

Community Detection in Colorful Graphs

December 17, 2015

1 Problem Set-up

Let $P = (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_L)$ and $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_L)$ be discrete distributions over L colors and 0. Let $\sigma_0 : [n] \rightarrow K$ be the true clustering. For a pair (i, j) in the same cluster ($\sigma_0(i) = \sigma_0(j)$), suppose $A_{ij} \sim P$ and for a pair (i, j) in different clusters, we suppose $A_{ij} \sim Q$.

We observe the colorful matrix A but not P and Q and the goal is to recover the clusters. We refer to the setting where P, Q are known as the oracle setting.

Note that under the oracle setting, the log-likelihood of a clustering σ is

$$\begin{aligned} l(A | \sigma) &= \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(i) = \sigma(j)} \sum_{l=0}^L \log P_l \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l} + \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(i) \neq \sigma(j)} \sum_{l=0}^L \log Q_l \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l} \\ &= \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(i) = \sigma(j)} \sum_{l=0}^L \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l} + \sum_{i < j} \sum_{l=0}^L \log Q_l \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l} \end{aligned}$$

Let $I_{tot} = -2 \log \sum_l \sqrt{P_l Q_l}$ be the $1/2$ Renyi-divergence between the distributions P, Q .

2 Weak Recovery Under the Oracle Setting

[1] characterizes the minimax rate of weak recovery for Bernoulli P, Q . Their results and proofs can be extended in a straightforward manner to general discrete P, Q under the oracle setting.

Proposition 2.1. (*Upper bound*) Assume $\frac{n I_{tot}}{K \log K} \rightarrow \infty$. The maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\sigma}$ in the oracle setting achieves:

$$\sup_{\Theta(n, K, \beta, P, Q)} \mathbb{E} r(\hat{\sigma}, \sigma) \leq \begin{cases} \exp \left(-(1 + o(1)) \frac{n I_{tot}}{2} \right), & K = 2, \\ \exp \left(-(1 + o(1)) \frac{n I_{tot}}{\beta K} \right), & K \geq 3 \end{cases}$$

Proof. Proof of this proposition follows that of Theorem 3.2 in [1]. We describe only the parts that need to be modified.

Because we have a different likelihood function, our $T(\sigma)$ takes on a different form from that of [1] at the bottom of page 8:

$$T(\sigma) = \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma(i)=\sigma(j)} \sum_{l=0}^L \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l}$$

Let σ_0 denote the true community assignment. We make a mistake if for some other community assignment σ , we get $T(\sigma) > T(\sigma_0)$. The key part of the proof is to bound

$$P_m \equiv P(\exists \sigma : T(\sigma) > T(\sigma_0), d_H(\sigma, \sigma_0) = m)$$

To that end, we bound the probability of error of a fixed σ m -distant from σ_0 in Hamming distance. We will prove an analogue of Proposition 5.1 in [1]:

Let σ be an arbitrary assignment satisfying $d(\sigma, \sigma_0) = m$. Let X_i, Y_i be random variables such that

$$X_i = \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \text{ w.p. } P_l \quad Y_i = \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \text{ w.p. } Q_l$$

and α, γ be integers where

$$\alpha = |\{(i, j) : \sigma_0(i) = \sigma_0(j) \wedge \sigma(i) \neq \sigma(j)\}| \quad \gamma = |\{(i, j) : \sigma_0(i) \neq \sigma_0(j) \wedge \sigma(i) = \sigma(j)\}|$$

Then

$$P(T(\sigma) \geq T(\sigma_0)) \leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} X_i - \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} Y_i < 0\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma + \alpha}{2} I\right) \quad (2.1)$$

Lemma 5.3 from [1] bounds α, γ and Proposition 5.2 bounds the number of σ 's (up to equivalent classes) such that $d_H(\sigma, \sigma_0) = m$. These pieces together bounds P_m . The rest of the proof follows [1] exactly starting from Page 16.

We devote the rest of the proof toward proving equation 2.1.

$$\begin{aligned} T(\sigma_0) - T(\sigma') &= \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma_0(i)=\sigma_0(j) \wedge \sigma'(i) \neq \sigma'(j)} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l} \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma_0(i) \neq \sigma_0(j) \wedge \sigma'(i) = \sigma'(j)} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l} \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} X_i - \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} Y_i \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} Y_i - \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} X_i > 0\right) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(e^{-t \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} X_i} e^{t \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} Y_i}\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left(e^{-t X_1 \alpha} e^{t Y_1 \gamma}\right) \\
&\leq \left(\mathbb{E} e^{-t X_1} \mathbb{E} e^{t Y_1}\right)^{(1-w)\alpha + w\gamma} \frac{\left(\mathbb{E} e^{t Y_1}\right)^{(1-w)(\gamma-\alpha)}}{\left(\mathbb{E} e^{-t X_1}\right)^{w(\gamma-\alpha)}}
\end{aligned}$$

We will show that when $t = 1/2$ and $w = 1/2$, the fraction term equals 1 and the first term equals $\exp(-(1/2\alpha + 1/2\gamma)I)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} e^{-t X_1} &= \sum_l P_l e^{-t \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l}} \\
&= \sum_l P_l \left(\frac{Q_l}{P_l}\right)^t \\
&= \sum_l \sqrt{P_l Q_l} \quad (\text{if } t = 1/2)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} e^{t Y_1} &= \sum_l Q_l e^{t \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l}} \\
&= \sum_l Q_l \left(\frac{P_l}{Q_l}\right)^t \\
&= \sum_l \sqrt{P_l Q_l} \quad \text{if } t = 1/2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} Y_i - \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} X_i > 0\right) &\leq \left(\sum_l \sqrt{P_l Q_l}\right)^{\alpha+\gamma} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}I\right)^{\alpha+\gamma} \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(\alpha+\gamma)}{2}I\right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

3 Fixed L Case

Suppose L is fixed. Suppose also that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0 \wedge Q_0 \rightarrow 1$ so that $P_l, Q_l \rightarrow 0$ for $l \neq 0$.

Proposition 3.1. Suppose $\frac{nI}{K} \rightarrow \infty$. If weak recovery (consistency) is possible under the oracle setting, then it is possible when P, Q are unknown.

Proof. It is clear that weak recovery is possible iff $\frac{nI_{tot}}{K \log K} \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\begin{aligned} I_{tot} &= -2 \log \left(\sum_{l=1}^L \sqrt{P_l Q_l} + \sqrt{(1 - \sum_{l=1}^L P_l)(1 - \sum_{l=1}^L Q_l)} \right) \\ &= -2 \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{l=0}^L (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \right) \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \sum_{l=0}^L (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \end{aligned}$$

Since $I_{tot} = \omega(\frac{K \log K}{n})$ by hypothesis, it must be that, for some l , $(\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 = \omega(\frac{K \log K}{n})$.

We choose such an l and consider an estimator $\hat{\sigma}_l$ that uses only the information $\mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l}$.

Since the Renyi-divergence I_l of $Ber(P_l)$ and $Ber(Q_l)$ is

$$I_l = (1 + o(1)) \left((\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 + (\sqrt{1 - P_l} - \sqrt{1 - Q_l})^2 \right)$$

We have that $\frac{nI_l}{K \log K} \rightarrow \infty$ and weak consistency is thus achievable with $\hat{\sigma}_l$. \square

Although weak consistency is achievable with the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_l$ that considers only $\mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l}$, the estimator converges at $\exp(-\frac{nI_l}{\beta K})$ and therefore does not converge at the same rate. It is easy to see that $I_l \geq I_{tot} \geq \frac{1}{L} I_l (1 - o(1))$.

We propose a procedure to remove the $\frac{1}{L}$ factor and get oracle rate of convergence:

1. Split data into two halves.
2. For each color $l = 1, \dots, L$ and for $l = 0$, cluster the first half of the data based on $\mathbf{1}_{A_{ij}=l}$ and get $\hat{\sigma}_l$. Use the second half to verify the accuracy, either by likelihood evaluation or by clustering the second half as well and testing consistency.
3. Cluster all data with the best l and use the rough clustering to estimate \hat{P}_l and \hat{Q}_l .
4. Plug in the estimated \hat{P}_l and \hat{Q}_l into the maximum likelihood estimator.

As a first step toward analyzing such a procedure, we ask the following question: suppose σ^* is an imperfect clustering of points $(2, \dots, n)$ such that $d_H(\sigma_0, \sigma^*) = \gamma$. We want to assign a cluster to node 1 based on σ^* . We will

pretend we can see P, Q exactly and assign node 1 by maximum likelihood. We will for simplicity also assume two clusters each of size $n/2$ for now. Assume without loss of generality that $\sigma_0(1) = 1$.

The assignment is

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{k=1,2} \sum_{j: \sigma^*(j)=k} \sum_{l=0}^L \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \mathbf{1}_{A_{1j}=l}$$

We can think of this as assigning a weight of $\log \frac{P_l}{Q_l}$ to edges with color l and then assigning node 1 to the cluster that maximizes the weights of the edges $(1, j)$ for j in that cluster.

What is the probability that point 1 will be assigned the wrong cluster using σ^* ? There are four categories of points:

1. j such that $\sigma_0(j) = 1$ and $\sigma^*(j) = 1$. There are $n/2 - \gamma/2$ of these. $A_{1j} \sim P$.
2. j such that $\sigma_0(j) = 2$ and $\sigma^*(j) = 1$. There are $\gamma/2$ of these. $A_{1j} \sim Q$.
3. j such that $\sigma_0(j) = 1$ and $\sigma^*(j) = 2$. There are $\gamma/2$ of these. $A_{1j} \sim P$.
4. j such that $\sigma_0(j) = 2$ and $\sigma^*(j) = 2$. There are $n/2 - \gamma/2$ of these. $A_{1j} \sim Q$.

Thus,

$$\sum_{j: \sigma^*(j)=1} \sum_{l=0}^L \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \mathbf{1}_{A_{1j}=l} \leq \sum_{j: \sigma^*(j)=2} \sum_{l=0}^L \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l} \mathbf{1}_{A_{1j}=l}$$

if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-\gamma/2} X_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma/2} Y_i &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-\gamma/2} Y_j + \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma/2} X_j \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-\gamma} X_i &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n/2-\gamma} Y_j \end{aligned}$$

where $X_j = \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l}$ with probability P_l and $Y_j = \log \frac{P_l}{Q_l}$ with probability Q_l . Note that $\mathbb{E}[X_j] > \mathbb{E}[Y_j]$.

Standard Chernoff argument yield that the probability of error is at most $\exp(-(1 - 2\frac{\gamma}{n})\frac{n}{2}I)$. This seems to indicate that refinement based on σ^* will achieve that oracle rate so long as σ^* is consistent, i.e., $\gamma = o(n)$.

4 $L \rightarrow \infty$ Case.

In this case, suppose that

$$\frac{n}{K \log K} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \rightarrow \infty$$

Again, we want to know when we can reduce the multi-color problem to a Bernoulli problem. More precisely, we would like to say that there exists a subset of colors $C \subset \{0, \dots, l\}$ such that $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_{tot} \rightarrow \infty$ implies that $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_C \rightarrow \infty$. This would mean that clustering based on the labels

$$\tilde{A}_{ij} = I_{A_{ij} \in C}$$

is consistent whenever consistency is possible under the oracle setting.

The current results in this section are:

1. Choosing C as a singleton is inconsistent.
2. Choosing $C = \{l : P_l > Q_l\}$ is inconsistent in general. It is consistent under further assumptions.

Let us prove the first bullet point.

Proposition 4.1. *There exist distributions P, Q such that, for any l , we have that $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_{tot} \rightarrow \infty$ but $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_C \rightarrow c < \infty$ for $C = \{l\}$.*

Proof. We define P, Q as such:

$$P_l = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} & \text{for } l = 1, \dots, \log n \\ 0 & \text{for } l > \log n \end{cases} \quad Q_l = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2n} & \text{for } l = 1, \dots, 2 \log n \\ 0 & \text{for } l > 2 \log n \end{cases}$$

with $P_0 = 1 - \frac{\log n}{n}$ and $Q_0 = 1 - \frac{\log n}{n}$.

$$\begin{aligned} I_{tot} &= \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \right) (1 + o(1)) \quad (\text{by lemma 5.1}) \\ &\geq \left(\log n \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{2n}} \right)^2 \right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{\log n}{n} (1 - \sqrt{1/2})^2 (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for fixed K , $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_{tot} \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us now upper bound I_C . Clearly, if $C = \{0\}$, then $I_C = 0$. Therefore, let $C = \{l\}$ for some $l > 0$. First, suppose $l \in \{1, \dots, \log n\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} I_C &= (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &= (\sqrt{1/n} - \sqrt{1/2n})^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

If $l \in \{\log n + 1, \dots, 2 \log n\}$, then it is clear that $I_C = \frac{1}{2n}(1 + o(1))$.

Therefore, $\frac{nI_C}{K \log K} \rightarrow c < \infty$

□

Now we move on to the second point.

We first state a useful lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $C \subset \{0, \dots, l\}$ be a subset of the colors. Let $P_C = \sum_{l \in C} P_l$ and Q_C be similarly defined.*

Let $d_C = P_C - Q_C$ and assume w.l.o.g. $d_C > 0$. Suppose

$$\frac{d_C}{P_C} \rightarrow 0 \quad P_C \rightarrow 0$$

Then, we have that

$$I_C = \Theta\left(\frac{d_C^2}{P_C}\right)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} I_C &= (\sqrt{P_C} - \sqrt{Q_C})^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \left(P_C \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{Q_C}{P_C}}\right)^2\right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \left(P_C \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{P_C - Q_C}{P_C}}\right)^2\right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \left(P_C \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d_C}{P_C} (1 + o(1))\right)\right)^2\right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &= P_C \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d_C}{P_C}\right)^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{d_C^2}{P_C} (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we have the following unachievability proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *There exist distributions P, Q such that $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_{tot} \rightarrow \infty$ but $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_C \rightarrow c < \infty$ for $C = \{l : P_l \geq Q_l\}$.*

Proof. Let $x, d > 0$ such that $x, d \rightarrow 0$. Let P, Q be defined as the following:

$$P_l = \begin{cases} d & \text{if } l = 1 \\ (x - d)2^{-l+1} & \text{if } l > 1 \end{cases} \quad Q_l = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l = 1 \\ (x - d)2^{-l+1} & \text{if } l > 1 \end{cases}$$

We therefore have $P_0 = 1 - x$ and $Q_0 = 1 - (x - d)$.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{tot} &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &= d(1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

We then set $d = \frac{\log n}{n}$ and $x = \frac{\log^2 n}{n}$ so that $I_C = \Theta(\frac{d^2}{x})$ by Lemma 4.1.

$$I_{tot} = \Theta\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \quad I_C = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$$

□

Finally, we have a condition under which we have achievability (ignoring computational difficulties). The intuition is that we need P_l and Q_l to be on the same scale.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $f(n)$ be some sequence such that $f(n) \rightarrow 0$. Let a_1, a_2, \dots be constants such that $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} a_l < \infty$ and b_1, b_2, \dots be constants such that $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l < \infty$.*

Let $P_l = a_l f(n)$ and $Q_l = b_l f(n)$ for $l > 0$. Then, we have, so long as $\frac{n}{K \log K} I_{tot} \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$\frac{n}{K \log K} I_C \rightarrow \infty$$

for $C = \{l : P_l \geq Q_l\}$.

Proof. First, it is clear that the total variation distance

$$\begin{aligned} \|P - Q\|_{TV} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} |P_l - Q_l| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(|P_0 - Q_0| + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} |a_l f(n) - b_l f(n)| \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\left| 1 - \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} a_l f(n) - (1 - \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l f(n)) \right| + \|a - b\|_1 f(n) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} f(n) \left(\left| \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (a_l - b_l) \right| + \|a - b\|_1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the total variation, which we denote by d , is of the order $d = \Theta(f(n))$. Since $I_{tot} \leq 2d(1 + o(1))$, we have that $I_{tot} = O(f(n))$ as well.

We claim that $I_C = \Theta(f(n))$. The proof would be complete if we can validate this claim. Without loss of generality, let's suppose that $P_0 < Q_0$.

$$I_C = P_C \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{Q_C}{P_C}} \right)^2 (1 + o(1))$$

Since $\frac{Q_C}{P_C} = \frac{\sum_{l \in C} b_l}{\sum_{l \in C} a_l} = c < 1$, we have that $I_C = \Theta(P_C) = \Theta(f(n))$.

□

5 Technical Lemmas

Lemma 5.1. *Let $P = \{P_l\}_{l=0,\dots,\infty}$ and $Q = \{Q_l\}_{l=0,\dots,\infty}$ be two discrete distributions and suppose $P_0, Q_0 \rightarrow 1$.*

Then, we have that $I \rightarrow 0$ and

$$I = (1 + o(1)) \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2$$

Proof. First, it is clear that if $P_0, Q_0 \rightarrow 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 &= (\sqrt{P_0} - \sqrt{Q_0})^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \\ &= (\sqrt{P_0} - \sqrt{Q_0})^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P_l + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} Q_l - 2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{P_l Q_l} \\ &\leq (\sqrt{P_0} - \sqrt{Q_0})^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P_l + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} Q_l \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} I &= -2 \log \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{P_l Q_l} \\ &= -2 \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \quad (\text{since the sum tends to 0}) \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $(\sqrt{P_0} - \sqrt{Q_0})^2 = o\left(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2\right)$ and the result follows immediately.

Let $P' = 1 - P_0$ and $Q' = 1 - Q_0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\sqrt{P_0} - \sqrt{Q_0})^2 &= (\sqrt{1 - P'} + \sqrt{1 - Q'})^2 \\
&= (1 - P') \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{1 - Q'}{1 - P'}} \right)^2 \\
&= (1 - P') \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{Q' - P'}{1 - P'}} \right)^2 \\
&\leq (1 - P') \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{Q' - P'}{1 - P'} \right) (1 + o(1)) \right) \right)^2 \\
&\leq (1 - P') \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{Q' - P'}{1 - P'} \right) (1 + o(1)) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{Q' - P'}{1 - P'} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)) \leq \frac{1}{4} (Q' - P')^2 (1 + o(1))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P_l + Q_l - 2\sqrt{P_l Q_l} \\
&\geq P' + Q' - 2\sqrt{\left(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P_l \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} Q_l \right)} \\
&= P' + Q' - 2\sqrt{P' Q'} \\
&= (\sqrt{P'} - \sqrt{Q'})^2 \\
&= P' \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{Q'}{P'}} \right)^2 \\
&= P' \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{P' - Q'}{P'}} \right)^2 \\
&\geq P' \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{P' - Q'}{P'} (1 + o(1)) \right) \right)^2 \\
&\geq P' \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{P' - Q'}{P'} (1 + o(1)) \right)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{(P' - Q')^2}{P'} \right) (1 + o(1))
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\sqrt{P_0} - \sqrt{Q_0})^2 &\leq \frac{1}{4} (Q' - P')^2 (1 + o(1)) \\
\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 &\geq \frac{1}{4} \frac{(P' - Q')^2}{P'} (1 + o(1))
\end{aligned}$$

Since $P' \rightarrow 0$, the proof is complete.

□

6 Continuous Distributions

In this section, we suppose that the weights of within-cluster edges are drawn from a density p and that of between-cluster edges are drawn from a density q .

In the following analysis, we will suppose that p, q are mixtures. The first components of both p, q are identical, and the second component of q is a mean-shift of that of p .

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) &= \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)g(x) \\ q(x) &= \lambda f(x - \alpha) + (1 - \lambda)g(x) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, some density $g(x)$ supported on the interval $[0, 1]$, and some density $f(x)$ supported on the interval $[0, 1 - \alpha]$.

For simplicity, we will suppose that $g(x) = 1$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $I = -2 \log \int \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} dx$ be the continuous Renyi divergence.*

Suppose α is sufficiently small, then, for some constants c, C , we have that

$$c\alpha^2 \leq I \leq C\alpha^2$$

Proof. First, denote $H = \int (\sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{q(x)})^2 dx$ as the continuous Hellinger distance and we will first show that $c\alpha^2 \leq H \leq C\alpha^2$.

Note that $f(x - \alpha) = f(x) + f'(c_x)\alpha$ for some c_x in between $x - \alpha, x$. Therefore, $q(x) = p(x) - \lambda f'(c_x)\alpha$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (\sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{q(x)})^2 dx \\ &= \int (\sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{p(x) - \lambda f'(c_x)\alpha})^2 dx \\ &= \int p(x) \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{\lambda f'(c_x)\alpha}{p(x)}} \right)^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

Since f' is bounded and $p(x)$ is bounded away from zero, we have that, for some η close to 0,

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int p(x) \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda f'(c_x)\alpha}{p(x)} (1 - \eta) \right) \right)^2 dx \\ &= \int p(x) \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda f'(c_x)\alpha}{p(x)} \right)^2 (1 - \eta) dx \\ &= \alpha^2 (1 - \eta) \int p(x) \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda f'(c_x)}{p(x)} \right)^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

Now, it remains to bound I in terms of H . Since

$$\begin{aligned} I &= -2 \log \int \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} dx \\ &= -2 \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \int (\sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{q(x)})^2 dx \right) \\ &= -2 \log(1 - \frac{1}{2}H) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for α small enough such that $H \leq 1/2$, we have that $2H \geq I \geq H$. \square

Let the interval $[0, 1]$ be divided into L equally spaced sub-intervals. Let l index each of these sub-intervals and let $B = 1/L$ be the length of each sub-interval.

Let $P_l = \int_{\text{Bin}_l} p(x) dx$ and $Q_l = \int_{\text{Bin}_l} q(x) dx$. We define the *discretized Renyi divergence* as $\tilde{I} = -2 \log \sum_{l=1}^L \sqrt{P_l Q_l}$ and $\tilde{H} = \sum_{l=1}^L (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2$.

We will show that $\tilde{H} \geq c\alpha^2$ for some constant c and for small enough α . We will also show that, for any α , $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{I} = I$.

These facts combined show that $\tilde{I} \geq \tilde{H} \geq c\alpha^2$ and therefore, $\tilde{I} - I = \eta\alpha^2$ where $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \eta = 0$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let P_l, Q_l, \tilde{I} be defined as above. Suppose $|p'(x)|, |q'(x)| \leq M$ for some absolute constant M .*

Then,

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{I} = I$$

Proof. Let $\text{Bin}_l = [a_l, b_l]$.

$$\begin{aligned} P_l &= \int_{\text{Bin}_l} p(x) dx \\ &= \int_{a_l}^{b_l} p(x) dx \\ &= \int_{a_l}^{b_l} p(a_l) + p'(c_x)(x - a_l) dx \quad \text{for } c_x \in [a_l, b_l] \\ &= Bp(a_l) + B^2\xi_l \quad \text{where } |\xi_l| \leq M/2 \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we have that $Q_l = Bq(a_l) + B^2\xi'_l$.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I} &= -2 \log \sum_{l=1}^L \sqrt{P_l Q_l} \\ &= -2 \log \sum_{l=1}^L B \sqrt{(p(a_l) + B\xi_l)(q(a_l) + B\xi'_l)} \\ &= -2 \log \sum_{l=1}^L B \sqrt{p(a_l)q(a_l)} + \left(B^2 \frac{\xi_l}{p(a_l)} + B^2 \frac{\xi'_l}{q(a_l)} \right) (1 + \eta) \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $B \rightarrow 0$. $p(a_l), q(a_l)$ are lower bounded and ξ_l, ξ'_l are bounded. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{B \rightarrow 0} \tilde{I} &= \lim_{B \rightarrow 0} -2 \log \left(\sum_{l=1}^L B \sqrt{p(a_l)q(a_l)} + \sum_{l=1}^L B^2 c_l (1 + \eta) \right) \\ &= -2 \log \left(\int \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} dx \right)\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 6.3. *Let $\tilde{I} = -2 \log \sum_{l=1}^L \sqrt{P_l Q_l}$. Then, for sufficiently small α , $\tilde{I} \geq c\alpha^2$ for some absolute constant c .*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H} &= \sum_{l=1}^L (\sqrt{P_l} - \sqrt{Q_l})^2 \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^L P_l \left(1 - \sqrt{Q_l/P_l} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^L P_l \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{P_l - Q_l}{P_l}} \right)^2\end{aligned}$$

We bound the terms $P_l - Q_l$ and P_l separately.

$$\begin{aligned}P_l - Q_l &= \int_{\text{Bin}_l} p(x) - q(x) dx \\ &= \int_{a_l}^{b_l} \lambda f'(c_x) \alpha dx \\ &= \lambda \xi_l \alpha B\end{aligned}$$

where $|\xi_l| \leq M$.

$$P_l = \int_{\text{Bin}_l} p(x) dx \geq B(1 - \lambda)$$

Thus, for small enough α , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H} &= \sum_{l=1}^L P_l (c_l \alpha)^2 \\ &\geq c\alpha^2\end{aligned}$$

for some constant c . The claim follows since $\tilde{I} \geq \tilde{H}$.

□

7 A More General Condition

References

- [1] Anderson Y Zhang and Harrison H Zhou. Minimax rates of community detection in stochastic block model.