

Uniqueness of RS Saddle Point for Ising Perceptron

Shuta Nakajima

Department of Mathematics, Keio University

Abstract

We study the replica-symmetric saddle point equations for the Ising perceptron with Gaussian disorder and margin $\kappa \geq 0$. We prove that for each $\kappa \geq 0$ there is a critical capacity $\alpha_c(\kappa) = \frac{2}{\pi \mathbb{E}[(\kappa - Z)_+^2]}$, where Z is a standard normal and $(x)_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$, such that the saddle point equation has a unique solution for $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_c(\kappa))$ and has no solution when $\alpha \geq \alpha_c(\kappa)$. When $\alpha \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa)$ and $\kappa > 0$, the replica-symmetric free energy at this solution diverges to $-\infty$. In the zero-margin case $\kappa = 0$, Ding and Sun obtained a conditional uniqueness result, with one step verified numerically. Our argument gives a fully analytic proof without computer assistance. We used GPT-5 to help develop intermediate proof steps and to perform sanity-check computations.

1 Setup and main results

Let ϕ and Φ be the standard normal density and cumulative distribution function, respectively:

$$\phi(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-u^2/2}, \quad \Phi(u) = \int_{-\infty}^u \phi(s) ds, \quad \bar{\Phi}(u) = 1 - \Phi(u) = \int_u^{\infty} \phi(s) ds.$$

Define the inverse Mills ratio by

$$E(u) := \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}),$$

and for $q \in [0, 1)$ set

$$F_q(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q}} E\left(\frac{\kappa - x}{\sqrt{1-q}}\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. For $r \geq 0$, define

$$P(r) := \mathbb{E}[\tanh^2(\sqrt{r} Z)] \in [0, 1),$$

and for $\alpha > 0$, $\kappa \geq 0$ and $q \in [0, 1)$ define

$$R_\kappa(q, \alpha) := \alpha \mathbb{E}[F_q(\sqrt{q} Z)^2] \in (0, \infty).$$

We study solutions $(q, r) \in [0, 1) \times [0, \infty)$ to

$$\begin{cases} q = P(r), \\ r = R_\kappa(q, \alpha). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

It is convenient to introduce

$$B(q) := (1 - q) \mathbb{E} \left[E \left(\frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q} Z}{\sqrt{1 - q}} \right)^2 \right], \quad q \in [0, 1], \quad (2)$$

so that the second equation in (1) can be rewritten as

$$r = \frac{\alpha}{(1 - q)^2} B(q). \quad (3)$$

Set

$$C_\kappa := \mathbb{E}[(\kappa - Z)_+^2] = (\kappa^2 + 1)\Phi(\kappa) + \kappa\phi(\kappa), \quad \alpha_c(\kappa) := \frac{2}{\pi C_\kappa}.$$

Theorem 1. Fix $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_c(\kappa))$. There exists a unique solution to the equation (1). Moreover, if $\alpha \geq \alpha_c(\kappa)$, then there is no solution.

For $\alpha < \alpha_c(\kappa)$, let (q_α, r_α) be the unique solution to the equation (1) given by Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. Fix $\kappa \geq 0$. When $\alpha \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa)$,

$$q_\alpha \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r_\alpha \rightarrow \infty.$$

Theorem 3. Fix $\kappa \geq 0$. Define the RS functional

$$\mathcal{F}_\kappa(\alpha; q, r) := -\frac{r(1 - q)}{2} + \mathbb{E}[\log(2 \cosh(\sqrt{r} Z))] + \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[\log \bar{\Phi} \left(\frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q} Z}{\sqrt{1 - q}} \right) \right]. \quad (4)$$

For $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_c(\kappa))$, define the Gardner formula (also known as the replica-symmetric formula) by

$$\text{RS}_\star(\alpha, \kappa) := \mathcal{F}_\kappa(\alpha; q_\alpha, r_\alpha),$$

where (q_α, r_α) is the unique solution given by Theorem 1. Then

$$\lim_{\alpha \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa)} \text{RS}_\star(\alpha, \kappa) = -\infty.$$

2 Motivation and related research

2.1 The Ising perceptron and the storage problem

The binary (Ising) perceptron is a standard high-dimensional model for memory storage in a single-layer neural network. It can also be seen as a random constraint satisfaction problem with many constraints. Fix $N \geq 1$ and let $g^1, \dots, g^M \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be i.i.d. random patterns. In this paper, we focus on Gaussian disorder, $g^m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_N)$ i.i.d. We set the number of constraints $M = \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$ with $\alpha > 0$ fixed as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For a margin parameter $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, define the feasible set

$$\mathcal{S}_{N,M}^{(\kappa)} := \left\{ \sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^N : \frac{\langle g^m, \sigma \rangle}{\sqrt{N}} \geq \kappa \text{ for all } m \in [M] \right\}, \quad [M] := \{1, \dots, M\},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Euclidean inner product in \mathbb{R}^N , and the corresponding number of solutions

$$Z_{N,M}^{(\kappa)} := |\mathcal{S}_{N,M}^{(\kappa)}|.$$

When $\kappa = 0$, this becomes the classical half-space intersection model. In this case, $Z_{N,M}^{(0)}$ counts vertices of the hypercube in the intersection of M random half-spaces. We study the quenched free energy

$$F_N(\alpha, \kappa) := \frac{1}{N} \log Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(\kappa)},$$

and we ask when $Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(\kappa)} > 0$. It is expected that feasibility exhibits a sharp transition in α . The critical capacity was predicted by statistical physics in the late 1980s; see [1, 2, 3].

2.2 Replica-symmetric free energy and the saddle point system

A main goal is to determine the limiting free energy $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N(\alpha, \kappa)$ and relate it to the feasibility threshold. Methods from statistical physics predict that this limit is given by an explicit variational formula, often called the Gardner or Krauth–Mézard prediction for the Ising perceptron [2, 3]. Talagrand proved the replica-symmetric formula at small densities α , for the half-space model and for more general activation functions [4, 5]. Later, Bolthausen, Sun, Xu, and Nakajima gave another proof based on the conditional second-moment method via approximate message passing (AMP), which applies to a wider class of activation functions [6].

To describe the previous work more precisely, we use the generalized replica-symmetric expression from [6]. Let $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a measurable activation function. For $M = \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$ and $G \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries (rows g^m), define

$$Z_N := \sum_{\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^N} \prod_{m=1}^M U\left(\frac{\langle g^m, \sigma \rangle}{\sqrt{N}}\right).$$

The half-space model corresponds to $U(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \geq \kappa\}$. In that case $Z_N = Z_{N,M}^{(\kappa)}$. The replica-symmetric functional uses a pair (q, r) . We view q as an overlap parameter and r as a variance parameter. Let $Z, \xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ be independent. For $q \in (0, 1)$ define

$$L_q(x) := \log \mathbb{E}\left[U(x + \sqrt{1-q}\xi)\right], \quad F_q(x) := \frac{d}{dx} L_q(x).$$

The replica-symmetric free energy is the functional

$$\text{RS}(\alpha; U; q, r) := -\frac{r(1-q)}{2} + \mathbb{E}\left[\log(2 \cosh(\sqrt{r} Z))\right] + \alpha \mathbb{E}\left[L_q(\sqrt{q} Z)\right]. \quad (5)$$

The following theorem summarizes the replica-symmetric formula and the uniqueness of the associated fixed point equation at sufficiently small α .

Theorem 4 ([4]; [6]). *Assume that U satisfies the following conditions (cf. [6]).*

(A1) $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is measurable, and for $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[\xi U(\xi)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} z U(z) \phi(z) dz \neq 0.$$

(A2) Let $\xi, \xi' \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ be i.i.d. Assume that

$$(K_2)_1(U) := \sup \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\xi, \xi'}[(\xi - \xi')^2 U(x + c\xi) U(x + c\xi')]}{\mathbb{E}_{\xi, \xi'}[U(x + c\xi) U(x + c\xi')]} : x \in \mathbb{R}, \frac{2}{5} \leq c \leq \frac{7}{3} \right\} < \infty,$$

with the convention that the ratio is $+\infty$ when the denominator is 0.

Then there exists $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(U) > 0$ such that for every $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ the fixed point equation (6) has a unique solution (q_\star, r_\star) , and

$$\frac{1}{N} \log Z_N \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} \text{RS}(\alpha; U; q_\star, r_\star).$$

In the special cases where $U(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \geq \kappa\}$, or U is sufficiently smooth, the convergence above was proved earlier by Talagrand [4, 5].

The saddle point equations are the stationarity conditions for (5). They can be written as the fixed point equation

$$q = \mathbb{E}[\tanh^2(\sqrt{r} Z)], \quad r = \alpha \mathbb{E}[F_q(\sqrt{q} Z)^2]. \quad (6)$$

In the half-space case $U(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \geq \kappa\}$, we have the explicit formulas

$$L_q(x) = \log \Phi\left(\frac{x - \kappa}{\sqrt{1 - q}}\right), \quad F_q(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - q}} \frac{\phi\left(\frac{x - \kappa}{\sqrt{1 - q}}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{x - \kappa}{\sqrt{1 - q}}\right)},$$

where Φ and ϕ are the standard Gaussian distribution function and density. In this case (6) is equivalent to (1) above.

There are two ways to understand the fixed point equation (6). One way is from replica computations: the moment calculation of Z_N becomes a saddle point problem over order parameters, and (6) gives the self-consistency condition. Another way is from the TAP/AMP description of the Gibbs measure of Z_N . In this view, q and r describe macroscopic second moments of the AMP iterations, and (6) follows from the AMP state evolution [7, 6].

2.3 Sharp thresholds and capacity results

There is also work on sharp thresholds for feasibility. For Bernoulli disorder versions of the half-space model, Xu proved a sharp threshold phenomenon from $\{Z_{N,M}^{(\kappa)} > 0\}$ to $\{Z_{N,M}^{(\kappa)} = 0\}$ of the half-space model [8] in the sense of (8). For general disorder (including Gaussian disorder) and more general $\{0, 1\}$ -valued activation functions, Sun and Nakajima proved self-averaging of the free energy, the existence of a sharp threshold sequence, and universality with respect to the disorder [9]. These results suggest a clear picture: feasibility transitions occur in a narrow window as α varies, though the window may depend on N in those work.

Another line of work aims to determine the critical capacity of the Gaussian half-space model in the zero-margin case $\kappa = 0$. Ding and Sun proved, conditional on an additional analytic hypothesis, a lower bound matching the constant $\alpha_\star \approx 0.833$ predicted by Krauth and Mézard, using a second-moment argument together with an AMP-motivated truncation [7]. More recently, Huang obtained a conditionally matching upper bound under a related maximization assumption, yielding a conditional verification of the Krauth–Mézar prediction [10]. We summarize the streamlined version of their results here.

Theorem 5 ([7]; [8]; [9]; [10]). *Let $\kappa = 0$. Then there exists $\alpha_\star(0) \in (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\text{RS}_\star(\alpha, 0) > 0 \quad \text{for } \alpha < \alpha_\star(0), \quad \text{RS}_\star(\alpha, 0) < 0 \quad \text{for } \alpha > \alpha_\star(0).$$

Under the analytic hypotheses of [7, 10], it holds that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(0)} > 0) = \begin{cases} 1, & \alpha < \alpha_\star(0), \\ 0, & \alpha > \alpha_\star(0). \end{cases}$$

Motivated by this, it is natural to view the replica-symmetric prediction as defining a candidate feasibility threshold via the point at which the predicted limiting free energy vanishes. These works show that understanding the replica-symmetric equations, and in particular the structure of the saddle point system, is important for rigorous capacity bounds.

2.4 Main result: uniqueness of the replica-symmetric saddle point

The replica-symmetric formula is most useful in parameter regimes where the saddle point equation (6) has a unique solution (q, r) . Uniqueness matters for several reasons. It eliminates ambiguity in selecting a branch of solutions, yields regular dependence of (q, r) on the parameters (α, κ) , and controls the derivatives of the replica-symmetric free energy (5).

Related work of Ding and Sun [7] established the uniqueness when $\kappa = 0$, with one step verified via a computer-assisted numerical check.

In this paper we give a fully analytic proof of uniqueness for the half-space Ising perceptron. Concretely, when $U(x) = \mathbf{1}\{x \geq \kappa\}$ with $\kappa \geq 0$, we show that the map in (6) has at most one fixed point in the relevant domain. As a consequence, the replica-symmetric free energy can be written unambiguously as

$$\text{RS}(\alpha; U) = \text{RS}(\alpha; U; q(\alpha), r(\alpha)),$$

where $(q(\alpha), r(\alpha))$ is the unique solution to (6).

2.5 Connection to the multi-label classification

The Ising perceptron is closely related to the multi-label classification with random labels. Consider random inputs $g^1, \dots, g^M \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and L -dimensional outputs $y^m \in \{-1, 1\}^L$. Assume that the entries of g^m are i.i.d., and that the labels (y_ℓ^m) are i.i.d. uniform on $\{-1, 1\}$ and independent of the inputs (g^m) . We write $[n] := [1, n] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. A binary weight matrix $W = (w_{\ell i}) \in \{-1, 1\}^{L \times N}$ satisfies the multi-output classification constraints if

$$\text{sgn}(Wg^m) = y^m, \quad \text{for all } m \in [M],$$

which is written as

$$\text{sgn}(\langle w^\ell, g^m \rangle) = y_\ell^m \quad \text{for all } m \in [M], \ell \in [L],$$

where w^ℓ is the ℓ -th row of W . Equivalently, since $\langle w^\ell, g^m \rangle \neq 0$ almost surely,

$$y_\ell^m \langle w^\ell, g^m \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } m, \ell.$$

If the input distribution is symmetric, meaning $g^m \stackrel{d}{=} -g^m$, then the label-flipped patterns $\tilde{g}^{m,\ell} := y_\ell^m g^m$ satisfy $\tilde{g}^{m,\ell} \stackrel{d}{=} g^m$ for each fixed ℓ . Therefore, for each ℓ the feasibility event for row ℓ has the same distribution as $\{Z_{N,M}^{(0)} > 0\}$. Let \mathcal{E} be the event that there is *no* matrix solution W . Then

$$\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ \text{no feasible } w^\ell \in \{-1, 1\}^N \text{ for output } \ell \right\}.$$

By a union bound, we obtain the bounds

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{N,M}^{(0)} = 0) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq L \mathbb{P}(Z_{N,M}^{(0)} = 0). \quad (7)$$

The same reduction applies with a positive margin: if one requires $y_\ell^m \langle w^\ell, g^m \rangle / \sqrt{N} \geq \kappa$ for all $m \in [M]$ and $\ell \in [L]$, then the analogue of (7) holds with $Z_{N,M}^{(\kappa)}$.

We use the sharp-threshold sequence proved in [8, 9] to summarize the conclusion. Fix $\kappa \geq 0$, and write $M = \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$. Assume there exists a sequence $\alpha_N = \alpha_N(\kappa)$ such that for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $c_\varepsilon > 0$ with, for all large N ,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \leq \alpha_N - \varepsilon &\implies \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(\kappa)} = 0\right) \leq e^{-c_\varepsilon N}, \\ \alpha \geq \alpha_N + \varepsilon &\implies \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(\kappa)} = 0\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_\varepsilon N}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

If $\alpha \leq \alpha_N - \varepsilon$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq L \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(\kappa)} = 0\right) \leq L e^{-c_\varepsilon N},$$

so whenever $\log L = o(N)$ (e.g., fixed L or polynomial L), the probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ still decays exponentially in N . If $\alpha \geq \alpha_N + \varepsilon$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{N, \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor}^{(\kappa)} = 0\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_\varepsilon N},$$

which converges to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Thus, except for a narrow window, the two models behave in the same way.

2.6 How we use GPT-5 in this project

We used GPT-5 as a tool for computation and reasoning throughout the project (in particular, Lemma 13, 15 below). In a typical workflow, we supplied a problem together with a proposed proof strategy, and asked GPT-5 to suggest an outline and to elaborate intermediate steps. Because the outputs contained gaps or errors, we independently verified the details and either corrected them ourselves or asked GPT-5 to address specific issues. We repeated this process iteratively until reaching the final version of each proof. All arguments in the manuscript are fully analytic and were not computer-verified. Overall, we found generative AI helpful for converting informal sketches or computer-assisted arguments into fully rigorous analytic proofs. Numerical computer-assisted proofs typically depend on approximating a large number of quantities, while an analytic proof often reduces the problem to a small set of key estimates. This type of reduction appears to match well with the strengths of generative AI.

3 Auxiliary results for Theorem 1

3.1 Roadmap of the proof

The aim of this section is to reduce the fixed point equation (1) to a one-dimensional equation and to isolate the main technical ingredient needed for Theorem 1 (the strict monotonicity of B , proved in Section 3).

Recall that, with B defined in (2), the second equation in (1) can be rewritten as (3):

$$r = \frac{\alpha}{(1-q)^2} B(q).$$

Substituting $q = P(r)$ yields

$$r(1 - P(r))^2 = \alpha B(P(r)).$$

Define

$$A(r) := r(1 - P(r))^2 = r \left(\mathbb{E}[\operatorname{sech}^2(\sqrt{r} Z)] \right)^2, \quad r \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

Letting $q = P(r)$, solving (1) is equivalent to solving the one-dimensional equation

$$A(r) = \alpha B(P(r)), \quad r \geq 0, \quad (10)$$

The remaining ingredients are standard: P is strictly increasing (Lemma 6); A is strictly increasing with range $[0, 2/\pi)$ (Lemma 7); and B is finite/continuous on $[0, 1)$ with endpoint limits $B(0) = E(\kappa)^2$ and $\lim_{q \uparrow 1} B(q) = C_\kappa$ (Lemmas 9 and 10). Once B is known to be strictly decreasing, the difference $A(r) - \alpha B(P(r))$ is strictly increasing and has at most one root, and comparing endpoint limits yields existence/nonexistence with threshold $\alpha_c(\kappa) = 2/(\pi C_\kappa)$.

3.2 Properties of P

Lemma 6. *The function $P : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1)$ defined by*

$$P(r) = \mathbb{E}[\tanh^2(\sqrt{r} Z)]$$

is continuous and strictly increasing, satisfies $P(0) = 0$ and $P(r) < 1$ for all finite r , and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} P(r) = 1.$$

Proof. For each fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}$, the map $r \mapsto \tanh^2(\sqrt{r} z)$ is nondecreasing and continuous on $[0, \infty)$. Since $0 \leq \tanh^2(\sqrt{r} Z) \leq 1$, dominated convergence yields continuity of P and preserves monotonicity.

To see strictness, fix $0 \leq r_1 < r_2$. Then $\tanh^2(\sqrt{r_1} z) < \tanh^2(\sqrt{r_2} z)$ for every $z \neq 0$, and $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$, hence $P(r_1) < P(r_2)$.

The identity $P(0) = 0$ is immediate. If $r < \infty$, then $\tanh^2(\sqrt{r} z) < 1$ for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$, hence $P(r) < 1$. Finally, when $r \rightarrow \infty$ one has $\tanh^2(\sqrt{r} z) \rightarrow 1$ for every $z \neq 0$, so dominated convergence yields $P(r) \rightarrow 1$. \square

3.3 The function A : monotonicity and range

Lemma 7. *The function $A : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined in (9) is continuous on $[0, \infty)$ and strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$. Moreover,*

$$A(0) = 0, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} A(r) = \frac{2}{\pi}.$$

In particular, A is a bijection from $[0, \infty)$ onto $[0, 2/\pi)$.

Proof. For $r > 0$, let

$$S(r) := \mathbb{E}[\operatorname{sech}^2(\sqrt{r} Z)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sech}^2(\sqrt{r} z) \phi(z) dz.$$

Then $A(r) = rS(r)^2$. Make the change of variables $y = \sqrt{r} z$ to obtain

$$S(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi r}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sech}^2(y) e^{-y^2/(2r)} dy.$$

Hence

$$A(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} I(r)^2, \quad I(r) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sech}^2(y) e^{-y^2/(2r)} dy. \quad (11)$$

For $r > 0$ we may differentiate under the integral sign:

$$I'(r) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sech}^2(y) e^{-y^2/(2r)} \frac{y^2}{2r^2} dy > 0.$$

Therefore I is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$, hence so is A by (11). Continuity of A follows from continuity of P (Lemma 6) and the representation $A(r) = r(1 - P(r))^2$.

Finally, for each y one has $e^{-y^2/(2r)} \uparrow 1$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, so by monotone convergence,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} I(r) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{sech}^2(y) dy = [\tanh(y)]_{-\infty}^{\infty} = 2.$$

Using (11) yields $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} A(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot 2^2 = \frac{2}{\pi}$. \square

3.4 The function B : finiteness, continuity, and endpoint values

In this subsection, we record the basic analytic properties of B ; the strict monotonicity of B is deferred to Section 3.

The following lemma provides a simple bound for the inverse Mills ratio. Since the proof is elementary, we defer it to the appendix.

Lemma 8. *Recall $E(u) = \phi(u)/\bar{\Phi}(u)$. There exists a finite constant $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$0 < E(u) = \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq u_+ + C, \quad u_+ := \max\{u, 0\}.$$

Moreover, for all $u > 0$,

$$u < \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq u + \frac{1}{u}.$$

Lemma 9. *The function*

$$B(q) = (1 - q) \mathbb{E} \left[E \left(\frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q} Z}{\sqrt{1 - q}} \right)^2 \right]$$

is finite and continuous for all $q \in [0, 1)$.

Proof. Fix $q_0 \in [0, 1)$ and let $q_n \in [0, 1)$ with $q_n \rightarrow q_0$. Define

$$U_n := \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q_n} Z}{\sqrt{1 - q_n}}, \quad U_0 := \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q_0} Z}{\sqrt{1 - q_0}}.$$

Then $U_n \rightarrow U_0$ almost surely, hence $(1 - q_n)E(U_n)^2 \rightarrow (1 - q_0)E(U_0)^2$ almost surely.

To apply dominated convergence, use Lemma 8:

$$E(U_n)^2 \leq (U_n^+ + C)^2 \leq 2((U_n^+)^2 + C^2) \leq 2(U_n^2 + C^2).$$

Multiplying by $(1 - q_n)$ gives

$$(1 - q_n)E(U_n)^2 \leq 2((1 - q_n)U_n^2 + C^2(1 - q_n)) = 2((\kappa - \sqrt{q_n} Z)^2 + C^2(1 - q_n)).$$

Since $0 \leq q_n \leq 1$ eventually, $(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n} Z)^2 \leq 2(\kappa^2 + Z^2)$ and $(1 - q_n) \leq 1$, so

$$(1 - q_n)E(U_n)^2 \leq 4(\kappa^2 + Z^2) + 2C^2.$$

The right-hand side is integrable because $\mathbb{E}[Z^2] = 1$. Therefore dominated convergence applies, and we obtain $B(q_n) \rightarrow B(q_0)$. Finiteness follows from the same domination. \square

Lemma 10. *Let B be defined by (2). Then*

$$B(0) = E(\kappa)^2, \quad \lim_{q \uparrow 1} B(q) = C_\kappa = \mathbb{E}[(\kappa - Z)_+^2] = (\kappa^2 + 1)\Phi(\kappa) + \kappa\phi(\kappa).$$

Proof. At $q = 0$, it is trivial to see $B(0) = (1 - 0)E(\kappa)^2$. For the limit $q \uparrow 1$, set

$$U_q := \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q} Z}{\sqrt{1 - q}}.$$

For each fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(1 - q) E(U_q(z))^2 \rightarrow (\kappa - z)_+^2 \quad (q \uparrow 1),$$

because $U_q(z) \rightarrow +\infty$ when $z < \kappa$, $U_q(z) \rightarrow -\infty$ when $z > \kappa$, $E(u) \sim u$ as $u \rightarrow +\infty$ by Lemma 8 and $E(u) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow -\infty$ since $|E(u)| \leq 2\phi(u)$ for $u < 0$.

Moreover, one may dominate the integrand as follows. By Lemma 8, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $E(u) \leq u_+ + C$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, by $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$, for any $q \in (0, 1)$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - q)E(U_q(z))^2 &\leq 2(1 - q)(U_q(z))^2 + 2C^2(1 - q) \\ &= 2(\kappa - \sqrt{q}z)^2 + 2C^2(1 - q) \\ &\leq 2(\kappa + |z|)^2 + 2C^2. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side is integrable against $\phi(z) dz$, so dominated convergence yields

$$\lim_{q \uparrow 1} B(q) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\kappa - z)_+^2 \phi(z) dz = \mathbb{E}[(\kappa - Z)_+^2] =: C_\kappa.$$

Finally,

$$C_\kappa = \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} (\kappa - z)^2 \phi(z) dz = \kappa^2 \Phi(\kappa) - 2\kappa \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} z \phi(z) dz + \int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} z^2 \phi(z) dz.$$

Using $\phi'(z) = -z\phi(z)$ gives $\int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} z \phi(z) dz = -\phi(\kappa)$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\kappa} z^2 \phi(z) dz = \Phi(\kappa) - \kappa\phi(\kappa)$, hence

$$C_\kappa = (\kappa^2 + 1)\Phi(\kappa) + \kappa\phi(\kappa).$$

□

Recall that $\alpha_c(\kappa) = 2/(\pi C_\kappa)$; this is the value at which the limiting upper range $2/\pi$ of A matches the limiting size αC_κ of the right-hand side in (10).

3.5 Reduction of Theorem 1 to monotonicity of B

Lemma 11. *Assume that B is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1)$. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and define*

$$f(r) := A(r) - \alpha B(P(r)), \quad r \geq 0.$$

Then f is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$. In particular, the one-dimensional equation (10) has at most one solution $r \in [0, \infty)$, and the fixed point equation (1) admits at most one solution $(q, r) \in [0, 1) \times [0, \infty)$.

Proof. By Lemma 7, A is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$. By Lemma 6 and the assumed strict monotonicity of B , the composition $r \mapsto B(P(r))$ is strictly decreasing on $(0, \infty)$. Hence f is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$.

Moreover, by Lemmas 6, 7, and 10,

$$f(0) = A(0) - \alpha B(P(0)) = -\alpha B(0) = -\alpha E(\kappa)^2 < 0,$$

so any zero of f must lie in $(0, \infty)$. Since f is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$, it has at most one zero. Therefore (10), which is equivalent to $f(r) = 0$, has at most one solution $r \in [0, \infty)$. The correspondence $q = P(r)$ then yields at most one solution (q, r) to (1). □

Thus, the proof of Theorem 1 reduces to the following monotonicity property of B .

Theorem 12 (Monotonicity of B). *The function $q \mapsto B(q)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1)$.*

Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 12.

4 Monotonicity of B

Recall that $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and for $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\phi(u) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-u^2/2}, \quad \Phi(u) := \int_{-\infty}^u \phi(s) ds, \quad \bar{\Phi}(u) := 1 - \Phi(u), \quad E(u) := \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)},$$

and for $q \in [0, 1)$ define

$$U_q := \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q} Z}{\sqrt{1-q}}, \quad B(q) := (1-q) \mathbb{E}[E(U_q)^2].$$

We now prove Theorem 12.

4.1 Preliminaries on E and truncated Gaussians

Let $X \sim N(0, 1)$. For every $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq u) = \bar{\Phi}(u), \quad \mathbb{E}[X \mathbf{1}_{\{X \geq u\}}] = \phi(u),$$

hence

$$E(u) = \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq u]. \quad (12)$$

Differentiating $E(u) = \phi(u)/\bar{\Phi}(u)$ and using $\phi'(u) = -u\phi(u)$ and $\bar{\Phi}'(u) = -\phi(u)$ gives

$$E'(u) = E(u)^2 - u E(u). \quad (13)$$

Define also

$$d(u) := E(u) - u = \mathbb{E}[X - u \mid X \geq u].$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid X \geq u)$ and let Y_u denote the random variable $Y_u := X - u$ under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$. Then $d(u) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u]$. Moreover, $Y_u \geq 0$ $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s., and for every integer $k \geq 0$ its conditional moments are finite:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^k] = \mathbb{E}[(X - u)^k \mid X \geq u] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(X - u)^k \mathbf{1}_{\{X \geq u\}}]}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[(|X| + |u|)^k]}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} < \infty,$$

since $X \sim N(0, 1)$ has moments of all orders and $\bar{\Phi}(u) > 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

A useful identity is

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - E'(u) &= 1 - (E(u)^2 - uE(u)) \\ &= 1 + uE(u) - E(u)^2 \\ &= \frac{\int_u^\infty x^2 \phi(x) dx}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} - \left(\frac{\int_u^\infty x \phi(x) dx}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \right)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X^2 \mid X \geq u] - (\mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq u])^2 = \text{Var}(X \mid X \geq u) > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

so $E'(u) < 1$ for all u , and consequently

$$d'(u) = E'(u) - 1 = -\text{Var}(X \mid X \geq u) < 0. \quad (15)$$

In particular, $d(u) > 0$ and d is strictly decreasing on \mathbb{R} .

4.2 Derivative formula

Fix $t \in (0, 1)$ and let $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Set

$$U_t := \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{t} Z}{\sqrt{1-t}}, \quad (16)$$

so that $B(t) = (1-t) \mathbb{E}[E(U_t)^2]$. Let $h(u) := E(u)^2$. Then $B(t) = (1-t) \mathbb{E}[h(U_t)]$. We differentiate under the expectation,

$$B'(t) = -\mathbb{E}[h(U_t)] + (1-t) \mathbb{E}[h'(U_t) \partial_t U_t].$$

A direct computation gives

$$\partial_t U_t = \frac{U_t}{2(1-t)} - \frac{Z}{2\sqrt{t}\sqrt{1-t}},$$

hence

$$B'(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[-h(U_t) + \frac{1}{2}U_t h'(U_t)\right] - \frac{\sqrt{1-t}}{2\sqrt{t}} \mathbb{E}[Z h'(U_t)]. \quad (17)$$

We now use Gaussian integration by parts: for smooth φ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z\varphi(Z)] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi'(Z)].$$

Apply this with

$$\varphi(z) := h'\left(\frac{\kappa - \sqrt{t} z}{\sqrt{1-t}}\right) = h'(U_t(z)).$$

Since $\frac{d}{dz}U_t(z) = -\sqrt{\frac{t}{1-t}}$, we have

$$\varphi'(z) = -\sqrt{\frac{t}{1-t}} h''(U_t(z)),$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[Z h'(U_t)] = -\sqrt{\frac{t}{1-t}} \mathbb{E}[h''(U_t)].$$

Substituting into (17) yields

$$B'(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[-h(U_t) + \frac{1}{2}U_t h'(U_t) + \frac{1}{2}h''(U_t)\right].$$

Next,

$$h'(u) = 2E(u)E'(u), \quad h''(u) = 2(E'(u))^2 + 2E(u)E''(u).$$

Thus, we have

$$B'(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[-(E(U_t))^2 + U_t E(U_t)E'(U_t) + (E'(U_t))^2 + E(U_t)E''(U_t)\right].$$

Using the identity (recall $E'(u) = E(u)^2 - uE(u)$ from (13))

$$E''(u) = 2E(u)E'(u) - E(u) - uE'(u),$$

we get

$$uE(u)E'(u) + E(u)E''(u) - (E(u))^2 = 2E(u)^2(E'(u) - 1).$$

Hence

$$B'(t) = \mathbb{E}[(E'(U_t))^2 + 2E(U_t)^2(E'(U_t) - 1)] = \mathbb{E}[g(U_t)], \quad (18)$$

where we define, for $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$g(u) := E'(u)^2 - 2(1 - E'(u))E(u)^2. \quad (19)$$

Therefore, to prove that B is strictly decreasing on $(0, 1)$, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[g(U_t)] < 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, 1). \quad (20)$$

4.3 The function g on $[0, \infty)$

Recall that $E(u) = \frac{\phi(u)}{\Phi(u)} = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \geq u]$ with standard normal X . Using (13), i.e., $E'(u) = E(u)^2 - uE(u)$, one can rewrite g as the quartic form

$$g(u) = E(u)^2(3E(u)^2 - 4uE(u) + u^2 - 2). \quad (21)$$

We will also use the first few conditional moments of Y_u : for $k \geq 0$,

$$\mu_k(u) := \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^k] = \mathbb{E}[(X - u)^k \mid X \geq u].$$

Recall that $d(u) := E(u) - u = \mu_1(u)$. A standard integration by parts recursion gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(u) &= 1, & \mu_1(u) &= d(u), \\ \mu_2(u) &= 1 - u d(u), \\ \mu_3(u) &= (u^2 + 2) d(u) - u, \\ \mu_4(u) &= u^2 + 3 - u(u^2 + 5) d(u). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Lemma 13. *The function g is strictly decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. In particular, $g(u) \leq g(0)$ for all $u \geq 0$. Moreover,*

$$g(0) = \frac{12}{\pi^2} - \frac{4}{\pi} = -\frac{4(\pi - 3)}{\pi^2}.$$

Before going into the proof of the lemma above, we introduce a simple analytic lemma which will be proved in the appendix.

Lemma 14. *Let $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfy $x \geq 0$, $0 < y < \frac{2}{3}$, and*

$$x + 2y \geq 1, \quad x^2 + xy - 3x - 3y + 2 \geq 0, \quad x + y < 1. \quad (23)$$

Then it holds that

$$F(x, y) := x^2 + 6xy + 6y^2 - x - 4y < 0. \quad (24)$$

Proof of Lemma 13 assuming Lemma 14. We differentiate g and rewrite it in a form that is convenient for moment inequalities. Set $E = E(u)$, $E' = E'(u) = E(u)^2 - uE(u)$, and $d = d(u) = E(u) - u$. A direct differentiation of (21), using (13) and $d' = E' - 1$, yields the identity

$$g'(u) = 2E(u)^2 H(u), \quad H(u) := u^2 d + 6ud^2 + 6d^3 - u - 4d. \quad (25)$$

Since $E(u) > 0$ for all u , the sign of $g'(u)$ is the sign of $H(u)$.

Fix $u \geq 0$. Let $X \sim N(0, 1)$ and let $Y_u = X - u$ under the conditional law given $\{X \geq u\}$. Then $Y_u \geq 0$ almost surely, and $\mu_k(u) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u^k]$ are given in (22).

For any polynomial P we have $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[P(Y_u)^2] \geq 0$, so the (unshifted) Hankel moment matrices $(\mu_{i+j}(u))_{i,j \geq 0}$ are positive semidefinite. Moreover, since $Y_u \geq 0$, also $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y_u P(Y_u)^2] \geq 0$, so the *shifted* Hankel matrices $(\mu_{i+j+1}(u))_{i,j \geq 0}$ are positive semidefinite. In particular,

$$M_1(u) := \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & \mu_2 \\ \mu_2 & \mu_3 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad \widetilde{M}_2(u) := \begin{pmatrix} \mu_0 & \mu_1 & \mu_2 \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \mu_3 \\ \mu_2 & \mu_3 & \mu_4 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0,$$

and $\text{Var}(Y_u) = \mu_2 - \mu_1^2 > 0$.

Hence $\det M_1(u) \geq 0$ and, using (22),

$$\det M_1(u) = \mu_1 \mu_3 - \mu_2^2 = ud + 2d^2 - 1 \geq 0. \quad (26)$$

Similarly, $\det \widetilde{M}_2(u) \geq 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \det \widetilde{M}_2(u) &= \mu_0(\mu_2 \mu_4 - \mu_3^2) - \mu_1(\mu_1 \mu_4 - \mu_2 \mu_3) + \mu_2(\mu_1 \mu_3 - \mu_2^2) \\ &= u^2 d^2 + ud^3 - 3d^2 - 3ud + 2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Finally,

$$\text{Var}(Y_u) = \mu_2 - \mu_1^2 = 1 - ud - d^2 > 0, \quad (28)$$

so $ud + d^2 < 1$.

Introduce the variables

$$x := ud, \quad y := d^2.$$

Since $d = \mathbb{E}[X - u \mid X \geq u] > 0$, for $u \geq 0$ one has $x \geq 0$ and $y > 0$. The inequalities (26), (27), (28) become

$$x + 2y \geq 1, \quad x^2 + xy - 3x - 3y + 2 \geq 0, \quad x + y < 1. \quad (29)$$

Also, $u \mapsto d(u)$ is decreasing by (15), so $d(u) \leq d(0) = E(0) = \sqrt{2/\pi}$ and hence

$$0 < y \leq \frac{2}{\pi} < \frac{2}{3}. \quad (30)$$

Now rewrite $H(u)$ in terms of (x, y) :

$$F(x, y) := dH(u) = u^2 d^2 + 6ud^3 + 6d^4 - ud - 4d^2 = x^2 + 6xy + 6y^2 - x - 4y. \quad (31)$$

By Lemma 14 with $d > 0$, we have $H(u) < 0$ for all $u \geq 0$. By (25), $g'(u) < 0$ on $[0, \infty)$, so g is strictly decreasing there.

Finally, at $u = 0$ one has $E(0) = \phi(0)/\bar{\Phi}(0) = \sqrt{2/\pi}$ and by (13) $E'(0) = E(0)^2 = 2/\pi$. Plugging into (19) gives

$$g(0) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^2 - 2\left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\right)\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right) = \frac{12}{\pi^2} - \frac{4}{\pi} = -\frac{4(\pi - 3)}{\pi^2}. \quad (32)$$

□

4.4 g on $(-\infty, 0]$ via critical points

Lemma 15. *For all $u \leq 0$ one has*

$$g(u) \leq \frac{1}{18}.$$

Proof. First note that g is continuous on \mathbb{R} (because E is smooth on \mathbb{R}), and $g(u) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow -\infty$ since $E(u) = \phi(u)/\bar{\Phi}(u) \leq 2\phi(u)$ for $u \leq 0$ and $\phi(u) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow -\infty$. Moreover, $|u|\phi(u) \rightarrow 0$, so $|u|E(u) \leq 2|u|\phi(u) \rightarrow 0$ and (13) gives $E'(u) = E(u)^2 - uE(u) \rightarrow 0$, hence $g(u) \rightarrow 0$. Also, $g(0) < 0$ by Lemma 13.

If $\sup_{u \leq 0} g(u) = 0$, then $g(u) \leq 0 \leq 1/18$ for all $u \leq 0$ and there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, $\sup_{u \leq 0} g(u) > 0$. Since $g(0) < 0$, this supremum cannot be attained at $u = 0$ and therefore must be attained at some interior maximizer $u_* < 0$.

At such an interior maximizer, $g'(u_*) = 0$. By (25), this implies $H(u_*) = 0$, where H is as in (25). Write $d_* := d(u_*) = E(u_*) - u_*$, and define

$$r_* := -\frac{u_*}{d_*} = -\frac{u_*}{E(u_*) - u_*}.$$

Since $u_* < 0$ and $d_* > 0$, one has $r_* > 0$. Moreover,

$$0 < \phi(u_*)/\bar{\Phi}(u_*) = E(u_*) = u_* + d_* = d_*(1 - r_*),$$

so $r_* < 1$. Hence $r_* \in (0, 1)$.

The equation $H(u_*) = 0$ becomes, after substituting $u_* = -r_*d_*$,

$$u_*^2 d_* + 6u_* d_*^2 + 6d_*^3 - 4d_* - u_* = (r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6)d_*^3 + (r_* - 4)d_* = 0.$$

Dividing by $d_* > 0$ gives

$$(r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6)d_*^2 + (r_* - 4) = 0, \quad \text{so} \quad d_*^2 = \frac{4 - r_*}{r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6}.$$

Now evaluate $g(u_*)$ using (21), i.e., $g(u_*) = E(u_*)^2(3E(u_*)^2 - 4u_*E(u_*) + u_*^2 - 2)$. With $E(u_*) = u_* + d_* = d_*(1 - r_*)$ and $u_*d_* = -r_*d_*^2$, one has

$$g(u_*) = d_*^2(1 - r_*)^2((-2r_* + 3)d_*^2 - 2).$$

Substituting $d_*^2 = (4 - r_*)/(r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6)$, a cancellation occurs:

$$((-2r_* + 3)d_*^2 - 2) = \frac{(3 - 2r_*)(4 - r_*) - 2(r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6)}{r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6} = \frac{r_*}{r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6}.$$

Therefore the value of g at any critical point $u = u_* < 0$ is

$$g(u_*) = \frac{r_*(4 - r_*)(1 - r_*)^2}{(r_*^2 - 6r_* + 6)^2}, \quad r_* \in (0, 1). \quad (33)$$

It remains to bound the right-hand side:

$$\frac{r(4 - r)(1 - r)^2}{(r^2 - 6r + 6)^2} \leq \frac{1}{18}, \quad r \in (0, 1).$$

Since this is a straightforward estimate, we defer the proof to the appendix; see Lemma 16.

Combining this with (33), every interior maximizer $u_* < 0$ satisfies $g(u_*) \leq 1/18$. Since $g(u) \leq \max\{0, g(u_*)\}$ for all $u \leq 0$ and $0 \leq 1/18$, it follows that $g(u) \leq 1/18$ for all $u \leq 0$. \square

4.5 Completion of the proof: monotonicity of B

Proof of Theorem 12. Fix $t \in (0, 1)$ and write $U_t = \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{t}Z}{\sqrt{1-t}}$ as in (16). Since $\kappa/\sqrt{t} \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(U_t < 0) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\kappa - \sqrt{t}Z}{\sqrt{1-t}} < 0\right) = \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{t}Z > \kappa) = \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Split the expectation in (18) according to the sign of U_t . By Lemma 13, for $U_t \geq 0$ one has $g(U_t) \leq g(0)$. By Lemma 15, for $U_t < 0$ one has $g(U_t) \leq 1/18$. Therefore, with $p_t := \mathbb{P}(U_t < 0) \in (0, 1/2]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[g(U_t)] \leq g(0)(1 - p_t) + \frac{1}{18}p_t. \quad (34)$$

We now show $g(0) < -1/18$, so that the right-hand side of (34) is strictly negative. From Lemma 13, we have $g(0) = -4(\pi - 3)/\pi^2$. Hence, it suffices to show that

$$-\frac{4(\pi - 3)}{\pi^2} < -\frac{1}{18}. \quad (35)$$

It is classical (Archimedes' bounds) that $\pi > \frac{223}{71}$. The function

$$h(x) := \frac{4(x - 3)}{x^2}$$

is strictly increasing for $x \in (3, 6)$ because $h'(x) = \frac{4(6-x)}{x^3} > 0$ there. Since $\pi \in (3, 6)$, we have

$$\frac{4(\pi - 3)}{\pi^2} = h(\pi) \geq h\left(\frac{223}{71}\right) = \frac{4\left(\frac{223}{71} - 3\right)}{\left(\frac{223}{71}\right)^2} = \frac{201640}{3530759} > \frac{1}{18}.$$

Insert this into (34):

$$\mathbb{E}[g(U_t)] < g(0)(1 - p_t) - g(0)p_t = g(0)(1 - 2p_t) \leq 0,$$

since $g(0) < 0$ and $p_t \leq 1/2$. By (18), $B'(t) = \mathbb{E}[g(U_t)] < 0$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$.

Therefore B is strictly decreasing on $(0, 1)$. Continuity of B on $[0, 1)$ follows directly from the definition and dominated convergence, so B is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1)$ as claimed. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1, 2, 3

Proof of Theorem 1. By Theorem 12, B is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1)$. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and define $f(r) = A(r) - \alpha B(P(r))$ as in Lemma 11. Then f is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$.

Moreover, by Lemmas 7, 6, and 9, the function f is continuous on $[0, \infty)$. By Lemmas 7, 6, and 10,

$$f(0) = A(0) - \alpha B(P(0)) = -\alpha B(0) < 0.$$

Also, using Lemmas 7, 6, and 10,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} A(r) - \alpha \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} B(P(r)) = \frac{2}{\pi} - \alpha C_\kappa.$$

If $\alpha < \alpha_c(\kappa) = \frac{2}{\pi C_\kappa}$, then $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) > 0$, so by continuity there exists $r_* \in (0, \infty)$ with $f(r_*) = 0$. Since f is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$, this r_* is unique. Using $R_\kappa(q, \alpha) = \alpha \mathbb{E}[F_q(\sqrt{q}Z)^2] =$

$\alpha B(q)/(1-q)^2$, we get $r_* = R_\kappa(q_*, \alpha)$. Setting $q_* := P(r_*) < 1$, the identity $f(r_*) = 0$ is equivalent to $r_* = \alpha B(q_*)/(1-q_*)^2$, so (q_*, r_*) solves (1).

If $\alpha \geq \alpha_c(\kappa)$, then $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f(r) \leq 0$. Since $f(0) < 0$ and f is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$, it follows that $f(r) < 0$ for all $r \geq 0$. Any solution (q, r) of (1) would satisfy $f(r) = 0$ (since $q = P(r)$ and $r = R_\kappa(q, \alpha) = \alpha B(q)/(1-q)^2$), contradicting $f(r) < 0$. Hence (1) has no solution. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Fix $\kappa \geq 0$. For each $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_c(\kappa))$, let (q_α, r_α) be the unique solution to (1). It suffices to show that for any sequence $\alpha_n \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa)$,

$$r_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Indeed, if $r_{\alpha_n} \rightarrow \infty$ then $q_{\alpha_n} = P(r_{\alpha_n}) \rightarrow 1$ by Lemma 6. Since the choice of α_n is arbitrary, this yields

$$r_\alpha \rightarrow \infty, \quad q_\alpha \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } \alpha \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa).$$

Let $\alpha_n \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa)$. Set $(q_n, r_n) := (q_{\alpha_n}, r_{\alpha_n})$, so

$$q_n = P(r_n), \quad r_n = \frac{\alpha_n}{(1-q_n)^2} B(q_n).$$

We will prove that $r_n \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, assume the contrary. Then there exists a subsequence, still denoted (r_n) , that is bounded. By compactness, after passing to a further subsequence we may assume $r_n \rightarrow r_* \in [0, \infty)$. By Lemma 6 and $q_n = P(r_n)$,

$$q_n \rightarrow q_* := P(r_*).$$

Since $r_* < \infty$, Lemma 6 gives $q_* = P(r_*) < 1$.

Now use the second equation and take limits. Because $q_n \rightarrow q_* < 1$, we have $(1-q_n)^{-2} \rightarrow (1-q_*)^{-2}$, and by Lemma 9, $B(q_n) \rightarrow B(q_*)$. Also, $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha_c(\kappa)$. Therefore

$$r_* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{(1-q_n)^2} B(q_n) = \frac{\alpha_c(\kappa)}{(1-q_*)^2} B(q_*).$$

Together with $q_* = P(r_*)$, this shows that (q_*, r_*) solves (1) at $\alpha = \alpha_c(\kappa)$. This contradicts Theorem 1, which states that a solution exists if and only if $\alpha < \alpha_c(\kappa)$. The contradiction proves $r_n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\alpha_n \uparrow \alpha_c(\kappa)$ and set $(q_n, r_n) := (q_{\alpha_n}, r_{\alpha_n})$. Write $\varepsilon_n := 1 - q_n$. By Theorem 2, $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $r_n \rightarrow \infty$. Recall also from Theorem 1 that (q_n, r_n) satisfies the fixed point relations

$$q_n = \mathbb{E}[\tanh^2(\sqrt{r_n} Z)], \quad r_n = \frac{\alpha_n}{\varepsilon_n^2} B(q_n).$$

Define

$$U_n := \frac{\kappa - \sqrt{q_n} Z}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_n}}, \quad A_n := \mathbb{E}[(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n} Z)_+^2].$$

Then

$$\text{RS}_*(\alpha_n, \kappa) = \log 2 - \frac{r_n \varepsilon_n}{2} + \mathbb{E}[\log \cosh(\sqrt{r_n} Z)] + \alpha_n \mathbb{E}[\log \Phi(U_n)].$$

For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ one has $\log \cosh x \leq x \tanh x$. Taking $x = \sqrt{r_n} Z$ and using Gaussian integration by parts,

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \cosh(\sqrt{r_n} Z)] \leq \sqrt{r_n} \mathbb{E}[Z \tanh(\sqrt{r_n} Z)] = r_n \mathbb{E}[\text{sech}^2(\sqrt{r_n} Z)]. \quad (36)$$

Since $\operatorname{sech}^2 = 1 - \tanh^2$ and $q_n = \mathbb{E}[\tanh^2(\sqrt{r_n}Z)]$, this gives $\mathbb{E}[\operatorname{sech}^2(\sqrt{r_n}Z)] = 1 - q_n = \varepsilon_n$, hence

$$-\frac{r_n \varepsilon_n}{2} + \mathbb{E}[\log \cosh(\sqrt{r_n}Z)] \leq \frac{r_n \varepsilon_n}{2}.$$

Using $r_n = \frac{\alpha_n}{\varepsilon_n^2} B(q_n)$ yields

$$-\frac{r_n \varepsilon_n}{2} + \mathbb{E}[\log \cosh(\sqrt{r_n}Z)] \leq \frac{\alpha_n}{2\varepsilon_n} B(q_n). \quad (37)$$

Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Since $q_n \rightarrow 1$, for all large n we have $\sqrt{q_n} \geq 1/2$. On the event $\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}$,

$$\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z \geq \kappa - \sqrt{q_n}(\kappa - \delta) = \kappa(1 - \sqrt{q_n}) + \sqrt{q_n}\delta \geq \delta/2,$$

so $U_n \geq \delta/(2\sqrt{\varepsilon_n}) > 0$ on $\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}$.

For $u > 0$, Chernoff's bound gives

$$\bar{\Phi}(u) = \mathbb{P}(Z \geq u) \leq e^{-u^2} \mathbb{E}[e^{uZ}] = e^{-u^2/2}.$$

By Lemma 8, we have

$$\bar{\Phi}(u) \leq \phi(u)/u \leq u^{-1}e^{-u^2/2}.$$

Hence

$$\log \bar{\Phi}(u) \leq -\frac{u^2}{2}, \quad \log \bar{\Phi}(u) \leq -\frac{u^2}{2} - \log u, \quad (u > 0),$$

and trivially $\log \bar{\Phi}(u) \leq 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, for all large n ,

$$\log \bar{\Phi}(U_n) \leq -\frac{U_n^2}{2} \mathbf{1}_{\{U_n > 0\}} - (\log U_n) \mathbf{1}_{\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}}.$$

Taking expectations and using $U_n^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{U_n > 0\}} = \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z)_+^2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \bar{\Phi}(U_n)] \leq -\frac{A_n}{2\varepsilon_n} - \mathbb{E}[(\log U_n) \mathbf{1}_{\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}}].$$

On $\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}$ we have $\log U_n = \log(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z) - \frac{1}{2} \log \varepsilon_n$, hence

$$-\mathbb{E}[(\log U_n) \mathbf{1}_{\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}}] = \frac{\Phi(\kappa - \delta)}{2} \log \varepsilon_n - \mathbb{E}[\log(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z) \mathbf{1}_{\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}}].$$

Since on $\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}$ and for large n we have $\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z \geq \delta/2$, it follows that $\log(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z) \geq \log(\delta/2)$ and therefore

$$-\mathbb{E}[\log(\kappa - \sqrt{q_n}Z) \mathbf{1}_{\{Z \leq \kappa - \delta\}}] \leq -\log(\delta/2).$$

Consequently, with $C(\delta) := -\log(\delta/2) \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \bar{\Phi}(U_n)] \leq -\frac{A_n}{2\varepsilon_n} + \frac{\Phi(\kappa - \delta)}{2} \log \varepsilon_n + C(\delta), \quad (38)$$

for all large n .

Next, let $E(u) := \phi(u)/\bar{\Phi}(u)$ and recall

$$B(q_n) = \varepsilon_n \mathbb{E}[E(U_n)^2], \quad A_n = \varepsilon_n \mathbb{E}[(U_n)_+^2].$$

For $u > 0$, Lemma 8, $\bar{\Phi}(u) \leq \phi(u)/u$, implies $E(u) \geq u$, hence $E(u)^2 \geq u^2 = (u_+)^2$, while for $u \leq 0$ one has $(u_+)^2 = 0 \leq E(u)^2$. Thus $E(u)^2 \geq (u_+)^2$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and so $B(q_n) \geq A_n$.

Moreover, there is a finite constant C_0 such that

$$0 \leq E(u)^2 - (u_+)^2 \leq C_0 \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Indeed, if $u \leq 0$, then $\bar{\Phi}(u) \geq 1/2$ and $\phi(u) \leq \phi(0)$, so $E(u) \leq 2\phi(0) = \sqrt{2/\pi}$ and $E(u)^2 - (u_+)^2 = E(u)^2 \leq 2/\pi$. If $u \geq 1$, the two-sided Mills bound $\bar{\Phi}(u) \geq \phi(u)u/(1+u^2)$ by Lemma 8 gives $E(u) \leq (1+u^2)/u = u + 1/u$, hence

$$0 \leq E(u)^2 - u^2 \leq (u + 1/u)^2 - u^2 = 2 + 1/u^2 \leq 3.$$

Finally, on $u \in [0, 1]$ the function $u \mapsto E(u)^2 - u^2$ is continuous and hence bounded. Taking C_0 as the maximum of these bounds yields the claim.

Therefore,

$$0 \leq B(q_n) - A_n = \varepsilon_n \mathbb{E}[E(U_n)^2 - (U_n)_+^2] \leq C_0 \varepsilon_n. \quad (39)$$

Combining (37), (38), and (39),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RS}_*(\alpha_n, \kappa) &\leq \log 2 + \frac{\alpha_n}{2\varepsilon_n} B(q_n) + \alpha_n \left(-\frac{A_n}{2\varepsilon_n} + \frac{\Phi(\kappa - \delta)}{2} \log \varepsilon_n + C(\delta) \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_n \Phi(\kappa - \delta)}{2} \log \varepsilon_n + \log 2 + \frac{\alpha_n}{2\varepsilon_n} (B(q_n) - A_n) + \alpha_n C(\delta) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha_n \Phi(\kappa - \delta)}{2} \log \varepsilon_n + \log 2 + \frac{C_0 \alpha_c(\kappa)}{2} + \alpha_c(\kappa) C(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

for all large n , since $\alpha_n \leq \alpha_c(\kappa)$ and $C(\delta) > 0$.

Since $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, we have $\log \varepsilon_n \rightarrow -\infty$, and since $\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha_c(\kappa) > 0$ and $\Phi(\kappa - \delta) > 0$, the right-hand side tends to $-\infty$. Therefore $\text{RS}_*(\alpha_n, \kappa) \rightarrow -\infty$, proving the claim. \square

A Appendix

A.1 Uniform growth bound for the inverse Mills ratio: Lemma 8

Recall $E(u) = \phi(u)/\bar{\Phi}(u)$. We aim to prove that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$0 < E(u) = \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq \max\{u, 0\} + C.$$

For all $u > 0$,

$$u < \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq u + \frac{1}{u}.$$

Proof of Lemma 8. For $u \leq 1$, since $\bar{\Phi}$ is decreasing, we have $\bar{\Phi}(u) \geq \bar{\Phi}(1) > 0$ and $\phi(u) \leq 1$, hence

$$E(u) = \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq \frac{1}{\bar{\Phi}(1)} =: C_1 < \infty.$$

For $u > 0$, integrate by parts to get the classical identity

$$\bar{\Phi}(u) = \int_u^\infty \phi(t) dt = \left[-\frac{\phi(t)}{t} \right]_{t=u}^\infty - \int_u^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^2} dt = \frac{\phi(u)}{u} - \int_u^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^2} dt.$$

Here the boundary term at ∞ vanishes since $\phi(t)/t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since $t \geq u$ on $[u, \infty)$,

$$\int_u^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^2} dt \leq \frac{1}{u^2} \int_u^\infty \phi(t) dt = \frac{\bar{\Phi}(u)}{u^2},$$

so

$$\bar{\Phi}(u) \geq \frac{\phi(u)}{u} - \frac{\bar{\Phi}(u)}{u^2}, \quad \text{hence} \quad \frac{\phi(u)}{\bar{\Phi}(u)} \leq u + \frac{1}{u}. \quad (40)$$

In particular, for $u \geq 1$ we have $E(u) \leq u + 1$. Hence, we can choose $C := \max\{C_1, 1\}$.

Finally, for $u > 0$,

$$\bar{\Phi}(u) = \int_u^\infty \phi(t) dt = \int_u^\infty \frac{-\phi'(t)}{t} dt = \left[-\frac{\phi(t)}{t} \right]_u^\infty - \int_u^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^2} dt < \frac{\phi(u)}{u}.$$

□

A.2 Proof of Lemma 14

We aim to prove the following: Let $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfy $x \geq 0$, $0 < y < \frac{2}{3}$, and

$$x + 2y \geq 1, \quad x^2 + xy - 3x - 3y + 2 \geq 0, \quad x + y < 1. \quad (41)$$

Then it holds that

$$F(x, y) := x^2 + 6xy + 6y^2 - x - 4y < 0. \quad (42)$$

Proof. Fix $y \in (0, 2/3)$. Consider the quadratic constraint

$$q_y(x) := x^2 + xy - 3x - 3y + 2 \geq 0.$$

Its roots are

$$r_\pm(y) = \frac{3 - y \pm \sqrt{y^2 + 6y + 1}}{2}. \quad (43)$$

Since $y^2 + 6y + 1 > (y + 1)^2$ for $y > 0$, we have

$$r_+(y) = \frac{3 - y + \sqrt{y^2 + 6y + 1}}{2} > \frac{3 - y + (y + 1)}{2} = 2 > 1.$$

Because q_y has leading coefficient 1, the inequality $q_y(x) \geq 0$ implies

$$x \in (-\infty, r_-(y)] \cup [r_+(y), \infty).$$

From $x + y < 1$ in (41) we get $x < 1 - y \leq 1 < r_+(y)$, so the second branch is impossible and therefore $x \leq r_-(y)$. Moreover, $r_-(y) + y < 1$ holds for $y > 0$, because it is equivalent to $\sqrt{y^2 + 6y + 1} > y + 1$.

Combining $x \geq 0$ and $x + 2y \geq 1$ from (41) with $x \leq r_-(y)$, the feasible set of x for this fixed y is the interval

$$I_y := \left[\max\{0, 1 - 2y\}, r_-(y) \right]. \quad (44)$$

Note that if I_y is empty, then the claim follows immediately for that y . Hence, we assume that I_y is not empty.

For fixed y , the function $x \mapsto F(x, y)$ is a convex quadratic since

$$F(x, y) = x^2 + (6y - 1)x + (6y^2 - 4y), \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} F(x, y) = 2 > 0.$$

Hence the maximum of $F(\cdot, y)$ over the interval I_y is attained at an endpoint since I_y is a closed interval and $F(\cdot, y)$ is convex and continuous.

For the left endpoint, there are two cases. If $y \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $\max\{0, 1 - 2y\} = 1 - 2y$ and

$$F(1 - 2y, y) = -2y^2 < 0. \quad (45)$$

If $y \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then $\max\{0, 1 - 2y\} = 0$ and, using $y < \frac{2}{3}$,

$$F(0, y) = 6y^2 - 4y = 2y(3y - 2) < 0. \quad (46)$$

For the right endpoint $x = r_-(y)$, use the identity $q_y(x) = 0$ to eliminate x^2 :

$$F(x, y) = (x^2 + xy - 3x - 3y + 2) + (5xy + 2x + 6y^2 - y - 2) = 5xy + 2x + 6y^2 - y - 2.$$

Substituting $x = r_-(y)$ gives

$$F(r_-(y), y) = \frac{7y^2 + 11y + 2 - (5y + 2)\sqrt{y^2 + 6y + 1}}{2}. \quad (47)$$

Both $7y^2 + 11y + 2$ and $(5y + 2)\sqrt{y^2 + 6y + 1}$ are strictly positive for $y > 0$, so (47) is negative if and only if

$$(5y + 2)\sqrt{y^2 + 6y + 1} > 7y^2 + 11y + 2.$$

Squaring and simplifying yields

$$(5y + 2)^2(y^2 + 6y + 1) - (7y^2 + 11y + 2)^2 = 8y^3(2 - 3y), \quad (48)$$

which is strictly positive for $y \in (0, 2/3)$. Hence $F(r_-(y), y) < 0$.

Therefore F is negative at both endpoints of I_y , so $\max_{x \in I_y} F(x, y) < 0$ and $F(x, y) < 0$ for every feasible x at this y . Since y was arbitrary in $(0, 2/3)$, the conclusion follows. \square

A.3 A rational function inequality

Lemma 16. *For any $r \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\frac{r(4 - r)(1 - r)^2}{(r^2 - 6r + 6)^2} \leq \frac{1}{18}.$$

Proof. This is equivalent to

$$(r^2 - 6r + 6)^2 - 18r(4 - r)(1 - r)^2 \geq 0.$$

Expanding gives the quartic polynomial

$$P(r) := 19r^4 - 120r^3 + 210r^2 - 144r + 36.$$

A useful factorization is

$$P(r) - 1 = (r - 1)C(r), \quad C(r) := 19r^3 - 101r^2 + 109r - 35.$$

On $[0, 1]$, the cubic C is strictly concave because

$$C''(r) = 114r - 202 < 0 \quad \text{for all } r \in [0, 1].$$

The derivative $C'(r) = 57r^2 - 202r + 109$ is strictly decreasing, and $C'(0) = 109 > 0$ while $C'(1) = -36 < 0$, so there is a unique $r_0 \in (0, 1)$ with $C'(r_0) = 0$, and C attains its maximum at r_0 . Using $C'(r_0) = 0$ (i.e. $57r_0^2 = 202r_0 - 109$) gives

$$C(r_0) = \frac{5024 - 7976r_0}{171}.$$

The quadratic formula yields

$$r_0 = \frac{202 - \sqrt{202^2 - 4 \cdot 57 \cdot 109}}{2 \cdot 57}$$

and $202^2 - 4 \cdot 57 \cdot 109 = 15952 < 127^2$, hence $r_0 > (202 - 127)/114 = 25/38$. Therefore $7976r_0 > 7976 \cdot (25/38) = 99700/19 > 5024$, so $C(r_0) < 0$. Thus $C(r) < 0$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$. Since $r - 1 < 0$ for $r \in (0, 1)$, we obtain $(r - 1)C(r) > 0$ on $(0, 1)$, and thus $P(r) > 1$ on $(0, 1)$. In particular, $P(r) > 0$ on $(0, 1)$, proving the desired inequality. \square

References

- [1] E. Gardner and B. Derrida. Optimal storage properties of neural network models. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 21(1):271–284, 1988. doi:10.1088/0305-4470/21/1/031.
- [2] W. Krauth and M. Mézard. Storage capacity of memory networks with binary couplings. *J. Physique*, 50(20):3057–3066, 1989. doi:10.1051/jphys:0198900500200305700.
- [3] M. Mézard. The space of interactions in neural networks: Gardner’s computation with the cavity method. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 22(12):2181–2190, 1989. doi:10.1088/0305-4470/22/12/018.
- [4] M. Talagrand. Intersecting random half-spaces: toward the Gardner–Derrida formula. *Ann. Probab.*, 28(2):725–758, 2000. doi:10.1214/aop/1019160259.
- [5] M. Talagrand. *Mean Field Models for Spin Glasses*, Vol. I: Basic Examples and Vol. II: Advanced Replica-Symmetry and Low Temperature. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15202-3 and doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22253-5.
- [6] E. Bolthausen, S. Nakajima, N. Sun, and C. Xu. Gardner formula for Ising perceptron models at small densities. In *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT), Proc. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 178:1787–1911, 2022. arXiv:2111.02855.
- [7] J. Ding and N. Sun. Capacity lower bound for the Ising perceptron. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 193:627–715, 2025. doi:10.1007/s00440-025-01364-x; arXiv:1809.07742.
- [8] C. Xu. Sharp threshold for the Ising perceptron model. *Ann. Probab.*, 49(5):2399–2415, 2021. doi:10.1214/21-AOP1511; arXiv:1905.05978.
- [9] S. Nakajima and N. Sun. Sharp threshold sequence and universality for Ising perceptron models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 638–674. SIAM, 2023. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977554.ch28; arXiv:2204.03469.
- [10] B. Huang. Capacity threshold for the Ising perceptron. In *2024 IEEE 65th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1126–1136. IEEE, 2024. doi:10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00074; arXiv:2404.18902.