

SPECTRA OF HIGH-DIMENSIONAL SPARSE RANDOM GEOMETRIC GRAPHS

YIFAN CAO AND YIZHE ZHU

ABSTRACT. We analyze the spectral properties of the high-dimensional random geometric graph $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$, formed by sampling n i.i.d vectors $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^n$ uniformly on a d -dimensional unit sphere and connecting each pair $\{i, j\}$ whenever $\langle v_i, v_j \rangle \geq \tau$ so that $p = \mathbb{P}(\langle v_i, v_j \rangle \geq \tau)$. This model defines a nonlinear random matrix ensemble with dependent entries. We show that if $d = \omega(np \log^2(1/p))$ and $np \rightarrow \infty$, the limiting spectral distribution of the normalized adjacency matrix $\frac{A}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ is the semicircle law. To our knowledge, this is the first such result for $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ in the sparse regime. In the constant sparsity case $p = \alpha/n$, we further show that if $d = \omega(\log^2(n))$ the limiting spectral distribution of A in $\mathcal{G}(n, \alpha/n)$ coincides with that of the Erdős-Rényi graph $\mathcal{G}(n, \alpha/n)$. Our approach combines the classical moment method in random matrix theory with a novel recursive decomposition of closed-walk graphs, leveraging block-cut trees and ear decompositions, to control the moments of the empirical spectral distribution. A refined high trace analysis further yields a near-optimal bound on the second eigenvalue when $np = \Omega(\log^4(n))$, removing technical conditions previously imposed in [44]. As an application, we demonstrate that this improved eigenvalue bound sharpens the parameter requirements on d and p for spontaneous synchronization on random geometric graphs in [1] under the homogeneous Kuramoto model.

1. INTRODUCTION

Random geometric graphs arise naturally in modeling complex systems with latent spatial or geometric structures [54, 45], such as wireless communication networks [49], biological networks [31], and social graphs [32]. In a random geometric graph, each node is assigned a random position in a geometric space, and edges are formed based on pairwise geometric proximity, inducing intricate dependencies between edges. These dependencies distinguish random geometric graphs from classical random graph models like Erdős–Rényi graphs, where edges are included independently.

Let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be n independent random vectors uniformly distributed on the $(d-1)$ -dimensional unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . The *random geometric graph* $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ is constructed by adding edges between two vertices i and j if their corresponding vectors satisfy $\langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle \geq \tau$. The threshold parameter τ is chosen such that for $i \neq j$, $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{1}(\langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle \geq \tau) = p$. This implies that $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ has the same edge density as the Erdős–Rényi graph $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$.

A compelling aspect of this model is that the graph structure emerges from a geometric representation of the vertices. This makes it particularly suitable for modeling applications in data science, where network nodes are naturally described by feature vectors in a d -dimensional space, and edges reflect similarity in features [55]. Additionally, geometric random graphs exhibit the *triangle-closing property* [16], the phenomenon that “a friend of a friend is also likely to be a friend.” This arises from the inherent dependencies among edges: if two nodes are each close to a common neighbor in the geometric space, then they are more likely to be close to each other as well, making the formation of triangles more probable. Such edge correlations are absent in classical Erdős–Rényi graphs, but are crucial for capturing clustering behaviors observed in real-world networks.

In this paper, our primary objective is to investigate the limiting spectral distribution and the second eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix associated with $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$, and to determine under what conditions it resembles the spectral properties of $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$. Understanding the spectral properties of random geometric graphs, particularly in high dimensions and sparse regimes, is crucial for

advancing both theoretical and applied research in network science, high-dimensional statistics, and random matrix theory.

Testing high-dimensional geometry. Recent advances in statistics and learning theory highlight the growing importance of high-dimensional feature spaces. In this context, the random geometric graph model $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ has become a canonical model. [19] first showed that, for fixed n and $d \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ become indistinguishable in total variation distance. When $n, d \rightarrow \infty$, with constant p , [13] identified a sharp phase transition at $d \asymp n^3$ in the total variation distance between the two models. In the sparse regime $p = \frac{\alpha}{n}$ for a constant $\alpha > 0$, the same authors showed that the total variation distance between the two distributions goes to 1 if $d = o(\log^3(n))$ and conjectured a critical window at $d \asymp \log^3(n)$. This conjecture was nearly solved by [43], who showed indistinguishability when $d = \Omega(\log^{36}(n))$.

Subsequent works have extended these testing thresholds to varied settings. [5] used Edgeworth-style expansions to analyze random toroidal graphs. [7, 8] investigated low-degree polynomial complexity and the sandwiching coupling for comparing random geometric and Erdős–Rényi graphs. [12] determined thresholds for anisotropic latent geometries, and [41, 48] studied the recovery of the latent inner product $\langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle$, locating a threshold at $d \asymp np \log(1/p)$.

While the total variation distance gives one angle of comparison, another perspective comes from spectral graph theory. Since Wigner’s semicircle law, it has been known that for the Erdős–Rényi model $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$, the empirical eigenvalue distribution of its adjacency matrix converges to the semicircle law [60]. This raises the question:

Can one distinguish $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ from $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ by their limiting spectral distributions?

We answer this in the negative under a mild condition on the dimension: as soon as $d \gg np \log^2(1/p)$, the two models share the same global spectrum for all $p \in (0, 1/2)$. We treat the case when $np \rightarrow \infty$ and $np = c$ differently since $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ has different limiting spectral distributions [36, 60]. The case when $np \rightarrow 0$ is trivial since $(1 - o(1))n$ many vertices are isolated and $1 - o(1)$ portion of the eigenvalues are 0.

Our results (Theorems 2.1 and 2.2) thus reveal a universality phenomenon: despite their very different constructions, $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ become spectrally indistinguishable above a critical dimension. Based on the entropic and spectral thresholds $d \asymp np \log(1/p)$ pointed out in [8, 41, 48], we conjecture that the true threshold for semicircle convergence is in fact $d \gg np \log(1/p)$, removing just a single logarithmic factor from our current condition.

Nonlinear random matrices. A nonlinear random matrix is obtained by a nonlinear function applied entrywise to a classical random matrix ensemble. In recent years, a rich theory has emerged around such models, including kernel random matrices [10, 14, 20, 24, 51, 52], conjugate kernels and neural tangent kernels arising from neural networks [46, 53, 26, 29]. Semicircle laws have been obtained [47, 23, 62] for a broad class of nonlinear random matrices.

Closest to the random geometric graph setting is the random inner-product kernel matrices studied in [47]. Let \mathbf{A} be an $n \times n$ random matrix such that $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = f(\langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle) \mathbf{1}\{i \neq j\}$, where $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ are i.i.d. random vectors uniformly distributed on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , and f is a function independent of d . It was shown in [23] that when $d/n = n^\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon > 0$, the limiting spectral distribution of \mathbf{A} is the semicircle law. Taking $f(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \geq \tau\}$ recovers the adjacency matrix of a $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ for fixed $p \in (0, 1)$. However, in the sparse regime $p \rightarrow 0$, f is a function depending on n , and existing proofs break down.

To the best of our knowledge, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are the first to describe the limiting spectral distributions of $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ in the simultaneous high-dimensional ($d \rightarrow \infty$) and sparse ($p \rightarrow 0$)

regimes. This model unites two of the most challenging aspects in modern random matrix analysis, nonlinearity and sparsity, and therefore requires novel technical tools. Beyond the growing-dimension setting, the spectrum of fixed-dimensional random geometric graphs has also been explored in [3, 30].

Spectral gap of random graphs. The adjacency matrix in the Erdős–Rényi graph $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ has long been an important object in both random graph theory and random matrix theory. In particular, once the average degree satisfies $np = \Omega(\log n)$, it is known that, with high probability, the second-largest eigenvalue (in absolute value) is of order $O(\sqrt{np})$ [27, 40, 9]. These results show that sparse Erdős–Rényi graphs exhibit nearly optimal spectral expansion, comparable with random regular graphs [28].

In recent years, this line of work has been extended to high-dimensional random geometric graphs [44, 7, 8], motivated by connections to high-dimensional expanders and data-science models. In parallel, [5] shows that by changing to the ℓ_∞ -metric on the d -dimensional torus, the spectral properties of the random geometric graphs are different from the spherical case. [41] analyzed a Gaussian-mixture block model variant of $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$, showing consistency of spectral clustering based on the adjacency matrix.

A natural question is whether, despite the edge dependencies induced by geometry, $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ still achieves the optimal $O(\sqrt{np})$ bound once d exceeds an appropriate threshold. Our Theorem 2.3 shows that for $d = \Omega(np)$, the second eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} is of order $O(\log^4(n)\sqrt{np})$, which is optimal up to a $\text{polylog}(n)$ factor. We conjecture that, above a critical dimension, the second largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ indeed satisfies the optimal $O(\sqrt{np})$ bound. Achieving such a bound with the moment method would likely require a novel combinatorial counting argument that goes beyond the classical high-trace method developed in [61].

The Kuramoto model on random geometric graphs. The Kuramoto model [39] is a classical framework in nonlinear dynamical systems that captures the collective behavior of coupled oscillators evolving on a network, which may exhibit synchronization [22, 21, 57]. Understanding how the network topology influences the emergence of synchrony is a central question in the theory of synchronization [37, 59], where random graphs are often used as tractable models for complex networks. However, most rigorous analyses of the Kuramoto model have focused on homogeneous random graphs [42, 2, 38, 34], which do not capture the intrinsic geometric structures observed in many real-world systems. The work of [1] provides the first rigorous result for the Kuramoto model on random geometric graphs, and recent studies [15, 18, 17] further explore related synchronization phenomena in such geometrically structured settings. Building on our new spectral gap result for $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$, we show that the Kuramoto model on a sparse random geometric graph achieves synchronization with high probability under relaxed conditions on p and d compared to [1]. See Section 2.4 for further details.

Organization of the paper. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state our main theorems and give an outline of the proofs. Section 3 includes some basic facts about random matrix theory, ear decomposition, and the block-cut tree, which will be used in our proof. In Sections 4 and 5, we prove Theorems 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 for the limiting spectral distribution, respectively. We combine the new proof technique with the high trace method to prove Theorem 2.3 in Section 6. The proof of Theorem 2.6 is in Section 7. Auxiliary lemmas and their proofs are included in Appendix A. A detailed comparison with [44] is given in Appendix B.

2. MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Semicircle law for $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$. Our first main result establishes a semicircle law for random geometric graphs.

Theorem 2.1 (Semicircle law). *Let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of a random graph $G \sim \mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$. Assume $p \in (0, p_0]$ for any constant $p_0 < 1/2$, $np \rightarrow \infty$ and $d = \omega(np \log^2(1/p))$. Then the empirical spectral distribution of $\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ converges weakly in probability to the semicircle law.*

When p is constant, Theorem 2.1 recovers the semicircle law for random inner-product kernel matrices from [23] in the regime $d = \omega(n)$ while [23] requires a stronger condition $d = n^{1+\varepsilon}$. The special case $p = 1/2$ can also be proved using the results from [7]. More broadly, it exhibits a universality phenomenon for $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$: even as the graph becomes sparse, the semicircle law persists under the relatively mild condition $d = \omega(np \log^2(1/p))$, quantifying the precise trade-off between sparsity and the ambient dimension.

2.2. Limiting spectral distribution for $\mathcal{G}(n, d, \frac{\alpha}{n})$. We next turn to the very sparse regime $p = \frac{\alpha}{n}$, for fixed $\alpha > 0$. In this case, the limiting spectral distribution of $\mathcal{G}(n, \frac{\alpha}{n})$ no longer follows the semicircle law. Instead, as shown in [11, 36, 25], the empirical spectral distribution of the rescaled adjacency matrix $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\mathbf{A}$ converges weakly to a deterministic limit ν_α . Its odd moments vanish, and for even $k = 2m$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right)^{2m} = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\ell+1} \binom{2\ell}{\ell} \alpha^{\ell-m}. \quad (1)$$

Moreover, as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, ν_α converges back to the semicircle law, although no closed-form density is known for ν_α . Our next theorem shows that the random geometric graph $\mathcal{G}(n, d, \frac{\alpha}{n})$ shares this same limiting spectral distribution ν_α whenever the dimension grows mildly.

Theorem 2.2 (Bounded expected degree). *Let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of a random graph G sampled from $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$. Assume $p = \frac{\alpha}{n}$ and $d = \omega(\log^2(n))$. Then the empirical spectral distribution of $\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$ converges weakly in probability to ν_α .*

We present two numerical simulations for Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. Figure 1 shows a semicircle law behavior of the empirical spectral distributions for both $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$, and Figure 2 shows when $p = \frac{c}{n}$, the empirical spectral distributions for both $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ are close even when d is small.

2.3. Second largest eigenvalue. Applying the trace estimates based on ear decomposition and the block-cut tree in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we also obtain the following bound on the second largest eigenvalue (in absolute value)

$$\lambda(\mathbf{A}) := \max\{|\lambda_2(\mathbf{A})|, |\lambda_n(\mathbf{A})|\}.$$

Theorem 2.3 (Second largest eigenvalue). *Let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of a random graph G sampled from $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$. For any constant $\gamma \geq 1$, assume $\frac{(4\gamma \log n)^4}{n} \leq p \leq e^{-4}$. Then there is an absolute constants $C_1 > 0$ such that when $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p)$, with probability $1 - n^{-\gamma}$,*

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| \leq 4(\gamma^4(\log n)^4 \sqrt{np} + \tau np)$$

and

$$\lambda(\mathbf{A}) \leq 4(\gamma^4(\log n)^4 \sqrt{np} + \tau np). \quad (2)$$

Remark 2.4 (Relaxing the conditions in [44]). A second eigenvalue bound appears in [44, Theorem 1.7] as a corollary of [44, Theorem 1.10], but only under two restrictive assumptions: (i) $\tau \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{np}}$, equivalently $d = O(np \log^2(1/p))$ and (ii) $np = \omega(d^3 \log^4(n))$, which confine their result to a low-dimensional regime. A detailed comparison is provided in Appendix B. These conditions limit its applicability when one studies expansion properties of $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ (see, e.g., [1]). By contrast, we remove these technical constraints so that (2) holds for all $d = \Omega(\log(1/p))$.




FIGURE 1. Empirical spectral distributions of the Erdős-Rényi graph $\mathcal{G}(2500, 0.01)$ (left) and the geometric graph $\mathcal{G}(2500, 300, 0.01)$ (right).




FIGURE 2. Empirical spectral distributions of the Erdős-Rényi graph $\mathcal{G}(2500, 2.23/2500)$ (left) and the geometric graph $\mathcal{G}(2500, 100, 2.23/2500)$ (right)

From Lemma A.3, $\tau \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}}$. Therefore, when $d = \Omega(np)$, Theorem 2.3 implies $\lambda(\mathbf{A}) = O(\log^4(n)\sqrt{np})$, showing that in high-dimensional regimes, the expansion of $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ matches that of the Erdős-Rényi graph [27, 40], up to a poly $\log(n)$ factor. The generalized Alon-Boppana bound in [35, Theorem 8] implies that $\lambda(\mathbf{A}) = \Omega(\sqrt{np})$ with high probability. Thus Theorem 2.3 is tight up to a poly $\log(n)$ factor.

2.4. Spontaneous synchronization on random geometric graphs. The Kuramoto model [39] describes the temporal evolution of a system of coupled phase oscillators. Following the formulation in [1], we consider the homogeneous case where all oscillators share the same natural frequency. The dynamics of the system are governed by

$$\frac{d\theta_i(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sin(\theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t)),$$

where $\theta_i(t)$ denotes the phase of oscillator i at time t . When the interactions are constrained by a graph $G = (V, E)$ with adjacency matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, $a_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$, the dynamics become

$$\frac{d\theta_i(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \sin(\theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t)).$$

This system of coupled oscillators can equivalently be viewed as a gradient flow minimizing the *energy function*

$$E_G(\theta) := \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} (1 - \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)), \quad (3)$$

which quantifies the total phase misalignment across edges of the graph [21]. Synchronization can therefore be characterized in terms of the critical points of this energy function.

Definition 2.5. A graph $G = (V, E)$ with adjacency matrix A is said to be *globally synchronizing* if every local minimum of the energy function (3) corresponds to a constant configuration, i.e., $\theta_i = \theta$ for all $i \in [n]$.

As an application of Theorem 2.3, we provide the following guarantee of spontaneous synchronization in the Kuramoto model on random geometric graphs. The proof of Theorem 2.6 is deferred to Section 7.

Theorem 2.6 (Spontaneous synchronization). *Let G be a random graph sampled from $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$. There exist absolute constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that if $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p) \log^2(n)$ and $\frac{C_2 \log^{10}(n)}{n} \leq p \leq e^{-4}$, then with probability $1 - O(n^{-2})$, the graph G is globally synchronizing.*

Remark 2.7 (Comparison with [1]). The same result was stated in [1, Theorem 4] under the assumptions $d = C_1 \log^3 n$ and $np = C_2 \log^{10} n$. However, their proof implicitly requires $np = \omega(d^3 \log^4 n)$ to invoke the spectral gap bound from [44, Theorem 1.10] (see Appendix B for details). Consequently, under their setting $d = C_1 \log^3 n$, one must in fact assume $np = \omega(\log^{13} n)$. In contrast, our proof of Theorem 2.6, which builds on Theorem 2.3, improves the sparsity requirement from $np = \omega(d^3 \log^4 n)$ to $np = \Omega(\log^{10} n)$. Furthermore, when $p \leq e^{-4}$ is independent of n , the dimensional condition is further relaxed to $d = \Omega(\log^2 n)$.

2.5. Technical overview. Our proof relies on the moment method from random matrix theory [6, 61], applied both to derive the limiting spectral distribution and to bound the top eigenvalues.

To obtain the limiting spectral distribution for a Wigner-type matrix \mathbf{M} with independent (up to symmetry) entries [63], one analyzes the normalized trace $\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^k)$ for each fixed k . After a proper scaling, the dominant contributions come from closed walks on rooted planar trees, each edge of which is traversed exactly twice. Counting these “double-edge” walks yields the Catalan numbers, and hence the k -th moment of the semicircle law. Crucially, independence forces any walk containing an edge visited only once to have zero expectation. To obtain a sharp spectral norm bound, one lets $k = O(\log n)$ and evaluates $\mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}^k)$ by a finer subgraph-count estimate, and then applies Markov’s inequality [61].

In contrast, the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$ exhibits edge dependencies that invalidate the “zero-contribution” argument for edges traversed only once. To apply the moment method, we work with the centered adjacency matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}$ and study its normalized trace:

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^k = \frac{1}{n^{k/2+1} (p(1-p))^{k/2}} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1 i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2 i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_{k-1} i_k} \mathbf{Q}_{i_k i_1}].$$

Each term corresponds to a closed walk on the complete graph. To overcome the edge dependencies, our analysis proceeds in two stages:

- (1) *Tree-like closed walks:* When the underlying walk graph is a tree (each edge traversed exactly twice), we exploit conditional independence: by peeling off leaves one at a time, we evaluate the expectation recursively. This recovers the Catalan-number moments of the semicircle law.
- (2) *Non-tree closed walks:* For walks whose underlying graph contains cycles or edges traversed more than twice, we develop a novel graph-decomposition algorithm combining block-cut trees and ear decompositions (see Section 3 for a brief introduction) to evaluate the expectation of a closed-walk graph recursively. Conditioned on the random vectors associated with the endpoints of each ear, this peeling procedure allows us to show that each ear contributes negligibly in the limit. Together with refined subgraph probability estimates from

[41], we obtain the semicircle law down to $d = \omega(np \log^2(1/p))$. A similar strategy works for the proof of Theorem 2.2 in the constant expected degree regime.

Earlier works also applied the trace method to $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$. [44] used a 2-core contraction argument to bound $\mathbb{E} \text{tr}(\mathbf{Q}^k)$ by conditioning on vertices with degree at least three. [41] expanded the threshold function in Gegenbauer polynomials and used their orthogonality to evaluate the closed-walk subgraphs, also with a contraction argument. However, their estimates fall short of proving the moment convergence to the semicircle. Different from their arguments, we evaluate conditional expectations recursively by peeling off ears one by one, which helps us to obtain a tighter bound for the contribution of non-tree closed walks.

For the second eigenvalue bound, we apply our new estimates to all closed-walk subgraphs to bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A})^k]$ for $k = O(\log n)$. This allows us to remove the technical conditions in [44] and achieve a spectral gap bound valid across all regimes of d . We expect that our decomposition and peeling techniques will extend to other sparse random geometric graph models and to more general nonlinear random matrices.

3. PRELIMINARIES

3.1. Random matrix theory.

Definition 3.1 (Empirical spectral distribution). Given an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix A with eigenvalues $\lambda_1(A) \leq \lambda_2(A) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(A)$, the empirical spectral distribution (ESD) for A is

$$\mu_A(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{\lambda_i(A)}(x).$$

The semicircular distribution with density supported on $[-2, 2]$ is $\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{4 - x^2}$, whose k -th moment m_k satisfies $m_k = \begin{cases} 0 & k \text{ is odd} \\ C_k & k \text{ is even} \end{cases}$, where $C_k = \frac{(2k)}{k+1}$ is the Catalan number [58].

3.2. Ear decomposition. Our proof for the semicircle law will rely on the ear decomposition [50, 56] of 2-edge connected graphs to evaluate the contribution of each subgraph in the trace expansion. We give a brief introduction below.

Definition 3.2 (k -edge-connected). A graph is k -edge-connected if the removal of any $(k - 1)$ edges leaves a connected subgraph.

Definition 3.3 (Ear decomposition). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite, undirected, 2-edge-connected graph. An *ear decomposition* of G is a sequence of subgraphs (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_s) satisfying the following conditions:

- R_1 is a simple cycle in G .
- For each $i \geq 2$, R_i is a path (called an *ear*) whose internal vertices are disjoint from $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} V(R_j)$, and whose endpoints lie in $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} V(R_j)$.
- The union of all edges in the sequence gives the edge set of G , i.e., $\bigcup_{i=1}^s E(R_i) = E(G)$.

See Figure 3 for an example of an ear decomposition. By peeling off R_4, R_3, R_2, R_1 recursively, the graph becomes empty.

In the proof of our main results, we will use the following fact about ear decomposition:

Lemma 3.4. *A graph G is 2-edge-connected if and only if it has an ear decomposition. For every vertex v in G , there exists an ear decomposition in which $v \in R_1$.*

The proof of Lemma 3.4 is deferred to Appendix A.




FIGURE 3. Ear decomposition of a 2-edge-connected graph with 11 vertices, where $R_1 = \{(1,2)(2,3), (3,4), (4,1)\}$, $R_2 = \{(2,5), (5,6), (6,7), (7,4)\}$, $R_3 = \{(4,11), (11,7)\}$, and $R_4 = \{(5,8), (8,9), (9,10), (10,7)\}$

3.3. Block-cut tree. Another ingredient in our proof is the *block-cut tree*. Any connected graph can be decomposed into a tree of 2-edge-connected components, which is called the *block-cut tree* of the graph [33]. We now introduce some definitions for *block-cut trees*.

Definition 3.5 (bridges). We define *bridges* as edges whose removal increases the number of connected components.

Definition 3.6 (Block-cut tree). We decompose the graph G into its 2-edge-connected components, which are connected by bridges. We express G as

$$G = \bigcup_{i=1}^r G_{C_i} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^q F_j,$$

where each G_{C_i} denotes a *2-edge-connected component*, and each F_j represents a *1-edge-connected component* spanned by bridges. We call each F_j a *bridge component*, and it is a subtree of G . This gives a *block-cut tree* of G .

See Figure 4 for an example of a block-cut tree decomposition of a graph G .




FIGURE 4. In this example, the graph contains one *bridge component* (shown in red), $(8, 2, 1, 5)$, and two *2-edge-connected components* (shown in black): $(8, 9, 10)$ and $(2, 3, 4, 6, 7)$.

Definition 3.7 (junction vertex). We define junction vertices as vertices in the intersection between bridges and the 2-edge-connected components. Let $J(G)$ be the set of all junction vertices in G .

In the example shown in Figure 4, $\{2, 8\}$ is the set of junction vertices.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

4.1. **Trace expansion.** Denote

$$\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}.$$

We will show Theorem 2.1 by applying the moment method to \mathbf{Q} . We start with the trace expansion,

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^k = \frac{1}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1 i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2 i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_{k-1} i_k} \mathbf{Q}_{i_k i_1}], \quad (4)$$

where the sum is over all sequences (i_1, \dots, i_k) with $i_j \neq i_{j-1}$, $2 \leq j \leq k$ and $i_k \neq i_1$. The sequence (i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1) corresponds to a closed walk of length $k+1$ on a complete graph with n vertices. For each closed walk $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1)$, we can associate a graph $G_I = (V, E)$. We classify closed walks into two categories:

- \mathcal{C}_1 : Closed walks in which each edge is traversed exactly twice, and the underlying graph is a tree.
- \mathcal{C}_2 : All other closed walks not included in \mathcal{C}_1 .

We write (4) as

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^k = S_1 + S_2,$$

where S_i is the contribution from all G_I in \mathcal{C}_i . We estimate each S_i in the following subsections.

4.2. **Estimating S_1 .** By our definition, $S_1 = 0$ if k is odd since closed walks on the tree must be of even length. Now we assume $k = 2m$, then for each closed walk $I \in \mathcal{C}_1$, $G_I = (V, E)$ is a tree and we must have $|V| = m+1$ and $|E| = m$. With (4),

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{n^{m+1}(p(1-p))^m} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2m}) \in \mathcal{C}_1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2, i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_{2m}, i_1}].$$

Let \mathcal{T}_m be the set of all rooted planar trees with $m+1$ vertices, then

$$|\mathcal{T}_m| = \frac{\binom{2m}{m}}{m+1}, \quad (5)$$

which is the m -th Catalan number [58]. For each unlabeled rooted planar tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_m$, there are $n(n-1) \cdots (n-m) = (1+o(1))n^{m+1}$ many ways to label T with distinct vertex labels from $[n]$. Each rooted planar tree T with $m+1$ distinct vertex labels in $[n]$ corresponds to a closed walk (i_1, \dots, i_{2m}) , with the vertex sequence in the depth-first search on T . We apply a canonical labeling with $\{1, \dots, m+1\}$ to vertices in T such that whenever the k -th distinct vertex v is visited by the depth-first search on T for the first time, v is assigned with a label $k \in [m+1]$.

Since each edge in T is visited exactly twice, we can rewrite S_1 as

$$S_1 = \frac{n(n-1) \cdots (n-m)}{n^{m+1}(p(1-p))^m} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_m} \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_e = \mathbf{Q}_{ij}$ if $e = \{i, j\}$, which represents the entry of \mathbf{Q} index by an edge $e \in T$. Let T be a tree with m edges e_1, \dots, e_m and $m+1$ vertices v_1, \dots, v_{m+1} . Since each $v \in V(T)$ corresponds to a latent vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 \quad (7)$$

as the expectation taken over all vectors corresponding to the vertices $v \in V(T)$. We denote the collection of such vectors by \mathcal{V} .

We aim to compute (7) by recursively peeling off the leaves of the tree. At each step, we choose one of the leaf edges $e^* = (v_1^*, v_2^*)$, where v_1^* is a leaf node and v_2^* is an internal node. We condition on the random vector \mathbf{v}_2^* associated with node v_2^* to make the leaf edge independent from the rest of the tree. By independence, we can write:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_2^*} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{\mathbf{v}_2^*\}} \prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_2^*} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{\mathbf{v}_1^*, \mathbf{v}_2^*\}} \prod_{e \in E(T) \setminus \{e^*\}} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_1^*} \mathbf{Q}_{e^*}^2 \right].$$

Since for each edge, \mathbf{Q}_e satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 = p(1-p)^2 + (1-p)(-p)^2 = p(1-p),$$

we can iteratively peel off one leaf at a time, multiplying the expectation by $p(1-p)$ at each step. Repeating this for all m edges in the tree, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 = [p(1-p)]^m. \quad (8)$$

From equations (6) and (5), this gives:

$$S_1 = \begin{cases} (1 + o(1)) \frac{\binom{2m}{m}}{m+1} & \text{if } k = 2m, \\ 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

4.3. Estimating S_2 . Note that in the analysis of S_1 , no assumption on d is used. However, estimating S_2 involves closed walks where certain edges are traversed only once, and their contributions depend on the vector dimension d . To establish that closed walks in \mathcal{C}_2 have vanishing contributions to the moment, we combine *block-cut tree decomposition* and the *ear decomposition* and algorithmically evaluate the moment.

4.3.1. A graph decomposition algorithm. Recall that we want to evaluate

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{n^{k/2+1} (p(1-p))^{k/2}} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) \in \mathcal{C}_2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2, i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_k, i_1}].$$

For a closed walk of length k , $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k) \in \mathcal{C}_2$, we denote by $G_I = (V, E)$ the simple graph spanned by I , with $v = |V|$ and $e = |E|$. Let \mathcal{G}_2 denote the collection of distinct unlabeled graphs obtained from all possible closed walks in \mathcal{C}_2 . For each $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$, there are

$$n(n-1) \cdots (n-v+1) = O(n^v)$$

ways to label it. It suffices to evaluate the contribution of a fixed $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$, given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)}, \quad (9)$$

where $m(e)$ denotes the multiplicity of each edge $e \in E(G)$, and the expectation is taken over the random vectors \mathbf{v} corresponding to each vertex $v \in V(G)$ as we did in Section 4.2. We proceed with the following steps.

Step 1: A block-cut tree of G

Recall the definition of a block-cut tree from Definition 3.6. We decompose the graph G into its 2-edge-connected components, which are connected by bridges. Since G is spanned by a closed walk I , every bridge must be traversed at least twice. We express G as

$$G = \bigcup_{i=1}^r G_{C_i} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^q F_j,$$

where each G_{C_i} denotes a *2-edge-connected component*, and each F_j is a *bridge component*. This gives a *block-cut tree* of G . Note that when $r = 0$, G is a tree.

Denote by v_{F_j} and e_{F_j} the number of vertices and edges in F_j , respectively, and by v_{C_i} and e_{C_i} the number of vertices and edges in the 2-edge-connected component G_{C_i} , respectively.

Let $J(G)$ be the set of all junction vertices in G defined in Definition 3.7. We condition on all junction vertices to make the contribution from each 2-edge-connected component and each bridge independent. We can bound (9) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{v \in J(G)} \prod_{i=1}^r \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G_{C_i}) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \prod_{j=1}^q \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(F_j) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(F_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Step 2: Evaluating the expectation of a leaf component

Denote $T(G)$ the block-cut tree of G . A leaf of $T(G)$ has two possibilities:

- (1) It corresponds to a leaf in G , belonging to certain F_j .
- (2) It corresponds to 2-edge-connected component G_{C_i} that only contains one junction vertex.

We call this F_j or G_{C_i} an leaf component of G . We treat the two cases separately.

Case 1: F_j is a leaf component

Since each edge in the bridge path F_j is traversed at least twice and F_j contains a leaf vertex in G , by (8), and the fact $|\mathbf{Q}_e| \leq 1$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(F_j) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(F_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(F_j) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(F_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^2 = [p(1-p)]^{v_{F_j}-1}, \quad (11)$$

where the last identity holds by taking the conditional expectation sequentially as in (8).

Case 2: G_{C_i} is a leaf component

We now deal with the conditional expectation from a 2-edge-connected component G_{C_i} , where G_{C_i} contains only one junction vertex.

Our analysis relies on the *ear decomposition* defined in Definition 3.3. By Lemma 3.4, we can find an ear decomposition whose initial cycle R_1 contains the junction vertex in G_{C_i} . Let (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_s) be the ear decomposition of G_{C_i} , where $s = s(C_i)$ is the number of ears. Let $e_{R_j} = |E(R_j)|$. By the properties of the ear decomposition, we have

$$e_{C_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{s(C_i)} e_{R_j}.$$

We have the following inequality from the ear decomposition:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G_{C_i}) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G_{C_i}) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{j=1}^s \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(R_j) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(R_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right|.$$

Next, we handle the contribution from each ear recursively. There are two subcases:

Case (1): $s = 1$. In this case, G_{C_i} is a cycle of length e_{C_i} . Note that G_{C_i} contains only one junction vertex, with Lemma A.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G_{C_i}) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} (\alpha_{m(e)} \mathbf{Q}_e + \beta_{m(e)}) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha_{m(e)}, \beta_{m(e)}$ are constants with $\alpha_{m(e)} \in [0, 1]$. We can expand the expectation in (12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} [\mathbf{Q}_e \alpha_{m(e)} + \beta_{m(e)}] &= \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e \alpha_{m(e)} + \sum_{S \subsetneq E(G_{C_i})} \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in S} \mathbf{Q}_e \alpha_{m(e)} \prod_{e \notin S} \beta_{m(e)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e \alpha_{m(e)}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the second term on the right-hand side vanishes because each subset $S \subsetneq E(G_{C_i})$ forms a forest, and the expectation is zero due to the conditional independence of edges.

On the other hand, by a binomial expansion and the conditional independence of edges,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} (\mathbf{A}_e - p) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{A}_e - p^{e_{C_i}} \right| \leq C p^{e_{C_i}-1} (C\tau)^{e_{C_i}-2} \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

for a constant $C \geq 1$ such that $C\tau < 1$, where the last inequality is due to the cycle probability estimate from Lemma A.5 under the assumption $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p)$.

Combining all (12), (13), and (14), we obtain

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G_{C_i}) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq C p^{e_{C_i}-1} (C\tau)^{e_{C_i}-2} \sqrt{\log(1/p)}.$$

Case (2): $s \geq 2$. In this case, R_2, \dots, R_s are paths. Note that the last ear R_s only intersects with the previously constructed subgraph $\bigcup_{j=1}^{s-1} R_j$ through its two endpoints. Let $J(R_j)$ be the set of the two endpoints in R_j . There are three cases depending on e_{R_j} :

- If $e_{R_j} \geq 3$, using the the expansion as in (12) (13), and (14), the contribution of R_j is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(R_j) \setminus J(R_j)} \prod_{e \in E(R_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(R_j) \setminus J(R_j)} \prod_{e \in E(R_j)} \mathbf{A}_e - p^{e_{R_j}} \right| \\ &\leq C p^{e_{R_j}-1} (C\tau)^{e_{R_j}-2} \sqrt{\log(1/p)}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where in the last inequality, we use the path probability estimate from Lemma A.5.

- If $e_{R_j} = 1$, with e being the only edge, we have $V(R_j) \setminus J(R_j) = \emptyset$, and

$$|\mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)}| \leq 1.$$

- If $e_{R_j} = 2$, let (v_1, v_2, v_3) be the path formed by R_j with $e_1 = (v_1, v_2), e_2 = (v_2, v_3)$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(R_j) \setminus J(R_j)} \prod_{e \in E(R_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{v_2} [\mathbf{Q}_{v_1 v_2}^{m(e_1)} \mathbf{Q}_{v_2 v_3}^{m(e_2)}] \right| \leq |\mathbb{E}_{v_2} \mathbf{Q}_{v_1 v_2} \mathbf{Q}_{v_2 v_3}| \leq \mathbb{E}_{v_2} |\mathbf{Q}_{v_1 v_2}| \leq 2p,$$

where in the first inequality we use (12). Hence combining the cases for $e_{R_j} = 1, 2$, when $e_{R_j} \leq 2$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(R_j) \setminus J(R_j)} \prod_{e \in E(R_j)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq (2p)^{e_{R_j}-1}. \quad (16)$$

Let t_{C_i}, x_{C_i} be the number of length-2 and length-1 ears in G_{C_i} , respectively. Let s_{C_i} be the number of ears in G_{C_i} . We can apply the estimate (15) and (16) sequentially by peeling off R_s, \dots, R_2 , and finally R_1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G_{C_i}) \setminus J(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G_{C_i})} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \\ & \leq \prod_{j=2}^{s_{C_i}} \left(p^{e_{R_j}-1} (C\tau)^{e_{R_j}-2} C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \mathbf{1}_{e_{R_j}>2} + 2p \mathbf{1}_{e_{R_j}=2} + \mathbf{1}_{e_{R_j}=1} \right) p^{e_{R_1}-1} (C\tau)^{e_{R_1}-2} C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \\ & = 2^{t_{C_i}} p^{e_{C_i}-s_{C_i}} (C\tau)^{e_{C_i}-2s_{C_i}+x_{C_i}} C^{s_{C_i}-t_{C_i}-x_{C_i}} \log^{(s_{C_i}-t_{C_i}-x_{C_i})/2}(1/p). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Step 3: Peeling off the block-cut tree

In Step 2, we have shown how to evaluate the contribution from the first leaf component in the block-cut tree of G . Now, we decompose each graph G by starting with any leaf component in its block-cut tree. After evaluating its conditional expectation, we sequentially remove leaf components one by one until the block-cut tree is empty.

Using the conditional independence, combining (11) and (17), we can bound (10) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{v \in V(G)} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \\ & \leq \prod_{i=1}^r \left(2^{t_{C_i}} p^{e_{C_i}-s_{C_i}} (C\tau)^{e_{C_i}-2s_{C_i}} C^{s_{C_i}-t_{C_i}} \log^{(s_{C_i}-t_{C_i})/2}(1/p) \right) \prod_{j=1}^q p^{v_{F_j}-1} \\ & = 2^{\sum_{i=1}^r t_{C_i}} p^{e(G)-\sum_{i=1}^r s_{C_i}} (C\tau)^{\sum_{i=1}^r (e_{C_i}-2s_{C_i}+x_{C_i})} C^{\sum_{i=1}^r (s_{C_i}-t_{C_i}-x_{C_i})} \log^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^r (s_{C_i}-t_{C_i}-x_{C_i})}(1/p). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Denote $t(G) = \sum_{i=1}^r t_{C_i}$ and $x(G) = \sum_{i=1}^r x_{C_i}$ the total number of length-2 and length-1 ears in G , respectively. Since the number of all ears in the block-cut tree is the excess of G denoted by

$$g(G) := e(G) - v(G) + 1,$$

we have $\sum_{i=1}^r s_{C_i} = g(G) = e(G) - v(G) + 1$. We also denote $c(G) = \sum_{i=1}^r e_{C_i}$ to be the number of total edges in all 2-edge-connected components of G . Then we can simplify (18) as

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq 2^{t(G)} p^{v(G)-1} (C\tau)^{c(G)-2g(G)+x(G)} \left(C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g(G)-t(G)-x(G)}, \quad (19)$$

which holds for any $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

4.3.2. *Bounding S_2 .* Recall

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \frac{1}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) \in \mathcal{C}_2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2, i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_k, i_1}] \\ &= \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_2} \left[\frac{n^{v(G)}}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For each $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$, from (19), since $p \in [0, p_0]$,

$$\frac{n^{v(G)}}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq 2^{k/2+t} (np)^{v-1-k/2} (C\tau)^{c-2g+x} (C\sqrt{\log(1/p)})^{g-t-x}. \quad (20)$$

Here, t, v, c, g, x stand for $t(G), v(G), c(G), g(G)$, and $x(G)$, respectively.

One can check that (20) also holds when G is a tree. Therefore (20) holds for all graphs spanned by a closed walk of length k .

We now consider two cases:

Case 1: G is a tree.

In this case, since $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$ does not contribute to S_1 , G contains only bridges, and at least one bridge is visited more than twice. This implies

$$v < 1 + \frac{k}{2}, \quad \text{and } t = c = g = x = 0.$$

Therefore, since $np \rightarrow \infty$, (20) is bounded by

$$2^{k/2} (np)^{-1} = o(1).$$

Case 2: G is not a tree.

In this case, we have $g \geq 1$. Since $\tau \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}}$ from Lemma A.3, we can bound (20) by

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{k/2+t+c-2g+x} (np)^{v-1-k/2} \left(2C\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}} \right)^{c-2g+x} (C\sqrt{\log(1/p)})^{g-t-x} \\ &= 2^{k/2+t+c-2g+x} C^{c-g-t} \frac{(np)^{v-1-k/2} \log(1/p)^{c/2-g/2-t/2}}{d^{c/2-g+x/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the number of edges in G equals the sum of the number of edges in all bridges and the number of edges in all *2-edge-connected components*, and since each edge in a bridge must be visited at least twice, we have

$$e \leq c + \frac{k-c}{2} = \frac{k}{2} + \frac{c}{2}.$$

Thus

$$v - 1 - \frac{k}{2} \leq \frac{c}{2} - e + v - 1 = \frac{c}{2} - g$$

and we can further bound (20) by

$$2^{k/2+t+c-2g+x} C^{c-g-t} \left(\frac{np \log^2(1/p)}{d} \right)^{c/2-g+x/2} (np)^{-x/2} (\log(1/p))^{3g/2-t/2-c/2-x}. \quad (21)$$

Since the total number of edges in all *2-edge-connected components* equals the number of length-1 ears plus twice the number of length-2 ears plus the number of edges in all other ears of length ≥ 3 , we have $c \geq x + 2t + 3(g-t-x) = 3g - t - 2x$, or equivalently,

$$3g/2 - t/2 - c/2 - x \leq 0. \quad (22)$$

Moreover, by our construction of the ear decomposition, each 2-edge-connected component G_{C_i} has at least a cycle ear R_1 of length at least 3, so we have $g \geq t + x + 1$, hence $c \geq 2g + (g - t - 2x) \geq 2g - x + 1$, or equivalently,

$$c/2 - g + x/2 \geq 1/2. \quad (23)$$

Under the assumption $d = \omega(np \log^2(1/p))$ and $np \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (21) is $o(1)$ for any fixed k .

Combining Cases 1 and 2, since $|\mathcal{G}_2|$ is finite when k is fixed, we conclude $S_2 = o(1)$.

4.4. Variance bound.

Let

$$m_{n,k} = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^k.$$

Next, we show that for any fixed k ,

$$\text{Var}(m_{n,k}) = o(1). \quad (24)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(m_{n,k}) &= \mathbb{E}[m_{n,k}^2] - (\mathbb{E}m_{n,k})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{k+2}(p(1-p))^k} \cdot \\ &\quad \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k \in [n]} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{i_\ell i_{\ell+1}} \prod_{r=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{j_r j_{r+1}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{i_\ell i_{\ell+1}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{j_r j_{r+1}} \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Whenever the graphs G_I, G_J spanned by two closed walks (i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1) and (j_1, \dots, j_k, j_1) share no common edge, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{i_\ell i_{\ell+1}} \prod_{r=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{j_r j_{r+1}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{i_\ell i_{\ell+1}} \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{j_r j_{r+1}} \right].$$

We can then upper bound $\text{Var}(m_{n,k})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(m_{n,k}) &\leq \frac{1}{n^{k+2}(p(1-p))^k} \cdot \\ &\quad \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n], j_1, \dots, j_k \in [n] \\ E(G_I) \cap E(G_J) \neq \emptyset}} \left\{ \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{i_\ell i_{\ell+1}} \prod_{r=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{j_r j_{r+1}} \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{i_\ell i_{\ell+1}} \right| \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{r=1}^k \mathbf{Q}_{j_r j_{r+1}} \right| \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the sum is over $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k, i_1)$, $J = (j_1, \dots, j_k, j_1)$ such that the associated graph G_I and G_J share at least one common edge.

Define the connected graph $G_H = G_I \cup G_J$. Recall that we defined $v(G)$ as the number of vertices of G , $E(G)$ as the set of edges of G , and $m(e)$ as the multiplicity of each edge $e \in E(G)$. For each $e \in E(G_H)$, we consider $m(e)$ to be the total multiplicity, i.e. $m_H(e) = m_I(e) + m_J(e)$. We rewrite

(25) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var}(m_{n,k}) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n^{k+2}(p(1-p))^k} \cdot \\
& \quad \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n], j_1, \dots, j_k \in [n] \\ E(G_I) \cap E(G_J) \neq \emptyset}} \left\{ \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_H)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_I)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_J)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{G_I, G_J \in \mathcal{G}, E(G_I) \cap E(G_J) \neq \emptyset} \frac{n^{v(G_H)}}{n^{k+2}(p(1-p))^k} \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_H)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| + \\
& \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \frac{n^{v(G_I)}}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_I)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \cdot \frac{n^{v(G_J)}}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_J)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right|,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{G} denotes the collection of distinct unlabeled simple graphs induced by closed walks of length k . The extra $1/n^2$ comes from the fact that any pair of $G_I, G_J \in \mathcal{G}$ shares at least two vertices.

Applying (20) to each G_H (with $2k$ in place of k), we obtain

$$\frac{n^{v(G_H)}}{n^{k+2}(p(1-p))^k} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_H)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{n^{v(G_H)}}{n^{k+1}(p(1-p))^k} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_H)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| = o(1).$$

Similarly, applying (20) to each $G_I, G_J \in \mathcal{G}$ yields

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \cdot \frac{n^{v(G_I)}}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_I)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \cdot \frac{n^{v(G_J)}}{n^{k/2+1}(p(1-p))^{k/2}} \cdot \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G_J)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| = o(1).$$

Since \mathcal{G} is finite for fixed k , summing over all possibilities yields the total contribution of the joint term is $o(1)$. Then (24) holds.

4.5. Proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Combining all the estimates above, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} m_{n,k} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^k = S_1 + S_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m+1} \binom{2m}{m} & \text{if } k = 2m, \\ 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Since (24) holds, this implies $m_{n,k}$ converges in probability to the k -th moment of the semicircle law. Standard moment convergence results (see, e.g., [6, 4]) imply the empirical spectral distribution of $\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ converges weakly in probability to the semicircle law.

Define \mathbf{B} to be the $n \times n$ matrix obtained by subtracting p from each entry of \mathbf{A} , including the diagonal entries. Then $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) = 1$. By Lemma A.1,

$$\| F^{\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}} - F^{\frac{\mathbf{B}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}} \| \leq \frac{1}{n}, \tag{26}$$

and thus $\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ and $\frac{\mathbf{B}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ have the same limiting spectral distribution. Note that the matrix \mathbf{Q} differs from \mathbf{B} only in the diagonal entries. Moreover, adding $p\mathbb{I}$, where \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix, shifts the eigenvalues by at most $p/\sqrt{np(1-p)} = o(1)$. Therefore $\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ and $\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}$ have the same limiting spectral distribution. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

Now we aim to show that for $\mathcal{G}(n, p, d)$, when $np = \alpha$ for some fixed constant $\alpha > 0$, the normalized adjacency matrix attains the same limiting spectral distribution as $\mathcal{G}(n, \frac{\alpha}{n})$. Again, we start with the trace expansion.

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right)^k = \frac{1}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1 i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2 i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_{k-1} i_k} \mathbf{Q}_{i_k i_1}], \quad (27)$$

We classify closed walks into two categories:

- \mathcal{C}_1 : Closed walks in which the resulting simple graph is a tree.
- \mathcal{C}_2 : All other closed walks not included in \mathcal{C}_1 .

Our goal is to demonstrate that when $n \rightarrow \infty$, walks belonging to \mathcal{C}_1 contribute to (27), whereas those in \mathcal{C}_2 have vanishing contributions.

5.1. Estimating S_1 . By our definition, $S_1 = 0$ when k is odd, since closed walks on a tree must be of even length. Note that \mathcal{C}_1 here differs from the definition in Section 4; here we also consider walks that may traverse some edges more than twice.

Now assume $k = 2m$. For each closed walk $I \in \mathcal{C}_1$, the graph $G_I = (V, E)$ is a tree, and we must have $|V| = |E| + 1 \leq m + 1$ and $|E| \leq m$. Using (27), we can write:

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{2m}) \in \mathcal{C}_1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1 i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2 i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_{2m} i_1}].$$

Let \mathcal{T}_ℓ denote the set of all rooted planar trees with $\ell + 1$ vertices. Then

$$|\mathcal{T}_\ell| = \frac{1}{\ell + 1} \binom{2\ell}{\ell}, \quad (28)$$

which is the ℓ -th Catalan number. For each unlabeled rooted planar tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell$, there are $n(n-1) \cdots (n-\ell) = (1 + o(1))n^{\ell+1}$ ways to assign distinct vertex labels from $[n]$. Each such labeled tree corresponds to a closed walk (i_1, \dots, i_k) , where the vertex sequence follows a depth-first search traversal of T . We apply a canonical labeling using $\{1, \dots, \ell + 1\}$ such that whenever the k -th distinct vertex v is first visited in the depth-first search of T , it is assigned label $k \in [\ell + 1]$.

We can now rewrite S_1 as

$$S_1 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{n(n-1) \cdots (n-\ell)}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\ell} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right] \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_e = \mathbf{Q}_{ij}$ if $e = \{i, j\}$. By Lemma A.2, we have that for $m(e) \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)}] = (1 + o(1))p.$$

Therefore, for a tree T with ℓ edges, for any fixed ℓ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(T)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} = [(1 + o(1))p]^\ell = (1 + o(1))p^\ell. \quad (30)$$

With (30) and (28), we can rewrite (29) into

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{n^{\ell+1}}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell+1} \binom{2\ell}{\ell} \cdot (1+o(1))p^\ell \\
&= (1+o(1)) \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{(np)^\ell}{\alpha^m} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell+1} \binom{2\ell}{\ell} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{\alpha^{m-\ell}} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell+1} \binom{2\ell}{\ell} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

This matches the moments of the limiting spectral distribution of $\mathcal{G}(n, \frac{\alpha}{n})$, as shown in (1).

5.2. Bounding S_2 . We apply the graph decomposition algorithm in Section 4.3.1 and replace np with α to bound S_2 .

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_2| &\leq \frac{1}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) \in \mathcal{C}_2} |\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Q}_{i_1, i_2} \mathbf{Q}_{i_2, i_3} \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{i_k, i_1}]| \\
&\leq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_2} \frac{n^{v(G)}}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

For each $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$, from (19),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n^{v(G)}}{n\alpha^{k/2}} \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| &\leq \alpha^{-k/2} 2^{t(G)} (np)^{v(G)-1} (C\tau)^{c(G)-2g(G)+x(G)} \left(C\sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g(G)-t(G)-x(G)} \\
&= \alpha^{v-1-k/2} 2^t \left(2C\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}} \right)^{c-2g+x} \left(C\sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g-t-x}, \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the upper bound on τ in Lemma A.3. Same as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, since we have (22) and (23), when $d = \omega(\log^2(n))$, we obtain (31) is $o(1)$ for any fixed k . Since $|\mathcal{G}_2|$ is finite when k is fixed, we conclude $S_2 = o(1)$. Therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right)^k = \begin{cases} \sum_{l=1}^m \alpha^{l-m} \cdot \frac{1}{l+1} \binom{2l}{l} & k = 2m \\ 0 & k = 2m+1 \end{cases}.$$

5.3. Proof of Theorem 2.2. By exactly the same argument as in Section 4.4, we obtain for each fixed k ,

$$\text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{n} \text{tr} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right)^k \right) = (1).$$

Then the empirical spectral distribution of $\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$ converges weakly in probability to ν_α . Since $\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$ and $\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$ have the same limiting spectral distribution due to (26), this finishes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

In this section, we apply our graph decomposition method to bound the second eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} . Recall from (19), we have the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *Assume $p \in (0, p_0]$ with a constant $p_0 < 1/2$ and $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p)$ for some constant $C_1 > 0$ depending on p_0 . For each fixed graph G spanned by a closed walk of length k , we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in E(G)} \mathbf{Q}_e^{m(e)} \right| \leq 2^{t(G)} p^{v(G)-1} (C\tau)^{c(G)-2g(G)+x(G)} \left(C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g(G)-t(G)-x(G)} \quad (32)$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$ such that $C\tau < 1$. Here

- $v(G)$ is the number of vertices in G ;
- $t(G)$ is the number of length-2 ears in G ;
- $x(G)$ is the number of length-1 ears in G ;
- $g(G) = e(G) - v(G) + 1$ is the excess number of G , which is also equal to the total number of ears in the ear decomposition of G ;
- $c(G)$ is the number of total edges in all 2-edge connected components.

Proof. In Section 4.3.1, we have shown (32) for any graph that is not a tree. Since (32) also holds when G is a tree, this finishes the proof. \square

Let $b(G)$ be the number of single edges in G . We will use the following counting lemma in [44].

Lemma 6.2 (Claim 3.10 in [44]). *The number of closed walks in the trace expansion whose associated graph G satisfies $e(G) = e, b(G) = b, g(G) = g$ is at most $n^{e+1-g} k^{2(k-b+g)}$.*

With Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let k be even. From (32) and Lemma 6.2, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{Q}^k \leq \sum_{c=0}^k \sum_{b=0}^c \sum_{x=0}^k \sum_{g=0}^{\frac{c+x}{2}} \sum_{e=c}^{\frac{k+b}{2}} \sum_{t=0}^g n^{e+1-g} k^{2(k-b+g)} 2^t p^{e-g} (C\tau)^{c-2g+x} \left(C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g-t-x},$$

where we have the range $0 \leq g \leq \frac{c+x}{2}$ and $c \leq e \leq \frac{k+b}{2}$ by counting the number of ears and edges respectively. Since we assume $\log(1/p) \geq 4$, summing over t , we obtain,

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{Q}^k \leq k \sum_{c=0}^k \sum_{b=0}^c \sum_{x=0}^k \sum_{g=0}^{\frac{c+x}{2}} \sum_{e=c}^{\frac{k+b}{2}} n^{e+1-g} k^{2(k-b+g)} p^{e-g} (C\tau)^{c-2g+x} \left(C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g-x}.$$

Since $np \geq 1$, summing over e yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{Q}^k &\leq nk^2 \sum_{c=0}^k \sum_{b=0}^c \sum_{x=0}^k \sum_{g=0}^{\frac{c+x}{2}} (np)^{\frac{k+b}{2}-g} k^{2(k-b+g)} (C\tau)^{c-2g+x} \left(C \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^{g-x} \\ &\leq nk^3 \sum_{c=0}^k \sum_{b=0}^c \sum_{x=0}^k \\ &\quad \max\{(C\tau)^c k^{2(k-b)} (np)^{\frac{k+b}{2}} \left(\tau / \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^x, (np)^{\frac{k+b-c-x}{2}} k^{2(k-b)+c+x} (C \sqrt{\log(1/p)})^{c-x/2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume $np \geq k^4$. Since $\tau / \sqrt{\log(1/p)} \leq 1$ and $\frac{k^2}{Cnp\sqrt{\log(1/p)}} \leq 1$, summing over x , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{Q}^k \leq nk^4 \sum_{c=0}^k \sum_{b=0}^c \max\{(C\tau)^c k^{2(k-b)} (np)^{\frac{k+b}{2}}, (np)^{\frac{k+b-c}{2}} k^{2(k-b)+c} (C \sqrt{\log(1/p)})^c\}.$$

Assume $k \geq \log n$. Since $np \geq k^4$, we further have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr} \mathbf{Q}^k &\leq nk^5 \sum_{c=0}^k \max \left\{ (C\tau)^c k^{2(k-c)} (np)^{\frac{k+c}{2}}, (np)^{\frac{k}{2}} k^{2k-c} \left(C\sqrt{\log(1/p)} \right)^c \right\} \\ &\leq nk^6 \max \left\{ k^{2k} (np)^{\frac{k}{2}}, (C\tau np)^k, (np)^{\frac{k}{2}} k^k (C\sqrt{\log(1/p)})^k \right\} \\ &= nk^6 \max \left\{ k^{2k} (np)^{\frac{k}{2}}, (C\tau np)^k \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Take $k = 4\lfloor \gamma \log n \rfloor$ for any $\gamma \geq 1$. Then by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P} (\|\mathbf{Q}\| \geq 3 \max\{(4\gamma \log n)^4 \sqrt{np}, C\tau np\}) \leq nk^6 3^{-k} \leq n^{-\gamma}.$$

Therefore when $np \geq (4\gamma \log(n))^4$ and $\log(1/p) \geq 4$, with probability $1 - n^{-\gamma}$,

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\| \leq 3 \left((\gamma \log n)^4 \sqrt{np} + \tau np \right).$$

Moreover, by the Courant min-max theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\mathbf{A}) &\leq \|\mathbf{A} - p\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| + \|p\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| + p \\ &\leq 4 \left((\gamma \log n)^4 \sqrt{np} + \tau np \right).\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.6

Same as in [1], we will show that the following deterministic conditions hold for random geometric graphs with high probability when $d = \Omega(\log(1/p) \log^2(n))$ and $np = \Omega(\log^{10}(n))$.

Lemma 7.1 (Theorem 11 in [38]). *Let G be a graph with n vertices, $p_0 \in (0, 1)$. Let \mathbf{A} be its adjacency matrix and $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$, where \mathbf{D} is the diagonal degree matrix. Define $\Delta_{\mathbf{A}} := \mathbf{A} - p\mathbf{J}$, with \mathbf{J} denoting the $n \times n$ all-ones matrix and $\Delta_{\mathbf{L}} := \mathbf{L} - np_0\mathbf{I} + p_0\mathbf{J}$. If the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) $\frac{\|\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}\|}{np_0} < \frac{1}{12}$,
- (ii) $\frac{\|\Delta_{\mathbf{L}}\|}{np_0} < \frac{1}{4}$,
- (iii) $\frac{\pi/4}{\sin^{-1}(12\|\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}\|/(np))} > \frac{\log(n/6)}{\log\left(\frac{np}{2\|\Delta_{\mathbf{L}}\|} - 1\right)} + 1$,

then the homogeneous Kuramoto model on G globally synchronizes.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. By Theorem 2.3 when $d = \Omega(\log(1/p))$ and $np = \Omega(\log^{10}(n))$, $p \leq e^{-4}$ for $\mathcal{G}(n, d, p)$, we have with probability $1 - O(n^{-2})$,

$$\frac{\|\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}\|}{np} \leq C \left(\frac{\log^4 n}{\sqrt{np}} + \tau \right)$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$. To meet condition (i) in Lemma 7.1, it suffices to have

$$\frac{\log^4 n}{\sqrt{np}} \leq \frac{1}{24C}, \text{ and } \tau \leq \frac{1}{24C}.$$

From Lemma A.3, this is equivalent to having

$$np \geq C_1 \log^8 n, \text{ and } d \geq C_2 \log(1/p), \quad (33)$$

where both C_1 and C_2 are absolute constants. Note that when $p < e^{-4}$ and under (33),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{L}}\| &= \|\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A} - np\mathbf{I} + p\mathbf{J}\| = \|\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D} + \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A} - p\mathbf{I}\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{D} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}\| + \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{A}\| + p \leq \|\mathbf{D} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}\| + \frac{1}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

By Chernoff's inequality, with probability $1 - O(n^{-2})$, $\|\mathbf{D} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{D}\| \leq \frac{1}{8}$ when $np \geq C_1 \log n$ for sufficiently large C_1 . Therefore, Condition (ii) holds. It has been checked in [1, Proof of Theorem 1] that under Conditions (i) and (ii), if additionally

$$\frac{\|\Delta_{\mathbf{A}}\|}{np} \leq \frac{1}{48 \log n},$$

Condition (iii) also holds. To meet this condition, we need to upgrade the conditions in (33) by ensuring:

$$np \geq C_3 \log^{10} n, \quad d \geq C_4 \log(1/p) \log^2 n,$$

where both C_3 and C_4 are absolute constants. This finishes the proof. \square

Acknowledgments. Y.Z. was partially supported by an AMS-Simons Travel Grant and the Simons Grant MPS-TSM-00013944. This material is based upon work supported by the Swedish Research Council under grant no. 202106594 while Y. Zhu was in residence at Institut Mittag-Leffler in Djursholm, Sweden during the Fall of 2024.

REFERENCES

- [1] Pedro Abdalla, Afonso S Bandeira, and Clara Invernizzi. Guarantees for spontaneous synchronization on random geometric graphs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 23(1):779–790, 2024.
- [2] Pedro Abdalla, Afonso S Bandeira, Martin Kassabov, Victor Souza, Steven H Strogatz, and Alex Townsend. Expander graphs are globally synchronizing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12788*, 2022.
- [3] Kartick Adhikari, Robert J Adler, Omer Bobrowski, and Ron Rosenthal. On the spectrum of dense random geometric graphs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(3):1734–1773, 2022.
- [4] Greg W Anderson, Alice Guionnet, and Ofer Zeitouni. *An introduction to random matrices*. Number 118. Cambridge university press, 2010.
- [5] Samuel Baguley, Andreas Göbel, Marcus Pappik, and Leon Schiller. Testing thresholds and spectral properties of high-dimensional random toroidal graphs via edgeworth-style expansions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18346*, 2025.
- [6] Zhidong Bai and Jack W Silverstein. *Spectral analysis of large dimensional random matrices*, volume 20. Springer, 2010.
- [7] Kiril Bangachev and Guy Bresler. On the fourier coefficients of high-dimensional random geometric graphs. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 549–560, 2024.
- [8] Kiril Bangachev and Guy Bresler. Sandwiching random geometric graphs and erdos-renyi with applications: Sharp thresholds, robust testing, and enumeration. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 310–321, 2025.
- [9] Florent Benaych-Georges, Charles Bordenave, and Antti Knowles. Spectral radii of sparse random matrices. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré-Probabilités et Statistiques*, volume 56, pages 2141–2161, 2020.
- [10] Charles Bordenave. Eigenvalues of euclidean random matrices. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 33(4):515–532, 2008.
- [11] Charles Bordenave and Marc Lelarge. Resolvent of large random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 37(3):332–352, 2010.
- [12] Matthew Brennan, Guy Bresler, and Brice Huang. Threshold for detecting high dimensional geometry in anisotropic random geometric graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 64(1):125–137, 2024.
- [13] Sébastien Bubeck, Jian Ding, Ronen Eldan, and Miklós Z Rácz. Testing for high-dimensional geometry in random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(3):503–532, 2016.
- [14] Xiuyuan Cheng and Amit Singer. The spectrum of random inner-product kernel matrices. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 2(04):1350010, 2013.
- [15] Francisco Cirelli, Pablo Groisman, Ruojun Huang, and Hernán Vivas. Scaling limit of the kuramoto model on random geometric graphs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 85(4):1719–1748, 2025.
- [16] Jesper Dall and M. Christensen. Random geometric graphs. *Physical Review E*, 66(1):016121, 2002.

- [17] Cecilia De Vita, Julián Fernández Bonder, and Pablo Groisman. The energy landscape of the kuramoto model in random geometric graphs in a circle. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 24(1):1–15, 2025.
- [18] Cecilia De Vita, Pablo Groisman, and Ruojun Huang. Phase synchronization in random geometric graphs on the 2d sphere. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01151*, 2025.
- [19] Luc Devroye, András György, Gábor Lugosi, and Frederic Udina. High-dimensional random geometric graphs and their clique number. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:2481 – 2508, 2011.
- [20] Yen Do and Van Vu. The spectrum of random kernel matrices: universality results for rough and varying kernels. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 2(03):1350005, 2013.
- [21] Florian Dörfler and Francesco Bullo. Synchronization in complex networks of phase oscillators: A survey. *Automatica*, 50(6):1539–1564, 2014.
- [22] Florian Dörfler, Michael Chertkov, and Francesco Bullo. Synchronization in complex oscillator networks and smart grids. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(6):2005–2010, 2013.
- [23] Sofia Dubova, Yue M Lu, Benjamin McKenna, and Horng-Tzer Yau. Universality for the global spectrum of random inner-product kernel matrices in the polynomial regime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18280*, 2023.
- [24] Noureddine El Karoui. The spectrum of kernel random matrices. *Annals of statistics*, 38(1):1–50, 2010.
- [25] Nathanaël Enriquez and Laurent Ménard. Spectra of large diluted but bushy random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(1):160–184, 2016.
- [26] Zhou Fan and Zhichao Wang. Spectra of the conjugate kernel and neural tangent kernel for linear-width neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7710–7721, 2020.
- [27] Uriel Feige and Eran Ofek. Spectral techniques applied to sparse random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 27(2):251–275, 2005.
- [28] Joel Friedman. *A proof of Alon’s second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems*. American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
- [29] Alice Guionnet and Vanessa Piccolo. Global law of conjugate kernel random matrices with heavy-tailed weights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18428*, 2025.
- [30] Mounia Hamidouche, Laura Cottatellucci, and Konstantin Avrachenkov. On the normalized laplacian spectra of random geometric graphs. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 36(1):46–77, 2023.
- [31] Desmond J Higham, Marija Rašajski, and Nataša Pržulj. Fitting a geometric graph to a protein–protein interaction network. *Bioinformatics*, 24(8):1093–1099, 2008.
- [32] Peter D Hoff, Adrian E Raftery, and Mark S Handcock. Latent space approaches to social network analysis. *Journal of the american Statistical association*, 97(460):1090–1098, 2002.
- [33] John Hopcroft and Robert Tarjan. Algorithm 447: efficient algorithms for graph manipulation. *Communications of the ACM*, 16(6):372–378, 1973.
- [34] Vishesh Jain, Clayton Mizgerd, and Mehtaab Sawhney. The random graph process is globally synchronizing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12205*, 2025.
- [35] Zilin Jiang. On spectral radii of unraveled balls. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 136:72–80, 2019.
- [36] Paul Jung and Jaehun Lee. Delocalization and limiting spectral distribution of erdős-rényi graphs with constant expected degree. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 2018.
- [37] Martin Kassabov, Steven H Strogatz, and Alex Townsend. Sufficiently dense kuramoto networks are globally synchronizing. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31(7), 2021.
- [38] Martin Kassabov, Steven H Strogatz, and Alex Townsend. A global synchronization theorem for oscillators on a random graph. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 32(9), 2022.
- [39] Yoshiki Kuramoto. Self-entrainment of a population of coupled non-linear oscillators. In *International symposium on mathematical problems in theoretical physics: January 23–29, 1975, kyoto university, kyoto/Japan*, pages 420–422. Springer, 2005.
- [40] Can M Le, Elizaveta Levina, and Roman Vershynin. Concentration and regularization of random graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 51(3):538–561, 2017.
- [41] Shuangping Li and Tselil Schramm. Spectral clustering in the gaussian mixture block model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00979*, 2023.
- [42] Shuyang Ling, Ruitu Xu, and Afonso S Bandeira. On the landscape of synchronization networks: A perspective from nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 29(3):1879–1907, 2019.
- [43] Siqi Liu, Sidhanth Mohanty, Tselil Schramm, and Elizabeth Yang. Testing thresholds for high-dimensional sparse random geometric graphs. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 672–677, 2022.
- [44] Siqi Liu, Sidhanth Mohanty, Tselil Schramm, and Elizabeth Yang. Local and global expansion in random geometric graphs. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 817–825, 2023.
- [45] Suqi Liu and Miklós Z Rácz. A probabilistic view of latent space graphs and phase transitions. *Bernoulli*, 29(3):2417–2441, 2023.

- [46] Cosme Louart, Zhenyu Liao, and Romain Couillet. A random matrix approach to neural networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 28(2):1190–1248, 2018.
- [47] Yue M Lu and Horng-Tzer Yau. An equivalence principle for the spectrum of random inner-product kernel matrices with polynomial scalings. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 35(4):2411–2470, 2025.
- [48] Cheng Mao and Shenduo Zhang. Impossibility of latent inner product recovery via rate distortion. In *2024 60th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pages 01–08. IEEE, 2024.
- [49] Guoqiang Mao and Brian DO Anderson. Connectivity of large wireless networks under a general connection model. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(3):1761–1772, 2012.
- [50] Yael Maon, Baruch Schieber, and Uzi Vishkin. Parallel ear decomposition search (eds) and st-numbering in graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 47:277–298, 1986.
- [51] Song Mei, Theodor Misiakiewicz, and Andrea Montanari. Generalization error of random feature and kernel methods: hypercontractivity and kernel matrix concentration. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 59:3–84, 2022.
- [52] Parthe Pandit, Zhichao Wang, and Yizhe Zhu. Universality of kernel random matrices and kernel regression in the quadratic regime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01062*, 2024.
- [53] Jeffrey Pennington and Pratik Worah. Nonlinear random matrix theory for deep learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [54] Mathew Penrose. *Random Geometric Graphs*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [55] Miklós Z Rácz and Sébastien Bubeck. Basic models and questions in statistical network analysis. *Statistics Surveys*, 11:1–47, 2017.
- [56] Herbert Ellis Robbins. A theorem on graphs, with an application to a problem of traffic control. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 46(5):281–283, 1939.
- [57] Francisco A Rodrigues, Thomas K DM Peron, Peng Ji, and Jürgen Kurths. The kuramoto model in complex networks. *Physics Reports*, 610:1–98, 2016.
- [58] Richard P Stanley. Enumerative combinatorics volume 1 second edition. *Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics*, 2011.
- [59] Richard Taylor. There is no non-zero stable fixed point for dense networks in the homogeneous kuramoto model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 45(5):055102, 2012.
- [60] Linh V Tran, Van H Vu, and Ke Wang. Sparse random graphs: Eigenvalues and eigenvectors. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 42(1):110–134, 2013.
- [61] Van H Vu. Spectral norm of random matrices. *Combinatorica*, 27(6):721–736, 2007.
- [62] Zhichao Wang and Yizhe Zhu. Deformed semicircle law and concentration of nonlinear random matrices for ultra-wide neural networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 34(2):1896–1947, 2024.
- [63] Yizhe Zhu. A graphon approach to limiting spectral distributions of wigner-type matrices. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 56(1):251–279, 2020.

APPENDIX A. ADDITIONAL PROOFS AND AUXILIARY LEMMAS

A.1. Proof of Lemma 3.4.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. The if and only if statement is due to [56]. Algorithm 1 describes the process of finding an ear decomposition based on the Depth-First Search (DFS), which guarantees R_1 is a cycle containing a given vertex in G . \square

A.2. Auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma A.1 (Rank inequality, Theorem A.43 in [6]). *Let A_n, B_n be two $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices. Let F^{A_n}, F^{B_n} be the cumulative distribution function of the empirical spectral distributions of A_n and B_n . Then*

$$\|F^{A_n} - F^{B_n}\| \leq \frac{\text{rank}(A_n - B_n)}{n},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the L^∞ -norm.

Lemma A.2 (Multiplicity reduction). *For all integer $k \geq 1$, there exists α_k and β_k , s.t.*

$$(\mathbf{A}_e - p)^k = (\mathbf{A}_e - p)\alpha_k + \beta_k,$$

where $\alpha_k \in [0, 1]$, $|\beta_k| \leq 2p(1 - p)$.

Algorithm 1 Ear Decomposition via DFS**Require:** A 2-edge-connected graph $G = (V, E)$ **Ensure:** A sequence of ears (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_s) 1: Perform a DFS traversal on G to classify each edge as a *tree edge* or a *back edge*.

2: Root the DFS tree and orient:

- All tree edges *toward* the root
- All back edges *away from* the root

3: **for** each back edge **do**

4: Traverse the unique directed cycle formed by the back edge and DFS tree edges

5: Stop traversal when a previously visited vertex is reached

6: Add the path to the ear sequence as a new ear R_i 7: **end for**8: **return** (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_s) *Proof.* A simple calculation yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{A}_e - p)^k &= \mathbf{A}_e((1-p)^k - (-p)^k) + (-p)^k \\
&= (\mathbf{A}_e - p)((1-p)^k - (-p)^k) + p(1-p)^k + (-p)^{k+1} + (-p)^k \\
&= (\mathbf{A}_e - p)\alpha_k + \beta_k,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha_k = (1-p)^k - (-p)^k, \quad \beta_k = p(1-p)^k + (1-p)(-p)^k.$$

We can check $\alpha_k \in [0, 1]$ and $|\beta_k| \leq 2p(1-p)$. \square

A.3. Relations between d, p , and τ . A typical inner product of two random vectors $\langle x_i, x_j \rangle$ on the unit sphere is of order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$. Choosing the threshold τ above this typical scale yields a sparse geometric random graph. Lemma A.3 further shows that $\tau \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}}$, establishing the precise relation among τ , p , and d .

Lemma A.3 (Two sided bounds on τ). *There is a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for any $p \in (0, 1/2]$,*

$$\left(C^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} - p \right) \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}} \right) \wedge \frac{1}{2} \leq \tau \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}}.$$

In particular, assume $p \in (0, p_0]$ for a constant $p_0 < 1/2$. There exists a universal constant $C_0 > 0$ such that when $d \geq C_0 \log(1/p)$, we have

$$C^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} - p_0 \right) \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}} \leq \tau \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}}. \quad (34)$$

Proof. The lower bound on τ is from Lemma 2 in [13] and the upper bound on τ is due to [43, Lemma 3.6]. \square

A.4. Subgraph probability estimates. We will use the following theorem from [44] to estimate the probability of a certain subgraph appearing in the random geometric graph. We relate subgraph probabilities to the mixing rate of a random walk on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Let P_p denote the transition kernel of a random walk, where at each step, we walk from a point $x \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ to a uniformly random point in the measure- p cap around it. Let ρ denote the uniform distribution on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Our subgraph probability estimates will depend on the following result from [44]:

Lemma A.4. *Assume $p \in (0, p_0]$ with any constant $p_0 < 1/2$. For any probability distribution μ over \mathbb{S}^{d-1} and any integer $k \geq 1$, the total variation distance between $P_p^k \mu$ and ρ satisfies*

$$d_{TV}(P_p^k \mu, \rho) \leq ((1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau)^{k-1} (1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\sqrt{\log(1/p)},$$

where $o_{d\tau^2}(1)$ denotes a function that goes to 0 as $d\tau^2 \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, assuming $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p)$ for a constant C_1 depending on p_0 , there is a constant $C \geq 1$ depending on p_0 such that $C\tau < 1$ and

$$d_{TV}(P_p^k \mu, \rho) \leq C(C\tau)^{k-1} \sqrt{\log(1/p)}. \quad (35)$$

Proof. The first claim follows from [44, Corollary 4.7] based on [44, Theorem 4.19]. For the second statement, due to the lower bound on τ in (34), when $d \geq C_0 \log(1/p)$,

$$d\tau^2 \geq C_1^{-2}(1/2 - p_0)^2 \log(1/p_0),$$

where C_1 is an absolute constant. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ depending on p_0 such that $(1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau \leq C$. Now let $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p)$ for a sufficiently large constant $C_1 > C_0$, from the upper bound on τ in (34), we can guarantee that $(1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau \leq C\tau < 1$. \square

With Lemma A.4, we can obtain the following useful lemma on subgraph probabilities. These bounds have been derived in [44] and are included here for completeness.

Lemma A.5 (Subgraph probability). *Assume $p \in (0, p_0]$ with any constant $p_0 < 1/2$. Let C_ℓ be a cycle of length ℓ with vertices $v_0, \dots, v_{\ell-1}$. Then there are constants $C, C_1 > 0$ depending only on p_0 such that when $d \geq C_1 \log(1/p)$, we have $C\tau < 1$ and*

$$|\mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in C_\ell} \mathbf{A}_e - p^\ell| \leq Cp^{\ell-1}(C\tau)^{\ell-2} \sqrt{\log(1/p)}.$$

Similarly, let P_ℓ be a path of length $\ell \geq 2$ with distinct vertices v_0, \dots, v_ℓ . Then

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}} \prod_{e \in P_\ell} \mathbf{A}_e - p^\ell \right| \leq Cp^{\ell-1}(C\tau)^{\ell-2} \sqrt{\log(1/p)},$$

where the expectation is conditioned on the random vectors corresponding to v_0, v_ℓ and is taken over random vectors corresponding to $v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}$.

Proof. We first consider the cycle probability. Let $\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\ell-1}$ be the random vectors associated with $v_0, \dots, v_{\ell-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in C_\ell} \mathbf{A}_e - p^\ell| &= |\mathbb{P}(C_\ell \in G) - p^\ell| \\ &= \left| p^{\ell-1} \mathbb{P}(\langle \mathbf{v}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{v}_0 \rangle \geq \tau | \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \geq \tau, 0 \leq i \leq \ell-2) - p^\ell \right| \\ &\leq p^{\ell-1} \left(p + d_{TV}(P_p^{\ell-1} \delta_{\mathbf{v}_0}, \rho) \right) - p^\ell \\ &= p^{\ell-1} d_{TV}(P_p^{\ell-1} \delta_{\mathbf{v}_0}, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (35), we get

$$|\mathbb{E} \prod_{e \in C_\ell} \mathbf{A}_e - p^\ell| \leq Cp^{\ell-1}(C\tau)^{\ell-2} \sqrt{\log(1/p)}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbb{E}_{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell-1}} \prod_{e \in P_\ell} \mathbf{A}_e - p^\ell \right| &= \left| \mathbb{P}(\langle \mathbf{v}_\ell, \mathbf{v}_{\ell-1} \geq \tau, \dots, \langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_0 \rangle \geq \tau) - p^\ell \right| \\
&= \left| p^{\ell-1} \mathbb{P}(\langle \mathbf{v}_\ell, \mathbf{v}_{\ell-1} \geq \tau | \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \geq \tau, 0 \leq i \leq \ell-2) - p^\ell \right| \\
&\leq p^{\ell-1} \left(p + d_{TV}(P_p^{\ell-1} \delta_{\mathbf{v}_0}, \rho) \right) - p^\ell \\
&= p^{\ell-1} d_{TV}(P_p^{\ell-1} \delta_{\mathbf{v}_0}, \rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (35) again finishes the proof. \square

APPENDIX B. COMPARISON WITH [44]

We clarify that the proof of [44, Theorem 1.7] implicitly assumes several additional conditions beyond those stated in the theorem, and we provide a brief explanation of these requirements.

The mixing rate of the p -cap random walk was given in [44, Theorem 1.17]:

$$d_{TV}(P_p^k \alpha, \rho) \leq ((1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau)^{k-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log(1/p)}. \quad (36)$$

On the other hand, their general Theorem 1.10 requires that for any $k \geq 1$,

$$d_{TV}(X^k \alpha, \rho) \leq C \lambda^k \quad (37)$$

and

$$\lambda \in [(np)^{-1/2}, 1]. \quad (38)$$

The authors use (36) and Theorem 1.10 to get their Theorem 1.7 under the condition

$$np = \omega(C^6 \log^4 n), \quad (39)$$

where C in (39) is the same parameter in (37). To apply Theorem 1.10, one has to check the three conditions (37), (38), and (39). Below, we discuss the choice of λ in two cases:

- **Case 1:** $(1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{np}}$. We pick $\lambda = (1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau$. Here

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log(1/p)}}{(1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau} = O\left(\sqrt{d}\right),$$

due to (36) and $\tau \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/p)}{d}}$ from Lemma A.3. Thus the restriction (39) becomes $np = \omega(d^3 \log^4(n))$.

- **Case 2:** $(1 + o_{d\tau^2}(1))\tau < \frac{1}{\sqrt{np}}$. The smallest λ one can choose is $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{np}}$ in (37). This indicates $C = \sqrt{np} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log(1/p)}$, which contradicts with (39).

Therefore, $np = \omega(d^3 \log^4(n))$ and $\tau \geq (np)^{-1/2}$ are required to apply [44, Theorem 1.10]. Instead, our Theorem 2.3 improves the sparsity condition to $np \geq C_0 \log^4 n$ for an absolute constant C_0 .

DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH AND FINANCIAL ENGINEERING, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
Email address: yc0570@princeton.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
Email address: yizhezhu@usc.edu