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Abstract
Computing the maximum size of an independent set in a graph is a famously hard combinatorial problem. There have been many analyses for the classical binomial random graph model of Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert and as a result, tight asymptotic bounds are known for these graphs. However, this classical model does not capture any dependency structure between edges that is widely prevalent in real-world networks. We initiate study in this direction by considering random graphs whose existence of edges is determined by a Markov process that is also governed by a decay parameter δ ∈ (0, 1]. We prove that the maximum size of an independent set in such an n-vertex random graph is with high probability lower bounded by \((1 - \delta^2 + \varepsilon) \pi(n)\) for arbitrary \(\varepsilon > 0\), where \(\pi(n)\) is the prime-counting function, and upper bounded by \(c_\delta n\), where \(c_\delta := e^{-\delta} + \delta / 10\) is an explicit constant. Since our random graph model collapses to the classical binomial random graph model when there is no decay (i.e., \(\delta = 1\)) and the latter are known to have independent sets roughly be of size no more than \(\log n\), it follows from our lower bound that having even the slightest bit of dependency in the random graph construction leads to the presence of large independent sets and thus our random model has a phase transition at its boundary value. We also prove that a greedy algorithm for finding a maximal independent set gives w.h.p. an output of size \(\Omega(n^{1/(1 + \tau)})\) where \(\tau = \lceil 1/(1 - \delta) \rceil\).
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1 Introduction
An independent set in a graph \(G = (V, E)\) is a subset of \(V\) such that no two vertices in this subset have an edge between them. The maximum cardinality of an independent set in \(G\) is called the stability number \(\alpha(G)\), and this is a difficult combinatorial problem that is in general NP-hard to approximate within factor \(|V|\) [Has99]. There is vast amount of literature on approximating this number for general and special graphs, and in theory and also computationally through optimization algorithms. This paper analyzes this number for a special class of random graphs. Random graph models have been used for analyzing topological structures of networks, such as social network, citation network, etc. [New02, GB11, Fos+18], and independent sets present some important properties of these networks. Stability numbers of random graphs have been theoretically analysed mostly for the classical binomial random graph, also called the Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert random graph, which is denoted by \(G_{n,p}\). This is a n-vertex graph where each edge has a given fixed probability \(p\) of being present in the graph. There is a long line of work on bounding \(\alpha(G_{n,p})\) asymptotically [GM75, BE76, Mat76, Fri90], and this has spawned asymptotic analysis of the chromatic number \(\chi(G_{n,p})\), which yields a lower bound on \(\alpha(G_{n,p})\), and its concentration [SS87, Bol88, McD90, Luc91, CPS08, Hec21]. We continue this line of
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work on asymptotic analysis of $\alpha(G)$ but initiate it on a new class of random graphs for which the Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert graphs are a boundary condition.

Typical network models have non-uniform edge probability and nonzero correlations between edges. To the best of our knowledge, there is no literature on analyzing the stability number of a random graph with dependency structures. The edges in our random graph are generated dynamically using a Markov process. Given $n$, $p$ and a decay parameter $\delta \in (0, 1)$, starting from the singleton graph $(\{v_1\}, \emptyset)$, a graph $G_{n,p}^\delta$ having $n$ vertices is generated in $n-1$ iterations where at each iteration $t \geq 2$, the vertex $v_i$ is added to the graph and edges $(v_i, v_t)$ for $1 \leq i \leq t-1$ are added as per a Bernoulli r.v. $X_i^t$. The success probability of $X_i^t$ is equal to $p$ for $i = 1$ and for $i \geq 2$, it is independent of the values of $\{X_1^t, \ldots, X_{i-1}^t\}$ and is equal to the success probability of $X_{i-1}^t$ when $X_{i-1}^t = 0$, and is reduced by a factor $\delta$ when $X_{i-1}^t = 1$.

**Definition 1.** For any $p, \delta \in (0, 1)$, a Markov random graph $G_{n,p}^\delta$ is a random graph on $n$ vertices $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ wherein the edge probabilities are defined as follows:

1. for $2 \leq i \leq n$, edge $(v_1, v_i)$ exists with probability equal to $p$;
2. for $2 \leq j < i \leq n$, probability of edge $(v_j, v_i)$ depends on whether edge $(v_{j-1}, v_i)$ is present or not, and is independent of all other edges, and we have the following dependency structure on their conditional probabilities,

$$
\mathbb{P}\{\text{edge } (v_{j+1}, v_i) \text{ exists} \mid \text{edge } (v_j, v_i) \text{ does not exist}\} = \mathbb{P}\{\text{edge } (v_j, v_i) \text{ exists}\}
$$

$$
\mathbb{P}\{\text{edge } (v_{j+1}, v_i) \text{ exists} \mid \text{edge } (v_j, v_i) \text{ exists}\} = \delta \mathbb{P}\{\text{edge } (v_j, v_i) \text{ exists}\}.
$$

We think of the parameter $p$ as the *initial probability* since it governs the edge probabilities between the first vertex and other vertices, and the parameter $\delta$ as the *decay parameter* since it decreases the edge probability by this factor whenever a previous edge (think of the vertices sorted from 1, \ldots, $n$ and edges between them) is present. Taking $\delta = 1$ makes all edges have equal probability $p$ and so $G_{n,p}^1$ is isomorphic to $G_{n,p}$, thereby making our Markov random graph a generalization of the Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert model.

**Notation.** The random graphs $G_{n,p}^\delta$ form an obvious finite probability space. Random variables in this paper are generally some function of the random graph $G_{n,p}^\delta$. We suppress $\omega$ from a r.v. $\xi(\omega)$ and write it simply as $\xi$. Commonly appearing random variables are the stability number $\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta)$, vertex degree which is $\deg(v_i)$, average degree $d(G_{n,p}^\delta)$, edge $(v_j, v_i)$ Bernoulli r.v. $X_j^i$. We use $\mathbb{E}$ to take expected value and $\mathbb{P}\{\}$ for probability measure, where the corresponding probability space is obvious from context. When a sequence of random variables $\{\xi_n\}$ on the same probability space converges to another random variable $\xi$, we denote it as $\xi_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \xi$, and when $\xi$ is a constant we sometimes say that $\xi_n$ concentrates to $\xi$. This convergence in probability means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the probability sequence $\mathbb{P}\{|\xi_n - \xi| \leq \varepsilon\}$ converges to 1 as $n \to \infty$. A property $\mathcal{P}_n$ is said to be with high probability (w.h.p.) if $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{P}_n \text{ is true}\} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Logarithm to the base $e$ (natural log) is denoted by $\log$.

### 1.1 Main Results and Outline

Our first main result is an asymptotic lower bound on $\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta)$ using the prime-counting function $\pi(n)$, which is defined as the number of primes less than or equal to $n$.

**Theorem 1.1.** We have w.h.p. that

$$
\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \geq \frac{1 - \delta}{2 + \varepsilon} \pi(n).
$$
We prove this theorem in §4 by first establishing that the average vertex degree scaled by a logarithmic factor concentrates to 2. This in turn leads us towards our theorem using a well-known result about general graphs that their stability number can be lower bounded in terms of their average degree. Our concentration result can be stated explicitly as follows, an equivalent assertion being that $d(G_{n,p}^\delta)/\log n \overset{p}{\rightarrow} 2(1 - \delta)$.

**Proposition 1.2.** For every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have w.h.p. that

$$\left| \frac{d(G_{n,p}^\delta)}{(1 - \delta) \log n} - 2 \right| < \varepsilon.$$ 

Our proof for this in §4 uses a key technical result about the sequence of dependent Bernoulli r.v.’s corresponding to each vertex $v_i$. We analyse such a Bernoulli sequence in §7, but use Theorem 7.1 and Corollary 7.4 corresponding to it when proving our above concentration result.

On the lower-bounding side, we also show in §5 that the maximal independent set found by a simple greedy algorithm is $\Omega(n^{\frac{\delta^2}{2(\delta - 1)}})$ w.h.p. The algorithm we consider iterates from $v_1$ to $v_n$ to add vertex into the output set whenever the set after adding new vertex is still an independent set.

**Proposition 1.3.** The greedy algorithm outputs $\alpha_G(G_{n,p}^\delta) = \Omega\left(n^{\frac{\delta^2}{2(\delta - 1)}}\right)$ where $\tau = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil$.

This gives a weaker lower bound on $\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta)$ than that from Theorem 1.1 because we know from the prime number theorem that $\pi(n)$ is asymptotically equal to $n/\log n$. Since the construction of our random graph is such that one can intuitively see that the vertex degrees are in the descending order from $v_1$ to $v_n$ w.h.p., the greedy algorithm we consider gives a worst-case performance bound on the greedy algorithm that one typically uses to approximate $\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta)$ by sorting vertices from smallest to largest degree (in our case that would be $v_n$ to $v_1$).

For upper bound on the size of independent sets in $G_{n,p}^\delta$, we prove in §6 a tight constant $c < 1$ that bounds $\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \leq cn$.

**Theorem 1.4.** For $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have w.h.p. that $\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \leq \left(e^{-\delta} + \frac{\delta}{\log q}\right) n$.

A crucial first step in our entire analysis is to establish the edge probabilities, i.e., success probability for Bernoulli r.v. corresponding to each edge. This is not a straightforward task, unlike the binomial graph $G_{n,p}$ for which this probability is readily available as the parameter $p$. Although we don’t derive an exact expression for the edge probabilities, we derive tight lower and upper bounds on it in §3. This is done by analyzing in §2 the rate at which terms in the recurrence formula $f_a: x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto x(1 - ax)$ grow. This recurrence appears due to the Markov process that generates our random graph.

Finally, we outline in Appendix A the challenges involved behind obtaining the probability distributions of the vertex degrees, in contrast to the analysis that has been done for $G_{n,p}$.

1.2 Discussion

The stability number of Erdös-Rényi-Gilbert random model $G_{n,p}$ has been well-studied. If $p \in (0, 1)$ is fixed, then Matula [Mat76] has shown that w.h.p. the stability number $\alpha(G_{n,p}) \approx 2\log_q(n)$, where the logarithm base is $q = 1/(1 - p)$. The graph $G_{n,p}$ with fixed $p$ is usually considered as a dense random graph. For sparse random graphs with $np = d$ fixed, Frieze [Fri90] showed that

$$\left| \alpha(G_{n,p}) - \frac{2n}{d} (\log d - \log \log d - \log 2 + 1) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{d}$$
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holds w.h.p. for all $d \geq d_\varepsilon$ where $d_\varepsilon$ is a constant depending on the chosen $\varepsilon > 0$. In contrast, our lower bound of $\Omega(n/\log n)$ indicates that there are much larger independent sets in our random graph $G_{n,p}^\delta$. Since all of our analysis heavily depends on $\delta < 1$, our results don’t generalise those known for the Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert graph, which also indicates that a phase transition occurs in our random graph model at the boundary value $\delta = 1$.

The proof for average degree concentration in Proposition 1.2 uses Chebyshev’s inequality. Due to the absence of independence structure between the r.v.s, we cannot apply Chernoff- or Hoeffding-type inequalities, and use of martingale tail inequalities also does not help. For fixed $p$, this concentration result shows $G_{n,p}^\delta$ to be more sparse than $G_{n,p}$ in terms of the number of edges. Intuitively, a denser graph has smaller stability number and our result indeed complies with this intuition,

$$\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) = \Omega\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{n}{1+p}\right) = \Omega(\alpha(G_{n,p})),$$

Proposition 1.2 relies on the asymptotic result of the sequence $\frac{S_n}{\log n}$ in Theorem 7.1 and this result does not trivially follow from the literature. We know of two studies [JKQ, LQY] that show $S_n/n$ converges to constants under the assumption that $\mathbb{P}\{Y_{n+1} = 1 \mid Y_1, \ldots, Y_1\} = \theta_n + h_n(S_n)$ where $h_n$ is a linear function and $\theta_n$ is a constant. Our work makes a different assumption where the conditional probability does not depend on the partial sum $S_n$. Furthermore, the variables we consider form a Markov process. A sequence of identically distributed Bernoulli variables with a Markovian property was first introduced by Edwards [Edw60] and the limiting property of their partial sum was later investigated by Wang [Wan81], but these require the transition matrix to be fixed during the whole process (homogenous Markov chain), which is not the case in our Bernoulli sequence.

Another powerful method to deal with a sequence of variables is martingale analysis. It is easy to see $\{S_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a super-martingale,

$$\mathbb{E}S_{n+1}|Y_1, \ldots, Y_n = \mathbb{E}Y_{n+1}|Y_n + S_n > 0.$$

Unfortunately, since $\{S_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a non-decreasing sequence, Doob’s inequality collapse to the Chebyshev’s inequality $\mathbb{P}\{S_n > C\} \leq \mathbb{E}S_n/C$. The main strategy for obtaining the asymptotic result of $S_n$ in our case is the second moment method.

# 2 Growth Rates in a Recurrence Formula

This section establishes some technical results on the following recursion formula that will be used throughout this paper,

$$x_{n+1} = f_a(x_n) \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq 1, \quad \text{where} \quad f_a : x \mapsto x(1 - ax), \quad \text{for} \quad a \in (0,1],$$

and it is assumed that $x_1 \in (0,1)$. We begin by observing that the function $f_a : x \mapsto x(1 - ax)$ used to generate this recurrence has the following properties from elementary calculus.

**Lemma 2.1.** $f_a$ is a concave quadratic that

1. is increasing on $(-\infty,a/2]$ and decreasing on $(a/2,\infty)$,
2. has a maximum value of $a^2/4$,
3. does not have any nonzero fixed point,
4. is positive-valued over $(0,1)$,
5. satisfies \( f_a(x) < x \) for \( x > 0 \),
6. satisfies \( af_a(x) = f_1(ax) \).
7. satisfies \( f_a(x) < f_b(x) \) for \( x > 0 \) if \( a > b \).

**Proof.** Rewrite \( f_a = x(1-ax) = -\left(x - a/2\right)^2 + a^2/4 \) and then the first 3 claims are obvious. Observe that \( f_a(0) = 0 \) and \( f_a(1) = 1 - a \geq 0 \). The first claim implies \( f_a(x) > \min\{f_a(0), f_a(1)\} = 0 \) for all \( x \in (0,1) \) and therefore, the fourth claim is true. Next, for all \( x > 0 \), the fifth claim is equivalent to \( 1 - ax < 1 \) which is essentially \( a > 0 \) followed from our assumption on \( a \). The sixth claim is no more than a simple computation \( af_a(x) = ax(1-ax) = f_1(ax) \). To prove the seventh claim, we evaluate \( f_a(x) - f_b(x) = (b-a)x^2 \) which is negative if \( a > b \) and \( x > 0 \). □

The terms in the recurrence are lower and upper bounded by constant multiples of \( 1/n \).

**Lemma 2.2.** Recurrence (1) generates a decreasing sequence with each term \( x_n \), for \( n \geq 2 \), bounded as

\[
\frac{1}{a} \ell_n(x_1) \leq x_n < \min\left\{\frac{a^2}{4}, \frac{1}{a} \cdot \frac{1}{n-1 + \frac{1}{x_1}}\right\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \ell_n(x_1) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{n+1})^2}, & n \geq 2 \\ \frac{f_1(x_1)}{n}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

(2)

**Proof.** We immediately have from the fifth and second claims in **Lemma 2.1** that (1) generates a decreasing sequence over \((0,a^2/4]\). The sixth claim in **Lemma 2.1** implies that the sequence \( \{y_n\} \) formed by the recurrence \( y_n = f_1(y_{n-1}) \) is related to \( \{x_n\} \) by \( y_n = ax_n \). Therefore, to obtain the other bounds on \( x_n \) it suffices to bound with \( a = 1 \) and then scale the results by dividing with \( a \). Henceforth, assume \( a = 1 \).

We prove by induction that \( x_n < \frac{1}{n-1 + \frac{1}{x_1}} \). The base case of \( n = 2 \) holds because \( x_2 = f_1(x_1) = x_1(1-x_1) < x_1/(1+x_1) = 1/(1+x_1) \), where the inequality is from \( 1 - x_1^2 < 1 \). Suppose \( x_n < 1/(n+\phi) \) for some \( n \geq 2 \), where for convenience of notation we let \( \phi = \frac{1}{x_1} - 1 \). Note that \( \phi > 0 \) because \( x_1 \in (0,1) \), and hence \( 1/(n+\phi) \in (0,1/2) \) and \( 1/(n+\phi) < 1/n \) for \( n \geq 2 \). Monotonicity of \( f_1 \) over \((0,1/2]\) from the first claim in **Lemma 2.1** and our induction hypothesis imply that \( f_1(1/(n+\phi)) > f_1(x_n) = x_{n+1} \). Since \( f_1(1/(n+\phi)) = (n+\phi-1)/(n+\phi)^2 < 1/(n+\phi) \) and \( x_{n+1} = f_1(x_n) \), we have arrived at \( x_{n+1} < 1/(n+\phi) \), which completes the induction for the upper bound.

For the lower bound, define two functions \( \phi(\lambda) := \max\{\frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1}, \frac{1}{f_1(x_1)}\} \) and \( g_n(\lambda) := \phi(\lambda) + n\lambda \), with domain \( \lambda > 1 \). We argue, by induction, that \( 1/g_n(\lambda) \) is a parametric lower bound on \( x_n \). Denote \( \phi := \phi(\lambda) \). The base case is \( n = 2 \). From recurrence formula \( x_2 = f_1(x_1) \) and \( \phi > 1/f_1(x_1) \), we get \( x_2 > 1/\phi \) and thus \( x_2 > 1/(\phi + 2\lambda) \) since \( \lambda > 0 \). For the inductive step, assume \( x_{n-1} > 1/(\phi + 2\lambda) \) is true. **Lemma 2.2** says that \( x_n \leq 1/4 \) for all \( n \geq 2 \) and the first claim in **Lemma 2.1** asserts \( f_1(x) \) is monotone increasing on \((0,1/4]\). \( x_{n+1} = f_1(x_n) \geq f_1\left(\frac{1}{\phi + 2\lambda}\right) = (\phi + 2\lambda)^{-1} \). Since \( (\phi + 2\lambda)^{-1} > 1/(\phi + (n+1)\lambda) \) and \( \lambda(\phi + n\lambda) - (\phi + k\lambda + \lambda) = (\phi+n\lambda)(\lambda - 1) - \lambda > 0 \) where the inequality is because \( \phi + n\lambda > \phi = \lambda/2 \), it follows that \( f_1\left(\frac{1}{\phi + 2\lambda}\right) > 1/(\phi + (n+1)\lambda) \). This leads to \( x_{n+1} > 1/(\phi + (n+1)\lambda) = \frac{1}{\phi + (n+1)\lambda} \).

Now we show that our claimed lower bound on \( x_n \) is a lower bound on the supremum of \( 1/g_n(\lambda) \) over \((1, \infty) \), or equivalently an upper bound on \( \inf_{\lambda > 1} g_n(\lambda) \). Denote \( \lambda^* = 1/(1-
Lemma 2.4. This value is such that \(\lambda^*/(\lambda^* - 1) = 1/f_1(x_1)\). Since \(\lambda/\lambda - 1\) is a decreasing function of \(\lambda\), we have that the function \(\phi\) has non-differentiability at \(\lambda^*\) and \(g_n\) can be written as

\[
g_n(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1} + n\lambda, & 1 < \lambda \leq \lambda^* \\
\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\lambda, & \lambda \geq \lambda^*. 
\end{cases}
\]

Therefore,

\[
\inf_{\lambda > 1} g_n(\lambda) = \min \left\{ \inf_{1 < \lambda < \lambda^*} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - 1} + n\lambda, \inf_{\lambda > \lambda^*} \frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\lambda \right\}, \tag{3}
\]

and let us evaluate the two infimums separately. The second one is obviously equal to \(\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\frac{1}{1 - f_1(x_1)}\). For the first infimum, it is easy to verify that the function to be minimised is convex in \(\lambda\), and the first derivative is \(n - 1/(\lambda - 1)^2\), so that the stationary point is at \(\hat{\lambda} = 1 + 1/\sqrt{n}\). Hence, the minimum value of this function over the real line is its value at \(\hat{\lambda}\), which is equal to \((\sqrt{n} + 1)^2\). We are interested in the minimum over the interval \((1, \lambda^*)\). The function has a vertical asymptote \(\lambda = 1\) and its value at the other endpoint is \(\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\frac{1}{1 - f_1(x_1)}\). It is easy to verify that \((\sqrt{n} + 1)^2 \leq \frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\frac{1}{1 - f_1(x_1)}\) if and only if \((\sqrt{n} + 1)f_1(x_1) - 1)^2 \geq 0\), which is obviously true. Therefore, the minimum over \((1, \lambda^*)\) is \((\sqrt{n} + 1)^2\) if \(\hat{\lambda} \leq \lambda^*\), otherwise the minimum is \(\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\frac{1}{1 - f_1(x_1)}\). The second value can be upper bounded as follows,

\[
\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\frac{1}{1 - f_1(x_1)} \leq \frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} + n\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)(1 - \frac{1}{4})} = \left(1 + \frac{n}{3}\right) \frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} < \frac{n}{f_1(x_1)},
\]

where the first inequality is by applying the following fact that is simple to verify by cross-multiplying denominators,

\[
0 < \xi_1 \leq \xi_2 < 1 \implies \frac{1}{1 - \xi_1} \leq \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_1(1 - \xi_2)},
\]

to \(\xi_1 = f_1(x_1)\) and \(\xi_2 = 1/4\) (this upper bound on \(x_2 = f_1(x_1)\) is from Lemma 2.2), and the second inequality is because \(n > 1 + n/3\) for \(n \geq 2\). Thus, the infimum in (3) is upper bounded by \(1/(\sqrt{n} + 1)^2\) if \(\hat{\lambda} \leq \lambda^*\), otherwise the bound is \(n/f_1(x_1)\).

It remains to simplify the condition \(\hat{\lambda} \leq \lambda^*\), which becomes \(1 + 1/\sqrt{n} \leq 1/(1 - f_1(x_1))\). This is equivalent to \(f_1(x_1) \geq 1/(1 + \sqrt{n})\), which rearranges to \(n \geq (\frac{1}{f_1(x_1)} - 1)^2\).

Another result that we will need is lower and upper bounds on the sum of terms in the recurrence for large enough \(n\). To prove the lower bound, let us recall that the \(n^{th}\) harmonic number is

\[
H_n := 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n},
\]

which is the partial sum of the harmonic series \(\sum_i \frac{1}{i}\). A well-known fact about the harmonic number is that it exhibits a logarithmic growth rate, which can be derived using the Euler-Maclaurin expansion formula.

Lemma 2.3 ([BW71]). \(H_n = \gamma + \log n + \frac{1}{2n} - R_n\), where \(0 \leq R_n \leq \frac{1}{8n^2}\) and \(\gamma \approx 0.57721\) is the Euler constant.

Lemma 2.4. Denote \(f_1 := f_1(x_1)\) and \(\eta(x_1) := 2(1 - f_1)\log f_1 - \left(\frac{5}{2} + \log 2\right)f_1\). For \(n \geq (\frac{1}{f_1} - 1)^2\), we have

\[
ax_1 + \eta(x_1) + \frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{n}} + \log n \leq a \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \leq ax_1 + \log(1 + (n - 1)x_1).
\]
Proof. For the upper bound, we have

\[
a \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \leq ax_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \frac{1}{i - 1 + \frac{1}{x_1}} \leq ax_1 + \int_{\frac{1}{x_1}}^{\frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_1}} \frac{1}{t} \, dt = ax_1 + \log \left(1 + (n - 1)x_1\right),
\]

where the first inequality is using the upper bound in Lemma 2.2 and the second inequality is due to the summation being the right Riemann sum of the decreasing function \( t \mapsto 1/(t + \frac{1}{x_1}) \) over the interval \([0, n - 1]\).

For the lower bound, let us denote \( n^* := (\frac{1}{f_1} - 1)^2 \) for convenience. Using the lower bound from Lemma 2.2 for each term in the sequence, the partial sum can be lower bounded as

\[
a \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \geq ax_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \ell_i(x_1) = ax_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \frac{f_1(x_1)}{i} + \sum_{i=n^*}^{n} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{i} + 1)^2}
\]

\[
= ax_1 + f_1(x_1)(H_{n^*} - 1) + \sum_{i=n^*}^{n} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{i} + 1)^2}
\]

\[
\geq ax_1 + f_1(x_1)(H_{n^*} - 1) + \int_{n^*}^{n} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{i} + 1)^2} \, dt
\]

\[
= ax_1 + f_1(x_1)(H_{n^*} - 1) + 2 \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{t}} + \log (1 + \sqrt{t}) \right]_{n^*}^{n}
\]

\[
\geq ax_1 + f_1(x_1)(H_{n^*} - 1) - \frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{n^*}} - 2 \log \left(1 + \sqrt{n^*}\right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{n}} + \log n,
\]

where the first equality is by definition of \( \ell_i \) in (2), the second equality is the definition of harmonic number \( H_n \), the second inequality is due to the summation being the left Riemann sum of the decreasing function \( t \mapsto (1 + \sqrt{t})^2 \) over the interval \([n^*, n]\), and the last inequality is from the fact that \( 2 \log (1 + \sqrt{t}) = \log (1 + t + 2\sqrt{t}) > \log t \). Now we simplify the terms in the middle involving \( n^* \) and argue that they are lower bounded by \( \eta(x_1) \). Since \( n^* := (\frac{1}{f_1} - 1)^2 \), we have \( 1 + \sqrt{n^*} = 1/f_1 \) and \( \log (1 + \sqrt{n^*}) = -\log f_1 \). Therefore, the middle terms depending on \( n^* \) are

\[
f_1(H_{n^*} - 1) - 2f_1 + 2 \log f_1 = f_1(H_{n^*} - 1 - 3) + 2 \log f_1,
\]

and we have to argue that this is lower bounded by \( \eta(x_1) \). By Lemma 2.3, the \( n^\text{th} \) harmonic number can be lower-bounded as

\[
H_n \geq \gamma + \log n + \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{8n^2} \implies H_n - 3 \geq \gamma + \log n + \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{8n^2} - 3 \geq \log n - \frac{5}{2},
\]

where the last inequality is because \( \gamma > 1/2 \) and \( 1/2n - 1/8n^2 > 0 \). Substituting this lower bound into the middle terms depending on \( n^* \) gives us the lower bound

\[
f_1 \left( \log (n^* - 1) - \frac{5}{2} \right) + 2 \log f_1.
\]

Since \( n^* - 1 = (1/f_1 - 2)/f_1 \), we have \( \log (n^* - 1) = \log (1/f_1 - 2) - \log f_1 \), and so the lower bound on the middle terms becomes

\[
(2 - f_1) \log f_1 + f_1 \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{f_1} - 2 \right) - \frac{5}{2} \right) = (2 - f_1) \log f_1 + f_1 \left( \log (1 - 2f_1) - \log f_1 - \frac{5}{2} \right)
\]

\[
\geq 2(1 - f_1) \log f_1 - f_1 \left( \log 2 + \frac{5}{2} \right) =: \eta(x_1),
\]
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where the inequality is because $f_1 \leq 1/4$ due to Lemma 2.1 implies that $\log (1 - 2f_1) \geq -\log 2$.

3 Estimating Edge Probabilities

In any random graph model, each edge can be associated with a Bernoulli random variable (r.v.) which is equal to 1 if and only if that edge is present in the random graph. The success probability for this r.v. depends on the construction of the random graph model; for the binomial random graph $G_{n,p}$ by Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert, this probability is equal to the parameter $p$, which implies that any two Bernoulli r.v.’s are iid. This significantly helps the analysis of these graphs for their stability number, concentration of chromatic number and many other graph properties. The same is not true for arbitrary edges in our Markov random graph $G_{n,p}^\delta$ since we have a dependency structure between the edges. Denote the Bernoulli r.v. $X_{ij}$ by

$$X_{ij}^i = 1 \iff \text{edge } (v_j, v_i) \text{ is present in graph } G_{n,p}^\delta, \quad 1 \leq j < i \leq n.$$ 

and its success probability by

$$p_{ij}^i := \mathbb{P}\{X_{ij}^i = 1\}, \quad 1 \leq j < i \leq n.$$ 

For each $j$, the edges $\{(v_j, v_i): j < i\}$ have their corresponding Bernoulli variables equal in distribution and also independent of each other.

Lemma 3.1. $X_k^i$ and $X_k^j$ are iid random variables for $k < \min\{i, j\}$ and $i \neq j$.

For every vertex $i$, there is a corresponding Markov chain formed by the sequence of Bernoulli r.v.’s from edges to vertices.

Lemma 3.2. For every $i \geq 2$, the sequence $\{X_i^1, \ldots, X_i^{i-1}\}$ forms a non-homogenous Markov chain with transition matrix from $X_k^i$ to $X_{k+1}^i$, for $1 \leq k \leq i - 2$, given by

$$P_k^i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p_k^i & p_k^i \\ 1 - \delta p_k^i & \delta p_k^i \end{bmatrix}.$$ 

Since all edges to $v_1$ occur with the same probability $p$, we have $p_1^i = p$ for all $i$. For the other edges, the success probabilities for the Markov chain $\{X_1^i, \ldots, X_{i-1}^i\}$, namely the sequence $\{p_2^i, \ldots, p_{i-1}^i\}$, satisfies a recursion.

Lemma 3.3. For $2 \leq j \leq i - 1$, we have

$$p_j^i = p_{j-1}^i \left[1 - (1 - \delta)p_{j-1}^i\right],$$

and consequently,

$$\frac{\ell_j ((1 - \delta)p)}{1 - \delta} \leq p_j^i < \min\left\{p_{j-1}^i, \frac{1}{(1 - \delta)\bar{j}}\right\}.$$
Lemma. This follows from the law of total probability,

\[ \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 1 \mid X_{j-1} = 1\} \mathbb{P}\{X_{j-1} = 1\} + \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 1 \mid X_{j-1} = 0\} \mathbb{P}\{X_{j-1} = 0\}, \]

where the second equality is from the conditional probabilities in Definition 1. Thus, for every \( i \), the sequence \( \{p_i, p_{i+1}, \ldots, p_{i+k}\} \) obeys the recursion \( x_{k+1} = x_k (1 - (1 - \delta)x_k) \) starting with \( x_1 = p_i \). This recursion is the same as the one analysed earlier in (1) and therefore, the claimed bounds follow from applying Lemma 2.2 with \( a = 1 - \delta \). \( \square \)

The transition matrix in Lemma 3.2 for the Markovian property gives us conditional probabilities for consecutive variables. For two arbitrary variables, the conditional probability can be bounded as follows.

Lemma 3.4. For \( 1 \leq k < j < i \),

\[ 1 - p_{j-1} \leq \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 0 \mid X_k = 0\} \leq 1 - \delta p_{j-1}, \quad \delta p_{j-1} \leq \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 1 \mid X_k = 1\} \leq p_{j-1}. \]

Proof. Fix any \( i \geq 2 \). For ease of readability, we suppress the superscript \( i \) in the probabilities. The Markovian property gives us \( \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 0 \mid X_k = 0\} = (P_k P_{k+1} \cdots P_{j-1})_{11} \). Since \( P_k \) is a stochastic matrix, for all \( k \), the product matrix \( M := P_k P_{k+1} \cdots P_{j-1} \) is also stochastic, which implies that \((MP_{j-1})_{11} = (1 - p_{j-1})a_{11} + (1 - \delta p_{j-1})(1 - a_{11})\), thereby leading to \( 1 - p_{j-1} \leq (MP_{j-1})_{11} \leq 1 - \delta p_{j-1} \). A similar argument gives bounds on the other conditional probability after observing that \( \mathbb{P}\{X_j = 1 \mid X_k = 1\} = (MP_{j-1})_{22} \). \( \square \)

For a subset \( A \) of vertices, a vertex \( v \notin A \) is disconnected from \( A \) if there is no edge between \( v \) and any vertex in \( A \). Thus, when \( A \) is an independent set, \( A \cup \{v\} \) is independent if and only if \( v \) is disconnected from \( A \). Using the bounds from the previous lemmata for edge probabilities we now obtain bounds on the probability for a vertex to be disconnected from a subset of vertices. Our bounds are independent from the indices of vertices in the subset and are solely determined by the size of the subset.

Lemma 3.5. For any subset \( A \subseteq \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) of size \( m \), for all \( i \geq k \),

\[ (1 - p) \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (1 - p_j) \leq \mathbb{P}\{v_i \text{ is disconnected from } A\} \leq \prod_{j=i-m}^{i-1} (1 - \delta p_j). \]

Proof. Fix \( i \geq k \) and let \( D_i(m) \) denote the event that \( v_i \) is disconnected from \( A \). We argue the lower bound first.

\[ \mathbb{P}\{D_i(m)\} = \mathbb{P}\{X_{j_1}^i = 0, \ldots, X_{j_m}^i = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{X_{j_1}^i = 0\} \prod_{k=2}^m \mathbb{P}\{X_{j_k}^i = 0 \mid X_{j_{k-1}}^i = 0\}. \]

By Lemma 3.4, \( \mathbb{P}\{X_{j_k}^i = 0 \mid X_{j_{k-1}}^i = 0\} \) is bounded below by \( 1 - p_{j_k-1} \), where we suppress the superscript \( i \) on probabilities for ease of readability. Therefore,

\[ \mathbb{P}\{D_i(m)\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{X_{j_1}^i = 0\} \prod_{k=2}^m (1 - p_{j_k-1}) = (1 - p_{j_1}) \prod_{k=2}^m (1 - p_{j_k-1}) \]

By Lemma 3.4, \( \mathbb{P}\{X_{j_k}^i = 0 \mid X_{j_{k-1}}^i = 0\} \) is bounded below by \( 1 - p_{j_k-1} \), where we suppress the superscript \( i \) on probabilities for ease of readability. Therefore,
We know from Lemma 3.3 that the sequence \( \{p_j\} \) is decreasing, and hence the sequence \( \{1-p_j\} \) is increasing. Immediately, we have \( 1-p_j \geq 1-p = p_1 \) is the largest value among all \( p_j \). Note that \( \prod_{k=2}^m (1-p_{jk-1}) \) contains \( m-1 \) distinct values \( p_{j_1-1}, p_{j_2-1}, \ldots, p_{j_m-1} \) where \( j_m > \cdots > j_1 \geq 1 \). Clearly, \( j_k \geq k \) for all \( 1 \leq k \leq m-1 \). Therefore, \( p_{jk-1} \leq p_{k-1} \) for all \( i \) and then \( \prod_{k=2}^m (1-p_{jk-1}) \geq \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (1-p_j) \). Consequently, \( (1-p_{j_1}) \prod_{k=2}^m (1-p_{jk-1}) \geq (1-p) \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (1-p_j) \) which is our desired lower bound.

The upper bound can be obtained similarly.

\[
\mathbb{P} \{ D_i(m) \} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_{j_1}^i = 0, \ldots, X_{j_m}^i = 0 \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_{j_1}^i = 0 \right\} \prod_{k=2}^m \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_{j_k}^i = 0 \mid X_{j_{k-1}}^i = 0 \right\}
\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_{j_1}^i = 0 \right\} \prod_{k=2}^m (1 - \delta p_{jk-1})
\leq \prod_{j=i-m}^{i-1} (1 - \delta p_j).
\]

The first inequality is obtained using Lemma 3.4. The last inequality is because \( \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_{j_1}^i = 0 \right\} \leq 1 \) and we claim that the product term is upper bounded by \( \prod_{j=i-m}^{i-1} (1 - \delta p_j) \). To argue this claim, we use the assumption that \( A \) only contains vertices with index less than \( i \). Hence, \( j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_m \leq i-1 \) and \( j_k \leq i-1-(m-k) \) for all \( 1 \leq k \leq m-1 \), which implies that \( p_{jk-1} \geq p_{i-2-m+k} \geq p_{i-1-m+k} \). Therefore, \( \prod_{k=2}^m (1 - \delta p_{jk-1}) \leq \prod_{j=i-m}^{i-1} (1 - \delta p_j) \).

4 Lower Bounds from Vertex Degrees

Our main goal here is to prove Theorem 1.1. A key part of this proof is analyzing the average vertex degree in this graph. Let us formally define vertex degree and average degree in \( G_{n,p}^d \).

The degree of vertex \( v_i \) is a random variable denoting the number of edges incident on \( v_i \), given by the expression

\[
deg(v_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} X_{j}^i + \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} X_{j}^i.
\]

The average degree \( d(G_{n,p}^d) \) is the average vertex degree across the entire graph,

\[
d(G_{n,p}^d) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \deg(v_i)
\]

4.1 Concentration of average degree

Our main tool in lower bounding \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^d) \) is the following concentration result about average degree, which can also be equivalently stated as saying that \( d(G_{n,p}^d)/\log n \xrightarrow{P} 2(1-\delta) \). To establish this concentration, we use a key technical result about a dependent Bernoulli sequence; the analysis of this sequence is presented later in §7.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. The sum of all edges is

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} d(v_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} X_{j}^{(i)} + \sum_{k=i+1}^{n} X_{k}^{(i)} \right) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} X_{j}^{(i)} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_{i-1}^{(i)} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_{i}^{(i+1)}
\]
where \( S_i^{(i+1)} \sim S_i \) (meaning they follow the same distribution) the sum of first \( i \) variables in the Markov process \( \{Y_j\}_{j \geq 1} \). The average degree of the graph is

\[
d(C_{n,p}^\delta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(v_i) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_i^{(i+1)}
\]

Note that each random variable in the Markov process \( \{Y_i\}_{i \geq 1} \) is nonnegative, so

\[
0 \leq_{st} S_1 \leq_{st} S_2 \leq_{st} \cdots \leq_{st} S_n
\]

where we denote stochastic dominance with \( \leq_{st} \) (\( X \leq_{st} Y \) means that \( P\{X \geq c\} \leq P\{Y \geq c\} \) for all real \( c \)) and where 0 denotes the constant random variable with probability 1 to be 0. Since \( S_i^{(i+1)} \sim S_i \), we obtain \( S_i^{(i+1)} \leq_{st} S_n \) for all \( i \leq n \). Furthermore,

\[
d(C_{n,p}^\delta) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_i^{(i+1)} \leq_{st} \frac{2(n-1)}{n} S_n \leq_{st} 2S_n \tag{4}
\]

From Corollary 7.4 which is proved later in this paper, we have that for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{1-\delta} \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\delta} \right\} = 1 \tag{5}
\]

and then (4) yields the following upper bound,

\[
\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{d(C_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \right| \geq 2 + \varepsilon_0 \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{2S_n}{\log n} \geq 2 + \varepsilon_0 \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{1-\delta} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2(1-\delta)} \right\}. \tag{6}
\]

Moreover,

\[
\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{1-\delta} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2(1-\delta)} \right\} \leq 1 - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{1-\delta} \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{3(1-\delta)} \right\}
\]

If we pick \( \varepsilon := \varepsilon_0/3 \) in (5) and take limit of both sides, the right hand side of the above goes to 0 and so is the left. Together with (6), we have for all \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \),

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{d(C_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \right| \geq 2 + \varepsilon_0 \right\} = 0 \implies \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{d(C_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \right| \leq \frac{2(1+\varepsilon_0)}{1-\delta} \right\} = 1. \tag{7}
\]

Therefore, \( d(C_{n,p}^\delta) \) is asymptotically bounded above by \( 2(1+\varepsilon_0)/(1-\delta) \log n \). For deriving the lower bound, we first mention that for \( n_c := \lfloor cn \rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) with \( c \in (0,1) \),

\[
d(C_{n,p}^\delta) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} S_i^{(i+1)} \geq_{st} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=n_c}^{n-1} S_i^{(i+1)} \geq_{st} \frac{2(n-n_c)}{n} S_{n_c} \geq_{st} 2(1-c)S_{n_c}.
\]

For the lower bound of \( \frac{d(C_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \), let’s now fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \). From (5),

\[
\forall \varepsilon > 0, \quad \exists N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{1-\delta} \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\delta)} \right\} \geq 1, \forall n \geq N_\varepsilon
\]
Let
\[ c := \frac{\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon^3}{2 - \varepsilon} \] (8)

Note that \( c \in (0, 1) \) is well-defined when \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \). In addition, \( c \) is monotone increasing in terms of \( \varepsilon \). Define
\[ M_\varepsilon := \max \left\{ \exp \left\{ -\frac{1 + \varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon^2} \log c \right\}, \frac{N_\varepsilon}{c} \right\}. \]

If \( n \geq M_\varepsilon \), then \( n \geq N_\varepsilon/c \) and so \( n_c = \lceil cn \rceil \geq N_\varepsilon \). Moreover,
\[ \frac{\log n}{\log n_c} = \frac{\log n}{\log n + \log c - 1} \leq 1 + \varepsilon^2. \] (9)

From \( d(G_{n,p}^\delta) \geq s \geq 2(1 - c)n \),
\[ P \left\{ \frac{d(G_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \geq \frac{2(1 - \varepsilon)}{1 - \delta} \right\} \geq P \left\{ \frac{2(1 - c)n}{\log n} \geq \frac{2(1 - \varepsilon)}{1 - \delta} \right\} \geq P \left\{ \frac{n_c}{\log n_c} \geq \frac{(1 + \varepsilon^2)(1 - \varepsilon)}{(1 - c)(1 - \delta)} \right\} \]

where the last inequality comes from \((1 + \varepsilon^2)n_c/\log n \geq n_c/\log n_c\) which is a straightforward result of (9). Substitute (8) and simplify the above term, we have
\[ P \left\{ \frac{s_{n_c}}{\log n_c} \geq \frac{(1 + \varepsilon^2)(1 - \varepsilon)}{(1 - c)(1 - \delta)} \right\} \geq P \left\{ \frac{2 - \varepsilon}{2(1 - \delta)} \right\} \]
\[ \geq P \left\{ \frac{2 - \varepsilon}{2(1 - \delta)} \right\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \]

So far, we have shown that, for all \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( M_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) such that
\[ P \left\{ \frac{d(G_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \geq \frac{2(1 - \varepsilon)}{1 - \delta} \right\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq M_\varepsilon. \]

Consequently, \( \frac{d(G_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \geq \frac{2(1 - \varepsilon)}{1 - \delta} \) w.h.p.. Together with the upper bound, we conclude that
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} P \left\{ \left| \frac{d(G_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} - \frac{2}{1 - \delta} \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \right\} = 1, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \]

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We will use the following classical result about general graphs that has been noted at various places in graph theory literature and can also be derived using Turan’s theorem.

Lemma 4.1 (cf. [Gri83]). For any \( n \)-vertex graph \( G \), the stability number \( \alpha(G) \) can be lower bounded in terms of the average degree \( d(G) \) of the graph as follows,
\[ \alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{1 + d(G)}. \]

We also note the following well-known fact about the prime-counting function \( \pi(n) \).

Lemma 4.2 (Prime Number Theorem). \[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\pi(n)}{n/\log n} = 1. \]
We are now ready to finish arguing our theorem on lower bounding \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \). By the prime number theorem, it suffices to argue that

\[
\alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \geq \frac{1 - \delta}{2(1 + \varepsilon)} \cdot \frac{n}{\log n} \quad \text{w.h.p.}
\]

For fixed \( \varepsilon > \varepsilon_0 > 0 \), we observe if \( n \) is sufficiently large then

\[
\mathbb{P}\left\{ \alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{\frac{2 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \log n} \right\} \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{ \alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{\frac{2 + \varepsilon_0}{1 - \delta} \log n + 1} \right\} \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{ \frac{d(G_{n,p}^\delta)}{\log n} \leq \frac{2 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \right\}
\]

where the first inequality follows from \( \frac{2 + \varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \log n > \frac{2 + \varepsilon_0}{1 - \delta} \log n + 1 \) for sufficiently large \( n \), and the second inequality has used Lemma 4.1. After taking the limit of both sides, the right-most term is equal to 1 because we have shown this limit in the proof of Proposition 1.2 in equation (7). Hence, the left-most term also has limit 1 and this concludes our proof.

5 Greedy algorithm

Now we analyse the performance of a greedy algorithm for approximating (lower bounding) \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \). This algorithm was introduced near the statement of Proposition 1.3 in §1.1. Our algorithm sorts vertices in the order \( v_1 \) to \( v_n \), and starting with an empty set iteratively builds an independent set in \( n \) iterations where at iteration \( i \) the vertex \( v_i \) is added to the independent set if this addition preserves the new set to also be independent. The definition of our random graph is such that one can intuitively see that the vertex degrees are in the descending order from \( v_1 \) to \( v_n \) w.h.p. Hence, our simple greedy algorithm can be regarded as the opposite of what one would use as a greedy algorithm for approximating \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \) wherein the vertices would be sorted in increasing order of their degrees (\( v_n \) to \( v_1 \) for \( G_{n,p}^\delta \)). Thus, lower bounding the performance of our algorithm tells us (intuitively speaking) the worst we can do in any greedy algorithm for approximating \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \).

We prove here the asymptotic lower bound guarantee that was stated earlier in Proposition 1.3. Let \( \alpha_G(G_{n,p}^\delta) \) be the output of our greedy algorithm.

**Proof of Proposition 1.3.** We adopt a similar strategy as in [GM75]. Let STAB be the independent set created during the iterations of the greedy algorithm. We analyze the number of iterations needed to increase the size of STAB by 1. Denote \( R_{m+1} \) to be the number of iterations needed to add a new vertex into STAB since when \( |\text{STAB}| = m \). Observe that \( R_{m+1} \) follows a geometric distribution whose parameter is \( \mathbb{P}\{v_i \text{ is disconnected from STAB}\} \). Suppose \( \text{STAB} = \{v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_m}\} \), then

\[
\mathbb{E}R_{m+1} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}\{v_i \text{ is disconnected from STAB}\}}, \quad \forall i > j_m
\]

We need to estimate the probability of \( v_i \) can be added into STAB i.e. \( v_i \) is disconnected from STAB. By Lemma 3.5,

\[
\frac{1}{\prod_{j=m}^{i-1}(1 - \delta p_j)} \leq \mathbb{E}R_{m+1} \leq \frac{1}{(1 - p) \prod_{j=m}^{i-1}(1 - p_j)}
\]

Note that there exists a positive integer \( w \) such that \( p_i \leq w/i \) for all \( i \). More precisely, we can take \( \tau = \lceil 1/(1 - \delta) \rceil \) by Lemma 3.3. Denote \( \gamma = (1 - p) \prod_{j=1}^{\tau}(1 - p_j) \). Then we can further
relax the upper bound above when \( m > \tau \).

\[
\mathbb{E} R_{m+1} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma \prod_{j=m+1}^{m} (1 - \frac{j}{\tau})} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{m!}{(m - \tau)! \tau!} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \frac{m}{\tau} \right)^{\tau} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \frac{me}{\tau} \right)^{\tau}.
\]

If \( k \) is large enough, then

\[
\mathbb{E} \sum_{m=1}^{k} R_m \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E} R_m + \sum_{m=\tau+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \frac{me}{\tau} \right)^{\tau} = O \left( k^{\tau+1} \right)
\]

Note that \( \sum_{m=1}^{\tau} \mathbb{E} R_m \) is a constant and \( \sum_{m=\tau+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \frac{me}{\tau} \right)^{\tau} \) is bounded above by \( \frac{k}{\gamma} \left( \frac{k \tau}{\tau} \right)^{\tau} = O \left( k^{\tau+1} \right) \). For the variance, since \( R_m \) follows geometric distribution,

\[
\text{Var} \sum_{m=1}^{k} R_m \leq \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} R_m^2 \leq 2 \sum_{m=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} R_m^2
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=1}^{w} \mathbb{E} R_m + \sum_{m=d+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\gamma^{2}} \left( \frac{m}{\tau} \right)^{2\tau}
\]

\[
= O \left( k^{2\tau+1} \right)
\]

For convenience of notation, we denote \( \sum_{m=1}^{k} R_m \) as \( Z_k \). Let

\[
k := k(n) := \left( \left( \frac{\tau}{e} \right)^{\tau} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{3} \cdot n \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau+1}} = O \left( n^{\frac{1}{\tau+1}} \right)
\]

Then, we have \( \mathbb{E} Z_k = O(n) \) and \( \text{Var} Z_k = O \left( n^{\frac{2\tau+1}{\tau+1}} \right) \). In particular, \( \mathbb{E} Z_k < \frac{n}{2} \) for sufficiently large \( n \), which implies that

\[
\mathbb{P} \{ Z_k \geq n \} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z_k \geq \mathbb{E} Z_k + \frac{n}{2} \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ |Z_k - \mathbb{E} Z_k| \geq \frac{n}{2} \right\}.
\]

Therefore, when \( n \to \infty \), we get that

\[
\mathbb{P} \{ Z_k \geq n \} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ |Z_k - \mathbb{E} Z_k| \geq \frac{n}{2} \right\} \leq \frac{4 \text{Var} Z_k}{n^2} = O \left( n^{-\frac{1}{\tau+1}} \right).
\]

Hence, \( Z_k \), the number of iterations needed to obtain a independent set of size \( k \), is at most \( n \) w.h.p. when \( n \to \infty \) and \( k = n^{1/(\tau+1)} \). Conversely, if our algorithm has \( n \) iterations, then the size of independent set is at least \( k \) w.h.p., i.e. the greedy stability number of \( G_{n,p}^\delta \) is \( \Omega \left( n^{1/(\tau+1)} \right) \).

Obviously, \( \alpha_G(G_{n,p}^\delta) \) gives another lower bound on \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \). However, this lower bound is much weaker than \( \Omega(n / \log(n)) \) in Theorem 1.1.

### 6 Upper Bound

Our goal here is to prove the upper bound on \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^\delta) \) from Theorem 1.4. We use the first moment argument, which has also been used for the binomial random graph model [Mat76, Fri90, FK16]. More precisely, let \( H_{k,n} \) be the number of independent sets of order \( k \) in \( G_{n,p}^\delta \). We want to find the minimum \( k \) such that \( \mathbb{P} \{ H_{k,n} > 0 \} \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). The first step towards this is to estimate the probability that a subset of vertices forms an independent set.
6.1 Bounding the probability for a subset to be independent

Lemma 3.5 bounded the probability for a single vertex to be disconnected from a subset of vertices. We use this to upper bound the probability that a subset of vertices is independent, since A subset is independent if and only if it is pairwise disconnected.

**Proposition 6.1.** The probability $P_k$ that a subset of $k$ vertices in $G_{n,p}^\delta$ is an independent set satisfies the following bound when $n-k+1 \geq (1/\tau - 1)^2$, for $\tau := f_1 ((1-\delta)p) = (1-\delta)p \left(1 - (1-\delta)p\right)$,

$$P_k \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-i+1}} \right)^i.$$

**Proof.** Let $A_k := \{v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \ldots, v_{j_k}\}$ be a subset of $k$ vertices in $G_{n,p}^\delta$. Wlog, assume the vertices in $A_k$ are sorted such that $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k$. It is clear that $P_k = \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_{j_1}^r = 0 : r > i \right\}$. Partition these edge variables based on their upper index into disjoint sets $B_{j_1}, B_{j_2}, \ldots, B_{j_k}$ where $B_j = \{X_{j_1}^{j_r}, X_{j_2}^{j_r}, \ldots, X_{j_{r-1}}^{j_r}\}$. From Definition 1, two different edge variables are dependent if and only if they have the same upper index and their lower indices are two consecutive numbers. Therefore, all variables inside $B_{j_r}$ are independent from these in $B_{j_l}$ with $l \neq r$ because their upper indices $j_r$ and $j_l$ are not the same. Observe that the event that all variables in $B_{j_l}$ equal to 0 is equivalent to say $v_{j_l}$ is disconnected from $\{v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_{l-1}}\}$. Consequently, we have

$$P_k = \prod_{i=2}^{k} \mathbb{P} \left\{ v_{j_i} \text{ is disconnected from } \{v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_{i-1}}\} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Applying upper bound from Lemma 3.5 to relax the right-hand side yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ v_{j_i} \text{ is disconnected from } \{v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_{i-1}}\} \right\} \leq \prod_{k=j_i-(i-1)}^{j_i-1} (1-\delta p_k), \quad (11)$$

where for the sake of brevity, we have suppressed the superscript $j_i$ on the probabilities. Since $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k \leq n$, we have $j_i \leq n - (k-i)$. Lemma 3.3 tells us that $\{p_k\}$ is a decreasing sequence. Therefore, $p_{j_i-t} \geq p_{n-(k-i)-t}$ for all $t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, i-1\}$ and now we can further relax (11) as

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ v_{j_i} \text{ is disconnected from } \{v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_{i-1}}\} \right\} \leq \prod_{k=j_i-(i-1)}^{j_i-1} (1-\delta p_k) \leq \prod_{t=k-(i-1)}^{k-1} (1-\delta p_{n-t})$$

Applying this inequality to (10),

$$P_k \leq \prod_{i=2}^{k} \prod_{t=k-i+1}^{k-1} (1-\delta p_{n-t}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1-\delta p_{n-i})^i.$$

We use the lower bound $p_{n-i} \geq \psi_{p,\delta}(n-i)/(1-\delta)$ obtained from Lemma 3.3 to get rid of $p_{n-i}$.

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ A_k \text{ is an independent set} \right\} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \delta q_{n-i}\right)^i \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \psi_{p,\delta}(n-i)\right)^i$$

Since $\psi_{p,\delta}(n-i) := \ell_{n-i}((1-\delta)p)$, and $\ell_{n}(x) = 1/(\sqrt{n} + 1)^2$ if $n \geq 1/(f_1(x) + 1)^2$, we obtain an explicit upper bound for sufficiently large $n-k$. \qed
6.2 Proof of Theorem 1.4

The function
\[ f_{\delta}(c) := c(1 - \log c) + \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \left(c + \log(1 - c)\right) = \frac{c}{1 - \delta} - c \log c + \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \log(1 - c). \]

appears in our analysis and we will need to use negative values of this function over the positive part of its domain, which lies within (0, 1). For this purpose we claim that there is a unique positive root beyond which \( f_{\delta} \) is negative-valued, and although it is difficult to characterise this root explicitly, we provide an upper bound on it in terms of \( \delta \).

**Claim 1.** For every \( \delta \in (0, 1) \) the function \( f_{\delta} \) has a unique positive root \( c^* \) and \( f_{\delta}(c) < 0 \) for all \( c \in (c^*, 1) \). Furthermore, \( c^* < e^{-\delta} + 0.1\delta \).

We argue an upper bound on \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^{\delta}) \) that is arbitrarily close to the root \( c^* \) of the function \( f_{\delta} \). In particular, we prove that for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), w.h.p. \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^{\delta}) \leq (c^* + \varepsilon) n \). Since Claim 1 tells us that \( c^* < e^{-\delta} + 0.1\delta \), it follows that \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^{\delta}) \leq \left(e^{-\delta} + 0.1\delta\right) n \).

Let \( H_{k,n} \) be the number of independent sets of order \( k \) in \( G_{n,p}^{\delta} \). We want to find a minimum \( k := k(n) \) such that \( \mathbb{P}\{H_{k,n} > 0\} \rightarrow 0 \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \). Then, with such a \( k(n) \), we have w.h.p. \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^{\delta}) \leq k(n) \). Observe that \( \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} i \mathbb{P}\{H_{k,n} = i\} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}\{H_{k,n} = i\} = \mathbb{P}\{H_{k,n} > 0\} \). It is sufficient to show that \( \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} \rightarrow 0 \) w.h.p.

Observe that \( \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} \) can be written as the sum of probabilities of all possible subsets of size \( k \) to be independent set,

\[ \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} = \sum_{A \subseteq \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\} : |A| = k} \mathbb{P}\{A \text{ is independent set}\}. \]

Using the upper bound from Proposition 6.1 for the probability in the summand, it follows that when \( n - k \) is large enough,

\[ \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} \leq \binom{n}{k} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{a} - i + 1)^2}\right)^i. \]

(12)

Let \( k \) be an upper bound on \( \alpha(G_{n,p}^{\delta}) \). Since \( G_{n,p}^{\delta} \) is a \( n \)-vertex graph, we can assume that \( k = cn \) for some constant \( c \) which is to be determined. We claim that

**Claim 2.** We have

\[ \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left(1 - \frac{h}{(\sqrt{a} - i + 1)^2}\right)^i \leq \exp \left\{ h (\log(1 - c) + c)n + O(n) \right\}. \]

Before proving this claim, let us argue why it finishes our proof of this theorem. When \( k \) is linear in terms of \( n \), it is well-known that binomial coefficient \( \binom{n}{k} \) is bounded above by \( (ne/k)^k \). Equation (2) applied to (12) implies that

\[ \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} \leq \left(\frac{ne}{k}\right)^k \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \frac{1}{(\sqrt{a} - i + 1)^2}\right)^i = \exp \left\{ n f_{\delta}(c) + O(n) \right\}. \]

If \( f_{\delta}(c) < 0 \), then \( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}H_{k,n} = 0 \) which is what we want for \( k = cn \) to be an upper bound on the stability number. For the tightest bound we take the smallest value of \( c \) with \( f_{\delta}(c) < 0 \). Claim 1 shows that \( f_{\delta}(c) < 0 \) for all \( c \in (c^*, 1) \) where \( c^* \) is the unique positive root of \( f_{\delta} \).

Therefore, taking \( c = c^* + \epsilon \) yields the desired upper bound of \( c^* + \epsilon \).

It remains to prove the two claims used in the above proof.
6.2.1 Proof of Claim 1

It is clear that the domain of $f_\delta$ is in $(-\infty, 1)$. Let us first prove uniqueness of the root in $(0, 1)$. We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial c} f_\delta(c) = \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - c}\right) - \log c, \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial c^2} f_\delta(c) = -\frac{1}{c} - \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \cdot \frac{1}{(1 - c)^2}.$$ 

As the second derivative $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial c^2} f_\delta(c)$ is always negative, $f_\delta(c)$ is concave for fixed $\delta$. Therefore, there are at most 2 roots. Next, we observe that

$$\lim_{c \to 0} f_\delta(c) = 0, \quad \lim_{c \to 0} f_\delta'(c) = \infty, \quad \lim_{c \to 1} f_\delta(c) = -\infty.$$ 

The boundary value of $f_\delta(c)$ at $c = 0$ is 0. However, $c = 0$ is not in the domain of $f_\delta(c)$ and so there is at most 1 root for $f_\delta(c)$. We now need to show such root actually exists between 0 and 1. Notice that the slope near $c = 0$ is positive and there must exist $a(\delta) \in (0, 1)$ such that $f_\delta(a(\delta)) > 0$ for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Since the either boundary value at $c = 1$ is $-\infty$, the continuity of $f_\delta(c)$ implies the existence of a root $c^* \in (a(\delta), 1)$. In particular, $f_\delta(c) < 0$ for all $c \in (c^*, 1)$ and $f_\delta(c) > 0$ for all $c \in (0, c^*)$.

Although there is no explicit formula for the root $c^*$, we can find some upper bound function $c(\delta)$ such that $1 > c(\delta) > c^*$ for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Consider $c(\delta) = e^{-\delta} + \frac{\delta}{10}$ and denote the function $g(\delta)$ by

$$g(\delta) := f_\delta(c(\delta)) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\delta} - \frac{\delta}{10}}\right) \delta - \log \left(e^{-\delta} + \frac{\delta}{10}\right).$$

We need to show $g(\delta) < 0$ for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$. It is clear that the boundary values of $g(\delta)$ are $g(0) = 0$ and $g(1) \approx -0.1197$. Since $g(\delta)$ is continuous and both boundary values are non-positive, it is sufficient to prove $g(\delta)$ has no root within interval $(0, 1)$. Suppose not, then $\exists \delta^* \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\delta^*} - \frac{\delta^*}{10}}\right) \delta^* = \log \left(e^{-\delta^*} + \frac{\delta^*}{10}\right).$$

Observe that $e^{-\delta} + \delta/10$ is monotone decreasing for $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, for $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the right hand side $\log \left(e^{-\delta} + \delta/10\right)$ is also monotone decreasing while the left hand side

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\delta} - \frac{\delta}{10}}\right) \cdot \delta$$

is monotone increasing. Furthermore, they both attain 0 at $\delta = 0$.

$$\log \left(e^{-\delta} + \frac{\delta}{10}\right) \bigg|_{x=0} = 0 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\delta} - \frac{\delta}{10}}\right) \delta \bigg|_{x=0}$$

Since one is decreasing and other is increasing, there is no $\delta^* \in (0, 1)$ making them equal.

6.2.2 Proof of Claim 2

Since $1 + x \leq e^x$, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} \left(1 - \frac{h}{a - i}\right)^i \leq \exp \left\{-h \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{i}{(\sqrt{a - i} + 1)^2} \right\} \quad (13)$$
The function \( x/(\sqrt{a-x+1})^2 \) is monotone increasing for \( 0 \leq x \leq a \). We can estimate the inner summation in (13) by evaluating an integral

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{i}{(\sqrt{a-i+1})^2} \geq \int_{0}^{cn} \frac{x}{(\sqrt{a-x+1})^2} \, dx
\]

\[
= -cn + 6\sqrt{n} - 6 + \frac{(4c-6)n + 6}{1 + \sqrt{(1-c)n}} + 2(n-3) \log \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{n}}{1 + \sqrt{(1-c)n}} \right)
\]

When \( n \to \infty \), the lower bound above is dominated by \(-cn + 2n \log \left( \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{(1-c)n}} \right)\). For the second term, its asymptotic value can be obtained from the Taylor expansion of \( \log x \), i.e.

\[
\log \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{n}}{1 + \sqrt{(1-c)n}} \right) = \log \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-c}} + O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1-c) + O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right).
\]

By using big-O notation, (14) can be written as

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{i}{(\sqrt{a-i+1})^2} \geq -(\log(1-c) + c)n + O(n).
\]

Therefore, we can apply this bound to (13) to get

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k} \left( 1 - \frac{h}{a-i} \right)^i \leq \exp \left\{ h \left( \log(1-c) + c \right)n + O(n) \right\},
\]

which finishes our proof for this claim.

7 Concentration of a Bernoulli Sequence

In this section, we establish a theorem about convergence of a dependent Bernoulli sequence, which is fundamental to our analysis of the average vertex degree in Proposition 1.2. We also present several consequences of our theorem, in particular, a generalisation in Corollary 7.4 wherein the marginal probabilities of the sequence are sandwiched between two converging sequences.

Consider a sequence of Bernoulli r.v.'s \( \{Y_n\} \), defined on the same probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\), that are not assumed to be iid. Denote the marginal probabilities and partial sum by

\[
p_n := \mathbb{P}\{Y_n = 1\} \quad n \geq 1, \quad S_n := Y_1 + Y_2 + \cdots + Y_n.
\]

We analyse the ratio of this partial sum to \( \log n \), and so for convenience let us denote

\[
\mathcal{Y}_n := \frac{S_n}{\log n}.
\]

Our main result of this section is to show that when the probability sequence \( \{p_n\} \) satisfies the recurrence formula (1) with \( a \) equal to some constant \( \beta \), then \( \mathcal{Y}_n \) concentrates to \( 1/\beta \). Furthermore, we also establish that the mean of \( \mathcal{Y}_n \), which is equal to \( \mathbb{E}S_n/\log n \), converges to \( 1/\beta \) and the distribution of \( \mathcal{Y}_n \) grows at a quadratic rate in the limit.
Theorem 7.1. Suppose the sequence \( \{p_n\} \) is such that there is some \( \beta \in (0, 1) \) for which 
\[ p_n = f_\beta(p_{n-1}) \] 
for all \( n \geq 2 \). Then, \( \mathbb{E} Y_n \to 1/\beta \) and \( Y_n \overset{p}{\to} 1/\beta \). Furthermore, the distribution of \( Y_n \) grows at a quadratic rate in the limit as follows,
\[
\frac{1}{1 - \theta} \geq \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{Y_n}{\mathbb{E} Y_n} \geq 1 - \theta \right\} \geq \theta^2, \quad \theta \in [0, 1).
\]

This theorem is proved in the next few sections. We discuss here some of its consequences. First, we have that the partial sum is dominated by arbitrary powers of \( n \).

Corollary 7.2. Under the conditions of Theorem 7.1, w.h.p. \( S_n = O(n^\varepsilon) \) for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \).

Proof. Fix any \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Note that \( \log n = O(n^\varepsilon) \), and so there exists a constant \( C_\varepsilon \) and integer \( N_\varepsilon \) such that \( \log n \leq C_\varepsilon n^\varepsilon \) for all \( n \geq N_\varepsilon \). Therefore, for all \( n \geq N_\varepsilon \),
\[
\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{S_n}{C_\varepsilon n^\varepsilon} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{S_n}{\log n} \geq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{\beta} \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{S_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{\beta} \geq \varepsilon \right\},
\]
where the first inequality is due to \( \varepsilon + 1/\beta < 1 + 1/\beta \), and the last inequality is due to \( |S_n/\log n - 1/\beta| \geq S_n/\log n - 1/\beta \). The concentration of \( S_n/\log n \) to \( 1/\beta \) in Theorem 7.1 means that the rightmost probability converges to 0, and then the above chain implies that the leftmost probability also goes to 0, which leads to \( S_n = O(n^\varepsilon) \) w.h.p. \( \square \)

The second consequence of our theorem is that it subsumes the case where the stochastic process \( \{Y_n\} \) forms a non-homogenous Markov chain whose transition matrix obeys a decay property.

Corollary 7.3. Suppose that \( \{Y_n\} \) is a Markov chain of Bernoulli r.v.’s, so that for every \( n \geq 1 \) we have
\[
\mathbb{P} \left\{ Y_{n+1} = y_{n+1} \mid Y_1 = y_1, \ldots, Y_n = y_n \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ Y_{n+1} = y_{n+1} \mid Y_n = y_n \right\},
\]
and also suppose that there is some \( \beta \in [0, 1) \) such that
\[
\mathbb{P} \left\{ Y_{n+1} = 1 \mid Y_n = 0 \right\} = \mathbb{P} \{ Y_n = 1 \}, \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ Y_{n+1} = 1 \mid Y_n = 1 \right\} = (1 - \beta) \mathbb{P} \{ Y_n = 1 \}.
\]

Then, \( \mathbb{E} Y_n \to 1/\beta \) and \( Y_n \overset{p}{\to} 1/\beta \).

Proof. Using arguments analogous to those already provided in Lemma 3.3 in the context of the Markov chain \( \{X^j_i\}_{j<i} \) for each vertex \( v_i \) in the random graph \( G^\delta_{n,p} \), it follows that \( p_n = f_\beta(p_{n-1}) \), and so this becomes a special case of Theorem 7.1. \( \square \)

This makes Theorem 7.1 relevant to our Markov random graph \( G^\delta_{n,p} \) by taking \( \beta = 1 - \delta \), and we use this convergence result to prove concentration of the average degree of this graph in Proposition 1.2.

A third consequence of our main theorem, which we state below and prove later in §7.4, is that we show convergence of expectation for the sequence \( \{Y_n\} \) under a weaker assumption, namely, when the probability sequence \( \{p_n\} \) is sandwiched between two sequences \( \{f_{a_n}(p_{n-1})\} \) and \( \{f_{b_n}(p_{n-1})\} \) that are generated using two converging sequences \( \{a_n\} \) and \( \{b_n\} \).

Corollary 7.4. Suppose there exist two converging sequences \( \{a_n\}, \{b_n\} \subset (0, 1) \) having the same limit \( \beta > 0 \) and such that the corresponding sequences \( \{f_{a_n}\} \) and \( \{f_{b_n}\} \) bound the marginal probabilities of \( \{Y_n\} \) as \( f_{a_n}(p_{n-1}) \leq p_n \leq f_{b_n}(p_{n-1}) \) for all \( n \geq 2 \). Then, \( \mathbb{E} Y_n \to 1/\beta \).
Let us also make some remarks about the claims in Theorem 7.1.

Remark 1. For a general random sequence, convergence of expected value and convergence in probability do not imply each other, but when the sequence is uniformly integrable then the latter implies the former (cf. [Han12]). This indicates that if we can show that the sequence \( \{Y_n\} \) is uniformly integrable then establishing \( Y_n \overset{p}{\to} 1/\beta \) gives us \( \mathbb{E}Y_n \to 1/\beta \). However, we do not use this implication in our proof since we do not think that \( \{Y_n\} \) is uniformly integrable. Instead, our proof first establishes convergence of \( \mathbb{E}Y_n \) and uses it to argue convergence in probability.

Remark 2. For a random sequence \( \{X_n\} \), there are two notions when talking about the expected values converging. The first is that of convergence of expectation where there is another r.v. \( X \) such that \( \mathbb{E}X_n \to \mathbb{E}X \) (if \( \mathbb{E}X_n \) converges to a finite number \( c \) then one could simply define \( X \) to be equal to \( c \) a.s.). The second notion is that of convergence in expectation where \( \mathbb{E}|X_n - X| \to 0 \) for some r.v. \( X \). Markov's inequality gives us that the latter implies convergence in probability, and it is well-known that the reverse implication is true if and only if \( \{X_n\} \) is uniformly integrable. Since we do not think that uniform integrability holds for our sequence \( \{Y_n\} \), we cannot use Theorem 7.1 to say that \( \{Y_n\} \) converges in expectation to \( 1/\beta \).

### 7.1 Convergence of Expectation

We prove here the first claim of Theorem 7.1 that \( \mathbb{E}Y_n \) converges to \( 1/\beta \). This convergence is a step towards establishing convergence in probability in the next section.

Since \( \mathbb{E}Y_n = \mathbb{E}S_n / \log n \), establishing convergence of expectation to \( 1/\beta \) is equivalent to showing that \( \beta \mathbb{E}S_n / \log n \) converges to \( 1 \). The definition of \( S_n \) implies that \( \mathbb{E}S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}Y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \). Since the sequence \( \{p_i\} \) follows the recursion \( p_i = f_\beta(p_{i-1}) \), we can use the bounding analysis of the recurrence formula that was done earlier in this paper. In particular, applying Lemma 2.4 with \( p_i = x_i \) and \( a = \beta \) gives us the bounds

\[
\beta p_1 + \eta(p_1) + \frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{n}} + \log n \leq \beta \mathbb{E}S_n \leq \beta p_1 + \log \left(1 + (n-1)p_1\right).
\]  

(15)

Divide throughout by \( \log n \) to get

\[
1 + \frac{\beta p_1 + \eta(p_1) + \frac{2}{1 + \sqrt{n}}}{\log n} \leq \beta \mathbb{E}Y_n \leq \frac{\beta p_1 + \log \left(1 + (n-1)p_1\right)}{\log n}.
\]

We argue that the above lower and upper bounds have limit (as \( n \to \infty \)) equal to \( 1 \), and then the squeeze theorem implies that \( \mathbb{E}Y_n \) converges to \( 1/\beta \). It is easy to see the limit of the lower bound because \( 2/(1 + \sqrt{n}) \leq 2 \), and \( \beta, p_1, \) and \( \eta(p_1) \) are all constants. Now consider the upper bound. This can be written as

\[
\frac{\beta p_1 + \log \left(1 + (n-1)p_1\right)}{\log n} = 1 + \frac{\beta p_1 + \log \left(1 + (n-1)p_1\right) - \log n}{\log n} = 1 + \frac{\beta p_1 + \log \left(p_1 + \frac{1-p_1}{n}\right)}{\log n}
\]

Denote \( g(n) := \beta p_1 + \log \left(p_1 + \frac{1-p_1}{n}\right) \). Since \( g(n) \) is decreasing in \( n \), it is clear that \( \lim_{m \to \infty} g(m) \leq g(n) \leq g(1) \) for every positive integer \( n \). The limit of \( g \) is equal to \( \beta p_1 + \log p_1 \), and so we have \( g(n) \in \beta p_1 + [\log p_1, 0] \). Since these bounds on \( g(n) \) are all constants and independent of \( n \), we get that the limit of \( g(n)/\log n \) is equal to \( 0 \) by the squeeze theorem. This means that the upper bound on \( \beta \mathbb{E}Y_n \), which in our notation is \( 1 + g(n)/\log n \), has limit equal to 1.
7.2 Convergence in Probability

This section proves the second claim of Theorem 7.1 that \( \mathcal{V}_n \) concentrates to \( 1/\beta \). We first argue an upper bound on the second moment of \( S_n \), and then use this bound in conjunction with two key technical results on sequences of random variables to finally deduce our claim on the concentration of \( \mathcal{V}_n \).

7.2.1 Second Moment of Partial Sum

The definition \( S_n = Y_1 + Y_2 + \cdots + Y_n \) implies that

\[
S_n^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i<j} Y_i Y_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i + 2 \sum_{i<j} Y_i Y_j,
\]

where the second equality is due to each \( Y_i \) being a Bernoulli r.v. Therefore, linearity of expectation and \( \mathbb{E}S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}Y_i \) means that the second moment of \( S_n \) is

\[
\mathbb{E}S_n^2 = \mathbb{E}S_n + 2 \sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}(Y_i Y_j). \tag{16}
\]

The next lemma upper bounds the expected value of each product term \( Y_i Y_j \).

**Lemma 7.5.** For \( n \geq 2 \),

\[
\mathbb{E}S_n^2 \leq \frac{2\delta}{1-\delta} \mathbb{E}S_n + \left( \frac{\log n}{1-\delta} \right)^2.
\]

**Proof.** If \( i \leq j - 2 \), the joint probability \( \mathbb{P}\{Y_i Y_j = 1\} \) is at most \( p_i p_{j-1} \). Indeed, by Lemma 3.4,

\[
\mathbb{P}\{Y_i Y_j = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{Y_i = 1, Y_j = 1\} \mathbb{P}\{Y_j = 1 | Y_i = 1\} \mathbb{P}\{Y_i = 1\} \leq p_i p_{j-1}
\]

Furthermore, for two dependent variables \( Y_{j-1} \) and \( Y_j \),

\[
\mathbb{P}\{Y_{j-1} Y_j = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{Y_j = 0\} + \mathbb{P}\{Y_{j-1} = 0\} \mathbb{P}\{Y_j = 1 | Y_{j-1} = 0\} = 1 - p_j + p_{j-1}(1 - p_{j-1})
\]

The recurrence relation implies \( p_j = p_{j-1}(1 - (1 - \delta)p_{j-1}) \). Thus,

\[
\mathbb{P}\{Y_i Y_j = 1\} \leq \begin{cases} p_i p_{j-1}, & i \leq j - 2 \\ \left( \frac{1}{1-\delta} - 1 \right)(p_{j-1} - p_j), & i = j - 1 \end{cases}
\]

We are ready to compute an upper bound for \( \sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}Y_i Y_j \),

\[
\sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}Y_i Y_j = \sum_{j=2}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{E}Y_i Y_j = \sum_{j=2}^{n} \mathbb{E}Y_{j-1} Y_j + \sum_{i=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} \mathbb{E}Y_i Y_j \\
\leq \left( \frac{1}{1-\delta} - 1 \right) \sum_{i=2}^{n} (p_{j-1} - p_j) + \sum_{j=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} p_i p_{j-1} \\
\leq \left( \frac{1}{1-\delta} - 1 \right) (p_1 - p_n) + \sum_{j=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} p_i p_{j-1}.
\]
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Note that $E S_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} E X_j = \sum_{j=1}^{n} p_j$. Then (16) can be written as

$$E S_n^2 = E S_n + \frac{2\delta}{1-\delta} (p_1 - p_0) + 2 \sum_{j=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} p_i p_{j-1}.$$  

From Lemma 3.3, $(1-\delta)p_i$ has an upper bound $1/i$, and so

$$\sum_{j=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} p_i p_{j-1} \leq \frac{1}{1-\delta} \sum_{j=3}^{n} p_{j-1} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} \frac{1}{i}.$$  

The partial sum of harmonic series $\sum_{i=1}^{j-2} \frac{1}{i} \leq \log(j - 1) + 1$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} p_i p_{j-1} \leq \frac{1}{1-\delta} \sum_{j=3}^{n} p_{j-1} + \frac{1}{1-\delta} \sum_{j=3}^{n} \log(j-1)p_{j-1} = \frac{E S_n - p_1 - p_2}{1-\delta} + \frac{1}{1-\delta} \sum_{j=3}^{n} \log(j-1)p_{j-1}.$$  

Then, we reuse the bound $p_j \leq 1/(1-\delta)j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ from Lemma 3.3,

$$\frac{1}{1-\delta} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \log(j)p_j \leq \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^2} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \frac{\log j}{j} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^2} \int_{1}^{n} \frac{\log t}{t} dt = \frac{\log n^2}{2(1-\delta)^2}.$$  

Combining the two inequalities above, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=3}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{j-2} p_i p_{j-1} \leq \frac{E S_n - p_1 - p_2}{1-\delta} + \frac{\log n^2}{2(1-\delta)^2}.$$  

It follows that

$$E S_n^2 \leq \frac{2\delta}{1-\delta} E S_n - 2p_1 - \frac{2}{1-\delta} p_2 - \frac{2\delta}{1-\delta} p_n + \left(\frac{\log n}{1-\delta}\right)^2$$

$$\leq \frac{2\delta}{1-\delta} E S_n + \left(\frac{\log n}{1-\delta}\right)^2,$$

which is the desired result. \qed

### 7.2.2 Two Lemmata on Random Sequences

Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of random variables all of which are defined on the same probability space. The following result about the terms in the sequence concentrating to their mean is a straightforward consequence of a classic concentration inequality.

**Lemma 7.6.** Suppose that $X_n \geq 0$ a.s. for all $n$, and the mean $\mu_n \in (0, \infty)$ and variance $\sigma_n^2$ of $X_n$ obey $\sigma_n^2 = o(\mu_n^2)$. Then, $X_n/\mu_n$ concentrates to 1.

**Proof.** Chebyshev’s inequality applied to $X_n$ tells us that $P\{|X_n - \mu_n| \geq k\sigma_n\} \leq 1/k^2$ for any $k > 0$. Taking $k = \varepsilon \mu_n / \sigma_n$ for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ gives us $P\{|X_n - \mu_n| \geq \varepsilon \mu_n\} \leq \sigma_n^2 / (\varepsilon^2 \mu_n^2)$. The assumption of $\mu_n$ being positive makes the probability equal to $P\{|X_n/\mu_n - 1| \geq \varepsilon\}$. Now taking limit on both sides leads to

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P\left\{|X_n/\mu_n - 1| \geq \varepsilon\right\} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sigma_n^2}{\varepsilon^2 \mu_n^2}.$$  

Since $\sigma_n^2 = o(\mu_n^2)$, the right-hand side goes to zero, which implies that the left-hand side is also zero and therefore, $X_n/\mu_n \overset{p}{\to} 1$. \qed
The second useful result is a special case of Slutsky’s theorem, or more generally the fact that convergence in probability is preserved under multiplication [cf. Çin11, Theorem III.3.6].

**Lemma 7.7.** Let \( \{Z_n\} \) be a converging sequence of positive reals with limit \( \tau \) and such that \( X_n/Z_n \xrightarrow{p} \lambda \) for some constant \( \lambda > 0 \). Then, \( X_n \xrightarrow{p} \lambda \tau \).

Note that the sequence \( \{Y_n\} \) is of positive reals and hence it trivially converges in probability.

### 7.2.3 Deducing the Concentration Result

**Claim 3.** \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{ES}_n^2}{(\text{ES}_n)^2} = 1 \).

**Proof of Claim.** Since the variance of \( S_n \) is equal to \( \text{ES}_n^2 - (\text{ES}_n)^2 \) and this variance is nonnegative, we know that the ratio \( \frac{\text{ES}_n^2}{(\text{ES}_n)^2} \) is at least 1. So, it remains to show that the limit is upper bounded by 1. For this proof, we only need a weaker lower bound for \( \text{ES}_n \) in (15) by dropping out \( \frac{2}{1+\sqrt{n}} \) to get

\[
\text{ES}_n \geq p_1 + \frac{1}{\beta} (\eta(p_1) + \log n),
\]

which implies that

\[
(\text{ES}_n)^2 \geq p_1^2 + \frac{2p_1}{\beta} (\eta(p_1) + \log n) + \frac{1}{\beta^2} (\eta(p_1) + \log n)^2.
\]

Combining this lower bound with the upper bound on \( \text{ES}_n^2 \) from Lemma 7.5 leads to

\[
\frac{\text{ES}_n^2}{(\text{ES}_n)^2} \leq \frac{2\delta}{(1-\delta)\text{ES}_n} + \frac{\left(\frac{\log n}{1-\delta}\right)^2}{p_1^2 + \frac{2p_1}{1-\delta} (\eta(p_1) + \log n) + \frac{1}{(1-\delta)^2} (\eta(w) + \log n)^2}.
\]

Note that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \text{ES}_n = \infty \) and thus the first term goes to 0. The limit of second term is dominated by coefficients of \( (\log n)^2 \). Then

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{ES}_n^2}{(\text{ES}_n)^2} \leq \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{\left(\frac{\log n}{1-\delta}\right)^2}{(1-\delta)^2 (\log n)^2} = 1,
\]

which completes the proof of this claim. \( \square \)

This implies that the variance of \( S_n \) is equal to \( o((\text{ES}_n)^2) \). Therefore, by Lemma 7.6, \( S_n/\text{ES}_n \) concentrates to 1. Equivalently, \( Y_n/\text{EV}_n \) concentrates to 1. From the convergence of expectation result in §7.1 we know that \( \text{EV}_n \) converges to \( 1/\beta \). Then, applying Lemma 7.7 with \( X_n = Y_n \) and \( Z_n = \text{ES}_n/\log n \) yields the desired result that \( Y_n \) concentrates to \( 1/\beta \).

### 7.3 Distribution Function

The distribution of \( Y_n/\text{EV}_n \) is the same as that of \( S_n/\text{ES}_n \). Since \( S_n \geq 0 \) a.s., Markov’s inequality immediately provides the upper bound \( P\left\{ \frac{S_n}{\text{ES}_n} \geq 1 - \theta \right\} \leq 1/(1 - \theta) \), which then also holds in the limit as \( n \to \infty \). For the lower bound, we use the Paley–Zygmund concentration inequality which gives us

\[
P\left\{ S_n \geq (1 - \theta) \text{ES}_n \right\} \geq \theta^2 \frac{(\text{ES}_n)^2}{\text{ES}_n^2}.
\]

Taking \( n \to \infty \), Claim 3 yields \( \lim_{n \to \infty} P\left\{ S_n \geq (1 - \theta) \text{ES}_n \right\} \geq \theta^2 \).
7.4 Proof of Corollary 7.4

Choose any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < \min\{1 - \beta, \beta/3\}$. Since both $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ converge to $\beta$, there exists an integer $N$ such that for every $n \geq N$ we have

$$\beta - \varepsilon < a_n < \beta + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \beta - \varepsilon < b_n < \beta + \varepsilon.$$ 

Let $\beta^+ = \beta + \varepsilon$ and $\beta^- = \beta - \varepsilon$. From the seventh property of $f_a$ in Lemma 2.1,

$$f_{\beta^+}(p_n) \leq f_a(p_n) \leq p_{n+1} \leq f_{\beta^-}(p_n), \quad \forall n \geq N. \quad (17)$$

Construct two new sequences $\{l_n\}_{n \geq N}$ and $\{u_n\}_{n \geq N}$ in which $l_N = u_N = p_N$ and subsequent elements for $n \geq N + 1$ are generated by the recurrence formulas as follows.

$$l_n = f_{\beta^+}(l_{n-1}), \quad u_n = f_{\beta^-}(u_{n-1}).$$

We want to show $l_n \leq p_n \leq u_n$ for all $n \geq N$. Note that when $n = N$, it’s obviously true by our construction. We now prove the inequality for $n \geq N + 1$ by induction. The base case $l_{N+1} \leq p_{N+1} \leq u_{N+1}$ follows directly from (17). Suppose $l_n \leq p_n \leq u_n$ for some $n \geq N + 1$. By (17),

$$u_n \leq f_{\beta^-}(u_{n-1}) \leq \max_{x \in (0,1)} f_{\beta^-}(x) = \frac{1}{4\beta^-} \leq \frac{1}{2\beta^+}, \quad \forall n \geq N + 1$$

where the last inequality follows from our choice of $\varepsilon$. As a result, $l_n, p_n, u_n \in (0, 1/4\beta^+]$. The first property in Lemma 2.1 shows $f_{\beta^+}$ and $f_{\beta^-}$ are both monotone increasing on $(0, 1/2\beta^+]$. Therefore,

$$l_{n+1} = f_{\beta^+}(l_n) \leq f_{\beta^+}(p_n) \leq p_{n+1} \leq f_{\beta^-}(p_n) \leq f_{\beta^-}(u_{n+1}) = u_{n+1}$$

We extend $\{l_n\}_{n \geq N}$ and $\{u_n\}_{n \geq N}$ by defining $l_i = p_i = u_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N - 1$. We are interested in the partial sum of these two sequences i.e. $L_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} l_i$ and $U_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i$. From the previous arguments,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{L_n}{\log n} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{ES_n}{\log n} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{U_n}{\log n}$$

Actually, the limits of the left and right hand sides are equal to $1/\beta^+$ and $1/\beta^-$ respectively. To see these, we first define two sequence $\{l'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{u'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $l'_{n+1} = f_{\beta^+}(l'_n)$ and $u'_{n+1} = f_{\beta^-}(u'_n)$. Furthermore, $l'_1 = l_i$ and $u'_i = u_i$ for all $i \geq N$. In other words, we extend $\{l_n\}_{n \geq N}$ and $\{u_n\}_{n \geq N}$ by two sequences $\{l'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{u'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ constructed completely from recurrence formulas. Note that $\{l'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{u'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are well-defined because the recurrence formulas $f_{\beta^+}$ and $f_{\beta^-}$ are both monotone increasing on $(0, 1/2\beta^+]$ and $l_n, u_n \in (0, 1/4\beta^+]$. It follows that there exist inverse elements $l'_{N-1}, u'_{N-1} \in (0, 1/4\beta^+]$ such that $l_N = f_{\beta^+}(l'_{N-1})$ and $u_N = f_{\beta^-}(u'_{N-1})$. We continue this procedure to get $l'_{N-2}, u'_{N-2}$ such that $l'_{N-1} = f_{\beta^+}(l'_{N-2})$ and $u'_{N-1} = f_{\beta^-}(u'_{N-2})$. Eventually, we can construct $\{l'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{u'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. From Theorem 7.1, the partial sums $L'_n = l'_1 + l'_2 + \ldots + l'_n$ and $U'_n = u'_1 + u'_2 + \ldots + u'_n$ satisfy

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{L'_n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{\beta^+} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{U'_n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{\beta^-}$$

There are only the first $N$ elements in $\{l_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are different from $\{l'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{u'_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. The sum of the first $N$ elements divided by $\log n$ goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{L_n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{\beta^+} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{U_n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{\beta^-}$$
This implies that
\[
\frac{1}{\beta + \varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\beta^+} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}S_n}{\log n} \leq \frac{1}{\beta^-} = \frac{1}{\beta - \varepsilon}
\]
and then taking \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) yields our desired claim \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}S_n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{\beta} \).
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**Appendix A  Remarks on Degree Distribution**

We comment on the challenges behind obtaining probability distributions for the vertex degrees. Let \( X_k \) be the number of vertices with degree \( k \) and let \( I_k^{(i)} \) be the indicator variable such that
\[
I_k^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v_i \text{ has degree } k \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]
With these definitions, \( X_k = \sum_{i=1}^n I_k^{(i)} \). The classic approach to obtain degree distributions given by Bollobás [Bol80] is to analyse the probability of the event \( X_k = m \). After exploring the moment of \( X_k \), he proved that \( X_k = m \) is asymptotically Poisson distribution if the limit of \( k^{n-1}p^k(1-p)^{n-k-1} \) is neither 0 nor infinity.

In Erdős-Rényi-Gilbert model \( G_{n,p} \) for fixed \( k \), all \( I_k^{(i)} \) follow the same Bernoulli distribution with success rate
\[
P\{I_k^{(i)} = 1\} = \binom{n-1}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k-1}
\]
However, in our Markov random graph \( G_{n,p}^\delta \), explicit distribution of \( I_k^{(i)} \) is unknown. Edge variables \( X_j^{(i)} \) joining at \( v_i \) can be partitioned into two sets: \( E_\leq = \{X_1^{(i)}, X_2^{(i)}, \ldots, X_{i-1}^{(i)}\} \) and \( E_\geq = \{X_{i+1}^{(i)}, \ldots, X_n^{(i)}\} \) based on whether the other endpoint has index larger than \( i \) or not. By the graph construction, \( E_\leq \) consists of the first \( i-1 \) states in our Markov chain and \( E_\geq \) contains i.i.d. Bernoulli Random variables with succeed rate \( p_i \). The total probability of the event \( v_i \) has degree \( k \) is
\[
P\{I_k^{(i)} = 1\} = \sum_{r=0}^{\min\{i-1,k\}} \left( P\{S_{i-1} = r\} + \binom{n-i}{k-r} p_i^{k-r} (1-p_i)^r \right)
\]
where \( S_{i-1} \) is the partial sum of the first \( i-1 \) states in the Markov chain.

There are mainly two challenges in adopting Bollobás’ approach in our case. Firstly, we have very limited knowledge of the explicit distribution of the parital sum \( S_i \). The bounds on the probability of \( S_i = r \) are not that useful since there is a large gap between them,
\[
\binom{i}{r} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} p_{i-j} \prod_{h=1}^{i-r} (1-p_h) \leq P\{S_i = r\} \leq \binom{i}{r} \prod_{j=1}^{r} p_{j} \prod_{h=0}^{i-r-1} (1-p_{i-h}).
\]
We shall note that, if \( i \) goes to infinity, then the lower bound tends to 0 and the upper bound goes to \( \prod_{j=1}^{r} p_{j} \). The second hardness is that all \( I_k^{(i)} \) are not identical and so it becomes difficult to analyze the moment of their sum.
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