

# NON-INTERSECTING PATHS AND THE DETERMINANT OF THE DISTANCE MATRIX OF A TREE

EMMANUEL BRIAND, LUIS ESQUIVIAS-QUINTERO, ÁLVARO GUTIÉRREZ,  
ADRIÁN LILLO, AND MERCEDES ROSAS

ABSTRACT. We present the first combinatorial proof of the Graham–Pollak formula for the determinant of the distance matrix of a tree, via sign-reversing involutions and the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot Lemma. Our approach provides a cohesive and unified framework for the understanding of the existing generalizations and  $q$ -analogues of the Graham–Pollak formula, and facilitates the derivation of a natural simultaneous generalizations for them.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a tree  $T$  with vertices labeled from 1 to  $n$ , and edge set  $E$ . The *distance* between vertices  $i$  and  $j$ , denoted by  $d(i, j)$ , is defined as the number of edges along the unique path connecting them in  $T$ . The *distance matrix* of  $T$ , denoted by  $M(T)$ , is then defined as  $(d(i, j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ . In their influential 1971 paper [GP71], Graham and Pollak established that the determinant of the distance matrix of  $T$  obeys what is now known as the *Graham–Pollak formula*:

$$\det M(T) = (-1)^{n-1} (n-1) 2^{n-2}.$$

Observe that this formula implies that the determinant of the distance matrix of  $T$  is solely dependent on its number of vertices, and not on its tree structure.

Multiple techniques drawn from linear algebra, ranging from Gauss elimination to Charles Dodgson’s condensation formula, have been used to prove the Graham–Pollak formula [GP71, YY07, ZD16, DY20]. None of these proofs is combinatorial. However, the expression  $(n-1)2^{n-2}$  strongly suggests that  $\det M(T)$  counts something. There is even an easy guess ([Til10]):  $(n-1)$  is the number of edges of  $T$ , so  $(n-1)2^{n-2}$  is the number of ways of selecting one edge and choosing an orientation for each of the the other  $n-2$ .

The main contribution of this work is a purely combinatorial proof of the Graham–Pollak formula that relies on the existence of sign-reversing involutions, and on the celebrated *Lindström–Gessel–Viennot Lemma* about signed enumeration of paths.

We conclude our work by demonstrating how our combinatorial proof serves not only as a unified framework for existing generalizations and  $q$ -analogues of the Graham–Pollak formula but also enables the derivation of a new one, which is the second contribution of this work.

Our journey starts in Section 3 where we introduce the notion of a *catalyst* for a tree, and show that  $\det M(T)$  does a signed enumeration of all catalysts of  $T$ . Each catalyst induces in a natural way a digraph, an *arrowflow* on  $T$ . We observe that several catalysts can induce the same arrowflow, and obtain in this way a partition of the set of catalysts for  $T$ , the *arrowflow partition*, in which we base our combinatorial study. This is done in Section 4.

The Graham–Pollak formula becomes transparent when expressed in terms of the arrowflow partition. After designating an arrowflow class either *zero-sum* or *unital*, we show that the signed sum of catalysts within a zero-sum class is always equal to zero, while within a unital class it is equal to  $(-1)^{n-1}$ . This is the content of Theorem 4.1 and constitutes the main result of this work.

To show that the signed sum of all catalysts in a zero-sum arrowflow class is zero we establish a sign-reversing involution without fixed points. This is done in Section 5.

To show that the signed sum of all catalysts on a unital arrowflow class on  $T$  equals  $(-1)^{n-1}$ , we develop a new combinatorial framework. We construct a  $n$ -network from a unital arrowflow  $A$  on  $T$ , the *Route Map*  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . Then, we set up a sign-preserving map that embeds the catalysts with arrowflow  $A$  into a families of  $n$  paths on  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . The Lindström–Gessel–Viennot Lemma allows us to conclude that the signed sum of all catalysts in the arrowflow class of  $A$  is equal to the signed count of non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths on  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . This is the content of Section 6.

The argument concludes with the determination, in Sections 7 and 8, of all families of non-intersecting paths on  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . Remarkably, non-intersecting families of paths in the Route Map  $\mathcal{R}_A$ , and their underlying permutation, can be described by means of appropriate Depth-First-Search walks on  $T$ . Using this, we prove that the underlying permutations are always  $n$ -cycles. This concludes our proof of Theorem 4.1.

Section 9 is devoted to deformations of the distance matrix and of the Graham–Pollak Formula. Multiple generalizations of the Graham–Pollak formula have been found. Replacing the distances  $d(i, j)$  by their  $q$ -analogues  $1 + q + q^2 + \dots + q^{d(i,j)-1}$ , one gets a matrix whose determinant is given by

$$(-1)^{n-1}(n-1)(1+q)^{n-2}$$

in [BLP06, YY07]. The determinant is, again, and remarkably, independent on the structure of the tree. Other deformations with the same property are obtained by putting weights on the edges [BKN05] or on the arcs [BLP09, ZD16]. The two kinds of deformations ( $q$ -analogues and weights) have

been combined ([YY07, BLP06] for  $q$ -analogues with weights on edges, [LSZ14] for  $q$ -analogues with weights on arcs).

Recently, Choudhury and Khare found a very general formula [CK23b, Thm. A and Rem. 1.10] that specializes to all of the above.

Our approach based on paths and families of paths in networks suits perfectly the study of deformations, since it allows introducing parameters as weights on arcs. We interpret the distance  $d(i, j)$  as the number of *marked paths* (paths with a distinguished step) from  $i$  to  $j$ . To each marked path

$$(1) \quad i_0 \ i_1 \ \dots \ i_{p-1} \ \underline{i_p \ i_{p+1}} \ i_{p+2} \ \dots \ i_{d-1} \ i_d$$

we associate a monomial

$$x_{i_0 i_1} \ \dots \ x_{i_{p-1} i_p} y_{i_p i_{p+1}} z_{i_{p+1} i_{p+2}} \ \dots \ z_{i_{d-1} i_d}$$

in three families of commuting variables attached to the arcs of the tree. We consider the matrix  $M'(T)$  whose entry  $i, j$  is the generating series of the marked paths from  $i$  to  $j$ . This is a deformation of the distance matrix, that is recovered by specializing all variables to 1. We are able to calculate a compact formula for the determinant of  $M'(T)$  (Theorem 9.4). In this generalization, the property of independence with respect to the structure of the tree is lost. We observe it can be recovered easily by imposing simple relations on the variables. This way, we re-derive very naturally not only Choudhury–Khare’s Formula, but even a deformation of it, involving one more family of parameters. We describe now this new deformation.

We attach to each edge  $e$  two variables  $\alpha_e$  and  $x_e$ , and to each arc  $\gamma$  one variable  $z_\gamma$ . For each edge  $e$ , let  $e^+$  and  $e^-$  be the two arcs it carries (the two orientations of  $e$ ). To each marked path (1) we associate the weight

$$(2) \quad x_{i_0 i_1} \ \dots \ x_{i_{p-1} i_p} \alpha_{\{i_p, i_{p+1}\}} (z_{i_p i_{p+1}} - x_{i_p i_{p+1}}) z_{i_{p+1} i_{p+2}} \ \dots \ z_{i_{d-1} i_d}.$$

where  $x_{e^+} = x_e$  and  $x_{e^-} = 1/x_e$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *The matrix whose entry  $i, j$  is the sum of the weights (2) of the marked paths from  $i$  to  $j$  has determinant*

$$(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e^2 (z_{e^+} - x_e) (z_{e^-} - x_e^{-1}) \prod_{\substack{f \in E \\ f \neq e}} \alpha_f (z_{f^+} z_{f^-} - 1).$$

Note that the matrix depends on the structure of the tree, on the choice of the arcs  $e^+$  and  $e^-$  for each edge  $e$ , and on the assignments of the weights to the edges. But the determinant does not depend on any of these. In particular, it is invariant under all permutations of the families of weights  $(\alpha_e, x_e, z_{e^+}, z_{e^-})$  assigned to each edge.

The Choudhury–Khare deformation [CK23b, Thm. A, case  $x = 0$ ] is obtained by the specialization  $x_e \rightarrow 1$ . Of course, all specializations of the Choudhury–Khare deformation can be obtained as well as specializations of the deformation in Theorem 1.1.

## 2. BASIC DEFINITIONS

We assume familiarity with the standard concepts of graph theory from the reader. Nonetheless, for the sake of consistency, we provide definitions for some of the terms utilized in this work.

We say *edge* for non-oriented edge, *arc* for oriented edge, *graph* for simple graph and *digraph* for directed graph. In a digraph, vertex  $i$  is a *predecessor* (resp. *successor*) of vertex  $j$  if  $(i, j)$  (resp.  $(j, i)$ ) is an arc of the digraph. The *arcs supported on an edge*  $\{i, j\}$  of a simple graph are the ordered pairs  $(i, j)$  and  $(j, i)$ . The *arcs supported on a graph* are the arcs supported on the edges of this graph. We consider *vertex* and *node* as synonyms, but we try to consistently use *vertex* for the trees considered in this work  $(Y, T_0, Y)$ , and *node* for the digraphs  $(\mathcal{H}(Y), \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}_A)$  we build from them, since some vertices (nodes) of the latter represent edges of the former.

A *walk* on a graph (resp. on a digraph) is a sequence of vertices where each pair of consecutive nodes is an edge (resp. an arc). Given a walk  $x = x_0x_1 \cdots x_m$ , we say that node  $x_0$  is its *origin*, node  $x_m$  its *terminus*, and that the ordered pairs  $(x_i, x_{i+1})$  are the *steps* of the walk. Finally, a *path* is a walk with no repeated vertices. Given two vertices  $i$  and  $j$  of a tree, we write  $P(i, j)$  to denote the unique path from  $i$  to  $j$ . Given a digraph  $G$ , we let  $\text{ARCS}(G)$  stand for the set of its arcs.

A  *$n$ -network* is an acyclic directed graph together with two sequences of  $n$  distinct nodes: the *sources*  $(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n)$  and the *sinks*  $(\nabla_1, \dots, \nabla_n)$ . A *family of  $n$  paths* in a  $n$ -network is a set of  $n$  paths, where each path starts from a different source, and ends at a different sink. It induces a permutation  $\sigma$ , determined by the fact that for all  $i$ , the path that starts at source  $\Delta_i$  ends at sink  $\nabla_{\sigma(i)}$ . The *sign* of a family of  $n$  paths is the sign of the corresponding permutation. A family of  $n$ -paths is *non-intersecting* when no node of the  $n$ -network belongs to more than one path of the family.

Given a  $n$ -network  $N$ , we denote with  $P(N)$  the set of its families of  $n$  paths, and with  $\text{NIP}(N)$  the subset of the non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths.

We denote the set of all steps of a path  $x$  by  $\text{STEPS}(x)$ . Given a family of  $n$  paths  $\Lambda = \{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n\}$  in a  $n$ -network, we set define  $\text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$  as the multiset of the steps of the  $\Lambda_i$ , where the multiplicity of a step is the number of paths it belongs to.

We will make use of the following version of the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot Lemma [Lin73, GV85].

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any  $n$ -network  $N$ , there exists a sign-reversing involution on the set of all families of  $n$ -paths of  $N$  with the following properties:*

- (1) *its fixed points are the non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths;*
- (2) *it stabilizes the multiset of steps of the families of  $n$  paths.*

As a consequence,

$$(3) \quad \sum_{\Lambda \in P(N)} \text{sign}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(N)} \text{sign}(\Lambda).$$

A wider application is for  $n$ -networks whose arcs carry weights. Then the weight of a path is defined as the product of the weights of its steps, and the weight  $w(\Lambda)$  of a family of  $n$  paths  $\Lambda$  as the product of the weights of its paths. Then:

$$(4) \quad \sum_{\Lambda \in P(N)} \text{sign}(\Lambda)w(\Lambda) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(N)} \text{sign}(\Lambda)w(\Lambda)$$

The simplifications (3) and (4) obtained from Lemma 2.1 are used in general to evaluate the determinant of a matrix  $A$  whose entry  $a_{i,j}$  counts (or gives the weights of) the paths from source  $i$  to sink  $j$  in a  $n$ -network. Because of that, “Lindström–Gessel–Viennot Lemma” usually refers to (3) or (4), but it is clear from the proofs that it can be restated as the more general Lemma 2.1, and applied as well to signed sums that are not determinants, as we will do in this work.

### 3. CATALYSTS

Throughout the paper, we fix a tree  $T$  with vertex set  $V(T) = [n]$  and edge set  $E$ , where  $[n]$  denotes the set of integers between 1 and  $n$ . Moreover, we let  $E^\pm = \{(i, j) : \{i, j\} \in E\}$  denote the set of arcs (oriented edges) supported on  $T$ .

Given a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[n]$  and a map  $f : V(T) \rightarrow E^\pm$ , the ordered pair  $(\sigma, f)$  is a *catalyst for  $T$*  if for each vertex  $i$ , its image  $f(i) = (v_i, v_{i+1})$  is a step in the path  $P(i, \sigma(i))$ . The *sign* of a catalyst is the sign of its underlying permutation.

**Example 3.1.** Consider the tree  $T$  of Figure 1a. Figures 1b, 1c, 1d show the diagrams of three of its catalysts.




Diagram 1b depicts the catalyst  $(\sigma, f)$  where  $\sigma$  and  $f$  are given by:

$i$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$f(i)$	12	25	31	47	21	62	49	84	41
$\sigma(i)$	6	5	8	7	1	2	9	4	1

FIGURE 1. A tree  $T$  and the diagrams of three of its catalysts.

Now, since  $d(i, \sigma(i))$  counts the steps of the unique path of  $T$  from  $i$  to  $\sigma(i)$ , the determinant  $\det M(T)$  does a signed enumeration of all catalysts for  $T$ . Indeed, by definition

$$\det M(T) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \text{sign}(\sigma) d(1, \sigma(1))d(2, \sigma(2)) \cdots d(n, \sigma(n)).$$

Therefore,  $\det M(T) = \sum_{\kappa} \text{sign} \kappa$ , where the sum is taken across all catalysts for  $T$ .

It is worth noting that the definition of catalyst implies that its underlying permutation is a derangement (permutation without fixed point).

Partitioning catalysts according to their underlying permutations proves to be ineffective in constructing a combinatorial proof for the Graham–Pollak formula. The reason is that in general, there are no cancellations between the resulting summands. In the following section we introduce the arrowflow partition—an optimal partition for the set of catalysts.

#### 4. ARROWFLOWS AND THE GRAHAM–POLLAK FORMULA

An *arrowflow on  $T$*  is a multiset of  $n$  arcs of  $T$ . By definition, given any catalyst  $\kappa = (\sigma, f)$ , the image of  $f$ , considered as a multiset (such that the multiplicity of an arc  $\gamma$  is the number of vertices  $i$  such that  $f(i) = \gamma$ ) is an arrowflow on  $T$ . We refer to it as the *arrowflow induced by  $\kappa$*  on  $T$ .

Observe that different catalysts on  $T$  can result on the same arrowflow. On the other hand, there exist arrowflows on  $T$  that are not induced by any catalyst for  $T$ .

The set of catalysts inducing  $A$  on  $T$  is termed *arrowflow class of  $A$* , denoted by  $C(A)$ . The *arrowflow partition* is the partition defined as the set of nonempty arrowflow classes on the set of all catalysts for  $T$ . Rewriting the signed enumeration of all catalyst that accomplished by  $\det M(T)$ , according to the arrowflow partition, we obtain that

$$(5) \quad \det M(T) = \sum_{\substack{A \\ \text{arrowflow}}} \sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa),$$

where the first sum is taken over all arrowflows on  $T$ , and the second one over all catalysts  $\kappa$  in the arrowflow class  $C(A)$ . Observe that empty arrowflow classes have no effect on this summation.

In Theorem 4.1 we show that the arrowflow partition defines an optimal way of partitioning the set of catalysts for  $T$ . However, before stating it, we need to introduce some additional definitions. We say that an arrowflow  $A$  is *connected* when each edge  $\{i, j\}$  of  $T$  carries an arc  $(i, j)$  or  $(j, i)$  in  $A$ . If  $A$  is a connected arrowflow, then there exist precisely one edge of  $T$  carrying two arcs of  $A$ . We call them the *marked arrows*; we call the underlying edge the *marked edge*.

An arrowflow is said to be *unital* when it is connected and has no repeated arcs, as illustrated in Figure 2 (a). Otherwise, it is said to be *zero-sum*. There are two possible causes for an arrowflow to be zero-sum. Either the arrowflow is disconnected, as illustrated in Figure 2 (b), or the arrowflow is connected, and there is a repeated arrow as illustrated in Figure 2 (c).




FIGURE 2. Unital and zero-sum arrowflows.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $A$  be an arrowflow. Then*

$$(6) \quad \sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{n-1} & \text{if } A \text{ is unital,} \\ 0 & \text{if } A \text{ is zero-sum.} \end{cases}$$

A combinatorial proof of this result will unfold in the next two sections. In the meantime, we show how to deduce a combinatorial proof of the Graham–Pollak formula from it.

*Theorem 4.1 implies the Graham–Pollak formula.* Observe that Formula (6) implies that there can be no cancellations between the different summands in (5). Therefore, it suffices to observe that there exists  $(n - 1) 2^{n-2}$  unital arrowflows on  $T$ , which all have  $\text{sign}(-1)^{n-1}$  by (6). Indeed, this will imply that

$$\det M(T) = \sum_{\substack{A \text{ unital} \\ \text{arrowflow}}} (-1)^{n-1} = (-1)^{n-1} (n - 1) 2^{n-2}.$$

To count the number of possible unital arrowflows on  $T$  note that the factor  $(n - 1)$  counts the ways of selecting the marked edge of  $T$ , whereas factor  $2^{n-2}$  counts the number of ways in which the remaining  $n - 2$  edges can be oriented. ■

## 5. ZERO-SUM ARROWFLOWS

Let  $A$  be a zero-sum arrowflow. In this section, we show that the signed sum of catalysts in  $C(A)$  is zero by exhibiting a sign-reversing involution  $\varphi_A$  of  $C(A)$  without fixed points. This amounts to one half of Theorem 4.1. The idea is to define  $\varphi_A(\sigma, f) = (\sigma \circ (i j), f \circ (i j))$  where  $i$  and  $j$  are two appropriately chosen vertices of  $T$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $A$  be a disconnected zero-sum arrowflow on  $T$ . Fix an edge  $\{i, j\}$  of  $T$  among those carrying no arc of  $A$ .*

*For any  $(\sigma, f) \in C(A)$ , set  $\varphi_A(\sigma, f) = (\sigma \circ (i j), f \circ (i j))$ . Then  $\varphi_A$  is a sign-reversing involution of  $C(A)$  without fixed points.*




FIGURE 3. Involution  $\varphi_A$  on a zero-sum disconnected arrowflow in which  $\{i, j\}$  does not separate  $\sigma(i)$  and  $\sigma(j)$ .




FIGURE 4. Involution  $\varphi_A$  on a zero-sum disconnected arrowflow in which  $\{i, j\}$  separates  $\sigma(i)$  and  $\sigma(j)$ .

*Proof.* It is enough to show that, for every  $\kappa = (\sigma, f) \in C(A)$ ,  $\varphi_A(\kappa)$  is a catalyst. As the multiset of the arcs  $f(i)$ , for  $i \in V(T)$ , is invariant under  $\varphi_A$ , we will conclude that  $\varphi_A(\kappa) \in C(A)$ .

Let  $\kappa = (\sigma, f) \in C(A)$  and  $\varphi_A(\kappa) = (\tau, g)$ . By construction, for any vertex  $k$  of  $T$  distinct from  $i$  and  $j$ , the arc  $g(k)$  is a step in  $P(k, \tau(k))$ . It remains to show that it is also the case when  $k$  is  $i$  or  $j$ . We will prove it only for  $k = i$ , since the case  $k = j$  is similar.

Let  $(a, b) = f(j)$ . Let  $T'$  the tree obtained from  $T$  by deleting the edge  $\{a, b\}$ . For any vertex  $k$ , observe that  $(a, b)$  is a step in  $P(k, \sigma(k))$  if and only if  $k$  and  $a$  are in one connected component of  $T'$  while  $\sigma(k)$  and  $b$  in the other. Since  $(a, b) = f(j)$ , it is a step of  $P(j, \sigma(j))$ . Therefore  $j$  and  $a$  are in one component of  $T'$ , and  $\sigma(j)$  and  $b$  are in the other. Since  $\{i, j\} \neq \{a, b\}$  (because  $\{i, j\}$  carries no arc of  $A$  but  $\{a, b\}$  carries  $(a, b) = f(j)$ ), the vertex  $i$  is still a neighbor of  $j$  in  $T'$ . Therefore it is in the same connected component as  $j$  and  $a$ . Applying the property again, we obtain that  $(a, b)$ , which is  $g(i)$ , is a step in  $P(i, \sigma(j))$ , which is  $P(i, \tau(i))$ . ■

We remark that the involution described above does not change the multiset of steps of the catalyst whenever  $\{i, j\}$  is in the path  $P(\sigma(i), \sigma(j))$ , see Figure 3. However, this is no longer true when we drop this assumption, see Figure 4.

For connected zero-sum arrowflows, we introduce a similar involution. Moreover,  $i$  and  $j$  will not depend on arbitrary choices.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $A$  be a connected zero-sum arrowflow on  $T$ . Let  $(a, b)$  be the unique element of  $A$  with multiplicity 2. For any  $(\sigma, f) \in C(A)$ , set*

$$\varphi_A(\sigma, f) = (\sigma \circ (i j), f \circ (i j)) = (\sigma \circ (i j), f),$$

where  $i$  and  $j$  are the two preimages of the marked arrow  $(a, b)$  of  $A$  under  $f$ . Then  $\varphi_A$  is a sign-reversing involution of  $C(A)$  without fixed points.




FIGURE 5. Involution  $\varphi_A$  on a zero-sum connected arrowflow.

*Proof.* As in the disconnected case, it is sufficient to show that  $f(i)$  is a step in  $P(i, \sigma(j))$ . By symmetry, we also have that  $f(j)$  is a step in  $P(j, \sigma(i))$ . Now, we proceed in the same way as the previous lemma. Since  $(a, b) = f(i) = f(j)$  is a step in both  $P(i, \sigma(i))$  and  $P(j, \sigma(j))$ , vertices  $i, j$  and  $a$  belongs to one connected component of the tree obtained from  $T$  by deleting  $\{a, b\}$ , whereas  $\sigma(i), \sigma(j)$  and  $b$  are in the other one. See Figure 5. ■

## 6. UNITAL ARROWFLOWS: THE ROUTE MAP $\mathcal{R}_A$

In this section and the following two, we proceed to prove (as Theorem 8.13) the second half of Theorem 4.1, corresponding to the case of unital arrowflows.

This section is devoted to the description of the  $n$ -network  $\mathcal{R}_A$  (the “Route Map”) associated to an unital arrowflow  $A$  on  $T$ , with the property that the set of catalyts in  $C(A)$  embeds into the set of families of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

**6.1. Construction of the Route Map.** *Overview:* Let  $A$  be a unital arrowflow on  $T$ . In 6.1.1 we build from  $T$  and  $A$  a plane rooted tree  $T_0$  by adjoining a root  $r$  to  $T$ , and equip it with an orientation  $A_0$  derived from  $A$ . In 6.1.2 we describe a general construction  $Y \mapsto \mathcal{H}(Y)$  that associates an acyclic digraph  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  to a planar rooted tree  $Y$ . In 6.1.3 this construction is applied twice to get two  $n$ -networks: the Southern Hemisphere  $\mathcal{S}$  and northern hemisphere  $\mathcal{N}$ , as

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{H}(T_0), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N} = \Psi(\mathcal{H}(T'_0))$$

where  $T'_0$  is the mirror image of  $T_0$ , and  $\Psi$  is an anti-isomorphism. Then the Route Map  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is obtained by gluing  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  with  $n$  arcs from the former to the latter.

6.1.1. *The plane rooted tree  $T_0$  obtained from  $T$  and the unital arrowflow  $A$ .* Given an unital arrowflow  $A$ , let  $T_0 = T_0(T, A)$  be the rooted tree obtained from  $T$  by subdividing the marked edge  $\{a, b\}$  by inserting a new vertex  $r$ , and choosing it as the root of  $T_0$ .

Let  $A_0$  be the set of arcs obtained from  $A$  by substituting the arcs  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, a)$  of  $A$  with  $(r, a)$  and  $(r, b)$ . As a result, every edge  $\{i, j\}$  in  $T_0$  supports exactly one arc  $((i, j)$  or  $(j, i))$  of  $A_0$ . Thus,  $A_0$  defines an orientation of  $T_0$ . See Figures 6a and 6b.

Let  $i$  and  $j$  be vertices of  $T_0$  with  $j$  a child of  $i$ . We say that  $j$  is an *ascending child* of  $i$  if  $(j, i) \in A_0$ ; otherwise (i.e. when  $(i, j) \in A_0$ ) we say that  $j$  is a *descending child* of  $i$ . In Figure 6b, the arcs connecting ascending children to their parent are highlighted. We endow  $T_0$  with the structure of a *plane tree* by choosing arbitrarily, for each vertex  $i$  of  $T_0$ , a total order  $<_i$  on its children, fulfilling the condition “*ascending children precede descending children*”. More precisely, we require that  $j <_i k$  whenever  $j$  and  $k$  are, respectively, an ascending child and a descending child of  $i$ . Finally, for any vertex  $i$  of  $T_0$  that is not the root  $r$ , extend the order  $<_i$  to the parent  $p$  of  $i$  by requiring that  $j <_i p$  for all children  $j$  of  $i$ . See Figure 6c.




FIGURE 6

6.1.2. *The hemisphere construction.* We describe here the *hemisphere  $n$ -network  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$*  built from a plane rooted tree  $Y$ , equipped with an orientation  $A_0$ .

This construction will be applied twice: with  $Y = T_0$  and with  $Y$  equal to the mirror image  $T'_0$  of  $T_0$ .

We start with an informal description of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . There are three types of nodes in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ : the  $v$ -nodes, representing the vertices of  $Y$ ; the  $e$ -nodes, representing the arcs of  $Y$ ; and the  $s$ -nodes, that represent *oriented sectors* of  $Y$ .

**Example 6.1.** Consider for  $Y$  the plane rooted tree  $T_0$  of Figure 6c. Its nodes are shown in Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. Nodes of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ .

Then one can walk in one step on  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ :

- (1) from an arc supported on  $Y$  entering vertex  $i$  to a sector around  $i$  adjacent to this arc;
- (2) from a sector around  $i$  towards the “next” sector around  $i$  (the two sectors have the same orientation);
- (3) from a sector around  $i$  towards the next adjacent arc leaving  $i$ ;
- (4) from vertex  $i$  to the first arc leaving  $i$ ;
- (5) from vertex  $i$  to the first oriented sector around  $i$ .

**Example 6.2** (Continuation of Example 6.1). Figure 8 shows the nodes of a walk in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  from the node representing vertex 4 to the node representing the arc  $(2, 6)$ .




FIGURE 8. Walk from  $v(4)$  to  $e(2, 6)$  in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ .

Let us now give a precise definition of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ .

Firstly, for each vertex  $i$  of  $Y$ , the order  $<_i$  on the children of  $i$  (defining the *plane* rooted tree structure) is extended to all neighbors of  $i$  (i.e. to its parent  $p$  if it exists) by imposing that  $j <_i p$  whenever  $j$  is a child of  $i$  (“parent last”).

The set of nodes of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  consists of:

- (1) One  $v$ -node  $v(i)$  for each vertex  $i$  of  $Y$ , including the root;
- (2) Two  $e$ -nodes  $e(i, j)$  and  $e(j, i)$  for every edge  $\{i, j\}$  of  $Y$ ;

(3) Two sequences of  $s$ -nodes

$$s_i(j_1, j_2), s_i(j_2, j_3), \dots, s_i(j_{m-1}, j_m) \quad \text{and} \\ s_i(j_m, j_{m-1}), s_i(j_{m-1}, j_{m-2}), \dots, s_i(j_2, j_1)$$

for each vertex  $i$  or  $Y$  where  $j_1 <_i j_2 <_i \dots <_i j_m$  are the neighbours of  $i$  (children and, last of all, the parent, if  $i$  is not the root).

The digraph  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  is obtained as

$$\mathcal{H}(Y) = \bigcup_{i \in V(T_0)} (\Gamma(i)^+ \cup \Gamma(i)^-)$$

where  $\Gamma(i)^+$  and  $\Gamma(i)^-$  are defined by Figure 9, in which  $j_1 <_i j_2 <_i \dots <_i j_m$  are the neighbors of  $i$ . The digraphs  $\Gamma(i)^+$  and  $\Gamma(i)^-$  intertwine to create the graph  $\Gamma(i) = \Gamma(i)^+ \cup \Gamma(i)^-$  shown in Figure 10.




FIGURE 9. The local digraphs  $\Gamma(i)^+$  and  $\Gamma(i)^-$ .




FIGURE 10. Digraph  $\Gamma(i)$  for a vertex  $i$ , different from the root, and with neighbours  $j_1 <_i j_2 <_i j_3 <_i j_4 <_i j_5$ . Note that  $j_5$  is the parent of  $i$ .

Observe that, by construction, every arc in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  is part of one and only one of the local graphs  $\Gamma(i)$ .

Two local digraphs  $\Gamma(i)$  and  $\Gamma(j)$  intersect if and only if vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are neighbors. In this case, the intersection uniquely consists of the pair of nodes  $e(i, j), e(j, i)$ .

6.1.3. *The hemispheres  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  and the Route Map  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .* We come back to the case of the tree  $T$  with arrowflow  $A$  and the plane rooted tree  $T'_0$  with orientation  $A_0$  obtained from them.

The *Southern Hemisphere*  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{H}(T_0)$ .

The Northern Hemisphere  $\mathcal{N}$ , on the other hand, is a flipped version of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $T'_0$  be the mirror image of  $T_0$ . As a rooted tree,  $T'_0$  is identical to  $T_0$ , but their plane directed tree structures differ:

- Orientation: the orientation of  $T'_0$  is defined by  $A'_0$ , the set of arcs obtained by reversing the orientation of the arcs of  $A_0$ . Therefore, any descending child of  $i$  switches to an ascending child in  $T'_0$ , and vice-versa.
- Plane tree structure: for each vertex  $i$  of  $T'_0$ , we define the order  $<'_i$  on the children of  $i$  in  $T'_0$  by reversing the order  $<_i$  on the children of  $i$  in  $T_0$ .

Thus, the tree  $T'_0$  still follows the rule “ascending children precede descending children”. See Figure 11.



(a) A plane rooted tree  $T_0$  oriented by  $A_0$ .

(b) The flipped image  $T'_0$  of  $T_0$ , with orientation  $A'_0$ .

FIGURE 11. A plane rooted directed tree and its mirror image.

The *Northern Hemisphere*  $\mathcal{N}$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{H}(T'_0)$  by reversing each arc in  $\mathcal{H}(T'_0)$ , and replacing each node  $x$  by  $\Psi(x)$  where

$$\Psi(v'(i)) = v'(i), \quad \Psi(e'(i, j)) = e'(j, i), \quad \Psi(s'_i(u, v)) = s'_i(v, u).$$

This makes of  $\Psi$  an anti-isomorphism of digraphs from  $\mathcal{H}(T'_0)$  to  $\mathcal{N}$ .

The *Route Map*  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is obtained from the disjoint union of  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  by adding  $n$  arcs  $(e(a), e'(a))$ , one for each  $a$  in  $A_0$ . These arcs are referred to as the *bridges between hemispheres* of  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

In Section 6.2, we will prove that the Southern Hemisphere, the Northern Hemisphere, and the Route Map are all acyclic digraphs. This observation allows us to endow each of them with a structure of *network* by declaring that, given  $A_0 = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ , the sources and sinks of each are

- $(v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n))$  and  $(e(a_1), e(a_2), \dots, e(a_n))$  for  $\mathcal{S}$ ;
- $(e'(a_1), e'(a_2), \dots, e'(a_n))$  and  $(v'(1), v'(2), \dots, v'(n))$  for  $\mathcal{N}$ ;
- $(v(1), v(2), \dots, v(n))$  and  $(v'(1), v'(2), \dots, v'(n))$  for  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

**6.2. Paths and walks in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ .** We come back in this section to the setting of 6.1.2, i.e. of a plane rooted tree  $Y$  with root  $r$ . We study the relation between paths in  $Y$  and walks in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . The results will be used to lift paths in  $T_0$  to paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

Let us associate to every walk  $W$  in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  an *induced path* on  $Y$ . With this aim, we first define two maps  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  on the nodes of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . If  $x$  is either a  $v$ -node or an  $s$ -node, there exists a unique vertex  $i$  in  $Y$  such that  $x$  belongs to the local graph  $\Gamma(i)$ ; in this situation, we set  $\alpha(x) = \beta(x) = i$ . On the other hand, if  $x$  is an  $e$ -node  $e(i, j)$ , we set  $\alpha(x) = i$  and  $\beta(x) = j$ . With this in mind, given a walk  $W$  in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  with origin  $x$  and terminus  $y$ , we define the *path of  $Y$  induced by  $W$*  as the unique path in  $Y$  from  $\alpha(x)$  to  $\beta(y)$ .

**Example 6.3** (Examples 6.1 and 6.2 continued). The path in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  show in Figure 8 is the unique path from  $v(4)$  to  $e(2, 6)$ . Its sequence of  $e$ -nodes is

$$e(4, 1), e(1, r), e(r, 2), e(2, 6).$$

Accordingly, its induced path of  $Y$  is 4, 1,  $r$ , 2, 6.

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $W$  be a walk in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , and let  $i_0 i_1 \cdots i_p$  be its induced path of  $Y$ . Then,*

$$W = S_0 e(i_0, i_1) S_1 e(i_1, i_2) \cdots S_{p-1} e(i_{p-1}, i_p) S_p,$$

where each  $S_k$  is a sequence of  $v$ -nodes and  $s$ -nodes in  $\Gamma(i_k)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x$  and  $y$  be the origin and terminus of  $W$ .

Let  $e(j_1, k_1), e(j_2, k_2), \dots, e(j_m, k_m)$  be the sub-sequence of the  $e$ -nodes in  $W$ . Then  $W$  decomposes as

$$S_0 e(j_1, k_1) S_1 e(j_2, k_2) \cdots S_{m-1} e(j_m, k_m) S_m,$$

where each  $S_\ell$  is a sequence of  $v$ -nodes and  $s$ -nodes. Since removing all  $e$ -nodes splits  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  into disjoint path digraphs, each contained in a single  $\Gamma(i)$ , each of the  $S_\ell$  is either empty or contained in a single graph  $\Gamma(i_\ell)$ .

For  $\ell$  such that  $0 < \ell < m$ , the sequence  $S_\ell$  is non-empty since no two  $e$ -nodes are adjacent. In that case, there is unique  $i_\ell$  such that  $S_\ell$  is contained in  $\Gamma(i_\ell)$ .

Any  $e$ -node  $e(j, k)$  has all its predecessors in  $\Gamma(j)$  and all its successors in  $\Gamma(k)$ . Therefore, for  $\ell$  such that  $0 < \ell < m$ , we have  $k_\ell = i_\ell = j_{\ell+1}$ . As a consequence, the decomposition of  $W$  is actually

$$S_0 e(j_1, i_1) S_1 e(i_1, i_2) \cdots S_{m-1} e(i_{m-1}, k_m) S_m.$$

For the same reason, if  $S_0$  is non-empty (resp.  $S_m$  is non empty) then  $j_1 = i_0$  (resp.  $k_m = i_m$ ). In that case,  $\alpha(x) = i_0$  (resp.  $\beta(y) = i_m$ ).

If  $S_0$  (resp.  $S_m$ ) is empty (which implies  $m > 0$ , because  $W$  is non-empty), just define  $i_0 = j_1$  (resp.  $i_m = k_m$ ). In that case,  $x = e(i_0, i_1)$  and it holds as well that  $\alpha(x) = i_0$  (resp.  $y = e(i_{m-1}, i_m)$  and  $\beta(y) = i_m$ ).

For each  $\ell < m$ , the existence of the node  $e(i_\ell, i_{\ell+1})$  shows that  $i_\ell$  and  $i_{\ell+1}$  are adjacent in  $Y$ . Therefore  $i_0 i_1 \cdots i_m$  is a walk in  $Y$ . This walk has no recoil (i.e. there is no  $\ell$  such that  $i_{\ell-1} = i_{\ell+1}$ ), because there is no walk from  $e(i_{\ell-1}, i_\ell)$  to  $e(i_\ell, i_{\ell+1})$  in  $\Gamma(i_\ell)$  (see Lemma 6.5 below). But in a tree, a walk with no recoil is a path. Therefore  $i_0 i_1 \cdots i_m$  is the path from  $i_0$  to  $i_m$  in  $T_0$ . Since  $i_0 = \alpha(x)$  and  $i_m = \beta(y)$ , this path is the unique path from  $\alpha(x)$  to  $\beta(y)$ , i.e. the path of  $Y$  induced by  $W$ . ■

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $i$  be a vertex of  $Y$ . Then,*

- (1) *There exists at most one walk in  $\Gamma(i)$  between any two nodes of  $\Gamma(i)$ .*
- (2) *There is no walk in  $\Gamma(i)$  from  $e(j, i)$  to  $e(i, j)$  whenever  $j$  is a neighbour of  $i$ .*
- (3) *There exists a walk in  $\Gamma(i)$  from  $v(i)$  to  $e(i, j)$  for any neighbour  $j$  of  $i$ .*
- (4) *There exists a walk in  $\Gamma(i)$  from  $e(j, i)$  to  $e(i, k)$ , for any two distinct neighbours  $j$  and  $k$  of  $i$ ,*

*Proof.* Let  $i$  be a vertex of  $Y$ . Let  $j_1 <_i j_2 <_i \cdots <_i j_m$  be the neighbours of  $i$ . Define the following height function  $h$  on the nodes of  $\Gamma(i)$ :

$$\begin{array}{c|cccccc} x & v(i) & s_i(j_\ell, j_{\ell+1}) & s_i(j_{\ell+1}, j_\ell) & e(i, j_\ell) & e(j_\ell, i) \\ \hline h(x) & 0 & \ell + \frac{1}{2} & \ell + \frac{1}{2} & \ell & \ell \end{array}$$

Any arc in  $\Gamma(i)$  belongs either to  $\Gamma(i)^+$  or  $\Gamma(i)^-$ . Call *increasing arcs* the arcs in  $\Gamma(i)^+$ , and *decreasing arcs* those in  $\Gamma(i)^-$ . Observe that an arc  $(x, y)$  of  $\Gamma(i)$  is increasing when  $h(x) < h(y)$ , and decreasing when  $h(x) > h(y)$ .

Note that, given two arcs  $(x, y)$  and  $(y, z)$  of  $\Gamma(i)$ , such that the end of the first arc is the start of the second, it always holds that either they are both increasing, or both decreasing. See Figure 9. Therefore any non-trivial walk in  $\Gamma(i)$  consists of only increasing steps, or only decreasing steps.

Consider two nodes  $x$  and  $y$  of  $\Gamma(i)$ . Since both  $\Gamma(i)^+$  and  $\Gamma(i)^-$  are directed trees, there is at most one walk from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\Gamma(i)^+$ , and at most one walk from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\Gamma(i)^-$ . Moreover, if there is a walk from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\Gamma(i)^+$  (resp. in  $\Gamma(i)^-$ ) then  $h(y) > h(x)$  (resp.  $h(y) < h(x)$ ). Therefore, there cannot exist at the same time a walk from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\Gamma(i)^+$  and another one in  $\Gamma(i)^-$ . This proves (1).

To prove (2), it suffices to observe that for any neighbour  $j$  of  $i$ ,  $h(e(i, j)) = h(e(j, i))$ .

To prove (3), we exhibit a path in  $\Gamma(i)$  from  $v(i)$  to  $e(i, j)$ . There exists  $\ell$  such that  $j = j_\ell$ . The path is:

$$v(i) s_i(j_1, j_2) s_i(j_2, j_3) \cdots s_i(j_{\ell-1}, j_\ell) e(i, j_\ell).$$

Finally, let  $k$  be a neighbour of  $i$ , different from  $j$ . There exists  $p \neq \ell$  such that  $k = j_p$ . Then,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{if } p > \ell : & e(j_\ell, i) s_i(j_\ell, j_{\ell+1}) s_i(j_{\ell+1}, j_{\ell+2}) \cdots s_i(j_{p-1}, j_p) e(i, j_p), \\ \text{if } p < \ell : & e(j_\ell, i) s_i(j_\ell, j_{\ell-1}) s_i(j_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-2}) \cdots s_i(j_{p+1}, j_p) e(i, j_p). \end{array}$$

is a path in  $\Gamma(i)$  from  $e(j, i)$  to  $e(i, k)$ . This proves (4). ■

**Proposition 6.6.** *Given any pair of nodes  $x$  and  $y$  of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , there is at most one walk in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  from  $x$  to  $y$ . Therefore, any walk in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  is a path, and  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  is acyclic.*

*Proof.* Assume there is a walk  $W$  in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  from  $x$  to  $y$ . Consider the decomposition of  $W$  as in Lemma 6.4.

If  $p = 0$ , then  $W = S_0$ , thus  $W$  is the unique walk in  $\Gamma(i_0)$  from  $x$  to  $y$ .

On the other hand, if  $p > 0$ , then  $S_0e(i_0, i_1)$  is the unique walk in  $\Gamma(i_0)$  from  $x$  to  $e(i_0, i_1)$ . Similarly, for every  $\ell$  satisfying that  $0 < \ell < p$ , the walk  $e(i_{\ell-1}, i_\ell)S_\ell e(i_\ell, e_{\ell+1})$  is the unique in walk in  $\Gamma(i_\ell)$  from  $e(i_{\ell-1}, i_\ell)$  to  $e(i_\ell, i_{\ell+1})$ . Finally,  $e(i_{p-1}, i_p)S_p$  is the unique walk in  $\Gamma(i_p)$  from  $e(i_{p-1}, i_p)$  to  $y$ .

We conclude that any walk  $W$  is entirely determined by its origin  $x$  and its terminus  $y$ , thus ensuring its uniqueness. ■

**6.3. Catalysts induce families of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .** We return to general setting of the tree  $T$  with arrowflow  $A$ , and of its derived plane rooted tree  $T_0$  with orientation  $A_0$ . We assume the plane rooted tree structure of  $T_0$  and the orientation  $A_0$  fulfill the condition "ascending children precede descending children".

We apply the results of the previous section to show how any catalyst  $(\sigma, f) \in C(A)$  induces a family of  $n$  paths on the Route Map  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

**Corollary 6.7.** *Any walk in  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is a path. Therefore,  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_A$  are acyclic digraphs.*

*Proof.* The result is immediate for  $\mathcal{S}$  since it is  $\mathcal{H}(T_0)$ . The same results hold for  $\mathcal{H}(T'_0)$  and extend to  $\mathcal{N}$  as the image of  $\mathcal{H}(T'_0)$  by the anti-isomorphism  $\Psi$ .

Finally, since all bridges between hemispheres point from South to North, the properties extend to  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . ■

As defined in the introduction, a *marked path* in a tree is a pair consisting of a path  $\pi = i_0i_1 \cdots i_m$  in the tree together with a distinguished step  $(i_p, i_{p+1})$ . Recall that  $T_0$  is constructed from  $T$  by subdividing an edge  $\{a, b\}$ ; a path  $\pi$  in  $T$  induces a path  $\pi_0$  in  $T_0$  by changing each instance of the subwalk  $ab$  for  $arb$  and the subwalk  $ba$  for  $bra$ . A marked path  $(\pi; \gamma)$  of  $T$  induces a marked path  $(\pi_0; \gamma_0)$  of  $T_0$  in the following way: if  $\gamma = (a, b)$ , then let  $\gamma_0 = (r, b)$ , and if  $\gamma = (b, a)$  then let  $\gamma_0 = (r, a)$ ; otherwise, let  $\gamma_0 = \gamma$ .

Let  $(\pi, \gamma)$  be a marked path in  $T$ , and let  $(\pi_0; \gamma_0)$  be the corresponding marked path in  $T_0$ , with  $\pi_0 = i_0 \cdots i_m$ . If  $\gamma$  is in the arrowflow  $A$ , then  $\gamma_0$  is in  $A_0$ . In this situation, the marked path can be lifted to the Route Map. Indeed, there exists a unique path from  $v(i_0)$  to  $e(\gamma_0)$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  (Lemma 6.5 (3) and (4)) and a unique path from  $e'(\gamma_0)$  to  $v'(i_m)$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  (Corollary 6.7). Finally, since  $\gamma_0 \in A_0$ , the bridge between hemispheres  $(e(\gamma_0), e'(\gamma_0))$  belongs to  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . Therefore, the concatenation

$$v(i_0) \cdots e(\gamma_0)e'(\gamma_0) \cdots v'(i_m)$$

is a path in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ , that we call the *lifting of the marked path*  $(\pi_0; \gamma_0)$ . By abuse of notation, we also call it the lifting of the marked path  $(\pi; \gamma)$ . The *lifting of a catalyst*  $\kappa = (\sigma, f)$  in  $C(A)$  is the family of  $n$  paths

$$\Lambda(\kappa) = \{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \dots, \Lambda_n\}$$

where  $\Lambda_i$  is the lifting of the marked path  $(P(i, \sigma(i)); f(i))$ .

**Example 6.8.** Let  $\kappa = (\sigma, f)$  be the catalyst of Example 3.1, defined by the table:

$i$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$f(i)$	12	25	31	47	21	62	49	84	41
$\sigma(i)$	6	5	8	7	3	2	9	4	1

Let  $\mathcal{R}_A$  be the Route Map in Figure 13. To lift  $\kappa$  into a family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ , we proceed as follows.

To obtain  $\Lambda_9$ , note that  $\sigma(9) = 1$  and  $f(1) = 41$ . The marked path  $(P(9, 1); 41)$  is 941, and its corresponding marked path in  $T_0$  is also 941. To lift it to the Route Map, we trace the unique path from  $v(9)$  to  $v'(1)$  that goes through the edge  $(e(4, 1), e'(4, 1))$ . See Figure 12.





FIGURE 12. Lifting of a marked path  $(P(9,1); 41)$  to  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

To obtain  $\Lambda_1$ , note that  $\sigma(1) = 6$  and  $f(1) = 12$ . The marked path  $(P(1, 6); 12)$  is 126, and its corresponding marked path in  $T_0$  is 1r26. To lift it to the Route Map, we trace the unique path from  $v(1)$  to  $v'(6)$  that goes through the edge  $(e(r, 2), e'(r, 2))$ .

Similarly, this can be done with the rest of vertices. The resulting family  $\Lambda$  of path is illustrated in Figure 13, where a node gets subscript  $i$  if it is visited by  $\Lambda_i$ .

A family of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is *full* when every bridge  $(e(u, v), e'(u, v))$  belongs to exactly to one of its paths. Since any family that is not full must contain an intersection at some bridge, non-intersecting families of paths are always full. Moreover, the lifting of catalysts in a unital arrowflow class are always full.

**Lemma 6.9.** *The operation of lifting defines a sign-preserving bijection between the set of catalysts with unital arrowflow  $A$  and the set of full families of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .*

FIGURE 13. Lifting of a catalyst to  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

*Proof.* In order to show that the lifting map is bijective, we give its inverse. Let  $\Lambda = \{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n\}$  be a family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . Let  $\sigma$  be its underlying permutation. Define a map  $\tilde{f} : V(T) \rightarrow A_0$  that sends  $i$  to the arc  $a_i$  corresponding to the bridge  $(e(a_i), e'(a_i))$  of  $\Lambda_i$ . If  $\{a, b\}$  is the marked edge of the arrowflow  $A$ , post-compose  $\tilde{f}$  with the map  $A_0 \rightarrow E^\pm$  sending  $(r, a) \mapsto (b, a)$  and  $(r, b) \mapsto (a, b)$  and that is the identity elsewhere. Then the composition

$$f : V(T) \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow E^\pm$$

together with  $\sigma$  is a catalyst  $(\sigma, f) \in C(A)$ .

We have defined a left inverse for the lifting map. This suffices, since there is a unique path in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  from a given  $v(i)$  to a given  $v'(j)$  and through a given bridge; see Proposition 6.6 and Corollary 6.7.

Finally, since the underlying permutation of a catalyst is the permutation induced by its lifting, the lifting map is a sign-preserving bijection. ■

Observe that Lemma 6.9 allows us to rewrite Equation (6) as

$$\sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa) = \sum_{\Lambda \in F(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda),$$

where  $F(\mathcal{R}_A)$  denotes the set of full families of  $n$  paths on  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

**Theorem 6.10.** *Let  $A$  be a unital arrowflow. Then,*

$$\sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda),$$

where  $\text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)$  denotes the set of non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

*Proof.* As we have remarked above, Lemma 6.9 allows to rewrite the signed enumeration of catalysts in  $C(A)$  as a signed enumeration of full families of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is an  $n$ -network by Corollary 6.7. We can thus apply the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot involution from Lemma 2.1. We only need the simpler Equation (3); we choose to be more explicit to help the reader. The Lindström–Gessel–Viennot involution:

- (1) stabilizes the multiset of steps of the families, and thus it sends full families to full families;

- (2) is sign-reversing, and thus non-fixed points cancel each other out in the signed sum;
- (3) fixes the set of non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths, and therefore those are the only surviving summands.

Moreover, recall a non-intersecting family is necessarily full. Altogether,

$$\sum_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}_A) \cap \text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda). \quad \blacksquare$$

### 7. NON-INTERSECTING FAMILIES OF $n$ PATHS IN $\mathcal{H}(Y)$

The setting of this section is that of 6.1.2, i.e. of a plane rooted tree  $Y$  with root  $r$ , but with the additional data of an orientation  $A_0$  such that

- the root  $r$  of  $Y$  has exactly two children  $a$  and  $b$ , which are either both descending or both ascending (in order to cover as well the cases  $Y = T_0$  where both children are descending and  $Y = T'_0$  where both children are ascending).
- for each vertex  $i$  of  $Y$ , in the local order  $<_i$  ascending children precede descending children.

We say that an arc  $(i, j)$  of  $Y$  is *forward* if  $(i, j) \in A_0$ , or *backward* if  $(j, i) \in A_0$ . We also say that  $(i, j)$  is *upward* if  $j$  is the parent of  $i$  or *downward* if  $j$  is a child of  $i$ . This partitions the set of arcs of  $Y$  in four parts:

	forward	backward
upward	$U_F$	$U_B$
downward	$D_F$	$D_B$

Using this language, we have that arcs  $(r, a)$  and  $(r, b)$  of  $Y$  are either both forward or both backwards, that if  $(i, j)$  is downward upward and  $(i, j')$  is downward-backward, then  $j <_i j'$ , and that if  $(i, j)$  is downwards and  $(i, j')$  is upwards then  $j <_i j'$ .

We introduce notations to establish our conventions. For any set  $E$  of arcs within an  $n$ -network  $N$ , the *outdegree* (denoted by  $\text{out}_E z$ ), *indegree* (denoted by  $\text{in}_E z$ ), and *degree* (denoted by  $\text{deg}_E z$ ) of a node  $x$  in  $N$  are defined, respectively, by  $\text{out}_E z = \#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x = z\}$ ,  $\text{in}_E z = \#\{(x, y) \in E \mid y = z\}$ , and  $\text{deg}_E z = (\text{out}_E z, \text{in}_E z)$ . Moreover, the *net flow* passing by a set  $X$  of nodes of  $N$  is defined as:

$$F_E(X) = \sum_{z \in X} (\text{out}_E z - \text{in}_E z)$$

Therefore,

$$(7) \quad F_E(X) = \#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x \in X \text{ and } y \notin X\} \\ - \#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x \notin X \text{ and } y \in X\}.$$

If  $N$  is an  $n$ -network with sinks  $\Delta$  and sources  $\nabla$ ,  $\Lambda$  is a non-intersecting path of  $N$ , and  $E = \text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$ , then it holds that

$$(8) \quad F_E(X) = \#(\Delta \cap X) - \#(\nabla \cap X).$$

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $N$  be an  $n$ -network, in which no node simultaneously serves as both a source and a sink, and let  $E$  be a set of arcs of  $N$ .*

*Then, there exist at most one non-intersecting path  $\Lambda$  in  $N$  with  $\text{STEPS}(\Lambda) = E$ . Furthermore, given a non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $N$  with set of steps  $E$ , for every node  $z$  in  $N$ ,*

$$\deg_E z = \begin{cases} (1, 0), & \text{if } z \text{ is a source of } N, \\ (0, 1), & \text{if } z \text{ is a sink of } N, \\ (1, 1) \text{ or } (0, 0), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . Let  $E = \text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$ . Let  $i$  and  $j$  be two vertices of  $Y$  such that  $i$  is the parent of  $j$ . Then*

$$\text{out}_E e(j, i) = \text{in}_E e(i, j).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Sigma(j) = \bigcup_h \Gamma(h)$ , where the union is over all vertices  $h$  of the subtree  $Y(j)$  of  $Y$  formed by  $j$  and all of its descendants (children, grandchildren, etc.). Let  $B$  be the set of all nodes of  $\Sigma(j)$ . Let us count the sources and the sinks of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  in  $B$ .

The sources in  $B$  are the nodes  $v(h)$  for  $h$  vertex of  $Y(j)$ . Let  $m$  be the number of such vertices.

The sinks in  $B$ , on the other hand, are the  $e$ -nodes  $e(p, q)$  where  $(p, q)$  is forward and  $\{p, q\}$  is either  $\{i, j\}$ , or an edge in  $Y(j)$ . There are  $m - 1$  such edges, since  $Y(j)$ , as any tree, has one edge less than vertices. This amounts to  $m$  sinks. Therefore there are as many sources as sinks in  $\Sigma(j)$ . By (8), the total flow  $F_E(B)$  is zero. Moreover, by (7), we obtain that  $\#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x \in B \text{ and } y \notin B\}$  is equal to  $\#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x \notin B \text{ and } y \in B\}$ .

Finally, for any arc  $(x, y)$  of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , we have that  $(x \in B \text{ and } y \notin B)$  if and only if  $x = e(j, i)$ . Similarly, we have that  $(x \notin B \text{ and } y \in B)$  if and only if  $y = e(i, j)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x \in B \text{ and } y \notin B\} &= \text{out}_E e(j, i), \\ \#\{(x, y) \in E \mid x \notin B \text{ and } y \in B\} &= \text{in}_E e(i, j). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $\text{out}_E e(j, i) = \text{in}_E e(i, j)$ . ■

We now have all the necessary ingredients to describe the nodes of a non-intersecting family path in a hemisphere  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . This is achieved in Lemmas 7.3 (the  $e$ -nodes), 7.4 (the  $s$ -nodes).

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , and let  $e(\gamma)$  be an  $e$ -node of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . Then  $e(\gamma)$  is:*

- (1) *a terminus of  $\Lambda$  if  $\gamma$  is forward;*
- (2) *an intermediary node (i.e. not a terminus nor an origin) of  $\Lambda$  if  $\gamma$  is upward-backward;*
- (3) *not a node of  $\Lambda$  if  $\gamma$  is downward-backward.*

*Proof.* Let  $E = \text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$ . Let  $i$  and  $j$  be two vertices of  $Y$ , such that  $i$  is the parent of  $j$ .

Suppose  $(i, j)$  is forward. Then,  $e(i, j)$  is a sink of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , thus  $\text{in}_E e(i, j) = 1$ . By Lemma 7.2,  $\text{out}_E e(j, i) = 1$ . And since  $e(j, i)$  is not a source, it is an intermediary node of  $\Lambda$ . This shows (taking  $\gamma = (j, i)$ ) that  $e(\gamma)$  is an intermediary node when  $\gamma$  is upward-backward.

Suppose  $(i, j)$  is backward. In this case,  $e(j, i)$  is a sink of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , thus  $\text{out}_E e(j, i) = 0$ . By Lemma 7.2,  $\text{in}_E e(i, j) = 0$ . Since  $e(i, j)$  is not a sink, it is not on  $\Lambda$ . This shows (using now  $\gamma = (i, j)$ ) that  $e(\gamma)$  is not on  $\Lambda$  when  $\gamma$  is downward-backward.

The case  $e(\gamma)$  when  $\gamma$  is forward is immediate: then  $e(\gamma)$  is a terminus of  $\Lambda$ , since it is a sink of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . ■

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . Then, the  $s$ -nodes of  $\Lambda$  are all the  $s$ -nodes of the digraphs  $\Gamma(i)^+$ , for  $i$  different from the root, and additionally, but only if the children of  $r$  are descending, both  $s$ -nodes  $s_r(a, b)$  and  $s_r(b, a)$  of  $\Gamma(r)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $E = \text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$ . Let  $x$  be a  $s$ -node of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . Let  $i$  be the unique vertex of  $Y$  such that  $x$  is in  $\Gamma(i)$ .

If  $i$  is a leaf of  $Y$ , then  $\Gamma(i)$  has no  $s$ -node and the assertion is trivially satisfied. Let us assume from now that  $i$  is not a leaf of  $Y$ . Let  $j_1 <_i j_2 <_i \dots <_i j_m$  be the neighbours of  $i$ .

For any  $s$ -node  $z$ , we have  $\text{out}_E z = \text{in}_E z$ , since a  $s$ -node is neither a source nor a sink of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . For each  $k$  from 1 to  $m-1$ , set

$$\begin{aligned} x_k &= \text{in}_E s_i(j_k, j_{k+1}) = \text{out}_E s_i(j_k, j_{k+1}), \\ y_k &= \text{in}_E s_i(j_{k+1}, j_k) = \text{out}_E s_i(j_{k+1}, j_k). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $k > 1$ . From (7) applied to the set of nodes

$$X = \{s_i(j_{k-1}, j_k), s_i(j_k, j_{k+1}), s_i(j_{k+1}, j_k), s_i(j_k, j_{k-1}), e(i, j_k), e(j_k, i)\},$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{out}_E s_i(j_{k-1}, j_k) + \text{out}_E s_i(j_{k+1}, j_k) + \text{out}_E e(i, j_k) \\ = \text{in}_E s_i(j_k, j_{k-1}) + \text{in}_E s_i(j_k, j_{k+1}) + \text{in}_E e(j_k, i) \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $x_{k-1} + y_k + \text{out}_E e(i, j_k) = y_{k-1} + x_k + \text{in}_E e(j_k, i)$ . But since  $\text{out}_E e(i, j_k) = \text{in}_E e(j_k, i)$  (by Lemma 7.2), we get that  $x_{k-1} + y_k = y_{k-1} + x_k$ . Hence,  $x_{k-1} - y_{k-1} = x_k - y_k$ . As a consequence, the sequence

$$(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_{m-1}, y_{m-1})$$

either has: all its terms  $(1, 0)$ ; or all its terms  $(0, 1)$ ; or all its terms  $(0, 0)$  or  $(1, 1)$ .

Let us determine  $(x_{m-1}, y_{m-1})$ . Since there is only one arc of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  from  $s_i(j_{m-1}, j_m)$ , and it is the only arc of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  to  $e(i, j_m)$ , we have:

$$x_{m-1} = \text{out}_E(s_i(j_{m-1}, j_m)) = \text{in}_E(e(i, j_m)).$$

Similarly, there is only one arc of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  to  $s_i(j_m, j_{m-1})$ , which is the only arc of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$  from  $e(j_m, i)$ . Thus,

$$y_{m-1} = \text{in}_E(s_i(j_m, j_{m-1})) = \text{out}_E(e(j_m, i))$$

Therefore,  $(x_{m-1}, y_{m-1}) = (\text{in}_E(e(i, j_m)), \text{out}_E(e(j_m, i)))$ .

We now consider several cases.

First, if  $i$  is not the root of  $Y$ , then, by Lemma 7.3, and since  $j_m$  is the parent of  $i$ :

$$\text{in}_E(e(i, j_m)) = 1 \text{ and } \text{out}_E(e(j_m, i)) = 0.$$

Then  $(x_{m-1}, y_{m-1}) = (1, 0)$ . In this case, all of the  $(x_k, y_k)$  are  $(1, 0)$  we well. This means that all of the  $s_i(j_k, j_{k+1})$ , and none of the  $s_i(j_{k+1}, j_k)$ , belong to the union of the paths of  $\Lambda$ . Their  $\text{deg}_E$  are respectively  $(1, 1)$  and  $(0, 0)$ .

If  $i = r$ , and its two children  $a$  and  $b$  are descending, then  $(i, j_m) = (r, b)$  is downward-forward, and, by Lemma 7.3:

$$\text{in}_E(e(i, j_m)) = 1 \text{ and } \text{out}_E(e(j_m, i)) = 1.$$

Thus  $(x_1, y_1) = (1, 1)$ . This means that  $\text{deg}_E(x) = (1, 1)$  for both  $s$ -nodes  $x = s_r(a, b)$  and  $x = s_r(b, a)$ .

If  $i = r$ , and its two children  $a$  and  $b$  are ascending, then  $(i, j_m) = (r, b)$  is upward-forward, and, by Lemma 7.3,

$$\text{in}_E(e(i, j_m)) = 0 \text{ and } \text{out}_E(e(j_m, i)) = 0.$$

Thus  $(x_1, y_1) = (0, 0)$ . This means that  $\text{deg}_E(x) = (0, 0)$  for both  $s$ -nodes  $x = s_r(a, b)$  and  $x = s_r(b, a)$ . ■

We are now ready to show that there is at most one family of non-intersecting paths in  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . This is achieved in the following lemmas.

**Lemma 7.5.** *Let  $i$  be a vertex of  $Y$  distinct from the root. Let  $j_1 <_i \dots <_i j_m$  be the neighbours of  $i$ , and let  $p$  be the index such that  $j_k$  is an ascending child of  $i$  if  $k < p$ , a descending child of  $i$  if  $p \leq k < m$ , and the parent of  $i$  if  $k = m$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be a non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ .*

*Then  $\text{STEPS}(\Lambda) \cap \text{ARCS}(\Gamma(i))$  is the arc set of the union of the path graph*

$$v(i) \rightarrow s_i(j_1, j_2) \rightarrow s_i(j_2, j_2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow s_i(j_{p-1}, j_p) \rightarrow e(i, j_p)$$

*and the path graphs*

$$e(j_k, i) \rightarrow s_i(j_k, j_{k+1}) \rightarrow e(i, j_{k+1})$$

*for all  $k$  such that  $p \leq k < m$ .*

*Proof.* Since any arc of  $\Gamma(i)$  is incident to some  $s$ -node, and all  $s$ -nodes of  $\Gamma(i)$  that are in  $\Lambda$  are in  $\Gamma(i)^+$  (Lemma 7.4), all steps of  $\Lambda$  are in  $\Gamma(i)^+$ .

Let us consider the arcs of  $\Gamma(i)^+$  that are incident to some  $e$ -node: they either end at some  $e(i, j)$ , or start at some  $e(j, i)$ . The arc to  $e(i, j)$  is a step of  $\Lambda$  if and only if  $e(i, j)$  is an intermediary node or a terminus of  $\Lambda$ . By Lemma 7.3, the arc  $(i, j)$  is either forward, or backward-upward. Equivalently, “not backward-downward”. This means  $j$  is not an ascending child of  $i$ ; it is  $j_k$  for some  $k \geq p$ .

The arc from  $e(j, i)$  is a step of  $\Lambda$  if and only if  $e(j, i)$  is an intermediary node of  $\Lambda$  (since it cannot be an origin). By Lemma 7.3, the arc  $(j, i)$  is upward-backward. This means that  $j$  is a descending child of  $i$ , and hence

it is equal to some  $j_k$  with  $p \leq k < m$ . Thus,  $\text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$  contains all arcs of the paths  $e(j_k, i) \rightarrow s_i(j_k, j_{k+1}) \rightarrow e(i, j_{k+1})$  such that  $p \leq k < m$ .

The  $s$ -nodes  $s_i(j_k, j_{k+1})$  for  $k \geq p$  have already 2 incident steps of  $\Lambda$  in these paths and admit no other. The remaining steps of  $\Lambda$  in  $\Gamma(i)$  must be among the arcs of the path

$$v(i) \rightarrow s_i(j_1, j_2) \rightarrow s_i(j_2, j_2) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow s_i(j_{p-1}, j_p) \rightarrow e(i, j_p)$$

and since all the nodes in this path are in  $\Lambda$ ,  $\text{STEPS}(\Lambda)$  contains all the arcs of this path. ■

**Lemma 7.6.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a non-intersecting path of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ . If both children  $a$  and  $b$  of  $r$  are descending, then the steps of  $\Lambda$  in  $\Gamma(r)$  are the arcs of*

$$e(a, r) \rightarrow s_r(a, b) \rightarrow e(r, b) \quad \text{and} \quad e(b, r) \rightarrow s_r(b, a) \rightarrow e(r, a).$$

*On the other hand, if both children of  $a$  and  $b$  of  $r$  are ascending, then  $\Lambda$  has no step in  $\Gamma(r)$ .*

*Proof.* The node  $v(r)$  is not on  $\Lambda$ . Therefore no step of  $\Lambda$  is incident to  $v(r)$ . The arcs non-incident to  $v(r)$  are those of the two paths

$$e(a, r) \rightarrow s_r(a, b) \rightarrow e(r, b) \quad \text{and} \quad e(b, r) \rightarrow s_r(b, a) \rightarrow e(r, a).$$

If both children are descending, both  $s_r(a, b)$  and  $s_r(b, a)$  are intermediary nodes of  $\Lambda$  (Lemma 7.4), therefore both arcs of both paths are steps of  $\Lambda$ .

If both children are ascending, none of  $s_r(a, b)$  and  $s_r(b, a)$  is on  $\Lambda$  (Lemma 7.4 again), and thus  $\Lambda$  has no step in  $\Gamma(r)$ . ■

**Lemma 7.7.** *There exists at most one non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in the  $n$ -network  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ .*

*Proof.* Since the arcs of the local graphs  $\Gamma(i)$  for  $i \in Y$  cover the set of arcs of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , the map

$$\Lambda \mapsto (\text{STEPS}(\Lambda) \cap \text{ARCS}(\Gamma(i)))_{i \in V(T)}$$

from the set of all non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths of  $\mathcal{H}(Y)$ , is injective. On the other hand, by Lemmas 7.5 and 7.6, all non-intersecting families of  $n$  paths have the same image. ■

## 8. THE UNIQUE NON-INTERSECTING FAMILY OF $n$ PATHS IN $\mathcal{R}_A$

This section wraps up our combinatorial argument and show that there is a unique non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ , and that its underlying permutation is always an  $n$ -cycle. This amounts to the remaining half of Theorem 4.1. This is achieved in two steps. First, we show that there is at most one non-intersection path in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  (Lemma 8.1), and then we describe in in terms of the Depth-First-Search algorithm. From this analysis, we are able to show that the underlying permutation of the unique non-intersecting family of paths is always a cycle.

**Lemma 8.1.** *There is at most one non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .*

*Proof.* Any path in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  from a source  $x$  to a sink  $x'$  splits uniquely as  $\pi\pi'$  where  $\pi$  is a path in  $\mathcal{S}$  with origin  $x$  and  $\pi'$  is a path in  $\mathcal{N}$  with terminus  $x'$ . Let  $y$  be the terminus of  $\pi$  and let  $y'$  be the origin of  $\pi'$ . Then necessarily  $(y, y')$  is a bridge edge of  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . In particular  $y' = \Psi(y)$ ,  $y$  is a sink of  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $y'$  is a source of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

It follows from what precedes that the above decomposition induces a bijection  $\text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A) \rightarrow \text{NIP}(\mathcal{S}) \times \text{NIP}(\mathcal{N})$ .

After Lemma 7.7, each of  $\text{NIP}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $\text{NIP}(\mathcal{N})$  has at most one element. The result follows. ■

For any vertex  $i$  of  $T_0$ , let  $\text{DFS}(i)$  be the sequence defined recursively by:

- If  $i$  is a leaf then  $\text{DFS}(i)$  is the one-term sequence  $(i)$ .
- Otherwise, let  $j_1 <_i j_2 <_i \dots <_i j_m$  be the children of  $i$ , then

$$\text{DFS}(i) = i \text{DFS}(j_1) i \text{DFS}(j_2) i \dots i \text{DFS}(j_m) i.$$

Let  $w = \text{DFS}(r)$ . This is the **Depth-First-Search (DFS) walk** on the plane rooted tree  $T_0$ , a closed walk of length  $2n$ . When convenient, we also consider it as indexed by the integers modulo  $2n$ ; in that case we refer to it as the *cyclic DFS walk*.

For any arc  $(i, j)$  of  $T_0$ , define  $\text{NEXT}(i, j)$  as the successor of  $i$  with respect to  $<_j$  among the neighbors of  $j$ , if it is defined (i.e. if  $i$  is a child of  $j$ ); and as the first neighbor of  $j$  is  $i$  is the parent of  $j$ .

**Lemma 8.2.** *The DFS walk on  $T_0$  has the following properties:*


- (1) *Every arc supported on  $T_0$  appears exactly once as a step of  $w$ .*
- (2) *It admits the following iterative definition:*
  - $w_0 = r$ ,
  - $w_1$  is the first child of  $r$ .
  - for all  $k$  from 2 to  $2n$ ,  $w_k = \text{NEXT}(w_{k-2}, w_{k-1})$ .
- (3) *No downward-backward step follows an upward-backward step in  $w$ .*

*Proof.* The first property is well-known, see [Eve11, Lemma 3.2]

The second property corresponds to the iterative presentation of Depth-First Search with a stack, where a vertex is popped only after all its children, and the children are pushed one at a time. In this context,  $w_0, w_1, w_2, \dots$  are the successive values of the top of the stack. If  $w_{k-2}$  is a child of  $w_{k-1}$ , then at step  $k-1$  of DFS,  $w_{k-2}$  is popped from the stack, and at step  $k$ , either the next child of  $w_{k-1}$  is pushed on it, or (if  $w_{k-2}$  is the last child) vertex  $w_{k-1}$  is popped as well. In both cases, the new top  $w_k$  is the neighbor of  $w_{k-1}$  that comes after  $w_{k-2}$ . If  $w_{k-2}$  is the parent of  $w_{k-1}$ , then at step  $k-1$ , vertex  $w_{k-1}$  is pushed on the stack, and at step  $k$ , either the first child of  $w_{k-1}$  is pushed as well; or (if  $w_{k-1}$  has no child) vertex  $w_{k-1}$  is popped, and the new top  $w_k$  is the parent of  $w_{k-1}$ . In both cases,  $w_k$  is the first neighbor of  $w_{k-1}$ .

The last property is a consequence of the rule “ascending children precede descending children” imposed on the local orders  $<_i$  of the neighbors of  $i$ . ■

**Example 8.3.** The DFS walk for the plane rooted tree  $T_0$  from the previous examples is  $r13148474941r26252r$ . See Figure 14(a).



(a) The cyclic DFS walk on the tree follows the dotted loop. (b) The DFS walk unfolded, with vertices corresponding to the in-indices circled.

FIGURE 14

Define the *in-index* of each vertex  $i$  of  $T_0$  different from  $r$  as the only index  $k$  such that

- (1)  $w_k = i$ ,
- (2) all occurrences of all ascending children of  $i$  in the DFS walk are before index  $k$ ,
- (3) all occurrences of all descending children of  $i$  in the DFS walk are after index  $k$ .

Note that we do not associate any in-index to the root  $r$ .

**Example 8.4** (Ex. 8.3 continued). Consider the DFS walk from the running example. For the vertices different from  $r$ , circle their occurrence corresponding to their in-index and insert the arrows corresponding to the orientation  $A_0$ :


$$r \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow \textcircled{3} \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow \textcircled{8} \rightarrow \textcircled{4} \rightarrow \textcircled{7} \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow \textcircled{9} \dots$$

$$\dots \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow \textcircled{1} \leftarrow r \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow \textcircled{6} \rightarrow \textcircled{2} \rightarrow \textcircled{5} \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow r.$$

See also Figure 14(b).

**Lemma 8.5.** Let  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2n\}$ . Then  $k$  is not an in-index if and only if  $(w_{k-1}, w_k)$  is upward-backward or  $(w_k, w_{k+1})$  is downward-backward.

*Proof.* Consider first the case when  $w_k \neq r$ . The index  $k$  is an in-index if and only if both conditions are fulfilled: (1)  $w_{k-1}$  is either an ascending child of  $w_k$  or the parent of  $w_k$ ; and (2)  $w_{k+1}$  is either a descending child of  $w_k$  or the parent of  $w_k$ .



Condition (1) restates as:  $(w_{k-1}, w_k)$  is either upward-forward, or downward. Equivalently, “not upward-backward”. Condition (2) restates as:  $(w_k, w_{k+1})$  is either downward-forward, or upward. Equivalently, “not downward-backward”. Therefore,  $k$  is an in-index if and only if  $(w_{k-1}, w_k)$  is not upward-backward and  $(w_k, w_{k+1})$  is not downward-backward, which is a restatement of the equivalence in the lemma.

Consider now the case when  $w_k = r$ . Then  $k$  is not an in-index of a vertex different from the root. If both children or  $r$  are descending, then  $(w_{k-1}, w_k)$  is upward-backward and  $(w_k, w_{k+1})$  is downward-forward. If both children or  $r$  are ascending, then  $(w_{k-1}, w_k)$  is upward-forward and  $(w_k, w_{k+1})$  is downward-backward. In both cases the equivalence holds. ■

Let  $\Omega$  be the cyclically ordered set of all in-indices. Our next two lemmas are key in relating the DFS walk to the Route Map. We aim to generalize the following observation in our running example.

**Example 8.6** (Ex. 8.4 continued). We work with the DFS walk of Figure 14(b). Consider the walks that start at a circled vertex, and stop at the next one. Distinguish the unique forward ( $\rightarrow$ ) step in each of these: 3148, 84, 47, 749, 941, 1r26, 62, 25, and (cycling) 52r13. These marked paths encode the unique 9-path of  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .

**Lemma 8.7.** *In the cyclic DFS walk, in-indices and forward arcs are interlaced: given any two in-indices  $u$  and  $v$ , consecutive in  $\Omega$ , there is a unique forward step in  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$ . Moreover, all steps of  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  before this forward step are upward-backward, and all steps after it are downward-backward.*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  and  $v$  be two consecutive in-indices. Let  $\mu$  be the word obtained from the sequence of steps of  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  by replacing each step with its type:  $U_B$  for upward-backward,  $D_B$  for downward-backward, or  $F$  for forward. See Figure 14(b).

Lemma 8.5 implies that each pair of consecutive letters must either start with  $U_B$  or end with  $D_B$ . Lemma 8.2 implies that the pair cannot be  $U_B D_B$ . The only possible pairs are thus

$$U_B U_B, \quad U_B F, \quad F D_B, \quad \text{and} \quad D_B D_B.$$

As a consequence, the word  $\mu$  is of the form  $(U_B)^p F (D_B)^q$  for some non-negative integers  $p$  and  $q$ . ■

**Lemma 8.8.** *Let  $u, v$  be two in-indices.*

*If  $u$  and  $v$  are consecutive in  $\Omega$ , then the subwalk  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  of the cyclic DFS walk is a path in  $T_0$ .*

*Proof.* Let us prove the implication in the lemma by proving its contrapositive.

Suppose that  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  is not a path. Since any walk in a tree with no recoil is a path, we deduce that there exists  $k$  such that  $w_{k-1} = w_{k+1}$  and  $u < k < v$ . As a consequence,  $w_k$  is a leaf of  $T_0$ , because the cyclic DFS walk has recoils only at the leaves of  $T_0$ . And since each leaf is visited only once,  $k$  is the in-index of  $w_k$ . Thus  $u$  and  $v$  are not consecutive in  $\Omega$ . ■

For any pair  $u, v$  of in-indices consecutive in  $\Omega$ , define  $\Lambda(w_u, w_v)$  as the path of  $\mathcal{R}_A$  that is the lifting (see Section 6.2) of the marked path  $(w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v; \gamma)$ , where  $\gamma$  is the unique forward step of  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  as per Lemma 8.7.

**Proposition 8.9.** *The set*

$$\Lambda^* = \{\Lambda(w_u, w_v) \mid u \text{ and } v \text{ are in-indices consecutive in } \Omega\}$$

*is a non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u, v$  be two in-indices consecutive in  $\Omega$ , and let  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  be the associated walk in  $T_0$ . Let us show first that the paths  $\Lambda(w_u, w_v)$  do not meet in the Southern hemisphere  $\mathcal{S}$ . That is, we only care about the subpath  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_m w_{m+1}$ , where  $w_m w_{m+1}$  is the unique forward step (cf. Lemma 8.7).

The lifting of this subpath  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_m w_{m+1}$  starts at the  $v$ -node  $v(w_u)$ , ends at the  $e$ -node  $e(w_k, w_{k+1})$ , and by Lemma 6.4 it is of the form

$$v(w_u) S_u e(w_u, w_{u+1}) S_{u+1} e(w_{u+1}, w_{u+2}) \cdots S_m e(w_m, w_{m+1}),$$

where each  $S_\ell$  is a sequence of  $s$ -nodes in  $\Gamma(w_k)$ . By (the proof of) Lemma 6.5(3),  $S_u$  is

$$s_{w_u}(j_1, j_2) s_{w_u}(j_2, j_3) \cdots s_{w_u}(j_{k-1}, j_k)$$

and  $j_k = w_{u+1}$ . Note that  $j_1, \dots, j_{k-1}$  are the ascending children of  $w_u$ . In other words, those nodes for which  $(j, w_u)$  is a forward arc of  $E^\pm$ . Similarly, for  $\ell > u$ , by (the proof of) Lemma 6.5(4),  $S_\ell$  is the one-term sequence  $(s_{w_\ell}(w_{\ell-1}, w_{\ell+1}))$ . Note that  $w_{\ell-1} <_{w_u} w_{\ell+1}$ . We conclude:

- (1) A  $v$ -node  $v(i)$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  belongs to  $\Lambda(w_u, w_v)$  if and only if  $w_u = i$ .
- (2) A given  $e$ -node  $e(\gamma)$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  belongs to  $\Lambda(w_u, w_v)$  if and only if  $\gamma$  is either the forward step or an upward-backward step of  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$ .
- (3) An  $s$ -node  $s_i(j, k)$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  belongs to  $\Lambda(w_u, w_v)$  if and only if
  - (a) it belongs to  $\Gamma^+(i)$ , and
  - (b) either  $w_u = i$  with  $(j, i)$  forward, or  $(j, i)$  is an upward-backward step of  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$ .

This shows that each node of  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $\Lambda^*$  belongs to only one path  $\Lambda(w_u, w_v)$ , since each arc supported on  $T_0$  appears exactly once in the DFS walk, and its subwalks  $w_u w_{u+1} \cdots w_v$  for  $u, v$  consecutive in  $\Omega$ , have no step in common.

A very similar argument works for  $\mathcal{N}$ , since all we have used are the structural lemmas for a hemisphere. Hence,  $\Lambda^*$  is non-intersecting. ■

**Proposition 8.10.** *There is exactly one non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Proposition 8.9 and Lemma 8.1, that say respectively that there is at least and at most one non-intersecting path in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ . ■

**Lemma 8.11.** *The underlying permutation of the unique non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is a cycle of length  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T_0$  be a fixed plane rooted tree structure on  $T$  induced by  $A$ , let  $\Omega = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_{2n}$  be the DFS walk on  $T_0$ . For each pair of in-indices  $u, v$  consecutive in  $\Omega$ , the underlying permutation of the unique non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  sends  $u$  to  $v$ . In particular it is a cycle of length  $n$ . ■

**Corollary 8.12.** *The unique non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is of sign  $(-1)^{n-1}$ .*

This shows the second half of Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 8.13.** *Let  $A$  be a unital arrowflow. Then,*

$$\sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa) = (-1)^{n-1}.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 6.10, we have

$$\sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda).$$

By Proposition 8.10, the latter sum has a unique summand, which is  $(-1)^{n-1}$  by Corollary 8.12. ■

## 9. DEFORMATIONS OF THE GRAHAM–POLLAK FORMULA

In this section, we derive our new deformation of the Graham–Pollak formula, Theorem 1.1.

**9.1. Weighted distance matrix.** Looking for a generalization as broad as possible of the distance matrix, we interpret the distance  $d(i, j)$  as the number of marked paths from  $i$  to  $j$ . We associate to each marked path  $(\pi; \gamma) = (i_0 i_1 \dots i_d; i_p i_{p+1})$  in  $T$  the monomial

$$w(\pi; \gamma) = x_{i_0 i_1} \cdots x_{i_{p-1} i_p} y_{i_p i_{p+1}} z_{i_{p+1} i_{p+2}} \cdots z_{i_{d-1} i_d}$$

in three families of commuting variables  $x_\gamma, y_\gamma, z_\gamma$  attached to the arcs  $\gamma$  of  $T$ .

We refer to the subsequences

$$i_0 i_1 \cdots i_p, \quad i_p i_{p+1} \quad \text{and} \quad i_{p+1} i_{p+1} \cdots i_d$$

that decompose  $\pi$  as the *tail*, *body*, and *head* of  $(\pi; \gamma)$ . We define the following deformation of the distance:

$$d'(i, j) = \sum_{\gamma \in \text{STEPS}(P(i, j))} w(P(i, j); \gamma).$$

This is the generating series of the marked paths from  $i$  to  $j$ .

The weighted distance matrix  $M'(T)$  is  $(d'(i, j))_{i, j \in [n]}$ .

**9.2. Weighted catalysts and the zero-sum involution.** We can understand a catalyst  $\kappa = (\sigma, f)$  as a set of marked paths in  $T$ , each path of the form  $(P(i, \sigma(i)); f(i))$  for some  $i \in V(T)$ . The *weight of a catalyst* is therefore defined to be

$$w(\kappa) = \prod_{i \in V(T)} w(P(i, \sigma(i)); f(i)).$$

We define the tail (resp. body, head) of a catalyst to be the multiset of tails (resp. bodies, heads) of its marked paths.

Note that  $\text{BODY}(\kappa)$  is the set of arcs of its arrowflow. The same reasoning as in the unweighted case gives  $\det M'(T)$  as a weighted sum of catalysts,

$$\det M'(T) = \sum_{\kappa \in K} \text{sign}(\kappa) w(\kappa).$$

Next, we show that zero-sum catalysts do not contribute to this sum.

**Lemma 9.1.** *Let  $A$  be a disconnected zero-sum arrowflow. Assume  $x_{k\ell} = x_{\ell k}^{-1}$  for all  $(k, \ell) \in E^\pm$ . The involution  $\varphi_A$  defined in Lemma 5.1 is weight-preserving.*

*Proof.* Let  $\kappa = (\sigma, f) \in C(A)$ , and let  $i$  and  $j$  as in Lemma 5.1.

If  $\{i, j\}$  separates  $\sigma(i)$  and  $\sigma(j)$  (as in Figure 4), then  $\varphi_A(\kappa)$  and  $\kappa$  have the same body and head. The tail of  $\varphi_A(\kappa)$  is obtained from the tail of  $\kappa$  by either removing or adding one occurrence of each of  $(i, j)$  and  $(j, i)$ . Accordingly, the weight of  $\varphi_A(\kappa)$  is obtained from that of  $\kappa$  by multiplying or dividing by  $x_{ij}x_{ji}$ . This has no effect since  $x_{ij}x_{ji} = 1$ .

If  $\{i, j\}$  does not separate  $\sigma(i)$  and  $\sigma(j)$  (as in Figure 3),  $\kappa$  and  $\varphi_A(\kappa)$  have the same head, body and tail, and thus the same weight. ■

**Lemma 9.2.** *Let  $A$  be a connected zero-sum arrowflow. The involution  $\varphi_A$  defined in Lemma 5.2 is weight-preserving.*

*Proof.* The involution  $\varphi_A$  just swaps the tails of two of the marked paths of the catalyst (see Figure 5). In total, it preserves the tail, body and tail of the catalyst. Hence, it is weight-preserving. ■

As a result, the determinant of the weighted distance matrix is the signed, weighted sum of all unital catalyts,

$$\det M'(T) = \sum_{A \text{ unital}} \sum_{\kappa \in C(A)} \text{sign}(\kappa) w(\kappa).$$

**9.3. Weighted Route Maps and liftings.** For each unital arrowflow  $A$ , consider the plane rooted tree  $T_0$ , and the corresponding digraph  $A_0$  obtained by substituting  $(a, b)$  and  $(b, a)$  for  $(r, a)$  and  $(r, b)$ . We introduce two dummy variables  $y_{ra} := y_{ba}$  and  $y_{rb} := y_{ab}$  to alleviate notation. Dummy variables  $x_{ra}, x_{rb}, z_{ra}, z_{rb}$  are defined similarly. We equip the Route Map with a weight function  $w$  on its arcs by assigning

- (1) for each arc  $\gamma$  supported on  $T_0$  different from  $(b, r)$  and  $(a, r)$ , a weight of  $x_\gamma$  to all arcs of  $\mathcal{S}$  leaving  $e(\gamma)$ ,
- (2) for each  $\gamma \in A_0$  a weight of  $y_\gamma$  to the bridge  $(e(\gamma), e'(\gamma))$  between hemispheres,
- (3) for each arc  $\gamma$  supported on  $T_0$  different from  $(b, r)$  and  $(a, r)$ , a weight of  $z_\gamma$  to all arcs of  $\mathcal{N}$  arriving to  $e'(\gamma)$ ,
- (4) a weight of 1 to any other arc.

The weight  $w(\Lambda)$  of a family of  $n$  paths  $\Lambda$  in  $\mathcal{R}_A$  is defined to be the product of the weights of the steps of its paths.

**Lemma 9.3.** *The lifting map of Section 6.3 is weight-preserving; if  $\Lambda_i$  is the lifting of the marked path  $(P(i, j); \delta)$ , then  $w(\Lambda_i) = w(P(i, j); \delta)$ . Therefore, if  $w(\kappa)$  is the weight of a catalyst, then  $w(\Lambda(\kappa)) = w(\kappa)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(P(i, j); \delta)$  be a marked path in  $T$ , and let  $(\pi_0, \delta_0)$  be the corresponding marked path in  $T_0$ . Let  $\Lambda_i$  be its lifting. Let  $u$  and  $v$  be the vertices of  $T$  such that  $(u, v) = \delta$ .

On the one hand, the weight of the marked path is

$$w(P(i, j); \delta) = \left( \prod_{\gamma \in \text{STEPS}(P(i, u))} x_\gamma \right) y_\delta \left( \prod_{\eta \in \text{STEPS}(P(v, j))} z_\eta \right).$$

On the other hand, the weight of  $\Lambda_i$  is the product of all arc weights of  $\Lambda_i$ . We have thus a factor of  $y_\delta$ , since  $\Lambda_i$  traverses the bridge  $(e(\delta_0), e'(\delta_0))$ .

If  $(a, b) \in \text{STEPS}(P(i, u))$ , then  $\Lambda_i$  visits  $(r, b)$  and this is not the last node of  $\mathcal{S}$  that it visits; similarly if  $(b, a) \in \text{STEPS}(P(i, u))$ . For any other  $\gamma \in \text{STEPS}(P(i, u))$ , the path  $\Lambda_i$  visits  $e(\gamma)$  and this is not the last node of  $\mathcal{S}$  that it visits. Altogether, the Southern part of the walk contributes with a weight of  $\prod_{\gamma \in \text{STEPS}(P(i, u))} x_\gamma$ .

For each  $\eta \in \text{STEPS}(P(v, j))$ , the path  $\Lambda_i$  visits  $e'(\eta)$  (provided that  $\eta$  is not supported on  $\{a, b\}$ ) and this is not the first node of  $\mathcal{N}$  that it visits. The special case  $\eta$  where is supported on  $\{a, b\}$  is taken care of as above. We arrive at the above formula again. ■

This implies that the determinant of the weighted distance matrix does a weighted enumeration of families of  $n$  paths in the Route Maps  $\mathcal{R}_A$ , as  $A$

ranges over unital arrowflows. By the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\det M'(T) = \sum_{A \text{ unital}} \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda) w(\Lambda).$$

Indeed, for  $A$  unital, the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot involution is weight-preserving since it preserves the multiset of steps of the  $n$  paths. We are using the simpler weighted version of the lemma from Equation (4).

**9.4. The formula.** For each unital arrowflow  $A$  there is a unique non-intersecting family of  $n$  paths  $\Lambda^*$  in  $\mathcal{R}_A$ , defined in Proposition 8.9. By Lemma 8.7, we have

$$w(\Lambda^*) = \prod_{\gamma \in U_B(A)} x_\gamma \cdot \prod_{\delta \in F(A)} y_\delta \cdot \prod_{\eta \in D_B(A)} z_\eta,$$

where the sets  $U_B(A)$ ,  $F(A)$ , and  $D_B(A)$  denote the sets of upward backward, forward, and downward backward arcs of  $A$ , as defined in Section 7 and used in the proof of Lemma 8.7. The underlying sign is  $(-1)^{n-1}$  by Corollary 8.12. For each  $e = \{a, b\} \in E$  define  $U(e)$  to be the set of arcs supported on  $T$  “pointing to  $e$ .” That is,

$$U(e) = \{(i, j) \in E^\pm : \{i, j\} \neq \{a, b\} \text{ and } j \in P(i, a)\}.$$

Equivalently, it is the set of arcs  $(i, j)$  that become upward in the rooted tree obtained from  $T$  by subdividing  $e$ . We arrive at the following expansion.

**Theorem 9.4.** *Under the hypothesis  $x_{ji} = x_{ij}^{-1}$  for all edges  $\{i, j\}$  of  $T$ , the determinant of the weighted distance matrix of a tree is*

$$(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e=\{a,b\} \in E} y_{ab} y_{ba} \prod_{(i,j) \in U(e)} (y_{ij} x_{ji} + y_{ji} z_{ij}).$$

*Proof.* Express the determinant as

$$\begin{aligned} \det M'(T) &= \sum_{A \text{ unital}} \sum_{\Lambda \in \text{NIP}(\mathcal{R}_A)} \text{sign}(\Lambda) w(\Lambda) \\ &= \sum_{A \text{ unital}} (-1)^{n-1} w(\Lambda^*) \\ &= (-1)^{n-1} \sum_{A \text{ unital}} \prod_{\gamma \in U_B(A)} x_\gamma \cdot \prod_{\delta \in F(A)} y_\delta \cdot \prod_{\eta \in D_B(A)} z_\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Fix a unital arrowflow  $A$  and let  $T_0$  be the plane rooted tree structure of  $T$  induced by  $A$ . Let  $a$  and  $b$  be the vertices of  $T_0$  adjacent to the root  $r$ . Then  $(a, r)$  and  $(b, r)$  are forward and carry a weight of  $y_{ab}$  and  $y_{ba}$ . For any other arc  $(i, j) \in E^\pm$ , suppose without loss of generality that  $i$  is the parent of  $j$  in  $T_0$ . Then either  $(i, j)$  is forward and  $(j, i)$  is upward backward, or

$(j, i)$  is forward and  $(i, j)$  is downward backward. We obtain the desired formula,

$$\det M'(T) = (-1)^{n-1} \sum_{\{a,b\} \in E} y_{ab} y_{ba} \prod_{(i,j) \in U(\{a,b\})} (y_{ij} x_{ji} + y_{ji} z_{ij}). \quad \blacksquare$$

For each edge  $e$  of  $T$ , let  $e^+$  and  $e^-$  be the two arcs it carries. Similarly, for any arc  $\gamma$  of  $T$ , let  $\gamma^-$  be its reverse, and  $\gamma^0$  be its underlying edge in  $E$ . The above formula can be rewritten as

$$\det M'(T) = (-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e \in E} y_{e^+} y_{e^-} \prod_{\gamma \in U(e)} (y_{\gamma} x_{\gamma^-} + y_{\gamma^-} z_{\gamma}).$$

**9.5. Generalization independent of tree structure.** The above generalization of the distance makes the determinant depend on the tree structure, and, in this sense, is not a generalization of the result of Graham and Pollak:

“the determinant of the distance matrix is independent of the tree structure.”

A simple way to specialize further the formula to make it independent on the tree structure is to impose

$$(y_{\gamma} x_{\gamma^-} + y_{\gamma^-} z_{\gamma}) = (y_{\gamma^-} x_{\gamma} + y_{\gamma} z_{\gamma^-}),$$

so that  $\gamma \in U(e)$  contributes to the formula as much as  $\gamma^- \notin U(e)$ , for all  $\gamma$ .

For this, we introduce a new variable  $\alpha_e$  for each  $e \in E$ , and impose

$$\alpha_e = \frac{y_{e^+}}{z_{e^+} - x_{e^+}} = \frac{y_{e^-}}{z_{e^-} - x_{e^-}}.$$

Equivalently,  $y_{\gamma} = \alpha_{\gamma^0} (z_{\gamma} - x_{\gamma})$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Specialize the formula of Theorem 9.4 as above, by letting  $y_{\gamma} = \alpha_{\gamma^0} (z_{\gamma} - x_{\gamma})$  to obtain an expression of  $\det M'(T)$  equal to

$$(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e^2 (z_{e^+} - x_{e^+}) (z_{e^-} - x_{e^-}) \prod_{\substack{f \in E \\ f \neq e}} \alpha_f (z_{f^+} z_{f^-} - 1).$$

Set now  $x_e$  for  $x_{e^+}$ . Then  $x_{e^-} = x_e^{-1}$ . ■

In this same spirit, we specialize  $x_e = 1$  to obtain [CK23b, Thm. A]. We reiterate that this is a fully combinatorial proof, in contrast to the proof found in the original paper.

**Corollary 9.5** (Choudhury–Khare [CK23b]). *Associate to each arc  $\gamma$  supported on  $T$  a variable  $z_{\gamma}$ , and to edge  $e$  of  $T$  a variable  $\alpha_e$ .*

*Define the CK-weight of a marked path  $(\pi; \gamma)$  to be*

$$\alpha_{\gamma^0} (z_{\gamma} - 1) \prod_{\delta \in \text{HEAD}(\pi, \gamma)} z_{\delta}.$$

*where  $\gamma^0$  is the edge that supports  $\gamma$ .*

Define the CK-distance from  $i$  to  $j \in V(T)$  to be the weighted sum of all marked paths from  $i$  to  $j$ . The determinant of the CK-distance matrix of a tree is

$$\left( \prod_{f \in E} \alpha_f (1 - z_{f^+} z_{f^-}) \right) \sum_{e \in E} \frac{\alpha_e (z_{e^+} - 1)(z_{e^-} - 1)}{1 - z_{e^+} z_{e^-}}.$$

*Proof.* Note that the CK-weight of a marked path is obtained from the weight of a marked path of Equation (2) by letting  $x_e = 1$  for all  $e$ . Theorem 1.1 then gives a formula for the determinant of the CK-distance matrix as

$$(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e \in E} \alpha_e^2 (z_{e^+} - 1)(z_{e^-} - 1) \left( \prod_{f \neq e} \alpha_f (z_{f^-} z_{f^+} - 1) \right). \quad \blacksquare$$

**9.6. A remark on formal  $q$ -integers.** Among the deformations of the Graham-Pollak Formula, the  $q$ -analogue with weights  $u_\gamma$  on arcs [LSZ14] deforms the distance  $d(i, j)$  into

$$d_q(i, j) = [u_{i_0 i_1}] + [u_{i_1 i_2}] + \cdots + [u_{i_{d-1} i_d}]$$

where  $i_0 i_1 \cdots i_d$  is the path from  $i$  to  $j$ , and  $[u_\gamma]$  stands for  $(q^{u_\gamma} - 1)/(q - 1)$ . The determinant of the matrix of the  $d_q(i, j)$  is shown to be equal to [LSZ14, Thm. 3]:

$$(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e \in E} [u_{e^+}] [u_{e^-}] \prod_{\substack{f \in E \\ f \neq e}} ([u_{f^+}] + [u_{f^-}]).$$

In [LSZ14], the weights  $u_\gamma$  and the variable  $q$  are restricted to be positive numbers—the case  $q = 1$  has to be stated separately. We would like to observe here that the above result can be stated formally, with variables (instead of numbers) for the weights and the parameter  $q$ , allowing specializations. For this, we transfer the dependence on  $q$  to the operation of sum by introducing the operation  $q$ -sum, that we denote by  $\textcircled{q}$  and define as

$$a \textcircled{q} b = a + b + (q - 1)ab.$$

It has the properties that the ordinary sum is recovered with  $q = 1$ , and

$$[a + b] = [a] \textcircled{q} [b].$$

Then, changing  $[u_\gamma]$  for  $\beta_\gamma$ , we get

$$d_q(i, j) = \beta_{i_0 i_1} \textcircled{q} \beta_{i_1 i_2} \textcircled{q} \cdots \textcircled{q} \beta_{i_{d-1} i_d}$$

and the determinant of the matrix of the  $d_q(i, j)$  becomes:

$$(-1)^{n-1} \sum_{e \in E} \beta_{e^+} \beta_{e^-} \prod_{\substack{f \in E \\ f \neq e}} (\beta_{f^+} \textcircled{q} \beta_{f^-}).$$

## 10. CLOSING REMARKS

While the framework of Choudhury–Khare has proven to be the correct algebraic setting to study distance matrices, our work sets the grounds for a natural enumerative approach to the area. More precisely: we believe catalyts to be the natural objects with which to study distance matrices, and Route Maps to be the natural object with which to enumerate catalyts.

To support our idea we mention that a recently released formula for the principal minors of the distance matrix of a tree [RSW24] has been elucidated in [GL24] through slight generalizations of the combinatorial objects presented here. Future research directions might explore (i) parametric deformations of this formula and (ii) formulas for the non-principal minors of the matrix.

Another line of research is the study of multiplicative generalizations of the distance matrix of a tree, in the sense of [CK23b, Thm. A, case  $x \neq 0$ ], [YY07, Corollary 2.2 and Thm. 3.3] and [BS13]. As it stands, these are not explained by Theorem 1.1. Finally, and on a broader level, Choudhury and Khare recently extended in [CK23a] their formulas to arbitrary graphs. These remain out of the reach of our combinatorial framework.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We dedicate this work to Ira Gessel as a token of our gratitude for his lecture on the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot lemma, which he virtually delivered at the University of Seville in march of 2022 [Ges22]. The senior authors would also like to express their gratitude to Xavier Viennot for the entrancing memories of his lectures.

This work has been partially supported by the Grant PID2020-117843GB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033 and by P2001056 (Junta de Andalucía, FEDER, PAIDI2020).

Á.G. was partially funded by the University of Bristol Research Training Support Grant.

## REFERENCES

- [BKN05] Ravindra B. Bapat, Stephen J. Kirkland, and Michael Neumann. On distance matrices and laplacians. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 401:193–209, 2005. Special Issue in honor of Graciano de Oliveira.
- [BLP06] Ravindra B. Bapat, Arbind K. Lal, and Sukanta Pati. A  $q$ -analogue of the distance matrix of a tree. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 416(2-3):799–814, 2006.
- [BLP09] Ravindra B. Bapat, Arbind K. Lal, and Sukanta Pati. The distance matrix of a bidirected tree. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 18:233–245, 2009.
- [BS13] Ravindra B. Bapat and Sivaramakrishnan Sivasubramanian. Product distance matrix of a graph and squared distance matrix of a tree. *Appl. Anal. Discrete Math.*, 7(2):285–301, 2013.
- [CK23a] Projesh Nath Choudhury and Apoorva Khare. The additive-multiplicative distance matrix of a graph, and a novel third invariant. *arXiv e-prints*, 2023, arxiv:2309.08691 [math.CO].

- [CK23b] Projesh Nath Choudhury and Apoorva Khare. Distance matrices of a tree: Two more invariants, and in a unified framework. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 115:103787, 2023.
- [DY20] Zhibin Du and Jean Yeh. Another simple proof of Graham and Pollak's theorem. *Discrete Math.*, 343(10):111994, 3, 2020.
- [Eve11] Shimon Even. *Graph Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, second edition, 2011.
- [Ges22] Ira Gessel. Nonintersecting paths in enumerative combinatorics, 2022. Online talk at the seminar "Combinatoria Algebraica en Sevilla".
- [GL24] Alvaro Gutiérrez and Adrián Lillo. Principal minors of the distance matrix of a tree. *Preprint*, 2024.
- [GP71] Ronald L. Graham and Henry O. Pollak. On the addressing problem for loop switching. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 50:2495–2519, 1971.
- [GV85] Ira Gessel and Gérard Viennot. Binomial determinants, paths, and hook length formulae. *Adv. in Math.*, 58(3):300–321, 1985.
- [Lin73] Bernt Lindström. On the vector representations of induced matroids. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 5:85–90, 1973.
- [LSZ14] Hong-Hai Li, Li Su, and Jing Zhang. On the determinant of  $q$ -distance matrix of a graph. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, 34(1):103–111, 2014.
- [RSW24] Harry Richman, Farbod Shokrieh, and Chenxi Wu. Minors of tree distance matrices. *Preprint*, 2024.
- [Til10] Valerie Tillia. Determinants of distance matrices of trees. Master's thesis, Portland State University, 2010.
- [YY07] Weigen Yan and Yeong-Nan Yeh. The determinants of  $q$ -distance matrices of trees and two quantiles relating to permutations. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 39(3):311–321, 2007.
- [ZD16] Hui Zhou and Qi Ding. The distance matrix of a tree with weights on its arcs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 511:365–377, 2016.

(E. Briand) DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA APLICADA 1, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA  
*Email address:* ebriand@us.es

(L.Esquivias) DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA, AND DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA, GEOMETRÍA Y TOPOLOGÍA, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID.  
*Email address:* lesquivias@us.es

(Á. Gutiérrez) DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA, AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL  
*Email address:* a.gutierrezcaceres@bristol.ac.uk

(A. Lillo, M. Rosas) DEPARTAMENTO DE ÁLGEBRA, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA  
*Email address, A. Lillo:* alillo@us.es  
*Email address, M. Rosas:* mrosas@us.es