

U -statistics on bipartite exchangeable networks

Tâm Le Minh¹

¹ *Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR MIA-Paris, 75005, Paris, France, e-mail: tam.le-minh@inrae.fr*

Abstract:

U -statistics are used to estimate a population parameter by averaging a function on a subsample over all the subsamples of the population. In this paper, the population we are interested in is formed by the entries of a row-column exchangeable matrix. We consider U -statistics derived from functions of quadruplets, i.e. submatrices of size 2×2 . We prove a weak convergence result for these U -statistics in the general case and we establish a Central Limit Theorem when the matrix is also dissociated. Since row-column exchangeable matrices are an actual representation for exchangeable bipartite networks, we apply these results to statistical inference in network analysis.

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 60F05; secondary 60G09, 62G20.

Keywords and phrases: U -statistics, row-column exchangeability, Central Limit Theorem, network inference.

1. Introduction

U-statistics U -statistics form a large class of statistics with powerful properties for many purposes such as estimation and hypothesis testing. They are built as the average of a given function on a subsample of a population, called kernel, applied to all the subsamples taken from this population. The population usually consists of i.i.d. individuals. In this case, [Hoeffding \(1948\)](#) gives a Central Limit Theorem (CLT), which ensures their asymptotic normality. For non-i.i.d. cases, similar results ([Nandi and Sen, 1963](#)) exist when the population is exchangeable, i.e. when the joint distribution of a subsample only depends on its size or equivalently for any finite permutation σ ,

$$(Y_1, Y_2, \dots) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (Y_{\sigma(1)}, Y_{\sigma(2)}, \dots).$$

In these cases, it is convenient to view the kernel h taken on each subsample of size k as a random variable indexed by k -tuple, e.g. $X_{\mathbf{i}} = X_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k} := h(Y_{i_1}, Y_{i_2}, \dots, Y_{i_k})$ and the U -statistic is therefore a sum of random variables. If the population is exchangeable, then the array X is not necessarily exchangeable, but it is jointly exchangeable, i.e. for any sequence of k -tuples $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \dots)$ and for any finite permutation σ ,

$$(X_{\mathbf{i}}, X_{\mathbf{j}}, \dots) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (X_{\sigma(i_1)\sigma(i_2)\dots\sigma(i_k)}, X_{\sigma(j_1)\sigma(j_2)\dots\sigma(j_k)}, \dots).$$

A CLT exists for sums of jointly exchangeable variables, which has been proven by [Eagleson and Weber \(1978\)](#).

RCE matrices In our paper, we are interested in a more complex invariance structure in the data. In network analysis, the exchangeability of all the entries of the adjacency matrix Y means that all the edges are exchangeable. For data such as social or ecological interaction networks, one may rather consider the exchangeability of the nodes of the networks.

In bipartite networks, featuring two types of nodes, interactions can only happen between nodes of different types. Then, on the adjacency matrix Y , the rows and the columns represent the two different types of individual and each entry Y_{ij} represents the interaction between the individuals i (of type 1) and j (of type 2).

If the nodes of the same type are exchangeable, then the rows and columns of Y are separately exchangeable. This property on Y is called row-column exchangeability (RCE). Denoting \mathbb{S}_n the symmetric group of order n , we say that Y is a RCE matrix if for any $\Phi = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathbb{S}_m \times \mathbb{S}_n$,

$$\Phi Y \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Y,$$

where $\Phi Y := (Y_{\sigma_1(i)\sigma_2(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n}$.

The WBEDD model As an example of model for RCE matrices, we consider two versions of the Weighted Bipartite Expected Degree Distribution (WBEDD) model, which is a weighted, bipartite and exchangeable extension of the Expected Degree Sequence model ([Chung and Lu, 2002](#); [Ouadah, Latouche and Robin, 2021](#)). For binary graphs, the degree of a node is the number of edges that stem from it. For weighted graphs, the equivalent notion is the sum of the weights of these edges. It is sometimes called node strength ([Barrat et al., 2004](#)), but we will simply refer to it as node weight. The WBEDD model draws the node weights from two distributions, characterised by real functions f and g . The expected edge weights Y_{ij} are then proportional to the expected weights of the involved nodes. The model can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i, \eta_j &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}[0, 1] \\ Y_{ij} \mid \xi_i, \eta_j &\sim \mathcal{L}(\lambda f(\xi_i)g(\eta_j)). \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{L} is a family of probability distributions over positive real numbers such that the expectation of $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$ is μ and f and g are normalized by the condition $\int f = \int g = 1$. Conditionnally to λ , U_i and V_j , the expected weight of the i -th row is $\lambda f(U_i)$ and the expected weight of the j -th column is $\lambda g(V_j)$. Consequently, λ is the mean intensity of the network. The two versions of the WBEDD are:

Version 1 λ is constant,

Version 2 λ is a positive random variable.

Contribution Our contribution applies to RCE matrices Y of size $m \times n$. We consider U -statistics based on submatrices of size 2×2 , that we call quadruplets

$$Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}} := \begin{pmatrix} Y_{i_1 j_1} & Y_{i_1 j_2} \\ Y_{i_2 j_1} & Y_{i_2 j_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Their kernels are real functions h over quadruplets which present the following symmetry property : for any matrix Y ,

$$h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) = h(Y_{\{2,1;1,2\}}) = h(Y_{\{1,2;2,1\}}) = h(Y_{\{2,1;2,1\}}). \quad (1)$$

Applied to a matrix of size $m \times n$, a quadruplet U -statistic is then defined by

$$U_{m,n}^h = \binom{m}{2}^{-1} \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n}} h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}}),$$

where $\binom{m}{2}$ is the number of 2-combinations from m elements. For simplicity, we denote

$$X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} := h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}}).$$

However, contrarily to the case where Y is fully exchangeable, X is not jointly exchangeable due to the more complex structure of invariance of Y . Therefore, the result of [Eagleson and Weber \(1978\)](#) does not apply to our U -statistics. Our aim is to establish a weak convergence theorem similar to that of [Eagleson and Weber \(1978\)](#), but for our quadruplet U -statistics over RCE matrices. From that, we derive a CLT result in the case where the RCE matrices are dissociated, i.e. any of its submatrices with disjoint indexing sets are independent.

Finally, we apply our results to bipartite weighted network analysis. We explain the implications of the two versions of the WBEDD model and how our theorems apply to both of them. We suggest a method to perform statistical inference on these models using quadruplet U -statistics and we discuss how one can extend it.

Outline The weak convergence theorem in the general case and the CLT in the dissociated case are presented and proven in [Section 2](#). We shed further light on the difference between the dissociated and the non-dissociated cases using the Aldous-Hoover representation theorem. [Section 3](#) gives some examples of application of the CLT to statistical inference on network data.

2. Main result

2.1. Asymptotic framework

Our results apply in an asymptotic framework where the numbers of rows and columns of Y grow at the same rate, i.e. $m/(m+n) \rightarrow c$ and at each step, only one row or one column is added to the matrix Y . Now, we build a sequence of dimensions $(m_N, n_N)_{N \geq 1}$ that satisfies these conditions.

Definition 2.1 (Sequences of dimensions). Let c be an irrational number such that $0 < c < 1$. For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $m_N = 2 + \lfloor c(N+1) \rfloor$ and $n_N = 2 + \lfloor (1-c)(N+1) \rfloor$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function.

Proposition 2.2. m_N and n_N satisfy:

1. $\frac{m_N}{m_N + n_N} \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} c$,
2. $m_N + n_N = 4 + N$, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Corollary 2.3. At each iteration $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, one and only one of these two propositions is true:

1. $m_N = m_{N-1} + 1$ and $n_N = n_{N-1}$,
2. $n_N = n_{N-1} + 1$ and $m_N = m_{N-1}$.

Throughout the paper, only sequences satisfying Definition 2.1 are considered. Such sequences m_N and n_N satisfy the desired growth conditions (proof given in Appendix A). We define the sequence of U -statistics as $U_N^h := U_{m_N, n_N}^h$.

2.2. Theorems

We establish the following results on the asymptotic behaviour of U -statistics over RCE matrices.

Theorem 2.4 (Main theorem). Let Y be a RCE matrix. Let h be a quadruplet kernel such that $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$. Let $\mathcal{F}_N = \sigma((U_{kl}^h, k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N))$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_N$. Set $U_\infty^h = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty]$ and

$$V = \frac{4}{c} \text{Cov}(h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}), h(Y_{\{1,3;3,4\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty) + \frac{4}{1-c} \text{Cov}(h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}), h(Y_{\{3,4;1,3\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty).$$

If V is positive, then

$$\sqrt{N}(U_N^h - U_\infty^h) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} W,$$

where W is a random variable with characteristic function $\phi(t) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2V)]$.

Theorem 2.4 states that the limit distribution of $\sqrt{N}(U_N^h - U_\infty^h)$ is a mixture of Gaussians, but we see that if V is constant, then it is a simple Gaussian. Next we identify a class of models where the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{N}(U_N^h - U_\infty^h)$ is a simple Gaussian.

Definition 2.5. Y is a dissociated matrix if and only if $(Y_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m', 1 \leq j \leq n'}$ is independent of $(Y_{ij})_{m' < i \leq m, n' < j \leq n}$, for all m' and n' such that $1 \leq m' \leq m-1$ and $1 \leq n' \leq n-1$.

In other words, Y is dissociated if submatrices that are not sharing any row or column are independent. Now we claim the following extension to Theorem 2.4 for dissociated RCE matrices.

Theorem 2.6. *In addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4, if Y is dissociated, then U_∞^h and V are constant and*

$$\sqrt{N}(U_N^h - U_\infty^h) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, V),$$

More precisely,

1. $U_\infty^h = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})]$,
2. $V = \frac{4}{c} \text{Cov}(h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}), h(Y_{\{1,3;3,4\}})) + \frac{4}{1-c} \text{Cov}(h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}), h(Y_{\{3,4;1,3\}}))$.

2.3. The Aldous-Hoover theorem

We shall explain this result in the light of the Aldous-Hoover representation theorem. Theorem 1.4 of Aldous (1981) states that for any RCE matrix Y , there exists a real function f such that if we denote $Y_{ij}^* = f(\alpha, \xi_i, \eta_j, \zeta_{ij})$, for $1 \leq i, j < \infty$, where the α, ξ_i, η_j and ζ_{ij} are i.i.d. random variables with uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$, then

$$Y \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Y^*.$$

It is possible to identify the role of each of the random variables involved in the representation theorem. We notice that each Y_{ij} is determined by α, ξ_i, η_j and ζ_{ij} . ζ_{ij} is entry-specific while ξ_i is shared by all the entries involving the row i and η_j by the ones involving the column j . Therefore, the ξ_i and η_j represent the contribution of each individual of type 1 and type 2 of the network, i.e. each row and column of the matrix. These contributions are i.i.d., which makes the network exchangeable. Finally, α is global to the whole network and shared by all entries.

Proposition 3.3 of Aldous (1981) states that if Y is dissociated, then Y^* can be written without α , i.e. it is of the form $Y_{ij}^* = f(\xi_i, \eta_j, \zeta_{ij})$, for $1 \leq i, j < \infty$. In this case, because the ξ_i, η_j and ζ_{ij} are i.i.d., averaging with the U -statistic over an increasing number of nodes nullifies the contribution of each individual interaction (ζ_{ij}) and node (ξ_i and η_j). In the general case, i.e. when Y is not dissociated, then conditionally on α , Y is dissociated. It is easy to see that the mixture of Gaussians from Theorem 2.4 results from this conditioning.

We can also state with ease that Theorem 2.4 can be applied to matrices Y generated by the two versions of the WBEDD model. Theorem 2.6 only applies to Version 1, where the matrix is dissociated. Indeed, we see that in both models conditionally on λ , the expected mean of the interactions of any submatrix is λ . Therefore any 2 submatrices are independent if λ is constant. We could also have noticed that λ is determined by the α from the representation theorem of Aldous-Hoover.

In practice, dissociated exchangeable random graph models are widely spread. Notably, a RCE model is dissociated if and only if it can be written as a W -graph (or graphon), i.e. it is defined by a distribution \mathcal{W} depending on two

parameters in $[0, 1]$ such that for $1 \leq i, j < \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i, \eta_j &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{U}[0, 1] \\ Y_{ij} \mid \xi_i, \eta_j &\sim \mathcal{W}(\xi_i, \eta_j) \end{aligned}$$

In this definition, it is easy to recognize the variables from the representation theorem of Aldous-Hoover. We simply identify the ξ_i and η_j , then it suffices to take $\phi_{\xi_i, \eta_j}^{-1}$ the inverse distribution function of $\mathcal{W}(\xi_i, \eta_j)$ to see that defining the dissociated RCE matrix Y^* such that $Y_{ij}^* = f(\xi_i, \eta_j, \zeta_{ij}) := \phi_{\xi_i, \eta_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{ij})$ fulfills $Y^* \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Y$. It is also straightforward to remark that unlike Version 2, Version 1 of the WBEDD model can be written as a W -graph model, setting $\mathcal{W}(\xi_i, \eta_j) := \mathcal{L}(\lambda f(\xi_i)g(\eta_j))$.

2.4. Proof of Theorem 2.4

To prove Theorem 2.4, we adapt the proof of [Eagleson and Weber \(1978\)](#) establishing the asymptotic normality of sums of backward martingale differences. The definition of a backward martingale is reminded in [Appendix B](#).

Theorem 2.7 ([Eagleson and Weber, 1978](#)). *Let $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a square-integrable reverse martingale, V a \mathcal{F} -measurable, a.s. finite, positive random variable. Denote $M_\infty := \mathbb{E}[M_1 | \mathcal{F}_\infty]$ where $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n$. Set $Z_{nk} := \sqrt{n}(M_k - M_{k+1})$. If:*

1. $\sum_{k=n}^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_{nk}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k+1}] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} V$ (asymptotic variances),
2. for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\sum_{k=n}^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_{nk}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_{nk}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k+1}] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$ (conditional Lindeberg condition),

then $\sum_{k=n}^\infty Z_{nk} = \sqrt{n}(M_n - M_\infty) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} W$, where W is a random variable with characteristic function $\phi(t) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2V)]$.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. The three steps to apply Theorem 2.7 to $(M_N)_{N \geq 1} = (U_N^h)_{N \geq 1}$ are to show that it is a backward martingale for a well chosen filtration and that it fulfills conditions 1 and 2. The expression of V is made explicit along the way. More precisely,

1. first, defining $\mathcal{F}_N = \sigma((U_{kl}^h, k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N))$, [Proposition C.1](#) states that $(U_N^h, \mathcal{F}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is indeed a square-integrable reverse martingale ;
2. then, [Proposition D.1](#) implies that $\sum_{K=N}^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_{NK}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{K+1}]$ does converge to a random variable V with the desired expression ;
3. finally, the conditional Lindeberg condition is ensured by [Proposition E.1](#), since from it, we deduce that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $\sum_{K=N}^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_{NK}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_{NK}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{K+1}] \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$.

Hence, if V is positive, Theorem 2.7 can be applied to U_N^h and we obtain that $\sqrt{N}(U_N^h - U_\infty^h) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} W$, where W is a random variable with characteristic

function $\phi(t) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}t^2V)]$. The proofs of Propositions C.1, D.1 and E.1 are provided in Appendices C, D, and E respectively. \square

2.5. Proof of Theorem 2.6

The proof of Theorem 2.6 relies on a Hewitt-Savage type zero-one law for events that are permutable in our row-column setup. Therefore, it is useful to define first what a row-column permutable event is. We remind the Aldous-Hoover representation theorem for dissociated RCE matrices as stated earlier: if Y is a dissociated RCE matrix, then its distribution can be written with $(\xi_i)_{1 \leq i < m_N}$, $(\eta_j)_{1 \leq j < n_N}$ and $(\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m_N, 1 \leq j \leq n_N}$ arrays of i.i.d. random variables.

Then let us consider such arrays of i.i.d. random variables $(\xi_i)_{1 \leq i < m_N}$, $(\eta_j)_{1 \leq j < n_N}$ and $(\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m_N, 1 \leq j \leq n_N}$. If we were to consider events depending only on them, there is no loss of generality in using the product probability space $(\Omega_N, \mathcal{A}_N, \mathbb{P}_N)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_N &= \{(\omega^\xi, \omega^\eta, \omega^\zeta) : \omega^\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{m_N}, \omega^\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_N}, \omega^\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{m_N n_N}\} = \mathbb{R}^{m_N + n_N + m_N n_N}, \\ \mathcal{A}_N &= \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})^{m_N + n_N + m_N n_N}, \\ \mathbb{P}_N &= \mu^{m_N + n_N + m_N n_N}.\end{aligned}$$

We then define the action of a row-column permutation on an element of Ω_N .

Definition 2.8. Let $\Phi = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathbb{S}_{m_N} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_N}$. The action of Φ on $\omega \in \Omega_N$ is defined by

$$\Phi\omega = (\sigma_1\omega^\xi, \sigma_2\omega^\eta, (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)\omega^\zeta)$$

where $\sigma_1\omega^\xi = (\omega_{\sigma_1(i)}^\xi)_{1 \leq i < m_N}$, $\sigma_2\omega^\eta = (\omega_{\sigma_2(j)}^\eta)_{1 \leq j < n_N}$ and $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)\omega^\zeta = (\omega_{\sigma_1(i)\sigma_2(j)}^\zeta)_{1 \leq i < m_N, 1 \leq j < n_N}$

Definition 2.9. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_N$. A is invariant by the action of $\mathbb{S}_{m_N} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_N}$ if and only if for all $\Phi \in \mathbb{S}_{m_N} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_N}$, $\Phi^{-1}A = A$, i.e.

$$\{\omega : \Phi\omega \in A\} = \{\omega : \omega \in A\}.$$

Notation. In this section, we denote by \mathcal{E}_N the collection of events of \mathcal{A}_N that are invariant by row-column permutations of size $m_N \times n_N$, i.e. $\Phi \in \mathbb{S}_{m_N} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_N}$. We denote $\mathcal{E}_\infty := \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{E}_N$, which is the collection of events that are invariant by permutations of size $m_N \times n_N$, for all N .

The following theorem is an extension of the Hewitt-Savage zero-one law to the row-column setup.

Theorem 2.10. *For all $A \in \mathcal{E}_\infty$, $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$ or $\mathbb{P}(A) = 1$.*

The proof of Theorem 2.10 is given in Appendix F. Now we use this result to derive Theorem 2.6 from Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. In this proof, we specify the matrices over which the U -statistics are taken, i.e. we denote $U_{k,l}^h(Y)$ instead of $U_{k,l}^h$ the U -statistic of size $k \times l$ with kernel h taken on Y . We denote also $\mathcal{F}_N(Y) = \sigma((U_{kl}^h(Y), k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N))$ which are sets of events depending on Y .

Since Y is RCE and dissociated, Proposition 3.3 of Aldous (1981) allows us to consider a real function f such that for $1 \leq i, j < \infty$, $Y_{ij}^* = f(\xi_i, \eta_j, \zeta_{ij})$ and $Y^* \stackrel{D}{=} Y$, where ξ_i , η_j and ζ_{ij} , for $1 \leq i, j < \infty$ are i.i.d. random variables with uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Therefore we can consider these random variables, the product spaces $(\Omega_N, \mathcal{A}_N, \mathbb{P}_N)$ and the sets \mathcal{E}_N of invariant events defined earlier.

But $\mathcal{F}_N(Y^*) = \sigma((U_{kl}^h(Y^*), k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N)) \subset \sigma(U_N(Y^*), \xi_i, \eta_j, \zeta_{ij}, i > m_N, j > n_N)$, so for all N , $\mathcal{F}_N(Y^*) \subset \mathcal{E}_N$. It follows that $\mathcal{F}_\infty(Y^*) \subset \mathcal{E}_\infty$, so $U_\infty(Y^*)$ is $\mathcal{F}_\infty(Y^*)$ -measurable. Theorem 2.10 states that all the events in \mathcal{E}_∞ happen with probability 0 or 1, so it ensures that $U_\infty(Y^*) = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}^*) | \mathcal{F}_\infty(Y^*)] = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}^*)]$ is constant. Moreover, since the distribution of $U_N^h(Y)$ is the same as this of $U_N^h(Y^*)$, we can conclude that $U_\infty(Y) = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty(Y)] = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})]$.

Likewise, we deduce that $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})h(Y_{\{1,3;3,4\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty(Y)] = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})h(Y_{\{1,3;3,4\}})]$ and $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})h(Y_{\{3,4;1,3\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty(Y)] = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})h(Y_{\{3,4;1,3\}})]$ which gives the desired result for V . Thus we conclude that W of Theorem 2.4 follows a Gaussian distribution of variance V . □

3. Applications

In this section, we illustrate how the results from the previous section can be used for statistical inference for network data through different examples. First, we show how one might exploit different kernels to estimate the row heterogeneity in a WBEDD network (Version 1 with constant density), with the use of the delta-method. Next, we extend this first example to build a statistical test to compare the row heterogeneity of two networks. Finally, we highlight the fact that it is easy to define other interesting statistical tests using the same approach. We also discuss the computation cost of the U -statistics.

3.1. Heterogeneity in the row weights of a network

In this first example, we are interested in assessing the heterogeneity of the row weights of a network. In the WBEDD model, the expected weight of the row node i is $\lambda f(U_i)$ where U_i follows a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Therefore, the variance of the expected weight of a row node is $\lambda^2(\int_0^1 f^2(u)du - 1)$ and the heterogeneity of the rows can be quantified by $F_2 := \int_0^1 f^2(u)du$. In the example of an interaction network, if f is constant, i.e. $f \equiv 1$ and $F_2 = 1$, then the row expected weight is constant and the row weight distribution is homogeneous, with all the row individuals having around the same number of interactions. Besides, the higher F_2 is, the more this distribution is unbalanced. In ecology, a large value of F_2 indicates a strong distinction between generalist (with high degree) and specialists (with low degree) species.

General method F_2 can be estimated with the U -statistic based on the quadruplet kernel h_1 defined as

$$h_1(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]}) = \frac{1}{2}(Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_1 j_2} + Y_{i_2 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2}).$$

We see that $\mathbb{E}[U_N^{h_1}] = \mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}})] = \lambda^2 F_2$. So Theorem 2.6 and the derivation of V gives the following result :

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{V}}(U_N^{h_1} - \lambda^2 F_2) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (2)$$

where

$$V = \frac{\lambda^4}{c}(F_4 - F_2^2) + \frac{4\lambda^4}{1-c}F_2^2(G_2 - 1). \quad (3)$$

h	$h(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]})$	$\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}})]$
h_1	$\frac{1}{2}(Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_1 j_2} + Y_{i_2 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2})$	$\lambda^2 F_2$
h_2	$\frac{1}{2}(Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2} + Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_2 j_1})$	λ^2
h_3	$\frac{1}{2}(Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_1} + Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_2 j_2})$	$\lambda^2 G_2$
h_4	$\frac{1}{2}((Y_{i_1 j_1}^2 - Y_{i_1 j_1})(Y_{i_1 j_2}^2 - Y_{i_1 j_2}) + (Y_{i_2 j_1}^2 - Y_{i_2 j_1})(Y_{i_2 j_2}^2 - Y_{i_2 j_2}))$	$\lambda^4 F_4 G_2^2$

TABLE 1

Kernels h_1 to h_4 and their expectations

In order to exploit this result, we have to estimate the remaining unknown quantities λ^2 , G_2 and F_4 . We use the kernels listed in Table 1. First, from h_2 , we build $U_N^{h_2}$ a consistent estimator of λ^2 . It follows from Slutsky's theorem that

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{V}}U_N^{h_2} \left(\frac{U_N^{h_1}}{U_N^{h_2}} - F_2 \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (4)$$

This result allows us to state that $\hat{\theta}_N = U_N^{h_1}/U_N^{h_2}$ is a consistent estimator for F_2 .

Then, to estimate V , we consider the U -statistics $U_N^{h_3}$ and $U_N^{h_4}$, based on the kernels h_3 and h_4 , which are consistent estimators for respectively $\lambda^2 G_2$ and $\lambda^4 F_4 G_2^2$. Thus, using formula (3), V can be consistently estimated by

$$\hat{V}_N = \frac{1}{c} \left[\frac{U_N^{h_4} (U_N^{h_2})^2}{(U_N^{h_3})^2} - (U_N^{h_1})^2 \right] + \frac{4}{1-c} (U_N^{h_1})^2 \left[\frac{U_N^{h_3}}{U_N^{h_2}} - 1 \right].$$

Finally, a further application of Slutsky's theorem implies that

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{\hat{V}_N}}U_N^{h_2} \left(\hat{\theta}_N - F_2 \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (5)$$

From this result, one can derive the following asymptotic confidence interval for F_2 :

$$CI_{F_2}(\alpha, N) = \left[\hat{\theta}_N - q_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\sqrt{\hat{V}_N}}{U_N^{h_2} \sqrt{N}}, \hat{\theta}_N + q_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\sqrt{\hat{V}_N}}{U_N^{h_2} \sqrt{N}} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Correction with the delta-method However, even if the application of Slutsky's theorem in the result (2) to obtain (4) stands, the variance of $\widehat{\theta}_N$ is actually much smaller than V for small values of N , since $U_N^{h_1}$ and $U_N^{h_2}$ are very correlated. On that account, for these values of N , \widehat{V}_N is a consistent, but heavily biased estimator for $\mathbb{V}[\widehat{\theta}_N]$. This bias can be partially corrected using the delta-method. For this, one needs the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Y be a dissociated matrix. Let h_1 and h_2 be two quadruplet kernels such that $t_1 h_1 + t_2 h_2 \not\equiv 0$ for all $t = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, and that Theorem 2.6 applies, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[h_2(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$. Then*

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} U_N^{h_1} \\ U_N^{h_2} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} U_\infty^{h_1} \\ U_\infty^{h_2} \end{pmatrix} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),$$

with

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} V^{h_1} & C^{h_1, h_2} \\ C^{h_1, h_2} & V^{h_2} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $U_\infty^{h_1}, V^{h_1}$ for h_1 and $U_\infty^{h_2}, V^{h_2}$ for h_2 are defined in Theorem 2.6 and $C^{h_1, h_2} = \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \text{NCov}(U_N^{h_1}, U_N^{h_2})$.

The proof of Lemma 3.1 relies on the Cramér-Wold theorem. It is given in Appendix G. From that Lemma, we find that

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\begin{pmatrix} U_N^{h_1} \\ U_N^{h_2} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 F_2 \\ \lambda^2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),$$

with

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} V^{h_1} & C^{h_1, h_2} \\ C^{h_1, h_2} & V^{h_2} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $V^{h_1} = \lambda^4 c^{-1} (F_4 - F_2^2) + 4\lambda^4 (1-c)^{-1} F_2^2 (G_2 - 1)$, $V^{h_2} = \lambda^4 c^{-1} (F_2 - 1) + 4\lambda^4 (1-c)^{-1} (G_2 - 1)$ and $C^{h_1, h_2} = 2\lambda^4 c^{-1} (F_3 - F_2) + 4\lambda^4 (1-c)^{-1} F_2 (G_2 - 1)$.

Finally, applying the delta-method to $\phi(U_N^{h_1}, U_N^{h_2}) = U_N^{h_1} / U_N^{h_2} = \widehat{\theta}_N$, we obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{V^\delta}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_N - F_2 \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (7)$$

where

$$V^\delta = \frac{1}{\lambda^4} V^{h_1} - \frac{2F_2}{\lambda^4} C^{h_1, h_2} + \frac{F_2^2}{\lambda^4} V^{h_2} = \frac{1}{c} (F_4 + F_2(4F_2^2 - F_2 - 4F_3)). \quad (8)$$

h	$h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}})$	$\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}})]$
h_5	$\frac{1}{4}(Y_{i_1 j_1} + Y_{i_1 j_2} + Y_{i_2 j_1} + Y_{i_2 j_2})$	λ
h_6	$\frac{1}{4}(Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_1 j_2} (Y_{i_1 j_1} + Y_{i_1 j_2} - 2) + Y_{i_2 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2} (Y_{i_2 j_1} + Y_{i_2 j_2} - 2))$	$\lambda^3 F_3 G_2$

TABLE 2

Kernels h_5 and h_6 and their expectations

Using equation (8) and two additional U -statistics U^{h_5} and U^{h_6} based on the kernels h_5 and h_6 defined in Table 2, we build \widehat{V}_N^δ a consistent estimator for V^δ , defined as

$$\widehat{V}_N^\delta = \frac{1}{c} \left(\frac{U_N^{h_4}}{(U_N^{h_3})^2} + \frac{U_N^{h_1}}{U_N^{h_2}} \left(4 \frac{(U_N^{h_1})^2}{(U_N^{h_2})^2} - \frac{U_N^{h_1}}{U_N^{h_2}} - 4 \frac{U_N^{h_6}}{U_N^{h_5} U_N^{h_3}} \right) \right). \quad (9)$$

Finally, a further application of Slutsky's theorem implies that

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{\widehat{V}_N^\delta}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_N - F_2 \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (10)$$

Asymptotic confidence intervals are then derived in a similar manner as previously :

$$CI_{F_2}^\delta(\alpha, N) = \left[\widehat{\theta}_N - q_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{V}_N^\delta}{N}}, \widehat{\theta}_N + q_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{V}_N^\delta}{N}} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Using these confidence intervals, one can also build a statistical test on the value of F_2 , for example of the following hypotheses : $\mathcal{H}_0 : f \equiv 1$ vs. $\mathcal{H}_1 : f \neq 1$.

Simulations To illustrate this example, we simulated networks with the WBDD model. We chose power functions for f and g , i.e. we set α_f and α_g in $[0, +\infty[$ and $f(u) = (\alpha_f + 1)^{-1} u^{\alpha_f}$ and $g(v) = (\alpha_g + 1)^{-1} v^{\alpha_g}$. Therefore, the values of F_2 and G_2 can be set by α_f and α_g . The constant c is set at 0.5, so we consider square matrices ($m = n$). Figure 1 represents the frequency with which 4 confidence intervals built with respectively equations (4), (5), (7) and (10) contain the true value of F_2 . The simulation results suggests that the delta-method corrects well enough the bias induced by the application of Slutsky's theorem to obtain (5) from (2). Using Slutsky to plug in \widehat{V}_N^δ for V^δ in (10) still leads to acceptable frequencies that converge when N grows. Figure 2 represents the empirical distribution of $\widehat{\theta}_N$ for different sizes N . It can be inferred that $\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\theta}_N - F_2)$ converges to a normal distribution with variance V^δ .

3.2. Network comparison

In the previous example, the analysis is only carried on a single network. In fact, it is easy to extend this framework to network comparison, provided the networks are independent. Indeed, consider two independent networks Y^A and Y^B and we wish to compare their row heterogeneity. Y^A and Y^B are of respective sizes $m_A \times n_A$ and $m_B \times n_B$ and they are respectively generated by $\Theta^A = (\lambda^A, f^A, g^A)$ and $\Theta^B = (\lambda^B, f^B, g^B)$. Then, each network is associated with their respective value F_2^A or F_2^B and we would like to perform the following test : $\mathcal{H}_0 : F_2^A = F_2^B$ vs. $\mathcal{H}_1 : F_2^A \neq F_2^B$.




FIG 1. Estimation of F_2 : Frequency of the confidence intervals that contain the true value of F_2 for different values of N . For each $N \in \{8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048\}$, we simulate $K = 500$ networks with $\lambda = 1$, $F_2 = 3$, $G_2 = 2$. For each simulated network, we estimate F_2 with the estimator $\hat{\theta}_N$ and at level $\alpha = 0.95$, we build the asymptotic confidence intervals from the weak convergence results : $[v]$ built from (5) (estimated value of V by \hat{V}_N), $[vt]$ built from (4) (true value of V), $[vd]$ built from (10) (estimated value of V^δ by \hat{V}_N^δ), and $[vdt]$ built from (7) (true value of V^δ). The horizontal dashed lines represent the confidence interval at level 0.95 of the frequency $Z = X/K$, if X follows the binomial distribution with parameters K and α .

General method Let $N := N_A + N_B$. Suppose that $N_A/N \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow +\infty]{} \rho \in]0, 1[$.

Then one can simply notice that $\hat{\delta}_N(Y^A, Y^B) := \hat{\theta}_{N_A}(Y^A) - \hat{\theta}_{N_B}(Y^B)$ is still asymptotically normal from equation (7)

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{V(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)}} \left(\hat{\delta}_N(Y^A, Y^B) - (F_2^A - F_2^B) \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

with $V(\Theta^A, \Theta^B) = V^\delta(\Theta^A)/\rho + V^\delta(\Theta^B)/(1 - \rho)$.

Using the estimators \hat{V}_N^δ stemming from the delta-method (9), we build $\hat{V}_N(Y^A, Y^B)$ a consistent estimator for $V(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)$

$$\hat{V}_N(Y^A, Y^B) = \frac{1}{\rho} \hat{V}_N^\delta(Y^A) + \frac{1}{1 - \rho} \hat{V}_N^\delta(Y^B).$$

Hence, Slutsky's theorem ensures that

$$\sqrt{\frac{N}{\hat{V}_N(Y^A, Y^B)}} \left(\hat{\delta}_N(Y^A, Y^B) - (F_2^A - F_2^B) \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$




FIG 2. Estimation of F_2 : Distribution of $\hat{\theta}_N$ for different values of N . For each $N \in \{8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048\}$, we simulate $K = 1000$ networks with $\lambda = 1$, $F_2 = 3$, $G_2 = 2$. For each simulated network, we estimate F_2 with the estimator $\hat{\theta}_N$. The empirical distributions (solid red lines) are interpolated using the `density()` function from base R stats package. The dashed curves in blue correspond to the normal distribution densities with mean $F_2 = 3$ and variance V^δ/N . Under each plot, the value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic D between the empirical distribution of $\hat{\theta}_N$ and the normal distribution with mean $F_2 = 3$ and variance V^δ/N is given. $D = \sup_x |F_{emp}(x) - F(x)|$ where F_{emp} is the empirical c.d.f. of $\hat{\theta}_N$ and $F(x)$ the c.d.f. of the normal distribution with mean $F_2 = 3$ and variance V^δ/N .

In this example, we consider the statistical test $\mathcal{H}_0 : F_2^A = F_2^B$ vs. $\mathcal{H}_1 : F_2^A \neq F_2^B$. So we consider the test statistic

$$Z_N(Y^A, Y^B) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{\hat{V}_N(Y^A, Y^B)}} \hat{\delta}_N(Y^A, Y^B), \quad (12)$$

for which Slutsky's theorem applies

$$Z_N(Y^A, Y^B) - \sqrt{\frac{N}{\hat{V}_N(Y^A, Y^B)}} (F_2^A - F_2^B) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Under \mathcal{H}_0 , $Z_N \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ which allows us to build asymptotic acceptance intervals for this test at level α :

$$I(\alpha) = \left[-q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}, q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\right].$$

Simulations Figure 3 shows simulation results for this test. Once again, we consider networks generated by the WBEDD model with power law functions f and g . To perform the test, we generate couples of networks (Y^A, Y^B) . Y^A is always generated with the same parameters, same for Y^B except parameter α_f , which is used to set F_2^B . The empirical power for this test with varying F_2^B is evaluated for several values of N . It is compared with the asymptotic theoretical power $\psi_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)$ for this test. Let $\mu_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B) := \sqrt{\frac{N}{V(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)}}(F_2^A - F_2^B)$. If a random variable \tilde{Z}_N is such that $\tilde{Z}_N - \mu_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, then $\psi_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{Z}_N \in I(\alpha)\right)$, so it can be computed with

$$\psi_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B) = F_{(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)}\left(q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\right) - F_{(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)}\left(-q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\right) \quad (13)$$

where $F_{(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)}(t)$ is the cumulative distribution function of a Gaussian variable with mean $\mu_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)$ and variance 1. We notice that the empirical power becomes very close to the asymptotic theoretical power as N grows, which suggests that this test works well for networks with $N > 100$.

3.3. Further remarks and leads

Other kernels One can define more elaborate kernels to test further hypotheses on other models. Although the kernel h should check the symmetry condition (1), this is not a real constraint because any function over quadruplets can be twisted to fit this condition. Indeed, let k be a function of interest, but where (1) does not stand. It suffices to define h such that $h(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]}) = k(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]}) + k(Y_{[i_2, i_1; j_1, j_2]}) + k(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_2, j_1]}) + k(Y_{[i_2, i_1; j_2, j_1]})$, as h fullfills (1) and we have $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]})] = \mathbb{E}[k(Y_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]})]$.

Other models : graphons The only conditions on the model are that it should be RCE and dissociated, i.e. it can be written as a bipartite W-graph model. For example, given the W-graph model $Y_{ij} \mid \xi_i, \eta_j \sim \mathcal{P}(\lambda w(\xi_i, \eta_j))$ with $\int \int w = 1$, one could have tested if it is of product form, i.e. if $f(u) = \int w(u, v)dv$ and $g(v) = \int w(u, v)du$, w can be written as $w(u, v) = f(u)g(v)$ (as in the WBEDD model). An appropriated kernel for this test would be

$$\begin{aligned} h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}}) &= \frac{1}{4}Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2} (Y_{i_1 j_1} + Y_{i_2 j_2} - Y_{i_1 j_2} - Y_{i_1 j_2} - 2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_1 j_2} (Y_{i_1 j_2} + Y_{i_1 j_2} - Y_{i_1 j_1} - Y_{i_2 j_2} - 2) \end{aligned}$$

as $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}})] = \int \int w(u, v)(w(u, v) - f(u)g(v))dudv$ and should be equal to 0 if the hypothesis is true.

Motifs frequency The counts of bipartite motifs of size 2×2 can be expressed as quadruplet U -statistics and can be integrated in our framework. If Y is a binary matrix, then one can count the diagonal motifs using a kernel and obtain




FIG 3. Comparison of F_2 for two networks : Power of the test $\mathcal{H}_0 : F_2^A = F_2^B$ vs. $\mathcal{H}_1 : F_2^A \neq F_2^B$ using the statistic $Z_N(Y^A, Y^B)$ defined by (12). We set $\lambda^A = \lambda^B = 1$, $G_2^A = G_2^B = 2$, $c^A = c^B = 0.5$. The value of F_2^A is fixed at 3. Only N and F_2^B will vary. Several values of F_2^B are considered between 1 and 5. For each $N \in \{32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024\}$, for each F_2^B , we generate $K = 200$ couple of networks of same size $N^A = N^B = N/2$ with respective F_2 values F_2^A and F_2^B . On each couple of networks (Y^A, Y^B) , we compute $Z_N(Y^A, Y^B)$ and we reject the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 if $Z_N(Y^A, Y^B) \notin I(\alpha)$. The empirical power (solid lines) is the frequency with which the hypothesis is admitted among the K simulations. The theoretical power (dashed lines) is the function $\psi_N(\Theta^A, \Theta^B)$, which only depends on F_2^B since the other parameters are constant, computed with equation (13).

statistical guarantees. For example, motif 5 of Figure 7 in [Ouahad, Latouche and Robin \(2021\)](#) can be counted with the kernel

$$h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}}) = Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_2 j_1} (1 - Y_{i_2 j_2}) + Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_2 j_2} (1 - Y_{i_2 j_1}) \\ + Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2} (1 - Y_{i_1 j_2}) + Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_2 j_1} Y_{i_2 j_2} (1 - Y_{i_1 j_1}).$$

Computational cost In the two examples, one interesting feature of the chosen kernels is that they are simple to compute. Indeed, if we denote $Y_N := (Y_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m_N, 1 \leq j \leq n_N}$, one can write $U_N^{h_1}$ used in the previous example as

$$U_N^{h_1} = \frac{1}{n_N m_N (m_N - 1)} [|Y_N^T Y_N|_1 - \text{Tr}(Y_N^T Y_N)] \quad (14)$$

where Tr is the trace operator. We see that $U_N^{h_1}$ can be computed using only simple operations on matrices, which are optimized in most computing software. This can also be said for all the other U -statistics used in this example (see Appendix H).

Interest for U -statistics of larger subgraphs It is legitimate to wonder if one can extend our framework to U -statistics over submatrices of size different from 2×2 , for example $Y_{\{i_1, \dots, i_p; j_1, \dots, j_q\}}$ of size $p \times q$. If this can be done, then our framework can be used to count motifs of larger size. Also, in the row heterogeneity example where we used formula (2) to derive an asymptotic confidence interval for F_2 , we notice that one could have estimated the term $\lambda^4 F_4$ appearing in V with a kernel over submatrices of size 1×4 such as $h(Y_{\{i_1; j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4\}}) = Y_{i_1 j_1} Y_{i_1 j_2} Y_{i_1 j_3} Y_{i_1 j_4}$ and $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{i_1; j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4\}})] = \lambda^4 F_4$. The possibility for an extension is discussed in the next section.

4. Discussion

In this paper, we have proven a weak convergence result for quadruplet U -statistics over RCE matrices, using a backward martingale approach. We use the Aldous-Hoover representation of RCE matrices and a Hewitt-Savage type argument to extend this result and obtain a CLT in the dissociated case. Using this CLT, we provide a general framework to perform statistical inference on bipartite exchangeable networks through several examples.

Indeed, U -statistics can be used to build unbiased estimators. The advantage of taking quadruplets is to define functions over several interactions of the same row or column. This allows us to extract information on the row and column distribution. The CLT then guarantees an asymptotic normality result of the estimators, where the only unknown is their asymptotic variances, which have to be estimated then plugged in with Slutsky's Theorem.

Extension to larger subgraphs It is possible to extend our theorem to U -statistics over submatrices of size different from 2×2 , for example $Y_{\{i_1, \dots, i_p; j_1, \dots, j_q\}}$ of size $p \times q$. In this case, for some kernel h on these submatrices,

$$U_N^h = \left[\binom{m_N}{p} \binom{n_N}{q} \right]^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq m_N} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_q \leq n_N} h(Y_{\{i_1, \dots, i_p; j_1, \dots, j_q\}}),$$

would also be asymptotically normal. All the steps of our proof can be adapted to U -statistics of larger subgraphs. These U -statistics are indeed backward martingales and the equivalent of Proposition D.1 and Proposition E.1 require more calculus. As a consequence, the asymptotic variance also has a different expression. On the one hand, such an extension would allow more flexibility in the choice of the kernel, hence the ability to build more complex estimators. On the other hand, in practice, the computation of such U -statistics may also be more complex and computationally demanding, whereas simple functions on quadruplets can easily be expressed with matrix operations.

Choice of the optimal kernels It is simple to design new U -statistics using various kernels. So when it comes to estimate some particular parameter, one may have the choice between several kernels. Even though they have the same expectation, not only the asymptotic variances might differ, but their rates of convergence to their asymptotic distributions can also vary. In addition, one should remain careful that the derived U -statistics are easily computable. In conclusion, each kernel does not necessarily lead to the same statistical and computational guarantees. The art of designing the best estimation procedures or statistical tests using our approach relies on finding the optimal kernels, depending on the situation.

Berry-Esseen Further studies might be carried to investigate the rate of convergence of $\sqrt{N}(U_N^h - U_\infty^h)$ to its limiting distribution. For specific applications, one can for now rely on simulations to assess how quickly it converges. A possible direction to find theoretical guarantees is the derivation of a Berry-Esseen-type bound.

Appendix A: Properties of m_N and n_N

In this appendix, we provide the proofs for Proposition 2.2 and further properties of the sequences m_N and n_N defined as $m_N = 2 + \lfloor c(N + 1) \rfloor$ and $n_N = 2 + \lfloor (1 - c)(N + 1) \rfloor$ for all $N \geq 1$, where c is an irrational number (Definition 2.1).

Proof of Proposition 2.2. The second result stems from the fact that

$$m_N + n_N = 4 + \lfloor c(N + 1) \rfloor + \lfloor (1 - c)(N + 1) \rfloor = 4 + \lfloor c(N + 1) \rfloor + \lfloor -c(N + 1) \rfloor + N + 1$$

and $\lfloor c(N + 1) \rfloor + \lfloor -c(N + 1) \rfloor = -1$ because $c(N + 1)$ is not an integer since c is irrational. Then, the first result simply follows as

$$\frac{m_N}{m_N + n_N} = \frac{\lfloor c(N + 1) \rfloor + 2}{N + 4} \underset{N}{\sim} \frac{c(N + 1) + 2}{N + 4} \underset{N}{\sim} \frac{cN}{N},$$

where $\underset{N}{\sim}$ denotes the asymptotic equivalence when N grows to infinity, i.e. $a_N \underset{N}{\sim} b_N$ if and only if $a_N/b_N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 1$. □

Proof of Corollary 2.3. As m_N and n_N are non decreasing, the corollary is a direct consequence of $m_N + n_N = 4 + N$, because then $m_{N+1} + n_{N+1} = 4 + N + 1 = m_N + n_N + 1$. □

Definition A.1. We define \mathcal{B}_c and \mathcal{B}_{1-c} two complementary subsets of \mathbb{N}^* as

$$\mathcal{B}_c = \{N \in \mathbb{N}^* : m_N = m_{N-1} + 1\} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_{1-c} = \{N \in \mathbb{N}^* : n_N = n_{N-1} + 1\}.$$

Proposition A.2. Set $\kappa_c(m) := \lfloor \frac{m-2}{c} \rfloor$ and $\kappa_{1-c}(n) := \lfloor \frac{n-2}{1-c} \rfloor$. If $N \in \mathcal{B}_c$, then $N = \kappa_c(m_N)$. Similarly, if $N \in \mathcal{B}_{1-c}$, then $N = \kappa_{1-c}(n_N)$.

Proof. Remember that c is an irrational number, so if $N \in \mathcal{B}_c$, then

$$cN + 2 < \lfloor cN \rfloor + 3 = m_{N-1} + 1 = m_N = \lfloor c(N+1) \rfloor + 2 < c(N+1) + 2,$$

which means that $\frac{m_N-2}{c} - 1 < N < \frac{m_N-2}{c}$, thus $N = \lfloor \frac{m_N-2}{c} \rfloor$. \square

Appendix B: Backward martingales

In this appendix, we recall the definition of backward martingales and their convergence theorem.

Definition B.1. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a decreasing filtration and $M = (M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of integrable random variables adapted to \mathcal{F} . $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a backward martingale if and only if for all $n \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E}[M_n | \mathcal{F}_{n+1}] = M_{n+1}$.

Theorem B.2. *Let $(M_n, \mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a backward martingale. Then, $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable, and, denoting $M_\infty = \mathbb{E}[M_1 | \mathcal{F}_\infty]$ where $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n$, we have*

$$M_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_1} M_\infty.$$

Furthermore, if $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is square-integrable, then $M_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_2} M_\infty$.

Appendix C: Square-integrable backward martingale

In this appendix, we prove Proposition C.1, which states that U_N^h is a square-integrable backward martingale.

Proposition C.1. *Let Y be a RCE matrix. Let h be a quadruplet kernel such that $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$. Let $\mathcal{F}_N = \sigma((U_{kl}^h, k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N))$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_N$. Set $U_\infty^h := \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty]$. Then $(U_N^h, \mathcal{F}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is a square-integrable backward martingale and $U_N^h \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_2} U_\infty^h = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_\infty]$.*

The proof relies on the following lemma.

Lemma C.2. *For all $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m_N$ and $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_N$, $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_N] = \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_N]$.*

Proof. In the proof of this lemma, we specify the matrices over which the U -statistics are taken, i.e. we denote $U_{k,l}^h(Y)$ instead of $U_{k,l}^h$ the U -statistic of kernel h and of size $k \times l$ computed on Y .

By construction, for all $k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N$, for all matrix permutation $\Phi \in \mathbb{S}_{m_N} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_N}$ (only changing the first m_N rows and n_N columns), we have $U_{k,l}^h(\Phi Y) = U_{k,l}^h(Y)$. Moreover, since Y is RCE, we also have $\Phi Y \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Y$. Therefore,

$$\Phi Y | (U_{k,l}^h(Y), k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Y | (U_{k,l}^h(Y), k \geq m_N, l \geq n_N).$$

That means that conditionally on \mathcal{F}_N , the first m_N rows and n_N columns of Y are exchangeable and the result to prove follows from this. \square

Proof of Proposition C.1. First, we remark that as $\mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$, then for all N , $\mathbb{E}[(U_N^h)^2] < \infty$. Thus, the $(U_N^h)_{N \geq 1}$ are square-integrable. Second, $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is a decreasing filtration and for all N , U_N^h is \mathcal{F}_N -measurable.

Now using lemma C.2, we have for all $K \leq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_K^h | \mathcal{F}_N] &= \binom{m_K}{2}^{-2} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m_K \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_N] \\ &= \binom{m_K}{2}^{-2} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m_K \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_N] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}}) | \mathcal{F}_N], \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E}[U_{N-1}^h | \mathcal{F}_N] = \mathbb{E}[U_N^h | \mathcal{F}_N] = U_N^h$, which concludes the proof that $(U_N^h, \mathcal{F}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is a square-integrable backward martingale. Finally, Theorem B.2 ensures that $U_N^h \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_2} U_\infty^h$. \square

Appendix D: Asymptotic variances

We prove Proposition D.1 which gives the convergence and an expression for the asymptotic variance. The proof involves some tedious calculations. Before that, we introduce some notations to make the proof of Proposition D.1 more readable.

Notation. In this appendix and in Appendix E, we denote

- $X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} := h(Y_{\{i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2\}})$,
- $Z_{NK} := \sqrt{N}(U_K - U_{K+1})$,
- $S_{NK} := \mathbb{E}[Z_{NK}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{K+1}]$,
- $V_N := \sum_{K=N}^{\infty} S_{NK}$.

The exchangeability of Y implies that $\mathbb{E}[X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} X_{[i'_1, i'_2; j'_1, j'_2]} | \mathcal{F}_K]$ only depends on the numbers of rows and columns shared by both $[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]$ and $[i'_1, i'_2; j'_1, j'_2]$. For $0 \leq p \leq 2$ and $0 \leq q \leq 2$, we set

$$c_K^{(p,q)} := \mathbb{E}[X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} X_{[i'_1, i'_2; j'_1, j'_2]} | \mathcal{F}_K],$$

and

$$c_\infty^{(p,q)} := \mathbb{E}[X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} X_{[i'_1, i'_2; j'_1, j'_2]} | \mathcal{F}_\infty],$$

where they share p rows and q columns.

Proposition D.1. $V_N \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} V = 4c^{-1}(c_\infty^{(1,0)} - U_\infty^2) + 4(1-c)^{-1}(c_\infty^{(0,1)} - U_\infty^2)$.

The proof of Proposition D.1 will be based on the following five lemmas.

Lemma D.2. *If $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$, then*

$$Z_{N,K-1} = \sqrt{N} \frac{2}{m_K - 2} (U_K - \delta_K),$$

where

$$\delta_K = (m_K - 1)^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq m_K - 1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[i_1, m_K; j_1, j_2]}.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m_K \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m_K - 1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2]} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq m_K - 1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[i_1, m_K; j_1, j_2]}.$$
(15)

But if $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$ (see definition A.1), then $m_{K-1} = m_K - 1$ and $n_{K-1} = n_K$. Therefore, equation (15) is equivalent to

$$\binom{m_K}{2} \binom{n_K}{2} U_K = \binom{m_K - 1}{2} \binom{n_K}{2} U_{K-1} + (m_K - 1) \binom{n_K}{2} \delta_K,$$

so

$$U_{K-1} = \frac{1}{m_K - 2} (m_K U_K - 2\delta_K).$$

This concludes the proof since $Z_{N,K-1} = \sqrt{N}(U_{K-1} - U_K)$. \square

We now calculate $S_{N,K}$ in the following lemmas.

Lemma D.3. *For all $0 \leq p \leq 2$ and $0 \leq q \leq 2$, $c_N^{(p,q)} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_1} c_\infty^{(p,q)}$.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that $(c_N^{(p,q)}, \mathcal{F}_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is a backward martingale. \square

Lemma D.4. *If $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$, then*

$$S_{N,K-1} = 4N \left(\frac{(n_K - 2)(n_K - 3)}{(m_K - 1)(m_K - 2)n_K(n_K - 1)} c_K^{(1,0)} - \frac{1}{(m_K - 2)^2} U_K^2 + \psi(K) \right),$$

where ψ does not depend on N and $\psi(K) = o(m_K^{-2})$.

Proof. Because of Lemma D.2 and the \mathcal{F}_K -measurability of U_K ,

$$S_{N,K-1} = \frac{4N}{(m_K - 2)^2} (\mathbb{E}[\delta_K^2 | \mathcal{F}_K] + U_K^2 - 2U_K \mathbb{E}[\delta_K | \mathcal{F}_K]).$$

First, Lemma C.2 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta_K | \mathcal{F}_K] = U_K.$$

Then, we can calculate

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta_K^2 | \mathcal{F}_K] = (m_K - 1)^{-2} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq m_K - 1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i'_1 \leq m_K - 1 \\ 1 \leq j'_1 < j'_2 \leq n_K}} \mathbb{E}[X_{[i_1, m_K; j_1, j_2]} X_{[i'_1, m_K; j'_1, j'_2]} | \mathcal{F}_K].$$

Each term of the sum only depends on the number of rows and columns the quadruplets in $X_{[i_1, m_K; j_1, j_2]}$ and $X_{[i'_1, m_K; j'_1, j'_2]}$ have in common. For example, if they share p rows and q columns, it is equal to $c_K^{(p, q)}$. So by breaking down the different cases for p and q , we may count the number of possibilities. For example, if $(p, q) = (1, 2)$, then the number of possibilities is $(m_K - 1)(m_K - 2) \binom{n_K}{2}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\delta_K^2 | \mathcal{F}_K] &= (m_K - 1)^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (m_K - 2)(n_K - 2)(n_K - 3) c_K^{(1, 0)} + 2(m_K - 2)(n_K - 2) c_K^{(1, 1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (m_K - 2) c_K^{(1, 2)} + \frac{1}{2} (n_K - 2)(n_K - 3) c_K^{(2, 0)} + 2(n_K - 2) c_K^{(2, 1)} + c_K^{(2, 2)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, setting

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(K) &:= (m_K - 1)^{-3} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \left\{ 2(m_K - 2)(n_K - 2) c_K^{(1, 1)} + (m_K - 2) c_K^{(1, 2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} (n_K - 2)(n_K - 3) c_K^{(2, 0)} + 2(n_K - 2) c_K^{(2, 1)} + c_K^{(2, 2)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain the desired result, with $\psi(K) = o(m_K^{-2})$ since $\frac{m_K}{c_K} \sim \frac{n_K}{1-c_K} \sim K$. \square

Remark. In the case where $K \in \mathcal{B}_{1-c}$, the equivalent formulas to those of Lemmas D.2 and D.4 are derived from similar proofs. If $K \in \mathcal{B}_{1-c}$, then

$$Z_{N, K-1} = \sqrt{N} \frac{2}{n_K - 2} (U_K - \gamma_K),$$

where

$$\gamma_K = (n_K - 1)^{-1} \binom{m_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq m_K \\ 1 \leq j_1 \leq n_K - 1}} X_{[i_1, i_2; j_1, n_K]},$$

and

$$S_{N, K-1} = 4N \left(\frac{(m_K - 2)(m_K - 3)}{(n_K - 1)(n_K - 2)m_K(m_K - 1)} c_K^{(0, 1)} - \frac{1}{(n_K - 2)^2} U_K^2 + \varphi(K) \right),$$

where φ does not depend on N and $\varphi(K) = o(n_K^{-2})$.

Lemma D.5. *Let $(R_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables and $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of real positive numbers. Set $C_n := n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k R_k$. If*

- $n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$, and

- there exists a random variable R_∞ such that $R_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} R_\infty$,

then $C_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} R_\infty$. Furthermore, if $R_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} R_\infty$, then $C_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} R_\infty$.

Proof. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |C_n - R_\infty| &= \left| n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k R_k - R_\infty \right| \\ &\leq \left| n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k R_k - n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k R_\infty \right| + \left| n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k R_\infty - R_\infty \right| \\ &\leq \left(n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k \right) \times \sup_{k \geq n} |R_k - R_\infty| + \left| n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k - 1 \right| \times |R_\infty|. \end{aligned}$$

If $n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$ and $R_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} R_\infty$, then for all ω fixed except a set of neglectable size, $C_n(\omega) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} R_\infty(\omega)$, which gives the a.s. convergence. Now, consider also that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|C_n - R_\infty| \right] &\leq n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k \mathbb{E} \left[|R_k - R_\infty| \right] + \left| n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k - 1 \right| \mathbb{E} \left[|R_\infty| \right] \\ &\leq \left(n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k \right) \times \sup_{k \geq n} \mathbb{E} \left[|R_k - R_\infty| \right] + \left| n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k - 1 \right| \mathbb{E} \left[|R_\infty| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

So if $R_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} R_\infty$, then $\mathbb{E} \left[|R_n - R_\infty| \right] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} 0$ and $\sup_{k \geq n} \mathbb{E} \left[|R_k - R_\infty| \right] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} 0$. Since $n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$, the first term converges to 0, and the second term too because $\mathbb{E} \left[|R_\infty| \right] < \infty$. Finally, $\mathbb{E} \left[|C_n - R_\infty| \right] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. \square

Lemma D.6. Let $(Q_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables. Set $C_n := n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} Q_k$. If there exists a random variable C_∞ such that $n^2 Q_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} C_\infty$, then $C_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} C_\infty$. Furthermore, if $n^2 Q_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} C_\infty$, then $C_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_1} C_\infty$.

Proof. This is a direct application of Lemma D.5, where $R_n := n^2 Q_n$ and $\lambda_n := n^{-2}$, as $n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} k^{-2} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 1$. \square

Proof of Proposition D.1. Recall that from Corollary 2.3, \mathcal{B}_c and \mathcal{B}_{1-c} form a partition of the set of the positive integers \mathbb{N}^* , so that we can write

$$V_N = V_N^{(c)} + V_N^{(1-c)},$$

where $V_N^{(c)} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{B}_c}^{\infty} S_{N, K-1}$ and $V_N^{(1-c)} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{B}_{1-c}}^{\infty} S_{N, K-1}$. Here, we only detail the computation of $V_N^{(c)}$, as one can proceed analogously with $V_N^{(1-c)}$.

In $V_N^{(c)}$, the sum is over the $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$. So, from Lemma D.4,

$$S_{N,K-1} = 4N \left(\frac{(n_K - 2)(n_K - 3)}{(m_K - 1)(m_K - 2)n_K(n_K - 1)} c_K^{(1,0)} - \frac{1}{(m_K - 2)^2} U_K^2 + \psi(K) \right).$$

Now we use Proposition A.2 to replace K with $\kappa_c(m_K) = \lfloor \frac{m_K - 2}{c} \rfloor$ and

$$S_{N,\kappa_c(m_K)-1} = 4N \left(\frac{(\kappa_c(m_K) - m_K + 2)(\kappa_c(m_K) - m_K + 1)}{(m_K - 1)(m_K - 2)(\kappa_c(m_K) - m_K + 4)(\kappa_c(m_K) - m_K + 3)} c_{\kappa_c(m_K)}^{(1,0)} - \frac{1}{(m_K - 2)^2} U_{\kappa_c(m_K)}^2 + \psi(\kappa_c(m_K)) \right).$$

Therefore, because for all $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$ we have $m_K = m_{K-1} + 1$, we can then transform the sum over K into a sum over m and

$$V_N^{(c)} = \sum_{\substack{K=N+1 \\ K \in \mathcal{B}_c}}^{\infty} S_{N,K-1} = \sum_{m=m_{N+1}}^{\infty} S_{N,\kappa_c(m)-1} = N \sum_{m=m_{N+1}}^{\infty} R_m,$$

where $R_m := S_{N,\kappa_c(m)-1}/N$, i.e.

$$R_m = \frac{4(\kappa_c(m) - m + 2)(\kappa_c(m) - m + 1)}{(m - 1)(m - 2)(\kappa_c(m) - m + 4)(\kappa_c(m) - m + 3)} c_{\kappa_c(m)}^{(1,0)} - \frac{4}{(m - 2)^2} U_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 + 4\psi(\kappa_c(m)).$$

But we notice that since $\psi(\kappa_c(m)) = o(m^{-2})$, then Lemma D.3 and Proposition C.1 give for all N ,

$$m^2 R_m \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_1} 4(c_\infty^{(1,0)} - U_\infty^2).$$

And since $\frac{m_{N+1}}{N} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} c$ from Proposition 2.2, we find with Lemma D.6 that

$$V_N^{(c)} = \frac{N}{m_{N+1}} \times m_{N+1} \sum_{m=m_{N+1}}^{\infty} R_m \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_1} \frac{4}{c} (c_\infty^{(1,0)} - U_\infty^2).$$

We can proceed likewise with $V_N^{(1-c)}$, where all the terms have $K \in \mathcal{B}_{1-c}$, to get

$$V_N^{(1-c)} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_1} \frac{4}{1-c} (c_\infty^{(0,1)} - U_\infty^2),$$

which finally gives

$$V_N = V_N^{(c)} + V_N^{(1-c)} \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{a.s., L_1} V := \frac{4}{c} (c_\infty^{(1,0)} - U_\infty^2) + \frac{4}{1-c} (c_\infty^{(0,1)} - U_\infty^2).$$

□

Appendix E: Conditional Lindeberg condition

We verify the conditional Lindeberg condition as stated by Proposition E.1. We use the notations defined in Appendix D.

Proposition E.1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then the conditional Lindeberg condition is satisfied :*

$$\sum_{K=N}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[Z_{NK}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_{NK}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{K+1}] \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$$

The proof relies on the four following lemmas.

Lemma E.2. *Let $(Q_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables. Set $C_n := n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} Q_k$. If $n^2 \mathbb{E}[|Q_n|] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$, then $C_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$.*

Proof. Lemma D.6 and the triangular inequality give $\mathbb{E}[|C_n|] \leq n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|Q_k|] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. Let some $\epsilon > 0$, then Markov's inequality ensures that

$$\mathbb{P}(|C_n| > \epsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[|C_n|]}{\epsilon} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

□

Lemma E.3. *For sequences of random variables U_n and sets B_n , if $U_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_2} U$ and $\mathbf{1}(B_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(B_n)] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$.*

Proof. Note that for all n , $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(B_n)] &= \mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(B_n) \mathbf{1}(U_n^2 > a)] + \mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(B_n) \mathbf{1}(U_n^2 \leq a)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(U_n^2 > a)] + \mathbb{E}[a \mathbf{1}(B_n)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(U_n^2 > a)] + a \mathbb{P}(B_n) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. $U_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{L_2} U$, so $(U_n^2)_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable and there exists $a > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(U_n^2 > a)] \leq \sup_k \mathbb{E}[U_k^2 \mathbf{1}(U_k^2 > a)] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{1}(B_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$, which translates to $\mathbb{P}(B_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$ and there exists an integer n_0 such that for all $n > n_0$, $\mathbb{P}(B_n) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2a}$. Choosing such a real number a , we can always find an integer n_0 such that for $n > n_0$, we have $\mathbb{E}[U_n^2 \mathbf{1}(B_n)] \leq \epsilon$. □

Lemma E.4. *For sequences of random variables M_n and sets B_n , if $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a backward martingale with respect to some filtration and $\mathbf{1}(B_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[M_n \mathbf{1}(B_n)] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$.*

Proof. We notice that from Theorem B.2, $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable, then the proof is similar to that of Lemma E.3. □

Lemma E.5. Set $A_K := m_K^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{2 \leq i_2 \leq m_K+1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[1, i_2; j_1, j_2]}$. If $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$, then $A_K \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \delta_K$, where δ_K is defined in Lemma D.2.

Proof. Remember that if $K \in \mathcal{B}_c$ (see Definition A.1), then by symmetry of h , $\delta_K = (m_K - 1)^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq m_K-1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[m_K, i_2; j_1, j_2]}$. The exchangeability of Y says

that all permutations on the rows and the columns of Y leave its distribution unchanged, hence for all $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathbb{S}_{m_K} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_K}$, we have

$$\delta_K \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (m_K - 1)^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq m_K-1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[\sigma_1(m_K), \sigma_1(i_2); \sigma_2(j_1), \sigma_2(j_2)]}.$$

Consider σ_2 to be the identity and $\sigma_1 \in \mathbb{S}_{m_K}$ the permutation defined by :

- $\sigma_1(i) = i + 1$ if $i < m_K$,
- $\sigma_1(m_K) = 1$,
- $\sigma_1(i) = i$ if $i > m_K$.

Then $A_K = (m_K - 1)^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2 \leq m_K-1 \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[\sigma_1(m_K), \sigma_1(i_2); \sigma_2(j_1), \sigma_2(j_2)]}$, hence

$$A_K \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \delta_K. \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition E.1. Similarly to the proof of the Proposition D.1, we can verify the conditional Lindeberg condition by decomposing the sum along with $K + 1 \in \mathcal{B}_c$ and $K + 1 \in \mathcal{B}_{1-c}$ (Corollary 2.3), so here we only consider $\sum_{\substack{K=N+1 \\ K \in \mathcal{B}_c}}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[Z_{N, K-1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|Z_{N, K-1}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_K]$.

Like previously, using Proposition A.2, we can transform the sum over K into a sum over m :

$$\sum_{\substack{K=N+1 \\ K \in \mathcal{B}_c}}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[Z_{N, K-1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|Z_{N, K-1}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_K] = \sum_{m=m_{N+1}}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[Z_{N, \kappa_c(m)-1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|Z_{N, \kappa_c(m)-1}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_c(m)}],$$

where $\kappa_c(m) = \lfloor \frac{m-2}{c} \rfloor$.

We remark that for $m \geq m_{N+1} = m_N + 1 > c(N + 1) + 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_{\{|Z_{N, \kappa_c(m)-1}| > \epsilon\}} &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \frac{2\sqrt{N}}{m-2} |U_{\kappa_c(m)} - \delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \epsilon \right\}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |U_{\kappa_c(m)} - \delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{m-2}{2\sqrt{m-2}} \epsilon \right\}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon \right\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon \right\}}. \end{aligned}$$

So, using the identity $(U_{\kappa_c(m)} - \delta_{\kappa_c(m)})^2 \leq 2(U_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 + \delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2)$, we get for $m \geq m_{N+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[Z_{N, \kappa_c(m)-1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|Z_{N, \kappa_c(m)-1}| > \epsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_c(m)}] \\ &\leq \frac{8N}{(m-2)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(U_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 + \delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon \right\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ |\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon \right\}} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_c(m)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality and Lemma E.2 imply that a sufficient condition to have the conditional Lindeberg condition is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(U_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 + \delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{|U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{|\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right) \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (16)$$

Next, we prove that this condition is satisfied.

First, note that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{4\mathbb{E}[|U_{\kappa_c(m)}|]}{\epsilon \sqrt{c(m-2)}} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon \right) \leq \frac{4\mathbb{E}[|\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}|]}{\epsilon \sqrt{c(m-2)}} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Now, remember that from Proposition C.1, $U_K \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow \infty} U_\infty$, therefore $U_{\kappa_c(m)} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} U_\infty$ and Lemma E.3 can be applied, which gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[U_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{|U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{|\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right) \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (17)$$

Likewise, we calculated $\mathbb{E}[\delta_K^2 | \mathcal{F}_K]$ in the proof of Lemma D.4. The application of Lemma D.3 shows that $\mathbb{E}[\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_c(m)}]$ is a backward martingale. It follows from Lemma E.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{\kappa_c(m)}] \mathbb{1}_{\{|U_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (18)$$

Finally, applying Lemma E.5, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\delta_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[A_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|A_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right], \quad (19)$$

where $A_K = m_K^{-1} \binom{n_K}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{2 \leq i_2 \leq m_{K+1} \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_K}} X_{[1, i_2; j_1, j_2]}$. Using similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition C.1, it can be shown that A_K is a square integrable backward martingale with respect to the decreasing filtration $\mathcal{F}_K^A = \sigma(A_K, A_{K+1}, \dots)$. Therefore, Theorem B.2 ensures that there exists A_∞ such that $A_K \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow \infty} A_\infty$. This proves that $A_{\kappa_c(m)} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} A_\infty$, so applying Lemma E.3 again, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[A_{\kappa_c(m)}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|A_{\kappa_c(m)}| > \frac{\sqrt{c(m-2)}}{4} \epsilon\}} \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (20)$$

Combining (17), (18), (19) and (20), we deduce that the sufficient condition (16) is satisfied, thus concluding the proof. \square

Appendix F: Hewitt-Savage theorem

Proof of Theorem 2.10. This proof adapts the steps taken by [Feller \(1971\)](#) and detailed by [Durrett \(2019\)](#) to our case. Let $A \in \mathcal{E}_\infty$.

First, let $\mathcal{A}_N = \sigma((\xi_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m_N}, (\eta_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n_N}, (\zeta_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq m_N, 1 \leq j \leq n_N})$, the σ -field generated by the random variables associated with the first m_N rows and n_N columns. Notice that $A \in \mathcal{A} := \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{A}_N$. Since \mathcal{A} is the limit of \mathcal{A}_N , then for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a N and an associated set $A_N \in \mathcal{A}_N$ such that $\mathbb{P}(A - A \cap A_N) < \epsilon$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_N - A \cap A_N) < \epsilon$, so that $\mathbb{P}(A \Delta A_N) < 2\epsilon$, where Δ is the symmetric difference operator, i.e. $B \Delta C = (B - C) \cup (C - B)$. Therefore, we can pick a sequence of sets A_N such that $\mathbb{P}(A \Delta A_N) \rightarrow 0$.

Next, we consider the row-column permutation $\Phi^{(N)} = (\sigma_1^{(N)}, \sigma_2^{(N)}) \in \mathbb{S}_{m_N} \times \mathbb{S}_{n_N}$ defined by

$$\sigma_1^{(N)}(i) = \begin{cases} i + m_N & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq m_N, \\ i - m_N & \text{if } m_N + 1 \leq i \leq 2m_N, \\ i & \text{if } 2m_N + 1 \leq i. \end{cases}$$

$$\sigma_2^{(N)}(j) = \begin{cases} j + n_N & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n_N, \\ j - n_N & \text{if } n_N + 1 \leq j \leq 2n_N, \\ j & \text{if } 2n_N + 1 \leq j. \end{cases}$$

Since $A \in \mathcal{E}_\infty$, by the definition of \mathcal{E}_∞ , it follows that

$$\{\omega : \Phi^{(N)}\omega \in A\} = \{\omega : \omega \in A\} = A.$$

Using this, if we denote $A'_N := \{\omega : \Phi^{(N)}\omega \in A_N\}$, then we can write that

$$\{\omega : \Phi^{(N)}\omega \in A_N \Delta A\} = \{\omega : \omega \in A'_N \Delta A\} = A'_N \Delta A.$$

Furthermore, the $(U_i)_{1 \leq i < \infty}$, $(V_j)_{1 \leq j < \infty}$ and $(L_{ij})_{1 \leq i < \infty, 1 \leq j < \infty}$ are i.i.d., so

$$\mathbb{P}(A_N \Delta A) = \mathbb{P}(\omega : \omega \in A_N \Delta A) = \mathbb{P}(\omega : \Phi^{(N)}\omega \in A_N \Delta A).$$

and we conclude that $\mathbb{P}(A'_N \Delta A) = \mathbb{P}(A_N \Delta A) \rightarrow 0$.

From this, we derive that $\mathbb{P}(A_N) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A)$ and $\mathbb{P}(A'_N) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A)$. We also remark that $\mathbb{P}(A_N \Delta A'_N) \leq \mathbb{P}(A_N \Delta A) + \mathbb{P}(A'_N \Delta A) \rightarrow 0$, so $\mathbb{P}(A_N \cap A'_N) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A)$.

But A_N and A'_N are independent, so we have $\mathbb{P}(A_N \cap A'_N) = \mathbb{P}(A_N)\mathbb{P}(A'_N) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A)^2$, therefore $\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{P}(A)^2$, which means that $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$ or 1 . \square

Appendix G: Application of Cramér-Wold theorem

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For some $t = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, we set $h_t := t_1 h_1 + t_2 h_2$. Then $t_1 U_N^{h_1} + t_2 U_N^{h_2} = U_N^{h_t}$ is a U -statistic with quadruplet kernel h_t .

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[h_2(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] < \infty$, we have furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h_t(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] &= t_1^2 \mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] + t_2 \mathbb{E}[h_2(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] \\ &\quad + 2t_1 t_2 \mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})h_2(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})], \\ &\leq t_1^2 \mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] + t_2 \mathbb{E}[h_2(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] \\ &\quad + 2t_1 t_2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[h_1(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2] \mathbb{E}[h_2(Y_{\{1,2;1,2\}})^2]}, \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, $h_t \not\equiv 0$, so Theorem 2.6 also applies for $U_N^{h_t}$ and $\sqrt{N}(U_N^{h_t} - U_\infty^{h_t}) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, V^{h_t})$, where $U_\infty^{h_t} = t_1 U_\infty^{h_1} + t_2 U_\infty^{h_2}$ and $V^{h_t} = t_1^2 V^{h_1} + t_2^2 V^{h_2} + 2t_1 t_2 C^{h_1, h_2} = t^T \Sigma t$ where C^{h_1, h_2} and Σ are defined in this Lemma.

By taking the obvious case where $t = (0, 0)$ and $U_N^{h_t} = 0 \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} 0$ into account, we can finally apply Cramér-Wold theorem which states that $\sqrt{N} \left(U_N^{h_1} - U_\infty^{h_1}, U_N^{h_2} - U_\infty^{h_2} \right)$ converges jointly in distribution to a multivariate Gaussian with covariance matrix Σ with the desired form, so this concludes the proof. \square

Appendix H: Some U-statistics written with matrix operations

Following formula (14), we write all the remaining U-statistics considered in the examples described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 as simple operations on matrices,

$$\begin{aligned} U_N^{h_2} &= \frac{1}{m_N(m_N - 1)n_N(n_N - 1)} \left[(|Y_N|_1)^2 - |Y_N^T Y_N|_1 + \text{Tr}(Y_N^T Y_N) - |Y_N Y_N^T|_1 + \text{Tr}(Y_N Y_N^T) - |Y_N^{\odot 2}|_1 \right], \\ U_N^{h_3} &= \frac{1}{m_N(m_N - 1)n_N} \left[|Y_N Y_N^T|_1 - \text{Tr}(Y_N Y_N^T) \right], \\ U_N^{h_4} &= \frac{1}{m_N n_N (n_N - 1)} \left[|\tilde{Y}_N^T \tilde{Y}_N|_1 - \text{Tr}(\tilde{Y}_N^T \tilde{Y}_N) \right], \\ U_N^{h_5} &= \frac{1}{m_N n_N} |Y_N|_1, \\ U_N^{h_6} &= \frac{1}{m_N n_N (n_N - 1)} \left[|\tilde{Y}_N^T Y_N|_1 - \text{Tr}(\tilde{Y}_N^T Y_N) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where Tr is the trace operator and \tilde{Y} is defined by $\tilde{Y}_{ij} = Y_{ij}^2 - Y_{ij}$.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Stéphane Robin (INRAE), Sophie Donnet (INRAE) and François Massol (CNRS) for many fruitful discussions and insights. This work was funded by a grant from Région Île-de-France and by the grant ANR-18-CE02-0010-01 of the French National Research Agency ANR (project EcoNet).

References

- ALDOUS, D. J. (1981). Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **11** 581–598.
- BARRAT, A., BARTHELEMY, M., PASTOR-SATORRAS, R. and VESPIGNANI, A. (2004). The architecture of complex weighted networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **101** 3747–3752.
- CHUNG, F. and LU, L. (2002). The average distances in random graphs with given expected degrees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **99** 15879–15882.
- DURRETT, R. (2019). *Probability: theory and examples* **49**. Cambridge university press.
- EAGLESON, G. K. and WEBER, N. C. (1978). Limit theorems for weakly exchangeable arrays. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **84** 123–130. Cambridge University Press.
- FELLER, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability theory and its application Vol II*. John Wiley and Sons.
- HOEFFDING, W. (1948). A Class of Statistics with Asymptotically Normal Distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 293–325.
- NANDI, H. and SEN, P. (1963). On the properties of U-statistics when the observations are not independent: Part two unbiased estimation of the parameters of a finite population. *Calcutta Statistical Association Bulletin* **12** 124–148.
- OUADAH, S., LATOUCHE, P. and ROBIN, S. (2021). Motif-based tests for bipartite networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.11381*.