

Multivariate Inference of Network Moments by Subsampling

Mingyu Qi^a, Tianxi Li^b, and Wen Zhou^c

^aDepartment of Statistics, University of Virginia

^bSchool of Statistics, University of Minnesota

^cDepartment of Biostatistics, School of Global Public Health, New York University

September 4, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we study the characterization of a network population by analyzing a single observed network, focusing on the counts of multiple network motifs or their corresponding multivariate network moments. We introduce an algorithm based on node subsampling to approximate the nontrivial joint distribution of the network moments, and prove its asymptotic accuracy. By examining the joint distribution of these moments, our approach captures complex dependencies among network motifs, making a significant advancement over earlier methods that rely on individual motifs marginally. This enables more accurate and robust network inference. Through real-world applications, such as comparing coexpression networks of distinct gene sets and analyzing collaboration patterns within the statistical community, we demonstrate that the multivariate inference of network moments provides deeper insights than marginal approaches, thereby enhancing our understanding of network mechanisms.

1 Introduction

Networks, spanning diverse fields such as social sciences, biology, and computer science, are widely used as data structures for exploring complex systems. Statistical network analysis serves as a powerful toolset for uncovering patterns, structures, and dynamics within these networks, providing insights into phenomena ranging from social interactions to biological processes [Barabási, 2013, Newman, 2018]. Here, we are interested in characterizing a population of networks based on a single observed network, allowing for a broader understanding of the underlying structure and dynamics of complex systems.

Network motif counts, such as the number of triangles or stars, are crucial for understanding local structure and connectivity patterns within networks. By quantifying the prevalence of these motifs across a population of networks, we can discern common structural motifs and infer underlying mechanisms governing network formation and functions [Borgs et al., 2010, Bickel et al., 2011]. For example, a high number of triangles in a social network may indicate the presence of tightly-knit communities or cliques, while an abundance of stars could suggest influential hubs connecting disparate network parts [Wasserman and Faust, 1994]. Moreover, local motif counts reveal global properties and facilitate inference across networks of varying sizes but within the same population. Thus, motif counts are vital in goodness-of-fit testing and model selection [Gao and Lafferty, 2017, Klusowski and Wu, 2020, Yuan et al., 2022], as well as for network comparison tasks such as two-sample tests and correlation analysis [Ghoshdastidar et al., 2017, Mao et al., 2021, Maugis et al., 2020, Shao et al., 2022].

At a high level, our statistical task is as follows. Given a network G , assumed to be generated from a population graphon model [Bickel and Chen, 2009], and a set of motifs R_1, \dots, R_m of interest, we seek

to characterize the joint distribution of properly rescaled motif counts, or network moments, for random networks generated from the same graphon model.

One seemingly natural approach is to estimate the true graphon model and then directly derive or sample the desired distribution. However, accurately identifying the graphon function is challenging without making restrictive assumptions [Yang et al., 2014, Chan and Airoidi, 2014] or resorting to computationally infeasible methods [Olhede and Wolfe, 2014, Choi and Wolfe, 2014, Gao et al., 2015]. While there are computationally feasible and accurate methods for estimating the connection probabilities of the given network G [Chatterjee, 2015, Zhang et al., 2017, Li and Le, 2023], they are not suitable for studying population distributions at the graphon level. Additionally, these estimation approaches still depend on certain structural regularity assumptions. Therefore, we turn to resampling strategies, which are generally considered flexible and versatile for approximating population distributions. Many studies have explored resampling inference methods in network problems, including cross-validation [Chen and Lei, 2018, Li et al., 2020], bootstrap [Levin and Levina, 2019, Green and Shalizi, 2022], subsampling [Bhattacharyya and Bickel, 2015b, Zhang and Xia, 2022, Lunde and Sarkar, 2023], and conformal inference [Lunde et al., 2023].

Among the aforementioned methods, those most relevant to our study are the subsampling method of Zhang and Xia [2022] and Lunde and Sarkar [2023], along with the bootstrap methods of Levin and Levina [2019] and Green and Shalizi [2022], which also focus on the distribution of motif counts from the population model. However, these studies primarily address the resampling approximation of the marginal distribution for a single motif, offering a limited view of network structure by isolating individual aspects without considering interactions among motifs. Such marginal distributions fail to capture the full complexity of network interdependencies, potentially leading to less robust inferences. For example, when comparing two gene coexpression networks, G_1 and G_2 , from different gene sets, suppose we examine the counts (properly normalized for network size) of two motifs, 2-star (\vee) and 3-star (Δ), separately. We might find that G_1 has a statistically higher proportion of both motifs compared to G_2 . However, since a 2-star is a subgraph of a 3-star, these counts are highly dependent. A greater number of 2-stars generally indicates more 3-stars, which might not provide additional insights into the differences between the networks beyond what is already indicated by the 2-stars. Ignoring this dependence can lead to false positive and redundant comparison, and thus, basing analysis and inference solely on separate marginal distributions can produce misleading scientific conclusions. This issue is further discussed in our examples in Section 5. The examples there underline the need to explore the joint distribution of motif counts as a crucial tool for understanding multivariate objectives like dependence structures and conditional distributions.

As discussed above, the dependence between network moments is heavily influenced by the shared topology between motifs, making their joint distribution challenging to characterize. In this paper, we propose using node subsampling to characterize the joint distribution of multiple network moments. We prove that subsampling provides an asymptotically accurate approximation of the population joint distributions of network motifs under a general graphon model, extending the known effectiveness of subsampling in network analysis from single to multiple motifs. Our contributions are significant in two main aspects. First, from a practical standpoint, we highlight that joint or conditional distributions should be used instead of marginal distributions to characterize network properties. We support this argument with compelling data examples using our principled subsampling inference. Second, from a methodological perspective, the proposed multivariate distribution approximation via node subsampling is a *simple yet fundamental* addition to the current statistical toolkit for network analysis. Although using subsampled network motifs to approximate the joint distribution is a natural extension of the marginal approach, the theoretical analysis of this procedure is highly nontrivial. It requires an involved characterization of the dependence between network motifs and the corresponding asymptotic convergence, significantly enhancing our understanding of network motifs. Our findings enable more flexible approaches to network inference. We demonstrate its utility in two

real-world network comparison studies: one comparing coexpression networks across distinct gene sets and the other examining collaboration patterns within the statistics community, including temporal changes and comparisons to high-energy physics. Both examples showcase the valuable insights gained from multivariate network moment inference.

2 Notations, motif counts and network moments

Throughout this paper, we denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for any positive integer n by $[n]$, and denote the cardinality of a set by $|\cdot|$. Let G be an undirected unweighted graph whose node set is $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and edge set is $\mathcal{E}(G) = \{(v_i, v_j) : v_i, v_j \in V(G)\}$.

A graph S is a subgraph of G , written as $S \subset G$, if $V(S) \subset V(G)$ and $\mathcal{E}(S) \subset \mathcal{E}(G)$. In particular, a subgraph $S \subset G$ is called an induced subgraph of G , denoted by $S \subset\subset G$, if for any $v_i, v_j \in V(S)$, $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(S)$ whenever $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(G)$. Lastly, two graphs S and G are isomorphic, denoted by $S \cong G$, when there exists a bijective function $\phi: V(S) \rightarrow V(G)$ such that $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(S)$ if and only if edge $[\phi(v_i), \phi(v_j)] \in \mathcal{E}(G)$.

A motif refers to a (usually simple) graph, such as an edge (ℓ), a 2-star/V-shape (\vee), a triangle (Δ), or a 3-star (\star), which forms the building blocks of larger graphs. In this study, we denote a motif by R , with $|V(R)| = r$ representing the number of nodes and $|\mathcal{E}(R)| = \tau$ representing the number of edges. We focus exclusively on connected motifs, aligning with previous research [Bickel et al., 2011, Bhattacharyya and Bickel, 2015b, Lunde and Sarkar, 2023]. For network G and motif R , the motif count of R in G is defined as the number of subgraphs of G that are isomorphic to R :

$$X_R(G) = |\{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}|. \quad (1)$$

This functional has received considerable attention in network analysis [Cook, 1971, Milo et al., 2002, Maugis et al., 2020, Bhattacharya et al., 2022]. Note that the subgraph S need not be an induced subgraph of G . In contrast, the induced motif count is defined as

$$\tilde{X}_R(G) = |\{S : S \subset\subset G, S \cong R\}|, \quad (2)$$

which requires that the subgraph S in the calculation must be an induced subgraph. These two definitions are essentially equivalent due to their linear mapping relations [Bickel et al., 2011, Maugis et al., 2020]. However, the non-induced counts (1) offer a more streamlined theoretical analysis [Zhang and Xia, 2022]. Thus, following Bickel et al. [2011], Bhattacharyya and Bickel [2015b] and Zhang and Xia [2022], we focus on the non-induced motif count (1) for our theoretical studies, but the distributional properties also hold for the induced motifs. Our data analyses in Section 5 employ induced counts for a better interpretability.

The scale of motif counts is influenced by the size of both network and motif, making direct comparisons across networks of different sizes less informative. To avoid this, it is common to rescale the motif count. For a given motif R , the (sample) network moment of R in a graph G is defined as

$$U_R(G) = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(G).$$

Several efficient computation strategies for network moments are outlined in Ribeiro and Silva [2010], Gonen et al. [2011], and Maugis et al. [2020].

3 Node subsampling and its properties

Before presenting our multivariate inference of network moments, we first outline the probabilistic framework that defines the network population and facilitates our analysis, namely the graphon framework adopted from [Hoover, 1979, Aldous, 1981, Bickel and Chen, 2009].

Definition 3.1 (Sparse graphon model). *Let the graphon function $w : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a nonnegative Lebesgue measurable function, such that $w(u, v) = w(v, u)$ for any $u, v \in [0, 1]$ with $\int_0^1 \int_0^1 w(u, v) du dv = 1$. Define a sequence of scalars $\rho_n \in [0, 1]$. A random network is denoted as $\mathbb{G}_n \sim \rho_n w(u, v)$ if it is generated as follows.*

1. Generate $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ independently with

$$\xi_i \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1) \tag{3}$$

2. For each node pair $(i, j), i < j$, connect the two nodes independently with probability $\rho_n w(u, v) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n w(u, v) \leq 1\}}$.

The parameter ρ_n , governing network sparsity, typically tends towards 0 at a specific rate. Similar to Bickel et al. [2011], we always assume that $\rho_n w(u, v) \leq 1$ and ignore the constraint $\rho_n w(u, v) \leq 1$.

We assume that the observed network G follows the sparse graphon model $\rho_n w(u, v)$. From G , our objective is to infer the distributional properties of network moments derived from this graphon model. Specifically, given a set of motifs R_j for $j \in [m]$ and a sample size b where $b < n^1$, we aim to characterize the distribution of network moments $U_{R_j}(\mathbb{G}_b)$, for \mathbb{G}_b drawn from $\rho_b w$. Our primary focus, as previously discussed, is on the joint distribution of $U_{R_j}(\mathbb{G}_b)$ for $j \in [m]$, rather than their marginal distributions.

Consider an ideal scenario where the true graphon model $\rho_n w$ is known. In this context, we could approximate the distribution of $U_{R_j}(\mathbb{G}_b)$ for $j \in [m]$ directly using the Monte Carlo method: sampling \mathbb{G}_b from the model, computing the corresponding network moments, which give the empirical cumulative distribution functions. However, in our context, the graphon model is unknown, rendering the above procedure inapplicable. Nonetheless, if n is sufficiently large, we can consider the graph G as a discretized approximation of the true graphon, which allows for a feasible sampling procedure based on G that resembles the Monte Carlo strategy. This insight forms the basis for the subsequent subsampling algorithm.

Algorithm 1. *Uniform node subsampling for multivariate network moments*

Input: network G of size n ; motifs R_1, \dots, R_m ; replication number N_{sub} ; subsampling size b .

Steps: Calculate $\hat{\rho}_n = |\mathcal{E}(G)|/[n(n-1)]$.

For i from 1 to N_{sub}

Randomly sample b nodes (without replacement) from $[n]$ to be the subsampled set \mathcal{S} .

Set $G_b^{(i)} \subset G$ to be the induced subgraph by \mathcal{S}*

Calculate the network moments of the subsampled graph $U_{R_j}[G_b^{(i)}]$ for $j \in [m]$.*

Set the m -dimensional vector $Y_b^{(i)} = (U_{R_1}[G_b^{(i)}], \dots, U_{R_m}[G_b^{*(i)}])$.*

Output: $\hat{\rho}_n; \{Y_b^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sub}}}$ for downstream inference tasks.

A crucial aspect of the subsampling approach is its emphasis on computing network moments within networks of size b rather than n during the generation of $Y_b^{(i)}$. Given that motif counting complexity typically

¹In practical scenarios, n is typically large, rendering the computation of network moments for $b \geq n$ infeasible, even without considering advanced inference tasks. Hence, we focus on the case where $b < n$.

increases superlinearly with network size [Ribeiro and Silva, 2010], this subsampling method emerges as a pivotal technique for addressing scalability in network inference tasks, allowing for the analysis of a large network G by computing motif counts in a much smaller one of size b . Additionally, it is important to note that we keep the specific inference method for downstream tasks open in the algorithm, subsequent to obtaining the sample $\{Y_b^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sub}}}$. This flexibility ensures that the process can accommodate any inference method the user prefers, ranging from intuitive visualization to more sophisticated testing procedures.

Subsampling procedures similar to ours have been explored by Zhang and Xia [2022] and Lunde and Sarkar [2023]. However, as noted in Section 1, those studies primarily focused on inferring individual network moments, particularly concerning the marginal distribution of single motifs. In contrast, we will examine the validity of our method on the joint distribution of network moments, laying the foundation for flexible multivariate inference on network moments. This generalization requires a precise characterization of the dependence between network moments, which is nontrivial when extending beyond marginal cases.

Now we proceed to discuss the theoretical validity of the node sampling for multiple network motifs. Algorithm 1 operates based on the observed network G , with $\{Y_b^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sub}}}$ representing a random sample from the subsampling distribution conditioned on $\mathbb{G}_n = G$, where $\mathbb{G}_n \sim \rho_n w$. Our goal is to show that the subsampling distribution, viewed as a random probability measure (with respect to the randomness of \mathbb{G}_n), effectively approximates the multivariate network moments distribution of \mathbb{G}_b from the graphon model. Let $\mathbb{G}_b^{(*G)}$ denote a randomly induced subgraph of G from the node subsampling procedure. When discussing distributional quantities such as the expectation or variance of $\mathbb{G}_b^{(*G)}$, conditioned on $\mathbb{G}_n = G$, we use $(*G)$ in our notation. For instance, $\text{var}(*G)$ refers to the variance of $\mathbb{G}_b^{(*G)}$, conditioned on $\mathbb{G}_n = G$. We simplify $(*G)$ as $*$ when the context clearly identifies G . For all the asymptotics, we consider a sequence of random networks $\{\mathbb{G}_n\}$, with $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Fix a set of motifs $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$, with $r_j = |V(R_j)|$ and $\tau_j = |\mathcal{E}(R_j)|$ for $j \in [m]$, define the following cumulative distribution functions:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{*,n,b}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) &= \text{pr}_* \left\{ \sqrt{b} [\widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(G)] \leq t_1, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots, \sqrt{b} [\widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(G)] \leq t_m \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{b,c}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) &= \text{pr} \left\{ \sqrt{bc} \{ \widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b) - E[\rho_b^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b)] \} \leq t_1, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots, \sqrt{bc} \{ \widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b) - E[\rho_b^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b)] \} \leq t_m \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We refer to $J_{*,n,b}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}$ as the subsampling distribution, conditioned on G , and $J_{b,c}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}$ as the graphon sampling distribution. The term c will be used to adjust for the discrepancy in sampling sizes between b and n , with its exact form to be explicitly defined later. We first introduce the following assumptions for our theoretical analysis.

Assumption 1 (Sparsity level). *Define $r = \max\{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$ and $\tau = \max\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\}$. There exists a constant $c_1 > 1$ such that $n\rho_n^{4\tau} \geq c_1 \log(n)$ for sufficiently large n . Furthermore, $b\rho_n^{r/2} \rightarrow \infty$, and $b\rho_n^{2\tau} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Assumption 2 (Subsampling size). *The subsample size $b \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b/n = c_2$ for a constant $c_2 \in [0, 1]$.*

Assumption 3 (Non-degenerate moment). *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the covariance matrix of $\{\sqrt{n}\rho_n^{-\tau} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_n), \dots, \sqrt{n}\rho_n^{-\tau} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_n)\}$ converges to a positive definite matrix.*

Similar assumptions have been introduced in [Green and Shalizi \[2022\]](#), [Zhang and Xia \[2022\]](#), and [Lunde and Sarkar \[2023\]](#) to study the marginal distribution of individual network moments. [Zhang and Xia \[2022\]](#) considers a sparser regime while also imposes additional Cramer-type conditions to ensure the regularity of network moments. [Lunde and Sarkar \[2023\]](#) requires a slightly stronger condition with $b = o(n)$, and their sparsity assumption is implicit.

We have the following property for our node subsampling distribution.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1-3, with probability one (with respect to the random sequence $\{\mathbb{G}_n\}$),*

$$\sup_{(t_1, \dots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) - J_{b,(1-b/n)}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad (6)$$

Theorem 1 is the first result that shows the first-order consistency of the subsampling joint distribution of network moments. For subsampling marginal distributions of network moments, [Zhang and Xia \[2022\]](#) have established the second-order accuracy through their Edgeworth expansion. However, whether such higher-order accuracy is attainable for multivariate joint distributions remains unclear. We defer the exploration of this direction to future endeavors.

4 Simulation

We now employ numerical studies to assess the accuracy of approximating subsampling distributions by evaluating the finite sample approximation error given by the righthand side of (6). Specifically, using networks generated from graphon models, we calculate the empirical Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance between $\hat{J}_{*,n,b}^{R_1, \dots, R_m}$ and $\hat{J}_{b,(1-b/n)}^{R_1, \dots, R_m}$, which are the empirical cumulative distribution functions corresponding to (4) and (5), respectively. We focus on the performance for $m = 1$ (marginal distribution) and 2 (bi-variate joint distribution), considering three basic motifs: \vee (2-star), Δ (triangle), and Υ (3-star). The experimental setups are detailed below:

- The true network models: two graphons from previous studies [[Green and Shalizi, 2022](#), [Zhang and Xia, 2022](#), [Lunde and Sarkar, 2023](#)] are used.
 1. Graphon 1 (smooth): $w(u, v) \propto \exp\{-25(u - v)^2/2\}$.
 2. Graphon 2 (nonsmooth): $w(u, v) \propto 0.5 \cos[0.1\{(u - 0.5)^2 + (v - 0.5)^2\} + 0.01] \cdot \max(u, v)^{2/3} + 0.4$.
- The network and subsampling sizes: n varies from 2000 to 16000 and $b = \lceil n^{2/3} \rceil$.
- Sparsity levels: Two sparsity levels are considered $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.1}$ and $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.25}$.

For each configuration, the true cumulative distribution function is approximated by the empirical cumulative distribution function from network moments of size- b networks sampled from the true model. To assess the approximation error, measured by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance, we generate a size- n network from the true model and use the empirical cumulative distribution function of the subsampled $\{Y_b^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sub}}}$ from Algorithm 1 with $N_{\text{sub}} = 2000$. This process is replicated 50 times, and we report the average approximation errors from these replications as the performance metric.

Figure 1 displays the log-scale approximation errors for both the marginal and pairwise joint distributions under two graphon models at a sparsity level of $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.1}$. The errors across all evaluated cumulative distribution functions exhibit a clear decreasing trend. With both axes labeled on a log scale, this decreasing trend appears nearly linear as expected. The rate at which the marginal distribution errors decrease roughly

aligns with the findings of [Zhang and Xia \[2022\]](#). Although the joint distributions show a slightly slower decrease in errors, the overall pattern remains the same. Both graphons, smooth or nonsmooth, demonstrate similar decreasing patterns, suggesting the subsampling method’s robustness to graphon smoothness.




Figure 1: Empirical approximation errors of the cumulative distribution functions under the sparsity level $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.1}$.

Figure 2 presents results under a sparser setting with $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.25}$. The pattern remains consistent with previous results, though the errors are slightly higher due to the increased sparsity. The variation in numerical values across different motifs is more pronounced, yet the overall trend remains the same. It is important to note that excessive sparsity can weaken the signal-to-noise ratio to the extent that the approximation may fail, a known issue in network resampling methods [[Zhang and Xia, 2022](#), [Green and Shalizi, 2022](#), [Lunde and Sarkar, 2023](#)]. We explore such an overly sparse scenario in Section H of the Appendix. Additional results for experiments with a subsampling size of $b = \lceil 2n^{1/2} \rceil$ are also available in Section H of the Appendix.




Figure 2: Empirical approximation errors of the cumulative distribution functions under the sparsity level $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.25}$.

5 Applications in unmatchable network comparison

Network comparison involves determining whether two or more networks originate from the same underlying population, a question that has gained significant attention recently. For example, studies like [Ghoshdastidar and Von Luxburg \[2018\]](#), [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), [Yuan and Wen \[2023\]](#) have focused on comparing two groups of networks, where each group contains a large number of individual networks. In contrast, research such as [Tang et al. \[2017a\]](#), [Li and Li \[2018\]](#), [Liu et al. \[2021\]](#), [Chatterjee et al. \[2023\]](#), [Du and Tang \[2023\]](#) has explored comparisons between two individual networks that share the same set of nodes, often known as “matchable networks”.

Comparing “unmatchable” networks — those differing in both size and node composition — introduces further complications. Various methods [[Tang et al., 2017b](#), [Agterberg et al., 2020](#), [Alyakin et al., 2024](#)] have been developed to address these challenges, particularly under the random dot product graph model [[Young](#)

and Scheinerman, 2007]. In the context of the more general graphon model, Ghoshdastidar et al. [2017] and Shao et al. [2022] have introduced hypothesis testing procedures based on network moments, which can be incorporated into resampling methods. However, these methods focus only on the marginal distributions of network moments, potentially leading to spurious discovery. As one of its important applications, the subsampling approach studied in this paper paves the road for comparing unmatchable networks through the lens of multivariate inference on network moments.

5.1 Network comparisons based on subsampling distributions

Consider two unmatchable networks, G and G' , with sizes n and n' , respectively. Assume they are realizations of two graphon models $\mathbb{G} \sim \rho_n w$ and $\mathbb{G}' \sim \rho_{n'} w'$. We aim to determine whether $w = w'$ using multiple network moments jointly. Given the motifs of interest, R_1, \dots, R_m , we consider two different cases of comparing unmatchable networks to show the adaptability of subsampling inference.

Case 1: Comparison with highly imbalanced sizes. Suppose $n \gg n'$ and n' is sufficiently large. In this scenario, set $b = n'$. By Theorem 1, we subsample from G using Algorithm 1 to approximate the true distribution of network moments (5) for a network of size n' from graphon w . We then compare whether the observed network moments in G' match this distribution. The comparison step can be achieved by a variety of user-specific methods such as outlier detection or naive visualization on either the joint or proper conditional distributions.

Case 2: Comparison with comparable sizes. Suppose n and n' are comparable, and both are sufficiently large. In this case, subsampling one network based on the size of another is not effective. We choose a subsampling size b that is much smaller than both n and n' . Algorithm 1 can be applied separately on G and G' to generate two sets of multiple network moments: $\{Y_b^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sub}}}$ from G and $\{Y_b'^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{N_{\text{sub}}}$ from G' . According to Theorem 1, they represent random samples from the joint moment distributions of network size b from w and w' , respectively. We can then directly compare the distributions using hypothesis testing or simple visualization methods.

In the following sections, we will explore both scenarios and highlight the advantages of joint inference of network moments over the univariate marginal method. In the first example, while the marginal distributions of the two networks show statistically significant differences, the conditional distribution reveals no differences in the higher-order moment. In the second example, although the marginal distributions of the network moments exhibit no significant differences, the conditional distribution uncovers notable differences between the two networks. In these examples, we will use the induced motif counts $\tilde{X}_R(G)$ in (2) in place of $X_R(G)$ for easier interpretation.

5.2 Comparison of coexpression networks of core versus non-core genes for evolutionary adaption

Fischer et al. [2021] leveraged phenotypic plasticity and parallel adaptation across independent lineages of Trinidadian guppies as the biological model to investigate whether flexibility in underlying mechanisms shapes evolutionary trajectories. By comparing transcriptional mechanisms associated with adaptation within and across parallel lineages, they identified a small number of differentially expressed genes shared across drainages, which are considered core genes critical during the early stages of adaptation. By further examining the correlations among core genes and those among non-core genes, the authors speculated that the transcriptional network of core genes and that of non-core genes may share common structures, reflecting a certain degree of evolutionary stability during the adaptation process.

To better understand this evolutionary stability, we apply our method to compare the coexpression networks of core genes and non-core genes. We first apply the method of Cai and Liu [2016] to construct gene-wise adjacency matrices based on testing whether the pairwise correlations are zero, controlling the

false discovery rate at 0.05. These resulting binary adjacency matrices are used to represent the coexpression networks. The non-core genes, totaling 16485, correspond to the larger network G , while the 618 core genes form the smaller network G' . Recognizing the significant size imbalance between G and G' , we employed the Case 1 strategy in Section 5.1. Specifically, we subsampled $N_{\text{sub}} = 2000$ networks of size 618 from the non-core gene coexpression network. We use the 2-star (∇) and 3-star (Υ) as the motifs for analysis. Intuitively, they characterize two types of interactions between genes of 3rd- and 4th-order in each coexpression network.




Figure 3: The blue points in panel (a) and histogram in panel (b) display the subsampling distributions of network moments from the coexpression network of non-core genes. The red point in panel (a) and dashed line in panel (b) represent the observed network moments in the core gene coexpression network.

The results are displayed in Figure 3a. The 2-star and 3-star moments from the 2000 subsampled networks are shown as a data cloud, with the corresponding moments of the core gene coexpression network represented by the red point. From the marginal distribution perspective, we observe that the core gene coexpression network has significantly smaller 2-star and 3-star moments compared to the non-core coexpression network. If we base our analysis solely on these marginal comparisons, we might come to the conclusion that the two coexpression networks differ in both interaction patterns. Nevertheless, since the 2-star is an induced subgraph of the 3-star, the two network moments are inherently correlated. Thus, the observed marginal differences could be an artifact caused by this topological dependence.

We further examine the conditional distribution of the 3-star network moment given the 2-star moment, focusing specifically on cases where the 2-star moment in the subsampled network matches the value observed in the core gene coexpression network. As shown in Figure 3b, conditioned on the 2-star moment, the 3-star moment shows no significant difference between the core gene coexpression network and the expected values from the non-core coexpression network. This suggests that the marginal difference in 3-star moments can be fully attributed to the difference in 2-star moments. After accounting for this, no strong statistical evidence remains for additional differences in higher-order interaction patterns between the two gene coexpression networks in the context of evolutionary adaptation. This finding supports the original biological speculation regarding evolutionary stability.

5.3 Analysis of collaboration patterns in statistical research

Ji et al. [2022] collected a data set of publications, citations, and collaborations in statistical research, encompassing over 80000 papers spanning more than 40 years. This data offers a valuable test base for statistical analysis on both text and network data. In this example, we use the collaboration data to analyze the collaboration patterns among statisticians by comparing them with those in high-energy physics [Newman, 2001] and also exploring their temporal variations.

Collaboration comparison between statistics and high-energy physics. We focus on the period of from 1995 to 1999 to align with the high-energy physics study by Newman [2001]. The dataset from Ji et al. [2022] covers a broad range of publications, including various interdisciplinary journals. To concentrate on statistical research, we follow the approach of Ji and Jin [2016], narrowing our scope to four prominent statistical journals: Annals of Statistics, Biometrika, Journal of the American Statistical Association, and the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. In the collaboration network, two authors are connected if they have coauthored at least one paper in the data set. The high-energy physics collaboration network has already been processed by Newman [2001]. For both fields, we extract the largest connected components, as is common practice in literature [Karrer and Newman, 2011, Amini et al., 2013, Li et al., 2022, Miao and Li, 2023], resulting in networks with 750 and 5835 nodes for statistics and high-energy physics, respectively. Our goal is to compare the collaboration patterns in the two fields using network moments. Given the difference in their size, we apply the strategy outlined in Case 1 of Section 5.1, as already demonstrated in the guppy gene coexpression network example.

Figure 4 presents the comparison between the statistics and high-energy physics collaboration networks. Both network moments of the statistics network fall within the expected ranges of values for the subsamples from the high-energy physics network, with respect to the marginal distributions. However, a closer examination of the joint distribution in Figure 4a and the conditional distribution in Figure 4b reveals a significantly higher-than-expected number of 3-stars in the statistics network, given its 2-star moment. This indicates that while the two fields are similar in their 2-star values, the statistics network has more 3-stars than expected according to the high-energy physics collaboration patterns. This suggests a tendency toward more centralized collaboration within the statistics research community as opposed to high-energy physics. Such insights emerges only from comparing the network moments jointly, rather than individually.




Figure 4: Comparison of network moments between collaboration networks in statistics and high-energy physics: the blue points and bars represent the subsampling distributions from the high-energy physics collaboration network while the red point and dotted line indicate the observed values in the statistics collaboration network.

Temporal comparison of statistics collaborations over time. We next compare the collaboration patterns in statistics over two equal-length periods: 1995–1999 and 2000–2004. After processing the data separately as before, both networks contain 750 nodes, with 215 overlapping statisticians. The relatively small overlapping proportion, combined with the possibility that the same person may have different collaboration patterns in non-overlapping periods, leads us to treat the two networks as unmatchable. Given their similar sizes, we use the strategy from Case 2 in Section 5.1. For each network, we used Algorithm 1 to generate 10,000 subsampled network moments with $b = 100$ for comparison.

Figure 5 displays the two bivariate distributions as scatter plots of the 10000 subsampled observations from each period, revealing a nonlinear positive correlation between \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{Y} . The scatter plots from the two

periods overlap substantially, with nearly identical contour shapes. This result suggests that the collaboration mechanism remained stable over the two periods. Such stationarity, in turn, supports the effectiveness of our method: the recovered distributions are reliable, ensuring that the comparison avoids false discoveries in this example.




Figure 5: Joint distributions of network moments for Ψ^* ($\times 10^3$) and Ψ of statistical collaboration networks in two periods (1995–1999, 2000–2004).

6 Discussion

We have demonstrated that network node subsampling provides asymptotically valid inference for the joint distributions of multiple network moments. Through multiple examples in the real network data analysis, we have shown that the joint distribution derived from subsampling offers greater utility and deeper insights than the marginal distributions previously studied. Several avenues could extend this work. A natural next step is to examine whether higher-order accuracy of the joint distribution exists for node subsampling. Furthermore, calculating network moments can be computationally intensive, limiting their practical application. Developing efficient methods for calculating network moments in large networks, potentially with some approximations, is a crucial next step. Understanding how these approximations affect the resulting inferences is another important area of study. Advancements here could greatly enhance the scalability of the subsampling inference in network analysis tasks.

References

- J. Agterberg, M. Tang, and C. Priebe. Nonparametric two-sample hypothesis testing for random graphs with negative and repeated eigenvalues. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09828*, 2020.
- D. J. Aldous. Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 11(4):581–598, 1981.
- A. A. Alyakin, J. Agterberg, H. S. Helm, and C. E. Priebe. Correcting a nonparametric two-sample graph hypothesis test for graphs with different numbers of vertices with applications to connectomics. *Applied Network Science*, 9(1):1, 2024.
- A. A. Amini, A. Chen, P. J. Bickel, and E. Levina. Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(4):2097–2122, 2013.

- O. Amini, F. V. Fomin, and S. Saurabh. Counting subgraphs via homomorphisms. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 26(2):695–717, 2012.
- A.-L. Barabási. Network science. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 371(1987):20120375, 2013.
- B. B. Bhattacharya, A. Chatterjee, and S. Janson. Fluctuations of subgraph counts in graphon based random graphs. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, pages 1–37, 2022.
- S. Bhattacharyya and P. Bickel. Supplement to “Subsampling bootstrap of count features of networks”. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2015a.
- S. Bhattacharyya and P. J. Bickel. Subsampling bootstrap of count features of networks. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(6):2384–2411, 2015b.
- P. J. Bickel and A. Chen. A nonparametric view of network models and newman–girvan and other modularities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(50):21068–21073, 2009.
- P. J. Bickel, A. Chen, and E. Levina. The method of moments and degree distributions for network models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2280–2301, 2011.
- M. Bloznelis and F. Götze. Orthogonal decomposition of finite population statistics and its applications to distributional asymptotics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(3):899–917, 2001.
- M. Bloznelis and F. Götze. An Edgeworth expansion for symmetric finite population statistics. *The Annals of Probability*, 30(3):1238–1265, 2002.
- B. Bollobás and O. Riordan. Metrics for sparse graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0708.1919*, 2007.
- C. Borgs, J. Chayes, and L. Lovász. Moments of two-variable functions and the uniqueness of graph limits. *Geometric and functional analysis*, 19:1597–1619, 2010.
- T. T. Cai and W. Liu. Large-scale multiple testing of correlations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(513):229–240, 2016.
- G. Casella and R. Berger. *Statistical Inference*. CRC Press, 2024.
- S. Chan and E. Airolidi. A consistent histogram estimator for exchangeable graph models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 208–216. PMLR, 2014.
- S. Chatterjee. Matrix estimation by universal singular value thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):177–214, 2015.
- S. Chatterjee, D. Saha, S. Dan, and B. B. Bhattacharya. Two-sample tests for inhomogeneous random graphs in l_r norm: Optimality and asymptotics. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 6903–6911. PMLR, 2023.
- K. Chen and J. Lei. Network cross-validation for determining the number of communities in network data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):241–251, 2018.
- D. Choi and P. J. Wolfe. Co-clustering separately exchangeable network data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(1):29–63, 2014.
- S. A. Cook. The complexity of theorem-proving procedures. In *Proceedings of the third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 151–158, 1971.

- X. Du and M. Tang. Hypothesis testing for equality of latent positions in random graphs. *Bernoulli*, 29(4): 3221–3254, 2023.
- E. K. Fischer, Y. Song, K. A. Hughes, W. Zhou, and K. L. Hoke. Nonparallel transcriptional divergence during parallel adaptation. *Molecular Ecology*, 30(6):1516–1530, 2021.
- C. Gao and J. Lafferty. Testing network structure using relations between small subgraph probabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.06742*, 2017.
- C. Gao, Y. Lu, and H. H. Zhou. Rate-optimal graphon estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2624–2652, 2015.
- D. Ghoshdastidar and U. Von Luxburg. Practical methods for graph two-sample testing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- D. Ghoshdastidar, M. Gutzeit, A. Carpentier, and U. von Luxburg. Two-sample tests for large random graphs using network statistics. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 954–977. PMLR, 2017.
- M. Gonen, D. Ron, and Y. Shavitt. Counting stars and other small subgraphs in sublinear-time. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 25(3):1365–1411, 2011.
- A. Green and C. R. Shalizi. Bootstrapping exchangeable random graphs. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(1):1058–1095, 2022.
- D. N. Hoover. Relations on probability spaces and arrays of random variables. *Preprint, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ*, 2:275, 1979.
- P. Ji and J. Jin. Coauthorship and citation networks for statisticians. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 1779–1812, 2016.
- P. Ji, J. Jin, Z. T. Ke, and W. Li. Co-citation and co-authorship networks of statisticians. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40(2):469–485, 2022.
- B. Karrer and M. E. Newman. Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, 83(1):016107, 2011.
- J. M. Klusowski and Y. Wu. Estimating the number of connected components in a graph via subgraph sampling. *Bernoulli*, 26(3):1635–1664, 2020.
- K. Levin and E. Levina. Bootstrapping networks with latent space structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10821*, 2019.
- T. Li and C. M. Le. Network estimation by mixing: Adaptivity and more. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–16, 2023.
- T. Li, E. Levina, and J. Zhu. Network cross-validation by edge sampling. *Biometrika*, 107(2):257–276, 2020.
- T. Li, L. Lei, S. Bhattacharyya, K. Van den Berge, P. Sarkar, P. J. Bickel, and E. Levina. Hierarchical community detection by recursive partitioning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(538):951–968, 2022.
- Y. Li and H. Li. Two-sample test of community memberships of weighted stochastic block models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.12593*, 2018.

- F. Liu, W. Xu, J. Lu, and D. J. Sutherland. Meta two-sample testing: Learning kernels for testing with limited data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:5848–5860, 2021.
- L. Lovász and B. Szegedy. Limits of dense graph sequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(6):933–957, 2006.
- R. Lunde and P. Sarkar. Subsampling sparse graphons under minimal assumptions. *Biometrika*, 110(1): 15–32, 2023.
- R. Lunde, E. Levina, and J. Zhu. Conformal prediction for network-assisted regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10095*, 2023.
- C. Mao, Y. Wu, J. Xu, and S. H. Yu. Testing network correlation efficiently via counting trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11816*, 2021.
- P.-A. Maugis, S. Olhede, C. Priebe, and P. Wolfe. Testing for equivalence of network distribution using subgraph counts. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 29(3):455–465, 2020.
- R. Miao and T. Li. Informative core identification in complex networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(1):108–126, 2023.
- R. Milo, S. Shen-Orr, S. Itzkovitz, N. Kashtan, D. Chklovskii, and U. Alon. Network motifs: simple building blocks of complex networks. *Science*, 298(5594):824–827, 2002.
- M. Newman. *Networks*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- M. E. Newman. The structure of scientific collaboration networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(2):404–409, 2001.
- S. C. Olhede and P. J. Wolfe. Network histograms and universality of blockmodel approximation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(41):14722–14727, 2014.
- P. Ribeiro and F. Silva. G-tries: an efficient data structure for discovering network motifs. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM symposium on applied computing*, pages 1559–1566, 2010.
- L. Rodriguez. Automorphism groups of simple graphs, 2014.
- M. Shao, D. Xia, Y. Zhang, Q. Wu, and S. Chen. Higher-order accurate two-sample network inference and network hashing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07573*, 2022.
- M. Tang, A. Athreya, D. L. Sussman, V. Lyzinski, Y. Park, and C. E. Priebe. A semiparametric two-sample hypothesis testing problem for random graphs. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26(2):344–354, 2017a.
- M. Tang, A. Athreya, D. L. Sussman, V. Lyzinski, and C. E. Priebe. A nonparametric two-sample hypothesis testing problem for random graphs. *Bernoulli*, 23(3):1599 – 1630, 2017b.
- S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Cambridge university press, 1994.
- J. Yang, C. Han, and E. Airoldi. Nonparametric estimation and testing of exchangeable graph models. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1060–1067. PMLR, 2014.
- S. J. Young and E. R. Scheinerman. Random dot product graph models for social networks. In *International Workshop on Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph*, pages 138–149. Springer, 2007.

- M. Yuan and Q. Wen. A practical two-sample test for weighted random graphs. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 50(3):495–511, 2023.
- M. Yuan, R. Liu, Y. Feng, and Z. Shang. Testing community structure for hypergraphs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(1):147–169, 2022.
- Y. Zhang and D. Xia. Edgeworth expansions for network moments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(2):726–753, 2022.
- Y. Zhang, E. Levina, and J. Zhu. Estimating network edge probabilities by neighbourhood smoothing. *Biometrika*, 104(4):771–783, 2017.
- L. Zhao and X. Chen. Normal approximation for finite-population u-statistics. *Acta mathematicae applicatae Sinica*, 6(3):263–272, 1990.
- Y. Zhao. *Graph Theory and Additive Combinatorics: Exploring Structure and Randomness*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.

Appendix

Section A presents additional theoretical results. Technical results in Sections A.2, A.3, and A.4 are proved in Sections C, D, and E, respectively. Finally, the main results in the paper are shown in Sections F and G. Additional numerical results are displayed in Section H.

A Supporting propositions, lemmas, and additional theoretical results

For the ease of notation, we define

$$h_n(u, v) = \rho_n w(u, v) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n w(u, v) \leq 1\}}. \quad (7)$$

If a network $\mathbb{G}_n \sim h_n$, we denote it by $\mathbb{G}_n^{h_n}$ for simplicity. The network moment $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is a function of \mathbb{G}_b^* , and \mathbb{G}_b^* can be viewed as a conditional random variable.

Note that $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is a finite population U-statistic [Zhang and Xia, 2022] and network G can be treated as a finite population: $G = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$, where each unit \mathbf{v}_i represent the adjacency information between the i th node and others. The finite population U-statistic has been studied in Zhao and Chen [1990], Bloznelis and Götze [2001, 2002], which is defined as follows.

Definition A.1 (Finite population U-statistic). *Let $\mathcal{V} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ be a finite population consisting of n units. Let $T = t(\mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_b)$ denote a statistic based on simple random sample $\mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_b$ drawn without replacement from \mathcal{V} . If the kernel function t is invariant under permutations of its arguments, then T is called a finite population U-statistic.*

A.1 Properties of motif counts

In this section, we introduce two useful features of motif counts. The first one is the relationship between motif counts and graph injective homomorphisms:

Lemma 1 (Proposition 1 of Amini et al. [2012]). *For any motif R and graph G ,*

$$X_R(G) = \text{inj}(R, G) / |\text{Aut}(R)|,$$

where $\text{inj}(R, G)$ denotes the number of injective graph homomorphisms [Lovász and Szegedy, 2006], and $\text{Aut}(R)$ denotes the set of all automorphisms of R . A mapping $\phi: V(R) \rightarrow V(G)$ is a graph homomorphism if $(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)$ implies $[\phi(v_i), \phi(v_j)] \in \mathcal{E}(G)$, and it is an injective graph homomorphism if $\phi(v_i) = \phi(v_j)$ implies $v_i = v_j$. On the other hand, $\text{Aut}(R)$ is the set of all permutations ψ of the node set $V(R)$ such that $(x, y) \in \mathcal{E}(R)$ if and only if $[\psi(x), \psi(y)] \in \mathcal{E}(R)$. More discussions on $\text{Aut}(R)$ are provided in Rodriguez [2014].

Let $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$ denote the set of all unlabeled graphs that can be formed from R and R' . That is,

$$\mathcal{S}_{R,R'} = \left\{ S \subset K_{r+r'} : V(S) = V(R_1) \cup V(R_2), \mathcal{E}(S) = \mathcal{E}(R_1) \cup \mathcal{E}(R_2), R_1 \cong R, R_2 \cong R' \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where K_n denotes the complete graph of size n . Furthermore, $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$ can be partitioned into disjoint sets $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}$ based on the number of merged nodes q , where $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)} = \{S : S \subset \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}, |V(S)| = r + r' - q\}$. Lastly, for each $S \subset \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$, we define a constant c_S as

$$c_S = \left| \left\{ (R_1, R_2) \subset S : V(S) = V(R_1) \cup V(R_2), \mathcal{E}(S) = \mathcal{E}(R_1) \cup \mathcal{E}(R_2), R_1 \cong R, R_2 \cong R' \right\} \right|. \quad (9)$$

Following [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), we use two examples to explain above definitions. In the first example, let R be a \triangle and R' also be a \triangle . Then the set $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$ can be constructed as $\{\triangle\triangle, \blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft, \blacktriangledown, \triangle\}$. Each element in $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$ can be obtained by building blocks based on R and R' . Let R_1 be a copy of R , and R_2 be a copy to R' . The pattern $\triangle\triangle$ can be built by either put R_1 in the left side or in the right side. Thus, $c_{\triangle\triangle} = 2$. Similarly, $c_{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} = 2$, $c_{\blacktriangledown} = 2$ and $c_{\triangle} = 1$. Generally speaking, c_S denotes the number of ways S can be built from copies of R and R' . Based on the number of merged nodes, we have $S_{R,R'}^{(0)} = \{\triangle\triangle\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(1)} = \{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(2)} = \{\blacktriangledown\}$, and $S_{R,R'}^{(3)} = \{\triangle\}$. For the second example, let R be a \square and R' be a \square . Then $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'} = \{S_{R,R'}^{(0)}, S_{R,R'}^{(1)}, S_{R,R'}^{(2)}, S_{R,R'}^{(3)}, S_{R,R'}^{(4)}\}$, with $S_{R,R'}^{(0)} = \{\square\square\square\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(1)} = \{\diamond\diamond\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(2)} = \{\diamond, \blacklozenge, \square\square\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(3)} = \{\blacklozenge, \blacklozenge, \blacklozenge\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(4)} = \{\square\}$. Correspondingly, $c_{\square\square\square} = 2$, $c_{\diamond\diamond} = 2$, $c_{\diamond} = 6$, $c_{\blacklozenge} = 2$, $c_{\square\square} = 2$, $c_{\blacklozenge\blacklozenge} = 2$, $c_{\blacklozenge} = 6$, $c_{\square} = 6$ and $c_{\square} = 1$.

We are in position to introduce the second feature regarding the linearity of motif counts.

Lemma 2 (Lemma 1 in [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#)). *For any two motifs R and R' .*

$$X_R(G)X_{R'}(G) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S X_S(G) = \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S X_S(G). \quad (10)$$

As noted in [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), $X_R(G)X_{R'}(G)$ involves counting pairs of motifs, and could be recovered by counting the number of the all motifs that are formed by using one copy of R and one copy of R' as building blocks. This is the intuition of Lemma 2. Moreover, (10) provides flexibility as it does not depend on the generation mechanism of G .

A.2 Statistical properties of network moments of graphs under the sparse graphon model

Following [Bickel et al. \[2011\]](#), we define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{h_n}(R) &= \int_{[0,1]^r} \prod_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)} h_n(\xi_i, \xi_j) \prod_{v_i \in V(R)} d\xi_i, \\ P_w(R) &= \int_{[0,1]^r} \prod_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)} w(\xi_i, \xi_j) \prod_{v_i \in V(R)} d\xi_i. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Lemma 3 below documents some fundamental properties of network moment $U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)$.

Lemma 3. *For any motif R ,*

$$E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_{h_n}(R). \quad (12)$$

Moreover, for a pair of motifs R and R' , using the definitions in (8) and (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] &= \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\ &\quad - \left[\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right] \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

in which recall that r and r' are the number of nodes in R and R' , respectively.

We focus on the statistical properties of $\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)$ rather than $U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)$ because both the expectation and variance of $U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)$ shrink to zero when ρ_n converges to zero under the sparse graphon model.

Proposition 1. *For any motif R ,*

$$E[\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_w(R). \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, consider motifs R and R' with sizes $r \leq r'$. Assume that $n\rho_n^{r/2} \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{cov}[\sqrt{n}\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), \sqrt{n}\rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(1)}} \frac{c_S r! r'!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S) - \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{c_S r! r'! r r'}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S). \quad (15)$$

The right-hand side in (15) describes the limit of covariance for any pair of motifs, and it includes the variance of $\sqrt{n}\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)$ as a special case. When the limit of variance is non-zero, we say $\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)$ is *non-degenerate*.

A.3 Statistical properties of network moments of subsampled graphs

Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ denote the collection of all possible instantiations of \mathbb{G}_b^* . For a fixed node $v \in V(G)$, we use \mathbb{G}_b^{v*} to denote a randomly induced subgraph of G based on the fixed node v and other $b-1$ nodes randomly drawn without replacement from $V(G) \setminus v$. Similarly, we use $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})$ to denote the sample space of \mathbb{G}_b^{v*} . Let $G_b^{v*} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})$ be one instantiation. We use $\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**}$ to denote a randomly induced subgraph of G_b^{v*} based on node v and other $r-1$ nodes randomly drawn without replacement from $V(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*}) \setminus v$, and use $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})$ to denote the set contains all possible $\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**}$. The following lemma provides a few useful identities to be used in later proofs.

Lemma 4. *For any network \mathcal{G} and motif R , the following identities hold:*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)} X_R(\mathcal{G}) = \binom{n-r}{b-r} X_R(G), \quad (16)$$

$$\left| \{S : S \subset G_b^{v*}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| = \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \quad (17)$$

$$\left| \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| = \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v**})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{G_b^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] = \binom{n-r}{b-r} \left| \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right|, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \{S : S \subset G, v_i \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| = r X_R(G). \quad (20)$$

We now introduce the following extension of the results in [Bhattacharyya and Bickel \[2015b\]](#).

Lemma 5. *Given the network G , for any motif R ,*

$$E_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = U_R(G). \quad (21)$$

And for any two motifs R and R' with $r + r' < b$,

$$\text{cov}_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} C_S \binom{b}{s} \binom{n}{s}^{-1} X_S(G) - U_R(G)U_{R'}(G), \quad (22)$$

where $s = |V(S)| = r + r' - q$. Moreover, suppose that $G \sim \mathbb{G}_n$. Then

$$E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] = E\{E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{*\mathbb{G}_n=G})]\} = E\{E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n}), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] = \text{cov}\{E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)], E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]\} + E\{\text{cov}_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]\}. \quad (24)$$

The following proposition extends the results on finite population statistics from [Bloznelis and Götze \[2001, 2002\]](#) to the context of network subsampling.

Proposition 2.

(a) *The Hoeffding's decomposition of $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is*

$$U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) = E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq b} g_{2,R}(\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j) + \dots, \quad (25)$$

where

$$g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) = \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{r(n-1)}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) = \frac{(n-1)}{b} [U_R(G) - U_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1)], \quad (26)$$

with

$$\text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] = \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq - rr'}{n^2} X_S(G). \quad (27)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\text{cov}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i), \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] = \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{cov}_*[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)], \quad (28)$$

and as $n, b \rightarrow \infty$

$$\lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right] = 0. \quad (29)$$

(b) *For two motifs R and R' , $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is also a symmetric finite population statistic with the following Hoeffding's decomposition*

$$U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) = E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq b} g_{2,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j) + \dots,$$

where

$$g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) = g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) + g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1). \quad (30)$$

Moreover, the variance of linear parts satisfies:

$$\text{var}_* \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) = \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* [g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)], \quad (31)$$

$$\lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] = 0. \quad (32)$$

A.4 Asymptotic distribution of network moments of subsampled graphs

Using the tools in Bloznelis and Götze [2001], we derive the following results for the subsampled moments.

Theorem 2. Suppose that $\{G^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of networks, where $G^{(n)} \sim \mathbb{G}_n$.

(a) The Hoeffding's decomposition of $\sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_{b_n}^*)$ is

$$\sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_{b_n}^*) = \sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R[G^{(n)}] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b_n} \sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \Delta[\sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_{b_n}^*)]. \quad (33)$$

For any network sequence, the following conditions hold with probability one.

(i) Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_* \Delta^2[\sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_{b_n}^*)] = 0, \quad (34)$$

$$0 < c_3 \leq \text{var}_* [\sqrt{b_n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_{b_n}^*)] \leq c_4 < \infty \text{ for some } c_3, c_4 > 0. \quad (35)$$

(ii) Under Assumption 1, for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n E_* [b_n \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \mathbb{1}_{\{b_n \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) > \epsilon\}}] = 0, \quad (36)$$

Consequently, if Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold, with probability one,

$$\sqrt{b} [\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(G)] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{*R}^2) \text{ in distribution}, \quad (37)$$

(b) Let $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ be m motifs with $\max\{r_1, \dots, r_m\} \leq r$ and $\max\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m\} \leq \tau$. Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. With probability one (with respect to the random sequence $\{\mathbb{G}_n\}$),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{b} \left\{ [\rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \dots, \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - [\rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(G), \dots, \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(G)] \right\} \\ & \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[0, \Sigma(*\mathbf{R})] \text{ in distribution}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The next result is about the impact on the variance and covariance scale due to the subsampling.

Lemma 6. Let R and R' be two motifs with $\max\{r, r'\} \leq r_1$ and $\max\{\tau, \tau'\} \leq \tau_1$. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds after replacing r by r_1 and τ by τ_1 , and Assumption 2 holds. Then

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \text{cov}_* [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \sqrt{b} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_b^{-(\tau+\tau')} \text{cov} [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b), \sqrt{b} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)]$$

with probability one.

A.5 Consistency of empirical distribution

Consider the following empirical cumulative distribution function

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sqrt{b} [\widehat{\rho}_G^{\mathbf{r}_1} U_{R_1}(G_b^{*(i)}) - \widehat{\rho}_G^{\mathbf{r}_1} U_{R_1}(G)] \leq t_1, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots, \sqrt{b} [\widehat{\rho}_G^{\mathbf{r}_m} U_{R_m}(G_b^{*(i)}) - \widehat{\rho}_G^{\mathbf{r}_m} U_{R_m}(G)] \leq t_m \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The following consistency result is developed based on [Lunde and Sarkar \[2023\]](#):

Lemma 7. *For $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$ with $\max\{r_1, \dots, r_m\} \leq r$ and $\max\{\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_m\} \leq \mathbf{r}$. Under Assumptions 1-3, with probability one:*

$$\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| \widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) - J_{*,n,b}^{\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}}(t_1, \dots, t_m) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

B Two examples for Definition 8

Following [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), we use two examples to explain this definition. In the first example, let R be a \triangle and R' also be a \triangle . Then the set $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$ can be constructed as $\{\triangle\triangle, \blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft, \blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft, \triangle\}$. Each element in $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'}$ can be obtained by building blocks based on R and R' . Let R_1 be a copy of R , and R_2 be a copy to R' . The pattern $\triangle\triangle$ can be built by either put R_1 in the left side or in the right side. Thus, $c_{\triangle\triangle} = 2$. Similarly, $c_{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} = 2$, $c_{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} = 2$ and $c_{\triangle} = 1$. Generally speaking, c_S denotes the number of ways S can be built from copies of R and R' . Based on the number of merged nodes, we have $S_{R,R'}^{(0)} = \{\triangle\triangle\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(1)} = \{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(2)} = \{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft\}$, and $S_{R,R'}^{(3)} = \{\triangle\}$. For the second example, let R be a \square and R' be a \square . Then $\mathcal{S}_{R,R'} = \{S_{R,R'}^{(0)}, S_{R,R'}^{(1)}, S_{R,R'}^{(2)}, S_{R,R'}^{(3)}, S_{R,R'}^{(4)}\}$, with $S_{R,R'}^{(0)} = \{\square\square\square\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(1)} = \{\diamond\diamond\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(2)} = \{\diamond\diamond, \square\square, \square\square\square\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(3)} = \{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle, \diamond, \blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft\}$, $S_{R,R'}^{(4)} = \{\square\square\}$. Correspondingly, $c_{\square\square\square} = 2$, $c_{\diamond\diamond} = 2$, $c_{\diamond} = 6$, $c_{\square\square} = 2$, $c_{\square\square\square} = 2$, $c_{\blacktriangle\blacktriangle} = 2$, $c_{\diamond} = 6$, $c_{\blacktriangleright\blacktriangleleft} = 6$ and $c_{\square\square} = 1$.

As noted in [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), $X_R(G)X_{R'}(G)$ involves counting pairs of motifs, and could be recovered by counting the number of the all motifs that are formed by using one copy of R and one copy of R' as building blocks. This is the intuition of Lemma 2. Moreover, the equation in (10) provides flexibility as it does not depend on the generation mechanism of G .

C Proofs for Section A.2

C.1 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Lemma 3 mostly follows the results in [Bhattacharyya and Bickel \[2015a\]](#), [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), [Bhattacharyya et al. \[2022\]](#). We provide the proof here for completeness.

i) First, by (C.4) in Lemma C.8, $E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(K_n) P_{h_n}(R)$, such that

$$X_R(K_n) \stackrel{\text{(C.5) in Lemma C.8}}{=} \binom{n}{r} X_R(K_r) \stackrel{\text{(C.6) in Lemma C.8}}{=} \binom{n}{r} \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

and

$$E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(K_n) P_{h_n}(R) = \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_{h_n}(R).$$

These give (12) directly.

ii) To show (13), we start with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] &= E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(C.4)}}{=} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} E[X_R(\mathbb{G}_n)X_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] - \left\{ E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{\text{(10)}}{=} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} E \left[\sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S X_S(\mathbb{G}_n) \right] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

The result in [Bhattacharyya and Bickel \[2015b\]](#) (see $\sigma(R_1, R_2; \rho)$ in Part **B**₁) implies that

$$\text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] - \left[1 - \frac{\binom{n-r}{r'}}{\binom{n}{r'}} \right] \cdot E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)].$$

Combining with (C.2), we obtain

$$E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)]. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] &\stackrel{\text{(C.2)}}{=} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\quad - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\stackrel{\text{(C.3)}}{=} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\quad + \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\quad - \frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&= \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right) \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)],
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (13). □

Lemma C.8.

$$E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} E[X_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(K_n) P_{h_n}(R), \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where K_n denotes a complete graph of size n , and $P_{h_n}(R)$ is defined in (11).

$$X_R(K_n) = \binom{n}{r} X_R(K_r), \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$X_R(K_r) = r! / |\text{Aut}(R)|. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

The (C.4) is proved in [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#) (See their Equation (1)), (C.5) is used in [Bollobás and Riordan \[2007\]](#), and (C.6) is proved in [Bhattacharya et al. \[2022\]](#) (see their Equation (2.7)).

C.2 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. Proof of (14):

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] &= \rho_n^{-\tau} E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] \stackrel{(12)}{=} \frac{\rho_n^{-\tau} r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_{h_n}(R) \\
&\stackrel{(11)}{=} \frac{\rho_n^{-\tau} r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \int_{[0,1]^r} \prod_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)} h_n(\xi_i, \xi_j) \prod_{v_i \in V(R)} d\xi_i \\
&= \frac{r! \rho_n^{-\tau} \rho_n^{\tau}}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \int_{[0,1]^r} \prod_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)} w(\xi_i, \xi_j) \mathbb{1}_{\{\rho_n w(\xi_i, \xi_j) \leq 1\}} \prod_{v_i \in V(R)} d\xi_i \\
&= \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \int_{[0,1]^r} \prod_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)} w(\xi_i, \xi_j) \prod_{v_i \in V(R)} d\xi_i \stackrel{(11)}{=} \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_w(R).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (15): we decompose the covariance as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}[\sqrt{n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), \sqrt{n} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] &= n \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\stackrel{(13)}{=} n \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\quad - n \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \left[\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right] \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&:= \text{I} - \text{II}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $|V(S)| = s$ and $|E(S)| = \mathfrak{s}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{I} &= n \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&= \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \frac{n r! (n-r)! r'! (n-r')!}{n! n!} \binom{n}{s} E[U_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\stackrel{(14)}{=} \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S \rho_n^{\mathfrak{s} - (\tau+\tau')} \frac{n r! (n-r)! r'! (n-r')!}{n! n!} \frac{n!}{s! (n-s)!} \frac{s!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S) \\
&= \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} \rho_n^{\mathfrak{s} - (\tau+\tau')} \frac{(n-r')!}{(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1)(n-s)!} \frac{c_S r! r'!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S).
\end{aligned}$$

The quantities r , r' , c_S , $|\text{Aut}(S)|$, and $P_w(S)$ are invariant of n . The quantities $\rho_n^{\mathfrak{s} - (\tau+\tau')}$ and $(n-r')! / [(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1)(n-s)!]$ change with n . Now, we consider these two quantities based on the number of merged nodes q .

- When $q = 1$, we have $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{r}'$ and $s = r + r' - 1$. The following quantity

$$\frac{(n - r')!}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)(n - s)!} = \frac{(n - r')(n - r' - 1) \cdots (n - r - r' + 2)}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)}$$

has $r - 1$ items including n in both numerator and denominator. Thus,

$$\rho_n^{\mathfrak{s} - (\mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{r}')} \frac{(n - r')!}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)(n - s)!} = 1 + o(1).$$

- When $q = 2$, we have $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{r}' - 1$ because one edge is merged. The following quantity

$$\frac{(n - r')!}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)(n - s)!} = \frac{(n - r')(n - r' - 1) \cdots (n - r - r' + 3)}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)}$$

has $r - 2$ items with n in numerator, and $r - 1$ items with n in denominator. As $n\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\rho_n^{\mathfrak{s} - (\mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{r}')} \frac{(n - r')!}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)(n - s)!} = O\left(\frac{1}{n\rho_n}\right) = o(1).$$

- When $2 < q < \min\{r, r'\}$, at most $q(q - 1)/2$ edges are merged. The following quantity

$$\frac{(n - r')!}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)(n - s)!} = \frac{(n - r')(n - r' - 1) \cdots (n - r - r' + (q + 1))}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)}$$

has $r - q$ items with n in numerator and $r - 1$ items with n in denominator. Since $n^{(q-1)}\rho_n^{(q(q-1)/2)} = (n\rho_n^{q/2})^{(q-1)} \rightarrow \infty$

$$\rho_n^{\mathfrak{s} - (\mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{r}')} \frac{(n - r')!}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)(n - s)!} = O\left(\frac{1}{(n\rho_n^{q/2})^{(q-1)}}\right) = o(1).$$

Therefore, $I \rightarrow \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(1)}} (c_S r! r')! (|\text{Aut}(S)|)^{-1} P_w(S)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now we turn to Part II. Since $s = r + r'$ and $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{r}'$ when $q = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{n \binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - n \right] \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \binom{n}{s} &= \frac{r! r'!}{(r + r')!} \left\{ b \left[1 - \frac{(n - r)!(n - r')!}{n!(n - r - r')!} \right] \right\} \\ &= \frac{r! r'!}{(r + r')!} \left[\frac{n(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1) - (n - r)! \cdots (n - r - r' + 1)}{(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} n(n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1) &= n^r - \frac{(r - 1)r}{2} n^{r-1} + o(n^{r-1}), \\ (n - r') \cdots (n - r - r' + 1) &= n^r - \frac{(2r' + r - 1)r}{2} n^{r-1} + o(n^{r-1}), \\ (n - 1) \cdots (n - r + 1) &= n^{r-1} + o(n^{r-1}). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - n \right) \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \binom{n}{s} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r!r'!}{(r+r')!} \left[\frac{n(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1) - (n-r') \cdots (n-r-r'+1)}{(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1)} \right] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r!r'!}{(r+r')!} \frac{rr'n^{r-1} + o(n^{r-1})}{n^{r-1} + o(n^{r-1})} = \frac{r!r'!}{(r+r')!} rr'.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{II} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \left(\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right) \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \rho_n^{s-(\tau+\tau')} \left(\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right) \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \binom{n}{s} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[\rho_n^{-s} U_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right) \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \binom{n}{s} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} c_S E[\rho_n^{-s} U_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\stackrel{(14)}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left(\frac{\binom{n}{r'}}{\binom{n-r}{r'}} - 1 \right) \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \binom{n}{s} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} c_S \frac{s!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S) \\
&\stackrel{(C.7)}{=} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{c_S r!r'!rr'}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above results, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{cov} \left[\sqrt{n} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), \sqrt{n} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n) \right] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{I} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{II} \\
&= \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(1)}} \frac{c_S r!r'!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S) - \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{c_S r!r'!rr'}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (15). □

D Proofs for Section A.3

D.1 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. The following equation from [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#) is used in this proof.

$$\binom{n}{r} U_R(G) = X_R(G) = \sum_{R_c \in \{S: S \subset G, S \cong R\}} 1 = |\{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}|. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

We now prove the identities in Lemma 4 one by one.

- i) For any $R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}$, recall that $R_c \subset G_b^*$ if both $V(R_c) \subset V(G_b^*)$ and $\mathcal{E}(R_c) \subset \mathcal{E}(G_b^*)$. Furthermore, since $R_c \subset G$ and $G_b^* \subset G$, $V(R_c) \subset V(G_b^*)$ implies $\mathcal{E}(R_c) \subset \mathcal{E}(G_b^*)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset G_b^*\}} = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad V(R_c) \subset V(G_b^*). \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Now let us consider drawing b nodes from $V(G)$ by first selecting all nodes in $V(R_c)$, and then randomly drawing $b - r$ nodes without replacement from $V(G) \setminus V(R_c)$. There are $\binom{n-r}{b-r}$ ways to draw these b nodes. Thus,

$$\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_b^*)} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} = \binom{n-r}{b-r}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_b^*)} X_R(\mathcal{G}) &\stackrel{(\text{D.1})}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_b^*)} \sum_{R_c \in \{S: S \subset \mathcal{G}, S \cong R\}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_b^*)} \sum_{R_c \in \{S: S \subset \mathcal{G}, S \cong R\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\ &= \sum_{R_c \in \{S: S \subset G, S \cong R\}} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_b^*)} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.3})}{=} \sum_{R_c \in \{S: S \subset G, S \cong R\}} \binom{n-r}{b-r} \stackrel{(\text{D.1})}{=} \binom{n-r}{b-r} X_R(G), \end{aligned}$$

which gives (16).

- ii) For any $G_{b,r}^{v**} \in \mathcal{S}(G_{b,r}^{v**})$, if $S \subset G_{b,r}^{v**}$ and $|V(S)| = |V(G_{b,r}^{v**})|$, we have $V(S) = V(G_{b,r}^{v**})$. In addition, as $v \in V(G_{b,r}^{v**})$, we have

$$\{S : S \subset G_{b,r}^{v**}, S \cong R\} = \{S : S \subset G_{b,r}^{v**}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Let $R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}$. Suppose that $R_c \subset G_b^*$ and $v \in V(R_c)$. As every $G_{b,r}^{v**}$ is an induced subgraph, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_{b,r}^{v**})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} = \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(G_{b,r}^{v**})} \mathbb{1}_{\{V(R_c) = V(\mathcal{G})\}} = 1. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \{S : S \subset G_b^{v*}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \\
&= \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G_b^{v*}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} 1 \stackrel{(D.5)}{=} \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G_b^{v*}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \left(\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} \left(\sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G_b^{v*}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} \left(\sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} 1 \right) \\
&\stackrel{(D.1)}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \\
&\stackrel{(D.4)}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, S \cong R\} \right| \stackrel{(D.1)}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v**})} X_R(\mathcal{G}),
\end{aligned}$$

leading to (17).

iii) If $|V(S)| = r$ and $S \subset G_r^{v*}$, we have $V(S) = V(G_r^{v*})$. Thus,

$$\{S : S \subset G_r^{v*}, S \cong R\} = \{S : S \subset G_r^{v*}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}.$$

Let $R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}$. Because $G_r^{v*} \subset G$, there exist only one $G_r^{v*} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})$ such that $V(R_c) = V(G_r^{v*})$. Also, $V(R_c) = V(G_r^{v*})$ implies $E(R_c) \subset E(G_r^{v*})$. Thus,

$$\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} = \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} \mathbb{1}_{\{V(R_c) \subset V(\mathcal{G})\}} = 1.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| &= \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} 1 \\
&= \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \left(\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} \left(\sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, S \cong R\} \right| = \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}),
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to (18)

iv) Let $R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} &= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), v \in V(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} + \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), v \notin V(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), v \in V(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} + 0 \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{G_b^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} \left(\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right) &\stackrel{(17)}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset \mathcal{G}, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\
&= \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v*})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\
&\stackrel{(D.6)}{=} \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)} \mathbb{1}_{\{R_c \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\
&\stackrel{(D.3)}{=} \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\}} \binom{n-r}{b-r} \\
&= \binom{n-r}{b-r} \left| \{S : S \subset G, v \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right|,
\end{aligned} \tag{D.7}$$

which gives (19).

v) For the last identity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \{S : S \subset G, v_i \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| &\stackrel{(D.1)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, v_i \in V(S), S \cong R\}} 1 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{v_i \in V(R_c)\}} \\
&= \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{v_i \in V(R_c)\}} \\
&= \sum_{R_c \in \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}} r \\
&= r \left| \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\} \right| = r X_R(G),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (20).

□

D.2 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. We will prove the stated identities of Lemma 5 one by one.

i) Following the results in [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] &\stackrel{\text{(D.1)}}{=} E_*\left[\binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)\right] = \binom{b}{r}^{-1} E_*[X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{b}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\text{(16)}}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{b}^{-1} \binom{n-r}{b-r} X_R(G) \\ &= \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(G) \stackrel{\text{(D.1)}}{=} U_R(G), \end{aligned}$$

which gives (21).

ii) We start by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] &\stackrel{\text{(12)}}{=} \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_{h_n}(R) \stackrel{\text{(C.1)}}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(K_b) P_{h_n}(R) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(C.4)}}{=} E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})]. \end{aligned} \tag{D.8}$$

Hence, $E\{E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]\} = E\{E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{(*)})]\} = E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] = E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})]$, where the second and third identities are from (21) and (D.8), respectively. This gives (23).

iii) Following [Bhattacharyya and Bickel \[2015b\]](#), [Maugis et al. \[2020\]](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] &\stackrel{\text{(D.1)}}{=} \text{cov}_*\left[\binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} X_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)\right] \\ &= \left\{ \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} E_*[X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) X_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right\} - E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_*[X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) X_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] &\stackrel{\text{(10)}}{=} E_*\left[\sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S X_S(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S E_*[X_S(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} E_*[U_S(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(21)}}{=} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} U_S(G). \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we have

$$E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \stackrel{\text{(21)}}{=} U_R(G) U_{R'}(G).$$

Thus,

$$\text{cov}_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} U_S(G) - U_R(G)U_{R'}(G),$$

which gives (22). As a special case,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] &= \left\{ \binom{b}{r}^{-2} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{2r-q} U_S(G) \right\} - [U_R(G)]^2 \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-2} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{\binom{b}{2r-q}}{\binom{n}{2r-q}} X_S(G) - [U_R(G)]^2 \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-2} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{\binom{n-2r+q}}{\binom{b-2r+q}} \frac{\binom{b}{2r-q}}{\binom{n}{2r-q}} X_S(G) - [U_R(G)]^2 \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-2} \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(0)}} c_S \frac{\binom{n-2r}}{\binom{b-2r}} X_S(G) + \sum_{q=1}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{\binom{n-2r+q}}{\binom{b-2r+q}} \frac{\binom{b}{2r-q}}{\binom{n}{2r-q}} X_S(G) \right] - [U_R(G)]^2, \end{aligned}$$

matching the result of [Bhattacharyya and Bickel \[2015a\]](#).

- iv) It remains to examine the total covariance in terms of network node subsampling. First, it holds that $\text{cov}\{E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)], E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]\} = \text{cov}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] = E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)]$, where the first equality follows (21).

Second, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left\{ \text{cov}_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(22)}{=} E\left\{ \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} U_S(\mathbb{G}_n) - U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n) \right\} \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} E[U_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov} \left\{ E_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)], E_* [U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right\} + E \left\{ \text{cov}_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right\} \\
&= \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} E[U_S(\mathbb{G}_n)] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_n)] \\
&\stackrel{\text{(D.8)}}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} E[U_S(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] \\
&\stackrel{\text{(D.1)}}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S E[X_S(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] \\
&= E \left[\binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}-1} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S X_S(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n}) \right] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] \\
&\stackrel{\text{(10)}}{=} E \left[\binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n}) X_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n}) \right] - E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] E[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})] \\
&= \text{cov} [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n}), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^{h_n})],
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (24). □

D.3 Proof of Proposition 2

Let T denote a general finite population U-statistic. The following Hoeffding's decomposition represents T as the sum of mutually uncorrelated U-statistics of increasing order:

$$T = E_*(T) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_1(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq b} g_2(\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j) + \dots \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Bloznelis and Götze [2001, 2002] showed that this decomposition is unique and orthogonal, which implies that $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^b$ are centered and satisfy

$$E_*[g_i(\mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_i) \mid \mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_{i-1}] = 0. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

Additionally, Bloznelis and Götze [2001] (see their Equation (2.3)) also showed that

$$g_1(\mathbb{V}_1) = \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_1(\mathbb{V}_1), \quad (\text{D.11})$$

where $h_1(\mathbb{V}_1) = E_*[T - E_*(T) \mid \mathbb{V}_1]$.

Since the network G can be treated as a population $G = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$, the subsampled network \mathbb{G}_b^* is uniquely determined by a random sample $\{\mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_b\}$. Thus, $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is a statistic based on \mathbb{G}_b^* , and is invariant of its permutation. Thus, $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is a finite population U-statistic by definition A.1. We next

present the following auxiliary lemma, whose proof is given in Section D.4.

Lemma D.9. *For any motifs R and R' ,*

$$\text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] = \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq - rr'}{n^2} X_S(G) \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Now we start to prove Proposition 2.

Proof of Proposition 2. We start by proving the results in part (a).

(a.i) We first show (26). From (D.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) &= E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid \mathbb{V}_1]] = E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid \mathbb{V}_1] - E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)], \\ g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) &= \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.13})$$

We focus on $h_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)$ first. Recall that \mathbb{G}_b^* denotes a random induced graph of G with node v and other $b-1$ random nodes drawn without replacement from $V(G) \setminus v$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid (\mathbb{V}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1) &= U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}) = \binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.1})}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, S \cong R\} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.14})$$

Next, we partition $\{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, S \cong R\}$ by $\{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, v_1 \notin V(S), S \cong R\}$ and $\{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\}$,

which leads to the decomposition of $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid (\mathbb{V}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid \mathbf{v}_1 &= \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, S \cong R\} \right| \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \left\{ \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, v_1 \notin V(S), S \cong R\} \right| + \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \right\} \\ &= \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \left\{ \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*} \setminus v_1, S \cong R\} \right| + \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.1})}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*} \setminus v_1) + \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \left| \{S : S \subset \mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*}, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \\ &\stackrel{(17)}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*} \setminus v_1) + \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v_1^{**}})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \\ &:= \text{I} + \text{II}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.15})$$

where $\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*} \setminus v_1$ is a randomly induced subsampled graph based on $b-1$ nodes that are randomly drawn without replacement from $V(G) \setminus v_1$. Let $G' = G \setminus v_1$ be the network after removing node v_1 and all edges involving v_1 from G . Then $\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*} \setminus v_1$ is essentially a randomly induced graph \mathbb{G}'_{b-1} . In

addition, we use $E_{*\setminus v_1}$ to indicate probability calculations with respect to other $b - 1$ random nodes without v_1 .

In (D.15), term I admits

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{*\setminus v_1}[\text{I}] &= E_{*\setminus v_1} \left[\binom{b}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*} \setminus v_1) \right] = \frac{b-r}{b} E_{*\setminus v_1} \left[\binom{b-1}{r}^{-1} X_R(\mathbb{G}_{b-1}^*) \right] \\
&= \frac{b-r}{b} E_{*\setminus v_1} \left[U_R(\mathbb{G}_{b-1}^*) \right] \stackrel{(21)}{=} \frac{b-r}{b} U_R(G') \\
&= \frac{b-r}{b} U_R(G \setminus v_1) \stackrel{(D.1)}{=} \frac{b-r}{b} \binom{n-1}{r}^{-1} X_R(G \setminus v_1) \\
&\stackrel{(D.1)}{=} \frac{b-r}{b} \binom{n-1}{r}^{-1} \left(\left| \{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\} \right| - \left| \{S : S \subset G, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \right) \\
&= \frac{b-r}{b} \binom{n-1}{r}^{-1} \left(X_R(G) - \left| \{S : S \subset G, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \right) \\
&\stackrel{(18)}{=} \frac{b-r}{b} \binom{n-1}{r}^{-1} \left(X_R(G) - \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For term II, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{*\setminus v_1}(\text{II}) &= E_{*\setminus v_1} \left[\binom{b}{r}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v_1^{**}})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] = \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{n-1}{b-1}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G}^* \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_b^{v_1^*})} \left(\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{b,r}^{v_1^{**}})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(19)}{=} \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{n-1}{b-1}^{-1} \binom{n-r}{b-r} \left| \{S : S \subset G, v_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\} \right| \\
&\stackrel{(18)}{=} \frac{r!(n-r)!}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting these two parts together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid \mathbf{v}_1] &= E_{*\setminus v_1}[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \mid \mathbf{v}_1] = E_{*\setminus v_1}[\text{I} + \text{II}] \\
&= \frac{b-r}{b} \binom{n-1}{r}^{-1} \left[X_R(G) - \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] + \frac{r!(n-r)!}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \\
&= \frac{(b-r)n}{b(n-r)} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(G) - \frac{(b-r)r!(n-r-1)}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \\
&\quad + \frac{(n-r)r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \\
&= \frac{(b-r)n}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) + \frac{r!(n-r-1)!(n-b)}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, (21) indicates that $E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = U_R(G)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) &\stackrel{\text{(D.13)}}{=} E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] | \mathbb{V}_1] = E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) | \mathbb{V}_1] - E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\
&= \frac{(b-r)n}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) + \frac{r!(n-r-1)!(n-b)}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - U_R(G) \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!(n-b)}{b(n-1)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{(n-b)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) \stackrel{\text{(D.13)}}{=} \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) = \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G).$$

The first term satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{(18)}}{=} \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \left[|\{S : S \subset G, \mathbb{V}_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\}| \right] \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \left[|\{S : S \subset G, S \cong R\}| - |\{S : S \subset G, \mathbb{V}_1 \notin V(S), S \cong R\}| \right] \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \left[X_R(G) - X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} X_R(G) - \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) &= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} X_R(G) - \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) - \frac{(n-1)r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-1)!} X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \\
&= \frac{(n-1)}{b} [U_R(G) - U_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1)],
\end{aligned} \tag{D.16}$$

which gives (26).

We now show $g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)$ has mean zero.

$$\begin{aligned}
E_*[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)] &= E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)] \\
&= E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}\left[\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G)\right] \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}\left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G})\right] - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{nb(n-2)!} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G})\right] - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) \tag{D.17} \\
&\stackrel{(20)}{=} \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{nb(n-2)!} r X_R(G) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{nb(n-2)!} \frac{rn!}{r!(n-r)!} U_R(G) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) \\
&= \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) - \frac{(n-1)r}{b(n-r)} U_R(G) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(a).ii Now we proceed to prove (27). We use $\text{var}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}$ and $\text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}$ to indicate probability calculations with respect to random \mathbb{V}_1 . Because the randomness in $\text{cov}_*[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)]$ is from the random node \mathbb{V}_1 , we have

$$\text{cov}_*[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] = \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)].$$

Thanks to Lemma D.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] &\stackrel{(26)}{=} \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}\left[\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G})\right] \\
&= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}\left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G})\right] \\
&\stackrel{(D.12)}{=} \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq - rr'}{n^2} X_S(G). \tag{D.18}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (27) follows. As a special case, $\text{var}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*}[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)] = \{[r!(n-r-1)!]/[b(n-2)!]\}^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(k)}} c_S (nk - r^2)n^{-2} X_S(G)\right]$.

(a).iii Now we continue to prove (28). Recall that the subscript in \mathbb{V}_i^* indicates the randomness from random node \mathbb{V}_i , and the subscripts in \mathbb{V}_i^* and \mathbb{V}_j^* indicate that the randomness are from random nodes \mathbb{V}_i and \mathbb{V}_j . Notice that $(n-1)rU_R(G)/b(n-r)$ and $(n-1)r'U_{R'}(G)/b(n-r')$ are two constants when

G is given. We first decompose the covariance by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i), \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^b \sum_{j=1}^b \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j} \left[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_j) \right] \\
(26) \quad & \stackrel{=}{=} \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{i=1}^b \sum_{j=1}^b \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
& = \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{i=1}^b \left\{ \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_i} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^b \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \right\} \\
& := \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{i=1}^b \left(\text{I}(i) + \text{II}(i) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.19}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{I}(i) & = \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
& = E_{\mathbb{V}_i} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - E_{\mathbb{V}_i} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] E_{\mathbb{V}_i} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
& = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^n \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{v_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{v_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
(20) \quad & \stackrel{=}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^n \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{v_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{v_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \frac{r X_R(G)}{n} \frac{r' X_{R'}(G)}{n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.20}$$

For part II(i), first we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
&= E_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - E_{\mathbb{V}_i} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] E_{\mathbb{V}_j^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
&= E_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_k^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right] \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_k^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
&\stackrel{(20)}{=} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{b=1, b \neq a}^n \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_b^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \left[\sum_{b=1, b \neq a}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_b^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \left[\sum_{b=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_b^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) - \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \left[r X(R', G) - \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] - \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2} \\
&= \frac{r X_{R'}(G)}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2} \\
&\stackrel{(20)}{=} \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2(n-1)} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}). \tag{D.21}
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(i) &= \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^b \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_j^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
&\stackrel{(D.21)}{=} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^b \left\{ \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2(n-1)} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right\} \\
&= (b-1) \left\{ \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2(n-1)} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By adding I(i) and II(i) following previous results, we have

$$I(i) + \Pi(i) = \frac{n-b}{n-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_a^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{r X_R(G) r' X_{R'}(G)}{n^2} \right\}$$

$$\stackrel{\text{(D.20)}}{=} \frac{n-b}{n-1} \text{cov} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right].$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cov}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i), \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] \stackrel{\text{(D.19)}}{=} \frac{r!(n-r-1)! r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)! b(n-2)!} \sum_{i=1}^b \left(\text{I}(i) + \text{II}(i) \right) \\ &= \frac{n-b}{n-1} \frac{r!(n-r-1)! r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)! b(n-2)!} \sum_{i=1}^b \text{cov} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_i^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\ &= \frac{b(n-b)}{n-1} \frac{r!(n-r-1)! r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)! b(n-2)!} \text{cov} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(26)}}{=} \frac{b(n-b)}{n-1} \text{cov}_* \left[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{D.22}$$

which gives (28).

(a).iv To show (29), we start by decomposing the variance.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{var}_* \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \stackrel{\text{(28)}}{=} \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* \left[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(27)}}{=} \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq-r^2}{n^2} X_S(G) \right] \\ &= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \right)^2 \left\{ \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \right] - \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r^2}{n^2} X_S(G) \right] \right\} \\ &= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r^2}{n^2} X_S(G) \right] \\ &= \text{I} - \text{II}. \end{aligned}$$

For term I, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S q}{n} \binom{n}{2r-q} U_S(G) \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S q}{n} \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-2} \binom{n}{2r-q} U_S(G) \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=1}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S q}{n} \left(\frac{(r-1)!(n-r)!}{(n-1)!} \right)^2 \frac{n!}{(2r-q)!(n-2r+q)} U_S(G) \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=1}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{q[(r-1)!]^2 c_S (n-r)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-2r+q+1)}{(2r-q)! (n-1)(n-2) \cdots (n-r+1)} U_S(G) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(n-r)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-2r+q+1)/(n-1)(n-2) \cdots (n-r+1)$ has $r-q$ items in the numerator and $r-1$ items in the denominator, and $U_S(G) < 1$ for all S . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left[\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \right]^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \right] \\
&= \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left[\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \right]^2 \sum_{q=1}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{q[(r-1)!]^2 c_S (n-r)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-2r+q+1)}{(2r-q)! (n-1)(n-2) \cdots (n-r+1)} U_S(G) \\
&= \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{b} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(1)}} \frac{c_S (r!)^2}{(2r-1)!} = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.23}$$

For term II,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r^2}{n^2} X_S(G) \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \frac{r}{n} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S X_S(G) \right] \stackrel{(10)}{=} \left(\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r}{n} \right)^2 X_R(G) X_R(G) \\
&= \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \right)^2 \binom{n}{r}^{-2} X_R(G) X_R(G) = \frac{(n-b)}{b(n-1)} \left(\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} U_R(G) \right)^2 \\
&\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned} \tag{D.24}$$

as $n, b \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $\lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right] = \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{I} - \text{II} = 0$, which gives (29).

Next, we continue to prove part (b) based on the results in part (a).

(b).i We can verify (30) similarly to (26). As $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is a symmetric finite population statistic, (D.11) implies that

$$h_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) = E_* \left[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \mid \mathbb{V}_1 \right]$$

and

$$g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) = \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1).$$

By the linearity of conditional expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) \\ \stackrel{\text{(D.11)}}{=} & \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) \\ = & \frac{n-1}{n-b} \left(E_* \left\{ U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \mid \mathbb{V}_1 \right\} \right) \\ = & \frac{n-1}{n-b} \left(E_* \left\{ U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \mid \mathbb{V}_1 \right\} + E_* \left\{ U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \mid \mathbb{V}_1 \right\} \right) \\ \stackrel{\text{(D.13)}}{=} & \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) + \frac{n-1}{n-b} h_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) \\ \stackrel{\text{(D.13)}}{=} & g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) + g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1). \end{aligned}$$

(b).ii (31) can be verified according to (28) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] = \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] \\ = & \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] + \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] + 2\text{cov}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i), \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] \\ \stackrel{\text{(28)}}{=} & \frac{b(n-b)}{n-1} \left\{ \text{var}_* [g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)] + \text{var}_* [g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] \right\} + 2\text{cov}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i), \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] \\ \stackrel{\text{(D.22)}}{=} & \frac{b(n-b)}{n-1} \left\{ \text{var}_* [g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)] + \text{var}_* [g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] + 2\text{cov}_* [g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] \right\} \\ = & \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* [g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)]. \end{aligned}$$

(b).iii Now we turn to prove (32). First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{var}_* \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \stackrel{\text{(28)}}{=} \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* [g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] \\ = & \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* [g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1)] + \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* [g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] + \frac{2b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{cov}_* [g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] \\ \stackrel{\text{(28)}}{=} & \text{var}_* \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \text{var}_* \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \frac{2b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{cov}_* [g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1)] \\ = & \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}. \end{aligned}$$

For terms I and II, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{I} &\stackrel{\text{(D.23)}}{=} 0 \\ \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{II} &\stackrel{\text{(D.24)}}{=} 0. \end{aligned} \tag{D.25}$$

We next focus on the behavior of term III.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{III} &= \text{cov}_* \left[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right] = \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1} \left[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1), g_{1,R'}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\ &= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \text{cov} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(D.18)}}{=} \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq - rr'}{n^2} X_S(G) \\ &= \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \left\{ \left[\sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \right] - \frac{rr'}{n^2} X_R(G) X_{R'}(G) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \\ &\quad - \frac{rr'(n-1)(n-1)}{b^2(n-r)(n-r')} U_R(G) U_{R'}(G) \end{aligned}$$

As $U_R(G)U_{R'}(G) \leq 1$, we have

$$\lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{rr'(n-1)(n-1)}{b^2(n-r)(n-r')} U_R(G) U_{R'}(G) = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{q}{n} X_S(G) \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{q}{n} \binom{n}{r+r'-q} U_S(G) \\ &= \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{r'!(n-r'-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \frac{q}{n} \frac{n!}{(r+r'-q)!(n-r-r'+q)!} U_S(G) \\ &= \sum_{q=1}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{qr!r'}{b^2(r+r'-q)!} \frac{(n-1)(n-r'-1) \cdots (n-r'-r+q+1)}{(n-2)(n-3) \cdots (n-r)} U_S(G) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(n-1)(n-r'-1)\cdots(n-r'-r+q+1)/(n-2)(n-3)\cdots(n-r)$ has $r-q$ items in the numerator and $r-1$ items in the denominator, and $U_S(G) \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{RR'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{r!(n-r-1)! r'!(n-r'-1)! q}{b(n-2)! b(n-2)! n} X_S(G) \\ n \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} \infty & \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{RR'}^{(1)}} c_S \frac{r! r'}{b^2(r+r'-1)!} U_S(G) b \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} \infty 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R,R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] = \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} \stackrel{\text{(D.25)}}{=} \lim_{b,n \rightarrow \infty} \text{III} = 0,$$

leading to (32). □

D.4 Proof of Lemma D.9

Proof. To begin with, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\ & \stackrel{\text{(18)}}{=} \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[|\{S : S \subset G, \mathbb{V}_1 \in V(S), S \cong R\}|, |\{S : S \subset G, \mathbb{V}_1 \in V(S), S \cong R'\}| \right] \\ & \stackrel{\text{(D.15)}}{=} \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G) - X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1), X_{R'}(G) - X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\ & = \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1), X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\ & = E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] - E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] E \left[X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[X_R(G \setminus v_i) X_{R'}(G \setminus v_i) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(10)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S X_S(G \setminus v_i) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S \sum_{i=1}^n X_S(G \setminus v_i) \\
& = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S \sum_{i=1}^n \left[X_S(G) - |\{H : H \subset G, v_i \in V(H), H \cong S\}| \right] \\
& = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S \sum_{i=1}^n X_S(G) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{H}_{R,R'}} c_S \sum_{i=1}^n |\{H : H \subset G, v_i \in V(H), H \cong S\}| \\
& \stackrel{(20)}{=} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S X_S(G) - \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S \frac{s}{n} X_S(G).
\end{aligned}$$

Regarding the second component, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_R(G \setminus v_i) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{R'}(G \setminus v_i) \\
& \stackrel{(D.15)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_R(G) - |\{S : S \subset G, v_i \in V(S), S \cong R\}| \right) \right] \cdot \\
& \quad \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(X_{R'}(G) - |\{S : S \subset G, v_i \in V(S), S \cong R'\}| \right) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(20)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \left[n X_R(G) - r X_R(G) \right] \frac{1}{n} \left[n X_{R'}(G) - r' X_{R'}(G) \right] \\
& = \frac{(n-r)}{n} \frac{(n-r')}{n} X_R(G) X_{R'}(G) = \left(1 - \frac{r+r'}{n} + \frac{rr'}{n^2} \right) X_R(G) X_{R'}(G) \\
& \stackrel{(10)}{=} \left(1 - \frac{r+r'}{n} + \frac{rr'}{n^2} \right) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S X_S(G).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}), \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_{r'}^{\mathbb{V}_1^*})} X_{R'}(\mathcal{G}) \right] \\
& = E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] - E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_R(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] E_{\mathbb{V}_1^*} \left[X_{R'}(G \setminus \mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(10)}{=} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S X_S(G) - \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S \frac{s}{n} X_S(G) - \left(1 - \frac{r+r'}{n} + \frac{rr'}{n^2} \right) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} c_S X_S(G) \\
& = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}} \left(\frac{r+r'-s}{n} - \frac{rr'}{n^2} \right) c_S X_S(G) = \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq-rr'}{n^2} X_S(G).
\end{aligned}$$



E Proofs for Results in Section A.4

E.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We start by introducing the setup of finite population asymptotic described in [Bloznelis and Götze \[2001\]](#): Suppose that there exist a sequence of finite populations $\{\mathcal{V}^{(n)}\}$, where $\mathcal{V}^{(n)} = \{\mathbf{v}_1 \cdots \mathbf{v}_n\}$ with $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, $\{T_n\}$ is a sequence of finite population U-statistics, where $T_n = t_n(\mathbb{V}_1, \cdots, \mathbb{V}_{b_n})$ is based on samples $\{\mathbb{V}_1, \cdots, \mathbb{V}_{b_n}\}$ drawn without replacement from $\mathcal{V}^{(n)}$, with $b_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We first present a few auxiliary lemmas. Proofs for Lemmas [D.13](#) and [D.14](#) are deferred to Sections [E.2](#) and [E.3](#), respectively.

Lemma D.10. (*Proposition 3 in [Bloznelis and Götze \[2001\]](#)*) *The Hoeffding's decomposition of T_n is*

$$T_n = E_*[T_n] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b_n} T_{1,n}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \Delta(T_n),$$

where $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b_n} T_{1,n}(\mathbb{V}_i)$ is the linear term, and $\Delta(T_n)$ is the remainder. Suppose that

- 1) $E_*\Delta^2(T_n) = o(1)$.
- 2) There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $0 < c_1 \leq \text{var}_*(T_n) \leq c_2 < \infty$,
- 3) For every $\epsilon > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n E_*[T_{1,n}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{1,n}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) > \epsilon\}}] = 0$.

Then $(T_n - E_*T_n)/(\text{var}_*(T_n))$ is asymptotically standard normal. Note that the subscript $*$ is not used in [Bloznelis and Götze \[2001\]](#), and we add it here to distinguish the source of randomness.

Lemma D.11 ([Bloznelis and Götze \[2002\]](#)). *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} T &= E_*T + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_1(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq b} g_2(\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j) + \cdots \\ &= E_*T + S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{D.26}$$

be the Hoeffding's decomposition for a general finite population U-statistic T . Then we have

$$E_*[S_a S_b] = 0, \quad \text{if } a \neq b. \tag{D.27}$$

Lemma D.12 (Theorem 1 of [Bickel et al. \[2011\]](#)). *Let $\iint w^2(u, v) dudv < \infty$.*

- a) *If $(n-1)\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_n}}{\rho_n} &\rightarrow 1 \text{ in probability,} \\ \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_n}}{\rho_n} - 1 \right) &\rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \text{ in distribution,} \end{aligned} \tag{D.28}$$

for some $\sigma^2 > 0$.

- b) *For any motif R , assume that $\iint w^{2r}(u, v) dudv < \infty$, also $\rho_n = \omega(n^{-1})$ if R is acyclic and $\rho_n = \omega(n^{-2/r})$ otherwise. Then*

$$\sqrt{n} \left[\rho_n^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) - \rho_n^{-r} E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] \right] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_R^2) \text{ in distribution} \tag{D.29}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_n}^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) &\rightarrow \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] \text{ in probability} \\ \sqrt{n} \left[\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_n}^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) - \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} E[U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)] \right] &\rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_R^2) \text{ in distribution,} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.30})$$

where σ_R^2 is defined in Assumption 3.

c) More generally, for m motifs R_1, \dots, R_m with sizes $\max\{r_1, \dots, r_m\} \leq r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \left[\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_n}^{-\mathfrak{r}_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_n), \dots, \widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_n}^{-\mathfrak{r}_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_n) \right] - \left[\rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}_1} E[U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_n)], \dots, \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}_m} E[U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_n)] \right] \right\} \\ \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(\mathbf{R})) \text{ in distribution,} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.31})$$

Lemma D.13. Consider two motifs R and R' with $\max\{r, r'\} \leq r_1$ and $\max\{\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{r}'\} \leq \mathfrak{r}_1$. With r and \mathfrak{r} replaced by r_1 and \mathfrak{r}_1 , Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then with probability one,

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-(\mathfrak{r}+\mathfrak{r}')} \text{cov}_* [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \sqrt{b} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_b^{-(\mathfrak{r}+\mathfrak{r}')} \text{cov} [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b), \sqrt{b} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)].$$

Lemma D.14. For any motif R , under Assumptions 1, with probability one,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) = \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_w(R). \quad (\text{D.32})$$

Now we proceed to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. We start with part (a), and will prove the results one by one. For notational simplicity, we write $G = G^{(n)}$, $b = b_n$.

(a).i Since $U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is a finite population U-statistic, $\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$ is also a finite population U-statistic. (33) can be obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) &\stackrel{(25)}{=} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} \left\{ E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq b} g_{2,R}(\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j) + \dots \right\} \\ &= \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} \left\{ E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right\} + \Delta[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &= E_*[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \Delta[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &\stackrel{(21)}{=} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(G) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \Delta[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.33})$$

(a).ii Proof of (34): To begin with, we have

$$E_* \left(\left\{ \Delta[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right\} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{r}} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right\} \right) \stackrel{(\text{D.27})}{=} 0. \quad (\text{D.34})$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_* \left[\Delta^2 [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right] \stackrel{(33)}{=} E_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right]^2 \\
& = E_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right]^2 + E_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right]^2 \\
& \quad - 2 E_* \left[\left(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_* [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right) \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(33)}{=} \text{var}_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] + E_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right]^2 \\
& \quad - 2 E_* \left[\left(\Delta [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right) \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(D.34)}{=} \text{var}_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] - E_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right]^2 \\
& \stackrel{(D.17)}{=} \text{var}_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] - \text{var}_* \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] = \text{I} - \text{II}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.35}$$

Term I is the variance of the network moment. For the convenience of later analysis, we study the more general covariance term here for any two motifs R and R' .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] = b \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \text{cov}_* \left[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] \\
& \stackrel{(22)}{=} b \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \left\{ \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} U_S(G) - U_R(G) U_{R'}(G) \right\} \\
& = b \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \left\{ \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} U_S(G) - \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} X_R(G) X_{R'}(G) \right\} \\
& \stackrel{(10)}{=} b \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \left\{ \binom{b}{r}^{-1} \binom{b}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{b}{s} U_S(G) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \binom{n}{r'}^{-1} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} c_S \binom{n}{s} U_S(G) \right\} \\
& = \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r'}{s! \rho_n^{\tau+\tau'}} \left(\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!} - \frac{b(n-r)!(n-r')!}{n!(n-s)!} \right) U_S(G) \\
& = \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r,r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r'}{s! \rho_n^{\tau+\tau'}} \left(\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')! n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-s)! n!(n-s)!} \right) U_S(G).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.36}$$

As a special case of $R = R'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= \text{var}_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r!}{s! \rho_n^{2\tau}} \left(\frac{(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \right) U_S(G). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.37})$$

For term II, based on Proposition 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}_* \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} \sum g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] &= b \rho_n^{-2\tau} \text{var}_* \left[\sum g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \right] \stackrel{(\text{D.28})}{=} \rho_n^{-2\tau} b \frac{b(n-b)}{(n-1)} \text{var}_* \left[g_{1,R}(\mathbb{V}_1) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.27})}{=} \rho_n^{-2\tau} \frac{b^2(n-b)}{(n-1)} \left[\frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{b(n-2)!} \right]^2 \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{nq - r^2}{n^2} X_S(G) \\ &= \rho_n^{-2\tau} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} c_S \frac{b^2(n-b)}{(n-1)} \frac{r!(n-r-1)!r!(n-r-1)!}{b^2(n-2)!(n-2)!} \frac{(nq - r^2)}{n^2} \frac{n!}{(2r-q)!(n-2r+q)!} U_S(G) \\ &= \rho_n^{-2\tau} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r!}{(2r-q)!} \left[\frac{n-b}{n-1} \frac{n(n-1)}{n^2} \frac{(n-r-1) \cdots (n-2r+q+1)}{(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} (nq - r^2) \right] U_S(G) \\ &= \rho_n^{-2\tau} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r!}{(2r-q)!} \left[\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-2r+q+1)(nq - r^2)}{n(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} \right] U_S(G) \\ &= \rho_n^{-2\tau} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r!}{s!} \left[\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-s+1)(nq - r^2)}{n(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} \right] U_S(G). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by combining term I and term II, we have

$$E_* \left\{ \Delta^2 \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \right] \right\} \stackrel{(\text{D.35})}{=} \text{I} - \text{II} = \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} a_S y_{n,S} z_{n,S}, \quad (\text{D.38})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_S &= \frac{c_S r! r!}{s}, \\ y_{n,S} &= \left[\frac{(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(n-b)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-s+1)(nq - r^2)}{n(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} \right], \\ z_{n,S} &= \rho_n^{-2\tau} U_S(G). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.39})$$

For a given S , a_s is a fixed quantity. Now we focus on the limiting behavior of $y_{n,S} z_{n,S}$ for different numbers of the merged nodes q .

- When $q = 0$, we have $s = 2r$ and $s = 2r$. We start with the first part of $y_{n,S}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \\
&= \frac{[n \cdots (n-r+1)(b-r) \cdots (b-2r+1)] - [b \cdots (b-r+1)(n-r) \cdots (n-2r+1)]}{(b-1) \cdots (b-r+1)n \cdots (n-r+1)} \\
&= \frac{\text{IV} - \text{V}}{\text{VI}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we study each component as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IV} &= b^r n^r - (r+r+1 + \cdots + r+r-1)b^{r-1}n^r - [1+2+\cdots+(r-1)]b^r n^{r-1} \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) + o(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) \\
&= b^r n^r - \frac{(r+2r-1)r}{2} b^{r-1}n^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} b^r n^{r-1} \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) + o(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}). \\
\text{V} &= b^r n^r - (r+r+1 + \cdots + r+r-1)n^{r-1}b^r - [1+2+\cdots+(r-1)]n^r b^{r-1} \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) + o(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) \\
&= b^r n^r - \frac{(r+2r-1)r}{2} n^{r-1}b^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} n^r b^{r-1} \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) + o(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IV} - \text{V} &= b^r n^r - \frac{(r+2r-1)r}{2} b^{r-1}n^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} b^r n^{r-1} \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) \\
&\quad - \left[b^r n^r - \frac{(r+2r-1)r}{2} n^{r-1}b^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} n^r b^{r-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) \right] \\
&= \frac{-(r+2r-1)r}{2} n^{r-1}b^{r-1}(n-b) + \frac{(r-1)r}{2} n^{r-1}b^{r-1}(n-b) \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(n^{r-2}b^r) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}) \\
&= (-r^2)n^{r-1}b^{r-1}(n-b) + O(b^{r-2}n^r) + O(n^{r-2}b^r) + O(b^{r-1}n^{r-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{VI} &= b^{r-1}n^r + o(b^{r-1}n^r). \\
\frac{\text{IV} - \text{V}}{\text{VI}} &= (-r^2) \frac{n-b}{n} + o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.40}$$

For the second part of $y_{n,S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-s+1)(nq-r^2)}{n(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} \right] \\
&= \left[\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1)(n-r-2) \cdots (n-2r+1)(0-r^2)}{n(n-2)(n-3) \cdots (n-r)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left[\left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{r+1}{n-2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{r+1}{n-3}\right) \cdots \left(1 - \frac{r+1}{n-r}\right) (-r^2) \right] \\
&= -r^2 \left[\frac{n-b}{n} + o(1) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$y_{n,S} = (-r^2) \frac{n-b}{n} + o(1) - (-r^2) \frac{n-b}{n} + o(1) = o(1).$$

To understand $z_{n,S}$, recall that $G \sim \mathbb{G}_n$. Lemma D.14 implies that under Assumption 1, with probability one,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-s} U_S(\mathbb{G}_n) = \frac{s!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S).$$

Thus, we assert that $y_{n,S} z_{n,S} \rightarrow 0$ with probability one.

- When $q = 1$, we have $\mathfrak{s} = 2r$ and $s = 2r - 1$. As before, we study the first part of $y_{n,S}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{[(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!]}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \\
&= \frac{[(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-2r+1)! - b!(b-2r+1)!(n-r)!(n-r)!]}{(b-1)!(b-2r+1)!n!(n-2r+1)!} = 1 - \frac{b}{n} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

For the second part of $y_{n,S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-s+1)(nq-r^2)}{n(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} \right] \\
&= \left[\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1)(n-r-2) \cdots (n-2r+2)(n-r^2)}{n(n-2)(n-3) \cdots (n-r)} \right] \\
&= 1 - \frac{b}{n} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when $q = 1$, we have $y_{n,S} = o(1)$. Thus, we also have $y_{n,S} z_{n,S} \rightarrow 0$ with probability one.

- When $q > 1$, the first part of $y_{n,S}$ is

$$\frac{[(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!]}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} = O\left[\frac{1}{b^{(q-1)}}\right].$$

The second part of $y_{n,S}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(n-b)(n-r-1) \cdots (n-s+1)(nq-r^2)}{n(n-2) \cdots (n-r)} \\
&= \frac{(n-b)(n-r-1)(n-r-2) \cdots (n-2r+q+1)(nq-r^2)}{n(n-2)(n-3) \cdots (n-r)} \\
&= O\left[\frac{(n-b)}{n^q}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $y_{n,s} = o(1)$. We have $y_{n,S} z_{n,S} \rightarrow 0$ for every $q \geq 2$.

Finally, because r is a constant and $\mathcal{S}_{R,R}$ is a fixed set given R . For any random network sequence

$\{G^{(n)}\}$, with probability one,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_* \{ \Delta^2 [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-2\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{q=0}^r \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R}^{(q)}} a_S y_{n,s} z_{n,s} = 0.$$

(a).iii Now we want to show (35), which is related to non-degeneration, and is termed as the non-lattice assumption in Zhang and Xia [2022]. From Lemma D.13, under Assumptions 1 and 2, with probability one,

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-2\tau} \text{var}_* [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_b^{-2\tau} \text{var} [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b)].$$

Since $c_2 < 1$ is a constant, (35) holds by Assumption 3.

(a).iv Next, we want to show (36), the Lindeberg-Feller typed condition. To verify this, We want to show that

$$b \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) = o(1).$$

Let's begin by considering the following expression:

$$b \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \stackrel{(26)}{=} \frac{\rho_n^{-2\tau}}{b} \left\{ \frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) - \frac{(n-1)r}{(n-r)} U_R(G) \right\}^2. \quad (\text{D.41})$$

Recall that K_r denotes a complete graph of r nodes. Clearly, for any $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})$,

$$X_R(\mathcal{G}) \leq X_R(K_r).$$

Equation (2.7) in Bhattacharya et al. [2022] shows that $X_R(K_r) = r! / |\text{Aut}(R)|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{r!(n-r-1)!}{(n-2)!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) = \frac{r(n-r)}{(n-1)} \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \\ & \leq \frac{r(n-r)}{(n-1)} \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})} \left(\frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{R \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \\ & = \frac{r(n-r)}{(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \right) \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})} \mathbb{1}_{\{R \subset \mathcal{G}\}} \leq \frac{r(n-r)}{(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.42})$$

By (D.41),

$$\begin{aligned} b \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) & \stackrel{(\text{D.41})}{\leq} \frac{\rho_n^{-2\tau}}{b} \left\{ \left[\frac{r(n-1)}{(n-r)} \binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{G}_r^{V_1^*})} X_R(\mathcal{G}) \right]^2 + \left[\frac{(n-1)r}{(n-r)} U_R(G) \right]^2 \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(\text{D.42})}{\leq} \frac{\rho_n^{-2\tau}}{b} \left\{ \left[\frac{r(n-r)}{(n-1)} \left(\frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \right) \right]^2 + \left[\frac{(n-1)r}{(n-r)} U_R(G) \right]^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given that both r and $|\text{Aut}(R)|$ are constants, and considering $U_R(G) \leq 1$, it follows that if $\rho_n^{-2\tau}/b \rightarrow$

0, then for any given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $K > 0$ such that when $k > K$,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{b\rho_n^{-2\tau}g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) > \epsilon\}} = 0. \quad (\text{D.43})$$

The above arguments indicate

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} bE_* [b\rho_n^{-2\tau}g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{b\rho_n^{-2\tau}g_{1,R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) > \epsilon\}}] = 0.$$

(a).v To prove (37), recall that (5) implies $E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = U_R(G)$. When (34), (35), and (36) hold, Lemma D.10 implies that

$$\frac{\sqrt{b}[\rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(G^{(n)})]}{\text{var}_*(\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*))}$$

is asymptotically standard normal.

Now we proceed to prove Part (b). Give the m motifs, R_1, \dots, R_m be m , consider the following linear combination

$$\Theta_{R_1, \dots, R_m}^{(a_1, \dots, a_m)} = a_1\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau_1}U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \dots + a_m\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau_m}U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$$

where a_1, \dots, a_m are constants. For simplicity, denote $\Theta = \Theta_{R_1, \dots, R_m}^{(a_1, \dots, a_m)}$, which is a symmetric finite population statistic with Hoeffding's decomposition

$$\Theta = E_*(\Theta) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,\Theta}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \Delta(\Theta).$$

We want to show that every linear combination Θ is asymptotically normal. Following Lemma D.10, we need to verify the following conditions:

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} E_*\Delta^2(\Theta) = 0, \quad \text{where } \Delta(\Theta) = \Theta - E_*(\Theta) - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,\Theta}(\mathbb{V}_i). \quad (\text{D.44})$$

$$0 < c_1 \leq \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_*(\Theta) \leq c_2 < \infty, \quad \text{for some } c_1, c_2 > 0. \quad (\text{D.45})$$

$$\text{For every } \epsilon > 0 \quad \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} bE_* [g_{1,\Theta}^2(\mathbb{V}_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{g_{1,\Theta}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) > \epsilon\}}] = 0. \quad (\text{D.46})$$

(b).i To show (D.44), we first consider a special case that we have only a pair of motifs R and R' whose linear combination is defined by two coefficients α and β . In this case,

$$\Theta = \Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)} = \alpha\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \beta\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau'}U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*). \quad (\text{D.47})$$

The Hoeffding's decomposition of $\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}$ can be expressed as follows

$$\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)} = E_*(\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1,\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq b} g_{2,\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_i, \mathbb{V}_j) + \dots \quad (\text{D.48})$$

The Proposition 2 implies

$$E_*(\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}) = \alpha\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau}E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \beta\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau'}E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)], \quad (\text{D.49})$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_i) \stackrel{(30)}{=} \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R'}(\mathbb{V}_i), \quad (\text{D.50})$$

where $g_{1, R}(\mathbb{V}_i)$ and $g_{1, R'}(\mathbb{V}_i)$ are defined in (26). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta[\Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}] &= \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)} - E_*[\Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}] - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_i) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.47})}{=} \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - E_*[\Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}] - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_i) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.49})}{=} \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \\ &\quad - \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_i) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.50})}{=} \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) \\ &\quad - \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &\quad - \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R}(\mathbb{V}_i) - \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \\ &= \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} E_*[U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R}(\mathbb{V}_i) \\ &\quad + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} E_*[U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R'}(\mathbb{V}_i) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{D.33})}{=} \alpha \Delta(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)) + \beta \Delta(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.51})$$

Consequently,

$$E_*[\Delta^2(\Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)})] \stackrel{(\text{D.51})}{\leq} 2E_*[\alpha \Delta(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*))]^2 + 2E_*[\beta \Delta(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*))]^2.$$

From (34), under Assumptions 1-3, we have

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} E_*[\Delta^2(\Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)})] \leq \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} 2E_*[\alpha \Delta(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*))]^2 + \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} 2E_*[\beta \Delta(\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*))]^2 = 0.$$

More generally, for m motifs, we have

$$E_*[\Theta] = a_1 E_*[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \cdots + a_m E_*[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]. \quad (\text{D.52})$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, \Theta}(\mathbb{V}_i) \stackrel{(\text{D.50})}{=} a_1 \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_1} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R_1}(\mathbb{V}_i) + \cdots + a_m \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_m} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq b} g_{1, R_m}(\mathbb{V}_i). \quad (\text{D.53})$$

Similar to the derivation of (D.51), we have:

$$\Delta(\Theta) = a_1 \Delta[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \cdots + a_m \Delta[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)].$$

Thus, the accuracy of approximation of the linear part could be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} E_* \Delta^2(\Theta) &\leq m \left\{ a_1^2 \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} E_* \Delta^2[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots + a_m^2 \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} E_* \Delta^2[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \right\} \stackrel{(34)}{=} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.54})$$

(b).ii Now we prove (D.45). Again, we first consider the case of a pair of motifs R, R' to illustrate the procedure.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}_*[\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}] &= \text{var}_*[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &= \alpha^2 \text{var}_*[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] + \beta^2 \text{var}_*[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &\quad + 2\alpha\beta \text{Cov}_*[\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.55})$$

By Lemma D.13, under Assumptions 1 and 2, with probability one,

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_*[\Theta_{R,R'}^{(\alpha,\beta)}] = (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)]. \quad (\text{D.56})$$

Therefore, for any sequence of networks, condition in (D.45) holds with probability one if

$$0 < c_1 \leq \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)] \leq c_2 < \infty. \quad (\text{D.57})$$

Now we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_R^2 &= \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b)], \\ \tilde{\sigma}_{R'}^2 &= \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)], \\ \tilde{\sigma}_{R,R'} &= \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{cov}[\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b), \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)], \end{aligned}$$

and recall that Proposition 1 implies that $\tilde{\sigma}_R^2$, $\tilde{\sigma}_{R'}^2$, and $\tilde{\sigma}_{R,R'}^2$ are the constants if $b \rho_b^{\max\{r,r'\}/2} \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)] &= \tilde{\sigma}_R^2 \alpha^2 + 2\tilde{\sigma}_{R,R'} \alpha \beta + \tilde{\sigma}_{R'}^2 \beta^2 \\ &= \beta^2 \left[\tilde{\sigma}_R^2 \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2} + 2\tilde{\sigma}_{R,R'} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \tilde{\sigma}_{R'}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma D.12 implies that $(\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b), \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b))$ converges in distribution to a bivariate Gaussian distribution and Assumption 3 implies that: $\tilde{\sigma}_{R,R'} < \sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}_R \tilde{\sigma}_{R'}}$.

Therefore, $\beta^2 \left[\tilde{\sigma}_R^2 \frac{\alpha^2}{\beta^2} + 2\tilde{\sigma}_{R,R'} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \tilde{\sigma}_{R'}^2 \right]$ has no real root, leading to

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)] > 0,$$

which is satisfied by letting $c_1 = 1/2 \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-r'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)]$. On the other

hand, we set the upper bound $c_2 = \max\{4\alpha^2\tilde{\sigma}_R^2, 4\beta^2\tilde{\sigma}_{R'}^2\}$ based on

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var} \left[\alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b) \right] \\ & \leq 4 \max \left\{ \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \alpha^2 \text{var} \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) \right], \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \beta^2 \text{var} \left[\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (D.45) is verified.

More generally, for m motifs, Proposition D.13 indicates

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_* [\Theta] = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var} \left[a_1 \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b) + \cdots + a_m \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b) \right] \quad (\text{D.58})$$

with probability one. From Lemma D.12, we have

$$\left(a_1 \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b), \cdots, a_m \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma(\mathbf{R})).$$

Let q be a $1 \times m$ vector with all elements equal to one, with the positive definiteness of $\Sigma(\mathbf{R})$, we have:

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var} \left[a_1 \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b) + \cdots + a_m \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b) \right] = q \Sigma(\mathbf{R}) q^\top > 0.$$

Hence, the non-lattice condition in Equation (D.45) holds by setting

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var} \left[a_1 \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b) + \cdots + a_m \sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b) \right]$$

and $c_2 = \max\{m a_1^2 \tilde{\sigma}_{R_1}^2, \cdots, m a_m^2 \tilde{\sigma}_{R_m}^2\}$.

(b).iii To show (D.46), first consider two motifs R and R' , so that

$$g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}(\mathbb{V}_1) \stackrel{(\text{D.53})}{=} \alpha \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} g_{1, R}(\mathbb{V}_1) + \beta \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} g_{1, R'}(\mathbb{V}_1).$$

We have, with probability one

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \leq 2 \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \alpha^2 b \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1, R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) + 2 \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \beta^2 b \rho_n^{-2\tau'} g_{1, R'}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \stackrel{(\text{D.43})}{=} 0.$$

Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large N and B such that for any $n > N$ and $b > B$, with probability one $\mathbb{1}_{\{g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}^2 > \epsilon\}} = 0$. Hence, with probability one,

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} b E_* \left[g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \mathbb{1}_{\{g_{1, \Theta_{R, R'}^{(\alpha, \beta)}}^2 > \epsilon\}} \right] = 0. \quad (\text{D.59})$$

For m motifs, condition in Equation (D.46) also holds as

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} g_{1, \Theta}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \stackrel{(\text{D.53})}{\leq} m \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} a_1^2 b \rho_n^{-2\tau} g_{1, R}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) + \cdots + m \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} a_m^2 b \rho_n^{-2\tau'} g_{1, R'}^2(\mathbb{V}_1) \stackrel{(\text{D.43})}{=} 0.$$

Lemma D.10 thus indicates the asymptotic normality of $a_1 \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*) + \cdots + a_m \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)$.

Finally, note that the above argument is for any arbitrary linear combination, by Corollary 4.6.9 of Casella and Berger [2024], we have

$$\sqrt{b} \left\{ [\rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \dots, \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - [\rho_n^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(G), \dots, \rho_n^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(G)] \right\} \\ \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[0, \Sigma(*\mathbf{R})] \text{ in distribution.}$$

□

E.2 Proof of Lemma D.13

Proof. The following result has been developed in (D.36).

$$\text{cov}_* [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau'} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ \stackrel{\text{(D.36)}}{=} \sum_{q=0}^{\min\{r, r'\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R, R'}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r'!}{s! \rho_n^{\tau + \tau'}} \left[\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \right] U_S(G).$$

Notice c_S , $r!$, $r'!$ are fixed quantities, while we have to study the limiting behaviors for other quantities under different values of q .

- When $q = 0$, we have $s = \tau + \tau'$ and $s = r + r'$. Thus,

$$\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \\ = \frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-r-r')! - b!(b-r-r')!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-r-r')!n!(n-r-r')!} \\ = \frac{n \cdots (n-r+1)(b-r') \cdots (b-r-r'+1) - b(b-1) \cdots (b-r+1)(n-r') \cdots (n-r-r'+1)}{(b-1) \cdots (b-r+1)n(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1)} \\ = \frac{\text{IV} - \text{V}}{\text{VI}}.$$

Similar to (D.40), Now we study each component as follows:

$$\text{IV} = b^r n^r - (r' + r' + 1 + \cdots + r' + r - 1) b^{r-1} n^r - [1 + 2 + \cdots + (r-1)] b^r n^{r-1} \\ + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}) \\ = b^r n^r - \frac{(r + 2r' - 1)r}{2} b^{r-1} n^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} b^r n^{r-1} \\ + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}). \\ \text{V} = b^r n^r - (r + r + 1 + \cdots + r + r - 1) n^{r-1} b^r - [1 + 2 + \cdots + (r-1)] n^r b^{r-1} \\ + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}) \\ = b^r n^r - \frac{(r + 2r' - 1)r}{2} n^{r-1} b^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} n^r b^{r-1} \\ + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IV} - \text{V} &= b^r n^r - \frac{(r+2r-1)r}{2} b^{r-1} n^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} b^r n^{r-1} \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}) \\
&\quad - \left[b^r n^r - \frac{(r+2r'-1)r}{2} n^{r-1} b^r - \frac{(r-1)r}{2} n^r b^{r-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(b^r n^{r-2}) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}) \right] \\
&= \frac{-(r+2r'-1)r}{2} n^{r-1} b^{r-1} (n-b) + \frac{(r-1)r}{2} n^{r-1} b^{r-1} (n-b) \\
&\quad + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(n^{r-2} b^r) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}) \\
&= (-rr') n^{r-1} b^{r-1} (n-b) + O(b^{r-2} n^r) + O(n^{r-2} b^r) + O(b^{r-1} n^{r-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\frac{\text{IV} - \text{V}}{\text{VI}} = (-rr') \frac{n-b}{n} + o(1),$$

and by Assumption 2,

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{IV} - \text{V}}{\text{VI}} = (-rr')(1 - c_2). \quad (\text{D.60})$$

On the other hand, since $\rho_n^{\tau+\tau'} = \rho_n^{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \rho_n^{2\tau_1}$, by Lemma D.14.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{c_S r! r'!}{s! \rho_n^{\tau+\tau'}} \left(\frac{\text{IV} - \text{V}}{\text{VI}} \right) U_S(G) &\stackrel{(\text{D.40})}{=} (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{-c_S r! r'! r r'}{s!} \rho_n^{-\mathfrak{s}} U_S(G) \\
&\stackrel{(\text{D.32})}{=} (1 - c_2) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{-c_S r! r'! r r'}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S).
\end{aligned}$$

- When $q = 1$, we have $\mathfrak{s} = \tau + \tau'$ and $s = r + r' - 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \\
&= \frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-r-r'+1)! - b!(b-r-r'+1)!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-r-r'+1)!n!(n-r-r'+1)!} \\
&= 1 - \frac{b}{n} + o(1).
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.61})$$

Since $\rho_n^{\tau+\tau'} = \rho_n^{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \rho_n^{2\tau_1}$, by Assumption 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(1)}} \frac{c_S r! r'!}{s! \rho_n^{\mathfrak{s}}} \left[\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r')!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \right] U_S(G) \\
&\stackrel{(\text{D.61})}{=} (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(1)}} \frac{c_S r! r'!}{s! \rho_n^{\mathfrak{s}}} U_S(G) \stackrel{(\text{D.32})}{=} (1 - c_2) \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(1)}} c_S \frac{r! r'!}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S).
\end{aligned}$$

- When $q > 1$, we have

$$\frac{[(b-r)!(b-r)!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!]}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} = O\left(\frac{1}{b^{(q-1)}}\right).$$

In addition, since $\rho_n^{(s-\tau-\tau')}$ is at most $O(\rho_n^{-(q-1)q/2})$ and $\rho_n^{q/2}b \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r'}{s! \rho_n^{\tau+\tau'}} \left[\frac{(b-r)!(b-r')!n!(n-s)! - b!(b-s)!(n-r)!(n-r)!}{(b-1)!(b-s)!n!(n-s)!} \right] U_S(G) \\ &= \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r'}{s! \rho_n^{\tau+\tau'-s}} O\left(\frac{1}{b^{(q-1)}}\right) \rho_n^{-s} U_S(G) = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(q)}} \frac{c_S r! r'}{s!} O\left(\frac{1}{b \rho_n^{q/2}}\right)^{(q-1)} \rho_n^{-s} U_S(G) \stackrel{\text{(D.32)}}{=} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability one,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-(\tau+\tau')} \text{cov}_* [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \sqrt{b} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] \\ &= (1 - c_2) \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(1)}} c_S \frac{r! r'}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S) - \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{R,R'}^{(0)}} \frac{c_S r! r' r r'}{|\text{Aut}(S)|} P_w(S) \right] \\ &= (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \rho_b^{-(\tau+\tau')} \text{cov} [\sqrt{b} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b), \sqrt{b} U_{R'}(\mathbb{G}_b)]. \end{aligned}$$

As a special, we have

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_* [\sqrt{b} \rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] = (1 - c_2) \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var} [\sqrt{b} \rho_b^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_b)] \quad (\text{D.62})$$

with probability one. □

E.3 Proof of Lemma D.14

Proof. The current proof is adapted from the techniques of Lovász and Szegedy [2006] and Zhao [2023]. We start with a sequence of graphs $\{\mathbb{G}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$. The first graph $\mathbb{G}^{(1)}$ is only a node v_1 with latent position $\xi_1 \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$. The second graph $\mathbb{G}^{(2)}$ contains two nodes v_1, v_2 : v_1 is already associated with the latent position ξ_1 in $\mathbb{G}^{(1)}$ and we sample $\xi_2 \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$. The probability of an edge between v_1, v_2 is $h_n(\xi_1, \xi_2)$. In this way, $\{\mathbb{G}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$ is generated by incrementally adding one node and the corresponding edges at a time, and previously selected nodes and edges are not revisited. Furthermore, we have $\mathbb{G}^{(i)} \sim \mathbb{G}_i^{h_n}$.

Let $\phi: V(R) \rightarrow V(G)$ be an injective mapping, and let A_ϕ denote the event that ϕ is a homomorphism from R to graph $\mathbb{G}^{(n)}$. We define the sequence $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as

$$A_i = (n)_r^{-1} \sum_{\phi} pr(A_\phi | G^{(i)}). \quad (\text{D.63})$$

Based on the definition of A_i , we have

$$A_n = (n)_r^{-1} \sum_{\phi} pr(A_{\phi} | \mathbb{G}^{(n)}) = t(R, \mathbb{G}^{(n)}), \quad (\text{D.64})$$

$$A_0 = (n)_r^{-1} \sum_{\phi} pr(A_{\phi}) = \int_{[0,1]^r} \prod_{(v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}(R)} h_n(\xi_i, \xi_j) \prod_{v_i \in V(R)} d\xi_i \stackrel{(11)}{=} P_{h_n}(R). \quad (\text{D.65})$$

Lovász and Szegedy [2006] showed that $\{A_n\}$ is a martingale and $|A_i - A_{i-1}| \leq r/n$ in their Theorem 2.5. Then by invoking Azuma's inequality, they showed that, for every $\delta > 0$,

$$pr\left(|t(R, \mathbb{G}_n) - P_{h_n}(R)| > \delta\right) \leq 2 \exp(-\delta^2 n / 2r^2).$$

On the other hand, the Proposition 1 of Amini et al. [2012] implies that

$$X_R(G) = \text{inj}(R, G) / |\text{Aut}(R)|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(G) = \rho_n^{-\tau} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} X_R(G) = \rho_n^{-\tau} \binom{n}{r}^{-1} \frac{\text{inj}(R, G)}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} = \rho_n^{-\tau} \frac{r! t(R, G)}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} \quad (\text{D.66})$$

and

$$pr\left(\left|\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) - \frac{\rho_n^{-\tau} r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_{h_n}(R)\right| > \frac{r! \rho_n^{-\tau} \delta}{|\text{Aut}(R)|}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2 n}{2r^2}\right).$$

For every $0 < \epsilon < 1$, let $\delta = \rho_n^{\epsilon} \epsilon |\text{Aut}(R)| / r!$, then by (14) we have

$$pr\left(\left|\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) - E[\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n)]\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 |\text{Aut}(R)|^2 \rho_n^{2\tau} n}{2(r r!)^2}\right).$$

When $\rho_n w(u, v) \leq 1$ for all u, v , the quantity $\rho_n^{-\tau} P_{h_n}(R) = P_w(R)$ does not depend on n . Thus, if there exist some $c_1 > 1$, such that $n \rho_n^{2\tau} > c_1 \log n$, then the sum of the following series converges:

$$\sum_n 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 |\text{Aut}(R)|^2 \rho_n^{2\tau} n}{2(r r!)^2}\right).$$

By Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have

$$\rho_n^{-\tau} U_R(\mathbb{G}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{\rho_n^{-\tau} r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_{h_n}(R) = \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_w(R).$$

As a special case, when motif R is an edge, $\hat{\rho}_G = U_R(G)$. Thus, Lemma D.14 implies that with probability one:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-\tau} \hat{\rho}_G = \frac{r!}{|\text{Aut}(R)|} P_w(R).$$

Since $\tau = 1$, $r = 2$, $|\text{Aut}(R)| = 2$ [Rodriguez, 2014] and $P_w(R) = 1$ [Bickel et al., 2011], with

probability one, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-1} \widehat{\rho}_G = 1. \quad (\text{D.67})$$

□

F Proof of of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. We first focus on a single motif R , and we want to show that, with probability one:

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{*,n,b}^R(t) - J_{b,(1-\frac{b}{n})}^R(t)| \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{D.68})$$

It is easy to see that (D.68) can be upper bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{*,n,b}^R(t) - J_{b,(1-\frac{b}{n})}^R(t)| &\leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{b,(1-\frac{b}{n})}^R(t) - J_{b,c}^R(t)| + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{b,c}^R(t) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{c,R}}\right)| \\ &\quad + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{c,R}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{*R}}\right) \right| + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{*,n,b}^R(t) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{*R}}\right)|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.69})$$

where $c = 1 - c_2$, $\sigma_{c,R}^2 = c\sigma_R^2$ with $\sigma_R^2 = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\sqrt{b}\rho_b^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b)]$, and

$$\sigma_{*R}^2 = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_*[\sqrt{b}\rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*)].$$

Now we are in the position to show that all four components on the right-hand side of (D.69) go to zero. By Slutsky's theorem, we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{b,(1-\frac{b}{n})}^R(t) - J_{b,c}^R(t)| \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma D.12 implies that:

$$\sqrt{b}\{\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) - E[\rho_b^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b)]\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_R^2) \text{ in distribution,}$$

which gives:

$$\sqrt{bc}\{\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b) - E[\rho_b^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b)]\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, c\sigma_R^2) \text{ in distribution.}$$

Since σ_R is fixed, the continuity of Φ leads to

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |J_{b,c}^R(t) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{c,R}}\right)| \rightarrow 0.$$

For the third term, recall that $G \sim \mathbb{G}_n$. Lemma D.13 implies that σ_{*R}^2 equals to $c\sigma_R^2$ almost surely. Then, with continuity, we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{*R}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{c,R}}\right) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Next, since Assumptions 3, 1, 2 are satisfied, then by (37), with probability one:

$$\sqrt{b}[\rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \rho_n^{-\tau}U_R(G)] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{*R}^2) \text{ in distribution.}$$

In addition, (D.67) implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-1}\widehat{\rho}_G = 1$ with probability one. Consequently, by Slutsky's theorem, with probability one:

$$\sqrt{b}[\widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau}U_R(\mathbb{G}_b^*) - \widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau}U_R(G)] \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{*R}^2) \text{ in distribution,}$$

which further implies with probability one:

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| J_{*,n,b}^R(t) - \Phi\left(\frac{t}{\sigma_{*R}}\right) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, with probability one:

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| J_{*,n,b}^R(t) - J_{b,c}^R(t) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Now we turn to consider m motifs $\{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$. For simplicity, let $[t_m] = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ and $[R_m] = \{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$.

Under Assumption 3, similar as before, we break the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J_{b,c}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) \right| \leq \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{b,c}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - \Phi_{\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{c,R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{c,R_m}}\right) \right| \\ & + \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| \Phi_{\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{c,R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{c,R_m}}\right) - \Phi_{\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{*R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{*R_m}}\right) \right| \\ & + \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - \Phi_{\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{*R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{*R_m}}\right) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where for each $i \in [m]$, $\sigma_{c,R_i}^2 = c\sigma_{R_i}^2$ with $\sigma_{R_i}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\sqrt{n}\rho_n^{-\tau}U_{R_i}(\mathbb{G}_n)]$, and

$$\sigma_{*R_i}^2 = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}_*[\sqrt{b}\rho_b^{-\tau}U_{R_i}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)].$$

As before, we now want to show that all three components go to zero. By Lemma D.12:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{b} \left\{ [\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau_1}U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b), \dots, \widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau_m}U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b)] - [\rho_b^{-\tau_1}E[U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b)], \dots, \rho_b^{-\tau_m}E[U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b)]] \right\} \\ & \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[0, \Sigma(\mathbf{R})] \text{ in distribution.} \end{aligned}$$

Since $c > 0$ is a constant, by Slutsky's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{bc} \left\{ [\widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau_1}U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b), \dots, \widehat{\rho}_{\mathbb{G}_b}^{-\tau_m}U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b)] - [\rho_b^{-\tau_1}E[U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b)], \dots, \rho_b^{-\tau_m}E[U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b)]] \right\} \\ & \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[0, \Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})] \text{ in distribution.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{b,c}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - \Phi_{\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{c,R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{c,R_m}}\right) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{D.70})$$

The second term goes to zero as Lemma D.13 implies that $\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})$ converge to $\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})$ almost surely.

Under Assumptions 1-3, by Theorem 2, for any sequence $\{G^{(n)}\}$, with probability one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{b} \left\{ [\rho_n^{-\tau_1}U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \dots, \rho_n^{-\tau_m}U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - [\rho_n^{-\tau_1}U_{R_1}(G), \dots, \rho_n^{-\tau_m}U_{R_m}(G)] \right\} \\ & \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[0, \Sigma(*\mathbf{R})] \text{ in distribution,} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{-\tau} \widehat{\rho}_G = 1$ with probability one,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{b} \left\{ [\widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(\mathbb{G}_b^*), \dots, \widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(\mathbb{G}_b^*)] - [\widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_1} U_{R_1}(G), \dots, \widehat{\rho}_G^{-\tau_m} U_{R_m}(G)] \right\} \\ & \rightarrow \mathcal{N}[0, \Sigma(*\mathbf{R})] \text{ in distribution with probability one,} \end{aligned}$$

which further implies that with probability one:

$$\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - \Phi_{\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})} \left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{*R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{*R_m}} \right) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{D.71})$$

Therefore, with probability one:

$$\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J_{b,c}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies

$$\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J_{b,(1-\frac{b}{n})}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

as $c = 1 - c_2$.

□

G Proof of the empirical consistency

As before, let $c = 1 - c_2$, $[t_m] = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ and $[R_m] = \{R_1, \dots, R_m\}$. The following lemmas are used for the proof.

Lemma D.15 (Theorem 1 in [Lunde and Sarkar \[2023\]](#)). *Suppose there exists a CDF $J([t_m])$, such that for all continuity points of $J(\cdot)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{b,c}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J([t_m])| &\rightarrow 0, \\ |J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J([t_m])| &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) \rightarrow J([t_m]) \text{ in probability.}$$

Proof of Theorem 7. To begin with, let $J([t_m]) = \Phi_{\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})}(t_1\sigma_{c,R_1}^{-1}, \dots, t_m\sigma_{c,R_m}^{-1})$ and

$$J_*([t_m]) = \Phi_{\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})}(t_1\sigma_{*R_1}^{-1}, \dots, t_m\sigma_{*R_m}^{-1}).$$

Under Assumptions 2, 1, and 3, (D.70) and (D.71) imply $|J_{b,c}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J([t_m])| \rightarrow 0$ and $|J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J_*([t_m])| \rightarrow 0$, respectively.

Moreover, Lemma D.13 implies that $\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})$ converge to $\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})$ almost surely. Thus, $J_*([t_m])$ converge to $J([t_m])$ almost surely. Therefore, by Lemma D.15, with probability one (measure on the random network sequence):

$$\widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) \rightarrow J([t_m]) \text{ in probability.}$$

Consequently, for all continuity points of $J(\cdot)$,

$$\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} |\widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J([t_m])| \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally, based on (D.70) and (D.71), we arrived at

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} |\widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m])| \leq \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} |\widehat{J}_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - \Phi_{\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{c,R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{c,R_m}}\right)| \\ &+ \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| \Phi_{\Sigma_c(\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{c,R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{c,R_m}}\right) - \Phi_{\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{*R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{*R_m}}\right) \right| \\ &+ \sup_{[t_m] \in \mathbb{R}^m} \left| J_{*,n,b}^{[R_m]}([t_m]) - \Phi_{\Sigma(*\mathbf{R})}\left(\frac{t_1}{\sigma_{*R_1}}, \dots, \frac{t_m}{\sigma_{*R_m}}\right) \right| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

H Additional simulation results

In Figures 6 and 7, we show the counterpart of results in Figures 1 and 2, but with different subsampling size $b = \lceil 2n^{1/2} \rceil$. The patterns in this setting are consistent with Figures 1 and 2.




Figure 6: Empirical approximation errors of the cumulative distribution functions under $b = \lceil 2n^{1/2} \rceil$ and $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.1}$.




Figure 7: Empirical approximation errors of the cumulative distribution functions under $b = \lceil 2n^{1/2} \rceil$ and $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.25}$.

Figure 8 displays the results in an over-sparse regime with $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.5}$. The networks become overly sparse in this scenario, so that the signal-to-noise ratio no longer suffices to support the subsampling inference. This phenomenon is indicated in Assumption 1 and has also been observed for other resampling inference methods on network moments [Green and Shalizi, 2022, Levin and Levina, 2019, Zhang and Xia, 2022, Lunde and Sarkar, 2023].




Figure 8: Empirical approximation errors of the cumulative distribution functions under $b = \lceil n^{2/3} \rceil$ and $\rho_n = 0.25n^{-0.5}$.




Figure 9: Comparison of network moments between two genetic networks: the blue points and bars illustrate the subsampling distributions from the reference gene network, while the red point and dotted line denote the observed values in the target gene network.




Figure 10: Comparison of network moments between statistics network and high energy physics network: the blue points and bars illustrate the subsampling distributions from the high energy physics network, while the red point and dotted line denote the observed values in the statistics network.