

Sparse graphs: metrics and random models

Béla Bollobás^{*†} Oliver Riordan[‡]

December 14, 2008; revised 07 February 2010

Abstract

Recently, Bollobás, Janson and Riordan introduced a family of random graph models producing inhomogeneous graphs with n vertices and $\Theta(n)$ edges whose distribution is characterized by a kernel, i.e., a symmetric measurable function $\kappa : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. To understand these models, we should like to know when different kernels κ give rise to ‘similar’ graphs, and, given a real-world network, how ‘similar’ is it to a typical graph $G(n, \kappa)$ derived from a given kernel κ .

The analogous questions for dense graphs, with $\Theta(n^2)$ edges, are answered by recent results of Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós, Szegedy and Vesztergombi, who showed that several natural metrics on graphs are equivalent, and moreover that any sequence of graphs converges in each metric to a graphon, i.e., a kernel taking values in $[0, 1]$.

Possible generalizations of these results to graphs with $o(n^2)$ but $\omega(n)$ edges are discussed in a companion paper [12]; here we focus only on graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges, which turn out to be much harder to handle. Many new phenomena occur, and there are a host of plausible metrics to consider; many of these metrics suggest new random graph models, and vice versa.

1 Introduction

In a series of papers, Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós, Szegedy and Vesztergombi (see [16, 15, 37, 36, 17, 18] and the references therein) introduced several natural metrics for graphs, and showed that they are equivalent, in that if (G_n) is a sequence of graphs with $|G_n| \rightarrow \infty$, then if (G_n) is Cauchy with respect to one of these metrics then it is Cauchy with respect to all of them. Moreover, there is a natural completion of the space of graphs with respect to any of

^{*}Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK and Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Memphis, Memphis TN 38152, USA. E-mail: b.bollobas@dpms.cam.ac.uk.

[†]Research supported in part by NSF grants DMS-0906634, CNS-0721983 and CCF-0728928, and ARO grant W911NF-06-1-0076

[‡]Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, 24–29 St Giles’, Oxford OX1 3LB, UK. E-mail: riordan@maths.ox.ac.uk.

these metrics, consisting of (equivalence classes of) *graphons*, i.e., symmetric measurable functions $\kappa : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Throughout this paper we assume without loss of generality that G_n has n vertices; we do not require G_n to be defined for all n , but only for a sequence $n_i \rightarrow \infty$. While the results just mentioned apply to all sequences (G_n) , they are meaningful only for *dense* graphs, where $e(G_n) = \Theta(n^2)$. More precisely, any sequence with $e(G_n) = o(n^2)$ converges to the zero graphon.

A different connection between graphs and objects related to graphons arises in the work of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9]. Throughout this paper, by a *kernel* κ we shall mean a symmetric integrable function $\kappa : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$; note that graphons are a special case of kernels. Roughly speaking, in [9] an arbitrary kernel κ was used to define a sparse inhomogeneous random graph $G(n, \kappa) = G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$, although the details are rather involved.

In [12] we extended the definitions of three of the metrics mentioned above, the cut metric d_{cut} , the count (or subgraph) metric d_{sub} , and the partition metric d_{part} , to sparse graphs. In each case one fixes a normalizing function $p = p(n)$ and adapts the definition of the metric to graphs with $e(G_n) = \Theta(pn^2)$; for the details see the definitions in the relevant sections here. In addition to discussing the relationships between the different metrics, we also discussed the close connection between metrics and random graph models, concentrating on the case where $p(n)$ is chosen so that $np \rightarrow \infty$. Here we shall continue this investigation, but now considering the case $p = 1/n$.

When studying, for example, the random graph $G(n, p)$, there are many possibilities for p as a function of n ; which is most natural depends on what kind of properties one is interested in. Nevertheless, there are two canonical ranges of particular interest: the *dense* case, $p = \Theta(1)$, and the (*extremely*) *sparse* case, $p = \Theta(1/n)$, the minimum sensible density. Here we are not only studying random graphs, but it is still true that the most natural special cases are the densest graphs, those with $\Theta(n^2)$ edges, studied by Lovász and Szegedy [37] and Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztergombi [17, 18], for example, and the sparsest graphs, those with $\Theta(n)$ edges, as studied by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9]. Here we consider the second range, taking $p = p(n) = 1/n$ as our normalizing density.

One might expect that graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges are somehow simpler than denser graphs, but in fact the reverse is often the case, particularly for the random graph $G(n, p)$. As a trivial example, note that there is significant variation in the vertex degrees in $G(n, c/n)$, while the degrees in $G(n, p)$ are concentrated around their mean if $np \rightarrow \infty$. For this reason, we expect graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges to be much harder to work with in the present context, which turns out to be the case. Indeed, as we shall see, hardly any of the results in [12] apply to such graphs.

One advantage of the extremely sparse case is that there is a unique natural normalization: except where explicitly indicated otherwise, in this paper we fix $p = 1/n$ as our normalizing function. We shall discuss several metrics in turn, starting with the cut metric. Before doing so, let us recall a few definitions from (for example) [12].

Throughout this paper, by a *kernel* we mean an integrable function $\kappa : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\kappa(x, y) = \kappa(y, x)$ for all x, y . A *rearrangement* of a kernel κ is any kernel $\kappa^{(\tau)}$ defined by $\kappa^{(\tau)}(x, y) = \kappa(\tau(x), \tau(y))$, where $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a measure-preserving bijection. We write $\kappa \approx \kappa'$ if there is a rearrangement $\kappa^{(\tau)}$ of κ with $\kappa' = \kappa^{(\tau)}$ a.e.

A kernel κ is of *finite type* if there is a finite partition (A_1, \dots, A_n) of $[0, 1]$ such that κ is constant on each set $A_i \times A_j$. Given a graph G_n with n vertices and a normalizing function $p = p(n)$, we write κ_{G_n} for the finite-type kernel associated to G_n , defined by partitioning $[0, 1]$ into n intervals I_i of length $1/n$ and setting κ_{G_n} equal to $1/p$ on $I_i \times I_j$ if $ij \in E(G_n)$, and to equal to 0 otherwise. Note that the definition of κ_{G_n} depends on our normalizing function $p = p(n)$.

Given subsets U, W of $V(G_n)$, we write $e(U, W) = e_{G_n}(U, W)$ for the number of edges of G from U to W , i.e., the number of ordered pairs (u, w) with $u \in U$, $w \in W$ and $uw \in E(G_n)$. Suppressing the dependence on G_n , we write

$$d_p(U, W) = \frac{e_{G_n}(U, W)}{p|U||W|} \quad (1)$$

for the normalized density of edges from U to W in G_n .

As in [12], given a kernel κ and a normalizing function $p = p(n)$, we write $G_p(n, \kappa)$ for the random graph defined by choosing vertex types x_1, \dots, x_n independently and uniformly from $[0, 1]$, and, given these types, joining each pair $\{i, j\}$ of vertices with probability $\min\{p\kappa(x_i, x_j), 1\}$, independently of all other pairs. When $p = 1/n$ this is a special case of the sparse inhomogeneous model of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9]; in [9] the sequence x_1, \dots, x_n is not assumed to be i.i.d., so the model there is much more general. On the other hand, in [9] there are certain technical assumptions, including that κ is continuous almost everywhere. These assumptions are not needed here, since the i.i.d. sequence case is always well behaved; see the discussion in [10] or [11]. When $p = 1$ and κ is bounded by 1, then $G_p(n, \kappa)$ is what is called a κ -*random graph* by Lovász and Szegedy [37].

Often in what follows we consider sequences (G_n) of random graphs, i.e., sequences of probability distributions on n -vertex graphs. In general, there is no canonical coupling between these distributions for different n , so formally we should only consider convergence in probability. However, in many cases the error bounds one obtains are strong enough to give almost sure convergence for any coupling, and one can in any case ensure almost sure convergence by passing to a suitable subsequence. Since the relevant ‘in probability’ notions of (for example) Cauchy sequences are perhaps unfamiliar and distracting, we shall often implicitly fix a coupling and consider almost sure convergence instead.

As usual, when discussing random graphs we say that a sequence of events E_n holds *with high probability*, or *whp*, if $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We write $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} c$ to denote convergence in probability. If (X_n) is a sequence of random variables and $f(n)$ a function, then $X_n = o_p(f(n))$ means $X_n/f(n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$.

2 The cut metric and Szemerédi's Lemma

Let us briefly recall the definitions of the cut norm of Frieze and Kannan [30], and the cut metric, defined for kernels and dense graphs by Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztergombi [17], and adapted to sparse graphs in [12].

Given an integrable function $\kappa : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its *cut norm* is

$$\|\kappa\|_{\text{cut}} = \sup_{S, T \subset [0, 1]} \left| \int_{S \times T} \kappa(x, y) dx dy \right|, \quad (2)$$

where the supremum is over all pairs of measurable subsets of $[0, 1]$. The *cut metric* is defined for kernels by

$$d_{\text{cut}}(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = \inf_{\kappa'_2 \approx \kappa_2} \|\kappa_1 - \kappa'_2\|_{\text{cut}},$$

where the infimum is over all rearrangements of κ_2 . The cut metric is extended to graphs by mapping a graph G_n to the corresponding finite-type kernel κ_{G_n} . Note that this mapping depends on the normalizing function $p = p(n)$, so when applying the cut metric to graphs we should more properly speak of the *p-cut metric*. However, all our metrics will depend on the normalizing function p , so most of the time we shall not indicate this dependence.

In the dense and intermediate ranges, one of the key results used in the study of the cut metric is some form of Szemerédi's Lemma [43]. In the extremely sparse setting, there is no way to apply Szemerédi's Lemma: the 'bounded density' assumption considered in [12, Section 4] can only be satisfied if $e(G_n) = o(n)$, and there is no reasonable way to define an (ε, p) -regular partition so that such a thing exists at all! Correspondingly, many of the nice properties of the cut metric fail when $p = 1/n$, as we shall now see.

Given a graph G and a kernel κ , let $d_{\text{cut}}(G, \kappa) = d_{\text{cut}}(\kappa_G, \kappa)$. As shown in [12], when $np \rightarrow \infty$ then, under suitable mild assumptions, any sequence (G_n) had a subsequence converging to some (bounded) kernel. Here such convergence is impossible, except in the trivial case where $\kappa = 0$ almost everywhere (in which case $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ simply says that $e(G_n) = o(n)$). This is easy to see for bounded kernels (using [12, Lemma 4.2]), but in fact holds for arbitrary kernels.

Theorem 2.1. *Set $p = 1/n$, let κ be a symmetric measurable function on $[0, 1]^2$ with $0 < \int \kappa < \infty$, and let (G_n) be a sequence of graphs with $|G_n| = n$. Then $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, \kappa)$ is bounded away from zero.*

Proof. Suppose not; then, passing to a subsequence, we have $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$. Hence there are rearrangements $\kappa^{(\tau_n)}$ of κ such that

$$\|\kappa_{G_n} - \kappa^{(\tau_n)}\|_{\text{cut}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (3)$$

Note that

$$d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, \kappa) \geq \left| \int \kappa_{G_n} - \int \kappa \right| = \left| \frac{2e(G_n)}{n} - \int \kappa \right|,$$

so $e(G_n)/n \rightarrow \int \kappa/2$. In particular, G_n has $\Theta(n)$ edges.

Let M_n be a largest matching in G_n . We claim that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that, for n large enough, M_n contains at least cn edges. Otherwise, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $|M_n|/n \rightarrow 0$. Writing A_n for the vertex set of M_n , and B_n for its complement, we have $e(B_n, B_n) = 0$. Let X_n be the subset of $[0, 1]$ corresponding to B_n under the rearrangement τ_n . Then, from (3), $\int_{X_n \times X_n} \kappa \rightarrow 0$. Writing μ for Lebesgue measure, we have $\mu(X_n) = |B_n|/n \rightarrow 1$, so from basic properties of integration it follows that $\int_{X_n \times X_n} \kappa \rightarrow \int_{[0,1]^2} \kappa$, which is positive by assumption. This contradiction proves the claim.

Fix $c > 0$ for which the claim above holds. Since κ is integrable, we have $\int \kappa 1_{\{\kappa > C\}} \rightarrow 0$ as $C \rightarrow \infty$, where $1_{\{\kappa > C\}} : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the indicator function of the event that $\kappa(x, y) > C$. In particular, there is a $C < \infty$ with $\int \kappa 1_{\{\kappa > C\}} \leq c/4$. Fix an n with $n > 4C/c$, noting that if $S \subset [0, 1]^2$ satisfies $\mu(S) \leq 1/n$, then

$$\int_S \kappa \leq C\mu(S) + \int \kappa 1_{\{\kappa > C\}} \leq C/n + c/4 \leq c/2. \quad (4)$$

Choosing n large enough, we may assume from (3) that there is a $\kappa' \approx \kappa$ with

$$\|\kappa_{G_n} - \kappa'\|_{\text{cut}} \leq c/25. \quad (5)$$

Let $\{u_1 w_1, \dots, u_r w_r\}$ be a matching in G_n with $r \geq cn$; such a matching exists by our claim. Let $U = \{u_i\}$ and $W = \{w_i\}$. Identifying subsets of $V(G)$ with subsets of $[0, 1]$ in the natural way, from (5) we have

$$\left| \int_{U \times W} \kappa' - \frac{e_{G_n}(U, W)}{n} \right| \leq c/25.$$

Let U' be a random subset of U obtained by selecting each vertex independently with probability $1/2$, and let W' be the complementary subset of W , defined by $W' = \{w_i : u_i \notin U_i\}$. The edges of our matching never appear as edges from U' to W' . On the other hand, any other edge $u_i w_j$, $i \neq j$, from U to W has probability $1/4$ of appearing. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}(e_{G_n}(U', W')) = e_{G_n}(U, W)/4 - r/4.$$

Similarly, writing $S \subset [0, 1]^2$ for the union of the r $1/n$ -by- $1/n$ squares corresponding to the edges $u_i w_i$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\int_{U' \times W'} \kappa' \right) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{U \times W} \kappa' - \frac{1}{4} \int_S \kappa'.$$

Combining the last three displayed equations using the triangle inequality, and noting that $\mu(S) = r/n^2 \leq 1/n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{U' \times W'} \kappa' \right) - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(e_{G_n}(U', W')) \right| &\geq \frac{r}{4n} - \frac{1}{4} \int_S \kappa' - c/100 \\ &\geq c/4 - c/8 - c/100 > c/16, \end{aligned}$$

using (4). On the other hand, from (5),

$$\left| \int_{U' \times W'} \kappa' - \frac{e_{G_n}(U', W')}{n} \right| \leq c/25$$

always holds, which implies a corresponding upper bound on the difference of the expectations. Since $c/25 < c/16$, we obtain a contradiction, completing the proof. \square

The argument above in fact shows much more.

Theorem 2.2. *With $p = 1/n$, a sequence (G_n) of graphs with $|G_n| = n$ is Cauchy with respect to d_{cut} if and only if $e(G_n) = o(n)$.*

Proof. If $e(G_n) = o(n)$ then (G_n) is trivially Cauchy, so we may assume that (G_n) is Cauchy.

On the one hand, if there is some $c > 0$ such that infinitely many G_n contain a matching of size at least cn then, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that all G_n do. The argument above then shows that for any kernel κ , if n is large enough then $d_{\text{cut}}(\kappa_{G_n}, \kappa) > c/25$. Applying this with $\kappa = \kappa_{G_m}$ shows that (G_n) cannot be Cauchy.

On the other hand, if the largest matching in G_n has size $o(n)$, then G_n contains $n - o(n)$ vertices spanning no edges, which implies that $\liminf d_{\text{cut}}(\kappa, G_n) \geq \int \kappa$ for any fixed kernel κ . Taking $\kappa = \kappa_{G_m}$, since (κ_{G_n}) is Cauchy it follows that $\int \kappa_{G_m} \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., that $e(G_n) = o(n)$. \square

Theorem 2.2 shows that one cannot hope to extend the results of Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztergombi [17, 18] for the dense version of d_{cut} , or those of [12] for the sparse version with $np \rightarrow \infty$, to the present extremely sparse case. It may still make sense, however, to use d_{cut} as a measure of the similarity of two graphs G_1, G_2 with the same number n of vertices. For this purpose, as in the denser context, there is a more natural metric $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_1, G_2)$, defined as the minimum over graphs G'_2 with $V(G'_2) = V(G_1)$ and G'_2 isomorphic to G_2 of the maximum over $S, T \subset V(G_1)$ of $|e_{G_1}(S, T) - e_{G'_2}(S, T)|/n$. (This corresponds to only allowing rearrangements of $[0, 1]$ that map vertices, i.e., intervals $((i-1)/n, i/n]$, into vertices.) In the extremely sparse case, it is not so clear what it means for $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n)$ to tend to zero, if G_n, G'_n are graphs with n vertices. For example, consider the following concrete question:

Fix $c > 0$, and let G_n and G'_n be independent instances of the Erdős–Rényi random graph $G(n, c/n)$. Does the expected value of $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n)$ tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$?

If we consider graphs that are even a little denser, i.e., $G(n, p)$ with $np \rightarrow \infty$, then the answer is trivially yes, defining \widehat{d}_{cut} with respect to this density, of course. Indeed, there is no need to rearrange the vertices of G'_n in this case: it is immediate from Chernoff's inequality that whp every cut in $G(n, p)$ has size within $o(pn^2)$ of its expectation. As we shall see, in the extremely sparse case the situation is rather different.

Firstly, with $p = c/n$, rearrangement is certainly necessary: we must match all but $o(n)$ of the $(e^{-c} + o_p(1))n$ isolated vertices of G_n with isolated vertices of G'_n . In fact, matching up almost all the small components of G_n with isomorphic small components of G'_n , it is not hard to see that the question above reduces to a question about the giant component of $G(n, c/n)$. In particular, if $c \leq 1$, then the answer is yes, for the rather uninteresting reason that G_n can be made isomorphic to G'_n by adding and deleting $o_p(n)$ edges. As we shall see, this is the only possibility for a positive answer!

For two graphs G_1, G_2 with the same number of vertices, the (*normalized*) *edit distance* between G_1 and G_2 is the minimum number of edge changes (additions or deletions) needed to turn one of the graphs into a graph isomorphic to the other, divided by pn^2 :

$$d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2) = \frac{1}{pn^2} \min\{|E(G_1) \Delta E(G'_2)| : G'_2 \cong G_2\}. \quad (6)$$

Usually, one would leave the edit distance unnormalized; here we normalize for consistency with our notation for \widehat{d}_{cut} . It seems that Axenovich, Kézdy and Martin [3] were the first to define the edit distance explicitly, although implicitly the notion had been used much earlier, e.g., by Erdős [27] and Simonovits [42] in 1966, and in many subsequent papers. If $|G_1| = |G_2| = n$, then, trivially, $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_1, G_2) \leq 2d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2)$. In general, \widehat{d}_{cut} may be *much* smaller than d_{edit} ; for example, in the dense case where $p = 1$, two independent instances of the random graph $G(n, 1/2)$ are very close in \widehat{d}_{cut} , but far apart in d_{edit} . One can construct sparse examples by ‘cheating’: take two instances of $G(\sqrt{n}, 1/2)$ padded with $n - \sqrt{n}$ isolated vertices.

Although \widehat{d}_{cut} and d_{edit} are in general very different, in the extremely sparse case it turns out that they are closely related, at least for well behaved graphs.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p = 1/n$, and let (G_n) and (G'_n) be sequences of graphs with $O(n)$ edges, with $|G_n| = |G'_n| = n$. Suppose that any $o(n)$ vertices of G_n meet $o(n)$ edges of G_n , and that the same holds for G'_n . Then $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n) \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. As noted above, $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n) \leq 2d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n)$, so our task is to show that if $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n) \rightarrow 0$, then $d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n) \rightarrow 0$. Relabelling the vertices of G'_n , we may assume that $\|\kappa_{G_n} - \kappa_{G'_n}\|_{\text{cut}} \rightarrow 0$.

Let C be a constant such that $e(G_n), e(G'_n) \leq Cn$. Suppose first that $G_n \setminus G'_n$ (or $G'_n \setminus G_n$) contains a matching M of size at least cn , for some constant $c > 0$. Set $a = c/(2C) > 0$, and select each edge of M with probability a , independently of the others. Write M' for the set of edges obtained, and V for the vertex set of M' . Then $\mathbb{E}(e(G_n[V]))$, the expected number of edges of G_n spanned by V , is at least acn , considering only edges in M . On the other hand, if $e \notin M$ has both ends in the vertex set of M , then the probability that both endpoints of e are included in V is a^2 , so $\mathbb{E}(e(G'_n[V])) \leq a^2e(G'_n) \leq a^2Cn$. Recalling that $a = c/(2C)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(e(G_n[V]) - e(G'_n[V])) \geq acn - a^2Cn = c^2n/(4C) = \Theta(n).$$

Choosing a set for which the random difference is at least its expectation, we see that $\|\kappa_{G_n} - \kappa_{G'_n}\|_{\text{cut}} = \Theta(1)$, a contradiction.

From the above we may assume that the largest matchings in $G_n \setminus G'_n$ and in $G'_n \setminus G_n$ have size $o(n)$. But then there is a set V of $o(n)$ vertices that meets every edge of the symmetric difference $G_n \Delta G'_n$. By assumption, V meets only $o(n)$ edges of $G_n \cup G'_n$, so it follows that $e(G_n \Delta G'_n) = o(n)$, so $d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n) \rightarrow 0$. \square

Note that Lemma 2.3 becomes false if the condition that $o(n)$ vertices meet $o(n)$ edges is omitted, as shown by the example mentioned earlier, where G_n and G'_n are two instances of the random graph $G(\sqrt{n}, 1/2)$, each with $n - \sqrt{n}$ isolated vertices added.

Lemma 2.3 applies to two independent instances G_1, G_2 of the random graph $G(n, c/n)$. Hence, $\widehat{d}_{\text{cut}}(G_1, G_2) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ if and only if $d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2) \xrightarrow{P} 0$. It is not too hard to see that the latter condition cannot hold for any $c > 1$.

Theorem 2.4. *For every $c > 1$ there is a $\delta = \delta(c) > 0$ such that, if G_1 and G_2 are independent instances of $G(n, c/n)$, then whp the unnormalized edit distance between G_1 and G_2 is at least δn .*

In other words, normalizing with $p = 1/n$, we have $d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2) \geq \delta$ whp.

Proof. Let us start with an observation about $G(n, c/n)$. Let $0 < a < b$ be constants; we shall estimate the probability of the event $E_\delta(H)$ that $G_2 = G(n, c/n)$ contains all but at most δn edges of some graph H' isomorphic to H , where H is any given graph with $\lfloor an \rfloor$ vertices and at least bn edges, and $\delta < b/2$. There are $\binom{n}{\lfloor an \rfloor}$ choices for the vertex set of H' , and then at most $\lfloor an \rfloor!$ graphs H' with this vertex set isomorphic to H . Finally, given H' , there are crudely at most $\delta n \binom{e(H)}{\delta n}$ choices for the edges of H' to omit, while the probability that $G(n, c/n)$ contains the remaining edges is at most $(c/n)^{e(H) - \delta n}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(E_\delta(H)) &\leq \binom{n}{\lfloor an \rfloor} \lfloor an \rfloor! \delta n \binom{e(H)}{\delta n} (c/n)^{e(H) - \delta n} \\ &\leq n^{an} (eb/\delta)^{\delta n} (c/n)^{(bn - \delta n)} \delta n = n^{(a-b+\delta)n} e^{O(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

If a, b and δ are constants with $\delta < b - a$, then the final probability is $o(1)$.

Turning to the proof of the theorem, if $d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2) \leq \delta$, then the event $E_\delta(H)$ holds for any $H \subset G_1$. If $c > 2$, then G_1 itself has n vertices and $cn/2 + o_p(n)$ edges, so setting $a = 1$ and $b = c'/2$ for any $2 < c' < c$, whp G_1 has a subgraph H with $e(H) \geq bn$. Setting $\delta = (c' - 2)/2 > 0$, whp we have

$$\mathbb{P}(d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2) \leq \delta \mid G_1) \leq \mathbb{P}(E_\delta(H)) = o(1),$$

from which the result follows.

If $1 < c \leq 2$, then the original results of Erdős and Rényi [28] (see also [8]) imply that there are functions $\rho(c)$ and $\zeta(c)$ with $0 < \rho(c) < \zeta(c)$ such that the largest component of $G(n, c/n)$ has $\rho(c)n + o_p(n)$ vertices and $\zeta(c)n + o_p(n)$ edges. Fixing $a < b$ with $\rho(c) < a < b < \zeta(c)$, it follows that whp $G_1 = G(n, c/n)$ contains a subgraph H with at most an vertices and at least bn edges. Taking $\delta = (b - a)/2 > 0$, the result follows as above. \square

Using the results of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9], the proof above may be extended easily to the much more general model $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$, although one first needs to decide what the appropriate statement is. As in [9], let T_κ be the integral operator associated to κ , defined by

$$(T_\kappa f)(x) = \int_0^1 \kappa(x, y) f(y) d\mu(y),$$

and let $\|T_\kappa\|$ be its L^2 -norm. Roughly speaking, it was shown in [9] that $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ has a giant component if and only if $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$. (There is a slight caveat here: the results of [9] assume that κ is continuous almost everywhere; this assumption is only needed due to the more general choice of the vertex types made there. It is easy to see that these results apply to general κ if we choose the vertex types i.i.d., as we do in the definition of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$; this is discussed in [10].)

More precisely, it is shown in [9] that if κ satisfies a certain irreducibility condition, then $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ has a ‘giant component’ with $\rho(\kappa)n + o_p(n)$ vertices and $\zeta(\kappa)n + o_p(n)$ edges, for constants $\rho(\kappa)$ and $\zeta(\kappa)$ satisfying $0 < \rho(\kappa) < \zeta(\kappa)$ whenever $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$ (see Theorems 3.1 and 3.5 and Proposition 10.1 in [9]). Since any kernel effectively contains an irreducible kernel (see Lemma 5.17 of [9]), it follows that if κ is any kernel with $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$, then there are constants $0 < a < b$ depending only on κ such that, whp, $G_1 = G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ has a (connected) subgraph H with at most an vertices and at least bn edges. Setting $\delta = \delta(\kappa) = (\zeta(\kappa) - \rho(\kappa))/2 > 0$, the observation at the start of the proof of Theorem 2.4 shows that, for any c , the probability that $G(n, c/n)$ contains all but δn edges of such a graph H is $o(1)$. If κ is bounded, then we may couple $G_2 = G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ and $G(n, \sup \kappa/n)$ so that the former is a subgraph of the latter, and it follows that whp independent copies G_1 and G_2 of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ are at edit distance at least $\delta(\kappa)/2$.

If κ is unbounded then we can approximate with bounded kernels as in [9]; we omit the details, noting only that, considering bounded kernels κ^M tending up to κ , there is some M_0 such that $\delta(\kappa^{M_0}) > 0$. Then for any $M_1 > M_0$, the argument above shows that independent copies of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa^{M_1})$ are whp at distance at least $\delta(\kappa^{M_0})$, which does not depend on M_1 . This bound still applies if M_1 tends to infinity slowly enough, but then $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa^{M_1})$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ are very close in d_{edit} .

As shown in [9, Proposition 8.11], the graph $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 2.3. Putting the pieces together, we have thus proved the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *Let κ be a kernel with $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$, and let G_n and G'_n be independent instances of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$. Then there is a constant $\delta > 0$ such $d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n) \geq \delta$ and $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n) \geq \delta$ hold whp. \square*

In fact, standard martingale arguments show that each of $d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n)$ and $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n)$ is concentrated about its mean, which is thus bounded away from zero. We omit the details, which are very similar to those in the proof of Theorem 5.4 below.

As noted above for $G(n, c/n)$, the condition $\|T_\kappa\| > 1$ is necessary: otherwise, from the results of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9], $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ consists almost entirely of small tree components, with the number of copies of any given tree concentrated. It follows easily that $d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n)$ and hence $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, G'_n)$ converge to 0 in probability (and almost surely) in this case.

3 Tree counts

Since it seems that we cannot do much with the cut metric d_{cut} in the extremely sparse case, let us now turn our attention to the count or subgraph metric d_{sub} . As in [12], given two graphs F and G we write $\text{hom}(F, G)$ for the number of *homomorphisms* from F to G , i.e., the number of maps $\phi : V(F) \rightarrow V(G)$ such that $xy \in E(F)$ implies $\phi(x)\phi(y) \in E(G)$, and $\text{emb}(F, G)$ for the number of *embeddings* of F into G , i.e., the number of injective homomorphisms from F to G . If G_n has n vertices, we normalize the homomorphism and subgraph counts by setting

$$t_p(F, G_n) = \frac{\text{hom}(F, G_n)}{n^{|F|} p^{e(F)}} \quad \text{and} \quad s_p(F, G_n) = \frac{\text{emb}(F, G_n)}{n_{(|F|)} p^{e(F)}},$$

where $p = p(n)$ is our normalizing edge density, here $1/n$, and $n_{(|F|)} = n(n-1)\cdots(n-|F|+1)$ is the number of possible embeddings of F . In [12], the subgraph metric d_{sub} is defined by choosing a certain set \mathcal{A} of *admissible* graphs, and defining d_{sub} so that (G_n) is Cauchy if and only if $s_p(F, G_n)$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each $F \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let F be a connected graph which is not a tree. The denominator in the definition of $t_p(F, G_n)$ or $s_p(F, G_n)$ is $\Theta(n^{|F|} p^{e(F)})$, which is order 1 if F is unicyclic, and tends to zero if F contains two or more cycles. This suggests that, in this range, the parameters $s_p(F, \cdot)$ and $t_p(F, \cdot)$ make sense only if F is a tree, i.e., that we should take for \mathcal{A} the set \mathcal{T} of (isomorphism classes of) finite trees. Indeed, with F unicyclic, convergence of $s_p(F, G_n)$ simply means that for large n , every G_n contains the same number of copies of F . This condition is very far from the kind of global graph property we are looking for. Since the expected number of copies of a connected graph F in $G(n, c/n)$ tends to infinity if and only if F is tree, roughly speaking we do not expect to see small cycles in graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges. Of course, there are natural examples of extremely sparse graphs containing many short cycles, but we should handle these differently; see Section 7. For now, we shall consider graphs that, like $G(n, c/n)$, contain few short cycles. More formally, throughout this section we assume that (G_n) is *asymptotically treelike*, in the sense that

$$\text{emb}(F, G_n) = o(n) \tag{7}$$

for any connected F that is not a tree. Under a suitable assumption on the degrees in G_n , it suffices to impose condition (7) for cycles.

Under the assumption (7), it is easy to see that the parameters $(s_p(T, G_n))_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ and $(t_p(T, G_n))_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ are essentially equivalent. In particular, up to a $o(1)$ error,

for any tree T , $t_p(T, G_n)$ can be written as a linear combination of the parameters $s_p(T', G_n)$, $|T'| \leq |T|$, and vice versa. We shall work with $s_p(T, G_n)$, which is more natural. Adjusting the normalizing constant very slightly, we shall simply set

$$s_p(T, G_n) = \text{emb}(T, G_n)/n.$$

As in [12], we assume that the normalized counts of all admissible subgraphs remain bounded. In other words, we shall assume that

$$\sup_n s_p(T, G_n) \leq c_T < \infty$$

for each tree T . In fact, it will be convenient to make the stronger assumption that the tree counts are *exponentially bounded*, i.e., that there is a constant C such that

$$\limsup s_p(T, G_n) \leq C^{e(T)}$$

for every tree T . For example, taking T to be a star, this condition implies that the k th moment of the degree of a random vertex of G_n is at most $C^k + o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As in [12], writing \mathcal{F} for the set of isomorphism classes of finite graphs, and enumerating the set \mathcal{T} of isomorphism classes of finite trees as T_1, T_2, \dots , define a map

$$s_p : \mathcal{F}_0 \rightarrow X, \quad G \mapsto (s_p(T_i, G))_{i=1}^\infty,$$

where \mathcal{F}_0 is the subset of \mathcal{F} consisting of graphs satisfying the tree-count bounds above, and $X = \prod_i [0, c_{T_i}]$. We then define the (tree) subgraph distance $d_{\text{sub}}(G_1, G_2)$ between two graphs G_1 and G_2 as $d(s_p(G_1), s_p(G_2))$, where d is any metric on X giving rise to the product topology. (It is not clear whether d_{sub} is a metric or only a pseudometric, but this is not important.) Defining

$$s(F, \kappa) = \int_{[0,1]^k} \prod_{ij \in E(F)} \kappa(x_i, x_j) \prod_{i=1}^k dx_i,$$

as before, we may extend s_p to bounded kernels κ by mapping κ to $(s(T_i, \kappa))_{i=1}^\infty$, and it then makes sense to consider the question of when $d_{\text{sub}}(G_n, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$.

Unlike the cut metric, it is certainly possible to have convergence in the metric d_{sub} . Indeed, it is easy to check that $s_p(T, G_{1/n}(n, \kappa))$ converges in probability to $s(T, \kappa)$ for any tree T and any bounded kernel κ , and one can then show that $d_{\text{sub}}(G_{1/n}(n, \kappa), \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ in probability and (coupling suitably) with probability 1.

In this section, the main questions we shall consider are: which points X of $[0, 1]^{\mathcal{T}}$ are realizable as limits of sequences $(s_p(G_n))$, where (G_n) is asymptotically treelike and has bounded tree counts, and how do these limit points relate to kernels? In fact, we shall reformulate these questions slightly.

Recall that in the definition of $\text{emb}(T, G_n)$, the tree T is labelled. Let us also regard T as rooted, with root vertex 1, say. Letting v denote a vertex of G_n chosen uniformly at random, $s_p(T, G_n)$ is simply the expected number of embeddings from T into G_n mapping the root to v . Letting T run over stars, the

numbers $s_p(T, G_n)$ give the moments of the degree of v ; assuming these moments converge, and that the limiting moments are exponentially bounded, a standard result implies that they determine the limiting degree distribution. (For an example of two non-negative integer valued distributions with the same finite moments, see Janson [33], taking, for example, $\alpha = \log(2/3)$ and $\alpha = \log(4/5)$ in Example 2.12.) More generally, the parameters $s_p(T, G_n)$ for all finite trees T provide a sort of moment characterization of the local neighbourhood of v . Presumably, if these tree counts are exponentially bounded, then they characterize the distribution of the local neighbourhood of v . (It should not be hard to adapt the proof that convergence of exponentially bounded moments implies convergence in distribution based on the Jordan–Bonferroni inequalities: consider the event that certain edges are present, forming a copy of some given tree T with v as the root, and apply inclusion–exclusion to calculate the probability that certain other edges are absent, so T is the local neighbourhood of v ; we have not checked the details.) In fact, for this something weaker than exponentially bounded tree counts should be enough, but exponential boundedness is a natural assumption, as it is the global analogue of the (perhaps too restrictive) local condition that all degrees are uniformly bounded. In any case, it makes more sense to study the distribution of local neighbourhoods directly, rather than its moments.

For $t \geq 0$, let $\Gamma_{\leq t}(v)$ denote the subgraph of G_n formed by all vertices within graph distance t of v , regarded as a rooted graph with root v . Let \mathcal{T}_t^r denote the set of isomorphism classes of rooted trees of height at most t , i.e., such that every vertex is within distance t of the root. Finally, for $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r$, let

$$p(T, G_n) = p_t(T, G_n) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{\leq t}(v) \cong T),$$

where v is a vertex of G_n chosen uniformly at random, and \cong denotes isomorphism as rooted graphs. Officially, the subscript t is necessary in the notation, since if $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r \subset \mathcal{T}_{t+1}^r$, then $\Gamma_{\leq t}(v) \cong T$ and $\Gamma_{\leq t+1}(v) \cong T$ are different conditions. In practice, we work with the disjoint union \mathcal{T}^r of the sets \mathcal{T}_t^r , $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, so each $T \in \mathcal{T}^r$ comes with a height t which we do not indicate in the notation; T may or may not contain vertices at distance t from the root.

Since each $p(T, G_n)$ lies in $[0, 1]$, any sequence (G_n) has a subsequence on which $p(T, G_n)$ converges for every T . We would like to study the set \mathcal{P} of possible limits $(p(T))_{T \in \mathcal{T}^r}$ arising from asymptotically treelike sequences with exponentially bounded tree counts.

We start with some simple observations. First note that if (G_n) is asymptotically treelike, then

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r} p(T, G_n) \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with t fixed; this is simply the statement that only $o(n)$ vertices have cycles in their t -neighbourhoods. In general, such a statement does not carry over to the limit, since infinite sums are not continuous with respect to pointwise convergence. Recall that we are assuming that the tree counts in (G_n) are (exponentially) bounded. It is easy to check that, under this assumption,

for any $t \geq 0$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an M such that, for large enough n , at most εn vertices v have more than M edges in their t -neighbourhoods. (In the terminology of probability theory, for each t the sequence $(X_{n,t})$ of random variables given by $X_{n,t} = e(\Gamma_{\leq t}(v))$ is ‘tight’, where v is a uniformly chosen random vertex of G_n . Equivalently, the random variables $\Gamma_{\leq t}(v)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, are themselves tight.) In other words, for large n , at least $1 - \varepsilon$ of the mass of the distribution $(p(T, G_n))_{T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r}$ is concentrated on a fixed, finite set of trees. Under this condition, pointwise convergence implies convergence in L^1 , and it follows that $\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r} p(T) = 1$ whenever $(p(T)) \in \mathcal{P}$. In other words, p gives a probability distribution on \mathcal{T}_t^r for each t .

Given a finite or infinite rooted tree T , we may define the *restriction* of T to height t to be the subtree $T|_t$ of T induced by all vertices within distance t of the root, which we naturally regard as an element of \mathcal{T}_t^r . If (G_n) is asymptotically treelike, then, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r$, we have

$$p(T, G_n) = \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_{t+1}^r: T'|_t = T} p(T', G_n) + o(1).$$

(The $o(1)$ correction appears because of the possibility that the $t + 1$ neighbourhood of a random vertex v contains a cycle while the t neighbourhood does not.) Using L^1 convergence, it follows that

$$p(T) = \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_{t+1}^r: T'|_t = T} p(T')$$

whenever $(p(T)) \in \mathcal{P}$. In other words, the distribution on \mathcal{T}_t^r is obtained from that on \mathcal{T}_{t+1}^r by the natural restriction operation.

This last fact allows us to combine the distributions on \mathcal{T}_t^r given by $p \in \mathcal{P}$ into a single probability distribution on the set \mathcal{T}_∞^r of (finite or infinite) locally finite rooted trees. Of course, we take for the set of measurable events the σ -field generated by the sets

$$E_{t,T} = \{T' \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^r : T'|_t = T\}$$

for $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r$. We say that a probability distribution π on \mathcal{T}_∞^r is the *local limit* of a sequence (G_n) of graphs with $|G_n| = n$ if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_t(T, G_n) = \pi(E_{t,T})$$

holds for every $t \geq 0$ and every $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r$. We should like to know which probability distributions π on \mathcal{T}_∞^r arise as local limits of asymptotically treelike, exponentially bounded sequences (G_n) . (For a closely related question of Aldous and Lyons [1], see Section 7.)

We shall give some examples of such distributions in the next section, arising from random graphs. Here, we give a trivial example: fix $d \geq 2$ and let π be the distribution that is concentrated on one point of \mathcal{T}_∞^r , the (infinite) d -regular

tree. This distribution arises as a local limit if we take G_n to be a random d -regular graph with n vertices.

Having given a trivial example of a distribution that can arise, let us give a trivial example of one that cannot. Let π be any distribution concentrated on the two trees $T \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^r$ in which every vertex has degree 2 or 3, and the neighbours of a vertex of degree 2 have degree 3 and vice versa. (There are two such trees since our trees are rooted.) Considering graphs G_n in which the vertices have degrees 2 and 3, there is no ‘local reason’ why the neighbourhoods of a random vertex v shouldn’t look like the first few generations of π . However, unless π satisfies an extra condition, there is of course a global reason: there are as many edges from vertices of degree 2 to vertices of degree 3 as vice versa. Thus, if all edges join vertices of different degrees, we must have $3/2$ times as many degree 2 vertices as degree 3 vertices, and if π is to arise as a local limit, it must assign probabilities $3/5$ and $2/5$ to the trees in which the root has degree 2 and 3, respectively.

More generally, consider the following two ways of picking a (not uniformly) random vertex of G_n . (A) pick a vertex v with probability proportional to its degree. (B) pick a vertex w with probability proportional to its degree, then choose an edge incident with w uniformly, and let v be the other end of this edge. It is easy to see that (A) and (B) give the same distribution for the vertex v - indeed, we are simply choosing an edge e of G at random, and then picking an end of e at random. In (B) we ‘change our minds’ after picking the random end, which makes no difference. The equivalence of (A) and (B) gives rise to a consistency condition on our distributions π .

Let π be any probability distribution on \mathcal{T}_∞^r in which the expected degree of the root is finite. (Any distribution in \mathcal{P} will have this property, due to the bounded average degree of graphs in G_n .) Then we may define the ‘root-sized-biased’ version $\tilde{\pi}$ of π to be the distribution π biased by the degree of the root. In other words, for any $t \geq 1$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r$,

$$\tilde{\pi}(E_{t,T}) = \frac{d_0(T)\pi(E_{t,T})}{\mathbb{E}_\pi(d_0)},$$

where the $d_0(T)$ denotes the degree of the root of T , and $\mathbb{E}_\pi(d_0)$ is simply the expectation of the degree of the root of a π -random $T \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^r$. Let us define the *shift* $\tilde{\pi}^*$ of $\tilde{\pi}$ to be the distribution on \mathcal{T}_∞^r obtained as follows: first choose a $T \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^r$ according to the distribution $\tilde{\pi}$. Then pick a neighbour v of the root uniformly from among the $d_0(T)$ neighbours. Finally, let $T' \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^r$ be the tree obtained from T by taking v as the root. Since the restriction of T' to height t is determined by the restriction of T to height $t + 1$, it is easy to check that this does define a probability distribution $\tilde{\pi}^*$ on \mathcal{T}_∞^r .

Using the equivalence of the procedures (A) and (B) above for picking a random vertex of G_n , it is easy to see that if π arises as the local limit of one of our sequences (G_n) , then π is *shift invariant*, in that $\tilde{\pi}^* = \tilde{\pi}$. It is tempting to believe that this condition is sufficient, but in fact, as pointed out to us by Gábor Elek, this is not the case, as we shall now explain.

An infinite graph is called *quasi-transitive* if the action of its automorphism group on the vertex set induces a finite number of orbits, i.e., if there are only finitely many different ‘types’ of vertices in the graph. A quasi-transitive tree may be described by a square matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ specifying, for each i and j , the number of type- j neighbours each vertex of type i has. Also, given any square matrix A with non-negative integer entries in which $a_{ij} > 0$ if and only if $a_{ji} > 0$, one can construct a corresponding quasi-transitive tree. (This correspondence is not one-to-one; it may be that vertices corresponding to different rows of A end up having the same type. For example, if each row of A has the same sum d , then T is simply the d -regular tree. It is easy to describe conditions on A under which this kind of ‘collapse’ does not happen.)

Example 3.1. A non-unimodular tree. Let T be the infinite (unrooted) tree corresponding to the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus vertices in T have degree 2, 3 or 4, each vertex has one neighbour of the ‘next’ degree (where 2 follows 4), and 1, 2 or 3 neighbours of the previous degree. There are three rooted trees corresponding to T ; let us call these T_2 , T_3 and T_4 , where the root of T_i has degree i .

Suppose that π is a probability distribution on \mathcal{T}_∞^r supported on $\{T_2, T_3, T_4\}$, and giving mass π_i to T_i . Suppose also that π is the local limit of an asymptotically treelike sequence (G_n) . Then, considering the 1-neighbourhood of a random vertex, the convergence assumption implies that G_n has $\pi_i n + o(n)$ vertices of each degree i , $i = 2, 3, 4$. Considering the 2-neighbourhood, we also see that $\pi_2 n + o(n)$ vertices of degree 2, i.e., all but $o(n)$ vertices of degree 2, have one neighbour of degree 3 and one of degree 4. Hence the number of edges of G_n from degree 2 vertices to degree 3 vertices is $\pi_2 n + o(n)$. But, similarly, all but $o(n)$ of the $\pi_3 n + o(n)$ vertices of degree 3 have two neighbours of degree 2, so there are $2\pi_3 n + o(n)$ edges from degree 3 vertices to degree 2 vertices. Hence, $\pi_2 = 2\pi_3$. Similar arguments show that $\pi_3 = 3\pi_4$ and $\pi_4 = \pi_2$. Together these equations imply that $\pi_i = 0$ for all i , contradicting $\pi_2 + \pi_3 + \pi_4 = 1$. Thus there is no probability distribution supported on $\{T_2, T_3, T_4\}$ that is a local limit.

A little calculation shows that taking $\pi_2 = 9/20$, $\pi_3 = 7/20$ and $\pi_4 = 4/20$ gives a shift-invariant distribution supported on $\{T_2, T_3, T_4\}$, so this shift-invariant distribution is not a local limit.

The reason for the terminology ‘non-unimodular’ above will become clear in Section 7. A different example of a non-unimodular tree is given in Example 3.1 of Benjamini, Lyons, Peres and Schramm [4], corresponding to the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The argument leading to $\pi_2 = 2\pi_3$ in the example above can be generalized. In this argument, we drew an oriented edge from a vertex x to a neighbour y if the local neighbourhood (in this case the 2-neighbourhood) of x satisfied a certain rule (that x had degree 2 and y degree 3). We can of course use any such rule. For this it turns out to be useful to consider *doubly rooted trees*, i.e., trees with an ordered pair of adjacent distinguished vertices x and y . Formally, we shall consider $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{rr}}$, the set of triples $\{(T, x, y)\}$ in which (T, x) is a rooted locally finite tree and y is a neighbour of x . (We do not quotient by isomorphisms at this stage.) Similarly, we consider the set $\mathcal{T}_t^{\text{rr}} = \{(T, x, y)\}$ of finite doubly rooted trees in which all vertices are within distance t of x .

Let $A \subset \mathcal{T}_t^{\text{rr}}$ be any *isomorphism invariant* set of doubly rooted trees of radius t . We say that a (potentially) infinite doubly rooted tree (T, x, y) is in A if its restriction to the t -neighbourhood of the root is in A . Note that if x and y are adjacent vertices of T , then (T, y, x) is to be viewed as a tree rooted at y , with a second distinguished vertex x . We claim that if π is a local limit, then

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi |\{y : (T, x, y) \in A\}| = \mathbb{E}_\pi |\{y : (T, y, x) \in A\}|, \quad (8)$$

where the expectation is over the choice of a random rooted tree (T, x) with distribution π . The argument is as above so let us just outline it: let (G_n) be a sequence of finite graphs converging to π in the appropriate sense. In each G_n , draw a directed edge from a vertex x to a neighbour y if and only if $(\Gamma_{\leq t}(x), x, y) \in A$, where $\Gamma_{\leq t}(x)$ is the t -neighbourhood of x in G_n . Now the limiting fraction of vertices of G_n whose t -neighbourhood has a certain form is given by π . It follows that the expected out-degree of a random vertex of G_n converges to the left-hand side of (8). On the other hand, the limiting fraction of vertices of G_n whose $(t+1)$ -neighbourhood has a certain form is again given by π . From the $(t+1)$ -neighbourhood of x one can obtain the t -neighbourhood of each neighbour y of x , and thus decide whether we drew an edge from y to x . It follows that the expected in-degree converges to the right-hand side of (8). Since in any finite directed graph, the average out- and in-degrees are equal, (8) follows.

Let \cong denote isomorphism of doubly-rooted trees. In the above, we took A to be any subset of $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{rr}} / \cong$ such that whether $(T, x, y) \in A$ holds is determined by the t -neighbourhood of x for some $t = t(A)$. In general, we can consider arbitrary subsets of $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{rr}} / \cong$ that may be approximated by such subsets, i.e., arbitrary measurable subsets of $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{rr}} / \cong$. Also, replacing a subset by its characteristic function, there is no need to restrict to 0-1 functions. This leads us to the following definition.

Let π be a probability measure on $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{r}}$. Then π is called *involution invariant* if for every non-negative measurable function f on $\mathcal{T}_\infty^{\text{rr}} / \cong$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \sum_y f(T, x, y) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \sum_y f(T, y, x) \quad (9)$$

where the expectation is over the π -random rooted tree (T, x) , and the sum is over all neighbours y of x . Note that f must be isomorphism invariant, but if

the root x of T has degree d , then there are d terms in the sums above, even if several of these correspond to isomorphic doubly-rooted trees. Note also that it suffices to consider functions f that are characteristic functions of measurable sets.

We have seen above that if π is a local limit then π must be involution invariant. This observation was first made (in a slightly different context) by Benjamini and Schramm [5]; we return to this in Section 7. We do not know whether this necessary condition on π is sufficient. (See also Question 7.1.)

Question 3.2. *Does every involution-invariant probability distribution on \mathcal{T}_∞^i arise as the local limit of some sequence (G_n) of graphs with $|G_n| = n$?*

The sequence (G_n) above will necessarily be asymptotically treelike (otherwise the total weight of π would be less than 1, so π would not be a probability distribution). However, in the question above we have lost the condition that the tree counts of (G_n) be exponentially bounded. Such a condition may or may not be needed to get sensible limiting behaviour. To avoid possible complications, in the first draft of this paper we posed the following variant of Question 3.2.

Question 3.3. *Let $\Delta \geq 2$ be given, and let π be an involution-invariant probability distribution on the set of trees $T \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^i$ with maximum degree at most Δ . Must π arise as the local limit of some sequence (G_n) of graphs with all degrees at most Δ ?*

Question 3.3 has now been answered in the affirmative by Elek [25].

Let us finish this section by noting that there is a certain class of distributions for which the answer to the questions above is trivially yes, namely the class of probability distributions π on *finite* rooted trees. It is easy to check that a distribution π on the set of finite rooted trees (a subset of \mathcal{T}_∞^i) corresponds in the natural way to a distribution on unrooted trees if and only if π is involution invariant. In this case it is easy to construct forests G_n with the appropriate limiting distribution of trees.

4 Tree counts in random graphs

We have seen in the previous section that the metric d_{sub} , defined using only tree counts, makes sense in the extremely sparse case ($p = 1/n$), in that there are non-trivial convergent sequences: unlike the cut metric, d_{sub} is not ‘too strong’ to be meaningful. Here we ask whether it is ‘too weak’ to be useful, i.e., whether too many sequences converge that ‘should not’. Of course this is rather a vague question, so we concentrate on a precise special case: we have seen that for any bounded kernel we have $d_{\text{sub}}(G_{1/n}(n, \kappa), \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ with probability 1, so we ask: which kernels are distinguished by d_{sub} ? In other words, when do two kernels κ_1 and κ_2 satisfy $s(T, \kappa_1) = s(T, \kappa_2)$ for every tree T ? As in the previous section, we shall change viewpoint slightly, considering the distribution of local neighbourhoods, rather than counting subgraphs.

Adopting the terminology of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9], let (\mathcal{S}, μ) be an arbitrary probability space. By a *kernel* on (\mathcal{S}, μ) we mean an integrable, symmetric, non-negative function on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$. So far we have almost always taken $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]$ and μ Lebesgue measure, but the notation is more convenient if we are rather more general here. As in [9] (but taking the special case where the vertex types are i.i.d.), suppressing the dependence on (\mathcal{S}, μ) in the notation, we may form a random graph $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ as follows: let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{S}$ be i.i.d. with the distribution μ , and then, given (x_1, \dots, x_n) , join each pair of vertices $\{i, j\} \subset [n]^{(2)}$ with probability $\min\{\kappa(x_i, x_j)/n, 1\}$, independently of the other pairs. We say that vertex i has *type* x_i and call (\mathcal{S}, μ) the *type space*.

Let \mathfrak{X}_κ be the multi-type Poisson Galton–Watson branching process naturally associated to κ : we start in generation 0 with a single particle whose type is distributed according to μ . A particle of type x has children whose types form a Poisson process on \mathcal{S} with the distribution $\kappa(x, y) d\mu(y)$: the number of such children in a measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{S}$ is Poisson with mean $\int_A \kappa(x, y) d\mu(y)$. As usual, the children of different particles are independent, and independent of the history. This branching process is the key to the analysis of the random graph $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ in [9].

The branching process \mathfrak{X}_κ is of course simply a random rooted tree with labels attached to the vertices, giving the type of each vertex. Forgetting the labels, we may regard \mathfrak{X}_κ as a random rooted tree; we write π_κ for the corresponding probability measure on \mathcal{T}_∞^r . It is not hard to check that if κ is bounded, then π_κ provides the correct local approximation for $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$: in the notation of the previous section, for each $T \in \mathcal{T}_t^r$ we have

$$p_t(T, G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)) \rightarrow \pi_\kappa(E_{t,T}) \text{ with probability 1.}$$

This is the distributional equivalent of the convergence in moments given by $s_p(T, G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)) \rightarrow s(T, \kappa)$ for every tree T .

In the light of the comments above, we should like to answer the following question: when do two different branching processes \mathfrak{X}_{κ_1} and \mathfrak{X}_{κ_2} give rise to the same random tree? In other words, when is $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$? It is not hard to check that, at least for bounded κ , the counts $(s(T, \kappa))_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ determine π_κ and vice versa, so this is the same question as that asked at the start of the section. Since π_κ directly describes the local structure of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$, we consider the present branching process formulation more informative.

There is an obvious case when $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$: let κ_i be a kernel on (\mathcal{S}_i, μ_i) . We say that κ_1 *refines* κ_2 , and write $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_2$, if there is a measure-preserving map $\tau : \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_2$ such that for μ_1 -almost every $x \in \mathcal{S}_1$ we have

$$\int_{\tau^{-1}(A)} \kappa_1(x, y) d\mu_1(y) = \int_A \kappa_2(\tau(x), y) d\mu_2(y)$$

for all measurable $A \subset \mathcal{S}_2$. (This is a very different notion to that appearing in [12, Subsection 2.4], despite the superficial similarity to $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2^{(\tau)}$.) In other words, if we take a particle of \mathfrak{X}_{κ_1} and look at the distribution of the images under τ of the types of its children, then this distribution depends only on the

image of the type of the original particle, and it does so according to the kernel κ_2 . From this description it is immediate that if $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_2$, then $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$.

From now on we shall concentrate on the finite-type case, i.e., take \mathcal{S} to be finite. Note that there is a natural correspondence between this case and the case of kernels κ on $[0, 1]^2$ that are piecewise constant on rectangles. In this case $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_2$ simply means that the types associated to κ_1 may be grouped together to form the types associated to κ_2 , and the distribution of the grouped types of the children of a particle in \mathfrak{X}_{κ_1} is what it should be in \mathfrak{X}_{κ_2} .

The relation \prec is clearly transitive. Hence the natural conjecture is that two kernels give the same distribution on trees if and only if they have a common refinement. Or should it be if and only if they are both refinements of a common ‘coarsening’? In fact, somewhat surprisingly, the two are equivalent!

Theorem 4.1. *Let κ_1 and κ_2 be finite-type kernels. Then the following are equivalent: (i) there is a finite-type kernel κ_r with $\kappa_r \prec \kappa_1$ and $\kappa_r \prec \kappa_2$, and (ii) there is a finite-type kernel κ_c with $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_c$ and $\kappa_2 \prec \kappa_c$.*

Proof. Let κ_i have type-space (\mathcal{S}_i, μ_i) . Since the definition of \prec ignores sets of measure zero, we may assume that each μ_i is a strictly positive measure on the finite set \mathcal{S}_i .

We start by showing that (ii) implies (i). Suppose then that $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_c$ and $\kappa_2 \prec \kappa_c$. Let κ_c have type space (\mathcal{S}_c, μ_c) . Then each of $\mathfrak{X}_{\kappa_1}, \mathfrak{X}_{\kappa_2}$ may be viewed as \mathfrak{X}_{κ_c} with ‘extra labels’ on the vertices, indicating the subtypes in \mathcal{S}_i . We wish to add labels of both kinds simultaneously. It is easy to write down a way of doing so.

Let $\tau_i : \mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_c$ be the map witnessing $\kappa_i \prec \kappa_c$. Let \mathcal{S}_r be the set of pairs $(i, j) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ with $\tau_1(i) = \tau_2(j)$, and set

$$\mu_r((i, j)) = \frac{\mu_1(i)\mu_2(j)}{\mu_c(\tau_1(i))}.$$

Summing first over all $i \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $j \in \mathcal{S}_2$ mapping to a given $k \in \mathcal{S}_c$, it is easy to check that μ_r is a probability measure on the finite set \mathcal{S}_r . It remains to define an appropriate kernel.

For $(i, j), (k, \ell) \in \mathcal{S}_r$, set

$$\kappa_r((i, j), (k, \ell)) = \frac{\kappa_1(i, k)\kappa_2(j, \ell)}{\kappa_c(\tau_1(i), \tau_1(k))},$$

whenever the denominator is non-zero, and set $\kappa_r((i, j), (k, \ell)) = 0$ otherwise.

Since, despite appearances, the definitions above are symmetric with respect to κ_1 and κ_2 , to establish (i) it suffices to show that $\kappa_r \prec \kappa_1$. Of course, in doing so we shall map $(i, j) \in \mathcal{S}_r$ to $i \in \mathcal{S}_1$. This map is measure preserving. Since κ_r is of finite type, all we must check is that for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{S}_r$ and $k \in \mathcal{S}_1$, a particle of type (i, j) in \mathfrak{X}_{κ_r} has the right number of children of (subtypes of) type k . In other words, we must show that

$$\sum_{\ell : \tau_2(\ell) = \tau_1(k)} \kappa_r((i, j), (k, \ell))\mu_r((k, \ell)) = \kappa_1(i, k)\mu_1(k).$$

If $\kappa_c(\tau_1(i), \tau_1(k))$ is zero then $\kappa_1(i, k)$ is also zero (since $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_c$), so both sides are zero. Otherwise, the left hand side above is simply

$$\sum_{\ell: \tau_2(\ell)=\tau_1(k)} \frac{\kappa_1(i, k)\kappa_2(j, \ell)}{\kappa_c(\tau_1(i), \tau_1(k))} \frac{\mu_1(k)\mu_2(\ell)}{\mu_c(\tau_1(k))} = \kappa_1(i, k)\mu_1(k) \frac{\sum_{\ell: \tau_2(\ell)=\tau_1(k)} \kappa_2(j, \ell)\mu_2(\ell)}{\kappa_c(\tau_1(i), \tau_1(k))\mu_c(\tau_1(k))}.$$

Recalling that $\tau_1(i) = \tau_2(j)$, the final fraction is 1 since τ_2 is a map witnessing $\kappa_2 \prec \kappa_c$: the numerator and denominator both express, for a particle of type $j \in \mathcal{S}_2$ (and hence of type $\tau_2(j) \in \mathcal{S}_c$), the expected number of children of type $\tau_1(k)$. This completes the proof that (ii) implies (i).

Suppose now that (i) holds, i.e., that κ_1 and κ_2 have a common refinement κ_r . Each type in the corresponding type space maps to some $i \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and some $j \in \mathcal{S}_2$. It is easy to see that we may group together all types mapping to the same pair (i, j) , obtaining a common refinement of κ_1 and κ_2 that we also denote κ_r , with type space \mathcal{S}_r a subset of $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. As before, we delete any types with measure zero. We may regard \mathcal{S}_r as the edge set of a bipartite graph G with vertex classes \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 ; we shall construct the common coarsening κ_c as a kernel with type space the set of components of G . Since $\kappa_r \prec \kappa_1$, the map from \mathcal{S}_r to \mathcal{S}_1 given by $(i, j) \mapsto i$ is measure preserving. In other words, for each j , writing ij for (i, j) ,

$$\sum_{j: ij \in E(G)} \mu_r(ij) = \mu_1(i). \quad (10)$$

Similarly, $\sum_{i: ij \in E(G)} \mu_r(ij) = \mu_2(j)$. For each component C of G , set $\mu_c(C) = \sum_{ij \in E(C)} \mu_r(ij)$; this defines a probability measure on the set \mathcal{S}_c of components of G . If C has vertex set $C_1 \cup C_2$, $C_i \subset \mathcal{S}_i$, then from (10),

$$\mu_c(C) = \sum_{i \in C_1} \sum_{j: ij \in E(G)} \mu_r(ij) = \sum_{i \in C_1} \mu_1(i).$$

Hence the map $\tau_1: \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_c$ mapping each $i \in \mathcal{S}_1 \subset V(G)$ to the component in which it lies is measure preserving. Similarly for the corresponding map $\tau_2: \mathcal{S}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_c$.

Fix two components C and C' of G , which need not be distinct. For each edge $e \in C$ set

$$\lambda(e, C') = \sum_{f \in E(C')} \kappa_r(e, f)\mu_r(f),$$

the expected number of children in C' of a particle in \mathfrak{X}_{κ_r} of type e . Writing $e = ij$, we may rewrite $\lambda(e, C')$ as follows:

$$\lambda(ij, C') = \sum_{k \in C'_1} \sum_{\ell \in E(G)} \kappa_r(ij, k\ell)\mu_r(k\ell) = \sum_{k \in C'_1} \kappa_1(i, k)\mu_1(k),$$

where the second step is from $\kappa_r \prec \kappa_1$. This quantity does not depend on j , so if e_1, e_2 are edges of C meeting at a vertex of C_1 , then $\lambda(e_1, C') = \lambda(e_2, C')$. A similar argument, using $\kappa_r \prec \kappa_2$, gives the same conclusion for edges meeting

at a vertex of C_2 . Since C is connected, it follows that $\lambda(e, C')$ is constant on the edges of C . Let us write the common value as $\kappa_c(C, C')\mu_c(C')$. Then, for each $i \in C_1$,

$$\sum_{k \in C'_1} \kappa_1(i, k)\mu_1(k) = \kappa_c(C, C')\mu_c(C'),$$

and similarly, for each $j \in C_2$,

$$\sum_{\ell \in C'_2} \kappa_2(j, \ell)\mu_2(\ell) = \kappa_c(C, C')\mu_c(C').$$

These last two identities establish $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_c$ and $\kappa_2 \prec \kappa_c$ respectively, completing the proof. \square

The statement of Theorem 4.1 makes sense in the general case, without the restriction to finite-type kernels, but the proof as written does not. It is easy to adapt the proof that (ii) implies (i) to the general case, but it does not seem to be easy to prove that (i) implies (ii) in general. Indeed, it is not impossible that this implication is false in the general case.

Our main aim in this section is to prove the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let κ_1 and κ_2 be finite-type kernels. Then $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$ if and only if there is a kernel κ_c with $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_c$ and $\kappa_2 \prec \kappa_c$.*

The proof will be a little involved (although most of the difficulties are notational rather than actual), so we shall start by illustrating a very simple special case of the basic idea.

Let κ be a kernel on the (finite) type space (\mathcal{S}, μ) . In fact, our initial remarks will apply to general kernels. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_\infty^x$ denote a random rooted tree with distribution π_κ , so T is obtained from \mathfrak{X}_κ by forgetting the types of the particles. Also, let $T_t = T|_t$ denote the subtree of T corresponding to the first t generations of \mathfrak{X}_κ . We shall show that the distribution of T_t is determined by a certain function of κ , and vice versa. We start by writing out the much simpler case $t = 1$.

The tree T_1 is simply a star, so its distribution is determined by the distribution of the degree of the root, i.e., the distribution of the number d_0 of children of the initial particle of \mathfrak{X}_κ . As in [9], for each $x \in \mathcal{S}$, let us write

$$\lambda(x) = \lambda_1(x) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \kappa(x, y) d\mu(y)$$

for the *expected degree* of x , i.e., the expected number of children of a particle of type x . (The reason for the subscript 1 will become clear later.) Also, let $\Lambda = \Lambda_1$ denote the (*first order*) *expected degree distribution* of κ , i.e., the distribution of $\lambda(x)$ when x is chosen according to the distribution μ . From the definition of \mathfrak{X}_κ , given the type of the root, d_0 has a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda(x)$. Thus

the unconditional distribution of d_0 is the mixed Poisson distribution $\text{Po}(\Lambda)$, defined in the discrete case by

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Po}(\Lambda) = k) = \sum_{\lambda} \mathbb{P}_{\Lambda}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda^k e^{-\lambda}}{k!}, \quad (11)$$

where the sum is over the finite set of possible values of Λ . It follows that the distribution Λ determines the distribution of d_0 , and hence of T_1 . The reverse is also true, since the distribution of $\text{Po}(\Lambda)$ determines that of Λ . (This is trivial in the discrete case, using the tail of $\mathbb{P}(\text{Po}(\Lambda) = k)$ for large k to identify the maximum possible value of Λ and its probability, then subtracting off the corresponding contribution to the sum in (11), identifying the next largest possible value, and so on. The general case is not hard, using the generating function of the distribution $\text{Po}(\Lambda)$.)

Let x be a type with $\lambda(x) > 0$. From the definition of \mathfrak{X}_{κ} , the types of the children of a particle of type x form a Poisson process on \mathcal{S} with intensity measure μ_x , defined by $d\mu_x(y) = \kappa(x, y) d\mu(y)$. In order to understand the distribution of T_2 , we consider the *offspring expected degree distribution* $\lambda_2(x)$, the image of $\mu_x(y)$ under the map $y \mapsto \lambda_1(y)$. Thus, if μ_x were a probability measure, $\lambda_2(x)$ would be the distribution of $\lambda_1(Y)$ when Y has the distribution μ_x ; in general, neither μ_x nor $\lambda_2(x)$ is a probability measure: they both have total mass $\mu_x(\mathcal{S}) = \lambda_1(x)$.

Similarly, for $k \geq 3$, we define $\lambda_k(x)$ to be the image of the measure $\mu_x(y)$ under the map $y \mapsto \lambda_{k-1}(y)$. Thus

$$(\lambda_k(x))(A) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{S} : \lambda_{k-1}(y) \in A} d\mu_x(y) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{S} : \lambda_{k-1}(y) \in A} \kappa(x, y) d\mu(y).$$

Note that for a given x , $\lambda_1(x) = \lambda(x)$ is a real number, $\lambda_2(x)$ is a measure on the reals, $\lambda_3(x)$ is a measure on the set of measures on the reals, and so on. If κ is of finite type, then all these measures are discrete. By the *k-th order expected degree distribution* Λ_{κ} of κ , we mean the distribution of $\lambda_k(x)$ when x is chosen randomly with distribution μ .

We shall deduce Theorem 4.2 from the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $k \geq 1$, and let κ be a finite-type kernel. Then the distribution Λ_k determines the distribution of T_k and vice versa.*

The restriction to finite-type kernels is presumably not needed here, but simplifies the proofs, avoiding any possible difficulties associated to choosing the right notion of convergence. Note that we have already proved the case $k = 1$.

Before proving Lemma 4.3, let us show that Theorem 4.2 does indeed follow.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. If $\kappa_1 \prec \kappa_c$ and $\kappa_2 \prec \kappa_c$, then $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_c} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$; the content of the theorem is the reverse implication. We shall show that if κ is a finite-type kernel, then one can define a (finite-type) kernel κ_c with $\kappa \prec \kappa_c$ in a way that depends only on π_{κ} ; this clearly implies the result.

Given a finite-type kernel κ on (\mathcal{S}, μ) , define an equivalence relation \sim on \mathcal{S} by $x \sim y$ if $\lambda_k(x) = \lambda_k(y)$ for every k . If $x \not\sim y$, then there is some smallest $k = k(x, y)$ such that $\lambda_k(x) \neq \lambda_k(y)$. Let K be an upper bound on the set $\{k(x, y) : x, y \in \mathcal{S}, x \not\sim y\}$, which exists since \mathcal{S} is finite. Since $\lambda_{k+1}(x)$ determines $\lambda_k(x)$, we have $\lambda_K(x) \neq \lambda_K(y)$ whenever $x \not\sim y$, so

$$x \sim y \iff \lambda_K(x) = \lambda_K(y) \iff \lambda_{K+1}(x) = \lambda_{K+1}(y). \quad (12)$$

Note that K is determined by the set Λ_k , $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$: we may take K to be the smallest integer such that the distribution of λ_{K+1} (which then determines that of λ_K) has property (12).

Let us define a type space \mathcal{S}_c whose elements are the possible values of $\lambda_K(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{S}$, and a corresponding μ_c given by the μ -probability of the corresponding set of (equivalent) types $x \in \mathcal{S}$. Note that \mathcal{S}_c and μ_c depend only on the distribution of $\lambda_K(x)$, and hence are determined by Λ_{K+1} . We map \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}_c in the obvious way; this map is measure preserving by definition. The distribution of $\lambda_K(y)$ over children y of a particle of type x is determined by $\lambda_{K+1}(x)$, and hence, from (12), by $\lambda_K(x)$. It follows that the distribution of the \mathcal{S}_c -types of the children depends only on the \mathcal{S}_c -type of x . This is exactly the statement that there is a kernel κ_c on (\mathcal{S}_c, μ_c) with $\kappa \prec \kappa_c$. The kernel κ_c is determined by the distribution of $\Lambda_{K+1}(x)$, i.e., by Λ_{K+2} . Hence, κ_c is determined by the sequence Λ_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Using Lemma 4.3 it follows that κ_c is determined by the distribution of T_k for all k , and thus by π_κ . As noted above the existence of such a κ_c with $\kappa \prec \kappa_c$ suffices to prove the theorem. \square

It remains to prove Lemma 4.3. Note the lemma makes two separate statements; in proving Theorem 4.2 we only used one of these, that the distribution of T_k determines that of Λ_k . We shall prove Lemma 4.3 by induction; for this we need both statements. In fact, to make the induction work, we shall need to prove a little more.

Let κ be a kernel on the finite type-space (\mathcal{S}, μ) . The measure μ plays two roles in the branching process \mathfrak{X}_κ : it appears in the distribution of the offspring of a particle, and also in the distribution of the type of the initial particle. It will be convenient to generalize \mathfrak{X}_κ slightly as follows: let μ_0 be any probability measure on \mathcal{S} , and let $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\mu_0)$ be the branching process defined as \mathfrak{X}_κ , but starting with a single particle of type distributed according to μ_0 . Note that $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\mu_0)$ depends on μ as well as μ_0 , and that $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\mu) = \mathfrak{X}_\kappa$.

Let $\Lambda_k(\mu_0)$ denote the distribution of $\lambda_k(x)$ when x is chosen randomly with distribution μ_0 , so $\Lambda_k(\mu) = \Lambda_k$. Also, let $T_k(\mu_0)$ denote the random rooted tree obtained from the first k generations of $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\mu_0)$ by forgetting the types of the particles. The following lemma is slightly stronger than Lemma 4.3, which can be recovered by setting $\mu_0 = \mu$.

Lemma 4.4. *Fix $k \geq 1$, let κ be a finite-type kernel on (\mathcal{S}, μ) , and let μ_0 be a probability measure on \mathcal{S} . Then (i) the distribution $\Lambda_k(\mu_0)$ determines the distribution of $T_k(\mu_0)$, and (ii) the distribution of $T_k(\mu_0)$ determines $\Lambda_k(\mu_0)$.*

Proof. We start with the easier statement, namely part (i), which we prove by induction on k ; as noted above, the case $k = 1$ is trivial: T_1 is a star the degree of whose root has the mixed Poisson distribution $\text{Po}(\Lambda_1(\mu_0))$.

Suppose then that $k \geq 2$ and that (i) holds with k replaced by $k - 1$. It is easy to see that it suffices to prove (i) with μ_0 concentrated on a single type x , in which case $\Lambda_k(\mu_0) = \lambda_k(x)$. Let us fix the type $x \in \mathcal{S}$ of the root, writing $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(x) = \mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\delta_x)$ for the branching process \mathfrak{X}_κ started with a single particle of type x .

Let X_1 denote the first generation of $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(x)$. Given X_1 , the descendants of a particle v in X_1 have the distribution of $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(y)$, where y is the type of v , and the subtrees corresponding to different v are independent. By induction, the distribution of the first $k - 1$ generations of the descendants of v are determined by $\lambda_{k-1}(y)$. Hence, given X_1 , the conditional distribution of T_k depends only on the multiset $M = \{\lambda_{k-1}(y)\}$, where y runs over the types in X_1 . Given the type x of the root, the types of the particles in X_1 form a Poisson process on \mathcal{S} with intensity measure μ_x . Hence, M is a Poisson process on the appropriate space of distributions with intensity measure $\lambda_k(x)$. In particular, the distribution of M , and hence that of T_k , is determined by $\lambda_k(x)$, completing the proof of part (i) by induction.

We now turn to the reverse implication, part (ii), which we again prove by induction. For $k = 1$ the argument is as before: the degree of the root in $T_1(\mu_0)$ has a mixed Poisson distribution $\text{Po}(\Lambda_1(\mu_0))$, which determines $\Lambda_1(\mu_0)$. Suppose then that $k \geq 2$, and that (ii) holds with k replaced by $k - 1$, i.e., that for any probability measure μ'_0 on \mathcal{S} , the distribution of $T_{k-1}(\mu'_0)$ determines $\Lambda_{k-1}(\mu'_0)$. This time we cannot simply condition on the type of the root, as we are given the distribution of T_k without types. It is here that we shall use the fact that \mathcal{S} is finite.

For any realization T of the random tree $T_k(\mu_0)$, let $\mathcal{D}(T)$ denote the empirical distribution of the branches of T , i.e., the subtrees of T of height $k - 1$ rooted at the neighbours of the root of T . Thus $\mathcal{D}(T)$ is a distribution on \mathcal{T}_{k-1}^r , the set of rooted trees of height $k - 1$, and the weight $\mathcal{D}(T)$ assigns to a tree T' is just the number of branches of T that are isomorphic to T' divided by the total number of branches. Let τ_0 denote the type of the root of $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\mu_0)$, and $d_0 = |X_1|$ its degree. Given that $\tau_0 = x$ and $d_0 = N$, the types of the particles in X_1 are independent with the distribution $\tilde{\mu}_x = \mu_x / \mu_x(\mathcal{S}) = \mu_x / \lambda(x)$, the normalized version of μ_x . Hence their descendants are independent copies of the branching process $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\tilde{\mu}_x)$, and the corresponding branches are N independent samples from the distribution $T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$. Let us view the empirical distribution $\mathcal{D}(T_k(\mu_0))$ as a point \mathbf{v} in the space $[0, 1]^{\mathcal{T}_{k-1}^r}$ taken with the supremum norm. This point is random, since it depends on the realization of $\mathfrak{X}_\kappa(\mu_0)$. From the law of large numbers and the comments above, as $N \rightarrow \infty$ the random point \mathbf{v} obtained after conditioning on $\tau_0 = x$ and $d_0 = N$ converges in probability to the single point $T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x) \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{T}_{k-1}^r}$.

Since all we are given is the distribution of $T_k(\mu_0)$, we cannot condition on the type of the root. We can however condition on its degree, $d_0 = |X_1|$. Let

λ_{\max} be the largest value of $\lambda(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mu_0(x) > 0$. As $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 = x \mid d_0 = N) \rightarrow p_x = \mu_0(x)/\mu_0(\{y : \lambda(y) = \lambda_{\max}\})$$

if $\lambda(x) = \lambda_{\max}$, and to zero otherwise. From the comments above, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution of $\mathbf{v} = \mathcal{D}(T_k(\mu_0))$ given that $d_0 = N$ tends to the discrete distribution taking each value $T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$ with probability p_x . Hence, the distribution $T_k(\mu_0)$ determines what distributions are possible for $T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$ with $\lambda(x) = \lambda_{\max}$, and the probability of each (a sum of $p_{x'}$ over x' such that $T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_{x'}) = T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$).

By induction, for each possible distribution $T_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$ there is a unique corresponding distribution $\Lambda_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$. Since we know λ_{\max} , and the measure $\Lambda_{k-1}(\mu_x)$ is simply obtained by multiplying the probability measure $\Lambda_{k-1}(\tilde{\mu}_x)$ by the constant factor λ_{\max} , we recover the possible distributions $\Lambda_{k-1}(\mu_x)$ for x with $\lambda(x) = \lambda_{\max}$, and the p -probability of each. In other words, we recover the distribution $\Lambda_k(p)$ where p is the probability measure defined by $p(\{x\}) = p_x$.

By part (i), the distribution $\Lambda_k(p)$ determines the distribution of $T_k(p)$, which is simply that of $T_k(\mu_0)$ conditioned on τ_0 lying in the set $\lambda(\tau_0) = \lambda_{\max}$. Since we recover this distribution *exactly*, we also recover the conditional distribution of $T_k(\mu_0)$ given that $\lambda(\tau_0) < \lambda_{\max}$, i.e., we recover the distribution $T_k(\mu'_0)$, where μ'_0 is the distribution μ_0 conditioned on $\lambda(\cdot) < \lambda_{\max}$. Repeating the argument above, we can recover the part of $\Lambda_k(\mu'_0)$ coming from the largest possible λ -value of the root, i.e., the part of $\Lambda_k(\mu_0)$ coming from the second largest value, and so on. This shows that the distribution of $T_k(\mu_0)$ does determine that of $\Lambda_k(\mu_0)$, completing the proof of (ii) by induction. \square

Theorem 4.2 shows that there are many examples of different kernels that give rise to the same branching process, and hence to the same distribution of tree counts in the corresponding random graphs $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$. One extremely special case concerns homogeneous kernels: we say that κ is *homogeneous with degree c* if $\int_y \kappa(x, y) dy = c$ for almost every x . In this case, \mathfrak{X}_κ seen without types becomes a standard single-type Galton–Watson branching process \mathfrak{X}_c in which each particle has a Poisson number of children with mean c . Writing c also for the constant kernel taking the value c , Theorem 4.2 shows that $\pi_\kappa = \pi_c$ if and only if κ is homogeneous with degree c . (This special case is essentially trivial, however: one need consider only the first generation of the branching process.)

In the denser case, i.e., whenever $np \rightarrow \infty$, Lemma 4.10 of [12] tells us that the sequence $G_p(n, \kappa)$ converges to κ in the cut metric with probability 1, so it follows that the models $G_p(n, \kappa_1)$ and $G_p(n, \kappa_2)$ are genuinely different unless $d_{\text{cut}}(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = 0$, i.e., unless κ_1 and κ_2 are equivalent in the sense of [12, Subsection 2.4], in which case the models are trivially the same. When $p = 1/n$, we have seen that there are many pairs (κ_1, κ_2) of kernels where the random graphs $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_1)$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_2)$ are presumably different, but are not distinguished by their tree counts. This suggests that we need better methods of distinguishing very sparse graphs. However, as we shall see in this

next sections, while this is true, the question of which pairs of kernels give rise to equivalent models is not so easy.

5 The partition metric

In the spirit of the rest of the paper, we say that two graphs with n vertices are *essentially the same* if one can be changed into a graph isomorphic to the other by adding and deleting $o(pn^2)$ edges, where $p = p(n)$ is our normalizing function, as usual. (Of course, the definition makes formal sense only for two sequences.) Otherwise, they are *essentially different*. In all previous sections, graphs that were essentially the same were treated as equivalent, in the sense that their distance in any of the metrics we considered tends to zero.

Let $p = 1/n$, and let κ be a kernel whose corresponding branching process always dies out. In the notation of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9], we assume that the operator T_κ corresponding to the kernel κ satisfies $\|T_\kappa\| \leq 1$, i.e., κ is (weakly) *subcritical*. From the results in [9], almost all vertices of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ are in small tree components: more precisely, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a K such that, whp, all but at most εn vertices of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ are in tree components with size at most K . Furthermore, the asymptotic number of copies of a given tree T in $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ is determined by the probability of T in the distribution π_κ . It follows that if κ_1 and κ_2 are subcritical kernels, then $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_1)$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_2)$ are (whp) essentially the same if and only if $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$. Hence, in the subcritical case, the random graph $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ depends only on the branching process \mathfrak{X}_κ . Of course, this rather trivial observation does not extend to the supercritical case.

Given two real numbers $a, b \geq 0$, let $\kappa_{a,b}$ denote the 2-by-2 ‘chessboard’ kernel defined as follows:

$$\kappa_{a,b}(x, y) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } x < 1/2, y < 1/2 \text{ or } x \geq 1/2, y \geq 1/2, \\ b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

To form the random graph $G_p(n, \kappa_{a,b})$, we partition the vertex set randomly into two parts, and then take each cross-edge to be present with probability bp , and each other edge with probability ap . Note that $\kappa_{a,b}$ is homogeneous with constant $(a+b)/2$. Also, if $a = b$, then $\kappa_{a,b}$ is simply the constant kernel taking the value $a = b$.

For $p = 1/n$, perhaps the simplest example of two sequences of essentially different graphs not distinguished by their tree counts is given by the random graphs $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{2,2})$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{4,0})$, i.e., the usual Erdős–Rényi random graph $G(n, 2/n)$ and (essentially) the random bipartite graph $G(n/2, n/2; 4/n)$. How do we know that these graphs are different? For the obvious reason that one is bipartite, with almost equal vertex classes, while the other is not. Indeed, the smallest balanced cut in $G(n, 2/n)$ has size of order $\Theta(n)$: this follows, for example, from the result of Luczak and McDiarmid [38] that removing $o(n)$ edges from the giant component of $G(n, c/n)$, $c > 1$, leaves a connected component with only $o(n)$ fewer vertices than the original giant. Note that one has to be a

little careful here: writing $\rho(c)$ for the largest solution to $\rho = 1 - e^{-c\rho}$, so $\rho(c)n$ is the typical size of the giant component in $G(n, c/n)$, we need $\rho(c) > 1/2$; otherwise, it is easy to construct a balanced cut with $o(n)$ edges across it. Note that both $G(n, 2/n)$ and $G(n/2, n/2; 4/n)$ have balanced cuts with a range of sizes: the difference between the two graphs can be seen in the difference between these ranges.

In the discussion above we considered balanced partitions of the vertex set of a graph into two pieces. Of course, it makes sense to consider any fixed number k of pieces; this leads us to consider the *partition metric* d_{part} defined in [12] for any normalizing function $p = p(n)$, but in fact motivated by the present case. Let us recall the definitions from [12], writing $d_p(U, W)$ for the normalized density of edges from U to W in G_n as in (1).

Fix throughout a normalizing function $p = p(n)$ and a constant $C > 0$; we shall only consider graphs G_n with n vertices and at most $Cpn^2/2$ edges.

Given a graph G_n with $|G| = n$ and $e(G) \leq Cpn^2/2$, for each partition $\Pi = (P_1, \dots, P_k)$ of $V(G_n)$ into non-empty parts let $M_{\Pi}(G_n) = (d_p(P_i, P_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$ be the matrix encoding the normalized densities of edges between the parts of Π . Since $M_{\Pi}(G_n)$ is symmetric, we may think of this matrix as an element of $\mathbb{R}^{k(k+1)/2}$. For $2 \leq k \leq n$, let

$$\mathcal{M}_k(G_n) = \{M_{\Pi}(G_n)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{k(k+1)/2},$$

where Π runs over all balanced partitions of $V(G_n)$ into k parts, i.e., all partitions (P_1, \dots, P_k) with $|P_i| - |P_j| \leq 1$.

Recall that $e(G_n) \leq Cpn^2/2$, so $e(U, W) \leq e(V(G_n), V(G_n)) = 2e(G_n) \leq Cpn^2$. Since each part of a balanced partition has size at least $n/(2k)$, the entries of any $M_{\Pi}(G_n) \in \mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ are thus bounded by $C_k = (2k)^2 C$, and $\mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ is a subset of the compact space $B_k = [0, C_k]^{k(k+1)/2}$.

As in [12], let $\mathcal{C}_0(B_k)$ denote the set of non-empty compact subsets of B_k , and let d_{H} be the Hausdorff metric on $\mathcal{C}_0(B_k)$, defined with respect to the ℓ_{∞} distance, say. Thus

$$d_{\text{H}}(X, Y) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : X^{(\varepsilon)} \supset Y, Y^{(\varepsilon)} \supset X\},$$

where $X^{(\varepsilon)}$ denotes the ε -neighbourhood of X in the ℓ_{∞} metric. Since (B_k, ℓ_{∞}) is compact, by standard results (see, for example, Dugundji [24, p. 253]), the space $(\mathcal{C}_0(B_k), d_{\text{H}})$ is compact. For technical reasons we add the empty set to $\mathcal{C}_0(B_k)$, considering $\mathcal{C}(B_k) = \mathcal{C}_0(B_k) \cup \{\emptyset\}$, setting $d_{\text{H}}(\emptyset, X) = C_k$, say, for any $X \in \mathcal{C}(B_k)$, so the empty set is an isolated point in the compact metric space $(\mathcal{C}(B_k), d_{\text{H}})$.

Finally, let $\mathcal{C} = \prod_{k \geq 2} \mathcal{C}(B_k)$, and let $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{C}$ be the map defined by

$$\mathcal{M}(G_n) = (\mathcal{M}_k(G_n))_{k=2}^{\infty}$$

for every graph G_n with n vertices and at most $Cpn^2/2$ edges, noting that $\mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ is empty if $k > n$. Then we may define the *partition metric* d_{part} by

$$d_{\text{part}}(G, G') = d(\mathcal{M}(G), \mathcal{M}(G')),$$

where d is any metric on \mathcal{C} giving rise to the product topology.

As noted in [12], d_{part} is indeed a metric on the set \mathcal{F} of isomorphism classes of finite graphs. Also, since each space $(\mathcal{C}(B_k), d_{\text{H}})$ is compact, (G_n) is Cauchy with respect to d_{part} if and only if there are non-empty compact sets $Y_k \subset B_k$ such that $d_{\text{H}}(\mathcal{M}_k(G_n), Y_k) \rightarrow 0$ for each k . In particular, convergence in d_{part} is equivalent to convergence of the set of partition matrices for each fixed k .

In the dense case, a metric equivalent to d_{part} was introduced independently by Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztegombi [18].

The definitions above may appear rather unnatural: the set $\mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ of possible density matrices is perhaps more naturally seen as a multiset, with one element for each of the $N_{n,k}$ balanced partitions of $[n]$ into k (ordered) parts; the Hausdorff metric ignores the multiplicities of the points of these sets. For multisets S, S' in a metric space (X, d) with $|S| = |S'| = N$, (a version of) their *matching distance* is given by

$$d_{\text{match}}(S, S') = \min_{\phi} \max_{x \in S} d(x, \phi(x)), \quad (14)$$

where ϕ runs over all *bijections* between S and S' (as multisets). In other words, we pair up the points of S with those of S' and measure the maximum distance between corresponding points, minimized over pairings. For graphs G_n, G'_n with the same number of vertices, it may make sense to use d_{match} instead of d_{H} to measure the distance between $\mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ and $\mathcal{M}_k(G'_n)$, defining the *partition matching distance* $d_{\text{p-m}}(G_n, G'_n)$ accordingly.

In fact, d_{match} can easily be extended to multisets S, S' with different numbers of elements: simply replace each point of S by $|S'|$ points, and each point of S' by $|S|$ points, then compute the matching distance. In other words, minimize over ‘fractional bijections’ ϕ above; if $|S| = |S'|$ this does not change the minimum distance. Extending d_{match} in this way, we could thus define $d_{\text{p-m}}(G, G')$ for any two graphs G, G' . However, the resulting metric behaves much less well than d_{part} : for example, not all (sparse) sequences will have subsequences that are Cauchy, in contrast to d_{part} , which, as noted above, is defined via a metric on a compact space. Even worse, it is easy to see that the sequence $(G(n, c/n))$ will not converge in the partition matching metric.

The matching distance and the Hausdorff distance share what might appear to be an undesired property: they are strongly influenced by atypical partitions Π . Surely, for multisets, it would be more natural to weight points by their multiplicity, replacing (14) by

$$d'_{\text{match}}(S, S') = \min_{\phi} \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{x \in S} d(x, \phi(x)).$$

Recall, however, that our main aim in introducing the partition metric is to distinguish in a sensible way such pairs of graphs as the uniform random graph $G_n = G(n, 2/n)$ and the random bipartite graph $G'_n = G(n/2, n/2; 4/n)$. It is very easy to see that for almost all partitions of $V(G'_n)$ into a fixed number k of parts, each part contains almost equal numbers of vertices from the two

vertex classes of G'_n . It follows that almost all (in the multiset sense) density matrices arising from G'_n are very close to each other and to almost all density matrices arising from G_n . The whole point of the partition metric is that it accords significant weight to atypical partitions, in particular, to the partition of G'_n corresponding to its two vertex classes. For this reason we now return to considering $\mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ as a set rather than a multiset, and stay with the definition of d_{part} above based on the Hausdorff metric.

As noted in [12], we may extend the map \mathcal{M} , and hence d_{part} , to kernels in a natural way: instead of partitioning the vertex set into k almost equal parts, we partition $[0, 1]$ into k exactly equal parts. We omit the details, noting only that as shown by Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztergombi [18], one should take the closure of the resulting set of density matrices, which need not itself be closed; see their Example 4.4.

As for the cut metric, it is easy to check that it makes little difference whether we define d_{part} for graphs directly, or by going via kernels; the next lemma is from [12, Section 6].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $p = p(n)$ satisfy $p \geq 1/n$, and let (G_n) be a sequence of graphs with $e(G_n) = O(pn^2)$ and $\Delta(G_n) = o(pn^2)$. Then $d_{\text{part}}(G_n, \kappa_{G_n}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square*

Although the partition metric was defined in [12], the real motivation for its study comes from the present extremely sparse setting. Indeed, as shown in [12, Section 6], whenever $np \rightarrow \infty$ then (for sequences G_n satisfying a mild additional condition) d_{cut} and d_{part} are essentially equivalent.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $np \rightarrow \infty$, and let (G_n) be a sequence of graphs with $|G_n| = n$ satisfying the bounded density assumption [12, Assumption 4.1]. Let κ be a bounded kernel. Then $d_{\text{part}}(G_n, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $d_{\text{cut}}(G_n, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$. \square*

5.1 The partition metric and random graphs

Let us return to our main focus in this paper, the extremely sparse case $p = 1/n$. Our hope was that in this setting the partition metric might play the role of the cut metric in the denser setting, showing, for example, that a random sequence $(G_{1/n}(n, \kappa))$ has a limit with probability 1, and that this limit is different for different κ .

For d_{cut} , in the denser setting, the limit was κ itself, but here we cannot hope for this. Indeed, it is very easy to check that in $G(n, c/n)$, the largest and smallest balanced cuts have sizes that differ from $cn/4$ (the expected size of a random cut) by order n . Indeed, using the greedy algorithm to assign vertices one by one to a part of the bipartition, it is easy to construct such a cut. For the best current bounds on the largest cut in $G(n, c/n)$, see [6], [20] and [21] (for related results, see [7], [35], [38], [29], [22]). As pointed out to us by Christian Borgs, one can describe the problem in the language of statistical physics: when $p = 1/n$, the entropy and energy terms balance. More precisely, a given cut is ‘only’ exponentially unlikely to have 1% fewer edges than the

expected number (as opposed to superexponentially unlikely when $np \rightarrow \infty$), but there are exponentially many cuts, so some atypical cuts will exist.

Despite the observation above, it is extremely likely that $(G_{1/n}(n, \kappa))$ is Cauchy with respect to d_{part} with probability 1, i.e., that there is a limit point (depending only on κ) in the space $\prod_k \mathcal{C}(B_k)$ defined above, even though this limit is not given by κ in the way one might expect.

Conjecture 5.3. *For any bounded kernel κ , the random sequence $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ is Cauchy with respect to d_{part} with probability 1.*

Note that the analogue of Conjecture 5.3 with $np \rightarrow \infty$ is trivial, since Chernoff's inequality shows that $G_p(n, \kappa)$ and κ are close in the cut metric, and hence in d_{part} . While Conjecture 5.3 is very likely to be true, it may also be rather hard to prove, since it would imply the convergence of many quantities associated to $G(n, c/n)$ (such as the normalized size of the largest cut) that are not known to converge. For example, one can use partitions to pick out the size of the largest independent set within $o(n)$ (in this sparse setting, an almost independent set, spanning $o(n)$ edges, contains an independent set of almost the same size), so Conjecture 5.3 implies the following statement: there is a function $\beta(c)$ such that the independence number of $G(n, c/n)$ is $\beta(c)n + o_p(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with c fixed; in particular, the independence number is concentrated for each n . While concentration is well known and easy to prove, at the moment it is not known that the independence number can't 'jump around' as n increases, although of course this is extremely implausible. For a discussion of this, see, for example, Gamarnik, Nowicki and Swirszcz [31]; surprisingly, for $c \leq e$, convergence is known: it follows from results of Karp and Sipser [34].

The same concentration applies to d_{part} , as shown by the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Let κ be a bounded kernel, let $k \geq 2$ be fixed, and let $G_n = G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$. For each n there is a set $Y_n \subset B_k$ such that $d_{\text{H}}(\mathcal{M}_k(G_n), Y_n)$ converges to 0 in probability.*

Proof. Since B_k is compact, from the definition of the Hausdorff metric it is enough to show that for any given point $M \in B_k$ the random variable

$$Z_n = d(M, \mathcal{M}_k(G_n)) = \inf_{M' \in \mathcal{M}_k(G_n)} d(M, M')$$

is concentrated around its mean as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, taking an ε -net in B_k , one can then find (discrete) sets $Y_{n,\varepsilon}$ such that

$$d_{\text{H}}(\mathcal{M}_k(G_n), Y_{n,\varepsilon}) \leq 3\varepsilon \tag{15}$$

holds whp. Since (15) holds whp for any fixed ε , it also holds whp for some function $\varepsilon(n)$ tending to zero; taking $Y_n = Y_{n,\varepsilon(n)}$ then gives the result.

Roughly speaking, since the real-valued random variable Z_n changes by order $1/n$ if we add or delete an edge of G_n , concentration of Z_n follows by standard martingale arguments. One must be a little careful, however, for two reasons. Firstly, we cannot afford to use the edge-exposure martingale, since it has too

many steps. Using vertex exposure, one must consider the possibility of large degrees. Secondly, the ‘type variables’ x_1, \dots, x_n introduce some dependence between edges. There are many ways of working around these problems. One possibility is as follows.

Let $c = \sup \kappa < \infty$. We may couple G_n and $G'_n = G(n, c/n)$ in a natural way so that $G_n \subset G'_n$. Indeed, first construct G'_n , then choose the types x_1, \dots, x_n , then keep each edge ij of G'_n with probability $\kappa(x_i, x_j)/c$, independently of the others. It is easy to see that the set of edges remaining has the distribution of G_n . (This construction is also used by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [10].)

For the moment, let us condition on G'_n , fixing a possible graph G'_n with $e(G'_n) \leq 10cn$ and $\Delta(G'_n) \leq n^{1/10}$, say. We can construct G_n from G'_n using a sequence of $n + 2e(G'_n)$ independent uniform $U[0, 1]$ random variables: one, x_i , for each vertex, and one, w_{ij} , for each edge ij of G'_n . Indeed, we simply keep the edge ij of G'_n if and only if $w_{ij} \leq \kappa(x_i, x_j)/c$. Changing one of the w_{ij} adds or deletes at most one edge of G_n , and so changes Z_n by at most k^2/n . Changing one of the x_i only affects the presence in G_n of edges of G'_n incident with vertex i . By assumption, there are at most $n^{1/10}$ such edges, so changing x_i changes Z_n by at most $k^2 n^{-9/10}$. Since we make only $O(n)$ choices, it follows using the Hoeffding–Azuma inequality that, given G'_n with the above properties, Z_n is concentrated about its mean $\mathbb{E}(Z_n \mid G'_n)$.

Since almost every $G'_n = G(n, c/n)$ satisfies the bounds on $e(G'_n)$ and $\Delta(G'_n)$ above, it remains only to show that $\mathbb{E}(Z_n \mid G'_n)$ is concentrated. For this it is more convenient to consider the graph G''_n obtained as follows: choose $cn/2$ edges independently and uniformly at random from all $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges, deleting any repeated edges. It is easy to see that G''_n and $G(n, c/n)$ may be coupled to agree within $o_p(n)$ edges. Since adding or deleting an edge of G changes $\mathbb{E}(Z_n \mid G'_n = G)$ by at most k^2/n , it suffices to prove concentration of $\mathbb{E}(Z_n \mid G'_n)$ when G'_n has the distribution G''_n . But this is immediate from the Hoeffding–Azuma inequality, since G''_n is constructed from $O(n)$ independent choices each of which changes this expectation by at most k^2/n . \square

The result above shows that the random sets $\mathcal{M}_k(G_n)$ become concentrated as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The problem is that the points they become concentrated around might in principle jump around as n varies.

Even without a proof of Conjecture 5.3, it still makes good sense to ask whether d_{part} at least separates different random graph models $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$. As before, let us write $d_{\text{edit}}(G_1, G_2)$ for the normalized edit distance between two graphs G_1, G_2 with $|G_1| = |G_2| = n$, i.e., for $1/(pn^2)$ times the minimal number of edge changes (additions or deletions) that must be made to G_1 to produce a graph isomorphic to G_2 . By a *random graph model* we simply mean a sequence of probability measures on the sets of n -vertex graphs. We say that two random graph models are *essentially equivalent* if one can couple the corresponding n -vertex random graphs G_n and G'_n so that $\mathbb{E}(d_{\text{edit}}(G_n, G'_n)) = o(1)$.

Conjecture 5.5. *Let $p = 1/n$, and let κ_1 and κ_2 be bounded kernels such that the models $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_1)$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_2)$ are not essentially equivalent. Then the*

expected d_{part} distance between $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_1)$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_2)$ is bounded below as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that the distance between the n vertex graphs is concentrated by Theorem 5.4. Of course, any proof of Conjecture 5.5 is likely to involve understanding for which pairs of kernels the corresponding models $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ are essentially equivalent. We discuss this briefly in the next section.

6 Which kernels give the same random graphs?

We have already seen a rather simple example of two kernels that are not equivalent (in the sense of [12, Subsection 2.4]), which nonetheless give rise to essentially equivalent sparse random graphs: we may take any two non-equivalent kernels κ_1, κ_2 corresponding to the same subcritical branching process. Of course, the corresponding random graphs have a rather simple structure, since they are made up of (essentially) only small tree components. Unfortunately, (or interestingly, depending on one's point of view) a simple modification of this example gives examples with more complex structure.

Example 6.1. Let $c > 1$ be constant, and let κ_1 and κ_2 be bounded kernels corresponding to the same subcritical branching process. Writing $c + \kappa_i$ for the pointwise sum of the constant kernel c and the kernel κ_i , the models $G_{1/n}(n, c + \kappa_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, are essentially equivalent. To see this, we realize $G_{1/n}(n, c + \kappa_i)$ by first constructing $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_i)$, and then adding each non-edge with probability c/n , and then adding each non-edge with a tiny probability to get the edge probabilities exactly right. We can ignore the last step since it adds $O_p(1) = o_p(n)$ edges. Constructing the graphs $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_i)$ first, we may relabel the vertices of these graphs so that they coincide apart from $o_p(n)$ edges. We may then add each possible edge to both graphs simultaneously with probability c/n to obtain (essentially) the required coupling of the graphs $G_{1/n}(n, c + \kappa_i)$.

In general, we believe the following is an interesting question.

Question 6.2. *For which pairs of supercritical kernels κ_1, κ_2 are the models $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_1)$ and $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_2)$ essentially equivalent?*

Certainly, any such pair must satisfy $\pi_{\kappa_1} = \pi_{\kappa_2}$, otherwise the models are distinguished by their tree counts. A simple answer to Question 6.2 would be important for the general understanding of the sparse inhomogeneous model of Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [9].

Since Question 6.2 is rather open ended, let us focus on one particular example: the pair consisting of the constant kernel c and the kernel $\kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta}$ defined in (13), with $0 < |\delta| < c$. The cases δ positive and δ negative may behave differently, although we do not expect this to be the case. For $0 < \delta' < \delta$, or $0 > \delta' > \delta$, one can construct $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta', c-\delta'})$ from $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ by deleting each edge independently with a certain probability, and then adding in each non-edge with an appropriate probability. It follows that if $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$

and $G(n, c/n)$ are essentially equivalent, then so are $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta', c-\delta'})$ and $G(n, c/n)$. Hence there is an interval $I(c)$ such that $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ and $G(n, c/n)$ are essentially equivalent for all $\delta \in I(c)$, but for no $\delta \in [-c, c] \setminus I(c)$.

The construction in Example 6.1 shows that $[-1, 1] \subset I(c)$ whenever $c > 1$. On the other hand, it is not hard to show that for c large, the most extreme balanced cuts in $G(n, c/n)$ contain $cn/4 \pm \Theta(\sqrt{cn})$ edges; for the best known bound on the largest cut see [6], [20] and [21]. Since a typical $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ clearly contains a balanced cut with $(c - \delta)n/4 + o_p(n)$ edges, it follows that $I(c) \subset [-A\sqrt{c}, A\sqrt{c}]$ for c large, where A is an absolute constant. It is not hard to convince oneself that the second bound is closer to the truth, although we do not have a proof. In fact, we believe that the endpoints of $I(c)$ are exactly $\pm\sqrt{c}$ for every $c \geq 1$, although we make no guess as to whether these endpoints are included.

Conjecture 6.3. *Let $c > 1$ and $-c \leq \delta \leq c$ be constants. If $\delta < \sqrt{c}$, then the models $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ and $G(n, c/n)$ are essentially equivalent. If $\delta > \sqrt{c}$, then they are not.*

The model $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ is a special case of the *planted bisection* model $G(n; p, p')$: for any $p = p(n)$ and $p' = p'(n)$, the graph $G(n; p, p')$ is constructed by partitioning its vertex set $[n]$ at random into two (almost) equal parts, and then joining any two vertices in the same part with probability p , and two vertices in different parts with probability p' . The question of reconstructing the vertex partition given only the graph has received considerable attention, generally with emphasis on polynomial-time algorithms for p, p' satisfying suitable conditions; see, for example, Boppana [14], and, for a linear expected time algorithm, Bollobás and Scott [13]. Most such results are for graphs with average degree tending to infinity, but Coja-Oghlan [19] proved results that include the extremely sparse case, showing that one can find a minimum balanced cut in $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ in polynomial time whenever $\delta > \Theta(1 + c \log(c))$. The connection with Conjecture 6.3 is rather loose, but nonetheless interesting.

Let us present another question that does seem to be closely related to Conjecture 6.3.

Question 6.4. *When does the branching process $\mathfrak{X}_{\kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta}}$ forget the type of the root?*

To spell out what we mean by Question 6.4, let T_t be the random labelled tree corresponding to the first t generations of $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}_{\kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta}}$, with each vertex labelled by the type of the corresponding particle. Here we take the types to be 1 and 2, corresponding to $x \leq 1/2$ and $x > 1/2$. Note that each particle has $\text{Po}((c + \delta)/2)$ children of its own type, and $\text{Po}((c - \delta)/2)$ of the opposite type. Recall that, since $\pi_{\kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta}} = \pi_c$, the distribution of T_t without labels is simply that of the first t generations of a single-type branching process. Let U_t be the tree obtained from T_t by forgetting the labels of all vertices *other than those at distance t from the root*, and let p_t be the probability, conditional on U_t , that the root has type 1, so p_t is a random variable depending on \mathfrak{X} via U_t .

We say that \mathfrak{X} *forgets the type of the root* if $p_t \xrightarrow{P} 1/2$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is easy to couple the branching processes $\mathfrak{X}(1)$ and $\mathfrak{X}(2)$ started with particles of type 1 and 2, respectively, so that the tree structures always agree, and the expected number of label mismatches in level t is δ^t . It follows that \mathfrak{X} forgets the type of the root if $\delta \leq 1$. Although we have not checked the details, we believe that \mathfrak{X} forgets the type of the root if and only if $\delta \leq \sqrt{c}$; this is based on linearizing the natural recurrence describing the distribution of p_{t+1} in terms of that of p_t . (Actually, one works with the distribution of p_t given that the root has type 1.) This argument certainly shows that \mathfrak{X} cannot forget the type of the root if $\delta > \sqrt{c}$; the reverse implication is not so clear.

Although we certainly have no proof, it seems likely that if $\mathfrak{X} = \mathfrak{X}_{\kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta}}$ forgets the type of the root, then the models $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ and $G(n, c/n)$ are essentially equivalent. Roughly speaking, suppose that, given the global structure of $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$, seen without types, we can somehow form a good guess as to which vertices at graph distance 100 from a given vertex v are of type 1 and which of type 2. Even then, v itself is (almost) equally likely to be of either type. This strongly suggests that one can get essentially no information about the vertex types from the graph, and hence that the types do not matter to the graph. This vague heuristic is very far from a proof, however!

In summary, it seems very likely that the answers to Conjecture 6.3 and Question 6.4 are closely related. In turn they may well be related to the question of when the maximum/minimum balanced cut distinguishes $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa_{c+\delta, c-\delta})$ from $G(n, c/n)$. We do not even have a guess as to the form of a more general answer to Question 6.2.

7 General extremely sparse graphs

So far, we have mainly considered locally acyclic graphs (the exception is Section 5). This is natural when considering the metric d_{sub} , for which only counts of trees make sense when using the $p = 1/n$ special case of the normalization used in [12]. It is also natural when considering the random graph model $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$. However, there are many natural sequences of graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges that are not treelike. A simple example is given by taking G_n to consist of $n/3$ vertex disjoint triangles, for n a multiple of three. Clearly, this graph is not close to any locally treelike graph. It would be nice to have a notion of when two general graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges are close, as well as a more general random model generating such graphs.

What distinguishes the union of $n/3$ triangles from a Hamilton cycle C_n , say? The simplest answer is the number of triangles. Throughout this section we consider sequences (G_n) with exponentially bounded tree counts, i.e., we assume that there is a constant C such that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} t(T, G_n) \leq C^{e(T)}$ for every tree T . This condition is certainly satisfied if the graphs G_n have bounded maximum degree, for example, and the reader may wish to think of this case for simplicity. In fact, as in Section 3, something weaker than exponential boundedness probably suffices, but exponential boundedness is a natural assumption.

If (G_n) has exponentially bounded (or indeed simply bounded) tree counts, then the number of embeddings or homomorphisms from any fixed graph F into G_n is $O(n)$.

For each fixed F , let

$$\tilde{s}(F, G_n) = \text{emb}(F, G_n)/n,$$

and let $\tilde{t}(F, G_n) = \text{hom}(F, G_n)/n$. As in Section 3 or in [12], we can use the (now differently normalized) subgraph counts \tilde{s} or \tilde{t} to define a metric \tilde{d}_{sub} , by first mapping G_n to

$$\tilde{s}(G_n) = (\tilde{s}(F, G_n))_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \in [0, \infty)^{\mathcal{F}}.$$

As noted above, each coordinate is bounded for the sequences we consider, so \tilde{s} maps into a compact subset X of $[0, \infty)^{\mathcal{F}}$. Using any metric d on X giving rise to the product topology, we may then define $\tilde{d}_{\text{sub}}(G, G') = d(\tilde{s}(G), \tilde{s}(G'))$.

As in Section 3, one can view the (limiting) counts $\tilde{s}(F, G_n)$ as giving the moments of a certain distribution that we could instead study directly. Let \mathcal{G}_t^r be the set of isomorphism classes of connected finite rooted graphs with radius at most t , i.e., with every vertex at graph distance at most t from the root. Also, let \mathcal{G}^r be the set of all locally finite rooted (finite or infinite) graphs. As in Section 3, for $F \in \mathcal{G}_t^r$ let

$$p(F, G_n) = p_t(F, G_n) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{\leq t}(v) \cong F),$$

where v is a vertex of G_n chosen uniformly at random, and $\Gamma_{\leq t}(v)$ is the subgraph of G_n induced by the vertices within distance t of v , viewed as a rooted graph with root v . Since each $p_t(F, G_n)$ lies in $[0, 1]$, trivially, any sequence (G_n) has a subsequence along which $p_t(F, G_n)$ converges to some $p_t(F)$ for every t and every $F \in \mathcal{G}_t^r$. Furthermore, as in Section 3, if (G_n) has bounded tree counts then it is easy to check that $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{G}_t^r} p_t(F) = 1$, so p_t is a probability distribution on \mathcal{G}_t^r . Furthermore, these probability distributions for different t are consistent in the natural sense, and so may be combined to form a probability distribution on \mathcal{G}^r . For this reason, we say that a probability distribution π on \mathcal{G}^r is the *local limit* of the sequence (G_n) if

$$p_t(F, G_n) \rightarrow \pi(\{G : G|_t = F\})$$

for every $t \geq 1$ and every $F \in \mathcal{G}_t^r$, where for $G \in \mathcal{G}^r$, the graph $G|_t$ is the subgraph of G induced by the vertices within distance t of the root.

Of course one can define a corresponding metric d_{loc} , by mapping each graph to the point $(p_t(F, G_n)) \in X = \prod_t [0, 1]^{\mathcal{G}_t^r}$, and then applying any metric on X giving rise to the product topology. Just as for tree counts, under suitable assumptions, the local limit π determines the limiting subgraph counts \tilde{s} and vice versa. (One ‘suitable assumption’ is bounded maximum degree. In fact, as in Section 3, exponentially bounded tree counts will almost certainly do.) Thus the metrics \tilde{d}_{sub} and d_{loc} are equivalent. As before, it seems more natural to

study the distribution of the neighbourhoods of vertices directly, rather than the subgraph counts, which are essentially moments of this distribution.

This notion of local limit is extremely natural. In fact, Benjamini and Schramm [5] used the same notion (but for a random rather than deterministic sequence (G_n)) to define a ‘distributional limit’ of certain random planar graphs; they showed that the random walk on the limiting graph is recurrent with probability 1. The same notion in slightly different generality was studied by Aldous and Steele [2], under the name ‘local weak limit’, and Aldous and Lyons [1], where the term ‘random weak limit’ is used. Returning to basic questions about this notion of limit, perhaps the first is: which probability distributions on \mathcal{G}^r can arise in this way? As in Section 3, a necessary condition is that the distribution π must be *involution invariant*, meaning that

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \sum_y f(G, x, y) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \sum_y f(G, y, x) \quad (16)$$

for any non-negative isomorphism invariant function f defined on triples (G, x, y) , where G is a locally finite graph and x and y are adjacent vertices of G . Here the expectation is over the π -random rooted graph (G, x) , and the sum is over neighbours of x .

The following question is due to Aldous and Lyons [1].

Question 7.1. *Does every involution-invariant probability distribution on \mathcal{G}^r arise as the local limit of some sequence (G_n) of graphs with $|G_n| = n$?*

Just as in the tree case, it may make sense to restrict to graphs with bounded maximum degree, asking the analogue of Question 3.3. Note that it does not matter here whether we consider a sequence of deterministic finite graphs, or a sequence of distributions on n -vertex graphs: for the purposes of Question 7.1, a distribution on connected n -vertex graphs may be well approximated by a much larger finite graph whose components have approximately the right distribution.

Since this question seems to be rather important, let us briefly describe its history; for more details we refer the reader to Aldous and Lyons [1]. Firstly, as noted above, the question is from [1], where it is stated as an especially important open question. (Lyons [39] referred to a proof of a positive answer to Question 7.1, but in a note added in proof said that this proof was incorrect.)

Benjamini and Schramm [5] were the first to note that any distribution that is a local limit must be involution invariant. In fact, they noted that it must satisfy an *a priori* stronger condition they called the ‘intrinsic mass transport principle’. (This is the same as involution invariance except that one considers a function f defined on triples (G, x, y) where x and y are any vertices of G , not necessarily adjacent vertices.) Aldous and Steele [2] introduced the somewhat simpler condition of involution invariance. As shown by Aldous and Lyons [1], involution invariance and the intrinsic mass transport principle are equivalent.

Aldous and Lyons [1] use the term ‘unimodular’ for an involution invariant probability distribution on \mathcal{G}^r . The motivation comes from a very special case: suppose that π is supported on a single rooted graph (G, x) . Then G must

be vertex transitive. In this case, π is involution invariant if and only if G is unimodular, in the sense that its automorphism group is unimodular, i.e., its left-invariant Haar measure is also right-invariant.

Unimodular transitive graphs have been studied for some time, quite independently of the question of local limits (and well before this arose); see, for example, Benjamini, Lyons, Peres and Schramm [4]. For a simple description of unimodularity in this context, see, for example, Timar [44]. It is perhaps surprising that there exist (bounded degree) vertex transitive graphs that are non-unimodular. One example is the ‘grandmother graph’ G shown in Figure 1, introduced by Trofimov [45] in a slightly different context. This is the graph




Figure 1: The grandmother graph (left), and the subgraph induced by the neighbourhood of a vertex (right).

obtained by arranging the vertices of the 3-regular tree into levels so that every vertex in level n has one neighbour in level $n - 1$, its parent, and two in level $n + 1$, its children, and then joining every vertex to its grandparent and grand-children in addition to its parent and children. As can be seen from Figure 1, from the 2-neighbourhood of a vertex in G one can identify its parent in the original 3-regular tree. Let π be the distribution on \mathcal{G}^r supported only on the (rooted) grandmother graph G , and let $f(G, x, y)$ be the function taking the value 1 if G is the grandmother graph and y is the parent of x , and 0 otherwise; this function is isomorphism invariant. For this π and f , the left hand side of (16) is the number of parents of the root, i.e., 1, and the right hand side is the number of children (the number of vertices whose parent the root is), i.e., 2. Thus G is not unimodular.

Other examples of non-unimodular transitive graphs include the Diestel–Leader graphs introduced in a different context in [23].

As noted by Aldous and Lyons [1], a positive answer to (their slightly more general form of) Question 7.1 would have major implications in group theory, since it would essentially imply that all finitely generated groups are ‘sofic’. This group property was initially introduced (in a slightly different form) by Gromov [32]; the term ‘sofic’ was coined by Weiss [46]. The key point is that several well-known conjectures in group theory have been proved for sofic groups; see Elek and Szabó [26] for example. For a brief survey of the topic of sofic groups, see Pestov [41].

Returning to metrics on sparse graphs, in one sense, the metric d_{loc} associated to the notion of local convergence seems to be the most natural measure of ‘similarity’ between general sparse graphs. However, while this notion captures local information well, it still loses global information: if (G_n) has a certain local limit π , then the graphs H_{2n} formed by taking the disjoint union of two copies of G_n have the same local limit. (Indeed, $p_t(F, G_n) = p_t(F, H_{2n})$ for every connected graph F .) This shows that d_{loc} fails to capture the global structure of the graph, and suggests that it makes sense to consider d_{loc} and d_{part} together; we shall do so in the next section.

8 Further metrics, models and questions

For fully dense graphs, with $\Theta(n^2)$ edges, the results of Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztegombi [17, 18] show that one single metric, say d_{cut} , effectively captures several natural notions of local and global similarity. Indeed, convergence in d_{cut} is equivalent to convergence in the partition metric d_{part} (a natural global notion) and to convergence in d_{sub} , i.e., convergence of all small subgraph counts, a natural local notion.

In the extremely sparse case, we have considered two metrics, the partition metric d_{part} and the local metric d_{loc} , which respectively capture global and local similarity. Of course, one would like a single metric capturing both notions, and also the interaction between local and global properties. Fortunately, there is a natural combination of d_{part} and d_{loc} .

8.1 The coloured neighbourhood metric

Let G_n be a graph with n vertices, and $k \geq 1$ an integer. We shall think of G_n as having $\Theta(n)$ edges, though this is only relevant when we come to sequences (G_n) . Let $\Pi = (P_1, \dots, P_k)$ be a partition of the vertex set of G_n , which we may think of as a (not necessarily proper) k -colouring of G_n . This time, for variety, we do not insist that the parts have almost equal sizes; this makes essentially no difference. Let $\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r$ be the set of isomorphism classes of k -coloured connected rooted graphs with radius at most t . For each $F \in \mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r$, let $p_{k,t}(G_n, \Pi)(F)$ be the probability that the t -neighbourhood of a random vertex of the coloured graph (G_n, Π) is isomorphic to F as a coloured rooted graph, so $p_{k,t}(G_n, \Pi)$ is a probability distribution on $\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r$. Finally, let

$$\mathcal{M}_{k,t}(G_n) = \{p_{k,t}(G_n, \Pi)\},$$

where Π runs over all k -partitions of $V(G_n)$. Thus $\mathcal{M}_{k,t}(G_n)$ is a finite subset of the space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ of probability distributions on $\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r$. Of course, one can view $\mathcal{M}_{k,t}(G_n)$ as a multiset, in which case it has exactly k^n elements, one for each colouring. However, as for the partition metric in Section 5, it turns out to be better to ignore the multiplicities.

The space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ of probability distributions on $\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r$ is naturally viewed as a metric space, with the total variation distance d_{TV} between two distributions

as the metric. In other words, regarding $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ as a subset of the unit ball of ℓ_1 in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r}$, we simply take the ℓ_1 -metric on this set. Let d_H denote the Hausdorff distance between compact subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$, defined with respect to d_{TV} . Then we may define the *coloured neighbourhood metric* d_{cn} by

$$d_{cn}(G, G') = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{t \geq 1} 2^{-k-t} d_H(\mathcal{M}_{k,t}(G), \mathcal{M}_{k,t}(G')),$$

say. (As before, we can instead use any metric on $\prod_{t,k} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ giving rise to the product topology.) If we restrict our attention to graphs with maximum degree at most some constant Δ , then the corresponding sets $\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r$ are finite, so each $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ is compact, and any sequence (G_n) has a subsequence that is Cauchy with respect to d_{cn} , and in fact converges to a limit point consisting of one compact subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ for each k, t . In fact, it is not hard to check that whenever (G_n) has bounded tree counts (i.e., contains $O(n)$ copies of any fixed tree T), it has a convergent subsequence with respect to d_{cn} . Of course, as before, we can combine the limiting subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{k,t}^r)$ as t varies. Also, as in Section 5, there may be circumstances in which it is better to view $\mathcal{M}_{k,t}(G_n)$ as a multiset after all, and use the matching distance between such multisets to define a *coloured neighbourhood matching metric* d_{cn-m} .

Taking just $k = 1$ above, we recover the notion of local limit. On the other hand, the set \mathcal{M}_k used to define the partition metric can be recovered from $\mathcal{M}_{k,1}$. (The latter set codes, for each partition, how many vertices there are in each part, and how many neighbours in each part each vertex has. From this information one can calculate the number of edges between each pair of parts.) It follows that if (G_n) is Cauchy with respect to d_{cn} , then it is Cauchy with respect to both d_{loc} and d_{part} . In other words, d_{cn} is a ‘joint refinement’ of d_{loc} and d_{part} .

8.2 Models for metrics

The following rather vague question was posed in [12].

Question 8.1. *Given a metric d , can we find a ‘natural’ family of random graph models with the following two properties: (i) for each model, the sequence of random graphs (G_n) generated by the model is Cauchy with respect to d with probability 1, and (ii) for any sequence (G_n) with $|G_n| = n$ that is Cauchy with respect to d , there is a model from the family such that, if we interleave (G_n) with a sequence of random graphs from the model, the resulting sequence is still Cauchy with probability 1.*

As noted in [12], for any of d_{cut} , d_{sub} or d_{part} the answer is yes in the dense case, since (G_n) is Cauchy if and only if $d_{cut}(G_n, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ for some kernel κ , while the dense inhomogeneous random graphs $G(n, \kappa) = G_1(n, \kappa)$ converge to κ in d_{cut} with probability 1. Thus our family consists of one model $G(n, \kappa)$ for each kernel κ (to be precise, for each equivalence class of kernels under the relation

\sim defined in [12, Subsection 2.4]). In the sparse case, but with $np \rightarrow \infty$, some partial answers are given in [12], but the situation is much more complicated.

Here, with $p = 1/n$, $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$ is very unsatisfactory as a model for an *arbitrary* sequence of sparse graphs, since it produces graphs with essentially no cycles. The following natural model proposed by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [10] is rather more general. In the uniform case, generalizing $G(n, c/n)$, assign a weight w_F to each fixed graph F . To generate a random graph with n vertices, starting from the empty graph, for each F add each of the $\Theta(n^{|F|})$ possible copies of F with probability $w_F/n^{|F|-1}$, deleting any duplicate edges. Note that, on average, we add $\Theta(n)$ copies of each graph F . The point is that this model produces graphs with $\Theta(n)$ edges, but (in general) $\Theta(n)$ triangles, and indeed $\Theta(n)$ copies of any fixed graph F .

In the general case, Bollobás, Janson and Riordan [10] start from a *kernel family* (κ_F) consisting of one kernel κ_F for each isomorphism type of connected finite graph F ; the kernel κ_F is simply a measurable function on $[0, 1]^{V(F)}$ that is symmetric under the action of the automorphism group of F . To construct the random graph $G(n, (\kappa_F))$, choose x_1, \dots, x_n independently and uniformly from $[0, 1]$, and then for each F and each set v_1, \dots, v_k of $k = |F|$ vertices, insert a copy of F with vertex set v_1, \dots, v_k with probability $\kappa_F(x_{v_1}, \dots, x_{v_k})/n^{k-1}$. For full details, see [10].

While the model $G(n, (\kappa_F))$ is much more general than $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$, it still has its limitations. It is not hard to see that the asymptotic degree distribution of $G(n, (\kappa_F))$ will be a mixture of compound Poisson distributions (rather than the mixture of Poisson distributions one obtains for $G_{1/n}(n, \kappa)$). In particular, there is no kernel family for which $G(n, (\kappa_F))$ produces graphs in which (almost) all vertices have degree 3, say. A positive answer to Question 8.1 for either of the metrics d_{loc} or d_{cn} would involve, among other things, models that produce graphs with arbitrary given degree distributions (with finite expectation, say, or perhaps bounded, to keep things simple). Of course this is easy, but such an answer would require much more – it would require producing all possible distributions of local structure. Even for d_{loc} , this is likely to be hard, since one would presumably have to first understand the possible limiting distributions, which would involve answering Question 7.1. For d_{cn} , much more is needed: one needs to understand the possible combinations of local and global structure.

Let us give one very simple example of the kind of model we have in mind, associated to d_{loc} in the extremely sparse case. Let parameters n and d be given; we shall think of d fixed as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Assuming that nd is a multiple of three, let $T(n, d)$ be the random graph obtained as follows: start with n vertices, each of which has d ‘stubs’ associated to it. Take a uniformly random partition of the set of nd stubs into $nd/3$ triplets, and add a triangle corresponding to each triplet, sitting on the vertices that the stubs in the triplet are associated to. In general, $T(n, d)$ is a multigraph, but it will be very close to a simple graph (in fact, $T(n, d)$ will be simple with probability bounded away from 0). The model $T(n, d)$ is a natural ‘triangle version’ of the random regular graph, generated via the configuration model. (Since the first draft of this paper was written, Newman [40] has described a natural inhomogeneous version of this model.)

It is not hard to see that in $T(n, d)$ every (or, if we make the graph simple, almost every) vertex has degree $2d$, and is in exactly d (edge-disjoint) triangles. Furthermore, other than this, $T(n, d)$ has no local structure: the local limit of the sequence $T(n, d)$ is an infinite tree of triangles. Thus $T(n, d)$ is an appropriate model for certain Cauchy sequences in d_{loc} . Of course one can construct many other models along these lines, but it is hard to imagine that all Cauchy sequences can be covered in this way!

As we have seen, in the extremely sparse case, Question 8.1 is likely to be very hard to answer for the metrics we have considered. Nonetheless, it may be possible to answer the same question for weaker metrics, or to provide partial answers. Such partial answers would hopefully provide great insight into the structure of the set of sparse graphs.

Acknowledgement. We are grateful to Gábor Elek for pointing out an error in an earlier version of this manuscript, and for drawing our attention to the connections to the theory of sofic groups.

References

- [1] D. Aldous and R. Lyons, Processes on unimodular random networks, *Electron. J. Probab.* **12** (2007), 1454–1508 (electronic).
- [2] D. Aldous and J.M. Steele, The objective method: probabilistic combinatorial optimization and local weak convergence, in *Probability on discrete structures, Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.* **110**, Springer (2004), pp. 1–72.
- [3] M. Axenovich, A. Kézdy and R. Martin, On the editing distance of graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **58** (2008), 123–138.
- [4] I. Benjamini, R. Lyons, Y. Peres and O. Schramm, Group-invariant percolation on graphs, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **9** (1999), 29–66.
- [5] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm, Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs, *Electron. J. Probab.* **6** (2001), no. 23, 13 pp. (electronic).
- [6] A. Bertoni, P. Campadelli and R. Posenato, An upper bound for the maximum cut mean value, in *Graph-theoretic Concepts in Computer Science* (Berlin, 1997), Lecture Notes in Computer Science **1335**, Springer, Berlin, 1997, pp. 78–84.
- [7] B. Bollobás, The isoperimetric number of random regular graphs, *European J. Combin.* **9** (1988), 241–244.
- [8] B. Bollobás, *Random Graphs*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press (2001), xviii + 498 pp.
- [9] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs, *Random Structures and Algorithms*, **31** (2007), 3–122.

- [10] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, Sparse random graphs with clustering, to appear in *Random Structures and Algorithms*.
arXiv:0807.2040.
- [11] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, The cut-metric, random graphs, and branching process, preprint (2009). arXiv:0901.2091.
- [12] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, Metrics for sparse graphs, in *Surveys in Combinatorics 2009*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series **365**, S. Huczynska, J.D. Mitchell and C.M.Roney-Dougal eds, CUP (2009), pp. 212-287.
- [13] B. Bollobás and A. Scott, Max Cut for random graphs with a planted partition, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **13** (2004), 451-474.
- [14] R. Boppana, Eigenvalues and graph bisection: An average-case analysis (extended abstract), *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science* (1987), pp. 280-285.
- [15] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, B. Szegedy and K. Vesztergombi, Graph limits and parameter testing, *Proc. 38th ACM Symp. Theory of Computing* (2006), 261-270.
- [16] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi, Counting graph homomorphisms, in *Topics in Discrete Mathematics* (eds. M. Klazar, J. Kratochvil, M. Loeb, J. Matousek, R. Thomas, P. Valtr), Springer (2006), pp 315-371.
- [17] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi, Convergent sequences of dense graphs I: Subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing, *Advances in Math.* **219** (2008), 1801-1851.
- [18] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi, Convergent sequences of dense graphs II: Multiway cuts and statistical physics. Preprint, March 2007.
- [19] A. Coja-Oghlan, A spectral heuristic for bisecting random graphs, *Random Structures Algorithms* **29** (2006), 351-398.
- [20] D. Coppersmith, D. Gamarnik, M.T. Hajiaghayi and G.B. Sorkin, Random MAX SAT, random MAX CUT, and their phase transitions, in *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms* (Baltimore, MD, 2003), ACM, New York, 2003, pp. 364-373.
- [21] D. Coppersmith, D. Gamarnik, M.T. Hajiaghayi and G.B. Sorkin, Random MAX SAT, random MAX CUT, and their phase transitions, *Random Structures Algorithms* **24** (2004), 502-545.
- [22] J. Diaz, M.J. Serna and N.C. Wormald, Bounds on the bisection width for random d -regular graphs, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **382** (2007), 120-130.

- [23] R. Diestel and I. Leader, A conjecture concerning a limit of non-Cayley graphs, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **14** (2001), 17–25.
- [24] J. Dugundji, *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass. (1966), xvi+447 pp.
- [25] G. Elek, On the limit of large girth graph sequences, preprint (2008).
arXiv:0811.1149.
- [26] G. Elek and E. Szabó, Sofic groups and direct finiteness, *J. Algebra* **280** (2004), 426–434.
- [27] P. Erdős, On some new inequalities concerning extremal properties of graphs, in *Theory of Graphs* (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 77–81.
- [28] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, On the evolution of random graphs, *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.* **5** (1960), 17–61.
- [29] U. Feige, M. Karpinski, and M. Langberg, Improved approximation of Max-Cut on graphs of bounded degree, *J. Algorithms* **43** (2002), 201–219.
- [30] A. Frieze and R. Kannan, Quick approximation to matrices and applications, *Combinatorica* **19** (1999), 175–220.
- [31] D. Gamarnik, T. Nowicki and G. Swirszcz, Maximum weight independent sets and matchings in sparse random graphs. Exact results using the local weak convergence method, *Random Structures Algorithms* **28** (2006), 76–106.
- [32] M. Gromov, Endomorphisms of symbolic algebraic varieties, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **1** (1999), 109–197.
- [33] S. Janson, Rounding of continuous random variables and oscillatory asymptotics, *Ann. Probab.* **34** (2006), 1807–1826.
- [34] R. Karp and M. Sipser, Maximum matchings in sparse random graphs, in *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science* (1981), pp. 364–375.
- [35] A.V. Kostochka and L.S. Melnikov, On a lower bound for the isoperimetric number of cubic graphs, in *Probabilistic Methods in Discrete Mathematics* (Petrozavodsk, 1992), *Progr. Pure Appl. Discrete Math.* **1**, VSP, Utrecht, 1993, pp. 251–265.
- [36] L. Lovász and V.T. Sós, Generalized quasirandom graphs, *J. Combin. Theory B* **98** (2008), 146–163.
- [37] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy, Limits of dense graph sequences, *J. Combin. Theory B* **96** (2006), 933–957.

- [38] M.J. Luczak and C. McDiarmid, Bisecting sparse random graphs, *Random Structures and Algorithms* **18** (2001), 31–38.
- [39] R. Lyons, Asymptotic enumeration of spanning trees, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **14** (2005), 491–522.
- [40] M.E.J. Newman, Random graphs with clustering, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009), 058701 [4 pages].
- [41] V.G. Pestov, Hyperlinear and sofic groups: a brief guide, *Bull. Symbolic Logic* **14** (2008), 449–480.
- [42] M. Simonovits, A method for solving extremal problems in graph theory, stability problems, in *Theory of Graphs* (Proc. Colloq., Tihany, 1966), Academic Press, New York, 1968, pp. 279–319.
- [43] E. Szemerédi, Regular partitions of graphs, in *Problèmes combinatoires et théorie des graphes* (Colloq. Internat. CNRS, Univ. Orsay, Orsay, 1976), *Colloq. Internat. CNRS* **260**, CNRS, Paris (1978), pp. 399–401.
- [44] A. Timár, Percolation on nonunimodular transitive graphs, *Ann. Probab.* **34** (2006), 2344–2364.
- [45] V.I. Trofimov, Groups of automorphisms of graphs as topological groups, *Mat. Zametki* **38** (1985), 378–385, 476.
- [46] B. Weiss, Sofic groups and dynamical systems, *Sankhyā Ser. A* **62** (2000), 350–359.