

Ferromagnetic Ising model on multiregular random graphs

Diego Alberici¹, Pierluigi Contucci², Emanuele Mingione², and
Filippo Zimmaro^{2,3}

¹*DISIM, University of L'Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy*

²*Department of Mathematics, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy*

³*Department of Computer Science, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

Abstract

A family of multispecies Ising models on generalized regular random graphs is investigated in the thermodynamic limit. The architecture is specified by class-dependent couplings and magnetic fields. We prove that the magnetizations, neighbours correlations and free energy converge to suitable functions evaluated at the solution of a belief propagation fixed point equation. In absence of magnetic fields, a phase transition is identified and the corresponding critical parameters are determined by the spectral radius of a low-dimensional matrix.

1 Introduction

Statistical Mechanics on diluted networks provides remarkable examples of complex systems with fruitful applications [1, 2, 3]. The archetype is the ferromagnetic Ising model on the Erdos-Rényi random graph, or more general locally tree-like graphs [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Further examples cover the Potts and hard-core models [10, 11], the antiferromagnetic Ising model [12] and the monomer-dimer model [13, 14, 15] on random graphs. In certain circumstances, the Theoretical Physics ideas of cavity fields and belief propagation [1] provide exact solutions and may be turned into rigorous proofs based on local weak convergence [16] and correlation inequalities.

The class of diluted Ising models we consider is characterized by an additional block (species) structure. More precisely, we assume that the N particles of the system are partitioned in n different species and we denote by N_a the number of particles of class a . Unlike in the standard mean-field case where the dilution is invariant with respect to the symmetric group acting on the N particles, here such invariance is relaxed to the product of the symmetric groups acting on different blocks of particles. The large N limit is taken keeping fixed the ratios $\alpha_a = N_a/N$. These models are often called multispecies models and

have been recently studied with both deterministic [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] and disordered interactions [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. The introduction of the multispecies structure has, roughly speaking, the effect of a dimensional growth of the degrees of freedom of the problem. For instance, in the multispecies version of the Curie Weiss model the solution is given by an n -dimensional variational principle and its stationary points represent the equilibrium values of the magnetization for each species [17]. We find that in diluted models, instead, the number of relevant parameters is smaller or equal to n^2 . Compared with the mean-field case, this feature can be related to the presence of non trivial correlations in diluted models.

In this work we study the Ising model on a class of diluted random graphs that we call $\mathbf{k}$ -regular random graphs, where $\mathbf{k} = (k_{ab})_{a,b \leq n}$ is a given, suitably chosen matrix. The value k_{ab} represents the number of neighbours of class b that a vertex of class a has. The quenched randomness is the uniform measure on all the possible graph realizations of type $\mathbf{k}$ with given vertices. This class of random graphs is the multispecies generalization of standard k -regular random graphs, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which correspond to the case $n = 1$. In the considered models, ferromagnetic couplings $\beta_{ab} > 0$ and external fields h_a are class-dependent.

We prove several results in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. First, for positive external fields, local magnetisations, neighbours' correlations and free energy are expressed as functions of the unique solution with positive entries of a multidimensional fixed point equation of dimension at most n^2 . These results extend to non-negative external fields, at least one positive, under a general condition on the connectivity of the classes. Moreover, we prove that for arbitrary external fields and high temperature the local magnetisations converge to the unique solution of the fixed point equation. Finally, for zero external fields we show that the model undergoes a phase transition by computing its spontaneous magnetisation. The critical values of the parameters are identified: they are related to the spectral radius of a suitable matrix $\mathbf{M}$ (dimension at most $n^2 \times n^2$), which comes from the linearisation of the recursion and encodes the connectivity of classes.

Our proofs rely on the general ideas of cavity fields, belief propagation algorithms and local convergence, since the considered $\mathbf{k}$ -regular random graphs are locally tree-like. Thus, we first focus on the existence and uniqueness of the solution of the fixed point equation obtained by the belief propagation recursion on the deterministic trees associated to our class of random graphs. Existence and uniqueness (in a suitable region) are proven by monotonicity and concavity arguments applied to the recursion. For non-negative fields, monotonicity and concavity follow from GKS and GHS correlation inequalities [31, 32, 33, 34]. However, aiming at going beyond positive fields, we provide a direct proof looking directly at the recursion: a suitable condition on the initialisation implies monotonicity and concavity without appealing to general correlation inequalities. This method allows us to identify three fixed points for zero external fields and low temperature and prove uniqueness of the fixed point for arbitrary fields and high temperature. Eventually, in order to establish a connection between local observables on random graphs (local magnetisations and correlations) and

the corresponding observables on trees, GKS and FKG correlation inequalities are used [35]. The free energy is also computed, since its derivatives can be expressed in terms of local quantities on the graph.

As mentioned above, our approach allows to study the recursion beyond the case of non-negative fields. However, the lack of correlation inequalities does not always allow to move from trees to random graphs. In future works we aim at investigating regimes with external fields of opposite signs and low temperature, due to the relevance of such models (e.g., Random Field Ising Models (RFIM) [36, 37]) and their applications in Physics [38], Chemistry [39] and Social Sciences [40, 41].

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the model and the main results. Sections 3 deals with the analysis of the recursion on trees. Section 4 covers the proofs of the main theorems by transposing the results of Section 3 from trees to the class of random graphs. A short Appendix collects auxiliary results (part A) and recalls GKS, FKG, and GHS correlation inequalities (part B).

2 Definitions and Main Results




Figure 1: An example of a $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graph with 3 classes of respectively red, green and blue nodes; $\mathbf{k} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0.25, 0.5, 0.25)$, $N = 20$.

Let us fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, an irreducible integer matrix $\mathbf{k} = (k_{ab} \in \mathbb{N})_{a,b \leq n}$ and a positive vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_a \in \mathbb{Q}^+)_{a \leq n}$ satisfying the following constraints:

- i) $\sum_{a=1}^n \alpha_a = 1$,

ii) $\alpha_a k_{ab} = \alpha_b k_{ba}$ for $1 \leq a < b \leq n$.

We consider the sequence of integer numbers $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $a = 1, \dots, n$

iii) $N_a := \alpha_a N$ is integer,

iv) $N_a k_{aa}$ is even.

Let V_N be a set of cardinality N . Let $V_N^{(1)}, \dots, V_N^{(n)}$ be a partition of V_N in n non-empty classes of cardinalities $N_1, \dots, N_n$ respectively. It is convenient to assume $V_N^{(a)} \subset V_{N'}^{(a)}$ for $N < N'$, and set $C_a := \bigcup_N V_N^{(a)}$ for $a = 1, \dots, n$.

Definition 2.1. A graph on the vertex set V_N is called **k-regular** if for every couple $a, b = 1, \dots, n$, every vertex of each class C_a has exactly k_{ab} neighbours of class C_b . In this case $k_a := \sum_{b=1}^n k_{ab}$ denotes the degree of each vertex of class C_a , $a = 1, \dots, n$.

Definition 2.2. A *random k-regular graph* $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$ is uniformly drawn among the set of all **k-regular** graphs with the same vertex set and the same partition in classes. The corresponding probability measure will be denoted by $\mathbb{P}$.

Remark 2.3. A random **k-regular** graph on the vertex set V_N can be constructed by the following procedure. For every couple $a, b = 1, \dots, n$, for every vertex in C_a one draws exactly $N_a k_{ab}$ half-edges, for every vertex in C_b one draws exactly $N_b k_{ba}$ half-edges. The former half-edges are successively closed choosing uniformly at random one of the remaining latter half-edges. Notice that conditions ii), iv) ensure that the process is feasible and there are no remaining half-edges.

It is convenient to introduce another graph representing the connections among classes: let us denote by $\mathcal{G}$ the graph with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and weighted adjacency matrix $\mathbf{k}$. Edges of $\mathcal{G}$ are direct, weighted and self-edges may be present. The set of edges of $\mathcal{G}$ is

$$\mathcal{E} := \{(a, b) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2 : k_{ab} \neq 0\} = \{(a, b) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^2 : k_{ba} \neq 0\} \quad (1)$$

thanks to property ii) above. We denote by $\mathcal{E}_a := \{b : (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ the set of neighbours of $a = 1, \dots, n$. Throughout the paper we will always assume that the matrix $\mathbf{k}$ is irreducible, so that the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected.

Definition 2.4. Let $\beta = (\beta_{ab} \in \mathbb{R}^+)_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}, a \leq b}$ and $\mathbf{h} = (h_a \in \mathbb{R})_{a \leq n}$, called respectively *coupling coefficients* and *external fields*. An Ising model on the random **k-regular** graph $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$ is described by the following (random) Hamiltonian

$$H_{G_N}(\sigma) := - \sum_{\substack{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}: \\ a \leq b}} \beta_{ab} \sum_{\substack{ij \in E_N: \\ i \in C_a, j \in C_b \\ \text{or viceversa}}} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{a \leq n} h_a \sum_{\substack{i \in V_N: \\ i \in C_a}} \sigma_i \quad (2)$$

for $\sigma = (\sigma_i)_{i \in V_N} \in \{-1, 1\}^{V_N}$. Without loss of generality, we will write $\beta_{ab} \equiv \beta_{ba}$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$.

The Boltzmann-Gibbs expectation induced by the Hamiltonian (2) will be denoted by $\langle \cdot \rangle_{G_N, \beta, \mathbf{h}}$ or simply $\langle \cdot \rangle_{G_N}$. Notice that this is a random measure, due to the randomness of the graph G_N .

The main result of the present paper is the characterization of the large N limit of the main physical quantities at equilibrium: the magnetisation, the internal energy and the free energy per particle. The large N limit is taken along a sequence satisfying conditions iii) and iv). As the observables are random quantities, we will prove convergence in $L^r(\mathbb{P})$ -norm w.r.t. the randomness of the graph G_N .

Theorem 2.5 (Positive external fields). *Consider the Ising model (2) on a random $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graph G_N . Assume one of the following conditions:*

i) $h_1, \dots, h_n > 0$;

ii) $h_1, \dots, h_n \geq 0$ at least one of them strictly positive, and $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$.

Then for every vertex $i \in C_a$, $a = 1, \dots, n$ the (random) spin magnetization converges in $L^r(\mathbb{P})$ -norm for any $r \in [1, \infty)$ to

$$\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \tanh \left(h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}) \right), \quad (3)$$

and for every edge $ij \in E_N$, $i \in C_a$, $j \in C_{a'}$ with $(a, a') \in \mathcal{E}$, the (random) two points correlation converges to

$$\langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \tanh \left(\beta_{aa'} + \tanh^{-1} \left(\tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')}) \tanh(\bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}) \right) \right), \quad (4)$$

where

$$F_\beta(x) := \tanh^{-1}(\tanh(\beta) \tanh(x)), \quad (5)$$

$\bar{\mathbf{z}} = (\bar{z}_a^{(b)})_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ is the unique fixed point with non-negative (actually positive) components of the following multi-dimensional recursion

$$z_a^{(b)}(s) = h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1)), \quad (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}, \quad s \geq 1 \quad (6)$$

and δ_{bc} denotes the Kronecker delta. Moreover, $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ is reached as $s \rightarrow \infty$ starting from any non-negative initialization ($z_a^{(b)}(0) \geq 0$) $_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ of the recursion.

Remark 2.6. For every vertex $i \in V_N$ belonging to the same class C_a the spin magnetisation $\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N}$ shares the same distribution under the measure $\mathbb{P}$. And for every edge $ij \in E_N$ with endpoints belonging to the same two classes $C_a, C_{a'}$ the spin-spin correlation $\langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle_{G_N}$ shares the same distribution. Therefore the macroscopic observables corresponding to (3), (4) also converge:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in V_N} \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \sum_{a \leq n} \alpha_a \tanh \left(h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}) \right) \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij \in E_N} \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \sum_{(a,a') \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{\alpha_a k_{aa'}}{2^{\delta_{aa'}}} \tanh \left(\beta_{aa'} + \tanh^{-1} \left(\tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')}) \tanh(\bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}) \right) \right) \quad (8)$$

where the factor $\frac{\alpha_a k_{aa'}}{2^{\delta_{aa'}}$ multiplied by N corresponds to the number of edges connecting a vertex of class C_a with a vertex of class $C_{a'}$.

Theorem 2.7. *Under the same hypothesis and notation of Theorem 2.5, consider the (random) partition function*

$$Z_{G_N} := \sum_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}^{V_N}} e^{-H_{G_N}(\sigma)}. \quad (9)$$

Then:

$$p_{G_N} := N^{-1} \log Z_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} p(\beta, \mathbf{h}), \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p(\beta, \mathbf{h}) := & -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a \leq n} \alpha_a \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{aa'} \left(\frac{\log(1 - \theta_{aa'}^2)}{2} + \log(1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}) \right) + \\ & + \sum_{a \leq n} \alpha_a \log \left(e^{h_a} \prod_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} (1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a)})^{k_{aa'}} + e^{-h_a} \prod_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} (1 - \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a)})^{k_{aa'}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where we set $\theta_{aa'} := \tanh(\beta_{aa'})$ and $\bar{m}_a^{(a')} := \tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')})$.

Given the matrices $\mathbf{k}, \beta$, let us introduce the *weighted non-backtracking* matrix $\mathbf{M}$, indexed by $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$, with entries

$$M_{(a,b),(c,d)} := \begin{cases} \tanh(\beta_{ac}) (k_{ac} - 1) & \text{if } a = d, b = c \\ \tanh(\beta_{ac}) k_{ac} & \text{if } a = d, b \neq c \\ 0 & \text{if } a \neq d \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

for every $(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}$, $(c,d) \in \mathcal{E}$. The name is justified by the similarity with the *non-backtracking matrix* (see [42, 43]). In the following, we indicate by $\rho(\mathbf{M})$ the spectral radius of $\mathbf{M}$.

Theorem 2.8 (High temperature, arbitrary external fields). *Consider the Ising model (2) on a random $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graph G_N . If $\rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1$, then the spin magnetisations verify (3), now denoting by $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = (\bar{z}_a^{(b)})_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ the unique fixed point in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}$ of the recursion (6) reached as $s \rightarrow \infty$ from any initialization.*

For the next Theorem, we need to exclude the particular case in which the graph of classes $\mathcal{G}$ is made of only two cycles, oppositely directed, and in at least one of them a walk can never backtrack (i.e. $\mathcal{G}$ is "simply cyclic", see Definition A.2 in the Appendix).

Theorem 2.9 (Phase transition at zero external fields). *Consider the Ising model (2) on a random $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graph G_N . Assume $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{G}$ not*

simply cyclic. For simplicity assume homogeneous external field $h := h_1 = \dots = h_n$. The spontaneous magnetization of a spin σ_i , $i \in C_a$, can be defined as

$$S_a(\beta) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N, \beta, h} \quad (13)$$

where the limit with respect to N is in $L^r(\mathbb{P})$ -norm. We have:

$$S_a(\beta) = \begin{cases} 0 & , \text{ if } \rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1 \\ \tanh \left(\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)+}) \right) > 0 & , \text{ if } \rho(\mathbf{M}) > 1 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $\bar{z}^+ = (\bar{z}_a^{(b)+})_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ is the unique fixed point with all positive components of the recursion (6) with $h_1 = \dots = h_n = 0$.

Being a non-analytic function, $S_a(\beta)$ denotes the presence of a phase transition in the model when $h = 0$ and $\rho(\mathbf{M}) = 1$.

Remark 2.10. In the case of homogeneous $\beta := \beta_{ab}$ for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$, the critical inverse temperature $\beta = \beta_c$ such that $\rho(\mathbf{M}) = 1$ rewrites more explicitly as

$$\beta_c = \tanh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\rho(\bar{\mathbf{M}})} \right) \quad (15)$$

where the entries of $\bar{\mathbf{M}}$ are

$$\bar{M}_{(a,b),(c,d)} := \begin{cases} k_{ac} - 1 & \text{if } a = d, b = c \\ k_{ac} & \text{if } a = d, b \neq c \\ 0 & \text{if } a \neq d \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

for $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathcal{E}$. The following bounds hold true:

$$\tanh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\max_{a=1, \dots, n} k_a - 1} \right) \leq \beta_c \leq \tanh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\min_{a=1, \dots, n} k_a - 1} \right). \quad (17)$$

In particular for k -regular random graphs, i.e., for $n = 1$, we find $\beta_c = \tanh^{-1}(\frac{1}{k-1})$ in agreement with [6, 4]. In (17), the lower bound is obtained by taking the ∞ -norm of $\bar{\mathbf{M}}$, while for the upper bound one follows the proof of Corollary 3.24, applying a small homogeneous boundary field.

3 General results on trees

3.1 Recursion

Let us consider a finite tree $T = (V(T), E(T))$ and a general Ising model on T with Hamiltonian

$$H_T(\sigma) = - \sum_{ij \in E(T)} \beta_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{i \in V(T)} h_i \sigma_i. \quad (18)$$

Denote by $\mu_T(\cdot)$, $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$ the associated Gibbs measure and expectation. In this subsection we recall a well-known recursion on trees, then we apply it to the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular case.

Fix a root v among the vertices of the tree T . Given a vertex w , we denote by T_w the subtree rooted at w generated by w itself together with the connected vertices that lay further than w from v . The vertices $u_1, \dots, u_{K_w}$ that are neighbours of w in the subtree T_w are called the *children* of w . K_w is called the *forward degree* of w and corresponds to $\deg_T(w) - 1$, unless $w = v$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let w be any vertex of the rooted tree T , let $m_w := \langle \sigma_w \rangle_{T_w}$ denote its magnetization in the Ising model (18) restricted to the tree T_w . Set $z_w := \tanh^{-1}(m_w)$. The following recurrence relation holds true:*

$$z_w = h_w + \sum_{i=1}^{K_w} F_{\beta_{wu_i}}(z_{u_i}) \quad (19)$$

where $u_1, \dots, u_{K_w}$ are the children of w and F_β is defined by (5).

Remark 3.2. Taking $w = v$, then $T_v = T$ and the recursion leads to the root magnetization for the Ising model on the original tree T , $m_v = \langle \sigma_v \rangle_T$.

Remark 3.3. If the vertex u belongs to the boundary of the rooted tree T , then $T_u = \{u\}$ and thus $z_u = h_u$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let ww' be any edge of the tree T . Denote by $T_w^{(w')}$, $T_{w'}^{(w)}$ the two disjoint subtrees rooted respectively in w, w' obtained from T by deleting the edge ww' . We have:*

$$\langle \sigma_w \sigma_{w'} \rangle_T = \tanh \left(\beta_{ww'} + \tanh^{-1}(m_w^{(w')}) m_{w'}^{(w)} \right) \quad (20)$$

where $m_w^{(w')} := \langle \sigma_w \rangle_{T_w^{(w')}}$ is the magnetization of the vertex w in the Ising model (18) restricted to the tree $T_w^{(w')}$.

For completeness, the proofs of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.4 can be found in Appendix A.

Now we introduce $\mathbf{k}$ -regular trees and specify the recursion (19) on this class of trees.

Definition 3.5. Let $a = 1, \dots, n$, let $t \in \mathbb{N}$. A $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree of depth t rooted at a vertex of class C_a is denoted by $T_a(\mathbf{k}, t)$ (or $T_a(t)$ for simplicity) and defined as follows. The root originates k_{ab} children of class C_b for every $b = 1, \dots, n$ (1^{st} generation). Recursively, for every $b, c = 1, \dots, n$ each vertex of class C_b in the g^{th} generation whose parent belongs to class C_c originates $k_{bc} - 1$ children of class C_c and k_{bd} children of class C_d for $d = 1, \dots, c - 1, c + 1, \dots, n$ ($(g + 1)^{\text{th}}$ generation). This procedure stops at the t^{th} generation.

Remark 3.6. A finite $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree is not a $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graph, because the vertices of the last generation (i.e., the boundary) do not have the prescribed degrees. Unlikely random $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graphs, the realization of a $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T_a(t)$ is unique up to graph isomorphism, given the root class and the depth.

Definition 3.7. Let $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $T_a^{(b)}(s)$ a tree of depth s rooted at a vertex of class C_a , which differs from the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T_a(s)$ only for the fact that the root has $k_{ab} - 1$ children of class C_b .

Remark 3.8. For each pair (a, b) in $\mathcal{E}$, we say that a vertex of the tree $T_a(t)$ is of type $(b(c), s)$, meaning that b is the class of the vertex, c is the class of its parent, and $s = 0, \dots, t - 1$ its distance from the boundary of the tree. Every subtree of $T_a(t)$ generated by a vertex of type $(b(c), s)$ together with its descendants is isomorphic $T_b^{(c)}(s)$.




Figure 2: One of the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular trees associated to the class of random $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graphs in Fig. 1, namely $T_r(3)$, is shown. $T_g^{(r)}(2)$ is also indicated.

For the rest of Section 3 we will consider an Ising model on the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T \equiv T_a(t)$ or $T \equiv T_a^{(b)}(t)$ with class-dependent couplings and fields, up to an extra field $\mathbf{h}_* = (h_{*a}^{(b)} \in [-\infty, \infty])_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ added at the boundary T_* , that is the set of vertices at distance t from the root. Precisely we consider the following Hamiltonian:

$$H_T(\sigma) = - \sum_{\substack{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}: \\ a \leq b}} \beta_{ab} \sum_{\substack{ij \in E(T): \\ i \in C_a, j \in C_b \\ \text{or viceversa}}} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{a \leq n} h_a \sum_{\substack{i \in V(T): \\ i \in C_a}} \sigma_i - \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}} h_{*a}^{(b)} \sum_{\substack{i \in T_*: \\ i \in C_a, \partial i \in C_b}} \sigma_i . \quad (21)$$

where ∂i identifies the parent of vertex i in the tree T . Notice that the last generations of T can be empty, in that case T_* is also empty.

Proposition 3.9. Let $m_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*)$ denote the magnetization of the root in the Ising model (21) on the tree $T \equiv T_a^{(b)}(s)$. Set $z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) := \tanh^{-1}(m_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*))$.

The following recursion holds true for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{cases} z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) = h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)) , & s \geq 1 \\ z_a^{(b)}(0, \mathbf{h}_*) = h_a + h_{*a}^{(b)} , & s = 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

where $F_\beta(x)$ is defined in (5) and δ_{bc} is the Kronecker delta.

Moreover, let $m_a(t, \mathbf{h}_*)$ denote the magnetization of the root in the Ising model (21) on the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T \equiv T_a(t)$. Set $z_a(t, \mathbf{h}_*) := \tanh^{-1}(m_a(t, \mathbf{h}_*))$. We have:

$$z_a(t, \mathbf{h}_*) = h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(t-1, \mathbf{h}_*)) . \quad (23)$$

Proof. By Remarks 3.6, 3.8, the proof is a straightforward application of Lemma 3.1 to the Ising model (21) on a $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T_a(t)$, as long as $s < t$. $\square$

In the following we will denote by $\mathbf{z}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) = (z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*))_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ the solution of recursion (22) at step s .

3.2 Existence of fixed points

We show two simple properties of the recursion (22), then we focus on a condition which provides the existence of fixed points by monotonicity.

Lemma 3.10. *The following bounds hold true*

$$h_a - \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \beta_{ac} \leq z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \leq h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \beta_{ac} \quad (24)$$

for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$, $s \geq 1$.

Proof. It follows from expression (22) using the fact that $|F_\beta(x)| \leq \beta$. $\square$

Lemma 3.11. *The function $h_{*d}^{(e)} \mapsto z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*)$ is monotonic non-decreasing for every $(a, b), (d, e) \in \mathcal{E}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let us reason by induction on s . At the boundary $s = 0$ we have

$$\frac{\partial z_a^{(b)}(0, \mathbf{h}_*)}{\partial h_{*d}^{(e)}} = \delta_{(a,b),(d,e)} \geq 0 . \quad (25)$$

At $s \geq 1$ suppose that $\frac{\partial z_a^{(b)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)}{\partial h_{*d}^{(e)}} \geq 0$ for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$, then differentiating the recursion (22) we find

$$\frac{\partial z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*)}{\partial h_{*d}^{(e)}} = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F'_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)) \frac{\partial z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)}{\partial h_{*d}^{(e)}} \geq 0 \quad (26)$$

since $F'_\beta(x) \geq 0$. $\square$

Remark 3.12. The monotonicity with respect to the extra boundary fields also follows by general FKG inequalities (see Remark B.4 in the Appendix). Indeed $\frac{\partial m_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*)}{\partial h_{*d}^{(e)}} \geq 0$ independently of the sign of the external fields, since the couplings are non-negative.

Now, provided that the following limits exist, we denote

$$\bar{z}_a^{(b)}(\mathbf{h}_*) := \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E} \quad (27)$$

the components of the fixed point $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{h}_*)$ of the recursion (22) reached starting from extra boundary field $\mathbf{h}_*$. We simply write $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(h_*)$ when the extra boundary field is homogeneous, that is $h_{*a}^{(b)} = h_*$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$.

The following Proposition uses monotonicity to prove the existence of fixed points for specific choices of extra boundary fields.

Proposition 3.13 (Existence of fixed points). *Let $\underline{\mathbf{h}} = (h_a^{(b)} \geq -\infty)_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ such that*

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(h_c + \underline{h}_c^{(a)}) \geq \underline{h}_a^{(b)} \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (28)$$

Notice that $\underline{\mathbf{h}} = -\infty$ is always a feasible choice. Then the sequence $s \mapsto z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}})$ is monotonic non-decreasing for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. In particular, a fixed point $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}})$ of the recursion (22) exists and its components satisfy $\bar{z}_a^{(b)}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) \geq h_a + \underline{h}_a^{(b)}$.

Similarly, let $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = (\bar{h}_a^{(b)} \leq \infty)_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ such that

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(h_c + \bar{h}_c^{(a)}) \leq \bar{h}_a^{(b)} \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (29)$$

Notice that $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = +\infty$ is always a feasible choice. Then the sequence $s \mapsto z_a^{(b)}(s, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$ is monotonic non-increasing for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. In particular, a fixed point $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\bar{\mathbf{h}})$ of the recursion (22) exists and its components satisfy $\bar{z}_a^{(b)}(\bar{\mathbf{h}}) \leq h_a + \bar{h}_a^{(b)}$.

Finally, if $\underline{\mathbf{h}} \preceq \mathbf{h}_ \preceq \bar{\mathbf{h}}$ where $\preceq$ denotes componentwise inequality, then:*

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) \preceq \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \preceq \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{z}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \preceq \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\bar{\mathbf{h}}). \quad (30)$$

Proof. Condition (28) simply rewrites as

$$\mathbf{z}(1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \succeq \mathbf{z}(0, \underline{\mathbf{h}}). \quad (31)$$

Therefore we claim that

$$\mathbf{z}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \succeq \mathbf{z}(s-1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \quad \forall s \geq 1. \quad (32)$$

Let us prove the claim by induction on s . If $\mathbf{z}(s-1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \succeq \mathbf{z}(s-2, \underline{\mathbf{h}})$, then applying the recursion (22), since $F_\beta(x)$ is non-decreasing, one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) &= h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \underline{\mathbf{h}})) \geq \\ &\geq h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-2, \underline{\mathbf{h}})) = z_a^{(b)}(s-1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. This proves the non-decreasing monotonicity (32). As a consequence $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{z}}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}})$ exists, is bounded below by $\mathbf{z}(0, \underline{\mathbf{h}})$ and bounded above by (24).

In an analogous way, we can show that condition (29) implies the existence of $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\bar{\mathbf{h}}) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbf{z}}(s, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$ by non-increasing monotonicity, bounded above by $\mathbf{z}(0, \bar{\mathbf{h}})$ and bounded below by (24).

Finally, thanks to the monotonicity with respect to the extra boundary fields (Lemma 3.11), if $\underline{\mathbf{h}} \preceq \mathbf{h}_* \preceq \bar{\mathbf{h}}$ then

$$\mathbf{z}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \preceq \mathbf{z}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \preceq \mathbf{z}(s, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) \quad (34)$$

for every $s \in \mathbb{N}$. As $s \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the bounds (30). $\square$

Corollary 3.14. *Suppose $h_1, \dots, h_n \geq 0$. The homogenous extra boundary fields $\underline{\mathbf{h}} = 0$ (free boundary conditions) and $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = +\infty$ (positive boundary conditions) are such that the magnetizations are respectively monotonic non-decreasing and monotonic non-increasing with respect to the inclusion of a new generation.*

Proof. It follows by Proposition 3.13. Indeed, if the external fields are non-negative the condition (28) is satisfied by $\underline{h}_a^{(b)} = \underline{h} = 0$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. On the other hand, condition (29) is always fulfilled by $\bar{h}_a^{(b)} = \bar{h} = +\infty$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. $\square$

Remark 3.15. Corollary 3.14 also follows by general GKS inequalities (see Remark B.2 in the Appendix).

3.3 Uniqueness of fixed points

In order to fully exploit Proposition 3.13, we show that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\bar{\mathbf{h}})$ for suitable choices of $\underline{\mathbf{h}} \prec \bar{\mathbf{h}}$.

Lemma 3.16. *Suppose there exists $\underline{\mathbf{h}} = (\underline{h}_a^{(b)})_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ satisfying condition (28) and*

$$\underline{h}_a^{(b)} \geq -h_a \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (35)$$

Let $\mathbf{h}_ \succeq \underline{\mathbf{h}}$. Then $z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \geq 0$ and*

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (h_{*d}^{(e)})^2} z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \leq 0 \quad (36)$$

for every $(a, b), (d, e) \in \mathcal{E}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Proposition 3.13 together with (35) imply that $z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{h}) \geq z_a^{(b)}(0, \underline{h}) \geq 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.11 also

$$z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) \geq 0. \quad (37)$$

Now, let us take the second derivative of recursion (22) with respect to the extra boundary field $h_{*d}^{(e)}$. For $s \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (h_{*d}^{(e)})^2} z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) &= \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (h_{*d}^{(e)})^2} F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)) = \\ &= \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \left(F''_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial h_{*d}^{(e)}} z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*) \right)^2 + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + F'_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial (h_{*d}^{(e)})^2} z_c^{(a)}(s-1, \mathbf{h}_*) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and at the boundary $s = 0$ we have $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial (h_{*d}^{(e)})^2} z_a^{(b)}(0, \mathbf{h}_*) = 0$. Observe that $F'_\beta(x) \geq 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, while $F''_\beta(x) \leq 0$ only for $x \geq 0$. Therefore identity (38) together with (37) can be used to prove (36) by induction on s . $\square$

Remark 3.17. For $h_1, \dots, h_n \geq 0$, the concavity condition (36) can be alternatively proved by correlation inequalities, specifically the GHS inequality (see Appendix 3.15).

Proposition 3.18 (Existence and uniqueness of fixed point). *Suppose there exists $\underline{h} = (h_a^{(b)})_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{E}}$ verifying (35), (28) and*

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(h_c + \underline{h}_c^{(a)}) > \underline{h}_a^{(b)} \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ s.t. } k_a \geq 2. \quad (39)$$

Then for every $\mathbf{h}_* \succeq \underline{h}$ we have

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\underline{h}) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{h}_*) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}(+\infty) =: \bar{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (40)$$

$\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ is the unique fixed point of recursion (22) having components $\bar{z}_a^{(b)} \geq h_a + \underline{h}_a^{(b)}$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. For $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) = k_a - 1 = 0$ the uniqueness is trivial since by (22) we have $\bar{z}_a^{(b)}(\mathbf{h}_*) = z_a^{(b)}(s, \mathbf{h}_*) = h_a$ for every $s \geq 1$, $\mathbf{h}_* \in [-\infty, \infty]^\mathcal{E}$. From now on we consider $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) = k_a - 1 > 0$.

The functions $\rho \mapsto z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{h} + \rho \mathbf{1})$ are concave for $\rho \geq 0$ (Lemma 3.16) for every $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, setting $\bar{\mathbf{h}} := \underline{h} + R \mathbf{1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} := \underline{h} + \rho \mathbf{1}$ for $\rho \in (0, R)$, $R \in (0, \infty)$, we have

$$z_a^{(b)}(s, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{h}) \leq \frac{R}{\rho} (z_a^{(b)}(s, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{h})) \quad (41)$$

for every $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us choose $R \geq \max_{a,b} \left(\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \beta_{ac} - \underline{h}_a^{(b)} \right)$, so that $\bar{\mathbf{h}}$ satisfies condition (29) by Lemma 3.10. Let us choose $\rho \in (0, R)$ sufficiently small so that

$$z_a^{(b)}(s, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \leq z_a^{(b)}(s+1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (42)$$

One can prove that such ρ exists by induction on s . Indeed by hypothesis (39), for $\rho > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(h_c + \underline{h}_c^{(a)}) \geq \underline{h}_a^{(b)} + \rho, \quad (43)$$

that is

$$z_a^{(b)}(1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \geq z_a^{(b)}(0, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}). \quad (44)$$

Then (32) follows using the recursion (22) and the monotonicity of F_β .

Now, the l.h.s. of (41) can be bounded below uniformly in s using Proposition 3.13:

$$z_a^{(b)}(s, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \geq z_a^{(b)}(t, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(t, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \quad \forall s \leq t. \quad (45)$$

Plugging inequalities (45) and (42) into (41) we find:

$$z_a^{(b)}(t, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - \bar{z}_a^{(b)}(t, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \leq \frac{R}{\rho} \left(z_a^{(b)}(s+1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \right), \quad (46)$$

then summing over $s = 0, \dots, t$ we get:

$$(t+1) \left(z_a^{(b)}(t, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(t, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \right) \leq \frac{R}{\rho} \left(z_a^{(b)}(t+1, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(0, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \right). \quad (47)$$

The r.h.s. of (47) is bounded by a suitable constant $C > 0$ independent of t (Lemma 3.10). Therefore we have:

$$z_a^{(b)}(t, \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - z_a^{(b)}(t, \underline{\mathbf{h}}) \leq \frac{C}{t+1}. \quad (48)$$

The l.h.s. is always non-negative (Lemma 3.11). Hence letting $t \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\bar{z}_a^{(b)}(\bar{\mathbf{h}}) - \bar{z}_a^{(b)}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = 0. \quad (49)$$

Now, using the bounds in (30) it follows that

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\underline{\mathbf{h}}) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{h}_*) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\bar{\mathbf{h}}) =: \bar{\mathbf{z}} \quad (50)$$

for any $\underline{\mathbf{h}} \preceq \mathbf{h}_* \preceq \bar{\mathbf{h}}$. Moreover, let $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ be a fixed point of (22) with components $\bar{z}_a^{(b)} \in [h_a + \underline{h}_a^{(b)}, h_a + \bar{h}_a^{(b)}]$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. We can consider $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ as the starting point of the recursion (22) with extra boundary fields $\mathbf{h}_*$ with components $h_{*a}^{(b)} := \bar{z}_a^{(b)} - h_a \in [\underline{h}_a^{(b)}, \bar{h}_a^{(b)}]$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. Then by (50) we have that $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \bar{\mathbf{z}}$.

The previous results extend to $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = +\infty$. Indeed,

$$\mathbf{z}(1, +\infty) = \mathbf{z}(0, \mathbf{h}_*) \quad (51)$$

where the vector $\mathbf{h}_*$ has components $h_{*a}^{(b)} := \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \beta_{ac} \in [\underline{h}_a^{(b)}, \bar{h}_a^{(b)}]$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. Then by (50) it follows that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(+\infty) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}$. $\square$

Remark 3.19. If conditions (28), (35) hold true, condition (39) can be replaced by a weaker one in the hypothesis of Proposition 3.18. If for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$ with $k_a \geq 2$ there exists $s^* = s_{ab}^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$z_a^{(b)}(s^*, \underline{h}) > z_a^{(b)}(s^* - 1, \underline{h}), \quad (52)$$

then, by continuity of $\underline{h}_* \mapsto z_a^{(b)}(s, \underline{h}_*)$, it is possible to find $\rho > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$z_a^{(b)}(s^*, \underline{h}) \geq z_a^{(b)}(s^* - 1, \underline{h} + \rho \mathbf{1}) \quad (53)$$

and one can adapt the arguments used in the proof of Proposition 3.18. Notice that inequality (39) is nothing but (52) for $s^* = 1$.

Proposition 3.20 (Existence and uniqueness of fixed point at high temperature). *Suppose $\rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1$. Then there exists a unique fixed point $\bar{z}$ of the recursion (22) and*

$$\bar{z}(\underline{h}_*) = \bar{z} \quad \forall \underline{h}_* \in [-\infty, \infty]^\mathcal{E}. \quad (54)$$

Proof. Set $\mathbf{e}(s) := \mathbf{z}(s, +\infty) - \mathbf{z}(s, -\infty)$ for every $s \in \mathbb{N}$. By recursion (22) we get

$$\begin{cases} e_a^{(b)}(s) \leq \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \tanh(\beta_{ac}) e_c^{(a)}(s-1), & s \geq 2 \\ e_a^{(b)}(1) = 2 \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \beta_{ac}, & s = 1 \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$, where for the first line we have linearized $F_\beta(x_2) - F_\beta(x_1) \leq \max_{x \in [x_1, x_2]} F'_\beta(x) (x_2 - x_1) \leq \tanh(\beta) (x_2 - x_1)$, while in the second line we have used $F_\beta(+\infty) - F_\beta(-\infty) = 2\beta$. We then rewrite the first line of (55) as

$$\mathbf{e}(s) \preceq \mathbf{M} \mathbf{e}(s-1) \quad (56)$$

where $\preceq$ denotes componentwise inequality and matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is defined in (16). Since $\mathbf{e}(s)$ and $\mathbf{M}$ have non-negative entries, the previous inequality can be iterated finding

$$\mathbf{e}(s) \preceq \mathbf{M}^{s-1} \mathbf{e}(1). \quad (57)$$

Therefore, choosing a suitable operator norm $\|\cdot\|$, we have

$$|\mathbf{e}(s)| \leq |\mathbf{M}^{s-1} \mathbf{e}(1)| \leq \|\mathbf{M}^{s-1}\| |\mathbf{e}(1)|. \quad (58)$$

Since by hypothesis $\rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1$, Gelfand's formula [44] implies the existence of $s_0 \geq 2$ such that $\|\mathbf{M}^{s_0}\| < 1$. Hence, from (58) it follows

$$|\mathbf{e}(ss_0 + 1)| \leq \|\mathbf{M}^{ss_0}\| |\mathbf{e}(1)| \leq \|\mathbf{M}^{s_0}\|^s |\mathbf{e}(1)| \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (59)$$

Therefore

$$\bar{z}(-\infty) = \bar{z}(+\infty). \quad (60)$$

The uniqueness of the fixed point of (22), reached from any initialization $\underline{h}_*$, then follows by Lemma 3.11. $\square$

3.4 Results on trees for different external fields

We derive consequences of Propositions 3.13, 3.18, 3.20, for different choices of the external fields $h_1, \dots, h_n$.

Corollary 3.21. *Suppose $h_1, \dots, h_n > 0$. Then there exists a unique fixed point $\bar{z}$ of the recursion (22) having all non-negative components, precisely its components satisfy $\bar{z}_a^{(b)} \geq h_a > 0$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. Moreover*

$$\bar{z}(\mathbf{h}_*) = \bar{z} \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_* \in [0, \infty]^\mathcal{E}. \quad (61)$$

Proof. It follows immediately by Proposition 3.18 taking $\underline{h} = \mathbf{0}$. $\square$

Corollary 3.22. *Suppose $h_1, \dots, h_n \geq 0$ at least one of them strictly positive, and $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$. Then there exists a unique fixed point $\bar{z}$ of the recursion (22) having all non-negative components. Moreover (61) holds true.*

The proof requires the following Lemma, which is proven in Appendix A.

Lemma 3.23. *Let $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $f = 1, \dots, n$. If $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$, then there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the tree $T_a^{(b)}(s)$ contains a vertex of class C_f . We denote by $s_{ab}^*(f)$ the smallest of such s .*

Proof of Corollary 3.22. Taking $\underline{h} = \mathbf{0}$, the Corollary follows from Remark 3.19 and Proposition 3.18. Indeed, set $s_{ab}^* := \min\{s_{ab}^*(f) \mid f = 1, \dots, n, h_f > 0\}$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$, as defined in Lemma 3.23. The recursion (22) brings $z_a^{(b)}(s, 0) = 0$ for $s = 1, \dots, s_{ab}^* - 1$, while $z_a^{(b)}(s_{ab}^*, 0) > 0$. Therefore condition (52) is satisfied. $\square$

Corollary 3.24. *Suppose $h_1 = \dots = h_n = 0$.*

i) If $\rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1$, then $\mathbf{0}$ is the unique fixed point of recursion (22). Moreover

$$\bar{z}(\mathbf{h}_*) = \mathbf{0} \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_* \in [-\infty, \infty]^\mathcal{E} \quad (62)$$

ii) Assume also $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{G}$ not simply cyclic. If $\rho(\mathbf{M}) > 1$, then there exist exactly 3 fixed points of the recursion (22): $\bar{z}, \mathbf{0}, -\bar{z}$, where $\bar{z}$ have all strictly positive components. Moreover,

$$\bar{z}(\mathbf{h}_*) = \bar{z} \quad \forall \mathbf{h}_* \in (0, +\infty]^\mathcal{E}. \quad (63)$$

The proof requires the following Lemma, which is proven in Appendix A.

Lemma 3.25. *Suppose $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{G}$ not simply cyclic. Then the matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is irreducible.*

Proof of Corollary 3.24. Part i) immediately follows from Proposition 3.20 observing that $\mathbf{0}$ is always a fixed point of recursion (22) for $h_1 = \dots = h_n = 0$.

Part *ii*). We claim that there exists a unique fixed point $\bar{z}$ with all positive components. The result then follows by symmetry of the recursion at $h_1 = \dots = h_n = 0$.

Now, since the matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is irreducible (Lemma 3.25) and $\rho(\mathbf{M}) > 1$ is its largest eigenvalue, by Perron-Frobenius theorem there exists an eigenvector $\mathbf{v} \succ \mathbf{0}$, $|\mathbf{v}| = 1$, with all positive components. Hence

$$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} = \rho(\mathbf{M})\mathbf{v} \succ \mathbf{v}. \quad (64)$$

The claim follows by Proposition 3.18 choosing $\underline{h} := \varepsilon \mathbf{v}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Indeed condition (35) is obviously fulfilled as $\underline{h} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $h_1 = \dots = h_n = 0$. Condition (39) at $h_1 = \dots = h_n = 0$, by expanding $F_\beta(x)$ around $x = 0$, rewrites as

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) \tanh(\beta_{ac}) \underline{h}_c^{(a)} + O(|\underline{h}|^2) > \underline{h}_a^{(b)} \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (65)$$

which by definition (16) of the matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is simply

$$\mathbf{M}\underline{h} + O(|\underline{h}|^2) \succ \underline{h}. \quad (66)$$

Dividing both sides by ε we end up with $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{v} + O(\varepsilon) \succ \mathbf{v}$. Thanks to (64) the latter inequality is verified for ε sufficiently small. $\square$

4 From trees to random graphs

Proposition 4.1. *Let $G_N = (V_N, E_N)$ be a random $\mathbf{k}$ -regular graph. Fix $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and a vertex $i \in V_N$. Let $B_N(i, t)$ denote the ball of radius t and center i in the graph G_N . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(B_N(i, t) \text{ is a tree}) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 1. \quad (67)$$

Proof. Let us fix a total order on the vertices of G_N , which follows their distance from i . For every vertex j , denote by $\Gamma(j)$ the connected subgraph of G_N generated by j together with all the previous vertices. We have:

$$\mathbb{P}(B_N(i, t) \text{ is a tree}) = \prod_{j \in B_N(i, t) \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(j) \text{ is a tree} \mid \Gamma(j-1) \text{ is a tree}). \quad (68)$$

Let $j \in B_N(i, t) \setminus \{i\}$. $\Gamma(j)$ is connected by construction. Hence, knowing $\Gamma(j-1)$ is a tree, $\Gamma(j)$ is not tree if and only if the vertex j has (at least one) extra connection to $\Gamma(j-1)$. Then, since the connections of $j \in C_b$ are chosen uniformly at random among the available possibilities, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\Gamma(j) \text{ is NOT a tree} \mid \Gamma(j-1) \text{ is a tree}) \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_b} k_{bc} \frac{\text{n}^\circ \text{ of vertices of class } C_c \text{ in } \Gamma(j-1)}{\text{n}^\circ \text{ of vertices of class } C_c \text{ in } G_N \setminus \Gamma(j-1)} \\ & \leq \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_b} k_{bc} \frac{\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \hat{k}^s}{\alpha_c N - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \hat{k}^s} = O(N^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

setting $\hat{k} := \max_d \sum_{d'} k_{dd'}$. Therefore, plugging (69) into (68) we find:

$$\mathbb{P}(B_N(i, t) \text{ is a tree}) = \prod_{j \in B_N(i, t) \setminus \{i\}} (1 - O(N^{-1})) = 1 + O(N^{-1}) \quad (70)$$

since the cardinality of $B_N(i, t)$ is bounded by $\sum_{s=0}^t \hat{k}^s$ independently of N . $\square$

Remark 4.2. If the ball $B_N(i, t)$ is a tree, then it is isomorphic to the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T_a(t, \mathbf{k})$, where C_a is the class of vertex i .

4.1 Proof of Theorems 2.5, 2.8, and 2.9

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Let us restrict the Ising model (2) to the ball $B_N(i, t)$, choosing free and positive boundary conditions: they correspond respectively to no extra fields and infinite fields attached to the vertices at distance t from i . Let us denote by $\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^0$ and $\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^+$ the corresponding equilibrium magnetization of spin σ_i . By GKS inequalities, applying the same method (removal of edges and addition of fields) described for trees in the proof of Remark 3.15 (see Appendix), we have:

$$\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^0 \leq \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N} \leq \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^+ \quad (71)$$

By Proposition 4.1 the ball $B_N(i, t)$ is isomorphic to the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T_a(t)$ with probability convergent to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Let us denote by $\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^0, \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^+$ the root magnetisations in the Ising model (21) on the tree $T = T_a(t)$, with extra fields at the boundary respectively $h_* = 0, h_* = +\infty$. By Corollary 3.22 we have:

$$\langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^+ \searrow \bar{m}_a, \quad \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^0 \nearrow \bar{m}_a \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (72)$$

where

$$\bar{m}_a := \tanh \left(h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}) \right) \quad (73)$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = (\bar{z}_b^{(c)})_{(b, c) \in \mathcal{E}}$ is the unique fixed point of the recursion (22) with all non-negative entries. Now let $\epsilon, \delta > 0$. Using inequalities (71) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N} - \bar{m}_a &\leq \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^+ - \bar{m}_a \\ &\leq \left| \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^+ - \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^+ \right| + \left| \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^+ - \bar{m}_a \right| \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{m}_a - \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N} &\leq \bar{m}_a - \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^0 \\ &\leq \left| \bar{m}_a - \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^0 \right| + \left| \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^0 - \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{B_N(i, t)}^0 \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

By convergence (83) and Proposition 4.1, there exist $t_\epsilon, N_{\delta, t_\epsilon}$ finite such that

$$\left| \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^+ - \bar{m}_a \right| < \epsilon, \quad \left| \bar{m}_a - \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{T_a(t)}^0 \right| < \epsilon \quad \forall t \geq t_\epsilon \quad (76)$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\langle\sigma_i\rangle_{B_N(i,t_\epsilon)}^+ \neq \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{T_a(t_\epsilon)}^+ \text{ or } \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{B_N(i,t_\epsilon)}^0 \neq \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{T_a(t_\epsilon)}^0\right) < \delta \quad \forall N \geq N_{\delta,t_\epsilon}. \quad (77)$$

Therefore combining the previous inequalities,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\langle\sigma_i\rangle_{G_N} - \bar{m}_a| \geq \epsilon\right) < \delta \quad \forall N > N_{\delta,t_\epsilon}. \quad (78)$$

As $\langle\sigma_i\rangle_{G_N} - \bar{m}_a$ is bounded, convergence in probability implies L^r -norm convergence, and we have proved (3).

Now, let us restrict the Ising model (2) to the ball $B_N(ij, t)$ of radius t centered in the edge $ij \in E_N$, i.e., the subgraph of G_N generated by the vertices at distance $\leq t$ from either i or j . By the GKS inequalities (140), (141),

$$\langle\sigma_i\sigma_j\rangle_{B_N(ij,t)}^0 \leq \langle\sigma_i\sigma_j\rangle_{G_N} \leq \langle\sigma_i\sigma_j\rangle_{B_N(ij,t)}^+ \quad (79)$$

Superscripts 0 and + refer, as usual, to free and plus boundary conditions respectively. By Propostion 4.1,

$$\mathbb{P}(B_N(ij, t) \text{ is a tree}) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} 1 \quad (80)$$

and this tree is necessarily the $\mathbf{k}$ -regular tree $T_{aa'}(t)$ of depth t rooted in an edge connecting two vertices of classes a, a' (each of them generates a first generation and so on up to generation t). By an application of Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.22, we have

$$\langle\sigma_i\sigma_j\rangle_{T_{aa'}(t)}^0 \nearrow \bar{\gamma}_{aa'} \text{ , } \quad \langle\sigma_i\sigma_j\rangle_{T_{aa'}(t)}^+ \searrow \bar{\gamma}_{aa'} \quad \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (81)$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_{aa'} = \tanh\left(\beta_{aa'} + \tanh^{-1}\left(\tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')})\tanh(\bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)})\right)\right)$. Indeed (20) is monotonic non-decreasing with respect to the product $m_a^{(a')}m_{a'}^{(a)}$. Now, following the same procedure already explained for the magnetisation we obtain the convergence (4). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Let us restrict the Ising model (2) to the ball $B_N(i, t)$, choosing respectively negative and positive boundary conditions, i.e., attaching $\pm\infty$ fields to the vertices at distance t from i in G_N . FKG inequalities (see (B.3) respectively addition and removal of fields) always guarantee that:

$$\langle\sigma_i\rangle_{B_N(i,t)}^- \leq \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{G_N} \leq \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{B_N(i,t)}^+ \quad (82)$$

On the other hand, let us denote by $\langle\sigma_i\rangle_{T_a(t)}^\pm$ the root magnetisation of the Ising model (21) on the tree $T = T_a(t)$, with extra field at the boundary respectively $h_* = \pm\infty$. For $\rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1$, by Corollary 3.20 we have:

$$\langle\sigma_i\rangle_{T_a(t)}^- \nearrow \bar{m}_a \text{ , } \quad \langle\sigma_i\rangle_{T_a(t)}^+ \searrow \bar{m}_a \quad \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (83)$$

where

$$\bar{m}_a := \tanh \left(h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}) \right) \quad (84)$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = (\bar{z}_b^{(c)})_{(b,c) \in \mathcal{E}}$ is the unique fixed point of the recursion (22). The proof now proceeds in the same way as the proof of Theorem 2.5, obtaining the convergence (3). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.9. By Theorem 2.5, the spontaneous magnetisation (13) is given by the following expression

$$S_a(\beta) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \tanh \left(h + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{ac} F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}) \right) \quad (85)$$

where for every $h > 0$, $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h)$ is the only solution with all positive components of the fixed point equation

$$\bar{z}_a^{(b)} = h + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}), \quad (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (86)$$

The limit $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h)$ is reached with decreasing monotonicity (Lemma 3.11), and by continuity of the function $F_\beta(x)$ it is a solution of

$$\bar{z}_a^{(b)} = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(\bar{z}_c^{(a)}), \quad (a, b) \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (87)$$

If $\rho(\mathbf{M}) < 1$, we know that $\mathbf{0}$ is the unique solution of fixed point equation (87) (Corollary 3.24). Therefore $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h) = \mathbf{0}$. It follows $S_a(\beta) = 0$.

On the contrary, if $\rho(\mathbf{M}) > 1$ equation (87) has also a (unique) solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^+ = \bar{\mathbf{z}}^+(\beta) \succ \mathbf{0}$ with all positive components (Corollary 3.24). We claim that

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h) \succeq \bar{\mathbf{z}}^+(\beta) \quad \forall h > 0. \quad (88)$$

Then letting $h \rightarrow 0+$

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h) \succeq \bar{\mathbf{z}}^+(\beta) \quad (89)$$

and by uniqueness it follows that $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0+} \bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}^+(\beta)$. Replacing the limit in (85) concludes the proof. In order to show the validity of claim (88), observe that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\beta, h)$ for $h > 0$ is reached as $s \rightarrow \infty$ by the following recursion:

$$\begin{cases} z_a^{(b)}(s) = h + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{bc}) F_{\beta_{ac}}(z_c^{(a)}(s-1)), & s \geq 1 \\ z_a^{(b)}(0) = \bar{z}_a^{(b)+}(\beta) > 0, & s = 0 \end{cases} \quad (90)$$

for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$ (Corollary 3.21). Then, using positivity of h and monotonicity of the function $F_\beta(x)$, it is easy to prove (88) by induction on s . $\square$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.7

Proof of Theorem 2.7. The proof consists in different steps.

1. Show that at $\beta = \mathbf{0}$ we have $p_{G_N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) = p(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h})$ for every N .
2. Show that for every $(a, a') \in \mathcal{E}$

$$\frac{\partial p_{G_N}(\beta, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \beta_{aa'}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{ij \in E_N: \\ i \in C_a, j \in C_{a'}}} \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \frac{\alpha_a k_{aa'}}{2^{\delta_{aa'}}} \langle \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \rangle_{aa'} \quad (91)$$

where $\delta_{aa'}$ is the Kronecker delta and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{aa'}$ is the Gibbs measure associated to the following two spins Hamiltonian

$$H_{aa'}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = -\bar{z}_a^{(a')} \sigma_1 - \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)} \sigma_2 - \beta_{aa'} \sigma_1 \sigma_2, \quad (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \{\pm 1\}^2. \quad (92)$$

3. Show that for every $(a, a') \in \mathcal{E}$ also

$$\frac{\partial p(\beta, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \beta_{aa'}} = \frac{\alpha_a k_{aa'}}{2^{\delta_{aa'}}} \langle \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \rangle_{aa'} \quad (93)$$

4. The previous steps entail the convergence of the derivatives at any β and the equivalence of the pressures at $\beta = \mathbf{0}$. Finally use the fundamental theorem of calculus and dominated convergence to prove (10).
1. For the proof of the first point it suffices to compute the partition function in the non-interacting case:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{G_N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{V_N}} e^{\sum_{a=1}^n h_a \sum_{i \in C_a} \sigma_i} = \prod_{a=1}^n \prod_{i \in C_a} \sum_{\sigma_i = \pm 1} e^{h_a \sigma_i} \\ &= \prod_{a=1}^n (2 \cosh(h_a))^{N \alpha_a} \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

then

$$p_{G_N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) = N^{-1} \log Z_{G_N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) = \log 2 + \sum_{a=1}^n \alpha_a \log \cosh(h_a). \quad (95)$$

On the other hand substituting $\beta = \mathbf{0}$ in the expression (11) one can see that also

$$p(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) = \log 2 + \sum_{a=1}^n \alpha_a \log \cosh(h_a). \quad (96)$$

2. A standard computation shows the first identity in (91). On the other hand we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \rangle_{aa'} &= \frac{e^{\beta_{aa'} + \bar{z}_a^{(a')} + \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}} + e^{\beta_{aa'} - \bar{z}_a^{(a')} - \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}} - e^{-\beta_{aa'} + \bar{z}_a^{(a')} - \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}} - e^{-\beta_{aa'} - \bar{z}_a^{(a')} + \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}}}{e^{\beta_{aa'} + \bar{z}_a^{(a')} + \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}} + e^{\beta_{aa'} - \bar{z}_a^{(a')} - \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}} + e^{-\beta_{aa'} + \bar{z}_a^{(a')} - \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}} + e^{-\beta_{aa'} - \bar{z}_a^{(a')} + \bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}}} \\
&= \frac{\tanh(\beta_{aa'}) + \tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')}) \tanh(\bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)})}{1 + \tanh(\beta_{aa'}) \tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')}) \tanh(\bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)})} \\
&= \tanh \left(\beta_{aa'} + \tanh^{-1} \left(\tanh(\bar{z}_a^{(a')}) \tanh(\bar{z}_{a'}^{(a)}) \right) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

where in the last step we used $\tanh(x+y) = \frac{\tanh(x) + \tanh(y)}{1 + \tanh(x) \tanh(y)}$. Therefore the convergence in (91) follows from convergence (4) reasoning as in Remark 2.6.

3. The whole proof of the third point consists in the computation of $\frac{\partial p}{\partial \beta_{bb'}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h})$ from expression (11). Let us first consider a generic vector $\mathbf{x} = \{x_j \in \mathbb{R}\}_{j \in J}$ and a parameter $h \in \mathbb{R}$. Set

$$K^\pm(\mathbf{x}, h) := e^h \prod_{j \in J} (1 + x_j) \pm e^{-h} \prod_{j \in J} (1 - x_j) \tag{98}$$

$$G(\mathbf{x}, h) := \frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}, h)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}, h)}. \tag{99}$$

For $i \in J$ consider a vector with one component less $\mathbf{x}_{-i} = \{x_j\}_{j \in J \setminus \{i\}}$. We have:

$$\frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}, h)} = \frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)/K^+(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}, h)/K^+(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)} = \frac{G(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)}{1 + x_i G(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)} \tag{100}$$

using the identity $K^+(\mathbf{x}, h) - K^+(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h) = x_i K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-i}, h)$ which is easy to check. On the other hand, the function G rewrites as:

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\mathbf{x}, h) &= \frac{e^{2 \log \left(e^h \prod_{j \in J} \left(\frac{1+x_j}{1-x_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)} - 1}{e^{2 \log \left(e^h \prod_{j \in J} \left(\frac{1+x_j}{1-x_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)} + 1} = \tanh \log \left(e^h \prod_{j \in J} \left(\frac{1+x_j}{1-x_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\
&= \tanh \left(h + \sum_{j \in J} \tanh^{-1}(x_j) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Now, let us start computing the derivatives of p . For every $(b, b') \in \mathcal{E}$, $b \leq b'$, we have

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial \beta_{bb'}} = \frac{\partial \theta_{bb'}}{\partial \beta_{bb'}} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \theta_{bb'}} = (1 - \theta_{bb'}^2) \frac{\partial p}{\partial \theta_{bb'}} = \frac{1 - \theta_{bb'}^2}{2} \sum_{a \leq n} \alpha_a \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \theta_{bb'}} \tag{102}$$

where we set

$$f_a := - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{aa'} \left(\frac{\log(1 - \theta_{aa'}^2)}{2} + \log(1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}) \right) + \\ + 2 \log \left(e^{h_a} \prod_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} (1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a)})^{k_{aa'}} + e^{-h_a} \prod_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} (1 - \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a)})^{k_{aa'}} \right). \quad (103)$$

Notice that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ depends on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and it is differentiable by the implicit function theorem. Then for every $a \leq n$ we can write

$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \theta_{bb'}} = \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \text{explicit} \theta_{bb'}} + \sum_{(c, c') \in \mathcal{E}} \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \bar{m}_{c'}^{(c)}} \frac{\partial \bar{m}_{c'}^{(c)}}{\partial \theta_{bb'}} \quad (104)$$

where the first derivative on the r.h.s. is taken with respect to the explicit contribution of $\theta_{bb'}$. Now, let us introduce the following vector

$$\mathbf{x}^{(a)} := \left(\underbrace{\theta_{a1} \bar{m}_1^{(a)}, \dots, \theta_{a1} \bar{m}_1^{(a)}}_{k_{a1} \text{ times}}, \underbrace{\theta_{a2} \bar{m}_2^{(a)}, \dots, \theta_{a2} \bar{m}_2^{(a)}}_{k_{a2} \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{\theta_{an} \bar{m}_n^{(a)}, \dots, \theta_{an} \bar{m}_n^{(a)}}_{k_{an} \text{ times}} \right) \quad (105)$$

where each element $\theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}$ is repeated $k_{aa'}$ times. For every $a' \in \mathcal{E}_a$, let us also introduce the vector $\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}$, obtained from $\mathbf{x}^{(a)}$ removing only one component of the type $\theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}$. Then, recalling also $\theta_{bb'} \equiv \theta_{b'b}$, we compute:

$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \text{explicit} \theta_{bb'}} = - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} \delta_{\{a, a'\}, \{b, b'\}} k_{aa'} \left(\frac{-\theta_{aa'}}{1 - \theta_{aa'}^2} + \frac{\bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}}{1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}} \right) + \\ + 2 \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} \delta_{\{a, a'\}, \{b, b'\}} k_{aa'} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)} \frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}^{(a)}, h_a)} \quad (106)$$

where $\delta_{\{a, a'\}, \{b, b'\}} = (\delta_{a,b} \delta_{a',b'} + \delta_{a,b'} \delta_{a',b}) / 2^{\delta_{bb'}}$. Applying the identity (100) we have

$$\frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}^{(a)}, h_a)} = \frac{G(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a)}{1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a)} G(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a)} \quad (107)$$

and by (101), since $\tanh^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{m}})$ is a fixed point of recursion (22), we find

$$G(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a) = \tanh \left(h_a + \sum_{c \in \mathcal{E}_a} (k_{ac} - \delta_{a'c}) \tanh^{-1}(\theta_{ac} \bar{m}_a^{(c)}) \right) = \bar{m}_a^{(a')}. \quad (108)$$

Plugging the previous identities into (106) and rearranging terms we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial^{explicit} \theta_{bb'}} = \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} \delta_{\{a,a'\}, \{b,b'\}} k_{aa'} \left(\frac{\theta_{aa'}}{1 - \theta_{aa'}^2} + \frac{\bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}}{1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}} \right). \quad (109)$$

Now, for every $(c, c') \in \mathcal{E}$ let us compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \bar{m}_{c'}^{(c)}} &= - \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} k_{aa'} \frac{\theta_{aa'} \left(\bar{m}_a^{(a')} \delta_{(a,a'), (c',c)} + \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)} \delta_{(a,a'), (c,c')} \right)}{1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}} + \\ &+ 2 \sum_{a' \in \mathcal{E}_a} \delta_{(a,a'), (c,c')} k_{aa'} \theta_{aa'} \frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}^{(a)}, h_a)} \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

where $\delta_{(a,a'), (c,c')} = \delta_{a,c} \delta_{a',c'}$. As already seen $\frac{K^-(\mathbf{x}_{-a'}^{(a)}, h_a)}{K^+(\mathbf{x}^{(a)}, h_a)} = \frac{\bar{m}_a^{(a')}}{1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}}$, hence we find

$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \bar{m}_{c'}^{(c)}} = 0. \quad (111)$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial f_a}{\partial \theta_{bb'}} = \frac{\partial f_a}{\partial^{explicit} \theta_{bb'}}. \quad (112)$$

Finally, plugging expression (109) into (102) and using the identity $\alpha_b k_{bb'} = \alpha_{b'} k_{b'b}$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \beta_{bb'}} &= \frac{1 - \theta_{bb'}^2}{2} \sum_{(a,a') \in \mathcal{E}} \delta_{\{a,a'\}, \{b,b'\}} \alpha_a k_{aa'} \left(\frac{\theta_{aa'}}{1 - \theta_{aa'}^2} + \frac{\bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}}{1 + \theta_{aa'} \bar{m}_a^{(a')} \bar{m}_{a'}^{(a)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_b k_{bb'}}{2 \delta_{bb'}} \frac{\theta_{bb'} + \bar{m}_b^{(b')} \bar{m}_{b'}^{(b)}}{1 + \theta_{bb'} \bar{m}_b^{(b')} \bar{m}_{b'}^{(b)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

which proves (93) by noticing again that $\frac{\theta_{bb'} + \bar{m}_b^{(b')} \bar{m}_{b'}^{(b)}}{1 + \theta_{bb'} \bar{m}_b^{(b')} \bar{m}_{b'}^{(b)}} = \langle \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \rangle_{bb'}$.

4. Using the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and point 1. we write:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|p_{G_N}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h}) - p(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h})\|_{L^r(\mathbb{P})} = \\ &= \left\| \int_0^1 \left(\frac{dp_{G_N}(t\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h})}{dt} - \frac{dp(t\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h})}{dt} \right) dt \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \sum_{(a,a') \in \mathcal{E}} \beta_{aa'} \left\| \frac{\partial p_{G_N}}{\partial \beta_{aa'}}(t\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h}) - \frac{\partial p}{\partial \beta_{aa'}}(t\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{h}) \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{P})} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

The latter quantity vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by points 2., 3. and dominated convergence, completing the proof.

□

Remark 4.3. One can easily verify that

$$\frac{\partial p_N(\beta, \mathbf{h})}{\partial h_a} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i \in V_N: \\ i \in C_a}} \langle \sigma_i \rangle_{G_N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{L^r(\mathbb{P})} \frac{\partial p(\beta, \mathbf{h})}{\partial h_a}. \quad (115)$$

A Auxiliary results

In this Appendix we prove some auxiliary results used in Section 3.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Denote by σ_{T_w} the spin configuration on the subtree T_w and by $H_{T_w}(\sigma_{T_w}) = -\sum_{(i,j) \in E(T_w)} \beta_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{i \in V(T_w)} h_i \sigma_i$ the corresponding Hamiltonian. We can rewrite $H_{T_w}(\sigma_{T_w})$ as follows:

$$H_{T_w}(\sigma_{T_w}) = -h_w \sigma_w - \sum_{i=1}^{K_w} \beta_{wu_i} \sigma_{u_i} \sigma_w + \sum_{i=1}^{K_w} H_{T_{u_i}}(\sigma_{T_{u_i}}). \quad (116)$$

Setting $S_{w,T_w}(\pm 1) := \mu_{T_w}(\sigma_w = \pm 1)$ and $Z_{T_w} := \sum_{\sigma_{T_w}} e^{H_{T_w}(\sigma_{T_w})}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{w,T_w}(\xi) &= \frac{1}{Z_{T_w}} \sum_{\sigma_{T_w} : \sigma_w = \xi} e^{-H_{T_w}(\sigma_{T_w})} \\ &= \frac{e^{h_w \xi}}{Z_{T_w}} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} \sum_{\sigma_{T_{u_i}}} e^{\beta_{wu_i} \sigma_{u_i} \xi} e^{-H_{T_{u_i}}(\sigma_{T_{u_i}})} \\ &= \frac{e^{h_w \xi}}{Z_{T_w}} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} \left(e^{\beta_{wu_i} \xi} \sum_{\sigma_{T_{u_i}} : \sigma_{u_i} = 1} e^{-H_{T_{u_i}}(\sigma_{T_{u_i}})} + e^{-\beta_{wu_i} \xi} \sum_{\sigma_{T_{u_i}} : \sigma_{u_i} = -1} e^{-H_{T_{u_i}}(\sigma_{T_{u_i}})} \right) \\ &= \frac{e^{h_w \xi}}{Z_{T_w}} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} Z_{T_{u_i}} (e^{\beta_{wu_i} \xi} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(1) + e^{-\beta_{wu_i} \xi} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(-1)) \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{K_w} Z_{T_{u_i}}}{Z_{T_w}} e^{h_w \xi} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} (e^{\beta_{wu_i} \xi} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(1) + e^{-\beta_{wu_i} \xi} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(-1)) \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

for $\xi = \pm 1$. Let us take the ratio,

$$\frac{S_{w,T_w}(1)}{S_{w,T_w}(-1)} = \frac{e^{h_w} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} (e^{\beta_{wu_i}} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(1) + e^{-\beta_{wu_i}} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(-1))}{e^{-h_w} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} (e^{-\beta_{wu_i}} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(1) + e^{\beta_{wu_i}} S_{u_i, T_{u_i}}(-1))}. \quad (118)$$

Notice that $S_{w,T_w}(\pm 1) = \frac{1 \pm m_w}{2}$ and $\frac{S_{w,T_w}(1)}{S_{w,T_w}(-1)} = \frac{1+m_w}{1-m_w}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1+m_w}{1-m_w} &= e^{2h_w} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} \frac{e^{\beta_w u_i} (1+m_{u_i}) + e^{-\beta_w u_i} (1-m_{u_i})}{e^{-\beta_w u_i} (1+m_{u_i}) + e^{\beta_w u_i} (1-m_{u_i})} \\ &= e^{2h_w} \prod_{i=1}^{K_w} \frac{1 + \tanh(\beta_w u_i) m_{u_i}}{1 - \tanh(\beta_w u_i) m_{u_i}}. \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

Recall that $\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1+x}{1-x} = \tanh^{-1}(x)$. Then applying the logarithm on both sides of the previous identity, we obtain

$$\tanh^{-1}(m_w) = h_w + \sum_{i=1}^{K_w} \tanh^{-1}(\tanh(\beta_w u_i) m_{u_i}) \quad (120)$$

completing the proof. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.4. The Hamiltonian splits in three contributions:

$$H_T(\sigma) = H_{T_w^{(w')}}(\sigma_{T_w^{(w')}}) + H_{T_w^{(w)}}(\sigma_{T_w^{(w)}}) - \beta_{ww'} \sigma_w \sigma_{w'} \quad (121)$$

for $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^{V(T)}$. Then, setting $S_{ww',T}(\pm 1) := \mu_T(\sigma_w \sigma_{w'} = \pm 1)$ and $S_{w,T_w^{(w')}}(\pm 1) := \mu_{T_w^{(w')}}(\sigma_w = \pm 1)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ww',T}(1) &= \sum_{\sigma: \sigma_w \sigma_{w'} = 1} \frac{e^{-H_{T_w^{(w')}} - H_{T_w^{(w)}} + \beta_{ww'} \sigma_w \sigma_{w'}}}{Z_T} \\ &= \frac{e^{\beta_{ww'}}}{Z_T} \left(\sum_{\sigma: \sigma_w = 1, \sigma_{w'} = 1} e^{-H_{T_w^{(w')}} - H_{T_w^{(w)}}} + \sum_{\sigma: \sigma_w = -1, \sigma_{w'} = -1} e^{-H_{T_w^{(w')}} - H_{T_w^{(w)}}} \right) \\ &= e^{\beta_{ww'}} \frac{Z_{T_w^{(w')}} Z_{T_w^{(w)}}}{Z_T} \left(S_{w,T_w^{(w')}}(1) S_{w',T_w^{(w)}}(1) + S_{w,T_w^{(w')}}(-1) S_{w',T_w^{(w)}}(-1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

Similarly:

$$S_{ww',T}(-1) = e^{-\beta_{ww'}} \frac{Z_{T_w^{(w')}} Z_{T_w^{(w)}}}{Z_T} \left(S_{w,T_w^{(w')}}(1) S_{w',T_w^{(w)}}(-1) + S_{w,T_w^{(w')}}(-1) S_{w',T_w^{(w)}}(1) \right). \quad (123)$$

Taking the ratio we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 + \langle \sigma_w \sigma_{w'} \rangle_T}{1 - \langle \sigma_w \sigma_{w'} \rangle_T} &= \frac{S_{ww',T}(1)}{S_{ww',T}(-1)} \\ &= e^{2\beta_{ww'}} \frac{(1+m_w^{(w')})(1+m_w^{(w)}) + (1-m_w^{(w')})(1-m_w^{(w)})}{(1+m_w^{(w')})(1-m_w^{(w)}) + (1-m_w^{(w')})(1+m_w^{(w)})} \\ &= e^{2\beta_{ww'}} \frac{1+m_w^{(w')} m_w^{(w)}}{1-m_w^{(w')} m_w^{(w)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

By applying the logarithm at both side and inverting, we get (20). $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.23. Let us consider the graph $\mathcal{G}$ with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and weighted adjacency matrix $\mathbf{k}$. Let $W(\mathcal{G})$ be the set of finite walks on $\mathcal{G}$ (we denote a walk of length $s \in \mathbb{N}$ as $c_0 c_1 \dots c_s \in \{1, \dots, n\}^{s+1}$) such that

- i) the term $\dots cd \dots$ is allowed in a walk only if $k_{cd} \geq 1$ (including the case $c = d$);
- ii) the term $\dots dcd \dots$ is allowed in a walk only if $k_{cd} \geq 2$.

For brevity we call *walk any walk that belongs to $W(\mathcal{G})$. In other words a *walk is a walk on the graph $\mathcal{G}$ that may have self-edges and cannot backtrack on edges of weight 1. We denote by W_a the set of *walks starting from a , and by $W_a^{(b)}$ the set of *walks starting from a satisfying also:

- iii) the initial term $ab \dots$ is allowed in a walk only if $k_{ab} \geq 2$.

It takes a moment to understand that the classes of vertices appearing in the trees $T_a \equiv \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{N}} T_a(s)$, $T_a^{(b)} \equiv \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{N}} T_a^{(b)}(s)$ are exactly those appearing in the collection of *walks W_a , $W_a^{(b)}$ respectively (see Definitions 3.5, 3.7). In other terms

$$\mathcal{C}(T_a) = \mathcal{C}(W_a), \quad \mathcal{C}(T_a^{(b)}) = \mathcal{C}(W_a^{(b)}) \quad (125)$$

where $\mathcal{C}(A) \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ denotes the set of classes of vertices appearing in A .

Now, since the matrix $\mathbf{k}$ is irreducible, the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected. Moreover, *walks can visit the same vertices as standard walks: the non-backtracking condition ii) is not restrictive. Indeed a non-backtracking walk (where $\dots dcd \dots$ is never allowed) could only be stuck in a leaf c , that is a vertex of the graph $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\exists ! d \neq c : k_{cd} \geq 1$. But the hypothesis $2 \leq k_c = k_{cc} + k_{cd}$ guarantees that this is not the case for *walks, since either the term $\dots dcd \dots$ or the term $\dots dccd \dots$ is allowed. Therefore for every $f = 1, \dots, n$ there exists a *walk of type $a \dots f$, that is

$$\mathcal{C}(W_a) = \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (126)$$

Now, we claim that also

$$\mathcal{C}(W_a^{(b)}) = \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad (127)$$

namely for every $f = 1, \dots, n$ there exists a *walk of type $ba \dots f$. In order to prove it, let us distinguish three cases:

- if $k_{ab} \geq 2$, then $W_a^{(b)} = W_a$ and (127) follows from (126);
- if $k_{ab} = 1$ and removing the edge (a, b) the graph $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{(a, b)\}$ remains strongly connected, then we have (127) (as before, since condition ii) does not restrict the set of visited vertices);

- if $k_{ab} = 1$ and removing the edge (a, b) the graph $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{(a, b)\}$ is not strongly connected, we denote by $\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b$ its two strongly connected components containing a, b respectively. Since $k_a \geq 2$, there is a *walk $a \dots ca$ of positive length in $\mathcal{G}_a$ that starts from a and comes back to a after visiting all the vertices of $\mathcal{G}_a$; in particular $c \neq b$. Then:

$$W_a^{(b)} \supseteq \{a \dots ca\} \times W_b^{(a)}. \quad (128)$$

Now, there is a *walk $b \dots d$ in $\mathcal{G}_b$ that starts from b and visits all the vertices of $\mathcal{G}_b$. Thus $W_b^{(a)} \supseteq \{b \dots d\}$. Therefore plugging into (128) we get

$$W_a^{(b)} \supseteq \{a \dots cab \dots d\} \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}(W_a^{(b)}) = \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (129)$$

Identity (127) together with (125) conclude the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Remark A.1. $k_1, \dots, k_n \geq 2$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{C}(W_a^{(b)}) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for all $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$. However, if some $k_a = 1$ Corollary 3.22 can be extended, noticing that in this case $\bar{z}_a^{(b)} = h_a$ for $b \in \mathcal{E}_a$, and verifying case-by-case whether for every $(c, d) \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{(a, b)\}$ there exists $f \in \mathcal{C}(W_c^{(d)})$ such that $h_f > 0$.

Definition A.2. Consider the graph $\mathcal{G}$. We say that a couple of vertices (a, b) is *+adjacent* if $a - (b - 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$; we say that (a, b) is *-adjacent* if $a - (b + 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. $\mathcal{G}$ is called *simply cyclic* if

$$k_{ab} > 0 \Leftrightarrow (a, b) \text{ is +adjacent or -adjacent} \quad (130)$$

and $\nexists a, b, c, d \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that ab +adjacent, cd -adjacent, $k_{ab} \geq 2, k_{cd} \geq 2$.

Proof of Lemma 3.25. Let us introduce the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}$ indexed by $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ with entries

$$\tilde{M}_{(a,b),(c,d)} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (a = d, b = c, k_{ac} \geq 2) \text{ or } (a = d, b \neq c) \\ 0 & \text{if } a \neq d \text{ or } (a = d, b = c, k_{ac} = 1) \end{cases} \quad (131)$$

for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}, (c, d) \in \mathcal{E}$. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ have the same positive entries, $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}$ is irreducible if and only if $\mathbf{M}$ is.

Notice that for $s \geq 1$ the element $(\tilde{\mathbf{M}}^s)_{(a,b),(c,d)}$ represents the number of possible *walks on the graph $\mathcal{G}$ (as defined in the Proof of Lemma 3.23) of type $ba \dots dc$ and length $s + 1$. Therefore, in order to prove that the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}$ is irreducible, we have to show that for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}, (c, d) \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists a *walk on $\mathcal{G}$ of type

$$ba \dots dc. \quad (132)$$

In Lemma 3.23 we have already proved that for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}, d \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ there exists a *walk of type

$$ba \dots d. \quad (133)$$

Let us write the latter *walk as $ba\dots ed$. If $k_{dc} \neq 1$ or $e \neq c$, the existence of (132) follows immediately since a possible *walk is $ba\dots edc$. Suppose now $k_{dc} = 1$ and $e = c$, since $k_d \geq 2$ there exists a *walk $ba\dots cdf$ for some $f \neq c$. To continue from df we have the following alternatives:

- if $k_{fd} \geq 2$, then we can backtrack and $ba\dots cdfdc$ is a possible *walk;
- if $k_{fd} = 1$, since $k_f \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected and not a simple cycle, there exists a *walk of type $dfg\dots hf$ with $g, h \neq d$. Then $hfdc$ is a possible *walk. Gluing them together we find the desired *walk: $ba\dots cdfg\dots hfdc$.

□

B Correlation Inequalities

In this second Appendix we report the classical GKS (Griffiths-Kelly-Sherman) [31, 32], FKG (Fortuin-Kasteleyn-Ginibre) [35] and GHS (Griffiths-Hurst-Sherman) [33, 34] correlation inequalities, which are involved in many proofs of the present paper.

We consider an Ising spin system of N binary spins, $\sigma_i = \{-1, +1\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, on a general graph $G_N(V, E)$, $|V| = N$, with Hamiltonian

$$H(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = - \sum_{ij \in E} \beta_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_{i \in V} h_i \sigma_i \quad (134)$$

Under the Gibbs (Boltzmann) measure

$$\mu_I(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \frac{e^{-H(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} e^{-H(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}} \quad (135)$$

so expressing the average of an observable (function of the spins) as

$$\langle f(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \frac{f(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) e^{-H(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} e^{-H(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}} \quad (136)$$

the following inequalities, under the corresponding assumptions on the Hamiltonian, hold. Before listing the inequalities, let us also recall that defining $m_i = \langle \sigma_i \rangle$ we have that $\frac{\partial m_i}{\partial h_j} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle - \langle \sigma_i \rangle \langle \sigma_j \rangle$ and

$$\frac{\partial^2 m_i}{\partial h_j \partial h_k} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k \rangle + 2 \langle \sigma_i \rangle \langle \sigma_j \rangle \langle \sigma_k \rangle - (\langle \sigma_i \rangle \langle \sigma_j \sigma_k \rangle + \langle \sigma_j \rangle \langle \sigma_i \sigma_k \rangle + \langle \sigma_k \rangle \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle).$$

Theorem B.1 (GKS inequalities). *If $h_i \geq 0 \forall i$, $\beta_{ij} \geq 0 \forall i, j$ then*

$$\langle \sigma_A \sigma_B \rangle \geq \langle \sigma_A \rangle \langle \sigma_B \rangle \quad (137)$$

where $A, B \subseteq V$ and $\sigma_A = \prod_{i \in A} \sigma_i$.

Remark B.2. Under the conditions of the GKS, $\forall i, j, k, l$

$$\frac{\partial m_i}{\partial h_j} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle - \langle \sigma_i \rangle \langle \sigma_j \rangle \geq 0 \quad (138)$$

$$\frac{\partial m_i}{\partial \beta_{jk}} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k \rangle - \langle \sigma_i \rangle \langle \sigma_j \sigma_k \rangle \geq 0 \quad (139)$$

$$\frac{\partial \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle}{\partial h_k} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k \rangle - \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle \langle \sigma_k \rangle \geq 0 \quad (140)$$

$$\frac{\partial \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle}{\partial \beta_{kl}} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k \sigma_l \rangle - \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle \langle \sigma_k \sigma_l \rangle \geq 0 \quad (141)$$

Theorem B.3 (FKG inequalities). *For any external fields $h_i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i$, for $\beta_{ij} \geq 0 \forall i, j$, if $f(\vec{\sigma})$ and $g(\vec{\sigma})$ are increasing functions of the spins, in the sense that $f(\vec{\sigma}) := f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_N)$ is such that*

$$f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i = -1, \dots, \sigma_N) \leq f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i = 1, \dots, \sigma_N) \quad (142)$$

for any i , and same for $g(\vec{\sigma})$; then

$$\langle fg \rangle \geq \langle f \rangle \langle g \rangle \quad (143)$$

Remark B.4. If $\beta_{ij} \geq 0, \forall i, j$

$$\frac{\partial m_i}{\partial h_j} = \langle \sigma_i \sigma_j \rangle - \langle \sigma_i \rangle \langle \sigma_j \rangle \geq 0 \quad (144)$$

(since we apply FKG inequality choosing $f(\vec{\sigma}) = \sigma_i$ and $g(\vec{\sigma}) = \sigma_j$, both increasing functions).

Theorem B.5 (GHS inequalities). *If $h_i \geq 0 \forall i$, $\beta_{ij} \geq 0 \forall i, j$ then*

$$\frac{\partial^2 m_i}{\partial h_j \partial h_k} \leq 0 \quad (145)$$

$\forall i, j, k$ not necessarily distinct.

Proof of Remark 3.15. Consider the following $\mathbf{k}$ -regular trees:

- T_1 of depth t and positive boundary conditions obtained by fixing the fields of the spins at the boundary to $+\infty$
- T_2 of depth $t+1$, with positive infinite fields not only at the last generation, but also at the generation t
- T_3 of depth $t+1$, with positive infinite fields at the last generation

For any $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_a^{(b)}(s-1, +\infty) &\equiv z_a^{(b)}(s-1, T_1) = z_a^{(b)}(s, T_2) & s \geq 1 \\ z_a^{(b)}(s, +\infty) &\equiv z_a^{(b)}(s, T_1) = z_a^{(b)}(s, T_3) & s \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

where the boundary (and second-last generation) conditions are specified through $T_{1/2/3}$.

For transforming T_2 into T_3 we have to remove the fields at the t -th generation, thus the GKS inequalities (138) hold and

$$z_a^{(b)}(s, T_2) \geq z_a^{(b)}(s, T_3) \quad s \geq 0 \quad (147)$$

Thus, inserting (146), we obtain

$$z_a^{(b)}(s-1, +\infty) \geq z_a^{(b)}(s, +\infty) \quad s \geq 1 \quad (148)$$

which proves the monotonic non-increasing behaviour of the recursion for $h_* = +\infty$.

For free boundary conditions ($h_* = 0$), we consider the following $\mathbf{k}$ -regular trees:

- T_1 of depth t and all free boundary conditions (in the sense that there is no added field at the boundary, $h_* = 0$)
- T_2 of depth $t+1$, with no added fields at the boundary and no edges among the spins of the last and second-last generations
- T_3 of depth $t+1$, with no added field at the boundary

Analogously, for any $(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_a^{(b)}(s-1, 0) &\equiv z_a^{(b)}(s-1, T_1) = z_a^{(b)}(s, T_2) & s \geq 1 \\ z_a^{(b)}(s, 0) &\equiv z_a^{(b)}(s, T_1) = z_a^{(b)}(s, T_3) & s \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

For transforming T_2 into T_3 we have to add to T_2 the the missing ferromagnetic couplings between the last two generations. As we only increase the weight of some edges, the GKS inequalities (139) hold and

$$z_a^{(b)}(s, T_2) \leq z_a^{(b)}(s, T_3) \quad s \geq 0 \quad (150)$$

Thus, inserting (149), we obtain

$$z_a^{(b)}(s-1, 0) \leq z_a^{(b)}(s, 0) \quad s \geq 1 \quad (151)$$

which proves the monotonic non-decreasing behaviour of the recursion for $h_* = 0$. $\square$

Proof of Remark 3.17. By applying the chain rule, we obtain

$$\frac{d^2 z_a^{(b)}(s, h_*)}{dh_*^2} = \frac{d}{dh_*} \sum_{l=1, \dots, n} \frac{\partial z_a^{(b)}(s, h_*)}{\partial h'_{*l}} = \sum_{l, p=1, \dots, n} \frac{\partial^2 z_a^{(b)}(s, h_*)}{\partial h'_{*p} \partial h'_{*l}} \leq 0 \quad (152)$$

where $h'_{*l} = h_l + h_*$. The last inequality follows from the GHS theorem (B.5), as the fields and couplings are all non-negative. $\square$

Acknowledgements

PC and EM was supported by the EU H2020 ICT48 project Humane AI Net contract number 952026; by the Italian Extended Partnership PE01 - FAIR Future Artificial Intelligence Research - Proposal code PE00000013 under the MUR National Recovery and Resilience Plan; by the project PRIN 2022 - Proposal code: J53D23003690006. The work is partially supported by GNFM (Indam), EU H2020 ICT48 project Humane AI Net. The authors are affiliated to GNFM INdAM.

References

- [1] Marc Mezard and Andrea Montanari. *Information, physics, and computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [2] Remco Van Der Hofstad. *Random graphs and complex networks*. Vol. 1. Cambridge university press, 2016.
- [3] Remco Van Der Hofstad. *Random graphs and complex networks*. Vol. 2. Cambridge university press, 2024.
- [4] M Leone et al. “Ferromagnetic ordering in graphs with arbitrary degree distribution”. In: *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* 28 (2002), pp. 191–197.
- [5] Luca De Sanctis and Francesco Guerra. “Mean field dilute ferromagnet: high temperature and zero temperature behavior”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 132 (2008), pp. 759–785.
- [6] Amir Dembo and Andrea Montanari. “Ising models on locally tree-like graphs”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability, Vol. 20* (2010).
- [7] Amir Dembo and Andrea Montanari. “Gibbs measures and phase transitions on sparse random graphs”. In: *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics* (2010).
- [8] Andrea Montanari, Elchanan Mossel, and Allan Sly. “The weak limit of Ising models on locally tree-like graphs”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 152 (2012), pp. 31–51.
- [9] Sander Dommers, Cristian Giardinà, and Remco van der Hofstad. “Ising critical exponents on random trees and graphs”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 328 (2014), pp. 355–395.
- [10] Amir Dembo, Andrea Montanari, and Nike Sun. “Factor models on locally tree-like graphs”. In: *The Annals of Probability, Vol. 41*, (2013).
- [11] Amir Dembo et al. “The replica symmetric solution for Potts models on d-regular graphs”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 327.2 (2014), pp. 551–575.
- [12] Pierluigi Contucci et al. “Antiferromagnetic Potts model on the Erdős-Rényi random graph”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 323 (2013), pp. 517–554.
- [13] Lenka Zdeborová and Marc Mézard. “The number of matchings in random graphs”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2006.05 (2006), P05003.
- [14] C Bordenave, M Lelarge, and J Salez. “Matchings on infinite graphs”. In: *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* (2012). DOI: 10.1007/s00440-012-0453-0.
- [15] Diego Alberici and Pierluigi Contucci. “Solution of the Monomer–Dimer Model on Locally Tree-Like Graphs. Rigorous Results”. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 331 (2014), pp. 975–1003.

- [16] David Aldous and Russell Lyons. “Processes on unimodular random networks”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* (2007).
- [17] Ignacio Gallo and Pierluigi Contucci. “Bipartite mean field spin systems. Existence and solution”. English. In: *Math. Phys. Electron. J.* 14 (2008). Id/No 1, p. 21. ISSN: 1086-6655.
- [18] Micaela Fedele and Pierluigi Contucci. “Scaling Limits for Multi-species Statistical Mechanics Mean-Field Models”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 144 (Nov. 2010), pp. 1186–1205. DOI: 10.1007/s10955-011-0334-4.
- [19] Matthias Löwe and Kristina Schubert. “Fluctuations for block spin Ising models”. In: *Electronic Communications in Probability* 23.none (2018), pp. 1–12. DOI: 10.1214/18-ECP161. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-ECP161>.
- [20] Werner Kirsch and Gabor Toth. “Two Groups in a Curie-Weiss Model”. In: *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* 23 (May 2020). DOI: 10.1007/s11040-020-09343-5.
- [21] Francesca Collet. “Macroscopic limit of a bipartite Curie-Weiss model: a dynamical approach”. English. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 157.6 (2014), pp. 1301–1319. ISSN: 0022-4715. DOI: 10.1007/s10955-014-1105-9.
- [22] Adriano Barra et al. “Multi-Species Mean Field Spin Glasses. Rigorous Results”. In: *Annales Institut Henri Poincaré* 16 (2013).
- [23] Dmitry Panchenko. “The free energy in a multi-species Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model”. In: *Annals of Probability* 43 (2015).
- [24] S. Dey Partha and Qiang Wu. “Fluctuation Results for Multi-species Sherrington-Kirkpatrick Model in the Replica Symmetric Regime”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 185 (2021).
- [25] Erik Bates, Leila Sloman, and Youngtak Sohn. “Replica symmetry breaking in multi-species Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 174 (2018).
- [26] Jinho Baik and Ji Oon Lee. “Free energy of bipartite spherical Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model”. In: *Annales Institut Henri Poincaré* 56 (2020).
- [27] Diego Alberici, Pierluigi Contucci, and Emanuele Mingione. “Deep Boltzmann Machines: rigorous results at arbitrary depth”. In: *Annales Institut Henri Poincaré* (2021).
- [28] J. Mourrat. “Nonconvex interactions in mean-field spin glasses”. In: *Prob. Math. Phys.* 2 (2021). DOI: 10.2140/pmp.2021.2.61.
- [29] Hong-Bin Chen and Jean-Christophe Mourrat. *On the free energy of vector spin glasses with non-convex interactions*. Oct. 2023. arXiv: 2311.08980 [cond-mat.dis-nn].
- [30] Diego Alberici et al. “The solution of the deep Boltzmann machine on the Nishimori line”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* (July 2021). DOI: 10.1007/s00220-021-04165-0.

- [31] Robert B Griffiths. “Correlations in Ising ferromagnets. I”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 8.3 (1967), pp. 478–483.
- [32] Douglas G Kelly and Seymour Sherman. “General Griffiths’ inequalities on correlations in Ising ferromagnets”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 9.3 (1968), pp. 466–484.
- [33] Robert B Griffiths, Charles A Hurst, and Seymour Sherman. “Concavity of magnetization of an Ising ferromagnet in a positive external field”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 11.3 (1970), pp. 790–795.
- [34] Joel L Lebowitz. “GHS and other inequalities”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 35.2 (1974), pp. 87–92.
- [35] Cees M Fortuin, Pieter W Kasteleyn, and Jean Ginibre. “Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 22 (1971), pp. 89–103.
- [36] Anatoly I Larkin. “Effect of inhomogeneties on the structure of the mixed state of superconductors”. In: *Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics* 31 (1970), p. 784.
- [37] Florent Krzakala, Federico Ricci-Tersenghi, and Lenka Zdeborová. “Elusive spin-glass phase in the random field Ising model”. In: *Physical review letters* 104.20 (2010), p. 207208.
- [38] Joseph Klafter and Ping Sheng. “The Coulomb quasigap and the metal-insulator transition in granular systems”. In: *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* 17.3 (1984), p. L93.
- [39] Pierre-Gilles De Gennes. “Liquid-liquid demixing inside a rigid network. Qualitative features”. In: *The journal of Physical Chemistry* 88.26 (1984), pp. 6469–6472.
- [40] Serge Galam. “Rational group decision making: A random field Ising model at $T = 0$ ”. In: *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 238.1-4 (1997), pp. 66–80.
- [41] Filippo Zimmaro, Serge Galam, and Marco Alberto Javarone. “Asymmetric games on networks: mapping to Ising models and bounded rationality”. In: *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* (2024).
- [42] Mark Kempton. “Non-backtracking random walks and a weighted Ihara’s theorem”. In: *Open journal of Discrete Mathematics* (2016).
- [43] Cory Glover and Mark Kempton. “Spectral properties of the non-backtracking matrix of a graph”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09385* (2020).
- [44] Nelson Dunford et al. *Spectral theory: self adjoint operators in Hilbert space*. 1963.