (4.10). Finally, applying the \( \mathcal{O}_{dot} \) in Definition 4.2, we define
\[
\mathcal{O}_{GG}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}] := \mathcal{O}_{dot} \circ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{GG}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}].
\]

**Definition 4.6** (\( G\hat{G} \) expansion operator). Suppose a normal regular graph \( \mathcal{G} \) takes the form \( \mathcal{G} = G_{xy}G_{y'x}f(G) \) with \( y, y' \neq x \), where \( f(G) \) does not contain \( G \) edges attached to \( x \). Then by taking \( k_1 = k_2 = 1 \) and \( k_3 = k_4 = 0 \) in Definition 4.4, we define
\[
\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{GG}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}] := |m|^2 \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} G_{xy} G_{ay}' f(G) + m \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} (G_{aa} - m) \mathcal{G}
+ m(G_{xx} - m) \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} G_{xy} G_{ay}' f(G) - m \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} G_{xy} G_{ay} \partial_{ha_x} f(G) + Q_{G\hat{G}}.
\]
where \( Q_{G\hat{G}} \) is defined by
\[
Q_{G\hat{G}} := Q_x(\mathcal{G}) - mQ_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} G_{xx} G_{xy} G_{ay}' f(G) \right] - mQ_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} (G_{aa} - m) \mathcal{G} \right]
+ mQ_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{xa} G_{xy} G_{ay} \partial_{ha_x} f(G) \right].
\]

If \( \mathcal{G} \) takes the form \( \mathcal{G} = G_{xy} \hat{G}_{y'x} f(G) \), we define \( \mathcal{O}_{G\hat{G}}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}] \) by taking \( k_1 = k_2 = 0 \) and \( k_3 = k_4 = 1 \) in Definition 4.4, and we omit the explicit expression here. Finally, applying the \( \mathcal{O}_{dot} \) in Definition 4.2, we define
\[
\mathcal{O}_{GG}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}] := \mathcal{O}_{dot} \circ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{GG}^{(x)}[\mathcal{G}].
\]

As shown in [32], the operations \( \mathcal{O}_{weight}^{(x)} \), \( \mathcal{O}_{multi-e}^{(x)} \), \( \mathcal{O}_{GG}^{(x)} \) and \( \mathcal{O}_{G\hat{G}}^{(x)} \) are all obtained from Gaussian integration by parts. Their basic properties have been summarized in Section 3 of [32]. In particular, it is easy to see that the new atoms \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) appearing in these expansions are connected to atom \( x \) through a path of waved edges, so they are included into the existing molecule containing atom \( x \). Hence Definitions 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 all give local expansions. Applying these expansions repeatedly, we can expand any regular graph into a linear combination of locally standard graphs, \( Q \)-graphs and higher order graphs. To define locally standard graphs, we first introduce the following concept of standard neutral atoms.

**Definition 4.7** (Standard neutral atoms). Consider an internal atom \( x \) of degree 2 in a graph. We say the two edges connected with \( x \) are **mismatched** if they are of following forms:

![Mismatched edges](image)

Otherwise the two edges are **matched** and of the following forms:

![Matched edges](image)

An atom is said to be **standard neutral** if it is only connected to three edges besides the \( x \)-dotted edges: two matched \( G \) edges of opposite charges and one waved \( S \) edge.

Note that the edges connected with a standard neutral atom almost form a \( T \)-variable (but not an exact \( T \)-variable because of the \( x \)-dotted edges; see Section 4.3 for more details).
Definition 4.8 (Locally standard graphs). A graph \( G \) is locally standard if

(i) it is a normal regular graph without \( P/Q \) labels;

(ii) it has no weights or light weights;

(iii) the degree of any internal atom is 0 or 2;

(iv) all degree 2 internal atoms are standard neutral atoms.

Given a regular graph \( G \), we first apply \( O_{\text{dot}} \) to expand it into a linear combination of normal regular graphs, then apply the weight expansions to remove the weights, and then apply the multi-edge, \( GG \) and \( GG \) expansions one by one to remove all atoms that are not standard neutral. Finally, we can expand \( G \) into a sum of locally standard graphs, recollision graphs, \( Q \)-graphs and higher order graphs. The following basic lemma on local expansions has been proved in [32].

Lemma 4.9 (Lemma 3.22 of [32]). Let \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) be a normal regular graph with no solid edge connected with \( a \). Then for any fixed \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we have that

\[
G_{a,b_1,b_2} = (G_{\text{local}})_{a,b_1,b_2} + R^{(n)}_{a,b_1,b_2} + (A^{(\geq 1)}_{a,b_1,b_2}) + Q^{(n)}_{a,b_1,b_2},
\]

where \((G_{\text{local}})_{a,b_1,b_2}\) is a sum of \( O(1) \) many locally standard graphs, \( R^{(n)}_{a,b_1,b_2}\) is a sum of \( O(1) \) many \( \oplus/\ominus \)-recollision graphs, \((A^{(\geq 1)}_{a,b_1,b_2})\) is a sum of \( O(1) \) many graphs of scaling order > 1, and \((Q^{(n)}_{a,b_1,b_2})\) is a sum of \( O(1) \) many \( Q \)-graphs. Every molecule in the graphs on the right side is obtained by merging some molecules in the original graph \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \).

If there are no dotted or waved edges added between different molecules, then the molecules in a new graph are the same as those in \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \). In general, there may be newly added dotted edges (due to the dotted edge partition \( O_{\text{dot}} \)) or waved edges (due to the first term on the right-hand side of \((4.10)\)), so the molecules in a new graph are obtained from merging the molecules connected by dotted or waved edges. Now we show that the local expansions do not break the doubly-connected property.

Lemma 4.10. Suppose a normal regular graph \( G \) is doubly-connected in the sense of Definition 2.12. Then applying any expansion in Definitions 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 to \( G \), the new graphs (including the \( Q \)-graphs) are all doubly connected normal regular graphs.

Proof. The following discussions focus on the molecular graphs. First, in the dotted edge partition of a graph \( G \), the blue solid and (labelled) diffusive edges between molecules are all unchanged. The only changes are that in new molecular graphs, some molecules are merged into one molecule due to newly added dotted edges between different molecules. It is obvious that such merging operations will not break the doubly connected structure.

Then we consider the weight expansion in Definition 4.3. It is trivial to see that \( O^{(\geq 1)}_{\text{weight}} \) does not change the molecular graph at all. Hence with the statement for \( O_{\text{dot}} \), we only need to show that \( O^{(x)}_{\text{weight}}[G] \) of a doubly connected graph \( G \) is still a sum of doubly connected graphs. Let \( G_1 \) be one of the new graphs. Since new atoms are all included into the molecule containing \( x \), the molecules in the molecular graph of \( G_1 \) are the same molecules as those in the original molecular graph of \( G \). Moreover, (labelled) diffusive edges between molecules are also not affected in the expansions, i.e., the black net does not change. It remains to consider the plus \( G \) edges between molecules in \( G_1 \). From \((4.3)\), it is easy to see that any plus \( G \) edge in the molecular graph of \( G \) between two different molecules, say \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), either is not affected or becomes a connected path of two plus \( G \) edges between \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) due to the partial derivatives \( \partial_{h_{a\alpha}} \) or \( \partial_{h_{b\alpha}} \). (For example, if the atoms \( x \), \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are in molecule \( M_3 \), then the edge between \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) becomes two plus \( G \) edges from \( M_1 \) to \( M_3 \) and from \( M_3 \) to \( M_2 \).) In either case, the path connectivity of the blue net is not affected, and hence the doubly connected property preserves in \( G_1 \).

For the edge expansions in Definitions 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6, the argument is exactly the same.

4.3 Global expansions

In this section, we define the global expansions. As an induction hypothesis, suppose we have obtained the \((n-1)\)-th order \( T \)-expansion. Then a global expansion of a locally standard graph, say \( G \), consists of the following three steps:

}\[
\]
(i) we choose a standard neutral atom in $G$;

(ii) we replace the $T$-variable containing the atom in (i) by the $(n - 1)$-th order $T$-expansion;

(iii) we apply the $Q$-expansions to the resulting graphs with $Q$-labels from (ii).

We call this procedure “global” because it may create new molecules in the graphs. Unlike the local expansions, a global expansion may break the doubly connected structures of graphs. To avoid this issue, we need to follow a specific criterion in choosing the standard neutral atom in (i). This will be discussed in Section 3. In this subsection, we define step (ii) in the above procedure, and postpone the definition of the $Q$-expansions in step (iii) to the next subsection.

Picking a standard neutral atom, say $x$, in a locally standard graph, the edges connected to it take one of the following forms:

$$t_{x,y_1y_2} := |m|^2 \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha} G_{\alpha y_1} G_{\alpha y_2} 1_{\alpha \neq y_1, 1_{\alpha \neq y_2}}, \quad \text{or} \quad t_{y_1y_2,x} := |m|^2 \sum_{\alpha} G_{y_1\alpha} G_{y_2\alpha} s_{\alpha} 1_{\alpha \neq y_1, 1_{\alpha \neq y_2}}. \quad (4.14)$$

Then we apply the $(n - 1)$-th order $T$-expansion in (3.1) to these variables in the following way:

$$t_{x,y_1y_2} = m \Theta_{x y_1} G_{y_1y_2} + m (\Theta \Sigma^{(n-1)} \Theta)_{x y_1} G_{y_1y_2} + (R^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2} + (A^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2} + (Q^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2}
+ (\mathcal{E} \mathcal{R}_{n-1, D})_{x,y_1y_2} - \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha} G_{\alpha y_1} G_{\alpha y_2} (1_{\alpha \neq y_1} 1_{\alpha = y_2} + 1_{\alpha = y_1} 1_{\alpha \neq y_2} + 1_{\alpha = y_1} 1_{\alpha = y_2}).$$

Note that $1_{\alpha = y_1} 1_{\alpha = y_2} = 0$ if $y_1 \neq y_2$, and $1_{\alpha \neq y_1} 1_{\alpha = y_2} = 1_{\alpha = y_1} 1_{\alpha \neq y_2} = 0$ if $y_1 = y_2$. The last term on the right-hand side gives one or two recollision graphs, so we combine them with $(R^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2}$ and denote the resulting term by $(R^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2}$. Hence we get the following expansion formula of the $t$-variables:

$$t_{x,y_1y_2} = m \Theta_{x y_1} G_{y_1y_2} + m (\Theta \Sigma^{(n-1)} \Theta)_{x y_1} G_{y_1y_2} + (R^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2} + (A^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2} + (Q^{(n-1)}_{T})_{x,y_1y_2}
+ (\mathcal{E} \mathcal{R}_{n-1, D})_{x,y_1y_2}. \quad (4.15)$$

The expansion of $t_{y_1y_2,x}$ can be obtained by exchanging the order of every pair of matrix indices in the above equation.

### 4.4 $Q$-expansions

If we replace a $t$-variable with a graph in $Q^{(n-1)}_{T}$, then we will get a graph of the form

$$G_0 = \sum_x \Gamma_0 Q_x (\bar{\Gamma}_0), \quad (4.16)$$

where both the graphs $\Gamma_0$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_0$ do not contain any $P/Q$ labels. The $Q$-expansions will expand the above graph into a sum of $Q$-graphs and graphs without $P/Q$ labels. By Definition 3.1, $Q$-graphs refer to graphs where all edges and weights have the same $Q$-label. The graph $G_0$ does not satisfy this property, so we will not call it a $Q$-graph to avoid confusion.

**Step 1:** First, we apply $O^{(1)}_{\text{weight}} \circ O_{\text{dot}}$ to $G_0$ in (4.16) and get a sum of normal regular graphs without regular weights on atom $x$. Now for any new graph, say $G = \sum_x \Gamma Q_x (\bar{\Gamma})$, if $\Gamma$ does not contain any light weight or edges attached to atom $x$, then we apply the following operations.

Let $H^{(x)}$ be the $(N - 1) \times (N - 1)$ minor of $H$ obtained by removing the $x$-th row and column of $H$, and define the resolvent minor $G^{(x)}(z) := (H^{(x)} - z)^{-1}$. The following resolvent identity is well-known:

$$G_{x_1,x_2} = G^{(x)}_{x_1,x_2} + \frac{G_{x_1,x} G_{x_2,x}}{G_{xx}}, \quad x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

which follows from the Schur complement formula. Correspondingly, we introduce a new type of weights, $(G_{xx})^{-1}$ and $(\bar{G}_{xx})^{-1}$, and a new label $(x)$ to solid edges and weights. More precisely, if a weight on $x$ has a label “$(-1)$”, then this weight represents a $(G_{xx})^{-1}$ or $(\bar{G}_{xx})^{-1}$ factor depending on its charge; if an edge or a weight has a label $(x)$, then it represents a $G^{(x)}$ entry.
Applying \([4.17]\) to expand the resolvent entries in \(\Gamma\) one by one, we can get that

\[
\Gamma = \Gamma^{(x)} + \sum_{\omega} \Gamma_{\omega},
\]

(4.18)

where \(\Gamma^{(x)}\) is a graph whose weights and solid edges all have the \((x)\) label, and hence is independent of the \(x\)-th row and column of \(H\). The second term on the right-hand side of \((4.18)\) is a sum of \(O(1)\) many graphs. Moreover, each \(\Gamma_{\omega}\) has a strictly higher scaling order than \(\Gamma\), at least two new solid edges connected with \(x\), and some weights with label \(\omega\) on \(\Gamma\). Using \((4.18)\), we can expand \(\mathcal{G}\) as

\[
\mathcal{G} = \sum_{x} \Gamma Q_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \sum_{\omega} \sum_{x} \Gamma_{\omega} Q_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}) + \sum_{x} Q_{x}(\Gamma \tilde{\Gamma}) - \sum_{\omega} \sum_{x} Q_{x}(\Gamma_{\omega} \tilde{\Gamma}),
\]

(4.19)

where the second and third terms are sums of \(Q\)-graphs.

Next, we expand graphs \(\Gamma_{\omega}\) in \((4.19)\) into sums of graphs without \(G^{(x)}\), \((G_{xx})^{-1}\) or \((\overline{G}_{xx})^{-1}\) entries. First, we apply the following expansion to the \(G^{(x)}\) entries in \(\Gamma_{\omega}\):

\[
G_{x_1 x_2}^{(x)} = G_{x_1 x_2} - \frac{G_{x_1 x_2}}{G_{xx}}
\]

(4.20)

In this way, we can write \(\Gamma_{\omega}\) as a sum of graphs \(\sum_{\zeta} \Gamma_{\omega, \zeta}\), where each \(\Gamma_{\omega, \zeta}\) does not contain any \(G^{(x)}\) entries. Second, for the \((G_{xx})^{-1}\) and \((\overline{G}_{xx})^{-1}\) weights in \(\Gamma_{\omega, \zeta}\), we expand them using the Taylor expansion

\[
\frac{1}{G_{xx}} = \frac{1}{m} + \sum_{k=1}^{D} \frac{1}{m} \left( -\frac{G_{xx} - m}{m} \right)^{k} + \mathcal{W}_{D}^{(x)}, \quad \mathcal{W}_{D}^{(x)} := \sum_{k>D} \left( -\frac{G_{yy} - m}{m} \right)^{k}.
\]

(4.21)

We will regard \(\mathcal{W}_{D}^{(x)}\) and \(\mathcal{W}_{D}^{(x)}\) as a new type of weights of scaling order \(D + 1\). Expanding the products of all Taylor expansions of the \((G_{xx})^{-1}\) and \((\overline{G}_{xx})^{-1}\) weights, we can write each \(\Gamma_{\omega, \zeta}\) into a sum of graphs that do not contain any weights with label \(\omega\). Finally, applying \(O^{(x).1}_{\text{weight}} \circ \mathcal{O}_{\text{dot}}\) again, we will get a sum of normal regular graphs without regular weights on \(x\).

Now we summarize Step 1 in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.11.** Given a normal regular graph taking the form \((4.16)\), we can expand it into a sum of \(O(1)\) many graphs:

\[
\mathcal{G}_{0} = \sum_{\omega} \Gamma_{\omega} Q_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega}) + \sum_{\zeta} Q_{x}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\zeta}) + \mathcal{G}_{\text{err}},
\]

(4.22)

where \(\Gamma_{\omega}\), \(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega}\) and \(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{\zeta}\) are normal regular graphs without \(P/Q\), \((-1)\) or \((-1)\) labels, and \(\mathcal{G}_{\text{err}}\) is a sum of normal regular graphs of scaling order \(> D\). If \(\Gamma_{0}\) does not contain any weights or edges attached to \(x\), then every \(\Gamma_{\omega}\) has a strictly higher scaling order than \(\Gamma_{0}\) and contains at least one atom which either is connected to \(x\) through a solid edge or has been merged with \(x\).

**Proof.** We only prove the second statement. Suppose \(\Gamma_{0}\) does not contain any weights or edges attached to \(x\). Then there exists at least one \(G_{x_1 x_2}\) or \(\overline{G}_{x_1 x_2}\) entry in \(\Gamma_{0}\) that has been replaced with two solid edges \(G_{x_1 x_2}\) or \(\overline{G}_{x_1 x_2}\) (together with a \((G_{xx})^{-1}\) or \((\overline{G}_{xx})^{-1}\) weight). These two solid edges will either appear in \(\Gamma_{\omega}\) or become weights if \(x_1\) or \(x_2\) is identified with \(x\) due to newly added dotted edges in \(\mathcal{O}_{\text{dot}}\) operations.

If \(\Gamma_{0}\) does not contain any weights or edges attached to \(x\), then after Step 1 the structures of \(\Gamma_{\omega}\) in \((4.22)\) are already good enough for our purpose. In Steps 2 and 3, we aim to remove the \(Q_{x}\) label in \(Q_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega})\).

**Step 2:** In this step and Step 3, we will remove the \(Q_{x}\) label in

\[
\Gamma_{\omega} Q_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega}) = \Gamma_{\omega} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega} - \Gamma_{\omega} P_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega}).
\]

It suffices to write \(P_{x}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega})\) into a sum of graphs without the \(P_{x}\) label. To this end, we will use the following lemma.
Lemma 4.12. Let $f$ be a differentiable function of $G$. We have that

$$ P_x[(G_{xx} - m)f(G)] = P_x\left[ m^2 \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha \alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) f(G) + m \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha \alpha} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) (G_{xx} - m) f(G) \right] $$

$$ - P_x\left[ m \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha x} \partial_{\alpha x} f(G) \right]. $$

(4.23)

Given a graph $\mathcal{G}$ taking the form \[4.7\], we have the following identity if $k_1 \geq 1$:

$$ P_x[\mathcal{G}] = \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} m^2 P_x \left[ \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{\alpha y_i}' \right) \frac{\mathcal{G}}{G_{xy_i} G_{xy_i}'} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{k_3} m^2 P_x \left[ \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w,\alpha} \right) \frac{\mathcal{G}}{G_{xy_i} G_{w,x}} \right] $$

$$ + \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} m P_x \left[ (G_{xx} - m) \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{\alpha y_i}' \right) \frac{\mathcal{G}}{G_{xy_i} G_{xy_i}'} \right] $$

$$ + \sum_{i=1}^{k_3} m P_x \left[ (G_{xx} - m) \left( \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w,\alpha} \right) \frac{\mathcal{G}}{G_{xy_i} G_{w,x}} \right] $$

$$ + m P_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} (G_{\alpha \alpha} - m) \mathcal{G} \right] + (k_1 - 1) m P_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w,\alpha} \mathcal{G} \right] $$

$$ + k_4 m P_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} G_{\alpha y_i} G_{w,\alpha} \mathcal{G} \right] - m P_x \left[ \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha x} \mathcal{G} \right]. $$

(4.24)

**Proof.** These two identities both follow from Gaussian integration by parts, and have been proved in Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.10 of [32].

Similar to Definition 4.3, we can define an operator $\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{weight}}$ acting on a graph $P_x(\mathcal{G})$ as

$$ \mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{weight}}[P_x(\mathcal{G})] := \mathcal{O}^{(x),1}_{\text{weight}} \circ \mathcal{O}_{dot} \circ \mathcal{O}^{(x),2}_{\text{weight}} \circ \mathcal{O}^{(x),1}_{\text{weight}}[P_x(\mathcal{G})], $$

where $\mathcal{O}^{(x),2}_{\text{weight}}$ is an operator defined from \[4.23\]. Also similar to Definition 4.4, we can define an operator $\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-e}}$ acting on a graph $P_x(\mathcal{G})$ as

$$ \mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-e}}[P_x(\mathcal{G})] := \mathcal{O}_{dot} \circ \mathcal{O}^{(x),1}_{\text{multi-e}}[P_x(\mathcal{G})], $$

where $\mathcal{O}^{(x),1}_{\text{multi-e}}$ is an operator defined from \[4.24\]. The $k_1 = 0$ case can be handled in the same way as cases (ii)-(iv) of Definition 4.4 and we omit the details.

If a normal regular graph $P_x(\mathcal{G})$ contains weights or solid edges attached to $x$, then we will apply $\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{weight}}$ or $\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-e}}$ to it. We repeat the operations until all graphs do not contain weights or solid edges attached to $x$, and hence obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.13.** Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a normal regular graph without $P/Q$, $(x)$ or $(-1)$ labels. Then we can expand $P_x(\mathcal{G})$ into a sum of $O(1)$ many graphs:

$$ P_x(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{\omega} P_x(\mathcal{G}_\omega) + \mathcal{G}_{\text{err}}, $$

where $\mathcal{G}_\omega$ are normal regular graphs without weights or edges attached to $x$ (and without $P/Q$, $(x)$ or $(-1)$ labels), and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{err}}$ is a sum of normal regular graphs of scaling order $> D$.

**Proof.** We only describe the main argument for the proof without writing down all the details. Given a normal regular graph $P_x(\mathcal{G})$, it is easy to check that every graph in $\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{weight}}[P_x(\mathcal{G})]$ or $\mathcal{O}^{(x)}_{\text{multi-e}}[P_x(\mathcal{G})]$, say $P_x(\mathcal{G}_1)$, satisfies one of the following properties:

- $P_x(\mathcal{G}_1)$ has a strictly higher scaling order than $P_x(\mathcal{G}_0)$;
- $P_x(\mathcal{G}_1)$ contains strictly fewer weights or edges attached to $x$. 
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Hence applying the operations \( \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{(x)} \) or \( \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{	ext{multi-}}^{(x)} \) for \( C_{G,D} \) many times, each resulting graph either is of scaling order \( > D \), or has no weights or edges attached to \( x \). Here \( C_{G,D} \in \mathbb{N} \) is a large constant depending only on \( D \) and the number of weights and edges attached to atom \( x \) in \( \mathcal{G} \).

With this lemma, in Step 2 we can expand \( Q_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_\omega) \) into

\[
Q_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_\omega) = \Gamma_x \tilde{\Gamma}_\omega + \sum_\zeta P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta}) + \mathcal{G}_\text{err},
\]

(4.25)

where \( \Gamma_{\omega,\zeta} \) are normal regular graphs without weights or edges attached to \( x \), and \( \mathcal{G}_\text{err} \) is a sum of graphs of scaling order \( > D \).

**Step 3:** In this step, we expand the graphs \( P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta}) \) in (4.25). Suppose \( \mathcal{G} \) is a normal regular graph without weights or edges attached to \( x \). Using the resolvent identity (4.17), we can write it into a similar form as in (4.18):

\[
\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{(x)} + \sum_\omega \mathcal{G}_\omega,
\]

where \( \mathcal{G}^{(x)} \) is a graph whose weights and solid edges all have the \((x)\) label, and each graph \( \mathcal{G}_\omega \) has a strictly higher scaling order than \( \mathcal{G} \), at least two new solid edges connected with \( x \), and some weights with label \(-1\) on \( x \). Then we can expand \( P_x(\mathcal{G}) \) as

\[
P_x(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G} - \sum_\omega \mathcal{G}_\omega + \sum_\omega P_x(\mathcal{G}_\omega).
\]

Then as in Step 1, we apply (4.20) and (4.21) to remove the \( \mathcal{G}^{(x)} \) entries and \((G_{xx})^{-1}\) or \((\tilde{G}_{xx})^{-1}\) weights from the graphs \( \mathcal{G}_\omega \). Finally, we apply \( \mathcal{O}_\text{weight} \circ \mathcal{O}_\text{dot} \) to all the resulting graphs to get a sum of normal regular graphs without regular weights on \( x \). In sum, we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 4.14.** Suppose \( \mathcal{G} \) is a normal regular graph without \( P/Q \), \((x)\) or \((-1)\) labels. Moreover, suppose \( \mathcal{G} \) has no weights or edges attached to \( x \). Then we can expand \( \mathcal{G} \) into a sum of \( O(1) \) many graphs:

\[
P_x(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G} + \sum_\omega \mathcal{G}_\omega + \sum_\zeta P_x(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\zeta) + \mathcal{G}_\text{err},
\]

where \( \mathcal{G}_\omega \) and \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\zeta \) are normal regular graphs without \( P/Q \), \((x)\) or \((-1)\) labels, and \( \mathcal{G}_\text{err} \) is a sum of normal regular graphs of scaling order \( > D \). Moreover, \( \mathcal{G}_\omega \) and \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\zeta \) have strictly higher scaling orders than \( \mathcal{G} \), and have light weights or edges attached to atom \( x \).

With this lemma, we can expand \( P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta}) \) in (4.25) as

\[
P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta}) = \tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta} + \sum_\xi \Gamma_{\omega,\zeta,\xi} + \sum_\gamma P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta,\gamma}) + \mathcal{G}_\text{err},
\]

where \( \Gamma_{\omega,\zeta,\xi} \) and \( \tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta,\gamma} \) respectively satisfy the same properties as \( \mathcal{G}_\omega \) and \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\zeta \) in Lemma 4.11. Next we apply Step 2 to the graphs \( P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\omega,\zeta,\gamma}) \) again. Repeating Steps 2 and 3 for \( O(1) \) many times, we can finally write \( P_x(\tilde{\Gamma}_\omega) \) into a sum of graphs without \( P_x \) labels (besides graphs of scaling order \( > D \)).

Combining Steps 1–3, we obtain the following lemma on \( Q \)-expansions.

**Lemma 4.15 (\( Q \)-expansions).** Suppose \( \Gamma_0 \) and \( \tilde{\Gamma}_0 \) in (4.16) are normal regular graph without \( P/Q \), \((x)\) or \((-1)\) labels. Then \( \mathcal{G}_0 \) can be expanded into a sum of \( O(1) \) many graphs:

\[
\mathcal{G}_0 = \sum_\omega \mathcal{G}_\omega + \sum_\zeta Q_x(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\zeta) + \mathcal{G}_\text{err},
\]

(4.26)

where \( \mathcal{G}_\omega \) and \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\zeta \) are normal regular graphs without \( P/Q \), \((x)\) or \((-1)\) labels, and \( \mathcal{G}_\text{err} \) is a sum of normal regular graphs of scaling order \( > D \). Moreover, these graphs satisfy the following properties.

(i) Every graph on the right-hand side of (4.26) has scaling order \( \geq \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_0) \).
(ii) If there is a new atom in a graph after the expansion, then it is connected to \( x \) through a path of waved edges. Hence the expansion \((4.26)\) is a local expansion.

(iii) If \( G_0 \) is doubly connected, then all the graphs on the right-hand side of \((4.26)\) are also doubly connected.

(iv) If \( \Gamma_0 \) does not contain any weights or edges attached to \( x \), then the scaling order of \( G_\omega \) is strictly higher than that of \( G_0 \) for every \( \omega \). Furthermore, \( G_\omega \) contains at least one atom that belongs to the original graph \( \Gamma_0 \) and satisfies the following property: it is connected to \( x \) through a solid edge or has been merged with \( x \).

Proof. This lemma is an easy consequence of Lemmas 4.11, 4.13 and 4.14. We now give the main arguments without writing down all the details.

First, we show that the expansion \((4.26)\) exists. Given \( G_0 \), we first expand it as in \((4.22)\). Then for the first term on the right-hand side of \((4.22)\), we repeat Steps 2 and 3 to remove the \( Q_x \) label in it. By Lemmas 4.13 and 4.14, after an iteration of Steps 2 and 3, every new graph either has no \( P/Q \) labels or has a strictly higher scaling order than the original graph. Hence after repeating Steps 2 and 3 for \( D \) many times, \( \Gamma_\omega Q_x (\tilde{\Gamma}_\omega) \) can be written into a sum of graphs without \( P/Q \) labels and graphs of scaling orders \( > D \). This gives \((4.26)\).

The properties (i) and (ii) are trivial. The proof of (iii) is similar to the one for Lemma 4.10. The property (iv) follows from Lemma 4.11.

The property (iv) is crucial to our global expansion strategy as we will explain in Section 6. Graphs with \((x)\) and \((-1)\) labels only appear during the \( Q \)-expansions, and will not appear in any other part of the expansions. Hence for the rest of this paper, unless mentioned otherwise, our graphs are assumed to have no \((x)\) and \((-1)\) labels.

5 Pre-deterministic property

The choice of the standard neutral atom is one of the most delicate parts of global expansions defined in Section 4.3, and this subsection is devoted to this issue. Our goal is to define a rule to choose the \( t \) variable to expand for each locally standard graph, so that the doubly connected property is preserved throughout the global expansions. In this section, we will define a specific order of blue solid edges, called the pre-deterministic order, for each graph, and we will show that the expansions can continue if we expand the blue solid edges according to the pre-deterministic order. As a convention, expansion of a blue solid edge refers to the expansion of a \( t \)-variable containing this edge.

In this section, we mostly consider molecular graphs with all red solid edges removed, because these edges are not used in the doubly connected property.

5.1 Isolated subgraphs

Using Definition 2.12, it is trivial to prove the following simple property.

Claim 5.1. Let \( G \) be a doubly connected graph satisfying Definition 2.12. Then in its molecular graph \( G_M \) with all red solid edges removed, any subset of internal molecules \( M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k \) are connected to other molecules (including the external molecules) through at least one blue solid edge and one diffusive edge, or at least two diffusive edges.

Then we define an isolated subgraph to be a subgraph induced on a subset of molecules that are connected to other molecules through exactly two edges in a molecular graph without red solid edges.

Definition 5.2 (Isolated subgraphs). Let \( G \) be a doubly connected graph and let \( G_M \) be its molecular graph with all red solid edges removed.

- Isolated subsets of molecules. A subset of internal molecules in \( G \), say \( M = \{M_1, M_2, \ldots, M_k\} \), is isolated if and only if \( M \) is connected to \( M^c \) exactly by two edges in \( G_M \). Here the complement \( M^c \) contains the internal molecules that are not in \( M \) and all the external molecules.
• **Isolated subgraphs.** An isolated subgraph of $G$ is a subgraph induced on an isolated subset of molecules. Here by the “subgraph induced on a subset of molecules”, we mean the subgraph induced on the atoms in these molecules (recall Definition 2.3).

Given any isolated subset of molecules $M$, we can define an isolated subgraph induced on it, denoted by $I_M$. Conversely, given an isolated subgraph $I$, the molecules in it form an isolated subset of molecules, denoted by $M(I)$. Furthermore, we define the proper isolated subgraphs.

• **Proper isolated subgraphs.** Given any subset of molecules (which is not necessarily isolated), say $S$, $M_1 \subset S$ is called a proper isolated subset if $M_1 \neq S$ and $M_1$ is an isolated subset of molecules in $G$. Moreover, if $G|_S$ is the subgraph induced on $S$, a proper isolated subgraph of $G|_S$ means a subgraph induced on a proper isolated subset of molecules in $S$.

We call the set of all internal molecules the maximal subset of internal molecules, denoted by $M_{\text{max}}$. Correspondingly, the subgraph induced on $M_{\text{max}}$ is called the maximal subgraph, denoted by $G_{\text{max}}$. Whenever we say a proper isolated subset of molecules (resp. isolated subgraph) without specifying the superset, we mean a proper isolated subset (resp. isolated subgraph) of $M_{\text{max}}$ (resp. $G_{\text{max}}$). Given any subset of molecules $S$, we say an atom is inside $S$ if this atom belongs to a molecule in $S$, and we say an edge is inside $S$ if its ending atoms are inside $S$. Given two disjoint subsets of molecules $S_1$ and $S_2$, an edge between $S_1$ and $S_2$ refers to an edge between an atom in $S_1$ and an atom in $S_2$.

Every graph in our expansions has at least one edge between the internal and external molecules (recall property (ix) in Definition 3.2). Then from Definition 5.2, it is easy to get the following property.

**Claim 5.3.** Let $G$ be a doubly connected graph such that there is at least one edge between its internal and external molecules in the molecular graph $G_M$ without red solid edges. Then for any two isolated subsets of molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$ in $G$, we have that either one is a subset of the other or $M_1 \cap M_2 = \emptyset$.

**Proof.** Suppose $M_1 \not\subset M_2$, $M_2 \not\subset M_1$ and $M_1 \cap M_2 \neq \emptyset$. First, assume that $M_1 \cap M_2$ is connected to $(M_1 \cup M_2)^c$ through $a$ many edges with $a \in \{1, 2\}$ in $G_M$. Since $M_1$ and $M_2$ are isolated, $M_1 \setminus M_2$ connects to $M_1^c$ through $2 - a$ many edges and $M_2 \setminus M_1$ connects to $M_2^c$ through $2 - a$ many edges. Applying Claim 5.1, we get that $M_1 \setminus M_2$ connects to $M_1 \setminus M_2$ through at least $a$ many edges. This gives that $M_2$ connects to $M_2^c$ through at least $a + 2 \geq 3$ many edges, contradicting the fact that $M_2$ is isolated.

Now we assume that $M_1 \cap M_2$ is not connected to $(M_1 \cup M_2)^c$. Suppose $M_1 \cap M_2$ connects to $M_1 \setminus M_2$ through $a$ many edges and $M_2 \setminus M_1$ through $b$ many edges. By Claim 5.1, and the facts that $M_1$ and $M_2$ are isolated, we have $0 \leq a \leq 2$, $0 \leq b \leq 2$ and $a + b \geq 2$. If $a = 0$, then $M_1 \setminus M_2$ connects to $M_1^c$ through two edges and $M_1 \cap M_2$ connects to $M_2 \setminus M_1$ through two edges, which contradicts the fact that $M_1$ is isolated. If $a = 2$, then $M_2 \setminus M_1$ is not connected to $M_1^c$ since $M_2$ is isolated. This implies that $b = 2$ by applying Claim 5.1 to $M_2 \setminus M_1$. Since $M_2$ is also isolated, $M_1 \setminus M_2$ is not connected to $M_1^c$. Hence we get that $M_1 \cup M_2$ is disconnected from $(M_1 \cup M_2)^c$, which contradicts the assumption on $G_M$. Finally, we are left with the case where $a = b = 1$, $M_1 \setminus M_2$ connects to $M_1^c$ through one edge and $M_2 \setminus M_1$ connects to $M_2^c$ through one edge. However, it is not hard to see that this case contradicts the doubly connected property.

This claim shows that there is a natural partial order of isolated subgraphs in a doubly connected graph satisfying Claim 5.3. In particular, we can define the maximal and minimal subgraphs.

**Definition 5.4.** (i) An isolated subgraph (resp. isolated subset of molecules) is said to be minimal if it has no proper isolated subgraphs (resp. proper isolated subsets). As a convention, if there is no proper isolated subgraph, then the minimal isolated subgraph (MIS) refers to the maximal subgraph $G_{\text{max}}$.

(ii) Given a subset of molecules $S$, an isolated subset $M$ of $S$ is said to be maximal if it is not a proper subset of a proper isolated subset of $S$. In this case, $I_M$ is called a maximal isolated subgraph of the subgraph $G|_S$ induced on $S$.

### 5.2 Redundant edges

For the global expansions defined in Section 4.3, it is easy to see that expanding a blue solid edge inside a molecule will not break the doubly connected property. On the other hand, the doubly connected property may or may not be broken when we expand a blue solid edge between molecules, depending on whether this edge is pivotal or redundant.
**Definition 5.5** (Pivotal edges and redundant edges). We say a plus $G$ edge in a doubly connected graph $G$ is pivotal if after removing it, the remaining graph is not doubly connected anymore. Otherwise, this plus $G$ edge is called redundant.

**Example 5.6.** In (5.1), the plus $G$ edge $b$ connecting an isolated subgraph $I$ to its complement is pivotal:

In the above graphs, inside the black circles are some subgraphs whose details are not drawn, and we did not indicate the directions of the solid edges for conciseness. If we replace the $T$-variable (containing edge $b$) in the first graph by a graph in (3.9), then we get the second graph, where the purple circle denotes a new molecule $M$. Note that the second graph is not doubly connected anymore: in order to have a connected black net $B_{\text{black}}$, we have to put the two diffusive edges into $B_{\text{black}}$, but then there is no edge in the blue net $B_{\text{blue}}$ that connects $M$ and the molecules in $I$ to other molecules.

By definition, blue solid edges inside molecules are all redundant edges. Now we show that a redundant edge can be expanded without breaking the doubly connected property.

**Lemma 5.7.** Suppose $G$ is a doubly connected graph containing a $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ variable in (4.14), where the blue solid edge $G_{xy_1}$ is redundant. If we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ with a graph on the right-hand side of (4.15) (including any recollision, $Q$, higher order or error graph), then the resulting graph is still doubly connected.

**Proof.** We denote the blue solid edge $G_{xy_1}$ as $b$. If we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ with $m\Theta_{xy_1}G_{xy_1,y_2}$ or a graph in $m(\Theta\Sigma^{(n-1)}\Theta)_{xy_1}G_{xy_1,y_2}$, then it corresponds to replacing the edge $b$ with a diffusive edge in the molecular graph. Obviously, this will not break the doubly connected property because a diffusive edge can be also used in the blue net. Next suppose we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ with a graph, say $\tilde{G}_{xy_1,y_2}$, in other terms. Since $b$ is redundant, $G$ has a black net $B_{\text{black}}$ and a blue net $B_{\text{blue}}$ satisfying Definition 2.12 such that $B_{\text{blue}}\setminus \{b\}$ is still a blue net that connects all the internal molecules. By property (x) of Definition 3.2 $\tilde{G}_{xy_1,y_2}$ also contains a black net $B_{\text{black}}$ and a blue net $B_{\text{blue}}$ satisfying Definition 2.12. Moreover, by property (ix) of Definition 3.2 the atom $x$ connects to the internal molecules of $\tilde{G}_{xy_1,y_2}$ through a diffusive edge, say $b_1$, while the atom $y_1$ connects to the internal molecules of $\tilde{G}_{xy_1,y_2}$ through a blue solid or diffusive or dotted edge, say $b_2$. Then $B_{\text{black}}\cup \tilde{B}_{\text{black}}\cup \{b_1\}$ and $(B_{\text{blue}}\setminus \{b\})\cup \tilde{B}_{\text{blue}}\cup \{b_2\}$ are respectively the black and blue nets of the resulting graph if $b_2$ is not a dotted edge. If $b_2$ is a dotted edge, then the blue net can be chosen as $B_2\cup \tilde{B}_2$ after identifying the molecules connected by $b_2$. In either case, the resulting graph is still doubly connected.

**5.3 Pre-deterministic property**

In the proof of Theorem 3.7 we need to expand $T_{a,b_1,b_2}$ into a sum of graphs that satisfy the properties in Definition 3.3. Hence for a graph that is not a recollision, higher order, or $Q$ graph, we want its maximal subgraph to be deterministic, so that the only random parts in the graph are two plus and minus $G$ edges connected with $\oplus$ and $\ominus$. On the other hand, since we want to maintain the doubly connected property during the expansions, we are only allowed to expand redundant $G$ edges. Hence, not all doubly connected graphs with non-deterministic maximal subgraphs can be expanded without breaking the doubly connected property. For example, in a doubly connected graph where both the black and blue nets are trees, all the blue solid edges between molecules are pivotal.

Now we want to identify a graphical property with which we can tell whether a graph can be potentially expanded into deterministic graphs in the end without breaking the doubly connected property. We can easily obtain a necessary condition by looking at the leading terms of global expansions, where we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ in (4.14) with $m\Theta_{xy_1}G_{xy_1,y_2}$. This corresponds to changing a plus $G$ edge into a diffusive edge in the molecular graph. Hence we need to be able to change all plus $G$ edges into diffusive edges one by one, such that for each expansion the corresponding plus $G$ edge is redundant. This leads to the following definition of the pre-deterministic property.

**Definition 5.8** (Pre-deterministic property). We say a doubly connected graph $G$ is pre-deterministic if the following property holds. There exists an order of all the internal blue solid edges, denoted by $b_1 \preceq b_2 \preceq \cdots$, where the blue solid edge $b$ connecting an isolated subgraph $I$ to its complement is pivotal: (5.1)
such that for any $k$, after changing the edges $b_1, \cdots, b_{k-1}$ into diffusive edges, the blue solid edge $b_k$ becomes a redundant edge. (Recall that internal edges refer to edges that do not connect to external atoms.) We shall call this order of blue solid edges a pre-deterministic order.

The pre-deterministic order is not necessarily unique. Moreover, we can always choose an order where blue solid edges inside molecules precede blue solid edges between molecules. If all the internal plus $G$ edges in a graph $G$ are redundant, then $G$ is obviously a pre-deterministic graph. On the other hand, our definition covers more general graphs. We use the following example to explain why we define pre-deterministic graphs in the above way, and why the order of blue solid edges is important:

Here all the graphs are molecular graphs without red solid edges. Note that the edges call this order of blue solid edges a pre-deterministic order. A redundant edge. (Recall that internal edges refer to edges that do not connect to external atoms.) We shall such that for any $k$, after changing the edges $b_1, \cdots, b_{k-1}$ into diffusive edges, the blue solid edge $b_k$ becomes a redundant edge. (Recall that internal edges refer to edges that do not connect to external atoms.) We shall call this order of blue solid edges a pre-deterministic order.

The pre-deterministic order is not necessarily unique. Moreover, we can always choose an order where blue solid edges inside molecules precede blue solid edges between molecules. If all the internal plus $G$ edges in a graph $G$ are redundant, then $G$ is obviously a pre-deterministic graph. On the other hand, our definition covers more general graphs. We use the following example to explain why we define pre-deterministic graphs in the above way, and why the order of blue solid edges is important:

Here all the graphs are molecular graphs without red solid edges. Note that the edges $b_1$ and $b_2$ are redundant in the first graph, but $b_3$ and $b_4$ are not. Now we show that this graph is actually pre-deterministic. First, we replace $b_1$ and $b_2$ with diffusive edges. Then in the second graph, if we choose the black net as $\{e_1, e_3, b_1\}$ and the blue net as $\{e_2, b_3, b_4\}$, then $b_3$ is a redundant edge, and we can replace it with a diffusive edge in the third graph. In the third graph, if we choose the black net as $\{e_2, e_3, b_1\}$ and the blue net as $\{e_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}$, then $b_4$ becomes redundant, and we can replace it with a diffusive edge in the fourth graph. This argument gives a pre-deterministic order $b_1 \leq b_2 \leq b_3 \leq b_4$.

### 5.4 Sequentially pre-deterministic property

Not all graphs in our expansions satisfy the pre-deterministic property. Instead, we need to consider the following extension.

**Definition 5.9** (Sequentially pre-deterministic property). A graph $G$ is said to be sequentially pre-deterministic (SPD) if its molecular graph $G_M$ without red solid edges satisfies the following properties.

(i) $G_M$ is doubly connected in the sense of Definition 2.12

(ii) Any two proper isolated subgraphs $I_1$ and $I_2$ satisfy either $I_1 \subset I_2$ or $I_2 \subset I_1$.

(iii) The minimal isolated subgraph of $G_M$ is pre-deterministic. Moreover, given an isolated subgraph $I$, if we replace its maximal isolated subgraph, say $I'$, plus the two external edges with a single diffusive edge, then $I$ becomes pre-deterministic. (Here by “external edges”, we mean the blue solid or diffusive edges connecting $M(I')$ to the two molecules, say $M$ and $M'$, in the complement of $M(I')$; by “replace”, we mean that we remove $I'$ and its two external edges, and add a diffusive edge between $M$ and $M'$. If $M = M'$, then this diffusive edge is inside $M$ and will not appear in the molecular graph.) Finally, if we replace the maximal isolated subgraph plus the two external edges of the internal subgraph $(G_M)_{\max}$ with a single diffusive edge, then $(G_M)_{\max}$ becomes pre-deterministic.

Now we discuss the meanings of properties (ii) and (iii). The property (ii) means that $G$ contains at most one sequence of proper isolated subgraphs, say

$$I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_1 \subset G_{\max}, \quad (5.2)$$

where $I_1$ is the maximal isolated subgraph of $G_{\max}$ and for any $j$, $I_{j+1}$ is the maximal isolated subgraph of $I_j$. In particular, any subgraph has at most one maximal isolated subgraph, so property (iii) is well-defined. Suppose that corresponding to (5.2), the sequence of proper isolated subsets of molecules is

$$M_k \subset M_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset M_1 \subset M_{\max}, \quad M_i := M(I_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k. \quad (5.3)$$
We draw a sequence of isolated subgraphs in the following figure, where inside each black circle is a subgraph component $\Gamma_i$, which will be called a component in the proof, and we only draw the diffusive and blue solid edges between each isolated subgraph and its complement:

![Diagram of isolated subgraphs](image)

Here for definiteness, we draw a graph with one blue solid edge between internal and external molecules, but generally there may be zero or more than one edge between them. Moreover, the blue solid edges between components can be replaced by blue diffusive edges. Note that the component $\Gamma_k$ is the minimal isolated subgraph $\mathcal{I}_k$, the component $\Gamma_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ is the subgraph induced on $M_i \setminus M_{i+1}$, and $\Gamma_0$ is the subgraph induced on $M_{\max} \setminus M_1$. From (5.4), one can see that the isolated subgraphs in a SPD graph form a simple chain structure. Then property (iii) means that if we replace the MIS $\Gamma_k$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, then the resulting graph is still SPD. In the new graph, replacing the MIS $\Gamma_{k-1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge also gives a SPD graph. Continuing this process, after replacing $\Gamma_1$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, $\Gamma_0$ becomes a pre-deterministic graph.

The reason why we define the SPD property in the above way is due to our global expansion strategy (cf. Strategy 6.6). We now give one possible scenario to obtain a SPD graph. Initially, there are no proper isolated subgraphs in a graph obtained from the local expansions, and its maximal subgraph is pre-deterministic. Then we find the first redundant blue solid edge in the pre-deterministic order, replace a proper isolated subgraphs in a graph obtained from the local expansions, and its maximal subgraph is pre-deterministic (cf. Strategy 6.6). We now give one possible scenario to obtain a SPD graph. Initially, there are no red solid edges. For $i=0,1,2,3$, if $\Gamma_i$ contains a pre-deterministic maximal subgraph, then this maximal subgraph becomes a pre-deterministic isolated subgraph $\mathcal{I}_i$ in graph $\mathcal{G}_i$. Next we find the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of $\mathcal{I}_i$, replace it with another graph, say $\mathcal{G}_2$, in (4.15), and get a new graph $\mathcal{G}_2$. Continuing this process, we get a SPD graph with a sequence of isolated subgraphs as in (5.2). Notice that at each step we expand the first blue solid edge in the minimal isolated subgraph. Moreover, replacing $\mathcal{I}_{i+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge corresponds to replacing the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of $\mathcal{I}_i$ by a diffusive edge (i.e. the leading term in (4.15)), which still gives a pre-deterministic $\mathcal{I}_i$ by Definition 5.8. This explains why we define property (iii) in such a way.

We now show that the SPD property is preserved under local expansions.

**Lemma 5.10.** Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a SPD graph. Then applying any expansion in Definitions 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 to $\mathcal{G}$, the new graphs (including the Q-graphs) are all sequentially pre-deterministic.

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.10, all new graphs are still doubly connected. It remains to check the properties (ii) and (iii) in Definition 5.9 for any new graph, say $\mathcal{G}$.

By Lemma 4.9, each molecule in $\mathcal{G}$ is obtained by merging some molecules in $\mathcal{G}$. We claim that any proper isolated subset of molecules, say $M$, in $\mathcal{G}$ is obtained from merging a proper isolated subset of molecules in $\mathcal{G}$. In fact, suppose the molecules of $M$ are obtained from merging a subset of molecules $\mathcal{S}$ that is not isolated in $\mathcal{G}$. Then $\mathcal{S}$ is connected to $\mathcal{S}^c$ through at least three edges, say $b_1$, $b_2$ and $b_3$, in the molecular graph $\mathcal{G}_M$ without red solid edges. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, if $b_i$ is a diffusive edge, then it is not changed in all expansions and is still an external edge of $M$ in the molecular graph $\mathcal{G}_M$ without red solid edges. If $b_i$ is a plus $G$ edge in $\mathcal{G}_M$ between molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$, then either $b_i$ is a plus $G$ edge between $M_1$ and $M_2$ in $\mathcal{G}_M$, or $b_i$ becomes a connected path of two plus $G$ edges, say $b_{i,1}$ and $b_{i,2}$, between $M_1$ and $M_2$. (The molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$ may be merged with other molecules in $\mathcal{G}_M$.) In the former case, $b_i$ is an external edge of $M$ in $\mathcal{G}_M$, and in the latter case either $b_{i,1}$ or $b_{i,2}$ is an external edge of $M$ in $\mathcal{G}_M$. In sum, we see that $M$ is connected to $M^c$ through at least three edges in $\mathcal{G}_M$, which contradicts the assumption that $M$ is isolated.

Now we prove property (ii) of Definition 5.9 for $\mathcal{G}$ with the above claim. Suppose two proper isolated subsets of molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$ in $\mathcal{G}$ are respectively obtained from merging two proper isolated subsets of molecules $M'_1$ and $M'_2$ in $\mathcal{G}$. Then we have either $M_1 \subseteq M_2$ if $M'_1 \subseteq M'_2$, or $M_2 \subseteq M_1$ if $M'_2 \subseteq M'_1$.

It remains to prove property (iii) of Definition 5.9 for $\mathcal{G}$. In all expansions, it is not hard to see that there are only two types of operations that may affect the doubly connected structure of the molecular graphs:

(A) merging a pair of molecules due to a newly added dotted or waved edge between them;
(B) replacing a plus $G$ edge $b_0$ between molecules $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ with a path of two plus $G$ edges—edge $b$ between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ and edge $b'$ between $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$—due to the partial derivatives $\partial_{h_{ax}}$ or $\partial_{h_{bx}}$, where $\mathcal{M}''$ is a different molecule from $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$.

All the other operations only act on the local structures within molecules, and hence are irrelevant for our proof. Moreover, in case (B), we have assumed that $\mathcal{M}''$ is different from $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$, because otherwise the molecular graph without red solid edges will be unchanged. To conclude the proof, it suffices to show that both operations (A) and (B) do not break the property (iii) of Definition 5.9.

Suppose the sequence of proper isolated subgraphs in $\mathcal{G}$ is given by (5.3) and takes the form (5.4). In case (A), it is easy to see that merging a pair of molecules in the same component does not break the SPD property. Now suppose we merge a pair of molecules in different components $\Gamma_i$ and $\Gamma_j$ with $i < j$. With a slight abuse of notation, we still denote the subgraphs induced on $\mathcal{M}_i$ by $I_i$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Then the sequence of isolated subgraphs in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is

$$I_k \subset I_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_{j+1} \subset I_j \subset I_{i-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_i.$$  

In particular, $I_i$ is not isolated in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ anymore for $j+1 < l < i$. By the SPD property of $\mathcal{G}$, we immediately obtain the following property of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$: for $l \geq j + 1$ or $l \leq i - 1$, if we replace $I_{l+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge in the molecular graph of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, then $I_l$ becomes pre-deterministic. It remains to show that after replacing $I_{j+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, then the subgraph $I_j$ becomes pre-deterministic. This is given by the following lemma, whose proof is postponed to Appendix A.

**Lemma 5.11.** In the setting of (5.4), we merge a pair of molecules in different components $\Gamma_i$ and $\Gamma_j$ with $i < j$. Then after replacing $I_{j+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge in the molecular graph without red solid edges, the subgraph $I_j$ becomes pre-deterministic.

Next we consider case (B). First, we assume that $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}'$ and $\mathcal{M}''$ are all inside $\Gamma_i$ for some $0 \leq i \leq k$. Then all the components are unchanged after operation (B), except for the component $\Gamma_i$. By definition, after replacing $I_{i+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, $I_i$ becomes pre-deterministic in $\mathcal{G}$. Suppose that the pre-deterministic order is $e_1 \preceq \cdots \preceq e_{i-1} \preceq b_0 \preceq e_{i+1} \preceq \cdots$. Then in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, after replacing $I_{i+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, $e_1 \preceq \cdots \preceq e_{i-1} \preceq b \preceq b' \preceq e_{i+1} \preceq \cdots$ is a pre-deterministic order in $I_i$. Using this fact, we can readily check that $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is still SPD.

Second, we assume that $\mathcal{M} \in \Gamma_i$, $\mathcal{M}' \in \Gamma_{i+1}$ and (1) $\mathcal{M}'' \in \Gamma_i$, or (2) $\mathcal{M}'' \in \Gamma_{i+1}$. Suppose we have replaced $I_{i+2}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge in $I_{i+1}$ and get the following graphs:

In case (1), $I_{i+1}$ is pre-deterministic because it is unchanged after the operation (B). In the second graph of case (1), we replace $I_{i+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge $b''$. We show that the edge $b$ is now redundant in $I_i$. By the doubly connected property of $\mathcal{G}$, removing the subgraph $I_{j+1}$ and its two external edges still gives a doubly connected graph. Correspondingly, in the first graph of case (1), if we remove $\Gamma_i$, its two external edges (including $b'$) and edge $b$, we still get a doubly connected graph. Hence the edge $b$ is redundant in the second graph of case (1). Now if we replace $b$ with a diffusive edge, then the path of diffusive edges $b''$ and $b$ will play the role of a single diffusive edge between $\mathcal{M}_0$ and $\mathcal{M}$ in $I_i$, and hence $I_i$ becomes pre-deterministic by property (iii) of Definition 5.9 for the original graph $\mathcal{G}$.

In case (2), $I_{i+1}$ is still pre-deterministic by choosing the edge $b'$ as the last edge in the pre-deterministic order. Moreover, after replacing $I_{i+1}$ and its two external edges (including $b$) with a diffusive edge, $I_{i+1}$ becomes pre-deterministic by property (iii) of Definition 5.9 for the original graph $\mathcal{G}$.

It remains to consider the case where $\mathcal{M}''$ is in a different component from $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$.

**Lemma 5.12.** In the setting of (5.4), suppose a blue solid edge between molecules $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ is replaced by a path of two blue solid edges from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{M}''$ and from $\mathcal{M}''$ to $\mathcal{M}'$. Let the new graph be $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, and with a slight abuse of notation, we still denote the subgraphs induced on $\mathcal{M}_1$ by $I_i$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. Suppose $\mathcal{M}''$ is inside component $\Gamma_j$. Then we have the following five cases for the molecular graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_M$ without red solid edges.
(i) If \( M, M' \in \Gamma_i \) and \( i < j \), then \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_i \). Moreover, after replacing \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, the subgraph \( I_i \) becomes pre-deterministic.

(ii) If \( M, M' \in \Gamma_i \) and \( i > j \), then \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_j \). Moreover, after replacing \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, the subgraph \( I_j \) becomes pre-deterministic.

(iii) If \( M \in \Gamma_i, M' \in \Gamma_{i+1} \) and \( i < j \), then \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_i \), and \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_{i+1} \). Moreover, after replacing \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, the subgraph \( I_{i+1} \) becomes pre-deterministic.

(iv) If \( M \in \Gamma_i, M' \in \Gamma_{i+1} \) and \( i > j \), then \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_j \). Moreover, after replacing \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, the subgraph \( I_j \) becomes pre-deterministic.

(v) If \( M \) is an external molecule and \( M' \in \Gamma_0 \), then \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal proper isolated subgraph. Moreover, after replacing \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, the maximal subgraph \( \hat{G}_{\text{max}} \) becomes pre-deterministic.

The proof of Lemma 5.12 will be postponed to Appendix A. Similar to case (A), combining Lemma 5.12 with the SPD property of the original graph \( G \), we can readily show that the new graph obtained from the operation (B) is still SPD. We omit the details. This concludes Lemma 5.10.

Similar to Lemma 5.10, we have the following result for \( Q \)-expansions.

**Lemma 5.13.** Let \( G_0 \) in (4.10) be a SPD graph. Then applying the \( Q \)-expansions in Section 4.4, the new graphs (including the \( Q \)-graphs) are all SPD.

**Proof.** The proof of this lemma is similar to the one for Lemma 5.10 by using Lemmas 5.11 and 5.12 because \( Q \)-expansions are also local expansions as those in Lemma 5.10. We omit the details.

## 6 Proof of Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.8

### 6.1 Proof of Corollary 3.8

Given the \( n \)-th order T-equation constructed in Theorem 3.7, we can solve (3.11) to get that

\[
T_{a,b_1,b_2} = m \left( \frac{1}{1 - \Theta \Sigma(n)} \Theta \right)_{ab_1} \Theta_{b_1,b_2} + \sum_x \left( \frac{1}{1 - \Theta \Sigma(n)} \right)_{ax} \left[ (R^{(n)}_{IT})_{x,b_1,b_2} + (A^{(n)}_{IT})_{x,b_1,b_2} + (Q^{(n)}_{IT})_{x,b_1,b_2} + (\epsilon e_{n,D})_{x,b_1,b_2} \right].
\]  

(6.1)

By property (iv) of Definition 3.3, we have that

\[
(R^{(n)}_{IT})_{x,b_1,b_2} = \sum_y \Theta_{xy}(G_R^{(n)})_{y,b_1,b_2}, \quad (A^{(n)}_{IT})_{x,b_1,b_2} = \sum_y \Theta_{xy}(G_A^{(n)})_{y,b_1,b_2},
\]

\[
(Q^{(n)}_{IT})_{x,b_1,b_2} = \sum_y \Theta_{xy}(G_Q^{(n)})_{y,b_1,b_2}, \quad (\epsilon e_{n,D})_{x,b_1,b_2} = \sum_y \Theta_{xy}(G_{e_{n,D}})_{y,b_1,b_2},
\]

for some sums of graphs \( G_R^{(n)}, G_A^{(n)}, G_Q^{(n)} \) and \( G_{e_{n,D}}^{(n)} \). Using the definition (1.18), we can write (6.1) as

\[
T_{a,b_1,b_2} = m(\Theta_{ab_1}^{(n)}) \Theta_{b_1,b_2} + \sum_x (\Theta_{ax}^{(n)} \left[ (G_R^{(n)})_{x,b_1,b_2} + (G_A^{(n)})_{x,b_1,b_2} + (G_Q^{(n)})_{x,b_1,b_2} + (G_{e_{n,D}}^{(n)})_{x,b_1,b_2} \right]).
\]  

(6.2)

We expand \( \Theta^{(n)} \) as

\[
\Theta^{(n)} = \sum_{k=0}^{D} (\Theta \Sigma^{(n)})^k \Theta + \Theta_{e_{n,D}}^{(n)}, \quad \Theta_{e_{n,D}}^{(n)} := \sum_{k>D} (\Theta \Sigma^{(n)})^k \Theta.
\]  

(6.3)
The terms \((\Theta \Sigma^{(n)})^k \Theta\) can be expanded into sums of labelled diffusive edges, and we regard \((\Theta^{(n)}_{err})_y\) as a new type of diffusive edge of scaling order \(\geq 2(D + 2)\) between atoms \(x\) and \(y\). Then we plug the expansion \([6.3]\) into \([6.2]\) and rearrange the resulting graphs as follows. First, all graphs containing \(\Theta^{(n)}_{err}\) and graphs from \(\sum_x \Theta_{ax}^{(n)}(G_{err}^{(n,D)})_{x,b_1 b_2}\) will be included into \((\Theta_{err}^{(n)})_{a,b_1 b_2}\). For the rest of the graphs,

- the term \(n \Theta_{ab_1}^{(n)}(\bar{G}_{b_1 b_2})\) will give the first two terms on the right-hand side of \([3.1]\) and some higher order graphs in \((\mathcal{A}^{(>n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\);
- the term \(\sum_x \Theta_{ax}^{(n)}(G_R^{(n)})_{x,b_1 b_2}\) will give \((\mathcal{R}^{(n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\) and some higher order graphs in \((\mathcal{A}^{(>n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\);
- the term \(\sum_x \Theta_{ax}^{(n)}(G_A^{(>n)})_{x,b_1 b_2}\) will give higher order graphs in \((\mathcal{A}^{(>n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\);
- the term \(\sum_x \Theta_{ax}^{(n)}(G_Q^{(n)})_{x,b_1 b_2}\) will give graphs in \((\mathcal{Q}^{(n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\).

This concludes Corollary 3.8.

### 6.2 Globally standard graphs

For the rest of this section, we focus on proving Theorem 3.7. In this subsection, we introduce the standard graphs for global expansions. By taking into account the external red solid edges connected with isolated subgraphs, we define the following concept of weakly and strongly isolated subgraphs.

**Definition 6.1** (Weakly and strongly isolated subgraphs). An isolated subset of molecules \(M\) is said to be strongly isolated if there is at most one red solid edge between \(M\) and \(M^c\), and the corresponding subgraph \(I(M)\) is called a strongly isolated subgraph. Otherwise, \(M\) and \(I(M)\) are said to be weakly isolated (i.e. a weakly isolated subgraph is an isolated subgraph that is not strongly isolated).

With Definition 5.9 and Definition 6.1, we define globally standard graphs.

**Definition 6.2** (Globally standard graphs). A graph is said to be globally standard if it is SPD, and every proper isolated subgraph of it is weakly isolated.

The reason for introducing globally standard graphs is to avoid non-expandable graphs, i.e. graphs that cannot be expanded without breaking the doubly connected property. As an example, we consider the following two graphs, where \(\Gamma_1\) is strongly isolated in (a) and weakly isolated in (b):

![Graphs](image_url)

Suppose both graphs (a) and (b) are SPD with \(\Gamma_1\) being the minimal isolated subgraph. If \(\Gamma_1\) contains blue solid edges, then we can either perform local expansions or expand the first blue solid edge in a predetermined order of \(\Gamma_1\). Now suppose \(\Gamma_1\) does not contain any internal blue solid edge, then it is not locally standard in graph (b) because there are more external red solid edges than blue solid edges, so we can always perform local expansions. On the other hand, if both the subgraphs \(\Gamma_0\) and \(\Gamma_1\) in (a) are deterministic, then graphs (a) is locally standard and only contains a pivotal blue solid edge, so it cannot be expanded without breaking the doubly connected property. Such a graph cannot be included into the second term on the right-hand side of \([3.11]\) if it is not a recollision, \(Q\), higher order or error graph. In sum, the SPD property in Definition 6.2 gives a canonical order of blue solid edges to expand, while the weakly isolated property guarantees that our expansions will not give graphs which only contain pivotal blue solid edges.

Now we state some additional properties satisfied by the graphs in the \(T\)-expansion and \(T\)-equation. Recall the definition of minimal isolated subgraphs (MIS) in Definition 5.4.

**Definition 6.3** (\(T\)-expansion and \(T\)-equation: additional properties). The graphs in Definition 3.2 satisfy the following additional properties.

(i) Each graph in \((\mathcal{R}^{(n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\) is globally standard.

(ii) Each graph in \((\mathcal{A}^{(>n)}_T)_{a,b_1 b_2}\) is SPD.
Exercise 5.10. Let $G$ be a globally standard graph without any $P/Q$ labels. Let $\tilde{G}$ be one of the new graphs. As shown in the proof of Lemma 5.10, any proper isolated subset of molecules $M$ in $\tilde{G}$ is obtained from merging a proper isolated subset of molecules, say $M_0$, in $G$. Moreover, it easy to see that the number of external red solid edges of $M$ in $\tilde{G}$ is larger than or equal to the number of external red solid edges of $M_0$ in $G$. Since $M_0$ is weakly isolated in $G$, we get that $M$ is also weakly isolated in $\tilde{G}$. This concludes (i). The property (ii) can be checked readily using the Definitions 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6.

The following lemma is key to our proof. Roughly speaking, it shows that the globally standard property is preserved if we expand the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS.

Lemma 6.5. Suppose $G$ is a globally standard graph without any $P/Q$ labels. Let $I_k$ be the MIS of $G$. Consider a $t_{x,y_1y_2}$ variable in $G$ defined by (4.14), so that the blue solid edge $G_{x,y_1}$ is the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of $I_k$.

1. If we replace $t_{x,y_1y_2}$ with a graph in the first two terms on the right-hand side of (4.14), then the resulting graph, say $\tilde{G}$, has no $P/Q$ labels and is globally standard. Moreover, $\tilde{G}$ either has a strictly higher scaling order than $G$, or is obtained by replacing $t_{x,y_1y_2}$ with $m_{\Theta_{x,y_1}} G_{y_1y_2}$.
2. If we replace $t_{x,y_1y_2}$ with a graph $(G_R)_{x,y_1y_2}$ in $(\tilde{R}_T^{(n-1)})_{x,y_1y_2}$, then the resulting graph has no $P/Q$ labels, is globally standard and has a scaling order $\geq \text{ord}(G) + 1$.
3. If we replace $t_{x,y_1y_2}$ with a graph $(G_A)_{x,y_1y_2}$ in $(\tilde{A}_T^{(n-1)})_{x,y_1y_2}$, then the resulting graph has no $P/Q$ labels, is SPD and has a scaling order $\geq \text{ord}(G) + n - 2$.
4. Suppose we replace $t_{x,y_1y_2}$ with a graph $(G_Q)_{x,y_1y_2}$ in $Q_{x,y_1y_2}$ and get a graph $\tilde{G}$. Then applying the $Q$-expansions, we can expand it into a sum of $O(1)$ many graphs:

$$\tilde{G} = \sum_{\omega} G_{\omega} + G + G_{\text{err}}.$$  (6.4)

Here each $G_{\omega}$ has no $P/Q$ labels, is globally standard and has a scaling order $\geq \text{ord}(G) + 1$; $Q$ is a sum of $Q$-graphs, each of which is SPD and has a MIS containing the atom in the $Q$-label; $G_{\text{err}}$ is a sum of doubly connected graphs of scaling orders $> D$. 

}\nomath
(5) If we replace \( t_{x,y_1,y_2} \) with a graph \((\mathcal{G}_{\text{err}})_{x,y_1,y_2} \) in \((\mathcal{E}_{\text{err}})_{x,y_1,y_2} \), then the resulting graph is doubly connected and has a scaling order \( \geq \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}) + D - 1 \).

**Proof.** The proofs of (1), (3) and (5) are simple by using the properties in Definitions 3.2 and 6.3. We focus on the proofs of (2) and (4).

**Proof of (2):** We denote the new graph by \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \). Then we have the following graph (a), where we only show a case which has a dotted edge connected with \( y_1 \) in \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \). There are also cases with a dotted edge connected with \( y_2 \). With a slight abuse of notation, we have used \( x \) and \( y_1 \) to denote the respective molecules that contain atoms \( x \) and \( y_1 \).

![Graph (a)](image)

The graph (a) gives the molecular isolated subgraph \( \mathcal{I}_k \) in \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \) with all red solid edges removed, where we have not merged the molecules connected by the dotted edge. Inside the back circles are some subgraphs, where \( \Gamma_k \) contains the molecules in \( \mathcal{I}_k \) of the original graph \( \mathcal{G} \), \( \mathcal{I}_k = \mathcal{I}_{k+1} \) is the first proper isolated subgraph in \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) and also the \( (k+1) \)-th proper isolated subgraph in \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \). \( \Gamma' \) contains the molecules in \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) that are not in \( \mathcal{I}_k \). The graph (b) is obtained by removing the dotted edge from graph (a) and renaming the subgraphs.

First, \( \text{ord}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}) \geq \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}) + 1 \) follows immediately from the fact that \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) has scaling order \( \geq 3 \). Second, using the fact that both \( \mathcal{G} \) and \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) have no proper strongly isolated subgraphs, we immediately get that \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \) also does not contain any proper strongly isolated subgraphs. It remains to prove the SPD property of \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \). With Lemma 5.11, it suffices to show that graph (b) in (6.5), denoted by \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_b \), is SPD. In this graph, we have renamed \( \mathcal{I}_{k+1} \) in (a) as \( \mathcal{I}_{k+2} \) and \( \Gamma' \) as \( \Gamma_{k+1} \). Notice that \( \Gamma_{k+1}, \mathcal{I}_{k+2} \) and the two edges between them form the isolated subgraph \( \mathcal{I}_{k+1} \) in \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_b \).

Now we verify the three properties of Definition 6.9 for \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_b \). The property (i) follows from Lemma 5.7. Using the SPD property of \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) given by Definition 6.3, we get that there is at most one sequence of isolated graphs in \( \mathcal{I}_k \). Together with the SPD property of \( \mathcal{G} \) and the fact that \( \mathcal{I}_k \) is the MIS of \( \mathcal{G} \), it concludes property (ii) for \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_b \). It remains to prove property (iii). Suppose the sequence of proper isolated subgraphs in \( \mathcal{G}_b \) is

\[
\mathcal{I}_l \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{I}_{k+2} \subset \mathcal{I}_{k+1} \subset \mathcal{I}_k \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{I}_1, \quad \text{for some } l \geq k,
\]

and for simplicity of notation, we denote the maximal subgraph by \( \mathcal{I}_0 \). For \( j \geq k + 1 \), if we replace \( \mathcal{I}_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, then \( \mathcal{I}_j \) becomes pre-deterministic because \((\mathcal{G}_R)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) is SPD. For \( j \leq k - 1 \), if we replace \( \mathcal{I}_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, then \( \mathcal{I}_j \) becomes pre-deterministic because \( \mathcal{G} \) is SPD. Finally, if we replace \( \mathcal{I}_{k+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, then it corresponds to changing the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of \( \mathcal{I}_k \) into a diffusive edge. Hence \( \mathcal{I}_k \) becomes pre-deterministic by Definition 5.8. In sum, we get that \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_b \) is SPD, which concludes statement (2) of Lemma 6.5.

**Proof of (4):** Using a similar argument as the one for \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_b \), we get that \( \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \) is SPD. Then the SPD property of the graphs on the right-hand side of (6.4) follow from Lemma 5.13. The conditions on the scaling orders and the fact that the atom in the \( Q \)-label of a \( Q \)-graph belongs to the MIS follow from Lemma 4.15. It remains to prove the weakly isolated property of the proper isolated subgraphs in \( \mathcal{G}_w \).

We assume that \((\mathcal{G}_Q)_{x,y_1,y_2} \) indeed contains strongly isolated subgraphs, since otherwise the proof will be trivial. Then we have the following molecular graph without red solid edges:
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Here all the solid edges and weights inside the purple rectangle have the same \( Q_y \) label for an atom \( y \) in the MIS, denoted by \( \mathcal{I}_l \) for some \( l \geq k \). Inside the back circles are some subgraphs, where \( \Gamma \) contains...
the molecules in the original graph $\mathcal{G}$, and $\Gamma_i$ are components corresponding to the isolated subgraphs in $(\mathcal{G}_Q)_{x_1,y_2}$ (following the notations in (6.4)). Again we denote the isolated subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}$ by (6.6). Then by property (iv) of Lemma 4.15, in each $\mathcal{G}_\omega$ there exist external atoms or atoms in $\Gamma$ so that (a) they connect to $y$ through red solid edges, (b) they connect to $y$ through blue solid edges, or (c) they have been merged with $y$. In cases (b) and (c), the subgraphs $\mathcal{I}_i$, $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, are not isolated anymore. In case (a), we have the following graph (or some variant of it, where we are not trying to draw all possible cases):

![Diagram](image)

In this case, any subgraphs $\mathcal{I}_i$, $k+1 \leq i \leq l$, is weakly isolated if it is still an isolated subgraph in $\mathcal{G}_\omega$. In sum, we see that $\mathcal{G}_\omega$ does not contain proper strongly isolated subgraphs, and hence is globally standard.

### 6.3 Global expansion strategy

Lemma 6.5 gives a canonical choice of the standard neutral atom in the global expansion of a globally standard graph, that is, we choose an ending atom of a blue solid edge that is the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS. Using this choice, we define the global expansion strategy for the proof of Theorem 3.7 in this subsection.

Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As an induction hypothesis, suppose we have obtained the $(n-1)$-th order $T$-expansion. Then we define the following stopping rules. We stop the expansion of a graph if it is a normal regular graph and satisfies at least one of the following properties:

- (S1) it is a $\oplus/\ominus$-recollision graph;
- (S2) its scaling order is at least $n+1$;
- (S3) it is a $Q$-graph (recall Definition 3.1);  
- (S4) it is non-expandable, that is, it is locally standard and has no redundant blue edge.

If a graph has a deterministic maximal subgraph, then it is non-expandable. On the other hand, in a non-expandable graph that is not deterministic, we cannot expand a plus $G$ edge without breaking the doubly connected property. Now we give our global expansion strategy.

**Strategy 6.6 (Global expansion strategy).** Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D > n$. Given the above stopping rules (S1)-(S4), we apply the following global expansion strategy.

**Step 0:** We start with the second order $T$-expansion (3.8) for $T_{x_1,y_2}$, and apply the local expansions to obtain a linear combination of new graphs, each of which either satisfies the stopping rules (S1)–(S3) already, or is locally standard. At this step, there is only one internal molecule in each graph, and hence is trivially a globally standard graph.

**Step 1:** Given a globally standard input graph, we perform the local expansions in Definitions 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 on atoms in the MIS. We send the resulting graphs that already satisfy the stopping rules (S1)–(S4) to the outputs. Every remaining graph is globally standard by Lemma 6.4, and its minimal isolated subgraph (MIS) is locally standard (i.e. the MIS has no weights and every atom in it either has degree 0 or is a standard neutral atom; see Definition 4.8).

**Step 2:** Given a globally standard input graph $\mathcal{G}$ with a locally standard MIS, say $\mathcal{I}_k$, we find a $t_{x_1,y_2}$ or $t_{y_1,y_2,x}$ variable defined in (4.14), so that $a$ is a standard neutral atom in $\mathcal{I}_k$ and the blue solid edge $G_{a,y_1}$ or $G_{y_1,a}$ is the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of $\mathcal{I}_k$. If we cannot find such a $t$-variable, then we stop expanding the input graph.

**Step 3:** We apply the global expansions defined in Section 4.3 to the $t_{x_1,y_2}$ or $t_{y_1,y_2,x}$ variable chosen in Step 2. More precisely, we first replace $t_{x_1,y_2}$ or $t_{y_1,y_2,x}$ with (4.15) or an expression obtained by taking the transposition of all the $G$ entries in (4.15). Then we apply the $Q$-expansions defined in Section 4.4 to
graphs that take the form \((4.16)\), where both \(\Gamma_0\) and \(\tilde{T}_0\) are non-empty. We send the resulting graphs that already satisfy the stopping rules (S1)–(S4) to the outputs. The remaining graphs are all globally standard by Lemma 6.5 and we sent them back to Step 1.

Using the definition of globally standard graphs, it is easy to show that if an output graph from the above strategy does not satisfy the stopping rules (S1)–(S3), then it must have a deterministic maximal subgraph.

\textbf{Lemma 6.7.} Let \(G_{a,b_1b_2}\) be an output graph from the global expansion strategy \[6.6\]. If \(G_{a,b_1b_2}\) does not satisfy stopping rules (S1)-(S3), then it has a deterministic maximal subgraph with a doubly connected structure.

\textbf{Proof.} Under the assumption of this lemma, \(G_{a,b_1b_2}\) either is non-expandable or does not contain a \(t\)-variable as required in Step 2 of Strategy \[6.6\]. In either case, \(G_{a,b_1b_2}\) contains a locally standard MIS, say \(I_k\), which, by the pre-deterministic property of \(I_k\), does not contain any internal blue solid edges.

Now we consider two cases. First, suppose \(I_k\) is a proper isolated subgraph. Due to the weakly isolated property, \(I_k\) is connected with at least two external red solid edges and at most one blue solid edge. Hence \(I_k\) must contain a non-standard neutral atom, which gives a contradiction. Second, suppose \(I_k\) is indeed the maximal subgraph of \(G_{a,b_1b_2}\). Then \(I_k\) is locally standard and does not contain any internal blue solid edges, so it is deterministic.

With Lemma 6.5 we show that the global expansions in Strategy \[6.6\] will stop after \(O(1)\) many iterations.

\textbf{Lemma 6.8.} The global expansions in Strategy \[6.6\] will stop after at most \(C_n\) many iterations of Steps 1–3, where \(C_n\) denotes a large constant depending on \(n\). All graphs from the expansions are doubly connected. If a graph satisfies the stopping rule (S1)/(S2)/(S3) and has scaling order \(\leq D\), then it satisfies the property (i)/(ii)/(iii) of Definition 6.3.

\textbf{Proof.} Let \(G\) be an input graph of Step 3 of Strategy \[6.6\]. From the second order \(T\)-expansion (3.8), we see that \(\text{ord}(G)\) must be larger than or equal to the scaling orders of the graphs in (3.9), i.e. \(\text{ord}(G) \geq 3\). Hence the new graphs from case (3) of Lemma 6.5 are SPD and have scaling orders \(\geq n + 1\), so it satisfies property (ii) of Definition 6.2, the new graphs from case (5) of Lemma 6.5 are doubly connected and have scaling orders \(\geq D + 2\). Moreover, the new graphs from cases (1) and (2) of Lemma 6.5 are globally standard, so they satisfy the property (i)/(ii) of Definition 6.2 if they satisfy the stopping rule (S1)/(S2). Finally, in equation (6.4), the graphs in \(Q\) satisfy the stopping rule (S3) and property (iii) of Definition 6.2; the graphs in \(G_{err}\) are doubly connected and have scaling orders \(\geq D + 1\); the graphs \(G_e\) in (6.4) are globally standard, so they satisfy the property (i)/(ii) of Definition 6.2 if they satisfy the stopping rule (S1)/(S2). Combining the above discussions with Lemma 6.4 for local expansions in Step 1 of Strategy \[6.6\] we conclude the second statement.

Now we prove the first statement. Let \(G_0\) be a graph from Step 0. We construct inductively a tree diagram \(T\) for the global expansions of \(G_0\) as follows. Let \(G_0\) be the root. Given a graph \(G\) represented by a vertex of the tree, its children are the graphs obtained from an iteration of Steps 1–3 acting on \(G\). Suppose a graph \(G\) satisfies the stopping rule, then we stop the expansion and \(G\) has no children on the tree. Let the height of \(T\) be the maximum distance between the root and a leaf of \(T\). To show that the global expansions will stop after \(C_n\) many iterations of Steps 1–3, it is equivalent to show that \(T\) is a finite tree with height \(\leq C_n\).

Let \(G_0 \rightarrow G_1 \rightarrow G_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow G_h\) be a self-avoiding path from the root to a leaf. Let \(k_0 = 0\). After having defined \(k_i\), let \(k_{i+1} := h \land \min\{j > k_i : \text{ord}(G_j) > \text{ord}(G_{k_i})\}\). Then the increasing sequence \(\{k_0, k_1, k_2, \cdots\}\) has length at most \(n\), because a graph of scaling order \(\geq n + 1\) satisfies the stopping rule (S2) and has no children. Moreover, we claim that \(|k_{i+1} - k_i| \leq n\). First, by Lemma 6.5 if a new graph after an iteration of Steps 1–3 has the same scaling order as the input graph, then it must have one fewer blue solid edge than the input graph. Second, by property (ii) of Definition 6.2 the number of internal atoms in \(G_{k_i}\) is less than or equal to the number of waved and diffusive edges, which shows that the number of blue solid edges in \(G_{k_i}\) is at most \(n\). These two facts together conclude the claim. In sum, we have shown that \(h \leq n^2\), i.e. the height of \(T\) is at most \(n^2\).

\textbf{6.4 Proof of Theorem 3.7}

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 3.7 using the results in Sections 6.2 and 6.3. To summarize, we have proved the following facts.

(1) The expansions of \(T_{a,b_1b_2}\) will stop and give \(O(1)\) many new graphs (Lemma 6.8).
(II) If a new graph from the expansions satisfies the stopping rule (S1)/(S2)/(S3), then it satisfies the property (i)/(ii)/(iii) of Definition [6.3] (Lemma [6.8]).

(III) If a new graph from the expansions does not satisfy the stopping rules (S1)–(S3), then it has a deterministic doubly connected maximal subgraph (Lemma [6.7]).

Now we prove Theorem [3.7] inductively. We have obtained the second order $T$-expansion and $T$-equation in (3.8). Fix any $2 \leq n \leq M$. Suppose for all $2 \leq k \leq n - 1$, we have constructed the $k$-th order $T$-equation using Strategy 6.6 shown the properties (1.20)–(1.22) of $\mathcal{E}_{n-1}$ by Lemma 3.9 and obtained the $k$-th order $T$-equation using Corollary 3.8. Now applying Strategy 6.6, we obtain the following expansion of $T_{n,b_1,b_2}$:

$$T_{n,b_1,b_2} = m\Theta_{ab_1}G_{b_1,b_2} + \sum_x (\Theta \Sigma^{(n)}_{ax}t_{x,b_1,b_2} + (\tilde{R}^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} + (A^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} + (Q^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} + (\mathcal{E}rr')_{a,b_1,b_2}.$$ 

Denoting

$$(R^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} = (\tilde{R}^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} - \sum_x (\Theta \Sigma^{(n)}_{ax}m)^2 \sum_\alpha s_{x\alpha}G_{\alpha b_1}G_{\alpha b_2} (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\alpha \neq b_1} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha \neq b_2}),$$

the above equation can be rewritten as

$$T_{n,b_1,b_2} = m\Theta_{ab_1}G_{b_1,b_2} + \sum_x (\Theta \Sigma^{(n)}_{ax}T_{x,b_1,b_2} + (R^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} + (A^{(n)}_{IT})_{a,b_1,b_2} + (\mathcal{E}rr')_{a,b_1,b_2}. \tag{6.7}$$

By the above facts (I)–(III), we have shown that (6.7) satisfies Definitions 3.3 and 6.3 except for the following properties:

- in the decomposition (3.12) of $R^{(n)}_{IT}$, $R_{IT,l}$, $4 \leq l \leq n - 1$, are the same expressions as those in lower order $T$-equations;
- in the decomposition (3.13) of $Q^{(n)}_{IT}$, $Q_{IT,l}$, $4 \leq l \leq n - 1$, are the same expressions as those in lower order $T$-equations;
- in the decomposition (3.14) of $\Sigma^{(k)}$, $\mathcal{E}_l$, $4 \leq l \leq n - 1$, are the same self-energies as those in lower order $T$-equations.

We decompose the graphs $\Sigma^{(n)}$, $R^{(n)}_{IT}$ and $Q^{(n)}_{IT}$ in (6.7) as

$$\Sigma^{(n)} = \hat{\Sigma}^{(n-1)} + \mathcal{E}_n, \quad R^{(n)}_{IT} = \hat{R}^{(n-1)}_{IT} + R_{IT,n}, \quad Q^{(n)}_{IT} = \hat{Q}^{(n-1)}_{IT} + Q_{IT,n} + Q^{(n)}_{IT}, \tag{6.8}$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}^{(n-1)}$, $\hat{R}^{(n-1)}_{IT}$ and $\hat{Q}^{(n-1)}_{IT}$ are sums of graphs of scaling orders $\leq n - 1$, $\mathcal{E}_n$, $R_{IT,n}$ and $Q_{IT,n}$ are sums of graphs of scaling order $n$, and $Q^{(n)}_{IT}$ is a sum of $Q$-graphs of scaling order $> n$. To conclude the proof, it suffices to prove that

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{(n-1)} = \Sigma^{(n-1)}, \quad \hat{R}^{(n-1)}_{IT} = R^{(n-1)}_{IT}, \quad \hat{Q}^{(n-1)}_{IT} = Q^{(n-1)}_{IT}, \tag{6.9}$$

if we perform the expansions in a proper way. In order to have (6.9), we perform almost the same $(n-1)$-th and $n$-th order expansions of $T_{n,b_1,b_2}$ in parallel, with the only difference being the cutoff order in the stopping rule: the cutoff order is $n - 1$ for the $(n-1)$-th order expansion, and $n$ for the $n$-th order expansion. We now give a more precise description of the expansion procedure.

After the $r$-th step expansion (where one step refers to a local expansion in Section 4.2, a $Q$-expansion in Section 4.4 for a substitution in global expansions), we denote by $\mathbf{E}_r^{(n-1)}$ and $\mathbf{E}_r^{(n)}$ the collections of graphs of scaling orders $\leq n - 1$ in $(n-1)$-th and $n$-th order expansions, respectively. We trivially have $\mathbf{E}_r^{(n-1)} = \mathbf{E}_r^{(n)}$. Suppose $\mathbf{E}_r^{(n-1)} = \mathbf{E}_r^{(n)}$ for a fixed $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then given any graph in $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{E}_r^{(n-1)}$, we perform the $(r+1)$-th step expansion as follows:

- If we apply a local expansion to $\mathcal{G}$ in the $(n-1)$-th order expansion, then we apply the same expansion to the same weight or edge of $\mathcal{G}$ in the $n$-th order expansion.
• If \( G \) is of the form (4.16), then we apply exactly the same \( Q \)-expansions to it in both the \((n-1)\)-th and \(n\)-th order expansions.

• Suppose in the \((n-1)\)-th order expansion, we replace a \( t_{x,y_1,y_2} \) variable in \( G \) with an \((n-2)\)-th order \( T \)-expansion (i.e. (4.15) with \( n-1 \) replaced by \( n-2 \)). Then in the \(n\)-th order expansion, we replace the same \( t_{x,y_1,y_2} \) variable with (4.15). By (3.2), (3.3) and (3.6), we have that

\[
\Sigma_T^{(n-1)} - \Sigma_T^{(n-2)} = \Sigma_{T,n-1}, \quad R_T^{(n-1)} - R_T^{(n-2)} = R_{T,n-1},
\]

\[
\mathcal{Q}_T^{(k-1)} - \mathcal{Q}_T^{(k-2)} = \mathcal{Q}_{T,k-1} + \mathcal{Q}_T^{(>k-1)} - \mathcal{Q}_T^{(>k-2)}.
\]

Then the \((n-2)\)-th order version of (4.15) is different from (4.15) only in the following terms:

\[
m(\Theta \Sigma_{T,n-1} \Theta)_{x,y_1,y_2}, \quad (R_{T,n-1})_{x,y_1,y_2}, \quad (Q_{T,n-1} + Q_T^{(>n-1)} - Q_T^{(>n-2)})_{x,y_1,y_2},
\]

\[
(A_T^{(n-2)})_{x,y_1,y_2}, \quad (A_T^{(n-1)})_{x,y_1,y_2}, \quad (\varepsilon r_{n-1,D})_{x,y_1,y_2}, \quad (\varepsilon r_{n,D})_{x,y_1,y_2}.
\]

However, if we have replaced \( t_{x,y_1,y_2} \) with a graph in these terms, then the resulting graph must be of scaling order at least \( n \). Such graphs will not be included into \( \mathcal{G}_{r+1}^{(n-1)} \) or \( \mathcal{G}_{r+1}^{(n)} \).

In sum, we see that \( \mathcal{G}_{r+1}^{(n-1)} = \mathcal{G}_{r+1}^{(n)} \) as long as we perform the \(n\)-th order expansions in the above way. By induction in \( r \), we get that (6.9) holds, which concludes the proof.

7 Proof of Theorem 3.6

Recall the following standard large deviation estimates in Lemma 7.1 which show that the resolvent entries can be bounded using \( T \)-variables. The bound (7.2) was proved in equation (3.20) of [33], and (7.3) was proved in Lemma 5.3 of [12]. Given a matrix \( M \), we will use \( \|M\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |M_{ij}| \) to denote its maximum norm.

Lemma 7.1. Suppose for a constant \( \delta_0 > 0 \) and deterministic parameter \( W^{-d/2} \leq \Phi \leq W^{-\delta_0} \) we have that

\[
\|G(z) - m(z)\|_{\max} \lesssim W^{-\delta_0}, \quad \|T\|_{\max} \lesssim \Phi^2,
\]

uniformly in \( z \in D \) for a subset \( D \subset \mathbb{C}_+ \). Then

\[
1_{x \neq y} |G_{xy}(z)|^2 \lesssim T_{xy}(z)
\]

uniformly in \( x, y \in Z^d_L \) and \( z \in D \), and

\[
|G_{xx}(z) - m(z)| \lesssim \Phi
\]

uniformly in \( x \in Z^d_L \) and \( z \in D \).

Now we state the three main ingredients, Lemmas 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4, for the proof of Theorem 3.6. First, we have an initial estimate when \( \eta = 1 \), whose proof will be given in Section 8.

Lemma 7.2 (Initial estimate). Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.6 for any \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa) \) and \( \eta = 1 \), we have that

\[
|G_{xy}(z) - m(z)\delta_{xy}|^2 \lesssim B_{xy}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d_L.
\]

Second, we have a continuity estimate in Lemma 7.3 whose proof will be given in Section 8. It allows us to get some a priori estimates on \( G(z) \) from the local law (3.16) on \( G(\tilde{z}) \) for \( \tilde{z} \) with a larger imaginary part \( \text{Im} \tilde{z} = W^{\varepsilon_0} \text{Im} z \), where \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) is a small constant.
Lemma 7.3 (Continuity estimates). Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.6, suppose that

\[ |G_{xy}(\bar{z}) - m(\bar{z})\delta_{xy}|^2 < B_{xy}(\bar{z}), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \]

with \( \bar{z} = E + i\eta \) for some \( E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa) \) and \( \eta \in [W^{2+\eps}/L^2, 1] \). Then for any \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( W^{2+\eps}/L^2 \leq \eta \leq \bar{\eta} \), we have that

\[ \max_{x, x_0} \frac{1}{K^d} \sum_{y: |y - x_0| \leq K} \left( |G_{xy}(z)|^2 + |G_{yx}(z)|^2 \right) < \left( \frac{\eta}{\bar{\eta}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{W^4 K^{d-4}}, \]

for all \( K \in [W, L/2] \). Moreover, for any constant \( \eps_0 \in (0, d/20) \), we have that

\[ \|G(z) - m(z)\|_{max} \prec W^{-d/2+\eps_0}, \]

uniformly in all \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( \eta \in [W^{-\eps_0}\bar{\eta}, \bar{\eta}] \).

Compared with (3.16), the \( \ell^\infty \) bound (7.7) is sharp up to a factor \( W^{\eps_0} \). The estimate (7.6) is an averaged bound instead of an entrywise bound and the right-hand side of (7.6) loses an \( W^2/K^2 \) factor when compared with the sharp averaged bound \( W^{-2}K^{-(d-2)} \). We need to use the following lemma to improve the weaker estimates (7.6) and (7.7) to the stronger local law (3.16). Its proof will be given in Section 8. Note that (7.6) verifies the assumption (7.8) as long as we have \( W^{-\eps_0}\bar{\eta} \leq \eta \leq \bar{\eta} \).

Lemma 7.4 (Entrywise bounds on \( T \)-variables). Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 3.6 hold. Fix any \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa) \) and \( \eta \in [W^{2+\eps}/L^2, 1] \). Suppose for some constant \( \eps_0 > 0 \), (7.7) and the following estimate hold:

\[ \max_{x, x_0} \frac{1}{K^d} \sum_{y: |y - x_0| \leq K} \left( |G_{xy}(z)|^2 + |G_{yx}(z)|^2 \right) \prec \frac{W^{2\eps_0}}{W^4 K^{d-4}}, \]

for all \( K \in [W, L/2] \). As long as \( \eps_0 \) is sufficiently small (depending on \( n \) and \( c_0 \) in (3.17)), we have that

\[ T_{xy}(z) \prec B_{xy}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \]

Combining the above three lemmas, we can give the proof of Theorem 3.6 using a bootstrapping argument on a sequence of multiplicatively decreasing \( \eta \) given in (7.10). The details have been given in Section 5.2 of 32. For the reader’s convenience, we repeat the arguments here.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. For a small constant \( \eps_0 > 0 \) and a fixed \( E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa) \), we define the following sequence of decreasing \( \eta \):

\[ \eta_k := \max(\max(W^{-k\eps_0}, W^{2+\eps}/L_n^2), 0 \leq k \leq \ell_0), \]

where \( \ell_0 \) is the smallest integer such that \( W^{-\ell_0\eps_0} \leq W^{2+\eps}/L_n^2 \). By definition, \( \eta_{k+1} = W^{-\eps_0}\eta_k \) for \( k \leq \ell_0 - 1 \) and we always have \( \eta_{\ell_0} = W^{2+\eps}/L_n^2 \). Now we prove Theorem 3.6 through an induction on \( k \). First, by Lemma 7.2 (3.16) holds with \( z = z_0 = E + i\eta_0 \). Then suppose (3.16) holds with \( z = z_k = E + i\eta_k \) for some \( 0 \leq k \leq \ell_0 - 1 \). By Lemma 7.3, 7.7 and 7.8 hold for all \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( \eta_{k+1} \leq \eta \leq \eta_k \). Then applying Lemma 7.4 we obtain that (7.9) holds with \( z = \bar{z}_{k+1} \). Using Lemma 7.1, we conclude (3.16) with \( z = z_{k+1} \). Repeating the induction for \( \ell_0 \) steps, we obtain that

(i) (3.16) holds for all \( z_k \) with \( 0 \leq k \leq \ell_0 \);

(ii) (7.7) and (7.8) hold for all \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( \eta_{\ell_0} \leq \eta \leq 1 \).

To conclude Theorem 3.6, we need to extend (3.16) uniformly to all \( z = E + i\eta \) with \( E \in (-2 + \kappa, 2 - \kappa) \) and \( \eta \in [\eta_{\ell_0}, 1] \). This is a standard perturbation and union bound argument, so we omit the details. □
8 High moment estimate

In this section, we prove Lemma 7.3 and Lemma 7.4. Their proofs use the same idea, that is, we bound the high moments $E T_{xy}(z)^p$ for any fixed $p \in \mathbb{N}$ using the $n$-th order $T$-expansion. First, Lemma 7.4 follows immediately from the high moment bounds in Lemma 8.1 which will be proved in Section 8.2.

**Lemma 8.1.** Suppose the assumptions of Lemma 7.4 hold. Assume that

$$T_{xy} < B_{xy} + \tilde{\Phi}^2, \quad \forall \ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d,$$

(8.1)

for a deterministic parameter $\tilde{\Phi}$ satisfying $0 \leq \tilde{\Phi} \leq W^{-\delta}$ for a constant $\delta > 0$. Then for any fixed $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$Et_{xy}(z)^p < (B_{xy} + W^{-c}\tilde{\Phi}^2)^p$$

(8.2)

for a constant $c > 0$ depending only on $d$ and $c_0$ in (3.17).

**Proof of Lemma 7.4.** By (7.7), we have that (8.1) holds with $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}_1 := W^{-d/2+c_0}$. Then combining (8.2) with Markov’s inequality, we obtain that

$$T_{xy}(z) \leq B_{xy} + W^{-c}\tilde{\Phi}^2.$$ 

Hence (8.1) holds with a smaller parameter $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}_1 := W^{-d/2}\tilde{\Phi}_0$. Applying Lemma 8.1 and Markov’s inequality again, we obtain that

$$T_{xy}(z) \leq B_{xy} + W^{-2c}\tilde{\Phi}^2.$$ 

Now for any fixed $D > 0$, iterating the above arguments for $\lceil D/c \rceil$ many times, we obtain that

$$T_{xy}(z) \leq B_{xy} + W^{-D}.$$ 

This concludes (7.9) as long as $D$ is large enough. 

8.1 Estimates of doubly connected graphs

The proof of Lemma 8.1 will use some important estimates on doubly connected graphs stated in this subsection. First, inspired by the maximum bound (7.7), the weak averaged bound (7.8) and the local law (8.16), the following weak and strong norms was introduced in [32].

**Definition 8.2.** Given a $\mathbb{Z}_L^d \times \mathbb{Z}_L^d$ matrix $A$ and some fixed $a, b > 0$, we define its weak-$(a, b)$ norm as

$$\|A\|_{w(a, b)} := W^{ad/2} \max_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d} |A_{xy}| + \sup_{K \in [W, L/2]} \left( \frac{W}{K} \right)^b \max_{x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d} 1 \sum_{K \in [W, L/2]} \frac{1}{K^d} \sum_{y : |y - x| \leq K} \left( |A_{xy}| + |A_{yz}| \right),$$

and its strong-$(a, b)$ norm as

$$\|A\|_{s(a, b)} := \max_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d} \left( \frac{W}{x - y} \right)^b (x - y)^{ad/2} |A_{xy}|.$$ 

It is easy to check that $\|B\|_{s(2, 2)} = 1$, $\|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{s(1, 1)} = 1$ if (3.16) holds, and $\|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{w(1, 1)} < W^{c_0}$ if (7.7) and (7.8) hold. We introduce another positive random variable $\Psi_{xy}$ for a small constant $\tau > 0$ and a large constant $D > 0$, which was defined in [33] Definition 3.4:

$$\Psi_{xy}^2 = \Psi_{xy}^2 (\tau, D) := W^{-D} + \max_{|x_1 - x_2| \leq W^{1+\tau}} s_{x_1 y_1} + W^{-(2+2\tau)d} \sum_{|x_1 - x_2| \leq W^{1+\tau}} |G_{x_1 y_1}|^2.$$ 

(8.3)

It is easy to see that $\|\Psi(z)\|_{w(1, 2)} < (\|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{w(1, 2)} + 1$ and $\|\Psi(z)\|_{s(1, 1)} < (\|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{s(1, 1)} + 1$ as long as $D$ is large enough. The motivation for introducing the $\Psi$ variables is as follows: given two atoms $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d$, suppose $y_1 \neq y_2$ satisfy that

$$|y_1 - x_1| \leq W^{1+\tau/2}, \quad |y_2 - x_2| \leq W^{1+\tau/2}.$$ 

(8.4)
Then under the setting of Lemma 7.1 by applying (7.2) twice we obtain that

\[ |G_{y_1y_2}(z)|^2 \prec T_{y_1y_2}(z) = |m|^2 s_{y_1y_2}|G_{y_2y_3}(z)|^2 + |m|^2 \sum_{\alpha \neq y_2} s_{y_1\alpha}|G_{y_2\alpha}(z)|^2 \]

\[ \prec s_{y_1y_2} + \sum_{\alpha \neq y_2} s_{y_1\alpha}T_{y_2\alpha}(z) \leq s_{y_1y_2} + \sum_{\alpha, \beta} s_{y_1\alpha}s_{y_2\beta}|G_{\alpha\beta}(z)|^2 \]

\[ \leq W^{-D} + s_{y_1y_2} + W^{-2d} \sum_{\alpha - y_1 \leq W^{1+r/2}} \sum_{\beta - y_2 \leq W^{1+r/2}} |G_{\alpha\beta}(z)|^2 \leq W^{2d} \Psi^2 x_{1x_2}(t, D), \] (8.5)

where we used (1.9) and the identity \( G_{xy}(z) = G_{yx}(\overline{z}) \) in the derivation. In particular, if \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \) are in the same molecules as \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \), respectively, then (8.4) holds, since otherwise the graph will be smaller than \( W^{-D} \) for any fixed \( D > 0 \) by (1.9) and (2.3). Hence (8.5) shows that all the \( G \) edges between two molecules containing atoms \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) can be bounded by the same variable \( \Psi x_{1x_2} \). This fact will be convenient for our proof.

In this paper, we only use weak or strong-\((a, b)\) norms with \( a \leq 2 \). In this case, it is not hard to check that the strong-\((a, b)\) norm is strictly stronger than the weak-\((a, b)\) norm. By Definition 8.2 we immediately get the bounds

\[ \max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d} |A_{xy}| \leq W^{-ad/2} \|A\|_{w(a,b)}, \] (8.6)

\[ \max_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d} \frac{1}{Kd} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d} (|A_{xy}| + |A_{yx}|) \leq \frac{1}{Wb}\frac{1}{Kd} \|A\|_{w(a,b)}, \quad \text{for all } K \in [W, L/2], \] (8.7)

\[ |A_{xy}| \leq \frac{1}{Wb(x-y)^{ad/2-a}} \|A\|_{z(a,b)}. \] (8.8)

Using these estimates, we can easily prove the following bounds.

\textbf{Claim 8.3.} Let \( a \) and \( b \) be two positive constants satisfying that

\[ ad/2 - b - 2 \geq 0. \] (8.9)

Given any two matrices \( A^{(1)} \) and \( A^{(2)} \), we have that

\[ \sum_{x} |A^{(1)}_{x\beta}| \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} B_{xy_i} \prec W^{-ad/2} \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k) \cdot \|A^{(1)}\|_{w(a,b)}, \] (8.10)

\[ \sum_{x} A_{x\alpha}^{(1)} A_{x\beta}^{(2)} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} B_{xy_i} \prec W^{-ad/2} \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k) \cdot \frac{1}{Wb(x-y)^{ad/2-a}} \cdot \|A^{(1)}\|_{s(a,b)} \cdot \|A^{(2)}\|_{s(a,b)}, \] (8.11)

\[ \sum_{x} A_{x\alpha}^{(1)} A_{xy_i}^{(2)} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} B_{xy_i} \prec W^{-ad/2} \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k) A_{\alpha\beta} \cdot \|A^{(1)}\|_{w(a,b)} \cdot \|A^{(2)}\|_{w(a,b)} \] (8.12)

where \( A_{\alpha\beta} \) is a positive variable satisfying \( \|A\|_{w(a,b)} \leq 1 \) and \( \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k) \) is defined by

\[ \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_{j \neq i} B_{y_iy_j}. \] (8.13)

\textbf{Proof.} The proof of this claim is basic by using (8.6)–(8.8), so we omit the details. The reader can also refer to the proof of Claim 6.11 in [32] for a formal proof.

The following lemma gives almost sharp estimates on doubly connected graphs.

\textbf{Lemma 8.4 (Lemma 6.10 of [32]).} Suppose \( d \geq 8 \) and \( G \) is a doubly connected normal regular graph without external atoms. Pick any two atoms of \( G \) and fix their values \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d \). Then the resulting graph \( G_{xy} \) satisfies that

\[ |G_{xy}| \prec W^{-(n_{xy}-3)/2} B_{xy} A_{xy} \cdot \|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{w(1,2)}^{n_{xy}-2}, \] (8.14)
and
\[ |G_{xy}| \prec W^{-(n_{xy}-3)d/2}B_{xy}^2 \cdot \|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{w(1,2)}^{n_{xy}-2}, \tag{8.15} \]
where \(n_{xy} := \text{ord}(G_{xy})\) is the scaling order of \(G_{xy}\) and \(A_{xy}\) is a positive variable satisfying \(\|A\|_{w(1,2)} \prec 1\). If we fix an atom \(x \in G\), then the resulting graph \(G_x\) satisfies that
\[ |G_x| \prec W^{-\text{ord}(G_x)d/2} \cdot \|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{w(1,2)}^{n_{xy}-2}. \tag{8.16} \]
The above bounds hold also for the graph \(G_{\text{abs}}\), which is obtained by replacing each component (including edges, weights and coefficients) in \(G\) with its absolute value and ignoring all the \(P\) or \(Q\) labels (if any).

Deterministic doubly connected graphs satisfy better bounds than Lemma 8.4, because all the edges in the blue net are now (labelled) diffusive edges, whose strong-\((2,2)\) norms are bounded by \(O_{x}(1)\).

**Lemma 8.5** (Corollary 6.12 of [32]). Suppose \(d \geq 4\) and \(G\) is a deterministic doubly connected regular graph without external atoms. Pick any two atoms of \(G\) (Corollary 6.12 of [32]) and suppose \(ab\) is a graph in \((G_{\text{abs}})^{(n-1)}_{ab}\) of scaling order \(4\), which is obtained by replacing each component (including edges and coefficients) in \(G\) with its absolute value.

**8.2 Proof of Lemma 8.1**

In this subsection, we prove Lemma 8.1 using the \(n\)-th order T-expansion.

**Proof of Lemma 8.1.** We rename the indices \(x\) and \(y\) as \(a\) and \(b\). Moreover, following the notations in (2.4), we represent \(a\) and \(b\) by \(\otimes\) and \(\oplus\) in graphs. Applying (3.1) to one \(T_{ab}\) in \(E_{ab}^p\), we obtain that
\[ E_{T_{ab}}^p = E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} \left[ m \Theta_{ab} + m(\Theta_0^{(n)} \Theta)_{ab} \right] G_{bb} + E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} (R_{T}^{(n)})_{ab} \]
\[ + E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} (A_{T}^{(n)})_{ab} + E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} (Q_{T}^{(n)})_{ab} + E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} (E_{fr})_{ab}. \tag{8.18} \]
Using (1.14) and (3.7), we can bound the first term on the right-hand side as
\[ E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} \left[ m \Theta_{ab} + m(\Theta_0^{(n)} \Theta)_{ab} \right] G_{bb} \prec B_{ab} E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1}. \tag{8.19} \]
Next we claim that
\[ (R_{T}^{(n)})_{ab} \prec W^{-d/2+\epsilon_0} B_{ab}. \tag{8.20} \]
Let \(G_{ab}\) be a graph in \((G_{\text{abs}})^{(n-1)}_{ab}\). By Definition 3.2, it has dotted edges connected with \(\otimes\), has a (labelled) diffusive edge connected with \(\oplus\), is of scaling order \(\geq 3\), and is doubly connected in the sense of Definition 2.12. Now combining \(\oplus\) with the internal atoms that are connected to it through dotted edges, we can write \(G_{ab}\) as
\[ G_{ab} = \sum_x \Theta_{ax}(G_0)_{xb}, \]
where the \(\Theta\) edge can be also replaced by a labelled diffusive edge and \((G_0)_{xb}\) is a graph satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 8.4. Then using (1.14) or (2.8) if \(\Theta_{ax}\) is replaced by a labelled diffusive edge, (8.14) and \(\|G(z) - m(z)I_N\|_{w(1,2)} \prec W^{\epsilon_0}\) by the assumptions of Lemma 7.4, we can bound that
\[ |G_{ab}| \prec W^{n_{xb}-3}(-d/2+\epsilon_0)+\epsilon_0 \sum_x B_{ax}B_{xb}A_{xb} \prec W^{n_{xb}-2}(-d/2+\epsilon_0) B_{ab}, \tag{8.21} \]
where \(n_{xb} := \text{ord}((G_0)_{xb})\). \(A_{xb}\) is a positive variable satisfying \(\|A\|_{w(1,2)} \prec 1\), and in the last step we used (8.10) with \((a, b) = (1, 2)\). Using (8.21) and the fact that \(n_{xb} \geq 3\), we conclude (8.20). Now with (8.21), we can bound the second term on the right-hand side of (8.18) as
\[ E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1} (R_{T}^{(n)})_{ab} \prec W^{-d/2+\epsilon_0} B_{ab} E_{T_{ab}}^{p-1}. \tag{8.22} \]
It remains to bound the last three terms on the right-hand side of (8.18). This can be done with the following two claims.
Claim 8.6. Under the setting of Lemma 8.1, we have that
\[
(A_T^{(n)})_{a,b} \prec W^{(n-1)(-d/2+\varepsilon_0)|L_2|/W^2}(B_{ab} + \Phi^2),
\] (8.23)
and
\[
(E_{rr,n,D})_{a,b} \prec W^{D(-d/2+\varepsilon_0)|L_2|/W^2}(B_{ab} + \Phi^2).
\] (8.24)

Claim 8.7. Under the setting of Lemma 8.1, we have that
\[
\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-1}(Q_T^{(n)})_{a,b} \prec \sum_{k=2}^{p} \left[W^{-d/4+\varepsilon_0/2}(B_{ab} + \Phi^2)^2\right]^k \mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-k}.
\] (8.25)

We postpone the proofs of these two claims until we complete the proof of Lemma 8.1. Using Claim 8.6 and the condition \(\varepsilon > 0\), we get that
\[
\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-1} (A_T^{(n)})_{a,b} + (E_{rr,n,D})_{a,b} \prec W^{(n-1)(-d/2+\varepsilon_0)|L_2|/W^2}(B_{ab} + \Phi^2)\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-1} \leq W^{-c_0(n-1)}(B_{ab} + \Phi^2)\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-1}.
\] (8.26)

Combining (8.19), (8.22), (8.25) and (8.26), and using Hölder’s inequality \(\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-k} \leq (\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p})^{\varepsilon_0/2} \), we can bound (8.18) as
\[
\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^p < (B_{ab} + W^{-c_0\Phi^2})^{p \varepsilon_0} + \sum_{k=2}^{p} \left[W^{-c_0}(B_{ab} + \Phi^2)^2\right]^k \mathbb{E}T_{ab}^{p-k},
\] (8.27)
where \(c := \min(c_0 - (n-1)\varepsilon_0, d/4 - \varepsilon_0/2)\) is a positive constant as long as \(\varepsilon_0\) is sufficiently small. Applying Young’s inequality to each term on the right-hand side, we get
\[
\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^p \prec W^{c}(B_{ab} + W^{-c_0\Phi^2})^p + W^{-\varepsilon_0}\mathbb{E}T_{ab}^p \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}T_{ab}^p < W^{\varepsilon_0}(B_{ab} + W^{-c_0\Phi^2}),
\] (8.28)
for any constant \(\varepsilon > 0\). Since \(\varepsilon\) is arbitrary, we conclude (8.2).

For convenience of our proof, we introduce the following notation of \(\Omega\) variables, which satisfy the same properties needed for the proof as off-diagonal \(G\) edges.

Notation 8.8. We will use \(\Omega\) to denote matrices of non-negative random variables satisfying \(\|\Omega\|_{\infty(1,2)} \prec W^{\varepsilon_0}\) and
\[
\Omega_{xy} \prec B^{1/2} + \Phi.
\] (8.29)

In the setting of Lemma 8.1, \(|G_{xy} - m\delta_{xy}|\) and \(\Psi_{xy}\) in (8.3) are both \(\Omega\) variables.

Now we claim the following useful fact: if \(\Omega^{(1)}\) and \(\Omega^{(2)}\) satisfy Notation 8.8, then
\[
\Omega_{\alpha,\beta} := \frac{W^{d/2-\varepsilon_0}}{\Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k)} \sum_x \Omega^{(1)}_{x,\alpha}\Omega^{(2)}_{x,\beta} \prod_{i=1}^k B_{xy_i}, \text{ also satisfies Notation 8.8}.
\] (8.30)

First, notice that by (8.12), we have \(\|\Omega\|_{\infty(1,2)} \prec W^{\varepsilon_0}\). It remains to prove that \(\Omega\) satisfies (8.29). Consider two regions \(\mathcal{I}_1 := \{x : (x-\alpha) \geq (x-\beta)\}\) and \(\mathcal{I}_2 := \{x : (x-\alpha) < (x-\beta)\}\). On \(\mathcal{I}_1\), we have \((x-\alpha) \geq (\alpha-\beta)/2\), which gives that
\[
\Omega^{(1)}_{x,\alpha} < B^{1/2} + \Phi \leq \Omega^{(1)}_{x,\alpha} + \Phi.
\] (8.30)

Together with (8.10), it gives that
\[
\sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \Omega^{(1)}_{x,\alpha} \Omega^{(2)}_{x,\beta} \prod_{i=1}^k B_{xy_i} \prec (B^{1/2} + \Phi) \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \Omega^{(1)}_{x,\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^k B_{xy_i} \prec (B^{1/2} + \Phi) \cdot W^{-d/2} \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k).
\] (8.31)

We have a similar bound for the sum over \(\mathcal{I}_2\). This concludes (8.30). In the proof, it is more convenient to use the following form of (8.30):
\[
\sum_{x_i} B_{y_1 x_1} \cdots B_{y_k x_k} \Omega^{(1)}_{x,\alpha} \Omega^{(2)}_{x,\beta} = W^{-d/2+\varepsilon_0} \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k) \Omega_{\alpha,\beta},
\] (8.31)
for some \(\Omega\) satisfying Notation 8.8.
Proof of Claim 8.6. We only need to consider the graphs in $(A_2^{(>n)})_{ab}$ that are not $\oplus$-recollision graphs, because $\oplus$-recollision graphs have been shown to satisfy (8.21). Any such graph $G_{ab}$ can be written into

$$G_{ab} = \sum_{x, y_1, y_2} \Theta_{ax}(G_0)_{x, y_1 y_2} G_{y_1 b} G_{y_2 b}, \quad G_{ab} = \sum_{x, y} \Theta_{ax}(G_0)_{xy} |G_{yb}|^2, \quad G_{ab} = \sum_{x, y} \Theta_{ax}(G_0)_{xy} \Theta_{yb}, \quad (8.32)$$

or some forms obtained by setting $x$ to be equal to $y$, $y_1$ or $y_2$ and by replacing the $\Theta$ edges with labelled diffusive edges. Here the graphs $G_0$ are doubly connected graphs without external atoms in the sense of Definition 2.12. Using (8.14), we can bound the second and third terms of (8.32) as

$$|G_{ab}| \lesssim W^{(n \rho_x - 3) - d/2 + \varepsilon_0} \sum_{x, y} B_{ax} B_{xy} \lesssim W^{(n \rho_x - 2) - d/2 + \varepsilon_0} \sum_y B_{ay} \lesssim W^{(n \rho_x - 2) - d/2 + \varepsilon_0} (\frac{1}{W^4(a - b)^{d-4}} + \frac{L^2}{W^2} \bar{\Phi}^2) \lesssim W^{(n - 1) - (d/2 + \varepsilon_0)} \frac{L^2}{W^2} \bar{\Phi}^2, \quad (8.33)$$

where $n := \text{ord}((G_0)_{xy})$. Here in the second and third steps we used the simple bounds

$$\sum_{x, y} B_{ax} B_{xy} \lesssim W^{-d/2} B_{ay}, \quad \sum_y B_{ay} \lesssim \frac{1}{W^4(a - b)^{d-4}}, \quad \sum_y B_{ay} \lesssim \frac{L^2}{W^2},$$

and in the fourth step we used $\text{ord}((G_0)_{xy}) = \text{ord}(G_{ab}) \geq n + 1$ and $(a - b) \lesssim L$. It remains to bound the first expression in (8.32). (The variants of (8.32) obtained by setting $x$ to be equal to $y$, $y_1$ or $y_2$ and by replacing the $\Theta$ edges with labelled diffusive edges can be estimated in similar ways, so we omit the details.)

By (1.9), (1.14), (2.3) and (2.8), we have the following maximum bounds on the deterministic edges:

$$\max_{x, y} |S_{xy}^\pm| = O(W^{-d}), \quad \max_{x, y} \Theta_{xy} = O(W^{-d}), \quad \max_{x, y} |\Theta \varepsilon_{2k_1} \Theta \varepsilon_{2k_2} \Theta \varepsilon_{2k_3} \Theta| < W^{-kd/2}, \quad (8.34)$$

where $k := \sum_{i=1}^{l} 2k_i - 2(l - 1)$. For simplicity, we will use $\alpha \sim_M \beta$ to mean that “atoms $\alpha$ and $\beta$ belong to the same molecule”. Suppose there are $\ell$ internal molecules $M_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, in $G_0$. We choose one atom in each $M_i$, say $x_i$, as a representative. For definiteness, we assume that $x$, $y_1$ and $y_2$ belong to different molecules. Otherwise, the proof will be easier and we omit the details. Throughout the following proof, we fix a small constant $\tau > 0$ and a large constant $D > 0$. For any $\alpha \sim_M x_i$, it suffices to assume that

$$|\alpha - x_i| \lesssim W^{1 + \tau/2}, \quad (8.35)$$

because otherwise the graph is smaller than $W^{-D}$. Then under the assumption (8.35), for $\alpha_i \sim_M x_i$ and $\alpha_j \sim_M x_j$, by (1.14), (8.5) and (2.8) we have that

$$|G_{\alpha_i \alpha_j}| < W^{d\tau} \Psi_{x,x_j}(\tau, D), \quad \Theta_{\alpha_i \alpha_j} < W^{d\tau/2} B_{x_i x_j}, \quad (8.36)$$

$$|\Theta \varepsilon_{2k_1} \Theta \varepsilon_{2k_2} \Theta \varepsilon_{2k_3} \Theta| < W^{-(k - 2)d/2 + (d - 2)\tau/2} B_{x_i x_j}. \quad (8.37)$$

The above estimates show that we can bound edges between different molecules with $\Psi$ or $B$ variables that only contain the representative atoms $x_i$ in their indices.

We first bound the edges between different molecules. Due to the doubly connected property of $G_0$, we can pick two spanning trees of the black net and blue net, which we refer to as the black tree and blue tree, respectively. We bound the internal edges that are not in the two trees with the maximum norms:

(i) we bound each solid edge that is not in the blue tree by $O_{\sim}(W^{-d/2 + \varepsilon_0})$;

(ii) we bound each diffusive edge that is not in the black tree and blue tree by $O_{\sim}(W^{-d})$;

(iii) we bound each labelled diffusive edge that is not in the black tree and blue tree by $O_{\sim}(W^{-kd/2})$, where $k$ is the scaling order of this edge.

We bound the external edges and edges in the two trees as follows:
(iv) the blue solid and diffusive edges in the two trees and the external edges \( \Theta_{x_i} \), \( G_{yi,b} \) and \( G_{yj,b} \) are bounded using \( (8.36) \) and \( (8.37) \).

In this way, we can bound that

\[
|G_{ab}| < W^{-n_1d/2+n_2\tau+n_3\ell_0} \sum_{x_1, \ldots, x_\ell} \Gamma_{\text{global}}(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell) \prod_{i=1}^\ell |G_{x_i}^{(i)}|,
\]  

(8.38)

where \( W^{-n_1d/2+n_2\tau+n_3\ell_0} \) is a factor coming from the above items (i)–(iv); \( \Gamma_{\text{global}} \) is a product of blue solid edges that represent \( \Psi \) entries, and (black or blue) double-line edges that represent \( B \) entries; each \( G_{x_i}^{(i)} \) is the subgraph inside the molecule \( M_i \), which has \( x_i \) as an external atom. The local structures \( G_{x_i}^{(i)} \) can be bounded as follows:

- we bound each waved or diffusive edge by \( O_{\ell}(W^{-d}) \) using the maximum bounds in \( (8.34) \);
- we bound each labelled diffusive edge by \( O_{\ell}(W^{-kd/2}) \), where \( k \) is its scaling order;
- we bound each off-diagonal \( G \) edge and light \( G \) weight by \( O_{\ell}(W^{-d/2+\tau_0}) \);
- we bound each summation over an internal atom in \( M_i \setminus \{ x_i \} \) by \( O(W^{(1+\tau/2)d}) \) due to \( (8.35) \).

Thus with the definition of scaling order in \( (2.12) \), we get that

\[
|G_{x_i}^{(i)}| < W^{-\text{ord}(G_{x_i}^{(i)})d/2+l_i\varepsilon_0+k_i\ell_0/2},
\]  

(8.39)

where \( l_i \) is the number of off-diagonal \( G \) edges and light weights in \( G_{x_i}^{(i)} \), and \( k_i \) is the number of internal atoms. Finally, for convenience of proof, we bound each diffusive edge in the blue (but not black) tree of \( \Gamma_{\text{global}}(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell) \) as

\[
B_{x_i,x_j} \leq W^{-d/2}B_{x_i,x_j}^{1/2}.
\]  

(8.40)

(This is solely because we can express both the \( \Psi \) and \( B^{1/2} \) entries using the Notation \( (8.8) \) ) Plugging \( (8.39) \) and \( (8.40) \) into \( (8.38) \), we obtain that

\[
G_{ab} < W^{(n_{ab}-\ell-1)(-d/2+\varepsilon_0)}n_1\tau(G_{ab})_{\text{aux}}, \quad \text{with} \quad n_{ab} := \text{ord}(G_{ab}),
\]  

(8.41)

where \( n_{ab} := n_2 + \sum_{i=1}^\ell k_i d/2 \), and the \( n_{ab} - \ell - 1 \) in the exponent can be obtained by counting the number of \( W^{-d/2} \) factors from the above arguments. Here we also used the following fact: by property (ii) of Definition \( 2.5 \), the number of internal atoms in \( G_{ab} \) is smaller than the number of waved and diffusive edges, and hence the number of \( W^{\tau_0} \) factors coming from off-diagonal \( G \) edges and light weights is less than or equal to the number of \( W^{-d/2} \) factors. \( (G_{ab})_{\text{aux}} \) is an auxiliary graph satisfying the following properties:

(i) \( G_{ab} \) has external atoms \( a \) and \( b \), and internal atoms \( x_i, 1 \leq i \leq \ell \), which are the representative atoms of the internal molecules;

(ii) each double-line edge between atoms \( x \) and \( y \) represents a \( B_{xy} \) factor, and each blue solid edge between atoms \( x \) and \( y \) represents a variable satisfying Notation \( (8.8) \);

(iii) there is a spanning tree of black double-line edges, and \( \otimes \) is connected to an internal atom through a double-line edge (which corresponds to the edge \( \Theta_{x_i} \) in \( G_{ab} \));

(iv) there is a spanning tree of blue solid edges, and \( \oplus \) is connected to internal atoms through two blue solid edges (which correspond to the edges \( G_{yi,b} \) and \( G_{yj,b} \) in \( G_{ab} \)).

Now we choose an atom connected to \( \oplus \) as the root of the blue spanning tree. Then we sum over the internal atoms in \( (G_{ab})_{\text{aux}} \) from the leaves to this root. Without loss of generality, assume that we sum over the internal atoms according to the order \( \sum_{x_\ell} \cdots \sum_{x_2} \sum_{x_1} \), such that atom \( x_\ell \) is the root. For simplicity of notations, we denote all the blue solid edges appearing in the proof by \( \Omega \), including the \( \Psi \) and \( B^{1/2} \) edges in \( (G_{ab})_{\text{aux}} \) and the new edges coming from applications of \( (8.30) \). All these \( \Omega \) variables satisfy Notation \( (8.8) \) and their exact forms may change from one line to another.
We sum over the internal atoms one by one. For the sum over $x_1$, using \eqref{eq:8.31} (if $x_1$ is connected with $\oplus$) or \eqref{eq:8.10} (if $x_1$ is not connected with $\oplus$), we can bound $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ as

$$(G_{ab})_{aux} \approx W^{-d/2+\varepsilon_0} \sum_{k=1}^{n_2} (G_{ab,k}^{(1)})_{aux},$$

where $(G_{ab,k}^{(1)})_{aux}$ are auxiliary graphs obtained by replacing the edges connected to $x_1$ with the graphs on the right-hand side of \eqref{eq:8.31} or \eqref{eq:8.10}, and $n_2$ is the number of atoms connected to $x_1$ through double-line edges. More precisely, after summing over $x_1$, we get rid of the blue solid edge connected with $x_1$. If $\oplus$ and $x_1$ are connected through a blue solid edge in $(G_{ab})_{aux}$, then in each new graph $\oplus$ is connected to the parent of $x_1$ on the blue tree through a blue solid edge. Moreover, suppose $w_1, \ldots, w_{n_1}$ are the atoms connected to $x_1$ through double-line edges. Then corresponding to the $n_1$ terms in $\Gamma(w_1, \ldots, w_{n_1})$, the atoms $w_1, \ldots, w_{n_1}$ are now connected to one of them, say $w_k$, through double-line edges in the new graphs, which leads to the $n_1$ different choices in \eqref{eq:8.42}. Now it is important to observe that each new graph $(G_{ab,k}^{(1)})_{aux}$ is doubly connected in the following sense: there is a black spanning tree connecting all the internal atoms and $\oplus$, and a disjoint blue spanning tree connecting all the internal atoms and $\otimes$. Furthermore, there are at least two blue solid edges connected with $\oplus$ in $(G_{ab,k}^{(1)})_{aux}$.

Then we sum over the atoms $x_2, \ldots, x_{l-1}$ one by one using \eqref{eq:8.31} or \eqref{eq:8.10}. At each step, we gain a $W^{-d/2+\varepsilon_0}$ factor and reduce a graph into a sum of several new graphs, each of which has one fewer atom, a black spanning tree connecting all the internal atoms and $\oplus$, a blue spanning tree connecting all the internal atoms and $\otimes$, and two blue solid edges connected with $\oplus$. In the following figure, we give one example of the graph reduction process by summing over the internal atoms $x_1, x_2, x_3$.

Finally, we get a graph with only one internal atom $x_1$, one double-line edge between $\otimes$ and $x_1$, and two blue solid edges between $\oplus$ and $x_1$. Hence using \eqref{eq:8.29}, we can bound \eqref{eq:8.41} as

$$|G_{ab}| \approx W^{(n_{ab} - 2)(-d/2+\varepsilon_0)+n_4\tau} \sum_{x\in E} B_{ax} \left(B_{xb} + \overline{\Phi}^2\right) \lesssim W^{(n-1)(-d/2+\varepsilon_0)+n_4\tau} \frac{L^2}{W} \left(B_{ab} + \overline{\Phi}^2\right),$$

where we used $n_{ab} \geq n + 1$ and a similar argument as in \eqref{eq:8.33}. Since $\tau$ is arbitrary, we can bound the first case in \eqref{eq:8.32} by the right-hand side of \eqref{eq:8.23}. This concludes the proof.

**Proof of Claim 8.7** We only consider the graphs in $(Q^{(n)}_T)_{ab,bb}$ that are not $\oplus$-recollision graphs, because $\oplus$-recollision graphs are much easier to deal with and we omit the details. Let $G_{ab}$ be such a $Q$-graph. We need to bound the graph $ET_{ab}^{-1}G_{ab}$. In the following proof, we call the $2(p-1)$ solid edges in $T_{ab}^{p-1}$ external solid edges, and we regard the atoms $x$ in $T_{ab} = \{m\}^2 \sum_s s_{ax} |G_{xb}|^2$ as an atom in the external $\otimes$ molecule.

We perform the $Q$-expansion in Section 4.4 to $T_{ab}^{p-1}G_{ab}$ and get that

$$\mathbb{E} T_{ab}^{p-1} G_{ab} = \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=2}^{p} T_{ab}^{p-k} \sum_{\omega} (G^{(k)}_{ab})_{cd} + \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=2}^{p} T_{ab}^{p-k} \sum_{\zeta} (G^{(k)}_{err,\zeta})_{ab}. \tag{8.43}$$

Each $(G^{(k)}_{ab})_{cd}$ is a normal regular graph satisfying the following properties.

(1) $(G^{(k)}_{ab})_{cd}$ contains no $P/Q$ labels.

(2) The subgraph induced on the internal molecules is doubly connected.

(3) $\otimes$ is connected to the internal molecules through a (labelled) diffusive edge.
(4) Let the atom in the $Q$-label of $G_{ab}$ be $\alpha$. There are $r, k-1 \leq r \leq 2(k-1)$, external edges (coming from $(k-1)$ many $T_{ab}$ variables) that become paths of two external solid edges in the molecular graph from the $\otimes$ molecule to the molecule containing $\alpha$, and from the molecule containing $\alpha$ to the $\oplus$ molecule.

(5) Besides the external solid edges in (4), the internal molecules are also connected to $\oplus$ through a diffusive edge, or a blue solid edge and a red solid edge (which correspond to the two solid edges connected with $\oplus$ in $G_{ab}$). In the latter case, we call the two solid edges special solid edges.

Each graph $(G_{\omega}^{(k)})_{ab}$ is of scaling order $> 2k + D$ and satisfies the above properties (2)-(5) (but it may contain $P/Q$ labels). For convenience of presentation, whenever we refer to external solid edges in the following proof, they do not include the special solid edges in (5). In the rest of the proof, we estimate the graphs $(G_{\omega}^{(k)})_{ab}$, while the graphs $(G_{\omega}^{(k)})_{ab}$ can be bounded in the same way. Moreover, we only consider the hardest case: (a) there are no dotted edges connected with $\oplus$ or $\otimes$ in $(G_{\omega}^{(k)})_{ab}$; (b) in the above item (5), $\oplus$ is connected to the internal molecules through a blue solid edge and a red solid edge. The cases where (a) or (b) does not hold are all easier to bound.

We will follow similar arguments as in the above proof of Claim 8.6. More precisely, given any graph $(G_{\omega}^{(k)})_{ab}$, we first pick two spanning trees of the black net and blue net. Then we bound the internal edges that are not in the two trees by their maximum norms, and bound the local structures inside the internal molecules by 8.39. Furthermore, we bound the external edges, special solid edges and the internal edges that belong to the two trees using 8.36, 8.37 and 8.40. Finally, we can reduce the problem to bounding an auxiliary graph $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ satisfying the following properties:

(i) $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ has two external atoms $a$ and $b$, and internal atoms $x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, which are the representative atoms of the internal molecules;

(ii) each double-line edge between atoms $x$ and $y$ represents a $B_{xy}$ factor, and each blue solid edge between atoms $x$ and $y$ represents a variable satisfying Notation 8.8;

(iii) each external or special solid edge between two molecules in $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ is replaced by an external blue solid edge between the representative atoms of these molecules in $(G_{ab})_{aux}$;

(iv) the subgraph of $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ induced on the internal atoms has a spanning tree of black double-line edges and a spanning tree of blue solid edges;

(v) in $(G_{ab})_{aux}$, $\otimes$ is connected to the internal atoms through a black double-line edge, and $\oplus$ is connected to the internal atoms through two special blue solid edges;

(vi) in $(G_{ab})_{aux}$, there are $2(k-1) - r$ blue solid edges between $a$ and $b$, $r$ blue solid edges between $a$ and $x_\ell$, and $r$ blue solid edges between $b$ and $x_\ell$, where $x_\ell$ is the representative atom of the molecule containing $\alpha$.

Since $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ is of scaling order $> 2k + D$, we only need to estimate $(G_{ab})_{aux}$. Now we choose the atom $x_\ell$, the representative atom of the molecule containing $\alpha$, as the root of the blue spanning tree. Then we sum over the internal atoms in $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ from the leaves to this root. Without loss of generality, assume that we sum over the internal atoms according to the order $\sum_{x_1} \cdots \sum_{x_2} \sum_{x_1}$. For simplicity of notations, we denote all the blue solid edges appearing in the proof by $\Omega$, including the edges in the original graph $(G_{ab})_{aux}$ and the new edges coming from applications of 8.30. All these $\Omega$ variables satisfy Notation 8.8 and their exact forms may change from one line to another. Suppose the two special blue solid edges in (v) connect $\otimes$ to atoms $x_i$ and $x_j$, respectively. We have the following two cases.

Case 1: Suppose the unique path on the blue spanning tree from $x_i$ to $x_j$ passes through $x_\ell$. Then, similar to the proof of Claim 8.6, we sum over the internal atoms and reduce the graphs using 8.10 and 8.51. Finally, we get the following graph with $2(k-1) - r$ blue solid edges between $\otimes$ and $\oplus$, and only one internal atom $x_\ell$, which is connected with $\otimes$ through a black double-line edge and $r$ external solid edges, and with $\oplus$ through two special solid edges and $r$ external solid edges. (To have a clearer picture, we draw two copies of the $\otimes$ and $\oplus$ atoms in the graph.)
Denote this graph by \((\tilde{G}_{ab})_{aux}\). To estimate \((\tilde{G}_{ab})_{aux}\), we consider two regions \(I_1 := \{x_\ell : (x_\ell - a) \geq (x_\ell - b)\}\) and \(I_2 := \{x : (x_\ell - a) < (x_\ell - b)\}\). Then we can bound that

\[
\langle \tilde{G}_{ab}\rangle_{aux} \leq \left( \sum_{x_\ell \in I_1} + \sum_{x_\ell \in I_2} \right) (B_{ax_\ell}|\Omega_{x_\ell b}|^2) (|\Omega_{ax_\ell}|^r|\Omega_{x_\ell b}|^r) |\Omega_{ab}|^{2k-2-r} \\
< \left[ \sum_{x_\ell \in I_1} B_{ax_\ell} \left( B_{x_\ell b} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right) |\Omega_{x_\ell b}|^r + \sum_{x_\ell \in I_2} B_{ax_\ell} \left( B_{x_\ell b} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right) |\Omega_{ax_\ell}|^r \right] \left( B_{ab}^{1/2} + \tilde{\Phi} \right)^{2k-2},
\]

(8.44)

where in the second step we used \((8.29)\), \(\langle x_\ell - a \rangle \geq \langle a - b \rangle / 2\) on \(I_1\) and \(\langle x_\ell - b \rangle \geq \langle a - b \rangle / 2\) on \(I_2\). We bound the sum over \(I_1\) as

\[
\sum_{x_\ell \in I_1} B_{ax_\ell} \left( B_{x_\ell b} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right) |\Omega_{x_\ell b}|^r < W^{r(1)(-d/2 + \varepsilon_0)} \sum_{x_\ell \in I_1} B_{ax_\ell} \left( B_{x_\ell b} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right) |\Omega_{x_\ell b}|^r \\
< W^{r(-d/2 + \varepsilon_0)} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right),
\]

(8.45)

where we used \((8.6)\) in the first step and \((8.10)\) in the second step with \((a, b) = (1, 2)\) and \(\|\Omega\|_{w(1, 2)} < W^\gamma_0\). We have a similar bound for the sum over \(I_2\). Hence we get that

\[
\langle \tilde{G}_{ab}\rangle_{aux} \leq W^{r(-d/2 + \varepsilon_0)} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right) \left( B_{ab}^{1/2} + \tilde{\Phi} \right)^{2k-2} \lesssim W^{r(-d/2 + \varepsilon_0)} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \right)^k.\]

(8.46)

**Case 2:** Suppose the unique path on the blue spanning tree from \(x_i\) to \(x_j\) does not pass through \(x_\ell\). Then, similar to the proof of Claim \(8.6\), we sum over the internal atoms and reduce the graphs using \((8.10)\) and \((8.31)\). At certain step, we will get a graph where the two special blue solid edges are connected with the same internal atom, say \(x_i\). Denote this graph by \((\tilde{G}_{ab})_{aux}\). Then applying \((8.29)\) to the two special edges, we can bound \((\tilde{G}_{ab})_{aux}\) by

\[
\langle \tilde{G}_{ab}\rangle_{aux} \leq \langle \tilde{G}_{ab}^{(1)}\rangle_{aux} + \tilde{\Phi}^2 \langle \tilde{G}_{ab}^{(2)}\rangle_{aux},
\]

(8.47)

where \((\tilde{G}_{ab}^{(1)})_{aux}\) is obtained by replacing the two special edges by a double-line edge between \(x_i\) and \(x_j\), and \((\tilde{G}_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux}\) is obtained by removing the two special edges. In the following figure, we draw one example of graphs \((\tilde{G}_{ab})_{aux}\), \((\tilde{G}_{ab}^{(1)})_{aux}\) and \((\tilde{G}_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux}\).

There is a \(\tilde{\Phi}^2\) factor associated with the third graph \((\tilde{G}_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux}\), but we did not draw it in the graph.

Similar to the proof of Claim \(8.6\), we sum over the internal atoms of \((\tilde{G}_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux}\) from the leaves to the root \(x_\ell\) on the blue tree and reduce the graphs using \((8.10)\) at each step. We will finally get the following graph.
with only one internal atom $x$:  

Denote this graph by $(\tilde G_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux}$. Using similar arguments as in (8.44) and (8.45), we can bound that  

\[
(\tilde G_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux} \prec (\tilde G_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux} \prec \left( \sum_{x \in I_1} B_{ax} \omega_x b \right) + \left( \sum_{x \in I_2} B_{ax} \omega_x \right) \left( B_{ab}^{1/2} + \tilde \Phi \right)^{2k-2} 
\]

\[
\prec \left( \sum_{x \in I_1} B_{ax} \omega_x b + \sum_{x \in I_2} B_{ax} \omega_x \right) W^{r-1} (d/2 + \epsilon_0) \left( B_{ab}^{1/2} + \tilde \Phi \right)^{2k-2} 
\]

\[
\prec W^{r-1} (d/2 + \epsilon_0) \left( B_{ab} + \tilde \Phi^2 \right)^{k-1}. 
\]  

(8.48)

To estimate the graph $(\tilde G_{ab}^{(1)})_{aux}$, we also sum over its internal atoms from the leaves to the root $x$ on the blue tree and reduce the graphs using (8.10) at each step. After each summation, we will get a sum of several new graphs, each of which has a black spanning tree that connects all the internal atoms and the atoms $\otimes$ and $\oplus$. In the end, we get a sum of graphs with only one internal atom $x$. Each of these graphs must take one of the following three forms:  

Graph (a), denoted by $(\tilde G_{ab}^{(a)})_{aux}$, can be bounded using similar arguments as in (8.44) and (8.45):  

\[
(\tilde G_{ab}^{(a)})_{aux} \prec W^{r-1} (d/2 + \epsilon_0) B_{ab} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde \Phi^2 \right)^{k-1}. 
\]

Graph (b), denoted by $(\tilde G_{ab}^{(b)})_{aux}$, can be bounded by  

\[
(\tilde G_{ab}^{(b)})_{aux} \prec B_{ab} (\tilde G_{ab}^{(2)})_{aux} \prec W^{r-1} (d/2 + \epsilon_0) B_{ab} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde \Phi^2 \right)^{k-1}. 
\]

It is trivial to see that this bound also holds for graph (c) denoted by $(\tilde G_{ab}^{(c)})_{aux}$. Combining these estimates, we obtain that  

\[
(\tilde G_{ab}^{(1)})_{aux} \prec (\tilde G_{ab}^{(a)})_{aux} + (\tilde G_{ab}^{(b)})_{aux} + (\tilde G_{ab}^{(c)})_{aux} \prec W^{r-1} (d/2 + \epsilon_0) B_{ab} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde \Phi^2 \right)^{k-1}. 
\]  

(8.49)

Plugging (8.48) and (8.49) into (8.47), we get the estimate (8.46) in case 2.

Finally, combining the above two cases, we conclude from (8.46) that  

\[
(\tilde G_{ab}^{(k)})_{aux} \prec (G_{ab})_{aux} \prec W^{r-1} (d/2 + \epsilon_0) \left( B_{ab} + \tilde \Phi^2 \right)^k \prec \left[ W^{d/4 + \epsilon_0/2} \left( B_{ab} + \tilde \Phi^2 \right) \right]^k, 
\]

where we used $k \geq 2$ and $r \geq k - 1 \geq k/2$ in the last step. Inserting this estimate into (8.43), we can conclude Claim (8.7).
8.3 Proof of Lemma 7.2

The proof of Lemma 7.2 is similar to (and actually much easier than) the one for Lemma 7.4. In the case, by (1.14) we have that for any small constant \( \tau > 0 \) and large constant \( D > 0 \),

\[
\Theta_{xy} \leq \frac{W}{W^d} 1_{|x-y| \leq W^{1+\tau}} + O(W^{-D}). \tag{8.50}
\]

In other words, the \( \Theta \) edge is typically a “short edge” of length \( O(\tau) \).

To prove (8.52), we use the second order \( T \)-expansion (3.8). Using (8.50), (8.51) and (8.1), we can easily bound that

\[
(A_T^{(2)})_{ab} \leq W^{-d/2} \sum_{x,y} \frac{W}{W} \left( B_{ab} + \Phi^2 \right) + W^{-D} \prec W^{-d/2+2d\tau} \left( B_{ab} + \Phi^2 \right). \tag{8.52}
\]

Moreover, we can prove that

\[
\mathbb{E}T_{ab}(z)^p \prec (B_{xy} + W^{-d/4} \Phi^2)^p. \tag{8.52}
\]

To prove (8.52), we use the second order \( T \)-expansion (3.8). Using (8.50), (8.51) and (8.1), we can easily bound that

\[
(A_T^{(2)})_{ab} \leq W^{-d/2} \sum_{x,y} \frac{W}{W} \left( B_{ab} + \Phi^2 \right) + W^{-D} \prec W^{-d/2+2d\tau} \left( B_{ab} + \Phi^2 \right). \tag{8.52}
\]

Moreover, we can prove that

\[
\mathbb{E}T_{ab}(z)^p \prec (B_{xy} + W^{-d/4} \Phi^2)^p. \tag{8.52}
\]

We omit the details since the proof is similar to (and actually much easier than) the one for Claim 8.7. With the above two estimates, we can obtain an estimate similar to (8.27), which gives (8.52) by the argument in (8.28).

9 Continuity estimate

9.1 Proof of Lemma 7.3

Define the subset of indices \( \mathcal{I} = \{ y : |y - x_0| \leq K \} \) for \( x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d \) and \( K \in [W, L/2] \). Then we define the \( \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I} \) positive definite Hermitian matrix \( A = (A_{yy'} : y, y' \in \mathcal{I}) \) by

\[
A_{yy'} := \frac{G_{yy'}(z) - \overline{G_{yy'}(z)}}{2i}. \tag{9.1}
\]

In the proof of Lemma 5.3 in [32], we have obtained the following estimates:

\[
\sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} |G_{xy}(z)|^2 \lesssim \sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} |G_{xy}(z)|^2 + \left( \frac{\eta}{\eta} \right)^2 \|A\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}, \tag{9.2}
\]

\[
\sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} |G_{yz}(z)|^2 \lesssim \sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} |G_{yz}(z)|^2 + \left( \frac{\eta}{\eta} \right)^2 \|A\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}, \tag{9.3}
\]

with high probability. Using (7.5), we can bound that

\[
\sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} (|G_{xy}(z)|^2 + |G_{yz}(z)|^2) \lesssim 1 + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{I}} B_{xy} \lesssim \frac{K^2}{W^2}. \tag{9.4}
\]

In this section, we will prove the following bound.
Lemma 9.1. Suppose the assumptions of Lemma 7.3 hold. Then for any fixed $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and small constant $\varepsilon > 0$, the matrix $A$ in (9.1) satisfies that
\[
\mathbb{E} \text{Tr} \left( A^{2p} \right) \leq K^d \left( W^4 \frac{K^4}{W^4} \right)^{2p-1}. \tag{9.5}
\]

With Lemma 9.1, we obtain that
\[
\mathbb{E} \parallel A \parallel_{\ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2}^{2^p} \leq \mathbb{E} \text{Tr} \left( A^{2p} \right) \leq K^d \left( W^4 \frac{K^4}{W^4} \right)^{2p-1}. \tag{9.6}
\]

Since $p$ can be arbitrarily large, using Markov's inequality we obtain that
\[
\parallel A \parallel_{\ell^2 \rightarrow \ell^2} \leq K^d \frac{W^4}{W^4}. \tag{9.6}
\]

Inserting (9.4) and (9.6) into (9.2) and (9.3), we conclude (7.6). The proof of (7.7) uses a standard perturbation and union bound argument, which has been given in [32]. Hence we omit the details.

9.2 Non-universal $T$-expansion

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Lemma 9.1. Recall that the matrix $A$ is defined using $G(\bar{z})$. Hence the $G$ edges in the following proof all represent $G(\bar{z})$ entries, and they satisfy the local law (7.5). The proof of Lemma 9.1 is based on an intricate expansion of the graphs in $\text{Tr} (A^{2p})$, which is an extension of Strategy 6.6. In this section, we further expand the $n$-th order $T$-expansion and obtain a non-universal $T$-expansion, which expands $T_{a,b_1,b_2}$ into a sum of deterministic graphs (more precisely, graphs whose maximal subgraphs are deterministic) and $Q$-graphs. In other words, we will further expand the graphs in $(R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a,b_1,b_2}$ and $(A_{IT}^{(\geq n)})_{a,b_1,b_2}$ into deterministic graphs plus $Q$-graphs. As we will see later, the expansion is called non-universal because it depends on $L$ explicitly, and the graphs in the expansion are bounded properly only when the condition (3.15) holds.

To get a non-universal $T$-expansion, we apply Strategy 6.6 to the graphs in $(R_{IT}^{(n)})_{a,b_1,b_2}$ and $(A_{IT}^{(\geq n)})_{a,b_1,b_2}$ with the following stopping rules: we will stop expanding a graph when it has a deterministic maximal subgraph, it is a $Q$-graph, or its scaling order is larger than a large enough constant $D > 0$. However, there is one scenario which is not covered by Strategy 6.6 that is, at a certain step we have to expand a pivotal edge and hence break the double connected property. This is the main difficulty with our proof in this section. We will design an expansion strategy so that in the end all the non-doubly connected graphs in the non-universal $T$-expansion can be bounded properly under the condition (3.15).

Although some graphs may not be doubly connected, all graphs in the expansions will automatically have a black net. On the other hand, the subset of blue and red solid edges may not contain a spanning tree and can be separated into disjoint components. For simplicity, we summarize these properties in the following definition.

**Definition 9.2.** We say a subgraph $G$ without external atoms has (at most) $k_0 \equiv k_0(G)$ many components if there exist three disjoint collections of edges in the molecular graph $G_M$ such that the following properties hold.

(i) $B_{\text{black}}$ is a black net consisting of diffusive edges.

(ii) $B_{\text{blue}}$ is a blue net consisting of blue solid (i.e. plus $G$) and diffusive edges.

(iii) $R_{\text{red}}$ is a red net consisting of red solid (i.e. minus $G$) edges.

(iv) There are $k_0$ disjoint components in the molecular subgraph consisting of the edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \cup R_{\text{red}}$. (By definition, a component means a subgraph in which any two molecules are connected to each other by a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \cup R_{\text{red}}$, and which is connected to no additional molecules in the rest of the graph.)

A graph $G$ with external atoms is said to have $k_0$ many components if its maximal subgraph with all external atoms removed has $k_0$ many components.
If a graph has only one component, then Lemma 8.4 applies to it. In general, we have the following lemma for graphs with more than one component.

**Lemma 9.3.** Under the assumptions of Lemma 7.3, let $G$ be a normal regular graph without external atoms and with (at most) $k_0$ components in the sense of Definition 9.2. Pick any two atoms of $G$ and fix their values $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_L^d$. Then the resulting graph $G_{xy}$ satisfies that

$$|G_{xy}| \lesssim \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_0-1} W^{-(n_{xy}-2)d/2} \frac{1}{(x-y)^d},$$

(9.7)

where $n_{xy} := \text{ord}(G_{xy})$ is the scaling order of $G_{xy}$. This bound holds also for the graph $G^{\text{aux}}$.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the one for Lemma 8.4 in [32] and the one for Claim 8.6 in Section 8. Hence we will only explain the main differences instead of writing down all the details. First, we pick a spanning tree of blue solid edges in $B_{\text{black}}$, and a spanning tree of blue and red edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \cup R_{\text{red}}$ for each component. Then similar to the proof of Claim 8.6 we can reduce the problem to bounding an auxiliary graph $(G_{xy})_{\text{aux}}$ satisfying the following properties:

- $G_{xy}$ has two external atoms $x$ and $y$, and internal atoms $x_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, which are the representative atoms of the internal molecules;
- there is a spanning tree of black double-line edges connecting all atoms, where a double-line edge between atoms $\alpha$ and $\beta$ represents a $B_{\alpha\beta}$ factor;
- there is a spanning tree of blue solid edges connecting all atoms in each of the $k_0$ components, where a blue solid edge between atoms $\alpha$ and $\beta$ represents a $B_{\alpha\beta}^{1/2}$ factor.

In obtaining the auxiliary graph, we also bound the red solid edges in the spanning trees of the $k_0$ components by $B_{\alpha\beta}^{1/2}$ factors. This is different from the proof of Claim 8.6 where we bound all red solid edges by their maximum norms.

For any spanning tree of blue solid edges in a component of $(G_{xy})_{\text{aux}}$, we choose an atom in it as the root. If a blue tree contains $x$ or $y$, then we choose $x$ or $y$ as the root. For definiteness, we assume that $x$ and $y$ belong to different blue trees in the following proof. The case where $x$ and $y$ belong to the same tree can be handled in a similar way, and we omit the relevant details. Now we sum over the atoms in a spanning tree from leaves to the root. Similar to the proof of Claim 8.6 we bound each sum over an internal atom using (8.10) and (8.11) with $(a, b) = (1, 1)$. After summing over all internal atoms in one component except for the root, we turn to the blue spanning tree of the next component and sum over its internal atoms from leaves to the chosen root. After summing over the non-root atoms in all components, we will obtain a graph, say $(G_{xy})_{\text{aux}}$, satisfying the following properties:

- it has two external atoms $x$, $y$ and $k_0 - 2$ internal atoms, which are the roots of the $k_0$ blue trees;
- it has a spanning tree of black diffusive edges connecting all atoms.

We sum over the internal atoms, say $x_1, \cdots, x_{k_0-2}$, of the graph $(\tilde{G}_{xy})_{\text{aux}}$ one by one, and bound each summation using the simple estimate

$$\sum_{x_i} B_{y_1x_i} \cdots B_{y_kx_i} \lesssim \frac{L^2}{W^2} \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_k).$$

(9.8)

In $(\tilde{G}_{xy})_{\text{aux}}$, we have a black spanning tree connecting all internal atoms. By (9.8), after each summation, we get a graph with one fewer internal atom, an additional $L^2/W^2$ factor and a black spanning tree connecting all atoms. After summing over all the $k_0 - 2$ internal atoms, we get a graph where $x$ is connected to $y$ through a double-line edge, i.e.,

$$(\tilde{G}_{xy})_{\text{aux}} \lesssim \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_0-2} B_{xy} \lesssim \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_0-1} \frac{1}{(x-y)^d}.$$

Finally, by counting the number of $W^{-d/2}$ factors carefully, we can obtain (9.7).

\[\Box\]
For our purpose, the weakest bound required for a graph $G_{xy}$ satisfying the setting of Lemma 9.3 is $(x - y)^{-d}$. Hence we need to make sure that the factor $W^{-(n_{xy} - 2)d/2}$ is small enough to cancel the $(L^2/W^2)^{k_0-1}$ factor. By condition (3.15), if we have $n_{xy} \geq (n - 1) \cdot (k_0 - 1) + 2$, then (9.7) gives

$$|G_{xy}| < \frac{W^{-(k_0-1)c_0}}{(x - y)^d}.$$ 

Thus in expansions, we need to make sure that the scaling orders of the graphs are sufficiently high depending on the number of components in them. For this purpose, we introduce the following helpful tool.

**Definition 9.4 (Ghost edges).** We use a green dashed edge between atoms $x$ and $y$ to represent a $W^2/L^2$ factor, and we call such an edge a **ghost edge**. We do not count the ghost edges when calculating the scaling order of a graph, i.e. the scaling order of a ghost edge is 0. Moreover, the doubly connected property in Definition 2.12, the SPD property in Definition 5.9, and the globally standard property in Definition 6.2 can be extended to graphs with ghost edges by including these edges into blue nets.

To keep graph values unchanged, whenever we add a ghost edge to a graph, we always multiply it by $L^2/W^2$ to cancel this edge. In a doubly connected graph with $k_0$ ghost edges, removing all of them gives at most $k_0 + 1$ many components. Hence with Lemma 9.3, we immediately obtain the following estimate.

**Lemma 9.5.** Under the assumptions of Lemma 7.3, let $G$ be a doubly connected normal regular graph without external atoms and with $k_{gh}$ many ghost edges. Pick any two atoms of $G$ and fix their values $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d$. Then the resulting graph $G_{xy}$ satisfies that

$$|G_{xy}| \approx \left(\frac{L^2}{W^2}\right)^{k_{gh}} \frac{W^{-(n_{xy} - 2)d/2}}{(x - y)^d},$$

where $n_{xy} := \text{ord}(G_{xy})$ is the scaling order of $G_{xy}$. This bound holds also for the graph $G^\text{abs}$.

Ghost edges are introduced to deal with expansions of pivotal blue solid edges (recall Definition 5.5). We have avoided such expansions in the proof of Theorem 3.7, but they are necessary for constructing non-universal $T$-expansions. Roughly speaking, when we expand a pivotal blue solid edge in a graph, we will add a ghost edge between its two ending atoms and multiply the graph by $L^2/W^2$ to keep the graph value unchanged. Then this pivotal edge becomes redundant, and we can make use of the tools developed in Sections 5 and 6. In this way, we do not have to rebuild a new set of graphical tools from scratch. However, different from Strategy 6.6 we also need to keep track of the scaling orders of our graphs carefully to make sure that they are high enough to cancel the $L^2/W^2$ factors associated with the ghost edges. To deal with this issue, we will introduce some new graphical tools.

To define the non-universal $T$-expansions, we first define the **generalized SPD property**, extending the SPD property in Definition 5.9. For simplicity of notations, we call an isolated subgraph plus its external edges (including the ending atoms of them) the closure of this isolated subgraph.

**Definition 9.6 (Generalized SPD property).** A graph $G$ with ghost edges is said to be a generalized sequentially pre-deterministic graph if the following properties hold.

(i) $G$ is doubly connected by including the ghost edges into the blue net.

(ii) $G$ contains at most one sequence of proper isolated subgraphs with non-deterministic closures. (By definition, an isolated subgraph has a non-deterministic closure if this subgraph contains $G$ edges and weights inside it, or it is connected with at least one external $G$ or $G^\text{abs}$ edge.)

(iii) The maximal subgraph $G_{\text{max}}$ or an isolated subgraph $I$ of $G$ is pre-deterministic if it has no proper isolated subgraph with non-deterministic closure. Otherwise, let $I'$ be its maximal isolated subgraph with non-deterministic closure. If we replace $I'$ and its two external edges with a single diffusive edge in the molecular graph without red solid edges, then $G_{\text{max}}$ or $I$ becomes pre-deterministic.

The only difference from Definition 5.9 is that property (ii) of Definition 9.6 is restricted to the sequence of isolated subgraphs with non-deterministic closures. In other words, a proper isolated subgraph of $G$ may have several other sequences of deterministic isolated subgraphs. Now we are ready to state the main result of this subsection on non-universal $T$-expansions.
Lemma 9.7 (Non-universal T-expansions). Suppose the assumptions of Lemma 7.3 hold. For any large constant $D > 0$, $T_{a,b_1b_2}$ can be expanded into a sum of $O(1)$ many graphs:

$$
T_{a,b_1b_2} = m\Theta_{ab_1}\overline{G}_{b_1b_2} + \sum_{\mu} B^{(\mu)}_{ab_1} G_{b_1b_2} f_\mu(G_{b_1b_2}) + \sum_{\mu} \tilde{B}^{(\nu)}_{ab_2} G_{b_2b_1} f_\nu(G_{b_2b_1}) \\
+ \sum_{\mu} B^{(\mu)}_{a,b_1b_2} g_\mu(G_{b_1b_2}, G_{b_2b_1}, \overline{G}_{b_1b_2}, G_{b_2b_1}) + Q_{a,b_1b_2} + \mathcal{E} \epsilon_{a,b_1b_2}. 
$$

(9.10)

The graphs on the right-hand side depend on $n$, $D$, $W$ and $L$, directly, and satisfy the following properties.

(i) $\mathcal{E} \epsilon_{a,b_1b_2}$ is an error term satisfying $\mathcal{E} \epsilon_{a,b_1b_2} \prec W^{-D}$.

(ii) $B^{(\omega)}_{ab_1}$ and $\tilde{B}^{(\nu)}_{ab_2}$ are deterministic graphs satisfying

$$
|B^{(\mu)}_{ab_1}| \prec W^{-c_1} B_{ab_1}, \quad |\tilde{B}^{(\nu)}_{ab_2}| \prec W^{-c_1} B_{ab_2},
$$

under the condition \[3.15\], where $c_1 := \min(c_0, d/2)$.

(iii) $\overline{D}^{(\mu)}_{ab_1}$ are deterministic graphs of the form $\sum_x \overline{B}^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}$, where $\overline{B}^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}$ satisfies

$$
|\overline{B}^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}| \prec B_{x,b_1b_2},
$$

and $D^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}$ is doubly connected with $x$, $b_1$ and $b_2$ regarded as internal atoms and satisfies

$$
\text{ord}(D^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}) \geq k_{gh}(D^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}) \cdot (n - 1) + 2.
$$

(9.13)

Here $k_{gh}(D^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2})$ denotes the number of ghost edges in $D^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1b_2}$.

(iv) $f_\mu$ are monomials of $G_{b_1b_1}$ and $\overline{G}_{b_1b_1}$, $\tilde{f}_\nu$ are monomials of $G_{b_2b_1}$ and $\overline{G}_{b_2b_1}$, and $g_\mu$ are monomials of $G_{b_1b_1}$, $\overline{G}_{b_1b_1}$, $G_{b_2b_2}$, $\overline{G}_{b_2b_2}$, $G_{b_1b_2}$, $G_{b_2b_1}$ and $G_{b_1b_1}$.

(v) $Q_{a,b_1b_2}$ is a sum of $O(1)$ many $Q$-graphs, denoted by $Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}$, satisfying the following properties.

(a) $Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}$ is a generalized SPD graph.

(b) The atom in the $Q$-label of $Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}$ belongs to the MIS with non-deterministic closure, denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{\text{min}}$. In other words, we can write that

$$
Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2} = \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_{gh}(Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2})} \sum_\alpha Q_\alpha(G^{(\omega)}),
$$

where $k_{gh}(Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2})$ denotes the number of ghost edges in $Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}$, $G^{(\omega)}$ is a graph without $P/Q$ labels, and the internal atom $\alpha$ is inside $\mathcal{T}_{\text{min}}$.

(c) The scaling order of $Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}$ satisfies

$$
\text{ord}(Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}) \geq k_{gh}(Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}) \cdot (n - 1) + 2.
$$

(9.14)

(vi) Each $Q^{(\omega)}_{a,b_1b_2}$ has a deterministic graph $B^{(\omega)}_{ax}$ between $\otimes$ and an internal atom $x$, where $B^{(\omega)}_{ax}$ satisfies

$$
|B^{(\omega)}_{ax}| \prec B_{ax}.
$$

(9.15)

Moreover, there is at least an edge, which is either plus $G$ or diffusive or dotted, connected to $\oplus$, and there is at least an edge, which is either minus $G$ or diffusive or dotted, connected to $\ominus$. 
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To prove Lemma 9.7, we start with the $n$-th order $T$-expansion (3.1). The term $m(\Theta \Sigma^{(n)}_T)_{ab} G_{b, b_2}$ can be included into the second term on the right-hand side of (9.10). $(Q^{(n)}_T)_{a, b, b_2}$ can be included into $Q_{a, b, b_2}$ and $(\text{Err}_{n,D})_{a, b, b_2}$ can be included into $\text{Err}_{a, b, b_2}$. It remains to expand the graphs in $(R^{(n)}_T)_{a, b, b_2}$ and $(A^{(n)}_T)_{a, b, b_2}$. We will again use the Strategy 6.6, but with some modifications to handle the ghost edges and to keep track of the scaling orders of graphs (see Strategy 9.8 below).

To describe the expansion strategy, we now define the stopping rules. Given a graph $G$, we define

$$\text{size}(G) := \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_{gh}(G)} W^{-\text{ord}(G) - d/2},$$

(9.16)

where $k_{gh}(G)$ denotes the number of ghost edges in $G$. By Lemma 9.5, we have $|G| \preceq \text{size}(G)$ if $G$ is doubly connected. Given the large constant $D$ in Lemma 9.7, we stop expanding a graph $G$ if it is normal regular and satisfies at least one of the following properties:

(T1) $G$ has a deterministic maximal subgraph, which contains a standard neutral atom connected with a pair of external plus and minus $G$ edges;

(T2) $\text{size}(G) \leq W^{-D};$

(T3) $G$ is a $Q$-graph.

Then, similar to Strategy 6.6, the core of the expansion strategy for the proof of Lemma 9.7 is still to expand the plus $G$ edges according to a pre-deterministic order in the MIS with non-deterministic closure. However, there is a key difference that we have to expand a pivotal blue solid edge connected with an isolated subgraph at a certain step. To deal with this issue, we add a ghost edge between the ending atoms of the pivotal edge which we want to expand. Then this blue solid edge becomes redundant, and we can expand it in the same way as Step 3 of Strategy 6.6. However, we need to make sure that every graph, say $G$, from the expansion has a scaling order satisfying

$$\text{ord}(G) \geq (n - 1) \cdot k_{gh}(G) + 2.$$
Definition 9.9 (Generalized globally standard graphs). We say a graph \( G \) is generalized globally standard (GGS) if it is a generalized SPD graph and satisfies at least one of the following properties.

(A) \( G \) satisfies
\[
\text{ord}(G) \geq (n - 1) \cdot |k_{gh}(G)| + 2.
\] (9.17)

(B) \( G \) satisfies
\[
\text{ord}(G) \geq (n - 1) \cdot k_{gh}(G) + 2.
\] (9.18)

Let \( I_k \) be the minimal strongly isolated subgraph with non-deterministic closure. (In other words, \( I_k \) may contain weakly isolated subgraphs, but a proper strongly isolated subgraph of \( I_k \) must have a deterministic closure.) There exists a ghost edge, say \( g_0 \), inside \( I_k \) such that the following property holds.

(B1) Let \( I' \) be the minimal isolated subgraph of \( I_k \) that contains \( g_0 \). (\( I' \) can be \( I_k \) if \( g_0 \) is not inside any proper isolated subgraph of \( I_k \).) If we replace the closure of the maximal proper isolated subgraph of \( I' \) and all other blue solid edges in \( I' \) with diffusive edges, then \( g_0 \) becomes redundant.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.7 in Section 6, Lemma 9.7 follows from the following two facts:

- if the input graph is GGS, then after one step of expansion in Strategy 9.8, all the resulting non-Q graphs are still GGS and all the Q-graphs satisfy property (v) of Lemma 9.7.
- the expansion of \( T_{a,b_1,b_2} \) will stop after \( O(1) \) many iterations of Strategy 9.8.

We postpone the detailed proof of Lemma 9.7 to Appendix B.

9.3 Generalized doubly connected property

In this subsection, we develop another tool for the proof of Lemma 9.1, that is, a generalized doubly connected property of graphs with external atoms, which extends the doubly connected property in Definition 2.12.

Definition 9.10 (Generalized doubly connected property). A graph \( G \) with external molecules is said to be generalized doubly connected if its molecular graph satisfies the following property. There exist a collection, say \( B_{\text{black}} \), of diffusive edges, and another collection, say \( B_{\text{blue}} \), of blue solid, diffusive or ghost edges such that:

(a) \( B_{\text{black}} \cap B_{\text{blue}} = \emptyset \),

(b) each internal molecule connects to external molecules through a path of edges in \( B_{\text{black}} \) and a path of edges in \( B_{\text{blue}} \).

Given a generalized doubly connected graph \( G \), after removing its external molecules we do not get a doubly connected graph in the sense of Definition 2.12 (i.e., the maximal subgraph of \( G \) consisting of internal molecules may not have a black net and a blue net). For example, the following graph is a generalized doubly connected graph with external molecules \( a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \) and internal molecules \( x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 \), but it is not doubly connected.

However, by Definition 9.10 if we merge all external molecules in a generalized doubly connected graph into a single internal molecule, then we will get a doubly connected graph in the sense of Definition 2.12.

Generalized doubly connected graphs satisfy the following bound.

Lemma 9.11. Under the assumptions of Lemma 7.3 let \( G \) be a generalized doubly connected normal regular graph. Then it satisfies the bound
\[
|G| \prec \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_{gh}(G)} \cdot W^{-\text{ord}(G) \cdot d/2}.
\] (9.19)
Proof. The proof of this lemma is similar to the one for Lemma 9.3. With the generalized doubly connected property of $G$, we can choose disjoint black spanning trees and blue spanning trees with external molecules so that each internal molecule connects to an external molecule through a unique black path on a black tree, and to an external molecule through a unique blue path on a blue tree. We can again reduce the problem to bounding an auxiliary graph $G_{aux}$ consisting of these black and blue trees. Then we sum over the internal atoms in $G_{aux}$ from the leaves of the blue trees to the roots of them. We bound the summation over each internal atom using (8.10) with $(a,b) = (1,1)$ (if the blue edge in the summation is bounded by a $B^{1/2}$ entry), or (9.8) (if the blue edge in the summation is bounded by $W^2/L^2$). After each summation, we get a sum of new graphs that are still generalized doubly connected. Finally, after summing over all internal atoms, we get the bound (9.19). We omit the details of the proof.

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Lemma 9.1. It bounds the average of a deterministic generalized doubly connected graph over its external molecules in the box $I$.

**Lemma 9.12.** Under the assumptions of Lemma 7.3, let $G$ be a deterministic generalized doubly connected normal regular graph with $2p$ external atoms $a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 2p$. Moreover, suppose $G$ is a connected graph in the sense that all molecules (including both internal and external molecules) are connected to each other. Finally, suppose all the ghost edges are between internal atoms. Then we have that

$$\frac{1}{(Kd)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2p} \in \mathcal{I}} |G(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2p})| \prec \left(\frac{W^{d-4}}{K^{d-4}}\right)^{2p-1} \left(\frac{L^2}{W^2}\right)^{\text{gh}_{gh}(G)} W^{-\text{ord}(G) - d/2},$$

where recall that $\mathcal{I} = \{y : |y - x_0| \leq K\}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_d^d$. We emphasize that in calculating ord($G$), $a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 2p$, are still treated as external atoms, regardless of the sum $\sum a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2p}$.

Proof. We can assume that there are no dotted edges in $G$. Otherwise, we merge the atoms connected by dotted edges and still get a graph satisfying the assumption of this lemma and with at most $2p$ external atoms (there may be dotted edges between external atoms, so after the merging operation the graph may contain strictly fewer external atoms). Without loss of generality, we assume that the external atoms are $a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq q$, for some $1 \leq q \leq 2p$. Moreover, we can simply pick out the $(L^2/W^2)^{\text{gh}_{gh}(G)}$ factor in the coefficient of $G$ and do not keep it in the following proof.

Following the argument in the proof of Claim 8.6, we again reduce the problem to bounding a generalized doubly connected auxiliary graph $G_{aux}$ obtained as follows. $G_{aux}$ has a set of external atoms, say $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q$, and a set of internal atoms, say $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t$, which are the representative atoms of the internal molecules. Each diffusive edge between different molecules $G$ is replaced by a double-line edge representing a $B$ factor in $G_{aux}$. Each ghost edge in $G$ is still a ghost edge representing a $W^2/L^2$ factor in $G_{aux}$. To conclude the proof, it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{(Kd)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2q} \in \mathcal{I}_K} |G_{aux}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{q})| \prec \left(\frac{W^{d-4}}{K^{d-4}}\right)^{2p-1} W^{-\text{ord}(G_{aux}) - d/2},$$

where ord($G_{aux}$) is defined by

$$\text{ord}(G_{aux}) := 2\#\{\text{double-line edges}\} - 2\#\{\text{internal atoms}\}.$$
check that after each summation, we get a sum of new graphs that are generalized doubly connected and whose external atoms are all connected to each other. Finally, we will get a linear combination of graphs where each blue tree in them contains only one internal atom that is connected to an external atom through a blue double-line edge.

In sum, by the above arguments, we can bound \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) by a linear combination of deterministic graphs:

\[
\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \prec \sum_{\omega} W^{-\Delta_{\alpha}/2} \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}, \quad \Delta_{\alpha} := \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}) - \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}).
\]  

Each \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) satisfies the following properties: (a) \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) is a connected graph consisting of double-line edges only, (b) \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) is generalized doubly connected, and (c) each internal atom in \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) is connected with at least one external atom through a double-line edge in the blue net. Here we give such an example with 10 external atoms \( a_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq 10 \), and 6 internal atoms \( x_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq 6 \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Note that the left-hand side is a star graph with a solid edge between atoms following properties:} \\
\text{Then using (9.25), we can bound the summation over the internal atoms from the leaves of the black trees to the roots. First, suppose these black trees are disjoint, and each of them contains an external atom as the root. Then we sum over unique path trees such that each internal atom connects to an external atom through a solid edge connected with a blue double-line edge.} \\
\text{whose external atoms are all connected to each other. Finally, we will get a linear combination of graphs where each blue tree in them contains only one internal atom that is connected to an external atom through a blue double-line edge.} \\
\text{In sum, by the above arguments, we can bound \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) by a linear combination of deterministic graphs:} \\
\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \prec \sum_{\omega} W^{-\Delta_{\alpha}/2} \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}, \quad \Delta_{\alpha} := \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}) - \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}).
\end{align*}
\]

Each \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) satisfies the following properties: (a) \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) is a connected graph consisting of double-line edges only, (b) \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) is generalized doubly connected, and (c) each internal atom in \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \) is connected with at least one external atom through a double-line edge in the blue net. Here we give such an example with 10 external atoms \( a_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq 10 \), and 6 internal atoms \( x_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq 6 \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Now we use (9.25) to bound the sums over the internal atoms in \( \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \). We choose a collection of black trees such that each internal atom connects to an external atom through a unique path on a black tree. These black trees are disjoint, and each of them contains an external atom as the root. Then we sum over the internal atoms from the leaves of the black trees to the roots. First, suppose \( x_1 \) is a leaf of a black tree. Then using (9.25), we can bound the summation over \( x_1 \) by a sum of new graphs, each of which satisfies the following properties:} \\
(\text{i}) \text{ it is a connected graph consisting of double-line edges and purple solid edges;} \\
(\text{ii}) \text{ it is generalized doubly connected;} \\
(\text{iii}) \text{ each internal atom is connected with at least one external atom through a double-line edge in the blue net.}
\end{align*}
\]

In every new graph, we find another leaf of a black tree, and bound the sum over it using (9.25). More precisely, when we sum over \( x_i \), \( x_1 \) is a leaf of a black tree, \( y_1 \) is the parent of \( x_1 \) on this tree, \( B_{x_1,y_1} \) is a blue double-line edge connecting \( x_1 \) to an external atom \( a \), \( B_{y_1,z_1} \), \( 2 \leq j \leq k \), are the remaining double-line edges connected with \( x_i \), and the purple solid edges connected with \( z_1, \ldots, z_r \) are the edges coming from previous sums over internal atoms. Then we can bound the summation over \( x_i \) by a sum of new graphs satisfying the above properties (i)–(iii). Finally, after summing over all internal atoms, we obtain that

\[
\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}} \prec \sum_{\gamma} \mathcal{G}_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}},
\]  

\[\Delta_{\alpha} := \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}) - \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_{\omega,\text{aux}}).\]
where each $G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}}$ is a connected graph consisting of external atoms $a_1, \ldots, a_q$, and double-line and purple solid edges. Since $G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}}$ only contains external atoms, its scaling order is

$$\text{ord}(G_{\omega,\text{aux}}) = \text{ord}(G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}}) = 2\#\{\text{diffusive and purple solid edges}\}. \quad (9.27)$$

Finally, it remains to bound

$$\frac{1}{(K^d)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q \in \mathcal{I}} G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}} (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q).$$

We can perform the summations according to any order. We will use the following estimate to bound each average:

$$\frac{1}{K^d} \sum_{a_1 \in \mathcal{I}} B_{a_1} \lesssim \frac{1}{W^d K^{d-4}} \sum_{l=1}^{k} \prod_{j \neq l} B_{a_j} = W^{-d} \cdot \frac{W^{d-4}}{K^{d-4}} \sum_{l=1}^{k} \prod_{j \neq l} B_{a_j}.$$ 

This estimate shows that we can bound each average by a sum of new connected graphs with one fewer atom, while gaining an extra factor $W^{-d} K^{-(d-4)}$. After taking average over $a_1, \ldots, a_{q-2}$, we obtain a graph $(\tilde{B}_{a_{q-1} a_q})^k$ with

$$k := \text{ord}(G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}})/2 - (q - 2).$$

Its average over $a_{q-1}$ can be bounded by

$$\frac{1}{K^d} \sum_{a_{q-1} \in \mathcal{I}} (\tilde{B}_{a_{q-1} a_q})^k \lesssim W^{-kd} W^{d-4} K^{d-4}.$$ 

Finally, the average over $a_q$ is equal to 1. In sum, we get that

$$\frac{1}{(K^d)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q \in \mathcal{I}} G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}} (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_q) \prec \left( \frac{1}{K^d} \right)^{2p-q} \left( \frac{W^{d-4}}{K^{d-4}} \right)^{q-1} W^{-\text{ord}(G_{\omega,\gamma,\text{aux}}) d/2}. \quad (9.28)$$

Plugging this estimate into (9.26) and further into (9.23), we obtain (9.21), which concludes (9.20). \hfill \Box

### 9.4 Proof of Lemma 9.1

In this subsection, we complete the proof of Lemma 9.1. Using (9.1), we can expand $E \text{Tr}(A^{2p})$ as

$$E \text{Tr}(A^{2p}) = \sum_{a_1, \ldots, a_{2p} \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{s_1, \ldots, s_{2p} \in \{\pm, -\}} c(s_1, \ldots, s_{2p}) \prod_{i=1}^{2p} G_{a_i, a_{i+1}}^{s_i} $$

where as a convention we let $a_{2p+1} \equiv a_1$, $c(s_1, \ldots, s_{2p})$ is a deterministic coefficient of order $O(1)$, and $s_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 2p$, denote $\pm$ signs. Here we adopt the notation

$$G_{xy}^+ := G_{xy}, \quad G_{xy}^- := G_{xy}^\top.$$ 

Thus to conclude (9.5), it suffices to prove that for any 2p-gon graph

$$G_{a_1, \ldots, a_{2p}} \equiv G_{a_1, \ldots, a_{2p}} (s_1, \ldots, s_{2p}) := \prod_{i=1}^{2p} G_{a_i, a_{i+1}}^{s_i},$$

we have

$$\sum_{a_1, \ldots, a_{2p} \in \mathcal{I}} E G_{a_1, \ldots, a_{2p}} \lesssim K^d \left( \frac{W^4}{K^4} \right)^{2p-1}, \quad (9.31)$$

for any small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. The proof of (9.31) is based on the results in Sections 9.2 and 9.3. We first use Lemma 9.7 to expand $G_{a_1, \ldots, a_{2p}}$ into a sum of deterministic generalized doubly connected graphs, and then use Lemma 9.12 to bound each of them.
Because of the estimates (9.11), (9.12) and (9.15), it is more natural to treat graphs $B^{(\nu)}$, $\widehat{B}^{(\nu)}$, $\widehat{B}^{(\mu)}$ and $B^{(\omega)}$ in Lemma 9.7 as new types of diffusive edges in the following proof. It is not hard to see that Lemma 9.11 and Lemma 9.12 still hold for generalized doubly connected graphs containing these new diffusive edges, as long as we replace the factor $(L^2/W^2)^{k_b(G)}W^{-\alpha(G)/2}$ by size$(G)$ defined in (9.16).

Corresponding to Definition 9.10 we can extend the generalized SPD property in Definition 9.6 and the globally standard property in Definition 6.2 as follows.

Definition 9.13. (i) A graph $G$ is said to satisfy the generalized SPD property with external molecules if, after merging all external molecules of $G$ into one single internal molecule, the resulting molecular graph satisfies Definition 9.6.

(ii) A graph $G$ is said to be globally standard with external molecules if it is generalized SPD with external molecules in the above sense, and each proper isolated subgraph with non-deterministic closure is weakly isolated.

It is easy to see that Lemma 9.1 is a simple consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 9.14. Suppose the assumptions of Lemma 7.3 hold. Then for any large constant $D > 0$, a $2p$-gon graph in (9.30) can be expanded as

$$E(G_{a_1,\ldots,a_{2p}} = \sum_\omega G^{(\omega)}_{a_1,\ldots,a_{2p}} + O_\prec(W^{-D}), \quad (9.32)$$

where the first term on the right-hand side is a sum of $O(1)$ many deterministic graphs $G^{(\omega)}_{a_1,\ldots,a_{2p}}$ satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 9.12. Moreover, each of them satisfies

$$\frac{1}{(K_d)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_{2p}} G^{(\omega)}_{a_1,\ldots,a_{2p}} < \left(\frac{1}{W^d K_d^4}\right)^{2p-1}. \quad (9.33)$$

Proof. The expansion (9.32) can be obtained by applying Strategy 6.6 with the following modifications:

(i) we will use the non-universal $T$-expansion (9.10) instead of the $n$-th order $T$-expansion;

(ii) we will use the globally standard property with external molecules defined in Definition 9.13;

(iii) we will stop the expansion of a graph if it is deterministic, its size is less than $W^{-D}$ or it is a $Q$-graph.

The proof is actually easier than the one for Theorem 3.7, because the non-universal $T$-expansion takes a simpler form with only two types of graphs: graphs with deterministic maximal subgraphs and the $Q$-graphs. Moreover, the $Q$-graphs from the expansions of $G_{a_1,\ldots,a_{2p}}$ will vanish after taking expectation, so we do not need to keep them. We give more details in the following proof.

First, we apply local expansions to $G_{a_1,\ldots,a_{2p}}$ to get a linear combination of locally standard graphs without $P/Q$ labels. The new atoms generated in this process are all included into the external molecules around $a_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 2p$. Then we pick any $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ variable in one of the new graphs, say $\tilde{G}$, and replace it with the non-universal $T$-expansion (9.10):

$$t_{x,y_1,y_2} = m \Theta_{x,y_2} G_{y_1,y_2} + \sum_\mu B^{(\mu)}_{x,y_2} G_{y_1,y_2} \hat{f}_\mu(G_{y_1,y_2}) + \sum_\nu \tilde{B}^{(\omega)} G_{y_1,y_2} \hat{f}_\nu(G_{y_1,y_2})$$

$$+ \sum_\mu B^{(\mu)}_{x,y_1,y_2} \hat{g}_\mu(G_{y_1,y_2}, G_{y_2,y_2}, G_{y_2,y_1}) + Q_{x,y_1,y_2} + \mathcal{E}rr_{x,y_1,y_2}. \quad (9.34)$$

Here we again include the graphs containing $t_{x,y_1,y_2} - T_{x,y_1,y_2}$ into the second and third terms on the right-hand side of (9.34) (where we abuse the notation a little bit). If we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ with a graph in the first four terms on the right-hand side of (9.34), then we will get a generalized doubly connected graph which either does not contain any internal molecule or has a deterministic maximal subgraph. Moreover, the new graph either has one fewer blue solid edge or is of smaller size than size($\tilde{G}$) by a factor $W^{-c_1}$. If we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ with a graph in $\mathcal{E}rr_{x,y_1,y_2}$, then the new graph is of size $\leq W^{-D}$.

Now suppose we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ in $\tilde{G}$ with a $Q$-graph in $Q_{x,y_1,y_2}$ and apply the $Q$-expansions. Then by Lemma 6.5 the resulting non-$Q$ graphs are globally standard with external molecules in the sense of Definition 9.13. Here we draw two examples of molecular graphs obtained from $Q$-expansions with $2p = 6$: 
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Inside the black circle is a subgraph containing the internal molecules, and $y$ is the atom in the label of the $Q$-graph (where we used $y$ to label the molecule containing it). Graph (a) does not contain any isolated subgraph with non-deterministic closure and has a pre-deterministic order: the internal blue solid edges $a_1 \prec b_1 \prec b_2 \prec b_3$. Graph (b) may contain isolated subgraphs with non-deterministic closures, but they are weakly isolated due to the two red solid edges $b_2 \prec b_3$ connected with $y$. Now for each resulting graph from $Q$-expansions, we either perform the local expansions on atoms in the MIS as in Step 1 of Strategy 6.6 or expand the first blue solid edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS as in Step 3 of Strategy 6.6 by plugging into the non-universal $T$-expansion.

Continuing the expansions, we will get a sum of non-$Q$ graphs that are generalized doubly connected with external molecules, and whose internal molecules are only connected with deterministic edges. In other words, all the $G$ edges are inside or between external molecules as in the following example:

Now we repeat the previous expansions, that is, we first apply the local expansions and then pick any $x,y_1,y_2$ variable to apply the expansion $[9.34]$. This will generate a new subset of internal molecules if we replace $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ with a $Q$-graph and apply $Q$-expansions. Again in the resulting non-$Q$ graphs, we will apply Strategy 6.6 to them. Notice that since the old internal molecules are connected only with deterministic edges, they will not be affected in the rest of the expansion process.

After each step of expansion, all non-$Q$ graphs satisfy the following properties: it is generalized doubly connected, all the molecules are connected together, and the ghost edges are between internal atoms. Our expansions will stop when every graph is deterministic, of size $\leq W^{d-D}$, or a $Q$-graph. Then taking expectation gives $[9.32]$ with deterministic graphs $G^{(\omega)}_{a_1,\cdots,a_{2p}}$, satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 9.12. Notice that throughout the expansions, the numbers of ghost edges in all graphs (including $G^{(\omega)}_{a_1,\cdots,a_{2p}}$) are under control due to the conditions $[9.13]$ and $[9.14]$. Now repeating the proof of Lemma 9.12, we can bound that

$$\frac{1}{(K^d)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p} \in \mathcal{I}} G^{(\omega)}_{a_1,\cdots,a_{2p}} \leq \frac{1}{(K^d)^{2p}} \sum_{q=1}^{2p} \sum_{\omega,\gamma,a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p} \in \mathcal{I}} G^{(\omega,\gamma,aux)}_{\omega,\gamma,a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p}} \left( a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_q \right),$$

where we used the notation in $[9.26]$: $G^{(\omega,\gamma,aux)}_{\omega,\gamma,a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p}}$ are connected graphs with external atoms $a_1,\cdots,a_q$, and double-line and purple solid edges. Using $[9.28]$ and the fact

$$\text{ord} \left( G^{(\omega,\gamma,aux)}_{\omega,\gamma,a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p}} \right) = 2 \# \{ \text{diffusive and purple solid edges} \} \geq 2(q-1),$$

we get that

$$\frac{1}{(K^d)^{2p}} \sum_{a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p} \in \mathcal{I}} G^{(\omega,\gamma,aux)}_{\omega,\gamma,a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_{2p}} \left( a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_q \right) \leq \left( \frac{1}{K^d} \right)^{2p-q} \left( \frac{W^{d-4}}{K^{d-4}} \right)^{q-1} W^{-(q-1)d}.$$

Plugging it into $[9.35]$, we conclude $[9.33]$. □
A Proof of Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.12

For simplicity, we assume that all graphs in this section are molecular graphs without red solid edges. Moreover, we say a diffusive edge is black (resp. blue) if this edge is used in the black (resp. blue) net. In the proof, whenever we say “we can change a blue solid edge into a diffusive edge”, we actually mean “we know that this edge is redundant and we then change it into a diffusive edge”. Thus showing a subgraph is pre-deterministic is equivalent to saying that “we can change the blue solid edges in this subgraph into diffusive edges one by one”.

First, we state the following two claims, whose proofs are trivial.

Claim A.1. Given a graph \( G \), let \( S \) be a subset of molecules such that the subgraph induced on \( S \) is doubly connected. Then \( G \) is doubly connected if and only if the following quotient graph \( G/S \) is doubly connected: \( G/S \) is obtained by treating the subset of molecules \( S \) as one single vertex, and the edges of \( G \) connected with \( S \) are now connected with this vertex \( S \) in \( G/S \).

Claim A.2. Suppose a blue solid edge \( b_0 \) is redundant in a doubly connected graph \( G \). We replace a diffusive edge \( b \) between two molecules \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) with a path of two diffusive edges: \( b_1 \) from \( M_1 \) to another molecule \( M \), and \( b_2 \) from \( M \) to \( M_2 \). Then the edge \( b_0 \) is still redundant in the new graph.

Now Lemma 5.11 follows from repeated applications of the above claims.

Proof of Lemma 5.11. We replace \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a black diffusive edge, and get the following graph (a) for \( I_i \):

![Diagram A.1](A.1)

Here we keep the names \( \Gamma_l, i \leq l \leq j \), for the subgraph components inside the black circles. We also keep the dotted edge between \( \Gamma_i \) and \( \Gamma_j \) in order to have a clearer comparison with the original graph without the dotted edge. In particular, the ending molecules of this dotted edge should be understood as the same molecule, denoted by \( M \).

First, by the SPD property of the original graph \( G \), we know that the component \( \Gamma_j \) in graph (a) of (A.1) is pre-deterministic, and hence we can change the blue solid edges in it into diffusive edges one by one according to a pre-deterministic order. By Claim A.1, graph (a) of (A.1) is equivalent (in the sense of doubly connected property) to graph (b) of (A.2) with \( \Gamma_j \) replaced by a vertex. Furthermore, by merging the molecules connected by the dotted edge, we get the following graph (a):

![Diagram A.2](A.2)

We claim that \( b_2 \) is redundant in graph (a) of (A.1). By the doubly connected property of the original graph \( G \), removing the subgraph \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges still gives a doubly connected graph. Correspondingly, in graph (a) of (A.1), if we remove the edges \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \), we still get a doubly connected graph, so the edge \( b_2 \) is redundant. Then we can change \( b_2 \) into a diffusive edge as in graph (b) of (A.2).

Next, by property (iii) of Definition 5.9, if we replace \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) with a single diffusive edge \( b \) between \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) in graph (b) of (A.2), then the component \( \Gamma_{j-1} \) in the new graph becomes pre-deterministic. Then using Claim A.2, we get that the component \( \Gamma_{j-1} \) in graph (b) of (A.2) is pre-deterministic, and we can change the blue solid edges in it into diffusive edges one by one. After that, the subgraph induced on...
the molecule $\mathcal{M}$ and the molecules in $\Gamma_{j-1}$ is a doubly connected graph. Then we can replace this subgraph with a vertex by Claim A.1 and obtain a graph with a similar structure as graph (a) of (A.2). Hence we can repeat exactly the same argument again.

Continuing in this way, we can show that the blue solid edges in $\mathcal{I}_i$ can be changed into diffusive edges one by one according to an order given by the above argument. Hence $\mathcal{I}_i$ is pre-deterministic. 

The proof of case (i) in Lemma 5.12 uses Claim A.1 and the following three claims.

**Claim A.3.** Given a doubly connected graph $\mathcal{G}$, we construct a new graph $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$ as follows: we create a new molecule $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$: we add a diffusive edge $b_1$ between $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ and a molecule $\mathcal{M}_1$ in $\mathcal{G}$, and a blue solid edge $b_2$ between $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ and a molecule $\mathcal{M}_2$ in $\mathcal{G}$; we replace a blue solid edge $b$ between molecules $\mathcal{M}_3$ and $\mathcal{M}_4$ in $\mathcal{G}$ with two blue solid edges $b_3$ between $\mathcal{M}_3$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ and $b_4$ between $\mathcal{M}_4$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$. Then the blue solid edge $b_2$ is redundant in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$.

**Proof.** We illustrate the setting of this claim with the following figure, where graphs (a) and (b) represent $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$, respectively:

\[ \text{(A.3)} \]

The original graph $\mathcal{G}$ is doubly connected with black and blue nets denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{\text{black}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{blue}}$. In $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$, the edge $b_1$ connects the new molecule $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ to $\mathcal{M}_1$, and hence $\mathcal{B}_{\text{black}} \cup \{b_1\}$ is a black net in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$. Moreover, the path of edges $b_3$ and $b_4$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$ can replace the role of $b$ in the blue net $\mathcal{B}_{\text{blue}}$, and they also connect $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ to the molecules in $\mathcal{G}$. Hence $\mathcal{B}_{\text{blue}} \cup \{b_3, b_4\} \setminus \{b\}$ is a blue net in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$. Since $b_2$ is not used in this blue net, it is redundant in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$. 

**Claim A.4.** Given a doubly connected graph $\mathcal{G}$, we construct a new graph $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$ as follows: we create a new molecule $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$: we replace a diffusive edge $b_0$ between molecules $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ in $\mathcal{G}$ with two diffusive edges $b_1$ between $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$, and $b_2$ between $\mathcal{M}_2$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$; we replace a blue solid edge $b$ between molecules $\mathcal{M}_3$ and $\mathcal{M}_4$ in $\mathcal{G}$ with two blue solid edges $b_3$ between $\mathcal{M}_3$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ and $b_4$ between $\mathcal{M}_4$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$. Then we have that:

(i) If a blue solid edge is not equal to $b$ and redundant in $\mathcal{G}$, then it is also redundant in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$.

(ii) If the edge $b$ is redundant in $\mathcal{G}$, then either $b_3$ or $b_4$ is redundant. Moreover, if we change one redundant edge of them into a diffusive edge, the other edge also becomes redundant.

**Proof.** We first prove statement (i). Suppose the redundant blue solid edge we are considering is $e = (\mathcal{M}_5, \mathcal{M}_6)$. We consider two cases: (A) the diffusive edge $b_0$ is included in the black net of $\mathcal{G}$ in order for $e$ to be redundant, and (B) the diffusive edge $b_0$ is included in the blue net of $\mathcal{G}$ in order for $e$ to be redundant.

**Case (A):** The graphs (a) and (b) of the following figure represent $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$, respectively:

\[ \text{(A.4)} \]

In graph $\mathcal{G}$, the edge $e = (\mathcal{M}_5, \mathcal{M}_6)$ is redundant by putting $b_0$ into the black net. Let the corresponding black net and blue net be $\mathcal{B}_{\text{black}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{blue}}$, such that $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{black}}$, and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e\}$ is still a blue net that connects all the molecules in $\mathcal{G}$. Then in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$, if we put edges $b_1$ and $b_2$ into the black net, they can replace the role of $b_0$ in the black net $\mathcal{B}_{\text{black}}$ and also connect $\mathcal{M}_{\text{new}}$ to other molecules. Hence $\mathcal{B}_{\text{black}} \cup \{b_1, b_2\} \setminus \{b_0\}$ is a black net in $\mathcal{G}_{\text{new}}$. On the other hand, the path of edges $b_3$ and $b_4$ can replace the role of $b$ in the blue
net $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e\}$ and also connect $M_{\text{new}}$ to other molecules. Hence $B_{\text{blue}} \cup \{b_3, b_4\} \setminus \{e, b\}$ is a blue net in $G_{\text{new}}$. Since $e$ is not used in this blue net, it is redundant in $G_{\text{new}}$.

**Case (B):** The graphs (a) and (b) of the following figure represent $G$ and $G_{\text{new}}$, respectively:

In graph $G$, the edge $e = (M_5, M_6)$ is redundant by putting $b_0$ into the blue net. Let the corresponding black net and blue net be $B_{\text{black}}$ and $B_{\text{blue}}$, such that $b_0 \in B_{\text{blue}}$ and $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e\}$ is still a blue net that connects all the molecules in $G$. Then either $M_1$ or $M_2$ is connected to molecules $M_3$ and $M_4$ through a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e, b_0\}$, since otherwise adding back the edge $b_0$ to $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e, b_0\}$ does not give a blue net, which is a contradiction. Without loss of generality, assume that $M_2$ is connected to $M_3$ through a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e, b_0, b\}$. In graph (b) of (A.5), the dashed edge represents such a path from $M_2$ to $M_3$.

Now in graph (b) of (A.5), we put $b_1$ into the blue net and $b_2$ into the black net. Then $B_{\text{black}} \cup \{b_2\}$ is a black net in $G_{\text{new}}$, because $b_2$ connects the new molecule $M_{\text{new}}$ to other molecules. On the other hand, we claim that $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}} := B_{\text{blue}} \cup \{b_1, b_3, b_4\} \setminus \{e, b_0, b\}$ is a blue net in $G_{\text{new}}$. This can be derived from the following facts.

1. $M_3$ and $M_4$ are connected by the path of edges $b_3$ and $b_4$, which replaces the role of edge $b$ in the blue net $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e\}$ in $G$.

2. $M_1$ and $M_2$ is connected by a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}}$ consisting of $b_1$, $b_3$, $b_4$ and a path of edges connecting $M_2$ to $M_3$ in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e, b_0, b\}$. This shows that the role of edge $b_0$ in the blue net $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e\}$ can be replaced by a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}}$.

3. The new molecule $M_{\text{new}}$ is connected to other molecules through $b_1$, $b_3$ and $b_4$.

Combing the above observations with the fact that $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{e\}$ is a blue net in $G$, we conclude that $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}}$ is a blue net in $G_{\text{new}}$. Since $e$ is not in this blue net, it is redundant in $G_{\text{new}}$.

Next we prove statement (ii). Again there are two cases: (C) the diffusive edge $b_0$ is included in the black net of $G$ in order for $b_0$ to be redundant, and (D) the diffusive edge $b_0$ is included in the blue net of $G$ in order for $b$ to be redundant.

**Case (C):** In this case, $G$ and $G_{\text{new}}$ are represented by the graphs (a) and (b) in (A.4) (where the edge $e$ is irrelevant). The graph $G$ has a black net $B_{\text{black}}$ and a blue net $B_{\text{blue}}$, such that $b_0 \in B_{\text{black}}$ and $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b\}$ is still a blue net in $G$. Then in $G_{\text{new}}$, if we put edges $b_1$ and $b_2$ into the black net, they can replace the role of $b_0$ in the black net $B_{\text{black}}$ and also connect $M_{\text{new}}$ to other molecules. Hence $B_{\text{black}} \cup \{b_1, b_2\} \setminus \{b_0\}$ is a black set in $G_{\text{new}}$. On the other hand, $B_{\text{blue}} \cup \{b_4\} \setminus \{b\}$ is a blue net in $G_{\text{new}}$, because $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b\}$ is a blue net in $G$ and $b_4$ connects $M_{\text{new}}$ to other molecules. Since $b_3$ is not used in this blue net, it is redundant in $G_{\text{new}}$. Hence we change $b_3$ into a diffusive edge. Then with the same argument, we can show that $b_4$ is also redundant in the new graph. This concludes statement (ii) for case (C).

**Case (D):** In this case, $G$ and $G_{\text{new}}$ are represented by the graphs (a) and (b) of (A.5) (where the edge $e$ is irrelevant). The graph $G$ has a black net $B_{\text{black}}$ and a blue net $B_{\text{blue}}$, such that $b_0 \in B_{\text{blue}}$ and $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b\}$ is still a blue net in $G$. By a similar argument as in case (B), either $M_3$ or $M_4$ is connected to one of the molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$ through a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $M_3$ is connected to $M_2$ through a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$ (which is represented by the dashed edge in graph (b) of (A.5)). First, it is easy to see that $B_{\text{black}} \cup \{b_2\}$ is a black net in $G_{\text{new}}$. Then we claim that $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}} := B_{\text{blue}} \cup \{b_1, b_3\} \setminus \{b_0\}$ is a blue net in $G_{\text{new}}$. This claim follows from the observation that $M_1$ and $M_2$ is connected by a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}}$ consisting of $b_1, b_3$, and a path of edges connecting $M_2$ to $M_3$ in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$, and hence the role of edge $b_0$ in $B_{\text{blue}} \setminus \{b\}$ can be replaced by a path of edges in $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}}$. Since $b_4$ is not used in $B_{\text{blue}}^{\text{new}}$, it is redundant in $G_{\text{new}}$. 
Now we change $b_4$ into a diffusive edge and get the following graph, denoted by $\tilde{G}_{new}$:

![Diagram](A.6)

We put $b_4$ into the black net, and $b_1$ and $b_2$ into the blue net. Then it is easy to see that $B_{black} \cup \{b_4\}$ is a black net in $G_{new}$. Moreover, $B_{blue} \cup \{b_1, b_2\} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$ is a blue net in $G_{new}$, because the path of edges $b_1$ and $b_2$ can replace the role of edge $b_0$ in the original blue net $B_{blue} \setminus \{b\}$ of $G$, and $b_1$ and $b_2$ also connect $M_{new}$ to other molecules. Since $b_3$ is not used in this blue net, it is redundant in $G_{new}$. This concludes statement (ii) for case (D).

**Claim A.5.** Given a doubly connected graph $G$, we construct a new graph $G_{new}$ as follows: we create a new molecule $M_{new}$; we replace a diffusive edge $b_0$ between molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$ in $G$ with two diffusive edges $b_1$ between $M_1$ and $M_{new}$ and $b_2$ between $M_2$ and $M_{new}$; we replace a diffusive edge $b$ between molecules $M_3$ and $M_4$ in $G$ with two diffusive edges $b_3$ between $M_3$ and $M_{new}$ and $b_4$ between $M_4$ and $M_{new}$. If a blue solid edge is redundant in $G$, then it is also redundant in $G_{new}$.

**Proof.** Suppose the redundant blue solid edge we are considering is $e = (M_5, M_6)$. If the edge $b$ is included into the blue net in order for $e$ to be redundant in $G$, we will put the edges $b_3$ and $b_4$ into the blue net in $G_{new}$, and then the result follows from Claim A.4 (because the blue diffusive edges and blue solid edges are equivalent in a blue net). Notice that $b_0$ and $b$ play symmetric roles. Hence if $b_0$ is included into the blue net in order for $e$ to be redundant in $G$, we can conclude the proof with the same argument.

It remains to consider the case where both $b$ and $b_0$ are included into the black net in order for $e$ to be redundant in $G$. We have the following figure, where graphs (a) and (b) represent $G$ and $G_{new}$, respectively:

![Diagram](A.7)

The graph $G$ has a black net $B_{black}$ and a blue net $B_{blue}$, such that $b_0, b \in B_{black}$ and $B_{blue} \setminus \{e\}$ is still a blue net in $G$. Then either $M_3$ or $M_4$ is connected to one of the molecules $M_1$ and $M_2$ through a path of black edges in $B_{black} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$, since otherwise adding back the edges $b$ and $b_0$ to $B_{black} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$ does not give a black net, and hence gives a contradiction. Without loss of generality, assume that $M_3$ is connected to $M_2$ through a path of edges in $B_{black} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$, which is represented by the dashed edge in graph (b) of (A.7). Then in $G_{new}$, we put $b_2$ into the blue net, and put edges $b_1, b_3$ and $b_4$ into the black net. First, since $B_{blue} \setminus \{e\}$ is a blue net in $G$, we see that $B_{blue} \cup \{b_2\} \setminus \{e\}$ is a blue net in $G_{new}$. Then we claim that $B_{black} := B_{black} \cup \{b_1, b_3, b_4\} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$ is a black net in $G_{new}$. This is due to the following observations.

1. $M_3$ and $M_4$ are connected by the path of edges $b_3$ and $b_4$, which replaces the role of edge $b$ in the original black net $B_{black}$ in $G$.
2. $M_1$ and $M_2$ are connected by a path of edges in $B_{new}$ consisting of $b_1, b_3$ and a path of black edges connecting $M_2$ to $M_3$ in $B_{black} \setminus \{b, b_0\}$. This shows that the role of edge $b_0$ in the original black net $B_{black}$ in $G$ can be replaced by a path of edges in $B_{black}$.
3. The new molecule $M_{new}$ is connected to other molecules through $b_1, b_3$ and $b_4$.

Hence $G_{new}$ has a black net $B_{new}$ and a blue net $B_{blue} \cup \{b_2\} \setminus \{e\}$. Since edge $e$ is not used in the blue net, it is redundant. 
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Now we give the proof of case (i) in Lemma 5.12 using the above three claims. Recall that the original graph is denoted by $G$, and the new graph is denoted by $\tilde{G}$.

**Proof of Lemma 5.12 case (i).** The statement that $I_{j+1}$ is the maximal isolated subgraph of $I_j$ is trivial. We replace $I_{j+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, and get the following graph (a) for the isolated subgraph $I_j$ of $\tilde{G}$:

Here we keep the names $\Gamma_i$, $i \leq l \leq j$, for the subgraph components inside the black circles. By the SPD property of $G$, we know that the component $\Gamma_j$ in graph (a) is pre-deterministic, and hence we can change the blue solid edges in it into diffusive edges one by one according to a pre-deterministic order. Next by Claim A.1 it suffices to show that graph (b) with $\Gamma_j$ replaced by a vertex is pre-deterministic.

Now we show that the edge $b_2$ is redundant in graph (b) of (A.8). By the doubly connected property of $\tilde{G}$, removing the subgraph $I_{j+1}$ and its two external edges still gives a doubly connected graph. Correspondingly, in graph (b) of (A.8), if we remove the two edges $b_1$ and $b_2$ and replace the edges $b_3$ and $b_4$ with a single blue solid edge $b = (M, M')$, we still get a doubly connected graph. Then by Claim A.3, the edge $b_2$ is redundant, so we can change it into a diffusive edge and get the following graph:

By the SPD property of $G$, if we replace $I_j$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, then the blue solid edges in $\Gamma_{j-1}$ can be changed into diffusive edges one by one according to a pre-deterministic order. Now using Claim A.4 (i), we get that the blue solid edges in $\Gamma_{j-1}$ in (A.9) can be changed into diffusive edges according to the same pre-deterministic order. After that, since the subgraph induced on the molecules in $\Gamma_{j-1}$ and the molecule $M_{\text{new}}$ is doubly connected, by Claim A.1, it is equivalent to replace them with a single molecule and get a graph that is similar to graph (b) of (A.8).

Continuing the above argument, we finally reduced the graph to the following graph (b) with component $\Gamma_i$ only and a molecule $M_{\text{new}}$:

Here graph (a) is obtained from $G$ by replacing $I_{j+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge $b_0$ between $M_1$ and $M_2$. By property (iii) of Definition 5.9, the component $\Gamma_i$ in graph (a) is pre-deterministic. Suppose a pre-deterministic order of the blue solid edges is $e_1 \preceq \cdots \preceq e_{\ell-1} \preceq b \preceq e_{\ell+1} \preceq \cdots \preceq e_k$. By Claim A.3, the edge $b_2$ in graph (b) of (A.9) is redundant, so we can change it into a diffusive edge and get graph (c) of (A.10). Then by Claim A.4 (i), the blue solid edges $e_1, \cdots, e_{\ell-1}$ in $\Gamma_i$ can be changed into diffusive edges one by one. Then by Claim A.4 (ii), the edges $b_3$ and $b_4$ can be changed into diffusive edges according to the order $b_3 \preceq b_4$ or $b_4 \preceq b_3$, which gives graph (d) of (A.10). Finally, by Claim A.5, the blue solid edges $e_{\ell+1}, \cdots, e_k$ in $\Gamma_i$ can be changed into diffusive edges one by one.

In sum, we have shown that the blue solid edges in the isolated subgraph $I_j$ can be changed into diffusive edges one by one according to an order given by the above argument. Hence $I_j$ is pre-deterministic. This concludes case (i) of Lemma 5.12. 

The cases (ii)–(v) of Lemma 5.12 are all easier to prove than case (i). We consider them case by case.

Proof of Lemma 5.12: cases (ii) and (iv). For case (ii), the statement that $I_{i+1}$ is the maximal isolated subgraph of $I_j$ is trivial. We replace $I_{i+1}$ and its two external edges with a black diffusive edge, and get the following graph (a) for the isolated subgraph $I_j$ of $\tilde{G}$:

By the SPD property of $G$, we know that after replacing the edges $b_3$ and $b_4$ in graph (a) with a blue solid edge $b := (M, M')$, the graph component $\Gamma_j$ becomes pre-deterministic. Suppose a pre-deterministic order of blue solid edges in $\Gamma_i$ is $e_1 \preceq \cdots \preceq e_{\ell-1} \preceq b \preceq e_{\ell+1} \preceq \cdots \preceq e_k$. Then it is trivial to observe that in graph (a), the edges $e_1, \cdots, e_{\ell-1}, b_3, b_4, e_{\ell+1}, \cdots, e_k$ can be changed into diffusive edges one by one, which gives graph (b) of (A.11). Now if we put $b_3$ into the blue net and $b_4$ into the black net, the subgraph induced on the molecules in $\Gamma_i$ and the molecule $M''$ is a doubly connected subgraph. By Claim A.1, it is equivalent to look at the quotient graph with this subgraph replaced by a single vertex. The quotient graph has the same structure as graph (a) of (A.2), which has been shown to be pre-deterministic. Hence we conclude case (ii) of Lemma 5.12.

For case (iv), we replace $I_{i+2}$ and its two external edges with a black diffusive edge, and get the following graph (a) for the isolated subgraph $I_j$ of $\tilde{G}$:

The statement that $I_{i+1}$ is the maximal isolated subgraph of $I_j$ is trivial. Then we replace $I_{i+1}$ and its two external edges with a diffusive edge, and get graph (b) in (A.12). Again this graph has the same structure as graph (a) of (A.2), which has been shown to be pre-deterministic. Hence we conclude case (iv) of Lemma 5.12.

The proofs of cases (iii) and (v) of Lemma 5.12 use the following two claims.

Claim A.6. Given a doubly connected molecular graph $G$, we construct a new graph $G_{new}$ as follows:

More precisely, we create a new molecule $M_{new}$. Given any three molecules $M_1, M_2$ and $M_3$ in $G$, we add a diffusive edge $b_1$ between $M_{new}$ and $M_1$, a blue solid edge $b_2$ between $M_{new}$ and $M_2$, and a blue solid edge $b_3$ between $M_{new}$ and $M_3$. Then the blue solid edges $b_2$ and $b_3$ are both redundant in $G_{new}$.

Claim A.7. Given a doubly connected molecular graph $G$, we construct a new graph $G_{new}$ as follows:
More precisely, we create a new molecule \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{new}} \), replace a diffusive edge \( b_0 = (\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2) \) in \( \mathcal{G} \) with two diffusive edges \( b_1 \) between \( \mathcal{M}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{new}} \) and \( b_2 \) between \( \mathcal{M}_2 \) and \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{new}} \), and add a diffusive edge \( b_3 \) between \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{new}} \) and a molecule \( \mathcal{M}_3 \) in \( \mathcal{G} \). If a blue solid edge is redundant in \( \mathcal{G} \), then it is also redundant in \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{new}} \).

The proofs of the above two claims are simple, so we omit the details.

**Proof of Lemma 5.12** cases (iii) and (v). The case (v) can be regarded as a special case of case (iii). For case (iii), it is trivial to show that \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_j \), and \( I_{j+1} \) is the maximal isolated subgraph of \( I_{j+1} \). We replace \( I_{j+1} \) and its two external edges with a diffusive edge and get the following graph (a) for the isolated subgraph \( I_{j+1} \):

By the SPD property of \( \mathcal{G} \), the component \( \Gamma_j \) in graph (a) of \( \text{(A.13)} \) is pre-deterministic and we can change its blue solid edges into diffusive edges one by one. Next by Claim [A.1] we can replace \( \Gamma_j \) with a single molecule and get graph (b) of \( \text{(A.13)} \). By Claim [A.6] both \( b_2 \) and \( b_3 \) are redundant, so we can change them into diffusive edges. Then by Claim [A.7] we can change the blue solid edges in \( \Gamma_{j-1} \) into diffusive edges one by one. In the resulting graph, since the subgraph induced on the molecules in \( \Gamma_{j-1} \) and the molecule \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{new}} \) is a doubly connected subgraph, by Claim [A.1] we can replace them with a single molecule and get a graph that is similar to graph (b) of \( \text{(A.13)} \). Repeating the above argument, we can show that the blue solid edges in \( I_{i+k} \) can be changed into diffusive edges one by one according to an order. Hence \( I_{i+k} \) is pre-deterministic, which concludes case (iii) of Lemma 5.12.

**B PROOF OF LEMMA 9.7**

As discussed below Lemma 9.7, we need to expand the graphs in \( (\mathcal{R}_T^{(n)}_{a,b_1,b_2}) \) and \( (\mathcal{A}_T^{(>n)}_{a,b_1,b_2}) \). First, we keep applying cases 1 and 2 of Strategy 9.8 until all graphs satisfy the stopping rules (T1)–(T3) or the setting in cases 3 of Strategy 9.8. So far, all the resulting graphs do not contain any ghost edges. Moreover, as shown in Section 9.7, the resulting graphs \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) can be classified as follows.

(a) If \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) satisfies (T2), then it can be included into \( \mathcal{E}rr_{a,b_1,b_2} \).

(b) If \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) is a Q-graph, then it satisfies property (v) of Lemma 9.7 with \( k_{gh}(\mathcal{G}) = 0 \).

(c) Suppose \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) satisfies (T1) and is a \( \oplus/\ominus \)-recollision graph. Depending on whether each of \( \oplus \) and \( \ominus \) is connected with a dotted edge or not, we can write \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) as

\[
G_{a,b_1,b_2} = \sum_x \Theta_{ax} D_{xb_0} \Gamma_{b_1,b_2} f(G_{b_1,b_1}), \quad \text{or} \quad G_{a,b_1,b_2} = \sum_x \Theta_{ax} D_{xb_0} G_{b_2,b_1} f(G_{b_2,b_2}), \quad \text{(B.1)}
\]

or

\[
G_{a,b_1,b_2} = \sum_x \Theta_{ax} D_{xb_1,b_2} g(G_{b_1,b_1}, G_{b_2,b_2}), \quad \text{(B.2)}
\]

where \( \mathcal{D} \) are deterministic doubly connected graphs with \( x, a, b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) regarded as internal atoms, and \( f \) and \( g \) are monomials satisfying (iv) of Lemma 9.7. If \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) takes the form (B.2), then it can be included into the fourth term on the right-hand side of (9.10). If \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) takes one of the forms in (B.1), using Lemma 8.3 we get that

\[
\sum_x |\Theta_{ax} D_{xb_1}| \sim \sum_x B_{ax} B_{xb_1}^2 \sim W^{-d} B_{ab_1}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad \text{(B.3)}
\]

Hence \( G_{a,b_1,b_2} \) can be included into the second or third term on the right-hand side of (9.10).
(d) If \( G_{a,b_1b_2} \) satisfies (T1) and is not a \( \oplus/\ominus \)-recollision graph, then we have \( \text{ord}(G_{a,b_1b_2}) > n \), because it must come from expansions of a graph in \((A_T^{(\geq n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\). Then \( G_{a,b_1b_2} \) can be written as

\[
G_{a,b_1b_2} = \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{xy} D_{xy} t_{xy,b_1b_2},
\]

where \( D_{xy} \) is a deterministic doubly connected graph of scaling order \( \geq n \).

Now we consider the remaining graphs that satisfy the setting in cases 3 of Strategy 9.8 but not the stopping rules (T1)–(T3). So far, these graphs do not contain any ghost edges. We claim that all these graphs are GGS. By Lemma 5.10 and Lemma 6.5, all these graphs are SPD. Then we show that these graphs satisfy (9.17). First, if a graph comes from expansions of a graph in \((A_T^{(\geq n)})_{x,y} \), then it trivially satisfies (9.17) with \( k_{gh} = 0 \). Second, suppose a graph, say \( G_0 \), comes from expansions of a graph, say \( G_0 \), in \((R_T^{(n)})_{a,b_1b_2}\). Since \( G_0 \) is globally standard, it has no strongly isolated subgraph. Furthermore, the only operation to generate a strongly isolated subgraph is to replace a non-Q edge by \( (9.17) \). Now we add a ghost edge, denoted by \( g_0 \), between the ending atoms of \( b_1 \), and denote the resulting graph by \( \tilde{G} \).

Then we have

\[
\text{ord}(\tilde{G}) \geq (n - 1) \cdot k_{gh}(\tilde{G}) + 2,
\]

and \( b_1 \) becomes a redundant edge in \( \tilde{G} \). Using the generalized SPD property of \( G_{a,b_1b_2} \), it is trivial to see that \( b_1 \) is the first edge in a pre-deterministic order of the MIS containing \( I_k \).

Now we apply (4.15) (with \( n - 1 \) replaced by \( n \)) to \( t_{x,y_1y_2} \) in (4.14), where \( G_{a,y_1} \) is the edge \( b_1 \) and \( \alpha \) is the standard neutral atom in \( I_k \). By (B.5), all the new graphs satisfy (9.18). Moreover, using Lemma 6.5 we get that the resulting Q-graphs satisfy the property (v) of Lemma 9.7 and the resulting non-Q graphs satisfy the generalized SPD property. It remains to prove the property (A) or (B1) of Definition 9.9 for the non-Q graphs. Corresponding to the terms on the right-hand side of (4.15), we have the following four cases.

**Case I:** If we replace \( t_{x,y_1y_2} \) with the first two terms on the right-hand side of (4.15), then it is trivial to see that the edge \( g_0 \) is redundant in each resulting graph, so that the property (B1) of Definition 9.9 holds.

**Case II:** If we replace \( t_{x,y_1y_2} \) with a graph \( (G_A)_{x,y_1y_2} \) in \((A_T^{(\geq n)})_{x,y_1y_2} \) or \((E_{rr_n,D})_{x,y_1y_2} \), then each resulting graph, say \( G_{\text{new}} \), satisfies that

\[
\text{ord}(G_{\text{new}}) \geq \text{ord}(\tilde{G}) + (n - 1) \geq (n - 1) \cdot [k_{gh}(\tilde{G}) + 1] + 2 = (n - 1) \cdot [k_{gh}(G_{\text{new}}) + 1] + 2.
\]

Hence \( G_{\text{new}} \) satisfies the property (A) of Definition 9.9.

**Case III:** Suppose we replace \( t_{x,y_1y_2} \) with a graph \( (G_R)_{x,y_1y_2} \) in \((R_T^{(n)})_{x,y_1y_2} \), and get the following molecular graph (a) without red solid edges. We only show a case where there is a dotted edge connected with \( y_2 \) in \((G_R)_{x,y_1y_2} \). All the other cases can be analyzed in similar ways. With slight abuse of notation, we use \( x \), \( y_1 \), and \( y_2 \) to denote the respective molecules that contain atoms \( x \), \( y_1 \) and \( y_2 \).
Inside the back circles of graph (a) are some subgraphs, where \( \Gamma_k \) contains the molecules in \( I_k \) of the original graph \( \tilde{G} \), and \( \Gamma \) contains the molecules in \((G_R)_{x,y_1y_2}\). We now show that \( g_0 \) is redundant in graph (a), which is stronger than the property (B1) of Definition 9.9. By Claim A.1, it is equivalent to consider graph (b) obtained by merging all molecules in \( \Gamma \) with molecule \( y_2 \). If we include the edges \( b_2 \) and \( b_3 \) into the blue net, then \( g_0 \) becomes redundant.

**Case IV:** Suppose we replace \( t_{x,y_1y_2} \) with a graph \((G_Q)_{x,y_1y_2}\) in \( Q^{(n)}_{x,y_1y_2} \) and get a graph \((G_{new})_{a,b_1b_2}\).

Applying \( Q \)-expansions, we can expand it into a sum of \( O(1) \) many new graphs:

\[
(G_{new})_{a,b_1b_2} = \sum_\omega G_\omega + Q + G_{err},
\]

where \( G_\omega \) are graphs without \( P/Q \) labels, \( Q \) is a sum of \( Q \)-graphs and \( G_{err} \) satisfies \( |G_{err}| < W^{-D} \). Now we show that the graphs \( G_\omega \) are all GGS. Suppose all the solid edges and weights in \((G_Q)_{x,y_1y_2}\) have the same \( Q_y \) label for an atom \( y \). Let \( G' \) be the complement of \( I_k \) in \( \tilde{G} \). By property (iv) of Lemma 4.15, \( G_\omega \) satisfies at least one of the following properties:

1. there exist atoms in \( G' \) that have been merged with \( y \) due to dotted edges;
2. the atoms in \( G' \) connect to \( y \) only through red solid edges;
3. there exist atoms in \( G' \) that connect to \( y \) through blue solid edges.

In case (1), we can show that \( g_0 \) is redundant using the argument in case (III). In case (2), if \((G_Q)_{x,y_1y_2}\) is a \( \oplus/\ominus \)-recollision graph, then we can again use the argument in case (III) to show that \( g_0 \) is redundant. Otherwise, \((G_Q)_{x,y_1y_2}\) is the closure of a weakly isolated subgraph, and replacing it with a diffusive edge corresponds to replacing the edge \( b_1 \) in graph \( \tilde{G} \) with a diffusive edge, in which case the ghost edge \( g_0 \) becomes redundant. This argument shows that \( G_\omega \) satisfies the property (B1) of Definition 9.9 in case (2).

Finally, we consider case (3), where we have the following molecular graph (a) without red solid edges:

![Molecular Graph](attachment://molecular_graph.png)

We change \( b_2 \) to a diffusive edge and get graph (b). We claim that \( g_0 \) is redundant in graph (b), which implies that \( G_\omega \) satisfies the property (B1) of Definition 9.9. By Claim A.1, it is equivalent to show that \( g_0 \) is redundant in graph (c) obtained by merging the molecules in \( \Gamma \). This follows directly from Claim A.4.

Combining the above four cases, we conclude that the new non-\( Q \) graphs satisfy either property (A) or (B) of Definition 9.9 and hence are GGS.

**Lemma B.2.** Let \( G_{a,b_1b_2} \) be a GGS graph without \( P/Q \) labels. Apply any expansion in Definitions 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 on an atom in the MIS with non-deterministic closure, the resulting non-\( Q \) graphs are still GGS, and the resulting \( Q \)-graphs satisfy the property (v) of Lemma 9.7.

**Proof.** Using Lemma 6.4, we get that the resulting \( Q \)-graphs satisfy the property (v) of Lemma 9.7 and the resulting non-\( Q \) graphs satisfy the generalized SPD property. It remains to prove that the new non-\( Q \) graphs satisfy property (A) or (B1) of Definition 9.9. If \( G \) satisfies (9.17) (resp. (9.18)), then the new graphs satisfy (9.17) (resp. (9.18)), because they have scaling orders \( \geq \) ord(\( G \)). Hence we only need to prove that if \( G_{a,b_1b_2} \) satisfies the property (B1) of Definition 9.9, then the resulting non-\( Q \) graphs also satisfy the property (B1).

Similar to the proof of Lemma 5.10, we need to show that the following two operations will preserve the property (B1) of Definition 9.9:

1. (I) merging a pair of molecules due to a newly added dotted or waved edge between them;
2. (II) replacing a plus \( G \) edge between molecules \( M \) and \( M' \) with a path of two plus \( G \) edges from \( M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow M' \) for a molecule \( M'' \) in the MIS with non-deterministic closure.
Denote the maximal isolated subgraph of $\mathcal{I}'$ in $\mathcal{G}_{a,b_1,b_2}$ by $\mathcal{I}_1'$. In case (I), the proof of case (I) is non-trivial only when one molecule is inside $\mathcal{I}_1'$, while the other is not. The proof is the same as the one for Lemma 5.11 by using Claims A.1 and A.2, so we omit the details. In case (II), the proof is non-trivial only when molecules $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are not inside $\mathcal{I}_1'$, as shown in graph (a) of the following figure:

(a)\begin{figure}
\end{figure}
(b)\begin{figure}
\end{figure}
(c)\begin{figure}
\end{figure}

Let $\mathcal{I}''$ be the MIS containing $g_0$ in graph (a). We replace the blue solid edges in $\mathcal{I}''$ with diffusive edges and get graph (b). To show that $g_0$ is redundant in graph (b), by Claim A.1, it is equivalent to consider graph (c) obtained by merging the molecules in $\mathcal{I}'$. Now by Claim A.5, $g_0$ is redundant in graph (c). This implies that graph (a) satisfies the property (B1) of Definition 9.9.

**Lemma B.3.** Let $\mathcal{G}_{a,b_1,b_2}$ be a GGS graph without $P/Q$ labels. Applying the expansion in Case 2 of Strategy 9.8, the resulting non-$Q$ graphs are still GGS, and the resulting $Q$-graphs satisfy the property (v) of Lemma 9.7.

**Proof.** This lemma can be proved using similar arguments as in the proofs of Lemmas B.1 and B.2. We do not repeat them again.

In sum, the above three lemmas show that applying the one step of expansion in Strategy 9.8 to any GSS input graph, all the resulting non-$Q$ graphs are still GGS and all the $Q$-graphs satisfy property (v) of Lemma 9.7. Hence we can keep applying Strategy 9.8 until all graphs satisfy the stopping rules (T1)–(T3).

Now we claim that the expansions will stop after $O(1)$ many iterations of Strategy 9.8. The proof of this claim is similar to the one for Lemma 6.8, so we will not write down all the details.

If we only apply Cases 1 and 2 of Strategy 9.8, then the expansions will stop after $O(1)$ many steps by Lemma 6.8. To complete the proof, we only need to show that Case 3 of Strategy 9.8 is applied at most $O(1)$ many times when all the graphs satisfy the stopping rules (T1)–(T3). Suppose a graph $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies the setting in Case 3 of Strategy 9.8. As explained in the proof of Lemma [B.1](#), we can remove a redundant ghost edge from $\mathcal{G}$ if necessary so that $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies the property (A) of Definition 9.9. We expand graph $\mathcal{G}$ by applying Strategy 9.8 repeatedly, and construct correspondingly a tree diagram of graphs as in the proof of Lemma 6.8. Suppose $\mathcal{G}_1$ is a graph on the tree so that it satisfies the setting in Case 3 of Strategy 9.8, but all the other graphs on the unique path between $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}_1$ do not. Following the expansions, we find that at least one of the following properties holds for $\mathcal{G}_1$.

- $\mathcal{G}_1$ contains strictly fewer blue solid edges than $\mathcal{G}$.
- $\mathcal{G}_1$ has a strictly higher scaling order than $\mathcal{G}$, but no more ghost edges. Hence we have
  \[ \text{size}(\mathcal{G}_1) \leq W^{-d/2} \text{size}(\mathcal{G}). \]
- $\mathcal{G}_1$ has one more ghost edge than $\mathcal{G}$, and is of scaling order
  \[ \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}_1) \geq \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}) + (n-1). \]

Here the extra ghost edge appears when we apply Case 3 of Strategy 9.8 to $\mathcal{G}$. Furthermore, in order for this ghost edge to be non-redundant in $\mathcal{G}_1$, we must have replaced a $t_{x,y_1,y_2}$ variable with a graph in $\mathcal{A}_{T>(n)}$ at some step. This gives the condition (B.6). Using (3.15) and (9.16), we get that
\[ \text{size}(\mathcal{G}_1) \leq W^{-c_0} \text{size}(\mathcal{G}). \]

With the above facts, it is easy to show that Case 3 of Strategy 9.8 are applied at most $O(1)$ many times when the expansion process stops.

Applying Strategy 9.8 repeatedly until all graphs satisfy stopping rules (T1)–(T3), we can expand $\mathcal{I}_{a,b_1,b_2}$ into a sum of $O(1)$ many graphs. If a graph satisfies the stopping rule (T2), then it can be included into $E_{err, a,b_1,b_2}$ in (9.10). If a graph satisfies the stopping rule (T3), then it can be included into $Q_{a,b_1,b_2}$ in (9.10).
If a graph $\mathcal{G}_{a,b_1 b_2}$ satisfies the stopping rule (T1) and is a $\oplus/\ominus$-recollision graph, then it can be written into one of the forms in (B.1) and (B.2), where $\mathcal{D}_{b_1}$, $\mathcal{D}_{c b_2}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{c,b_1,b_2}$ are deterministic doubly connected graphs satisfying (9.18). Then using Lemma 9.5 and a similar calculation as in (B.3), we get that $\mathcal{G}_{a,b_1 b_2}$ can be included into the second to fourth terms in (9.10). If a graph $\mathcal{G}_{a,b_1 b_2}$ satisfies the stopping rule (T1) and is not a $\oplus/\ominus$-recollision graph, then it is GGS and can be written into

$$\mathcal{G}_{a,b_1 b_2} = \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{yx} \bar{D}_{xy} T_{y,b_1,b_2} = \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{yx} \bar{D}_{xy} T_{y,b_1,b_2} - \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{yx} \bar{D}_{xy} |m|^2 \sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha a} G_{\alpha b_1} \bar{G}_{\alpha b_2} (1 - 1_{a \neq b_1} 1_{a \neq b_2}),$$

where $\bar{D}_{xy}$ is a deterministic doubly connected graph satisfying (9.17) (by removing a redundant ghost edge if necessary). We include the second term of this equation into the second to fourth terms on the right-hand side of (9.10). In sum, we have obtained the following expansion:

$$T_{a,b_1 b_2} = m \Theta_{ab_1} \bar{G}_{b_1 b_2} + \sum_{\mu} B^{(\mu)}_{ab_1} \bar{G}_{b_1 b_2} f_\mu(G_{b_1 b_2}) + \sum_{\mu} \bar{B}^{(\nu)}_{ab_2} G_{b_2 b_1} \bar{f}_\nu(G_{b_2 b_2})$$

$$+ \sum_{\mu} \sum_{x} \Theta_{yx} \bar{D}^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1 b_2} g_\mu(G_{b_1 b_2}, G_{b_2 b_2}, \bar{G}_{b_1 b_2}, \bar{G}_{b_2 b_2}) + \sum_{\mu} \sum_{x,y} \Theta_{yx} \bar{D}^{(\mu)}_{xy} T_{y,b_1,b_2} + Q_{a,b_1 b_2} + \epsilon \mu_{a,b_1 b_2},$$

where $\bar{D}^{(\mu)}_{x,b_1 b_2}$ are deterministic doubly connected graphs satisfying (9.18), and $\bar{D}^{(\mu)}_{xy}$ are deterministic doubly connected graphs satisfying (9.17).

Now similar to the proof of Corollary 3.8 in Section 6.1, we solve (B.7) to get that

$$T_{a,b_1 b_2} = \sum_{x} \left( 1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu} \right)^{-1} \alpha x \left[ m \Theta_{xb_1} \bar{G}_{b_1 b_2} + \sum_{\mu} B^{(\mu)}_{xb_1} \bar{G}_{b_1 b_2} f_\mu(G_{b_1 b_2}) + \sum_{\nu} \bar{B}^{(\nu)}_{xb_2} G_{b_2 b_1} \bar{f}_\nu(G_{b_2 b_2}) \right]$$

$$+ \sum_{x} \left( 1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu} \right)^{-1} \alpha x \left[ \sum_{\mu} \sum_{y} \Theta_{xy} \bar{D}^{(\mu)}_{y,b_1 b_2} g_\mu(G_{b_1 b_2}, G_{b_2 b_2}, \bar{G}_{b_1 b_2}, \bar{G}_{b_2 b_2}) \right]$$

$$+ \sum_{x} \left( 1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu} \right)^{-1} \alpha x \left[ Q_{x,b_1 b_2} + \epsilon \mu_{x,b_1 b_2} \right].$$

Using (9.9), we can get that

$$\sum_{\alpha} \Theta_{x\alpha} \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu}_{xy} \lesssim \left( \frac{L^2}{W^2} \right)^{k_{bh}(\bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu}_{xy})} W^{-[\text{ord}(\bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu}_{xy}) - 2]d/2} B_{xy} \lesssim \frac{W^{-c_0}}{(x - y)^d},$$

where we used (9.17), (3.15) and $W^2/L^2 \cdot B_{xy} \lesssim (x - y)^d$ in the second step. Using this estimate and the Taylor expansion of $(1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu})^{-1}$, we can get that

$$\left( 1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu} \right)^{-1} \delta_{xy} \lesssim \frac{W^{-c_0}}{(x - y)^d} + W^{-D},$$

for any large constant $D > 0$. By (B.9), we see that

- matrix products of (labelled) diffusive edges with $(1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu})^{-1}$ give deterministic graphs $\bar{B}^{(\mu)}$ and $\bar{B}^{(\nu)}$ satisfying (9.12) and (9.15);
- matrix products of $B^{(\mu)}$ and $\bar{B}^{(\nu)}$ in (B.8) with $(1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu})^{-1}$ give deterministic graphs satisfying (9.11) (where we have used the same notations $B^{(\mu)}$ and $\bar{B}^{(\nu)}$ for convenience);
- $(1 - \Theta \bar{D}^{(\mu) \nu})^{-1} \Theta_{xy} = \Theta_{xy} + B^{(\mu)}_{xy}$ for a deterministic graph $B^{(\mu)}_{xy}$ satisfying (9.11).

Hence (B.8) can be written into the expansion (9.10). This concludes the proof of Lemma 9.7.
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