

RANDOM SELF-SIMILAR TREES AND A HIERARCHICAL BRANCHING PROCESS

YEVGENIY KOVCHEGOV AND ILYA ZALIAPIN

ABSTRACT. We study self-similarity in random binary rooted trees. In a well-understood case of Galton-Watson trees, a distribution is called self-similar if it is invariant with respect to the operation of pruning, which cuts the tree leaves. This only happens in the critical case (a constant process progeny), which also exhibits other special symmetries. We extend the prune-invariance set-up to a non-Markov situation and trees with edge lengths. In this general case the class of self-similar processes becomes much richer and covers a variety of practically important situations. The main result is construction of the *hierarchical branching processes* that satisfy various self-similarity constraints (distributional, mean, in edge-lengths) depending on the process parameters. Taking the limit of averaged stochastic dynamics, as the number of trajectories increases, we obtain a deterministic system of differential equations that describes the process evolution. This system is used to establish a phase transition that separates fading and explosive behavior of the average process progeny. We describe a class of *critical Tokunaga* processes that happen at the phase transition boundary. They enjoy multiple additional symmetries and include the celebrated critical binary Galton-Watson tree with independent exponential edge length as a special case. Finally, we discuss a duality between trees and continuous functions, and introduce a class of *extreme-invariant* processes, constructed as the Harris paths of the self-similar hierarchical branching process, whose local minima has the same (linearly scaled) distribution as the original process.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Set-up and main results	3
2.1. Pruning of trees and prune-invariance	3
2.2. Galton-Watson trees	3
2.3. Non-Markov trees	4
2.4. Hierarchical branching process	5
2.5. Tree representation of a function	7
2.6. Horton law in self-similar trees	8
3. Random Self-Similar Trees	9
3.1. Tree pruning and related concepts	9
3.2. Labeling tree vertices	11
3.3. Distributional self-similarity	12
3.4. Mean self-similarity	13
3.5. Mean self-similar measure: Independent random attachment, [10]	15

Date: June 12, 2022.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 60C05; Secondary 82B99.

This research is supported by the NSF DMS-1412557 award.

3.6. Self-similarity of trees with edge lengths	15
4. Tree Representation of Continuous Functions	16
4.1. Harris path	16
4.2. Level Set Tree	16
4.3. Level-set trees and pruning	18
4.4. Level set trees of random walks on \mathbb{R}	18
4.5. Exponential random walks	19
5. Hierarchical branching process	20
5.1. The width function and criticality	24
5.2. Forest invariance property at criticality	25
5.3. A closed form formula for equally distributed branch lengths	26
5.4. Critical Galton-Watson process	27
5.5. Critical Tokunaga processes	28
6. Open problems	31
Acknowledgements	31
References	31

1. INTRODUCTION

Nature commonly exhibits dendritic structures, both static and dynamic, that can be represented by tree graphs [1, 24, 16]. Examples from diverse applications, together with a review of related coalescence and branching models can be found in Aldous [1], Berestycki [2], Bertoin [3], Le Gall [14], and Pitman [18]. Despite their apparent diversity, a number of rigorously studied dendritic structures possess structural self-similarity, which often allows a low-dimensional parameterization [17, 16, 23, 10]. An illuminating example is the combinatorial structure of river networks, which is closely approximated by a two-parametric Tokunaga self-similar model with parameters that are independent of river's geographic location [22, 17, 6, 26]. The tree self-similarity has been studied primarily in terms of the average values of selected branch statistics, and rigorous results have been obtained only for a very special classes of Markov trees (e.g., binary Galton-Watson trees with no edge lengths, as in [4]). At the same time, solid empirical evidence motivates the search for a flexible and conveniently treatable class of self-similar models that would encompass a variety of observed structures and extend beyond the Markov constraint. Here we introduce a general concept of distributional self-similarity that accounts for both combinatorial and metric tree structure (Sec. 3.6, Def. 10) and describe a model (Sect. 5), called *hierarchical branching process*, that generates a broad range of self-similar trees (Thm. 4) and includes the critical binary Galton-Watson tree with exponential edge lengths as a special case (Thm. 6). We describe *critical* hierarchical branching processes, which satisfy the so-called *forest invariance property*, which is a convenient generalization of Markov growth (Thm. 5). We also introduce a class of critical self-similar *Tokunaga processes* (Sect. 5.5) that enjoy additional symmetries — their edge lengths are i.i.d. random variables (Prop. 6), and sub-trees of the large Tokunaga trees reproduce the probabilistic structure of the entire random tree space (Prop. 7). The duality between planar trees and continuous functions [25] allows us using the hierarchical branching process to construct a novel class of time series that satisfy the

extreme-invariance property: the distribution of their local minima is the same as that of the original series (Sect. 4).

2. SET-UP AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Pruning of trees and prune-invariance. We work with binary reduced (i.e. having no non-root vertices of degree 2) unlabeled rooted trees with no plane embedding; a space of such trees is denoted by \mathcal{T} . The concept of self-similarity is related to the pruning operation \mathcal{R} that cuts the leaves and eliminates the related non-root degree-2 vertices from a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ [17, 4, 10]. The pruning induces a contracting flow on \mathcal{T} :

$$T \equiv \mathcal{R}^0(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^1(T) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(T) = \phi,$$

with the empty tree ϕ as the (only) fixed point. Any finite tree is eliminated in a finite number $k(T)$ of prunings; this number is called the Horton-Strahler order of the tree [9, 21]. Pruning partitions the tree space into exhaustive and mutually exclusive set of subspaces \mathcal{H}_K of trees of order $K \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}_{K+1}) = \mathcal{H}_K$.

We focus on distributions that are invariant under the pruning operation. Specifically, consider a probability measure μ on \mathcal{T} such that $\mu(\phi) = 0$. Let $\nu(T) = \mu \circ \mathcal{R}^{-1}(T) = \mu(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T))$. Note that here $\nu(\phi) > 0$. Measure μ is called invariant with respect to the pruning operation if for any tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$(1) \quad \nu(T | T \neq \phi) = \mu(T).$$

2.2. Galton-Watson trees. Galton-Watson trees present an important and well-understood class of random distributions on \mathcal{T} . Recall that a binary Galton-Watson tree describes trajectory of a branching process that starts with a single progenitor (tree root) at time $t = 0$. At each discrete time step every existing population member terminates and produces either no offspring with probability p_0 or two offspring with probability $p_2 = 1 - p_0$, independently of the other members. We call the distribution of resulting trees $\mathcal{GW}(p_0, p_2)$.

We define here a *subtree* of T rooted at vertex $v \in T$ to be the maximal subtree of T rooted at vertex v ; it includes v and all edges and vertices descendant to v . The order of an internal vertex $v \in T$ is defined as the order of the subtree rooted at v , and a sequence of vertices of the same order is called a *branch*. Let $T_{i,j}(s, T)$ be the number of instances when a branch of order $i < j$ merges into a branch s of order j in a finite tree T ; this process is called *side-branching*. Burd, Waymire and Winn [4] have shown that the following three properties are equivalent for the binary Galton-Watson distributions $\mathcal{GW}(p_0, p_2)$: (i) A distribution is prune-invariant; (ii) A distribution has a very particular side-branching structure: $E(T_{i,j}) = T_{j-i} = 2^{j-i-1}$; and (iii) A distribution is critical: $p_0 = p_2 = 1/2$. The Markov structure of critical Galton-Watson trees ensures the existence of several other special properties: (iv) The sub-tree rooted in a uniform random vertex from a random tree $T \in \mathcal{GW}(1/2, 1/2)$ has the same distribution as T ; (v) The forest of trees obtained by cutting the edges and vertices at depth $\leq d$ has the same frequency structure as the original space $\mathcal{GW}(1/2, 1/2)$; (vi) The forest of trees obtained by considering sub-trees rooted at every vertex of T approximates the frequency structure of the entire space of trees when the order of T increases. Our goal is to describe general, non-Markov, spaces of trees that reproduce these properties. This is done by introducing the hierarchical branching process (Sect. 5) and considering its particular parameterizations.

2.3. Non-Markov trees. The Markov property of Galton-Watson trees leads to the equivalence between the prune-invariance, mean self-similarity, and criticality [4]. In a general case, however, this equivalence no longer exists. In particular, in the non-Markov case the invariance with respect to pruning is not a very informative property at all. Indeed, consider the following process of assigning probabilities $\mu(\cdot)$ on \mathcal{T} . (i) Assign an arbitrary probability $\mu(\mathcal{H}_1) > 0$ to the single-leaf tree that forms \mathcal{H}_1 , (ii) Given a distribution on \mathcal{H}_K for $K \geq 1$, create a distribution on \mathcal{H}_{K+1} . For that, for every $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ consider the trees from the pre-image $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T) \subset \mathcal{H}_{K+1}$ and assign their probabilities in an arbitrary fashion with the only condition that their sum equals $\mu(T)(1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1))$. The total probability of the space is hence

$$\sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \mu(\mathcal{H}_K) = \mu(\mathcal{H}_1) \sum_{K=0}^{\infty} (1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1))^K = 1.$$

The pruning operation eliminates \mathcal{H}_1 , so the prune-induced probability $\nu(T)$ of any tree T is that of $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T)$ divided by $(1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1))$, which ensures that the total mass of the new space is unity. By construction

$$\nu(T|T \neq \phi) = \frac{\mu(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T))}{1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1)} = \mu(T),$$

hence μ is prune-invariant. It is clear, however, that this construction does not need to satisfy any symmetries in terms of side-branching. For instance, we can assign the total mass on \mathcal{H}_K to the trees with exactly K side-branches of order 1 within each branch of higher order. In this case $\mathbf{E}(T_{i,j}(s))$ is not a function of $(j - i)$. In general, $T_{i,j}$ may even have different distributions for different branches.

In this study we follow [10] and introduce a condition

$$(2) \quad \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_{i,j})}{\mathbf{E}(N_j)} = T_{j-i}$$

for some non-negative sequence T_k , where $N_j = N_j(T)$ is the number of branches of order j , and $N_{i,j} = N_{i,j}(T)$ is the number of instances when a branch of order $i < j$ merges with a branch of order j in a finite tree T . The numbers T_{j-i} are called *Tokunaga coefficients*, after Eiji Tokunaga, who introduced a related empirical constraint in studying the organization of river networks [22]. Our results, in particular, provide a general description of distributions that satisfy the condition (2).

To achieve this, Sect. 3.3 introduces a coordination property of measures (Def. 5) that acts in lieu of Markov structure and, together with prune-invariance (Def. 4), guarantees the mean self-similarity (2). Informally, the prune-invariance (Def. 4) implies that the structure of trees from \mathcal{T} is the same near the root. Coordination (Def. 5) requires that the tree structure is the same at the periphery of a tree (which is automatically satisfied for Markov trees). A measure that satisfies both prune-invariance and coordination is called *distributionally self-similar* (Def. 6). Section 3.6 extends the definition of self-similarity to trees with edge lengths (Def. 10). Section 3.4 presents a weaker version of self-similarity in terms of the mean branch counts (Defs. 8,9), which formalizes and generalizes the approach traditionally explored in the applied literature. In particular, we drop the usual assumption of the same probabilistic structure for the number of side-branches within different branches of a given order.

2.4. Hierarchical branching process. The main result of this paper is the hierarchical branching process $S(t)$, $t \geq 0$, that generates self-similar trees for an arbitrary non-negative sequence $\{T_k\}$ of Tokunaga coefficients. We also select a positive sequence $\{\lambda_j\}$, $j \geq 1$, that controls the branch lengths. The order-conditioned process $S_K(t)$ starts at time $t = 0$ with a root branch of Horton-Strahler order K . Every branch of order $j \leq K$ produces offspring of order $i < j$ with rate $\lambda_j T_{j-i}$. A branch of order j terminates with rate λ_j . After that a branch of order $j \geq 2$ splits into two branches of order $j - 1$, while a branch of order $j = 1$ terminates without leaving offspring. Finally, the initial order $K \geq 1$ is drawn from a distribution $\{p_K\}$. The process is uniquely specified by the triplet

$$S = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\}).$$

A trajectory of this process is a random binary rooted tree with edge lengths and no plane embedding. We use for this tree the same notation $S(t)$, e.g., we talk about self-similarity of $S(t)$, which creates no confusion.

Consider the branch count vector

$$x(t) = \left(x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots \right)^T : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^\infty,$$

where $x_k(t)$ is the average number of branches of order k at time t in the hierarchical branching process $S(t)$. We show in Sect. 5 that

$$(3) \quad x(t) = \exp \{ \mathbb{G} \Lambda t \} x(0),$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$ is an infinite dimensional diagonal operator with the diagonal entries $\{\lambda_j\}$ and \mathbb{G} is a linear operator

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{G} := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & T_1 + 2 & T_2 & T_3 & \dots \\ 0 & -1 & T_1 + 2 & T_2 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & T_1 + 2 & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the process construction, we solve (3) with a random initial condition

$$(5) \quad x(0) = \pi = \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} p_K e_K,$$

where e_K is the K -th element of the standard basis.

The following theorem describes self-similar properties of $S(t)$. Notice that the process is constructed in such a way that it is always mean self-similar (Thm. 4, part 1), although distributional self-similarity requires additional constraints on $\{\lambda_j\}$ and p_K (Thm. 4, parts 2,3).

Theorem 4 (Self-similarity of hierarchical branching process). *Consider a hierarchical branching process $S(t) = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\})$ such that*

$$L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty.$$

Then the following statements hold.

- (1) *The combinatorial part of the process $S(t)$ is mean self-similar (according to Def. 8,9) with Tokunaga coefficients T_k .*
- (2) *The combinatorial part of the process $S(t)$ is distributionally self-similar (according to Def. 6) if and only if*

$$p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}$$

for any $0 < p < 1$.

- (3) *The process $S(t)$ is distributionally self-similar (according to Def. 10) with length self-similarity constant $\zeta > 0$ if and only if*

$$p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}, \quad \lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$$

for any positive γ and $0 < p < 1$.

Let $C(t)$ be the average progeny of the process, that is the average number of branches of any order alive at instant t :

$$(6) \quad C(t) = \|e^{\mathbb{G}\Lambda t} \pi\|_1.$$

In hydrological literature $C(t)$ is called the *width function* of a tree $S(t)$.

Theorem 5 (Criticality of hierarchical branching process). *Consider a distributionally self-similar hierarchical branching process $S(t) = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\})$ such that*

$$L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty, \quad p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}, \quad \lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, $\zeta \in [1, \infty) \cap (L, \infty)$, and $0 < p < 1$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) *The process is critical, i.e., $C(t) = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$.*
- (ii) *The process has the forest-invariance property, which means that the frequencies of trees in the forest produced by the process dynamics are time-invariant:*

$$x(t) = \exp\{\mathbb{G}\Lambda t\} x(0) = x(0), \quad \text{where} \quad x(0) = p \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} (1-p)^{K-1} e_K.$$

- (iii) *The parameter ζ is bounded from above by R ($\zeta < R$), and the geometric distribution of the initial orders has parameter*

$$p = p_c := 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R},$$

where $w_0 = R^{-1}$ is the only real root of $\hat{t}(z)$ within the interval $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$:

$$\hat{t}(z) = -1 + 2z + \sum_j z^j T_j.$$

The critical binary Galton-Watson tree is a special case of our general construction (Sect. 5.4).

Theorem 6 (Critical Galton-Watson tree). *The tree of a hierarchical branching process with parameters*

$$(7) \quad \lambda_j = \gamma 2^{2-j}, \quad p_K = 2^{-K}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_k = 2^{k-1}$$

for any $\gamma > 0$ is equivalent to the critical binary Galton-Watson tree with independent edge lengths that have exponential distribution with density $f(x) = 2\gamma e^{-2\gamma x}$. This process is

distributionally self-similar (according to Def. 10) with length self-similarity constant $c = 2$, critical (as in Thm. 5, (i)), and forest-invariant (as in Thm. 5, (ii)). In addition, we have

$$\hat{t}(z) = \frac{(1 - 4z)(z - 1)}{1 - 2z}, \quad w_0 = \frac{1}{4}, \quad R = 4, \quad \text{and } p_c = \frac{1}{2}.$$

The hierarchical branching process allows one to generate critical processes with arbitrary $c > 1$, as described in the following statement that we prove in Sect. 5.5.

Proposition 6 (Critical Tokunaga process). *The tree of a hierarchical branching process $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$ with parameters*

$$\lambda_j = \gamma c^{2-j}, \quad p_K = 2^{-K}, \quad \text{and } T_k = (c - 1) c^{k-1} \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \quad c > 1,$$

which we call the critical Tokunaga process, is a distributionally self-similar critical tree with length self-similarity constant c (see Def. 10) and such that, independently of the process combinatorial shape, the edge lengths are i.i.d. exponential random variables with parameter 2γ . In addition, we have

$$\hat{t}(z) = \frac{(1 - 2cz)(z - 1)}{1 - cz}, \quad w_0 = \frac{1}{2c}, \quad R = 2c, \quad \text{and } p_c = \frac{1}{2}.$$

The other special properties of the Tokunaga process, which parallel those of a critical binary Galton-Watson tree with exponential edge lengths, are described in Sect. 5.5, Props. 7,8.

2.5. Tree representation of a function. We emphasize a connection between functions and trees, which can be used for constructing new classes of self-similar trees and time series models. Recall that a Harris path $H_T(t)$ for a planar rooted tree T is defined as a piecewise linear function with alternating slopes $= \pm 1$ that describes contouring T in order of depth-first search (see Sect. 4.1, Fig. 3). Conversely, a level-set tree $\text{LEVEL}(X)$ is defined as a planar rooted tree with edge lengths that describes the topology of level-exceedance intervals for a continuous function $X(t)$ (see Sect. 4.2, Fig. 4). We review both definitions and related results in Sect. 4 and observe that the Harris path and level set trees are reciprocal to each other in suitably chosen spaces. We show furthermore that the operation of pruning is equivalent to transition from a function $X(t)$ to the linearly interpolated function $X^{\min}(t)$ of its local minima. Accordingly, the problem of finding self-similar trees is equivalent to finding *extreme-invariant processes*

$$X_k \stackrel{d}{=} \zeta X_k^{\min} \quad \text{for some } \zeta > 0,$$

where X_k , $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, is a discrete-time process with an atomless value distribution and $X_0 = 0$, and X_k^{\min} is the discrete-time process of the local minima of X_k shifted so that $X_0^{\min} = 0$. Here we assume that the i -th local minimum of X_k corresponds to X_{i-1}^{\min} .

A partial solution to this problem is given in [25], which shows that Markov chains with symmetric exponential jumps are extreme-invariant with $\zeta = 2$ (see Sect. 4.4, Thm. 1). In particular, the level set tree for this process coincides with the critical binary Galton-Watson tree with exponential edge lengths. Moreover, any Markov chain with symmetric jumps is mean self-similar (according to Defs. 8,9), in terms of the combinatorial part of its level set tree, with Tokunaga coefficients $T_k = 2^{k-1}$, $k \geq 1$.

The duality between trees and time series together with the self-similar properties of the hierarchical branching process $S(t)$ (Thm. 4) allow us to significantly expand the class of extreme-invariant processes. Specifically, an extreme-invariant process with arbitrary

self-similarity parameter $\zeta > 0$ can be constructed as the Harris paths of the respective distributionally self-similar hierarchical branching tree with edge lengths. This novel class of processes can find applications in various science areas that use self-similar time series models.

2.6. Horton law in self-similar trees. We say that a random tree T satisfies a *strong Horton law* if the respective sequence N_k of branch numbers decays in geometric fashion. Specifically, we request

$$(8) \quad \lim_{k(T) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}(N_k)}{\mathbf{E}(N_1)} = R^{k-1}, \quad \text{for any } k \geq 1.$$

Horton law and its ramifications, which epitomize scale-invariance of dendritic hierarchical structures, play an important role in hydrology (e.g., [19, 17, 6]) and have been reported in biology and other areas (e.g., [16]). It has been shown in [11] that the tree of Kingman's coalescent process with N particles obeys a weaker version of Horton law as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and that the first pruning of this tree is equivalent to a level set tree of a white noise.

Recently, we demonstrated [10] that a necessary and sufficient condition for a strong Horton law in mean self-similar trees is $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty$, with T_k defined by (2). The Horton exponent R in this case is given by $R = 1/w_0$, where w_0 is the only real root of

$$\hat{t}(z) = -1 + 2z + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^k T_k$$

within the interval $[0, 1/2]$. Informally this means that any mean self-similar tree with a “tamed” sequence of Tokunaga coefficients satisfies a strong Horton law.

The hierarchical branching process $S(t)$ is always mean self-similar (Thm. 4, (i)) and hence it always satisfies the strong Horton law (8). We use this fact in Sect. 5.5 to prove the following statement that establishes the strong Horton law for vertices of a Tokunaga tree and shows that a large Tokunaga tree reproduces the frequency structure of the entire space.

Proposition 7. *Consider tree T of a critical Tokunaga branching process $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$ with parameters*

$$\lambda_j = \gamma c^{2-j}, \quad p_K = 2^{-K}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_k = (c-1)c^{k-1} \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \quad c > 1.$$

Let $V_k[K](T)$ denote the number of vertices of order $1 \leq k \leq K$ in a tree $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ of order $K \geq 1$ and define $\mathcal{V}_k[K] = \mathbf{E}(V_k[K])$. Then

$$(9) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{V}_k[K]}{\mathcal{V}_1[K]} = 2^{1-k}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(10) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\text{a random vertex from } T \in \mathcal{H}_K \text{ has order } k) = p_k = 2^{-k},$$

where a random vertex is selected by uniform random drawing from all $\#T$ vertices.

3. RANDOM SELF-SIMILAR TREES

The focus of this paper is on finite unlabeled rooted reduced binary trees with no planar embedding. The space of such trees, which includes the empty tree ϕ , is denoted by \mathcal{T} . The existence of the root imposes the parent-offspring relationship between each pair of the connected vertices: the one closest to the root is called *parent*, and the other – *offspring*. The absence of planar embedding in this context means the absence of order between the two offspring of the same parent. A tree is called *reduced* if it has no non-root vertices of degree 2; such trees are also called *full* binary trees. All internal vertices in a reduced binary tree have degree 3, leaves have degree 1, and the root has degree 2. In this work we find it convenient to have a “ghost” edge attached to the root, which makes the number $\#T$ of edges and vertices in a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ the same. With this convention, all leaves in $T \in \mathcal{T}$ have degree 1, and all parental vertices, including the root, have degree 3.

The edges of a tree from \mathcal{T} , including the ghost edge, may be assigned positive lengths, and the total length $\text{LENGTH}(T)$ of the tree is the sum of its edge-lengths. The space of trees from \mathcal{T} with edge lengths is denoted by \mathcal{L} . Any tree from \mathcal{T} or \mathcal{L} can be embedded (and represented graphically) in a plane by selecting an order for each pair of offspring. The space of embedded trees from \mathcal{T} (and respectively \mathcal{L}) is denoted $\mathcal{T}_{\text{plane}}$ (and respectively $\mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$). Choosing different embeddings for the same tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ (or $T \in \mathcal{L}$) leads, in general, to different trees from $\mathcal{T}_{\text{plane}}$ (or $\mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$). Sometimes we focus on the combinatorial tree $\text{SHAPE}(T) \in \mathcal{T}$, which retains the branching structure of T while omitting its edge lengths and embedding.

3.1. Tree pruning and related concepts. *Pruning* of a tree is an onto function $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$, whose value $\mathcal{R}(T)$ for a tree $T \neq \phi$ is obtained by removing the leaves and their parental edges from T , and then applying *series reduction* – removing each degree-two vertex and merging its adjacent edges. We also set $\mathcal{R}(\phi) = \phi$. Notice that the operation of pruning may remove the current root of the tree during series reduction; in this case the immediate surviving descendant of the root of T becomes the root of $\mathcal{R}(T)$.

The pruning is also well defined for trees with edge lengths (\mathcal{L}), where series reduction adds the lengths of merging edges, and for planar trees ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{plane}}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$), where the embedding of the remaining part of a tree is unaffected by pruning. Pruning is illustrated in Fig. 1.

Pruning induces a contracting flow on \mathcal{T} . The trajectory of each tree T under $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ is uniquely determined and finite:

$$T \equiv \mathcal{R}^0(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^1(T) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^k(T) = \phi.$$

The pre-image $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T)$ of any non-empty tree T consists of an infinite collection of trees. It is natural to think of the distance to ϕ under the pruning flow and introduce the respective notion of tree order (see Fig. 1).

Definition 1 (Horton-Strahler orders). The Horton-Strahler order $k(T) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ of a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ is defined as the minimal number of prunings necessary to eliminate the tree:

$$k(T) = \min_{k \geq 0} (\mathcal{R}^k(T) = \phi).$$

Remark 1. Equivalently, the Horton-Strahler ordering can be done by hierarchical counting [5, 9, 21, 17, 16, 4]. In this approach, each leaf is assigned order $k(\text{leaf}) = 1$. An internal




FIGURE 1. Example of pruning and Horton-Strahler ordering. The Horton-Strahler orders are shown next to each vertex of the initial tree T . The figure shows the two stages of each pruning – cutting the leaves (top row), and consecutive series reduction (bottom row). The order of the tree is $k(T) = 3$ with $N_1 = 10$, $N_2 = 3$, $N_3 = 1$, and $N_{1,2} = 3$, $N_{1,3} = 1$, $N_{2,3} = 1$.

vertex p whose children have orders i and j is assigned the order

$$k(p) = \max(i, j) + \delta_{ij} = \lfloor \log_2(2^i + 2^j) \rfloor,$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker’s delta and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the maximal integer less than or equal to x . The parental edge of a vertex has the same order as the vertex.

Definition 2 (Horton-Strahler terminology). We introduce the following definitions related to the Horton-Strahler order of a tree (see Fig. 2):

- (1) For any vertex $v \in T$, a *sub-tree* T_v is defined as the only sub-tree in T rooted at v and comprised by v and all its descendant vertices together with their parental edges (Fig. 2b).
- (2) The Horton-Strahler order $k(v)$ of a vertex $v \in T$ and its parental edge coincides with the order of the subtree $T_v \in T$ rooted at v (Fig. 2a).
- (3) A connected sequence of vertices of the same order together with their parental edges is called a *branch* (Fig. 2a).
- (4) The branch vertex closest to the root is called the *initial* vertex of the branch (Fig. 2a).
- (5) A subtree of T rooted at the initial vertex of a branch of order $K \leq k(T)$ is called a *complete subtree* of order K (Fig. 2b). The single complete subtree of order $k(T)$ coincides with T . (All subtrees of order $k = 1$ are complete.)




FIGURE 2. Illustration of the Horton-Strahler terminology (Def. 2) in a tree T of order $k(T) = 3$. (a) Tree root, ghost edge parental to the root, branch, initial vertex of a branch. The numbers indicate the Horton-Strahler orders of the vertices. (b) Examples of a complete (T_v) and incomplete (T_u) sub-trees. The sub-tree T_u is incomplete since it roots not at the initial vertex of a branch. This tree has four complete sub-trees of order $k \geq 2$: T_v , T_b , T_c , and $T_a = T$.

3.2. Labeling tree vertices. Sometimes we will need to label the vertices and edges of a tree. The vertices of a planar tree can be labeled by numbers $1, \dots, \#T$ in order of depth-first search. We also assume that label of the parental edge for each vertex is taken from that vertex.

For a tree with no embedding, labeling is done by selecting a suitable embedding and then using the depth-first search labeling as above. It is natural to introduce embeddings aligned with the pruning operation, which we describe in the following definition.

Definition 3 (Proper embedding). An embedding $\text{EMBED} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\text{plane}}$ ($\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$) is called *proper* if for any $T \in \mathcal{T}$ ($T \in \mathcal{L}$)

$$\mathcal{R}(\text{EMBED}(T)) = \text{EMBED}(\mathcal{R}(T)),$$

where the pruning on the left-hand side is in $\mathcal{T}_{\text{plane}}$ ($\mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$) and pruning on the right-hand side is in \mathcal{T} (\mathcal{L}).

A proper embedding for a tree with no edge lengths can be constructed using the following induction construction. A tree of order $k = 1$ assumes a unique embedding. A tree of order $k = 2$ is embedded by branching all its side-branches of order 1 to the right. Assuming there exists a proper embedding for trees of order $k \leq K$, we construct the labeling for a tree of order $K + 1$. All its side-branches (of any order) branch to the right. To embed the (only) two complete sub-trees, $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$, of order K , we consider their farthest non-identical pruning descendants: trees $d_i = \mathcal{R}^k(\tau_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ obtained by the maximal possible number k of pruning iterations such that $d_1 \neq d_2$. The number $0 \leq k \leq K - 2$ is well defined since all trees of order 1, which is the ultimate pruning limit, coincide. By construction, the trees d_i differ only by the number of side-branches of order 1 attached to the tree $d_0 = \mathcal{R}^{k+1}(\tau_i)$, which already has proper embedding. Consider the numbers of order-1 side-branches within

each edge of d_0 , in the order of its labeling: $(n_1^{(i)}, \dots, n_{\#d_0}^{(i)})$. The tree whose sequence has the smallest first non-coinciding number branches to the right.

A proper embedding for a tree $T \in \mathcal{L}$ with edge length is constructed in the same fashion, with the only correction. From the two merging complete sub-trees of order K with the same combinatorial structure, the one with the shortest root edge branches to the right. This definition covers the situation of atomless length distribution, which is of primary interest to us.

3.3. Distributional self-similarity.

Definition 4 (Prune-invariance). Consider a probability measure μ on \mathcal{T} such that $\mu(\phi) = 0$. Let $\nu(T) = \mu \circ \mathcal{R}^{-1}(T) = \mu(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T))$. (Note that $\nu(\phi) > 0$.) Measure μ is called invariant with respect to the pruning operation if for any tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$(11) \quad \nu(T \mid T \neq \phi) = \mu(T).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_K \subset \mathcal{T}$ be the subspace of trees of Horton-Strahler order $K \geq 1$. Naturally, $\mathcal{H}_K \cap \mathcal{H}_{K'} = \emptyset$ if $K \neq K'$, and $\bigcup_{K \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_K = \mathcal{T} \setminus \{\phi\}$. Consider a set of conditional probability measures $\{\mu_K\}_{K \geq 1}$ on \mathcal{H}_K : $\mu_K(T) = \mu(T \mid T \in \mathcal{H}_K)$. Then

$$\mu = \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \mu(\mathcal{H}_K) \mu_K.$$

Proposition 1. *Let μ be a prune-invariant measure on \mathcal{T} . Then*

$$(12) \quad \mu(\mathcal{H}_K) = \mu(\mathcal{H}_1) (1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1))^{K-1},$$

and for any $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$

$$(13) \quad \mu_{K+1}(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T)) = \mu_K(T).$$

Proof. Pruning is a shift operator on the sequence of subspaces $\{\mathcal{H}_k\}$:

$$(14) \quad \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{H}_{K-1}) = \mathcal{H}_K, \quad K \geq 2.$$

The only tree eliminated by pruning is the tree of order 1: $\{\tau : \mathcal{R}(\tau) = \phi\} = \mathcal{H}_1$. This means that we can rewrite (11) for any $T \neq \phi$ as

$$(15) \quad \mu(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T)) = \mu(T) (1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1)).$$

Combining (14) and (15) we find for any $K \geq 2$

$$(16) \quad \mu(\mathcal{H}_K) \stackrel{\text{by (14)}}{=} \mu(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{H}_{K-1})) \stackrel{\text{by (15)}}{=} (1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1)) \mu(\mathcal{H}_{K-1}),$$

which establishes (12). Next, for any tree $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ we have

$$\mu(T) = \mu(\mathcal{H}_1) (1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1))^{K-1} \mu_K(T),$$

$$\mu(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T)) = \mu(\mathcal{H}_1) (1 - \mu(\mathcal{H}_1))^K \mu_{K+1}(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(T)).$$

Together with (15) this implies (13). □

Proposition 1 shows that a prune-invariant measure μ is completely specified by its conditional measures μ_K and the mass $\mu(\mathcal{H}_1)$ of the single-leaf tree.

We assume below that complete sub-trees of the same order have the same distribution, although they can be dependent, as discussed below. Consider the following process of selecting a *uniform random complete sub-tree* of order K from $T \in \mathcal{H}_{\geq K} = \bigcup_{k \geq K} \mathcal{H}_k$. First, select a random tree T according to conditional measure

$$\mu_{\geq K}(\cdot) = \mu(\cdot | T \in \mathcal{H}_{\geq K}).$$

Label all complete sub-branches of order K in T in order of proper labeling of Sect. 3.2, and select a uniform random sub-branch, which we denote **subtree $_K$** .

Definition 5 (Coordination). A probability measure μ on \mathcal{T} is called *coordinated* if for any $K \geq 1$ a uniform random complete sub-tree of order K has distribution μ_K , that is, for any $T \in \mathcal{H}_{\geq K}$

$$P(\text{subtree}_K = T) = \mu_K(T).$$

Example 1. The space of finite Galton-Watson binary trees has the coordination property. Recall that a random Galton-Watson binary tree starts with a single progenitor (root) and increases its depth in discrete steps: at every step each existing vertex can either split in two with probability p_2 or become a leaf (disappear) with probability $p_0 = 1 - p_2$. This generation mechanism creates complete sub-trees of the same structure, independently of the other complete sub-trees of the same order (coordination). Burd et al. [4] have shown that in this case the prune-invariance only holds for the critical binary trees, $p_0 = p_2 = 1/2$.

Definition 6 (Distributional self-similarity). A probability measure μ on \mathcal{T} is called *self-similar* if and only if it is coordinated and prune-invariant.

The distributional self-similarity requires that the branching structure of a tree is the same near the root and at the periphery, and is not affected by the tree order.

3.4. Mean self-similarity. This section describes a weaker class of self-similarity requirements, introduced in our earlier work [10], that only consider the average values of branch statistics.

We write $E_K(\cdot)$ for the mathematical expectation with respect to μ_K . Let $N_k = N_k[T]$ denotes the number of branches of order k in a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$. We define the *average Horton numbers* for subspace \mathcal{H}_K as

$$\mathcal{N}_k[K] = E_K(N_k), \quad 1 \leq k \leq K, \quad K \geq 1.$$

Let $N_{i,j} = N_{i,j}[T]$ denote the number of instances when an order- i branch merges with an order- j branch, $1 \leq i < j$, in a tree T . Such branches are referred to as *side-branches* of order $\{i, j\}$. Consider the respective expectation $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}[K] := E_K(N_{i,j})$. The *Tokunaga coefficients* $T_{i,j}[K]$ for subspace \mathcal{H}_K are defined as

$$(17) \quad T_{i,j}[K] = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{i,j}[K]}{\mathcal{N}_j[K]}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq K.$$

Definition 7 (Mean coordination). A set of measures $\{\mu_K\}$ on $\{\mathcal{H}_K\}$ is called *mean-coordinated* if $T_{i,j} := T_{i,j}[K]$ for all $K \geq 2$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq K$.

For a set of coordinated measures $\{\mu_K\}$, the Tokunaga matrix \mathbb{T}_K is a $K \times K$ matrix

$$\mathbb{T}_K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & T_{1,2} & T_{1,3} & \dots & T_{1,K} \\ 0 & 0 & T_{2,3} & \dots & T_{2,K} \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 & T_{K-1,K} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which coincides with the restriction of any larger-order Tokunaga matrix \mathbb{T}_M , $M > K$, to the first $K \times K$ entries.

Definition 8 (Mean self-similarity). A collection of mean-coordinated probability measures $\{\mu_K\}$ on $\{\mathcal{H}_K\}$ is called *mean self-similar* if $T_{i,j} = T_{j-i}$ for some sequence $T_k \geq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. The elements of the sequence T_k are also referred to as Tokunaga coefficients, which does not create confusion with $T_{i,j}$.

For a mean self-similar collection of measures the Tokunaga matrix becomes Toeplitz:

$$\mathbb{T}_K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & T_1 & T_2 & \dots & T_{K-1} \\ 0 & 0 & T_1 & \dots & T_{K-2} \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 & T_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Pruning \mathcal{R} decreases the Horton-Strahler order of each vertex (and hence of each branch) by unity; in particular

$$(18) \quad N_k[T] = N_{k-1}[\mathcal{R}(T)], \quad k \geq 2,$$

$$(19) \quad N_{i,j}[T] = N_{i-1,j-1}[\mathcal{R}(T)], \quad 2 \leq i < j.$$

Consider measure $\mu_K^{\mathcal{R}}$ induced on \mathcal{H}_K by the pruning operator:

$$\mu_K^{\mathcal{R}}(A) = \mu_{K+1}(\mathcal{R}^{-1}(A)) \quad \forall A \subset \mathcal{H}_K.$$

The Tokunaga coefficients computed on \mathcal{H}_K using the induced measure $\mu_K^{\mathcal{R}}$ are denoted by $T_{i,j}^{\mathcal{R}}[K]$.

Definition 9 (Mean self-similarity). A collection of mean-coordinated probability measures $\{\mu_K\}$ on $\{\mathcal{H}_K\}$ is called *self-similar* if $T_{i,j}[K] = T_{i,j}^{\mathcal{R}}[K]$ for any $K \geq 2$ and all $1 \leq i < j \leq K$.

It is shown in [10] that the Defs. 8 and 9 are equivalent. The Def. 9 is a direct analog of the prune-invariance of Def. 4, expressed in terms of the means.

A variety of mean self-similar measures can be constructed for an arbitrary sequence of Tokunaga coefficients $T_k \geq 0$, $k \geq 1$. Next, we give a natural example.

3.5. Mean self-similar measure: Independent random attachment, [10]. The subspace \mathcal{H}_1 , which consists of a single-leaf tree, possesses a trivial unity mass measure. To construct a random tree from \mathcal{H}_2 , we select a discrete probability distribution $P_{1,2}(n)$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, with the mean value T_1 . A random tree $T \in \mathcal{H}_2$ is obtained from the single-leaf tree τ_1 of order 1 via the following two operations. First, we attach two offspring vertices to the only vertex of τ_1 . This creates a tree of order 2 with no side-branches – two leaves attached to the root. Second, we draw the number $N_{1,2}$ from the distribution $P_{1,2}$, and attach $N_{1,2}$ vertices to this tree so that they form side-branches of order $\{1, 2\}$.

In general, to construct a random tree $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ of order $K \geq 2$ we select a set of discrete probability distributions $P_{k,K}(n)$, $k = 1, \dots, K-1$, on \mathbb{Z}_+ with the respective mean values T_k . A random tree $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ is constructed by adding branches of order 1 (leaves) to a random tree $\tau \in \mathcal{H}_{K-1}$. First, we add two new child vertices to every leaf of τ hence producing a tree \tilde{T} of order K with no side-branches of order 1. Second, for each branch of order $2 \leq j \leq K$ in \tilde{T} we draw a random number $N_{1,j}$ from the distribution $P_{j-1,K}$ and attach $N_{1,j}$ new child vertices to this branch so that they form side-branches of order $\{1, j\}$. Each new vertex is attached in a random order with respect to the existing side-branches. Specifically, we notice that $m \geq 0$ side-branches attached to a branch of order j are uniquely associated with $m+1$ edges within this branch. (When discussing the single branch of the maximal order k , we count one “ghost” edge parental to the tree root.) The attachment of the new $N_{1,j}$ vertices among the $m+1$ edges is given by the equiprobable multinomial distribution with $m+1$ categories and $N_{1,j}$ trials.

We notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{i,j}[K] &= \mathbf{E}_K(N_{i,j}) = \mathbf{E}_K(\mathbf{E}_K(N_{i,j}|N_j)) = \mathbf{E}_K(N_j T_{j-i}) \\ &= T_{j-i} \mathbf{E}_K(N_j) = T_{j-i} \mathcal{N}_j[K], \end{aligned}$$

and hence $T_{i,j}[K] = \mathcal{N}_{i,j}[K]/\mathcal{N}_j[K] = T_{j-i}$, so the tree is mean self-similar, according to Defs. 8,9.

If one fixes a sequence of distributions P_k on \mathbb{Z}_+ with means T_k and uses $P_{k,K} = P_k$ for any $K \geq 1$, then the independent random attachment measure becomes distributionally self-similar, according to Def. 6.

3.6. Self-similarity of trees with edge lengths. Consider a tree $T \in \mathcal{L}$ with edge lengths given by a positive vector $l_T = (l_1, \dots, l_{\#T})$ such that $\text{LENGTH}(T) = \sum_i l_i$. We assume that the edges are labeled in a proper way as described in Sect. 3.2. A tree is completely specified by its combinatorial shape $\text{SHAPE}(T)$ and edge length vector l_T . The edge length vector l_T can be specified by distribution $\chi(\cdot)$ of a point $x_T = (x_1, \dots, x_{\#T})$ on the simplex $\sum_i x_i = 1$, $0 < x_i \leq 1$, and conditional distribution $F(\cdot|x_T)$ of the tree length $\text{LENGTH}(T)$, where

$$l_T = x_T \times \text{LENGTH}(T).$$

A measure η on \mathcal{L} is a joint distribution of tree’s combinatorial shape and its edge lengths with the following component distributions

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\tau) &= \mathbf{Law}(\text{SHAPE}(T) = \tau), \\ \chi_\tau(\bar{x}) &= \mathbf{Law}(x_T = \bar{x} \mid \text{SHAPE}(T) = \tau), \\ F_{\tau,\bar{x}}(\ell) &= \mathbf{Law}(\text{LENGTH}(T) = \ell \mid x_T = \bar{x}, \text{SHAPE}(T) = \tau). \end{aligned}$$

We denote by μ^K , χ^K , and F^K the respective measures for a uniform complete subtree subtree_K . We also consider the distribution of edge lengths after pruning:

$$\Xi_\tau(\bar{x}) = \text{Law} \left(x_{\mathcal{R}(T)} = \bar{x} \mid \text{SHAPE}(\mathcal{R}(T)) = \tau \right)$$

and

$$\Phi_{\tau, \bar{x}}(\ell) = \text{Law} \left(\text{LENGTH}(\mathcal{R}(T)) = \ell \mid x_{\mathcal{R}(T)} = \bar{x}, \text{SHAPE}(\mathcal{R}(T)) = \tau \right).$$

Definition 10 (Distributional self-similarity for trees with edge lengths). We call a measure η on \mathcal{L} self-similar if and only if the following conditions hold

- (i) The measure is coordinated in shapes and lengths:

$$\mu^K(\tau) = \mu_K(\tau), \quad \chi_\tau^K(\bar{x}) = \chi_\tau(\bar{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\tau, \bar{x}}^K(\ell) = F_{\tau, \bar{x}}(\ell).$$

- (ii) The measure is prune-invariant in shapes and lengths. This means that for $\nu = \mu \circ \mathcal{R}^{-1}$ we have

$$\mu(\tau) = \nu(\tau \mid \tau \neq \phi), \quad \Xi_\tau(\bar{x}) = \chi_\tau(\bar{x})$$

and there exists a *self-similarity constant* $\zeta > 0$ such that for any combinatorial tree $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$\Phi_{\tau, \bar{x}}(\ell) = \zeta^{-1} F_{\tau, \bar{x}} \left(\frac{\ell}{\zeta} \right).$$

The main goal of this study is to construct a rich class of measures that satisfy the above definition. This is done in Sect. 5 that introduces a hierarchical branching process.

4. TREE REPRESENTATION OF CONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

4.1. Harris path. For any embedded tree with edge lengths $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$ the *Harris path* is defined as a piece-wise linear function [8, 18]

$$H_T(t) : [0, 2\text{LENGTH}(T)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

that equals the distance from the root traveled along the tree T in the depth-first search, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Accordingly, for a tree T with n leaves, the Harris path $H_T(t)$ is a piece-wise linear positive excursion that consists of $2n$ linear segments of alternating slopes with values ± 1 [18].

4.2. Level Set Tree. Consider a continuous function X_t , $t \in [a, b]$ with a finite number of distinct local minima. The level set $\mathcal{L}_\alpha(X_t)$ is defined as the pre-image of the function values above α :

$$\mathcal{L}_\alpha(X_t) = \{t : X_t \geq \alpha\}.$$

The level set \mathcal{L}_α for each α is a union of non-overlapping intervals; we write $|\mathcal{L}_\alpha|$ for their number. Notice that $|\mathcal{L}_\alpha| = |\mathcal{L}_\beta|$ as soon as the interval $[\alpha, \beta]$ does not contain a value of local extrema of X_t and $0 \leq |\mathcal{L}_\alpha| \leq n$, where n is the number of the local maxima of X_t .

The *level set tree* $\text{LEVEL}(X_t) \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$ is a tree that describes the topology of the level sets \mathcal{L}_α as a function of threshold α , as illustrated in Fig. 4. Specifically, there are bijections between (i) the leaves of $\text{LEVEL}(X_t)$ and the local maxima of X_t , (ii) the internal (parental) vertices of $\text{LEVEL}(X_t)$ and the local minima of X_t (excluding possible local minima at the boundary points), and (iii) the pair of subtrees of $\text{LEVEL}(X_t)$ rooted at a local minima X_{t^*} and the first positive excursions (or meanders bounded by $t = a$ or $t = b$) of $X_t - X_{t^*}$ to right and left of t^* . Every edge in the tree is assigned a length equal the difference of the values




FIGURE 3. (a) Tree T and its depth-first search illustrated by dashed arrows. (b) Harris path $H_T(t)$ for the tree T of panel (a).




FIGURE 4. Function X_t (panel a) with a finite number of local extrema and its level-set tree $\text{LEVEL}(X)$ (panel b).

of X_t at the local extrema that correspond to the vertices adjacent to this edge according to the bijections (i) and (ii) above. If the global minimum of X_t is not reached at the boundary (see, e.g., Fig. 4), then we add a “ghost” edge to the tree root. The length of the ghost edge is chosen in accordance with a particular problem being considered (often it is unity or an exponentially distributed random variable). We refer to [25] for discussion of some subtleties related to this construction as well as for further references.

By construction, the level-set tree $\text{LEVEL}(X_t)$ is completely determined by the sequence of the values of local extrema of X_t . Specifically, if $g(t)$ is continuous and monotone increasing on $[a, b]$, and X_t^{lin} is a linear interpolation of the local extrema of X_t , then

$$\text{LEVEL}(X_t) = \text{LEVEL}(X_t^{\text{lin}}).$$

Hence, without loss of generality we can focus on the level set trees of continuous functions with alternating slopes $= \pm 1$. To ensure that the level set tree of a function is binary, we need to eliminate the instances of consecutive local minima with the same values. This, for instance, is achieved if the distribution of lengths of linear segments has no atoms (clearly,

this condition is sufficient, but not necessary). The space of piece-wise linear continuous functions on $[a, b]$ with alternating slopes $= \pm 1$ and atomless segment length distribution is denoted $\mathcal{E}([a, b])$.

By construction, the level set tree and Harris path are reciprocal to each other as described in the following statement.

Proposition 2 (Reciprocity of Harris path and level set tree). *Consider the space $\mathcal{E}^{\text{ex}}([a, b])$ of positive excursions from $\mathcal{E}([a, b])$. The Harris path ($H_T : \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{\text{ex}}$) and the level set tree ($\text{LEVEL}(X) : \mathcal{E}^{\text{ex}} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$) are reciprocal to each other. Specifically, for any $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$ we have $\text{LEVEL}(H_T) \equiv T$, and for any $X \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{ex}}$ we have $H_{\text{LEVEL}(X)} \equiv X$.*

4.3. Level-set trees and pruning. In the space of continuous functions, the pruning corresponds to coarsening the function resolution by removing (smoothing) the local maxima. An iterative pruning corresponds to iterative transition to the local minima.

Proposition 3 (Pruning of a function, [25]). *The transition from a function $X \in C([a, b])$ with a finite number of local extrema to the linearly interpolated function $X^{(1)} \in C([a, b])$ of its local minima corresponds to the pruning of the level-set tree $\text{LEVEL}(X)$. Formally,*

$$\text{LEVEL}(X^{(m)}) = \mathcal{R}^m(\text{LEVEL}(X)), \forall m \geq 1,$$

where $X^{(m)}$ is obtained from X by iteratively taking local minima m times (i.e., local minima of local minima and so on.)

It is hence interesting to describe the class of functions invariant with respect to the pruning operation. A partial answer to this question is given in the following sections.

4.4. Level set trees of random walks on \mathbb{R} . Consider a random walk $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ on \mathbb{R} with a homogeneous transition kernel $p(x, y) \equiv p(x - y)$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, where $p(x)$ is an atomless density function. Extending to \mathbb{R} , we let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ denote a function from $C(-\infty, \infty)$ obtained by linearly interpolating the values of the original time series $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$. A homogeneous random walk is called *symmetric* if $p(x) = p(-x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following result establishes invariance of Markov chains with respect to the pruning operation.

Lemma 1 (Pruning of Markov chains, [25]). *The following statements hold.*

- a:** *The local minima of a homogeneous random walk $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ form a homogeneous Markov chain.*
- b:** *The local minima of a symmetric homogeneous random walk $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ form a symmetric homogeneous Markov chain.*

Consider a symmetric homogeneous random walk X_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Its transition kernel can be represented as

$$p(x) = \frac{f(x) + f(-x)}{2},$$

where $f(x)$ is a probability density function with support in \mathbb{R}_+ . It is natural to look for random walks invariant with respect to the pruning:

$$(20) \quad X_t \stackrel{d}{=} \zeta X_t^{(1)}, \quad \text{for some } \zeta > 0.$$

Proposition 4 (Prune-invariance of symmetric homogeneous random walks on \mathbb{R} , [25]). *The local minima of a symmetric homogeneous random walk $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ on the real line with a transition kernel $p(x) = \frac{f(x)+f(-x)}{2}$ form a symmetric homogeneous random walk with a transition kernel*

$$p^{(1)}(x) = \frac{p(x/\zeta)}{\zeta}, \quad c > 0$$

if and only if $\zeta = 2$ and

$$(21) \quad \Re \left[\widehat{f}(2s) \right] = \left| \frac{\widehat{f}(s)}{2 - \widehat{f}(s)} \right|^2,$$

where $\widehat{f}(s)$ is the characteristic function of $f(x)$ and $\Re[z]$ stays for the real part of $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

The level set tree of an interpolated symmetric homogeneous random walk $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ in Proposition 4 satisfies the distributional self-similarity for trees with edge lengths as in Def. 10. A solution to (21) is given for example by $f(x) = \phi_\lambda(x)$ with an exponential density function $\phi_\lambda(x)$ of (23) for any $\lambda > 0$.

Theorem 1 (Mean self-similarity of symmetric homogeneous random walks on \mathbb{R} , [25]). *The combinatorial level set tree $T = \text{SHAPE}(\text{LEVEL}(X_t))$ of a finite symmetric homogeneous random walk X_t with $t = 1, \dots, N$ is mean self-similar. Specifically, for any complete sub-tree $\tau \in T$ of order $K < \mathbf{k}(T)$ the numbers $\tau_{i,j}^{(r)}$ of side-branches of order i that merge the r -th branch of order j with $2 \leq j \leq K$ in τ are independent identically distributed random variables. If $\tau_{i,j}$ is a random variable such that $\tau_{i,j}^{(r)} \stackrel{d}{=} \tau_{i,j}$, then*

$$(22) \quad T_{i,j} := \mathbb{E}[\tau_{i,j}] = 2^{j-i-1} =: T_{j-i}.$$

Moreover, by the strong law of large numbers $\mathbf{k}(T) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$ and for any $i, j \geq 1$ we have

$$T_{i,j} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} T_{j-i} = 2^{j-i-1}, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $T_{i,j}$ can be computed over the entire T .

4.5. Exponential random walks. We call a symmetric homogeneous random *exponential* if its kernel is a mixture of exponential jumps constructed as follows

$$p(x) = p \phi_{\lambda_u}(x) + (1-p) \phi_{\lambda_d}(-x), \quad 0 \leq p \leq 1, \quad \lambda_u, \lambda_d > 0,$$

where ϕ_λ is the exponential density

$$(23) \quad \phi_\lambda(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda e^{-\lambda x}, & x \geq 0, \\ 0, & x < 0. \end{cases}$$

We will refer to an exponential random walk by its parameter triplet $\{p, \lambda_u, \lambda_d\}$. Each exponential random walk with parameters $\{p, \lambda_u, \lambda_d\}$ can be considered as a function, whose rises and falls have independent exponential lengths with parameters $(1-p)\lambda_u$ and $p\lambda_d$, respectively.

Theorem 2 (Prune-invariance of exponential random walks, [25]). *Let X_t be an exponential random walk with parameters $\{p, \lambda_u, \lambda_d\}$. Then*

a: The local minima of X_t form an exponential random walk with parameters $\{p^*, \lambda_u^*, \lambda_d^*\}$ such that

$$(24) \quad p^* = \frac{p \lambda_d}{p \lambda_d + (1-p) \lambda_u}, \quad \lambda_d^* = p \lambda_d, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_u^* = (1-p) \lambda_u.$$

b: The walk X_t satisfies the distributional self-similarity (20) if and only if $p = 1/2$ and $\lambda_u = \lambda_d$.

c: The self-similarity (20) is achieved after the first pruning, for the chain $X_t^{(1)}$ of the local minima, if and only if the walk's increments have zero mean, $p \lambda_d = (1-p) \lambda_u$.

Definition 11 (Exponential binary Galton-Watson tree, [18]). We say that a random embedded binary plane tree $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{plane}}$ is an exponential binary Galton-Watson tree $\text{GW}(\lambda', \lambda)$, for $0 \leq \lambda' < \lambda$, if $\text{SHAPE}(T)$ is a binary Galton-Watson tree with a single progenitor and the offspring distribution

$$p_0 = \frac{\lambda + \lambda'}{2\lambda}, \quad p_2 = \frac{\lambda - \lambda'}{2\lambda},$$

and given $\text{SHAPE}(\mathcal{G})$ has n leaves, the $2n$ edges of T (including the ‘‘ghost’’ edge at the root) are independent exponential random variables with parameter 2λ , i.e., with density $f(x) = 2\lambda e^{-2\lambda x}$.

A connection between exponential random walks with the Galton-Watson trees is given by the following well known result, which we formulate using the terminology of our paper.

Theorem 3. [18, Lemma 7.3],[13, 15] *Consider a random walk $X_t \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{ex}}([a, b])$. The level set tree $\text{LEVEL}(X_t)$ is an exponential binary Galton-Watson tree $\text{GW}(\lambda', \lambda)$ if and only if the rises and falls of X_t , excluding the last fall, are distributed as independent exponential random variables with parameters $(\lambda + \lambda')$ and $(\lambda - \lambda')$, respectively, for some $0 \leq \lambda' < \lambda$. In other words, a level set tree of a homogeneous random walk is a binary Galton-Watson tree $\text{GW}(\lambda', \lambda)$ if and only if the walk is exponential with parameters $\{p, \lambda_u, \lambda_p\}$ such that $(1-p)\lambda_u = \lambda + \lambda'$ and $p\lambda_d = \lambda - \lambda'$.*

We emphasize the following direct consequence of Thms. 2(a) and 3.

Corollary 1. *Consider a critical binary Galton-Watson tree with independent exponential lengths, $T = \text{GW}(0, \gamma)$. The following statements hold:*

- a:** *The Harris path of $\mathcal{R}^k(T)$ for any $0 \leq k < \mathbf{k}(T)$ is a positive excursion of a symmetric exponential random walk with parameters $\{\frac{1}{2}, 2^{1-k}\gamma, 2^{1-k}\gamma\}$, or, equivalently, $\mathcal{R}^k(T) = \text{GW}(0, 2^{-k}\gamma)$.*
- b:** *The length of any branch of order $j \geq 1$ in T has exponential distribution with parameter $2^{2-j}\gamma$. The lengths of branches (of all orders) are independent.*

5. HIERARCHICAL BRANCHING PROCESS

The results of previous section concern a very narrow class of self-similar trees – those with $T_k = 2^{k-1}$. Among such trees, the distributional self-similarity so far is established only for the critical Galton-Watson binary tree with independent exponential edge lengths, $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$. Here we construct a branching process that generates distributionally self-similar trees for an arbitrary sequence $T_k \geq 0$ such that

$$(25) \quad L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty.$$

In our construction, we want the life of a branch of order j to be exponential with parameter λ_j , for a sequence of positive numbers $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots}$.

Given a probability mass function $\{p_K\}_{K=1,2,\dots}$, we introduce a multi-type branching process that with probability p_K starts with a root edge of hierarchical order K . Every branch of order j produces offsprings of order $i < j$ with rate $\lambda_j T_{j-i}$. The branch of order j terminates with rate λ_j , at which moment the branch of order $j \geq 2$ splits into two branches, each of order $j - 1$, while a branch of order $j = 1$ terminates without leaving offspring. The branching history of such multi-type branching process creates a random binary tree T in the space \mathcal{L} of binary trees with edge lengths. We will call this multi-type branching process a *hierarchical branching process*.

Observe that in order for the measure μ over \mathcal{L} generated by the hierarchical branching process to be prune-invariant as in Def. 4, the probabilities $\{p_K\}$ need to be geometric by Proposition 1. Assuming $p_K = p(1 - p)^{K-1}$, the distributional self-similarity, according to Def. 10, is achieved if and only if the sequence λ_j is geometric, i.e. $\lambda_j = \gamma \cdot \zeta^j$ for some $\gamma, \zeta > 0$. In this case, Def. 10 is satisfied with the above parameter ζ . We summarize the above construction and findings in the following statements.

Theorem 4 (Self-similarity of hierarchical branching process). *Consider a hierarchical branching process $S(t) = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\})$ such that*

$$L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty.$$

The tree T of process $S(t)$ is coordinated (according to Def. 5), with independent complete sub-trees, and the following statements hold.

- (1) *The combinatorial part of the process $S(t)$ is mean self-similar (according to Def. 8,9) with Tokunaga coefficients T_k .*
- (2) *The combinatorial part of the process $S(t)$ is distributionally self-similar (according to Def. 6) if and only if*

$$p_K = p(1 - p)^{K-1}$$

for any $0 < p < 1$.

- (3) *The process $S(t)$ is distributionally self-similar (according to Def. 10) with length self-similarity constant $\zeta > 0$ if and only if*

$$p_K = p(1 - p)^{K-1}, \quad \lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$$

for any positive γ and $0 < p < 1$.

We are interested in the temporal statistics of Horton-Strahler branches. We assume that $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots}$ is satisfying the following two conditions.

Condition 1. $\sup_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j < \infty$.

Condition 2. Let L be as defined in (25), then $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j^{1/j} < 1/L$.

We consider n independent copies of the hierarchical branching process, and average the observed frequencies of the Horton-Strahler orders at time s . Let $x^{(n)}(s) = (x_1(s), x_2(s), \dots)^T$ be such empirical process, where $x_j(s)$ is the number of branches of order j at time s in n independent copies of T divided by n . Let e_i denote the standard basis vectors. The process $x^{(n)}(s)$ evolves according to the following transition rates

$$q^{(n)}(x, x + \ell) = n\beta_\ell \left(\frac{1}{n}x \right),$$

where

$$\beta_\ell(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1 x_1 & \text{if } \ell = -e_1, \\ \lambda_{i+1} x_{i+1} & \text{if } \ell = 2e_i - e_{i+1} \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots), \\ \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j T_{j-i} x_j & \text{if } \ell = e_i \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots). \end{cases}$$

Thus, the infinitesimal generator of the stochastic process $x^{(n)}(s)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} L_n f(x) &= n\lambda_1 x_1 \left[f\left(x - \frac{1}{n}e_1\right) - f(x) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} n\lambda_{i+1} x_{i+1} \left[f\left(x - \frac{1}{n}e_{i+1} + \frac{2}{n}e_i\right) - f(x) \right] \\ (26) \quad &+ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} n\lambda_j T_{j-i} x_j \right) \left[f\left(x + \frac{1}{n}e_i\right) - f(x) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first term on the right reflects termination of branches of order 1, which happens with rate $n\lambda_1 x_1(s)$; the second term reflects termination of branches of orders greater than 1, each of which results in creation of two branches of a smaller order; and the last term reflects side-branching.

Let

$$F(x) := \sum_{\ell} \beta_\ell(x) = -\lambda_1 x_1 e_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{i+1} x_{i+1} (2e_i - e_{i+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j T_{j-i} x_j \right) e_i.$$

The convergence result of Kurtz ([7, Theorem 2.1, Chapter 11], [12, Theorem 8.1]) extends (without changing the proof) to the Banach space $\ell^1(\mathbb{R})$ provided the same conditions are satisfied for $\ell^1(\mathbb{R})$ as for \mathbb{R}^d in the theorem of Kurtz. Specifically, we require that for a compact set \mathcal{C} in $\ell^1(\mathbb{R})$,

$$(27) \quad \sum_{\ell} \|\ell\|_1 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \beta_\ell(x) < \infty,$$

and there exists $M_{\mathcal{C}} > 0$ such that

$$(28) \quad \|F(x) - F(y)\|_1 \leq M_{\mathcal{C}} \|x - y\|_1, \quad x, y \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Here the first condition (27) follows from

$$\sum_i \sup_{x \in \mathcal{C}} |\lambda_i x_i| < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_i \sup_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j T_{j-i} |x_j| < \infty,$$

which in turn follow from Condition 1 and Condition 2 respectively. Equivalently, Lipschitz conditions (28) are satisfied in \mathcal{C} due to Condition 1 and Condition 2. Thus, by Kurtz ([7, Theorem 2.1, Chapter 11], [12, Theorem 8.1]), the process $x^{(n)}(s)$ converges almost surely to

$x(s)$ that satisfies $\dot{x} = F(x)$, which expands as the following system of ordinary differential equations:

$$(29) \quad \begin{cases} x'_1(s) &= -\lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2(T_1 + 2)x_2 + \lambda_3 T_2 x_3 + \dots \\ x'_2(s) &= -\lambda_2 x_2 + \lambda_3(T_1 + 2)x_3 + \lambda_4 T_2 x_4 + \dots \\ &\vdots \\ x'_k(s) &= -\lambda_k x_k + \lambda_{k+1}(T_1 + 2)x_{k+1} + \lambda_{k+2} T_2 x_{k+2} + \dots \\ &\vdots \end{cases}$$

with the initial conditions $x(0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^{(n)}(0) = \pi := \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} p_K e_K$ by the law of large numbers.

Let

$$(30) \quad \mathbb{G} := \begin{bmatrix} -1 & T_1 + 2 & T_2 & T_3 & \dots \\ 0 & -1 & T_1 + 2 & T_2 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & T_1 + 2 & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \ddots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

The system of ODEs (29) rewrites in terms of \mathbb{G} as

$$(31) \quad \dot{x} = \mathbb{G}\Lambda x \quad \text{with the initial conditions } x(0) = \pi,$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots\}$ is a diagonal operator with the diagonal entries $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$. Observe that here $\|\pi\|_1 = 1$, and Condition 1 and Condition 2 imply that $\mathbb{G}\Lambda$ is a bounded operator in $\ell^1(\mathbb{R})$.

Let $\hat{t}(z) = -1 + 2z + \sum_j z^j T_j$ for $|z| < 1/L$, where L is defined in (25). Observe that there is a unique real root of $\hat{t}(z)$ within $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The following lemma is proven in [10].

Lemma 2. *Let w_0 be the only real root of $\hat{t}(z) = -1 + 2z + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^j T_j$ in the interval $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$.*

Then, for any other root w of $\hat{t}(z)$, we have $|w| > w_0$.

We formulate our results below in terms of the *Horton exponent* $R := w_0^{-1}$ (e.g., [17, 10]). Observe that since $\hat{t}(w_0) = 0$ and \mathbb{G} is a Toeplitz operator,

$$\mathbb{G}v = \hat{t}(w)v \quad \text{for } v = \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} w^K e_K, \quad |w| < L.$$

and

$$\mathbb{G}v_0 = \hat{t}(w_0)v_0 = 0 \quad \text{for } v_0 := \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} w_0^K e_K.$$

5.1. **The width function and criticality.** Consider the **width function**

$$C(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j(s) = \left\| e^{\mathbb{G}\Lambda s} \pi \right\|_1.$$

If distribution π is such that $\Lambda\pi$ is a constant multiple of the geometric vector $v_0 = \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} R^{-K} e_K$, then $\mathbb{G}\Lambda\pi = \hat{t}(w_0)\Lambda\pi = 0$ and

$$C(s) = \|x(s)\|_1 = \|e^{\mathbb{G}\Lambda s} \pi\|_1 = \|\pi\|_1 = 1.$$

Definition 12. A discrete distribution $\pi := \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} p_K e_K$ is said to be **critical** if and only if the width function $C(s) = 1$ for all $s \geq 0$.

From here until the end of the section, let us consider the general self-similar case, where we have $p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}$ and $\lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$ for some $\gamma, \zeta > 0$.

In order for Condition 1 and Condition 2 to be satisfied, we need $\zeta \geq 1$ and $\zeta > L$. Assuming $\zeta \geq 1$ and $\zeta > L$, we have

$$\Lambda\pi = \frac{\gamma p}{1-p} \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} (\zeta^{-1}(1-p))^K e_K,$$

and therefore

$$(32) \quad \mathbb{G}\Lambda\pi = \hat{t}(\zeta^{-1}(1-p))\Lambda\pi.$$

Iterating recursively, we obtain

$$(\mathbb{G}\Lambda)^2\pi = \hat{t}(\zeta^{-1}(1-p))\mathbb{G}\Lambda^2\pi = \hat{t}(\zeta^{-1}(1-p))\hat{t}(\zeta^{-2}(1-p))\Lambda^2\pi,$$

and in general,

$$(\mathbb{G}\Lambda)^m\pi = \hat{t}(\zeta^{-1}(1-p))\mathbb{G}\Lambda^m\pi = \left[\prod_{i=1}^m \hat{t}(\zeta^{-i}(1-p)) \right] \Lambda^m\pi.$$

Thus, taking $x(0) = \pi$,

$$(33) \quad x(s) = e^{\mathbb{G}\Lambda s} \pi = \pi + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{s^m}{m!} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m \hat{t}(\zeta^{-i}(1-p)) \right] \Lambda^m\pi.$$

The width function for the given values of $p \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma > 0$ and $\zeta \geq 1$ can therefore be expressed as

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(s) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j(s) = 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{s^m}{m!} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m \hat{t}(\zeta^{-i}(1-p)) \right] \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\Lambda^m\pi)_j \\ &= 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(s\gamma/\zeta)^m}{m!} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m \hat{t}(\zeta^{-i}(1-p)) \right] \frac{p}{1-\zeta^{-m}(1-p)} \end{aligned}$$

as $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\Lambda^m\pi)_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^m \pi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \gamma^m \zeta^{-jm} p(1-p)^{j-1} = \gamma^m \zeta^{-m} \frac{p}{1-\zeta^{-m}(1-p)}$.

Next, notice that by letting $p' = 1 - \zeta^{-1}(1-p)$, we have from (34) and the uniform convergence of the corresponding series for any fixed $M > 0$ and $s \in [0, M]$, that

$$(35) \quad \frac{d}{ds} C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(s) = \frac{\gamma}{\zeta} \hat{t}(1-p') C_{p',\gamma,\zeta}(s) \quad \text{with} \quad C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(0) = C_{p',\gamma,\zeta}(0) = 1.$$

Observe that $\zeta \geq 1$ implies $p' \geq p$ and $C_{p',\gamma,\zeta}(s) \leq C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(s)$. Also, observe that

$$\hat{t}(1-p') \begin{cases} < 0 & \text{if } p > 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R} \\ = 0 & \text{if } p = 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R} \\ > 0 & \text{if } p < 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R} \end{cases}$$

as \hat{t} is an increasing function on $[0, \infty)$ and $\hat{t}(1/R) = 0$. Hence there are two cases.

Case I. If $\zeta = 1$ as in Subsection 5.3, (35) implies $C_{p,\gamma,1}(s) = \exp\{s\gamma\hat{t}(1-p)\}$ and

$$C_{p,\gamma,1}(s) \begin{cases} \text{is exponentially decreasing} & \text{if } p > 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}, \\ = 1 \text{ for all } s \geq 0 & \text{if } p = 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}, \\ \text{is exponentially increasing} & \text{if } p < 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}. \end{cases}$$

Case II. If $\zeta > 1$, (35) implies that

$$C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(s) \begin{cases} \text{is decreasing} & \text{if } p > 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}, \\ = 1 \text{ for all } s \geq 0 & \text{if } p = 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}, \\ \text{is increasing} & \text{if } p < 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}. \end{cases}$$

Here, if $p < 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R}$, the width function $C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(s)$ may increase subexponentially. For example, if there is a nonnegative integer d such that $\zeta^{d+1} < R$. Then for $p = 1 - \frac{\zeta^{d+1}}{R}$, $\hat{t}(\zeta^{-d-1}(1-p)) = 0$ and (33) implies $C_{p,\gamma,\zeta}(s)$ is a polynomial of degree d .

5.2. Forest invariance property at criticality. Observe that in the general self-similar case, (32) implies there is only one possible critical distribution

$$\pi_c = \frac{1}{Z_{R,\Lambda}} \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \frac{e_K}{R^K \lambda_K}, \quad \text{provided} \quad Z_{R,\Lambda} := \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{R^K \lambda_K} < \infty,$$

where, $Z_{R,\Lambda} < \infty$ if and only if $\zeta < R$. Moreover, (32) implies

$$(36) \quad p = p_c := 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R} \quad \text{for } \zeta < R.$$

Here, p_c is said to be the **critical** probability. It is observed from (33) that the process is critical ($p = p_c$) if and only if

$$(37) \quad e^{\mathbb{G}\Lambda s} \pi = \pi.$$

In other words, the average number of branches of different orders is constant for all $s \geq 0$. Specifically, consider a random forest with tree orders generated independently by the geometric distribution $p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}$, and each tree of each order K being independently generated by the hierarchical branching dynamics. Then the statistics of Horton orders of branches at time $s > 0$ will be the same as the original statistics of orders of trees, i.e. distributed according to $\{p_K\}$, if and only if $p = p_c$. This property will be referred to as **forest invariance property**. We observe that a binary Galton-Watson tree $\text{GW}(\lambda', \lambda)$

satisfies this forest invariance property due to its Markovian construction independent of Horton orders.

Finally, observe that if $\Lambda = \gamma I$, $x(s) = e^{s\gamma\hat{t}(1-p)}\pi$ and $C(s) = \|x(s)\|_1 = e^{s\gamma\hat{t}(1-p)}$. We summarize our findings in the following theorem.

Theorem 5 (Criticality of hierarchical branching process). *Consider a distributionally self-similar hierarchical branching process $S(t) = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\})$ such that*

$$L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty, \quad p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}, \quad \lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, $\zeta \in [1, \infty) \cap (L, \infty)$, and $0 < p < 1$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) *The process is critical, i.e., $C(t) = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$.*
- (ii) *The process has the forest-invariance property, which means that the frequencies of trees in the forest produced by the process dynamics are time-invariant:*

$$x(t) = \exp\{\mathbb{G}\Lambda t\}x(0) = x(0), \quad \text{where} \quad x(0) = p \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} (1-p)^{K-1} e_K.$$

- (iii) *The parameter ζ is bounded from above by R ($\zeta < R$), and the geometric distribution of the initial orders has parameter*

$$p = p_c := 1 - \frac{\zeta}{R},$$

where $w_0 = R^{-1}$ is the only real root of $\hat{t}(z)$ within the interval $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$:

$$\hat{t}(z) = -1 + 2z + \sum_j z^j T_j.$$

5.3. A closed form formula for equally distributed branch lengths. Consider a hierarchical branching process with $\Lambda = I$ and $x(0) = e_K$ for a given integer $K \geq 1$. Here the system of equation (29) is finite dimensional,

$$(38) \quad \begin{cases} x'_1(s) &= -x_1 + (T_1 + 2)x_2 + T_2x_3 + \dots + T_{K-1}x_K \\ x'_2(s) &= -x_2 + (T_1 + 2)x_3 + T_2x_4 + \dots + T_{K-2}x_K \\ &\vdots \\ x'_{K-1}(s) &= -x_{K-1} + (T_1 + 2)x_K \\ x'_K(s) &= -x_K \end{cases}$$

with the initial conditions $x(0) = e_K$.

Define a sequence $t(j)$ as

$$t(0) = -1, \quad t(1) = T_1 + 2, \quad \text{and} \quad t(j) = T_j \text{ for } j \geq 2,$$

and let $y(s) = e^s x(s)$. Then (38) becomes

$$(39) \quad \begin{cases} y'_1(s) &= t(1)y_2 + t(2)y_3 + \dots + t(K-1)y_K \\ y'_2(s) &= t(1)y_3 + t(2)y_4 + \dots + t(K-2)y_K \\ &\vdots \\ y'_{K-2}(s) &= t(1)y_{K-1} + t(2)y_K \\ y'_{K-1}(s) &= t(1)y_K \\ y'_K(s) &= 0 \end{cases}$$

with the initial conditions $y(0) = e_K$. The ODEs (39) can be solved recursively in a reversed order of equations in the system obtaining for $m = 1, \dots, K-1$,

$$y_{K-m}(s) = \sum_{n=1}^m \left(\sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_n \geq 1 \\ i_1 + \dots + i_n = m}} t(i_1) \cdot \dots \cdot t(i_n) \right) \frac{s^n}{n!}.$$

Let $\delta_0(j) = I_{\{j=0\}}$ be the Kronecker delta function. Then we arrive with the closed form solution

$$(40) \quad x_{K-m}(s) = e^{-s} y_{K-m}(s) = e^{-s} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{(t + \delta_0) * (t + \delta_0) * \dots * (t + \delta_0)}_{n \text{ times}}(m) \frac{s^n}{n!}.$$

Observe that if we randomize the orders of trees by assigning an order K to a tree with geometric probability $p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}$, then the above closed form expression (40) would yield a familiar expression for the width function that was observed earlier in Subsection 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} C(s) &= e^{-s} + e^{-s} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (1-p)^m \underbrace{(t + \delta_0) * (t + \delta_0) * \dots * (t + \delta_0)}_{n \text{ times}}(m) \frac{s^n}{n!} \\ &= e^{-s} + e^{-s} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\hat{t}(1-p) + 1 \right)^n \frac{s^n}{n!} = \exp \{ s \hat{t}(1-p) \}. \end{aligned}$$

5.4. Critical Galton-Watson process. Consider a critical binary Galton-Watson tree with exponential edge lengths $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$. By Corollary 1, the length of a branch of order $j \geq 1$ is exponentially distributed with the parameter $\lambda_j = \gamma 2^{2-j}$. It is also known that for the critical binary Galton-Watson trees we have $p_K = 2^{-K}$, $T_k = 2^{k-1}$, and, accordingly, $R = 4$, see [20, 4, 25, 10]. Let us construct a hierarchical branching process with matching parameters

$$(41) \quad \lambda_j = \gamma 2^{2-j}, \quad p_K = 2^{-K}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_k = 2^{k-1} \text{ for some } \gamma > 0.$$

We observe that this will be a *critical* hierarchical branching process, since $\Lambda\pi$ is a constant multiple of the geometric vector $\sum_{K=1}^{\infty} R^{-K} e_K$:

$$\Lambda\pi = \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \lambda_K p_K e_K = \gamma \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} 4^{1-K} e_K = 4\gamma \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} R^{-K} e_K.$$

Recall also that for the critical hierarchical branching process we have $e^{\mathbb{G}\Lambda s}\pi = \pi$, that is each branch randomly picked at time s is distributed according to μ . This is also a well-known property of Galton-Watson processes. These observations motivate us to prove the following result.

Theorem 6 (Critical Galton-Watson tree). *A critical hierarchical branching process with parameters (41) is distributionally equivalent to a critical binary Galton-Watson tree $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$ with independent exponential edge lengths.*

Proof. Consider a tree $T = \text{GW}(0, \gamma) \in \mathcal{L}$. By Corollary 1, each branch of order j in T is exponentially distributed with parameter $\lambda_j = \gamma 2^{2-j}$, which matches the branch length distribution in the hierarchical branching process. Furthermore, conditioned on $\mathcal{R}^i(T) \neq \phi$ (which happens with a positive probability), we have $\mathcal{R}^i(T) = \text{GW}(0, 2^{-i}\gamma)$. This means that the space $\mathcal{R}^i(\mathcal{L})$ of pruned trees is a linearly scaled version of the original space \mathcal{L} (the same combinatorial structure, linearly scaled edge lengths). Burd et al. [4] have shown that the total number of sub-branches within a branch of order $j \geq 2$ in T has geometric distribution with mean $T_1 + \dots + T_{j-1} = 2^{j-1} - 1$ (that is $\mathbb{P}(m) = 2^{1-j} (1 - 2^{1-j})^m$ for $m = 0, 1, \dots$), where $T_{i,j} = T_{j-i} = 2^{j-i-1}$. The assignment of orders among the m side-branches is done according to the multinomial distribution with m trials and success probabilities $T_i / (T_1 + \dots + T_{j-1})$, $i = 1, \dots, j-1$. This implies that, conditioning on a particular implementation of the pruned tree $\mathcal{R}(T)$, the leaves of the original tree merge into every branch of the pruned tree as a Poisson point process with intensity $\gamma = \lambda_j T_{j-1}$. Iterating this pruning argument, conditioning on the particular implementation of $\mathcal{R}^i(T) = \text{GW}(0, 2^{-i}\gamma)$, the branches of order i merge into any branch of the pruned tree $\mathcal{R}^i(T)$ as a Poisson point process with intensity $\gamma 2^{1-i} = \lambda_j T_{j-i}$ for every $j > i$. Finally, the critical binary Galton-Watson space has $p_K = 2^{-K}$ [4]. We, hence, conclude that a $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$ tree is distributionally identical to the hierarchical branching process with parameters (41). \square

5.5. Critical Tokunaga processes. The following proposition follows naturally from the preceding discussion.

Proposition 5 (Side-branching in hierarchical branching process). *Consider a hierarchical branching process $S(t) = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\})$ such that*

$$L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty.$$

For any branch $b \subset T$ of order $K+1 \geq 2$, let $m_i := m_i(b) \geq 0$ be the number of its sub-branches of order $i = 1, \dots, K$, and $m := m(b) = m_1 + \dots + m_K$. Let $l_i := l_i(b)$ be the lengths of $m+1$ edges within b , counted sequentially from the initial vertex, and $l := l(b) = l_1 + \dots + l_{m+1}$ be the branch length. Then the following statements hold:

- (1) *The total number of sub-branches has geometric distribution:*

$$\mathbb{P}(m(b) = \kappa) = q(1-q)^\kappa \quad \text{with} \quad q = \frac{1}{1 + T_1 + \dots + T_K}, \quad \kappa = 0, 1, \dots,$$

and, given m , the distribution of $\{m_i\}$ is multinomial with m trials and success probabilities

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{side-branch has order } i) = q_i = \frac{T_i}{T_1 + \dots + T_K}.$$

The sub-branch order vector $\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_m)$, where the sub-branches are labeled sequentially starting from the initial vertex of b , is obtained from the sequence

$$\text{orders} = \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{m_1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{m_2 \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{(K, \dots, K)}_{m_K \text{ times}}$$

by a uniform random permutation σ_m of indices $\{1, \dots, m\}$:

$$\mathbf{k} = \text{orders} \circ \sigma_m.$$

- (2) The branch length l has exponential distribution with parameter λ_{K+1} , independent of the lengths of any other branch (of any order). The corresponding edge lengths l_i are i.i.d. random variables; every length has exponential distribution with parameter

$$\lambda_{K+1}(1 + T_1 + \dots + T_K).$$

Observe that Proposition 5(2) implies, in particular, that if $\lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$ for some $\gamma, \zeta > 0$, as in Thm. 4(4), then the lengths of the edges in T are i.i.d. random variables with exponential distribution if and only if $T_k = a c^{k-1}$ with $\zeta = c > 1$ and $a = c - 1$. In this case, every edge has exponential distribution with parameter γc^{-1} .

In this subsection we describe a class of processes that extends some of the symmetries observed in the critical binary Galton-Watson tree with exponential edge lengths (where $c = 2$) to the general case of $c > 1$. Specifically, consider a hierarchical branching process $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$, which we call the *critical Tokunaga branching process*, with parameters

$$(42) \quad \lambda_j = \gamma c^{2-j}, \quad p_K = 2^{-K}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_k = (c - 1) c^{k-1} \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \quad c > 1.$$

Remark 2. The condition $T_{i,i+k} = T_k = a c^{k-1}$ was first introduced in hydrology by Eiji Tokunaga [22] in a study of river networks, hence the process name. The additional constraint $a = c - 1$ is necessitated here by the self-similarity of tree lengths, which requires the sequence λ_j to be geometric. The sequence of the Tokunaga coefficients then also has to be geometric, and satisfy $a = c - 1$, to ensure identical distribution of the edge lengths (see Proposition 5). Interestingly, the constraint $a = c - 1$ appears in the Random Self-similar Network (RSN) model introduced by Veitzer and Gupta [23], which uses a purely topological algorithm of recursive local replacement of the network generators to generate self-similar random trees. The necessity of the constraint $a = c - 1$ in a combinatorial situation is explained by the following discussion and Propositions 6,7.

Proposition 6. *The process $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$ is a distributionally self-similar critical process with length self-similarity constant c and such that, independently of the process combinatorial shape, the edge lengths are i.i.d. exponential random variables with parameter 2γ . In addition, we have*

$$\hat{t}(z) = \frac{(1 - 2cz)(z - 1)}{1 - cz}, \quad w_0 = \frac{1}{2c}, \quad R = 2c, \quad \text{and} \quad p_c = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Criticality follows from Theorem 5, and the edge lengths property follows from Proposition 5. \square

Consider a tree T of the hierarchical branching process $S(t)$ and select a vertex $v \in T$ by a uniform random drawing from $\{1, \dots, \#T\}$. Observe that, by the process construction, the subtree $T_v \in T$ rooted at v , given the order $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}(v)$ of the vertex, has the same distribution

as $S_k(t)$. The spaces of Tokunaga trees introduced in Proposition 6 have an additional important property: the frequencies of vertex orders in large-order trees approximate the frequencies of orders in the entire space \mathcal{T} . This means, informally, that a large tree $T \in \mathcal{T}$, being chopped into a forest of trees rooted at every vertex of T , reproduces the frequency structure of the entire space.

To formalize this observation, consider the number $V_k[K](T)$ of vertices of order $1 \leq k \leq K$ in a tree $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ of order $K \geq 1$ and define $\mathcal{V}_k[K] = \mathbb{E}(V_k[K])$.

Proposition 7. *Let $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$ be a critical Tokunaga branching process. Then*

$$(43) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{V}_k[K]}{\mathcal{V}_1[K]} = 2^{1-k}, \text{ and}$$

$$(44) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(a \text{ random vertex from } T \in \mathcal{H}_K \text{ has order } k) = p_k = 2^{-k},$$

where a random vertex is selected by uniform random drawing from all $\#T$ vertices.

Proof. It has been shown in [10] that the mean self-similar trees satisfy the strong Horton law:

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{N}_k[K]}{\mathcal{N}_1[K]} = R^{1-k}, \text{ for any } k \geq 1.$$

Observe now that for any $T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ we have

$$V_k(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_k(T)} (1 + m_i(T)),$$

where $m_i(T)$ is the number of sub-branches that merge the i -th branch of order $1 \leq k \leq K$ in T , according to the proper branch labeling of Sect. 3.2. Proposition 5 gives

$$\mathcal{V}_k[K] = \mathcal{N}_k[K](1 + T_1 + \cdots + T_{k-1}).$$

For the process $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$ this implies

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{V}_k[K]}{\mathcal{V}_1[K]} = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{N}_k[K](1 + T_1 \cdots + T_{k-1})}{\mathcal{N}_1[K]} = R^{1-k} c^{k-1} = 2^{1-k}.$$

The statement (44) is an immediate consequence of (43), since

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_1(T)}{\#T} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

Consider now a uniform random edge point $a \in T$. Formally, select a uniform random vertex $v \in T$ and consider a point uniformly distributed along its parental edge. Similarly to the above construction for vertices, observe that the subtree $T_a \in T$ that descends from a , given the order $k(a)$ of the edge to which the point a belongs, has the same distribution as $S_k(t)$. The fact that all edges in T have the same exponential distribution leads to the following statement.

Proposition 8. *Let $S^{\text{Tok}}(t; c, \gamma)$ be a critical Tokunaga branching process. Consider a uniform random point $a \in T \in \mathcal{H}_K$ and let $\mathbf{k} \leq K$ denote the order of the edge to which the point a belongs. Then*

$$(45) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{k} = k) = p_k = 2^{-k}.$$

6. OPEN PROBLEMS

We conclude with a list of open problems, which refer to extending selected properties of the critical Galton-Watson tree with independent exponential edge lengths, $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$, which is a special case of the hierarchical branching process (see Thm. 6), to a general case. Here $S(t) = (\{T_k\}, \{\lambda_j\}, \{p_K\})$ is a distributionally self-similar hierarchical branching process with

$$L = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k^{1/k} < \infty, \quad p_K = p(1-p)^{K-1}, \quad \lambda_j = \gamma \zeta^{-j}$$

for some positive $\gamma > 0$, $\zeta \in [1, \infty) \cap (L, \infty)$, and $0 < p < 1$.

Open Problem 1. *Describe the correlation structure of the Harris path of $S(t)$. (The critical binary Galton-Watson tree with independent exponential edge lengths $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$ corresponds to a symmetric Markov chain with exponential jumps $\{\frac{1}{2}, 2\gamma, 2\gamma\}$, see Thm. 6).*

Open Problem 2. *Establish a proper infinite-tree limit of $S(t)$, where the edge lengths go to zero and the tree length increases to infinity, that preserves the suitably defined limit version of the self-similarity property. Describe the respective limit Harris path processes. (The Harris path of the critical binary Galton-Watson tree $\text{GW}(0, \gamma)$ can be rescaled to converge to excursion of the standard Brownian motion [13, 15].)*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Ed Waymire for his continuing support and encouragement. YK wishes to thank Tom Kurtz for providing a feedback regarding infinite dimensional population processes during the workshop *Interplay of Stochastic and Deterministic Dynamics* at the Mathematical Biosciences Institute (MBI) held February 22-26, 2016. The authors would like to thank Jim Pitman for suggesting relevant publications. We thank the participants of the conference *Random Trees and Maps : Probabilistic and Combinatorial Aspects*, June 6-10, 2016, Centre International de Rencontres Mathématiques (CIRM), Marseille, France, and the *31st Conference on Mathematical Geophysics* of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, June 6-10, 2016, Paris, France to whom we presented an early version of this work.

REFERENCES

1. D. J. Aldous, *Deterministic and stochastic models for coalescence (aggregation and coagulation): a review of the mean-field theory for probabilists*, Bernoulli, **5** (1999) 3–48.
2. N. Berestycki, *Recent progress in coalescent theory*, Ensaios Matemáticos, **16** (2009) 1–193.
3. J. Bertoin, *Random Fragmentation and Coagulation Processes*, Cambridge University Press, (2006).
4. G. A. Burd, E. C. Waymire, R. D. Winn, *A self-similar invariance of critical binary Galton-Watson trees*, Bernoulli, **6** (2000) 1–21.
5. L. Devroye, P. Kruszewski, *A note on the Horton-Strahler number for random trees*, Inform. Processing Lett., **56** (1994) 95–99.

6. P. S. Dodds, D. H. Rothman, *Scaling, Universality, and Geomorphology*, Ann. Rev. Earth and Planet. Sci., **28** (2000) 571–610.
7. S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz, *Markov Processes. Characterization and convergence* Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York (1986) MR0838085.
8. T. E. Harris, *First passage and recurrence distribution*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **73** (1952) 471–486.
9. R. E. Horton, *Erosional development of streams and their drainage basins: Hydrophysical approach to quantitative morphology* Geol. Soc. Am. Bull., **56** (1945) 275–370.
10. Y. Kovchegov and I. Zaliapin, *Horton Law in Self-Similar Trees* Fractals, **24**(2) (2016) 1650017.
11. Y. Kovchegov and I. Zaliapin, *Horton self-similarity of Kingman’s coalescent tree* to appear in the Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques (2017)
12. T. G. Kurtz, *Approximation of population processes*, SIAM, **36** (1981).
13. J. F. Le Gall, *The uniform random tree in a Brownian excursion*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, **96** (1993) 369–383.
14. J. F. Le Gall, *Random trees and applications*, Probability Surveys, **2** (2005) 245–311.
15. J. Neveu and J. Pitman, *Renewal property of the extrema and tree property of the excursion of a one-dimensional Brownian motion* Séminaire de Probabilités XXIII, **1372** of the series Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 239-247 (1989).
16. W. I. Newman, D. L. Turcotte, A. M. Gabrielov, *Fractal trees with side branching* Fractals, **5** (1997) 603–614.
17. S. D. Peckham, *New results for self-similar trees with applications to river networks* Water Resources Res., **31** (1995) 1023–1029.
18. J. Pitman, *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1875** Springer-Verlag (2006).
19. R. L. Shreve, *Statistical law of stream numbers* J. Geol., **74** (1966) 17–37.
20. R. L. Shreve, *Infinite topologically random channel networks*. J. Geol., **75** (1967) 178–186.
21. A. N. Strahler, *Quantitative analysis of watershed geomorphology* Trans. Am. Geophys. Un., **38** (1957) 913–920.
22. E. Tokunaga, *Consideration on the composition of drainage networks and their evolution* Geographical Rep. Tokyo Metro. Univ., **13** (1978) 1–27.
23. S. A. Veitzer, and V. K. Gupta, *Random self-similar river networks and derivations of generalized Horton Laws in terms of statistical simple scaling*, Water Resour. Res., **36**(4) (2000) 10331048, doi:10.1029/1999WR900327.
24. X. G. Viennot, *Trees everywhere*. In CAAP’90 (pp. 18-41), Springer Berlin Heidelberg (1990).
25. I. Zaliapin and Y. Kovchegov, *Tokunaga and Horton self-similarity for level set trees of Markov chains* Chaos, Solitons & Fractals, **45**(3) (2012) 358–372.
26. S. Zanardo, I. Zaliapin, and E. Foufoula-Georgiou, *Are American rivers Tokunaga self-similar? New results on fluvial network topology and its climatic dependence*. J. Geophys. Res., **118** (2013) 166–183.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, CORVALLIS, OR 97331

E-mail address: kovchegy@math.oregonstate.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, NV, 89557-0084,
USA

E-mail address: zal@unr.edu