

The degree-restricted random process is far from uniform

Michael Molloy* and Erlang Surya† and Lutz Warnke‡

October 31, 2022

Abstract

The degree-restricted random process is a natural algorithmic model for generating graphs with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$: starting with an empty n -vertex graph, it sequentially adds new random edges so that the degree of each vertex v_i remains at most d_i . Wormald conjectured in 1999 that, for d -regular degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n , the final graph of this process is similar to a uniform random d -regular graph.

In this paper we show that, for degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n that are not nearly regular, the final graph of the degree-restricted random process differs substantially from a uniform random graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . The combinatorial proof technique is our main conceptual contribution: we adapt the switching method to the degree-restricted process, demonstrating that this enumeration technique can also be used to analyze stochastic processes (rather than just uniform random models, as before).

1 Introduction

Random graph processes that grow step-by-step over time are powerful in both theory and practice: they are often used to generate sophisticated combinatorial objects with surprising properties [8, 9, 19, 10, 11], and are also frequently used to model complex networks arising in applications [1, 15, 16, 6, 39]. Rather few proof techniques exist for analyzing such stochastic processes, which is why even the most basic questions about these process are often hard to answer. In this paper we add the so-called ‘switching method’ to the list of techniques for analyzing stochastic processes.

This paper concerns the perhaps simplest random graph process that attempts to generate a graph with a given graphic¹ degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)})$: the *degree-restricted random \mathbf{d}_n -process* starts with an empty n -vertex graph, and then step-by-step adds a new random edge subject to the constraint that the degree of each vertex v_i remains at most d_i (without creating loops or multiple edges). The \mathbf{d}_n -process is so natural that it has been studied since the mid 1980s in chemistry [32, 2, 3], combinatorics [43, 52, 46] and statistical physics [7], often with a focus on d -regular degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n . For graphic degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n with constant maximum degree, Ruciński and Wormald [43] showed in 1990 that the \mathbf{d}_n -process is a natural algorithmic model in the sense that it typically generates² a graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . Conceptually the perhaps most interesting open problem remaining [4, 5, 52, 46] concerns its distribution: is the final graph of the \mathbf{d}_n -process similar to a uniform random graphs with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n ?

To make this question precise, let $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ be the final graph of the \mathbf{d}_n -process conditioned on having degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , and let $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ be the uniform random graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . Since the distributions

*Dept of Computer Science, University of Toronto, Toronto M5S 3G4, Canada. E-mail: molloy@cs.toronto.edu. Supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 2019-06522.

†Department of Mathematics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla CA 92093, USA. E-mail: esurya@ucsd.edu. Supported by NSF grant DMS-2225631.

‡Department of Mathematics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla CA 92093, USA. E-mail: lwarnke@ucsd.edu. Supported by NSF CAREER grant DMS-2225631 and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

¹As usual, a degree-sequence \mathbf{d}_n is called *graphic* if it is the degree sequence of some simple graph. It is well known (and easy to check) that any degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)}) \in \{0, \dots, \Delta\}^n$ is graphic when the degree sum $\sum_{i \in [n]} d_i^{(n)}$ is even and larger than some sufficiently large constant $m'_0 = m'_0(\Delta)$; see Lemma 19.

²The \mathbf{d}_n -process does not always generate a graph with the desired degree sequence. For example, using the graphic degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_4 = (2, 2, 2, 2)$ it is possible to get stuck after three steps if we create a triangle.

of $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ are not³ identical, it is natural [42, 27, 14, 37, 33, 28] to focus on similarity with respect to their typical properties. More formally, the remaining key question is whether $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ are *contiguous*, i.e., if every property that holds with high probability⁴ in one also holds with high probability in the other (see [29, Section 9.6]). In fact, Wormald conjectured in 1999 that $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ are contiguous for d -regular degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n , for any fixed $d \geq 2$ (see [52, Conjecture 6.3]). Until now these contiguity questions have remained open, partly because we are lacking suitable proof techniques for such questions in random graph processes such as $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ (which are much harder to analyze⁵ than uniform random graphs such as $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$).

In this paper we show that, for graphic degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n with constant maximum degree $\Delta = O(1)$, the final graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ of the \mathbf{d}_n -process is *not* contiguous to the uniform random graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$, unless the degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n is nearly regular (which means that all but $o(n)$ vertices have the same degree). In other words, the final graph of the degree-restricted random process differs substantially from a uniform random graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . Here we denote the number of vertices in \mathbf{d}_n with degree j by

$$n_j := n_j(\mathbf{d}_n) := |\{v \in \{1, \dots, n\} : d_v^{(n)} = j\}|.$$

Theorem 1 (The degree restricted process is far from uniform). *Fix two constants: an integer $\Delta \geq 1$ and a real $\xi \in (0, 1)$. Assume that the graphic degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)}) \in \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta\}^n$ satisfies the ‘non-regularity’ assumption $\max_{1 \leq j \leq \Delta} n_j/n \leq 1 - \xi$. Then the final graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ of the degree restricted random \mathbf{d}_n -process is not contiguous to the uniform random graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n .*

This theorem follows from a more general result we shall present in Section 1.1, which shows that a certain edge-statistic typically differs substantially between $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$. This yields a stronger discrepancy between $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ than non-contiguity, including that the total variation distance between them is nearly maximal, and also the existence of a simple algorithm that can distinguish between them.

The combinatorial proof technique used for Theorem 1 is our main conceptual contribution: we adapt the switching method [34, 23, 36, 52, 35, 26, 22] to the degree-restricted random \mathbf{d}_n -process, demonstrating that this enumeration technique can also be used to analyze stochastic processes (rather than just uniform random models, as before). Interestingly, this is not the first time that the \mathbf{d}_n -process has stimulated the development of a new proof technique for stochastic processes: indeed, the widely-used differential equation method [43, 50, 53] as well as the associated self-correction idea [45, 46] were first developed for the random \mathbf{d}_n -process; both were crucial for later breakthroughs in Ramsey Theory [8, 9, 19, 10], demonstrating the potential of developing new proof techniques for stochastic processes such as the random \mathbf{d}_n -process.

1.1 Main result: discrepancy in edge-statistics

Our main result shows that the number of certain edges differs substantially between the degree restricted random process and a uniform random graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . To formalize this difference, note that after rescaling ξ to $\xi/2$ (as we may), the ‘non-regularity’ assumption of Theorem 1 implies that

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} n_j/n \in [\xi, 1 - \xi] \tag{1}$$

for some integer $k < \Delta$. For any graph G , let $X_k(G)$ denote the number of edges in G whose endpoints are of degree at most k ; we call such edges *small edges*. Theorem 2 with $\epsilon = \beta/2$, say, shows that $X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P)$ and $X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n})$ differ with high probability, which implies the non-contiguity result Theorem 1. Here

$$\mu = \mu(\mathbf{d}_n, k) := \frac{(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} j n_j)^2}{4m} \quad \text{with} \quad m = m(\mathbf{d}_n) := \frac{\sum_{1 \leq j \leq \Delta} j n_j}{2}, \tag{2}$$

where μ approximates the expected number of small edges in the uniform random graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ (see Appendix A.2), and m equals the number of edges of the degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n .

³The fact that the distributions of $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ are not identical can be seen by inspection of specific sequences on a few vertices; see Appendix A.1 for an example. For 2-regular degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n certain expectations and probabilities also differ [44, 46] slightly, but these minor differences do not rule out contiguity (since they do not concern high probability events).

⁴As usual, we say that a graph property holds *with high probability* if it holds with probability tending to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

⁵For example, a moment of reflection reveals that even estimating $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G)$ is challenging; see [43, Section 1].

Theorem 2 (Discrepancy in number of small edges). *Fix two constants: an integer $\Delta \geq 1$ and a real $\xi \in (0, 1)$. Assume that the graphic degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n \in \{1, \dots, \Delta\}^n$ satisfies for some integer $k = k(\mathbf{d}_n) \in \{1, \dots, \Delta - 1\}$ the ‘non-regularity’ assumption (1). Then the following holds, with $\mu = \mu(\mathbf{d}_n, k)$ as defined in (2):*

(i) *For any $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) \gg n^{-1/2}$, the uniform random graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}) - \mu| < \epsilon\mu) \geq 1 - e^{-\Theta(\epsilon^2 n)}. \quad (3)$$

(ii) *There is a constant $\beta = \beta(\xi, \Delta) > 0$ such that the final graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ of the \mathbf{d}_n -process satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| > \beta\mu) \geq 1 - e^{-\Theta(n)}. \quad (4)$$

Invoking again Theorem 2 with $\epsilon = \beta/2$, note that, with probability at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n)}$, the number of small edges satisfies $|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| > \beta\mu$ and $|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}) - \mu| \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta\mu$. This striking difference between $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ has a number of interesting consequences: (a) a polynomial algorithm can tell $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ apart by simply counting the number of small edges, (b) the edit-distance⁶ between $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ is at least $\frac{1}{2}\beta\mu = \Theta(n)$, i.e., very large, and (c) the total variation distance⁷ between $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ is nearly maximal:

$$|\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{TV}}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P, G_{\mathbf{d}_n}) - 1| \leq e^{-\Theta(n)}. \quad (5)$$

The proof of inequality (3) for the uniform random graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n is standard: it is based on routine configuration model [12, 52, 20] arguments, and appears in Appendix A.2. Our main contribution is the proof of inequality (4) for the \mathbf{d}_n -process: it is based on an intricate edge-switching argument involving the trajectories of the random \mathbf{d}_n -process, see the proof outline in Section 1.2 and the technical details in Sections 3–5. In Section 6 we also mention a potential alternative approach based on the differential equation method based, which so far has resisted rigorous analysis (which is why we resorted to the switching method).

We now give some intuition as to why the number X_k of small edges differs between $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ and $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$. Namely, if we construct a random graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n using the standard configuration model by adding edges step-by-step (one at a time), then in each step the probability of selecting a vertex v as an endpoint is proportional to the current unused degree of that vertex. By contrast, in the degree restricted \mathbf{d}_n -process all vertices with positive unused degree are (approximately) equally likely to be selected in each step. This ‘preferential versus uniform’ difference heuristically suggests that small edges tend to be created with higher probability in the \mathbf{d}_n -process, which makes the edge-discrepancies in Theorem 2 plausible (see also Remark 4).

1.2 Proof strategy: switching method

The basic idea of the switching method is to estimate ratios of closely related set-sizes via local perturbations: namely, by defining a suitable ‘switching operation’ that maps objects in \mathcal{A} to objects in \mathcal{B} , one can often estimate the set-size ratio $|\mathcal{A}|/|\mathcal{B}|$ fairly precisely via a double-counting argument (by estimating the number of switchings from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} and the number of inverse switchings from \mathcal{B} to \mathcal{A}). This has been successfully used to enumerate many combinatorial structures and analyze uniform models thereof, including graphs with a given degree sequence [34, 36, 52, 26, 22, 31], 0-1-matrices [25, 35], regular hypergraphs [17], structured graph classes [51, 21, 13], and Latin rectangles [23].

Our proof of Theorem 2 (ii) adapts the switching method to the degree restricted random \mathbf{d}_n -process, which requires several new ideas. Indeed, for uniform random structures such as $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ the normalizing constants in $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} \in \mathcal{A})/\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} \in \mathcal{B}) = |\mathcal{A}|/|\mathcal{B}|$ cancel, and the switching method directly applies. This simplification does not happen for stochastic processes like the \mathbf{d}_n -process, so we needed to develop a form of the switching method that allows for different probabilities: roughly speaking, we (i) apply switching operations directly to the trajectories of the random \mathbf{d}_n -process, and then (ii) average over the probabilities of these trajectories and their corresponding graphs; both ideas should also aid analysis of other stochastic processes.

The starting point of our proof strategy is the following well-known⁸ *switching operation on graphs*: given a graph G^+ with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n where the two edges ab, xy satisfy the degree constraints

⁶Given two graphs G_1, G_2 with the same number of vertices, the *edit-distance* between them is defined as the minimum number of edge-changes (addition or removal) one needs to apply to G_1 in order to obtain a graph that is isomorphic to G_2 .

⁷As usual, the *total variation distance* $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{TV}}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P, G_{\mathbf{d}_n})$ is defined as $\frac{1}{2} \sum_G |\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G) - \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} = G)|$, where the sum is taken over all possible graphs G with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n .

⁸This switching operation was introduced by Peterson [40, 38] in year 1891 (to analyze structural properties of regular graphs).




Figure 1: Switching example: the edges ab, xy in G^+ are replaced with the edges ax, by to obtain G^- (all other edges remain unchanged). Note that G^+ and G^- have the same vertex degrees, and that G^+ has one more edge than G^- where both endpoints have degree one (which are so-called small edges).

$\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b)\} \leq k$ and $\min\{\deg(x), \deg(y)\} > k$, we write G^- for the graph obtained by replacing⁹ the edges ab, xy with the edges ax, by ; see Figure 1 for an example with $k = 1$. Note that G^+ and G^- both have the same degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , and, more importantly, that G^+ has exactly one small edge more than G^- , i.e.,

$$X_k(G^+) = X_k(G^-) + 1. \quad (6)$$

Since our goal is to show that the \mathbf{d}_n -process prefers more small edges than the uniform model $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$, in view of $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} = G^+) / \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} = G^-) = 1$ we thus would like to prove the probability ratio estimate

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G^+)}{\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G^-)} \geq 1 + \epsilon \quad (7)$$

for some constant $\epsilon > 0$, as this would imply the desired discrepancy in the number of small edges.

In Section 1.2.1 we first sketch a switching argument for establishing (7) in the special case $k = 1$, and outline how it implies Theorem 2 (ii). Afterwards, in Section 1.2.2 we discuss how we modify this switching argument for the more interesting general case $k \geq 1$, where we need to deal with the major obstacle that (7) is not always true: see Figure 3 in Appendix A.1 for a counterexample with $k = 2$. Finally, in Section 1.2.3 we compare our approach with classical switching arguments (that do not concern stochastic processes).

1.2.1 Special case $k = 1$: comparison of edge-sequences of graphs

To prove the probability ratio estimate (7) in the special case $k = 1$, we look at the trajectories of the \mathbf{d}_n -process, which means that we take the order of the added edges into account (this is important, since different orderings of the same edge set can occur with different probabilities). In particular, by summing over the set Π_G of all ordered edge-sequences of a given graph G , the probability that the \mathbf{d}_n -process produces G is

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_G} \mathbb{P}(\sigma), \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\sigma)$ denotes the probability that the \mathbf{d}_n -process produces the edge-sequence σ . Recall that, in our switching operation on graphs, the edges ab, xy in G^+ are replaced with the edges ax, by to obtain G^- ; see Figure 1. Let $\sigma_{ab,xy}$ be any edge-sequence of G^+ where the edge ab appears earlier than the edge xy . For our new *switching operation on edge-sequences*, it is natural to consider the following two edge-sequences of G^- : (i) the edge-sequence obtained by replacing ab, xy with ax, by in that order, which we call $\sigma_{ax,by}$, and (ii) the one obtained by replacing ab, xy with by, ax in that order, which we call $\sigma_{by,ax}$. To complete the symmetry, we also consider the edge-sequence of G^+ obtained by swapping the positions of ab, xy in $\sigma_{ab,xy}$, which we call $\sigma_{xy,ab}$. By expanding $\mathbb{P}(\sigma)$ and carefully estimating the resulting formula (see (20)–(21) in Section 3.1), it turns out that one can prove the surprisingly clean ratio estimate

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{ab,xy}) + \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{xy,ab})}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{ax,by}) + \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{by,ax})} \geq 1, \quad (9)$$

⁹See Sections 2.1–2.2 for how we deal with the possibility that this replacement might create multiple edges.

which already implies the desired probability ratio estimate (7) with $\epsilon = 0$ by noting that

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G^+) = \sum_{\sigma_{ab,xy}} [\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{ab,xy}) + \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{xy,ab})] \geq \sum_{\sigma_{ax,by}} [\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{ax,by}) + \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{by,ax})] = \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G^-). \quad (10)$$

With more work one can show that, for a positive proportion of the edge-sequences $\sigma_{ab,xy}$, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{ab,xy}) + \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{xy,ab})}{\mathbb{P}(\sigma_{ax,by}) + \mathbb{P}(\sigma_{by,ax})} \geq 1 + \epsilon' \quad (11)$$

for some constant $\epsilon' > 0$, which by similar reasoning as for inequality (10) then proves the desired probability ratio estimate (7) for an appropriately defined $\epsilon > 0$, which was our main goal.

For the interested reader, we now outline how (7) implies Theorem 2 (ii). To this end, let

$$\mathcal{G}_\ell := \{G : \text{graph with degree sequence } \mathbf{d}_n \text{ and } X_k(G) = \ell\}. \quad (12)$$

Note that ‘switching’ the edges ab, xy to ax, by maps a graph from $\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}$ to a graph in \mathcal{G}_ℓ . When the number of small edges satisfies $\ell \approx \mu$, then by counting the number of ways each graph in $\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}$ can be mapped a graph in \mathcal{G}_ℓ , and vice versa, one can obtain the size ratio estimate $|\mathcal{G}_\ell|/|\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}| \approx 1$ via a double counting argument that is standard for switching arguments. Combining these ideas with (7), the crux is that by a more careful double counting argument one can also obtain the probability ratio estimate

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) = \ell)}{\mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) = \ell + 1)} = \frac{\sum_{F \in \mathcal{G}_\ell} \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = F)}{\sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}} \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = H)} \leq 1 - \tau \quad (13)$$

for an appropriately defined $\tau \in (0, 1)$; in fact, estimate (13) remains true as long as $|\ell - \mu| \leq \gamma\mu$ for some sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$. For any $0 \leq z \leq \gamma\mu$ we then obtain the probability ratio estimate

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| \leq z)}{\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| \leq z + 1)} \leq \frac{\sum_{\ell: |\ell - \mu| \leq z} \mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) = \ell)}{\sum_{\ell: |\ell - \mu| \leq z} \mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) = \ell + 1)} \leq 1 - \tau, \quad (14)$$

and the proof of inequality (4) follows readily for $\beta := \gamma/2$: by invoking (14) we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| \leq \beta\mu) \leq \prod_{0 \leq i \leq \beta\mu - 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| \leq \beta\mu + i)}{\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| \leq \beta\mu + i + 1)} \leq (1 - \tau)^{\lfloor \beta\mu \rfloor} \leq e^{-\Theta(n)}, \quad (15)$$

where for the last inequality we used the fact that $\mu \geq (\xi n)^2 / (2\Delta n) = \Theta(n)$.

1.2.2 General case $k \geq 1$: comparison of edge-sequences of sets of graphs

With the benefit of hindsight, our switching argument for $k = 1$ can be summarized as follows. We started with switching inequalities (9) and (11) for edge-sequences, which we then sequentially ‘lifted’ to the basic switching inequality (7) for graphs, then to the key inequality (13) for closely related sets of graphs, and finally to the desired inequality (15) for edge statistics. Our general argument for $k \geq 1$ will go through a similar (albeit more complicated) lifting of inequalities, but there is one major obstacle: the basic switching inequality (7) for graphs is not always true, even with $\epsilon = 0$; see Appendix A.1 for a counterexample with $k = 2$.

Our strategy for overcoming this obstacle is based on the idea of averaging over suitable sets of graphs, called *clusters* (see Section 3.2). To this end, for any specific choice of our vertices a, b, x, y , we will partition the choices for G^+ (i.e., graphs containing edges ab, xy) into sets, which we call *upper clusters*. For each upper cluster C^+ , we also construct the corresponding set C^- of the choices for G^+ obtained by replacing ab, xy by ax, by in each member of C^+ ; we call these sets *lower clusters*. We will essentially prove that (7) holds when averaging over graphs in the corresponding clusters: namely, for every cluster pair C^+, C^- we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(C^+) := \sum_{G \in C^+} \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G) \geq \sum_{G \in C^-} \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G) =: \mathbb{P}(C^-), \quad (16)$$

and for a positive proportion of the cluster pairs C^+, C^- we also obtain the stronger ratio estimate

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(C^+)}{\mathbb{P}(C^-)} \geq 1 + \epsilon. \quad (17)$$

for some constant $\epsilon > 0$ (see Lemmas 5–6 in Section 3.3).

To prove the probability ratio estimates (16)–(17), we will establish switching inequalities for edge-sequences analogous to (9)–(11) from the case $k = 1$, the main difference being as follows: while in (9)–(11) we matched two edge-sequences of G^+ with two edge-sequences of G^- , for (16)–(17) we shall match two edge-sequences of each graph in C^+ with two edge-sequences of graphs in C^- (but not necessarily from the same graph; see Section 4).

Finally, with estimates (16)–(17) in hand, we can then prove Theorem 2 (ii) similarly to inequalities (13)–(15) from the case $k = 1$, but there is another difference that makes the details more complicated: whereas the graph switching inequality (7) holds for every pair of graphs G^+, G^- , the cluster switching inequality (17) only holds for some pairs of clusters C^+, C^- (see Section 3.4 for the details).

1.2.3 Another look at our switching argument

We close this proof strategy subsection with a high-level discussion of how our switching argument compares to previous switching arguments applied to uniform random models, bearing in mind that the switching inequality (13) is at the core of the argument leading to the telescoping product of ratios estimate (15).

In particular, if we were analyzing uniform random graphs $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , then in view of $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} = F) = \mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n} = H)$ the left-hand side of the corresponding key-inequality (13) would reduce to $|\mathcal{G}_\ell|/|\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}|$. Obtaining tight asymptotic bounds on such ratios of closely related set-sizes is usually the main step in switching papers (see, e.g. [34, 23, 36, 52, 25, 22], which also use different switching operations.)

By contrast, in our analysis of the random \mathbf{d}_n -process we nearly automatically have $|\mathcal{G}_\ell|/|\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}| \approx 1$, since we may focus on $\ell \approx \mu$. The main step in our proof of (13) thus is to compare the average value of $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^F = F)$ over graphs $F \in \mathcal{G}_\ell$ to the average of $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^H = H)$ over graphs $H \in \mathcal{G}_{\ell+1}$, which (together with the idea of looking at edge-sequences, i.e., trajectories of the \mathbf{d}_n -process) is at the heart of our use of switchings.

2 Relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process: main technical result

In this section we state our main technical result Theorem 3 for a relaxed variant of the d_n -process, which allows for multiple edges but no loops. Of course, this technical result is formulated in a way that will imply our main result Theorem 2 (ii) for the standard d_n -process, see Section 2.3 and Appendix A.3. Using the relaxed d_n -process for the proofs has two notable technical advantages: (a) by allowing multiple edges, in the switching arguments we do not have to worry about switching to an edge that already exists, and (b) by forbidding loops, we obtain a simpler and more tractable formula¹⁰ for the probabilities of the process.

2.1 Definition: configuration-graphs

Inspired by the configuration model [12, 52, 20], in this subsection we define a *configuration-graph* with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)})$ as follows. For each vertex v_i in a graph we imagine a bin containing $d_i^{(n)}$ labeled points. By a configuration-graph G with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n we mean a perfect matching of all points where we do not allow points from the same vertex to be matched. Formally, G is thus a perfect matching on the set of points

$$P(G) := \{v_i^j : i \in [n] \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d_i^{(n)}\},$$

subject to having no matched pairs of the form $v_i^j v_i^\ell$ (to avoid creating loops).

As in the configuration model, a configuration-graph G naturally represents a multigraph $\pi(G)$ with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , obtained by contracting the set of points

$$V_i := \{v_i^j : 1 \leq j \leq d_i^{(n)}\}$$

¹⁰Note that if we allowed for loops, then the degree-constraint would still forbid adding loops at vertices v whose current degree is $\deg(v) = d_v^{(n)} - 1$, which would considerably complicate the probability formulas in Section 3.1.

to vertex v_i for each $i \in [n]$. Note that the multigraph $\pi(G)$ may contain multiple edges but not loops.

With the multigraph representation in mind, we say that $P(G)$ are points of G , while the sets V_i with $i \in [n]$ are vertices of the configuration-graph G . We also say that the *degree* of a point in a configuration-graph is the size of the vertex that contains it. So, as with graphs, $X_k(G)$ is the number of edges whose endpoints are of degree at most k , meaning that the endpoints are contained in vertices of size at most k .

2.2 Definition: relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process

In this subsection we formally define our relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process, which attempts to randomly generate a configuration-graph with degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)})$. At any step of the process, we say that a vertex is *unsaturated* if at least one point in the vertex is currently not matched.

Sampling random partial configuration-graph with relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process

- 1: $G := (P(G), E(G))$ with $E(G) := \emptyset$
 - 2: **while** there are at least 2 unsaturated vertices in G **do**
 - 3: Pick a uniformly random pair V_i, V_j of distinct unsaturated vertices
 - 4: Pick uniformly random unmatched points $v_i^p \in V_i$ and $v_j^q \in V_j$
 - 5: Add the edge $v_i^p v_j^q$ to $E(G)$
 - 6: **end while**
 - 7: **return** G
-

As with the (standard) \mathbf{d}_n -process, it is possible that the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process will not complete, i.e., not succeed in matching every point, and so the final configuration-graph will not have the desired degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . However, it turns out that this ‘bad behavior’ happens with sufficiently small probability (see Lemma 19 in Appendix A.3), so that conditioning on the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process completing does not create any technical problems. We henceforth write $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$ for the final configuration-graph of the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process conditioned on having degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , i.e., conditioned on completing (this is well-defined, since we only consider degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n that are graphic).

2.3 Main technical result: small edges in relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process

Our main technical result is the following theorem, which is a reformulation of our main result Theorem 2 (ii) for the relaxed d_n -process. It intuitively shows that the number of small edges in $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$ is typically far from μ , i.e., the typical number of small edges in $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ (see part (i) of Theorem 2).

Theorem 3 (Main technical result). *Suppose that assumptions of Theorem 2 hold. Then there is a constant $\alpha = \alpha(\xi, \Delta) > 0$ such that the final graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$ of the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu) \leq e^{-\Theta(n)}. \quad (18)$$

As the reader can guess, Theorem 3 for the relaxed d_n -process implies Theorem 2 (ii) for the standard d_n -process $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$. While this kind of transfer from multigraphs to simple graphs is conceptually standard (much in the spirit of the standard argument for the configuration model), it turns out that the transfer argument for the d_n -process is more involved than usual; hence we defer the technical details to Appendix A.3. To sum up: in order to establish Theorem 2 (ii), it remains to prove Theorem 3 in the following Sections 3–5.

Remark 4. *While Theorem 3 is enough to prove our main result, in Appendix A.4 we will in fact establish the stronger bound that $\mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}) > (1 + \alpha)\mu) \geq 1 - e^{-\Theta(n)}$. Hence, with high probability, the \mathbf{d}_n -process indeed contains significantly more small edges than $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}$ (as suggested by the heuristics in Section 1.1).*

3 Core switching arguments

This section is devoted to the switching-based proof of our main technical result Theorem 3, which concerns the number of small edges in the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process. Namely, in Sections 3.1–3.2 we introduce the setup and main switching definitions, and in Section 3.3 then state several key switching and counting results, which in turn are used to prove Theorem 3 in Section 3.4.

3.1 Preliminaries: probabilities in relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process

For our upcoming switching arguments we need to be able to compare the probabilities with which the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process produces certain configuration-graphs. Here our basic approach is to expand these probabilities, by considering all possible edge-sequences that produce the configuration-graphs (as mentioned in Section 1.2.1).

Turning to the details, let G be any configuration-graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , and let σ be any ordering of its edges (to clarify: the endpoints of the edges of a configuration-graph consist of points, see Section 2.1). Consider building G by adding its edges one at a time, ordered by σ . Defining

$$\Gamma_i(\sigma) := \text{number of unsaturated vertices remaining after adding the first } i \text{ edges,} \quad (19)$$

the probability that the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process chooses the edges of G in order σ is easily seen to be

$$\prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i(\sigma)(\Gamma_i(\sigma) - 1)} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{d_j^{(n)}!}. \quad (20)$$

If we condition on the process completing (i.e., that the final configuration-graph has degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n), then the probability that the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process chooses the edge-sequence σ is thus proportional to

$$Z(\sigma) := \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i(\sigma)(\Gamma_i(\sigma) - 1)}. \quad (21)$$

Therefore $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*} = G)$, the probability that the (conditional) relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process produces G , is proportional to

$$Z(G) := \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_G} Z(\sigma), \quad (22)$$

where we sum over the set Π_G of all edge-sequences of G . When summing over a set S of configuration-graphs S , we henceforth also use the convenient shorthand

$$Z(S) := \sum_{G \in S} Z(G). \quad (23)$$

3.2 Definition: clusters of configuration-graphs

In this subsection we introduce sets of configuration-graphs called *clusters*, whose probabilities we shall compare in our upcoming switching arguments (as mentioned in Section 1.2.2). To motivate their definition, in Section 3.2.1 we develop some intuition about which configuration-graphs are more likely to be produced by the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process. The reader mainly interested in the formal definition of clusters may wish to directly skip to Section 3.2.2

3.2.1 Intuition about configuration-graphs

In order to discuss our intuition about which configuration-graphs the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process favors, we first recall the switching setup from Section 1.2. We have a configuration-graph G^+ with edges ab, xy that satisfy $\deg(a), \deg(b) \leq k$ and $\deg(x), \deg(y) > k$ (recall that a, b, x, y are points, and that the degree of a point is the size of the vertex that contains it). We let A, B, X, Y denote the vertices containing points a, b, x, y respectively, where we henceforth assume $A \neq B$ and $X \neq Y$. Furthermore, we write G^- for the configuration-graph obtained by replacing the edges ab, xy with ax, by ; see Figure 1 for an example with $k = 1$.

As discussed in Section 1.2, ideally the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process should produce G^+ with higher probability than G^- , which by Section 3.1 means that $Z(G^+) \geq Z(G^-)$. It turns out that this is true for $k = 1$, but *not* always true for $k \geq 2$. To gain some intuition why, we wish to understand what configuration-graphs G have high values of $Z(G) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_G} Z(\sigma)$. By carefully inspecting (21), it is not hard to see that $Z(\sigma)$ tends to be big when the values $\Gamma_i(\sigma)$ tend to be small, i.e., when vertices tend to become saturated early. Furthermore, the impact on $Z(\sigma)$ of a vertex becoming saturated early is amplified if other vertices are also saturated early.

With these ‘early saturation’ observations in mind, we now consider the case $k = 1$, i.e., where $\deg(A) = \deg(B) = 1$ holds. If the vertices A, B form the edge ab , then they will both become saturated at the same

time, namely the step where that edge appears in the edge-sequence σ . So in edge-sequences where A is saturated early, we automatically get the amplification of a second vertex becoming saturated at the same time. Of course, in edge-sequences where A is saturated late then B is also saturated late. But it turns out that the multiplicative nature of the formula for Z results in the good edge-sequences outweighing the bad ones. After summing over all edge-sequences, it thus becomes plausible that $Z(G^+) > Z(G^-)$.

For $k \geq 2$, the reasoning is not as clean-cut since the edge ab does not ensure that A, B both become saturated at the same time. Nevertheless, it increases the probability that, when A is saturated then B will be saturated soon (and vice versa). Furthermore, the described increase in probability is intuitively higher for the edge ab than for the edge ax , because the degree of B is lower than X (so fewer other points need to be selected until saturation). Hence joining ab seemingly brings a similar, albeit smaller, amplification benefit as doing the same in the case $k = 1$. However, the behavior of the \mathbf{d}_n -process turns out to be more complicated: other neighbours of A, B can also significantly impact Z , and in certain situations this ‘neighborhood effect’ can even be stronger than the benefit of A being adjacent to B . For example, it could be better for A to be adjacent to a vertex X with slightly higher degree than B , provided that the neighbors of X have significantly lower degrees than the neighbors of B (since this intuitively gives the amplified benefit of several neighbors of X becoming saturated at around the same time that A and X are). Figure 3 in Appendix A.1 contains an example where this happens: we have $\deg(X) = \deg(B) + 1$, but X is adjacent to more low degree vertices than B , and we indeed have $Z(G^+) < Z(G^-)$. Note that the described problematic ‘neighborhood effect’ cannot occur for $k = 1$, since when A, B are adjacent, then they have no other neighbors (which partially explains why the case $k = 1$ is more well-behaved; see also Remark 13 in Section 4).

To overcome the discussed obstacle, we have developed a more complicated form of switching. Instead of measuring the effect on Z of switching edges of a single configuration-graph, we will measure the average effect of switching on a set of configuration-graphs, which we call a *cluster*. These clusters are specifically chosen so that, when averaging over a cluster, the neighbors of X will not be any better than the neighbors of B , and so the described problematic ‘neighborhood effect’ will not occur. But the amplifying effect from the edge ab still remains, and so Z really will be larger on average in G^+ than in G^- (see Lemma 5 in Section 3.3).

3.2.2 Formal definition of clusters

With an eye on introducing clusters, for any configuration-graph G with a set of points S , we write

$$N_G(S) := \{v \text{ point in } G : v \notin S \text{ and there is } w \in S \text{ such that } vw \in E(G)\} \quad (24)$$

for the set of neighbors of S . Often S will be specified as a vertex, or a collection of vertices; this means S will be the set of points of these vertices. So $N_G(S)$ will not be the set of vertices adjacent to S , but the specific points within those vertices that are matched in G to the points of S . We are now ready to formally define clusters, which are illustrated in Figure 2. Recall that A, B, X, Y are distinct vertices with $\deg(A), \deg(B) \leq k$ and $\deg(X), \deg(Y) > k$, and that a, b, x, y are points of A, B, X, Y , respectively.

Definition (Clusters).

- (a) $G_{ab,xy}$ is the set of configuration-graphs with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n that contain the two edges ab, xy . Similarly, $G_{ax,by}$ is the set of configuration-graphs with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n that contain the two edges ax, by .
- (b) We define an equivalence relation \sim on $G_{ab,xy}$ and $G_{ax,by}$, where $G_1 \sim G_2$ if $N_{G_1}(A \cup B \cup X \cup Y) = N_{G_2}(A \cup B \cup X \cup Y)$ holds and the set of edges not incident to A, B, X, Y are identical.
- (c) The equivalence classes of \sim on $G_{ab,xy}$ are called upper clusters. The equivalence classes of \sim on $G_{ax,by}$ are called lower clusters.

For a configuration-graph $G \in G_{ab,xy}$, we denote by $C^+(G, ab, xy)$ the upper cluster containing G that corresponds to an equivalence class in $G_{ab,xy}$. Similarly for a configuration-graph $G \in G_{ax,by}$, we denote by $C^-(G, ax, by)$ the lower cluster containing G that corresponds to an equivalence class in $G_{ax,by}$. Thus, if H is another configuration-graph in $C^+(G, ab, xy)$ then $C^+(G, ab, xy) = C^+(H, ab, xy)$.

We can think of an upper cluster as follows. Start with any configuration-graph G with edges ab, xy . Remove all edges of G with at least one endpoint in A, B, X, Y , except for ab, xy . Then replace them with any other edges, each having at least one endpoint in A, B, X, Y , subject to the final degree-sequence being \mathbf{d}_n . So if a vertex Z (distinct from A, B, X, Y) had ℓ neighboring points in A, B, X, Y , then Z will




Figure 2: Example of an upper cluster $C^+ = C^+(G, ab, xy)$ containing ten configuration-graphs. In this case $N_G(A \cup B \cup X \cup Y) = \{v\}$, and three edges are fixed: ab, xy and the only edge not incident to A, B, X, Y . If we start with only these three edges, one can construct any configuration-graph in the cluster C^+ by (i) matching v to an unmatched point in A, B, X, Y , and then (ii) matching the remaining four unmatched points in A, B, X, Y . One can easily check that there are five ways to do step (i), and in each case there are exactly two ways to complete step (ii), leading to all ten depicted configuration-graphs.

still have ℓ neighboring points in those vertices. The set of configuration-graphs that can be obtained is the upper cluster; cf. Figure 2. We can think of lower clusters in the same manner, replacing ab, xy with ax, by .

Definition (Switching partners). *Given $G^+ \in G_{ab,xy}$, let $G^- \in G_{ax,by}$ be the graph obtained by replacing the edges ab, xy in G^+ with ax, by . There is a natural bijection between configuration-graphs in $C^+ = C^+(G^+, ab, xy)$ and $C^- = C^-(G^-, ax, by)$. Namely, for every configuration-graph in C^+ , replace the edges ab, xy with ax, by . The resulting set of configuration-graphs is the lower cluster C^- . We call this pair of clusters C^+, C^- switching-partners.*

We remark that comparing the values of Z averaged over the configuration-graphs of two switching-partners (see Lemma 5 below) is the more complicated form of switching that we alluded to in Section 3.2.1. The crux is that in this average, the vertices in A, B, X, Y each have the same potential neighbors outside of $\{A, B, X, Y\}$, which eliminates the problematic ‘neighborhood effect’ described in Section 3.2.1.

3.3 Key lemmas: switching and counting results for clusters

In this subsection we state our main switching results for clusters, along with relevant counting results.

We start with the following switching-type result between upper and lower clusters, whose proof we defer to Section 4.1. Recall that $Z(C) = \sum_{G \in C} Z(G) = \sum_{G \in C} \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_G} Z(\sigma)$ is proportional to the probability that the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process produces a graph from the cluster C , see (22)–(23). So Lemma 5 intuitively states that, up to some local averaging¹¹, the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process prefers the edges ab, xy over the edges ax, by , i.e., prefers configuration-graphs with more small edges (which is consistent with Remark 4 and the heuristics from Section 1.1).

¹¹Since C^+ and C^- have the same cardinality, Lemma 5 shows that $\sum_{G \in C^+} Z(G)/|C^+| \geq \sum_{G \in C^-} Z(G)/|C^-|$, which in concrete words means that $Z(G)$ averaged over $G \in C^+$ is at least as large as $Z(G)$ averaged over $G \in C^-$.

Lemma 5 (Switching of clusters). *For all for switching-partners C^+, C^- , we have $Z(C^+) \geq Z(C^-)$.*

We would like to strengthen the conclusion of Lemma 5 to $Z(C^+) \geq (1 + \epsilon)Z(C^-)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. We believe that this holds for all pairs C^+, C^- , but for technical reasons we only prove it for clusters with special properties, defined below as *good clusters* (which suffices, since a significant proportion of clusters turns out to be good). The main difficulty is that when the vertex A or B become saturated during the final few steps of the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process, then the number of unsaturated vertices Γ_i is so small that a small (additive) change to it could have a significant effect on $Z(\sigma)$. The definition of good clusters will intuitively ensure that such ‘late saturation effects’ have limited impact on our arguments. Recall that $G_{ab,xy}$ is the set of configuration-graphs with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n that contain the edges ab, xy , see Section 3.2.2.

Definition (Good edge-sequences and clusters). *An edge-sequence σ of $G \in G_{ab,xy}$ is called good with respect to a, b, x, y if the following two conditions hold:*

- (i) *no points of X, Y are adjacent to any points of A, B in G , and*
- (ii) *the vertices A and B are both saturated in the first $(1 - \zeta)m$ steps, where*

$$\zeta := \frac{\xi^2}{16\Delta^3}. \quad (25)$$

An upper cluster $C^+ = C^+(G, ab, xy)$ is called good if at least a quarter of its total Z -value comes from good edge-sequences σ , i.e., if

$$\sum_{G \in C^+} \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in \Pi_G: \\ (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}}} Z(\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{4}Z(C^+), \quad (26)$$

where

$$\mathbb{G} := \{(\sigma, ab, xy) : \sigma \text{ is good with respect to } a, b, x, y\}. \quad (27)$$

The next lemma, whose proof we defer to Section 4.1, shows that for good clusters we can indeed strengthen the switching-type estimate of Lemma 5 by an extra factor of $1 + \epsilon$.

Lemma 6 (Switching of good clusters). *There are $\epsilon, n_0 > 0$ such that the following holds for all $n \geq n_0$: if C^+, C^- are switching-partners and $C^+ = C^+(G, ab, xy)$ is good, then we have*

$$Z(C^+) \geq (1 + \epsilon)Z(C^-).$$

Recall that that $X_k(G)$ is the number of small edges in a configuration-graph G , and that μ is approximately the expected number of small edges in a uniform configuration-graph with degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . Our main technical result Theorem 3 bounds the probability that, in the graph chosen by the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process, the number of small edges has a small (but significant) distance from μ . We thus define

$$\mathcal{N}_z := \{G : \text{configuration-graph with degree sequence } \mathbf{d}_n \text{ and } |X_k(G) - \mu| \leq z\}. \quad (28)$$

and henceforth focus on the configuration-graphs $G \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$ where $\gamma > 0$ is a constant. For such G , different choices for a, b, x, y can yield different upper clusters $C^+(G, ab, xy)$, and similarly for lower clusters. Note that while switching partners form a bijection upon specifying a, b, x, y , each configuration-graph can have different switching partners for different choices of those four vertices. One particularly noteworthy example arises when we exchange x, y . Note that $C^+(G, ab, xy) = C^+(G, ab, yx)$, but $C^-(G, ax, by)$ and $C^-(G, ay, bx)$ are disjoint. Similarly when we exchange a, b . This leads us to specify the following convention, which will be useful for the counting result Lemma 7 below.

Notational Convention. *$C^+(G, ab, xy), C^+(G, ab, yx), C^+(G, ba, xy), C^+(G, ba, yx)$ are considered to be four different clusters, despite the fact that they are identical. Similarly $C^-(G, ax, by), C^-(G, by, ax)$ are considered to be two different clusters and so are $C^-(G, ay, bx), C^-(G, bx, ay)$. On the other hand, $C^+(G, ax, by)$ and $C^+(G, xa, by)$ are considered the same (since they are not obtained by swapping a, x , not a, b or x, y). The main reason behind using this convention is to form a bijection between the set of all upper clusters and the set of all lower clusters by mapping the upper cluster $C^+(G^+, ab, xy)$ to its switching partner $C^-(G^-, ax, by)$.*

When we discuss the number of clusters containing G , we mean the number of choices of a, b, x, y such that G lies in a cluster $C^+(G, ab, xy)$ or $C^-(G, ax, by)$; i.e., the number of choices of a, b, x, y such that $E(G)$ contains ab, xy or ax, by . From the notation convention above, we see that clusters obtained by permuting the order of a, b or x, y are considered to be distinct, even if they contain the same set of configuration-graphs (e.g., $C^+(G, ab, xy)$ and $C^+(G, ab, yx)$ are counted as two different clusters). With this convention in mind, for any configuration-graph G , we define U_G to be the number of upper clusters that contain G . We similarly define L_G to be the number of lower clusters that contain G .

The next lemma, whose proof we defer to Section 5.1, shows that for any configuration-graph with approximately μ small edges, the number of upper and lower clusters containing it are roughly equal.

Lemma 7 (Counting clusters). *There are $\gamma_0, n_0, D > 0$ such that the following holds for all $0 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ and $n \geq n_0$: we have $|L_G/U_H - 1| \leq D\gamma$ for all configuration-graphs $G, H \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$.*

For technical reasons we shall also need the following lemma, whose proof we defer to Section 5.2. It intuitively says that, for any edge-sequence σ of a configuration-graph with approximately μ small edges, at least half of the choices of small edges $ab \in E(G)$ and large edges $xy \in E(G)$ yield a good edge-sequence (σ, ab, xy) .

Lemma 8 (Counting good edge-sequences). *There are $\gamma, n_0 > 0$ such that the following holds for all $n \geq n_0$: for all configuration-graphs $G \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$ and edge-sequences $\sigma \in \Pi_G$ we have*

$$|\{ab, xy \in E(G) : (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}\}| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\{ab, xy \in E(G) : ab \text{ small, } xy \text{ large}\}|. \quad (29)$$

We close this subsection with an observation about the number of small edges in switching partners.

Observation 9 (Small edges in switching partners). *For any pair of switching partners C^+, C^- the following holds: if C^- contains any configuration-graph $G \in \mathcal{N}_z$, then $C^+ \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}$.*

Proof. Any two configuration-graphs in $C^+ \cup C^-$ can differ in at most 4Δ edges. Therefore no member of C^+ can have greater than 4Δ more small edges than G does. \square

3.4 Double-counting argument: proof of Theorem 3

This subsection is devoted to the proof of our main technical result Theorem 3, and we start by outlining our proof strategy. Our main step will be to prove that, when z is sufficiently small, decreasing z by an additive constant will decrease $Z(\mathcal{N}_z)$ by a multiplicative constant. Specifically, we will prove that the following key inequality holds (for all sufficiently large n): there is a constant $\tau \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$Z(\mathcal{N}_z) \leq (1 - \tau)Z(\mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq z \leq \gamma\mu, \quad (30)$$

where γ comes from Lemmas 7 and 8 (and we use 4Δ as our additive constant because of Observation 9). Iterating (30) implies that decreasing z by $\Theta(n)$ will decrease $Z(\mathcal{N}_z)$ by a factor that is exponentially small in $\Theta(n)$. In particular, setting $\alpha := \gamma/2$ and noting that $\mu \geq (\xi n)^2/(2\Delta n) = \Theta(n)$, we thus obtain that

$$Z(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\mu}) \leq e^{-\Theta(n)}Z(\mathcal{N}_{2\alpha\mu}).$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*} \in \mathcal{N}_z)$ is proportional to $Z(\mathcal{N}_z)$, see Section 3.1, this immediately implies Theorem 3.

Our strategy for proving the key inequality (30) focuses on clusters. Recall that each configuration-graph G lies in L_G lower-clusters and U_G upper clusters. Lemma 7 tells us that the values of L_G, U_G are very close over all configuration-graphs $G \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$; close enough that (30) will follow from proving

$$\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} L_G Z(G) \leq (1 - 2\tau) \sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}} U_G Z(G), \quad (31)$$

and taking γ to be sufficiently small in terms of τ . We will use \mathcal{L} to denote the set of lower clusters C^- that contains any $G \in \mathcal{N}_z$, and \mathcal{U} to denote the corresponding set of upper clusters C^+ . Observation 9 implies that every cluster in \mathcal{U} is contained in $\mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}$. Hence (31) would be implied by

$$\sum_{C^- \in \mathcal{L}} Z(C^-) \leq (1 - 2\tau) \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U}} Z(C^+). \quad (32)$$

Since \mathcal{U} consists of the switching-partners of the clusters in \mathcal{L} , Lemma 5 implies the following weaker bound: $\sum_{C^- \in \mathcal{L}} Z(C^-) \leq \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U}} Z(C^+)$. If a positive proportion of the clusters in \mathcal{U} are good then Lemma 6 allows us to improve this bound to obtain inequality (32). In the remaining case where rather few clusters of \mathcal{U} are good, inequality (32) might not hold. But it turns out that, using Lemma 8, we are essentially able to compare $Z(\mathcal{U})$ with $Z(\mathcal{L})$ via the contributions of good edge-sequences. This will allow us to complete the proof of inequality (31) by a technical case analysis; see (39)–(42) below for the details.

Proof of Theorem 3. As mentioned in the above proof outline, our main goal is to prove inequality (30). Indeed, by iterating this key inequality, in view of Section 3.1 it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}) - \mu| \leq \gamma\mu/2) \leq \frac{Z(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu/2})}{Z(\mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu})} \leq (1 - \tau)^{\Theta(\gamma\mu/\Delta)} \leq e^{-\Theta(n)}, \quad (33)$$

which completes the proof with $\alpha := \gamma/2$.

It thus remains to prove inequality (30). To this end we will henceforth tacitly assume that $0 \leq z \leq \gamma\mu$ holds, and also that $\gamma > 0$ is sufficiently small (whenever necessary). We shall first switch the focus of inequality (30) from configuration-graphs to clusters, leveraging that any $G \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$ is contained in roughly the same number of clusters. Indeed, recalling the definition (23) of $Z(\mathcal{N}_\ell)$, Lemma 7 implies that

$$\frac{Z(\mathcal{N}_z)}{Z(\mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta})} = \frac{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} Z(G)}{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}} Z(G)} \leq (1 + O(\gamma)) \cdot \frac{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} L_G Z(G)}{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}} U_G Z(G)}, \quad (34)$$

where the implicit constant in $O(\gamma)$ is uniform i.e., does not depend on γ . In order to further rewrite the right-hand side of inequality (34) in terms of clusters, we define

$$\mathcal{L} := \{C^- : \text{lower cluster with } C^- \cap \mathcal{N}_z \neq \emptyset\}, \quad (35)$$

and denote by \mathcal{U} the set of upper clusters that are switching partners of the clusters in \mathcal{L} . Noting that we have the inclusions $\mathcal{N}_z \subseteq \bigcup_{C^- \in \mathcal{L}} C^-$ and $\mathcal{N}_z \subseteq \bigcup_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U}} C^+ \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}$ (by Observation 9), it follows that

$$\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} L_G Z(G) \leq Z(\mathcal{L}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}} U_G Z(G) \geq Z(\mathcal{U}). \quad (36)$$

With the cluster based inequalities from (36) in hand, we are now in a position to estimate the right-hand side of (34) from above. Let \mathcal{G} denote the set of good clusters, where good clusters are defined around (26). Decomposing $Z(\mathcal{L})$ into two parts, by invoking Lemmas 5 and 6 separately for $C^+ \in \mathcal{G}^c$ and $C^+ \in \mathcal{G}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\mathcal{L}) &= \sum_{C^- : C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}^c} Z(C^-) + \sum_{C^- : C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}} Z(C^-) \\ &\leq \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}^c} Z(C^+) + \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}} Z(C^+) = Z(\mathcal{U}) - \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \epsilon} \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}} Z(C^+), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where in the summations C^- denotes the switching partner of C^+ (defined by the bijection discussed earlier). We now distinguish two cases. If $\sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}} Z(C^+) \geq Z(\mathcal{U})/8$, then inequality (37) implies

$$Z(\mathcal{L}) \leq (1 - \nu)Z(\mathcal{U}) \quad (38)$$

for $\nu := \epsilon/[8(1 + \epsilon)] \in (0, 1)$, say. Otherwise $\sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}} Z(C^+) \leq Z(\mathcal{U})/8$ holds. In this case, writing

$$\Pi_{C^+} = \Pi_{C^+(G, ab, xy)} := \{(\sigma, ab, xy) : \sigma \in \Pi_G \text{ for some } G \in C^+\},$$

using the definition of good upper clusters we see that the contribution of good edge-sequences to $Z(\mathcal{U})$ satisfies

$$\sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{(\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G} \cap \Pi_{C^+}} Z(\sigma) \leq \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}} Z(C^+) + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{G}^c} Z(C^+) \leq \frac{3}{8} Z(\mathcal{U}). \quad (39)$$

Furthermore, writing $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}_z} := \bigcup_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} \Pi_G$ for the set of all edge-sequences of some configuration-graph in \mathcal{N}_z , using Lemma 8 and $\mathcal{N}_z \subseteq \bigcup_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U}} C^+$ (as established above) it also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} U_G Z(G) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathcal{N}_z}} \frac{1}{2} Z(\sigma) |\{ab, xy \in E(G) : ab \text{ small}, xy \text{ large}\}| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi_{\mathcal{N}_z}} \sum_{ab, xy: (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}} Z(\sigma) \leq \sum_{C^+ \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{ab, xy: (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G} \cap \Pi_{C^+}} Z(\sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

which together with (39) and Lemma 7 then implies that

$$Z(\mathcal{U}) \geq \frac{4}{3} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} U_G Z(G) \geq (1 - O(\gamma)) \cdot \frac{4}{3} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} L_G Z(G). \quad (41)$$

Combining both cases with (36), using inequalities (38) and (41) it follows that we always have

$$\frac{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} L_G Z(G)}{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_{z+4\Delta}} U_G Z(G)} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{Z(\mathcal{L})}{Z(\mathcal{U})}, \frac{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{N}_z} L_G Z(G)}{Z(\mathcal{U})} \right\} \leq \max \left\{ 1 - \nu, \frac{1}{4/3 - O(\gamma)} \right\}, \quad (42)$$

which together with estimate (34) establishes inequality (30) for sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$. \square

4 Switching results: deferred proofs

This section is devoted to the deferred proofs of the ‘cluster switching’ results Lemma 5 and 6 from Section 3.3. To avoid clutter, we henceforth always tacitly assume that $n \geq n_0(\Delta, \xi)$ is sufficiently large (whenever necessary). Furthermore, recalling that there is a natural bijection between the upper clusters and the lower clusters, for the rest of the section we fix an upper cluster $C^+ = C^+(G^+, ab, xy)$ and its switching-partner lower cluster $C^- = C^-(G^-, ax, by)$, as defined in Observation 3.2.2. We also define

$$\mathcal{P}^- := \bigcup_{G \in C^-} \Pi_G \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}^+ := \bigcup_{G \in C^+} \Pi_G \quad (43)$$

to be the set of edge-sequences of configuration-graphs that lie in C^- and C^+ , respectively. Thus, if $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$ then σ contains the edges ab, xy , while if $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^-$ then σ contains the edges ax, by .

In our upcoming switching based proofs it will be important to understand when certain points are chosen. More specifically, at any point in our proof, when we are comparing two edge sequences the step at which any vertex beside A, B, X, Y saturates will be the same in both edge sequences (where A, B, X, Y denote the vertices that contain the points a, b, x, y , as usual). This allows us to focus on the time when points of A, B, X, Y are chosen. For any edge-sequence $\sigma = (e_1, \dots, e_m)$ of the edges of a configuration-graph G and for any point v of G , we let

$$\sigma(e) \in \{1, \dots, m\} \quad (44)$$

be the unique edge-number such that $e = e_{\sigma(e)}$. Similarly let $\sigma(v) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be the unique edge-number such that $v \in e_{\sigma(v)}$. For our analysis, we will need to focus on the last step at which a point of the vertex A besides a is chosen in σ , which we formally denote as

$$t_a = t_a(\sigma) := \begin{cases} \max\{\sigma(a') : a' \in A \setminus \{a\}\} & \text{if } |A| > 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

The crux will be that $\sigma(a)$ and t_a together determine the time $\max\{\sigma(a), t_a\}$ when the vertex A saturates in σ , which will be important for understanding the contributions of the vertex A to $Z(\sigma)$. We define t_b, t_x, t_y analogously to t_a .

With the notation above, Lemma 5 can be stated as

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+} Z(\sigma) \geq \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^-} Z(\sigma). \quad (46)$$

Our proof strategy for inequality (46) is as follows: in Section 4.3 we will construct pairings of edge-sequences $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{P}^+ \times \mathcal{P}^-$, called *twins*, which will satisfy $Z(\sigma_1) = Z(\sigma_2)$. Hence (46) holds with equality when summing only over those paired edge-sequences. The only unpaired $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}^-$ will have the very useful property that $t_a \leq t_y$ and $t_b \leq t_x$. In such case the edge ab , especially if located early in the sequence, will help to saturate A and B early on. This suggests that $Z(\sigma)$ should typically have higher values when ab is in σ , i.e., $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$. Using this property, we will see that (46) also holds when summing only over those unpaired members. Combining these estimates will eventually establish (46) and thus Lemma 5; see Section 4.1.

Recall that two configuration-graphs $G^+ \in C^+$ and $G^- \in C^-$ are switching-partners if G^- is obtained from G^+ by replacing edges ab, xy with ax, by , see Section 3.2.2. This notion extends naturally to edge-sequences of configuration-graphs that lie in C^+ and C^- , respectively.

Definition (Counterparts). *We say that the edge-sequences $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$ and $\sigma' \in \mathcal{P}^-$ are counterparts if σ' is obtained by replacing ab with ax and xy with by in σ .*

Note that two counterparts have the same values of t_a, t_b, t_x and t_y ; this is one of the motivations for defining those values. Note also that the vertices A, Y become saturated at the same step of two counterparts, but that B and X may become saturated at different steps. This means that, in general, $Z(\sigma)$ differs from $Z(\sigma')$. When defining pairs of twins in Section 4.3, we will account for this by rearranging some of the edges involving b, x so that t_b, t_x exchange values, while t_a, t_y remain the same. As a result, every vertex except B and X becomes saturated at the same step in σ and in its twin. Furthermore, the step at which B and X saturates will swap between twins. Therefore, the twins will both have the same Z -value, as desired; see Section 4.3 for the details.

Besides replacing edges as in counterparts, we also need an operation that changes the relative order of appearance of the switching-relevant edges. First, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$, we define $\bar{\sigma}$ to be the edge-sequence obtained from σ by swapping the positions of ab and xy . Similarly, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^-$ we define $\bar{\sigma}$ to be the edge-sequence obtained from σ by swapping the positions of ax and by . For later reference, we now record some basic properties of these natural operations on edge-sequences (whose routine verification we omit).

Observation 10. *For all counterparts $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$ and $\sigma' \in \mathcal{P}^-$ the following properties hold:*

- (i) *The edge-sequences $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\sigma}'$ are counterparts.*
- (ii) *The values t_a, t_b, t_x, t_y are the same for $\sigma, \sigma', \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}'$.*
- (iii) *The map $\sigma \mapsto \bar{\sigma}$ is a bijection between \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^+ , and a bijection between \mathcal{P}^- and \mathcal{P}^- .*

In the following lemma, \mathcal{T} denotes the set of edge-sequences which have a twin; see Section 4.3.4. As indicated above, an edge-sequence $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$ and its twin will have the same Z -value, which allows us to obtain part (i) in the following lemma (the technical property from part (iii) was also discussed above).

Lemma 11 (Properties of twins). *There exists $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}^-$ satisfying the following properties:*

- (i) $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{P}^+} Z(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{P}^-} Z(\sigma)$.
- (ii) *For all counterparts $\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}'$ we have: $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $\sigma' \in \mathcal{T}$ iff $\bar{\sigma}' \in \mathcal{T}$.*
- (iii) *If $\sigma \notin \mathcal{T}$ then $t_a \leq t_y$ and $t_b \leq t_x$ in σ .*
- (iv) *If in $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}^-$ all edges incident to X, Y appears after all edges incident to A, B , then $\sigma \notin \mathcal{T}$.*

Recall that in order to prove Lemma 5, our strategy is to first sum over edge-sequences with a twin, for which we shall invoke part (i) of Lemma 11. When summing over the remaining edge-sequences with no twin, which we call *non-twins*, in Section 4.1 we will invoke part (i) of the following lemma (which applies due to part (iii) of Lemma 11). For Lemma 6 we will use a variant of this strategy, exploiting the stronger conclusion of part (ii) of Lemma 12 in order to obtain the desired extra $1 + \epsilon$ factor.

Lemma 12 (Switching of edge-sequences). *There is $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(\zeta) > 0$ such that, for all counterparts $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$ and $\sigma' \in \mathcal{P}^-$ satisfying $t_a \leq t_y$ and $t_b \leq t_x$, the following holds:*

- (i) $Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma}) \geq Z(\sigma') + Z(\bar{\sigma}')$.
- (ii) *If $\min\{\sigma(xy), t_x, t_y\} - \max\{\sigma(ab), t_a, t_b\} \geq \zeta m/3$, then $Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma}) \geq (1 + \epsilon')[Z(\sigma') + Z(\bar{\sigma}')$.*

Before giving the proofs of the above two auxiliary lemmas, we shall first use both to prove the ‘cluster switching’ results Lemmas 5 and 6 in Section 4.1. Afterwards, in Section 4.2 we use edge-switching arguments to prove Lemma 12, and in Section 4.3 we then define twins and prove Lemma 11.

Remark 13 (Special case $k = 1$). *In the case $k = 1$ we have $t_a = t_b = 0$, and so every pair of counterparts σ, σ' satisfies $t_a \leq t_y$ and $t_b \leq t_x$, and thus Lemma 12 applies. Hence there is no need for Lemma 11 or even the concept of twins. This is one place where the case $k = 1$ is much simpler than the general case.*

4.1 Switching of clusters: proofs of Lemmas 5 and 6

To prove the basic cluster switching result Lemma 5, we shall invoke Lemma 11 for twins σ and Lemma 12 for non-twins σ , as discussed.

Proof of Lemma 5. Recalling Observation 10 (iii) as well as twins properties (ii) and (iii) from Lemma 11, using part (i) of Lemma 12 it follows that non-twins satisfy

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \mathcal{T}} [Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma})] \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^- \setminus \mathcal{T}} [Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma})] = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^- \setminus \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma).$$

Combining this inequality with part (i) of Lemma 11 for twins, we infer that

$$Z(C^+) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma) + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \setminus \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma) \geq \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^- \cap \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma) + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^- \setminus \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma) = Z(C^-),$$

as claimed. \square

Turning to the proof of the stronger switching result Lemma 6 for good clusters $C^+ = C^+(G, ab, xy)$, to work with good edge-sequences in $G \in C^+$ it is convenient to define the shorthand

$$\mathbb{G}_{ab,xy} := \{\sigma : (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}\}, \quad (47)$$

where \mathbb{G} is defined as in (27). Our strategy will be to construct a ‘super nice’ subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy} \cap \mathcal{T}^c$ of non-twins that satisfy the gap property required by Lemma 12 (ii). In comparison with the above proof of Lemma 5, this eventually allows us to gain the desired extra $1 + \epsilon$ factor by invoking the stronger conclusion of Lemma 12 (ii) for non-twins $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof of Lemma 6. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^+$ denote the set of edge-sequences $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+$ with the following two properties: (a) that $\min\{\sigma(xy), t_x, t_y\} - \max\{\sigma(ab), t_a, t_b\} \geq \zeta m/3$ holds, and (b) that all edges incident to X, Y appear after all edges incident to A, B . By property (iv) of twins (see Lemma 11) it follows that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^c$. Recalling that the map $\sigma \mapsto \sigma'$ is a bijection between \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^- (see Observation 10), we shall now decompose $Z(C^-) = \sum_{\sigma \in C^+} Z(\sigma')$ into several parts, and apply different inequalities to each part. Recalling Observation 10 and twins property (ii), by invoking claims (i) and (ii) of Lemma 12 separately for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}^c$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$, together with Lemma 11 it follows that there is $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(\zeta) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(C^-) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [Z(\sigma') + Z(\bar{\sigma}')] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{T}^c \cap \mathcal{S}^c} [Z(\sigma') + Z(\bar{\sigma}')] + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma') \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1 + \epsilon')} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma})] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{T}^c \cap \mathcal{S}^c} [Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma})] + \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{T}} Z(\sigma) \\ &= Z(C^+) - \frac{\epsilon'}{(1 + \epsilon')} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} [Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma})]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

It thus suffices to prove that $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} Z(\sigma) \geq \varrho Z(C^+)$ for some $\varrho = \varrho(\zeta, \Delta) > 0$. Indeed, for $\epsilon := \epsilon'/(1 + \epsilon') \cdot \varrho/2$ we then infer the desired result $Z(C^+) \geq (1 + \epsilon)Z(C^-)$ by noting that

$$Z(C^-) \leq (1 - \epsilon)Z(C^+) \leq Z(C^+)/(1 + \epsilon). \quad (49)$$

In the remaining proof of $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} Z(\sigma) \geq \varrho Z(C^+)$, we shall work with a fixed lexicographic ordering of all possible edges. The following mapping $f : \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is at the heart of our argument. Given an edge-sequence $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}$, we write e_1, \dots, e_ℓ for an enumeration of all edges incident to X, Y (including xy) according to our lexicographic ordering. For $i = 1 \dots \ell$ we now sequentially proceed as follows: if the edge e_i

is not in the last $\frac{2}{3}\zeta m - 2\Delta$ steps of our current edge-sequence, then we repeatedly shift it back by exactly $\lfloor \frac{1}{3}\zeta m \rfloor$ steps until it is. Writing $f(\sigma)$ for the edge-sequence resulting from this shifting process, we define

$$\mathcal{S}_f := \{f(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}\}. \quad (50)$$

We claim that $\mathcal{S}_f \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Fix $\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}_f$, where by construction $\sigma^* = f(\sigma)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}$. Note that $\sigma \in \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}$ implies $\sigma^* \in \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}$, and that the edges e_1, \dots, e_ℓ all appear in the last $\frac{2}{3}\zeta m$ steps of the new edge-sequence σ^* (since $\ell \leq 2\Delta$). Furthermore, since A, B are not adjacent to X, Y in $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}$ by definition of good clusters, it follows that A, B are saturated in the first $(1-\zeta)m$ steps in σ and thus σ^* (since we do not shift edges incident to A, B). Putting things together, we infer that σ^* satisfies both properties (a) and (b). Therefore $\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}$, establishing the claim that $\mathcal{S}_f \subseteq \mathcal{S}$.

We now bound the preimage size $|f^{-1}(\sigma^*)|$ for $\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}_f$. Note that σ and $\sigma^* = f(\sigma)$ contain the same sets of edges, so from σ^* we can uniquely recover the lexicographic enumeration of the edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_ℓ incident to X, Y . The crux is that if we are given σ^* and the number of times each edge e_i is shifted backward (which is at most $\lceil m/\lfloor \frac{1}{3}\zeta m \rfloor \rceil$ by construction), then we can uniquely recover σ . Since $\ell \leq 2\Delta$, it follows that

$$|f^{-1}(\sigma^*)| \leq \left(\left\lceil \frac{m}{\lfloor \frac{1}{3}\zeta m \rfloor} \right\rceil \right)^\ell \leq \left(\frac{6}{\zeta} \right)^{2\Delta}. \quad (51)$$

We next bound the ratio $Z(\sigma^*)/Z(\sigma)$ for $\sigma^* = f(\sigma)$, writing $G_i(\sigma^*)$ for the graph induced by the first i edges of σ^* . For each step $i \leq \lceil (1-\zeta/3)m \rceil$ the numbers of unsaturated vertices satisfy $\Gamma_i(\sigma) \geq \Gamma_i(\sigma^*) - (2\Delta + 2)$ and $\Delta\Gamma_i(\sigma^*) \geq \sum_{v \in [n]} [d_v^{(n)} - \deg_{G_i(\sigma^*)}(v)] = 2(m-i) \geq \zeta m/3 + 1$. Using $m = \Theta(n)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Z(\sigma^*)}{Z(\sigma)} &\geq \prod_{i=1}^{\lceil (1-\zeta/3)m \rceil} \frac{[\Gamma_i(\sigma^*) - (2\Delta + 2)][\Gamma_i(\sigma^*) - 1 - (2\Delta + 2)]}{\Gamma_i(\sigma^*)(\Gamma_i(\sigma^*) - 1)} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2\Delta + 2}{\frac{\zeta m}{3\Delta}}\right)^m \left(1 - \frac{2\Delta + 2}{\frac{\zeta m}{3\Delta}}\right)^m \geq e^{-36\Delta^2/\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Finally, combining $\mathcal{S}_f \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with the definition of good clusters and (51)–(52), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}} Z(\sigma^*)}{Z(C^+)} &\geq \frac{\sum_{\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}_f} Z(\sigma^*)}{\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}} Z(\sigma)} \cdot \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathbb{G}_{ab,xy}} Z(\sigma)}{Z(C^+)} \\ &\geq \frac{\sum_{\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}_f} Z(\sigma^*)}{\sum_{\sigma^* \in \mathcal{S}_f} \sum_{\sigma \in f^{-1}(\sigma^*)} Z(\sigma)} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \geq \frac{e^{-36\Delta^2/\zeta}}{(6/\zeta)^{2\Delta}} \cdot \frac{1}{4} =: \varrho, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 6, as discussed. \square

4.2 Switching of edge-sequences: proof of Lemma 12

For an edge-sequence $\sigma \in \Pi_G$ of G , recall that the definition (21) of the probability parameter $Z(\sigma)$ is

$$Z(\sigma) = \prod_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i(\sigma)(\Gamma_i(\sigma) - 1)},$$

where $\Gamma_i = \Gamma_i(\sigma)$ denotes the number of unsaturated vertices after adding the first i edges of the edge-sequence σ . To prove the switching result Lemma 12, we will analyze how the denominators $\Gamma_i(\Gamma_i - 1)$ differ between the edge-sequences $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}, \sigma', \bar{\sigma}'$. A close inspection of these transformations reveals that A, B, X, Y are the only vertices whose saturation steps might differ between $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}, \sigma', \bar{\sigma}'$, so our analysis reduces to tracking when A, B, X, Y saturate in these edge-sequences (recall that A, B, X, Y denote the vertices that contain the points a, b, x, y).

Proof of Lemma 12. For the sake of analysis we henceforth (without loss of generality) assume that $\sigma(ab) < \sigma(xy)$ and $t_a \leq t_b$ hold. A key observation is that the transformations $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}, \sigma', \bar{\sigma}'$ leave t_a, t_b, t_x, t_y as defined around (45) unchanged, i.e., they are the same for all these four edge-sequences. With foresight, we now set

$$i_a := \begin{cases} \sigma(ab), & \text{if } \sigma(ab) \geq t_a, \\ t_a, & \text{if } \sigma(ab) < t_a < \sigma(xy), \\ \sigma(xy), & \text{if } t_a \geq \sigma(xy), \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

which intuitively locates t_a with respect to the interval $[\sigma(ab), \sigma(xy)]$. We define i_b, i_x, i_y similarly. As mentioned above, a careful inspection reveals that A, B, X, Y are the only vertices whose saturation steps might differ between $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}, \sigma', \bar{\sigma}'$. Note that $t_a = \min\{t_a, t_b, t_x, t_y\}$ implies $i_a = \min\{i_a, i_b, i_x, i_y\}$. Consider step i in all these edge-sequences: (a) if $i \leq i_a$, then none of the vertices A, B, X, Y are saturated, (b) if $\sigma(xy) \geq i > \max\{t_x, t_y\}$, then exactly two of the vertices A, B, X, Y are saturated, and (c) if $i > \sigma(xy)$, then the same set of edges are processed and hence the same number of vertices A, B, X, Y are saturated. For each step $i \notin [i_a + 1, \max\{t_x, t_y\}]$ it follows that the number of unsaturated vertices $\Gamma_i = \Gamma_i(\pi)$ is the same for all edge-sequences $\pi \in \{\sigma, \bar{\sigma}, \sigma', \bar{\sigma}'\}$, which in turn implies

$$\frac{Z'(\sigma)}{Z(\sigma)} = \frac{Z'(\bar{\sigma})}{Z(\bar{\sigma})} = \frac{Z'(\sigma')}{Z(\sigma')} = \frac{Z'(\bar{\sigma}')}{Z(\bar{\sigma}')} \quad \text{for} \quad Z'(\pi) := \prod_{i_a < i \leq \max\{t_x, t_y\}} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i(\pi)(\Gamma_i(\pi) - 1)}. \quad (54)$$

It follows that inequality $Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma}) \geq Z(\sigma') + Z(\bar{\sigma}')$ from claim (i) is equivalent to

$$Z'(\sigma) + Z'(\bar{\sigma}) \geq Z'(\sigma') + Z'(\bar{\sigma}'), \quad (55)$$

and that the inequality from claim (ii) is equivalent to $Z(\sigma) + Z(\bar{\sigma}) \geq (1 + \epsilon')[Z(\sigma') + Z(\bar{\sigma}')]$. Using several case distinctions, we shall now prove these equivalent inequalities.

Case $t_a \leq t_b \leq t_x \leq t_y$: For brevity, we define $\Gamma_i^* = \Gamma_i^*(\sigma)$ as Γ_i plus the number of saturated vertices among A, B, X, Y at step i . By tracking when the vertices A, B, X, Y saturate, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Z'(\sigma) &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:B_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:C_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_x < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:D_1}, \\ Z'(\bar{\sigma}) &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:B_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:C_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_x < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:D_2}, \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} Z'(\sigma') &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:B_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:C_3} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_x < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:D_1}, \\ Z'(\bar{\sigma}') &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:B_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:C_3} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_x < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:D_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $B_1 \geq B_2$, $C_3 \geq C_2$, $D_1 \geq D_2$ and $C_1 C_2 \geq C_3^2$. Using elementary estimates¹² we then obtain that

$$\frac{Z'(\sigma) + Z'(\bar{\sigma})}{Z'(\sigma') + Z'(\bar{\sigma}')} = \frac{\frac{B_1 C_1 D_1}{B_2 C_2 D_2} + 1}{\frac{B_1 C_3 D_1}{B_2 C_2 D_2} + \frac{C_3}{C_2}} \geq \frac{\frac{C_3^2}{C_2^2} \frac{B_1}{B_2} \frac{D_1}{D_2} + 1}{\frac{C_3}{C_2} (\frac{B_1}{B_2} \frac{D_1}{D_2} + 1)} \geq \frac{(\frac{C_3}{C_2})^2 + 1}{2 \frac{C_3}{C_2}} \geq 1, \quad (56)$$

¹²In equation (56) we exploit that for all $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$ have $\alpha^2(\beta - 1) \geq \beta - 1$, which implies $2(\alpha^2\beta + 1) \geq (\alpha^2\beta + 1) + (\alpha^2 + \beta) = (\alpha^2 + 1)(\beta + 1)$ and thus $(\alpha^2\beta + 1)/[\alpha(\beta + 1)] \geq (\alpha^2 + 1)/(2\alpha)$.

establishing inequality (55). For claim (ii), note that for $i_b < i \leq i_x$ we have $\Gamma_i^* - 2 = \Gamma_i(\sigma)$. Combined with the observation $\Gamma_i(\sigma) \leq \sum_{v \in [n]} [d_v^{(n)} - \deg_{G_i(\sigma)}(v)] = 2(m - i)$ and the gap property implication $i_x - i_b \geq \min\{\sigma(xy), t_x\} - \max\{\sigma(ab), t_b\} \geq \zeta m/3$, it then follows that

$$\frac{C_3}{C_2} = \prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^* - 2}\right) \geq \prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{m - i}\right) = 1 + \frac{i_x - i_b}{m - i_x + 1} \geq 1 + \frac{\zeta m/3}{m + 1} \geq 1 + \zeta/6, \quad (57)$$

which enables us to improve the final inequality of (56) to $\geq 1 + \epsilon'$ for suitable $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(\zeta) > 0$.

Case $t_a \leq t_b \leq t_y \leq t_x$: Proceeding analogously to the previous case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z'(\sigma) &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:B_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:C_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:D_1}, \\ Z'(\bar{\sigma}) &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:B_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:C_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:D_2}, \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} Z'(\sigma') &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:B_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:C_3} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:D_2}, \\ Z'(\bar{\sigma}') &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:B_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:C_3} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:D_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $B_1 \geq B_2$, $C_1 C_2 \geq C_3^2$, $C_3 \geq C_2$, and $D_1 \geq D_2$. Similarly to (56), using elementary estimates¹³ we then obtain that

$$\frac{Z'(\sigma) + Z'(\bar{\sigma})}{Z'(\sigma') + Z'(\bar{\sigma}')} \geq \frac{\frac{C_3^2}{C_2^2} \frac{B_1}{B_2} \frac{D_1}{D_2} + 1}{\frac{C_3}{C_2} \left(\frac{B_1}{B_2} + \frac{D_1}{D_2}\right)} \geq \frac{\left(\frac{C_3}{C_2}\right)^2 + 1}{2 \frac{C_3}{C_2}} \geq 1, \quad (58)$$

establishing (55). For claim (ii), using $i_y - i_b \geq \zeta m/3$ we obtain analogously to (57) that

$$\frac{C_3}{C_2} = \prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^* - 2}\right) \geq \prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{m - i}\right) = 1 + \frac{i_x - i_b}{m - i_x + 1} \geq 1 + \zeta/6,$$

which again enables us to improve the final inequality of (58) to $\geq 1 + \epsilon'$.

Case $t_a \leq t_y \leq t_b \leq t_x$: Proceeding similarly to the previous cases, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z'(\sigma) &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:B_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:C_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=:D_1}, \\ Z'(\bar{\sigma}) &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=:B_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:C_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=:D_2}, \end{aligned}$$

¹³Similarly to Footnote 12, in equation (58) we exploit that for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 1$ we have $\alpha^2 \beta (\gamma - 1) \geq \gamma - 1$ and $\alpha^2 \gamma (\beta - 1) \geq \beta - 1$, which implies $2(\alpha^2 \beta \gamma + 1) \geq (\alpha^2 \beta + \gamma) + (\alpha^2 \gamma + \beta) = (\alpha^2 + 1)(\beta + \gamma)$ and thus $(\alpha^2 \beta \gamma + 1)/[\alpha(\beta + \gamma)] \geq (\alpha^2 + 1)/(2\alpha)$.

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
Z'(\sigma') &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=B_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=C_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=D_2} \\
Z'(\bar{\sigma}') &= \underbrace{\prod_{i_a < i \leq i_y} \frac{2}{\Gamma_i^*(\Gamma_i^* - 1)}}_{=B_2} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_y < i \leq i_b} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 1)(\Gamma_i^* - 2)}}_{=C_1} \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i_b < i \leq i_x} \frac{2}{(\Gamma_i^* - 2)(\Gamma_i^* - 3)}}_{=D_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $B_1 \geq B_2$ and $D_1 \geq D_2$ imply $(B_1 - B_2)(D_1 - D_2) \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\frac{Z'(\sigma) + Z'(\bar{\sigma})}{Z'(\sigma') + Z'(\bar{\sigma}')} = \frac{B_1 D_1 + B_2 D_2}{B_1 D_2 + B_2 D_1} \geq 1.$$

For claim (ii) there is nothing to show in this case, since $t_y \leq t_b$ implies $\min\{\sigma(xy), t_x, t_y\} - \max\{\sigma(ab), t_a, t_b\} \leq 0 < \zeta m/3$, contradicting the assumed gap property.

Remaining cases with $t_b \leq t_a$: They follow by symmetry, since $t_a \leq t_y$ and $t_b \leq t_x$. \square

4.3 Pairings of edge-sequences: twins and proof of Lemma 11

Expanding on the beginning of Section 4, the majority of this subsection is devoted to the rigorous construction of twins, i.e., pairings of edge-sequences $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in (\mathcal{P}^+ \times \mathcal{P}^-) \cup (\mathcal{P}^- \times \mathcal{P}^+)$ that satisfy $Z(\sigma_1) = Z(\sigma_2)$ and a number of additional technical properties that are useful for the proof of Lemma 11.

Before giving the formal details of our construction, we start with a simple yet illustrative example for the case $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^+$ with $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$. Suppose that B and X are not adjacent, with $\deg(B) = 4$ and $\deg(X) = 6$, and that the ten edges incident to B and X appear in the edge-sequence σ_1 in the following manner:

$$\dots, qx_1, \dots, rb_1, \dots, ab, \dots, sx_2, \dots, tx_3, \dots, ux_4, \dots, vx_5, \dots, xy, \dots, wb_2, \dots, zb_3, \dots$$

We then replace the edges ab, xy with ax, by (which can be thought of as swapping the points b and x), and further swap some of the points in B with some of the points in X (say, swapping b_2 and x_3 , and swapping b_3 and x_5) to obtain the edge-sequence $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ (clusters are defined to accommodate these operations; in particular, swapping of b and x ensures $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$):

$$\dots, qx_1, \dots, rb_1, \dots, ax, \dots, sx_2, \dots, tb_2, \dots, ux_3, \dots, vb_3, \dots, by, \dots, wx_4, \dots, zx_5, \dots$$

There are two important properties to observe in this example:

- (i) Only points of B and X move to different positions, meaning that any vertex $V \notin \{B, X\}$ becomes saturated during the same step of σ_2 as it does in σ_1 .
- (ii) Inspecting the definition (44)–(45), we have $t_x(\sigma_2) = t_b(\sigma_1)$ and $t_b(\sigma_2) = t_x(\sigma_1)$, as well as $\sigma_2(ax) = \sigma_1(ab)$ and $\sigma_2(by) = \sigma_1(xy)$. This implies that the steps at which B and X become saturated are swapped between σ_1 and σ_2 .

From these properties, it follows that the number of unsaturated vertices satisfies $\Gamma_i(\sigma_1) = \Gamma_i(\sigma_2)$ for all steps $1 \leq i \leq m$, which in turn leads to $Z(\sigma_1) = Z(\sigma_2)$. In this case, we will call σ_2 the BX -twin of σ_1 , and vice versa; see Section 4.3.1. In general, we will carefully swap some points in B and X but not in a BX edge such that the two properties stated above holds (to clarify: we will not swap the endpoints of any edges between B and X , since that could create loops).

With that example in mind, we now turn to the formal details of our construction, where the following auxiliary observation will be used to swap points.

Observation 14. *Consider any integers satisfying $0 < d_b < d_x \leq t < d_x + d_b$. Let Θ_1 denote the set of sequences consisting of d_x many X 's and d_b many B 's such that: (i) the last character is B , (ii) the t^{th} character is X , and (iii) every character after the t^{th} is B . Let Θ_2 denote the set of sequences consisting of d_x many X 's and d_b many B 's such that: (i) the last character is X , (ii) the t^{th} character is B , and (iii) every character after the t^{th} is X . Then $|\Theta_1| \leq |\Theta_2|$.*

Proof. The main idea is that restriction (iii) is stricter for Θ_1 than for Θ_2 because of $d_x > d_b$. More formally, by considering the first $t - 1$ character in the sequence, it follows that $|\Theta_1| = \binom{t-1}{d_x-1} \leq \binom{t-1}{d_b-1} = |\Theta_2|$, where the inequality holds since $t \leq d_x + d_b - 1$. \square

Observation 14 implies that there is an injection I_{t,d_b,d_x} mapping Θ_1 into Θ_2 . There are many possible injections, but we henceforth fix one arbitrarily (and use it in what follows).

4.3.1 BX -twins

Consider any edge-sequence $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^+$ with $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$. We will construct its BX -twin $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ by generalizing the example above, where we swapped b and x , but did not swap points of B and X in a BX edge. To this end we define λ_{BX} as the number of edges between B and X (which we will call BX edge), and introduce the parameters

$$d_b := \deg(B) - 1 - \lambda_{BX} \quad \text{and} \quad d_x := \deg(X) - 1 - \lambda_{BX}, \quad (59)$$

which corresponds to the number of B and X points that we might swap. Using $\deg(B) < \deg(X)$, we infer that $d_b < d_x$. With a view towards applying Observation 14, we consider the $d_b + d_x$ edges in σ_1 incident to B or X but is not ab or xy and not a BX -edge. By considering these edges in the order in which they appear in σ_1 , we naturally obtain a sequence containing d_b many B 's and d_x many X 's, where the i^{th} entry is B (resp. X) if the i^{th} edge is has B (resp. X) as an endpoint. The resulting sequence S_1 is well-defined, since none of these edges has both B and X as endpoints. Since $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$, it follows that the last entry of S_1 is a B . Let t be the position in S_1 of the last X . Thus $t \geq d_x$. So, using the notation from Observation 14, we have $S_1 \in \Theta_1$ and we then set $S_2 := I_{t,d_b,d_x}(S_1)$ using the injection we fixed above. (As an illustration, in the example above we have $d_b = 3$ and $d_x = 5$ as well as $S_1 = X, B, X, X, X, X, B, B$ and $S_2 = X, B, X, B, X, B, X, X$.) With S_1 and S_2 in hand, we are now ready to construct σ_2 by modifying σ_1 via the following steps:

- (i) In σ_1 , replace ab with ax and xy with by .
- (ii) We temporarily ignore the label of points in X . For every edge e counted by d_x , i.e., edges incident to X that is not xy and not a BX edge, let i_e denote the position in S_1 corresponding to e ; thus S_1 has an X in position i_e . If S_2 has a B in position i_e , then we modify e by changing endpoint X to B ; keep this edge in the same position in σ_2 as e is in σ_1 . (If S_2 has an X in position i_e , then we do nothing.)
- (iii) We temporarily ignore the label of points in B . For every edge e counted by d_b , i.e., edges incident to B that is not ab and not a BX edge, let i_e denote the position in S_1 corresponding to e ; thus S_1 has a B in position i_e . If S_2 has a X in position i_e , then we modify e by changing endpoint B to X ; keep this edge in the same position in σ_2 as e is in σ_1 . (If S_2 has an B in position i_e , then we do nothing.)
- (iv) Label the points of B not equal to b in σ_2 with the same relative ordering as (labeled) points of B not equal to b in σ_1 . Similarly, label the points of X not equal to x in σ_2 with the same relative ordering as (labeled) points of X not equal to x in σ_1 .

The resulting edge-sequence σ_2 is called a BX -twin of σ_1 , and from the definition of clusters it follows that $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ (because we did not change the set of edges not incident to B and X , and we did not change the union of neighboring points of B and X). The following lemma records some additional properties.

Lemma 15. *The BX -twin $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ constructed above satisfies the following properties:*

- (a) $Z(\sigma_1) = Z(\sigma_2)$.
- (b) $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ and $t_b(\sigma_2) < t_x(\sigma_2)$.
- (c) $t_a(\sigma_2) = t_a(\sigma_1)$, $t_y(\sigma_2) = t_y(\sigma_1)$, $t_b(\sigma_2) = t_x(\sigma_1)$, $t_x(\sigma_2) = t_b(\sigma_1)$.
- (d) Every $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}^-$ with $t_b(\sigma) < t_x(\sigma)$ has at most one BX -twin.

Proof. We first argue that $t_b(\sigma_1) = t_x(\sigma_2)$. Since $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$, the last edge in σ_1 which has B as an endpoint cannot be a BX edge. So $t_b(\sigma_1)$ is the index corresponding to the last element of S_1 . That edge is modified to have endpoint X in σ_2 , and no edges following it in σ_1 , except possibly ab and xy , are modified. Also, no edges following it, except possibly xy , have X as an endpoint, since $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$. So that index becomes $t_x(\sigma_2)$, establishing $t_b(\sigma_1) = t_x(\sigma_2)$.

Similar reasoning shows that $t_b(\sigma_2) = t_x(\sigma_1)$. The two key additional insights are: (i) every character after that point in S_2 is an X . Thus (ii) any edges after that point in σ_2 that have B as an endpoint must be BX edges or ab . The index of the latest such edge that is not ab , if any exist, would be $t_x(\sigma_1)$ and $t_b(\sigma_2)$.

Now, since the positions of all copies of a, y are the same in σ_2 as in σ_1 , it follows that the findings of the first two paragraphs imply part (c).

Part (c) immediately implies part (b).

For part (a) note that, since ab, xy in σ_1 become ax, by in σ_2 , the step at which B is saturated in σ_1 is equal to the step at which X is saturated in σ_2 , and vice versa. Furthermore, every other vertex becomes saturated at the same step of σ_1 and σ_2 (since they all appear on the same edges and in the same position in both). Hence $\Gamma_i(\sigma_1) = \Gamma_i(\sigma_2)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, which implies $Z(\sigma_1) = Z(\sigma_2)$, establishing part (a).

Part (d) follows because I_{t, d_b, d_x} is an injection. Indeed, given $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ with $t_b(\sigma_2) < t_x(\sigma_2)$, we look at the d_b edges incident to B and d_x edges incident to X , other than ax, by and any BX edges. This specifies the sequence $S_2 \in \Theta_2$ and the latest B in that sequence establishes the value t . Now we obtain $S_1 = I_{t, d_b, d_x}^{-1}(S_2)$, which then allows us to uniquely reconstruct the BX -twin of σ_2 , concluding the proof. \square

Next consider any $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ with $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$. We can construct a BX -twin $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^+$ in the same manner, with only the following change: In σ_1 , replace ax with ab and by with xy . The obvious analogue of Lemma 15 holds, by the same proof. This will be encompassed by the more general Lemma 16 below.

4.3.2 AY -twins and properties of twins

Consider any $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}^-$ with $t_y(\sigma_1) < t_a(\sigma_1)$. We construct its AY -twin $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ using the same construction as for BX -twins, where we this time swap the points of A and Y not in an AY edge (instead of the points of B and X not in an BX edge). Besides notational changes, this really just corresponds to interchanging the roles of the vertices B and A as well as the vertices X and Y in the construction from Section 4.3.1. In particular, we here use a sequence of $d_a := \deg(A) - 1 - \lambda_{AY}$ many A 's and $d_y := \deg(Y) - 1 - \lambda_{AY}$ many Y 's. We replace step (i) with the following: (a) if $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^+$, then, in σ_1 , replace ab with by and xy with ax , and (b) if $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ then, in σ_1 , replace ax with xy and by with ab . In steps (ii) and (iii) we use the injection I_{t, d_a, d_y} , where t is defined analogously as in the BX -twin case (the assumptions of Section 14 hold, since $\deg(A) < \deg(Y)$ implies $d_a < d_y$), and modify step (iv) in the obvious way.

We henceforth use the term *twins* to refer to both BX -twins and AY -twins. Then the obvious analogue of Lemma 15 holds (by the same proof), and we now record these key properties for later reference.

Lemma 16 (Key properties of twins). *Defining $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}^- \cup \mathcal{P}^+$, the following holds for twins:*

- (a) *If (σ_1, σ_2) are twins, then $Z(\sigma_1) = Z(\sigma_2)$.*
- (b) *Every $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ with $t_x(\sigma) < t_b(\sigma)$ has exactly one BX -twin, and every $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ with $t_y(\sigma) < t_a(\sigma)$ has exactly one AY -twin.*
- (c) *Every $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ with $t_b(\sigma) < t_x(\sigma)$ has at most one BX -twin, and every $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ with $t_a(\sigma) < t_y(\sigma)$ has at most one AY -twin.*
- (d) *If σ and σ' are counterparts then either (i) they both do not have BX -twins, or (ii) their BX -twins are counterparts of each other. The same is true for AY -twins.*

Proof. Parts (a) and (c) are simply restatements of parts (a) and (d) of Lemma 15 and its analogues. Part (b) holds by construction of twins. Part (d) follows from the fact that, as counterparts, both σ and σ' will have the same values of d_b, d_x, t_b, t_x and the same ordering of edges incident to B and X except ab, xy, ax, by . So if one of them is a BX -twin then either $t_x < t_b$ or we can reconstruct their BX -twin using I_{t, d_b, d_x}^{-1} as in the proof of Lemma 15(d). In both cases both σ and σ' are BX -twins. \square

4.3.3 Quadruplets

Consider $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}^-$ with $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$ and $t_y(\sigma_1) < t_a(\sigma_1)$. Then σ_1 has both a BX -twin σ_2 and an AY -twin σ_3 . By Lemma 15 and its analogues, $t_y(\sigma_2) < t_a(\sigma_2)$ and $t_x(\sigma_3) < t_b(\sigma_3)$. Therefore, σ_2 has an AY -twin and σ_3 has a BX -twin. In the proof of Lemma 11, the following result will eventually allow us to uniquely pair up edge-sequences with their twins (this is not obvious, because there could exist edge-sequences σ_1, σ_2 and σ_3 that have two twins).

Lemma 17. *The AY-twin of σ_2 is equal to the BX-twin of σ_3 .*

Proof. When we construct a BX-twin, we do not alter any endpoints that are A or Y, and the edges containing those endpoints remain in the same position in the edge-sequences. It follows that when we construct the AY-twin of σ_2 and the AY-twin of σ_1 , we alter the exact same sequence S_1 of A's and Y's and, since we always use the same injection I_{t,d_a,d_y} , we alter it in the same way. The only difference in the two constructions is that, for one twin we change (ab, xy) to (by, ax) and for the other we change (ax, by) to (xy, ab) . Similarly for when we construct the BX-twins of σ_1 and σ_3 .

Thus, the sequence of two modifications: $\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2 \rightarrow$ AY-twin of σ_2 makes the same alterations as the sequence $\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_3 \rightarrow$ BX-twin of σ_3 , with the following exception: In the first sequence, if $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^+$, we have $(ab, xy) \rightarrow (ax, by) \rightarrow (xy, ab)$, and in the other sequence, $(ab, xy) \rightarrow (by, ax) \rightarrow (xy, ab)$. If $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ then we have $(ax, by) \rightarrow (ab, xy) \rightarrow (by, ax)$ and $(ax, by) \rightarrow (xy, ab) \rightarrow (by, ax)$. So in both sequences, we end up with the same pair, concluding the proof. \square

We henceforth refer to $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ and the AY-twin of σ_2 (i.e., the BX-twin of σ_3) as *quadruplets*.

4.3.4 Summing over twins and quadruplets: proof of Lemma 11

In the following proof of Lemma 11 we construct the desired pairings of edge-sequences (σ_2, σ_1) , defining $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^+ \cup \mathcal{P}^-$ as the set of all edge-sequences σ which have a twin.

Proof of Lemma 11. The goal of part (i) is to show that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{P}^+} Z(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{P}^-} Z(\sigma). \quad (60)$$

To prove this equation, we apply Lemmas 16 and 17 to pair terms from the left-hand side of (60) with terms from the right-hand side of (60). More precisely, for each set of quadruplets, we arbitrarily choose one of the two ways to split the four into two pairs, where each pair $(\sigma_2, \sigma_1) \in (\mathcal{P}^+ \times \mathcal{P}^-) \cup (\mathcal{P}^- \times \mathcal{P}^+)$ is a set of twins. For each remaining edge-sequence $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{P}^+$ that has a twin (and is not part of a quadruplet), we then form the pair (σ_2, σ_1) , where $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}^-$ is the unique twin of σ_2 . By Lemma 16(a), all paired edge-sequences each have the same Z-value. So in (60) all terms cancel out, establishing that the left-hand side of (60) is equal to the right-hand side of (60), concluding the proof of part (i).

Part (ii) follows from Lemma 16(d) and the fact that the position of the edges ab, xy, ax, by in σ plays no role in the construction of twins.

Part (iii) follows from Lemma 16(b).

For part (iv), for the sake of contradiction suppose $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ is a BX-twin of σ . Then $t_x(\sigma_1) < t_b(\sigma_1)$ and no points of X, Y are adjacent to any points of A, B in σ_1 . Then by Observation 14 (ii), σ satisfies that there is some $t \geq d_x > d_b$ such that the t^{th} edge in the sequence of edges incident to B and X is incident to B. In particular we see that not all edges incident to X appear after all edges incident to B, a contradiction. Therefore σ is not a BX-twin, and similarly σ is not an AY-twin, which completes the proof. \square

5 Counting results: deferred proofs

This section is devoted to the deferred proofs of the counting results Lemma 7 and 8 from Section 3.3, which give bounds on the number of clusters containing a given configuration-graph and the number of good edge-sequences. Both proofs are based on counting arguments and the following observation. For brevity, we henceforth always tacitly assume that $\gamma > 0$ is sufficiently small and that $n \geq n_0(\gamma, \Delta, \xi)$ is sufficiently large (whenever necessary).

Observation 18. *There are constants $c = c(\xi, \Delta) > 1/2$ and $\nu = \nu(\xi, \Delta) > 0$ such that $m \geq \max\{c \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j, \mu\}$ and $\mu + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j \geq \nu \max\{m, \mu\}$.*

Proof. Since by assumption $\sum_{k < j \leq \Delta} n_i = n - \sum_{j \in [k]} n_j \geq \xi n$, it follows that $m \geq c \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j$ for some constant $c = c(\xi, \Delta) > 1/2$. Hence

$$\mu + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j = \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j}{2m}\right)^2 \cdot m \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2c}\right)^2 \cdot m,$$

which completes the proof by noting that $m^2 \geq (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)^2/4$ implies $m \geq \mu$. \square

5.1 Counting clusters: proof of Lemma 7

Recall that U_G and L_G count the number of upper and lower clusters that contain the configuration-graph G (see Section 3.3). To prove Lemma 7 we shall exploit (i) that U_G equals four times the number of pairs consisting of small and large edge, and (ii) that L_G equals twice the number of pairs consisting of mixed edges that lie on disjoint vertices.

Proof of Lemma 7. We first estimate L_G and U_G for any configuration-graph G with $\ell = X_k(G)$ small edges. To this end we say that an edge $ax \in E(G)$ is a mixed edge if $\deg(a) \leq k$ and $\deg(x) > k$. Note that the number L_G of lower cluster containing G equals to twice the number of pairs of mixed edges in G that lies on different vertices. Since there are 2ℓ small points whose neighbor is also small, we infer that there are $\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\ell$ mixed edges. It follows that

$$\left(\sum_{j \in [k]} \frac{j n_j - 2\ell}{2}\right) - (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\ell) \cdot 2\Delta \leq \frac{L_G}{2} \leq \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} \frac{j n_j - 2\ell}{2}\right). \quad (61)$$

Note that the number U_G of upper cluster containing G is four times the number of pair of edges (ab, xy) where ab is small and xy is large (to clarify: the factor of four accounts for the fact that we by definition have four copies of the same upper cluster; cf. Section 3.3). Since there are ℓ small edges and $m - \ell - (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\ell) = m + \ell - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j$ large edges, it follows that

$$U_G = 4\ell(\ell + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j). \quad (62)$$

We next simplify inequality (61) for L_G when G has $\ell \leq (1 + \gamma)\mu$ small edges. Using Observation 18 we infer $2\ell \leq (1 + \gamma) \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j / (2c)$ for some $c > 1/2$, so that $\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\ell = \Omega(\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j) = \omega(1)$ for all sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$. Hence inequality (61) implies

$$L_G = (1 + o(1)) \cdot (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\ell)^2. \quad (63)$$

Finally, combining (62)–(63) with $4m\mu = (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)^2$ and Observation 18, for all sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$ it follows that for all configuration-graphs $G, H \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L_G}{U_H} &= \frac{(1 + o(1)) \cdot (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2[1 + O(\gamma)]\mu)^2}{(1 + O(\gamma)) \cdot 4\mu([1 + O(\gamma)]\mu + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)} \\ &= (1 + O(\gamma)) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{(\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)^2 - 4m\mu + O(\gamma\mu(\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j + \mu))}{4\mu([1 + O(\gamma)]\mu + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)}\right) \\ &= (1 + O(\gamma)) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{O(\gamma m)}{\nu \max\{m, \mu\} - O(\gamma\mu)}\right) = 1 + O(\gamma), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

as claimed. \square

5.2 Counting good edge-sequences: proof of Lemma 8

To prove Lemma 8, we shall first use counting arguments to show that many small edges have endpoints lying in vertices that do not become saturated during the last ζm steps of the edge-sequence σ . Then, for each such small edge ab , we shall use counting arguments to show that almost all large edges xy yield a good

edge-sequence $(\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}$, i.e., X and Y are not adjacent to A and B (recall that A, B, X, Y denote the vertices that contain the points a, b, x, y). As we shall see, this together implies that many edge-sequences are good.

Proof of Lemma 8. We henceforth fix a configuration-graph $G \in \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\mu}$ and an edge-sequence $\sigma \in \Pi_G$ of the edges of $E(G)$. A small edge $ab \in E(G)$ is called early if both vertices A, B saturate during the first $(1 - \zeta)m$ steps. By definition of good edge-sequences \mathbb{G} (see Section 3.3), we have

$$\frac{|\{ab, xy \in E(G) : (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}\}|}{|\{ab, xy \in E(G) : ab \text{ small, } xy \text{ large}\}|} \geq \frac{|\{ab \in E(G) : ab \text{ early}\}|}{|\{ab \in E(G) : ab \text{ small}\}|} \cdot \min_{\substack{ab \in E(G): \\ ab \text{ small} \\ ab \text{ early}}} \frac{|\{xy \in E(G) : (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}\}|}{|\{xy \in E(G) : xy \text{ large}\}|}. \quad (65)$$

It remains to bound the two fractions in the right hand-side of (65) from below, and we start with the first fraction. As before, we write $\ell = X_k(G)$ for the number of small edges of G , where $\ell \geq (1 - \gamma)\mu$ by assumption. During the final ζm steps of the process, at most $2 \cdot \zeta m \leq \zeta n \Delta$ small vertices become saturated. Noting that $2m \leq n\Delta$ and $\gamma \leq 1/2$ imply $\ell \geq (1 - \gamma)\mu \geq (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)^2 / 8m \geq \xi^2 n / (4\Delta)$, using the definition (25) of $\zeta = \xi^2 / (16\Delta^3)$ it follows that

$$\frac{|\{ab \in E(G) : ab \text{ early}\}|}{|\{ab \in E(G) : ab \text{ small}\}|} \geq \frac{\ell - \zeta n \Delta \cdot \Delta}{\ell} = 1 - \frac{\xi^2 n}{16\Delta \ell} \geq \frac{3}{4}. \quad (66)$$

Turning to the second fraction in the right hand-side of (65), let $ab \in E(G)$ be a small and early edge. There are $\ell + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j$ large edges $xy \in E(G)$, as established above (62). Furthermore, there are at most $2k \cdot \Delta \leq 2\Delta^2$ edges $xy \in E(G)$ with the property that at least one point of X, Y is adjacent to a point in A, B (recall that A, B, X, Y denote the vertices containing the points a, b, x, y). For sufficiently small $\gamma > 0$ Observation 18 implies that $\mu + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j \geq 2\gamma\mu$, so using $\ell \geq (1 - \gamma)\mu$ and $\mu = \Theta(n)$ it follows that

$$\frac{|\{xy \in E(G) : (\sigma, ab, xy) \in \mathbb{G}\}|}{|\{xy \in E(G) : xy \text{ large}\}|} \geq \frac{\ell + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\Delta^2}{\ell + m - \sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j} \geq 1 - \frac{2\Delta^2}{\gamma\mu} \geq \frac{2}{3}, \quad (67)$$

which together with inequalities (65)–(66) establishes the desired estimate (29). \square

6 Epilogue: alternative approach

In this final section we briefly discuss an alternative approach to Theorems 1 and 2, which instead of switching is based on the differential equation method [50, 53, 48]. Our primary interest is the intriguing possibility that this approach can be made rigorous, which would lead to a conceptually simpler proof of our main result.

The basic idea is straightforward: standard combinatorial methods (see Appendix A.2) show that in the uniform model the number of small edges $X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n})$ is concentrated around $\mu = (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)^2 / (4m)$, and a routine application of the differential equation method shows that in the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process the number of small edges $X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P)$ is concentrated around $\rho_k n$, where the quantity ρ_k has an analytic description in terms of differential equations. To prove a discrepancy it thus suffices to show that the two rescaled means μ/n and ρ_k differ in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$. While this discrepancy is easy to verify for any concrete degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n covered by Theorem 2 (by numerically solving the relevant differential equations), we are lacking an analytic proof technique that can prove this for all such \mathbf{d}_n based only on the relevant differential equations.

To stimulate further research into such analytic proof techniques (which would most likely enhance the power of the differential equation method), as a proof of concept we now outline an analytic argument that works for degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n that are sufficiently irregular, i.e., under much stronger assumptions than Theorem 2. To this end we shall assume that in \mathbf{d}_n the number of vertices of degree j satisfies $n_j/n \rightarrow r_j$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $j \in [\Delta]$, which in view of the (standard) combinatorial part (i) of Theorem 2 implies that in the uniform model we typically have

$$\frac{X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n})}{n} \sim \frac{\mu}{n} \sim \frac{(\sum_{j \in [k]} j r_j)^2}{2 \sum_{j \in [\Delta]} j r_j} =: \hat{\rho}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{m}{n} \sim \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in [\Delta]} j r_j =: T,$$

where $a_n \sim b_n$ is the usual shorthand for $a_n = (1 + o(1))b_n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To analyze the number of small edges $X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P)$ in the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process, we shall track the following random variables after each step i : $U(i)$ counts the number of unsaturated vertices, $U_a(i)$ with $a \in [\Delta]$ counts the number of unsaturated vertices v with degree $d_v^{(n)} = a$ in \mathbf{d}_n , and $X_{a,b}(i)$ with $a, b \in [\Delta]$ counts the number of edges whose two endvertices have degrees a and b in \mathbf{d}_n . A standard application of the differential equation method shows that typically the following holds: for all steps $0 \leq i \leq m$ we have $U(i)/n = u(t) + o(1)$, $U_j(i)/n = u_j(t) + o(1)$, $X_{a,b}(i)/n = x_{a,b}(t) + o(1)$ with $t = i/n$, where the functions $u(t)$, $u_j(t)$ and $x_{a,b}(t)$ are the solutions to suitable differential equations that depend only on r_1, \dots, r_Δ . In the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process we thus typically have

$$\frac{X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P)}{n} = \sum_{1 \leq a \leq b \leq k} \frac{X_{a,b}(m)}{n} = \rho_k + o(1) \quad \text{for} \quad \rho_k := \sum_{1 \leq a \leq b \leq k} x_{a,b}(T).$$

To prove a discrepancy in the number of small edges in both models, by our above discussion it thus remains to analytically show that $\rho_k \neq \hat{\rho}_k$ (which we know to be true by our switching based Theorem 2). The key to proving this discrepancy is to prove suitable bounds on the values of $x_{a,b}(T)$. We know how to do this when the degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n is sufficiently far from regular, in a sense specified below. But new ideas are needed to do so for all the degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n covered by Theorem 2. We close this paper with further elaboration of this analytic approach, and a description of how it works on some degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n . The relevant differential equations satisfy $u_j(0) = r_j$ and $u_j'(t) \geq -2u_j(t)/u(t)$, from which it follows¹⁴ that

$$u_j(t) \geq r_j e^{-\lambda(t)} \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda(t) := \int_0^t \frac{2}{u(x)} dx.$$

The simple degree-counting argument above (52) shows that $U(i) \geq 2(m-i)/\Delta$, and one can similarly show that $u(t) \geq 2(T-t)/\Delta$, using which $\lambda(t) \leq \Delta \ln(T/(T-t))$ follows. Inserting these estimates and $u(t) \leq 1$ into the relevant differential equations $x_{a,b}(0) = 0$ and $x'_{a,b}(t) = (1 + \mathbb{1}_{\{a \neq b\}})u_a(t)u_b(t)/u^2(t)$, we obtain that

$$x_{a,b}(T) = \int_0^T x'_{a,b}(x) dx \geq (1 + \mathbb{1}_{\{a \neq b\}})r_a r_b \int_0^T \left(\frac{T-x}{T}\right)^{2\Delta} dx = (1 + \mathbb{1}_{\{a \neq b\}})r_a r_b \frac{T}{2\Delta + 1},$$

which in turn implies that, say,

$$\rho_k = \sum_{1 \leq a \leq b \leq k} x_{a,b}(T) \geq \frac{T(\sum_{j \in [k]} r_j)^2}{2\Delta + 1} \geq \frac{T(\sum_{j \in [k]} j r_j)^2}{(2\Delta + 1)k^2}.$$

Comparing $\hat{\rho}_k$ with ρ_k , we see that the desired discrepancy in the number of small edges is implied by $T/(2\Delta + 1) > k^2/(4T)$, or equivalently $\sum_{j \in [\Delta]} j r_j > k\sqrt{2\Delta + 1}$. While this sufficient condition is weaker than the one from Theorem 2, it does apply to sufficiently irregular degree sequences \mathbf{d}_n . For example, this condition establishes non-contiguity for $\Delta \geq 7$ when half of the vertices of \mathbf{d}_n have degree one and half have degree Δ (i.e., where $r_1 = r_\Delta = 1/2$ and $k = 1$). We leave it as an open problem to find an improved analytic argument that recovers Theorems 1 and 2 based on analysis of the relevant differential equations.

Acknowledgements. Lutz Warnke would like to thank Nick Wormald for many stimulating discussions about the behavior of the degree-restricted random \mathbf{d}_n -process.

References

- [1] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **74** (2002), 47.
- [2] K. Balińska and L. Quintas. Random graph models for physical systems. In *Graph Theory and Topology in Chemistry (Athens, Ga., 1987)*, volume 51 of *Studies in Physical and Theoretical Chemistry*, pages 349–361. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [3] K. Balińska and L. Quintas. The sequential generation of random f -graphs. Line maximal 2-, 3- and 4-graphs. *Computers & Chemistry* **14** (1990), 323–328.

¹⁴With more work one can show that $u_j(t) = r_j e^{-\lambda(t)} \sum_{0 \leq \ell < j} \lambda^\ell(t)/\ell!$ and $u(t) = \sum_{j \in [\Delta]} u_j(t)$ hold.

- [4] K. Balińska and L. Quintas. Big cycles in random edge maximal 2-graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing (Boca Raton, FL, 1993)*, volume 93, pages 131–141, 1993.
- [5] K. Balińska and L. Quintas. The random f -graph process. In *Quo vadis, graph theory?*, volume 55 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, pages 333–339. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1993.
- [6] A.-L. Barabási. *Network Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2016).
- [7] E. Ben-Naim and P.L. Krapivsky. Dynamics of random graphs with bounded degrees. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **11** (2011), P11008.
- [8] T. Bohman. The triangle-free process. *Advances in Mathematics* **221** (2009), 1653–1677.
- [9] T. Bohman and P. Keevash. The early evolution of the H -free process. *Inventiones Mathematicae* **181** (2010), 291–336.
- [10] T. Bohman and P. Keevash. Dynamic concentration of the triangle-free process. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **58** (2021), 221–293.
- [11] T. Bohman and L. Warnke. Large girth approximate Steiner triple systems. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **100** (2019), 895–913.
- [12] B. Bollobás. A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics* **1** (1980), 311–316.
- [13] G. Chapuy and G. Perarnau. Connectivity in bridge-addable graph classes: the McDiarmid-Steger-Welsh conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **136** (2019), 44–71.
- [14] C. Cooper, A. Frieze, M. Molloy and B. Reed. Perfect matchings in random r -regular, s -uniform hypergraphs. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **5** (1996), 1–14.
- [15] S.N. Dorogovtsev and J.F.F. Mendes. *Evolution of Networks*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003).
- [16] S.N. Dorogovtsev. *Lectures on Complex Networks*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2010).
- [17] A. Dudek, A. Frieze, A. Ruciński, M. Ślęk. Approximate counting of regular hypergraphs. *Information Processing Letters* **113** (2013), 785–788.
- [18] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On random graphs I. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen* **5** (1959), 290–297.
- [19] G. Fiz Pontiveros, S. Griffiths, and R. Morris. The triangle-free process and $R(3, k)$. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* (2020), 125 pages.
- [20] A. Frieze and M. Karoński. *Introduction to random graphs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2016).
- [21] P. Gao and C. Sato. A transition of limiting distributions of large matchings in random graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **116** (2016), 57–86.
- [22] P. Gao and N. Wormald. Enumeration of graphs with a heavy-tailed degree sequence. *Advances in Mathematics* **287** (2016), 412–450.
- [23] C. Godsil and B. McKay. Asymptotic enumeration of Latin rectangles. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **48** (1990), 19–44.
- [24] C. Greenhill, A. Ruciński, and N. Wormald. Random hypergraph processes with degree restrictions. *Graphs Combinatorics* **20** (2004), 319–332.
- [25] C. Greenhill, B. McKay, and X. Wang. Asymptotic enumeration of sparse 0-1 matrices with irregular row and column sums. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* **113** (2006), 291–324.
- [26] C. Greenhill and B. McKay. Asymptotic enumeration of sparse multigraphs with given degrees. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **27** (2013), 2064–2089.
- [27] S. Janson. Random regular graphs: Asymptotic distributions and contiguity, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **4** (1995), 369–405.
- [28] S. Janson. Asymptotic equivalence and contiguity of some random graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **36** (2010), 26–45.
- [29] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński. *Random graphs*. Wiley-Interscience, New York (2000).
- [30] S. Janson and L. Warnke. Preferential attachment without vertex growth: emergence of the giant component. *Annals of Applied Probability* **31** (2021), 1523–1547.
- [31] F. Joos, G. Perarnau, D. Rautenbach, and B. Reed. How to determine if a random graph with a fixed degree sequence has a giant component. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **170** (2018), 263–310.
- [32] J. Kennedy and L. Quintas. Probability models for random f -graphs. In *Combinatorial Mathematics: Proceedings of the Third International Conference (New York, 1985)*, volume 555 of *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, pages 248–261. The New York Academy of Sciences, New York, 1989.
- [33] J.H. Kim and N. Wormald. Random matchings which induce Hamilton cycles and Hamiltonian decompositions of random regular graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **81** (2001) 20–44.
- [34] B. McKay. Asymptotics for 0-1 matrices with prescribed line sums In *Enumeration and Design*, Academic Press (1984), pp. 225–238.
- [35] B. McKay. Subgraphs of Random Graphs with Specified Degrees. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians 2010 (ICM 2010)*, World Scientific (2011), pp. 2489–2501.
- [36] B. McKay and N. Wormald. Asymptotic enumeration by degree sequence of graphs with degrees $o(\sqrt{n})$. *Combinatorica* **11** (1991), 369–382.
- [37] M. Molloy, H. Robalewska, R. Robinson and N. Wormald. 1-factorisations of random regular graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **10** (1997), 305–321.
- [38] H. Mulder. Julius Petersen’s theory of regular graphs. *Discrete Mathematics* **100** (1992), 157–175.
- [39] M. Newman. *Networks*. 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford (2018).
- [40] J. Petersen. Die Theorie der regulären graphs. *Acta Mathematica* **15** (1891), 193–220.
- [41] O. Riordan and L. Warnke. The phase transition in bounded-size achlioptas processes. Preprint (2017). [arXiv:1704.08714](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.08714)
- [42] R. Robinson and N. Wormald. Almost all regular graphs are Hamiltonian *Random Structures and Algorithms* **5** (1994), 363–374.




Figure 3: Counterexample to the simple switching heuristic from Sections 1.2 and 3.2.1 (we depict configuration-graphs as defined in Section 2.1, where each vertex v is represented by an ellipse containing $\deg(v)$ many points): the graph G^- is obtained from G^+ by the natural switching operation which replaces the edges ab, xy with ax, by , but despite the degree difference $\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b)\} < \min\{\deg(x), \deg(y)\}$ the resulting graph G^- is more likely than G^+ ; see Appendix A.1 for more details.

- [43] A. Ruciński and N. Wormald. Random graph processes with degree restrictions. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **1** (1992), 169–180.
- [44] A. Ruciński and N. Wormald. Random graph Processes with Maximum Degree 2. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **7** (1997), 183–199.
- [45] A. Ruciński and N. C. Wormald. Connectedness of graphs generated by a random d -process. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 72(1):67–85, 2002.
- [46] A. Telcs, N. Wormald and S. Zhou. Hamiltonicity of random graphs produced by 2-processes. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **31** (2007), 450–481.
- [47] L. Warnke. On the method of typical bounded differences. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **25** (2016), 269–299.
- [48] L. Warnke. On Wormald’s differential equation method. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, to appear. [arXiv:1905.08928](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.08928)
- [49] L. Warnke and N. Wormald. Phase transition in evolving random graphs with bounded degrees. Manuscript (2022).
- [50] N. Wormald. Differential equations for random processes and random graphs. *Annals of Applied Probability* **5** (1995), 1217–1235.
- [51] N. Wormald. The perturbation method and triangle-free random graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms* **9** (1996), 253–270.
- [52] N. Wormald Models of random regular graphs. In *Surveys in Combinatorics*, pp. 239–298, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1999).
- [53] N. Wormald. The differential equation method for random graph processes and greedy algorithms. In *Lectures on Approximation and Randomized Algorithm*, PWN, Warsaw (1999), pp. 73–155.

A Appendix

A.1 Counterexample to simple switching heuristic

In Sections 1.2 and 3.2.1 we discussed a simple switching heuristic which suggested that, when the degrees of a (configuration) graph G^+ satisfy $\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b)\} < \min\{\deg(x), \deg(y)\}$, then the switching operation which replaces the edges ab, xy with ax, by should decrease the probability of the resulting (configuration) graph G^- , i.e., G^+ should be more likely than G^- . Figure 3 depicts an example where this heuristic fails: with a computer program one easily checks that in the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process (see Section 2.2) we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*} = G^+)}{\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*} = G^-)} = \frac{Z(G^+)}{Z(G^-)} \approx 0.95652 < 1.$$

For the reader worried that this counterexample might be an artifact of using the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process, we remark that if we interpret G^+ and G^- as normal graphs (by contracting all points in an ellipse to one vertex), then with a computer program one easily checks that in the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process we also have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G^+)}{\mathbb{P}(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P = G^-)} \approx 0.82164 < 1.$$

For switching arguments, the example from Figure 3 thus suggests that very local consideration on the level of pairs of graphs do not suffice, i.e., that looking at larger sets of graphs at once seems to be necessary (in this paper we implement this by considering clusters, see Section 3.2).

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2 (i): number of small edges X_k in uniform model

In this appendix we, for completeness, prove Theorem 2 (i) using routine configuration model arguments.

Proof of Theorem 2 (i). Let $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^C$ be the random graph obtained by from the configuration model [12, 52, 20] on the degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n . As usual, $X_k(G)$ denotes the number of small edges in G . Since the maximum degree is $\Delta = O(1)$, it follows from well-known transfer results (see, e.g., [20, Theorem 11.3]) that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}) - \mu| \geq \epsilon\mu) \leq O(1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^C) - \mu| \geq \epsilon\mu), \quad (68)$$

so that we may henceforth focus on the number $X_k := X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^C)$ of small edges (which include loops) in the configuration model. To this end, let E_k denote the set of all possible small edges. Note that $|E_k| = \binom{\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j}{2}$. Writing I_e is the indicator variable for the event that the edge e is in $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^C$, using (1) and $\epsilon \gg n^{-1/2}$ it follows that $\min\{\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j, m\} = \Omega(n)$ as well as

$$\mathbb{E} X_k = \sum_{e \in E_k} \mathbb{E} I_e = \frac{|E_k|}{2m-1} = (1 + O(n^{-1})) \frac{(\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j)^2}{4m} = (1 + o(\epsilon))\mu.$$

Gearing up towards an application of the bounded differences inequality for the configuration model (which follows from a simple modification of [52, Theorem 2.19] for regular \mathbf{d}_n ; see also [47, Section 1.1.4]), note that a switching operation can change the number X_k of small edges by at most two. In view of $\epsilon \gg n^{-1/2}$, $\Delta = \Theta(1)$ and $\mu = \Omega(n)$, see (1), now a routine application of the bounded differences inequality to $X_k = X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^C)$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k - \mu| \geq \epsilon\mu) \leq \mathbb{P}(|X_k - \mathbb{E} X_k| \geq \epsilon\mu/2) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-\Theta(\epsilon^2 \mu^2)}{n\Delta \cdot \Theta(1)}\right) \leq \exp(-\Theta(\epsilon^2 n)),$$

which together with $X_k = X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^C)$ and inequality (68) completes the proof of the desired estimate (3). \square

A.3 Transfer of Theorem 3 to Theorem 2 (ii)

In this appendix we show that our main technical result Theorem 3 for the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process transfers to the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process, i.e., implies our main result Theorem 2 (ii). This kind of transfer argument is conceptually standard, but the technical details are more involved than usual. Recall that, in both the final graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ of the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process and the final graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$ of the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process, we each time condition on having degree sequence \mathbf{d}_n , i.e., we condition on the underlying process completing. The following lemma shows that the probability of completing is always at least a positive constant (stronger bounds can be deduced from [43] and the arguments therein, but we do not need this).

Lemma 19 (Completion probability). *For any integer $\Delta \geq 1$ there are $m_0, c > 0$ such that, for any degree sequence $\mathbf{d}_n = (d_1^{(n)}, \dots, d_n^{(n)}) \in \{0, \dots, \Delta\}^n$ with even degree sum $\sum_{i \in [n]} d_i^{(n)}$ and at least $m = m(\mathbf{d}_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} d_i^{(n)} \geq m_0$ edges, the (unconditional) standard and relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process both complete with probability at least c .*

As we shall see, this lemma (whose elementary proof we defer to the end of this appendix section) and Theorem 3 effectively reduce the proof of Theorem 2 (ii) to a comparison argument between the unconditional models. To this end we below write $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^P$ for the graph of the (unconditional) standard \mathbf{d}_n -process after step i , and also write $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^{P,*}$ for the (unconditional) relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process after step i .

Proof of Theorem 2 (ii). Fix $\alpha > 0$ as in Theorem 3. The main idea is to compare the (unconditional) standard and relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process after $m_0 := m - \lfloor \min\{\alpha\mu/4, m/2\} \rfloor$ steps, exploiting that during the final

$m - m_0 \leq \alpha\mu/4$ steps the number of small edges can only change by at most most $\alpha\mu/4$. Since the graph $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ has the same distribution as $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m}^P$ conditioned on completing, by invoking Lemma 19 it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/4) \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m}^P) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/4)}{\mathbb{P}(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m}^P \text{ completes})} \leq O(1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^P) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2). \quad (69)$$

Suppose that we condition on the graph $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*}$ of the (unconditional) relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process after m_0 steps. Then the remaining $m - m_0 = \Theta(\min\{\mu, n\}) \gg 1$ steps of the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process again correspond to a relaxed \mathbf{d}'_n -process with a modified degree sequence \mathbf{d}'_n (where the vertex degrees after m_0 steps are subtracted off) with even degree sum, so by Lemma 19 the conditional probability of completing is at least $c = \Omega(1)$. Since the graph $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m}^{P,*}$ conditioned on completing has the same distribution as $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$, by invoking Theorem 3 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2 \text{ and } H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m}^{P,*} \text{ completes})}{c} \\ &\leq O(1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu) \leq e^{-\Theta(n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

In view of (69)–(70) it remains to compare the probabilities in both unconditional processes after m_0 steps, for which we shall use a standard step-by-step comparison argument (similar to [24, 41, 30, 49]). To this end, for mathematical convenience we henceforth write

$$H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^{P,+} := \pi(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^{P,*}) \quad (71)$$

for the multigraph representation of the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process after step i , as defined in Section 2.1. We now fix a graph sequence $(G_0)_{0 \leq i \leq m_0}$ satisfying $|X_k(G_{m_0}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2$ that can be attained by $(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^P)_{0 \leq i \leq m_0}$. Comparing the probability with which the next edge is added in each process, for $0 \leq i < m_0$ it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i+1}^P = G_{i+1} \mid \bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq i} \{H_{\mathbf{d}_n, j}^P = G_j\}\right) = \frac{\binom{\Gamma_i}{2}}{|\mathcal{Q}_i|} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i+1}^{P,+} = G_{i+1} \mid \bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq i} \{H_{\mathbf{d}_n, j}^{P,+} = G_j\}\right), \quad (72)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_i = \binom{\Gamma_i}{2} \setminus E(G_i)$ denotes the set of edges that can be added to $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^P$, and Γ_i denotes the number of unsaturated vertices in G_i (as before). Noting $|E(G_i) \cap \binom{\Gamma_i}{2}| \leq \Gamma_i \cdot \Delta$ and $\Gamma_i - 1 \geq \Gamma_i/2 \geq (m - i)/\Delta \geq (m - m_0)/\Delta \gg 1$, it follows using $1 - x \geq e^{-2x}$ for $x \in [0, 1/2]$ that

$$|\mathcal{Q}_i| \geq \binom{\Gamma_i}{2} - \Gamma_i \Delta = \binom{\Gamma_i}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2\Delta}{\Gamma_i - 1}\right) \geq \binom{\Gamma_i}{2} \exp\left(\frac{-4\Delta^2}{m - m_0}\right).$$

Since initially $\mathbb{P}(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, 0}^P = G_0) = 1 = \mathbb{P}(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, 0}^{P,*} = G_0)$, by multiplying (72) it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{0 \leq i \leq m_0} \{H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^P = G_i\}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{4\Delta^2 m_0}{m - m_0}\right) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{0 \leq i \leq m_0} \{H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^{P,+} = G_i\}\right). \quad (73)$$

Recalling $\Delta = O(1)$, by definition of m_0 we have $\Delta^2 m_0 / (m - m_0) = O(1)$. Summing (73) over all graph sequences $(G_0)_{0 \leq i \leq m_0}$ satisfying $|X_k(G_{m_0}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2$ that can be attained by $(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, i}^P)_{0 \leq i \leq m_0}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^P) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2) &\leq O(1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,+}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2) \\ &\leq O(1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(|X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*}) - \mu| \leq \alpha\mu/2), \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where for the last step we used $X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,+}) = X_k(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*})$, i.e., that $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*}$ and its multigraph representation $H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,+} = \pi(H_{\mathbf{d}_n, m_0}^{P,*})$ contain the same number of small edges.

Finally, combining (74) with (69)–(70) completes the proof of inequality (4) with $\beta := \alpha/4$. \square

We conclude by giving the deferred proof of Lemma 19, which is based on counting arguments.

Proof of Lemma 19. We first consider the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process. When this process fails to complete, we are left with an edge-sequence $\hat{\sigma}$ with less than m edges, to which no more edges can be added without violating the degree constraint (not allowing multiedges). We denote the set of such ‘stuck’ edge-sequences be $S = S(\mathbf{d}_n)$, and write $\mathbb{P}(\sigma)$ for the probability that the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process produces the edge-sequence σ .

We claim that there is a function g such that the following holds for any $\hat{\sigma} \in S$: the edge-sequence $g(\hat{\sigma})$ completes, is identical with $\hat{\sigma}$ in the first $m_\Delta := m - 3\Delta^3$ steps, and we also have

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}) \leq D \cdot \mathbb{P}(g(\hat{\sigma})) \quad \text{and} \quad |g^{-1}(g(\hat{\sigma}))| \leq D \quad \text{for} \quad D := (6\Delta^3)^{6\Delta^3}.$$

Writing $\text{Im}(g)$ for the image of g , using this claim it follows that $\sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in S} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma}) \leq D^2 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Im}(g)} \mathbb{P}(\sigma)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{d}_n\text{-process completes}) \geq \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \text{Im}(g)} \mathbb{P}(\sigma)}{\sum_{\sigma \in \text{Im}(g)} \mathbb{P}(\sigma) + \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in S} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma})} \geq \frac{1}{1 + D^2}, \quad (75)$$

which establishes the desired lower bound on the probability of completing, with $c := 1/(1 + D^2)$.

In the remainder we show the existence of such g with the claimed properties (to ensure that all described steps are feasible, we shall always tacitly use that the number of edges $m \geq m_0$ is sufficiently large, whenever necessary). Consider $\hat{\sigma} \in S$ and the graph H containing all edges in $\hat{\sigma}$. Note that the remaining set U of unsaturated vertices of H are pairwise adjacent (otherwise we can add more edges). Since the maximum degree in \mathbf{d}_n is Δ , it follows that there are at most $|U| \leq \Delta$ unsaturated vertices at the end. Hence the number ℓ of missing edges is at most $\ell \leq |U| \cdot \Delta \leq \Delta^2$. We shall next pick ℓ pairwise disjoint edges whose endpoints are not adjacent to any vertices of U . To this end we initialize $F = N(U)$ as the set of forbidden vertices. At each step $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, we then pick from $\hat{\sigma}$ the latest edge $u_i v_i$ whose endpoints are disjoint from F , and add $u_i v_i$ to F . Let $(a_1, \dots, a_{2\ell})$ be an arbitrary but deterministic enumeration of the multiset of unsaturated vertices of $\hat{\sigma}$ where unsaturated vertex v appears $d_v^{(n)} - \deg_H(v)$ times. We now construct the edge-sequence $g(\hat{\sigma})$ by replacing the edge $u_i v_i$ in $\hat{\sigma}$ with the sequence of edges $u_i a_{2i-1}, v_i a_{2i}$. By construction, the resulting new edge-sequence $g(\hat{\sigma})$ completes. Furthermore, since each edge $u_i v_i$ appears after step $m - (\ell\Delta + \ell \cdot 2\Delta) \geq m - 3\Delta^3 = m_\Delta$ in $\hat{\sigma}$, the edge-sequence $g(\hat{\sigma})$ is identical with $\hat{\sigma}$ in the first m_Δ steps. Since after m_Δ steps there at most most $2(m - m_\Delta) = 6\Delta^3$ unsaturated vertices left, it follows that

$$|g^{-1}(g(\hat{\sigma}))| \leq \binom{6\Delta^3}{2}^{m - m_\Delta} \leq (6\Delta^3)^{6\Delta^3} = D. \quad (76)$$

We write $\mathcal{Q}_i(\sigma)$ for the set of edges that can be added in step $i + 1$ of the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process after adding the first i edges in σ . By construction, it follows that

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\hat{\sigma})}{\mathbb{P}(g(\hat{\sigma}))} = \frac{\prod_{m_\Delta \leq i < m - \ell} |\mathcal{Q}_i(\hat{\sigma})|^{-1}}{\prod_{m_\Delta \leq i < m} |\mathcal{Q}_i(g(\hat{\sigma}))|^{-1}} \leq \prod_{m_\Delta \leq i < m} |\mathcal{Q}_i(g(\hat{\sigma}))| \leq \binom{6\Delta^3}{2}^{m - m_\Delta} \leq D, \quad (77)$$

which completes the proof of the lower bound (75), as discussed.

Finally, we sketch the similar argument for the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process, where it again suffices to show that any stuck edge-sequence can be changed into a completing edge-sequence without changing the choices made in the first $m_\Delta = m - O(1)$ steps. Note that in the relaxed \mathbf{d}_n -process only one vertex remains unsaturated, so the number of missing edges is $\ell \leq \Delta$. Then we can again find the last ℓ edges in $\hat{\sigma}$ not incident to the unsaturated vertex, and use a similar edge-replacement procedure to construct suitable $g(\hat{\sigma})$, which then establishes the desired constant lower bound on the probability of completing. \square

A.4 Proof of Remark 4: lower tail of X_k in degree restricted process

In this appendix we establish Remark 4 by complementing Theorem 3 with a lower tail result for the number $X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*})$ of small edges, for which a simpler variant of the proof of Theorem 3 suffices. In particular, we can avoid the notion of good clusters and only rely on the basic cluster switching result Lemma 5, by exploiting that configuration-graphs G which at most $X_k(G) \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu$ small edges are contained in considerably more lower than upper clusters (in contrast to the proof of Theorem 3, where the relevant configuration-graphs G with $X_k(G) \approx \mu$ are contained in approximately the same number of lower and upper clusters).

Theorem 20 (Number of small edges: lower tail). *Suppose that assumptions of Theorem 2 hold. Then, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the relaxed random graph process $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}) \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu) \leq e^{-\Omega(n)}$.*

Proof. We proceed similarly to Theorem 3, though some details are simpler here. We henceforth write $X_k(G)$ for the number of small edges in G , and assume that $\ell \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$. Let \mathcal{L} be the set of all lower cluster that contains a configuration-graph G with $X_k(G) \leq \ell$ small edges, and let \mathcal{U} be the set of corresponding upper clusters. Note that any configuration-graph $G \in C^+$ for some $C^+ \in \mathcal{U}$ has $X_k(G) \leq \ell + 4\Delta$ small edges. Proceeding similarly to (37) and (36), by invoking Lemma 5 to all clusters it follows that

$$\sum_{G: X_k(G) \leq \ell} L_G Z(G) \leq Z(\mathcal{L}) \leq Z(\mathcal{U}) \leq \sum_{G: X_k(G) \leq \ell + 4\Delta} U_G Z(G).$$

Since $\epsilon\mu = \Theta(n)$, we have $\ell + 4\Delta \leq (1 - 2\epsilon/3)\mu$, say. For any configuration-graph G with $X_k(G) \leq \ell + 4\Delta$ small edges, by inspecting equations (62)–(64) carefully (noting that (62) for U_G and (63) for L_G are increasing and decreasing in ℓ , respectively) it is routine to see that there is $\tau = \tau(\epsilon) \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$L_G \geq (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\mu)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad U_G \leq (1 - \tau) (\sum_{j \in [k]} j n_j - 2\mu)^2.$$

Putting things together, for any $\ell \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$ it follows that

$$\sum_{G: X_k(G) \leq \ell} Z(G) \leq (1 - \tau) \cdot \sum_{G: X_k(G) \leq \ell + 4\Delta} Z(G).$$

By iterating this inequality, it then follows similarly to equation (33) that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_k(G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}) \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu) \leq \frac{\sum_{G: X_k(G) \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu} Z(G)}{\sum_{G: X_k(G) \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu} Z(G)} \leq (1 - \tau)^{\Theta(\epsilon\mu/\Delta)} \leq e^{-\Theta(n)},$$

completing the proof. □

Finally, the lower tail result Theorem 20 for $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^{P,*}$ of course also transfers to the standard \mathbf{d}_n -process $G_{\mathbf{d}_n}^P$ (the comparison arguments from Section A.3 go through mutatis mutandis).