

**SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL:  
THE EVOLUTION OF THE RANDOM REVERSAL GRAPH**

CHRISTIAN M. REIDYS\* AND EMMA Y. JIN

1. SOME BASIC FACTS

We consider the Cayley graph  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ , having vertex set  $B_n$  and edges  $\{v, v'\}$  where  $v^{-1}v' \in R_n$ . Let  $B_n$  denote the set of signed permutation of length  $n$  and  $R_n$  be the set of reversals  $\rho_{i,j}$  where  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ . For  $v, v' \in B_n$ , let  $d(v, v')$  be the minimal number of reversals by which  $v$  and  $v'$  differ. For  $A \subset B_n$ , we set  $\mathbf{B}(A, j) = \{v \in B_n \mid \exists \alpha \in A; d(v, \alpha) \leq j\}$  and  $\mathbf{d}(A) = \{v \in B_n \setminus A \mid \exists \alpha \in A; d(v, \alpha) = 1\}$  and call  $\mathbf{B}(A, j)$  and  $\mathbf{d}(A)$  the ball of radius  $j$  around  $A$  and the vertex boundary of  $A$  in  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ . If  $A = \{\alpha\}$  we simply write  $\mathbf{B}(\alpha, j)$ . Let  $E \subset B_n$ , we call  $E$  dense in  $B_n$  if  $\mathbf{B}(\sigma, 1) \cap E \neq \emptyset$  for any  $\sigma \in B_n$ . Let “ $<$ ” be the following linear order over  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ ,  $\sigma < \tau$  if and only if  $\sigma <_{\text{lex}} \tau$ , where  $<_{\text{lex}}$  denotes the lexicographical order. Any notion of minimal or smallest element in a subset  $A \subseteq B_n$  refers to the above linear order.

The random graph  $\Gamma_{\lambda_n}(B_n, R_n)$  is the probability space consisting of  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ -subgraphs,  $\Gamma_n$ , having vertex set  $B_n$ , obtained by selecting each  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ -edge with independent probability  $\lambda_n$ . A property  $\mathbf{M}$  is a subset of induced subgraphs of  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$  closed under graph isomorphisms. The terminology “ $\mathbf{M}$  holds a.s.” is equivalent to  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Prob}(\mathbf{M}) = 1$ . A component of  $\Gamma_n$  is a maximal, connected, induced  $\Gamma_n$ -subgraph,  $C_n$ . The largest  $\Gamma_n$ -component is denoted by  $C_n^1$ . We write  $x_n \sim y_n$  if and only if (a)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n/y_n$  exists and (b)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n/y_n = 1$ . We furthermore write  $g(n) = O(f(n))$  and  $g(n) = o(f(n))$  for  $g(n)/f(n) \rightarrow \kappa$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $g(n)/f(n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , respectively. A largest component is called giant if it is unique in “size”, i.e. any other component,  $C_n$ , satisfies  $|C_n| = o(|C_n^1|)$ .

---

*Date:* November, 2009.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A16.

Let  $Z_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$  be a sum of mutually independent indicator random variables (r.v.),  $\xi_i$  having values in  $\{0, 1\}$ . Then we have Chernoff's large deviation inequality [4], that is, for  $\eta > 0$  and  $c_\eta = \min\{-\ln(e^\eta[1+\eta]^{-[1+\eta]}), \frac{\eta^2}{2}\}$

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Prob}(|Z_n - \mathbb{E}[Z_n]| > \eta \mathbb{E}[Z_n]) \leq 2e^{-c_\eta \mathbb{E}[Z_n]}.$$

$n$  is always assumed to be sufficiently large and  $\epsilon$  is a positive constant satisfying  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . We write the binomial distribution as  $B_m(\ell, \lambda_n) = \binom{m}{\ell} \lambda_n^\ell (1 - \lambda_n)^{m-\ell}$ .

Let us next recall some basic facts about branching processes,  $\mathcal{P}_m = \mathcal{P}_m(p)$  [6, 7]. Suppose  $\mathcal{P}_m$  is initiated at  $\xi$ . Let  $(\xi_i^{(t)})$ ,  $i, t \in \mathbb{N}$  count the number of "offspring" of the  $i$ th-"individual" of  $(t-1)$ th "generation", where the r.v.  $\xi$  and  $\xi_i^{(t)}$  are  $B_m(\ell, p)$ -distributed. Let  $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}_0(p)$  denote the branching process for which  $\xi$  is  $B_m(\ell, p)$ - and all  $\xi_i^{(t)}$  are  $B_{m-1}(\ell, p)$ -distributed. Furthermore, let  $\mathcal{P}_P(\lambda)$ , ( $\lambda > 0$ ) denote the branching process in which the individuals generate offsprings according to the Poisson distribution, i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}(\xi_i^{(t)} = j) = \frac{\lambda^j}{j!} e^{-\lambda}$ . We consider the family of r.v.  $(Z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ :  $Z_0 = 1$  and  $Z_t = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{t-1}} \xi_i^{(t)}$  for  $t \geq 1$  and interpret  $Z_t$  as the number of individuals "alive" in generation  $t$ . Of particular interest for us will be the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_t > 0)$ , i.e. the probability of infinite survival. We write

$$\pi_0(p) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_0(Z_t > 0), \quad \pi_m(p) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_m(Z_t > 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_P(\lambda) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_P(Z_t > 0)$$

for the survival probability of  $\mathcal{P}_0(p)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_m(p)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_P(\lambda)$ , respectively.

**Lemma 1.** [3]

- (1) For all  $0 \leq p \leq 1$ , we have  $\pi_{m-1}(p) \leq \pi_0(p) \leq \pi_m(p)$ .
- (2) If  $\lambda > 1$  is fixed, then  $\pi_P(\lambda)$  is the unique solution of  $x + e^{-\lambda x} = 1$  in the interval  $0 < x < 1$ .
- (3) Let  $p = \frac{1+\epsilon_n}{m}$  and  $0 < \epsilon_n = o(1)$ . Then

$$\pi_m(p) = \frac{2m\epsilon_n}{m-1} + O(\epsilon_n^2).$$

In particular, if  $r = m - s$  then

$$\pi_r(p) = 2\epsilon_n + O(\epsilon_n/m) + O(s/m) + O(\epsilon_n^2);$$

and hence if  $s = o(\epsilon_n m)$  then  $\pi_r(p) = (1 + o(1))\pi_0(p)$ .

Let us finally give the key facts about the relations between the survival probabilities  $\pi_0(p)$ ,  $\pi_m(p)$  and  $\pi_P(\lambda)$ :

**Corollary 1.** [3] (1) If  $p = \lambda/m$  where  $\lambda > 1$ , then  $\pi_0(p) = (1 + o(1))\pi_P(\lambda)$ .  
 (2) Let  $p = \frac{1+\epsilon_n}{m}$ , where  $0 < \epsilon_n = o(1)$ . Then, if  $r = m - s$  and  $s = o(m\epsilon_n)$ ,

$$\pi_0(p) = (1 + o(1))\pi_r(p) = (2 + o(1))\epsilon_n.$$

## 2. $k$ -CELLS

In the following, we shall always assume

$$\lambda_n = \lambda_n(\epsilon_n) = \frac{1 + \epsilon_n}{\binom{n+1}{2}} \quad \text{where } n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta} \leq \epsilon_n < 1 \text{ and } 0 < \delta < \frac{1}{4}$$

Suppose  $x > 0$  is the unique root of  $e^{-(1+\epsilon)y} = 1 - y$  and

$$(2.1) \quad \wp(\epsilon_n) = \begin{cases} (1 + o(1))x & \text{for } \epsilon_n = \epsilon > 0 \\ (2 + o(1))\epsilon_n & \text{for } n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta} \leq \epsilon_n = o(1). \end{cases}$$

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we furthermore set

$$\mu_n = \lfloor \frac{1}{2k(k+1)} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor, \quad \ell_n = \lfloor \frac{k}{2(k+1)} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor.$$

**Lemma 2.** Each signed permutation,  $v$ , is contained in a  $\Gamma_n$ -subtree  $\mathcal{T}_n(v)$  of size  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$  with probability at least  $\wp(\epsilon_n)$ , given by eq. (2.1).

*Proof.* We shall construct the subtree  $\mathcal{T}_n(v)$  by constructing a branching process  $\mathcal{P}_m(\lambda_n)$  [6] within  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ , initiated at  $id$  where  $m$  is given by eq. (2.2). The offspring of this branching process is generated by the following set of reversals

$$N = \left\{ \rho_{l,r} \mid \lfloor \frac{1}{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor + 1 \leq l \leq r \leq n \right\} \subset R_n.$$

We initiate the process as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 = L_0 &= \{id\} \subset B_n \\ U_0 &= \emptyset \subset N \\ D_0 &= \emptyset \subseteq \{ \lfloor \frac{1}{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor + 1, \dots, n \}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we are given  $M_j, U_j \subset N, L_j \subset B_n$  and  $D_j$ , the process stops at  $j+1$  either when  $L_j = \emptyset$  or  $|M_j| = \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$ . Otherwise, we consider the smallest element  $\omega_j \in L_j$  and connect among the smallest

$$(2.2) \quad m = \binom{n - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor + 1}{2} - (n - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor) \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$$

$\omega_j$ -neighbors,  $x = \omega_j \cdot \rho_{\alpha_j, \beta_j}$ . We select with independent probability  $\lambda_n(\epsilon_n)$ , subject to the conditions  $\rho_{\alpha_j, \beta_j} \in N \setminus U_j$  and  $\alpha_j \notin D_j$ . Note that if  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor - 1$  vertices have been connected, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |N| - |U_j \cup \{\rho_{\alpha_j, \beta} \mid \alpha_j \in D_j\}| &= |N| - |\{\rho_{\alpha_j, \beta} \mid \alpha_j \in D_j\}| \\ &\geq \binom{n - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor + 1}{2} - (n - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor) \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor = m \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as long as we connect less than  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor - 1$  vertices, we are guaranteed to have  $m$  smallest  $\omega_j$ -neighbors. Suppose now  $x_1 = \omega_j \cdot \rho_{y_{l_1}, y_{r_1}}$  is the first connected neighbor. Then we “update”  $U_j(x_1) = U_j \dot{\cup} \{\rho_{y_{l_1}, y_{r_1}}\}$ ,  $D_j(x_1) = D_j \dot{\cup} \{y_{l_1}\}$  and connect the next  $\omega_j$ -neighbor via reversals contained in  $N \setminus U_j(x_1)$ . Repeating this procedure until all smallest  $m$   $\omega_j$ -neighbors are explored, we obtain the set all connected  $\omega_j$ -neighbors,  $N[\omega_j]$ . We then set

$$\begin{aligned} M_{j+1} &= M_j \dot{\cup} N[\omega_j] \\ U_{j+1} &= \cup_{x \in N[\omega_j]} U_j(x) \subset N \\ D_{j+1} &= \cup_{x \in N[\omega_j]} D_j(x) \subseteq \{\lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor + 1, \dots, n\} \\ L_{j+1} &= L_j \setminus \{\omega_j\} \cup N[\omega_j]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that each reversal is used at most once and reversals of the form  $\rho_{i,*}$  can only appear in one generation.

*Claim.* The above process generates a tree, that is each  $M_j$ -element is considered only once.

We prove the Claim by contradiction: assume the process generates a cycle  $\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_m \cdot \sigma_0 = 1$ , where  $\sigma_i \in R_n$ . Without loss of generality, we shall assume that for reversals  $\rho_{i,s}$ , we always have  $i \leq s$  and consider  $j = \min\{h \mid \sigma_i = \rho_{h,s}, 0 \leq i \leq m\}$ . There are at most two reversals among  $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$  of the form  $\rho_{j,*}$ . In case of only one such reversal, it is clear that such a cycle cannot exist. Therefore we can, without loss of generality, assume  $\sigma_0 = \rho_{j,a}$  and  $\sigma_1 = \rho_{j,b}$  where  $a \neq b \in \mathbb{N}^+$ . By construction, position  $j$  is never touched by the reversals  $\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m$ , whence we arrive at the contradiction

$$-b = (id \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \sigma_i)_j = (id \cdot \sigma_0^{-1})_j = (id \cdot \sigma_0)_j = -a$$

and the Claim follows. Since  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{4}$ , we have for sufficiently large  $n$

$$\mathbb{E}(N[w_j]) = \frac{1 + \epsilon_n}{\binom{n+1}{2}} \cdot \left[ \binom{n - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor + 1}{2} - (n - \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor) \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor \right] > 1.$$

Since we always connect only among the smallest  $m$  neighbors, we obtain, via the survival probability of the branching processes  $\mathcal{P}_P(\lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_0(\lambda_n)$ , depending on whether we have  $\epsilon_n = \epsilon > 0$  or  $\epsilon_n = o(1)$ , the following lower bound on  $\mathbb{P}\left(|M_j| = \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor \mid \text{for some } j\right)$ :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|M_j| = \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor \mid \text{for some } j\right) \geq \wp(\epsilon_n)$$

and the lemma follows.  $\square$

By choosing  $k$  sufficiently large, we next enlarge the trees constructed via Lemma 2 to subcomponents of arbitrary polynomial size, which we call  $k$ -cells.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose  $k$  is arbitrary but fixed and  $\theta_n \geq O(n^\delta)$ . Then each  $\Gamma_n$ -vertex is contained in a  $k$ -cell, i.e. a  $\Gamma_n$ -subcomponent of size  $\geq O(n^{\frac{3}{4}+k\delta})$  with probability at least*

$$\delta_k(\epsilon_n) = \wp(\epsilon_n) (1 - e^{-\beta_k \theta_n}), \quad \text{where } \beta_k > 0.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we start the construction at the identity. We set

$$A_m = \left\{ \rho_{l^{(m)}, r^{(m)}} \in R_n \mid (m-1)\mu_n + 1 \leq l^{(m)} \leq r^{(m)} \leq m\mu_n \right\}$$

and write  $w_i^{(h)} = \rho_{l_i^{(h)}, r_i^{(h)}} \in A_h$ . We consider the branching process of Lemma 2 at  $id$  and denote the potentially generated tree of size  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$  by  $T^1$ . We consider the r.v.

$$J_1 = \left| \{w_i^{(1)} \in A_1 \mid \exists x \in T^1; \{x, x \cdot w_i^{(1)}\} \in \Gamma_n\} \right|.$$

According to Lemma 2, any two distinct  $J_1$ -reversals connect distinct vertices

$$\forall x, y \in T^1; \forall w_i^{(1)} \neq w_r^{(1)} \in A_1; \quad x \cdot w_i^{(1)} \neq y \cdot w_r^{(1)},$$

and the expected number of  $J_1$ -elements is given by

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{E}[J_1] = \binom{\mu_n + 1}{2} \cdot \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1 + \epsilon_n}{\binom{n+1}{2}} \right)^{\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor} \right) \sim \frac{1}{2} \mu_n^2 \left( 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1 + \epsilon_n}{2} n^{-\frac{5}{4}}\right) \right).$$

Chernoff's large deviation inequality eq. (1.1) [4] implies that there exists some constant  $c_1 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(J_1 < \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[J_1]\right) \leq \exp(-c_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}[J_1]).$$

We proceed by selecting the smallest element,  $x_j^{(1)}$ , from the set  $\{x \cdot w_j^{(1)} \mid x \in T^1, w_j^{(1)} \in J_1\}$  and start the branching process of Lemma 2 at  $x_j^{(1)}$ . As a result, we derive the subcomponent  $C_2(x_j^{(1)})$  of size  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$  with probability at least  $\wp(\epsilon_n)$ . According to Lemma 2, this generation exclusively involves labels  $j$  where  $j > \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$ . Therefore, since any two smallest elements  $x_{j_1}^{(1)}$  and  $x_{j_2}^{(1)}$  differ in at least one coordinate,  $h$ , for  $1 \leq h \leq \mu_n$ , which is not touched by the branching process of Lemma 2, we have

$$C_2(x_{j_1}^{(1)}) \cap C_2(x_{j_2}^{(1)}) = \emptyset.$$

Let  $X_1$  be the r.v. counting the number of these new  $\Gamma_n$ -subcomponents. In view of eq. (2.3), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1] \geq \wp(\epsilon_n) \cdot \mathbb{E}[J_1] \sim \wp(\epsilon_n) \cdot \frac{1}{2}\mu_n^2 \left(1 - \exp\left(-\left(1 + \epsilon_n\right)\frac{1}{2}n^{-\frac{5}{4}}\right)\right) \triangleq \theta_n \geq O(n^\delta).$$

Again, using the large deviation inequality, eq. (1.1), we conclude that there exists some  $\beta_1 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 < \frac{1}{2}\theta_n) \leq \exp(-\beta_1\theta_n).$$

The union of all the  $C_2(x_j^{(1)})$ -subcomponents with  $T^1$  forms a  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ -subcomponent,  $T^2$ , and we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|T^2| < \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{2}\theta_n\right) \leq \exp(-\beta_1\theta_n).$$

We proceed by induction:

*Claim:* For each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , there exists some constant  $\beta_{i-1} > 0$  and a  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$ -subcomponent  $T^i$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|T^i| < \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{2^{i-1}}\theta_n^{i-1}) \leq \exp(-\beta_{i-1}\theta_n).$$

We have already established the induction basis. As for the induction step, let us assume the Claim holds for  $i < k$  and let  $C_i(\alpha)$  denote a subcomponent generated by the branching process of Lemma 2 in the  $i$ -th step at  $\alpha$ . We consider the  $w_r^{(i+1)} \neq w_a^{(i+1)} \in A_{i+1}$  and

$$J_{i+1} = \{w_r^{(i+1)} \in A_{i+1} \mid \exists x \in C_i(\alpha); \{x, x \cdot w_r^{(i+1)}\} \in \Gamma_n\}.$$

At the minimal elements,  $x_r^\alpha$  of  $\{x \cdot w_r^{(i+1)} \mid x \in C_i(\alpha), w_r^{(i+1)} \in J_{i+1}\}$ , we initiate the branching process of Lemma 2. The process generates subcomponents  $C_{i+1}(x_r^\alpha)$  of size  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$  with probability

$\geq \varphi(\epsilon_n)$ . By construction, any two of these are mutually disjoint and let  $X_{i+1}$  be the r.v. counting their number. We derive setting  $q_n = \lfloor \frac{1}{4}n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|T^{i+1}| < q_n \frac{1}{2^i} \theta_n^i\right) &\leq \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\left(|T^i| < q_n \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \theta_n^{i-1}\right)}_{\text{failure at step } i} + \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\left(|T^{i+1}| < q_n \frac{1}{2^i} \theta_n^i \text{ and } |T^i| \geq q_n \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \theta_n^{i-1}\right)}_{\text{failure at step } i+1 \text{ conditional to } |T^i| \geq q_n \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \theta_n^{i-1}} \\ &\leq \underbrace{e^{-\beta_{i-1} \theta_n}}_{\text{induction hypothesis}} + \underbrace{e^{-\beta \theta_n^i}}_{\text{large deviation results}} \cdot (1 - e^{-\beta_{i-1} \theta_n}), \quad \beta_{i-1} > 0 \\ &\leq e^{-\beta_i \theta_n} \end{aligned}$$

and the Claim follows.

Therefore each  $\Gamma_n$ -vertex is contained in a subcomponent of size at least  $O(n^{\frac{3}{4}+k\delta})$ , with probability at least  $\varphi(\epsilon_n)(1 - \exp(-\beta_k \theta_n))$  and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

We will call a subcomponent constructed in Lemma 3 a  $k$ -cell or simply a cell.

### 3. SMALL COMPONENTS

Let  $\Gamma_{n,k}$  denote the set of  $\Gamma_n$ -vertices contained in components of size  $\geq O(n^{\frac{3}{4}+k\delta})$  for some  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{4}$ . In this section we prove that  $|\Gamma_{n,k}|$  is a.s.  $\sim \varphi(\epsilon_n) \cdot 2^n \cdot n!$ . In analogy to Lemma 3 of [9] we first observe that the number of vertices, contained in  $\Gamma_n$ -components of size  $< c_k n^{\frac{3}{4}+k\delta}$ , is sharply concentrated. The concentration reduces the problem to a computation of expectation values. It follows from considering the indicator r.v.s. of pairs  $(C, v)$  where  $C$  is a component and  $v \in C$  and to estimate their correlation. Since the components in question are small, no ‘‘critical’’ correlation terms arise.

**Lemma 4.** [9] *Let  $\omega_n = |\Gamma_n \setminus \Gamma_{n,k}|$  and  $\lambda_n = \frac{1+\epsilon_n}{\binom{n+1}{2}}$ , where  $n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta} \leq \epsilon_n \leq \lambda$ , for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\omega_n - \mathbb{E}[\omega_n]| \geq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\omega_n]\right) = o(1).$$

With the help of Lemma 4, we are in position to compute the size of  $\Gamma_{n,k}$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\lambda_n = \frac{1+\epsilon_n}{\binom{n+1}{2}}$ , where  $n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta} \leq \epsilon_n \leq \epsilon < 1$  and suppose  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  is sufficiently large. Then*

$$|\Gamma_{n,k}| \sim \wp(\epsilon_n) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! \quad \text{a.s. .}$$

*Proof.* First we prove for any  $n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta} \leq \epsilon_n \leq \lambda$ , where  $\lambda > 0$

$$(1 - o(1))\wp(\epsilon_n) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! \leq |\Gamma_{n,k}| \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By assumption we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\omega_n] \leq (1 - \delta_k(\epsilon_n)) \cdot 2^n \cdot n!.$$

In view of Lemma 4, we derive

$$\omega_n < \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \mathbb{E}[\omega_n] < \left(1 - \delta_k(\epsilon_n) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! \quad \text{a.s.,}$$

whence

$$|\Gamma_{n,k}| \geq \left(\delta_k(\epsilon_n) - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) |\Gamma_n| = (1 - o(1))\wp(\epsilon_n) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Next we prove for  $n^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta} \leq \epsilon_n < 1$

$$|\Gamma_{n,k}| \leq (1 + o(1))\wp(\epsilon_n) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For this purpose we consider the branching process on a  $\binom{n+1}{2}$ -regular rooted tree  $T_{r^*}$  where the r.v.  $\xi_{r^*}$  of the rooted vertex  $r^*$  is  $B\left(\binom{n+1}{2}, \lambda_n\right)$  distributed while the r.v. of any other vertex  $r$  has the distribution  $B\left(\binom{n+1}{2} - 1, \lambda_n\right)$ . Let  $C_{r^*}$  denote the component generated by such a branching process. Bollobás *et al.* [3] showed that

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| = i) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{(\lambda_n \cdot (\binom{n+1}{2} - 1))^{i-1}}{i\sqrt{2\pi i}} \left[ \frac{((\binom{n+1}{2} - 1)(1 - \lambda_n))}{\binom{n+1}{2} - 2} \right]^{((\binom{n+1}{2} - 2)i + 2)},$$

where  $i = i(n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The key observation is an inequality [3], relating this process with the construction of a spanning component of a  $\Gamma_n$ -component at vertex  $r$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| \leq m) \leq \mathbb{P}(|C_r| \leq m).$$

Eq. (3.2) follows immediately from the observation that during the generation of a spanning component, there are for each vertex at most  $(\binom{n+1}{2} - 1)$  neighbors that are not in the component, while in  $T_{r^*}$  there exist exactly  $(\binom{n+1}{2} - 1)$  new neighbors. Suppose now  $k$  is sufficiently large, satisfying  $k\delta + \frac{3}{4} \geq 3\frac{1}{3}$ . Then  $n^2 \leq c_k \cdot n^{k\delta + \frac{3}{4}}$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , i.e.

$$\mathbb{P}(c_k \cdot n^{k\delta + \frac{3}{4}} \leq |C_{r^*}| < \infty) \leq \mathbb{P}(n^2 \leq |C_{r^*}| < \infty).$$



This probability can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(n^2 \leq |C_{r^*}| < \infty) &= \sum_{i \geq n^2} \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| = i) \\
 &\leq \sum_{i \geq n^2} (1 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{(\lambda_n \cdot \binom{n+1}{2} - 1)^{i-1}}{i \sqrt{2\pi i}} \left[ \frac{(\binom{n+1}{2} - 1)(1 - \lambda_n)}{\binom{n+1}{2} - 2} \right]^{(\binom{n+1}{2} - 2)i+2} \\
 &\leq \sum_{i \geq n^2} [(1 + \epsilon_n)e^{-\epsilon_n}]^i \leq \sum_{i \geq n^2} c(\epsilon)^i = o(e^{-n \ln(2n)}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 < c(\epsilon) < 1$ . We accordingly derive

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| < c_k \cdot n^{k\delta + \frac{3}{4}}) = \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| < \infty) - \mathbb{P}(c_k \cdot n^{k\delta + \frac{3}{4}} \leq |C_{r^*}| < \infty)$$

$$(3.4) \quad \geq \underbrace{(1 - (1 + o(1))\wp(\epsilon_n))}_{=\pi_0} - o(e^{-n \ln(2n)}),$$

where  $\pi_0$  denotes the survival probability of the branching process on  $T_{r^*}$ , see Corollary 1. From eq. (3.2) and eq. (3.4) we immediately obtain, taking the expectation

$$\mathbb{E}[\omega_n] \geq (1 - \wp(\epsilon_n)) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! + o(1).$$

Lemma 4 accordingly implies

$$(1 - \wp(\epsilon_n) - O(\frac{1}{n})) \cdot 2^n \cdot n! \leq \omega_n \quad \text{a.s.},$$

whence the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $\lambda_n = \frac{1-\epsilon}{\binom{n+1}{2}}$ , where  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , then a.s.  $\Gamma_n$  contains no component larger than  $O(n \ln(n))$ .*

*Proof.* We show that there exists some  $\kappa > 0$  such that  $|C_n^{(1)}| \leq \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)$  a.s.. For this purpose we study the probability that each vertex  $r$  is contained in a component of size  $> \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)$ . As in Lemma 5, let  $C_r$  be the component containing vertex  $r$  in  $\Gamma_n$  and let  $C_{r^*}$  denote the component in the  $\binom{n+1}{2}$ -regular tree  $T_{r^*}$ , rooted in  $r^*$ . The key observation is eq. (3.2),

$$\mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| \leq m) \leq \mathbb{P}(|C_r| \leq m),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(|C_r| > \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)) &\leq 1 - \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| \leq \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)) \\
 &= \sum_{i > \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)} \mathbb{P}(|C_{r^*}| = i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $X_\kappa$  denote the r.v. counting the number of vertices in components of size  $> \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)$ . In view of eq. (3.1) and  $\lambda_n = \frac{1-\epsilon}{\binom{n+1}{2}}$ , we derive

$$\mathbb{E}(X_\kappa) \leq 2^n \cdot n! \cdot \mathbb{P}(|C_r| > \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)) \leq \frac{2^n \cdot n!}{1-\epsilon} \cdot \sum_{i > \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)} i^{-\frac{3}{2}} ((1-\epsilon) \cdot e^\epsilon)^i.$$

Since  $\Lambda_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon) \cdot e^\epsilon < 1$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}(X_\kappa) \leq \frac{2^n \cdot n!}{1-\epsilon} \cdot (\kappa \cdot n \ln(n))^{-\frac{3}{2}} \Lambda_\epsilon^{\kappa \cdot n \ln(n)} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\Lambda_\epsilon} = o(1).$$

Thus, choosing  $\kappa$  sufficiently large, we can conclude that a.s.  $\Gamma_n$  contains no components of size  $> \kappa \cdot n \ln(n)$ .  $\square$

#### 4. DENSITY AND SPLITS

**Lemma 7.**  $\Gamma_{n,k}$  is a.s. dense in  $B_n$ .

*Proof.* We consider

$$A_{k+1} = \left\{ \rho_{l_j^{(k+1)}, r_j^{(k+1)}} \in R_n \mid k\mu_n + 1 \leq l_j^{(k+1)} \leq r_j^{(k+1)} \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor \right\}$$

Let  $w_j^{(k+1)} = \rho_{l_j^{(k+1)}, r_j^{(k+1)}}$  and recall that  $\ell_n = \lfloor \frac{k}{2(k+1)} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor$ . We set

$$d^{(k+1)}(v) = \{v \cdot w_i^{(k+1)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq \binom{\ell_n + 1}{2}\}.$$

Clearly,

$$|d^{(k+1)}(v)| = \binom{\ell_n + 1}{2} \sim \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{k}{2(k+1)} \right]^2 \cdot n^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot (1 + o(1)).$$

Let  $\Delta_k = \left[ \frac{k}{2(k+1)} \right]^2 / 2$  and  $Z(v)$  be the r.v. counting the number of vertices contained in the set  $d^{(k+1)}(v) \cap \Gamma_{n,k}$ , whose subcomponents are constructed in Lemma 3. We immediately observe

$$\mathbb{E}(Z(v)) \geq \delta_k(\epsilon_n) \cdot |d^{(k+1)}(v)| \sim \Delta_k n^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \wp(\epsilon_n)(1 - e^{-\beta_k \theta_n}) \geq \Delta_k \cdot n^{\frac{5}{4} + \delta}.$$

Since the construction of the Lemma 3-subcomponents did not involve any elements contained in  $[k\mu_n + 1, \lfloor \frac{1}{2} n^{\frac{3}{4}} \rfloor]$ , any two such subcomponents are vertex-disjoint. Therefore the r.v.  $Z(v)$  is a

sum of *independent* indicator r.v.s. and Chernoff's large deviation inequality [4] implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z(v) < \frac{1}{2} \Delta_k \cdot n^{\frac{5}{4}+\delta}\right) \leq \exp(-\kappa n^{\frac{5}{4}+\delta}) \quad \text{for some } \kappa > 0.$$

We conclude from this that the expected number of  $B_n$ -vertices with the property  $Z(v) < \frac{1}{2} \Delta_k n^{\frac{5}{4}+\delta}$  is tending to zero, whence the lemma.  $\square$

Next we show that there exist many vertex disjoint paths between  $\Gamma_{n,k}$ -splits of sufficiently large size. The proof is analogous to Lemma 7 in [9]. We remark that Lemma 8 does not use an isoperimetric inequality [5]. It only employs a generic estimate of the vertex boundary in Cayley graphs due to Aldous [1, 2].

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $(S, T)$  be a vertex-split of  $\Gamma_{n,k}$  with the properties*

$$(4.1) \quad \exists 0 < \rho_0 \leq \rho_1 < 1; \quad 2^n \cdot (n-2)! \leq |S| = \rho_0 |\Gamma_{n,k}| \quad \text{and} \quad 2^n \cdot (n-2)! \leq |T| = \rho_1 |\Gamma_{n,k}|.$$

*Then there exists some  $c > 0$  such that a.s.  $S$  is connected to  $T$  in  $\Gamma(B_n, R_n)$  via at least*

$$c \cdot \frac{2^n \cdot (n-3)!}{\binom{n+1}{2}^3}$$

*edge disjoint (independent) paths of length  $\leq 3$ .*

*Proof.* We distinguish the cases  $|\mathbf{B}(S, 1)| \leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2^n \cdot n!$  and  $|\mathbf{B}(S, 1)| > \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2^n \cdot n!$ . In the former case, we employ the generic estimate of vertex boundaries in Cayley graphs [1],

$$(4.2) \quad |\mathbf{d}(A)| \geq \frac{1}{\text{diam}(\Gamma(B_n, R_n))} \cdot |A| \left(1 - \frac{|A|}{2^n \cdot n!}\right).$$

In view of eq. (4.1) and  $\text{diam}(\Gamma(B_n, R_n)) = n+1$  [8], eq. (4.2) implies

$$\exists d_1 > 0; \quad |\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}(S, 1))| \geq \frac{d_1}{n+1} \cdot |\mathbf{B}(S, 1)| \geq d_1 \cdot 2^{n-1} \cdot (n-3)!.$$

According to Lemma 7, a.s. all signed permutations are within distance 1 to some  $\Gamma_{n,k}$ -vertex, whence

$$|\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}(S, 1)) \cap \mathbf{B}(T, 1)| \geq d_1 \cdot 2^{n-1} \cdot (n-3)! \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Let  $\beta_1 \in \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}(S, 1)) \cap \mathbf{B}(T, 1)$  and set

$$T^* = \{\alpha_1 \in \mathbf{d}(S) \mid d(\alpha_1, \beta_1) = 1, \text{ for some } \beta_1 \in \mathbf{B}(T, 1)\}.$$

Evidently, at most  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  elements in  $d(S)$  can be connected to the same  $\beta_1$ , whence there are a.s. at least

$$d_1 \cdot \frac{2^{n-1} \cdot (n-3)!}{\binom{n+1}{2}}$$

edge disjoint paths connecting  $d(S)$  to  $B(T, 1)$ . Let furthermore  $T_1 \subset T^*$  be some maximal set such that any pair of  $T_1$ -vertices  $(\beta_1, \beta'_1)$  has distance  $d(\beta_1, \beta'_1) > 2$ . Then  $|T_1| > |T^*|/2((\binom{n+1}{2} + 1)^2)$  since  $|B(v, 2)| < 2((\binom{n+1}{2} + 1)^2)$ . By construction, any two of the paths from  $S$  to  $T_1 \subset d(S)$  are edge disjoint and accordingly there are a.s. at least

$$d_1 \cdot \frac{2^{n-1} \cdot (n-3)!}{2\binom{n+1}{2}((\binom{n+1}{2} + 1)^2)} \sim c \cdot \frac{2^n \cdot (n-3)!}{\binom{n+1}{2}^3}, \quad \text{where } c > 0$$

edge disjoint paths of length 2 or 3 connecting  $S$  and  $T$ .

It remains to study the case  $|B(S, 1)| > \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2^n \cdot n!$ . By construction both:  $S$  and  $T$  satisfy eq. (4.1), whence we can, without loss of generality assume that also  $|B(T, 1)| > \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2^n \cdot n!$  holds. But then

$$|B(S, 1) \cap B(T, 1)| > \frac{1}{3} \cdot 2^n \cdot n!,$$

we have a.s at least  $\frac{1}{3} \cdot 2^n \cdot n!$  edge disjoint paths of length  $\leq 2$  connecting  $S$  and  $T$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Aldous and P. Diaconis, Strong uniform times and finite random walks, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **2**(1987), 69-97.
- [2] L. Babai, Local expansion of vertex transitive graphs and random generation in finite groups, *Proc 23 ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (ACM New York)* **1**(1991), 164-174.
- [3] B. Bollobás, Y. Kohayakawa and T. Łuczak, The evolution of random subgraphs of the cube, *Random Struct. Alg.* **3**(1992), 55-90.
- [4] H. Chernoff. A measure of the asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations, *Ann. Math. Statist.* **23**(1952), 493-509.
- [5] L.H. Harper, Minimal numberings and isoperimetric problems on cubes, *Theory of Graphs, International Symposium, Rome 1966*.
- [6] T.E. Harris, The Theory of Branching Processes (Dover Phenix editions), Dover Pubns. *Springer Verlag* 1963.
- [7] V.F. Kolchin, Random Mappings, Optimization Software Inc., *Springer Verlag* New York, 1986.
- [8] E. Konstantinova, Vertex reconstruction in Cayley graphs, *Discr. Math.* **309**(3)(2009), 548-559.
- [9] C. Reidys, Large components in random induced subgraphs of n-cubes, *Discr. Math.* **309**(10)(2009), 3113-3124.

CENTER FOR COMBINATORICS, LPMC-TJKLC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN 300071, P.R. CHINA, PHONE: \*86-22-2350-6800, FAX: \*86-22-2350-9272

*E-mail address:* [duck@santafe.edu](mailto:duck@santafe.edu)