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Abstract

In Achlioptas processes, starting from an empty graph, in each step two potential edges are chosen uniformly at random, and using some rule one of them is selected and added to the evolving graph. The evolution of the rescaled size of the largest component in such variations of the Erdős–Rényi random graph process has recently received considerable attention, in particular for the so-called product rule. In this work we establish the following result for rules such as the product rule: the limit of the rescaled size of the ‘giant’ component exists and is continuous provided that a certain system of differential equations has a unique solution. In fact, our result applies to a very large class of Achlioptas-like processes.

Our proof relies on a general idea which relates the evolution of stochastic processes to an associated system of differential equations. Provided that the latter has a unique solution, our approach shows that certain discrete quantities converge (after appropriate rescaling) to this solution.

1 Introduction

More than 50 years ago Erdős and Rényi initiated the systematic study of the random graph process, which is the random sequence of graphs obtained by starting with an empty graph on \( n \) vertices and then in each step adding a new random edge. Already in their seminal 1960 paper [12] they investigated the size of the largest component in great detail. Suppressing, as usual, the dependence on \( n \), let \( L_1(m) \) denote the size of the largest component after \( m \) steps. Their results imply, for example, that there is a continuous function \( \rho = \rho^\text{ER} : [0, \infty) \to [0, 1] \) such that for any fixed \( t \geq 0 \) we have \( L_1(\lfloor tn \rfloor)/n \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \rho(t) \) as \( n \to \infty \), where \( \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \) denotes convergence in probability. Nowadays the evolution of the component structure, in particular the size of the largest component, is one of the most studied properties in the theory of random graphs, see e.g. the many references in [7, 8].
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In an attempt to create processes with potentially different behaviour, in 2000 Dimitris Achlioptas suggested certain variants of the classical random graph process (inspired by the ‘power of random choices’ paradigm [3]). These also start with an empty graph $G(0)$ on $n$ vertices. But at each later step $m \geq 1$, two potential edges $e_1$ and $e_2$ are chosen independently and uniformly at random from all \( \binom{n}{2} \) possible edges (or from those edges not present in $G(m - 1)$). One of these edges is selected according to a rule $R$ and added to the graph, so $G(m) = G(m - 1) \cup \{e\}$ for $e = e_1$ or $e_2$. Processes of this type are now known as Achlioptas processes; always adding $e = e_1$ gives the Erdős–Rényi random graph process.

During the last decade the evolution of the largest component in Achlioptas processes has received considerable attention. In one line of research the location (and existence) of the phase transition has been investigated, see e.g. [5, 6, 23]. This is motivated by Dimitris Achlioptas’ original question, namely whether the ‘freedom of choice’ in each step can be used to substantially delay or accelerate the appearance of the linear size ‘giant’ component. The above results answer this affirmatively by considering so-called ‘bounded-size’ rules, whose decisions only depend on the sizes of the components containing the endvertices of $e_1$ and $e_2$, with the restriction that all sizes larger than some constant $B$ are treated the same way.

A more recent direction of research concerns finer details of the phase transition in Achlioptas processes, see e.g. [4, 16, 17], investigating similarities and differences to the well-understood classical random graph process. In this context in particular the product rule (suggested by Bollobás) has received considerable attention: given two potential edges, it picks the one minimizing the product of the sizes of the components of its endvertices. Based on extensive simulations, Achlioptas, D’Souza and Spencer conjectured in Science [1] that the rescaled size of the largest component undergoes a discontinuous phase transition for the product rule, i.e., there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ so that $L_1/n$ ‘jumps’ from $o(1)$ to at least $\delta$ in $o(n)$ steps. Called explosive percolation, this phenomenon has been of great interest to physicists, see e.g. [9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 26]. However, very recently it has been rigorously shown in [19, 21] that the simulations were misleading, and that the phase transition is actually continuous for all Achlioptas processes.

The discussion above, and much of the physics literature, takes an important question for granted: does the scaling limit even exist? More precisely, as in [13, 24] we say that a rule $R$ is globally convergent if there exists an increasing function $\rho = \rho^R : [0, \infty) \to [0, 1]$ such that for any $t$ at which $\rho$ is continuous we have

$$L_1([tn]) / n \xrightarrow{p} \rho(t)$$

as $n \to \infty$. The function $\rho = \rho^R$ is called the scaling limit of (the size of the giant component of) $R$. Writing $N_k(m)$ for the number of vertices of $G(m)$ in components with $k$ vertices, we call a rule $R$ locally convergent if there exist functions $\rho_k = \rho_k^R : [0, \infty) \to [0, 1]$ such that, for each fixed $k \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$, we have $N_k([tn]) / n \xrightarrow{p} \rho_k(t)$ as $n \to \infty$. Spencer and Wormald [23] conjectured
that all bounded size rules are globally convergent, and this was recently settled in [19] for an even larger class of rules. In fact, in [19] it was shown that global convergence follows from local convergence. According to Achlioptas, D’Souza and Spencer [1], more complex rules such as the product rule are ‘beyond the reach of current mathematical techniques’, and, with this in mind, it is not too surprising that for these no convergence results are known. Svante Janson [15] remarks that most likely new methods are needed for understanding the detailed behaviour of such rules.

1.1 Main result

In this paper we address the convergence question for Achlioptas processes: we show that involved rules such as the product rule are globally convergent provided that a certain associated system of differential equations (defined in Section 2.2) has a unique solution. In fact, our result applies to a very large class of Achlioptas-like processes, including essentially all Achlioptas processes studied so far. For the definitions of \( \ell \)-vertex rule, merging and well-behaved see Section 2.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( \ell \geq 2 \) and let \( \mathcal{R} \) be a merging \( \ell \)-vertex rule that is well behaved. Suppose the associated system of differential equations given by (5)–(7) has a unique solution \((\hat{\rho}_k(t))_{k \geq 1}\). Then \( \mathcal{R} \) is locally and globally convergent. In particular, for each fixed \( k \geq 1 \) and \( t \geq 0 \), we have

\[
\frac{N_k([tn])/n}{\to} \hat{\rho}_k(t)
\]

as \( n \to \infty \). The scaling limit \( \rho^\mathcal{R} \) is continuous and satisfies

\[
\rho^\mathcal{R}(t) = 1 - \sum_{k \geq 1} \hat{\rho}_k(t).
\]

The merging assumption is needed in Theorem 1 since in [20] examples of ‘natural’ non-merging rules are given where (1) does not hold, i.e., which are not globally convergent. All rules for which convergence has been established are merging and well-behaved, including the classical Erdős–Rényi case [12], all bounded size rules [23] (such as the Bohman–Frieze rule [16]) as well as the dCDGM rule [10] and adjacent edge rule [11]. In fact, for all such rules there is a \( K \geq 1 \) such that each \( \rho'_k \) in (6) can be written as a function of \( \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_{\max\{k,K\}} \).

In this case the form of the differential equations (5)–(7) implies by standard results that its solution is unique. So Theorem 1 generalizes these previous convergence results.

The main contribution of this work is a new approach for proving convergence. Previous results in this area apply Wormald’s ‘differential equation method’ [24, 25], which is nowadays widely used in probabilistic combinatorics. This shows that under certain conditions, suitable sequences of random variables converge to the solution of a system of differential equations. The key point is that Wormald’s conditions imply that the differential equations have a unique solution, but are not implied by this. By establishing a more direct connection between the random process and the differential equations, we only
need to assume that the system of differential equations has a unique solution. Thus, our method is potentially applicable to a much larger class of Achlioptas processes. The general proof idea outlined in Section 3 might also be useful to establish convergence in other stochastic processes.

We see our main result as a first step towards resolving the convergence question in Achlioptas processes. In particular, further investigation of the system of differential equations (5)–(7) associated to the product rule (and other involved rules) seems to be needed: does it have a unique solution? When the equations do have a unique solution many questions remain, for example which conditions are needed to establish asymptotic normality as in [22].

In the next section we define the processes under consideration and state the system of differential equations associated to these. In Section 3 we first outline a general idea for proving convergence in stochastic processes, and then use this approach to establish our main result.

2 Preliminaries and notation

Our core argument will involve considering sequences of points \( \omega_n \) in different probability spaces. For this reason we indicate the dependence on \( n \) explicitly in the notation. We now recall the relevant definitions from [19]. Fix \( \ell \geq 2 \). Each \( \ell \)-vertex rule \( R \) yields for each \( n \) a random sequence \((G_{n,m})_{m \geq 0}\) of graphs with vertex set \([n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}\), where \( G_{n,0} \) is the empty graph. For each \( m \geq 0 \) we draw \( \ell \) vertices \( v_{n,m+1} = (v_1, \ldots, v_\ell) \) from \([n]\) independently and uniformly at random, and then obtain \( G_{n,m+1} \) by adding a (possibly empty) set of edges \( E_{n,m+1} \) to \( G_{n,m} \), where \( R \) selects \( E_{n,m+1} \) as a subset of all pairs between vertices in \( v_{n,m+1} \). To avoid ‘trivial’ rules we require that \( E_{n,m+1} \neq \emptyset \) if all \( \ell \) vertices in \( v_{n,m+1} \) are in distinct components of \( G_{n,m} \). Formally, we assume the existence of a sample space \( \Omega_n \) and a filtration \( F_{n,0} \subseteq F_{n,1} \subseteq \cdots \) such that \( \omega_{n,m+1} \) is \( F_{n,m+1} \)-measurable and independent of \( F_{n,m} \), and require \( E_{n,m+1} \) (and hence \( G_{n,m+1} \)) to be \( F_{n,m+1} \)-measurable. For later usage we let \( c_{n,m+1} = (c_1, \ldots, c_\ell) \) denote the sizes of the components containing the chosen vertices \( v_{n,m+1} = (v_1, \ldots, v_\ell) \) in \( G_{n,m} \). We write \( N_{n,k,m} \) for the number of vertices of \( G_{n,m} \) in components of size \( k \), and let \( N_{n,\leq k,m} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} N_{n,j,m} \). We define \( N_{n,\geq k,m} \) in an analogous way.

For the purposes of this paper these definitions are robust with respect to small changes, since our arguments have \( o(1) \) elbow room in each step of the process. So we may weaken the conditions on \( \omega_{n,m+1} \): it suffices if, for \( m = O(n) \), say, the conditional distribution of \( \omega_{n,m+1} \) given \( F_{n,m} \) is close to (at total variation distance \( \alpha_n = o(1) \)) from the one defined above. This includes variations such as picking an \( \ell \)-tuple of distinct vertices, or picking (the ends of) \( \ell/2 \) randomly selected (distinct) edges not already present in \( G_{n,m} \), see [19]. Hence we may treat the original examples of Achlioptas as 4-vertex rules where \( R \) always selects one of the pairs \( \{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_3, v_4\} \); below we call such \( R \) Achlioptas rules.

We say that an \( \ell \)-vertex rule is merging if whenever \( C, C' \) are distinct components with \( |C|, |C'| \geq \varepsilon n \), then in the next step we have probability at least
\( \varepsilon^4 \) of joining \( C \) to \( C' \) (this can be slightly weakened, see [19]). In particular all Achlioptas rules are merging, since with probability at least \( \varepsilon^4 \) both potential pairs join \( C \) to \( C' \).

### 2.1 Well behaved rules

We say that an \( \ell \)-vertex rule \( R \) is well behaved (at infinity) if there are functions \( d_k \) and \( g \) such that the following conditions hold:

1. Whenever all vertices \( v_j \) are in different components we have
   \[
   \mathbb{E}(N_{n,k,m+1} - N_{n,k,m} \mid F_{n,m}, \underline{c}_{n,m+1}) = d_k(c_1, \ldots, c_\ell),
   \tag{3}
   \]
   where \( \underline{c}_{n,m+1} = (c_1, \ldots, c_\ell) \) lists the sizes of the components containing the selected vertices.

2. Suppose there are \( L \subseteq [\ell] \) and \( S \geq k \) such that all \( v_j \) with \( j \in L \) are in the same component of size \( c_j > g(S) \), whereas all other vertices are in different components with sizes \( c_j \leq S \). Whenever this holds we have
   \[
   \mathbb{E}(N_{n,k,m+1} - N_{n,k,m} \mid F_{n,m}, \underline{c}_{n,m+1}) = d_k(\tilde{c}_1, \ldots, \tilde{c}_\ell),
   \tag{4}
   \]
   where \( \tilde{c}_j = \infty \) for \( j \in L \) and \( \tilde{c}_j = c_j \) otherwise.

In fact, taking \( L = \emptyset \) in (4) gives (3), but we note (3) separately for clarity. As we shall discuss below, these conditions are very mild and hold for essentially all Achlioptas processes previously studied, including ‘unbounded rules’ such as the sum and product rules. All rules which have been considered so far are size-rules, which only use \( \underline{c}_{n,m+1} \) to decide which edge(s) are added. For these the change of \( N_{n,k,m} \) in (3) is deterministic given \( \underline{c}_{n,m+1} \), but considering the conditional expected change is slightly more general (we can also allow for small deviations in (3) and (4), but leave this to the interested reader). Intuitively, the second condition ensures that whenever one component is significantly larger than all others, then we can decide which relevant pairs are joined without knowing its exact size (this fails, for example, if the change depends on the parity of \( \max_{j \in [\ell]} c_j \)). This mild assumption holds for a large class of rules; for example, \( g(s) = \max\{K, s\} \), \( g(s) = \max\{B, s\} \), \( g(s) = s^2 \) and \( g(s) = 2s \) suffice for nice rules as defined in [19], bounded size rules, the product rule and the sum rule, respectively. Note that since \( N_{n,k,m} \) always changes by at most \( \ell k \) per step, we have \(|d_k(\cdot)| \leq \ell k\).

### 2.2 An associated system of differential equations

Suppose that \( R \) is a well-behaved \( \ell \)-vertex rule. In the following equations, each \( \rho_k(t) \) is a function on \([0, \infty)\) satisfying

\[
0 \leq \rho_k(t) \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \rho_k(t) \leq 1. \tag{5}
\]
The system of differential equations associated to \( \mathcal{R} \) is given by

\[
\rho_k'(t) = \sum_{c_1, \ldots, c_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} d_k(c_1, \ldots, c_\ell) \prod_{j \in [\ell]} \rho_{c_j}(t)
\]

for all \( k \geq 1 \), where

\[
\rho(t) = \rho_\infty(t) = 1 - \sum_{k \geq 1} \rho_k(t),
\]

together with the initial conditions

\[
\rho_k(0) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

For \( t = 0 \), the derivative in (6) is taken to be the right-derivative. Note that for all \( t \geq 0 \) we have \( |\rho_k'(t)| \leq \max_{c} |d_k(c)| \leq tk \).

As a basic example, consider the Erdős–Rényi random graph process, for which we have \( d_k(c_1, c_2) \in \{-2k, -k, 0, k\} \). It is not difficult to see that in this case (6) simplifies to

\[
\rho_k'(t) = -2k\rho_k(t) + k \sum_{c_1 + c_2 = k} \rho_{c_1}(t)\rho_{c_2}(t),
\]

which is a special case of Smoluchowski’s coagulation equations in a form where sol-gel interaction is considered, see e.g. [2] and the references therein. Here uniqueness follows easily from standard results, since \( \rho_k' \) depends only on \( \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k \).

### 3 Proof of the main result

We starting by outlining a rather general idea for proving convergence to the unique solution of a system of differential equations, which we shall later use to establish Theorem 1. We consider a discrete stochastic process with sample space \( \Omega_n \) and filtration \( \mathcal{F}_{n,0} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{n,1} \subseteq \cdots \). For each (discrete) step \( m \) we introduce (continuous) time \( t = m/s_n \), where the scaling satisfies \( s_n \to \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). Suppose our objective is to find a collection of random variables \( X_{n,k,m} \) and (continuous) functions \( x_k \) together with scaling parameters \( S_{n,k} \) such that for each fixed \( k \geq 1 \) and \( t \geq 0 \), we have

\[
X_{n,k,ts_n}/S_{n,k} \xrightarrow{p} x_k(t)
\]

as \( n \to \infty \), where we ignore the rounding to integers. The two main steps of our approach are as follows:

1. Defining the one-step change as \( \Delta X_{n,k,m+1} = X_{n,k,m+1} - X_{n,k,m} \), we use martingale techniques (the Azuma–Hoeffding inequality together with an absolute bound on \( |\Delta X_{n,k,m+1}| \)) to show that, with probability tending
to 1 as \( n \to \infty \), the following holds: for each fixed \( k \) and all \( m_1, m_2 \geq 0 \) with \( m_2 - m_1 = O(s_n) \) we have
\[
X_{n,k,m_2} - X_{n,k,m_1} = \sum_{m_1 \leq m < m_2} \mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,m}) + o(S_{n,k}). \tag{9}
\]

2. Suppose we are given a sequence of sample points \( \omega_n \in \Omega_n \), defined for some infinite subset of \( \mathbb{N} \), for which (9) and some additional technical conditions hold. Proceeding as in the proof of Helley’s selection theorem (see e.g. Theorem 5.8.1 in [14]), we pick a subsequence \( (\tilde{\omega}_n) \) such that for each \( t \geq 0 \) and \( k \geq 1 \), for some limiting value \( x_k(t) \) we have
\[
X_{\tilde{n},k,ts_{\tilde{n}}} / S_{\tilde{n},k} \to x_k(t) \tag{10}
\] as \( \tilde{n} \to \infty \). Here we exploit that each \( X_{\tilde{n},k,ts_{\tilde{n}}} / S_{\tilde{n},k} \) as a function of \( t \) satisfies a Lipschitz condition. Along this subsequence, we show that for all \( t \geq 0, \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( k \geq 1 \) there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that for \( \tilde{n} \) large enough the following holds: for each \( m \geq 0 \) satisfying \( |m - ts_{\tilde{n}}| \leq \delta s_{\tilde{n}} \) we have
\[
\mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{\tilde{n},k,m+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{n},m})(\omega_{\tilde{n}}) = (f_k(t) \pm \varepsilon) S_{\tilde{n},k} / s_{\tilde{n}}, \tag{11}
\]
where \( f_k(t) = f_k(t,x_1,x_2,\ldots) \) is a function of the scaling limits along the selected subsequence. To establish (11) we combine coupling arguments with ‘typical’ properties of the underlying stochastic process.

Now, using (9)–(11) it is straightforward to show that for all \( t \geq 0, \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( k \geq 1 \) there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that for all \( 0 < |h| \leq \delta \) with \( t + h \geq 0 \) we have
\[
\left| \frac{x_k(t + h) - x_k(t)}{h} - f_k(t) \right| \leq \varepsilon
\]
along the selected subsequence, i.e., the \( x_k \) satisfy the differential equation
\[
x_k'(t) = f_k(t,x_1,x_2,\ldots).
\]

But if the associated system of differential equations has a unique solution, then this implies that the limiting functions \( x_k(t) \) in (11) do not depend on the selected subsequence, which establishes the desired convergence. Finally, let us remark that by comparison with the underlying process we can (typically) derive additional properties of the \( x_k \); these might help in proving uniqueness of the solution to the system of differential equations.

In the remainder we use the above approach to establish Theorem . Aiming at \( N_{n,k,tn}/n \overset{p}{\to} \rho_k(t) \), we closely follow steps one and two in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 respectively, with \( X_{n,k,m} = N_{n,k,m}, x_k(t) = \rho_k(t) \), \( S_{n,k} = n \) and \( s_n = n \).

### 3.1 Proof of Theorem

Our proof of Theorem relies on a technical lemma which requires some preparation. Set \( \eta = \eta(n) = (\log \log \log n)^{-1} \), say. Let \( \mathcal{U}_n \) denote the event that at
every step $m$ there is at most one component of size at least $\eta m$. Since $\mathcal{R}$ is merging, by the discussion following Theorem 2 in [19] we know that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{U}_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. In the rest of the paper the particular form of $\eta = \eta(n)$ does not matter, only that $\eta \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. By Theorem 2 in [19] there exist functions $K(\gamma)$ and $\xi = \xi(n)$ with $\xi \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that, defining $\mathcal{K}_n$ as the event that for all $m \geq 0$ we have

$$\forall \gamma \geq \xi : N_{n,\geq K(\gamma),m} < L_{1,n,m} + \gamma n,$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Here $L_{1,n,m}$ is the number of vertices in the largest component of $G_{n,m}$.

Fix $0 < \lambda < 1/4$, say $\lambda = 1/8$ for concreteness. For each $m \geq 0$ set $\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} = X_{n,k,m+1} - X_{n,k,m}$ and $Y_{n,k,m+1} = \Delta X_{n,k,m+1} - \mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} | \mathcal{F}_n,m)$. Set $Z_{n,k,j} = \sum_{0 \leq m < j} Y_{n,k,m+1}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_n = D_n(\lambda)$ denote the event that for all $1 \leq k \leq n^\lambda$ and $1 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 \leq n^2$ with $m_2 - m_1 \leq n^{1+\lambda}$ we have $|Z_{n,k,m_2} - Z_{n,k,m_1}| < n^{1/2+2\lambda}$. Note that by rearranging terms, for all such $k, m_1, m_2$ the event $\mathcal{D}_n$ implies

$$N_{n,k,m_2} - N_{n,k,m_1} = \sum_{m_1 \leq m < m_2} \mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} | \mathcal{F}_n,m) \pm n^{1/2+2\lambda}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

Since the number of vertices in components of size $k$ changes by at most $\ell k$ per step, we have $|\Delta X_{n,k,m+1}| \leq \ell k$ and thus $|Z_{n,k,m+1} - Z_{n,k,m}| = |Y_{n,k,m+1}| \leq 2\ell k$. Furthermore $\mathbb{E}(Y_{n,k,m+1} | \mathcal{F}_n,m) = 0$, so $(Z_{n,k,j})_{j \geq m_1}$ is a martingale. Thus, for fixed $k, m_1, m_2$ satisfying the conditions above, by the Azuma–Hoeffding inequality we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z_{n,k,m_2} - Z_{n,k,m_1}| \geq n^{1/2+2\lambda}) \leq 2e^{-n^{3\lambda}/(8\ell^2 k^2)} \leq 2e^{-n^{3\lambda}/(8\ell^2)} \leq n^{-9}$$

for $n$ large enough. Taking a union bound (to account for all choices of $k, m_1, m_2$) yields $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

Finally, define the ‘good’ event $\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{D}_n \cap \mathcal{K}_n \cap \mathcal{U}_n$. Our discussion yields that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. We are now ready to state our main technical lemma. As usual, we ignore the irrelevant rounding to integers.

**Lemma 2.** Let $\ell \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{R}$ be a merging $\ell$-vertex rule that is well-behaved. Let $(\omega_t)$ with $\omega_t \in \mathcal{G}_n \subseteq \Omega_n$ be defined for some infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$. There exists a subsequence $(\omega_{\bar{t}})$ such that for each $t \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$ we have $N_{n,k,t}(\omega_{\bar{t}})/\bar{t} \to \rho_k(t)$, where the $(\rho_k(t))_{k \geq 1}$ are functions on $\mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying the system of differential equations \([5]–[7]\) associated to $\mathcal{R}$.

Note that Lemma 2 implies that the system of differential equations \([5]–[7]\) has at least one solution. By comparison with the underlying process we can establish additional properties of the $\rho_k(t)$, e.g. that $\rho_{\leq k}(t) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \rho_j(t)$ is monotone decreasing. Before giving the proof of Lemma 2 we first show how it implies Theorem 1. By Theorem 3 in [19] it suffices to establish \([2]\), i.e., local convergence. Aiming at a contradiction, suppose there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, $t_0 \geq 0$, $k_0 \geq 1$ and an infinite subsequence $\bar{n}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $|N_{n,k_0,t_0,\bar{n}}/\bar{n} - \bar{\rho}_{k_0}(t_0)| > \varepsilon$
holds with probability at least $\varepsilon$, where $\hat{\rho}_{k_0}(t)$ is given by the (by assumption) unique solution to (13)–(17). Since $\mathbb{P}(G_n) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, this implies (by discarding a finite number of elements in the beginning) that there exists an infinite subsequence of sample points $(\omega_n)$ with $\omega_n \in G_n \subseteq \Omega_n$ that satisfy

$$|N_{n,k_0,t_0}(\omega_n)/\bar{n} - \hat{\rho}_{k_0}(t_0)| > \varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

Now Lemma 2 gives a subsequence $(\omega_n)$ satisfying $N_{N_{n,k},t_0}(\omega_n)/\bar{n} \to \rho_k(t)$ for each $t \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$, where the $(\rho_k(t))_{k \geq 1}$ solve (13)–(17) on $\mathbb{R}^+$. But now $(14)$ implies $\rho_{k_0}(t_0) \neq \hat{\rho}_{k_0}(t_0)$, contradicting uniqueness.

### 3.2 Proof of Lemma 2

We start by selecting a ‘nice’ subsequence of $(\omega_n)$, and proceed as in the proof of Helley’s selection theorem (see e.g. Theorem 5.8.1 in [13]). Define $F_n(k,t) = N_{n,k,t,n}(\omega_n)/n$ if $1 \leq k \leq n$, otherwise set $F_n(k,t) = 0$. Clearly, $F_n(k,t) \in [0,1]$. Furthermore, $F_n(1,0) = 1$ and $F_n(k,0) = 0$ for $k \geq 2$. Let $(q_{r})_{r \geq 1}$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Q}^+$. By using the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem repeatedly, a standard diagonal argument yields a subsequence $(\omega_n)$ such that for all $(k,q_r) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Q}^+$ the value of $F_n(k,q_r)$ converges to some limit $s_{k,q_r}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we now define $\rho_k(q_r) = s_{k,q_r}$ for all $q_r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. Since $N_{n,k,m}$ changes by at most $\ell k$ per step, as a function of $t$ each $F_n(k,t)$ is Lipschitz on $\mathbb{Q}^+$ with constant $\ell k$, so $\rho_k$ has this property on $\mathbb{Q}^+$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we thus can extend $\rho_k$ to a Lipschitz continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Henceforth we always work with the subsequence selected above, but write $n$ instead of $\bar{n}$ for ease of notation. In particular, for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we thus have

$$N_{n,k,t,n}(\omega_n)/n \to \rho_k(t). \quad (15)$$

Turning to some basic properties of the $\rho_k(t)$, clearly $0 \leq \rho_k(t) \leq 1$. Furthermore, the initial conditions $\rho_1(0) = 1$ and $\rho_k(0) = 0$ for $k \geq 2$ hold. Counting vertices we see that $0 \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \rho_k(t) \leq 1$. So far we established (4) and (7).

The following deterministic claim is the main ingredient in the proof of Lemma 2. Recall that $\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} = N_{n,k,m+1} - N_{n,k,m}$. For brevity, we write $f_k(t) = f_k(t,\rho_1,\rho_2,\ldots)$ for the right hand side of (9).

**Claim 3.** For all $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ there exists $0 < \delta \leq 1$ such that for $n$ large enough the following holds: for each $m \geq 0$ satisfying $|m - tn| \leq \delta n$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} | F_{n,m})(\omega_n) = f_k(t) \pm \varepsilon/3. \quad (16)$$

**Proof.** Recall that $\omega_n \in K_n \cap U_n$ satisfies (15). Given $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, pick $\gamma \leq \varepsilon/(50\ell^2 k)$. Then choose $S \geq k$ such that $S \geq k = K(\gamma)$ and $\rho_{S}(t) \geq 1 - \rho(t) - \gamma$ hold, which is possible since $1 - \rho(t) = \lim_{s \to \infty} \rho_{S}(t)$, where $\rho_{S}(t) = \sum_{1 \leq j < s} \rho_j(t)$ is increasing in $s$. Pick $\delta \leq \min\{\gamma/(3\ell S^2),1\}$. By choice of $S$ we have

$$\rho_{S}(t) \leq \rho(t) + \gamma. \quad (17)$$
Consider $m \geq 0$ satisfying $|m - tn| \leq \delta n$. Since $\omega_n \in \mathcal{U}_n$, we know that
\[
N_{n, \geq \eta, m}(\omega_n) > 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad N_{n, \geq \eta, m}(\omega_n) = L_{1, n, m}(\omega_n).
\]
(18)

We henceforth assume $\eta \leq \gamma$ and $\max\{S, g(S)\} < \eta n$, which both hold for $n$ large enough (depending on $\gamma$, $S$, $g$). As $\omega_n \in \mathcal{K}_n$, $S \geq K$ and (12) imply $N_{n, \geq S, m}(\omega_n) \leq L_{1, n, m}(\omega_n) + \gamma n$ for $n$ large enough (depending on $\gamma$). So, by distinguishing whether $L_{1, n, m}(\omega_n)$ is larger or smaller than $\eta n$, we see that
\[
N_{n, \geq S, m}(\omega_n) - N_{n, \geq \eta, m}(\omega_n) \leq \eta n + \gamma n \leq 2\gamma n.
\]
(19)

We shall now evaluate $\mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n, k, m+1} | F_{n, m})(\omega_n)$. For this we regard the graph $G_{n, m}(\omega_n)$ as fixed, and the vertices $\omega_{n, m+1} = (v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ as random. So, in the following all probabilities $\mathbb{P}(\ast)$ are shorthand for $\mathbb{P}(\ast | F_{n, m})(\omega_n)$. Recall the definitions of $\omega_{n, m+1} = (v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ and $\omega_{n, m+1} = (c_1, \ldots, c_\ell)$: the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_\ell$ are chosen independently and uniformly at random from $[n]$, and each $c_j$ denotes the size of the component in $G_{n, m}(\omega_n)$ containing $v_j$. So, for each $s \in [n]$ we have
\[
\mathbb{P}(c_j = s) = N_{n, s, m}(\omega_n)/n.
\]

We define $\mathcal{T}$ as the event that (a) all vertices $v_j$ with $c_j \leq S$ are in different components, and (b) there are no vertices $v_j$ with $S < c_j < \eta n$. Recall that whenever $\mathcal{T}$ holds, by (13) all vertices in components of size larger than $g(S)$ are in the same component (the largest), so (3) or (4) applies giving
\[
\mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n, k, m+1} | F_{n, m}, \omega_{n, m+1}) = d_k(\tilde{c}_1, \ldots, \tilde{c}_\ell),
\]
(20)
where $\tilde{c}_j = \infty$ for $c_j \geq \eta n$ and $\tilde{c}_j = c_j$ otherwise. In any case, the two sides of (20) are bounded by $\ell k$. Using (19) we see that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \ell^2 S/n + 2\ell \gamma$, and so by choice of $\gamma$ we have
\[
2\ell k \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \leq 2\ell k \cdot (\ell^2 S/n + 2\ell \gamma) \leq \varepsilon/9.
\]

Setting $\Theta = \{S\} \cup \{s \in [n]: s \geq \eta n\}$, by taking expectations of both sides of (20), it follows that
\[
\mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n, k, m+1} | F_{n, m})(\omega_n) = \sum_{s_0, \ldots, s_\ell \in \Theta} d_k(\tilde{s}_1, \ldots, \tilde{s}_\ell) \prod_{j \in [\ell]} \mathbb{P}(c_j = s_j) \pm \varepsilon/9, \quad (21)
\]
where $\tilde{s}_j = \infty$ for $s_j \geq \eta n$ and $\tilde{s}_j = s_j$ otherwise.

Note that in the estimates above we had plenty of elbow room. So, if the conditional distribution of $\omega_{n, m+1}$ is at total variation distance $\alpha_n = o(1)$ from the one used above, then a standard coupling argument shows that this only adds an additive error of at most $2\ell k \alpha_n$, which is negligible for $n$ large enough (depending on $k, \varepsilon$), say, at most $\varepsilon/99$. So (21) is easily seen to still hold in such slight variations.
We define the random variable $Y$ as follows:

$$
P(Y = \infty) = \begin{cases} 
L_{1,n,m}(\omega_n)/n, & \text{if } L_{1,n,m}(\omega_n) \geq \eta n, \\
0, & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
$$

and, for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we set

$$
P(Y = s) = \begin{cases} 
N_{n,s,m}(\omega_n)/n, & \text{if } s < \eta n, \\
0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
$$

Note that by (18) this yields a probability distribution. Let $Y_1, \ldots, Y_\ell$ be iid with distribution $Y$ and observe that $P(Y_j = s) = P(c_j = s)$ for $s \leq S < \eta n$. Since by (18) there is at most one component of size at least $\eta n$ (and $\tilde{s}_j = \infty$ for $s_j \geq \eta n$), we see that (21) gives

$$
E(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} \mid F_{n,m})(\omega_n) = \sum_{s_1, \ldots, s_\ell \in [S] \cup \{\infty\}} d_k(s_1, \ldots, s_\ell) \prod_{j \in [\ell]} P(Y_j = s_j) \pm \varepsilon/9.
$$

Now, using $|d_k(\cdot)| \leq \ell k$ and (19), we extend the sum to all $s_1, \ldots, s_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ at the price of an additive error of $2\gamma\ell^2 k$. Since $2\gamma\ell^2 k \leq \varepsilon/20$ by choice of $\gamma$, this gives

$$
E(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} \mid F_{n,m})(\omega_n) = E(d_k(Y_1, \ldots, Y_\ell)) \pm \varepsilon/6. \tag{22}
$$

For $s \leq S$ note that $N_{n,s,m}$ changes by at most $\ell s \leq \ell S$ in each step, so $|m - tn| \leq \delta n$ implies $|N_{n,s,m}(\omega_n) - N_{n,s,tn}(\omega_n)| \leq \ell S \delta n$. Hence, using the definition of $\delta$ and that (15) yields $N_{n,s,tn}(\omega_n)/n \to \rho_s(t)$, for $s \leq S$ we have, say,

$$
|N_{n,s,m}(\omega_n)/n - \rho_s(t)| \leq \ell S \delta + \gamma/(2S) \leq \gamma/S \tag{23}
$$

for $n$ large enough (depending on $\gamma, S$). Using this observation we shall now show that the right hand side of (22) is essentially determined by the $(\rho_k(t))_{k \geq 1}$; this is key for our approach. To this end we consider the random variable $Z$ which is defined by as follows for every $s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$:

$$
P(Z = s) = \begin{cases} 
\rho(t), & \text{if } s = \infty, \\
\rho_s(t), & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases} \tag{24}
$$

**Claim 4.** For $n$ large enough (depending on $\gamma, S$) we have

$$
d_{TV}(Y, Z) \leq 4\gamma.
$$

**Proof.** Recall that the total variation distance is given by

$$
d_{TV}(Y, Z) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}} |P(Y = s) - P(Z = s)|. \tag{25}
$$
For $s \leq S$, note that given a large enough $n$, \( \sum_{s \in [S]} |\mathbb{P}(Y = s) - \mathbb{P}(Z = s)| \leq \gamma. \)

Next, we consider the summands where $S < s < \infty$. By \( \mathbb{P}(S < Z < \infty) \leq \gamma \) and \( \mathbb{P}(S < Y < \infty) \leq 2\gamma \), we have
\[
\sum_{S < s < \infty} |\mathbb{P}(Y = s) - \mathbb{P}(Z = s)| \leq 3\gamma.
\]

Finally, since $Y$ and $Z$ are probability distributions, they differ on $s = \infty$ no more than the sum of the differences of the other values, i.e., by at most $4\gamma$. This readily completes the proof (using the additional factor of $1/2$ in (23)).

Now, taking $Z_1, \ldots, Z_\ell$ iid with distribution $Z$, using Claim 4 the distribution of the $Y_j$ and $Z_j$ can be coupled such that they all agree with probability at least $1 - 4\ell \gamma$. So, since $|d_k(\cdot)| \leq \ell k$, in (22) we may replace all occurrences of $Y_j$ by $Z_j$ at the price of an additive error of $8\gamma \ell^2 k$. Since $8\gamma \ell^2 k \leq \varepsilon/6$ by choice of $\gamma$, our discussion yields
\[
\mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} | \mathcal{F}_{n,m})(\omega_n) = \mathbb{E}(d_k(Z_1, \ldots, Z_\ell)) \pm \varepsilon/3.
\]

Note that the first term on the right hand side equals $f_k(t) = f_k(t, \rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots)$ by definition of the $Z_j$, see (17) and (21). This establishes (16) and thus completes the proof of Claim 4.

Finally, with Claim 3 in hand, we now complete the proof of Lemma 2. Given $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, pick $0 < \delta \leq 1$ as given by Claim 3. For each $0 < |h| \leq \delta$ with $t + h \geq 0$ write $m_1, m_2$ for the minimum and maximum of \( \{(t+h)n, tn\} \), which satisfy $m_1 \geq 0$ and $0 < m_2 - m_1 < n^{1+\lambda}$. Recall that $\omega_n \in \mathcal{D}_n$, and note that $k \leq n^\lambda$ for $n$ large enough (depending on $k$). Now, using (13) and (16) we see that for $n$ large enough
\[
N_{n,k,(t+h)n}(\omega_n) - N_{n,k,tn}(\omega_n) = \text{sgn}(h) \cdot \sum_{m_1 \leq m < m_2} \mathbb{E}(\Delta X_{n,k,m+1} | \mathcal{F}_{n,m})(\omega_n) \pm n^{1/2 + 2\lambda}
\]
\[
= hn \cdot (f_k(t) \pm \varepsilon/3) \pm n^{1/2 + 2\lambda}.
\]

Rearranging terms, using (15) and $\lambda < 1/4$ we deduce that for $n$ large enough (depending on $\varepsilon, h$) we have
\[
\left| \frac{\rho_k(t+h) - \rho_k(t)}{h} - f_k(t) \right| \leq \varepsilon/2 + n^{-1/2 + 2\lambda} / |h| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{26}
\]

To summarize, for all $t \geq 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $0 < |h| \leq \delta$ with $t + h \geq 0$ equation (26) holds along the selected subsequence (for $n$ large enough). In other words, for $t > 0$ we have $\rho_k(t) = f_k(t)$, which establishes (9). For $t = 0$ we only considered $0 < h \leq \delta$, so we proved the corresponding statement for the right derivative, and the proof of Lemma 2 is complete.
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