

INHOMOGENEOUS RANDOM GRAPHS WITH INFINITE-MEAN FITNESS VARIABLES

LUCA AVENA, DIEGO GARLASCHELLI, RAJAT SUBHRA HAZRA, AND MARGHERITA LALLI

ABSTRACT. We consider an inhomogeneous Erdős-Rényi random graph ensemble with exponentially decaying random disconnection probabilities determined by an i.i.d. field of variables with heavy tails and infinite mean associated to the vertices of the graph. This model was recently investigated in the physics literature in [Garuccio et al. \(2020\)](#) as a scale-invariant random graph within the context of network renormalization. From a mathematical perspective, the model fits in the class of scale-free inhomogeneous random graphs whose asymptotic geometrical features have been recently attracting interest. While for this type of graphs several results are known when the underlying vertex variables have finite mean and variance, here instead we consider the case of one-sided stable variables with necessarily infinite mean. To simplify our analysis, we assume that the variables are sampled from a Pareto distribution with parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We start by characterizing the asymptotic distributions of the typical degrees and some related observables. In particular, we show that the degree of a vertex converges in distribution, after proper scaling, to a mixed Poisson law. We then show that correlations among degrees of different vertices are asymptotically non-vanishing, but at the same time a form of asymptotic tail independence is found when looking at the behavior of the joint Laplace transform around zero. Moreover, we present some findings concerning the asymptotic density of wedges and triangles, show a cross-over for the existence of dust (i.e. disconnected nodes), and identify a strongly connected regime in the ensemble.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article we consider a class of inhomogeneous Erdős-Rényi random graphs on n vertices. Our vertex set V is denoted by $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and on each vertex we assign independent weights (or ‘fitness’ variables) $(W_i)_{i \in [n]}$ distributed according to a common distribution $F_W(\cdot)$ with $1 - F_W(x) \sim x^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Therefore the weights have infinite mean. Conditioned on the weights, an edge between two distinct vertices i and j is drawn independently with probability

$$p_{ij} = 1 - \exp(-\varepsilon W_i W_j) \quad (1.1)$$

where ε is a parameter tuning the overall density of edges in the graph and playing a crucial rule in the analysis of the model. This inhomogeneous model is a special example of models where the connection probability between vertices i and j in (2.2) is replaced by $\min\{1, \kappa_n(W_i, W_j)\}$, where $\kappa_n : [0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a well-behaved function, and the weights are drawn independently from a certain distribution. In the physics literature, these are called ‘fitness’ or ‘hidden variable’ network models ([Boguná and Pastor-Satorras \(2003\)](#), [Caldarelli et al. \(2002\)](#), [Garlaschelli et al. \(2007\)](#)). In the mathematical literature, a well-known example is the generalized random graph model [Chung and Lu \(2002\)](#). In most of the cases considered so far, due to the integrability conditions on κ_n and moment properties of F_W , these models have a locally tree-like structure. We refer to Chapter 6 of

Date: March 9, 2023.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60G15, 82B20, 82B41, 60G70 .

Key words and phrases. generalized random graphs, inhomogeneous random graph, infinite mean.

van der Hofstad (2016) for the properties of the degree distribution and to Bollobás et al. (2007), van der Hofstad (2022) for further geometric structures. Models with exactly the same connection probability as in Eq. (1.1), but with finite-mean weights, have been considered previously (Caron and Fox (2017), Norros and Reittu (2006)). In this article we are instead interested in the non-standard case of infinite mean of the weights, corresponding to the choice $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as mentioned above. A combination of the specific form of the connection probability (1.1) and these heavy-tailed weights make the model interesting. We believe that many mathematical features of an *ultra-small world* network can be captured through this model.

The motivation from the model studied here comes from the statistical physics literature, where the model was introduced as a scale-invariant random graph under hierarchical renormalization of vertices Garuccio et al. (2020). In this model, one looks at the same random graph ensemble at different hierarchical levels $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. In particular, one starts with level $\ell = 0$ and considers a random graph on $n(0)$ vertices and each vertex $i = 1, n(0)$ having a weight W_i . To move to level $\ell = 1$, one specifies a partition of the original $n(0)$ vertices into $n(1) < n(0)$ blocks; the blocks of the partition become the vertices of the graph at the new level and any two different blocks are connected if there existed an edge between the original vertices across them. At this new level, the weights of vertices get summed over the blocks. The process can continue to higher levels $\ell > 1$ and one wants to see if the probability distribution of the graph preserves its functional form across all levels. It was argued in Garuccio et al. (2020) that, for such a thing to happen, the weights $(W_i)_i$ should be sampled independently from a one-sided stable distribution of parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (thus with infinite mean), the blocks of the partition should be equal in size, and the connection probability should be of the form mentioned in (1.1). In this way, the random graph ensemble becomes scale-invariant under a renormalization process that, by admitting any partition of nodes into equally sized blocks, does not require the notion of coordinates for the vertices in some underlying metric space, unlike other models based on the idea of geometric renormalization where ‘closer’ nodes are merged Boguna et al. (2021), García-Pérez et al. (2018).

Another model where a connection probability similar to the one in Eq. (1.1) occurs, but again with an additional notion of embedding geometry, is the scale-free percolation model on \mathbb{Z}^d . The vertex set in this graph is no longer a finite set of points and the connection probabilities depend also on the spatial positions of the vertices. Here also one starts with independent weights $(W_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ and distributed according to $F_W(\cdot)$, where F_W has a power law index of $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ and conditioned on the weights, vertices x and y are connected independently with probability

$$\tilde{p}_{xy} = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda W_x W_y}{\|x - y\|^s}\right),$$

where s and λ are some positive parameters. The model was introduced in Deijfen et al. (2013), where it was shown the degree of distribution have a power law exponent of parameter $-\tau = -s\beta/d$. The asymptotics of the maximum degree was derived recently in Bhattacharjee and Schulte (2022) and further properties of the chemical distances were studied in Deprez et al. (2015), Heydenreich et al. (2017), van der Hofstad and Komjathy (2017). As we see in some cases the degree can be infinite too. The mixing properties of the scale free percolation on a torus of side length n was studied in Cipriani and Salvi (2021). In our model, the distance term $\|x - y\|^{-s}$ is not there and hence on one hand the form becomes easier, but on the other hand many useful integrability properties are lost due to the fact that interactions do not decay with distance.

We show some important properties of the degree distribution of our model. In particular, we show that the average degree grows like $\log n$ if we choose the specific scaling $\varepsilon = n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. In this case, the (cumulative) degree distribution roughly behaves like a power law with exponent -1 . In the literature for random graphs with degree sequences having infinite mean, this falls in the critical case of exponent $\tau = 1$. The configuration model with given degree sequence $(D_i)_{i \in [n]}$ i.i.d. with law D having power law exponent $\tau \in (0, 1)$ was studied in [van den Esker et al. \(2005\)](#). It was shown that the typical distance between two randomly chosen points is either 2 or 3. It was also shown that for $\tau = 1$ similar ultra small world behaviour is true. Instead of the configuration model, we study the properties of the degree distribution for the model which also naturally gives rise to degree distributions with power law exponent -1 .

2. MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

The formal definition of the model reads as follows. Let the vertex set be given by $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n > 0$ be a parameter which will depend on n . The random graph with law \mathbf{P} is constructed in the following way:

- (a) Sample n independent weights (W_i) , under \mathbf{P} , according to a Pareto distribution with parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, that is,

$$1 - F_W(w) = \mathbf{P}(W_i > w) = \begin{cases} w^{-\alpha}, & w > 1, \\ 1, & 0 < w \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

- (b) For all $n \geq 1$, given the weights $(W_i)_{i \in [n]}$, construct the random graph G_n by joining edges independently with probability given by [\(1.1\)](#). That is,

$$p_{ij} := \mathbf{P}(i \leftrightarrow j \mid W_i, W_j) = 1 - \exp(-\varepsilon_n W_i W_j) \quad (2.2)$$

where the event $\{i \leftrightarrow j\}$ means that vertices i and j are connected by an edge in the graph. We will denote the above random graph by $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ as it depends on the parameters α and ε . Self-loops and multi-edges are not allowed and hence the final graph is given by a simple graph on n vertices.

Note that, in choosing the distribution of the weights in [\(2.1\)](#), we could have alternatively started with a regularly varying random variable with power law exponent $-\alpha$, i.e. $\mathbf{P}(W_i > w) = w^{-\alpha} L(w)$ where $L(\cdot)$ is a slowly varying function, that is, for any $w > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(wt)}{L(t)} = 1.$$

It is our belief that most of the results stated in this article will go through in presence of a slowly varying function, even if the analysis would be more involved. In this first work we refrain from going into this technical side.

Connection with the model in [Garuccio et al. \(2020\)](#). In particular, it should be noted that, in the original formulation of the model mentioned above, the weights are drawn from a one-sided α -stable distribution with arbitrary scale parameter γ , and not from a Pareto [[Garuccio et al. \(2020\)](#)]. Such a specification comes from a scale-invariance requirement demanding that, if the $n(0)$ vertices of the random graph defined at the hierarchical level $\ell = 0$ are partitioned into $n(0)/b$ ‘blocks’ of equal size b (where two blocks get connected if an edge is realized between any pair of constituent vertices across the two blocks) and the fitness of each block is defined as the sum of the fitness

values of the b constituent vertices, then one sees a new ‘renormalized’ random graph at level $\ell = 1$ with $n(1) = n(0)/b$ coarse-grained vertices, fitness distributed according to the same distribution as for the previous level $\ell = 0$ (with renormalized parameters), and the same functional form of the connection probability. This requirement implies that the fitness is drawn from a one-sided α -stable distribution, with an arbitrary scale parameter $\gamma(0)$ for $\ell = 0$ and rescaled parameter $\gamma(1) = b^{1/\alpha}\gamma(0)$ for $\ell = 1$, and that the connection probability has the specific form in Eq. (2.2), with ε unchanged under renormalization [Garuccio et al. (2020)]. If iterated ℓ times, the coarse-graining generates a random graph with the same ε , a reduced number $n(\ell) = n(0)/b^\ell$ of nodes and a set of α -stable distributed fitness values with scale parameter $\gamma(\ell) = b^{\ell/\alpha}\gamma(0)$. The three parameters of the model are therefore $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma(0) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. However, only α and the combination $\varepsilon\gamma^2(0)$ are independent parameters [Garuccio et al. (2020)]. Indeed, note that rescaling $\gamma(0)$ to $\gamma(\ell) = b^{\ell/\alpha}\gamma(0)$ and leaving ε unchanged is equivalent to leaving $\gamma(0)$ unchanged and rescaling ε to $\varepsilon(\ell) = b^{2\ell/\alpha}\varepsilon$. Therefore our formulation here can be thought of as deriving from an equivalent model where, rather than having an ℓ -independent density parameter ε and an ℓ -dependent scale parameter $\gamma(\ell)$, we have an ℓ -dependent density parameter $\varepsilon(\ell) = b^{2\ell/\alpha}\varepsilon(0)$ and ℓ -independent scale parameter $\gamma(\ell) = \gamma_\alpha$ for all ℓ , where

$$\gamma_\alpha \equiv \left[\frac{\pi}{2\Gamma(\alpha) \sin(\frac{\pi\alpha}{2})} \right]^{1/\alpha},$$

which corresponds to asymptotically the same tail as the Pareto in Eq. (2.1). In this way, the only two free parameters are α and $\varepsilon(\ell)$. Looking at the original model at a certain hierarchical level ℓ is equivalent to looking at our random graph for a suitable value of $\varepsilon(\ell)$, where the α -stable has been replaced by a Pareto with asymptotically the same tail. Results that we obtain for a specific range of values of ε can therefore be thought of as applying to a corresponding specific range of hierarchical levels in the original model. In particular, achieving a certain scaling ε_n in the model considered here corresponds to finding a suitable level ℓ with the corresponding scaling $\varepsilon_{n(\ell)}$ in the original model. We will comment back on this point at the end of the next Section.

Notation. Convergence in distribution and convergence in probability will be denoted respectively by \xrightarrow{d} and \xrightarrow{P} . $\mathbf{E}[\cdot]$ is the expectation with respect to \mathbf{P} and the conditional expectation with respect to the weight W of a typical vertex is denoted by $\mathbf{E}_W[\cdot] = \mathbf{E}[\cdot|W]$. Let $(a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be the indicator variables $(\mathbb{1}_{i \leftrightarrow j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$. As standard, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we will write $f(n) \sim g(n)$ if $f(n)/g(n) \rightarrow 1$, $f(n) = o(g(n))$ if $f(n)/g(n) \rightarrow 0$ and $f(n) = O(g(n))$ if $f(n)/g(n) \leq C$ for some $C > 0$. Lastly, $f(n) \asymp g(n)$ denote that there exists positive constants c_1 and C_2 such that

$$c_1 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)/g(n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)/g(n) \leq C_2.$$

2.1. Degrees. Our first theorem characterises the behaviour of a typical degree and of the joint distribution of the degrees. Consider the degree of vertex $i \in [n]$ defined as

$$D_n(i) = \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij}. \quad (2.3)$$

Theorem 1. [Scaling and asymptotic of the degrees.] Consider the graph $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ and let $D_n(i)$ the degree of the vertex $i \in [n]$.

(i) **[Expected degree.]** The expected degree of a typical vertex i scales as follows

$$\mathbf{E}[D_n(i)] \sim -(n-1)\Gamma(1-\alpha)\varepsilon^\alpha \log \varepsilon^\alpha, \text{ as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$ then we have

$$\mathbf{E}[D_n(i)] \sim \Gamma(1-\alpha) \log n \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(ii) **[Asymptotic degree distribution.]** Let $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, then for all $i \in [n]$

$$D_n(i) \xrightarrow{d} D_\infty(i) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $D_\infty(i)$ is a mixed Poisson random variable with parameter $\Lambda = \Gamma(1-\alpha)W_i^\alpha$. Additionally, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > x) \sim \Gamma(1-\alpha)x^{-1} \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

(iii) **[Asymptotic joint degree behaviour.]** Let $D_\infty(i)$ and $D_\infty(j)$ be the asymptotic degree distribution of two arbitrary distinct vertices $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}[t^{D_\infty(i)} s^{D_\infty(j)}] \neq \mathbf{E}[t^{D_\infty(i)}] \mathbf{E}[s^{D_\infty(j)}], \quad \text{for fixed } t, s \in (0, 1), \quad (2.5)$$

and for s, t sufficiently close to 1 we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{E}[t^{D_\infty(i)} s^{D_\infty(j)}] - \mathbf{E}[t^{D_\infty(i)}] \mathbf{E}[s^{D_\infty(j)}] \right| \\ & \leq O\left((1-s)(1-t) \log\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)(1-s)}\right)\left(1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)(1-t)}\right)\right)\right) + C((1-t) + (1-s)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

We shall prove Theorem 1 in Section 3. The first part of the result shows that average degree of the graph diverges logarithmically. This indeed rules out any kind of the local weak limit of the graph. We also see in the second part that asymptotically degrees have cumulative power law exponent -1 . It is expected that when $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, we should have $\mathbf{P}(D_n(i) > x) \asymp x^{-1}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. The third part of the result deserves further comments.

Indeed Eq. (2.5) shows that $D_\infty(i)$ and $D_\infty(j)$ are *not independent*. In the generalized random graph model, this is a surprising phenomenon. If we consider a generalized random graph, with weights as described in (2.1) and

$$\tilde{p}_{ij} = \frac{W_i W_j}{n^{1/\alpha} + W_i W_j}$$

then it follows from Theorem 6.14 of [van der Hofstad \(2016\)](#) that asymptotic degree distribution has the same behaviour as our model and the asymptotic degree distributions are independent. Although there is no independence as (2.5) shows, we still believe that the following will be true

$$\left| \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > x, D_\infty(j) > x) - \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > x) \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(j) > x) \right| = o(\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > x) \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(j) > x)), \quad (2.7)$$

and hence the limiting vector will be *asymptotically tail independent*. Although not provided with a rigorous proof yet, this conjecture is supported by numerical simulations (see Fig.1).

Such a property of limiting degree was observed and proved using multivariate version of Karata's Tauberian theorem for Preferential attachment models, see [Resnick and Samorodnitsky](#)




FIGURE 1. **Asymptotic tail independence between degrees.** Scatter-plot of the degrees of the nodes with labels 1 and 2 (assigned randomly but fixed for every realisation in the ensemble). Each point in the plot corresponds to one of 2000 realizations of a network of $N = 2000$ nodes, each generated as described at the beginning of Section 2 (see Eqs. (2.1) and (2.2)).

(2015). In our case, Eq. (2.6) suggests that Eq. (2.7) would hold true provided an explicit characterization of the full joint distribution of the asymptotic degrees can be derived, but we have not explored this here.

2.2. Wedges, triangles and clustering. Our second result concerns the number of wedges and triangles associated to a typical vertex $i \in [n]$, defined respectively as follows:

$$\mathbb{W}_n(i) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} a_{ij} a_{ik}, \quad \Delta_n(i) = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk}. \quad (2.8)$$

Theorem 2. [Triangles and Wedges of typical nodes.] Consider the graph $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ and let $\mathbb{W}_n(i)$ and $\Delta_n(i)$ be the number of wedges and triangles at vertex $i \in [n]$. Then:

(i) **[Average number of wedges.]**

$$\mathbf{E} [\mathbb{W}_n(i)] \sim \frac{\Gamma^2(-\frac{\alpha}{2})\alpha^2}{2} \varepsilon^\alpha n^2 \text{ as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

In particular, when $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, then

$$\mathbf{E} [\mathbb{W}_n(i)] \sim \frac{\Gamma^2(-\frac{\alpha}{2})\alpha^2}{2} n.$$

(ii) **[Asymptotic distribution of wedges.]** Let $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, then

$$\mathbb{W}_n(i) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{W}_\infty(i)$$

where $\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) = D_\infty(i)(D_\infty(i) - 1)$ with $D_\infty(i)$ as in Theorem 1. Also, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) > x) \sim Cx^{-1/2} \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

(iii) [**Average number of triangles.**] Let $i \in [n]$, the average number of triangles grows as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}[\Delta_n(i)] \sim -\frac{\alpha^3}{12}\Gamma^3\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}\alpha}n^2 \text{ as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

In particular, when $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\Delta_n(i)] \sim -\frac{\alpha^3}{12}\Gamma^3\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)\sqrt{n} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(iv) [**Convergence in probability for the total number of triangles.**] Let $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$ and $\Delta_n = \sum_{i \in [n]} \Delta_n(i)$ be the total number of triangles, then

$$\frac{12\Delta_n}{\alpha^3 n^{3/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} -\Gamma^3\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{12\Delta_n(i)}{\alpha^3 n^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} -\Gamma^3\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right).$$

Remark 3. [Global and local clustering.] Let $\mathbb{W}_n = \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{W}_n(i)$ be the total number of wedges. We see from above result that

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[\Delta_n]}{\mathbf{E}[\mathbb{W}_n]} \asymp \varepsilon^{\alpha/2}, \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

This shows in a quantitative form that the graph is not highly clustered from the point of view of the *global* count of triangles. In particular, in the scale of $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, the above ratio goes to zero like $n^{-1/2}$. However, this does not mean that the graph is not highly clustered from the point of view of the *local* count of triangles around individual nodes. Indeed, simulations in [Garuccio et al. \(2020\)](#) of the average local clustering coefficient suggest that the graph is locally clustered. A dissimilarity in the behaviour of local and global clustering coefficients has also been observed in different inhomogeneous random graph models, see for example [Michiellan et al. \(2022\)](#), [van der Hofstad et al. \(2017, 2020\)](#). We do not consider the local clustering here.

2.3. Connectedness. Connectivity properties of inhomogeneous random graphs were studied in the sparse setting by [Bollobás et al. \(2007\)](#). The connectivity properties when the connection probabilities are of the form $\min\{1, \kappa(W_i, W_j) \frac{\log n}{n}\}$ with κ being a square integrable kernel was studied in [Devroye and Fraiman \(2014\)](#). Note that due to dependency of ε_n in our p_{ij} this do not fall in this setting. We do not give a full characterisation of the connectivity but we find some first properties of the isolated points in the graph (which we refer to as *dust*) and a strongly connected regime. In particular, the next statement shows a cross-over for the presence of isolated nodes.

Proposition 4. [Phase transition for dust.] Consider the graph $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon)$. Let N_0 be the number of isolated nodes, that is,

$$N_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{i \text{ is isolated}\}} \tag{2.9}$$

(i) If $\varepsilon_n > k_1 n^{-1/\alpha}$ with $k_1 = \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}\right)^{1/\alpha}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) = 0.$$

(ii) If $\varepsilon_n < k_2 n^{-1/\alpha}$ with $k_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)(2-2^\alpha)}\right)^{1/\alpha}$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) = 1.$$

In particular, this shows that $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ is disconnected with high probability.

The next proposition identifies a strongly connected regime within the parametric region of ε_n with absence of dust as captured in Proposition 4 (i).

Proposition 5. [Strong connectedness.] *Let $\varepsilon_n = \eta n^{-1/\alpha}$, with $\eta > k_3 \equiv (\frac{e}{e-1})^{1/\alpha}$, then there are no connected components of size smaller than $\hat{\delta}n$ with $\hat{\delta} = 1 - \frac{1}{(k_3^{-1}\eta)^\alpha}$. In particular, if $\hat{\delta} > \frac{1}{2}$ (that is, $\eta > 2^{1/\alpha}k_3$), then $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon_n)$ is strongly connected with high probability, that is,*

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon_n) \text{ is disconnected}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.10)$$

Remark 6. [Implications of connectivity on coarse-graining.] Theorems 1 and 2 consider a particular scaling $\varepsilon_n \sim n^{-1/\alpha}$ to investigate various structural properties (degrees, wedges, triangles) and Propositions 4 and 5 identify specific constants k_m (with $m = 1, 2, 3$) that are relevant for the emergence of the connectedness of the graph when $\varepsilon_n = k_m n^{-1/\alpha}$. As we mentioned in the Section 1, one can reinterpret a specific value of ε_n in this model in terms of a specific hierarchical level ℓ in the original scale-invariant model introduced in Garuccio et al. (2020). In particular, in the original model one can effectively vary the constant k for $\varepsilon_n = k n^{-1/\alpha}$ by changing the hierarchical level as follows: start from level $\ell = 0$ with $n(0)$ vertices and parameter $\varepsilon_{n(0)} = k(0)[n(0)]^{-1/\alpha}$; after ℓ coarse-grainings, one obtains the same model on a renormalized graph with $n(\ell) = n(0)/b^\ell$ vertices and modified $\varepsilon(\ell) = b^{2\ell/\alpha}\varepsilon(0) = k(\ell)[n(\ell)]^{-1/\alpha}$, where $k(\ell) \equiv k(0)b^{\ell/\alpha}$. This coarse-graining effectively corresponds to changing $\varepsilon_n = k(0)n^{-1/\alpha}$ to $\varepsilon_n = k(\ell)n^{-1/\alpha}$ in our model here. This means that, starting from $k(0) \ll k_m$ at level $\ell = 0$ in the original model, there will be an implied critical level $\ell_m > 0$ such that $k(\ell_m) = k_m$; at this critical level, the relevant connectivity properties and cross-overs studied here in Propositions 4 and 5 (for $m = 1, 2, 3$) will emerge in the graph, as the result of coarse-graining. Critical parameter values considered here correspond to critical hierarchical levels in the renormalization of the original graph model.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1: TYPICAL DEGREES

Since the Karamata's Tauberian theorem is used here as a key tool in the analysis of the degree distribution and later analysis, it is first worth recalling those results.

Theorem 7 (Karamata's Tauberian theorem (Bingham et al., 1989, Theorem 8.1.6)). *Let X be a non-negative random variable with distribution F and Laplace transform*

$$\hat{F}(s) = \mathbf{E}[e^{-sX}], s \geq 0.$$

Let L be a slowly varying function and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then the following are equivalent

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad & 1 - \hat{F}(s) \sim \Gamma(1 - \alpha)s^\alpha L\left(\frac{1}{s}\right), \text{ as } s \downarrow 0, \\ (b) \quad & 1 - F(x) \sim x^{-\alpha}L(x), \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Then, another property of the tails of products of regularly varying distributions will be needed. A general statement about product of n iid random variables with Pareto tails can be found in (Anders Hedegaard Jessen, 2006, Lemma 4.1 (4)). For completeness, a proof for two random variables is given here, which is useful in our analysis.

Lemma 8. Let W_1 and W_2 be independent random variables satisfying the tail assumptions (2.1). Then

$$\mathbf{P}(W_1 W_2 \geq x) \sim \alpha x^{-\alpha} \log x, \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Consider the random variable $\log(W_1)$ which follows an exponential distribution, or alternatively a Gamma distribution with shape parameter $k = 1$ and scale $\theta = 1/\alpha$. Then, the random variable $Z = \log(W_1) + \log(W_2)$ follows a Gamma distribution with shape parameter 2 and scale θ . This means:

$$\mathbf{P}(\log(W_1) + \log(W_2) > x) = \frac{\alpha^2}{\Gamma(2)} \int_x^\infty y e^{-\alpha y} dy.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbf{P}(W_1 W_2 > x) = \mathbf{P}(\log W_1 + \log W_2 > \log x) = \alpha^2 \int_{\log x}^\infty y e^{-\alpha y} dy = \alpha^2 \int_x^\infty \log(t) t^{-\alpha-1} dt. \quad (3.3)$$

Then applying Karamata's Theorem (see (Anders Hedegaard Jessen, 2006, Theorem 12))

$$\mathbf{P}(W_1 W_2 > x) \sim \alpha^2 \frac{x^{-\alpha} \log x}{\alpha}, \quad (3.4)$$

which proves the statement. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. (i) We begin by evaluating the asymptotics of the expected degree, which is an easy consequence of Lemma 8 and Theorem 7. Indeed we can write

$$\mathbf{E}[D_n(i)] = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E}[1 - \exp(-\varepsilon W_i W_j)] = (n-1) \mathbf{E}[1 - \exp(-\varepsilon W_1 W_2)], \quad (3.5)$$

where the last equality is due to exchangeability of the nodes.

It follows from Lemma 8 that $\mathbf{P}(W_1 W_2 > x) \sim \alpha x^{-\alpha} \log x$. Therefore, using Theorem 7 we have

$$\mathbf{E}[1 - \exp(-\varepsilon W_1 W_2)] \sim \Gamma(1-\alpha) \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0, \quad (3.6)$$

which together with (3.5) gives the claim.

(ii) By following the line of the proof of Theorem 6.14 of van der Hofstad (2016), we can prove our statement by showing that the probability generating function of $D_n(i)$ in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to the probability generating function of a mixed Poisson random variable. Let $t \in (0, 1)$, the probability generating function of the degree $D_n(i)$ reads:

$$\mathbf{E}[t^{D_n(i)}] = \mathbf{E}\left[t^{\sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij}}\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{j \neq i} t^{a_{ij}}\right], \quad (3.7)$$

where a_{ij} are the entries of the adjacency matrix related to the graph $\mathbf{G}_n(\alpha, \varepsilon)$, i.e. Bernoulli random variables with parameter p_{ij} as in (2.2). Conditioned on the weights, these variables are independent. Recall that we denoted by $\mathbf{E}_{W_i}[\cdot]$ the conditional expectation given the weight W_i . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_{W_i}[t^{D_n(i)}] &= \mathbf{E}_{W_i} \left[\prod_{j \neq i} ((1-t)e^{-\varepsilon_n W_j W_i} + t) \right] \\
&= \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E}_{W_i} [(1-t)e^{-\varepsilon_n W_j W_i} + t] = \prod_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E}_{W_i} [\varphi_{W_i}(\varepsilon_n W_j)],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where we have used the independence of the weights and introduced the function

$$\varphi_{W_i}(x) := (1-t)e^{-W_i x} + t.$$

Let us introduce the following notation to simplify our expression:

$$\psi_n(W_i) := \mathbf{E}_{W_i} [\varphi_{W_i}(\varepsilon_n W_j)]. \tag{3.9}$$

Using exchangeability, tower property of the conditional expectation, the moment generating function of the $D_n(i)$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{E}[t^{D_n(i)}] = \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{j \neq i} \psi_n(W_i) \right] = \mathbf{E} [\psi_n(W_i)^{n-1}]. \tag{3.10}$$

Consider now a differentiable function $h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $h(0) = 0$. By integration by parts one can show that

$$\mathbf{E}[h(W_i)] = \int_0^\infty h'(x) \mathbf{P}(W_i > x) dx. \tag{3.11}$$

By using (3.11) with $h(w) = \varphi_{W_i}(\varepsilon_n w) - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_n(w_i) &= 1 + \mathbf{E} [\varphi_{W_i}(\varepsilon_n w) - 1] \\
&= 1 + \int_0^\infty \varepsilon_n \varphi'_{W_i}(\varepsilon_n w) (1 - F_W(w)) dw \\
&= 1 + \int_0^\infty \varphi'_{W_i}(y) (1 - F_W(\varepsilon_n^{-1} y)) dy \\
&= 1 + \int_0^{\varepsilon_n} \varphi'_{W_i}(y) dy + \int_{\varepsilon_n}^\infty \varphi'_{W_i}(y) (1 - F_W(\varepsilon_n^{-1} y)) dy \\
&= 1 + \varphi_{W_i}(\varepsilon_n) - \varphi_{W_i}(0) + \varepsilon_n^\alpha \int_{\varepsilon_n}^\infty (t-1) W_i e^{-y W_i} y^{-\alpha} dy.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

In particular for $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, combining (3.10) and (3.12) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [t^{D_n(i)}] &= \mathbf{E} [\psi_n(W_i)^{n-1}] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\left(1 + \varphi_{W_i}(n^{-1/\alpha}) - \varphi_{W_i}(0) + \frac{1}{n} \int_{n^{-1/\alpha}}^\infty (t-1) W_i e^{-y W_i} y^{-\alpha} dy \right)^{n-1} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for a fixed realization of W_i , as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$(1-t) \int_{n^{-1/\alpha}}^\infty W_i e^{-y W_i} y^{-\alpha} dy \rightarrow (1-t) W_i^\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha)$$

and

$$\varphi_{W_i}(n^{-1/\alpha}) \rightarrow \varphi_{W_i}(0) = 1.$$

Thus, an application of dominated convergence theorem as in (van der Hofstad, 2016, Theorem 6.14) leads to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left[t^{D_n(i)} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\exp \left(-(1-t) W_i^\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha) \right) \right].$$

So the generating function of the graph degree $D_n(i)$ asymptotically corresponds to the generating function of a mixed Poisson random variable with parameter $\Gamma(1-\alpha)W_i^\alpha$. Therefore, the variable $D_n(i) \xrightarrow{d} D_\infty(i)$ where $D_\infty(i) \mid W_i \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Poisson}(\Gamma(1-\alpha)W_i^\alpha)$.

In particular, we have the following tail of the distribution of the random variable $D_\infty(i)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) \geq k) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}(\text{Poisson}(\Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha) \geq k \mid W_i = w) F_{W_i}(dw) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha} \Gamma(1-\alpha)^m w^{\alpha m}}{m!} F_{W_i}(dw) \\ &= \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{1}{m!} \int_1^\infty e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha} \Gamma(1-\alpha)^m w^{\alpha m} \alpha w^{-\alpha-1} dw. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Let us introduce the new variable $y = \Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^\infty e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha} \Gamma(1-\alpha)^m w^{\alpha m} \alpha w^{-\alpha-1} dw &= \int_1^\infty e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha} \Gamma(1-\alpha)^{m-1} w^{\alpha m} w^{-2\alpha} \alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha) w^{\alpha-1} dw \\ &= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \int_{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}^\infty e^{-y} y^{m-2} dy \\ &= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \Gamma(m-1) - \Gamma(1-\alpha) \int_0^{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} e^{-y} y^{m-2} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

The first integral is dominant with respect to the second one. To show this, we can use a trivial bound:

$$\int_0^{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} e^{-y} y^{m-2} dy \leq \Gamma(1-\alpha)^m.$$

Since $m! \geq (m/e)^m$, then the following inequalities hold true

$$\sum_{m \geq k} \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)^m}{m!} \leq \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{(e\Gamma(1-\alpha))^m}{m^m} \leq C(e\Gamma(1-\alpha))^k k^{-k},$$

where in the last step we use that k is large enough (it is at least greater than $e\Gamma(1-\alpha)$). Note that

$$k \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)^m}{m!} \leq C e^{\log k - k \log k + k e \Gamma(1-\alpha)} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

By using (3.14) we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m \geq k} \frac{1}{m!} \int_1^\infty e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)w^\alpha} \Gamma(1-\alpha)^m w^{\alpha m} \alpha w^{-\alpha-1} dw &= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{\Gamma(m-1)}{m!} + o(k^{-1}) \\
&= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{(m-2)!}{m!} + o(k^{-1}) \\
&= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \sum_{m \geq k} \frac{1}{m(m-1)} + o(k^{-1}) \sim \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{k}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) \geq k) \sim \Gamma(1-\alpha)k^{-1}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(iii) Fix $t, s \in (0, 1)$. Due to node exchangeability, without loss of generality we consider the vertices 1 and 2.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[t^{D_n(1)} s^{D_n(2)} \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[t^{\sum_{j \neq 1} a_{1j}} s^{\sum_{j \neq 2} a_{2j}} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{j \neq 1, 2} t^{a_{1j}} s^{a_{2j}} (ts)^{a_{12}} \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[((1-ts)e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_2} + ts) \prod_{j \neq 1, 2} ((1-t)e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_j} + t) ((1-s)e^{-\varepsilon W_2 W_j} + s) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where we have used the independence of the connection probabilities *given* the weights. In order to simplify the notation, we can introduce the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_a^b(x) &:= (1-b)e^{-\varepsilon_n a x} + b, \\
\psi_n(W_1, W_2) &:= \mathbf{E}_{W_1, W_2} [\phi_{W_1}^t(W_j) \phi_{W_2}^s(W_j)] \text{ for } j \neq 1, 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $a, b > 0$ and, as customary throughout this paper, $\mathbf{E}_{W_1, W_2}[\cdot] := \mathbf{E}[\cdot | W_1, W_2]$.

Using the tower property of conditional expectation, Eq. (3.15) reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left[t^{D_n(1)} s^{D_n(2)} \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\phi_{W_1}^{ts}(W_2) \prod_{j \neq 1, 2} \phi_{W_1}^t(W_j) \phi_{W_2}^s(W_j) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\phi_{w_1}^{ts}(w_2) \mathbf{E}_{W_1, W_2} \left[\prod_{j \neq 1, 2} \phi_{w_1}^t(w_j) \phi_{w_2}^s(w_j) \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\phi_{w_1}^{ts}(W_2) \prod_{j \neq 1, 2} \mathbf{E}_{W_1, W_2} [\phi_{W_1}^t(W_j) \phi_{W_2}^s(W_j)] \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} [\phi_{W_1}^{ts}(W_2) \psi_n(W_1, W_2)^{n-2}],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where we used conditional independence in the second last step and exchangeability in the last step. The function ψ_n can be processed as follows. Just as in the one dimensional case, using $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$, we get \mathbf{P} a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_n(W_1, W_2) - 1 &= \mathbf{E}_{W_1, W_2} [\phi_{W_1}^t(W_3) \phi_{W_2}^s(W_3) - 1] \\
&\rightarrow -\Gamma(1-\alpha) [(1-t)(1-s)(W_1 + W_2)^\alpha + (1-t)sW_1^\alpha + t(1-s)W_2^\alpha] \\
&= -\Gamma(1-\alpha) \left\{ (1-t)(1-s) [(W_1 + W_2)^\alpha - W_1^\alpha - W_2^\alpha] + (1-t)W_1^\alpha + (1-s)W_2^\alpha \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where in the second step we used (3.11) with $h(x) := \phi_{W_1}^t(x) \phi_{W_2}^s(x) - 1$. By using $\phi_{W_1}^{ts}(W_2) \rightarrow 1$ and the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} [t^{D_\infty(1)} s^{D_\infty(2)}] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} [t^{D_n(1)} s^{D_n(2)}] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha) \left\{ (1-t)(1-s) [(W_1 + W_2)^\alpha - W_1^\alpha - W_2^\alpha] + (1-t)W_1^\alpha + (1-s)W_2^\alpha \right\}} \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)(1-t)(1-s) [(W_1 + W_2)^\alpha - W_1^\alpha - W_2^\alpha]} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)(1-t)W_1^\alpha} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)(1-s)W_2^\alpha} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

It is straightforward to note that in the limit $t \rightarrow 1$ and for fixed $s \in (0, 1)$ we recover the correct moment generating function of $D_\infty(1)$ and the inverse holds true as well. Finally, since $(W_1 + W_2)^\alpha \neq W_1^\alpha + W_2^\alpha$ \mathbf{P} -a.s., then (2.5) follows.

We next move to the proof of (2.6), for which we abbreviate $\eta = 1 - t$, $\gamma = 1 - s$ and show that

$$\lim_{\substack{\eta \rightarrow 0 \\ \gamma \rightarrow 0}} \left| \mathbf{E} [(1-\eta)^{D_\infty(1)} (1-\gamma)^{D_\infty(2)}] - \mathbf{E} [(1-\eta)^{D_\infty(1)}] \mathbf{E} [(1-\gamma)^{D_\infty(2)}] \right| = 0.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbf{E} [(1-\eta)^{D_\infty(1)} (1-\gamma)^{D_\infty(2)}] - \mathbf{E} [(1-\eta)^{D_\infty(1)}] \mathbf{E} [(1-\gamma)^{D_\infty(1)}] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma[(w_1+w_2)^\alpha - w_1^\alpha - w_2^\alpha]} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta w_1^\alpha} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma w_2^\alpha} \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta w_1^\alpha} \right] \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma w_2^\alpha} \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbf{E} \left[\left(e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma[(w_1+w_2)^\alpha - w_1^\alpha - w_2^\alpha]} - 1 \right) e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta w_1^\alpha} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma w_2^\alpha} \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \int_1^\infty \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} [-(x+y)^\alpha + x^\alpha + y^\alpha]^k \right) e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^\alpha} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^\alpha} \alpha^2 (xy)^{-\alpha-1} dx dy \right| \\
&\leq \int_1^\infty \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} \left| -(x+y)^\alpha + x^\alpha + y^\alpha \right|^k e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^\alpha} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^\alpha} \alpha^2 (xy)^{-\alpha-1} dx dy.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

Now, since $(x+y)^\alpha \leq (x^\alpha + y^\alpha)$ $\forall \alpha \in (0, 1)$, we get

$$\left| x^\alpha + y^\alpha - (x+y)^\alpha \right|^k \leq (x^\alpha + y^\alpha)^k \leq 2^{k-1} (x^{\alpha k} + y^{\alpha k}). \tag{3.21}$$

Therefore, after bringing the summation out of the integral and using the inequality (3.21), we are left with the following quantity (which we will show to be converging to zero):

$$\alpha^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} 2^{k-1} \int_1^{\infty} \left(x^{\alpha k} + y^{\alpha k} \right) e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^{\alpha}} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^{\alpha}} (xy)^{-\alpha-1} dx dy. \quad (3.22)$$

Let us consider the different terms of the sum separately. In the following we will consider the exponential integral $E_1(x) = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{e^{-tx}}{t} dt$ and the related inequality $E_1(x) < e^{-x} \ln(1 + \frac{1}{x})$ for any $x > 0$.

Case 1: $k = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha^2 \Gamma(1-\alpha) \eta \gamma \int_1^{\infty} \int_1^{\infty} (x^{\alpha} + y^{\alpha}) e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^{\alpha}} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^{\alpha}} (xy)^{-\alpha-1} dx dy \\ &= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \eta \gamma \left[E_1(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta) \int_1^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma z}}{z^2} dz + E_1(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma) \int_1^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta z}}{z^2} dz \right] \\ &\leq \Gamma(1-\alpha) \eta \gamma [E_1(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta) + E_1(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma)] \\ &< \Gamma(1-\alpha) \left[\eta \gamma e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta} \right) + \eta \gamma e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $k = 2$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha) \eta \gamma)^2 \int_1^{\infty} \int_1^{\infty} (x^{2\alpha} + y^{2\alpha}) e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^{\alpha}} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^{\alpha}} (xy)^{-\alpha-1} dx dy \\ &= \Gamma(1-\alpha) (\eta \gamma)^2 \left[\frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta}}{\eta} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma z}}{z^2} dz + \int_1^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta z}}{z^2} dz \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma}}{\gamma} \right] \\ &\leq \Gamma(1-\alpha) (\eta \gamma)^2 \left[\frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta}}{\eta} + \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma}}{\gamma} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Case 3: $k > 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha^2 \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} 2^{k-1} \int_1^\infty (x^{\alpha k} + y^{\alpha k}) e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^\alpha} e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^\alpha} (xy)^{-\alpha-1} dx dy \\
&= \alpha^2 \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} 2^{k-1} \left[\int_1^\infty \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^\alpha}}{x^{\alpha(1-k)+1}} dx \int_1^\infty \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^\alpha}}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_1^\infty \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta x^\alpha}}{x^{\alpha+1}} dx \int_1^\infty \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma y^\alpha}}{y^{\alpha(1-k)+1}} dy \right] \\
&= \alpha^2 \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} 2^{k-1} \left[\int_{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta}^\infty \left(\frac{z}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta} \right)^{k-2} e^{-z} \frac{dz}{\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta} \int_1^\infty \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma z}}{z^2} dz \frac{1}{\alpha} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_1^\infty \frac{e^{-\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta z}}{z^2} dz \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma}^\infty \left(\frac{z}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma} \right)^{k-2} e^{-z} \frac{dz}{\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma} \right] \\
&\leq \alpha^2 \frac{(\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta\gamma)^k}{k!} 2^{k-1} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta} \right)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta}^\infty z^{k-2} e^{-z} dz \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma} \right)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma}^\infty z^{k-2} e^{-z} dz \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}{k!} 2^{k-1} \Gamma(k-1) (\eta\gamma)^k \left[\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{k-1} + \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \right)^{k-1} \right] \\
&= \Gamma(1-\alpha) \frac{2^{k-1}}{k(k-1)} (\eta\gamma^k + \eta^k\gamma)
\end{aligned}$$

So, combining together all the bounds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbf{E} \left[(1-\eta)^{D_\infty(1)} (1-\gamma)^{D_\infty(2)} \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[(1-\eta)^{D_\infty(1)} \right] \mathbf{E} \left[(1-\gamma)^{D_\infty(2)} \right] \right| \\
& < \Gamma(1-\alpha) \left[\eta\gamma \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\eta} \right) + \eta\gamma \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\gamma} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{2^k}{k(k-1)} (\eta\gamma^k + \eta^k\gamma) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Since $x \log(1 + \frac{1}{x}) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$, the above quantity goes to 0 as $\eta, \gamma \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2: WEDGES & TRIANGLES

Proof of Theorem 2. (i) Start from the equality

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathbf{E} [\mathbb{W}_n(i)] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} a_{ij} a_{ik} \right] \\
&= (n-1)(n-2) \alpha^3 \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{(1 - e^{-\varepsilon xy})(1 - e^{-\varepsilon xz})}{(xyz)^{\alpha+1}} dx dy dz.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

The latter integral can be solved exactly by using the substitutions $A = xy, B = xz$ and $C = yz$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[\mathbb{W}_n(i)] &= \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{4} \alpha^3 \int_1^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon A}}{A^{\alpha/2+1}} dA \int_1^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon B}}{B^{\alpha/2+1}} dB \int_1^\infty C^{-\alpha/2-1} dC \\ &= \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{4} \alpha^3 \left[\frac{2}{\alpha} - \varepsilon^{\alpha/2} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}; \varepsilon\right) \right]^2 \frac{2}{\alpha}\end{aligned}\quad (4.2)$$

where $\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha}{2}; \varepsilon)$ is the incomplete Gamma function. When ε is small, the following expansion (Bender et al. (1999)) can be used:

$$\Gamma(s; \varepsilon) \sim \Gamma(s) - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{\varepsilon^{s+k}}{k!(s+k)}, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+ \text{ and } s \neq 0, -1, -2, -3, \dots \quad (4.3)$$

So we see that in our case,

$$\Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}, \varepsilon\right) \sim \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) + \frac{2}{\alpha} \varepsilon^{-\alpha/2} + O\left(\varepsilon^{1-\alpha/2}\right), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, at the first order:

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbb{W}_n(i)] \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\alpha^2 n^2}{2} \left[-\varepsilon^{\alpha/2} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right]^2 = \frac{\alpha^2 n^2}{2} \varepsilon^\alpha \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)^2. \quad (4.4)$$

(ii) Assume now that $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$. From Theorem 1 we know that $D_n(i) \xrightarrow{d} D_\infty(i)$. Using the continuous mapping $x \mapsto x(x-1)$ we have, by the Continuous Mapping Theorem, convergence in distribution of the number of wedges $\mathbb{W}_n(i)$:

$$\mathbb{W}_n(i) = D_n(i)(D_n(i) - 1) \xrightarrow{d} D_\infty(i)(D_\infty(i) - 1) \equiv \mathbb{W}_\infty(i). \quad (4.5)$$

Let us now show that as $x \rightarrow \infty$, the tail satisfies

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) > x) \sim \Gamma(1 - \alpha) x^{-1/2} \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Indeed, first notice that by (2.4) we have

$$\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x) = \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > \sqrt{x}) \sim \Gamma(1 - \alpha) x^{-1/2}. \quad (4.6)$$

We first find the upper bound. Let $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 - D_\infty(i) > x) &= \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x + D_\infty(i), D_\infty(i) > x + \delta) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x + D_\infty(i), D_\infty(i) \leq x + \delta) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x + D_\infty(i), D_\infty(i) > x + \delta) + \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > \omega) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > x + \delta) + \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x).\end{aligned}$$

Then for any $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) > x)}{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x)} &= \frac{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 - D_\infty(i) > x)}{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x)} \leq \frac{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > x + \delta)}{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x)} + 1 \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)(x + \delta)^{-1/2}}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)x^{-1/2}} + 1 \\ &\sim x^{-1/2} + 1 \rightarrow 1.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) > x)}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)x^{-1/2}} \leq 1.$$

We do a similar break-up for the lower bound. Let $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 - D_\infty(i) > x) &\geq \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > (1 + \delta)x, D_\infty(i) \leq \delta x) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > (1 + \delta)x) - \mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i) > \delta x). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 - D_\infty(i) > x)}{\mathbf{P}(D_\infty(i)^2 > x)} &\geq \frac{((1 + \delta)x)^{-1/2} - (\delta x)^{-1}}{x^{-1/2}} \\ &\sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{(1 + \delta)}} - \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\delta x} \quad (\text{as } x \rightarrow \infty) \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 + \delta)}} - \delta^{-1}x^{-1/2} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \delta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

So we have

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) > x)}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)x^{-1/2}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 + \delta)}}.$$

The result follows by taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and it shows that $\mathbf{P}(\mathbb{W}_\infty(i) > x) \sim \Gamma(1 - \alpha)x^{-1/2}$.

(iii) We will here focus on the average number of triangles, whose evaluation will require integral asymptotics similar to the ones used for the wedges.

$$\begin{aligned} 6 \mathbf{E}[\Delta_n(i)] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} \right] = \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbf{E}[p_{ij} p_{ik} p_{jk}] \\ &= (n - 1)(n - 2)\alpha^3 \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{(1 - e^{-\varepsilon xy})(1 - e^{-\varepsilon xz})(1 - e^{-\varepsilon yz})}{(xyz)^{\alpha+1}} dx dy dz. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Analogously to what has been done before, the latter integral can be solved exactly by using the substitutions $A = xy, B = xz, C = yz$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} 6 \mathbf{E}[\Delta_n(i)] &= \frac{(n - 1)(n - 2)\alpha^3}{2} \int_1^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon A}}{A^{\alpha/2+1}} dA \int_1^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon B}}{B^{\alpha/2+1}} dB \int_1^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon C}}{C^{\alpha/2+1}} dC \\ &= \frac{(n - 1)(n - 2)\alpha^3}{2} \left[\frac{2}{\alpha} - \varepsilon^{\alpha/2} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}; \varepsilon\right) \right]^3 \\ &= \frac{n^2 \alpha^3}{2} \left[-\varepsilon^{\alpha/2} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) + O(\varepsilon) \right]^3 = -\frac{n^2 \alpha^3}{2} \varepsilon^{\frac{3\alpha}{2}} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)^3 + O(n^2 \varepsilon^3) \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where in the last step we used the expansion approximating the incomplete Gamma function (4.3).

By our assumption, $n^2 \varepsilon^3 = o\left(n^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{3\alpha}{2}}\right)$ and hence the result follows.

(iv) Let $\varepsilon_n = n^{-1/\alpha}$ then $\mathbf{E}[\Delta_n(i)] \sim -\frac{\alpha^3}{12} n^{1/2} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)^3$. The above computations also shows that $\Delta_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_n(i)$ behaves as $\mathbf{E}[\Delta_n] \sim -\frac{\alpha^3 n^{3/2}}{12} \Gamma\left(-\frac{\alpha}{2}\right)^3$.

For studying the concentration of the latter quantity, we start by evaluating the second moment:

$$\mathbf{E} [\Delta_n^2] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' \sum_{u,v,w}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} a_{uv} a_{uw} a_{vw} \right] = A + B + C + D \quad (4.10)$$

where A represents the term in which there is no intersection between the triples of indices of the two summations ($(u, v, w) \neq (i, j, k)$), B is the term in which there is an intersection of 1 index, C an intersection of 2 indices and D is the term in which all the indices coincide ($u = i, v = j, w = k$). Above, $\sum_{i,j,k}'$ means sum over distinct indices.

(A) No common indices:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' \sum_{(u,v,w) \neq (i,j,k)}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} a_{uv} a_{uw} a_{vw} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} \right] \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{u,v,w}' a_{uv} a_{uw} a_{vw} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

(B) One common index:

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' \sum_{1 \text{ intersection}}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} a_{uv} a_{uw} a_{vw} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k} a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} 3 \sum_{v,w} a_{vw} (a_{iv} a_{iw} + a_{jv} a_{jw} + a_{kv} a_{kw}) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k} a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} 9 \sum_{v,w} a_{vw} \right] = 9 n \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n] \mathbf{E} [D_n(i)]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

(C) Exactly two common indices:

$$C = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' \sum_{2 \text{ intersections}}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} a_{uv} a_{uw} a_{vw} \right] \leq 6 n \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} \right] = 6 n \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]. \quad (4.13)$$

(D) All indices match:

$$D = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k}' a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} \right] = \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]. \quad (4.14)$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Var} (\Delta_n)}{\mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]^2} &= \frac{\mathbf{E} [\Delta_n^2] - \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]^2}{\mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]^2} = \frac{B + C + D}{\mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]^2} \\ &\leq \frac{9 n \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n] \mathbf{E} [D_n(i)] + 6 n \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n] + \mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]}{\mathbf{E} [\Delta_n]^2} \\ &\sim \frac{\alpha 9 c_6 c_7 n^5 n^{-5/2} \log 1/n + 6 c_6 n^4 n^{-3/2} + c_6 n^3 n^{-3/2}}{c_6^2 n^6 n^{-3}} = O \left(\frac{\log n}{n^{1/2}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where c_6 and c_7 are taken respectively from eqs. (4.9) and Theorem 1. Now using Chebyshev's inequality it follows that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\left| \frac{\Delta_n}{\mathbf{E}[\Delta_n]} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(\Delta_n)}{\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{E}[\Delta_n]^2} = O \left(\frac{\log n}{n^{1/2}} \right).$$

This completes the proof of the first statement in Part (iv). The second one follows from the very same computations. \square

5. CONNECTIVITY: PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS 4 AND 5

Proof of Proposition 4. (i) The number of isolated nodes is given by

$$N_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{i \text{ is isolated}\}}. \quad (5.1)$$

For the first part we use the first moment method. By Markov inequality we have

$$\mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) = \mathbf{P}(N_0 \geq 1) \leq \mathbf{E}[N_0]. \quad (5.2)$$

Therefore, when $\mathbf{E}[N_0] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$, the graph has no isolated points. We now evaluate the expectation of N_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[N_0] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{P}(i \text{ is isolated}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{k \neq i} (1 - p_{ik}) \right] = \sum_i \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{k \neq i} e^{-\varepsilon W_i W_k} \right] \\ &= \sum_i (\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_i W_k}])^{n-1} = \sum_i e^{(n-1) \log(\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_i W_k}])} = n e^{(n-1) \log(\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_2}])}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where we have used the property of the weights being independent and identically distributed.

Now, if ε is small:

$$\log(\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_2}]) = \log\{1 - (1 - \mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_2}])\} \sim - (1 - \mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_2}]). \quad (5.4)$$

Using Theorem 7 and Lemma 8 we get

$$1 - \mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon W_1 W_2}] \sim \Gamma(1 - \alpha) \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha \log 1/\varepsilon. \quad (5.5)$$

Therefore, by merging eqs.(5.4) and (5.5) into eq. (5.3):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[N_0] &\sim n e^{(n-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha \log \varepsilon} \\ &= n e^{\log \varepsilon^{(n-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}} = n \varepsilon^{(n-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Fix $\varepsilon_n = k_1 n^{-1/\alpha}$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}[N_0] \sim \exp \left(\log n + \Gamma(1 - \alpha) k_1^\alpha \log \frac{k_1^\alpha}{n} \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (5.7)$$

if and only if $1 - \Gamma(1 - \alpha) k_1^\alpha < 0$, that is, $k_1 > \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \right)^\alpha$.

(ii) We can find the scale at which disconnected nodes start to appear by using the second moment method:

$$\mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) \geq \frac{\mathbf{E}[N_0]^2}{\mathbf{E}[N_0^2]}. \quad (5.8)$$

First we evaluate the second moment:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[N_0^2] &= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{i,j} \prod_{k \neq i} (1 - p_{ik}) \prod_{\ell \neq j} (1 - p_{j\ell}) \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_i \prod_{k \neq i} (1 - p_{ik}) \prod_{\ell \neq i} (1 - p_{i\ell}) \right] + \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_i \prod_{k \neq i} (1 - p_{ik}) \sum_{j \neq i} \prod_{\ell \neq j} (1 - p_{j\ell}) \right] \\
&= \sum_i \mathbf{E} \left[\left(\prod_{k \neq i} (1 - p_{ik}) \right)^2 \right] + \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E} \left[(1 - p_{ij})^2 \prod_{k \neq i,j} (1 - p_{ik}) \prod_{\ell \neq i,j} (1 - p_{j\ell}) \right] \\
&= \sum_i \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{k \neq i} e^{-2\varepsilon W_i W_k} \right] + \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-2\varepsilon W_i W_j} \prod_{k \neq i,j} e^{-\varepsilon W_k (W_i + W_j)} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

The first term in Eq. (5.9) corresponds to $\mathbf{E}[N_0]$ with parameter 2ε , while the second term has an upper bound which can be found explicitly in an analogous way thanks to the independence of the weights $(W_i)_{1,\dots,n}$. Indeed, due to the *subexponentiality property* of regularly varying random variables

$$\mathbf{P}(W_i + W_j > x) \sim 2\mathbf{P}(W_1 > x) \sim 2x^{-\alpha}.$$

The calculations performed for $\mathbf{E}[N_0]$ can be carried along the same line by considering the product $(W_i + W_j)W_k$ instead of $W_i W_k$. From Lemma 8,

$$\mathbf{P}((W_i + W_j)W_k > x) \sim 2x^{-\alpha} \log x, \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-2\varepsilon W_i W_j} \prod_{k \neq i,j} e^{-\varepsilon W_k (W_i + W_j)} \right] &\leq \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{E} \left[\prod_{k \neq i,j} e^{-\varepsilon W_k (W_i + W_j)} \right] \\
&= \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\varepsilon W_k (W_i + W_j)} \right] \right)^{n-2} \\
&= \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e^{(n-2) \log \left(\mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\varepsilon W_k (W_i + W_j)} \right] \right)} \\
&\stackrel{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}{\sim} n(n-1) e^{(n-2) 2\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha) \varepsilon^\alpha \log \varepsilon} \\
&= n(n-1) \varepsilon^{(n-2) 2\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha) \varepsilon^\alpha}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Plugging everything into Eq. (5.8) we get

$$\mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) \geq \frac{\mathbf{E}[N_0]^2}{\mathbf{E}[N_0^2]} \geq \frac{n^2 \varepsilon^{2(n-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha}}{n(2\varepsilon)^{(n-1) \Gamma(1-\alpha) \alpha (2\varepsilon)^\alpha} + n(n-1) \varepsilon^{(n-2) 2\alpha \Gamma(1-\alpha) \varepsilon^\alpha}}. \tag{5.11}$$

When the second term at the denominator of Eq. (5.11) is the leading one, then $\mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) \geq 1$, which means $\mathbf{P}(N_0 > 0) \rightarrow 1$. This is the case if $\varepsilon_n^\alpha \ll \frac{1}{n}$. Indeed, the second term is leading if

$$(2 - 2^\alpha) \Gamma(1 - \alpha) \varepsilon^\alpha \log \varepsilon^\alpha - 2^\alpha \log 2^\alpha \Gamma(1 - \alpha) \varepsilon^\alpha > -\frac{\log n}{n}. \tag{5.12}$$

We can write again the last equation by introducing the function $f(x) = -x \log x$:

$$(2 - 2^\alpha) \Gamma(1 - \alpha) f(\varepsilon^\alpha) - f(2^\alpha) \Gamma(1 - \alpha) \varepsilon^\alpha < f\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \tag{5.13}$$

Note that $f(x)$ is an increasing function of x for x small. Taking $\varepsilon^\alpha \ll \frac{1}{n}$ ensures $(2 - 2^\alpha)\Gamma(1 - \alpha)f(\varepsilon^\alpha) - f(2^\alpha)\Gamma(1 - \alpha)\varepsilon^\alpha \ll f(\frac{1}{n})$ since $f(2^\alpha)\Gamma(1 - \alpha)\varepsilon^\alpha = o(1)$. A finer threshold for this can be found by fixing $\varepsilon_n = k_2 n^{-1/\alpha}$. Then the condition in (5.12) reads

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^\alpha)\Gamma(1 - \alpha)k_2^\alpha \log\left(\frac{k_2}{n}\right) - 2^\alpha\Gamma(1 - \alpha)\log(2^\alpha)k_2^\alpha &> \log n \\ \text{if and only if} & \\ [1 - (2 - 2^\alpha)\Gamma(1 - \alpha)k_2^\alpha] \log n + [(2 - 2^\alpha)\log k_2^\alpha - 2^\alpha \log 2^\alpha] \Gamma(1 - \alpha)k_2^\alpha &> 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

which, in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ leads to the condition

$$(2 - 2^\alpha)\Gamma(1 - \alpha)k_2^\alpha < 1. \quad (5.15)$$

This proves the statement (ii) in Proposition 4. \square

Before we prove Proposition 5 we will prove a small lemma which gives a lower bound for the connection probabilities.

Lemma 9. *Let $A \subset [n]$ with $|A| = k$ and $W_A = \sum_{i \in A} W_i$ and consider W_j with $j \notin A$. For ε_n small enough,*

$$\mathbf{E}[1 - \exp(-\varepsilon_n W_j W_A)] \geq (1 - e^{-1})k \varepsilon_n^\alpha \log \varepsilon_n^{-\alpha}. \quad (5.16)$$

Proof. Note that by integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[1 - \exp(-\varepsilon_n W_j W_A)] &= \varepsilon_n \int_0^\infty e^{-\varepsilon_n x} \mathbf{P}(W_A W_j > x) dx \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}\left(W_A W_j > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right) \varepsilon_n \int_0^{1/\varepsilon_n} e^{-\varepsilon_n x} dx \\ &= (1 - e^{-1}) \mathbf{P}\left(W_A W_j > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now without loss of generality, assume $A = [k]$ and hence

$$\mathbf{P}\left(W_A W_j > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k W_i W_j > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right).$$

We have seen that $\mathbf{P}\left(W_i W_j > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right) \sim \varepsilon_n^\alpha \log \varepsilon_n^{-\alpha}$ and hence by the subexponentiality of the regularly varying random variables we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k W_i W_j > \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right) \sim k \varepsilon_n^\alpha \log \varepsilon_n^{-\alpha} \text{ as } \varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence the lower bound follows for ε_n small enough. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. Let N_k be the number of connected components of size k . Consider $\delta \in (0, 1)$ which will be specified later. Then, define $\varepsilon_n = \eta n^{-1/\alpha}$ with $\eta > k_3 \equiv (\frac{e}{e-1})^{1/\alpha}$. By Proposition 4 (since $\Gamma(1 - \alpha) > 1 - e^{-1}$, we have $k_3 > k_1$), if $\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} N_k = 0$ then all connected components have size larger than $\lfloor n\delta \rfloor$. Therefore we would like to prove that:

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} N_k > 0\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (5.17)$$

First of all notice that, by Markov inequality and linearity:

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} N_k > 0\right) \leq \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} N_k\right] = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} \mathbf{E}[N_k]. \quad (5.18)$$

Now consider a subset A of k nodes and its complement A^c of size $|A^c| = n - k$. Let the event $A \nleftrightarrow A^c$ mean that "there are no edges between nodes in A and nodes in A^c ", then we can write:

$$\mathbf{E}[N_k] \leq \binom{n}{k} \mathbf{P}(A \nleftrightarrow A^c). \quad (5.19)$$

Let $W_A = \sum_{i \in A} W_i$ and note by exchangeability that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(A \nleftrightarrow A^c) &= \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{j \in A^c} \prod_{i \in A} (1 - p_{ij})\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{j \in A^c} \prod_{i \in A} e^{-\varepsilon_n W_i W_j}\right] \\ &= \prod_{j \in A^c} \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{i \in A} e^{-\varepsilon_n W_i W_j}\right] = \prod_{j \in A^c} \mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon_n W_A W_j}] = (\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon_n W_A W_j}])^{n-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Therefore using $\log x \leq x - 1$ for $x > 0$, and $\binom{n}{k} \leq n^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[N_k] &\leq \binom{n}{k} (\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon_n W_A W_j}])^{n-k} \\ &\leq n^k (\mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon_n W_A W_j}])^{n-k} \\ &= e^{k \log n + (n-k) \log \mathbf{E}[e^{-\varepsilon_n W_A W_j}]} \\ &\leq e^{k \log n - (n-k) \mathbf{E}[1 - e^{-\varepsilon_n W_A W_j}]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

By using Lemma 9 and the fact that $k \leq n\delta$, the above can be bounded further by the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} N_k > 0\right) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} e^{k \log n - (n-k) k_3^{-\alpha} k \epsilon_n^\alpha \log \epsilon_n^{-\alpha}} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} e^{k \log n - n(1-\delta) k_3^{-\alpha} k \epsilon_n^\alpha \log \epsilon_n^{-\alpha}} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} e^{k \left[\log n - n(1-\delta) k_3^{-\alpha} \eta^\alpha n^{-1} \log \frac{n}{\eta^\alpha} \right]} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} e^{-k \left[((1-\delta) k_3^{-\alpha} \eta^\alpha - 1) \log n + (1-\delta) k_3^{-\alpha} \eta^\alpha \log \eta^{-\alpha} \right]} = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} e^{-k [C_1 \log n + C_2]} \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = (1 - \delta) k_3^{-\alpha} \eta^\alpha - 1$, $C_2 = (1 - \delta) k_3^{-\alpha} \eta^\alpha \log \eta^{-\alpha}$. By taking $\delta < \hat{\delta} = 1 - \frac{1}{k_3^{-\alpha} \eta^\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ (with $\eta > k_3$) we ensure that $C_1 > 0$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} N_k > 0\right) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n\delta \rfloor} e^{-k [C_1 \log n + C_2]} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-k [C_1 \log n + C_2]} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-(C_1 \log n + C_2)}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that when $\varepsilon_n = \eta n^{-1/\alpha}$ with $\eta > k_3$, all components have size $> \hat{\delta}n$. If $\hat{\delta} > \frac{1}{2}$, this is also showing that the graph must be strongly connected since multiple components of size greater than $n/2$ cannot coexist. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Part of this work started during M. Lalli's internship in Lorentz Institute of Theoretical Physics in Leiden which was supported by the ERASMUS+ Grant Agreement n. 2020-1-IT02-KA103-077946/03. L. Avena and R.S. Hazra were supported by NWO Gravitation Grant 024.002.003-NETWORKS. D. Garlaschelli acknowledges support from the Dutch Econophysics Foundation (Stichting Econophysics, Leiden, the Netherlands).

REFERENCES

- T. M. Anders Hedegaard Jessen. Regularly varying functions. *Publications de l'Institut Mathématique*, 80(94)(100):171–192, 2006. URL <http://eudml.org/doc/258304>.
- C. M. Bender, S. Orszag, and S. A. Orszag. *Advanced mathematical methods for scientists and engineers I: Asymptotic methods and perturbation theory*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- C. Bhattacharjee and M. Schulte. Large degrees in scale-free inhomogeneous random graphs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(1):696–720, 2022.
- N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, J. L. Teugels, and J. Teugels. *Regular variation*. Number 27. Cambridge university press, 1989.
- M. Boguná and R. Pastor-Satorras. Class of correlated random networks with hidden variables. *Physical Review E*, 68(3):036112, 2003.
- M. Boguna, I. Bonamassa, M. De Domenico, S. Havlin, D. Krioukov, and M. Serrano. Network geometry. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(2):114–135, 2021.
- B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan. The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 31(1):3–122, 2007.
- G. Caldarelli, A. Capocci, P. De Los Rios, and M. A. Munoz. Scale-free networks from varying vertex intrinsic fitness. *Physical review letters*, 89(25):258702, 2002.
- F. Caron and E. B. Fox. Sparse graphs using exchangeable random measures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(5):1295–1366, 2017.
- F. Chung and L. Lu. The average distances in random graphs with given expected degrees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(25):15879–15882, 2002.
- A. Cipriani and M. Salvi. Scale-free percolation mixing time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.05201*, 2021.
- M. Deijfen, R. van der Hofstad, and G. Hooghiemstra. Scale-free percolation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 49(3):817–838, 2013. ISSN 0246-0203. doi: 10.1214/12-AIHP480. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AIHP480>.
- P. Deprez, R. S. Hazra, and M. V. Wüthrich. Inhomogeneous long-range percolation for real-life network modeling. *Risks*, 3(1):1–23, 2015.
- L. Devroye and N. Fraiman. Connectivity of inhomogeneous random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 45(3):408–420, 2014.
- G. García-Pérez, M. Boguñá, and M. Serrano. Multiscale unfolding of real networks by geometric renormalization. *Nature Physics*, 14(6):583–589, 2018.
- D. Garlaschelli, A. Capocci, and G. Caldarelli. Self-organized network evolution coupled to extremal dynamics. *Nature Physics*, 3(11):813–817, 2007.

- E. Garuccio, M. Lalli, and D. Garlaschelli. Multiscale network renormalization: scale-invariance without geometry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11024*, 2020.
- M. Heydenreich, T. Hulshof, and J. Jorritsma. Structures in supercritical scale-free percolation. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(4):2569–2604, 2017.
- R. Michielan, N. Litvak, and C. Stegehuis. Detecting hyperbolic geometry in networks: Why triangles are not enough. *Physical Review E*, 106(5):054303, 2022.
- I. Norros and H. Reittu. On a conditionally poissonian graph process. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 38(1):59–75, 2006.
- S. Resnick and G. Samorodnitsky. Tauberian theory for multivariate regularly varying distributions with application to preferential attachment networks. *Extremes*, 18(3):349–367, 2015.
- H. van den Esker, R. van der Hofstad, G. Hooghiemstra, and D. Znamenski. Distances in random graphs with infinite mean degrees. *Extremes*, 8(3):111–141, 2005.
- R. van der Hofstad. *Random graphs and complex networks*, volume 43. Cambridge university press, 2016.
- R. van der Hofstad. *Random graphs and complex networks, Volume 2*. <https://www.win.tue.nl/~rhofstad/NotesRGCNII.pdf>, 2022.
- R. van der Hofstad and J. Komjathy. Explosion and distances in scale-free percolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02597*, 2017.
- R. van der Hofstad, A. J. E. M. Janssen, J. S. H. van Leeuwen, and C. Stegehuis. Local clustering in scale-free networks with hidden variables. *Phys. Rev. E*, 95:022307, Feb 2017. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.95.022307. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.95.022307>.
- R. van der Hofstad, P. Van der Hoorn, N. Litvak, and C. Stegehuis. Limit theorems for assortativity and clustering in null models for scale-free networks. *Advances in applied probability*, 52(4):1035–1084, 2020.

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, NIELS BOHRWEG 1 2333 CA, LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS.
Email address: l.avena@math.leidenuniv.nl

LORENTZ INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS, LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, P.O. Box 9504, 2300 RA LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS & IMT SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES, PIAZZA S. FRANCESCO 19, 55100 LUCCA, ITALY & INDAM-GNAMPA ISTITUTO NAZIONALE DI ALTA MATEMATICA, ITALY
Email address: garlaschelli@lorentz.leidenuniv.nl

UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN, NIELS BOHRWEG 1, 2333 CA, LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS
Email address: r.s.hazra@math.leidenuniv.nl

IMT SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES, PIAZZA S. FRANCESCO 19, 55100 LUCCA, ITALY
Email address: margherita.lalli@imtlucca.it