

# On a surface formed by randomly gluing together polygonal discs

Sergei Chmutov and Boris Pittel

Department of Mathematics, Ohio State University,  
231 West 18th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210, USA  
chmutov@math.ohio-state.edu and bgp@math.ohio-state.edu

November 1, 2021

Mathematics Subject Classifications: 05C80, 05C30, 05A16, 05E10, 34E05, 60C05

Keywords: surfaces, polygonal discs, random permutations, irreducible characters, Euler characteristic, genus, limit distributions

## Abstract

Starting with a collection of  $n$  oriented polygonal discs, with an even number  $N$  of sides in total, we generate a random oriented surface by randomly matching the sides of discs and properly gluing them together. Encoding the surface in a random permutation  $\gamma$  of  $[N]$ , we use the Fourier transform on  $S_N$  to show that  $\gamma$  is asymptotic to the permutation distributed uniformly on the alternating group  $A_N$  ( $A_N^c$  resp.) if  $N - n$  and  $N/2$  are of the same (opposite resp.) parity. We use this to prove a local central limit theorem for the number of vertices on the surface, whence for its Euler characteristic  $\chi$ . We also show that with high probability the random surface consists of a single component, and thus has a well-defined genus  $g = 1 - \chi/2$ , which is asymptotic to a Gaussian random variable, with mean  $(N/2 - n - \log N)/2$  and variance  $(\log N)/2$ .

## 1 Introduction and main results

In this paper we study random surfaces obtained by gluing, uniformly at random, sides of  $n$  polygons with various (not necessarily equal) number of

sides. We call this scheme of generating a surface the *map model*. (A model dual to the map model is very important for algebraic geometry [14]. It can be generalized to hypermaps; in [4] it is called  *$\sigma$ -model*.) In the map model the interiors of polygons represent countries (*faces*); the glued sides represent boundaries between countries (*edges*). Thus the map model can be considered as a graph embedded into the surface such that the faces correspond to the original polygons.


This model generalizes the random map model of N. Pippenger and K. Schleich [20] where all the polygons are triangles, a model motivated by studies in quantum gravity. In particular, for the Euler characteristic  $\chi$  of the randomly triangulated surface they proved that  $E[\chi] = n/2 - \log n + O(1)$ ,  $\text{Var}(\chi) = \log n + O(1)$ , and made startlingly sharp conjectures regarding the remainder terms  $O(1)$ , based on simulations and results for similar models. The case when the number of sides of all polygons are equal, gluings of  $k$ -gons ( $k \geq 3$ ), was considered by A. Gamburd in [11]. His breakthrough result was that (for  $2\text{lcm}\{2, k\} \mid 3n$ ), the underlying random permutation of polygons sides was asymptotically uniform on the alternating subgroup  $A_{3n}$ , implying, for instance, that  $\chi$  was asymptotic, in distribution, to  $n/2$  minus  $\mathcal{N}(\log n, \log n)$ , the Gaussian variable, with mean and variance equal  $\log n$ . K. Fleming and N. Pippenger [9] used Gamburd's result to prove sharp asymptotic formulas for the first four moments of the Euler characteristic  $\chi$ , in particular confirming their earlier conjectures for  $k = 3$ . Another special case of this model is when there is only one polygon whose sides are glued in pairs. This case is well studied, popular, and important in combinatorics and the theory of moduli spaces of algebraic curves. The classical paper of J. Harer and D. Zagier [12] solved the difficult problem of enumerating the resulting surfaces by genus. Their result was used in [5] to determine the limiting genus distribution for the surface chosen uniformly at random from all such surfaces.

The sides of the polygons are glued in pairs. So the total number of sides  $N$  of all polygons must be even, and the resulting map will have  $N/2$  edges. We also assume that all polygons are directed and that in each glued pair the edges are directed opposite-wise. Thus the resulting surface will be oriented.

The map model can be described in terms of permutations. Label  $e$ 's the directed sides (edges) of all polygons by numbers from  $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ ;  $e_j$  will denote the edge labeled  $j$ . Let  $n_j$  be the number of polygons with  $j$  sides,  $j$ -gons, and let  $J$  stand for the set of all possible numbers of sides of our  $n = \sum_j n_j$  polygons, so that  $\sum_{j \in J} j n_j = N$  and each map will have  $n$

faces. We define the permutation  $\alpha$  of  $[N]$  as follows:  $\alpha(e_j) = e_k$  if  $e_k$  follows, immediately,  $e_j$  in one of the  $n$  directed polygons. Thus  $\alpha$  has  $n$  cycles, each cycle consisting of the edges of the attendant polygon listed according to the polygon orientation. The set of all such  $\alpha$ 's is the conjugacy class  $\mathcal{C}_J$  of permutations of  $[N]$  with  $n_j$  cycles of length  $j$ . A gluing itself is encoded in the permutation  $\beta$  which is a product of transpositions of edges that are glued to each other; those  $\beta$ 's are all  $(N - 1)!!$  elements of the conjugacy class  $\mathcal{C}_2$  of permutations of  $[N]$  with cycles of length 2 only.

Here is how a given pair of permutations  $\alpha, \beta$  induces the corresponding surface. The first edge  $e_1$  is glued to the edge  $\beta(e_1)$ ; the edge  $\beta(e_1)$  is followed by the edge  $e_2 = \alpha(\beta(e_1)) = (\alpha\beta)(e_1)$  in the directed polygon that contains  $\beta(e_1)$ . Next  $e_2$  is glued to  $\beta(e_2)$  followed by  $e_3 = \alpha(\beta(e_2)) = (\alpha\beta)(e_2)$  in the cycle that contains  $\beta(e_2)$ , and so on, producing a sequence of edges  $e_1, e_2, \dots$ , whose *tails* are lumped together as a single vertex. Since  $\alpha\beta$  is a permutation of  $[N]$ , the sequence  $e_1, e_2, \dots$  eventually loops back on the starting edge  $e_1$ , forming a cycle  $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow e_m \rightarrow e_1$  of  $\alpha\beta$ , see the picture:




Likewise, starting from the first edge not in this cycle, i. e. distinct from  $e_1, \dots, e_m$ , we obtain an *independent* cycle containing this edge, that determines another vertex of the map. Proceeding in this fashion, we eventually partition the edge set into disjoint subsets, each associated with its own vertex of the map. Clearly, the number of those subsets, i. e. the number of vertices  $V_N$ , equals the number of cycles of  $\gamma := \alpha\beta$ .


Also it is obvious that the connected components of the resulting surface correspond to the orbits of the subgroup generated by permutations  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . For each such orbit we know the number of faces (which is equal to the number of cycles of  $\alpha$  restricted to the orbit), the number of edges (which is equal to the number of cycles of  $\beta$  restricted to the orbit), and the number of vertices (which is equal to the number of cycles of  $\gamma$  restricted to the orbit). Thus we know the Euler characteristic of the corresponding connected

component. Since the Euler characteristic is a complete topological invariant of connected oriented surfaces, the permutations  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  completely determine the topology of the surface.

For example, consider two oriented squares with labeled sides:



The following three gluings result in a sphere, a torus, and two tori respectively.



We define a *random surface* as a surface obtained by gluing via the per-

mutations  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  that are chosen uniformly at random (uar), and independently of each other, from the conjugacy classes  $\mathcal{C}_J$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  respectively.

In Section 2 we show, Theorem 2.2, that the probability distribution of the permutation  $\gamma$  is asymptotically uniform on  $A_N$  ( $A_N^c$  resp.) if  $\mathcal{C}_2$  and  $\mathcal{C}_J$  are of the same (opposite resp.) parity. This generalizes result from [11, Theorem 4.1] and improves the guaranteed rate of convergence from  $N^{-1/12}$  to  $N^{-1}$ . By and large, we follow [11] to reduce the problem to Fourier-based analysis of the total variation distance between two probability measures on  $S_N$ , main tool being a fundamental general bound due to P. Diaconis and M. Shashahani [7]. At the crucial point, when we need to estimate a character value of an irreducible representation on a *general* conjugacy class of  $S_N$  (rather than the classes  $\mathcal{C}_\ell$  in [11] treated via a bound discovered by S. Fomin and N. Lulov [10] in 1997), we use a bound proved recently by M. Larsen and A. Shalev [15].

In Section 3, as a corollary of Theorem 2.2, we state that the total variation distance between  $V_N = V_{N,\mathcal{C}_J}$ , the number of vertices on the random surface, and the number of cycles  $C_N^e$  ( $C_N^o$  resp.) in the uniformly random even (odd resp.) permutation of  $[N]$  is of order  $O(N^{-1})$ . Our main result, a local central limit theorem (LCLT) for  $V_N$ , follows then from a LCLT for  $C_N$ , the number of cycles in the permutation distributed uniformly on  $S_N$ , due to V. Kolchin [13]. The LCLT for the Euler characteristic  $\chi_N = \chi_{N,\mathcal{C}_J}$  of the random surface follows immediately.

In the last Section 4 we discuss the distribution of the number of connected components of the surface. Generalizing the result of Pippenger and Schleich for  $J = \{3\}$ , [20], we prove in Theorem 4.1 that the resulting surface is connected with probability  $1 - O(N^{-1})$ . Thus, with high probability, the genus  $g_N = g_{N,J}$  of the random surface is well defined, and using  $g_N = 1 - \chi_N/2$  we obtain a LCLT for  $g_N$ . For a very special case of one polygon,  $J = \{N\}$ , this proves a slightly weaker version of our earlier result in [5].

## 2 Limiting uniformity

Given  $N$ , let  $J = J(N)$  be a subset of  $\{3, 4, \dots\}$ . Let  $\{n_j\}$  be such that  $\sum_{j \in J} j n_j = N$ . Consider the set of all partitions of  $[N]$  into  $n = \sum_{j \in J} n_j$  disjoint cycles, with  $n_j$  cycles of lengths  $j \in J$ . This set can be viewed as the conjugacy class  $\mathcal{C}_J = \mathcal{C}_{N,J}$  of all permutations  $\alpha \in S_N$  with  $n_j$  cycles of length

$j \in J$ . Assuming that  $N$  is divisible by 2, let  $\mathcal{C}_2$  denote the conjugacy class of  $S_N$  consisting of permutations that are products of  $N/2$  disjoint 2-cycles.

Let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be chosen independently of each other, uniformly at random (uar) from  $\mathcal{C}_J$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  respectively, and let  $\gamma = \alpha\beta$ .

Gamburd [11] had studied a special case when  $J$  is a singleton  $\{k\}$ , ( $k \geq 3$ ), and  $\alpha, \beta$ , whence  $\gamma$ , are *all even*. (A permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[N]$  is called even if it has an even number of even cycles, or equivalently if  $N$  minus the number of cycles of  $\sigma$  is even.)

**Theorem 2.1.** (*Gamburd*) *Suppose that  $N \rightarrow \infty$  through values divisible by  $2 \operatorname{lcm}\{2, k\}$ . Let  $P_\gamma$  be the probability distribution of  $\gamma$  and let  $U$  be the uniform probability measure on the alternating subgroup  $A_N$  of even permutations. Let  $\|P_\gamma - U\| = \|P_\gamma - U\|_{TV}$  denote the total variation distance between  $P_\gamma$  and  $U$ . Then*

$$\|P_\gamma - U\| = O(N^{-1/12}). \quad (2.1)$$

As noted in Fleming and Pippenger [9], the original condition  $\operatorname{lcm}\{2, k\} | N$  in [11] does not guarantee that both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are even, implying evenness of  $\gamma$ . Namely (assuming  $\operatorname{lcm}\{2, k\} | N$ ): (1)  $\beta$  is even (odd resp.), if  $4 | N$  ( $4 \nmid N$  resp.); (2) if  $k$  is even and  $2k | N$  ( $2k \nmid N$  resp.), then  $\alpha$  is even (odd resp.); (3) if  $k$  is odd then  $\alpha$  is even. Thus  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  are all even iff  $2 \operatorname{lcm}\{2, k\} | N$ ;  $\gamma$  itself is even iff  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are of the same parity, i. e. iff  $2k | N(k - 2)$ .

Gamburd proved (2.1) by using a character-based bound, due to Diaconis and Shashahani [7], for the *total variation distance* between two probability measures (one being uniform) on a general finite group  $G$  in the special case when  $G$  was the alternating subgroup  $A_N$ . We found that Gamburd's argument can be modified to prove a far more general, and stronger, result by using a *variation* of the bound in [7] for the group  $S_N$  itself, when the "uniform" measure is supported either by  $A_N$  or its coset  $A_N^c$ , dependent upon parity of  $\gamma$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** *Uniformly over all the classes  $\mathcal{C}_J$  with  $\min J \geq 3$ ,  $\gamma = \alpha\beta$  is asymptotically uniform over  $A_N$  (over  $A_N^c$  resp.) if  $\mathcal{C}_J, \mathcal{C}_2$  are of the same parity (of opposite parity resp.), and more precisely*

$$\|P_\gamma - U_{A_N}\| = O(N^{-1}), \quad (\|P_\gamma - U_{A_N^c}\| = O(N^{-1}) \text{ resp.}), \quad (2.2)$$

$U_{A_N}, U_{A_N^c}$  being the probability measures uniform on  $A_N$  and  $A_N^c$  respectively.

For  $|J| = 1$ , and even  $\alpha, \beta$ , the (first) bound in (2.2) improves the bound (2.1).

*Proof.* Like the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [11], the starting point is the already mentioned Diaconis-Shashahani's bound. Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $P, U$  be two probability measures on  $G$ ,  $U$  being uniform, i. e.  $U(g) = 1/|G|$  for every  $g \in G$ . Then

$$\|P - U\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\rho \in \hat{G}, \rho \neq \text{id}} \dim(\rho) \text{tr}(\hat{P}(\rho)\hat{P}(\rho)^*); \quad (2.3)$$

here  $\hat{G}$  denotes the set of all irreducible representations  $\rho$  of  $G$ , "id" denotes the trivial representation,  $\dim(\rho)$  is the dimension of  $\rho$ , and  $\hat{P}(\rho)$  is the matrix value of the Fourier transform of  $P$  at  $\rho$ . This bound followed from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$4\|P - U\|^2 \leq |G| \sum_{s \in G} |P(s) - U(s)|^2, \quad (2.4)$$

combined with the Plancherel Theorem

$$|G| \sum_{s \in G} |P(s) - U(s)|^2 = \sum_{\rho \in \hat{G}} d(\rho) \text{tr}[(\hat{P}(\rho) - \hat{U}(\rho))(\hat{P}(\rho) - \hat{U}(\rho))^*], \quad (2.5)$$

and the observation that **(i)**  $\hat{P}(\rho) = \hat{U}(\rho) = 1$  for  $\rho = \text{id}$ , and **(ii)**  $\hat{U}(\rho) = 0$  for  $\rho \neq \text{id}$ .

Now, (2.4)-(2.5) hold for any two measures on  $G$ , whence for two probability measures  $P_H$  and  $U_H$  supported by the same subset  $H \subseteq G$ . In this case, the condition **(i)** still holds, and we get

$$\|P_H - U_H\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\rho \neq \text{id}} d(\rho) \text{tr}[(\hat{P}_H(\rho) - \hat{U}_H(\rho))(\hat{P}_H(\rho) - \hat{U}_H(\rho))^*]. \quad (2.6)$$

For  $G = S_N$ , the irreducible representations  $\rho$  are labeled by  $\lambda$ , where each  $\lambda$  is a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots)$  of  $N$ ,  $\lambda \vdash N$  in short, and  $\dim(\rho^\lambda) = f^\lambda$ , given by the hook formula

$$f^\lambda = \frac{N!}{\prod_{u \in \lambda} h(u)}.$$

Furthermore one-row  $\lambda = \langle N \rangle$  is the identifying label of the trivial representation “id”, and one-column  $\lambda = \langle 1^N \rangle$  is the label of the second one-dimensional representation “sign”, with value 1 on  $A_N$  and value  $-1$  on  $A_N^c$ . In our case  $H$  is either  $A_N$  or  $A_N^c$ , so  $\text{sign}(\sigma)$  is the same,  $\text{sign}(H)$ , for all permutations  $\sigma \in H$ . Consequently, for  $\rho = \text{sign}$ ,

$$\hat{P}_H(\rho) = \sum_{\sigma \in H} \text{sign}(\sigma) P_H(\sigma) = \text{sign}(H) \sum_{\sigma \in H} P_H(\sigma) = \text{sign}(H),$$

and likewise  $\hat{U}_H(\rho) = \text{sign}(H)$ . Therefore

$$\hat{P}_H(\rho) - \hat{U}_H(\rho) = 0, \quad (\rho = \text{sign}). \quad (2.7)$$

Consider  $\lambda \neq \langle N \rangle, \langle 1^N \rangle$ . If  $\lambda$  is not self-dual, i. e.  $\lambda \neq \lambda'$ , then the  $\rho^\lambda$  restricted to  $A_N$  is a nontrivial irreducible representation  $\rho$  of  $A_N$ , whence  $\sum_{\sigma \in A_N} \rho^\lambda(\sigma) = 0$ , (Diaconis [6], Ch. 2B, Exer. 3). Of course  $\sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \rho^\lambda(\sigma) = 0$  too, whence we have

$$\hat{U}_H(\rho^\lambda) = \frac{1}{|H|} \sum_{\sigma \in H} \rho^\lambda(\sigma) = 0, \quad (\lambda \neq \lambda'). \quad (2.8)$$

If  $\lambda = \lambda'$  then  $\rho^\lambda$  restricted to  $A_N$  is a direct sum of two irreducible representations each of dimension  $f^\lambda/2$ , which exceeds 1 for  $N \geq 5$ , because  $f^\lambda \geq 6$  for the self-dual  $\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| \geq 5$ . Therefore again we have: for  $N \geq 5$ ,

$$\hat{U}_H(\rho^\lambda) = \frac{1}{|H|} \sum_{\sigma \in H} \rho^\lambda(\sigma) = 0, \quad (\lambda = \lambda', |\lambda| \geq 5). \quad (2.9)$$

Putting together (2.6), (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9), we obtain: for  $N \geq 5$  and  $H = A_N$  or  $H = A_N^c$ ,

$$\|P_H - U_H\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\lambda \neq \langle N \rangle, \langle 1^N \rangle} f^\lambda \text{tr}[\hat{P}_H(\rho^\lambda) \hat{P}_H(\rho^\lambda)^*]. \quad (2.10)$$

Once (2.10) is proved, the next step is essentially the same as in Gamburd’s argument when  $J = \{k\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_k, \mathcal{C}_2$  are both even, implying that  $H = A_N$ . In our case  $P_H = P_\gamma = U_{\mathcal{C}_J} \star U_{\mathcal{C}_2}$ , and so, by multiplicativity of the Fourier transform for convolutions,

$$\hat{P}_H(\rho^\lambda) = \hat{U}_{\mathcal{C}_J}(\rho^\lambda) \cdot \hat{U}_{\mathcal{C}_2}(\rho^\lambda).$$



Since  $U_{\mathcal{C}_J} = |\mathcal{C}_J|^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{C}_J}$ ,  $U_{\mathcal{C}_2} = |\mathcal{C}_2|^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{C}_2}$  are class functions, each supported by a single conjugacy class,

$$\hat{U}_{\mathcal{C}_J}(\rho^\lambda) = \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)}{f^\lambda} I_{f^\lambda}, \quad \hat{U}_{\mathcal{C}_2}(\rho^\lambda) = \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} I_{f^\lambda};$$

here  $\chi^\lambda$  is the character of  $\rho^\lambda$ . So

$$\hat{P}_H(\rho^\lambda) = \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{(f^\lambda)^2} I_{f^\lambda}$$

and therefore (2.10) becomes

$$\|P_\gamma - U_H\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\lambda \neq \langle N \rangle, \langle 1^N \rangle} \left( \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} \right)^2. \quad (2.11)$$

With  $1/2$  instead of  $1/4$  and  $\mathcal{C}_k$  instead of the general  $\mathcal{C}_J$ , the RHS of (2.11) is Gamburd's upper bound for his case. To make use of his bound, Gamburd applied the following estimate due to Fomin and Lulov [10]: for  $N = tn$ ,

$$|\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_t)| = O(N^{1/2-1/(2t)})(f^\lambda)^{1/t}, \quad (2.12)$$

uniformly for all  $N$  and  $\lambda$ . He used (2.12) for both  $t = 2$  and  $t > 2$ . For  $|J| > 1$  a similar bound for  $|\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)|$  was not available at that time. More recently Larsen and Shalev [15] proved a remarkable extension of the Fomin-Lulov bound: given  $m$ , uniformly for all permutations  $\sigma$  without cycles of length below  $m$ , and partitions  $\lambda$ ,

$$|\chi^\lambda(\sigma)| \leq (f^\lambda)^{1/m+o(1)}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.13)$$

(For  $m = 2$ , i. e. for fixed-point-free permutations, this is very similar to a bound conjectured earlier by Fomin and Lulov.) With this bound applied to both  $\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)$  and  $\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)$ , the remaining proof of Theorem 2.2 largely, but not entirely, follows the original Gamburd's argument.

Introduce  $\Lambda = \{\lambda \vdash N : \lambda_1 \geq N - 6\}$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\gamma - U\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \widehat{S_N} \\ \lambda \neq \langle N \rangle, \langle 1^N \rangle}} \left( \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash N \\ \lambda_1 \leq N-7}} \left( \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} \right)^2 + \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash N \\ \lambda \in \Lambda}} \left( \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} \right)^2 \\ &=: \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2. \end{aligned}$$

Consider  $\Sigma_1$ . By (2.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} \right)^2 &\leq \left( \frac{(f^\lambda)^{1/3+1/2+o(1)}}{f^\lambda} \right)^2 \\ &= (f^\lambda)^{-1/3+o(1)}, \end{aligned}$$

so using Proposition 4.2 (Gamburd),

$$\Sigma_1 = O(N^{-7t})|_{t=1/3-o(1)} = o(N^{-2}). \quad (2.14)$$

To handle  $\Sigma_2$ , we use the following bounds. If  $a > 0$  is fixed, then uniformly for  $\lambda$  such that  $\lambda_1 = N - a$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_J$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f^\lambda &\geq \binom{N-a}{a} \geq \frac{N^a}{2a!}, \\ |\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)| &= O(N^{\lfloor a/2 \rfloor}), \quad |\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)| = O(N^{\lfloor a/3 \rfloor}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

For the first line bound see [11] equation (4.17). Let us prove the second line bounds. Consider  $|\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)|$ , for example.  $\mathcal{C}_J$  is a set of all permutations  $\sigma \in A_N$  whose cycles are of lengths from  $J$ , with fixed counts of cycles of each admissible length. Let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)$  be an arbitrary composition formed by cycle lengths of a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_J$ . From Murnaghan-Nakayama rule, Stanley [22] (Section 7.17, Equation (7.75)),

$$|\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)| \leq g^\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha}),$$

where  $g^\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  is the total number of ways to empty the diagram  $\lambda$  by successive deletion of the rim hooks, one hook at a time, of lengths  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$ . Let us show that

$$g^\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = O(N^{\lfloor a/3 \rfloor}).$$

Each of the  $g^\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  ways to empty  $\lambda$  consists of an ordered sequence of hook deletions not touching any of the first  $a$  cells in the first row, concatenated with an ordered sequence of hook deletions, the first of which deletes at least the cell  $(1, a)$  from among those  $a$  cells, with the remaining deletions taking place entirely in a remaining corner-subdiagram  $\mu$ , with  $|\mu| \leq 2(a-1)$ . So the number of ways to empty the residual diagram  $\mu$  is at most some  $S_1(a) = O(1)$ , as  $a$  is fixed. As for the first batch of hook deletions, they are deletions of *horizontal* rim hooks from the first row, possibly interspersed

with deletions of rim hooks from the subdiagram  $\nu$  formed by all the other rows of  $\lambda$ . Since  $|\nu| = a$ , the length of the subsequence formed by these hook deletions is, very crudely,  $\lfloor a/3 \rfloor$  at most, and the total number of those subsequences is at most some  $S_2(a) = O(1)$ . So  $g^\lambda(\alpha)$ , the overall number of ways to empty  $\lambda$ , is bounded by the number of  $\lfloor N/3 \rfloor$ -long  $\{0, 1\}$ -sequences, with at most  $\lfloor a/3 \rfloor$  1's, corresponding to the deletions of rim hooks from the bottom subdiagram  $\nu$ , multiplied by  $S_1(a)S_2(a)$ , whence

$$g^\lambda(\alpha) = O\left(\binom{\lfloor N/3 \rfloor}{\lfloor a/3 \rfloor}\right) = O(N^{\lfloor a/3 \rfloor}).$$

Consequently in the sum  $\Sigma_2$ , i. e. for  $\lambda_1 = N - a$  with  $a \leq 6$ ,

$$\frac{\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_J)\chi^\lambda(\mathcal{C}_2)}{f^\lambda} = O\left(\frac{N^{\lfloor a/2 \rfloor + \lfloor a/3 \rfloor}}{N^a}\right).$$

Since

$$\min_{a \in [1, 6]} [a - (\lfloor a/2 \rfloor + \lfloor a/3 \rfloor)] = 1,$$

and  $|\Lambda| = S_3(a)$  is fixed, we obtain then that

$$\Sigma_2 = O(N^{-2}). \tag{2.16}$$

Combining (2.14) and (2.16), we obtain

$$\|P_\gamma - U\|^2 = O(N^{-2}).$$

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is complete.  $\square$

### 3 Number of vertices and Euler characteristic

The next claim is directly implied by Theorem 2.2.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $V_N$  denote the number of vertices on the surface formed by randomly gluing polygons with the sides numbers from  $J$ ,  $\min J \geq 3$ , such that the counts  $n_j$  of polygons with  $j$  sides satisfy  $\sum_{j \in J} j n_j = N$ . Let  $C_N^e$ , ( $C_N^o$  resp.) denote the total number of cycles of the permutation chosen*

uniformly at random from all even (all odd permutations resp.) of  $[N]$ . If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are of the same parity (the opposite parity resp.), then

$$\|P_{V_N} - P_{C_N^e}\| = O(N^{-1}), \quad (\|P_{V_N} - P_{C_N^o}\| = O(N^{-1}) \text{ resp.}),$$

uniformly for all admissible  $\{n_j\}_{j \in J}$ .

**Note.** Fleming and Pippenger [9] used Gamburd's Theorem 2.1 to evaluate the  $\ell$ -th central moment of  $V_N$  for  $J = \{k\}$ ,  $k \geq 3$ , within an additive error term  $O(N^{-1/12} \ln^\ell N)$ , ( $\ell \geq 1$ ), for  $J = \{k\}$ ,  $k \geq 3$ , and  $N$  divisible by  $2 \operatorname{lcm}\{2, k\}$ . With Theorem 3.1 at hand, the estimates in [9] can be extended to all  $N$  divisible by  $\operatorname{lcm}\{2, k\}$  with a smaller error term  $O(N^{-1} \ln^\ell N)$ .

Let us have a look at  $P_{C_N^{e.o}}$ . Let  $s(N, \ell)$  be the *signless* Stirling number of first kind, i. e. the number of permutations of  $[N]$  with  $\ell$  cycles. Then

$$P(C_N^e = \ell) = \frac{2s(N, \ell)}{N!}, \text{ if } N - \ell \text{ even; else } P(C_N^e = \ell) = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$P(C_N^o = \ell) = \frac{2s(N, \ell)}{N!}, \text{ if } N - \ell \text{ odd; else } P(C_N^o = \ell) = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

see, for instance, Sachkov and Vatutin [21]. (The equation (3.1) is implicit in Fleming and Pippenger [9], Equation (2.2).) Thus the ranges of  $C_N^e$  and  $C_N^o$  interlace each other. Now  $\{s(N, \ell)/N!\}_{\ell \leq N}$  is distribution of  $C_N$ , the number of cycles in the random permutation of  $[N]$ , and it is well known that  $C_N$  is asymptotically normal with mean and variance given by

$$\begin{aligned} E[C_N] &= \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{j} = \ln N + O(1), \\ \operatorname{Var}(C_N) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{j} \left(1 - \frac{1}{j}\right) = \ln N + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

The standard proof is based on the observation that  $C_N$  has the same distribution as  $\sum_{j=1}^N Y_j$ , where  $Y_j \in \{0, 1\}$  are independent with  $P(Y_j = 1) = 1/j$ . In fact, Kolchin [13] had proved a local limit theorem (LLT) for  $C_N$ , which implies the integral asymptotic normality of  $C_N$ :

$$P(C_N = \ell) = \frac{(1 + o(1)) \exp\left(-\frac{(\ell - E[C_N])^2}{2\operatorname{Var}(C_N)}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi\operatorname{Var}(C_N)}}, \quad (3.3)$$

uniformly for  $\ell$  such that

$$\frac{\ell - \mathbb{E}[C_N]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(C_N)}} \in [-a, a], \quad a > 0 \text{ fixed.} \quad (3.4)$$

Note that the probability generating function of  $C_N$  has only real roots  $0, -1, \dots, -(n-1)$ , so that, by Menon's theorem [19], the distribution of  $C_N$  is log-concave. Using Canfield's quantified version of Bender's LLT for log-concave distributions ([1], [3]), one can show that in (3.3)  $o(1) = O(\text{Var}(C_N)^{-1/4})$ . Applying a LLT proved recently in Lebowitz et al [16] this bound can be further improved to  $O(\text{Var}(C_N)^{-1/2})$ . Combining (3.3) with (3.1)-(3.2), we obtain: uniformly for  $\ell$  satisfying (3.4),

$$P(C_N^{e,o} = \ell) = \frac{(2 + O(\text{Var}(C_N)^{-1/2})) \exp\left(-\frac{(\ell - \mathbb{E}[C_N])^2}{2\text{Var}(C_N)}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi \text{Var}(C_N)}}; \quad (3.5)$$

here  $N - \ell$  is even (odd resp.) for  $C_N^e$  ( $C_N^o$  resp.) The equation (3.5) and Theorem 3.1 taken together imply a strong *local* limit theorem for  $V_N$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *Uniformly for all admissible  $\ell$ , meeting (3.4),*

$$P(V_N = \ell) = \frac{(2 + O(\text{Var}(C_N)^{-1/2})) \exp\left(-\frac{(\ell - \mathbb{E}[C_N])^2}{2\text{Var}(C_N)}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi \text{Var}(C_N)}}; \quad (3.6)$$

*admissibility means that  $N - \ell$  is even (odd resp.) when  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are of the same parity (the opposite parity resp.). Consequently  $V_N$  is asymptotically normal with mean and variance  $\ln N$  both,  $V_N \sim \mathcal{N}(\ln N, \ln N)$  in short.*

**Note.** Gamburd used his Theorem 2.1 to prove that  $V_N$  is asymptotic in distribution (i. e. integrally) to  $\mathcal{N}(\ln N, \ln N)$  for  $J = \{k\}$  and  $N$  divisible by  $2 \text{ lcm}\{2, k\}$ .

Since the surface has  $V_N$  vertices,  $N/2$  edges and  $n = \sum_j n_j$  faces, its Euler characteristic  $\chi_N$  is

$$\chi_N = V_N - N/2 + n.$$

Using Theorem 3.2, we obtain then

**Corollary 3.1.**

$$P(\chi_N = -N/2 + n + \ell) = \frac{(2 + O(\text{Var}(C_N)^{-1/2})) \exp\left(-\frac{(\ell - E[C_N])^2}{2\text{Var}(C_N)}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi \text{Var}(C_N)}}, \quad (3.7)$$

uniformly for all admissible  $\ell$ , satisfying (3.4).

**Note.** In effect, the equation (3.7) gives an asymptotic formula for the fraction of surfaces with a given value of the Euler characteristic in the case when the absolute-value difference between the number of vertices and  $\ln N$  is of order  $O((\ln N)^{1/2})$ .

## 4 Number of components

Let  $X_N$  denote the total number of components of the random surface.

**Theorem 4.1.**

$$P(X_N = 1) = 1 - O(N^{-1}).$$

**Notes.** (1) This estimate is qualitatively best in general, since Pippenger and Schleich [20] proved that  $P(X_N = 1) = 1 - 5/(6N) + O(N^{-2})$  for  $J = \{3\}$ . (2)  $X_N$  can be viewed as the number of components in a random *multigraph*  $MG$  on  $n = \sum_j n_j$  vertices, with the given vertex-degree sequence, such that  $n_j$  vertices have degree  $j$ . (Each of the vertices  $j$  is represented by a set  $S_j$  of cardinality  $j$ , and two vertices  $j$  and  $j'$  are joined by an edge iff in the uniformly random matching  $M$  on  $S = \uplus_j S_j$  there are points  $u \in S_j$  and  $u' \in S_{j'}$  such that  $(u, u') \in M$ . This model was introduced by Bollobás [2].) The theorem 4.1 asserts that  $MG$  is connected with probability  $1 - O(N^{-1})$ , uniformly over *all* degree sequences bounded by 3 from below. For the maximum degree  $\leq n^{0.02}$  this claim is implicit in Łuczak [18], its focus being on graphs, rather than multigraphs; see also an earlier result by Wormald [23] for the bounded maxdegree case.

*Proof.* If  $X_N > 1$  then there exists a partition of the  $n = \sum_{j \in J} n_j$  cycles into two groups such that no two sides of a pair of cycles belonging to different groups are glued together; call it “no-match” condition. A generic partition into two groups of cycles is given by the two sets,  $\{n'_j\}_{j \in J}$  and  $\{n''_j\}_{j \in J}$ , such that  $n'_j + n''_j = n_j$ ,  $j \in J$ . Introduce  $N' = \sum_j j n'_j$ ,  $N'' = \sum_j j n''_j$ ; so  $N = N' + N''$ . For an admissible partition, both  $N'$  and  $N''$  must be

even. Consequently  $N', N'' \geq m$ , where  $m = \min J$  if  $\min J$  is even, and  $m = 2 \min J$  otherwise. The probability of no-match is

$$P(N', N'') := \frac{(N' - 1)!(N'' - 1)!!}{(N - 1)!!}.$$

Using Stirling formula, we obtain: uniformly for  $N' \geq m, N'' \geq m$ ,

$$P(N', N'') = O(P^*(N', N'')), \quad P^*(N', N'') = \frac{(N')^{N'/2}(N'')^{N''/2}}{N^{N/2}}. \quad (4.1)$$

Furthermore, the total number of  $\{n'_j, n''_j\}_{j \in J}$  with parameters  $N', N''$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q(N', N'') &= \sum_{\substack{n'_j + n''_j = n_j \\ \sum_j j n'_j = N'; \sum_j j n''_j = N''}} \prod_{j \in J} \frac{n_j!}{n'_j! n''_j!} \\ &= [x_1^{N'} x_2^{N''}] \prod_{j \in J} \sum_{n'_j + n''_j = n_j} \frac{n_j!}{n'_j! n''_j!} x_1^{j n'_j} x_2^{j n''_j} \\ &= [x_1^{N'} x_2^{N''}] \prod_{j \in J} (x_1^j + x_2^j)^{n_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Now

$$P(X_N > 1) \leq \sum_{\substack{N', N'' \geq 2 \\ N' + N'' = N}} P(N', N'') Q(N', N''),$$

so, by (4.1), we need to bound  $P^*(N', N'') Q(N', N'')$  for the generic  $N', N''$ . By symmetry, it suffices to consider  $N' \leq N''$ . By (4.2) and  $N' + N'' = \sum_j j n_j$ , we have: for all  $x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(N', N'') &\leq x_1^{-N'} x_2^{-N''} \prod_{j \in J} (x_1^j + x_2^j)^{n_j} \\ &\leq y^{-N'} \prod_{j \in J} (y^j + 1)^{n_j} = \exp(H(y, N')); \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

$$H(y, N') := \sum_j n_j \ln(y^j + 1) - N' \ln y, \quad y := \frac{x_1}{x_2}.$$

The best value of  $y$  minimizes  $H(y, N')$ , and so it is a root of  $H_y(y, N') = 0$ , which is equivalent to

$$\sum_j n_j \frac{j y^j}{y^j + 1} = N'. \quad (4.4)$$

The LHS strictly increases with  $y$ , and equals 0 at  $y = 0$  and  $\sum_j j n_j / 2 = N/2 \geq N'$ . So  $H(y, N')$  does attain its minimum at a unique point  $y(N') \in (0, 1]$  for all  $N' \leq N/2$ .  $y(N')$  is strictly increasing with  $N'$ , and—considered as a function of the continuous parameter  $N'—y(N')$  is *continuously differentiable* for  $N' > 0$ , as

$$\frac{d}{dy} \left( \sum_j n_j \frac{jy^j}{y^j + 1} \right) > 0, \quad \forall y > 0.$$

Thus  $Q(N', N'') \leq \exp(H(y(N'), N'))$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} P^*(N', N'')Q(N', N'') &= O(\exp(\mathcal{H}(y(N'), N'))), \\ \mathcal{H}(y(N'), N') &:= H(y(N'), N') \\ &\quad + (N'/2) \ln N' + (N''/2) \ln N'' - (N/2) \ln N. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

We want to show that  $\mathcal{H}(y(N'), N')$  is strictly decreasing with  $N'$ . Since  $H_y(y, N')|_{y=y(N')} = 0$ , and  $N'' = N - N'$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dN'} \mathcal{H}(y(N'), N') &= \frac{\partial}{\partial N'} \mathcal{H}(y, N')|_{y=y(N')} \\ &= -\ln y(N') + (1/2) \ln N' - (1/2) \ln N'' \\ &= \ln \left( \sqrt{\frac{N'}{N''}} \cdot \frac{1}{y(N')} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we need to show that  $y(N') > y_1 = y_1(N') := \sqrt{\frac{N'}{N''}}$  for  $N' < N/2$ , or equivalently by (4.4), that

$$\sum_j n_j \frac{jy_1^j}{y_1^j + 1} < N'.$$

By convexity of  $z/(1+z)$  for  $z \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j n_j \frac{jy_1^j}{y_1^j + 1} &\leq N \frac{\sum_j y_1^j(jn_j)/N}{\sum_j y_1^j(jn_j)/N + 1} \\ &\leq N \frac{y_1^3 \sum_j(jn_j)/N}{y_1^3 \sum_j(jn_j)/N + 1} \\ &= N \frac{y_1^3}{y_1^3 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$



and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_j n_j \frac{j y_1^j}{y_1^j + 1} - N' &\leq (N' + N'') \frac{y_1^3}{y_1^3 + 1} - N' \\
&= N'' \left[ (y_1^2 + 1) \frac{y_1^3}{y_1^3 + 1} - y_1^2 \right] \\
&= -N'' \frac{y_1^2(1 - y_1)}{y_1^3 + 1} < 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for  $N' < N/2$ . Thus indeed  $y(N') > y_1$ , whence  $\mathcal{H}(y(N'), N')$  is strictly decreasing for  $N' \in (0, N/2]$ .

Consider  $N' \in [\nu, N/2]$ ,  $\nu = \lfloor 6 \ln N \rfloor$ , so that  $N'' = N - \nu$ . Then, with  $y_1 := y_1(\nu)$ ,  $n = \sum_j n_j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(y(N'), N') &\leq \mathcal{H}(y(\nu), \nu) \leq \mathcal{H}(y_1, \nu) \\
&= \sum_j n_j \ln(1 + y_1^j) - (\nu/2) \ln(\nu/N'') \\
&\quad + (\nu/2) \ln \nu + (N''/2) \ln N'' - (N/2) \ln N \\
&\leq \sum_j n_j y_1^j - (N/2) \ln(N/N'') \\
&\leq n \left( \frac{6 \ln N}{N''} \right)^{3/2} - \frac{\nu}{2} = O(\sqrt{N^{-1} \ln^3 N}) - \frac{\nu}{2} \\
&\leq -2 \ln N.
\end{aligned}$$

From this bound and (4.5) it follows then that

$$\sum_{\substack{N' + N'' = N \\ 6 \log N \leq N' \leq N''}} P^*(N', N'') Q(N', N'') = O(N \exp(-2 \log N)) = O(N^{-1}). \quad (4.6)$$

It remains to consider  $m \leq N' \leq 6 \ln N$ . We will use the bound (4.3) again, but this time we are content with a suboptimal  $\hat{y} = \hat{y}(N') := (N'/N'')^{1/j_1}$ ,  $j_1 := \min J \geq 3$ . Using the resulting bound for  $P^*(N', N'') Q(N', N'')$ , i. e. (4.5) with  $\hat{y}(N')$  instead of  $y(N')$ , and also

$$\sum_j n_j \ln(1 + \hat{y}^j) \leq \sum_j \hat{y}^j n_j \leq \frac{N'}{N''} \sum_j n_j = \frac{n N'}{N''},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
P^*(N', N'')Q(N', N'') &= O(\exp(\hat{\mathcal{H}}(N'))), \\
\hat{\mathcal{H}}(N') &:= \frac{nN'}{N''} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{j_1}\right) N' \ln N' \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{N'}{j_1} + \frac{N''}{2}\right) \ln N'' - \frac{N}{2} \ln N.
\end{aligned}$$

Considering  $N'$  as a continuously varying parameter,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\hat{\mathcal{H}}}{dN'} &= \frac{nN}{(N'')^2} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{j_1}\right) \ln \frac{N''}{N'} - \frac{1}{j_1} - \frac{N'}{j_1 N''} \\
&\leq -0.5 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{j_1}\right) \ln N,
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for  $m \leq N' \leq 6 \ln N$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m \leq N' \leq 6 \ln N} \exp(\hat{\mathcal{H}}(N')) &\leq \exp(\hat{\mathcal{H}}(m)) \sum_{s \geq 0} [\exp(-0.5(1/2 - 1/j_1) \ln N)]^s \\
&\leq 2 \exp(\hat{\mathcal{H}}(m)) = O(N^{-m(1/2 - 1/j_1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

If  $j_1 \geq 3$  is even then  $m = j_1 \geq 4$ , and if  $j_1$  is odd then  $m = 2j_1 \geq 6$ ; so  $m(1/2 - 1/j_1) \geq 1$ . Consequently

$$\sum_{m \leq N' \leq 6 \ln N} \exp(\hat{\mathcal{H}}(N')) = O(N^{-1}). \quad (4.7)$$

Combining (4.7) with (4.6), we complete the proof of Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

On the event  $\{X_N = 1\}$ , the genus  $g_N$  is given by  $g_N = 1 - \chi_N/2$ . Thus  $g_N$  is defined with probability  $1 - O(N^{-1})$ , and so by Corollary 3.1 we have

**Corollary 4.1.** *For all admissible  $\ell$ , and  $N$  large enough,*

$$P\left(g_N = 1 + \frac{N}{4} - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{\ell}{2}\right) = \frac{(2 + O(\text{Var}(C_N)^{1/2})) \exp(-\frac{(\ell - E[C_N])^2}{2\text{Var}(C_N)})}{\sqrt{2\pi \text{Var}(C_N)}}, \quad (4.8)$$

( $n = \sum_j n_j$ ), uniformly for all admissible  $\ell$ , satisfying  $\frac{\ell - E[C_N]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(C_N)}} \in [-a, a]$ .

In particular, for  $J = \{k\}$ ,  $k \in [3, N]$ ,

$$1 + \frac{N}{4} - \frac{n}{2} = 1 + \frac{N(k-2)}{4k};$$

so that for a single disc with  $N$  sides, ( $N$  even), the genus  $g_N$  is asymptotic, integrally *and* locally, to  $N/4 - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(\ln N, \ln N)$ . We proved this result in Chmutov and Pittel [5] by using the Harer-Zagier [12] formula for the generating function of chord diagrams enumerated by the genus of the attendant surface. That study was prompted by an earlier result of Linial and Nowik [17], who proved, using the H-Z formula, that  $E[g_N] = N/4 - 0.5 \ln N + O(1)$ . (They also proved that  $E[g_N] = N/2 - \Theta(\ln N)$  for a different random surface induced by an oriented chord diagram, for which a counterpart of the H-Z formula is unknown.)

## References

- [1] E. A. Bender, *Central and local limit theorems applied to asymptotic enumeration*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **15** (1973) 91–111.
- [2] B. Bollobás, *A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs*, European J. Combin., **1** (1980) 311–316.
- [3] E. R. Canfield, *Application of the Berry-Esséen inequality to combinatorial estimates*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **28** (1980) 17–25.
- [4] S. Chmutov, F. Vignes-Tourneret, *Partial Duality of Hypermaps*. Preprint [\protect\vrule width0pt\protect\href{http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0632}](http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0632){arXiv:1409.0632}
- [5] S. Chmutov and B. Pittel, *The genus of a random chord diagram is asymptotically normal*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **120**(1) (2013) 102–110.
- [6] P. Diaconis, *Group Representations in Probability and Statistics*, IMS Lecture Notes–Monograph Series, **11** (1988).
- [7] P. Diaconis and M. Shashahani, *Generating a random permutation with random transpositions*, Z. Wahr. Verw. Gebiete, **57** (1981) 159–179.

- [8] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol. 2, 2nd Edition*, Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1971).
- [9] K. Fleming and N. Pippenger, *Large deviations and moments for the Euler characteristic of a random surface*, Random Struct. Algorithms, **37** (2010) 465–476.
- [10] S. V. Fomin and N. Lulov, *On the number of rim hook tableaux*, J. Math. Sciences, **87** (1997) 4118–4123.
- [11] A. Gamburd, *Poisson-Dirichlet distribution for random Belyi surfaces*, The Ann. Probability., **34** (2006) 1827–1848.
- [12] J. Harer and D. Zagier, *The Euler characteristic of the moduli space of curves*, Invent. Math., **85** (1986) 457–485.
- [13] V. F. Kolchin, *Random Graphs*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, Cambridge University Press (1999).
- [14] S. K. Lando and A. K. Zvonkin, *Graphs on Surfaces and Their Applications*, (Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, volume 141), Springer-Verlag (2004).
- [15] M. Larsen and A. Shalev, *Characters of symmetric groups: sharp bounds and applications*, Invent. Math., **174** (2008) 645–687.
- [16] J. L. Lebowitz, B. Pittel, D. Ruelle and E. R. Speer, *Central limit theorems, Lee-Yang zeros, and graph-counting polynomials*, JCTA (submitted).
- [17] N. Linial and T. Nowik, *The expected genus of a random chord diagram*, Discrete Comput. Geom., **45** (2011) 161–180.
- [18] T. Łuczak, *Sparse random graphs with a given degree sequence*, in: A. Frieze, T. Łuczak (Eds.), Random Graphs, Vol. 2, Wiley, New York, (1992) 165–182.
- [19] K. V. Menon, *On the convolution of logarithmically concave sequences*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc., **23** (1969) 439–441.
- [20] N. Pippenger and K. Schleich, *Topological characteristics of random triangulated surfaces*, Random Struct. Algorithms, **28** (2006) 247–288.

- [21] V. N. Sachkov and V. A. Vatutin, *Probabilistic Methods in Combinatorial Analysis*, Cambridge University Press (2010).
- [22] R. P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics, Vol. 2*, Cambridge University Press (1999).
- [23] N. C. Wormald, *The asymptotic connectivity of labelled regular graphs*, J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B, **31** (1981) 156–167.