

Statistical hypothesis testing for differences between layers in dynamic multiplex networks

Maximilian Baum, Francesco Sanna Passino, and Axel Gandy

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London
180 Queen's Gate, SW7 2AZ, London (United Kingdom)

Abstract

With the emergence of dynamic multiplex networks, corresponding to graphs where multiple types of edges evolve over time, a key inferential task is to determine whether the layers associated with different edge types differ in their connectivity. In this work, we introduce a hypothesis testing framework, under a latent space network model, for assessing whether the layers share a common latent representation. The method we propose extends previous literature related to the problem of pairwise testing for random graphs and enables global testing of differences between layers in multiplex graphs. While we introduce the method as a test for differences between layers, it can easily be adapted to test for differences between time points. We construct a test statistic based on a spectral embedding of an unfolded representation of the graph adjacency matrices and demonstrate its ability to detect differences across layers in the asymptotic regime where the number of nodes in each graph tends to infinity. The finite-sample properties of the test are empirically demonstrated by assessing its performance on both simulated data and a biological dataset describing the neural activity of larval *Drosophila*.

Keywords — random graphs, hypothesis testing, spectral embedding, stochastic blockmodel.

1 Introduction

With the rise of increasingly complex graph-based data, the ability to answer fundamental statistical questions about these objects becomes increasingly relevant. In particular, when studying graphs which are observed at multiple points in time and which present multiple connection types through different layers, a question that is of high practical importance is whether any of these observed graphs are structurally different from the others or whether they are independent realizations of the same random process. For instance, in computer network monitoring, such analysis can reveal whether traffic patterns remain stable over time or exhibit structural shifts due to attacks or configuration changes. Similarly, in neuroscience, testing for differences across layers of a multiplex brain network can shed light on how specific types of neural connections influence learning or behavior (*cf.* Section 5). In this work, we formulate this problem within a *statistical hypothesis testing* framework.

More formally, we focus on a dynamic multiplex network with $K \in \mathbb{N}$ layers observed at $T \in \mathbb{N}$ time points, denoted by $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \{\mathcal{E}_{k,t}\}_{k \in [K], t \in [T]})$, where $\mathcal{V} = [n]$ is a set of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ nodes shared across all layers and time points, with $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{k,t} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ representing the edges of type k at time t , such that $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_{k,t}$ if and only if nodes $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ are connected by an edge of type k at time t . We do not

assume that edge sets are disjoint: for any (k, t) and (k', t') , $\mathcal{E}_{k,t} \cap \mathcal{E}_{k',t'}$ may be nonempty, allowing the same pair of nodes to be connected across multiple layers and time points.

Our goal is to determine whether the layers of \mathcal{G} correspond to realizations of a shared latent structure or whether they differ systematically. More precisely, we consider the null hypothesis that, while the edge sets $\mathcal{E}_{k,t}$ may vary over time points $t \in [T]$, they arise from a common generative mechanism for all $k \in [K]$, against the alternative that at least one layer deviates in its underlying connectivity. In order to address this question, we adopt tools from the spectral embedding literature. In particular, we build upon the *Doubly Unfolded Adjacency Spectral Embedding* (DUASE; Baum et al., 2024) method to develop a statistical test based on its latent position estimates. This approach builds on work developed for pairwise tests between individual graphs based on standard adjacency spectral embedding (Tang et al., 2017a,b), extending them to a general framework for *joint* testing in multilayer and dynamic settings. Furthermore, we provide theoretical results describing the performance of the test as the number of nodes increases.

To the best of our knowledge, the proposed testing mechanism is the first test of its kind, and no other procedures have been formally introduced in the literature to test whether layers in dynamic multiplex graphs differ in their underlying connectivity patterns.

We begin this work with a brief overview of statistical testing for graphs in Section 1.1, before formally introducing the joint hypothesis testing problem for random graphs in Section 2. The testing methodology is detailed in Section 3, and Section 3.2 describes a bootstrap procedure that can be used to estimate the critical value for an α -level test. The performance of these methods is assessed on both simulated data (cf. Section 4) and biological learning networks of larval *Drosophila* (cf. Section 5).

1.1 Background and related literature

1.1.1 Statistical testing for graphs

The topic of hypothesis testing for graphs has been extensively explored in literature. However, much of the existing work is centered around the topic of testing hypotheses relating to a single graph. Within this vein, Green and Shalizi (2022) explore the problem of bootstrapping to estimate the distribution of different subgraph structures when the nodes of a graphs are exchangeable, while Du and Tang (2023) and Fan et al. (2022) work within the latent position model (LPM Hoff et al., 2002) framework and investigate the problem of testing whether the latent positions or community memberships of two nodes within the same graph are equal. In this work, we are not interested in testing hypotheses for single nodes or quantities within a single graph, but rather we explore hypothesis testing for differences *between* graphs. In this way, our framework is more similar to the two-sample hypothesis testing problem for random graphs in which one seeks to determine if two sets of graphs come from the same underlying distribution. Variations of this problem are an active area of research, recently explored in Ghoshdastidar et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2023) and Jin et al. (2024).

The literature that is most closely related to our own work is the class of spectral embedding-based tests for the two-graph case (see, for example Tang et al., 2017a,b), which can also be extended to the setting where the number of nodes in the graphs diverges (Alyakin et al., 2024). In addition to sharing the underlying network model of the random dot product graph (RDPG, cf. Athreya et al., 2018) with our work, the structure of the testing procedure is also similar. In both our work and in Tang et al. (2017a), a test statistic is derived from spectral embedding estimates, and a bootstrap algorithm is used in order to generate a reference distribution and calculate a p -value. The existing literature on the two-sample hypothesis testing problem for graphs naturally results in tests that are similar to a t -test for networks. In this work, we construct a joint test for differences between layers of a multiplex network, which is therefore analogous to an equivalent of an F -test for graph-based data. To our knowledge, the problem of testing differences between layers of dynamic multiplex graphs has not yet been explored.

1.1.2 Latent position models

One of the foundational classes of network models is the family of so-called latent position models (LPM; Hoff et al.,

2002). Under this framework, each node in a graph is equipped with a latent position $\vec{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in [n]$. The adjacency matrix is then treated as a random matrix where the connection between nodes i and j is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter obtained via a kernel function $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of the latent positions of the nodes. More formally, each of the edges are independent and satisfy $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{A}_{i,j} = 1) = \kappa(\vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j)$. When we take the kernel function to be the inner product, the model corresponds to the random dot product graph, whose latent positions can be consistently estimated up to an orthogonal transformation via a spectral decomposition of the adjacency matrix (see, for example, Athreya et al., 2018). This framework can be adapted to accommodate graphs that are both dynamic and multiplex through the dynamic multiplex random dot product graph (DMRPDPG; Baum et al., 2024), used in this work. In particular, in Definition 2.1 we define a variant of this model for the case of fixed latent positions, and utilize the model to construct a test for differences between layers, leveraging an extension of the theoretical results in Baum et al. (2024).

2 Problem setting

As a framework for analyzing dynamic and multilayer graphs, we make use of statistical latent space models which impose a low-rank structure on the connection probabilities of the graph. The mathematical foundations that we adopt for this work come from the literature on the random dot product graph. Specifically, we adopt the dynamic multiplex random dot product graph (DMRPDPG) and the doubly unfolded adjacency spectral embedding (DUASE) estimator from Baum et al. (2024) for its parameters.

Definition 2.1 (Dynamic multiplex random dot product graph, DMRPDPG; Baum et al. (2024)). *Consider a dynamic multiplex graph with n nodes, T time points and K layers. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\vec{x}^\top \vec{y} \in [0, 1]$ for any $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$, and let $\mathbf{X}^1, \dots, \mathbf{X}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $\mathbf{Y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be a collection of fixed matrices such that $\mathbf{X}_i^k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_i^t \in \mathcal{Y}$ for all $k \in [K]$, $t \in [T]$, $i \in [n]$, where \mathbf{X}_i^k and \mathbf{Y}_i^t are the i -th row of \mathbf{X}^k and \mathbf{Y}^t respectively. Define the $n \times n$ connection probability matrices for each time point and layer as $\mathbf{P}^{k,t} = \mathbf{X}^k \mathbf{Y}^{t\top}$ and construct the doubly unfolded probability matrix as*

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P}^{1,1} & \dots & \mathbf{P}^{1,T} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{P}^{K,1} & \dots & \mathbf{P}^{K,T} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{Y}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times nT},$$

where the tall matrices $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}^1 \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{X}^K] \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$ and $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{Y}^1 \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{Y}^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ are obtained by vertical stacking. Given a sequence of adjacency matrices $\mathbf{A}^{k,t} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, for $k \in [K]$, $t \in [T]$, we define the doubly unfolded adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{nK \times nT}$ as

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}^{1,1} & \dots & \mathbf{A}^{1,T} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}^{K,1} & \dots & \mathbf{A}^{K,T} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

We can then say that $\mathbf{A} \sim \text{DMPRDPG}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ if the matrix $\mathbf{A}^{k,t}$ has independent entries with distribution

$$\mathbf{A}_{i,j}^{k,t} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\mathbf{P}_{i,j}^{k,t}),$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i \neq j$, $k \in [K]$, $t \in [T]$. Equivalently, we write $\mathbf{A} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\mathbf{P})$ or $\mathbf{A} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y}^\top)$.

Definition 2.2 (Doubly unfolded adjacency spectral embedding, DUASE; Baum et al. (2024)). Consider a set of adjacency matrices $\{\mathbf{A}^{k,t}\}_{k \in [K], t \in [T]}$ arising from a dynamic multiplex graph, where $\mathbf{A}^{k,t} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ for all $k \in [K]$ and $t \in [T]$. Construct the doubly unfolded adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} as described in Equation (1), and, for $d \in [n]$, consider the singular value decomposition

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{V}^\top + \mathbf{U}_\perp \mathbf{D}_\perp \mathbf{V}_\perp^\top,$$

where $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the d largest singular values of \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$ and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ contain the corresponding left and right singular vectors respectively, and \mathbf{D}_\perp , \mathbf{U}_\perp and \mathbf{V}_\perp contain the remaining singular values, left singular vectors, and right singular vectors respectively. Then, the doubly unfolded adjacency spectral embedding of $\{\mathbf{A}^{k,t}\}_{k \in [K], t \in [T]}$ into \mathbb{R}^d is defined as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}.$$

Through the DUASE estimation procedure in Definition 2.2, we obtain separate sets of latent position estimates: $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$, corresponding to layer-specific features, and $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$, corresponding to time-specific latent positions. In particular, the DUASE left embedding $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ provides a time-agnostic representation of layer-specific latent structure, which is suitable for testing whether layers differ in their underlying connectivity patterns, effectively marginalising out over time but not assuming that the network is temporally invariant. Therefore, in this work we make use of the DUASE left-embedding $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = [\hat{\mathbf{X}}^1 \mid \dots \mid \hat{\mathbf{X}}^K]$ to construct a test for differences between layers.

The theoretical framework that we consider consists of a sequence of DMPRDPGs with an increasing number of nodes. Concretely, we consider a sequence of latent position matrices $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ which are fixed but unknown. We observe a sequence of dynamic multiplex graphs resulting in adjacency matrices modeled as $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \text{DMPRDPG}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, and formulate the testing problem in terms of the layer-specific left latent positions \mathbf{X}_n . The graphs in this sequence are made up of an increasing number of nodes n , and we are interested in studying the performance of our test as the number of nodes in each graph grows. In this framework, the sequence of null hypotheses H_0^n of no differences between layers can be naturally defined by:

$$H_0^n : \mathbf{X}_n^1 = \mathbf{X}_n^2 = \dots = \mathbf{X}_n^K. \quad (2)$$

Each null hypothesis H_0^n is tested against an alternative hypothesis H_1^n stating that $\mathbf{X}_n^k \neq \mathbf{X}_n^\ell$ for at least one pair (k, ℓ) ,

with $k \neq \ell$, $k, \ell \in [K]$. We note that hypotheses H_0^n and $H_0^{n'}$ need not be nested or related for $n \neq n'$. In Section 3, we propose a test statistic for H_0^n versus H_1^n , and we study its asymptotic behavior when the number of nodes n is allowed to grow. For our results to hold, we simply require two mild regularity conditions on the sequence of latent positions, which will be further detailed in Section 3.

In contrast to many standard testing problems, the parameter space of the matrices \mathbf{X}_n on which we formulate our null hypothesis increases in size as n increases. Our testing problem is therefore not parametric in the traditional sense. However, we treat the latent position matrices as fixed and the model places distributional requirements on the doubly unfolded adjacency matrices $\mathbf{A}_n \in \{0, 1\}^{nK \times nT}$ and in this way the procedure cannot be considered strictly non-parametric. Our test is therefore best classified as semiparametric in the sense of Tang et al. (2017a).

We note that the problem of testing for differences over time for dynamic multiplex graphs is closely related to our research question, and can be solved using the same fundamental methodology, by replacing the left embedding \mathbf{X}_n with the right DUASE embedding \mathbf{Y}_n . For clarity, in this work we focus exclusively on the test for differences between layers, but we note that the same procedure could equally be applied to testing for differences over time.

3 Methods and results

The testing framework that we introduce for the null hypothesis defined in (2) calculates a test statistic based on spectral embedding of the doubly unfolded matrix \mathbf{A}_n . Let $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_n) = \text{DUASE}(\mathbf{A}_n)$ and define the test statistic

$$\psi_n = \frac{1}{K\sqrt{\log n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \right\|_F, \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix. The test statistic ψ_n calculates a measure of the difference between each of the layer-specific embedding estimates and their average.

Notably, this test statistic does not include a Procrustes transformation between the different embeddings $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k$ and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^\ell$ as is common in other tests based on spectral embedding (see, for example, Tang et al., 2017a). By performing joint embedding via DUASE rather than individual embedding procedures for each layer, the latent position estimates for different layers are directly comparable to one another. This detail reduces the computational cost of calculating the test statistic and eliminates one source of statistical error.

As a key contribution of this work, we show that the test statistic ψ_n defined in (3) can be used to construct a principled and powerful test for the null hypothesis (2) when paired with a rejection region (C, ∞) for an appropriately chosen $C > 0$.

3.1 Key results

We now introduce two results which show that the proposed statistic ψ_n is able to differentiate between the null and alternative hypotheses as the number of nodes in the graph grows. First, we show in Theorem 3.1 that when the latent positions are equal across layers, the probability of rejection via the proposed test statistic converges to 0 as n tends to infinity. Furthermore, when the divergence between layer-specific latent positions is sufficiently large, Theorem 3.2 demonstrates that the rejection probability associated with the proposed testing procedure converges to 1.

Before stating the results, we discuss two regularity conditions which we impose on the sequence of latent position matrices $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$.

Assumption 1 (Singular values of \mathbf{P}_n). *Consider a sequence of matrices $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$, and define the matrix $\mathbf{P}_n = \mathbf{X}_n \mathbf{Y}_n^\top$. We require that for all n the singular values of \mathbf{P}_n are unique and $\sigma_\ell(\mathbf{P}_n) = \Theta(n)$ for all $\ell \in [d]$, where $\sigma_\ell(\mathbf{M})$ is the ℓ -th largest singular value of the matrix \mathbf{M} .*

Assumption 2 (Convergence of Gram matrices). *Consider a sequence of matrices $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$. We require the existence of positive definite matrices $\Delta_X, \Delta_Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $n^{-1} \mathbf{X}_n^\top \mathbf{X}_n \rightarrow \Delta_X$ and $n^{-1} \mathbf{Y}_n^\top \mathbf{Y}_n \rightarrow \Delta_Y$.*

The prescribed growth rate of the singular values of \mathbf{P}_n in Assumption 1 is a mild condition which follows naturally from the interpretation of the rows of \mathbf{X}_n and \mathbf{Y}_n as latent positions with magnitudes not dependent on the total number of nodes in the graph. Assumption 2 corresponds to a requirement that the latent positions for individual nodes exhibit a form of stability as n increases. These assumptions are automatically satisfied in the setting where the latent positions for each node are treated as samples from a shared distribution (cf. Propositions 3 and 12, Baum et al., 2024).

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we obtain the following key theoretical results on the asymptotic behavior of the proposed test statistic ψ_n when combined with a test that rejects H_0^n if its observed value is larger than a constant C .

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ be a sequence of latent positions satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.1 and Assumptions 1 and 2, such that $\mathbf{X}_n^1 = \mathbf{X}_n^2 = \dots = \mathbf{X}_n^K$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \text{DMPRDPG}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\psi_n > C) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ be a sequence of latent positions satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.1 and Assumptions 1 and 2, such that $K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{X}_n^k - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n\|_F = \omega(\sqrt{\log n})$, where $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_n = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{X}_n^k$. Let $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \text{DMPRDPG}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$. Then, for any constant $C > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\psi_n > C) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

The proofs for Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are provided in the appendix in Sections A.3 and A.4. Together, these results ensure the existence of a fixed rejection region such that, as n tends to infinity, it is extremely unlikely that ψ_n lies within this region under the null hypothesis and extremely likely to lie within this region when the difference between layer-specific embeddings is sufficiently large. We remark that the set of alternatives over which the test statistic is able to differentiate from the null is not entirely complementary to the null hypothesis. For alternatives in which the divergence of the layer-specific latent positions from the mean scales as or slower than $\sqrt{\log n}$, it is not guaranteed that the test will reject even for large graphs. This case roughly corresponds to the setting in which fewer than $\log n$ nodes exhibit differentiated behavior across layers. The inability to detect differences affecting only a small number of nodes is expected as the test statistic ψ_n captures both the true differences in layer-specific latent positions as well as the noise corresponding to each of the latent position estimates. When only a tiny fraction of the nodes exhibit differentiated behavior across layers, the relatively small signal of true latent position differences is drowned out by the noise from an increasing number of latent position estimates.

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 arise from consistency results in Theorem 1 in Baum et al. (2024), adapted to the case of fixed latent positions, resulting in the key statement in Theorem 3.3 below. To place a bound on the random latent position estimates, we adopt the concept of overwhelming probability (Tao and Vu, 2010) and use $O_{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ to denote an asymptotic rate that bounds a sequence of random variables with overwhelming probability. For a sequence of real-valued random variables Z_n and real-valued function f , we write $|Z_n| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\{f(n)\}$ if, for any $\gamma > 0$, there exist $n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C_\gamma > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{|Z_n| \leq C_\gamma f(n)\} \geq 1 - n^{-\gamma}$ for all $n \geq n_\gamma$.

Theorem 3.3 (Fixed position two-to-infinity norm bound). *Let $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ be a sequence of latent positions satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.1 and Assumptions 1 and 2. Let $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \text{DMPRDPG}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ and define $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_n) = \text{DUASE}(\mathbf{A}_n)$. Then there exists a sequence of matrices $\mathbf{Q}_n \in \text{GL}(d)$ such that for $k \in [K]$*

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right),$$

where $\text{GL}(d)$ is the general linear group of degree d and $\|\cdot\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ is the two-to-infinity matrix norm.

The proof of this result is reported in Section A.2. Theorem 3.3 is critical for the analysis of the asymptotic behavior of the test statistic. Because the $\|\cdot\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ norm corresponds to the maximum Euclidean row norm (Cape et al., 2019), Theorem 3.3 provides a uniform bound on the maximum estimation error of the latent position estimate for any individual node. This result allows us to bound the growth rate of the noise component of ψ_n as the number of nodes in the graph tends to infinity.

3.2 Estimating the distribution of the test statistic via bootstrapping

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 demonstrate that the test statistic ψ_n produces a powerful and well-controlled test when paired with an appropriate critical value C . Unfortunately, despite the availability of a central limit theorem for the DUASE estimators (cf. Baum et al., 2024), the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic ψ_n , under the null hypothesis is not available in closed form in practice. Therefore, in order to estimate an appropriate critical value, we propose a bootstrap procedure which approximates the distribution of ψ_n under the null hypothesis. Using this bootstrapped distribution, we are able to calculate a p -value for the observed test statistic. The proposed procedure is described in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Bootstrap procedure for DUASE.

```

1 Input Left DUASE  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = [\hat{\mathbf{X}}^1 \mid \dots \mid \hat{\mathbf{X}}^K] \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$ ,
   right DUASE  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = [\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 \mid \dots \mid \hat{\mathbf{Y}}^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ ,
   number of bootstrap samples  $n_{boot}$ .
2 Output Test  $p$ -value.
3 Compute  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{X}}^k$ .
4 Compute  $\psi_{obs} = (K\sqrt{\log n})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^k - \hat{\mathbf{X}}\|_F$ .
5 for  $b \in [n_{boot}]$  do
6   for  $k \in [K]$  do
7     for  $t \in [T]$  do
8       Sample  $\mathbf{A}_{boot}^{k,t} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}^k \hat{\mathbf{Y}}^{t\top})$ .
9     Compute  $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{boot}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{boot}) = \text{DUASE}(\mathbf{A}_{boot})$ .
10    Compute  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{boot} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{boot}^k$ .
11    Compute
12       $\psi_b^* = (K\sqrt{\log n})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{boot}^k - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{boot}\|_F$ .
13 Compute
14    $p_{test} = (1 + n_{boot})^{-1} [1 + \sum_{b=1}^{n_{boot}} \mathbb{1}\{\psi_b^* > \psi_{obs}\}]$ .
15 Return Test  $p$ -value  $p_{test}$ .
```

The use of bootstrap methods to estimate the distribution of graph attributes is an active research area in the random graphs literature (see, for example, Green and Shalizi, 2022; Zu and Qin, 2024; Levin and Levina, 2025; Dilworth et al., 2025). Levin and Levina (2025) show that bootstrap methods that use spectral embedding to estimate the connection probability matrix and then simulate new graphs from this matrix are appropriate in an asymptotic sense. Finite sample behavior of such bootstraps, however, is not always well behaved. Dilworth et al. (2025) introduce a testing procedure to determine if a bootstrap is valid and find that a nearest-neighbor based bootstrap algorithm can outperform the naive plug-in based bootstrap for graphs of finite size. For simplicity and computational tractability, in Algorithm 1 we adopt a procedure based on the standard plug-in method. Our procedure is in the spirit of the bootstrap procedure presented in Tang et al. (2017a), where we substitute a different embedding procedure and add an averaging step across the layer-specific embeddings.

The logic behind the bootstrap procedure in Algorithm 1

is that when the latent positions for all layers are equal, the average embedding will be a good estimate for each of these latent positions. When this is not the case, averaging over the layers will produce an adjacency matrix with less variation between the layers than the original graph.

4 Simulations

To complement the asymptotic results in Section 3, we explore an application of the testing procedure to the setting where n is finite via simulation. In particular, we demonstrate that the bootstrap procedure in Algorithm 1 produces a faithful approximation of the theoretical test statistic distribution resulting in critical values that respect the defined level of the test and produce meaningful power. As an illustrative example, we consider the case of the stochastic blockmodel (SBM; Holland et al., 1983) and adapt it to the dynamic multiplex case as the dynamic multiplex stochastic blockmodel (DMP SBM; Baum et al., 2024), a special case of the DM-PRDPG. Under this framework, each node is assigned to one layer-specific and one time-specific community, and the probability of a link between nodes i and j depends only on their community memberships.

Definition 4.1 (Dynamic multiplex stochastic blockmodel, DMP SBM; Baum et al. (2024)). Assume that, for a dynamic multiplex network with K layers and T time points, nodes in a graph are assigned to groups or communities, where integers $z_i^k \in [G_1]$, $v_i^t \in [G_2]$, $G_1, G_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in [n]$, denote the group membership assigned to the i -th node for the t -th time point and k -th layer respectively. Furthermore, define matrices $\mathbf{B}^{k,t} \in [0, 1]^{G_1 \times G_2}$ representing between-group connection probabilities for the k -th layer and t -th time point, and set $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{B}^{k,t}\}_{k \in [K], t \in [T]}$, $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_i^k\}_{i \in [n], k \in [K]}$ and $\mathcal{U} = \{v_i^t\}_{i \in [n], t \in [T]}$. For a set of adjacency matrices $\{\mathbf{A}^{k,t}\}_{k \in [K], t \in [T]}$, we say that $\mathbf{A} \sim \text{DMP SBM}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U})$, where \mathbf{A} is the doubly unfolded adjacency matrix (1), if

$$\mathbf{A}_{i,j}^{k,t} \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\mathbf{B}_{z_i^k, v_j^t}^{k,t}\right)$$

for each $i, j \in [n]$, $k \in [K]$ and $t \in [T]$.

We simulate data from a directed DMP SBM with $G_1 = 2$, $G_2 = 2$, $K = 10$ and $T = 3$, where the group memberships are static such that $z_i^k = z_i^{k'}$ and $v_i^t = v_i^{t'}$ for all $i \in [n]$, $k, k' \in [K]$ and $t, t' \in [T]$. The connection probabilities between and within each community are defined as functions of $k \in [K]$ and $t \in [T]$ and are prescribed by the following set of matrices $\{\mathbf{B}^{k,t}\}$:

$$\mathbf{B}^{k,t} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.25 + \varepsilon k & 0.1 + 0.1 \sin(2\pi t/T) \\ 0.1 + 0.1 \sin(2\pi t/T) & 0.25 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Although the network behavior varies across both layer and time, our aim is to isolate and test for differences between layer only. In our simulation, the magnitude of the differences between layers of the graph is encoded by a parameter

	$\varepsilon = 0.0$	$\varepsilon = 0.005$	$\varepsilon = 0.01$	$\varepsilon = 0.02$
$n = 50$	0.031	0.117	0.580	1.0
$n = 100$	0.053	0.425	0.999	1.0
$n = 200$	0.046	0.997	1.0	1.0
$n = 300$	0.056	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table 1: Fraction of rejected tests for each combination of graph size n and layer-specific difference ε for the simulation described in Section 4.




Figure 1: Cumulative distribution function of the p -values for graphs with n nodes (for n ranging from 50 to 300) and $\varepsilon = 0$ for the simulation described in Section 4.

ε . The case where $\varepsilon = 0$ corresponds to the null hypothesis and, as the parameter increases, we deviate further from the null setting. While varying the number of nodes in each graph, as well as the value of ε , we run simulations to estimate the power of the testing procedure when $\varepsilon > 0$ and demonstrate that the number of false positives is well controlled when $\varepsilon = 0$. To achieve this, we generate one graph from the DMPSBM and embed it according the DUASE procedure with embedding dimension $d = 2$ corresponding to the true dimension of the unfolded matrix of connection probabilities when $\varepsilon = 0$. We then input these embedding estimates into Algorithm 1 with the number of bootstrap samples $n_{boot} = 1000$ to test for differences between layers using $\alpha = 0.05$. For each value of $n \in \{50, 100, 200, 500\}$ and $\varepsilon \in \{0, 0.005, 0.01, 0.02\}$, this process is repeated 1000 times resulting in 1000 Monte Carlo replicates. For each value of n and ε the fraction of rejected tests is reported in Table 1.

As prescribed by Theorem 3.2, the power of the testing procedure increases as both the number of nodes in the graph and the magnitude of layer-wise differences increase. We see that under the null hypothesis, the DUASE procedure produces Type-I errors at approximately the rate of 5% as we would expect when running the bootstrap procedure with $\alpha = 0.05$.

To further investigate the validity of the testing procedure under the null, we examine the distribution of p -values when $\varepsilon = 0$ in Figure 1. We find that, even for graphs as small as $n = 50$, the empirical distribution is exceptionally close to the expected uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, suggesting that the samples generated by Algorithm 1 accurately approximate the distribution of the test statistic ψ_n under the null setting.

5 Application to biological learning networks of larval *Drosophila*

To demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed methodology in an applied setting, we analyze a dataset originally presented in Zheng et al. (2024), which captures the dynamic neural activity of *Drosophila* larvae over time. Using methods from Eschbach et al. (2020) and Jiang and Litwin-Kumar (2021), it is possible to use the neural connections mapped out in Winding et al. (2023) to develop biologically-informed simulations of *Drosophila* brain activity under different experimental conditions.

In this analysis, we study the learning process of the *Drosophila* and use our hypothesis testing method to identify which neural connections play an important role in this process. Simulations were produced to describe the neural activity of a *Drosophila* in an experiment where the insect is first presented with a random odor paired with a reward stimulus. At two later time points, the insect is presented with the same odor but now without the accompanying stimulus. If the insect has learned to associate the odor with the stimulus from the initial exposure, then we expect to see a neural response similar to a reward stimulus in the latter two time points despite the fact that only the odor was presented. To generate different experimental conditions, individual neural connections can be selectively removed from the model that is used to produce the simulated data, and this modified connectome model can then be used to simulate the brain activity during this learning process. If the removed neural connection is irrelevant for the learning process, then we expect the data from the resulting simulation to be unchanged. Only when the removed connection plays a critical role in the learning process do we expect to see a meaningful change in the simulated data. The brain activity data produced by these simulations describes the level of activation of individual neural connections and in this way is naturally represented by a graph. The experimental process of removing a single connection from the data simulation model was completed for $K = 13$ different neural connections. For each of these, the simulation was repeated 11 times resulting in a total of $11 \times 13 = 143$ dynamic graphs observed at $T = 160$ points in time.

Using this collection of dynamic multiplex graphs, we use the hypothesis testing method detailed in Section 3 to determine if any neural connections are important for the learning process and, if so, which ones. As a first step, we perform a statistical test to confirm that the 11 replicates for each experimental condition are similar. In order to do this, we split the dataset into 13 sets of dynamic graphs and represent each

Algorithm 2: Modified bootstrap procedure for DUASE on averaged adjacency matrices.

```

1 Input Left DUASE  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = [\hat{\mathbf{X}}^1 \mid \dots \mid \hat{\mathbf{X}}^K] \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$ ,
   right DUASE  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = [\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^1 \mid \dots \mid \hat{\mathbf{Y}}^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ ,
   number of bootstrap samples  $n_{boot}$ , number of
   average adjacency matrices  $n_{rep}$ .
2 Output Test  $p$ -value.
3 Compute  $\bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{X}}^k$ .
4 Compute  $\psi_{obs} = (K\sqrt{\log n})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\mathbf{X}}^k - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}\|_F$ .
5 for  $b \in [n_{boot}]$  do
6   for  $k \in [K]$  do
7     for  $t \in [T]$  do
8       for  $r \in [n_{rep}]$  do
9         Sample  $\mathbf{A}_{boot,r}^{k,t} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}} \hat{\mathbf{Y}}^{t\tau})$ .
10        Compute  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{boot}^{k,t} = n_{rep}^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^{n_{rep}} \mathbf{A}_{boot,r}^{k,t}$ .
11      Compute  $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{boot}, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{boot}) = \text{DUASE}(\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{boot})$ .
12      Compute  $\tilde{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_{boot} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{boot}^k$ .
13      Compute
           $\psi_b^* = (K\sqrt{\log n})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\tilde{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_{boot}^k - \tilde{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_{boot}\|_F$ .
14 Compute
           $p_{test} = (1 + n_{boot})^{-1} [1 + \sum_{b=1}^{n_{boot}} \mathbb{1}\{T_b^* > T_{obs}\}]$ .
15 Return Test  $p$ -value  $p_{test}$ 
    
```

of the 11 replicates as a distinct layer. We can then test for differences between each of these replicates by running the testing procedure, where the embedding dimension is selected using the scree-plot criterion of [Zhu and Ghodsi \(2006\)](#), on each of these sub-datasets. As expected, each of these tests produces a large p -value and for each of the 13 experimental conditions we fail to reject the null hypothesis that any of the 11 replicates are significantly different from the others. In each of these tests, the observed test statistic is much smaller than the values that are generated using the bootstrap algorithm suggesting that the variation we observe between replicates is considerably smaller than we would expect if each of these layers were truly independent samples from a DM-PRDPG. This reduction in variance may be due to a failure of the independent edge assumption. Therefore, the p -values should not be interpreted as the probabilities of events under the null hypothesis; however, tests between layers can still be used to gain insight into the relative magnitude of differences between layers.

Since the null hypothesis of no difference within replicates is not rejected, we then average the adjacency matrices corresponding to the replicates for each layer to create a dataset with $K = 13$ layers and $T = 160$ time points describing the averaged brain activity for each of the experimental interventions. Using the modified bootstrap procedure presented in Algorithm 2, which accounts for the averaging of the adjacency matrices, we perform a global test for the null hypothesis that the latent positions for all of the $K = 13$ layers are identical. This is easily rejected with the observed test statistic and bootstrap values reported in Figure 2a, suggesting

that there are significant differences between the time series of graphs obtained by removing different neural connections.

In order to gain further understanding of which of the neural connections behave most differently, we conduct each of the 78 possible pairwise tests and report the heatmap of p -values in Figure 2b, and the number of rejections at the level $\alpha = 0.01$ for each layer in Figure 2c. Layer 13 appears to be the most differentiated and corresponds to the brain connection from neuron *DAN-f1* to *FBN-1*. Critically, this is the same connection that was identified as exhibiting distinct behavior in [Zheng et al. \(2024\)](#) using clustering methods and which has a biological justification for behaving differently in this particular experiment: it expresses the only scenario in which a connection to a *feedback neuron* is removed ([Zheng et al., 2024](#)).

6 Conclusion

The ability to test for differences between layers of a dynamic multiplex graph is a research question that is of key importance and arises in fields as diverse as cybersecurity and biology. In this work, we have shown that it is possible to use spectral methods to achieve this goal. We construct a test statistic that is based on a spectral embedding of the adjacency matrices of a dynamic multiplex graph and provide two formal results to prove that this test statistic is effective in the asymptotic regime where the number of nodes tends to infinity. Concretely, we prove the existence of a rejection region such that our proposed test has a Type-I error rate that converges to 0 under the null and power that converges to 1 under the set of alternatives where the divergence between layer-specific latent positions scales as $\omega(\sqrt{\log n})$. In order to identify this rejection region in practice, we propose a bootstrap algorithm and demonstrate that, in simulations where a dynamic multiplex graph is generated by a two-community block model, the algorithm produces rejection regions such that the resulting test is both powerful and respects the prescribed level. Additionally, we apply this testing procedure to a biological dataset where we find that it can be effectively used to correctly detect the neural connections in the *Drosophila* connectome that are most relevant for the learning process.

Code

Code to implement the methods proposed in this work, and reproduce the simulated experiments, is available in the Github repository [mjbaum/dmprdpdg/testing](https://github.com/mjbaum/dmprdpdg/testing).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Carey Priebe and Youngser Park (Johns Hopkins University) for providing access to the data used in Section 5. Francesco Sanna Passino acknowledges funding from the EPSRC, grant number EP/Y002113/1.




Figure 2: Tests for differences between layers in the *Drosophila* connectome data: (a) global test for equality of latent positions, (b) heatmap of p-values for all pairwise tests, and (c) number of rejections per layer across pairwise tests with significance level $\alpha = 0.01$.

A Proofs

A.1 Intermediate results

Corollary 1. Let $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ be a sequence of latent positions satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.1 as well as Assumptions 1 and 2. Let $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \text{DMPDPG}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ and define $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_n) = \text{DUASE}(\mathbf{A}_n)$. Then there exists a sequence $\mathbf{Q}_n \in \text{GL}(d)$ such that:

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\sqrt{\log n} \right).$$

Proof. This result follows directly from the interpretation of $\|\mathbf{M}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ as the maximum Frobenius norm of any row of \mathbf{M} . In particular:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_F &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sqrt{\left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_F^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sqrt{n \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sqrt{n} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Theorem 3.3 we have $\left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} \log^{1/2} n)$, which gives the result. \square

Corollary 2. Let $(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$, $\mathbf{X}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nK \times d}$, $\mathbf{Y}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{nT \times d}$ be a sequence of latent positions satisfying the conditions in Definition 2.1 as well as Assumptions 1 and 2. Let $\mathbf{A}_n \sim \text{DMPDPG}(\mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Y}_n)$ and define $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_n) = \text{DUASE}(\mathbf{A}_n)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k$. Then there exists a sequence $\mathbf{Q}_n \in \text{GL}(d)$ such that:

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\sqrt{\log n} \right).$$

Proof. The result follows from the following inequality:

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F = \left\| \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\mathbf{X}_n^k - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n \right) \right\|_F$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \mathbf{X}_n^k - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F.$$

Applying Corollary 1 yields the desired result. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. The proof for this result follows from the proof for the case of random latent positions presented in Theorem 1 of Baum et al. (2024), but where we replace Proposition 3 of Baum et al. (2024) with Assumption 1. The one exception is the bound on the two to infinity norm of the terms $\mathbf{R}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{2,2}$ in Proposition 14. In the fixed latent position case, the rows of these terms are no longer exchangeable and we therefore provide an alternative proof for this bound for the fixed position case. To bound the term $\|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T) \mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^T\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ we follow Corneek et al. (2025) by making use of leave-one-out analysis in order to disentangle the dependence between $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^T$. For $i \in [nK]$ let $\mathbf{A}^{(i)}$ be defined such that:

$$\mathbf{A}_{k,j}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_{k,j} & \text{if } k \neq i, \\ \mathbf{P}_{k,j} & \text{if } k = i, \end{cases}$$

for $k \in [nK]$ and $j \in [nT]$. In other words, the matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(i)}$ is equal to the matrix \mathbf{A} except that the i -th row has been stripped of the noise corresponding to $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i$. Let $\mathbf{V}_A^{(i)}$ denote the right singular vectors of the matrix $\mathbf{A}^{(i)}$. We can then decompose $\|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T) \mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^T\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T) \mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^T\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} &\leq \\ \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} &+ \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T) (\mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^T - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top})\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and bound these two terms separately. We begin with several intermediate results. As a first step we bound $\|\mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T\|$. By applying the Davis-Kahan theorem in a manner similar to the proof of Proposition 8 of Baum et al. (2024), we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{2\sqrt{d} \|\mathbf{A}^{(i)} - \mathbf{P}\| \{2\sigma_1(\mathbf{P}) + \|\mathbf{A}^{(i)} - \mathbf{P}\|\}}{\sigma_d(\mathbf{P})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that by definition $\|\mathbf{A}^{(i)} - \mathbf{P}\| \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P}\|$ we can apply the rates from Assumption 1 and Proposition 4 of [Baum et al. \(2024\)](#) to find that:

$$\left\| \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \right\| = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(n^{1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right). \quad (5)$$

We then proceed by bounding $\|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)}\|_F$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \right\|_F = \left\| \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \right\|_F \\ & = \left\| (\mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \right\|_F \\ & \leq \left\| \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \right\|_F \\ & \leq \left\| \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \right\| \cdot 2d = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(n^{1/2} \log^{1/2} n \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where in the last line we have used the rate from Equation (5) and the relation $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{M}\| \cdot \text{rank}(\mathbf{M})$. We can now proceed with the bound of the first term of right-hand side of Equation (4). We use the fact that $\|\cdot\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ corresponds to be maximum Frobenius norm of the individual rows and proceed to bound the Frobenius norm of the i -th row of $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top}$ using the relation

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} \right\|_F \\ & \leq \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

If we examine the term on the right-hand side of this expression, we see that each of its d entries is a weighted sum of nT bounded independent random variables with weights given by the columns of $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)}$. Because this term contains only $\mathbf{V}_A^{(i)}$ rather than \mathbf{V}_A , the weights are statistically independent of the i -th row of $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})$. If we denote the j -th element of $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)}$ as $Z_{i,j}$ we can apply Hoeffding's Inequality to bound this term. Applying the rate from Equation (6) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z_{i,j}| > t) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ \frac{-t^2}{O_{\mathbb{P}}(n \log n)} \right\}.$$

By substituting $t = n^{1/2} \log^{3/2} n$ we see that

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z_{i,j}| > n^{1/2} \log^{3/2} n) \leq 2 \exp(-\log^2 n).$$

and therefore that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} \right\|_F \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{1/2} \log^{3/2} n). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the union bound over all rows we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{1/2} \log^{3/2} n). \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

It now remains to bound the second term of the right-hand side of Equation (4). For analyzing the i -th row of the matrix we use the relation $\|\mathbf{BC}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{B}\| \|\mathbf{C}\|_F$ to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) (\mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top}) \right\|_F \\ & \leq \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top)\| \left\| \mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top)\| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{n})$ as $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i$ is a vector of nT elements with bounded entries and $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top)$ has constant spectral norm. To bound $\|\mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top}\|_F$ we make use of Wedin's theorem (see, for example, Theorem 2.9 in [Chen et al., 2021](#)) to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{\|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)}\|_F}{\sigma_d(\mathbf{A}^{(i)}) - \sigma_{d+1}(\mathbf{A}^{(i)}) - \|(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hoeffding's inequality to the numerator shows that this term is $O_{\mathbb{P}}(\log n)$, while for the denominator we apply Corollary 7.3.5 from [Horn and Johnson \(2012\)](#) along with Proposition 6 of [Baum et al. \(2024\)](#) to show that this term is $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(n)$. We therefore find that for all $i \in [nK]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) (\mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top}) \right\|_F \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} \log n). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the union bound over all rows yields :

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) (\mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top - \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)} \mathbf{V}_A^{(i)\top}) \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} \log n). \end{aligned}$$

By applying this bound as well as the rate from Equation (7) to Equation (4), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{P})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top) \mathbf{V}_A \mathbf{V}_A^\top \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} \log^{3/2} n). \end{aligned}$$

Following the same steps as the proof of Theorem 1 of [Baum et al. \(2024\)](#) gives the desired result. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. Let \mathbf{Q}_n denote the invertible transformation that most closely maps $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_n$ to \mathbf{X}_n in the two-to-infinity norm, written $\mathbf{Q}_n = \arg \min_{\mathbf{Q} \in \text{GL}(d)} \|\mathbf{X}_n - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n \mathbf{Q}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$. We begin by decomposing and bounding the numerator of the proposed test statistic ψ_n , rescaled by $\sigma_d(\mathbf{Q}_n) \equiv \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{Q}_n)$, the smallest singular value of \mathbf{Q}_n :

$$\frac{\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{Q}_n)}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \mathbf{X}_n^k \right\|_F + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \mathbf{X}_n^k - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\|_F + \left\| \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F.$$

Under the null hypothesis H_0^n in Equation (2), the second term of the right-hand side is equal to zero by definition and therefore can be excluded from our analysis. We apply Corollary 1 to bound the first term and can bound the third term by Corollary 2. The quantity $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{Q}_n)$ is of constant order by Proposition 12 of Baum et al. (2024) and therefore

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \right\|_F = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\sqrt{\log n} \right).$$

It follows that $\psi_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and therefore by the definition of overwhelming probability for n large and any $\alpha > 0$, there exists a constant C such that $\mathbb{P}(\psi_n > C) \leq n^{-\alpha}$, which gives the result. \square

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. We begin with the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbf{X}_n^k - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\|_F \\ &= \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n + \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n + \mathbf{X}_n^k - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F + \left\| \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \mathbf{Q}_n - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\|_F \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathbf{X}_n^k - \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Corollary 1 and Corollary 2 to show that the latter two terms are $O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log n})$ and we make use of the fact that $\left\| \mathbf{Q}_n \right\|_F$ is of constant order by Proposition 12 of Baum et al. (2024). By assumption, we have $K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \mathbf{X}_n^k - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_n \right\|_F = \omega(\sqrt{\log n})$. This gives:

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\| \hat{\mathbf{X}}_n^k - \bar{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}_n \right\|_F = \omega_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\sqrt{\log n} \right).$$

It follows that $\psi_n = \omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and therefore for any constant $C > 0$ we have that $\mathbb{P}(\psi_n > C) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

References

- Alyakin, A. A., Agterberg, J., Helm, H. S., and Priebe, C. E. (2024) Correcting a nonparametric two-sample graph hypothesis test for graphs with different numbers of vertices with applications to connectomics. *Applied Network Science*, **9**, 1.
- Athreya, A., Fishkind, D. E., Tang, M., et al. (2018) Statistical inference on random dot product graphs: a survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **18**, 1–92.
- Baum, M., Sanna Passino, F., and Gandy, A. (2024) Doubly unfolded adjacency spectral embedding of dynamic multiplex graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09810*.
- Cape, J., Tang, M., and Priebe, C. E. (2019) The two-to-infinity norm and singular subspace geometry with applications to high-dimensional statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, **47**, 2405 – 2439.
- Chen, L., Zhou, J., and Lin, L. (2023) Hypothesis testing for populations of networks. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, **52**, 3661–3684.
- Chen, Y., Chi, Y., Fan, J., Ma, C., et al. (2021) Spectral methods for data science: A statistical perspective. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, **14**, 566–806.
- Corneek, J., Cohen, E. A. K., and Sanna Passino, F. (2025) Spectral embedding of inhomogeneous Poisson processes on multiplex graphs. Preprint.
- Dilworth, E., Davis, E., and Lawson, D. J. (2025) Valid bootstraps for network embeddings with applications to network visualisation. In *The 41st Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*.
- Du, X. and Tang, M. (2023) Hypothesis testing for equality of latent positions in random graphs. *Bernoulli*, **29**, 3221–3254.
- Eschbach, C., Fushiki, A., Winding, M., et al. (2020) Recurrent architecture for adaptive regulation of learning in the insect brain. *Nature Neuroscience*, **23**, 544–555.
- Fan, J., Fan, Y., Han, X., and Lv, J. (2022) Simple: Statistical inference on membership profiles in large networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, **84**, 630–653.
- Ghoshdastidar, D., Gutzeit, M., Carpentier, A., and Von Luxburg, U. (2020) Two-sample hypothesis testing for inhomogeneous random graphs. *The Annals of Statistics*, **48**, 2208–2229.
- Green, A. and Shalizi, C. R. (2022) Bootstrapping exchangeable random graphs. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **16**, 1058–1095.
- Hoff, P. D., Raftery, A. E., and Handcock, M. S. (2002) Latent space approaches to social network analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **97**, 1090–1098.
- Holland, P. W., Laskey, K. B., and Leinhardt, S. (1983) Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks*, **5**, 109–137.
- Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R. (2012) *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jiang, L. and Litwin-Kumar, A. (2021) Models of heterogeneous dopamine signaling in an insect learning and memory center. *PloS Computational Biology*, **17**, e1009205.

- Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., Luo, S., and Ma, Y. (2024) Optimal network pairwise comparison. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–15.
- Levin, K. and Levina, E. (2025) Bootstrapping networks with latent space structure. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **19**, 745–791.
- Tang, M., Athreya, A., Sussman, D. L., et al. (2017a) A semiparametric two-sample hypothesis testing problem for random graphs. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **26**, 344–354.
- Tang, M., Athreya, A., Sussman, D. L., Lyzinski, V., and Priebe, C. E. (2017b) A nonparametric two-sample hypothesis testing problem for random graphs. *Bernoulli*, **23**, 1599–1630.
- Tao, T. and Vu, V. (2010) Random matrices: Universality of local eigenvalue statistics up to the edge. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, **298**, 549–572.
- Winding, M., Pedigo, B. D., Barnes, C. L., et al. (2023) The connectome of an insect brain. *Science*, **379**, eadd9330.
- Zheng, R., Athreya, A., Zlatic, M., Clayton, M., and Priebe, C. E. (2024) Dynamic networks clustering via mirror distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19012*.
- Zhu, M. and Ghodsi, A. (2006) Automatic dimensionality selection from the scree plot via the use of profile likelihood. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **51**, 918–930.
- Zu, T. and Qin, Y. (2024) Local bootstrap for network data. *Biometrika*, **112**, asae046.