

DOMAIN SIZE ASYMPTOTICS FOR MARKOV LOGIC NETWORKS

VERA KOPONEN

ABSTRACT. A Markov logic network (MLN) determines a probability distribution on the set of structures, or “possible worlds”, with an arbitrary finite domain. We study the properties of such distributions as the domain size tends to infinity. Three types of concrete examples of MLNs will be considered, and the properties of random structures with domain sizes tending to infinity will be studied:

- (1) Arbitrary quantifier-free MLNs over a language with only one relation symbol which has arity 1. In this case we give a pretty complete characterization of the possible limit behaviours of random structures.
- (2) An MLN that favours graphs with fewer triangles (or more generally, fewer k -cliques). As a corollary of the analysis a “ δ -approximate 0-1 law” for first-order logic is obtained.
- (3) An MLN that favours graphs with fewer vertices with degree higher than a fixed (but arbitrary) number.

The analysis shows that depending on which “soft constraints” an MLN uses the limit behaviour of random structures can be quite different, and the weights of the soft constraints may, or may not, have influence on the limit behaviour. It will also be demonstrated, using (1), that quantifier-free MLNs and lifted Bayesian networks (in a broad sense) are *asymptotically incomparable*, roughly meaning that there is a sequence of distributions on possible worlds with increasing domain sizes that can be defined by one of the formalisms but not even approximated by the other. In a rather general context it is also shown that on large domains the distribution determined by an MLN concentrates almost all its probability mass on a totally different part of the space of possible worlds than the uniform distribution does.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Logic and probability. *Statistical relational artificial intelligence (SRAI)*, also called *statistical relational learning*, is a branch of artificial intelligence (AI) that combines the logical and the probabilistic schools in AI in order to be able to reason about objects, properties they may have, and relations between objects in the presence of uncertain or incomplete information [8, 11]. A central approach to attain this combination is to consider a set \mathbf{W}_D of “possible worlds” with a common finite domain (set) D of objects, and a probability distribution \mathbb{P}_D on \mathbf{W}_D , so every possible world is assigned a probability. Mathematically speaking, each possible world in \mathbf{W}_D is a structure in the sense of first-order logic with domain D . Once such a probability distribution \mathbb{P}_D has been learned it can be used to make inferences about events concerning objects in D . The distribution \mathbb{P}_D is often specified by some kind of *graphical model* (GM) in which the nodes are random variables (which can represent propositional formulas or grounded atomic first-order formulas) and the edges specify how the random variables depend on each other [20].

1.2. Knowledge transfer. It is of course more useful if the learned distribution \mathbb{P}_D also makes sense on other domains. For this to be possible its specification need to be such that it can be used to define a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_{D'}$ on the set of possible worlds $\mathbf{W}_{D'}$ where D' is some other domain of objects. This leads to the idea of a template that, in a uniform way, defines a probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_D for any finite domain D .

Date: 4 September, 2025.

In SRAI such templates include *parametrized*, or *lifted*, graphical models, of which there are many kinds, including parametrized Bayesian networks (of different kinds), Markov logic networks, and probabilistic logic programming [5, 8, 17, 30].

But even if we are given a *lifted graphical model* (LGM) \mathbb{G} , which defines a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}$ in a uniform way on \mathbf{W}_D for every finite domain D , the question remains to what extent inference on a domain D with $\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}$ can be transferred, at least approximately, to another domain D' with $\mathbb{P}_{D'}^{\mathbb{G}}$, defined by the same \mathbb{G} . A related question is to what extent an LGM \mathbb{G} learned from a domain (of examples) D is relevant for making inferences, via $\mathbb{P}_{D'}^{\mathbb{G}}$, on another domain D' , in particular if D and D' have very different sizes.

1.3. Computational complexity (scalability). Another question is how to compute $\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E})$ efficiently, where $\mathbf{E} \subseteq \mathbf{W}_D$ is an event. Since $\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}) = \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{E}} \mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathcal{A})$ we can compute the right hand sum, an instance of *weighted model counting*, but in general this procedure has exponential time complexity in the size of D . Now let φ be a sentence (formula without free variables) in (for example) first-order logic and let \mathbf{E}_D^{φ} be the set of all possible worlds $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_D$ in which φ is true. Suppose that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and all sufficiently large domains D and D' , $|\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_D^{\varphi}) - \mathbb{P}_{D'}^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_{D'}^{\varphi})| < \varepsilon$. Then, for any large enough domain D , $\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_D^{\varphi})$, or even an approximation of it, is an approximation of $\mathbb{P}_{D'}^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_{D'}^{\varphi})$ if the domain D' is large enough. Thus, from both the perspective of knowledge transfer and computational efficiency it is of interest to understand how $\mathbb{P}_D^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_D^{\varphi})$ behaves as the size of D tends to infinity.

1.4. Conventions. Since only the cardinality of D will matter in this study we will let $D := [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ for some positive integer n . Let σ be some finite set of relation symbols, a *language* (also called *signature* or *vocabulary*), let \mathbf{W}_n be the set of all σ -structures with domain $[n]$ (i.e. interpretations of the relation symbols in σ on the domain $[n]$). If \mathbb{G} is an LGM then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}$ denotes the probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n which is (uniformly in n) defined by \mathbb{G} .

1.5. Directed acyclic, and undirected, lifted graphical models. In \mathbb{G} is a directed acyclic LGM, such as some kind of lifted Bayesian network \mathbb{G} or probabilistic logic program, then the parameters and formulas used by \mathbb{G} have the *same* intuitive meaning for $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}$ and *all* n , and there are rather general results concerning the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_n^{\varphi})$ where φ is a first-order sentence, or a sentence of some other logic. That is, results have been obtained that apply to a whole class of directed LGMs and a whole class of formulas (e.g. all first-order formulas). The proofs of such results rely on the acyclicity of the LGM from which it follows that no atomic relation “depends on itself”, and therefore an argument by induction on the longest directed path in the LGM is possible. If there are cycles this approach breaks down, and this is a major obstacle for getting similar results when $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}$ is determined by an undirected LGM \mathbb{G} , and indeed very little is known about the existence (and in that case value) of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}(\mathbf{E}_n^{\varphi})$ in this case. But the ability of an undirected LGM to let a property or relation depend on itself can be useful when modeling probabilities. For example, if we know that many persons have a particular flu, then this typically increases the probability that another person has it. With a directed acyclic LGM we can model how the flu depends on *other* properties or relationships, but there is no direct way to let it “depend on itself”, as can be done with for example a Markov logic network. The property of undirected LGMs to model properties or relations in a way that cannot be done with directed acyclic LGMs motivate deeper investigations into the asymptotics of undirected LGMs.

1.6. Markov logic networks. The notion of a Markov logic network, which is an undirected LGM, was conceived by Richardson and Domingos in [29] (from 2006) and has been an often discussed LGM ever since, see e.g. [5, 8, 17]. A *Markov logic network* (MLN) over σ is a finite set of pairs $(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w)$ where $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ is a first-order formula over σ (and we allow the formula to use the identity symbol ‘=’) and w is a nonnegative real number, called the *weight* of the formula. Each MLN \mathbb{M} determines, on every finite domain, a Markov random field (or Markov network) and a probability distribution on that domain. It is probably not clear why an MLN is called a *graphical* model. The reason is that if an MLN is “grounded”, as a Markov random field (also called Markov network) on a finite domain D , then it produces an undirected graph the vertices of which are all groundings of atomic formulas in the domain D . Two different vertices, that is, grounded atomic formulas, have an undirected edge between them if both appear as subformulas in some grounding of a formula of the MLN. For example, if $R(x) \vee R(y)$ is a formula of an MLN and the domain D contains elements a and b , then $R(a) \vee R(b)$ is a grounding of $R(x) \vee R(y)$ in D and $R(a)$ and $R(b)$ are vertices in the produced Markov random field on D and there will be an edge between them (as both $R(a)$ and $R(b)$ are subformulas of $R(a) \vee R(b)$). This indicates that $R(a)$ depends on $R(b)$ and that $R(b)$ depends on $R(a)$, so “influence” goes in both directions. The strength of the influence is given by the weight that is assigned to the formula $R(x) \vee R(y)$ by the MLN.

In particular, every MLN \mathbb{M} determines a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ on \mathbf{W}_n for each positive integer n as explained precisely in Definition 5.2. But, intuitively speaking, an MLN, say \mathbb{M} , over a language σ determines a probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n in such a way that, other things equal, if $(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w) \in \mathbb{M}$, $w > 0$, $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \mathbf{W}_n$, and the number of ν -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_ν) of elements from $[n]$ such that $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_\nu)$ (meaning that (a_1, \dots, a_ν) satisfies $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ in \mathcal{A}) is larger than the number of ν -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_ν) such that $\mathcal{A}' \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_\nu)$, then the probability of \mathcal{A} is higher than that of \mathcal{A}' . Thus, for each $(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w) \in \mathbb{M}$, $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ can be viewed as a *soft constraint* which may be violated but each violation of it makes the structure (possible world) in which the violation happens less probable; and the larger w is, the more is each violation penalized by decreasing the probability more. As shown in [29, Proposition 4.3], if n is *fixed* and we let all weights of an MLN \mathbb{M} tend to infinity, then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ will converge to a distribution on \mathbf{W}_n such that every structure in which some tuple violates some constraint gets probability 0, and all other structures (in which no constraint is ever violated) get equal probability. (Of course this presupposes that the later kind of structure exist.) But here we do not consider a fixed n , but n that tends to infinity and then the situation is more complicated. All previous examples and results that I am aware of about MLNs and varying domain size have only considered MLNs such that all soft constraints have been quantifier-free formulas, that is, boolean combinations of atomic formulas, although a soft constraint may in general be any first-order formula. We call MLNs with only quantifier-free formulas as soft constraints *quantifier-free MLNs*.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS STUDY

2.1. Brief summary. It will be demonstrated that the asymptotic behavior of random structures with respect to $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where \mathbb{M} is an MLN, can differ very much depending on the soft constraints used. Even for very simple languages the behaviour and its analysis can be quite complex. Sometimes the weight(s) of an MLN will influence (even strongly) the asymptotic behaviour of random structures, sometimes it/they will not. Three types of concrete examples of quantifier-free MLNs will be analysed:

- (1) Arbitrary quantifier-free MLNs over a language $\sigma = \{R\}$ where the relation symbol R has arity 1. Intuitively, we can see these MLNs as specifying various

distributions of a “colouring”. In this case we give a pretty complete characterization of the possible limit behaviours of random structures.

- (2) An MLN that favours graphs with fewer triangles (or more generally, fewer k -cliques). As a corollary of the analysis a “ δ -approximate 0-1 law” for first-order logic is obtained.
- (3) An MLN that favours graphs with fewer vertices with degree more than Δ , for an arbitrary fixed $\Delta \geq 1$.

In contrast to examples given in [15, 27, 28, 33] the above MLNs have a clear combinatorial meaning. It will be demonstrated, using (1) above, that quantifier-free MLNs and lifted Bayesian networks (in a broad sense) are *asymptotically incomparable*, roughly meaning that with either kind of LGM one can define a sequence of probability distributions which can not even be approximated by the other kind of LGM. In a rather general context we also show that the distribution determined by an MLN concentrates its probability density on an entirely different part of the space of possible worlds than the uniform distribution does (Theorem 5.5). So an event that is almost surely true with respect to the MLN is almost surely false with respect to the uniform distribution, and vice versa.

2.2. Colour distributions expressible with quantifier-free MLNs. Theorem 6.3 states that if \mathbb{M} is a quantifier-free MLN over $\sigma = \{R\}$ (with R unary) then there are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in [0, 1]$ such that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and all large enough n , the proportion of elements in $[n]$ that satisfy R is, with high probability (tending to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$), within distance ε to one of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$. The numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ are the points in the interval $[0, 1]$ where a polynomial that depends only on \mathbb{M} reaches its maximum when restricted to $[0, 1]$. In particular these numbers depend on the weights of the soft constraints of \mathbb{M} and can be changed rather freely by tuning the weights up and down.

For example, we can construct an MLN (as in Theorem 6.2) in which all soft constraints have 2 variables and such that with probability tending to $1/2$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, a random $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ will have no coloured point, and with probability tending to $1/2$ all points are coloured. (The associated polynomial restricted to $[0, 1]$ will have maxima in 0 and 1.) We can also construct an MLN with the *same* soft constraints as the previous one but with different weights (changing the shape of the mentioned polynomial), with the effect that for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the probability that the proportion of points that are coloured is close to α tends to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

2.3. Relative asymptotic expressivity. Since there are several different sorts of LGMs one can ask how they relate to each other, especially from an asymptotic point of view. Another way to informally phrase the question is to ask to which extent one kind of LGM, say a lifted Bayesian network (of some kind) is “replaceable” by another kind of LGM, say an MLN. A step in this direction, but only for directed acyclic LGMs, was made in [26] where some *inference frameworks* were classified according to their relative asymptotic expressivity. To compare sequences of probability distributions we use the notion now defined. Let \mathbb{P}_n and \mathbb{P}'_n be probability distributions on \mathbf{W}_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. We will say that

($\mathbb{P}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}^+$) and ($\mathbb{P}'_n : n \in \mathbb{N}^+$) are *asymptotically total variation equivalent* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is n_ε such that for all $n \geq n_\varepsilon$ and all $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{W}_n$, $|\mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{Y}) - \mathbb{P}'_n(\mathbf{Y})| < \varepsilon$.

Below it will be proved, in the simplest context where the language σ contains only one relation symbol R and it has arity 1, that lifted Bayesian networks (in a quite broad sense) and quantifier-free MLNs are “asymptotically incomparable”:

- (Theorem 6.2) There is a quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M} over σ such that for every lifted Bayesian network \mathbb{G} over σ , $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ are *not* asymptotically total variation equivalent.
- (Theorem 6.4) There is a lifted Bayesian network \mathbb{G} over σ (the DAG of \mathbb{G} consists of only one vertex R) such that for every quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M} over σ , $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ are *not* asymptotically total variation equivalent.

It does not seem likely to me that lifted Bayesian networks over σ and quantifier-free MLNs over σ would become “asymptotically comparable” if we would consider a language σ with more symbols, or a symbol with higher arity than 1.

2.4. MLNs that favour graphs with few triangles. Suppose that \mathbb{M} is an MLN which makes graphs with fewer triangles more likely, so the single soft constraint of \mathbb{M} is a formula that says “ x, y and z does not form a triangle”. By Theorem 7.1 below, for each $\delta > 0$, if the weight is chosen large enough (depending only on δ) then for all large enough n the probability, using $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$, that a random graph with n vertices is triangle-free is at least $1 - \delta$.

As a corollary of Theorem 7.1 we get, for every $\delta > 0$, a δ -*approximate zero-one law* for first-order logic in the case of the MLN that favours graphs with fewer triangles, provided that the weight of its soft constraint is large enough (Corollary 7.3). I am not aware of any zero-one law for an MLN or for any other undirected LGM, so this appears to be the closest thing so far. The results concerning the soft constraint “ x, y and z does not form a triangle” still hold if, for any $k \geq 4$, the soft constraint “ x, y and z does not form a triangle” is replaced by the soft constraint “ x_1, \dots, x_k does not form a clique (complete subgraph) of k different vertices”.

2.5. MLNs that favour graphs with a bound on the maximum degree. Now let \mathbb{M} be an MLN which, for a fixed but arbitrary integer $\Delta > 0$, makes graphs with fewer vertices with degree higher than Δ more likely, so as the single soft constraint of \mathbb{M} we take a formula that says “if all $x_2, \dots, x_{\Delta+2}$ are different then x_1 is not adjacent to all of them”. By Theorem 8.1, *no matter how* the weight is chosen, the probability, using $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$, that a random graph with n vertices has maximum degree at most Δ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This situation is a contrast to the example of an MLN favouring graphs with few triangles, where we can make the asymptotic probability that the soft constraint is always satisfied as close to 1 as we like by choosing the weight large enough.

3. RELATED WORK AND DISCUSSION

There is a fairly large number of rather general (and mostly recent) results concerning convergence for broad classes of logical formulas with respect to distributions generated by different kinds of *directed acyclic LGMs* such as relational Bayesian networks [14], relational Bayesian network specifications [7], lifted Bayesian networks [22, 25], probabilistic logic programs [31], PLA-networks [26, 24, 23], and functional lifted Bayesian networks [32]. There are also convergence results related to graph neural networks [1, 2, 3].

Regarding convergence results for distributions generated by *undirected* LGMs I am only aware of the articles [15, 27, 28, 33]. Poole, Buchanan, Kazemi, Kersting, and Natarajan [28] followed up by Mittal, Bhardwaj, Gogate, and Singla [27] and by Weitekämper [33] showed the following: If \mathbb{M} is an MLN with a single soft constraint and φ denotes a ground atomic formula, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{E}_n^\varphi)$ need *not* depend on the weight of the soft constraint of \mathbb{M} . In these studies the soft constraint considered seems a bit contrived as it does not seem to have any intuitive meaning. In any case, since the limit (as above) does not depend on the weight of the soft constraint, the weight loses its influence with respect to $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{E}_n^\varphi)$ when n is large enough.

To remedy the loss of influence of the weight of the soft constraint, for large n , a couple of modifications of Markov logic networks have been proposed by Jain, Barthels, and Beetz (Adaptive MLNs) [15], and by Mittal, Bhardwaj, Gogate, and Singla (domain-size aware MLNs) [27]. The common idea of these modifications is the following: Suppose that \mathbb{M} is an (ordinary) MLN with weights learned on a domain with size m . For simplicity suppose that \mathbb{M} has only one soft constraint with learned weight w . Now we construct a *rescaled MLN* \mathbb{M}' which replaces the constant weight w by a function f_w , that depends on w , from the positive integers to the nonnegative reals. For each positive integer n , \mathbb{M}' determines a probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n by taking \mathbb{M} , replacing its weight w by $f_w(n)$ and using the so modified \mathbb{M} to determine a distribution on \mathbf{W}_n in the usual way for MLNs. Thus, the weight of \mathbb{M}' is not a constant but a function of n that depends on w . In [15] and [27] it is shown that, for the earlier considered soft constraints in [28]) and ground formulas φ (matching the respective soft constraint) and with the respective rescaling \mathbb{M}' of \mathbb{M} , the limit probability of φ , using \mathbb{M}' , exists and *depends* on w , the weight of the single soft constraint of the original MLN \mathbb{M} .

However, Weitekämper [33] later showed that if we consider *another* ground atomic formula, say ψ , from the same example of MLN (that is, using the same soft constraint), then the limit probability of ψ (using the rescaled \mathbb{M}') exists and does *not* depend on the weight w of the original \mathbb{M} . So the approach of rescaled MLNs in [15, 27] do not, in general, solve the problem of the weights becoming irrelevant in the limit. To complicate the picture further, it is clear from the results in Section 6 that the weights of the MLNs considered there *do (strongly) influence* the limit probabilities of ground atomic formulas.

Besides that there seems to be no known rescaling that always gives dependence on the weights in the limit of ground atomic formulas, let alone for logical formulas in general, and besides that sometimes the weights matter without rescaling (as demonstrated in Section 6), the question is also how to motivate that any kind of rescaled weights are the “right ones”. Or why should the limit obtained with some of the suggested rescalings in each of a few examples be considered the “right” limit, especially if it is not made clear in a sufficiently general setting how the limit of the rescaled MLN depends on the original MLN? A criterion for a “good rescaling” could arguably be that if (for simplicity) \mathbb{M} is an MLN with only one soft constraint with weight w which has been learned from a domain of size m , $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ is the distribution determined by \mathbb{M} on \mathbf{W}_n , \mathbb{M}' is the rescaled MLN (obtained from \mathbb{M}), $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}'}$ is the distribution on \mathbf{W}_n determined by \mathbb{M}' , and φ is a ground atomic formula, then $\mathbb{P}_m^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{E}_n^\varphi)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}'}(\mathbf{E}_n^\varphi)$ should be approximately the same for all sufficiently large n ; the closer the better.

But given the uncertainty about what would be the “right” rescaling of an ordinary MLN to get asymptotic probabilities where the original (learned and constant) weights matter in a sensible way, it seems of interest to further study the asymptotic properties of distributions $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ determined by ordinary MLNs \mathbb{M} , with various types of soft constraints, to get a better idea of the asymptotic behaviour of MLNs with respect to the domain size. Are there patterns and to which extent would such patterns guide our use of such models, or of their rescalings?

4. NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

\mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}^+ denote the set of nonnegative, respectively, positive integers. Let $\exp_2(x) := 2^x$. If S is a set then $|S|$ denotes its cardinality, also informally called its size. Finite sequences will be denoted by \bar{s} for some letter s and the length of \bar{s} will be denoted by $|\bar{s}|$.

Basic knowledge about first-order logic will be assumed (see e.g. [9, 13]). If a sequence of logical variables is denoted by \bar{x} (say) then it is assumed that all entries in \bar{x} are different (i.e. if $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ then $x_i \neq x_j$ whenever $i \neq j$). By a *language* (also

called *signature* or *vocabulary*) we mean a finite set of relation symbols σ where all relation symbols in σ have arity ≥ 1 and the identity symbol ‘=’ does not belong to σ . If σ is a language then $FO(\sigma)$ is the set of first-order formulas that can be formed by using symbols in σ and the identity symbol ‘=’. If a formula in $FO(\sigma)$ is denoted by $\varphi(\bar{x})$ (where \bar{x} is a finite sequence of logical variables) then it is assumed that every free variable in the formula denoted by $\varphi(\bar{x})$ occurs in \bar{x} and that every variable that occurs in \bar{x} is a free variable of the formula denoted by $\varphi(\bar{x})$. First-order structures will be denoted by calligraphic letters \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , etc. If $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in FO(\sigma)$ and \mathcal{A} is a σ -structure with domain A (i.e. an interpretation of all relations in σ on the domain A), then we let the notation ‘ $\varphi(\mathcal{A})$ ’ denote the set of k -tuples of elements from the domain of \mathcal{A} that satisfy $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$, or equivalently,

$$\varphi(\mathcal{A}) := \{(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in A^k : \mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_k)\}.$$

If φ is a sentence (formula without free variables) and $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi$, then we let $\varphi(\mathcal{A})$ be the set containing only the empty sequence, and otherwise we let $\varphi(\mathcal{A})$ be the empty set. If $R \in \sigma$ is a relation symbol then $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes its interpretation in the σ -structure \mathcal{A} , and it follows that $R(\mathcal{A}) = R^{\mathcal{A}}$. Let R be a k -ary relation on a set A . We say that R is *irreflexive and symmetric* if the following holds: (a) $R(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ implies that all a_1, \dots, a_k are different, and (b) if $R(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ holds then, for every permutation τ of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, $R(a_{\tau(1)}, \dots, a_{\tau(k)})$ holds.

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we let $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For every language σ , \mathbf{W}_n denotes the set of all σ -structures with domain $[n]$.

5. MARKOV LOGIC NETWORKS

Let σ be a nonempty language, let $r \geq 1$ be the number of relation symbols in σ , and let $\rho \geq 1$ be the maximal arity of a relation symbol in σ . We assume that for each $R \in \sigma$ it is specified if R can be interpreted as any relation (of arity matching that of R) or if R must always be interpreted as an irreflexive and symmetric relation. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let \mathbf{W}_n be the set of σ -structures with domain $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that if it is specified that $R \in \sigma$ should be interpreted as an irreflexive and symmetric relation then this is the case in all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$.

In this section we define the notion of a Markov logic network over σ and the probability distribution that it defines on \mathbf{W}_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. The first part of the main result of this section, Theorem 5.5, is that if \mathbb{M} is an MLN with $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ as its only soft constraint with positive weight w , then, with probability approaching 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the number of ν -tuples of elements that violate $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ in a random structure from \mathbf{W}_n is less or equal to rn^ρ/w . The second part of the same theorem tells that, with the uniform distribution on \mathbf{W}_n , if $\nu > \rho$ then the probability of the same event tends to 0, so the two distributions behave in “opposite ways” if $\nu > \rho$. In order to prove the second part of Theorem 5.5 we need a result which is a combination of results from [12] and [16]. Theorem 5.5 will be used to prove the main result of Section 7, Theorem 7.1. Finally we give a technical (but useful) lemma that states that for every quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M} over σ there is a quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M}' such that, for all n , \mathbb{M} and \mathbb{M}' determine the same distribution on \mathbf{W}_n and \mathbb{M}' has a specific “normal form”. This lemma will be used in Section 6

Definition 5.1. A *Markov logic network (MLN)* over σ is a finite set \mathbb{M} of pairs of the form $(\varphi(\bar{x}), w)$ where $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$, \bar{x} is a sequence of distinct variables, and w is a non-negative real number. We also assume that for $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$, $\varphi(\bar{x})$ occurs in at most one pair of \mathbb{M} . For each $(\varphi(\bar{x}), w) \in \mathbb{M}$, we call $\varphi(\bar{x})$ a *soft constraint* (of \mathbb{M}) and w its *weight*; we also call $|\bar{x}|$ the *arity* of the soft constraint $\varphi(\bar{x})$. If for every $(\varphi(\bar{x}), w) \in \mathbb{M}$ the formula $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is quantifier-free we call \mathbb{M} a *quantifier-free MLN*.

Note that if \mathbb{M} is an MLN and $(\varphi(\bar{x}), w) \in \mathbb{M}$ and $(\psi(\bar{y}), v) \in \mathbb{M}$ are different pairs, then \bar{x} and \bar{y} may be different sequences of variables and they may have different lengths. We allow \bar{x} in $\varphi(\bar{x})$ to be empty in which case φ is a sentence (a formula without free variables). Recall that if $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is a first-order formula and \mathcal{A} is a finite structure, then $|\varphi(\mathcal{A})|$ is the number of ordered $|\bar{x}|$ -tuples of elements from the domain of \mathcal{A} that satisfy $\varphi(\bar{x})$ in \mathcal{A} .

Definition 5.2. Let $\mathbb{M} = \{(\varphi_1(\bar{x}_1), w_1), \dots, (\varphi_t(\bar{x}_t), w_t)\}$ be an MLN and let $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

For every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$, define $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathcal{A}) = \exp_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^t w_i |\varphi_i(\mathcal{A})| \right)$,

and for every $\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathbf{W}_n$, define $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{X}} \mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathcal{A})$, and

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X})}{\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n)}.$$

Then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ is a probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n which we call the *distribution (on \mathbf{W}_n) determined by \mathbb{M}* .

Remark 5.3. (a) If \mathbb{M} is the empty set, then the “empty” sum has value zero and it follows that $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ is the uniform probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n .

(b) If all weights are zero, then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ is the uniform probability distribution.

(c) Recall that from the notational conventions it follows that, if some φ_i in Definition 5.2 is a sentence, that is, if \bar{x}_i is empty, then $|\varphi_i(\mathcal{A})| = 1$ if $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi_i$ and $|\varphi_i(\mathcal{A})| = 0$ otherwise.

(d) The choice of 2 as a base of exponentiation is irrelevant for the results to be presented (as long as the base is larger than 1), but will make some computations simpler.

Theorem 5.4. (Combination of results [12] and [16]) *Let $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_l)$, let $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$ and suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is satisfiable in a finite structure by an l -tuple of distinct elements. Then there is $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $c > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n ,*

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{|\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : (\alpha - \varepsilon)n^l \leq |\varphi(\mathcal{A})| \leq (\alpha + \varepsilon)n^l\}|}{|\mathbf{W}_n|} \geq 1 - e^{-cn}.$$

If also $\neg\varphi(\bar{x})$ is satisfiable in a finite structure by an l -tuple of distinct elements, then $\alpha < 1$.

Proof. The results of [12] and [16] hold no matter if some relation symbols are always interpreted as irreflexive and symmetric relations, or not, so we need not worry about this. Suppose that $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$ is satisfiable in a finite structure by an l -tuple of distinct elements. By [12] there is a quantifier-free $\psi(\bar{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$ such that if

$$\mathbf{X}_n = \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models \forall \bar{x}(\varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}))\}$$

then there is $d > 0$ such that $\frac{|\mathbf{X}_n|}{|\mathbf{W}_n|} \geq 1 - e^{-dn}$ for all sufficiently large n . Without loss of generality we may assume that $\psi(\bar{x})$ has the form $\bigvee_{i=1}^s \theta_i(\bar{x})$ where each $\theta_i(\bar{x})$ is a maximal consistent conjunction of σ -literals using the variables in \bar{x} . Without loss of generality we may assume that $\theta_1(\bar{x}), \dots, \theta_t(\bar{x})$, where $t \leq s$, enumerates (without repetition) all $\theta_i(\bar{x})$ such that $\theta_i(\bar{x}) \models \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} x_i \neq x_j$. This sequence is nonempty because we assume that $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is satisfied by an l -tuple of distinct elements in some finite structure. It follows results in [16] that, for every $i = 1, \dots, t$, there is $0 < \alpha_i \leq 1$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $c_\varepsilon > 0$ (depending only on ε) such that for all sufficiently large

n ,

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{|\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : (\alpha_i - \varepsilon)n^l \leq |\theta_i(\mathcal{A})| \leq (\alpha_i + \varepsilon)n^l\}|}{|\mathbf{W}_n|} \geq 1 - e^{-c\varepsilon n}.$$

(To be more precise, the above is a consequence of Lemma 3.2 and lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 in [16], including their proofs to get the exponentially fast convergence to 1.) With $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_t$ we get (5.1) (for some $c > 0$).

Now suppose that $\neg\varphi(\bar{x})$ is satisfiable in a finite structure by an l -tuple of distinct elements. Then there is a maximal consistent conjunction of σ -literals using the variables in \bar{x} , say $\theta(\bar{x})$ such that $\theta(\bar{x}) \models \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq l} x_i \neq x_j$ and $\theta(\bar{x}) \wedge \theta_i(\bar{x})$ is inconsistent for all $i = 1, \dots, t$. Then (5.2) holds with $\theta(\bar{x})$ in place of $\theta_i(\bar{x})$ and some $0 < \beta \leq 1$ in place of α_i . Consequently $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_t < 1$. \square

If $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$ then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $0 \leq m \leq n$, we define

$$\mathbf{Y}_n^m(\varphi) := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |\neg\varphi(\mathcal{A})| \leq m\}.$$

Hence $\mathbf{Y}_n^m(\varphi)$ consists of all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ such that at most m $|\bar{x}|$ -tuples of elements from $[n]$ “violate” $\varphi(\bar{x})$ in \mathcal{A} . In particular, $\mathbf{Y}_n^0(\varphi)$ consists of all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ such no tuple violates $\varphi(\bar{x})$ in \mathcal{A} , or equivalently, $\mathcal{A} \models \forall \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x})$.

Informally, part (a) of the next result says if $\mathbb{M} = \{(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w)\}$ is an MLN then, with probability (determined by \mathbb{M}) approaching 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, all but at most $\frac{rn^\rho}{w}$ ν -tuples from the domain of a random structure satisfy $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ (where ρ is the maximal arity of a relation symbol in σ and $r = |\sigma|$). On the other hand, part (b) says that if $\nu > \rho$ and $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ has a property that should be satisfied by any interesting soft constraint, then the *proportion* of structures with domain $[n]$ in which all but at most $\frac{rn^\rho}{w}$ ν -tuples from the domain satisfy $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n determined by \mathbb{M} and the uniform distribution on \mathbf{W}_n concentrate almost all their respective probability masses on disjoint subsets of \mathbf{W}_n for large n .

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\mathbb{M} = \{(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w)\}$ where $w > 0$ be an MLN. Suppose that, for all sufficiently large n , $|\mathbf{Y}_n^0(\varphi)| \geq 2^{cn}$ for some $c > 0$ that depends only on φ . Define $f(n) = \frac{rn^\rho}{w}$.*

(a) *For all sufficiently large n , $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi)) \geq 1 - 2^{-cn}$.*

(b) *If $\nu > \rho$ and each one of $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ and $\neg\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ is satisfiable in a finite structure by a ν -tuple of distinct elements, then there is $d > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n*

$$\frac{|\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi)|}{|\mathbf{W}_n|} \leq 2^{-dn}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{M} = \{(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w)\}$ where $w > 0$ be an MLN and let $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ be the distribution on \mathbf{W}_n determined by \mathbb{M} . Suppose that, for all sufficiently large n , $|\mathbf{Y}_n^0(\varphi)| \geq 2^{cn}$ for some $c > 0$ that depends only on φ and define $f(n) := \frac{rn^\rho}{w}$. Then, for all sufficiently large n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n \setminus \mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi)) &= \frac{\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n \setminus \mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi))}{\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n \setminus \mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi))}{\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{Y}_n^0(\varphi))} \leq \frac{|\mathbf{W}_n| \cdot 2^{w(n^\nu - f(n))}}{|\mathbf{Y}_n^0(\varphi)| \cdot 2^{wn^\nu}} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{rn^\rho + wn^\nu - wf(n)}}{2^{cn + wn^\nu}} = \frac{2^{rn^\rho + wn^\nu - rn^\rho}}{2^{cn + wn^\nu}} = \frac{1}{2^{cn}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for large enough n , $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi)) \geq 1 - 2^{-cn}$.

Suppose that $\nu > \rho$ and that each one of $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ and $\neg\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_\nu)$ is satisfiable in a finite structure by an ν -tuple of distinct elements. It follows from Theorem 5.4 that

there is $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $d > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large n ,

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{|\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : (\alpha - \varepsilon)n^\nu \leq |\varphi(\mathcal{A})| \leq (\alpha + \varepsilon)n^\nu\}|}{|\mathbf{W}_n|} \geq 1 - e^{-dn}.$$

Also observe that (since $\nu > \rho$) if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi)$ then, for all large enough n , $|\varphi(\mathcal{A})| \geq n^\nu - f(n) = n^\nu - \frac{rn^\rho}{w} > n^\nu - \varepsilon n^\nu = (1 - \varepsilon)n^\nu$ if $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. So for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi) \cap \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : (\alpha - \varepsilon)n^\nu \leq |\varphi(\mathcal{A})| \leq (\alpha + \varepsilon)n^\nu\} = \emptyset.$$

This together with (5.3) implies that, for some $d > 0$ and all sufficiently large n , $|\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}(\varphi)|/|\mathbf{W}_n| \leq 2^{-dn}$. \square

The next lemma gives a kind of “normal form” for quantifier-free MLNs which will be used to prove the main results of the next section. I believe that it will also be useful for proving future results about quantifier-free MLNs.

Lemma 5.6. *Let \mathbb{M} be a quantifier-free MLN over σ . Then there is a quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M}' over σ such that*

- \mathbb{M} and \mathbb{M}' determine the same probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n for all n , and
- for some $\nu \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $s_1, \dots, s_\nu \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{M}' = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\nu} \{(\varphi_{k,1}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,1}), \dots, (\varphi_{k,s_k}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,s_k})\}$$

where, for all $k = 1, \dots, \nu$ and $l = 1, \dots, s_k$, $\varphi_{k,l}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is a maximal consistent conjunction of σ -literals which implies $x_i \neq x_j$ if $1 \leq i < j \leq k$.

Proof. Let \mathbb{M} be a quantifier-free MLN over σ . Let \mathbb{M}_1 consist of all pairs $(\theta(\bar{x}), w)$ that satisfy the following conditions:

- (1) $\theta(\bar{x})$ is a maximal consistent conjunction of literals using variables from \bar{x}
- (2) there is some $(\varphi(\bar{x}), v) \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $\theta(\bar{x})$ implies $\varphi(\bar{x})$
- (3) w is the sum of all v such that there is $(\varphi(\bar{x}), v) \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $\theta(\bar{x})$ implies $\varphi(\bar{x})$.

Let \mathbb{M}_2 be obtained from \mathbb{M}_1 by keeping (in \mathbb{M}_2) only one of two pairs $(\theta(\bar{x}), w)$ and $(\theta'(\bar{x}), w')$ if $\theta(\bar{x})$ and $\theta'(\bar{x})$ are equivalent (and note that in this case $w = w'$, because of the construction of \mathbb{M}_1). Then (as the reader can verify) \mathbb{M} and \mathbb{M}_2 determine the same probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n for all n .

Let us fix some order on the countably infinite set of logical variables. For variables x_i and x_j of a maximal consistent conjunction of literals $\theta(\bar{x})$ define $E(x_i, x_j)$ if and only if $\theta(\bar{x})$ implies $x_i = x_j$. Since $\theta(\bar{x})$ is consistent, if $\theta(\bar{x})$ implies $x_i = x_j$ and implies $x_j = x_l$, then $\theta(\bar{x})$ implies $x_i = x_l$. So E is an equivalence relation on the variables that occur in $\theta(\bar{x})$. For every maximal consistent conjunction of literals $\theta(\bar{x})$ let *the variable reduction of $\theta(\bar{x})$* be the formula obtained by, for every equivalence class of E , choosing the first variable (according to the order of variables), say x_i , in the class and replacing, in $\varphi(\bar{x})$, every other (if there is any) variable in the same class by x_i . It follows that if $\theta'(\bar{x}')$ is the variable reduction of a maximal consistent conjunction of literals $\theta(\bar{x})$, then $\text{rng}(\bar{x}') \subseteq \text{rng}(\bar{x})$, $\theta'(\bar{x}')$ is a maximal consistent conjunction of literals, $\theta'(\bar{x}')$ implies $x_i \neq x_j$ for all different variables x_i and x_j that occur in $\theta'(\bar{x}')$, and, for every finite structure \mathcal{A} , $|\theta'(\mathcal{A})| = |\theta(\mathcal{A})|$ (that is, the number of $|\bar{x}|$ -tuples that satisfy $\theta(\bar{x})$ equals the number of $|\bar{x}'|$ -tuples that satisfy $\theta'(\bar{x}')$).

Define \mathbb{M}' to consist of all pairs $(\theta'(\bar{x}'), w)$ such that there is $(\theta(\bar{x}), v) \in \mathbb{M}_2$ such that $\theta'(\bar{x}')$ is the variable reduction of $\theta(\bar{x})$, and w is the sum of all v such that there is $(\theta(\bar{x}), v) \in \mathbb{M}_2$ such that $\theta'(\bar{x}')$ is the variable reduction of $\theta(\bar{x})$. Then (as the reader

can verify) \mathbb{M}' and \mathbb{M}_2 (hence \mathbb{M}' and \mathbb{M}) determine the same probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n for all n . \square

6. COLOUR DISTRIBUTIONS EXPRESSIBLE WITH QUANTIFIER-FREE MLNS

In this section we consider the simplest case of a nonempty language σ , namely when $\sigma = \{R\}$ where R is a unary relation symbol, and we can think of $R(x)$ as meaning “ x is coloured”. We will describe the probability distributions that quantifier-free MLNs over σ can determine in a fairly precise way and the proof shows that the weights play a vital role (Theorem 6.3). This will be used (in combination with Theorems 6.2 and 6.4) to show that quantifier-free MLNs and lifted Bayesian networks are “asymptotically incomparable”. We begin by mentioning a characteristic property of lifted Bayesian networks over σ .

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that \mathbb{G} is a lifted Bayesian network over σ , in a general sense (e.g. as in any of [14, 7, 22, 26, 32]). Then, if $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $a, b \in [n]$ are different, the events $\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(a)\}$ and $\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(b)\}$ are independent with respect to the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}$ on \mathbf{W}_n determined by \mathbb{G} .*

Proof. Suppose that \mathbb{G} is a lifted Bayesian network over σ according to any one of the formalizations, or templates, that have been considered (e.g. [14, 7, 22, 26, 32]). Then the underlying directed acyclic graph of \mathbb{G} has only one vertex, say the formula $R(x)$ which can also be viewed as a parameterized/lifted random variable. \mathbb{G} also attaches a probability α to $R(x)$ and this is interpreted as meaning that, for every n , the grounding of \mathbb{G} on $[n]$ produces the Bayesian network with the grounded formulas $R(1), \dots, R(n)$ as its vertices and no edge between them (as there is no edge in \mathbb{G}) and where the same probability α is associated to all $R(i)$. By the usual rules for computing probabilities with Bayesian networks it follows that if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ then the probability of \mathcal{A} is $\alpha^{|\varphi(\mathcal{A})|}(1 - \alpha)^{n - |\varphi(\mathcal{A})|}$ where $|\varphi(\mathcal{A})|$ is the number of elements that satisfy $R(x)$ in \mathcal{A} . It follows from this (by standard arguments) that for different $a, b \in [n]$, the events $\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(a)\}$ and $\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(b)\}$ are independent. \square

We will use the following notation, where $0 \leq m \leq n$ are integers:

$$\mathbf{W}_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |R(\mathcal{A})| = m\}.$$

So intuitively speaking, \mathbf{W}_n^m consists of the structures from \mathbf{W}_n in which exactly m elements are coloured, and note that \mathbf{W}_n^0 and \mathbf{W}_n^n are singleton sets.

The next result states, in a precise way, that there is an MLN \mathbb{M} such that no lifted Bayesian network, in a broad sense, can approximate the sequence of distributions $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ that is determined by \mathbb{M} . Recall the definition of *asymptotic total variation equivalence* in Section 2.3.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathbb{M} = \{(\varphi_0(x, y), w_0), (\varphi_1(x, y), w_1), (\varphi_2(x, y), w_2)\}$ be an MLN where $w_0 = w_2 = 1$, $w_1 = 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_0(x, y) & \text{ is the formula } \neg R(x) \wedge \neg R(y), \\ \varphi_1(x, y) & \text{ is the formula } (R(x) \wedge \neg R(y)) \vee (\neg R(x) \wedge R(y)), \text{ and} \\ \varphi_2(x, y) & \text{ is the formula } R(x) \wedge R(y). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n^0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n^n) = \frac{1}{2}$, and hence, for all large enough n and all distinct $i, j \in [n]$, the event that $R(i)$ holds is dependent on the event that $R(j)$ holds. Consequently, there does not exist a lifted Bayesian network (in a broad sense) \mathbb{G} such that the sequences of distributions $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ are asymptotically total variation equivalent.

Since, in this section, we only work with one relation symbol which has arity 1, which can represent a colour, the only interesting property of a structure is the number, or

proportion, of coloured elements in it. Informally speaking, the next theorem states that if the sequence of probability distributions is determined by a quantifier-free MLN, then, for large n , this proportion is almost surely approximately equal to one of the numbers in a finite set of numbers determined by the MLN.

Theorem 6.3. *Let \mathbb{M} be a quantifier-free MLN over σ . Then there are $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in [0, 1]$, depending only on \mathbb{M} , such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} \left(\left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \frac{|R(\mathcal{A})|}{n} \in \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \right\} \right) = 1.$$

The numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$ are the points in the interval $[0, 1]$ where a polynomial that depends only on \mathbb{M} reaches its maximum when restricted to $[0, 1]$. In particular, these numbers depend on the weights of the soft constraints of \mathbb{M} .

The next result is the converse of Theorem 6.2 and shows that there is a sequence $(\mathbb{P}_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ of distributions that is determined by a lifted Bayesian network over σ (in the sense of [14] or [26] for example), but there is no MLN over σ such that the sequence of distributions that it determines is asymptotically total variation equivalent to $(\mathbb{P}_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$.

Theorem 6.4. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ define*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^*(\mathcal{A}) = n^{-\frac{1}{5}|R(\mathcal{A})|} \cdot (1 - n^{-\frac{1}{5}})^{n-|R(\mathcal{A})|},$$

so, informally speaking, \mathbb{P}_n^ is the probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n such that, for all $i \in [n]$, the probability that $R(i)$ holds is $n^{-\frac{1}{5}}$, independently of whether $R(j)$ holds for $j \neq i$. There is a lifted Bayesian network \mathbb{G} over σ (according to any one of the formalizations in [14] or [26]) such that the probability distribution that \mathbb{G} determines on \mathbf{W}_n is exactly \mathbb{P}_n^* for all n .*

For every quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M} over σ , the sequences of distributions $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n^ : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ are not asymptotically total variation equivalent. In fact, for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^* \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)n^{4/5}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)n^{4/5}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) \neq 1.$$

The proofs of the above theorems are found in Appendices B, C, and D.

Remark 6.5. One may ask if, for every MLN \mathbb{M} over σ there is a *quantifier-free* MLN \mathbb{M}' over σ such that the sequences $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}'} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ are asymptotically total variation equivalent? I believe that the answer is negative. To give an idea of why, let $\psi(x, y)$ be the formula

$$\begin{aligned} x &= x \wedge y = y \wedge \\ \exists u, v, w &(R(u) \wedge R(v) \wedge R(w) \wedge u \neq v \wedge u \neq w \wedge v \neq w \wedge \\ \forall z &(R(z) \rightarrow (z = u \vee z = v \vee z = w))). \end{aligned}$$

Then let $\mathbb{M}_3 := \{(\psi(x, y), w)\}$ where $w > 0$. It follows that if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n^3$ then $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}_3}(\mathcal{A}) = 2^{wn^2}$, and if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n \setminus \mathbf{W}_n^3$ then $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}_3}(\mathcal{A}) = 1$. Note also that $|\mathbf{W}_n| = 2^n$. By straightforward arguments it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}_3}(\mathbf{W}_n^3) = 1$. Suppose that \mathbb{M} is a quantifier-free MLN over σ . Due to the character of the function (in the proof of Theorem 6.3) that determines $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{W}_n^3)$ I do not believe that $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ can concentrate almost all of its probability mass on \mathbf{W}_n^3 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. There is nothing particular about the number 3. I think that the same holds for any *fixed* $m > 0$. But to verify (or refute) this conjecture seems to require a detailed technical analysis which I leave for another occasion.

7. MLNS THAT FAVOUR GRAPHS WITH FEW TRIANGLES

In this section we assume that $\sigma = \{R\}$ where R is a relation symbol of arity 2 which is always interpreted as an irreflexive and symmetric relation. Thus \mathbf{W}_n is the set of all undirected graphs without loops with vertex set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ and we simply refer to these as graphs. Let $\varphi(x, y, z)$ be a formula that expresses that “ x and y and z does not form a triangle”, so $\varphi(x, y, z)$ can be

$$x = y \vee x = z \vee y = z \vee \neg R(x, y) \vee \neg R(x, z) \vee \neg R(y, z).$$

Then let

$$\mathbb{M} := \{(\varphi(x, y, z), w)\} \quad \text{where } w \geq 0.$$

Also define, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $0 \leq m \leq n$,

$$\mathbf{X}_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |\neg\varphi(\mathcal{A})| = m\}.$$

Hence \mathbf{X}_n^0 is the set of all triangle-free graphs in \mathbf{W}_n .

The main result of this section tells that by choosing $w > 0$ large enough we can make the asymptotic probability that a random $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ is triangle-free as close to 1 as we like.

Theorem 7.1. *Suppose that $w > 0$. For every $\delta > 0$, if n is large enough then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}_n^0) &\geq 1 - \delta - (1 + \delta) \frac{2^{-w}}{1 - 2^{-w}} \quad \text{where} \\ \lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \delta - (1 + \delta) \frac{2^{-w}}{1 - 2^{-w}} \right) &= 1 - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

If $w = 0$, then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ is the uniform probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n and therefore Theorem 5.4 implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}_n^0) = 0$. Hence the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}_n^0)$ is different in the cases when $w = 0$ and when $w > 0$ is large enough, so the weight w is not entirely irrelevant. Unfortunately I am not able to give an interesting upper bound of $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}_n^0)$ for large n when $w > 0$. A technical obstacle for this is that I am not aware of good enough asymptotics for the numbers $|\mathbf{X}_n^m|$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $1 \leq m \leq n^2/w$. The following 0-1 law for triangle-free graphs was proved by Kolaitis, Prömel and Rotchild in 1987:

Theorem 7.2. [19] *For every first-order sentence φ , the proportion*

$$\frac{|\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{X}_n^0 : \mathcal{A} \models \varphi\}|}{|\mathbf{X}_n^0|} \quad \text{tends to either 0 or 1 as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Corollary 7.3. (δ -approximate 0-1 law) *Let $\delta > 0$ and let φ be a first-order sentence. If the weight w is large enough then, for all large enough n ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models \varphi\}) \quad \text{is either at most } \delta \text{ or at least } 1 - \delta.$$

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$. Let φ be a first-order sentence. Note that if $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbf{X}_n^0$, then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathcal{B})$, so $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ conditioned on \mathbf{X}_n^0 is the uniform distribution. So, by Theorem 7.2, conditioned on \mathbf{X}_n^0 , the probability that φ holds tends to either 0 or 1. By Theorem 7.1, if w is large enough then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{X}_n^0) \geq 1 - \delta/2$ for all large enough n . So, if the probability that φ is true, conditioned on \mathbf{X}_n^0 , tends to 1, then the (unconditional) probability that φ is true is at least $1 - \delta$ for all large enough n . If the probability that φ is true, conditioned on \mathbf{X}_n^0 , tends to 0, then the (unconditional) probability that φ is true is at most δ for all large enough n . \square

Remark 7.4. (Generalization to K_l -free graphs) Theorem 7.2 and Theorems E.1 and E.2 (in Appendix E) are special cases of more general theorems in [19] and [10], respectively, which apply to K_l -free graphs, for $l \geq 3$, where K_l denotes a complete graph with l vertices. (A graph is K_l -free if it has no subgraph that is isomorphic to K_l .) Therefore

the proof of Theorem 7.1 can be modified in a straightforward way (but at the expense of slightly messier computations) to yield a proof of the same statement as in Theorem 7.1, but where the only soft constraint of \mathbb{M} is a formula saying that “ x_1, \dots, x_l do not form a complete graph on l different vertices” and \mathbf{X}_n^0 denotes the set of all K_l -free graphs. Then we also get Corollary 7.3 for the new \mathbb{M} , which favours graphs with fewer copies of K_l , by exactly the same proof as above.

Theorem 7.1 is proved in Appendix E.

8. MLNS THAT FAVOUR GRAPHS WITH A BOUND ON THE MAXIMUM DEGREE

In this section, as in the previous, we let $\sigma = \{R\}$ where R is a relation symbol of arity 2 which is always interpreted as an irreflexive and symmetric relation, so \mathbf{W}_n is the set of all undirected graphs without loops, from now on simply called graphs, with vertex set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$. We also fix some $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Let $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2})$ be the formula

$$\bigvee_{2 \leq i < j \leq \Delta+2} x_i = x_j \vee \bigvee_{i=2}^{\Delta+2} \neg R(x_1, x_i),$$

so $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2})$ expresses that if all $x_2, \dots, x_{\Delta+2}$ are different then x_1 is *not* adjacent to all $x_2, \dots, x_{\Delta+2}$. It follows that if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ and $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2})$ for all choices of $a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2} \in [n]$, then every vertex of \mathcal{A} has degree at most Δ and in this case we say that \mathcal{A} has *maximum degree at most Δ* . Let

$$\mathbb{M} := \{(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2}), w)\} \quad \text{where } w \geq 0.$$

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\Omega_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \text{ has maximum degree at most } m\}.$$

Informally, the result of this section says that no matter how the weight $w \geq 0$ is chosen (or how $\Delta \geq 1$ is chosen), the probability, using $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ determined by \mathbb{M} , that a random graph has maximum degree at most Δ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This is a contrast to Theorem 7.1 where w could be chosen so that triangle-free graphs are more likely than other graphs, if the vertex set is large enough.

Theorem 8.1. *For every choice of the weight $w \geq 0$ of \mathbb{M} , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}(\Omega_n^\Delta) = 0$.*

Remark 8.2. We do not avoid getting the limit 0 in Theorem 8.1 by reducing the number of free variables by the use of quantifiers. For example, if we replace $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2})$ in \mathbb{M} by, say, the soft constraint

$$\psi(x_1) := \forall x_2, \dots, x_{\Delta+2} \left(\bigvee_{2 \leq i < j \leq \Delta+2} x_i = x_j \vee \bigvee_{i=2}^{\Delta+2} \neg R(x_1, x_i) \right)$$

then we can argue essentially as in the proof of Theorem 8.1 (in Appendix F), by just replacing ‘ $n^{\Delta+2}$ ’ in that proof by ‘ n ’ and letting $\tau := \Delta + 3$ in the same proof.

The reason that the limit is 0 for every choice of w seems to be that, although, for some $d > c > 0$, there are between 2^{cn} and 2^{dn} graphs with vertex set $[n]$ and with maximum degree Δ , this number is miniscule, for large n , compared to the number of all graphs with vertex set $[n]$, which is $\exp_2\left(\frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2}\right)$. So even if each graph with maximum degree at most Δ gets much higher weight than a graph that does not satisfy this condition, there may simply be too few graphs of the first sort to make its total weight comparable to that of the second sort. Another reason could be that even if w is very large, there may be (too) many graphs with maximum degree larger than Δ , but with only few failures

of the soft constraint and then the weight of each such graph need not be much lower (in proportional terms) than the weight of a graph with maximum degree Δ .

I think that the proof of Theorem 8.1 can be modified to show that, for every fixed k , the probability that there are at most k $(\Delta + 2)$ -tuples that violate the soft constraint $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2})$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (but the combinatorics would become more messy).

Theorem 8.1 is proved in Appendix F.

9. CONCLUSION

We have considered Markov logic networks (MLNs) \mathbb{M} and the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ on the set \mathbf{W}_n of structures, or “possible worlds”, with domain $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ where $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ is determined by \mathbb{M} . The problem of how $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ behaves, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with respect to various properties has been addressed. We have considered three kinds of concrete MLNs with natural combinatorial interpretations. This contrasts earlier analysed examples [15, 27, 28, 33] which do not seem to have any clear intuitive interpretations. A fairly complete characterization has been given for the asymptotic behaviour of random σ -structures where the language σ consists of only one relation symbol which has arity 1 and when the probability distribution is generated by a quantifier-free MLN. The characterization (and its proof) has been used to show that lifted Bayesian networks, in a broad sense, and MLNs are “asymptotically incomparable”, roughly meaning that one can, with any one of the two kinds of lifted graphical model, define a sequence of probability distributions on possible worlds with growing domain size which can not even be approximated with the other kind of lifted graphical model.

We have seen, by also analysing MLNs that favour graphs with fewer triangles, and MLNs that favour graphs with fewer vertices with degree more than Δ (for some fixed but arbitrary $\Delta \geq 1$), that the asymptotic behaviour of random structures determined by an MLN depends in a drastical way on the soft constraints used by the MLN. The weights of the MLN may, or may not, influence the limit behaviour of random structures. It depends on which soft constraints the MLN uses.

The presented work, together with earlier work, shows that it is difficult to find general results about the asymptotic properties of MLNs, and case by case analysis seems to be necessary in order to get detailed results. Nevertheless, a result has been presented which tells that, under fairly general assumptions, the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ determined by an MLN \mathbb{M} and the uniform probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n concentrate their respective probability masses on almost disjoint subsets of \mathbf{W}_n when n is large.

Knowledge about the asymptotic behaviour of distributions determined by MLNs as the domain size tends to infinity is still quite limited and the area is wide open for research. Many types of soft constraints are still not investigated. More knowledge in this direction is probably necessary in order to find principles that guide the use of MLNs, or appropriate rescalings of them, in a trustworthy and flexible way on varying domain sizes.

Acknowledgements. I thank Prof. Stephan Wagner for helping me out and proving Proposition A.4. This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council, grant 2023-05238_VR.

APPENDIX A. AUXILLIARY RESULTS

In this appendix some auxilliary results are stated which will be used in the proofs of the main results. The following result about independent Bernoulli trials is a direct consequence of [4, Corollary A.1.14] which in turn follows from a bound given by Chernoff [6]:

Lemma A.1. *Let Z be the sum of n independent 0/1-valued random variables, each one with probability p of having the value 1, where $p > 0$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $c_\varepsilon > 0$, depending only on ε , such that the probability that $|Z - pn| > \varepsilon pn$ is less than $2e^{-c_\varepsilon pn}$.*

Remark A.2. It is known that by using Stirling's approximation $n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n (1 + o(1))$ one can straightforwardly derive the following:

(1) If $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor} &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha(1-\alpha)n} \left[\alpha^\alpha (1-\alpha)^{1-\alpha}\right]^n} \\ &= \frac{(1 + o(1)) 2^{nH(\alpha)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha(1-\alpha)n}} \quad \text{where } H(\alpha) = -\alpha \log_2 \alpha - (1-\alpha) \log_2 (1-\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $m = o(\sqrt{n})$ and $m = \omega(1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{m} &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{2\pi m}} \cdot \left(\frac{ne}{m}\right)^m \quad \text{which implies that} \\ \binom{n}{\lfloor n^{1/4} \rfloor} &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sqrt{2\pi n^{1/8}}} \cdot 2^{\frac{3\sqrt{n}}{4}} \cdot e^{n^{1/4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.3. *Let w_0, w_1 be nonnegative reals. Define $g(0) = w_0$, $g(1) = w_1$, and for all $x \in (0, 1)$ define*

$$g(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x) + (w_1 - w_0)x + w_0.$$

Then g is continuous on $[0, 1]$, g has a unique maximum point in the interval $[0, 1]$, and the maximum point belongs to $(0, 1)$.

Proof sketch. It is well known that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x \log_2 x = 0$. It follows that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x) = w_0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} g(x) = w_1$. Hence $g(x)$ is continuous on $[0, 1]$. By considering the derivative $g'(x)$ and the equation $g'(x) = 0$ (which is equivalent to $2^{g'(x)} = 1$) we see that g has a unique critical point $\alpha^* \in (0, 1)$. By computing the second derivative $g''(x)$ we see that $g''(x) < 0$ for all $x \in (0, 1)$ so α^* is a maximum point. Hence $g(x)$ must be increasing on $(0, \alpha^*)$ and decreasing on $(\alpha^*, 1)$. It follows that α^* must be the unique maximum point of g on $[0, 1]$. \square

Proposition A.4. (due to Prof. Stephan Wagner, private communication)

Let $w_0, \dots, w_k \in \mathbb{R}$. The polynomial

$$f(x) = \sum_{s=0}^k w_s \binom{k}{s} x^s (1-x)^{k-s}.$$

is constant if and only if $w_0 = \dots = w_k$.

Proof. If the weights are all equal, i.e., $w_0 = w_1 = \dots = w_k = w$, then the polynomial simplifies to

$$f(x) = w \sum_{s=0}^k \binom{k}{s} x^s (1-x)^{k-s} = w(x+1-x)^k = w.$$

So we only need to prove the converse. Suppose that the polynomial is constant. We first rewrite it by grouping terms according to the exponent of x :

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x) &= \sum_{s=0}^k w_s \binom{k}{s} x^s (1-x)^{k-s} = \sum_{s=0}^k w_s \binom{k}{s} x^s \sum_{r=0}^{k-s} \binom{k-s}{r} (-x)^r \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^k w_s \sum_{r=0}^{k-s} \binom{k}{s} \binom{k-s}{r} (-1)^r x^{r+s} = \sum_{s=0}^k w_s \sum_{r=0}^{k-s} \frac{k!(k-s)!}{s!(k-s)!r!(k-s-r)!} (-1)^r x^{r+s} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^k \sum_{r=0}^{k-s} \binom{k}{r+s} \binom{r+s}{s} (-1)^r w_s x^{r+s} = \sum_{n=0}^k \sum_{s=0}^n \binom{k}{n} \binom{n}{s} (-1)^{n-s} w_s x^n \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} \left(\sum_{s=0}^n \binom{n}{s} (-1)^{n-s} w_s \right) x^n.
\end{aligned}$$

So for the polynomial to be constant, we must have

$$\sum_{s=0}^n \binom{n}{s} (-1)^{n-s} w_s = 0$$

for all $n > 0$. Now we show by strong induction on n that this implies $w_n = w_0$ for all $n \geq 0$. This is trivial for $n = 0$, so we proceed with the induction step. For $n > 0$, the induction hypothesis gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \sum_{s=0}^n \binom{n}{s} (-1)^{n-s} w_s = w_n + \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{s} (-1)^{n-s} w_0 \\
&= w_n + w_0 \left(-1 + \sum_{s=0}^n \binom{n}{s} (-1)^{n-s} \right) = w_n + w_0 \left(-1 + (1-1)^n \right) \\
&= w_n - w_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $w_n = w_0$, completing the induction. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.2

Let $\sigma = \{R\}$ where R is a relation symbol of arity 1 and let \mathbb{M} be the MLN that is defined in Theorem 6.2. Recall the notation

$$\mathbf{W}_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |R(\mathcal{A})| = m\}.$$

In this proof, let us simplify notation by letting $\mu_n := \mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n := \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ for all n , (where $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ are as in Definition 5.2).

Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ and $|R(\mathcal{A})| = m$, so \mathcal{A} has exactly m coloured elements. The number of ordered pairs of (not necessarily distinct) elements from $[n]$ (the domain of \mathcal{A}) such that

- both entries are coloured is m^2 ,
- exactly one entry is coloured is $2m(n-m)$, and
- both entries are uncoloured is $(n-m)^2$.

It follows from the definition of \mathbb{M} in Theorem 6.2, which sets $w_0 := w_2 := 1$ and $w_1 := 0$, and from Definition 5.2 of μ_n that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_n(\mathcal{A}) &= \exp_2(w_0 m^2 + 2w_1 m(n-m) + w_2 (n-m)^2) = \exp_2(m^2 + (n-m)^2) \\
&= \exp_2\left(n^2 \left[\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^2 \right]\right) = \exp_2\left(n^2 \left[1 - 2\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) + 2\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^2 \right]\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$f(\alpha) = 1 - 2\alpha + 2\alpha^2.$$

Then $\mu_n(\mathcal{A}) = \exp_2(n^2 f(m/n))$. Since a subset of $[n]$ of cardinality m can be chosen in $\binom{n}{m}$ ways we get

$$(B.1) \quad \mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) = \binom{n}{m} \exp_2(n^2 f(m/n)).$$

By straightforward calculations one notices that $f(0) = 1 = f(1)$, f is decreasing on $(-\infty, 1/2)$, increasing on $(1/2, \infty)$, and that $1/2$ is the minimum point of f and $f(1/2) = 1/2$. By a straightforward calculation one can also check that for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ we have $f(1 - \alpha) = f(\alpha)$. This together with a similar calculation as above shows that for all n and $0 \leq m \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^{n-m}) &= \binom{n}{n-m} \exp_2\left(n^2 \left[1 - 2\binom{n-m}{n} + 2\left(\frac{n-m}{n}\right)^2\right]\right) \\ &= \binom{n}{m} \exp_2\left(n^2 f\left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)\right) = \binom{n}{m} \exp_2\left(n^2 f\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)\right) = \mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(B.2) \quad \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) = \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} = \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^{n-m})}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} = \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^{n-m}).$$

Suppose that $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, so f is decreasing on $(0, \varepsilon)$ and increasing on $(1 - \varepsilon, 1)$. Let $\delta = f(0) - f(\varepsilon) (= f(1) - f(1 - \varepsilon))$, so $\delta > 0$. Suppose that $\varepsilon n \leq m \leq (1 - \varepsilon)n$, so $\varepsilon \leq \frac{m}{n} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)$ and $f(m/n) - f(0) \leq -\delta$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &= \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^0)} = \frac{\binom{n}{m} \exp_2(n^2 f(m/n))}{\binom{n}{0} \exp_2(n^2 f(0))} \\ &= \binom{n}{m} \exp_2(n^2 [f(m/n) - f(0)]) \leq 2^n \cdot \exp_2(-\delta n^2) = \exp_2(n - \delta n^2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{\varepsilon n \leq m \leq (1-\varepsilon)n} \mathbf{W}_n^m\right) \leq n \exp_2(n - \delta n^2),$$

so

$$(B.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{\varepsilon n \leq m \leq (1-\varepsilon)n} \mathbf{W}_n^m\right) = 0.$$

Now suppose that $n^{1/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n$ where $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$. Then $m - n \leq \varepsilon n - n$ so

$$2m(m - n) \leq 2m(\varepsilon n - n) = -2m(1 - \varepsilon)n \leq -2n^{1/4}(1 - \varepsilon)n = -2(1 - \varepsilon)n^{1.25}.$$

Using this and (B.1) we now get

$$\begin{aligned} (B.4) \quad \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &= \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^0)} = \frac{\binom{n}{m} \exp_2(n^2 f(m/n))}{\binom{n}{0} \exp_2(n^2 f(0))} \\ &= \binom{n}{m} \exp_2(2m^2 - 2mn) = \binom{n}{m} \exp_2(2m(m - n)) \\ &\leq 2^n \exp_2(-2(1 - \varepsilon)n^{1.25}) = \exp_2(n - 2(1 - \varepsilon)n^{1.25}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(B.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{n^{1/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n} \mathbf{W}_n^m\right) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \exp_2(n - 2(1 - \varepsilon)n^{1.25}) = 0.$$

Finally, suppose that $1 \leq m \leq n^{1/4}$. Then $m - n \leq n^{1/4} - n$ so

$$2m(m - n) \leq 2m(n^{1/4} - n) = -2m(n - n^{1/4}) \leq -2(n - n^{1/4}).$$

Now we argue similarly as in the previous case, but use the above inequalities, (B.4) and Remark A.2 (2) to get, for all large enough n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &\leq \binom{n}{m} \exp_2(2m(m-n)) \leq \binom{n}{\lfloor n^{1/4} \rfloor} \exp_2(-2(n-n^{1/4})) \\ &= \frac{1+o(1)}{\sqrt{2\pi}n^{1/8}} \cdot 2^{\frac{3\sqrt{n}}{4}} \cdot e^{n^{1/4}} \exp_2(-2(n-n^{1/4})) \\ &\leq \exp_2(-2n + (3\sqrt{n})/4 + 2n^{1/4} + n^{1/4} \log_2 e). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(B.6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq m \leq n^{1/4}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \exp_2(-2n + (3\sqrt{n})/4 + 2n^{1/4} + n^{1/4} \log_2 e) = 0.$$

By combining (B.2), (B.3), (B.5), and (B.6), we get $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^n) = 1/2$. This means that for all sufficiently large n and distinct $i, j \in [n]$ the probability that $R(i)$ holds is roughly $1/2$, and the probability that both $R(i)$ and $R(j)$ hold is also roughly $1/2$. If the two events would be independent then the probability that both $R(i)$ and $R(j)$ hold should be roughly $1/4$, which is not the case. So the events are dependent.

Suppose that $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}$ is the distribution on \mathbf{W}_n generated by some kind of lifted Bayesian network \mathbb{G} . Suppose for a contradiction that $(\mathbb{P}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and $(\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}} : n \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ are asymptotically total variation equivalent. Then, for all large enough n and all $i \in [n]$, $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(i)\}) \approx \mathbb{P}_n(\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(i)\}) \approx 1/2$. Lemma 6.1 implies that $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{G}}(\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(1) \wedge R(2)\}) \approx 1/4$, but we have shown that $\mathbb{P}_n(\{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \models R(1) \wedge R(2)\}) \approx 1/2$, contradicting that the two sequences are asymptotically total variation equivalent.

APPENDIX C. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.3

Let \mathbb{M} be a quantifier-free MLN over $\sigma = \{R\}$ where R has arity 1. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ be as defined in Definition 5.2 and let us use the abbreviations $\mu_n^{\mathbb{M}} := \mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n := \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$. We first show that \mathbb{M} can be assumed to have a certain ‘‘normal form’’.

Lemma C.1. *There is a quantifier-free MLN \mathbb{M}' over σ such that*

- \mathbb{M} and \mathbb{M}' determine the same probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n for all n , and
- for some $\nu \in \mathbb{N}^+$

$$\mathbb{M}' = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\nu} \{(\varphi_{k,0}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,0}), \dots, (\varphi_{k,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,k})\}$$

where, for all $k = 1, \dots, \nu$ and $s = 0, \dots, k$, $\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is the formula

$$(C.1) \quad \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\} \\ |I|=s}} \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} R(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin I} \neg R(x_i) \right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.6 we may assume that for all $(\varphi(\bar{x}), w) \in \mathbb{M}$, $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is a maximal consistent conjunction of literals and $\varphi(\bar{x})$ implies $x_i \neq x_j$ whenever x_i and x_j are different variables in $\varphi(\bar{x})$. Since weights are allowed to be 0 we may, without loss of generality, assume that, for some $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $k = 1, \dots, \nu$, if $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is a maximal consistent conjunction of literals then there is $(\theta'(x_1, \dots, x_k), w) \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $\theta'(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is equivalent to $\theta(x_1, \dots, x_k)$.

It follows that if $(\varphi(\bar{x}), w) \in \mathbb{M}$, where $\bar{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ say, then there is $I \subseteq [k]$ such that $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is equivalent to

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in I} R(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin I} \neg R(x_i).$$

Suppose that $J \subseteq [k]$ and $|J| = |I|$, and let $\psi(\bar{x})$ be the formula

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in J} R(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin J} \neg R(x_i).$$

So if \mathcal{A} is a finite σ -structure and $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(\bar{a})$, then \bar{a} can be reordered to \bar{a}' , say, so that $\mathcal{A} \models \psi(\bar{a}')$, and vice versa. Hence $|\varphi(\mathcal{A})| = |\psi(\mathcal{A})|$.

Suppose that $|I| = s$. Let $J_1, \dots, J_{\binom{k}{s}}$ enumerate all subsets of $[k]$ of cardinality s . By assumption we may assume that, for $l = 1, \dots, \binom{k}{s}$, there is

$$(\varphi_{k,s,l}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,s,l}) \in \mathbb{M}$$

where $\varphi_{k,s,l}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is the formula

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in J_l} R(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin J_l} \neg R(x_i).$$

By the observation above we have $|\varphi_{k,s,l}(\mathcal{A})| = |\varphi_{k,s,l'}(\mathcal{A})|$ for all $1 \leq l \leq l' \leq \binom{k}{s}$ and every finite σ -structure \mathcal{A} . Therefore we can replace all pairs $(\varphi_{k,s,l}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,s,l}) \in \mathbb{M}$ by a single pair $(\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,s})$ where $\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ has the form (C.1) and $w_{k,s} = w_{k,s,1} + \dots + w_{k,s,\binom{k}{s}}$. The thus obtained MLN will determine the same probability distribution on \mathbf{W}_n as \mathbb{M} does. As we can repeat the procedure for every $k = 1, \dots, \nu$, this completes the proof. \square

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 6.3. By Lemma C.1 we may assume that

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\nu} \{(\varphi_{k,0}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,0}), \dots, (\varphi_{k,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,k})\}$$

where, for all $k = 1, \dots, \nu$ and $s = 0, \dots, k$, $\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is the formula

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\} \\ |I|=s}} \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} R(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin I} \neg R(x_i) \right).$$

Hence $\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ expresses that all x_1, \dots, x_k are different and that exactly s of them are coloured.

Case 1. Suppose that for all $k \in [\nu]$ and all $s, s' \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ we have $w_{k,s} = w_{k,s'}$. It follows from the definition of \mathbb{P}_n that for all $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \mathbf{W}_n$, $\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}')$, so \mathbb{P}_n is the uniform probability distribution. Then it follows from Theorem 5.4 that there is $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \frac{|R(\mathcal{A})|}{n} \in (\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon) \right\} \right) = 1.$$

(By well-known arguments, using for example Lemma A.1, one can see that the above holds with $\alpha = 1/2$.)

Case 2. Now suppose that for some $k \in [\nu]$ there are $s, s' \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ such that $w_{k,s} \neq w_{k,s'}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that there are $s, s' \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$ such that $w_{\nu,s} \neq w_{\nu,s'}$, because otherwise the MLN

$$\mathbb{M}' = \mathbb{M} \setminus \{(\varphi_{\nu,s}(x_1, \dots, x_\nu), w_{\nu,s}) : s = 0, \dots, \nu\}$$

would determine the same probability distribution as \mathbb{M} on each \mathbf{W}_n , so we could consider \mathbb{M}' instead (and redefine $\nu := \nu - 1$).

Case 2a. Suppose that $\nu \geq 2$. For each integer $l \geq 2$ there is a polynomial p_l of degree $l - 1$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $p_l(n)$ is the number of ordered l -tuples of elements from $[n]$ such that at least two different entries in the l -tuple are equal.

Suppose that $M \subseteq [n]$ and $|M| = m$. The number of ordered k -tuples of distinct elements from $[n]$ such that exactly s of them belong to M is

$$\binom{k}{s} (m)_s (n - m)_{k-s}$$

because we can choose the places in the k -tuple which are to hold the elements from M in $\binom{k}{s}$ ways. We have $(m)_s = m^s - p_s(m)$ and $(n - m)_{k-s} = (n - m)^{k-s} - p_{k-s}(n - m)$, so we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(C.2)} \quad & \binom{k}{s} (m)_s (n - m)_{k-s} = \\ & \binom{k}{s} (m^s - p_s(m)) \left((n - m)^{k-s} - p_{k-s}(n - m) \right) = \\ & \binom{k}{s} m^s (n - m)^{k-s} - \\ & \binom{k}{s} \left[m^s p_{k-s}(n - m) + p_s(m) (n - m)^{k-s} - p_s(m) p_{k-s}(n - m) \right] = \\ & \binom{k}{s} m^s (n - m)^{k-s} - O(n^{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By (C.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(C.3)} \quad & \frac{\binom{k}{s} (m)_s (n - m)_{k-s}}{n^k} = \frac{\binom{k}{s} m^s (n - m)^{k-s} - O(n^{k-1})}{n^k} \\ & \frac{\binom{k}{s} (m)_s (n - m)_{k-s}}{n^s n^{k-s}} - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \\ \text{(C.4)} \quad & \binom{k}{s} \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^s \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{k-s} - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$f_k(\alpha) = \sum_{s=0}^k w_{k,s} \binom{k}{s} \alpha^s (1 - \alpha)^{k-s}$$

so f_k is a polynomial of degree k which takes only nonnegative values when restricted to $[0, 1]$. By assumption there are $s, s' \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$ such that $w_{\nu,s} \neq w_{\nu,s'}$. It follows from Proposition A.4 that f_ν is not constant, and as f_ν is a polynomial it is still not constant when restricted to $[0, 1]$.

Recall that $M \subseteq [n]$ and $|M| = m$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ and $R^{\mathcal{A}} = M$. By (C.2) and (C.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_n(\mathcal{A}) &= \exp_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} \sum_{s=0}^k w_{k,s} \binom{k}{s} (m)_s (n-m)_{k-s} \right) = \\
&\exp_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} n^k \sum_{s=0}^k w_{k,s} \frac{\binom{k}{s} (m)_s (n-m)_{k-s}}{n^k} \right) = \\
&\exp_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} n^k \sum_{s=0}^k \left[w_{k,s} \binom{k}{s} \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^s \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{k-s} - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right] \right) = \\
&\exp_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} n^k \left[\sum_{s=0}^k w_{k,s} \binom{k}{s} \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^s \left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right)^{k-s} - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right] \right) = \\
&\exp_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} n^k \left(f_k \left(\frac{m}{n}\right) - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For all $m = 0, 1, \dots, n$ define

$$\mathbf{W}_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |R^{\mathcal{A}}| = m\}.$$

Since we can choose $M \subseteq [n]$ such that $|M| = m$ in $\binom{n}{m}$ ways it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(C.5)} \quad \mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &= \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu} n^k \left(f_k \left(\frac{m}{n}\right) - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) \right) \\
&= \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^{\nu} \left(f_{\nu} \left(\frac{m}{n}\right) - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let β be the maximal value that f_{ν} takes on $[0, 1]$, that is, $\beta = \sup\{f_{\nu}(\alpha) : \alpha \in [0, 1]\}$. Since f_{ν} takes only nonnegative values on $[0, 1]$ and is not constant it follows that $\beta > 0$. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in [0, 1]$ enumerate all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $f_{\nu}(\alpha) = \beta$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$.

As f_{ν} is continuous we can choose $\delta > 0$ small enough such that if $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon)$ then $f_{\nu}(\alpha) < \beta - \delta$. Suppose that $\nu \geq 2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_n \left(\left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \frac{|R(\mathcal{A})|}{n} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \right\} \right) = \\
& \frac{\mu_n \left(\left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \frac{|R(\mathcal{A})|}{n} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \right\} \right)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \\
& \frac{\mu_n \left(\left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \frac{|R(\mathcal{A})|}{n} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \right\} \right)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^{[\alpha_1 n]})} = \\
& \frac{\sum \{ \mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) : m \in [n] \text{ and } \frac{m}{n} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \}}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^{[\alpha_1 n]})} = \\
& \frac{\sum \left\{ \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(f_\nu \left(\frac{m}{n} \right) - o(1) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right) : m \in [n] \text{ and } \frac{m}{n} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \right\}}{\binom{n}{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(f_\nu \left(\frac{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor}{n} \right) - o(1) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)} \leq \\
& \frac{e^{cn} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu (\beta - \delta - o(1)) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)}{\binom{n}{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(f_\nu \left(\frac{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor}{n} \right) - o(1) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)} = \\
& \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(f_\nu \left(\frac{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor}{n} \right) - \beta + \delta \pm o(1) \right) \pm O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)}{e^{cn}}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu \geq 2$ and $f_\nu \left(\frac{\lfloor \alpha_1 n \rfloor}{n} \right) \rightarrow \beta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ it follows that the last expression above tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\left\{ \mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \frac{|R(\mathcal{A})|}{n} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^t (\alpha_i - \varepsilon, \alpha_i + \varepsilon) \right\} \right) = 0$$

and we are done in the case when $\nu \geq 2$.

C.1. Case 2b. Suppose that $\nu = 1$. Then $f_\nu(\alpha) = f_1(\alpha) := (w_{1,1} - w_{1,0})\alpha + w_{1,0}$. For simplicity of notation let us rename $w_1 := w_{1,1}$ and $w_0 := w_{1,0}$ and $f := f_\nu$, so

$$f(\alpha) = (w_1 - w_0)\alpha + w_0.$$

If $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ and $|R^{\mathcal{A}}| = m$, then

$$\mu_n(\mathcal{A}) = 2^{w_1 m + w_0(n-m)} = 2^{nf \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)}$$

and hence

$$\text{(C.6)} \quad \mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) = \binom{n}{m} 2^{nf \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)}.$$

From an earlier assumption it follows that $w_0 \neq w_1$. Suppose that $w_1 > w_0$. (The case $w_1 < w_0$ is treated similarly.) Let

$$g(\alpha) = -\alpha \log_2 \alpha - (1 - \alpha) \log_2 (1 - \alpha) + (w_1 - w_0)\alpha + w_0$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma A.3, g has a unique critical point α^* which is a maximum point, and $0 < \alpha^* < 1$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. As g is continuous there is $\delta > 0$ such that if $\alpha \notin [\alpha^* - \varepsilon, \alpha^* + \varepsilon]$, then $g(\alpha^*) - g(\alpha) > \delta$.

Let $m \in [n]$ and suppose that $\alpha := m/n \notin [\alpha^* - \varepsilon, \alpha^* + \varepsilon]$. By using Remark A.2, (C.6), and the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lfloor \alpha^* n \rfloor}{n} = \alpha^*$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &= \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^{\lfloor \alpha^* n \rfloor})} = \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor} \exp_2(nf(\alpha))}{\binom{n}{\lfloor \alpha^* n \rfloor} \exp_2(nf(\alpha^*))} \\ &= \frac{(1 + o(1)) \exp_2(ng(\alpha))}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha(1-\alpha)n}} \bigg/ \frac{(1 + o(1)) \exp_2(ng(\alpha^*))}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha^*(1-\alpha^*)n}} \\ &\leq (1 \pm o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^*(1-\alpha^*)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}} \cdot 2^{-(1 \pm o(1))\delta n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{\substack{m \in [n] \\ m/n \notin [\alpha^* - \varepsilon, \alpha^* + \varepsilon]}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) &= \sum_{\substack{m \in [n] \\ m/n \notin [\alpha^* - \varepsilon, \alpha^* + \varepsilon]}} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) = \\ &\leq n(1 \pm o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^*(1-\alpha^*)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}} \cdot 2^{-(1 \pm o(1))\delta n} \end{aligned}$$

where the last expression tends to 0 as n tends to infinity. This completes the proof of Theorem 6.3.

APPENDIX D. PROOF OF THEOREM 6.4

Suppose that $\sigma = \{R\}$ where R has arity 1 and (as before) let

$$\mathbf{W}_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |R(\mathcal{A})| = m\}.$$

Let \mathbb{P}_n^* be as described in Theorem 6.4. Let $X_n : \mathbf{W}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the random variable defined by $X_n(\mathcal{A}) = |R(\mathcal{A})|$ for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$. By Lemma A.1, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^*(|X_n - n \cdot n^{-1/5}| > \varepsilon n \cdot n^{-1/5}) < 2e^{-c_\varepsilon n \cdot n^{-1/5}},$$

for some $c_\varepsilon > 0$, depending only on ε , so

$$\mathbb{P}_n^*((1 - \varepsilon)n^{4/5} \leq X_n \leq (1 + \varepsilon)n^{4/5}) \geq 1 - 2e^{-c_\varepsilon n^{4/5}}$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^* \left(\bigcup_{(1-\varepsilon)n^{4/5} \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)n^{4/5}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) \geq 1 - 2e^{-c_\varepsilon n^{4/5}}.$$

As $n^{3/4} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)n^{4/5}$ for all sufficiently large n , we get

$$(D.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^* \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)n^{4/5}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) = 1.$$

Let \mathbb{M} be a quantifier-free MLN over σ , let $\mu_n := \mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$, and $\mathbb{P}_n := \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$. By Lemma C.1, we may assume that

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\nu} \{(\varphi_{k,0}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,0}), \dots, (\varphi_{k,k}(x_1, \dots, x_k), w_{k,k})\}$$

where, for all $k = 1, \dots, \nu$ and $s = 0, \dots, k$, $\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is the formula

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigvee_{\substack{I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\} \\ |I|=s}} \left(\bigwedge_{i \in I} R(x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \notin I} \neg R(x_i) \right),$$

so $\varphi_{k,s}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ expresses that all x_1, \dots, x_k are different and that exactly s of them are coloured.

We need to prove the following:

$$(D.2) \quad \text{for all sufficiently small } \varepsilon > 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)n^{4/5}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) \neq 1.$$

First suppose that $\nu = 1$. From case 2b of the proof of Theorem 6.3 in Appendix C it follows that there is $0 < \alpha^* < 1$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(D.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{(1-\varepsilon)\alpha^*n \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)\alpha^*n} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) = 1$$

and (D.2) follows from this.

So now we assume that $\nu \geq 2$. If \mathbb{P}_n is the uniform probability distribution for all n , then (D.3) holds with $\alpha^* = 1/2$ and hence (D.2) follows. Therefore, as explained in the beginning of case 2 of the proof of Theorem 6.3 in Appendix C, we may assume that $w_{\nu,i} \neq w_{\nu,j}$ for some i and j . So the assumptions are now as in case 2a of the proof of Theorem 6.3.

As in (case 2a of) the proof of Theorem 6.3 let

$$f_\nu(\alpha) = \sum_{s=0}^{\nu} w_{\nu,s} \binom{\nu}{s} \alpha^s (1-\alpha)^{\nu-s},$$

so f_ν is a polynomial of degree ν and can also be written

$$f_\nu(\alpha) = c_0 + c_1\alpha + c_2\alpha^2 + \dots + c_\nu\alpha^\nu \quad \text{for some constants } c_0, \dots, c_\nu \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By the use of (C.5) we have the following for all $0 \leq m \leq n$:

$$(D.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &= \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n^0)} \\ &= \frac{\binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(f_\nu \left(\frac{m}{n} \right) - O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)}{\exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(f_\nu(0) - O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)} \\ &= \frac{\binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(c_0 + c_1 \frac{m}{n} + c_2 \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^2 + \dots + c_\nu \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^\nu - O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)}{\exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(c_0 - O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right)} \\ &= \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(c_1 \frac{m}{n} + c_2 \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^2 + \dots + c_\nu \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^\nu \pm O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For later use note that (as $\nu \geq 2$) we have,

$$(D.5) \quad \nu - \frac{1}{4} > \nu - \frac{2}{4} > \dots > \nu - \frac{\nu}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu - \frac{2}{4} > \nu - 1.$$

Towards a contradiction,

(D.6) suppose that for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq (1+\varepsilon)n^{4/5}} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) = 1.$$

According to (case 2a of) the proof of Theorem 6.3 $f_\nu(\alpha)$ restricted to $[0, 1]$ must attain its unique maximal value when $\alpha = 0$. We have two cases. Either 0 is a critical point of f_ν (i.e. $f'_\nu(0) = 0$), or not.

First suppose that 0 is *not* a critical point of f_ν . Then, for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, f_ν is decreasing on $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ so (as f_ν is a polynomial, hence everywhere differentiable) $f'_\nu(0) < 0$. This implies that $c_1 < 0$. Suppose that $n^{3/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n$.

By (D.4) and as $n^{3/4} \leq m$ and $c_1 < 0$ we get, for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &\leq \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(c_1 \frac{m}{n} + c_2 \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^2 + \dots + c_\nu \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^\nu \pm O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right) \\ &\leq \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(c_1 n^{\nu-1/4} + c_2 n^{\nu-2/4} + \dots + c_\nu n^{\nu-\nu/4} \pm O(n^{\nu-1}) \right) \\ &\leq \exp_2 \left(n + c_1 n^{\nu-1/4} + c_2 n^{\nu-2/4} + \dots + c_\nu n^{\nu-\nu/4} \pm O(n^{\nu-1}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So by (D.5) and since $\nu \geq 2$ and $c_1 < 0$ we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \exp_2 \left(c_1 n^{\nu-1/4} \pm O(n^{\nu-1/2}) \right) = 0.$$

Now suppose that 0 is a critical point of f_ν and still assume that $n^{3/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n$. Then $f'_\nu(0) = 0$ which implies that $c_1 = 0$. We also assume that 0 is the unique maximum of f_ν restricted to $[0, 1]$. This implies that $f''_\nu(0) < 0$ and therefore $c_2 < 0$. By (D.4) and as $n^{3/4} \leq m$, $c_1 = 0$ and $c_2 < 0$ we get, for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{W}_n^m) &\leq \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(n^\nu \left(c_2 \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^2 + \dots + c_\nu \left(\frac{m}{n} \right)^\nu \pm O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) + O(n^{\nu-1}) \right) \\ &\leq \binom{n}{m} \exp_2 \left(c_2 n^{\nu-2/4} + \dots + c_\nu n^{\nu-\nu/4} \pm O(n^{\nu-1}) \right) \\ &\leq \exp_2 \left(n + c_2 n^{\nu-2/4} + \dots + c_\nu n^{\nu-\nu/4} \pm O(n^{\nu-1}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (D.5) and since $\nu \geq 2$ and $c_2 < 0$ we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \exp_2 \left(c_2 n^{\nu-2/4} \pm O(n^{\nu-3/4}) \right) = 0.$$

Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n \left(\bigcup_{n^{3/4} \leq m \leq \varepsilon n} \mathbf{W}_n^m \right) = 0$, whether or not 0 is a critical point of f_ν , and this contradicts (D.6). This completes the proof.

APPENDIX E. PROOF OF THEOREM 7.1

Let $\varphi(x, y, z)$ be the formula

$$x = y \vee x = z \vee y = z \vee \neg R(x, y) \vee \neg R(x, z) \vee \neg R(y, z)$$

and let

$$\mathbb{M} := \{(\varphi(x, y, z), w)\} \quad \text{where } w > 0.$$

Again we use the abbreviations $\mu_n := \mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n := \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $0 \leq m \leq n$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_n^m &:= \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |\neg \varphi(\mathcal{A})| = m\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{Y}_n^m &:= \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : |\neg \varphi(\mathcal{A})| \leq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem E.1. [10] *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and all sufficiently large n (depending on ε),*

$$|\mathbf{Y}_n^{\varepsilon n^3}| \leq 2^{\frac{n^2}{4} + g(\varepsilon)},$$

where $g(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Define

$$f(n) = \frac{n^2}{w}.$$

Since $f(n) \leq \varepsilon n^3$ and hence $\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}_n^{\varepsilon n^3}$ for all sufficiently large n it follows from Theorem E.1 that

$$(E.1) \quad |\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}| \leq 2^{\frac{n^2}{4} + g(\varepsilon)} \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } n.$$

Since $\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}$ is the disjoint union of all \mathbf{X}_n^m where $m = 0, \dots, \lfloor f(n) \rfloor$ it follows that

$$(E.2) \quad |\mathbf{X}_n^m| \leq 2^{\frac{n^2}{4} + g(\varepsilon)} \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } n \text{ and all } m = 0, \dots, \lfloor f(n) \rfloor.$$

Theorem E.2. [10] *The number of triangle-free graphs with vertex set $[n]$ is asymptotic to $2^{\frac{n^2}{4}}$, or equivalently,*

$$|\mathbf{X}_n^0| \sim 2^{\frac{n^2}{4}}.$$

It follows from (E.1) and Theorem E.2 that, for every $\delta > 0$ we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\frac{|\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}|}{|\mathbf{X}_n^0|} \leq \frac{(1 + \delta/2) 2^{\frac{n^2}{4} + g(\varepsilon)}}{2^{\frac{n^2}{4}}} = (1 + \delta/2) 2^{g(\varepsilon)} \leq 1 + \delta.$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ as small as we like. Since for every $m \leq f(n)$ we have $\mathbf{X}_n^m \subseteq \mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}$, it follows that if $m \leq f(n)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough and n large enough, then

$$\frac{|\mathbf{X}_n^m|}{|\mathbf{X}_n^0|} \leq 1 + \delta.$$

It follows that, for large enough n and $m \leq f(n)$,

$$(E.3) \quad \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^m) = \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{X}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n(\mathbf{X}_n^m)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0)} = \frac{|\mathbf{X}_n^m| \cdot 2^{w(n^3 - m)}}{|\mathbf{X}_n^0| \cdot 2^{wn^3}} = \frac{|\mathbf{X}_n^m|}{|\mathbf{X}_n^0|} \cdot 2^{-wm} \leq \frac{1 + \delta}{2^{wm}}.$$

From Theorem 5.5 we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}) = 1.$$

It follows that for all large enough n ,

$$\mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

With this and (E.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \delta &\leq \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{Y}_n^{f(n)}) = \mathbb{P}_n\left(\bigcup_{m=0}^{\lfloor f(n) \rfloor} \mathbf{X}_n^m\right) = \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor f(n) \rfloor} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^m) = \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0) + \sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor f(n) \rfloor} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^m) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0) + \sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor f(n) \rfloor} \frac{1 + \delta}{2^{wm}} = \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0) + (1 + \delta) \sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor f(n) \rfloor} \frac{1}{2^{wm}} \\ &= \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0) + (1 + \delta) \frac{2^{-w}(1 - 2^{-w\lfloor f(n) \rfloor})}{1 - 2^{-w}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0) + (1 + \delta) \frac{2^{-w}}{1 - 2^{-w}}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$(E.4) \quad \mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{X}_n^0) \geq 1 - \delta - (1 + \delta) \frac{2^{-w}}{1 - 2^{-w}}.$$

We are interested in how the right hand side above depends on $w > 0$. The right hand side above as a function of w depends only on the part $\frac{2^{-w}}{1-2^{-w}}$ and it is clear that $\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{-w}}{1-2^{-w}} = 0$. Hence

$$(E.5) \quad \lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \delta - (1 + \delta) \frac{2^{-w}}{1 - 2^{-w}} \right) = 1 - \delta.$$

Now Theorem 7.1 follows from (E.4) and (E.5).

APPENDIX F. PROOF OF THEOREM 8.1

Recall the following assumptions from Section 8. $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2})$ is the formula

$$\bigvee_{2 \leq i < j \leq \Delta+2} x_i = x_j \vee \bigvee_{i=2}^{\Delta+2} \neg R(x_1, x_i).$$

$$\mathbb{M} := \{(\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2}), w)\} \quad \text{where } w \geq 0.$$

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\Omega_n^m := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{A} \text{ has maximum degree at most } m\}.$$

Also let $\mu_n := \mu_n^{\mathbb{M}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_n := \mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{M}}$. If $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbf{W}_n$ and $a \in [n]$ then let

$$N_{\mathcal{A}}(a) := \{a\} \cup \{b \in [n] : b \text{ is adjacent to } a\}.$$

If $n \geq \Delta + 3$, $i \in [n]$, and $\mathcal{A} \in \Omega_n^{\Delta}$, then define $F_i(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathbf{W}_n$ to be the graph that is obtained by adding edges between i and the first $\Delta + 2$ vertices (in $[n]$) that are different from i . Then

- (1) in the graph $F_i(\mathcal{A})$, the vertex i has degree $\geq \Delta + 2$ and it is the only vertex with degree $\geq \Delta + 2$,
- (2) in the graph $F_i(\mathcal{A})$, the vertex i has degree $\leq 2\Delta + 2$,
- (3) in the graph $F_i(\mathcal{A})$, at most $\Delta + 3$ vertices have degree $\geq \Delta + 1$, and
- (4) in the graph $F_i(\mathcal{A})$, if v is a vertex with degree $\geq \Delta + 1$ and $v \neq i$, then its degree is exactly $\Delta + 1$.

Let $F_i(\Omega_n^{\Delta}) := \{F_i(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \in \Omega_n^{\Delta}\}$.

Lemma F.1. *For all sufficiently large n and all $i \in [n]$, $|F_i(\Omega_n^{\Delta})| \geq |\Omega_n^{\Delta}| / 2^{\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \Omega_n^{\Delta}$, $i \in [n]$, and suppose that $F_i(\mathcal{A}) = F_i(\mathcal{A}')$. Then i has exactly the same neighbours in $F_i(\mathcal{A})$ as in $F_i(\mathcal{A}')$, so $N_{F_i(\mathcal{A})}(i) = N_{F_i(\mathcal{A}')} (i)$. For every vertex v outside of $N_{F_i(\mathcal{A})}(i) = N_{F_i(\mathcal{A}')} (i)$, v has the same neighbours (by definition of F_i) in \mathcal{A} as in \mathcal{A}' . Hence \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' can only differ on $N_{F_i(\mathcal{A})}(i) = N_{F_i(\mathcal{A}')} (i)$ where $|N_{F_i(\mathcal{A})}(i)| \leq 2\Delta + 3$. Since there are at most $s := 2^{\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}$ (undirected) graphs (without loops) on a vertex set with at most $2\Delta + 3$ vertices there can be at most s distinct members of Ω_n^{Δ} that are mapped by F_i to the same graph. Hence $|F_i(\Omega_n^{\Delta})| \geq |\Omega_n^{\Delta}| / 2^s$. \square

Lemma F.2. *For all sufficiently large n , all $i, j \in [n]$, and all $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \Omega_n^{\Delta}$, if $i \neq j$ then $F_i(\mathcal{A}) \neq F_j(\mathcal{A}')$. Hence $F_i(\Omega_n^{\Delta}) \cap F_j(\Omega_n^{\Delta}) = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$.*

Proof. By (1) above, i is the unique vertex in $F_i(\mathcal{A})$ that has more than $\Delta + 1$ neighbours, and j is the unique vertex in $F_j(\mathcal{A}')$ that has more than $\Delta + 1$ neighbours. So if $i \neq j$ then $F_i(\mathcal{A}) \neq F_j(\mathcal{A}')$. \square

Lemma F.3. *Suppose that $n \geq \Delta + 3$, $i \in [n]$, and $\mathcal{A} \in \Omega_n^\Delta$. The number of ordered tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2}) \in [n]^{\Delta+2}$ such that $F_i(\mathcal{A}) \models \neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2})$ is at most $\tau := \binom{2\Delta+2}{\Delta+1}! + (\Delta + 2)(\Delta + 1)!$. Hence $\mu_n(F_i(\mathcal{A})) \geq 2^{w(n^{\Delta+2}-\tau)}$.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{A} \models \neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2})$ if and only if all $a_2, \dots, a_{\Delta+2}$ are different and a_1 is adjacent to all $a_2, \dots, a_{\Delta+2}$, so a_1 must be a vertex with degree at least $\Delta + 1$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \in \Omega_n^\Delta$ and $F_i(\mathcal{A}) \models \neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2})$. Then, by (3) above, we have at most $\Delta + 3$ choices of a_1 , one of which is $a_1 = i$. If $a_1 = i$ then (by (2)) a_1 has at most $2\Delta + 2$ neighbours (in $F_i(\mathcal{A})$) and we can choose $\Delta + 1$ of them as $a_2, \dots, a_{\Delta+2}$ in at most $t := \binom{2\Delta+2}{\Delta+1}$ ways and order them in at most $t!$ ways. If $a_1 \neq i$ then (by (4)) then a_1 has exactly $\Delta + 1$ neighbours (in $F_i(\mathcal{A})$) which can be ordered in $(\Delta + 1)!$ ways. Hence the number of $(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2}) \in [n]^{\Delta+2}$ such that $F_i(\mathcal{A}) \models \neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_{\Delta+2})$ is at most $t! + (\Delta + 2)(\Delta + 1)!$. \square

If $\mathcal{A} \in \Omega_n^\Delta$ then no $(\Delta + 2)$ -tuple of vertices from $[n]$ falsifies $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{\Delta+2})$ in \mathcal{A} , so

$$(F.1) \quad \mu_n(\Omega_n^\Delta) = |\Omega_n^\Delta| \cdot 2^{wn^{\Delta+2}}.$$

By Lemmas F.1 and F.2 we get

$$(F.2) \quad \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i(\Omega_n^\Delta) \right| \geq \sum_{i=1}^n |F_i(\Omega_n^\Delta)| \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\Omega_n^\Delta|}{2^{\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}} = \frac{n|\Omega_n^\Delta|}{2^{\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}}.$$

By (F.2) and Lemma F.3 we get the following, where $\tau = \binom{2\Delta+2}{\Delta+1}! + (\Delta + 2)(\Delta + 1)!$:

$$(F.3) \quad \mu_n\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i(\Omega_n^\Delta)\right) \geq \frac{n|\Omega_n^\Delta|}{2^{\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}} \cdot 2^{w(n^{\Delta+2}-\tau)}.$$

Finally, by combining (F.1) and (F.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\Omega_n^\Delta) &= \frac{\mu_n(\Omega_n^\Delta)}{\mu_n(\mathbf{W}_n)} \leq \frac{\mu_n(\Omega_n^\Delta)}{\mu_n\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i(\Omega_n^\Delta)\right)} \leq \frac{|\Omega_n^\Delta| \cdot 2^{wn^{\Delta+2}}}{\frac{n|\Omega_n^\Delta|}{2^{\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}} \cdot 2^{w(n^{\Delta+2}-\tau)}} \\ &= \frac{2^{\tau+\binom{2\Delta+3}{2}}}{n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 8.1 and note that we get the above conclusion independently of what w and Δ are.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sam Adam-Day, Theodor-Mihai Iliant and Ismail Ilkan Ceylan, Zero-one laws of graph neural networks, *Proceedings of the 37th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2023)*.
- [2] Sam Adam-Day, Michael Benedikt, Ismail Ilkan Ceylan and Ben Finkelshtein, Almost surely asymptotically constant graph neural networks, *Proceedings of the 38th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2024)*.
- [3] Sam Adam-Day, Michael Benedikt, Alberto Larrauri, Convergence laws for extensions of first-order logic with averaging, *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2025)*.
- [4] Noga Alon and Joel H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method, Second Edition*, John Wiley & Sons (2000).
- [5] Guy van den Broeck and Kristian Kerstin and Sriram Natarajan and David Poole (editors), *An Introduction to Lifted Probabilistic Inference*, The MIT Press (2021).
- [6] H. Chernoff, A measure of the asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, Vol. 23 (1952) 493–509.

- [7] Fabio G. Cozman and Denis D. Mauá, The finite model theory of Bayesian network specifications: Descriptive complexity and zero/one laws, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, Vol. 110 (2019) 107–126.
- [8] Luc De Raedt and Kristian Kersting and Sriraam Natarajan and David Poole, *Statistical Relational Artificial Intelligence; Logic, Probability, and Computation*, Morgan and Claypool Publishers (2016).
- [9] Heinz-Dieter Ebbinghaus and Jörg Flum, *Finite Model Theory, Second Edition*, Springer (1999).
- [10] P. Erdős, D. J. Kleitman, and B. L. Rothschild, Asymptotic enumeration of K_n -free graphs, *Colloquio Internazionale sulle Teorie Combinatorie (Rome, 1973)*, Tomo II, Atti dei Convegni Lincei, No. 17, 19-27, Accad. Naz. Lincei, Rome (1976).
- [11] Lise Getoor, Ben Taskar (Editors), *Introduction to Statistical Relational Learning*, The MIT Press (2007).
- [12] Y. Glebskii, D. Kogan, M. Liogon'kii and V. Talanov, Range and degree of realizability of formulas in the restricted predicate calculus, *Cybernetics*, Vol. 5 (1969) 142–154.
- [13] Valentin Goranko, *Logic as a Tool: A Guide to Formal Logical Reasoning*, John Wiley & Sons (2016).
- [14] Manfred Jaeger, Convergence results for relational Bayesian networks, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 98)*, (1998) 44–55.
- [15] Dominik Jain, Andreas Barthels, and Michael Beetz, Adaptive Markov logic networks: Learning statistical relational models with dynamic parameters, *Proceedings of the ECAI-10* (2010) 937–942.
- [16] H. Jerome Keisler and Wafik B. Lotfallah, Almost everywhere elimination of probability quantifiers, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, Vol 74 (2009) 1121–1142.
- [17] Angelika Kimmig, Lilyana Mihalkova and Lise Getoor, Lifted graphical models: a survey, *Machine Learning*, Vol. 99 (2015) 1–45.
- [18] Ph. G. Kolaitis and M. Y. Vardi, Infinitary logics and 0-1 laws, *Information and Computation*, Vol 98 (1992) 258–294.
- [19] Ph. G. Kolaitis, H. J. Prömel and B. L. Rotchild, K_{l+1} -free graphs: asymptotic structure and a 0-1 law, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, Vol. 303 (1987) 637–671.
- [20] D. Koller, N. Friedman, *Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques*, MIT Press (2009).
- [21] Vera Koponen, Random graphs with bounded maximum degree: asymptotic structure and a logical limit law, *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science* Vol. 14:2 (2012) 229–254.
- [22] Vera Koponen, Conditional probability logic, lifted Bayesian networks, and almost sure quantifier elimination, *Theoretical Computer Science*, Vol. 848 (2020) 1–27.
- [23] Vera Koponen, Random expansions of finite structures with bounded degree, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04802>.
- [24] Vera Koponen and Yasmin Tousinejad, Random expansions of trees with bounded height, *Theoretical Computer Science*, Vol. 1040, (2025) 115201, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2025.115201>.
- [25] Vera Koponen and Felix Weitkämper, Asymptotic elimination of partially continuous aggregation functions in directed graphical models, *Information and Computation*, Vol. 293 (2023) 105061, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2023.105061>.
- [26] Vera Koponen and Felix Weitkämper, On the relative asymptotic expressivity of inference frameworks, *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, Vol. 20 (2024) 13:1–13:52, [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-20\(4:13\)2024](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-20(4:13)2024).
- [27] H. Mittal, A. Bhardwaj, V. Gogate, P. Singla, Domain-size aware Markov logic networks, in K. Chaudhuri, M. Sugiyama (eds.) *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2019, Naha, Japan, 16–18 April 2019*, Proceedings of machine learning research, Vol. 89 (2019) 3216–3224.
- [28] D. Poole, D. Buchanan, S. M. Kazemi, K. Kersting, S. Natarajan, Population size extrapolation in relational probabilistic modelling, in U. Straccia, A. Cali (Eds.), *Scalable Uncertainty Management — 8th International Conference*, Oxford, UK, September 15–17 2014, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8720 (2014) 292–305.
- [29] M. Richardson and P. Domingos, Markov logic networks, *Machine Learning*, Vol. 62 (2006) 107–136.
- [30] Fabrizio Riguzzi and Theresa Swift, A survey of probabilistic logic programming, *Declarative Logic Programming: Theory, Systems, and Applications* (2018) 185–228.
- [31] Felix Weitkämper, An asymptotic analysis of probabilistic logic programming, *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, Vol. 21 (2021) 802–817.
- [32] Felix Weitkämper, Probabilities of the third type: Statistical Relational Learning and Reasoning with Relative Frequencies, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, Vol. 80 (2024) 1407–1436.
- [33] Felix Weitkämper, Scaling the weight parameters in Markov logic networks and relational logistic regression models, *Machine Learning*, (2025) 114:85.

VERA KOPONEN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UPPSALA UNIVERSITY, SWEDEN.
Email address: `vera.koponen@math.uu.se`