Sampling trees in the complete graphs

Yves Le Jan

May 1, 2025

Abstract

We investigate the distributions of subtrees connecting several vertices in the spanning trees of the complete graphs and their asymptotics.

A connected graph \mathcal{G} equipped with conductances and a non-vanishing killing function allows to define a Green matrix G indexed by pairs of vertices. Adding a cemetery point Δ allows to consider the value of the killing function at any vertex x as a conductance between x and Δ . Then a spanning forest of rooted trees on \mathcal{G} can be identified to a spanning tree on the extended graph \mathcal{G}_{Δ} , by connecting Δ to the roots. An extension of Cayley's theorem (cf. for example [7], [8]) shows that if we define the weight of such a spanning tree to be the product of the conductances of its edges, the sum of these weights is the determinant of G. This allows to define a probability on spanning forests.

This applies in particular to the spanning forests of the complete graph K_n with vertices $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$ endowed with unit conductances and a constant killing factor κ . Local limits for these objects have been determined in [4], extending a result of Grimmett [5].

The expression of the Green matrix $G^{(n)}$ is:

$$\frac{1}{\kappa(n+\kappa)}(\kappa I+J)$$

where J denotes the (n, n) matrix with all entries equal to 1. It is easy to check that for any (m, m) square matrix M with diagonal entries equal to

⁰Key words and phrases: Trees, complete graphs

⁰AMS 2020 subject classification: 60C05, 60J10

a + b and off diagonal entries equal to b, $det(M) = a^{m-1}(a + mb)$. Hence we get the following:

$$det(G^{(n)}) = \frac{1}{\kappa (n+\kappa)^{n-1}}$$
(1)

Moreover, for 0 < d < n,

$$\det(G_{i,j}^{(n)}, 1 \le i, j \le d) = \frac{d+\kappa}{\kappa(n+\kappa)^d}$$
(2)

A way to sample a spanning tree under this probability is to perform Wilson's algorithm which is based on loop erasure. The probability of a looperased path from a given vertex ξ_0 to Δ is the product of its conductances normalized by the determinant of the restriction of the Green matrix to the vertices of ξ . Wilson's algorithm starts by constructing a loop erased path from the first vertex to Δ , then at each step constructs a loop erased path from the first unused vertex to the tree of used vertices (including Δ). Given U a tree rooted in Δ whose leaves are $\{1, ..., l\}$ (we call such a tree a *l*-tree) the spanning tree $\Upsilon_{\Delta}^{(n)}$ produced by the algorithm will contain it iff it is obtained at the *l*-th step of the algorithm the tree of used vertices is U. It is easy to check (see for example [7], [8]) that the probability of this event is given by the product of its conductances normalized by the determinant of the restriction of the Green matrix to the vertices of U. If U has d vertices (root excepted) and r edges incident to Δ , we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(U \subseteq \Upsilon_{\Delta}^{(n)}) = \frac{\kappa^{r-1}(d+\kappa)}{(n+\kappa)^d}$$
(3)

A *l*-tree is determined by the choice of a subset $\mathcal{I}^{(n)}$ (possibly empty) of internal vertices in $\{l + 1, ..., n\}$ and of a surjective map p from $\{1, ..., n\} \cup \{\Delta\}$ onto $\mathcal{I}^{(n)} \cup \{\Delta\}$ fixing Δ and such that for any other vertex x in $\mathcal{I}^{(n)} \cup \{1, ..., l\}$ and positive integer $m, p^m(x) \neq x$.

If p(y) = x, we say that y is a child of x and x the mother of y. If $p^m(y) = x$ for some positive integer m, we say that y is above x (and that x is below y). A vertex is a node if it has at least two children. A node or a leaf belongs to the k-th generation if there are k - 1 nodes below it.

There is a mapping j from nodes and leaves into parts of $\{1, ..., l\}$. It maps a node x to the sets of leaves of the subtree rooted in x, and a leaf i into $\{i\}$. We also set $j(\Delta) = \{1, ..., l\}$. Images of nodes or leaves of the k-th generation are disjoint and obtained by partitioning the images of the node of the (k-1)-th generation below them (or $\{1, ..., l\}$ for the first generation). The order on leaves is used to induce an order on set of leaves by listing the leaves in the set in increasing order and then use alphabetical order For example we have 1 < 1, 3 < 2 < 2, 3. Nodes and leaves inherit of that order we will call the *l*-order.

We say that a tree is reduced iff all inner vertices are nodes. The tree $T_l^{(n)}$ can be decomposed into a reduced tree $T_{l,R}^{(n)}$ (with root Δ) and intermediate inner vertices with a single child.

Two *l*-trees are equivalent if they can be exchanged by a permutation of $\{l + 1, ..., n\}$. Note that equivalence preserves the *l*-order we defined on vertices. The (equivalence) class of $T_{l,R}^{(n)}$, denoted by $Q_l^{(n)}$ inherits a tree structure. Its inner vertices are the images of nodes by j and its leaves singletons in $\{1, ..., l\}$. The class of $T_l^{(n)}$ is determined by $Q_l^{(n)}$ and the numbers of intermediate inner vertices between each leaf or node and the first node below it, or Δ if there is none, hence by a map u_l from the set of vertices of $Q_l^{(n)}$ into the set N of nonnegative integers. We say that $(Q_l^{(n)}, u_l^{(n)})$ is a N-extension of $Q_l^{(n)}$.

We say that a tree is binary iff every internal vertex has exactly two children. An easy induction shows that the set \mathcal{B}_l of binary *l*-tree classes has cardinality $c_l = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} (2i-1) = \frac{(2l-3)!}{2^{l-2}(l-2)!}$ and that these trees have l-1 internal vertices. Indeed, adding one leaf is done by choosing a vertex, add a node just below it and connect it to the new leaf. Consider now binary tree extensions: using the *l*-order on leaves and nodes, $u_l^{(n)}$ becomes a (2l-1)-tuple of nonnegative integers $(u^{(n)}(i), 1 \leq i \leq 2l-1)$.

We are interested in the asymptotic behavior of the pair $(Q_l^{(n)}, u_l^{(n)})$ as $n \uparrow \infty$.

Proposition 0.1 a) Given $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}_l$, $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha) = c_l^{-1}$ b) Given $t \in \mathbb{R}^{2l-1}_+$, $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} n^{(2l-1)/2} \mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha, u_l^n = [t\sqrt{n}]) = (\sum_{1}^{2l-1} t_i)e^{-(\sum_{1}^{2l-1} t_i)^2/2}$.

Proof. We start with the proof of b). Note that setting $\Sigma = \sum_{l=1}^{2l-1} ([t_i \sqrt{n}] + 1)$, there are $\prod_{i=l}^{\Sigma} (n-i)$ possible choices for the inner vertices of T_l , given that $u_l^n = [t\sqrt{n}]$. From equation 3, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha, u_l = [t\sqrt{n}]) = \frac{\Sigma + \kappa}{(n+\kappa)^{\Sigma}} \prod_{i=l}^{\Sigma} (n-i).$$

Using Stirling's approximation, it follows that $\ln(\mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha, u_l^n(i) = [t_i\sqrt{n}])) = \ln(\Sigma + \kappa) - \Sigma \ln(n + \kappa) + (n - l) \ln(n - l) + \kappa$

 $n - l + \frac{1}{2}\ln(2\pi(n-l)) - (n-\Sigma)\ln(n-\Sigma) - n + \Sigma - \frac{1}{2}\ln(2\pi(n-\Sigma)) + O(1/n)$

which, by Taylor's formula gives: $\ln(\mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha, u_l^n(i) = \ln(\Sigma + \kappa) - l\ln(n) + (n + 1/2)[\ln(n - l) - \ln(n - \Sigma)] + \sum -l + O(n^{-1/2})$

 $= \ln(\Sigma/\sqrt{n}) - (2l-1)\ln(\sqrt{n}) - \Sigma^2/2n + O(n^{-1/2}).$

The statement b) follows. One notes that if the t_i 's are bounded, the remainder term O(1/n) in the first equation can be bounded uniformly by a constant multiple of 1/n. Similarly $O(n^{-1/2})$ can be uniformly bounded by a constant multiple of $1/\sqrt{n}$.

To prove a), we can first check that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2l-1}_{\perp}} (\sum_{1}^{2l-1} t_i) e^{-(\sum_{1}^{2l-1} t_i)^2/2} = c_l^{-1}$. Then a Riemann sum argument shows that a) follows from b).

More precisely, the proof of b) shows that given $k \in \mathbb{N}^{2l-1}$ such that $k_i < c\sqrt{n}$, $\lim_{n\uparrow\infty} n^{(2l-1)/2} \mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha, u_l^n = k) = (\sum_{1}^{2l-1} k_i/\sqrt{n})e^{-(\sum_{1}^{2l-1} k_i)^2/2n}$ uniformly in k. Hence $\mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha) > \lim_{n\uparrow\infty} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}^{2l-1},k_i< c\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{P}(Q_l^{(n)} = \alpha, u_l^n = k) = n^{-(2l-1)/2} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}^{2l-1},k_i< c\sqrt{n}} (\sum_{1}^{2l-1} k_i/\sqrt{n})e^{-(\sum_{1}^{2l-1} k_i)^2/2n} + O(n^{-1/2})^{\cdot}$ It converges towards $\int_{[0,c]^{2l-1}} (\sum_{1}^{2l-1} t_i)e^{-(\sum_{1}^{2l-1} t_i)^2/2} \prod_i dt_i$ which can be made arbitrarily close from c_l^{-1} by taking c large enough. This concludes the proof as it implies that the probability for $Q_l^{(n)}$ to be binary tends to 1.

Remark 0.1 As l increases, we get from b) a consistent family of distributions on \mathbb{R}_+ -extensions of *l*-binary tree classes. This family is the consistent family of proper k-trees defined in section 4.3 of [3]. It is shown in [3] that this family can be represented by the Brownian continuum random tree (CRT) as it satisfies a tightness condition. Other constructions of this CRT are given in [2], [1], using Brownian excursions or branching processes. See also [9], [10], [6].

Remark 0.2 Note that this limiting distribution is independent of κ . If $\kappa = 1$, the result can be interpreted as giving the asymptotic distribution of the unrooted uniform spanning tree on K_{n+1} .

The distribution of $Q_l^{(n)}$ converges towards the uniform distribution on \mathcal{B}_l . Note that for finite $n Q_l^{(n)}$ can be non-binary but the corresponding probability tends to 0 as $n \uparrow \infty$. It follows that any finite set of vertices asymptotically belong to the same large tree of the spanning forest.

It is shown in [8], among other results, that the probability for two vertices to belong to different trees is equivalent to $\frac{\kappa\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{2N}}$ and that the probability for two vertices to be on the same branch starting from the root is equivalent to $\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{N}}$.

Taking l = 1, we see that in particular, as n increases to infinity, the distribution of the graph distance of any fixed vertex to the root rescaled by \sqrt{n} converges to the density $xe^{-x^2/2}$. Note that the scaling by \sqrt{n} appeared already in [11].

References

- David Aldous The Continuum Random Tree I. Annals of Probability 19 pp 1-28 (1991).
- [2] David Aldous The Continuum Random Tree II. Proceedings of the Durham Symposium on Stochastic Analysis, pp. 23 - 70. (1990).
- [3] David Aldous The Continuum Random Tree III. Annals of Probability 21, pp. 248-289 (1993.)
- [4] Matteo D'Achille, Nathanaël Enriquez, Paul Melotti Local limit of massive spanning forests on the complete graph arXiv:2403.11740
- [5] Geoffrey R. Grimmett. Random labelled trees and their branching networks. Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, 30(2):229–237, (1980).
- [6] Le Gall, J.-F. (1989). Marches aléatoires, mouvement brownien et processus de branchement. Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg, Volume 23, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1372, Springer. pp. 447-464 (1989).
- [7] Yves Le Jan. Markov paths, loops and fields. École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXVIII - 2008. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2026. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg (2011).
- [8] Yves Le Jan. Random walks and physical fields. Springer (2024).
- [9] Neveu, J. and Pitman, J.W. (1989). Renewal property of the extrema and tree property of the excursion of a one dimensional Brownian motion. Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg, Volume 23. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1036, Springer, pp. 239-247 (1989).
- [10] Neveu, Jacques; Pitman, James W. The branching process in a brownian excursion Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg, Volume 23. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1372, Springer(1989), pp. 248-257 (1989).

[11] G. Szekeres, Distribution of labelled trees by diameter, Combinatorial Mathematics X (Adelaide, 1982), Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1036, Springer (1983).

Département de Mathématique. Université Paris-Saclay. Orsay