Branching processes and random trees

Svante Janson

Modern perspectives of branching in probability Münster, 27 September, 2017

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Simply generated trees

Trees are rooted and ordered (a.k.a. plane).

 $\mathbf{w} = (w_k)_{k \ge 0}$ is a fixed weight sequence with $w_k \ge 0$.

The *weight* of a finite tree T is

$$w(T) := \prod_{v \in T} w_{d^+(v)},$$

where $d^+(v)$ is the outdegree of v.

Trees with such weights are called *simply generated trees* and were introduced by Meir and Moon (1978).

We let \mathcal{T}_n be the random simply generated tree obtained by picking a tree with *n* nodes at random with probability proportional to its weight.

Galton–Watson trees

Let $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} w_k = 1$, so $(w_k)_1^{\infty}$ is a probability distribution on $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$ (a probability weight sequence).

Let ξ be a random variable with $\mathbb{P}(\xi = k) = w_k$.

Then the random tree T_n = the conditioned Galton–Watson tree with offspring distribution ξ .

(The random Galton–Watson tree defined by ξ conditioned on having exactly *n* vertices.)

Many kinds of random trees occuring in various applications can be seen as simply generated random trees and conditioned Galton–Watson trees.

Example $w_k = 1$ yields uniformly random ordered trees (plane trees).

Also $w_k = 2^{-k-1}$, a *Geometric distribution* Ge(1/2)

Example $w_k = 1/k!$ yields uniformly random *labelled trees*. Also $w_k = e^{-1}/k!$, a *Poisson distribution* Po(1).

Example $w_0 = 1$, $w_1 = 2$, $w_2 = 1$, $w_k = 0$ for $k \ge 3$ yields uniformly random *binary trees*.

Also
$$w_k = \binom{2}{k} \frac{1}{4}$$
, a *Binary distribution* Bi $(2, 1/2)$.

Equivalent weights

Let a, b > 0 and change w_k to

$$\widetilde{w}_k := ab^k w_k.$$

Then the distribution of \mathcal{T}_n is not changed.

In other words, the new weight sequence (\tilde{w}_k) defines the same simply generated random trees \mathcal{T}_n as (w_k) .

We say that weight sequence (w_k) and (\tilde{w}_k) are *equivalent*.

For many (w_k) there exists an equivalent probability weight sequence; in this case \mathcal{T}_n can thus be seen as a conditioned Galton–Watson tree.

(Not if grows w_k grows too rapidly, such as k!.)

Moreover, in many cases this can be done such that the resulting probability distribution has mean 1. In such cases it thus suffices to consider the case of a probability weight sequence with mean $\mathbb{E} \xi = 1$; then \mathcal{T}_n is a conditional critical Galton–Watson tree.

Thus, simply generated trees and (critical) conditioned Galton–Watson trees are almost the same

For many (w_k) there exists an equivalent probability weight sequence; in this case \mathcal{T}_n can thus be seen as a conditioned Galton–Watson tree.

(Not if grows w_k grows too rapidly, such as k!.)

Moreover, in many cases this can be done such that the resulting probability distribution has mean 1. In such cases it thus suffices to consider the case of a probability weight sequence with mean $\mathbb{E} \xi = 1$; then \mathcal{T}_n is a conditional critical Galton–Watson tree.

Thus, simply generated trees and (critical) conditioned Galton–Watson trees are almost the same

- BUT ONLY ALMOST !

Three types

Three types:

I. Critical Galton-Watson tree.

II. Subcritical Galton–Watson tree; not equivalent to any critical. Example: $(k + 1)^{-3}/\zeta(3)$.

III. Simply generated tree, not equivalent to any Galton–Watson tree.

Example: $w_k = k!$.

Critical Galton–Watson trees form a nice and natural setting, with many known results (possibly with extra assumptions).

Some of these results can be extended to the general case, including cases II and III.

A theorem

Theorem

Let $\mathbf{w} = (w_k)_{k \ge 0}$ be any weight sequence with $w_0 > 0$ and $w_k > 0$ for some $k \ge 2$.

Then $\mathcal{T}_n \xrightarrow{d} \widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ as $n \to \infty$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ is an infinite modified Galton–Watson tree (see below).

The limit (in distribution) in the theorem is for a topology where convergence means convergence of outdegree for any fixed node; it thus really means local convergence close to the root.

(It is for this purpose convenient to regard the trees as subtrees of the infinite Ulam–Harris tree.)

Kennedy (1975), Aldous & Pitman (1998), Kolchin (1984), Jonsson & Stefánsson (2011), et al + J

Characterizations of the cases

Let

$$\Phi(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} w_k z^k$$

be the generating function of the weight sequence. Let $\rho \in [0, \infty]$ be its radius of convergence.

If $\rho > 0$, then the probability weight sequences equivalent to (w_k) are

$$p_k = rac{t^k w_k}{\Phi(t)}, \qquad k \ge 0,$$

where t > 0 and $\Phi(t) < \infty$. Denote the mean $\sum_k kp_k$ of this distribution by $\Psi(t)$. Let

$$u := \Psi(\rho) := \lim_{t \nearrow \rho} \Psi(t) \le \infty.$$

In words:

 ν is the supremum of the means of all probability weight sequences equivalent to (w_k) .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

The three cases can be characterised as

I. $\nu \ge 1$. Then $0 < \rho \le \infty$. II. $0 < \nu < 1$. Then $0 < \rho < \infty$. III. $\nu = \rho = 0$.

In particular, $\nu = 0 \iff \rho = 0$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

If $\nu \ge 1$, let τ be the unique number in $[0, \rho]$ such that $\Psi(\tau) = 1$. If $0 \le \nu < 1$, let $\tau := \rho$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

In both cases, au is the minimum point in $[0, \rho]$, or $[0, \infty)$, of $\Phi(t)/t$.

If $\nu \ge 1$, let τ be the unique number in $[0, \rho]$ such that $\Psi(\tau) = 1$. If $0 \le \nu < 1$, let $\tau := \rho$.

In both cases, au is the minimum point in $[0, \rho]$, or $[0, \infty)$, of $\Phi(t)/t$.

Let

$$\pi_k := rac{ au^k w_k}{\Phi(au)}, \qquad k \ge 0.$$

 (π_k) is a probability weight sequence. Its mean is $\mu := \Psi(\tau)$. Its variance is

$$\sigma^2 := \tau \Psi'(\tau) = \frac{\tau^2 \Phi''(\tau)}{\Phi(\tau)}.$$

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

The three cases again

- I. $\nu \geq 1$. Then $0 < \tau < \infty$ and $\tau \leq \rho \leq \infty$. The weight sequence (w_k) is equivalent to (π_k) , which is a probability distribution with mean $\mu = \Psi(\tau) = 1$ and probability generating function $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi_k z^k$ with radius of convergence $\rho/\tau \geq 1$. (Exponential moment iff $\rho/\tau > 1$ iff $\nu > 1$.)
- II. $0 < \nu < 1$. Then $0 < \tau = \rho < \infty$. The weight sequence (w_k) is equivalent to (π_k) , which is a probability distribution with mean $\mu = \Psi(\tau) = \nu < 1$ and probability generating function $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \pi_k z^k$ with radius of convergence $\rho/\tau = 1$.
- III. $\nu = 0$. Then $\tau = \rho = 0$, and (w_k) is not equivalent to any probability distribution.

The infinite limit tree

Let ξ be a random variable with distribution $(\pi_k)_{k=0}^{\infty}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi=k)=\pi_k, \qquad k=0,1,2,\ldots$$

Assume that $\mu := \mathbb{E} \xi = \sum_k k \pi_k \leq 1$.

There are *normal* and *special* nodes. The root is special.

Normal nodes have offspring (outdegree) as copies of ξ . Special nodes have offspring as copies of $\hat{\xi}$, where

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\xi}=k):=\begin{cases} k\pi_k, & k=0,1,2,\ldots,\\ 1-\mu, & k=\infty. \end{cases}$$

When a special node gets a finite number of children, one of its children is selected uniformly at random and is special. All other children are normal.

(Based on Kesten ($\mu = 1$) + Jonsson & Stefánsson ($\mu \leq 1$).)

The spine

The special nodes form a path from the root; we call this path the *spine* of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}.$

There are three cases:



I. $\mu = 1$ (the critical case).

 $\widehat{\xi} < \infty$ a.s. Each special node has a special child and the spine is an infinite path. Each outdegree in $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ is finite, so the tree is infinite but locally finite.

The distribution of $\hat{\xi}$ is the *size-biased* distribution of ξ , and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is the size-biased Galton–Watson tree defined by Kesten.

I. $\mu = 1$ (the critical case).

 $\widehat{\xi} < \infty$ a.s. Each special node has a special child and the spine is an infinite path. Each outdegree in $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ is finite, so the tree is infinite but locally finite.

The distribution of $\hat{\xi}$ is the *size-biased* distribution of ξ , and $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is the size-biased Galton–Watson tree defined by Kesten.

Alternative construction: Start with the spine (an infinite path from the root). At each node in the spine attach further branches; the number of branches at each node in the spine is a copy of $\hat{\xi} - 1$ and each branch is a copy of the Galton–Watson tree \mathcal{T} with offspring distributed as ξ ; furthermore, at a node where k new branches are attached, the number of them attached to the left of the spine is uniformly distributed on $\{0, \ldots, k\}$.

Since the critical Galton–Watson tree ${\cal T}$ is a.s. finite, it follows that $\widehat{\cal T}$ a.s. has exactly one infinite path from the root, viz. the spine.

II. $0 < \mu < 1$ (the subcritical case).

A special node has with probability $1 - \mu$ no special child. Hence, the spine is a.s. finite and the number *L* of nodes in the spine has a (shifted) geometric distribution $Ge(1 - \mu)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(L = \ell) = (1 - \mu)\mu^{\ell - 1}, \qquad \ell = 1, 2, \dots$$

The tree $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ has exactly one node with infinite outdegree, viz. the top of the spine. $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ has no infinite path.

II. $0 < \mu < 1$ (the subcritical case).

A special node has with probability $1 - \mu$ no special child. Hence, the spine is a.s. finite and the number *L* of nodes in the spine has a (shifted) geometric distribution $Ge(1 - \mu)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(L = \ell) = (1 - \mu)\mu^{\ell - 1}, \qquad \ell = 1, 2, \dots$$

The tree $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ has exactly one node with infinite outdegree, viz. the top of the spine. $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ has no infinite path.

Alternative construction: Start with a spine of random length *L*. Attach further branches that are independent copies of the Galton–Watson tree \mathcal{T} ; at the top of the spine we attach an infinite number of branches and at all other nodes in the spine the number we attach is a copy of $\xi^* - 1$ where $\xi^* \stackrel{d}{=} (\hat{\xi} \mid \hat{\xi} < \infty)$ has the size-biased distribution $\mathbb{P}(\xi^* = k) = k\pi_k/\mu$.

The spine thus ends with an explosion producing an infinite number of branches, and this is the only node with an infinite degree. III. $\mu = 0$ ($\rho = \nu = \tau = 0$. Not Galton–Watson tree.)

A degenerate special case of II.

A normal node has 0 children. A special node has ∞ children, all normal.

The root is the only special node. The spine has length L = 1. The tree \widehat{T} is an infinite star. (No randomness.)

III. $\mu = 0$ ($\rho = \nu = \tau = 0$. Not Galton–Watson tree.)

A degenerate special case of II.

A normal node has 0 children. A special node has ∞ children, all normal.

The root is the only special node. The spine has length L = 1. The tree $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ is an infinite star. (No randomness.)

Example

 $w_k = k!.$

In the limit, T_n has Po(1) branches of length 2; all others have length 1.

Node degrees

Theorem

As $n \to \infty$, $\mathbb{P}(d^+_{\mathcal{T}_n}(o) = d) \to d\pi_d, \quad d \ge 0.$

Consequently,

$$d^+_{\mathcal{T}_n}(o) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{\longrightarrow} \widehat{\xi},$$

where $\hat{\xi}$ is a random variable in $\{0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$.

Note that the sum $\sum_{0}^{\infty} d\pi_{d} = \mu$ of the limiting probabilities in may be less than 1; in that case we do not have convergence to a proper finite random variable.

If we instead take a random node, we obtain a different limit distribution, viz. (π_k) .

Theorem

Let v be a uniformly random node in \mathcal{T}_n . Then, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(d^+_{\mathcal{T}_n}(v)=d) o \pi_d, \quad d\geq 0.$$

Consequently,

$$d^+_{\mathcal{T}_n}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\mathrm{d}}{\longrightarrow} \xi,$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

When $\nu > 1$, this was proved by Otter (1949).

Fringe trees

More generally:

Given a tree T, let T_v be the fringe tree at v, i.e., the subtree rooted at v, and let T^* be the fringe tree at a uniformly random node v.

Theorem

Let \mathcal{T}_n^* , be the random fringe tree of \mathcal{T}_n . Then, as $n \to \infty$, \mathcal{T}_n^* converges in distribution to the (unconditioned) Galton–Watson tree \mathcal{T} with offspring distribution π , i.e., for any fixed (finite) tree \mathcal{T} ,

 $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_n^* = T) \to \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T} = T).$

For $\mu = 1$, i.e., critical Galton–Watson trees, explicit in Aldous (1991), referring to Kolchin (1986).

Even more generally:

Define the extended fringe tree T^{**} by adding also the mother of v, with its descendents, the grandmother, and so on, i.e., by considering T "shifted" with centre at the random node v.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Theorem

The extended fringe tree \mathcal{T}_n^{**} converges to a random tree $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ constructed as follows:

- (i). If $\mu = 1$ (critical case), add an infinite spine backwards from the root of \hat{T} ; let each node in the spine be special (with a $\hat{\xi}$ offspring distribution), and add independent forward TGalton–Watson trees to all their children.
- (ii). If $\mu < 1$ (subcritical case), add a spine backwards with special nodes, until the first node with an infinite number of children appears; then continue backwards and add more special nodes until another node with an infinite number of children appears; stop and discard the last node. Then add independent forward Galton–Watson trees as above.

Quenched version

Let $n_T(\mathcal{T}_n)$ be the number of subtrees of \mathcal{T}_n that are isomorphic to \mathcal{T} .

Theorem

Assume
$$\mu := \mathbb{E} \xi = 1$$
 and $\operatorname{Var} \xi < \infty$.

(i). For any fixed tree T, $\frac{n_T(\mathcal{T}_n)}{n} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_n^* = T \mid \mathcal{T}_n) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T} = T).$ (ii). $\frac{n_T(\mathcal{T}_n) - n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T} = T)}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \gamma^2)$ for some $\gamma^2 = \gamma_T^2 < \infty$.

Part II – general CMJ branching processes

A Crump-Mode-Jagers process is a branching process in continuous time, where each individual has a random number N of children (with $0 \le N \le \infty$), born at times when the individual itself has ages $\xi_1 \le \xi_2 \ldots$; these are also random (and may be dependent in any way). (Technically, best seen as a point process.)

Different individuals have i.i.d. life stories.

Let \mathcal{T}_{∞} be the complete family tree of the process, starting with a single individual born at time 0, and let \mathcal{T}_t be the subtree of individuals born up to time t.

We are interested in cases when \mathcal{T}_{∞} is infinite but each \mathcal{T}_t a.s. is finite. Thus assume $\mathbb{E} N > 1$ (supercritical case) and assume for simplicity $N \geq 1$.

Let $Z_t := |\mathcal{T}_t|$, the number of individuals at time *t*.

More generally, a *characteristic* of an individual is a random function ϕ of the age $t \ge 0$; we assume $\phi(t) \ge 0$ and $\phi \in D[0, \infty)$. Let, where σ_x is the time individual x is born,

$$Z_t^{\phi} := \sum_{x:\sigma_x \leq t} \phi_x(t - \sigma_x),$$

the total characteristic of all individuals existing at time t.

Known results (Crump, Mode, Jagers, Nerman, et al): Assume some technical conditions.

• There exists $\alpha > 0$ (the Malthusian parameter), such that

$$e^{-\alpha t}Z_t \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} W$$

for some random variable W > 0.

More generally,

$$e^{-lpha t} Z^{\phi}_t \stackrel{\mathrm{a.s.}}{\longrightarrow} m_{\phi} W$$

for a constant $m_{\phi} > 0$.

Hence

$$Z_t^{\phi}/Z_t \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} m_{\phi}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Fix a characteristic ψ . Define $\tau_n := \inf\{t : Z_t^{\psi} \ge n\}$ and $T_n := \mathcal{T}_{\tau(n)}$. Main example : $\psi = 1$. T_n has *n* nodes (if birth times are a.s. distinct).

Fringe trees

Theorem

- (i). (Annealed version.) The random fringe tree T_n^* converges in distribution to the random tree $\overline{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\tau}$, where $\tau \sim \text{Exp}(\alpha)$ is a random time, independent of \mathcal{T} .
- (ii). (Quenched version.) For every finite tree T,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_n^* = T \mid T_n) = \frac{|\{v : T_{n;v} = T\}|}{|T_n|} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{T}} = T).$$

Extended fringe trees

Define a sin-tree \tilde{T} as follows:

- Start with a copy of the branching process, starting with o born at time 0.
- ► Give *o* an infinite line of ancestors, *o*⁽¹⁾, *o*⁽²⁾,..., each having a modified life history where one child is distinguished, and called *heir*, and the probability is weighted by a factor *e*^{-αξ}, where ξ is the time the heir is born.
- ► Let the heir of o⁽ⁱ⁾ be o⁽ⁱ⁻¹⁾. This defines the (negative) birth times of the ancestors. Let all other children of the ancestors start new copies of T.

Theorem

(i). (Annealed.) The extended fringe tree of T_n converges in distribution to \tilde{T} .

(ii). (Quenched.) This holds also conditioned on T_n , a.s.

Example

Children born with independent Exp(1) waiting times, i.e., according to a Poisson process with rate 1. The branching process is the Yule process.

 T_n is the random recursive tree. The next node is added as a child to a uniformly chosen node.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

General preferential attachment tree

Example

Let $(w_k)_0^\infty$ be a sequence of weights with $w_k \ge 0$ and $w_0 > 0$.

Grow a tree by choosing the mother of each new node randomly with probability proportional to w_d where d is the outdegree (number of existing children).

 T_n where the waiting time for child k is $Exp(w_{k-1})$.

General preferential attachment tree

Example

Let $(w_k)_0^\infty$ be a sequence of weights with $w_k \ge 0$ and $w_0 > 0$.

Grow a tree by choosing the mother of each new node randomly with probability proportional to w_d where d is the outdegree (number of existing children).

 T_n where the waiting time for child k is $Exp(w_{k-1})$.

Standard case: $w_k = k + 1$.

General preferential attachment tree

Example

Let $(w_k)_0^\infty$ be a sequence of weights with $w_k \ge 0$ and $w_0 > 0$.

Grow a tree by choosing the mother of each new node randomly with probability proportional to w_d where d is the outdegree (number of existing children).

 T_n where the waiting time for child k is $Exp(w_{k-1})$.

Standard case: $w_k = k + 1$.

Linear case: $w_k = \chi k + \rho$.

Binary search tree

Example

Each individual gets two children, one left and one right; each after an Exp(1) time (independent).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

m-ary search tree (with external nodes)

Example

 $m \ge 2$ fixed.

A newborn has 0 "keys". It get m-1 keys after independent waiting times Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m-1} with $Y_i \sim \text{Exp}(i)$. When the last key arrives, m children are born.

 $\psi(t)$ is the number of keys at time t.

Fragmentation trees

Example

Start with an object of mass $x_0 > 0$; break it ito *b* pieces with masses V_1x_0, \ldots, V_bx_0 , where (V_1, \ldots, V_b) is a random vector with $V_i \ge 0$ and $\sum_i V_i = 1$. Continue recursively with each piece of mass $\ge x_1$, using a new copy of (V_1, \ldots, V_b) each time.

Regard the fragments of masses $\ge x_1$ seen during the process as nodes in the *fragmentation tree*.

CMJ process: An individual has b children, born at times ξ_1, \ldots, ξ_b with $\xi_i := -\log V_i$.

The fragmentation tree is the tree $\mathcal{T}_{log(x_0/x_1)}$.

▲□ > ▲□ > ▲目 > ▲目 > ▲□ > ▲□ >

▲□ > ▲□ > ▲目 > ▲目 > ▲□ > ▲□ >

▲□ > ▲□ > ▲目 > ▲目 > ▲□ > ▲□ >