

Largest eigenvalue statistics of sparse random adjacency matrices

Bogdan Slavov and Kirill Polovnikov

Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, 121205 Moscow, Russia

Sergei Nechaev

LPTMS, Université Paris Saclay, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France and

Laboratory of Complex Networks, Brain and Consciousness Research Center, Moscow, Russia

Nikita Pospelov

Institute of Chemical Physics, Moscow, Russia and

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

We investigate the statistics of the largest eigenvalue, λ_{\max} , in an ensemble of $N \times N$ large ($N \gg 1$) sparse adjacency matrices, A_N . The most attention is paid to the distribution and typical fluctuations of λ_{\max} in the vicinity of the percolation threshold, $p_c = \frac{1}{N}$. The overwhelming majority of subgraphs representing A_N near p_c are exponentially distributed linear subchains, for which the statistics of the normalized largest eigenvalue can be analytically connected with the Gumbel distribution. For the ensemble of all subgraphs near p_c we suggest that under an appropriate modification of the normalization constant the Gumbel distribution provides a reasonably good approximation. Using numerical simulations we demonstrate that the proposed transformation of λ_{\max} is indeed Gumbel-distributed and the leading finite-size corrections in the vicinity of p_c scale with N as $\sim \ln^{-2} N$. All together, our results reveal a previously unknown universality in eigenvalue statistics of sparse matrices close to the percolation threshold.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
II. Scaling estimates of spectral boundaries	3
III. Spectrum of linear chains	6
IV. Longest success run	7
V. Large- n corrections to the largest eigenvalue of a random tridiagonal matrix	8
VI. Spectra of sparse Erdős-Rényi graphs	10
A. Contribution of linear subgraphs	10
B. Maximum degree bounds	11
C. Gumbel statistics related to λ_{\max} in sparse graphs	12

D. Empirical choice of normalization constant	14
VII. Conclusion	16
Acknowledgments	17
References	17

I. INTRODUCTION

The rare-event statistics has many manifestations in natural sciences. To name but a few, we can mention the peculiar statistics of communication receivers [1], of sparse contact maps of protein-protein interactions [2], of individual DNA molecules in cell nuclei [3]. The peculiarity of thermal noise emerges on the level of nano-objects [4, 5], in dynamic properties of dendritic polymers [6], etc. The everyday experience tells us that it is difficult to expect a nontrivial statistical patterns in sparse datasets. However, the spectral analysis of sparse datasets often demonstrates very peculiar hierarchically organized patterns. The rare-event statistics naturally emerges in high dimensional spaces, where it manifests itself in the special hierarchical organization of distances between points, known as “ultrametricity” [7]. Sparse statistics and ultrametricity together are rooted in high dimensionality and randomness. That has been unambiguously shown in [8], where it was proved that in a D -dimensional Euclidean space the distances between points in a highly sparse samplings tend to the ultrametric distances as $D \rightarrow \infty$.

From the other hand, experimenting with physical properties of highly diluted solutions of biologically active substances, one should pay attention to a very peculiar structure of a background noise originating from the rare-event statistics of dissolved clusters. The peculiar shape of a sparse random noise spectrum can be misinterpreted, or at least can make the data incomprehensible [9, 10]. In order to conclude about any biological activity of regarded substance, the signal from background noise should be clearly identified. From this point of view, the work [3] seems very interesting, since it represents an exceptional example of careful attention of to unusual hierarchical distributions in real biological and clinical data which are indebted to randomness.

The information about topological and statistical properties of dissolved substances can be collected by measuring their relaxation spectra in the solution [11]. Roughly, a dissolved polymeric cluster can be modelled by a set of monomers (atoms) connected by elastic springs. If deformations of springs are small, the response of the molecule on external excitation is harmonic according to the Hooke’s law. The relaxation modes are determined by the Laplacian matrix of the molecule. Measuring the response of the diluted solution of individual polymeric clusters on external excitation, one can see the signature of different eigenmodes in the spectral density as peaks at specific frequencies. In physical literature the spectrum of the adjacency matrix of a polymeric cluster typically is interpreted as the set of resonant frequencies, while the Laplacian spectrum provides the information about the typical relaxation times of the system.

Specifically, we consider a cluster of connected atoms as an N -vertex network (graph). Let us enumerate the atoms by the index $i = 1 \dots N$. The adjacency matrix $A = \{a_{ij}\}$

describes the topology (connectivity) of a cluster, it is symmetric ($a_{ij} = a_{ji}$) and its matrix elements, a_{ij} , take binary values, 0 and 1, such that diagonal elements vanish, i.e. $a_{ii} = 0$. For off-diagonal elements, $i \neq j$, we set $a_{ij} = 1$, if the vertices (atoms) i and j are connected, and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise:

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } p \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - p \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for $i \neq j$. The symmetric matrix A is an adjacency matrix of a random Erdős-Rényi graph G without self-connections and double edges. The eigenvalues of A are all real.

Spectrum and topology of Erdős-Rényi graphs are controlled by the dependency of p on N . Many results are known in cases when p goes to zero slower than $1/N$. Meanwhile, there are many white spots in the case when $p = c/N$, where c is a constant. In [12] Krivelevich and Sudakov proved that for $p \in (0, 1)$ the typical largest eigenvalue is

$$\lambda_{\max} = (1 + o(1)) \max\{\sqrt{d_{\max}}, Np\}, \quad (2)$$

where d_{\max} is the maximal vertex degree in G . Intuition is the following. The largest eigenvalue of a star-graph is $\sqrt{\Delta}$, where Δ is the degree of the central node. Since the star with $\Delta = d_{\max}$ is a subgraph of G , the $\lambda_{\max} \geq \sqrt{d_{\max}}$. At the same time $\lambda_{\max} \geq \bar{d}$, the average degree in G . It turns out that there is a threshold between two cases: when λ_{\max} is asymptotically determined by $\sqrt{d_{\max}}$ (“more sparse” case) and by \bar{d} (“denser” case). In [13–15] other eigenvalues in spectrum are analyzed for different regimes of p . Eigenvalues fluctuations are also an object of interest in literature. In recent work [16] the lower and upper tail large deviations of λ_{\max} are studied for $n^{o(1)-1} \ll p \ll \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\frac{\ln N}{\ln \ln N}}$ (we discuss the fraction of logarithms later). In the preprint [17] λ_{\max} is stated to have Gaussian fluctuations when $n^{\varepsilon-1} \leq p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. The cavity and replica methods of statistical mechanics are used in [18–21] for studying the typical value of λ_{\max} as well as the distribution of top eigenvector’s components in sparse graphs with bounded maximal degree.

In the present work we study the fluctuations of λ_{\max} of Erdős-Rényi graphs in the vicinity of the percolation point $p_c = 1/N$. We start with the qualitative investigation of spectral boundaries and analytical derivation of the largest eigenvalue distribution for exponentially distributed linear chains. Then we conjecture that after appropriate choice of the normalization constant,

$$\frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}^{(\text{lin})}}{2}} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{c}}, \quad (3)$$

the proposed transformation of λ_{\max} continues to be Gumbel distributed. We show that Gumbel distribution leads to the same scaling of finite-size corrections ($\ln^{-2} N$) established qualitatively in the vicinity of $p_c = 1/N$. We also provide numerical simulations supporting the conjecture.

II. SCALING ESTIMATES OF SPECTRAL BOUNDARIES

The ideas of works [22], applied to ensembles of Gaussian random matrices can be straightforwardly translated to the ensemble of random symmetric adjacency matrices A . Namely,

we can estimate the finite size corrections to the eigenvalues which bound the main spectral zone in dense ($p = O(1)$) and sparse ($p = \frac{1}{N}$) ensembles of matrices A .

Let ρ be the eigenvalue density of the ensemble of such matrices. For $p = O(1)$ in (1), the spectral density, $\rho(\lambda)$, where λ designates the eigenvalue of A , consists of the main zone in a form of a Wigner semicircle, $\rho_W(\lambda)$, typical for the Gaussian matrix ensembles, and one separated far-removed largest eigenvalue, λ_{\max} . The Wigner semicircle

$$\rho_W(\lambda) = \frac{2}{\pi \lambda_b^2} \sqrt{\lambda_b^2 - \lambda^2} \quad (4)$$

bounds the main zone of the spectrum by the values $\pm \lambda_b$, where

$$\lambda_b = f(p) \sqrt{N} \quad (5)$$

and $f(p)$ is some function of the connectivity, p .

To have a intuition about the typical behaviors of spectral densities $\rho(\lambda)$ in dense and sparse regimes, we have plotted in Fig. 1a,b the function $\rho(\lambda)$ for $p = O(1) \approx 0.02$ (figure (a)) and for $p = \frac{1}{N} = 0.0002$ (figure (b)) for ensembles of random adjacency matrices of size $N = 5000$ with the Bernoulli distribution of matrix elements (1). The plot in Fig. 1c provides the spectral density of tridiagonal symmetric matrix with random distribution of off-diagonal elements: one has $a_{k,k+1} = 1$ with the probability p_{lin} and $a_{k,k+1} = 0$ with the probability $1 - p_{\text{lin}}$ (for all $1 \leq k \leq N - 1$, independent on k).




Figure 1. Spectral densities of random $N \times N$ matrices in (a) dense, (b) sparse regimes, and (c) of a tridiagonal random operator with off-diagonal $\{0,1\}$ disorder.

The behavior of the true maximal eigenvalue, λ_{\max} , follows from the Perron-Frobenius theorem, which states that λ_{\max} of a positive matrix $A = \{a_{ij}\}$ satisfies the bilateral inequality

$$\min_i \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \leq \lambda_{\max} \leq \max_i \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \quad (6)$$

When $p \gg \ln N/N$ the graph is almost regular with high probability (Proposition 2.4.1 in [23]) and λ_{\max} is sandwiched between two variables, both of which $\approx \bar{d}$. Thus we arrive at the following expectation for λ_{\max} at $N \gg 1$:

$$\lambda_{\max} \approx pN \quad (7)$$

The requested estimate of the finite-size correction, $\lambda_b(N) = f(p)\sqrt{N}$, to the main zone of the spectral boundary (see Fig. 1a) in the dense regime is as follows. Suppose that the function $f(p)$ depends on p only and is N -independent. Define the typical distance, Δ , between adjacent eigenvalues in the vicinity of main zone boundary, λ_b . By definition the integral of $\rho(\lambda)$ over the interval $[\lambda_b - \Delta, \lambda_b]$ is the fraction of eigenvalues falling within this range, i.e.

$$\int_{\lambda_b - \Delta}^{\lambda_b} \rho(\lambda) d\lambda \simeq \frac{1}{N} \quad (8)$$

Plugging (4) into (8) and taking into account that $\lambda_b = f(p)\sqrt{N}$, one arrives at the equation

$$\frac{2}{\pi f^2(p)N} \int_{f(p)\sqrt{N} - \Delta}^{f(p)\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{f^2(p)N - \lambda^2} d\lambda \simeq \frac{1}{N}. \quad (9)$$

which provides an estimate of subleading scaling correction, Δ in the vicinity of λ_{\max} , valid at $N \gg 1$:

$$\frac{4\sqrt{2}\Delta^{3/2}}{3\pi f^{3/2}(p)N^{3/4}} \simeq \frac{1}{N}; \quad \Delta \simeq \frac{(3\pi)^{2/3}}{2^{5/3}} f(p)N^{-1/6}. \quad (10)$$

Thus, the eigenvalue $\lambda_b \approx f(p)\sqrt{N}$ which bounds the continuous zone of the spectral density at large finite N is defined with the uncertainty $\Delta \sim f(p)N^{-1/6}$, i.e.

$$\lambda_b \simeq f(p)\sqrt{N} \pm f(p)N^{-1/6} \quad (11)$$

The same line of reasoning can be extended to estimate the uncertainty of the largest eigenvalue, λ_{\max} , of the sparse matrix ensemble at the percolation threshold, $p = p_c = 1/N$. Note that now λ_{\max} is not detached from other eigenvalues. It is known [24, 25] that the spectral density, $\rho(\lambda)$, of an ensemble of sparse matrices near the spectral edge, λ_{\max} , has the singular behavior which manifests itself in the appearance of a ‘‘Lifshitz tail’’,

$$\rho(\lambda) \sim e^{-\frac{g(p)}{\sqrt{|\lambda_{\max} - \lambda|}}} \quad (12)$$

where $g(p)$ is some function of the graph connectivity. Proceeding with (12) as with (4) and (8), we get

$$\int_{\lambda_{\max}-\delta}^{\lambda_{\max}} e^{-\frac{g(p)}{\sqrt{|\lambda_{\max}-\lambda|}}} d\lambda \simeq \frac{1}{N} \quad (13)$$

where λ_{\max} is the maximal (boundary) eigenvalue of the spectrum in the sparse matrix ensemble. Defining the new variable $\delta = \lambda_{\max} - \lambda$ ($0 < \lambda < \lambda_{\max}$) and performing the integration in (9), we arrive at the equation for δ ($0 < \delta \ll 1$):

$$\left(\frac{2\delta^{3/2}}{g^3(p)} + O(\delta^2) \right) e^{-\frac{g(p)}{\sqrt{\delta}}} \simeq \frac{1}{N} \quad (14)$$

At $\delta \rightarrow 0$ the solution of (14) up to the leading term is:

$$\delta \approx \left(\frac{g(p)}{\ln N} \right)^2 \quad (15)$$

Thus, for $N \gg 1$ one arrives at the following finite size correction to the leading eigenvalue in sparse regime

$$\lambda_{\max}(N)|_{N \gg 1} \simeq \lambda_{\max}(\infty) \pm \frac{g^2(p)}{\ln^2 N} \quad (16)$$

More refined estimation of the asymptotic value $\lambda_{\max}(\infty) \equiv \lambda_{\max}$ in the vicinity of the percolation threshold is the subject of discussion provided in Section VI.

III. SPECTRUM OF LINEAR CHAINS

Consider a symmetric $n \times n$ tridiagonal matrix[26] A_n composed of $n-1$ Bernoulli variables x_i ($i = 1, \dots, n-1$):

$$A_n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ x_1 & 0 & x_2 & & \\ 0 & x_2 & 0 & & \\ \vdots & & & & \\ & & & x_{n-1} & \\ 0 & & x_{n-1} & 0 & \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } p \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1-p \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

It is easy to see that the matrix A_n has a block-diagonal structure of the following type

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \boxed{\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{matrix}} & & \\ & \boxed{\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{matrix}} & \\ & & \boxed{\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{matrix}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where each block is a perfect tridiagonal matrix B_j of a size, n_j , and blocks are uniquely defined by a sequence of zeros in x_i ($i = 1, \dots, n-1$). The spectrum of tridiagonal Toeplitz (diagonal-constant) matrices of size n is given by a formula:

$$\lambda(k, n) = a + 2\sqrt{bc} \cos \frac{\pi k}{n+1}, \quad k = 1 \dots n, \quad (19)$$

where a, b, c are the values on main, upper and lower diagonals, respectively. Any linear chain has the adjacency matrix of exactly the same form, with $a = 0$ and $b = c = 1$. Thus, the eigenvalues of each B_j have the form

$$\lambda_{k,j} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi k}{n_j + 1}, \quad \text{where } k = 1, \dots, n_j \quad (20)$$

We will be interested in the largest eigenvalue, which, as follows from (20), corresponds to the minimum of the cosine argument, i.e.

$$\lambda_{\max}(n_j) = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{n_j + 1} \quad (21)$$

Inverting (21) we can express the block size, n_j , as a function of the largest eigenvalue, $\lambda_{\max}(n_j)$:

$$n_j = \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{2}} - 1. \quad (22)$$

Since the determinant of the block matrix $\det(A - \lambda I)$ is the product of the determinants of blocks $\det(B_j - \lambda I)$, the spectrum of matrix A is the union of the spectra of submatrices. Thus, the largest eigenvalue of A is

$$\lambda_{\max} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{\max_j n_j + 1}, \quad (23)$$

where $\max_j n_j$ denotes the maximum length of consecutive set of “1” in A . Hence, the statistics of the variable

$$n_{\max} = \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{2}} - 1 \quad (24)$$

is governed by the distribution of $\max_j n_j$. In other words, knowing the extreme value statistics of the maximum linear length, n_j , we shall know the distribution of λ_{\max} , and vice versa.

IV. LONGEST SUCCESS RUN

In the block-diagonal matrix A_n we have denoted by $\max n_j$ the size of the maximal block. Since blocks are formed between zeros (called “failures”) in Bernoulli tests, $\max n_j$ is the maximum length of consecutive successes, which we call below as the “longest success run” (LSR) in the sequence x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1} . More precisely, let $\text{LSR}(n, p)$ (or just LSR) is the length of the maximum sequence of successes among n Bernoulli trials, where p is the probability of having “1” (see (17)).

Let us focus on $n \gg 1$. Since x_j are independent, the number of k consecutive successes has the geometric distribution

$$\mathbb{P}\{\xi = k\} = p^k(1 - p), \quad (25)$$

that can be replaced by the appropriate exponential distribution $\exp(\alpha)$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\xi = k\} = \int_k^{k+1} \alpha e^{-\alpha t} dt = e^{-\alpha k} (1 - e^{-\alpha}). \quad (26)$$

Comparing (26) with (25) we get $\alpha = -\ln p$. The average number of zeros in the sequence is $\lfloor n(1 - p) \rfloor$. Therefore we can estimate LSR as $\text{LSR} = \max(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\lfloor n(1-p) \rfloor}) - \frac{1}{2}$, where η_j are i.i.d. random variables from $\exp(-\ln p)$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ is the continuity correction term.

The problem is now reduced to the following one: what is the limiting distribution of maximum of $\lfloor n(1 - p) \rfloor$ independent exponentially distributed variables? Using the Fisher-Tippett-Gnedenko theorem (see, for example [27]) and considering the survival function, one arrives at the celebrated Gumbel distribution. Namely, if $\{X_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ are the i.i.d. exponential random variables with the parameter α and $Y_n = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} X_j$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{Y_n - \alpha^{-1} \ln n}{\alpha^{-1}} \leq z \right\} = e^{-e^{-z}} \quad (27)$$

This implies when $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbb{P} \{ \text{LSR}(n, p) < z \} = e^{-e^{-\frac{z - \mu}{\beta}}} \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mu = \log_{1/p} n(1 - p) - \frac{1}{2}, \quad \beta = -\frac{1}{\ln p}. \quad (29)$$

Using the well-known properties of the Gumbel distribution, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \text{LSR}(n, p) = \log_{1/p} n(1 - p) - \frac{\gamma}{\ln p} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (30)$$

where $\gamma \approx 0.5772$ is the Euler–Mascheroni constant.

V. LARGE- n CORRECTIONS TO THE LARGEST EIGENVALUE OF A RANDOM TRIDIAGONAL MATRIX

Now we turn back to the tridiagonal matrix A_n defined in (17) and its largest eigenvalue λ_{\max} . From (23) we have

$$\lambda_{\max} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{(\text{LSR} + 1) + 1}, \quad (31)$$

where LSR is the maximum length of consecutive “1” on the subdiagonal of A_n (the size of the corresponding block is $n + 1$). Having the Gumbel distribution for LSR, we can immediately derive the related distribution for λ_{\max} of the random tridiagonal matrix:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{2}} < x \right\} = \mathbb{P} \{ \text{LSR} \leq x - 2 \} = e^{-e^{-\frac{x - 2 - \mu}{\beta}}}. \quad (32)$$

Taking the logarithm twice and substituting (29) into (32), we get the linear function of x :

$$\ln(-\ln F) = \left(x - \log_{1/p} n(1-p) - \frac{3}{2}\right) \ln p, \quad (33)$$

where $F = F(x)$ is the cumulative probability function (CDF) in the LHS of (32). Now, using (30) we can find the mean value

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{2}} \right\} = \log_{1/p} n(1-p) - \frac{\gamma}{\ln p} + \frac{3}{2}. \quad (34)$$

Equations (33) and (34) are in excellent agreement with the results of numeric simulations. Corresponding plots are shown in Fig. 2.




Figure 2. Comparison of analytic and numerical results for equations (33) and (34) based on 10^5 tridiagonal samples for each pair of n and p .

It should be pointed out that the asymptotic expression (34) is consistent with the one obtained in Introduction via the naive estimation of $\mathbb{E}(\lambda_{\max})$ based on the analysis of eigenstates in the Lifshitz tail of the density $\rho(\lambda)$ near the spectral edge in the sparse matrix ensemble – see (16). Expanding $\pi / \arccos(\lambda_{\max}/2)$ near the spectral edge of linear chains, $\lambda_{\max} = 2$, we find:

$$\left. \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{2-\delta}{2}} \right|_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \approx \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \frac{\pi\sqrt{\delta}}{24} + O(\delta^{3/2}) \quad (35)$$

Substituting (35) into (34), we get for δ the following expression

$$\delta = \frac{\pi^2}{\left(\log_{1/p} n(1-p) - \frac{\gamma}{\ln p} + \frac{3}{2}\right)^2} \bigg|_{n \gg 1} \approx \frac{\pi^2}{\log_{1/p}^2 n} = \frac{\pi^2 \ln^2 p}{\ln^2 n} \quad (36)$$

Comparing (36) and (16) one sees that both expressions have the same dependence on n . The non-rigorous nature of derivation in Introduction does not permit to rely on coefficients in (16), while (36) provides correct answer (confirmed numerically) in the large- n limit.




Figure 3. Spectrum of $\mathcal{G}(N, p)$ grouped by types of subgraphs.

VI. SPECTRA OF SPARSE ERDŐS-RÉNYI GRAPHS

Let $G \sim \mathcal{G}(N, p)$ be a random Erdős-Rényi graph with N vertices and the probability p of an edge formation. Here is a brief recap of how the structure of G evolves with the increase of p . At $p < p_c = \frac{1}{N}$ linear chains statistically suppress branching graphs, so the spectrum of G is entirely determined by linear chains and lies within the interval $[-2, 2]$ – see Fig. 3a plotted at $p = \frac{0.5}{N}$. As we approach the percolation point, subgraphs with $z > 2$ branchings start to contribute, and the giant component increases in size becoming of order of $N^{2/3}$ at the percolation point. The corresponding regime is depicted in Fig. 3b at $p = \frac{1.5}{N}$ i.e. slightly above the percolation point. As p increases further, the giant component continues to grow, crowding out all other subgraphs. At the point $p_c^* = \frac{\ln N}{N}$ a cloud of short linear chains and isolated vertices floats around, and at $p > (1 + \varepsilon)p_c^*$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the graph G almost surely becomes connected in the thermodynamic regime. The corresponding phases are illustrated in Fig. 3c where $p \approx \frac{\ln N}{N}$.

A. Contribution of linear subgraphs

In the case when linear subgraphs dominate (see III) the largest eigenvalue of the random adjacency is determined by the maximal length of a chain. In [28] it has been shown that in the vicinity of the percolation threshold $p_c = 1/N$ linear subchains provide the dominant contribution to \mathcal{G} and are exponentially distributed with the law $P(L) \sim e^{-L}$, where L is the subchain length. As we know from Section V, that leads to the Gumbel distribution of the variable

$$n_{\text{lin}} = \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}^{(\text{lin})}}{2}}, \quad (37)$$

where $\lambda_{\text{max}}^{(\text{lin})}$ is the largest eigenvalue for linear chains separated from all other components in the Erdős-Rényi graph G . The spectrum of any graph is the union of spectra of its connectivity components. Since the largest eigenvalue λ_{max} in G can be determined by a non-linear component, the following natural question emerges: could the distribution of λ_{max} still be estimated if the graph topology is known?

There are two upper bounds for λ_{max} depending on the maximum vertex degree (or

“branching”) d_{\max} . One can be applied to any graph

$$\lambda_{\max} \leq d_{\max} \quad (\text{any graph}), \quad (38)$$

whereas another one is about trees ([29]),

$$\lambda_{\max} \leq 2\sqrt{d_{\max} - 1} \quad (\text{tree}). \quad (39)$$

Both inequalities (38) and (39) are sharp: the first one becomes equality for a complete graph and the second one – for an infinite regular tree. For linear chains upper bounds coincide, since $d_{\max} = 2\sqrt{z - 1}$ for $z = 2$. Now we are in position to formulate the main conjecture:

Conjecture. *Taking into account that the normalization constant 2 in the denominator of (37) is the spectral boundary of ensemble of linear graphs, to extend our consideration beyond the ensemble of linear graphs, let us replace 2 in the denominator of (37) by the spectral boundary \mathcal{C} for ensemble of sparse graphs generated at some value p :*

$$n = \frac{\pi}{\arccos \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\mathcal{C}}}. \quad (40)$$

Gumbel distribution traced for n_{lin} in (37) for linear subgraphs motivates to suppose its validity in (40) even beyond the linear case. Since components in the Erdős-Rényi model are not obliged to be trees even at the percolation point (the probability $\mathbb{P}\{\text{no cycle in } G\}$ tends to 0 when $N \rightarrow \infty$ as it is proved in [30]), it is better to use the first inequality (38) to find an appropriate normalization constant \mathcal{C} in (40). Thus, we end up with the question of finding the best estimate for d_{\max} in ensemble of sparse graphs above the percolation threshold.

B. Maximum degree bounds

Every vertex degree is a sum of elements in the corresponding row of the adjacency matrix. There are many inequalities estimating tails of sum of Bernoulli variables. However, Chernoff inequality ([23]) turns out to be an effective tool, when the mean value of sum is $O(1)$.

Proposition 1. *Consider a random graph $G \sim \mathcal{G}(N, 1/N)$. Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta > 0$ there is a positive constant M such that for any $N > M$ the following inequality is valid:*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \exists i \in G : d_i \geq (1 + \delta) \frac{\ln N}{\ln \ln N} \right\} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where d_i is the degree of node i . In other words, for any $N > M$ with the probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ all vertices in G have degree less than $(1 + \delta) \ln N / \ln \ln N$.

Proof. Let us use denote by i vertices in G and by d_i the corresponding vertex degree. We begin with the following bound:

$$\mathbb{P} \{ \exists i : d_i \geq t \} \leq N \mathbb{P} \{ d_i \geq t \}, \quad (41)$$

where $t = \frac{(1+\delta)\ln N}{\ln \ln N}$. Certainly $\mu \equiv \mathbb{E} d_i = \frac{N-1}{N} \leq 1$ and using the Chernoff inequality we get

$$\mathbb{P} \{ \exists i : d_i \geq t \} \leq N e^{-\mu} \left(\frac{e\mu}{t} \right)^t \leq N \left(\frac{e}{t} \right)^t \leq \exp(\ln N + t - t \ln t) \leq \exp[b(N, \delta)]. \quad (42)$$

We are about to show that the last expression tends to 0, since the expression in the brackets tends to $-\infty$. The explicit form of $\ln t$ is

$$\ln t = \ln(1 + \delta) + \ln \ln N - \ln \ln \ln N. \quad (43)$$

Substituting this expression in (42) and rearranging the terms, we get the exponent

$$b(N, \delta) = \frac{\ln N}{\ln \ln N} [-\delta \ln \ln N + (1 + \delta)(\ln \ln \ln N + 1 - \ln(1 + \delta))]. \quad (44)$$

Fixing any positive δ , the whole expression in (44) tends to $-\infty$, since the leading term inside brackets is $-\delta \ln \ln N$. Returning to (42) we see that the upper bound tends to 0. Namely, starting with some positive M the probability of having a node with the degree $\geq t$ will be less than ε . In other words, all degrees in this expression are less than t with probability bigger than $1 - \varepsilon$. \square

Surely, if all degrees are less than some value, it does not necessarily mean that there are some degrees close to that value. The upper bound (42) with the explicit expression for the exponent (44) reveals the interplay between N, δ , and desired probability, $1 - \varepsilon$. This becomes important when one generates any *finite* collection of graphs $G \sim \mathcal{G}(N, \frac{1}{N})$ with *finite* N . We address this question in next Section.

C. Gumbel statistics related to λ_{\max} in sparse graphs

Generally, if E is an event happen with the probability, say, $1/1000$, then in practical computations we can expect detecting about one such event, E , among 1000 independent samples. This implies that if we work with N and δ such that the upper bound (42) is $\ll 1/1000$, we can neglect the occurrence of E among 1000 independent samples. The Table I provides upper bounds for different values of N and δ . Decreasing δ by 0.5 leads to increasing the upper bound by several orders of magnitude. So, to reduce the upper bound one need to increase N significantly. For example, one can generate about 1000 graphs G of sizes $N \times N$ (say, $N > 10^5$) and with a high probability there will be no vertices with the degree bigger than $\frac{3 \ln N}{\ln \ln N}$ in the whole collection.

Depending on the number of samples one can choose the appropriate value of δ providing the upper bound for d_{\max} with a high probability. Since δ is of order 1 and there is a probabilistic gap between λ_{\max} and d_{\max} depending on exact topology of each sampled graph, one can assume that $\frac{\ln N}{\ln \ln N}$ is a good bound in the large- N limit. That motivates us to update the normalization constant in (40) with the new norm and get a new quantity:

$$x = \frac{\pi}{\arccos \left(\lambda_{\max} / \frac{\ln N}{\ln \ln N} \right)}. \quad (45)$$

N	δ	$\exp(b(N, \delta))$
10^5	2	$\approx 8 \times 10^{-6}$
10^5	1.5	$\approx 4 \times 10^{-3}$
10^6	2	$\approx 9 \times 10^{-7}$
10^6	1.5	$\approx 1 \times 10^{-3}$

Table I. Numerical values of (42). Graph $G \sim \mathcal{G}(N, 1/N)$, $\mathbb{P}\{\exists i \in G : d_i \geq (1 + \delta) \ln N / \ln \ln N\} < \exp(b(N, \delta))$ (see Proposition 1).

Below we provide numerical arguments in support of the hypothesis that not only the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}^{(\text{lin})}$ in the ensemble of *linear chains*, but also the largest eigenvalue λ_{\max} in the ensemble of *sparse graphs* shares the Gumbel distribution at least in the vicinity of the percolation point, $p_c = 1/N$. We have seen in (32) that the Gumbel statistics implies CDF of the form

$$F(x) = e^{-e^{-\frac{x-\mu}{\beta}}}. \quad (46)$$

Our check depicted in Fig. 4 is based on the numerical verification of linearity in doubly logarithmic coordinates of the cumulative distribution function $F(x)$.




Figure 4. Numerical cumulative distribution function (CDF) F based on 1024 randomly sampled Erdős-Rényi graphs with edge probability equal $1/N$. Number of bins is 1000. Numerical value of $F(e)$ at the bin edge e defined as number of sampled x values $< e$ divided by the number of samples. Bin edges where F is $\leq \varepsilon_F = 10^{-9}$ or $\geq 1 - \varepsilon_F$ were excluded.

For each N we generate 1024 graph samples with the edge probability $1/N$ and calculate 1024 values of x from (45). Then we divide the region $[\min x - \varepsilon_x, \max x + \varepsilon_x]$ into 1000 bins, where $\varepsilon_x = 10^{-9}$ (this number is much less than any value of x) and find min / max among sampled x (for each N individually). Now we have a collection of tuples $(e, F(e))$, where e is the bin edge, $F(e)$ is the number of sampled x values less than e divided by the number of samples (this is the definition of the numerical cumulative distribution function (CDF)). Since our CDF at first and last bins can be 0 and 1, the value of $\ln(-\ln F)$ is not defined at that points and we consider only bin edges where numerical CDF is $> \varepsilon_F$ and $< 1 - \varepsilon_F$ ($\varepsilon_F = 10^{-9}$). Noise at tails in Fig. 4 is a natural consequence of having rare “superlarge” or “supersmall” sampled x where numerical values of F do not follow the main trend because of the lack of samples around these x .

D. Empirical choice of normalization constant

Here we suggest the numerical procedure which permits to choose the desired norm \mathcal{C} in (40). Let us scan all possible \mathcal{C} , calculate residuals of the linear fit and choose the smallest one among them. This prescription provides the value corresponding of the correct norm for our particular collection of samples.

Let us first test how this algorithm works for the tridiagonal case (i.e. for linear subgraphs). For small p fluctuations of max length of the continuous sequence of ones are of the order of its length. Meanwhile for large p the max length becomes of order of N and different chains of ones start to affect the statistics of each other. Recall that we established the Gumbel distribution (32) when $N \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed p . So, for large p we need to increase N to be able to simulate the thermodynamic limit. Since it only affects our computational resources we set for simplicity $p = 0.5$. Below we provide the results of numerical investigation of λ_{\max} norm for linear chains. The corresponding plots are shown in Fig. 5. Normalization constant \mathcal{C} in Fig. 5 is changing within the interval $[1.99, 2.10]$ with the step 10^{-5} . Since any \mathcal{C} must be greater than the sampled max λ_{\max} , we skip values of \mathcal{C} less than $(\max \lambda_{\max} - \varepsilon_{\lambda})$, where $\varepsilon_{\lambda} = 10^{-9}$. For each N and \mathcal{C} we repeat the algorithm described at the end of previous Section. We observe a narrow fall of the residual until local minimum is reached. The local minimum is followed by a steady sloping growth. The best norm fluctuates around 2, however not always it is exactly equal to 2. It happens because the sampled finite statistics is not sufficient for finding the true normalization constant.




Figure 5. Linear fit residuals of $\ln(-\ln F)$, where F is the numerical CDF of sampled $\pi/\arccos(\lambda_{\max}/\mathcal{C})$ in the tridiagonal case for different normalization constant. 1024 samples for each N .

Turning to sparse graph simulations one should take into account two technical circumstances. First, for a fixed N the configurational space of sparse graph ensemble is much bigger than that of linear chains. Second, it is much heavier computational task to calculate the largest eigenvalue of a sparse matrix than of a tridiagonal one. Figure 6 repeats for sparse matrices the construction shown in Fig. 5 for tridiagonal case.

We iterate \mathcal{C} with a step 10^{-2} over the interval $[3, 40]$ skipping values that are less than $(\max \lambda_{\max} - \varepsilon_{\lambda})$. Residuals in Fig. 6 follow the same pattern which we had for linear subgraphs: sharp narrow decay till the minimum fluctuating around $\mathcal{C} = \ln N / \ln \ln N$ followed by a steady growth. The choice of \mathcal{C} as $\ln N / \ln \ln N$, but not as $\sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N}$ as suggested in [12] is discussed below.




Figure 6. Linear fit for residuals of $\ln(-\ln F)$, where F is the numerical CDF of sampled $\pi / \arccos(\lambda_{\max}/\mathcal{C})$ in the sparse case for different normalization constants. Dashed vertical lines are at $\mathcal{C} = \ln N / \ln \ln N$. We have generated 1024 random samples from $\mathcal{G}(N, 1/N)$ for each N .

Repeating many times random sampling, sometimes we do not see the minimum around \mathcal{C} , where it typically occurs in Fig. 6. This happens because of insufficient number of samples. Generating additional set of graphs, the minimum emerges and becomes more profound (see Fig. 7). The wide plateau of residuals in Fig. 7 means that in this region the results are practically insensitive to the normalization constant \mathcal{C} , signaling that values of \mathcal{C} of order of $\ln N / \ln \ln N$ are as good as the ones of order of $\sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N}$.

It is worth mentioning that the estimate $\lambda_{\max}(N) = (1 + o(1))\sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N}$ derived in [12] is the best known estimate of the asymptotics of the largest eigenvalue in a sparse graph ensemble. However in our numerical simulations this estimate cannot be used as a normalization constant. The reason is as follows: for any *finite* N and *finite* set of samples many graphs have $\lambda_{\max} > \sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N}$ which means that we can not extract N from (40) with $\mathcal{C} = \sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N}$. As one sees from Fig. 6 (where $\sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N} \approx 2.31$ for $N = 1.45 \times 10^6$) decreasing the norm from the lowest point around $\ln N / \ln \ln N$ forces a very rapid growth of the residual in our fit. Since the logarithm and the root of it are very slowly




Figure 7. Increasing number of samples leads to a pronounced local minimum corresponding the best normalization constant \mathcal{C} in (40). Dashed vertical lines are at $\mathcal{C} = \ln N / \ln \ln N$. When the sampled statistics is not enough for minimum to occur, than $\ln N / \ln \ln N$ happens to be in a region, where the plateau starts.

increasing functions one needs extremely large N to distinguish between them, however still the lack of samples may influence the residual dependency on the normalization constant.

To summarise, λ_{\max} (which is not bigger than d_{\max}) and d_{\max} itself are two random variables which are equal $\sqrt{\ln N / \ln \ln N}$ and $\ln N / \ln \ln N$ in the thermodynamic limit. However, since we are interested in statistics of λ_{\max} for a finite N and finite set of samples, we may meet hypothetically the situation where $\lambda_{\max} = d_{\max} = N - 1$. Wondering which appropriate norm should be chosen for λ_{\max} , we address to (42). Choosing the desirable δ , one finds such N that $\mathbb{P}\{\exists i : d_i \geq (1 + \delta) \ln N / \ln \ln N\}$ would be much less than 1/number of samples. That would give an effective upper bound for d_{\max} and, as a result, for λ_{\max} .

VII. CONCLUSION

We have analyzed semi-analytically – semi-numerically the statistics of eigenvalues in the vicinity of the spectral boundary of large sparse random adjacency matrices with the bimodal distribution of matrix elements, a_{ij} , i.e.: $P(a_{ij} = 1) = p$ and $P(a_{ij} = 0) = 1 - p$ where $p = c/N$ and c is close to 1.

We have shown that the Gumbel distribution emerges for the largest eigenvalue of tridiagonal matrices (see (32)), which are adjacency matrices of linear subgraphs (see (37)). Based on this analysis we have proposed an ansatz for the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in the ensemble of sparse adjacency matrices and have checked numerically its validity using the variational approach. Specifically, we have demonstrated that if the limiting value of the largest eigenvalue in the ensemble of tridiagonal matrices is replaced by $\mathcal{C} \approx \frac{\ln N}{\ln \ln N}$, then the value $\pi / \arccos(\lambda_{\max}/\mathcal{C})$ still possesses the Gumbel distribution (46) for the ensemble of sparse matrices at $N \gg 1$ at least slightly above of the percolation threshold.

In the sparse regime the *extremal value statistics* (like the “longest success run” for the ensemble of tridiagonal matrices) matters and the Lifshitz tail of the spectral density $\rho(\lambda) \sim e^{-g(p)/\sqrt{|\lambda_{\max}-\lambda|}}$ close to λ_{\max} ensures that the finite-size corrections to the largest eigenvalue have logarithmic behavior (see (16)):

$$|\lambda_{\max}(\infty) - \lambda_{\max}(N)| \sim \ln^{-2} N \quad (47)$$

The last question which we would like to comment concerns the dependence of the gap between the largest eigenvalue and the spectral boundary of the main zone (see Fig. 1a) as a function of p . In the dense regime ($p = O(1)$) the largest eigenvalue λ_{\max} is detached from the boundary of the semicircle by a gap of order of pN as it follows from the Frobenius theorem – compare (5) and (7). On the other hand, at the percolation threshold, $p = 1/N$, the largest eigenvalue λ_{\max} coincides with the boundary of the main zone meaning that the gap between λ_{\max} and λ_b is closed. From Fig. 8 one can see that with decreasing p from $p = O(1)$ towards the percolation threshold, $p = 1/N$, the distance $|\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_b|$ shrinks and below $p = \frac{\ln N}{N}$ becomes of order of the distance between neighboring eigenvalues in the main zone (i.e. λ_{\max} and λ_b become indistinguishable). Let us note that the distance $|\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_b|$ shrinks slower than the distance from the largest eigenvalue of the second giant component which has maximum at the percolation point and is nullified (in average) before reaching $p_c^* = \frac{\ln N}{N}$.




Figure 8. The largest eigenvalue (λ_{\max}), the second largest eigenvalue (boundary of the main zone, λ_b) and two largest eigenvalues of the second giant component in $G \sim \mathcal{G}(N, p)$, where $N = 1000$. Each value is averaged over 10^5 samples of G . After $p = 1/N$ the giant component starts to crowd out all other subgraphs, which is seen in the steep drop of the largest eigenvalue of the second giant component. $p = \ln N / N$ is the probability point where the whole graph almost sure becomes connected. Presence of the largest eigenvalue of the second giant component till this point is the sign of sporadic samples with subgraphs of small sizes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Alexander Gorsky for valuable discussions on different stages of the work. KP acknowledges hospitality of LPTMS (CNRS-Université Paris-Saclay) and Institute Curie (Paris) where a part of the work has been done.

-
- [1] M. Planat and C. Eckert, On the frequency and amplitude spectrum and the fluctuations at the output of a communication receiver, *IEEE Transactions on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control* **47**, 1173 (2000).
 - [2] M. Middendorf, E. Ziv, and C. Wiggins, Inferring network mechanisms: The drosophila melanogaster protein interaction network, *PNAS* **102**, 3192 (2005).
 - [3] V. Trifonov, L. Pascualucci, R. Dalla-Favera, and R. Rabadan, Fractal-like distributions over the rational numbers in high-throughput biological and clinical data, *Sci. Rep.* **1**, 191 (2011).
 - [4] E. Vanden-Eijnden and J. Weare, Rare event simulation of small noise diffusions, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **65** (2012).
 - [5] V. A. Avetisov, A. A. Markina, and A. F. Valov, Oligomeric “catastrophe machines” with thermally activated bistability and stochastic resonance, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **10**, 5189 (2019).

- [6] M. Galiceanu, A. Reis, and M. Dolgushev, Dynamics of semiflexible scale-free polymer networks, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **141**, 144902 (2014).
- [7] R. Rammal, G. Toulouse, and M. A. Virasoro, Ultrametricity for physicists, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **58**, 765 (1986).
- [8] A. P. Zubarev, On stochastic generation of ultrametrics in high-dimensional euclidean spaces, *P-Adic Numbers, Ultrametric Analysis, and Applications* **6**, 155 (2014).
- [9] J. Mairal, F. Bach, and J. Ponce, Sparse modeling for image and vision processing, *Foundations and Trends in Computer Graphics and Vision* **8**, 85 (2014).
- [10] T. Peleg, Y. Eldar, and M. Elad, Exploiting statistical dependencies in sparse representations for signal recovery, *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on* **60**, 2286 (2012).
- [11] A. Brouwer and W. Haemers, *Spectra of Graphs* (Springer-Verlag, Amsterdam, 2010).
- [12] M. Krivelevich and B. Sudakov, The largest eigenvalue of sparse random graphs, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **12**, 61–72 (2003).
- [13] F. Benaych-Georges, C. Bordenave, and A. Knowles, Largest eigenvalues of sparse inhomogeneous Erdős–Rényi graphs, *The Annals of Probability* **47**, 1653 (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**, 2141 (2020).
- [15] J. Alt, R. Ducatez, and A. Knowles, Extremal eigenvalues of critical Erdős–Rényi graphs, *The Annals of Probability* **49**, 1347 (2021).
- [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**, 1847 (2021).
- [17] S. Diaconu, Two clts for sparse random matrices (2022), arXiv:2210.09625 [math.PR].
- [18] V. A. R. Susca, P. Vivo, and R. Kühn, Top eigenpair statistics for weighted sparse graphs, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **52**, 485002 (2019).
- [19] V. A. R. Susca, P. Vivo, and R. Kühn, Second largest eigenpair statistics for sparse graphs, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **54**, 015004 (2020).
- [20] Y. Kabashima, H. Takahashi, and O. Watanabe, Cavity approach to the first eigenvalue problem in a family of symmetric random sparse matrices, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **233**, 012001 (2010).
- [21] Y. Kabashima and H. Takahashi, First eigenvalue/eigenvector in sparse random symmetric matrices: influences of degree fluctuation, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **45**, 325001 (2012).
- [22] M. J. Bowick and E. Brézin, Universal scaling of the tail of the density of eigenvalues in random matrix models, *Physics Letters B* **268**, 21 (1991).
- [23] R. Vershynin, *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics (Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- [24] O. Khorunzhiy, W. Kirsch, and P. Müller, Lifshitz tails for spectra of erdős–rényi random graphs, *Annals of Applied Probability* **16**, 295 (2006).
- [25] W. Kirsch and S. Warzel, Anderson localization and lifshits tails for random surface potentials, *Journal of Functional Analysis* **230**, 222 (2006).
- [26] For tridiagonal random matrices and for the ensemble of linear subgraphs we use the lowercase index n , while the sparse matrices and the corresponding ensemble of graphs are denoted by the capital letter N .
- [27] L. Zarfaty, E. Barkai, and D. A. Kessler, Accurately approximating extreme value statistics, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **54**, 315205 (2021).

- [28] V. Avetisov, P. L. Krapivsky, and S. Nechaev, Native ultrametricity of sparse random ensembles, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 035101 (2015).
- [29] D. Stevanović, Bounding the largest eigenvalue of trees in terms of the largest vertex degree, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **360**, 35 (2003).
- [30] P. Erdos and A. Renyi, On the evolution of random graphs, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hungary. Acad. Sci.* **5**, 17 (1960).