

Threshold for Detecting High Dimensional Geometry in Anisotropic Random Geometric Graphs

Matthew Brennan*

Guy Bresler[†]Brice Huang[‡]

June 29, 2022

Abstract

In the anisotropic random geometric graph model, vertices correspond to points drawn from a high-dimensional Gaussian distribution and two vertices are connected if their distance is smaller than a specified threshold. We study when it is possible to hypothesis test between such a graph and an Erdős-Rényi graph with the same edge probability. If n is the number of vertices and α is the vector of eigenvalues, [EM19] shows that detection is possible when $n^3 \gg (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_3)^6$ and impossible when $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_4)^4$. We show detection is impossible when $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_3)^6$, closing this gap and affirmatively resolving the conjecture of [EM19].

1 Introduction

Extracting information from large graphs is a fundamental statistical task. Because many natural networks have underlying metric structure – for example, nearby proteins in a biological network are more likely to share function, and users with similar interests in a social network are more likely to interact – a central inference problem is to infer latent geometric structure in an observed graph. Moreover, with the proliferation of large data sets in the modern world, statistical inference is inherently high dimensional, see e.g. the survey [Joh06]. This motivates the study of inferring latent high dimensional geometry in a graph.

In this paper, we consider the hypothesis testing problem that determines if such inference is information-theoretically possible. This continues a line of work originated by Bubeck, Ding, Eldan, and Rácz [BDER16] and continued by Eldan and Mikulincer [EM19]. Our main contribution is a tight characterization of when detection is possible in the anisotropic setting introduced in [EM19].

Formally, given a graph G on $[n]$, we wish to test between two hypotheses. The null hypothesis is that G is a sample from the Erdős-Rényi graph $G(n, p)$, where each edge is present with independent probability p . The alternative hypothesis is that G is a sample from a random geometric graph (RGG), which we define precisely below. In such graphs, each vertex corresponds to a random point in some metric space and an edge exists between two vertices if their distance is smaller than a given threshold.

Arguably the most natural RGG is the isotropic model: each vertex $i \in [n]$ corresponds to an independent latent vector X_i sampled from the Haar measure on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} or an isotropic d -dimensional Gaussian,¹ and edge (i, j) is present if $\langle X_i, X_j \rangle \geq t_{p,d}$, where $t_{p,d}$ is chosen so that each edge is present with probability p . Let $G(n, p, d)$ denote the isotropic RGG with spherical latent data; we fix $p \in (0, 1)$ and allow d to vary with n . The following seminal result of Bubeck, Ding, Eldan, and Rácz characterizes, for fixed $p \in (0, 1)$, when it is possible to test between $G(n, p)$ and $G(n, p, d)$. Let TV denote total variation distance.

Theorem 1. [BDER16] *Let $p \in (0, 1)$ be fixed.*

(a) *If $n^3 \ll d$, then $\text{TV}(G(n, p), G(n, p, d)) \rightarrow 0$.*

*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

[†]guy@mit.edu, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

[‡]bmhuang@mit.edu, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Key words and phrases. Random geometric graph, Erdős-Rényi graph, high dimensional geometry, Wishart matrix, hypothesis testing.

¹These models have the same threshold for the detection task we consider.

(b) If $n^3 \gg d$, then $\text{TV}(G(n, p), G(n, p, d)) \rightarrow 1$.

Each coordinate of the latent vector X_i represents an attribute of vertex i . The isotropic model assumes that each attribute has the same influence on the network structure. In real networks, some attributes are more important than others: for example, in a social network geographic location has a stronger influence on connectivity than preference of ice cream flavor. This motivates the following anisotropic generalization of the RGG, introduced in [EM19], in which attributes may have different weights.

Definition 1.1 (Anisotropic random geometric graph). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$, let $G(n, p, \alpha)$ be the following random graph model. Generate X_1, \dots, X_n i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, D_\alpha)$ where D_α is the diagonal matrix with diagonal α . Let $t_{p, \alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ be the unique number satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\langle X_1, X_2 \rangle \geq t_{p, \alpha}) = p$. Then, $G \sim G(n, p, \alpha)$ is a graph on $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ where (i, j) is an edge if and only if $\langle X_i, X_j \rangle \geq t_{p, \alpha}$.

By rotational invariance of the model, the assumption that X_i has diagonal covariance is without loss of generality. Thus, all our results apply to the case of latent Gaussian vectors with arbitrary covariance.

Throughout, we fix $p \in (0, 1)$ and allow d, α to vary with n . The central question we study is, under what limiting behaviors of (n, d, α) can one statistically distinguish $G(n, p, \alpha)$ from $G(n, p)$? This question was first studied in [EM19], in which the following upper and lower bounds on detection were derived.

Theorem 2. [EM19, Theorem 2] Let $p \in (0, 1)$ be fixed. Then,

- (a) If $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_4)^4$, then $\text{TV}(G(n, p), G(n, p, \alpha)) \rightarrow 0$.
- (b) If $n^3 \gg (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$, then $\text{TV}(G(n, p), G(n, p, \alpha)) \rightarrow 1$.

When $\alpha = 1^d$, this recovers the sharp $d \asymp n^3$ detection threshold in the isotropic model. However, for general α there is a polynomially sized gap between the upper and lower bounds of Theorem 2. For example, if $\alpha_i = i^{-1/3}$, $(\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_4)^4 \asymp d^{2/3}$ while $(\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6 \asymp d$. [EM19, Conjecture 1] conjectures that the hypothesis of part (a) can be weakened to $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$, i.e. the detection threshold is $n^3 \asymp (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$.

The main result of this paper is to affirmatively resolve this conjecture.

Theorem 3 (Main result). If $p \in (0, 1)$ is fixed and $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$, then $\text{TV}(G(n, p), G(n, p, \alpha)) \rightarrow 1$.

In light of Theorem 1, this result can be interpreted as meaning that for the task of detecting geometry, the effective dimension of the anisotropic RGG is $(\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$.

[EM19, Conjecture 1] is motivated by the fact that Theorem 2(b) is witnessed by the *signed triangles statistic*

$$\theta(G) = \sum_{i < j < k} (G_{i,j} - p)(G_{i,k} - p)(G_{j,k} - p),$$

which is also the optimal statistic witnessing Theorem 1(b). A heuristic reason to expect that this statistic is optimal is that it is the lowest-degree nontrivial term in the Fourier expansion of the likelihood ratio $dG(n, p, \alpha) / dG(n, p)$. So, Theorem 3 confirms this heuristic and the optimality of the signed triangles statistic in the anisotropic setting.

1.1 Central Limit Theorem for Anisotropic Wishart Matrices

Closely related to the anisotropic RGG is the following matrix of inner products generating $G(n, p, \alpha)$. A sample of $G(n, p, \alpha)$ can be obtained by thresholding each entry of this matrix at $t_{p, \alpha}$.

Definition 1.2 (Diagonal-removed anisotropic Wishart matrix). Let $W \sim W(n, \alpha)$ be the random $n \times n$ matrix generated as follows. Sample $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ with i.i.d. columns sampled from $\mathcal{N}(0, D_\alpha)$, and set $W = \|\alpha\|_2^{-1} (X^\top X - \text{diag}(X^\top X))$.

For fixed n , if $d \rightarrow \infty$ and $\|\alpha\|_\infty / \|\alpha\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, by the multidimensional CLT $W(n, \alpha)$ converges to the following matrix of Gaussians.

Definition 1.3. Let $M \sim M(n)$ be a symmetric random $n \times n$ matrix with zero diagonal and i.i.d. standard Gaussians above the diagonal.

If we now allow d, α to vary with n , a natural question is, for which (n, d, α) can one test between $W(n, \alpha)$ and $M(n)$? This can be regarded as the random matrix analog of the question of detecting geometry in random graphs. Eldan and Mikulincer obtain the following detection lower bound.

Theorem 4. [EM19, Theorem 4] *If $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_4)^4$, then $\text{KL}(W(n, \alpha), M(n)) \rightarrow 0$.*

Of course, by Pinsker's inequality this also implies $W(n, \alpha)$ and $M(n)$ converge in total variation. Furthermore, the statistic $\theta(M) = \text{tr}(M^3)$ distinguishes $W(n, \alpha)$ and $M(n)$ to total variation distance $1 - o(1)$ when $n^3 \gg (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_3)^6$, which can be verified by computing the mean and variance of this statistic under the two hypotheses.

Similarly to above, these upper and lower bounds match for $\alpha = 1^d$, but in general there is a polynomially sized gap between them. We prove the following result, which identifies the sharp threshold for this detection task by improving the lower bound in Theorem 4. This result can be regarded as a tight CLT for anisotropic Wishart matrices.

Theorem 5. *If $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_3)^6$, then $\text{TV}(W(n, \alpha), M(n)) \rightarrow 0$.*

1.2 Techniques

Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 5 by the thresholding idea introduced in [BDER16]. Note that $G(n, p, \alpha)$ and $G(n, p)$ are entry-wise thresholdings of $W(n, \alpha)$ and $M(n)$. Thus $\text{TV}(G(n, p, \alpha), G(n, p))$ is upper bounded by $\text{TV}(W(n, \alpha), M(n))$ plus a small error term from the difference of the thresholds.

Our main technical contributions are in the proof of Theorem 5. We divide the entries of α into large coordinates α^+ and small coordinates α^- , each accounting for a constant fraction of its L^2 mass. We note (Lemma 2.4) that $(\|\alpha^-\|_2/\|\alpha^-\|_4)^4$ is of the same order as $(\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_3)^6$, so Theorem 4 is sufficient to show that $W(n, \alpha^-)$ converges in total variation to $M(n)$.

It remains to control the contributions of the large coordinates α^+ . We consider a procedure (Lemma 2.3) where we add the coordinates of α^+ to α^- one by one. Note that the effect of this operation on $W \sim W(n, \alpha)$ is to add an independent rank-one spike and scale down by a constant. By a data processing argument, the increase in $\text{TV}(W(n, \alpha), M(n))$ from one step of this procedure is bounded by $\text{TV}(M(n, u), M(n))$, where $M(n, u)$ is a linear combination of $M(n)$ and an independent rank-one Gaussian spike (see Definition 2.1).

This last quantity is bounded (Lemma 2.2) using the Ingster-Suslina χ^2 method, as $M(n, u)$ is a mixture of shifted Gaussian matrices parametrized by the spike. This is done after conditioning on a high probability event under which the χ^2 divergence's tails are integrable. The resulting χ^2 divergence is an expectation over two independent copies of the Gaussian spike, which is bounded by hypercontractivity estimates.

1.3 Related Work

There is a long history of work on low-dimensional random geometric graphs, see e.g. [Pen03]. The study of high-dimensional random geometric graphs began in [DGLU11], which showed that the isotropic model $G(n, p, d)$ converges in total variation to $G(n, p)$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$ for n fixed, and moreover that their clique numbers converge if $d \gg \log^3 n$. [BDER16] showed Theorem 1, that the threshold for convergence of $G(n, p, d)$ and $G(n, p)$ with p fixed is $d \asymp n^3$. They conjectured that if $p = o(1)$, convergence occurs at smaller d ; in particular, for $p = c/n$ they conjectured the threshold $d \asymp \log^3 n$. [BBN20] proved convergence occurs when $d = \tilde{\omega}(n^3 p, n^{7/2} p^2)$, meaning the threshold does decrease with p . Recently [LMSY22] proved that for $p = c/n$ ($c \geq 1$), convergence occurs when $d \gtrsim \log^{36} n$, resolving the conjecture of [BDER16] up to polylog factors. In a different direction, [LR21] obtain detection upper and lower bounds for soft random geometric graphs, wherein the inner products $\langle X_i, X_j \rangle$ determine the probability of edge (i, j) being present.

There is also a growing literature on CLTs for random matrices. [CM07] proved a general multidimensional CLT using Stein's method. [JL15] and [BDER16] concurrently showed that $W(n, d) \triangleq W(n, 1^d)$ converges in total variation to $M(n)$ if $d \gg n^3$. [BG18] generalized this result to arbitrary log-concave entry distributions, showing that the random matrix $W = d^{-1/2}(X^\top X - \text{diag}(X^\top X))$, where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ has i.i.d. entries from a log-concave measure, converges to $M(n)$ if $d/\log^2 d \gg n^3$. [RR19] refined the result of [JL15, BDER16] by computing the limiting value of $\text{TV}(W(n, d), M(n))$ if $n, d \rightarrow \infty$ with $d/n^3 \rightarrow c$. [CW19] showed a countable sequence of phase transitions for the Wishart ensemble $W(n, d)$: for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

if $n^{k+3} \gg d^{k+1}$, they show that $W(n, d)$ converges to an explicit density f_k . CLTs have been shown for Wishart tensors [Mik22] and Wishart matrices with arbitrary deleted entries [BBH21]. Finally, [NZ21] considers Wishart matrices $W = \sqrt{d}(d^{-1}X^\top X - I_n)$ where the columns of X are drawn i.i.d. from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ for $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ of the form

$$\Sigma_{i,j} = s(i - j),$$

where $s : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a covariance function with $s(0) = 1$. They show that W converges in Wasserstein distance to a Gaussian matrix if $n^3 \ll d$ and $s \in \ell^{4/3}(\mathbb{Z})$, and under various conditions if s is the correlation function of a fractional Brownian noise.

1.4 Notation and Preliminaries

We adopt standard asymptotic notations: $f \gg g$ means that $f/g \rightarrow \infty$ and $f \gtrsim g$ means that $f \geq cg$ for an absolute constant c . Throughout, $c, C > 0$ denote universal constants that may change from line to line.

We use TV, KL, and χ^2 to denote total variation, Kullback-Leibler divergence, and chi-square divergence. That is, for measures ν, μ with ν absolutely continuous with respect to μ ,

$$\text{TV}(\nu, \mu) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mu} \left| \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(\xi) - 1 \right|, \quad \text{KL}(\nu, \mu) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mu} \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(\xi) \log \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(\xi), \quad \chi^2(\nu, \mu) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim \mu} \left(\frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(\xi) - 1 \right)^2.$$

We recall that TV satisfies the triangle inequality and the data processing inequality $\text{TV}(\mathcal{K}(\nu), \mathcal{K}(\mu)) \leq \text{TV}(\nu, \mu)$ for any Markov kernel \mathcal{K} . We also recall the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $4\text{TV}(\nu, \mu)^2 \leq \chi^2(\nu, \mu)$.

Acknowledgements We are grateful to Dheeraj Nagaraj and Dan Mikulincer for helpful and stimulating discussions. This work was done in part while the authors were participating in the Probability, Geometry, and Computation in High Dimensions program at the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing in Fall 2020.

GB was supported by NSF CAREER award CCF-1940205. BH was supported by a NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, a Siebel Scholarship, and NSF award DMS-2022448.

2 Proof of Main Results

For $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\Delta(g) = (gg^\top - \text{diag}(gg^\top))$. We introduce the following random matrix, consisting of a linear combination of a sample from $M(n)$ and a rank-one Gaussian spike (with diagonal removed).

Definition 2.1. For $u \in [0, 1]$, let $M \sim M(n, u)$ be generated by

$$M = u\Delta(g) + \sqrt{1 - u^2}M', \tag{1}$$

where $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$ and $M' \sim M(n)$ are independent.

We defer the proof of the following lemma to Section 3. Using this lemma, we prove Theorems 3 and 5.

Lemma 2.2. *We have that $\text{TV}(M(n, u), M(n)) \lesssim u^3 n^{3/2}$.*

2.1 Detection Lower Bound for Anisotropic Wishart Matrices

We first prove Theorem 5. Assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_d \geq 0$. Define $\alpha^+ = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ and $\alpha^- = (\alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_d)$, for the smallest r such that $\|\alpha^+\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{3}\|\alpha\|_2^2$. We may assume

$$\frac{1}{3}\|\alpha\|_2^2 \leq \|\alpha^+\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{3}\|\alpha\|_2^2. \tag{2}$$

Indeed, if $\|\alpha^+\|_2^2 > \frac{2}{3}\|\alpha\|_2^2$, because the α_i are decreasing we in fact have $r = 1$ and $\alpha_1^2 > \frac{2}{3}\|\alpha\|_2^2$. In this case, $\alpha_1, \|\alpha\|_2, \|\alpha\|_3$ are within constant factors of each other. Then the condition $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2/\|\alpha\|_3)^6$ is vacuous so there is nothing to prove. Henceforth we assume (2). For $t = 0, 1, \dots, r$, define

$$\alpha^t = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_d).$$

These interpolate between α^- and α in the sense that $\alpha^0 = \alpha^-, \alpha^r = \alpha$.

Lemma 2.3. For each $t = 1, \dots, r$,

$$\mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^t), M(n)) \leq \mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^{t-1}), M(n)) + C \frac{\alpha_t^3}{\|\alpha\|_2^3} n^{3/2}.$$

Proof. Let $u_t = \alpha_t / \|\alpha^t\|_2$. By the triangle inequality,

$$\mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^t), M(n)) \leq \mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^t), M(n, u_t)) + \mathrm{TV}(M(n, u_t), M(n)). \quad (3)$$

For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, define the Markov kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(M) = u_t \Delta(g) + \sqrt{1 - u_t^2} M$$

where $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$. Note that $W \sim W(n, \alpha^t)$, $M \sim M(n, u_t)$ can be generated by $W = \mathcal{K}(W')$, $M = \mathcal{K}(M')$ for $W' \sim W(n, \alpha^{t-1})$, $M' \sim M(n)$. By data processing,

$$\mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^t), M(n, u_t)) \leq \mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^{t-1}), M(n)).$$

The remaining term in (3) can be bounded by Lemma 2.2:

$$\mathrm{TV}(M(n, u_t), M(n)) \lesssim u_t^3 n^{3/2} = \frac{\alpha_t^3}{\|\alpha^t\|_2^3} n^{3/2} \lesssim \frac{\alpha_t^3}{\|\alpha\|_2^3} n^{3/2}$$

where the final inequality uses (2). □

Lemma 2.4. We have that $(\|\alpha^-\| / \|\alpha^-\|_4)^4 \gtrsim (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$.

Proof. Note that

$$\|\alpha^+\|_2^2 \|\alpha^-\|_4^4 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=r+1}^d \alpha_i^2 \alpha_j^4 \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=r+1}^d \alpha_i^3 \alpha_j^3 \leq \|\alpha\|_3^6.$$

Thus, using (2),

$$(\|\alpha^-\|_2 / \|\alpha^-\|_4)^4 \geq (\|\alpha^+\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^2 (\|\alpha^-\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^4 \gtrsim (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 5. By applying Lemma 2.3 repeatedly, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha), M(n)) &\leq \mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^-), M(n)) + C \sum_{t=1}^r \frac{\alpha_t^3}{\|\alpha\|_2^3} n^{3/2} \\ &\leq \mathrm{TV}(W(n, \alpha^-), M(n)) + C \frac{\|\alpha\|_3^3}{\|\alpha\|_2^3} n^{3/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The hypothesis $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$ implies the second term of (4) is $o(1)$. By Lemma 2.4 we further have $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha^-\|_2 / \|\alpha^-\|_4)^4$. Therefore Theorem 4 and Pinsker's inequality imply that the first term of (4) is $o(1)$. This concludes the proof. □

Remark 2.5. We conjecture that Theorem 5 remains true if the diagonal is not removed, i.e. if $W(n, \alpha)$ and $M(n)$ are replaced by the law $W^*(n, \alpha)$ of $W = \|\alpha\|_2^{-1} (X^\top X - \|\alpha\|_1 I_n)$, where X is as in Definition 1.2, and the law $M^*(n)$ of a GOE matrix. With minor modifications, the proof of Lemma 2.2 in the next section generalizes if the diagonal is not removed, i.e. if $\Delta(g)$ and $M(n)$ are replaced by $gg^\top - I_n$ and $M^*(n)$. So, if Theorem 4 holds without diagonal removal, the above proof can be easily modified to conclude Theorem 5 without diagonal removal. The difficulty is that the entropy chain rule argument used to prove Theorem 4 requires the diagonal to be removed.

2.2 Detection Lower Bound for Anisotropic RGGs

The proof of Theorem 3 is identical to that of Theorem 2(a) (Theorem 2(b) in [EM19]), using Theorem 5 in place of Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 3. Define the threshold functions $H_{p,\alpha}, K_p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by

$$H_{p,\alpha}(x) = \mathbb{1}\{x \geq t_{p,\alpha}\}, \quad K_p(x) = \mathbb{1}\{x \geq \Phi^{-1}(p)\},$$

where $t_{p,\alpha}$ is defined in Definition 1.1 and $\Phi(t) = \mathbb{P}_{Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)}(Z \geq t)$ is the complement of the cdf of the standard Gaussian. Then, $G(n, p, \alpha)$ and $G(n, p)$ can be generated as the following entry-wise thresholdings of $W(n, \alpha)$ and $M(n)$:

$$G(n, p, \alpha) = H_{p,\alpha}(W(n, \alpha)), \quad G(n, p) = K_p(M(n)).$$

Using the TV triangle inequality and data processing inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(G(n, p, \alpha), G(n, p)) &\leq \text{TV}(H_{p,\alpha}(W(n, \alpha)), H_{p,\alpha}(M(n))) + \text{TV}(H_{p,\alpha}(M(n)), K_p(M(n))) \\ &\leq \text{TV}(W(n, \alpha), M(n)) + \text{TV}(H_{p,\alpha}(M(n)), K_p(M(n))). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Since $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$, Theorem 5 implies that the first term of (5) is $o(1)$. The second term of (5) is $o(1)$ by [EM19, Lemma 16]. Indeed, the proof of this lemma proceeds identically if the hypothesis $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_4)^4$ is weakened to $n^3 \ll (\|\alpha\|_2 / \|\alpha\|_3)^6$. \square

3 Proof of TV Bound for Spiked Gaussian Matrix

In this section we will prove Lemma 2.2. Let $M(n, u, g)$ be the random matrix M generated by (1) for $g \in \mathbb{R}^n$ fixed and $M' \sim M(n)$. Thus $M(n, u)$ is a mixture of the random matrices $M(n, u, g)$ over latent randomness $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$.

Further, for (always measurable and high probability) $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, let μ_S be the law of $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$ conditioned on $g \in S$. Let $M(n, u, S)$ be the law of M generated by (1) for $g \sim \mu_S$ and $M' \sim M(n)$. This can be regarded as $M(n, u)$ conditioned on $g \in S$, and as a mixture of the $M(n, u, g)$ over $g \sim \mu_S$.

We begin with the following series of estimates. Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set we will specify later.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(M(n, u), M(n)) &\leq \text{TV}(M(n, u), M(n, u, S)) + \text{TV}(M(n, u, S), M(n)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)}(g \in S^c) + \text{TV}(M(n, u, S), M(n)). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 4\text{TV}(M(n, u, S), M(n))^2 &\leq \chi^2(M(n, u, S), M(n)) \\ &= -1 + \mathbb{E}_{A \sim M(n)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{g \sim \mu_S} \frac{dM(n, u, g)}{dM(n)}(A) \right)^2 \\ &= -1 + \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} \mathbb{E}_{A \sim M(n)} \frac{dM(n, u, g)}{dM(n)}(A) \frac{dM(n, u, h)}{dM(n)}(A). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The two estimates leading to (6) are by the TV triangle inequality and the data processing inequality. The estimate leading to (7) is by Cauchy-Schwarz.

These estimates are the starting point of the so-called truncated Ingster-Suslina χ^2 method. It is necessary to condition on an appropriate S in (6) so that the tails of the χ^2 divergence (7) are integrable. The following lemma evaluates the inner expectation in (7).

Lemma 3.1. *For $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{A \sim M(n)} \frac{dM(n, u, g)}{dM(n)}(A) \frac{dM(n, u, h)}{dM(n)}(A) \\ &= (1 - u^4)^{-n(n-1)/4} \exp \left(\frac{u^2}{1 - u^4} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} g_i g_j h_i h_j - \frac{u^4}{1 - u^4} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (g_i^2 g_j^2 + h_i^2 h_j^2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The densities of $M(n)$ and $M(n, u, g)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dM(n)}{d\text{Leb}}(A) &= \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}A_{i,j}^2\right), \\ \frac{dM(n, u, g)}{d\text{Leb}}(A) &= \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (2\pi \cdot (1 - u^2))^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2(1 - u^2)}(A_{i,j} - ug_i g_j)^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{A \sim M(n)} \frac{dM(n, u, g)}{dM(n)}(A) \frac{dM(n, u, h)}{dM(n)}(A) \\ = (1 - u^2)^{-n(n-1)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbb{E}_{A_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)} \exp\left(-\frac{(A_{i,j} - ug_i g_j)^2}{2(1 - u^2)} - \frac{(A_{i,j} - uh_i h_j)^2}{2(1 - u^2)} + A_{i,j}^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

By a straightforward calculation the inner expectation equals

$$\sqrt{\frac{1+u^2}{1-u^2}} \exp\left(\frac{u^2}{1-u^4} g_i g_j h_i h_j - \frac{u^4}{2(1-u^4)} (g_i^2 g_j^2 + h_i^2 h_j^2)\right)$$

from which the result follows. \square

Before proceeding further, we record two consequences of Boolean and Gaussian hypercontractivity. The proof of the following lemma is standard, see [O'D14, Chapters 9 and 11].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$ and $\nu = \text{unif}(\{-1, 1\}^n)$. Further, let $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu} f(x)^2$.*

(a) *For any $k \geq 2$, $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu} f(x)^k \leq d^{dk/2} \sigma^k$.*

(b) *There exist constants C_d, c_d such that $\mathbb{P}_{x \sim \nu}[|f(x)| \geq t\sigma] \leq C_d \exp(-c_d t^{2/d})$.*

The same statements hold if $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu = \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$.

For $a \geq 1$, let

$$S(a) = \left\{g \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|g\|_2^2 \leq (1+a)n, \|g\|_4^4 \leq 3(1+a)n\right\}.$$

We will prove Lemma 2.2 by taking $S = S(a)$ in the calculation (7) for appropriate a . We first estimate the probability of $S(a)$.

Lemma 3.3. *For $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$, $\mathbb{P}(g \in S(a)^c) \leq C \exp(-ca^{1/2}n^{1/4})$.*

Proof. Let $f_2 = \|g\|_2^2 - n$ and $f_4 = \|g\|_4^4 - 3n$. Note that $\mathbb{E} f_2^2 = 2n$ and $\mathbb{E} f_4^2 = 100n$. By Lemma 3.2(b)

$$\mathbb{P}(\|g\|_2^2 > (1+a)n) = \mathbb{P}(f_2 > an) \leq C_2 \exp(-c_2 an / \sqrt{2n}) \leq C \exp(-can^{1/2}).$$

Similarly

$$\mathbb{P}(\|g\|_4^4 > 3(1+a)n) = \mathbb{P}(f_4 > 3an) \leq C_2 \exp\left(-c_2(3an/\sqrt{100n})^{1/2}\right) \leq C \exp(-ca^{1/2}n^{1/4}).$$

\square

In light of Lemma 3.1, define the random variables

$$X = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} g_i g_j h_i h_j, \quad Y = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (g_i^2 g_j^2 + h_i^2 h_j^2).$$

The following two lemmas bound, respectively, the low and high moments of X and Y under $g, h \sim \mu_{S(a)}$.

Lemma 3.4. *The following estimates hold for all $a \geq 1$.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} X &= 0, \\ \mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} XY &= 0, \\ \left| \mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} X^2 - \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \right| &\lesssim \mathbb{P}(S(a)^c)^{1/2} n^2, \\ \left| \mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} Y - \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \right| &\lesssim \mathbb{P}(S(a)^c)^{1/2} n^2, \\ \left| \mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} X^3 - n(n-1)(n-2) \right| &\lesssim \mathbb{P}(S(a)^c)^{1/2} n^3. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first two claims follow by the symmetry of $S(a)$ under the map $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \mapsto (x_1 g_1, \dots, x_n g_n)$ for any $x \in \{-1, 1\}^n$. In the rest of this proof, let \mathbb{E} denote expectation with respect to $g, h \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$. By straightforward calculation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} X^2 &= \frac{n(n-1)}{2}, \\ \mathbb{E} Y &= \frac{n(n-1)}{2}, \\ \mathbb{E} X^3 &= n(n-1)(n-2). \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the discrepancy caused by changing the measure from $\mu_{S(a)}$ to $\mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$ using the following generic bound. For any (g, h) -measurable ξ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} \xi = \mathbb{P}(S(a))^{-2} \mathbb{E} \mathbb{1}\{g, h \in S(a)\} \xi = \mathbb{P}(S(a))^{-2} [\mathbb{E} \xi - \mathbb{E} \mathbb{1}\{(g, h \in S(a))^c\} \xi].$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} \xi - \mathbb{E} \xi \right| &\leq (\mathbb{P}(S(a))^{-2} - 1) |\mathbb{E} \xi| + \mathbb{P}(S(a))^{-2} |\mathbb{E} \mathbb{1}\{(g, h \in S(a))^c\} \xi| \\ &\leq \frac{2\mathbb{P}(S(a)^c) + \sqrt{2\mathbb{P}(S(a)^c)}}{\mathbb{P}(S(a))^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\xi^2)} \lesssim \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(S(a)^c) \mathbb{E}(\xi^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\xi = X^2$, by Lemma 3.2(a)

$$\mathbb{E} \xi^2 = \mathbb{E} X^4 \leq 4^8 (\mathbb{E} X^2)^2 \lesssim n^4,$$

which proves the third conclusion. For $\xi = X^3$, we similarly have $\mathbb{E} \xi^2 \lesssim n^6$, proving the fifth conclusion. For $\xi = Y$, a straightforward calculation shows $\mathbb{E} \xi^2 \lesssim n^4$, proving the fourth conclusion. \square

Lemma 3.5. *For $a \geq 1$ and integer $i, j \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} |X^i Y^j| \leq (6i)^i (2an)^{i+2j}.$$

Proof. By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} |X^i Y^j| \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} X^{2i} \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} Y^{2j} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (8)$$

For all $g \in S(a)$,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} g_i^2 g_j^2 \leq \|g\|_2^4 \leq (1+a)^2 n^2 \leq (2an)^2$$

and similarly for h . Thus if $g, h \in S(a)$, then $|Y| \leq (2an)^2$, which implies

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{g,h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} Y^{2j} \right)^{1/2} \leq (2an)^{2j}. \quad (9)$$

If $i = 0$, this implies the result. Otherwise assume $i \geq 1$. By symmetry of the set $S(a)$, the distribution of X under $g, h \sim \mu_{S(a)}$ is the same as that of

$$\tilde{X} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} x_i x_j g_i g_j h_i h_j$$

where $x \sim \text{unif}(\{-1, 1\}^n)$ and $g, h \sim \mu_{S(a)}$ are independent. By Lemma 3.2(a), conditioned on g, h ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x \tilde{X}^{2i} \leq (2i)^{2i} \left(\mathbb{E}_x \tilde{X}^2 \right)^i = (2i)^{2i} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} g_i^2 g_j^2 h_i^2 h_j^2 \right)^i.$$

For $g, h \in S(a)$,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} g_i^2 g_j^2 h_i^2 h_j^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (g_i^4 g_j^4 + h_i^4 h_j^4) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|g\|_4^8 + \|h\|_4^8) \leq 3^2 (1+a)^2 n^2 \leq 3^2 (2an)^2.$$

So,

$$\mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} X^{2i} = \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_{S(a)}} \mathbb{E}_x \tilde{X}^{2i} \leq (6i \cdot 2an)^{2i}.$$

Recalling (8) and (9) this implies the result. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.2. We may assume $u^2 n \leq 10^{-4}$ because otherwise the lemma is trivial. Take $S = S(a)$ for $a = (u^2 n)^{-1/4}$. By Lemma 3.3, $\mathbb{P}(S^c) \leq C \exp(-cu^{-1/4} n^{1/8})$. Equation (7) and Lemma 3.1 imply

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + 4\text{TV}(M(n, u, S), M(n))^2 &\leq (1 - u^4)^{-n(n-1)/4} \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} \exp\left(\frac{u^2}{1 - u^4} X - \frac{u^4}{1 - u^4} Y\right) \\ &= (1 - u^4)^{-n(n-1)/4} \left(\sum_{i, j \geq 0} \frac{(-1)^j}{i! j!} \cdot \frac{u^{2i+4j}}{(1 - u^4)^{i+j}} \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} X^i Y^j \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $T = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2 : i + 2j < 4\}$ and $T^c = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^2 \setminus T$. By the estimates in Lemma 3.4,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(i, j) \in T} \frac{1}{i! j!} \frac{u^{2i+4j}}{(1 - u^4)^{i+j}} \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} X^i Y^j \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{u^4}{1 - u^4} \cdot \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + \frac{u^4}{(1 - u^4)^2} \cdot \frac{n(n-1)}{4} + \frac{u^6}{(1 - u^4)^3} \cdot \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{6} + Cn^3 e^{-cu^{-1/4} n^{1/8}} \\ &\leq 1 - u^4 \cdot \frac{n(n-1)}{4} + Cu^6 n^3. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we have used that $n^3 e^{-cu^{-1/4} n^{1/8}} \ll u^6 n^3$, because $e^{cu^{-1/4} n^{1/8}}$ is larger than any polynomial in u^{-1} . By Lemma 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i, j) \in T^c} \frac{1}{i! j!} \frac{u^{2i+4j}}{(1 - u^4)^{i+j}} \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} X^i Y^j &\leq \sum_{(i, j) \in T^c} \frac{1}{(i/e)^i} \frac{u^{2i+4j}}{(1 - u^4)^{i+2j}} \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} |X^i Y^j| \\ &\leq \sum_{(i, j) \in T^c} \frac{(6i)^i}{(i/e)^i} \left(\frac{2au^2 n}{1 - u^4} \right)^{i+2j} \\ &\leq \sum_{(i, j) \in T^c} \left(\frac{12e \cdot au^2 n}{1 - u^4} \right)^{i+2j}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $au^2 n = (u^2 n)^{3/4} \leq 10^{-3}$, this is a convergent double-geometric sum. As $i + 2j \geq 4$ for $(i, j) \in T^c$,

$$\sum_{(i, j) \in T^c} \frac{1}{i! j!} \frac{u^{2i+4j}}{(1 - u^4)^{i+j}} \mathbb{E}_{g, h \sim \mu_S} X^i Y^j \lesssim (au^2 n)^4 = u^6 n^3.$$

Combining the above,

$$\begin{aligned} \log(1 + 4\text{TV}(M(n, u, S), M(n))^2) &\leq -\frac{n(n-1)}{4} \log(1 - u^4) + \log\left(1 - u^4 \cdot \frac{n(n-1)}{4} + Cu^6 n^3\right) \\ &\leq Cu^6 n^3. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\text{TV}(M(n, u, S), M(n)) \lesssim u^3 n^{3/2}.$$

Finally, since $\mathbb{P}(S^c) \leq C \exp(-cu^{-1/4} n^{1/8}) \ll u^3 n^{3/2}$, (6) implies $\text{TV}(M(n, u), M(n)) \lesssim u^3 n^{3/2}$. \square

References

- [BBH21] Matthew Brennan, Guy Bresler, and Brice Huang. De Finetti-style results for Wishart matrices: Combinatorial structure and phase transitions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14011*, 2021.
- [BBN20] Matthew Brennan, Guy Bresler, and Dheeraj Nagaraj. Phase transitions for detecting latent geometry in random graphs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 178(3):1215–1289, 2020.
- [BDER16] Sébastien Bubeck, Jian Ding, Ronen Eldan, and Miklós Z Rácz. Testing for high-dimensional geometry in random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(3):503–532, 2016.
- [BG18] Sébastien Bubeck and Shirshendu Ganguly. Entropic CLT and phase transition in high-dimensional Wishart matrices. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2018(2):588–606, 2018.
- [CM07] Sourav Chatterjee and Elizabeth Meckes. Multivariate normal approximation using exchangeable pairs. *arXiv preprint math/0701464*, 2007.
- [CW19] Didier Chételat and Martin T Wells. The middle-scale asymptotics of Wishart matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2639–2670, 2019.
- [DGLU11] Luc Devroye, András György, Gábor Lugosi, and Frederic Udina. High-dimensional random geometric graphs and their clique number. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:2481–2508, 2011.
- [EM19] Ronen Eldan and Dan Mikulincer. Information and dimensionality of anisotropic random geometric graphs. In *In Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar*, pages 273–324. Springer, 2017–2019.
- [JL15] Tiefeng Jiang and Danning Li. Approximation of rectangular beta-Laguerre ensembles and large deviations. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 28(3):804–847, 2015.
- [Joh06] Iain M Johnstone. High dimensional statistical inference and random matrices. *arXiv preprint math/0611589*, 2006.
- [LMSY22] Siqi Liu, Sidhanth Mohanty, Tselil Schramm, and Elizabeth Yang. Testing thresholds for high-dimensional sparse random geometric graphs. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 672–677, 2022.
- [LR21] Suqi Liu and Miklós Z Rácz. Phase transition in noisy high-dimensional random geometric graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15249*, 2021.
- [Mik22] Dan Mikulincer. A CLT in Stein’s distance for generalized Wishart matrices and higher-order tensors. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2022(10):7839–7872, 2022.
- [NZ21] Ivan Nourdin and Guangqu Zheng. Asymptotic behavior of large Gaussian correlated Wishart matrices. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, pages 1–30, 2021.
- [O’D14] Ryan O’Donnell. *Analysis of Boolean functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- [Pen03] Mathew Penrose. *Random geometric graphs*, volume 5. OUP Oxford, 2003.
- [RR19] Miklós Z Rácz and Jacob Richey. A smooth transition from Wishart to GOE. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 32(2):898–906, 2019.