

ANALYTIC COMBINATORICS OF COMPOSITION SCHEMES AND PHASE TRANSITIONS WITH MIXED POISSON DISTRIBUTIONS

CYRIL BANDERIER, MARKUS KUBA, AND MICHAEL WALLNER

ABSTRACT. Multitudinous combinatorial structures are counted by generating functions satisfying a composition scheme $F(z) = G(H(z))$. The corresponding asymptotic analysis becomes challenging when this scheme is critical (i.e., G and H are simultaneously singular). The singular exponents appearing in the Puiseux expansions of G and H then dictate the asymptotics.

In this work, we first complement results of Flajolet et al. for a full family of singular exponents of G and H . We identify the arising limit laws (for the number of H -components in F) and prove moment convergence. Then, motivated by many examples (random mappings, planar maps, directed lattice paths), we consider a natural extension of this scheme, namely $F(z) = G(H(z))M(z)$. We discuss the number of H -components of a given size in F ; this leads to a nice world of limit laws involving products of beta distributions and of *Mittag-Leffler distributions*. We also obtain continuous to discrete phase transitions involving *mixed Poisson distributions*, giving an unified explanation of the associated thresholds. We end with extensions of the critical composition scheme to a cycle scheme and to the multivariate case, leading again to product distributions. Applications are presented for random walks, trees (supertrees of trees, increasingly labelled trees, preferential attachment trees), triangular Pólya urns, and the Chinese restaurant process.

This article is kindly devoted to Alois Panholzer, on the occasion of his 50th birthday.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. New main results	5
2.1. Composition schemes analysed in this article	5
2.2. Plan of the paper	7
3. Singularity analysis, stable laws, and mixed Poisson distributions	7
3.1. Singularity analysis and asymptotic expansions	7
3.2. Probability distribution melting pot	9
4. Extended composition scheme	15
5. Refined composition scheme	20
6. Applications and examples	24
6.1. Supertrees	24
6.2. Root degree and branching structure in bilabelled increasing trees	26
6.3. Returns to zero: walks and bridges with drift zero	29
6.4. First returns in coloured bridges and walks	31
6.5. Sign changes: walks with drift zero (Dyck, Motzkin, etc.)	33
6.6. Triangular urn models and Beta-stable product distributions	35
6.7. Tables in the Chinese restaurant process	36
7. Further extensions	40
7.1. Critical cycle scheme	40
7.2. Multivariate critical composition schemes	42
8. Conclusion and Outlook	48
References	50

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60C05, 60E07, 60G50.

Keywords: Mixed Poisson distributions, stable laws, Mittag-Leffler distributions, product distributions, analytic combinatorics, generating functions, singularity analysis, critical composition schemes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many combinatorial structures are an assemblage of more basic building blocks; this situation is ubiquitous in analytic and probabilistic combinatorics and in statistical mechanics: It appears for example in random mappings, random forests, parking functions, Pólya–Eggenberger urn models, (Bienaymé)–Galton–Watson processes, directed lattice paths/random walks, tree destruction procedures in simply generated trees, inversions in labelled tree families, generalized plane-oriented recursive trees (scale-free trees), set or integer partitions with some constraints, sequences of words, tilings, different families of graphs or maps, etc.; see e.g. [5–7, 10–12, 25, 26, 32, 35–38, 72, 77, 78, 80, 88, 91]. In the language of generating functions, one then has a functional composition scheme such as

$$F(z) = G(H(z)).$$

Let us illustrate this composition scheme with some examples (each of them being in fact the starting point of many theorems in the literature): a random forest is a set of random trees; a permutation is a set of cycles; a bridge (a random walk on \mathbb{Z}) is a sequence of positive or negative arches; an integer partition is sequence of parts; the factorization of a polynomial in a finite field is a multiset of irreducible factors; functional mappings are cycles of Cayley trees; supertrees are trees in which each leaf is replaced by another family of trees; following the work of Tutte, several important families of planar maps can be seen as a “simple core” in which each node is replaced by some “simple map”, etc. The reader can find many other examples illustrating the universality of the scheme $F(z) = G(H(z))$ in the wonderful book by Flajolet and Sedgewick on analytic combinatorics [35]. Structurally, this composition scheme is at the heart of many fascinating phase transition phenomena (analytically corresponding, e.g., to coalescing saddle points or to confluence of singularities). More precisely, let $G(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n$ and $H(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n z^n$ be analytic functions at the origin with nonnegative coefficients and $G(0) = 0$. Let ρ_G and ρ_H be the radii of convergence of $G(z)$ and $H(z)$, respectively. Then, following [6, 35], we focus on *critical composition schemes*.

Definition 1.1 (Critical composition scheme). *The composition scheme $F(z) = G(H(z))$ is critical if it satisfies $H(\rho_H) = \rho_G$.*

We will assume throughout this work that we are always in the critical case (the asymptotic analysis is straightforward otherwise). Note that this terminology is a generalization of the notion of critical/supercritical/subcritical Galton–Watson processes, initially popularized by Harris for neutron branching processes [43].

Often, $G(z)$ and $H(z)$ are the counting series of certain combinatorial families \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} such that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{H}$. We refer to the first part of [35] for a more detailed presentation of this combinatorial approach, starting from the so-called atoms, and then assembling them in more elaborate structured blocks via combinatorial constructors. Some important subclasses of such structures were also subject of more probabilistic approaches; see e.g. [3, 61].

Now, our goal is to analyse probabilistic properties of critical compositions like

$$F(z, u) = G(uH(z)),$$

where u marks each occurrence of any object of \mathcal{H} . From a combinatorial perspective, $F(z, u)$ enumerates \mathcal{F} -structures of size n made of k “building blocks from \mathcal{H} ” (also simply called \mathcal{H} -components), i.e., \mathcal{G} -structures made of k blocks, where each block is then replaced by an \mathcal{H} -block (which is itself a structured set of atoms).

For any combinatorial structure in \mathcal{F} , its corresponding \mathcal{G} -structure is sometimes called its *core*¹ (or “skeleton”, or “backbone”).

A first natural question is what is the typical size of this core, i.e., what is the *typical number of \mathcal{H} -components*? Having such an insight is for example important to tune efficiently many algorithms on combinatorial structures, as illustrated by Knuth in [60]. To answer this question, one considers the discrete random variable X_n associated to this core size in a uniformly chosen object of size n . Its probability mass function is obtained by extraction of coefficients:

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\} = \frac{[z^n u^k]F(z, u)}{[z^n]F(z, 1)} = g_k \frac{[z^n]H(z)^k}{f_n},$$

where $[z^n]$ denotes the extraction of coefficients operator: $[z^n] \sum_n f_n z^n = f_n$. Thus, we see that the probability $\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\}$ depends on the singular expansion of H :

$$H(z) = \tau_H + c_H \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right)^{\lambda_H} + \dots$$

In this expansion, the exponent λ_H (which is called the *singular exponent* of H) plays a key rôle. It allows establishing four distinct universal behaviours for X_n :

- For $\lambda_H > 2$, the limit law is related to a Gaussian law.
- For $1 < \lambda_H < 2$, the limit law is related to a stable law of parameter λ_H (this distribution is supported on \mathbb{R} and possesses moments up to order λ_H ; e.g. for $\lambda_H = 3/2$, one has the map-Airy distribution).
- For $0 < \lambda_H < 1$, we will show that the limit law is related to the reciprocal of a stable law of parameter λ_H (this distribution is supported on \mathbb{R}^+ and has moments of any order; e.g. for $\lambda = 1/2$, one has the Rayleigh distribution). We say that λ_H is a *small singular exponent* if it belongs to this interval.
- For $\lambda_H < 0$ the scheme is not critical because the function $H(z)$ diverges at $z = \rho$, and thus leads to a singularity of $G(H(z))$ at some $z < \rho$. Such a scheme is called *supercritical* and typically leads to a discrete limit law.

The case $\lambda_H < 0$ is analysed by Flajolet and Sedgewick [35]. The cases $0 < \lambda_H < 1$, $1 < \lambda_H < 2$ and $\lambda_H > 2$ were briefly analysed by Banderier et al. [6], but without a precise statement for the limit laws, the right renormalizations, etc. It is partly due to the fact that the initial motivation of the authors of [6] was to analyse the core of planar maps, so they focused on the subcase $\lambda_H = \frac{3}{2}$, which corresponds to the map-Airy distribution. In fact, we were surprised that the detailed analysis for $0 < \lambda_H < 1$, that we present in this article, was much more challenging than expected: As we shall see, it required several new ingredients. Our identification of the limit laws involves *moment-tilted distributions* (see Subsection 3.2) and *product distributions* (for an interesting variant of the initial composition scheme). This also contributes to some open problems like the identification of the limit law for (un)balanced triangular urns; see Flajolet et al. [32] and Janson [55, Problem 1.15]. To summarize, a complete analysis of the small singular exponent case remained to be done. The first main objective of this work is to tackle this problem and to generalize it. A second main objective is to study a refined composition scheme

$$F(z, v) = G(H(z) - (1 - v)h_j z^j), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

and to uncover a general phase transition phenomenon. This construction already appeared in many instances, see [35, Chapter III] and also [35, 64, 65, 67, 69, 72, 80, 81].

¹The word “core” comes from the theory of graphs and maps, where this composition scheme is natural and was, e.g., analysed in [6, 56].

The corresponding random variable $X_{n,j}$ has an additional parameter j and its probability mass function is given by

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_{n,j} = k\} = \frac{[z^n v^k]F(z, v)}{[z^n]F(z, 1)}.$$

For mathematical objects we refer to "phase transition" when there is a change of properties under varying parameters. Usually, the main problems [14,40,41,46–48] in this context are to locate the phase transition, to properly describe the phase transition in terms of the involved parameters and to give intuitive explanations of the observed phenomena. The simplest and maybe best known phase transition is the classical central limit theorem. It is also closely related to the Poisson law, as the binomial distribution $X_n \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} B(n, p)$ can be approximated by a Poisson distributed random variable. This results in a trichotomy, a continuous to discrete phase transition (see Table 1): When n tends to infinity and the expected value $\mathbb{E}(X_n) = p \cdot n$ also tends to infinity, here $p = p(n)$ may depend on n , then a central limit theorem for X_n follows. In contrast, if $p \cdot n \rightarrow \lambda$, then X_n is asymptotically Poisson distributed.

A new phase transition from continuous to discrete was observed in a great many examples, amongst others the analysis of inversions in labelled tree families [80], stopping times in urn models [67, 69], death processes [69, 70], node degrees in increasing trees [65], block sizes in k -Stirling permutations [67], descendants in increasing trees [64], ancestors and descendants in evolving k -tree models [81]. In these examples, pairs of random variables X and Y arise as limiting distributions for certain parameters of interest, associated to the combinatorial structures. The random variable X can usually be determined via its (power) moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$, whereas the random variable Y is specified in terms of the sequence of factorial moments $\mathbb{E}(Y^{\underline{s}}) = \mathbb{E}(Y(Y-1) \dots (Y-(s-1)))$, satisfying the relation

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^{\underline{s}}) = \rho^s \mu_s, \quad s \geq 1.$$

In [72], many more examples leading to the same phenomenon were discovered. The nature of the random variable Y was clarified under the umbrella of *mixed Poisson distributions*, leading to a phase transition from continuous to discrete limit law. However, the case by case study lacked a proper uniform description of the arising phase transitions. As proposed in [72, Section 7.1], instead of treating the examples individually, we study the refined composition scheme (4). It will turn out the phase transition of the random variable $X_{n,j}$ depends on the growth of $j = j(n)$ with respect to the size n and involves a continuous random variable X and a *mixed Poisson distribution* Y , whose mixing distribution U satisfies $U \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} X$. It is our goal to analyse the general mechanism behind the phase transitions observed before in specific examples, uncovering a trichotomy of limits laws: from continuous to discrete to degenerate limit law. Moreover, we will also add applications of the refined composition scheme and mixed Poisson distributions to Chinese restaurant process, returns to zero in random walks, sign changes in random walks, as well as the branching structure of random trees.

While there is a large literature on the applications of mixed Poisson distributions in applications and actuarial sciences, very few studies have been conducted on combinatorial aspects concerning discrete structures of large size. We also note that mixed Poisson distributions provide a common generalization of three major discrete laws of analytic combinatorics (see [35, Figure IX.5]), namely the ordinary Poisson distribution, the geometric distribution and the negative binomial distribution, and thus are of great importance per se.

2. NEW MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Composition schemes analysed in this article. In this work we complement and refine many previous studies of composition schemes. In the case of small singular exponents, we identify the limit laws as moment-tilted reciprocal stable laws. Motivated by models associated to directed lattice paths [5, 10–12, 91] and triangular Pólya urns [32, 54, 55], we also relax and extend the scheme by adding another component $M(z)$, which allows us to apply our results to various examples.

More precisely, we consider the following *extended composition scheme*

$$F(z) = G(H(z)) \cdot M(z), \quad (1)$$

for some functions $F/G/H/M$ analytic at the origin, with nonnegative coefficients. Such schemes are *critical* if $\rho_G = H(\rho_H)$ (like in Definition 1.1) and additionally satisfy $\rho_M \geq \rho_H$, where ρ_M is the radius of convergence of $M(z)$ (the analysis is straightforward if the extended composition scheme is not critical). In order to enumerate the family \mathcal{F} according to the occurrences of \mathcal{H} -components, we consider

$$F(z, u) = G(uH(z)) \cdot M(z), \quad (2)$$

to which we refer as the extended composition scheme from now on. Equivalently, $[z^n u^k]F(z, u)$ is the number of \mathcal{F} -structures of size n having k \mathcal{H} -components. We now introduce the corresponding random variable X_n . For $k \geq 0$, its probability mass function is given by

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\} = \frac{[z^n u^k]F(z, u)}{[z^n]F(z, 1)} = g_k \frac{[z^n]H(z)^k \cdot M(z)}{f_n}. \quad (3)$$

Then, our first main result is Theorem 4.1, in which we give explicit expressions for the asymptotics of the factorial moments of X_n , the limit distribution of X_n , suitably normalized, and the density function of the limit law X .

Second, we consider a *refined composition scheme*, which allows us to capture some threshold phenomenon via a bivariate generating function $F(z, v)$ ²:

$$F(z, v) = G(H(z) - (1-v)h_j z^j) \cdot M(z), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4)$$

Combinatorially, we enumerate the number of \mathcal{F} -structures of size n having k \mathcal{H} -components each of size j :

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} \circ (\mathcal{H}_{\neq j} + v\mathcal{H}_{=j}) \times M.$$

Given $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X_{n,j}$ denotes the random variable counting the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j inside \mathcal{F} -structures of size n . Note that the random variables $X_{n,j}$ naturally refine the distribution of the core size X_n given in (3), since

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} X_{n,j} = X_n. \quad (5)$$

Thus, $X_{n,j}$ encodes the distribution of the size of the j -core. Concerning the probability mass function of the j -core, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_{n,j} = k\} = \frac{[z^n v^k]F(z, v)}{[z^n]F(z, 1)} = \frac{h_j^k [z^{n-jk}]G^{(k)}(H(z) - h_j z^j)M(z)}{f_n}.$$

Our second main result is Theorem 5.1, in which we give for the j -core $X_{n,j}$ explicit expressions for its asymptotic factorial moments (they appear to be of mixed Poisson type) and the corresponding limit distribution.

²Note that we still use the letter F to denote the main function. The auxiliary variable is now v and no more u as we are marking a different parameter. This choice avoids more cumbersome notation and is also motivated by the fact that we always have $F(z, 1) = F(z)$.

Our third main result is Theorem 5.6 in which we complement our results for $X_{n,j}$ by studying the covariance and correlation coefficient between the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j_1 and j_2 :

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} \circ (\mathcal{H}_{\neq j_1, j_2} + v_1 \mathcal{H}_{=j_1} + v_2 \mathcal{H}_{=j_2}) \times \mathcal{M}.$$

We study the corresponding random variables X_{n,j_1} and X_{n,j_2} , with $1 \leq j_1 < j_2$, whose joint distribution and joint moments³

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_{n,j_1} = k_1, X_{n,j_2} = k_2\} = \frac{[z^n v_1^{k_1} v_2^{k_2}] F(z; v_1, v_2)}{[z^n] F(z; 1, 1)} \quad (6)$$

are defined in terms of the generating function

$$F(z; v_1, v_2) = G(H(z) - (1 - v_1)h_{j_1}z^{j_1} - (1 - v_2)h_{j_2}z^{j_2}) \cdot M(z). \quad (7)$$

The analysis of the refined composition scheme unravels some universal phase transition phenomena, visualized in Table 1.




Scale	$j \ll n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$	$j = \Theta\left(n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}\right)$	$j \gg n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$
Limit law	continuous	discrete (mixed Poisson)	degenerate
Example			
	Rayleigh distribution	Mixed Poisson Rayleigh distribution	Dirac distribution

TABLE 1. Continuous to discrete phase transition for the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j in \mathcal{F} -structures of size n in the critical refined scheme (4), depending on the relation between j and n ; see Theorem 5.1.

Here, it should be pinpointed that, quite often, generating functions have a dominant singularity which is of square-root type (i.e. $\lambda_H = 1/2$). This phenomenon is explained by the Drmota–Lalley–Woods: Whenever $H(z)$ is given by a strongly connected set of polynomial equations, it has such a critical exponent (see e.g. [4, 24, 35]). Accordingly, in conjunction with Table 1, this explains why one observes a threshold at $j = n^{1/3}$ in many phase transitions.

³Joint moments are the moments of a joint distribution. Some authors call them mixed moments, but we prefer here the terminology “joint moments”, to avoid any confusion with the mixed Poisson and other mixture distributions.

2.2. Plan of the paper. In Section 3 we collect results from analytic combinatorics. We also present our basic assumptions on the generalized composition scheme and collect properties of various distributions that appear later in our main results. Section 4 is devoted to our results on the random variable X_n corresponding to the extended composition scheme (2) involving $F(z, u)$. Section 5 contains the results for the random variable $X_{n,j}$ corresponding to the refined composition scheme (4) involving $F(z, v)$, exhibiting phase transitions. We also give the covariance and correlation coefficients of X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2} , observing again some phase transitions. In Section 6 we discuss various examples. Finally, in Section 7, we analyse further extensions for a cycle scheme and for a multivariate critical composition scheme. We also present new examples for these two extensions.

3. SINGULARITY ANALYSIS, STABLE LAWS, AND MIXED POISSON DISTRIBUTIONS

In this section, we first present a few important notions from analytic combinatorics [35] which we use to identify the radius of convergence and the singular exponents in our composition schemes. Then, we present a few results on the family of moment-tilted stable laws, based on James [49–51] and Janson [55]. We also collect properties of mixed Poisson distributions and their factorial moments [42, 72]. All of this allows us to identify in Sections 4 and 5 the distribution of the \mathcal{H} -components in our composition schemes.




FIGURE 1. The three fundamental methods of asymptotic analysis, as visually summarized by Flajolet in [31], require information on the function in different parts (shown here in red) of the complex plane. Flajolet and Odlyzko’s singularity analysis [34] offers more powerful results, but requires analyticity in a Δ -domain (tastefully also sometimes called “camembert domain” by Flajolet himself!): it is a domain $\Delta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \text{ such that } |z| < \rho + \varepsilon \text{ and } \arg(z - \rho) > \theta\}$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \theta < \pi/2$. This analyticity is agreeably typically granted for most combinatorial constructions (e.g., for the ones leading to meromorphic functions, algebraic-logarithmic functions, hypergeometric functions, D-finite functions, etc.).

3.1. Singularity analysis and asymptotic expansions. Let $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$ be a function with nonnegative coefficients f_n that is analytic in a Δ -domain (see Figure 1 for this notion) with a finite radius of convergence ρ and singular expansion

$$F(z) = P\left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho}\right) + c_F \cdot \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho}\right)^{\lambda_F} (1 + o(1)), \quad (8)$$

where $\lambda_F \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ is called the *singular exponent* (of $F(z)$ at $z = \rho$), and where $P(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ is a polynomial (of degree ≥ 1 for $\lambda_F > 1$, of degree 0 for $0 < \lambda_F < 1$, and $P = 0$ for $\lambda_F < 0$). Then, by standard singularity analysis [34], if ρ is the unique singularity of $F(z)$ in $|z| \leq \rho$, the Taylor series coefficients of $F(z)$ satisfy

$$[z^n]F(z) = f_n = \frac{c_F}{\rho^n} \cdot \frac{n^{-\lambda_F-1}}{\Gamma(-\lambda_F)} \cdot (1 + o(1)). \quad (9)$$

As the f_n 's are positive, this implies the sign property

$$\operatorname{sgn}(c_F) = \operatorname{sgn}(\Gamma(-\lambda_F)), \quad (10)$$

i.e., due to the sign change of the Gamma function between each negative integers:

$$c_F < 0 \text{ for } 0 < \lambda_F < 1, c_F > 0 \text{ for } \lambda_F < 0, \text{ and } \operatorname{sgn}(c_F) = (-1)^{\lfloor \lambda_F \rfloor} \text{ for } \lambda_F > 1. \quad (11)$$

Note that it is in general easy to get more asymptotic terms in (8), and that singularity analysis directly translates them into more asymptotic terms in (9). What is more, if one has several dominant singularities, one just has to sum the contributions of the local expansions at each singularity to get the asymptotics of the coefficients (this standard process is well presented in [35, Chapter IV. 6]). Multiple dominant singularities often arise in the context of walks or trees, as soon as their spreading distribution has periodic support, and the limiting behaviour can then be obtained following the lines of [13].

Now, we define $\tau_F = P(0)$ as the constant term of the expansion (8). For $\lambda_F > 0$ we have $\tau_F = F(\rho)$ (note that $\tau_F > 0$, as it is an infinite converging sum of nonnegative not-all-zero terms), while $F(\rho) = +\infty$ whenever $\lambda_F < 0$. Hence, we can write

$$F(z) = \begin{cases} \tau_F + o(1) & \text{if } \lambda_F > 0, \\ c_F \cdot \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho}\right)^{\lambda_F} (1 + o(1)) & \text{if } \lambda_F < 0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Note that algebraic functions constitute one of the main sources of functions satisfying the conditions of the expansion (8); indeed, they admit a Puiseux expansion

$$F(z) = \sum_{k \geq k_0} c_k \cdot \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho}\right)^{k/r},$$

for $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and an integer $r \geq 1$. For example, in Section 6.1 we will encounter the Catalan generating function $1/2 - \sqrt{1 - 4z}/2$, for which one has $\rho = 1/4$, $P(x) = 1/2$, $\tau_F = 1/2$, $k_0 = 0$, and $r = 2$. (This Catalan example is pleasantly simple, and thus obviously not generic, as here the Puiseux expansion contains only two terms. In full generality it can involve an infinite number of terms whose sum is converging.)

We now consider the critical scheme $F(z) = G(H(z))M(z)$ where we assume that each of the functions $G(z)$, $H(z)$, and $M(z)$ has a unique dominant singularity (i.e., the one of smallest modulus). By Pringsheim's theorem [35, p. 240], the non-negativity of the coefficients implies that this dominant singularity lies on the positive real axis and corresponds therefore to the radius of convergence which we denote by ρ_G , ρ_H , and ρ_M , respectively. Moreover, as in (8), we define for each function:

- the singular exponents λ_G , λ_H , and λ_M ,
- the constant terms τ_G , τ_H , and τ_M ,
- and the singular coefficients c_G , c_H , and c_M .

Additionally, we assume that $M(z)$ has the same radius of convergence as $H(z)$ (i.e., $\rho_M = \rho_H$); otherwise, the asymptotics would easily be obtained via

$$[z^n]F(z) \sim G(H(\rho_M))[z^n]M(z) \quad (\text{if } \rho_M < \rho_H), \quad (13)$$

$$[z^n]F(z) \sim M(\rho_H)[z^n]G(H(z)) \quad (\text{if } \rho_M > \rho_H). \quad (14)$$

However, as our work extends to some interesting degenerated cases where $M(z)$ is an entire function (i.e., $\rho_M = +\infty$), we will also encompass this case, for which it is convenient to set $\lambda_M = 0$. The case $\lambda_M = 0$ is archetypal of cases where $M(z)$ only affects the asymptotics of f_n by a multiplicative constant like in Equation (14).

Thus, thanks to Equations (13) and (14), we can now focus (without loss of generality, or rather "without loss of difficulty!") on the case $\rho_M = \rho_H$ which is

more involved as here $G(z)$, $H(z)$, and $M(z)$ are *all contributing* to the asymptotics in a nontrivial way. Indeed, plugging the singular expansions (8) and (12) for $G/H/M$ into $F(z) = G(H(z))M(z)$, we get the following expansions (where we omit the terms not contributing to the first-order asymptotics):

$$F(z) = \begin{cases} c_M c_G \left(\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G} \right)^{\lambda_G} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_G \lambda_H + \lambda_M} + \dots & \text{if } \lambda_G < 0, \lambda_M \leq 0, \quad (15a) \\ \tau_M c_G \left(\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G} \right)^{\lambda_G} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_G \lambda_H} + \dots & \text{if } \lambda_G < 0, \lambda_M > 0, \quad (15b) \\ \tau_M c_G \left(\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G} \right)^{\lambda_G} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_G \lambda_H} + c_M \tau_G \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_M} + \dots & \text{if } 0 < \lambda_G < 1, \quad (15c) \end{cases}$$

where $\tau_M = c_M = M(\rho_H)$ if $\lambda_M = 0$. Note that, for the third case (15c), the two terms cannot cancel, as $\tau_M c_G \left(\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G} \right)^{\lambda_G}$ and $c_M \tau_G$ have the same sign; this can be seen via the sign property given in (11). The expansions of $F(z)$ show that if $\lambda_M > 0$ and $\lambda_G < 0$, then one gets the same (first-order) asymptotics as in the case $\lambda_M = 0$:

$$[z^n]F(z) \sim M(\rho_H)[z^n]G(H(z)). \quad (16)$$

We note further that for the third case (15c), we not only require $0 < \lambda_G < 1$, but also $\lambda_G \cdot \lambda_H < \lambda_M$. Otherwise there are two possible regimes: First, for $0 < \lambda_G < 1$ and $\lambda_M \leq \lambda_G \lambda_H$ the singular exponent λ_M directly contributes to the asymptotic of $F(z)$, but we will show in Theorem 4.6 that in this case the distribution of X_n mostly degenerates. Second, for $\lambda_G > 1$ the non-zero polynomial $P(x)$ in the singular expansion (8) of $G(z)$ influences the singular expansion, due to the additional summand $P(1 - \frac{H(z)}{\rho_G})$: then the polynomial $P(1 - \frac{H(z)}{\rho_G})$, and thus only $\lambda_H < \lambda_G \lambda_H$, guides the singular exponent of $G(H(z))$. This leads again to mostly to degenerate cases, depending also on the value of λ_M .

This motivates the following definition, which makes the notion of *small singular exponent* mentioned in the introduction more precise.

Definition 3.1 (Small singular exponents). *In the extended or refined composition schemes (1) and (4), the singular exponents of G , H , and M are called small singular exponents if they satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} 0 < \lambda_H < 1 & \text{if } \lambda_G < 0, \\ 0 < \lambda_H < 1, \lambda_G \lambda_H < \lambda_M & \text{if } 0 < \lambda_G < 1. \end{cases}$$

This definition and the different expansions of $F(z)$ in (15a), (15b), and (15c) lead to the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For critical composition schemes $F(z) = G(H(z))M(z)$ with small singular exponents, the radius of convergence of $F(z)$ is given by $\rho_F = \rho_H$ and the singular exponent is given by*

$$\lambda_F = \lambda_G \lambda_H + \min(0, \lambda_M).$$

We assume here and throughout this work that our scheme is critical and that it has small singular exponents.

3.2. Probability distribution melting pot. First, we discuss properties of tilted probability distributions and study in particular positive stable distributions. Then, we collect properties of a family of discrete distributions called mixed Poisson distributions [42, 59, 72, 93].

For a random variable X of density $f(x)$, the tilt of $f(x)$ by a nonnegative integrable functions $g(x)$ is the following density

$$\text{tilt}_g(f(x)) = \frac{g(x)}{\mathbb{E}(g(X))} \cdot f(x).$$

An important class of tilted densities are the *polynomially tilted densities*, where one tilts by a polynomial $g(x) = x^c$ (where c can have any real value such that $\mathbb{E}(X^c)$ is well-defined):

$$\text{tilt}_g(f(x)) = \frac{x^c}{\mathbb{E}(X^c)} \cdot f(x).$$

Hereafter, as we consider only polynomially tilted densities, one will simply write $\text{tilt}_c(f(x))$ instead of $\text{tilt}_g(f(x))$.

Such tilted densities occur in many places: in the connection of degree distribution in preferential attachment trees [50,51] and Lamberti-type laws [49]; in triangular urn schemes [54,55], for node-degrees in generalized plane-oriented recursive trees [65], for some connectivity parameters in random maps [6], as well as table sizes in the Chinese restaurant process [2,72,85,86]. Moreover, many classes of distributions like the beta-distribution, generalized gamma-distribution [9], the F-distribution, the beta-prime distribution, and distributions with gamma-type moments [55] are closed under the tilting operation.

The operator tilt_c admits in fact several equivalent definitions, in terms of density, moments, or Laplace transform, as shown by the following lemma (see also [55, Remark 2.11]).

Lemma 3.3 (Polynomially tilted density functions and moment shifts). *Consider a random variable X with moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \geq 0}$ and density $f(x)$ with support $[0, \infty)$. Now consider a random variable X_c , having a distribution uniquely determined by its moments. Then the following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) *Tilted density: X_c is a random variable with density $f_c(x) = \frac{x^c}{\mu_c} \cdot f(x)$.*
- (2) *Shifted moments: X_c is a random variable with moments $\mathbb{E}[X_c^s] = \frac{\mu_{s+c}}{\mu_c}$.*
- (3) *Differentiated moment generating function: X_c is such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{tX_c}) = \frac{1}{\mu_c} \frac{d^c}{dt^c} \mathbb{E}(e^{tX}).$$

Remark 3.4 (The tilt operator for densities/moments/random variables). This lemma justifies a slight abuse of notation: Starting with the densities of X and X_c linked by $\text{tilt}_c(f(x)) = f_c(x)$, the operator tilt_c is also used to denote the corresponding tilted random variable $\text{tilt}_c(X) := X_c$ and the corresponding tilted moments $\text{tilt}_c(\mu_s) := \frac{\mu_{s+c}}{\mu_c}$.

Remark 3.5. The parts (1) and (2) of Lemma 3.3 stay valid for random variables X and corresponding densities $f(x)$, such that only moments μ_1, \dots, μ_n exist up to a certain value $n \geq 1$. Moreover, it is possible to extend the result above to real $c > 0$, as required later, or even negative c , assuming that the corresponding moments exist. However, only the density and moment parts stay directly valid.

Remark 3.6 (Densities with nonpositive support). In Lemma 3.3, if c is even then one can drop the restriction that the support of $f(x)$ is in $[0, \infty)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. For (1) \Rightarrow (2), first observe that $f_c(x)$ is indeed a density: one has $f_c(x) \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R}^+ and $\int_0^\infty f_c(x) dx = \frac{\mu_c}{\mu_c} = 1$. Then, one checks that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_c^s) = \int_0^\infty x^s f_c(x) dx = \int_0^\infty x^{s+c} \frac{f(x)}{\mu_c} dx = \frac{\mu_{s+c}}{\mu_c}.$$

The fact that X_c is uniquely determined by its moments then implies (2) \Rightarrow (1).

For (2) \Leftrightarrow (3), observe that

$$\frac{d^c}{dt^c} \mathbb{E}(e^{tX}) = \frac{d^c}{dt^c} \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{\mu_s t^s}{s!} = \sum_{s \geq c} \frac{\mu_s t^{s-c}}{(s-c)!} = \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{\mu_{s+c} t^s}{s!},$$

and on the other hand by (1) and (2) we have

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{tX_c}) = \int_0^\infty f_c(x) e^{tx} dx = \frac{1}{\mu_c} \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{t^s}{s!} \int_0^\infty x^{s+c} f(x) dx = \frac{1}{\mu_c} \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{t^s}{s!} \mu_{s+c},$$

which proves the claim. \square

Next we discuss positive stable laws, following James [49–51], Feller [28], and the survey of Janson [55].

Example 3.7 (Reciprocal stable laws and moment shifts). Let S_α denote a positive stable random variable with the Laplace transform $\mathbb{E}(e^{-tS_\alpha}) = e^{-t^\alpha}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Note that any positive stable distribution is of this type up to a scale factor. Its density function $f(x)$ is given (see [28]) by

$$f_{S_\alpha}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\Gamma(n\alpha + 1) \sin(\pi n \alpha)}{n!} x^{-n\alpha-1}.$$

Now, let $\beta > 0$ and define $S_{\alpha,\beta} = (S_\alpha)^{-\beta}$. It is called a reciprocal stable law with parameters α and β (see [55]); its moments are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(S_{\alpha,\beta}^s) = \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{s\beta}{\alpha})}{\Gamma(1 + s\beta)}, \quad s > -\frac{\alpha}{\beta}. \quad (17)$$

By inverse Mellin transform, we obtain

$$f_{S_{\alpha,\beta}}(x) = \frac{1}{\beta\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\Gamma(n\alpha + 1) \sin(\pi n \alpha)}{n!} x^{n\alpha/\beta-1}. \quad (18)$$

For $\alpha = \beta$ we get the Mittag-Leffler distribution $M_\alpha = S_{\alpha,\alpha}$, whose moment generating function $\mathbb{E}(e^{xM_\alpha})$ is the Mittag-Leffler function $E_\alpha(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{x^k}{\Gamma(1+\alpha k)}$. An important special case is

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^s) = \mathbb{E}(S_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}^s) = \frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2}+1)} = 2^s \frac{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})} = \frac{2^s}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Gamma\left(\frac{s+1}{2}\right),$$

so $S_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}} = M_{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{2} \cdot |\mathcal{N}|$ is the half-normal distribution; see Example 3.13 hereafter.

For $c > -\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ consider the moment-tilted random variable $X_c = \text{tilt}_c(S_{\alpha,\beta})$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_c^s) = \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{(s+c)\beta}{\alpha})}{\Gamma(1 + (s+c)\beta)} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta c)}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{c\beta}{\alpha})} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{(s+c)\beta}{\alpha})}{\Gamma((s+c)\beta)} \frac{\Gamma(\beta c)}{\Gamma(\frac{c\beta}{\alpha})}; \quad (19)$$

see James [49–51]. By (18) and Lemma 3.3, the density of X_c is given by

$$f_{X_c}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(1 + \beta c)}{\beta\pi\Gamma(1 + \frac{c\beta}{\alpha})} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\Gamma(n\alpha + 1) \sin(\pi n \alpha)}{n!} x^{n\alpha/\beta+c-1}. \quad (20)$$

For $c = 1$ and $\alpha = \beta$, $X_1 = \text{tilt}_c(M_\alpha)$ we obtain

$$f_{X_1}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\Gamma(n\alpha + 1) \sin(\pi n \alpha)}{n!} x^n.$$

An important special case is $c = 1$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_1^s) = \frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right),$$

so $\text{tilt}_1(M_{\frac{1}{2}})$ is the Rayleigh distribution; see Example 3.14 hereafter.

In the following we collect the properties of two product distributions. Their moments will be used in our main result concerning the extend composition scheme for small singular exponents. The second distribution is then later used in the multivariate generalization.

Example 3.8 (Beta distribution). A beta-distributed random variable $W \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ with parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$ has a probability density function given by $f(x) = \frac{1}{B(\alpha, \beta)} x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1}$, where $B(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}$ denotes the Beta-function. The moments of W are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(W^s) = \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{s-1} (\alpha + j)}{\prod_{j=0}^{s-1} (\alpha + \beta + j)} = \frac{\Gamma(s + \alpha)\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(s + \alpha + \beta)\Gamma(\alpha)}, \quad s > 0,$$

and the beta-distribution is uniquely determined by the sequence of its moments.

Later on, in one of our main results (Theorem 4.4), we will need the following product of distributions:

Lemma 3.9 (Beta-stable product distributions). *Let the independent random variables $X_c = \text{tilt}_c(S_{\alpha_1, \beta_1})$ and $W \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Beta}(\beta_1 c, \beta_2)$ be distributed like a moment-tilted stable law and a beta distribution, respectively, with $0 < \alpha_1 < 1$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2, c > 0$. Then, the product*

$$Z = X_c \cdot W^{\beta_1}$$

possesses the moments of order s (with $s > 0$)

$$\mathbb{E}(Z^s) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(s+c)\beta_1}{\alpha_1}\right) \Gamma(\beta_1 c + \beta_2)}{\Gamma((s+c)\beta_1 + \beta_2) \Gamma\left(\frac{c\beta_1}{\alpha_1}\right)}, \quad (21)$$

and the density function

$$f_Z(z) = \int_0^1 f_{W^{\beta_1}}(x) f_{X_c}\left(\frac{z}{x}\right) \frac{1}{x} dx. \quad (22)$$

Proof. First note that for $W \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ the moments of order s of W^r (with $s > 0$ and $r > 0$) are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(W^{rs}) = \frac{\Gamma(rs + \alpha)\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(rs + \alpha + \beta)\Gamma(\alpha)}. \quad (23)$$

Due to the independence of the random variables we have $\mathbb{E}(Z^s) = \mathbb{E}(X_c^s) \cdot \mathbb{E}(W^{s\beta_1})$. Then, a short computations (starting from (19) and (23) with $r = \beta_1$) leads to (21).

Finally, the integral expression of $f_Z(x)$ follows directly from the densities $f_{X_c}(x)$ and $f_{W^{\beta_1}}(x)$; compare with [65]. \square

Note that in Theorem 4.4 we will give a different and more explicit expression of (22), based on a local limit theorem (or alternatively a general result of Janson [55]).

Example 3.10 (Dirichlet distribution and Dirichlet-stable product distributions). The Dirichlet distribution is a multivariate generalization of the beta distribution, which can be realized as quotients of independent gamma random variables. More formally, a Dirichlet distributed random vector $(W_1, \dots, W_k) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Dir}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ with positive parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ has a probability density function

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k)}{\prod_{j=1}^k \Gamma(\alpha_j)} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{\alpha_j - 1},$$

supported on the $k - 1$ simplex $\{x_j \geq 0, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k, \text{ such that } \sum_{j=1}^k x_j = 1\}$.

Accordingly, the joint moments of (W_1, \dots, W_k) are given by

$$\mathbb{E}(W_1^{s_1} \dots W_k^{s_k}) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j)}{\Gamma(\sum_{j=1}^k (s_j + \alpha_j))} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^k \Gamma(s_j + \alpha_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^k \Gamma(\alpha_j)}.$$

Let us now consider a random vector (Z_1, \dots, Z_k)

$$(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (V_1 \cdot W_1^{r_1}, \dots, V_k \cdot W_k^{r_k}),$$

which depends on some parameters $r_i > 0$, on mutually independent tilted Mittag-Leffler distributions V_j 's, and on a Dirichlet distributed random vector:

$$\begin{cases} (W_1, \dots, W_k, W_{k+1}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Dir}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \alpha_{k+1}), \\ V_j \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{tilt}_{c_j}(M_{\alpha_j}) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k. \end{cases}$$

Here, the moment-tilted Mittag-Leffler distributions V_j 's and the Dirichlet vector $(W_1, \dots, W_k, W_{k+1})$ are also independent. Here, one may think that there is a superfluous W_{k+1} entry, but this last entry of the Dirichlet vector (W_1, \dots, W_{k+1}) is in fact fully determined by the knowledge of W_1, \dots, W_k and the α_i 's, as this vector lives on a k -dimensional simplex.

Using the closed form from Equation (23) for the moments of the tilted Mittag-Leffler distributions, we get the joint moments of (Z_1, \dots, Z_k) :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z_1^{s_1} \dots Z_k^{s_k}) &= \mathbb{E}(W_1^{r_1 s_1} \dots W_k^{r_k s_k}) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}(V_j^{s_j}) \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \alpha_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_{k+1} + \sum_{j=1}^k (r_j s_j + \alpha_j))} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(r_j s_j + \alpha_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_j)} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(s_j + c_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_j(s_j + c_j))} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_j c)}{\Gamma(c_j)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This formula simplifies a lot if one sets $r_j = \alpha_j$ and $c_j = \alpha_j / \alpha_j$ (for $1 \leq j \leq k$); we will meet later this family of distributions, for which the moments are thus

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_1^{s_1} \dots Z_k^{s_k}) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \alpha_j)}{\Gamma(\alpha_{k+1} + \sum_{j=1}^k (r_j s_j + \alpha_j))} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(s_j + c_j)}{\Gamma(c_j)} \right). \quad \blacksquare$$

Another important ingredient of this article will be the mixed Poisson distributions. These distributions were first introduced by Dubourdieu in 1938 for actuarial mathematics and then also studied by Lundberg and others (sometimes under the name "compound Poisson process", a term which nowadays means something else); they later also occurred in link with some point processes (see [42]).

Definition 3.11 (Mixed Poisson distributions). *Let X denote a non-negative random variable with cumulative distribution function U . Then the discrete random variable Y with probability mass function given by*

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\} = \frac{\rho^\ell}{\ell!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} X^\ell e^{-\rho X} dU, \quad \ell \geq 0,$$

has a mixed Poisson distribution with mixing distribution U and scale parameter $\rho \geq 0$, in symbol $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho U)$.

Note that, for the MPo notation, it is convenient to not strictly distinguish between the distribution U and a concrete random variable $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} U$, so we often simply write $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$ instead of $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho U)$. A more compact notation for the probability mass function of Y is sometimes used instead of the one given above, namely

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\} = \frac{\rho^\ell}{\ell!} \mathbb{E}(X^\ell e^{-\rho X}).$$

Here, the parameter ρ scales the mixing distribution X .

We emphasize that the *factorial moments* of a mixed Poisson distribution are closely related to the classical *raw moments* of its mixing distribution:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^{\underline{s}}) = \rho^s \mathbb{E}(X^s), \quad s \geq 1.$$

Additionally, like for any distribution, the factorial and raw moments⁴ of Y are related via the Stirling set partition numbers $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} s \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ (also called Stirling numbers of the second kind):

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^s) = \sum_{k=0}^s \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} s \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\} \mathbb{E}(Y^{\underline{k}}).$$

We note in passing that such general relations are called Stirling transforms [16]. We refer to [72] for more properties of the Stirling transformation and mixed Poisson distributions; therein, Panholzer and the second author also gave the following useful expression for the probability mass function of $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$ in terms of its factorial moments.

Proposition 3.12. *Let X denote a random variable with moment sequence given by $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathbb{E}(e^{zX})$ exists in a neighbourhood of zero, including the value $z = -\rho$. A random variable Y with factorial moments given by $\mathbb{E}(Y^{\underline{s}}) = \rho^s \mu_s$ has a mixed Poisson distribution $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$ with mixing distribution X and scale parameter $\rho > 0$, and the sequence of moments of Y is the Stirling transform of the moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$. The probability mass function of Y is given by*

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\} = \sum_{s \geq \ell} (-1)^{s-\ell} \binom{s}{\ell} \mu_s \frac{\rho^s}{s!}, \quad \ell \geq 0.$$

Let us give two short examples, as we shall later see that they correspond to ubiquitous cases in combinatorics.

Example 3.13 (Mixed Poisson half-normal distribution). A half-normally distributed random variable $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{HN}(\sigma)$ with parameter σ is the absolute value of a normally distributed random variable $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$: $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} |Y|$. Consequently, X has the probability

⁴Throughout this work we denote by $x^{\underline{n}}$ the n^{th} falling factorial, $x^{\underline{n}} = x(x-1)\cdots(x-n+1)$, $n \geq 0$, with $x^{\underline{0}} = 1$. It will be used for $\mathbb{E}(X^{\underline{n}})$, the factorial moment of order n of a random variable X .

density function

$$f(x; \sigma) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \quad x > 0;$$

alternatively, it is fully characterized by its moment sequence $\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \sigma^s 2^{s/2} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})}$.

A discrete random variable Y with probability mass function

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\} = \frac{\rho^\ell}{\ell!} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty x^\ell e^{-\rho x - \frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx, \quad \ell \geq 0,$$

has a mixed Poisson distribution $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$ with mixing distribution $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{HN}(\sigma)$ and scale parameter ρ . Note that we can readily expand the exponential function and obtain various series representations of $\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\}$.

Example 3.14 (Mixed Poisson Rayleigh distribution). A Rayleigh distributed random variable $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Rayleigh}(\sigma)$ with parameter σ has the probability density function

$$f(x; \sigma) = \frac{x}{\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \quad x \geq 0;$$

alternatively, it is fully characterized by its moment sequence

$$\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \sigma^s 2^{s/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2} + 1\right).$$

Thus, a discrete random variable Y with probability mass function

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\} = \frac{\rho^\ell}{\ell! \sigma^2} \int_0^\infty x^{\ell+1} e^{-\rho x - \frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx, \quad \ell \geq 0,$$

has a mixed Poisson distribution $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$ with mixing distribution $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Rayleigh}(\sigma)$ and scale parameter ρ . Another representation valid for all $\rho > 0$ can be stated in terms of the incomplete gamma function $\Gamma(s, x) = \int_x^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt$:

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y = \ell\} = \frac{(\rho\sigma)^\ell}{\ell!} e^{\frac{(\rho\sigma)^2}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell+1} \binom{\ell+1}{i} (-\rho\sigma)^{\ell+1-i} 2^{\frac{i-1}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{i+1}{2}, \frac{(\rho\sigma)^2}{2}\right).$$

4. EXTENDED COMPOSITION SCHEME

In the following we state and prove our main theorem on the extended critical composition scheme (2) for small singular exponents. For the concepts of critical and small singular exponents we refer to Definitions 1.1 and 3.1.

Theorem 4.1. *In an extended critical composition scheme $F(z, u) = G(uH(z))M(z)$ with small singular exponents, the core size X_n has factorial moments*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) \sim n^{s\lambda_H} \kappa^s \cdot \mu_s, \quad \kappa = \frac{\tau_H}{-c_H}, \quad \mu_s = \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G) \Gamma(s\lambda_H - \lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}, \quad (24)$$

where $\lambda'_M = \min(0, \lambda_M)$. The scaled random variable $X_n / (\kappa n^{\lambda_H})$ converges in distribution with convergence of all moments to a random variable X , uniquely determined by its moment sequence (μ_s) :

$$\frac{X_n}{\kappa \cdot n^{\lambda_H}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} X. \quad (25)$$

Moreover, we have the local limit theorem

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = x \cdot \kappa n^{\lambda_H}\} \sim \frac{1}{\kappa n^{\lambda_H}} \cdot f_X(x), \quad (26)$$

with density $f_X(x)$ of the random variable X given by

$$f_X(x) = \frac{\Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G)} \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{(-1)^j x^{-\lambda_G + j - 1}}{j!} \frac{\sin(\pi(1 + j\lambda_H + \lambda'_M))}{\pi} \Gamma(1 + j\lambda_H + \lambda'_M). \quad (27)$$

Proof. The factorial moments are obtained as follows⁵:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) = \frac{[z^n] \partial_u^s (F)(z, 1)}{[z^n] F(z, 1)} \quad (28)$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) = \frac{[z^n] H(z)^s G^{(s)}(H(z)) M(z)}{[z^n] G(H(z)) M(z)}. \quad (29)$$

In the following we use the notation ρ_F , τ_F , λ_F , and c_F from Section 3.1 for the singular expansions of $F = G/H/M$. By Lemma 3.2 the unique singularity of $F(z) = G(H(z))M(z)$ is at $z = \rho_H$. Then, we unify the three cases (15a), (15b), and (15c) by using $\lambda'_M = \min(0, \lambda_M)$ and choosing C_M according to the specific case (C_M is for $\lambda_M \neq \lambda_G \lambda_H$ either τ_M or c_M ; for $\lambda_M \neq \lambda_G$ it may be deduced from (15c); yet C_M will cancel in the end.) This gives

$$F(z) \sim C_M c_G \left(\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G} \right)^{\lambda_G} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_G \lambda_H + \lambda'_M}.$$

Therefore, using singularity analysis we get

$$f_n = [z^n] F(z, 1) \sim \frac{C_M c_G \rho_G^{-\lambda_G} (-c_H)^{\lambda_G}}{\rho_H^n} \cdot \frac{n^{-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M - 1}}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}. \quad (30)$$

Using singular differentiation [30, 35] for $G(z)$, we get the following singular expansion of the higher order derivatives $G^{(s)}(z)$, for integer $s \geq 1$:

$$G^{(s)}(z) \sim (-1)^s \frac{c_G}{\rho_G^s} \lambda_G^s \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_G} \right)^{\lambda_G - s}.$$

From this we get further

$$G^{(s)}(H(z)) \sim (-1)^s c_G \rho_G^{-\lambda_G} \lambda_G^s (-c_H)^{\lambda_G - s} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_G \lambda_H - s \lambda_H}.$$

Next, from the singular expansion of $H(z)$ we directly get

$$H(z)^s \sim \tau_H^s - s \tau_H^{s-1} \cdot (-c_H) \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda_H}. \quad (31)$$

Combining these expansions with the one of $M(z)$ gives the required expansion

$$H(z)^s G^{(s)}(H(z)) M(z) \sim (-1)^s \tau_H^s C_M c_G \rho_G^{-\lambda_G} \lambda_G^s (-c_H)^{\lambda_G - s} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H} \right)^{\lambda'_M + \lambda_H \lambda_G - s \lambda_H}.$$

Next we rewrite $(-1)^s \lambda_G^s$ using the gamma function:

$$(-1)^s \lambda_G^s = \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G)}.$$

Hence, we obtain by singularity analysis and extraction of coefficients

$$[z^n] H(z)^s G^{(s)}(H(z)) M(z) \sim \left(\frac{\tau_H}{-c_H} \right)^s \frac{C_M c_G \rho_G^{-\lambda_G} (-c_H)^{\lambda_G}}{\rho_H^n} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G)} \cdot \frac{n^{-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M - 1 + s \lambda_H}}{\Gamma(s \lambda_H - \lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}.$$

⁵Throughout this work, we denote by ∂_u the differentiation operator with respect to the variable u . Accordingly, one uses the shorthand notation $\partial_u (F)(z, 1) = (\partial_u F(z, u))|_{u=1}$.

Combining this expression with (30) gives

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) \sim n^{s\lambda_H} \kappa^s \cdot \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G) \Gamma(s\lambda_H - \lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)},$$

with $\kappa = \frac{\tau_H}{-c_H}$. We express the raw moments by using the factorial moments and the Stirling numbers of the second kind:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=0}^s \begin{Bmatrix} s \\ j \end{Bmatrix} X_n^j\right) = \sum_{j=0}^s \begin{Bmatrix} s \\ j \end{Bmatrix} \mathbb{E}(X_n^j), \quad (32)$$

such that $\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) \sim \mathbb{E}(X_n^s)$. Consequently, we observe that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(X_n^s)}{n^{s\lambda_H} \kappa^s} \rightarrow \mu_s,$$

obtaining the moment convergence to the stated moment sequence. By Stirling's formula for the gamma function

$$\Gamma(z) = \left(\frac{z}{e}\right)^z \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{z}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right)\right), \quad (33)$$

we observe that for $s \rightarrow \infty$ the moments satisfy

$$(\mu_s)^{-1/(2s)} \sim \sqrt{e^{1-\lambda_H} \lambda_H^{\lambda_H} s^{\frac{H-1}{2}}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)\right).$$

Recall that $0 < \lambda_H < 1$ and therefore Carleman's criterion [20, pp. 189–220] (see also [35]),

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \mu_s^{-1/(2s)} = +\infty, \quad (34)$$

is satisfied and consequently the moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ characterizes a unique distribution. Thus, by the Fréchet–Shohat Theorem [39], we obtain weak convergence of the normalized random variable $\frac{X_n}{\kappa \cdot n^{\lambda_H}}$ to a random variable X with moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Concerning the local limit theorem, we use (3): $\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\} = \frac{g_k [z^n] H(z)^k M(z)}{f_n}$, with f_n given in (30). We assume that $k = x \cdot \kappa \cdot n^{\lambda_H}$, with x in a compact subinterval of $(0, \infty)$. First, we note that by (9) applied to $G(z)$ we directly obtain

$$g_k \sim \frac{c_G}{\rho_G^k} \cdot \frac{(\kappa x)^{-\lambda_G - 1} n^{-\lambda_H \lambda_G - \lambda_H}}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G)}. \quad (35)$$

It remains to determine the asymptotics of $[z^n] H(z)^k M(z)$. We follow closely the proof of the semi-large powers theorem [6,35] for small singular exponents. Compare also with a very detailed analysis of a special case in [88]. We have

$$[z^n] H(z)^k M(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint \frac{H(z)^k M(z)}{z^{n+1}} dz.$$

Here, the integration in the Δ -domain can be transformed into an integral over a Hankel contour C , in which one sets $z = \rho_H(1 - t/n)$; one then gets the asymptotics

$$[z^n] H(z)^k M(z) \sim \frac{\tau_H^k C_M}{\rho_H^n n^{1+\lambda'_M}} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C t^{\lambda'_M} e^{t-x t^{\lambda_H}} dt.$$

We evaluate the integral by expansion of $e^{-x t^{\lambda_H}}$ and term-wise integration

$$[z^n] H(z)^k M(z) \sim -\frac{\tau_H^k C_M}{\rho_H^n n^{1+\lambda'_M}} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C e^t \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{(-x)^j}{j!} t^{j\lambda_H + \lambda'_M} dt,$$

in which we recognize the Hankel contour representation of the gamma function [92, Section 12.22]:

$$\Gamma(z) = -\frac{1}{2i \sin(\pi z)} \int_C (-t)^{z-1} e^{-t} dt.$$

Combining the expansions of f_n from (30), g_k from (35), and previous asymptotics gives the desired local limit theorem:

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\} = \frac{\Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\kappa n^{\lambda_H} \Gamma(-\lambda_G)} \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{(-1)^j x^{j-\lambda_G-1}}{j!} \frac{\sin(\pi(1+j\lambda_H + \lambda'_M))}{\pi} \Gamma(1+j\lambda_H + \lambda'_M).$$

It remains to verify that $f_X(x)$ is the density function of X with moments

$$\mu_s = \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G) \Gamma(s \lambda_H - \lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}.$$

Since the gamma function is never zero and has simple poles at the negative integers, this implies that μ_s (considered as a complex function of s) has simple poles at $\rho_n = \lambda_G - n$ (for $n \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$). Then, Janson's work on moments of gamma type (namely, [55, Theorem 5.4] with $\gamma = \gamma' = 1 - \lambda_H > 0$) implies that the random variable X has a density function. By [55, Equation (6.12) in Theorem 6.9], we get a simple representation in terms of the residues of μ_s : For $x > 0$, one has

$$f_X(x) = \sum_{\rho_n \text{ pole of } \mu_s} \text{Res}_{s=\rho_n}(\mu_s) x^{|\rho_n|-1}.$$

We use Euler's reflection formula $\Gamma(z)\Gamma(1-z) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi z)}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{s=\rho_n}(\mu_s) &= \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G) \Gamma(-n\lambda_H - \lambda'_M)} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\pi \Gamma(-\lambda_G)} \cdot \frac{(-1)^n \sin(\pi(-n\lambda_H - \lambda'_M))}{n!} \Gamma(1+n\lambda_H + \lambda'_M). \end{aligned}$$

This gives the density function $f_X(x)$, as observed in the local limit theorem (26). \square

Remark 4.2. As also explained by Formula (16), the special case $\lambda'_M = 0$ behaves like the ordinary composition scheme (i.e., $M(z) = 1$) with small singular exponents, as originally considered in [6, 35]. The sequence construction SEQ of symbolic combinatorics [35] corresponds to the case $\lambda_G = -1$, and occurs in a great many places in applied probability theory; compare with the examples given in Section 6. Furthermore, note that for $\lambda'_M = 0$ we have $\sin(\pi(1+j\lambda_H + \lambda'_M)) = 0$ for $j = 0$ and the first summand in the series of the density function vanishes. Moreover, for $\lambda_M < 0$ we have by Definition 3.1 $\lambda_G < 0$, so $-\lambda_G + j - 1 > -1$ for all $j \geq 0$.

Theorem 4.3. *In the extended critical composition scheme with small singular exponents, if $\lambda'_M = 0$, then the limit law X has a moment-tilted Mittag-Leffler distribution of parameter λ_H*

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{tilt}_{-\lambda_G}(M_{\lambda_H}). \quad (36)$$

In particular, for $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda_G = -1$ the random variable X follows a Rayleigh distribution of parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{2}$.

Proof. Thus, for $\lambda'_M = 0$ observe that the moments match the moment sequence of a tilted reciprocal stable law, a tilted Mittag-Leffler distribution (19) with $\alpha = \beta = \lambda_H$, $\beta c = -\lambda_G \lambda_H$ and $c = -\lambda_G > -1$. In particular, $\lambda_G = -1$ and $\lambda_H = 1/2$ lead to the Rayleigh law with parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{2}$, with moments as given in Example 3.14:

$$\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(s+1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}. \quad \square$$

Theorem 4.4. *In an extended critical composition scheme with small singular exponents, if $\lambda'_M < 0$ and $\lambda_G < 0$, then the limit law X has a distribution given by the product of a power of beta distribution and a tilted Mittag-Leffler distribution of parameter λ_H ,*

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Beta}(-\lambda_G \lambda_H, -\lambda'_M)^{\lambda_H} \text{tilt}_{-\lambda_G}(M_{\lambda_H}). \quad (37)$$

In the special case $\lambda_G = -1$ and $\lambda_H - \lambda'_M = 1$ we obtain a Mittag-Leffler distribution of parameter λ_H :

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} M_{\lambda_H}. \quad (38)$$

In particular, for $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$ the random variable X follows a half-normal distribution of parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{2}$.

Proof. For $\lambda'_M < 0$, as before we observe $\alpha_1 = \beta_1 = \lambda_H$, $c = -\lambda_G$. Comparing with the moments in (21) we observe that for $\lambda_G < 0$ the beta distribution, taken to the power $r = \beta_1 = \lambda_H$, has parameters $\alpha_2 = \beta_1 c = -\lambda_G \lambda_H > 0$ and $\beta_2 = -\lambda'_M > 0$. \square

Remark 4.5. Note that the random variable X from Theorem 4.1 is rescaled by κ . Hence, the limit laws of Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 can also be interpreted as the laws of the random variable $\tilde{X} = \kappa X$ with parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{2}\kappa$.

It is noteworthy to mention that our methods also allow us to go beyond the range of small singular exponents considered in Definition 3.1. In the following, we study for the sake of completeness the remaining ranges $0 < \lambda_G < 1$, with $\lambda_M \leq \lambda_H \cdot \lambda_G$, and $\lambda_G > 1$. They lead mostly to degenerate limit laws, but also to discrete distributions, as well as a mixture of discrete and continuous distribution. This can be compared with the decomposition of the limit law for $\lambda_H = \frac{3}{2}$ obtained in [6, 35]: there, the limit law consists of a discrete part *plus* a continuous part, a map-Airy distribution. Interestingly, the discrete part of the limit law in [6, 35] for $\lambda_H = \frac{3}{2}$ is similar to the one occurring for $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda_G > 1$, reminiscent of a Boltzmann sampling distribution [18, 27].

Theorem 4.6 (Extended composition scheme - degenerate cases). *Given an extended critical composition scheme $F(z, u) = G(uH(z))M(z)$ with $0 < \lambda_H < 1$ and $\lambda_M \notin \mathbb{N}_0$.*

For $0 < \lambda_G < 1$, and $\lambda_M \leq \lambda_H \cdot \lambda_G$ the core size X_n has for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the following behaviour:

- For $\lambda_M < \lambda_H \cdot \lambda_G$ the random variable X_n degenerates,

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\} \rightarrow 1.$$

- For $\lambda_M = \lambda_H \cdot \lambda_G$ the random variable X_n partially degenerates, as

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\} \rightarrow p = \frac{\tau_G(-c_M)}{\tau_G(-c_M) + \tau_M(-c_g) \cdot \left(\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G}\right)^{\lambda_G}}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\frac{X_n}{\kappa \cdot n^{\lambda_H}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} X \cdot \text{Be}(p)$$

with X a continuous random variable, as given in Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, and $\text{Be}(p)$ denoting a Bernoulli random variable, independent of X .

For $\lambda_G > 1$ the core size X_n has for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the following behaviour:

- For $\lambda_M < \lambda_H$ the random variable X_n degenerates,

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\} \rightarrow 1.$$

- For $\lambda_M = \lambda_H$ the random variable X_n partially degenerates, as

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\} \rightarrow p = \frac{\tau_G(-c_M)}{\tau_G(-c_M) + \tau_M G'(\tau_H) \tau_H} \quad (39)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\} \rightarrow (1-p) \cdot g_k \cdot k \cdot \frac{\tau_H^{k-1}}{G'(\tau_H)}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Thus, the core size X_n converges in distribution to

$$X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \text{Be}(p) \cdot S,$$

with p as given in (39) and S a discrete random variable with

$$\mathbb{P}\{S = k\} = g_k \cdot k \cdot \frac{\tau_H^{k-1}}{G'(\tau_H)}, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (40)$$

- For $\lambda_M > \lambda_H$ we have $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} S$, with S in (40).

We note that in the ordinary scheme, $\lambda_M = 0$ and $\lambda_G > 1$, we also have $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} S$, with S in (40).

Proof. First, we turn to the case $\lambda_G < 1$. We study the probability $\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\}$ given by

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\} = [z^n]G(0)M(z) = \tau_G \cdot \frac{[z^n]M(z)}{f_n} = \tau_g \cdot \frac{m_n}{f_n}.$$

By (15c) we observe that this expression tends to one for $\lambda_M < \lambda_H \cdot \lambda_G$. In contrast, for $\lambda_M = \lambda_H \cdot \lambda_G$ we obtain from (15c) the singular expansion

$$F(z) \sim (\tau_G c_M + \tau_M c_g \cdot (\frac{-c_H}{\rho_G})) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right)^{\lambda_M}.$$

Singularity analysis leads to the stated result for $\mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\}$. The moments of X_n can be obtained identically to Theorem 4.1, except for an additional constant factor, stemming from the new asymptotics of f_n .

For $\lambda_G > 1$ we use (8) and observe that $P(x) \neq 0$. Consequently, we have a singular expansion of $G(z)$ of the form

$$G(z) \sim \tau_G + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \lambda_G \rfloor} c_j \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_g}\right) + c_G \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_g}\right)^{\lambda_G}.$$

Hence, we have $c_1 = -\rho_G \cdot G'(\rho_G) < 0$, as we assume that the coefficients $g_k \geq 0$ and $G(z)$ are non-degenerate. As the scheme is critical, we have $\rho_g = \tau_H$. This implies that the asymptotics of $F(z) = G(H(z))$ are governed solely by the singular exponent λ_H of $H(z)$. Consequently, the singular expansion of $F(z) = G(H(z))M(z)$ is governed either by $\lambda_F = \lambda_M < \lambda_H$, by $\lambda_F = \lambda_M = \lambda_H$ or by $\lambda_F = \lambda_H$, depending on the singular exponent λ_M . Thus, Equation 3, as well as basic singularity analysis applied to (31), gives the desired expansions of $\mathbb{P}\{X_n = k\}$, $k \geq 0$. \square

5. REFINED COMPOSITION SCHEME

In the refined composition scheme, the limit law X of Theorem 4.1 appears again, in what we will refer to in the following as a *mixed Poisson type limit behaviour*.

Theorem 5.1 (Mixed Poisson type limit behaviour for the refined scheme with small singular exponents). *In a refined critical composition scheme with small singular exponents $F(z, v) = G(H(z) - (1 - v)h_j z^j)M(z)$, with $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the j -core $X_{n,j}$, counting the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j has factorial moments of mixed Poisson type:*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s \cdot (1 + o(1)), \quad (41)$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \frac{\rho_H^j}{-c_H} h_j n^{\lambda_H}$ and mixing distribution X as in Theorem 4.1 with moment sequence:

$$\mu_s = \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G) \Gamma(s \lambda_H - \lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}, \quad s \geq 0. \quad (42)$$

For $n \rightarrow \infty$, the limiting distribution of $X_{n,j}$ undergoes a phase transition, depending on $j = j(n)$, with critical growth range given by $j = j(n) = \Theta(n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}})$:

- (i) For $j \ll n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$ we have $\theta_{n,j} \rightarrow \infty$ and the random variable $\frac{X_{n,j}}{\theta_{n,j}}$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to the mixing distribution X .
- (ii) For $j \sim \rho \cdot n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$, $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, we have $\theta_{n,j} \rightarrow \rho$, and the random variable $X_{n,j}$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to a mixed Poisson distributed random variable $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$.
- (iii) For $j \gg n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$ we have $\theta_{n,j} \rightarrow 0$ and the random variable $X_{n,j}$ degenerates and converges to zero.

Remark 5.2 (Phase transition I). The intuition behind the phase transition is as follows: In the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, there are many small ($j \ll n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$), some giant ($j \sim \rho n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$), and no super-giant (i.e., of size $j \gg n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$) \mathcal{H} -components of size j . It is interesting to compare this situation with the birth of the giant component in Erdős–Rényi random graphs; see [56]. Note that the case $j \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed (i.e. independent of n as n tends to infinity) falls into the case $j \ll n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$.

Remark 5.3 (Phase transition II). For the often observed case of a square-root singularity of $H(z)$ (i.e., $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$), we reobtain the critical range $j = \Theta(n^{1/3})$, which was already observed in the mixed Poisson Rayleigh distributions in [72]. Furthermore, Equation (41) offers en passant a connection between the $\theta_{n,j}$'s and the rescaling factor κn^{λ_H} in Theorem 4.1:

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \theta_{n,j} = \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{\rho_H^j}{-c_H} h_j n^{\lambda_H} = \frac{H(\rho_H)}{-c_H} n^{\lambda_H} = \frac{\tau_H}{-c_H} n^{\lambda_H} = \kappa n^{\lambda_H}.$$

This connection can be seen as an asymptotic avatar of the combinatorial relation $\sum_{j \geq 1} X_{n,j} = X_n$, implying

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}) = \mathbb{E}(X_n).$$

In order to prove Theorem 5.1, we first need the following lemma concerning the convergence of mixed Poisson distributions.

Lemma 5.4 (Factorial moments and limit laws of mixed Poisson type [72]). *Let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote a sequence of random variables, whose factorial moments are asymptotically of mixed Poisson type, i.e., they satisfy for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the asymptotic expansion*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) = \theta_n^s \cdot \mu_s \cdot (1 + o(1)), \quad s \geq 1,$$

with $\mu_s \geq 0$, and $\theta_n > 0$. Furthermore, assume that the moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ determines a unique distribution X satisfying Carleman's condition. Then, the following limit distribution results hold:

- (i) if $\theta_n \rightarrow \infty$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random variable $\frac{X_n}{\theta_n}$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to the mixing distribution X .
- (ii) if $\theta_n \rightarrow \rho \in (0, \infty)$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random variable X_n converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to a mixed Poisson distributed random variable $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$.
- (iii) if $\theta_n \rightarrow 0$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random variable X_n degenerates: $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} 0$.

Remark 5.5. The third case is implicitly mentioned in [72, Remark 3] and follows elementarily:

$$1 \geq \mathbb{P}\{X_n = 0\} = 1 - \mathbb{P}\{X_n \geq 1\} \geq 1 - \mathbb{E}(X_n),$$

as the expectation value $\mathbb{E}(X_n) \sim \theta_n \cdot \mu_1 \rightarrow 0$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that the second and third case can in principle be grouped together, since for $\rho = 0$ we have $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(0) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} 0$. We mention further that the discrete random variable $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$ converges for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, after scaling, to its mixing distribution X : one has $\frac{Y}{\rho} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} X$, with convergence of all moments.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The factorial moments $\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\{X_{n,j} = k\} k^s$ of $X_{n,j}$ are obtained from $F(z, v)$ by repeated differentiation and evaluation at $s = 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \frac{[z^n] \partial_v^s (F)(z, 1)}{[z^n] F(z, 1)} = h_j^s \frac{[z^{n-j \cdot s}] G^{(s)}(H(z)) M(z)}{f_n}. \quad (43)$$

We already know the asymptotics of f_n from (30). For fixed j we can simply proceed by extraction of coefficients, while for j tending to infinity, $j = j(n)$ depending on n , the asymptotic expansion of h_j follows by singularity analysis applied to $H(z)$ (see Equation (9)):

$$h_j = \frac{c_H}{\rho_H^j} \cdot \frac{j^{-\lambda_H - 1}}{\Gamma(-\lambda_H)} \cdot (1 + o(1)). \quad (44)$$

What is more, one has

$$G^{(s)}(H(z)) M(z) \sim (-1)^s c_M c_G \rho_G^{-\lambda_G} \lambda_G^s (-c_H)^{\lambda_G - s} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right)^{\lambda_H \lambda_G - s \lambda_H + \lambda'_M}. \quad (45)$$

So, for $j = j(n) = o(n)$, this gives

$$[z^{n-j \cdot s}] G^{(s)}(H(z)) M(z) \sim (-1)^s c_M c_G \rho_G^{-\lambda_G} \lambda_G^s (-c_H)^{\lambda_G - s} \frac{1}{\rho_H^{n-j \cdot s}} \frac{n^{-\lambda_H \lambda_G + s \lambda_H - \lambda'_M - 1}}{\Gamma(-\lambda_H \lambda_G + s \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}. \quad (46)$$

This implies that $X_{n,j}$ has factorial moments of mixed Poisson type:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) \sim h_j^s (-c_H)^{-s} \rho_H^{j \cdot s} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(s - \lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_H \lambda_G + s \lambda_H - \lambda'_M)} \cdot n^{s \lambda_H}. \quad (47)$$

We already observed that the moment sequence $(\mu_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}}$ determines a unique distribution, satisfying Carleman's criterion (34). Thus, the limit laws follow by using Lemma 5.4.

Finally, the critical growth range is obtained via the closed-form expression for $\theta_{n,j}$ (in which one inserts the expansion (44)): Indeed

$$\theta_{n,j} \sim \frac{n^{\lambda_H}}{j^{\lambda_H + 1} \Gamma(-\lambda_H)} \quad (48)$$

converges to a nonzero constant if and only if $j(n) \sim \rho \cdot n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}}$, therefore the critical growth range is $\Theta(n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}})$. \square

Next we turn to the dependence between the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j_1 and j_2 , determining the covariance and the correlation coefficient.

Theorem 5.6. *In a refined critical composition scheme with small singular exponents, the covariance of the random variables X_{n,j_1} and X_{n,j_2} , counting the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j_1 and j_2 (with $j_1, j_2 = o(n)$), satisfies*

$$\text{Cov}(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) \sim \theta_{n,j_1} \theta_{n,j_2} \cdot \mathbb{V}(X), \quad (49)$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \frac{\rho_H^j}{c_H^j} h_j n^{\lambda_H}$ and where X denotes the limit law in Theorem 5.1. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient between X_{n,j_1} and X_{n,j_2} satisfies

$$\rho(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) \sim \frac{\sqrt{\theta_{n,j_1} \theta_{n,j_2}}}{\sqrt{(\theta_{n,j_1} + \mathbb{E}(X))(\theta_{n,j_2} + \mathbb{E}(X))}}, \quad (50)$$

such that

$$\rho(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) \sim \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } \theta_{n,j_1}, \theta_{n,j_2} \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{\sqrt{\rho_1}}{\sqrt{\rho_1 + \mathbb{E}(X)}}, & \text{for } \theta_{n,j_1} \rightarrow \rho_1, \theta_{n,j_2} \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{\sqrt{\rho_1 \rho_2}}{\sqrt{\rho_1 + \mathbb{E}(X)} \sqrt{\rho_2 + \mathbb{E}(X)}}, & \text{for } \theta_{n,j_1} \rightarrow \rho_1, \theta_{n,j_2} \rightarrow \rho_2. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

Remark 5.7. We observe that for small j_1, j_2 , the random variables are asymptotically highly correlated with $\rho(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) \sim 1$.

Proof of Theorem 5.6. By (6) and (7) the joint moment $\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j_1} X_{n,j_2})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j_1} X_{n,j_2}) = \frac{[z^n] \partial_{v_1} \partial_{v_2} (F)(z; 1, 1)}{[z^n] F(z; 1, 1)}. \quad (52)$$

We already know the asymptotics of $f_n = [z^n] F(z; 1, 1)$, given in (30). We get by differentiation and evaluation at $v_1 = v_2 = 1$

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j_1} X_{n,j_2}) = h_{j_1} h_{j_2} \frac{[z^{n-j_1-j_2}] G''(H(z)) M(z)}{f_n}. \quad (53)$$

The asymptotics of h_{j_1} and h_{j_2} are given in (44). The singular expansion of $G''(H(z)) M(z)$ is a special case of (45), so we obtain for $j_1, j_2 = o(n)$:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j_1} X_{n,j_2}) \sim h_{j_1} h_{j_2} c_H^{-2} \rho_H^{j_1+j_2} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X^2) \cdot n^{2\lambda_H}, \quad (54)$$

with $\mathbb{E}(X^2)$ denotes the second moment of the limit law X associated with (42). Hence, we obtain for the covariance,

$$\text{Cov}(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) \sim \frac{h_{j_1} h_{j_2} \rho_H^{j_1+j_2}}{c_H^2} (\mathbb{E}(X^2) - \mathbb{E}(X)^2) n^{2\lambda_H}, \quad (55)$$

using the result for the expected value(s) in Theorem 5.1. By $\mathbb{V}(X) = \mathbb{E}(X^2) - \mathbb{E}(X)^2$ and the definition of $\theta_{n,j}$, this implies the stated result. For the correlation coefficient, we observe that Theorem 5.1 implies $\mathbb{V}(X_{n,j}) \sim \theta_{n,j}^2 \mathbb{V}(X) + \theta_{n,j} \mathbb{E}(X)$.

Collecting all contributions, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) &= \frac{\text{Cov}(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2})}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}(X_{n,j_1})} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}(X_{n,j_2})}} \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}(X)}{\theta_{n,j_1}}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}(X)}{\theta_{n,j_2}}}}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that for $\min\{\theta_{n,j_1}, \theta_{n,j_2}\} \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\rho(X_{n,j_1}, X_{n,j_2}) \sim 1$. \square

Before to present in Section 7 a multivariate generalization of these results, we now list several applications to a variety of combinatorial structures.

6. APPLICATIONS AND EXAMPLES

Our main Theorems 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, and also Theorem 5.1 can be readily applied to the problems considered by Panholzer and the second author [72], once the required singular expansions of the involved generating functions are established. This includes returns to record-subtrees in Cayley trees, edge-cutting in Cayley trees, returns to zero in Dyck paths, cyclic points and trees in graphs of random mappings, all leading to (mixed Poisson) Rayleigh laws, as well as block sizes in k -Stirling permutations.

In the following we discuss several new results for the distribution of different parameters such as returns to zero and sign changes in walks and bridges with arbitrary steps, the number of subtrees satisfying some constraint in different fundamental families of trees, as well as the evolution of the number of balls in triangular urn models, and the table sizes in the Chinese restaurant process.

6.1. Supertrees. Let \mathcal{C} denote the family of plane trees (i.e., trees with all arities allowed and embedded into the plane) more formally defined by

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Z} \times \text{SEQ}(\mathcal{C}), \quad \text{which translates to} \quad C(z) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4z}}{2}.$$

The dominant singularity of $C(z)$ is at $\rho_{\mathcal{C}} = \frac{1}{4}$ with $\tau_{\mathcal{C}} = C(\rho_{\mathcal{C}}) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Following [35, pp. 412–414, 714], we consider supertrees, or “trees of trees”, defined by

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{C} \left((\mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{Z}) \times \mathcal{C} \right), \quad \text{which translates to} \quad K(z) = C(2zC(z)).$$

The tree family \mathcal{K} corresponds to trees where onto each node we graft a red or blue tree; see Figure 2. By Lagrange inversion, these supertrees \mathcal{K} are thus enumerated by a nice combinatorial sum:

$$K_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \frac{2^k}{n-k} \binom{2k-2}{k-1} \binom{2n-3k-1}{n-k-1},$$

thus the sequence K_n for $n \geq 2$ starts like 2, 2, 8, 18, 64, 188, 656, 2154, \dots , constituting sequence A168506 in the OEIS⁶. By the Laplace method or by singularity analysis, this directly leads to the asymptotic expansion

$$K_n \sim \frac{4^n}{8\Gamma(3/4)n^{5/4}}.$$

(See also DeVries [21,84] for an alternative approach to this expansion via multivariate analysis.) This asymptotic behaviour is noteworthy, because one sees here an unusual occurrence of the exponent $-\frac{5}{4}$, while most tree-like structures in combinatorics usually involve the exponent $-\frac{3}{2}$. In fact, one could similarly define super-supertrees, super-super-supertrees, and so on, by further iterations of the critical scheme: $\mathcal{C}_{k+1} = \mathcal{C}_k(2\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{C}_k)$ (with $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{C}$). This leads to structures whose asymptotics involve dyadic exponents $-1 - 1/2^{k+1}$; see [4] for a complete characterization of the possible singular exponents for \mathbb{N} -algebraic functions in combinatorics.

⁶OEIS stands for the On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, accessible via <https://oeis.org>.

With respect to supertrees, the critical scheme is

$$K(z) = G(H(z)), \quad G(z) = C(z), \quad H(z) = 2zC(z),$$

where $H(z)$ has the following Puiseux expansion at $z \sim \frac{1}{4}$:

$$H(z) \sim \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{1-4z}.$$

Now, we can study the core size X_n via the bivariate generating function

$$K(z, u) = C(u \cdot 2zC(z)),$$

as well as the number of \mathcal{H} -components of size j , as captured by

$$K(z, v) = C(2zC(z) - (1-v)2c_{j-1}z^j).$$

We can then apply our main Theorems 4.1 and 5.1 (with $\tau_H = \frac{1}{4}$, $c_H = -\frac{1}{4}$, and $\kappa = 1$). This directly gives the following corollaries.

Corollary 6.1. *The core size X_n in supertrees of size n has factorial moments given by*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) \sim n^{s/2} \cdot \mu_s, \quad \mu_s = \frac{\Gamma(s - \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{1}{4})}{\Gamma(-\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} - \frac{1}{4})}.$$

The scaled random variable $X_n/n^{1/2}$ converges in distribution with convergence of all moments to a $c = -1/2$ moment-tilted reciprocal stable distribution, a tilted Mittag-Leffler distribution of index $1/2$:

$$\frac{X_n}{n^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} X, \quad X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{tilt}_{-1/2}(M_{1/2}),$$

Moreover, we have the local limit theorem

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = x \cdot n^{1/2}\} \sim \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \cdot f_X(x),$$

with $f_X(x)$ denoting the density of the random variable X .

Note that by Legendre’s duplication formula one has

$$\frac{\Gamma(s - \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{1}{4})}{\Gamma(-\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} - \frac{1}{4})} = 2^s \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})},$$

so the random variable X can also be seen as equal in law to the chi distribution of parameter $\frac{1}{2}$, which is itself a generalized gamma distribution [58, Section 17.8.7].

We can also study the specific occurrences of trees of size j :




FIGURE 2. A bicoloured supertree is a “tree of trees”: To each node of a plane tree (white) we attach another plane tree in red or blue.

Corollary 6.2. *The number of coloured trees of size $j - 1$ in supertrees of size n has factorial moments of mixed Poisson type given by*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s(1 + o(1)),$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = 2 \cdot (\frac{1}{4})^{j-1} c_{j-1} \cdot n^{1/2}$ and mixing distribution $X = \chi(\frac{1}{2})$ with $\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \mu_s$.

The limiting distribution of $X_{n,j}$ depends on the growth of $j = j(n)$, with critical growth range given by $j = \Theta(n^{1/3})$, and satisfies a mixed Poisson type limit behaviour of Theorem 5.1.

We note in passing that a very similar result holds for the family of binary supertrees \mathcal{S} , occurring in Bousquet-Mélou's study [19] of the integrated super-Brownian excursion. This family is defined in terms of the family of complete binary trees \mathcal{B} :

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{B}), \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B},$$

with initial values of S_n given by $1, 1, 3, 8, 25, 80, 267, 911, \dots$, constituting sequence A101490 in the OEIS. These functional equations indeed lead to $B(z) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4z^2}}{2z}$, and to the following Puiseux expansion for $\bar{S}(z) = S(\sqrt{z})$:

$$\bar{S}(z) \sim 1 - \sqrt{2}(1 - 4z)^{1/4} + (1 - 4z)^{1/2} + \dots;$$

thus leading to limit laws similar to the ones of supertrees in Corollaries 6.1 and 6.2.

6.2. Root degree and branching structure in bilabelled increasing trees. Bilabelled increasing trees are a natural generalization of increasing trees [66] where every node is assigned two labels instead of just one. General families of bilabelled trees are in bijection with increasing diamonds, which are a natural type of directed acyclic graphs; see [73] for the general statement) and Figure 3 for a concrete example. Increasing diamonds model partial orders and their linear extensions, as well as computational processes and their executions in parallel computing [17]. They possess nice combinatorial properties and are enumerated by variants of hook-length formulas [68, 71, 73].




FIGURE 3. An increasing diamond and the bijectively equivalent bilabelled increasing plane-oriented recursive tree.

Given a *degree-weight sequence* $(\varphi_j)_{j \geq 0}$, the corresponding *degree-weight generating function* is defined as $\varphi(t) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \varphi_j t^j$. The family \mathcal{T} of bilabelled increasing trees can be described by the following symbolic equation:

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{Z}^\square * (\mathcal{Z}^\square * \varphi(\mathcal{T})),$$

where \mathcal{Z} denotes single unlabelled nodes, $\mathcal{A}^\square * \mathcal{B}$ denotes the *boxed product* (i.e., the smallest label is constrained to lie in the \mathcal{A} component) of the combinatorial classes

\mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , and $\varphi(\mathcal{A}) = \varphi_0 \cdot \{\epsilon\} + \varphi_1 \cdot \mathcal{A} + \varphi_2 \cdot \mathcal{A}^2 + \dots$ denotes the class containing all *weighted finite labelled sequences* of objects of \mathcal{A} (i.e., each sequence of length k is weighted by φ_k ; ϵ denotes the *neutral object* of size 0); see [35]. Note that increasing diamonds are associated to $\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{1-t}$. On the level of exponential generating functions, $T(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \frac{z^n}{n!}$ with n counting the number of labels, this description translates into

$$T''(z) = \varphi(T(z)), \quad T(0) = 0, \quad T'(0) = 0. \tag{56}$$




FIGURE 4. An increasing plane-oriented recursive tree and the bijectively equivalent 3-bundled bilabelled increasing plane-oriented recursive tree. (The grey ellipses are just here to sketch the bijective correspondences.)

We now focus on the case of 3-bundled bilabelled increasing trees; see Figure 4. The family of 3-bundled trees is defined by Equation (56) with the following degree-weight generating function

$$\varphi(t) = (1-t)^{-3} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{k+2}{2} t^k. \tag{57}$$

In other words, each node may have any number k of children, and the binomial indicates two bars between these children, thus creating 3 (possibly empty) sequences (or *bundles*) of children. From [71] we get the remarkably simple closed form

$$T(z) = 1 - \sqrt{1-z^2} = \sum_{n \geq 1} (2n-1)!!(2n-3)!! \frac{z^{2n}}{(2n)!},$$

where the double factorials are defined as

$$(2n-1)!! = \prod_{k=1}^n (2k-1) = \frac{(2n)!}{n! \cdot 2^n},$$

with initial values of T_{2n} given by 1, 3, 45, 1575, 99225, 9823275, 1404728325, ..., constituting sequence [A079484](#) in the OEIS.

We are interested in the random variable X_n counting the root degree of these 3-bundled bilabelled increasing trees of size n , under the random tree model. Note that by definition there are no bilabelled trees with an odd number of labels, so $T_{2n+1} = 0$ and, consequently, $X_{2n+1} = 0$. In the following we use the notation $R_n = X_{2n}$ for the root degree. By (56) and (57), the generating function

$$T(z, u) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \mathbb{E}(u^{X_n}) \frac{z^n}{n!}$$

satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} T(z, u) = \varphi(uT(z)) = \frac{1}{(1 - u(1 - \sqrt{1 - z^2}))^3}.$$

Therefore, the Taylor expansion of $T(z, u)$ starts as follows

$$T(z, u) = 1 + 3u \frac{z^2}{2!} + (3u + 9u^2) \frac{z^4}{4!} + (36u + 135u^2 + 540u^3) \frac{z^6}{6!} + \dots$$

We get

$$\mathbb{E}(u^{R_{n+1}}) = \frac{(2n)!}{T_{2n+2}} [z^n] \frac{1}{(1 - u(1 - \sqrt{1 - z}))^3}.$$

By Stirling's formula for the gamma function (33) and basic singularity analysis (9) we get

$$\frac{T_{2n+2}}{(2n)!} \sim \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sim [z^n] \frac{1}{(1 - z)^{3/2}}. \quad (58)$$

This implies that, except for the non-standard shift in the random variable, the problem corresponds directly to a composition scheme with $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$, $\rho_H = 1$, and $\lambda_G = -3$. We note in passing that in this special case, it is also possible to obtain a quite simple closed-form expression for the probability mass function, as well as the (factorial) moments, due to the explicit expressions for the involved generating functions:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{2n+2}^s) = \frac{(2n)!}{T_{2n+2}} [z^n] \partial_u^s \frac{1}{(1 - u(1 - \sqrt{1 - z}))^3} \Big|_{u=1}.$$

However, here we use our general scheme and Theorem 4.1 with $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$, $\rho_H = 1$, $\lambda_G = -3$, and $\lambda'_M = 0$. We apply Legendre's duplication formula and obtain

$$\frac{\Gamma(s+3)\Gamma(\frac{3}{2})}{\Gamma(3)\Gamma(\frac{s+3}{2})} = 2^s \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s+4}{2}\right).$$

This leads to the following result.

Corollary 6.3. *The random variable R_n , counting the root degree in a random strict bilabelled increasing three-bundled tree with $2n$ labels, with tree generating function given by $\varphi(t) = (1 - t)^{-3}$, satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_n^s) \sim n^{s/2} \cdot 2^s \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s+4}{2}\right).$$

The random variable $R_n/n^{1/2}$ converges to a multiple of a chi-distributed random variable $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \chi(4)$, with four degrees of freedom:

$$\frac{R_n}{n^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \sqrt{2} \cdot X, \quad X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \chi(4).$$

We can refine the root degree by looking at the branching structure. We denote with $R_{n,j} = X_{2n,j}$, the random variable counting the number of branches (subtrees) with $2j$ labels, $1 \leq j \leq n$, attached to the root node,

$$R_n = \sum_{j \geq 1} R_{n,j}.$$

Such random variables naturally arise in the context of the Chinese restaurant process [72, 85, 86] and generalized plane-oriented recursive trees [63]. See also

Feng et al. [90] for the analysis of the branching structure of recursive trees. The generating function $T(z, v) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \mathbb{E}(v^{X_{n,j}}) \frac{z^n}{n!}$ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} T(z, v) = \varphi \left(T(z) - (1-v) \frac{T_{2j}}{(2j)!} z^{2j} \right).$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}(u^{R_{n+1,j}}) = \frac{(2n)!}{T_{2n+2}} [z^{2n}] \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left((1 - \sqrt{1-z^2}) - (1-v) \frac{T_{2j}}{(2j)!} z^{2j} \right) \right)^3}.$$

We can use the asymptotics (58) and apply Theorem 5.1 to obtain the following result.

Corollary 6.4. *The random variable $R_{n,j}$ counting the number of size $2j$ branches attached to the root in a random strict bilabelled increasing three-bundled tree with $2n$ labels, with tree generating function given by $\varphi(t) = (1-t)^{-3}$, has factorial moments of mixed Poisson type,*

$$\mathbb{E}(R_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s (1 + o(1)),$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \sqrt{2} \cdot \frac{T_{2j}}{(2j)!} \cdot n^{1/2}$ and mixing distribution $X = \chi(4)$ with $\mu_s = \mathbb{E}(X^s)$.

The limiting distribution of $R_{n,j}$ depends on the growth of $j = j(n)$, with critical growth range given by $j = \Theta(n^{1/3})$, and satisfies a mixed Poisson type limit behaviour of Theorem 5.1.

6.3. Returns to zero: walks and bridges with drift zero. A lattice path of length n is a sequence (s_1, \dots, s_n) of steps $s_i \in \mathcal{S}$ for a fixed finite subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ called step set. Geometrically, we fix the starting point 0 and consider the partial sums $\sum_{i=1}^k s_i$ which can be interpreted as appending the steps one after another. Each step s_i gets a weight $p_i > 0$ and the weight of a path is the product of all steps. The step polynomial $P(u) = \sum_i p_i u^i$ connects the weights and the steps. We call a step set *periodic* if there exist integers $b, p \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \geq 2$ such that $P(u) = u^b P(u^p)$; otherwise we call it *aperiodic*. We assume in this section and the next one that the step set is aperiodic. Note that this is no major constraint as the asymptotics of walks with periodic steps can be deduced from the ones with aperiodic ones; see [13]. We call a lattice path a walk if it is unconstrained, and a bridge if it ends at zero, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i = 0$. A *return to zero* is a point in the path such that $\sum_{i=1}^k s_i = 0$; see Figure 5.

Generalizing results from Feller [28, Problems 9–10] and Barton [89, Discussion pp. 115], it was shown in [91, Section 3.2] that for drift $P'(1) = 0$ the law of the number of returns to zero follows a Rayleigh distribution for bridges, while it follows a half-normal distribution for walks. The proof utilized a general theorem on the singular structure of the generating functions. However, the situation is also amenable to Theorem 4.1 and we can give an alternative proof next.

Let $w_{n,k}$ be the number of walks of length n with k returns to zero. The bivariate generating function of walks $W(z, u) = \sum_{n,k \geq 0} w_{n,k} z^n u^k$ is given by

$$W(z, u) = \frac{1}{1 - u \left(1 - \frac{1}{B(z)} \right)} \frac{W(z)}{B(z)}, \quad (59)$$

where $B(z)$ and $W(z) = 1/(1 - zP(1))$ are the generating functions of bridges and walks, respectively; see [91, Equation (3.3)]. To explain (59), observe that every bridge is a sequence of *minimal bridges*, which are bridges that never return to the x -axis between the start- and endpoint; see Figure 5. Therefore, minimal bridges are enumerated by $1 - 1/B(z)$. Hence, this is exactly the situation of the extended




FIGURE 5. A walk consists of an initial bridge which contains all returns to zero (red dots) and a final walk never returning to zero. The bridge is further decomposed into minimal bridges touching zero only twice.

composition scheme (2) with $G(z) = 1/(1-z)$, $H(z) = 1 - 1/B(z)$, and $M(z) = W(z)/B(z)$. Moreover, from [91, Equation (3.4)] we see that

$$B(z) = \frac{c_B}{\sqrt{1-zP(1)}} + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{with} \quad c_B = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{2P''(1)}}. \quad (60)$$

Hence, $\lambda_G = -1$, $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\lambda'_M = -\frac{1}{2}$ and we have small singular exponents. This is exactly the situation of Theorem 4.4 and the number of returns to zero in walks thus follows a half-normal distribution with parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{2}c_B = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{P''(1)}}$.

Now, the generating function for bridges is nearly the same as $W(z, u)$ from (59) except that the last factor $\frac{W(z)}{B(z)}$ is omitted. So, by Theorem 4.3, the number of returns to zero here follows a Rayleigh distribution with the same parameter $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{P''(1)}}$.

We can refine this result for the random variable $X_{n,j}$ counting the number of distance- j -zeroes (which were introduced in [72]). These are the number of returns to zero which have a distance of exactly j steps to the *previous* zero contact. The union over j of distance- j -zeroes gives all returns to zero and they therefore clearly represent a partition of all returns to zero. Using Theorem 5.1, we then get the following limit theorem.

Corollary 6.5. *Let $X_{n,j}$ be the number of distance- j -zeroes in lattice paths of length n . For walks (resp. bridges) with zero drift (i.e., $P'(1) = 0$), $X_{n,j}$ has factorial moments of mixed Poisson half-normal type (resp. mixed Poisson Rayleigh type)*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s (1 + o(1)), \quad (61)$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{2P''(1)}} \frac{h_j}{P(1)^j} \cdot n^{1/2}$ and $\mu_s = \mathbb{E}(X^s)$, where X is given by

$$X = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_{n,j}}{\theta_{n,j}} = \begin{cases} HN(\sigma) & \text{for walks,} \\ \text{Rayleigh}(\sigma) & \text{for bridges,} \end{cases} \quad \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{P''(1)}}.$$

The limiting distributions depend on the growth of $j = j(n)$, with critical growth range given by $j = \Theta(n^{1/3})$, and satisfy mixed Poisson type limit behaviour of Theorem 5.1.

Remark 6.6 (Universality of the rescaling factor). Let us stress the neat factorization in Formula (61) for the moments: One factor regroups the quantities with a probabilistic flavour (involving the variance $P''(1)$ of the allowed steps, and μ_s), while the remaining factor (h_j , the number of minimal bridges of length j) corresponds

to a quantity with a combinatorial flavour. This could also be explained using renewal theory. What is more, note that the rescaling factor $\theta_{n,j}$ in (61) is the same for walks and bridges, while the moment sequence μ_s changes. This independence of $\theta_{n,j}$ can be explained: in Figure 5, the last factor of the walk is a walk not touching zero and is encoded by $M(z) = W(z)/B(z)$, then by Theorem 5.1 we know that $\theta_{n,j}$ is independent of this factor $M(z)$ and thus has the same value for walks and bridges.

Furthermore, this factor $M(z)$ is also responsible for the often observed dichotomy between half-normal and Rayleigh distributions in the extended composition scheme which we will also observe in the next examples of first returns and sign changes.

6.4. First returns in coloured bridges and walks. We generalize the previous model by introducing k -coloured bridges B_k (see Figure 6): A bridge is coloured in exactly k colours, where each colour by itself must be a non-empty bridge. Combinatorially, we append k non-empty bridges one after the other: $B_k = (B - 1)^k$. Then, we are interested in the number of returns to zero in the first bridge, i.e., the initial one that we uniformly coloured. We call such returns also *first returns*.




FIGURE 6. A 4-coloured bridge, with 3 first returns marked by red dots.

Reusing the combinatorial constructions of the previous section, this gives for the bivariate generating function $B_k(z, u)$ the following decomposition

$$B_k(z, u) = \left(\frac{1}{1 - u \left(1 - \frac{1}{B(z)}\right)} - 1 \right) (B(z) - 1)^{k-1}.$$

For $k = 1$ this is (59) except the factor $W(z)/B(z)$ and the constraint to be non-empty. Asymptotically, and therefore for the law, the non-emptiness is negligible. The generating function $W_k(z, u)$ of k -coloured walks (with the tail coloured in the same colour as the final bridge) is given by

$$W_k(z, u) = (1 + B_k(z, u)) \frac{W(z)}{B(z)}.$$

Now, we can directly apply Theorems 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4. From the reasoning above we see that $\lambda_G = -1$, $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\lambda'_M = -\frac{k-1}{2}$ for bridges and $\lambda'_M = -\frac{k}{2}$ for walks.

Corollary 6.7. *The random variable X_n counting the number of first returns in a k -coloured bridge (resp. walk) of length n satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) \sim n^{s/2} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^n \cdot \mu_s, \quad \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{P''(1)}}, \quad \mu_s = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(s+1)\Gamma(k/2)}{\Gamma((k+s)/2)}, & \text{for bridges,} \\ \frac{\Gamma(s+1)\Gamma((k+1)/2)}{\Gamma((k+s+1)/2)}, & \text{for walks.} \end{cases}$$

The scaled random variable $X_n/n^{1/2}$ converges in distribution with convergence of all moments to a Rayleigh distribution and a scaled beta distribution (see Examples 3.8 and 3.14):

$$\frac{X_n}{n^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} X, \quad X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Rayleigh}(\sigma) \cdot W^{1/2},$$

with independent

$$\text{Rayleigh}(\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad W = \begin{cases} \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-1}{2}\right), & \text{for bridges,} \\ \text{Beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k}{2}\right), & \text{for walks,} \end{cases}$$

where $\text{Beta}(\alpha, 0) = 1$.

Moreover, we have the local limit theorem

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_n = x \cdot n^{1/2}\} \sim n^{-1/2} \cdot f_X(x), \quad (62)$$

with density $f_X(x)$ of the random variable X for bridges (for walks one replaces k by $k+1$) given by

$$f_X(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\sigma^2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{k}{2}\right) e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}} \mathcal{U}\left(\frac{k}{2} - 1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{U}(a, b, x)$ is the confluent hypergeometric function of the second kind which is the solution of $zy'' + (b-z)y' - ay = 0$ such that $\mathcal{U}(a, b, x) \sim z^{-a}$ for $z \rightarrow \infty$ and $|\arg(z)| < 3\pi/2$; see [22, Section 13.2].

Observe the special cases $\mathcal{U}(-1/2, 1/2, x) = \sqrt{x}$ and $\mathcal{U}(0, 1/2, x) = 1$ which nicely gives the density functions of a Rayleigh (see Example 3.14) and half-normal distribution (see Example 3.13). Hence, for $k = 1$ we recover the results of the previous section and uncover a large family of connected probability distribution. It is interesting that this distribution also appears in the context of preferential attachments in graphs [82, Formula (1.1)].

It is also interesting to consider the case of arbitrary colours. In this case, the bivariate generating function $B(z, u)$ of bridges is given by

$$B(z, u) = \sum_{k \geq 1} B_k(z, u) = \left(\frac{1}{1 - u \left(1 - \frac{1}{B(z)}\right)} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{2 - B(z)}.$$

The generating function for the total number of such walks is $B(z, 1) = \frac{1}{2 - B(z)} - 1$. From (60) we see that $B(z)$ possesses a singularity of order $-1/2$ at $z = 1/P(1)$, and hence $B(z, 1)$ becomes singular at some $z_0 > 0$ which is the unique solution of $B(z_0) = 2$. Hence, the analysis of the probability generating function for the number of first returns in arbitrarily coloured bridges gives a geometric distribution of parameter $1/2$:

$$\frac{[z^n]B(z, u)}{[z^n]B(z, 1)} = \frac{1}{1 - u \left(1 - \frac{1}{B(z_0)}\right)} - 1 = \frac{u/2}{1 - u/2}.$$

In order to compare these results, observe that the truncated sum $\sum_{k=1}^{k_0} B_k(z, u)$ behaves asymptotically like $B_{k_0}(z, u)$. Thus, we see here a phase transition from a continuous to a discrete law. Note that the results hold verbatim for walks.

Finally, let us remark that also the refined scheme Theorem 5.1 is applicable in this context, counting as before first returns in k -coloured bridges or walks which are a certain distance apart.

Corollary 6.8. *Let $X_{n,j}$ be the number of first returns of distance j to the previous zero contact in k -coloured bridges or walks of length n . Then, $X_{n,j}$ has factorial moments of mixed Poisson type*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s (1 + o(1)),$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \sqrt{\frac{P(1)}{2P''(1)}} \frac{h_j}{P(1)^j} \cdot n^{1/2}$, $h_j = [z^j](1 - 1/B(z))$, and $\mu_s = \mathbb{E}(X^s)$, where X is given in Corollary 6.7. The limiting distributions depend on the growth of $j = j(n)$, with

Jumps	GF	Sequence	OEIS
$\{U, D\}$	$\frac{8z^2 - 2 - \sqrt{1-4z^2}}{16z^2 - 3}$	1, 0, 2, 0, 10, 0, 52, 0, 274, 0, 1452, 0, 7716, ...	A075436
$\{U, D, H_1\}$	$\frac{z + \sqrt{1-4z^2}}{1-5z^2}$	1, 1, 3, 5, 13, 25, 61, 125, 295, 625, 1447, ...	A098615
$\{U, D, H_2\}$	$\frac{z^2 + \sqrt{1-4z^2}}{1-4z^2 - z^4}$	1, 0, 3, 0, 11, 0, 43, 0, 173, 0, 707, 0, 2917, ...	A026671

TABLE 2. Special cases and variants: Dyck-like coloured bridges ending at $(n, 0)$ using up steps $U = (1, 1)$, down steps $D = (1, -1)$, and possibly an additional horizontal steps $H_1 = (1, 0)$ or $H_2 = (2, 0)$ that are only allowed at altitude 0. In the last two cases first returns are the returns before the first horizontal step. The limit laws of first returns in the respective k -coloured bridges are all the same and special cases of Corollaries 6.7 and 6.8. Note that in the first and third case we take the subsequence of even steps.

critical growth range given by $j = \Theta(n^{1/3})$, and satisfy mixed Poisson type limit behaviour of Theorem 5.1.

The results above hold also for other variants that already appear in the literature. Note that we give these a new/the first combinatorial interpretation and there is a lot of potential for further applications. To mention one, consider a horizontal step $\zeta = (1, 0)$ that is only allowed on the real axis; see Table 2 for special cases and connections to existing sequences. The first returns are then defined as the returns to zero before the first step L and no colours are needed to distinguish different parts. Then, the limit law results of Corollaries 6.7 and 6.8 hold verbatim.

6.5. Sign changes: walks with drift zero (Dyck, Motzkin, etc.) Using the same notation as in Example 6.3, we now define the *sign* of the path (s_1, \dots, s_n) after k steps as $\text{sgn}(\sum_{i=1}^k s_i) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Thereby every lattice path is associated with a sequence of signs. A *sign change* is therein any subsequence $(-1, 0^*, 1)$ or $(1, 0^*, -1)$ where 0^* denotes a (possibly empty) sequence of 0s; see Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. A Motzkin walk (i.e., step set $\mathcal{S} = \{-1, 0, 1\}$) with 4 sign changes marked in red.

In this section we consider *Motzkin paths*. They are composed of up steps $+1$, down steps -1 , and horizontal steps 0 ; see again Figure 7. Their step polynomial is therefore given by $P(u) = \frac{p_{-1}}{u} + p_0 + p_1 u$. In the case of zero drift, the limit law follows a Rayleigh distribution for bridges and a half-normal distribution for walks [91, Section 3.4]. Note that the famous Dyck paths also fall into this class after setting $p_0 = 0$. Dyck paths lead to generating functions with 2 dominant singularities, which can be treated with the results for “periodic models” from [13]. Hence, from now on we assume $p_0 \neq 0$. The associated bivariate generating functions (see [91, Eq. (3.7)] and [91, Section 3.8]) do not directly fall into the class of

decompositions (2); however, one can show that the perturbations are asymptotically negligible and that the dominant part indeed follows this decomposition.

From [91, Theorem 3.11] we see that the bivariate generating function of bridges is

$$B(z, u) = S(z) \left(1 + \frac{2H(z)}{1 - uH(z)} \right), \quad \text{where}$$

$$S(z) = \frac{1}{1 - p_0 z}, \quad \text{and} \quad H(z) = \frac{E(z)}{S(z)} - 1.$$

Here, $S(z)$ is the generating function sequences of horizontal steps, $E(z)$ is the classical generating function of excursions [5], and $H(z)$ is the generating function of excursions which start with an up or a down step (and not with a horizontal step). We will need the following asymptotic expansion from [91, Theorem 3.13]

$$H(z) = 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{2P(1)}{P''(1)}} (1 - zP(1))^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}(1 - zP(1)).$$

Thus, as the radius of convergence $1/p_0$ of $S(z)$ is strictly larger than $1/P(1)$ which is the one of $H(z)$, we see that the additive term $S(z)$ is negligible for the limit law. Then, we have the desired form (2) where $M(z) = 2S(z)H(z)$ has the asymptotic expansion

$$M(z) = 2C \left(\frac{1}{P(1)} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{1 - zP(1)}).$$

Hence, we have $\lambda'_M = 0$ which means that the factor $M(z)$ is asymptotically negligible for the law. The asymptotic dominant part arises from

$$\frac{1}{1 - uH(z)}, \quad (63)$$

and we get from Theorem 4.3 the expected convergence to a Rayleigh distribution with parameter $\sigma = -\sqrt{2} \frac{\tau_H}{c_H} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{P''(1)}{P(1)}}$.

A similar reasoning allows to deal with sign changes of walks. At first the bivariate generating function from [91, Proposition 3.15] also does not obey the decomposition (2). But one easily observes that the dominant part is equal to (63) multiplied by $\frac{W(z)}{B(z)}$. Then, like in the case of returns to zero, Theorem 4.4 proves the convergence to a half-normal distribution with the same parameter $\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{P''(1)}{P(1)}}$.

As before, we refine the analysis by counting sign changes which are j steps apart. Then we can apply Theorem 5.1 to get the following refined result which strongly depends on $H(z) = \sum_{j \geq 0} h_j z^j$. Note that the analogous statement of Remark 6.6 also applies in this case.

Corollary 6.9. *For walks of length n of Motzkin paths, let the random variable $X_{n,j}$ be the number of sign changes of distance j to the previous sign change or the origin. For walks (resp. bridges) with zero drift (i.e., $P'(1) = 0$), $X_{n,j}$ has factorial moments of mixed Poisson half-normal type (resp. mixed Poisson Rayleigh type)*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s (1 + o(1)),$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{P''(1)}{2P(1)}} \frac{h_j}{P(1)^j} \cdot n^{1/2}$ and mixing distributions

$$X = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_{n,j}}{\theta_{n,j}} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \begin{cases} \text{HN}(\sigma) & \text{for walks,} \\ \text{Rayleigh}(\sigma) & \text{for bridges,} \end{cases} \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{P''(1)}{P(1)}}$$

each such that $\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \mu_s$. These two limiting distributions depend on the growth of $j = j(n)$, with critical growth range given by $j = \Theta(n^{1/3})$, and satisfy a mixed Poisson type limit behaviour of Theorem 5.1.

6.6. Triangular urn models and Beta-stable product distributions. Two-colour triangular urns are instances of generalized Pólya urn models [32, 52, 74]. At each time step $n \geq 1$, a ball is drawn uniformly at random, reinserted, and depending on the observed colour, balls of both colours are added to the urn: if a white ball was drawn, we add α white and β black balls, whereas if a black was drawn we add γ white and δ black balls. The addition/replacement of balls can be described by the so-called *ball replacement matrix*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix},$$

where for *balanced* urn models it holds that $\alpha + \beta = \gamma + \delta$, such that the total number $\sigma = \alpha + \beta$ of added balls in each step is independent of the observed colour. The initial configuration of the urn consists of w_0 white balls and b_0 black balls, and the random variable \mathcal{W}_n counts the number of white balls in the urn after n draws. For balanced triangular urns with entries

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & \delta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta = \sigma = \alpha + \beta,$$

it was shown by Flajolet, Dumas, and Puyhaubert [32] (and also by Janson [54, 55] via different analytic methods) that $\mathcal{W}_n/n^{\alpha/\sigma} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{W}$, for a random variable with moments

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{W}^s) = \alpha^s \frac{\Gamma(\frac{b_0+w_0}{\sigma})}{\Gamma(\frac{w_0}{\alpha})} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(s + \frac{w_0}{\alpha})}{\Gamma(s \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} + \frac{b_0+w_0}{\sigma})}.$$

Figure 8 shows the evolution of the first three draws of a triangular urn.




FIGURE 8. The evolution of a balanced triangular urn with replacement matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and initially $w_0 = 2$ white balls and $b_0 = 1$ black ball. Dashed arrows indicate that a white ball was drawn, solid arrows indicate that a black ball was drawn. The number below each node corresponds to the number of possible transitions (or histories) to reach this state. In this article we identify the limit law of the number of white balls in arbitrary balanced triangular urns.

In the special case $(w_0, b_0) = (\alpha, \beta)$, and thus $w_0 + b_0 = \sigma$, this simplifies to a Mittag-Leffler distribution with parameter $0 < \alpha/\sigma < 1$. For $b_0 > 0$ and either $w_0 = 0$ or $w_0 = \beta$, Janson [54] observed a moment-tilted stable law. However, the distribution of the limit law in the general balanced case was unknown (see

Janson [54, Theorem 1.8 and Problem 1.15]). We can directly reobtain the previous results using our extended scheme. The key tool is the history generating function $H(u, z) = \sum_{n,k \geq 0} h_{n,k} u^k \frac{z^n}{n!}$ where $h_{n,k}$ is equal to the number of transitions (or histories) leading to a configuration with k white balls after n steps; see Figure 8.

Its closed form was derived in [32, Proposition XIV]:

$$H(u, z) = u^{w_0} (1 - \sigma z)^{-b_0/\sigma} \left(1 - u^\alpha (1 - (1 - \sigma z)^{\alpha/\sigma}) \right)^{-w_0/\alpha}.$$

Thus, the scheme can be directly applied with $\mathcal{W}_n = X_n$. An interesting byproduct of our results is the completion of the missing identification of random variables arising in the context of balanced triangular urn models, extending the earlier results [54, Theorem 1.8]. By Theorem 4.4 we obtain the following result. For the beta-stable product distribution; see Example 3.8.

Corollary 6.10. *Let \mathcal{W}_n be the random variable for the number of white balls in a balanced triangular Pólya urn with initially $w_0 > 0$ white and $b_0 \geq 0$ black balls. Then,*

$$\frac{\mathcal{W}_n}{n^{\alpha/\sigma}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{W}$$

and the limit law \mathcal{W} satisfies a Beta-stable product distribution: $X_c \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{tilt}_c(M_{\frac{\alpha}{\sigma}})$, $W \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Beta}(\frac{w_0}{\sigma}, \frac{b_0}{\sigma})$ independent of X_c , such that

$$\mathcal{W} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \alpha \cdot X_{\frac{w_0}{\alpha}} \cdot W^{\frac{\alpha}{\sigma}}. \quad (64)$$

By Theorem 5.1, we immediately get factorial moments of mixed Poisson type for a random variable $X_{n,j}$ and the corresponding limit laws. However, at the moment, the combinatorial interpretation of the random variable(s) $X_{n,j}$ is unclear to the authors.

6.7. Tables in the Chinese restaurant process. Following Aldous, Pitman, and Dubins (see [2, 85, 86]), we now consider the Chinese restaurant process. This a discrete-time stochastic process having as value at time n one of the B_n partitions of the set $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ (where B_n denotes the Bell numbers found as sequence A000110 in the OEIS). One fancifully imagines a Chinese restaurant with an infinite number of tables, where each table has a possibly infinite number of seats. In the beginning the first customer takes a seat at the first table. At each discrete time step a new customer arrives and either joins one of the existing tables, or takes a seat at the next empty table. Each table corresponds to a block of a random partition. In the beginning (at time $n = 1$), the trivial partition $\{\{1\}\}$ is obtained with probability 1. Given a partition $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$ of $[n]$ with $|T| = k$ parts t_i , at time $n + 1$ the element $n + 1$ is either added to one of the existing parts $t_i \in T$ with probability

$$\mathbb{P}\{n + 1 <_c t_i\} = \frac{|t_i| - a}{n + \theta}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

where $n + 1 <_c t_i$ denotes that $n + 1$ is a customer sitting at table t_i , or as a new singleton block with probability

$$\mathbb{P}\{n + 1 <_c t_{|T|+1}\} = \frac{\theta + k \cdot a}{n + \theta}.$$

This model (parametrized by the two parameters $0 < a < 1$ and $\theta > -a$) thus assigns a probability to any particular partition T of $[n]$. One is interested in the distribution of the random variable $C_{n,j}$, counting the number of parts of size j in a partition of $[n]$ generated by the Chinese restaurant process. As pointed out in [72], this process can be embedded into a variant of the growth process of generalized plane-oriented recursive trees with two different connectivity parameters $\alpha > 0$ and

$\beta > -1$. This allows studying properties of the Chinese restaurant process using analytic combinatorial tools. For the reader's convenience, we restate this embedding below.




FIGURE 9. A plane-oriented recursive tree of size 15, where the root node labelled zero has one size-one, one size-two, one size-three, two size-four branches and the corresponding table structure in the Chinese restaurant model.

We collect the results of [72] and complement them by extending the constraint $\beta > 0$ to the full range $\beta > -1$ as well as by providing the missing identification of the limit law as a (moment-shifted) stable law.

Combinatorially, we consider a family $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}$ of generalized plane-oriented recursive trees, where the degree-weight generating function $\psi(t) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^\beta}$, $\beta > 0$, associated to the root of the tree, is different to the one for non-root nodes in the tree, $\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$. Then, the family $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is closely related to the corresponding family \mathcal{T} of generalized plane-oriented recursive trees with degree-weight generating $\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{(1-t)^\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$, via the following formal recursive equations:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta} = \mathbb{1} \times \psi(\mathcal{T}), \quad \mathcal{T} = \mathbb{1} \times \varphi(\mathcal{T}). \quad (65)$$

The weight $w(T)$ of a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is then defined as

$$w(T) = \psi_{d(\text{root})} \prod_{v \in T \setminus \{\text{root}\}} \varphi_{d(v)},$$

where $d(v)$ denotes the outdegree of node v . Thus, the generating functions $T_{\alpha,\beta}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_{\alpha,\beta;n} \frac{z^n}{n!}$ and $T(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \frac{z^n}{n!}$ of the total weight of size- n trees in $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}$ and \mathcal{T} , respectively, satisfy the differential equations

$$T'_{\alpha,\beta}(z) = \psi(T(z)), \quad T'(z) = \varphi(T(z)).$$

The ordinary tree evolution process to generate a random tree of arbitrary given size in the family \mathcal{T} (see [79] for a detailed discussion) can be extended in the following way to generate a random tree in the family $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}$. The process, evolving in discrete time, starts with the root labelled by zero. At step $n + 1$, with $n \geq 0$, the node with label $n + 1$ is attached to any previous node v with outdegree $d(v)$ of the already grown tree with probabilities $p(v)$, which are given for non-root nodes v by

$$\mathbb{P}\{n + 1 <_c v\} = \frac{d(v) + \alpha}{\beta + (\alpha + 1)n},$$

where here $n + 1 <_c v$ denotes that the node labelled $n + 1$ is attached (a child of) node v , and for the root by

$$\mathbb{P}\{n + 1 <_c \text{root}\} = \frac{d(\text{root}) + \beta}{\beta + (\alpha + 1)n}.$$

We are interested in the random variable C_n , counting the total number of tables in the Chinese restaurant process with parameters α and θ , as well as the random variable $C_{n,j}$, counting the number of parts of size j in a partition of $[n]$. We recall the following result from [72].

Proposition 6.11 (Chinese restaurant process and generalized plane-oriented recursive trees). *A random partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ generated by the Chinese restaurant process with parameters $\alpha > 0$ and $\theta > 0$ can be generated equivalently by the growth process of the family of generalized plane-oriented recursive trees $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \beta}$ when generating such a tree of size $n + 1$. The parameters α, θ and $\alpha, \beta > 0$, respectively, are related via*

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{1 + \alpha'}, \quad \theta = \frac{\beta}{1 + \alpha'}.$$

Moreover, C_n is distributed as the out-degree X_{n+1} of the root of a random generalized plane-oriented recursive tree of size $n + 1$ from the family $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \beta}$: $C_n \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} X_{n+1}$. Furthermore, the random variable $C_{n,j}$ is distributed as $X_{n+1,j}$, which counts the number of branches of size j attached to the root of a random generalized plane-oriented recursive tree of size $n + 1$ from the family $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha, \beta}$: $C_{n,j} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} X_{n+1,j}$.

Note that in above relation, θ cannot be negative, since β is assumed to be positive. As already observed in [72], the correspondence can be extended to the full range $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\theta > -\alpha$, such that

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha} - 1 > 0, \quad \beta = \frac{\theta}{\alpha} > -1,$$

by treating $\beta > -1$ using a different degree-weight generating function $\psi(t)$ for the root node. Assume that $-1 < \beta \leq 0$. Since the root connectivity is similar to the choice $\beta \mapsto 1 + \beta$ for an outdegree of the root larger than one, we use a shifted connectivity of the root node:

$$\psi(t) = 1 + \int_0^t \frac{1}{(1-x)^{1+\beta}} dx = 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \left(\frac{1}{(1-t)^\beta} - 1 \right) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \binom{\beta+k}{k-1} \frac{t^k}{k},$$

for $-1 < \beta < 0$, while for $\beta = 0$ one has

$$\psi(t) = 1 - \log(1-t) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{t^k}{k}.$$

Thus, we have some generalized plane-oriented recursive trees attached to a root with a different tree-weight generating function $\psi(t)$. Summarizing, we have

$$\psi(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(1-t)^\beta}, & \beta > 0, \\ 1 - \log(1-t), & \beta = 0, \\ 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \left(\frac{1}{(1-t)^\beta} - 1 \right), & -1 < \beta < 0. \end{cases}$$

Here (except for the special case $\beta = 0$, which is handled by a slightly different approach, detailed later in Theorem 7.1), we can directly apply our results from Theorems 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, and to

$$T'_{\alpha, \beta}(z, u) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \mathbb{E}(u^{X_n}) \frac{z^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} = \psi(u \cdot T(z)), \quad T'(z) = \varphi(T(z)),$$

for the total number of tables and, for the number of tables of size j , to

$$T'_{\alpha, \beta}(z, u) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \mathbb{E}(v^{X_{n,j}}) \frac{z^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} = \psi(T(z) - (1-v)z^j \frac{T_j}{j!}), \quad T'(z) = \varphi(T(z)).$$

This allows us to extend a result of [72] to the full range of $\beta > -1$, also providing the missing identification of the limit law as a (moment-tilted) stable law:

Theorem 6.12. *Given $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > -1$. The random variable $X_{n,j}$ counting the number of branches of size j in a random tree of size n (or, equivalently, the number of tables with j seated customers in a Chinese restaurant process with a total of $n - 1$ customers) has factorial moments satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \lambda_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s(1 + o(1)),$$

i.e., they are asymptotically moments of a distribution $MPo(\rho X)$, a Poisson distribution mixed with the (moment-tilted) stable law

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{tilt}_\beta(M_{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}), \quad \mathbb{E}(X^s) = \mu_s = \frac{\Gamma(s + \beta + 1)\Gamma(\frac{\beta}{\alpha+1} + 1)}{\Gamma(\beta + 1)\Gamma(\frac{\beta+s}{\alpha+1} + 1)}$$

and with scale parameter $\rho = \lambda_{n,j} = \frac{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}(j^{-1} - \frac{1}{\alpha+1})}{(\alpha+1)^j}$.

Thus, $X_{n,j}$ satisfies a mixed Poisson phase transition in the sense of Theorem 5.1:

- (i) *For $j \ll n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+2}}$ we have $\theta_{n,j} \rightarrow \infty$ and the random variable $\frac{X_{n,j}}{\theta_{n,j}}$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to the mixing distribution X .*
- (ii) *For $j \sim \rho \cdot n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+2}}$, $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, $\theta_{n,j} \rightarrow \rho$, and the random variable $X_{n,j}$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to a mixed Poisson distributed random variable $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} MPo(\rho X)$.*
- (iii) *For $j \gg n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+2}}$ we have $\theta_{n,j} \rightarrow 0$ and the random variable $X_{n,j}$ degenerates and converges to zero.*

Remark 6.13. Our result above implies that there are only a finite number of giant tables in the Chinese restaurant process, i.e., tables with a number of customers proportional to $n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+2}}$. In contrast, there are much more tables with a smaller number of customers.




FIGURE 10. Schematic representation of the tables in the Chinese restaurant model: many tables with a small number of customers (coloured teal), only a few tables with an intermediate number (coloured purple), and a single "giant" overcrowded table.

Remark 6.14. Closed formulas for the factorial moments $\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s)$, as well as a formula for the probability mass function of $X_{n,j}$ are readily obtained from the generating functions by extraction of coefficients.

Remark 6.15. Our results also allow recovering the limit theorem [86] for the total number of tables C_n in the Chinese restaurant process (via X_n), albeit with a totally different proof, as the normalized random variable $X_n/n^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ converges in distribution with convergence of all moments to a random variable X , with X given in the theorem before. For the reader's convenience we state the moments in terms of θ and α , compare with [86, Theorem 3.8]

$$\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \frac{\Gamma(s + \frac{\theta}{\alpha})\Gamma(\theta)}{\Gamma(\theta + s \cdot \alpha)\Gamma(\frac{\theta}{\alpha})}.$$

Proof of Theorem 6.12. We follow very closely [72] and sketch the remaining steps. We solve the differential equation $T'(z) = \varphi(T(z))$ and get

$$T(z) = 1 - (1 - (\alpha + 1)z)^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}}.$$

Thus, the probability generating function is given by

$$\mathbb{E}(v^{X_{n+1,j}}) = \frac{n!}{T_{n+1}} [z^n] \psi \left(T(z) - (1-v)z^j \frac{T_j}{j!} \right),$$

where the coefficient

$$\frac{T_{n+1}}{n!} = [z^n] \psi(T(z))$$

is computed by standard singularity analysis. Except for the non-standard shift, we can readily apply our schemes. More precisely, since $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > -1$, we can apply our schemes with $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{\alpha+1}$ and $\lambda_G = -\beta$ for $\beta \neq 0$. Hence, the critical range is given by

$$j(n) = \Theta \left(\frac{\lambda_H}{\lambda_H + 1} \right) = \Theta \left(\frac{1}{\alpha + 2} \right).$$

Here, no additional factor $M(z)$ is present, so $\lambda'_M = 0$. In the case of $\beta = 0$ we apply the cycle scheme of Theorem 7.3. This gives

$$\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \mu_s = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(s+\beta)\Gamma(\frac{\beta}{\alpha+1})}{\Gamma(\beta)\Gamma(\frac{\beta+s}{\alpha+1})}, & \beta \neq 0, \\ \frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{\alpha+1}+1)}, & \beta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Finally, both expression are unified simply using $\Gamma(x+1) = x \cdot \Gamma(x)$. \square

This ends our list of applications of our results on the extended and refined composition schemes. We now give a few extensions of our works to other schemes.

7. FURTHER EXTENSIONS

7.1. Critical cycle scheme. Many combinatorial structures are cycles of more basic building blocks (e.g., cyclic permutations or functional applications which are cycles of Cayley trees, etc.). This corresponds to

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathcal{H} = \text{Cyc}(\mathcal{H}) \implies F(z, u) = -\log(1 - uH(z)),$$

where $\mathcal{G} = \text{Cyc}$ denotes the cycle-operator. This scheme is analysed in Flajolet and Sedgewick's magnum opus [35, page 414] in the supercritical case, and we now extend this analysis to the critical case. Note that the previous sections were assuming Puiseux-like expansions for the generating function $F(z, 1)$ at its dominant singularity $z = \rho = \rho_H$; for critical cycle schemes, F does not have a Puiseux

expansion, so the previous results need to be adapted as follows. Note that by Definition 1.1 we have $H(\rho_H) = 1$ in the critical cycle scheme.

First, consider for example the case $H(z) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - 2z}$. Then,

$$f_n = n! \cdot [z^n]F(z) = n! \cdot [z^n] \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2z} \right) = (n-1)! 2^{n-1} = (2n-2)!!, \quad n \geq 1,$$

with initial values of f_n given by 1, 2, 8, 48, 384, 3840, ..., constituting sequence A000165 in the OEIS. We note that the moments $\mathbb{E}(X_n^s)$ are of order $n^{s/2}$, so the scaling with $1/\sqrt{n}$ leads directly to moment convergence.

It turns out that this scheme is similar to the sequence operator $\mathcal{G} = \text{SEQ}$, $G(z) = \frac{1}{1-z}$, such that $c_G = 1$, $\lambda_G = -1$, and $\rho_G = 1$, except for a shift in the moments. Alternatively, we may think of this case as the limit case of Theorem 4.1 with $\lambda_G \rightarrow 0$ (compare with Remark 7.2 below). Similarly, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we can look at the refined scheme

$$\mathcal{F} = \text{CYC}(v\mathcal{H}_{=j} + \mathcal{H}_{\neq j}),$$

leading to the bivariate generating function

$$F(z, v) = -\log \left(1 - (H(z) - (1-v)h_j z^j) \right).$$

We observe again factorial moments of mixed Poisson type with Mittag-Leffler mixing distribution M_{λ_H} . We state our results in the following theorems.

Theorem 7.1. *In a critical cycle composition scheme*

$$F(z, u) = -\log(1 - uH(z)), \quad (66)$$

if $H(z)$ has a critical exponent $0 < \lambda_H < 1$, then the core size X_n has factorial moments given by

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n^s) \sim \kappa n^{s\lambda_H} \mu_s, \quad \kappa = \frac{1}{-c_H}, \quad \mu_s = \frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{\Gamma(s\lambda_H + 1)}.$$

The scaled random variable $X_n/(\kappa n^{\lambda_H})$ converges in distribution with convergence of all moments to a Mittag-Leffler distributed random variable $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} M_{\lambda_H}$.

Remark 7.2. We note in passing that for $\lambda'_M = 0$ the moments in the extended composition scheme, Theorem 4.1, can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}(X^s) = \frac{\Gamma(s+1 - \lambda_G) \Gamma(-\lambda_G \lambda_H + 1)}{\Gamma(-\lambda_G + 1) \Gamma(s\lambda_H - \lambda_G \lambda_H + 1)}.$$

Thus, indeed for $\lambda_G \rightarrow 0$ the moments of the random variable X converges to the moments of an ordinary Mittag-Leffler distribution; see Example 3.7. Similarly, taking the limit $\lambda_G \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 4.3 gives $\lambda_G = 0$ as the tilting parameter, resulting again in the ordinary Mittag-Leffler distribution.

Theorem 7.3. *In the refined critical cycle composition scheme*

$$F(z, v) = -\log \left(1 - (H(z) - (1-v)h_j z^j) \right), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (67)$$

if $H(z)$ has a critical exponent $0 < \lambda_H < 1$, then the number $X_{n,j}$ of \mathcal{H} -components of size j in structures of size n has factorial moments of mixed Poisson type,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,j}^s) = \theta_{n,j}^s \cdot \mu_s \cdot (1 + o(1)),$$

with $\theta_{n,j} = \frac{\rho_H^j}{-c_H} h_j n^{\lambda_H}$ and Mittag-Leffler mixing distribution $X \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} M_{\lambda_H}$. The limiting distribution of $X_{n,j}$ depends on the growth of $j = j(n)$, with critical growth range given by $j = \Theta(n^{\frac{\lambda_H}{1+\lambda_H}})$, and satisfies a mixed Poisson type limit behaviour of Theorem 5.1.

Proofs of Theorem 7.1 and 7.3. For both theorems, one has

$$F(z, 1) = -\log(1 - H(z)) = -\log\left(\left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right)^{\lambda_H}(1 + o(1))\right) \sim -\lambda_H \cdot \log\left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right).$$

So, the asymptotic expansion of $[z^n]F(z, 1)$ follows directly using the transfer theorems of [35]. Then, for Equations (66) and (67), the factorial moments of order s are obtained by considering $\partial_u^s F$ and $\partial_v^s F$. Note that the log function can then be replaced by a quasi-inverse, using the following trick

$$\partial_u^s \log\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) = \partial_u^{s-1} \frac{1}{1-u}.$$

Thus, the asymptotics of these factorial moments and the corresponding limit laws follow by setting $G(z) = \frac{1}{1-z}$ in Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1: the normalized moments converge to the moments of a Mittag-Leffler distribution (in the cycle scheme case) and of a mixed Poisson distribution (in the refined scheme case). \square

7.2. Multivariate critical composition schemes. It is possible to generalize the critical composition scheme by looking at combinatorial constructions of the form

$$\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{G}_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_1) \times (\mathcal{G}_2 \circ \mathcal{H}_2) \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{G}_m \circ \mathcal{H}_m) \times \mathcal{M} = \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^m (\mathcal{G}_\ell \circ \mathcal{H}_\ell) \right) \times \mathcal{M}.$$

We measure the size of the \mathcal{G}_ℓ component by the variable u_ℓ , leading to the multivariate generating function

$$F(z, u_1, \dots, u_m) = \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^m G_\ell(u_\ell H_\ell(z)) \right) \cdot M(z). \quad (68)$$

The random vector $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,m})$ measures the sizes of the \mathcal{G}_ℓ -components,

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_{n,1} = k_1, \dots, X_{n,m} = k_m\} = \frac{[z^n u_1^{k_1} \dots u_m^{k_m}] F(z, u_1, \dots, u_m)}{[z^n] F(z, 1, \dots, 1)}.$$

Building on the notation from Section 3.1, we say that the multivariate composition scheme (68) is critical with small singular exponents if

- The functions $H_\ell(z)$ have singular expansions with $0 < \lambda_{H_\ell} < 1$ with identical radius of convergence $\rho_H = \rho_{H_\ell}$ and $\tau_\ell = H_\ell(\rho_H) = \rho_{G_\ell}$;
- $G_\ell(z)$ has a singular expansion with $\lambda_{G_\ell} < 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq m$;
- $M(z)$ has singular exponent $\lambda'_M \leq 0$.

Let $\vec{e}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^m$ denote the ℓ th canonical base vector. Moreover, we use the notation $\vec{1} = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \vec{e}_\ell$. The marginal distributions $\mathbb{P}\{X_{n,\ell} = k\}$ are then encoded by $F(z, \vec{1} - (1 - u_\ell) \cdot \vec{e}_\ell)$, and they fall under the scope of the extended critical composition scheme analysed in detail before, with

$$F(z, \vec{1} - (1 - u_\ell) \cdot \vec{e}_\ell) = G_\ell(u_\ell H_\ell(z)) \cdot M_\ell(z), \quad \text{with } M_\ell(z) = M(z) \cdot \prod_{\substack{1 \leq r \leq m \\ r \neq \ell}} G_r(H_r(z)).$$

Note that in the special case $\mathcal{G}_r = \mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{H}_r = \mathcal{H}$, for $1 \leq r \leq m$, the random variables $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,m}$ are exchangeable and

$$F(z, u_1, \dots, u_m) = M(z) \cdot \prod_{r=1}^m G(u_r H(z)).$$

We obtain the following result.

Theorem 7.4. *In the multivariate critical composition scheme with small exponents, the joint moments of the random vector $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,m})$ satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,1}^{s_1} \dots X_{n,m}^{s_m}) \sim \mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} \cdot \prod_{\ell=1}^m n^{s_\ell \lambda_{H_\ell}} \kappa_\ell^{s_\ell},$$

with $\kappa_\ell = \frac{\tau_{H_\ell}}{-c_{H_\ell}}$ and μ_{s_1, \dots, s_m} given by

$$\mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} = \frac{\Gamma(-\sum_{\ell=1}^m \lambda_{G_\ell} \lambda_{H_\ell} - \lambda_M)}{\Gamma(\sum_{\ell=1}^m s_\ell \lambda_{H_\ell} - \sum_{\ell=1}^m \lambda_{G_\ell} \lambda_{H_\ell} - \lambda_M)} \cdot \prod_{\ell=1}^m \frac{\Gamma(s_\ell - \lambda_{G_\ell})}{\Gamma(-\lambda_{G_\ell})}.$$

Consequently, the scaled random vector $(X_{n,1}/(\kappa_1 n^{\lambda_1}), \dots, X_{n,m}/(\kappa_m n^{\lambda_m}))$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to a random vector \mathbf{X} , determined by its joint moment sequence $\mu_s = \mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m}$. Moreover, the random vector \mathbf{X} has a scaled Dirichlet-stable product distribution,

$$\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (V_1 \cdot W_1^{\lambda_{H_1}}, \dots, V_m \cdot W_m^{\lambda_{H_m}}), \quad (69)$$

where $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, \dots, W_m, W_{m+1})$ follows a Dirichlet distribution,

$$\mathbf{W} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{Dir}(-\lambda_{G_1} \lambda_{H_1}, \dots, -\lambda_{G_m} \lambda_{H_m}, -\lambda_M) \quad (70)$$

and where the V_ℓ 's (for $1 \leq \ell \leq m$) are m independent moment-tilted Mittag-Leffler distributions $V_\ell \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{tilt}_{-\lambda_{G_\ell}}(M_{\lambda_{H_\ell}})$, also independent of \mathbf{W} .

Proof. The proof is very similar to the first part of Theorem 4.1, so we will be very brief. The mixed factorial moments of \mathbf{X}_n are obtained by differentiation and extraction of coefficients:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,1}^{s_1} \dots X_{n,m}^{s_m}) = \frac{[z^n] \partial_{u_1}^{s_1} \dots \partial_{u_m}^{s_m} (F)(z, 1, \dots, 1)}{[z^n] F(z, 1, \dots, 1)}.$$

The differentiation with respect to u_ℓ only affects the factor $G_\ell(u_\ell H_\ell(z))$, leading to a singular expansions covered in Section 3.1. Extraction of coefficients then gives an asymptotic expansion of the factorial moments. Converting all the factorial moments into moments using (32) gives the desired asymptotics.

For the identification, we simply note that the Dirichlet distribution from (70), together with the definition of the moment-tilted Mittag-Leffler random variables occurring in (69), leads to the stated moment sequence; see Example 3.10. \square

Remark 7.5. The marginals X_ℓ of the random vector \mathbf{X} are also covered by Theorems 4.1 and 4.4. The random vector \mathbf{X} is closely related to Poisson–Dirichlet distributions $\text{PD}(\alpha, \theta)$, [50, 51, 87] and the joint limit law of node degrees in preferential attachment trees or generalized plane-oriented recursive trees [76]; see also the subsequent example.

A result similar to Theorem 5.1 also holds for the multivariate refined scheme

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M} \times \prod_{\ell=1}^m \mathcal{G}_\ell \circ (\mathcal{H}_{\ell, \neq j_\ell} + v_\ell \mathcal{H}_{\ell, =j_\ell}).$$

We obtain the following result.

Theorem 7.6 (Mixed Poisson type limit behaviour for the m.v. refined scheme with small singular exponents). *In a multivariate refined critical composition scheme with small singular exponents*

$$F(z, v_1, \dots, v_m) = M(z) \cdot \prod_{\ell=1}^m G_\ell(H_\ell(z) - (1 - v_\ell) h_{\ell, j_\ell} z^{j_\ell})$$

the j_ℓ -cores X_{n,ℓ,j_ℓ} , counting the number of H_ℓ -components of size j_ℓ have joint factorial moments of mixed Poisson type:

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n,1,j_1}^{s_1} \cdots X_{n,m,j_m}^{s_m}) = \mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} \cdot \prod_{\ell=1}^m \theta_{n,\ell,j_\ell}^{s_\ell} \cdot (1 + o(1)),$$

with $\theta_{n,\ell,j_\ell} = \frac{\rho_{H_\ell}^{j_\ell}}{c_{H_\ell}} h_{\ell,j_\ell} n^{\lambda_{H_\ell}}$ and joint mixing distribution $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$ as in Theorem 7.4, Equation 69.

Let $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ and X_ℓ denotes the marginal distribution of the ℓ st coordinate of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$. For $n \rightarrow \infty$, the limiting distributions of X_{n,ℓ,j_ℓ} jointly undergo mixed Poisson type phase transitions with mixing distributions X_ℓ . The phase transitions depend on the growth of $j_\ell = j_\ell(n)$, with critical growth ranges given by $j_\ell = j_\ell(n) = \Theta(n^{\frac{\lambda_{H_\ell}}{1+\lambda_{H_\ell}}})$.

In particular, for $j_\ell(n) \sim \rho_\ell \cdot n^{\frac{\lambda_{H_\ell}}{1+\lambda_{H_\ell}}}$, $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, the random vector $\mathbf{X}_{n,j} = (X_{n,1,j_1}, \dots, X_{n,m,j_m})$ converges in distribution with convergence of (factorial) moments to a multivariate mixed Poisson distribution $\text{MPo}(\rho\mathbf{X})$.

For properties of multivariate mixed Poisson distributions we refer to [29] or [72].

Remark 7.7. An even further refinement in the sense of Remark 5.7 is also possible.

The key component for proving Theorem 7.6 is the following extension of Lemma 5.4 to the multivariate case.

Lemma 7.8 (Joint factorial moments and limit laws of mixed Poisson type). *Let $(\mathbf{X}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote a sequence of m -dimensional random vectors, whose factorial moments are asymptotically of mixed Poisson type, i.e., they satisfy for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the asymptotic expansion*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}_n^{\mathbf{s}}) = \mathbb{E}(X_{n,1}^{s_1} \cdots X_{n,m}^{s_m}) = \mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} \cdot \prod_{\ell=1}^m \theta_{n,\ell}^{s_\ell} \cdot (1 + o(1)), \quad s \geq 1,$$

with $\mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} \geq 0$, and $\theta_{n,\ell} > 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq m$. Furthermore, assume that the sequence of joint moments $(\mu_{\mathbf{s}})_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{N}^m}$ determines a unique distribution $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, \dots, L_m)$. Then, the following joint limit distribution results hold:

- (i) if $\theta_{n,\ell} \rightarrow \infty$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random variable $\frac{X_{n,\ell}}{\theta_{n,\ell}}$ converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to L_ℓ .
- (ii) if $\theta_{n,\ell} \rightarrow \rho \in (0, \infty)$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random variable X_n converges in distribution, with convergence of all moments, to a mixed Poisson distributed random variable $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho L_\ell)$.
- (ii) if $\theta_{n,\ell} \rightarrow 0$, for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the random variable X_n degenerates: $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} 0$.

Proof of Lemma 7.8. We follow the proof of the univariate case [72].

Assume that the set $\{1, \dots, m\}$ decomposes into two disjoint sets C and D such that for indices $k \in C$ we have $\lambda_{n,k} \rightarrow \infty$, whereas for an index $k \in D$ it holds $\lambda_{n,k} \rightarrow \rho_k$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. We observe that the mixture of joint raw moments and joint factorial moments converge:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\prod_{k \in C} \frac{X_{n,k}^{s_k}}{\lambda_{n,k}^{s_k}} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{k \in D} X_{n,k}^{s_k} \right) \right) \rightarrow \mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} \cdot \prod_{k \in D} \rho_k^{s_k}.$$

The latter joint moment sequence, both raw and factorial moments, is exactly the joint moment sequence of a random vector $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_m)$, with

$$\forall k \in C: Z_k \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} L_k, \quad \forall k \in D: Z_k \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho_k L_k),$$

such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\prod_{k \in C} Z_k^{s_k} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{k \in D} Z_k^{s_k} \right) \right) = \mu_{s_1, \dots, s_m} \cdot \prod_{k \in D} \rho_k^{s_k}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 7.6. The proof is very similar to proofs of Theorems 7.4 and 5.1, so we will be brief again. The mixed factorial moments of \mathbf{X}_{n, j_ℓ} are obtained by differentiation and extraction of coefficients:

$$\mathbb{E} (X_{n,1,j_1}^{s_1} \cdots X_{n,m,j_m}^{s_m}) = \frac{[z^n] \partial_{v_1}^{s_1} \cdots \partial_{v_m}^{s_m} (F)(z, 1, \dots, 1)}{[z^n] F(z, 1, \dots, 1)}.$$

The differentiation with respect to v_ℓ only affects the factor

$$G_\ell (H_\ell(z) - (1 - v_\ell) h_{\ell, j_\ell} z^{j_\ell}),$$

leading to singular expansions covered in Section 3.1 and additional factors $h_{\ell, j_\ell}^{s_\ell}$, $1 \leq \ell \leq m$. The asymptotics of these factors for $j_\ell \rightarrow \infty$ are all governed by (44). The individual singular expansions are similar to (45). Thus, extraction of coefficient $[z^{n-s_1 j_1 - \dots - s_m j_m}]$ from

$$M(z) \cdot \prod_{\ell=1}^m G_\ell^{(s_\ell)} (H_\ell(z))$$

then leads to the asymptotic expansion of the joint factorial moments. Lemma 7.8 then leads to the stated limit law. □

We end this section with four examples covered by the multivariate scheme.

Example 7.9 (*m*-bundled plane-oriented recursive trees). We have encountered before 3-bundled trees in the framework of bilabelled trees. In the following we study ordinary increasing trees [15, 24, 57, 65, 75, 79], where each node has only one label. As before, given a degree-weight sequence $(\varphi_j)_{j \geq 0}$, the corresponding degree-weight generating function is defined via $\varphi(t) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \varphi_j t^j$. The associated family \mathcal{T} of increasing trees can be described by the following symbolic equation:

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{Z}^{\square} * \varphi(\mathcal{T}).$$

On the level of exponential generating functions, $T(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \frac{z^n}{n!}$, we have

$$T'(z) = \varphi(T(z)), \quad T(0) = 0.$$

We are interested in families of generalized plane-oriented recursive trees with degree-weight generating function $\varphi(t) = 1/(1-t)^m$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For $m = 1$ we get the ordinary plane-oriented recursive tree, whereas for $m > 1$ we get the so-called *m*-bundled trees, with generating function

$$T(z) = 1 - (1 - (m+1)z)^{1/(m+1)}. \quad (71)$$

One may think of each node holding $m - 1$ additional separation bars [57], which can be regarded as a special type of edges. Naturally, this refines the root degree X_n in a random tree of size n , since we may look at the number of nodes attached to the root in a specific cluster, induced by the $m - 1$ bars: $X_n = \sum_{\ell=1}^m X_{n,\ell}$.

By construction, the random variables $X_{n,\ell}$ are exchangeable, but not independent. Writing $\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{X}_n} = u_1^{X_{n,1}} \cdots u_m^{X_{n,m}}$, the generating function

$$T(z, \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{T_n \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{X}_n})}{n!} z^n$$

of the random vector $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,m})$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} T(z, \mathbf{u}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^m \frac{1}{1 - u_\ell T(z)}.$$

This refinement is covered by the multivariate scheme (68) with small exponents (with a shift: $X_{n+1,\ell}$, instead of $X_{n,\ell}$). Similarly, one may study the outdegree of node labelled j , leading to closely related generating functions [51, 65, 76].

Example 7.10 (Bilabelled increasing trees and refined root degree). As noted in Example 7.9, it is possible to refine the root degree for bundled trees. Continuing from Subsection 6.2, we can refine the root-degree X_n in 3-bundled bilabelled increasing trees of size $2n$, $X_n = X_{n,1} + X_{n,2} + X_{n,3}$, where the $X_{n,\ell}$ are exchangeable. The corresponding generating function

$$T(z, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \sum_{n \geq 1} T_n \mathbb{E}(u_1^{X_{n,1}} u_2^{X_{n,2}} u_3^{X_{n,3}}) \frac{z^n}{n!}$$

then satisfies

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} T(z, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \prod_{\ell=1}^3 \frac{1}{1 - u_\ell (1 - \sqrt{1 - z^2})}.$$

Except for the non-standard shift in the random variable, the problem corresponds directly to a multivariate composition scheme with small singular exponents.

Example 7.11 (Returns in coloured bridges and walks). We consider again k -coloured bridges B_k , where as before a bridge is coloured in exactly k colours, where each colour by itself must be a non-empty bridge. Combinatorially, we append k non-empty bridges one after the other. Then, we are interested in the number of returns to zero in the first k_1 bridges, followed by k_2 additional bridges, such that $k_1 + k_2 = k$. Reusing the combinatorial constructions of the previous subsection, this gives for the bivariate generating function $B_k(z, \mathbf{u})$ the following decomposition:

$$B_k(z, u_1, \dots, u_{k_1}) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k_1} \left(\frac{1}{1 - u_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{B(z)}\right)} - 1 \right) \right) (B(z) - 1)^{k_2}.$$

By our previous considerations, we see that the corresponding random variables are exchangeable and the multivariate scheme directly applies. Moreover, as before, we can consider walks and a refined generating function $W_k(z, \mathbf{u})$ of k -coloured walks with the tail coloured in the same colour as the final bridge, taking into account the individual returns to zero of the first k_1 bridges,

$$W_k(z, \mathbf{u}) = (1 + B_k(z, \mathbf{u})) \frac{W(z)}{B(z)}.$$

Again, the corresponding random variables are exchangeable and the multivariate scheme directly applies again.

Example 7.12 (Triangular urn models and node degrees in generalized recursive trees). We discuss a specific balanced triangular urn model with $k + 1$ colours, extending the earlier results for the two-colour case. Our urn model is specified by its $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ balanced ball replacement matrix M with $\alpha_r, \beta_r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_r + \beta_r = \sigma$, $1 \leq r \leq k + 1$. It generalizes the 2×2 model, discussed before in Subsection 6.6. M is given by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \beta_1 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 & \dots & 0 & \beta_2 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \alpha_k & \beta_k \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \alpha_{k+1} + \beta_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (72)$$

We assume that there are initially $A_{0,r} = a_r$ balls of type r , $1 \leq r \leq k + 1$ and that the random variables $A_{n,r}$ count the number of balls of type r after n draws.

We use the history-counting approach of [32,33] to analyse the urn model with replacement matrix M and to derive the history generating function $H(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}; z)$. Due to the balance condition, it suffices to study the function $H(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1; z)$. In the associated differential system, the functions $x_\ell(t)$ satisfy

$$\dot{x}_r(z) = x_r^{\alpha_r+1} x_{k+1}^{\beta_r}(z), \quad 1 \leq r \leq k, \quad \dot{x}_{k+1}(z) = x_{k+1}^{\sigma+1}(z),$$

with initial conditions $x_\ell(0) = x_{0,\ell}$. First, we directly obtain $x_{k+1}(z)$ ⁷ by separation of variables:

$$x_{k+1}(z) = x_{0,k+1} (1 - \sigma x_{0,k+1}^\sigma z)^{-1/\sigma}.$$

The functions $x_r(z)$ are readily obtained by integration and we obtain for $1 \leq r \leq k$ the result

$$x_r(z) = x_{0,r} \left(1 - x_{0,r}^{\alpha_r} x_{0,k+1}^{-\alpha_r} (1 - (1 - \sigma x_{0,k+1}^\sigma z)^{\alpha_r/\sigma}) \right)^{-1/\alpha_r}. \quad (73)$$

Using the basic isomorphism between differential systems and history generating functions [32], we obtain the generating function of urn histories associated to the ball replacement matrix M .

Proposition 7.13. *The history generating function $H(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1; z)$, associated to the balanced triangular urn model with ball replacement matrix M (72) and initial conditions $A_{0,r} = a_r$, $1 \leq r \leq k + 1$, is given by*

$$H(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1; z) = (1 - \sigma z)^{-\frac{\alpha_{k+1}}{\sigma}} \cdot \prod_{r=1}^k x_r^{\alpha_r} \left(1 - x^{\alpha_r} (1 - (1 - \sigma z)^{\alpha_r/\sigma}) \right)^{-\frac{\alpha_r}{\alpha_r}}.$$

This generating function is covered by the multivariate critical composition scheme.

It is well known that node degrees in generalized plane-oriented recursive trees can be modelled by Pólya–Eggenberger urns [53,76]. Concerning applications, we note first that for the special choices $\alpha_r = 1$ and $\beta_r = k$ and initial values $a_r = 1$, $1 \leq r \leq k$ and $a_{k+1} = 0$, the random variables $A_{n,1}$ up to $A_{n,k}$ are exchangeable and count the refined root degree of k -bundled plane-oriented recursive trees.

Moreover, the urn model M can be used to study the joint degree distribution in generalized plane-oriented recursive trees models of the nodes labelled $1, 2, \dots, k$. Here, $\alpha_r = 1$ and $\beta_r = \alpha$, where $\alpha > 0$ denotes the connectivity parameter of the nodes in the trees [24,57,65,79]. Thus, one may obtain multivariate limit laws for

⁷There is a small sign error in [32, page 36] where, in the corresponding result for the 2×2 model, $y_0^{-\sigma}$ should be replaced by y_0^σ .

the node degrees of nodes labelled $1, 2, \dots, k$, in generalized plane-oriented recursive trees using Theorem 7.4 and Proposition 7.13, extending the univariate limit law of [65] in the case of fixed k ; compare with the results of Móri [76], who obtained multivariate limit laws for a slightly modified tree family, as well as the work of James [51] for an identification of the multivariate limit law. We finally note that, using additional methods, it is also possible to obtain refined limit laws for arbitrary real $\alpha > 0$, conditioning on a specific connectivity structure of the nodes $1, 2, \dots, k$; this will be discussed in a forthcoming paper [62].

8. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

This work makes explicit the limit laws for combinatorial structures counted by schemes like $G(uH(z))M(z)$ or $G(H(z, v))M(z)$. We focused on the technically more delicate and mathematically richer case where G, H , and M are all singular at the same time. We proved that when these functions have algebraic dominant singularities with exponents between 0 and 1, the limit laws of the schemes are moment-tilted stable distributions and product distributions involving reciprocal stable laws. In the refined scheme where one follows the number of \mathcal{H} -components of a given size, we proved a mixed Poisson distributions and a phase transition from continuous to discrete to degenerate limit law, with explicit threshold sizes depending on the exponents. We also presented a few extensions (multivariate cases, logarithmic singularities) and many examples of applications. See Table 3 for an overview of the covered schemes and limit laws.

Composition scheme	Symbolic form	Limit law	Thm.
Ordinary	$F(z, \mathbf{u}) = G(uH(z))$	moment-tilted Mittag-Leffler	4.1 4.3
Extended	$F(z, \mathbf{u}) = M(z)G(uH(z))$	product distribution: power of Beta-dist. and moment-tilted Mittag-Leffler	4.1 4.4 4.6
Cyclic	$F(z, \mathbf{u}) = \log\left(\frac{1}{1-uH(z)}\right)$	Mittag-Leffler	7.1
Multivariate extended	$F(z, \mathbf{u}) = M(z) \prod_{\ell=1}^m G_{\ell}(u_{\ell}H_{\ell}(z))$	multivariate product distribution	7.4
Refined	$F(z, \mathbf{v}) = M(z)G(H(z) - z^j h_j(1-v))$	mixed Poisson type phase transition	5.1
Refined cyclic	$F(z, \mathbf{v}) = \log\left(\frac{1}{1-(H(z)-(1-v)h_j z^j/j!)}\right)$	mixed Poisson type phase transition	7.3
Multivariate refined	$F(z, \mathbf{v}) = M(z) \times \prod_{\ell=1}^m G_{\ell}(H_{\ell}(z) - z^{j_{\ell}} h_{\ell, j_{\ell}}(1-v_{\ell}))$	mv. mixed Poisson type phase transition	7.6

TABLE 3. Overview of our results on critical composition schemes, where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$.

Our methods can also deal with schemes having other types of singularities (algebraic-logarithmic, essential singularities, etc.). For example, it is possible to relax the function $H(z)$ to have a structure of the form

$$H(z) \sim \left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right)^{\lambda_H} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{z} \ln\left(1 - \frac{z}{\rho_H}\right)\right)^{\Psi_H},$$

or more general algebraic-logarithmic terms. This would allow us to cover a few instances of 3-colour balanced triangular urn models [32, 88], which contains additional logarithmic factors. However, a complete unified analysis of 3-colour balanced triangular urn models seems to require a lot of additional effort, as other families of limit laws appear, whose nature is unclear. Compare also with the related open problem by Janson [55], asking for a more detailed description of the limit law of unbalanced two-colour triangular urn models.

Another interesting question is the speed of convergence of X_n , properly normalized, to its limit law X . In a forthcoming article, we plan to show how using the next asymptotic terms in our Puiseux expansions can give uniform bounds on the moments, thus leading to a Berry–Esseen-like inequality for the speed of convergence of all the limit laws associated to critical composition schemes. Note that it would thus generalize to a full class of limit laws the results obtained by martingale theory on some examples. Recently, a few works addressed similar questions in the context of generalized preferential attachment rules [83] and the total number of tables in the Chinese restaurant process [23], also called Pitman’s alpha-diversity. Thus, a unified approach using a more detailed analysis of the moments, similar to [44] and leading to uniform asymptotic expansions, would certainly be desirable. Maybe it is also of interest to establish first a mixed Poisson approximation for X_n to $Y_n = \text{MPo}(\kappa \cdot n^{\lambda_H} \cdot X)$, and second, to study the speed of convergence of $Y_n = \text{MPo}(\kappa \cdot n^{\lambda_H} \cdot X)$ to X , similar to [1].

It is certainly also of interest to address the problem of measuring the distance of $X_{n,j}$ to $Y \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \text{MPo}(\rho X)$. This would result in mixed Poisson approximation for the refined scheme, unifying all three cases into one, as already pointed out in [72].

In some forthcoming work, we plan to further extend our analysis to

- schemes with algebraic singularities with $1 < \lambda_H < 2$: the basic composition scheme analysed in [6] (and leading to the map-Airy distribution) is here generalizing to stable laws for the extended scheme. For the refined scheme we anticipate a phase transition, whose nature is to be clarified;
- schemes with algebraic singularities with $\lambda_H > 2$: in contrast to our current work, we anticipate in this case Gaussian limit laws, as already informally derived in [6]. In the refined scheme, we anticipate a Poisson to Gaussian phase transition, similar to the mixed Poisson phase transition observed herein.

This would thus achieves our exploration of the landscape of critical composition schemes, and associated phase transitions.

Acknowledgments. We are pleased to dedicate this article to our colleague/mentor Alois Panholzer, on the occasion of his 50th birthday. In fact, Alois played a central rôle in the birth of this article in various different ways:

- As a byproduct of Alois’ analysis of combinatorial structures and stochastic processes, such as simply-generated trees, permutations, Stirling permutations, increasing trees, bucketed tree families, parking functions, lattice paths, and urn models (both standard and diminishing), phase transitions involving the mixed Poisson distribution were uncovered. At first, the connection to the mixed Poisson distribution was unclear. An important first step was carried out in a special case [80]. Based on the special case, the mixed Poisson distribution was recognized and this led to a clear understanding, culminating in the work [72]. The latter then indicated to consider the refined scheme, which in turn, required a more complete understanding of the original and

the extended scheme, in order to understand the arising families of limit laws and to understand their connection to the work of the third author [91]. Our goal is to explain the underlying limit laws in the beforehand mentioned schemes, to study the analytic phenomena, to establish more universal laws, and to extend previous analyses of different families of schemes by Flajolet, Drmota, Hwang, etc. [6, 25, 36, 45, 47, 91].

- Alois also connected the first and second authors via a French-Austrian international project in 2005/2006, continuing a long tradition of exchanges in combinatorics between France and Austria mostly initiated by Michael Drmota, Philippe Flajolet, Dominique Foata, Christian Krattenthaler, Helmut Prodinger, and Robert Tichy. A part of this project resulted in the article [8], which established Gaussian limit laws for some composition schemes related to trees.
- Alois was also a constant source of inspiration and guidance for the second author. Without him, we would never have started this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] José A. Adell and Jesús de la Cal. On the uniform convergence of normalized Poisson mixtures to their mixing distribution. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 18:227–232, 1993.
- [2] David J. Aldous. *Exchangeability and related topics*, volume 1117 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 1985. [doi].
- [3] Richard Arratia, A. D. Barbour, and Simon Tavaré. *Logarithmic Combinatorial Structures: a Probabilistic Approach*. EMS Monographs in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society, 2003.
- [4] Cyril Banderier and Michael Drmota. *Formulae and asymptotics for coefficients of algebraic functions*. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 24(1):1–53, 2015.
- [5] Cyril Banderier and Philippe Flajolet. *Basic analytic combinatorics of directed lattice paths*. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 281(1-2):37–80, 2002.
- [6] Cyril Banderier, Philippe Flajolet, Gilles Schaeffer, and Michèle Soria. *Random maps, coalescing saddles, singularity analysis, and Airy phenomena*. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 19(3-4):194–246, 2001. [doi].
- [7] Cyril Banderier and Paweł Hitczenko. *Enumeration and asymptotics of restricted compositions having the same number of parts*. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(18):2542–2554, 2012.
- [8] Cyril Banderier, Markus Kuba, and Alois Panholzer. *Analysis of three graph parameters for random trees*. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 35(1):42–69, 2009. [doi].
- [9] Cyril Banderier, Philippe Marchal, and Michael Wallner. *Periodic Pólya urns, the density method and asymptotics of Young tableaux*. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(4):1921–1965, 2020.
- [10] Cyril Banderier and Michael Wallner. *Some reflections on directed lattice paths*. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Probabilistic, Combinatorial and Asymptotic Methods for the Analysis of Algorithms*, pages 25–36, 2014.
- [11] Cyril Banderier and Michael Wallner. *Lattice paths with catastrophes*. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, Vol. 19 no. 1, 2017.
- [12] Cyril Banderier and Michael Wallner. *Local time for lattice paths and the associated limit laws*. In *Proceedings of GASCom 2018*, volume 2113, pages 69–78. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 2018.
- [13] Cyril Banderier and Michael Wallner. *The kernel method for lattice paths below a rational slope*. In *Lattice paths combinatorics and applications*, volume 58 of *Developments in Mathematics Series*, pages 119–154. Springer, 2019.
- [14] Andrew D. Barbour, Lars Holst, and Svante Janson. *Poisson Approximation*. Clarendon Press, 1992.
- [15] François Bergeron, Philippe Flajolet, and Bruno Salvy. *Varieties of increasing trees*. In *CAAP '92 (Rennes, 1992)*, volume 581 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Science*, pages 24–48. Springer, 1992. [doi].
- [16] Mira Bernstein and Neil J. A. Sloane. *Some canonical sequences of integers*. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 226-228:57–72, 1995.
- [17] Olivier Bodini, Matthieu Dien, Xavier Fontaine, Antoine Genitrini, and Hsien-Kuei Hwang. *Increasing diamonds*. In *LATIN 2016*, volume 9644 of *Lect. Notes Comput. Science*, pages 207–219. Springer, 2016.
- [18] Olivier Bodini, Olivier Roussel, and Michèle Soria. *Boltzmann samplers for first-order differential specifications*. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 160(18):2563–2572, 2012.
- [19] Mireille Bousquet-Mélou. *Limit laws for embedded trees: applications to the integrated superBrownian excursion*. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 29(4):475–523, 2006. [doi].
- [20] Torsten Carleman. *Sur les équations intégrales singulières à noyau réel et symétrique*. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1923.

- [21] Timothy DeVries. *Algorithms for Bivariate Singularity Analysis*. PhD thesis, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 2011.
- [22] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.0.28 of 2020-09-15. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.
- [23] Emanuele Dolera and Stefano Favaro. **A Berry–Esseen theorem for Pitman’s α -diversity**. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30(2):847–869, 2020.
- [24] Michael Drmota. *Random Trees*. Springer, 2009. [doi].
- [25] Michael Drmota and Michèle Soria. **Marking in combinatorial constructions: generating functions and limiting distributions**. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 144(1-2):67–99, 1995.
- [26] Michael Drmota and Michèle Soria. **Images and preimages in random mappings**. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 10(2):246–269, 1997.
- [27] Philippe Duchon, Philippe Flajolet, Guy Louchard, and Gilles Schaeffer. Boltzmann Samplers for the Random Generation of Combinatorial Structures. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 13(4-5):577–625, 2004.
- [28] William Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications. Vol. II*. Second edition. John Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- [29] A. Ferrari, G. Letac, and J.-Y. Tourneret. **Multivariate mixed poisson distributions**. In *12th European Signal Processing Conference, IEEE*, pages 1067–1070, 2004.
- [30] James Allen Fill, Philippe Flajolet, and Nevin Kapur. **Singularity analysis, Hadamard products, and tree recurrences**. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 174(2):271–313, 2005.
- [31] Philippe Flajolet. **Some exactly solvable models of urn process theory**, 2006. Slides for the conference Mathinfo in Nancy, 2006.
- [32] Philippe Flajolet, Philippe Dumas, and Vincent Puyhaubert. **Some exactly solvable models of urn process theory**. In *Fourth Colloquium on Mathematics and Computer Science Algorithms, Trees, Combinatorics and Probabilities*, pages 59–118. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., 2006.
- [33] Philippe Flajolet, Joaquim Gabarró, and Helmut Pekari. **Analytic urns**. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(3):1200–1233, 2005.
- [34] Philippe Flajolet and Andrew Odlyzko. **Singularity analysis of generating functions**. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 3(2):216–240, 1990. [doi].
- [35] Philippe Flajolet and Robert Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [36] Philippe Flajolet and Michèle Soria. **Gaussian limiting distributions for the number of components in combinatorial structures**. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 53(2):165–182, 1990.
- [37] Philippe Flajolet and Michèle Soria. **The cycle construction**. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 4(1):58–60, 1991. [doi].
- [38] Philippe Flajolet and Michèle Soria. **General combinatorial schemas: Gaussian limit distributions and exponential tails**. *Discrete Math.*, 114(1-3):159–180, 1993. *Combinatorics and algorithms* (Jerusalem, 1988).
- [39] M Fréchet and J Shohat. **A proof of the generalized second limit theorem in the theory of probability**. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 33(2):533–543, 1931.
- [40] Michael Fuchs. Subtree sizes in recursive trees and binary search trees: Berry–Esseen bounds and Poisson approximations. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 17(5):661–680, 2008.
- [41] Michael Fuchs. Limit theorems for subtree size profiles of increasing trees. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 21(3):412–441, 2012.
- [42] Jan Grandell. *Mixed Poisson Processes*. Chapman & Hall, 1997.
- [43] Theodore Edward Harris. *The Theory of Branching Processes*. Springer, 1963.
- [44] Hsien-Kuei Hwang. Second phase changes in random m-ary search trees and generalized quicksort: convergence rates. *Ann. Probab.*, 31(2):609–629, 1998.
- [45] Hsien-Kuei Hwang. **On convergence rates in the central limit theorems for combinatorial structures**. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 19(3):329–343, 1998.
- [46] Hsien-Kuei Hwang. **Asymptotics of Poisson approximation to random discrete distributions: an analytic approach**. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 31(2):448–491, 1999.
- [47] Hsien-Kuei Hwang. **Phase changes in random recursive structures and algorithms**. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Probability with Applications to Finance and Insurance*, pages 82–97. World Scientific, 2004.
- [48] Hsien-Kuei Hwang and Vytas Zacharovas. **Uniform asymptotics of Poisson approximation to the Poisson-binomial distribution**. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 55(2):198–224, 2011.
- [49] Lancelot F. James. **Lamperti-type laws**. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 20(4):1303–1340, 2010.
- [50] Lancelot F. James. **Stick-breaking $PG(\alpha, \zeta)$ -generalized gamma processes**, 2013.
- [51] Lancelot F. James. **Generalized Mittag Leffler distributions arising as limits in preferential attachment models**, 2015.
- [52] Svante Janson. **Functional limit theorems for multitype branching processes and generalized Pólya urns**. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 110(2):177–245, 2004.
- [53] Svante Janson. **Asymptotic degree distribution in random recursive trees**. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 26(1-2):69–83, 2005. [doi].

- [54] Svante Janson. [Limit theorems for triangular urn schemes](#). *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 134(3):417–452, 2006. [\[doi\]](#).
- [55] Svante Janson. [Moments of Gamma type and the Brownian supremum process area](#). *Probab. Surv.*, 7:1–52, 2010. With addendum on pages 207–208.
- [56] Svante Janson, Donald E. Knuth, Tomasz Łuczak, and Boris Pittel. [The birth of the giant component](#). *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 4(3):233–358, 1993.
- [57] Svante Janson, Markus Kuba, and Alois Panholzer. [Generalized Stirling permutations, families of increasing trees and urn models](#). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(1):94–114, 2011.
- [58] Norman L. Johnson, Samuel Kotz, and Narayanaswamy Balakrishnan. *Continuous Univariate Distributions. Vol. 2*. John Wiley & Sons, second edition, 1995.
- [59] Dimitris Karlis. [EM algorithm for mixed Poisson and other discrete distributions](#). *Astin Bull.*, 35(1):3–24, 2005.
- [60] Donald E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming. Vol. 3: Sorting and searching*. Addison-Wesley, 1998. Second edition (1st ed: 1973).
- [61] Valentin F. Kolchin. *Random graphs*, volume 53. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [62] Markus Kuba. A note on central limit theorem analogues for node degree preferential attachment trees and Pitman’s α -diversity. *In preparation*, 2021.
- [63] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [Analysis of label-based parameters in increasing trees](#). In *Fourth Colloquium on Mathematics and Computer Science Algorithms, Trees, Combinatorics and Probabilities*, pages 321–330. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., 2006.
- [64] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [Descendants in increasing trees](#). *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 13 (1)(Paper 8), 2006.
- [65] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [On the degree distribution of the nodes in increasing trees](#). *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 114(4):597–618, 2007.
- [66] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [A combinatorial approach to the analysis of bucket recursive trees](#). *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 411(34-36):3255–3273, 2010.
- [67] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [Analysis of statistics for generalized Stirling permutations](#). *Discrete Math.*, 20:875–910, 2011.
- [68] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [Bilabelled increasing trees and hook-length formulae](#). *European J. Combin.*, 33(2):248–258, 2012.
- [69] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [Limiting distributions for a class of diminishing urn models](#). *Advances in Applied Probability*, 44(4):1–31, 2012.
- [70] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [On death processes and urn models](#). In *Proceeding of the 23rd international meeting on probabilistic, combinatorial, and asymptotic methods in the analysis of algorithms (AofA’12), Montreal, Canada, June 18–22*, pages 29–42. Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science (DMTCS), 2012.
- [71] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [Combinatorial families of multilabelled increasing trees and hook-length formulas](#). *Discrete Math.*, 339(1):227–254, 2016.
- [72] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [On moment sequences and mixed Poisson distributions](#). *Probab. Surv.*, 13:89–155, 2016.
- [73] Markus Kuba and Alois Panholzer. [On bucket increasing trees, clustered increasing trees and increasing diamonds](#). *To appear in Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 2021.
- [74] Hosam M. Mahmoud. *Pólya Urn Models*. CRC Press, 2009.
- [75] Hosam M. Mahmoud, R. T. Smythe, and Jerzy Szymański. [On the structure of random plane-oriented recursive trees and their branches](#). *Random Structures Algorithms*, 4(2):151–176, 1993. [\[doi\]](#).
- [76] Tamás F. Móri. [The maximum degree of the Barabási–Albert random tree](#). *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 14(3):339–348, 2005. [\[doi\]](#).
- [77] Alois Panholzer. [Non-crossing trees revisited: cutting down and spanning subtrees](#). In *Discrete random walks (Paris, 2003)*, pages 265–276. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., 2003.
- [78] Alois Panholzer. [Cutting down very simple trees](#). *Quaest. Math.*, 29(2):211–227, 2006. [\[doi\]](#).
- [79] Alois Panholzer and Helmut Prodinger. [Level of nodes in increasing trees revisited](#). *Random Structures Algorithms*, 31(2):203–226, 2007. [\[doi\]](#).
- [80] Alois Panholzer and Georg Seitz. [Limiting distributions for the number of inversions in labelled tree families](#). *Ann. Comb.*, 16(4):847–870, 2012. [\[doi\]](#).
- [81] Alois Panholzer and Georg Seitz. [Ancestors and descendants in evolving k-tree models](#). *Random Structures Algorithms*, 44:465–489, 2014.
- [82] Erol A. Peköz, Adrian Röllin, and Nathan Ross. [Degree asymptotics with rates for preferential attachment random graphs](#). *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(3):1188–1218, 2013.
- [83] Erol A. Peköz, Adrian Röllin, and Nathan Ross. [Generalized gamma approximation with rates for urns, walks and trees](#). *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):1776–1816, 2016.
- [84] Robin Pemantle and Mark C. Wilson. *Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables*. Cambridge University Press, 2013. [\[doi\]](#).

- [85] Jim Pitman. [Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions](#). *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 102(2):145–158, 1995.
- [86] Jim Pitman. *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes*, volume 1875 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 2006. Lectures from the 32nd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 2002.
- [87] Jim Pitman and Marc Yor. [The two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet distribution derived from a stable subordinator](#). *Ann. Probab.*, 25(2):855–900, 1997.
- [88] Vincent Puyhaubert. *Modèles d’urnes et phénomènes de seuils en combinatoire analytique*. PhD thesis, École Polytechnique, Palaiseau, 2005.
- [89] John G. Skellam and Leonard R. Shenton. Distributions associated with random walk and recurrent events. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B.*, 19:64–111 (discussion 111–118), 1957.
- [90] Chun Su, Qunqiang Feng, and Zhishui Hu. [Uniform recursive trees: branching structure and simple random downward walk](#). *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 315(1):225–243, 2006.
- [91] Michael Wallner. [A half-normal distribution scheme for generating functions](#). *European J. Combin.*, 87:103138, 21, 2020. [[doi](#)].
- [92] Edmund Taylor Whittaker and George Neville Watson. *A Course of Modern Analysis. Repr. of the 4th ed. 1927*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [93] Gord Willmot. [Mixed compound Poisson distributions](#). *ASTIN Bulletin*, 16(S1):S59–S79, 1986.

CYRIL BANDERIER, LABORATOIRE D’INFORMATIQUE DE PARIS NORD, UNIVERSITÉ SORBONNE PARIS NORD, 99 AVENUE JEAN-BAPTISTE CLÉMENT, 93430 VILLETANEUSE, FRANCE

MARKUS KUBA, DEPARTMENT APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES - TECHNIKUM WIEN, HÖCHSTÄDTPLATZ 5, 1200 WIEN

MICHAEL WALLNER, INSTITUT FÜR DISKRETE MATHEMATIK UND GEOMETRIE, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, WIEDNER HAUPTSTR. 8-10/104, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA