

Optimal estimators and tests for reciprocal effects*

Qunqiang Feng¹

Jiashun Jin²

Yaru Tian¹

Ting Yan³

Abstract

The p_1 model plays a fundamental role in modeling directed networks, where the reciprocal effect parameter ρ is of special interest in practice. However, due to nonlinear factors in this model, how to estimate ρ efficiently is a long-standing open problem.

We tackle the problem by the cycle count approach. The challenge is, due to the nonlinear factors in the model, for any given type of generalized cycles, the expected count is a complicated function of many parameters in the model, so it is unclear how to use cycle counts to estimate ρ . However, somewhat surprisingly, we discover that, among many types of generalized cycles with the same length, we can carefully pick a pair of them such that in the ratio between the expected cycle counts of the two types, the non-linear factors *cancel out nicely with each other*, and as a result, the ratio equals to $\exp(\rho)$ exactly. Therefore, though the expected count of cycles of any type is not tractable, the ratio between the expected cycle counts of a (carefully chosen) pair of generalized cycles may have an utterly simple form.

We study to what extent such pairs exist, and use our discovery to derive both an estimate for ρ and a testing procedure for testing $\rho = \rho_0$. In a setting where we allow a wide range of reciprocal effects and a wide variety of network sparsity and degree heterogeneity, we show that our estimator achieves the optimal rate and our test achieves the optimal phase transition. Technically, first, motivated by what we observe on real networks, we do not want to impose strong conditions on reciprocal effects, network sparsity, and degree heterogeneity. Second, our proposed statistic is a type of U -statistic, the analysis of which involves complex combinatorics and is error-prone. For these reasons, our analysis is long and delicate.

¹Department of Statistics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230000, China.
 Email: fengqq@ustc.edu.cn, tt1997@mail.ustc.edu.cn

²Department of Statistics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA. Email: jiashun@stat.cmu.edu

³Department of Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, 430079, China. Email: tingyanty@mail.ccnu.edu.cn

*Author names are sorted alphabetically.

Key words: Generalized cycles; edge-encoding; cycle count ratios; limiting null; minimax, optimality; pseudo-low-rank representation

1 Introduction

Reciprocity is a fundamental principle in social psychology, where we believe that individuals tend to respond to the actions of others in a way that reflects the nature (positive/negative) of those actions, and people make choices based on what they can gain (profits, trusts, feelings) from others in return. Just like social duties, reciprocity makes it possible to build sustainable and continuing relationships that bond different individuals in a community together.

In directed networks, how to model reciprocity is a problem of great interest. The p_1 model by [Holland and Leinhardt \(1981\)](#) is among the most popular models for directed networks. It is a powerful tool for characterizing reciprocation and has been widely applied in practice; see [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#) for a survey. Consider a directed network with n nodes. Let A be the adjacency matrix, where $A_{ij} = 1$ if there is a (directed) edge from node i to node j . As a convention, $A_{ii} = 0$. We assume that the bivariate random variables $\{(A_{ij}, A_{ji}) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ are independent (bivariate) Bernoulli, and that for parameters $\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n$ and any $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{ij} = a, A_{ji} = b) = K_{ij} \cdot \exp(a(\gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_j) + b(\gamma + \alpha_j + \beta_i) + ab\rho), \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, \quad (1)$$

where $K_{ij} = [1 + e^{\gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_j} + e^{\gamma + \alpha_j + \beta_i} + e^{2\gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \alpha_j + \beta_i + \rho}]^{-1}$. For identifiability, we assume

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_n = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_n = 0. \quad (2)$$

Here, ρ calibrates the strength of reciprocated edges, γ calibrates the overall sparsity level, and α_i and β_i calibrate the expansiveness and popularity of node i , respectively.

The p_1 model can also be viewed as a special case of the Exponential Random Graph Model [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#); [Schweinberger et al. \(2020\)](#). It includes the well-known β -model [Chatterjee et al. \(2011\)](#) as a special case. The β -model has been widely studied (e.g., [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Yan et al. \(2016\)](#); [Yan and Xu \(2013\)](#)). Also, if we neglect the non-linear factors K_{ij} , then the p_1 model reduces to a special block model. The block models have received a lot of attention recently (e.g., [Chen et al. \(2018\)](#); [Fan et al. \(2022\)](#); [Ke and Jin \(2023\)](#); [Ke and Wang \(2024\)](#); [Li et al. \(2020\)](#); [Saldana et al. \(2017\)](#); [Wang and Bickel \(2017\)](#); [Zhao et al. \(2012\)](#)). See Section 3.7 and Section 6 for more discussion.

Note that real networks usually have severe degree heterogeneity ([Ke and Jin, 2023](#)) (meaning the degree, in-degree or out-degree, of a node can be hundreds time larger than that of the other). Also, the sparsity level of a network may range significantly from one occasion to another. For these reasons, we allow $\gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n$ to take all possible

values in their range of interest.

Let $\theta = (\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$. Due to the importance of reciprocity, out of the $(2n+2)$ unknown parameters, ρ (the reciprocity parameter) has received the most attention [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#). In many applications (e.g., link prediction, citation prediction [Ji et al. \(2022\)](#)), the parameter plays an important role. Motivated by these, our primary interest of the paper is as follows.

- *Optimal estimation of ρ .* How to estimate ρ with the optimal rate of convergence.
- *Optimal tests.* Given a ρ_0 , how to derive optimal tests for testing whether $\rho = \rho_0$.
- *Optimal adaptivity.* The tests and estimators are optimal in a broad setting covering all possible levels of reciprocity and sparsity and allowing for severe degree heterogeneity.

Despite the popularity of the p_1 model in practice, how to estimate ρ and other parameters is a long-standing problem that has challenged us for over 40 years [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#); [Rinaldo et al. \(2013\)](#). The main reason is that, due to factors K_{ij} in Model (1), the p_1 model is *nonlinear* (see Section 2). We now briefly review the literature on estimating ρ (discussion for testing is similar and is omitted).

First, we may consider the Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) approach. However, as pointed out by [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#), MLE faces grand challenges: “A major problem with the p_1 and related models, ..., we have no consistency in results for the maximum likelihood estimates, and no simple way to test for $\rho = 0$.” Also, [Rinaldo et al. \(2013, Theorem 1.5, supplement\)](#) proved that the MLE exists if and only if the adjacency matrix A in the p_1 model satisfies two hard-to-check conditions (in fact, MLE and LRT do not exist in many cases; see Section 4). Also, relatively, MLE is computationally slow and sensitive to outliers and model mis-specification.

Second, we may consider the spectral approach, which is popular in network analysis (e.g., [Ke and Jin \(2023\)](#)). However, spectral approaches are only appropriate for low-rank network models. In a low-rank network model, we can decompose the adjacency matrix A as $A = \Omega + W$, where the matrix Ω is low-rank and non-stochastic (containing the information of the parameters) and the matrix W contains the noise and secondary effect. Unfortunately, due to the nonlinear factors K_{ij} in Model (1), the p_1 model is not a low-rank model (see Section 2 for more discussion), and it is unclear how to develop an efficient spectral approach to estimate ρ .

Last, we may consider the cycle count approach, which is also popular in network analysis. Consider an undirected network with K communities. In recent works, [Gao and Lafferty \(2017\)](#); [Jin et al. \(2018, 2021\)](#) developed a cycle count approach to global testing where the goal is to test whether $K = 1$ or $K > 1$ and [Jin et al. \(2023\)](#) developed a cycle count approach to estimating K . Unfortunately, these works have been largely focused on (a) different problems, and (b) undirected networks with low-rank models, and it remains unclear how to extend their ideas to address our problem. For these reasons, how to estimate ρ is an interesting but largely unsolved problem.

1.1 LCR: A novel cycle count approach to estimating ρ

We wish to develop a cycle count approach for our problem. The main challenge is, for any $m \geq 3$, there are many different types of m -cycles (see below), and it is unclear which cycle count statistics may contain the key information about ρ .

To address the challenge, our idea is as follows. We first extend the notion of (regular) cycles for undirected networks to generalized cycles for directed networks, with more complicated forms. We then introduce pseudo low-rank representation (PLR) and edge-encoding for the p_1 model. Using PLR and edge encoding, for any type of length- m generalized cycles, we can explicitly represent the expected number of such cycles with a big sum. The problem is, however, due to the nonlinear factors K_{ij} in (1), it is hard to further simplify the big sum above with a succinct formula and relate it to our parameters. Fortunately, we discover that, for some $m \geq 3$, we can construct a pair of generalized m -cycles, Type- a and Type- b , such that for an integer $c_0 \neq 0$ (known to us),

$$\frac{\text{Expected number of Type-}a \text{ generalized cycles}}{\text{Expected number of Type-}b \text{ generalized cycles}} = e^{c_0 \rho}. \quad (3)$$

Below, we show that there are $O(4^{2m})$ pairs of (a, b) , but out of them, only very few pairs satisfy (3); we need non-trivial efforts to find such pairs of (a, b) (see Section 3). Therefore, *though it is hard to derive a simple formula for either the numerator or denominator on the LHS of (3), we can derive a very simple formula for their ratio*. This gives rise to a convenient way to estimate ρ and to test whether $\rho = \rho_0$ for a given ρ_0 ; see Section 3.

As far as we know, the discovery in (3) is new. We have the following contributions. (1). When m is even, we can always construct a pair of length- m generalized cycles such that (3) is satisfied. However, when m is odd, such a pair does not exist. (2). Using the above discovery, we propose the logarithmic cycle-count ratio (LCR) as a novel approach to estimating ρ . In a broad setting where ρ may vary in its whole range of interest, and which covers all interesting sparsity levels and allows severe degree heterogeneity, we show that LCR is asymptotical minimax (and thus is optimal). (3). We propose a new way to estimate the variances of LCR estimators, and use the results to develop the LCR tests for testing $\rho = \rho_0$. In the same broad setting, we show that the LCR tests have $N(0, 1)$ as the limiting null and achieve the optimal phase transition (similar to the minimax framework, phase transition is a theoretical framework for optimality [Donoho and Jin \(2015\)](#); [Jin et al. \(2017\)](#)). In practice, an explicit limiting null is especially useful (e.g., for computing p -values). In summary, our approach is new, and for the first time, we derive optimal tests and estimators for the reciprocal parameter ρ in a broad setting (by far, consistent estimators for ρ in a broad setting are not available).

Organizations and notations. Section 2 presents the Pseudo Low-rank Representation (PLR) for the p_1 model. Section 3 contains our main results. Section 4 contains numerical studies. Section 5 sketches the proof ideas. Section 6 is a short discussion. We use $C > 0$ to denote a generic constant which may vary from one occasion to another. For a vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)' \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|x\|_q$ denotes the ℓ^q -norm of x , and x_{\max} and x_{\min} de-

note the largest and smallest entry of x , respectively. For any positive sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\{b_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, we say $a_n \sim b_n$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n/b_n) = 1$ and $a_n \asymp b_n$ if there are constants $c_1 > c_0 > 0$ such that $c_0 \leq (a_n/b_n) \leq c_1$ for sufficiently large n . For $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n,m}$ ($m \geq 1$), $A \circ B \in \mathbb{R}^{n,m}$ denotes the matrix of entry-wise product. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, (x, y) denotes their inner product.

2 Preliminary: The PLR and generalized cycles

We introduce the Pseudo Low-rank Representation (PLR) and edge coding for model (1). Let \circ be the Hadamard or entry-wise product [Horn and Johnson \(1985\)](#). Let K be the $n \times n$ matrix $K = (K_{ij})$. Let μ, ν be the $n \times 1$ vectors satisfying $\mu_i = e^{\gamma/2+\alpha_i}$ and $\nu_i = e^{\gamma/2+\beta_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, and let $\eta = \mu \circ \nu$. Let $\tilde{\Omega} = \mu\nu' + e^\rho \eta\eta'$ and $\Omega = K \circ \tilde{\Omega}$. By (1), it is seen that $\Omega_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(A_{ij} = 1)$, $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$. Let $\text{diag}(\Omega)$ be the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix where the i -th diagonal entry is Ω_{ii} . Let W be the $n \times n$ matrix where $W_{ij} = A_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}$ if $i \neq j$ and $W_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. It follows that

$$A = \Omega - \text{diag}(\Omega) + W, \quad \text{where } \Omega = K \circ \tilde{\Omega} \text{ with } \tilde{\Omega} = [\mu\nu' + e^\rho \eta\eta']. \quad (4)$$

Let $J_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}$ be the matrix of all ones and $\tilde{J}_n = J_n - I_n$, where I_n is the identity matrix. Introduce four $n \times n$ matrix as follows (assuming $i \neq j$ in the paragraph below): (1). $A^{11} = A \circ A'$. Note that $A_{ij}^{11} = 1$ if and only if there is a double edge between i and j ; (2). $A^{00} = (\tilde{J}_n - A) \circ (\tilde{J}_n - A')$ ($A_{ij}^{00} = 1$ if and only if there is no edge between i and j); (3). $A^{10} = A \circ (\tilde{J}_n - A')$ and its transpose $A^{01} = (A^{10})'$. Note that $A_{ij}^{10} = 1$ if and only if there is a (directed) edge from i to j but there is no edge from j to i ; similar for A^{01} . Note also that A^{11} and A^{00} are symmetrical but A^{10} and A^{01} may not. Let $\tilde{\Omega}^{00} = J_n$, $\tilde{\Omega}^{10} = (\tilde{\Omega}^{01})' = \mu\nu'$ and $\tilde{\Omega}^{11} = e^\rho \eta\eta'$. For $a \in \{00, 11, 10, 01\}$, let $\Omega^a = K \circ \tilde{\Omega}^a$. Also, similarly, let $\text{diag}(\Omega^a)$ be the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix where the i -th diagonal entry is Ω_{ii}^a , and let W^a be the $n \times n$ matrix where $W_{ij}^a = A_{ij}^a - \Omega_{ij}^a$ if $i \neq j$ and $W_{ij}^a = 0$ otherwise. It follows that

$$A^a = \Omega^a - \text{diag}(\Omega^a) + W^a \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^a = K \circ \tilde{\Omega}^a, \quad \text{for any } a \in \{00, 11, 10, 01\}. \quad (5)$$

We call (4)-(5) the *pseudo low-rank representation (PLR)* of the p_1 model, for if the nonlinear matrix K is dropped, then matrices $\Omega, \Omega^{00}, \Omega^{10}, \Omega^{01}, \Omega^{11}$ are all low-rank.

We now introduce generalized cycles and edge coding. Fix $m \geq 3$. A generalized m -cycle contains m distinct nodes, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m , and many edges. For any pair of nodes i, j in $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\}$, there are 4 different types of edges: no edge, a directed edge from i to j , a directed edge from j to i , and a double edge; we encode them by $\{00, 10, 01, 11\}$. Therefore, to consider a specific type of length- m generalized cycle, we need to specify the edge pattern first. Introduce $S_m = \{a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m) : \text{where each } a_i \text{ takes values from } \{00, 10, 01, 11\}\}$.

Definition 1. For $m \geq 3$, a generalized m -cycle with edge pattern prescribed by an $a \in S_m$ consists of m distinct nodes i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m , where the edge type between i_1 and i_2 , i_2 and i_3 , ..., and i_m and i_1 are a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m , respectively (we call it an m -cycle of Type- a).

For example, when $m = 4$, we have $4^4 = 256$ different generalized 4-cycles (quadrilaterals) and 42 different non-isomorphic generalized quadrilaterals. See the supplement.

By the PLR and edge-coding, we can represent the number of any given type of generalized cycles succinctly by a big sum. Fix $m \geq 3$ and $a \in S_m$. By the PLR, the number of generalized m -cycles of Type- a is $\frac{1}{C_m(a)} \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m(\text{dist})} A_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} A_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots A_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}$. This is because the value of $A_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} A_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots A_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}$ is either 0 and 1, and it is 1 if and only if there is a type- a_1 edge from i_1 to i_2 , a type- a_2 edge from i_2 to i_3 , ..., and a type- a_m edge from i_m to i_1 . Here, $C_m(a)$ is a combinatoric number representing the number of times we have counted each cycle repeatedly. This motivates us to consider the statistic (where G stands for generalized cycle)

$$G_{n,m}(a) = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m(\text{dist})} A_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} A_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots A_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}. \quad (6)$$

Since i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m are distinct, the m random variables $A_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1}, A_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2}, \dots, A_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}$ are independent of each other. Therefore, if we let $g_{n,m}(a) = \mathbb{E}[G_{n,m}(a)]$, then it follows that

$$g_{n,m}(a) = \mathbb{E}[G_{n,m}(a)] = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m(\text{dist})} \Omega_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} \Omega_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots \Omega_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}. \quad (7)$$

Below we use these big sums to introduce our main ideas and results.

3 Main results

In this section, we propose an optimal approach to estimating ρ and to testing whether $\rho = \rho_0$.

3.1 A novel approach for estimating ρ using a cancellation trick

Fix an $m \geq 3$ and $a \in S_m$ and let $G_{n,m}(a)$ and $g_{n,m}(a)$ be as in (6)-(7). To construct an estimator for ρ , as the first attempt, we hope to find $a \in S_m$ such that ρ is a simple function of $g_{n,m}(a)$. Note that we expect to see that $G_{n,m}(a) \approx g_{n,m}(a)$. Therefore, once we can express ρ as a simple function of $g_{n,m}(a)$, a simple estimator for ρ arises.

Unfortunately, due to the nonlinear factors K_{ij} in the p_1 -model, such an approach does not work. In fact, by (4) and (7),

$$g_{n,m}(a) = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m(\text{dist})} \Omega_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} \Omega_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots \Omega_{i_m i_1}^{a_m} = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m(\text{dist})} K_{i_1 i_2} \dots K_{i_m i_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} \dots \tilde{\Omega}_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}.$$

Due to the nonlinear factors $K_{i_1 i_2} \dots K_{i_m i_1}$ in each term in the big sum, it is hard to further simplify the RHS and derive an explicit formula in terms of $\theta = (\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$.

To overcome the difficulty, our idea is as follows. Fix $a, b \in S_m$ and consider the ratio $G_{n,m}(a)/G_{n,m}(b)$. Similarly, we expect to see $G_{n,m}(a)/G_{n,m}(b) \approx g_{n,m}(a)/g_{n,m}(b)$, where

$$\frac{g_{n,m}(a)}{g_{n,m}(b)} = \frac{\sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m (\text{dist})} K_{i_1 i_2} K_{i_2 i_3} \dots K_{i_m i_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots \tilde{\Omega}_{i_m i_1}^{a_m}}{\sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m (\text{dist})} K_{i_1 i_2} K_{i_2 i_3} \dots K_{i_m i_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_1 i_2}^{b_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_2 i_3}^{b_2} \dots \tilde{\Omega}_{i_m i_1}^{b_m}}. \quad (8)$$

Note that (a) the non-linear factors $K_{i_1 i_2} K_{i_2 i_3} \dots K_{i_m i_1}$ do not depend on a and b and are the same in the numerator and denominator, and (b) the matrices $\tilde{\Omega}^{a_i}$ and $\tilde{\Omega}^{b_i}$ are relatively simple and easy-to-handle. Therefore, if we can find a pair of (a, b) where we can cancel the nonlinear factors $K_{i_1 i_2} K_{i_2 i_3} \dots K_{i_m i_1}$ in each term of the numerator and the denominator, then we are able to derive a simple and closed-form formula for $g_{n,m}(a)/g_{n,m}(b)$.

Somewhat surprisingly, this turns out to be possible. In detail, if we pick $a, b \in S_m$ such that for an explicit and known number $c_0(a, b) > 0$,

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{i_1 i_2}^{a_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_2 i_3}^{a_2} \dots \tilde{\Omega}_{i_m i_1}^{a_m} = e^{c_0(a, b)\rho} \cdot \tilde{\Omega}_{i_1 i_2}^{b_1} \tilde{\Omega}_{i_2 i_3}^{b_2} \dots \tilde{\Omega}_{i_m i_1}^{b_m}, \quad \text{for all distinct } i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m, \quad (9)$$


then each nonlinear factor $K_{i_1 i_2} K_{i_2 i_3} \dots K_{i_m i_1}$ in the big sum of the numerator of (8) cancels with the same factor in the denominator, and so $g_{n,m}(a)/g_{n,m}(b) = e^{c_0(a, b)\rho}$; see Lemma 1.

It remains to construct $a, b \in S_m$ such that (9) holds. When m is odd, such a construction does not exist. However, for an even number $m \geq 4$, such a construction always exist. Recall that a_i, b_i take values in $\{00, 01, 10, 11\}$. Lemma 1 is proved in the supplement.

Lemma 1. *If (9) hold, then $g_{n,m}(a)/g_{n,m}(b) = e^{c_0(a, b)\rho}$. When $m \geq 3$ and is odd, no pair of (a, b) satisfies condition (9). When $m \geq 3$ and is even, such pairs exist if we let $N = m/2$, $G_{n,m}(a) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_m (\text{dist})} A_{i_1 i_2}^{1x_1} A_{i_2 i_3}^{y_1 0} \dots A_{i_{m-1} i_m}^{1x_N} A_{i_m i_1}^{y_N 0}$, and $G_{n,m}(b) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_m (\text{dist})} A_{i_1 i_2}^{0x_1} A_{i_2 i_3}^{y_1 1} \dots A_{i_{m-1} i_m}^{0x_N} A_{i_m i_1}^{y_N 1}$, where $x_1, y_1, \dots, x_N, y_N \in \{0, 1\}$ satisfy $c_0(a, b) := (x_1 + \dots + x_N) - (y_1 + \dots + y_N) > 0$. Moreover, this gives all possible pairs of (a, b) : for any pair (a', b') satisfying (9), there is a pair of (a, b) given above such that the generalized cycles associated with a' and b' are isomorphic to those associated with a and b , respectively.*

When $m = 4$, there are a total 3 non-isomorphic pairs of (a, b) satisfying (9); see Figure 1. For each $1 \leq k \leq 3$, there is a pair of (a, b) given by Lemma 1 with $m = 4$ such that the generalized cycles corresponding to $a^{(k)}$ and $b^{(k)}$ are isomorphic to the generalized cycles corresponding to a and b , respectively. For example, the generalized cycles defined by $(a^{(1)}, b^{(1)})$ in Figure 1 are isomorphic to $A^{1x_1} A^{y_1 0} A^{1x_2} A^{y_2 0}$ and $A^{0x_1} A^{y_1 1} A^{0x_2} A^{y_2 1}$, respectively, with $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. See also Figure 1 for the geometrical shapes of these cycles.

We now discuss how to estimate ρ . By Remark 2 below, we focus on $m = 4$. When



Pairs	$a^{(k)}$ vs. $b^{(k)}$	$G_{n,m}(a^{(k)})$	$G_{n,m}(b^{(k)})$	$\mathbb{E}[G_{n,m}(a^{(k)})]/\mathbb{E}[G_{n,m}(b^{(k)})]$
$k = 1$	Q11 vs. Q13	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{11} A_{jk}^{00} A_{k\ell}^{01} A_{\ell i}^{00}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{10} A_{jk}^{10} A_{k\ell}^{00} A_{\ell i}^{10}$	e^ρ ($c_0(a^{(k)}, b^{(k)}) = 1$)
$k = 2$	Q12 vs. Q28	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{11} A_{jk}^{00} A_{k\ell}^{11} A_{\ell i}^{00}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{10} A_{jk}^{10} A_{k\ell}^{10} A_{\ell i}^{10}$	$e^{2\rho}$ ($c_0(a^{(k)}, b^{(k)}) = 2$)
$k = 3$	Q26 vs. Q32	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{11} A_{jk}^{01} A_{k\ell}^{11} A_{\ell i}^{00}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{10} A_{jk}^{11} A_{k\ell}^{10} A_{\ell i}^{10}$	e^ρ ($c_0(a^{(k)}, b^{(k)}) = 1$)

Figure 1: The three non-isomorphic pairs of (a, b) that satisfy condition (9) for $m = 4$ (e.g., Q11 is the 11-th generalized 4-cycle (quadrilateral) in the supplement). Top (from left to right): generalized quadrilaterals for $(Q11, Q13)$, $(Q12, Q28)$, and $(Q26, Q32)$.

$m = 4$, using any of the 3 pairs of (a, b) in Figure 1, we can successfully cancel the nuisance nonlinear factors $K_{i_1 i_2} K_{i_2 i_3} \dots K_{i_m i_1}$, and a simple estimator for ρ arises from

$$G_{n,m}(a)/G_{n,m}(b) \approx g_{n,m}(a)/g_{n,m}(b) = \exp(c_0(a, b)\rho), \quad (\text{note: } m = 4 \text{ and } c_0(a, b) \text{ is known}).$$

This gives rises to three different estimators for ρ . In Section 3.6, we show that among the three estimators, the first one has the fastest rate. For this reason, we focus on the first pair of (a, b) in our study below. In detail, write for short $(a, b) = (a^{(1)}, b^{(1)})$. Introduce (Q stands for quadrilateral)

$$Q_n(a) \equiv G_{n,4}(a) = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{11} A_{jk}^{00} A_{k\ell}^{01} A_{\ell i}^{00}, \quad Q_n(b) \equiv G_{n,4}(b) = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} A_{ij}^{10} A_{jk}^{10} A_{k\ell}^{00} A_{\ell i}^{10}.$$

Let $H(\cdot; t)$ be the hard-thresholding operator where $H(X; t) = X$ if $|X| \leq t$ and $H(X; t) = \text{sign}(X) \cdot t$ otherwise. We propose the *Logarithmic Cycle-count Ratio (LCR)* estimate by

$$\hat{\rho}^* = H(\hat{\rho}; 2 \log(n)), \quad \text{with } \hat{\rho} = \log(Q_n(a)/Q_n(b)). \quad (10)$$

The hard-thresholding makes it easier to control rare events, but practically it does not make any difference: the range of interest is $n^{-2} \ll e^\rho \ll n^2$ (and so $|\rho| < 2 \log(n)$); see Section 3.2.

Consider now the computing cost of $\hat{\rho}^*$. By the PLR, when $\{i, j, k, \ell\}$ are not distinct, $A_{ij}^{11} A_{jk}^{00} A_{k\ell}^{01} A_{\ell i}^{00} = A_{ij}^{10} A_{jk}^{10} A_{k\ell}^{00} A_{\ell i}^{10} = 0$. Using this, we have Lemma 2 (the proof is skipped).

Lemma 2. $Q_n(a) = \text{trace}(A^{11} A^{00} A^{01} A^{00})$ and $Q_n(b) = \text{trace}(A^{10} A^{10} A^{00} A^{10})$.

The main computating cost of $\hat{\rho}^*$ comes from computing $Q_n(a)$ and $Q_n(b)$, but the complexity of computing $Q_n(a)$ and $Q_n(b)$ are $O(n^2 d)$, where $d = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d_i$, and d_i is the maximum of in-degree, out-degree, and double-edge degree of node i . For very sparse networks, d is small, and the complexity is only larger than n^2 by a comparably small

factor.

Remark 1. Our paper is connected to several recent works in network analysis (e.g., [Gao and Lafferty \(2017\)](#); [Jin et al. \(2018, 2021, 2023, 2025\)](#)), which also use cycle count statistics, but there are several major differences. First, our paper is for directed networks, where there are many types of m -cycles (and our statistic is the ratio of two types of m -cycles). The above cited works are for undirected networks, where we only have one type of m -cycles. Second, our cycle count statistic is applied to the original adjacency matrix A , while those in [Jin et al. \(2021, 2023\)](#) are applied to a centeredized adjacency matrix $A - \widehat{\Omega}$. Last but not the least, our paper is for estimating the reciprocal effects in a directed network, while [Gao and Lafferty \(2017\)](#); [Jin et al. \(2018, 2021, 2023\)](#) focused on the testing and estimation problems associated with the number of network communities. For these reasons, our idea (including the cancellation trick, the construction of (a, b) , and the suggested tests and estimators below) is new and was not discovered before.

Remark 2 (The case of larger m). By Lemma 1, for any even number $m \geq 4$, we can construct a pair of $(a, b) \in S_m$ such that (9) holds. This means we can have many similar estimators as $\hat{\rho}^*$. However, the estimator for a larger m is *much more tedious* to analyze. Since $\hat{\rho}^*$ is already rate optimal (see below), we leave further investigation to the future.

Remark 3. Our approach is a *non-parametric direct approach* for it does not require estimating the other $(2n + 1)$ parameters in the p_1 model. In high-dimensional settings, a direct approach is especially desirable for many reasons. First, it is unclear what is the best estimates for the other parameters. Second, if we first estimate other parameters and then use the results to estimate ρ , then we may have non-optimal results, for the optimal rates of estimating other parameters may be slower than that of estimating ρ . Last, many times, a direct approach is faster and conceptually simpler. See Section 3.7 for more discussion.

Remark 4. The LCR has a closed-form and is optimal in a broad setting (see below). In comparison, the MLE does not have a closed-form and faces a grand analytical hurdle: it remains largely unclear when the MLE exists (e.g., [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#); [Rinaldo et al. \(2013\)](#)); in fact, for many real networks, the MLE does not exist. LCR is also much faster and can conveniently scale to very large networks. See our numerical study in Section 4.

3.2 Regularity conditions

In this paper, we let $n \rightarrow \infty$, and allow $\theta = (\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$ to depend on n as n vary (but for notational simplicity, we still write $\rho = \rho_n, \gamma = \gamma_n, \alpha_i = \alpha_{in}, \beta_i = \beta_{in}$, without the subscripts). By the PLR in Section 2, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mu_i = e^{\alpha_i + \gamma/2}, \nu_i = e^{\beta_i + \gamma/2}$, and $\eta_i = \mu_i \nu_i$. Let μ_{\max} and μ_{\min} denote the largest and smallest entry in (μ_1, \dots, μ_n) respectively (similar for ν_{\max} and ν_{\min}). For any $i \neq j$, the probability that there is no edge between them is $K_{ij}^{-1} = [1 + \mu_i \nu_j + \mu_j \nu_i + e^\rho \eta_i \eta_j]^{-1}$. Since most real networks are

sparse, we assume

$$(G1) : \quad \mu_{max} \rightarrow 0, \quad \nu_{max} \rightarrow 0, \quad e^{\rho/2} \eta_{max} \rightarrow 0, \quad (11)$$

so for each node, the in-degree, out-degree, and degree of double edges are $o(n)$.¹ Now, when (11) holds, the total degree of double edges is $\sim e^\rho \|\eta\|_1^2$, so it is necessary to assume $e^{\rho/2} \|\eta\|_1 \rightarrow \infty$. Also, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the in-degree and out-degree of node i are $\sim \mu_i \|\nu\|_1$ and $\sim \nu_i \|\mu\|_1$, respectively. Recall that $\eta_i = \mu_i \nu_i$. It is therefore necessary to assume $\|\eta\|_1 \rightarrow \infty$. In light of this, we assume

$$(G2) : \quad e^{\rho/2} \|\eta\|_1 \rightarrow \infty, \quad \|\eta\|_1 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (12)$$

By explanations above, both items in (12) are mild conditions.

(G1) and (G2) are the general conditions we need in the paper. In some cases, we also need two *specific* conditions. First, note that both $Q_n(a)$ and $Q_n(b)$ are big sums of many terms, where in order to accommodate severe degree heterogeneity, different terms may have very different magnitudes. In order for the central limit theorem (CLT) and well-known large-deviation inequalities (e.g., [Durrett \(2010\)](#)) to work, we need a mild condition:

$$(SP1) : \quad (\mu_{max}^2 \nu_{max}^2) / [(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)] \rightarrow 0, \quad (13)$$

where (x, y) denote the inner product of x and y . For CLT to work in $Q_n(a)$ and $Q_n(b)$, (SP1) is the minimum condition we need and can not be further relaxed. The condition is also only mild (e.g., in the MDH case in Remark 5 below, $(\mu_{max}^2 \nu_{max}^2) / [(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)] \asymp (1 / [\|\mu\|_1 \|\nu\|_1])$, so (SP1) is implied by (G2)). Second, the range of interest for e^ρ is $n^{-2} \ll e^\rho \ll n^2$ and it can be very large in some cases. Introduce the quantity $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}(\mu, \nu, \eta) = \log(\|\eta\|_1^2 / [(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)])$. Note that by (11)-(12), $\tilde{\rho} \geq -\log(\mu_{max} \nu_{max}) \rightarrow \infty$. We discuss two cases for ρ .

- Case (S). In this case, $e^\rho \ll e^{\tilde{\rho}}$. In this case, e^ρ is small or moderately large at most (note: it includes the case of $\rho \leq C$). Practically, this is the most interesting case.
- Case (L). In this case, $e^\rho \geq C e^{\tilde{\rho}}$ and e^ρ is relatively large. Sometimes, we may further divide it to (L1) and (L2), where $e^\rho \asymp e^{\tilde{\rho}}$ and $e^\rho \gg e^{\tilde{\rho}}$, respectively.

The analysis for Case (L) is more delicate and requires a specific condition below:

$$(SP2) : \quad \|\mu\|_1 \asymp \|\nu\|_1, \quad \text{in (and only in) Case (L).} \quad (14)$$

(SP2) requires that the total in- and out-degrees are at the same order. This is a mild condition: it always holds in the MDH case (see Remark 5) and is only needed for Case

¹The variance of a cycle count statistic usually has many terms, with a cumbersome form. Fortunately, it was discovered (e.g., [Jin et al. \(2021, 2023\)](#)) that with a mild sparsity condition, then asymptotically, the variance reduces to a simple form. G1 is part of such a condition: It is largely for technical reasons, and can be relaxed.

(L).

Conditions (11)-(14) are all the main regularity conditions in the paper, except for that in some places, we may slightly strengthen (12) with a multi- $\log(n)$ factor; see (19) below. Here, (11)-(12) are general conditions which we use in most places, and (13)-(14) are specific conditions which we only use in some places. These conditions define a broad class of settings where we allow (a) e^ρ to fully range in (n^{-2}, n^2) , (b) a wide range of sparsity, where the total degrees may fully vary in $[1, n]$ (up to a multi- $\log(n)$ factor on both ends), and (c) severe degree heterogeneity: μ_i , ν_i , and η_i may be at very different magnitudes for different $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Remark 5. (The moderate degree heterogeneous (MDH) case). In most of our results, we allow severe degree heterogeneity (SDH). However, for illustration purpose, we may also consider the MDH case where there is a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\max_{\{1 \leq i \leq n\}} \{\max\{|\alpha_i|, |\beta_i|\}\} \leq c_0. \quad (15)$$

In such a case, $\max\{\frac{\mu_{\max}}{\mu_{\min}}, \frac{\nu_{\max}}{\nu_{\min}}, \frac{\eta_{\max}}{\eta_{\min}}\} \leq C$ and condition (14) holds. The average in- or out-degree is $O(ne^\gamma)$ and the total # of double edges is $O(ne^{\rho+2\gamma})$. Conditions (11)-(13) reduce to $1 \ll ne^\gamma \ll n$ and $1 \ll n^2 e^{\rho+2\gamma} \ll n^2$. This covers all sparsity levels in the range of interest.

3.3 The Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) of the LCR estimate $\hat{\rho}^*$

Recall that $\hat{\rho}^* = H(\hat{\rho}; 2 \log(n))$ where $\hat{\rho} = \log(Q_n(a)/Q_n(b))$. Introduce

$$U_n(\rho) = Q_n(a) - e^\rho Q_n(b). \quad (16)$$

Recall that $\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)] = e^\rho \mathbb{E}[Q_n(b)]$. By basic calculus, we expect to see $\hat{\rho} - \rho = \log(\frac{Q_n(a)}{e^\rho Q_n(b)}) = \log(1 + \frac{U_n(\rho)}{e^\rho \mathbb{E}[Q_n(b)]}) \approx \frac{U_n(\rho)}{e^\rho \mathbb{E}[Q_n(b)]} = \frac{U_n(\rho)}{\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)]}$. Therefore, the key to analyze $\hat{\rho}^*$ is to analyze the Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR), defined by

$$\text{SNR} = \mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)] / [\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))]^{1/2}. \quad (17)$$

We now analyze the SNR. For $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, let $r_{ij} = \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{k\ell}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$, $s_{ij} = \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{k\ell}^{11} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$, and $t_{ij} = \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} (\Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{k\ell}^{10} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00} + \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{k\ell}^{10} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10} + \Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{k\ell}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10})$. Recall that $\theta = (\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$. Introduce

$$V_n(\rho) = \sum_{i \neq j} [2r_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{11} + (s_{ij} - e^\rho t_{ij})^2 \Omega_{ij}^{10}], \quad r_n(\theta) = \max\{1/[e^\rho \|\eta\|_1^2], (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)/\|\eta\|_1^4\}. \quad (18)$$

Theorem 1. Consider the LCR estimator $\hat{\rho}^*$ in (10) and suppose conditions (11), (12), (14) hold, where (μ, ν, η) are defined in (4) as in the PLR of the p_1 model. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,

- $\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)] = e^\rho \mathbb{E}[Q_n(b)] = (1 + o(1)) \cdot e^\rho \|\eta\|_1^2 \|\mu\|_1 \|\nu\|_1$.

- $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho)) = (1+o(1))V_n(\rho) = (1+o(1))[2e^\rho\|\eta\|_1^2\|\mu\|_1^2\|\nu\|_1^2 + e^{2\rho}(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\|\mu\|_1^2\|\nu\|_1^2 + 3e^{2\rho}(\mu, \eta)\|\eta\|_1^2\|\mu\|_1\|\nu\|_1^2 + 3e^{2\rho}(\nu, \eta)\|\eta\|_1^2\|\mu\|_1^2\|\nu\|_1 - 3e^{2\rho}\|\eta\|_1^4\|\mu\|_1\|\nu\|_1]$.

- Moreover, $(1/2 + o(1)) \leq \text{Var}(U_n(\rho))/[\text{Var}(Q_n(a)) + e^{2\rho}\text{Var}(Q_n(b))] \leq 1 + o(1)$ and

$$\text{Var}(U_n(\rho)) \begin{cases} \sim \text{Var}(Q_n(a)) \asymp e^\rho\|\eta\|_1^2\|\mu\|_1^2\|\nu\|_1^2, & \text{if } e^\rho \ll e^{\tilde{\rho}} \text{ (Case (S))}, \\ \asymp e^\rho\|\eta\|_1^2\|\mu\|_1^2\|\nu\|_1^2, & \text{if } e^\rho \asymp e^{\tilde{\rho}} \text{ (Case (L1))}, \\ \sim \text{Var}(e^\rho Q_n(b)) \asymp e^{2\rho}(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\|\mu\|_1^2\|\nu\|_1^2, & \text{if } e^\rho \gg e^{\tilde{\rho}} \text{ (Case (L2))}, \end{cases}$$

where as before $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}(\mu, \nu, \eta) = \log(\|\eta\|_1^2/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)])$.

- We have $\text{SNR} \asymp 1/\sqrt{r_n(\theta)} \rightarrow \infty$. Especially, in the MDH case where (15) holds,

$$\text{SNR} \asymp ne^{\gamma/2} \cdot \min\{1, e^{(\rho+\gamma)/2}\} = \begin{cases} ne^{(\rho/2)+\gamma}, & e^\rho \gg e^{-\gamma} \text{ (Case (S))}, \\ ne^{\gamma/2}, & e^\rho \geq Ce^{-\gamma} \text{ (Case (L))}. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1 is proved in Section 5, with more details in the supplement. The proof is difficult and extremely long. One reason is that, $Q_n(a)$, $Q_n(b)$ and $U_n(\rho)$ are U-statistics in nature. The analysis of such statistics frequently involves delicate combinatorics, and is known to be hard, tedious, and error-prone. Another reason is that, we do not want to impose any artificial conditions (so we may have a shorter proof, but may also hurt the practical utility). See Section 5 and also Jin et al. (2021, 2023) for more detailed discussion on this.

3.4 Asymptotical optimality of the LCR estimate $\hat{\rho}^*$

Without loss of generality, we measure the loss by mean-squared error (MSE) for any estimator for ρ . Recall that in condition (12), we assume $\|\eta\|_1 \rightarrow \infty$ and $e^{\rho/2}\|\eta\|_1 \rightarrow \infty$. In Theorem 2 below, we *slightly* strengthen this condition by assuming

$$\|\eta\|_1/\log^2(n) \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\rho/2}\|\eta\|_1/\sqrt{\log(n)} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (19)$$

Recall that $\text{SNR} \asymp 1/\sqrt{r_n(\theta)}$ and note that by definitions and basic algebra,

$$r_n(\theta) = \max\{1/[e^\rho\|\eta\|_1^2], (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)/\|\eta\|_1^4\} \asymp \begin{cases} 1/[e^\rho\|\eta\|_1^2], & \text{in Case (S)}, \\ (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)/\|\eta\|_1^4, & \text{in Case (L)}. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

The following theorem is proved in the supplement.

Theorem 2. (Upper bound). Suppose (11), (19), and (13)-(14) hold. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\rho}^* - \rho)^2] \leq C \frac{\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))}{(\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)])^2} \leq Cr_n(\theta),$$

where $r_n(\theta) \rightarrow 0$. If additionally (15) holds, then $r_n(\theta) \leq (C/n^2e^\gamma) \max\{1, e^{-(\gamma+\rho)}\} \rightarrow 0$.

We now consider the lower bound using the well-known two-point testing argument (e.g., Donoho and Liu (Donoho and Liu, 1991)). The key is to construct a null case and an alternative case, where the parameters ρ in two cases differ by an amount of δ but the χ^2 -distance between the null distribution and alternative distribution $\rightarrow 0$. In such a case, the minimax MSE is no smaller than $C\delta^2$ (and so $C\delta^2$ is a lower bound). In detail, fix a null case $\theta = (\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$. Construct an alternative case $\tilde{\theta} = (\rho^{(1)}, \gamma^{(1)}, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$ where

$$(\rho^{(1)}, \gamma^{(1)}) = \begin{cases} (\rho + \delta_1, \gamma), & \text{if } e^\rho \ll e^{\tilde{\rho}} \text{ (Case (S)),} \\ (\rho + 2\delta_2, \gamma - \delta_2), & \text{if } e^\rho \geq Ce^{\tilde{\rho}} \text{ (Case (L)).} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Similar as before, $\rho, \gamma, \alpha_i, \beta_i, \delta_1$ and δ_2 may depend on n . Let $P_0^{(n)}$ and $P_1^{(n)}$ be the joint distribution under the null and alternative, respectively (to clarify, the null is $H_0^{(n)} : \rho = \rho_0$ and the alternative is $H_1^{(n)} : \rho = \rho_0 + \delta_1$ in case (S) and $\rho = \rho_0 + 2\delta_2$ in case (L); for simplicity, in (21), we have dropped the subscript ‘0’ in ρ_0). Theorem 3 is proved in the supplement.

Theorem 3. (Lower bound). *Suppose conditions (11)-(12) hold in the null case, and $e^\rho \|\eta\|_1^2 \delta_1^2 \rightarrow 0$ in Case (S) and $\|\mu\|_1 \|\nu\|_1 \delta_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ in Case (L). As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\chi^2(P_0^{(n)}, P_1^{(n)}) \rightarrow 0$.*

Introduce $c_{\mu, \nu, \eta} = \|\eta\|_1^4 / [(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\|\mu\|_1\|\nu\|_1]$. Note that (a) by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, $c_{\mu, \nu, \eta} \leq 1$, (b) in the MDH case where (15) holds, $c_{\mu, \nu, \eta} \geq C > 0$, and (c) most importantly, $\frac{1}{\|\mu\|_1\|\nu\|_1} = c_{\mu, \nu, \eta}(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) / \|\eta\|_1^4$. By Donoho and Liu (Donoho and Liu (1991)), Theorem 3 suggests a lower bound of $Cr_n^-(\theta)$ for the MSE, where

$$r_n^-(\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{e^\rho \|\eta\|_1^2}, & \text{Case (S),} \\ \frac{1}{\|\mu\|_1\|\nu\|_1} = c_{\mu, \nu, \eta}(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) / \|\eta\|_1^4, & \text{Case (L).} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Comparing this with $r_n(\theta)$ in (20), the RHS are the same except for the factor $c_{\mu, \nu, \eta}$. If

$$c_{\mu, \nu, \eta} \geq c_1, \quad \text{for a constant } c_1 > 0, \quad (23)$$

then $r_n(\theta) \asymp r_n^-(\theta)$ and the lower bound is tight. Note that condition (23) is much weaker than the MDH condition (15). This suggests that, in the minimax framework, if we construct a pair of null and alternative hypotheses as in (21) with (23) holds, then the construction is a least-favorable configuration and our method is asymptotic minimax.

In detail, we consider a minimax setting as follows. Recall that our parameters are $\theta = (\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n)$. Consider the class of parameters

$$\Theta_0 = \left\{ \theta : \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_{max}}, \frac{1}{\nu_{max}}, \frac{1}{e^{\rho/2}\eta_{max}}, \frac{\|\eta\|_1}{\log^2(n)}, \frac{e^{\rho/2}\|\eta\|_1}{\sqrt{\log(n)}}, \frac{(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)}{\mu_{max}^2\nu_{max}^2} \right\} \geq \log(\log(n)) \right\},$$

where the term $\log(\log(n))$ is chosen only for convenience and can be replaced by other

diverging sequence a_n . Note that if we neglect the two multi- $\log(n)$ terms on the left hand side, then Θ_0 defines essentially all θ satisfying conditions (11)-(13) hold. Fix an $\epsilon_n > 0$ and consider the class of parameters

$$\Theta(\epsilon_n) = \{\theta \in \Theta_0 : r_n(\theta) \leq \epsilon_n \text{ and condition (14) holds in Case (L)}\}.$$

The minimax risk in $\Theta(\epsilon_n)$ is then $R_n^*(\epsilon_n) = \inf_{\hat{\rho}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(\epsilon_n)} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\rho} - \rho)^2]$, and the worst-case MSE for $\hat{\rho}^*$ is then $R_n(\hat{\rho}^*; \epsilon_n) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(\epsilon_n)} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\rho}^* - \rho)^2]$. By our conditions, the interesting range for $r_n(\theta)$ (and so that for ϵ_n) is $n^{-2} \ll r_n(\theta) \ll 1$. Theorem 4 is proved in the supplement.

Theorem 4. *(Optimality). As $n \rightarrow \infty$, if $(\log \log(n)/n)^2 \leq \epsilon_n \leq 1/(\log(n)[\log \log(n)]^2)$, then $C\epsilon_n \leq R_n^*(\epsilon_n) \leq R_n(\hat{\rho}^*; \epsilon_n) \leq C\epsilon_n$, so $\hat{\rho}^*$ is asymptotically minimax.*

In summary, first, the LCR estimator $\hat{\rho}^*$ is asymptotically minimax and is thus rate optimal. second, the testing result in Theorem 3 is sharp in Case (S). Recall that Case (S) includes the case of $\rho \leq C$ and is the most interesting case in practice. The testing result is also sharp in Case (L) provided with (23) holds. Note that condition (23) holds in the MDH case where (15) holds, but it covers a setting much broader than the MDH case. We will revisit these in Section 3.5 when we discuss the phase transition (similar to the minimax framework, phase transition is a theoretical framework for optimality (e.g., [Donoho and Jin \(2015\)](#))).

Recall that the minimax rate is determined by $r_n(\theta)$. It is of interest to consider the MDH case and derive a more explicit form for $r_n(\theta)$. In the MDH case where (15) holds, all μ_i, ν_i, η_i equal $O(e^{\gamma/2})$ by definitions, and $\tilde{\rho}(\mu, \nu, \eta) = \log(\|\eta\|^2/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)]) \asymp -\gamma$. Therefore,

$$r_n(\theta) \asymp \max\{1/(n^2 e^{\rho+2\gamma}), 1/(n^2 e^\gamma)\} \asymp \begin{cases} 1/(n^2 e^{\rho+2\gamma}), & \text{if } e^\rho \ll e^{-\gamma} \text{ (Case (S))}, \\ 1/(n^2 e^\gamma), & \text{if } e^\rho \geq C e^{-\gamma} \text{ (Case (L))}. \end{cases}$$

See Figure 2. In the MDH case, condition (23) always holds, and our estimator is optimal in the minimax sense (our test also achieves the optimal phase transition; see Section 3.5).

Remark 6. The p_1 -model can be viewed as the extension of the β -model for directed networks. The β -model was well-studied, but existing estimators for the parameters (e.g., [Chatterjee et al. \(2011\)](#); [Karwa and Slavković \(2016\)](#); [Stein and Leng \(2024\)](#); [Yan et al. \(2016\)](#); [Yan and Xu \(2013\)](#)) are only proved to be consistent when the network density $\tau_n \geq Cn^{-1/6}$, where $\tau_n = n^{-2} \times (\text{expected number of total edges})$. For instance, [Chatterjee et al. \(2011\)](#); [Karwa and Slavković \(2016\)](#) assumed that $\tau_n \geq 1/\log n$ or $\tau_n \geq 1/n^{22}$, and [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Stein and Leng \(2024\)](#) assumed that $\tau_n \gg O(n^{-1/2})$. In comparison, we allow all networks with $n^{-2} \log(n) \ll \tau_n \ll 1$, where our estimator $\hat{\rho}^*$ is consistent ρ .




Figure 2: Rate of minimax risk (γ is fixed); x -axis: ρ range from $-2(\gamma + \log(n))$ to -2γ .

3.5 Variance estimation and optimal phase transition for testing

We now test $H_0 : \rho = \rho_0$, where ρ_0 is given but (as before) may depend on n . For this purpose, previous results are inadequate, for we not only need a good estimator for ρ , but also need a consistent estimate for the variance of the estimator. Recall that $\hat{\rho}^* = H(\hat{\rho}; 2 \log(n))$ (see (10)) where $\hat{\rho} - \rho \approx U_n(\rho)/\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)]$ with $U_n(\rho) = Q_n(a) - e^\rho Q_n(b)$ as in (16). The following lemma is proved in the supplement.

Theorem 5. (Normality). *Suppose conditions (11)-(14) hold. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{U_n(\rho)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))}} \rightarrow N(0, 1) \text{ and } \text{SNR} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))}} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho) \rightarrow N(0, 1), \text{ in law.}$$

We now test the null hypothesis $H_0^{(n)} : \rho = \rho_0$. By Theorem 5, we can tackle this using $(\hat{\rho}^* - \rho_0)$, but to do so, we must have a consistent estimate for SNR, or equivalently $\mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)]$ and (especially) $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))$. By Theorem 1,

$$\text{Var}(U_n(\rho)) = (1 + o(1))V_n(\rho), \quad \text{where } V_n(\rho) = \sum_{i \neq j} [2r_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{11} + (s_{ij} - e^\rho t_{ij})^2 \Omega_{ij}^{10}].$$

We now discuss how to estimate $V_n(\rho)$. First, we can estimate ρ by $\hat{\rho}$. Second, we can estimate Ω_{ij}^{11} and Ω_{ij}^{10} by A_{ij}^{11} and A_{ij}^{10} , respectively. Last, by the sparsity assumption (11), it is seen that $r_{ij} = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} \Omega_{k\ell}^{01}$, $s_{ij} = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} \Omega_{k\ell}^{11}$, and $t_{ij} = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} (\Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{k\ell}^{10} + \Omega_{k\ell}^{10} \Omega_{li}^{10} + \Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{li}^{10})$, where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly for all i, j . Therefore, we can estimate r_{ij} , s_{ij} , and t_{ij} by \hat{r}_{ij} , \hat{s}_{ij} , and \hat{t}_{ij} , respectively, where

$$\hat{r}_{ij} = \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} A_{k\ell}^{01}, \quad \hat{s}_{ij} = \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} A_{k\ell}^{11}, \quad \hat{t}_{ij} = \sum_{k, \ell \notin \{i, j\}, k \neq \ell} (A_{jk}^{10} A_{k\ell}^{10} + A_{k\ell}^{10} A_{li}^{10} + A_{jk}^{10} A_{li}^{10}).$$

A convenient estimate for $V_n(\rho)$ is therefore

$$\hat{V}_n(\hat{\rho}) = \sum_{i \neq j} [2\hat{r}_{ij}^2 A_{ij}^{11} + (\hat{s}_{ij} - e^{\hat{\rho}} \hat{t}_{ij})^2 A_{ij}^{10}]. \quad (24)$$

Combining this with Theorem 5, we propose the following test statistics:

$$\psi_n^* = \widehat{\text{SNR}} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho_0), \quad \text{where } \widehat{\text{SNR}} = Q_n(a) / \sqrt{\widehat{V}_n(\hat{\rho})}. \quad (25)$$

Now, if $\widehat{\text{SNR}} \approx \text{SNR}$ as expected, then by elementary algebra and Theorem 5, $\psi_n^* \approx \text{SNR} \cdot (\rho - \rho_0) + \text{SNR} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho)$, where $\text{SNR} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho) \rightarrow N(0, 1)$ by Theorem 5. Therefore, the power of the test hinges on the quantity of $\text{SNR} \cdot |\rho - \rho_0|$. In detail, fix $0 < \alpha < 1$ and let $z_{\alpha/2}$ be the number such that $\mathbb{P}(N(0, 1) \geq z_{\alpha/2}) = \alpha/2$. Consider the LCR test where we reject the null if and only if $|\psi_n^*| \geq z_{\alpha/2}$. We assume

$$e^{\rho/2} \|\eta\|_1 / \sqrt{\log(n)} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \min\left\{\frac{\mu_{\min}}{\mu_{\max}}, \frac{\nu_{\min}}{\nu_{\max}}\right\} \cdot \|\eta\|_1 / \log(n) \rightarrow \infty \text{ in Case (L).} \quad (26)$$

Here, the first condition is mild and appeared before in (19). The second condition is required in deriving the large-deviation bounds for $\widehat{V}_n(\rho)$. The condition is also mild (e.g., in the MDH case, it reduces to $\|\eta\|_1 / \log(n) \rightarrow \infty$). Theorem 6 is proved in the supplement.

Theorem 6. *Suppose conditions (11), (14) and (26) hold, and consider the two-sided LCR test above for testing the null hypothesis $H_0^{(n)} : \rho = \rho_0$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

- $\widehat{V}_n(\hat{\rho})/V_n(\rho) \rightarrow 1$ and $\frac{\widehat{\text{SNR}}}{\text{SNR}} \rightarrow 1$ in probability, and $\widehat{\text{SNR}} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho) \rightarrow N(0, 1)$ in law.
- If $H_0^{(n)}$ holds, then $\psi_n^* \rightarrow N(0, 1)$ in law and the level of the LCR test is $\alpha + o(1)$.
- If $H_0^{(n)}$ is not true and $\text{SNR} \cdot |\rho - \rho_0| \rightarrow \infty$, then the power of the LCR test $\rightarrow 1$.

In the case where $\text{SNR} \cdot (\rho - \rho_0) \rightarrow c$ for a constant c , we can similarly show that the power is $1 - \Phi(z_{\alpha/2} - c) + \Phi(-z_{\alpha/2} - c) + o(1)$. Note that (14) and (26) are only required in Case (L) where e^ρ is relatively large. In Case (S), we have a much simpler approximation for $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))$: $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho)) \sim \sum_{i \neq j} 2r_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{11}$, and so we have a simpler estimator for $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))$ (and so a simpler test). In detail, denote W_n by $W_n = \sum_{i \neq j} 2r_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{11}$ and let $\widehat{W}_n = \sum_{i \neq j} 2\hat{r}_{ij}^2 A_{ij}^{11}$. Introduce a simpler version of ψ_n^* by $\phi_n^* = \widehat{\text{snr}} \cdot (\hat{\rho} - \rho_0)$ where $\widehat{\text{snr}} = Q_n(a) / \sqrt{\widehat{W}_n}$. Similarly, fixing a $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we can have a two-sided test that rejects the null when $|\phi_n^*| \geq z_{\alpha/2}$. We call this the *simplified LCR test*. Corollary 1 is proved in the supplement.

Corollary 1. *Suppose (11) and (19) hold. Consider the simplified LCR test for Case (S) where $e^\rho \cdot (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) / \|\eta\|_1^2 \rightarrow 0$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

- $\widehat{W}_n/W_n \rightarrow 1$ and $\frac{\widehat{\text{snr}}}{\text{SNR}} \rightarrow 1$ in probability, and $\widehat{\text{snr}} \cdot (\hat{\rho}^* - \rho) \rightarrow N(0, 1)$ in law.
- If $H_0^{(n)}$ holds, then $\phi_n^* \rightarrow N(0, 1)$ and the level of the simplified LCR test is $\alpha + o(1)$.
- If $H_0^{(n)}$ is not true and $\text{SNR} \cdot |\rho - \rho_0| \rightarrow \infty$, then the power of the test above $\rightarrow 1$.

We can slightly relax (19) by replacing $\|\eta\|_1/\log^2(n) \rightarrow \infty$ with that of $(\|\mu\|_1\|\nu\|_1)/\log(n) \rightarrow \infty$. Also, recall that (19) is a slightly stronger version of (12), so essentially we only require (11)-(12) here, which are very relaxed conditions. As discussed before, Case (S) covers the most interesting case from a practical viewpoint (especially, it includes the case of $\rho \leq C$). When we believe ρ is relatively small, we prefer ϕ_n^* to ψ_n^* , for ϕ_n^* is not only simpler, but the regularity conditions in Lemma (1) are more relaxed than those in Theorem 6.

Remark 7. In Theorem 6 and Corollary 1, the targeted Type I error is $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (fixed). We may allow α to tend 0, so the Type I error $\rightarrow 0$: we call $\alpha = \alpha_n$ tends to 0 *slowly enough* if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $z_{\alpha/2} \leq C \log(\log(n))$. Here, the $\log \log(n)$ can be replaced by any sequence that tends to ∞ slowly enough. In such a case, in Theorem 6 and Corollary 1, the Type II error of the tests $\rightarrow 0$ provided with a slightly strong condition: $[\log \log(n)]^{-1} \cdot |\rho - \rho_0| \cdot \text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty$.

We now discuss the lower bound. Recall that $r_n^-(\theta)$ is defined in (22). The following corollary is a direct result of Theorem 3 so the proof is omitted.

Corollary 2. (Lower bound). *Suppose conditions (11)-(12) hold. If $|\rho - \rho_0|/\sqrt{r_n^-(\theta)} \rightarrow 0$, then we can pair the alternative with a null, so that the χ^2 -distance between two distributions (null and alternative) $\rightarrow 0$. As a result, the sum of Type I and Type II error of any test $\rightarrow 1$ (so any test will be powerless in separating the alternative from the null).*

Our results describe a sharp phase transition. Similar as the celebrated minimax framework, phase transition is a theoretical framework for optimality. However, in the minimax framework, we are primarily focused on optimality near least favorable cases, but least favorable cases are not necessarily the most interesting or challenging cases in practice. The phase transition framework allows us to consider optimality at *all cases*, so practically it can be a more appealing framework. See [Donoho and Jin \(2015\)](#); [Jin et al. \(2017\)](#).

Recall that in Section 3.4, we show the LCR estimator $\hat{\rho}^*$ is optimal in minimax sense. Below, we further show the LCR tests ψ_n^* and ϕ_n^* achieve the optimal phase transition. In detail, recall that $r_n(\theta) \asymp r_n^-(\theta)$ in Case (S) and $r_n(\theta) \asymp r_n^-(\theta)$ in Case (L) provided with (23) holds. Recall $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}(\mu, \nu, \eta) = \log(\|\eta\|_1^2/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)])$. Comparing Theorem 6, Corollaries 1-2, and Remark 7, we have two case, Case (S) and Case (L). In Case (S), $e^\rho \ll e^{\tilde{\rho}}$ (where ρ is small and moderately large; this is the most interesting case in practice). In this case, $r_n(\theta) \asymp r_n^-(\theta)$. If $|\rho - \rho_0| \geq \log(\log(n)) \cdot \sqrt{r_n(\theta)}$, then the sum of Type I and Type II error of the LCR tests ψ_n^* and ϕ_n^* tend to 0. If $|\rho - \rho_0| \ll \sqrt{r_n(\theta)}$, then for all tests, the sum of Type I and Type II error tends to 1 (and so all tests fail). In Case (L), $e^\rho \geq C e^{\tilde{\rho}}$ (where ρ is relatively large). In this case, if $|\rho - \rho_0| \geq \log(\log(n)) \cdot \sqrt{r_n(\theta)}$, then the sum of Type I and Type II error of the LCR test ψ_n^* tends to 0. If $|\rho - \rho_0| \ll \sqrt{r_n(\theta)}$ and condition (23) holds, then $r_n(\theta) \asymp r_n^-(\theta)$, and for all tests, the sum of Type I and Type II error tends to 1. Therefore, the LCR tests achieve the optimal phase transition in Case (S), and also in Case (L) if (23) holds. Especially, in the MDH case where (15) holds, condition (23) holds automatically. In this case, the LCR test ψ_n^* achieves the optimal

transition in both Case (S) and Case (L), and it is optimal in the whole range of interest. Note that the optimality here is for each individual parameter θ , but the optimality in the minimax framework is essentially only for least favorable cases. In this sense, LCR meets a higher standard of optimality.

3.6 Comparison with the other two pairs of (a, b) in Figure 1

Recall that the key of LCR is to find a pair of $(a, b) \in S_m$ (i.e., generalized cycles) to satisfy (9). When $m = 4$, we have identified three non-isomorphic pairs of (a, b) satisfying (9), denoted by $(a^{(k)}, b^{(k)})$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$; see Figure 1. So far, we have only considered the first pair. For the other two pairs, we can similarly construct an estimator $\hat{\rho}^*$ and a test of ψ_n^* . By previous sections, to compare the performances of $(\hat{\rho}_n^*, \psi_n^*)$ constructed for different pairs of (a, b) , it is sufficient to compare the SNR. In light of this, similarly as in (17), for $k = 1, 2, 3$, define the SNR for the resultant estimator and test associated with $(a^{(k)}, b^{(k)})$ by

$$\text{SNR}_k = \mathbb{E}[Q_n(a^{(k)})]/\sqrt{\text{Var}(U_{n,k}(\rho))}, \quad \text{where } U_{n,k}(\rho) = Q_n(a^{(k)}) - e^{c_k \rho} Q_n(b^{(k)}),$$

and for short, $c_k = c_0(a^{(k)}, b^{(k)}) = 1, 2, 1$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Let $c_\mu = [\|\eta\|_1(\mu \circ \mu, \eta)]/[(\mu, \eta)^2]$ and $c_\nu = [\|\eta\|_1(\nu \circ \nu, \eta)]/[(\nu, \eta)^2]$. Here, (a) $c_\mu, c_\nu \geq 1$ by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and

k	The general case	The MDH case
1	$\text{SNR}_1 \asymp \ \eta\ _1^2/\sqrt{\max\{e^{-\rho}\ \eta\ _1^2, (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\}}$	$ne^{\gamma/2} \min\{1, e^{(\rho+\gamma)/2}\}$
2	$\text{SNR}_2 \asymp \ \eta\ _1^2/\sqrt{\max\{e^{-\rho}\ \eta\ _1^2, (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta), 1\}}$	$ne^{\gamma/2} \min\{1, e^{(\rho+\gamma)/2}, e^{3\gamma/2}\}$
3	$\text{SNR}_3 \leq C\ \eta\ _1^2/\sqrt{\max\{e^{-\rho}\ \eta\ _1^2 \max\{c_\mu, c_\nu, 1/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)]\}, (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\}}$	$ne^{\gamma/2} \min\{1, e^{(\rho+\gamma)/2}, ne^{(\rho+4\gamma)/2}\}$

Table 1: SNR comparison, each is for an $\hat{\rho}^*$ corresponding to a pair of (a, b) in Figure 1.

(b) while we may have $\max\{c_\mu, c_\nu\} \gg 1$ in the SDH case, $\max\{c_\mu, c_\nu\} \leq C$ in the MDH case where (15) holds. Table 1 compares the three SNR, with more details in supplement.

In summary, we have the following. First, among three SNR's, SNR_1 is always the largest and the corresponding estimator is optimal. Second, the order of SNR_3 may be significantly smaller than that of SNR_1 , but is the same if $\max\{c_\mu, c_\nu, 1/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)]\} \leq C$. Therefore, the corresponding estimator is optimal in the subregion of the parameters where $\max\{c_\mu, c_\nu, 1/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)]\} \leq C$, but may be non-optimal outside the region. Similarly, the order of SNR_2 is the same as that of SNR_1 if $\max\{e^{-\rho}\|\eta\|_1^2, (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\} \geq C$ and is significantly smaller if $\max\{e^{-\rho}\|\eta\|_1^2, (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\} \ll 1$. Therefore, the corresponding estimator is optimal in the subregion where $\max\{e^{-\rho}\|\eta\|_1^2, (\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)\} \geq C$ but may be non-optimal outside the region. Take the MDH case for example. We can divide the parameters (ρ, γ) into two cases: Case 1: $\gamma > -(2/3)\log(n)$, and Case 2: $\gamma \leq -(2/3)\log(n)$. Both the orders of SNR_2 and SNR_3 are the same as that of SNR_1 in Case 1, but can be significantly smaller in Case 2 when ρ is of the order $O(1)$. Therefore, all three estimators are optimal in Case 1, but only the first one is optimal in both cases.

For these reasons, we prefer to use the first pair of (a, b) in Figure 1 to construct the LCR estimators and tests.

Note that for each of three pairs of cycles in Figure 1, we construct an estimator for ρ , and in the noiseless case, all estimators equal to ρ . Consider now the real case. Note that the expected numbers of cycles in the first pair are larger than those in the other two pairs. Therefore, the first estimator has more effective samples to estimate ρ and so has smaller variance. This explains why we have the best rate if we choose the first pair in Figure 1 to construct our statistic.

3.7 Extensions and future work

The p_1 model has $(2n + 2)$ parameters $\rho, \gamma, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_n$. For reasons of space and especially practical interests, we focus on the reciprocal parameter ρ in this paper, but our idea is readily extendable to estimating γ (overall sparsity) and (α_i, β_i) (heterogeneity parameter for node i). In fact, by carefully picking an $m \geq 3$ and two types of generalized m -cycles, Type C and Type D , we discover that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have $\rho + \gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_i = \log(C_i/D_i)$, where C_i and D_i are the expected number cycles containing node i of Type C and Type D, respectively. Such a discovery can be used to develop a convenient estimate for all other $(2n + 1)$ parameters of p_1 model. Here, similarly as in Section 3.1, each C_i and D_i is a big sum, containing the nonlinear factors K_{ij} of the p_1 model, but if we design the two types of m -cycles carefully, the nonlinear term cancel out with each other in the ratio of C_i/D_i .

Note the idea we just mentioned is readily extendable to the β -model. In the β -model, we similarly have $A = \Omega - \text{diag}(\Omega) + W$ as in (4) but where (A, Ω, W) are symmetrical and $\log(\Omega_{ij}/(1 - \Omega_{ij})) = \beta_i + \beta_j$. How to estimate β_1, \dots, β_n in the β -model is also a long-standing problem (e.g., Chatterjee et al. (2011); Chen et al. (2021); Yan et al. (2016); Yan and Xu (2013)), but fortunately, since the β -model can be viewed as a special case of the p_1 model, the idea above is extendable to address the problem.

Of course, while the high-level idea is extendable, we still need delicate (and especially very long) analysis to study the estimators for the new settings. Since this paper is already very long (the supplement is about 150 pages), we leave the study along this line to the future.

4 Numerical study

4.1 Simulations

Our simulated work contains two parts, an estimation part and a testing part.

Estimation part. We generate the adjacency matrix A in the p_1 model as follows. For each $n = 500, 1000, 2000$, we consider 3 different choices of γ ($\gamma_1 = -\log(n)/4, \gamma_2 = -\log(n)/2, \gamma_3 = -\log n + \log(\log n)$) and 5 different choices of ρ ($\rho_1 = -(\log n)/4, \rho_2 = 0, \rho_3 = 0.5, \rho_4 = \log(\log n)$ and $\rho_5 = (\log n)/4$). Generate α_i and β_i independently from

Table 2: Comparison with $|\hat{\rho}^* - \rho|$ (left) and $|\hat{\rho}^{mle} - \rho|$ (right); based on 100 repetitions. NA: MLE failed to exist in all 100 repetitions

γ	n	$\rho = -\frac{1}{4} \log n$	$\rho = 0$	$\rho = 0.5$	$\rho = \log(\log n)$	$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \log n$
γ_1	500	(.024, .025)	(.018, .018)	(.016, .016)	(.016, .016)	(.015, .015)
	1000	(.015, .014)	(.008, .008)	(.008, .008)	(.007, .008)	(.007, .008)
	2000	(.009, .009)	(.005, .005)	(.004, .004)	(.003, .004)	(.004, .004)
γ_2	500	(.071, .069)	(.038, .036)	(.033, .033)	(.023, .022)	(.023, .024)
	1000	(.050, .057)	(.023, .021)	(.020, .019)	(.014, .014)	(.014, .014)
	2000	(.037, .038)	(.016, .016)	(.014, .014)	(.008, .008)	(.009, .009)
γ_3	500	(.234, NA)	(.126, NA)	(.099, NA)	(.062, NA)	(.058, NA)
	1000	(.263, NA)	(.089, NA)	(.082, NA)	(.046, NA)	(.048, NA)
	2000	(.201, NA)	(.091, NA)	(.061, NA)	(.035, NA)	(.037, NA)

$N(0, 1)$ and $U(-1, 1)$, respectively (centered empirically so that (2) holds). These cover a wide range of reciprocal effects and network sparsity where the network densities (defined as $n^{-2} \times$ expected number of total edges) are $n^{-1/4}$, $n^{-1/2}$ and $\log n/n$ for $\gamma = \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, respectively, and allow relatively severe degree heterogeneity where the largest degree can be hundred times larger than the smallest one.

First, we compare our estimator $\hat{\rho}^*$ with the MLE estimator $\hat{\rho}^{mle}$ (the frequently used iterative algorithm in [Holland and Leinhardt \(1981\)](#)). Note that in order for MLE to exist, we need strong (and generally hard-to-check) conditions [Rinaldo et al. \(2013\)](#). For example, when there is a node whose in-degree or out-degree is 0 or $(n - 1)$, the MLE does not exist (the maximum likelihood is ∞). For each setting, we repeat 100 times, but for MLE, we only count the repeats where the MLE exists (this is in favor of MLE). The results are in Table 2 (NA: MLE does not exist for all 100 repetitions). For each setting, the fraction that the MLE does not exist (in 100 repetitions) is reported in Figure 3. Computation time (in R) of two approaches are compared in Table 3.

We have the following observations. First, our estimator LCR generally perform satisfactorily, especially for larger (n, ρ) and smaller γ (where it is more sparse). Second, the MLE fails to exist in many cases, but when it exists, it also works well, with an accuracy comparable to the LCR. Last, in the experiments we investigated, the MLE is slower than our methods by 6-16 times in computation. Therefore, the LCR has a clear winning edge over the MLE.

Our approach is relatively robust to model misspecification (e.g., contaminated nodes, misspecified number of communities). Consider a misspecified setting where we have a directed network with 2 communities. For a parameter θ , assume $\mathbb{P}(A_{ij} = a, A_{ji} = b) = K_{ij} \cdot \exp(a(\gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_j) + b(\gamma + \alpha_j + \beta_i) + ab\rho + (a + b)\theta\delta_{ij})$, where $K_{ij} = [1 + e^{\gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \theta\delta_{ij}} + e^{\gamma + \alpha_j + \beta_i + \theta\delta_{ij}} + e^{2\gamma + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \alpha_j + \beta_i + \rho + 2\theta\delta_{ij}}]^{-1}$ and $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if nodes i, j belong to the same community and $\delta_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. In such a setting, LCR may be biased, but for a wide range of θ , the biases are relatively small. See Table 4 below, where $n = 1000$ and $\gamma = -\log(n)/4$. This suggests that our procedure is relatively robust to

model misspecification.




Figure 3: The fraction (out of 100 repetitions) that the MLE does not exist in each setting.

Table 3: Computing time for our method LCR (left) and MLE (right) in seconds (average in 10 repetitions). In many cases, MLE is 10 times slower than our method ($\gamma = \gamma_1 = -\log(n)/4$).

n	$\rho = -\frac{1}{4} \log n$	$\rho = 0$	$\rho = 0.5$	$\rho = \log(\log n)$	$\rho = \frac{1}{4} \log n$	
1000	1.843	26.341	1.895	22.075	1.883	25.493
2000	9.28	80.156	9.766	98.839	9.826	100.785
3000	27.486	170.712	29.169	290.237	29.512	188.213

Table 4: Average absolute biases when the model is misspecified ($\theta \neq 0$).

ρ	$\theta = -0.5$	$\theta = -0.2$	$\theta = 0$	$\theta = 0.2$	$\theta = 0.5$
0.5	0.062	0.012	0.008	0.012	0.061
1	0.061	0.013	0.007	0.011	0.061

Testing part. We now discuss our test ψ_n^* . First, Theorem 6 shows that the limiting null of ψ_n^* is $N(0, 1)$. Figure 4 presents the Q-Q plots of simulated ψ_n^* when the null hypothesis is true ($n = 1000$, $\gamma = \gamma_2 = -\log(n)/2$, $\rho = \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_5$, repeat for 1000 times). The result fits well with our theory, even when the network is relatively sparse.




Figure 4: Q-Q plots for ψ_n^* when the null is true ($n = 1000$, $\gamma = -\log(n)/2$).

Second, we study the power. There are relatively few testing approaches for the p_1 model, among which there is the (generalized) LRT suggested by Holland and Leinhardt

Holland and Leinhardt (1981). Since LRT is closely related to MLE, it is not surprising that (a) algorithm for LRT is only available for $\rho_0 = 0$ (so we take ρ_0 below), (b) LRT does not exist in many cases, and (c) even when it exists, the underlying theory is largely unknown, but it was conjectured to have limiting null of $\chi_1^2(0)$ Holland and Leinhardt (1981). We now compare the powers of two tests at the nominal level of 5% (using $N(0, 1)$ and $\chi_1^2(0)$ as the null distribution, respectively). For the alternative, take $\rho = -0.2, -0.15, -0.1, \dots, 0.25$ but other parameters are the same as the null. We repeat 1000 times (and to save time, we only report that for $n = 500$). The results are in Table 5 and Figure 5. The powers of the LCR method and the LRT are very close when $\gamma = -\log n/4, -\log n/2$ while the MLE failed to exist in all simulations when $\gamma = -\log n + \log \log n$, corresponding to a extremely sparse network with network densities 0.02. Note that when $\rho = 0$ (first column), we are in the null case, so the power is nothing but the Type I error; since the target level is 5%, the results fit well with our theory. Also, when ρ gradually deviate from ρ_0 , the power rapidly increase to 1, as expected (the last row of Table 5 corresponds to the case of $\gamma_3 = -\log(n) + \log \log(n)$, where the networks are very sparse (network density is $\log(n)/n$). In this case, for all ρ 's in Table 5, the SNR are relatively low, so the powers are also relatively low. We can however increase the SNR and power by increasing ρ . For example, when $\rho = 0.5$, the power is 0.98). Note that LRT does not exist for many cases, especially for sparse networks (i.e., a smaller γ). Note also LRT is computationally much slower than our test. These results suggest that our test has a clear winning edge of the LRT.

Table 5: Powers of our methods (first cell value) and LRT (second cell value); cell values are power $\times 100$ ($n = 500$, 1000 repetitions). Boldface: fraction of repetitions where LRT does not exist (NA: LRT does not exist for all repetitions; note that $\rho = 0$ is the null case as $\rho_0 = 0$).

	$\rho = -0.20$	$\rho = -0.15$	$\rho = -0.10$	-0.05	$\rho = 0$	$\rho = 0.05$	$\rho = 0.10$	$\rho = 0.15$	$\rho = 0.20$	$\rho = 0.25$
γ_1	(100, 100, 0)	(100, 100, 0)	(99.7, 99.7, 0)	(76.7, 73.8, 0.1)	(6.4, 4.8, 0.7)	(76.6, 73.8, 0)	(99.8, 99.8, 0.1)	(100, 100, 0.6)	(100, 100, 0)	(100, 100, 0.6)
γ_2	(97.5, 97.9, 81.3)	(84.9, 84.6, 70.8)	(53.5, 53.5, 65.4)	(16.1, 14.3, 79)	(5.1, 4.9, 81.8)	(21.4, 20, 56.9)	(58.1, 54.4, 74.8)	(92.5, 93.5, 70.6)	(99.4, 98.7, 69.7)	(100, 100, 75.5)
γ_3	(28.2, NA, 100)	(13.1, NA, 100)	(9.3, NA, 100)	(5.3, NA, 100)	(4.5, NA, 100)	(7.1, NA, 100)	(12.2, NA, 100)	(22.2, NA, 100)	(36.8, NA, 100)	(53.4, NA, 100)




Figure 5: Powers of LCR and LRT ($n = 500$, 1000 repetitions).

4.2 Analysis of several real networks

We apply the proposed estimator and tests to the well-known weblog data and a citation network of statisticians. These networks have more than one communities. Since the p_1 model is for networks with only one community, it is not appropriate to use it to directly model the entire network, but we can divide each network into several sub-networks, each with only one community. Now, for each subnetwork, it is appropriate to model it with the p_1 model, where our approaches are directly applicable. ²

The original weblog data [Adamic and Glance \(2005\)](#) was collected during the 2004 presidential election. It is a directed network that consists of 1,490 nodes representing weblogs and 19,090 directed edges representing hyperlinks from one weblog pointing to another weblog. Each node is manually labeled as democrat or republican, and therefore there are two perceivable communities: democrat and republican. Using the manual labels, we divide the network into two sub-networks, denoted by Weblog-Dem and Weblog-Rep. The citation network of statisticians is constructed using the recent MADStat data set collected by Ji, Jin, Ke, and Li [Ji et al. \(2022\)](#). The MADStat contains the bibtex and citation information of 83,331 papers published in 36 journals in 1971-2015. Ji *et al.* [Ji et al. \(2022\)](#) reported a citee network (which is undirected due to preprocessing) with 2,831 nodes (each is an author). They argued that (a) the 2,831 nodes are the most active authors in their data range, (b) the network has 3 interpretable communities: “Bayes”, “biostatistics”, and “non-parametric”. Following [Ji et al. \(2022\)](#), we divide all nodes into these 3 communities by applying the k -means to the rows of the estimated membership matrix by Mixed-SCORE [Jin et al. \(2024\)](#); see details therein. Using these communities and original citation data in MADStat, we construct six directed networks with two time period (i.e., 2013-2015, 2014-2015), denoted by Citation-Bay(13-15), Citation-Bio(13-15), and Citation-NP(13-15), Citation-Bay(14-15), Citation-Bio(14-15), and Citation-NP(14-15), where a directed edge from i to j means that papers published by author i during 2013-2015 cite papers by author j in the same period once (similar definition for 2014-2015 data). We apply our approaches to all these networks, and the results are in Table 6 (both $\hat{\sigma}^2 \equiv \hat{V}_n(\rho_0)$ and the p -value are associated with the hypothesis testing of $H_0 : \rho = 0$, or $\rho_0 = 0$ by our previous notation).

For the two weblog sub-networks, the estimates of the reciprocity parameters, i.e., $\hat{\rho}^*$, are 2.42 and 2.74, respectively. Also, for the null hypothesis $H_0 : \rho = 0$, both test statistics $\psi_n^*(\rho)$ for two sub-networks are 32.5, with very small p -values. These results indicate a strong reciprocity. Our results suggest the following. First, for each of the networks Weblog-Dem and Weblog-Rep, there is a strong reciprocity effect. The result is quite reasonable, especially as the data set is collected in an election year, a time period where the bloggers with similar political viewpoints try very hard to support each other.

²Alternatively, we may extend the p_1 model to directed networks with multiple communities. However, it is unclear what are appropriate models and approaches. In fact, due to the nonlinear K_{ij} , the p_1 model is hard to analyze (e.g., [Jin and Wang \(2025\)](#)). An extended version of the p_1 model will be even harder to analyze.

Table 6: Results for real data analysis ($\hat{\sigma}^2 = \hat{V}_n(\hat{\rho})$).

Name	# of nodes	# of double edges	$\hat{\rho}^*$	$\hat{\sigma}$	ψ_n^*	p-value
Weblog-Dem	758	2177	2.42	0.074	32.5	$< 10^{-4}$
Weblog-Rep	732	2244	2.74	0.084	32.5	$< 10^{-4}$
Citation-Bay(14-15)	919	45	13.65	0.607	22.5	$< 10^{-4}$
Citation-Bay(13-15)	919	96	4.64	1.123	4.1	$< 10^{-4}$
Citation-Bio(14-15)	1108	33	2.64	1.604	1.6	0.100
Citation-Bio(13-15)	1108	98	5.89	1.118	5.3	$< 10^{-4}$
Citation-NP(14-15)	804	49	4.43	1.414	3.1	0.002
Citation-NP(13-15)	804	118	3.37	0.556	6.1	$< 10^{-4}$

In such an atmosphere, it is very common that when one adds a hyperlink to another, he/she will get a hyperlink in return. Despite that the weblog data has been well-studied in the literature (e.g., Zhao et al. (2012); Wang et al. (2023)), our work is the first one that analyzes the reciprocal effects: Many existing works treated the network as undirected by ignoring the directions of edges, where the reciprocal effects are not properly modeled. For citation networks, the p -values for all 6 networks are significant, except for Citation-Bio(14-15). This suggests that citations are indeed reciprocal in statistics, but it may take a long time (more than 1 year) in order for the reciprocal effects to be fully realized. This is reasonable, for statistics is known to have a relatively slow publication cycle. Also, note that the reciprocal effects in Bayes are generally stronger than those in Non-parametric and Biostatistics, suggesting that Bayes community is more tightly-woven than the other two. See the supplement for more discussion.

5 Sketch of our proof ideas

To prove our results, the key is to bound $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\rho} - \rho)^2]$ where $\hat{\rho} = \log(Q_n(a)/Q_n(b))$. Note that $\hat{\rho} - \rho = \log(\frac{Q_n(a)}{e^\rho Q_n(b)}) = \log(1 + \frac{U_n(\rho)}{e^\rho Q_n(b)}) \approx \frac{U_n(\rho)}{e^\rho Q_n(b)}$, where $U_n(\rho) = Q_n(a) - e^\rho Q_n(b)$. Therefore, the key is to bound $\text{Var}(Q_n(a))$, $\text{Var}(Q_n(b))$ and $\text{Cov}(Q_n(a), e^\rho Q_n(b))$. The following lemma is proved in the supplement (recall that (μ, ν, η) are defined in (4)).

Lemma 3. *Suppose conditions (11), (12) and (14) hold. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

- $\text{Var}(Q_n(a)) = (1 + o(1)) \sum_{i \neq j} (2r_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{11} + s_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{10}) = (1 + o(1)) [2e^\rho \|\eta\|_1^2 \|\mu\|_1^2 \|\nu\|_1^2 + e^{2\rho} \|\eta\|_1^4 \|\mu\|_1 \|\nu\|_1]$.
- $\text{Var}(Q_n(b)) = (1 + o(1)) \sum_{i \neq j} t_{ij}^2 \Omega_{ij}^{10} = (1 + o(1)) [(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \|\mu\|_1^2 \|\nu\|_1^2 + 3(\mu, \eta) \|\eta\|_1^2 \|\mu\|_1 \|\nu\|_1^2 + 3(\nu, \eta) \|\eta\|_1^2 \|\mu\|_1^2 \|\nu\|_1 + 2\|\eta\|_1^4 \|\mu\|_1 \|\nu\|_1] + \text{rem}$, where the remainder term $|\text{rem}| \sim \|\eta\|_3^3 \|\mu\|_1^2 \|\nu\|_1^2 = o(1) \cdot [e^{-2\rho} \text{Var}(Q_n(a)) + Q_n(b)]$.
- $\text{Cov}(Q_n(a), e^\rho Q_n(b)) = -2(1 + o(1)) \sum_{i \neq j} e^\rho s_{ij} t_{ij} \Omega_{ij}^{10} + o(1) \cdot [\text{Var}(Q_n(a)) + e^{2\rho} \text{Var}(Q_n(b))]$.

In the second item, the remainder term is $o(1) \cdot [e^{-2\rho} \text{Var}(Q_n(a)) + \text{Var}(Q_n(b))]$ so it has a negligible contribution in $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))$. If we impose a mild condition of $a_n \rightarrow 0$, where

$a_n := \|\eta\|_3^3/[(\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta)] < 1$, then the reminder term is $o(1) \cdot \text{Var}(Q_n(b))$. Lemma 3 is the key to our proofs. Take Theorem 1 for example: the key is to derive an exact formula for $\text{Var}(U_n(\rho))$. But since $U_n(\rho) = Q_n(b) - e^\rho Q_n(a)$, the formula follows directly from Lemma 3.

	Expression	Variance		Expression	Variance
$S_{1,1}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,1}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,2}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,2}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,3}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,3}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,4}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,4}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,5}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,5}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,6}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^{2\rho} \ \eta\ _1^4 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1)$	$R_{1,6}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,7}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^{2\rho} \ \eta\ _1^4 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1)$	$R_{1,7}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,8}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^{2\rho} \ \eta\ _1^4 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1)$	$R_{1,8}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,9}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,9}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,10}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,10}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
$S_{1,11}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$	$o(e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$	$R_{1,11}$	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
S_2	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$ $+ e^{2\rho} \ \eta\ _1^4 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1)$	$(1 + o(1))(\mu, \eta) \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1^2$	R_2	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} W_{\ell i}^{10}$	$(1 + o(1))(\mu, \eta) \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1^2$
S_3	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$ $(1 + o(1))e^{2\rho} \ \eta\ _1^4 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1$	$(1 + o(1))\Omega_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	R_3	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{10} W_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	$o((\mu, \eta)(\nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2)$
S_4	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$ $+ e^{2\rho} \ \eta\ _1^4 \ \mu\ _1 \ \nu\ _1)$	$(1 + o(1))\Omega_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	R_4	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{10} W_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$	$(1 + o(1))(\nu, \eta) \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1$
S_5	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} \Omega_{\ell i}^{00}$	$2(1 + o(1))e^\rho \ \eta\ _1^2 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2$	R_5	$\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{10} \Omega_{jk}^{10} \Omega_{kl}^{00} \Omega_{\ell i}^{10}$ $- (1 + o(1))\ \eta\ _3^3 \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2$	$(1 + o(1))(\mu, \eta) \ \nu, \eta) \ \mu\ _1^2 \ \nu\ _1^2$

Table 7: The variances of all 15 terms in $Q_n(a) - \mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)]$ (left) and $Q_n(b) - \mathbb{E}[Q_n(b)]$ (right).

We now sketch the high-level idea for proving Lemma 3, with detailed proof in the supplement. Consider $\text{Var}(Q_n(a))$ (the first item of Lemma 3) first. Write $Q_n(a) - \mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)] = S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4 + S_5$, where $S_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{11} S_{1,k}$, and so $(Q_n(a) - \mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)])$ is the sum of a total of 15 terms. See Table 7 (left). Here, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5 are so-called *linear terms*. Take $S_2 = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \Omega_{ij}^{11} \Omega_{jk}^{00} \Omega_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$ for example. Each terms in the big sum is a product of 4 items: one is a W -term which is random, the other three are Ω -terms which are non-random. Therefore, S_2 is a linear combination of many W -terms, and thus is linear. In this sense, $S_{1,1}, S_{1,2}, \dots, S_{1,11}$ (and so S_1) are *nonlinear terms*. For each of these 15 terms, we compute the variance separately; see Table 7. By delicate and lengthy analysis, we find that out of all 15 terms, S_3 and S_5 are dominating in terms of variance, where the correlation between S_3 and S_4 is asymptotically vanishing. As a result, $\text{Var}(Q_n(a)) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \text{Var}(S_3 + S_5) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot (\text{Var}(S_3) + \text{Var}(S_5))$. This largely reduces the difficulty level of downstream analysis. Finally, in our notations $S_3 = \sum_{i \neq j} s_{ij} W_{ij}^{01}$ and $S_5 = \sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij} W_{ij}^{11}$. The first item of Lemma 3 follows by directly computing $\text{Var}(\sum_{i \neq j} s_{ij} W_{ij}^{01})$, $\text{Var}(\sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij} W_{ij}^{11})$, together with basic calculus. See the supplement for the details.

Consider $\text{Var}(Q_n(b))$ (the second item of Lemma 3) next. Similarly, we write $Q_n(b) - \mathbb{E}[Q_n(b)] = R_1 + R_2 + R_3 + R_4 + R_5$, where $R_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{11} R_{1,k}$, R_2, R_3, R_4, R_5 are linear terms and $R_{1,k}$ are nonlinear terms. Similarly, we find that $(R_2 + R_4 + R_5)$ dominates in variance, and $\text{Var}(Q_n(b)) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \text{Var}(R_2 + R_4 + R_5)$. By our notations, it is seen $R_2 + R_4 + R_5 = \sum_{i \neq j} t_{ij} W_{ij}^{10}$. The second result follows by directly computing $\text{Var}(\sum_{i \neq j} t_{ij} W_{ij}^{10})$ and basic calculus. See the supplement for details.

We now consider $\text{Cov}(Q_n(a), e^\rho Q_n(b))$. By elementary statistics, a term that has a negligible contribution in variance also has a negligible contribution in covariance. Therefore, by the above discussions, $\text{Cov}(Q_n(a), e^\rho Q_n(b)) = \text{Cov}(S_3 + S_5, e^\rho(R_2 + R_4 + R_5)) + o(1) \cdot (\text{Var}(Q_n(a)) + e^{2\rho} \text{Var}(Q_n(b)))$, where the first term on the right hand side is the leading term, and in our notations, it is $\text{Cov}(\sum_{i \neq j} (r_{ij} W_{ij}^{11} + s_{ij} W_{ij}^{10}), \sum_{i \neq j} t_{ij} W_{ij}^{10})$. The remaining part is detailed analysis. See the supplement for details.

We now briefly explain why the proof of Lemma 3 is so delicate and long. First, we need to analyze 100+ terms (each is a big sum similar as those in Table 7) separately. In detail, to compute $\text{Var}(Q_n(a))$, we have to split $(Q_n(a) - \mathbb{E}[Q_n(a)])$ into 15 terms, each is a big sum as in Table 7, and analyze them separately; same for $\text{Var}(Q_n(b))$. Also, we also need analyze $\text{Cov}(Q_n(a), e^\rho Q_n(b))$. Therefore, for these together, we need to analyze at least 30+ terms, each is a big sum similar to those in Table 7. But this is not the end: for each of the 30+ terms, the variance further splits into several terms which we have to analyze separately. Take $\text{Var}(S_{1,1}) = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$ for example. By the assumptions of the p_1 model, $\text{Var}(S_{1,1}) = \mathbb{E}[S_{1,1}^2] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} \sum_{i',j',k',\ell'(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00} W_{i'j'}^{11} W_{j'k'}^{00} W_{k'\ell'}^{01} W_{\ell' i'}^{00}]$. To analyze the RHS, we need to use complicated combinatorics to further divide the RHS into several sub-terms. In short, to prove Lemma 3, we need to carefully analyze 100+ terms, each is a big sum similar to those in Table 7. Note that our statistics are U-statistics in nature, and the above analytical approach is conventional: we are not aware of any shortcut.

Moreover, for many of these terms, we need to find the precise leading term (a cruder bound is frequently insufficient for the optimality results we desire). Also, comparing the order of the variance of different terms is challenging. Take Table 7 (left) for example. It is not immediately clear which of the 15 listed variances are dominating. Also, we face complicated combinatorics, especially as we do not have symmetry. Take $S_{1,1} = \sum_{i,j,k,\ell(\text{dist})} W_{ij}^{11} W_{jk}^{00} W_{kl}^{01} W_{\ell i}^{00}$ for example, we do not have symmetry among the 4 W terms. Last, from a practical viewpoint, we need to accommodate severe degree heterogeneity, so in our settings, different (α_i, β_i) may have very different magnitudes. All these make our analysis hard, delicate, long, and error-prone.

However, this does not mean our proofs are hard to extend. For example, for analysis of similar settings in the future, researchers can use a large part of our calculations. Also, if we wish to sacrifice some of the assumptions, we may largely shorten the proofs.

6 Discussion

Despite that it is one of the most popular models for directed network, the p_1 model does not model community structures. To overcome such a limitation, we may consider similar model as in (4), but $\tilde{\Omega}$ is a general low-rank matrix which may be much broader than that in (4). Seemingly, the model is not only a generalization of the p_1 model but also the popular block-models (e.g., [Ke and Jin \(2023\)](#)). In fact, in the special case where K is the matrix of all ones, Ω is low-rank, and the model includes the block-model family) as

special cases. How to analyze such a model is of major interest. One possible approach is to combine LCR with the idea of community detection, where we first apply SCORE [Jin \(2015\)](#) (say) for community detection, divide the nodes into different communities, and then apply the LCR for each community (we may alternately apply community detection and LCR for several times).

The p_1 model can also be viewed as a special case of the ERGM model [Goldenberg et al. \(2010\)](#); [Schweinberger et al. \(2020\)](#). Despite its broadness, the ERGM model is well-known for hard-to-analyze. An interesting question is therefore to what extent our approach for the p_1 model is extendable to the ERGM model. Also, while our focus is on static networks, the idea is readily extendable to dynamic networks.

References

Adamic, L. and Glance, N. (2005). The political blogosphere and the 2004 u.s. election: divided they blog. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Link Discovery*, pages 36–43.

Chatterjee, S., Diaconis, P., and Sly, A. (2011). Random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 21(4):1400–1435.

Chen, M., Kato, K., and Leng, C. (2021). Analysis of networks via the sparse β -model. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. B.*, 83(5):887–910.

Chen, Y., Li, X., and Xu, J. (2018). Convexified modularity maximization for degree-corrected stochastic block models. *Ann. Statist.*, 46(4):1573–1602.

Donoho, D. and Jin, J. (2015). Higher Criticism for large-scale inference, especially for rare and weak effects. *Stat. Sci.*, 30(1):1–25.

Donoho, D. and Liu, R. (1991). Geometrizing rates of convergence, II. *Ann. Statist.*, 19(2):633–667.

Durrett, R. (2010). *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 4 edition.

Fan, J., Fan, Y., Han, X., and Lv, J. (2022). Simple: Statistical inference on membership profiles in large networks. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. B.*, 84(2):630–653.

Gao, C. and Lafferty, J. (2017). Testing network structure using relations between small subgraph probabilities. *ArXiv:1704.06742*.

Goldenberg, A., Zheng, A. X., Fienberg, S. E., and Airoldi, E. M. (2010). A survey of statistical network models. *Foundations Trends Mach. Learn.*, 2(2):129–233.

Holland, P. W. and Leinhardt, S. (1981). An exponential family of probability distributions for directed graphs. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 76(373):33–50.

Horn, R. and Johnson, C. (1985). *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Ji, P., Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., and Li, W. (2022). Co-citation and co-authorship networks of statisticians (with discussion). *J. Bus. Econ. Stat.*, 40(2):469–485.

Jin, J. (2015). Fast community detection by SCORE. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(1):57–89.

Jin, J., Ke, T., Sui, B., and Wang, Z. (2025). Counting cycles with deepseek. *ArXiv.2505.17964*.

Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., and Luo, S. (2018). Network global testing by counting graphlets. In *ICML*, pages 2338–2346.

Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., and Luo, S. (2021). Optimal adaptivity of signed-polygon statistics for network testing. *Ann. Statist.*, 49(6):3408–3433.

Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., and Luo, S. (2024). Mixed membership estimation for social networks. *J. Econom.*, 239(2):105369.

Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., Luo, S., and Wang, M. (2023). Optimal estimation of the number of network communities. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 118(543):2101–2116.

Jin, J., Ke, Z. T., and Wang, W. (2017). Phase transition high dimensional clustering and related problems. *Ann. Statist.*, 45(5):2151–2189.

Jin, J. and Wang, J. (2025). Fitting networks with a cancellation trick. *ICLR*.

Karwa, V. and Slavković, A. (2016). Inference using noisy degrees-differentially private beta model and synthetic graphs. *Ann. Statist.*, 44:87–112.

Ke, Z. T. and Jin, J. (2023). Special invited paper: The SCORE normalization, especially for heterogeneous network and text data. *Stat.*, 12(1):e545.

Ke, Z. T. and Wang, J. (2024). Optimal network membership estimation under severe degree heterogeneity. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 120(550):948–962.

Li, T., Levina, E., and Zhu, J. (2020). Network cross-validation by edge sampling. *Biometrika*, 107(2):257–276.

Rinaldo, A., Petrović, S., and Fienberg, S. E. (2013). Maximum likelihood estimation in the β -model. *Ann. Statist.*, 41(3):1085–1110.

Saldana, D. F., Yu, Y., and Feng, Y. (2017). How many communities are there? *J. Comp. Graph. Stat.*, 26(1):171–181.

Schweinberger, M., Krivitsky, P., Butts, C., and Stewart, J. (2020). Exponential-family models of random graphs. *Statist. Sci.*, 35(4):627–662.

Stein, S. and Leng, C. (2024). A sparse beta regression model for network analysis. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 50(120):1281–1293.

Wang, J., Zhang, J., Liu, B., Zhu, J., and Guo, J. (2023). Fast network community detection with profile-pseudo likelihood methods. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 118(542):1359–1372.

Wang, Y. R. and Bickel, P. J. (2017). Likelihood-based model selection for stochastic block models. *Ann. Statist.*, 45(2):500–528.

Yan, T., Leng, C., and Zhu, J. (2016). Asymptotics in directed exponential random graph models with an increasing bi-degree sequence. *Ann. Statist.*, 44(1):31–57.

Yan, T. and Xu, J. (2013). A central limit theorem in the β -model for undirected random graphs with a diverging number of vertices. *Biometrika*, 100(2):519–524.

Zhao, Y., Levina, E., and Zhu, J. (2012). Consistency of community detection in networks under degree-corrected stochastic block models. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(4):2266–2292.