

# UPPER TAIL OF THE SPECTRAL RADIUS OF SPARSE ERDŐS-RÉNYI GRAPHS

ANIRBAN BASAK

ABSTRACT. We consider an Erdős-Rényi graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  on  $n$  vertices with edge probability  $p$  such that

$$\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \ll np \leq n^{1/2-o(1)},$$

and derive the upper tail large deviations of the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix. Within this regime we show that, for  $p \gg n^{-2/3}$  the log-probability of the upper tail of the largest eigenvalue equals to that of planting a clique of an appropriate size (upon ignoring smaller order terms), while for  $p \ll n^{-2/3}$  the same is given by that of the existence of a high degree vertex.

In the regime  $\log(np) \gtrsim \log n$  the large deviations of the spectral radius is derived from that of homomorphism counts of cycles of even length. A similar dichotomy, as above, arises for the homomorphism counts of cycles of length  $2t$ , with the *threshold depending on  $t$* .

This, in particular, identifies a sparsity regime, both in the context of the largest eigenvalue and homomorphism counts of even cycles, where the large deviation is due to the presence of a *non-planted* localized structure. It further demonstrates that in a certain sparsity regime the large deviation rate functions for the homomorphism and subgraph counts differ from each other, while the large deviation speeds continue to be the same, even when the expected value of the former is  $1 + o(1)$  times that of the latter.

Our results also identify the typical behavior of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  conditioned on the upper tail events of the spectral radius and homomorphism counts of even cycles in certain sub-regimes of  $p$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Study of spectral statistics of large random matrices are of significant interest. There is a host of results regarding the typical behavior of spectral observables of random matrices. However, results on atypical behaviors, such as large deviations, of spectral observables, e.g. extreme eigenvalues, the ESD (empirical spectral distribution), are few and far between. Using the explicit formula for the joint density of the eigenvalues large deviations of the largest eigenvalue and the empirical measure of the eigenvalues of GOE (Gaussian orthogonal ensemble) matrices were obtained in [11, 12]. Beyond such exactly solvable models of random matrices, the first breakthrough was due to Bordenave and Caputo [18], where they derived large deviations of the ESD of Wigner matrices with entries with stretched exponential tails. There they showed that the large deviation event is created by a relatively few large entries. This was later extended for the largest eigenvalue by Augeri [4]. Very recently, Guionnet and Husson [26], using asymptotics of *spherical integrals*, derived the large deviations for the largest eigenvalue for Wigner matrices with entries possessing a *sharp sub-Gaussian tail* (e.g. Rademacher distribution), and this has been extended to the case of entries with sub-Gaussian tails, see [6].

---

*Date:* January 16, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C80, 60B20, 60C05, 60F10.

*Key words and phrases.* Erdős-Rényi graph, large deviations, largest eigenvalue, cycle homomorphism counts.

The results mentioned thus far are in the context of *dense* random matrices. The goal of this article is to derive the large deviations of the largest eigenvalue of a class of *sparse* random matrices, namely, the adjacency matrices of Erdős-Rényi graphs. An Erdős-Rényi graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  on  $n$  vertices is the random graph obtained by joining the edge between each pair of vertices with probability  $p = p(n) \in (0, 1)$ , and independently of every other pair. Here we consider the case  $p \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Over the last decade or so there have been extensive research on understanding large deviation phenomena in random graph models. Chatterjee and Varadhan [21] first successfully considered the problem of upper tail large deviations of triangle counts in dense  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ , i.e.  $p \asymp 1$  (see Section 1.5 for the notations used in this paper). To tackle this problem [21] introduced a general framework for large deviation principle that uses Szemerédi's regularity lemma [35] and the theory of graph limits [19, 31, 32]. They expressed the large deviation rate function as the solution of a *mean-field variational problem*, and obtained the structure of the random graph conditioned on the large deviation event in the *replica symmetry region*. Later this was extended by Lubetzky and Zhao [33] for *nice graph parameters*, e.g. regular subgraph densities and the spectral radius. They also identified the phase boundary between the replica symmetry and symmetry breaking regimes.

In a breakthrough work Chatterjee and Dembo [20] proposed a new framework of nonlinear large deviations that can be applied to a host of problems, including, in particular, the upper tail large deviations of subgraph counts in sparse  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ . Similar to the dense setting, here also the large deviation rate function is given by the solution of an appropriate mean-field variational problem, which was solved in [17]. The results of [20] have been extended and improved by [5, 22, 24].

The recent work [22], in addition to the large deviations of homomorphism densities, derives the large deviation of the upper tail of the spectral radius of an Erdős-Rényi graph where the rate function is again shown to be the solution of some mean-field variational problem. The solution to this variational problem was identified in [15]. These two results together imply that

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)np)}{n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)} = \min \left\{ \frac{(1 + \delta)^2}{2}, \delta(1 + \delta) \right\}, \quad \text{for } n^{-1/2} \ll p \ll 1,$$

and  $\delta > 0$ , where  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  denotes the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ . On the other hand, in [16], using a completely different approach, it has been shown that

$$(1.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)\sqrt{\mathfrak{L}_p})}{\log n} = 2\delta + \delta^2,$$

for  $\delta > 0$  and  $p$  such that

$$\log n \gg \log(1/np) \quad \text{and} \quad np \ll \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}},$$

where

$$\mathfrak{L}_p := \frac{\log n}{\log \log n - \log(np)}$$

(they derive both upper and lower tail large deviations for the joint distribution of an  $O(1)$  extreme eigenvalues).

Before moving further let us add that the typical behavior of the spectral radius of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  was established by Krivelevich and Sudakov [29]:

$$\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) = (1 + o(1)) \max \left\{ \sqrt{\Delta(\mathbb{G}(n, p))}, np \right\}, \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

where for a graph  $\mathbb{G}$  the notation  $\Delta(\mathbb{G})$  is used to denote its maximum degree (the typical behavior of extreme eigenvalues has been extended to the inhomogeneous setting by [13, 14]). This together with results on the typical value of  $\Delta(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  (cf. [16, Lemma 2.2]) demonstrates that there is a change of behavior of the typical value of the spectral radius of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  depending on whether  $np \ll \sqrt{\log n / \log \log n / n}$  or  $np \gg \sqrt{\log n / \log \log n / n}$ . In the former regime,  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) = (1 + o(1))\sqrt{\mathfrak{L}_p}$ , while in the latter regime  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) = (1 + o(1))np$ , almost surely. This explains the difference between the description of the upper tail events in (1.1) and (1.2).

In this paper we will derive large deviations of the spectral radius in the intermediate regime of sparsity, i.e. for  $p$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \ll np \lesssim n^{1/2-o(1)}.$$

Therefore, the results of this paper together with [15, 16, 22] resolve the upper tail large deviations for the spectral radius of eigenvalues in the entire sparse regime, except for a couple of boundary cases. Let us now highlight some of the key consequences, and similarities and differences with (1.1) and (1.2), of the large deviations results obtained in this article.

Towards this end, let us point out to the reader that one can conclude from (1.1) that the large deviations probability of the upper tail event for  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$ , in the regime  $n^{-1/2} \ll p \ll 1$ , equals, asymptotically, to that of *planting* either a *clique* or a *hub* of appropriate sizes. It is widely believed that conditioned on the upper tail event of  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  the graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  should typically contain either an *almost clique* or an *almost hub* (the reader is referred to [27, Section 1.3] for a precise definition of these structures). Since *localized structures* (i.e. subgraphs that are “microscopic” in size) are responsible for the large deviation event, in the literature this is termed as the *localization phenomenon*. On the contrary, in (1.2) the upper tail large deviation of  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  is given by the same for  $\Delta(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$ . Moreover, it follows from [16, Eqn. (3.6)] that conditioned on the upper tail event of  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$ , typically one has that  $\Delta(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)^2 \mathfrak{L}_p (1 - o(1))$ .

In this paper we see a large deviation phenomenon which can be described as an amalgamation of the above two behaviors. In particular, for  $p$  such that (1.3) holds and  $np \gg n^{1/3}$  we derive that the log-probability of the upper tail of the spectral radius is same as, upon ignoring smaller order terms, equals to that of planting a clique on  $\lceil (1 + \delta)np \rceil$  vertices, while if  $np \ll n^{1/3}$  and (1.3) hold then the same equals to that of the existence of a vertex with degree greater than  $(1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2$ . See Theorem 1.1 below.

Perhaps, at the very first glance, the transition of this large deviation behavior at  $p \asymp n^{-2/3}$  may seem surprising. However, it may be observed the log-large deviation probability should be at least as large as the maximum of the log-probabilities of the two events described above (in Theorem 1.1 we show that this is also the upper bound, upon ignoring smaller order terms). For  $p \ll n^{-2/3}$  the probability of the second event dominates that of the first, and hence the phenomenon described above. It is also worth noting that the second event ceases to be a viable option if  $p \gg n^{-1/2}$  and therefore one does not see it appearing in (1.1).

The reader may be tempted to interpret the second scenario (described above) as planting a high degree vertex. However, the Erdős-Rényi model being a probability measure on the set of edges the localized structure responsible for the large deviation should be viewed as the star graph formed by the one neighborhood of the high degree vertex. Since that star graph depends on the configuration of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ , and thus random, this localized structure is a *non-planted structure*. Thus we see the *emergence of a non-planted localized structure* for  $p$  such that  $np \ll n^{1/3}$  and (1.3) hold. See section 1.2 for a precise formulation of the notions of planted and non-planted structures.

Let us also add that whenever  $\log(np) \gtrsim \log n$ , a large atypical value of the spectral radius produces the same for the homomorphism counts of  $C_{2t}$ , the cycle graph on  $2t$  vertices, for large  $t$ . Using this observation, we derive the upper bound on the large deviation probability in that range of  $p$ . Therefore, in the light of the above discussion, it is not surprising that we also observe a transition from planted localized structure to a non-planted one. However, this time the threshold depends on  $t$ , see Theorem 1.5. It is worth mentioning that Theorem 1.5 together with [8] show that in a certain regime of sparsity *the large deviation rate functions for the upper tail of subgraph counts and homomorphism counts for  $C_{2t}$  differ but the large deviation speeds of these two events remain the same*. This difference in the rate function is probably due to lack of low complexity of the gradient of the homomorphism count function in the above mentioned regime of  $p$ . See Section 1.2 for further discussions.

**1.1. Main results.** The following is the main result on the upper tail large deviations of  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Fix  $\delta > 0$ .*

(a) *Let  $p \in (0, 1)$  be such that*

$$(1.4) \quad np \gg \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \log(np) \ll \log(1/p).$$

*Then*

$$(1.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)np)}{n^2 p^2 \log(np)} = (1 + \delta)^2.$$

(b) *Let  $p \in (0, 1)$  be such that*

$$(1.6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/p)}{\log n} = \alpha \in (1/2, 1).$$

*Then*

$$(1.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)np)}{n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)} = \min \left\{ \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cdot (1 + \delta)^2.$$

**Remark 1.2.** The assumption (1.6) is chosen in Theorem 1.1(b) for a neater representation of the large deviation bound. In fact, we will prove that

$$(1.8) \quad -\log \mathbb{P}(\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)np) = (1 + o(1)) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(1/p), (1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right\},$$

for  $p$  satisfying

$$(1.9) \quad \log(np) \gtrsim \log n \quad \text{and} \quad np \leq n^{1/2}(\log n)^{-\omega(1)}.$$

Notice that if  $\alpha < 2/3$  then the second term in the RHS of (1.7) achieves the minimum, while for  $\alpha > 2/3$  the first term achieves the minimum. This demonstrates the dichotomy of the large deviation behavior of  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  mentioned above.

From the proof of (1.5) we can also derive the typical structure of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  conditioned on the atypical event that its largest eigenvalue is large. In particular, we obtain the following result. For ease in writing, let us introduce the following notation: For  $\delta, \xi > 0$  we set

$$\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta) := \{\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta)np\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{UT}_\Delta(\xi) := \{\Delta(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq \xi n^2 p^2\}$$

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.4). Then for any  $\delta > 0$  and  $\chi \in (0, 1)$  we have that*

$$(1.10) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\Delta((1 + \delta)^2(1 - \chi)) \mid \text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)) \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Observe that Corollary 1.3 treats the sparsity regime (1.4) and shows that in that regime the upper tail large deviation event of the largest eigenvalue is (primarily) due to the presence of a very large degree. We expect that an appropriate analogue of Corollary 1.3 should hold for the entire regime (1.3). See Section 1.3.

The proof of Theorem 1.1(b) hinges on understanding the upper tail large deviations of the homomorphism counts of even cycles in Erdős-Rényi graphs. First let us provide necessary definitions.

**Definition 1.4** (Homomorphism counts and labelled copies). Given graphs  $H$  and  $\mathbb{G}$  we write  $\text{Hom}(H, \mathbb{G})$  to denote the number of homomorphisms of  $H$  into  $\mathbb{G}$ . That is,

$$(1.11) \quad \text{Hom}(H, \mathbb{G}) := \sum_{\varphi: V(H) \rightarrow V(\mathbb{G})} \prod_{e=(x,y) \in E(H)} a_{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)}^{\mathbb{G}},$$

where the sum runs over *all* maps  $\varphi$  from  $V(H)$  to  $V(\mathbb{G})$  and  $\{a_{u,v}^{\mathbb{G}}\}$  are the entries of the adjacency matrix of  $\mathbb{G}$ .

There is a closely related notion to the homomorphism counts, known as the number labelled copies of  $H$  in  $\mathbb{G}$ , which is defined as follows:

$$N(H, \mathbb{G}) := \sum_{\varphi: V(H) \hookrightarrow V(\mathbb{G})} \prod_{e=(x,y) \in E(H)} a_{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)}^{\mathbb{G}}.$$

Here the sum is over all *injective* maps.

Below is the result on the upper tail large deviations of homomorphism counts of  $C_{2t}$  in  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *Fix  $t \geq 3$  and let  $p$  be such that*

$$(1.12) \quad n^{t+1} p^t \ll n^{2t} p^{2t}.$$

*Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))] = (1 + o(1)) n^{2t} p^{2t}.$$

*If additionally  $p$  satisfies (1.6) then, for any  $\widehat{\delta} > 0$  we have*

$$(1.13) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log \mathbb{P} \left( \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \widehat{\delta}) n^{2t} p^{2t} \right)}{n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)} = \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\delta}^{1/t} \cdot \min \left\{ 2^{1-1/t} \cdot \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}, 1 \right\}.$$

The case  $t = 2$  is excluded from Theorem 1.5, as for  $t = 2$  there is no  $p$  satisfying (1.12). Let us also add that, similar to (1.7), one also sees a dichotomous large deviations behavior (1.13).

Although we do not investigate whether the large deviations probabilities in Theorems 1.1 and 1.5 admit mean-field approximations. It seems plausible to predict that this should be the case. See Section 1.2 for a further discussion on this.

**Remark 1.6.** While proving Theorem 1.5 we will work with a slightly more general assumption than the one in (1.6). In particular, we will show that for any  $p$  such that

$$(1.14) \quad n^{t+1} p^t \ll n^{2t} p^{2t} \quad \text{and} \quad p \leq n^{-1/2} (\log n)^{-\omega(1)},$$

and any  $t \geq 3$  fixed, we have

$$(1.15) \quad -\log \mathbb{P} \left( \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \widehat{\delta}) n^{2t} p^{2t} \right) \\ = (1 + o(1)) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\delta}^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(1/p), \left( \frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2} \right)^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right\}.$$

From this, under the additional assumption (1.6) the large deviations result in (1.13) is immediate.

The next result identifies the typical behavior of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  conditioned on the upper tail of  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$ .

**Corollary 1.7.** *Consider the same setup as in Theorem 1.5. Additionally, assume that  $\alpha$  in (1.6) is such that  $2^{1-1/t} \cdot (1 - \alpha)/\alpha < 1$ . Then, for any  $\chi > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \text{UT}_{\Delta}((\widehat{\delta}/2)^{1/t}(1 - \chi)) \mid \text{UT}_t(\widehat{\delta}) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where, for any  $\delta' > 0$ ,

$$\text{UT}_t(\delta') := \left\{ \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta')n^{2t}p^{2t} \right\}.$$

**1.2. Connection to the Naïve mean-field approximation.** For a function  $h : \{0, 1\}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and the uniform measure  $\mu$  on  $C_N := \{0, 1\}^N$ , the *Gibbs variational principle* states that

$$(1.16) \quad Z_h := \log \int e^h d\mu = \sup_{\nu} \left\{ \int h d\nu - D_{KL}(\nu \parallel \mu) \right\},$$

where  $D_{KL}(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$  denotes the *Kulback-Leibler divergence* and the supremum in (1.16) is taken over all probability measures  $\nu$  on  $C_N$ . If the supremum in (1.16) is replaced by product measures on  $C_N$ , in statistical mechanics, the approximation is termed as the *naïve mean-field approximation*. Over the past ten years there have been several works, in different settings, attempting to find sufficient conditions on  $h(\cdot)$ , e.g. appropriate *low-complexity* conditions on the (discrete) gradient of  $h(\cdot)$ , such that the mean-field approximation is asymptotically tight for the *log-partition function*  $Z_h$  (see [5, 7, 9, 20, 24, 36]).

A related problem, which is probably the motivation of the seminal work [20], is to derive asymptotics of the probability  $\{f \geq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f]\}$ , where  $f : [0, 1]^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu_p$  is the product of  $N$  i.i.d.  $\text{Ber}(p)$  measures, with  $p \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . For this setup, under the low-complexity gradient assumption, the mean-field approximation leads to the following conclusion:

$$(1.17) \quad \log \mathbb{P}(f \geq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f]) = -(1 + o(1))\Phi_p(f, \delta),$$

where

$$(1.18) \quad \Phi_p(f, \delta) := \inf \left\{ I_p(\boldsymbol{\xi}) : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in [0, 1]^N \text{ and } f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f] \right\},$$

$$I_p(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \sum_{i=1}^N I_p(\xi_i), \quad \boldsymbol{\xi} := (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N), \quad \text{and} \quad I_p(x) := x \log \frac{x}{p} + (1 - x) \log \frac{1 - x}{1 - p} \text{ for } x \in [0, 1],$$

with the convention  $0 \log 0 = 0$ . Functions that are of interests and fit into this framework include  $N(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$ , for  $\mathbb{H} \subset K_n$ , and  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  (set  $N = \binom{n}{2}$  and identify  $\binom{n}{2}$  possible edges of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  to  $[N]$ ).

Once (1.17) has been established the task then boils down to analyzing the minimizer of the variational problem in (1.18). This two-step scheme has been successfully employed to derive large deviations for Homomorphism counts and the largest eigenvalue in sparse  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ , where (1.17) has been shown to hold in [5, 20, 22, 23, 24], for various ranges of sparsity, and related variational problems have been solved in [15, 17, 34]. It has been further observed that, in the sparsity regime considered there, any minimizer  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_*$  of these variational problems satisfy  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_* \in \{p, 1\}^N$ . Therefore, such  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_*$  are also the minimizers of the following simpler version of the variational problem (1.18):

$$(1.19) \quad \widehat{\Phi}_p(f, \delta) := \inf \left\{ e(\mathbb{G}) \log(1/p) : \mathbb{G} \subset K_n \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}}[f] \geq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f] \right\},$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}}[f] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f(\zeta) \mid \zeta_{\alpha} = 1; \alpha \in E(\mathbb{G})]$  and  $E(\mathbb{G})$  is given by  $\mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} := \{\alpha \in [N] : \xi_{\alpha} = 1\}$ .

This leads us to the definition of planted structures. Note that for  $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [0, 1]^N$  the probability measure  $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} := \otimes_{i=1}^N \text{Ber}(\xi_i)$  can be naturally associated to the inhomogeneous Erdős-Rényi graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\xi})$  with edge probabilities given by  $\xi_{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in [N]$ . Therefore, the edges  $\mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  are present with probability one, *and hence planted*, in  $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\xi})$ . This motivates the nomenclature ‘planted’ and the structure, such as the clique and the hub, is determined by the set of edges  $\mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ .

On the other hand, if for a  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  the set of edges  $\mathcal{P}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \emptyset$  (or of ‘insignificant’ cardinality) then we term such a  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ , or equivalently  $\mathbb{G}(n, \boldsymbol{\xi})$ , to be ‘non-planted’, and the (random) structure associated to such a random graph will be said to be determined by the edge set  $\{\alpha : \xi_{\alpha} > p\}$ . To illustrate this let consider  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  such that  $\widehat{\xi}_{1,j} = p + \tau np^2$ , for some  $\tau > 0$ , and  $\widehat{\xi}_{i,j} = p$  for the rest of the indices ( $p \ll n^{-1/2}$ ). Observe that the random structure associated to  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  is the random star graph formed by the one-neighborhood of vertex one. Moreover, it can be verified that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}}[f] \geq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f]$  for  $f = \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  with  $\tau = (\delta/2)^{1/t}$  and  $(1 + \delta)^2$ , respectively. Further notice that, with the above choice of  $\tau$ ,  $I_p(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}})$  equals the second terms in the RHS-s of (1.8) and (1.15) (set  $\widehat{\delta} = \delta$ ). Therefore, it does not rule out that the RHS-s of (1.8) and (1.15) equal to the solution of the following variational problem

$$(1.20) \quad \Psi_p(f, \delta) := \inf \{I_p(\boldsymbol{\xi}) : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in [0, 1]^N \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}}[f] \geq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f]\}.$$

Let us also make the following two observations:

- (i) From the proof of [15, Theorem 1.2] it follows that for  $f = \lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $p$  such that  $np \gg 1$  the first term in the RHS of (1.8) equals  $(1 + o(1))\Phi_p(f, \delta)$ .
- (ii) If  $np \ll n^{1/3}$  then the second term in (1.8) is strictly smaller than the first term. Therefore, in that regime  $-\log \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\delta)) > (1 + o(1))\Phi_p(f, \delta)$ . Similar comments apply for  $f = \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$ .

These observations may suggest that in the sparsity regime described above the mean-field approximation to the large deviation probability no longer holds. However, in the *absence* of ‘low-complexity gradient’ criterion, the right formulation should probably be to replace  $\Phi_p(f, \delta)$  by  $\Psi_p(f, \delta)$  in (1.17).

**1.3. Extensions and open problems.** In the light of the discussion in Section 1.2 it is plausible to speculate that the RHS-s of (1.8) and (1.15) equal to  $(1 + o(1))\Psi_p(f, \delta)$  for  $f = \lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  (with  $\widehat{\delta} = \delta$ ), respectively. This would then validate that the mean-field approximation continues to hold in the sparsity regime (1.3) and (1.14), respectively.

Another natural question would be to extend Theorem 1.5 for all regular graphs. It would be interesting to check if there is a sparsity regime where the large deviation rate functions for the upper tails of  $\text{Hom}(H, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $N(H, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  are different, but the speed is the same. We expect this behavior to depend on whether  $H$  is bipartite or not. For example, preliminary computations show that  $H = C_{2t+1}$  upper tails of  $\text{Hom}(H, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $N(H, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  share the same large deviation speed and rate function for all  $p$  such that  $np \geq (\log n)^C$ , for some  $C < \infty$ . It remains to be investigated whether the same should hold in the entire ‘localized regime’.

Observe that Theorem 1.1 leaves out two boundary cases. If  $np \asymp \sqrt{\log n / \log \log n}$  it is natural to predict the large deviation speed to be  $\log n$  and the rate function should be some combination of the rate function in Theorem 1.1(a) and [16, Theorem 1.1]. We expect Theorem 1.1(b) to extend for  $p$  such that  $n^{-1/2-o(1)} \leq np \ll n^{1/2}$ . It seems that one can combine the ideas of Lemma 3.6 and those in [27, Section 7] to treat this regime. However, for the sake of brevity and clarity of the presentation we have not attempted this here. Next, in the regime  $p \asymp n^{-1/2}$  one is expected to encounter some integrality issue, as was seen in [27, Theorem 1.7].

Corollary 1.3 provides a description of the typical behavior of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  conditioned on  $\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)$  in the regime (1.4). The same behavior should extend for  $np \ll n^{1/3}$ . See Remark 4.4. It is expected that in the regime  $n^{1/3} \ll np \ll n^{1/2}$  the graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ , conditioned on  $\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)$ , should typically contain an almost-clique of an appropriate size. Same is believed to hold for  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  for  $p$  in the regime not covered in Corollary 1.7. This would require analyzing the near-minimizers of (1.18) (or (1.19)). See the discussion in [27, Section 10] in this regard.

Another related problem is the large deviations of the largest eigenvalue of diluted Wigner matrices, i.e. matrices of the form  $W_n \circ B_n$ , where  $W_n$  is a Wigner matrix and  $B_n$  is a symmetric matrix with i.i.d.  $\text{Ber}(p)$  entries on the diagonal and above the diagonal positions, and  $p \rightarrow 0$  with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The case of  $p \asymp 1/n$  and the entries of  $W_n$  are standard Gaussian was recently dealt in [25]. This problem is closely related to the problem of studying large deviations of the second largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ . This is a work in progress with Fanny Augeri.

**1.4. Outline of the proof.** Proofs of Theorem 1.1(a) and (b) proceed via two completely different approaches. To prove Theorem 1.1(a) we split the random graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  into vertices of high, moderate, and low degrees (see Definition 2.3). At a high level, such a decomposition of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  is similar to those in [16, 29]. However, the threshold used to define such subsets of vertices, as well as the arguments employed here to prove Theorem 1.1(a) are completely different from those in [16, 29]. For example, the key ideas in [16] are to show that (i) there are no ‘large’ cycles, and (ii) any vertex is not incident to too many edge disjoint ‘small’ cycles, at the large deviation scale. These do not hold for the entirety of the regime (1.4). Hence, we need to use other ideas.

Bounding the spectral radius of different parts of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  require different approaches. Let us highlight some of them. In Lemma 2.8 we show that it is unlikely, at the large deviations scale, to have a connected component  $\mathbf{G}$  of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  such that all its vertices are of moderate degree and  $v(\mathbf{G}) \gg np \log(np)$ . Using this and the fact that  $\lambda(\mathbf{G}) \leq \sqrt{2e(\mathbf{G})}$  we then argue that the subgraph of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  consisting of moderate degree vertices has a negligible spectral radius.

To bound the spectral radius of a certain subgraph of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  such that all its vertices are of low degree (see the proof of Theorem 1.1(a) for a precise definition of this subgraph) we employ the following ‘bootstrap’ strategy: using a bound on the number of high degree vertices (see Lemma 2.7) we first show that for such a graph, say  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ , at the large deviations scale, one must have that  $e(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}) \leq (np)^C$ , for some absolute constant  $C < \infty$ . Then, we argue that if  $\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{G}})$  is non-negligible (i.e.  $\gtrsim np$ ) then, upon excluding an event of negligible probability, one can procure a subgraph  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}' \subset \tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  such that  $e(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}') \leq (np)^{C-1}$  and  $\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}')$  is still non-negligible (see Lemma 2.9). We iterate this argument to finally obtain a subgraph  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0 \subset \tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ , with minimum degree two, such that  $e(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0) \leq n^2 p^2$  and  $\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0) \gtrsim np$ . Applying Binomial tail probability bound we then deduce that the number of excess edges of  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0$  (i.e.  $e(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0) - v(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0)$ ) should not be large, see Lemma 2.6. By Lemma 2.2(viii) this upper bound then yields that  $\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_0)/np$  must be small.

To treat the spectral radius of the bipartite subgraph of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  with vertex bipartition consisting of moderate and low degree vertices we use the following idea: we apply estimates on the number of moderate degree vertices in the two-neighborhood of any given vertex (see Lemma 2.4) and a bound on the spectral radius of a bipartite graph (see Lemma 2.2(vii)) to deduce that the spectral radius to be non-negligible there must be two sets of vertices of small sizes containing too many edges between them. By the standard bound on Binomial tail probability, and a union bound, this event turns out to be unlikely at the large deviations scale. To treat the rest of the parts of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  we employ estimates that are already mentioned above, i.e. Lemmas 2.4, and 2.6-2.9. See Section 2 for further details.



Let us now move to describe the main ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.5. From this Theorem 1.1(b) follows upon letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . To derive Theorem 1.5 we follow the general strategy developed in [27, 8]. However, [27, 8] deal with the upper tail large deviations of  $N(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  (in fact they cover all regular graphs), while here we are interested in that of  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$ . As the large deviation results in these two cases differ, in the sparsity regime we consider, the argument require considerable modifications. As in [27, 8], in the first step we apply Markov's inequality to deduce that conditioned on  $\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})$  the random graph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p) \supset \mathbf{G}$  for some  $\mathbf{G} \subset K_n$  such that  $e(\mathbf{G}) \lesssim n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)$  and the conditional expectation of  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  given  $\mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p)$  is at least  $\hat{\delta}(1 - o(1))n^{2t} p^{2t}$ , holds with probability  $1 - o(1)$ . The class of such graphs  $\mathbf{G}$  will be called pre-seed graphs (see Definition 3.1). This step allows us to reduce the configuration space to a smaller one that is 'responsible' for the large deviation event.

The next step is to reduce the configuration space further to the set  $\mathbb{G}(n, p) \supset \mathbf{G}$  where  $\mathbf{G}$  runs over the set of all core graphs (see Definition 3.5). This step was almost trivial in [8]. However, as  $\varphi$  in (1.11) is allowed to be non-injective some of the edges of  $C_{2t}$  may get mapped to the same edge in  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ , and thus the number of independent edges at our disposal may decrease. To overcome this challenge we introduce a notion of generating and non-generating edges and vertices (see Definition 3.12) and perform a combinatorial analysis. See Section 3.1.

Next, we split the set of core graphs into two further subsets:  $e(\mathbf{G}) \gg n^2 p^2$  and  $e(\mathbf{G}) = O(n^2 p^2)$ . Using a simple combinatorial argument the first subset can be shown to be unlikely at the large deviations scale. Applying pigeonhole principle and the fact that  $x \mapsto x^{1/t} + (1-x)^{1/t}$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,  $t \geq 2$ , is strictly concave we further deduce that there exists a splitting for any core graph  $\mathbf{G}$  belonging to the second subset (upon excluding a negligible number of edges) to  $\mathbf{G}'$  and  $\mathbf{G}''$  such that the number of homomorphisms of  $C_{2t}$  in at least one of them is at least  $\hat{\delta}(1 - o(1))n^{2t} p^{2t}$ . Furthermore, all the vertices of  $\mathbf{G}'$  are of moderately large degrees, while  $\mathbf{G}''$  is a bipartite graph with parts  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  such that  $\max_{u \in U_1} \deg_{\mathbf{G}''}(u) = O(1)$ , and  $\min_{u \in U_2} \deg_{\mathbf{G}''}(u) \gtrsim n^2 p^2$ . Using a lower bound on  $e(\mathbf{G}')$  and  $e(\mathbf{G}'')$ , and an upper bound on the number of such graphs we complete the argument.

To prove Corollary 1.7 we need to strengthen some of the above steps. In fact, we argue that under the set up of Corollary 1.7, conditioned on  $\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})$ , the number of homomorphisms of  $C_{2t}$  in  $\mathbf{G}''$  is  $\hat{\delta}(1 \pm o(1))n^{2t} p^{2t}$ , and  $e(\mathbf{G}'') - |U_1| \ll n^2 p^2$ , with probability  $1 - o(1)$ . This shows that almost all the excess homomorphisms in  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  is due to the stars centered at vertices of  $U_2$ , i.e. vertices with degree  $\gtrsim n^2 p^2$ . From this the conclusion of Corollary 1.7 follows by yet another use of the estimate on Binomial tail probability.

**1.5. Notation.** For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we use the standard notations  $\lceil x \rceil := \min\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \geq x\}$  and  $\lfloor x \rfloor := \max\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \leq x\}$ . For  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  we let  $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$  and  $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ . For  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we let  $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Given two sequences of positive reals  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  we write  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  to denote  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n < \infty$ . The notation  $a_n \gtrsim b_n$  will be used to denote  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n > 0$ . We write  $a_n \asymp b_n$  if  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  and  $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ . We further write  $a_n \ll b_n$ ,  $b_n = \omega(a_n)$ , and  $b_n \gg a_n$  to denote  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$ . Let  $\{a_n\}$  be a sequence of reals and  $\{b_n\}$  be a sequence of positive reals then we write  $a_n = O(b_n)$  if  $|a_n| \lesssim b_n$ , and write  $a_n = o(b_n)$  if  $|a_n| \ll b_n$ .

The notation  $K_n$  will denote the complete graph on  $[n]$ . For a graph  $\mathbf{G}$  we write  $V(\mathbf{G})$  and  $E(\mathbf{G})$  to denote its vertex and edge sets, respectively. We let  $v(\mathbf{G}) := |V(\mathbf{G})|$  and  $e(\mathbf{G}) := |E(\mathbf{G})|$ , where  $|\cdot|$  is the cardinality of a set. Unless otherwise mentioned, the set  $V(\mathbf{G})$  will be assumed to consist only non-isolated vertices. The notation  $\deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v)$  will be used to denote the degree of a vertex  $v$  in the graph  $\mathbf{G}$ . When the choice of the graph is clear from the context, to lighten the notation we will write  $\deg(v)$  instead of  $\deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v)$ . We will use  $\Delta(\mathbf{G})$  and  $\delta(\mathbf{G})$  to denote the largest and the smallest degrees in  $\mathbf{G}$ , respectively. We will write  $\mathbf{G}' \subset \mathbf{G}$  to denote that  $V(\mathbf{G}') \subset V(\mathbf{G})$  and

$E(G') \subset E(G)$ . The notation  $K_n$  will be used to denote the complete graph on  $n$  vertices. For two graphs  $G, G' \subset K_n$  the graph  $G \setminus G'$  will be the graph induced by the edges  $E(G) \setminus E(G')$ . Moreover for  $S \subset V(G)$  we write  $G[S]$  to denote the subgraph induced by the edges with both end points belonging to  $S$ . For two disjoint subsets  $U, V \subset V(G)$  we further use  $G[U, V]$  to denote the bipartite subgraph induced by edges with one end point belonging to  $U$  and the other in  $V$ . We will use the shorthands  $e(S) := e(G[S])$  and  $e(U, V) := e(G[U, V])$ . For two vertices  $u, v \in V(G)$  we write  $u \sim v$  to denote that they are neighbors.

For a graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices we let  $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$  be the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix arranged in a non-increasing order. To ease up the notation, whenever there is no scope of confusion, we will write  $\lambda(G)$  instead of  $\lambda_1(G)$ . By a slight abuse of terminology we will often refer  $\lambda(G)$  as the top/largest eigenvalue of  $G$ .

For two random variables  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  we write  $Y_1 \stackrel{d}{=} Y_2$  to denote that they have the same distribution. For an event  $\mathcal{A}$  the notation  $\mathcal{A}^c$  will denote its complement.

**Organization of the paper.** In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.1(a) and Corollary 1.3. Proofs of all auxiliary estimates are in Section 2.1. In Section 3 we introduce necessary definitions, e.g. pre-seed graphs, core graphs, etc, and state a few relevant lemmas. Using these results we complete the proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.1(b). Section 3.1 is devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.6 which allows us to move from pre-seed graphs to core graphs. In Sections 3.2 and 3.3 we deal with core graphs with edges  $\gg n^2 p^2$  and  $O(n^2 p^2)$ , respectively. Section 4 provides the proof of Corollary 1.7. In Appendix A we provide the proofs of some non-standard bounds on the spectral radius of a graph. Finally, in Appendix B we provide some results on core graphs that are used in Section 3.

**Acknowledgments.** The author thanks Fanny Augeri for helpful discussions. This research was carried out in part as a member of the Infosys-Chandrasekharan Virtual Center for Random Geometry, supported by a grant from the Infosys Foundation. The author acknowledges the support of the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project no. RTI4001. The research was also partially supported by a MATRICS Grant (MTR/2019/ 001105) and a Start-up Research Grant (SRG/2019/001376) from Science and Engineering Research Board of Govt. of India, and an Infosys-ICTS Excellence Grant.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1(a)

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 for all  $p$  satisfying (1.4). First let us derive the large deviation lower bound. This will be straightforward. To derive that bound we will need estimates on the binomial upper tail probability. We use the following result.

**Lemma 2.1** ([3, Lemma 4.7.2]). *Let  $X \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Bin}(N, s)$  for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $s \in (0, 1)$ . Fix any  $\lambda \in (s, 1)$ . Then*

$$\frac{\exp(-NI_s(\lambda))}{\sqrt{8N\lambda(1-\lambda)}} \leq \mathbb{P}(X \geq \lambda N) \leq \exp(-NI_s(\lambda)),$$

where  $I_s(\cdot)$  is the binary relative entropy function. That is,

$$(2.1) \quad I_s(\lambda) := \lambda \log \frac{\lambda}{s} + (1-\lambda) \log \frac{1-\lambda}{1-s}.$$

For any  $\gamma > 0$  such that  $(1+\gamma)s \leq 1$  one can also derive from above the following well known Chernoff bound.

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, s) \geq (1+\gamma)Ns) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2+\gamma}Ns\right).$$

The following lemma provides bounds on the top eigenvalue of a graph in terms of various graph parameters. It will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1, for the lower bound and more extensively for the upper bound.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $e$  edges, maximum degree  $\Delta$ , and minimum degree  $\delta$ . Then the following bounds hold for the top eigenvalue  $\lambda(G)$  of the adjacency matrix of  $G$ .*

- (i)  $\sqrt{\Delta} \leq \lambda(G) \leq \min\{\Delta, \sqrt{2e}\}$ .
- (ii) If  $E(G) = \cup_i E(G_i)$  then  $\lambda(G) \leq \sum_i \lambda(G_i)$ . Additionally, if the collection of graphs  $\{G_i\}$  are vertex disjoint then  $\lambda(G) = \max_i \lambda(G_i)$ .
- (iii) If  $G$  is a forest then  $\lambda(G) \leq 2\sqrt{\Delta - 1}$ .
- (iv) If  $G$  is a star then  $\lambda(G) = \sqrt{\Delta}$ .
- (v) If  $G$  is a bipartite graph such that the degrees on both sides of the bipartition are bounded by  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  respectively, then  $\lambda(G) \leq \sqrt{\Delta_1 \Delta_2}$ .
- (vi) Let  $G' \subset G$  then  $\lambda(G') \leq \lambda(G)$ .
- (vii) Let  $G$  be a bipartite graph with vertex bipartition  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . That is, all its edges are between  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Then

$$\lambda(G) \leq \min_{i \in \{1,2\}} \max_{v \in V_i} \sqrt{\sum_{u:u \sim v} \deg_G(u)}.$$

- (viii) If  $G$  is a graph with  $\delta \geq 2$  then we have

$$\lambda(G) \leq \sqrt{2(e - v) + \Delta + 2},$$

where  $v$  is the number of vertices in  $G$ .

Most of the bounds in Lemma 2.2 are well known. The proofs of the rest are provided in Appendix A.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 (lower bound) for  $p$  satisfying (1.4).* By Lemma 2.2(i) we have that

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)) \geq \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\Delta((1 + \delta)^2)) \geq \mathbb{P}(\deg_{G(n,p)}(v) \geq (1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2),$$

where  $v \in [n]$  is an arbitrarily chosen vertex. Now the desired lower bound follows upon noting that

$$(2.4) \quad I_s(\lambda) = \lambda \log \frac{\lambda}{s} \cdot (1 + o(1)), \quad \text{for } 0 < s \ll \lambda \ll 1,$$

where  $I_s(\lambda)$  is as in (2.1). □

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the upper bound. As outlined in Section 1.4 this will require us to split the graph appropriately and show that the spectral radius of the random subgraph obtained upon removing the one neighborhoods of high degree vertices is small in the large deviations scale.

**Definition 2.3** (Decomposition of the graph). Fix  $\eta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ . Given any graph  $G$  (possibly random) with vertex set  $V(G) \subset [n]$  we define the vertices of high, low, and moderate degrees, to be denoted by  $V_H(G)$ ,  $V_L(G)$ , and  $V_M(G)$ , respectively, as follows:

$$V_H(G) := \{v \in V(G) : \deg_G(v) \geq \varpi_n\},$$

where

$$(2.5) \quad \varpi_n := \begin{cases} np \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}, & \text{if } \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \ll np \leq (\log n)^{1-\eta/2}, \\ (np)^{1+\eta} & \text{if } (\log n)^{1-\eta/2} \leq np \text{ and } \log np \ll \log n, \end{cases}$$

$$V_L(\mathbf{G}) := \{v \in V(\mathbf{G}) : \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \leq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))np\},$$

and  $V_M(\mathbf{G}) := V(\mathbf{G}) \setminus (V_H \cup V_L)$ . When the graph is clear from the context we suppress the dependence in  $\mathbf{G}$  and write  $V_H, V_M$ , and  $V_L$ . We then let  $V_{L_1}$  to be the subset of  $V_L$  that are connected to  $V_H$ . That is,

$$V_{L_1} := \{v \in V_L : \exists u \in V_H \text{ such that } (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G})\}.$$

Denote  $V_{L_2} := V_L \setminus V_{L_1}$ . Now we describe the necessary decomposition of the graph  $\mathbf{G}$ :

- We let  $\mathbf{G}_H := \mathbf{G}[V_H]$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_M := \mathbf{G}[V_M]$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_{L_1} := \mathbf{G}[V_{L_1}]$ , and  $\mathbf{G}_{L_2} := \mathbf{G}[V_{L_2}]$ .
- Define  $\mathbf{G}_{HM} := \mathbf{G}[V_H, V_M]$ . Similarly define  $\mathbf{G}_{L_1L_2}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_{ML}$ .
- Denote  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{L_1L_2}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{L_1}$  be the two cores of  $\mathbf{G}_{L_1L_2}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_{L_1}$ , respectively. Set  $\mathbf{F}_{L_1L_2} := \mathbf{G}_{L_1L_2} \setminus \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{L_1L_2}$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{L_1} := \mathbf{G}_{L_1} \setminus \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{L_1}$ . Note that by definition  $\mathbf{F}_{L_1L_2}$  and  $\mathbf{F}_{L_1}$  are forests.
- Similarly as above we define  $\mathbf{G}_{HL_1}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{HL_1}$ , and  $\mathbf{F}_{HL_1}$ .
- We further decompose the forest  $\mathbf{F}_{HL_1}$  into two subgraphs. We let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}$  to be the subgraph spanned by the edges that are incident to vertices  $u \in V_{L_1}$  that have degree one in  $\mathbf{F}_{HL_1}$ . Note that by construction  $\widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}$  is a vertex disjoint union of stars with center vertices belonging to  $V_H$ . Finally set  $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1} := \mathbf{F}_{HL_1} \setminus \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}$ .

Equipped with the above decomposition of a graph we now state a few lemmas that help us to prove the large deviations upper bound. The first lemma yields a bound on the number of moderate and high degree vertices in the two neighborhood of any given vertex. To state this lemma let us introduce the following notation.

For any  $v \in [n]$  we let

$$\mathcal{N}_M(v, \mathbf{G}) := \{u \in [n] : (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G}) \text{ and } u \in V_M(\mathbf{G})\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v, \mathbf{G}) := \{u \in [n] : \text{dist}_{\mathbf{G}}(u, v) \leq 2 \text{ and } u \in V_M(\mathbf{G})\},$$

where  $\text{dist}_{\mathbf{G}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the graph distance. We similarly define  $\mathcal{N}_H(v, \mathbf{G})$  and  $\mathcal{N}_H^{(2)}(v, \mathbf{G})$ . When  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbb{G}(n, p)$  (which will be the case in the most of this section that follows), to ease the notation, we will drop the dependence on  $\mathbf{G}$  and write  $\mathcal{N}_M(v)$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_H(v)$  etc. This convention will be adopted also for other notations throughout this section.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.4). Then for any  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $C_1 < \infty$ , depending only on  $\delta$ , such that*

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists v \in [n] : |\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)| \geq C_1 np \log(np)) \leq \exp(-2(1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np))$$

and

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\exists v \in [n] : |\mathcal{N}_H^{(2)}(v)| \geq (np)^{1-\eta/2})}{n^2 p^2 \log(np)} = -\infty.$$

**Remark 2.5.** Note that by definition  $\mathcal{N}_M(v) \subset \mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_H(v) \subset \mathcal{N}_H^{(2)}(v)$ . Therefore, the bounds (2.6) and (2.7) continue to hold when  $\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_H^{(2)}(v)$  are replaced by  $\mathcal{N}_M(v)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_H(v)$ , respectively.

Next, fix  $C_2 < \infty$  and  $\gamma > 0$ . Let

$$\mathcal{A}_1 := \{\exists S \subset [n] : |S| \leq n^2 p^2, \text{ and } e(S) \geq |S| + \gamma n^2 p^2\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_2 := \{\exists S \subset [n] : n^2 p^2 \leq |S| \leq (np)^{C_2} \text{ and } e(S) \geq (1 + \gamma)|S|\}.$$

The following lemma shows that both  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are unlikely at the large deviations scale.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.4). For any  $\gamma > 0$  and  $C_2 < \infty$  we have that*

$$\max\{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1), \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2)\} \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma}{2}n^2p^2 \log n\right),$$

for all  $n$  sufficiently large.

The next lemma provides a bound on the number of high degree vertices.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.4). Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(|V_H| \geq (np)^{1-\eta/2})}{n^2p^2 \log(np)} = -\infty.$$

In the following lemma we will show that any connected component of  $\mathbb{G}_M$  (the underlying graph is again  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ ) cannot have too many vertices. This will require some further notation. Fix  $C_3 < \infty$  and let

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\exists S \subset V_M : |S| \geq C_3np \log(np) \text{ and } \mathbb{G}[S] \text{ is connected}\}.$$

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.4). There exists  $C_3 < \infty$ , depending only on  $\delta$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}) \leq \exp(-2(1 + \delta)^2n^2p^2 \log(np)).$$

The goal of the next lemma will be to show that  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}_{L_1} \cup \mathbb{G}_{L_1L_2}) = o(np)$  at the large deviations scale. As mentioned above the argument will involve an iterative pruning procedure. To state the result we will need to introduce a couple more notation.

Fix  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . For  $\ell \in [L - 1]$  set

$$\mathcal{C}_\ell := \{\mathbb{G} \subset K_n : \delta(\mathbb{G}) \geq 2, \Delta(\mathbb{G}) \leq (1 + \delta)np, v(\mathbb{G}) \leq (np)^{L-\ell+1}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_\ell := \left\{ \exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\ell \text{ and } \lambda(\mathbb{G}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{\ell-1}}np \right\}.$$

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.4). Then for any  $\ell \in [L - 2]$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}) + \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{C(1 + \delta)2^{2\ell}}n^2p^2 \log n\right),$$

where  $C < \infty$  is some absolute constant.

The proofs of these lemmas are postponed to Section 2.1. Below, using these lemmas, we complete the proof of the large deviations upper bound.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 (upper bound) for  $p$  satisfying (1.4).* Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small. We will show that  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}(n, p) \setminus \widetilde{\mathbb{F}}_{HL_1}(\mathbb{G}(n, p))) \geq \varepsilon np$  with a negligible probability at the large deviations scale. This will yield the upper bound.

**Step 1.** We claim that

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\max\{\lambda(\mathbb{G}_H), \lambda(\mathbb{G}_{HM})\} \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15}np\right) \leq 2 \exp(-2(1 + \delta)^2n^2p^2 \log(np)).$$

By Lemma 2.2(i) and (v)

$$\lambda(\mathbb{G}_H) \leq \max_{v \in V_H} |\mathcal{N}_H(v)| \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(\mathbb{G}_{HM}) \leq \sqrt{\max_{v \in V_M} |\mathcal{N}_H(v)| \cdot \max_{u \in V_H} |\mathcal{N}_M(v)|}.$$

Therefore, (2.8) is now immediate from Lemma 2.4 (see also Remark 2.5).

**Step 2.** We next claim that

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \lambda(\mathbf{G}_M) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15} np \right) \leq 2 \exp(-2(1+\delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np)).$$

Since the top eigenvalue of a graph is the maximum of the top eigenvalues of its connected components we obtain that

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \lambda(\mathbf{G}_M) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15} np \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \exists S \subset V_M : \mathbf{G}[S] \text{ is connected and } \lambda(\mathbf{G}[S]) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15} np \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \exists S \subset [n] : |S| \leq C_3 np \log(np) \text{ and } \lambda(\mathbf{G}[S]) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15} np \right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}). \end{aligned}$$

Now note that, for any  $c_\star > 0$ , upon taking a union bound,

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\exists S \subset [n] : |S| \leq C_3 np \log(np) \text{ and } e(S) \geq c_\star n^2 p^2) &\leq \sum_{w \geq c_\star n^2 p^2} \sum_{s \leq C_3 np \log(np)} \binom{n}{s} \binom{s^2}{w} p^w \\ &\leq \sum_{w \geq c_\star n^2 p^2} \sum_{s \leq C_3 np \log(np)} \exp(s \log n + w \log(2es) - w \log(1/p)) \\ &\leq O(np \log(np)) \sum_{w \geq c_\star n^2 p^2} \exp\left(-\frac{w}{2} \log n\right) \leq n^3 \exp\left(-\frac{c_\star}{2} n^2 p^2 \log n\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{c_\star}{4} n^2 p^2 \log n\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used Stirling's approximation, and the third inequality is due to the facts that  $s = O(np \log(np))$ ,  $\log(np) \ll \log n$ ,  $np \gg 1$ , and  $w \geq c_\star n^2 p^2$ .

Upon setting  $c_\star = \varepsilon\delta/450$ , we observe that (2.9) follows from the fact that  $\lambda(\mathbf{G}) \leq \sqrt{2e(\mathbf{G})}$  (see the upper bound in Lemma 2.2(i)), (2.10)-(2.11), and Lemma 2.8.

**Step 3.** We aim to show that

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{L_1} \cup \mathbf{G}_{L_1 L_2}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15} np \right) \leq \exp(-2(1+\delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np)),$$

for all large  $n$ .

To this end, we begin by noting that

$$(2.13) \quad \mathbb{P}(\Delta(\mathbf{G}(n, p)) \geq (np)^{2+\eta/3}) \leq n \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(n-1, p) \geq (np)^{2+\eta/3}) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(np)^{2+\eta/3} \log(np)\right),$$

which is negligible at the large deviations scale. As every vertex in  $V_{L_1}$  must be connected to some vertex in  $V_H$  we observe that on the event

$$\Omega_0 := \left\{ \Delta := \Delta(\mathbf{G}(n, p)) \leq (np)^{2+\eta/3} \right\} \cap \left\{ |V_H| \leq (np)^{1-\eta/2} \right\}$$

we have that  $|V_{L_1}| \leq \Delta \cdot |V_H| \leq (np)^{3-\eta/6}$ . By a same reasoning, on the event  $\Omega_0$ , we also have that

$$|\{u \in V_{L_2} : (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G}(n, p)) \text{ for some } v \in V_{L_1}\}| \leq \left[ \max_{v \in V_{L_1}} \deg(v) \right] \cdot |V_{L_1}| \leq (np)^{4-\eta/12}.$$

Thus, on the event  $\Omega_0$ , we have that  $v(\mathbf{G}_{L_1} \cup \mathbf{G}_{L_1 L_2}) \leq (np)^4$ . Therefore, setting  $L = 4$  and  $\alpha = \varepsilon\delta/30$ , and applying Lemma 2.9 we derive that

$$(2.14) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \lambda(\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{L_1} \cup \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_{L_1 L_2}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{30} np \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\Omega_0^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\Omega_0^c) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_3) + 2 \exp(-c_1 \varepsilon^2 n^2 p^2 \log n),$$

for some constant  $c_1 > 0$ , depending only on  $\delta$ . Observe that, by (2.13) and Lemma 2.7

$$(2.15) \quad -\log \mathbb{P}(\Omega_0^c) \gg n^2 p^2 \log(np).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2(viii) for any graph  $G$  with  $\delta(G) \geq 2$  and  $\Delta(G) \lesssim np$  we have that

$$\lambda(G) \gtrsim np \Rightarrow e(G) - v(G) \gtrsim n^2 p^2.$$

Therefore,  $\mathcal{C}_3 \subset \mathcal{A}_1$ , for a suitably chosen  $\gamma$ , and hence by Lemma 2.6 we deduce that

$$(2.16) \quad -\log \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_3) \gg n^2 p^2 \log(np).$$

Recall that  $F_{L_1} = G_{L_1} \setminus \widehat{G}_{L_1}$  and  $F_{L_1 L_2} = G_{L_1 L_2} \setminus \widehat{G}_{L_1 L_2}$  are forests. Hence, by Lemma 2.2(iii)

$$\lambda(F_{L_1 L_2} \cup F_{L_1}) = O\left(\sqrt{\max_{v \in V_L} \deg(v)}\right) = O(\sqrt{np}).$$

This observation together with (2.14)-(2.16) now yield (2.12).

**Step 4.** Our next goal is to derive that

$$(2.17) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda(G_{ML}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon \delta}{15} np\right) \leq \exp(-2(1+\delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np)).$$

Fix any  $\tilde{c} > 0$ . As  $G_{ML}$  is a bipartite graph with vertex bipartition  $V_M$  and  $V_L$ , Lemma 2.2(vii) implies that

$$(2.18) \quad \{\lambda(G_{ML}) \geq \tilde{c} np\} \subset \left\{ \exists v \in V_M, \mathcal{W} \subset V_L : w \sim v \forall w \in \mathcal{W} \text{ and } \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \deg_{G_{ML}}(w) \geq \tilde{c}^2 n^2 p^2 \right\} =: \tilde{\Omega}_0.$$

Using again that  $G_{ML}$  is a bipartite graph we also observe that on the event  $\tilde{\Omega}_0$  there exists  $\mathcal{U} \subset V_M$  (namely the set of neighbors in  $V_M$  of the vertices in  $\mathcal{W}$ ) such that  $e(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{U} \cup \{v\}) \geq \tilde{c}^2 n^2 p^2$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)$ . Therefore, noting that  $\deg(v) \leq \varpi_n$  for any  $v \in V_M$  (see Definition 2.3) we deduce that

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \tilde{\Omega}_0 \setminus \left\{ \exists v' \in [n] : |\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v')| \geq C_1 np \log(np) \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \exists v \in [n], \mathcal{U} \subset V_M, \mathcal{W} \subset V_L : |\mathcal{U}| \leq C_1 np \log(np), |\mathcal{W}| \leq \varpi_n, e(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W} \cup \{v\}) \geq \tilde{c}^2 n^2 p^2 \right\} \\ & =: \widehat{\Omega}_0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1$  is as in Lemma 2.4. By the union bound and Lemma 2.1 (see also (2.4)) we now obtain that

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\Omega}_0) & \leq \sum_{\substack{u \leq \varpi_n \\ w \leq C_1 np \log(np)}} \sum_{v \in [n]} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=u, |\mathcal{W}|=w}} \mathbb{P}(e(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W} \cup \{u\}) \geq \tilde{c}^2 n^2 p^2) \\ & \leq n^2 \cdot \exp(\varpi_n \log n + O(np \log(np)) \log n - \tilde{c}^2 n^2 p^2 \log n \cdot (1 + o(1))) \\ & \leq n^2 \exp\left(-\frac{\tilde{c}^2}{2} n^2 p^2 \log n\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\tilde{c}^2}{4} n^2 p^2 \log n\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second and third steps we used that  $\varpi_n, np \log(np) \ll n^2 p^2 \leq n^{o(1)}$ , and in the last step we used that  $np \gg 1$ . Now, upon choosing  $\tilde{c} = \varepsilon \delta / 15$ , (2.17) follows from (2.18)-(2.20) and Lemma 2.4.

**Step 5.** We will show that

$$(2.21) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \lambda(\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{15} np \right) \leq \exp(-2(1+\delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np)).$$

We claim that

$$(2.22) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\Delta(\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}) \geq (1+\delta)np)}{n^2 p^2 \log(np)} = -\infty.$$

Since  $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}$  is a star, upon applying Lemma 2.2(iii), (2.21) is immediate from (2.22). By definition  $\max_{v \in V_L} \deg(v) < (1+\delta)np$ . Therefore, as  $\mathbf{F}_{HL_1}$  is a forest not containing any star that has its center vertex belonging to  $V_H$ , we find that

$$\left\{ \Delta(\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}) \geq (1+\delta)np \right\} \subset \left\{ \exists v \in [n] : |\mathcal{N}_H^{(2)}(v)| \geq (1+\delta)np \right\}.$$

Thus (2.22) follows from Lemma 2.4.

**Step 6.** Finally we note that

$$(2.23) \quad \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{L_2} \cup \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}) \leq \max \left\{ \sqrt{\Delta(\mathbb{G}(n,p))}, (1+\delta(1-\varepsilon))np \right\}.$$

This is immediate since  $\mathbf{G}_{L_2}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}$  are vertex disjoint, and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}$  is a vertex disjoint union of stars (apply Lemma 2.2(ii) and (iv)).

We may now complete the proof of the theorem. Indeed, by Lemma 2.2(ii)

$$(2.24) \quad \text{UT}_\lambda(\delta) \subset \left\{ \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{L_2} \cup \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}) \geq (1+\delta(1-\varepsilon/2))np \right\} \cup \Omega_\star \subset \text{UT}_\Delta((1+\delta(1-\varepsilon/2))^2) \cup \Omega_\star,$$

where

$$\Omega_\star := \left\{ \lambda(\mathbf{G}_H) + \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{HM}) + \lambda(\mathbf{G}_M) + \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{ML}) + \lambda(\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{HL_1}) + \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{L_1} \cup \mathbf{G}_{L_1 L_2}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\delta}{2} np \right\},$$

and the last step in (2.24) follows from (2.23). By (2.8), (2.9), (2.12), (2.17), and (2.21) we have that

$$(2.25) \quad \mathbb{P}(\Omega_\star) \lesssim \exp(-2(1+\delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np)).$$

This together with Lemma 2.1 and (2.24) now yield that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta))}{n^2 p^2 \log(np)} \leq -(1+\delta(1-\varepsilon/2))^2.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary this completes the proof.  $\square$

We now prove Corollary 1.3 for  $p$  such that (1.4) holds. The proof for the other regime is provided in Section 4.

*Proof of Corollary 1.3 (first regime).* We see from (2.24) that

$$\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta) \cap \text{UT}_\Delta((1+(1-\chi)\delta)^2)^\complement \subset \Omega_\star,$$

for any  $\chi > \varepsilon/2$ . Therefore, using (2.25) for the numerator, and (2.3) and the lower bound from Lemma 2.1 for the denominator we deduce that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \text{UT}_\Delta((1+(1-\chi)\delta)^2)^\complement \mid \text{UT}_\lambda(\delta) \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_\star)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta))} = 0.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary this completes the proof.  $\square$



**2.1. Proofs of Lemmas 2.4 and 2.6-2.9.** We start with the proof of Lemma 2.7.

*Proof of Lemma 2.7.* This is a simple application of the binomial tail probability bound. Indeed, fix a set  $\mathcal{U} \subset [n]$  of cardinality  $t$ . Observe that

$$(2.26) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \deg(u) \geq \varpi_n t \right) = \mathbb{P}(2e(\mathcal{U}) + e(\mathcal{U}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{U}) \geq \varpi_n t) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(e(\mathcal{U}) \geq \varpi_n t/3) + \mathbb{P}(e(\mathcal{U}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{U}) \geq \varpi_n t/3).$$

As  $\varpi_n \gg np$ , and

$$e(\mathcal{U}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{U}) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Bin}(t(n-t), p) \quad \text{and} \quad e(\mathcal{U}) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Bin} \left( \binom{t}{2}, p \right),$$

using Lemma 2.1 (see also (2.4)) we obtain that, there exists some  $c > 0$ , depending only on  $\eta$ , such that the LHS of (2.26) is bounded above by  $\exp(-c\varpi_n t \log \log n)$ . Hence, applying the union bound we now deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}(|V_H| \geq (np)^{1-\eta/2}) \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}| = (np)^{1-\eta/2}}} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \deg(u) \geq \varpi_n (np)^{1-\eta/2} \right) \\ \leq \exp \left( -(np)^{1-\eta/2} (c\varpi_n \log \log n - \log n) \right) \leq \exp \left( -\frac{c}{2} (np)^{1-\eta/2} \varpi_n \log \log n \right) \\ \leq \exp \left( -\frac{c}{2} (np)^{2+\eta/2} \log \log n \right),$$

where in the penultimate step we have used that  $\varpi_n \log \log n \gg \log n$  (follows from (2.5) and that  $np \gg \sqrt{\log n / \log \log n}$ ) and in the last step we used that  $\varpi_n \geq (np)^{1+\eta}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Next we prove Lemma 2.6.

*Proof of Lemma 2.6.* Fix a set  $S \subset [n]$  with  $|S| = s \leq (np)^{C_2}$ . Then  $e(S) \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Bin}(\binom{s}{2}, p)$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.1 (see also (2.4)), as  $\log(np) \ll \log n$ , we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(e(S) \geq (1+\gamma)s) \leq \exp(-(1+\gamma)s \{\log n - \log(np)\}) \cdot (1+o(1)) \\ \leq \exp(-(1+\gamma)s \log n (1+o(1))),$$

where in the last inequality we used the upper bound on  $s$ . Now the upper bound on  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2)$  follows after taking a union over the choices of  $S \subset [n]$  with  $n^2 p^2 \leq |S| \leq (np)^{C_2}$ .

The proof of the upper bound on  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1)$  is similar. Indeed, fixing  $S \subset [n]$  with  $|S| = s \leq n^2 p^2$ , using the binomial tail probability bound and that  $\log(np) \ll \log n$  once more, we find that

$$\mathbb{P}(e(S) \geq s + \gamma n^2 p^2) \leq \exp(-(s + \gamma n^2 p^2) \log n) \cdot (1+o(1)).$$

Now the proof follows by taking a union over  $S \subset [n]$  such that  $|S| \leq n^2 p^2$ .  $\square$

Now we proceed to prove Lemma 2.4. Let us add that a similar result was proved in [29] (see Lemma 2.4 there).

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.* Fix any  $v \in [n]$ . We will show that

$$(2.27) \quad \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)| \geq C_1 np \log(np)) \leq \exp(-3(1+\delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np)).$$

Since  $n^2 p^2 \log(np) \gg \log n$ , an application of the union bound then yields (2.6).

Turning to prove (2.27) let us fix a set  $\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \setminus \{v\}$  of cardinality  $\ell$  and  $\mathcal{W} \supset \mathcal{U} \cup \{v\}$  such that  $\ell + 1 \leq |\mathcal{W}| \leq 2\ell + 1$ . Fix a collection of edges  $\mathcal{E}$  such that at least one end point of the edges in  $\mathcal{E}$  belong to  $\mathcal{U}$ , and  $|\mathcal{E}| = |\mathcal{W}| - 1 \leq 2\ell$ . Let  $\{a_{i,j}\}_{i < j}$  be i.i.d.  $\text{Ber}(p)$  and for  $i > j$  set  $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i}$ .

We claim that for any  $\ell \leq n^2 p^2$

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \deg(u) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))npl \mid a_{i,j} = 1 \forall \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{\substack{i, j \in \mathcal{U} \\ \{i, j\} \notin \mathcal{E}}} a_{i,j} + \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{U}, j \notin \mathcal{U} \\ \{i, j\} \notin \mathcal{E}}} a_{i,j} \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npl \mid a_{i,j} = 1 \forall \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(2e(\mathcal{U}) + e(\mathcal{U}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{U}) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npl) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(n\ell, p) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 3\varepsilon))npl) + \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(\ell^2/2, p) \geq \delta\varepsilon npl/2) \leq \exp(-c_\delta npl),$$

for some  $c_\delta > 0$ . The first inequality above follows from that  $|\mathcal{E}| \leq 2\ell$  and  $np \gg 1$ . The second inequality is a consequence of the fact that the edges in  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  are independent and stochastic domination of binomial random variables. The penultimate inequality follows from a union bound. As  $\log(np) \ll \log(1/p)$ , the last inequality in (2.28) follows from Lemma 2.1 (see also (2.2) and (2.4)).

Now note that the event  $|\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)| \geq \ell$  implies that there exists a set  $\mathcal{U} \subset V_M$  with  $|\mathcal{U}| = \ell$  such that

$$(2.29) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}, j \in [n]} a_{i,j} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \deg(u) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))npl.$$

Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be the set of vertices of the smallest subgraph of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  containing  $\mathcal{U} \cup \{v\}$  that is connected. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the edge set of that subgraph. Since the vertices of  $\mathcal{U}$  are at a distance at most two from  $v$  it follows that  $\ell + 1 \leq |\mathcal{W}| \leq 2\ell + 1$ . Furthermore, note that the smallest connected subgraph being a tree we also have that  $|\mathcal{E}| = |\mathcal{W}| - 1$ .

Equipped with these observations, to bound the probability that  $|\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)|$  exceeds  $\ell$  we first fix  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W}$ , and  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then we find a bound on the probability that (2.29) and the event that  $a_{i,j} = 1$  for all  $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}$  hold. Finally we take a union bound over the choices of  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{W}$ , and  $\mathcal{E}$ . Carrying out these steps, by (2.28) and Stirling's approximation, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}_M^{(2)}(v)| \geq \ell) \leq \sum_{w=\ell+1}^{2\ell+1} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=\ell}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{W} \subset [n] \\ \mathcal{W} \supset \mathcal{U} \cup \{v\} \\ |\mathcal{W}|=w}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{E}: \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W} \\ |\mathcal{E}|=w-1}} \mathbb{P}(a_{i,j} = 1 \forall \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E}) \\ \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \deg(u) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))npl \mid a_{i,j} = 1 \forall \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{E} \right) \\ \leq \sum_{w=\ell+1}^{2\ell+1} \binom{n}{\ell} \binom{n-\ell-1}{w-\ell-1} \binom{\ell w}{w-1} \cdot p^{w-1} \exp(-c_\delta npl) \\ \leq \sum_{w=\ell+1}^{2\ell+1} (np)^w (e\ell)^w \cdot \frac{\ell^w}{w!} \cdot p^{-1} \exp(-c_\delta npl)$$

$$\leq 2\ell n \cdot (3e^2 np)^{3\ell} \exp(-c_\delta n p \ell) \leq \exp\left(\log n - \frac{c_\delta}{2} n p \ell\right),$$

where in the penultimate step we used that  $p \geq n^{-1}$  and in the last step we used that  $np \gg 1$ . Now, upon choosing  $\ell = C_1 np \log(np)$ , for some large  $C_1 < \infty$ , depending only on  $\delta$ , as  $n^2 p^2 \log(np) \gg \log n$ , we obtain (2.27).

The proof of (2.7) being similar to that of (2.6) is omitted. This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Next we prove Lemma 2.8.

*Proof of Lemma 2.8.* Fix a subset of vertices  $\mathcal{T} \subset [n]$  of cardinality  $t$ , and a subset  $\mathcal{E} \in \binom{[n]}{2}$  such that  $|\mathcal{E}| = t - 1$ . Arguing similarly as in (2.28) we observe that

$$(2.30) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}} \deg(u) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))npt \mid a_{i,j} = 1 \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\substack{i,j \in \mathcal{T} \\ \{i,j\} \notin \mathcal{E}}} a_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}, j \notin \mathcal{T}} a_{i,j} \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npt \mid a_{i,j} = 1 \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(2e(\mathcal{T}) + e(\mathcal{T}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{T}) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npt).$$

Now we claim that, there exists some constant  $c_\delta > 0$ , depending only on  $\delta$  such that

$$(2.31) \quad \mathbb{P}(2e(\mathcal{T}) + e(\mathcal{T}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{T}) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npt) \leq \mathbf{p}_t := \begin{cases} \exp(-c_\delta npt) & \text{if } t \leq n^2 p^2, \\ \exp(-\varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)npt/2) & \text{if } n^2 p^2 \leq t \leq \varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n, \\ \exp(-\hat{c}npt) & \text{if } \varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n \leq t \leq c_0 n, \end{cases}$$

where  $c_0 \in [\varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1), 1)$  to be determined below, and  $\hat{c} > 0$  is some constant depending on  $\delta, \varepsilon$ , and  $c_0$ . To see this, for  $t \leq \varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n$ , by the triangle inequality, we observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(2e(\mathcal{T}) + e(\mathcal{T}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{T}) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npt) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(t(n-t), p) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 6\varepsilon))npt) + \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Bin}\left(\binom{t}{2}, p\right) \geq \binom{t}{2}p + \varepsilon\delta npt\right),$$

By (2.2) it follows that the first term in the RHS is bounded above by  $\exp(-2c_\delta npt)$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1 and (2.4) we obtain that the second term in the RHS is bounded above by  $\exp(-\varepsilon\delta npt \log n/2)$  for  $t \leq n^2 p^2$ , while applying the Chernoff bound (see (2.2)) with  $\gamma = 2\varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n/t$  we find that the same term is bounded by  $\exp(-\varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)npt/2)$  for  $t \leq \varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n$ . Combining these estimates we obtain (2.31) for all  $t \leq \varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n$ . To prove the remaining range of  $t$  we use triangle inequality again to obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(2e(\mathcal{T}) + e(\mathcal{T}, [n] \setminus \mathcal{T}) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - 2\varepsilon))npt) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(t(n-t), p) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))t(n-t)p) + \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Bin}\left(\binom{t}{2}, p\right) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))\binom{t}{2}p\right),$$

and then use the Chernoff bound and the fact that  $\varepsilon(\delta \wedge 1)n \leq t \leq c_0 n$ . This proves (2.31).

If  $S \subset V_M$  then  $2e(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq \sum_{u \in S} \deg(u) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))np|S|$ . Therefore, for  $c_0 = c_0(\delta, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$  such that  $c_0(1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon)) \geq (1 + \delta/2)$ , by Chernoff bound, we find that

$$(2.32) \quad \mathbb{P}(\Omega_M) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(e(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq (1 + \delta/2) \cdot \binom{n}{2}p\right) \leq \exp(-\tilde{c}_\delta n^2 p),$$

for some  $\tilde{c}_\delta > 0$ , depending only on  $\delta$ , where  $\Omega_M := \{\exists S \subset V_M : |S| \geq c_0 n\}$ . For the rest of the proof we will work with this choice of  $c_0$ .

Equipped with all necessary bounds we now complete the proof of the lemma. To this end, we notice that on the event  $\mathcal{M} \setminus \Omega_M$  there must exist a set of vertices  $\mathcal{T} \subset [n]$  such that  $|\mathcal{T}| = t$ , where  $t \in [C_3 np \log(np), c_0 n]$ , and  $\mathbb{G}[\mathcal{T}]$  is connected. This further implies the existence of an spanning tree  $\mathbb{T}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  with edge set  $\mathcal{E} \subset \binom{\mathcal{T}}{2}$  such that  $a_{i,j} = 1$  for  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ , where  $a_{i,j}$ 's are as in (2.30).

Hence, using that the number of trees on  $t$  vertices is bounded by  $t^{t+2}$ , applying (2.30)-(2.31), and a union bound we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}) - \mathbb{P}(\Omega_M) &\leq \sum_{t \geq C_3 np \log(np)}^{c_0 n} \sum_{\mathcal{T}: |\mathcal{T}|=t} \sum_{\mathcal{E}} p^{t-1} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}} \deg(u) \geq (1 + \delta(1 - \varepsilon))npt \mid a_{i,j} = 1 \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=C_3 np \log(np)}^{c_0 n} \binom{n}{t} t^{t+2} p^{t-1} \mathbf{p}_t \leq n^3 \sum_{t=C_3 np \log(np)}^{c_0 n} (enp)^t \mathbf{p}_t \\ &\leq n^3 \left( \exp\left(-\frac{c_\delta C_3}{2} n^2 p^2 \log(np)\right) + \exp(-c_\star n^3 p^3) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $c_\star > 0$ . Now recalling that  $n^2 p^2 \log(np) \gg \log n$  and  $n \gg np \log(np)$ , the proof completes upon applying (2.32), and choosing  $C_3 < \infty$  sufficiently large, depending only  $\delta$ .  $\square$

We end this section with the proof of Lemma 2.9.

*Proof of Lemma 2.9.* We begin by noting that, by Lemma 2.2(vii), for any graph  $\mathbb{G}$  with  $\delta(\mathbb{G}) \geq 2$  and  $\Delta(\mathbb{G}) \leq (1 + \delta)np$ , as  $np \gg 1$ , the lower bound  $\lambda(\mathbb{G}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{\ell-1}} np$  implies that

$$e(\mathbb{G}) - v(\mathbb{G}) \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2^{2\ell}} n^2 p^2,$$

for all large  $n$ .

Therefore, by Lemma 2.6 we have that

$$(2.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_\ell) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\ell, \lambda(\mathbb{G}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{\ell-1}} np, \text{ and } v(\mathbb{G}) \geq n^2 p^2\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2^{2\ell+1}} n^2 p^2 \log n\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\ell) + 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma_\star}{8} n^2 p^2 \log n\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\ell := \left\{ \exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{C}_\ell, \lambda(\mathbb{G}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{\ell-1}} np, e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_\star}{4}\right) v(\mathbb{G}), \text{ and } v(\mathbb{G}) \geq n^2 p^2 \right\}$$

and  $\gamma_\star := \frac{\alpha^2}{(1+\delta) \cdot 9 \cdot 2^{2\ell}}$ . It now remains to show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\ell \subset \mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ . This will complete the proof.

Turning to do this task let us decompose the vertices of  $\mathbb{G}$  as follows:

$$V_1 := \{v \in V(\mathbb{G}) : \deg_{\mathbb{G}}(v) \geq \gamma_\star np\} \quad \text{and} \quad V_2 := V(\mathbb{G}) \setminus V_1.$$

Define

$$\mathbf{G}_1 := \mathbf{G}[V_1], \quad \mathbf{G}_2 := \mathbf{G}[V_2], \quad \text{and } \mathbf{G}_{12} := \mathbf{G}[V_1, V_2].$$

Further let  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_1$  be the two core of  $\mathbf{G}_1$  and set  $\mathbf{F}_1 := \mathbf{G}_1 \setminus \widehat{\mathbf{G}}_1$ . Note that  $\mathbf{F}_1$  is a forest. Also observe that for any  $\mathbf{G}$  with  $\Delta(\mathbf{G}) \leq (1 + \delta)np$ , due to our choice of  $\gamma_*$ , by Lemma 2.2(i), (iii), and (v) we have that

$$\max\{\lambda(\mathbf{F}_1), \lambda(\mathbf{G}_{12}), \lambda(\mathbf{G}_2)\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{3 \cdot 2^\ell} np.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.2(ii)

$$\lambda(\mathbf{G}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^{\ell-1}} np \implies \lambda(\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_1) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2^\ell} np.$$

Moreover, for  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfying the hypotheses of the event  $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_\ell$ , we notice that

$$\frac{\gamma_*}{2} np \cdot |V_1| \leq \sum_{v \in V(\mathbf{G})} (\deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) - 2) = 2(e(\mathbf{G}) - v(\mathbf{G})) \leq \frac{\gamma_*}{2} v(\mathbf{G}),$$

yielding that  $v(\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_1) \leq (np)^{L-\ell}$ . Hence, the subgraph  $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}_1 \subset \mathbf{G}$  satisfies the hypotheses of the event  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ . Therefore  $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_\ell \subset \mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}$ , and the proof of the lemma is now complete.  $\square$

### 3. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1(b) AND 1.5

We start with the proof of Theorem 1.5. We begin with the proof of the lower bound.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5 (lower bound).* Fix  $\beta > 0$ . For graphs  $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G}''$  such that  $\mathbf{G}' \subset \mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{G}'' \subset \mathbf{G} \setminus \mathbf{G}'$  we observe that

$$\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}) \geq \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}') + \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}'').$$

Therefore, denoting  $\mathbb{G}_1$  to be the random subgraph of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  induced by the edges between  $\{1\}$  and  $[n] \setminus \{1\}$ ,  $\check{\mathbb{G}}_1$  to be random subgraph on  $[n] \setminus \{1\}$ ,  $\mathbb{G}_2$  to be the random subgraph induced by  $\lceil (\widehat{\delta} + \beta)^{1/(2t)} np \rceil$ , and  $\check{\mathbb{G}}_2$  to be the random subgraph induced by the rest of the vertices, we obtain that

$$\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}_1) + \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \check{\mathbb{G}}_1)$$

and

$$\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p)) \geq \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}_2) + \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \check{\mathbb{G}}_2).$$

It is easy to note that

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}_1) \geq (\widehat{\delta} + \beta)n^{2t}p^{2t}) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\deg_{\mathbb{G}(n,p)}(1) \geq ((\widehat{\delta} + \beta)/2)^{1/t} n^2 p^2\right) \\ &\geq \exp\left(- (1 + o(1)) \cdot \left(\frac{\widehat{\delta} + \beta}{2}\right)^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(np)\right) =: \mathfrak{q}_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to Lemma 2.1 and we have used that  $np^2 \ll 1 \ll np$ . Moreover,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{q}_2 := \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \lceil (\widehat{\delta} + \beta)^{1/(2t)} np \rceil^2 \log(1/p)\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(K_{\lceil (\widehat{\delta} + \beta)^{1/(2t)} np \rceil} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}_2) \geq (1 + o(1)) \cdot (\widehat{\delta} + \beta)n^{2t}p^{2t}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the independence of the edges of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  we further deduce that

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\widehat{\delta})) &\geq \max\left\{\mathfrak{q}_1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \check{\mathbb{G}}_1) \geq (1 - \beta)n^{2t}p^{2t}), \mathfrak{q}_2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \check{\mathbb{G}}_2) \geq (1 - \beta/2)n^{2t}p^{2t})\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\check{\mathbb{G}}_1$  and  $\check{\mathbb{G}}_2$  are distributed as  $\mathbb{G}(n', p)$  and  $\mathbb{G}(n'', p)$  with  $n', n'' = n(1 - o(1))$  and  $\beta$  is arbitrary we observe from (3.1)-(3.3) that, writing  $A_n$  for the adjacency matrix of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ , it suffices to show that

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{Tr}(A_n^{2t}) \leq (1 - \beta/2)n^{2t}p^{2t}) = o(1).$$

Turning to prove (3.4) we apply standard concentration inequalities (e.g. [10, Theorem 1.16]) and the interlacing inequality, upon noting  $\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}A_n) = np(1 + o(1))$ , to obtain that, for any  $\varepsilon' > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1(A_n) \leq (1 - \varepsilon')np) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|A_n - \mathbb{E}A_n\| \geq \varepsilon'np/2) = o(1).$$

From this the claim (3.4) follows and thus the proof of the lower bound is now complete.  $\square$

The next few sections are devoted to the proof of the large deviation upper bound for the upper tail of  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$ . As mentioned in Section 1.4 we will borrow terminologies from [8, 27]. The first notion is about pre-seed graphs. For  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  and a function  $f$  we define

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}}[f(\mathbb{G}(n, p))] = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbb{G}(n, p)) \mid a_{i,j}^{\mathbb{G}} = 1 \forall (i, j) \in E(\mathbb{G})],$$

where  $\{a_{i,j}^{\mathbb{G}}\}$  is the adjacency matrix of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ .

**Definition 3.1** (Pre-seed graph). Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  sufficiently small and integer  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\bar{C} := \bar{C}(\hat{\delta}, t)$  be a sufficiently large constant. A graph  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  is said to be a pre-seed graph if the followings hold:

- (PS1)  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))] \geq (1 + \hat{\delta}(1 - \varepsilon))\mathbb{E}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))]$ .
- (PS2)  $e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \bar{C}n^2p^2 \log(1/p)$ .

The choice of  $\bar{C}$  will be made precise during the course of the proof. In the lemma below we show that probability of the upper tail event can be approximately bounded by that of the existence of pre-seed subgraphs of  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.14). Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})) \leq (1 + o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is a pre-seed graph}).$$

The proof of Lemma 3.2 relies on the following result from [27]. For a function  $F(Y)$ , where  $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N)$  is a random vector, and  $I \subset [N]$ , we use the shorthand  $\mathbb{E}_I[F]$  to denote the conditional expectation of  $F$  given  $\{Y_i, i \in I\}$ .

**Lemma 3.3** ([27, Lemma 3.7]). *Let  $Y := (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N)$  be a random variable taking values in  $\{0, 1\}^N$  and  $F := F(Y)$  be a nonzero polynomial with nonnegative coefficient of degree at most  $d$ . Then for every  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\hat{\delta} > 0$ , and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F \geq (1 + \hat{\delta})\mathbb{E}[F] \text{ and } Y_I = 0 \text{ for all } I \in \mathcal{I}\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon\hat{\delta}}{1 + \hat{\delta}}\right)^\ell,$$

where

$$\mathcal{I} := \left\{I \subset [N] : |I| \leq d\ell \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_I[F] \geq (1 + \hat{\delta}(1 - \varepsilon))\mathbb{E}[F]\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_I := \prod_{i \in I} Y_i.$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* We set  $F = \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))$  and  $N = \binom{n}{2}$ . Identifying the set  $\{(i, j), i < j \in [n]\}$  with  $[N]$  we apply Lemma 3.3 with  $\ell = \bar{C}t^{-1}n^2p^2 \log(1/p)$  to deduce that

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}) \cap \{\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ a pre-seed graph}\}^c\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\bar{C}t^{-1}n^2p^2 \log(1/p)} \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})),$$

where the last step follows upon choosing  $\bar{C}$  choosing sufficiently large, and from the lower bound on the probability of  $\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})$  (proved above). This immediately implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})) \leq o(1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})) + \mathbb{P}\left(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}) \cap \{\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ a pre-seed graph}\}\right),$$

which in turn yields the desired upper bound on the probability of  $\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})$ .  $\square$

The condition (PS1) in Definition 3.1 is difficult to work with. Below we will show that, in the regime (1.14), such graphs admit a nicer description, and moreover subgraphs of those graphs can be extracted so that each edge of the subgraph participates in a lot of homomorphism counts. These two sets of graphs will be termed as seed graphs and core graphs, respectively.

**Definition 3.4** (Seed graph). Let  $\varepsilon, \hat{\delta}, t$ , and  $\bar{C}$  be as in Definition 3.1. A graph  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  is said to be a seed graph if the followings hold:

- (S1)  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}) \geq \hat{\delta}(1 - 2\varepsilon)n^{2t}p^{2t}$ .
- (S2)  $e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \bar{C}n^2p^2 \log(1/p)$ .

**Definition 3.5** (Core graph). With  $\varepsilon, \hat{\delta}, t$ , and  $\bar{C}$  as in Definition 3.1 we define a graph  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  to be a core graph if

- (C1)  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}) \geq \hat{\delta}(1 - 3\varepsilon)n^{2t}p^{2t}$ ,
- (C2)  $e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \bar{C}n^2p^2 \log(1/p)$ ,

and

- (C3)  $\min_{\mathbf{e} \in E(\mathbb{G})} \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{e}) \geq \hat{\delta}\varepsilon n^{2t}p^{2t} / (\bar{C}n^2p^2 \log(1/p))$ ,

where for an edge  $\mathbf{e} \in E(\mathbb{G})$  the notation  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{e})$  denotes the number of homomorphisms of  $C_{2t}$  in  $\mathbb{G}$  that contain the edge  $\mathbf{e}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.14). Then, for all large  $n$ ,*

$$\{\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is pre-seed}\} \subset \{\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is core}\}.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.6 is postponed to Section 3.1. Equipped with Lemma 3.6 we observe that it now suffices to bound the probability of the existence of a core graph in  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$ . We split the set of core graphs into two subsets: (i) core graphs with a large number of edges and (ii) core graphs with  $O(n^2p^2)$  many edges. We show below that the existence of the first set of graphs are unlikely at the large deviations scale. To treat the second set of graphs we extract yet another subgraph of core graphs so that each edge participates in even a larger number of homomorphism counts. These graphs will be termed as strong-core graphs.

**Definition 3.7** (Strong-core graph). Let  $\varepsilon, \hat{\delta}$ , and  $t$  be as in Definition 3.1, and  $\bar{C}_* := \bar{C}_*(\hat{\delta}, t) < \infty$  be a large constant, depending on  $\hat{\delta}$  and  $t$ , and the ratio  $\log(np)/\log(1/p)$ . We define a graph  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  to be a strong-core graph if

- (SC1)  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}) \geq \hat{\delta}(1 - 6\varepsilon)n^{2t}p^{2t}$ ,
- (SC2)  $e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \bar{C}_*n^2p^2$ ,

and

- (SC3)  $\min_{\mathbf{e} \in E(\mathbb{G})} \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{e}) \geq (\hat{\delta}\varepsilon/\bar{C}_*) \cdot (np)^{2t-2}$ .

The choice of  $\bar{C}_*$  will also be made precise in the proof. Note the difference in the lower bounds in (C3) and (SC3) in Definitions 3.5 and 3.7, respectively.

**Lemma 3.8.** Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for  $p$  satisfying (1.14) and  $\varepsilon \leq 1/(36t)$  we have that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is core and } e(\mathbb{G}) \geq \bar{C}_* n^2 p^2)}{n^2 p^2 \log(np)} \leq -\frac{\bar{C}_*}{20}.$$

**Lemma 3.9.** Consider the same setup as in Lemma 3.8. Then, there exists some absolute constant  $\beta < \infty$  such that

$$\log \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is strong-core}) \leq \exp(-\phi_t(\hat{\delta})(1 - \beta t \varepsilon)),$$

for all large  $n$ , where

$$(3.6) \quad \phi_t(\hat{\delta}) := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \hat{\delta}^{1/t} \log(1/p), \left( \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2} \right)^{1/t} \log(np) \right\} n^2 p^2.$$

Proofs of Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9 are postponed to Sections 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. Equipped with Lemmas 3.2, 3.6, 3.8, and 3.9 we now complete the proof of the large deviation upper bound.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5 (upper bound).* Using Lemmas 3.2 and 3.6 we derive that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})) \leq (1 + o(1)) \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is core}).$$

Therefore, once we show that

$$(3.7) \quad \{\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ is core and } e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \bar{C}_* n^2 p^2\} \subset \{\exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbb{G} \text{ strong-core}\},$$

application of Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9, with  $\bar{C}_* = C \hat{\delta}^{1/t}$  for some large absolute constant  $C < \infty$ , would yield that

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})) \leq \exp(-\phi_t(\hat{\delta})(1 - 2\beta t \varepsilon)),$$

for all large  $n$ . To prove (3.7) we consider the subgraph  $\mathbb{G}' \subset \mathbb{G}$  obtained by iteratively deleting edges  $\mathbf{e}$  of  $\mathbb{G}$  such that  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{e}) \leq (\hat{\delta} \varepsilon / \bar{C}_*) \cdot (np)^{t-2}$ . Using triangle inequality it follows that  $\mathbb{G}'$  is indeed a strong-core graph. Thus (3.7) holds and the proof of the theorem is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 3.10.** For the rest of the paper we set  $\bar{C}_* = C \hat{\delta}^{1/t}$ .

Next, using Theorem 1.5, we prove Theorem 1.1(b).

*Proof of Theorem 1.1(b).* As mentioned in Section 1.1 we will prove the following large deviation bound for  $p$  satisfying (1.14):

$$(3.9) \quad -\log \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)) = (1 + o(1)) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(1/p), (1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right\}.$$

From this (1.7) is immediate. First let us prove the large deviation lower bound. For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $K_{[m]}$  denote the clique on  $[m]$ . Since  $\lambda(K_{[m]}) = m - 1$ , by Lemma 2.2(i) and (vi) we have that

$$\{K_{\lceil (1+\delta)np \rceil + 1} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p)\} \cup \text{UT}_\Delta(\delta) \subset \text{UT}_\lambda(\delta).$$

Now the desired large deviation lower bound follows from Lemma 2.1 and the fact that the probability that  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  contains  $K_{[m]}$  is bounded below by  $\exp(-m^2/2 \log(1/p))$ .

Turning to prove the upper bound we note that for any graph  $\mathbb{G}$

$$(3.10) \quad \lambda_1(\mathbb{G})^{2t} \leq \sum_i \lambda_i(\mathbb{G})^{2t} = \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}).$$



Now, as  $\log(np) \gtrsim \log n$ , there exists  $c > 0$  such that  $np \geq n^c$ , for all large  $n$ . Hence, (1.12) holds for all  $t > 1/c$ . This, together with (3.10) and (3.8) now shows that

$$(3.11) \quad -\log \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)) \geq \phi_t(\widehat{\delta})(1 - 2t\beta\varepsilon)$$

for all  $t > 1/c$  with  $\widehat{\delta} = \widehat{\delta}(t) = (1 + \delta)^{2t} - 1$ . As  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\delta}^{1/t} = (1 + \delta)^2$ , given any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $t_0 > 1/c$  such that  $(\widehat{\delta}/2)^{1/t} \geq (1 + \delta)^2(1 - \epsilon)$ . Setting  $\varepsilon = \epsilon t_0^{-1} \beta^{-1}$  we therefore find that

$$-\log \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta)) \geq (1 - 2\epsilon) \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(1/p), (1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right\},$$

for all large  $n$ . Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary the desired upper bound now follows. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.1. Bounds on expected homomorphism counts.** In this section our goal is to derive Lemma 3.6. To prove Lemma 3.6 we will need a couple of results. The first one provides a necessary bound on  $\mathbb{E}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))]$ .

To state the result we need the notion of quotient graphs. For  $\pi$  a partition of  $V(H)$  we let  $H/\pi$  to be the *quotient graph* obtained from  $H$  by identifying vertices within parts of the partition  $\pi$  and deleting multiple edges (but keeping self-loops). Note that if some part of  $\pi$  contain vertices that do not form an independent set of  $H$  then the quotient graph  $H/\pi$  possesses self-loops. By an abuse of notation, quotient graphs that do not possess any self-loops will be termed, for convenience, *simple quotient graphs*.

**Lemma 3.11.** *Fix  $t \geq 2$ .*

- (a) *Let  $H = C_{2t}/\pi$  be a simple quotient subgraph of  $C_{2t}$ . If  $H$  is a tree then  $v(H) \leq t + 1$ . Furthermore, the number of simple quotient subgraphs of  $C_{2t}$  that are trees and have (vertex) size  $(t + 1)$  is  $\binom{2t}{t}/(t + 1)$ .*
- (b) *Let  $p \in (0, 1)$  such that  $np \gg 1$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))] = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \left( n^{2t} p^{2t} + \frac{\binom{2t}{t}}{t + 1} n^{t+1} p^t \right).$$

Next, recalling Definitions 3.1 and 3.4 we note that one also needs that  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))] = (1 + o(1))\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G})$ . This step is significantly different than the one in the context of subgraph counts. For the subgraph count the maps  $\varphi : V(C_{2t}) \mapsto [n]$  under consideration are injective and therefore *all* the edges of  $C_{2t}$  that are not mapped to those of  $\mathbb{G}$  retain their independence.

On the other hand, a homomorphism  $\varphi$  not necessarily being an injective map the edges of  $C_{2t}$  that are not mapped to  $E(\mathbb{G})$  need not be mapped to distinct edges of  $K_n \setminus \mathbb{G}$ , and hence all these edges may not be “free” and some may get “frozen” via  $\varphi$ . To tackle this new difficulty one needs an additional combinatorial analysis. We require a few definitions to carry out this step.

**Definition 3.12** (Equivalence classes of maps, and generating and non-generating edges and vertices). Let  $\varphi : V(C_{2t}) \mapsto [n]$  be a map such that no two adjacent vertices of  $C_{2t}$  are mapped to the same element in  $[n]$ . It naturally induces a map from  $E(C_{2t})$  to  $\binom{[n]}{2}$ , which, by a slight abuse of notation, will be continued to be denoted by  $\varphi$ .

For  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  and  $H \subset C_{2t}$  we let  $\mathcal{S}(H, \mathbb{G})$  to be set of all maps  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi(E(H)) \subset E(\mathbb{G})$  and  $\varphi(E(\bar{H})) \subset E(\bar{\mathbb{G}})$ , where  $\bar{H} := C_{2t} \setminus H$  and  $\bar{\mathbb{G}} := K_n \setminus \mathbb{G}$ .

Notice that  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbb{G})$  further induces equivalence classes on  $E(\bar{H})$ . Namely,  $e_i, e_j \in E(\bar{H})$  are said to be equivalent iff  $\varphi(e_i) = \varphi(e_j)$ . Inside each equivalence class an arbitrarily chosen edge,

e.g. the edge with the smallest index under the canonical labelling of  $E(C_{2t})$  (see Definition 3.13 below), is said to be *generating* (or *free*), while the others are said to be *non-generating* (or *frozen*).

This also allows us to extend the notion of free/frozen for vertices that are incident to some edge in  $E(\bar{H})$ : Both end points of a non-generating edge are set to be non-generating (or frozen), while the rest of the vertices are termed to be generating (or free).

**Definition 3.13** (Types of edges). For convenience, let us put the canonical labelling on  $C_{2t}$ . That is,  $V(C_{2t}) = [2t]$  and  $E(C_{2t}) = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^{2t}$ , where  $e_i = (i, i+1)$  for  $i \in [2t-1]$  and  $e_{2t} = (2t, 1)$ . For  $i \in [2t]$ , the vertex  $i$  will be said to be the left end point of the edge  $e_i$ , while the vertex in the other end of  $e_i$  will be its right end point.

Fix  $H \subset C_{2t}$ . We classify the edges of  $\bar{H}$  as follows. If both end points of the edge  $\mathbf{e} \in E(\bar{H})$  are in  $V(H)$  then we classify  $\mathbf{e}$  as a *type I edge*. If  $\mathbf{e}$  is such that only its left end point belongs to  $V(H)$  then we classify it as a *type II edge*. When only the right end point of  $\mathbf{e}$  belongs to  $V(H)$  we term that to be a *type III edge*. The rest of the edges of  $\bar{H}$  are *type IV edges*.

**Definition 3.14.** Fix  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$  and  $H \subset C_{2t}$ . Define

$$\psi(H) = \psi_{\mathbb{G}}(H) := \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbb{G})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}} \left[ \prod_{\mathbf{e}=(x,y) \in E(C_{2t})} a_{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)}^{\mathbb{G}} \right].$$

Let  $\mathbf{f} := (f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)$ , where  $f_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ , and define  $\mathcal{S}(H, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{f})$  to be the subset of all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbb{G})$  such that the number of frozen edges of Type  $i$  equals  $f_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ . Set

$$(3.12) \quad \psi(H, \mathbf{f}) = \psi_{\mathbb{G}}(H, \mathbf{f}) := \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{f})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}} \left[ \prod_{\mathbf{e}=(x,y) \in E(C_{2t})} a_{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)}^{\mathbb{G}} \right].$$

Equipped with the above definitions we now have the following result.

**Lemma 3.15.** Fix  $\emptyset \neq H \subsetneq C_{2t}$ ,  $\mathbb{G} \subset K_n$ , and  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}^4$  such that  $H$  does not contain any isolated vertex and  $e(\mathbb{G}) = O(n^2 p^2 \log n)$ . Then, for  $p \in (0, 1)$  such that  $(\log n)^t \ll np \ll n^{1/2} (\log n)^{-2t}$  we have that

$$(3.13) \quad \psi(H, \mathbf{f}) = o(n^{2t} p^{2t}).$$

Let us postpone the proof of Lemma 3.15 to later and now provide the proof of Lemma 3.6.

*Proof of Lemma 3.6 (using Lemmas 3.11 and 3.15).* It follows from Definition 3.14 and Lemma 3.15 that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{G}}[\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}(n, p))] = \sum_{H: H \subset C_{2t}} \psi_{\mathbb{G}}(H) = \psi_{\mathbb{G}}(C_{2t}) + (1+o(1))n^{2t} p^{2t} = \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}) + (1+o(1))n^{2t} p^{2t},$$

where the sum over  $H$  in the first step is restricted to those subgraphs of  $C_{2t}$  that do not possess any isolated vertex. Therefore, by Lemma 3.11(b) we deduce that any pre-seed is graph  $\mathbb{G}$  is a seed graph, for  $p$  as in (1.14) and all large  $n$ . Now upon deleting edges  $\mathbf{e} \in E(\mathbb{G})$  (iteratively) such that  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbf{e}) \leq \delta \varepsilon n^{2t} p^{2t} / (\bar{C} n^2 p^2 \log(1/p))$  we obtain a subgraph  $\mathbb{G}' \subset \mathbb{G}$  such that conditions (C2) and (C3) of Definition 3.5 holds for  $\mathbb{G}'$ . Since  $e(\mathbb{G}) \leq \bar{C} n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)$ , by triangle inequality we obtain that (C1) also holds for  $\mathbb{G}'$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{G}'$  is a core graph. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

It remains to prove Lemmas 3.11 and 3.15. First, we prove Lemma 3.15.

*Proof of Lemma 3.15.* To derive (3.13) we will split the sum over  $\varphi$  into subsets of  $\mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{f})$  such that the equivalence classes, determined by  $\varphi$ , are same and show that the bound (3.13) holds for all allowable choices of equivalence classes.

To this end, we fix a partition  $\mathcal{P}$  of the edge set  $E(\bar{H})$ . This automatically defines equivalence classes on  $E(\bar{H})$  and therefore it further determines the set of non-generating/frozen edges, to be denoted by  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}) \subset E(\bar{H})$ . There is still an indeterminacy in the choice of which end of generating edge to be mapped to the left end of non-generating edges. So we fix  $\mathbf{m} \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathcal{F}}$ . Now we let  $\mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) \subset \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{f})$  to be the collection of all maps  $\varphi$  such that the equivalence class induced by  $\varphi$  is  $\mathcal{P}$ , in particular the set of non-generating edges is  $\mathcal{F}$ , and the end points of the free edges to be mapped (via  $\varphi$ ) to the left end of the frozen edges are determined by  $\mathbf{m}$ .

We then let  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$  to be the RHS of (3.12) when the sum there is taken over  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ . As there are only finitely many choices of  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  (depending only on  $t$ ) such that the number of frozen edges is  $\mathbf{f}$  we notice that it suffices to prove the bound (3.13) for  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$  for any fixed  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathbf{m}$ .

We now turn to prove (3.13) for  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ . Observe that conditioned on the edges in  $\mathbf{G}$ , for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ , only the edges  $\varphi(E(\bar{H}) \setminus \mathcal{F})$  are independent. Therefore

$$(3.14) \quad \psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{\mathbf{e}=(x,y) \in E(\bar{H})} a_{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)}^{\mathbf{G}} \right] = \tilde{\psi}(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) \cdot p^{|E(\bar{H}) \setminus \mathcal{F}|},$$

where  $\tilde{\psi}(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) := |\mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})|$ . As

$$(3.15) \quad |E(\bar{H}) \setminus \mathcal{F}| = 2t - e(H) - \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathbf{f}_i,$$

it now remains to find an appropriate bound on  $\tilde{\psi}(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ . To this end, we let  $V_{\star} := V(H) \setminus V(\mathcal{F})$  and  $\hat{V} := [2t] \setminus (V(H) \cup V(\mathcal{F}))$ , where  $V(\mathcal{F})$  is the set of frozen vertices. Recalling Definition 3.12, as  $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ , we observe that  $\varphi(V_{\star} \cup \hat{V})$  determines the values of  $\varphi(V(\mathcal{F}))$ . Therefore

$$\mathcal{S}(H, \mathbf{G}, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) \subset \left\{ \varphi_{\star} \mid \varphi_{\star} : V_{\star} \mapsto V(\mathbf{G}), \varphi_{\star}(E(H_{\star})) \subset E(\mathbf{G}) \right\} \times \left\{ \hat{\varphi} \mid \hat{\varphi} : \hat{V} \mapsto [n] \right\},$$

where  $H_{\star} := \mathbf{G}[V_{\star}]$ . Hence

$$\tilde{\psi}(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) \leq n^{\hat{v}} \cdot \text{Hom}(H_{\star}, \mathbf{G}),$$

where  $\hat{v} := |\hat{V}|$ .

Since  $\emptyset \neq H \subsetneq C_{2t}$  and  $H$  does not contain isolated vertices it is easy to see that  $H$  must be a vertex disjoint union of paths and hence, by the definition of  $H_{\star}$ , so is  $H_{\star}$ . Let us assume that  $H = \cup_{i=1}^k P_{s_i}$  for some  $k \geq 1$  and  $s_i \geq 1$  for  $i \in [k]$ , where  $P_{\ell}$  denotes a path of length  $\ell$ . Recall Definition 3.13 and note that each frozen edge appearing after a path  $P_{s_i}$ , for some  $i \in [k]$  (when  $C_{2t}$  is traversed from the lowest indexed edge to the highest indexed edge in its canonical labelling) must be either a type I or type II edge, while each frozen edge preceding a path  $P_{s_i}$  should be either a type I and or type III edge. This yields that

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbf{f}_1 + \mathbf{f}_2 \vee \mathbf{f}_3 \leq k.$$

We next claim that

$$(3.17) \quad \hat{v} \leq 2t - v(H) - \mathbf{f}_2 \vee \mathbf{f}_3 - \mathbf{f}_4$$

and

$$(3.18) \quad \text{Hom}(H_{\star}, \mathbf{G}) \lesssim n^{v(H)} p^{e(H)} \cdot (np^2)^k \cdot (np)^{-(\mathbf{f}_1 + \mathbf{f}_2 \vee \mathbf{f}_3)} \cdot (\log n)^{3t}.$$

Before proving (3.17)-(3.18) let us use these bounds to derive the bound (3.13) for  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ . Using (3.14)-(3.15) and (3.17)-(3.18) we obtain that

$$\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}) \lesssim (np)^{2t} \cdot (\log n)^{3t} \cdot (np^2)^{k-f_1-f_2 \vee f_3} \cdot (np)^{-(f_2 \vee f_3 + f_4)}.$$

Now recall (3.16). If  $f_1 + f_2 \wedge f_3 < k$  then the upper bound on  $p$  implies that the bound (3.13) holds for  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ . On other hand, if  $f_2 \wedge f_3 > 0$  then the lower bound on  $p$  yields the desired bound on  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$ . In the remaining case, i.e. when  $f_2 \wedge f_3 = 0$ , as type I edges can only be mapped to edges of same type via  $\varphi$  and there must at least one generating type I edge, we further obtain that  $f_1$  must be strictly less than the number of type I edges which in turn is strictly less than  $k$ . From this observation the bound on  $\psi(H, \mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m})$  in this remaining case follows.

To complete the proof of the lemma it now remains to derive (3.17)-(3.18). To prove (3.17) pick any frozen edge that is of type either II or IV. Consider the vertex on its right end point. Observe that such vertices are distinct as we move over all type II and IV frozen edges. Furthermore, all these vertices are in  $([2t] \setminus V(H)) \cap V(\mathcal{F})$ . Therefore,  $\hat{v} \leq 2t - v(H) - f_2 - f_4$ . Now considering type III and IV frozen edges and the vertices at the left end point of these edges, and repeating the same argument as above we arrive at the bound (3.17).

Turning to prove (3.18) we observe that, for  $\ell \geq -1$ ,

$$(3.19) \quad \text{Hom}(P_\ell, \mathbf{G}) \leq (2e(\mathbf{G}))^{\lceil \frac{\ell+1}{2} \rceil} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Hom}(H_1 \cup H_2, \mathbf{G}) \leq \text{Hom}(H_1, \mathbf{G}) \cdot \text{Hom}(H_2, \mathbf{G}),$$

where for notational convenience we set  $P_0$  to be the graph containing a single isolated vertex and  $P_{-1}$  to be the empty graph, and  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  vertex disjoint. We then recall the definitions of  $V_\star$  and  $H_\star$  from above to find that  $H_\star = \cup_{i=1}^k P_{\tilde{s}_i}$  for some sequence  $\{\tilde{s}_i\}_{i \in [k]}$  such that  $-1 \leq \tilde{s}_i \leq s_i$  for all  $i \in [k]$ . We claim that

$$(3.20) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{s}_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k s_i - f_1 - f_2 \vee f_3 = e(H) - f_1 - f_2 \vee f_3 = v(H) - k - f_1 - f_2 \vee f_3.$$

The equalities in (3.20) follow from the fact that  $H$  is a vertex disjoint union of paths  $\{P_{s_i}\}_{i=1}^k$  with  $s_i \geq 1$ . To prove the inequality in (3.20) we consider type I or II frozen edges. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the vertices at the left end point of such edges. Clearly  $\mathcal{R} \subset V(H) \cap V(F)$ , all elements of  $\mathcal{R}$  are distinct, and  $|V(H) \cap V(F)| \geq |\mathcal{R}| = f_1 + f_2$ . By a similar argument we also have that  $|V(H) \cap V(F)| \geq f_1 + f_3$ . Thus  $v(H_\star) \leq v(H) - f_1 - f_2 \vee f_3$ . Then using that  $v(P_\ell) = \ell + 1$  for all  $\ell \geq -1$  we obtain the inequality in (3.20).

Equipped with (3.20) we apply (3.19) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}(H_\star, \mathbf{G}) &\lesssim e(\mathbf{G})^{\sum_{i=1}^k (\frac{\tilde{s}_i}{2} + 1)} \lesssim (np)^{\sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{s}_i + 2k} \cdot (\log n)^{3t} \leq (np)^{v(H) + k - f_1 - f_2 \vee f_3} \cdot (\log n)^{3t} \\ &= n^{v(H)} p^{e(H)} (np^2)^k (np)^{-(f_1 + f_2 \vee f_3)} \cdot (\log n)^{3t}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we used that  $e(\mathbf{G}) = O(n^2 p^2 \log n)$ ,  $v(H) \leq 2t$ , and  $k \leq t$ , and in the last step we have used  $v(H) = e(H) + k$ . This yields (3.18). The proof of the lemma is now complete.  $\square$

We end this section with the proof of Lemma 3.11. To prove part (a) we will need to use some standard notion that are used in the proof of Wigner's semicircle law, such as words, and graphs associated to words. These are borrowed from [2, Chapter 2.1.3]. Readers familiar with these notions can skip the definition below and move straight to the proof of Lemma 3.11.

**Definition 3.16.** Given a finite set  $\mathcal{S}$  an  $\mathcal{S}$ -word  $w$  is a finite sequence of letters, elements of  $\mathcal{S}$ , i.e.  $w = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_k$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The length of  $w$ ,  $\ell(w)$ , is defined to be  $k$  and its weight, to

be denoted by  $\text{wt}(w)$ , is the number of distinct letters in  $\text{supp}(w) := \{s_i, i \in [k]\}$ . The word  $w$  is closed if  $s_1 = s_k$ . Two  $\mathcal{S}$ -words are equivalent if there is a bijection on  $\mathcal{S}$  which maps one word to the other. If  $\mathcal{S}$  is clear from the context, we refer to  $w$  simply as a word.

For a word  $w$  as above we let  $G(w)$  to be the graph associated with it whose vertex set is  $\text{supp}(w)$  and the edge set is  $\{\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}, i \in [k]\}$ . Note that for a closed word  $w$  this defines a path starting and ending at the same vertex. For an edge  $\mathbf{e} \in E(G(w))$  we define  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{e}}(w)$  to be the number of times this path traverses the edge  $\mathbf{e}$ .

We then let  $\mathcal{V}_{k,r}$  to be a set of representatives for the equivalence classes of closed  $[r]$ -words  $w$  with  $\ell(w) = k+1$  and  $\text{wt}(w) = r$ . Define  $\mathcal{W}_{k,r} \subset \mathcal{V}_{k,r}$  be the collection of all  $w$  such that  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{e}}(w) \geq 2$  for all  $\mathbf{e} \in E(G(w))$ . The set  $\mathcal{W}_{k,k/2+1}$  ( $k$  must be even) is said to be the set of all Wigner words.

*Proof of Lemma 3.11.* Fix a partition  $\pi$  so that the quotient subgraph  $C_{2t}/\pi$  is simple. Our strategy would be to associate any such simple quotient graph to  $G(w)$  for some appropriately chosen closed word  $w$ , and then use properties of  $G(w)$ .

Towards this end, we observe that for any partition  $\pi$  of  $[2t]$  there is a natural choice of a closed word  $w = w(\pi) = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{2t+1}$  such that  $\text{wt}(w)$  is the number of parts in the partition  $\pi$ , and  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_i\}$  is a discrete interval in  $\mathbb{N}$  for all  $i \in [2t+1]$ . Let us illustrate it through examples: If  $\pi_1 = \{\{1, 3, 5\}, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{6\}\}$  and  $\pi_2 = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{5\}, \{6\}\}$  then  $w(\pi_1) = 1213141$  and  $w_2(\pi) = 1212341$ . It can be argued that that this map  $\pi \mapsto w(\pi)$  is a bijection between the set of all  $\pi$  such that its number of parts is  $r$  and  $\mathcal{V}_{2t,r}$ . Furthermore, the graphs  $G(w(\pi))$  and  $C_{2t}/\pi$  are isomorphic.

Let  $\pi$  be such that  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{e}}(w(\pi)) = 1$  for some edge  $\mathbf{e} \in G(w(\pi))$ . We claim that  $G(w(\pi))$  (or equivalently  $C_{2t}/\pi$ ) must contain a cycle. To see this, for ease of writing assuming that  $\mathbf{e}_0 = ([1], [2t])$  is traversed only once we observe that the path induced by the set of edges  $\{([i], [i+1]), i \in [2t-1]\}$ , where  $[j]$  denotes the equivalence class containing the vertex  $j$  induced by  $\pi$ , does not contain the edge  $\mathbf{e}_0$ . Therefore there are two paths between  $[1]$  and  $[2t]$  yielding the claim.

On the other hand  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{e}}(w(\pi)) \geq 1$  for all edge  $\mathbf{e}$ ,  $e(G(w(\pi))) \geq \text{wt}(w) - 1$  and  $\sum_{\mathbf{e}} \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{e}}(w(\pi)) = 2t$ , where the lower bound on  $e(G(w(\pi)))$  is due to the fact that  $G(w(\pi))$  is connected. This shows that for any  $r \geq t+2$  such that  $\text{wt}(w(\pi)) = r$  there exists some edge  $\mathbf{e}_*$  such that  $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{e}_*}(w(\pi)) = 1$ . Hence, we conclude that any simple quotient graph  $H = C_{2t}/\pi$  with  $v(H) > t+1$  cannot be a tree.

It additionally follows from above that the set of  $\pi$  for which that  $C_{2t}/\pi$  is a tree on  $(t+1)$  vertices has a bijection with  $\mathcal{W}_{2t,t+1}$ . So, the conclusion on the number of trees follows from the one-to-one correspondence between Wigner words and Dyck paths (cf. [2, Proof of Lemma 2.1.6]). This completes part (a).

The proof of (b) uses the following well known identity:

$$(3.21) \quad \text{Hom}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{G}) = \sum_{\pi} N(\mathbf{H}/\pi, \mathbf{G}),$$

where the sum is over all partition  $\pi$  of the vertex set  $V(\mathbf{H})$  (cf. [30, Chapter 5]), and we recall that  $N(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{G})$  denotes the number of labelled copies of  $\mathbf{H}$  in  $\mathbf{G}$ . Note that if  $\mathbf{G}$  does not possess any self-loop then the sum in (3.21) can be restricted to a sum over  $\pi$  such that the graph  $\mathbf{H}/\pi$  is a simple quotient graph. By part (a), for a simple quotient graph  $H = C_{2t}/\pi$  either  $e(H) \geq v(H)$  or  $e(H) = v(H) - 1$  only if  $v(H) \leq t+1$ . Since for any  $H$  one has that  $N(H, \mathbb{G}(n, p)) = n^{v(H)} p^{e(H)} (1 + o(1))$ , denoting  $\mathcal{T}$  to be the set of all trees on  $(t+1)$  vertices and  $\phi$  to be the trivial partition (i.e. consisting of only singletons), and using that  $np \gg 1$  we deduce that

$$\sum_{\pi: \pi \neq \phi, C_{2t}/\pi \notin \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[N(C_{2t}/\pi, \mathbb{G}(n, p))] = o(n^{2t} p^{2t}) + o(n^{t+1} p^t).$$

Finally using the bound on the number of simple quotient graphs  $C_{2t}/\pi \in \mathcal{T}$  and (3.21) the proof completes.  $\square$

**3.2. Cores with many edges are unlikely.** In this section we will prove Lemma 3.8. This will be based on a combinatorial argument and it will require the following result on the number of graphs with certain specified properties.

**Lemma 3.17.** *Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $p$  be such that  $(\log n)^{2t} \ll np \lesssim n^{1/2}$ , and  $\mathfrak{D} := \mathfrak{D}(\varepsilon)$  and  $D := D(\varepsilon) := \lceil 32/\varepsilon \rceil$  be integers such that  $\mathfrak{D} \geq D$ . Denote*

$$\mathcal{V}_1 := \mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{G}) := \{v \in V(\mathbf{G}) : \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \leq \mathfrak{D}\}$$

and  $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_1 := V(\mathbf{G}) \setminus \mathcal{V}_1$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{v}, \mathfrak{D})$  be the number of core graphs  $\mathbf{G}$  with  $e(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{e}$  and  $v(\mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{G})) = \mathbf{v}$ . Then, for all large  $n$ , we have

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{v}, \mathfrak{D}) \leq \binom{n}{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \exp(\varepsilon \mathbf{e} \log(1/p)).$$

Proceeding similarly as in the proof of [8, Lemma 4.7], and using the lemma below instead of [8, Lemma 3.6], the proof of Lemma 3.17 follows. Therefore, we spare the details.

**Lemma 3.18.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.14) and  $\mathbf{G}$  be a core graph. Then, for every edge  $\mathbf{e} = (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G})$*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{G}}(u) \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_0(\varepsilon, t) n^2 p^2}{(\log n)^{2t}},$$

for some constant  $\tilde{c}_0(\varepsilon, t) > 0$ .

The proof of Lemma 3.18 is postponed to Appendix B. We now proceed to prove Lemma 3.8.

*Proof of Lemma 3.8.* Let  $\mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{G})$  be as in Lemma 3.17 with  $\mathfrak{D} = D$ . Note that, by Lemma 3.18, there are no edges  $\mathbf{G}$  with both end points in  $\mathcal{V}_1$ . Therefore,  $e(\mathbf{G}) \geq e(\mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{G}), \overline{\mathcal{V}}_1(\mathbf{G})) \geq v(\mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{G}))$ . We claim that

$$(3.22) \quad \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{v}, D) \leq \begin{cases} \exp(2(1/3 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{e} \log(1/p)), & \text{if } \mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{e}/3, \\ \exp(\{(1 + 2\varepsilon) \log(1/p) - \log(np)/3\} \mathbf{e}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As the probability of any graph  $\mathbf{G}$  with  $\mathbf{e}$  edges is  $p^{\mathbf{e}}$ , and upon using that  $t^{-1} \log(1/p) \leq \log(np) \leq \log(1/p)$ , for  $p$  satisfying (1.14), the proof of this lemma follows by taking a union over  $(\mathbf{e}_{11}, \mathbf{e}_{12}, \mathbf{v})$  such that  $\mathbf{e} \geq \tilde{C}_* n^2 p^2$ , and  $\mathbf{e}_{11}, \mathbf{e}_{12}$ , and  $\mathbf{v} \leq n^2$ .

Thus, it remains to prove (3.22). Since  $p \ll n^{-1/2}$  the upper bound in (3.22) is immediate from Lemma 3.17 when  $\mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{e}/3$ . Turning to prove the remaining case we apply Lemma 3.17 again, together with Stirling's approximation, to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{v}, D) &\leq \left(\frac{en}{\mathbf{v}}\right)^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \exp(\varepsilon \mathbf{e} \log(1/p)) \leq \left(\frac{3en}{\tilde{C}_* n^2 p^2}\right)^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \exp(\varepsilon \mathbf{e} \log(1/p)) \\ &\leq \exp(\{(1 + 2\varepsilon) \log(1/p) - \log(np)/3\} \mathbf{e}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last two steps we have used that  $\mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{e}/3$ , and in the penultimate and the final steps we have also used that  $\mathbf{e} \geq \tilde{C}_* n^2 p^2$  and  $v(\mathcal{V}_1(\mathbf{G})) \leq e(\mathbf{G})$ , respectively. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.3. Probability upper bound on the existence of strong-core graphs.** In this section we prove Lemma 3.9. This will require that for all but a few edges in a strong-core graph, the product of the degrees of two adjacent vertices satisfy a tight upper and lower bound. First we define the set of “bad” and “good” edges.

**Definition 3.19.** Fix  $C_0 < \infty$ . Let  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{high}} \subset \mathbf{G}$  be the subgraph spanned by the edges  $\mathbf{e} = (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G})$  for which

$$(3.23) \quad \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(u) \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \geq C_0 n^2 p^2,$$

and set  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}} := \mathbf{G} \setminus \mathbf{G}_{\text{high}}$ .

The next lemma shows that a careful choice of  $C_0$  in (3.23) yields that  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G})$  almost same as  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}_{\text{low}})$ , while keeping the number of edges in  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{high}}$  small. It also provides a lower bound on the product of the degree of two adjacent vertices. The proof is postponed to Appendix B.

**Lemma 3.20.** *Consider the same setup as in Lemma 3.8. Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a strong-core graph. There exist constants  $0 < c_0(\varepsilon, t), C_0(\varepsilon, t) < \infty$  such that the followings hold:*

(a) *For every edge  $\mathbf{e} = (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G})$*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{G}}(u) \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \geq c_0(\varepsilon, t) n^2 p^2.$$

(b) *Let  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{high}} = \mathbf{G}_{\text{high}}(\varepsilon, t)$  and  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}} = \mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}(\varepsilon, t)$  be as in Definition 3.19 with  $C_0 = C_0(\varepsilon, t)$  in (3.23). Then*

$$\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad e(\mathbf{G}_{\text{high}}) \leq \varepsilon e(\mathbf{G}).$$

We now prove Lemma 3.9.

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* In the first step we decompose a strong-core graph  $\mathbf{G}$  into three subgraphs: one is a bipartite graph with edges between vertices of low and high degrees only, the second subgraph consisting of vertices of large degrees, and the third consisting of negligible many edges. Furthermore, almost all the homomorphisms of  $C_{2t}$  into  $\mathbf{G}$  are contained in the first two subgraphs.

To carry out this step we need to introduce several notation. Let  $D = D(\varepsilon)$  be as in Lemma 3.17, and  $C_0 = C_0(\varepsilon, t)$  and  $c_0 = c_0(\varepsilon, t)$  be as in Lemma 3.20. Set  $D_0 := 0$ ,

$$(3.24) \quad \tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\varepsilon, t) := (t - 1) \left( \left\lceil \frac{(2\tilde{C}_*)^t}{\varepsilon \hat{\delta}} \right\rceil + 2 \right), \quad \text{and} \quad D_i := D \cdot \left( \frac{C_0}{c_0} \right)^{i-1}, \quad \text{for } i \in [\tilde{C}].$$

Define  $\tilde{V}_0 := \emptyset$ . Then, for  $i \in [\tilde{C}]$  we (iteratively) define

$$V_i = V_i(\mathbf{G}) := \{v \in V(\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}) : D_{i-1} + 1 \leq \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \leq D_i\}$$

and

$$\tilde{V}_i = \tilde{V}_i(\mathbf{G}) := \{v \in V(\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}) : (u, v) \in E(\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}) \text{ for some } u \in V_i\} \setminus \tilde{V}_{i-1}.$$

We further define  $\mathbf{H}_i$  to be the subgraph (of  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}$ ) spanned by the edges that are incident to some vertex in  $\cup_{j=1}^i V_j$ , and  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_i = \mathbf{G}_{\text{low}} \setminus \mathbf{H}_i$ . Note that, by Lemma 3.20,  $\{\mathbf{H}_i\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{C}}$  are bipartite graphs.

We now claim that there exists an  $i \in [\tilde{C}]$  such that

$$(3.25) \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i) + \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \bar{\mathbf{H}}_i) \geq \hat{\delta}(1 - 8\varepsilon) n^{2t} p^{2t}.$$

To derive this claim we observe that there exists an  $i \in [\tilde{C} - t + 1]$  such that

$$(3.26) \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_{i+(t-1)}) - \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i) \leq \varepsilon \hat{\delta} n^{2t} p^{2t}.$$

Otherwise, as for a graph  $\mathbf{G}$  and a bipartite graph  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  one has that

$$(3.27) \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}) \leq (2e(\mathbf{G}))^t \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \tilde{\mathbf{G}}) \leq 2(e(\tilde{\mathbf{G}}))^t,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{G}) &\geq \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{C}/(t-1)-1} \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_{k(t-1)+1}) - \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_{(t-1)(k-1)+1}) \right] + \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_1) \\ &\geq \left( \frac{\tilde{C}}{t-1} - 1 \right) \varepsilon \hat{\delta} n^{2t} p^{2t} > (2\bar{C}_*)^t n^{2t} p^{2t}, \end{aligned}$$

(recall the definition of  $\tilde{C}$ ) yielding a contradiction to the fact that  $e(\mathbf{G}) \leq \bar{C}_* n^2 p^2$ .

Recalling the definition of  $\{D_k\}_{k=1}^{\tilde{C}}$ , and using the tight upper and lower bounds on the product of the degrees of adjacent vertices in  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}$  given by Lemma 3.20, we further deduce that any edge in  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_k$  that is incident to some edge in  $\mathbf{H}_k$  must be contained in  $\mathbf{H}_{k+1}$ . Therefore, as the distance between any two vertices of same parity in  $C_{2t}$  is at most  $(t-1)$ , by induction we derive that any homomorphism of  $C_{2t}$  that uses edges of both  $\mathbf{H}_i$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_i$  must be contained in  $\mathbf{H}_{i+(t-1)}$ , but not in  $\mathbf{H}_i$ . Hence, by (3.26), we also obtain that the number of such homomorphisms is at most  $\varepsilon \hat{\delta} (np)^{2t}$ . As any homomorphism of  $C_{2t}$  into  $\mathbf{G}_{\text{low}}$  must either be fully contained in  $\mathbf{H}_i$  or  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_i$ , or must use edges of both  $\mathbf{H}_i$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_i$ , an application of Lemma 3.20(b) now yields the claim (3.25). This concludes the first step.

It now remains to find an upper bound on the probability of the existence of a strong-core subgraph  $\mathbb{G}(n, p)$  such that (3.25) holds. This would be the second step of the proof. Turning to do this we introduce a few more notation. Let

$$\mathcal{I}_{i,e} := \left\{ \mathbf{G} : \mathbf{G} \text{ strong-core, } e(\mathbf{G}) = e, \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i) + \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \bar{\mathbf{H}}_i) \geq \hat{\delta}(1 - 8\varepsilon)n^{2t}p^{2t} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{i,j,e,e_\#} := \left\{ \mathbf{G} : \mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,e}, e(\mathbf{H}_i) = e_\#, (j-1)\varepsilon\hat{\delta} \leq \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i)/(np)^{2t} \leq j\varepsilon\hat{\delta} \right\}, \quad j \in [s_0],$$

where  $s_0 := \lfloor (1 - 10\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \rfloor$ , and

$$\mathcal{I}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_\#} := \left\{ \exists \mathbf{G} : \mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,e}, e(\mathbf{H}_i) = e_\#, \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i)/(np)^{2t} \geq s_0\varepsilon\hat{\delta} \right\}.$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{J}_{i,j,e,e_\#} := \left\{ \exists \mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,j,e,e_\#} \right\}, \quad j \in [s_0 + 1].$$

Observe that it suffices to show the following bounds:

$$(3.28) \quad \mathbb{P}(\cup_{i,e,e_\#} \mathcal{J}_{i,1,e,e_\#}) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\hat{\delta}^{1/t}(1 - \tilde{\beta}\varepsilon)n^2p^2 \log(1/p)\right),$$

$$(3.29) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{i,e,e_\#} \cup_{j=2}^{s_0} \mathcal{J}_{i,j,e,e_\#}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\phi_t(\hat{\delta})(1 - \tilde{\beta}\varepsilon)^{1/t}(1 + \beta_*\varepsilon^{1/t}) + \hat{\beta}t\varepsilon\phi_t(\hat{\delta})\right),$$

(recall (3.6)) and

$$(3.30) \quad \mathbb{P}(\cup_{i,e,e_\#} \mathcal{J}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_\#}) \leq \exp\left(-\phi_t(\hat{\delta})(1 - \tilde{\beta}t\varepsilon)\right),$$

where the unions in  $i, j, e$ , and  $e_\#$  are taken over their allowable ranges, and  $\tilde{\beta}, \hat{\beta}$ , and  $\beta_*$  are some absolute constants.



To prove (3.28)-(3.30) we let  $\mathbf{v}_\#(\mathbf{G}) := |\cup_{j=1}^i V_j|$ , and split into two cases:  $\mathbf{v}_\#(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{v}_\# \leq \varepsilon e(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_\# > \varepsilon e$ . In the first case, applying Lemma 3.17 with

$$\mathcal{V}_1 = \cup_{j=1}^i V_j \cup \{v \in V(\mathbf{G}_{\text{high}}) : \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v) \leq D_i\}$$

and  $\mathfrak{D} = D_i$  we find that the number of core graphs under consideration can be bounded by

$$\binom{n}{v} \left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\varepsilon e} \leq \exp(8\varepsilon e \log(1/p)),$$

where we also used  $|\mathcal{V}_1| = v \leq \mathbf{v}_\# + 2\varepsilon e(\mathbf{G})$  (follows from Lemma 3.20(b) and  $p \ll n^{-1/2}$ ). Since, by (3.27), for any strong-core graph  $\mathbf{G}$  one has the bound  $e(\mathbf{G}) \geq \mathbf{e}_0 := \frac{1}{2}\widehat{\delta}^{1/t}(1 - 8\varepsilon)^{1/t}n^2p^2$  and the probability of a graph  $\mathbf{G}$  with  $\mathbf{e}$  edges is  $p^{\mathbf{e}}$ , using the union bound, we derive that (3.31)

$$\mathbb{P}(\cup_{i,e,v,\mathbf{v}_\# \leq \varepsilon e_\#} \{\exists \mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n,p) : \mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,j,e,e_\#}, \mathbf{v}_\#(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{v}_\#\}) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\widehat{\delta}^{1/t}(1 - \beta_0\varepsilon)n^2p^2 \log(1/p)\right),$$

for some absolute constant  $\beta_0 < \infty$  and all large  $n$ .

In the second case, using the lower bound  $\mathbf{e} \geq \mathbf{e}_0$  we obtain that

$$\binom{n}{v} \leq \left(\frac{4e}{\varepsilon\widehat{\delta}^{1/t}}\right)^v \cdot \left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^v \cdot \left(\frac{1}{np}\right)^{\mathbf{v}_\#}.$$

Therefore, applications of Lemmas 3.17 and 3.20(b) now yield that

$$(3.32) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n,p) : \mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,j,e,e_\#}, \mathbf{v}_\#(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{v}_\# > \varepsilon e) \\ \leq \exp(-\log(1/p)(\mathbf{e} - \mathbf{e}_\#) - \log(1/p)(\mathbf{e}_\# - \mathbf{v}_\#) - \log(np)\mathbf{v}_\# + 4\varepsilon e \log(1/p)),$$

for all large  $n$ . We now need an upper bound on the RHS of (3.32). To obtain such a bound we note that, if  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_i) \geq \eta_1 \widehat{\delta}(np)^{2t}$  and  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i) \geq \eta_2 \widehat{\delta}(np)^{2t}$  then by (3.27) and recalling that  $\mathbf{H}_i$  is a bipartite graph one has that

$$(3.33) \quad \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{e}_\# \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta_1^{1/t}\widehat{\delta}^{1/t}n^2p^2$$

and

$$(3.34) \quad \log(1/p)(\mathbf{e}_\# - \mathbf{v}_\#) + \log(np)\mathbf{v}_\# \geq \log(np)(1 - o(1))\mathbf{e}_\# \geq \eta_2^{1/t} \left(\frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2}\right)^{1/t} n^2p^2 \log(np)(1 - o(1)).$$

On the other hand, as  $p$  satisfies (1.14) and  $\mathbf{e} \leq \bar{C}_* n^2 p^2$  (see also remark 3.10), we have

$$(3.35) \quad \mathbf{e} \log(1/p) = O(\widehat{\delta}^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(1/p)) = O(t\phi_t(\widehat{\delta})).$$

Now, we apply (3.33) with  $\eta_1 = 1 - 10\varepsilon$ , and (3.35) to obtain a bound on the RHS of (3.32) for  $j = 1$ . Taking a union over the allowable ranges of  $i, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_\#, \mathbf{e}$ , and  $\mathbf{e}_\#$ , and using the bound in (3.31) we then deduce (3.28).

Next, we apply (3.34) with  $\eta_2 = 1 - 11\varepsilon$  to obtain a bound on the RHS of (3.32) for  $j = s_0 + 1$ . Therefore, using (3.35) again and proceeding similarly as in the case of  $j = 1$  we derive (3.30).

To prove (3.29) we fix  $j_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, s_0\}$ , and apply (3.33) and (3.34) with  $\eta_1 = 1 - 9\varepsilon - j_0\varepsilon$  and  $\eta_2 = (j_0 - 1)\varepsilon$ , respectively. Since  $1 \leq j_0 - 1 \leq j_0 \leq (1/\varepsilon - 10)$ , by the definition of  $s_0$ , we find that

$$\eta_1^{1/t} + \eta_2^{1/t} \geq (1 - 10\varepsilon)^{1/t} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{1/t}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$(3.36) \quad \log(1/p)(e - e_{\sharp}) + \log(1/p)(e_{\sharp} - v_{\sharp}) + \log(np)v_{\sharp} \geq (1 - o(1)) \cdot (\eta_1^{1/t} + \eta_2^{1/t})\phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) \\ \geq \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) \cdot (1 - \beta_0\varepsilon)^{1/t} \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon^{1/t}}{4}\right).$$

Plugging this bound and (3.35) in (3.32), followed by a union over  $i, j, v, v_{\sharp}, e$ , and  $e_{\sharp}$  over their respective allowable ranges, and using (3.31) we now establish (3.29). This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.7

We start with some auxiliary results that help us to identify and eliminate a few unlikely events at the large deviations scale. The first result shows that if the number of edges of a bipartite graph  $G$ , with vertex bipartition  $V(G) = U_1 \cup U_2$ , does not exceed much from the size of  $U_1$  then almost all homomorphisms of  $C_{2t}$  must be due to the stars centered at the vertices in  $U_2$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $G$  be a bipartite graph with vertex bipartition  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ . Assume that  $e(G) - |U_1| \leq \alpha e(G)$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ . Then*

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, G) \leq 2\alpha t e(G)^t + 2 \sum_{w \in U_2} \deg_G(w)^t.$$

*Proof.* Consider the canonical labelling of the vertices and edges of  $C_{2t}$ . Fix  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t \in U_1$  (not necessarily distinct) and let  $\underline{u} := (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_t)$ . Denote  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, G, \underline{u})$  to be the cardinality of  $\mathcal{H}_{\underline{u}}$ , the set of homomorphisms  $\varphi$  of  $C_{2t}$  into  $G$  such that  $\varphi(2i-1) = u_i$  for  $i \in [t]$ . Since  $G$  is bipartite it follows that

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, G) = 2 \sum_{\underline{u} \in U_1^t} \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, G, \underline{u}).$$

We will show that

$$(4.3) \quad \text{Hom}(C_{2t}, G, \underline{u}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^t (\deg_G(u_i) - 1) \cdot \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \deg_G(u_j) \right] + \sum_{w \in U_2} \prod_{i=1}^t a_{u_i, w}^G,$$

for  $\underline{u} \in U_1^t$ , where  $\{a_{u,v}^G\}$  denotes the adjacency matrix of  $G$ . Sum the second term in the RHS of (4.3) over all  $\underline{u} \in U_1^t$ , and apply (4.2) to obtain the second term in the RHS of (4.1). On the other hand, summing the first term in the RHS of (4.3), and using the assumption  $e(G) - |U_1| \leq \alpha e(G)$  and (4.2) we obtain the first term in the RHS of (4.1).

Turning to prove (4.3) we split the set  $\mathcal{H}_{\underline{u}}$  into two further subsets  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}} := \mathcal{H}_{\underline{u}} \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}}$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}}$  is the set of homomorphisms  $\varphi$  such that the cardinality of the set  $\{\varphi(2i)\}_{i=1}^t$  is one. Thus,  $\varphi \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}}$  implies that  $\varphi(2i) = w$ , for some  $w \in U_2$ , and  $a_{u_i, w}^G = 1$  for all  $i \in [t]$ . This indeed shows that  $|\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}}|$  is bounded by the second term in the RHS of (4.3).

To establish the bound on  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}}$  we observe that  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}} \subset \cup_{i=1}^t \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}, i}$ , where  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}, i}$  is the set of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{\underline{u}}$  such that  $\varphi(2i) \neq \varphi(2i-2)$  (the vertex 0 is to be understood as the vertex  $2t$ ). We claim that

$$(4.4) \quad |\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\underline{u}, i}| \leq (\deg_G(u_i) - 1) \cdot \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \deg_G(u_j) \right].$$

Let us prove this claim for  $i = 2$ . The other cases are similar. The number of choices of  $\varphi(2)$  is bounded by  $\deg_{\mathbb{G}}(u_1)$ . Pick one such choice and let  $\varphi(2) = w$  for some  $w \in U_2$ . Now, by definition, for any  $\varphi \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{u,2}$  we have that  $\varphi(4) \in U_2 \setminus \{w\}$ . So, the number of choices of  $\varphi(4)$  is at most  $\deg_{\mathbb{G}}(u_2) - 1$ . Continuing this argument we get the claim. Now summing (4.4) over  $i \in [t]$  we obtain the first term in the RHS of (4.3). This completes the proof.  $\square$

The next result is a strengthening of some of the bounds in the proof of Lemma 3.9. To state this result we need a few more notation, and we will reuse the notations of proof of Lemma 3.9. For  $\alpha_1 > 0$ , we define

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{i,e,e_{\sharp},v_{\sharp}} := \left\{ \mathbb{G} \subset K_n : \mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_{\sharp}}, v_{\sharp}(\mathbb{G}) = v_{\sharp}, e(\mathbb{H}_i) - v_{\sharp}(\mathbb{G}) \geq \alpha_1 e(\mathbb{H}_i) \right\},$$

where  $i, s_0, v_{\sharp}, e_{\sharp}$  etc are as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. Set  $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{i,e,e_{\sharp},v_{\sharp}} := \left\{ \exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n,p) : \mathbb{G} \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{i,e,e_{\sharp},v_{\sharp}} \right\}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $p$  satisfy (1.14).*

(a) *Additionally assume that*

$$(4.5) \quad (1 + \tilde{\chi}) \log(np) \leq \log(1/p),$$

*for some absolute constant  $\tilde{\chi} > 0$ . Fix  $\alpha_1 > 0$ . Then, for all large  $n$ ,*

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \cup_{i,e,e_{\sharp},v_{\sharp}} \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{i,e,e_{\sharp},v_{\sharp}} \right) \leq \exp \left( -(1 - \tilde{\beta}\varepsilon)^{1/t} (1 + \alpha_1 \tilde{\chi}) \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) + \widehat{\beta} t \varepsilon \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) \right),$$

*where the union over  $i, e, v_{\sharp}$ , and  $e_{\sharp}$  are over their respective allowable ranges.*

(b) *Fix  $\chi_{\star} > 0$  and define  $e_{\star} := e_{\star}(\chi_{\star}, \widehat{\delta}, t) = (1 + \chi_{\star}) \cdot (\widehat{\delta}/2)^{1/t} n^2 p^2$ . Then, for  $\varepsilon$  sufficiently small we have that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \cup_{i,e} \cup_{e_{\sharp} \geq e_{\star}} \mathcal{J}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_{\sharp}} \right) \leq \exp \left( - \left( 1 + \frac{\chi_{\star}}{2} \right) \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) + \widehat{\beta} t \varepsilon \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) \right).$$

*Proof.* First let us prove part (a). Indeed, using (4.5) and the lower bound  $e(\mathbb{H}_i)^t = e_{\sharp}^t \geq (1 - 11\varepsilon) \cdot (\widehat{\delta}/2) \cdot n^{2t} p^{2t}$  for any  $\mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_{\sharp}}$ , we find that

$$\log(1/p)(e_{\sharp} - v_{\sharp}) + \log(np)v_{\sharp} \geq (1 + \alpha_1 \tilde{\chi}) \log(np)e_{\sharp} \geq \left( (1 - 11\varepsilon)^{1/t} + \alpha_1 \tilde{\chi} \right) \left( \frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2} \right)^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(np),$$

for any  $\mathbb{G} \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{i,e,e_{\sharp},v_{\sharp}}$ . Thus, upon using (3.32) and (3.35), and applying union bounds (4.6) follows.

Proof of (b) is also straightforward. We recall (3.32). Since  $\log(np) \leq \log(1/p)$ , using (3.35) we find that for any  $e_{\sharp} \geq e_{\star}$  we have

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n,p) : \mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_{\sharp}}, v_{\sharp}(\mathbb{G}) > \varepsilon e \right) \leq \exp \left( -(1 + \chi_{\star}) \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) + \widehat{\beta} \varepsilon t \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) \right).$$

Proceeding as in the proof of (3.31), as  $e(\mathbb{G}) \geq e(\mathbb{H}_i) = e_{\sharp}$ , we also have that for any  $e_{\sharp} \geq e_{\star}$

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \exists \mathbb{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n,p) : \mathbb{G} \in \mathcal{I}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_{\sharp}}, v_{\sharp}(\mathbb{G}) \leq \varepsilon e \right) \leq \exp \left( -(1 + \chi_{\star})(1 - \beta_0 \varepsilon) \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}) \right),$$

where  $\beta_0$  is as in (3.31). Now performing a union bound the desired bound follows from (4.7)-(4.8). This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

During the proof of Corollary 1.7, upon using Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 we will be able to show that most of the excess homomorphism counts of  $C_{2t}$  in  $\mathbb{G}(n,p)$  must be due to the one neighborhood of vertices of degree  $\gtrsim n^2 p^2$ . The next lemma essentially shows that on  $\text{UT}_{\Delta}(\widehat{\delta}^{1/t}(1 - \chi)^{1/t})^{\mathbb{G}}$  the event described above is unlikely to happen.

**Lemma 4.3.** Fix  $\xi, \varrho, \tilde{\chi} > 0$ , and  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{W} \subset [n]$  be such that  $|\mathcal{W}| = w = O(1)$ . Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{W}}(\xi) := \left\{ \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \deg_{\mathbb{G}(n,p)}(w)^t \geq \xi n^{2t} p^{2t} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{W}}(\varrho) := \left\{ \min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \deg_{\mathbb{G}(n,p)}(w) \geq \varrho n^2 p^2 \right\}.$$

Then, there exist absolute constants  $\beta$  and  $c_0$  such that for  $\tilde{\chi} \leq c_0$  and all large  $n$ ,

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{W}}(\xi) \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{W}}(\varrho) \cap \text{UT}_{\Delta}(\xi^{1/t}(1-2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t})^{\complement} \right) \lesssim (tw\tilde{\chi}^{-1})^w \exp \left( -\xi^{1/t}(1+\beta\tilde{\chi}^{1/t})n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right).$$

*Proof.* For  $w \in \mathcal{W}$  we define  $X_w$  to be the degree of vertex  $w$  in the subgraph of  $\mathbb{G}(n,p)$  induced by the vertices  $[n] \setminus \mathcal{W}$ . So  $\{X_w\}_{w \in \mathcal{W}}$  are independent and  $X_w \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Bin}(n', p)$ , where  $n' = (1 - o(1))n$ . Denoting

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{W}}(\xi) := \left\{ \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} X_w^t \geq \tilde{\xi} n^{2t} p^{2t} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathcal{W}}(\varrho) := \left\{ \min_{w \in \mathcal{W}} X_w \geq \tilde{\varrho} n^2 p^2 \right\},$$

where  $\tilde{\xi} := \xi(1 - o(1))$  and  $\tilde{\varrho} := \varrho(1 - o(1))$ , we observe that

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} \cap \text{UT}_{\Delta}(\xi^{1/t}(1-2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t})^{\complement} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \cap \left\{ \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} X_w \leq \xi^{1/t}(1-2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \right\} =: \tilde{\mathcal{D}}.$$

Thus, it suffices to obtain a bound on the probability of the RHS of (4.10). Turning to prove such a bound we split the allowable range of  $X_w$  for  $w \in \mathcal{W}$  into small subintervals and find probability bounds for each possible choice of collection of indices  $w \in \mathcal{W}$  that belong to any given subinterval. We then perform a union bound.

To carry out this approach, we let

$$h := \frac{\xi^{1/t}((1-\tilde{\chi})^{1/t} - (1-2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t})}{2w} \leq \frac{\xi^{1/t}\tilde{\chi}}{tw} \quad \text{and} \quad K := \left\lceil (\xi^{1/t}(1-2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t} - \tilde{\varrho})/h \right\rceil.$$

Let  $\{\mathcal{N}_k\}_{k \in [K]}$  be a partition of  $\mathcal{W}$ . We allow  $\mathcal{N}_k$ 's to be empty sets. For  $k \in [K]$ , set  $R_k := [q_k n^2 p^2, r_k n^2 p^2)$ , where  $q_k := \tilde{\varrho} + (k-1)h$  and  $r_k := \tilde{\varrho} + kh$ . Define

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\underline{N}} := \{X_w \in R_k, \forall w \in \mathcal{N}_k \text{ and } k \in [K]\} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\underline{N}} := \{X_w \geq q_k n^2 p^2, \forall w \in \mathcal{N}_k \text{ and } k \in [K]\}.$$

Letting  $\underline{n} := (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}^K$  it follows that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \cap \left\{ \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} X_w \leq \xi^{1/t}(1-2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \right\} \subset \bigcup_{\underline{n}} \bigcup_{\underline{N}: |\mathcal{N}_k|=n_k, k \in [K]} \hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\underline{N}}.$$

We also observe that on the event  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \cap \hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\underline{N}}$

$$\tilde{\xi} n^{2t} p^{2t} \leq \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} X_w^t = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}_k} X_w^t \leq \sum_{k=1}^K n_k q_k^t n^{2t} p^{2t} + \tilde{\chi} \xi (1-\tilde{\chi})^{1-1/t} n^{2t} p^{2t},$$

where  $|\mathcal{N}_k| = n_k$  and the last two inequalities are due to the definitions of  $h$ ,  $K$ , and  $q_k$ 's. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \subset \bigcup_{\underline{n}} \bigcup_{\underline{N}: |\mathcal{N}_k|=n_k, k \in [K]} \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\underline{N}},$$

where the sum over  $\underline{n}$  is such that

$$(4.11) \quad \sum_{k=1}^K n_k q_k^t \geq \xi(1-\tilde{\chi}-o(1)).$$

By Lemma 2.1, for any  $\underline{n}$  such that (4.11) holds, as  $q_1 \gtrsim 1$ , we find that

$$(4.12) \quad -\log \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\underline{N}}) \geq \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K n_k q_k n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right] \cdot (1 - o(1)) \\ \geq \xi^{1/t} \cdot \left[ (1 - \tilde{\chi} - o(1))^{1/t} + \frac{(\tilde{\chi} - o(1))^{1/t}}{4} \right] \cdot (1 - o(1)) n^2 p^2 \log(np) \geq \xi^{1/t} (1 + \beta \tilde{\chi}^{1/t}) n^2 p^2 \log(np),$$

where the penultimate step is due to  $q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \dots \leq q_K \leq \xi^{1/t} (1 - 2\tilde{\chi})^{1/t}$ , and the fact that

$$\min_{\underline{x}} \sum_{s=1}^m x_s^{1/t} \geq 1 + \frac{x_\star^{1/t}}{4} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{s=1}^m x_s \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{s=1}^m x_s \leq 1 - x_\star,$$

for any collection of nonnegative reals  $\underline{x} := \{x_i\}_{i \in [m]}$  and  $x_\star \in (0, 1/2)$ . In the last step we used that  $\tilde{\chi} \leq c_0$  for some sufficiently small absolute constant  $c_0$ . Since the number of choices of placing  $\mathbf{w}$  objects into  $K$  bins is trivially bounded by  $K^w$ , upon performing a union bound, the bound (4.9) is now immediate from (4.12). This completes the proof.  $\square$

Equipped with Lemmas 4.1-4.3 we are now ready to complete the proof of Corollary 1.7.

*Proof of Corollary 1.7.* Fix  $t \geq 3$  and  $\chi > 0$ . We will show that for  $p$  satisfying (1.14) and

$$(4.13) \quad 2^{-1/t} \log(np) (1 + \hat{\chi}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log(1/p),$$

for some absolute constant  $\hat{\chi} > 0$ , the bound

$$(4.14) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}) \cap \text{UT}_\Delta((\hat{\delta}/2)^{1/t} (1 - \chi)^{1/t})^c) \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}))$$

holds. This will prove the corollary. Notice that (4.13) continues to hold even if we shrink  $\hat{\chi}$ .

Observe that for  $p$  satisfying (1.14) and (4.13) we have that  $\phi_t(\hat{\delta}) = (\hat{\delta}/2)^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(np)$  (recall (3.6)) and thus, for any  $\zeta > 0$ , the lower bound

$$(4.15) \quad \log \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})) \geq -(1 + \zeta) \left( \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2} \right)^{1/t} n^2 p^2 \log(np)$$

holds for all large  $n$  (see the proof of the lower bound on  $\mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}))$ ).

Recall from the proof of Theorem 1.5 that a core graph  $\mathbf{G}$  with  $e(\mathbf{G}) \leq \bar{C}_\star n^2 p^2$  contains a strong-core subgraph. Therefore, applying (3.5), Lemmas 3.6 and 3.8, and the lower bound on  $\mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}))$  we observe that it suffices to show that

$$(4.16) \quad \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta}) \cap \text{UT}_\Delta(\hat{\delta}^{1/t} (1 - \chi)^{1/t})^c \cap \{\exists \mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n, p) : \mathbf{G} \text{ is strong-core}\}) \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})).$$

Let  $\varepsilon = c^t$ , for some suitably chosen absolute constant  $c > 0$ . Upon choosing  $\zeta$  sufficiently small, depending only on  $c$ , by (3.28)-(3.29) and the lower bound (4.15) we already have that

$$(4.17) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i, e, e_\#} \bigcup_{j=1}^{s_0} \mathcal{J}_{i, j, e, e_\#}\right) \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})),$$

for all large  $n$ . Application of Lemma 4.2(a)-(b), with  $\varepsilon$  as above (we may need to shrink  $c$  depending only on  $\chi$ ),  $\alpha_1 = t^{-1} e^{-1} \chi / 4$ ,  $\chi_\star = t^{-1}$ , and  $\tilde{\chi} = 2^{1-1/t} (1 + \hat{\chi}) - 1$ , and the lower bound (4.15) further yields that

$$(4.18) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}) \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\hat{\delta})),$$

for all large  $n$ , where

$$\mathcal{K} := \cup_{i,e,e_\#,v_\#} \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{i,e,e_\#,v_\#} \cup \cup_{i,e} \cup_{e_\# \geq e_*} \mathcal{J}_{i,s_0+1,e,e_\#}.$$

Further denote

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} := \{\exists \mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{G}(n,p) : \mathbf{G} \text{ is strong-core}\} \setminus \left( \mathcal{K} \cup \cup_{i,e,e_\#} \cup_{j=1}^{s_0} \mathcal{J}_{i,j,e,e_\#} \right).$$

Recall notations from the proof of Lemma 3.9 and observe that any  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfying the hypothesis of the event  $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$  must have that  $e(\mathbf{H}_i)^t \leq (e/2)\widehat{\delta}n^{2t}p^{2t}$  and  $\text{Hom}(C_{2t}, \mathbf{H}_i) \geq (1 - 11\varepsilon)\widehat{\delta}n^{2t}p^{2t}$  for some  $i \in [\widetilde{C}]$ . Since  $\mathbf{H}_i$  is a bipartite graph, applying Lemma 4.1, with  $\alpha = \alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_1$  as above, we find that

$$(4.19) \quad \sum_{u \in \mathcal{W}_i} \deg_{\mathbb{G}(n,p)}(u)^t \geq (1 - 11\varepsilon - \chi/4) \frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2} n^{2t} p^{2t} \geq (1 - \chi/2) \frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2} n^{2t} p^{2t},$$

where  $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_i = \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_i(\mathbf{G}) := \cup_{j=1}^i V_j$  and  $\mathcal{W}_i = \mathcal{W}_i(\mathbf{G}) := V(\mathbf{H}_i) \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_i$  are the vertex bipartition of  $\mathbf{H}_i$ . On the other hand, by the definition of  $\widetilde{C}$  (see (3.24)) and Lemma 3.20(a) we further have that

$$(4.20) \quad \min_{u \in \mathcal{W}_i} \deg_{\mathbb{G}(n,p)}(u) \geq \varrho n^2 p^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{W}_i| \leq (e/2)^{1/t} \widehat{\delta}^{1/t} \varrho^{-1} =: \mathbf{w} = O(1),$$

for some  $\varrho = \varrho(\varepsilon, t) > 0$ . Therefore, setting  $\xi = (1 - \chi/2) \frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2}$  by (4.19)-(4.20) we deduce that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} \subset \bigcup_{\mathbf{w}' \leq \mathbf{w}} \bigcup_{\mathcal{W} \subset \binom{[n]}{\mathbf{w}'}} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{W}}(\xi) \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{W}}(\varrho).$$

Hence, applying Lemma 4.3, with  $\widetilde{\chi} = \chi/4$ , and a union bound we now derive that

$$(4.21) \quad \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} \cap \text{UT}_\Delta((\widehat{\delta}/2)^{1/t} (1 - \chi)^{1/t})^{\mathfrak{L}}) \lesssim n^{O(1)} \exp \left( - \left( \frac{\widehat{\delta}}{2} \right)^{1/t} (1 - \chi/2)^{1/t} (1 + \beta\chi^{1/t}/2) n^2 p^2 \log(np) \right) \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_t(\widehat{\delta})),$$

where the last step follows for  $\chi$  sufficiently small. From (4.17), (4.18), and (4.21) we obtain (4.16). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** Similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1(b) one may hope to use the proof of Corollary 1.7 to derive that Corollary 1.3 continue to hold for  $p$  such that

$$(4.22) \quad \log(np) \gtrsim \log n \quad \text{and} \quad np \ll n^{1/3}.$$

However, notice that for any  $\gamma' > 0$  and all large  $t$

$$2^{1/t} (1 + \gamma' t^{-1}) \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}(t)) \geq (1 + \delta)^2 n^2 p^2 \log(np) > \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}(t)),$$

where  $\widehat{\delta}(t) := (1 + \delta)^{2t} - 1$ . On the other hand, one can investigate (4.18) to deduce that it can be improved to  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}) \leq \exp(-(1 + \gamma t^{-1}) \phi_t(\widehat{\delta}(t)))$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ . Since  $2^{-1/t} (1 + \gamma t^{-1}) < 1$ , for  $\gamma$  sufficiently small, we cannot conclude that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}) \ll \mathbb{P}(\text{UT}_\lambda(\delta))$ , for large  $t$ , and therefore one cannot proceed further to derive an analogue of Corollary 1.3 for  $p$  satisfying (4.22).

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Alt, R. Ducatez, and A. Knowles. Extremal eigenvalues of critical Erdős-Rényi graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, **49(3)**, 1347–1401, 2021.
- [2] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An introduction to random matrices*, Volume 118 of Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [3] R. B. Ash. *Information Theory*. Dover Publications, 1990.
- [4] F. Augeri. Large deviations principle for the largest eigenvalue of Wigner matrices without Gaussian tails. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, **21**, 49 pp., 2016.
- [5] F. Augeri. Nonlinear large deviation bounds with applications to traces of Wigner matrices and cycles counts in Erdős-Rényi graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, **48(5)**, 2404–2448, 2020.
- [6] F. Augeri, A. Guionnet, and J. Husson. Large deviations for the largest eigenvalue of sub-Gaussian matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **383**, 997–1050, 2021.
- [7] T. Austin. The structure of low-complexity Gibbs measures on product spaces. *The Annals of Probability*, **47(3)**, 4002–4023, 2019.
- [8] A. Basak and R. Basu. Upper tail large deviations of regular subgraph counts in Erdős-Rényi graphs in the full localized regime. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, to appear.
- [9] A. Basak and S. Mukherjee. Universality of the mean-field for the Potts model. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **168(3)**, 557–600, 2017.
- [10] A. Basak and M. Rudelson. Sharp transition of the invertibility of the adjacency matrices of sparse random graphs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **180**, 233–308, 2021.
- [11] G. Ben Arous, A. Dembo, and A. Guionnet. Aging of spherical spin glasses. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **120(1)**, 1–67, 2001.
- [12] G. Ben Arous and A. Guionnet. Large deviations for Wigner’s law and Voiculescu’s non-commutative entropy. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **108(4)**, 517–542, 1997.
- [13] F. Benaych-Georges, C. Bordenave, and A. Knowles. Largest eigenvalues of sparse inhomogeneous Erdős-Rényi graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, **47(3)**, 1653–1676, 2019.
- [14] F. Benaych-Georges, C. Bordenave, and A. Knowles. Spectral radii of sparse random matrices. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, **56(3)**, 2141–2161, 2020.
- [15] B. B. Bhattacharya and S. Ganguly. Upper tails for edge eigenvalues of random graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, **34(2)**, 1069–1083, 2020.
- [16] B. B. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, and S. Ganguly. Spectral edge in sparse random graphs: upper and lower tail large deviations. *The Annals of Probability*, **49(4)**, 1847–1885, 2021.
- [17] B. B. Bhattacharya, S. Ganguly, E. Lubetzky, and Y. Zhao. Upper tails and independence polynomials. *Advances in Mathematics*, **319**, 313–347, 2017.
- [18] C. Bordenave and P. Caputo. A large deviation principle for Wigner matrices without Gaussian tails. *The Annals of Probability*, **42(6)**, 2454–2496, 2014.
- [19] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós, and K. Vesztegombi. Convergent sequences of dense graphs I: Subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing. *Advances in Mathematics*, **219(6)**, 1801–1851, 2008.
- [20] S. Chatterjee and A. Dembo. Nonlinear large deviations. *Advances in Mathematics*, **299**, 396–450, 2016.
- [21] S. Chatterjee, S. R. S. Varadhan. The large deviation principle for the Erdős-Rényi random graph. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, **32(7)**, 1000–1017, 2011.
- [22] N. Cook and A. Dembo. Large deviations of subgraph counts for sparse Erdős-Rényi graphs. *Advances in Mathematics*, **373**, 107289, 2020.
- [23] N. Cook, A. Dembo, and H. T. Pham. Regularity method and large deviation principles for the Erdős-Rényi hypergraph. *ArXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [24] R. Eldan. Gaussian-width gradient complexity, reverse log-Sobolev inequalities and nonlinear large deviations. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, **28(6)**, 1548–1596, 2018.
- [25] S. Ganguly and K. Nam. Large deviations for the largest eigenvalue of Gaussian networks with constant average degree. *ArXiv preprint*, 2021.
- [26] A. Guionnet and J. Husson. Large deviations for the largest eigenvalue of Rademacher matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, **48(3)**, 1436–1465, 2020.
- [27] M. Harel, F. Mousset, and W. Samotij. Upper tails via high moments and entropic stability. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, to appear.
- [28] Y. Hong. A Bound on the Spectral Radius of Graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, **108**, 135–139, 1988.

- [29] M. Krivelevich and B. Sudakov. The largest eigenvalue of sparse random graphs. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, **12(1)**, 61–72, 2003.
- [30] L. Lovász. Large networks and graph limits. *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. Vol. **60**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [31] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy. Limits of dense graph sequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, **96(6)**, 933–957, 2006.
- [32] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy. Szemerédi’s lemma for the analyst. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, **17(1)**, 252–270, 2007.
- [33] E. Lubetzky and Y. Zhao. On Replica Symmetry of Large Deviations in Random Graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, **47(1)**, 109–146, 2015.
- [34] E. Lubetzky and Y. Zhao. On the variational problem for upper tails in sparse random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, **50(3)**, 420–436, 2017.
- [35] E. Szemerédi. Regular partitions of graphs. *Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976)*, pp. 399–401, Colloq. Internat. CNRS, 260, CNRS, Paris.
- [36] J. Yan. Nonlinear large deviations: Beyond the hypercube. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **30(2)**, 812–846, 2020.

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.2

The proof of  $\lambda(\mathbf{G}) \leq \sqrt{2e}$  is trivial. Indeed, denoting  $\mathbf{a}_{i,j}$  to be the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of the adjacency matrix of  $\mathbf{G}$  we note that

$$\lambda(\mathbf{G}) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_i^2(\mathbf{G})} = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{i,j}} = \sqrt{2e}.$$

The rest of (i), and (ii)-(v) are taken from [29, Proposition 3.1]. The proof of (vi) is standard. It relies on the variational representation of eigenvalues and the fact that the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of a matrix with nonnegative entries has nonnegative entries. We omit further details.

We are not able to locate the proof of (vii) in the literature. It follows from an intermediate step in the proof of (viii). A bound similar to (vii) was derived in [28] for  $\delta = 1$ . We adapt their proof to deduce our bound for  $\delta \geq 2$ . Turning to do that, for ease in writing let us assume that  $\mathbf{G}$  is a graph on  $[N]$ . Let  $\rho$  be an eigenvalue of its adjacency matrix  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$  be the corresponding eigenvector of unit Euclidean norm. Then for any  $i \in [N]$  we have that

$$(A.1) \quad \rho^2 x_i^2 = |(\mathfrak{A}\mathbf{x})_i|^2 = \left( \sum_{j:j \sim i} x_j \right)^2 \leq \deg_G(i) \cdot \left( \sum_{j:j \sim i} x_j^2 \right).$$

Now summing the both sides of (A.1) over  $i \in [N]$  we deduce that

$$(A.2) \quad \rho^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^N x_j^2 \left( \sum_{i:i \sim j} \deg_G(i) \right) = 2e - \sum_{j=1}^N x_j^2 \left( \sum_{i:i \not\sim j} \deg_G(i) \right).$$

Observe that, as  $\delta \geq 2$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N x_j^2 \left( \sum_{i:i \not\sim j} \deg_G(i) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \deg_G(i) x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \deg_G(i) \left( \sum_{\substack{j:j \sim i \\ j \neq i}} x_j^2 \right)$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i)x_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \sum_{\substack{j:\ j \sim i \\ j \neq i}} x_j^2 \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i)x_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N (N - \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i) - 1)x_i^2 \\
&= 2(N-1) - \sum_{i=1}^N \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i)x_i^2 \geq 2(N-1) - \Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this bound in (A.2) the desired bound on  $\lambda(\mathbf{G})$  follows.

It remains to prove (vii). Our starting point is (A.1). Recall that  $\mathbf{G}$  is a bipartite graph with vertex partition  $V_1$  and  $V_2$ . Summing the both sides of (A.1) over  $j \in V_1$  we obtain

$$(A.3) \quad \rho^2 \sum_{i \in V_1} x_i^2 \leq \sum_{j \in V_2} x_j^2 \left( \sum_{i: i \sim j} \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i) \right) \leq \left[ \max_{j \in V_2} \left( \sum_{i: i \sim j} \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i) \right) \right] \cdot \sum_{j \in V_2} x_j^2.$$

Since  $\mathbf{G}$  is a bipartite graph, upon permuting the vertices if required, we have that its adjacency matrix  $\mathfrak{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathfrak{A}_0 \\ \mathfrak{A}_0^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  for some matrix  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  of dimension  $|V_1| \times |V_2|$ . It is straightforward to see that  $\rho$  is a singular value of  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  if and only if  $\pm\rho$  are eigenvalues of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Furthermore, if  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  are the left and right singular vectors of  $\mathfrak{A}_0$  corresponding to the singular value  $\rho$ , then  $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \pm\mathbf{z} \end{pmatrix}$  are the eigenvectors of  $\mathfrak{A}$  corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\pm\rho$ . This, immediately implies that  $\sum_{i \in V_1} x_i^2 = \sum_{j \in V_2} x_j^2$ . Thus, (A.3) yields that

$$\rho \leq \max_{j \in V_2} \sqrt{\sum_{i: i \sim j} \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(i)}.$$

Now reversing the roles of  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  the desired bound on  $\lambda(\mathbf{G})$  follows. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. LOCAL HOMOMORPHISM COUNT BOUNDS AND PROOFS OF LEMMAS 3.18 AND 3.20

We start with a couple of local homomorphism bounds.

**Lemma B.1.** *Let  $H$  be a  $\Delta$ -regular graph. For every graph  $\mathbf{G}$  and an edge  $e = \{u, v\} \in E(\mathbf{G})$  we have*

$$|\text{Hom}(H, \mathbf{G}, e)| \leq 4e_H \cdot (2e_{\mathbf{G}})^{\frac{v_H}{2} - \frac{2\Delta-1}{\Delta}} \cdot (4 \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(u) \cdot \deg_{\mathbf{G}}(v))^{\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta}}.$$

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $H$  be a  $\Delta$ -regular graph. For every graph  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{G}' \subset \mathbf{G}$  we have*

$$\sum_{e \in E(\mathbf{G}')} |\text{Hom}(H, \mathbf{G}, e)| \leq e_H \cdot (2e_{\mathbf{G}})^{v_H/2} \cdot \left( \frac{e_{\mathbf{G}'}}{e_{\mathbf{G}}} \right)^{1/\Delta}.$$

Notice that analogs of Lemmas B.1 and B.2 are proved in [27, Section 5.3] for subgraph counts. To prove these two results we will follow the same route.

We will need the following abstract result.

**Lemma B.3.** *Let  $H$  be a  $\Delta$ -regular graph and  $\mathcal{E}$  be a collection of homomorphisms of  $H$  into  $\mathbf{G}$ . For every edge  $e = (a, b) \in E(H)$ , we set*

$$\mathcal{E}_e := \{ \{ \varphi(a), \varphi(b) \}, \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \}.$$

Then

$$|\mathcal{E}| \leq \prod_{e \in E(H)} (2|\mathcal{E}_e|)^{1/\Delta}.$$

Using Shearer's inequality the same bound was shown to hold in [27] (see Lemma 5.10 there) when  $\mathcal{E}$  is a collection of embeddings of  $H$  into  $G$ . The same argument works in our setup. So we omit the details.

Equipped with Lemma B.3 one can proceed as in the proofs of [27, Lemma 5.7] and [27, Lemma 5.9] to obtain Lemmas B.1 and B.2, respectively. We refrain from repeating it here.

The proof of Lemma 3.20 now follows upon using Lemmas B.1 and B.2 (instead of [27, Lemmas 5.7 and 5.9]), and imitating the rest of the proof of [8, Lemma 4.2]. A similar comment applies for the proof of Lemma 3.18. We spare the tedious details.

ANIRBAN BASAK, INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, BANGALORE, INDIA

*Email address:* `anirban.basak@icts.res.in`