

The Critical Beta-splitting Random Tree II: Overview and Open Problems

David J. Aldous*

March 7, 2023

Abstract

In the critical beta-splitting model of a random n -leaf rooted tree, clades are recursively split into sub-clades, and a clade of m leaves is split into sub-clades containing i and $m - i$ leaves with probabilities $\propto 1/(i(m - i))$. This article provides an extensive overview of structure theory and explicit quantitative aspects. There is a canonical embedding into a continuous-time model, that is a random tree CTCS(n) on n leaves with real-valued edge lengths, and this model turns out more convenient to study. We show that the family (CTCS(n), $n \geq 2$) is consistent under a “delete random leaf and prune” operation. That leads to an explicit inductive construction of (CTCS(n), $n \geq 2$) as n increases. An accompanying technical article [5] studies in detail (with perhaps surprising precision) many distributions relating to the heights of leaves, via analytic methods. We give alternative probabilistic proofs for some such results, which provides an opportunity for a “compare and contrast” discussion of the two methodologies. We prove existence of the limit *fringe distribution* relative to a random leaf, whose graphical representation is essentially the format of the cladogram representation of biological phylogenies. We describe informally the scaling limit process, as a process of splitting the continuous interval $(0, 1)$. These topics are somewhat analogous to those topics which have been well studied in the context of the Brownian continuum random tree. Many open problems remain.

1 Introduction

This project revisits an old model, the *beta-splitting model* introduced in [4], and specifically the critical case, mentioned there but not subsequently studied. The

*Department of Statistics, 367 Evans Hall # 3860, U.C. Berkeley CA 94720; aldousdj@berkeley.edu; www.stat.berkeley.edu/users/aldous.

general setting is a certain class of probability models for n -leaf rooted binary trees. For each $m \geq 2$, specify a probability distribution $(q(m, i), 1 \leq i \leq m - 1)$ with the symmetry condition $q(m, i) \equiv q(m, m - i)$. Given n , construct the random tree by specifying that there is a left edge and a right edge at the root, leading to a left subtree which will have L_n leaves and a right subtree which will have $R_n = n - L_n$ leaves, where L_n (and also R_n , by symmetry) has distribution $q(n, \cdot)$. Continue recursively; a subtree which will have $m \geq 2$ leaves is split into two subtrees of random size from the distribution $q(m, \cdot)$; continue until reaching subtrees of size 1, which are leaves.




Figure 1: Equivalent representations of a realization of DTCS(20).

The construction is illustrated in Figure 1. On the left side the construction is represented as a process of recursively splitting the discrete interval $[1, 2, \dots, n]$, stopping when reaching a singleton. In the center and the right side the construction is represented as a tree. The interval-splitting representation is mathematically convenient, as a minimal precise formalization of the verbal description above. The tree representation is by itself rather ambiguous regarding what precise mathematical structure is intended, but for large n is more human-comprehensible – we do not know how to draw the $n = 400$ case (see Figure 2 later) as interval-splitting in a comprehensible way. However there is an extensive literature (see e.g. [9, 25, 27, 28]) on many different aspects of many different models of random trees, so regarding our structure as a tree suggests aspects of our model to be studied and compared with other models. In the continuous model later, we will find it most intuitive to visualize trees as on the right side of Figure 1.

The main context in which trees with a specified number of leaves have arisen is as phylogenetic trees in evolutionary biology: that is “deep background” to

this article but is not addressed here except in occasional comments. We do find it convenient to adopt the biological term *clade* for the set of leaves in a subtree, that is the elements in a subinterval somewhere in the interval-splitting process. So the 6th level upwards in the left side of Figure 1 shows the 4 clades $\{5, 6\}$, $\{7\}$, $\{9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17\}$, $\{18, 19\}$ containing 14 leaves; these correspond on the right side to the 4 “lines of descent” at that level, and correspond to the numbers of leaves in each associated subtree.

The particular case we will study is the case where $q(n, i) \propto \frac{1}{i(n-i)}$. Writing $\frac{1}{i(n-i)} = (\frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{n-i})/n$ allows us to identify the normalization constant, leading to:

$$q(n, i) = \frac{n}{2h_{n-1}} \frac{1}{i(n-i)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \quad (1)$$

where h_{n-1} is the harmonic sum $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} 1/i$. Let us call this the *discrete-time critical splitting* (DTCS(n)) model on n leaves. In an abuse of notation, we write DTCS(n) (and analogous models later) for both the random process and for its distribution, as should be clear from context.

1.1 Outline of results

- In section 2 we argue that there is a canonical way to embed the discrete-time DTCS(n) model into a continuous-time model (which we call CTCS(n)) by specifying that a clade of size $m \geq 2$ is split at rate h_{m-1} . This has a key property (Proposition 1), that the height of the branchpoint between the paths to two distinct random leaves has exactly Exponential(1) distribution.
- The family of random trees (CTCS(n), $n \geq 2$) have the consistency property (Theorem 2) that if we delete one random leaf from CTCS($n+1$) and re-prune then we get CTCS(n). This provides a natural joint distribution, which gives a canonical way to construct CTCS($n+1$) from CTCS(n) via a simple algorithm. Section 3 gives the explicit description of this inductive construction of (CTCS(n), $n \geq 2$).
- Consider the height D_n of a uniform random leaf in the CTCS(n) model. It is easy to see that D_n is the absorption time at state 1, starting at state n , for the continuous-time Markov process $(X_t^{(n)})$ on states $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ with transition rates

$$\lambda_{m,i} = \frac{1}{m-i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m-1, \quad m \geq 2. \quad (2)$$

This structure enables many results related to D_n to be obtained in an accompanying article [5] via analytic (analysis of recursions) methods, extending the

fundamental asymptotic result $\mathbb{E}D_n \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log n$ in many directions with great precision. Those results are summarized in section 4.1.

- In section 5 we give an alternative probabilistic argument that readers may find more intuitive. One readily sees the approximation

$$\log X_t^{(n)} \approx \log n - Y_t$$

where (Y_t) is a certain subordinator with $\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = \pi^2/6$. Bounding the approximation error leads to the fundamental result above and, via a martingale CLT, one obtains a CLT for D_n . In parallel we repeat some of the simpler “analysis of recurrences” arguments from [5], hoping this article may be useful as a pedagogical example to compare and contrast those methods. We also discuss bounds and heuristics for the maximum leaf height, which remains an open problem.

- In section 6 we prove existence of the limits of the occupation probabilities

$$a(i) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_t^{(n)} = i \text{ for some } t).$$

These numbers determine the distribution of the limit *fringe process* of CTCS(n), that is the local weak limit relative to a random leaf. Coincidentally this is the way that real-world phylogenies are drawn as *cladograms*, and we illustrate a real example alongside a realization of our model. Alas our coupling proof does not give an explicit formula for the $a(i)$.

- In section 7 we discuss the total length of CTCS(n), which remains an open problem.
- In section 8 we informally describe the scaling limit of $(\text{CTCS}(n), n \geq 2)$, which is a process of splitting of the continuous interval $(0, 1)$ with a corresponding continuum tree. We discuss analogies with the Brownian continuum random tree.
- Development of this project has substantially benefitted from extensive interaction with Boris Pittel.

1.2 Remarks on the model

The theme of [4] was to introduce the *beta-splitting model*

$$q(n, i) = \frac{1}{a_n(\beta)} \frac{\Gamma(\beta + i + 1)\Gamma(\beta + n - i + 1)}{\Gamma(i + 1)\Gamma(n - i + 1)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \quad (3)$$

with a parameter $-2 \leq \beta \leq \infty$ and normalizing constant $a_n(\beta)$. The qualitative behavior of the model is different for $\beta > -1$ than for $\beta < -1$; in the former case the height (number of edges to the root) of a typical leaf grows as order $\log n$, and in the latter case as order $n^{-\beta-1}$. In this article we are studying the *critical* case $\beta = -1$, with two motivations.

(a) A stochastic model, at a critical¹ parameter value separating qualitatively different behaviors (loosely called a “phase transition” by analogy with statistical physics), often has mathematically interesting special properties: is this true in our setting?

(b) Second, our small-scale study of real phylogenetic trees in [6] suggested that, amongst all splits of clades of size m , the median size of the smaller subclade scales roughly as $m^{1/2}$. The $\beta = -1$ case of our model has this property (from (1) above). And our model does seem to match qualitative features of real large phylogenetic trees – see Figure 9. The general beta-splitting model is often² mentioned in the mathematical biology literature on phylogenetics as one of several simple stochastic models. See [26, 32] for recent overviews of that literature. Obviously it is biologically unsatisfactory by not being a forward-in-time model of extinctions and speciations, and indeed the latter type of model with age-dependent speciation rates is more plausible and can match the shapes of real trees quite well [21], though whether one can identify rates uniquely remains a contentious issue [30]. Is the qualitative similarity of these different models just a coincidence, or is there some mathematical connection between the models?

2 The canonical continuous-time embedding

One can embed the DTCS(n) model into the continuous-time Markov branching process in which, for each $m \leq n$, a size- m clade splits (independently of other splits and according to the distribution $q(m, \cdot)$ at (1)) at some rate $r(m, n)$ to be specified. Let us argue that the canonical choice is $r(m, n) = h_{m-1}$.

In this continuous process write $(X_n(i, t), i \geq 1)$ for the clade sizes at time t and consider

$$Q_n(t) = \sum_i X_n^2(i, t).$$

Note that, when a size- m clade is split, the effect on sum-of-squares of clade sizes

¹But note that *critical* in our context is quite different from the usual *critical* in the context of branching processes or percolation.

²[4] has 287 citations on Google Scholar.

has expectation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (m^2 - i^2 - (m-i)^2) q(m, i) = \frac{m}{2h_{m-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} 2 = \frac{m(m-1)}{h_{m-1}}. \quad (4)$$

So

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(t) - Q_n(t+dt)|\mathcal{F}_t] = \sum_i r(X_n(i, t), n) \frac{X_n(i, t)(X_n(i, t) - 1)}{h_{X_n(i, t)-1}} dt.$$

So by choosing $r(m, n) = h_{m-1}$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(t) - Q_n(t+dt)|\mathcal{F}_t] = (Q_n(t) - n) dt.$$

Because $Q_n(0) = n^2$ we obtain the exact formula

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(t)] = n + (n^2 - n)e^{-t}, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty. \quad (5)$$

So let us adopt $r(m, n) = h_{m-1}$ as our choice of rates, and shift our focus to this *continuous-time critical splitting* CTCS(n) model on n leaves. Figure 2 shows a simulation with $n = 400$. The simple form of (5) is a first reason for designating the choice $r(m, n) = h_{m-1}$ as *canonical*, and the reformulation in Proposition 1 below reinforces this choice.

Regarding terminology, remember that “time” and “height” are the same: within the construction of CTCS(n) for fixed n , the height³ of a leaf is the time at which its clade becomes a singleton, and the height of a split between clades is the time at which the split occurs. Within the mathematical analysis of random processes we generally follow the usual “time” convention, while in stating results we generally use the tree-related terminology of “height”.

Proposition 1 *Let B_n denote the height of the branchpoint between the paths to two uniform random distinct leaves of CTCS(n). Then, for each $n \geq 2$, B_n has exactly Exponential(1) distribution.*

Proof. In the notation above, the conditional probability that both sampled leaves are in clade i at time t equals $\frac{1}{n(n-1)} X_n(i, t)(X_n(i, t) - 1)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(B_n > t) &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i X_n(i, t)(X_n(i, t) - 1)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \mathbb{E}[Q_n(t) - n] \\ &= e^{-t} \text{ by (5).} \end{aligned}$$

³Or depth, if one draws trees upside-down.




Figure 2: A realization of the tree-representation of the CTCS(n) model with $n = 400$. Drawn as in Figure 1 (center), so the width of subtrees above a given time level are the sizes of clades at that time.




Figure 3: Schematic for a spanning tree on $k = 10$ leaves within $CTCS(n)$ for some $n \gg k$ (left) and the corresponding pruned tree $PRU(n,k)$ (right).

2.1 Spanning trees and pruned trees

Thinking of the $CTCS(n)$ process as partitioning the n -element set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, considering the induced partitioning process on a given k -element subset. Visualizing the process as a tree, the induced process is a spanning tree on k given leaves, which will qualitatively resemble the left tree in Figure 3. In terms of the interval-splitting process, the left tree indicates at each time the partition of those k leaves into “same interval”, continued in time (for each of those k leaves) until it is a singleton within the $CTCS(n)$ process. On the right side of Figure 3 is the corresponding “pruned” spanning tree where (for each of those k leaves) we stop when it is the only one of the k leaves in its interval. Graphically, this means we cut back each terminal branch to where it branched off the rest of the tree, and indicate that position as a *bud*. Applying this operation with k uniform distinct random leaves gives a random “pruned” tree we will call $PRU(n,k)$.

Terminology note. Visualizing the tree as in Figure 3 (right), and because the inductive construction in section 3 “grows” a tree, it is more evocative to use the word *bud* instead of *leaf* in the pruning and growing context. But these mean the same.

Now the structure of a pruned tree is represented in Figure 3 (right) as an instance of $PRU(n,10)$ with 4 *side-buds* and 3 pairs of *terminal buds*. This mathe-

mathematical structure is of the same form as the trees in Figure 1 (right) and Figure 2, merely drawn slightly differently – the horizontal lines in those figures are replaced by the buds. And the pruning operation with $n = k$ has no effect: $\text{PRU}(k,k)$ is just the $\text{CTCS}(k)$ tree itself.

Our main “structural” result is

Theorem 2 $\text{PRU}(k+1,k) = \text{CTCS}(k)$ (in distribution), for each $k \geq 2$.

That is, our family $(\text{CTCS}(k), k \geq 2)$ is consistent under the “delete random leaf and prune” operation, so $\text{PRU}(n,k) = \text{CTCS}(k)$ for all $n > k$. To see intuitively why this should be true, two random distinct leaves of $\text{PRU}(n,k)$ are two random distinct leaves of $\text{CTCS}(n)$, and so by Proposition 1 the height of their branchpoint has Exponential(1) distribution. Any limit $\text{PRU}(\infty, k) = \lim_n \text{PRU}(n, k)$ must share that property, and – because it would be remarkable if there were some random tree distribution other than $\text{CTCS}(k)$ with that property – one expects that limit to be $\text{CTCS}(k)$. But the family $(\text{PRU}(\infty, k), k \geq 2)$ automatically has the consistency property, by construction.

We believe there should be some “soft” proof of Theorem 2 based on the fact [4] that the distribution $q(n, \cdot)$ arises via the first split of n i.i.d. Uniform(0,1) points when the interval is split according to the (improper) density $1/(x(1-x))$. But we have been unable to produce a satisfactory argument along those lines. A more abstract and general approach to sampling consistency was introduced in [20] (see [23] for recent developments) and Theorem 2 seems implicit in that work. Instead, in this article we will prove Theorem 2 in the next section by explicit calculation of the distributions, which will allow us to give an explicit inductive construction of $(\text{CTCS}(n), n \geq 2)$.

Remark. If we did not prune, that is if we studied spanning trees as in Figure 3 (left), then the k terminal branches would become infinite in the $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit (as will be quantified in section 4). This is why we work with the side-buds and terminal-buds representation of a tree.

3 The inductive construction

Given the consistency property in Theorem 2, the joint distribution $(\text{CTCS}(n+1), \text{PRU}(n+1, n) = \text{CTCS}(n))$ will determine the associated conditional distribution of $\text{CTCS}(n+1)$ given $\text{CTCS}(n)$ which turns out to be described by a simple algorithm. We will prove Theorem 2 via explicit formulas for the distributions, which will immediately provide the conditional distributions.

We work with the pruned representation of a tree, so we should be careful about what it means for two trees to be the same or different.. First, the left/right distinction matters; switching gives a different tree (because edge-lengths in our model are independent Exponentials, different edges cannot have the same length), and switching a side-bud to the other side gives a different tree. But buds are unlabelled, so switching the two buds in a bud-pair gives the same tree.

Consider a pair of trees $(\mathbf{t}_n, \mathbf{t}_{n+1})$ which are a feasible realization of $(\text{CTCS}(n), \text{CTCS}(n+1))$ in which \mathbf{t}_n has arisen from \mathbf{t}_{n+1} via the “delete a bud and prune” operation. So \mathbf{t}_{n+1} arises by adding a new bud to \mathbf{t}_n , which can happen in one of three qualitative ways, illustrated in Figure 4. The new leaf is either a side-bud (case **a** in Figure 4) attached at the interior of some existing edge, or involves what we will call a branch extension (case **b**), in which one bud of a terminal pair grows into a new branch to a terminal pair of buds, or is a *side-leaf extension* (case **c**) in which a side-bud grows into a new branch with two terminal buds.




Figure 4: Possible transitions from $\text{CTCS}(10)$ to $\text{CTCS}(11)$: the added bud is \bullet .

We will do explicit calculations for $(\text{CTCS}(3), \text{CTCS}(4))$ in the following section. This enables one to guess the inductive algorithm, which we state and verify for general n in section 3.2.

3.1 A starting step

The distribution of CTCS(n) is specified by the shape of the tree and the probability density of the edge-lengths. For $n = 3$ there are only two possible shapes, as \mathbf{t} in Figure 5 and as its “reflection” with the side-bud on the left instead of the right. There are two edge-lengths (a, b) . Clearly the density of CTCS(3) is

$$f(\mathbf{t}; a, b) = \frac{1}{2}h_2e^{-h_2a} \cdot e^{-b}; \quad 0 < a, b < \infty \quad (6)$$

and the probability of \mathbf{t} is $1/2$. There are 7 shapes of CTCS(4) that are consistent with this \mathbf{t} , shown as $\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \mathbf{t}_3, \mathbf{t}_4$ in Figure 5, together with the “reflected” forms of \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4 (the added side-bud involves the other side; drawn as $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{t}}_3, \hat{\mathbf{t}}_4$) which will be accounted for as $q(\cdot, \cdot) + q(\cdot, \cdot)$ terms in the calculation below.⁴ The densities of these shapes involve 3 edge-lengths (a, b, c) , calculated below as $f_i^+(a, b, c)$. We also calculate the marginals $f_i(a, b) = \int f_i^+(a, b, c) dc$.

The consistency assertion that we wish to verify is the assertion, for $f = f(\mathbf{t}; \cdot, \cdot)$ as at (6),

$$f \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{1}{4}f_1 + \frac{2}{4}f_2 + \frac{1}{4}f_3 + \frac{2}{4}f_4 \quad (7)$$

where the fractions denote the probability that deleting a random bud gives \mathbf{t} with the given edge-lengths (a, b) . From the definition of CTCS(4) we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^+(a, b, c) &= (q(4, 1) + q(4, 3)) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3c} \cdot q(3, 2) \cdot h_2e^{-h_2(a-c)} \cdot e^{-b} \\ f_1(a, b) &= (q(4, 1) + q(4, 3)) \cdot h_3 \cdot 3(1 - e^{-a/3}) \cdot q(3, 2) \cdot h_2e^{-h_2a} \cdot e^{-b} \\ &= 3(e^{-h_2a} - e^{-h_3a}) \cdot e^{-b} \\ f_2^+(a, b, c) &= q(4, 2) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3a} \cdot e^{-b}e^{-c} \\ f_2(a, b) &= q(4, 2) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3a} \cdot e^{-b} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}e^{-h_3a} \cdot e^{-b} \\ f_3^+(a, b, c) &= q(4, 3) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3a} \cdot (q(3, 2) + q(3, 1)) \cdot h_2e^{-h_2c} \cdot e^{-(b-c)} \\ f_3(a, b) &= q(4, 3) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3a} \cdot (q(3, 2) + q(3, 1)) \cdot h_2 \cdot 2(1 - e^{-b/2}) \cdot e^{-b} \\ &= 2e^{-h_3a}(1 - e^{-b/2}) \cdot e^{-b} \\ f_4^+(a, b, c) &= q(4, 3) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3a} \cdot (q(3, 2) + q(3, 1)) \cdot h_2e^{-h_2b} \cdot e^{-c} \\ f_4(a, b) &= q(4, 3) \cdot h_3e^{-h_3a} \cdot (q(3, 2) + q(3, 1)) \cdot h_2e^{-h_2b} \\ &= e^{-h_3a} \cdot e^{-h_2b}. \end{aligned}$$

From this we can verify (7).

⁴That is, f_1^+ is the density of \mathbf{t}_1 plus the density of $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_1$.




Figure 5: The possible transitions from t : the added bud is \bullet .

This argument is not so illuminating, but we can immediately derive the conditional distribution of CTCS(4) given that CTCS(3) is (\mathbf{t}, a, b) . Writing $g_i(c|a, b)$ for the conditional density of shape \mathbf{t}_i or $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$ and additional edge length c , and $p(\mathbf{t}_i|a, b) = \int g_i(c|a, b) dc$ for the conditional probability of shape \mathbf{t}_i or $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(c|a, b) &= \frac{\frac{1}{4}f_1(a, b, c)}{f(a, b)} = \frac{1}{3}e^{-c/3}; & p(\mathbf{t}_1|a, b) &= 1 - e^{-a/3} \\ g_2(c|a, b) &= \frac{\frac{1}{2}f_2(a, b, c)}{f(a, b)} = \frac{1}{3}e^{-a/3} \cdot e^{-c}; & p(\mathbf{t}_2|a, b) &= \frac{1}{3}e^{-a/3} \\ g_3(c|a, b) &= \frac{\frac{1}{4}f_3(a, b, c)}{f(a, b)} = \frac{1}{3}e^{-a/3} \cdot e^{-c/2}; & p(\mathbf{t}_3|a, b) &= \frac{2}{3}e^{-a/3}(1 - e^{-b/2}) \\ g_4(c|a, b) &= \frac{\frac{1}{2}f_4(a, b, c)}{f(a, b)} = \frac{2}{3}e^{-a/3}e^{-b/2} \cdot e^{-c}; & p(\mathbf{t}_4|a, b) &= \frac{2}{3}e^{-a/3} \cdot e^{-b/2}. \end{aligned}$$

One can now see that these are the conditional probabilities that arise from the algorithm below, with $k = 3$.

The inductive algorithm. Given a realization of CTCS(k) for some $k \geq 2$:

- Pick a uniform random bud; move up the path from the root toward that bud. A “stop” event occurs at rate = $1/(\text{size of sub-clade from current position})$.
- If “stop” before reaching the target bud, make a side-bud at that point, random on left or right. (As in \mathbf{t}_1 or \mathbf{t}_3 above).
- Otherwise, extend the target bud into a branch of Exponential(1) length to make a bud-pair. (As in \mathbf{t}_4 above).

Figure 5 indicated three of these possibilities ($\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_3, \mathbf{t}_4$) when the chosen target bud was at the top right. The “rate” is $1/3$ until the side-bud, and then $1/2$. Note that case \mathbf{t}_2 arises as an “extend the target bud” for a different target bud.

3.2 The general step

To set up a calculation, we consider the side-bud case first, illustrated by the example in Figure 6, where the left diagram shows the relevant part of \mathbf{t}_n and the right diagram shows the side-bud addition making \mathbf{t}_{n+1} . The ℓ_i are edge-lengths and the (n_i) are clade sizes. The side-bud is attached to some edge, in the Figure an edge at edge-height 4 with length ℓ_4 and defining a clade of size $n_4 \geq 2$. The new bud splits that edge into edges of length α and $\ell_4 - \alpha$. The probability density function

on a given tree is a product of terms for each edge. Table 1 shows the terms for the edges where the terms differ between the two trees – these are only the edges on the path from the root to the added bud. The first three lines in Table 1 refer to the edges below the old edge into which the new bud is inserted, and the bottom line refers to that old edge.




Figure 6: Growing via a side-bud addition

left tree	right tree
$h_{n_1-1} \exp(-h_{n_1-1} \ell_1) d\ell_1 \cdot q(n_1, n_2)$	$h_{n_1} \exp(-h_{n_1} \ell_1) d\ell_1 \cdot q(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$
$h_{n_2-1} \exp(-h_{n_2-1} \ell_2) d\ell_2 \cdot q(n_2, n_3)$	$h_{n_2} \exp(-h_{n_2} \ell_2) d\ell_2 \cdot q(n_2 + 1, n_3 + 1)$
$h_{n_3-1} \exp(-h_{n_3-1} \ell_3) d\ell_3 \cdot q(n_3, n_4)$	$h_{n_3} \exp(-h_{n_3} \ell_3) d\ell_3 \cdot q(n_3 + 1, n_4 + 1)$
$h_{n_4-1} \exp(-h_{n_4-1} \ell_4) d\ell_4$	$h_{n_4} \exp(-h_{n_4} \alpha) d\alpha \cdot q(n_4 + 1, 1)$ $\cdot h_{n_4-1} \exp(-h_{n_4-1} (\ell_4 - \alpha)) d\ell_4$

Table 1: Differing terms in density product (side-bud case)

$h_{n_4-1} \exp(-h_{n_4-1} \ell_4) d\ell_4$	$h_{n_4} \exp(-h_{n_4} \ell_4) d\ell_4 \cdot q(n_4 + 1, 1)$ $\cdot h_1 \exp(-h_1 \beta) d\beta$
---	--

Table 2: Differing terms in density product (branch extension case)

Because $h_{n-1}q(n, k) = \frac{n}{2k(n-k)}$ the ratios right/left of each of the first 3 lines in Table 1 equal

$$\frac{n_i + 1}{n_i} \cdot \frac{n_{i+1}}{n_{i+1} + 1} \cdot \exp(-\ell_i/n_i), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

The corresponding ratio for the final term equals

$$\frac{n_4 + 1}{2n_4} \cdot \exp(-\alpha/n_4) d\alpha.$$

Combining terms, the ratio of densities equals

$$\frac{n + 1}{2n} \cdot \exp(-\ell_1/n_1 - \ell_2/n_2 - \ell_3/n_3 - \alpha/n_4) d\alpha.$$

In obtaining \mathbf{t}_n from \mathbf{t}_{n+1} we chose one of $n + 1$ buds to delete, so finally the conditional density of CTCS(n+1) given CTCS(n) at $(\mathbf{t}_{n+1}|\mathbf{t}_n)$ equals

$$\frac{1}{2n} \cdot \exp(-\ell_1/n_1 - \ell_2/n_2 - \ell_3/n_3 - \alpha/n_4) d\alpha. \quad (8)$$

We need to check that this agrees with the inductive algorithm. According to the algorithm, the conditional density is a product of terms

- n_4/n : the chance that the target bud is in the relevant clade;
- $\exp(-\ell_1/n_1 - \ell_2/n_2 - \ell_3/n_3)$: the chance of not stopping before reaching the edge of length ℓ_4 ;
- $\frac{1}{n_4} \exp(-\alpha/n_4) d\alpha$: the chance of stopping in $d\alpha$;
- $1/2$: chance of placing side-bud on right side.

And this agrees with (8).

That was the side-bud case. Now consider the “branch extension” case, illustrated in Figure 7. In this case, \mathbf{t}_n has an edge terminating in two buds. Then \mathbf{t}_{n+1} is obtained by extending the branch by an extra edge of some length β to an two terminal buds, leaving one bud as a side-bud. Comparing the densities of \mathbf{t}_n and \mathbf{t}_{n+1} in this case, the first 3 lines are the same as in Table 1, and the 4th is shown in Table 2. Following the previous argument we derive the conditional density in a format similar to (8):

$$\frac{1}{2n} \cdot \exp(-\ell_1/n_1 - \ell_2/n_2 - \ell_3/n_3 - \ell_4/n_4 - \beta) d\beta. \quad (9)$$

Again this is agrees with the inductive algorithm. The third case, the side-leaf extension, is similar.




Figure 7: Growing via a branch extension

3.3 Exploiting the inductive construction?

One might expect to be able to exploit the inductive construction to prove asymptotic results, but we have been unable to do so, yet. One possibility is outlined in section 7.1. Another possibility: the construction is reminiscent of other structures where martingales play a useful role, for instance urn models [29] and branching process and branching random walk [31], so

Open Problem 1 *Is there a useful martingale associated with the inductive construction?*

4 Heights in the CTCS model

To start our study of quantitative aspects of CTCS(n), let us consider heights of leaves. What can we say about the height D_n of a uniform random leaf ℓ ? Figure 2 suggests that D_n increases slowly with n .

We can characterize D_n in an alternate way, as follows. The sequence of clade sizes along the path from the root to ℓ is the discrete-time Markov chain, starting in state n , whose transition ($m \rightarrow i$) probabilities $q^*(m, i)$ are obtained by size-biasing the $q(m, \cdot)$ distribution; so

$$q^*(m, i) := \frac{2i}{m}q(m, i) = \frac{1}{h_{m-1}} \frac{1}{m-i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m-1, \quad m \geq 2 \quad (10)$$

from (1). Because the continuous-time CTCS process exits m at rate h_{m-1} , the continuous-time process of clade sizes along the path is the continuous-time Markov process on states $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ with transition rates

$$\lambda_{m,i} = \frac{1}{m-i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m-1, \quad m \geq 2 \quad (11)$$

with state 1 absorbing. So D_n is the absorption time for this chain, started at state n . Let us call this the *size-bias* chain.

4.1 Results from analysis of recursions

From (11) one can write down a recurrence for $t_n := \mathbb{E}D_n$:

$$t_n = \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} q^*(n, i)t_i = \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{t_i}{n-i} \right) \quad (12)$$

with $t_1 = 0$. And there are similar recurrences for variance and Laplace transform of D_n . In the accompanying article [5], purely analytic (that is, no use of random variables) methods are used to obtain surprisingly precise asymptotics, based on the recurrences. But at the cost of considerable technical intricacy. We quote some main results.

Write $\zeta(\cdot)$ for the Riemann zeta-function, and recall that $\zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$. Write γ for the Euler constant: $\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{j} = \log n + \gamma + O(n^{-1})$. Asymptotics are as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 3 ([5])

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \log n + O(1) \quad (13)$$

$$\text{var}(D_n) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{2\zeta(3)}{\zeta^3(2)} \log n \quad (14)$$

and

$$\frac{D_n - \zeta^{-1}(2) \log n}{\sqrt{\frac{2\zeta(3)}{\zeta^3(2)} \log n}} \implies \text{Normal}(0, 1). \quad (15)$$

together with convergence of all moments. Moreover, contingent on a numerically supported “*h*-ansatz”

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] = \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} \log n + c_0 - \frac{1}{2\zeta(2)} n^{-1} + O(n^{-2}) \quad (16)$$

for a constant $c_0 = 0.7951556604\dots$ estimated numerically, and

$$\text{var}(D_n) = \frac{2\zeta(3)}{\zeta^3(2)} \log n + O(1).$$

The “*h*-ansatz” [5] essentially says that there is some expansion of form (16); then (remarkably) one can find the order n^{-1} coefficient explicitly, without knowing c_0 explicitly.

Figure 8 shows the Normal distribution emerging.




Figure 8: Histogram of leaf heights, relative to mean and s.d.; multiple simulations with $n = 3,200$.

Remark. Our D_n refers to the height of a leaf in $\text{CTCS}(n)$, that is the sum of edge-lengths on the path leading to the leaf. One can instead consider the number of edges, that is the *hop-length* D_n^{hop} or equivalently the height in the discrete-time model $\text{DTCS}(n)$. Results parallel to Theorem 3 for D_n^{hop} are given in [5]. In particular

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n^{\text{hop}}] \sim \frac{1}{2\zeta(2)} \log^2 n. \quad (17)$$

Informally, this is consistent with the result $\mathbb{E}[D_n] \sim \frac{1}{2\zeta(2)} \log n$ for CTCS(n), as follows. One $\log n$ term is the initial speed-up. The factor of 2 arises because, on the scale of time (= log(clade size) - see section 5) the relative speed in continuous time decreases linearly from 1 to 0. See also (52) later.

4.2 Decomposition of variance

Here we discuss another result proved in [5] but not discussed there. In the tree model, D_n arises from two levels of randomness, as the distance $d(U_n, \mathbb{T}_n)$ within a random tree \mathbb{T}_n from the root to a uniform random leaf U_n of that tree. Write $a(\mathbb{T}_n)$ for the average height of the n leaves of \mathbb{T}_n . The law of total variance says

$$\text{var}[D_n] = \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(d(U_n, \mathbb{T}_n) | \mathbb{T}_n)] + \text{var}[a(\mathbb{T}_n)]. \quad (18)$$

The first term of the right indicates the “within tree” variability of leaf height, and the second term indicates the “between trees” variability. As a standard technique, one can calculate as follows. Consider two independent uniform random leaves $(U_n^{(1)}, U_n^{(2)})$ of the *same* realization \mathbb{T}_n . Then

$$\mathbb{E}[d(U_n^{(1)}, \mathbb{T}_n) \cdot d(U_n^{(2)}, \mathbb{T}_n) | \mathbb{T}_n] = a^2(\mathbb{T}_n) \quad \text{by independence}$$

$$\text{var}[a(\mathbb{T}_n)] = \mathbb{E}[a^2(\mathbb{T}_n)] - (\mathbb{E}[D_n])^2.$$

Putting these identities together, if we define

$$r_n := \frac{\text{var}[a(\mathbb{T}_n)]}{\text{var}[D_n]}$$

meaning the proportion of total variance that arises from “between tree” variability, then we can calculate r_n via

$$r_n := \frac{\mathbb{E}[d(U_n^{(1)}, \mathbb{T}_n) \cdot d(U_n^{(2)}, \mathbb{T}_n)] - (\mathbb{E}[D_n])^2}{\text{var}[D_n]}$$

which is simply the correlation between the heights of two independent random leaves in the same tree.⁵

Theorem 4 ([5]) *Assuming the h-ansatz*

$$r_\infty := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \frac{\gamma \zeta(2)}{2\zeta(3)} = 0.39494 \dots,$$

Open Problem 2 *Prove the CLT for $a(\mathbb{T}_n)$.*

⁵In [5] this is stated for two distinct leaves, but the asymptotics are the same.

Open Problem 3 *Prove that there is a bivariate Gaussian limit for $(d(U_n^{(1)}, \mathbb{T}_n), d(U_n^{(2)}, \mathbb{T}_n))$ with correlation r_∞ .*

These could presumably be proved by the methods of [5], but there might be more intuitive proofs using the “probabilistic” methods of section 5.

4.3 An illustration of analysis of recursions

Here we digress to illustrate the methodology behind Theorem 3. We will copy the first steps of the proof of (13) in [5], to get the weaker result below. The proof uses only the recurrence for $t_n := \mathbb{E}D_n$ mentioned earlier:

$$t_n = \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{t_i}{n-i} \right) \quad (19)$$

with $t_1 = 0$. One can see the first order result $\mathbb{E}[D_n] \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log n$ heuristically by plugging $c \log n$ into the recursion and taking the natural first-order approximation to the right side; the constant c would emerge as the inverse of the constant

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\log(1/x)}{1-x} dx = \zeta(2) = \frac{\pi^2}{6} \quad (20)$$

and indeed this is how it emerges in the proof below.

Proposition 5

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log n + O(\log \log n) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. The proof involves three steps.

Step 1. We shall prove

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] \geq \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log n, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (21)$$

Setting $\tau_n = A \log n$ for $A = 6/\pi^2$, it suffices to show

$$\frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\tau_k}{n-k} \right) \geq \tau_n, \quad n \geq 2, \quad (22)$$

because then, by (19) and induction on n , $\mathbb{E}[D_n] \geq \tau_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, establishing

(21). We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\tau_k}{n-k} \right) &= \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{A \log k}{n-k} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + A(\log n)h_{n-1} + A \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\log(k/n)}{n(1-k/n)} \right) \\
&= \tau_n + \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + A \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\log(k/n)}{n(1-k/n)} \right) \\
&\geq \tau_n + \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 - A \int_0^1 \frac{\log(1/x)}{1-x} dx \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality holds because the integrand is positive and decreasing. So by (20), the choice $A = 6/\pi^2$ establishes (22).

Step 2. Let us prove

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] \leq f(n) := \max\{0, 1 + \log(n-1)\}. \quad (23)$$

This is true for $n = 1$ since $\mathbb{E}[D_n] = 0$. So, similarly to (22), it is enough to show that $f(n)$ satisfies

$$f(n) \geq \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{f(i)}{n-i} \right), \quad n \geq 2. \quad (24)$$

Since $f(x)$ is *concave* for $x > 1 + e^{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{f(i)}{n-i} \right) &\leq \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} + f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{i}{n-i} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} + f \left(n - \frac{n-1}{h_{n-1}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} + f(n) - f'(n) \left(\frac{n-1}{h_{n-1}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly $f(n)$, since $f'(x) = \frac{1}{x-1}$ for $x > 1$. The second inequality holds by concavity for $n \geq 3$ and by direct calculation for $n = 2$.

Step 3. Let $n_0 \geq 2$, and

$$A = A(n_0) := \left(\int_{1/n_0}^1 \frac{\log(1/x)}{1-x} dx \right)^{-1}, \quad B = B(n_0) := n_0^{\frac{2}{A \log 2} - 1}.$$

We shall prove

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] \leq A \log(nB), \quad n \geq 2. \quad (25)$$

This inequality certainly holds for $n \leq n_0$, because, by (23), for those n

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] \leq \frac{2}{\log 2} \log n = A \log n \cdot \frac{2}{A \log 2} = A \log \left(n^{\frac{2}{A \log 2}} \right) \leq A \log(nB).$$

Therefore it suffices to show that $\tau_n := A \log(nB)$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\tau_i}{n-i} \right) \leq \tau_n, \quad n > n_0.$$

Plugging $\tau_i = \tau_n - A \log(n/i)$ into the left side of the inequality above, we rewrite it as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\tau_i}{n-i} \right) &= \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 + A \log(nB) \cdot h_{n-1} - A \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\log(n/i)}{n(1-i/n)} \right) \\ &\leq A \log(nB) + \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 - A \int_{1/n}^1 \frac{\log(1/x)}{1-x} dx \right) \\ &\leq A \log(nB) + \frac{1}{h_{n-1}} \left(1 - A \int_{1/n_0}^1 \frac{\log(1/x)}{1-x} dx \right) \\ &= A \log(nB) = \tau_n. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (25).

Step 4. Note that $A(n_0) \leq \frac{6}{\pi^2} + O\left(\frac{\log n_0}{n_0}\right)$ and $\log B(n_0) = O(\log n_0)$. So choosing $n_0 = \lceil \log n \rceil$ we have

$$A(n_0) \log(nB(n_0)) \leq \left(\frac{6}{\pi^2} + O\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}\right) \right) (\log n + O(\log \log n)).$$

So (25) establishes the upper bound in Theorem 5, and (21) establishes the lower bound.

Discussion The seemingly naive idea is to replace a recurrence equality by a recurrence *inequality* for which an exact solution can be found and then to use it to upper bound the otherwise-unattainable solution of the recurrence *equality*. Needless to say, it is critically important to have a good guess as to how that “hidden” solution behaves asymptotically. The “probabilistic” heuristics below provide one way of making such guesses.

5 Probabilistic proofs of asymptotics of D_n

The informal approximation (27) below provides a simple intuitive explanation of why the CLT for D_n has this form. After justifying the approximation, we get less precise results than are obtained analytically in [5], but without requiring such intricate analysis.

5.1 Outline

Write $\mathbf{X} = (X_t, t \geq 0)$ for the continuous-time size-bias chain with rates (11), or $\mathbf{X}^{(n)} = (X_t^{(n)}, t \geq 0)$ for this chain starting with $X_0^{(n)} = n$. For the proof below we need only a weaker result than Proposition 5:

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n] \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log n \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (26)$$

The key idea is to study the process $\log \mathbf{X} = (\log X_t, t \geq 0)$. By considering its transitions one quickly sees that, for large n , there should be a good approximation

$$\log X_t^{(n)} \approx \log n - Y_t \text{ while } Y_t < \log n \quad (27)$$

where $(Y_t, 0 \leq t < \infty)$ is the subordinator with *Lévy measure* $\hat{\psi}_\infty$ and corresponding σ -finite density \hat{f}_∞ on $(0, \infty)$ defined as

$$\hat{\psi}_\infty[a, \infty) = -\log(1 - e^{-a}); \quad \hat{f}_\infty(a) = \frac{e^{-a}}{1 - e^{-a}}, \quad 0 < a < \infty. \quad (28)$$

Recall that a *subordinator* [7] is the continuous-time analog of the discrete-time process of partial sums of i.i.d. positive summands: informally

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+dt} - Y_t \in da) = \hat{f}_\infty(a) da dt.$$

Such a subordinator satisfies the law of large numbers

$$t^{-1}Y_t \rightarrow \rho \text{ a.s. as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (29)$$

where the limit is the mean

$$\rho = \int_0^\infty \hat{\psi}_\infty[a, \infty) da = \int_0^\infty -\log(1 - e^{-a}) da = \pi^2/6 \quad (30)$$

by essentially the same integral as at (20). Moreover the subordinator satisfies a central limit theorem, because the central limit theorem for renewal processes⁶ extends immediately to subordinators by considering integer times. So the approximation (27) suggests not only the “first-order” result (26) but also the desired second-order Gaussian limit. We restate (15) as follows.

⁶Commonly seen as a textbook exercise, e.g. [18] 10.6.3 or [12] 3.4.7

Theorem 6

$$\frac{D_n - \mu \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}} \rightarrow_d \text{Normal}(0, \mu^3 \sigma^2) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where

$$\mu := 1/\zeta(2) = 6/\pi^2 = 0.6079\dots; \quad \sigma^2 := 2\zeta(3) = 2.4040\dots$$

Our “probabilistic” proof of Theorem 6 will justify the approximation (27). The details are surprisingly lengthy, and likely the argument could be substantially streamlined. With a view towards proving further results such as Open Problems (2) and (3), we state

Open Problem 4 *Simplify the proofs in sections 5.2 and 5.3.*

The fact that the chain is decreasing causes some awkwardness in exposition, in that we use a “reflected” version of the subordinator.

5.2 The weak law of large numbers

Assume we know the result $\mathbb{E}[D_n] \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log n$, proved by a simple recurrence argument. Next we need the “weak law”

Lemma 7 $\frac{D_n}{\log n} \rightarrow_p 6/\pi^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

This follows from the variance estimate (14), which has a more intricate recurrence proof in [5]. Here is our “probability” proof.

Proof. The process $\log \mathbf{X}$ is itself Markov with transition rates described below. A jump⁷ of X from j to $j-i$ has height $-i$, which corresponds to a jump of $\log \mathbf{X}$ from $\log j$ having height $\log(j-i) - \log j = \log(1-i/j)$. Define the measure ψ_j on $(-\infty, 0)$ as the measure assigning weight $1/i$ to point $\log(1-i/j)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq j-1$. So this measure ψ_j specifies the heights and rates of the downward jumps of $\log X$ from $\log j$. Writing

$$\psi_j(-\infty, a] = \sum_{i=j(1-e^{-a})}^{j-1} 1/i$$

shows that there is a $j \rightarrow \infty$ limit measure in the sense

$$\psi_j(-\infty, a] \rightarrow \psi_\infty(-\infty, a] \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad -\infty < a < 0 \quad (31)$$

where the limit σ -finite measure ψ_∞ on $(-\infty, 0)$ is the “reflected” version of the measure $\hat{\psi}_\infty$ on $(0, \infty)$ at (28):

$$\psi_\infty(-\infty, a] := -\log(1-e^a), \quad f_\infty(a) = \frac{e^a}{1-e^a}, \quad -\infty < a < 0. \quad (32)$$

⁷Note these are *downward* jumps, so take negative values.

In fact we use only a one-sided bound in (31), which we will get by coupling, in two stages. We first define, for $j \geq 2$, a measure ν_j on $(-\infty, 0)$, whose total mass h_{j-1} is the same as the total mass of ψ_j , and where the reflected measures on $(0, \infty)$ satisfy the usual stochastic ordering $\hat{\psi}_j \preceq \hat{\nu}_j$ on the line, that is to say

$$\hat{\psi}_j[0, b] \geq \hat{\nu}_j[0, b], \quad 0 < b < \infty, \quad j \geq 2.$$

To define ν_j we simply take the mass $1/i$ of ψ_j at point $\log(1 - i/j)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq j - 1$, and spread the mass over the interval $[\log(1 - (i + 1)/j), \log(1 - i/j)]$ with density proportional to f_∞ . This procedure gives a measure ν_j with density

$$g_j(u) = b_i f_\infty(u), \quad u \in [\log(1 - (i + 1)/j), \log(1 - i/j)], \quad 1 \leq i \leq j - 1$$

on $-\infty < u < \log(1 - 1/j)$, where

$$b_i := \frac{1}{i(\log(i + 1) - \log i)}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Clearly we have the stochastic ordering $\hat{\psi}_j \preceq \hat{\nu}_j$ of the reflected measures. Define a kernel density, for $a > 0$ and $u > 0$,

$$\kappa(a, u) := g_j(u) \text{ on } \log(j - 1) < a < \log j.$$

Now write $(Z_t^{(n)}, t \geq 0)$ for the decreasing Markov process on $(0, \infty)$, starting at $Z_0^{(n)} = \log n$, for which the heights u and rates κ of the downward jumps from a are given by $\kappa(a, u)$. The stochastic ordering relation $\hat{\psi}_j \preceq \hat{\nu}_j$ between the driving measures of the processes $\log \mathbf{X}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{Z}^{(n)}$, together with the fact that each process is stochastically monotone, imply that we can couple the two processes so that

$$\log X_t^{(n)} \geq Z_t^{(n)} \text{ while } Z_t^{(n)} > 0. \tag{33}$$

Now fix small $\varepsilon > 0$ and define a density f_∞^ε on $(-\infty, 0)$ by

$$f_\infty^\varepsilon(u) = 2f_\infty(u), \quad -\varepsilon < u < 0 \tag{34}$$

$$= (1 + \varepsilon)f_\infty(u), \quad -\infty < u \leq -\varepsilon. \tag{35}$$

Because $2 > b_i \downarrow 1$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, there exists $j(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$g_j \leq f_\infty^\varepsilon \text{ for all } j > j(\varepsilon)$$

and therefore

$$\kappa(a, u) \leq f_\infty^\varepsilon(u), \quad a \geq \log j(\varepsilon). \tag{36}$$

Now consider the subordinator \mathbf{Y}^ε with Lévy density f_∞^ε . The inequality (36) implies that we can couple $\mathbf{Z}^{(n)}$ and \mathbf{Y}^ε as

$$Z_t^{(n)} \geq \log n - Y_t^\varepsilon \text{ while } \log n - Y_t^\varepsilon \geq j(\varepsilon). \quad (37)$$

Now the strong law of large numbers for \mathbf{Y}^ε is

$$t^{-1}Y_t^\varepsilon \rightarrow \rho^\varepsilon := \int_0^\infty u f_\infty^\varepsilon(u) du.$$

Combining this with (33, 37) and noting that $\rho^\varepsilon \downarrow \rho = \pi^2/6$ by (30), it is straightforward to deduce

$$\liminf_n D_n / \log n \geq 6/\pi^2 \text{ a.s.}$$

Together with the upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[D_n]$ from Theorem 5, this implies $D_n / \log n \rightarrow_p 6/\pi^2$.

5.3 The Gaussian limit

Recalling (27) and (29), the first-order approximation for our size-bias chain $(X_t^{(n)})$ is

$$\log X_t^{(n)} \approx \log n - \rho t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \rho^{-1} \log n$$

where $\rho = \mu^{-1} = \pi^2/6$. To study the second-order structure, we standardize as follows. Subtract the first order approximation, divide by $\sqrt{\log n}$ (the desired order of the s.d.) and speed up by $\log n$ (the order of $\mathbb{E}[D_n]$). So the standardized process is

$$\tilde{S}_s^{(n)} := \frac{\log X_{s \log n}^{(n)} - \log n + \rho s \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq \rho^{-1} \quad (38)$$

and essentially we want to show this converges in distribution to Brownian motion.

The first step is that the rates (11) determine the infinitesimal draft rate $a(j)$ and the variance rate $b(j)$ of $\log X_t$ when $X_t = j$, as follows.

$$a(j) := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j-1} \frac{\log i - \log j}{j-i}; \quad b(j) := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j-1} \frac{(\log i - \log j)^2}{j-i} \quad (39)$$

Approximating the sums by integrals,

$$a(j) \rightarrow -\rho \text{ and } b(j) \rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{\log^2 y}{1-y} dy := \sigma^2 = 2\zeta(3) \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty. \quad (40)$$

We will need a bound on the former rate of convergence, but we do not need a bound for $b(j)$. Applying Euler's summation formula⁸ (Graham, Knuth, and Patashnik [17], (9.78)) for a smooth function f ,

$$\sum_{a \leq i < b} f(i) = \int_a^b f(x) dx - \frac{1}{2}f(x)\Big|_a^b + \frac{1}{12}f'(x)\Big|_a^b + O\left(\int_a^b |f''(x)| dx\right),$$

to $f_j(x) = \frac{\log x - \log j}{j-x}$, one can show

$$|a(j) + \rho| = O(j^{-1} \log j). \quad (41)$$

To start a proof of convergence, we need to stop the process before $X_t = O(1)$, so take the stopping time

$$T_n := \min\{t : \log X_t^{(n)} \leq \log^{1/3} n\}$$

and replace (38) by the stopped process

$$S_s^{(n)} := \frac{\log X_{\min(s \log n, T_n)}^{(n)} - \log n + \rho \min(s \log n, T_n)}{\sqrt{\log n}}, \quad 0 \leq s < \infty.$$

The central issue is to prove the following. Write $(B_s, 0 \leq s < \infty)$ for standard Brownian motion. Recall $\mu = \rho^{-1} = 6/\pi^2$.

Proposition 8 $(S_s^{(n)}, 0 \leq s < \infty) \rightarrow_d (\sigma B_{\min(s, \mu)}, 0 \leq s < \infty)$ in the usual Skorohod topology.

Granted Proposition 8, we proceed as follows. Clearly $T_n \leq D_n$ and from $\mathbb{E}[D_m] \sim \mu \log m$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n - T_n] = O(\log^{1/3} n). \quad (42)$$

Combining this with Lemma 7, that $D_n / \log n \rightarrow_p \mu$, we have

$$T_n / \log n \rightarrow_p \mu.$$

From Proposition 8 at $s = T_n / \log n$ we have

$$S_{T_n / \log n}^{(n)} \rightarrow_d \sigma B_\mu =_d \text{Normal}(0, \mu \sigma^2)$$

and then from the definition of $S_s^{(n)}$

$$\frac{T_n - \mu \log n}{\mu \sqrt{\log n}} \rightarrow_d \text{Normal}(0, \mu \sigma^2).$$

⁸Variants of this formula play a central role in the precise estimates in [5].

Using (42) again, we can replace T_n by D_n , and then rewrite as

$$\frac{D_n - \mu \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}} \rightarrow_d \text{Normal}(0, \mu^3 \sigma^2)$$

as in the Theorem.

Proof of Proposition 8. Recall the infinitesimal rates $a(j)$ and $b(j)$ at (40). Consider the Doob-Meyer decomposition $S^{(n)} = A^{(n)} + M^{(n)}$ in which $A^{(n)}$ is a continuous process and $M^{(n)}$ is a martingale. In this decomposition $S_0^{(n)} = A_0^{(n)} = M_0^{(n)} = 0$ and $A_t^{(n)} = \int_0^t dA_s^{(n)}$ and one readily sees that

$$dA_s^{(n)} = (\log^{1/2} n) (a(X_{s \log n}^{(n)}) + \mu^{-1}) ds.$$

Here and in what follows we need only consider $s < T_n / \log n$.

The increasing process $\langle M^{(n)} \rangle_t$ associated with $M^{(n)}$, that is the continuous component of the Doob-Meyer decomposition of $(M^{(n)})^2$, is

$$d \langle M^{(n)} \rangle_s = b(X_{s \log n}^{(n)}) ds. \quad (43)$$

To prove Proposition 8, it will suffice to prove

- (i) $A^{(n)}$ converges to the zero process
- (ii) $M^{(n)}$ converges to the stopped Brownian motion process $(\sigma B_{\min(s, \mu)}, 0 \leq s < \infty)$.

For (i) it is enough to show

$$(\log^{1/2} n) \int_0^{T_n / \log n} |a(X_{s \log n}^{(n)}) + \mu^{-1}| ds \rightarrow_p 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (44)$$

and (because $X_{s \log n}^{(n)} \geq \exp(\log^{1/3} n)$ on the interval of integration) the bound $|a(j) + \mu^{-1}| = O(j^{-1} \log j)$ from (41) is more than sufficient to prove (44).

By one version of the classical martingale CLT (Helland [22] Theorem 5.1(a)), to prove (ii) it suffices to show that for each $t < \mu$

$$\langle M^{(n)} \rangle_t \rightarrow_p \sigma^2 t \quad (45)$$

$$\rho^\varepsilon[M^{(n)}]_t := \sum_{u \leq t} |\Delta M^{(n)}(u)|^2 1_{\{|\Delta M^{(n)}(u)| > \varepsilon\}} \rightarrow_p 0 \quad (46)$$

where the sum is over jumps $\Delta M^{(n)}(u) := M^{(n)}(u) - M^{(n)}(u-)$.

Now (45) is immediate from (40) and (43). To prove (46), we require only very crude bounds. The jumps of $M^{(n)}$ are the jumps of $S^{(n)}$ which are the jumps of

$(\log^{-1/2} n) \log X^{(n)}$. So $0 > \Delta M^{(n)}(u) \geq -\log^{1/2} n$, and it suffices to show that for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the number of large jumps satisfies

$$(\log n) \mathbb{E}[|\{u : \Delta M^{(n)}(u) \leq -\varepsilon\}|] \rightarrow 0.$$

In other words, it suffices to show

$$(\log n) \mathbb{E}[|\{u : \log X_{u-}^{(n)} - \log X_u^{(n)} \geq \varepsilon \log^{1/2} n\}|] \rightarrow 0. \quad (47)$$

Now from the transition rates (11) for X_t , we have

for $1 \leq i \leq j/2$, the rate of jumps from j to some $k \leq i$ equals $\sum_{k=1}^i 1/(j-k) \leq 2i/j$.

The jumps in (47) are from some state j to a state below i where $i/j = \exp(-\varepsilon \log^{1/2} n)$, and so (for large n) occur at rate at most $\alpha_n := 2 \exp(-\varepsilon \log^{1/2} n)$. So the expectation in (47) is at most $(\mu \log n) \alpha_n$. Now $(\mu \log^2 n) \alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ as required to establish (47).

5.4 Bounds for the tree height

To study the maximum leaf height, we will need a tail bound on D_n .

Lemma 9 $\mathbb{P}(D_n > t) \leq (n-1)e^{-t}$, $0 \leq t < \infty$.

Proof. Write $(X_t \equiv X_t^{(n)}, 0 \leq t < \infty)$ for the chain started at $X_0 = n$, so $D_n = \inf\{t : X_t = 1\}$. From the transition rates,

$$\mathbb{E}(dX_t | X_t = j) = - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (j-i)/(j-i) dt = -(j-1)dt \text{ on } \{X_t \geq 2\}.$$

So setting $Y_t := X_t - 1$ we have $Y_0 = n - 1$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[dY_t | \mathcal{F}_t] = -Y_t, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

So

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t] = (n-1)e^{-t}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n > t) = \mathbb{P}(Y \geq 1) \leq (n-1)e^{-t}.$$

Now write D_n^* for the height of the random tree CTCS(n) itself, that is the maximum leaf height. From Boole's inequality and Lemma 9

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n^* > t) \leq n\mathbb{P}(D_n > t) \leq n(n-1)e^{-t}$$

and so

Corollary 10

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n^* > (2 + \varepsilon) \log n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0$$

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n^*] \leq \int_0^\infty \min(1, n(n-1)e^{-t}) dt \leq 1 + 2 \log n.$$

It is shown in [5] that one can extend the first bound to show that there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n^* \geq 2(1 + \varepsilon) \log n) = O(n^{-\alpha\varepsilon}).$$

However, this “2” is undoubtedly not the correct constant, as argued below.

5.5 A conjecture for maximum leaf height

One aspect where there is a substantial difference between the discrete and continuous time models concerns the tree height. We will discuss the DTCS(n) case in section 9.3. The situation for CTCS(n) is quite different.

Open Problem 5 *Show that $D_n^* \sim c \log n$ in probability, and identify the constant c .*

Conjecture 11 *This holds for $c := 1 + \mu + \mu^3 \sigma^2 / 2 = 1.878\dots$*

To discuss this conjecture, recall the CLT:

$$\frac{D_n - \mu \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}} \rightarrow_d \text{Normal}(0, \mu^3 \sigma^2) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where $\mu := 1/\zeta(2) = 6/\pi^2 = 0.6079\dots$; $\sigma^2 := 2\zeta(3) = 2.4040\dots$. The naive argument is that D_n^* behaves as the maximum of n i.i.d. samples from the approximating Normal distribution, which would give

$$D_n^* \approx \mu \log n + \sqrt{2 \log n} \times \sqrt{\mu^3 \sigma^2 \log n} = 2^{1/2} \sigma \mu^{3/2} \log n = 1.65\dots \log n. \quad (48)$$

But (48) is in fact not the right way to study D_n^* , because of the “fringe” behavior, discussed in section 6 later. Figure 2 gives a hint about the issue, which is that there are some unusually long terminal edges to a pair of leaves. The CTCS(n) tree has order n terminal edges to a pair of leaves; in the heuristics below we take as this as n for simplicity (this should only affect the estimate of D_n^* by $\pm O(1)$). These n edges have i.i.d. Exponential(1) distribution, and the (asymptotic) structure of the largest of these n lengths is well-known: the lengths in decreasing order are

$$(\log n + \xi_1, \log n + \xi_2, \log n + \xi_3, \dots)$$

where $\infty > \xi_1 > \xi_2 > \xi_3 > \dots > -\infty$ are the largest points of the Poisson point process on \mathbb{R} with rate e^{-x} , so that ξ_1 has the standard Gumbel distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq x) = \exp(-e^{-x}), \quad -\infty < x < \infty.$$

By imagining that the longest such edge is attached to the tree at the typical leaf depth D_n , and using the Normal limit for the random leaf heights D_n , we assert a lower bound

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n^* \leq (\mu + 1) \log n - \omega_n \sqrt{\log n}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for any } \omega_n \rightarrow \infty.$$

which one could certainly make rigorous. However, we conjecture that we get the right behavior for D_n^* by maximizing over all the $o(n)$ longest fringe edges. Imagine that each of these longest fringe edges is attached to the tree at independent depths D_n . So

$$D_n^* \approx (\mu + 1) \log n + H_n$$

$$H_n := \max_i (\xi_i + \nu_i)$$

for (ξ_i) as above and (ν_i) i.i.d. Normal $(0, \alpha_n^2)$, with $\alpha_n^2 = \mu^3 \sigma^2 \log n$ in the notation of the Normal limit for D_n .

Write $\bar{\Phi}_n(\cdot)$ for the tail distribution function of Normal $(0, \alpha_n^2)$. Because the pairs (ξ_i, ν_i) form a Poisson process we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \mathbb{P}(H_n \leq y) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x} \bar{\Phi}_n(y - x) dx \\ &= e^{-y} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{y-x} \bar{\Phi}\left(\frac{y-x}{\alpha_n}\right) dx \\ &= e^{-y} \alpha_n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\alpha_n u} \bar{\Phi}(u) du \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\Phi}$ refers to the standard Normal distribution, and $\phi(\cdot)$ below is its density. The integrand above is maximized for u around α_n , so setting $v = u - \alpha_n$ and using $\bar{\Phi}(z) \sim \phi(z)/z$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\approx e^{-y} \alpha_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(\alpha_n(v + \alpha_n)) \exp(-(v + \alpha_n)^2/2) \frac{1}{v + \alpha_n} dv \\ &\approx e^{-y} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-v^2/2 + \alpha_n^2/2) dv \\ &= e^{-y} e^{\alpha_n^2/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting all this together

$$-\log \mathbb{P}(H_n \leq y + \alpha_n^2/2) \approx e^{-y}$$

and the final conclusion is

$$D_n^* \approx c \log n + \xi; \quad c := 1 + \mu + \mu^3 \sigma^2 / 2 = 1.878\dots$$

where ξ has standard Gumbel distribution.

Now we don't believe that the $+O(1)$ term is correct, but this value of c seems plausible. Here is one "reality check" for the argument/calculation above. Look back at the first integral; for given y , the relevant values of x are around $y - \alpha_n^2$. The relevant values of y are around $\alpha_n^2/2$, so overall the relevant values of x are around $-\alpha_n^2/2$. This corresponds to the ν_i around position $-\alpha_n^2/2$, and the number of such edges is around $\exp(\alpha_n^2/2) \approx n^{0.27}$. So one implicit assumption was

If we pick $n^{0.27}$ random leaves from CTCS(n), then the distribution of their maximum height is essentially the same as $n^{0.27}$ picks from the Normal distribution.

This is all rather weird, because we started by saying (the naive argument) that this is not true for n picks. It is somewhat related to the idea of correlation between leaf heights, but only caring about the tail behavior. This is one context where one would pay attention to the labels $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ in the interval-splitting representation; roughly, we would need to bound the correlation between the heights of leaf i and leaf $i + n^{0.73}$.

6 The occupation measure and the fringe process

For our size-biased chain with rates

$$\lambda(j, i) = 1/(j - i); \quad 1 \leq i < j, \quad j \geq 2$$

consider the quantity

$$a(n, i) := \text{probability that the chain started at state } n \text{ is ever in state } i \quad (49)$$

which is the same for the discrete or continuous models.

Proposition 12 *The limit $a_i := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a(n, i)$ exists, $i = 1, 2, \dots$*

The coupling proof (in section 6.1 below) does not give any useful quantitative information about the limit $(a_i, i = 1, 2, \dots)$. However, by considering the relative probabilities ρ_m of jumping to state 2 or state 1 from state $m \geq 3$:

$$\rho_m = \frac{\frac{1}{2(m-2)}}{\frac{1}{m-1}} = \frac{m-1}{2(m-2)}$$

and observing that $1/2 \leq \rho_m \leq 1$, we see that $1/2 \leq a_2 \leq 1$, and a similar argument shows

$$a_i > 0 \text{ for all } i. \tag{50}$$

The limit $(a_i, i \geq 1)$ must satisfy the natural system of equations, for $q(j, i)$ at (1),

$$a_i = \sum_{j>i} a_j (q(j, i) + q(j, j-i)) i/j, \quad i \geq 1 \tag{51}$$

with $a_1 = 1$.

Open Problem 6 *Find an explicit expression for $(a_i, i \geq 1)$ and show it is the unique solution of (51).*

Some values of a_i by numerical calculations of $a(50,000, i)$ are shown in Table 3.

i	2	3	4	5	10	20	30
$q^\uparrow(1, i)$	0.6079	0.1520	0.0675	0.0381	0.0075	0.0017	0.0007
a_i	0.6079	0.4559	0.3715	0.3176	0.1911	0.1135	0.0831

Table 3: Occupation measure and the penultimate clade.

In section 6.1 below we will prove

Corollary 13 $\sum_{j=2}^m \frac{a_j}{\log j} \sim (6/\pi^2) \log m$.

and so it is very natural to make

Open Problem 7 *Prove $a_j \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} \frac{\log j}{j}$.*

This is strongly supported by numerical calculations. In fact, inspired by (16), one might conjecture a stronger relation

$$a_j \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} \frac{\log j + c_1}{j}$$

meaning that $b_j := \frac{\pi^2}{6} j a_j - \log j \rightarrow c_1$, and numerical calculations provide moderate support for this with $c_1 = 0.58 \pm 0.03$.

Note also that these asymptotics are consistent with (17), in the sense

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n^{hop}] = \sum_{i=2}^n a(n, i) \approx \sum_{i=2}^n a_i \sim \frac{3}{\pi^2} \log^2 n. \quad (52)$$

The motivation for Proposition 12 involves the distribution of the asymptotic *fringe process* [1, 24] for the tree model, that is the description of the tree relative to a typical leaf, which in the $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit can be described in terms of the a_i as follows. The sequence of clade sizes as one moves away from the leaf is the discrete time Markov chain started at state 1, whose “upward” transition probabilities are derived from (51):

$$q^\uparrow(i, j) = \frac{ia_j}{ja_i}(q(j, i) + q(j, j - i)), \quad j > i. \quad (53)$$

At each such step $i \rightarrow j$ there is the sibling clade of size $j - i$, and this clade is simply distributed as DTCS($j-i$). In particular, the first step (to the penultimate clade) is given by

$$q^\uparrow(1, j) = \frac{a_j}{j}(q(j, 1) + q(j, j - 1)), \quad j > 1$$

shown in Table 3. Conjecture 7 would then lead to

$$q^\uparrow(1, j) \sim \frac{12}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{j^2} \quad (54)$$

which of course has infinite mean. See section 8.1 for discussion of implications.

Figure 9 compares a real-world cladogram on 77 species with a simulation of our model. There is no biological significance to the choice of which is drawn as left and right branches; Figure 9 (bottom) follows a customary layout style, which we copied for our graphic.

6.1 Proof of Proposition 12.

We work in the continuous time model with rates

$$\lambda(y, i) = \frac{1}{y-i}, \quad 1 \leq i < y.$$

For our purpose, a *shift-coupling*⁹ $((X_t, Y_t), 0 \leq t < \infty)$ started at (x_0, y_0) is a process such that, conditional on $X_t = x_t, Y_t = y_t$ and the past, either

- (i) Over $(t, t + dt)$ each component moves according to $\lambda(\cdot, \cdot)$, maybe dependently;
- or
- (ii) One component moves as above while the other remains unchanged.

⁹Used more widely for other purposes [33].

Such a process must reach state $(1, 1)$ and stop, at some time $T^{absorb} < \infty$. So the *coupling time* is such that

$$T^{couple} := \min\{t : X_t = Y_t\} \leq T^{absorb}$$

and we can arrange that $X_t = Y_t$ for $t \geq T_{x_0, y_0}^{couple}$.

Write $S^{couple} := X_{T^{couple}}$ for the coupling *state*. We will construct a shift-coupling in which, for each $i \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S^{couple} < i) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } x_0, y_0 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (55)$$

This is clearly sufficient to prove Proposition 12, because $|a(x_0, i) - a(y_0, i)| \leq \mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S^{couple} < i)$.

In outline the construction is very simple. If the initial states x_0 and y_0 are not of comparable size, then we run the chain only from the larger start (as in (ii) above) until they are of comparable size; then at each time there is some non-vanishing probability that we can couple at the next transition (as in (i) above).

The details are given via two lemmas below. First we consider the ‘‘comparable size starts’’ case. As in section 5 we analyze the processes on the log scale.

The maximal coupling regime. In the maximal coupling regime, we construct the joint process $((X_t, Y_t), 0 \leq t < \infty)$ as follows. From $(X_t, Y_t) = (x, y)$ with $x < y$, each component moves according to $\lambda(\cdot, \cdot)$ but with the joint distribution that maximizes the probability they move to the same state. That joint distribution is such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{dt} = Y_{dt} = i) = \mathbb{P}(Y_{dt} = i) = \frac{dt}{y - i}, \quad 1 \leq i < x.$$

So

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{dt} = Y_{dt}) = \sum_{i=1}^{x-1} \frac{dt}{y - i} = \sum_{j=y-x+1}^{y-1} \frac{dt}{j}.$$

Taking limits as $y \rightarrow \infty, x/y \rightarrow c \in (0, 1)$

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{dt} = Y_{dt}) \sim (-\log(1 - c))dt. \quad (56)$$

Write $T_k^Y := \min\{t : Y_t \leq k\}$.

Lemma 14 *For the maximal coupling process, if $x_0/y_0 \rightarrow a \in (0, 1]$ then for each k we have $\mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S^{couple} \leq T_k^Y) \rightarrow 1$.*

Proof. Fix $0 < c < a < 1$ (the case $a = 1$ is similar). Consider the process (X_t, Y_t) using the maximal coupling with $(X_0, Y_0) = (x_0, y_0)$, where $x_0 < y_0$. The coupling is stochastically monotone, so $X_t \leq Y_t$ and the absorption times into state 1 satisfy $D^X \leq D^Y$. We consider limits as $y_0 \rightarrow \infty$, $x_0/y_0 \rightarrow a$. By Theorem 3 we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0, y_0}[D^Y - D^X] = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log 1/a + O(1) \quad (57)$$

where the $O(1)$ bound does not depend on a .

Consider the stopping time

$$S := \min\{t : X_t/Y_t \leq c\}.$$

Fix a large integer k , and take $y_0 > k$. Recall that, if an event happens at probability rate $\geq r$ per unit time, then the probability that it does *not* happen before a stopping time T is at most $\mathbb{E}[\exp(-rT)]$. On the event $\{S > T_k^Y\}$ the coupling event happens at rate $\geq \log(1/(1-c)) - o(1)$ by (56), so

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S^{couple} > T_k^Y) \leq \mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S \leq T_k^Y) + \mathbb{E}_{x_0, y_0}[\exp((\log(1/(1-c)) - o(1))T_k^Y)]. \quad (58)$$

On the event $\{S \leq T_k^Y\}$ the conditional expectation of $(D^Y - D^X)$ is at least $\frac{6}{\pi^2} \log 1/c - O(1)$ by (57). So by Markov's inequality and (57) again,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S \leq T_k^Y) \leq \frac{\log 1/a + O(1)}{\log 1/c - O(1)}.$$

As $y_0 \rightarrow \infty$ the expectation in (58) is $o(1)$, so

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0, y_0}(S^{couple} > T_k^Y) \leq \frac{\log 1/a + O(1)}{\log 1/c - O(1)} + o(1).$$

This holds for any $c > 0$, and the $O(1)$ terms do not depend on a, c , so letting $c \downarrow 0$ establishes the Lemma.

Given Lemma 14, to establish (55) it remains only to consider the case $x_0/y_0 \rightarrow 0$. Here we run the chain (Y_t) starting from $y_0 \gg x_0$ while holding $X_t = x_0$ fixed. The next lemma shows that the (Y_t) process does not overshoot x_0 by far, on the log scale.

The overshoot bound. Fix x and write

$$T_x = \min\{t : Y_t \leq x\}$$

$$V_x := \log x - \log Y_{T_x}.$$

Lemma 15 *There exists an absolute constant K such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_y[V_x] \leq K, \quad 1 \leq x < y < \infty.$$

Proof. The quantity $\mathbb{E}_y[V_x]$ depends only on the jump chain. The measure $\hat{\psi}_\infty$ at (32) has the property

$$\frac{\int_a^\infty (u-a)\hat{\psi}_\infty(du)}{\hat{\psi}_\infty[a, \infty)} \uparrow 1 \text{ as } a \uparrow \infty.$$

that the conditional mean excess over a is bounded above. By the subordinator approximation at (31) there exists $K < \infty$ such that the corresponding property holds for one transition $y \rightarrow Y_1$ of the jump chain on the log scale:

$$\mathbb{E}_y[(\log y - \log Y_1 - a)^+] \leq K\mathbb{P}_y(\log y - \log Y_1 > a). \quad (59)$$

Now fix x . For $y > x$ write

$$m(x, y) := \max_{x \leq z \leq y} \mathbb{E}_z[V_x].$$

By considering the first step $y \rightarrow Y_1$, which goes either into the interval $[1, x]$ (probability $q_{x,y}$ say) or into the interval $[x+1, y-1]$.

$$\mathbb{E}_y[V_x] \leq \mathbb{E}_y[(\log x - \log Y_1)^+] + \mathbb{P}_y(\log x - \log Y_1 < 0)m(x, y-1).$$

By (59) with $a = \log y - \log x$

$$\mathbb{E}_y[(\log x - \log Y_1)^+] \leq K\mathbb{P}_y(\log x - \log Y_1 > 0).$$

Combining those inequalities:

$$\mathbb{E}_y[V_x] \leq K(1 - q_{x,y}) + q_{x,y}m(x, y-1) = K + (m(x, y-1) - K)q_{x,y}$$

and so the bound $m(x, y) \leq K$ holds by induction on $y = x, x+1, x+2, \dots$

Completing the proof of Proposition 12. Given Lemma 14, it remains only to consider the case $x_0/y_0 \rightarrow 0$. Use the shift regime dynamics (x_0, Y_t) from $Y_0 = y_0$ until time

$$T_{x_0} := \min\{t : Y_t \leq x_0\}.$$

Lemma 15 shows that the overshoot

$$V_{x_0} := \log x_0 - \log Y(T_{x_0})$$

has $\mathbb{E}_{y_0}[V_{x_0}] \leq K$. This allows us to apply Lemma 14 with starting state $(x_0, Y(T_{x_0}))$.

6.2 Proof of Corollary 13.

Write K_1 for the “ $O(1)$ ” bound in $t(n) := \mathbb{E}[D_n] = 6\pi^{-2} \log n + O(1)$. In the notation of the overshoot bound, Lemma 15, the mean time spent in $[2, 3, \dots, x]$ by the chain started at $y > x$ can be expressed in two ways, giving the identity

$$\sum_{i=2}^x a(y, i)/h_{i-1} = \mathbb{E}_y[t(Y_{T_x})].$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbb{E}_y[t(x) - t(Y_{T_x})] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_y[6\pi^{-2}(\log x - \log Y_{T_x})] + 2K_1 \\ &\leq 6\pi^{-2}K + 2K_1 \end{aligned}$$

where K is the constant in Lemma 15. Letting $y \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=2}^x a(i)/h_{i-1} - t(x) \right| \leq 6\pi^{-2}K + 2K_1 \text{ for all } x$$

and the result follows.

7 Length

The number of edges of CTCS(n) equals $n - 1$ (see Figure 3 (right)), with the convention that a side-leaf splits an edge. In the usual formalization of an n -leaf binary tree there are $2n - 1$ edges, but we are ignoring the n edges adjacent to leaves. Defining the *length* L_n of CTCS(n) as the sum of edge-lengths. Each edge representing a split into a size- m clade has Exponential(h_{m-1}) distribution, and so one readily sees that, for (a_i) in Proposition 12

$$n^{-1}\mathbb{E}[L_n] \rightarrow \ell := \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{a_m}{mh_{m-1}} = 0.608\dots \quad (60)$$

where the sum was evaluated numerically from the estimates of $(a_i, i \geq 2)$ underlying Table 3.

Open Problem 8 *If unable to determine (a_i) explicitly, can we nevertheless determine ℓ explicitly?*

There are several other ways to think about ℓ . As in section 2, write $\mathbf{X}(t) = (X_n(i, t), i \geq 1)$ for the clade sizes of CTCS(n) at time t , and write $C_n(t)$ for the number of clades. Here we are including clades of size 1 corresponding to leaves. The size-bias chain $Z_n(t)$ in section 4 is such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n(t) = X_n(i, t) | \mathbf{X}(t)) = n^{-1} X_n(i, t)$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}[1/Z_n(t)] = n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[C_n(t)].$$

Now consider

$W_n(t)$ = number of edges of CTCS(n) at height t

$F_n(t)$ = number of leaves of CTCS(n) at height $\leq t$

then $W_n(t) = C_n(t) - F_n(t)$. Observing that $\mathbb{E}[F_n(t)] = n\mathbb{P}(D_n \leq t)$ we obtain

$$n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[W_n(t)] = \mathbb{E}[1/Z_n(t)] - \mathbb{P}(D_n \leq t).$$

Because $L_n = \int_0^\infty W_n(t) dt$, we conclude that the limit constant ℓ at (60) can be expressed as

$$\ell = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty (\mathbb{E}[1/Z_n(t)] - \mathbb{P}(D_n \leq t)) dt. \quad (61)$$

In principle one might obtain the value of ℓ by a sufficiently accurate analysis of the size-bias chain, but the Gaussian approximation from the CLTs is not sufficient. As (60) shows, the value of ℓ is determined by the details of the fringe distribution. So (61) is likely to be useless.

7.1 Coincidence or a hidden symmetry?

Our numerical estimates of the values of a_2 in Table 3 and of ℓ at (60) are very close, at 0.608...., so

Open Problem 9 *Does $a_2 = \ell$?*

There are two different implications of “ $a_2 = \ell$ ”. First, it says that (asymptotically) exactly half of the total length is in the “terminal” edges to a bud-pair. Second, in the inductive construction in section 3, we expect that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ there are limit probabilities for the three types of placement of the new bud:

- p^\uparrow is the probability of a branch extension
- p^\rightarrow is the probability of a side-bud addition
- p^\nearrow is the probability of a side-bud extension.

Now observe

$$p^\uparrow + p^\nearrow = \ell$$

because these are the cases where the tree length increases by a mean length 1. And

$$2p^\nearrow = a_2$$

because this is the only case where the number of buds in pairs increases, by 2.

So the assertion $\ell = a_2$ is equivalent to the assertion $p^\uparrow = p^\nearrow$. The latter is of course more interpretable as some kind of symmetry for the shape of the tree, but we do not understand what that might be.

8 The continuum fragmentation process and the corresponding continuum tree

Viewing the CTCS(n) model as splitting the discrete interval $[1, n]$, it is natural to rescale space to the unit interval $[0, 1]$ and view the clades as contiguous sets of intervals of length $1/n$. So now the clade lengths are $n^{-1}X_n(i, t)$. Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, but not rescaling time, we expect a $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit “continuum interval fragmentation” process featuring continuous splitting of the unit interval into smaller and smaller sub-intervals (“clades”). Such processes have been studied before. In fact Haas et al [20] and subsequent work such as [19] have given a detailed general treatment of such self-similar fragmentations, though the focus there is on characterizations and on models like the $-2 > \beta > -1$ case of the beta-splitting model (3): in such models there are limits qualitatively analogous to the Brownian continuum random tree, which is the case $\beta = -2$. Existence of, and convergence of the rescaled CTCS(n) model to, the limit “continuum fragmentation” process we will consider is at least implicit in this body of work. But how this general abstract theory applies to quantitative aspects of our specific $\beta = -1$ tree model seems a little hard to extract. In this section we will just give an informal account of our process and state

Open Problem 10 *Formalize the discussion below and relate to the previous literature.*

We assert that the “scaling limit” of CTCS(n) is the interval-splitting process with dynamics

(*) an interval of length x is split into subintervals of lengths y (left) and $x - y$ (right) at rate $\frac{x}{2y(x-y)} dy$.

One can check that this is the correct scaling by repeating the stochastic calculus analysis for sum-of-squares in section 2. That is, when an interval of length x is split into intervals of lengths y and $x - y$, the sum-of-squares-of-edge-lengths Q decreases by $2y(x - y)$, and so the expected rate of decrease attributed to the length- x interval equals $\int_0^x \frac{x}{2y(x-y)} 2y(x - y) dy = x^2$. Combining all intervals,

$$\mathbb{E}(Q(t) - Q(t + dt) | \mathcal{F}_t) = Q(t)dt$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}Q(t) = e^{-t}, \quad 0 \leq t < \infty. \tag{62}$$

Note this is the “scaling limit” version of (5).

We want to consider this interval-splitting process as a tree process, which we can do via spanning trees. That is, in the fragmentation process, any k points of the unit interval determine a spanning tree. Doing this with k i.i.d. uniform random points gives us

(**) a random tree whose “pruned” version is CTCS(k), for each k

from the consistency property of (CTCS(n), $n \geq 2$) in Theorem 2.

Recall that the “unpruned” version must have infinitely-long terminal branches, because (as quantified in section 4) the height of a random leaf in the CTCS(n) model increases to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

8.1 Analogies with and differences from the Brownian CRT

We can regard (**) as allowing a construction of a random tree \mathbb{T} corresponding to the interval-splitting dynamics (*). Such a construction is consistent as k increases, and exchangeable over the random leaves, and indeed this constitutes one general approach to the construction of continuum random trees (CRTs) [3, 14]. Our inductive construction in section 3 is analogous to the line-breaking construction of the Brownian CRT [2] and stable trees [16].

However some qualitative properties of \mathbb{T} are rather different from those of the Brownian CRT, as originally outlined in [2]. The tree \mathbb{T} is a scaling limit of CTCS(n) as seen from the root, analogous to the Brownian CRT as a scaling limit of conditioned Galton-Watson trees. Now the Brownian CRT has a certain “local and global limits are consistent” property, as follows. That CRT is the scaling limit of certain discrete random tree models, and is encoded by Brownian excursion, and the local weak limit of those discrete models is a discrete infinite tree encoded by random walk-like processes. However these two limit processes are consistent in the following sense: the local behavior of the CRT around a typical point is another continuum tree encoded by two-sided Brownian motion on \mathbb{R} , and this process is

also the scaling limit of the discrete infinite tree arising as the local weak limit. In our context, it is not at all clear whether our two limit processes – the continuum fragmentation process and the discrete fringe process – can be viewed as consistent in an analogous way. Because there is a substantial literature on coding trees as walks, a starting point is to ask

Open Problem 11 *Can one code the fringe process as a discrete stationary process $(V_n, n \in \mathbb{Z})$ whose scaling limit is an identifiable process $(\bar{V}_t, t \in \mathbb{R})$?*

In view of (54), the scaling limit should be something like a reflecting Cauchy process.

One can also ask how our \mathbb{T} relates to the *stable trees* whose construction is studied in [11, 16].

Finally, it is implausible that \mathbb{T} is as “universal” as the Brownian CRT has proved to be, but nevertheless one can ask

Open Problem 12 *Are there superficially different discrete models whose limit is the same \mathbb{T} ?*

9 Other aspects of the random tree

There are many other quantitative aspects of trees that could be studied in our model. Here are two possibilities.

9.1 Powers of subtree sizes

For instance [15] studies the sum of p -powers of subtree sizes, for the model of conditioned Galton–Watson trees conditioned on total size n . Our work provides some results and conjectures for that quantity $SS_n^{(p)}$ in our model. that is

$$SS_n^{(p)} := \sum_{j=2}^n N_n(j) j^p$$

where $N_n(j)$ is the number of size- j clades that ever arise in our model. By Proposition 12 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[N_n(j)] \sim na_j/j.$$

So for $-\infty < p < 1$ we have

$$n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[SS_n^{(p)}] \rightarrow \sum_{j \geq 2} a_j j^{p-1} \tag{63}$$

which is finite by Corollary 13. For $p = 1$ we have the identity

$$SS_n^{(1)} = n \cdot \mathbb{E}[D_n^{hop} | \mathbb{T}_n]$$

and so by (17)

$$\mathbb{E}[SS_n^{(1)}] \sim \frac{1}{2\zeta(2)} \log^2 n. \quad (64)$$

For $p = 2$ we are dealing with the discrete time analog $(Q_n^{hop}(t), t = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$ of the sum of squares of clade sizes in section 2. Instead of the exact formulas there, we have an approximation

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(t) - Q_n(t+1) | \mathcal{F}_t] \approx Q_n(t) / \log n, \quad t = O(\log n)$$

leading to

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_n(t)] \approx n^2 \exp(-t / \log n), \quad t = O(\log n).$$

So heuristically

$$\mathbb{E}[SS_n^{(2)}] \approx \sum_t (\mathbb{E}[Q_n(t)] - n) \approx n^2 \log n. \quad (65)$$

In fact [15] studies also complex powers α , so

Open Problem 13 *Give a detailed analysis of $SS_n^{(\alpha)}$ in our model.*

9.2 Comparing with cladogram data

As mentioned in section 1.2, the model was motivated by our small-scale study of real-world phylogenetic trees in [6] suggesting that, amongst all splits of clades of size m , the median size of the smaller subclade scales roughly as $m^{1/2}$. Though we do not expect the model to provide quantitatively accurate matches to real data, one might conduct a larger-scale study comparing model predictions with data for different tree statistics. The point is that more elaborate biologically-motivated models of the kind described in [26, 32] typically have real-valued parameters fitted to the individual tree data; how much do they improve on our zero-parameter model? In this context our asymptotics are irrelevant – one can just simulate DTCS(n) numerically. Interesting statistics include D_n^{hop} and $a(n, i)$.

9.3 The height of DTCS(n)

In this article we have focussed on the continuous model CTCS(n) rather than the discrete model DTCS(n), motivated by the consistency property in section 2. As mentioned in section 4.1, for the precise asymptotics of CTCS(n) in Theorem 3 there are parallel results in [5] for DTCS(n). But one key aspect in which the

models differ is the tree height, which (as noted in section 5.5) in CTCS(n) is affected by the extremes of the terminal edge lengths, which cannot happen for DTCS(n). For DTCS(n) let us rename D_n^{hop} and D_n^{*hop} as L_n and L_n^* . In [5] the (perhaps surprising) result is proved that both $\mathbb{E}[L_n]$ and $\mathbb{E}[L_n^*]$ are asymptotic to $3\pi^{-2} \log^2 n$. So $\mathbb{E}[L_n^* - L_n] = o(\log^2 n)$ which raises

Open Problem 14 *What is the order of magnitude of $\mathbb{E}[L_n^* - L_n]$?*

One could also¹⁰ consider the length L_n^+ of the path from the root that is chosen via the natural greedy algorithm, taking the larger sub-clade at each split. So $L_n \leq L_n^+ \leq L_n^*$: what are the orders of magnitude of the two differences?

Numerics suggest that $\mathbb{E}[L_n^+ - L_n]$ grows slightly faster than $(\log n) \cdot (\log \log n)$. We do not have a conjecture regarding Open Problem 14, though the next section contains an alternative way of viewing tree height.

9.4 Inspiration from the drawn cladogram representation

A perhaps novel aspect of random trees arises from considering how cladograms are actually drawn on paper. As illustrated in Figure 9, a typical convention is that the larger subclade is (mostly) drawn on the right side of the split. In the familiar models of random trees starting with the Galton-Watson tree, it is natural to study the *width profile process*, the number of vertices at each height from the root [10]. In contrast a cladogram is drawn with all the leaves at the same “level zero”. So one could measure “height” with reference to that level, but this depends on precisely how one draws the cladogram.

There is in fact another convention implicit in Figure 9. Each clade-split $\gamma \rightarrow (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, is represented by a horizontal line at some *draw-height* $\text{dh}(\gamma)$. The draw-height depends on the shape of the subtree at γ , not merely on its size $|\gamma|$. Setting $\text{dh}(\gamma) = 0$ for a leaf (where $|\gamma| = 1$), we define dh as follows¹¹:

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma| = 2 & : & \text{dh}(\gamma) = 1) \\ |\gamma| = 3 & : & \text{dh}(\gamma) = 2) \end{aligned}$$

and then inductively for $|\gamma| > 3$:

$$\gamma \rightarrow (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : \quad \text{dh}(\gamma) = 1 + \max(\text{dh}(\gamma_1), \text{dh}(\gamma_2)).$$

So a clade of size 4 may have draw-height = 2 or 3, and a clade of size 8 may have draw-height = 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7.

¹⁰This idea is mentioned in [4] but there is a foolish calculus error leading to an incorrect conclusion.

¹¹The “maximum” in this rule is somewhat reminiscent of the classical *Horton–Strahler* statistic [8] in river networks, though we do not see any precise relation.

Now consider the draw-height $\text{dh}(\mathbf{t})$ of a finite clade tree \mathbf{t} , that is the draw-height of the root split, It is easy to see that this equals the height of \mathbf{t} in its DTCS(n) representation, that is the largest number of edges in the path from the root to a leaf. For a leaf at this maximal height, the draw-heights upwards from the leaf take successive integer values $0, 1, 2, \dots, \text{dh}(\mathbf{t})$. For a leaf at lesser height, the difference of its height from the maximal height equals the number of missing integers in the draw-heights along the path from that leaf.

This leads to a novel set of questions about the “drawn cladogram” in our model DTCS(n). What can we say about the width profile process, that is the number $W(h)$ of vertical lines that cross an interval $(h, h + 1)$, that is the number of clades with draw-height $\leq h$ that arise as a split of a clade with draw-height $\geq h + 1$? What is the total “drawn length” $\sum_h W(h)$?

Acknowledgments. Thanks to Boris Pittel for extensive interactions regarding this project. Thanks to Serte Donderwinkel for pointing out a gap in an early version, and to David Clancy and Prabhanka Deka for helpful comments on draft versions.

References

- [1] David Aldous. Asymptotic fringe distributions for general families of random trees. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 1(2):228–266, 1991.
- [2] David Aldous. The continuum random tree. II. An overview. In *Stochastic analysis (Durham, 1990)*, volume 167 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 23–70. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [3] David Aldous. The continuum random tree. III. *Ann. Probab.*, 21(1):248–289, 1993.
- [4] David Aldous. Probability distributions on cladograms. In *Random discrete structures (Minneapolis, MN, 1993)*, volume 76 of *IMA Vol. Math. Appl.*, pages 1–18. Springer, New York, 1996.
- [5] David Aldous and Boris Pittel. The critical beta-splitting random tree I: Heights and related results. arXiv:2302.05066, 2023.
- [6] David J. Aldous. Stochastic models and descriptive statistics for phylogenetic trees, from Yule to today. *Statist. Sci.*, 16(1):23–34, 2001.

- [7] Jean Bertoin. Subordinators: examples and applications. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1997)*, volume 1717 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–91. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [8] Anna Brandenberger, Luc Devroye, and Tommy Reddad. The Horton-Strahler number of conditioned Galton-Watson trees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26:Paper No. 109, 29, 2021.
- [9] Michael Drmota. *Random trees*. SpringerWienNewYork, Vienna, 2009. An interplay between combinatorics and probability.
- [10] Michael Drmota and Bernhard Gittenberger. On the profile of random trees. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 10(4):421–451, 1997.
- [11] Thomas Duquesne and Jean-François Le Gall. Random trees, Lévy processes and spatial branching processes. *Astérisque*, (281):vi+147, 2002.
- [12] Rick Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 31 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, fourth edition, 2010.
- [13] Wright T.F. et al. A multilocus molecular phylogeny of the parrots (psittaciformes): support for a gondwanan origin during the cretaceous. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 25:2141–2156, 2008.
- [14] Steven N. Evans. *Probability and real trees*, volume 1920 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2008. Lectures from the 35th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2005.
- [15] James Allen Fill and Svante Janson. The sum of powers of subtree sizes for conditioned Galton-Watson trees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 27:Paper No. 114, 77, 2022.
- [16] Christina Goldschmidt, Bénédicte Haas, and Delphin Sénizergues. Stable graphs: distributions and line-breaking construction, 2018.
- [17] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, and Oren Patashnik. *Concrete mathematics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, second edition, 1994. A foundation for computer science.
- [18] Geoffrey R. Grimmett and David R. Stirzaker. *Probability and random processes*. Oxford University Press, New York, third edition, 2001.

- [19] Bénédicte Haas and Grégory Miermont. Scaling limits of Markov branching trees with applications to Galton-Watson and random unordered trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(6):2589–2666, 2012.
- [20] Bénédicte Haas, Grégory Miermont, Jim Pitman, and Matthias Winkel. Continuum tree asymptotics of discrete fragmentations and applications to phylogenetic models. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(5):1790–1837, 2008.
- [21] Oskar Hagen, Klaas Hartmann, Mike Steel, and Tanja Stadler. Age-dependent speciation can explain the shape of empirical phylogenies. *Systematic Biology*, 64:432–440, 2015.
- [22] Inge S. Helland. Central limit theorems for martingales with discrete or continuous time. *Scand. J. Statist.*, 9(2):79–94, 1982.
- [23] Benjamin Hollering and Seth Sullivant. Exchangeable and sampling-consistent distributions on rooted binary trees. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 59(1):60–80, 2022.
- [24] Cecilia Holmgren and Svante Janson. Fringe trees, Crump-Mode-Jagers branching processes and m -ary search trees. *Probab. Surv.*, 14:53–154, 2017.
- [25] Svante Janson. Tree limits and limits of random trees. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 30(6):849–893, 2021.
- [26] Amaury Lambert. Probabilistic models for the (sub)tree(s) of life. *Braz. J. Probab. Stat.*, 31(3):415–475, 2017.
- [27] Jean-François Le Gall and Grégory Miermont. Scaling limits of random trees and planar maps. In *Probability and statistical physics in two and more dimensions*, volume 15 of *Clay Math. Proc.*, pages 155–211. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [28] Russell Lyons and Yuval Peres. *Probability on trees and networks*, volume 42 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016.
- [29] Hosam M. Mahmoud. *Pólya urn models*. Texts in Statistical Science Series. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, [2009] ©2009.
- [30] Matt Pennell. Alternate histories in macroevolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(9):e2300967120, 2023.
- [31] Zhan Shi. *Branching random walks*, volume 2151 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2015. Lecture notes from the 42nd Probability Summer

School held in Saint Flour, 2012, École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour.
[Saint-Flour Probability Summer School].

- [32] Mike Steel. *Phylogeny—discrete and random processes in evolution*, volume 89 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2016.
- [33] Hermann Thorisson. Shift-coupling in continuous time. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 99(4):477–483, 1994.