arXiv:1611.07275v3 [math.PR] 31 May 2018

On Unfair Permutations

İlker Arslan* Ümit Işlak† Cihan Pehlivan‡

March 6, 2024

Abstract

In this paper we study the inverse of so-called unfair permutations. Our investigation begins with comparing this class of permutations with uniformly random permutations, and showing that they behave very much alike in case of locally dependent random variables. As an example of a globally dependent statistic we use the number of inversions, and show that this statistic satisfies a central limit theorem after proper centering and scaling.

Keywords: Random permutations, uniform permutations, descents, inversions, Stein's method, size biased coupling.

1 Introduction

Letting $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables each of which is uniformly distributed over $(0,1)$, and $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ be the corresponding ranks, it is well-known that the distribution of $(R_1, \ldots, R_n)$ is the same as the distribution of a uniformly distributed random permutation in S_n, the symmetric group on n distinct letters. This result, often attributed to Rényi, of course remains true if we replace the uniform distribution over $(0,1)$ with any other continuous distribution.

The purpose of this note is to study two related random permutation models; unfair permutations and their inverses. Former of these models was first introduced in [8] by following the ensuing game description.[1]There are n players labeled 1 through n, and i^{th} player chooses i independent random numbers each of which is uniformly distributed over $(0,1)$, and picks the maximum, say Z_i, as her score. Then, the resulting unfair permutation is $\gamma_n = (\gamma_n(1), \ldots, \gamma_n(n))$, where $\gamma_n(i)$ is the player whose rank is i, i.e. who has the i^{th} smallest value. Here, γ_n is unfair in the sense that when i is large, $\gamma_n(i)$ favors to have larger values, and vice versa. The motivation of [8] for introducing unfair permutations is related to the theory of partitions, see the cited work for a relevant discussion.

Given the same game description, we define another random permutation model by letting $\rho_n = (R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n)$, where R_i is the rank of the i^{th} player. Noting that $\gamma_n(i)$ is the label of the player with rank i and that $\gamma_n^{-1}(j)$ is the rank of player j, we see that $\rho_n = \gamma_n^{-1}$. For this reason, the permutation ρ_n is said to have the inverse-unfair permutation.

*Işık University, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: ilkerarslan@sabanciuniv.edu.

†Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: umit.islak1@boun.edu.tr.

‡Atılım University, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: cpehlivan@ku.edu.tr.

[1]Let us note that the definition of an unfair permutation given in [8] is not totally clear to us. At several points they use properties of inverses of unfair permutations as called in this paper, but then, for example, when they deal with the number of descents or the probability of a given permutation, their results are based on unfair permutations - again in the setting of this manuscript.

In order to clarify the definitions, let us continue with an example. Assume that there are 4 players, and player i, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, picks i random numbers $\{X_j^{(i)}\}_{j=1}^{i}$ independently each of which is uniform over $(0, 1)$, and that the resulting random numbers turn out to be $\{X_j^{(1)}\}_{j=1}^{1} = \{0.75\}$, $\{X_j^{(2)}\}_{j=1}^{2} = \{0.15, 0.95\}$, $\{X_j^{(3)}\}_{j=1}^{3} = \{0.12, 0.31, 0.72\}$, and $\{X_j^{(4)}\}_{j=1}^{4} = \{0.03, 0.27, 0.34, 0.52\}$. Then, recalling that $Z_i = \max_{j=1,\ldots,i}\{X_j^{(i)}\}$,

$$Z_1 = 0.75, \quad Z_2 = 0.95, \quad Z_3 = 0.72, \quad \text{and} \quad Z_4 = 0.52,$$

and so the corresponding rank sequence is

$$R_1 = 3, \quad R_2 = 4, \quad R_3 = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad R_4 = 1,$$

yielding an unfair permutation

$$\gamma_4 = (4, 3, 1, 2).$$

The corresponding inverse-unfair permutation is just the rank sequence

$$\rho_4 = (3, 4, 2, 1).$$

Here, and below, the permutations are written in one-line notation. For example, $\gamma_4 = (4, 3, 1, 2) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 4 & 3 & 1 & 2 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

In next section we will start the discussion by comparing inverse-unfair/unfair permutations to uniform permutations in various ways. In general, we show that statistics of these two random permutation models can behave quite differently when the underlying dependence is global, but that this is not the case when underlying dependence is only local. Also, we will focus on some specific examples of both locally and globally dependent statistics. Letting τ_n be a permutation in S_n, regarding local dependence, we will analyze the number of m-descents when m is a fixed natural number

$$D_{n,m}(\tau_n) = \#\{(i, j) : 1 \leq j - i \leq m, \tau_n(i) > \tau_n(j)\}, \tag{1}$$

and regarding globally dependent statistics we will focus on the number of inversions defined by

$$\mathrm{Inv}(\tau_n) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbf{1}(\tau_n(i) > \tau_n(j)).$$

Before moving to the main discussion, let us fix some notation. First, $=_d$, $\to_d$ and $\to_{\mathbb{P}}$ are used for equality in distribution, convergence in distribution and convergence in probability, respectively. $\mathcal{G}$ denotes a standard normal random variable, and C is used for constants (which may differ in each line) that do not depend on any of the parameters. The notations d_W and d_{TV} are reserved for the Wasserstein and total variation distances between probability measures, respectively. For two sequences a_n and b_n, we write $a_n \sim b_n$ if $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n/b_n = 1$. Finally, $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is used for the floor function.

Rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some basic probability computations that will be required in following sections. Results of Section 3 compare uniformly random permutations to unfair permutations, and provides a general connection between the two for locally dependent random variables. Same section contains a central limit theorem for two locally dependent statistics. Later, in Section 4, we also consider a globally dependent statistic, the number of inversions, and prove a central limit theorem. We conclude the paper in Section 5 with a discussion of two generalizations of unfair permutations.

2 Basics

As in Introduction, consider n players where player i picks i independent random numbers $\{X_j^{(i)}\}_{j=1}^{i}$ each of which is uniform over $(0,1)$. Set $Z_i = \max\{X_j^{(i)} : j = 1, \dots, i\}$, [2] and $R_1, \dots, R_n$ be the ranks of $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$, respectively. Define the random permutations ρ_n by setting $\rho_n = (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n)$ and γ_n by setting $\gamma_n = (\gamma_n(1), \dots, \gamma_n(n))$, where $\gamma_n(i)$ is the player whose rank is i.

As a starting point, let us note that there are certain statistics in S_n, say T is one such example, so that $T(\rho_n) = T(\gamma_n)$ thanks to some sort of symmetry within T. For instance, recalling that $\mathrm{Inv}(\tau_n)$ is the number of inversions in a permutation τ_n, and noting that $\mathrm{Inv}(\tau_n) = \mathrm{Inv}(\tau_n^{-1})$ for any τ_n, we have

$$\mathrm{Inv}(\rho_n) = \mathrm{Inv}(\gamma_n). \tag{2}$$

A generalization to this observation can be given by considering the number of increasing (or, decreasing) subsequences of a permutation τ_n of a given length m, denoted by $\mathrm{Inc}_{n,m}(\tau_n)$. This is so since if τ_n has an increasing subsequence indexed by $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m$, then τ_n^{-1} has an increasing subsequence indexed by $\tau_n(i_1) < \tau_n(i_2) < \cdots < \tau(i_m)$.

Moving on to probabilistic considerations, we will now do some elementary observations that will be used repeatedly throughout the paper. First, letting $X_1, \dots, X_i, Y_1, \dots, Y_j$ be i.i.d. uniform random variables over $(0,1)$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\rho_n(i) < \rho_n(j)) &= \mathbb{P}(\max\{X_1 \dots, X_i\} < \max\{Y_1, \dots, Y_j\}) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{j} \mathbb{P}\left(\max\{X_1, \dots, X_i, Y_1, \dots, Y_j\} = Y_\ell\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{j} \frac{1}{i+j} = \frac{j}{i+j}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where we use the i.i.d. assumption. Following the reasoning in derivation of (3), for $i_s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ where $1 \le s \le k$ and $i_{s_1} \neq i_{s_2}$ for $s_1 \neq s_2$, one can also easily show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_n(i_1) < \cdots < \rho_n(i_k)) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{k} \left(\frac{i_\ell}{\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} i_j} \right). \tag{4}$$

In particular, (4) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_n = id) = \frac{2^n}{(n+1)!}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{P}(\rho_n = (n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)) = \frac{2^n n!}{(2n)!}.$$

Also, since the inverse of $(n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)$ is the same permutation, we have $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_n = (n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)) = \frac{2^n n!}{(2n)!}$. The following list provides the probability mass function of an inverse-unfair permutation in S_4.

ρ_4	Probabilities	ρ_4	Probabilities	ρ_4	Probabilities	ρ_4	Probabilities
(1234)	0.13333	(2134)	0.06666	(3124)	0.04	(4123)	0.02666
(1243)	0.11428	(2143)	0.05714	(3142)	0.025	(4132)	0.02222
(1324)	0.1	(2314)	0.03333	(3214)	0.02666	(4213)	0.01777
(1342)	0.06857	(2341)	0.01714	(3241)	0.01428	(4231)	0.01111
(1423)	0.075	(2413)	0.02857	(3412)	0.01428	(4312)	0.01269
(1432)	0.06	(2431)	0.015	(3421)	0.01071	(4321)	0.00952

Table 1: Exact probabilities of all inverse-unfair permutations in S_4.

[2] From here on, we use the notation Z_i for maximum of i i.i.d. random numbers without further mention whenever it is clear from the context.

Regarding the unfair case, for any permutation $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \in S_n$, it can be easily shown that [8]

$$\mathbb{P}(\gamma_n = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)) = \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_j}. \tag{5}$$

The following list, which looks very much like Table 1, provides all probabilities for unfair permutations in S_4.

ρ_4	Probabilities	ρ_4	Probabilities	ρ_4	Probabilities	ρ_4	Probabilities
(1234)	0.13333	(2134)	0.06666	(3124)	0.03333	(4123)	0.01714
(1243)	0.11428	(2143)	0.05714	(3142)	0.025	(4132)	0.015
(1324)	0.1	(2314)	0.04	(3214)	0.02666	(4213)	0.01428
(1342)	0.075	(2341)	0.02666	(3241)	0.01777	(4231)	0.01111
(1423)	0.06857	(2413)	0.02857	(3412)	0.01428	(4312)	0.01071
(1432)	0.06	(2431)	0.02222	(3421)	0.01269	(4321)	0.00952

Table 2: Exact probabilities of all unfair permutations in S_4.

An induction argument can be used to show that the maximum of $\mathbb{P}(\rho_n = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n))$ is attained at the identity permutation $\rho_n = id = (1, 2, \ldots, n)$, and the minimum is attained at $\rho_n = (n, n-1, \ldots, 1)$. The same result holds for inverse-unfair permutations as well.

3 Comparison to uniform permutations

The purpose of this section is to discuss similarities and differences between uniform and unfair/inverse-unfair permutations. First, we would like to see how far are unfair permutations from the uniform ones. For this purpose, recall that the total variation distance between two probability measures μ and ν is defined by $d_{TV}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{A \subset \mathbb{R}} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|$. When the sample space $\mathcal{S}$ of μ and ν is discrete, it is well known [6] that we may write $d_{TV}(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{S}} |\mu(x) - \nu(x)|$.

Theorem 3.1 *Let ρ_n and π_n be random permutations in S_n with inverse-unfair and uniform distributions, respectively. Then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(\rho_n), \mathcal{L}(\pi_n)) = 1,$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\rho_n)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\pi_n)$ are the laws of ρ_n and π_n. Same result holds if we replace ρ_n by an unfair permutation γ_n.

Proof: Define $A_n := \{\tau \in S_n : \tau(1) < \tau(n), \cdots, \tau(\log n) < \tau(n)\}$. Then, evidently,

$$\mathbb{P}(\pi_n \in A_n) = \frac{1}{\log n + 1}.$$

(Here and below, $\log n$ is understood to be $\lfloor \log n \rfloor$, where $\lfloor . \rfloor$ is the floor function.) Next, letting $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ and $\{Y_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be sequences of i.i.d. uniformly random variables over $(0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\rho_n \in A_n) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max\left\{X_1, \ldots, X_{\frac{(\log n)(\log n+1)}{2}}\right\} < \max\{Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\}\right) \\ &= \frac{n}{n + \frac{(\log n)(\log n+1)}{2}} \longrightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

So, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \to \infty} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(\rho_n), \mathcal{L}(\pi_n)) &\geq \liminf_{n \to \infty} (\mathbb{P}(\rho_n \in A_n) - \mathbb{P}(\pi_n \in A_n)) \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{n}{n + \frac{(\log n)(\log n+1)}{2}} - \frac{1}{\log n + 1} \right) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$, proving the first claim.

For the second claim, we just observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(\rho_n), \mathcal{L}(\pi_n)) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} |\mathbb{P}\{\rho_n = \sigma\} - \mathbb{P}\{\pi_n = \sigma\}| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} |\mathbb{P}\{\rho_n = \sigma^{-1}\} - \mathbb{P}\{\pi_n = \sigma^{-1}\}| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} |\mathbb{P}\{\gamma_n = \sigma\} - \mathbb{P}\{\pi_n = \sigma^{-1}\}| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} |\mathbb{P}\{\gamma_n = \sigma\} - \mathbb{P}\{\pi_n = \sigma\}| = d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(\gamma_n), \mathcal{L}(\pi_n)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that π_n is uniform. □

The next result shows that the moments of certain locally dependent statistics in uniform and inverse-unfair permutations behave similarly asymptotically.

Theorem 3.2 *Let ρ_n and π_n be random permutations in S_n with inverse-unfair and uniform distributions, respectively. For a given $\tau_n \in S_n$, let*

$$Y(\tau_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \chi_i(\tau_n),$$

where $\chi_i(\tau_n)$ is a function of the form

$$\chi_i(\tau_n) = \mathbf{1}(\tau_n(i - m_{2,n}(i)) \triangle_{-m_{2,n}(i)} \cdots \triangle_{-2} \tau_n(i-1) \triangle_{-1} \tau_n(i) \triangle_0 \tau_n(i+1) \triangle_1 \cdots \triangle_{m_{1,n}(i)-1} \tau_n(i + m_{1,n}(i))),$$

with each $\triangle_j \in \{<, >\}$. Here, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $m_{1,n}(i) = \min\{i-1, r_1(i)\}$ and $m_{2,n}(i) = \min\{i-1, r_2(i)\}$ are integer valued functions with $1 \le r_1(i), r_2(i) \le M$ for some constant $M < \infty$. Then, for any $k \ge 1$, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[(Y(\rho_n))^k\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[(Y(\pi_n))^k\right]} \longrightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Let us demonstrate the use of the theorem with some well known locally dependent statistics in literature:

Statistic	Order of Expectation	Order of Variance
$D_n(\rho_n)$	$n/2$	$n/12$
$M_n(\rho_n)$	$n/3$	$2n/45$
$LA_n(\rho_n)$	$2n/3$	$8n/45$
$R_{n,m}(\rho_n)$	$\frac{n}{m!}$	$n\left(\frac{1}{m!}\left(1 - \frac{2m-1}{m!}\right) + 2\sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{(m+k)!}\right)$

Here the statistics are respectively the number of descents, the number of local maximums, the length of the longest alternating subsequence and the number of rising sequences of length m. Asymptotic orders follow from Theorem 3.2, and the corresponding asymptotic results for uniform permutations in [2], [9], [4], and [3], respectively.

Proof of Theorem 3.2: Let us first discuss the case $k = 1$. Observe that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[Y(\rho_n)\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Y(\pi_n)\right]} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)}. \tag{6}$$

Following the notation in Introduction, for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, let $\{X_i^{(j)}\}_{i=1}^j$ be the independent $U(0,1)$ random numbers used to form an inverse-unfair permutation. Also set $Z_j = \max\{X_i^{(j)} : i = 1, \ldots, j\}$, and define the events

$$B_i^{(j)} = \{Z_j \in \{X_1^{(j)}, \ldots, X_{i-m_{2,n}(i)}^{(j)}\}\},$$

and

$$A_i = \bigcap_{j=i-m_{2,n}(i)}^{i+m_{1,n}(i)} B_i^{(j)}.$$

Note that conditional on A_i, each of the random variables Z_j, $j = i - m_{2,n}(i), \ldots, i + m_{1,n}(i)$, can be considered the as the maximum of $i - m_{2,n}(i)$ i.i.d. $U(0,1)$ random variables so that $Z_{i-m_{2,n}(i)}, \ldots, Z_{i+m_{1,n}}(i)$ are i.i.d. as well. Since $\{\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1\}$ is an event related to the relative ordering of the Z_j's the conditional probability given that A_i occurs should be the same as that of $\{\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1\}$.

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(B_i^{(j)}) \geq \frac{i - m_{2,n}(i)}{j}, \text{ for each } j = i - m_{2,n}(i), \ldots, i + m_{1,n}(i),$$

and so using independence

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i) = \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=i-m_{2,n}(i)}^{i+m_{1,n}(i)} B_i^{(j)}\right) \geq \prod_{j=i-m_{2,n}(i)}^{i+m_{1,n}(i)} \frac{i - m_{2,n}(i)}{j} \geq \left(\frac{i-M}{i+M}\right)^{m_{1,n}(i)+m_{2,n}(i)+1} \geq \left(\frac{i-M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1}.$$

This also yields

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i^c) \leq 1 - \left(\frac{i-M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1}.$$

Going back to (6), we rewrite the right-hand as

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1 \big| A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1 \big| A_i^c)\mathbb{P}(A_i^c)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)}.$$

We will next prove

i. $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n)=1 \big| A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)} \longrightarrow 1$, as $n \to \infty$,

ii. $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n)=1 \big| A_i^c)\mathbb{P}(A_i^c)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)} \longrightarrow 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

Proof of i. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Observe that we have

$$\left(\frac{i-M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1} > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \iff i > \frac{2M}{1 - \exp\left(\frac{\log(1-\epsilon/2)}{2M+1}\right)} - M \geq M,$$

where the last inequality follows since $\log(1 - \epsilon/2) < 0$ and so $\exp\left(\frac{\log(1-\epsilon/2)}{2M+1}\right)$. Now, letting $M^* = \max\left\{M, \left(\frac{2M}{1-\exp\left(\frac{\log(1-\epsilon/2)}{2M+1}\right)}\right) - M\right\} = \frac{2M}{1-\exp\left(\frac{\log(1-\epsilon/2)}{2M+1}\right)} - M$, we write

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1 \big| A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{M^*} \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1 \big| A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)} + \frac{\sum_{i=M^*+1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n) = 1 \big| A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n) = 1)}.$$

First term on the left-hand side clearly converges to zero. Also it can be checked easily that the second term satisfies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=M^*+1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n)=1\big|A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)} \geq 1-\epsilon,$$

proving claim i..

Proof of ii. We have

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n)=1\big|A_i^c)\mathbb{P}(A_i^c)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i^c)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(1-\left(1-\frac{2M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)}.$$

Now observe that for $i > M$, Bernoulli's inequality yields

$$\left(1-\frac{2M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1} \geq 1-(2M+1)\frac{2M}{i+M}.$$

Therefore, when $i > M$, we obtain

$$1-\left(1-\frac{2M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1} \leq 1-\left(1-(2M+1)\frac{2M}{i+M}\right) = \frac{(2M+1)2M}{i+M},$$

and since M is a constant independent of n, this gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(1-\left(1-\frac{2M}{i+M}\right)^{2M+1}\right) \leq C\log n.$$

Noting that $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1) \geq c$, for some $c\in\mathbb{R}^+$, we conclude that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\rho_n)=1\big|A_i^c)\mathbb{P}(A_i^c)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{P}(\chi_i(\pi_n)=1)} \longrightarrow 0,$$

showing that claim ii is true. Combining all above, result follows for $k=1$.

For more general case, note that $(Y(\rho_n))^k$ can still be considered as a sum of indicator random variables that are locally dependent, and proof follows in a similar way. □

We conclude this section with a more detailed analysis of a locally dependent statistic, the number of generalized descents. Expectation of a special case of this statistic, the number of descents, in unfair permutations was previously studied in [8], where they find its expectation and asymptotic growth. However, our treatment below simplifies their computations significantly. The theory for $D_{n,m}$ in case of uniform permutations is well-established, see [2] and [7] for relevant work.

For a given permutation $\tau_n \in S_n$, and for $m \geq 1$, recall that the number of m-descents in τ_n is defined by $D_{n,m} = \#\{(i,j) : 1 \leq j-i \leq m, \tau_n(i) > \tau_n(j)\}$. When $m=1$, $D_{n,1}$ is known to be the number of descents in γ_n, and we simply write D_n for $D_{n,1}$. In a similar way, the number of m-ascents in τ_n is defined by $A_{n,m} = \#\{(i,j) : 1 \leq j-i \leq m, \tau_n(i) < \tau_n(j)\}$, and $A_n := A_{n,1}$ is said to be the number of ascents in τ_n.

Theorem 3.3 *Let ρ_n be an inverse-unfair permutation in S_n and $D_{n,m}$ be the number of m-descents in ρ_n. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{n,m}] = \frac{nm}{2} - \frac{m(m+1)}{4} - \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\frac{k}{2(2i+k)}, \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{Var}(D_{n,m}) \sim \frac{6nm+4m^3+3m^2-m}{72}.$$

Further,

$$\frac{D_{n,m}-\mathbb{E}[D_{n,m}]}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(D_{n,m})}} \longrightarrow_d \mathcal{G}, \qquad n\to\infty.$$

Proof: Noting that

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{n,m}] = \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \mathbb{P}(\rho_n(i) > \rho_n(i+k)),$$

and that $\mathbb{P}(\rho_n(i) > \rho_n(i+k)) = \frac{i}{2i+k}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{n,m}] = \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} \frac{i}{2i+k} = \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left[\frac{n-k}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\frac{k}{2i+k}\right] = \frac{nm}{2} - \frac{m(m+1)}{4} - \sum_{k=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k}\frac{k}{2(2i+k)}.$$

The asymptotics of $Var(D_{n,m})$ is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.2, and results of [7] on the number of generalized descents in uniformly random permutations. The central limit theorem follows from well-known asymptotic results on m-dependent sequences. Indeed, it is standard that besides the central limit theorem, one may obtain a convergence rate of order $1/\sqrt{n}$ with respect to Kolmogorov distance [1]. □

It is easy to see that choosing $m = 1$ in Theorem 3.3 yields $\mathbb{E}[D_n] = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{\log n}{4} + O(1)$. Noting that $A_n + D_n = n - 1$ we obtain $\mathbb{E}[A_n] = \frac{n}{2} + \frac{3\log n}{4} + O(1)$.

Remark 3.1 *Following steps similar to the computation of* $\mathbb{E}[D_{n,m}]$*, we may actually compute exact values of higher moments of* $D_{n,m}$*. As an example, let us compute* $\mathrm{Var}(D_n)$*. Letting* $U_i = \mathbf{1}(\rho_n(i) > \rho_n(i+1))$*, we have* $\mathrm{Var}(U_i) = \frac{i(i+1)}{(2i+1)^2}$ *since* $\mathbb{E}[U_i] = \mathbb{P}(\rho_n(i) > \rho_n(i+1)) = \frac{i}{2i+1}$*. When* $i+1 < j$*, we have* $\mathrm{Cov}(U_i, U_j) = 0$ *because* U_i *and* U_j *are independent. Also if* $i+1 = j$*, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[U_iU_j] = \mathbb{E}[U_iU_{i+1}] = \mathbb{P}(\rho_n(i) > \rho_n(i+1) > \rho_n(i+2)) = \frac{i}{6i+9},$$

and so

$$\mathrm{Cov}(U_i, U_{i+1}) = \frac{i}{6i+9} - \frac{i}{2i+1}\frac{i+1}{2i+3} = \frac{-i(i+2)}{3(2i+3)(2i+1)}.$$

Hence

$$\mathrm{Var}(D_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\frac{i(i+1)}{(2i+1)^2} - \frac{2}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\frac{i(i+2)}{(2i+3)(2i+1)} = \frac{n}{12} + O(1).$$

4 Number of inversions

The number of inversions in a permutation $\tau \in S_n$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Inv}(\tau) = \sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \mathbf{1}(\tau(i) > \tau(j)).$$

This is the number of pairs (i, j) whose corresponding values are out of order. The number of anti-inversions is defined in a similar way by setting

$$\mathrm{AInv}(\tau) = \sum_{i<j} \mathbf{1}(\tau(i) < \tau(j)).$$

Asymptotic properties of the number of inversions when τ is a uniformly random permutation are well studied. See [2] and [7].

The number of anti-inversions in an unfair permutation γ_n in S_n was previously studied in [8], where they proved that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{AInv}(\gamma_n)] = \left(\frac{\log 2}{2}\right)n^2 + O(n), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{AInv}(\gamma_n)) = \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\pi^2}{18} + \frac{2\log 2}{3} - \frac{\log 3}{2} + \frac{2\log^2 2}{3}\right)n^3 + o(n^3).$$

Clearly, these two imply that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Inv}(\gamma_n)] = \left(\frac{1-\log 2}{2}\right) n^2 + O(n), \tag{7}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Inv}(\gamma_n)) = \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\pi^2}{18} + \frac{2\log 2}{3} - \frac{\log 3}{2} + \frac{2\log^2 2}{3}\right) n^3 + o(n^3). \tag{8}$$

The main result of this section is the following which provides a central limit theorem for the number of inversions in an inverse-unfair permutation setting. The same result also holds for standard unfair permutations after a small modification, see Remark 4.1.

Theorem 4.1 *Let ρ_n be an inverse-unfair permutation in S_n. Then we have*

$$d_W\left(\frac{\mathrm{Inv}(\rho_n) - (1-\log 2/2)n^2}{\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Inv}(\gamma_n))}, \mathcal{G}\right) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where C is a constant independent of n. In particular,

$$\frac{\mathrm{Inv}(\rho_n) - (1-\log 2/2)n^2}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\pi^2}{18} + \frac{2\log 2}{3} - \frac{\log 3}{2} + \frac{2\log^2 2}{3}}\, n^{3/2}} \longrightarrow_d \mathcal{G},$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 4.1 *For symmetry reasons, we also have $\frac{\mathrm{Inv}(\gamma_n) - (1-\log 2/2)n^2}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\pi^2}{18} + \frac{2\log 2}{3} - \frac{\log 3}{2} + \frac{2\log^2 2}{3}}\, n^{3/2}} \longrightarrow_d \mathcal{G}$, as $n \to \infty$, where γ_n is an unfair permutation.*

Remark 4.2 *The discussion on number of inversions can be generalized to increasing (or decreasing) sequences of arbitrary length. This statistic in uniformly random permutation framework was previously studied in [5]. Their proof is a lot simpler due to underlying symmetry.*

4.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

The proof will require size biased couplings from the Stein's method literature. In general, this method refers to a general technique to provide estimation errors for distributional approximations. For a survey of the techniques from Stein's method, see [10].

Letting W be a nonnegative and integrable random variable, the distribution of W^s is said to be W-size biased if we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \mathbb{E}[W]\mathbb{E}[f(W^s)],$$

for all functions f for which the expectations exist and for which $\mathbb{E}|Wf(W)| < \infty$. The main result we will need is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2 *[10] Let $W \geq 0$ be a random variable with $\mathbb{E}[W] = \mu$ and $\mathrm{Var}(W) = \sigma^2 < \infty$. Let W^s be defined on the same space as W and have the size bias distribution with respect to W. Then*

$$d_W\left(\frac{W-\mu}{\sigma}, \mathcal{G}\right) \leq \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}(W^s - W|W))} + \frac{\mu}{\sigma^3}\mathbb{E}[(W^s - W)^2].$$

Clearly, in the following, for a given nonnegative random variable W, we will need to construct a size biased coupling of W with certain properties. The following result for sums of Bernoulli random variables will suffice for our purposes.

Proposition 4.1 *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be zero-one random variables with $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = p_i$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $(X_j^i)_{j \neq i}$ have the distribution of $(X_j)_{j \neq i}$ conditional on $X_i = 1$. If $W = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, $\mu = \mathbb{E}[W]$, and I is chosen independent of all else with $\mathbb{P}(I = i) = p_i/\mu$, then $W^s = \sum_{j \neq I} X_j^I + 1$ has the size-bias distribution of W.*

The proof is standard and we skip it referring to [10].

Proof of Theorem 4.1. First note that

$$\mathrm{Inv}(\rho_n) =_d \sum_{i<j} \mathbf{1}(Z_i > Z_j)$$

where Z_i is the maximum of i independent $U(0,1)$ random variables, and where Z_i's are independent. Let

$$Y_{ij} = \mathbf{1}(Z_i > Z_j)$$

and

$$W = \sum_{i<j} Y_{ij}.$$

To size bias W, first denoting $p_{i,j} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_{ij}]}{\sum_{k<l} \mathbb{E}[Y_{kl}]}$'s, we let I be a random variable taking values in $\{(i,j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} : i < j\}$ with distribution $\mathbb{P}(I = (i,j)) = p_{i,j}$. Now if $Y_{i,j} = 1$, then we keep the Z_k's as they are. Otherwise, we sample (Z_i^*, Z_j^*) according to the distribution of (Z_i, Z_j) conditionally on $Z_i > Z_j$. Letting

$$\begin{aligned} W^{ij} \quad = \quad & \sum_{\{k,l\} \cap \{i,j\} = \emptyset} \mathbf{1}(Z_k > Z_l) + \sum_{s=1}^{i-1} \mathbf{1}(Z_s > Z_i^*) + \sum_{s=i+1, s \neq j}^{n} \mathbf{1}(Z_i^* > Z_s) \\ & + \sum_{s=1, s \neq i}^{j-1} \mathbf{1}(Z_s > Z_j^*) + \sum_{s=j+1}^{n} \mathbf{1}(Z_j^* > Z_s) + 1, \end{aligned}$$

W^I has W size biased distribution. Also, for any (i,j) with $1 \leq i < j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} W^{ij} - W \quad = \quad & \sum_{s=1}^{i-1} (\mathbf{1}(Z_s > Z_i^*) - \mathbf{1}(Z_s > Z_i)) + \sum_{s=i+1, s \neq j}^{n} (\mathbf{1}(Z_i^* > Z_s) - \mathbf{1}(Z_i > Z_s)) \\ & + \sum_{s=1, s \neq i}^{j-1} (\mathbf{1}(Z_s > Z_j^*) - \mathbf{1}(Z_s > Z_j)) + \sum_{s=j+1}^{n} (\mathbf{1}(Z_j^* > Z_s) - \mathbf{1}(Z_j > Z_s)) + 1 - \mathbf{1}(Z_i > Z_j). \end{aligned}$$

This immediately gives $|W^{ij} - W| \leq 2n$ and so $\mathbb{E}|W^I - W|^2 \leq 4n^2$. Next we focus on the variance estimate. Setting $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ observe that

$$\mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}[W^I - W | W]) \leq \mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}[W^I - W | \mathbf{Z}]).$$

See Lemma 4 of [7] for a justification of this last step. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}[W^I - W|W]) &\leq \mathrm{Var}\left(\sum_{i<j} \frac{\frac{i}{i+j}}{\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}}\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}]\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i<j} \frac{\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2}\mathrm{Var}\left(\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}]\right)\right) \qquad (9) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i<j,i'<j',(i,j)\neq(i',j')} \frac{\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)\left(\frac{i'}{i'+j'}\right)}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2}\mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}], \mathbb{E}[W^{i'j'} - W|\mathbf{Z}]).\end{aligned}$$

Before moving further, we give some elementary estimates we will need below. First, it is clear that

$$\sum_{k<l} \frac{k}{k+l} \leq C_1 n^2,$$

for some $C_1 > 0$. Also,

$$\sum_{k<l} \frac{k}{k+l} \geq \sum_{k<l,k\geq n/2} \frac{k}{2l} \geq \sum_{k<l,k\geq n/2} \frac{n/2}{2n} = \binom{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}{2}\frac{1}{4} \geq C_2 n^2,$$

for some $C_2 > 0$. In particular, we conclude that $\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}$ is of order n^2. Lastly, note that

$$\sum_{k<l}\left(\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2 \leq \sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l} \leq C_3 n^2,$$

for some $C_3 > 0$.

Now for the first term in (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\sum_{i<j} \frac{\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2}\mathrm{Var}\left(\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}]\right)\right) &= \left(\frac{\sum_{i<j}\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2}\left(\mathrm{Var}(W^{ij} - W) - \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Var}(W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z})]\right)\right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i<j}\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2}\mathrm{Var}(W^{ij} - W)\right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i<j}\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2}\mathbb{E}[(W^{ij} - W)^2]\right) \\ &\leq 4n^2\frac{\sum_{i<j}\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2} \\ &\leq 4n^2\frac{C_3 n^2}{C_2^2 n^4} \\ &\leq C_4.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we focus on the second term in (9) involving covariances. Observe that since the expectations are conditional on $\mathbf{Z}$, for any given i, j, $\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}]$ will be dependent on Cn many other

$\mathbb{E}[W^{i'j'} - W|\mathbf{Z}]$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_{ij}$ the set of i', j' pairs with $i' < j'$ for which $\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}]$ depends on $\mathbb{E}[W^{i'j'} - W|\mathbf{Z}]$. Also observe that each of the terms $\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}]$ is a sum of $2n-1$ random variables that are themselves bounded by 1. Combining these observations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i<j, i'<j', (i,j)\neq(i',j')} \frac{\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)\left(\frac{i'}{i'+j'}\right)}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2} \mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}], \mathbb{E}[W^{i'j'} - W|\mathbf{Z}]) \\
&= \sum_{i<j} \sum_{(i',j')\in\mathcal{S}_{ij}} \frac{\left(\frac{i}{i+j}\right)\left(\frac{i'}{i'+j'}\right)}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2} \mathrm{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[W^{ij} - W|\mathbf{Z}], \mathbb{E}[W^{i'j'} - W|\mathbf{Z}]) \\
&\leq Cn^2 \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k<l}\frac{k}{k+l}\right)^2} \sum_{i<j} \frac{i}{i+j} \sum_{(i',j')\in\mathcal{S}_{ij}} \frac{i'}{i'+j'} \leq Cn^2 \frac{1}{n^4} n^2 n = Cn.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining our estimates, we therefore obtain

$$\mathrm{Var}(\mathbb{E}[W^I - W|W]) \leq Cn,$$

for any $n \geq 1$ where C is a constant independent of n. Recalling also that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{Inv}(\rho_n)\right] \sim (1 - \log 2/2)n^2,$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Inv}(\rho_n)) \sim \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\pi^2}{18} + \frac{2\log 2}{3} - \frac{\log 3}{2} + \frac{2\log^2 2}{3}\right) n^3,$$

result now follows from Theorem 4.2.

The second claim follows from a straightforward application of Slutsky's theorem. □

5 Concluding remarks

We conclude the paper by noting that unfair permutations admit two natural generalizations worth studying.

(1) In standard inverse-unfair permutation framework, i^{th} player chooses i many i.i.d. uniform numbers over $(0, 1)$ and picks the maximum. What if the i^{th} player chooses $\phi(i)$ random numbers for some function ϕ? Clearly, when ϕ is identically equal to 1 and ϕ is the identity function, this setting recovers the uniformly random and the inverse-unfair permutation cases, respectively. Depending on growth rate of ϕ_n, one will have quite different behaviours for underlying statistics.

(2) A second generalization can be given by making use of Markov chains. Let $\{\phi(i)\}_{i\geq 1}$ be a Markov chain starting at time $t = 1$, with state space $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$, and transition matrix $\mathbf{P}$. Also assume that $\phi(1) = 1$. Then we can define a variation of inverse-unfair permutations by saying that the i^{th} player draws $\phi(i)$ numbers and chooses the maximum of these. Clearly, if the state space is $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{Z}^+$, and the transition probability matrix $\mathbf{P}$ is $\mathbf{P}_{i,j} = \mathbf{1}(j = i+1)$, then we recover the standard unfair permutations. However, the model is far more general thanks to the flexibility in choice of $\mathbf{P}$. In particular, depending on properties of $\mathbf{P}$ such as transience, recurrence, etc., statistics of the resulting model will differ from the corresponding unfair permutation statistics significantly.

Acknowledgements The author C. P. has been supported by TUBITAK within the project 113F059 entitled "The conjecture of Mazur-Tate-Teitelbaum, CM elliptic curves and applications" as a postdoctoral researcher at Koç University. The author Ü. I. is supported by the Scientific and Research Council of Turkey [TUBITAK-117C047]. Parts of this paper were completed at the Nesin

Mathematics Village, the authors would like to thank Nesin Mathematics Village for their kind hospitality. Also, we would like to thank an anonymous referee who detected some errors in original manuscript, and whose comments improved the paper significantly.

References

[1] Chen, L. H. Y. and Shao, Q. M., *Normal approximation under local dependence.* Ann. Prob., 32, 1985-2028, 2004.

[2] Fulman, J., *Stein's method and non-reversible Markov chains*, Stein's Method, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 66-74, 2004.

[3] Ghosh, S. and Goldstein, L., *Applications of size biased couplings for concentration of measures*, Electronic Communications in Probability 16.70-83, 236 2011.

[4] Houdré, C. and Restrepo, R., *A probabilistic approach to the asymptotics of the longest alternating subsequence*, Electron. J. Combin. 17, no 1, 2010.

[5] Işlak, Ü. and Özdemir, A. Y., *Asymptotic results on weakly increasing subsequences in random words*, arXiv:1706.09510v2, preprint, 2017.

[6] Levin, D. A., Peres Y. and Wilmer, E. L., *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*, American Mathematical Society, 2009.

[7] Pike, J., *Convergence rates for generalized descents*, Electron. J. Combin. 18, no. 1, Paper 236, 1 pp, 2011.

[8] Prodinger, H., Schneider, C. and Wagner, S., *Unfair Permutations*, Europ. J. Comb. 32.8, 11282-1298, 2011.

[9] Romik, D., *Local extrema in random permutations and the structure of longest alternating subsequences*, 23rd International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics, 825-834, 2011.

[10] Ross, N., *Fundamentals of Stein's method*, Probability Surveys 8, 210-293, 2011.