

Mixing Time for Some Adjacent Transposition Markov Chains

Shahrzad Haddadan, Peter Winkler

Abstract

We prove rapid mixing for certain Markov chains on the set S_n of permutations on $1, 2, \dots, n$ in which adjacent transpositions are made with probabilities that depend on the items being transposed. Typically, when in state σ , a position $i < n$ is chosen uniformly at random, and $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$ are swapped with probability depending on $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$. The stationary distributions of such chains appear in various fields of theoretical computer science [24, 20, 4], and rapid mixing established in the uniform case [24].

Recently, there has been progress in cases with biased stationary distributions [3, 2], but there are wide classes of such chains whose mixing time is unknown. One case of particular interest is what we call the “gladiator chain,” in which each number g is assigned a “strength” s_g and when g and g' are adjacent and chosen for possible swapping, g comes out on top with probability $s_g/(s_g + s_{g'})$. We obtain a polynomial-time upper bound on mixing time when the gladiators fall into only three strength classes.

A preliminary version of this paper appeared as “Mixing of Permutations by Biased Transposition” in STACS 2017 [9].

1 Introduction

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let S_n be the set of all permutations of the numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$. One can think of a permutation as the order in which a search engine arranges its results [4], the order in which a self organizing list arranges its items [20, 10], or the order the playing cards appear after shuffling [24, 1]; each of these suggests different probability distributions on S_n . Taking samples from such distributions is a useful task which can be tackled using a Markov chain, in particular when dynamic programming approaches fail to have a polynomial runtime.¹

¹We note here that for the particular case of our study, i.e., gladiators with constant number of strengths, the dynamic programming approach is efficient. However, the mixing problem is still interesting for at least two reasons: (1) As discussed in the introduction, a self-organizing list is basically a Markov chain with high mixing time. Thus, analyzing the gladiator chain is closely related to studying this data structure’s performance. (2) Dynamic programming algorithms would require exponential time when we have polynomial number of teams. Thus, employing Markov chains could provide an efficient sampling tool in such cases.

A natural Markov chain on S_n picks a number $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ uniformly at random and from state σ , puts $\sigma(i+1)$ ahead of $\sigma(i)$ with probability $p_{\sigma(i),\sigma(i+1)}$. We call such chains *adjacent transposition* Markov chains.

In this paper, we consider the total variation mixing time, which is defined as the number of steps required before the total variation distance between the distribution of the current state and stationarity is less than ϵ (where ϵ is some fixed convergence factor). For Markov chain \mathcal{M} we denote this time by $t_\epsilon(\mathcal{M})$, or if $\epsilon = 1/4$, simply by $t(\mathcal{M})$.

Jim Fill [7] conjectured that if an adjacent transposition Markov chain is monotone, then it is rapidly mixing. Monotonicity in this context means that for all i, j satisfying $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, $p_{i,j} \geq 1/2$, $p_{i,j-1} \leq p_{i,j}$, and $p_{i+1,j} \leq p_{i,j}$ [7]. Furthermore, his conjecture asserts “the simple chain” whose stationary distribution is uniform has the highest spectral gap among all monotone adjacent transposition chains.²

Here we provide a brief history of the results on the adjacent transposition Markov chains. All of these chains are monotone and rapidly mixing. Wilson and Benjamini’s papers [24, 3] led to Fill’s conjecture [7]; Bhakta et al. [2] verified the conjecture in two cases. The current paper, as well as a recent result by Miracle et al. [16], study the so-called “gladiator chain” under certain conditions, and verify Fill’s conjecture in limited cases. We will define the gladiator chain and present a few of its applications later in this introduction.

1. The simple chain. In the case where $p_{i,j} = 1/2$ for all i and j , the chain will have a simple description: Given a permutation σ , pick two adjacent elements uniformly at random, and flip a fair coin to decide whether to swap them. We call this chain, whose stationary distribution is uniform, the *simple* chain. Getting precise mixing results for this chain turned out not to be simple; many papers targeted this problem [6, 5], and finally Wilson [24] showed the mixing time for this chain is $\Theta(n^3 \log n)$ (that is, he obtained lower and upper bounds within a constant factor).

2. The constant-bias chain. After Wilson’s paper, Benjamini et al. [3] studied the case where $p_{i,j} = p > 1/2$ for all $i < j$, and $p_{j,i} = 1-p$. The stationary distribution of this chain is the one assigning a probability proportional to $p^{\text{inv}(\sigma)}$, to each $\sigma \in S_n$ where $\text{inv}(\sigma)$ is the number of inversions in σ . This distribution appears in statistics and machine learning since it is the distribution generated by the “Mallows model” [4, 13].

Benjamini et al. [3], showed that the constant biased Markov chain is closely related to another Markov chain known as the *asymmetric simple exclusion process*, and both chains mix in $\Theta(n^2)$ steps. We will talk more about exclusion processes later on in this introduction.

3. “Choose your weapon” and “league hierarchy” chains. The following two special cases were studied by Bhakta et al. [2]. In the *choose your weapon chain* $p_{i,j}$ is only dependent on i , and the *league hierarchy chain* is

² The spectral gap is another measure of mixing. Here, we are interested in total variation mixing time which, in this case, is within a polynomial factor of the spectral gap.

given by a binary tree T with n leaves. Each interior node v of T is labeled with some probability $1/2 \leq q_v \leq 1$, and the leaves are labeled by numbers $1 \dots n$. The probability of putting j ahead of i for $j > i$ is equal to $p_{i,j} = q_{j \wedge i}$ where $j \wedge i$ is the node that is the lowest common ancestor of i and j in T . Bhakta et al. showed that the choose your weapon chain mixes in $\mathcal{O}(n^8 \log n)$ steps and the league hierarchy chain in $\mathcal{O}(n^4 \log n)$ steps.

Here we are interested in *gladiator* chains, which constitute a subclass of the monotone adjacent transposition chains. Gladiator chains have connections to self organizing lists, and were introduced by Jim Fill.

Fill was interested in probabilistic analysis of algorithms for *self-organizing lists* (SOLs). Self-organizing lists are data structures that facilitate linear searching in a list of records; the objective of a self-organizing list is to sort the records in non-decreasing order of their access frequencies [20]. Since these frequencies are not known in advance, an SOL algorithm aims to move a particular record ahead in the list when access on that record is requested. There are two widely used SOL algorithms: the *move ahead one* algorithm (MA1) and the *move to front* algorithm (MTF). In MA1, if the current state of the list is $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$ and the i th record is requested for access, it will go ahead in the list only one position and the list will be modified to $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$. In MTF it will go to the front and the list will be modified to $(x_i, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$. It appears that MA1 should perform better than MTF when the list is almost sorted and worse when the low frequency records are standing in front; although this has been confirmed by simulations, it has not been analytically confirmed [10]. Considering the adjacent transposition Markov chain corresponding to MA1, Fill shows [7] that there are cases in which the chain is not rapidly mixing. Hence, he poses the question of sampling from the stationary distribution of MA1, and he introduces the gladiator chain which has the same stationary distribution as MA1 and seems to be rapidly mixing for arbitrary choice of parameters.

In the gladiator chain, each element i can be thought of as a gladiator with strength $s(i)$. Every permutation of numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$ can be thought of as a ranking of gladiators. In each step of Markov chains we choose $1 \leq k < n$ uniformly at random, i.e., we choose adjacent gladiators $\sigma(k) = i$ and $\sigma(k+1) = j$. These gladiators will fight over their position in ranking. With probability $p_{j,i} = s(i)/(s(i) + s(j))$, gladiator i will be the winner of the game and will be placed ahead of j in σ if he isn't already. With probability $1-p$, j is put ahead of i . If Fill's conjecture holds, gladiator chains must mix rapidly.

Exclusion processes. A related Markov chain which has received a lot of attention is the *exclusion process* ([18, 17]). In this chain we have a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $m < |V|$ particles on the vertices of G . The sample space is the set containing all the different placements of the m particles on vertices of G . At each step of the Markov chain we pick a vertex v uniformly at random with probability $1/|V|$ and one of its adjacent vertices w with probability $1/d(v)$. If there is a particle in one of the vertices and not the other one, we swap the

position of the particle with a constant probability p . We are interested in the *linear* exclusion process when the graph is a finite path with n vertices. As mentioned before, the linear exclusion process was studied by Benjamini et al. [3] and is known to be mixing in time $\Theta(n^2)$.³ Later, Greenberg et al. [8] presented a simpler proof.

Our Contribution. We study the gladiator chain when the gladiators fall into a constant number of teams, gladiators in each team having the same strength (Definition 2.1). We then extend the definition of linear exclusion process (studied by Benjamini et al.) by allowing particles of different types to swap their positions on a line. We call this new chain a *linear particle system* (Definition 2.2). We will show that mixing results for linear particle systems can produce mixing results for gladiator chains (Theorem 2.2).

In particular, we study the linear particle system in which there are three particle types, and in Theorem 2.3 we extend Benjamini et al.’s result by showing the three particle system mixes rapidly. Having Theorem 2.3 we conclude that the following adjacent transposition chains mix rapidly, and hence confirming Fill’s conjecture in these cases: The gladiator chain when gladiators fall into three teams of same-strength gladiators; and the league hierarchy chain for ternary trees (extending Bhakta et al.’s work [2]).

Remark. We believe linear particle systems, like exclusion processes, are interesting Markov chains that may appear as components of other Markov chains, and thus would facilitate studying mixing times of other chains. For instance, in Section 4 of this paper, by using Theorem 2.3 we extend a result about binary trees to ternary trees. As another example, we remind the reader of the correspondence between the exclusion process and the Markov chains on the lattice paths in an $n \times m$ rectangular lattice (Figure 4). Similarly, there is a correspondence between the linear particle systems having k particles and the lattice paths in k -dimensional lattices (Figure 4). Some Markov chains defined on lattice paths in a k -dimensional rectangle have already been studied by Greenberg et al. [8].

We remark here that following our result in STACS 2017 [9], Miracle et al. [16] studied the mixing time of linear particle system when the number of particles is a constant k , and showed the mixing time is upper bounded by n^{2k+4} . With different techniques from ours, they prove the mixing time of gladiator chains with a constant number of teams is upper bounded by $n^{2k+6} \log k$. The mixing time for linear particle systems and gladiator chains with teams, remains an open problem in the cases in which the number of particle types or teams is more than a constant.

Definitions and results are presented in Section 2, along with the correspondence between the gladiator chains and the linear particle systems. Section 3 contains the proof that the linear three-type system mixes rapidly under certain

³Benjamini et al. use this result to prove that the constant biased adjacent transposition chain is rapidly mixing.




Figure 1: The correspondence between lattice paths and linear particle systems: The picture on the left illustrates two paths in a two dimensional lattice; the red one corresponds to 001110100100001 and the black one corresponds to 10110100010000. The picture on the right illustrates two paths in a three dimensional lattice; the red one corresponds to 0012122002 and the black one corresponds to 1012222000.

conditions. In Section 4, we discuss the league hierarchy chain and our result for ternary trees.

2 Definitions and Results

Definition 2.1. *Gladiator chain (Playing in teams).* Consider the Markov chain on state space S_n that has the following properties: The set $[n]$ (i.e. gladiators) can be partitioned into subsets: T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k (k teams). We have the following strength function: $s : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $s(g) = s_j$ iff $g \in T_j$. At each step of Markov chain, we choose $i \in [n-1]$ uniformly at random. Given that we are at state σ , and $\sigma(i) = g, \sigma(i+1) = g'$, we put g ahead of g' with probability $\frac{s(g)}{s(g)+s(g')}$. We denote a gladiator chain having n gladiators playing in k teams by $\mathcal{G}_k(n)$.⁴

This is a reversible Markov chain and the stationary distribution π is

$$\pi(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^n s(i)^{\sigma^{-1}(i)} / Z. \quad (Z \text{ is a normalizing factor.}) \quad (1)$$

Note that by writing $\sigma(i) = g$ we mean gladiator g is located at position i in σ . By writing $\sigma^{-1}(g)$ we are referring to the position of gladiator g in the permutation σ . We use this notation throughout the text and for permutations presenting both gladiators and particles.

Definition 2.2. *Linear particle systems.* Assume we have k types of particles and of each type i , we have n_i indistinguishable copies. Let $n = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$. Let $\Omega_{n_1, n_1, \dots, n_k}$ be the state space containing all the different linear arrangements of these n particles. If the current state of the Markov chain is σ , choose

⁴Although the notation $\mathcal{G}_k(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$ would be more precise (n_i being cardinality of T_i), we avoid using it for simplicity and also because our analysis is not dependent on n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k .

$i \in [1, n-1]$ uniformly at random. Let $\sigma(i)$ be of type t and $\sigma(i+1)$ be of type t' . If $t = t'$ do nothing. Otherwise, put $\sigma(i)$ ahead of $\sigma(i+1)$ w.p. $p_{t,t'}$ and put $\sigma(i+1)$ ahead of $\sigma(i)$ w.p. $1 - p_{t,t'}$. We denote the linear particle system having n particles of k different types by $\mathcal{X}_k(n)$.

This chain is also a reversible Markov chain. In the special case where $p_{t,t'} = \frac{s(t)}{s(t)+s(t')}$ the stationary distribution π is

$$\pi(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^n s(i)^{\sigma^{-1}(i)} / Z'. \quad (Z' \text{ is a normalizing factor.}) \quad (2)$$

Proposition 2.1. *By regarding gladiators of equal strength as indistinguishable particles, we associate to any gladiator system a linear particle system.*

Note that the state space of the gladiator system has cardinality $n!$ for n different gladiators but the linear particle system has only $n!/(n_1!n_2!\dots n_k!)$ states, since particles of the same type are indistinguishable. Thus, $Z' \ll Z$. The following theorem, whose proof will be presented later, shows the connection between the mixing times of the two chains.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $t(\mathcal{X}_k)$ and $t(\mathcal{G}_k)$ be respectively the mixing times for a linear particle system and its corresponding gladiator chain. Then, $t(\mathcal{G}_k) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^8) t(\mathcal{X}_k)$.*

Our main result, which extends the results of Benjamini et al. [3] on exclusion processes, is the following:

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{X}_3(n)$ be a linear particle system of Definition 2.2, having particles of type A , B and C . Assume that we have strength functions assigned to each particle type, namely $s_A < s_B < s_C$, and thus swapping probabilities $p_{B,A} = s_A/(s_A + s_B)$, $p_{B,C} = s_C/(s_C + s_B)$ and $p_{A,C} = s_C/(s_A + s_C)$. If $s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C < 1/2$, then the mixing time of $\mathcal{X}_3(n)$ satisfies $t(\mathcal{X}_3(n)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{10})$.*

Remark 2.4. *The condition $s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C \leq 1/2$ comes from the following simple bound on q -binomials that we later prove in Lemma 3.4: If $q < 1/2$ then, $\binom{m}{r}_q < 2^r < (\frac{1}{q})^r$. Better bounds on q -binomials would allow the result to be improved.*

We will prove Theorem 2.3 in Section 3. Having Theorem 2.3, we deduce the following case of Fill's conjecture:

Corollary 2.5. *The mixing time of $\mathcal{G}_3(n)$ satisfies $t(\mathcal{G}_3(n)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{18})$, provided $s_A/s_B < 1/2$ and $s_B/s_C < 1/2$, where C is the strongest playing team among the three, and the gladiators in team B are stronger than the gladiators in team A .*

Proof. From Theorems 2.3 and 2.2. □

We present the following corollary of Theorem 2.3 here and discuss it in full detail later in Section 4.

Corollary 2.6. (*League hierarchies for ternary trees*) *Let T be a ternary tree with n leaves. The children of each interior node v are labeled with labels $A(v)$, $B(v)$, and $C(v)$, and each internal node has three strength values $s_{A(v)}$, $s_{B(v)}$, and $s_{C(v)}$. The leaves are labeled by numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$. The probability of putting j ahead of i for $j > i$ is equal to $p_{i,j} = s_{X(v)} / (s_{X(v)} + s_{Y(v)})$ where v is the node that is the lowest common ancestor of i and j in T , and $X(v)$ is the child of v which is an ancestor of j , and $Y(v)$ is the child of v which is an ancestor of i . If for each $v \in T$, $s_{A(v)}$, $s_{B(v)}$, and $s_{C(v)}$ satisfy the conditions in Theorem 2.3, then the mixing time of the league hierarchy chain is bounded by $n^{14} \log n$.*

We finish this section by proving Theorem 2.2.

2.1 Gladiators and Particles (Proof of Theorem 2.2)

Consider the gladiator chain $\mathcal{G}_k(n)$ for arbitrary n being the number of gladiators and k the number of teams. Assume that we have n_i gladiators on team i ; hence, $\sum_{i=1}^k n_i = n$. At each step of the chain, one of two things is happening:

1. Whisking: gladiators of the same team are fighting.
2. Sifting: gladiators of different teams are fighting.

If we were restricted to whisking steps the chain would be equivalent to a product of several simple chains analyzed by Wilson [24]. If we were restricted to sifting steps the chain would be the linear particle system chain introduced in Definition 2.2. In order to study the mixing time of the gladiator chain we analyze sifting and whisking steps separately, and then we employ the following decomposition theorem:

Theorem 2.7. Decomposition Theorem [14]. *Let \mathcal{M} be a Markov chain on state space Ω partitioned into $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_k$. For each i , let \mathcal{M}_i be the restriction of \mathcal{M} to Ω_i that rejects moves going outside of Ω . Let $\pi_i(A) = \pi(A \cap \Omega_i) / \pi(\Omega_i)$ for $A \subseteq \Omega_i$. We define the Markov chain $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ on state space $\{1, \dots, k\}$ as follows: $Pr_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}(i, j) = \sum_{x \in \Omega_i, y \in \Omega_j} \pi_i(x) Pr_{\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$, where $Pr_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $Pr_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}$ are transition probabilities of \mathcal{M} and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ respectively. Then*

$$t(\mathcal{M}) \leq 2t(\bar{\mathcal{M}}) \max_i \{t(\mathcal{M}_i)\}.$$

To apply the decomposition theorem, we partition S_n to $S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k}$ for all choices of $\sigma_1 \in S_{n_1}, \sigma_2 \in S_{n_2}, \dots, \sigma_k \in S_{n_k}$, each $S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k}$ being the set of all permutations in S_n in which all the gladiators corresponding to particle i preserve the ordering associated to them by σ_i . The restriction of $\mathcal{G}_k(n)$ to $S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{X}_k(n)$. We define $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ to be the Markov chain on $\prod_{i=1}^k S_{n_i}$ with the following transition probabilities:

$$Pr_{\bar{\mathcal{G}}}(S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_k}, S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma'_i, \dots, \sigma_k}) = \sum_{\substack{x \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_k}, \\ y \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma'_i, \dots, \sigma_k}}} \frac{\pi(x) Pr_{\mathcal{G}}(x, y)}{\pi(S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_k})},$$

where σ_i and σ'_i are only different in swapping j and $j+1$ st elements and $Pr_{\mathcal{G}}(x, y) = 1/2(n-1)$ iff j and $j+1$ st copies of particle i are adjacent in x and swapped in y . Moreover, we observe that:

$$\frac{1}{\pi(S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_k})} \sum_{\substack{x \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_k}, \\ y \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma'_i, \dots, \sigma_k}}} \pi(x) \geq 1/(n-1).$$

We can verify the above equation by the following reasoning: consider an arbitrary permutation $z \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_k}$ in which j th and $j+1$ st copies of particle i are not adjacent. We can map z to two other permutations z_1 and z_2 where in z_1 we take the the j th copy of particle i down to make it adjacent to the $j+1$ st copy, and in z_2 we take the the $j+1$ st copy of particle i up to make it adjacent to the j th copy. We will have $\pi(z)/\pi(z_1) = \pi(z_2)/\pi(z)$, and hence one of $\pi(z_1)$ or $\pi(z_2)$ will be larger than $\pi(z)$. This mapping is in worst case $n-1$ to 1, hence the above equation holds.

Having the above observations, we realize $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ is the product of k adjacent transposition Markov chains, and in each of these Markov chains we swap two adjacent elements with probability at least $1/2(n-1)^2$. Let these chains be $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_1, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_2, \dots, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_k$. By comparing the conductance (for more information about conductance, see [12]) of this chain to the simple chain analyzed by Wilson [24], for each i we will have $t(\bar{\mathcal{G}}_i) \leq n_i^8$. We use the following Theorem of [2]:

Theorem 2.8. *If $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ is a product of k independent Markov chains $\{\bar{\mathcal{G}}_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and it updates each $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_i$ with probability p_i , then*

$$t_\epsilon(\bar{\mathcal{G}}) \leq \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \frac{2}{p_i} t_{\frac{\epsilon}{2^k}}(\bar{\mathcal{G}}_i).$$

Plugging in $p_i = n_i/n$, we have $t(\bar{\mathcal{G}}) \leq \max(2n/n_i)n_i^8 \leq 2n^8$. Summing up and employing the Decomposition Theorem,

$$t(\mathcal{G}_k(n)) \leq 4n^8 t(\mathcal{X}_k(n)).$$

3 Three-Particle Systems (Proof of the Main Theorem)

In this section we prove Theorem 2.3 which states that $t(\mathcal{X}_3(n)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{10})$ if $s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C \leq 1/2$.

Assume that we have a copies of particle A , b copies of particle B , and c copies of particle C . We denote the set containing all the different arrangements of these particles by $\Omega_{a,b,c}$. We introduce another Markov chain $\mathcal{X}_t(n)$ on the same sample space $\Omega_{a,b,c}$. Using the comparison method (see [19]) we will show that the mixing times of $\mathcal{X}_3(n)$ and $\mathcal{X}_t(n)$ are related.

Then we will use the path congestion technique to show $\mathcal{X}_t(n)$ mixes in polynomial time, and hence we deduce Theorem 2.3.

$$\text{mixing time of } \mathcal{X}_3(n) \stackrel{\text{Comparison}}{\longleftarrow \text{technique}} \text{mixing time of } \mathcal{X}_t(n)$$

Notation. We denote the substring $\sigma(i)\sigma(i+1)\dots\sigma(j)$ by $\sigma[i, j]$, and by B^t we refer to a string which is t copies of particle B .

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{X}_t(n)$ be a Markov chain on state space $\Omega_{a,b,c}$ and $n = a + b + c$. If the current state is σ , we choose natural numbers $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ uniformly at random and swap them following these rules (Figure 2):

1. If $\sigma(i) = A$ and in $\sigma(j) = C$ or vice versa and $\sigma[i+1, j-1] = B^{j-i-1}$. Then, put $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ in increasing order of their strength w.p. $(s_C/s_A)^{j-i}/(1+(s_C/s_A)^{j-i})$. With probability $1/(1+(s_C/s_A)^{j-i})$, put them in decreasing order. We call this move a *Jump* and we denote it by $\mathcal{J}_i^j(A, C)$ if $\sigma(i) = A$ and $\sigma(j) = C$; and $\mathcal{J}_i^j(C, A)$ for vice versa.
2. If $\sigma[i, j-1] = B^{j-i}$ and $\sigma(j) = A$ or if $\sigma[i+1, j] = B^{j-i}$ and $\sigma(i) = A$. Then, put $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ in increasing order of their strength w.p. $(s_B/s_A)^{j-i}/(1+(s_B/s_A)^{j-i})$. With probability $1/(1+(s_B/s_A)^{j-i})$, put them in decreasing order. We call this move a *Hop*, and we denote it by $\mathcal{H}_i^j(A, B)$ if $\sigma(i) = A$ and $\sigma(j) = B$; and $\mathcal{H}_i^j(B, A)$ for vice versa. Similar rules and notation apply when swapping B and C .
3. Else, do nothing.




Figure 2: Jumps and Hops are the transitions in the Markov chain \mathcal{X}_t .

It can be easily checked that \mathcal{X}_t is reversible and its stationary distribution is the π in Equation 2.

Lemma 3.1. $t(\mathcal{X}_3(n)) \leq 2n^4 t(\mathcal{X}_t(n))$.

Proof. We use the comparison technique⁵ in the proof of Lemma 3.1 (see [5, 19]). To any edge (σ, τ) in \mathcal{X}_t , we assign a path from σ to τ in \mathcal{X}_3 . Let $e_i(p, p')$ be a move in \mathcal{X}_3 which swaps particles p and p' located at positions i and $i+1$ in an arrangement. To $e = (\sigma, \tau)$ making $\mathcal{J}_i^j(A, C)$ in \mathcal{X}_t , we correspond the following path in \mathcal{X}_3 : $e_i(A, B), e_{i+1}(A, B), \dots, e_{j-2}(A, B), e_{j-1}(A, C), e_{j-2}(B, C), \dots, e_i(B, C)$. We denote this path by $\gamma_{\sigma\tau}$, and the set containing all such paths by $\Gamma_{\mathcal{J}}$. Similarly, to $e = (\sigma, \tau)$ making $\mathcal{H}_i^j(A, B)$ in \mathcal{X}_t , we correspond the following path in \mathcal{X}_3 : $e_i(A, B), e_{i+1}(A, B), \dots, e_{j-2}(A, B), e_{j-1}(A, B)$. We denote this path by $\gamma_{\sigma\tau}$, and the set containing all such paths by $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$. Let $\Gamma = \{\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}\}_{\sigma,\tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{J}} \cup \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$.

We now bound the congestion placed by Γ on edges of \mathcal{X}_3 . Consider an arbitrary $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ making swap $e_i(A, B)$ and assume $\alpha[i-t-1, i+d+1] = pB^tAB^d p'$ where p and p' are particles different from B . For any σ and τ in $\Omega_{a,b,c}$ if $e \in \gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$ then, there must be $i-t \leq j \leq i-1$ and $i+1 \leq k \leq i+d$ such that $\gamma_{\sigma\tau}$ corresponds to $\mathcal{H}_j^k(A, B)$ or to $\mathcal{J}_j^{i+d+1}(A, p')$. Thus, the congestion placed on e only by paths in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{\{\sigma,\tau|e \in \gamma_{\sigma\tau} \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}\}} |\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}| \mathcal{C}(\sigma,\tau)}{\mathcal{C}(e)} &= \sum_{j=i-t}^{i-1} \sum_{k=i+1}^{i+d} \frac{|\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}| (s_B/s_A)^{i-j} (1 + s_B/s_A)}{(1 + (s_B/s_A)^{k+1-j})} \\ &\leq 2(d+t) \sum_{j'=1}^t \sum_{k'=1}^d \frac{(s_B/s_A)^{j'} (s_B/s_A)}{(1 + (s_B/s_A)^{j'+k'})} \\ &\leq 2t(d+t) \sum_{k'=1}^d \frac{s_B/s_A}{(s_B/s_A)^{k'}} \leq n^2. \end{aligned}$$

We can similarly show that the congestion placed on e by $\Gamma_{\mathcal{J}}$ is less than n^2 , where n is the length of the arrangements or total number of particles. For each $e \in E(\mathcal{M})$, let \mathcal{A}_e be the congestion Γ places on e . We will have $\mathcal{A}_e \leq 2n^2$. We also know $\pi_{\min} \geq q^{n(n+1)}$, where $q = \max\{s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C\}$ (we consider q to be a constant). Hence, employing the Comparison Theorem we have

$$t(\mathcal{X}_3(n)) \leq \max_{e \in E(\mathcal{M})} \mathcal{A}_e \pi_{\min} t(\mathcal{X}_t(n)) \leq (2n^4) t(\mathcal{X}_t(n)).$$

□

Having the above connection it suffices to bound the mixing time of $\mathcal{X}_t(n)$. In the rest of this section our goal is to bound $t(\mathcal{X}_t)$. We use the path congestion theorem, which is stated below. In particular, for any two arbitrary states $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$, we introduce a path $\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$. Then we show that none of the edges of the Markov chain $\mathcal{X}_t(n)$ is congested heavily by these paths. Formally, we employ Theorem 3.2 and in Theorem 3.5 we show that $t(\mathcal{X}_t(n)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^4)$.

⁵ The comparison method was introduced by Diaconis and Saloff-Coste [5]; Randall and Tetali extended it and employed it for analysis of Glauber dynamics [19]. For more information about this method we encourage the reader to refer to [12].

Theorem 3.2. (Canonical Paths Theorem [11])

Let \mathcal{M} be a Markov chain with stationary distribution π and E the set of the edges in its underlying graph. For any two states σ and τ in the state space Ω we define a path $\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$. The congestion factor for any edge $e \in E$ is denoted by Φ_e and is defined by $\Phi_e = \frac{1}{C(e)} \sum_{x,y \in \gamma_{\sigma,\tau}} \pi(x)\pi(y)$. We can bound the mixing time of \mathcal{M} using the congestion factor: $t_\epsilon(\mathcal{M}) \leq 8\Phi^2(\log \pi_{\min}^{-1} + \log \epsilon)$, where $\Phi = \max_{e \in E} \Phi_e$, $\pi_{\min} = \min_{x \in \Omega} \pi(x)$ and ϵ is the convergence parameter.

The Paths. For each $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$, we introduce the following path in \mathcal{X}_t from σ to τ : We partition σ and τ to $b+1$ blocks; the end points of these blocks are locations of B s in τ . For instance if in τ , the first B is located at position i and the second B is located at position j then, the first block in both σ and τ is $[1, i]$, and the second is $[i+1, j]$. Starting from the first block, we change each block in two steps, first we use Jump moves and change the relative position of A and C s in σ to become in the order in which they appear in τ . Then, we bring the B in that block to its location in τ . Formally, we repeat the following loop:

Notation. By saying $k = B_j(\sigma)$, we mean the j th copy of particle B is located at position k in σ .

Starting from σ , we repeat the following steps until τ is reached.

Initially, let $i, j = 1$.

1. Let $k = B_j(\tau)$. We define the j th block of σ and τ to be the substring starting from i and ending in k . Note that in τ , each blocks starts right after a B and ends with a B . In the j th iteration, the goal is to change $\sigma[i, k]$ until $\sigma[1, k] = \tau[1, k]$, i.e. the first j blocks equal in σ and τ .
2. Using Jumps, and starting from the lowest index i , we bring particles C or A down until A and C particles in the block $[i, k]$ have the same order in σ and τ .
3. We use Hops and bring the j th B in σ to $B_j(\tau)$. In this process, we may need to bring several copies of particle B out of the j th block in σ . In that case, we choose a random ordering of B s and move them with respect to that order (details explained in the proof of Claim 3.3).
4. Set $i = B_j(\tau) + 1$.
5. Increment j .

Claim 3.3. Let $\{\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}\}_{\sigma,\tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}}$ be the set of paths defined as above. Then, for any arbitrary edge e in the Markov chain \mathcal{X}_t the congestion Φ_e , defined in Theorem 3.2 satisfies $\Phi_e \leq n$.

We present a roadmap to the proof of the above claim before providing details.




Figure 3: We use the path congestion technique to bound $t(\mathcal{X}_t)$. In each iteration we fix a block in σ until τ is reached.

In order to verify the claim, we analyze the congestion of Jump and Hop edges separately. In both of the analyses, we consider an edge $e = (\alpha, \beta)$, and to any σ, τ such that $e \in \gamma_{\sigma, \tau}$ we assign a $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) \in \Omega_{a, b, c}$. The reverse image of \mathcal{F} could be a subset of $\Omega_{a, b, c} \times \Omega_{a, b, c}$. However, using q -binomials⁶ we show that $\sum_{\sigma, \tau}$ are mapped to the same ζ $\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)$ is bounded by a polynomial function of n multiplied by $\pi(\zeta)$, and then we conclude the claim. A key factor of our analysis is the use of q -binomials. Note the following observations: Assume that we have no copies of particle A , b copies of B , and c copies of particle C . Let $M \in \Omega_{0, b, c}$ be the arrangement with maximum stationary probability, i.e. $M = B^b C^c$. Note that for each $\sigma \in \Omega_{0, b, c}$, $\pi(\sigma)/\pi(M) = (s_B/s_C)^t$, where t is the number of transpositions needed to get from M to σ . For a constant t , the number of σ s requiring t transpositions is equal to the number of integer partitions of t fitting in an $b \times c$ rectangle (see Figure 4). Thus:

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \Omega_{0, b, c}} \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(M)} = \binom{b+c}{b}_q ; q = s_B/s_C.$$

We will use the following lemma in our proof:




Figure 4: Correspondence of partition functions with q -binomials: There are three integer partitions of 9 that fit into a 3×4 rectangle, and there are three arrangements of gladiators in $\Omega_{0, 3, 4}$ with $q(\tau_1) = q(\tau_2) = q(\tau_3) = q^9$. In other words, the coefficient of q^9 in $\binom{7}{3}_q$ equals 3.

Lemma 3.4. *If $q < 1/2$ then, $\binom{m}{r}_q < \prod_{i=1}^r 1/(1-q) < 2^r < (\frac{1}{q})^r$.*

⁶More information about q -binomials can be found in Richard Stanley's course "Topics in Algebraic Combinatorics," Chapter 6 (see [23]).

Proof.

$$\binom{m}{r}_q = \frac{(1-q^m)(1-q^{m-1})\dots(1-q^{m-r+1})}{(1-q)(1-q^2)\dots(1-q^r)} = \prod_{i=1}^r (1-q^{m-i+1})/(1-q^i).$$

$$\binom{m}{r}_q < \prod_{i=1}^r 1/(1-q) < 2^r < \left(\frac{1}{q}\right)^r.$$

□

Proof of Claim 3.3. Consider an edge $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ corresponding to $\mathcal{J}_k^{k+g}(C, A)$. Assume that $k = C_l(\alpha)$, $k + d = A_m(\alpha)$ (remember the notation $k = p_m(\sigma)$ meaning the m th copy of particle p is located at position k in σ), i.e., this edge is swapping the l th C with the m th A in α .

It follows from the way we set the paths that, for some j , $A_m(\alpha) \leq j < A_{m+1}(\alpha)$, $A_m(\sigma) = j$, and for some i , $A_{m-1}(\beta) < i \leq A_m(\beta)$, $A_m(\tau) = i$. The preceding blocks of α have been changed in accordance with τ , and the succeeding blocks of α have not been changed yet, hence they resemble σ blocks. Therefore we have $\alpha[1, i-1] = \tau[1, i-1]$ and $\alpha[j+1, n] = \sigma[j+1, n]$ (see Figure 5).

We define the function $\mathcal{F}_e : \Omega_{a,b,c} \times \Omega_{a,b,c} \rightarrow \Omega_{a,b,c}$ as follows: For any σ, τ satisfying $e \in \gamma_{\sigma, \tau}$, let $\xi_{\sigma, \tau} := \sigma[1, i-1]|\tau[i, n]$ (the symbol $|$ denotes concatenation). Since the arrangements of particles is changing, we may have $\xi_{\sigma, \tau} \notin \Omega_{a,b,c}$. For instance we may have $\tau[i, n] \in \Omega_{x,y,z}$ and $\sigma[1, i-1] \in \Omega_{x',y',z'}$ but $x + x' \neq a$ or $y + y' \neq b$ or $z + z' \neq c$. However, we know $a - (x + x') + (b - (y + y')) + (c - (z + z')) = 0$, which means there is a way to substitute the particles in $\sigma[1, i-1]$ to change ξ to ζ so that $\zeta \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$. We call this stage the substitution stage, in which we identify the particle or particles with extra copies in $\sigma[1, i-1]$, and we substitute the lowest copies of them with inadequate particles and produce $\zeta \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$. Then, we define $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) := \zeta$. For instance, if $a - (x + x') + (b - (y + y')) = -(c - (z + z'))$, then substitute the lowest $c - (z + z')$ copies of A and B with C s, and produce $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) = \zeta$. The substitution stage will cause a *substitution cost*, we denote the substitution cost by $co(\zeta)$, and define it as: $co(\zeta) = \pi(\zeta)/\pi(\xi)$, where $\xi = \sigma[1, i-1]|\tau[i, n]$. Note that if we make t substitutions, the substitution cost is at most $(s_C/s_A)^t$. To make the analysis simpler we only analyze the worst case in which we assume we have substituted t C s with A s in $\sigma[1, i-1]$. This assumption also means that in $\sigma[i, j]$ we have t more A s and t fewer C s than in $\alpha[i, j]$.

Consider σ, τ such that $e \in \gamma_{\sigma, \tau}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) = \zeta$. We have,

$$\frac{\pi(\zeta)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \left(\frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)}\right) \left(\frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)}\right) \left(\frac{w^i(\alpha[i, j])}{w^i(\sigma[i, j])}\right) co(\zeta),$$

where the later term is the substitution cost, and $w^i(\sigma[i, j]) := \prod_{k=i}^j s(k)^{i+\sigma^{-1}(k)}$. Having $g = A_m(\alpha) - C_l(\alpha)$ we will get:




Figure 5: We define $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) = \zeta$. To produce ζ we first concatenate $\sigma[1, i-1]$ and $\tau[i, n]$, then substitute some particles.

$$\Phi_e = (1 + (s_A/s_C)^g) \left(\sum_{\substack{\sigma; \\ \alpha[j+1, n] = \sigma[j+1, n]}} \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)} \sum_{\substack{\tau; \\ \alpha[1, i-1] = \tau[1, i-1]}} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} \right) \pi(\alpha)$$

Let \mathcal{S}_t be the set of all σ s with t substitutions. We have:

$$\Phi_e \leq \sum_{\substack{\zeta \text{ needs } t \\ \text{substitutions}}} \frac{1}{\text{co}(\zeta)} \sum_{\tau} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_t} \left(\frac{\pi(\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau))}{\pi(\alpha)} \right) \left(\frac{w^i(\sigma[i, j])}{w^i(\alpha[i, j])} \right) \pi(\alpha). \quad (3)$$

Let $M_t(\alpha)$ be the arrangement that we get from replacing the lowest t copies of particle C with copies of particle A in $\alpha[i, j]$. We have: $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_t} \frac{w^i(\sigma[i, j])}{w^i(\alpha[i, j])} = \frac{w^i(M_t) Q_B^i(M_t(\alpha))}{w^i(\alpha[i, j])}$, where $w^i(\sigma[i, j]) := \prod_{k=i}^j s(k)^{i+\sigma^{-1}(k)}$, and $Q_B^i(M_t(\alpha)) := \sum_{\substack{\sigma: \text{fix the positions of all Bs} \\ \text{in } M_t(\alpha) \text{ and rearrange} \\ \text{the rest of particles}}} \pi(\sigma) / \pi(M_t(\alpha))$.




Figure 6: We obtain $M_t(\alpha)$ from α and then take the sum over all ζ s (Equation 3).

Note that $w^i(M_t) Q_B^i(M_t) \leq q^{t(t+1)-2t} w^i(\alpha[i, j])$, q being $\max\{s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C\}$. This inequality holds because $Q_B^i(M_t) \leq \binom{y}{t}_{s_A/s_C} \leq q^{-2t}$ and $w(M_t)/w(\alpha[i, j]) \leq q^{t(t+1)}$ (See Figure 6).

Moreover, $\sum_{\text{substitutions}} \zeta$ needs $t \frac{1}{c\alpha(\zeta)} \leq \binom{t+b'}{t} q^2 \leq q^{-2t}$, where b' is the number of B s in $\sigma[0, i-1]$ and $q = \max\{s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C\}$.

Putting all of the above inequalities together, we will have that each edge of Jump is only congested by:

$$\Phi_e \leq (1 + q^g) \sum_t (q^{t(t+1)-4t}) \leq n.$$

So far, we showed that any Jump edge is only congested by a factor of a polynomial function of n . Consider an edge corresponding to a Hop, namely e . We denote this edge by $e = (\alpha, \beta)$. Assume we are swapping A and B .

Consider a state σ traversing e to get to τ , and assume we traversed e while fixing block $[i, j]$. Since we are making a Hop, A s and C s in the block are fixed according to τ , and we are bringing the k th B to its position in τ .

Before we proceed to the proof there is a subtlety about using a Hop that needs to be explained. If A_k has to go down to reach its position in τ or if there is only one copy of it in the block there is no complication. Let's assume we have t copies of particle B in $\sigma[i, j]$. All of the t copies of B should move up and stand out of block $\sigma[i, j]$ to reach their position in τ . In order to accomplish this, we choose a subset S of $\{1_k, \dots, 1_{t+k}\}$ uniformly at random and we move the elements of S in decreasing order of their index out of the block.

Assume, when going from σ to τ we used $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ and in $\alpha[i, j]$ we have t copies of particle B : B_k, \dots, B_{k+t} and swapping $B_{k+l}, B_{k+l+1}, \dots, B_{k+d}$ with the next A . We have, $\tau[1, i] = \alpha[1, i]$, $\sigma[j+t, n] = \alpha[j+t, n]$, and for any i , if $B_{k+i}(\alpha) < B_{l+k}(\alpha)$ then, $B_{k+i}(\alpha) = B_{k+i}(\sigma)$. The following information about S can be determined by examining α and β : $B_{k+d+1}, \dots, B_{k+t} \notin S$ while S may contain any of B_k, \dots, B_{k+l} . Therefore, among the random paths connecting σ to τ , there are 2^l subsets traversing through e and hence the congestion they place on e is $\pi(\tau)\pi(\sigma)/2^{t-l}$.

To bound Φ_e for each e we introduce correspondence $\mathcal{F}_e : \Omega_{a,b,c} \times \Omega_{a,b,c} \rightarrow \Omega_{a,b,c}$ satisfying:

$$\forall \zeta \in \mathcal{F}_e(\Omega_{a,b,c}); \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{F}_e^{-1}(\zeta)=(\sigma,\tau)} \pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} \leq 2^{t-l}\pi(\zeta); \quad (4)$$

where c is the number of C s in $\alpha[i, j]$ and $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) \neq \text{NULL}$ if and only if, $e = (\alpha, \beta) \in \gamma_{\sigma, \tau}$.

Let σ and τ be two ends of a path traversing through e . We define $\mathcal{F}_e := \sigma[1, i-1]|\tau[i, n]$; to verify Equation 4, take $\zeta = \mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau)$. We have $\frac{\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} \pi(\alpha)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi(\zeta)}{\pi(\alpha)} &= \frac{\pi(\zeta[1, i-1]) \pi(\zeta[i, j-1]) \pi(\zeta[j, n])}{\pi(\alpha[1, i-1]) \pi(\alpha[i, j-1]) \pi(\alpha[j, n])} = \frac{\pi(\sigma[1, i-1]) \pi(\tau[i, j-1]) \pi(\tau[j, n])}{\pi(\alpha[1, i-1]) \pi(\alpha[i, j-1]) \pi(\alpha[j, n])} \\ &= \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)} \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)}, \end{aligned}$$

where σ' is the following arrangement: $\sigma' := \alpha[1, i-1]|\sigma[i, j-1]|\alpha[j, n]$. We have $\pi(\sigma')/\pi(\alpha) = \pi(\sigma[i, j])/\pi(\alpha[i, j])$. Hence,

$$\sum_{\sigma, \tau; \mathcal{F}(\sigma, \tau) = \zeta} \frac{\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \sum_{\substack{\sigma, \tau \\ \mathcal{F}(\sigma, \tau) = \zeta}} \frac{\pi(\sigma')}{\pi(\sigma)} \pi(\zeta).$$

Since we have $t-l$ Bs with undecided position between $j-i$ other elements we have $\sum \frac{\pi(\sigma')}{\pi(\sigma)} \leq \binom{j-i+t-l}{t-l}_q$, where $q = \max\{s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C\}$. Thus, we have $\sum \frac{\pi(\sigma')}{\pi(\sigma)} \leq 2^{t-l}$. Hence, the congestion placed on e is:

$$\Phi_{e=(\alpha, \beta)} = (1 + q^g) \sum_{\substack{\sigma, \tau \\ e \in \gamma_{\sigma, \tau}}} \frac{\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)2^{t-l}} \leq 1.$$

Summing up, we showed that for any edge e , $\Phi_e \leq \max\{n, 1\}$. □

Having the above claim, we now use the path congestion Theorem (Theorem 3.2) to bound $t(\mathcal{X}_t(n))$:

Theorem 3.5. *If $s_A/s_B, s_B/s_C \leq 1/2$, then $t(\mathcal{X}_t(n)) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^4)$.*

Proof. Since $\pi_{min} \geq q^{n(n+1)}$, q being maximum of s_A/s_B and s_B/s_C , we can apply Theorem 3.2 and we will have, $t_\epsilon(\mathcal{X}_t) \leq 8n^2(n^2 + \ln(\epsilon^{-1})) \implies t(\mathcal{X}_t) \leq 8n^4$. □

Finally, from Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.5 we conclude Theorem 2.3.

4 League Hierarchies for Ternary Trees.

As mentioned earlier in Section 1, the *league hierarchies* are a class of monotone adjacent transposition Markov chains and were introduced by Bhakta et al. (SODA 2014) [2] for binary trees. Here we extend their definition to ternary trees.

Definition 4.1. (League hierarchies for ternary trees). *Consider a ternary tree whose leaves are labeled by $1, 2, \dots, n$, and inside each interior node v there are three numbers $S_{R,v} > S_{C,v} > S_{L,v}$ satisfying: $\frac{S_{R,v}}{S_{C,v}}, \frac{S_{C,v}}{S_{L,v}} > 1/2$. We define the Markov chain \mathcal{L}_3 on S_n as follows. In state $\sigma \in S_n$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ is chosen uniformly at random and σ_i and σ_{i+1} are swapped with probability $p_{\sigma(i), \sigma(i+1)}$. The $p_{i,j}$ s are defined in accordance with the tree structure. For each $i \leq j$, the probability if swapping $p_{i,j}$ is equal to g ; $S_{X,v}/(S_{X,v} + S_{Y,v})$, v being the lowest common ancestor of the leaves labeled i and j , and X, Y being one of R, L, C depending respectively on whether they are in the right, left or central subtree rooted at v .*




Figure 7: The league hierarchies for binary trees and the ternary trees.

When the tree is a binary tree, Bhakta et al. (SODA 2014) [2], analyzed the mixing time of the league hierarchies using the comparison theorem and by comparing it to the following Markov chain:

Consider a tree whose leaves are labeled by $1, 2, \dots, n$, and inside each interior node v there are three numbers $S_{R,v} > S_{C,v} > S_{L,v}$ satisfying $\frac{S_{R,v}}{S_{C,v}}, \frac{S_{C,v}}{S_{L,v}} > 1/2$. The Markov chain \mathcal{M}_{tree} works as follows: in state $\sigma \in S_n$, i and j with $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ are chosen uniformly at random. Let $v = i \wedge j$ be the lowest common ancestor of i and j , and T_v the subtree rooted at v . We swap $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ iff $\sigma(i+1), \sigma(i+2), \dots, \sigma(j-1) \notin T_v$, with the probabilities given in Definition 4.1

Bhakta et al. proved that if the tree is a binary tree then \mathcal{M}_{tree} is rapidly mixing. In the following lemma we extend their result:

Lemma 4.1. *For the ternary tree labeled as in Definition 4.1, $t(\mathcal{M}_{tree}) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{10} \log n)$.*

Proof. The Markov chain of our discourse is a product of $n - 1$ smaller three particle systems (See Figure 7). Thus, by Theorem 2.8 and 2.3 we conclude the result. \square

Bhakta et al. [2] had shown that the two Markov chains \mathcal{L}_3 and \mathcal{M}_{tree} have the same stationary distribution. To conclude Corollary 2.6, it remains to show that their mixing time is related. As in Section 3, we use the comparison technique.

Lemma 4.2. $t(\mathcal{L}_3) \leq n^4 t(\mathcal{M}_{tree})$.

Proof. We label the interior nodes of the tree as done in Figure 7, then each edge in \mathcal{M}_{tree} will be corresponding to the exchange of two particles of the same type in the root between which there is no particle of the same type. Consider

an arbitrary edge $e = (\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{M}_{tree}$, we correspond the path Γ_e lying on \mathcal{L}_3 whose construction will be explained in the next paragraph. As an example, assume we are swapping 5 and 6 in 587231964 in a full balanced binary tree with 9 leaves and thus labeled by $CRLLLLRCC$. We define the path between any arbitrary σ and τ in \mathcal{L}_3 in which the particles at positions i and j are swapped as follows: Do the following until $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ meet (we call this stage one):

1. If $\sigma(i+1) = \sigma(j-1)$, swap $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$, then swap $\sigma(j-1)$ and $\sigma(j)$. Then, repeat.

In the example starting from $\sigma = 587231964; CRLLLLRCC$, the first edges in the path will be $587231964 \rightarrow 857231964 \rightarrow 857231694$.

2. If $\sigma(i+1) \neq \sigma(j-1)$, then swap $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$ if $\sigma(i) > \sigma(i+1)$. Otherwise, swap $\sigma(j)$ and $\sigma(j-1)$ if $\sigma(j) > \sigma(j-1)$. In case none of the above holds, we can conclude that both $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ are labeled by C and between them we have a sequence of L and R s. In this case, using adjacent transpositions, take $\sigma(k)$ to the position of $i+1$ if $\sigma(i+1)$ is labeled with R , and k is the smallest index greater than $i+1$ so that $\sigma(k)$ is labeled by L . Then, repeat. Otherwise, find a k with the largest index smaller than $j-1$ that is labeled by R and take it to the position at $j-1$. Then, repeat.

In our example we continue by the following edges:

$857231694; RCRLLLCRC \rightarrow 852731694 \rightarrow 852371694 \rightarrow 852317694$.
Then, we restart: $852317694; RCLLLCRC \rightarrow 852317694 \rightarrow 825316794 \rightarrow 823561794$.

Repeat the above steps until $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ meet, then swap them, and enter stage two.

In our example, we swap 5 and 6: $823651794 \rightarrow 823651794; RLLCCLRRC$.

Let μ be the permutation in which $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(j)$ meet. Note that by the transpositions of stage one, on our way from σ we only visit arrangements μ , we only visit permutations ω satisfying $\pi(\sigma) > \pi(\omega)$. After reaching this state, in stage two, we take $\sigma(i)$ to j and $\sigma(j)$ to i ; and also, in the case where the two particles were C s, potentially take back other particles to their original positions. Note that by $\sigma(i)$ can reach j by exactly performing the transpositions $\sigma(j)$ made in stage one, and vice versa. Thus, for any ω visited on this stage we always will have: $\pi(\sigma) \left(\max\left\{ \frac{s_R}{s_C}, \frac{s_C}{s_L} \right\} \right) \geq \pi(\omega)$.

In our example, in the second stage we take 6 and 5 to the final positions and also 7 to its original position:

$823651794 \rightarrow 826315794; RLCLLCRRC \rightarrow 826317594 \rightarrow 826317954 \rightarrow 862317954 \rightarrow 862371954 \rightarrow 86271954$.

The congestion placed on each edge in \mathcal{M}_{tree} by the paths of γ will be bounded by:

$$\mathcal{A}_e = \frac{\sum_{\{\sigma, \tau | e \in \gamma_{\sigma\tau} \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{H}}\}} |\gamma_{\sigma, \tau}| \mathcal{C}(\sigma, \tau)}{\mathcal{C}(e)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n q \leq qn^3.$$

; where $q = \max\{\frac{s_R}{s_C}, \frac{s_C}{s_L}\}$ is a constant.

Using the comparison theorem, we complete the proof.

$$t(\mathcal{L}_3) \leq \max_{e \in E(\mathcal{M})} \mathcal{A}_e \pi_{\min} t(\mathcal{M}_{tree}) \leq n^4 t(\mathcal{M}_{tree}).$$

□

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Dana Randall for a very helpful conversation about the gladiator problem and Fill’s conjecture, and Sergi Elizalde for his help and knowledge concerning generating functions.

References

- [1] D. Bayer and P. Diaconis. *Trailing the Dovetail Shuffle to its Lair*. The Annals of Applied Probability, Vol. 2, no. 2, Pages 294–313, 1992.
- [2] P. Bhakta, S. Miracle, D. Randall and A. Streib, *Mixing times of Markov chains for self-organized lists and biased permutations*. 25th Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), 2014.
- [3] I. Benjamini, N. Berger, C. Hoffman, and E. Mossel. *Mixing times of the biased card shuffling and the asymmetric exclusion process*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 357, Pages 3013–3029, 2005.
- [4] F. Chierichetti, A. Dasgupta, R. Kumar, S. Lattanzi. *On Reconstructing a Hidden Permutation*. In Proceedings of RANDOM, 2014.
- [5] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste, *Comparison techniques for random walks on finite groups*. The Annals of Applied Probability, Vol. 21, Pages 2131–2156, 1993.
- [6] P. Diaconis and M. Shahshahani, *Generating a random permutation with random transpositions*. Probability Theory and Related Fields, Vol. 57, Pages 159–179, 1981.
- [7] J. Fill. *An interesting spectral gap problem*. Unpublished manuscript, 2003.
- [8] S. Greenberg, A. Pascoe, and D. Randall. *Sampling Biased Lattice Configurations Using Exponential Metrics*. 20th Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), 2009.

- [9] S. Haddadan and P. Winkler. *Mixing of Permutations by Biased Transposition*. 34th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS), 2017.
- [10] J. H. Hester and D. S. Hirschberg. *Self-organizing linear search*. ACM Computing Surveys, Vol. 19, Pages 295–311, 1985.
- [11] M. Jerrum and A. Sinclair, *Approximating the permanent*. SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol. 18, Pages. 1149–1178, 1989.
- [12] D. A. Levin, Y. Peres , and E. L. Wilmer. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. American Mathematical Society, 2009.
<http://pages.uoregon.edu/dlevin/MARKOV/markovmixing.pdf>
- [13] C. L. Mallows. *Non-null ranking models*. I. Biometrika, Vol. 44(1-2), Pages 114–130, 1957.
- [14] R. Martin and D. Randall. *Disjoint decomposition of Markov chains and sampling circuits in Cayley graphs*. Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, Vol. 15, Pages 411–448, 2006.
- [15] M. Mihail and P. Winkler, *On the number of Eulerian orientations of a graph*. Algorithmica, Vol. 16, Pages 402–414, 1995.
- [16] S. Miracle, A. P. Streib. *Rapid Mixing of k-Class Biased Permutations* [arXiv:1708.05078](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.05078).
- [17] B. Morris. *The mixing time for simple exclusion*. Annals of Probability, Vol. 16, no. 2, Pages 615–635, 2006.
- [18] R. I. Oliveira. *Mixing of the symmetric exclusion processes in terms of the corresponding single-particle random walk*. Annals of Probability, Vol. 41, no. 2, Pages 871–913, 2013.
- [19] D. Randall and P. Tetali, *Analyzing glauber dynamics by comparison of Markov chains*. Journal of Mathematical Physics, Vol. 41, Pages 1598–1615, 2000.
- [20] R. Rivest. *On self-organizing sequential search heuristics*. Communications of the ACM, Vol. 19, no. 2, Pages 63–67, 1976.
- [21] A. Sinclair, *Improved bounds for mixing rates of Markov chains and multi-commodity flow*. Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, Vol. 1, Pages 351–370, 1992.
- [22] A. Sinclair and M. Jerrum, *Approximate Counting, Uniform Generation, and Rapidly Mixing Markov Chains*. Information and Computation, Vol. 82, Pages 93–133, 1989.

- [23] R. P. Stanley, *Topics in Algebraic Combinatorics*. Course notes for Mathematics, 2012. Citeseer.
<http://www-math.mit.edu/~rstan/algcomb/algcomb.pdf>.
- [24] D. Wilson, *Mixing times of lozenge tiling and card shuffling Markov chains*. The Annals of Applied Probability, Vol. 1, Pages 274–325, 2004.