

Robust recovery of Robinson L^p -graphons

Mahya Ghandehari, Teddy Mishura

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Ewing Hall, University of Delaware in Newark, DE

Abstract

In this paper, we study the Robinson graphon completion/recovery problem for the class of L^p -graphons. We introduce a function Λ on the space of L^p -graphons, which measures the extent to which a graphon w exhibits the Robinson property: for all $x < y < z$, $w(x, z) \leq \min\{w(x, y), w(y, z)\}$. We prove that the function Λ satisfies the following: (1) Λ is compatible with the cut-norm, in the sense that if two graphons are close in the cut-norm, then their Λ values are close; and (2) when $p > 5$, every L^p -graphon w can be approximated by a Robinson graphon, with error of the approximation bounded in terms of $\Lambda(w)$. When w is a noisy version of a Robinson graphon, our method provides a concrete formula for recovering the Robinson graphon approximating w in cut-norm.

Keywords: graphons, L^p -graphons, Robinson, Recovery,
2020 MSC: 05C62, 15A83, 15B52

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Notation and background | 3 |
| 2.1 | Graphons and the cut norm | 3 |
| 2.2 | The Robinson property | 4 |
| 3 | Robinson property: measurement and recovery | 5 |
| 3.1 | Bounded graphons | 5 |
| 3.2 | L^p -graphons | 6 |
| 4 | Robinson recovery of L^p-graphons | 6 |
| 4.1 | Robinson approximation of L^p -graphons | 7 |
| 4.2 | Stability of L^p approximations | 9 |

1. Introduction

Given an incomplete matrix M_I with many missing entries, is it possible to recover the underlying complete matrix M ? An instance of such a scenario is when data is aggregated from customer ratings, where any given customer only rates few items. In general, this problem is ill-posed; indeed, with low dimensional information, it is not possible to uniquely recover high dimensional data. However, in practical applications, it is often the case that additional structure about the original matrix M is known. In the above example regarding customer ratings, it is usually assumed that most people's preferences are based on very few factors, implying that the complete matrix M should be low rank. Leveraging this assumption makes the completion of M_I quite tractable, even if the majority of its entries are missing. In general, the problem of filling in the incomplete entries in a matrix M_I under the condition that the completed matrix satisfies a specified structural property is known as *matrix completion problem*. Due to its many applications

Email addresses: mahya@udel.edu (Mahya Ghandehari), tmishura@udel.edu (Teddy Mishura)

in data science, the completion problem for low rank matrices has gained the attention of many researchers (see e.g. [8, 9, 27, 39, 23, 43, 45, 24]). Matrix completion problem has also been investigated when other structural properties (e.g. Hankel, Toeplitz, and moment structures) are considered; see [15, 46, 14, 22] for some examples.

Unfortunately, even known information can be corrupt by noise. If \hat{M} is an estimate for the matrix M , structural knowledge about M often fails to be enough for exact identification of M from \hat{M} . Thus, in the case of noise, the problem of completion becomes that of *recovery*: Given an observed matrix \hat{M} , find a matrix close to M that satisfies a specified structural property. For examples of recovery of noisy matrices, see [7, 30, 28, 26, 41, 1, 29, 44] for low rank matrices, [16] for monotone matrices, and [6] for covariance matrices.

In this paper, we study the recovery problem for the *Robinson* matrices. A *Robinson matrix*, also called an *R-matrix*, is a symmetric matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ such that for $i < j < k$ we have

$$a_{ik} \leq \min\{a_{ij}, a_{jk}\}.$$

Robinson matrices are well-studied objects in data science, largely because of their connection with the classical seriation problem [17, 33, 36, 38, 42]. The objective of the seriation problem is to use pairwise comparisons of a set of items to recover their ‘linear’ ordering. Determining when a matrix can be permuted into a Robinson matrix, and finding a proper Robinson ordering, are well-studied problems; in fact, they can be solved in polynomial time; see [36] for the original algorithm, and [2, 18, 31, 32] for more recent efficient algorithms. Recovery of Robinson ordering, when the underlying matrix is perturbed by noise, has been studied before: For a polynomial time approximate algorithm when seeking infinity norm approximations, see [11], and for a discussion on the NP-hardness of this problem when other p -norm approximations are required, see [3].

To put matrices of various size in one framework, and also to allow sampling from such matrices, we use *graphons*. These are symmetric and measurable functions $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. A graphon is called an L^p -graphon if its p -norm is finite. L^∞ -graphons are typically referred to as graphons, and were introduced in [35] as the limit objects of converging sequences of dense graphs (i.e. graph sequences $\{G_n\}$ in which the number of edges is quadratic in the number of vertices). Borgs et al. extended this point of view in [4, 5], and proved that L^p -graphons (for $1 < p < \infty$) are limit objects of sparse graph sequences. The mode of convergence that defines these limits is the *cut norm*, which was introduced in [19] for matrices, and can be extended to graphons in a natural manner:

$$\|w\|_{\square} = \sup_{A, B \subseteq [0, 1]} \left| \iint_{A \times B} w(x, y) dx dy \right|,$$

where A, B are Lebesgue measurable. Similar to the case of matrices, we say an L^p -graphon $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *Robinson graphon* if for all $x < y < z$,

$$w(x, z) \leq \min\{w(x, y), w(y, z)\}.$$

An L^p -graphon is called *Robinson a.e.* if it is almost everywhere equal to a Robinson graphon.

In this paper, we study the graphon completion/recovery problem for the class of Robinson graphons. Having recovered the limiting Robinson graphon of a class of converging graph sequences, one can use efficient randomized algorithms in [25] to seriate the graphs. Naturally, we measure proximity in terms of cut norm, when performing the Robinson graphon recovery. Our goal here is to obtain a statement of the following general form:

Given a graphon w that is almost Robinson, find a Robinson graphon u such that $\|w - u\|_{\square}$ is sufficiently small.

As a first step towards such results, we need to formalize the notion of almost Robinson graphons. This is done by devising a graphon function, say Λ , that acts as a gauge of Robinson property by counting (aggregated) local violations of the Robinson property. Such a function is considered a suitable measurement of the Robinson property if it is subadditive and satisfies the following three properties:

- **(Recognition)** $\Lambda(w) = 0$ if and only if w is Robinson a.e.
- **(Continuity)** Λ is continuous with respect to the cut norm.
- **(Recovery)** Given a graphon w , there exists a Robinson graphon u such that $\|w - u\|_{\square} \leq f(\Lambda(w))$. Here, $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a fixed decreasing function with $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f(x) = 0$, which is independent of w .

In this paper, we design an L^p -graphon function Λ , which roughly speaking, measures local violations of the Robinson property for a graphon (Definition 3.3). We prove that Λ is a suitable measurement for the Robinson property when $p > 5$; that is, we show that Λ satisfies the properties of recognition and continuity (Proposition 4.1), as well as Robinson recovery (Theorem 4.15). This extends the results of [12, 21], where a suitable graphon function Γ on the space of L^∞ -graphons was introduced. Our results (in particular, Definition 4.2 and Theorem 4.15) provide us with a recipe for graphon recovery in the class of Robinson graphons.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce various necessary background involving graphons and the study of the Robinson property. Section 3 discusses previous work that has been done to recover Robinson graphons in the cut norm; here, we also comparatively summarize our own graphon recovery results. In Section 4, alongside the building of necessary machinery and statement of technical lemmas, we present proofs of our main recovery results. The aforementioned technical lemmas are proven in Appendix 4.2.

2. Notation and background

In this section of the paper, we present necessary background and notation for the reader, organized into two parts. We begin with basic notation used throughout the paper; afterwards, we present graph limit theory, stating required definitions alongside notable results, then transition into explanation of the Robinson property for both matrices and graphons.

All functions and sets discussed during this paper are assumed to be measurable. The symmetric difference between two sets A and B is denoted $A\Delta B$. The notation $\|\cdot\|_p$ is used to represent the standard p -norm; that is, for a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$,

$$\|f\|_p := \left(\int_X |f|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_\infty := \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{f(x) \leq a \text{ a.e.}\}.$$

Additionally, the notation $\mathbb{E}(X)$ is used to denote the expectation of the random variable X .

2.1. Graphons and the cut norm

We begin by defining the graphon, the fundamental building block of graph limit theory, in several of its myriad forms.

Definition 2.1 (Graphon space). We shall introduce several types of functions here, noting that unless otherwise stated, the word *graphon* will be used interchangeably throughout the text.

- Let \mathcal{W}_0 be the set of all symmetric, measurable functions $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The elements of this set are called *graphons*.
- Let \mathcal{W}^∞ be the set of all bounded, symmetric, measurable functions $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The elements of this set are called *kernels*.
- Let \mathcal{W}^p be the set of all symmetric, measurable functions $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|w\|_p < \infty$ for $p \geq 1$. The elements of this set are called *L^p graphons*.

It is clear that $\mathcal{W}_0 \subset \mathcal{W}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{W}^p$ for $p \geq 1$. We mention as well the space of *step graphons* $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{W}^\infty$, which comprises the set of symmetric step functions on $[0, 1]^2$; that is, for $w_n \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists some partition $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$ of $[0, 1]$ such that w_n is constant on $P_i \times P_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. We define $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{W}_0$ similarly.

Now that we have introduced several function spaces, we naturally introduce a norm. Specifically, we shall work with the *cut norm*, which was introduced in [19] for matrices and is defined for graphons below.

Definition 2.2 (Cut norm). Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$. We define the *cut norm* by

$$\|w\|_{\square} = \sup_{S, T \subseteq [0,1]} \left| \iint_{S \times T} w(x, y) dx dy \right|$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable subsets S and T .

It is obvious that for any function $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$,

$$\|w\|_{\square} \leq \|w\|_1 \leq \|w\|_p \leq \|w\|_{\infty}$$

for all $p \geq 1$. Another notion of distance used to compare graphons is the *cut distance*, a more general form of relabeling graphs to minimize norm difference. Applied to graphons, it is the set $[0, 1]$ that must be relabeled. Let Φ be the set of all measure preserving bijections from $[0, 1]$ to $[0, 1]$; that is, if $A \subset [0, 1]$, then $|\Phi(A)| = |A|$. The *cut distance* between two graphons u and w is

$$\delta_{\square}(u, w) = \inf_{\phi \in \Phi} \|u - w^{\phi}\|_{\square},$$

where $w^{\phi}(x, y) = w(\phi(x), \phi(y))$. However, the distance δ_{\square} is only a pseudometric; we can identify graphons of cut distance 0 to get the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_0$ of *unlabeled graphons*. $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^p$ are defined similarly. While these metrics may seem complicated, they provide a huge benefit: For $p > 1$, the metric space $(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^p, \delta_{\square})$ has a compact unit ball. For $p = 1$, additional conditions are required to ensure compactness, though we do not consider this case in the paper. Additionally, the cut norm and cut distance do not just exist as extrema—for the cut norm, the supremum is achieved, and likewise for the cut distance, the infimum is achieved [34, Lemma 8.10].

In the business of graphons, one will commonly have to deal with the average of functions over sets of the form $S \times T$, as is evidenced by the definition of the cut norm. Thus, some notation is introduced to allow us to easily refer to common objects related to such averages. Let $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and let $A, B \subseteq [0, 1]$. The *cell average* of w over $A \times B$ is given by

$$\bar{w}(A \times B) = \frac{1}{|A \times B|} \iint_{A \times B} w dx dy.$$

Given a fixed L^p -graphon $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$, there exists a specific construction of a step function $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\|w - w_{\mathcal{P}}\|_p$ is small for sufficiently many steps; it is possible to describe this construction in terms of cell averages, and we do so below. Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$ and let $\mathcal{P} = (S_1, \dots, S_k)$ —where we assume $|S_i| > 0$ —be a partition of $[0, 1]$ into a finite number of nonempty measurable sets. We define the function $w_{\mathcal{P}}$ by

$$w_{\mathcal{P}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{|S_i \times S_j|} \iint_{S_i \times S_j} w(x, y) dx dy = \bar{w}(S_i \times S_j) \quad (x \in S_i, y \in S_j),$$

where the operator $w \mapsto w_{\mathcal{P}}$ is called the *stepping operator*. The stepping operator does not increase either the p -norm or cut norm [5] of any graphon w it is applied to; indeed, if $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$, \mathcal{P} is any partition of $[0, 1]$ into a finite number of nonempty measurable sets, and $p \geq 1$, then

$$\|w_{\mathcal{P}}\|_p \leq \|w\|_p \quad \text{and} \quad \|w_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{\square} \leq \|w\|_{\square}.$$

We note that this property is sometimes referred to as being *contractive*.

2.2. The Robinson property

The Robinson property for matrices was first introduced in the study of the classical seriation problem [40], whose objective is to order a set of items so that similar items are placed close to one another. The seriation question translates naturally into a question regarding symmetric matrices which can be turned into Robinson matrices. A symmetric matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ is said to be a *Robinson matrix* if

$$i \leq j \leq k \implies a_{ik} \leq \min\{a_{ij}, a_{jk}\}.$$

A symmetric matrix A is called *Robinsonian* if it becomes a Robinson matrix after simultaneous application of a permutation π to its rows and columns. In that case, the permutation π is called a *Robinson ordering* of A . If the entries a_{ij} of the symmetric matrix A represent similarity of items i and j , then the Robinson ordering represents a linear arrangement of the items so that similar items are placed closer together.

The Robinson property for L^p -graphons is defined similarly and was first considered in [12]. When measuring large quantities of matrices or graphs for the Robinson property, such as in quality analysis of data, it is an interesting and useful question to determine if these objects can be viewed as samples of some process w . Were this the case, oftentimes only the Robinson property of the process w would need to be analyzed for quantitative results concerning the data as a whole. To this end, an L^p -graphon $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$ is said to be *Robinson* if

$$x \leq y \leq z \implies w(x, z) \leq \min\{w(x, y), w(y, z)\}.$$

We call an L^p graphon *Robinson almost everywhere*, or Robinson a.e. for short, if it is equal a.e. to a Robinson L^p graphon. An L^p graphon $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$ is called *Robinsonian* if there exists a Robinson L^p graphon $u \in \mathcal{W}^p$ such that $\delta_{\square}(w, u) = 0$. Robinson and Robinsonian graphons and kernels are identically defined.

This natural extension of the Robinson property to the world of graphons results in the addition of much difficulty; for example, the problem of finding the Robinson ordering of a matrix becomes finding a measure preserving bijection that properly re-orders a graphon, a clearly less tractable problem for most graphons of any interest. As a result of this phenomenon, much effort has been focused in the area of measuring and approximating the Robinson property of graphons—if a graphon is “close enough” to being Robinson, it might not need to be re-ordered at all for results about its samples to hold. We discuss this in more detail in the next section.

3. Robinson property: measurement and recovery

The recovery problem for Robinson matrices can be extended to the realm of graphons, where we aim for results of the form: If a graphon w is almost Robinson, then it is $\|\cdot\|_{\square}$ -close to a Robinson graphon. We formalize the meaning of an almost Robinson graphon by devising a graphon function that acts as a gauge of Robinson property. Such a function is considered suitable if it *recognizes* Robinson graphons (i.e. attains zero precisely when applied to Robinson graphon), is *continuous* on the space of graphons (i.e. attains similar values when applied to matrices of similar global structure), and provides a *stable* measurement of the Robinson property (i.e. if the number of local violations is small, then the matrix is indeed close to a Robinson matrix in the global sense). In this section, we give a brief overview of past results utilizing such graphon functions for recovering bounded Robinson graphons in cut norm [12], before discussing efforts to tackle this problem in the world of L^p -graphons.

3.1. Bounded graphons

The function $\Gamma : \mathcal{W}_0 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ was introduced in [12] and was used to estimate how close a given graphon was to the set of Robinson graphons in cut norm. We recall the definition of Γ , noting that it can naturally extend to \mathcal{W}^1 . For $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$ and a measurable subset A of $[0, 1]$, we define $\Gamma(w, A)$ to be the following integral

$$\Gamma(w, a) = \iint_{y < z} \left[\int_{x \in A \cap [0, y]} (w(x, z) - w(x, y)) dx \right]_+ dydz + \iint_{y < z} \left[\int_{x \in A \cap [z, 1]} (w(x, y) - w(x, z)) dx \right]_+ dydz,$$

where $[x]_+ = \max(x, 0)$. Moreover, $\Gamma(w)$ is defined as $\Gamma(w) := \sup_A \Gamma(w, A)$, where the supremum is taken over all measurable subsets of $[0, 1]$. The function Γ satisfies the following desirable properties:

- (i) (**Recognition** [12, Proposition 4.2]) $w \in \mathcal{W}_0$ is Robinson a.e. if and only if $\Gamma(w) = 0$.
- (ii) (**Continuity** [12, Lemma 6.2]) Γ is continuous on \mathcal{W}_0 with respect to cut norm.
- (iii) (**recovery** [21, Theorem 3.2]) For every $w \in \mathcal{W}_0$, there exists a Robinson graphon $u \in \mathcal{W}_0$ satisfying

$$\|u - w\|_{\square} \leq 14\Gamma(w)^{1/7}.$$

Combining all three statements above, it was proved in [21] that Γ recognizes samples of Robinson graphons: these are precisely graph sequences whose Γ -values converge to 0.

Remark 3.1. The proof of continuity of Γ in (ii) relies on continuity of the triangular cut operator on \mathcal{W}_0 , which cannot be generalized to graphons $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$ (see [37]). Thus, the cut norm continuity of Γ cannot be easily extended to the setting of L^p -graphons. In fact, whether Γ is cut norm continuous on \mathcal{W}^p remains an open question.

Remark 3.2. In [20], the first author and collaborators introduce a matrix function that measures how badly a given matrix fails to be Robinson. They also show that this function satisfies (i), (ii), and (iii) with 1-norm instead of cut norm. It is not hard to see that the function from [20] does not extend to a cut norm continuous function on \mathcal{W}_0 ; thus it is of no interest in this paper.

3.2. L^p -graphons

Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. We now introduce the new function $\Lambda : \mathcal{W}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on L^p -graphons for measuring the Robinson property. We define the following notation to facilitate ease of reading. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$. We say that $A \leq B$ if for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$, we have that $a \leq b$.

Definition 3.3 (Robinson measurement function). Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$. Define

$$\Lambda(w) = \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\substack{A \leq B \leq C, \\ |A|=|B|=|C|}} \left[\iint_{A \times C} w \, dx dy - \iint_{B \times C} w \, dx dy \right] + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\substack{X \leq Y \leq Z, \\ |X|=|Y|=|Z|}} \left[\iint_{X \times Z} w \, dx dy - \iint_{X \times Y} w \, dx dy \right]$$

where A, B, C and X, Y, Z are measurable subsets of $[0, 1]$.

Informally, Λ can be thought of as extending the Robinson property from pointwise comparison to comparison of blocks. It turns out that Λ extends the properties of Γ to L^p -graphons for $p \geq 1$, that is,

- (i) **(Recognition)** A graphon $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$ is Robinson a.e. if and only if $\Lambda(w) = 0$.
- (ii) **(Continuity)** Λ is continuous with respect to cut-norm, i.e., $|\Lambda(w) - \Lambda(u)| \leq 2\|w - u\|_{\square}$ for $u, w \in \mathcal{W}^1$.
- (iii) **(Recovery)** For every $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$ where $p > 5$, there exists a Robinson graphon $u \in \mathcal{W}^p$ satisfying

$$\|u - w\|_{\square} \leq 78\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}.$$

In fact, we provide a recipe for obtaining the Robinson approximation u for a given graphon w (Definition 4.2). We devote the next section to the proofs of the three statements above. As a corollary, we observe that our results for Λ , when applied to L^∞ -graphons, provide an improvement on the bound of Robinson approximation in [21].

4. Robinson recovery of L^p -graphons

In this section, we introduce and study the new function Λ on L^p -graphons for measuring the Robinson property. We borrow the following terminology from [21]. The upper triangle of the unit square is denoted

$$\Delta = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : x \leq y\}.$$

The *upper left (UL)* and *lower right (LR)* regions of a given point $(a, b) \in \Delta$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{UL}(a, b) &= [0, a] \times [b, 1], \\ \text{LR}(a, b) &= [a, b] \times [a, b] \cap \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

From Definition 3.3, we have $\Lambda(w) \geq 0$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$, as we may take $A = B = C = X = Y = Z = \emptyset$. Moreover,

$$\Lambda(w) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\iint_{A \times C} |w| \, dx dy + \iint_{B \times C} |w| \, dx dy + \iint_{X \times Z} |w| \, dx dy + \iint_{X \times Y} |w| \, dx dy \right) \leq \|w\|_1,$$

implying that $\Lambda(w) \leq \|w\|_p$ for every $p \geq 1$. Note that since the supremum is sublinear, we also have that Λ is subadditive, i.e., for all $u, w \in \mathcal{W}^p$

$$\Lambda(u + w) \leq \Lambda(u) + \Lambda(w). \quad (1)$$

Next, we show that Λ shares important properties with Γ .

Proposition 4.1. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Suppose $w, u \in \mathcal{W}^p$. Then we have*

(i) (Continuity) Λ is continuous with respect to cut-norm, i.e., $|\Lambda(w) - \Lambda(u)| \leq 2\|w - u\|_{\square}$.

(ii) (Recognition) Λ characterizes Robinson L^p -graphons, i.e., w is Robinson a.e. if and only if $\Lambda(w) = 0$.

Proof. To prove (i), let $w, u \in \mathcal{W}^1$, and fix $\epsilon > 0$. There exist measurable sets $A \leq B \leq C$ with equal size and measurable sets $X \leq Y \leq Z$ with equal size such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\iint_{A \times C} w \, dx dy - \iint_{B \times C} w \, dx dy + \iint_{X \times Z} w \, dx dy - \iint_{X \times Y} w \, dx dy \right) \geq \Lambda(w) - \epsilon. \quad (2)$$

Thus, combining (2) with the definition of $\Lambda(u)$, we get that

$$2(\Lambda(w) - \Lambda(u) - \epsilon) \leq \iint_{A \times C} (w - u) + \iint_{B \times C} (u - w) + \iint_{X \times Z} (w - u) + \iint_{X \times Y} (u - w) \leq 4\|w - u\|_{\square}.$$

The proof for $\Lambda(u) - \Lambda(w)$ follows the same logic. Taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get $|\Lambda(w) - \Lambda(u)| \leq 2\|w - u\|_{\square}$.

To prove (ii), observe that if w is Robinson a.e., then $\Lambda(w) = 0$. To prove the reverse direction, suppose $\Lambda(w) = 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $w_n = w_{\mathcal{P}_n}$, where \mathcal{P}_n is the partition $\{I_i = (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]\}_{i=1}^n$. Note that as $\Lambda(w) = 0$, for any choice of measurable subsets $A \leq B \leq C$ of $[0, 1]$ of equal size, we have

$$\iint_{A \times C} w(x, y) dx dy \leq \iint_{B \times C} w(x, y) dx dy \quad \text{and} \quad \iint_{A \times C} w(x, y) dx dy \leq \iint_{A \times B} w(x, y) dx dy.$$

Applying the above inequalities to the sets I_i , we observe that w_n is Robinson. Since $w_n \rightarrow w$ in the L^1 norm, using the Borel–Cantelli Lemma and going down to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $\{w_n\}$ converges to w pointwise a.e. in $[0, 1]^2$. So, there exists a null set $N \subset [0, 1]^2$ such that $w(x, y) = \lim_n w_n(x, y)$ for $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \setminus N$. As w is symmetric, we can assume that N is symmetric with respect to the main diagonal. Next, we define the symmetric function \tilde{w} as follows:

$$\tilde{w}(x, y) = \begin{cases} w(x, y) & (x, y) \in \Delta \setminus N \\ \sup \{w(u, v) : (u, v) \in \text{UL}(x, y) \setminus N\} & (x, y) \in \Delta \cap N \end{cases}.$$

Clearly $w = \tilde{w}$ a.e.; so, to finish the proof, we will show that \tilde{w} is Robinson. Take $(x_1, y_1) \in \Delta$ and $(x_2, y_2) \in \text{UL}(x_1, y_1)$, and consider the following cases:

Case 1: If $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \Delta \setminus N$, then the graphon \tilde{w} satisfies the Robinson property for these points, since \tilde{w} on $\Delta \setminus N$ is just the pointwise limit of Robinson graphons.

Case 2: If $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \Delta \cap N$, then the Robinson property for \tilde{w} at these points can be easily verified, using the definition of \tilde{w} for points in $\Delta \cap N$.

Case 3: Suppose $(x_1, y_1) \in \Delta \setminus N$ and $(x_2, y_2) \in \Delta \cap N$. Using Case 1, for every $(u, v) \in \text{UL}(x_2, y_2) \setminus N$, we have $w(u, v) \leq w(x_1, y_1) = \tilde{w}(x_1, y_1)$; taking the supremum on the left-hand-side of this inequality, we get $\tilde{w}(x_2, y_2) \leq \tilde{w}(x_1, y_1)$.

Case 4: Suppose $(x_1, y_1) \in \Delta \cap N$ and $(x_2, y_2) \in \Delta \setminus N$. The Robinson property of \tilde{w} at these points follows directly from the definition of $\tilde{w}(x_1, y_1)$. \square

4.1. Robinson approximation of L^p -graphons

In this section, we introduce the α -Robinson approximation of an L^p -graphon, and present some of its important properties.

Definition 4.2 (α -Robinson approximation for graphons). Let $p \geq 1$, and fix a parameter $0 < \alpha < 1$. Given a graphon $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$, the α -Robinson approximation R_w^α of w is the symmetric function defined as follows: for all $(x, y) \in \Delta$,

$$R_w^\alpha(x, y) = \sup \{ \bar{w}(S \times T) : S \times T \subseteq \text{UL}(x, y), |S| = |T| = \alpha \}, \quad (3)$$

where S, T are measurable, and taking the convention that $\sup \emptyset = 0$. Moreover, we set $R_w^\alpha = w$ if $\alpha = 0$ and w is Robinson.

Clearly, for every $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$, the approximation R_w^α is a Robinson graphon. Also, R_w^α attains 0 on every point with distance at most α to the boundary of the square $[0, 1]^2$. We summarize some other useful properties of R_w^α below.

Lemma 4.3 (Properties of the Robinson approximation). *Let $p \geq 1$, and fix a parameter $0 < \alpha < 1$. Given graphons $w, u \in \mathcal{W}^p$, we have:*

- (i) *If $u \leq w$ pointwise, then $0 \leq R_w^\alpha - R_u^\alpha \leq R_{w-u}^\alpha$.*
- (ii) *$\|R_w^\alpha\|_\infty \leq \alpha^{-\frac{2}{p}} \|w\|_p$.*
- (iii) *If $\{w_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}^p$ such that $\|w_n - w\|_1 \rightarrow 0$, then $\|R_w^\alpha - R_{w_n}^\alpha\|_\square \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

We note that for item (iii), only convergence in the L^1 norm—the weakest L^p norm—is required. Therefore, convergence in any L^p norm is enough to guarantee the convergence of the α -Robinson approximations in the cut norm.

Proof. To prove (i), let $(x, y) \in \Delta$. By definition of the α -Robinson approximation, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist sets $A, B \subseteq \text{UL}(x, y)$ such that $R_w^\alpha(x, y) \geq \bar{w}(A \times B) \geq R_w^\alpha(x, y) - \epsilon$ and $C, D \subseteq \text{UL}(x, y)$ such that $R_u^\alpha(x, y) \geq \bar{u}(C \times D) \geq R_u^\alpha(x, y) - \epsilon$. We also note that $|A| = |B| = |C| = |D| = \alpha$. Since $u \leq w$, we have

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{C \times D} (w - u) dx dy = \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{C \times D} w dx dy - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{C \times D} u dx dy \leq R_w^\alpha(x, y) - R_u^\alpha(x, y) + \epsilon$$

Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that $0 \leq R_w^\alpha - R_u^\alpha$. Moreover, we note that

$$R_w^\alpha(x, y) - \epsilon - R_u^\alpha(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{A \times B} w dx dy - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{A \times B} u dx dy = \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{A \times B} (w - u) dx dy \leq R_{w-u}^\alpha(x, y),$$

showing that (i) holds true, again by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

To prove (ii), we note that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist sets $A, B \subseteq \text{UL}(x, y)$ where $|A| = |B| = \alpha$ such that $R_w^\alpha(x, y) \geq \bar{w}(A \times B) \geq R_w^\alpha(x, y) - \epsilon$. Then, by Hölder's inequality,

$$R_w^\alpha(x, y) - \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{A \times B} w dx dy \leq \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \|w\|_p \|\mathbb{1}_{A \times B}\|_q = \alpha^{-\frac{2}{p}} \|w\|_p,$$

where we used $\|\mathbb{1}_{A \times B}\|_q = \alpha^{2/q} = \alpha^{2-2/p}$. Again, letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ finishes the proof of (ii).

To prove (iii), we define an auxiliary function $l_n(x, y) = \min(w_n(x, y), w(x, y))$. Clearly $|l_n - w| \leq |w_n - w|$, so $\{l_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ also converges to w in L^1 norm. Now, we use part (i) to get that

$$\|R_{w_n}^\alpha - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq \|R_{w_n}^\alpha - R_{l_n}^\alpha\|_\square + \|R_w^\alpha - R_{l_n}^\alpha\|_\square \leq \|R_{w_n - l_n}^\alpha\|_\square + \|R_{w - l_n}^\alpha\|_\square \leq \|R_{w_n - l_n}^\alpha\|_\infty + \|R_{w - l_n}^\alpha\|_\infty,$$

and then apply (ii) with $p = 1$ to get

$$\|R_{w_n - l_n}^\alpha\|_\infty + \|R_{w - l_n}^\alpha\|_\infty \leq \alpha^{-2} \left(\|w_n - l_n\|_1 + \|w - l_n\|_1 \right) \leq \alpha^{-2} \left(\|w_n - w\|_1 + 2\|w - l_n\|_1 \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

It turns out that the Robinson approximation given in Definition 4.2 is continuous almost everywhere; namely, R_w^α is continuous on $[\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2$ and is set to 0 otherwise.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then R_w^α is continuous on the set $[\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2$.*




Figure 1: The blue area represents the symmetric difference between $UL(x, y)$ and $UL(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y))$.

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in \Delta$ and let $\{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2$ be a sequence such that $(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow (x, y) \in [\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2$. Then, by definition of UL , it must be the case that $UL(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) \subseteq UL(x, y) \subseteq UL(\max(x_n, x), \min(y_n, y))$, which implies that

$$R_w^\alpha(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) \leq R_w^\alpha(x, y) \leq R_w^\alpha(\max(x_n, x), \min(y_n, y)). \quad (4)$$

We shall show that both the upper and lower bound in (4) converge to $R_w^\alpha(x, y)$; by the Squeeze Theorem, this will imply our original claim. To do so, note that as w is a measurable function with $\|w\|_1 < \infty$, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\iint_S |w| dx dy < \epsilon$ whenever $S \subset [\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2$ and $|S| < \delta$.

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that for all $n \geq N$, we have that $d((x_n, y_n), (x, y)) < \frac{\delta}{2}$. Define the set $S := UL(x, y) \setminus UL(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y))$ (the blue regions in Figure 4.1). Since $|S| < \delta$, we have

$$R_w^\alpha(x, y) \leq R_w^\alpha(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) + \iint_S |w| dx dy \leq R_w^\alpha(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) + \epsilon.$$

Since $R_w^\alpha(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) \leq R_w^\alpha(x, y)$ holds as well, we get

$$|R_w^\alpha(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) - R_w^\alpha(x, y)| < \epsilon.$$

This proves that $\lim_n R_w^\alpha(\min(x_n, x), \max(y_n, y)) = R_w^\alpha(x, y)$. An identical argument shows that the similar result $\lim_n R_w^\alpha(\max(x_n, x), \min(y_n, y)) = R_w^\alpha(x, y)$ holds. This finishes the proof. \square

4.2. Stability of L^p approximations

In this section we present our main results on Λ . Because Λ functions as a measure of the Robinson property, it is desirable for a graphon with a small Λ value to be in some way *close* to a Robinson graphon. We think of such a property as *Robinson stability*. Our proof that Λ is Robinson stable uses techniques similar to those in [21]. As a result, we need to introduce similar notation. Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^\infty$ be a graphon with $w \geq 0$ and $\|w\|_\infty = M$. Fix a parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (as in Definition 4.2), and let m be a fixed integer. For $k \in \{1, \dots, mM - 1\}$, define the k -th black region \mathcal{B}_k , the k -th white region \mathcal{W}_k and the k -th grey region \mathcal{G}_k as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_k &= \left\{ (x, y) \in \Delta : x = y \text{ or } \exists S \times T \subseteq UL(x, y) \text{ with } |S| = |T| = \alpha \text{ and } \overline{w}(S \times T) > \frac{k}{m} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{W}_k &= \left\{ (x, y) \in \Delta \setminus \mathcal{B}_k : \exists S \times T \subseteq LR(x, y) \text{ with } |S| = |T| = \alpha \text{ and } \overline{w}(S \times T) \leq \frac{k}{m} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_k &= \Delta \setminus (\mathcal{B}_k \cup \mathcal{W}_k). \end{aligned}$$

We set $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{W}_{mM} = \Delta$ and $\mathcal{W}_0 = \mathcal{B}_{mM} = \emptyset$ and let $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{mM-1} \mathcal{G}_k$. In addition, we also define the following regions:

$$\mathcal{R}_k := \mathcal{B}_k \cap \mathcal{W}_{k+1}.$$




Figure 2: An example of black and white regions for $m = 4$ and $\alpha = 0.1$.

Black regions provide lower bounds while white regions provide upper bounds on \bar{w} . Grey regions provide no information about what values \bar{w} could take on while the regions \mathcal{R}_k are used to form tight bounds on the behaviour of \bar{w} . Next, we observe that the \mathcal{R}_k regions partition $\Delta \setminus \mathcal{G}$, skipping the proof of the following lemma as it is identical to the one in [21, Lemma 4.8].

Lemma 4.5. *Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^\infty$ be such that $w \geq 0$ and $\lceil \|w\|_\infty \rceil = M$, and let \mathcal{B}_k , \mathcal{W}_k , and \mathcal{G}_k be as defined above. Then,*

$$\Delta \setminus \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{mM-1} \mathcal{G}_k \right) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{mM-1} \mathcal{R}_k.$$

By definition, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, mM - 1\}$, the regions \mathcal{B}_k and \mathcal{W}_k have *upper* and *lower boundary* functions $f_k, g_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where f_k is the upper boundary of \mathcal{B}_k and g_k is the lower boundary of \mathcal{W}_k . These are defined in [21] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_k(x) &= \sup\{z \in [x, 1] : (x, z) \in \mathcal{B}_k\}, \\ g_k(x) &= \inf\{z \in [x, 1] : (x, z) \in \mathcal{W}_k\}; \end{aligned}$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = 1$. Additionally, we define $f_0(x) = 1$ and $g_{mM}(x) = x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ to represent the corresponding boundaries for $\mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{W}_{mM} = \Delta$. Finally, since f_k and g_{k+1} are the upper and lower boundaries of \mathcal{B}_k and \mathcal{W}_{k+1} respectively, if the region \mathcal{R}_k is nonempty, then it is bounded from below by g_{k+1} and from above by f_k . We refer to Figure 4.2 for a visual representation of the regions and boundary functions previously mentioned.

From the definition of the black and white regions, it is easy to see that the functions f_k and g_k are both increasing functions. So, they can only admit jump discontinuities. We naturally extend the graph of these functions to *boundary curves* by adding vertical line segments connecting any such discontinuities, denoting the resulting curves once again by f_k and g_k respectively.

Let $S, T \subseteq [0, 1]$ be measurable. We say that $S \times T$ *crosses* a boundary curve f_k or g_k if the top-left corner of the cell is strictly above the boundary curve and its bottom-right corner is strictly below the curve. This definition is used as the set $S \times T$ is not necessarily a connected subset of \mathbb{R}^2 and so a boundary curve can go through the cell without having to intersect with it. See Figure 3 for an example of this phenomenon.




Figure 3: An example of a cell $S \times T$ that crosses a boundary curve f_2 without intersecting it.

The proof of our main theorem is based on the idea that the total area of all the grey regions is small. This allows us to concentrate on the behaviour of w and R_w^α inside the regions \mathcal{R}_k , where their values are strictly controlled. We show that their local average difference in these regions can be controlled by $\Lambda(w)$,

leading to the conclusion that $\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square$ must be small. We introduce three lemmas here, each necessary for controlling the size of regions or integrals over certain sets in the proof of our main result. We will present the proofs of Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 in Appendix 4.2; the proof of Lemma 4.6 is identical to [21, Lemma 4.10] and so we omit it.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}^p$ with $w \geq 0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, $\overline{\mathcal{G}_k}$ does not contain any $\beta \times \beta$ square, where $\beta > \alpha$. Here, $\overline{\mathcal{G}_k}$ denotes the closure of \mathcal{G}_k in the Euclidean topology of \mathbb{R}^2 .*

Lemma 4.7. *Let $u \in L^\infty[0, 1]$ (not necessarily non-negative), and $P \subseteq [0, 1]$ be a measurable subset such that $\int_P u \neq 0$. Let $0 < \beta < |P|$ be fixed. Then P can be partitioned into $N := \lceil |P|/\beta \rceil$ subsets P_1, \dots, P_N so that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $P_1 \leq \dots \leq P_{N-1}$.
- (ii) $|P_i| = \beta$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ and $|P_N| \leq \beta$.
- (iii) $|\int_{P_N} u| \leq \frac{1}{N} |\int_P u|$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $f \in L^1[0, 1]^2$, and let $S, S' \subseteq [0, 1]$ be measurable subsets such that $|S| = |S'|$. Suppose for a constant $C > 0$ we have*

$$\iint_{S \times S'} f \, dx dy \geq C.$$

Then, for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exist measurable sets $T \subset S$ and $T' \subset S'$ such that $|T| = |T'| = \alpha|S|$ and

$$\frac{1}{|T \times T'|} \iint_{T \times T'} f \, dx dy \geq \frac{C}{|S \times S'|}.$$

Prefacing our main result, we begin first with a necessary proposition—as our main proof heavily features “cutting” graphons off at certain values, we require a way to control their behaviour once cut. The following proposition, providing us with such a way, is the central part of our proof.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $p > 2$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}^\infty$ with $w \geq 0$. Suppose $\|w\|_p \leq 1$. If R_w^α is the Robinson approximation of w with parameter $\alpha = \|w\|_\infty^{\frac{p}{3p-2}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p}{5p-2}}$, then*

$$\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq 4 \left(1 + (8\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p + 2)\|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2p}{3p-2}} \right) \Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-2}{5p-2}}. \quad (5)$$

The proof of this proposition bears similarities to the proof of [21, Theorem 3.2]. However, the graphons in that paper were restricted to values in $[0, 1]$, making it easy to establish many claims and arguments. Unfortunately, even though the approximation result of [21] could be used, it would not provide the upper bound needed for Proposition 4.9 and would not suffice for the unbounded case. Therefore, we present a complete proof of the above proposition. As a corollary of this proposition, we improve upon the bound obtained in [21].

Proof. By [34, Lemma 8.10], there exist measurable $S, T \subseteq [0, 1]$ so that

$$\left| \iint_{S \times T} (w - R_w^\alpha) \, dx dy \right| = \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square.$$

Replacing $S \times T$ with $T \times S$ if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that

$$\left| \iint_{(S \times T) \cap \Delta} (w - R_w^\alpha) \, dx dy \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square. \quad (6)$$

Fix $\beta \in (\alpha, \frac{8}{7}\alpha)$. Next, we split S into $N_1 := \lceil |S|/\beta \rceil$ subsets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{N_1} , and T into $N_2 := \lceil |T|/\beta \rceil$ subsets T_1, \dots, T_{N_2} , so that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $S_1 \leq \dots \leq S_{N_1-1}$. (i) $T_1 \leq \dots \leq T_{N_2-1}$.
(ii) $|S_i| = \beta$ for $1 \leq i \leq N_1 - 1$ and $|S_{N_1}| \leq \beta$. (ii) $|T_j| = \beta$ for $1 \leq j \leq N_2 - 1$ and $|T_{N_2}| \leq \beta$.
(iii) $\left| \iint_{S_{N_1} \times T} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \leq \frac{\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square}{N_1}$. (iii) $\left| \iint_{S \times T_{N_2}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \leq \frac{\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square}{N_2}$.

To prove that a partition of S satisfying the above three properties exists, we apply Lemma 4.7 to the function $u(\cdot) = \int_T (w - R_w^\alpha)(\cdot, y) dy$ and $P = S$; a similar proof shows that such a partition exists for T .

We will assume, without loss of generality, that $N_1, N_2 \geq 8$, as the proposition holds true if $N_1 \leq 7$ or $N_2 \leq 7$ for the following reason. Assume that $N_1 \leq 7$. Then, it must be the case that $|S| \leq 7\beta$, and so we get

$$\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square = \left| \iint (w - R_w^\alpha) \mathbb{1}_{S \times T} \right| \leq \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\infty (7\beta) \leq \|w\|_\infty (8\alpha) = 8\|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2p-2}{3p-2}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p}{5p-2}}.$$

In the above inequalities, we used the fact that since $0 \leq w, R_w^\alpha$ and $\|R_w^\alpha\|_\infty \leq \|w\|_\infty$, we have $\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\infty \leq \|w\|_\infty$. To verify that the statement of the proposition holds true in this case, we need to show that

$$8\|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2p-2}{3p-2}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p}{5p-2}} \leq 8\|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2p}{3p-2}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-2}{5p-2}},$$

$$\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p+2}{5p-2}} \leq \|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2}{3p-2}}.$$

However, since $\Lambda(w) \leq 1$ and $p > 2$, we have $\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p+2}{5p-2}} \leq \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{3p-2}}$. This, together with the fact that $\Lambda(w) \leq \|w\|_\infty$, proves that Proposition 4.9 holds if $N_1 \leq 7$. An identical argument shows that the proposition also holds if $N_2 \leq 7$.

From this point forward, we make the following assumption:

Assumption 4.10. $N_1, N_2 \geq 8$.

Note that with repeated applications of the triangle inequality, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < N_1, 1 \leq j < N_2 \\ (S_i \times T_j) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset}} \left| \iint_{S_i \times T_j} (w - R_w^\alpha) \right| \geq \left| \iint_{(S \times T) \cap \Delta} (w - R_w^\alpha) \right| - \left| \iint_{(S_{N_1} \times T) \cup (S \times T_{N_2})} (w - R_w^\alpha) \right|,$$

which, together with Equation (6) and property (iii) of the partitions $\{S_i\}$ and $\{T_i\}$, implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < N_1, 1 \leq j < N_2 \\ (S_i \times T_j) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset}} \left| \iint_{S_i \times T_j} (w - R_w^\alpha) \right| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{N_1} - \frac{1}{N_2} \right) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square.$$

The above inequality, combined with Assumption 4.10, implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < N_1, 1 \leq j < N_2 \\ (S_i \times T_j) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset}} \left| \iint_{S_i \times T_j} (w - R_w^\alpha) \right| \geq \frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square. \quad (7)$$

Claim 4.11. *There exists a cell $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0} \subseteq \Delta$ contained in a region $\mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{B}_k \cap \mathcal{W}_{k+1}$ so that $|S_{i_0}| = |T_{j_0}| = \alpha$, and*

$$\left| \iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \geq \alpha^2 \left[\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \right].$$

We use the pigeonhole principle to prove the claim. Indeed, by Lemma 4.5, $\Delta = \bigcup_{k=0}^{mM-1} \mathcal{R}_k \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{mM-1} \mathcal{G}_k$, and that each of the regions \mathcal{G}_k or \mathcal{R}_k is bounded by boundary curves in $\{f_k, g_l : 1 \leq k \leq mM - 1, 1 \leq l \leq mM\}$. Thus, if a cell $S_i \times T_j$ does not cross the graph of any of these boundary curves, then it must be entirely contained inside one closed region $\overline{\mathcal{R}_k}$ or $\overline{\mathcal{G}_k}$. Next, by Lemma 4.6, none of the grey regions $\overline{\mathcal{G}_k}$ can contain any of the cells $S_i \times T_j$ with $1 \leq i < N_1$ and $1 \leq j < N_2$, because $|S_i| = |T_j| = \beta$ for such i and j .

Let \mathcal{I} denote the collection of indices (i, j) with $i < N_1$ and $j < N_2$, for which the associated cells do not lie in a single region $\overline{\mathcal{R}_k}$. From the above discussion, we have

$$\mathcal{I} = \left\{ (i, j) : 1 \leq i < N_1, 1 \leq j < N_2, \text{ and } \exists 1 \leq k \leq mM - 1 \text{ s.t. } (S_i \times T_j) \text{ crosses } f_k \text{ or } g_k \text{ or } g_{mM} \right\}.$$

Recall that the lower and upper boundaries f_k, g_k are increasing curves. As a result, each f_k (similarly g_k) crosses at most $2/\beta$ cells from the grid. Thus, as there are $2mM - 1$ total f_k and g_k , we have

$$|\mathcal{I}| \leq \frac{2(2mM - 1)}{\beta}.$$

Since every cell indexed in \mathcal{I} is of size β^2 , using Hölder's inequality, we show

$$\sum_{\substack{(i, j) \in \mathcal{I} \\ (S_i \times T_j) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset}} \left| \iint_{S_i \times T_j} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \leq \frac{2(2mM - 1)}{\beta} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \beta^{2 - \frac{2}{p}}. \quad (8)$$

Putting inequalities (7) and (8) together, we get

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < N_1, 1 \leq j < N_2 \\ (S_i \times T_j) \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset \\ (i, j) \notin \mathcal{I}}} \left| \iint_{S_i \times T_j} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \geq \frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \beta^{1 - \frac{2}{p}}.$$

Since there are at most $(\lfloor \beta^{-1} \rfloor)^2$ cells $S_i \times T_j$ of size $\beta \times \beta$ and $\beta^2 \leq (\lfloor \beta^{-1} \rfloor)^{-2}$, there must exist a cell $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0} \subseteq \Delta$ so that $|S_{i_0}| = |T_{j_0}| = \beta$, $(i_0, j_0) \notin \mathcal{I}$ and

$$\left| \iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \geq \beta^2 \left[\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \beta^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \right].$$

So $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$ lies entirely in $\overline{\mathcal{R}_k} = \overline{\mathcal{B}_k \cap \mathcal{W}_{k+1}}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq mM - 1$. By Lemma 4.8, we can reduce β to α ; this lets us assume that $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$ is an $\alpha \times \alpha$ cell contained in $\mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{B}_k \cap \mathcal{W}_{k+1}$ satisfying

$$\left| \iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \right| \geq \alpha^2 \left[\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \beta^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \right].$$

As this inequality holds for all $\beta > \alpha$, we take the limit as $\beta \rightarrow \alpha$. So, we have proved the claim.

From the definition of R_w^α and the black and white regions, we observe that if $1 \leq k \leq mM - 1$, then we have $\frac{k}{m} < R_w^\alpha \leq \frac{k+1}{m}$ on $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$; if $k = 0$, then $0 \leq R_w^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{m}$ on $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$.

Claim 4.12. *Under the assumptions made so far,*

$$\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq 4 \left(\frac{2\Lambda(w)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{m} + 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1 - \frac{2}{p}} \right).$$

To prove the claim, we consider three cases:

Case 1: Assume that $\iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy > 0$ and $0 \leq k \leq mM - 2$. In this case, using Claim 4.11, and the fact that $|S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}| = \alpha^2$, we have

$$\overline{w}(S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}) - \frac{k}{m} \geq \overline{w - R_w^\alpha}(S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1 - \frac{2}{p}}. \quad (9)$$

Now let (x, y) be the lower right corner of $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$. Then $(x, y) \in \mathcal{W}_{k+1}$, implying $\text{LR}(x, y)$ contains a region $S_l \times T_l$ so that $|S_l| = |T_l| = \alpha$, and $\overline{w}(S_l \times T_l) \leq \frac{k+1}{m}$. So inequality (9) combined with the definition

of Λ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(w) &\geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} [\bar{w}(S_{i_0} \times T_{i_0}) - \bar{w}(S_{i_0} \times T_l) + \bar{w}(S_{i_0} \times T_l) - \bar{w}(S_l \times T_l)] \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}} + \frac{k}{m} - \frac{k+1}{m} \right),\end{aligned}$$

which can be simplified as

$$\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq \frac{2\Lambda(w)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{m} + 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Case 2: For the second case, assume $\iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \geq 0$ and $1 \leq k \leq mM - 1$. By a similar argument used to show (9),

$$\frac{k+1}{m} - \bar{w}(S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Now let (x, y) be the upper left corner of $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$. Then $(x, y) \in \mathcal{B}_k$, which means $\text{UL}(x, y)$ contains a region $S_u \times T_u$ such that $|S_u| = |T_u| = \alpha$ and $\bar{w}(S_u \times T_u) > \frac{k}{m}$. Using the definition of Λ , similar to the argument in Case 1, we get

$$\Lambda(w) \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \left(\frac{k}{m} + \frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}} - \frac{k+1}{m} \right),$$

which simplifies to

$$\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq \frac{2\Lambda(w)}{\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{m} + 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Case 3: Assume that either $\iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy > 0$ and $k = mM - 1$ or that $\iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy \geq 0$ and $k = 0$. We note that $\mathcal{R}_{mM-1} = \mathcal{B}_{mM-1} \cap \mathcal{W}_{mM} = \mathcal{B}_{mM-1}$ and that $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{B}_0 \cap \mathcal{W}_1 = \mathcal{W}_1$. In the first assumption, we have that $R_w^\alpha > M - \frac{1}{m}$ on $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$ whereas $w \leq M$ by definition. Thus, $\frac{\alpha^2}{m} \geq \iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} (w - R_w^\alpha) dx dy > 0$. In the second assumption, we have that $R_w^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{m}$ on $S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}$ and by positivity of the integral in the second assumption it must be that $\frac{\alpha^2}{m} \geq \iint_{S_{i_0} \times T_{j_0}} w - R_w^\alpha \geq 0$. Combining either of these results with Claim 4.11 gives us that

$$\frac{\alpha^2}{m} \geq \alpha^2 \left[\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square - 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}} \right],$$

which can be rearranged to show

$$\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq \frac{1}{m} + 2(2mM - 1) \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \alpha^{1-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

So the claimed inequality holds in all cases.

We can now finish the proof. Taking $\alpha = \|w\|_\infty^{-\frac{p}{3p-2}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p}{5p-2}}$ and $m = \lceil \Lambda(w)^{-\frac{p-2}{5p-2}} \rceil$ in Claim 4.12, we get

$$\frac{1}{4} \|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq \left(1 + (4\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p + 2) \|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2p}{3p-2}} \right) \Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-2}{5p-2}} + \left(4\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_p \|w\|_\infty^{\frac{2p}{3p-2}} \right) \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p-4}{5p-2}}.$$

Since $\Lambda(w) \leq 1$, we get $\Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p-4}{5p-2}} \leq \Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-2}{5p-2}}$; this simplifies the above equation to the desired result. \square

As a corollary to Proposition 4.9, we obtain an improvement for the earlier results on Robinson approximation of traditional graphons and kernels.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a graphon. Then*

$$\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq 44\Lambda(w)^{\frac{1}{5}},$$

where $\alpha = \|w\|_\infty^{-\frac{1}{5}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{5}}$. For a bounded kernel $u : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\|u - R_u^{\alpha^*}\|_\square \leq 44\|u\|_\infty^{\frac{4}{5}} \Lambda(u)^{\frac{1}{5}},$$

where $\alpha^* = \|u\|_\infty^{-\frac{2}{5}} \Lambda(u)^{\frac{2}{5}}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha_p = \|w\|_\infty^{-\frac{p}{3p-2}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2p}{5p-2}}$. Then, from (5), we have $\|R_w^{\alpha_p} - w\|_\square \leq 44\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-2}{5p-2}}$, since $\|w\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|w - R_w^{\alpha_p}\|_p \leq 1$. Recall that the approximation in Proposition 4.9 is dependent upon the parameter α (dependent on p) chosen for the Robinson approximation. However, as $L^\infty[0, 1]^2 \subseteq L^p[0, 1]^2$ for every $p > 1$, we can allow $p \rightarrow \infty$, showing $\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq 44\Lambda(w)^{\frac{1}{5}}$, where $\alpha = \|w\|_\infty^{-\frac{1}{5}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{5}}$ as desired.

For a kernel $u : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \|u\|_\infty]$, we scale by the infinity norm to make a new function $u^* := u/\|u\|_\infty$ to get that

$$\|u^* - R_{u^*}^{\alpha^*}\|_\square \leq 44\Lambda(u^*)^{\frac{1}{5}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\alpha^* = \|u\|_\infty^{-\frac{2}{5}} \Lambda(u)^{\frac{2}{5}}$. We note that by definition of Λ and positivity of $\|u\|_\infty$, it must be the case that $\Lambda(u^*)^{\frac{1}{5}} = \|u\|_\infty^{-\frac{1}{5}} \Lambda(u)^{\frac{1}{5}}$. Furthermore, by definition of R_u^α , we have

$$R_{u^*}^{\alpha^*} = \|u\|_\infty^{-1} R_u^{\alpha^*}.$$

Thus, combining these two observations with (10) yields $\frac{1}{\|u\|_\infty} \|u - R_u^{\alpha^*}\|_\square \leq 44\|u\|_\infty^{-\frac{1}{5}} \Lambda(u)^{\frac{1}{5}}$, which proves the claim. \square

We are now ready to state and prove our main result about stability of Λ . We begin with a necessary definition—a key technique in this proof is taking an unbounded graphon and “cutting it off” at a certain threshold.

Notation 4.14 (M -cut-off). Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$ and define

$$E_M = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : w(x, y) > M\}.$$

The M -cut-off of w , denoted by w_M , is defined to be $w_M := (\mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1}_M)w$, where $\mathbb{1}_M$ is the characteristic function of E_M and $\mathbb{1}$ is the characteristic function of $[0, 1]^2$.

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an L^p -kernel with $p > 5$ and $\|w\|_p \leq 1$. Then there exists some $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that R_w^α , the Robinson approximation of w with parameter α , satisfies*

$$\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq 78\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}.$$

The idea of the proof is as follows: We use an $\epsilon/3$ argument on the difference in cut norm between w and its Robinson approximation R_w^α , introducing the terms w_M and $R_{w_M}^\alpha$, bounding each term above in terms of Λ . If w_M is Robinson, then the upper bound is proved only using properties of Robinson functions without use of Corollary 4.13. If w_M is not Robinson, then its difference in cut norm with $R_{w_M}^\alpha$ must be handled using Corollary 4.13. Handling these two cases finishes the proof.

Proof. By definition of Robinson approximation, if $\Lambda(w) = 0$, then we set $\alpha = 0$, resulting in $R_w^\alpha = w$. Thus, we assume that $\Lambda(w) > 0$ and define our cut-off value $M = 2\Lambda(w)^{-\frac{1}{p-1}}$. The proof then breaks into two cases.

Case 1: Suppose that $\Lambda(w_M) > 0$. We begin by defining the Robinson parameter $\alpha = \|w_M\|_\infty^{-\frac{2}{5}} \Lambda(w_M)^{\frac{2}{5}}$, where w_M is as defined in Definition 4.14. The triangle inequality can then be used to show that

$$\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq \|w - w_M\|_\square + \|w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square + \|R_w^\alpha - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square.$$

We will proceed by dealing with each of these terms one by one, starting with $\|w - w_M\|_{\square}$. By definition, $\mathbb{1}_M$ is the characteristic function of E_M , the region of $[0, 1]^2$ where $w > M$. Since $M|E_M|^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|w\mathbb{1}_M\|_p \leq \|w\|_p \leq 1$, we get that $|E_M| \leq (\frac{1}{M})^p$. Therefore, choosing q satisfying $1/p + 1/q = 1$, we get that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_M\|_q = |E_M|^{1/q} \leq \left(\frac{1}{M}\right)^{\frac{p}{q}} = M^{1-p} = 2^{1-p}\Lambda(w). \quad (11)$$

It is also true that

$$\|w - w_M\|_{\square} \leq \|w - w_M\|_1 = \|w\mathbb{1}_M\|_1 \leq \|w\|_p \|\mathbb{1}_M\|_q \leq 2^{1-p}\Lambda(w) \leq 2^{1-p}\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}, \quad (12)$$

handling the first term. We can further say that $\|w - w_M\|_{\square} \leq \frac{1}{16}\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}$ for all $p > 5$. Now we shift focus to $\|w_M - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square}$. By Corollary 4.13, as w_M is bounded, we have the following.

$$\|w_M - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq 44\|w_M\|_{\infty}^{\frac{4}{5}}\Lambda(w_M)^{\frac{1}{5}} \leq 44M^{\frac{4}{5}}(\Lambda(w) + 2^{1-p}\Lambda(w))^{\frac{1}{5}},$$

where the second inequality is due to the combination of (1) for $w_M = w - w\mathbb{1}_M$ alongside the fact that $\Lambda(-w\mathbb{1}_M) \leq \|w\mathbb{1}_M\|_1 \leq 2^{1-p}\Lambda(w)$ by (11). This simplifies to

$$\|w_M - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq 44(1 + 2^{1-p})^{\frac{1}{5}} M^{\frac{4}{5}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{1}{5}} \leq 44(1 + 2^{1-p})^{\frac{1}{5}} 2^{\frac{4}{5}} \Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}} \leq 77.6\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}, \quad (13)$$

where we used the fact that $p > 5$.

To bound the third term, we use Lemma 4.3 (i) and Proposition 4.1 (i) to get the following:

$$\|R_w^{\alpha} - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq \|R_w^{\alpha} - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\infty} \leq \|R_{w-w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\infty} \leq \alpha^{-2}\|w - w_M\|_1 = \alpha^{-2}\|w\mathbb{1}_M\|_1 \leq \alpha^{-2}\|w\|_p \|\mathbb{1}_M\|_q,$$

where, in the last inequality, we used Hölder's inequality with conjugate indices p, q . Now, using the upper bound for $\|\mathbb{1}_M\|_q$ provided by (11), and substituting the value of α , we get

$$\|R_w^{\alpha} - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq 2^{1-p}\alpha^{-2}\Lambda(w) = 2^{1-p}\Lambda(w) \left(\|w_M\|_{\infty}^{-\frac{2}{5}}\Lambda(w_M)^{\frac{2}{5}}\right)^{-2}. \quad (14)$$

Next, applying (1) to $w = w_M + w\mathbb{1}_M$, we get

$$\Lambda(w_M) \geq \Lambda(w) - \Lambda(w\mathbb{1}_M) \geq \Lambda(w) - \|w\mathbb{1}_M\|_1 \geq \Lambda(w) - \|w\|_p \|\mathbb{1}_M\|_q \geq (1 - 2^{1-p})\Lambda(w).$$

Since $p > 5$, the above inequality implies that $\Lambda(w_M) \geq \frac{15}{16}\Lambda(w)$. This lower bound, together with $\|w_M\|_{\infty} \leq M = 2\Lambda(w)^{\frac{-1}{p-1}}$ and inequality (14), implies that

$$2^{p-1}\|R_w^{\alpha} - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq \Lambda(w)\|w_M\|_{\infty}^{\frac{4}{5}}\Lambda(w_M)^{-\frac{4}{5}} \leq \Lambda(w)M^{\frac{4}{5}}(1 - 2^{1-p})^{-\frac{4}{5}}\Lambda(w)^{-\frac{4}{5}} \leq \frac{2^{\frac{4}{5}}}{(1 - 2^{1-p})^{\frac{4}{5}}}\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}.$$

When $p > 5$, we have $2^{\frac{4}{5}}2^{1-p}(1 - 2^{1-p})^{-\frac{4}{5}} \leq 0.2$, so

$$\|R_w^{\alpha} - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq 0.2\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}. \quad (15)$$

Thus (12), (13), and (15) together will give us that $\|w - R_w^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq 78\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}$, proving the statement of the theorem in this case.

Case 2: Suppose that $\Lambda(w_M) = 0$. In this case, we define the Robinson parameter to be $\alpha = M^{-\frac{2}{5}}\Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{5}}$. We proceed similarly to Case 1, bounding each of the three summands in the right hand side of the following inequality:

$$\|w - R_w^{\alpha}\|_{\square} \leq \|w - w_M\|_{\square} + \|w_M - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square} + \|R_w^{\alpha} - R_{w_M}^{\alpha}\|_{\square}.$$

The first term on the right side of the inequality can be handled identically to Case 1, yielding $\|w - w_M\|_{\square} \leq$

$\frac{1}{16}\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}$. For the third term, we can proceed identically to Case 1 up to (14) to get

$$\|R_w^\alpha - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square \leq 2^{1-p}\alpha^{-2}\Lambda(w).$$

Substituting $\alpha = M^{-\frac{2}{5}}\Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{5}}$ and noting that $p > 5$, we get $\|R_w^\alpha - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square \leq 0.2\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}$.

However, the second term $\|w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square$ must be handled differently. We observe that as $\Lambda(w_M) = 0$, it must be that w_M is Robinson a.e.; we therefore can directly approximate $R_{w_M}^\alpha$ as in the following claim.

Claim 4.16. *When $w_M : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, M]$ is Robinson a.e., we have*

$$\|w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square \leq \iint_{\{|x-y|\leq 2\alpha\}} w_M(x, y) dx dy.$$

To prove the claim, first note that for any point $(x, y) \in \Delta$, we have that $w_M(x, y)$ is an upper bound for every value of w_M over the set $\text{UL}(x, y)$; thus, any average over that set (such as in the definition of R_w^α) would not exceed $w_M(x, y)$. So $R_{w_M}^\alpha \leq w_M$. On the other hand, note that as w_M is Robinson a.e., we have

$$R_{w_M}^\alpha(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint_{[x-\alpha, x] \times [y, y+\alpha]} w_M dx dy & \text{for } (x, y) \in [\alpha, 1-\alpha]^2 \cap \Delta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (16)$$

where we also define $R_{w_M}^\alpha(x, y) = R_{w_M}^\alpha(y, x)$. We now introduce an auxiliary function \tilde{w}_M defined as follows:

$$\tilde{w}_M(x, y) = \tilde{w}_M(y, x) = \begin{cases} w_M(x - \alpha, y + \alpha) & (x, y) \in [\alpha, 1 - \alpha]^2 \cap \Delta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

It is clear from the definition of both \tilde{w}_M and (16) that $R_{w_M}^\alpha \geq \tilde{w}_M$. Thus we have $0 \leq w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha \leq w_M - \tilde{w}_M$ pointwise, allowing us to show the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square &\leq \|w_M - \tilde{w}_M\|_\square = 2 \iint_{[0, 1]^2 \cap \Delta} (w_M - \tilde{w}_M) dx dy \\ &= 2 \left(\iint_{[0, 1]^2 \cap \Delta} w_M dx dy - \iint_{[\alpha, 1-\alpha]^2 \cap \Delta} \tilde{w}_M dx dy \right) \\ &= 2 \left(\iint_{[0, 1]^2 \cap \Delta} w_M dx dy - \iint_{0 \leq x \leq y - 2\alpha \leq 1 - 2\alpha} w_M(x, y) dx dy \right) \\ &\leq \iint_{\{|x-y|\leq 2\alpha\}} w_M(x, y) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Claim 4.16. Finally, note that

$$\iint_{\{|x-y|\leq 2\alpha\}} w_M(x, y) dx dy \leq \|w_M\|_p \|\mathbb{1}_{[0, 1]^2 \cap \{|x-y|\leq 2\alpha\}}\|_q \leq (1 - (1 - 2\alpha)^2)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq (4\alpha)^{1 - \frac{1}{p}},$$

where in the last inequality we used that $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Substituting for α and noting that $p > 5$, we have

$$\|w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square \leq 4^{1 - \frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{\Lambda(w)}{M} \right)^{\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)(1 - \frac{1}{p})} = 2^{1 - \frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{\Lambda(w)}{M} \right)^{\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)(1 - \frac{1}{p})} \leq 2\Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{5}}.$$

Since $\Lambda(w) \leq 1$ and $\frac{2}{5} \geq (p-5)(5p-5)^{-1}$ for all $p > 5$, we get $\|w_M - R_{w_M}^\alpha\|_\square \leq 2\Lambda(w)^{\frac{2}{5}} \leq 2\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}$. Therefore, if $\Lambda(w_M) = 0$, we have that $\|w - R_w^\alpha\|_\square \leq 3\Lambda(w)^{\frac{p-5}{5p-5}}$, proving the theorem in Case 2. Thus the theorem holds true. \square

Remark 4.17. We draw attention to a particular property of Λ : Let $S_u \leq S_l \leq T_l \leq T_u$ be subsets of $[0, 1]$

such that $|S_u| = |S_l| = |T_l| = |T_u| = \alpha$. Then

$$\Lambda(w) \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2} (\bar{w}(S_u \times T_u) - \bar{w}(S_l \times T_l)).$$

To prove this, let $A = S_u$, $B = S_l$, $C = T_u$, $X = S_l$, $Y = T_l$, and $Z = T_u$. Then by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(w) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\iint_{S_u \times T_u} w \, dx dy - \iint_{S_l \times T_u} w \, dx dy + \iint_{S_l \times T_l} w \, dx dy - \iint_{S_l \times T_l} w \, dx dy \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha^2}{2} (\bar{w}(S_u \times T_u) - \bar{w}(S_l \times T_l)), \end{aligned}$$

proving the claim. This, alongside the fact that Λ is continuous with respect to the cut norm and recognizes Robinson graphons, classifies it as a “ Γ -type function” as defined in [21]. These were shown to have stable Robinson approximations for graphons taking values in $[0, 1]$, and to recognize when limits of convergent graph sequences are Robinson. While stability results for Λ already exist for bounded graphons, we prove here much better estimates than those given in [21] due to the improved definition of Λ and our careful estimates.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jeannette Janssen for helpful comments and fruitful discussions which improved this work. We thank the Department of Mathematical Sciences at the University of Delaware for their continued support throughout the process of this research. M. Ghandehari was supported by NSF grant DMS-1902301 while this work was being completed.

Appendix: Proofs of Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8

In this Appendix we present full proofs of the lemmas used previously in the paper, recalling their statements for clarity.

Lemma. (Lemma 4.7) *Let $u \in L^\infty([0, 1])$, let $P \subseteq [0, 1]$ be a measurable subset such that $\int_P u \, dx \neq 0$, and let $0 < \beta < |P|$ be fixed. Then P can be partitioned into $N := \lceil |P|/\beta \rceil$ subsets P_1, \dots, P_N so that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $P_1 \leq \dots \leq P_{N-1}$.
- (ii) $|P_i| = \beta$ for $1 \leq i \leq N - 1$ and $|P_N| \leq \beta$.
- (iii) $|\int_{P_N} u \, dx| \leq \frac{1}{N} |\int_P u \, dx|$.

Proof of Lemma 4.7. For any sets P_1, \dots, P_N satisfying the above properties, we must have

$$|P_N| = \delta := |P| - \beta \left(\left\lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \right\rceil - 1 \right).$$

To prove the lemma, it is enough to find a subset $P_N \subseteq P$ satisfying $|P_N| = \delta$ and condition (iii). Indeed, given such a subset P_N , one can form the other sets P_1, \dots, P_{N-1} by splitting $P \setminus P_N$ into consecutive sets of measure β .

If $\delta = \beta$, then the lemma follows trivially from the pigeonhole principle. So, we assume that $\delta < \beta$. Moreover, replacing u by $-u$ if necessary, we can assume that $\int_P u \, dx > 0$. We now prove the lemma in two steps:

Step 1: There must exist a set $Q \subset P$ such that $|Q| = |P| - \delta(\lceil \frac{|P|}{\delta} \rceil - 1)$ and $\int_Q u > 0$. To show this statement, note that

$$\int_P u \, dx = \int_{P^+} u \, dx + \int_{P^-} u \, dx > 0, \tag{17}$$

where $P^+ := \{x \in P : u(x) > 0\}$ and $P^- := \{y \in P : u(y) < 0\}$. If $|P^+| \geq \delta$, then any subset Q of measure δ from P^+ suffices. If $|P^+| < \delta$, then we let $Q = P^+ \cup Q'$ for a subset $Q' \subseteq P^-$ with $|Q'| = \delta - |P^+|$, and note that $\int_Q u \geq \int_P u > 0$ by (17).

Step 2: We now prove the existence of a subset $P_N \subseteq P$ satisfying $|P_N| = \delta$ and condition (iii). Towards a contradiction, assume that for any set $S \subseteq P$ such that $|S| = \delta$, we have

$$\left| \int_S u \, dx \right| > \frac{1}{N} \int_P u \, dx. \quad (18)$$

Consider now $R := P \setminus Q$. For any $p \in P$, let $r_p = \inf\{q : |R \cap [p, q]| = \delta\}$, and let the auxiliary function ϕ be defined as

$$\phi : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \phi(p) := \int_{R \cap [p, r_p]} u \, dx.$$

For ease of writing, let $R_p := R \cap [p, r_p]$, and note that as $|R_p| = \delta$, by (18), we get $\phi(p) \neq 0$ for all $p \in P$. It is easy to see that ϕ is continuous, as for $p, q \in P$, we have

$$|\phi(p) - \phi(q)| = \left| \int_{R_p} u \, dx - \int_{R_q} u \, dx \right| = \left| \int_{R_p \Delta R_q} u \, dx \right| \leq \|u\|_\infty |R_p \Delta R_q| \leq \|u\|_\infty |p - q|.$$

Therefore, as $\phi \neq 0$, it is either strictly positive or strictly negative. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\phi(p) > 0$ for all p , and to avoid violating our assumption, it must also be that

$$\phi(x) > \frac{1}{N} \int_P u \, dx \quad (19)$$

for all $p \in P$. Consider $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^M \subset R$, where $p_1 = 0$, $p_{i+1} = r_{p_i}$ for $1 < i < M$, and $M = \lceil \frac{|P|}{\delta} \rceil - 1$. Then it must be the case, due to the positivity of w and (19), that

$$\int_P u \, dx = \sum_{i=1}^M \phi(p_i) + \int_Q u \, dx > \frac{M}{N} \int_P u \, dx. \quad (20)$$

This will lead to a contradiction, as we will show that $M \geq N$, i.e. $\lceil \frac{|P|}{\delta} \rceil - 1 \geq \lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil$. We note that as $\delta < \beta$, it must be the case that $M \geq N - 1$. Therefore, the only way our claim can be violated is if M is indeed equal to $N - 1$. For this to be possible, δ must be within a tight range of values: specifically, $|P| / \lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil \leq \delta < \beta$. However, the exact value of δ is known to be $|P| - \beta(\lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil - 1)$. Thus, if $M = N - 1$, we have

$$\begin{cases} |P| - \beta \left(\lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil - 1 \right) \geq \frac{|P|}{\lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil}, \text{ or equivalently, } |P| \geq \beta \lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil \\ |P| - \beta \left(\lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil - 1 \right) < \beta, \text{ or equivalently, } |P| < \beta \lceil \frac{|P|}{\beta} \rceil \end{cases}$$

This is a contradiction, so it must be the case that $M \geq N$, making (20) a contradiction. Thus the lemma holds true and such a partition of P must exist. \square

Lemma. (Lemma 4.8) Let $f \in L^1([0, 1]^2)$, and let $S, S' \subseteq [0, 1]$ be measurable subsets such that $|S| = |S'|$. Suppose for a constant $C > 0$ we have

$$\iint_{S \times S'} f \, dx dy \geq C.$$

Then, for every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exist measurable sets $T \subset S$ and $T' \subset S'$ such that $|T| = |T'| = \alpha|S|$ and

$$\frac{1}{|T \times T'|} \iint_{T \times T'} f \, dx dy \geq \frac{C}{|S \times S'|}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.8. Suppose there exist integers n, k, l , with $l < k$, so that $|S| = \frac{k}{n}$ and $\alpha|S| = \frac{l}{n}$; the case

where one or both of $|S|$ or α is not rational can be done using standard density/approximation arguments. Next, split S into k consecutive sets $S_1 \leq S_2 \leq \dots \leq S_k$ of measure $\frac{1}{n}$; likewise, split S' into k consecutive sets $S'_1 \leq S'_2 \leq \dots \leq S'_k$ also of measure $\frac{1}{n}$ and note that

$$\iint_{S \times S'} f \, dx dy = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \iint_{S_i \times S'_j} f \, dx dy.$$

Let $B_{i,j} := \iint_{S_i \times S'_j} f \, dx dy$ and let $\mathcal{N}_{k,l}$ denote the collection of all l -subsets of the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Note that there are $\binom{k-1}{l-1}$ many l -subsets of k elements containing a specific element i_0 . Using this, counting the number of times a specific $B_{i,j}$ appears in the following sum results in

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}_{k,l}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{N}_{k,l}} \sum_{\substack{i \in I \\ j \in J}} B_{i,j} = \sum_{i,j=1}^k \binom{k-1}{l-1} B_{i,j} \geq \binom{k-1}{l-1}^2 C.$$

Thus, by the pigeonhole principle, there exist sets $I, J \in \mathcal{N}_{k,l}$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in I \\ j \in J}} B_{i,j} \geq \frac{\binom{k-1}{l-1}^2}{\binom{k}{l}^2} C = \frac{l^2}{k^2} C.$$

This implies that the sets $T = \cup_{i \in I} S_i$ and $T' = \cup_{i \in J} S'_i$ satisfy both that

$$\iint_{T \times T'} f \, dx dy \geq \frac{l^2}{k^2} C$$

and $|T| = |T'| = \alpha |S|$, proving the initial statement. \square

References

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Sahand Negahban, and Martin J. Wainwright. Noisy matrix decomposition via convex relaxation: Optimal rates in high dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2):1171 – 1197, 2012. doi: 10.1214/12-AOS1000. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1000>.
- [2] J.E. Atkins, E.G. Boman, and B. Hendrickson. A spectral algorithm for seriation and the consecutive ones problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(1):297–310, 1998.
- [3] J.P. Barthélemy and F. Brucker. Np-hard approximation problems in overlapping clustering. *Journal of classification*, 18(2):159–183, 2001.
- [4] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, H. Cohn, and Y. Zhao. An l^p theory of sparse graph convergence ii: Ld convergence, quotients and right convergence. *The Annals of Probability*, 46(1), Jan 2018. ISSN 0091-1798.
- [5] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, H. Cohn, and Y. Zhao. An l^p theory of sparse graph convergence i: Limits, sparse random graph models, and power law distributions. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 372(5):3019–3062, May 2019. ISSN 1088-6850.
- [6] Tony Cai and Weidong Liu. Adaptive thresholding for sparse covariance matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(494):672–684, 2011. doi: 10.1198/jasa.2011.tm10560.
- [7] Emmanuel J. Candes and Yaniv Plan. Matrix completion with noise. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 98(6): 925–936, 2010. doi: 10.1109/JPROC.2009.2035722.
- [8] Emmanuel J. Candès and Benjamin Recht. Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 9(6):717–772, Dec 2009. ISSN 1615-3383. doi: 10.1007/s10208-009-9045-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10208-009-9045-5>.

- [9] Emmanuel J. Candès and Terence Tao. The power of convex relaxation: near-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 56(5):2053–2080, 2010. ISSN 0018-9448. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2010.2044061. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2010.2044061>.
- [10] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Sujay Sanghavi, Pablo A. Parrilo, and Alan S. Willsky. Rank-sparsity incoherence for matrix decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(2):572–596, 2011. doi: 10.1137/090761793.
- [11] V. Chepoi and M. Seston. Seriation in the presence of errors: A factor 16 approximation algorithm for l_∞ -fitting robinson structures to distances. *Algorithmica*, 59:521–568, 02 2009.
- [12] H. Chuangpishit, M. Ghandehari, M. Hurshman, J. Janssen, and N. Kalyaniwalla. Linear embeddings of graphs and graph limits. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 113:162–184, Jul 2015. ISSN 0095-8956.
- [13] Yohann de Castro, Claire Lacour, and Thanh Mai Pham Ngoc. Adaptive estimation of nonparametric geometric graphs. *Mathematical Statistics and Learning*, 2017.
- [14] Armin Eftekhari, Dehui Yang, and Michael B. Wakin. Weighted matrix completion and recovery with prior subspace information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(6):4044–4071, 2018. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2018.2816685.
- [15] Maryam Fazel, Ting Kei Pong, Defeng Sun, and Paul Tseng. Hankel matrix rank minimization with applications to system identification and realization. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 34(3):946–977, 2013. ISSN 0895-4798. doi: 10.1137/110853996. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/110853996>.
- [16] Nicolas Flammarion, Cheng Mao, and Philippe Rigollet. Optimal rates of statistical seriation. *Bernoulli*, 25(1):623 – 653, 2019. doi: 10.3150/17-BEJ1000. URL <https://doi.org/10.3150/17-BEJ1000>.
- [17] F. Fogel, A. d’Aspremont, and M. Vojnovic. Spectral ranking using seriation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 17(1):3013–3057, January 2016. ISSN 1532-4435.
- [18] D. Fortin. Robinsonian matrices: Recognition challenges. *Journal of Classification*, 34:191–222, 2017.
- [19] A. Frieze and R. Kannan. Quick approximation to matrices and applications. *Combinatorica*, 19:175–220, 02 1999.
- [20] M. Ghandehari and J. Janssen. An optimization parameter for seriation of noisy data. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 33(2):712–730, 2019.
- [21] M. Ghandehari and J. Janssen. Graph sequences sampled from robinson graphons. 2020.
- [22] Florentin Goyens, Coralia Cartis, and Armin Eftekhari. Nonlinear matrix recovery using optimization on the grassmann manifold. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 62:498–542, 2023. ISSN 1063-5203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acha.2022.11.001>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1063520322000859>.
- [23] David Gross. Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 57(3):1548–1566, 2011. ISSN 0018-9448. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2011.2104999. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2011.2104999>.
- [24] Prateek Jain, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Sujay Sanghavi. Low-rank matrix completion using alternating minimization (extended abstract). In *STOC’13—Proceedings of the 2013 ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 665–674. ACM, New York, 2013. doi: 10.1145/2488608.2488693. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488608.2488693>.
- [25] Jeannette Janssen and Aaron Smith. Reconstruction of line-embeddings of graphons. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(1):331 – 407, 2022. doi: 10.1214/21-EJS1940. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-EJS1940>.

- [26] Raghunandan H. Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from noisy entries. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 11:2057–2078, 2010. ISSN 1532-4435.
- [27] Raghunandan H. Keshavan, Andrea Montanari, and Sewoong Oh. Matrix completion from a few entries. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(6):2980–2998, 2010. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2010.2046205.
- [28] Olga Klopp. Noisy low-rank matrix completion with general sampling distribution. *Bernoulli*, 20(1):282–303, 2014. ISSN 1350-7265. doi: 10.3150/12-BEJ486. URL <https://doi.org/10.3150/12-BEJ486>.
- [29] Olga Klopp, Karim Lounici, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Robust matrix completion. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 169(1):523–564, Oct 2017. ISSN 1432-2064. doi: 10.1007/s00440-016-0736-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-016-0736-y>.
- [30] Vladimir Koltchinskii, Karim Lounici, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Nuclear-norm penalization and optimal rates for noisy low-rank matrix completion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2302 – 2329, 2011. doi: 10.1214/11-AOS894. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/11-AOS894>.
- [31] M. Laurent and M. Seminaroti. A lex-bfs-based recognition algorithm for robinsonian matrices. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 222:151–165, 2017. ISSN 0166-218X.
- [32] M. Laurent, M. Seminaroti, and S. Tanigawa. A structural characterization for certifying robinsonian matrices. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 24, 01 2017.
- [33] I. Liiv. Seriation and matrix reordering methods: An historical overview. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal*, 3(2):70–91, 2010.
- [34] L. Lovász. *Large Networks and Graph Limits.*, volume 60 of *Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, 2012. ISBN 978-0-8218-9085-1.
- [35] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy. Limits of dense graph sequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(6):933–957, 2006. ISSN 0095-8956.
- [36] B.G. Mirkin, H.L. Beus, and S.N. Rodin. *Graphs and Genes*. Biomathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1984. ISBN 9783540126577.
- [37] T. Mishura. Cut norm discontinuity of triangular truncation of graphons. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 650:26–41, 2022. ISSN 0024-3795.
- [38] Pascal Pr ea and Dominique Fortin. An optimal algorithm to recognize Robinsonian dissimilarities. *J. Classification*, 31(3):351–385, 2014. ISSN 0176-4268. doi: 10.1007/s00357-014-9150-2. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00357-014-9150-2>.
- [39] Benjamin Recht. A simpler approach to matrix completion. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12(null):3413–3430, dec 2011. ISSN 1532-4435.
- [40] W. S. Robinson. A method for chronologically ordering archaeological deposits. *American Antiquity*, 16(4):293–301, 1951.
- [41] Angelika Rohde and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Estimation of high-dimensional low-rank matrices. *Ann. Statist.*, 39(2):887–930, 2011. ISSN 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/10-AOS860. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOS860>.
- [42] Morgan Seston. A simple algorithm for recognize Robinsonian dissimilarities. In *COMPSTAT 2008—Proceedings in Computational Statistics*, pages 241–248, CD-ROM. Physica-Verlag/Springer, Heidelberg, 2008.
- [43] Ruoyu Sun and Zhi-Quan Luo. Guaranteed matrix completion via non-convex factorization. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 62(11):6535–6579, 2016. ISSN 0018-9448. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2016.2598574. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2016.2598574>.

- [44] Min Tao and Xiaoming Yuan. Recovering low-rank and sparse components of matrices from incomplete and noisy observations. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(1):57–81, 2011. doi: 10.1137/100781894.
- [45] Bart Vandereycken. Low-rank matrix completion by Riemannian optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 23(2):1214–1236, 2013. ISSN 1052-6234. doi: 10.1137/110845768. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/110845768>.
- [46] Chuan-Long Wang, Chao Li, and Jin Wang. Comparisons of several algorithms for toeplitz matrix recovery. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 71(1):133–146, 2016. ISSN 0898-1221. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2015.11.010>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0898122115005416>.